MR BAYLE's
Hiſtorical and Critical
DICTIONARY

THE SECOND EDITION.

To which is prefixed,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

BY

Mr DES MAIZEAUX,

Fellow of the Royal Society.

VOLUME THE FOURTH.

M—R.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

DICTIONARY
Hiſtorical and Critical
OF
Mr PETER BAYLE.

THE SECOND EDITION,

Carefully collated with the ſeveral Editions of the Original; in which many Paſſages are reſtored, and the whole greatly augmented, particularly with a Tranſlation of the Quotations from eminent Writers in various Languages.

To which is prefixed,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

REVISED, CORRECTED, AND ENLARGED,

BY

Mr DES MAIZEAUX,

Fellow of the Royal Society.

VOLUME THE FOURTH.

M — R.

LONDON:
Printed for D. MIDWINTER; J. BROTHERTON; A. BETTESWORTH and
C. HITCH; J. HAZARD; W. INNYS and R. MANBY; T. WARD;
W. MEADOWS; T. WOODWARD; B. MOTTE; W. HINCHLIFFE;
J. WALTHOE; E. SYMON; T. COX; A. WARD; J. and P. KNAPTON;
D. BROWNE; T. LONGMAN; S. BIRT; W. BICKERTON; T. ASTLEY;
S. AUSTEN; L. GILLIVER; H. LINTOT; H. WHITRIDGE;
R. WILLOCK; E. WICKSTEED; J. and R. TONSON.

MDCCXXXVII.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

Mr BAYLE's
Hiſtorical and Critical
DICTIONARY.

M.

MACCIUS (SEBASTIAN), a learned Humaniſt, flouriſhed in Italy at the beginning of the XVIIth century. I ſpeak of him with reſpect only to thoſe things which Moreri has forgotten. Maccius was a very laborious man, and compoſed verſes with a wonderful facility; whereof he publiſhed a great number. He applied himſelf ſo much to writing, that he made a great cavity in his two fingers, with which he uſed to hold his pen (a). He loſt a ſon, who was but eighteen years old, and was already a Doctor (b). It is not true that his two daughters were Nuns [A]. His definition of hiſtory, contains a contradiction [B].

(a) Tam multa in ſcribendo opera fecit, ut in dexteræ manus pollice atque indice qua parte calamus adſtringitur, ex aſſidua illius tractatione, duo quaſi ſulci alte impreſſi conſpicerentur. *Nicius Erythræus Pinacoth. I. pag.* 278.

(b) *Taken from* Nicius Erythræus, *ibid.*

[A] *It is not true, that his two daughters were nuns.*] To ſhew what credit is to be given to Mr Moreri, I will compare his tranſlation with the Latin he tranſlates. *Maccio*, ſays he, *had two daughters who were nuns, and wrote Latin letters.* He grounds himſelf upon theſe words of Nicius Erythræus (1): ‘Ex duabus fœminis ejus, quæ monaſticam amplexa eſt diſciplinam, epiſtolæ aliquot Latinæ leguntur (2). - - - - *He left two daughters, of which one was a nun, and wrote Latin letters.*’ Can any one truſt to a man, who ſo ſtrangely miſtakes things that can ſo eaſily be related with exactneſs?

(1) *And not* Erythæus, *as Moreri ſays.*

(2) Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. I, *pag.* 279.

[B] *His definition of hiſtory contains a contradiction.*] See Voſſius (3), who calls him *Sebaſtianus Maccius Durentinus.* He ſhould ſay *Durantinus.* Maccius was of Caſtle-Durant. *Caſtri Durantis quod nunc Urbania* (4) *appellatur ortus* (5). Leander Alberti (6) pretends, that this place is ſo called, becauſe William Durant, author of the *Speculum Juris*, cauſed it to be built, whilſt he was Nuncio and Treaſurer to Martin IV in Rogmagna.

(3) Voſſius, de Arte Hiſtorica, *Cap. IV.*

(4) *Moreri ſays* Urbenia.

(5) Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. I, *pag.* 277.

(6) *In* Deſcriptione Italiæ, *pag. m.* 436.

MACCOVIUS, a Proteſtant Divine, ſee **MAKOWSKI**.

MACEDO (FRANCIS), (a) one of the moſt fertile writers of the XVIIth century, was born at Coimbra in 1596, and became a Jeſuit in 1610. He taught Rhetoric ſeveral years, Philoſophy one year, and Chronology a pretty while. He made profeſſion of the fourth vow in the year 1630 (b), nevertheleſs, he quitted the Jeſuits order, and entered into that of the Franciſcans, in the year ——. He nevertheleſs continued to labour for the glory of St Ignatius [A]. He hotly eſpouſed the intereſt of the duke of Braganza, promoted to the crown of Portugal, and publiſhed ſeveral books for the juſtice of that cauſe [B]. He accompanied that prince's ambaſſadors into France and England.

(a) *After he became a Franciſcan, he called himſelf* Franciſcus à Sancto Auguſtino.

(b) Nathan. Sotuel, Biblioth. Scriptorum Societ. Jeſu, *pag.* 235.

[A] *He continued to labour for the glory of St Ignatius.*] See the book he publiſhed at Venice, in the year 1668, intituled, *Concentus Euchologicus Sanctæ Matris Eccleſiæ in Breviario, & S. Auguſtini in libris, adjuncta harmonia Exercitiorum S. Ignatii Soc. Jeſu Fundatoris, & Operum Sancti Auguſtini Eccleſiæ Doctoris.* After having largely ſhewn in this work, that the priſons of the Breviary have a wonderful conformity with St Auguſtin's writings, he ſhews a like conformity betwixt theſe writings and St Ignatius's Spiritual Exerciſes; and not content with this, he parallels the manners and lives of theſe two ſaints, and finds a great agreement betwixt them (1).

[B] *He hotly eſpouſed the intereſt of the duke of Braganza, and publiſhed ſeveral books for the juſtice of that cauſe.*] Amongſt others, *de jure ſuccedendi in regnum*

(1) *See the* Giornale di Letterati, *of the 29th of December,* 1669, *pag.* 135.

RITISH

England. He was called to Rome to exerciſe honourable employments; being made profeſſor of Polemical Divinity in the college *de propaganda fide*, afterwards of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory in the college *della Sapienza*, as alſo cenſor of the holy office. He went from Rome to Padua about the year 1670, to teach Divinity there *(c)*. He was of a fiery temper, and of a pretty univerſal genius, and engaged in ſeveral quarrels [*C*]. It is a wonder that with ſo much learning and memory, he grew grey under the cowl, and was not promoted to a biſhopric. He has not failed to complain, that he was much neglected [*D*]. The Bibliographers of the Jeſuits have mentioned none of his works, but thoſe he publiſhed before his entering among the Franciſcans [*E*]. Don Nicolas Antonio gives

(c) Taken from Don Nicolas Antonio, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. *Tom. I, p.* 336. *Note, that in ſeveral books which Father* Macedo *publiſhed, whilſt he was profeſſor at Padua, he intitled himſelf, Profeſſor of Moral Philoſophy.*

Luſitaniæ, at Paris, 1641, in 4to; and *Propugnaculum Luſitano-Gallicum contra calumnias Hiſpano-Belgicas, in quo ferme omnia utriuſque regni tum domi tum foris præclare geſta continentur*, at Paris 1647, in folio. I remember a paſſage of the *Hexameron Ruſtique*, which I am going to produce, ‘The brothers Sammarthani having mentioned ſome record in the *layette* [drawer] of Champaigne marked *F*. Father Macedo, in his *Luſitano-Gallia*, quotes it, and makes a man of a drawer, *Franciſcus Layette Campanus* (2).’

[*C*] *He engaged in ſeveral quarrels.*] I will ſpeak of them more largely another time. It ſuffices to obſerve here, that he undertook to criticize cardinal Bona, only becauſe this cardinal had never quoted him (3). A ſign that Macedo was proud and quarrelſome. The republic of letters has it's bullies, and Macedo was one of them (4).

[*D*] *It is a wonder that with ſo much learning and memory . . . . . he was not promoted to a biſhopric. He has not failed to complain that he was much neglected.*] Mr Leti thinks it is a ſhame to our age, that ſuch a monk was not raiſed to the dignities of the church. Read what follows, where you will find Father Macedo's complaints. ‘E pure, vergogna del noſtro Secolo, quando morrà, ſi potrà di lui dire quello che eſſo medeſimo ſcriſſe à carte 12. del dottiſſimo Abate Ilarione Rancati. *Et tamen, tantus hic Vir domeſticis duntaxat inſignitus honoribus occubuit, & Monaſtico indutus habitu ſepelitur.* Ogni uno poi vede à chi ſpeſſe volte ſi danno i Veſcovadi, e l'altre dignità. Benche Modeſtiſſimo, non hà potuto far di meno tal volta di non ſi dolere della ſua cattiva fortuna, onde per tralaſciare diverſi altri luoghi nella Prefatione al Lettore del ſuo primo tomo delle *Collationi della Dottrina di S. Tomaſo, e di Scoto. Scribo procul à fuco, longè ab ambitione: omni ſpe honoris non modo abjecta, ſed etiam amiſſa: victima veritatis non macta, ſed mactata. Contigit mihi jactare in Schola, quod ille alter in acie*

Diſce, legens, doctrinam ex me, verumque laborem
Fortunam ex aliis: nam te mea Penna Minervæ
Addictum dabit, & nulla inter præmia ducet.

‘*E nella ſeconda Prefatione all' Apologia per ſan Vincentio Lirinenſe, intendendo del P. M. Noris, e di ſe medeſimo.* Scias, mi Lector, hujuſmodi Auctoribus nihil eſſe invidendum, præter fortunam. In aliis nihil deſiderari præter eandem (5). - - - - - *And to the ſhame of our age let it be ſaid, that when he dies, we may apply to him, what he wrote concerning the learned abbot Hilarion Rancati:* and yet ſo great a man died, diſtinguiſhed only by domeſtic preferment, and was buried in the habit of his order. *Every body may now ſee to whom are often given biſhoprics, and other dignities. Though he was exceedingly modeſt, he could not help complaining of his bad fortune; and without mentioning ſeveral other places, in the preface to the firſt volume of his Parallel of the doctrine of St Thomas and that of Scotus, he ſpeaks thus:* I write without any diſguiſe, and far from any ambition: all hopes of preferment, being not only diſregarded but abſolutely thrown away, as a victim to truth actually offered up. I uſed to ſay in the ſchool, what another ſaid in the field:

From me true learning you may underſtand,
The arts of fortune from another hand
You muſt enquire; for thoſe who truth regard,
With it content, muſt hope for no reward.

‘*And in the ſecond preface to the Apology for Vincentius Lirinenſis, ſpeaking of F. M. Noris, and himſelf he ſays,* you muſt know, courteous reader, that nothing can be envyed in theſe authors but their fortune; *in others nothing is wanting but the ſame.*’ We cannot ſee greater marks of a preſence of mind, and a rich treaſure of knowledge, than thoſe which Father Macedo gave, when for three days together he maintained a theſis upon all ſorts of ſubjects. Here are the particulars of it (6). ‘Has Theſes ſumma omnium expectatione, & admiratione exceptas ſuſtinuit Pater Macedo, eventu feliciſſimo, præſentibus multis excellentiſſimis D. D. Procuratoribus S. Marci, & compluribus Senatoribus, & Nobilibus Venetæ Reipublicæ, & magno numero Doctorum, ac Religioſorum Virorum, etiam alienigenarum quos fama exciverat. Interrogarunt, & probarunt hominem innumeris quæſitis, & argumentis Doctores, ac Magiſtri omnium Ordinum, quibus ipſe ad votum reſpondit: ac ſi præmeditata omnia habuiſſet. Tanta felicitate, ut nunquam titubaverit, nunquam dubitaverit, nunquam hæſerit, nunquam cunctatus fuerit. Imo ſæpè accidit, ut arguentibus quæ objiciebant, aut obliviſcentibus, aut male recitantibus, ipſe dicenda ſubminiſtraret, & corrigeret. Inter quos fuit unus qui Sacræ Scripturæ locum male citarat: & alter cui locus Virgilii memoria exciderat: & tertius qui nonnullos Autores ſuſpectos pro ſua Sententia allegaverat. Primo igitur teſtimonium Sacræ Scripturæ correxit. Secundo verſus Virgilii ſuggeſſit. Tertio ſubtraxit ſuſpectos Auctores, & idoneos ſubminiſtravit. - - - - - *Father Macedo undertook to maintain theſe theſes, to the great expectation and ſurpriſe of every body, and did it with the greateſt ſucceſs, in the preſence of many of the moſt excellent the proctors of St Marc, many of the ſenators and nobles of Venice, and a great number of doctors and religious, even Foreigners, whom fame had drawn thither. The Doctors, and Maſters of all the orders, interrogated, and tried him with innumerable queſtions and arguments, to which he replied as they could have wiſhed, as if every thing had been premeditated; and that ſo happily, that he never ſtumbled, never ſeemed to doubt, never heſitated, or was at a loſs. Nay it often happened, that he prompted and ſet right thoſe, who denied what they objected, or had forgot a thing, or miſquoted. Among theſe was one, who had quoted a paſſage of ſcripture wrong; another, who had forgot a paſſage of Virgil; and a third, who had alledged ſome ſuſpected authors for his opinion. For the firſt therefore he corrected the teſtimony of ſacred ſcripture: to the ſecond he ſuggeſted a verſe of Virgil; from the third he took away his ſuſpected authors, and ſupplied him with ſuch as were proper.*’ Add to this, theſe words of count Julius Clement Scotus (7). ‘Romæ commorans, cum omnium profectò digna admiratione, non ſolùm in S. Auguſtini, cujus doctrinæ eſt addictiſſimus, Templo, trium ſpatio dierum anno 1658, de omni planè Scibili theſes expoſuit, ac reſpondit; verùm & ex improviſo de quacumque re ſibi propoſita, copioſum, concinnumque ſermonem habuit, oppoſitaſque, ne dum diverſas Doctorum opiniones Catholicorum ingenioſiſſime defendit. - - - - - - *During his ſtay at Rome, in the year* 1658, *he not only explained theſes, and made replies, in every branch of knowledge, for three days together, in the church of St Auguſtin, whoſe doctrine he chiefly embraces; but he made eloquent and well-turned orations, off-hand, on any ſubject propoſed to him, and moſt ingeniouſly defended the oppoſite opinions of the Catholic Doctors.*’

[*E*] *The Bibliographers of the Jeſuits have mentioned none of his works but thoſe he publiſhed before his entring among the Franciſcans.*] They are theſes of Rhetoric which he maintained at Madrid, and lyric poems upon the apotheoſis of Francis Xavier, and St Elizabeth queen of Portugal, or elegies upon the death of Francis de Mendoza; and alſo, an abridgment of Chronology from the beginning of the world to the year 1633. A treatiſe concerning the art of Poetry, and the life of

(2) Hexameron Ruſtique, *p.* 29.

(3) John Paſtricius *told Father* Mabillon *this. See the* Muſæum Italicum *of this Father.*

(4) *See the article* ANGLUS, *remark* [*E*].

(5) Leti, Italia regnante, *Parte III, pag.* 193, 194.

(6) *Il Padre* Arcangelo di Parma, *à carte* 16 & 17 *della ſua* Riſpoſta al Padre Noris, *apud* Leti, Italia regnante, *Part. III, pag.* 209, 210.

(7) *Pag.* 3, *of his* Notæ ad Hiſtoriam Concilii Tridentini Patris Sfortiæ Pallavicini, *apud* Leti, *ibid. pag.* 208, 209.

gives the titles of ſome others [*F*]. Macedo was living in the year 1676, and was more than a jubilate lecturer. The elogies Mr Leti beſtows on him (*d*), may very well aſtoniſh all readers.

(*d*) *In his* Italia regnante. *You will find the extracts of them,* in Morhofius's Polyhiſtor, *Lib I, Cap. XXII, pag.* 269, *& ſeq.*

of Don Lewis de Ataide, viceroy of the Indies. This laſt book is in Spaniſh.

[*F*] *Don Nicolas Antonio* (8) *gives the titles of ſome others.*] Of the two I ſpeak of in the remark [*B*]; of the *Elogia Gallorum*, at Aix in Provence in 1642, in 4to; of the *Teſſera Romana authoritatis pontificiæ adverſus buccinam Thomæ Angli, & Lituus Luſitanus, hoc eſt Apologia mentis Innocentii X, adverſus Thomam Anglum*, London 1654, in 4to. The *Scrinium Divi Auguſtini de prædeſtinatione gratiæ, & libero arbitrio*, at Paris 1648, in 4to. The *Mens divinitus inſpirata Sanctiſſimo P. N. Innocentio X ſuper quinque propoſitionibus Cornelii Janſenii*, London 1643, in 4to. The *Scholæ Theologiæ poſitivæ ad doctrinam Catholicorum & refutationem hæreticorum apertæ*, at Rome 1664, in folio, and of ſeveral others. I will not affirm that Don Nicolas Antonio has every where mentioned the true place and year of the impreſſion. Conſult Konig (9) who will tell you that Macedo publiſhed forty ſeven volumes; he gives us the titles of ſome, and refers us to the *Italia Regnante* of Mr Leti. The thirteenth *Giornale de Letterati* of the year 1676 informs us, that the *Schema ſacræ Congregationis S. Officii Romani*, printed at Padua 1676, was the forty ſeventh tome of Father Macedo's works. The Inquiſition is extolled to the clouds in this book: why do I ſay to to the clouds? He places the firſt inſtitution of it in the terreſtrial paradice, and pretends that God began to perform there the office of inquiſitor, and that he continued it out of paradice againſt Cain, and the builders of the tower of Babel, and that St Peter acted in the ſame capacity againſt Ananias and Saphira, and that he tranſmitted it to the Popes, who inveſted St Dominic and his ſucceſſors with it. It is thus that Macedo proves by ſcripture the juſtice of this tribunal (10). I will mention below (11) his anſwer to the critic who wrote againſt the apologiſt of Annius Viterbienſis.

(8) Bibliotheca Scriptor. Hiſpan. *Tom. I, p.* 337.

(9) Konig. Bibl. vet. & nova, *pag.* 491.

(10) *See the XIIIth* Italian Journal, 1676, *p.* 201, 202.

(11) *In the firſt remark of the following article.*

MACEDO (ANTHONY), brother to the former, was born at Coimbra in the year 1612, and became a Jeſuit in the year 1626. He taught polite Literature and Morality; he preached, and afterwards went into Africa a miſſionary; and at laſt he was choſen by John IV king of Portugal, to accompany the ambaſſador that he ſent into Sweden to queen Chriſtina. He ſo pleaſed this princeſs; that ſhe ſecretly opened to him the deſign ſhe had of changing her religion. She ſent him to Rome, with letters to the general of the Jeſuits, in which ſhe deſired, that two of their ſociety might be diſpatched to her, Italians by nation, and learned men, who ſhould take another habit, and with whom ſhe might confer at her eaſe upon matters of religion. Her requeſt was granted [*A*]; but Anthony Macedo returned no more into Sweden. He lived at Rome in quality of apoſtolical penitentiary of the Vatican church, from the year 1651 to 1671, after which he returned into Portugal, and had ſeveral employments at Liſbon (*a*) (*b*). He compoſed ſome books [*B*].

(*a*) *Modo eſt Ulyſſipone Rector domus probationis, & Magiſter Tironum.* Sotuel, *ubi infra.*

(*b*) *Taken from* Nat. Southwell, Biblioth. Societ *pag.* 77.

[*A*] *Chriſtina's requeſt was granted.*] Two Jeſuits were immediately ſent to her, namely, Francis Malines, who taught Divinity at Turin, and Paul Caſatus, profeſſor of Mathematics at Rome (1). Theſe accompliſhed what Antony Macedo, the firſt confident of this queen's deſign, began. I call him the firſt confident, tho' I know that Henſchenius and Papebrochius aſcribe this honour to another; but Southwell is againſt them, and Father Francis Macedo has entirely confuted them. He took this matter ſo much to heart, for the ſake of his brother's intereſts, that he made an appendix to maintain them in a book that had no relation to this. This book is intituled, *Reſponſio ad notas nobilis Critici anonymi in Apologiam* (2) *F. Thomæ Mazzæ pro Jo. Annio Viterbienſi*, and was printed at Verona, in 1674. See what the Italian journaliſt has ſaid of the appendix: ‘Si aggiugne nel fine una ſcrittura dove l'Autore prova che il P. Antonio Macedo Gieſuita fû il primo al qual la Regina di Suetia communicaſſe il penſiero della ſua converſione, e non il P. Gottofredo Frankenio, come hanno ſcritto Henſchenio & Papebrokio nella vita del Bollando (3). - - - - - *There is ſubjoined to it an appendix, wherein the author proves, that F. Anthony Macedo, a Jeſuit, was the firſt to whom the queen of Sweden imparted the deſign of her converſion, and not Father Godfry Frankenio, as Henſchenius, and Papebroch have affirmed in the Life of Bollandus.*’

[*B*] *He compoſed ſome books.*] Theſe are the titles of them: *Luſitania infulata & purpurata, ſeu Pontificibus & Cardinalibus illuſtrata*, at Paris by Sebaſtian Cramoiſi 1673 (4), in 4to. *Vita P. Joannis de Almeida Societatis Presbyteri in Braſilia. Theſes Rhetoricæ varia eruditione refertæ: Elogia nonnulla & deſcriptio coronationis Sereniſſimæ Chriſtinæ Reginæ Sueciæ*, in proſe and in verſe at Stockholm, 1650 (5).

(1) Sotuel, Bibl. Societat. *p.* 77.

(2) *This* Apology *is an Italian book, printed at Verona, in* 1673, *in folio.* Tomaſo Mazza, *the author of it, is a Jacobin. The* Italian Journal *of the 28th of February,* 1674, *gives a large account of this work.*

(3) Giornale de Letterati, *of the 28th of January* 1675. *pag.* 13.

(4) *Or rather* 1663, *as* Nicolas Antonio *obſerves, Tom. I. p.* 112.

(5) Ex Nat. Sotuel, *ubi ſupra.*

MACEDONIA (ALEXANDER THE GREAT KING OF), was the moſt extraordinary man in the world; and if all that books tells us of him be true, he was not ſo much a man, as an incarnate intelligence. It ſeems as if providence made choice of him to demonſtrate to the world, how far the powers of a humane inſtrument can reach, when the time of the moſt wonderful revolutions is come. Poets and Orators are not Alexander's beſt panegyriſts; kings who pretend to wars and conqueſts, make his elogy much better, than writers do [*A*]. Let it not be ſaid, that opportunities were favourable to him [*B*], and that a prince, who in a long war, gets but little ground, would

[*A*] *Kings . . . make his elogy much better than writers do.*] There is nothing more proper to fill us with admiration of Alexander, and make us aſcribe to him qualities beyond all imagination, than to ſee ſo many great princes in all ages, who with all their courage, intrigues, politics, and good ſucceſſes, yet do but little aggrandize themſelves. They know how to conquer, but not to reap the fruits of their victories. See the remark [*A*] of the article CESAR. To what purpoſe were ſo many advantages that Charles V obtained over France? Did they augment his patrimony? Was it not a conſiderable point after the great victory that was gained at St Quintin, by his ſucceſſor, to recover what France had taken from the duke of Savoy, an ally of the houſe of Auſtria? And was it not even neceſſary to obtain this by the folly or infidelity of Henry the ſecond's favourites (1)?

[*B*] *Let it not be ſaid, that opportunities were favourable to him.*] I pretend not to deny it; my meaning is only, that they who would by this leſſen his merit, and juſtify the princes, who have vainly ſpent all their life in attempting conqueſts, are under a deluſion. I believe indeed, that Alexander's great deſigns might have been intirely ruined againſt a Seſoſtris, a Cyrus (2), and a Cæſar; but how many great kings have there been, who with more numerous and better diſciplined

(1) *See the article HENRY II, remarks* [*G*] *and* [*H*].

(2) *See the* Miſcellaneous Thoughts upon Comets, *num.* 213.

would have ſubdued a great empire, if he had had to do with the Perſians. Theſe are but excuſes, and poor comforts. That rapidity wherewith Alexander improved the opportunity, and took his advantages, would have given him a harveſt of triumphs, where many other kings can do nothing. It was to him it might be ſaid after his firſt victories, *I expect you in two years upon the banks of Euphrates.* I will not pretend to give the abridgment of his life, for beſides that other Dictionaries are prolix enough upon this ſubject, there is nothing more known to all ſorts of readers, than the Hiſtory of Alexander the Great. It ſeems moreover, that it would be a ſuperfluous labour to give his character [*C*]. It is ſufficiently known, and no body is ignorant, that it was equally compoſed of great virtues and great vices. There was nothing moderate in his perſon, but his ſtature; all the reſt, whether good or bad, was in extreams. His ambition proceeded even to madneſs [*D*]. He looked upon it as a crime that any one ſhould doubt of the ſucceſs of his deſigns [*E*]. On one hand he was impious enough to deſire to be thought a God [*F*]; and on the other, he was ſuperſtitious even to a womaniſh

ciplined troops than thoſe of Alexander, would have done Darius little harm? So that all did not depend upon opportunities. See our remarks upon Julius Cæſar (3).

[*C*] *It would be a ſuperfluous labour to give his character.*] Let us refer to a book that every body may eaſily conſult, and is very much inquired after. See, I ſay, Mr de Saint Evremond, in the judgment upon one of Mr Racine's tragedies, called, *Alexander the Great*, in the firſt tome of his works, and in his compariſon of Cæſar and Alexander in the ſame tome. See alſo the ſecond tome at the ninety ſeventh page of the Holland edition, 1693.

[*D*] *His ambition proceeded even to madneſs.*] His father was not miſtaken in believing Macedonia too little for his ſon (4). He ſaid this, when Alexander, being about ſixteen years of age, had broken one of the moſt terrible horſes in the world (5). How was Macedonia likely to ſuffice him, when the whole earth did not ſeem a kingdom large enough for him? He wept when he heard the Philoſopher Anaxarchus ſay, there were infinite worlds (6); his tears proceeded from his deſpair of conquering them all, ſeeing he had not yet conquered one. Juvenal expreſſes this ambition after a very lively manner; he repreſents Alexander ſweating in ſo ſtrait a lodging, as a kingdom no bigger than the earth:

Unus Pellæo juveni non ſufficit orbis:
Æſtuat infelix anguſto limite mundi,
Ut Gyaræ clauſus ſcopulis parvaque Seripho (7).

One world ſuffic'd not Alexander's mind:
Coop'd up he ſeem'd, in earth and ſeas confin'd,
And, ſtruggling, ſtretch'd his reſtleſs limbs about
The narrow globe, to find a paſſage out.

DRYDEN.

The world was to Alexander, what a little iſland was to malefactors confined in it. If they were ſtraitened in their walks, Alexander for his part looked upon the poſſeſſion of the whole earth, as the miſery of being reduced to a little corner. A Spaniſh author goes higher than Juvenal; he calls Alexander's heart an archheart, in a corner of which the world ſate ſo eaſy, that there was room for ſix more (8). But does it not ſeem, that ſo vaſt a heart confined it's higheſt happineſs within very narrow bounds, when it propoſed only to be praiſed by the Athenians? It is ſaid that the extraordinary pains he took to paſs the Hydaſpes, forced him to cry out, *O Athenians, could you believe, what dangers I expoſe my ſelf to, to be praiſed by you* (9)? Is not this, ſay ſome, to be at the ſame time inſatiable, and yet contented with the leaſt thing in the world? Is it not a madneſs to expoſe one's ſelf to ſo much pain and trouble for the ſake of a harangue?

- - - - - I demens, & ſævas curre per Alpes,
Ut pueris placeas & declamatio fias (10).

Go, climb the rugged alps, ambitious fool,
To pleaſe the boys, and be a theme at ſchool.

Idem.

Say what you pleaſe, upon the contradictions of the heart of man, upon it's follies and extravagancies; nevertheleſs I ſhall believe that the end Alexander propoſed to himſelf was very conſiſtent with the vaſt and immenſe extent of his ambition. He had a deſire to live to all future ages, to the moſt remote poſterity, and he hoped not this from one or more conquered worlds, but from books. He was not miſtaken, for if Greece had not furniſhed him with good pens, he had been for a long time as little talked of, as thoſe that commanded in Macedonia, before the birth of Amphitryon. He concerned himſelf ſo much with what ſhould be ſaid of him after his death, that he wiſhed he might return into the world for ſo long time, as was neceſſary to know how much his Hiſtorians were read (11). By this inſatiable deſire of praiſe, he did more juſtice to the valour of his enemies, than to that of his captains, for what he took from the latter, and gave to the former, returned to himſelf with intereſt. *Simplicius famam æſtimabat in hoſte quam in cive; quippe à ſuis credebat magnitudinem ſuam deſtrui poſſe, eamdem clariorem fore quo majores fuiſſent quos ipſe viciſſet* (12).

[*E*] *He looked upon it as a crime that any one ſhould doubt of the ſucceſs of his deſigns.*] They that by his order had killed Parmenio, came not to give him an account of that important ſervice without ſome reaſon to be uneaſy; for they were followed by the deputies of the province which they had governed, who had orders to accuſe them of many crimes. They particularized the pillages of theſe governors, the ſacrileges they had committed, and their attempts upon the honour of the ladies (13). Alexander having examined this accuſation, declared, that the deputies had forgotten the greateſt crime of all; which was, that the accuſed believed, he would never return from his expedition to the Indies; for if they had believed it, ſaid he, they would not have dared to commit theſe violences. *Rex, cognita cauſſa, pronunciavit ab accuſatoribus unum & id maximum crimen eſſe præteritum, deſperationem ſalutis ſuæ, nunquam enim talia auſuros, qui ipſum ex India ſoſpitem aut optaſſent reverti aut crediidiſſent reverſurum. Igitur hos quidem vinxit,* DC. *autem militum qui ſævitiæ eorum miniſtri fuerant, interfici juſſit* (14).

[*F*] *He was impious enough to deſire to be thought a god.*] A refined policy obliged him to make it believed that he was the ſon of Jupiter, and to admit the honours of adoration. He had experienced that this brought the Barbarians to ſubmiſſion; and indeed, who had ventured to take up arms againſt a conqueror who was looked upon to be a god? It was therefore his intereſt, the world ſhould have this advantageous opinion of him; and he dexterouſly encouraged it. He was more reſerved hereupon towards the Greeks than the Barbarians (15); becauſe the Greeks were wiſer, and leſs oppoſite to his deſigns; he one day publickly confeſſed, that his affairs required, that he ſhould be thought a god, and that he wiſhed the Indians would take him for one. 'Illud pene dignum riſu 'fuit, quod Hermolaus poſtulabat à me ut averſarer 'Jovem cujus oraculo adgnoſcor. An etiam quid Dii 'reſpondeant, in mea poteſtate eſt? Obtulit nomen 'filii mihi: recipere ipſis rebus quas agimus haud alienum fuit. Utinam Indi quoque Deum eſſe me 'credant. Fama enim bella conſtant, & ſæpe 'etiam, quod falſo creditum eſt, veri vicem obtinuit '(16). - - - - - - *Hermolaus ridiculouſly demanded of 'me to treat Jupiter with ſcorn, whoſe oracle had acknowledged me. Are even the anſwers of the gods in 'my power? He offered me the name of ſon; the ſtate 'of my affairs required me to accept of it. I wiſh the 'Indians* womaniſh weakneſs [*G*]. Whatever praiſe he deſerved on ſome occaſions with reſpect to continence [*H*], his life was far from being regular, on this head [*I*]. His intemperance

---

(3) *That is, the remarks* [*A*], [*B*], *and* [*C*], *of his article.*

(4) Plutarch. *in* Alexandro, *pag.* 667.

(5) *The horſe Bucephalus.*

(6) Plutarch. de Tranquillitate Animi, *pag.* 466.

(7) Juven. Sat. X, *Verſ.* 168.

(8) *Archicoraçon, pues cupo en un rincon del todo eſte mundo holgadamente, dexando lugar para otros ſeis.* Lorenzo Gracian.

(9) Ὦ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἆρά γε πιστεύσαιτε ἂν ἡλίκους ὑπομένω κινδύνους ἕνεκα τῆς παρ᾽ ὑμῖν εὐδοξίας; *Quis credat, Athenienſes, quanta pericula veſtri præconii cauſa ſubeam?* Plut. *in* Alexand. *pag.* 698, *E.*

(10) Juven. Sat. X, *Verſ.* 166.

(11) Lucianus, quomodo conſcribenda ſit Hiſtoria, *Oper. Tom.* I, *pag.* 694. *Edit. Salmur.*

(12) Quint. Curtius, *Libr.* VIII, *ſub fin.*

(13) *Quum omnia profana ſpoliaſſent, ne ſacris quidem abſtinuerant: virgineſque & principes fœminarum ſtupra perpeſſæ, corporum ludibria deflebant.* Idem, *Libr.* X. *Cap.* I.

(14) *Idem, ibid.*

(15) Τοῖς δὲ Ἕλλησι μετρίως καὶ ὑποφειδόμενος ἑαυτὸν ἐξεθείαζεν. *Apud Græcos vero divinitatem uſurpabat modice & parcius.* Plut. *in ejus* Vita, *p.* 681, *A.*

(16) Quint. Curtius, *Lib. VIII, Cap. VIII. Conſult* Freinſhemius's Commentary on this place.

‘ *Indians likewiſe would believe me to be a god. For wars are ſupported by fame, and often what is falſly believed carries with it the force of truth.*’ I could eaſily perſuade my ſelf, that by often ſaying this to others, and hearing his flatterers upon this topic, he came ſometimes to believe that he was a god, or to doubt whether he was not. For there are hardly any thoughts ſo vain, but extraordinary proſperity and power, with the addreſſes of an unlimited flattery, will be able to infuſe (17), but I do not believe that this opinion or doubt could ever take root in his ſoul. He ſaid that two things hindered him from believing that he was immortal, ſleep, and the enjoyment of women. Ἔλεγεν δὲ μάλιστα συνιέναι θνητὸς ὢν ἐκ τοῦ καθεύδειν καὶ συνουσιάζειν' ὡς ἀπὸ μιᾶς ἐγγινόμενον ἀσθενείας τῆ φύσει καὶ τὸ πονοῦν καὶ τὸ ἡδόμενον. *Dicebat mortalem ſe eſſe intelligere ſe potiſſimum ex ſomno & concubitu, quod ab eadem imbecillitate naturam inceſſat laſſitudo & voluptas* (18). He reaſoned well, tho' not very conſiſtently with the principles of the Heathen theology, which is full of Jupiter's amours, and his good fortune with the female ſex: but as the two things that ſerved him for a proof againſt his being a god, frequently recurred, I do not ſee, how the belief of his pretended Divine nature could take root in his ſoul: I ſhall produce many things upon this ſubject in the remarks of the article OLYMPIAS.

[G] *He was ſuperſtitious even to a womaniſh weakneſs* (19).] This never appeared ſo much as in the year of his death; which could not be attributed to the decline of his age, and the malignant influences of grey hairs, ſince he was not thirty three years old when he died. This notable increaſe of ſuperſtition proceeded from ſome events, which he was made to think ſo much the more unlucky preſages, becauſe he had gone to Babylon againſt the advice that was given him by Nearchus in the name of ſome Chaldean ſoothſayers not to go. This repetition of ill omens ſtruck him in ſuch a manner, that he diſtruſted both the gods and men. He believed the divine protection did forſake him, and that his friends grew treacherous. This diffidence ſo diſquieted his mind, that the leaſt extraordinary thing, that happened to him ſeemed to him a prodigy; his houſe was always full of prieſts and ſoothſayers; he ſpent all his time in ſacrifices, expiations, and auguries. Let us hear Plutarch, who relates not the thing without adding a reflexion upon it. Ὁ δ' οὖν Ἀλέξανδρος ὡς ἐνέδωκεν τότε πρὸς τὰ θεῖα ταραχώδης γενόμενος καὶ περίφοβος τὴν διάνοιαν, οὐδὲν ἦν μικρὸν οὕτως τῶν ἀήθων καὶ ἀτόπων ὃ μὴ τέρας ἐποιεῖτο καὶ σημεῖον, ἀλλὰ θυομένων καὶ καθαιρόντων καὶ μαντευόντων μεστὸν ἦν τὸ βασίλειον. οὕτως ἄρα δεινὸν μὲν ἀπιστία πρὸς τὰ θεῖα καὶ καταφρόνησις αὐτῶν· δεινὴ δὲ αὖθις ἡ δεισιδαιμονία δίκην ὕδατος ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ταπεινούμενον, καὶ ἀναπληροῦν ἀβελτηρίας καὶ φόβου τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον γενόμενον. Alexander igitur poſtquam ſemel religione obſtrictus eſt tumultuante & trepidante animo præditus, nulla res inſolita & aliena tam oblata exigua eſt quam non verteret in prodigium & oſtentum, ſed ſacrificantium, expiantium, & vaticinantium erat regia referta. Adeo res eſt horrenda incredulitas & contemptio deorum, horrenda item ſuperſtitio, quæ aquæ modo vergit ad demiſſa, impletque abſurdis opinionibus & metu mortales, ut tunc Alexandrum (20). - - - *Such force and confidence on one hand, has incredulity and the impious contempt of the gods, when once it takes root in mens heart; and on the other hand, ſuperſtition, flowing always, like water, downwards, into ſouls debaſed and dejected with fear, as it then filled Aleexander with madneſs, when once terror had ſeized him.* I muſt obſerve, that the advices of the Chaldeans, imparted by Nearchus, made ſuch an impreſſion upon Alexander, that he durſt not enter Babylon, till the Greek Philoſophers, knowing the grounds of his ſcruples, went to viſit him, and by the force of their arguments made him ſenſible of the vanity of the art of Divination: he then made his entrance into Babylon (21). The ill auguries which his head was full of, effaced the impreſſions theſe Philoſophers had made upon him. He returned to the great eſteem he had conceived for the ſcience of the Chaldeans; he deteſted the Philoſophers, that had perſuaded him to enter into the city, and he was angry with all thoſe, that attempted to undeceive him (22). See ſeveral things concerning Alexander's ſuperſtition in the remarks of the article ARISTANDER, his ſoothſayer. I have given them there for fear of making this article too long; I have uſed a like method with reſpect to many other facts, and ſhall ſtill uſe it as occaſion requires.

[H] *Whatever praiſe he deſerved . . . . . with reſpect to continence.*] In the firſt heat of his youth he appeared ſo indifferent with reſpect to women, that his mother feared that this might go too far, and that it proceeded from impotence; for which reaſon, by the conſent of her huſband, ſhe gave Alexander a moſt beautiful courteſan of Theſſaly for a bed-fellow, in order to melt the ice, and kindle love in this young man. Callixena (this was the fair Theſſalian's name) endeavoured ſeveral times to make him careſs her, and obtained nothing (23). If this ſtory be true, we muſt believe that nature, which in all other things had been very diligent for this prince, was ſluggiſh, and roſe ſomewhat late in this affair. It is ſaid (24), that he carried his virginity into Aſia, and that Memnon's widow (25) was the firſt woman that he enjoyed; and that he had nothing to do with any other till he married: Parmenio was even forced to provoke him to careſs her, as capable as ſhe was of enamouring a man. If this be true, they who ſpeak of Alexander's complaiſance to Apelles are miſtaken. They ſay, that having ordered Apelles to draw the handſomeſt and beſt beloved of his concubines naked (26), and perceiving that Apelles had fallen in love with her, he made a preſent of her to him. This ſtory and that of Plutarch are inconſiſtent; for he did not enjoy Memnon's widow, till he made himſelf maſter of Damaſcus; and it was at Epheſus that he knew Apelles, a long time before the taking it. Theſe two ſtories might be reconciled, if we ſuppoſe Alexander had not enjoyed his concubine, when he gave her to the Painter, or that he ordered her picture to be drawn after the taking of Damaſcus. But the firſt of theſe two ſuppoſitions is againſt the hiſtory in queſtion; for Pliny (27) who relates it, not only obſerves that this miſtreſs was very handſome (28), and the moſt beloved of all Alexander's concubines, but he further ſays, that this prince reſigned his bed and his affection to the Painter. Ælian, who relates the ſame ſtory, notes this circumſtance, that the aforeſaid concubine was of Lariſſa in Theſſaly, and the firſt woman that had given Alexander the ſenſe of venereal pleaſure (29). The ſecond ſuppoſition has no ſhadow of probability; would he have ſent to Epheſus, a woman of ſo great beauty, and whom he ſo tenderly loved, would he have ſent her ſo far, I ſay, to have her painted naked? And if he had ſent for Apelles, ſhould we not ſee that circumſtance in the authors, that have preſerved the memory of this fine preſent? Beſides this ſecond ſuppoſition does not remove the inconſiſtence between Ælian and Plutarch. Hitherto then, this laſt author has hardly proved the continence of his heroe; but what he ſays next, has a greater force. The mother, the wife, and the daughters of Darius, were Alexander's priſoners; the wife was a perfect beauty, and her daughters were like her; the young prince, who had them in his power, not only paid them all the honours that were due to them, but alſo took the utmoſt care of their reputation. They were kept as in a cloiſter, out of the ſight of the world, and out of the reach of every immodeſt object. Ὥσπερ οὐκ ἐν στρατοπέδῳ πολεμίων, ἀλλ' ἐν ἱεροῖς καὶ ἁγίοις φυλαττομένας παρθενῶσιν, ἀπόρρητον ἔχειν καὶ ἀόρατον ἑτέροις δίαιταν. *Quaſi non in hoſtium caſtris, verum in ſacris & ſanctis Veſtæ templis ſervatæ, in abdito extra aliorum oculos agerent* (30). His viſits, his looks, his diſcourſes, gave no occaſion for reproach; and with reſpect to the other Perſian ladies, who were alſo priſoners, and whoſe beauty and ſhape were very charming, he contented himſelf to ſay, by way of raillery, when he ſaw them, that the Perſian women make the eyes ſore, and he paſſed by them as by handſome ſtatues (31). He was angry in good-earneſt more than once with thoſe, who, to make their court to rance in wine was prodigious [*K*]. The cruelty he exerciſed upon the inhabitants of Tyre is

---

(17) - - - nihil
eſt quod credere de ſe
Non poſſit, cum laudatur Diis æqua poteſtas.
Nothing ſo monſtrous can be ſaid or ſeign'd,
But with belief and joy is entertain'd,
When to his face the worthleſs wretch is prais'd,
Whom vile court-flattery to a god has rais'd.
Mr DUKE.
Juven. Sat. IV. *Verſ.* 70.

(18) Plutarch. *in* Alexand. *pag.* 677. *B. See alſo* de Diſcrim. Adulat. & Amici, *pag.* 65. *F.*

(19) *See the article ARISTANDER, remark* [*A*].

(20) Plutarch. *in* Alex. *p.* 706.

(21) Diodor. Sicul. *Libr. XVII, pag. m.* 429.

(22) *Idem, ibid. pag.* 431.

(23) Theophraſtus, *referente* Hieronymo, *in* Epiſtolis, *apud* Athenæum, *Libr. X, Cap. X, pag.* 435.

(24) Plutarch. *in* Alex. *p.* 676.

(25) *She was called* Barſenes. *See the article MEMNON.*

(26) *Ælian calls her* Pancaſte, *and Pliny* Campaſpe.

(27) Se vicit, nec torum tantum ſuum, ſed etiam affectum donavit artifici. *Plin. Libr. XXXV, Cap. X.*

(28) *According to* Pliny, *the picture of Venus coming out of the waves, was drawn by Campaſpe's.*

(29) Ταύτη καὶ πρώτη φασὶν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ὡμίλησεν. *Cum qua primum Alexander rem habuiſſe dicitur.* Ælian. diver. Hiſtor. *Libr. XII, Cap. XXXIV.*

(30) Plut. *in* Alexand. *p.* 676.

(31) *Id. ib.*

to him, would ſend him handſome boys (32); and he ſaid in a letter, that he had neither ſeen Darius's wife, nor thought of ſeeing her, and even that he would not ſuffer diſcourſes to be made to him about this queen's beauty; Ἐγὼ γὰρ ȣ̓χ᾽ ὅτι ἑωρακὼς ἂν εὑρεθείην τὴν Δαρείȣ γυναῖκα ἢ βεβȣλευμένος ἰδεῖν, ἀλλ᾽ ȣ̎τε τῶν λεγόντων ϖερὶ τῆς εὐμορφίας αὐτῆς ϖροσδεδεγμένος τὸν λόγον. *Ego enim non ſolum non vidiſſe inveniar Darii uxorem aut videre cogitaſſe, verum noc verba facientes de ejus decore ſuſtinuiſſe audire* (33). It is eaſy to reconcile Plutarch with Q. Curtius: this latter Hiſtorian ſays (34), that Alexander never ſaw Darius's wife but once, and that by accident becauſe ſhe was with her mother-in-law, whom he viſited the day they were taken. Upon this account Alexander might boaſt not to have ſeen, that is, not to have viſited Darius's wife. This is certainly one of the fineſt paſſages of his life, as to morality (35), and I do not wonder that Darius admired it; Darius I ſay, who was in ſuch alarms for his wife's honour. Conſider the viciſſitudes of his paſſions upon the news that his wife was dead. Firſt he ſuſpected, that the meſſenger came to tell him, that her honour had been violated, and he looked upon this as the greateſt of all afflictions. Afterwards, underſtanding his wife was dead, he believed ſhe was killed for reſiſting the unchaſt deſires of the victor. That thought inſpired him with much grief and rage: he afterwards underſtood, that Alexander had been extreamly afflicted for this death, and lamented it as much as Darius himſelf. This was a cruel attack; his grief and rage were abated, but he fell again into a diſmal diſturbance, imagining that Alexander bewailed the loſs of her favours, that had been granted him. At laſt he was aſſured of the contrary, and prayed to the gods, that if they would not reſtore him, they would give his kingdom to ſo virtuous a conqueror. ‘ Ludibria ‘ meorum nunciaturus es mihi, &, ut credo, ipſis quo‘que, omni graviora ſupplicio . . . . . Nec dubi‘tavit Darius quin interfecta eſſet, quia nequiſſet con‘tumeliam pati. . . . . . . Ob hæc ipſa amantis ani‘mus in ſollicitudinem ſuſpicionemque revolutus eſt; ‘ deſiderium captivæ profecto à conſuetudine ſtupri ‘ ortum eſſe conjectans. . . . . . . Dii patrii primum ‘ mihi ſtibilite regnum: deinde ſi de me jam tranſa‘ctum eſt, precor ne quis Aſiæ rex ſit quàm iſte tam ‘ juſtus hoſtis, tam miſericors victor (36). - - - - - - ‘ *You come, I ſuppoſe, to inform me of the inſults offered* ‘ *to my family, more grievous to them than the heavieſt* ‘ *puniſhment* . . . . . *Nor did Darius doubt but that ſhe* ‘ *was put to death, becauſe ſhe would not ſuffer violation* ‘ . . . . . *Theſe conſiderations threw his fond heart in*‘*to trouble and ſuſpicion; conjecturing that Alexander's* ‘ *concern for the loſs of his captive, aroſe from their guilty* ‘ *commerce* . . . . . *Ye gods, whom we adore, firſt re*‘*eſtabliſh my kingdom; next, if all is over with me, I beg* ‘ *that he alone may be king of Aſia, who is ſo juſt an* ‘ *enemy, ſo compaſſionate a conqueror.*’

[*I*] *His life was far from being regular on this head.*] One irregularity, was his marrying three or four wives without being a widower (37), and cauſing his concubine Pancaſte to be drawn naked. The pleaſures of touch did not content his paſſion, he would moreover feaſt his eyes with the nakedneſs of his miſtreſs in her picture; an evident ſign that he fed them likewiſe with the original nakedneſs: he fell therefore into an exceſs, and ſuch a one as the god Mars, Venus's gallant, did not know, if we judge of it by Lucretius's words (38). This vitious pleaſure of the eyes would be more eaſily pardoned to thoſe, who when they can have no other, *Paſcon gli avidi ſguardi*. But this leudneſs of Alexander, as criminal as it was, is nothing in compariſon to what he did after his great proſperities. I do not ſpeak of the concubines he would have in the ſame number as Darius, that is as many as there are days in the year; for the Hiſtorian (39) who relates that theſe concubines preſented themſelves every evening to the king, that he might chuſe one to ſpend the night with, declares that Alexander ſeldom made this choice: it is certain that the eaſtern princes, and particularly Solomon in imitation of them, who valued themſelves upon keeping ſo many women, did not lie with them all, they dealt with them almoſt like the preſent Sultans, they drew great numbers of them together to have the better choice of ſome, the others ſerved only to ſhew their magnificence, like ſo many uſeleſs moveables in opulent houſes which are never employed, and perhaps are not ſo much as known (40). The kings who value themſelves upon having the fineſt ſtables, ride but a few of their horſes; the greateſt part are ſuffered to live and die without trying them. Some pleaſe themſelves with having magnificent libraries, and never touch a book. It would therefore not be a certain proof of Alexanders's incontinence, to alledge the great number of his concubines, tho' it is certain, that this train, and the equipage belonging to them, juſtly offended his antient ſubjects (41), and it is a blot upon his memory; but here are more formal teſtimonies againſt his reputation. He had abundance of proſtitutes to ſit at his table, and he accepted Bagoas, who had been Darius's minion (42). ‘ Na‘barzanes accepta fide occurrit, dona ingentia ferens ‘ inter quæ Bagoas erat ſpecie ſingulari ſpado, atque ‘ in ipſo flore pueritiæ, cui & Darius fuerat adſuetus, ‘ & mox Alexander adſuevit (43). - - - - *Nabarzanes,* ‘ *upon promiſe of ſafety, met him, with great preſents,* ‘ *among which was Bagoas, an eunuch of ſingular* ‘ *beauty, and in the flower of his youth, who had been* ‘ *Darius's minion, and was afterwards Alexander's.*’ His debaucheries cannot be repreſented in more expreſs terms than in theſe of Athenæus: Φιλόπαις δὲ ἦν ἐκμανῶς καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ βασιλεύς. Δικαίαρχος γȣ̃ν ἐν τῷ ϖερὶ τῆς ἐν Ἰλίῳ θυσίας Βαγώȣ τȣ̃ εὐνȣ́χȣ ȣ̎τως αὐτὸν φησὶν ἠρᾶσθαι, ὡς ἐν ὄψει θεάτρȣ ὅλȣ καταφιλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀνακλάσαντα, καὶ τῶν θεατῶν ἐπιφωνησάντων μετὰ κρότȣ ἐκ ἀπειθήσας ϖάλιν ἀνακλάσας ἐφίλησεν. Alexander Rex ad inſaniam amore puerorum exarſit. Dicæarchus libro de ſacrificio quod ad Ilium peractum eſt, eunuchum Bagoam adeo ipſum deperiiſſe ſcribit, ut reſupinus in conſpectu theatri totius eum ſuaviaretur, acclamante verò cum plauſu ſpectatorum turba, & tanquam ad iteranda oſcula invitante, paruiſſe, atque rurſum inflexa cervice baſia congeminaſſe (44). - - - - *Alexander was fired with the love of boys even to madneſs. Dicæarchus, in his book of the Sacrifice which was performed at Troy, writes, that he was ſo in love with the eunuch Bagoas, that, throwing himſelf back, he would kiſs him in ſight of the whole theatre; and, when the ſpectators, by their acclamations and applauſes, ſeemed to invite him to repeat his kiſſes, he obeyed, and, turning his head, redoubled them.*

[*K*] *His intemperence in wine was prodigious.*] He would be drunk, and when in that condition was guilty of a thouſand diſorders. Wine was the cauſe of his killing Clytus, who had ſaved his life; and burning Perſepolis, one of the fineſt cities of the Eaſt (45). The courtezan Thais, who was equally practiſed in bacchical and venereal debauchery (46), put him upon that horrid exploit, which circumſtance renders the action more infamous. They who wrote the journal of his life (47), obſerved, that he ſlept out his debauch ſometimes for two days and two nights. If a few glaſſes would have intoxicated him, he had been the leſs to be condemned for falling ſometimes into that fault, but he ſwallowed twenty cups of a prodigious bigneſs, before they made him drunk. Thus he died of drinking too much; it was the bed of honour he expired in. He undertook to drink a health to the greateſt drinker of his age (48), and to empty a veſſel of vaſt capacity (49). As ſoon as he had drank it off, he fainted away, and was ſeized with the diſtemper of which he died (50). Plutarch confutes this: he ſays (51), that Alexander had not emptied Hercules's cup, nor did he immediately feel a great pain in his back, as if he had been wounded with a lance; theſe are, ſays he, inventions deſigned for the embelliſhment of a mournful and tragical ſcene. Ταῦτα τινὲς ᾤοντο δεῖν γράφειν, ὥσπερ δράματος μεγάλȣ τραγικὸν ἐξόδιον καὶ ϖεριπαθὲς ϖλασάντες. *Hæc putaverant quidam ſcribenda quaſi magnæ fabulæ tragicum exodium & lamentabile fingentes* (52). But he confeſſes this prince did nothing but drink that day that his diſtemper ſeized him; which is confeſſion enough for this general propoſition, that Alexander killed himſelf with drinking. Who would believe, that ſo venturous a warriour ſhould receive his mortal wound at table? Let us here Seneca hereupon: ‘ Alexandrum ‘ tot itenera, tot prælia, tot hyemes per quas, victa ‘ temporum, locorumque difficultate, tranſierat, tot ‘ flumina ex ignoto cadentia, tot maria tutum dimiſe‘rant, intemperantia bibendi, & ille Herculeanus ac ‘ fatalis ſcyphus perdidit (53). - - - - *Alexander, after*

---

(32) *Id. ib.*

(33) *Ibid. pag.* 677, *B.*

(34) Semel omnino eam viderat quo die capta eſt, nec ut ipſam, ſed ut Darii matrem videret, eximiamque pulchritudinem formæ ejus non libidinis habuerat incitamentum, ſed gloriæ. Q. *Curtius, Libr. IV, Cap. X.*

(35) *It is thus* Diodorus Siculus, *Libr. XVII, judges of it.*

(36) Quintus Curtius, *Libr. IV, Cap. XI.*

(37) *I ſpeak of them in the article ROXANA.*

(38) Paſcit amore avidos in te Dea viſus.
He feeds his wanton eyes with gazing on thy charms.
Lucret. lib. I, ver. 37.

(39) Diod. Siculus, *lib. XVII.* Q. Curtius, *lib. VI, Cap. VI. Says they were in number* 360.

(40) Exilis domus eſt ubi non & multa ſuperſunt,
Et dominum fallunt, & proſunt furibus.
That houſe betrays it's maſter's poverty,
Where no ſuperfluous furniture abounds,
For ſlaves to ſteal, unheeded by his eye.
Horat. Epiſt. VI. *lib. I, ver.* 45.

(41) Pellices 360. totidem quot Darii fuerant, regiam implebant; quas ſpadonum greges, & ipſi muliebria pati adſueti, ſequebantur. Hæc luxu & peregrinis infecta moribus veteres Philippi milites, rudis natio ad voluptates, averſabantur. - - - - - *Three hundred and ſixty harlots, the ſame number as belonged to Darius, filled the palace: theſe were followed by a troop of eunuchs, who were Catamites likewiſe. Philip's veterans, a nation unbroke to voluptuouſneſs, were diſguſted at the contagious ſpreading of this luxury, and theſe foreign manners.* Quint. Curtius, *lib. VI, Cap. VI, num.* 8.

(42) *Id. Libr. V, Cap. VI, & Libr. VI, Cap. II.*

(43) *Id. Libr. VI, Cap. V.*

(44) Athen. *Libr. XIII, p.* 603.

(45) Q. Curt. *Libr. VIII, Cap. I.*

(46) *Id. Libr. V, Cap. VII.*

(47) Eumenes Cardianus, & Diodorus Erythræus, *apud* Athenæum, *Libr. X, Cap. IX, p.* 434.

(48) *This was a Macedonian named Proteas.*

(49) Quod duos congios capiebat. - - - - *Which held two gallons.* Q. Curtius, *Libr. V, Cap. VII.*

(50) *Id. ibid.*

(51) Plut. *in* Alexand. *p.* 706. *See the remark* [*D*] *of the article HERCULES.*

(52) *Plut. ibid.*

(53) Seneca, Epiſt. LXXXIII.

is inexcuſable [*L*]. Notwithſtanding all thoſe vices, he was after his death honoured as a god, and even in the times of the Roman emperors there were ſome families that choſe him for their tutelar deity [*M*]. Flattery had no hand in this, as it had when in his life-time divine honours were paid him: it was a true ſuperſtitious worſhip. He died at Babylon about the thirty third year of his age. Some ſay he was poiſoned, but more deny it (*a*). His conqueſts were indeed broke into many pieces after his death, but theſe pieces were large ones, and for a long time rendered the Greek nation famous and potent in Aſia. He had not much time to perform them in; for he paſſed the Helleſpont, the ſecond year of the CXIth Olympiad, and he died the firſt year of the CXIVth. He was born the firſt year of the CVIth, and he began his reign the firſt year of the CXIth (*b*). He had one particular good fortune, which is, that it cannot be ſaid to eclipſe

‘ *ſo many expeditions, ſo many battles, ſo many winters, during which, ſurmounting the difficulties of place and time, he had paſſed ſo many rivers, deſcending from unknown countries, and ſo many ſeas, in all which he had come off with ſafety, was at laſt killed by intemperate drinking, and that fatal Herculean cup.*’ Diodorus Siculus (54) relates, that Alexander having already drank too much, would drink off Hercules's cup, which he had no ſooner done, but he was ſeized with a cruel pain, as if he had received a great blow. Thus you ſee the only poiſon that killed him, and which made the Aſtrologers get the advantage which the Philoſophers had made them loſe (55). For as for actual poiſon, it was not mentioned till ſixteen years after Alexander's death, and probably thoſe who were the informers, deſigned only to cauſe Olympias to put a great many people to death, as ſhe did. Ariſtotle was not charged with being concerned in it, but upon the word of one Agnothemis, who, as they ſaid, had heard Antigonus ſay, that Ariſtotle diſcovered the poiſon to Antipater, that he was to uſe (56). Let us not forget, that Alexander cauſed Calanus's funeral to be pompouſly celebrated (57). There was a funeral oration, tournaments, ſolemn games, and every thing: but conſidering the Indian's inclination for wine, he bethought himſelf of ſetting up a combat of drunkenneſs (58); there were three prizes for the conquerors; the firſt was worth a talent. Of thoſe that entered the liſt, there were thirty five that died upon the ſpot, and ſix that followed them quickly after. The conqueror named Promachus drank four *Congii* (59), and lived but three days after his victory (60).

[*L*] *The cruelty he excercisſed upon the inhabitants of Tyre, is inexcuſable.*] Alexander's fortune, that hitherto had run with the rapidity of a torrent, found before this place a ſtrong reſiſtance, which checked it's courſe ſeveral months (61). This prince underſtood but too well, the miſchievous conſequences of ſuch an interruption; he loſt his main point, if he gave room to believe, that he could be ſtopped. Finding therefore a thouſand ſubjects of diſcontent, both in raiſing the ſiege and continuing it, he reſolved to make new efforts againſt this city. ‘ Hic rex fatigatus ſtatuerat ſoluta obſidione Ægyptum petere, quippe quum Aſiam ingenti celeritate percurriſſet circa muros unius urbis hærebat, tot maximarum rerum opportunitate dimiſſa. Cæterum tam diſcedere invitum quam morari pudebat. Fama quoque qua plura quam armis everterat ratus leviorem fore, ſi Tyrum quaſi teſtem ſe poſſe vinci reliquiſſet. Igitur ne quid inexpertum omitteret, &c (62). - - - - - - *Here the king, being wearied out, reſolved to raiſe the ſiege, and march into Egypt; the rapidity, with which he had over-run Aſia, being checked by the walls of a ſingle town, by which he loſt the opportunity of ſo many great actions. Yet he was as much aſhamed to depart, as to ſtay: beſides he conſidered, it would leſſen his fame, which had contributed more to his victories than his arms, if he left Tyre as a proof that he might be conquered. Therefore, to leave nothing unattempted,* &c.’ His new efforts ſucceeded, he ſtormed the place, but diſhonoured the victory by his cruelty. He commanded the houſes to be fired, and all to be put to the ſword, that had not retired to the temples; and he crucified two thouſand inhabitants, who had not ſo much eſcaped the fury of the ſoldiers, as their wearineſs of killing. *Triſte deinde ſpectaculum victoribus ira præbuit regis: duo millia in quibus occidendi defecerat rabies crucibus adfixi per ingens litoris ſpatium pependerunt* (63). There is no prince in theſe days, but would be degraded from all his glory in a thouſand volumes, ſhould he do the twentieth part of what Alexander did.

[*M*] *Some families* . . . . . *choſe him for their tutelar deity.*] I would not venture to affirm that his doublet, which they boaſted to have at Rome, was reckoned a pledge of ſome celeſtial benediction; and we muſt not reckon much upon Caligula's wearing it on a ſolemn day. Caligula was no ſuperſtitious man, and if he had been a Chriſtian, I do not think he would have had much faith for the ſcapulary. Not that I pretend to deny, that great villains have had childiſh ſuperſtitions. But be it how it will, I can ſay nothing of Caligula's opinion, with reſpect to that relic of Alexander, ſince Dion ſays nothing of it (64). Caracalla had a great affection for Alexander: this emperor made uſe of arms and goblets, and ſoldiers like thoſe of this conqueror; he perſecuted the Peripatetics, and would burn all the books of their maſter, becauſe of the report that was ſpread, that he was an accomplice in the poiſoning of Alexander. He teſtified by a hundred other things his veneration for him, but I ſhall take care not to imitate a learned critic (65), who makes uſe of theſe facts to prove, that a religious worſhip was paid to Alexander. What he cites from Trebellius Pollio, and Lampridius, has quite another force. The firſt of theſe two Hiſtorians tells us it was believed, that Alexander's effigies engraven in gold or ſilver, brought good luck to the perſon that wore it. The other Hiſtorian tells us, that there was in the city of Arcena a temple conſecrated to Alexander the Great. ‘ Alexandri nomen accepit (*Alexander Severus*) quod in templo dicato apud Arcenam urbem Alexandro magno natus eſſet, quum caſu illuc die feſto Alexandri pater cum uxore patriæ ſolennitatis implendæ cauſa veniſſet. Cui rei argumentum eſt quod eadem die natalem habet hic Mammeæ Alexander, qua ille Magnus exceſſit è vita (66). - - - - - *Severus took the name of Alexander, becauſe he was born in a temple dedicated to Alexander the Great in the city of Arcena, the father of Alexander coming thither by chance, with his wife, to celebrate ſome feſtival. In confirmation of this, it is obſervable that this Alexander, the ſon of Mammæa, was born the ſame day, on which Alexander the Great died.*’ This paſſage ſhews that the inhabitants of Arcena kept Alexander's feſtival every year the day that he died. Which is the ſame that is done at preſent with reſpect to ſeveral ſaints, whoſe feſtival falls on the day of their death. As for Trebellius Pollio's paſſage, I will recite it at large, in favour of thoſe, who ſhall read this Dictionary, without having many other books, or who do not care to ſtir from their place to conſult this author. They who do not care to know what he has ſaid may paſs over the following lines. ‘ Videtur mihi non prætermittendum de Macrianorum familia, quæ hodieque floret, id dicere quod ſpeciale ſemper habuerunt. Alexandrum Magnum Macedonem viri in annulis & argento, mulieres in reticulis & dextrocheriis, & in annulis, & in omni ornamentorum genere, exſculptum ſemper habuerunt: eo uſque ut tunicæ & limbi & penulæ matronales in familia ejus hodieque ſint, quæ Alexandri effigiem de liciis variantibus, monſtrent. Vidimus proxime Cornelium Macrum in eadem familia virum, quum cœnam in templo Herculis daret, pateram electrinam, quæ in medio vultum Alexandri haberet, & in circuitu omnem hiſtoriam contineret ſignis brevibus & minutulis, pontifici propinare, quam quidem circumferri ad omnes tanti illius viri cupidiſſimos juſſit. Quod id circo poſui, quia dicuntur juvari in omni actu ſuo, qui Alexandrum expreſſum vel auro geſtitant vel argento (67). - - - - - *I think I ought not to paſs by a circumſtance peculiar to the family of the Macriani, which ſtill flouriſhes. The men have always carried about them the effigies of Alexander the* ‘ *Great*

(*a*) *See* Plutarch, *in* Alex *ſub fin. pag.* 707: *and above remark* [*K*].

(*b*) *According to* Seth. Calviſius, *who makes the year of Alexander's death co-incident with the* 430*th year of Rome, and the* 321*ſt before* JESUS CHRIST.

(54) *Libr. XVII, ſub fin.*

(55) *See what hath been cited from Diodorus Siculus, in the remark* [*G*].

(56) Plut. in Alexand. *p.* 707.

(57) *An Indian Philoſopher, who burned himſelf with great ceremony.*

(58) Ἀκρατοποσίας ἀγῶνα, *meræ potionis certamen.* Chares Mitylenæus *in* Hiſtoriis de Alexandro, *apud* Athenæum, *Libr. X, pag.* 437.

(59) *Ibid.*

(60) Plut. *in* Alexand. *pag.* 703.

(61) *Apply to this theſe words.* Hinc ſive invidia Deum, ſive fato, rapidiſſimus procurrentis imperii curſus parumper . . . . ſupprimitur. - - - - *Hence, either thro' the envy of the gods, or fate, the rapid progreſs of the empire was checked for a while.* Florus, *Libr. I, Cap. XIII.*

(62) Q. Curt. *Libr. IV. Cap. IV.*

(63) *Id. ib.*

(64) *Libr. LIX.*

(65) Barthius in Statium, *Tom. I. pag.* 404.

(66) Lampridius, *in* Alexandro Severo, *pag. m.* 889, *Tom. I.*

(67) Trebellius Pollio, in 30. Tyrann. *pag.* 295, *Tom. II.*

eclipſe the luſtre of his glory, that treachery had any great ſhare in his triumphs [*N*]. There is no need to ſay that Philip his father deſcended from Hercules, and Olympias his mother from Achilles, and thus his extraction was as glorious, as it could have been, if he had had the liberty of chuſing it in Hiſtory. We ſhall not ſpeak here of his wives and children, referring this to the article Roxana. According to the nature of this Dictionary, I ſhould obſerve all the errors that people have committed concerning this conqueror, yet I ſhall note only ſome of them. The Jews pretend, that he determined ſeveral diſputes they had with their neighbours [*O*]. Some ſay, that the Romans ſent embaſſadors

'*Great of Macedon, engraven on their rings and money, and the women on their head-dreſſes, bracelets, rings, and all other ornaments: inſomuch that there are gowns and petticoats now in the family interwoven with the figure of Alexander. I my ſelf ſaw Cornelius Macer, of the ſame family upon his giving an entertainment in the temple of Hercules, drink to the prieſt in an amber cup, which had Alexander's head in the middle, and contained his whole hiſtory in ſmall characters round the brim, which he ordered to be carried round to all the admirers of ſo great a man. I mention this, becauſe they, who carry about them the effigies of Alexander in gold or ſilver, are ſaid to be aſſiſted in all their undertakings.*' I do not alledge the prayers Juſtin ſpeaks of; they are no proof of a fixed worſhip and invocation. The Macedonians were then in the utmoſt conſternation, they imitated drowning people, who catch at every thing they meet with. In ſuch caſes people canonize thoſe who have neither temples nor feſtivals. If you would however know, what Juſtin has ſaid, you may ſatisfy your ſelf without riſing from your place. 'Hæc cum nunciata per omnem Macedoniam eſſent, portæ urbium clauduntur, luctu omnia replentur, nunc orbitatem amiſſorum filiorum dolebant, nunc excidia urbium metuebant, nunc Alexandri Philippique Regum ſuorum nomina ſicuti Numina in auxilium vocabant. Sub illis ſe non ſolum tutos, verum etiam victores orbis terrarum extitiſſe, ut tuerentur patriam ſuam quam gloria rerum geſtarum cœlo proximam reddidiſſent, ac opem afflictis ferrent quos furor & temeritas Ptolemæi Regis perdidiſſet, orabant (68). - - - - *When the news of theſe things was ſpread all over Macedon, the gates of the cities were ſhut up, nothing was ſeen but tears and lamentations; one while they lamented their loſt ſons, then they feared the deſtruction of their cities, next they invoked the names of their kings, Alexander and Philip, as gods to their aſſiſtance. Under them they had not only been ſafe, but conquerors of the world; they entreated them to protect their country, which they had rendered ſo famous by their glorious exploits, and aſſiſt their afflicted country-men, whom the rage and raſhneſs of Ptolemy endeavoured to ruin.*'

[*N*] *It cannot be ſaid, that treachery had any great ſhare in his triumphs.*] Read Pauſanias, where he ſhews what prejudice was ſeveral times done to the liberty of the Greeks by the practices of thoſe who ſuffered themſelves to be bribed; you will there find that Philip king of Macedonia held thoſe correſpondences to aggrandize himſelf, but that Alexander, his ſon, had the good fortune to fortify and augment his power without theſe means. Κατὰ δὲ τὴν Φιλίππου βασιλείαν τοῦ Ἀμύντου, Λακεδαίμονα πόλεων μόνην οὐ προδοθεῖσαν τῶν ἐν Ἕλλησιν εὕροι τὶς ἂν. αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι πόλεις αἱ ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι, ὑπὸ προδοσίας μᾶλλον, ἢ ὑπὸ νόσου πρότερον τῆς λοιμώδους ἐφθάρησαν. Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δὲ τῷ Φιλίππου πάρεσχεν ἡ εὐτυχία, μικρὰ ἀνδρῶν προδοτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἄξια λόγου προσδεηθῆναι. Philippo vero Amyntæ filio ad Græciæ imperium adſpirante unam invenias proditionis immunem Spartam: ceteras Græcorum urbes non magis peſtilentia ſuperiorum temporum, quam proditiones deleverunt. Alexandri felicitas effecit, ut nullum magnopere inſigne proditionis exemplum, quo res ejus adjutæ fuerint, poſſit commemorari (69). - - - - *But when Philip, the ſon of Amyntas, aſpired to the empire of Greece, Sparta alone was not betrayed; as for the other cities of Greece, they were deſtroyed no leſs by treachery, than the peſtilence which had ſpread among them. It was Alexander's happineſs, that no ſignal inſtance of treachery, in the ſucceſs of his undertakings, can be recollected.* This oppoſition betwixt the character of the father and the ſon, has been very well deſcribed by the Hiſtorian Juſtin. 'Nulla apud eum (*Philippum*) turpis ratio vincendi, ... Amicitias utilitate, non fide colebat. Gratiam fingere in odio, in gratia offenſam ſimulare, inſtruere inter concordantes odia, apud utrumque gratiam quærere, ſolennis illi conſuetudo. . . . . Huic Alexander filius ſucceſſit, & virtute & vitiis patre major. Vincendi ratio utrique diverſa. Hic aparte, ille artibus bella tractabat. Deceptis ille gaudere hoſtibus, hic palam fuſis. Prudentior ille conſilio, hic animo magnificentior (70). - - - - *He* (Philip) *took no baſe methods of conquering . . . . he cultivated friendſhips, not on a point of honour, but of intereſt . . . . It was common with him to pretend kindneſs where he hated; and to take offence, where he had a kindneſs; to ſet at variance thoſe who were in agreement, and inſinuate himſelf into the good liking of both . . . . To him ſucceeded his ſon Alexander, greater than his father both in his virtues and his vices. They took different methods of conquering. The ſon carried on his wars openly, the father by ſtratagems. The latter took a pleaſure in deceiving his enemies, the former in routing them. The father conducted his deſigns with the greateſt prudence, the ſon with the greateſt courage, and magnanimity.*' There is hardly any occaſion where fortune has better ſhewed the prodigality of her favours to Alexander than this; for after all, men are naturally inclined to leſſen the glory of a conqueror, or rather entirely to efface it, when they know that he has corrupted the generals of his enemies, and the governors of places he deſigned to beſiege.

[*O*] *The Jews pretend that he determined ſeveral diſputes they had with their neighbours.*] They ſuppoſe that three ſorts of people applied to Alexander, to requeſt the reſtitution of the goods, which the Jews unjuſtly detained from them. The Canaanites, who eſcaped from Joſhua came to complain of the uſurpations of the Jews: the Egyptians came to demand the houſhold goods, which the Jews borrowed of them on leaving Egypt; the Arabians or the deſcendants of Iſhmael, and of the ſons of Keturah, came to demand their part of the ſucceſſion of Abraham. The Rabbi Gibea Ben-Peſiſa (71) pleaded for the Jews; the plaintiffs cited ſome paſſages of Scripture, and the Rabbi anſwering them in the like manner from Scripture, they knew not what to ſay and retired with ſhame. Never cauſe was more eaſily gained. I do not underſtand the anſwer Gibea made the Egyptians; one would think that he uſed this principle, that the Jews had laboured ſo much for the Egyptians, that what they borrowed, equalled not the leaſt ſalary of a labourer. Tertullian has ſaid ſomewhere (72) that the Jews pretend there were ſome conference betwixt the Egyptian envoys and theirs, and that the Egyptians renounced their jewels, when they heard the pretenſions, which the Jews founded on their great labours in Egypt. He ſeems on account of this reaſon to approve their keeping the jewels that had been lent them; but it is certain, that this would be introducing the bad morality of the modern Caſuiſts, to ground one's ſelf on ſuch a right: how could one by this principle blame a ſervant who robs his maſter, as far as the value of his wages? It is even true, that this ſervant's cauſe would be better than that of the Iſraelites, ſince they carried away the goods of thoſe, for whom they had not laboured; their labour was for the prince, and they paid themſelves with the goods of the ſubject. It is as if at preſent, the Proteſtants, whom the perſecution has robbed of their eſtate in France, ſhould indemnify themſelves upon their Catholic fellow-citizens, when they retire into foreign countries. There is no juſtifying the Iſraelites therefore, but by the expreſs command of God, who, being abſolute maſter of all things, can transfer the property of one perſon to another, as he pleaſes. I need not ſay, that theſe ſuits brought againſt the Jews before Alexander, are chimeras; it ſuffices to obſerve, that this ſtory is told otherwiſe in the Bereſchith Rabba (73) than in the Gemara Babylonica (74). I am far from reckoning in the number of fables, Alexander's march to Jeruſalem; the embaſſadors to him [*P*]. Livy contradicts himſelf, in ſpeaking of this prince [*Q*]. One of our moſt excellent Poets ſeems to contradict himſelf on the ſame ſubject [*R*]. We ſhall examine in another place (*c*) whether it be probable, that the queen of the Amazons took a long journey, to lye with this king; and that the ſea of Pamphylia deſerted it's banks, to facilitate the march of the Macedonian army (*d*). If to rally his troops he uſed a horn, the ſound whereof was heard two hundred *Stadia*, ſome of his Hiſtorians that remain would have ſpoken of it, and we need not ſeek for this in a manuſcript of the Vatican (*e*). I do not reckon in the number of Fables, what is related of the contempt he had for a man who gave him proofs of an extraordinary ſkill [*S*].

---

(68) Juſtinus, *Libr. XXIV, Cap. V.*

(69) Pauſan. *Libr. VII, Cap. X, p.* 546. *Lipſ. Edit.* 1696.

(70) Juſtinus, *Libr. IX, Cap. VIII, pag. m.* 207.

(71) *He was alſo called* Gibea Ben Koſan: *He was a famous Lawyer, as* Abraham Zacuth *ſays in* Sepher Juchaſin, *folio* 13, *apud* Autorem Poiygamiæ triumph. *p.* 287.

(72) Adverſus Marcionem, *Tom. II, Cap. XX, apud eumdem.*

(73) *Paraſch. LXI, folio* 68, *col.* 21, *apud Autorem* Polygam. triumph. *pag.* 283.

(74) Ad Titul. Sanhedr. *Cap. XI, folio* 91, *apud cumdem Autorem, p.* 287.

(*c*) *In the article* THALESTRIS.

(*d*) *In the article* PHASELIS.

(*e*) *Father Kircher*, in Arte magna Lucis & Umbræ. *Lib. ii, Part. i, Cap. vii, ſays, that this manuſcript treats* de Secretis Ariſtotelis ad Alexandrum. *See the* Memoirs of Arts and Sciences of Mr Denis, *ſecond of May,* 1672, *pag.* 111, 112.

the narrative Joſephus has left of it (75) may be fabulous in ſome points; but let who will ſay, it is ſo in all: the ſilence of heathen writers, who have ſaid ſo many other things leſs conſiderable concerning this prince, and that happened in countries as obſcure at leaſt as Judæa, may be a ſtrong argument with others, but not with me.

[*P*] *Some ſay that the Romans ſent embaſſadors to him.*] It is doubted of, though affirmed by Clitarchus; becauſe this Clitarchus is not accounted a faithful writer (76). He was in Alexander's train, and thereby might be well informed of things; but this ſignifies nothing, when a man delights in telling lies. A modern author (77) relates, that this Roman embaſſy is reckoned fabulous; becauſe neither the Roman hiſtorians, nor Ptolemy, nor Ariſtobulus, have mentioned it. *Romanos Alexandrum M. Legatione veneratos eſſe contra* Memnonem, *cap. xxiv.* Plinium *lib. iii, cap. v, negant cum* Arriano *lib. vii, quod de ea re ſileant non ſolum ſcriptores Romani omnes, ſed &* Ptolomæus *&* Ariſtobulus *hiſtorici, uterque Alexandri Socius, alter etiam Dux & poſtea Rex Ægypti.* I do not find, in the twenty fourth chapter of the extracts that Photius gives of Memnon, that Alexander received any embaſſy from Rome: nor does Pliny mention it; but only ſays, that Clitarchus has ſpoken of it.

[*Q*] *Livy contradicts himſelf in ſpeaking of this prince.*] He carefully examines, what might have happened, if Alexander, after having conquered Aſia, had brought the war into Italy, and he ſays, that the Romans had choſen Papyrius Curſor to oppoſe him in this caſe to that conqueror. 'Haud dubie illa ætate, qua nulla 'virtutum feracior fuit, nemo unus erat vir quo magis 'innixa res Romana ſtaret: quin eum parem DESTINARANT animis magno Alexandro ducem, ſi arma, 'Aſia perdomita, in Europam vertiſſet (78). - - - - '*In that age, than which none produced greater men, 'there was no one, on whom the Roman commonwealth 'could ſo ſecurely depend: nay, they had determined he 'ſhould lead their forces againſt Alexander the Great, 'if, after the conqueſt of Aſia, he had turned his arms 'againſt Europe.*' This Hiſtorian's digreſſion is not very long; and yet about the middle of it he declares, that he does not believe that the fame of Alexander reached ſo far as Rome. He ſays this, to anſwer an objection (79). The Greeks, jealous of the glory of the Romans, who had ſubdued them, jealous I ſay of that glory, ſo far as to become flatterers of the Parthians, in order to obſcure it, ſaid, that Alexander, by the meer majeſty of his name, and by the bare luſtre of his glory, would have brought down the courage of the Romans. Livy anſwers, this danger was little to be feared by people that had not ſo much as heard of that prince: why then had they appointed Papyrius Curſor to command their armies, in caſe Alexander, fluſhed with his Aſian conqueſts, ſhould bring the war into Italy; Livy cannot be excuſed; his heedleſſneſs, his want of attention, in a word, his contradiction, is palpable.

[*R*] *One of our moſt excellent Poets ſeems to contradict himſelf on the ſame ſubject.*] I have not at preſent the obſervations of Des-Marets of the French academy, publiſhed againſt Boileau's ſatires about the year 1674, but I have a confuſed notion that he ſeverely criticiſed this fine and ingenious invective (80):

Quoi donc, à vôtre avis, fut-ce un fou qu'Alexandre?
Qui? cet écervelé qui mit l'Aſie en cendre?
Ce fougueux l'Angeli qui de ſang alteré
Maître du monde entier s'y trouvoit trop ſerré?
L'enragé qu'il étoit, né Roy d'une Province,
Qu'il pouvoit gouverner en bon & ſage Prince,
S'en alla follement & penſant être Dieu
Courir comme un Bandit qui n'a ni feu ni lieu,
Et traînant avec ſoi les horreurs de la guerre
De ſa vaſte folie emplir toute la terre.
Heureux! ſi de ſon tems pour cent bonnes raiſons
La Macedoine eût eu de Petites Maiſons;
Et qu'un ſage Tuteur l'eût en cette demeure,
Par avis de Parens, enfermé de bonne heure.

Then, Alexander was a fool, you think ....
What! He, that hair-brain'd, raſh, ambitious, madman,
Who laid in aſhes Aſia's fertile plains,
And thought the world too little for his ſway?
Lord of an ample province born, whoſe crown
He might have worn, a monarch wiſe and good,
Yet ran, a public robber, up and down,
With idle boaſts of his Divinity:
And, with war's horrors in his bloody train,
Fill'd the wide earth with his extenſive folly.
Happy! for many good and weighty reaſons,
Had Macedon been ſtored with mad-houſes,
And a wiſe tutor, by advice of parents,
Confin'd the frantic youth, and lock'd him up betimes.

The critic, if I remember right, grounds himſelf, amongſt other things, upon Mr Boileau's praiſing Alexander in another place, and comparing him to Lewis XIV. It was not Des-Marets's fault, if his cenſure was not turned into a criminal accuſation, capable of caſting the accuſed out of his prince's favour. The public was ſo prejudiced in favour of Mr Boileau, and ſo thankful for being diverted by the reading of his ſatires, at many people's coſt, that no notice was taken of Des-Marets's reflexions. Tho' they had been never ſo ſolid and convincing, they would have been deſpiſed; the ſeaſon was not favourable for them: which an author ought to obſerve no leſs than a Gardener. To this may be applied what I cite (81).

[*S*] *The contempt he had for a man ..... of extraordinary ſkill.*] We read this particular in ſeveral moderns. Obſerve how Mr de la Mothe le Vayer applies it, in his inſtruction of the Dauphin (82): *There are arts of ſo little conſideration, and that conſiſt in ſuch uſeleſs ſubtilties, that princes may very well be ignorant of them; nor ought they ſo much as to eſteem or reward thoſe that have placed their ſtudies in them, except with recompences as inſignificant as their works. A man preſented himſelf to Alexander *, ſo dexterous at throwing a chich-pea through the eye of a needle, as to caſt a great many of them, one after another, at a good diſtance without miſſing. Alexander rewarded his induſtry, by commanding a buſhel of chich-peas to be given him. This example ſuffices to preſcribe the rule which ought to be practiſed by all ſovereigns on the like occaſions.* The book and chapter of Quintilian are well cited; but the words are very ill tranſlated. Let us ſee them in the original. 'Ματαιοτεχνία quoque eſt 'quædam, id eſt ſupervacua artes imitatio, quæ nihil 'ſane nec boni nec mali habeat, ſed vanum laborem: 'qualis illius fuit qui grana ciceris ex ſpatio diſtante miſſa in acum continuò & ſine fruſtratione inſerebat, quem cum ſpectaſſet Alexander, donaſſe dicitur ejuſdem leguminis modio. Quod quidem præmium fuit illo opere digniſſimum. - - - - *There is an 'unneceſſary imitation of art, which is neither good 'nor bad, but attended with labour to no purpoſe: 'ſuch as was his, who ſtuck grains of vetches on a 'needle's point, ſtanding at a diſtance, and repeated the 'experiment ſeveral times, without miſſing: which Alexander, being ſpectator of, is ſaid to have preſented 'him with a buſhel of that grain.*' This man's art did not conſiſt, as Mr de la Mothe le Vayer, affirms, in *caſting a chich-pea through the eye of a needle*, ſtanding *at a good diſtance*. This was not much more practicable than what was propoſed by our lord Jeſus Chriſt as a thing impoſſible (83). But his artifice was this; he put a chich-pea into his mouth, and by blowing threw it towards a needle at a good diſtance, and fixed it upon the point of this needle. Naudé, without uſing Quintilian's words, has happily expreſſed the thing (84), and not miſtaken it as the author I have cited. I do not remember ever to have have read, that Alexander was blamed for ſlighting this pea-blower. Plato would not have judged more rationally on this piece of dexterity than Alexander; for he was the only perſon, that did not admire one Anniceris who was ſo good a coachman, that he could drive his chariot an hundred rounds, without deviating the leaſt in the world from the ſame track (85). Plato judged, that a perſon who took ſo much pains to perfect himſelf in ſo uſeleſs an art, was not capable of great things. Πλάτων, τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν αὐτοῦ σπουδὴν διέβαλεν, εἰπών· ἀδύνατόν ἐστι, τὸν εἰς μικρὰ οὕτω καὶ οὐδενὸς ἄξια τοσαύτην φροντίδα κατατιθέμενον, ὑπὲρ μεγάλων τινῶν σπουδάσαι. πᾶσαν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὴν διάνοιαν εἰς ἐκεῖνα ἀποτεθεῖσαν ἀνάγκη ὀλιγωρεῖν τῶν ὄντως θαυμάζεσθαι δικαίων. Plato nimiam ejus induſtriam reprehendit, inquiens, fieri non poſſe, ut qui rebus tam nullius pretii operam navaret adeò diligentem, poſſit magnis & præclaris negotiis ullis vacare. Quum enim omnis cogitatio in iſta conferatur, neceſſum eſſe, ut ea negligat, quæ revera ſunt admiratione digna (86). - - - - *Plato blamed his too great induſtry, ſaying, that a man, who applies himſelf ſo diligently to a thing of no worth, can have no leiſure for great and noble employs. For his whole thoughts being bent that way, he muſt of neceſſity neglect thoſe things, which are really praiſe-worthy.*

---

(75) Joſeph. Antiquit. *Lib. xi, Cap. viii.*

(76) Clitarchi probatur ingenium fides infamatur. - - - - *Clitarchus is allowed to be an ingenious, but not a faithful, author.* Quintil. Lib. x, Cap. i.

(77) Joan. Eiſenhart, de Fide Hiſtorica, *p.* 130. ex Ruperto in Hiſtor. univ. Obſ. ad Synopſim min. Beſoldi, *Cap. xviii, pag.* 678.

(78) T. Livius, *Lib. ix, Cap. xvi.*

(79) Id vero periculum erat quod leviſſimi ex Græcis qui Parthorum quoque contra nomen Romanum gloriæ favent, dictitare ſolent, ne majeſtatem nominis Alexandri, QUEM NE FAMA QUIDEM ILLIS NOTUM ARBITROR FUISSE, ſuſtinere non potuerit populus Romanus. *Livius, Lib. ix, Cap. xvii.*

(80) *It is in the eighth ſatire.*

(81) Parcendum eſt maxime caritati hominum, ne temere in eos dicas qui diliguntur. - - - *But, in particular, ſpare whatever renders a man dear, leſt you raſhly ſpeak againſt thoſe, who are beloved.* Cicero, de Orat. *Lib. ii, Cap. lviii.*

(82) La Mothe le Vayer, *Tom. i, pag.* 226. Edit. in 12mo. 1681.

* Quintil. *Lib. ii,* Inſtit, *Cap. xx.*

(83) Εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστι κάμηλον (*or rather* κάμιλον) διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν, ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν. *It is eaſier for a camel* (or rather *a cable*) *to go thorough the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of* GOD. Matth. ch. xix, ver. xxiv.

(84) Alexander Magnus hominem ſolo oris halitu cicera minutiſſima ex magno intervallo in acum certiſſime inſigentem, cicerum modio, donari voluit, quo ſe ille nugator in tam ludicræ artis fatuitate diutius exerceret. - - - - *Alexander the Great, ſeeing a man ſtick ſmall vetches on a needle's point, by force of his breath alone, and ſtanding at a great diſtance, preſented him with a buſhel of vetches, that the trifler might exerciſe himſelf the longer in the folly of his childiſh art.* Naudæus in Syntagmate de ſtudio liberali.

(85) Lucian. *in* Encom. Demoſth. *pag. m.* 929, 930, *Tom. ii.*

(86) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib.* ii, *cap. xxvii.*

MACHIAVEL (Nicolas), a native of Florence, was a man of great wit, and an excellent pen: he knew but little Latin (*a*); but he was in the ſervice of a learned man, who having pointed out to him many fine places of the antient authors, enabled him to inſert them in his books [*A*]. He made a comedy upon the model of the antient Greeks [*B*], which was very much applauded, inſomuch that Leo X. would entertain the city

(*a*) In nulla vel certe mediocri Latinarum literarum oognitione. *Jovius, Elog. cap. lxxxvii, p.* 205.

[*A*] *He was in the ſervice of a learned man, who having pointed out to him many fine places of the antient authors, enabled him to inſert them in his books.*] It was Marcellus Virgilius; as we learn from Paul Jovius, who had it from Machiavel. ‘Conſtat eum, ‘ſicuti ipſe nobis fatebatur, à Marcello Virgilio, cujus & notarius, & aſſecla publici muneris fuit, Græcæ atque Latinæ linguæ flores accepiſſe, quos ſcriptis ſuis insereret (1). - - - - *It is well known, as he ‘himſelf confeſſed, that he had received the flowers ‘of the Greek and Latin tongues, in order to be inſerted ‘in his works, from Marcellus Virgilius, whoſe Notary ‘and Aſſiſtant in public buſineſs he was.*’

(1) Paul Jovius, Elog. *cap. lxxxvii, p. m.* 206.

[*B*] *He wrote a comedy upon the model of the ancient Greeks.*] He ridiculed in it ſeveral Florentines, who durſt not expreſs their reſentment. ‘Comiter æſtimemus ‘Etruſcos ſales, ad exemplar Comœdiæ veteris Ariſtophanis, in Nicia præſertim Comœdia; in qua ‘adeò jucunde vel in triſtibus riſum excitavit, ut illi ipſi ex perſona ſcitè expreſſa, in ſcena inducti ‘cives, quanquam præaltè commorderentur, totam ‘inuſtæ notæ injuriam civili lenitate pertulerint: ‘actamque Florentiæ, ex ea miri lepôris fama Leo ‘Pontifex, inſtaurato ludo, ut Urbi ea voluptas communicaretur, cum toto ſcenæ cultu, ipſiſque hiſtrionibus Romam acciverit (2). - - - - *Let us form a good ‘natured judgment of the Tuſcan wit, on the model of the ‘comedy of Ariſtophanes, particularly the Nicias, in ‘which, even on a melancholy ſubject he ſo pleaſantly ‘excited mirth, that thoſe very perſons, whom he laſhed ‘under theatrical characters, bore the injury without ‘reſentment; and having been acted at Florence, Pope Leo ‘upon the fame of it's great wit, ordered it to be performed at Rome, with all it's decorations, and by the ſame ‘actors, that that city might enjoy the pleaſure of it.*’ This paſſage of Paul Jovius informs us, that the Pope, hearing what great ſucceſs this play had on the ſtage of Florence, gave orders that it ſhould be acted at Rome by the ſame actors, and with the ſame ſcenes. I know not from whence Mr Varillas had ſo many other particulars, which he did not read in Paul Jovius. Here is his narrative (3): ‘One ‘day as Machiavel mimicked the geſtures and irregular ‘motions of ſome of the Florentines, the cardinal told ‘him, they would appear much more ridiculous on the ‘ſtage, in a comedy made in imitation of the comedies of Ariſtophanes. There needed no more to put ‘Machiavel upon writing his Sanitia (4), in which ‘the perſons he deſigned to ridicule were ſo lively ‘deſcribed, that they durſt not ſhew their reſentment ‘tho' they were preſent at it's firſt acting, for fear of ‘increaſing the public laughter, by diſcovering themſelves. The cardinal de Medicis was ſo charmed ‘with it, that after he was Pope, he cauſed the ſcenes, ‘the habits, and the actors themſelves, to be brought ‘to Rome, to divert his court with it.’ Mr Varillas not only relates things which Paul Jovius has not ſaid; but he ſuppoſes, againſt the narrative of this author, that this play was acted at the theatre of Florence before Leo X was Pope. Mr de Balzac obſerves, that Machiavel's Clitia is a copy of Plautus's Caſina, and he juſtly blames this Florentine for following his original, even in things where matters of religion were ridiculed. ‘Scriba quem nôſti Florentinus . . . . è ‘Latinâ bonâ Hetruſcam fecit meo judicio non malam. Clitia ſiquidem illius, eadem eſt quæ Plauti ‘Caſina; ex quâ nonnulla interpres fidiſſimus penè ‘ad verbum redidit, quædam correxit cum arte, ‘multa feliciſſimè imitatus eſt, aliqua verò aut imprudenter aut perversè; velut illa Olympionis villici ad Stalionem herum:

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 205.

(3) *Varillas Anecdotes of Florence, pag.* 248.

(4) *Paul Jovius calls this comedy* Nicia. *This piece is not inſerted in Machiavel's works. Only two comedies are found there, the firſt is intituled* Mandragola, *and the ſecond* Clitia.

Inimica eſt tua uxor mihi, inimicus filius,
Inimici familiares. Stal. *Quid id refert tua?*
Unus tibi hic dum propitius ſit Jupiter,
Tu iſtos minutos cave Deos flocciſeceris.
Olymp. *Nugæ ſunt iſtæ magnæ, quaſi tu neſcias,*
Repentè ut emoriantur humani Joves.
Sed tandem ſi tu Jupiter ſis emortuus,
Cùm ad Deos minores redierit regnum tuum,
Quis mihi ſubveniet, tergo, aut capiti, aut cruribus?

‘Quæ ſic Thuſcus effinxit Scena ſexta Actus tertii, ubi ‘Pyrrhus hunc cum Nicomacho ſermonem habet.

Nic. *Ch'importa à te? Stà ben con Chriſto, & fatti beffe de' Santi* (5).
Pir. *Si, ma ſe voi moriſſi, e Santi mi tratterebbeno aſſai male.*
Nic. *Non dubitare, io ti farò tal parte, che i Santi ti potranno dar poca briga,* &c.

‘Hæc quod ad elegantiam, multò inferiora ſunt Plautinis; indigna verò homine Chriſtiano, qui ſanctiores ‘Muſas colit, & in ludicris quoque meminiſſe debet ‘ſeveritatis (6). - - - - - *The Florentine ſcribe, whom ‘you know, has turned a good Latin play into one not ‘bad in the Tuſcan language; for his Clitia is the ſame ‘with Plautus's Caſina; ſome parts of which he has tranſlated word for word, ſome artfully corrected, and many moſt happily imitated; tho' ſome paſſages either imprudently or perverſely; as that of the bailiff Olympio ‘to his maſter Stalionon.* Your wife hates me, your ‘ſon hates me, and all your acquaintance hate me. ‘Stal. What is that to you? Whilſt Jupiter is your ‘friend, never mind thoſe minute deities. Olymp. ‘They are indeed not worth my regard, provided ‘theſe human Jupiters die ſoon; but if you, Mr Ju-
‘piter,

(5) *Compare above, citat.* (39) *of the article* D'ASSOUCI.

(6) Balzacius, Epiſt. Select. *p. m.* 202, 203.

city of Rome with it. He was Secretary, and afterwards Hiſtoriographer to the republic of Florence. The Medicis procured him this laſt employment with a good ſalary, as a ſatisfaction for his having been put to the rack (*b*). This was done upon the ſuſpicion of his being an accomplice in the conſpiracies of the Soderini, againſt the houſe of Medicis. He had the ſtrength to bear the torments, and confeſs nothing (*c*). The praiſes he gave Brutus and Caſſius in his diſcourſes and books, made him vehemently ſuſpected to be the principal director of a plot that was diſcovered (*d*) [*C*]. Nevertheleſs, there was no proſecution againſt him. But from that time he lived in poverty, ridiculing every thing, and having no religion (*e*). A medicine he had taken, by way of prevention,

‘ piter, ſhould die, and your kingdom come to the minor gods, what will become of my back, and ſhoulders, and ſhins? *Which the Tuſcan Poet has thus turned in the ſixth ſcene of the third act, where Pyrrhus holds this dialogue with Nicomachus.* NIC. What is it to you? keep in favour with CHRIST, and laugh at the ſaints. PYR. Yes; but if you die, and the ſaints uſe me very ill. NIC. Fear not; I will put you in ſuch a condition, that the ſaints ſhall be able to give you very little trouble. *This is much inferior in elegance to the paſſage of Plautus; but unworthy of a Chriſtian, whoſe muſe ought to be more holy, and, even in ludicrous ſubjects, remember ſeverity.*’

I ſhall here occaſionally tell you what I promiſed (7). Leo X forgetting the dignity of his character, was preſent one day publickly at a comedy. It was at the requeſt of cardinal Bibienna, who was a good Italian Poet, and writ a play in honour of the ducheſs of Mantua. ‘ Poëtices & Hetruſcæ linguæ ſtudioſus, comœdias multo ſale, multiſque facetiis refertas componebat: ingenuos juvenes ad hiſtrionicam hortabatur, & ſcenas in Vaticano ſpatioſis in conclavibus inſtituebat. Propterea quum forte Calandrum comœdiam à mollibus argutiſque leporibus perjucundam in gratiam Iſabellæ Mantuani principis uxoris per nobiles comœdos agere ſtatuiſſet, precibus impetravit, ut ipſe pontifex è conſpicuo loco deſpectaret (8). - - - - *Being a Poet, and maſter of the Tuſcan language, he wrote comedies full of wit and pleaſantry: he exhorted young perſons of diſtinction to turn actors, and got plays performed in the ſpatious apartments of the Vatican. Wherefore, having reſolved to exhibit, by actors of quality, the comedy of Calander, written with genteel and ſharp wit, in honour of Iſabella ducheſs of Mantua, he prevailed on the Pope to be ſpectator of it from a conſpicuous place.*’ I could eaſily believe, tho’ the Hiſtorian doth not ſay it, that Leo X was preſent at the acting of the Pœnulus. It is a piece of Plautus which was acted in the court of the Capitol with all kind of pomp in the year 1513. ‘ Eodem quoque anno Julianus Medices Leonis frater ab Senatu populoque Romano civitate donatus eſt: in cujus gratiam, in area Capitolii temporarium theatrum extructum eſt omni picturarum varietate mirificè cultum. Egere in Scena Plauti Pœnulum decore mirabili, & priſca quidem elegantia Romanæ juventutis lepidiſſimi quique, variaque extra ordinem poëmata recitata, florentibus non aliâs fœcundiore ſæculo poëtarum ingeniis (9). - - - - - *The ſame year likewiſe Julian Medicis, brother of Leo, was made free by the ſenate and people of Rome; in honour of whom an extemporaneous theatre was erected in the ſquare of the Capitol, wonderfully adorned with a variety of pictures. The Pœnulus of Plautus was acted by the moſt ſprightly of the Roman youth, with ſurpriſing decency and ancient elegance, and ſeveral pieces of poetry repeated beſides; no age having produced better Poets.*’ Famian Strada relates, that this Pope not only aſſiſted at the conferences of the Poets, but that he alſo approved their inſtituting public diſputes at which he was preſent (10). It is true he placed himſelf in a box where he could not be ſeen by the aſſembly. ‘ In Aula omnium ordinum frequentia, & Pontificiis potiſſimum aſſeclis referta, nullo exedrarum, locique diſcrimine conſidunt. Nam Leo Pontifex ratus inferius eſſe majeſtate Principis, ſi ſe in conſpectum concioni daret; in Aulæ receſſu, loculamento ſe ſuo ſublatus in ſpeculam inſeruerat (11). - - - - *They ſit down, without regard to precedency, in the hall, crowded with all ranks, and particularly the Pope's attendants. For Pope Leo, thinking it beneath the majeſty of a prince, to be preſent at the aſſembly, viewed it at a diſtance from his apartment.*’ There is no doubt but the fiction which Strada relates, was founded upon ſome known matter of fact.

[*C*] *He was ſuſpected to be director of a plot that was diſcovered.*] It coſt a Poet and a life-guard-man their lives, if we believe Paul Jovius. ‘ Quum dicendo ſcribendoque Brutos & Caſſios laudaret ejus conjurationis architectus fuiſſe putaretur, in qua Ajacetus Poëta, & Alamanus ex ipſa turma prætoria leviſſimus eques, concepti ſceleris capite pœnas dederunt. - - - - *Having, in converſation and writing, praiſed ſuch men as Brutus and Caſſius, he was thought to be the principal contriver of that conſpiracy, in which Ajacetus the Poet, and Alamanus of the Prætorian guard, loſt their heads.*’ Theſe people had a deſign to kill cardinal Julian de Medicis, who was afterwards Pope Clement VII. He that Paul Jovius calls Ajacetus, is called by others James Diacettin, or *Jacobo da Diacetto*, or *Jacobus Jacettus*. ‘ He often frequented the houſes and gardens of Ruſcellay: Scholars, citizens, and ſtrangers, were welcome there, and, amongſt others, Zanobi Buondelmonte, and Lewis Alamanni, and they commonly diſcourſed before Coſimin Ruſcellay . . . an impotent man, who was carried as in a cradle; and amongſt theſe was Nicholas Machiavel, who ſhewed them his works and dedicated his Diſcourſes, a work of a new invention, to Coſimin. Theſe men of learning and Philoſophy entered upon a project of killing the cardinal, not for any ill will, but to reſtore, as they ſaid, the republic to it's liberty. Diacettin confeſſed it before the judges, and he and the meſſenger were condemned and executed. Machiavel was much ſuſpected: Alamanni happened to be in the country and eſcaped into the duchy of Urbino: Buondelmonte was forced by his wife to leave his houſe, and to get out of the city, and ſo eſcaped to Carfagnana, where the Poet Lewis Arioſto, who was governor for the duke of Ferrara, ſaved him (12). Mr Varillas (13) ſuppoſes that Leo X was alive at the time of this conſpiracy; he is miſtaken in this, as much as in the interval he puts between Machiavel's promotion to the employment of Hiſtoriographer, and the exaltation of this Pope (14). But Paul Jovius's faults are much greater. He ſuppoſes, that the chief quality and diſtinguiſhing character of his Ajacetus was the being a Poet; which is not true (15): He ſhould have ſaid this of his Alamannus, inſtead of making him one of the light-horſe-guard; and he ought not to have put him in the number of the beheaded. Aloiſio Alamanni, a very ingenious man, and a great Poet, was an accomplice in this conſpiracy, but he was not puniſhed for it: he eſcaped beyond the Alps, and was very well received by Francis I. He publiſhed ſeveral poems in this prince's praiſe, and on many other ſubjects, and he flouriſhed in France in the year 1540, as Poccianti has obſerved (16), and in the year 1544, as we have ſeen above (17). There is a chapter (18) concerning him in Boccalini's *Ragguagli*. He is there blamed for the exceſſive praiſes he had given the French in an oration, and it is added, that he was quickly diſguſted with this nation, becauſe the French gave him too plainly to underſtand, that they deſpiſed him. Here is a paſſage of James Gohory: “ Finally, he wrote pretty little tracts, namely the Life of Caſtruccio Caſtracani (who, as I hear, has a relation, a very worthy gentleman now in this city) ſent by him to Luigi Alemanni, who wrote a book of Agriculture, and tranſlated the romance of Giron the courteous, by the great Francis's command very elegantly into Italian verſe; and he left two ſons in the court of France, one the preſent biſhop of Macon, a man of very good learning, the other ſteward of the king's houſhold, very expert in arms (19).’

[*D*] *A*

(*b*) Jovius, ubi ſupra, *p.* 206.

(*c*) *Varillas, Anecdotes of Florence, pag.* 247.

(*d*) Jovius, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) *See the remark* [*D*].

(7) *In the article* LEO X, *at the end of the remark* [*F*].

(8) Paul. Jovius, in vita Leonis X, *pag. m.* 189.

(9) Idem, Hiſtor. *lib. xi, ſub fin. See him alſo in* Vita Leonis X, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 145.

(10) Strada Proluſion. Academ. *lib. ii, Proluſ. v, pag. m.* 334. *See alſo pag.* 359, *where he ſays,* Fuit id Leoni perjucundum qui explorata haberet illorum ingenia, & ſolitus eſſet interdum ſeveritatem imperii atque acres generis humani curas eruditis hiſce voluptatibus temperare.

(11) *Id. ib. Proluſ. vi, p.* 363.

(12) *Peter de Boiſſat's Genealogical Hiſtory of the houſe of Medicis, p.* 241, 242.

(13) *Anecdotes of Florence, p.* 249.

(14) *Ibid. pag.* 248.

(15) *See the article JACCETIUS.*

(16) Floruit in maximo pretio in Gallia tranſalpina, 1540. Michael Poccianitius, in Catalogo Scriptorum Florentinorum, *pag.* 7. *Edit. Florent.* 1589.

(17) *Citat.* (26) *of the article FRANCIS I.*

(18) *It is the nineteenth of the ſecond century.*

(19) *James Gohory, in Machiavel's Life before his French tranſlation of the* Prince, *and the diſcourſes upon Livy, printed at Paris in* 1571.

tion, occaſioned his death in 1530 [D]. Some ſay that they were obliged to uſe the public authority, to force him to receive the ſacraments (f). Others ſay that he died uttering blaſphemies (g). That of all his books, which has been moſt cenſured (h), is a treatiſe of politics, intituled, *The Prince* [E]. Several authors have confuted it. Poſſevin, who

(h) *Th. Raynaudus, ubi ſupra, has given a liſt of ſeveral authors who have refuted Machiavel.*

[D] *A medicine he had taken by way of prevention, occaſioned his death in* 1530.] See the words of Paul Jovius (20). ‘Fato functus eſt quum accepto temere pharmaco, quo ſe adverſus morbos præmuniret, VITÆ SUÆ JOCABUNDUS ILLUSISSET, paulo antequam Florentia Cæſarianis ſubacta armis, Mediceos veteres dominos recipere cogeretur (21). - - - - *He died, having raſhly taken a medicine to prevent diſtempers, and* JESTING UPON HIS OWN LIFE, *a little before Florence, conquered by the Imperial arms, was obliged to receive their old maſters of the family of Medicis.*’ He had ſaid a little before, *Fuit exinde ſemper inops, uti irriſor & Atheos.* He ſuppoſes then that the Medicis forſook him, as ſoon as they ſuſpected him to be in Diacettin's plot; but he is miſtaken. Clement VII was not yet Pope; and we find, that Machiavel, dedicating his eight books of the Hiſtory of Florence to Clement VII, confeſſes he ſubſiſted by the bounties of this Pope. ‘Io vengo allegro in campo ſperando che come io ſono dalla humanita di V. B. honorato e NUTRITO, coſi ſarò delle armate legioni del ſuo ſanctiſſimo giudicio ajutato e difeſo. - - - - - *I come with alacrity into the field, hoping, that as I am obliged to your holineſs for my ſupport, ſo your judgment will aſſiſt and defend me in the armed legions.*’ This circumſtance of time manifeſts a notable falſhood of Varillas. He ſays (22), ‘That Machiavel wrote the eight books which we have of the hiſtory of his country in ſo florid and correct a ſtile, that it is blamed for being too much ſo. And it is principally in this, that Boccacio's eaſineſs and ſweet liberty is preferred before Machiavel's ſtile. His narration is ſometimes ill-natured and ſatirical; and Mark Muſurus ſo clearly convicted him of it that he durſt not reply.’ Muſurus died in Pope Leo the tenth's time; he could not therefore criticiſe a work of Machiavel, that came not out till Clement VII. Mr Varillas ſtrangely perverts and falſifies theſe words of Paul Jovius (23). ‘Pedeſtrem patrii ſermonis facultatem à Boccacii conditoris vetuſtate diffluentem novis & plane Atticis vinculis aſtrinxerat, ſic ut ille caſtigatior, ſed non purior aut gravior otioſis ingeniis exiſtimetur. - - - - *He confined with new and perfectly Attic chains, the old rambling proſe of Boccace, it's founder; yet ſo, as that the latter is eſteemed by the men of leiſure the more correct, but not the more pure or more weighty.*’ According to Paul Jovius, Boccacio's ſtile is more correct than that of Machiavel, but it is not purer or graver. However, when I ſay that Machiavel died in the year 1530. I accommodate myſelf to Paul Jovius's expreſſions; without knowing, whether it will be better to follow him or Poccianti, who places his death in the year 1526 (24). The Feuillant, Peter de St Romuald, puts it on the fifth of December 1530. See the ſecond tome (25) of his Chronological Journal. This doth not agree with Paul Jovius. See above, citation (20).

[E] *A treatiſe of Politics, intituled,* The Prince.] This author's maxims are very pernicious; the world is ſo perſuaded of it, that Machiaveliſm, and the art of reigning tyrannically, are terms of the ſame import. This work of Machiavel was tranſlated into French by Mr Amelot de la Houſſaye. The author of the News from the Republic of Letters (26), ſpeaking of the third edition of this tranſlation, makes the following remark. The preface ‘is full of reflexions which are very judicious; we there read amongſt other things this thought of Mr de Wicquefort; *Machiavel ſays almoſt every where what princes do, and not what they ought to do* (27). It is ſtrange there are ſo many people, who believe, that Machiavel teaches princes dangerous politics; for on the contrary princes have taught Machiavel what he has written. It is the ſtudy of the world, and the obſervation of the tranſactions in it, and not a fanciful cloſet meditation, that have been Machiavel's maſters. Let his books be burned, anſwered, tranſlated, and commented, it will be all one with reſpect to government. By an unhappy and fatal neceſſity, Politics ſet themſelves above Morality; they do not confeſs it, but yet they do as Achilles, *Jura negat ſibi nata.* A great Philoſopher of this age can not bear they ſhould ſay, that it was neceſſary man ſhould ſin: I believe, however, that he owns, with reſpect to princes, that ſin is now become a neceſſary thing, although that does not make them excuſable; for beſides that there are few who content themſelves with what is neceſſary, they would not be under this wretched condition, if they were all good men.’ To this may be added the ſaying of an ancient Poet, that by the bare exerciſe of royalty, the moſt innocent would learn to be guilty, without any tutor: *Ut nemo doceat fraudis & ſcelerum vias, regnum docebit* (28). - - - - - *Though no one were to teach the ways of fraud and wickedneſs, a kingdom will teach them.* Every body has heard that maxim, *qui neſcit diſſimulare neſcit regnare,* and he who denies the truth of it, muſt be very ignorant of affairs of ſtate. Boccalini cunningly gives us to underſtand, that the reign of ſome Popes taught Machiavel the politics of his Prince. Obſerve the apology he lends this writer. ‘Io in tanto non intendo difendere gli ſcritti miei, che pubblicamente gli accuſo, e condanno per empi, per pieni di crudeli, & eſecrandi documenti da governare gli ſtati. Di modo, che ſe quella, che ho publicata alla Stampa, è dottrina inventata di mio capo, e ſono Precetti nuovi, dimando, che pur' hora contro di me irremiſſibilmente, ſi eſeguiſca la ſentenza, che a i Giudici e piaciuto darmi contro: ma ſe gli Scritti miei altro non contengono, che quei Precetti Politici, e quelle regole di Stato, che ho cavate dalle attioni di alcuni Principi, che ſe voſtra Maeſtà mi darà licenza nominarò in queſto luogo, de quali è pena la vita dir male, qual giuſtitia, qual ragione vuole, ch'eſſi, che hanno inventata l'arrabbiata, è diſperata Politica ſcritta da me, ſieno tenuti ſacroſanti, io che ſolo l'ho publicata, un ribaldo, un atheiſta? Che certo non sò vedere, per qual cagione ſtia bene adorar l'originale di una coſa come ſanta, & abbruciare la copia di eſſa come eſecrabile: è come io tanto debba eſſer perſeguitato, quando la lettione delle Hiſtorie, non ſolo permeſſa, ma tanto commendata da ogn'uno notoriamente hà vertù di convertire in tanti Machiavelli quelli, che vi attendono con l'occhiale Politico (29).’ Obſerve theſe laſt words; Boccalini pretends, that ſince the reading of Hiſtory is both permitted and recommended, the reading of Machiavel is unjuſtly condemned. The meaning of which is, that the ſame maxims are found in Hiſtory, as in this author's Prince. There we ſee them put in practice, they are only here adviſed. It is perhaps upon this foundation, that men of ſenſe judge, that it were to be wiſhed no hiſtories were written (30). This does not excuſe Machiavel: he advances maxims which he does not blame; but a good Hiſtorian, who relates the practice of theſe maxims, condemns it. This makes a great difference between this Florentine's book and Hiſtory; and yet it is certain, that, by accident, the reading of Hiſtory is very apt to produce the ſame effect, as the reading of Machiavel. There are ingenious people, who have made his apology (31), ſaying, that all thoſe, who have attacked him, ſhow their ignorance in matters of policy (32). ‘Quicunque ſane hactenus MACHIAVELLUM ſibi ſumpſere confutandum, ſi verum licet profiteri, ſuam civilis philoſophiæ ἀπαιδευσίαν nimis apertè prodiderunt. Ita voco cum Ariſtotele, ſummo dicendi magiſtro, imperitiam τȣ̃ τρόπȣ τῆς ἐπιϛήμης, ſive naturæ & indolis politicæ ſcientiæ ignorantiam (33). Enim verò omnes penè videas diſſerere, quaſi non aliæ ſint Reſpublicæ, quam quæ primo ac per ſeſe, imò unicè, ſalutem populi ſpectant, aut verò affectant plenam exactamque humanæ vitæ felicitatem; eoque & politico magiſtro

---

(f) See Varillas ubi ſupra, pag. 249.

(g) Blaſphemans evomuit improbum Spiritum. *Th. Raynaudus, de malis & bonis libris, num. xlvi, pag.* 28.

(20) Jovius, Elog. *pag.* 206.

(21) *Florence was ſurrendered the ninth of Auguſt* 1530.

(22) *Varillas, Anecdotes of Florence. pag.* 248.

(23) Jovius, Elog. *p.* 206.

(24) Pocciantius, ubi ſupra, *p.* 137.

(25) *Pag. m.* 592.

(26) *News from the Republic of Letters, January,* 1687. *p.* 99.

(27) *The Chancellor* Bacon, de augment. Scientiar. *lib. vii, cap. ii, pag. m.* 397, *had ſaid the ſame.* Eſt quod gratias agamus Machiavello & hujuſmodi Scriptoribus qui aperte & indiſſimulanter proferunt quid homines facere ſoleant non quid debeant.

(28) Seneca in Thyeſte, *Act ii, ver.* 313. *He had ſaid ver.* 217. Sanctitas, pietas, fides, privata bona ſunt: qua juvat, Reges eant. - - - - - - *Sanctity, piety, fidelity, are private goods: let kings go where they pleaſe.*

(29) Boccalin. Ragguagli di Parnaſſo, centuria I, *cap. lxxxix.*

(30) *See* Maſcardi, de Arte Hiſtorica.

(31) Pro Machiavello inter alios Apologiam ſcripſit Gaſp. Sciopp. in libello Pædiæ Politicæ, & Diſſertatione adverſus Paganinum Gaudentium. *Boſius de comparanda prud. Civil. num. xciii, apud Magirum Eponymol. pag.* 552.

(32) Conringius *in Præfat. ſuæ libri de Principe editionis, apud Magirum, pag.* 554.

(33) *Refer to this, theſe words of the Sieur Naudé, chap. i, of* Coups d'Etat (*State politics.*) To ſpeak of politics, as they are handled and practiſed at this day, without ſaying any thing of theſe ſtate-politics, is properly to be ignorant of the diſcipline and method which Ariſtotle teaches, in his Analytics, to ſpeak of all things pertinently, and according to the principles and demonſtrations proper and eſſential to them: *Eſt enim pædiæ inſcientia neſcire quorum oporteat quærere demonſtrationem, quorum vero non oporteat:* as he ſays in his Metaphyſics.

de

who had not read it, was nevertheleſs the cauſe of it's being condemned by the Inquiſition [*F*]. Machiavel publiſhed ſeven books of the Military art, which made him paſs

‘de ſolis illis agendum eſſe: hinc ſanè omnem doctrinam, quæ non eſt de Rebuſpublicis, quas illi unicè cognoſcendas hominibus arbitrantur, damnare ſolent, & extra limites politicæ methodi abjicere. - - - - - - *Whoever hitherto have undertaken to confute Machiavel, if I may ſpeak the truth, have too plainly diſcovered their ignorance of Politics. You will find them almoſt all diſputing, as if there were no other republics, than ſuch as principally, if not ſolely, regard the good of the people, or aim at a full and exact happineſs of human life; and therefore that a Politician ought ſolely to confine himſelf to them: hence they condemn all doctrine, as without the limits of Politics, which does not regard ſuch republics, as they think ought alone to be inquired into by men.*’ You will find ſeveral reflexions of this nature, in the preface which the learned Conringius has prefixed to Machiavel's *Prince*. Obſerve, that our Florentine is accuſed of enriching himſelf with the ſpoils of Ariſtotle: his political maxims therefore have for a long time been in books. It is the ſame Conringius who charges him with this: ‘Nicolaus Machiavellus cymbalum illud Politicarum artium nullum ferè dominatûs arcanum conſilium Principem ſuum potuit docere, quod non dudum ante ad tyrannidem & dominatum conſervandum facere Ariſtoteli ſit libro V (*Politicorum*) obſervatum. Quin ſua omnia vaferrimus hic nequitiæ doctor diſſimulato plagio ex Ariſtotele fortaſſe tranſcripſit: eo tamen diſcrimine, quod hic impiè ac impudenter omni Principi commendet, quæ non niſi Dominis ac Tyrannis convenire longè rectius ac prudentius ſcripſerat antè Ariſtoteles (34). - - - *Nicolas Machiavel, that cymbal of the arts of Politics, could teach his prince no ſecret ſpring of government, which Ariſtotle had not long ago obſerved, for the preſervation of power, in the fifth book of his Politics. Nay, perhaps this cunning doctor of iniquity tranſcribed his whole doctrine from Ariſtotle, without confeſſing the theft; yet with this difference, that Machiavel impiouſly and impudently recommends to all princes, that, which, according to Ariſtotle, is applicable only to tyrants.*’ Gentillet (35) accuſes him of being Bartolus's plagiary. I wonder they do not ſay, that he has ſtole his maxims from the angelic doctor, the great St Thomas Aquinas. See in Naudé's *State-Politics* (36) a long paſſage of Thomas Aquinas's commentary upon the fifth book of Ariſtotle's Politics. Mr Amelot (37) proves, that Machiavel was but the diſciple or interpreter of Tacitus, and he makes uſe of the ſame obſervation as Conringius. ‘Of all thoſe, ſays he (38), that cenſure Machiavel, you will find that ſome confeſs, they never read him; and the others who have read him, have never underſtood him; as appears by their taking ſeveral paſſages in a literal ſenſe, which the Politicians know how to interpret otherwiſe. So that, to tell the truth, he is cenſured only becauſe he is ill underſtood; and he is ill underſtood by many, who are capable of underſtanding him better, only becauſe they read him with prejudice: whereas, if they read him as judges, that is, holding the balance even between him and his adverſaries, they would ſee, that his maxims are for the moſt part abſolutely neceſſary to princes, who, as the great Coſmo de Medicis ſaid, cannot always govern their ſtates with their beads in their hand *. He had been ſaying (39), That it is no wonder, that Machiavel is cenſured by ſo many people; ſince there are ſo few that underſtand the *Reaſons of State*, and conſequently ſo few qualified to be competent judges of his precepts and maxims. And I will ſay by the way, That there are abundance of miniſters and princes, that ſtudy them, and even practiſe them in every point, who had condemned and deteſted them, before they came to the miniſtry, or the throne. So true it is that a man muſt be a prince, or at leaſt a miniſter, to know, I ſay not the uſefulneſs, but the abſolute neceſſity of theſe maxims.’ This is applying to Machiavel, what another had ſaid of Tacitus; ‘They who accuſe him of holding impious maxims, and oppoſite to morality, muſt pardon me, if I tell them, That never Politician handled ſtate-maxims more reaſonably than he; and that the moſt ſcrupulous who have blamed them, whilſt they were private perſons, have ſtudied and practiſed them, when they were called to the management of public affairs (40).’ Mr Amelot having cited thoſe words of Mr de Chanvalon, immediately confirms them by an example: ‘Germany, ſays he (41), has very lately ſeen a notable example of this in the laſt biſhop of Vienna, who, when he was only Father Emeric, *in puris naturalibus*, inveighed, in all his ſermons, againſt the maxims of Policy, ſo far as to believe there was no ſalvation for thoſe who practiſed them; but who was no ſooner introduced into the emperor's court, and drawn into the miniſtry, but he changed his opinion as his fortune, and he himſelf practiſed (but more artfully) whatever he condemned before in his predeceſſors, the princes of Averſberg and Lobkowitz, whoſe diſgrace he had procured, and in count Auguſtin of Walſtein, his competitor, for the biſhopric of Vienna, and the cardinalſhip **.’

We muſt ſay ſomething of the book written by Innocent Gentillet, againſt that of Machiavel: It is called, in the edition I uſe (42), *Diſcourſes upon the Means of Well-governing and Maintaining a Kingdom, or Principality, in Peace, divided into three books: concerning the Council, Religion, and Policy, that a Prince ought to uſe. Againſt Nicolas Machiavel, a Florentine.* It is dedicated to the duke of Alençon, brother to king Henry III. There is neither the name of the author nor the Printer to it, nor the place where it was printed, but only the date 1576. This book is commonly cited, as if intituled *Anti-Machiavel.* This citation is ſhorter than that of the true title, and that was the occaſion of giving it the name of *Anti-Machiavel.* Conſult Mr Baillet (43).

I am perſuaded, that what I am going to quote from the Sieur de la Popeliniere, relates to Gentillet's treatiſe. He blames the tolerating this Florentine's books, filled with pernicious maxims; and then he adds (44): ‘Now ſince Chriſtian magiſtrates connived at ſuch prejudicial writings, a genteel wit aroſe in France, to confute the errors and impieties which he thought too open, and ſo much countenanced by the generality. But with ſo poor a ſucceſs, that by grounding himſelf only on authorities, and improper examples (which both ſides may uſe, and which the Florentine calls *ridiculous*), and ſhewing himſelf unprovided of ſolid reaſons, which are the true arms, wherewith he challenges all the world to a combat; the poor author could obtain no other recompence for ſo much labour in defending the ſtate, the religion, and duty of all together, but reproaches and menaces, inſtead of honours, and other worthy ſalaries, that ſuch a well-meant and laborious work deſerved.’ If we judged of the merit of a book, by the multitude of editions and tranſlations, that of Gentillet might pretend to a high degree of glory; for it has been tranſlated into divers languages, and printed ſeveral times. The edition of Leyden 1609 ſays, that it had been augmented above one half. The epiſtle dedicatory has been retrenched in that edition.

If we had the work entire, a part of which was publiſhed in the year 1622, perhaps we ſhould have the beſt book that has been written on Machiavel's Prince. This part, full of chaſms, is intituled, *A Fragment of the Examination of Machiavel's Prince; in which is diſcourſed of the Confidents, Miniſters, and Privy-Counſellors of a Prince, as alſo of the Fortune of his Favourites.* It is in 12mo, and contains 339 pages. I have quoted ſomething out of it, in the article of the chancellor de l'Hoſpital. There is a new Latin edition of Machiavel's Prince publiſhed at Amſterdam, in 8vo, 1699. *Interprete Caſparo Langenhert Philoſopho, qui ſua ei Commentaria adjecit:* He who gives this new tranſlation, *undertook it only, becauſe that, which we had before, ſeemed to him to be imperfect* (45).

[*F*] *Poſſevin, who had not read it, was . . . . the cauſe of it's being condemned by the Inquiſition.*] It was very late, when this tribunal thought of condemning that book. Machiavel's Prince was publiſhed about the year 1515, and dedicated to Laurence de Medicis, nephew to Leo X. It did not prejudice the author with this Pope, who nevertheleſs was the firſt who threatened thoſe with excommunication, that read a prohibited book. *Nec tamen à Papa iſthoc vel liber ullo fuit ſiniſtro verbo notatus (quamvis Leo omnium pri-*

---

(34) Conringius Introduct. *in* Polit. Ariſtotelis, *cap. iii, p.* 583. apud Thomaſium de Plagio literario, *pag.* 223, 224.

(35) In Præfat. *lib. iii.* Commentarior. adverſus Machiavellum.

(36) *In chap. i, pag. m.* 16.

(37) *In his notes upon Machiavel's Prince.*

(38) Amelot de la Houſſaye, *preface to Machiavel's Prince.*

* Che gli Stati non ſi tenevano con Pater-noſtri. *Machiavel, Hiſtor. vii.*

(39) *In the Epiſtle Dedicatory.*

(40) *Monſieur de* Harlai Chanvalon's *preface to the tranſlation of* Tacitus.

(41) *In his* Critical Diſcourſe *before* Tacitus's Morals, *printed in* 1686. *He put it afterwards before his French tranſlation of the ſix firſt books of* Tacitus's Annals.

** *In a German prince's manuſcript account of the court of Vienna.*

(42) *It is in* 8vo.

(43) *In the ſecond tome of the* Anti, *p.* 129, *& ſeq.*

(44) La Popeliniere, Hiſt. of Hiſtories, *book vii, pag.* 405, 406.

(45) Journal des Sçavans, 15*th of March*, 1700. *p.* 211. *Dutch edition.*

paſs with the duke of Urbino for a man very capable of drawing up an army in Battalia; but he was ſo wiſe, that he never would venture to try his theory, no, not ſo much as upon one ſquadron [*G*]. They lately publiſhed a new French tranſlation of the greateſt part of his works [*H*]. His novel of Belphegor, a very ingenious piece, was publiſhed by

mus intenderit vim librorum prohibitoriam, vetitis legi diſſidentium ſcriptis omnibus ſub excommunicationis pœna, quod hactenus carebat exemplo) vel auctor priſtino gratiæ loco motus (46). Which I obſerve, to ſhew, that the toleration of this book of Machiavel, ought not to be attributed to any general remiſſneſs of Leo's pontificate, with reſpect to bad books. The Pope was ſo far from diſcontinuing the expreſſions of his friendſhip to the author, that he employed him in writing a book that required ſecrecy. He ordered him to write a treatiſe concerning the reformation of the republic of Florence. *Valuit in tantum apud Leonem, ut hujus juſſu arcanam diſſertationem concinnaverit* de Reformatione Reip. Florentinæ, *quam manuſcriptam in bibliotheca Gaddiana ſupereſſe teſtatur Jacobus Gaddus* (47). ---- *Which manuſcript, James Gaddus ſays, is extant in the Gaddian library.* Hadrian VI, ſucceſſor to Leo X, did not cenſure Machiavel's book. Clement VII, ſucceſſor to Hadrian VI, did more; for he not only allowed of Machiavel's dedicating his Hiſtory of Florence to him, but alſo granted a privilege (48) to Antony Bladus to print this author's works at Rome. The ſucceſſors of Clement VII, to Clement VIII, excluſively, permitted the ſale of Machiavel's Prince, in all Italy, whereof there were frequent editions and tranſlations. It was however known, that this book did not pleaſe ſome doctors; for a book of Ambroſe Catharinus (49), printed at Rome in 1552, has a chapter againſt the Diſcourſes and the Prince of Machiavel. At laſt, under the pontificate of Clement VIII, the writings of this Florentine were condemned, after the loud complaints made at Rome, by the Jeſuit Poſſevin, and a prieſt of the Oratory called Thomas Bozius: tho' it is certain, that this Jeſuit had never read Machiavel's Prince; for if you look into the judgment he has publiſhed on four writers, La Nouë, Bodin, Du Pleſſis Mornai, and Machiavel (50), you will find that he ſuppoſes the Prince, written by the fourth, to be divided into three books; which is evidently falſe. He charges Machiavel with ſuch things as are not in the Prince. Conringius conjectures very well, that the occaſion of theſe miſtakes, was, becauſe Poſſevin never knew this work, but by the reading of Gentillet. ‘In ea (Diſſertatione *Poſſevini*) verò ita diſſeritur, quaſi à *Machiavello* tres *de Principe* libri compoſiti ſint: hinc ſtatim initio, ubi de *Machiavello* agit, aliquot ejus ſententiis enumeratis, *& hæc quidem*, inquit ille, *ſceleratum illud Satanæ organum prioribus duobus libris, quibus* de Principe *agit, inſipienti mundo obtruſit*. Non multò poſt cum diceret: *redeo ad eaſdem labes* Machiavelli, *ut cognita peſtis magis caveatur*. In margine libri notat *librum tertium*: quaſi libro tertio *Machiavellus* doceat, belli juſtitiam in ea, quam ſibi quiſque putat eſſe neceſſitatem, collocari. At verò certò eſt certius, non niſi unicum, & quidem exiguum libellum *de Principe Machiavello* auctore eſſe conſcriptum, & nuſquam terrarum tres in partes illum fuiſſe ſectum, nec in hoc libello reperiri ea, quæ inter alia criminatur Poſſevinus, religionem Ethnicam Chriſtianæ Præferendam, aut Doctores Chriſtianæ Religionis nihili faciendos: ut nec quicquam hoc libro (quod itidem Poſſevinus conqueritur) inclementius dicitur in Romanam Eccleſiam, ſed potiùs illud cap. xi. ipſum principatum Pontificium non humanis conſiliis atque artibus, ſed quâdam inuſitatâ vi, & quidem ſolius Dei favore, ſalvum eſſe; quod vix quiſquam Zelotici gregis affirmaverit. Nec tamen longè petenda aut hariolanda venit cauſa craſſi illius Poſſeviniani erroris modò quis inſpexerit volumen illud, quod *Anti-Machiavelli* titulo ἀνονύμως oppoſuit, hinc inde ex variis libris *Machiavellicis* excerptis ſententiis Innocentius Gentilletus. Hoc enim tres in libros eſt diſtinctum & in ejus duobus prioribus reprehenſa ſunt illa, quæ duobus prioribus *de principe* libris haberi Poſſevinus ridicule affirmat: in tertio etiam illorum librorum animadvertitur in ea, quæ ex tertio libro de Principe fruſtra repetit MACHIAVELLUS (51). Ut liquidò appareat, ex illo volumine *Anti-Machiavellico*, non autem ex MACHIAVELLO ipſo Poſſevinum ſua accepiſſe, *&c.* (52). ------ *Poſſevin's Diſſertation would perſuade us, that Machiavel compoſed three books* of the Prince: *hence at the very beginning, where he treats of MACHIAVEL, having enumerated ſome of his opinions, he ſays* theſe principles which that wicked inſtrument of ſatan obtruded on an ignorant world in the two firſt books of his Prince. *A little after, having ſaid*; I return to the ſame blemiſhes of Machiavel, that when we know the infection, we may avoid it; *in the margin he refers to* book the third; *as though MACHIAVEL teaches in the third book, that the juſtice of war conſiſts in what each man thinks to be the neceſſity of it. Yet it is certain to a demonſtration, that MACHIAVEL wrote but one book, and that a ſmall one* de Principe, *and that it does not contain what Poſſevin, among other things, aſcribes to it; namely, that Paganiſm is better than Chriſtianity, and that the doctors of the Chriſtian Religion are not to be regarded: there being nothing ſaid in this book (as Poſſevin complains there is) that bears hard againſt the Romiſh church; on the contrary, it is ſaid, ch. xi. that the Papal power ſubſiſts, not by human counſels and arts, but by ſome uncommon influence, and the ſole favour of GOD; which ſcarce one of the zealot-tribe will affirm. Nor need we look far to diſcover the foundation of this egregious error of Poſſevin; we need only look into the volume, which Innocent Gentillet publiſhed, without prefixing his name, under the title of the* Anti-Machiavel, *conſiſting of various ſentences picked out of Machiavel's works. For this work is divided into three books, in the two firſt of which the author cenſures thoſe things, which Poſſevin ridiculouſly affirms to be contained in the two firſt books* De Principe: *the third book likewiſe animadverts upon thoſe things, which Poſſevin in vain aſcribes to the third book* de Principe. *So that it is plain, that Poſſevin took his work from the* Anti-Machiavel, *not from MACHIAVEL himſelf.*’ Here is the remark of Conringius. ‘Et vero illud Poſſevini facinus luculente oſtendit, non deeſſe etiam eximiæ dignitatis atque exiſtimationis viros, qui ſcripto publico ne inſpectum quidem MACHIAVELLI Principem ſævo calculo abjecerint (53). ---- *This behaviour of Poſſevin ſhews clearly, that men of rank and credit, have wrote againſt Machiavel's Prince, without having ever ſeen it.*’

[G] *He was ſo wiſe, that he never would venture to try his theory, no not ſo much as upon one ſquadron of horſe.*] He that knows the war only by reading, ought to keep to the theory; for if he ſhould attempt to practiſe it upon one regiment, he would expoſe himſelf to the laughter of the meaneſt ſoldier. Machiavel is to be commended, for refuſing to comply with the deſire of the duke of Urbino (54). Perhaps we ſhould have been ignorant of this particular, if Cardan had not mentioned it. ‘Machiavellum ſeculi ſuperioris Doctorem qui tot & tanta de militari Romanorum diſciplina diſertiſſimè ſcripſerat, ne unam quidem cohortem, quàntumvis eum id ut tentaret, Urbini Princeps hortaretur, inſtruere auſum eſſe Cardanus teſtatur (55). *Cardan informs us, that Machiavel, a doctor of the laſt age, who wrote ſo much, and ſo well, on the military diſcipline of the Romans, would not venture to exerciſe a ſingle regiment, tho' the duke of Urbino preſſed him to attempt it.*’

[H] *They have lately publiſhed a new French tranſlation of the greateſt part of his works.*] Henry Deſbordes, a French Bookſeller at Amſterdam, printed it in ſix volumes in 12mo. The firſt came out in the year 1691, and contains the two firſt books of the diſcourſes upon Livy. The third book of theſe diſcourſes made the ſecond tome, and was publiſhed in the year 1692. The Art of War was printed in the year 1693. The Hiſtory of Florence was printed in two volumes in 1694. And the Prince, and ſome other tracts, in 1696. This laſt book was tranſlated a new tho' Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie had publiſhed it in French a few years before, becauſe it was believed, the public would be glad to have all the works of Machiavel from the ſame hand. They deſerved to

(46) Conringius, Præfat. Principis Machiav. apud Magirum, ubi ſupra, *p.* 548.

(47) Conring. *ibid.*

(48) *Dated the 23d of Auguſt, 1531. It was before Machiavel's works.*

(49) De libris à Chriſtiano deteſtandis, & ex Chriſtianiſmo penitus removendis.

(50) *He wrote it by the order of Innocent IX, and publiſhed it at Rome, in the year 1592. He inſerted part of it in his* Biblioth. Selecta. Conring. *in the ſame* Magirus, *ibid.*

(51) *It ſeems it ſhould be* Poſſevinus, *and not* Machiavellus.

(52) Conringius, ibid. apud eumdem, *pag.* 549.

(53) Conring. apud Magirum, *ibid. pag.* 550.

(54) *He was ſon of Peter de Medicis, and nephew to Leo X.*

(55) Cardan. *lib. iii,* de Utilit. ex adverſ. capienda, *citante* Beſoldo de Arte Jureq; Belli, cap. i, pag. 3, 4, apud Thomaſium, Præfat. xxi, pag. 118.

by Mr le Fevre of Saumur, in the year 1664 (*i*). There is in the continuation of the *Menagiana* (*k*), a very curious particular, about the artifice that Machiavel uſed, in writing the life of Caſtrucio Caſtracani. This life was tranſlated into French, by Monſieur Guillet. They pretend, That it was written with a great deal of inſincerity [*I*]. And the ſame judgment is made of his hiſtory of Florence (*l*) [*K*]. You will find ſome ſtories below concerning his impiety [*L*]. Some authors ſay (*m*) he ſerved Cæſar Borgia as his favourite-counſellor (*n*); and perhaps he was employed for him in France, when he had at Nants that converſation with the cardinal of Rouen, which he mentions in the third chapter of his *Prince*.

Thoſe who ſay, that in that work he deſigned to repreſent Charles V, are groſly miſtaken [*M*]. It has been ſaid, that it was the book which Catherine de Medicis made her peculiar ſtudy, and that ſhe put it into the hands of her children [*N*]. They who

to be tranſlated anew into our language, becauſe the old verſion was grown obſolete. I have ſeen a Paris edition of it later than the year 1630, but it was a new edition, for in it are found ſome French verſes written by Des Eſſars the tranſlator of Amadis. Mr de Beauval (56) has told us the name of him (57), who made the new verſion of Machiavel, and who has prefixed to the firſt volume a preface which deſerves to be read (58); it is an apology for Machiavel, and it treats the Inquiſition as it deſerves. The verſion wherein are the verſes of Des Eſſars, is doubtleſs James Gohory's. It contains the treatiſe of the Prince, and the Diſcouſes upon Livy, and was printed at Paris in 1571, in 8vo. This was a ſecond edition, reviſed very carefully, and much better than the former. The author did not put his name to the firſt, but he put it to the ſecond to prevent his tranſlation of the Diſcourſes upon Livy from being ſtolen from him by one (59) of the other two tranſlators of the Prince (60). It is ſaid, that Machiavel's Prince was tranſlated into the Turkiſh tongue, and read by Sultan Amurath the fourth, in that language (61).

[*I*] *They pretend that the Life of Caſtrucio Caſtracani was written with a great deal of inſincerity.*] Voſſius ſays this in a few words: 'Machiavellus, *ſays he* (62), plane multa comminiſcitur in vita Caſtrucii: nempe quia is hoſtis fuiſſet Reipublicæ Florentinæ. - - - - *Machiavel forges many things in the Life of Caſtrucio; and the reaſon is plain; he was an enemy of the Republic of Florence.*' Paul Jovius highly complains of this fraud of Machiavel, in his elogium of Nicolas Tegrimus, a Lawyer and Hiſtorian of Lucca, who deſcribed very exactly the actions of Caſtracani. 'Sed Machiavellus Florentinus Hiſtoricus, patrii veteris odii memor, petulanti malignitate, non interituram memorabilis Ducis famam fabulis involvit, quum vitam acerrimi hoſtis Etruſco ſermone ſcribere orſus, tam impudenti, quàm aſtuto illudendi genere, ſacroſanctam rerum geſtarum fidem corruperit (63). - - - *But Machiavel, the Florentine Hiſtorian, full of his country-reſentment, invidiouſly wraps up the character of a famous general in fables, and, undertaking to write the Life of an inveterate enemy in the Tuſcan language, corrupts the reality of his actions by impudently, as well as artfully, impoſing upon his reader.*'

[*K*] *The ſame judgment is made of his Hiſtory of Florence.*] I have already mentioned this work (64); and I add, that Jerom Turlerus, a German Civilian, printed the firſt book of it, in 1564. He had tranſlated it into Latin: and as Machiavel, in the firſt part of that work, explains the revolutions of the Roman empire, by the irruptions of the barbarous nations, the tranſlator takes an occaſion to write an epiſtle dedicatory, ſtuffed with aſtrological and numerical myſteries, which made the Mahometan religion to ceaſe at the end of an hundred years, and determined the time of the end of the world (65). Lazarus Zetznerus, a Bookſeller of Straſburg, ſeeing that the Latin verſion of the firſt book ſold well, and was often reprinted, cauſed the reſt to be tranſlated into the ſame language, and publiſhed the whole hiſtory, with the Life of Caſtracani. The edition that I uſe is printed in 1610 in 8vo.

'That hiſtory of Florence, (ſays James Gohory) was written in ſuch perfection, that the deceaſed Milles Perrot, Maſter of the Accounts, my near kinſman (the moſt learned perſon of his time in this kingdom in divers languages and ſciences) having made ſome notes on it in the margin more carefully with his own hand, than on his Livy and C. Tacitus, told me, that it was ſo fitted to the humour of our times, that he eſteemed the reading of it more profitable, than of the great antient Hiſtorians, ſo different from our preſent manners, faſhions, and cuſtoms (66).'

[*L*] *Some ſtories concerning his impiety.*] If I ſhould relate all thoſe which are told about it, I ſhould have a large field. Here follows one of thoſe ſtories: 'One comes to that deteſtable point of honour, as Machiavel did when he drew near the time of his death; for he had this viſion a little before he gave up the ghoſt; he ſaw a parcel of poor people like beggars, tattered, half-ſtarved, deformed, who ſtood confuſedly, and were but few in number: and it was told him, that thoſe belonged to paradiſe, of whom it was written, *Bleſſed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.* When theſe retired, there appeared an innumerable company of perſons full of gravity and majeſty; they looked like a ſenate, where ſtate-affairs and very ſerious matters were, treated of: He ſaw there Plato, Seneca, Plutarch, Tacitus, and others of the ſame condition: He asked who theſe venerable gentlemen were? and he was told, that they were the damned, and the ſouls reprobated by Heaven; for, *the wiſdom of the world is enmity with GOD.* This viſion being ended, he was asked, which of theſe companies he would be of? He anſwered, that he would rather be in hell with theſe great wits, to conſult with them about ſtate-affairs, than be with this vermin of ſcoundrels that had been ſhewn him. And preſently he died, and went to ſee how the ſtate-affairs went in the other world (67).' Spizelius relates the ſame ſtory in ſubſtance (68). There are ſome who tell this ſtory another way: They pretend that Machiavel ſaid, in one of his works, that he had rather be ſent to hell after his death, than go to paradiſe; for, added he, I ſhall find none in paradiſe but beggars and poor Monks and Hermits, and Apoſtles; but in hell I ſhall live with Popes and Cardinals, and with kings and princes. Francis Hotman (69), affirms, that this may be read in the Commentaries of Wolfius, upon the *Quæſtiones Tuſculanæ* of Cicero, and he is very ſorry, that, notwithſtanding theſe blaſphemies, and ſeveral others, an impreſſion of Machiavel's works, tranſlated by a profeſſor called Stupanus, ſhould be allowed at Baſil. He obſerves, that Perna, who had been ſeveral times impriſoned by order of the magiſtrates, for having printed divers impious and execrable books, was printing this tranſlation. Hotman relates this, and ſome other curious things, in a letter dated December 25, 1580.

[*M*] *Thoſe who ſay that in his prince, he deſigned to repreſent Charles V, are groſly miſtaken.*] I wonder that James Gohory has publiſhed this. 'Machiavel, *ſays he* (70), wrote that book of the Prince . . . in which he deſcribes particularly all the qualities neceſſary to a lord who aſpires to monarchy, and ſecretly repreſents Charles V then reigning, as he declares in one paſſage of it.' How came he to be ignorant, that this book was written before it was known whether Charles V ſhould acquire a great reputation? Had he not read in the twenty firſt chapter, that Ferdinand king of Arragon was alive when Machiavel wrote this book? had he not read in another place (71), that the author ſpeaks of the emperor Maximilian, as of a prince then alive? Did he not know that that emperor died in January, 1519, three years after Ferdinand, and then his grandſon Charles V was not full nineteen years old?

[*N*] *It has been ſaid that Catherine de Medicis made it her peculiar ſtudy, and put it into the hands of her children.*] The author of the *Alarm againſt Maſſacres*, obſerves (72), that Charles IX had been very ill educated,

---

(*i*) *See the Journal des Sçavans, of the twelfth of January*, 1665.

(*k*) *Pag.* 96. *of the Dutch edition.*

(*l*) Jovius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 205.

(*m*) Boſius, de Compar. Prud. Civ. *num.* 42.

(*n*) Conring. Præfat. Principis Machiavelli.

(56) Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, *July* 1691, pag. 483.

(57) It is Mr Tetard, a French Refugee and Phyſician at the Hague. He is of Blois, of the family of Mr Tetard, miniſter of Blois, who is often mentioned in the ſynods of France, at the time of the Saumurian diſputes about Univerſal Grace.

(58) *See Mr de Beauval*, 1691, *pag.* 483, *and the* Bibliotheque Univerſelle, *Tom. xx, pag.* 328. *Mr* Beughem, Bibliographiæ Conſp. ii, pag. 192, *is miſtaken when he ſays, the tranſlation mentioned in* Biblioth. Univerſ. *ibid. is Mr Amelot's.*

(59) *William Cappel, eldeſt ſon of the king's advocate and Phyſician, tranſlated Machiavel's* Prince, *printed in* 1553, La Croix du Maine, Biblioth Franç. pag. 144.

(60) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Prince, and that of the Diſcourſes on Livy, tranſlated by Gohory.

(61) Sagredo, Hiſtorical Memoirs of the Ottoman Empire. *This book was printed at Venice in* 1673.

(62) Voſſius, de Arte Hiſtorica, cap. x, pag. 56.

(63) Jovius, Elog. cap. cxli, pag. m. 283.

(64) In the remark [*D*].

(65) Centro excentrici ad alterum terminum mediocrem perveniente, ſperamus adfuturum Dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum, nam hoc loco circa creationem mundi fuit. - - - - *When the center of excentricity comes about to another middle term, we expect the coming of our Lord JESUS CHRIST; for it was in this ſituation about the creation of the world.*

(66) Gohory, Epiſt. Dedicat. of the Diſcourſes upon Livy.

(67) Binet, of the Salvation of Origen, p. 359, &c.

(68) Spizelius in Scrutinio Atheiſmi Hiſtorico Ætiologico. pag. m. 132. *He cites* Jac. Marchant in Hort. Paſtor. *Tract. i, Lect. vi, Propoſ. ii.*

(69) Franciſ. Hotomannus, Epiſt. xcix, pag. 139.

(70) Gohory, in the Life of Machiavel, prefixed to his tranſlation of the treatiſe of a Prince.

(71) In chap. xxiii.

(72) Alarm againſt maſſacres, pag. 53.

who make this obſervation, join to it many words of reproach both upon this queen and our Nicolas Machiavel. There are very few authors who ſpeak of him without curſing his memory (*o*). Some excuſe him, and undertake to defend him (*p*); and there are alſo ſome who look upon him as a writer very zealous for the public good [*O*], and think, that he repreſented the artifices of policy, for no other end but to inſpire men with horror againſt tyrants, and to excite the people to maintain their liberty. If any queſtion ſhould be made, what was his true motive; it ought at leaſt to be acknowledged, that he ſhewed himſelf, in his conduct, inſpired with a republican ſpirit [*P*]. Father Luccheſini

cated, and that he was kept in ignorance of theſe precepts in ſcripture *, that *a king, who is ſet over the people of God, ought not to lift up his heart above his brethren, but ſhould punctually obſerve the law of the Lord, and read and meditate on it all the days of his life* . . (73). ‘On the contrary, the queen cauſed her children to be inſtructed in thoſe precepts that were more proper for a tyrant than a virtuous king, and to be taught not only the fooliſh fancies of Perceforeſt, but chiefly to ſtudy the maxims of this atheiſt Machiavel, whoſe deſign was rather to teach a prince how to make himſelf feared than beloved, and to reign in grandeur, rather than to reign well. And indeed this book may very well be called the goſpel of the queen-mother; for tho' ſhe covers herſelf with the religion commonly received, yet it appears by her actions, that ſhe cares for it no further than is neceſſary for her own defence. And ſo her chief counſellor Morviliers has always this fine and Chriſtian book in his hand, to read a leſſon out of it to his miſtreſs, and never abandoned it, no more than Alexander did his Homer. In ſhort, it is probable that this tyrannical Inſtitution was taken in part from thence; and that from thence the queen drew her principal artifices to perſuade the king, that, notwithſtanding all the promiſes of peace and friendſhip, and alſo the ties of conſanguinity, he might take a furious revenge of all thoſe whom he eſteemed his enemies, by laying hold of any ſlight ſuſpicion, (if that may be called ſuſpicion, which is a calumny forged at pleaſure) for a ſufficient proof.’ Davila relates, that Corbinelli often read the Prince, and the Diſcourſes of Machiavel, to the duke of Anjou, who was afterwards king Henry III (74).

[*O*] *Some look upon him as a writer very zealous for the public good.*] This ſavours a little of a paradox; and therefore we muſt ſet down, a little at length, the very words of a famous Civilian, who judged ſo advantageouſly of Machiavel's deſign: to which I ſhall prefix a kind of preface, borrowed from another learned man; that ſo at once I may produce two conſiderable witneſſes, Albericus Gentilis, and Chriſtopher-Adam Rupert. ‘Ego vero non poſſum hic præterire, qui cane pejus & angue odiſſe ſoleo conceptas de auctoribus opiniones, accuratiſſimi Icti ac digniſſimi cenſoris judicium, *lib. iii, de Legationib. cap. ix*, ubi legatum ſuum ex Philoſophia inſtruens. Nec verò, *inquit*, in negotio iſto verebor omnium præſtantiſſimum dicere, & ad imitandum proponere Machiavellum, ejuſque plane aureas in Livium obſervationes. Quod namque hominem indoctiſſimum eſſe volunt & ſceleſtiſſimum, id nihil ad me, qui prudentiam ejus ſingularem laudo, nec impietatem ac improbitatem, ſi qua eſt, tueor. Quanquam ſi librum editum adverſus illum conſidero, ſi Machiavelli conditionem reſpicio, ſi propoſitum ſcribendi ſuum rectè cenſeo, ſi etiam meliori interpretatione volo dicta ipſius adjuvare, non equidem video cur & iis criminibus mortui hominis fama liberari non poſſit. Qui in illum ſcripſit *(intelligit Innocentium Gentilletum Ictum Delphinenſem)* illum nec intellexit, nec non in multis calumniatus eſt, & talis omninò eſt qualis, qui miſeratione digniſſimus ſit. Machiavellus Democratiæ laudator & aſſertor acerrimus: natus, educatus, honoratus in eo Reip. ſtatu; Tyranndis ſummè inimicus. Itaque Tyranno non favet; ſui propoſiti non eſt Tyrannum inſtruere, ſed arcanis ejus palàm factis ipſum miſeris populis nudum & conſpicuum exhibere. An enim tales, quales ipſe deſcribit principes, fuiſſe plurimos ignoramus? Eccur iſtiuſmodi principibus moleſtum eſt, vivere hominis operâ, & in luce haberi. Hoc fuit viri omnium præſtantiſſimi conſilium ut ſub ſpecie principalis eruditionis populos rudiret. Hæc Albericus Gentilis (75). - - - *Tho' I have a mortal averſion to conceived opinions concerning authors, I cannot omit here the judgment of a moſt accurate Civilian and worthy Critic, in the third book,* de Legationibus, *chap. ix, where, inſtructing his embaſſador from Philoſophy, he ſays; I will venture to prefer Machiavel to all others in a matter of this kind, and to propoſe him, and his truly golden obſervations on Livy, to your imitation. As to his being called an unlearned and a wicked man, that is nothing to me, who commend his extraordinary prudence, nor can diſcover that impiety and diſhoneſty in him. Though, if I conſider the book publiſhed againſt him, if I reflect on Machiavel's condition, if I rightly judge of the deſign of his writings, and if I would help out his meaning by a better interpretation, in truth I cannot ſee why the deceaſed author's fame may not be cleared from theſe accuſations. He who wrote againſt him* (he means Innocent Gentillet, a Civilian of Dauphiné) *did not underſtand him, and beſides ſlanders him in many things, and is a very wretched ſcribbler. Machiavel is a ſtrenuous defender of Democracy: he was born, educated, and reſpected, under that form of government, and was a great enemy to tyranny. Hence it is, that he does not favour a tyrant: it is not his deſign to inſtruct a tyrant, but to detect his ſecret attempts, and expoſe him naked and conſpicuous to the poor people. Do we not know, there have been many princes ſuch as he deſcribes? Why are ſuch princes angry at being immortalized by his means? This excellent author's deſign was, under the ſhew of inſtructing the prince, to inform the people. - - - - Thus far Albericus Gentilis.*’ Let us lengthen out the paſſage a little; for Rupert ſeems to me to have ſuppreſſed one part of it, which deſerves to be known: it is as follows: ‘Et eam ſpeciem prætexuit, ut ſpes eſſet cur ferretur ab his qui rerum gubernacula tenent, quaſi ipſorum educator, ac pædagogus. Cæterùm hæc diſceptatio ulterius haud ducitur. Si favere ſcriptoribus volumus, multa & in hoc vitia emendabimus: aut illa ſaltem feremus in eo, quæ in Platone ferimus, & Ariſtotele, aliiſque, qui non diſſimilia commisêre peccata. Feremus autem, quia meliora deterioribus longe plurima & is habet (76). - - - - *And he put on that diſguiſe, in hopes to be tolerated by thoſe at the helm, as their tutor and ſchoolmaſter. But this diſquiſition is carried no farther. If we will favour writers, we ſhall correct many things even in this author; or at leaſt we ſhall bear with thoſe things in him, which we allow of in Plato, Ariſtotle, and others, who have been guilty of the like faults. But we will bear with them, becauſe there are many more good, than bad things even in him.*’ There are two things to be conſidered in this laſt part of the paſſage of Albericus Gentilis. He affirms, I. that Machiavel took this method of inſtructing the people, that princes might permit his book to be ſold; which they would not have done, if they had conſidered him not as their own pedagogue, but as a lover of the liberty of the people. II. That we ought to excuſe in Machiavel, what we excuſe in Plato and Ariſtotle. Obſerve, that Leonclavius was very far from agreeing with Albericus Gentilis. See the epiſtle dedicatory (77) which he prefixed to the Education of Princes, written by Beliſarius Aquaviva.

[*P*] *He ſhewed himſelf, in his conduct, inſpired with a republican ſpirit.*] Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie ſhall be my commentator here. ‘I muſt ſay, that Machiavel, who paſſed every where for a teacher of tyranny, deteſted it more than any man of his time; as may eaſily appear by the tenth chapter of the firſt book of his Diſcourſes, in which he expreſſes himſelf very ſtrongly againſt tyrants. And Nardi †, his cotemporary, ſays, he made panegyrics upon liberty, and upon cardinal Julius de Medicis, who, after the death of Leo X, pretended, he would reſtore it to his own country; and that he was ſuſpected to be an accomplice in the conſpiracy of Jacopo da Diacetto, Zanobi Buondelmonti, Luigi Alamanus, and Coſimo Rucellai, againſt this cardinal,

---

(o) *See Claſen, in chap. ix, of his treatiſe* de Religione politica, *p.* 162, *edit.* 1682.

(p) *See the remarks* [*D*] *and* [*E*].

* Deut. xvii, 19, 20.

(73) Alarm, pag. 54.

(74) See, above, citat. (2) of the article CORBINELLI.

(75) Chriſtoph. Adamus Rupertus, Differt. ad Valer. Maxim. *lib. i, cap. ii, iii, pag.* 50.

(76) Alberic. Gentilis de Legationibus, lib. iii, cap. ix.

(77) Keckerman cites what is contained in it to the diſadvantage of Machiavel. See Mr Crenius, *Method. Stud.* Part. ii, p. 194.

† Hiſt. Flor. *lib. iii.*

Luccheſini an Italian Jeſuit, a conſultor to the Congregation of Rites, is one of the laſt authors who wrote againſt him. See his *Saggio della Sciocchezza di Nicolo Macchiavelli*, printed at Rome in 1697 (*q*). The author of the Appendix to the treatiſe *de Literatorum Infelicitate*, has placed Machiavel in his catalogue (*r*), and is not in the wrong, for this Florentine was perſecuted with ill fortune as well as others [Q].

' on account of the cloſe correſpondence he had ' with them, and other libertines. (So the partizans ' of the Medicis ‡ called thoſe, who would maintain ' the liberty of Florence) And probably this ſuſpicion deprived him of a reward for his Hiſtory of ' Florence, though he had writ it by the command of ' the ſame cardinal, as he obſerves at the very beginning of his epiſtle dedicatory (78).'

[Q] *He was perſecuted with ill fortune. as well as others.*] If I ſet down a longer paſſage of James Gohory, than my text ſeems to require, it is to obſerve in him a very groſs miſtake. ' Therefore he was neither ' greatly ſupported, nor enriched, by the princes and ' lords of his time, ſuch as Pope Clement VII, to ' whom he dedicated his Hiſtory of Florence; nor ' by the noble Laurence de Medicis, to whom he ' ſent his book of the Prince, who reſtored the ' golden age of learning in Italy, being the patron ' and defender of all learned men, ſuch as Marſilius ' Ficinus, who dedicated to him his tranſlations and ' commentaries upon Plato, Angelus Politianus, Hieronymus Donatus, and ſeveral others, whoſe epiſtles ' may be ſeen in the collection, intituled, *Epiſtolæ* ' *Virorum Illuſtrium*. Machiavel complains of it to ' him, imploring tacitly his aſſiſtance, in the dedica- ' tion of his Prince, in theſe terms: ' Et ſe voſtra ' magnificenza d'all'apice della ſua altezza, qualche ' volta volgera gli occhi in queſti luoghi baſſi, cognoſcera quanto indignamente io ſopporti una grande ' & continoua malignità di fortuna (79). - - - *And if your* ' *magnificence will caſt your eyes down from the ſummit of* ' *your exalted ſtation to my humble rank, you will be* ' *ſenſible how little I deſerve the great and continual* ' *malice of fortune.*' The groſs error of Gohory is this, that he believed Laurence de Medicis, the patron of Politian, *&c.* was the ſame Laurence to whom Machiavel dedicated his Prince; whereas this laſt Laurence was the grand-ſon of the other.

MACON, a city of France upon the Saone, in the duchy of Burgundy. Cæſar mentions it (*a*), and calls it Matiſco. The tables of Peutinger, and the Itinerary of Æthicus, mention it alſo; but Strabo and Ptolemy ſay nothing of it. About five hundred years ago, by an ordinary tranſpoſition of letters, Matiſco was changed into Maſtico, from whence came the name Maſcon, which is now pronounced Mâcon (*b*). This city was treated cruelly, during the diſorders, which the wars about religion produced in France, in the XVIth century. The reformed ſet up a church there in 1560 (*c*), and they multiplied there ſo faſt, that they eaſily made themſelves maſters of the city (*d*), when the maſſacre at Vaſſi obliged them to conſult their own ſafety. It was about the beginning of May, 1562, that they made themſelves maſters of it, without much violence, or effuſion of blood. Three days after, they heard, that the images were broken down in the city of Lyons; and it was impoſſible for the miniſters and elders of the city to hinder the common people of Macon from doing the like; and from that time the exerciſe of the Romiſh religion was ſuppreſſed there. Tavanes made ſeveral attempts to retake this city, but without ſucceſs: at laſt, by the help of ſecret intelligence, he ſurprized it, Auguſt 19, 1562 (*e*). He made himſelf maſter of it, after ſome hot ſkirmiſhes with the inhabitants in the ſtreets. All ſorts of plunderings and cruelties were committed [*A*], and then happened the *Leaps* of Macons [*B*] which I promiſed

[*A*] *All ſorts of plunderings and cruelties were committed.*] After the houſes of the Reformed had been ' ſo well gutted, that there ſeemed to be nothing left ' in them, Madam de Tavanes knew ſo well how to ' diſcover hidden treaſures in her cunning way, that, ' for her part of the ſpoil, ſhe had about 180 trunks ' full of moveables; beſides the yarn ſtuffs, all ſorts of ' linen, as bed-clothes, table-cloths, and napkins, ' wherewith Macon was reputed to be better furniſhed ' than any other city in France. As to the ranſoms, ' rings, utenſils, and other precious things, the value ' is not known; but only ſo far, that thoſe, who had ' the management of ſuch affairs, ſaid to their friends, ' that Tavanes got there as much as would have purchaſed 10000 livres a year (1).' After this it is not to be wondered, that the great lords fomented the diviſions, and increaſed, as much as they could, the flames of perſecution: it was a revenue to them, and a very gainful exaction.

[*B*] *Leaps of Macon.*] I ſhall uſe the very words of the Hiſtorian, quoted in the preceding remark. ' (2) The exerciſe of the Romiſh religion was pre- ' ſently reſtored there, and the prieſts and monks re- ' turned to their former ſtate, together with the bro- ' thel houſes (3). To compleat the misfortunes, ' St Poinct (4) (a man of a ſanguinary and cruel tem- ' whoſe mother had declared in open court, to clear ' her conſcience, that he was the ſon of a prieſt, whom ' ſhe named) was left by Tavanes, governor of the ' city; who, for his paſtime, after he had feaſted the ' ladies, was uſed to aſk whether the farce, which ' was from that time called *The Farce of St Poinct*, ' was ready to be acted. This was, as it were, the ' watch-word, upon which his people were wont to ' bring out of priſon one or two priſoners, and ſome- ' times more, whom they carried to the bridge of the ' Saone; and he being there with the ladies, after he ' had aſked them ſome pretty and pleaſant queſtions, ' he cauſed them to be thrown down headlong, ' and drowned in the river. It was alſo an uſual ' thing to give falſe alarms, and upon that pretence ' to drown or ſhoot ſome priſoner, or any other, ' whom he could catch, of the Reformed religion, ' charging them with a deſign to betray the city.' He was killed by one Achon, with whom he quarrelled, as he was returning *from his houſe near the city, whither he had carried about* 20000 *crowns of plunder*. It was a little after the pacification of the month of March, 1563. D'Aubigné (5) admirably deſcribes the barbarity of the man, under the picture of a ſchool, wherein, during the laſt ſervice at table, while the fruit and ſweat-meats are eating, the young men and maids were taught to ſee the Huguenots put to death without pity. He ſays elſewhere (6), *That St Pont plaid the buffoon at the execution of his cruelties, and that, at the concluſion of his feaſts, he entertained the ladies with the pleaſure of ſeeing ſome perſons leap from the bridge into the water*. The conduct of this governor was much more cruel than that of Lucius Flaminius, who gave order, during the time of dinner, that a criminal ſhould be put to death in his preſence, to pleaſe the object of his infamous amours, who had never ſeen any perſon killed (7). But, on the other ſide, the conduct of theſe ladies of Macon, was much more to be blamed than that of the veſtals, whom a Chriſtian Poet has ſo much cenſured for the pleaſure they took in ſeeing the Gladiators killed.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - conſurgit ad ictus:
Et quoties victor ferrum jugulo inſerit, illa,
Delicias, ait eſſe ſuas, pectuſque jacentis
Virgo modeſta jubet converſo pollice rumpi (8).

(*q*) See the Journal of Leipſic, 1698, pag. 352. which has given us an abſtract of it.

(*r*) See Cornel. Tollius in Appendice ad Pierium Valerianum, *pag*. 20, 21.

‡ Ibid.

(78) *Amelot de la Houſſaye*, in his preface to the tranſlation of the Prince, towards the end.

(79) Gohory, in the Life of Machiavel.

(*a*) De Bel. Gal. *lib. vii. fin.*

(*b*) Hadr. Valeſius, Notit. Gall. pag. 322, 323.

(*c*) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. iii*, *pag*. 214.

(*d*) Id. *lib. xv*, *pag*. 407.

(*e*) Ibid. *p*. 422.

(1) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. xv*, *pag*. 429.

(2) Ibid.

(3) *He had ſaid*, *pag*. 424, That the whores of the prieſts, who had been driven away before, returned, the ſame day it was taken, and ſerved thoſe cruel men to ſhew them the houſes of the Reformed, and chiefly of thoſe, who had driven them away.

(4) D'Aubigné calls him St Pont.

(5) D'Aubig. Hiſt. *Tom. i*. *pag*. 216.

(6) Pag. 202.

(7) Plutarch. in Flamin. *p*. 379.

(8) Prudentius, lib. II, in Symmach. ver. 1095.

miſed elſewhere (*f*) to ſpeak of in this place. I will now perform my promiſe; and at the ſame time it will appear, why I mention theſe terrible barbarities in divers places of this work [*C*]. The memory of theſe *Leaps* have been rendered more immortal than thoſe

(*f*) In the remark [C], of the article **BEAUMONT.**

Nor turns the modeſt virgin from the ſight,
But, with ſtrange cruelty, enjoys the fight,
And when at length ſhe ſees the proſtrate foe,
By ſignals bids the victor ſtrike the blow.

I doubt not but St Poinct alledged, in his excuſe, the leaps of the ſoldiers of Montbriſon by Des Adrets (9); as the latter pleaded in his excuſe the cruelties that were exerciſed at Orange. And thus you ſee how one bad example draws on another, almoſt without end: *abyſſus abyſſum invocat*. Wherefore they are moſt to blame, who ſet the example: and in juſtice they ſhould be puniſhed for all the crimes which follow theirs. D'Aubigné had not well conſulted the dates, when he ſays (10), that the baron Des Adret, being offended with the ſacking of Orange, and the throwing men headlong at Macon, marched to Pierrelate, made himſelf maſter of ſeveral towns, and at laſt came to Montbriſon. For it appears by Theodore Beza (11), that Pierrelate, and other towns, had been ſubdued by Des Adrets before the twenty ſixth of June, and that the ſoldiers of Montbriſon leaped the ſixteenth of July (12), and that Macon was taken by Tavanes the nineteenth of Auguſt (13).

(9) See the article BEAUMONT, remark [*E*].

(10) Tom. i. pag. 204.

(11) Lib. *xii*, *pag.* 265, 266.

(12) Pag. 224.

(13) Pag. 422.

[*C*] *It will appear why I mention theſe terrible barbarities in divers parts of this work.*] For the honour of the French name, and of the Chriſtian name, it were to be wiſhed, that the memory of theſe inhuman procedings had been utterly aboliſhed, and that all the books, which mention them, had been thrown into the fire. Thoſe who ſeem to find fault with hiſtories, becauſe, ſay they (14), they ſerve only to teach the readers all ſorts of crimes, have in ſome reſpects much reaſon to ſay ſo, with regard to the hiſtory of the religious wars: for it ſeems extreamly proper to nouriſh in the minds of men an irreconcilable hatred; and it aſtoniſhes me to ſee, that the French, of different religions, have lived, ſince the edicts, in ſo much brotherly love, though they had continually in their hands the hiſtories of our civil-wars, wherein they meet with nothing but ſacking of towns, profanation of holy things, maſſacres, overturning of altars, aſſaſſinations, perjuries, and outrageous actions. This good correſpondence had been leſs worthy of admiration, if all private perſons had been ignorant of the ſtories, which each party objects to the other. May it not therefore be ſaid to me, that I ſeem to have a deſign to revive the paſſions of men, and to add fewel to the fire of hatred, by ſpreading every where in my work the cruelleſt actions, that the hiſtory of the XVIth century mentions: an abominable century (15), and, in compariſon of which, the preſent generation might paſs for the golden age, as much a ſtranger as it is to true virtue. It is fit I ſhould clear up this difficulty. I ſay then, that I am ſo far from having any deſign to excite in the breaſts of my readers theſe ſtorms of wrath, that I ſhould willingly conſent, that this ſort of events might never be remembered, provided that by this means every one would learn better things, and do his duty better, without indulging his paſſions: but as theſe things are diſperſed in a great number of books, I would not lay myſelf under a reſtraint, in hopes the affectation of ſaying nothing of them in this might do any good; and I thought myſelf at liberty to make uſe of whatever lay in my way, and to follow the connexion there may be between ſubjects. But I ought not to forget, that, as every thing has two handles, ſo it were to be wiſhed, for very good reaſons, that the memory of theſe terrible barbarities were carefully preſerved: three ſorts of perſons ought to view them every day, and conſider them well. Thoſe, who govern, ſhould employ a page every morning, to ſay to them; *Diſturb no perſon for his opinions in religion, and extend not the power of the ſword over conſcience. See what Charles IX, and his ſucceſſor, got by it: It is a miracle that the French monarchy was not deſtroyed by their zeal for the Catholic religion. Such miracles do not happen every day; depend not upon them. They would not ſuffer the edict of January to continue; and after more than thirty years deſolation, and a torrent of blood, and many thouſand perjuries and conflagrations, they were obliged to grant one more favourable.* Thoſe, who conduct eccleſiaſtical affairs, are the ſecond ſort of people, who ought to remember well the XVIth century. When they hear any one ſpeak of Toleration, they fancy they hear a moſt frightful and monſtrous opinion; and, to intereſt the ſecular power on the ſide of their paſſions, they cry, that this is to deprive the magiſtrates of the beſt flower of their crown, if they are not allowed at leaſt to impriſon and baniſh Heretics. But if they would duly conſider what is to be feared from a religious war, they would be more moderate. *You will not*, may one ſay to them, *allow this ſect to pray to* GOD *in it's own way, nor preach it's opinions; but take heed, if you come to an open war, leaſt, inſtead of ſpeaking or writing againſt your opinions, they overturn your temples, and endanger your own perſons. What have you gained, in France and Holland, by adviſing perſecution? Truſt not to your great numbers. Your ſovereigns have neighbours, and conſequently your ſectaries will not want protectors, and aſſiſtants, tho' they were Turks.* In fine, let theſe turbulent Divines, who take ſo much pleaſure in innovations, continually have in view the religious wars of the XVIth century. The Reformers were the innocent cauſe of them; for, according to their principles, there was no medium. They muſt either ſuffer the Papiſts to be damned eternally, or convert them to Proteſtantiſm. But that people, who are perſuaded, that an error does not damn at all, ſhould have no regard to poſſeſſion, and had rather diſturb the public peace, than ſuppreſs their own private opinions, is a thing that cannot be too much deteſted. Let them conſider the conſequences of their novelties, and then, if they can, embark in them without an abſolute neceſſity, they muſt have the ſoul of a tyger, and a more brazen heart, than he who firſt ventured his life in a ſhip.

(14) *See* Maſcardi's Diſcourſe upon Hiſtory.

(15) *Confer quæ ſupra*, at the end of the remark [*F*] of the article LOGNAC.

WHO thoſe are, that ought carefully to conſider the miſchiefs, which are produced by civil-wars, on account of religion.

Illi robur & æs triplex
Circa pectus erat, qui fragilem truci
Commiſit pelago ratem
Primus, nec timuit præcipitem Africum
Decertantem Aquilonibus
Nec triſtis Hyadas, nec rabiem Noti.

. . . .

Quem mortis timuit gradum,
Qui rectis oculis monſtra natantia,
Quid vidit mare turbidum, &
Infamis ſcopulos Acroceraunia (16)?

(16) Horat. Od. III, lib. I, ver. 9.

Sure he, who firſt the paſſage try'd,
In harden'd oak his heart did hide,
And ribs of iron arm'd his ſide.
Or his at leaſt, in hollow wood,
Who tempted firſt the briny flood:
Nor fear'd the winds contending roar,
Nor billows beating on the ſhore,
Nor hyades portending rain,
Nor all the tyrants of the main.
What form of death cou'd him affright,
Who unconcern'd, with ſteadfaſt ſight,
Cou'd view the ſurges mounting ſteep,
And monſters rolling in the deep;
Cou'd thro' the ranks of ruin go,
With ſtorms above, and rocks below!

There is no probability, that any party ſhould ariſe among the Proteſtants, to reform their religion after the ſame manner as they reformed the Romiſh church; *i. e.* as a religion we muſt neceſſarily forſake except we will be damned: and ſo the diſorders, that might be feared from any innovating party, would be leſs terrible than thoſe of the laſt century; the animoſities would be leſs violent, than at that time; eſpecially ſince none of the parties could deſtroy any ſenſible object of ſuperſtition in the other; there would be no topical deities, nor tutelar ſaints, to be broken, or coined into money; no reliques to be thrown thoſe of the iſle of Caprea [*D*].

thrown away, no pixes or altars to be overturned (17). There might therefore be ſome differences between Proteſtant and Proteſtant, without fearing all the outrages, that appeared in the quarrels between Proteſtant and Catholic; but ſtill the miſchief would be fatal enough, to deſerve our endeavours to prevent it, by repreſenting to thoſe, who are too much addicted to diſputes, the horrible confuſions they have produced, and that the moſt fatal non-toleration does not proceed from princes, who uſe the ſword againſt ſectaries, but from thoſe private doctors, who, without a very urgent neceſſity, riſe up againſt errors protected by prejudice and cuſtom, and who obſtinately oppoſe them, at the ſame time they ſee all actually in flames.

[*D*] *The leaps of Macon have been more immortalized, than thoſe of the iſle of Caprea.*] And yet a famous Hiſtorian has inſerted them in his work; and the place was ſhown as one of the curioſities of the iſle. ‘ Carnificinæ ejus (*Tiberii*) oſtenditur locus Capreis, ‘ unde damnatos poſt longa & exquiſita tormenta ‘ præcipitari coram ſe in mare jubebat, excipiente claſ‘ſiariorum manu & contis atque remis elidente cada‘vera, ne cui reſidui ſpiritus quidquam ineſſet (18) ‘ - - - *In Caprea they ſhew the place, where Tiberius* ‘ *exerciſed his cruelties; when, after long and exquiſite* ‘ *tortures, he ordered the condemned to be thrown head*‘*long into the ſea, a body of mariners receiving them in* ‘ *their falls, and daſhing to pieces their bodies with poles* ‘ *and oars, to prevent their eſcaping alive.*’ But, in ſhort, I do not believe, that the Antients are to be compared with the Moderns, in tranferring the ſame things from one book to another, and ſo the *leaps* of Macon are to be read in more places, and have more monuments for pledges of their immortality, than thoſe of the Emperor Tiberius. It was not for the credit of thoſe, who made uſe of ſuch a puniſhment in the XVIth century, that they followed the ſteps of ſuch a tyrant. Some, perhaps, in reading this, may remember the remarks of the article LEUCAS.

(17) It is probable, that the French and Spaniards would not have ſhed ſo much Proteſtant blood, if they had not been enraged by the over throwing of their altars, images, reliques, *&c.*

(18) Suetonius in Tiberio. *c.* *lxii.*

MACRIN (SALMON), one of the beſt Latin Poets of the XVIth century, was of Loudun. What Thuanus has ſaid of him, and Mr Teiſſier in his Additions, is in every body's hands, ſince the edition of Utrecht: thither then I refer my reader, and ſhall only take notice of one thing, very ſingular, but a little doubtful, which Mr Varillas had learned of Mr Bouillaud [*A*]. It is ſaid, that Macrin was not the family-name of our Poet [*B*].

[*A*] *I ſhall mention a thing, very ſingular, but a little doubtful, which Mr Varillas had learned of Mr Bouillaud.*] ‘ His (1) great friend of Loudun, who ‘ had changed his name from Mitron to Macrin, ‘ valet de chambre to the king, a Latin Poet, and ‘ great imitator of Catullus, as well as he, was no ‘ leſs unhappy. He was accuſed before the king of ‘ being of the new religion, and the king threatened ‘ to hang him, if he was convicted of it. It is ‘ not certain whether he was guilty or no; but ‘ this may be ſaid, that almoſt all the fineſt wits ‘ inclined at that time to Calviniſm. His majeſty's ‘ menace did ſo terrify Macrin, that he going out ‘ of the Louvre, and ſeeing, at a diſtance, a crane, ‘ a machine which Wine-coopers make uſe of to ‘ let down hogſheads of wine into cellars, he took it ‘ for a gibbet, and ſo went mad, and drowned him‘ſelf in the next pond he met with (2).’ The authority of Mr Bouillaud, a native of Loudun as well as Macrin, a man of an extraordinary memory, and the beſt acquainted with the hiſtory of learned men, gives a great weight to this ſtory; eſpecially if we ſuppoſe, that Mr Varillas writ down immediately what he had heard from him. On the other ſide, when I conſider that Sammarthanus, a native of Loudun, and nearer to that time than Mr Bouillaud, affirms, that Salmon Macrin died of old age at Loudun, whither he retired a long while before (3); it is not eaſy to believe the account of Varillas; for who can believe, that ſo tragical an accident ſhould remain unknown to all the authors, who have writ of Macrin, ſuch as Sammarthanus, his countryman, who ſearched for memoirs in all parts; and Thuanus (4), who was no leſs curious in his enquiries, *&c.* Let us therefore place this among thoſe things which demand a further enquiry, ſince the beſt authors are not only ſilent about it, but alſo give us a narrative inconſiſtent with it.

[*B*] *Macrin was not the family-name of our Poet* (§ *a*).] We have already ſeen, that, according to Mr Varillas, *he changed his name Mitron into Macrin*; but, according to Mr Baillet (5), he was called John Salmon, *and on account of his leanneſs was often called in jeſt Macrinus by king Francis I*; ſo that *ſeeing that his name John did not pleaſe his wife, he laid it aſide, and ever after called himſelf Salmonius Macrinus.*

This is found in the Bibliotheque of Vau-privas. and after ſuch a manner as more plainly denotes the reaſon why our Macrin, having regard to his wife, changed his name: *John Salmon, leaving off his proper name, which happened to be troubleſome to him on account of his wife, took for a proper name, Salmon,* &c (6).

[(§ *a*) The French name of this Poet was *Maigret*. From *Macrinus*, as he is called in his Latin Poems, was formed that of *Macrin*, which he retained, See Fauchet, book IV, ch. XIV, of his *Antiquities*. REM CRIT.]

(1) That is, Marot's.

(2) Varillas, Hiſt. of Hereſy, Tom. v, B. 21. pag. m. 50, 51. *He puts in the margin*, I had theſe particulars from the learned Mr Bouillaut.

(3) Vitæ cœlibis pariter & aulicæ pertæſus, uxorem duxit, civem ſuam .... mortuamque ſuis & amicorum verſibus ... commendavit, ſuſceptis ex ea utriuſque ſexus liberis .... domi ſuæ ſenio plane confectus occidiſſet. - - *Being weary both of a ſingle and a court life, he married a woman of his own country* .‥ *and after her death celebrated her by his own and his friends verſes* .... *having had by her children of both ſexes* .... *he died at his own houſe in a good old age.* Sammarth. in Elog. *lib. i, p. m.* 21, 22.

(4) Thuan. lib. xix, ſub fin. ad ann. 1557.

(5) Judgments on the Poets, Tom. iii, num. 1293, pag. 258.

(6) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. pag. 754.

MACRO (*NAEVIUS SERTORIUS*) acquired a great authority under the reign of Tiberius. He was one of the chief inſtruments of the ruin of Sejanus, and ſucceeded him in the office of captain of the guards (*a*). He ſurpaſſed him in contrivance, and chiefly when he deſigned to deſtroy an enemy [*A*]. He refuſed the honours, which were decreed

(*a*) Dio, *lib. lviii*, m. 718.

[*A*] *He ſurpaſſed Sejanus in contrivance, and eſpecially when he deſigned to deſtroy an enemy.*] The hatred of Macro was very terrible: Mamercus Scaurus had a ſad experience of it. He was a man of a bad life, but illuſtrious for his birth, and a great Orator. Macro attacked him, upon pretence, that he had written ſome verſes in a Tragedy, which might relate to the conduct of Tiberius. Others accuſed him of magic and adultery. He prevented his condemnation by killing himſelf, and was encouraged to do it by his wife, who alſo killed herſelf. Read theſe words of Tacitus. *Mamercus dein Scaurus rurſum poſtulatur, inſignis nobilitate & orandis cauſſis, vitâ probroſus, nihil hunc amicitia Sejani, ſed labefecit haud minùs validum ad exitia Macronis odium, qui eaſdem artes occultiùs exercebat: detuleratque argumentum Tragœdiæ à Scauro ſcriptæ, additis verſibus qui in Tiberium flecterentur. Verùm ab Servilio & Cornelio accuſatoribus, adulterium Liviæ, magorum ſacra objectabantur. Scaurus, ut dignum veteribus Æmiliis, damnationem anteit; hortante Sextiâ uxore: quæ incitamentum mortis, & particeps fuit* (1). Dion furniſhes us with ſome circumſtances, which give a light to what concerns the Tragedy, at which the Emperor was offended. The title of it was *Atreus*, and it contained the words of Euripides, which adviſed a ſubject to bear with the folly of his king (2). Tiberius imagined, that this Tragedy was intended againſt him, and that on account of the murders he had committed, he was pointed at under the name of Atreus. I ſhall make an Ajax of the author, ſaid he. The threatning was put in execution; but, inſtead of uſing this pretence, he accuſed Scaurus of having lain with Livilla (3).

(1) Tacit. Annal. *lib. vi, cap. xxix*, ad ann. 787.

(2) Ἵνα τὴν τοῦ κρατοῦντος ἀβουλίαν φέρῃ. Ut ſtultitiam imperantis ferret. *Dio, lib. lviii, pag. m.* 730.

(3) Ex Dion. ib.

creed him by the ſenate, after the death of Sejanus (*b*), and I believe, policy had a greater ſhare in that refuſal, than modeſty. He took upon him an odious commiſſion, in the proceſſes, which the informers brought againſt the people ; for he preſided, when they were put to the torture, in order to diſcover thoſe, that were guilty, and to procure witneſſes. After this, the proofs, which he had collected this way, were ſent to the ſenate, and the accuſations of the informers ; ſo that the aſſembly had nothing left but the care of pronouncing the ſentence (*c*). It happened ſometimes, that none of the accuſed were acquitted ; nay, ſome were even condemned, without knowing, either by the letters of Tiberius, or the certificates of Macro, in relation to the depoſitions of the tortured, wherein conſiſted their crime ; and no other rule was obſerved, but what ſeemed to be agreeable to the deſires of the emperor, and of his captain of the guards (*d*). Every body may ſee, that Macro, by ſuch a conduct, ſtood in need of the life of the emperor Tiberius ; for he had reaſon to fear the worſt from a change of government. This he was very ſenſible of ; and hence it came to paſs, that, as ſoon as he reflected upon the age and infirmities of the emperor, he laboured all he could to gain the good graces of him, who was to ſucceed to the empire. He made his court to Caligula ; and the better to inſinuate himſelf into his favour, he made uſe of the wheedling arts of his wife Ennia [*B*]. He managed the matter ſo, that the young prince fell in love with her, and

(*b*) Id. ib. p. 722.

(*c*) Id. ib. p. 727,

(*d*) Id. ib. p. 730.

Let us add another example of the power of Macro's hatred : He bore an ill-will to Lucius Arruntius, and ſeeing him involved in a proceſs for a ſtate-crime, he laid hold of the opportunity ; he preſided at the examination of the witneſſes, and at the torture of the ſlaves (4), and ſhewed ſo plainly, that the effects of his hatred could not be avoided, that the accuſed put himſelf to death, without waiting for the deciſion of the cauſe. Let us ſee what he anſwered to thoſe, who adviſed him to diſpute the ground. I have lived, ſaid he to them, long enough, and I can promiſe myſelf no advantage from a longer life : the times will be more unhappy under the ſucceſſor of Tiberius ; for every thing that is bad is to be feared from Caligula, governed by Macro. Tacitus deſcribes this more largely and nobly ; let us therefore produce his words : they let us into the character of him who is the ſubject of this article. ‘ *Arruntius cunctationem & moras ſuadentibus amicis :* Non eadem omnibus decora, *reſpondit*, ſibi ſatis ætatis : neque aliud pœnitendum, quàm quòd inter ludibria & pericula anxiam ſenectam toleraviſſet, diu Sejano, nunc Macroni, ſemper alicui potentium inviſus ; non culpâ, ſed ut flagitiorum impatiens. Sanè paucos & ſupremos Principis dies poſſe vitari ; quemadmodum evaſurum imminentis juventam ? An cùm Tiberius poſt tantam rerum experientiam, vi dominationis convulſus & mutatis ſit : C. Cæſarem vix finitâ pueritiâ, ignarum omnium, aut peſſimis innutritum, meliora capeſſiturum, Macrone duce ? qui ut deterior ad opprimendum Sejanum delectus, plura per ſcelera Remp. conflictaviſſet. Proſpectare jam ſe acrius ſervitium, eoque fugere ſimul acta & inſtantia, *Hæc vatis in modum dictitans, venas reſolvit* (5) - - - His friends adviſing delay, Arruntius anſwered, *That all things did not equally become all perſons : that he had lived long enough : that he had nothing to repent of, but having expoſed his old age to ſcorn and danger, hated a long time by Sejanus, now by Macro, and always by ſome great man or other, not thro' his own fault, but becauſe he cenſured their vices : that the few remaining days of the Emperor's life might be avoided : but how to eſcape the youth of his ſucceſſor ? Since Tiberibus, after ſo much experience, was unſettled, and quite altered by power ; was it likely, Caius Cæſar, ſcarce out of his childhood, and not at all, or very badly, educated, would take better meaſures, eſpecially under the government of Macro ? who being choſen, for his ſuperior bad qualities, to effect the ruin of Sejanus, had adminiſtred affairs much more wickedly : that he foreſaw an harder ſervitude, and therefore fled both from paſt and approaching evils.* With theſe prophetic words, he opened his veins.' Note. that Arruntius, and two others (6), were accuſed as accomplices of the conſpiracy of Albucilla, a woman, who was no leſs infamous for her debaucheries (7), than were the heroines of Buſſi about forty years ago (8). I believe the accuſation was founded upon this, That theſe three Romans were known to be the galants of Albucilla (9) ; from whence it was probably concluded, that they muſt know of the conſpiracy, ſince they kept company with her in a way of galantry. Generally ſpeaking, this way of reaſoning is very good : and if there are ſcarce any women to be found, in proceſſes for ſtate-crimes, who uſe not ſuch galantries, there are likewiſe few to be found, who do not communicate their plot to their galants. The reaſon of the connexion of theſe things may eaſily be gueſſed at, and ſo, without much pains, it will appear, why the women, who reſemble Hippolita of Arragon, baroneſs of Alby (10), are thoſe who engage moſt frequently in conſpiracies. We muſt not forget, that Albucilla would have killed herſelf, but ſhe had not ſtrength enough to give herſelf a a mortal wound. ‘ Albucilla irrito ictu à ſemet vulnerata, juſſu Senatus in carcerem fertur (11) - - - *Albucilla, having miſſed giving herſelf a mortal wound, is, by order of the ſenate, carried to priſon.*' Tacitus, who informs us, that the ſenate cuſed her to be carried to priſon, does not tell us what became of her. He obſerves, that it was ſuppoſed, that almoſt all the proofs, which were ſent againſt the three perſons accuſed, were forged by Macro, who was known to be the declared enemy of Arruntius. *Sed teſtium interrogationi, tormentis ſervorum Macronem præſediſſe, commentarii ad ſenatum miſſi ferebant : nullæque in eos Imperatoris litteræ, ſuſpicionem dabant, invalido ac fortaſſe ignaro, ficta pleraque ob inimicitias Macronis notas in Arruntium* (12). It is probable, that Macro behaved himſelf very unjuſtly in this affair ; but he could not, even by the exact obſervation of judicial proceedings, avoid the ſuſpicion of having oppreſſed the innocent ; for when a prince, or his favourites, or miniſters, are hated by the people, it is ſcarce ever believed, that thoſe whom they puniſh are guilty. This was ſeen in France under the miniſtry of cardinal Richelieu (13).

[*B*] *He made uſe of the wheedling arts of his wife Ennia.*] This is the opinion of Tacitus. ‘ Supremi Tiberio Conſules, Cn. Acerronius, C. Pontius magiſtratum occepere, nimiâ jam potentiâ Macronis : qui gratiam C. Cæſaris nunquam ſibi neglectam, acriùs in dies fovebat, impuleratque poſt mortem Claudiæ, quam nuptam ei retuli, uxorem ſuam Enniam immittendo, amore juvenem inlicere, pactoque matrominii vincire, nihil abnuentem dum dominationis aſpiceretur (14). - - - *The laſt conſuls under Tiberius, Cn. Acerronius and Caius Pontius, entered upon their office, the power of Macro being now too great : who every day courted more earneſtly the favour of Caius Cæſar, which he had never neglected : and, after the death of Claudia, whom he had married, as I have related, Macro, by means of his wife Ennia, had drawn the young prince into love, and bound him by a marriage contract, he readily complying with every thing, whilſt he aimed at the empire.*' But Suetonius relates the matter differently : he would have it, that Caligula made his courtſhip to Macro's wife, and that he engaged her, by a promiſe of marriage, to procure him the good offices of her huſband. ‘ Quam (ſpem ſucceſſionis) quo magis confirmaret, amiſſa Junia ex partu, Enniam Næviam (15) Macronis uxorem, qui tum prætorianis cohortibus præerat, ſollicitavit ad ſtuprum, pollicitus & matrimonium ſuum, ſi potitus Imperio fuiſſet : deque ea re & jurejurando & chirographo cavit. Per hanc and ſhe aſſured him of the empire, provided he promiſed to marry her. Tiberius was not ignorant of the plot, and diſcovered his mind ſufficiently about it, by a reproach he made to Macro [*C*]; and indeed he intended to overturn the whole project, but found himſelf engaged in ſo many difficulties, that he was forced to leave it to take its chance (*e*). The Phyſician Charicles having told Macro, that Tiberius would not live above two days, he haſtened to get all things ready to ſerve the intereſt of Caligula (*f*). During theſe tranſactions, a report was ſpread abroad that the emperor was dead, and immediately Caligula marched to take poſſeſſion of the empire. He was ſurrounded by many courtiers, who came in crowds to congratulate him. But on a ſudden news came, that Tiberius was recovered from the ſwooning fit, which was taken for his death. This news ſtruck the courtiers of Caligula with a conſternation; ſo that ſome of them fled one way, and ſome another, and all of them diſſembled as well as they could. As for him, he looked upon himſelf as a dead man, and waited in profound ſilence for his laſt hour: But Macro was ſo far from being frighted at it, that he ordered Tiberius to be ſtifled, and all his attendants to withdraw from him (*g*). Yet neither he, nor his wife, enjoyed any long time the favour they had promiſed themſelves under the new emperor, who was ſo much obliged to them, but were both forced to make-away with themſelves [*D*]. The huſband had obtained a very good government (*h*); but he could not ſoften

---

(4) Tacit. lib. vi, cap. xlvii.

(5) Id. ib. cap. xlviii. ad ann. 790.

(6) Cn. Domitius & Vibius Marſus.

(7) Multorum amoribus famoſa Albucilla. *Tacit. ibid. lib. vi, cap. xlvii.*

(8) I write this in the year 1700.

(9) Connectebantur ut conſcii & adulteri ejus. *Tacit. id. ib.*

(10) See in the collection of divers curious pieces to ſerve for Hiſtory, the conſpiracy of this lady againſt the city of Barcelona, in favour of the Catholic king, in the years 1645, 1646, 1647, and 1648, pag. 43, &c. of the Holland edition, 1664.

(11) Tacit. ibid. cap. xlviii.

(12) Id. ib. cap. 47.

(13) See, above, the remark [*F*] of the article **LEWIS XIII.**

(14) Tacit. ubi ſupra. cap. 45. ad an. 790.

(15) We muſt read, as Caſaubo very well conjectured, *Nævii Macronis.*

‘ hanc inſinuatus Macroni, veneno Tiberium aggreſſus eſt (16). - - - *To confirm which hope (of the ſucceſſion) Junia being dead in child-birth, he addreſſed Ennia, wife of Macro, captain of the Prætorian guard, promiſing to marry her, if he came to the empire: to which he obliged himſelf both by oath and contract. By her means getting into the confidence of Macro, he attempted to poiſon Tiberius.*’ Dion chuſes rather to follow the narrative of Tacitus than that of Suetonius; for he ſays, that Caligula was enticed by the huſband himſelf to make love to his wife (17). Take which ſide you pleaſe, you will meet every where with probability: neither will it deſtroy probability, to ſay, that Macro, being more ambitious than jealous, perſuaded his wife to lay ſnares for Caligula, and to refuſe him nothing, which might be proper to captivate a young debauched prince. If Macro did this, he acted a part, which is very common among courtiers, and generally among thoſe, who have a mind to make their fortune. One of their maxims is that which Tireſias gave Ulyſſes:

> Scortator erit, cave te roget.
> Ultro Penelopen facilis potiori trade (18).
>
> *Stay not till aſk'd; but, of thy own accord,*
> *As all good-natur'd huſbands ought to do,*
> *Conduct thy wife to her adulterer's bed.*

In our days, they would not ſeem to ſleep, but would go into another chamber, if they ſaw their Mecenas diſpoſed to careſs their wives.

> - - - - - - doctus ſpectare lacunar,
> Doctus & ad calicem vigilanti ſtertere naſo (19).
>
> *Who his taught eyes up to the cieling throws,*
> *And ſleeps all over but his wakeful noſe.*
>
> DRYDEN.

This would be more decent, than what Galba did, who *having invited Mecenas, the favourite of Auguſtus, to ſupper, and perceiving he began to ogle, and caſt amorous glances at his wife, gently reclined his head upon a cuſhion, and pretended to fall aſleep* (20). Suppoſe, on the other ſide, that Caligula diſtruſting the intentions of Tiberius, and being not yet ſure to ſucceed that Emperor, endeavoured to debauch the wife of Macro, and imagined, that, if he could engage her in his intereſt, by a ſecret promiſe of marriage, ſhe would oblige her huſband to ſerve him; is it not a ſuppoſition very probable? The like conduct has been obſerved a thouſand times. Laſtly, ſuppoſe that Ennia, being perſuaded, that Caligula would ſucceed Tiberius, endeavoured to gain his love without the knowledge of her huſband, and ſpared for nothing, which might cheriſh the hopes of being one day an empreſs; ſtill we find a great probability. Nevertheleſs, I believe that the narrative of Tacitus is preferable to that of Suetonius, in ſpight of Philo, who affirms (21), that Macro was ignorant of the galantries of his wife.

[C] *Tiberius . . . . . diſcovered his mind ſufficiently about it, by a reproach he made to Macro.*] You forſake the ſetting ſun, ſaid he to him, and ſhow reſpect to the riſing-ſun (22). This is the way of the world, and it is one of the greateſt troubles that attends the old age of princes. I will not deſcribe the particular meaſures, which Tiberius intended to take, when he knew the intrigues of Macro; it is ſufficient to relate the words of Tacitus. ‘Gnarum hoc Principi; eoque dubitavit de tradenda Republica primum inter nepotes. . . . . Mox incertus animi, feſſo corpore, conſilium, cui impar erat, fato permiſit: jactis tamen vocibus per quas intelligeretur providus futurorum: Namque Macroni non abdita ambage, *Occidentem ab eo deſeri, Orientem ſpectari* exprobravit, &c. (23) - - - - *The emperor diſcovered this: which made him deliberate to which of his grandſons he ſhould leave the ſucceſſion to the empire. . . . . At length, doubtful in mind, and tired in body, he left, what he could not himſelf determine, to the deciſion of Fate: though he threw out expreſſions, which ſhewed he conſidered futurity. For he reproached Macro in the following manner, which diſcovered his meaning: that he* forſook the ſetting, and looked to the riſing-ſun.’

[D] *They were both forced to make away with themſelves.*] Dion Caſſius, relating thoſe things which were blamed in Caligula, does not forget the ingratitude of the emperor with reſpect to Macro and Ennia; which was ſo great that he reduced them to the hard neceſſity of killing themſelves. He neither remembred the love that Ennia had for him, nor the ſervices Macro had done him; which were of ſo great importance, that by them he was advanced to the throne without a colleague. And not content to take away his life, he defamed him, and made uſe of ſuch an accuſation, as reflected diſgrace chiefly upon his own perſon; for he declared, that Macro had ſerved him as a procurer: Καὶ ἐς αἰσχύνην ἧς αὐτὸς τὸ πλεῖστον μετεῖχε, κατέστησε. προαγωγείας γὰρ ἔγκλημα αὐτῷ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπήγαγε (24). *Et ea infamia oneravit, cujus ipſe maxima in parte futurus eſſet, objecto nimirum eo crimine quod ſtuprorum conciliatores fuiſſent* (25). This is in the fifty ninth book of Dion Caſſius: and take notice, that this Hiſtorian has obſerved, that it is much more cruel to force people to make away with themſelves, than to deliver them up to the executioner. This obſervation he makes againſt Tiberius, who, to conceal his being the death of the accuſed, obliged them by ſufficiently powerful motives (26) to prevent their condemnation, by putting themſelves to death. Προκαλουμένου διὰ τούτου τοὺς ἀνθρόπους τοῦ Τιβερίου αὐτοέντας γενέσθαι ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸς σφᾶς ἀποκτείνειν δόκῃ. ὥσπερ οὐ πολλῷ δεινότερον ὂν αὐτοχειρίᾳ τινὰ ἀποθανεῖν ἀναγκάσαι, τοῦ τῷ δημίῳ αὐτὸν παραδοῦναι. *Alliciente per hæc Tiberio homines ad conſciſcendam ſibi ipſis mortem ne ipſe eos necaſſe videretur: quaſi vero non longe gravius ſit adigere aliquem ad manus ſibi ipſi inferendas, quam ſpiculatori eum tradere* (27). Suetonius alſo mentions the violent death of Macro and Ennia among the great crimes of this emperor. *Et in primis ipſam Macronem, ipſam Enniam adjutores Imperii, quibus . . . . pro meritorum gratia cruenta mors perſoluta eſt* (28). If we knew nothing of Macro, but by the picture which a Jewiſh author has given of him, he would be more pitied; for one would take him for a very honeſt man, and none of thoſe ill

---

(*e*) See the remark [C].

(*f*) Tacit. Annal. *lib. vi, cap. l.*

(*g*) Ex Tacito, *ibid.*

(*h*) That of Egypt. See Dion, *lib. lix, p.* 743.

(16) Sueton. in Calig. *cap. iii.*

(17) Ἐς ἔρωτα αὐτὸν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γυναικὸς Ἐννίας Θρασύλλης προϋτῆκτο. Eum in amorem uxoris ſuæ Enniæ Thraſyllæ pellexerat. *Dio, lib. lviii, in fine.*

(18) Horat. Sat. V, lib. II, ver. 75.

(19) Juven. Sat. I, ver. 56.

(20) Plut. in Amatorio. pag. 759, 760.

(21) See the remark [*D*].

(22) Dio, *lib. lviii, in fine.*

(23) Tacitus, ubi ſupra, *cap.* 46.

(24) Dio, *lib. lix, pag.* 743.

(25) Thus Xylander and Leonclavius have tranſlated it; but it had been better tranſlated, *Objecto nimirum ei* (Macroni) *præter alia eo crimine, quod ſtuprorum conciliator fuiſſet.*

(26) Thoſe who were condemned died moſt cruel deaths, and all their goods were confiſcated; but the goods of thoſe, who killed themſelves, before the end of their trials, were very ſeldom confiſcated. *See Dio, ubi ſupra.*

(27) Dio, *lib. lviii, pag.* 723.

(28) Sueton. in Calig. *cap. xxvi.*

ſoften the rugged temper of Caligula.

ill qualities, which Tacitus and Dion Caſſius attribute to him, would be known to us.

Philo has given a catalogue of the crimes of Caligula, in which he ſets in the firſt rank the murder of the grand-child of Tiberius: and in the ſecond, the death of Macro. He ſays, that Tiberius, having diſcovered, by his ſagacity and ſharpneſs of wit, the corrupt diſpoſition of Caligula, had no deſire to leave him the Roman empire; but that Macro applied himſelf ſo dexterouſly to remove all his ſuſpicions, and to make an apology for this young prince, that he always prevented the fatal blow, which might exclude him: and when his reaſons did not operate powerfully enough, he offered himſelf to be ſurety for all that he alledged in favour of Caligula. This promiſe was of great weight; for he had given very great proofs of his zeal for the Imperial family, and for the perſon of Tiberius in particular, when he had a commiſſion to put Sejanus to death. What he did for Caligula with Tiberius, equals, or ſurpaſſes any thing, that can be done for a brother or a ſon: and to this he was induced by two motives; becauſe he ſaw that his friendſhip was cultivated by Caligula with the greateſt care; and becauſe he had a wife, who continually ſollicited him to loſe no opportunity of ſerving and obliging this young prince. The author, whom I abridge, obſerves, that the reaſon, which engaged this woman to lay the intereſts of Caligula ſo much at heart, was a thing kept ſecret (29); but he ſufficiently explains it, when he adds, that a woman, and chiefly one that is unchaſte, has great power over the mind of her huſband; for, being conſcious of her guilt, ſhe redoubles her careſſes and flatteries. Macro, continues he, knew not of his domeſtic diſgrace, and imagined that conjugal friendſhip rendered his ſpouſe ſo loving to him. Δεινὸν δὲ γυνὴ γνώμην ἀνδρὸς παραλύσαι καὶ παραγαγεῖν, καὶ μάλιςα μαχλάς. ἕνεκα γὰρ τοῦ συνειδότος κολακικωτέρα γίνεται. ὁ δὲ τὴν διαφθορὰν μὲν τοῦ γάμου καὶ τῆς οἰκίας ἀγνοῶν, τὴν δὲ κολακείαν εὔνοιαν ἀκραιφνεςάτην εἶναι νομίζων, ἀπατᾶται. *Eſt autem ad impellendum virum efficax impudica mulier, ut quæ blandior ſit propter conſcientiam. At ille ignarus probri domeſtici, & ratus ab amore conjugali proficiſci eas blanditias, decipitur* (30). Now, remembering, that he had ſaved the life of Caligula more than once, he very freely gave him advice. Like a good workman, he ſought credit from his workmanſhip, by making it laſting; and therefore, by his good admonitions, he did, as much as was poſſible, correct the faults of the emperor, whom he had created, and informed him of the duty, and true glory of thoſe, who are in that poſt. Caligula refuſed all his inſtructions, and boaſted openly, that he did not want ſuch a pedagogue. Thus Macro became odious to him. This wicked prince thought only how to get rid of him, and, for that end, to find out plauſible pretences againſt him. And he believed he had found ſuch, when he alledged, that Macro ſaid, 'Caligula is my workmanſhip, and my creature, much 'more than he is the creature of thoſe that begat him. 'My prayers have three times ſtopt the orders, that 'Tiberius would have given to kill him. I am the 'cauſe, why he alone ſucceeded to the empire after 'the death of Tiberius.' Macro lived not long after: he was forced to kill himſelf with his own hand. His wife was reduced to the ſame neceſſity, and found no relief from the love that Caligula had had for her: for this paſſion is not to be depended upon; it is liable to ſo many diſguſts. Λεγέται ὅτι ἠναγκάσθη, ὁ δείλαιος, αὐτοχειρίᾳ κτεῖναι ἑαυτὸν, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀναδέξασθαι συμφορὰν ἡ γυνὴ, καίτοι ποτὲ νομισθεῖσα διὰ συνηθείας αὐτῷ γενέσθαι. βέβαιον δὲ οὐδὲν φασι τῶν ἐν ἔρωτι φίλτρων εἶναι διὰ τὸ τοῦ πάθους ἁψίκορον. *Fertur miſer coactus ſeipſum interficere, uxor quoque habuiſſe eundem exitum, quamvis putaretur conſtuprata à Cæſare: ſed negant in amore firmum præſidium, propter crebra ejus affectus inconſtantiſſimi faſtidia* (31). The whole family of Macro was deſtroyed at the ſame time (32).

Three things, any one of which was ſufficient, conſpired to ruin him. He had ſaved the life of Caligula, and procured him a great empire: he boaſted of it; he cenſured him. There are few great men that can love thoſe, to whom they are too much obliged (33); and it is ſeldom ſeen, that thoſe, who advance a private perſon to the throne, continue long in his favour. They become odious to him, either becauſe we love not perſons, who think they have a right to demand every thing of us, or becauſe they boaſt too much of their ſervices, or complain, that they are not ſufficiently rewarded. I leave you to conſider, whether Caligula, the worſt natured man in the world, could long endure a benefactor, who publiſhed his important ſervices, and took the liberty to adviſe him as a governor?

(29) Ἡ Μάκρωνος γυνὴ διὰ σιωπωμένην αἰτίαν. Uxor Macronis propter quiddam tectum ſilentio. *Philo, de Legatione, pag.* 997.

(30) Id. ib. E.

(31) Id. ib. *pag.* 1000. *D.*

(32) Taken out of Philo, *in Libro de Legatione ad Caium, pag.* 997, *& ſeq.*

(33) Beneficia eo uſque læta ſunt, dum videntur exſolvi poſſe: ubi multum antevenere, pro gratia odium redditur. *Benefits are ſo far grateful, as they admit of a return: when they riſe above that, favour is repaid with hatred.* Tacit. Annal, *lib. iv, cap. xviii.* See in the Life of Mr du Pleſſis Mornai, *pag.* 257, a tranſlation of that, applied to the cold reception he met with from king Henry IV.

MAETS (CHARLES DE) a miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity at Utrecht, was born at Leyden, Jan. 25th, 1597. He was ſcarce two years old, when his father carried him to Middelburg (*a*), where our Charles ſtudied till the year 1615. Then it was time to ſend him to the univerſities, among which that of Franeker was preferred to that of Leyden, becauſe the latter was then looked upon as the chief field of battle between the Remonſtrants and Contra-remonſtrants. After he had continued long enough at Franeker, he went to ſtudy in the academy of Sedan. He made the tour of France, and then returned home, where he was ordained miniſter in 1620, and ſerved the church of Scherpeniſſe in Zeeland, till he was called to that of Middelburg in 1629. Five years after, he was employed, with ſome other learned miniſters, to reviſe the Dutch tranſlation of the New Teſtament, and the Apocryphal books. In 1636, he was offered at Utrecht a miniſter's and Divinity profeſſor's place; which he would not accept of, becauſe the magiſtrates and the conſiſtory of Middelburg paſſionately deſired to retain him. But the ſame call being offered him in 1639, he accepted it. He was inſtalled the next year, and exerciſed this double employ till his death, which happened in 1651. He married three wives [*A*]. He publiſhed ſomething (*b*) [*B*], and very much oppoſed Mr Des Cartes (*c*).

(*a*) He was driven out of Flanders, on account of the Proteſtant religion.

(*b*) Taken from his Funeral Oration, ſpoken by Hoornbeek, April 20, 1651, from whence we may certainly conclude, that Witte is miſtaken, when he places, in his *Diarium Biographicum*, the death of Charles de Maets, on the 20th of April.

(*c*) See Mr Baillet, in the Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. ii, paſſim.*

[*A*] *He married three wives.*] The firſt at Scherpeniſſe; the ſecond (1) at Middelburg; and the third at Utrecht. He left children by the two firſt; one of his ſons, called Charles, is become a profeſſor of Phyſic and Chemiſtry in the univerſity of Leyden, and has publiſhed ſome experiments. See the News from the Republic of Letters (2).

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſomething.*] We have a book in 4to of Charles de Maets, printed at Utrecht in 1650, and intituled, *Sylva Quæſtionum inſignium*. The chief thing he treats of, is a queſtion, which then made a great noiſe, *viz.* whether it be lawful for men to wear long hair? A Divine, called James de Reves (3), had written for the affirmative: De Maets publiſhed ſome theſes againſt him; and they were anſwered in a book, intituled, *Libertas Chriſtiana circa uſum Capillitii defenſa:* To which he replied in his *Sylva Quæſtionum*, where he occaſionally handles ſeveral points of morality. The title of this book was lately altered, which is a ſign that it did not ſell well.

(1) She was ſiſter to the wife of Boxhornius profeſſor at Leyden.

(2) For the month of September, 1685, in the catalogue, *num. viii.*

(3) In Latin *Revius.*

MAGINUS (JOHN-ANTONY) profeſſor of Mathematics in the univerſity of Bologna, was of Padua. He publiſhed many books of Aſtronomy (*a*), and wholly addicted himſelf to making horoſcopes. It is pretended, that he was wonderfully ſucceſsful

(*a*) Moreri has given the titles of the principal of them.

ceſsful in theſe ſort of predictions [*A*], and that he was not miſtaken in foretelling his own fate [*B*]. The emperor Rodolphus, not being able to draw him to Vienna, where he would have given him a profeſſor's chair, did nevertheleſs honour him with a very good penſion. Maginus was the firſt that made Maps and Commentaries (*b*) on Ptolemy's Geography (*c*). He was ſo fat and burly, that it is no wonder he died of an Apoplexy. This happened on the eleventh of February, 1617, in the ſixty ſecond year of his age. He had three ſons, and a daughter, who became a Nun. Two of his ſons died during his life-time, and the third was a Jacobin (*d*).

I have juſt found a great blunder in the book of an abbot of the confeſſion of Auſburg [*C*].

(*b*) He publiſhed them in the year 1597.

(*c*) Ptolomæi Geographiam primis Commentariis & Tabulis illuſtravit. *Tomaſ. in Elog. p.* 285. Note, this is an error; for others before him publiſhed Ptolemy with maps and commentaries.

(*d*) Taken from his *Elogium* compoſed by James-Philip Thomaſini.

[*A*] *It is pretended, he had wonderful ſucceſs in horoſcopes.*] He flattered no body; for, if he foretold to one a cardinal's cap, or an honourable employ, he forewarned others, that they ſhould be wounded, baniſhed, or afflicted in ſome other manner; he ingenuouſly declared every thing, which his conjectures taught him to read in the ſtars, to which, ſaid he, all things are ſubjected. *Urbis proceribus ex natalitia illorum figura multa feliciter divinabat: Equitibus tiaram, & purpuratas togas, hæreditates, & acceſſus ad magiſtratus & aulas principum: aliis vulnera, odia, exilia, domeſtica diſſidia, res adverſas omnes quoad ejus conjectura conſequi potuit, prædicebat. Item aſtrologiam aliorum nugis & inanibus ac ſuperſtitioſis auſpiciis obtenebratam miris conatibus illuſtravit, & æmulis ac inſciæ plebi cuncta cælo ſubjici, à cælo cuncta moveri liquido demonſtravit* (1).

[*B*] . . . . *that he was not miſtaken, in foretelling his own fate.*] Tomaſini obſerves, that Maginus, being arrived at his ſixty firſt year, was ſtruck with an Apoplexy, which ſent him into the other world; and that, a long while before, he had told him, and others, that he was afraid of that year. A little after, this Hiſtorian confutes himſelf, by the epitaph he produces. This epitaph teſtifies, that Maginus lived ſixty one years, ſeven months, twenty eight days, and an hour. It ought not therefore to have been alledged as an argument of the Aſtrological ſkill of Maginus, that he found ſuch malignities in his nativity, with regard to his ſixty firſt year; for he lived almoſt eight months after this terrible year. His diſciple, John-Antony Roffenus, profeſſor of Philoſophy, took better care of the honour of his maſter; for, without mentioning the ſixty firſt year, he only ſaid, that Maginus died under an aſpect of the planets, which, according to his own predictions, was to be fatal to him, 'Infeſtis aſtrorum 'ſolis ad corpus Martis quos ſibi prænoverat obtu'tibus, concedens. Roffenus, in Epitaphio Magini. 'Obiit . . . . ſole currente prope diametrum Martis, '& circa exagonum Saturni (2). - - - - *Yeilding to the 'malign aſpects alone of the ſtars on the body of Mars, 'which he foreknew.* Roffenus, in Maginus's Epitaph. '*He died . . . the ſun revolving near the diameter of Mars, 'and about the exagon of Saturn.*' John Goad (3) cites this epitaph, to prove, by an example of great weight, the certainty of Judicial Aſtrology. He adds, that Roffenus knew alſo, by his horoſcope, the time of his death; for, during the ſickneſs, of which he died, he affirmed for certain, that he ſhould not eſcape, and that the figure of his nativity, and his climacterical year, condemned him to die. *Sic enim geneſim ſuam & climactericum annum requirere.* Ricciolus, who reports it, heard him ſay it.

[*C*] *I have juſt now found a great blunder in a book of an abbot of the confeſſion of Auſburg.*] I have found there, that John-Antony Maginus, firſt profeſſor of the Mathematics in the univerſity of Bologna, died in 1629, and that we muſt reckon, among the ſervices he did to the public, the care he took, at his death, to deliver into the hands of Cæſar Marſilius, his friend, ſome treatiſes of Bonaventura Cavalleri, a very famous Mathematician, which had never been printed, or were not ſufficiently known in the Republic of Letters: He recommended to him the printing of them, and, by this means, was the cauſe, that his friend Marſilius obtained the profeſſor's chair. The Journal of Leipſic is quoted for this, in the month of December, 1691, p. 557 (4). And there is no fault in the citation; but, in the ſame page of the Journal, we find quite another thing; for there we ſee, that Bonaventura Cavalleri, hearing that John-Antony Maginus was dead, in 1629, had a mind to ſucceed him as profeſſor of the Mathematics at Bologna, and that, for this end, he gave Cæſar Marſilius, his friend, two treatiſes, which he had written, one upon Conic Sections, and the other upon the Geometry of Indiviſibles. Marſilius communicated them to the Geometricians of the univerſity of Bologna, who, admiring them, ſpoke ſo effectually to the ſenators in behalf of Cavalleri, that, in the month of November, 1629, he obtained the chair, which he deſired. This is what the Journaliſts of Leipſic ſay, in their abridgment of the Life of Cavalleri, prefixed to his *Sfera Aſtronomica* (5) by Urbano d'Aviſo. I wonder the abbot ſhould ſay, that our Maginus died in 1629, when his epitaph, mentioned by Tomaſini (6) places his death on the eleventh of February, 1617. And it is yet more aſtoniſhing, that the Latin of theſe Journaliſts ſhould have been ſo little underſtood, which is the cleareſt in the world. And, beſides, does ſuch a Particular anſwer the title of the work, in which it was inſerted? This title promiſes us nothing but memorable events relating to the church.

(1) Jacob. Philippus Tomaſinus, in Elog. Virorum illuſtrium, *pag.* 283, 284.

(2) Tomaſinus, *ubi ſupra.*

(3) In Aſtrometeorologia ſana, *pag.* 129. *There is mention made of this book, in the* Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, *Jan.* 1691, *pag.* 204.

(4) *Taken from a book, printed at Tubingen, in* 1697, *written by Andreas Carolus, abbot of St George, in the duchy of Wirtemberg, and intituled,* Memorabilia Ecclaſiaſtica.

(5) In the edition of Rome, 1690, in 12mo: a poſthumous piece.

(6) Jac. Philip. Tomaſinus, Elog. *Part I, pag.* 287, 288.

MAGIUS (*a*) (JEROM) was one of the learned men of the XVIth century. He was born at Anghiari in Tuſcany [*A*]; and having ſtudied claſſical learning, and the firſt elements of the Civil-Law, under Peter-Anthony Gheti (*b*), he went to Bologna, to improve himſelf by the lectures of Robortellus. He made a conſiderable progreſs in ſeveral ſciences, and very ſoon diſcovered his abilities for public employments; for he was deputed to Florence in his youth (*c*). He did not confine himſelf to any certain number of ſtudies, but applied himſelf almoſt to all; for, beſides his knowledge in the *Belles Lettres*, and Civil-Law, he ſtudied alſo the Military Art, and wrote ſome books about it (*d*), although the meanneſs of his fortune, which obliged him to be corrector in a Printing-houſe at Venice (*e*), ſeemed to reſtrain him from meddling with theſe kind of ſtudies: yet he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by it, when he was ſent to the iſle of Cyprus by the Venetians, to exerciſe the office of judge in their army; for, the Turks having beſieged Famagoſta, he performed there all the ſervices, which could be expected from an excellent Engineer. He invented certain mines, and fire-works, whereby he deſtroyed the works of the Turks, and overthrew, in a moment, what had coſt them much time and pains (*f*). But they had two many opportunities to revenge themſelves for the delay he occaſioned to their enterprize; for the town at laſt falling into their

(*a*) *I uſe his Latin name, which ſome have tranſlated* Maggi, *and others* Maggio.

(*b*) *Magius, Miſcell. lib. iv, cap. i.*

(*c*) *Idem, de Tintinnab. cap. xviii.*

(*d*) *See what he ſays of it, Miſcell. lib. i, cap. i.*

(*e*) Ad hæc Venetiis, ubi & Typographis Operam navaſſe fertur, *&c. Fr. Swertius, in Elog. Magii, init. Lib. de Tintinnab.*

(*f*) *Ant. Maria Gratiani, of the war of Cyprus, livr. iii.*

[*A*] *He was born at Anghiari in Tuſcany.*] In Latin this town is called Anglara, and it muſt not be confounded with that, which is called in Latin *Angleria* or *Anglaria*, or in Italian *Angiera*, and which is in the Milaneſe, by the lake Maggiore. It is a miſtake in Thuanus (1), Swertius, Aubertus Miræus, Quenſtedt, and ſeveral others, that they have aſſigned this laſt town for the country of Magius; for he himſelf tells us, that he was of *Anghiari* in Tuſcany. Mr Trichet du Freſne has quoted two paſſages, which are ſo expreſs

(1) Obſerve, that Thuanus calls it *Anglara*; and ſo he was not miſtaken in the name, but in the ſituation.

their hands, in the month of Auguſt, 1571, Magius became their ſlave, and was cruelly treated by them. His comfort, in this ſad condition, was, the remembrance of thoſe things he had formerly learned; and, as he had a great memory, he thought it was not impoſſible for him, though deſtitute of all ſorts of books, to compoſe ſome full of citations. In this work he employed the greateſt part of the night [*B*], being obliged to labour in the day-time as the vileſt ſlave. He conjured the embaſſadors of the Emperor, and of France, to endeavour his liberty: But whether it was, that they laid not his intereſt much to heart, or that their good intentions were fruſtrated by the barbarity of the Turks [*C*], it is certain, that Magius was ſo far from recovering his liberty, that he was ſtrangled in priſon, the twenty ſeventh of March 1572, or 1573 [*D*], as appears by the Journal of Arnold Manlius, Phyſician to the embaſſador of the Emperor. I give a catalogue of the books, which he publiſhed, before he went into Cyprus [*E*].

expreſs to this purpoſe, that Mr Teiſſier (2), who cites him, ought not, methinks, to leave his reader in ſuch uncertainty as he does by theſe words: *Jerom Maggi was born at Anglaria in the duchy of Milan, or at Anghiari in Tuſcany according to ſome.* One of the two paſſages, alledged by Mr Trichet du Freſne, is taken out of book i. chap. ii. *de muniendis civitatibus*; and the other out of book iv. ch. 9. of the Miſcellanies. He cites alſo the teſtimony of Gratiani, which he found in the third book *de Bello Cyprio*, p. 181. He might have cited the place of the Miſcellanies, where Magius calls Tuſcany, *noſtram Hetruriam.* It is in the firſt book, chap. 20.

[*B*] *He ſpent a good part of the night in writing books.*] He wrote, in priſon, a Treatiſe of Bells (3), *de Tintinnabulis*; and another of the Wooden-horſe, *de Equuleo.* What made him chuſe theſe ſubjects, was, partly, that he obſerved the Turks made no uſe of bells; and partly, that, in meditating on the different kinds of torments, to which his condition was expoſed, he remembred that no body had yet well explained the *Equuleus.* He dedicated the firſt of theſe two treatiſes to Charles Rym, a native of Ghent, embaſſador of the emperor at Conſtantinople; and the other to the embaſſador of France in the ſame place. Jungerman, in his notes upon the treatiſe *de Equuleo*, thinks, that this embaſſador of France was Francis de Noailles, biſhop of Acs. Mr Trichet du Freſne is of the ſame opinion. See his Elogium on Magius, at the beginning of the treatiſe *de Equuleo*, of the Amſterdam edition. Theſe two treatiſes of Magius were not printed till many years after his death. His manuſcript *de Tintinnabulis* was given by Philibert Rym, to the Jeſuits, who permitted it to be printed with the notes of Francis Swertius, at Hanaw, in the year 1608 (4). The next year, there was printed, with the notes of Jungerman, in the ſame place, the treatiſe *de Equuleo*, the manuſcript of which was left with Arnold Manlius by Magius himſelf (5). They were reprinted at Amſterdam, in the years 1664, and 1689.

[*C*] *Whether it was, that the embaſſadors, of the Emperor and France, laid not his intereſt much to heart, or that their good intentions were fruſtrated by the barbarity of the Turks.*] I believe theſe two embaſſadors to be wronged, when ſome affirm, they had no regard to the prayers of Magius; and I cannot underſtand how Mr Trichet du Freſne can accuſe them of being deaf in this reſpect (6), ſince, immediately after, he cites the Journal of Manlius the Phyſician, from whom we learn, that the cauſe of Magius's ruin, was, that, by an imprudent oſtentation, he was brought to the embaſſador's lodging, and that he was unſeaſonably ſet at liberty. *Imprudenti ambitione in noſtram Carvaſſaram ductus .... Conſtantinopoli intempeſtivè liberatus, ſtrangulari à Mahomete Baſſa in carcere juſſus.* After theſe words, there is no room to doubt, but that the price of his ranſom was agreed upon; but that which ſpoiled all, probably, was this: Mahomet Baſſa underſtood, that Magius had been with the emperor's embaſſador: he thought he made too much haſte: he remembered the miſchief occaſioned by this able Engineer; and this was to him a ſufficient motive for giving order, that he ſhould be ſtrangled the next night. Mr Gallois (7), is yet more poſitive in the matter, in an extract of the treatiſe of Bells. 'the embaſſadors (ſays he) treated of his ranſom; 'but while they thought to procure him liberty, 'they only promoted his death: for a baſſa, who 'had not forgot the miſchiefs, which Magius had 'done to the Turks at the ſiege of Famagoſta, having learned, that he was carried to the houſe of the 'emperor's embaſſador, ſent to retake him, and 'cauſed him to be ſtrangled the ſame night in priſon.'

Thuanus was not ſufficiently informed about this matter: he had heard, that Magius wrote ſomething in priſon; but, I. he knew not what it was, and Moreri ſhould not make him ſay, that it was a treatiſe *de Culeo* (8), and another *de Tintinnabulis.* II. He knew not, that Magius had dedicated one of theſe two books to the emperor's embaſſador, and the other to the embaſſador of France, and had begged of them to uſe their endeavours for his liberty. III. He knew not, that they had uſed their endeavours for that end. IV. He was ignorant, that he who cauſed Magius to be ſtrangled, was not his maſter; the author of that cruelty being Mahomet Baſſa; whereas the maſter of Magius was only the captain of a ſhip (9). V. He knew not the reaſon, why this illuſtrious priſoner was put to death, ſince he thought it was done out of covetouſneſs: 'Quaſi bos, *ſays he* (10), vetulus ab 'ingrato aratro faſtiditus, ab immani hero ſumptibus 'parcente ſtrangulatus eſt. - - - - *Like an old ox, hated 'by the ungrateful plow, who is killed by his barbarous 'maſter, to ſave expences.*' IV In fine, he ought not to have ſaid, that Magius was carried into Aſia, (which many others have affirmed after him (11); for he was carryed to Conſtantinople, and remained there all the time of his ſlavery. From all this I may boldly conclude, that Moreri's Dictionary ſtood in great need of correction in this article, which was tranſcribed from the words of Thuanus.

[*D*] *He was ſtrangled the twenty ſeventh of March, 1572, or 1573.*] The reaſon of my deſcribing the year of his death with ſuch uncertainty, is, becauſe on one ſide, Manlius wrote in his Journal, *That Magius was killed in priſon on* thurſday-night, March 27, 1572 (12); and on the other, he had written in the firſt page of the book *de Equuleo*, that Magius, having left him this book, was ſtrangled, a few days after, by that wicked wretch Mahomet Baſſa, at Conſtantinople, in 1573 (13). If Manlius were now alive, it would be incumbent on him to remove the ambiguity of this date. Jungerman thought he had light enough to incline him to believe, that the tragical end of poor Magius happened in 1573. Mr Teiſſier's Printer has put May 27, for March 27.

[*E*] *I give a catalogue of the books, he had publiſhed before he went into Cyprus.*] Magius had printed, *De Mundi exitio per exuſtionem libri quinque, Baſileæ*, 1562. fol. *Vitæ illuſtrium virorum, auctore Æmilio Probo, cum Commentariis, Baſileæ*, fol. Lambinus was accuſed of having borrowed many things from thoſe commentaries, without naming Magius (14). *Commentaria, in quatuor Inſtitutionum civilium libros, Lugduni*, in 8vo. *Miſcellanea* (15), *ſive variæ Lectiones, Venetiis, apud Jordanum Zilettum*, 1564, in 8vo. He publiſhed alſo ſome books in Italian, as he ſays expreſsly in the epiſtle dedicatory before the book *de Tintinnabulis*; and yet one (16) of thoſe, who has given us his *Elogium*, ſets down only one Italian book, among thoſe which have been publiſhed, the impreſſion whereof, he ſays, was *Ann.* 1584. The title of it is, *della Fortificatione delle Citta.* Magius wrote ſeveral other books, which never appeared. Swertius (17) has given us a catalogue of them: and yet ſome of them are mentioned by Simler, as if they had been publiſhed, and particularly that, which was intituled Μισοπυγιςία, *Odium Pædiconum*, a title far enough different from that, which ſome think, that John de la Caſa prefixed to one of his poems.

---

(2) Addition to the *Elogies*, taken from Thuanus, *Tom. i, pag.* 381.

(3) I have more reaſon to give the firſt place to this, than the Journal des Sçavans of Jan. 4, 1666, has to give it to the treatiſe *de Equuleo.*

(4) *Swert. in Elogio Magii.*

(5) *Epiſt Segheti ad Jungerm. & Jungermannus Not. in Tractat. de Equuleo.*

(6) Fuit ea fati inclementia & atrocitas, ut Legati (dictu pudendum) ejus precibus ſurdi fuerint, barbarique immiſſo in collum laqueo eum in carcere ſtrangulaverint. - - - - *Such was the inclemency and hardneſs of his fate, that the embaſſadors (I am aſhamed to ſay it) were deaf to his prayers, and the barbarous Turks ſtrangled him in priſon.*

(7) *Journal des Sçavans, of Jan.* 4. 1666.

(8) *A new miſtake; for he ſhould have ſaid* Equuleo, *and not* Culeo.

(9) *Trichet du Freſne, ubi ſupra.*

(10) *Hiſt. lib. xlix, ad an.* 1571.

(11) *Swert. in Elog. Konig. Bibliotb. pag.* 494.

(12) 1572. 27 *Martii, nocte diei Jovis necatur in carcere Hieronymus Magius.*

(13) *Hunc librum mihi reliquit D. Hieronymus Magius, paucis poſt diebus ab impio Mahomete Baſſa ſtrangulatus. Conſt.* 1573, Ex Segheti, *Epiſt. ad Jungerm.*

(14) *Swert. ubi ſupra.*

(15) *They are divided into four books. Gruterus has inſerted them in the 2d vol. of his* Theſaurus Criticus. *The Epitome of the Bibliotheque of Geſner,* 1583, *improperly diſtinguiſhes the* Miſcellanea *from the* Variæ lectiones.

(16) *Trichet du Freſne.*

(17) *Ubi ſupra.*

MAGNI (Valerian) a Capuchin of Milan, became famous in the XVIIth century. He applied himſelf not only to controverſy [*A*], but alſo to phyſical experiments. It is ſaid, that he attributed to himſelf the invention of thoſe of Torricellius [*B*]; and that he was convicted of being a Plagiary. He wrote vehemently againſt Ariſtotle (*a*). But I know of nothing that made him ſo well known, as the uſe that was made of one of his thoughts in the *Provincial Letters* [*C*]. He had great quarrels with the Jeſuits [*D*], and thereby loſt his liberty. He was one of thoſe, who converted prince Erneſt, landgrave of Heſſe (*b*). I think he has ſtretched his character too far in calling himſelf Apoſtolical Miſſionary to the north countries.

He

(*a*) *See the remark* [*B*].

(*b*) *He diſputed for that end, at Rheinsfield, with Haberkorn, a Lutheran profeſſor of Divinity at Gieſſen, in the year* 1651.

[*A*] *He applied himſelf . . . . to controverſy.*] His *Judicium de Acatholicorum regula credendi*, publiſhed in the year 1628, expoſed him to a long diſpute, becauſe he was obliged to reply to ſeveral writings of the Proteſtants. I give an account of it elſewhere (1).

[*B*] *It is pretended that he attributed to himſelf the invention . . . . of Toricellius.*] Mr Baillet informs us of this matter: Father Valerian Magni . . . . did not ‘think of making the experiment of Torricellius, till after he had publiſhed at Warſaw his treatiſe of the *Atheiſm of Ariſtotle*, which he had dedicated * to Father Merſennus; and the edition of this book was not only poſterior to the impreſſion of that of Mr Paſcal, but alſo to the death of Torricellius. Altho' the father Capuchin did nothing but repeat the experiment of Torricellius, without adding any thing new to it; yet he aſcribed it to himſelf, in the Narrative he cauſed to be printed the next year, as if he had been the inventer of it, without acknowledging, that it had been made in Italy, and France, before him. This writing of Father Valerian ſurprized thoſe, who were ſkilled in ſuch things: they diſcovered his uſurpation, and his pretenſion was preſently refuted by Roberval, who alledged the printed piece of Mr Paſcal as an undoubted proof againſt him. He plainly proved, that Magni had made his experiment, from the account, he had ſeen of it, in the writing Mr Paſcal cauſed to be ſent into Poland, and other parts of Europe: and the Latin letter, which he wrote to him about it, being delivered to him by means of Mr des Noyers, ſecretary of the orders of the queen of Poland, this good father made no anſwer to it, but, by his ſilence, deſiſted from his uſurpation (2).’ I have a book of this Capuchin, printed at Warſaw 1648. It is a collection of philoſophical treatiſes, dedicated to the Holy Virgin, *de Peripatu*; *de Logica*; *de per ſe Notis*; *de Syllogiſmo Demonſtrativo*; *Experimenta de Incorruptibilitate Aquæ*; *de Vitro Mirabiliter fracto*. There is added to it a letter of a Jeſuit, proving, Experimenta vulgata non vacuum probare, ſed plenum & antiperiſtaſim ſtabilire. *That the common experiments do not prove a vacuum, but confirm a Plenum and Antiperiſtaſis.* He publiſhed, at Venice, 1639. *Ocularis demonſtratio loci ſine locato, corporis ſucceſſive moti in vacuo, & luminis nulli corpori inhærentis*; and, at Rome 1642, *de luce mentium & ejus imagine.*

[*C*] *The uſe that was made of one of his thoughts, in the Provincial Letters.*] This thought is a certain method of ſilencing ſlanderers and calumniators, who have recourſe to general terms. ‘Does it not ſeem impoſſible ſays Mr Paſcal (3), to confute a ſlander ſo indeterminate? Nevertheleſs, an ingenious man has found out the ſecret of it. He is a Capuchin, called F. Valerian, of the houſe of the counts de Magnis. You may learn, by this little ſtory, how he anſwered your calumnies. He had happily ſucceeded in the converſion of the landgrave of D'Armſtadt. But your fathers, as if they had been troubled to ſee a ſovereign prince converted without calling in their aid, preſently wrote a book againſt him, (for you perſecute honeſt men every-where) wherein, falſifying one of his paſſages, they impute to him an Heretical doctrine. They alſo diſperſed a letter againſt him, in which they ſaid to him; *O! what things we have to diſcover*, (without telling what) *which will give you great uneaſineſs! For unleſs you take care of this matter, we ſhall be obliged to acquaint the Pope and cardinals with it.* . . . What ſhall I do, *anſwered he* (4), againſt theſe general and indeterminate reproaches? How ſhall I convict them of theſe ſlanders which they do not explain? The only way is this, to declare openly and publickly to all thoſe, who threaten me, that they are infamous impoſtors, and impudent liars, unleſs they diſcover theſe crimes to all the world. Appear therefore, you my accuſers, and publiſh theſe things upon the houſe-tops, which you have falſly whiſpered in the ear, with great aſſurance.’ The author of the Provincial Letters (5) obſerves, that the Jeſuits, having anſwered nothing to this challenge, did nevertheleſs, ſome years after, *attack Father Valerian after the ſame manner, upon another ſubject* He defended himſelf again in the ſame way (6). ‘There are few people, *ſays he* (7), who are capable of oppoſing ſo powerful a tyranny; which yet I have done. I have put a ſtop to their impudence, and ſhall put a ſtop to it again by the ſame means. I declare therefore, that they have lied moſt impudently, MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIME. If the things, which they object againſt me, are true, let them prove them, or elſe let them paſs for men convicted of an impudent lie. Their proceeding hereupon will diſcover who is in the right. In the mean time, I deſire all the world to obſerve, that this kind of men, who will not endure the leaſt reproach, which they can refute, appear very patient under thoſe, they cannot defend, and diſguiſe their want of power with the cloak of a falſe virtue. Wherefore, I have boldly attacked them, and endeavoured to bring them to ſhame; that even the moſt inſenſible may perceive, that, if they hold their peace, their patience is not the effect of their meekneſs, but of the trouble of their conſcience.’ Mr Paſchal has no ſooner related this method of Father Valerian, but he makes uſe of it in behalf of the Janſeniſts. ‘This father, *ſays he* (8), hath found the ſecret of ſtopping your mouths; and thus we muſt do, every time you accuſe people without proof. We need only anſwer to every one of you, as the father Capuchin did, *Mentiris Impudentiſſime.*’ He renewed the imitation a fortnight after: ‘You muſt ſpeak out, my fathers, you muſt name him, or elſe you muſt be looked on as ſhameful liars, unworthy of any credit. After this manner, the good Father Valerian has taught us, *to put ſuch impoſtors to the torture*, and ſtop their mouths. Your ſilence in this caſe, will be a full and entire conviction of this diabolical calumny. The blindeſt of your friends will be forced to confeſs, *that it will not be the effect of your virtue, but of your inability* (9).’ Since that time, Mr Arnaud has more than once made uſe of this thought of the Capuchin; and at laſt it has paſſed into ſome books of the Proteſtants. It appeared in the Chimerical Cabal (10), and has not produced a better effect, than in the book of it's firſt inventor: for the accuſer of this Cabal did not anſwer the challenge, but continued obſtinately ſilent. However it be, the name of Father Valerian was every where famous, upon the account of this invention.

[*D*] *He had great quarrels with the Jeſuits.*] What I have quoted out of the Provincial Letters, will not ſuffer us to doubt of it; but we do not find, that this father reaped any advantage by this ſecret, he had found out, of ſilencing his ſlanderers; for though he diſcovered their inability to prove their accuſations, yet he was caſt into priſon. It was (ſay ſome) becauſe he granted to the Proteſtants, that the primacy, and infallibility of the Pope are not founded upon ſcripture, but only upon tradition (11). *In æſtu diſputationis eò ſe abripi paſſus homo eſt, ut ſua vineta graviter cædens, quod res eſt, ſcriberet*, Primatum & Infallibilitatem Romani Pontificis ex Scripturis probari non poſſe, ſed ſola traditione conſtare. *Quod majeſtati Pontificiæ violatæ nefas interpretati Jeſuitæ* λεγόμενοι, *effecerunt, ut Valerianus in vincula raptus, ex iiſdem cauſam dicere coactus fuerit* (12). His quarrels with the Jeſuits did not always turn upon heterodox opinions; pecuniary matters were alſo intermixed with them.

This

---

(1) At the end of the diſſertation upon Junius Brutus, at the end of this Dictionary.

* The date of the Epiſt. Dedicat. is Nov. 19, 1647.

(2) Baillet, in the Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. ii, pag.* 329, *ad ann.* 1647.

(3) Paſcal's 15th Provincial Letter, *pag. m.* 252.

(4) In a book printed at Prague, in 1655, *p.* 112.

(5) Paſcal, *ibid. pag.* 253.

(6) I think it was in his book *de Homine infami perſonato ſub titulis M. Jocoſi Severi medii.* Dannhawer cites ſome paſſages out of it, in his *Vale Triumphali, pag.* 8, 9, 136, 188.

(7) Paſcal, *ibid. pag.* 254.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Idem, Paſcal, *Letter xvi, pag.* 275.

(10) Printed at Rotterdam, 1691, *pag.* 357, 358, of the 2d edition.

(11) See the paſſage of his book *de Homine infami perſonato*, quoted by Dannhawerus, in *Vale Triumphali, pag.* 288.

(12) *Heideggerus Hiſtoria Papatus, pag.* 319. Note, that by a paſſage in *Memorabilia Eccleſiaſtica, lib. vi, cap. xii, ad ann.* 1651. I find Mr Heidegger has not rightly related this fact.

He was of a noble, illuſtrious, and numerous family in the Milaneſe, and was born about the year 1587 (*c*). " When he took upon him the habit of a Capuchin, he aſſumed the name of Valerian. He was a long time maſter of the Novices, and was often guardian of the houſes of his order. He profeſſed alſo Philoſophy and Theology; and, becauſe he had great experience in controverſy, Pope Urban VIII, who had much eſteem and conſideration for him, made him apoſtolical miſſionary of all Germany, Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary, and declared him head of the miſſions to the north. It was believed, that he was no leſs ſkilled in Politics than Theology, which induced the princes of Europe to ſend him on ſeveral embaſſies. By theſe advances, he came very near to the honour of a cardinal's cap [*E*]. But his generous contempt of the pomps of this world made him contented with the fatigues of the miſſion, " which were very great and dangerous (*d*). *He ſuffered alſo much from the Peripatetics, who looked upon him as an enemy to their Ariſtotle. He was thrown into a frightful priſon, under ſome pretence of a new enterprize; but came out of it to his honour, by the aſſiſtance of the emperor Ferdinand* III. *Towards the later end of his life, he retired to Saltzburg, where he died* (*e*) *at the age of ſeventy five years, ſixty of which he had lived in the order of the* Capuchins. *The hiſtory of his death is found in a little book printed in* 1662, *in* 12°, *under this title*; Relatio veridica de pio obitu R. P. Valeriani (*f*). I ſhall give ſome account of an anſwer he made to a book of Comenius [*F*].

(*c*) *Baillet, in Tom. i, of his Anti, pag.* 257, 59.

(*d*) *Id. ib. pag.* 259.

(*e*) *In the year* 1661.

(*f*) *Baillet, ib. pag.* 260.

This Capuchin complains very much of the ſnares that were laid for a widow, his kinſwoman, to the prejudice of a fatherleſs child. ‘ Eſt quoddam genus hominum grave, *ſays he* (13), & intolerabile Orbi Chriſtiano, viduis vero piis ſpecialiter exitiale. . . . Neminem nomino, ſed do in argumentum veritatis, ſi nemo omnium ſit, qui non intelligat quos deſigno: ſi nemo eorum ſit, qui me poſtulet reum detractionis apud Judicem competentem. Huic genti, eorumque mancipiis imputo, quæ ſub nomine meæ chariſſimæ cognatæ fiunt. Hos enim nec poſtulante, Vir omni exceptione major, ex meo ſcripto monuit, fruſtra tamen, de omnibus, quæ iniquiſſimè perpetrantur, velut ex ſententia viduæ, in quam pravis artibus conantur devolvere jura hæredis minorennis, futuri hæredes ipſius viduæ, in præmium quòd eam irretierint iis artibus. . . . . *There is a certain race of men, intolerable to the Chriſtian world, but eſpecially fatal to pious widows. . . . . . I name no body, but appeal for the truth of my aſſertion, if every one underſtands who I mean; if none of them accuſes me of detraction before a competent judge. To this ſet of people, and their followers, I impute what is done under the name of my deareſt kinſwoman. An unexceptionable perſon adviſed theſe men out of my letters, but in vain, concerning all their iniquitous proceedings, as it were by virtue of the widow's will, upon whom by wicked arts, they endeavour to ſettle the rights of the young heir, being themſelves the widow's heirs, as a reward for enſnaring her by thoſe arts.*’

(13) In Comment. de Homine infami Perſonato, apud Dannhaw, ubi ſupra. *pag.* 136.

[*E*] *He came very near the honour of a cardinal's cap.*] I ſhall cite the words of a German writer, who relates, I. That this Capuchin made an oration at Rome, in the congregation *de propaganda fide*, to prove, by ſtrong reaſons, that the ſociety of certain women and maids, who took the name of *Jeſuiteſſes*, ought to be aboliſhed. It was aboliſhed by the bull of Urban VIII, publiſhed in the month of May, 1631. II. That the Jeſuits hindered him from being promoted to the dignity of a cardinal; though Uladiſlaus, king of Poland, had written in his behalf, upon this ſubject, to Pope Urban VIII. *Ille (Kortholtus ait) coram ſacra Congregatione de propaganda fide, graviſſimam & nervoſis rationum momentis inſtructam orationem Romæ habuit, qua movit & pervicit, ut nova, & ad morum virtutumque confuſionem Viennæ ac Pragæ propagata Jeſuitiſſarum Societas, Pontificiâ autoritate diſſolveretur, & everteretur. Sed eidem deinceps Lojolitæ, ne Cardinalitiam dignitatem impetraret, obicem poſuere. Quæ Uladiſlao, Poloniæ Regi, de Valeriano ſteterit ſententia, teſtatum fecit vel una Epiſtola ad Urbanm VIII perſcripta, qua prædictus Rex Valeriano Cardinalatûs dignitatem acquirere contendit; ac præter difficultatem acquiſita fuiſſet, niſi jam tum Societas, quam vocant, JESU, invidia & odio adverſus Monachum flagrans, impetrandæ dignitati obſtitiſſet; veluti nominatus autor, Chriſtianus Kortholtus, D. & Prof. Kilonienſis refert, in Valeriano Confeſſore, lit. a.* 4. 5 (14). Note, that Mr Kortholt, quoted in theſe Latin words, was one of the authors, who wrote againſt Father Valerian; an infinite number of others have done the ſame, particularly Dannhawerus, profeſſor of Divinity at Straſburg. See his treatiſe *de Gorgia Leontino in Valeriano magno redivivo.*

(14) Andreas Carolus, Memorabil. Eccleſ. Sæculi XVII. *lib. iv, cap. ix, pag.* 766.

[*F*] *I ſhall give ſome account of an anſwer he made to a book of Comenius.*] This book, as I have elſewhere ſaid (15), is intituled *Abſurditatum Echo*, and appeared under the falſe name of Huldricus Newfeldius. Valerian Magni intituled his anſwer, *Echo Abſurditatum Ulrici de Newfeld blæſa, demonſtrante Valeriano Magno Capucino*, and he publiſhed it at Cracow, in 1646, in 12mo.

(15) Citat (16) and (17) of the article COMENIUS.

MAHOMET, the founder of a religion, which ſoon had, and has ſtill a vaſt extent [*A*], was born at Mecca in Arabia, in the VIth century. The year of his birth [*B*], and the condition of his family [*C*], are not agreed upon; but no one denies, that

[*A*] *His religion ſoon had, and ſtill has, a vaſt extent.*] We muſt not believe thoſe who ſay, that it poſſeſſes one half of the world or more (1); it is ſufficient to ſay, ‘ That, if we divide the known countries of the earth into thirty equal parts, five of them are Chriſtian, ſix Mahometan, and nineteen Pagan (2).’ Thus the Mahometan religion is of much larger extent than the Chriſtian; for it exceeds it by one thirtieth part of the known world, which is a very conſiderable part.

(1) Poſtel. in Præfat. Grammat. Arabicæ. Ludovicus Regius de Viciſſitud. Rerum. *lib. viii*, in fine, cited by Brerewood in his *Enquiries into the diverſity of Languages, chap. xiv. pag.* 203.

(2) Brerewood, *ibid.*

[*B*] *The year of his birth is not agreed upon.*] He was born, according to ſome, in 560 (3), or in 577 (4); according to others in 580 (5), or 593 (6), or in 600 (7), or in 620 (8): but the moſt probable opinion is, that he was born in 571, or 572. This is the opinion of Elmacin: thus you ſee, that, though we adhere to one author only, there is no avoiding a diverſity of opinions. Elmacin, if we believe Hottinger (9), places the birth of Mahomet in 571; but, if we believe Reiſkius, he places it in 572. ‘ Cum nativitas Muhammedis inter Arabes & Chriſtianos hiſtoricos valde ſit controverſa, ex omnibus ſe Elmacinum ſequi profitetur Reiſkius, tanquam antiquum in hiſtoria Saracenica ſcriptorem, & ex ſæculo poſt N. C. ſeptimo ſuperſtitem. Emergit vero ſic annus nativitatis poſt N. C. 572, dieſque 22. menſi Niſan, h. e. Aprilis. - - - - - *The time of Mahomet's birth being controverted by the Arabian and Chriſtian Hiſtorians, Reiſkius profeſſes to follow Elmacin, as being an ancient writer in the Saracen hiſtory, and who lived in the VIIth century. Thus the year of his birth falls in the year of Chriſt* 572, *and the day is the twenty ſecond of the month Niſan, i. e. April.*’ Thus the Journaliſts of Leipſic (10) expreſs themſelves, in the extract of the *Chronicon Saracenicum & Turcicum Wolfgangi Drechſleri*, printed the firſt time in 1550, and in the laſt place at Leipſic, in 1689. Is it not a ſhame, that

(3) Freherus, in Chronologia ad Jus Græco-Romauum Leunclavii.

(4) Pfeiffer, ubi infra, citat. (28). *pag.* 267.

(5) Erpenius, Orat. II, de Ling. Arabica. *pag.* 42. apud Hotting. Hiſtor. Oriental. *pag.* 145.

(6) Schindlerus Lexico, apud Hoornbeek, Summa Controverſ. *pag. m.* 76.

(7) Vide Genebr. Chronolog.

(8) Joh. Andreas, in confuſione ſectæ Muhammedicæ, apud Hotting. *ibid.*

(9) Hiſtor. Oriental. *p.* 145.

(10) Acta Eruditor. Lipſ. 1689, *pag.* 377.

that Abdalla, his father, and Emina, his mother were poor. Abdalla died two months before the birth of Mahomet (*a*), Emina followed him ſix years after; and Abdolmutleb, the father of Abdalla, died two years after her; ſo that this infant muſt have been educated by Abutaleb his uncle. Abutaleb, and his wife, were well ſatisfied with the behaviour of their nephew (*b*), but, not having ſufficient means to marry him, they thought fit to place him in the ſervice of a woman, who traded into Syria. This woman, called Chadigha, fell in love with Mahomet, driver of her camels, and married him [*D*]. He was then twenty five years old. He had by this woman three ſons, who died very young, and four daughters, which were well married (*c*). Being ſubject to the falling-ſickneſs, and having a mind to conceal this infirmity from his wife, he made her believe, that he fell into theſe convulſions upon ſight of the angel Gabriel, which he was not able to bear, who came to reveal to him many things, in the name of God, concerning religion [*E*]. Chadigha, being either deceived, or feigning to be ſo, went about, and told from houſe to houſe, that her huſband was a prophet, and by that means endeavoured to procure him followers (*d*). His ſervant, and ſome others, whom he ſuborned, laboured in the ſame deſign, and that with ſo much ſucceſs, that the magiſtrates of Mecca feared an inſurrection; and therefore, to prevent the diſorders, which the riſe of a new ſect uſually produces, they reſolved to rid themſelves of Mahomet. He was apprized of it, and fled. The time of this flight is the Epocha of the Mahometans [*F*], from whence they reckon the years of the Hegira. He retired to Medina,

(*a*) *Elmacin. apud Hotting. Hiſt. Orient. lib. ii, cap. i, pag.* 205.

(*b*) *Abunazarus, pag.* 161, *apud Hotting. ibid.*

(*c*) *Id. apud eundem Hotting. ib. pag.* 210.

(*d*) *See the remark* [*E*].

---

that ſo little notice ſhould be taken of the year, wherein a falſe prophet was born, who made ſo great a noiſe during his life, and is become the idol of ſo many nations after his death.

[*C*] . . . . *nor the condition of his family.*] An infinite number of authors have written, that this falſe prophet was of mean extraction; and that his father was a Pagan, and his mother a Jeweſs. *Mahometis Arabis vitam qui deſcripſerunt multi fuerunt, qui etſi non uno modo illius res tradunt, in eo tamen conveniunt omnes quod eum è plebeio vilique genere ortum, pauperibus parentibus, patre Ethnico, matre Judæa affirmant* (11). Mr Moreri has followed this opinion, which does not agree with the Arabian authors: they do not pretend, that Mahomet's father was rich; but they maintain, that he was of great extraction, and that the tribe of the Coreiſchites, to which he belonged, excelled in rank and dignity all the other tribes of the Arabians (12). Ihn Calican, an Arabian author, ſays expreſsly, that Emina was of that tribe; and it is very probable, ſince the Arabians to this day continue exactly to obſerve the cuſtom of marrying with the women of their own tribe (13).

[*D*] *Chadigha fell in love with Mahomet . . . . and married him.*] Some ſay, that he made uſe of enchantments, to make this woman fall in love with him; but others pretend, that his youth (14) and natural vigour, which were very ſurpriſing, as we ſhall ſhew hereafter, were ſufficient for that end. Mr Chevreau ſays one thing, which none of the reſt affirm, *viz.* That this woman was married, when Mahomet was a domeſtic ſervant to her. ‘He was ſold to, or entruſted with, Abdimonephi, the richeſt Merchant of the Iſmaelites, to whom he did very great ſervices; and whoſe wife Chadigha fell in love with him; the factor perhaps having ſome qualities, which the maſter wanted. If we believe ſome authors, he was thick ſet, of moderate ſtature, had a large head, a dark viſage, a lively colour, a modeſt look, a noble air, a nimble and active body, a civil addreſs, an inſinuating converſation, a fine and pliant wit: was eloquent and ſtrong, and commonly deſpiſed the dangers, which others fear (15).’ Here follows a paſſage, which teſtifies, that he made uſe of charms. ‘Tum verò animi æquè ac corporis dotibus . . . . ornatus, Chadigam heram ſuam in ſui primum convertit amorem (præſtigiis illud factum ſcribit Zonaras *, habitum eum pro mago teſtantur Richardus in Confuſione Alcorani, & non paucæ Alcorani Azoaræ) cujus potitus matrimonio †, & cum eâ divitiis ampliſſimis ⸸, ingentia moliri cœpit, & amplarum regionum Imperium tantùm non deglutire (16). - - - - *Being adorned with the gifts both of mind and body, he firſt inclined his miſtreſs Chadiga to love him (Zonaras ſays, it was by magical arts; Richardus, in his overthrow of the Alcoran, and not a few Azoaræ of the Alcoran, teſtify, that he was eſteemed a Magician) to whom being married, and attaining by her to great riches, he began to form great deſigns, and aimed at uſurping large kingdoms.*’

[*E*] *He made his wife believe, that he fell into theſe convulſions . . . . by reaſon of the angel Gabriel, who came to reveal to him . . . . things concerning religion.*] He was forty years old, when he began to ſet up for a Prophet, and he would have his wife to be his firſt proſelyte. ‘Uxori ſuæ primum ‡ adjutus Monachi illius Byzantini opera, ſuas perſuaſit revelationes, Gabrielem Angelum à Deo miſſum ſecum colloqui fingens, & de diverſis ad religionem ſpectantibus rebus monere ac inſtruere, cujus aſpectum quod ferre nequiret, ſe oborta ex metu vertigine, collabi, & humi procumbere; hâc autem ratione comitialem morbum quo vexabatur, callide excuſabat **. Illa verò Chadiga circum curſitare, maritum ſuum ceu Prophetam deprædicare, in eundemque errorem alias gentiles ſuas pertrahere, pari †† etiam munere fungente ſervo Zeido, aliiſque ⸸⸸, quos auro corruperat Muhammed (17). - - - - *By the help of that Conſtantinopolitan Monk, he began with perſuading his wife into a belief of his revelations, pretending that the angel Gabriel was ſent from* GOD *to converſe with him, and inſtruct him in ſeveral things concerning religion; whoſe appearance not being able to bear, and fear making him giddy, he fell upon the ground: by which pretence he artfully concealed the falling-ſickneſs, to which he was ſubject. As for Chadiga, ſhe ran up and down, told every body that her huſband was a Prophet, and drew others of her country-women into the ſame error; his ſervant Zeid, and others, whom Mahomet had corrupted with gold, carrying on the ſame cheat.*’ If he began with ſeducing his wife, he did it not with a view of uſing the common artifice of almoſt all innovators, who affect to have women among their devotees, and to employ their intrigues and zeal, to promote the ſucceſs of their undertaking. Mahomet, as we ſhall ſee hereafter (18), ſlighted this ſtratagem. He had wives and concubines in a very great number; but it was for a natural uſe, for the cure of his incontinence; in a word, for venereal pleaſure, and not for the propagation of his faith. He did not gain the affection of his wives; for it is ſaid, they were the perſons, who took away his life (19). He was unfaithful to them, and beat them; and he even made a law, which permitted husbands to beat their wives, when it was neceſſary; he alledged that edict, when he had beaten one of his own, and ſaw, that the others murmured at it; and, for fear this reaſon ſhould not ſatisfy them, he joined to it a pleaſant ſophiſm, a ridiculous diſtinction. I have not, ſaid he, beaten her, as ſhe is my ſpouſe, but as ſhe is a curſed old woman. *Licentiam verberandarum uxorum, ex proprio dabat exemplo, nam quum aliquando durius excepiſſet mulierum ſuarum aliquam, & cæteræ indignarentur, ipſe tum legis patrocinio uſus fuit tum tali diſtinctione: quod illam verberaſſet, non quatenus uxor ejus, ſed quod execranda eſſet vetula* (20).

[*F*] *the time of this flight is the Epocha of the Mahometans.*] They call it *Hegira*; which word ſignifies *flight*; but, that the epocha might bear an honourable name, they affected to uſe this word in a peculiar ſenſe; I mean, for an act of religion, which makes

(11) Ludovicus Godefredus in Archontol. Coſmogr. apud Hotting. ubi ſupra. pag. 136.

(12) Hottinger, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 137.

(13) Ib. *p.* 136.

(14) Compare what has been ſaid of Apuleius, in the remark [*I*] of his article.

(15) Chevreau's Hiſtory of the World, *book v, ch. i, pag.* 10, *of the 3d tome, of the Dutch edition*, 1687.

* *Tom iii, pag.* 127, *b.*

† *Zonaras, lib. cap. Cedren. pag.* 347, *ad ann.* 21. *Heracl.*

⸸ *Eutrop. contin. rerum R. lib. xviii, pag.* 255.

(16) Samuel Schultetus in Ecleſia Muhammedana, *p.* 13, 14. *This is a theſis maintained at Strasburg in* 1667, *under Dannhawerus.*

‡ *Zonaras, Tom. iii, in Heraclio, pag. m.* 127. *b. Cedren. p.* 347.

** *Cedren. anno* 21. *Heracl. pag. m.* 347. *It. Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius & alii ap. Baron. ad ann.* 630. *num.* 2.

†† *Cedr. cap. i, Eutrop. contin. rerum Rom. lib. xviii, pag.* 255.

⸸⸸ *Elmac. Hiſt. Sar. lib. i, cap. i, apud Hotting. lib. i, pag.* 257.

(17) *Schultet. ubi ſupra, pag.* 14.

(18) In the remark [*Q*].

(19) Mahumedes . . . . dolo ſuarum uxorum periit anno Heraclii 22. Chriſti 632. *Joannes Cluverus, Hiſtor. totius mundi Epitome, in Heraclio, pag. m.* 346. *He cites Paulus Diac. lib. xviii, Ildeph.*

(20) Hoornb. Summa Controverſ. *pag.* 162.

Medina, accompanied by a few people; but was afterwards joined by ſeveral of his diſciples. It was not long before he diſcovered his deſign of planting his religion by arms. He gave his great ſtandard to his uncle Hamza, and ſent him on a party, with thirty men *(e)*: this firſt attempt had no ſucceſs; but the ſecond was very fortunate; for he attacked, with 319 men, a caravan of about 1000 Koreiſchites, and beat them. The booty was conſiderable, and he loſt but fourteen men, who have been honourably placed in the Mahometan Martyrology [*G*]. After ſeveral conſiderable battels, he made himſelf maſter of Mecca, in the eighth year of the Hegira *(f)*. He died three years after at Medina, at ſixty three years of age, according to ſome hiſtorians *(g)*. It is not eaſy to know the true detail of his actions; for if the writers of his own ſect have invented a thouſand fables in honour of him, it is no ways probable, that his adverſaries made any ſcruple of publiſhing lies againſt him. It is very remarkable, that he himſelf ſays, that he wrought no miracles, and yet his followers attribute many to him [*H*].

They

makes a man quit his country, to avoid the violence of thoſe who perſecuted people for their faith (21). The Koreiſchites looked upon Mahomet as a ſeditious perſon, and an impious wretch, who fled to avoid the juſt puniſhment that was prepared, for him. He, on the contrary, and his companions in baniſhment pretended, that they were holy pilgrims, who fled for the cauſe of religion, and of the true God. Mahomet had ſet up for a prophet, a long time before he abandoned his country, and had ſpent many days in a cave to prepare his prophecies. ‘Quod autem ſeditionem hinc metuerent Mecchani, præveniendum his cenſuere motibus novis Muhammedemque ſeditionis, ſub religionis prætexu motæ, accuſatum, convictum & condemnatum è medio tollere conſtituerant, niſi Muhammed de periculo admonitus ſolum ac civitatem vertiſſet, quod anno ætatis ipſius quinguageſimo quarto contigit, cum jam 15 per annos Pſeudoprophetiam in ſpeluncâ Garhera (uti Numa cum Egeria) prope Meccham, in quà multos ad crepuſculum uſque delituerat ſoles ‡‡, partim conflaſſet, partim in vulgus ſparſiſſet (22). - - - - *The magiſtrates of Mecca, fearing this might occaſion a ſedition, thought it proper to put a ſtop to theſe commotions, and had determined to get rid of Mahomet, by convicting, and condemning him, of raiſing ſedition under the pretence of religion*; *but Mahomet, apprized of the danger, fled his country*; *which happened in the fifty fourth year of his age, after having, for fifteen years, partly hatched his falſe-prophecy in the cave Garhera, near Mecca (in like manner as Numa with Egeria) and partly ſpread it among the vulgar.*’ This flight happened on the ſixteenth of July 622 (23).

[*G*] *He loſt fourteen men, who have been placed in the Mahometan Martyrology.*] Theſe are a pleaſant ſort of Martyrs, who are killed as they were robbing a rich caravan, and practiſing the trade of a robber and a Banditto. Elmacin ſays that Mahomet made this incurſion, only to rob the caravan. ‘Audiverat autem Abuſophianum filium Harethi in Syriam cum magna caravana Koreiſchitarum OPIBUS onuſta contendere. EGRESSUS EST IGITUR EAS DIREPTUM. . . . . . Vicerunt Muſlimini occidentes infidelium 70 totidemque capientes. Ex Muſliminis vero tanquam Martyres occubuerunt 14 (24). - - - - *He had heard, that Abuſophianus, the ſon of Hareth, was going into Syria, with a large caravan of Koreiſchites, loaden with riches.* He went out therefore with a deſign to plunder it. . . . . *The muſſlemen got the better, killing ſeventy of the infidels, and taking as many priſoners. Only fourteen of the muſſlemen died as it were martyrs.*’ The Arabian authors have very much extolled this fight; the Alcoran itſelf makes mention of it more than once (25) as an affair, wherein God and his Angels wonderfully protected the good cauſe.

[*H*] *He ſays himſelf, that he wrought no miracles, and yet his followers attribute many to him.*] Grotius makes uſe of this confeſſion, to refute Mahometaniſm, after having obſerved, that Mahomet does not deny the miracles of Jesus Christ. ‘Jeſus viſum cœcis, claudis greſſum, ægrotis ſanitatem dedit, imo fatente Mahumete, etiam vitam mortuis. Mahumetes * ſe miſſum ait non cum miraculis, ſed cum armis. Secuti tamen ſunt, qui ei & miracula attribuerent, at qualia? Nempe quæ aut arte humana facilè poſſunt effecta reddi, ut de columba ad aurem advolante: aut quorum nulli ſunt teſtes, ut de camelo noctu ei locuto: aut quæ ſua abſurditate refelluntur †, ut de magna Lunæ parte in manicam ipſius delapſa, & ab ipſo remiſſa ad reddendam ſideri rotunditatem (26). - - - - *Jeſus, by the confeſſion of Mahomet himſelf, gave ſight to the blind, feet to the lame, health to the ſick, and even life to the dead. Mahomet ſays, he was ſent, not with miracles, but with arms. Yet ſome, in after times, aſcribed miracles, to him: but of what ſort? Either ſuch as could eaſily be effected by human art, as that of a pigeon flying to his ear; or ſuch, as there are no witneſſes of, as that of a camel which ſpoke to him by night; or ſuch, as are refuted by their own abſurdity, as that of a great part of the moon dropping into his ſleeve, and ſent back again by him, in order to reſtore to that planet it's rotundity.*’ I wonder, Mr Simon forgot this fine miracle, mentioned by Grotius, *viz.* that a part of the moon fell into Mahomet's ſleeve, which he ſent back again into heaven, leſt that planet ſhould loſe it's roundneſs. The words of Mr Simon are theſe (27). ‘The Mamometans attribute ſome miracles to their legiſlator. They affirm, that he made water come out of his fingers, and that, by pointing at the moon with his finger, he clave it aſunder. They ſay alſo, that the ſtones, trees, and beaſts, owned him for a true prophet of God, and ſaluted him in theſe words: *You are the true embaſſador of GOD.* They affirm moreover, that Mahomet went one night from Mecca to Jeruſalem, from whence he aſcended into Heaven; that he ſaw Paradiſe, and Hell; that he converſed with God, tho' this is reſerved for the bleſſed after their death; and laſtly that he deſcended from Heaven the ſame night, and was in Mecca before day.’ But we muſt not leave this ſubject, before we ſet down the remark of a learned German: he ſays, that ſome Chriſtians, prompted by a falſe zeal againſt Mahomet, accuſe him of boaſting of certain miracles, which the Arabian writers never attributed to him. ‘There are ſome Arabian authors, who attribute miracles to Mahomet; but others deny them. For inſtance, the former ſay, *That the moon drawing near to Mahomet, he clave it aſunder.* Mr Pfeiffer obſerves, after Beidavi, that Mahomet never ſaid this, but only that, before the laſt day, that prodigy will be ſeen in heaven. They make him ſay, that, at the taking of the city of Chaibar, a Jewiſh women having preſented him with a poiſoned lamb, the lamb, tho' quite roaſted, warned him not to eat it. But Abulfeda, relating the ſtory, ſays only, that Mahomet, having taſted a bit of it, and perceiving that it was poiſoned, and ſpitting it out upon the ground, ſaid, this lamb tells me, that it is poiſoned; meaning, I find that it is poiſoned. In effect, he confeſſes often in the Alcoran, that he could not work miracles. Wherefore I conſider as a fable, what ſome tell us of a pigeon, that came to eat in his ear, and of a bull, that would eat nothing but what he gave him with his own hand. Mr Pfeiffer ⸸ acknowledges, that theſe ſtories are the effects of the diſtempered zeal of ſome Chriſtians againſt this impoſtor (28).

Might we not repreſent to Mr Pfeiffer, that the Chriſtians have uſed the Mahometans in this reſpect as the reformed have uſed the Catholics. For there are in ſome legendary writers, many miracles, which are not mentioned by grave authors of the Romiſh communion, and which they even laugh at. Does it follow therefore, that the Proteſtant writers are calumniators, or tranſported with too much zeal, becauſe they object to Catholics ſuch kind of miracles? And why may we not ſay, that the Chriſtians, who have ridiculed the Mahometans for ſuch miracles, as are not now

---

(e) *Hotting. ubi ſupra. pag.* 269. *ex Elmacino.*

(f) *Idem, pag.* 271.

(g) *Ib. id. pag.* 273. *ex Elmacino & Patricide.*

(21) Hotting. *ubi ſupra, pag.* 261.

‡‡ Joh. Andreæ, *lib. i, pag.* 15.

(22) Schultet. *ubi ſupra.*

(23) Hotting. *ubi ſupra, pag.* 262.

(24) Elmacin. *pag.* 5. apud Hotting. *p.* 269.

(25) *See* Hotting. *ibid. pag.* 269, 270.

* Azoara, 3, 14, 17, 30, 71.

† Azoara 64. Vide latius hanc fabulam ex capite Ceramur, apud Cantacuzenum Oratione in Mahumetem. *num.* 23.

(26) Grotius de veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ, *lib. vi, p. m.* 202. *He cites Azoara*, 5, 13.

(27) *Simon's Critical Hiſtory of the belief of the Eaſtern Nations, chap. xv, pag.* 167.

⸸ Pag. 272, 273.

(28) Auguſtus Pfeiffer, in vol. VII, of the Bibliotheque Univerſelle, *pag.* 257. The book, an extract whereof is to be found in that volume, is intituled, *Theologiæ . . . Judaicæ atque Muhammedicæ principia ſubleſta & fructus peſtilentes.*

They preteed, that even his birth was attended with circumſtances ſo miraculous, that they cannot be ſufficiently admired [*I*]. There are ſome who imagine, that he might believe what he ſaid [*K*], and who diſapprove, what is given out by others, That he drew

to be found in Arabian authors, had read them in ſome obſcure writers, who took the liberty to tell them, in honour of that falſe prophet, as the legendary writers have done in honour of the ſaints. If all that Mr Chevreau is going to tell us is not to be found in grave authors, perhaps it may be found in writers of a mean ſtamp, who reſemble thoſe who publiſh pamphlets, which the hawkers ſell about the ſtreets. Let us hear what Mr Chevreau ſays (29). ‘ When ‘ the Koreiſchites of Mecca deſired him (30), to work ‘ a miracle, that they might know who he was, *he* ‘ *divided the moon into two pieces, between which they* ‘ *perceived a mountain. Having called two trees,* ‘ *they joined together to come to him, and parted again* ‘ *as they went back, by virtue of his command. In all* ‘ *places where he went, the trees and ſtones ſaluted him* ‘ *with great reſpect and ſaid,* peace be upon you, the A‘poſtle of God. *He made fountains ſpring forth from be*‘*tween his two fingers, which in the greateſt drought* ‘ *furniſhed water to all his ſoldiers, and to all the beaſts* ‘ *of burden in his army, which was numerous. With a* ‘ *kid, and four little meaſures of barley, he ſatisfied the* ‘ *hunger of eighty men; he fed a great many more with* ‘ *a few loaves, and at another time all his troops with* ‘ *a few dates, which a young maid brought him in her* ‘ *hand. The trunk of a palm-tree, before which he was* ‘ *wont to pray unto GOD, had ſo great a love for him* ‘ *that in his abſence it was heard to cry louder than a* ‘ *camel, and it ceaſed crying the moment he came near* ‘ *it*. . . . . If we ſhould reckon up all his miracles, ‘ they would amount to a thouſand, according to ſome ‘ and to three thouſand, according to others.’

I will not deny, but, in ſome reſpects, the zeal of our diſputants is unjuſt; for if they make uſe of the extravagances of a Mahometan legendary, to make Mahomet himſelf odious or to ridicule him, they violate the equity, which is due to all the world, to wicked, as well as good men. We muſt not impute to any body what they never did, and conſequently we muſt not argue againſt Mahomet from theſe idle fancies, which ſome of his followers have fabled of him, if he himſelf never publiſhed them. We have ſufficient matter againſt him, tho' we charge him only with his own faults, and do not make him anſwerable for the follies, which the indiſcreet and romantic zeal of ſome of his diſciples has prompted them to write.

[*I*] *They pretend, that his birth was attended with circumſtances ſo miraculous, that they cannot be ſufficiently admired.*] ‘ If we believe ſome Arabians, there were ‘ miracles, that preceded or accompanied the birth of ‘ Mahomet, which aſtoniſhed the whole world. *E*‘*mina, without any uneaſineſs, carried this new prophet* ‘ *in her womb: ſhe brought him forth without pain; and* ‘ *he fell, when he came into the world, with his face* ‘ *againſt the ground, to do honour to GOD. When he* ‘ *raiſed his head up again, he cryed out,* that there ‘ was only one God, who had choſen him for his ‘ embaſſador. *He was born circumciſed, as the greateſt* ‘ *part of the Jews believe of Adam, Moſes, Joſeph, and* ‘ *David; and then the devils were all driven out* ‘ *of heaven. His nurſe Halima, or the debonair lady,* ‘ *who had no milk in her breaſts, found it in them,* ‘ *when ſhe offered herſelf to this new-born infant. Four* ‘ *voices were heard at the four corners of the Caabah,* ‘ *and publiſhed theſe wonders. The fire of the Perſians,* ‘ *which had always burnt, was extinguiſhed. A bar*‘*ren palm-tree put forth leaves, and bore fruit. Mid*‘*wives, of an extraordinary beauty, were found preſent,* ‘ *without being ſent for: and there were even birds,* ‘ *which had for their bills precious-ſtones, whoſe ſplendor* ‘ *ſhone from the eaſt to the weſt* (31).’ There is nothing more ridiculous, than what they make the guardian-angels of Mahomet do. They tranſported him to the top of a mountain; they ripped open his belly, and then waſhed his entrails ſo well, that they made them whiter than ſnow; they opened his breaſt, and took out of his heart the black kernel, or drop, which is the diabolical ſeed, that torments all other men: and all this they did to him, without putting him to any pain; and, having thus waſhed and cleanſed his entrails, he returned of himſelf to his houſe. Note, that he was then but four years old (32).

[*K*] *Some imagine, that he might believe what he ſaid.*] They reaſon after this manner: all Chriſtians are agreed, that the devil is the true author of Mahometiſm, and that he only made uſe of Mahomet as an inſtrument to eſtabliſh in the world a falſe religion. We muſt therefore ſay, that Mahomet was delivered up to the devil, by the providence of God; and that the power, God gave the devil over this wretch, was much leſs limited, than that he had over Job; for God did not permit the devil to pervert the ſoul of Job, as he permitted him to make uſe of the ſoul of Mahomet to deceive mankind. The devil having ſo great a power over him, by the confeſſion of all Chriſtians, as to inſtigate him to ſpread his new opinions; could he not perſuade him, that God had eſtabliſhed him a prophet? he could inſpire him with that vaſt deſign, of planting a new religion; he could make him willing to undergo a thouſand troubles, in order to deceive the world: and could he not ſeduce him? What reaſon can any one have, to admit the one, and deny the other? is it more difficult to move the will to great deſigns, in ſpite of all the light of reaſon, that oppoſes them, than to deceive the underſtanding, by a falſe perſuaſion, or to incline the will to embrace a falſe light, ſo as to acquieſce in it as a true revelation? I muſt confeſs, that one of theſe things does not appear to me more difficult than the other: But if the devil could ſeduce Mahomet, is it not very probable, that he did effectually ſeduce him? This man would be the fitter to execute the devil's deſigns, if he were ſo perſuaded, than if he were not. This cannot be denied me; for all things being otherwiſe equal, it is plain, that a man, who believes he does well, will always be more active and in earneſt, than he who believes he does ill. We muſt therefore ſay, that the devil, managing very dexterouſly the execution of his projects, did not forget the wheel, that was moſt neceſſary to his engine, and which would beſt increaſe the motion of it: that is to ſay, he ſeduced this falſe prophet. If he could, he would; and if he would, he did it; and we have already proved, that he could do it. Moreover, ſay theſe gentlemen, the Alcoran is the work of a fanatic: every thing in it ſavours of diſorder and confuſion; it is a chaos of disjointed thoughts.

- - - - rudis indigeſtaque moles:
Nec quicquam niſi pondus iners, congeſtaque eôdem
Non bene junctarum diſcordia ſemina rerum (33).

An indigeſted maſs, an unform'd world,
And ill-join'd ſeeds of things in wild confuſion hurl'd.

A deceiver would have ranged his doctrines better; a Comedian would have been more polite. And let none ſay, that the devil would never have perſuaded him to oppoſe idolatry, nor to recommend ſo much the love of the true God, and of virtue; for this proves too much; ſince from thence we might conclude, that Mahomet was not his inſtrument. Beſides this, we may anſwer, I. that it was ſufficient for him to oppoſe a falſe religion to Chriſtianity, tho' it tended to the ruin of Paganiſm. II. That it is not poſſible to make any one believe, that a religion comes from God, if it does not teach good moral doctrines (34). It would be to no purpoſe to alledge, that this falſe prophet boaſted of converſing with the angel Gabriel: for ſince the ſcripture tells us, that the *devil transforms himſelf into an angel of light*; cannot we ſay, that he preſented himſelf to Mahomet under that name, and in the figure of the angel Gabriel? But Mahomet would make people believe, that this angel came and whiſpered in his ear, in the ſhape of a pigeon; tho' it was a real pigeon, which Mahomet taught to come and peck at his ear. We ſhall preſently ſee (35), that this is a fable, of which the Arabians make no mention. The famous Giſbert Voetius does not at all doubt but that Mahomet was an enthuſiaſt, and poſſeſſed with a devil: Theſe are his words; which will ſhew, that there have been others of the ſame opinion. ‘ Non video cur hoc negan‘dum drew after him ſo many followers, only by accommodating his morals to the corruption of mens hearts [*L*], and by promiſing them a ſenſual paradiſe [*M*]. Without doubt, the principal

---

(29) Chevreau's Hiſtory of the World, *Tom. iii, Book v, pag.* 8.

(30) *i. e.* Mahomet.

(31) Chevreau, *ibid. pag.* 7. *See alſo Hotting. ubi ſupra, pag.* 149, *& ſeq.* & Hoornbeek, Summa Controverſ. *p.* 77, 78.

(32) Hoornbeek, *ibid. pag.* 78. *He cites* Joannes Andreas, in Confuſ. Sectæ Muhammed, *cap. i,* & Alkoranum Germanicum, *cap. iv.*

(33) Ovid. Metamorph. lib. I. ver. 7.

(34) *See* Miſcellaneous Thoughts upon Comets, *num.* 190.

(35) In the remark [*U*].

‘ dum ſit (*epilepſiæ, & maniacis deliriis aut enthuſiaſmis diabolicis Muhammedi adſuiſſe energema*), ſi vitam & actiones ejus intueamur. Et exſertè de illo probat *Johannes Andreas Maurus in Confuſione ſectæ Mahometicæ*, cap. 1. eum à Meccanis civibus pro fatuo & obſeſſo, & à propriâ uxore pro Phrenetico & à Satanæ tentationibus deluſo fuiſſe habitum. *Idem ibid.* & *Philippus Guadagnolo in apologiâ contra Achmedum Alabadin*, c. 10. ſect. 1. ex libris Saracenicis *Agar* & *Aſſifa* probant eum ex vita eremitica, & nimio jejunio factum fuiſſe inſomnem & furioſum, & in ſpelunca commorantem audiiſſe voces & ſermones, loquentem autem neminem vidiſſe. Ita cum furioſis & dœmoniacis Enthuſiaſtis, ac prophetis Monaſterienſibus quos patrum noſtrorum ætas vidit, in eo comparari poſſe (36). - - - *I do not ſee, why this is to be denied*, (that Mahomet was an enthuſiaſt, and poſſeſſed) *if we look into his life and actions. John Andreas Maurus, in his* Confuſio Sectæ Mahometicæ, *ch.* 1. *proves concerning him, that the citizens of Mecca took him for an enthuſiaſt and demoniac, and his own wife for one mad, and deluded by the temptations of the devil. The ſame author, in the ſame book, as alſo Philip Guadagnolo, in his* Apology againſt Achmed Alabadin, *ch.* 10. §. 1, *prove, out of the Saracen books* Agar *and* Aſſifa, *that ſolitude, and too much faſting, had made him mad, and that, during his ſtay in the cave, he had heard voices, but ſeen no body ſpeaking. Thus he may be compared to the mad and demoniacal enthuſiaſts, and monkiſh prophets, of former ages.*’

How ſpecious ſoever theſe reaſons may appear, I chuſe rather to concur with the common opinion, That *Mahomet* was an impoſtor: for, beſides what I ſhall ſay elſewhere (37) his inſinuating behaviour, and dexterous addreſs, in procuring friends, do plainly ſhew, that he made uſe of religion only as an expedient to aggrandize himſelf. ‘ Facetus moribus, voce ſuavi, viſitandi & excipiendi vices talionis lege ſuis reddens, pauperes munerans, magnates honorans, converſans cum junioribus, petentem à ſe aliquid repulſa nunquam abigens, aut ſermone facili non excipiens (38) - - - *He was of a pleaſant diſpoſition, a ſweet voice, receiving, and paying viſits regularly, beſtowing gifts on the poor, honouring the great, converſing with young men, never ſending away a petitioner repulſed, but always receiving him courteouſly.*’ Had a true fanatic ever ſuch a character? Did he ever underſtand his buſineſs ſo well? Tho’ a man ſhould, for ſome time, fancy that God has ſent an angel to reveal to him the true religion, yet, might not he perceive the deluſion, when he found, that he could not confirm his miſſion by any miracle? Now this was the caſe of Mahomet: the Koreiſchites offered to embrace his new religion, provided he wrought miracles; but he never had the boldneſs to promiſe them any: He cunningly evaded their propoſal, ſometimes telling them, that miracles were not neceſſary, and ſometimes by referring them to the excellency of the Alcoran (39). Was not this ſufficient to convince him, that he was not extraordinarily called by God to found a new religion? See remark [*N*], at the end.

[*L*] - - - *and who diſapprove what is pretended, that he drew after him ſo many followers, only by accommodating his morals to the corruption of mens hearts.*] And as to this point, I doubt not, but the perſons, mentioned in the preceding remark, have better grounds than they had, as to the pretended ſincerity of Mahomet. I do not ſee, that this falſe prophet has derogated from the morality of the Goſpel (40); on the contrary, I find, that as to ceremonies, he has conſiderably increaſed the yoke of Chriſtians. He ordains circumciſion, which is a thing very harſh to adult perſons: he requires them to abſtain from certain meats, which is a ſlavery that does not well agree with worldly men: he forbids the uſe of wine, which is a precept indeed, that is not ſo very harſh to the Aſiatic people, as to the northern nations, and which would certainly have made Willibrod and Boniface miſcarry in their deſign: but yet it is convenient in all countries, where wine grows; and we know, by antient and modern Hiſtory, that this liquor does not diſpleaſe the eaſtern people. Beſides, Mahomet impoſed faſtings and waſhings, which are very troubleſome, and ſuch a frequent uſe of prayers, as is tedious and uneaſy. He enjoins alſo pilgrimages: and, in a word, you need only conſider the forty aphoriſms of his morals (41), and there you will find every thing the moſt oppoſite to the corruption of man’s heart; the precept of patience in adverſity, of not ſpeaking evil of our neighbours, of being charitable, of renouncing vanity, of doing no injury to any man, and laſtly, that, which is the epitome of the law and the prophets (42), *Do to your neighbour, what you would that he ſhould do unto you* (43).

It is therefore an illuſion, to pretend, that the only reaſon why the law of Mahomet was propagated ſo readily, and ſpread ſo wide, was, becauſe it eaſed men of the yoke of good works, and troubleſome obſervances, and tolerated a corruption of manners. If I miſtake not, the only things, wherein it opened the gap, which the Goſpel had ſhut, are marriage, and revenge; for it permits Polygamy, and to return evil for evil: but the Jews and Pagans gained ſcarce any thing by this, for they were already in poſſeſſion of a cuſtom, which did not give them much trouble in this reſpect. Hottinger (44) has given us a long catalogue of the moral aphoriſms, or apophthegms, of the Mahometans. We may ſay, without flattering this religion, that the moſt excellent precepts, that can be given to man, for the practice of virtue, and avoiding of vice, are contained in theſe aphoriſms. Hottinger makes no ſcruple to exalt this morality above that of many monks. ‘ Ipſi judicent adverſarii ex illis que ex Arabum nunc monumentis afferemus. Nonne majus ſæpe & virtutum ſtudium & vitiorum odium præ ſe ferant Muhammedani, quam Pontificiorum plerique religioſi (45). - - - *Let the adverſaries themſelves judge from what we ſhall now produce out of the Arabian monuments. Do not the Mahometans often ſeem to practiſe virtue, and ſhun vice, better than moſt Popiſh monks.*’ Mr Simon has ſpoken no leſs advantageouſly of the Mahometan religion, with reſpect to morality: ‘ It conſiſts, *ſays he* (46), in doing good, and avoiding evil; and therefore they examine carefully virtues and vices, and their Caſuiſts are no leſs ſubtile in theſe points, than ours.’ After he has mentioned ſome of their pinciples concerning the neceſſity of faith, and truſt in God, and humility, and repentance, &c. he adds (47), ‘ I paſs over in ſilence the reſt of their morals, becauſe what has been ſaid is ſufficient to ſhew what they are; and I can aſſure you, that they are not ſo looſe as ſome Caſuiſts in our age. I ſhall only add, that they have many good precepts about the duties of private perſons to their neighbours, wherein they alſo preſcribe rules of civility. They have alſo written of the behaviour that is due to a prince; and one of their maxims is, That it is never lawful to kill him, nor even ſpeak evil of him, under pretence that he is a tyrant.’

[*M*] . . . *and by promiſing them a ſenſual paradiſe.*] It muſt be granted, that this promiſe might be a bait to allure the Pagans, who had only confuſed notions of the happineſs of another life; but I know not whether it was calculated to entice the Jews; neither do I think that it could have any influence upon Chriſtians: and yet how many Chriſtians have been drawn into apoſtacy by this falſe prophet? Underſtand what he ſays of the pleaſures of his paradiſe in a literal ſenſe, *That each perſon there ſhall have the ſtrength of* 100 *men, to enjoy full ſatisfaction with women, as well as to drink, and eat* (48). Yet this would not balance the idea, the Scripture has given us of the happineſs of another life; for it ſpeaks of it (49) as a ſtate which ſurpaſſes all that *eyes have ſeen, or ears heard, or hath entered into the heart of man to conceive.* So that, if we believe the Scripture, the happineſs of paradiſe is ſomething that ſurpaſſes imagination, and has no bounds ſet to it. Endeavour to have a fixed idea of it; you can never compaſs it, but your hopes ſtill carry you higher, and launch out farther beyond all bounds. Mahomet did not allow you this liberty, but confined you within certain bounds; he multiplied a hundred times the pleaſures you have already tried, and there he left you: but what is a hundred times, in compariſon of a number which is infinite?

(36) Voët. Diſputat. *Tom. i, pag.* 1057, 1058.

(37) In the remarks [*T*], and [*NN*].

(38) Elmacin. apud Hotting. Hiſt. Oriental. *pag.* 241.

(39) *See* Hotting. *ubi ſupra, p.* 302, & 303.

(40) *See* Hotting. Hiſtor. Oriental. *p.* 247, & *ſeq.*

(41) You will find them in Hotting. *ibid. pag.* 248, & *ſeq.*

(42) Saint Matthew’s Goſpel, chap. vii, ver. 12.

(43) Si tandem feceris alii quicquid gratum eſſet, ſi tibi fieret. *Hotting. ibid. pag.* 250.

(44) Hotting. *ubi ſupra, pag.* 315, & *ſeq.*

(45) Id. p. 314.

(46) Critical Hiſtory of the Levant, *p.* 173.

(47) Ibid. *pag.* 175, 176.

(48) Chevreau, *ubi ſpra. pag.* 14. See the remarks [*Q*], and [*II*].

(49) 1 Cor. chap. ii, ver. 9.

principal cauſe of the great progreſs he made, was the method he took to force thoſe, by arms, to ſubmit to his religion [*N*], who would not embrace it readily. This preſerves to the chriſtian religion one of the proofs of its Divinity [*O*], *viz.* that which is

But ſome may ſay, the Scripture ſpeaks only of pleaſure in general; and if it makes uſe of corporeal images, as when it promiſes, *that we ſhall be ſatisfied with the plenteouſneſs of the houſe of* God, *and that we ſhall drink of the rivers of his pleaſures* (50), you are preſently warned, that theſe are metaphors, under which ſpiritual pleaſures are veiled: but this does not affect worldly minds like ſenſible pleaſures. I anſwer, That ſouls, which are moſt immerſed in matter, will always prefer the paradiſe of the Goſpel before that of Mahomet, provided they give an hiſtorical faith to the deſcription of the beatific viſion, tho' they ſhould give the ſame faith to the Alcoran (51). I ſhall explain my meaning by this ſuppoſition: let us repreſent to ourſelves two preachers, the one a Chriſtian, and the other a Mahometan, preaching before Pagans; each of them endeavouring to allure them to his party, by laying open the joys of paradiſe. The Mahometan promiſes feaſts, and fine women; and, the better to move his auditors, he tells them, that in the other world the pleaſures of ſenſe will be a hundred times more delicious than in this. The Chriſtian declares, That the pleaſures of paradiſe will neither conſiſt in eating, nor drinking, nor in the conjunction of the two ſexes, but that they ſhall be ſo lively, that no man's imagination is able to reach them; and that all that can be conceived, by multiplying the pleaſures of this world a hundred times, a thouſand times, a hundred thouſand times, *&c.* is nothing in compariſon of the happineſs, which God imparts to the ſoul, by it's *ſeeing him face to face*, &c. Is it not certain, that the moſt unchaſte and luxurious hearers would rather follow the Chriſtian preacher, than the other, tho' we ſhould ſuppoſe, that they gave as much credit to the promiſes of the Mahometan, as to thoſe of the Chriſtian? They would doubtleſs do the ſame thing, which a ſoldier would do, who knows the offers of two captains, each of which would inliſt him: for tho' he was perperſuaded, that they were both of them ſincere, and would give all that they promiſed, he would certainly liſt himſelf with him that offered moſt. So likewiſe theſe Pagans would prefer the paradiſe of the Goſpel before that of Mahomet, tho' they ſhould be ſuaded, that both of theſe preachers would make good to their diſciples the reward they had promiſed (52). For it muſt not be imagined, that a voluptuous man loves ſenſual pleaſures, merely becauſe they flow from that ſource; he would equally love them, if they came from any other: make him feel more pleaſure by ſucking in the air of a cave, than by eating the moſt dainty meat; he will quit, with all his heart, the beſt meals, to go into the cave (53). Make him feel more pleaſure in examining a Geometrical problem, than in enjoying a fine woman, he will readily quit the fine woman for this problem; and conſequently it would be unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that a Mahometan ſhould draw after him all the hearers that are lovers of pleaſure: for ſince they love ſenſual pleaſures, only becauſe they can find no better, it is plain they would renounce them with eaſe, to enjoy a greater happineſs. What care I, would they ſay, if the paradiſe of Chriſtians does not furniſh me with the pleaſures of good eating, the enjoyment of fine women, *&c.* ſince it provides me with other pleaſures, that infinitely exceed all the ſenſible pleaſures of this world. I think therefore, we muſt not imagine, that the hopes, which Mahomet has given, of the happineſs of another life, was what allured to his ſect the Chriſtians that engaged in it. We may almoſt ſay the ſame thing with reſpect to the Jews; for it appears by ſeveral pſalms of David, that they had a wonderful idea of the happineſs of another life. The Pagans were more likely to be enticed, becauſe their religion left them in *thick darkneſs*, as to the particulars of the joys of paradiſe: but is it enough to tell people, that, after this life, they ſhall enjoy ſenſual pleaſures with much more ſatisfaction than in this world? And who are you, might they ſay, that promiſe us this? Who told you ſo? Or how do you know it? We muſt therefore ſuppoſe, in the firſt place, that Mahomet, antecedently to his promiſes of paradiſe, ſet up for a great prophet, and that, before they were allured by theſe pleaſures, they were perſuaded of his miſſion from heaven, for planting the true faith. And ſo the great progreſs, this ſect made, is not owing to the promiſes of a ſenſual paradiſe; for thoſe, who did not believe him ſent from God, paid no regard to his promiſes; and thoſe who believed him a true prophet, would nevertheleſs have followed him, tho' he had promiſed them only a ſpiritual happineſs in the other world. Let us not give any occaſion to the Libertines to retort this objection upon the Goſpel, as tho' it had never been ſo effectual to convert the Pagans, but upon the account of promiſing a paradiſe, or an happineſs, which infinitely ſurpaſſes all the pleaſures that can be imagined. And particularly let us abſtain from raillery upon the gold and precious ſtones, and ſuch like other ornaments of Mahomet's paradiſe; for you will find ſuch things, and all the kind of precious ſtones that the moſt famous jeweller has in his ſhop, in the deſcription, which the Revelation (54) gives us of paradiſe. And let no man tell me, that a carnal and brutiſh ſoul will ſooner believe pleaſures that are groſs, than thoſe that are ſpiritual; for if any thing appears incredible to ſuch an one, it is chiefly the reſurrection; wherefore, if Mahomet could perſuade him to believe the reſurrection, a Chriſtian might have convinced him of the ſpiritual joys of another world. See the margin (55).

[*N*] *He made proſelytes by force of arms.*] We need not ſearch elſewhere for the cauſe of his progreſs; for this was the ſole and entire cauſe of it. I do not deny, but the diviſions of the Greek church, whoſe ſects were unhappily multiplied, the bad ſtate of the oriental empire, and the corruption of manners, were a favourable conjuncture for the deſigns of this impoſtor. But after all, what reſiſtance can be made to conquering arms, forcing ſubſcriptions? Aſk the dragoons of France, who made uſe of this method in 1685; they will tell you, that they will undertake to make the world ſign the whole Alcoran, provided they have time to enforce that maxim, *Compelle intrare, compel them to come in.* It is very probable, that, if Mahomet had foreſeen, he ſhould have had ſuch good troops at his command, he would not have taken ſo much pains to have forged new revelations, and to have put on an air of devotion in his writings, and to tack together ſeveral pieces of Judaiſm and Chriſtianity. Without engaging in this troubleſome buſineſs, he might have been ſure of planting his religion, where-ever his arms were victorious: and if any thing were capable of perſuading me, that there was a good deal of Fanaticiſm in the caſe, I ſhould encline to believe it, from the infinite number of things in the Alcoran, which appear no wiſe neceſſary, but in caſe he had no mind to uſe force. Now there are many things in that book, which are poſterior to the firſt ſucceſs of Mahomet's arms.

[*O*] *This preſerves to the Chriſtian religion one of the proofs of it's Divinity.*] The Goſpel, preached by obſcure perſons, deſtitute of learning and eloquence, and of all human ſupports, and cruelly perſecuted, yet in a little time prevailed over the whole world. This is matter of fact, which no one can deny, and which plainly proves, it was the work of God. But this proof will be of no force, after it can be made appear, that a falſe church ſpread as far by the like means; and it is certain, that this argument would be ſpoiled, if it could be proved, that the Mahometan religion owed not the ſuddenneſs of it's great progreſs to the violence of it's arms. Since therefore there are two things equally clear in the monuments of hiſtory; one of which is, that the Chriſtan religion was eſtabliſhed without the uſe of the ſecular arm; the other, that the Mahometan religion was eſtabliſhed by the way of conqueſt: no reaſonable objection can be made againſt our proof, upon pretence, that this infamous impoſtor ſuddenly overſpread an infinite number of provinces with his falſe doctrines. It is well for us, that we have the three firſt centuries of Chriſtianity ſecure from this parallel; otherwiſe it would be folly in us, to object to the Mahometans the violence they uſed for the propagation is drawn from its ſpeedy propagation over the whole world; but we loſe the proof, which is taken from its large extent [*P*]. We muſt not wonder, that this falſe-prophet never

---

(50) Pſalm xxxvi. ver. 9. *See* Gaſſendus, Ethicæ, *lib. i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 679, *who, keeping cloſe to the Hebrew, renders the paſſage thus:* Inebriabuntur ab ubertate domus tuæ, & de torrente voluptatis tuæ potabis eos.

(51) Take notice of the following marginal note.

(52) This is to be underſtood without regard to the doctrine of Grace, according to which, we muſt ſay, that it is by the gift of God, and the favour of the holy ſpirit, that a man chuſes the true church. We ſpeak here upon a ſuppoſition, wherein we conſider only the motives of intereſt or ſelf-love, which would determine men to the choice of a religion.

(53) Trahit ſua quemque voluptas. *Virgil. Eclog. ii, ver.* 65.

(54) In ch. xxi.

(55) I deny not but Mahomet propoſed a ſtrong allurement to the Saracens, by allowing them Polygamy; for they were very much inclined to the venereal act. *Incredibile eſt quo ardore apud eos in Venerem uterque ſolvitur ſexus.* Amm. Marcellin. lib. xiv, cap. iv, p. m. 24.

never

tion of the Alcoran: they would quickly put us to ſilence, for they need only cite to us theſe words of Mr Jurieu (56): *Can any one deny, that Paganiſm was deſtroyed by the authority ef the Roman Emperors? We may venture to affirm, that Paganiſm would be ſtill in being, and that three-fourths of Europe would ſtill be Pagan, if Conſtantine, and his ſucceſſors had not employed their authority to aboliſh that religion . . .* (57). *The Chriſtian Emperors have extirpated Paganiſm, by pulling down it's temples, deſtroying it's images, forbidding the worſhip of it's falſe gods; by appointing preachers of the Goſpel, in the place of falſe prophets and teachers, by ſuppreſſing their books, and ſpreading ſound doctrine.* See the 8th Letter of the Picture of Socinianiſm, at page 501, where the ſame author affirms, *That doubtleſs, had it not been for the authority of the Emperors, the temples of Jupiter and Mars would ſtill be kept up, and the falſe gods of the heathens would have a great number of adorers.*

We muſt freely declare the truth: the kings of France have planted Chriſtianity in the country of the Friſons and Saxons by Mahometan ways; and the ſame force was made uſe of to plant it in the north. This appears horrible to moderate men, when they read it in the book of Mr Ornhialms (58). The ſame ways were made uſe of againſt the ſects, that durſt condemn the Pope, and will be uſed in the Indies, whenever it can be done (59). And from all this conduct it plainly appears, that we can no longer reproach Mahomet for having propagated his religion by force, I mean, by denying Toleration to any other. For he might argue thus *ad hominem:* If force be wrong in it's own nature, it can never be lawfully made uſe of: But you have made uſe of it from the IVth century unto this preſent time; and yet you pretend, you have done nothing in all this, but what is very commendable. You muſt therefore confeſs, that this way is not wrong in it's own nature; and conſequently, I might lawfully make uſe it in the firſt years of my vocation; For it would be abſurd to pretend, that a thing, which was very criminal in the firſt century, ſhould become juſt in the fourth; or that a thing, which was juſt in the fourth, ſhould not be ſo in the firſt. This might have been pretended, if GOD had made new laws in the IVth century; but do you not found the juſtice of your conduct, ſince Conſtantine till this preſent time, upon theſe words of the Goſpel, *compel them to come in* (60), and upon the duty of ſovereigns? You ſhould therefore have uſed force, if you could have done it, from the very day after the Aſcenſion. Bellarmin, and many other writers of the Romiſh party, would grant him this; for they ſay (61), ‘That if the Chriſtians did not depoſe Nero and Diocleſian, it was becauſe they had not ſufficient temporal force to do it, but that of right they might have done it, being no ways obliged to endure a king over them, who is not a Chriſtian, if he endeavours to pervert them from the faith (62).’ They were therefore obliged to ſet up a ſovereign over them, who ſhould eſtabliſh the Goſpel, and extirpate Paganiſm, by the means of authority. Mr Jurieu does not differ much from the opinion of Bellarmin; for he tells us, that the greateſt part of the Chriſtians were patient, only *through their weakneſs, and want of power* (63). And, though he does not blame their conduct, in not taking arms againſt their princes, yet he thinks they had a right to do it; and if they had done it, they could not have been blamed. Doubtleſs he believes, that, if they had had power, they might have placed upon the throne a Conſtantine, or a Theodoſius, from the time of Nero. Obſerve, I pray you, that he does not relate the manner of aboliſhing Paganiſm, meerly as a matter of fact, but as a thing that was juſt; for he compares it with the conduct of the Proteſtants, and with that, which the Catholic princes will obſerve in a little time, as he pretends, to ruin the church of Rome. The three examples he gives, of the way, in which authority may be lawfully employed, are, that of the kings of Iſrael, that of the Chriſtian emperors, and that of the Reformed princes (64): ‘Theſe laſt, *ſays he* (65), have aboliſhed Popery in their ſtates, by removing it's profeſſors, by appointing teachers of ſound doctrine and pure morals, by burning the images, by burying the relics in the earth, by forbidding all idolatrous worſhip. In this, they were ſo far from doing any thing againſt the law of GOD, that they exactly obſerved his commands: for it is his will, *that the kings of the earth ſhould ſtrip the beaſt, and break her image.* Never did any Proteſtant, to this day, blame this conduct, and never will any judicious man apprehend the thing otherwiſe. Things have always been thus, and, if it pleaſe GOD, will always be ſo, in ſpight of our libertines and inconſiderate men.’ Conſult the 284th page of his book, and you will find there theſe memorable words: ‘For the little profit, which you might draw from thence now (66), the church would ſuffer great loſs, and perhaps you would be obliged to retract in a few years, and doubtleſs you would do it. For if the kings of France, and Spain, ſhould uſe their authority, to drive Popery out of their dominions, as the kings of England, and Sweden have done, you would be ſo far from blaming them, that you would think it very well done. But you may be aſſured, that this is to come to paſs; for the holy Spirit ſays, *That the kings of the earth, who have given their power to the beaſt, ſhall take it from her, and that they ſhall make her deſolate, and eat her fleſh.* The ſame authority of the weſtern kings, who erected the empire of Popery, ſhall deſtroy it. And this will be perfectly agreeable to the deſign of GOD, and to his will; wherefore we ſhall find nothing in it to gainſay. And therefore, that you may be uniform in your judgment, follow the truth, which never changes; and do not govern your opinions according to intereſts, which are changing every day.’ You ſee therefore, that he lays it down as an immutable principle, which will hold in all times, That it is lawful to make uſe of authority for the propagation of the faith. If therefore he enters into diſpute with the Mahometans, he muſt renounce thoſe arguments, which have been always uſed againſt them from the manner of propagating their religion: for it was not, ſays he (67), by putting ‘a ſword to the throat of Chriſtians, to make them abjure Chriſtianity, and embrace Mahometaniſm; but by the poverty, meanneſs, miſery, and ignorance, to which they reduced Chriſtians;’ which are ways much leſs harſh, and more gentle, than thoſe which, he ſays, may be very juſtly made uſe of to extirpate Popery. See the remark [*AA*], at the end.

[*P*] . . . *but we loſe the proof, which is taken from it's large extent.*] I cannot leave this ſubject, till I have made one obſervation of ſome importance. The fathers have uſed an argument, which is improperly alledged againſt the reformers of the XVIth century. The extent of the Goſpel furniſhed the fathers with an argument againſt the Jews, and the ſects, which were bred in the boſom of Chriſtianity; becauſe this plainly ſhewed the completion of the prophecies of Scripture, which foretold, that the knowledge and ſervice of the true GOD, under the Meſſias, ſhould not be confined, as before to one little corner of Paleſtine, but that all nations ſhould become the people of GOD (68). This reaſoning confounded the Jews and Heretics, and continued in full force till the time of Mahomet. Since that time we muſt forſake it; for, conſidering only the extent, the religion of this falſe Prophet might claim to itſelf the antient prophecies, as well as the Chriſtian. We cannot therefore ſufficiently wonder, when we find the Bellarmines, and ſuch famous writers of controverſy, affirm in general, that extent is a mark of the true church, and pretend, by this method, to gain their cauſe againſt the Proteſtants. Nay, they are even ſo imprudent, as to put proſperity among the marks of the true church. ‘Elmacini Hiſtoria Saracenica luculentiſſime quos brevi tempore Muhammedica peſtis habuerit progreſſus, quos contra Chriſtianos ſucceſſus. Adeo ut mirari lubeat quid animi fuerit Bellarmino, cum ad ejuſmodi lapſus eſt nugas (69). - - - - *Elmacin's Saracen Hiſtory very clearly deſcribes the ſpeedy progreſs of Mahometiſm, and it's ſucceſs againſt the Chriſtians; ſo that I cannot but wonder, how Bellarmin ſtumbled upon ſo trifling and inconcluſive an argument.*’ It was

eaſy

---

(56) *Jurieu's Rights of two Sovereigns, pag.* 280. *He ſays, pag.* 297, 298, That Popery will never be aboliſhed but by the authority of the princes, that eſtabliſhed it, and that Paganiſm would be ſtill kept up, and reign under the cover of the doctrine of Toleration.

(57) Ib. p. 289.

(58) *Intituled,* Hiſtoriæ Suecorum Gothorumque Eccleſiaſticæ lib. iv. *See the* Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, for the month of November, 1690, *pag.* 109, &c.

(59) See, in the remark [*AA*], the words of the Jeſuit Frois.

(60) *See upon all this, the* Philoſophical Commentary upon *Compel them to come in.* Part i, chap. vii.

(61) Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. *lib. v, cap. vii.* § *quod ſi,* cited by Daillé, Reply to Adam, *Part. ii, chap. xxi, pag.* 125.

(62) Bellarm. *ib.* § *probatur hujus,* cited by Daillé, *ibid.*

(63) The ninth Paſtoral Letter, of the year 1688. pag. 202, Edit. in 12mo.

(64) The Rights of two Sovereigns, *pag.* 289.

(65) Ibid.

(66) That is to ſay, from the court of France being perſuaded, that it muſt tolerate falſe religions.

(67) The ninth Paſtoral Letter, of the year 1688, *p.* 196.

(68) See Father Thomaſin, Of the Unity of the Church, *Tom. ii.*

(69) Hotting. ubi ſupra, pag. 339.

never had recourſe to the artifice uſed by all the heads of parties, in the caſe of hereſies and ſects (*h*): He was not ſupported by the intrigues of women (*i*); nor did at all engage the fair

easy to foreſee, that, as to theſe two marks, they would be anſwered, that the Mahometan may more juſtly paſs for the true church, than the Chriſtian. The religion of Mahomet is unqueſtionably of much larger extent than the Chriſtian; it's victories, it's conqueſts, it's triumphs, are incomparably more illuſtrious, than any thing the Chriſtians can boaſt of, in this kind of proſperity. The exploits of the Mahometans are without doubt the moſt glorious things that Hiſtory affords. What can we find more wonderful than the empire of the Saracens, which extended from the Straits of Gibraltar as far as the Indies? Has it fallen? See the Turks on one ſide, and the Tartars on the other, who preſerve the grandeur and renown of Mahomet. Find, if you can, among the conquering Chriſtian princes, any that can be put in the balance with the Saladines, the Gingis-Chams, the Tamerlanes, the Amuraths, the Bajazets, the Mahomets II, the Solymans. Did not the Saracens confine Chriſtianity within the bounds of the Pyrenean mountains? Did they not commit an hundred outrages in Italy, and proceed as far as the heart of France (70)? Did not the Turks extend their conqueſts to the confines of Germany, and the gulf of Venice? The leagues, the croiſades, of Chriſtian princes, thoſe grand expeditions, which drained the Latin church of men and money, can they not be compared to a ſea, whoſe waves flow from the weſt to the eaſt, to be broken, when they encounter the Mahometan forces, like one that ſplits againſt a ſteep rock? At laſt the Chriſtians have been forced to yield to Mahomet's ſtar, and inſtead of following him into Aſia, they reckon it a great happineſs, when they are able to maintain a running fight in the center of Europe. See, below (71), the eternal monuments, which Chriſtianity has erected to the ſuperiority of the fortune of the Mahometans. We may apply to the Mahometans and Chriſtians, what Salluſt has obſerved of the Athenians and Romans. ‘Athenienſium res geſtæ, ‘ſicut ego exiſtimo, ſatis amplæ, magnificæque fuere, ‘verum aliquanto minores tamen, quam fama feruntur: ſed, quia provenere ibi magna ſcriptorum ingenia, per terrarum orbem Athenienſium facta pro ‘maximis celebrantur. Ita eorum qui ea fecere, virtus tanta habetur, quantum verbis ea potuere extollere præclara ingenia. At populo R. nunquam ‘ea copia fuit; quia prudentiſſimus quiſque negotioſus maxime erat. Ingenium nemo ſine corpore exercebat. Optimus quiſque facere, quam dicere; ſua ‘ab aliis benefacta laudari, quam ipſe aliorum narrare, mallebat (72). - - - *The actions of the Athenians* ‘*were, I think, great and magnificent enough, tho' not* ‘*ſo great as they are reported to have been: but, as* ‘*they abounded with excellent writers, hence the actions* ‘*of the Athenians are celebrated as the moſt glorious all* ‘*over the world. Thus the merit of thoſe, who performed them, is thought to have been as great, as the* ‘*words of the Hiſtorian repreſent it to be. The Romans* ‘*never had this advantage, becauſe the moſt ſenſible* ‘*perſons among them were taken up with buſineſs; and* ‘*no one exerciſed his mind without his body. They preferred actions to words, and choſe rather that their* ‘*goods deeds ſhould be praiſed by others, than that themſelves ſhould relate thoſe of others.*’ The Mahometans, being more addicted to war than ſtudy, have not written hiſtories equal to their actions; but the Chriſtians having many great wits, have wrote hiſtories which excel all that they have done. But notwithſtanding this want of Hiſtorians, theſe Infidels can tell us, that Heaven has at all times given teſtimony to the holineſs of their religion, by the victories they have obtained (73). The Chriſtians ought not to uſe that ſophiſm, and imitate them improperly, as a father of the oratory did (74). His book is ſcandalous, and of pernicious conſequence; for it is founded upon this falſe ſuppoſition, that the true church is that, which God has moſt enriched with temporal bleſſings. If we were to determine religious diſputes by this rule, Chriſtianity would quickly loſe the cauſe: But prudence will not permit, that they ſhould be decided in that manner; they muſt be fortified by confeſſions of faith, and no regard muſt be had either to extent, or the greater number of victories. I know not whether we may venture to be tried by our morals; but if the Infidels ſhould agree to allow the preference to wit, learning, and military virtue, we muſt take them at their word; for they would infallibly loſe the cauſe at this time; ſince they are much inferior to the Chriſtians in theſe three things. A fine advantage indeed, that we know better, than they, the art of killing, of bombarding, and deſtroying mankind (75)! Obſerve, I pray you, that the Mahometan religion had formerly a large ſhare in that temporal glory, which conſiſts in cultivating ſciences; for they flouriſhed under the empire of the Saracens with great luſtre (76); who then had fine Wits, good Poets, great Philoſophers, famous Aſtronomers, and renowned Phyſicians; to ſay nothing of ſeveral califs, who acquired a very great reputation by their moral qualities, and thoſe peaceable virtues, which are no leſs valuable than the military virtues. There is therefore no kind of temporal proſperity, wherewith that ſect has not been favoured in a very diſtinguiſhing manner.

I have ſaid, That it would not be very ſafe to leave it to be tried by our morals, whether the Chriſtian be the true religion. This requires ſome explanation. I do not pretend, that Chriſtians are more irregular, as to their morals, than the Infidels; but I dare not affirm that they are leſs. The relations of travellers do not agree in this; for ſome of them very much commend the probity, charity, and devotion, of the Turks. and repreſent the Turkiſh women as patterns of modeſty. There are alſo ſome, who ſpeak very ill of the morals of that nation. Hottinger quotes an author, who admires the virtue of the Turkiſh women, and oppoſes it to the behaviour of the Chriſtian. ‘Certe ‘mihi magna admiratio oritur quando honeſtatem ‘quam vidi in fœmineo ſexu inter Turcos conſidero, ‘& impudiciſſimos, improbos & damnatos mores fœminarum inter Chriſtianos conſpicio (77). - - - *I* ‘*cannot help being greatly ſurprized, when I conſider the* ‘*modeſt behaviour of the women in Turkey, and the impudent and ſcandalous conduct of the Chriſtian women.*’ The Turkiſh women never ſhew their face, go abroad but little, and account it a diſgrace to ride on horſeback. The diſcourſe, which a huſband holds with his wife, in his own houſe, is ſo modeſt, that nothing of ſenſuality is to be obſerved in it, no more than in her countenance. *Etiam in domibus propriis viri cum uxore nunquam in actibus & motibus vel collocutione minimum indicium laſciviæ vel inhoneſtatis deprehendi poteſt* (78). Sir John Chardin informs us, that, in Perſia, they marry without ſeeing one another; ‘and that a man does ‘not not ſee his wife, till he has conſummated the ‘marriage, which he many times does not till ſome ‘days after he has brought her home; for the woman ‘ſhuns him, and hides herſelf among the women, ‘being unwilling to let her huſband do it. Theſe ‘things happen often among perſons of quality; becauſe, in their opinion, it ſavours of leudneſs in a ‘woman to grant the man ſo ſoon the laſt favour. ‘The maids of the blood-royal more eſpecially behave ‘thus, and ſome months paſs before they can be ‘brought to ſubmit (79).’ He ſpeaks quite otherwiſe of the Georgians, who make profeſſion of Chriſtianity; for after he has ſaid that the men of that country have all the faults imaginable; he adds, ‘The women ‘are no leſs vicious, nor leſs wicked; they are eaſily ‘overcome by the men, and have certainly a larger ‘ſhare, than they, in this torrent of impurity, which ‘overflows all their country (80).’ The author, quoted by Hottinger, no leſs extols the morals of the Turks above thoſe of the Chriſtians, than the behaviour of the Turkiſh women above that of the Chriſtian women (81). Other relations accuſe the Turks of extream leudneſs, and do not forget the multitude of their concubines, which they buy in the market, and whom they ſearch, and feel all over their bodies, before they agree upon the price (82), juſt as the Butchers do, when they buy beaſts. ‘Verè ut Pius II. (*lib. i,* ‘*Epiſt. cxxxi,* & Boſkhierus ex eodem *Philip. X,* ‘*pag.* 362.) de Turcis ſcripſerit, *eſſe populum lambentem, fellatorem Leſbiatorem, fæminarum omnium*

(*h*) *Confer quæ ſupra, remark* [*D*] *of the article* GREGORY I.

(*i*) *Except, if you will, the good offices which Chadigha did him, at the beginning, as I have noted above.*

(70) See the article ABDERAME.

(71) See the following article, remark [*D*].

(72) Salluſt. in Bell. Catilin. *pag. m.* 14.

(73) See the following article. remark [*D*].

(74) Thomas Bozius, *de ruinis Gentium.*

(75) See the *Thoughts upon Comets*, num. 141.

(76) See the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Hottinger.

(77) Septem-Caſtrenſis, *cap. xii.* apud Hotting. Hiſt. Oriental. *pag.* 311. Septem-Caſtrenſis, is a Monk, who was a long time priſoner among the Turks.

(78) Id. ib.

(79) *News from the Republic of Letters*, October 1686. *p.* 1139. in the extract of the voyages of Sir John Chardin.

(80) Ibid. *pag.* 1129.

(81) Septem-Caſtrenſis de Turcarum moribus, *cap. viii, pag.* 38. apud Hotting. *ibid. pag.* 304.

(82) Compare the citation from Suetonius, in citation (64) of the article FULVIA.

fair ſex in his intereſts (Q). He believed, that the valour of his troops would be
ſufficient

'*concubitum guſtantem & delibantem*, addimus & verè fornicatorium, utpote, qui non tantum Virginis violant (ſcribente Bartholomæo Georgieviz) (*cap. vi, & vii.*) etiam ante ora patrum, ſed etiam maſculos captivos, indomitæ libidinis hi homines ſibi ſubſternunt (*Boſkhier. pag.* 61, *&* 89.) In foro venales, nudoſque exponunt viros fœminaſque, videndos & coram omnibus contrectandos, etiam quà pudor naturæ debetur, nudos currere, ſaltare jubent, quò vitia, ſexus, ætas, corruptio vel integritas appareant (83). - - - - - *It is true, what Pius II (and Boſkhierus) has written concerning the Turks, that they are* a people addicted to ſodomitical practices, and that they lie with every woman they meet: *to which may be added, that they not only deflower virgins (as Bartholomew Georgieviz writes), even in the ſight of their fathers, but theſe men of ourageous luſt abuſe the male captives they take. They expoſe to ſale in the markets men and women naked, to be ſeen and handled publickly, even where nature requires modeſty: beſides, they command them to run naked, and leap, to ſhew their faults, their ſex, their age, their perfections and defects.*' Thus a Pope accuſes the Turks of many leud actions: but what the Catholic writers have written of the court of Rome, and what may be written of many Chriſtian nations, is no better; inſomuch that one may affirm in general, that Chriſtians and Infidels cannot juſtly reproach each other; and, if there be any difference between them, as to their bad morals, that the difference of the climate is rather the cauſe of it, than the diverſity of religion.

[Q] *He did not engage the fair ſex in his intereſts.*] The permiſſion he granted to men to have many wives, and to whip them, when they were not obedient (84), and to divorce them upon any diſlike (85), was a law very prejudicial to the female ſex. He took care to deny women the liberty of having many men, neither would he allow them to quit their huſbands, though troubleſome, without their conſent (86). He ordained, that a woman divorced ſhould marry again but twice; and that, if ſhe was divorced from the third huſband, and the firſt would not take her again, ſhe ſhould never marry all her life-time (87). He was ſo far from permitting them to ſhow their breaſts, or even their neck, that he would not ſuffer their feet to be ſeen, but only by their huſband. *Mulieres itaque bonæ ſe curent, ne lunaticum aſpiciant, ſuoque peplo tegentes collum & pectus, omnemque ſuam pulchritudinem, niſi quantum apparere neceſſitas coget, celent omnibus, ſpeciemque pedum etiam eundo, niſi maritis ſuis* (88). But it is true, that in this, he only retained the cuſtom obſerved in Arabia; for we learn from Tertullian, that the women of that country did thus cover their faces, ſo that they could make uſe of but one eye. 'Judicabunt vos Arabiæ fœminæ Ethnicæ, quæ non caput, ſed faciem quoque ita totam tegunt, ut uno oculo liberato contente ſint dimidiam frui lucem quàm totam faciem proſtituere (89). - - - - - *The Pagan women of Arabia ſhall judge you; for they cover, not their head only, but their whole face, in ſuch a manner, that, with one eye only at liberty, they chuſe rather to enjoy but half the light, than expoſe their whole face to view.*' I believe it is a miſtake (90) to ſay, that Mahomet permitted men to marry as many women as they would; for he does ſo moderate and limit his permiſſion, that it plainly appears he had no mind they ſhould marry above four, and that he allowed them ſo many provided they thought themſelves capable of keeping them peaceable. *Quotcunque placuerit, duas ſcilicet, aut tres vel quatuor uxores ducite, niſi timueritis eas pacificare poſſe* (91). But it is no miſtake to affirm, that he ſet no bounds to the number of their concubines. And indeed the Turks may have as many as they are capable of maintaining. Is not the condition of the four wives deplorable, under a law which gives the huſband power to divert what is their due to as many handſome ſlaves as he can buy. Doth not this diverſion of the matrimonial ſtock reduce them to the greateſt want, and to an extreme indigence. Let no one tell me of the proviſion the law has made for them, by appointing the four wives to lie once every week with their huſband. 'So that if any one has not enjoyed this privilege for a whole week ſhe has a right to demand it on thurſday night in the following week, and ſhe may proſecute her huſband, in the courts of juſtice, in caſe of a refuſal (92).' For notwithſtanding this privilege, the law is very harſh, a law, I ſay, which reduces that to a ſmall proportion, which would ſcarce ſuffice, if it were entire, and which may ſo eaſily be broke through. A fine ſatisfaction indeed for the party offended; to obtain one ſingle night in return for a week loſt, beſides the trouble of citing him before the judges, and engaging in a proſecution ſo nice, and ſo contrary to modeſty. And what pleaſure can any one take in a matter of this nature, when it is obtained only by the execution of a ſentence from the magiſtrate? This ought not to be a work that is commanded, *nihil hæc ad edictum Prætoris:* when it is done only by way of duty, *perfunctoriè, & dicis cauſa*, there can be no great ſatisfaction in it. We muſt therefore confeſs, that Mahomet did not uſe the ſex well.

But, here follow more ſtrange things: for he did not only make women miſerable in this world, but deprived them of the joys of paradiſe. He did not only exclude them from that place, but he turned that joy into an occaſion of ſorrow to them: for it is pretended, he taught, that the pleaſures of marriage, which men ſhall enjoy after this life, ſhall be furniſhed them by Virgins of a raviſhing beauty, which God has created in heaven, and which are deſtined for them from eternity: and as to women, that they ſhall not enter into paradiſe, nor approach nearer to it, than is neceſſary to diſcover, a-croſs the paliſades, what ſhall be done there. Thus their eyes ſhall be witneſſes of the happineſs of men, and of the pleaſure they ſhall take with theſe celeſtial maids. What can be imagined more grievous? Is not this to be ingenious in mortifying our neighbour: Lucretius tells us, that it is pleaſant to ſee a ſhipwreck, which we are not in fear of.

Suave mari magno turbantibus æquora ventis,
E terra, magnum alterius ſpectare laborem.
Non quia vexari quemquam eſt jucunda voluptas;
Sed quibus ipſe malis careas, quia cernere ſuave
eſt (93).

'Tis pleaſant, when the ſeas are rough, to ſtand,
And view another's danger, ſafe at land,
Not that it gives us joy his pains to ſee,
But to behold thoſe ills, from which our ſelves are
free (94).

It is quite the reverſe, in Mahomet's ſyſtem, for the women; the ſight of a happineſs, of which they are deprived muſt needs afflict them, and it will be ſo much the more grievous to them, as well becauſe it will diſcover the pleaſures, which another enjoys, as becauſe they will ſee the happineſs, which they themſelves want; for the torment of jealouſy proceeds not ſo much from the want of a thing, as from knowing that others enjoy it. I have heard many people ſay, and I think I have even read it, that the damned ſhall have a very exact idea of the happineſs of paradiſe, that ſo the knowledge of the great joys, which they have miſſed, may augment their deſpair, and that the devil ſhall make uſe of this artifice, to render them more miſerable. Here we may apply theſe verſes of Perſius,

Magne pater Divûm, ſævos punire Tyrannos
Haud aliâ ratione velis, cùm dira libido
Moverit ingenium, ferventi tincta veneno:
Virtutem videant, intabeſcantque relictâ (95).

Great father of the gods, when, for our crimes,
Thou ſend'ſt ſome heavy judgment on the times;
Some tyrant king, the terror of his age,
The type and true vicegerent of thy rage;
Thus puniſh him: ſet virtue in his ſight,
With all her charms adorn'd with all her graces bright:
But ſet her diſtant, make him pale to ſee
His gains out-weigh'd by loſt felicity!
DRYDEN.

This is to underſtand very well the way of heightning the pains of the miſerable: and therefore we may
ſay

---

(83) Cornelius Uythagius, in Anti-chriſto Mahomete, *p.* 276.

(84) Quæ ſi forte præcepta non obſervaverint, à vobis correctæ & caſtigatæ, in domibus lectiſve detentæ verberentur, uſque quo veſtris nutibus & præceptis pareant. *Alcor. Surat.* 9.

(85) Quando illæ non amplius tibi placent, commutare eas licet. *Ib. Surat.* 8.

(86) Mulier ad fugam ſe præparans invito marito recuperetur ab eo. *Ib. Surat.* 3.

(87) Ibid.

(88) Ibid. Surat. 34.

(89) Tertul. *de Virginibus velandis.*

(90) See Ricaut's *State of the Ottoman Empire, lib. ii, chap. xxi*, and the notes of Beſpier.

(91) Alcor. Surat. 8.

(92) Ricaut. *ib. pag.* 457.

(93) Lucret. lib. II, init.

(94) See *Sentimens de Cleanthe, pag. m.* 36.

(95) Perſius, Sat. III, ver. 36.

ſufficient to his purpoſe. Perhaps he feared the Perſian women [*R*], becauſe he intended to eſtabliſh a Code full of ſeverity towards the women. Nevertheleſs, he had a moſt violent deſire to enjoy them, and ſome very notable things are related of his vigour in this reſpect [*S*]. His lewdneſs was doubtleſs the cauſe why he permitted Polygamy under ſome

ſay in a word, that Mahomet could not have diſcovered his cruelty more maliciouſly; for he would have women ſee, at a diſtance, that which can only create unprofitable temptations, and inſupportable grief.

But, to repreſent the matter as it really is, I muſt acquaint you, that the learned Mahometans do not ſay, that the women are excluded from paradiſe (96); yet I thought I might relate what I had read in many authors. I ſhall cite one of them. ‘ Haſce mulieres ſtatuunt non humanas atque ex hominibus genitas, ſed ab æterno in hunc finem à Deo creatas, & cœleſtes eſſe; ſuas enim quas hic habuerunt Muhammedani mulieres ſtatuunt exſortes fore Paradiſi, atque extra eum foris conſtitutas, per cancellos eminus virorum gaudia, & cum aliis ſc. uxoribus congreſſus conſpecturas. Longe plures ibi credunt fore mulieres, quam viros, ſinguliſque viris plures vel pauciores pro merito addendas, quibus non ad prolem, ſed unice ad lubitum & ſatietatem voluptatis uſuri ſint; quin & vires iis ſubminiſtrandas majores eum in finem, ut ſæpius coïre poſſint, eaſque eundem in finem fore mundas à menſtruis (97). - - - - - *They pretend, that theſe women are not human, or born of men, but that they are of celeſtial race, and created from eternity for this purpoſe: for the Mahometans ſay, that the wives, which they had in this world, will not be admitted into paradiſe, but, being placed without, will ſee at a diſtance, thro' the paliſades, the pleaſures their huſbands take in the embraces of other wives. They believe, there will be many more women there than men; and that each man will have more or fewer in proportion to his merit; whom they will enjoy, not for the propagation of the ſpecies, but only for pleaſure, and to ſatisfy their luſt; and that their ſtrength will be greater, for the ſake of more frequent coition, and that the women for that end will be free from diſorders.*’ This author quotes no body and had juſt before cited ſome paſſages of the Alcoran, which teach us only that the ladies of paradiſe ſhall have very ſparkling eyes, of the bigneſs of an egg, and that they ſhall be ſo modeſt, that they ſhall never look upon any man but their own huſbands (98). It is not therefore in the Alcoran, that we find what this author relates concerning theſe women; *viz.* that they ſhall be more numerous than men, that every man may have two or three, or more, proportionably to his merit; that they ſhall be given only for pleaſure, and not for bearing of children; that they ſhall always be in a condition to ſatisfy their huſbands, being never ſubject to the menſtrual flux, as the Phyſicians call it; that they ſhall be ſo beautiful and bright, that one of them would be ſufficient to illuminate the whole earth in the night-time, that if they were to ſpit into the ſea, they would quite take away it's ſaltneſs. *Tanta iſtarum puellarum deprædicatur pulchritudo & gratia, ut ſi iſtarum modo una aliquando noctu in terrâ appareret, totam eam facile eſſet colluſtratura; vel ſi in mare forte diſpueret, totam ejus ſalſedinem extingueret, inque mel dulciſſimum commutaret* (99). I have met with part of theſe things in a letter of Clenard; but this is only the opinion of a private perſon, and ſo this cannot be juſtly charged upon the whole body of Mahometiſm. ‘ Audi quæſo, *they are the words of Clenard,* quod hic mihi narravit præceptor dum legeremus locum Alcorani de Paradiſo, ubi ſic ſcriptum eſt, *& eo uxores habituri ſunt mundas. Mundas* inquit, *id eſt, liberas à menſtruis, ſcilicet ut quovis tempore liceat coire.* Quid inquam, an in paradiſo celebrabuntur nuptialia? *Quid ni? Attamen non eſt futura proles,* inquit. *Nam voluptatis cauſa illic erunt uxores non propagandis liberis, quin & ſingulis viris complures illic futuræ ſunt uxores, pro meritorum ratione. Deuſque huic plus, illi minus virium largiturus eſt, ut vel paucis vel multis reddat debitum* (100). - - - *Hear, I pray you, what my tutor told me, whilſt we were reading the part of the Alcoran, relating to Paradiſe, where it is written*; and there they will have wives that are clean. Clean, *ſaid he*, that is free from the menſes, for the ſake of coition at any time. *What, ſaid I, will they marry in Paradiſe?* Why not? But no off-ſpring will follow it; *ſaid he.* For wives there will be intended for pleaſure, not for propagation; and every man will have many wives, in proportion to his merit. And God will give this man more, and that leſs, ſtrength, for the ſatisfying of more or fewer women.’ Let us make the ſame remark as to what I am going to ſay. We ought not to impute it to Mahomet, as Peter Belonius does. They are fables, or falſe gloſſes, of ſome viſionary or burleſquing doctors. ‘ After the Turks have eaten and drunk their fill in this Paradiſe, then the pages, being adorned with gold and precious ſtones, and rings upon their arms, hands, legs and ears, ſhall come to the Turks, each of them holding a handſome diſh in his hand, with a great citron or lemon in it, which the Turks ſhall take, to ſmell to; and, on a ſudden, when each Turk ſhall put it to his noſe, there ſhall come forth a beautiful virgin, well accoutred and adorned, who ſhall embrace the Turk, as the Turk ſhall do her; and thus they ſhall remain fifty years in mutual embraces, without ſtirring, or parting from each other taking all ſorts of pleaſure, that a man can enjoy with a woman. And after fifty years, God will ſay unto them, (oh my ſervants) ſince you have had great feaſting in my Paradiſe, I will now ſhow you my face. Then he ſhall take away the veil from his face; but the Turks ſhall be ſtruck to the ground by the brightneſs that ſhall proceed from it; and God ſhall ſay unto them: ariſe, you my ſervants, and enjoy my glory? for you ſhall never die, nor be ſad, or diſpleaſed any more. And lifting up their heads, they ſhall ſee God face to face; and then every one, taking his virgin again, ſhall lead her into a chamber in the palace, where he ſhall find meat and drink; and having feaſted, and taken his pleaſure with his virgin, he ſhall paſs away his time merrily, without any fear of death. This is what Mahomet has related of his Paradiſe, with ſeveral other ſuch like fooleries; which makes us think, that the original of the Turkiſh ſeraglio's is derived from what Mahomet ſays of the pages and virgins of Paradiſe: for he ſays, that the chaſt virgins were thus created by God in Paradiſe, and are well guarded, and ſhut up within walls. And Mahomet ſays, that if one of them ſhould go forth out of the ſeraglio of Paradiſe at midnight, ſhe would enlighten the whole world like the ſun, and if one of them ſhould ſpit into the ſea, the water of it would become as ſweet as honey (101).

[*R*] *He feared the Perſian women.*] A modern author (102), without quoting any body, informs me, that this ſeducer confeſſed, ‘ that the ſole apprehenſion of the women of Perſia was the cauſe that he did not go into that country, ſince they were ſo full of charms, that the angels themſelves might fall in love with, and be overcome by them.’ Probably he feared, leſt they ſhould regulate his pen, and his pretended revelations, and make him publiſh laws too effeminate (103), which would have very much decried him; for he was very ſenſible, that his unchaſt actions gave great ſcandal. See the margin (104).

[*S*] *Some very notable things are related of his vigour in reſpect to women.*] Authors do not agree as to the number of his wives; but it is pretty generally agreed, that he had ſeveral at a time, and that he performed his conjugal duty with great vigour (105). ‘ You may ſee in Abul-faragius, that he had, according to ſome, to the number of ſeventeen wives, beſides miſtreſſes which he kept . . . . (106) It will not be very difficult to believe him (107) a ſaint in their way, when you know, that he married but fourteen wives; and that this great devotion was little more than three degrees below that of Mahomet, who had ſeventeen wives, beſides miſtreſſes, who were overjoyed to contribute to the diverſion of their great Prophet. It is true, that Ali was leſs vigorous than his father-in-law, who boaſted, that he performed marriage-duties every night, and that he had received, by ſpecial privilege, the ſtrength of forty men, on that occaſion.’ Let us ſee Mr Beſpier's note upon what Sir Paul Ricaut has ſaid (108), that Mahomet had nine wives,

(96) See the article HALI-BEIG, remark [*C*].

(97) Hoornbeek, Summa Controverſ. pag. 175.

(98) Fruentur fœminis quibus oculi clariſſimi grandeſque ut ova, quos non ad alios quam maritos ſuos erigent. *Surat.* 48. Ducturi virgines decentiſſimas cum oculis immenſis atque pudibundis nuſquam niſi tantum ad maritos ſuos flectendis. *Surat.* 62.

(99) Hoornbeek, ubi ſupra.

(100) Clenard, Epiſtol. lib. i, pag. 42.

(101) Peter Belonius, ubi infra, book iii, ch. ix, pag. 392.

(102) La Mothe le Vayer, *Letter cxiv, Tom. xii, pag.* 11, 12.

(103) That is, too favourable to the female ſex, as it is ſaid of ſome laws of Juſtinian, whoſe wife had very great credit.

(104) Theſe words are to be found in Brantome, *Dames Galantes, Tom. i, pag.* 304. The Moors have an antient and common proverb, that their prophet Mahomet would never go to Seiras, leſt, if he ſhould ſee one of the beautiful women there, his ſoul ſhould not enter into Paradiſe after his death.

(105) Chevreau's Hiſtory of the World, *lib. v, pag. m.* 14.

(106) Ibid. *pag.* 19.

(107) That is, *Ali.*

(108) The Preſent State of the Ottoman Empire, *Tom. ii, p.* 456.

ſome reſtraints, and concubinage without any bounds (*k*). He durſt not be the only perſon, who ſhould enjoy that privilege, though, as to Inceſt, he had the boldneſs to forbid it to his followers, and to allow it to himſelf by a ſpecial privilege [*T*]. Mr Moreri relates

(*k*) *See the remark* [*Q*].

wives, and Ali fourteen. ‘ John Andreas, in the ſame page, at the beginning of chap. vii, of the confuſion of the ſect of Mahomet, ſays, that Mahomet had nine wives at once, beſides ſlaves; and in the ſame place he ſays, that he had eleven wives, and proves it by a book, which he calls *Aſſameil*, which is, ſays he, the book of the good cuſtoms of Mahomet (109).’ The words, which John Andreas cites out of this book, ſignify, that Mahomet was a man of ſo great vigour, that in an hour's time he could know his eleven wives. *Robur ejus, ſuper eum pax, tantum erat ut viſitaret (circumiret) uxores ſuas unius horæ ſpatio, licet undecim forent.* Baudier (110) has given Mahomet fifteen wives beſides ſlaves. Elmacin ſpeaks only of three wives of Mahomet; but he omits the firſt, who was dead before he married the other three. ‘ I believe, there is no certainty, ſays Beſpier, as to the number of Mahomet's wives, and much leſs as to Ali's, of whom I have not read to this day, that he married any other wife beſides the only daughter of Mahomet, called Fatima (111).’ Mr Pfeiffer relates, that this falſe Prophet *took ſeventeen wives according to ſome, and twenty one according to others* (112). This would not be very ſtrange; but what Belon relates, and I have already mentioned, is extraordinary. ‘ It is written in an Arabian book, *ſays he* (113), intituled, The Good Cuſtoms of Mahomet, which praiſes his virtues and his bodily ſtrength, that he boaſted of lying with eleven women, one after another, in one and the ſame hour (114).’ Many here will call to mind Brother Fredon of Rabelais (115). I know not what to think of the tale, that Mahomet had to do with his aſs. ‘ Turcarum Legiſlator Mahumetes aſellam qua vehebatur ex indomito libidinis ardore compreſſit (116). - - - *Mahomet, the legiſlator of the Turks, through an immoderate luſt, lay with a ſhe-aſs, which he rode on.*’

[*T*] *He durſt not be the only perſon, who ſhould enjoy that privilege; though as to inceſt, he had the boldneſs . . . . to allow it to himſelf by a ſpecial privilege.*] To colour his incontinence, which moved him to marry ſeveral wives, he forged a revelation from God, that this was allowed. He muſt therefore inſert this article in his Alcoran; but becauſe his ſervant-maids pleaſed him, and he lay with them, therefore he ſtood in need of a new revelation in favour of adultery; and ſo it was neceſſary he ſhould make a diſtinct article of the concubinage of huſbands. He had but two wives, when Marina, his ſervant-maid, a very pretty laſs, pleaſed him ſo well, that he lay with her, before ſhe came to a marriageable age. His wives ſurpriſed him in the very fact, and were tranſported with rage againſt him. He ſwore to them, that he would never return to her any more if they would keep it ſecret; but, becauſe he broke his oath, they made a great noiſe, and went away from his houſe. To remove this great ſcandal, he feigned a voice from heaven, which informed him that it was lawful for him to have to do with his ſervant-maids. Thus this impoſtor begun with committing a crime, and finiſhed with converting it into a general law. This does not at all ſavourof Fanaticiſm. A good touch-ſtone to diſcover whether thoſe who boaſt of inſpiration, either to give out new prophecies, or to explain the old, ſuch as the Apocalypſe, act ſincerely, is, to examine whether their doctrine changes proportionably as the times change, and as their own peculiar intereſt becomes different from what it was before (117). *Id quoque notandum* (I make uſe of the authority of a famous Divine (118), *leges iſtas in ſuorum facinorum patrocinium excogitatas ab ipſo ſemper fuiſſe poſt commiſſa illa, non ante; ut ita manifeſtiſſimè liqueat, iſta in criminum ſuorum excuſationem vel defenſionem ab eo commenta dolo peſſimo fuiſſe.* (119) *Tale iſtud quod de Muhammede narrant, eum cum puellâ formosâ, ſed infra ætatem, Marinâ in adulterio deprehenſum fuiſſe, à conjugibus ſuis Aaſâ & Chadighâ juramento adactum promiſiſſe, modo tacerent, ab iſthac puellâ poſthac abſtenturum; verum quod non ſervarit: quare illæ eum deſeruerint, & ad patrias reverſæ ſint ædes. Quem tumultum ut ſedaret iterum, more ſolito, divinum commentus hoc reſponſum fuit, quod eſt capi* de prohibitione, *quo datur viris cum ancillis congrediendi poteſtas (ancilla quippe Muhammedis erat etiam illa Marina), quando & quouſque libuerit, nequidquam reclamantibus & æmulantibus uxoribus. Sed jam ante hanc confictam legem id facinus commiſerat, & fidem de non committendo interpoſuerat, perjurus adulter & ſtuprator* (120). With an impudence, that cannot be ſufficiently admired, he forged, that God forbid inceſt to other men, but allowed it him by a peculiar grace. ‘ Aliis ſevere ipſe interdicit, cap. *de mulieribus*, ne quaſcunque & conſanguineas ducant; *ne commiſceamini cum mulieribus, quæ cognitæ fuerunt à Patribus veſtris, quoniam turpe eſt & malum, & iniquum: prohibitæ ſunt vobis matres veſtræ, & filiæ veſtræ, & amitæ veſtræ, & pratrueles veſtræ, & filiæ fratris veſtri, & filiæ ſororis veſtræ*, &c. Sibi vero licentiam tribuit quaſi ex oraculo divino, quam libet potiundi, cap. *de hæreſibus*, vel ſectis. *O Propheta, nos certe concedimus tibi*, inquit ei Deus, *poteſtatem in uxores tuas omnes quibus dederis mercedes ſuas, & quaſcunque acceperit manus tua, & filias patrui tui, & filias amitæ tuæ, & filias fratris matris tuæ, & filias materteræ tuæ, quæ peregrinatæ ſunt tecum, & quamcunque mulierem credentem, quæ ſe tibi Prophetæ proſtituere voluerit, idque tibi ſpeciatim, & ſingulariter conceditur; non verò aliis quibuſcunque.* Dignum certe Prophetâ privilegium! Et poſt: *copulare cum quacunque ex illis tibi libuerit, & tecum fac inhabitare quamcunque volueris, & non erit tibi crimini, vel ad hanc accedere, vel ab illâ recedere. Hoc autem parum eſt: verum etiam gratum habeant ipſæ quicquid tibi libuerit, & non contriſtentur, & complaceant ſibi de quacunque re quam illis dederis.* Propudium hominis! ſibi primas in promiſcuâ & turpiſſimâ libidine explendâ concedens partes (121). - - - *He forbids others, under ſevere penalties, in his chapter* of women, *to marry within the degree of conſanguinity:* mix not with women, which have been known by your fathers, becauſe it is baſe, evil, and unjuſt: your mothers, your daughters, your aunts, and couſins, are forbidden you, &c. *But he indulges himſelf in the enjoyment of any one, as it were by authority from heaven, in his chapter* of hereſies or ſects. O Prophet, *ſays God, to him*, we give thee power over all thy wives, to whom thou ſhalt pay their hire, and whomſoever thou ſhalt take unto thee, whether they be the daughters of thy uncle, or the daughters of thy aunt, or the daughters of thy mother's brother, or the daughters of thy mother-in-law, which have journied with thee, and every woman, that is a believer, and is willing to proſtitute herſelf to thee a prophet: and this privilege is granted to thee in a ſpecial and peculiar manner; but not to other men. *A privilege worthy the prophet! And after:* you may lie with what woman you pleaſe, and make whom you pleaſe cohabit with you; and it ſhall be no crime in you, to approach this woman, or depart from that; and let them not lay it to heart, but be contented with what you ſhall give them. *Incontinent, ſhameleſs, wretch! to indulge himſelf principally in ſatisfying a promiſcuous and moſt ſcandalous luſt!*’ He durſt not always ſtretch his prerogative, for he ſaid, he was forbid, for the future, to take away his neighbour's wife. He was contented to tell the world, that God approved what was paſt, provided he did not relapſe into it again. For the better underſtanding of this, we muſt know, that Mahomet had already married nine wives, and then eſpouſed a tenth, which he took from his ſervant. They murmured at it. The ſervant exclaimed againſt the injury. The falſe prophet, to put a ſtop to the ſcandal, made a ſhew of deſiring to reſtore what he had taken; but, becauſe he had not really a mind to it, he quickly found out a way to diſpenſe with it. He feigned, that God had cenſured this reſolution, and had ordered him to keep his tenth wife, without paying any deference to human ſcandal, to the prejudice of a celeſtial approbation. ‘ Illam (*uxorem ſervi ſui Zaidis*) conſtupratam mox quaſi ex divino iterum oraculo deſponſavit in uxorem, quamvis novem aliis ſtipatus. Quare ut, tum aliis hoc indignantibus factum, tum ſervo Zaidi ſatisfaceret, introducit in Alkorano, capite citato, Deum ſe reprehendentem, quod cogitaſſet uxorem

(109) Beſpier's Curious Remarks, Tom. ii, pag. 681.

(110) Of the religion of the Turks, book i, ch. ii, apud Beſpier, *ibid. pag.* 682.

(111) Beſpier, *ib.*

(112) Pfeiffer, *in Theologiæ Mohammedicæ principiis ſubleſtis*, in the Bibliotheque Univerſelle. *Tom. vii, pag.* 257.

(113) Belon's Obſervations of many Rarities; *book iii, ch. x, pag. m.* 404, and not in ch. ix, as la Mothe le Vayer cites him, *Letter xc, pag.* 272, of *Tom. xi.*

(114) See the remark [*II*].

(115) By the oath you have taken, how many times do you commonly do it in a day? *Fr.* ſix. *Pan.* and how oft by night? *Fr.* 10. Says brother John, this whore-maſter counts it ſhameful to exceed ſixteen times. *Rabelais lib. v, cap. xxviii.*

(116) Balthaſar Bonifacius, Hiſt. Ludicra lib. ii, cap. vii, pag. 39, He cites *Bonſinius deciſ.* (probably he means *decad.*) *i, lib. viii.*

(117) See the remark [*NN*].

(118) Hoornbeek, ubi ſupra, pag. 117.

(119) Id. ib. pag. 118.

(120) The author refers us to John Andreas, *Confuſ. Muham. cap. vii*, to Philip Guadagnol, *contra Ahmedum Perſam, cap. v, ſect. iii, & cap. x, ſect, ii, & iii*, and to Vincentius Lirinenſis, *Specul. Hiſtor. lib. xxiv.* He ſhould have ſaid *Vincentius Bellovacenſis.*

(121) Hoornbeek, ubi ſupra, pag. 116.

relates a ſtory, to which he forgot to add an eſſential circumſtance, which is, concerning the man that was ſmothered with ſtones in a dry well [*U*]. One of the moſt impertinent lyes, that have been publiſhed concerning Mahomet, is, that he was a cardinal [*X*]. There are ſome Doctors, even in the communion of the Proteſtants, who have taken him for Anti-chriſt [*Y*]. I cannot believe, that his dead body was eaten by dogs

‘ Zaido reddere, ob offenſam, quam hinc nempe homines capiebant : *Et cum diceres illi, cui Deus beneficia contulit, & tu quoque contuliſti : accipe tibi uxorem tuam, & time Deum, & abſcondebas in corde tuo quod Deus operebatur, & timebas homines, & Deus dignior eſt ut timeas eum. Cum ergo Zaidus illam cognoverit, ſeu defloraverit eam, nos copulavimus eam tibi, ne ſit fidelibus peccatum in uxoribus deſideriorum eorum, cum cognoverint eas, & imperium Dei completum eſt : non eſt imputandum ad culpam prophetæ illud, quod Deus illi ſpeciatim permiſit* (122). - - *Having debauched the wife of his man Zaid, he afterwards married her, pretending a divine command, tho' he had already nine wives. Wherefore, to ſatisfy others, who murmured at the action, as well as his ſervant Zaid, he introduces* GOD, *in the ſame chapter of the Alcoran, reproving him for intending to reſtore to Zaid his wife, becauſe of the ſcandal it gave the world.* And when you ſay to him, on whom GOD hath beſtowed favours, you have alſo beſtowed them : take unto you your wife, and fear GOD ; and you hid in your heart what GOD wrought, and you had reſpect unto men, and GOD is more worthy to be reſpected. Since therefore Zaid has known, or deflowered her, we have joined her unto you, leſt the faithful ſhould ſin in the wives of their deſires, when they ſhall know them, and the will of GOD is fulfilled : what GOD has eſpecially granted to the prophet, is not to be imputed to him as a crime.’ He was very ſenſible, this would alarm all huſbands againſt him ; and therefore, to ſatiſfy every body, he publiſhed, that, for the future, by the order of GOD, he would let huſbands enjoy their own wives, tho' he ſhould fall in love with them (123).

[*U*] *A man . . . was ſmothered with ſtones in a dry well.*] This ſtory is found at the end of a long paſſage of the *Coups d'Etat*, which I ſhall now cite, and which contains ſeveral things concerning our falſe prophet (124). ‘ Finding himſelf very ſubject to the Falling-ſickneſs, he made his friends believe, that the moſt violent paroxyſms of his Epilepſy were ſo many ecſtaſies, and ſigns of the ſpirit of GOD, that deſcended on him : he perſuaded them alſo, that a white pigeon, which came to pick grains of corn in his ear, was the angel Gabriel, who came to declare to him, in the name of the ſame GOD, what he was to do. After this, *he made uſe of the monk Sergius, to compoſe an Alcoran, which he feigned to be dictated to him by the very mouth of* GOD. *Laſtly, he ſent for a famous Aſtrologer, to diſpoſe the people*, by his predictions, to the change of affairs, that was to happen, and the new law, that a great prophet was to eſtabliſh, the more eaſily to receive his, when he came to publiſh it. But perceiving once, that his ſecretary, Abdala Ben-Salon, againſt whom he had a groundleſs pique, began to diſcover, and publiſh ſuch impoſtures, he cut his throat one night in his own houſe, and ſet fire to the four corners of it, with a deſign to perſuade the people, next morning, that this happened by a fire from heaven, to chaſtiſe the ſaid ſecretary, who had attempted to change and corrupt ſome paſſages of the Alcoran. Nevertheleſs, this contrivance was not thought ſufficient to his purpoſe, he wanted ſtill one to perfect the myſtery ; which he did, by perſuading one of his faithfulleſt domeſtics, to deſcend to the bottom of a pit, which was near a great high-way, and to cry aloud, when he ſhould paſs by in company of the great multitude which commonly followed him, *Mahomet is the well-beloved of God! Mahomet is the well-beloved of God!* And this being done in the manner he had propoſed, he preſently thanked the Divine Goodneſs for a teſtimony ſo remarkable, and prayed all the people, that followed him, inſtantly to fill up the pit, and build over it a little moſque, in memory of ſuch a miracle ; by which means this poor domeſtic was preſently killed, and buried under a ſhower of ſtones ; and ſo there was no poſſible way left of diſcovering the falſhood of this miracle, *Excepit ſed terra ſonum, calamique loquaces* (125).’ Naudé forgot to tell us, how the public was informed, that Mahomet had ſuborned this man. Why had he not the wit to ſuppoſe, that this wretch had revealed the whole ſecret to his wife, who did not fail to tell her neighbours, and paſſengers, after ſhe was made acquainted with the tragical end of her huſband. The Latin words, which Naudé cites, are only an ingenious application of a circumſtance of the fable of Midas ; but it no ways clears this matter, nay rather it inſinuates, that he was not able to find out how this contrivance came to be diſcovered. As to the pigeon, mentioned by Naudé, I muſt inform you, that Dr Pocock, having read the ſtory in the 6th book of Grotius, *de Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ* (126), deſired Grotius to acquaint him from whence he had taken that particular, which is not be found in any Arabian author. He anſwered, that he had related it only upon the credit of the Chriſtian authors. *Grotius nonnulla recenſens columbæ ad Mohammedis aurem advolare ſolitæ meminit ; cujus cum nullam apud eos mentionem repererim, ac clariſ. virum ea de re conſulerem, ſe in hoc narrando non Mohammediſtarum, ſed noſtrorum hominum fide nixum, dixit, ac præcipuè Scaligeri, in cujus ad Manilium notis idem narratur* (127). See the remark [*DD*].

[*X*] *It has been ſaid, that he was a cardinal.*] ‘ Benevenuto of Imola has ſaid it expreſsly, in his commentaries upon Dante (128).’ Which is no leſs abſurd than what was ſaid by him, who wrote the gloſs upon the canon-law, that Mahomet was the head of the Nicolaitans. *Gloſſatorem autem Corporis Canonici qui Nicolaum Mahometum fuiſſe dicit æque abſurdum eſſe notat ac Benevenutum Imolenſem, qui Mahometum Sanctæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ Cardinalem fuiſſe aſſerit* (129).

[*Y*] *Some doctors have taken him for Antichriſt.*] See a diſſertation, intituled, *Anti-Chriſtus Mahometes, ubi non ſolum per S. Scripturam, ac Reformatorum teſtimonia, verum etiam per omnes alios probandi modos & genera, plenè, fuſè, invictè, ſolidéque demonſtratur* MAHOMETEM *eſſe Unum illum verum, Magnum, de quo in ſacris fit mentio, Anti-Chriſtum.* It was printed (130) in the year 1666. Cornelius Uythagius, a doctor of Divinity, who is the author of it, and diſcovers a great zeal againſt Popery, affirms, in his preface, that he only unfolds and confirms the opinion of ſome reformers. ‘ Sunt, ſemperque fuerunt, *ſays he*, qui Mahometem pro Anti-Chriſto illo magno agnoverunt, & per Babylonem civitatem illam magnam Apoc. cap. xvii. nobis deſcriptam, Conſtantinopolim, Romam Novam intellexerunt, inter quos ſunt, antiquiſſimus Theologorum Arethas Cæſareæ Cappadociæ Epiſcopus : Angelus Græcus, qui Conſtantinopli vixit : Cœlius Secundus Curio : Wenceſlaus Budowez Cæſaris conciliarius, qui aliquandiù Conſtantinopli degit : Boſkhierus ; & inter noſtros Reformatus magnus ille Melanthon, Bucerus, Muſculus, Zanchius : & ſi qui cum recentiores, tum antiqui cum illis. - - - *There are, and ever have been, thoſe, who have acknowledged Mahomet to be the Anti-Chriſt, and by Babylon, that great city deſcribed to us in the Revelation, ch. 17, have underſtood Conſtantinople, the New Rome : among whom are, the moſt antient of Divines Arethas biſhop of Cæſarea in Cappadocia, Angelus Græcus, who lived at Conſtantinople ; Cœlius Secundus Curio, Wenceſlaus Budowez, counſellor of the Emperor, who lived ſome time at Conſtantinople ; Boſkhierus ; and among our reformed the great Melancthon, Bucer, Muſculus, Zanchius ; and other Divines, both antient and modern.*’ The biſhop of Meaux names other writers, who are of that opinion : his words are theſe : ‘ If every thing muſt be referred to the end of the world, and to the time of Antichriſt, would ſo many learned men of the laſt age, as Annius Viterbienſis, John Hantenius of Mechlen, and our doctors Jodocus Clitoveus, Genebrard, and Feuardentius, who praiſes and follows thoſe grave authors, have been permitted to diſcover the beaſt and Antichriſt in Mahomet, and Enoch and Elias to be the two witneſſes of St John (131) ?’

---

(122) Id. ib. *pag.* 117.

(123) Non licebit tibi poſthac, O *Mahomet*, ut auferas uxores à viris ſuis, etiamſi earum pulchritudine captus fueris. *Apud eundem, ib.*

(124) Naudé, Coups d'Etat, *cap. iii, pag. m.* 322.

(125) The Hiſtory of this man, who was ſmothered with ſtones in a well, is to be found in another book of Naudé, *viz.* in the *Apology of the Great Men accuſed of Magic, pag.* 232, 233.

(126) Pag. m. 202.

(127) Edw. Pocockius, Not. in Specim. Hiſtor. Arabum, *pag.* 186, 187.

(128) Naudé, Dial. de Maſcurat. pag. 45.

(129) Thomas Ittigius, *de Hæreſiarchis ævi Apoſtolici, apud Acta Erudit. Leipſ.* ann. 1690, *pag.* 307, 308.

(130) *At* Amſterdam, apud Joannem Raveſteynium, in 12mo.

(131) Biſhop of Meaux, Preface upon the Apocalypſe, *num. xiii, pag. m.* 32, 33.

dogs [Z], as ſeveral have affirmed; and Father Loüis Maracci had juſt occaſion to obſerve, That the Chriſtians throw out ſome reproaches againſt the ſect of Mahomet, which proceed from ſo great an ignorance of matters of fact, that the infidels laugh at them, and grow more obſtinate in their infidelity (*l*). There has been publiſhed a Teſtament, under the name of Mahomet [*AA*], which has very much the air of a forgery:

(*l*) Eſſe etiam in illis dicit qui ex rerum Turcicarum ignorantia in medium proferant quæ riſum potius Mahumetanis excitent, ac in errere eos obſtinatiores reddant. *Lud. Maraccius è congregatione Clericorum Regularium Matris Dei, in prodromo ad refutationem Alcorani, apud Acta Erudit. Lipſ.* 1692, *pag.* 329.

[Z] *I cannot believe that his dead body was eaten by dogs.*] Camerarius has inſerted this ſtory in his Hiſtorical Meditations (132). He quotes his author. *Mahomet had foretold to his diſciples, that he ſhould depart out of this world in the tenth year of his reign, but that on the third day he ſhould riſe again. Whereupon, one of his diſciples, having amind to try whether he ſpoke truth, poiſoned his drink; and he having drunk it off, and finding himſelf near his end, ſaid to thoſe that were about him,* By water ye ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins; *and then on a ſudden he died. His diſciples guarded the body, expecting the iſſue of his prediction; but it ſtunk ſo, that they could not endure the ſmell of it, and ſo they went away, and returning after ten days, they found it had been eaten by dogs. I was willing to tranſcribe this ſtory from the Spaniſh chronicle, written by John Vaſæus, who ſays, that he had it from an author called Lucas Tudenſis: becauſe I do not remember that I had read it elſewhere.* I find in Vaſæus, that he relates this under the year 628, and cites Lucas Tudenſis, with ſome limitation; *hæc fere Lucas Tudenſis*, ſays he. Baronius has inſerted in his annals (133) a fragment of the apology of Eulogius, an author of the VIIIth century. There are in this fragment many little tales, and, among the reſt, that which I have juſt now related; but it is there, with a circumſtance that deſerves to be known; which is, that Mahomet had aſſured his diſciples, that the angel Gabriel would come to raiſe him on the third day. They continued about the body all that time, and then they retired, imagining that their preſence frighted the angels; but, when no body guarded the body, the dogs came and eat it, and left but very little of it, which was buried by the diſciples of this impoſtor; and, in revenge for this affront, they put to death every year a great number of dogs. Baronius refers us to ſeveral volumes, that have been written concerning the life of Mahomet; and he confeſſes, that he the more eaſily refrained from making uſe of them, becauſe he found many lies in them. *Abſtinuimus libentius quod multa fabuloſa in eis poſita invenerimus* (134). A Lutheran author (135), whom I have cited twice or thrice, and who relates this ſtory, without believing it, has named ſeveral authors, who make mention of it. Take notice of his citations. † 'Cadaver aliquot 'diebus manſiſſe inſepultum, quod tertio die ſe re'ſurrecturum dixiſſet, poſteà verò à canibus arroſum 'ſcribunt Eulogius & Vincentius ⸸. Sed cum parcum 'ſemper fuiſſe Muhammedem in jactandis miraculis, '& ferro, non prodigioſâ virtute ſuam propagandam 'eſſe ſcripſerit ſectam, hanc narrationem ſuis potiùs 'relinquimus autoribus. - - - *Eulogius and Vincentius 'write, that the dead body lay ſome days unburied, be'cauſe he had ſaid he would riſe again the third day, 'but that afterwards he was torn by dogs. But, as 'Mahomet ſeldom boaſted of miracles, and declared that 'his ſect was to be propagated by force, not by ſigns and 'wonders, we chuſe to leave this ſtory with it's au'thors.*' Father Maracci was not ſo incredulous; for he did not reject thoſe, who ſaid, that the diſciples of Mahomet, on account of the difference among them about the primacy, ſo neglected his body, that the dogs tore it in pieces. He builds upon this, that there are ſome relations, which ſay, that the ſepulchre of this falſe prophet contains but a ſmall portion of his body. *Exiguam corporis portionem in illo inveniri, colligit Auctor noſter non abſimile vero eſſe, quod graves ſcriptores prodiderunt, quum poſt mortem Mahumeti de imperio proceres certarent, cadaver ejus, nemine in tumultu cuſtodiente, à canibus dilaceratum fuiſſe* (136).

[*A A*] *There has been publiſhed a Teſtament under the name of Mahomet.*] There was printed at Paris, in Latin and Arabic, in 1630, a book intituled, *Teſtamentum & Pactiones initæ inter Muhammedum & Chriſtianæ fidei cultores.* Father Pacific Scaliger, a Capuchin, had brought the M. S. of it from the Eaſt. Gabriel Sionita is the author of the Latin tranſlation. John Fabricius publiſhed this Teſtament in Latin at Roſtock, in 1638. Mr Hinkelman, Miniſter of Hamburgh, publiſhed it in Latin and Arabic, in 1690 (137). The critics are of different opinions as to the queſtion, Whether this be a genuine piece? Grotius believes it to be a forgery. 'Edidit Ga'briel Sionita, *ſays he* (138), his diebus teſtamentum 'Muhammedis τȣ̃ ψευδοπροφήτȣ, aut indultum 'potius ejus in gratiam Chriſtianorum, haud dubie 'à Chriſtianis ſuppoſitum, ut ſub obtentu tanti nomi'nis Muſulmanis æquioribus uterentur. Ille tamen 'genuinum eſſe affirmat, & perſuadet iis qui naſum 'non habent. - - - - *Gabriel Sionita, in theſe days, 'publiſhed a Teſtament of Mahomet the falſe prophet, or 'rather an indulgence of his in favour of the Chriſtians, 'forged, no doubt, by the Chriſtians, to obtain better 'treatment from the Muſſulmen, under the ſhelter of 'ſo great a name. Yet he affirms it to be genuine, 'and impoſes upon the unſkillful.*' Voëtius (139), Hoornbeek (140), Beſpier (141), and many other miniſters, embrace this opinion. Hottinger (142), who had not ſeen the Arabic, durſt not determine the queſtion. Salmaſius affirms, that it is a genuine piece. 'Vidi 'nuper teſtamentum Muhammedis. De veritate ejus 'nullus dubito. Sed nollem ita reddidiſſet interpres; 'nihil enim minus quam teſtamentum. Fœdus eſt '& pactio qua ſecuritatem Chriſtianis dedit, cujus & 'mentionem facere videtur Almachinus in vita Mu'hammedis: ubi narrat ex hiſtoriis Chriſtianorum, 'addictum fuiſſe Chriſtianis illum Impoſtorem & be'nevolum; & cum ad ipſum quidam Chciſtiani veniſ'ſent petentes ſecuritatem, impoſuiſſe eis tributum, 'atque in ſidem eos ſuſcepiſſe (143). - - - *I lately 'ſaw Mahomet's Teſtament: I have no doubt of it's be'ing genuine. But I wiſh the tranſlator had not given 'it that name; for it is nothing like a Teſtament. It 'is a league and covenant, by which he made the Chri'ſtians ſecure; of which Elmacin, in the Life of Ma'homet, ſeems to make mention; where he relates out of 'the Chriſtian hiſtories, that that impoſtor favoured the 'Chriſtians, and, when ſome Chriſtians came to him, 'deſiring ſafe-guards, impoſed a tax on them, and entered 'into covenant with them.*' Mr Hinkelman (144), is of the ſame opinion with Salmaſius; and ſo was alſo Sir Paul Ricaut; for, endeavouring to prove, that Mahomet uſed craft at the beginning, by making a falſe ſhew of a ſincere intention, to live peaceably with the Chriſtians, he ſays (145), That this falſe prophet 'made a treaty with them, the original whereof 'was found in the monaſtery of Mount Carmel:' and then he adds theſe words (146); 'It is ſaid, that 'this original (147) was carried from that place into 'France, and put in the king's library. Since it is 'antient and curious, I think it will not be impro'per here to give you the interpretation of it.' Having related the tenor of it, he goes on after this manner (148): 'Altho' the Turks deny, that this treaty 'is Mahomet's, yet there are very good authors, who 'believe it to be genuine, and that it was made at 'the time ſet down at the end of it, *viz.* when the 'empire of Mahomet was yet very weak, and in it's 'infancy; for at that time he was at war with the 'Arabians, and feared leſt the Chriſtians ſhould de'clare againſt him: wherefore, to prevent his being 'attacked by two enemies at once, he made this 'treaty with them in the monaſtery of the monks of 'Mount Carmel (149), from whence theſe auſtere 'friars derive their name.' That which is certain, is, that at the time (150), when it is ſuppoſed, that Mahomet made this agreement with the Chriſtians, it was good policy in him not to provoke them. There is a paſſage in the Alcoran, which promiſes Infidels liberty of conſcience: Sir Paul Ricaut cites it (151). He might have cited a paſſage of Elmacin, which informs us, that Mahomet treated very

(132) Tom. i, book iii, chap. i.

(133) Ad. ann. 630. num. ix, & ſeq.

(134) Ibid. num. xii.

(135) Samuel Schultetus, in Eccleſ. Mahumed. pag. 17.

† Hotting. Hiſt. Orient. *lib. ii, cap. iv, p.* 273.

⸸ Apud Baron. ann. 630, num. ix. lib. xxiii, cap. xlvii, apud Magd. Cent vii. ver. 5, fo. m. 364. Confer. Acta Mahometis Francofurti cum iconibus Edita ann. 1597. pag. 261.

(136) Ludov. Maraccius in Prodromo ad Refutat. Alcorani apud Acta Erudit. Lipſ. 1692, pag. 331.

(137) See the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, Octob. 1690, pag. 80.

(138) Grotius, Epiſt. ad Gallos, pag. 329. apud Hotting. Hiſt. Orient. *lib. ii, cap. ii, p.* 237.

(139) Voëtius, Diſput. Theol. Tom. ii, p. 668.

(140) Hoornbeek, ubi ſupra, pag. 88.

(141) Beſpier's Remarks upon Ricaut, Tom. ii, pag. 623.

(142) Hotting. ubi ſupra.

(143) Salmaſ. *Epiſt. xx, lib. i, pag.* 44.

(144) See the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, *ubi ſupra.*

(145) Ricaut's State of the Ottoman Empire, *lib. ii, cap. ii, pag.* 307.

(146) Ib. p. 308.

(147) He did not know, that this book was publiſhed at Paris, in 1630, and at Roſtoch in 1638.

(148) Ibid. pag. 316, 317.

(149) Beſpier makes here this remark. This is not at all probable; nay the treaty is ſigned at Medina, as the piece ſays, and therefore could not be made in the monaſtery of mount Carmel, which is more than 200 leagues diſtant from Medina.

(150) *Viz.* In the fourth year of the Hegira.

(151) Ib. p. 307. See the *Thoughts upon Comets*, num. 244.

gery: It is a treaty of mutual toleration, which, they ſay, was concluded between him and the Chriſtians. Proofs of the forgery may be drawn from the piece itſelf [*BB*]. But however this be, it is certain, that, at the beginning, he had more humanity for them, than for the Jews; which is ſomething ſtrange; for, appearing with the ſplendor of a conqueror, he was the more likely to get himſelf followed by the Jewiſh nation, as the Meſſias,

very civilly a troop of Chriſtians, who came to deſire of him a ſafe-guard (152); for, upon this occaſion, he diſpatched ſuch orders, as aſſured them of his protection. Sir Paul Ricaut therefore had good reaſon to ſay, that Mahomet, at the beginning, offered peace to the Chriſtians: but his reaſons are not ſo ſtrong, by which he pretends to prove, that they appeared formidable to this falſe prophet. ‘The Chriſtians, *ſays he* (153), recommended themſelves by their zeal, their devotion, and the practice of all ſorts of virtues. All this concurred with the purity of their doctrine, and a holy and firm union in the profeſſion of the faith: and becauſe the emperors were then Chriſtians, Chriſtianity was not maintained only by patience, ſufferings, and hope, as it had been in the firſt ages, but was alſo ſupported by the arms and protection of the emperors.’ This is contrary to the general opinion. It is generally agreed, that the diviſions among the Chriſtians, their vices, and thoſe of the Imperial court (154), did extreamly facilitate the progreſs of Mahometiſm.

A COMPARISON between the Toleration of the Mahometans, and that of the Chriſtians.

I cannot proceed to another thing, till I have made a reflexion upon this. The Mahometans, according to the principles of their faith, are obliged to employ violence, to deſtroy other religions, and yet they tolerate them now, and have done ſo for many ages. The Chriſtians have no order, but to preach, and inſtruct; and yet, time out of mind, they deſtroy, with fire and ſword, thoſe who are not of their religion. ‘When you meet with Infidels, ſays Mahomet (155), kill them, cut off their heads, or take them priſoners, and put them in chains, till they have paid their ranſom, or you find it convenient to ſet them at liberty. Be not afraid to perſecute them, till they have laid down their arms, and ſubmitted to you.’ Neverthleſs, it is true, that the Saracens quickly left off the ways of violence; and that the Greek churches, as well the orthodox as the ſchiſmatical, have continued to this day under the yoke of Mahomet. They have their Patriachs, their Metropolitans, their Synods, their Diſcipline, their Monks. I know very well, that they ſuffer much under ſuch a maſter; but, after all, they have more reaſon to complain of the covetouſneſs and extortions of the Turks, than of their ſword. The Saracens were ſtill more gentle, than the Turks (156). See the proofs of it given by Mr Jurieu (157); which are taken out of Elmacin, and Eutychius. It may be affirmed for a certain truth, That if the weſtern princes had been lords of Aſia, inſtead of the Saracens and Turks, there would be now no remnant of the Greek church, and they would not have tolerated Mahometiſm, as theſe Infidels have tolerated Chriſtianity. Let us hear Mr Jurieu himſelf (158). ‘It may be truly ſaid, that there is no compariſon between the cruelty of the Saracens againſt the Chriſtians, and that of Popery again the True Believers. In the wars againſt the Vaudois, or in the maſſacres alone on St Bartholomew's day, there was more blood ſpilt upon account of religion, than was ſpilt by the Saracens in all their proſecutions of the Chriſtians. It is expedient to cure men of this prejudice, that Mahometiſm is a cruel ſect, which was propagated, by putting men to their choice, of death, or the abjuration of Chriſtianity. This is in no wiſe true; and the conduct of the Saracens was an evangelical meekneſs, in compariſon of that of Popery, which exceeded the cruelty of the Cannibals. It is not therefore the cruelty of the Mahometans, which has deſtroyed Chriſtianity in the Eaſt and South, but their avarice. They made the Chriſtians pay dear for their liberty of conſcience; they impoſed upon them heavy taxes; they made them often redeem their churches, which they ſometimes ſold to the Jews, and then the Chriſtians muſt redeem them again: poverty deſtroys wit, and debaſes courage. But, above all, Mahometiſm has deſtroyed Chriſtianity by ignorance.’ He repeats the ſame thing, in fewer words, in one of his Paſtoral Letters (159), ſuppoſing always, that Chriſtianity was deſtroyed under the empire of the Mahometans. But he is miſtaken, and would have ſaid otherwiſe, had he better conſulted the Hiſtorians: but that is not the point. Let us proceed, and obſerve, that he tells us plainly, that the Saracens and Turks treated the Chriſtian church with more moderation, than the Chriſtians ſhewed either to the Pagans, or to one another: for he obſerves, that the Chriſtian emperors ruined Paganiſm, by demoliſhing it's temples, deſtroying it's images, and forbidding the worſhip of it's falſe-gods; and that the Reformed princes aboliſhed Popery, by burning the images, burying the relics in the ground, and forbidding all idolatrous worſhip (160). It is is plain, that princes, who prohibit on a ſudden a religion, uſe more violence, than princes, who permit the public exerciſe of it, and only keep it under, as the Turks do by the Chriſtians.

The concluſion, which I would draw from all this, is, that men are little governed by their principles. The Turks, we ſee, tolerate all ſorts of religions, tho' the Alcoran enjoins them to perſecute the Infidels: and the Chriſtians, we ſee, do nothing but perſecute, tho' the Goſpel forbids them to do it. They would make fine work in the Indies, and in China, if ever the ſecular power there ſhould favour them: aſſure yourſelf they would apply the maxims of Mr Jurieu. They have already done it in ſome places. Read what follows, and you will find, that arguments not being ſufficient to convert the Infidels, the viceroy of Goa was deſired to aſſiſt the Goſpel, by decrees of confiſcation, &c. ‘Cum neceſſarium eſſet, ut præter authoritatem Eccleſiæ poteſtas Principum Virorum ad copioſam hanc frugem accederet, quæ obſtacula omnia amoliretur, Deus Dominus noſter Pro-rege tanquam inſtrumento in multis uſus eſt. Itaque ubi Brachmanni rationibus ſe deſtitui viderant, ad defenſionem ſatis eſſe putabant, ut quoquo modo de caſſibus effugerent, quod ſe more Majorum vivere profiterentur. Sed cum pro innata animi pertinacia neque unquam ſe victos agnoſcerent, neque rationibus quantumlibet efficacibus crederent; pro-rex in compendium miſſo negotio malo huic nodo malum cuneum opponit, legem promulgat, ut intra quadrageſimum diem à decreti promulgatione Brachmanes cum ſuis omnibus, qui Chriſtiani fieri nollent, ſuppellectili omni, quæque in ratis & cenſis haberent, intra id tempus diſtractis, in exilium abirent; qui non parerent, jacturam ejus facturos, & ad triremes abreptum iri comminatus eſt (161). - - - - *It being neceſſary, that, beſides the authority of the church, the power of the great ſhould concur in producing this plentiful fruit, our Lord God has in many things made uſe of the vice-roy as his inſtrument. Therefore where the Brachmans found they wanted arguments, they thought it ſufficient for their defence, any how to eſcape the nets, profeſſing to live after the manner of their anceſtors. But when, through their innate obſtinacy of mind, they would neither acknowledge themſelves vanquiſhed, nor ſubmit to arguments however ſtrong; the vice-roy, to cut the matter ſhort, publiſhed a law, that thoſe Brachmans, with their whole families, who ſhould refuſe to turn Chriſtians within forty days after the publication of the decree, ſhould forfeit their goods and eſtates, and go into baniſhment, and threatning the diſobedient with being ſent to the gallies.*’ See in the margin (162).

[*BB*] *Proofs of the forgery may be drawn from the piece itſelf.*] Conſider a little the words of Dean Prideaux: ‘Grotius rejects this capitulation as a forgery, and not without reaſon. For this piece is dated in the fourth year of the hegira, at a time when Mahomet was not in a condition to ſpeak in ſuch a manner, as he is made to ſpeak in that writing; his power at that time being not ſo formidable, as to move any perſons to pray him to grant them his protection; ſince he had been defeated a little before at the battle of Ohud, where he was ſo cruelly beaten, that at the time when this capitulation is dated, *viz.* on the fourth month of this year, he had not perfectly recovered his loſs, and found himſelf much lower, than ever he had been, from the time he took the ſword in hand, for *the propagation of his impoſture*. Beſides this, there is another particular, which moſt plainly diſcovers

---

(152) Securitatem petituri . . . ſecuritatis inſtrumentum ſcripſit. *See Hotting. ubi ſupra, pag.* 236. *citing Elmacin. Hiſt. Sarac. pag.* 11.

(153) Pag. 305.

(154) See Hotting. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 239.

(155) In the ninth chapter of the Alcoran. See Ricaut, *lib. ii, cap. ii, pag.* 318.

(156) See Ricaut, *ibid. & cap. iii.*

(157) Jurieu's Apology for the Reformation, *Tom. ii, pag.* 55. *& ſeq. Edit. in* 4*to.* See alſo the *Thoughts upon Comets, p.* 738.

(158) Jurieu, ib.

(159) The ninth of the year 1688, pag. 196. I have cited his words above, remark [O], citation (56).

(160) See what I have cited before out of the *Rights of the two Sovereigns*, remark [*O*], citation (65).

(161) Ludovicus Frois, in Epiſtola ad Fratres in Europa degentes ſcripta Goæ primo die Decembris, 1560. apud Dannhawerum in Vale Triumphali, *pag.* 10.

(162) The barbarities, which the Spaniards exercifed in America, are horrible.

Meſſias, whom they expected [*CC*]. The Mahometans have a very great veneration for him [*DD*], as it appears by ſeveral inſtances: they make very devout pilgrimages

‘ diſcovers the forgery of this piece; for, according to it, Moawias, the ſon of Abu-Sophian, was then ſecretary to Mahomet, and drew up this writing; and yet it is certain, that Moawias, with his father Abu-Sophian, did then bear arms againſt the impoſtor; and it was not till the time of the taking Mecca, which four years after, that they joined him, and embraced his impoſture, to ſave their lives (163).’

[*CC*] *He was likely to have been followed, as the Meſſias whom the Jews expected.*] There are ſome authors who ſay, that Mahomet, for ſome time, pretended to be the Meſſias, and that he applied to himſelf the oracles of the Old Teſtament, which had been accompliſhed in JESUS CHRIST (164). By this artifice, he drew a great many Jews after him: the bad condition of that nation in Arabia diſpoſed them ſo much the more to be ſeduced. It is ſaid, that they did not break with him, till he fled from Mecca; and there are hardly any good reaſons given of this rupture: for, to tell us, as ſome do, that they were diſguſted with him, becauſe they ſaw him eat of a camel, is to put us off with fables. Neither can I underſtand, that they at any time took him for the Meſſias; ſince, on the one hand, the Scripture ſays expreſsly, that the Meſſias, was to ſpring from the family of David; and, on the other hand, it was notorious, that Mahomet was not deſcended from that family, but was of a Pagan race. However, let us cite the authors, that have ſaid what I have related. ‘ Et quidem primis temporibus Muhammed ſe ipſum apud Chadigam uxorem, Arabes, Judæoſque venditabat pro Meſſia, quem Judæi expectarent, ut eſt apud Enuſtinum in Geneal. Mahom. pag. 10. Abbas Urſpergenſis in Chronico, pag. m. 150. *Hic erat Pſeudo-Propheta, ſed apud illos magnus æſtimabatur, ita ut etiam in principio adventus ejus æſtimarent hunc eſſe illum, qui ab eis expectatur Chriſtus* (165) . . . . . Secuti hunc ſunt complures Judæi, qui Muhammedum illico pro vero agnovere Meſſia. Theophanes aliique iſtius temporis ſcriptores ſcribunt, Judæos adhæſiſſe Muhammedo *uſque ad cædem illius*; μεχρι τῆς σφαγῆς αὐτȣ̃. Pro σφαγῆς rectius legi σφυγῆς uſque *ad fugam illius*, monet vir literarum Græcarum peritiſſimus Iſaacus Voſſius in allegatis ſibyllinis oraculis, pag. 24. aſſerens Theophanem alioſque pravam ſecutos fuiſſe lectionem. Itidem tradunt receſſiſſe Judæos à Muhammedo, cum eum cameli carnibus veſcentem conſpexiſſent. Alias alii afferunt ſeparationis cauſas (166). - - - - - *And indeed at firſt Mahomet pretended, to his wiſe Chadigha, the Arabians, and the Jews, that he was the Meſſias, whom the Jews expected; as we find in Enuſtinus*, Geneal. Mahom. pag. 10. *The abbot of Urſperg*, Chronic. pag. m. 150, *ſays*, This man was a falſe prophet, but was eſteemed a great man by them, inſomuch that at his firſt appearance, they took him for the CHRIST, whom they expected. . . . . *He was followed by ſeveral Jews, who preſently acknowledged Mahomet for the true Meſſias. Theophanes, and other writers of that time, inform us, that the Jews adhered to Mahomet till he fled to Mecca. . . . . . The ſame authors tell us, that the Jews abandoned Mahomet, having ſeen him feed upon Camel's fleſh. Others aſſign other cauſes of their ſeparation.*’ It is certain the Jews did not follow Mahomet to his death, for he perſecuted them outrageoſly both with his ſword and pen; he deteſts them in many places of his Alcoran; and the war he waged againſt them, was very bloody, and fatal to them (167). The Turks, in this, do wonderfully follow the genius of their prophet; for they have a greater averſion to the Jews, than to any people in the world, and they will not permit a Jew, who turns Mahometan to be buried in their burying-places (168). But what ſome ſay, that they will not ſuffer a Jew, who deſires to embrace Mahometiſm, to come over immediately to the profeſſion of their faith, but that he muſt firſt turn Chriſtian, before he becomes a Mahometan, is falſe (169).

[*DD*] *The Mahometans have a very great veneration for Mahomet.*] I might ſet down a great many circumſtances to this purpoſe; but I ſhall mention only a few, The Grand-Seignior (170) ſends every year into Arabia, *Five hundred chequins, an Alcoran covered with gold, carried upon a camel, and as much black ſtuff, as will ſerve the moſque of Mecca for a tent. When this new cover is put on, that of the preceding year is taken away, and the pilgrims preſently cut it in pieces, and every one carries off what he can of it, ſome more, ſome leſs. They keep this rag in their houſes, as a relic, and as a token of their pilgrimage. . . . . When the camel, which carries the Alcoran returns, he is adorned with flowers, and other ornaments; and after he has made this holy journey, he is exempt, for the reſt of his life, from any other labour, or ſervice* (171). The Turks (172) have a great veneration for a camel; *and they reckon it one of the greateſt ſins to lay too much burden upon him, and to make him labour more than a horſe. The reaſon of this is, becauſe this beaſt is very common in the holy places of Arabia, and it has the honour to carry the Alcoran, when they go a pilgrimage to Mecca. I have obſerved, that thoſe, who take care of this animal, take the froth, which comes out of his mouth, after he has drank in a trough, and rub it upon their beards with great devotion, as if it were a balſam of great value, and, while they do it, they repeat often, in a religious tone*, Hadgi Baba! Hadgi Baba! *O Father Pilgrim! O Father Pilgrim!* Here follows a paſſage from La Mothe le Vayer (173): ‘ Wherever the falſe religion of Mahomet prevails, thoſe of his line, which are called Cherifs *, are held in ſo great veneration, that they alone dare wear a green turbant (174), and they are even unexceptionable in courts of judicature. And it is no wonder the Turks, and other Muſſulmen, ſhould reſpect the poſterity of this impoſtor; ſince they ſo far eſteem the horſes that come from the mare he rode upon, that none dare beat them, or uſe them ill, as we learn from the relation of the Sieur de Breves.’ Many pilgrims, after having ſeen the ſepulchre of Mahomet, put out their eyes, as if all the reſt of the world were unworthy to be ſeen, after they have ſeen ſuch an object. I have read this in Brantome: the reader will not be diſpleaſed to know upon what occaſion he mentions it. ‘ The day being come, *ſays he* (175), that the embaſſadors of Poland (176), waited upon the queen of Navarre, ſhe appeared to them ſo beautiful, ſo magnificently adorned, and richly dreſſed, with ſo great majeſty and grace, that they were all confounded with the ſight of ſo great a beauty; and, among others, there was one Laſki, one of the chief of the embaſſy, whom I ſaw, at his withdrawing, ſo dazzled with the ſplendor of this beauty, that he ſaid, *I will ſee nothing after it: I could willingly do, as ſome Turkiſh pilgrims, when they come from Mecca, where the ſepulchre of their prophet Mahomet is, who are ſo glad, ſo tranſported, and raviſhed with the ſight of ſo fine and ſo ſtately a moſque, that they will never ſee any thing after it; and therefore they burn out their eyes with hot braſs plates, which deſtroy their ſight, ſaying, that, after this, there is nothing finer to be ſeen, and they will never ſee any thing more:* So ſaid this Polander of the admirable beauty of this princeſs.’ Since the authority of Brantome may not be ſufficient, I ſhall cite two Maronites, who tell us (177): ‘ Hinc factum eſt ut multi hujus loci deſiderio patriam conſanguineoſque reliquerint: plerique etiam tali inſania dementiaque capti fuerint, ut ſibi ſponte oculos eruerint, ne ſcilicet quicquam mundanum, ut inquiunt, viderent: reliquum vitæ curriculum ibi peregerint. - - - - *Hence it was, that many left their country and kindred for the ſake of this place; many alſo were ſo infatuated, that they pulled out their own eyes, that they might not, as they ſaid, behold any wordly object; and ſpent the reſt of their life there.*’ This puts me in mind of a thought of Mr Ogier. In compoſing a funeral oration upon Philip IV, king of Spain (178), he employed *all the knowledge, that he had acquired by the exerciſe and ſtudy of many years, in the art of Rhetoric, and then reſolved, that after this work, he would never concern himſelf with eloquence, but follow the example of a lord in the Low-Countries, who, after he had entertained Charles V in one of his houſes, blew it up with gun-powder the next day, as judging that no man was worthy to be received into it after that incomparable prince* (179). I have not yet related all the honours that are paid to beaſts, out of reſpect to Mahomet. There are in the territory of Mecca an infinite number of pigeons: for becauſe they are thought to be the offspring of that which came to the falſe prophet's ear, therefore it is accounted a great crime, not only grimages to the place of his nativity, and to that where his tomb is. It is not true, that this tomb hangs in the air [*EE*], as ſeveral writers, who tranſcribe one from another,

---

(163) Prideaux, in the Life of Mahomet, *pag. m.* 158, 159.

(164) Pleraque Veteris Inſtrumenti loca ad Meſſiam pertinentia impleverit, uti olim jam obſervatum Petro Cluniacenſi apud Iſaacum Voſſium in ſcripto de Sibyllinis Oraculis, *pag.* 25. *Joh. à Lent. de Judæorum, Pſeudo-Meſſiis, pag.* 28, 29.

(165) Ib. p. 29.

(166) Ib. p. 30.

(167) See Hotting. ubi ſupra, p. 214, *&c.* Joh. à Lent, ubi ſupra, pag. 30. ex Elmacino, pag. 6.

(168) Ricaut, ubi ſupra, *lib. ii, cap. iii, pag.* 325.

(169) Idem, ibid.

(170) Ricaut, ib. *lib. ii, cap. xxiii. pag. m.* 482.

(171) I have read, in the relation of the entry of Clement VIII into Ferrara, that the horſe, or mule, which ſerved for ſuch ceremonies was never put to work afterwards.

(172) Id. ib. *cap. xxvi.*

(173) La Mothe le Vayer, *Tom. viii, pag.* 364.

* Leo Africanus.

(174) *Spon, Voyage, Tom. ii, pag.* 16, *affirms*, That thoſe, who are born, when their mother was making a pilgrimage to Mecca, have the ſame privilege, of wearing the Green Turbant.

(175) Lives of Illuſtrious Ladies, in the diſcourſe of queen Margaret, *pag.* 205.

(176) Thoſe, who offered the crown to the duke of Anjou, brother to Charles IX.

(177) Gabriel Sionita, & John Heſronita, ubi infra, *pag.* 26.

(178) Journal des Sçavans, *Febr.* 22, 1666. *p. m.* 160, 161.

(179) Compare with this the paſſage of Terence, quoted in citation (11) of the article DIAGORAS, the wreſtler, and that of Pliny, quoted in citation (67), of the article HERCULES.

only to kill them, but even to take them, or put them to flight. *Summa columbarum copia invenitur, quæ quia ſunt de genere atque ſtirpe ejus, quæ ad Mohammedis aures (ut Moſlemanni nugantur) accedebat, eo pollent privilegio atque authoritate, ut non ſolum eas occidere, ſed aut capere aut fugare nefas eſſe exiſtiment* (180). I have tranſcribed this paſſage, to ſhew, that there are famous writers, who affirm, that the Muſſulmen mention this pigeon, which came to Mahomet's ear, of which the Arabic authors have ſaid nothing, if we believe Dr Pocock (181). We muſt not forget the camel, which *carried Mahomet from Mecca, as far as Medina, to the door of the houſe of Jul, a famous Turkiſh captain, whom this Prophet had a mind to viſit, without knowing the houſe, where this valiant man lived* (182). The Mahometans pretend, that this camel will riſe again, and enjoy the happineſs of Paradiſe (183). What ſhall we ſay of Mahomet's ſhirt? It is kept at Cairo in Egypt *and carried in proceſſion, on certain days with great ceremony* (184).

But it is falſe, that the Muſſulmen ever teſtified their veneration for Mahomet, by erecting ſtatues to him; and therefore, what we read in the hiſtory of the *Holy War*, publiſhed by Father Mabillon, is an untruth (185). The author there ſpeaks of a *ſtatue* of Mahomet, *found in a moſque, which he calls the temple of Solomon*. He ſays (186), 'That Tancred 'found it ſeated on a very high throne, and that it 'was ſo heavy, that *ſix of the ſtrongeſt men could 'hardly carry it, and that there muſt be ten at leaſt to 'raiſe it up*. Tancred made a very pathetical harangue to this ſtatue, and finding it to be Mahomet's, cries out, *It is this wicked Mahomet, who 'was the firſt Antichriſt. If the Antichriſt, that is to 'come, were now here with this, truly, I would quickly 'have cruſhed him under my feet*. Thoſe who know 'any thing of the Mahometan ſentiments, know very 'well, that they do not keep any images, neither 'in their moſques, nor in their houſes.' It is a queſtion, whether the Muſulmen invoke this falſe prophet, and believe that he is in Heaven: many aſcribe ſuch a belief to them (187). 'But there are none 'of their ſolemn prayers, which they do not directly 'addreſs to GOD, to whom they pray even for Mahomet; and they maintain, that all ſouls, that of 'the prophet, as well as others, remain, till the 'day of judgment, in the tombs, where their bodies 'are buried . . . . (188). The ſoul of Mahomet is 'alſo ſhut up in his ſepulchre; for he refuſed to go 'to Heaven, when GOD offered to receive him there, 'becauſe he would not be without his faithful. This 'ſoul ſhall conduct, at the laſt day, all the Mahometan ſouls to heavenly glory. . . . . That you may 'ſee they pray to GOD for Mahomet, here follows 'the concluſion of one of their prayers: *O my* GOD, '*be propitious to Mahomet, and to the Mahometan people, as thou waſt propitious to Abraham and his people, 'becauſe they praiſe and glorify thee*.' If there be no better proofs, that Mahomet is not invoked by his followers, I would not deny but that he is; for I have mentioned (189) a form of prayer, which ſhews, that they invoke GOD for the ſame ſaints whom they invoke. As to their veneration for the Alcoran, ſee what Mr Pfeiffer ſays in the ſeventh volume of the *Bibliotheque* (190). They are ſo ſtrongly attached to Mahometiſm, that ſcarce any can be converted from it to the Chriſtian religion (191), and without doubt, there are many more Chriſtians, that turn Mahometans, than Mahometans, who embrace the Goſpel. The Pagans are more eaſy to be converted (192). The diſtinction, which Richardus the monk uſes, appears to me to be vain; he ſays, That a Mahometan would more eaſily turn Chriſtian at the point of death, than when he is in good health; and that a Chriſtian would by no means embrace Mahometiſm at the hour of death; that therefore both of them are agreed, That the Mahometan religion is more convenient for living, and the Chriſtian more ſafe for dying. *Chriſtianus quidem nunquam in morte fieret Saracenus, ſed in vita; Saracenus autem potius in morte fit Chriſtianus, quam in vita: uterque igitur horum potius eligit Chriſtianus mori, quam Saracenus* (193). This diſtinction is an advantage, of which the Romancatholics and the Reformed equally boaſt. See the remark [*E*] of the article ABULPHARAGIUS.

But the truth is, excepting a few perſons, every body wiſhes to die in that religion, in which he was educated. If any one quits it for ſome temporal advantage, that advantage is of no uſe to him, when he comes to die, and therefore he wiſhes to die in his firſt communion. A Mahometan is in the ſame caſe with others, if he abjures his faith for worldly conſiderations: for ignorance does the ſame thing in the heart of theſe Infidels, that knowledge does in the heart of an orthodox honeſt man; I mean, it makes them adhere invincibly to their opinions. But I muſt obſerve, by the way, that the Mahometan religion is not ſo deſtitute of apologiſts as is commonly believed: there are ſome Arabians, who have written in favour of the Alcoran, and againſt the Bible, with a ſkill ſufficient to foment prejudices. Hottinger ſpeaks of an author (194), who has laid open the apparent contradictions of the Bible, and pretends to prove the miſſion of Mahomet even from that book. We ſhould be very ſimple, to think that a Turk, who examines this, finds it as groundleſs, as we do. He perceives no force in the objections againſt the Alcoran, but he ſees much ſtrength in the objections againſt the Chriſtians: ſo great is the power of prejudice!

[*E E*] *It is not true, that his tomb hangs in the air.*] An infinite number of perſons ſay, and believe, that Mahomet's tomb, being of iron, under a vault of load-ſtones, hangs in the air, and that this paſſes for a great miracle in the opinion of his followers: but it is a fable, which they laugh at, when they know, that the Chriſtians relate it as a certain matter of fact (195). And if they had uſed any ſuch trick, it is no more than what a king of Egypt formerly attempted to do; who had a deſign to procure the ſame advantage to the ſtatue of his wife; but his own death, and that of the Architect, hindered him from putting it in execution. 'Magnete lapide 'Dinochares architectus Alexandriæ Arſinoës templum concamerare inchoaverat, ut in eo ſimulacrum 'ejus è ferro pendere in aëre videretur. Interceſſit 'mors & ipſius & Ptolemæi, qui id ſorori ſuæ juſſerat 'fieri (196). - - - - *Dinochares the Architect, had be- 'gun to roof the temple of Arſinoe, at Alexandria, with 'load-ſtone, that her image made of iron might ſeem to 'hang there in the air. But the deſign was interrupted 'by his own death, and that of Ptolemy, who had or- 'dered it to be done in honour of his ſiſter*.' But if we believe Auſonius, this deſign was executed; for he ſpeaks of it as of a thing that did actually exiſt; but becauſe the Poets do not ſo narrowly conſider things, let us rather believe what Pliny ſays.

Conditor hic forſan fuerit Ptolemaïdos aulæ
Dinochares: quadro cui in faſtigia cono
Surgit, & ipſa ſuas conſumit Pyramis umbras,
Juſſus ob inceſti qui quondam fœdus amoris
Arſinoen Pharii ſuſpendit in aëre templi.
Spirat enim tecti teſtudine vera Magnetis,
Afflictamque trahit ferrato crine puellam (197).

He was, perhaps, Dinochares, by whoſe ſkill
The ſumptuous court of Ptolemaïs roſe;
To whom a pyramid erected ſtands,
And ſhoots aloft it's conic form in air:
Who, to immortalize a monarch's inceſt,
Suſpended high in air, by wonderous art,
Arſinoe's ſtatue, in the Pharian temple.
The force magnetic, acting from above,
Attracts the dam'ſel by her iron hair.

St Auguſtin did not at all doubt, but that by human ſkill and induſtry ſuch a thing had been produced. He does not name the place (198), but ſays only, that in a certain temple there was to be ſeen a ſtatue hanging in the air, equally diſtant from the pavement and the roof, becauſe the load-ſtone which draws it upwards, and that which draws it downwards, have the ſame virtue. *Quamobrem ſi tot & tanta tamque mirifica,* ſays he, *quæ* μηχανήματα *appellant, Dei creatura utentibus humanis artibus fiunt, ut ea qui neſciunt, opinentur eſſe divina, unde factum eſt, ut in quodam templo lapidibus Magnetibus in ſolo & in camera proportione magnitudinis* ther, have affirmed; neither is it very certain, that any Architect is capable of ſuch a contrivance [*FF*]. There are ſeveral predictions extant, which have threatened Mahometiſm a long

---

(180) Gabriel Sionita, & Joannes Heſronita, in Tractatu de nonnullis Orientalium urbibus, *cap. vii, pag.* 21.

(181) *See, above, remark* [*U*].

(182) Chevreau, *ubi ſupra, p.* 14.

(183) Id. ib.

(184) *See* la Mothe le Vayer, *Letter cxvi, Tom. xii, pag.* 33. *He cites the Voyage of le Gouz.*

(185) *In the ſecond Tome of the* Muſæum Italicum.

(186) *Cap. cxxv. See the* Bibliotheque Univerſelle, *Tom. vii, pag.* 177.

(187) Bibliotheque Univerſelle, *Tom. x, pag.* 98, *in an abſtract of a book publiſhed by Dr Barrow, intituled,* An Abridgment of the Faith and Religion of the Turks.

(188) Ib. pag. 100.

(189) *In the article FATIMA, remark* [*D*].

(190) Pag. 264.

(191) Experentia hactenus docuit, & quotidie etiamnum noſtrates docet, in Indiæ Orientalis Moluccis, regno Tarnatano, &c. ab Ethniciſmo plures poſſe converti, à Muhammediſmo fere nullos aut pauciſſimos. *Giſb. Voët. Diſp. Tom. ii, pag.* 668.

(192) *See the words of Voëtius, which I have juſt now cited.*

(193) Richardus, *Confut. Legis Saracen. cap. x, apud Hoornbeek, ubi ſupra, pag.* 208.

(194) *He is called,* Ahmed Abulabbas, Ben Edris, Sanhaghius, Melkita. *See Hotting. ubi ſupra, pag.* 337

(195) Unde igitur nobis *Mohammedes* ciſtæ ferreæ incluſus & magnetum vi in aëre pendulus? Hæc cum Mohammediſtis recitantur, riſu exploduntur, ut noſtrorum in ipſorum rebus inſcitiæ argumentum. *Pocockius, Specimen. Hiſtor. Arabum, pag.* 180.

(196) Plin. *lib. xxxiv, cap. xiv, in fin. pag. m.* 150.

(197) Auſonius, *Edyllio X, de Moſella, ver.* 311.

(198) *Father Hardouin, in* Plin. ubi ſupra, *ought not to have affirmed, that St Auguſtin ſaid this of a ſtatue, which was in the temple of Serapis.*

magnitudinis poſitis, ſimulachrum ferreum aëris illius medio inter utrumque lapidem, ignorantibus quid ſurſum eſſet ac deorſum, quaſi numinis poteſtate penderet . . . . . *Quanto magis Deus potens eſt facere*, &c (199)? He obſerves, that the people, who did not know the cauſe of this effect, attributed it to the power of God. It is probable that the temple, which St Auguſtin does not name, was that of Serapis at Alexandria; for Ruffinus gives us the following account of the cheats, which were diſcovered in that temple, when the Chriſtians were maſters of it: ‘Erat aliud fraudis genus hujuſmodi, natura lapidis magnetis hujus virtutis eſſe perhibetur, ut ad ſe rapiat & attrahat ferrum. Signum ſolis ad hoc ipſum ex ferro ſubtiliſſima manu artificis fuerat fabricatum, ut lapis, cujus naturam ferrum ad ſe trahere diximus, deſuper, in laquearibus fixus cum temperate ſub ipſo radio ad libram fuiſſet poſitum ſimulacrum, & vi naturali ad ſe raperet ferrum, aſſurrexiſſe populo ſimulacrum, & in aëre pendere videretur (200). - - - - *There was another cheat of this kind: the load-ſtone is ſaid to attract iron. An image of the ſun was curiouſly wrought in iron, for this purpoſe, that the ſtone, whoſe nature, as we obſerved, it is to attract iron, being fixed in the roof, might draw the iron towards it, and ſo the image might ſeem to the people to riſe up, and hang in the air.*’ Proſper relates the ſame thing with a circumſtance, which Ruffinus does not mention: he ſays, that a good ſervant of God, having learned by inſpiration wherein the artifice conſiſted, took away the load-ſtone from the roof, and immediately the ſtatue fell, and was broken in a thouſand pieces. ‘Apud Alexandriam in templo Serapidis hoc argumentum dæmonis fuit, quadriga ferrea nulla baſi ſuffulta, nullis uncis infixis parietibus colligata, in aëre pendens cunctis ſtuporem ac velut divinum ſubſidium oculis mortalium exhibebat, quum tamen lapis magnes, qui ferrum ſibimet attributum ſuſpendit, eo loco cameræ affixus totam illam machinam ſuſtentabat. Itaque cum quidam Dei ſervus inſpiratus id intellexiſſet, magnetem lapidem è camera ſubſtraxit, ſtatimque omne illud oſtentum cadens confractum comminutumque oſtendit divinum non eſſe, quod mortalis homo firmaverit (201). - - - - *At Alexandria, in the temple of Serapis, the devil made uſe of this argument: an iron chariot, ſupported by no pedeſtal, nor fixed to the wall by any hooks, hung in the air, exhibiting to the ſpectators a miraclous and aſtoniſhing appearance; whereas a load-ſtone, which attracts iron, being fixed in that part of the roof, ſupported the whole machine. But a certain ſervant of* God, *diſcovering it by inſpiration, privately took away the load-ſtone; and immediately the whole prodigy falling down, and being broken to pieces, ſhewed that it was not divine, but the contrivance of a meer man.*’ If we may believe Caſſiodorus (202), there was in the temple of Diana a Cupid of iron thus ſuſpended. The anonymous author of the Annals of Triers, cites a letter of Galba Victor, written to the ſophiſt Licinius, wherein this Galba acquaints him, That he ſaw at Triers a ſtatue of Mercury, made of iron, and very heavy, which continued hanging between heaven and earth, by reaſon of the equal forces which drew it upward and downward (203). There was a piece of a load-ſtone in the floor, and another in the roof, and this ſtatue was placed juſt in the middle above and below theſe two pieces of load-ſtone. I can ſcarce believe theſe things, both on account of the conſiderable diſtance, which, they ſay, was between the ſtatues of iron, and the ſtones, which attracted them; and, on account of the inſuperable difficulties, they muſt meet with, to balance ſo exactly the attractions (204). I ſhould rather believe what was ſaid of a ſtatue of Mars, which joined itſelf to a Venus of load-ſtone:

. . . . ferrea Martis
Forma nitet, Venerem magnetica gemma figurat (205).
. . . .
. . . . Cytherea maritum
Sponte rapit, cœlique toros imitata priores,
Pectora laſciva flatu Mavortia nectit,
Et tantum ſuſpendit onus, galeæque lacertos
Implicat, & vivis totum complexibus ambit.
Ille laceſſitus longo ſpiraminis actu
Arcanis trahitur gemmâ de conjuge nodis (206).

The god of war in burniſh'd iron ſhone;
A magnet put the form of Venus on.
. . . .
The Cyprian goddeſs, by magnetic laws,
Her conſort of obſequious metal draws.
The mimic ſtatues counterfeit embrace,
And twine, and kiſs, like thoſe of heav'nly race.

But this at leaſt is very certain, that the ſepulchre of Mahomet ought not to be reckoned amongſt theſe wonders. This falſe prophet was buried at Medina, where he died. Some authors ſay, that he was laid in the tomb of Aaiſca (207), one of his wives, who loved him beſt, whom the Muſſulmen call *the mother of the believers*, or, *the mother of the faithful*, one who underſtood the languages, and ſtudied hiſtory with great application (208). This tomb is an urn of ſtone, placed in a chapel, which no one can enter, becauſe it is compaſſed about with bars of iron. The pilgrims of Mecca go thither with extream devotion, and kiſs theſe bars religiouſly. This is what you will find in a little book *de nonnullis Orientalium Urbibus*, written by Gabriel Sionita and John Heſronita, and placed at the end of the *Geographia Nubienſis*, of which they publiſhed a Latin tranſlation at Paris in 1619. See alſo the diſſertation of Samuel Andreas, *de Sepulchro Muhammedis*. We ſhall ſee, in the following remark, what Mr Bernier ſays of this falſe ſtory of the ſuſpenſion of the tomb.

I cannot leave this ſubject, without relating a very ridiculous ſtory, which I have read in the Travels of Monconys. ‘The Oia of the embaſſador ſaid, that there was a ſtone at Mecca, hanging in the air, ſince Mahomet ſtept upon it to mount the *Bouraque*, which, according to the Alcoran, is an animal leſs than a mule, and larger than an aſs, that God had ſent to carry him up to Heaven. When the ſtone ſaw him going up, it followed him; but he perceiving it, cauſed it to ſtop, and it continued in that place of the air, where it then was. Others ſay, that ſome women, big with child, having ſince paſſed under it, did miſcarry, out of fear it ſhould fall upon them, and that ſome ſtones are put under it to ſupport it; but that they are of no uſe, and that without them it would neverthelеſs continue ſuſpended in the air (209).’

[*FF*] *It is not very certain, that any Architect is capable of ſuch a contrivance.*] I can cite, upon this head, an authority, which is not to be deſpiſed, and that is the opinion of one of the beſt diſciples of the famous Gaſſendus, which he makes in theſe words (210): ‘I ſhall ſay nothing of the pretended ſuſpenſion of the iron ſepulchre of Mahomet at Mecca, between loadſtones of equal force, and diſpoſed, as it were, in a kind of vault; which has been formerly ſaid of the iron horſe of Bellerophon; for it is a thing that exceeds all human ſkill, either that ſeveral loadſtones ſhould be of the ſame force, or applied in ſuch a manner, that the iron in the middle ſhall not feel more virtue on one ſide than on the other; or that the iron ſhould in all it's parts be of that ſhape, thickneſs, and temperature, which is neceſſary, that it may be equally attracted throughout: and yet it is evident, that the leaſt difference, whether in the loadſtone or the iron, or in the ſituation of them, would make the force of one prevail above that of the other. I might add, as having been more than a month at Gidda upon the Red-Sea, a ſmall day's journey from Mecca, that Mahomet's ſepulchre was never at Mecca, but that it is at Medina, which is about ſix or ſeven days journey from thence, and in thoſe parts they never heard any thing of this vault of loadſtones, or of this ſuſpenſion.’ Mr Vallemont maintains the poſſibility of the ſuſpenſion of a tomb of iron. Let us

ſee

---

(199) Auguſt. *de Civit. Dei, lib. xxi, cap. vi.*

(200) Ruffin. *lib. ii, Hiſtor. Eccleſ. cap. xxiii, apud Coquæum, Notis in Auguſt. de Civ. Dei, ubi ſupra, pag. m.* 961.

(201) Proſper, *de Prædict. Part. iii, cap. xxxviii, apud eundem Coquæum, ibid.*

(202) Caſſiodor. *Var. lib. i, Ep. xlv. p. m.* 45.

(203) *See Auſonius*, Variorum *publiſhed by Tollius, pag.* 403.

(204) *See Gaſſendus*, Oper. Tom. ii, pag. 334, who mentions the horſe of Bellerophon, of which they told the ſame ſtory, as of the ſepulchre of Mahomet; but he rejects it all.

(205) Claudian. *de Magnete, ver.* 25.

(206) Id. ib. ver. 31.

(207) Gabr. Sionita, & Jo. Eſronita, *ubi infra, pag.* 25. *See the remark* [OO], *where we criticiſe this place.*

(208) Gabr. Sionita & Jo. Eſronita, *de Nonnullis Orient. Urbibus, pag.* 23.

(209) *The travels of Monconys, Part i, in* 4*to, pag.* 464, 465, *ad ann.* 1648.

(210) *Bernier's Abridgment of the Philoſophy of Gaſſendus, Tom. v, p.* 322, 323.

a long while [GG]: and it is ſaid, That Mahomet, being aſked, how long his religion

ſee his proofs (211): ‘Father Cabeus ſays, that he placed one day two loadſtones above one another, and diſtant about four fingers, then taking a needle by the middle with his two fingers, he gently carried it between the loadſtones, endeavouring to find out the middle, where the needle not being more attracted by the one loadſtone than by the other, ſhould remain ſuſpended in the air without being ſupported by any thing. It requires ſome time, and a great deal of ſkill, to find out exactly this point, and to place the needle there without falling, which will happen by the leaſt agitation of the air. At laſt, Cabeus was ſucceſsful in this experiment: the needle remained in the air, between the two loadſtones, without touching any thing; and this pleaſing ſpectacle continued as long as one might repeat four long verſes: but upon his riſing to call ſome of his friends, the motion of the air broke, as we may ſay this innocent charm. Wherefore this philoſopher does not ſcruple to aſſert, that by this means an iron coffin may be ſuſpended in the middle of the air, in a chamber, whoſe walls are inlaid with loadſtones. *Teſtor me id feciſſe. Potuiſſet etiam arca ferrea fieri, & in cubiculo Magnete lapide parietato ita diſponi in medio aëre, ut penderet.* Cabeus lib. iv, cap. xviii, pag. 334, & 335. This Jeſuit ſays this, upon occaſion of what is ſo often ſaid, that the followers of the impious Mahomet have placed his body in a coffin of iron, which is ſuſpended in the air by loadſtones: but he does not at all doubt, but that it is a fable, as indeed it is.’ Mr Vallemont relates afterwards the laſt words of the paſſage of Mr Bernier, which has been quoted above; and he blames him for affirming, that it is a thing that ſurpaſſes all humane ſkill. ‘Reaſon, continues he (212), might evidently prove the contrary; and the experiment of Father Cabeus decides the matter againſt Mr Bernier.’ I will venture to ſay, that this experiment decides it rather in his favour; for it requires *much patience and ſkill,* and produces nothing that is laſting, and yet it is only about a ſmall needle. By this you may judge of the difficulties, that muſt be overcome, to ſuſpend an iron coffin between two loadſtones. Dr Prideaux is of the ſame opinion with Mr Vallemont; for after he has ſaid, that the body of Mahomet was buried at Medina (213), and remains there *to this day,* without an *iron coffin,* and *without any loadſtones,* he adds theſe words: ‘I do not pretend to deny the poſſibility of the thing; I know, that Dinocrates *, a famous Architect, built formerly of loadſtones the dome of the temple of Arſinoe at Alexandria; and by this means, the image of the princeſs, made wholly of iron, was ſuſpended in the middle of her temple, without any thing to ſupport it: But nothing like it was ever attempted in favour of Mahomet's dead body.’ See above (214) what concerns the ſtatue of Arſinoe.

[GG] *There are ſeveral predictions extant, which have threatened Mahometiſm a long while.*] Bibliander (215) affirms, that there is a famous prophecy among the Mahometans, which ſtrikes a great terror both into men and women, and which ſays, That the empire ſhall be deſtroyed by the ſword of the Chriſtians. The prophecy is expreſſed in the following words, which are tranſlated out of Perſian into Latin by Georgievitz (216). ‘Imperator noſter veniet, Gentilium Regnum capiet, rubrum malum capiet, ſubjugabit ſeptem uſque ad annos; Ethnicorum gladius ſi non reſurrexerit, duodecim uſque ad annos in eos dominabitur, domum ædificabit, vineam plantabit, hortos ſepe muniet, filium & filiam habebit: duodecim poſt annos Chriſtianorum gladius inſurget, qui & Turcam retrorsùm profligabit. - - - - *Our emperor ſhall come, ſhall take the kingdom of the Gentiles, ſhall take the red apple, ſhall ſubdue it even unto ſeven years; if the ſword of the Gentiles ſhall not riſe again, he ſhall reign over them twelve years, ſhall build a houſe, ſhall plant a vineyard, ſhall encloſe gardens with a hedge, ſhall have a ſon and a daughter: after twelve years the ſword of the Chriſtians ſhall riſe up, which ſhall beat back the Turk.* Sanſovin (217) publiſhed a book in 1570, wherein he affirms, That there is a prediction, That the laws of Mahomet ſhall laſt no longer than a thouſand years, and that the empire of the Turks ſhall fall under the fifteenth ſultan (218). He adds, That Leo the Philoſopher, emperor of Conſtantinople, has ſaid, in one of his books, ‘That a light-haired family, with its competitors, ſhall put all Mahometiſm to flight, and ſhall ſeize him, who is poſſeſſed of the ſeven mountains’: *Familia flava cum competitoribus totum Iſmaelem in fugam conjiciet, ſeptemque colles poſſidentem cum ejus poſſeſſionibus capiet.* The ſame emperor makes mention of a column, which was at Conſtantinople, whoſe inſcriptions the patriarch of the place explained, and ſaid, that they ſignified, That the Venetians and Muſcovites ſhall take the city of Conſtantinople; and, after ſome diſputes, they ſhall chuſe, with one conſent, and crown a Chriſtian emperor (219). This light-haired family, ſo fatal to the Muſſulmen, puts me in mind of a paſſage of Dr Spon, which I ſhall ſet down. ‘Of all the Chriſtian princes, there is none, whom the Turk fears ſo much as the great Czar of Moſcovy..... And I have heard ſome Greeks ſay, and, among the reſt, the Sieur Manno-Mannea, a merchant of the city of Arta, a man of wit and learning for that country, that there was a prophecy among them, which imported, That the empire of the Turks was to be deſtroyed by a nation *Chryſogenos*, that is, light-haired; which cannot be attributed to any but the Moſcovites, who are almoſt all light-haired (220).’ There is mention made of this, in the *Miſcellaneous Thoughts upon Comets* (221), on occaſion of I know not what tradition, which is current, That the Fates have promiſed the French the glory of deſtroying the Turks (222). See the remark [*F*] of the article MARESTS (JOHN DES). The prophecy of the Abyſſines mentions only a Chriſtian king, who ſhall be born in the north. Mentionem facit (Duret. Hiſt. des Langues, fol. 575, cujuſdam Prophetiæ, quam magni æſtimant Abyſſini; *quòd nempè, aliquando Mecha, Medina, aliæque fœlicis Arabiæ urbes, deſtruentur, Mahometique & ejus ſymmyſtarum cineres diſſipabuntur; hæcque omnia facturus ſit Rex aliquis Chriſtianus, in regionibus ſeptentrionalibus natus; quì pariter Ægyptum & Palæſtinam ſit occupaturus* (223). - - - - - *Duret, in his hiſtory of Languages, fol.* 575, *mentions a certain prophecy, which the Abyſſins greatly eſteem; namely,* That Mecca, Medina, and the other cities of Arabia Felix, ſhall hereafter be deſtroyed, and the aſhes of Mahomet, and his prieſts be diſſipated; and that ſome Chriſtian prince, born in the northern regions, ſhall perform all this, who ſhall alſo ſeize on Egypt and Paleſtine’. It is pretended, that a book was written in Arabic concerning this prophecy, before the taking of Damieta, and that this book was found by the Chriſtians (224). Wallichius (225) relates, That the Turks find in their annals, That the reign of Mahomet ſhall continue until the arrival of the light-haired boys; *donec veniant* figlivoli biondi, *i. e. flavi & albi filii, vel filii ex Septentrione flavis & albis capillis.* Some think, that this denotes the Swedes; but Antony Torquato, a famous Aſtrologer, applies it to the king of Hungary (226). I ſhall ſay nothing of the prophecy, which was current in the time of the empreſs Theodora, That the deſtruction of the Saracens ſhould be the work of the Macedonians; which was the cauſe, why the emperor Monomachus raiſed ſome troops in Macedonia, and ſent them into the Levant (227). The event did not confirm this prophecy, nor the commentary upon the predictions of the emperor Severus, and upon thoſe of the emperor Leo, printed at Francfort, with figures, in 1597. This commentary promiſed, That the Ottoman empire ſhould be deſtroyed under the ſultan Mahomet III (228). The commentary of Philip Nicolai upon the Apocalypſe was not more ſucceſsful; this Lutheran miniſter had foretold by virtue of ſome words of St John, That the Turkiſh empire ſhould fall in 1670 (229). Wolfius has inſerted, in his *Lectiones Memorabiles* (230), a piece which is intituled, *Diſcurſus de futura & ſperata victoria contra Turcam, è ſacris prophetiis, aliiſque vaticiniis, prodigiis, & prognoſticis depromptus, ac noviter in lucem datus per Joannem Baptiſtam Nazarum Brixienſem.* It was printed in 1570. The author examines ſeveral prophetical paſſages of Scripture; and he finds, by the manner in which he applies them, and by calculating the numeral letters, that they ſignify the ruin of the Turks, and by that means an univerſal peace in the year 1572, or 1575. The other oracles, which he conſults,

(211) *Vallemont's Deſcription of the Loadſtone, found at Chartres, pag.* 167.

(212) Id. ib. *pag.* 170.

(213) *Prideaux, in the Life of Mahomet, pag.* 134.

* Plin. lib. xxxiv, cap. xiv.

(214) *Citation* (196).

(215) De Ratione communi omnium linguarum, apud Beſoldum conſiderat. legis & ſectæ Saracenorum, pag. 47.

(216) Apud Beſoldum, *pag.* 47.

(217) *See Wolfius,* Lect. Memorab. *Tom. ii, pag.* 803.

(218) *Selim II, who reigned at that time.*

(219) Wolfius, *ibid.*

(220) *Spon's Travels, Tom. i, pag.* 270, *of the Holland edition.*

(221) Pag. 783.

(222) *See ſeveral authorities as to this matter, in the* Thoughts upon Comets, *pag.* 781.

(223) Beſoldus, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 48.

(224) *See Hotting.* in Theſauro Philologico.

(225) In Vita Mahometis, *pag.* 158. apud Schultetum, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 22.

(226) Apud Leunclavium, *in fin. Epiſt. fol.* 844, citante Schulteto, *ibid. See the article* TORQUATO (ANTONY).

(227) Cedrenus, *pag.* 9515, apud Schultet. *ibid.*

(228) Schultet. *ibid.*

(229) Schultet. *pag.* 21.

(230) *Tom. ii, p.* 884, & *ſeq.*

gion would continue? ſhewed his fingers extended; which, as is thought, ſignified, That it would laſt a thouſand years, and ſo would have an end in 1639 (*m*). I do not enquire, whether the calculation is exact, neither do I concern my ſelf to refute ſuch things: but I ought to ſay, in behalf of Chriſtian authors, That the followers of this impoſtor,

conſults, are certain prophetic authors, the ſigns that have appeared in Heaven, and the conſtellations; from all theſe he concludes, that the Turkiſh empire, and all Mahometiſm, draws near its final period; that they cannot eſcape; and that the Golden Age is juſt at hand, which ſhall eſtabliſh an univerſal peace upon earth. Beſoldus is admirable (231), he mentions both this treatiſe of Nazarus, and another (232), which was written in 1480, and printed at Paris about the year 1520. In it the Chriſtians were promiſed an hundred noble triumphs, which have proved meer chimera's; and yet he avers, that the final period of Mahometiſm draws near, which he founds upon this obſervation, That the Sciences do not now flouriſh there as they have done formerly. *Hæcque omnia, licet vana & fanatica multis videantur, ac etiam ratione temporis vel loci falli poſſint; certum tamen multi habent, adpropinquare quoque Saracenicæ legis ruinam. Nam ſanè jam diù eſt, quod diſciplina & eruditio ab eadem receſſit* (233). The Sieur Konig informs us, that Mr Baſire, chaplain to Charles I, king of England, declared, as he paſſed by Leipſic, when he was going to London, after the reſtauration of Charles II, that, according to the Apocalypſe, there would quickly be a war againſt the Turks: that we were now in the time of the ſixth vial: That the Turks would be very ſucceſsful in this war, and that they would attack the city of Rome; and that, after this victory, their empire would decline, and fall away; and that the wiſe men of that nation were of that opinion (234). There was a book printed at Paris in 1686, in which are inſerted many prophecies of things fatal to the oriental nations (235), which were given out by the abbot Joachim, by St Nerſes patriarch of the Armenians, by St Catalius biſhop of Trent (236), by St Angelus a carmelite, and by Berobius (237) of Patras. The author, pretending, that theſe oracles concern the moſt Chriſtian king, and exhort him to make war with the Ottomans. I ſhall not here repeat what I have ſaid in another place (238), to which the reader may have recourſe: I ſhall only ſay, that, among ſo many prophets, who have all pronounced *wo, wo*, againſt the Mohometan empire, there are ſome who have promiſed it great bleſſings. The Aſtronomers of Toledo publiſhed, in the XIIIth century, a prediction, that, within ſeven years, there ſhould ariſe diſputes among the Saracens, and that they would abandon their religion, and embrace the Goſpel. A Divine of Franeker (239) repreſented to Comenius, the falſhood of that oracle, by citing to him a Theſis, wherein Samuel Mareſius had ſaid, That it would be eaſy to prove by Scripture, that the Turks and Tartars ſhall not be converted, but that they ſhall join with the remains of Anti-chriſt, and endeavour to deſtroy Chriſtianity: that God, by his miracles, ſhall hinder them, and that they ſhall all be intirely ruined, at the ſecond coming of JESUS CHRIST. Mareſius was not to oppoſe the account of the Millennaries; they pretend, that the Turks ſhall be converted. Let us relate what concerns the Aſtronomers of Toledo. ‘Ac prout eventu caruit illa Aſtronomorum Toletanorum prædictio ante 400 annos edita, quæ ex Wendovero refertur in *Additamentis Matthæi Pariſienſis, ex edit. Londinenſi anni* 1632. & juxta quam intra ſeptennium ab edito illo Oraculo oritura erat *dubietas inter Saracenos*, & erant relicturi *Mahumerias ſuas*, & futuri *unum cum Chriſtianis*; ita non debemus nos facile lactare novâ ſpe converſionis Turcarum, quæ nuſquam in Dei Verbo promiſſa eſt (240). ---- *And, as that prediction of the Aſtronomers of Toledo has not been fulfilled, which was publiſhed four hundred years ago, as cited from Wendover, in the ſupplement of Matthew Paris, edit. Lond.* 1632, *and, according to which, within ſeven years after the publication to that prophecy, there were to ariſe among the Saracens doubts concerning their religion, and they were to quit their Mahometiſm, and become one with the Chriſtians; ſo we ought not to deceive ourſelves with a new hope of converting the Turks, which is no where promiſed in the word of* GOD’. There are alſo ſome, who foretel, That the Turks ſhall make great conqueſts; that they ſhall make inrodes as far as Flanders and Picardy. Read what I am going to tranſcribe. I have put in the margin the quotations of the author, without altering any thing in them. ‘Quam (*ſenectutem imperii Turcici*) etiamſi nondum agnoſcant plurimi Gogiticam priùs expectantes irruptionem, vel militiæ Turcicæ Coloniam uſque † deductionem, tùm Picardiæ, Flandriæ & Brabantiæ ⸸, imò omnium omninò regionum ‡ per Turcas, præceſſuras incurſiones; nos tamen de Turcicâ ſenectute præſenti non *vaticinia* tantùm, ſed *alia* etiam *indicia* reddunt certiſſimos (241). ---- *Though many do not acknowledge this decline of the Turkiſh empire, expecting firſt an irruption, or rather leading of the Turkiſh forces as far as Cologn, and their over-running Picardy, Flanders, Brabant, and almoſt all countries; yet not only prophecies, but manifeſt tokens, confirm me in the opinion of the preſent decay of the Turkiſh power.*’ You will find a ſupplement to all this in the remark [*B*] of the article TORQUATO (ANTONY).

THE origin of the prophetical threatenings againſt the Turks.

If we ſhould aſcribe all theſe prophetical threatnings to one cauſe only, we ſhould be miſtaken. The deſire ſome have to comfort themſelves with the hopes of the deſtruction of a furious perſecutor, makes them eaſily find this deſtruction in the predictions of Scripture, or in ſome other things. Thus, there are ſome who foretel through credulity and illuſion. The deſire of comforting people, and diſſipating their fears, obliges ſome to ſuppoſe, that the Scripture, prodigies, and many other prognoſtics, promiſe the approaching ruin of the power, which they fear. Thus there are ſome, who foretel things out of policy. Thoſe, who do it in order to render their troops more courageous, are prophets of the ſame kind. There are ſome, who prophecy, in order to ſtir up ſedition in an enemy's country; for inſtance, to encourage the Greeks, who acknowledge the Grand-Seignor for their prince, to take arms againſt their maſter. Theſe belong to another claſs, and may be called prophets of ſedition. You may place in what claſs you pleaſe, I care not which, the Pagans mentioned by St Auguſtin, who vented a prophecy, according to which Chriſtianity was to be deſtroyed, after it had laſted 365 years. ‘Excogitaverunt neſcio quos verſus Græcos, tanquam conſulenti cuidam divino oraculo effuſos, ubi Chriſtum quidem ab hujus tanquam ſacrilegii crimine faciunt innocentem: Petrum autem maleficia feciſſe ſubjungunt, ut coleretur Chriſti nomen per 365 annos: deinde completo memorato numero annorum, ſine mora ſumeret finem (242). ----- *They invented I know not what Greek verſes, in the manner of an oracle, or prophecy, in which they clear* CHRIST *from this crime of ſacrilege as it were: but they ſubjoin, that Peter procured by wicked arts, that the name of* CHRIST *ſhould be worſhiped* 365 *years; which term of years being completed, it was immediately to have an end.*’ St Auguſtin found, that, reckoning theſe 365 years from the reſurrection of JESUS CHRIST, they expired a year before Paganiſm received as it were its mortal blow, by the deſtruction of its temples. ‘Sequenti anno, conſule Manlio Theodoro, quando jam ſecundùm illud oraculum dæmonum aut figmentum hominum, nulla eſſe debuit religio Chriſtiana, quid per alias terrarum partes forſitan factum ſit, non fuit neceſſe perquirere. Interim quod ſcimus, in civitate notiſſima & eminentiſſima Carthagine Africæ Gaudentius & Jovius comites Imperatoris Honorii, quarto decimo calendas Aprilis Falſorum Deorum templa everterunt, & ſimulachra fregerunt (243). ---- *In the following year, Manlius Theodorus being conſul, when, according to that oracle of devils, or forgery of men, the Chriſtian religion was to be no more, what perhaps was done in other parts of the world, it was not neceſſary to enquire. In Carthage, the moſt famous city of Afric, we are aſſured, that Gaudentius and Jovius, under the emperor Honorius, overthrew the temples of the falſe gods, and broke down the images.*’ St Auguſtin obſerves, that ſeveral Pagans were converted, by the reflexions they made upon the falſhood of this oracle. As to the motives of thoſe, who publiſhed it, ſee what I quote out of Baronius. ‘Tanta gloria ejus (Chriſti)

(*m*) *See* Andreas Carolus, *at pag.* 953, *of the* Memorabilia Eccleſ. ſeculi XVII.

(231) *Ubi ſupra, pag.* 48.

(232) De futuris Chriſtianorum triumphis in Saracenos. *The author is called* Magiſter Joannes Viterbienſis.

(233) Beſoldus, *ubi ſupra.*

(234) Konig, *Biblioth. Vet. & Nov. pag.* 90. *ex Epiſtola Lipſiæ ſcripta die,* 24 *Aug.* 1661.

(235) *See the Journal of Leipſic for the month of February,* 1688, *pag.* 81. *in the abſtract of the* Theatre de la Turquie, par le Sieur Michel le Fevre.

(236) S. Catalii Epiſcopi Tridentini, Act. Lipſ. *ibid. He ſhould have ſaid,* S. Cataldi Epiſcopi Tarentini.

(237) *I believe it is the ſame with Bemechobus, in one of the following citations.*

(238 *In the article HERLICIUS, remark* [*F*].

(239) Nicolaus Arnoldus, in Diſcurſ. Theolog. contra Comenium, *printed at Franeker, in* 1660.

(240) Mareſius, Diſp. iii, Th. 28, apud Arnoldum, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 91, 92.

† *Methodus apud Wolf. Rer. Memor. Tom. ii, ann.* 1571.

⸸ *Claromontanus, apud. Wolf. lib. i.*

‡ *Secundùm Prophetiam Hebræam à Bemecho Patarenſi Epiſcopo in Latinum tranſlatam.* Note, that in Wolfius, pag. m. 886, this author is called *Bemechobus.*

(241) Schultetus, *ubi ſupra, p.* 21.

(242) Auguſtin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xviii, cap. liii. *See the biſhop of Meaux's Explication of the Apocalypſe, cap. xix, pag.* 231, *of the Dutch edition.*

(243) Idem, Auguſt. *ibid. cap. liv.*

impoſtor, have publiſhed the moſt ridiculous fables about him; for they are the perſons, who inform us, that rice and roſes ſprung out of his ſweat [*HH*]; and that the angel Gabriel taught him the compoſition of a ragoo, which gave him great vigour for the enjoyment of women [*II*]. For the reſt, the religion of this falſe teacher was ſubject

‘ Eccleſia aucta . . . . accidit ut Gentiles, qui viderent Eccleſiam Chriſtianam tanta gloria auctam, adeoque immenſa claritudine illuſtratam, invidia tabeſcentes, quo ſolatio aliquo lenirent de Chriſtianorum gaudio & incrementis conceptum mœrorem & amicorum acerbitatem, novum oraculum confinxerunt, atque ore omnium diffamarunt Græcis quibuſdam verſibus præcinentes Chriſtianam religionem 365 annis duraturam, quorum 313 jam prope elapſi eſſent (244). - - - *The glory of* CHRIST*'s church being ſo greatly increaſed, it happened that the Gentiles, who were witneſſes of the flouriſhing ſtate of the Chriſtian church, to comfort themſelves in ſome meaſure for its proſperity, which they beheld with grief and envy, forged a new prophecy, ſpreading it abroad in certain Greek verſes, which foretold, that the Chriſtian religion ſhould continue 365 years, of which 313 were then almoſt elapſed.*’

Some of thoſe, who have promiſed great conqueſts to the Turks, have been gradually determined to it by the hatred they conceived againſt the houſe of Auſtria; whether it be that that hatred rendered them really fanatics, or that they only pretended to viſions. But others have only followed the ſyſtem, which they had made upon the prophecies of the Apocalyſe, Gog and Magog, *&c.* Two things were lately told me: I. That a famous miniſter in Amſterdam had preached, during the ſiege of Vienna in 1683, That the Turks would take that city; which prediction he grounded upon ſome paſſages of Scripture. II. That the raiſing of this ſiege did ſo affect him with grief, that he died of it: not that he wiſhed, as Drabicius did, that the Turks ſhould make great progreſs in Germany; but he was vexed to be miſtaken. However, we may conclude, That thoſe, who attempt to reveal future things concerning the Great Turk, have miſtaken the times; for when they threatned him with ruin, he triumphed; when they promiſed him conqueſts, he loſt battles and provinces, as he has done ſince the year 1683 (245). But we may obſerve, that, even in the time of Drabicius, there were ſome people in Holland, who promiſed, that the Turk ſhould be deſtroyed. There were two pieces of a very different nature publiſhed at Leyden in 1664. The title of the firſt was, *de Tartarorum irruptione ſuccincta Diſſertatio* (246); the other, *Parænеſis ad Chriſtianos, ſuggerens conſilium ad eos liberandos, & opprimendos Turcas.* In the firſt, Holland is threatned with irruptions of the Tartars, unleſs it furniſhed great ſums of money for levying the troops, that were neceſſary to the war againſt the Turks. In the other, the conqueſt of the Turkiſh empire is promiſed, provided great levies were made of men and money; and the manner of dividing this conqueſt is deſcribed.

[*HH*] *That rice and roſes ſprung out of his ſweat.*] Here are the words of two learned Maronites (247). *Ineptè Mohamedis ſequaces confabulantur, ortam eſſe* (orizam) *ex ipſius Mohamedis ſudore antequam mundo ſe manifeſtaret, mundum infeſtaret penè dixerim, cùm thronum Dei circuibat in paradiſo: Deus enim converſus reſpexit eum, Mohamedes præ pudore ſudavit, tergenſque digito ſudorem, ſex extra paradiſum guttas miſit, ex quarum una roſa, ex altera oriza productæ ſunt, ex reliquis quatuor, quatuor Mohamedis ſocii nati ſunt.* This ſurpaſſes the abſurdeſt viſions of legendary Chriſtians. Mahomet, ſay they, walked round the throne of GOD in paradiſe, before he ſhewed himſelf to men. GOD turned towards him, and looked upon him: Mahomet was ſo aſhamed, that he ſweat; and having wiped off the ſweat with his fingers, he let fall ſix drops out of paradiſe, one of which produced a roſe, and another a grain of rice; from the other four drops ſprung the four companions of Mahomet. ‘ What think you, Sir, of the idle fancy of the Arabians, (theſe are the words of Balzac) who took the roſe away from the goddeſs Venus, to give it to the prophet Mahomet; and who maintain, (as Buſbequius ſays in his relations), That the firſt roſes did ſpring out of the ſweat of this great prophet? Do you not admire their Chronology, that will not allow there were any roſes in the world, before the reign of Heraclius? (248)’

[*II*] [*The angel Gabriel taught him the compoſition of a ragoo, which gave him great vigour for the enjoyment of women.*] He boaſted, That he had learned from the angel Gabriel, that the virtue of this ragoo (249) was to fortify the reins. Having eat once of it, by the order of the angel, he had ſufficient ſtrength to fight againſt forty men: Upon another occaſion, he had to do with women forty times, without being fatigued (250). *Mohamedes . . . . . affirmabat . . . . . hoc pulmentum à Gabriele Angelo ſe edoctum fuiſſe, & utilitatem ejus, eodem Angelo teſte, in eo conſiſtere, ut renes corroboret. Quandoque Angeli juſſu Mohamedes ex eo edens una nocte pugnavit adverſus quadraginta viros, aliaſque quadragies indefatigatus rem cum fæminis habuit. Sanè hæc, anuum delirantium fabellas aut alicujus Moſlemanicæ ſectæ oſoris calumnias eſſe opinaremur, niſi præfatum authorem* (251) *juris peritiſſimum eumdemque obſequentiſſimum Mohamedis ſectatorem ea omnia diſertè Arabico ſtylo, capite de quorundam ciborum delectu & utilitate, videremus referentem.* We have here a grave author among the Mahometans, who relates theſe infamous things of his Prophet; and therefore we muſt not ſuſpect, that the Chriſtians or Jews have invented theſe tales, on purpoſe to blacken this impoſtor; and ſo, though we do not read in the Alcoran, that the pleaſures of the conjunction between the two ſexes, ſhall laſt each time ſixty entire years, we for all that may believe, that this is a Mahometan tradition. But that every one may the better judge of this, we muſt produce a paſſage, which informs us, that Dr Pocock, ſo well verſed in Mahometan authors, ſays nothing of this tradition. Here is a note of Beſpier upon what Sir Paul Ricaut ſays (252), that the falſe prophet promiſed a Paradiſe, wherein there ſhould be fine women, the enjoyment of whom would give *exceſſive pleaſures, ... and which would laſt ſixty entire years without diſcontinuance.* ‘ (253) The Alcoran no where ſpeaks of the duration of theſe pleaſures. Baudier makes no ſcruple to extend it to *fifty years, pag.* 661 of his Hiſtory of the Religion of the Turks. This is what he has taken out of Vigenere, *pag.* 208, of his Illuſtrations upon Chalcondylas, and what both of them have taken out of John Andreas, *pag.* 72, where he ſays the ſame thing. I do not complain, that they have tranſcribed him in an infinite number of places, as they have done chiefly as to the pleaſures of Paradiſe, concerning which they have taken, almoſt word for word, four or five pages: but I blame them, becauſe neither of them names him in the places, which they have tranſcribed. For the reſt, I do not know whether the Zuna ſpeaks of theſe *fifty years*, as John Andreas affirms; but Pocock, who was very exact in deſcribing all that the Mahometans ſay of the pleaſures of Paradiſe, ſays nothing either of the *fifty years* of John Andreas, Baudier, and Vigenere, or of the *ſixty years* of our author: he only ſays, that theſe Infidels affirm, there ſhall be a hundred different degrees of pleaſure in Paradiſe, the leaſt of which ſhall be ſo great, that to the end the faithful may reliſh it without being over-whelmed, GOD ſhall give to each of them the ſtrength of a hundred men. *Kowat miat ragiol.*’

Let us here admire human infirmity. Mahomet, preaching and practiſing the moſt exceſſive leudneſs, did nevertheleſs perſuade a great number of people, that GOD had appointed him to be the founder of the true religion. Did not his life ſtrongly refute this impoſture? For, according to the obſervation of Maimonides, the principal character of a true prophet, is, to deſpiſe the pleaſures of ſenſe, and chiefly thoſe which are called venereal: Liceat hic adſcribere quæ habet ‘ Maimonides, *in Moreh, lib. ii, cap. xl,* ubi quomodo probandi ſunt Pſeudoprophetæ, docet his verbis. *Modus autem talem probandi, eſt ut perfectionem perſonæ ipſius animadvertas, & in facta ejus inquiras, & converſationem obſerves; ſignum autem præcipuum quo dignoſcatur eſt, ſi abdicaverit voluptates corporeas & eas contemptui habuerit (hic ſiquidem primus eſt gradus ſcientiæ*

---

(244) Baronius, ad ann. 313, *num. xvii, pag. m.* 130.

(245) *See the article KOTTERUS, remarks* [*A*] *and* [*G*].

(246) *The Dutch verſion is in the oppoſite page.*

(247) Gabriel Sionita, & Jo. Heſronita, de Nonnullis Oriental. Urbibus, *pag.* 5.

(248) Balzac, Entret. v, cap. ii, pag. m. 87. *Compare the remark* [*DD*], *of the article JUNO.*

(249) *Here follows the compoſition of it,* Solent (*Arabes*) frequenter nutriri pulmento quodam Heriſe dicto, quod ex tritico prius decocto conficiunt, poſt ſoli exſiccandum exponitur, tum in urna contunditur, donec emundetur, poſtremò pingui carne ſimul coquitur, donec caro conſumatur, quod ſane palato non eſt ingratum. - - - - *The Arabians are wont to feed upon a certain pottage called Heriſe, which they make of boiled wheat; it is afterwards laid out to dry in the ſun; then it is beat in a mortar, till it is cleanſed; laſtly, it is boiled up with fat fleſh, till the fleſh be conſumed; which certainly is not diſagreeable to the palate.* Gabriel Sionita, & Jo. Eſronita, *ubi ſupra.*

(250) Gabriel Sion. & Jo. Eſron. *ibid.*

(251) *That is, If I be not miſtaken,* Mohamedes Ben. Caſem, *of whom they cite, pag.* 2. Hortus rerum delectabilium.

(252) Ricaut, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 322.

(253) Beſpier's *Curious Remarks, pag.* 625.

jeƈt to the ſame inconvenience, which was obſerved at the birth of Chriſtianity, and the beginning of Luther's reformation; for, as ſoon as he had propheſied, there aroſe ſeveral falſe prophets [KK], and his followers were quickly divided. I am leſs aſtoniſhed at his boldneſs, with reſpect to the promiſe of the Paraclet, than at that of ſome Arabian authors, who boaſt of having read copies of the Goſpel, that contained ſome things concerning Mahomet, which they pretend the Chriſtians have blotted out [LL]. I know not,

THE ſtrange effects of prejudice.

‘*ſcientiâ præditorum, multo magis prophetarum) imprimis vero ſenſum illum qui juxta Ariſtotelem opprobrio nobis eſt, ac turpitudinem rei Venereæ; ideoque hoc indicio detexit* DEUS *omnes falſo de afflatu prophetico gloriabundos, ut ita patefieret veritas eam indagantibus, & ne in errorem inducantur* (254). - - - - *Let me here cite the words of Maimonides,* in Moreh lib. ii, cap. xl, *where he teaches how to diſtinguiſh falſe prophets, as follows.* Now the way to diſtinguiſh ſuch an one, is, to obſerve his perſonal excellence, and to inquire into his life and converſation: but the principal mark of diſtinction is, if he has renounced and deſpiſes corporeal pleaſures (for this is the firſt advance of learned men, and much more of prophets) and eſpecially that ſenſe, which, according to Ariſtotle, is a reproach to us, together with the filth of venereal matters: therefore by this mark God has detected all who have falſely pretended to inſpiration, that the enquirers after truth may not be led into error.’ It cannot be ſaid, that no body was deceived in this caſe, and that thoſe who adhered to Mahomet, did it only through ſelf-love, knowing his impoſtures. This is an aſſertion that cannot be maintained. The greateſt part of his diſciples rejected the news of his death, as a falſhood, which was inconſiſtent with his heavenly miſſion; and, to undeceive them, it was neceſſary to prove to them by the Alcoran, that he was to die (255). They were therefore ſeduced by his words. Now when we are once prepoſſeſſed with an opinion, that a certain man is a prophet, or a great ſervant of God, we are apt to believe rather, that the crimes which he commits, are no crimes, than to think that he commits any crime. This is the effect of the fooliſh prejudices of many narrow ſouls. Did not Seneca himſelf ſay, that it would be more eaſy to prove drunkenneſs to be a commendable thing, than that Cato committed a ſin in being drunk (256)? In like manner the followers of Mahomet ſaid in their hearts, it is better to believe, that leudneſs is not a vice, ſince our great prophet is ſubject to it, than to believe, that, ſince he is ſubject to it, he is not a great prophet. We ſee every day ſome inſtances of the ſame prejudices. If a man has once acquired the reputation of a great zealot for orthodox opinions, and ſignalized himſelf in diſputes againſt Hereſy, moſt people are ſo prejudiced in his favour, that you cannot bring them to confeſs, that he has done amiſs, in doing thoſe things, which they would condemn, if any other ſhould do them. St Paul ſays only, that the unbelieving wife is ſanctified by the believing huſband (257); but, if he had ſpoke according to the humour of theſe people, he ſhould have ſaid, that all that belongs to an orthodox man, and all that he does, is ſanctified by him.

[*KK*] *There aroſe many other falſe prophets.*] I remember the exordium of a ſermon of Mr Daillé, which turned upon this thought, that as ſoon as God ſends men to declare the truth, the devil raiſes up falſe teachers, to broach Hereſies. He raiſed, in the times of the apoſtles, Cerinthus, Ebion, *&c.* and at the time of the reformation, John of Leyden, David George, Servetus, and Socinus. The deſign of the devil is to croſs the progreſs of the truth; for it was natural to believe, that the Jews and Pagans would deſpiſe the Goſpel, when they ſhould ſee a variety of ſects among thoſe that preach it. So likewiſe it was probable, that the Catholics would deſpiſe and inſult the Reformation, when they ſhould ſee Luther, Zuinglius, Muncer, and Calvin, take different ways, and maintain diſputes againſt ſeveral party-leaders, who, after their example, would forſake the Romiſh communion. Two objections naturally occur: I. If theſe people were inſpired by God, they would be unanimous. II. Suppoſing that we muſt forſake the ancient doctrine, which party muſt we chuſe among ſo many new ſects? It is better for us to continue where we are, than to diſcuſs, whether one of them is true, and which it is. The event did not confirm theſe conjectures in their full extent; for, though it cannot be denied, that the multitude of falſe teachers, who aroſe in the firſt century, and formed ſo many parties in the boſom of the infant church, did a great deal of miſchief to the good cauſe; yet it muſt be confeſſed, that it did not all the miſchief the devil might hope for. Scepticiſm gained but little; I have already given the reaſons of it (258). This obſervation may be applied to the times of Luther and Calvin. Theſe two great Reformers did not make all the progreſs they might have done, had they been united in the ſame ſentiments, and if all thoſe, who oppoſed the Romiſh church, had ſpoken the ſame language. Their diviſions were a prejudice, which kept many perſons in the Romiſh communion; nevertheleſs the Proteſtant religion increaſed in a ſhort time, and gained a durable footing. However, every one may be ſenſible, that the devil purſues very well his own intereſt, if he croſſes the progreſs of a new orthodoxy, as Mr Daillé ſuppoſes; but it is not eaſy to conceive, that, having raiſed up Mahomet, to plant a falſe religion, he ſhould oppoſe againſt him the ſame obſtacles, he did againſt the apoſtles of Jeſus Chriſt. How came it then to paſs, that falſe prophets, the emiſſaries of Satan, attempted to deſtroy Mahometiſm at it's firſt appearance? Whence was it, that Mahomet had his rivals, who boaſted of heavenly inſpiration as well as he (259)? How happened it, that Muſeilema, his diſciple, abandoned him, to form a ſeparate ſect (260)? How came it, that an Aſwad, a Taliha, an Almotenabbi, ſet up for prophets, and drew after them as many followers as they could (261)? It is not eaſy to account for theſe phænomena, unleſs we ſuppoſe, that there is as great a diviſion among the bad angels, as among men, or that men, without the inſtigation of the devil, will attempt to found ſects. The heads of the parties, that I have named, called Mahomet a falſe prophet. But there aroſe others, after his death, who, without calling in queſtion his authority, pretended to excel one another in the underſtanding of the Alcoran. The two great ſects, which aroſe at firſt, of Ali and Omar, ſtill continue. Was not the permiſſion of this prejudicial to Mahometiſm? Was this the intereſt of the devil?

How great ſoever this difficulty may appear, ſeveral anſwers may be made to it. It may be ſaid, that the devil is not much concerned, if a falſe prophet be croſſed by other falſe prophets, and if each of thoſe impoſtors debauches the followers of his rivals: the devil can loſe nothing by that means; for it is equal to him, whether they follow Mahomet, or Muſeilema, or Almotenabbi. The fights, the wars, the confuſions of all ſorts, which theſe diviſions produce, are a more diverting ſpectacle to the enemy of mankind, than the calm and ſucceſsful progreſs of but one falſe ſect. Beſides, it flatters the pride of an ambitious ſpirit, to ſhew, that he can ſettle Mahometiſm in ſpight of a hundred obſtacles. Might he not hope, that, if this ſect did wonderfully increaſe, notwithſtanding it was oppoſed in it's infancy by other ſects, this would be looked upon as a character of it's divinity, and he ſhould thereby mimic God, who never diſplayed his power, in protecting the Goſpel more ſenſibly, than by preventing the bad effects of the Hereſies and Schiſms of the firſt century.

[*LL*] *Some Arabian authors . . . . boaſt of having read copies of the Goſpel, that contained ſome things concerning Mahomet, which they pretend the Chriſtians have blotted out.*] The moſt incredulous men ſtagger, when they ſee grave authors affirm certain things with a great pomp of circumſtances, as having ſeen them with their own eyes. It is therefore neceſſary to make it appear, by ſome notable examples, that ſuch affirmations are ſometimes deceitful. What greater example can we alledge, than that, which I am going to mention; wherein we ſee, that a Mahometan affirms, that a Chriſtian ſhewed him a copy of the Goſpel, in which there are many things clearly and expreſsly ſaid concerning Mahomet, and that there is but one more copy in the world like this. ‘Inter nomina ſeu titulos blaſphemi impoſtoris Paracletum numerant, teſte Al Jannabio: quin & aliàs in loco non uno, antè Evangelia

(254) Edwardus Pocockius, Notis in Specimen. Hiſtoriæ Arabum, *pag.* 181.

(255) *See Pocock. ibid. pag.* 178, 180.

(256) Catoni ebrietas objecta eſt: at facilius efficiet quiſquis objecerit, hoc crimen honeſtum, quam turpem Catonem. *Seneca de Tranquillitate Animi, cap. xv. pag. m.* 674.

(257) 1 *Cor. ch. vii, ver.* 14.

(258) *In the article LUTHER, remark* [CC].

(259) *See Hotting.* Hiſt. Oriental. *lib. ii, cap. iii, p.* 258.

(260) Id. ib.

(261) Ib. p. 259.

not, whether we may believe what ſome ſay, that Mahomet declared, that only a third part of the Alcoran was true [*MM*].

He who would ſee a Chronological account of the actions and adventures of this falſe prophet ſupported by very good citations, and a fine detail of circumſtances, need only read Dr. Prideaux's book (*n*). It has been tranſlated out of Engliſh into French (*o*), ſince the firſt edition of this Dictionary. In it, among other things, there are many proofs, that Mahomet was an impoſtor, and that he made *his impoſture ſubſervient to his luſt* (*p*). One of theſe proofs is taken from hence, that the variations of his prophetic ſpirit were ſuited to the change of his private intereſt [*NN*]. What is related of his amours, is very ſtrange. He was jealous to the higheſt degree, and yet he bore with patience the galantries of that wife, which was the deareſt to him [*OO*]. He could never

(*n*) *Intituled,* The Life of Mahomet.

(*o*) *The French tranſlation was publiſhed at Amſterdam in* 1698.

(*p*) *Prideaux, Life of Mahomet, pag. m.* 155.

‘gelia à Chriſtianis corrupta expreſſam ejus factam mentionem ſibi facile perſuadent, idque ab ipſis Chriſtianis edocti, ut refert Author modo laudatus; Mohammodem ſcil. Al Selencium, neſcio quem, à Sacerdote quodam magni inter Chriſtianos nominis didiciſſe nullibi extare Evangelii exemplar incorruptum, quàm apud ſe unum, ac Pariſiis alterum, atque è ſuo multa coram ipſis legiſſe, in quibus multa & perſpicua de Mohammede narrarentur (262). - - - - - *Among the names of this blaſphemous impoſtor, they reckon the* Comforter, *upon the authority of Al Jannabius: beſides which, they eaſily perſuade themſelves, that, before the Goſpels were corrupted by the Chriſtians, expreſs mention was made of him; and that upon the teſtimony of the Chriſtians themſelves, as the above-cited author relates; to wit, that one Mohammed Al Selencius had learned from a prieſt of great reputation among the Chriſtians, that there were but two uncorrupted copies of the Goſpel, the one in his own poſſeſſion, the other at Paris; and that he had read to them many things out of his copy, which were evidently ſpoken of Mahomet.*’

[*MM*] *Some ſay, that Mahomet declared, that only a third part of the Alcoran was true.*] Father Joſeph de Santa Maria, a bare footed Carmelite, apoſtolical miſſionary in the kingdom of Malabar, affirms (263), that the inhabitants of Maſcati pretend to be the moſt faithful obſervers of Mahomet's law, and that Mahomet declared, that of 12000 words, that are in the Alcoran, only 4000 are true. When they are confuted in any point, and know not how to defend themſelves, they place it in the number of the 8000 falſities. This is a very convenient way to come off in a diſpute.

[*NN*] *The variations of his prophetic ſpirit were ſuited to the change of his private intereſt.*] We ſhall keep to the words of Dr Prideaux (264). ‘Almoſt all his Alcoran was framed * after this manner, to anſwer ſome private deſign he had, according as occaſion required. If he had any new thing to ſet on foot; or ſome objection againſt himſelf, or his religion, to anſwer; ſome difficulty to reſolve; or ſome diſcontent among the people to pacify; ſome ſcandal to remove, or ſomething elſe to be done for carrying on his deſigns, he had commonly recourſe to the angel Gabriel for ſome new revelation; and preſently he inſerted in the Alcoran ſome addition, proper to anſwer the ends he then propoſed to himſelf. So that the whole almoſt was compoſed upon occaſions of this nature, to produce in his own party the effect which he propoſed to himſelf. And all his commentators plainly enough confeſs it, by ſhewing exactly the reaſons, for which each chapter had been ſent them from heaven But this was the cauſe of the many contradictions, that are to be found in this book. For as this impoſtor's affairs and deſigns varied, he was obliged to vary his pretended revelations; which is ſo well known among thoſe of his ſect, that they all confeſs this to be true; upon which account, when theſe contradictions are ſuch, that they cannot be reconciled, they revoke one of the contradictory places. And they reckon in the whole Alcoran ** more than one hundred and fifty verſes thus revoked, which is the beſt expedient they can take for ſaving the contradictions and inconſiſtencies that are in it. But herein they diſcover very much the levity and inconſtancy of him, who was the author of it.’ This proof of impoſture is of great force: I have mentioned it already (265); but here I ought to add, that it would be too far extended, if it ſhould be made uſe of without exception againſt all the expounders of the Apocalypſe, who change their hypotheſes as the general affairs take a different turn (266). It may ſometimes happen, that there is nothing but Fanaticiſm in the inconſtancy of thoſe men, and that not being ſenſible of the diſorder of their brain, they are no leſs ſincere, when they vary, than when they do not. Let us therefore make uſe of a diſtinction, and ſay only, that thoſe, who change their Apocalyptic ſyſtem, according to the news in the Gazette, and always agreeably to the general deſign of their writings, publiſh falſities, either without knowing it, or knowingly. Their conduct is very often an impoſture, but not always.

[*OO*] *He was jealous to the higheſt degree, and yet he bore with patience the galantries of that wife, which was deareſt to him.*] ‘As he became a brutiſh ſlave to the love of women, ſo he was extreamly jealous of thoſe he had married. Thus to diſſuade them from what he feared †, he threatened them once with a ſeverer chaſtiſement, than is given to other women, not only in this world, but in that which is to come, ſuppoſing that they ſhould be unfaithful to him. And when ſome of his followers frequented his houſe too much, and converſed there with ſome of his wives, he was ſo incenſed at it, that, to prevent it for the future, he declared, as in the name of God, thoſe verſes in the Alcoran ⸸, wherein he tells them, that they ought not to enter into the houſe of the prophet without leave, and that if they were invited to dine at his houſe, they ought to go away immediately after dinner, without entering into any converſation with his wives; and that, altho' the prophet was aſhamed to bid them go, yet God was not aſhamed to tell them the truth. And, in the ſame chapter, he forbids his wives to ſpeak to any man, unleſs their face was covered with a veil. Laſtly, he carried his jealouſy even beyond the grave; for, not being able to endure, that any ſhould have to do with his wives, tho' after his death ‡; he ſeverely forbad all his followers to come near them, as long they lived. So that, tho' all other women, when they were divorced, or became widows, had the liberty to marry again, yet all his wives were excluded from this privilege. Upon which account, all thoſe, whom he left behind him at his death ‡‡, remained always widows, tho' ſome of them were very young, as particularly Ayeſha, who was not then full twenty years old, and who lived forty eight years after, which was looked upon, in that hot country, as a very ſevere reſtraint (267).’

You ſee, in theſe words of Dr Prideaux, that the ſame wife, whom we called above Aaiſca (268), is here called Ayeſha. The two authors, whom I have cited in that place, do not well expreſs themſelves; they ſay, that Mahomet was buried in the tomb of Aaiſca; but, ſince ſhe ſurvived him, it had been better to ſay, that he was buried in the chamber of this wife. Thus Dr Prideaux expreſſes himſelf (269). He tells us (270), that Ayeſha, the daughter of Abubeker, *was ſhe of all his wives, whom Mahomet loved moſt tenderly . . . .; and tho' ſhe was a woman* †† *that loved galantry, and was always buſied in ſome intrigue, yet Mahomet could never reſolve to put her away. He wrote therefore the twenty fourth chapter of the Alcoran, to declare her innocent, and at the ſame time to juſtify himſelf for keeping her. Therefore he declares there to his Muſſulmen, in the name of* God, *that all thoſe reports, that were ſpread to the diſadvantage of Ayeſha, were impoſtures, and black calumnies; forbids them to ſpeak any more of them, and threatens, at the ſame time, with terrible puniſhments, both in this life and the other, thoſe who ſhould dare to defame good women. Mahomet having married her young* ⸸⸸, *took care to inſtruct her in all the*

(262) Pocockius, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 185, 186.

(263) *In the book intituled,* Prima Speditione all' Indie Orientali, *printed at Rome. The Journal of Italy, March* 31, 1668, *makes mention of it.*

(264) *Prideaux, Life of Mahomet, pag.* 155.

* *Richardi Confutatio, cap. xii.*

** *Johannes Andreas, Guadagnol. Tract. ii, cap. vii, ſect. iii.*

(265) *In the remark* [T].

(266) *See the Chimerical Cabal, at pag.* 189, *of the ſecond edition.*

† *Alcoran, cap. xxxiii.*

⸸ *Alcoran, cap. xxxiii.*

‡ *Alcoran, cap. xxxiii.*

‡‡ *Johannes Andreas, cap. vii.*

(267) *Prideaux, Life of Mahomet,* pag. 153, *&c.*

(268) *In the remark* [*EE*], *citation* (207).

(269) Prideaux, *pag.* 134.

(270) Id. ib. *pag.* 139.

†† Diſputatio Chriſtiani, *cap. vi,* Commentat. in Alcoran. *cap. xxiv.*

⸸⸸ *Appendix ad Geograph. Nubienſ. cap. viii.*

never reſolve to put her away ; and he brought in the great machines of his revelations, to put a ſtop to the ſcandalous reports concerning her, and the offence his tenderneſs for a wife of bad fame gave the people. His followers thought at laſt, that ſhe was virtuous ; for they received as oracles the interpretation ſhe put upon the words of their law [*PP*]. Some Chriſtian authors have publiſhed a very ridiculous tale concerning the credulity

*the ſciences that were uſually taught in Arabia, and chiefly in the elegance and politeneſs of language, and the knowledge of their antiquities : ſhe profited extreamly by her huſband's care, and became very polite and learned *. She hated Ali furiouſly, becauſe he diſcovered her incontinence and immoralities to Mahomet.* Here follows another proof of the tenderneſs wherewith ſhe was beloved by her huſband. *Sewda was ſhe of all Mahomet's wives †, whom he loved leaſt ; he had even reſolved to put her away ; but he was diverted from it by her earneſtly begging of him, that ſhe might ſtill continue to enjoy the name of Mahomet's wife, and promiſed him, that ſhe would require nothing more ; that when her turn ſhould come to lie with him, ſhe would reſign it to Ayeſha. The love he had for Ayeſha made him willingly conſent to this bargain, and ſo Sewda continued in his houſe during her life, upon the conditions propoſed* (271).

Some perhaps may think, that I ſpeak improperly, when I affirm, that Mahomet bore with patience the galantries of that wife, whom he loved moſt tenderly ; for one may imagine, that he believed her very innocent ; and in that caſe we muſt not conſider him as a huſband tender and jealous, and at the ſame time inſenſible to her conjugal unfaithfulneſs. Where will then be the ſingularity of that character I have ſpoken of ? I anſwer, that there is no probability that he doubted of the galantries of Ayeſha. He was informed of them by the relation of Ali his ſon-in-law ; and he continued to have as great a friendſhip for, and confidence in him, as he had before ; and doubtleſs he would not have treated him after this manner, if he had taken him for a ſlanderer in a matter of ſo nice a nature as this was. Let us therefore believe, that he was convinced of the truth of the report ; and alſo conſider, that if the amorous intrigues of his wife had not been real, ſuch tales and calumnies had never been forged of her, as obliged the falſe prophet to have recourſe to the authority of heaven, to put a ſtop to them. His followers, being once perſuaded that he ſpoke to them in the name of GOD, had a reſpect not only for his perſon, but alſo for his wives and children. They were therefore incapable of forging ſuch a bitter calumny againſt Ayeſha ; but, being well acquainted with the real diſorders of her conduct, they murmured, and complained of them, as an intolerable ſcandal, which diſhonoured the man of GOD. And we muſt obſerve, that jealouſy is not always uniform in it's cauſes and effects ; it deviates from it's own rules, and from the common road, oftener than is thought. There are ſome perſons, that would be jealous, if they were leſs amorous : the higheſt degree of tenderneſs produces in their heart a confidence, which a leſſer degree would not produce. There are ſome jealous perſons, who ceaſe to love, when they think themſelves betrayed. There are others, whom even a known unfaithfulneſs does not cure (272). Mahomet might very well be of this laſt ſort, with reſpect to his deareſt wife. We muſt remember that he always loved her ; and this is chiefly what is to be conſidered ; for if his only care had been to avoid the ridicule, to which he might have been expoſed by a divorce, we muſt aſcribe to him only a political patience, which is common enough in mankind. The number of thoſe, who prefer living with an hated object, to the noiſe of a rupture, is not inconſiderable.

[*PP*] *His followers received as oracles the interpretation ſhe put upon their law.*] Her credit, after the death of this falſe prophet, was great enough to hinder Ali from becoming Caliph. She hated him for the reaſon given in the preceding remark. Her hatred laſted long ; for altho' *Ali* (273) *had a right to the vacant throne, being ſon-in-law to the impoſtor, he was three ſeveral times ſucceſſively excluded. The throne was vacant the fourth time, and Ali at laſt came to it ; but Ayeſha appeared in arms againſt him ; and tho' ſhe ſucceed not this way, yet ſhe deſtroyed him, by ſtirring up and fomenting that revolt, which at length ruined Ali and his family ‡. Ayeſha ſurvived Mahomet full forty eight years, and enjoyed a great reputation in his ſect, who called her the propheteſs, and the mother of the faithful. She was the living oracle of his ſect, who conſulted her in all difficult points of the law, to learn of her what was the ſenſe of the law-giver. Whatever her anſwers were, they ‡ were received as oracles, and have always ſince paſſed among them for authentic traditions. All the traditions, which compoſe the Sunnah, according to them, came from Ayeſha, or from ſome one of the ten companions of Mahomet ; ſo they call thoſe ten men who firſt joined that ſeducer. But the teſtimony of Ayeſha renders a tradition very authentic. Abdorrahman Ebn Auf holds the ſecond rank.* Note, that Mahomet (274) did not entruſt her with the *ſtrong-box* of his apoſtleſhip, but Haphſa, the daughter of Omar. This is a little ſtrange ; for this daughter of Omar held but the ſecond ‡ rank in the heart of her huſband Mahomet. *In this box were all the originals of his pretended revelations, which ſerved for materials to compoſe the Alcoran. After this book was finiſhed, Abubeker ** gave the original of it to Haphſa, to be kept in the ſame box. Which may ſerve to diſcover the error of John Andreas, who pretends †† that it was Ayeſha who kept it. For this being ſo conſiderable a truſt among the Mahometans, what probability is there, that if Ayeſha had been once put in poſſeſſion of it by the impoſtor himſelf, Abubeker ſhould have endeavoured to diſpoſſeſs her of it, eſpecially ſhe being his own daughter. But Haphſa was much older than Ayeſha, and for that reaſon probably was preferred before her, to have the charge of that precious depoſite* (275).

There is ſome reaſon to wonder, that the Mahometan religion ſhould be ſo little advantageous to the female ſex (276), ſince it was founded by a man ſo exceſſively laſcivious, and ſince his laws were depoſited in the hands of one woman, and another could give what interpretation of them ſhe pleaſed. We have ſeen, that Ayeſha was looked upon as a propheteſs, and as an oracle, and ſhe was a true ſhe-Pope among the Mahometans. Mr Herbelot ſays (277), *That ſhe had among them a very great authority, even in matters of doctrine and religion, and that they often had recourſe to her, to learn ſome tradition of Mahomet, and that ſhe undertook to condemn the Caliph Othman for impiety.* She might then have ſettled matters upon a foot very favourable to her ſex. How then came it to paſs, that ſhe did not do it ? Was ſhe of the humour of certain women, who are the firſt and moſt zealous in defaming their own ſex ? May ſhe not be conſidered as a proof of what is ſometimes ſaid, That the authority of men is never greater, than when a woman is ſeated on the throne ; and that the authority of women is never greater, than when the ſceptre is in the hands of a man ? I cannot determine the point : let ſpeculative men exerciſe their wit as much as they pleaſe upon this queſtion. But conſider, I pray you, the influence of the fair ſex upon the foundation of Muſulmaniſm, and how the paſſions of a woman quickly ſpread in it the ſeeds of diſcord. Trace Ali's ſchiſm, and you will find the leudneſs of Ayeſha, whom he accuſed, to be the ſource of it. This woman never forgave him : ſhe hindered him three times ſucceſſively from arriving at the dignity of Caliph ; and, after he had obtained it, ſhe made a league againſt him (278), and put herſelf at the head of 30000 men. She loſt the battle, and was taken, and ſent back to Medina, where ſhe died, and was buried near Mahomet : but the league, ſhe had made, to revenge the death of Othman, died not with her. Ali was at laſt killed, upon this pretence, and from thence aroſe a great ſchiſm, which ſtill continues.

Mr HERBELOT *criticiſed.*

I cannot conclude without obſerving a ſmall want of exactneſs in the *Bibliotheque Orientale* of Mr Herbelot. He ſays in the article Aiſchah, that this widow of Mahomet *undertook to condemn Othman for impiety.* But in another place (279), he relates, that being conſulted by the faction, who brought complaints againſt this Caliph, ſhe made anſwer, That he ought to be admitted to penance ; and that ſhe *maintained it afterwards to Ali.* I do not object this as a contradiction, credulity of the Mahometans as to miracles [QQ]. Mr. Simon is blamed for certain things he has publiſhed, which tend to extenuate the infamy of Mahometiſm (q). See the laſt chapter of his Critical Hiſtory of the belief and cuſtoms of the nations of the Levant. But if what he ſays is true at the bottom; he deſerves to be commended; for we muſt not foment the hatred of evil, by making it appear more black and hateful than it really is.

---

* *Diſput. Chriſtiani, cap. vi, Elmacin. lib. i, cap. iv, Abul-Faraghius, Abul-Feda, &c.*

† *Gentius in notis ad Muſladin. Sadum. p.* 568.

(271) Prideaux, *ibid. pag.* 143.

(272) *Every one remembers the ſong, which begins with this complaint of a lover.*
Une infidélité cruelle n'efface point les traits d'une infidele, &c.
Tho' ſhe be cruel, ſtill ſhe's fair, &c.

(273) Prideaux, *ibid. pag.* 140.

† *For ſhe died in the 58d year of the Hegira.* Elmacin. *lib. i, cap. vii.*

‡ *Johannes Andreas, cap. iii.*

(274) Prideaux, *pag.* 142.

‡ *Joh. Andreas, cap. vii.*

** *Abul-Feda. Hottingeri Bibl. Orient. cap. ii. Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. pag.* 362.

†† *Joh. Andreas, de Confuſione Sectæ Mahometanæ, c. ii.*

(275) Prideaux, *ibid.*

(276) *See the remark* [Q].

(277) Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. *at the word* Aiſchah, *pag.* 80.

(278) Herbelot, ubi ſupra ; *and at the word* Ali, *pag.* 89, 90.

(279) *In the article OTHMAN, pag.* 696.

(q) *See the difficulties propoſed to Mr Steyaert, part vi, from pag.* 303, *to pag.* 316.

diction, but as an imperfect account. We muſt believe, I. That this woman judged the cauſe of Othman, and condemned him for impiety. II. That ſhe pronounced, that they ought to be ſatisfied with his penance. Mr Herbelot ſhould have united theſe two facts in the article of Aiſchah, and in the article of Othman, and not have ſeparated the one from the other, by placing the firſt in one place without the ſecond, and the ſecond in another place without the firſt. This advice is of great importance to all writers of Dictionaries; for they find it very difficult to avoid this fault. I am afraid I have been guilty of it more than once.

[QQ] *A very ridiculous tale concerning the credulity of the Mahometans as to miracles.*] A Benedictin of the Low-Countries publiſhed a book (280) in Latin and Flemiſh, at Deventer, in 1524; in which he relates a great many idle tales, among the reſt this which follows. A Genoeſe had ſo great a curioſity to ſee what the Moors or Saracens practiſed in their moſques, that he entered it by ſtealth, tho' he knew very well the cuſtom of putting all Chriſtians to death who enter there, or forcing them to abjure Chriſtianity. He was encompaſſed with ſo great a croud, that he could not get out, when an accident happened to him, which required him to go out immediately, being very much preſſed by a natural neceſſity; he could not get the better of it, and in a little time ſaw himſelf in danger of death, the bad ſmell he ſpread around him having diſcovered the miſchance. He freed himſelf from this danger, by giving them to underſtand, that he had been for a long time coſtive, and that now being come to recommend himſelf to Mahomet, he found immediate eaſe. Whereupon they took his breeches, and hung them up in the moſque, crying out, a miracle! a miracle! The words of this monk are theſe: *Cum ibi eſſet in medio maximæ multitudinis, & non poſſet exire, neceſſitaſque ei veniſſet ſuperfluum pondus corporis deponendi, ſtercorizavit in femoralibus. Cum autem fætor eſſet in illa Moſchæa, omnes circumſpiciebant qui hujus fætoris cauſa fuiſſet. Inveneruntque ipſum Januenſem, quem volentes occidere, ille, qui forte linguam eorum ſciebat, eis dixit, vel per interpretem mendacium hoc ſignificavit, ſcilicet, Quod cum ipſe non poſſet per longum tempus habere beneficium ventris, intravit templum, ut Mahumeto ſe commendaret, & ſtatim habuit beneficium ventris. Hoc autem audientes & credentes illi homines beſtiales, acceperunt femoralia illa ſtercore infecta, & ſuſpenderunt in Moſchæa, clamantes, miraculum! miraculum* (281)*!* Thus one half of the world laughs at the other; for doubtleſs the Mahometans are not ignorant of the ridiculous ſtories, that are told of the monks; and if it were true, that they know nothing of them, yet it might reaſonably be believed, that they ſpread lies and impertinent fables againſt the Chriſtian ſects. If they knew this ſtory of the Flemiſh Benedictin, they would ſay, perhaps, theſe honeſt forgers of miracles frame very groſs ones for us; not but that they know how to invent much finer; but thoſe they keep for themſelves; they drink off the wine, and ſend us the dregs.

(280) *Intituled*, Prognoſticon Antichriſti.

(281) Prognoſticon Antichriſti, *pag.* 38. apud Revium, in Hiſtoria Daventrienſi, *pag.* 228, 229.

MAHOMET II, the eleventh ſultan of the Turks, born at Adrianople the twenty fourth of March, 1430, was one of the greateſt men that is mentioned in hiſtory, if we conſider only the qualifications neceſſary for a conqueror; for as to thoſe of a good man, we muſt not look for them in his life. It is not true that his mother was a Chriſtian (a). He very well deſerved, the title of GREAT, which he ambitiouſly aſpired to, and which the Turks do not fail to give him [A]; for 'he ſignalized his reign by the conqueſt of two empires, twelve kingdoms, and two hundred conſiderable towns. But the progreſs he made was not the effect of a ſudden revolution, or of blind fortune, which led him on from victory to victory, without the aſſiſtance of prudent conduct. The blood, which he ſhed upon great occaſions, proves, that the advantages he gained were diſputed with him. He raiſed ſome ſieges, made haſty retreats, and loſt ſome battles; but thoſe diſgraces, which blunt the edge of common ſpirits, encouraged his, or rather inſtructed him how to behave himſelf for the future, and his judgment helped him to repair, by patience, what he had loſt by impetuoſity. He was indefatigable beyond imagination; for more than once he began a campaign gloriouſly in *Europe*, and finiſhed it ſtill more gloriouſly in *Aſia* (b).' It was his good fortune to be born in an age, in which the valour of his enemies infinitely contributed to raiſe the glory of his triumphs [B]. We need not have recourſe to the Turks, in order to form

(a) *See the remark* [F].

(b) *Guillet, Hiſtory of Mahomet II, pag. i. He cites Phranza, lib. i, cap. xxxiii.* Barlet. de Expug. Scodr. *lib. i.* Bapt. Egnat. de Orig. Turc. Phil. Lonicer. *lib. i.*

[A] *He very well deſerved the title of* GREAT . . ., *which the Turks do not fail to give him.*] They confeſs 'That all the conqueſts of his ſucceſſors had his for their foundation and pattern, and that it was eaſy for them to follow the way he had opened unto them, after he had removed all impediments. And therefore, when they ſpeak of him, they commonly ſuppreſs his name of Mahomet, altho' in their language it has the glorious ſignification of *praiſed*, or *loved* *, and they diſtinguiſh him from the other Sultans, by the magnificent titles of *Boiuc* and *Aboulfetch*, whereof one ſignifies *great*, and the other the *father of victory*. It is objected to him, that during his life, he was ambitious of the firſt of theſe titles; but did he not take pains enough to deſerve it? The Chriſtians themſelves have not denied it to him, and it is agreed on all hands, that he was the firſt of the Ottoman emperors, to whom our weſtern nations gave the title of Grand-Seignior, or Great Turk, which poſterity has continued to his ſucceſſors (1).'

[B] *The valour of his enemies . . . contributed to raiſe the glory of his triumphs*]. This is a happineſs, which the great Alexander wanted; for he found only weak enemies in Aſia, though they were innumerable. It ſeems therefore, that he was not the favourite of Fortune to the ſame degree as Mahomet was, who had almoſt always brave nations to contend with, and overcome, which diſtinguiſhes him from all other great conquerors, very much to his advantage. Let us prove this by the words of a modern author, who has given us a fine Hiſtory of this Sultan. 'It cannot be ſaid, that he had to do with obſcure enemies, and nations that were not war-like, ſince among the illuſtrious captains, who checked his ſucceſſes, are reckoned Huniades, and Matthias Corvinus, with the forces of Hungary; Scanderbeg, with thoſe of the fierce Albanians; the Valachian Uladus, as intrepid as they, although in truth not ſo honeſt a man; the emperors of Greece, and Trebiſonde, the kings of Perſia, of Naples, and Boſnia; the princes of Greece, of Servia, of Sinope, and Caramania; the republics of Venice and Genoa, the knights of Rhodes, and the armies of the Cruſade, that is, the choiceſt ſoldiers of our weſtern nations. There was not one of ſo many enemies, whom he did not meet deſignedly

* *Anton. Geufræus in Nomenclat. Vocabul. Barbar.*

(1) *Guillet, Hiſtory of Mahomet II, lib. i, pag.* 8.

form a juſt Idea of his merits. The Chriſtians have raiſed monuments to him [*C*], which exalt his victories above what the Ottoman annals do, and above all that the Turks could invent to immortalize the grandeur of his actions. It is therefore very ſtrange, that, in Chriſtendom, there ſhould be ſome eminent writers, who maintain, that proſperity is a ſign of a good cauſe [*D*], and that none but virtuous princes have a ſhare in the favours of

deſignedly, with extraordinary bravery, and who did not at laſt yield to his valour, or his conduct. Chriſtians, or Mahometans, they were alike the aim of his ambition; and the intereſt of his religion was never admitted among the maxims of his policy. Among ſo many Sultans, not one of them to this day, but he only, durſt ſend regular troops into Italy, where they gained a pitched battle, and took a ſtrong town, not by a ſudden aſſault, as pirates do, but by the regular attacks of a formal ſiege (2).

[*C*] *The Chriſtians have raiſed monuments to him.*] The ſame Hiſtorian has furniſhed us with the proof of this. ‘ I do not think it any fault to revive the memory of this conqueror; for, beſides that it is impoſſible his name ſhould periſh †, there never was any infidel prince, who left among us the like monuments. The Catholic church ⸸ takes care to put us in mind of him every day of the year, by a remarkable and perpetual ſignal; for the ringing of the bell every day for prayers, at noon, was enjoined by one of our Popes, only to advertiſe the people to recommend to God the faithful that fought againſt this Sultan ‡. For one battle that he loſt, we do ſtill, every year, return thanks to heaven, by ſolemnizing the feſtival of the transfiguration of our Saviour, which was inſtituted in memory of this victory. But, what deſerves our conſideration no leſs, he alone gave occaſion to the calling of a general council, and to the project of ſeveral others. His ** armies alone forced the Chriſtians to oppoſe againſt him thoſe of a Cruſade, which was plainly diſtinguiſhed from all other holy wars, becauſe a Pope marched with it in perſon, accompanied by the college of cardinals. Laſtly, he alone obliged the weſtern emperors to inſtitute the order †† of the knights of Auſtria, who, under this great name, taken from the houſe of their founder, and under the protection of St George, engaged themſelves by ſolemn vows to put a ſtop to his aſtoniſhing progreſs. An ⸸⸸ archbiſhop, a cardinal, and even a Pope publiſhed, during his Life, his victories in their writings, to raiſe up enemies againſt him in favour of our altars (3).’ The confeſſion, our Hiſtorians make, bears no leſs a teſtimony to his glory, than the preparations, which the Pope made to retire to Avignon, in caſe Italy was attacked by Mahomet in perſon. Achmet, who commanded in Otranto, went from thence, to wait upon his maſter, ‘ and confer with him about the progreſs of his arms in Italy, whither alſo he promiſed to carry him. The threats he uſed at his embarking, threw the Italians into a terrible conſternation, and made them fear a campaign, ſo much the more fatal, becauſe the Ottoman garriſon continued every day to make excurſions, and gained new advantages; ſo that Otranto was filled with Chriſtian ſlaves and booty. Italy has ſuffered greater miſchiefs; but it never was put into ſuch frights, and it ſeemed as if the people there were already condemned, to wear the turban. It is certain, that the ſovereign pontif ‡‡ Sixtus IV, fancying that Rome was already involved in the frightful deſtiny of Conſtantinople, deſigned to have truſted it to the protection of the apoſtles, and thought of nothing but equipping his gallies, to ſail to Provence, and to tranſlate a ſecond time the holy ſee to Avignon. The Hiſtorians of that time have written, that there was no hopes of ſafety for Italy; becauſe in effect there was not one place ſtrong enough to hold out againſt a hundred thouſand Mahometans, encouraged, as it was ſuppoſed, by the preſence of the Sultan. Among all the teſtimonies of that conſternation, I ſhall only relate that of Sabellicus, who was of that country, and lived at that time *. *There is no doubt but Italy had been ruined, had not the Providence of* God *put a ſtop to ſo horrible a miſchief by the death of Mahomet* (4).’ I ſhall preſently (5) cite a paſſage of Platina which may be added to the preceding.

Here is another monument, raiſed by the Chriſtians to the glory of this Turkiſh prince. The exceſſive joy, they teſtified at his death, was equivalent to the fineſt panegyrics of Greece. Let us again hear Mr Guillet. *The news of the death of Mahomet was received in Chriſtendom with the greateſt tranſports of joy that ever were ſeen. At Rhodes, where the news was brought ſooner than to other places, they made ſolemn rejoicings; but they were not equal to thoſe of Rome. Pope Sixtus cauſed all the churches to be opened, and forbad all artificers to work at their trades; he appointed feſtivals, which laſted three days, with public prayers and general proceſſions; he commanded, that, during this time, the whole artillery of the caſtle of St Angelo ſhould be continually diſcharged; and, which is moſt remarkable, he put a ſtop to the preparations for his voyage to Avignon, whither he intended to fly, as to a place of refuge from the Ottoman arms* (6). The Hiſtorian, being ſenſible, that ſo many demonſtrations of joy might be prejudicial to the Chriſtian name, becauſe they are not agreeable to that noble greatneſs of ſoul, which ancient Rome affected, endeavours to elude or refute this objection by a pious remark. *It muſt be confeſſed*, ſays he (7), *that the Chriſtian religion has put a great difference between the manners of the ancient Romans and of the modern, and that it hath done it with ſuch juſtice as cannot be too much admired. For ancient Rome, being prepoſſeſſed with it's proud maxims, and a policy, wherein pride had a larger ſhare than generoſity, would ſhew no ſigns of joy at the death of it's enemies, leſt it ſhould be ſuſpected ſhe was ſhamefully afraid of their power. Thus Cæſar affected to lament the death of Pompey; and Pagan Hiſtory is full of inſtances of ſuch like oſtentation. But, in the age of Mahomet, the deſtruction of ſacred altars, and the profanation of our moſt holy myſteries, juſtly required an exceeding great joy for the death of this famous, ſacrilegious robber, as a pious acknowledgement, that Rome was indebted to Heaven for the welfare of Chriſtianity.* I have already ſaid (8), that the Chriſtians gave this terrible enemy the ſirname of Grand-Seignior.

[*D*] *Some eminent Chriſtian writers maintain that proſperity is a ſign of a good cauſe.*] I have already ſhewn the impertinence of theſe writers in the article of MAHOMET the falſe prophet (9). I have ſhewn, that, with regard to triumphs, the ſtar of Mahometiſm has prevailed over the ſtar of Chriſtianity, and that, if we were to judge of the goodneſs of theſe religions by the glory of temporal ſucceſs, the Mahometan would appear to be the better of the two. The Mahometans are ſo certain of this, that they alledge no ſtronger proof of the goodneſs of their cauſe, than the glorious ſucceſſes, wherewith God has favoured it. See what a Monk, who continued long in Turkey, has taught us, as to the motives, which retain theſe infidels in their religion. ‘ Secundum motivum eſt victoria eorum continua contra Chriſtianos: quod aliquos multum movet. Unde victores ſe nominant, & gloriantur quaſi victores totius mundi. Orant etiam pro victoribus ſpecialiter in omnibus congregationibus ſuis, præſertim in continuis poſt comeſtionem gratiarum actionibus. Superbiunt inſuper, & Chriſtianos fœminas deſpiciendo nominant, & ſe viros eorum. Et ut ad hoc magis ac magis incitentur, anteceſſorum victorias deſcribunt, decantant, laudant ac præconizant (10). - - - *The ſecond motive is their continual victory over the Chriſtians; which is of great weight with ſome. From whence they ſtyle themſelves the conquerors, and boaſt as if they had conquered the whole world. For they put up prayers in particular for the conquerors in all their congregations, and eſpecially in their grace after meat. They pride themſelves moreover, and call the Chriſtians women, out of contempt, and themſelves men. And to incite themſelves ſtill the more to this, they deſcribe, ſing, extol, and cry up, the victories of their anceſtors.*’ Let us add another witneſs. ‘ The happy ſucceſs of the arms of theſe infidels is another argument, which they make uſe of, to maintain the truth of their religion. For, ſince they believe, that God is the author of all good events, they conclude, that the more they have ſucceeded in their wars, the more God makes it appear, that he approves their zeal and

(2) Guillet, *ibid. pag.* 6, 7.

† *Platina, Vit. Caliſt. Girolamo.*

⸸ *Briani. lib. xvii.*

‡ *Pandect. Leunclav. cap. cxxxiii. Turco-Græc. pag.* 62. *Petav. Ration. Temp. pars i, lib. ix. Briani. lib. xvii.*

** *P. Juſtinian. lib. viii, Platina Vit. di Pio II.*

†† *Lazius, lib. iii, rerum Viennenſium.*

⸸⸸ *Leon. Chienſ. Arch. Mityl. Iſid. Ruthen. Card. SS. Pet. & Mart. Pius II.*

(3) Guillet, ib. *pag.* 4, 5.

‡‡ *Cuſpinian. in Vit. Mahomet.*

* *Sabellic. Ennead. x, lib. vii.*

(4) Guillet, *ib. lib. vii, pag.* 374, 375, *ad ann.* 1480.

(5) *In the remark* [*E*].

(6) Guillet, ibid. pag. 384.

(7) Ibid.

(8) *In the remark* [*A*].

(9) *Remark* [*P*].

(10) Septem-Caſtrenſis de moribus Turcarum, cap. xi, pag. 40. apud Hottinger. Hiſtor. Oriental. pag. 338.

of fortune (*c*). It is to no purpoſe to alledge, that, if the Chriſtian princes had not been divided, they would have beaten the Mahometans [*E*]. Some have written, that this Sultan

‘ and religion. This perſuaſion makes the Turks hate and deteſt the Jews above all other people in the world. They call them a people abandoned by God, becauſe they have no fixed habitation upon earth, and no prince of their own nation to protect and defend them (11).’

The Monk, whom I juſt now cited, tells us a particular that deſerves our attention; which is, that the Turks look upon themſelves as men, and the Chriſtians as women. How does this agree with our Hiſtories, which inform us, that the Turks never conquered the Chriſtians without being ten or twelve to one, and without loſing twenty times as many men as the Chriſtians did? If this were true, would they ſay, that the Chriſtians are women? I know not what to ſay, upon this ſubject; but I am perſuaded on the one ſide, that our weſtern Chriſtians have always been as good ſoldiers at leaſt as the Ottomans; and, on the other ſide, that our Hiſtories are full of fables, as to the number of the ſoldiers ſlain, and of the ſoldiers that fought: they increaſe it prodigiouſly on the ſide of the Infidels, and leſſen it as much on the other ſide. They do what we have ſeen done by the Gazetteers of each party in theſe laſt campaigns, at the two ſieges of Namur (12). By turns the Gazettes of the beſieged ſpoke of ſeveral imaginary aſſaults, wherein the enemy loſt an infinite number of men; By turns they ſo increaſed their loſſes in real aſſaults, that he, who ſhould add together the ſlain, the wounded, the deſerters, and the ſick, mentioned in theſe relations, would not find one man left in the army of the beſiegers, who could hear the beſieged beat a parley. However things are changed for the better; the Turks have ſhewn, both in Hungary and Greece, ſince the year 1683, that they are but poor ſoldiers, and are not able to reſiſt the Chriſtian troops inferior to them in number. If they had always been ſo unſucceſsful, they would never have taken proſperiry for the mark of a true religion. They have met with great loſſes in Europe, and our news-writers pretend, that they have had fatal loſſes in Aſia; for how often have we read in the Gazettes, that Mecca (13), Grand Cairo, and the neighbouring provinces, have been ſacked, and that there was a great conſternation at Conſtantinople, upon occaſion of theſe irruptions and inſurrections (14). They were political frauds, deſigned to perſuade the people, that all the imperial troops would quickly be upon the Rhine. Two or three ſmall conſequences, very eaſy to be drawn, lead the reader preſently thither.

One would think the Turks, after theſe diſgraces, ſhould doubt whether their religion be good, and yet they do not: they are no more capable than other men of arguing conſequentially, and of following their own principles. They do as the orthodox would do; for they attribute their misfortunes, not to any fault in their religion, but to the little care they take to practiſe it. Give me leave to ſay one word about the inconſtancy of mens reaſonings with reſpect to adverſity and proſperity. Their maxims upon this ſubject are quite oppoſite: for you will be told, that they, who will live godly, muſt ſuffer perſecution (15), and that godlineſs has the promiſe of this life, and of that which is to come (16). You will be told, that God ſuffers the wicked to proſper in this life, and that, if we obſerve it narrowly, we ſhall find the maxim of Livy true, that thoſe, who fear God, ſucceed in their deſigns, and that fortune is an enemy to the ungodly (17). This is not all: as to the general theſis, it is agreed that we ſhould not judge of things by the event, and that thoſe, who do ſo, deſerve to be unhappy.

- - - - - careat ſucceſſibus opto,
Quiſquis ab eventu facta notanda putat (18).

May he ſtill want ſucceſs in all his deeds,
Who thinks no action good, but what ſucceeds.

But let us repreſent to ourſelves two great oppoſite parties, one of which has formed an important enterprize: if it ſucceeds, they do not fail to infer from thence, that it is juſt; they maintain, that this good ſucceſs is a mark of God's approbation; the other party, on the contrary, maintains, that we muſt keep to the general theſis, and to the *careat ſucceſſibus opto*, &c. and that God, for the puniſhment of men, very often permits the wicked to ſucceed in their pernicious deſigns. But if the party, who gives ſuch leſſons of morality, ſoon after forms an enterprize of conſequence, and ſees it ſucceſsful, you ſhall no more hear them ſpeak of the general theſis; but they ſay in their turn, that good ſucceſs is a mark of the juſtice of that affair, and that it is plain, God has approved it, ſince he has ſo viſibly accompanied it with his holy benediction. Then the other party will not be aſhamed to ſay, that we muſt not judge of things by the event, *careat ſucceſſibus opto*, &c. and to vent a hundred fine common places. Is any thing more convenient than this? Is not this to be furniſhed with principles, as we are with cloaths, theſe for ſummer, and thoſe for winter (19)?

[*E*] *It is to no purpoſe to alledge, that, if the Chriſtian princes had not been divided, they would have beaten the Mahometans.*] An infinite number of books are full of complaints, that the Chriſtian princes, by devourone another, have loſt Conſtantinople, the iſle of Rhodes, Hungary, *&c.* which they might eaſily have prevented, if they had united their forces againſt the common enemy of Chriſtendom. We have reaſon to believe this, and to complain of a diſagreement, which has proved ſo beneficial to the Turks. But it would be very ridiculous, if this remark ſhould be made uſe of, to ſhew, that the falſe church has not been more favoured with temporal proſperities than the true one; for this diſagreement of the Chriſtian princes is, in itſelf, a great unhappineſs: and, ſuppoſe the Infidels had not taken advantage of it, it had nevertheleſs been a great affliction to Chriſtendom. Obſerve well, that, in the queſtion, whether Chriſtianity has had a larger ſhare of proſperity, than the falſe religions, we are not to enquire, whether the Sultans obtained victories by the valour of their troops, or by the weakneſs of their enemies; but whether they conquered kingdoms, and gained battles over the Chriſtians. Whether they did ſo by good fortune, or by bravery, it is ſtill a temporal proſperity: and ſo we get nothing by leſſening the glory of their triumphs, under pretence of their taking advantage of the diviſions of the Chriſtians: this rather affords a new proof of the ill ſucceſs of the Chriſtians. Let us therefore eſteem it as a monument erected by the Chriſtians to the good fortune and glory of the Turks, that ſo many harangues have been publiſhed, exhorting Chriſtian princes to unite their forces againſt the Infidels. There was a time, when our profeſſors of eloquence would not have been thought worthy of their penſions, unleſs they had made an harangue of this nature, and thoſe harangues were not ſallies of wit, or ſchool-boys exerciſes, like the declamations, that were made at Rome upon Annibal (20) and Sylla (21); but they were ſerious and grave diſcourſes, deſigned to perſuade princes to enter into a ſtrict league, and undertake a famous expedition. Jerome Reuſnerus has collected ſeveral volumes of theſe harangues. Neither did princes alone ſtand in need of an exhortation to concord; there was another kind of diviſion, which did no ſmall miſchief to Chriſtianity. The eccleſiaſtics depended upon the laity, and theſe hoped the eccleſiaſtics would furniſh the expences of the war. Platina has very naturally deſcribed the ill effects, which followed from that reciprocal expectation. ‘ Mahometus Arabs, *ſays he* (22), magnum in Chriſtiano populo excitavit incendium: & ita magnum, ut verear ne ejus ſecta noſtra potiſſimum ætate reliquias Chriſtiani nominis penitus extinguat: adeo tepeſcimus, & animo ac corpore languidi interitum noſtrum expectantes concidimus. Invaleſcit ejus ſecta nunc multo magis quam antea. Nam tota Aſia & Africa, magnaque pars Europæ Mahometanus principibus ſubjecta eſt. Inſtant nunc Thurci terra ac mari: ut nos tanquam cuniculos, ex his Europæ latebris eruant. Sedemus otioſi: alter alterum expectantes, quaſi hoc malum univerſæ reipublicæ Chriſtianæ non immineat. Expectant ſacerdotes ut à ſæcularibus hoc tantum bellum & tam neceſſarium ſumatur. Expectant item ſæculares ut Preſbyteri tuendæ religionis cauſa pecunias in ſumptus bellicos polliceantur & ſubminiſtrent, ne in pejores uſus effundant, quemadmodum facere plerique conſuevere, pecunias eleemoſynis & ſanguine marrum comparatas, in aurea & argentea vaſa & pergran-

(*c*) *See what Boſius has written againſt Machiavel.*

(11) *Ricaut, Preſent State of the Ottoman Empire,* book ii, chap. iii, pag. m. 324.

(12) *The firſt in* 1692, *the ſecond in* 1695.

(13) *Note, that Mecca does not belong to the Turks, as the Gazettes ſuppoſed.*

(14) *Compare the words of Juvenal,* Sat. VI, ver. 407.

Quoſdam facit iſſe Niphatem
In populos, magnoque illic cuncta arva teneri
Diluvio, nutare urbes, ſubſidere terras.

Wrecks, floods, and fires, whatever ſhe can meet,
She ſpreads, and is the fame of ev'ry ſtreet.

How men ſport with different principles about proſperity and adverſity.

(15) 2 Tim. iii, 12.

(16) 1 Tim. iv, 8.

(17) Invenietis omnia proſpera eveniſſe ſequentibus Deos, adverſa ſpernentibus, *T. Livius, lib. v.*

(18) Ovid. Epiſt. Phyll. ad Demophoont.

(19) *Apply here what St Hilary ſays, lib. ii.* ad Conſtant. *againſt the* annuas atque menſtruas de Deo fides, *which were rather* fides temporum quam Evangeliorum. *See alſo the Advice to the Refugees,* pag. 85. *and the end of the remark* [*G*] *of the article ARIUS.*

(20) I demens & ſævas curre per Alpes,
Ut pueris placeas & declamatio fias.
Juven. Sat. X. ver. 166.

Go, climb the rugged Alps, ambitious fool,
To pleaſe the boys, and be a theme, at ſchool.
Dryden.

(21) Et nos ergo manum ferulæ ſubduximus, & nos
Conſilium dedimus Syllæ privatus ut altum
Dormiret . . . . .
Idem, Sat. I, ver. 13.

Provok'd by theſe incorrigible fools,
I left declaiming in pedantic ſchools;
Where, with men-boys, I ſtrove to get renown,
Adviſing Sylla to a private gown.
Idem.

(22) Platina, in Bonifacio V.

Sultan was an Atheiſt [*F*]. This may be true; at leaſt it is certain, that he made war, to ſatisfy his ambition, and not to aggrandize Mahometiſm. He preferred his own intereſt to that of the religion he profeſſed, and hence it came to paſs, that he granted a toleration

dia quidem fundentes: parum de futuro ſolliciti: Dei quem tantum utilitatis gratia colunt, & hominum contemptores. - - - - *Mahomet the Arabian blew up a great flame among the Chriſtians; ſo great a one, that I fear, leſt, in this our age, eſpecially, his ſect ſhould quite extinguiſh the remains of the Chriſtian name: we are ſo luke-warm, and ſit down in an indolent expectation of our ruin. His ſect prevails at preſent more than ever: for all Aſia and Africa, and a great part of Europe, is ſubject to Mahometan princes. The Turks now preſs us by ſea and land, to drive us out of Europe, like rabbets out of their burrows. We ſit ſtill, each expecting the other to ſtir, as if this evil did not hang over the whole Chriſtian world. The clergy expect the laity ſhould undertake this ſo great and neceſſary war. The laity in their turns expect the clergy ſhould engage to ſupply money to carry on the war, and not ſquander away, as moſt of them do, the money raiſed by charities and the blood of martyrs, in the purchaſe of large gold and ſilver veſſels, regardleſs of the future, and in contempt of GOD, whom they worſhip only for gain, as well as of men.*’

Bellarmin therefore is very juſtly laughed at for placing proſperity among the marks of the true church. ‘Quas ultimo ponit loco notas *Bellarminus IX & X infelicem exitum Eccleſiam oppugnantium, felicitatem vero Eccleſiam defendentium,* nomen notarum adeo non merentur, ut mirum ſit non cogitaſſe Cardinalem furioſis hac ratione Muhammedanis contra nos ſuppeditari arma (23). - - - - - *The ninth and tenth marks, which Bellarmin places laſt, to wit,* The ill ſucceſs of thoſe, who oppoſe the church, and the good fortune of thoſe who defend it, *are ſo far from deſerving the name of marks, that it is ſurpriſing the cardinal was not aware, that this was to furniſh the furious Mahometans with arms.*’ It belongs to the Mahometans to teach ſuch a doctrine, as Hottinger makes it appear, who, beſides ſhews, that the name of Catholic, antiquity, long and uninterrupted duration, large extent, ſucceſſion of biſhops, miracles, auſterity of manners, teſtimony of adverſaries, and ſuch other marks, whereby Bellarmin pretends to diſcern the true church, are the ſame, which the followers of Mahomet alledge to the advantage of their religion.

[*F*] *Some have written, that this Sultan was an Atheiſt.*] Paul Jovius makes the following remark upon this occaſion (24): ‘Natus erat ex Deſpoti Serviæ filia, quæ puerum Chriſtianis præceptis & moribus imbuerat, quorum mox oblitus adoleſcendo, ita ad Mahometis ſacra ſe contulit, ut neque hos, neque illos ritus teneret, & in arcano prorſus Atheos haberetur; utpote qui unum tantum bonæ fortunæ numen coleret, quod præclarè conciliari vivida efficacique animi virtute prædicabat. Itaque nulli addictus religioni, cunctorum hominum accuratas de Diis, tanquam humana nihil curantibus, cogitationes irridebat; eo animi decreto, ut nullum unquam jus amicitiæ aut fœderis, niſi ex commodo, exceptaque ad proferendum imperium occaſione, colendum atque ſervandum arbitraretur. - - - - *He was born of a daughter of the governor of Servia, who had inſtructed him during his childhood in the Chriſtian precepts and manners; which forgetting as he grew up, he embraced the Mahometan religion, but in ſuch a manner as not to ſtick to any particular rites, and was thought to be an Atheiſt in his heart; for he worſhipped only the deity of fortune, which he pretended might clearly be reconciled with a lively and efficacious virtue of the mind. Being therefore attached to no religion, he laughed at all mens notions about the gods, as not concerning themſelves with human affairs; and reſolved to obſerve no faith or compact farther than it ſerved to promote the ends of his ambition.*’ There are two obſervations to be made upon this paſſage: I. Paul Jovius is miſtaken when he affirms that the mother of Mahomet was a Chriſtian (25). ‘Neither the name, nor the quality of his mother, are known, though all the weſtern Hiſtorians, being prepoſſeſſed with a common error, have deſcribed her to us under names differently forged, ſometimes of Meliſſa, and Irene; ſometimes of Mary the daughter of the Deſpotes of Servia, and called Deſpœne, a title of honour which the Greeks gave to the eaſtern Chriſtian princeſſes. But though this Deſpœne was married to Sultan Amurat, yet ſhe was no more than ſtep-mother to Mahomet, and never had any children, as is plainly proved by the embaſſy of the Hiſtorian Phranza †, who was ſent to ſollicit her to marry the emperor Conſtantine, when ſhe was the widow of Amurat. The Turks, and the reſt of the Greeks are agreed in this (26). . . . . There is a great probability, that ‡ Deſpœne Mary, who, by a peculiar privilege, lived there (27) in the exerciſe of the Chriſtian religion, took ſome care of him; for ſhe taught him *the Lord's Prayer, and the Angelical Salutation,* not as a leſſon of piety, which Amurat, being jealous of his worſhip, would have rigorouſly condemned, but as a meer amuſement to a child, whoſe curioſity already inclined him to all things.’ My ſecond reflexion is, that Paul Jovius groſſly contradicts himſelf; for if Mahomet II acknowledged and ſerved the deity of fortune, and if he believed, that he could gain her favour by application, and by virtue of his courage, he was not at all an Atheiſt, and did not wholly reject Providence. It is plain, that this fortune, whom he ſerved, could not appear to his mind, but under the idea of a Being, which diſpoſes of events, and favours certain perſons. This cannot be attributed to a blind Being, which is moved by a natural force. But this Being muſt direct it's power according to it's deſires, muſt know what men do, and diſtinguiſh them one from another. Every one may ſee, that the Atheiſt's ſyſtem is inconſiſtent with the ſuppoſition of ſuch a Being (28). Father Maimbourg, who here tranſcribes Paul Jovius, has fallen into the ſame contradiction. *There never was,* ſays he (29), *a greater Atheiſt than this prince, who adored only his own good fortune, which he acknowledged as the only Deity, to which he was always ready to ſacrifice all things; who laughed at all religions; at the Chriſtian, in which he was inſtructed from his infancy by the Sultaneſs, his mother-in-law, daughter of the Deſpotes of Servia; and at the religion of Mahomet, whom he ſtiled the ring-leader of the banditti among his confidents; and at all thoſe, who believed there was any other Providence but that, which every one ought to have for himſelf. From hence it came to paſs, that his intereſt, grandeur, and pleaſure, were the only rule of his actions, and that he neither kept faith, nor word, nor oath, nor treaty, but only ſo far as he found it convenient, or uſeful, for attaining one of theſe three ends, which he aimed at in every thing that he undertook.*

A REFLEXION on the common opinion, that there are fortunate perſons.

It is a very common opinion, that ſome perſons are fortunate; and others unfortunate; and we can hardly refrain from believing it, when we conſider public events. There are ſome admirals, who are almoſt always croſſed by contrary winds, in the moſt important deſigns. There are others, for whom a fair wind ſeems to riſe, every time they have any great deſigns to execute. This good and bad fortune does not appear ſo manifeſtly in land-armies; but it cannot be denied that rain or fair weather, and many other accidents, which do not at all depend upon our wiſdom, oftener croſs or hinder the deſigns of certain generals, than they do thoſe of others. It may be obſerved likewiſe, that there are ſome generals, who are never ſeconded with what they call lucky hits, but when they fight againſt captains, who are accounted unlucky. If we were to trace the adventures of private perſons, we ſhould find proportionably as many marks of theſe lucky or unlucky hits. No Atheiſt, no Epicurean, can admit of this diſtinction of good and bad fortune: it is inconſiſtent with their ſyſtem. Will they alledge the influences of the ſtars? This is fit only to be ſaid in a ſonnet: for the ſtars can do nothing, in this caſe, unleſs they are directed by an intelligent principle; and this is what they do not admit. They will ſay, that he is an unlucky man, who purchaſes two hundred lottery tickets out of three thouſand, and draws no prize at all; and that he is a lucky man, who buys only three tickets out of a hundred thouſand, and draws the higheſt prize: but they will maintain, that this is done without the direction of any intelligent Being, and is a neceſſary conſequence

(23) Hotting. Hiſtor. Orient. pag. 338.

(24) Jovius, in Elog. virorum bellica virtute illuſtrium, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 262.

(25) Guillet, *ubi ſupra, lib. i, pag.* 10.

† Phranz. lib. iii, cap. ii. Chalcond. lib. vii, Turco-Græc. pag. 22. Annal. Sultan. cap. xciii, xcvi.

(26) Guillet, ib. pag. 11.

‡ Turco-Græc. pag. 194. Informat. di Paolo Giovio, pag. 75. Annal. Sultan. cap. xcix.

(27) *That is, in the Seraglio.*

(28) *See the article CÆSAR, remark* [*H*].

(29) *Maimbourg, Hiſtory of the Schiſm of the Greeks,* lib. vi, *pag.* 291. *of the Dutch edition. He cites Ducas, cap. xxxiii.*

toleration to the Greek church, and alſo ſhewed great civility to the patriarch of Conſtantinople [*G*]. There is no probability, that he made the vow which is attributed to him [*H*]. It is ſaid, that to let his ſoldiers ſee, that pleaſure was not capable to effeminate

ſequence of the mixture of the tickets. In effect, if there were no Providence, ſomebody muſt neceſſarily have the greateſt prize, and one perſon rather than a hundred others: but they cannot maintain, according to their ſyſtem, that certain men ſhall always have the great prizes, who buy only a few tickets, and that thoſe, who buy a great number, ſhall never draw any prize; for this would plainly evince the direction of ſome genius, that is either a friend, or an enemy. And thus it appears, why they cannot admit the diſtinction, properly ſpeaking of fortunate and unfortunate perſons (30). In a word, to return to Mahomet, if he acknowledged the deity of fortune, he was neither an Atheiſt, nor an Epicurean.

[G] *He granted a toleration to the Greek church, and ſhewed great civility to the patriarch of Conſtantinople.*] I perſuade myſelf, that my readers will be glad to find here a ſhort account of a matter ſo curious as this. I ſhall make uſe of the words of Father Maimbourg, who, having deſcribed the taking of Conſtantinople, and Mahomet's triumphal entry into that city, continues thus: ‘(31) After this, as he was very dextrous, being unwilling to loſe the Chriſtians, who were the chief ſtrength, and afforded the greateſt revenue of his new empire, he applied himſelf, by a maſter-piece of Policy, to gain their good will, by ſhewing them, that he would treat them very favourably, like a good maſter, and allow them the free exerciſe of their religion. For, underſtanding †, that the patriarchical ſee was vacant by the voluntary reſignation of Gregory Protoſyncellus, who had retired to Rome, he reſolved to fill it up: and that he might immediately act as emperor, he ordered that it ſhould be done after the ſame manner, as was practiſed under the laſt princes. . . . He cauſed ſome biſhops to aſſemble, who were then near Conſtantinople, with the few eccleſiaſtics, who remained there, and the chief citizens; and theſe choſe, according to his order, the famous ſenator ‡ George Scholarius, the ſame who had declared ſo ſtrongly for the Catholic faith at the council of Florence, and whom Mahomet, who loved able men, had ſpared, when he put to death ſo many perſons of quality, knowing that he was the moſt learned man, and the moſt eloquent of all the Greeks. He was then choſen under the name of Gennadius; and the Sultan would have the ſame ceremonies obſerved on this occaſion, which the emperors of Conſtantinople had uſed at the inſtalling of the patriarchs, after this manner . . . . . (32). Immediately after Gennadius had been choſen, he was conducted, by his order, with great pomp to the palace, where he received him with all ſorts of honours, and teſtimonies of good-will, making him even eat at his table, and holding long conferences with him, as if he had been one of his moſt intimate confidents. After which, having carried him into the great hall, the ceremony was performed of giving the paſtoral ſtaff into his hand, in the preſence of the Turks and Chriſtians, who flocked thither to ſee ſo ſurprizing a ſight; where the Sultan of the Turks, the mortal enemy of Chriſtendom, was ſeen to give the inveſtiture of the patriarchate of Conſtantinople, by the croſier. He did more than all this; for, tho' the new patriarch did all that he could to hinder him, alledging the example of other emperors, who had never carried goodneſs and civility ſo far; yet he would conduct him to the gate of the palace, and there he deſired him to mount on the fineſt horſe of his ſtables, richly harneſſed with white ſattin, embroidered with gold, and ordered all his viſiers and baſhaws to accompany him, as they did, marching in good order on foot, ſome before, and ſome behind him, in a long and magnificent train, a-croſs the ‡ whole city, as far as the famous church of the Twelve Apoſtles, which he had aſſigned to be his patriarchal church, inſtead of St Sophia, of which he had made a great moſque. He went alſo to viſit him ſome days after in the new patriarchal palace of the church of Our Lady, which he had obtained of the Sultan inſtead of that of the Twelve Apoſtles; and there he deſired him to explain to him the chief points of the Chriſtian religion: which that great man did with ſo much judgment, ſtrength, and clearneſs, and ſo much with the approbation of the Sultan, that he deſired to have that expoſition in writing, which is to be ſeen to this day in Greek, Latin, and Arabic half Turkiſh. Thus that able prince, by this counterfeited ſweetneſs at the beginning of his empire, endeavoured to oblige the Chriſtian Greeks to bear the yoke more patiently, which they were not to find ſo hard, as they have ſince found it to this day.’ Conſult Mr Guillet (33), who relates all this largely and exactly, and mentions ſeveral other things, which were done by Mahomet in favour of the Greeks. The abſtract of which is ſeen in the following remark.

[H] *There is no probability, that he made the vow, which is attributed to him.*] The Supplement to the ‘Annals of Baronius (34) in 1469, affirms, that Mahomet, tranſported with zeal for his religion, made the following ſolemn vow againſt ours. *I ſwear and proteſt by a vow, which I make to the only* GOD, *creator of all things, that I will neither taſte the ſweetneſs of ſleep, nor of good chear, that I will renounce even the deſires of pleaſure, and ſenſual delights, and that I will not turn my face from the eaſt to the weſt, till I have trampled under my horſe's feet all the gods, which the adorers of* CHRIST *ſhall make of wood, braſs, and gold, and all the paintings: in a word, till I have purged the whole face of the earth from their impieties, from the eaſt to the weſt, that I may cauſe the praiſes of the true* GOD, *and of Mahomet, his prophet, to be eternally ſounded forth every where.* The Greek Hiſtorians of that time, who could write with certainty about the affairs of their own country, and who did not ſpare this Sultan in any thing, ſay nothing of this vow. Is it poſſible, that the Latin Hiſtorians, without citing any authority, ſhould make Mahomet ſo zealous for his religion, who maintain, that he profeſſed none? Will they ſay, that this prince plaid the hypocrite, to flatter his ſubjects with a falſe appearance of piety, who was always ſo fierce, and ſo well perſuaded of his mighty power, that he never uſed any caution, nor was ever known to be reduced to ſuch a condeſcention by any ſedition of the army, or people, nor by any formality in the ceremonies of his law? It had been eaſy for him to have begun the performance of this vow in Turkey, where his ſacrilegious country-men would have been very well pleaſed to have ſeconded this falſe zeal. It is evident, that, contrary to the deſign of this pretended Policy, he would have made himſelf ridiculous there, by doing every day before their eyes the contrary to what he had promiſed: for we have deſcribed his care to reſtore the patriarchal dignity, to hold a kind of familiar converſation with the patriarchs Gennadius and Maximus, to authorize, from time to time, the exerciſe of their religion by letters-patents, or by the orders of his Cadies, and to people Conſtantinople with Chriſtian families, which he drew out of every city of Greece, as faſt as by his arms he conquered them. We need only conſider the preſent ſtate of Greece, where his ſucceſſors have permitted the exerciſe of Chriſtianity, according to the liberty he gave them, when they were firſt conquered. In the moſt famous monaſteries in that country, there are to be ſeen, to this day, the ſafe conducts and titles of exemption, which he generouſly granted to their prieſts. He did not forbid the Greeks the veneration of uncarved images, which is ſtill continued to them againſt the expreſs words of this vow; and he granted the ſame toleration for carved images, which were reverenced by the Genoeſe of the Romiſh church, ſettled at Galata, and by the Albanians of the ſame principle, who had been ſubject to Scanderbeg. The Latin Hiſtorians have alſo written, that, as often as Mahomet met a Chriſtian, he * believed himſelf defiled with a ſpiritual taint, and ran preſently to the waſhings of the Alcoran, and cleanſed his eyes and his mouth: but if this had been ſo, he muſt have uſed a great many purifications of this kind, when at the head of his army, he met fifty or ſixty thouſand Chriſtians (35).’

---

(30) See upon all this the remarks of the article TIMOLEON.

(31) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 358, *&c.*

† Phranza, lib. iii, cap. ix.

‡ Phranza, lib. cit. Leo Allat. de perp. conſenſ. lib. iii, cap. v, vi.

(32) Maimbourg, ibid. pag. 361, 362.

‡ Turco-Græc. lib. ii. Panmachariſtæ.

(33) Ubi ſupra, *lib. iii, pag.* 259, *&c.*

(34) That is, Spondanus, in the continuation of the Annals. He cites Letter ccclxxx, of the cardinal of Pavia, and ſays, that a certain perſon having carried a copy of that vow to Raguſa, it was tranſlated into Italian, and ſent to the Venetians, who communicated it to the Pope. Probably this piece was forged, either by ſome idle man, or ſome politician, to excite the weſtern princes to a war.

* Iſidor. Rhuten.

(35) Guillet, ubi ſupra, *lib. vi, pag.* 164, *&c.*

minate his warlike virtue, he cut off the head of a miſtreſs, with whom he was deſperately in love [*I*]. This ſtory, methinks, is a little apocryphal. Moſt of the Chriſtian hiſtorians, in ſpeaking of him, have ſacrificed their candor to their paſſion and reſentment [*K*]. He died on the third of May, 1481, in a town of Bithynia, *as he entered into the fifty ſecond year of his age* (*d*). *He was the firſt of the Sultans, who prepared for himſelf a particular monument* (*e*). I think he was alſo the firſt Sultan who loved the arts and ſciences [*L*]. His epitaph deſerves to be conſidered [*M*]. I ſhall have ſome faults to object to Mr Moreri [*N*], and will not paſs by the inconſiderateneſs of F. Maimbourg, who

[*I*] *He cut off the head of a miſtreſs, with whom he was deſperately in love.*] She was called Irene, and was but ſeventeen years old (36). *A Baſhaw had made her a ſlave at the taking of Conſtantinople, and given her to the Sultan* (37). You may find in Mr Guillet the circumſtances of this adventure; but ſince he obſerves (38) that all thoſe, who mention it, tranſcribe it from Bandelli (39), an Italian monk, *who ſeems to deſerve no credit, by the faults he has committed, contrary to the order of time, and to the names and ranks of the perſons he introduces there*; I give no great credit to it. Mr Scuderi, who made ſo many harangues under the names of illuſtrious ladies, made ſome political diſcourſes under the names of kings. One of theſe diſcourſes is a pretended anſwer of our Sultan to the complaints of his army, on the ſame day that he heheaded this fine woman.

[*K*] *Moſt of the Chriſtian Hiſtorians . . . have ſacrificed their candor to their paſſion.*] Mr Guillet, having obſerved, that the weſtern nations gave this Sultan the title of Grand-Seignior, or Great Turk, adds immediately (40); ‘ It is true, that this favourable teſtimony of our people was contradicted by the greateſt part of the weſtern Hiſtorians of his time; for there was no reproach, nor outrageous term, wherewith they did not, by their pen, blacken this prince. Indeed their zeal for the Chriſtian religion is to be commended, when, as occaſion offered, they were tranſported with indignation againſt the impieties of Mahomet; but then they ought alſo, as occaſion ſerved, to have publiſhed what commendable qualities he had. This is the juſt moderation, which was obſerved by Philip de Comines, and Chalcondylas, and in the letter of Pope Pius II, who, ſpeaking of this prince during his life, laid aſide vulgar prejudices, and obſerved ſuch wiſe reſerves, as we ought always to have for crowned heads. For, in ſhort, in all times, an unſeemly cuſtom has baniſhed that moderation, which ought to be uſed among writers of a different religion, and of different parties, and hath put them upon invective and bitterneſs; as if juſtice and reaſon ſtood in need of ſuch mean and ſhameful helps. And indeed it muſt be confeſſed, that if, among all the reproaches publiſhed at that time againſt Mahomet, you except a few, which were indeed warranted by modeſty and piety, the reſt appear to be diſguiſed praiſe, and the vain threatenings of thoſe, whom he made to tremble.’ This author gives us here a good picture of many people, who have appeared in all ages and all nations.

[*L*] *I think he was the firſt Sultan, who loved the arts and ſciences.*] He often read the hiſtory of Auguſtus, and of the other Cæſars, and with ſtill greater pleaſure that of Alexander, of Conſtantine, and Theodoſius; *becauſe all three reigned in the countries under his dominion* (41). . . . . *The love he had for hiſtory made him at length eſteem the Hiſtorians, of which he gave them ſome marks.* . . . . *He paſſionately loved Painting and Muſic, and applied himſelf to Carving and Agriculture* . . . . (42). *He was ſo fond of foreign languages, that, contrary to the genius of his nation, he ſpoke not only the Arabic, in which the Ottoman laws, and the religion of Mahomet the law-giver are written, but alſo the Perſian, the Greek, and the French, that is the Italian corrupted; thus facilitating to himſelf a communication with thoſe people, whom he threatened with his arms. But chiefly he excelled in Aſtrology; and, to encourage his own troops, and terrify his enemies, he gave out, that the motions and influences of the heavenly bodies promiſed him the empire of the world* (43). To know how well he was ſkilled in Painting, we need only read in Mr Guillet, what Vaſari relates of Gentile Belino, a famous Venetian Painter, who was for ſome time at Mahomet's court, and returned from thence loaded with preſents (44). He brought home the picture of that emperor, and ſo it was not difficult for Hiſtorians to deſcribe to us his aſpect, and yet they repreſent him very differently. F. Maimbourg has a little abuſed F. Bouhours upon this ſubject. See the *Critique Génerale de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme* (45). I ſhall end this remark with theſe words of Paul Jovius (46): ‘ Cæterum Mahomet qui impietatis apud ſuos, apud noſtros verò perſidiæ, & inhumanæ crudelitatis notam ſubiit, hanc ſaltem confeſſione omnium certam laudem à Barbaris repudiatam, non inſulſe tuliſſe exiſtimatur, quòd ei literarum, & præcellentium artium decus cordi fuerit; quando cunctas clariſſimarum gentium Hiſtorias, ſibi verti in Turcicam linguam juberet; ut inde hauſtis militiæ præceptis, actionum ſuarum diſciplinam, exemplorum varietate confirmaret, & præclaros artifices pictoreſque præſertim inſigni liberalitate complecteretur. Nam & commentaria rerum ab ipſo geſtarum à Liberto ejus Vicentino (47) conſcripta legimus; veraque ejus imagine ſumus potiti, quam Gentilis Bellinus, è Venetiis Byzantium evocatus pinxerat; quum ibi regiam multis tabulis rerum novarum ad oblectationem jucundiſſimam referſiſſet. - - - - *But Mahomet, whom thoſe of his own religion accuſed of impiety, but the Chriſtians of treachery and inhuman cruelty, muſt, by the confeſſion of all parties, receive this praiſe, that he had at heart the encouragement of learning and uſeful ſciences; having ordered the hiſtories of the moſt famous nations to be tranſlated into the Turkiſh language, that, by military precepts drawn from thence, he might confirm his own actions by a variety of examples: he was likewiſe very liberal to artificers that excelled in their way, and eſpecially to Painters. For there are extant Commentaries of his actions, written by his freed-man, a Vicentine; and we have an authentic picture of him, done by Gentilis Bellinus, who was ſent for from Venice to Conſtantinople, where he adorned the palace with many beautiful and excellent paintings.*’

[*M*] *His epitaph deſerves to be conſidered.*] ‘ His body was carried into the moſque, founded by himſelf, where his turbant and his ſcymitar are to be ſeen to this day: but the ſingularity of his epitaph is this, that it ſays nothing of his great actions, and ſeems to value them but little, in compariſon of his laſt thoughts, which are only expreſſed in it as the greateſt elogium, and moſt faithful picture of his courage. The inſcription conſiſted only of nine or ten Turkiſh words, which may be expounded by theſe; *I intended to conquer Rhodes, and proud Italy* (48).’ This very plainly informs us, I. That Mahomet's epitaph did not mention any of the deſigns he had executed, but only the deſigns he had intended to have executed. II. That theſe future actions were ſet down in the Turkiſh language. This is very different from the account of Madam Scuderi. *As ambition was the predominant paſſion of Mahomet, ſo it followed him to his death, and he ordered this inſcription to be put on his monument in the Latin tongue, after a long narrative of all his victories in the Turkiſh tongue.* HE INTENDED TO HAVE RUINED RHODES, AND PROUD ITALY (49). Spandiginus agrees (50) with this account, except that he does not ſay, the laſt words were in Latin. I find it probable enough, that Selim I, to go beyond this epitah, cauſed one to be made, in which he ſaid, that he ſtill made war after his death (51).

[*N*] *I ſhall have ſome faults to object to Mr Moreri.*] I. It is not true, that Mahomet ſubdued Carinthia and Stiria. His troops only made excurſions, and ravaged the country there, after the victory of Liſoncio, which they gained over the Venetians in 1476 (52). II. It is falſe that he made his own epitaph in Latin. III. And that he died at Nicomedia: for he died in a *town of Bithynia, known to the antients by the name of Aſtacus, between Conſtantinople and Nicomedia, which are diſtant from each other a day's journey*

(*d*) Guiellet, ib. book vii, pag. 378, 379.

(*e*) Id. ib. p. 381.

(36) Guillet, ib. *lib. iii, pag.* 293, *ad ann.* 1455.

(37) Id. ib.

(38) Ib. *p.* 299.

(39) This is BANDEL (MATTHEW), of whom I have made an article.

(40) Guillet, ubi ſupra, *lib. i, pag.* 9.

(41) Id. ib. *pag.* 15.

(42) Id. ib. *pag.* 16.

(43) Ibid. pag. 17. See upon all this Father Maimbourg's Hiſtory of the Schiſm of the Greeks, *lib. vi, p.* 289, who cites Phranz. *lib. i, cap. xxxiii. Leuncl. lib. xv.*

(44) Ibid. *lib. iv, pag.* 505, *&c.* See alſo Florent le Comte, in *Tom. i*, of the Cabinet of Singularities, *pag.* 29, 30, of the Paris Edit. 1699; and the *Journ. de Trevoux, May* 1702, *pag.* 122, French edition.

(45) Letter xxx, *pag.* 333, 334, of the third edition.

(46) Paul. Jovius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 265.

(47) He is doubtleſs the ANGIOLELLO, of whom I have made an article.

(48) Guillet, ubi ſupra, *lib. vii, pag.* 381.

(49) Scuderi, Illuſtre Baſſa, *Tom. i, pag.* 320, 321.

(50) Apud Spondanum, ad ann. 1481, num. ii.

(51) Here follows the ſubſtance of the epitaph, recited by du Verdier in his Hiſtory of the Turks; *I am the great Selim, who conquered the earth, who ſeek for fights ſtill after my death. Fortune did always bend under my efforts: my body is in this tomb, but my ſpirit is at war.*

(52) See Paul Jovius, ubi ſupra, pag. 263, & Guillet, lib. vii, pag. 290, 291.

who attributes to the Schiſm of the Greeks the miſchiefs they ſuffered under this Turkiſh prince [*O*].

Landinus, a knight of Rhodes, has collected divers letters, which this Sultan had written in Syriac, in Greek, and in Turkiſh, and tranſlated them into *Latin*. This tranſlation has been publiſhed. I ſhall ſpeak of it below [*P*]; but it is not known, where the originals may be found (*f*). I ſhall take notice likewiſe of a letter, which Pope Pius II wrote to the ſame Sultan. It has employed the pens of the controverſial writers [*Q*]. It may not only ſtand a ſuperficial examination, but alſo dazzle the eyes of

ney (53). This town is called by ſome Teggiur Tzair, and by others Geiviſe. IV. He lived not fifty three years, but a little more than fifty one years. V. One cannot ſufficiently wonder, that Mr Moreri ſhould ſay, that *Mahomet did not want courage*. It is thus we uſually to ſpeak of a man ſuſpected of cowardice, when we endeavour to vindicate him. It is thus we ſpeak of a very peaceable prince, who never gave any public proofs of his valour, but made it appear in private, that he neither feared death nor dangers: but it is abſurd to expreſs one's ſelf after this manner, ſpeaking of a thunder-bolt of war, and of ſuch a conqueror as our Mahomet was, who, to uſe the words of an Hiſtorian, whom Moreri ſhould have known (54), *had by nature a body extreamly ſtrong, that could endure all the fatigues of war, which he made his continual buſineſs during his whole life; had a very fiery temper, was vehement, bold, enterprizing, and inſatiable of glory, and had a heart even greater than his birth and fortune, together with an undaunted courage.* VI. Mr Moreri expreſſes himſelf very ill a little after, when he affirms, that, *to ſpeak ingenuouſly, one cannot hear of Mahomet's debaucheries without contempt*: and preſently after he ſays, *that this infamous wretch would have forced the princeſs of Walachia.* Is it not with horror, and not with contempt, that we hear of ſuch a leudneſs? VII. *Mahomet did not cut off the head of a woman, with his own hands, becauſe ſhe appeared to him too beautiful*: it was becauſe his ſoldiers murmured to ſee him loſe his reputation, and the fair opportunities of action, in the arms of a woman. Beſides, the fact is not certain (55). VIII. It is falſe, that this Sultan, *after the taking of Conſtantinople, vented his rage againſt the dead body of the emperor Conſtantine.* The chancellor (56) of that emperor, who was at Conſtantinople, and *wrote nothing but what he ſaw himſelf* (57) ſays the contrary: ‘He aſſures us, that the Sultan, having cauſed ſtrict ſearch to be made every where, to find out the truth of what was yet doubtful, *viz.* whether he was alive or dead, his body was at laſt found among the bodies of ſeveral Turks and Chriſtians, heaped one upon another; doubtleſs in the ſame place, where this brave prince had been killed, with thoſe valiant men who periſhed with him, after they had deſtroyed a great number of the enemy; for in the gates there were none but the bodies of Chriſtians, either ſtifled in the croud, or killed, while they were endeavouring to get out. He adds, that the body, tho' all disfigured, was known by the purple buſkins enriched with eagles embroidered in gold, which the emperors only wore; and that Mahomet, being deſirous to do honour to the virtue and courage of ſo great a prince, commanded all the funeral honours to be paid to him, that were due to the emperors (58).’

[*O*] *Father Maimbourg inconſiderately attibutes to the ſchiſm of the Greeks the miſchiefs they ſuffered under this Turkiſh prince.*] He perpetually repeats (59), that the taking of Conſtantinople, and the ruin of their empire, were the juſt puniſhment of their obſtinacy, in refuſing the ſubmiſſion they owed to the ſee of Rome. He was little the better for the cenſures he received for writing in the ſame dogmatical manner, in the hiſtory of the Iconoclaſts. It was then proved to him that this doctrine was ſeditious. He had ſaid (60) *that God took away the weſtern empire from the Greeks, as a puniſhment of the revolt they had ſo often renewed againſt the church*; which a critic thus cenſured (61). *God alone knows the cauſe of the change of empires and kingdoms; and it is, at leaſt, a raſh thing, to attribute it to the impiety, or the hereſies, of the princes or ſubjects of thoſe empires. Do you think*, continued he, *that it is allowable for any one to ſay of a king, or emperor, that is heretical, or of a prince, in whoſe dominions there are heretics, when we ſee them deprived of their dominions, that they have loſt them upon the account of the hereſies that aroſe in them. This approaches too near*, replied Euchariſtus, *to that deteſtable doctrine, condemned for hereſy in the council of Conſtance*. For if it may be ſaid of a prince, that he loſt his ſovereign power, and was deprived by* GOD *for his crimes, for his hereſy, or for the hereſy that prevailed in his dominions, is not this to ſay, that theſe crimes deſerve the deprivation of a prince?* This doctrine is not only ſeditious, but alſo an imitation of the complaints that were made by the Pagans againſt the Chriſtian church (62), on occaſion of the great ravages the Goths made in Rome, in all Italy, and elſewhere. The city of Rome was as ill treated by Charles the Vth, in 1527, as Conſtantinople was, when the Turks took it. Would not Father Maimbourg take it ill, if the Greeks ſhould tell him, that Rome was then laid waſte, becauſe ſhe was ſo ambitious as to require that the Greek church ſhould pay her obedience? What would he anſwer to this? that Rome was in the right, and that it was not ſo with the Greeks? But would not this be what is called *Petitio principii?* Men ought not thus to ſearch into the counſels of Providence. All parties ſtand in need of this leſſon; they often attribute the calamities of a contrary party to the qualities of it's doctrine, which is to forget the declarations of (63) JESUS CHRIST (64). Father Maimbourg would not have been much more unreaſonable, if he had adopted the ſtory related by Chalcondylas. That Hiſtorian pretends, that the Romans, being deſcended from Æneas, and being ſtill concerned in the ruin of Troy, ſaid, that the Greeks had ſuffered ſo much miſchief at the taking of Conſtantinople, as a puniſhment of the outrages they had formerly committed in the kingdom of Priamus. *Facetus eſt Chalcondylas dum ait Romanos ſeu Latinos conſtanter aſſeverare, hanc cladem contigiſſe Græcis in ultionem eorum quæ olim feciſſent barbaris in deſtructione Ilii; quod videlicet dicantur Romani à Trojanis deſcendiſſe* (65). According to this fine chimera, we ſhould not leave the numbers as they ſtand in the decalogue. We ſhould believe, that GOD *viſits the iniquities of the fathers upon the children*, not unto the fourth, but unto the thouſandth generation, and ſo preſcription ſhould never take place; *Delicta majorum immeritus lues Romane* (66). France would have reaſon to fear, leſt, two thouſand years hence, an irruption of Barbarians ſhould revenge on her the injuries, which the Romans and Greeks received from Brennus.

[*P*] *The tranſlation of his letters was publiſhed; I ſhall ſpeak of it below.*] It was printed at Lyons in 4to in 1520, and ſince at Baſil, with the Epiſtles of Symmachus, by Frobenius (67). It was afterwards inſerted in a collection of letters, which John Oporinus publiſhed at Baſil in 1554, in 12mo (68). This collection was compiled by Gilbert Couſin, and intituled, *Farrago Epiſtolarum Laconicarum & Selectarum.* The tranſlation of Landin, in 8vo, was reprinted at Marpurg, in 1604, and again at Leipſic, in 12mo, in 1690, by the care of Simon Gœbelius Romhildenſis Francus (69). Melchior Junius, Profeſſor of Eloquence at Straſburg, publiſhed at Montbeliard, in 1595, a collection of letters, which contains three of thoſe, written to Scanderbeg by Mahomet II. The compiler took them out of a book of Marinus Barletius *de vita & geſtis Scanderbegi.* There are added to them three anſwers, that were returned to the Sultan. The Turkiſh ferocity does not at all appear in theſe three letters of Mahomet; they are written in very civil terms, and are ſuch as might become the moſt debonaire Chriſtian princes to write.

[*Q*] *A letter which Pope Pius II wrote to the ſame Sultan . . . . has employed the controverſial writers.*] Mr du Pleſſis Mornai was the aggreſſor in theſe words (70). *The ambition of Pius II cannot be better known than by his Epiſtle* 396, *wherein he offers and promiſes*

(*f*) *See* Huet. de Interpret. pag. m. 183.

(53) Guillet, lib. vii, pag. 377.

(54) Maimbourg's Schiſm of the Greeks, *lib. vi, pag.* 299. He cites Leuncl. *book xv.* Lonic. Hiſt. Turc. *lib. i.* Cuſpin. in Mahom.

(55) See the remark [*I*].

(56) He was called Phranzes.

(57) Maimbourg, Hiſtory of the Schiſm of the Greeks, *lib. vi, pag.* 347.

(58) Id. ib. *pag.* 348, he cites Phranzes, *lib. iii, cap. xviii.*

(59) In the Hiſtory of the Schiſm of the Greeks, *lib. vi.*

(60) See the Dialogues of Eudoxus and Euchariſtus, *pag.* 95, of the Holland edition.

(61) Ib. *pag.* 96.

* Seſſ. xv. quilibet tyrannus, &c.

(62) See Oroſius in his preface, and St Auguſtin, de Civit. Dei, in Præfat. & alibi paſſim.

(63) St Luke's Goſpel, ch. xiii.

(64) *Confer quæ ſupra*, citat. (21) of the article CAUSSIN.

(65) Spondanus, ad ann. 1453. *num. xvii, pag. m.* 30.

(66) Horace, Od. IV, lib. III.

(67) Epit. Bibl. Geſneri, *p.* 533.

(68) Ib. *p.* 560.

(69) [illegible] Crenii, Animadverſ. Part. ii, pag. 26.

(70) Du Pleſſis, *Myſtery of Iniquity, pag.* 541.

of thoſe, who read it without the ſpirit of Criticiſm, and repreſent this Pope to them under an advantageous idea, and worthy of praiſe. Nay, even thoſe, who examine it ſtrictly, and conſider Pius II only under the notion of a ſovereign prince of one part of Italy, may judge his letter to be prudential; but, when it is weighed in the balance of the ſanctuary, and when we conſider, that he, who wrote it, calls himſelf the Vicar of

JESUS

promiſes the Grecian empire to Mahumed king of the Turks, provided he would turn Chriſtian, and ſuccour the church, that is, his own party, and aſſiſt him to rend Chriſtendom in pieces, as he did by continual wars, giving him to underſtand, that it was in his gift, and that thus his predeceſſors had granted the empire of Germany to Charlemagne. Coëffeteau filled all the ſails of his eloquence, or rather of his anger, in anſwering this paſſage of Du Pleſſis. ‘Is it poſſible, *ſays he* (71), that hereſy ſhould ſo far extinguiſh all ingenuity, as to make us condemn what is moſt commendable in the actions of thoſe we have a mind to defame? There can be nothing ſo learned and eloquent, nothing ſo ſolid and nervous, nothing ſo humble and Chriſtian, nothing ſo pious and religious, as this epiſtle; and yet Du Pleſſis alledges it, as a ſignal mark of the inſolence of it's author. Does then any ſpark of modeſty, any ſenſe of juſtice, remain with him? Here are the words, from which he would infer the ambition of Pius. *If you deſire,* ſays this Pope to Mahomet, *to enlarge your empire among the Chriſtians, and render your name glorious, you need neither gold nor ſilver, nor armies, nor ſhips, to do it. One little thing may render you the greateſt, the moſt powerful, the moſt famous, of all men that live this day. You will aſk what it is? It is not difficult to find it, and you need not ſearch far for it; it is to be met with in all parts of the world; it is only a little water, to baptize you, that you may embrace the Chriſtian religion, and believe the Goſpel. If you do this, no prince in the world will exceed you in glory, or equal you in power. We will call you the emperor of the Greeks, and of the Eaſt; and what you now poſſeſs by violence and injuſtice, you ſhall then poſſeſs by right and equity. All Chriſtians will honour you, and make you arbritrator of their differences,* &c. And again, *If you were baptized, and would go with us into the houſe of the Lord, the people would no longer dread your empire, nor would we aſſiſt them againſt you; but rather we would implore your aid againſt thoſe, who ſometimes uſurp what belongs to the Roman church, and lift up their horns againſt their mother. And as our predeceſſors, Stephen, Adrian, and Leo, called in to their aſſiſtance Pepin and Charlemagne, againſt Aſtulphus and Deſiderius, kings of the Lombards, and, after they had by them been delivered from the oppreſſion of tyrants, transferred to their deliverers the empire of the Greeks; ſo we would make uſe of your aſſiſtance, and we would not be ungrateful for the benefit we ſhould receive.* Can a reader, who conſiders theſe things without paſſion, diſcover any appearance of ambition in this epiſtle? was it not rather his zeal, that made him write thus, to influence the pride and courage of this Barbarian? And does he promiſe Mahomet any thing, but what all Chriſtendom would have conſented to, if this Barbarian had been willing to embrace theſe conditions, which Pius propoſed to him?’ This language is very fit to prejudice thoſe againſt Du Pleſſis, who are unacquainted with books of controverſy; I mean, ſo far as to diſcuſs matters, and confront the ſeveral pieces, that the anſwers and replies may the better be compared together. This is almoſt the only way to be well aſſured, that thoſe, who give themſelves the greateſt airs of triumph, and make the moſt tragical exclamations, are generally reduced to ſome troubleſome ſtreights, and under a neceſſity of ſupplying by figures of Rhetoric, what they want of reaſon. Thoſe, who are verſed in this kind of reading, which I have deſcribed, and, beſides, are tenderly concerned for the glory and memory of du Pleſſis Mornai, will have no reaſon to fear, when they read all the words of his adverſary; but if they be novices, and ſuch as cannot very readily lay hold of this prejudice againſt Coëffeteau, *viz.* that he being a Dominican, does not manage controverſy fairly, they will be much afraid, that Du Pleſſis was miſtaken, and will think that he is utterly confounded; and therefore they will be impatient to inform themſelves, whether he, or any other, has anſwered Coëffeteau. Whatever their uneaſineſs may be, they can no longer doubt of the victory of their champion, when they examine the reply of Rivet. And this ought to warn us to obey the precept, *audi & alteram partem; hear alſo the other party,* and that it is not ſufficient to examine what John ſays, and what Peter anſwers, but we muſt alſo inform our ſelves what is anſwered to Peter.

Rivet, anſwering for Du Pleſſis, confeſſes, that the long letter of Pius II to Mahomet contains *very good things againſt the belief of the Turks, in confirmation of the Chriſtian faith*; but, adds he (72), ‘beſides that it appears to be a very uſeleſs deſign, that of converting this prince by an epiſtle, which was no ways probable, there is a diabolical malice in it. For, inſtead of ſhewing that the poor Chriſtian Greeks under the empire of this Barbarian, raiſed the compaſſion of the Chriſtians in theſe parts, and exhorting him to treat them civilly, he ſeems to have written this epiſtle on purpoſe to blacken them as *falſe Chriſtians*, and to diſcover, that their loſs does not affect the Latins. Our Hiſtory adds, as a mark of ambition, that he propoſes to Mahomet, provided he would be baptized, the peaceable empire of all he had uſurped, and promiſes him, that *all will make him judge of their debates, and that the whole world will appeal to his deciſion* (you may judge whether the princes, who had been a long time Chriſtians, were not mightily obliged to him); *that many of themſelves would ſubmit to him, and to his ſentence,* &c. He adds, *that the charity of the Romiſh church will not only be towards him what it is to other kings, but ſo much greater, as he is higher than they.* Obſerve this ſtroke. *In fine, he repreſents to him, that the Romiſh church would implore his aid againſt the undutiful children that roſe up againſt their mother.* And in fine, having boaſted, that the Popes had transferred the empire of the Greeks to the French, he promiſes, that, in conſideration of his ſervices done to the church, he would do the like by him, in return for his benefits. There is wanting a long commentary on this diſcourſe. In a few words, this way of converting men by promiſing them the empire of the world is not apoſtolical. II. It is a ridiculous thing to promiſe a foreign and potent prince, what he is already poſſeſſed of. III. It is contrary to charity, which is no reſpecter of perſons, to be greater toward thoſe who are more highly advanced. IV. It is againſt the ſame charity, to diſcover to an infidel the miſeries of Chriſtendom, and to deſire his converſion, on purpoſe to make uſe of him againſt princes already Chriſtians. V. It is vanity, ambition, and preſumption, to boaſt, that the empire of Charlemagne is a reward from the Pope, and to pretend, that he could reward, after the ſame manner, him to whom he ſpeaks: let the reader judge, whether this diſcourſe becomes him, who ſays he is ſeated in the chair of St Peter: Is this a diſcourſe *humble, chriſtian, modeſt, and pious?* Would theſe *conditions and promiſes have been approved by all Chriſtendom?*’ I know not whether Coëffeteau, or any other Catholic, has anſwered this book of Rivet; and if I had in my hands the ſecond piece of the antagoniſts of Du Pleſſis, I would here ſet it down at length that nothing might be wanting, and that my readers might give ſentence, having a full knowledge of the cauſe, upon the charge alledged againſt Pius II. It ſeems not poſſible to reply any thing very material to the remarks of Rivet; but, on the contrary, it ſeems very poſſible to make them more unanſwerable; for what can be more horrible, and ſhameful to the Chriſtian religion, than to ſee Mahomet II, one of the greateſt criminals that ever lived, a man, who had ſhed ſo much blood, and robbed ſo many perſons of their eſtates by a continual train of cruelties and injuſtices, become lawful poſſeſſor of all his uſurpations, provided he would be baptized? What becomes of that inviolable law of Chriſtian morality, that the firſt ſtep of repentance that expiates a robbery, is the reſtitution of the ill-gotten goods? What would one ſay,

---

(71) Coëffet. *Anſwer to the Myſtery of Iniquity, pag.* 1197.

(72) Rivet's *Remarks upon the Anſwer to the Myſtery of Iniquity, Part ii, pag.* 617.

Jesus Christ, and conſequently the protector of the morality of the Goſpel, he cannot be excuſed. Since therefore this queſtion has different faces, none ought to blame me for relating a little at large the words of the advocates, who plead this cauſe. My commentary ought to be conſidered, among other reſpects, under the notion of that volume, in which Hiſtoriographers inſert all the pieces for their juſtification, which they mention in the courſe of the narrative. Let this be ſaid once for all. Some perſons believe, that the letter of Pius II was not written with the deſign of being ſent to Mahomet [*R*].

if a Jew, guilty of a fraudulent bankruptcy for three millions, ſhould obtain, by the meer ceremony of baptiſm, without being obliged to make any reſtitution, a full abſolution of his crimes, and a right to poſſeſs thoſe three millions? Would not the Infidels have very good reaſon to defame Chriſtianity as the peſt of equity and natural morality? And yet this procedure with reſpect to the bankrupt would be only a peccadillo, in compariſon of the offers, which Pius II made to Mahomet, to make him lawful poſſeſſor of his conqueſts, by means of a few drops of water ſprinkled upon his face. What would the apoſtles ſay at the ſight of ſuch a diſpenſation, and ſuch an uſe of the keys? Is this agreeable to what St Paul ſays (73), or even to what Ovid an Heathen Poet ſays,

O nimium faciles qui triſtia crimina cædis
Fluminea tolli poſſe putatis aqua (74).

Fools! to believe, that water, duly ſpilt,
Can waſh away the crimſon ſtains of guilt.

[*R*] *Some perſons believe, that the letter of Pius II was not written with the deſign of being ſent to Mahomet.*] I ſhall add nothing to the words which I borrow from a Catholic writer (75). 'Here we muſt add a word about the long letter, which † Franceſco Sanſovino has publiſhed, under the name of Pope Pius (76) to Sultan Mahomet. For it appears by it, that this Pope wrote it at a time, when the conqueſt of Sinope and Trebizonde made the Latin princes fear the like effort from the Ottoman arms. It ſhews at large the advantages of the Chriſtian religion above the Mahometan, and pretends to invite the Sultan to baptiſm by great examples, repreſenting to him, how glorious it was for Conſtantine the great, to have been the firſt of the Roman emperors, who became a Chriſtian, and to Clovis to have been alſo the firſt of the French kings, who embraced the Goſpel, and that it would be no leſs honourable for him to be the firſt of the Ottoman monarchs, who embraced our faith. There are many, who, reflecting upon the unacceſſible and moroſe humour of Mahomet, do not think it probable, that a letter, on ſo nice a ſubject, was ever delivered to him, or that any durſt wait for an anſwer to it. They add, that at leaſt it would have found the Sultan very little inclined to the propoſal, and that, unleſs by a miracle, his converſion could not be the effect of the remonſtrances of a letter. Thus when the Italians would expreſs the little hopes there is of ſucceſs in any matter, they ſay pleaſantly in their language, *La penna non toglie il filo alla ſpada*: That *the pen does not blunt the edge of the ſword.* It is probable therefore, that it was publiſhed among the weſtern nations, after the taking of Trebizonde, as a manifeſto, to juſtify the arms of the Cruſade, and to awake the ardor of the warriors in Chriſtendom, after they had ſeen, that the Pope had endeavoured in vain to divert the arms of the Sultan in the peaceable way of remonſtrances.'

(73) *For we are not as many, who corrupt the word of God.* 2 Cor. ii, 17.

(74) Ovid. Faſt. lib. II, ver. 27.

(75) Guillet, Hiſt. of Mahomet II, *Tom. i, pag.* 461, *& ſeq. ad ann.* 1461.

† Franceſco Sanſovino, *fol.* 134.

(76) He ſeems to be ignorant, that this letter is found in the editions of Pius II, his letters.

MAHOMET GALADIN, emperor of Mogul, was famous for his good qualities, and chiefly for his great application to hear the petitions and complaints of his ſubjects. He gave them audience twice a day; and, that perſons of a mean condition, who commonly could not, or durſt not, approach his tribunal, might have an opportunity to declare their grievances, he cauſed a bell to be ſet near him, to which a rope was tied that went into the ſtreet, and, whenever the bell was rung, he either went out, or ordered him, who had pulled the rope, to be brought in (*a*). He died in the year 1605, and none could ever know of what ſect he was (*b*). He had thoughts of becoming a Chriſtian; but the Mahometan prieſts diſſuaded him from it by two reaſons [*A*].

(*a*) Don Clement Toſi, *a Benedictin of the congregation of St Sylveſter, in the firſt volume of his* Gentileſimo confutato.

(*b*) Mori nel 1605, ſenza ſaperſi di qual Setta egli foſſe ſtato. *Giornale de Letterati, June* 27, 1669, *pag.* 83, in the abſtract of *Gentileſimo confutato.*

[*A*] *The Mahometan prieſts diſſuaded him from becoming a Chriſtian by two reaſons.*] By one reaſon applied to the mind, and another to the heart. They told him, that the Chriſtian religion propoſed to him myſteries to be believed, which he could not at all comprehend, and that it would oblige him to marry but one wife. It is very probable, that the ſecond reaſon weighed more with him than the firſt; for thoſe who have been educated in the doctrine of Polygamy, and have put it in practice, have a frightful idea of the Chriſtian doctrine in this point; and, although the Great Mogul might be told, that this evangelical doctrine did not much incommode many Chriſtian princes, becauſe almoſt all of them diſpenſed with it, not indeed by marrying many wives, but by keeping miſtreſſes, he might ſtill think it hard: for in ſhort there is a great difference between practiſing things agreeable to religion, and not being able to practiſe them without violating the laws of religion. *Poco vi manco che non accettaſſe la noſtra religione, e ne fu ritirato da i Mulaſi Sacerdoti Mahomettani dal non poter capir i miſteri della fede col, lume naturale, e l'obligo di contentarſi d'una ſola moglie* (1). Lyſerus, the grand apologiſt for Polygamy, does not forget to obſerve, that the law of marrying but one wife retards the converſion of the infidels (2).

(1) Giornale de Letterati, June 27, 1669, pag. 83, *in the abſtract of* Gentileſimo confutato, *by* Don Clement Toſi.

---

(2) *See* Polygamia triumphatrix, *pag.* 92.

MAYERNE (THEODORUS TURQUET SIEUR DE) one of the moſt famous Phyſicians of his time, was born near Geneva (*a*) in 1572, or thereabouts (*b*). He took, at Montpelier in 1596, his degree of Bachelor of Phyſic, and his degree of Doctor in the ſame faculty, Febr. 20. 1597. He went from thence to Paris ſome time after, and applied himſelf very much to the practice of Chymiſtry; which was a ſtudy greatly decried at that time, and very odious to the Phyſicians of Paris. Upon which account they railed moſt vehemently againſt Mayerne and du Cheſne (*c*), and endeavoured to make them paſs for ſworn enemies to Phyſic. This appears from a book, that was printed in 1603, againſt theſe two Phyſicians. Mayerne refuted it in another book, which was refuted in it's turn [*A*]. This was not all; for the faculty of Phyſic attacked

(*a*) In a country houſe, called Mayerne, in the territory of the Republic of Geneva. *Browne, in Præfat. Operum Mayernii.*

(*b*) *See in the remark* [C], *the true day of his birth.*

(*c*) *See the remark* [*A*], *citation* (8).

[*A*] *Mayerne refuted it in another book, which was refuted in it's turn.*] Guy Patin mentions this diſpute, but like one, that took pleaſure in cenſuring, and who was an enemy to innovating Phyſicians. 'The Sieur attacked him by a decree prohibiting him to practiſe; but, notwithſtanding this, Mayerne was ſent for to court, and was made Phyſician in ordinary to Henry the Great. After the death of this prince, he retired to England, and there raiſed a very great fortune. He obtained the friendſhip of ſeveral illuſtrious perſons there, and ſo far gained the favour of the learned king James, that he was not only his Firſt Phyſician, but alſo in ſome meaſure his favourite. He was loaded with honours (*d*), and his fortune ſtill increaſed under king Charles I. He was unanimouſly admitted Doctor of Phyſic in both univerſities of the kingdom. His reputation and practice were extraordinary, and he acquired a great eſtate. He had two ſons and one daughter, who was married to the marquis de Ruvigni (*e*). He died at the age of eighty two years. I take this from the preface to his works, printed at London in 1700 [*B*]. We ſhall give in the remarks a more particular and exact account [*C*]. I muſt not forget, that our Mayerne met

(*d*) *See in the remark* [*B*], *the inſcription under his print.*

(*e*) *It is a miſtake. See the remark* [*C*].

Sieur de Mayerne Turquet, *ſays he* (1), Phyſician to the king of England, is, as I have been informed, a native of Geneva, the ſon of one, who wrote the Hiſtory of Spain (2), which is now printed in two volumes in folio. His father wrote alſo a book intituled, the *Ariſtodemocratic Monarchy* (3), which was contradicted by Lewis d'Orleans, (who wrote the commentaries on Tacitus) in his *Human Plant*, printed at Lyons and at Paris. Turquet wrote an anſwer to Lewis d'Orleans, in 1617. He reſided at Geneva, or near it, and was of the religion of that country . . . . (4). I believe that his ſon is a Phyſician of Montpellier. He came to Paris in 1602, and, as he affected to be a great Chymiſt, he had a quarrel with ſome of ours; whereupon a decree was made, that none ſhould conſult with him; yet he had ſome friends of our profeſſion, who viſited the ſick with him. From this quarrel there proceeded an apology for the ſaid Theodore Mayerne, of which he was no more the author than you or I. Two doctors of our ſociety wrote it, Seguin, our antient, who always favoured the quacks, and his brother-in-law Acakia . . . . (5). This Mayerne is ſtill in England to this day, very old and almoſt grown a child again. It is ſaid, that he has quitted the king's party, and gone over to the parliament's ſide. I ſaw one of his children in this city, who ſtudied Phyſic, and is ſince dead in England. It is ſaid, that he is very harſh to his children, he is ſo covetous, and that he ſuffers them to ſtarve. He is a great Chymiſt, very rich, and knows the way of procuring to himſelf a great number of Jacobuſſes, by a conſult of five or ſix pages. He is, among other things, baron of Aubonne, a fine lordſhip in the country of Vaux, near Geneva, of which a certain biſhop of Nevers, called Paul Spiſame, was lord in 1560 . . . . (6). This apology of Mayerne did not want an anſwer. Riolanus, the father, anſwered it, by a book very elegant and learned, according to his uſual manner.'

Dr Brown, as I have already ſaid (7), obſerves, that Mayerne had a companion of his fortune, in the perſecution he ſuffered from the Phyſicians of Paris. He calls his aſſociate *Quercetanus*, whoſe French name was du Cheſne. Patin ſays nothing of it; but he ſpeaks very ſatirically of this Quercetanus. *In the ſame year* 1609, ſays he (8), *died a wicked rogue and quack, who killed many during his life, and even after his death, by the unhappy writings he left behind him, under his own name, which he had cauſed to be compoſed by other Phyſicians and Chymiſts, here and there I mean Joſephus Quercetanus, who went, at Paris, by the name of la Violette. He was a great drunkard, and a very ignoramus; who knew nothing of Latin, and, being by his firſt employment no more than a wandering Surgeon of the country of Armagnac, a poor, curſed, and unhappy country, paſſed at Paris, and particularly at court, for a great Phyſician, becauſe he had learned ſomething of Chymiſtry in Germany.* I muſt obſerve, that the general hiſtory of Spain, written by Louis de Mayerne Turquet of Lyons, was firſt printed in the year 1587, and, after that, by Abel l'Angelier, in the year 1608, at Paris, and, after that, again by Samuel Thibouſt, in 1635. The ſecond edition comprehends thirty books, and comes down as far as the year 1582. The third edition has ſix books added to it, and comes down to the end of the XVIth century.

[*B*] *I take this from the preface to his works, printed at London, in* 1700.] They are a pretty large folio, divided into two books; the firſt contains, *Conſilia, Epiſtolas, & Obſervationes*; and the ſecond, *Pharmacopœam variaſque Medicamentorum formulas.* There is prefixed to the book the picture of Dr Mayerne, ſuch as he was at the age of eighty two years. It is the moſt agreeable phyſiognomy in the world (9); he has a lively, ſerene, and majeſtic air, and a venerable beard. Underneath the picture we read; ‘ Theo. Turquet de Mayerne Eques Auratus, Patriâ Gallus, Religione Reformatus, Dignitate Baro, Profeſſione alter Hippocrates, ac trium Regum (exemplo rariſſimo) Archiater: eruditione incomparablis: experientia nulli ſecundus: & quod ex his omnibus reſultat, fama late vagante perilluſtris. - - - *Theodore Turquet Mayerne, Baronet, by birth a Frenchman, by religion a Proteſtant, by dignity a Baron, by profeſſion another Hippocrates, and (which is very uncommon) chief Phyſician to three kings: of incomparable learning; ſecond to none in experience; and, which is the conſequence, known far and near.*' The Engliſh Phyſician (10), who had the care of this edition, affirms, that he had never yet ſeen any work of Mayerne, which was truly his. ‘ Quicquid hactenus ſub Mayernii Nomine Orbem inviſit, tam crebris fœdatur interpolationibus, utpote quod partim ex ſuis, partim ex aliorum Chartis in Bibliotheca ſua repertis imperite conſuitur, ut nemo hariolari poſſit, quid author ſibi velit, ejuſque ſcopum aſſequi valeat, cum Caſus à Remediis peſſimo Conſilio ubique abſcindantur. . . . . Nihil hactenus ſub ejus nomine comparuit, quod ipſius revera eſſe dici poſſit (11). - - - - - *Whatever has yet been publiſhed under Mayerne's name, is corrupted with ſuch frequent interpolations, as being unſkillfully patched up, partly out of his own papers, and partly thoſe of others, found in his library, that no one can gueſs at the author's meaning, or find out what he aims at; the caſes being injudiciouſly ſeparated from the remedies. . . . Nothing has yet appeared under his name, which can truly be affirmed to be his.*' He gives us the reaſons, which hindred the publiſhing the chirurgical works of this Phyſician. You may find in *Lindenius renovatus* (12) the titles of ſome writings of this author; but do not imagine that Theodorus Mayernus Turquetus, and Theodorus Turguetus de Mayerne, who are there mentioned as two different writers (13), are two different perſons. No mention could be made there of the *Praxeos Mayernianæ in morbis internis præcipuè gravioribus & chronicis ſyntagma*; for that book was not printed till 1690 (14). The Journaliſts of Leipſic (15) have given us an abſtract of it.

[*C*] *We ſhall give . . . . a more particular and exact account.*] I ſhall give it ſuch as I received it from Mr Minutoli (16) who was pleaſed at my requeſt to inform himſelf exactly of all the circumſtances.

‘ Sir Theodore de Mayerne, baron of Aubonne, Counſellor and chief Phyſician to their Britannic majeſties James I, and Charles I, was the ſon of Lewis de Mayerne, famous for the General Hiſtory of Spain, which he compoſed, and for his Ariſtodemocratic Monarchy, dedicated to the States-General, and of Louiſa, the daughter of Antony le Maſſon (17), treaſurer of war to the kings Francis I, and Henry II, in Piedmont. The family is originally of that country, having flouriſhed a long time in the town of Quiers. And as to the name, or nick-name of Turquet, it came from a woman of their family, who, being well made, and of a pretty large ſize, was thought to reſemble a fine Turkiſh woman; which made people commonly give the ſirname of Turquetti to all her children. Lewis de Mayerne retired to Geneva about the end of the year 1572, having had two houſes demoliſhed at Lyons upon the account of religion. On the twenty eighth of September, 1573, Theodore Mayerne was born to him, having for

---

(1) Patin, Letter viii, pag. 35, of Tom. i. It is dated Nov. 16, 1645.

(2) See the end of this remark.

(3) This book was ſeized, confiſcated, and prohibited. See the *French Mercury, Tom. ii*, ad ann. 1611. pag. m. 184.

(4) Patin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 36.

(5) Id. ib. pag. 37.

(6) Ib. pag. 39.

(7) In the body of this article, citation (*c*).

(8) Patin, Letter xxxi, *pag.* 142, *Tom. i.*

(9) See the Journal of Leipſic, 1691, *pag.* 57.

(10) Joſephus Browne utriuſque Facultatis Doctor.

(11) Id. in Præfat.

(12) At page 997, of the edition of Nuremberg, 1686.

(13) There is the like error in the Bibliotheque of Konig. See page 522, and 822.

(14) At London in 8vo. Dr Charleton wrote a preface to it.

(15) At page 57, & *ſeq.* of the year 1691.

(16) Whom I have mentioned above, citat. (6) of the article BALZAC (JOHN LEWIS), and remark [*I*] of the article LUCRETIUS (TITUS, &c.)

(17) Mentioned, above, remark [*G*] of the article FERRET.

met with ſome envious perſons, who endeavoured to blacken him upon occaſion of the death of the prince of Wales, in the year 1612. But his honour was perfectly ſecured by authentic acts; I mean by the certificates, which king James, the lords of the council, and the officers and gentlemen of the deceaſed prince of Wales, gave him in the beſt form that could be wiſhed. They may be found, together with a relation of the *diſeaſe, death, and opening of the body* of that prince, in the work I have mentioned (*f*).

‘for his god-father Theodore Beza. He was inſtructed, in his own country, in claſſical learning, and from thence ſent to Heidelberg, where he continued ſome years. After which, being deſigned for Phyſic, he went to Montpelier, where he took his degree of Bachelor, and afterwards of Doctor. From thence he went to Paris, where, applying himſelf to practice, he read lectures of Anatomy to young Surgeons, and of Pharmacy to Apothecaries; and his preſcriptions gained him eſteem; ſo that he was known to Mr Ribbit Sieur de la Riviere, firſt Phyſician to king Henry IV, who recommended him ſo well to his majeſty, that he gave him the place of one of his Phyſicians in ordinary; and, in the year 1600, he appointed him to attend the duke of Rohan, in the journies he made for the affairs of France to the courts of the princes of Germany and Italy. Being returned, he was much eſteemed in the diſcharge of his office, and was in favour with the king, who promiſed him great things, if he would change his religion, ſetting, for that end, cardinal du Perron, and other eccleſiaſtics, to perſuade him to it. Nay, notwithſtanding his refuſal, the king iſſued out a warrant appointing him his firſt Phyſician, but the Jeſuits, who knew it, got it revoked by queen Mary de Medicis; a circumſtance and favour, which Dr Mayerne knew nothing of at that time; but, afterwards, in England, in the year 1642, he learned it from the mouth of Cæſar duke of Vendoſme, a natural ſon of France. In 1607, he took care of an Engliſh lord, who was ſick, and who, being cured, carried him into England, where he had a private audience of king James. And, even after the death of Henry IV, he continued to be Phyſician in ordinary to Lewis XIII, till 1616, when he ſold this place to a French Phyſician. In 1611, the king of England by his embaſſador, invited him, to be firſt Phyſician to himſelf, and to his wife queen Anne, and gave him a patent, ſealed under the great ſeal of England, where he ſerved the whole royal family with great honour and approbation to his death; as he did alſo the greateſt part of the nobility, and people. He made an exact collection of his medicinal advices. He compoſed a very curious Pharmacopœa of Medicines, Galenical as well as Spagyrical; but he never printed any thing, except an Apology againſt the Faculty of Phyſic at Paris, which had attacked him. There was a Phyſician called Brouent, who ſent to Dr Beverovicius an account of the bladder of Iſaac Caſaubon, written by the ſaid Mayerne, for which he expreſſed a reſentment. He had two wives, the firſt of whom was Margaret de Boetſlaer of the houſe of Aſperen, by whom he had two ſons, who died during his life. And the ſecond was Iſabel, the daughter of Albert Joachimy, famous for his embaſſies for the States-General in Muſcovy, and Sweden, and for above twenty four years in England, by whom he had two ſons, who died before him, and three daughters, two of whom died while he was alive. He died the fifteenth of March, 1655, at Chelſey, near London, leaving one only daughter, who brought a great eſtate by her marriage to the Marquis de Montpouillan, grandſon to the marſhal duke de la Force; but ſhe died at the Hague, in 1661, in labour, or at leaſt during her lying-in.’

Note, That Dr Mayerne had a niece, who was married to an Engliſh lord of great merit. She was called Louiſa de Frotté, and by her marriage was named lady Windſor. She was a perſon of a great deal of wit, and much reading, and for many years was an ornament to the city of Geneva: ſhe died there about the end of the year 1691. See her Elogium in the *Italia regnante* of Mr Leti (18). See alſo the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned (19).

MAIGNAN (EMANUEL) one of the greateſt Philoſophers of the XVIIth century, was a Minim Frier, a native of Toulouſe. He quitted the opinions of the ſchools, and oppoſed them very ſolidly. He was neither Carteſian, nor Gaſſendiſt, but agreed with the heads of theſe two ſects, in rejecting accidents, qualities, and ſubſtantial forms, and cultivating experimental Philoſophy. He was very well verſed in the Mathematics, and had joined to all theſe ſciences ſo great a ſkill in Divinity, that he was capable of teaching it even at Rome itſelf (*a*). He was engaged in ſeveral diſputes with the Peripatetics, and was ſo much the more able to make head againſt them, as he followed in a great meaſure the method of the Scholaſtics in his writings. The manner, in which he explains the retaining of accidents, without a ſubject, in the myſtery of the Euchariſt, is more happy than that of Des Cartes [*A*]. I have read in ſome of the journaliſts,

[*A*] *The manner, in which he explains the retaining of accidents without a ſubject, is more happy, than that of Des Cartes.*] Mr Rohault pretended the contrary; but it was becauſe he did not ſee the great difficulty conſequent upon that explication he takes for the beſt. Let us ſee how he relates that of F. Maignan. ‘There is nothing ſo eaſy as to explain the manner how the accidents of bread and wine ſubſiſt without the bread and wine; for, in a word, we need ſay no more, than that the bread and wine being taken away, GOD continues ſtill to make the ſame impreſſions upon our ſenſes, as they did, before they were changed. After this manner this myſtery is explained by a famous Divine of the order of the Minims, called Father Maignan (1).’ But Mr Rohault blames this hypotheſis, becauſe it admits two miracles, where but one is wanting. *Although it be true*, ſays he (2), *that GOD can produce in our ſenſes the impreſſions of bread and wine, after they have been changed by Tranſubſtantiation, yet there is no neceſſity, after this, to have recourſe to a new miracle, as this good father ſeems to do: becauſe it follows from the very eſſence of the myſtery (which is, that the bread is really changed into the body of JESUS CHRIST) that we muſt continue to perceive all the ſame appearances, as we perceived before,* i. e. *that the accidents of bread and wine muſt ſubſiſt.* This Carteſian pretends (3), that the body of JESUS CHRIST does in ſuch a manner take up the place of the bread, that the ſame ſpaces exactly, which ſerved for a place to the bread, are thoſe, wherein the body of JESUS CHRIST is diſpoſed, leaving to the matter, which filled the pores of the bread, the ſame ſpaces which it filled before. From whence it follows, that the parts of the body of JESUS CHRIST aſſume the figure, ſituation, and, in general, all the other modes of bread, and conſequently that they are bread: for, according to Mr Rohault, the eſſence of bread, or the form, which diſtinguiſhes it from all other bodies, is nothing but a particular concurrence of modifications: and therefore there muſt needs be bread whereſoever this concurrence is; and ſo, it being found in the body of JESUS CHRIST, at the ſacrament of the Euchariſt, this body is nothing elſe but bread: from whence it follows, that this great myſtery conſiſts in deſtroying a bit of bread, and replacing another bit of bread in the room of that, which was annihilated. This

---

(*f*) *Pag.* 103, *& ſeq. of the* Opera Medica Theod. Turquet. Mayernii, *Edit.* 1700. *Lond.*

(18) Part iv, pag. 64, *& ſeq.*

(19) Month of March 1692, *pag.* 336.

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(1) Rohault, Entretiens ſur la Philoſophie, *pag.* 48.

(2) Id. ib. p. 55.

(3) Id. ib. *pag.* 53, 57, *&c.*

journaliſts, that ſomebody is writing his Life. If I had read it, I would very willingly make a long article of this learned Minim. I ſhall ſay a word of his writings [*B*]. He is ſometimes miſtaken for another Philoſopher, called Magnen [*C*]. This article was already in the preſs, when I diſcovered that Father Maignan was miſplaced (*b*) in the ſupplement to Moreri's dictionary.

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I have ſeen a piece (*c*), whoſe title is, *De vita, moribus, & ſcriptis R. Patris Emanuelis Maignani Toloſatis, Ordinis Minimorum, Philoſophi atque Mathematici præſtantiſſimi Elogium.* It was compoſed by Father Saguens (*d*), and printed at Toloſe in 1697. I ſhall extract from it a good ſupplement. Emanuel Maignan, born the ſeventeenth of July 1601, was of an antient and noble family [*D*]. He gave hopes from his cradle of his future inclination to letters and ſciences; for nothing would ſooner ſtop his crying, than to put a book in his hand. He would turn over the leaves, and look upon the characters with much pleaſure, and it was perceived, after he had paſſed the age of five years, that he diſpiſed the little pleaſures of children, and that he gave wonderful attention to prayers, and catechetical inſtructions. Upon this account they took care betimes to place him under the direction of a domeſtic tutor. He went through his claſſical learning in the college of the Jeſuits, and performed with great diligence all the duties of a good ſcholar, both with reſpect to the literary exerciſes, and thoſe of religion. He diſcovered in all his conduct ſo much modeſty and ſincerity, that he was afraid of being infected by lewd converſation; and from thence it was, that by degrees he withdrew himſelf from the company of his ſchool-fellows, and that he choſe rather to leave off the diverſions proper to his age, than to expoſe his innocence to any danger (*e*). His hours of recreation were ſpent in walking in the convent of the Minims, where he met with an old man, who diſcourſed to him about ſalvation. Theſe diſcourſes were the ſeeds of a religious life, to which he dedicated himſelf ſome time after; and to this he was ſtrongly inclined by a diſgrace, which happened to him when he was ſtudying Rhetoric: he had compoſed a poem, to diſpute the prize of eloquence, and he believed, that they unjuſtly dealt with him, in adjudging the victory to another. The reflexions he made, during his vexation, confirmed him ſo much in the thought of quitting the world, that he deſired the habit of a Minim. It was not long denied him; and having acquitted himſelf well during his noviciate, he was admitted to make his vows at eighteen years of age, that is in 1619. He went through a courſe of Philoſophy under a maſter very much attached to the doctrine of Ariſtotle, and he loſt no opportunity of diſputing againſt every thing that was ſuſpected of Heterodoxy in the Phyſics of that antient Philoſopher. This was taken for a good omen by his profeſſor, who quickly after was aſtoniſhed to find, that his ſcholar underſtood very well the

Mathematics

This is abſurd, and altogether remote from the doctrine of Popery. It is true, that, in this ſuppoſition, there needs no miracle to explain how the appearances of bread ſubſiſt with reſpect to all our ſenſes. This is a natural conſequence from the ſituation of the body of our Lord in the place of the bread deſtroyed: but this advantage, proceeding only from an hypotheſis, which includes ſuch abſurdities, as are inconſiſtent with the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, cannot make the Carteſian explication equal to that of Father Maignan, although it requires a particular miracle for the continuation of the appearances of the bread and wine in the Euchariſt.

[*B*] *I ſhall ſay a word of his writings.*] He printed at Toulouſe a courſe of Philoſophy in four volumes, in 8vo, in the year 1652. He publiſhed it again in folio (4) in 1673, with many additions, and dedicated it to the preſident d'Onoville, who is ſo much commended in the voyage of Mr Bachaumont and Mr la Chapelle. He added to it, among other things, a critical diſcourſe on the vortices of Mr Des Cartes, and a diſſertation on the ſpeaking-trumpet, invented by Sir Samuel Moreland. There is alſo a book of his relating to Divinity, intituled *Philoſophia Entis ſacri*, and a *Perſpectiva horaria*, printed at Rome in 1648, in folio, *&c.* Mr Baillet ſpeaks of this laſt book as follows. ‘ Mr Carcavi acquainted Mr Des Cartes, that ‘ there was at Rome a Minim, called Father Maignan, ‘ who was more intelligent and profound than ‘ Father Merſenne, who had given him hopes of ‘ making ſome objections againſt his principles. This ‘ Father . . . . was called Emanuel, and was born at ‘ Toulouſe. But he then dwelt at Rome, where he ‘ taught Divinity in the convent of the Trinity of ‘ mount Pincio, otherwiſe called of the French Minims. ‘ A year before † he had publiſhed in Latin ‘ a curious work, divided in four books, concerning ‘ clocks and ſun-dials, and about the ſame time he ‘ wrote to Father Merſenne, being then alive ‡, that, ‘ by his Phyſical principles, he had proved Geometrically ‘ the ſame proportion of refractions with that ‘ of Des Cartes. But he did not believe, that the ‘ principles, he had laid down for the motion of a ‘ luminous body, which ſwells and falls, were true, or ‘ that, ſuppoſing theſe principles, it was poſſible, that ‘ refractions ſhould be made, as it is certain they are. ‘ It was upon this ſubject Father Maignan had a great ‘ deſire to put ſome objections to Mr Des Cartes, as ‘ probably he acquainted Mr Carcavi a year after (5).’ Let us not forget the *Diſſertatio Theologica de Uſu licito Pecuniæ*, publiſhed by our Minim in 1673, in 12mo. It was cenſured by ſome biſhops.

[*C*] *He is ſometimes confounded with another Philoſopher called Magnen.*] Some (I uſe the words of Mr Baillet) (6) have confounded Emanuel Maignan with John Chryſoſtom Magnen, Profeſſor of Pavia, who publiſhed, in 1648, *Democritus Reviviſcens*, which made the Dutch believe, that he was a Carteſian Philoſopher. Mr Baillet cites Revii Statera, p. 243. This John Chryſoſtom Magnen, was of Luxeuil, in Franche Comté, and profeſſed Phyſic at Pavia. Beſides the *Democritus Reviviſcens*, printed at Leyden, in 1648, in 12mo, and whoſe epiſtle dedicatory is dated April 30, 1646, I have ſeen a treatiſe of his *de Manna* (7), printed at the Hague, in 1658, in 12mo, and whoſe epiſtle dedicatory is dated April 5, 1648. Theſe Dutch editions are not the firſt.

[*D*] *He was of an antient and noble family.*] His father was counſellor to the king, referendary and dean of the chancery of Toulouſe, and reckoned among his anceſtors the barons of Maignan, who made a great figure in Armagnac. He married the daughter of Emanuel Alvarez, Royal Profeſſor of Phyſic in the univerſity of Toulouſe. Such was the father and mother of the Minim, we are ſpeaking of; and here follow the words of his Elogiſt. ‘ Pater ei fuit Petrus ‘ Maignanus Conſiliarius Regius, Referendarius ‘ & Decanus in Cancellaria Toloſana, vir æquitatem ‘ ſervans, & conſpicuus ſplendidiſſimi generis antiquâ ‘ nobilitate indubitatâ. Siquidem ut omnes novimus, ‘ Maignani Toloſates iſti ſtirpem ſuam trahunt ex illis, ‘ quos Eluza urbs nunc obſcura, ſed antiquitate

‘ celeberrima

(*b*) Under the word *Magnan.*

(*c*) Of fifty one pages in 4to.

(*d*) A Minim, native of Toulouſe, who was a diſciple of Father Maignan, and taught the Philoſophy of his maſter at Toulouſe, at Bourdeaux, and at Rome, for a long time. He publiſhed, in 1700, a book of 286 pages in 12mo, intituled, *Accidentia profligata, ſpecies inſtauratæ, ſive de ſpeciebus panis ac vini poſt conſecrationem Euchariſticam duntaxat manentibus, Opus Philoſophico-Theologicum*, in which he maintains very ſtrenuouſly Father Maignan's opinion about the ſacramental ſpecies.

(*e*) Ad omnes vitæ ſuæ actus, & uſus advocabat honeſtum ac modeſtum illum pudorem, qui abhorret ab omni inquinamento laſcivientis colloquii. Quare cœpit paulatim declinare à ſociis, præeligens omni joco abſtinere, quam facere vel leviſſimum verecundiæ ſuæ periculum. *Saguens, in Elogio Em. Maignani, p.* 5.

(4) Printed at Lyons by John Gregory.

† In 1648, in fol. at Rome. *Perſpectiva Horaria, &c.*

‡ Letter M.S. of Maignan to Merſenne, of July 17, 1648, pag. 512, of the firſt volume of M.S. Letters to Merſenne, *Variorum.*

(5) Baillet's Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. ii, pag.* 379, 380, *ad ann.* 1649.

(6) Ibid.

(7) It is printed with that *of Tobacco*, by the ſame author.

Mathematics, though no one had read lectures to him in that ſcience [*E*]. In this he was his own maſter. He was quite another man in his courſe of Divinity, than in that of Philoſophy; for, whereas in this he was very incredulous, and ſubmitted every thing to a ſevere examination, and to the moſt ſubtile diſcuſſions of diſpute, in that he ſubmitted humbly to Theological doctrines (*f*): but, as to the peripatetical reaſons, which were employed to illuſtrate and prove them, he did not think himſelf obliged to admit them without examination, and, if he found them not ſolid, he rejected them, and made no ſcruple to prefer the aſſiſtance of Plato to that of Ariſtotle. The proofs he gave of his parts during the ſix years that he ſate upon the benches, occaſioned his being looked upon as a fit perſon to mount the chair, *&c.* to do the office of a profeſſor; and he acquitted himſelf in that employment ſo ſubtilly, and ſo ſolidly, that his reputation flew over the Pyrenees and the Alps: whereupon the general of the Minims ſent for him to Rome, in 1636, to take upon him the like profeſſion. His great knowledge in mathematical inventions, and phyſical experiments, became quickly famous, and chiefly by a conteſt, which aroſe between him and Father Kircher, which was decided after ſuch a manner, that the glory of the invention, the ſubject of the diſpute, was not denied our Minim [*F*]. His book *De Perſpectiva Horaria*, printed at Rome in 1648, at the expence

(*f*) Submiſſiſſimam è contra iſtis (*exercitationibus Theologicis*) fidem offert; refugitque ut à leviuſcula dubitatione, ſic ab omni curioſa indagine, ex quo audiit ſcrutatorem Majeſtatis oppreſſum iri à gloria. *Id. ib. pag.* 10.

‘ celeberrima ad Geliſam amnem ſita in Comitatu Arminiaco Barones ſuos ſtrenuos, opulentos, magnificos per multas non interruptarum generationum ſucceſſiones reverenter, ac peramanter complexa eſt. Matrem habuit Gaudioſam de Alvarez charam filiam celeberrimi illius Medici Emanuelis de Alvarez quem Toloſa urbs Literarum omnium amantiſſima precibus ac pollicitationibus multis ex Luſitania advocavit perfuncturum munere Regii Profeſſoris. Hic originem ſuam ducebat ex antiquiſſima Familia Alvareziorum de Buhendya in regno Luſitaniæ, & fuit parens luſtricus Maignani noſtri, qui ex illo nomen Emanuelis obtinuit (8). - - - *His father was Peter Maignan, the king's counſellor, referendary and dean of the chancery of Toulouſe, a man of probity, and conſpicuous for the antient and undoubted nobility of his family. For, as we all know, the Maignans of Toulouſe are deſcended from the valiant, wealthy, and magnificent barons, who, for many ſucceſſive and uninterrupted generations, were the ornament of the city Eluza, now an obſcure town, but antiently very famous, ſituated on the river Geliſa, in the county of Armagnac. His mother was Gaudioſa de Alvarez, the beloved daughter of that famous Phyſician Emanuel de Alvarez, whom the city of Toulouſe, fond of all kind of learning, ſent for out of Portugal, by many entreaties and promiſes, to diſcharge the office of Royal Profeſſor. This Phyſician was deſcended from the very antient family of the Alvarez of Buhendya in the kingdom of Portugal, and was god-father of our Maignan, who from him had the name of Emanuel.*’

[*E*] *He vas very well acquainted with Mathematics, tho' no one had read lectures to him in that ſcience.*] This is a ſecond inſtance of what we ſhall ſhew hereafter in the article of Mr PASCAL? and Father Saguens does not fail to confirm the one by the other. Let us ſee the particulars of it: Such things are chiefly to be collected together, and inſerted in ſuch books as this Dictionary. ‘ Multo celſiorem de illo opinionem accepit (*Magiſter Ruffatius*) (9) quum occaſione data ſchematis Mathematici, quo ipſe ad explanationem reconditioris cujuſdam Phyſici myſterii lucem aſſerebat, intellexit eum eſſe Geometram; ſtupuitque, & curioſè requiſivit cauſam, ac methodum comparatæ, & eò uſque occultatæ eruditionis. Verùm ut reſponſuri juvenis modeſtiæ parcam, dicam ipſe ego paulò liberius, quod multo poſt ad ſuadenda rerum Mathematicarum ſtudia enarrabat ſibi obtigiſſe, ut intra horas unius anni liberas, ſeu reciſas à tempore ad cætera Chori, & Scholæ miniſteria uſitato, tot Theoremata, ac Problemata Geometrica per ſe ipſum adinveniret, ut deinceps non plura deprehenderit contineri totis ſex prioribus libris Euclideorum Elementorum. An non diceres illum talem fuiſſe, qui niſi extitiſſent Elementa Euclidis edidiſſet. Simile quid refertur de clariſſimo viro Paſcalio inter Geometras hujus ſæculi celeberrimos annumerando: ita ut videatur utrique Deus præſtantiſſimæ illius diſciplinæ anticipationem copioſiſſimam contuliſſe. Tum *neque mirum eſt* inquiebat Maignanus, *quod leves iſtos Mathematici tyrocinii conatus ultra promoverim: an neſcitis Crucem Matheſeos meæ Magiſtram habui?* Cum enim fruſtratus omni inſtrumentorum figuris exarandis inſervientium apparatu, nec normam haberet, nec circinum: circini quidem vice, duobus tignulis ligneis ex parte una liberè affixis infixerat ex altera duas acus ſutorias. At pro normâ, aut quod opportunum nihil occurreret, aut potius quod mallet ſua ſchemata omnia appoſito Crucis ſigno communiri, ut à pleriſque more Catholico illud appingitur ſummis capitibus paginarum, cruce lignea utebatur (10). - - - - *Ruffatius, his maſter, conceived a much higher opinion of him, when, on occaſion of a mathematical figure, which he produced in order to explain a difficult point in natural Philoſophy, he found him out to be a Geometrician, and was ſurprized at it, and was curious to enquire how he came by a knowledge, he had hitherto concealed. But, to ſpare the young man's modeſty, I will reply for him, that, in one year's vacant hours, or thoſe which were not employed in the ſchool, or the choir, he found out by himſelf as many geometrical theorems and problems, as are contained in the ſix firſt books of Euclid. May we not ſay, that, if Euclid's Elements were not extant, this man would have publiſhed them. The like is related of the famous Paſcal, one of the moſt celebrated Geometricians of this age: inſomuch that* GOD *ſeems to have beſtowed on them both an ample anticipation of that moſt excellent ſcience. Then* it is no wonder, *ſaid Maignan,* that I carried farther thoſe ſmall beginnings of mathematical apprenticeſhip: know you not, that the croſs was my mathematical maſter? *For being in want of the whole apparatus of inſtruments for delineating figures, and having neither rule, nor compaſs; inſtead of a compaſs, he made uſe of two Taylor's needles, fixed in two wooden ſticks, joined together looſely at one end. But inſtead of a rule, either becauſe he could find nothing that would ſerve the purpoſe, or becauſe he would have all his figures guarded by the ſign of the croſs, he made uſe of a wooden croſs, in the manmer it is painted by many Catholics at the head of each page.*’

[*F*] *A conteſt, which aroſe between him and Father Kircher . . . ., the glory of the invention was not denied our Minim.*] Father Saguens mentions only two books of a wonderful invention, and vaſt labour, written in the monaſtery of the order at Rome, by Emanuel Maignan. One was a book of Optics, and the other of Catoptrics. The firſt was a perſpective, the deſcription of which is to be found in the *Thaumaturgus Opticus* of the Minim Niceron (11). The other was a repreſentation of the heavens, with all the Aſtronomical circles, *catoptrica anacamptica, complectiturque integram cæli faciem ſuis omnibus ad res Aſtronomicas ſpectantibus circulis interſtinctam* (12). Father Kircher had no ſooner looked upon it, but he ſaid to a German gentleman, who accompanied him, What are you aſtoniſhed at? Is not this the figure of my book? *Quid ſtupes, an non hæc eſt figura mei libri?* A Minim, who heard this, and underſtood, that Father Kircher attributed to himſelf the whole glory of the invention, anſwered very bluntly, *on the contrary, this is the book of your figure*; imo hic eſt liber tuæ Figuræ, and related the thing quickly after to Father Maignan, who, being an humble man, ſaid no more, than that he was not conſcious of any theft, unleſs it were ſuppoſed that his hands had ſtolen the work from his mind (13). The matter had gone no further, if the friends on both ſides, had not thought it worthy of a further enquiry, as it concerned

(8) Saguens, in Elogio Emanuelis Maignani, *p.* 3.

(9) *It is the name of the Minim, under whom Father Maignan went thro' a courſe of Philoſophy.*

(10) Id. ib. pag. 8, 9.

(11) Ib. pag. 15.

(12) Id. ib.

(13) Nullius hac in re, *inquit*, furti mihi ſum conſcius, niſi fortè manus meas, opus quod elaboraverunt, menti ſubripuiſſe quis finxerit. *Id. ib. pag.* 16.

pence of cardinal Spada, was very much eſteemed. No body had yet undertaken ſuch a work (*g*). It contains a method of making Teleſcopes of his own invention, which he explains at large, and does not imitate thoſe, who conceal, as a myſtery, the inventions of their art, and die with their ſecret. He was not troubled with that diſeaſe; for if he met with any artificers, who had a mind to make dioptrical, or other inſtruments, according to his diſcoveries and method, he very readily communicated to them what he knew of that matter. He did not return from Rome to Toulouſe till 1650, and then he was received in his own country with univerſal joy. He was created provincial the ſame year, though he earneſtly deſired, that he might not be diverted from his ſtudies by the cares of any office. He publiſhed his courſe of Philoſophy, in 1652, by which work he may at leaſt expect to be called the reſtorer of it. And if, becauſe he explained Phyſics by the four elements, the glory of that invention ſhould be denied him, and given to Empedocles (*h*); yet it cannot be denied but he did, as to this hypotheſis, what Gaſſendus did as to that of the Atomiſts. The office of provincial being expired at the end of three years, our Minim had more leiſure to go on with his philoſophical Divinity; but a long ſickneſs, and ſome journies about the affairs of his order, retarded the execution of this deſign. We ſhall ſee in the remarks at what time the two tomes of that work appeared [*G*]. If the author had been ambitious, he might have found

(*g*) Opus vere eximium & ad illa uſque tempora intentatum. *Id. ib. pag.* 17.

(*h*) *Father Saguens, pag.* 25, *ſays, that Plato, and not Empedocles, was author of the* Elementary Philoſophy, *and cites for this the Timæus of Euſebius*, de Præparat. Evang. lib. xv.

---

concerned the glory of a German, or of a French Mathematician; for the principal praiſe is always due to the inventor. Father Maignan had like to have loſt the cauſe, when a Jeſuit ingenuouſly declared, that he had ſeen a like work in France, made by Father Maignan. Thus the learned men of Rome left the glory of the invention to each of the contending parties. This is only an abridgment of what you may ſee at large in the Latin of Father Saguens (14). ‘ Totaque res ibi ſubſtitiſſet, niſi viſa fuiſſet communibus amicis digna diligentiori examine; quodque ducebant vertendum ad gloriam non mediocrem aut Germani, aut Galli Mathematici. Omninò enim in quovis artium, & doctrinarum genere primum fuiſſe ita glorioſum eſt; ut id poſteritas omnis, quia imitari non poteſt, invidia dignum putet. Primus labor plerumque ſibi aut totum honorem vindicat; aut ſecundo non niſi magna ex parte imminutum relinquit: vel quod difficultatem penè omnem, quam in rebus inveniendis maximam eſſe conſtat, exhauriat: vel quod non parùm emolliat: vel denique quod præſtantioris cujuſdam ingenii aciem, judiciique demonſtret. Ecce itaque inter Doctos certatur, & ambigitur uter è duobus eximiæ illius primæ excogitationis Catoptrico-Gnomonicæ laudem ſit relaturus, graviſſimoque tandem judicio declinabant ad partes Kircheri, qui prior typis nuper eam commiſerat: niſi in teſtem acerrimum compellatus occurriſſet alius R. P. ejuſdem Societatis Mathematicus, qui feliciter Romam acceſſerat, & ingenuè enarrabat vidiſſe ſe multos ante annos in Gallia, & in conventu quidem hujus Aquitanicæ Provinciæ noſtræ Albaterrenſi tale quoddam opus Catoptricum à P. Maignano elaboratum. Res ita erat; & Maignanus quidem, me audiente, non ſemel retulit cogitationem illam horographicam ſibi adhuc juniori ſubito immoderatoque impetu occurriſſe; tantaque voluptate mentem occupaſſe, quâ nullam majorem in vita ſenſiſſet. Hinc eruditorum Romanorum cohors ſuam utrique palmam contulit, protulitque paria eſſe in gignendis fortunatiſſimi ingenii Viris Germaniæ Galliæque imperia. - - - - *The whole matter would have reſted there, had not the friends on both ſides thought it worthy a more careful examination, and that it would conduce not a little to the reputation either of the German, or the French Mathematician. For in every kind of art or ſcience, ſuch is the glory of being the firſt inventor, that all poſterity envies what it cannot imitate. The firſt labour claims the chiefeſt, if not the ſole honour, or at leaſt leaves it greatly diminiſhed to the ſecond: either becauſe it exhauſts almoſt all the difficulty, which is certainly the greateſt in the invention of things; or becauſe it ſoftens it not a little; or becauſe it is a proof of ſuperior abilities and judgment. It was therefore a conteſt among the learned, which of the two ſhould carry off the credit of that moſt excellent catoptrico-gnomonical diſcovery; and it would at length have been determined in favour of Kircher, who firſt ſent it to the preſs, had not another reverend Father of the ſame ſociety, and a Mathematician, who luckily came to Rome, ingenuouſly confeſſed, that he had ſeen many years before, in France, at the aſſembly of this our province of Aquitain, a catoptrical work of this nature, done by Father Maignan. And ſo it was. And Maignan often ſaid, in my hearing, that, in his younger days, that horographic invention had occurred to him, by a ſudden and impetuous ſtart of fancy, and had given him the greateſt pleaſure he had ever felt. Hence the learned men of Rome gave each his due praiſe, and concluded, that Germany and France produced equally happy geniuſes.*’ It is not impoſſible, but the ſame thing may be invented by two perſons, tho’ the one is not aſſiſted by the other.

[*G*] *We ſhall ſee . . . . at what time the two tomes of his Philoſophical Divinity appeared.*] The firſt was printed in 1662, and the ſecond in 1672. There had been a leſs ſpace of time between the publication of theſe two volumes, if the author had not been obliged to anſwer ſome writings that were publiſhed againſt him. The firſt antagoniſt he anſwered was a Jeſuit (15) of the college of Toulouſe, who, in his book *de Cycloide*, had pretended, that Father Maignan was miſtaken in ſeveral points concerning the ſtructure and gravity of bodies, the acceleration of motion, and the equality of the angles of incidence and reflexion, *&c.* The Minim maintained, that there was a paralogiſm in the demonſtration of the Jeſuit, and this occaſioned a long diſpute, the reſult of which contributed very much to confirm this aphoriſm of geometrical phyſics, that an excellent Naturaliſt, moderately verſed in Geometry, is better able to maintain Phyſics, than an excellent Geometrician, who has but little ſkill in Phyſics. ‘ Plus proderit, inquit Maignanus, in rebus Phyſicis peritiſſimus Phyſicus mediocriter in Geometricis verſatus, quàm peritiſſimus Geometra parum Phyſicus. *Then he adds*, At ſi utroque genere excellat, nihil prorſus optabilius eſſe poteſt (16). - - *But if he excels in both, nothing can be more deſirable.*’ This anſwer of Father Maignan was printed as an Appendix, and was followed by a ſecond Appendix, wherein he confuted the replies of the Jeſuit, and in which he intermixed very good obſervations concerning the ſucceſſive propagation of light, the ſcintillation of the fixed ſtars, and the glaſs-drops of Holland. The third Appendix is an anſwer to a Diſſertation, which Mr Ducaſſe publiſhed againſt the reaſon, which Father Maignan had given, why the Dutch glaſs-drops break in a thouſand pieces, after the little end is broken off (17). This experiment was made in the convent of the Minims, in 1662, in the preſence of many perſons. The fourth Appendix was an anſwer to a writer (18), with whom the Jeſuit at his death had entruſted the management of his cauſe. This writer dwelt upon acceſſories, and quitted the main point of the diſpute, which was the accuſation of a paralogiſm. He complained of Father Maignan, that he had injured the moſt famous Jeſuits, Suarez, Vaſquez, Mendoza, Zacchi, *&c.* The Minim anſwered all theſe complaints, and forgot not to produce again his proofs of the accuſation of a paralogiſm. This fourth Appendix was printed 1667, at Bourdeaux, whither the author went about the affairs of his order. The fifth Appendix was an anſwer to Theophilus Raynaud, who wrote againſt the hypotheſis, which our Minim made uſe of, to explain the retaining of the accidents

(14) Id. ib.

(15) *Called* Lalouvere.

(16) Id. ib. pag. 35.

(17) See Rohault's Phyſics, *Part i, cap. xxii, num. xlvii, &c. p. m.* 191.

(18) *Father Courboullez, a Jeſuit of the college of Toulouſe.*

found a fair opportunity of ſatisfying himſelf, when the king deſired him to come to Paris, which was in 1660, after that his majeſty himſelf had ſeen an infinite number of machines and curioſities in the cell of this monk [*H*]. Cardinal Mazarin, who viewed them with the king, acquainted Father Maignan next day with the intentions of this prince, by Mr Fieubet, firſt preſident of the parliament of Toulouſe. The Minim expreſſed ſo modeſtly and humbly his inclination to ſpend his whole life in the obſcurity of a cloiſter, in which he had taken upon him the habit of his order, that the affair reſted there. He had therefore the ſatisfaction of ſhunning the pomp, in which they would have engaged him, and peaceably ſpent his time in writing books, making experiments, and reading lectures. He was conſulted by the greateſt Philoſophers, and gave a thouſand anſwers to them, either by word of mouth, or by writing. Never man loved idleneſs leſs than he did; he ſtudied even in his ſleep; for his dreams put him upon ſome theorems [*I*], the deduction of which he purſued, till he arrived at the demonſtration of them; and it often happened that he awoke ſuddenly, on account of the great pleaſure he had in finding out a demonſtration. The goodneſs of his morals, and the purity of his virtues, rendered him no leſs worthy of eſteem, than his wit and knowledge. He died the twenty ninth of October, 1676 (*i*). We muſt not forget, that, when he went to Paris in 1657, he was admitted, with great marks of honour, to the philoſophical conferences (*k*) at the houſe of Mr de Mommor, maſter of the requeſts (*l*), and that he compoſed with great facility, and without blots (*m*).

(*i*) *Taken from F. Saguens, in his Elogium of Emanuel Maignan.*

(*k*) *Thoſe conferences are often mentioned in the letters of Sorbiere.*

(*l*) Saguens, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 46.

(*m*) Eloquar ne an tacebo incredibilem illam conſcribendi ſine lituris ullis cogitata ſua rapiditatem; appendicem tertiam tribus horis, quartam conſcripſit tribus hebdomadis. - - - - *Shall I declare, or ſay nothing of, that incredible quickneſs in writing down his thoughts without any blots: he wrote his third appendix in three hours, and his fourth in three weeks.* Id. ib. pag. 48.

dents of the bread and wine in the Euchariſt. This Jeſuit had ſhewn, that he underſtood nothing of the ſtate of the queſtion; for he believed, that the opinion of F. Maignan was the ſame with that of a certain Sicilian called Chiavetta. In the ſame Appendix, F. Maignan anſwered two other adverſaries, who were F. Vincent Baron, and F. Nicholas Arnu, both Jacobins. Theſe five Appendixes, having been printed at ſeveral times, were re-publiſhed together in 1672 (19). I have already ſpoken (20) of the ſecond edition of his courſe of Philoſophy, and of the two treatiſes, which were added to it, one againſt the vortices of Mr Des Cartes, and the other concerning Sir Samuel Morland's trumpet. I add here, that this father invented a machine, which he cauſed to play before ſeveral learned men, and which overthrew, what Des Cartes ſuppoſes concerning the manner, in which the univerſe was framed, or might have been framed, and concerning the tendency to move from the center of motion by tangents (21).

[*H*] *His majeſty himſelf had ſeen, in the cell of this Monk, an infinite number of machines and curioſities.*] The particulars, which I ſhall now mention, may ſerve to diſcover the dilligence and induſtry of F. Maignan. ‘Properabat Rex ad celebrandas nuptias ſuas. . . . ‘Sed caſu Toloſæ parumper conſtitit: nec inter res, ‘quæ oculis Regiis dignæ cenſebantur, infima fuit ‘cellula Cœnobitica Patris Maignani, quæ inter Re‘ligioſæ egeſtatis anguſtias, ſi quid Matheſis pulchrum ‘coluit, includebat; tubos omnis generis Teleſcopicos, ‘Microſcopicos, Polyoptricos, Hygroſcopicos, Ther‘mometricos; ut non adjiciam machinamenta Pneu‘matica, Hydraulica, Magnetica multa, ſileamque de ‘planiſpheriis, tabellis opticis, fabrefactis tum ad fi‘gurati torni induſtrias, tum ad vires ſtaticas atti‘nentibus ingenioſiſſimis plurimis: ſpeculiſque uſtoriis ‘qualia nec capacioris Sphæræ, nec nitidioris formæ, ‘nec demum incendii pernicioris ullibi tunc temporis ‘prodebantur. In quo copioſiſſimo ſupellectilis Ma‘thematicæ apparatu non tam mirabatur Rex ſuo cum ‘Aulico Comitatu manum artificem, quæ totum ela‘boraverat, quàm mentem ad multò plura & utilio‘ra Reipublicæ molimina perficienda inſtructam. Qua‘re recogitare apud ſe ipſum occæpit, quantus Ma‘theſeos fulgor per univerſam Galliam irradiaret, ſi ‘Vir ille bonus ex Toloſana, ut ſic loquar, eremo in ‘popularem Regiæ civitatis, & Aulæ frequentationem ‘educeretur (22). - - - - *The king was haſtening to the ‘celebration of his nuptials . . . . But, by accident, he ‘ſtopped a little while at Toulouſe; and, among the ‘curioſities, which were thought worthy of his royal in‘ſpection, the cell of Father Maignan was not the leaſt, ‘being furniſhed, notwithſtanding it's ſtraitneſs, with all ‘ſorts of mathematical rarities; ſuch as Teleſcopic, Mi‘croſcopic, Polyoptric, Hygroſcopic, Thermometric Tubes; ‘not to mention Pneumatic, Hydraulic, and Magnetic, ‘inſtruments; to ſay nothing likewiſe of planiſpheres, op‘tical-tables, and many ingenious ſtatical inventions; ‘together with burning-glaſſes of the largeſt diameter, ‘moſt beautiful form, and intenſeſt heat, then extant. ‘In which Apparatus of mathematical furniture, the ‘king and his courtiers did not ſo much admire the artiſt‘hand, that had framed the whole, as the mind of the ‘artificer, qualified to bring greater undertakings, and ‘more uſeful to the public, to perfection. Wherefore he ‘began to conſider, how much the credit of mathema‘tical learning would increaſe over all France, if that ‘good man were drawn out of the deſart (if I may ſo ‘ſpeak) of Toulouſe, to ſhine in the capital city of the ‘kingdom, and at court.*’

[*I*] *His dreams put him upon ſome theorems.*] Here follows a fact, which confirms an obſervation I made above (23). It is of the nature of thoſe I mentioned at the beginning of the remark [*E*]. Let us therefore relate it in the words of the original. ‘Mentem la‘boribus iſtis ita feliciter aſſuefecerat (*Maignanus*) ut ‘emenſa diem ſtudio, in nullam nocturnæ corporeæ ‘quietis partem veniret. Quod rarum aliis, frequen‘tiſſimum Maignano fuit, ut idem aſſequeretur ſomni, ‘& ſomnii alicujus eruditi initium redeunte mente ‘ad ſolita ſua theoremata, nec abſiſtente donec de il‘lis demonſtrationem obtinuiſſet, cujus inopinata vo‘luptas dormienti ſæpe fuit pro ſuſcitabulo. Tum ne ‘illa fulguris ad inſtar emicaret & fugeret, cretam ſuo ‘ſub cervicali recondebat, quà notulis, quantum id ‘tenebræ patiebantur, in parata charta exaratis eam ſi‘ſteret (24). - - - - *Maignan had applied himſelf ſo ſuc‘ceſsfully to thoſe ſtudies, that his mind, tho' employed the ‘whole day, was not at reſt even in the night. What ‘rarely happens to others, was very common with Maig‘nan, that ſome learned dream put him upon theorems, ‘which his waking thoughts purſued, till he had obtained ‘a demonſtration of thoſe things, the ſudden pleaſure of ‘which had often waked him out of his ſleep. And that ‘thoſe ideas might not vaniſh like lightening, he marked ‘them down by ſhort characters upon paper, as well as ‘the darkneſs would permit, by the help of a piece of ‘chalk, which he laid under his pillow.*’ Did our age love quibbles, we might ſay, that he was a Geometrician, whoſe ſtock increaſed in his ſleep.

(19) *Taken out of F. Saguens, pag.* 34, *&c.*

(20) *In the remark* [*B*].

(21) Saguens, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 42.

(22) Id. ib. *pag.* 31, 32.

(23) In remark [*G*], num. ii, of the article LOTICHIUS (PETER).

(24) Id. ib. *pag.* 47, 48.

MAIMBOURG (LEWIS) was born at Nancy in the year 1610, and became a Jeſuit in 1626. He taught claſſical learning ſix years; after which his ſuperiors employed him in the office of a preacher; which he diſcharged in the chief cities of the kingdom (*a*); and I think the laſt ſermons he preached were againſt the verſion of Mons. The anſwers, which the Janſeniſts publiſhed to his ſermons againſt this tranſlation, repreſent him very much to his diſadvantage. He wrote three treatiſes of Controverſy (*b*), which are not ill performed; but he acquired a much greater reputation by ſeveral hiſtories, which he publiſhed (*c*). The Janſeniſts criticiſed that of Arianiſm, and that of the Iconoclaſts, and ſuffered all the reſt to paſs. That, which he wrote of Calviniſm in 1681,

ſtirred

(*a*) *Taken from Nathan. Southwell,* Bibl. Societ. Jeſu, *pag.* 567.

(*b*) *See the remark* [*D*].

(*c*) *The Supplement to Moreri has given a liſt of them.*

ſtirred up againſt him a ſharp war, of which he left all the operations to his enemies; for he continued perfectly inactive; and neither acted offenſively, nor defenſively. He had already quitted the ſociety of the Jeſuits by order of their general, when he publiſhed the Hiſtory of Calviniſm, becauſe he declared too fiercely for the doctrines of the Gallican church, againſt thoſe of the Ultramontanes. He retired to the abbey of St Victor, and died there, Auguſt the thirteenth, 1686, after he had made a will, which ſhews that he was diſſatisfied with the Jeſuits [*A*]. He had a large ſhare in the friendſhip of Father Ferrier, the king's confeſſor [*B*]. I have elſewhere ſaid (*d*), that he ſtudied at Rome under John de Lugo. The books, that were written againſt him, are ſo common, and contain ſo fully a character of his genius and his conduct, that it is unneceſſary to collect thoſe facts here. But as thoſe, who have refuted his Hiſtory of Calviniſm, have ſaid nothing of a certain ſermon, which furniſhed a writer of Port-Royal with a merry ſtory [*C*], I ſhall inſert it in one of the remarks. I ſhall make another concerning the works of Father Maimbourg [*D*]; and another concerning

(*d*) *In the article* LUGO (JOHN DE) *citation* ‡.

[*A*] *He made a will, which ſhews, that he was diſſatisfied with the Jeſuits.*] See the news from the Republic of Letters for the month of September, 1686 (1).

[*B*] *He had a great ſhare in the friendſhip of Father Ferrier the king's confeſſor.*] He informs us of this himſelf in his Hiſtory of St Leo; for, after having ſhewn what *is an opinion truly probable, againſt the falſe notion which ſome have framed of it*; he adds, ‘and this will be found very ſolidly proved in the little book concerning probable opinions, written by the deceaſed Father Ferrier, confeſſor to the king, and one of the moſt learned Divines that ever I knew; for whoſe memory I ſhall always have a ſingular veneration, as well for his diſtinguiſhed merit, as for the particular obligations I have to him, and which I cannot diſcharge but by this ſmall teſtimony of my gratitude, which I will now leave to poſterity (2).’

[*C*] *One of his ſermons furniſhed a writer of Port-Royal, with a merry ſtory.*] It is in a preface to the defence of the tranſlation of Mons, of the Cologne edition, 1668, and which was not reprinted in the Geneva edition of all the pieces which concern this tranſlation. Hence it is that this ſtory is but little known, and was not laid hold of by the cenſurers of the Hiſtory of Calviniſm. It will not therefore be impertinent to inſert it here in this remark, as the author of the preface tells it.

‘It is now above twenty years, ſince going by chance into the chappel of the college of Clermont, I ſaw a man mount the pulpit, of an extraordinary mein, and who was none of thoſe, whom the ſcripture ſpeaks of, *whoſe wiſdom ſhines in their countenance.* On the contrary, there was nothing to be ſeen but fierceneſs in his eyes, in his geſtures, and in his whole air; and he might have ſtruck terror into the people, if this fierceneſs had not been mixed with a thouſand theatrical geſtures, fit to make people laugh . . . . His diſcourſe was yet more aſtoniſhing than his air, and the oddneſs of it was ſo ſtrange, that I could never forget it. It was the ſecond Sunday after Eaſter, when the Goſpel about the good ſhepherd is read: from hence he took occaſion to magnify the condition of ſhepherds, by obſerving, that it was not formerly the profeſſion of the meaneſt people, as it is at preſent; but that kings and princes did not think it unworthy of them. After this, he reckoned up a great number of princes, that were ſhepherds. He forgot not the patriarchs, but carried down the catalogue as low as David, upon whom he inſiſted a long time; for he gave us a merry deſcription of his beauty, the colour of his hair, his cloaths, and laſtly of his dog. *It was, ſays he, a brave dog, and had ſo much courage, that we may believe, while his maſter fought with Goliah, this dog, to avoid the diſgrace of doing nothing in the mean time, hunted after the wolves.* After this good father was once entered upon the ſubject of dogs, as if he had been linked to it by ſome ſecret ſympathy, he could not tell how to leave it, and therefore he divided his ſermon into four parts, according to the four ſeveral ſorts of dogs. The firſt ſort were bull-dogs: the ſecond were maſtiff-dogs: the third were lap-dogs: and the fourth the good dogs; of which he made an application to different ſorts of preachers. The bull-dogs were the Janſeniſts, or, as they were then called, the Arnaudiſts, whom he repreſented as an indiſcreet people, who tore in pieces all men indifferently, and made no diſtinction between the innocent and the guilty, but oppreſſed every body with hard penances. He deſcribed the maſtiff-dogs as being cowardly, and having no courage, but upon their own dunghill, and who, when off from that, are always fearful, which he applied to preachers of that humour. The lap-dogs were, according to him, the court-abbots; *They are*, ſaid he, *ſhaped like lions, and make a great noiſe*; *but when they are ſeen near, their noiſe is laughed at.* Upon this occaſion, he deſcribed their ruffles, their bands, their ſurplices, their geſtures. And laſtly, the good dogs were the Jeſuits, and ſuch preachers as himſelf. It is impoſſible to imagine after what manner he treated this ridiculous ſubject, and to what an exceſſive pitch he carried the buffoonry of his deſcriptions. I can aſſure you, that, being then preſent, I ſaw all the reverend Fathers, who were in the galleries above, holding their ſides with laughter, from the beginning of the ſermon to the end of it, and the reſt of the auditory could not well keep their countenance, and look grave: indeed there was nothing but burſts of laughter, which could not be ſtopped. All this diverted the good father, and inſpired him with a new ardor, to increaſe the laughter of his auditors, by new grimaces. After I had been a ſpectator of this ſtrange profanation, and was informed of the name of the Jeſuit who had preached, who was ſaid to be F. Maimbourg, I went out more ſcandalized at the ſociety than at their preacher (3).’

[*D*] *I ſhall make a remark concerning the works of F. Maimbourg.*] He publiſhed, at Roüen, two panegyrics in 1640; one is that of Lewis XIII, on his puting France under the protection of the virgin; the other is an elogium of the kings of France. He had publiſhed at Rome, in 1638, a funeral oration on Nicholas Zappi an Auguſtin monk; and he publiſhed at Paris his Lent-ſermons in 1670, in two volumes in 8vo. Father Southwell, who informed me of this, has ſaid nothing of the letters of Francis Romain, which is a work of F. Maimbourg; the title of which alone gives us to underſtand, that it relates to the manner of reconciling the obedience, due to the Pope, with that due to the king. Southwell did not forget the controverſial treatiſes, written by F. Maimbourg. They are three little treatiſes; one of which (4) is intituled, *A peaceable method to bring back the Proteſtants, without diſputation to the true faith as to the Euchariſt, upon occaſion of the conteſt* (5) *concerning the perpetuity of the faith of the ſame myſtery.* The ſecond is intituled, *Of the true church of* JESUS CHRIST. And the third, *Of the true word of* GOD. The firſt of theſe three works appeared ſo good to the Roman Catholics, that it holds the fifth place among the ſixteen methods of converting the Huguenots, which were recommended by the clergy of France to the controverſial writers in 1682. The words of the memorial, drawn up by that aſſembly, are theſe. ‘The fifth is a peaceable method, and without diſputation founded upon the ſynod of Dort, which all the Proteſtants of France have received, and which has determined by the holy Scripture, that, when there is a conteſt about any article between two parties, which are in the true church, it muſt be referred to it's deciſion, under this penalty to any one that refuſes to ſubmit to it, that he ſhall be accounted guilty of ſchiſm and hereſy.’ And indeed in this conſiſts

(1) *Page* 1034, *& ſeq.*

(2) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. of the Pontificate of St Leo, lib. iv, pag.* 343, *Edit. Holl.*

(3) Preface to the Defence of the Tranſlation of the New Teſtament, printed at Mons, againſt the ſermons of F. Maimbourg the Jeſuit, *p.* 6.

(4) Printed at Paris in 1670, and reprinted there the third time in 1682.

(5) It was that, which then made ſo great a noiſe between Mr Arnaud and Mr Claude.

concerning a couſin of his [*E*], who became a Proteſtant, and is the author of two or three books.

conſiſts the whole ſtrength of the method of F. Maimbourg. He ſhews, by the conduct, which was obſerved in Holland, when diſputes aroſe between the Arminians and Gomariſts, that, according to the doctrine of the Proteſtants, it belongs to the church, in whoſe boſom the conteſts ariſe, to do juſtice to the parties, by deciding which is in the right, and which is in the wrong; and that, by virtue of it's definitive ſentence they muſt drop the diſpute; and that thoſe, who will not ſubmit to this deciſion, are to be reputed Heretics, and to be cut off from the body as unruly members. According to this principle, will the Papiſts ſay, the Proteſtants ought to acknowledge, that it belonged to the council of Trent to give ſentence, without appeal, as to the diſputes of Luther and Calvin; and that, after the deciſion of this council, they were no longer permitted to quarrel, but that each of them ought to have conformed himſelf, to the definitive decree, with the Romiſh doctors, upon pain of deſerving the thunder of excommunication, as a Heretic and Rebel. This is not a place to examine, whether this argument *ad hominem* has any force (6). It is ſufficient to ſay, that the Proteſtant church cannot be blamed for eſtabliſhing an order, without which it is impoſſible any ſociety can ſubſiſt: for, in all ſocieties there muſt be a tribunal, to give ſentence without appeal in the diſputes of private perſons, and who have power to inflict the penalties of rebellion upon thoſe, who refuſe to ſubmit to its decrees; for otherwiſe it would not be poſſible to cure any diſorder, nor to hinder diſputes from laſting eternally. I know very well, it is objected, that, in this reſpect, there is no other difference between the Romiſh and Reformed church, as to the point of authority, but that the one declares itſelf to be infallible, and does not permit private perſons to examine it's deciſions; whereas the other acknowledges itſelf fallible, and permits private perſons to examine the whole, provided that at laſt they ſubmit to it's decrees. I know very well, I ſay, that it is objected, that, in this reſpect, the way of authority is no leſs the laſt refuge of Proteſtants than of Papiſts; but I know alſo what the Proteſtants anſwer. Three of their authors (7) have refuted the method of Father Maimbourg. He, whom I name laſt, has taken the beſt expedient that could be taken; his reflexions are fine and good; but he did not always perceive whether his anſwers were a paralogiſm. I will give an example of it.

He propoſes this objection in page 347. ‘If one is not obliged to ſubmit to the deciſions of councils and ſynods; if it be always lawful to appeal from them; if every one has a power to look upon thoſe deciſions as meer councils, and to reject them, when they judge them not agreeable to the word of GOD, there will be no way left of deciding any controverſy, or putting an end to it (8).' He anſwers, among other things, that they, who lay ſuch a ſtreſs upon this difficulty, do not remove it by the doctrine of the infallibility of the church. He proves it (9) by two hundred Hereſies, which, according to the calculation of Bellarmin, have made great devaſtations in the Romiſh church, which has always, *ſays he*, declared herſelf to be infallible. He adds (10) that there is in the birth of Hereſies θεῖόν τι, ſomething ſupernatural, and therefore that we muſt not imagine that we have it always in our power to ſtop thoſe miſchiefs, unleſs GOD interpoſes in an extraordinary manner. There are two great defects in this anſwer: I. It is to confeſs to the oppoſite party, that GOD has not left in his church any ordinary means of determining diſputes. II. That the multitude of Hereſies, which have appeared in Chriſtendom, proves, that the doctrine of authority is not a proper means to extinguiſh them. How came this author not to ſee, that theſe Hereſies could never have laſted, if their followers had believed this doctrine? They were maintained only by rejecting it: Does this prove any thing againſt the goodneſs of the remedy? Is a ſick man, who is not cured, becauſe he rejects all that the Phyſician orders him, a good evidence, that the Phyſician's remedies are good for nothing? I ſay this only by the bye, to adviſe the readers, that there is a large field for criticiſm in controverſial books.

I return now to the books of Father Maimbourg; but ſhall not mention the titles of his hiſtories, which may be found in the ſupplement to Moreri. I think it may be ſaid, that he had a particular talent for ſuch works. They are very agreeably written, contain many lively ſtrokes, and a great variety of occaſional Inſtructions. There are few Hiſtorians, even among thoſe, who write better, and are more learned and exact than he, who have the art of engaging the reader ſo much as he does. I wiſh that thoſe, who could exceed him in candor and knowledge, would give us all the hiſtories he had undertaken to write, if he had lived twenty years longer, and that they would ſet them off with the ſame attractives as he did: it would be no ſmall advantage to the learned world. I have ſaid in the body of this article, that his hiſtories of Arianiſm, and of the Iconoclaſts, were criticized. That criticiſm is very good (11). It was burnt at Paris, in 1674, and printed again in Holland, in 1683. His hiſtory of the church of Rome was alſo criticized, and I have heard ſay, that Dr Boileau is the author of that criticiſm. His work was printed twice (12), and is very much augmented in the ſecond edition. The *News from the Republic of Letters* mentions the firſt (13). The abſtract, which is found there of this piece, ſhews, that Mr Maimbourg ſucceeded very ill in the attack he made upon the infallibility of the Pope, and the ſuperiority of the Holy See over councils.

[*E*] *I ſhall make a remark concerning a couſin of his, named THEODORE MAIMBOURG.*] He conformed to the cuſtom of the times, in publiſhing the motives why he changed his religion. The letter, which he wrote upon this occaſion to his eldeſt brother, was printed in 1659. He retired into Guienne (14), to the houſe of the marquis de Bougi, and wrote a *Summary Anſwer* to the method of cardinal Richelieu. He dedicated it to madam de Turenne, and ſent the MSS. to Samuel Mareſius, who publiſhed it at Groningen, in 1664. The author gives himſelf the name, of R. de la Ruelle. He returned to the Romiſh communion ſome time after, and made profeſſion of it when the famous book of the expoſition of the Catholic faith was printed (15). He made ſome reflexions upon that work, which were ſeen in MSS. by ſome of the Reformed religion. This made Mr de la Baſtide (16) affirm, *That he knew a Catholic, who was writing againſt the Expoſition of the biſhop of Condom.* I uſe the ſame words, which the biſhop of Condom cites, as taken from the 23d page of the preface of Mr de la Baſtide; but I find, in this preface, at page 30 of the ſecond edition, the following words: ‘I have been informed, that there is a certain perſon of the Romiſh church, who is writing againſt this ſame Expoſition of the biſhop of Condom; and what thoſe of his own communion can ſay, concerning their own belief, will be of more weight, and leſs ſuſpected in their mouth, than in ours.' The biſhop of Condom obſerves, that the Proteſtants were impoſed upon, when they were told ſo. ‘It would certainly, *adds he* (17), be a curious thing, that this good Catholic, whom the Catholics have never known, ſhould place ſo much confidence in the enemies of the church, as to tell them of a book he was preparing againſt a biſhop of his own communion. But this imaginary writer has been now expected too long a time, and the pretended Reformed will be very credulous, if for the future they ſuffer themſelves to be amuſed with ſuch like promiſes.' The perſon, meant by Mr de la Baſtide, was our Theodore Maimbourg, who went into England about the year 1682, to return to the Proteſtant church. He took with him ſeveral manuſcripts, which he had written, and, among the reſt, an anſwer to the peaceable method of his couſin the Jeſuit, and an anſwer to the book of the biſhop of Condom. The firſt of theſe two pieces was printed at Rotterdam, in 1683. The Bookſeller was earneſtly deſired to print the ſecond immediately; but the ſale of the firſt gave him no encouragement to do it. Thus the work lay buried in the obſcurity of a ſtudy. The author was appointed governor to one of the natural ſons of king Charles II. He died at London about two or three years ago (18), and, if one may believe the reports that were ſpread of him, he declared to the miniſters that prepared him for death, that he died a Socinian, and continued obſtinate in it to the laſt. I

---

(6) Mr Jurieu, in his treatiſe of the Power of the Church, *pag.* 323, confeſſes, that there is wit and cunning in this book of Mr Maimbourg. And *pag.* 325, That the turn he gives to the difficulty has ſomething dazzling, and which ſtrikes the mind with an idea of great difficulty.

(7) *Viz.* I. Mr Lenfant, miniſter of Chatillon upon the Loing, father of Mr Lenfant, miniſter at Berlin. II. A couſin of Father Maimbourg, of whom I ſhall ſpeak below. III. Mr Jurieu, in his letters about the Power of the Church, printed at Roan in 1677.

(8) Jurieu's treatiſe of the Power of the Church, Letter vii, num. ix, pag. 347.

(9) Ib. *pag.* 348.

(10) Ib. *pag.* 351.

(11) The title is, *Dialogues between Eudoxus and Euchariſtus, upon the Hiſtory of Arianiſm, and the Hiſtory of the Iconoclaſts of Father Maimbourg.*

(12) In Holland in 1686, and in 1688.

(13) Month of April, 1686, *pag.* 461.

(14) To the caſtle of Calonge in Condomois, near Agen.

(15) Written by Mr Boſſuet, then biſhop of Condom. This book was printed the firſt time in 1671.

(16) In the advertiſement of his anſwer to the book of the biſhop of Condom. See the advertiſement of this prelate, on the ſecond edition, *pag.* 25. of the Holland Edition.

(17) Ibid.

(18) I write this in the month of January, 1696.

have heard ſome ſay, that he was a man of a good mein, of a great deal of wit, and who knew the world very well. What we read in a letter of Mr Simon (19), is enough to make one believe, that this man openly died an Unitarian, and that he had been ſo a long time *incognito*. It is a very curious particular. I adviſe you to read it in the original.

(19) The ſixth of his *Select Letters*, *pag.* 64, 65, edition of Trevoux, 1700.

There was a Jeſuit, a native of Lorrain, called JOHN MAIMBOURG, who was not inferior, either in knowledge or wit, to the famous Serrarius, another Jeſuit of Lorrain; but he would never publiſh any books, though he was earneſtly exhorted to do it. A Jeſuit of the ſame country gives us an account of theſe things. ‘ Magnum uterque Lotharingiæ lumen, magnum eruditionis omnis ornamentum, magnum pietatis, & Chriſtianæ modeſtiæ decus. Ambo florentes ingeniis, eruditi ambo, ambo in omnis generis authorum aſſidua lectione verſati, vel potius omnibus tum ſacræ tum prophanæ doctrinæ partibus abſoluti atque perfecti: ambo ſacras literas, & hanc ipſam, quæ me ſuſpenſum tenebat, inſcriptionem,

Explanare pares, & reſpondere parati.

‘ alter ſcriptis in lucem publicam emiſſis illuſtrior: alter ingenio par, eruditione, virtutibus: hoc uno duntaxat inferior quod adduci nunquam potuit, ut ingenii doctrinæque ſuæ fœtus expromeret, ac prælo mandari pateretur. Alter erat Nicolaus Serrarius, alter Joannes Memburgus (20). - - - - - - *They were both a great honour to Lorrain, a great ornament of all ſorts of learning, and a great credit to piety and Chriſtian modeſty. They were both men of flouriſhing parts, both learned, both verſed in the reading of all kinds of authors, or rather perfectly accompliſhed in all parts of learning, both ſacred and prophane: they were both equally ſkillful in explaining the ſcriptures, and ready to anſwer their adverſaries. The one was more famous for the works he had publiſhed; the other was his equal in wit, learning, and virtues; in this alone inferior to him, that he could never be prevailed upon to let his works ſee the light, or ſuffer them to be publiſhed. The one was Nicolas Serrarius, the other John Maimbourg.*

(20) Nicol. Abramus, in Pharo Veteris Teſtamenti, *pag.* 256, *col.* 2.

MAINUS (JASON) one of the moſt famous Civilians of his age, was born in 1435. Andreot Mainus, his father, being baniſhed from Milan, for a crime he had committed, retired to Peſaro, and there got his maid with child (*a*). To this noble exploit our Civilian owes his birth. He was educated at Milan, whither his father returned; but his tutor treated him very harſhly, and did not take the ſame care of him, as he did of the legitimate ſons of Andreot Mainus. He was ſent, to ſtudy the Civil-law at Pavia; where he was ſo much addicted to playing at cards, that, having loſt all his money and his books, he rambled about the ſtreets in a miſerable condition [*A*]. He profited by his father's puniſhment; for he applied himſelf ſo heartily to ſtudy, that he made a wonderful progreſs, both at Pavia and Bologna, inſomuch, that he was judged worthy to teach the Civil-law in 1471. He taught in Pavia from that year till 1486, when he was called to Padua. Though they gave him a large ſalary [*B*], he was not contented with it; and becauſe he could not obtain an augmentation of it, he retired, at the end of three years, to Piſa, where he had a better penſion. He was recalled to Pavia in 1491, and became ſo famous there, that he had three thouſand ſcholars. He was ſent to Rome, the next year, to congratulate the new Pope Alexander VI, to whom he made a very fine harangue. That, which he made upon the marriage of Maximilian of Auſtria, king of the Romans, with the niece of Lewis Sforza, was no leſs applauded at the court of the emperor, from whence he returned loaded with preſents, and honourable titles [*C*]. He harangued likewiſe in 1495, when Lewis Sforza was declared duke of Milan, which procured him new titles of honour (*b*). Having almoſt loſt his ſight, he broke off his lectures [*D*], but was prevailed upon to re-aſſume them by the urgent ſollicitations

(*a*) Piſaurum ad Galeacium Malateſtam oppidi dominum venit, ubi ex ancilla Annete concubina. . . . . Jaſonem filium ſuſcepit. *Guidius Panzirollus, ubi infra, pag.* 281.

(*b*) *See the remark* [*C*].

[*A*] *He rambled about the ſtreets in a miſerable condition.*] He was forced to be ſhaved, becauſe the ſcurf had eaten into his head, and beſides he was very ill cloathed. We ſhall make uſe of the words of Panzirollus. *In peſtilenti chartarum luſu adeo miſerè deperditus eſt, ut omni conſumpta ſuppellectile etiam jurium volumina in membranis magno pretio deſcripta vendere cogeretur, ad extremamque inopiam deductus vili veſte, & tonſo capite, quod deformi tinea obſitum erat, omnium ſordidiſſimus incedebat* (1).

(1) Panzirollus, de claris Legum Interpretibus, *lib. ii, cap. cxxvii, pag. m.* 281.

[*B*] *Though they gave him a large ſalary.*] *Viz.* The ſum of a thouſand ducats, which none ever had before him; the whole penſion, that was given to his predeceſſors, amounting only to two or three hundred ducats. *Primus ex noſtris jurium interpretibus mille aureorum ſalarium obtinuit, cum ante ducentis aut ſummum trecentis aureis docerent* (2). He was alſo the firſt, who required fifty ducats for a conſultation, nay, ſometimes 100 and more; whereas, before, no more than four were given (3). He was miſtaken ſometimes in his advice; but I know not whether he kept his word to his clients, who conſulted him, to whom he promiſed a reſtitution of the money, he had received from them, in caſe they loſt the cauſe. *Conſultoribus oneroſus in hoc laudem meruit, quod ſi cauſa excidiſſent, extortam pecuniam ſe reſtituturum pollicebatur, in quibuſdam tamen minus rectè conſuluiſſe arguitur* (4). There are ſome ſellers of febrifuges, who promiſe the like reſtitution, in caſe a fever does not go off. But ſhould it ſo happen, I do not believe the people ever make them refund the money.

(2) Id. ib. *pag.* 282.

(3) Primus etiam 50. 100. & amplius aureos pro reſponſis accepit, cum prius quatuor aureolis honorarentur. *Panzirol. ubi ſupra, pag.* 282.

(4) *Id. pag.* 285. He cites *Marza, conſ. i, fol.* 10, & 12. *in princ.*

[*C*] *He returned from the emperor's court loaden with preſents and honourable titles.*] *Auro argentoque donatus & equeſtri ac palatina dignitate boneſtatus, Cæſariſque patritius factus lætus in patriam rediit* (5). Mr Bullart relates (6), ‘ That Lewis Sforza, duke of Milan, having a mind to promote the glory of a man, who was his ſubject, preferred him to the rank of a ſenator in his council, and honoured him with the order of knighthood (7), and then ſent him on ſome embaſſies to the emperors Frederic and Maximilian; who judging him worthy of their eſteem, on account of his own merits, as well as of his character, did him extraordinary honours, and diſmiſſed him loaded with preſents.’ This is not well told; for, if we depend upon theſe words, we may imagine, that Mainus was ſent ſucceſſively to the emperors Frederic, and Maximilian. But this is a miſtake; for he was ſent only to the Imperial court, when Bonna Sforza married Maximilian, king of the Romans.

(5) Panzirol. ib. *pag.* 283.

(6) *Bullart's Academy of Sciences, Tom. i, pag.* 212.

(7) Ejus (*Ludovici Sfortiæ*) Senator ac Patritius eſt declaratus. *Panzirol. ibid.*

[*D*] *He broke off his lectures.*] For more than nine years, if we may believe Panzirollus; but he himſelf will not permit us to believe him: for he ſays, that king Lewis XII engaged him to read public lectures again, and that Mainus, being inveſted with a fief, upon condition he would teach the Law (8), performed this condition, and yet was diſappointed of his fief (9). He complained of this to Lewis XII, who diſpatched letters in his favour; but they were thrown on the ground, and he who preſented them received many blows. *Jaſon amicorum opera à Rege literas impetravit, ut ſibi ablata reſtituerentur; ſed nuncius pugnis, & calcibus percuſſus penè cæſus eſt, Literæ in terram projectæ, & conculcatæ fuere.* Mainus complained to Guy de Rocheford, chancellor of France, and did not forget to tell him of the hundred and fifty crowns, this affair had coſt him, without getting one penny from the lands, the

(8) Caſtrum Pioperam Rex in feudum Jaſoni, dum viveret, cum multis prædiis & proventibus conceſſit, hoc animo, ut Jura profiteri teneretur, niſi valetudine eſſet impeditus. *Id. ib. pag.* 283.

(9) Dominus à Corcu regiæ domus magiſter Jaſonem Caſtro ſpoliavit, etſi poſt acquiſitum Caſtrum ſemper docuit. *Ibid. pag.* 284.

ſollicitations of Lewis XII. He was honoured with the preſence of this prince at one of his lectures [*E*]; which was attended with a thouſand advantages; but the fief, wherewith he was inveſted, never brought him in one farthing (*c*); but on the contrary put him to great charges. The jealouſy between him, and Philip Decius, another profeſſor, was carried to a great height [*F*]. He was not a man of a very ſubtile wit, neither did he ſcruple to make uſe of the labours of others [*G*]. He exacted moſt exorbitant fees from thoſe who came to conſult him; but he promiſed to reſtore the money, if they loſt their cauſe (*d*). He was excuſed from reading lectures during the laſt years of his life; which was a favour, that he obtained from the duke of Milan, and which the bad ſtate of his mind was ſufficient to procure him. This laſt part of his life was very melancholy. He had loſt the uſe of his reaſon; and he had a nephew, who often beat him (*e*). He died at Pavia, the twenty ſecond of March, 1519, aged eighty four years, and left a natural ſon behind him, who had employments in the republic of Genoa (*f*). The anſwer he made to Lewis XII is ill related by Mr. Moreri [*H*]. He is the author of ſeveral books [*I*]. He ſtudied by candle-light in the day-time

the king had given him. Panzirollus adds, that theſe things happened in the year 1500, and that Mainus continued to teach till the year 1511. The interruption did not begin, at the ſooneſt, till the year 1495; where then ſhall we find the nine years which Panzirollus makes it continue? I uſed to be ſurprized, when I met with ſuch faults of Arithmetic in good authors; but now I wonder no longer at it: I have found too many of them, not to be accuſtomed, and pretty well hardened, to them.

[*E*] *He was honoured with the preſence of Lewis XII at one of his lectures.*] Lewis XII being at Pavia, had a mind to hear him. Mainus, being clad in a robe of gold, conducted him to the auditory. The king made him go before him, and ſaid, that the royal power in theſe places was inferior to that of the profeſſors (10). He was followed by five cardinals, and a hundred lords. He embraced Mainus, after he came down from his chair, and preſented him with a caſtle. We may compare this to the honours paid by Pompey to the Philoſopher Poſidonius. ‘ Cn. Pompeius confecto Mithridatico bello intraturus Poſidonii ſapientiæ profeſſione clari domum, fores percuti de more à lictore vetuit, & faſces literarum januæ ſubmiſit is cui ſe oriens occidens que ſubmiſerat (11). - - - *Cn. Pompey, juſt after the Mithridatic war, deſigning to enter the houſe of the famous Philoſopher Poſidonius, forbad his lictors to ſtrike the door, as uſual, and ſtruck his faſces at learning's gate; he, to whom the eaſt and weſt had ſubmitted.*’ The Sieur Bullart ſhould not have ſaid, that Lewis XII *went often to this auditory* (12); but this is the humour of all thoſe, who make elogiums: they never regard the exact numbers; they multiply every thing. The ſubject, treated of by Mainus in this lecture, ought not to be forgotten: he maintained, that the dignity of a knight, conferred by a prince upon him, who had ſignalized himſelf in a battle, ought to paſs from father to ſon. *Ea lectione dignitatem equeſtrem ob ſpectatum in acie facinus de manu Regis traditam, accendendæ virtutis ergo ad poſteros manare definivit* (13).

[*F*] *The jealouſy between him and Philip Decius, another Profeſſor, was carried to a great height.*] There is nothing more common than to ſee this kind of jealouſy produce a torrent of reproaches and ſlanders; but it happens ſeldom that thoſe, who are tainted with it, throw ſtones at one another, in a literal ſenſe, as theſe two Profeſſors did one day. They met in a narrow ſtreet, and diſputed the wall, and had like to have knocked one another down with ſtones. What a ſtrange ſight was this! and how diverting to children, and all paſſengers! *Jaſonis nominis invidia exagitatus Philippus Decius, ipſum uſque ad inſanas cavillationes numquam inſectari deſtitit. In tantum denique odium prorupere, ut ſemel in angiportu, obviam facti, cum de loco contendere cæpiſſent, etiam lapidibus ſeſe inceſſiſſe ferantur* (14).

[*G*] *Neither did he ſcruple to make uſe of the labours of others.*] It would have been wrong to have left him out of the liſt of Plagiaries (15); for he attributed to himſelf a book, which Alexander of Imola had compoſed; and he hired ſome ſcholars, who took copies of the lectures of the moſt learned Profeſſors, of which he afterwards made an advantage. One of theſe Profeſſors complained of it publickly, and was ſo enraged at the cheat, that he changed his ſentiments out of ſpite, and refuted thoſe opinions, which had been ſtolen from him. Read this Latin, and you will find the names of the perſons concerned. ‘ Aliorum ‘ etiam laboribus Jaſon libenter fruebatur, ſiquidem ‘ commentarium in titulum de Actionibus ab Alexandro Imolenſi ſcitè elaboratum ſibi adſcripſiſſe, & in ‘ lucem edidiſſe, fertur. † Hieronymi Torti Papienſis, qui cum Jacobo Puteo in patria veſpertinas lectiones paulo ante explicuerat, & aliorum ſcriptis ‘ locupletari voluit; Bononiæ quoque dum ibi Bartholomæus Socinus, deinde Carolus Ruinus profiterentur, auditores aluiſſe dicitur, qui eorum deſcriptas lectiones ad ſe referrent: id & ejus commentaria oſtendunt, & Ruinus ſæpe publicè deploravit, ‘ qui, mutata per indignationem ſententia, ſurreptas ‘ opiniones confutare conſueverat (16). - - - - *Jaſon ‘ freely made uſe of other mens labours; for he is reported to have aſcribed to himſelf the commentary on the ‘ title* de Actionibus, *curiouſly written by Alexander of ‘ Imola, and to have publiſhed it as his own: he ‘ would enrich himſelf with the works of Jerom Tortus ‘ of Pavia, who, a little before, had explained, together with James Puteus, the evening lectures, in ‘ his own country, as alſo with the works of other authors; at Bononia likewiſe, during the Profeſſorſhip of ‘ Bartholomew Socinus, and Charles Ruinus, he is ſaid ‘ to have kept in pay certain ſcholars, to tranſcribe, ‘ and bring their lectures to him. This his commentaries ſhew, and Ruinus often publickly lamented, who, ‘ changing his ſentiments through indignation, uſed to ‘ confute the opinions that were ſtolen from him.*’

[*H*] *His anſwer to Lewis XII is ill related by Mr Moreri.*] ‘ Paul Jovius adds, That Lewis XII ‘ having aſked him, why he was never married, he ‘ anſwered, becauſe he was perſuaded, that, by his ‘ Majeſty's ſollicitation, Pope Julius II would make ‘ him a cardinal (17).’ This is not tranſlating as he ſhould have done, the words of Paul Jovius ‘ Me ‘ audiente interrogatus à Ludovico Gallorum Rege ‘ cur nunquam duxiſſet uxorem, ut te commendante, ‘ inquit, Julius Pontifex ad purpureum galerum geſtandum me habilem ſciat (18). - - - - - *Being aſked, ‘ in my hearing, by Lewis, king of France, why he ‘ never married, that Pope Julius, on your recommendation, ſaid he, may know, that I am qualified to ‘ wear the red hat.*’ Nevertheleſs we may know, by this bad verſion, that Mainus wiſhed for a cardinal's hat; but it availed him nothing to diſcover the ſecret of his ambition. *Hoc reſponſo animi quidem ſecretum oſtendit, ſed nunquam voti compos factus eſt* (19). This is what Panzirollus ſays, after he had ſaid what you are going to read. ‘ In domeſtico colloquio ab eodem ‘ (Rege) interrogatus Jaſon, cur nunquam uxorem ‘ duxiſſet, Ut tua, inquit, ampliſſime Rex, opera Julius Pontifex me ad purpureum Galerum promovere ‘ poſſit (20). - - - - *Jaſon, in converſation, being aſked ‘ by the ſame king, why he had never taken a wife, ‘ that by your means, ſaid he, great king, Pope Julius ‘ may promote me to the red hat.*’

[*I*] *He is the author of ſeveral books.*] Of a Commentary upon the Pandects, and upon the Code of Juſtinian, beſides four volumes of Anſwers, and the explication of the title *de Actionibus* (21). He compiled many things; but he did not always underſtand what he borrowed from others. ‘ Jaſon non ‘ multum ingenio acutus ob hæſitationem indeciſos ‘ quandoque articulos reliquit, nec ſemel male percepta ‘ aliorum argumenta recitat, ac in referendis receptis opinionibus,

---

(*c*) *See the remark* [*D*].

(*d*) *See the remark* [*B*].

(*e*) Ferunt eum ſenio confectum deliraſſe, & ſæpe à Corn. Hippolyto ex fratre nepote pugnis cæſum fuiſſe. *Panzirol. ubi infra, pag.* 286.

(*f*) *Taken from Panzirol. lib. ii,* de claris Legum Interpretibus, *cap. cxxvii.*

(10) Rex eum velut præceptorem præire juſſit, quod eo in loco profitentibus regiam poteſtatem inferiorem eſſe diceret. *Panzirol. pag.* 283.

(11) Plinius, *lib. vii, cap. xxx.*

(12) Bullart, ubi ſupra.

(13) Jovius, in Elog. *cap. lxvi, pag.* 154. See alſo Panzirol. *ubi ſupra, pag.* 283.

(14) Panzirol. *pag.* 284.

(15) *He is in the liſt of Thomaſius, num.* 471.

† *Apoſtil. ad. conſ. lxii, & clxiii. Decii.*

(16) Panzirol. ibid. *pag.* 285.

(17) *Moreri, at the word Mayni.*

(18) Jov. in Elog. *cap. lxvi, pag.* 154.

(19) Panzirol. *pag.* 283.

(20) *Compare with this the anſwer of ALLATIUS, related in his article, remark* [*D*].

(21) Panzirol. *pag.* 282.

time [*K*].

‘ opinionibus, quæ Communes vocantur, non nunquam ‘ decipitur. Vir alioqui laborioſus, & in cumulandis ‘ aliorum dictis diligens ⸸, quicquid enim legebat, ‘ ſcriptis mandabat, unde à ſolo calamo Juris ſtudio‘ ſum adjuvari dictitabat, & ſe quantum ſtudebat, tan‘ tum ſcribere referebat (22). - - - *Jaſon, not being of a* ‘ *quick apprehenſion, ſometimes left articles undecided,* ‘ *through doubt: he often repeats the arguments of others,* ‘ *without underſtanding them, and is ſometimes miſtaken* ‘ *even in relating received opinions. He is otherwiſe a* ‘ *laborious man, and induſtrious in compiling what others* ‘ *have ſaid; for he wrote down whatever he read;* ‘ *whence he ſaid, that a ſtudent of the law was aſſiſted by* ‘ *his pen alone, and that himſelf wrote, as much as he ſtu*‘ *died.*’

⸸ *Hieron. Buttigel. in lib. i, §. ſi quis ſimpliciter. num. ix. ff. de ver. oblig.*

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 285.

[*K*] *He ſtudied by candle-light in the day-time.*] I have heard this ſaid of ſome other learned men, and I am very glad to find it printed concerning Jaſon Mainus. ‘ Linteo capiti obvoluto, etiam meridie occluſis fene‘ ſtris ad accenſum lumen elucubrare conſueverat, ne ‘ cœli claritate mentem evagari ſineret (23). - - - *With* ‘ *a linen night-cap on his head, and his windows ſhut* ‘ *up, at noon-day, he uſed to ſtudy by candle-light, leſt* ‘ *the brightneſs of the ſkie ſhould divert, and take off his* ‘ *thoughts.*’ The reaſon of this conduct may be eaſily gueſſed; there are ſome men, who can produce nothing, unleſs they collect themſelves, and concenter their thoughts within themſelves; and they find it very difficult to prevent diſtractions: upon which account it is neceſſary to remove from their eyes the variety of objects, which the open day-light preſents to them.

(23) Panzirol. *ibid.*

MAJORAGIUS (MARC ANTONY) profeſſor of Eloquence at Milan in the XVIth century, gained great reputation by the politeneſs of his ſtyle, and by his great knowledge in the *Belles Lettres*: he ſtudied at Como under a profeſſor, who was nearly related to him [*A*]; after which he went to Milan, where he met with a patron *(a)*, in whoſe houſe he lodged five years, and ſo applied himſelf to ſtudy, that he almoſt killed himſelf by it [*B*]. It came into his head to revive the cuſtom of declaming, which antiently qualified youth to be capable early to make eloquent harangues, and after he had given many of his ſcholars very uſeful inſtructions to this purpoſe, and prepared them for it in private, he reſolved to employ himſelf in this function publickly. The curators of the college were ſo favourable to him, that they beſtowed that employment upon him, as ſoon as they knew his intentions. He was then but twenty ſix years old. He diſcharged that office very well; but, at the end of two years, all the profeſſors were diſmiſſed, becauſe the Milaneſe was threatened with a dangerous war. He retired to Ferrara, where he ſtudied the Civil-law under Andreas Alciatus, and Philoſophy under Vincent

(*a*) *Called* Lancelot Fagniano.

[*A*] *He ſtudied under a Profeſſor, who was nearly related to him.*] He was a perſon of great merit, and his name was *Primus Comes* (1). This name occaſioned an ambiguity, which ſurpriſed Eraſmus; for this Italian having put his name at the bottom of a note, wherein he acquainted him, that he intended to pay him a viſit, it made Eraſmus, though then very weak, go forth in all haſte to meet him, thinking that he was ſome great prince. He was much aſtoniſhed to find only a little man all alone; but he did not repent of having made ſuch haſte; for the converſation of the man pleaſed him very much. Majoragius relates this much better than I do, and ſo deſerves to be heard. *Cum in Germaniam ea de cauſa profectus fuiſſet, ut Eraſmi conſuetudine per aliquot tempus frueretur, priuſquam ipſum Eraſmum conveniret, ad eum literas dedit, quibus adventus ſui cauſam declarabat, quarum in extrema parte nomen ſuum, ut fit, ita ſubſcripſerat, Tui ſtudioſiſſimus Primus Comes Mediolanenſis. Hanc cùm Eraſmus ſubſcriptionem vidiſſet, credidit ſtatim magnum aliquem adeſſe Principem, ſui viſendi gratiâ. Quare licet admodum ſenex & infirmus eſſet, tamen quo ſtudio, quoque apparatu potuit, obviam conſobrino meo longe proceſſit. Sed poſtquam homunculum unum, nullo comitatu, nullo ſervorum grege ſtipatum, & benè quidem literatum, ſed nullo elegantiori cultu veſtitum reperit, errorem ſuum ridere jucundiſſimè cœpit: & tamen eum ſibi multò gratiorem adveniſſe, quàm ſi magnus Princeps fuiſſet, multis audientibus, teſtatus eſt* (2). He informs us in the ſame place, that one reaſon why he quitted the name of *Comes*, *Count* (3), was, becauſe ſeveral perſons were deceived by it; for Gryphius, anſwering a letter of Majoragius, addreſſed him, as if he had been a prince. *Eadem ratione deceptus aliquando fuit in nomine meo vir inſignis ac literatus Sebaſtianus Gryphius. Cùm enim ad eum literas dediſſem, & me Comitem inſcripſiſſem, ille mihi tanquam alicui Principi reſpondit, & clariſſimum Comitem non ſemel appellavit* (4).

(1) *See* Natalis Comes, Mythol. *lib. ix, cap. v, pag. m.* 960. [Primus Comes *ſignifies alſo* firſt count. REM. CRIT.]

(2) Majoragius, Orat. 10. *pag. m.* 221, 222.

(3) *We ſhall ſee, below, in remark* [*D*], *that Majoragius was called* Antonius Maria Comes.

(4) Majoragius, ubi ſupra, *p.* 222.

[*B*] *He ſo applied himſelf to ſtudy, that he almoſt killed himſelf by it.*] Diverſions, ſports, feaſts, had no charms for him; and it was in vain to tell him that ſo ſedulous an application to his books would kill him, for he would not unbend at all; but at laſt a dangerous ſickneſs made him ſenſible, that he ſhould have yielded to the exhortations of his friends. This he himſelf informs us of. ‘ Fui apud hunc annos circiter quinque, ‘ quo quidem tempore literarum ſtudiis adeò vehemen‘ tem operam dedi, ut totum illud quinquennium in ‘ labore atque contentione animi contriverim, ut me ‘ non quies, non remiſſio, non æqualium ſtudia, non ‘ ludi, non convivia delectârint. Teſtis eſt vir iſte ‘ graviſſimus atque ornatiſſimus Lancillottus Fannianus, ‘ patronus meus, qui mihi adeſt, de me ſollicitus eſt, ‘ meum honorem atque exiſtimationem tuetur. Qui ‘ cùm in ſtudiis literarum me continenter verſari vide‘ ret, magno quodam cum amore ſæpiſſime reprehen‘ dere ſolebat, quod acquirendæ ſcientiæ deſiderio, ‘ propriæ ſalutis oblivíſcerer. Teſtes ſunt omnes, qui ‘ me norant eo tempore, ut non ſemel propter nimis ‘ aſſiduum ſtudium, cum in graviſſimos morbos inci‘ diſſem, de vitæ periculo dimicarim (5). - - - *I abode* ‘ *with him about five years, in which time I applied* ‘ *ſo cloſely to ſtudy, that I ſpent the whole five years in* ‘ *the toil and labour of the mind; ſo that I took no delight* ‘ *in unbending my thoughts, in feaſting, and diverſions. I* ‘ *appeal for the truth of this to that excellent man Lan*‘ *celot Fannianus, my patron, who is preſent with me, is* ‘ *ſollicituous concerning me, and defends my honour and re*‘ *putation: who, ſeeing me perpetually taken up with* ‘ *ſtudy, uſed, to reprove me in a very friendly man*‘ *ner, telling me, that I neglected my own health for the* ‘ *ſake of acquiring knowledge. All, who knew me at* ‘ *that time, can witneſs, that more than once, falling in*‘ *to moſt grievous ſickneſſes, through too much ſtudy, I was* ‘ *in danger of loſing my life.*’ After he was cured, he wanted no leſs to be put in mind, that he took too much pains; the love of knowledge and of glory enticed him ſo much, that he did not conſider the prejudice his health ſuffered by it. ‘ Quo quidem mu‘ nere (*Oratoriam artem publicè docendi*) duos annos ita ‘ perfunctus ſum, ut (ne quid arrogantius de me di‘ cam) nemo diligentiam aut induſtriam meam deſide‘ rarit. Quin potius ita noctes & dies in omnium do‘ ctrinarum meditatione verſabar, ut non tantum pro‘ pinqui atque neceſſarii mei, ſed etiam multi ex vobis, ‘ P. C. me ſæpiſſime reprehenderent, quod nimios ‘ magnos labores & viribus meis impares aſſumere non ‘ dubitarem. Ardebam enim (ut ingenue fatear) in‘ credibili gloriæ cupiditate, quam in adoleſcente ne‘ quaquam eſſe vituperandam ſapientes omnes exiſti‘ mant. Nullum igitur omnino diem eſſe patiebar, in ‘ quo non aut publice docerem, aut private mecum ‘ ipſe meditarer, & vel ſcriberem, vel declamarem: ‘ frequenter autem eodem die hæc omnia faciebam (6). ‘ - - - - - *Which employment (that of teaching Rhetoric* ‘ *publickly) I diſcharged, for two years, with the* ‘ *greateſt induſtry and diligence. Rather, I was ſo* ‘ *wrapt in ſtudy both night and day, that not only my re*‘ *lations*

(5) Id. ib. *p.* 196.

(6) Ib. *pag.* 198.

Vincent Magius. He publiſhed ſome pieces, in which he gave himſelf the name of Marcus Antonius Majoragius [*C*]. The alarms of war being over, he returned to Milan, and was reſtored to his profeſſorſhip, with a more conſiderable ſalary. His enemies, who had laboured in vain to hinder this, fell upon him, and drew up a proceſs againſt him, for the Name, which he had prefixed to one of his books [*D*]. He pleaded his cauſe publickly

‘ *lations and dependents, but even many of your venerable body, often reproved me for labouring beyond my ſtrength. For (to confeſs the truth) I had an incredible thirſt after glory, which all wiſe men think is by no means to be deſpiſed in a young man. Therefore I let no day paſs in which I did not either publickly teach, or meditate in private, and either write or declaim: nay, I frequently performed all theſe in the ſame day.*’

[*C*] *He publiſhed ſome pieces, in which he gave himſelf the name of Marcus Antonius Majoragius.*] I can hardly reconcile his ſeveral dates. . . . He ſays in his plea (7); that, being at Ferrara, he reſolved, by the advice of his friends, to print ſome treatiſes. They were ſome harangues, and the apology of Cicero againſt Calcagninus (8). After they were publiſhed, he began to be known at Ferrara by the name, which he had prefixed to them. Afterwards he returned to Milan, and there reaſſumed his firſt profeſſion, notwithſtanding the ill offices of his enemies. Some time after, he was accuſed of changing his name, as will appear in the following remark. This is not eaſily reconciled with the epiſtle dedicatory of his anſwer to the cenſure of Calcagninus; it is dated the eighth of July 1543; and in it he ſpeaks of himſelf, as of one who peaceably exerciſed at Milan the functions of his profeſſion. It is not therefore true, that this book was publiſhed while the author was at Ferrara, whither he had retired, when the confuſions of war interrupted the public lectures at Milan. Another remark is this; he was born the twenty ſixth of October, 1514 (9), and he was made profeſſor of Rhetoric, when he was ſcarce twenty ſix years old (10), that is, in 1540. He diſcharged this office two years, and then went to Ferrara (11). So that he went thither in 1542. Now he was at Milan in July 1543, and there exerciſed his functions peaceably; and it was then he publiſhed his defence of Cicero againſt Calcagninus. He is miſtaken therefore, when he ſays, that this book appeared, while the war interrupted his lectures, and before he quitted Ferrara to return to Milan. Let us go farther. He ſtudied the civil-law at Ferrara, under Andreas Alciatus, who did not begin his lectures there till the year 1543 (12). Therefore Majoragius publiſhed a falſehood, when he ſays, that he was admitted profeſſor at the age of twenty ſix years, and that, at the end of two years, he went to Ferrara, where he heard the lectures of Alciatus. In this he is miſtaken; forgive him this falſhood, it will be eaſy to remove all the other difficulties, and to reſtore the true date of his journey to Ferrara. Since the public lectures ceaſed upon the French army's being arrived in Piedmont (13), this interruption muſt be placed in 1544. The duke of Enguien was ſent this year into Italy with a re-inforcement of troops, and gained the battle of Cerizolles. Majoragius, being quiet in his houſe in the month of July in the preceding year, had written the epiſtle dedicatory to his treatiſe againſt Calcagninus; but, before he put this book to the preſs, he was forced to go to Ferrara, and during his abode there, he publiſhed it. The ſame date may be proved by ſome places of his harangue, wherein Majoragius juſtifies himſelf as to the change of his name. He obſerves, that he was then thirty two years of age (14). He juſtified himſelf therefore in 1546. He obſerves, that Andreas Alciatus had taught the civil-law at Ferrara the four laſt years (15). This is not inconſiſtent with the year 1546. He obſerves, that it was a year ſince his return to Milan (16). He returned therefore in the year 1545. From whence we may conclude, that the interruption of his lectures, and his ſtay at Ferrara, laſted a year, in which he publiſhed ſome harangues, and the apology for Cicero.

I have obſerved elſewhere (17), that the learned are ſometimes careleſs in ſetting down the dates of their adventures. Here is one, who made himſelf younger than he was, when he entered upon public offices.

[*D*] *His enemies drew up a proceſs againſt him for the name he had prefixed to one of his books.*] His Chriſtian name was Antony, as was that of his uncle by the father's ſide (18). His mother, by her particular authority, joined to it the name of Maria, both upon the account of her devotion for the Holy Virgin, and becauſe ſhe delighted to hear that word. *Boni ominis gratia . . . . nomini meo Mariam addidit, ut ſanctiſſimum illud divinæ matris nomen, materna quadam pietate muliebrique religione mihi additum, gratiorem ex nomine meo ſonum atque amabiliorem ad ipſius matris aures apportaret. Eam enim ſæpiſſime commemini dicere, ſe Mariæ nomine mirandum in modum ſolitam eſſe recreari* (19). And thus from the cradle our Majoragius was called Antony Maria. His father and his neighbours called him by this name; and by this name he was known afterwards wherever he made himſelf known. People therefore were ſurprized to ſee him call himſelf, in the title of his firſt book, Marc Antony, ſuppreſſing the venerable name of the Holy Virgin, which he had always taken. I wonder this was not the principal attack of his accuſers, and that they did not endeavour to convict him of having done an injury to the Mother of the Son of GOD. The cauſe was pleaded before the ſenate of Milan with great pomp. I know not whether the pleading of his accuſers (20) was made public; but we have the defence of the accuſed among his harangues. He juſtifies himſelf very eloquently, and cited a great many illuſtrious examples of the liberty he took. He confeſſed ſincerely the reaſon why he durſt not appear in public under the name of Antony Maria, which was becauſe he was ſo ſcrupulous in the choice of words, that he durſt not employ any, but what were to be found in the beſt Latin authors. Now there is no inſtance in Roman antiquity of a man's being called Maria, and having at once a maſculine and feminine name. Upon which account he changed the name Maria into Marcus, by lengthening out the laſt ſyllable, and prefixed it to Antony: for it had been a barbariſm, an uſage unknown to ancient Rome, to call himſelf Antonius Marcus: he therefore not only lengthened out one of his names, but alſo changed it's place. Since we have here an example of the ſuperſtitions of the Ciceronian ſect (21), we muſt recite the very words of this author. *In verborum delectu, quod C. Cæſar eloquentiæ principium eſſe dictitabat, adeo diligens, & pene dixerim ſuperſtitioſus eram, ut nullum omnino verbum, nullam verborum conjunctionem, nullam dicendi formulam admittendam mihi eſſe cenſerem, quam non apud veteres Latinos atque probatos auctores inveniſſem. Id igitur in nomine meo præcipue ſervandum eſſe ſtatuebam, ne, cum Latinæ linguæ candorem & elegantiam profiterer, aliquis mihi barbarum nomen & inuſitatum aliquando poſſet objicere: atque eo magis, quod mihi nullo modo convenire videbatur, ut muliebre nomen cum virili conjungeretur. Quis enim apud antiquos unquam talem nominis conjunctionem vel legit, vel audivit, ut quis à viro & muliere nominaretur* (22)? As to the name Majoragius, he preferred it to that of Comes, for the reaſon I have given above (23). Thus, inſtead of Antonius Maria Comes, by which name he was called before he appeared as an author, he called himſelf Marcus Antonius Majoragius, when he ſet up for an author. I add, that Majoragius was the name of his father, and that his father was ſo called, becauſe he was born in the village Majoragio, near to Milan. ‘ Julianus Comes, homo cum innocentia atque integritate vitæ, tum officio, fide, auctoritate ſui municipii facile Princeps, mihi pater fuit, P. C. qui cum Majoragium vicum habitaret, atque ita ſe comiter liberaliterque gereret ut vicinis omnibus gratus & charus haberetur; cognomen à loco ſortitus eſt, & Majoragius appellatus (24) - - - - *My father was Julian Comes, a man diſtinguiſhed above his country-men both by the innocence and probity of his life, and by his office and authority: who, inhabiting the village of Majoragio, and being reſpected by all his neighbours for his courteſy and humanity, took a ſirname from the place, and was called Majoragius.*’ For the reſt, this Julian Majoragius having married Magdalen de Conti, called himſelf *Comes*, in imitation of his brothers-in-law, who thought it improper to call themſelves *de Comite*, or *de Comitibus*. Of this our Majoragius informs us. ‘ Cum hoc locutionis

---

(7) Orat. 10. *pag. m.* 199.

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 200.

(9) Hankius, de Rerum Roman. Scriptoribus, *lib. i, pag.* 215.

(10) Majoragius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 198.

(11) Ibid.

(12) *See citation* (35) *of the article* ALCIATUS (ANDREW).

(13) Cum apud nos maxima eſſet belli ſuſpicio, quoniam ingentes Gallorum copiæ jam Alpes tranſcenderant, atque in Taurinis conſederant, omnes publici bonarum artium Profeſſores, ut fit, in ejuſmodi temporibus, dimiſſi ſunt, & ſtudia literarum intermiſſa. *Majorag. ubi ſupra, pag.* 198.

(14) Hic eſt exactæ vitæ meæ curſus, P. C. hæc ſtudiorum meorum ratio; hoc duorum & triginta annorum, quibus hactenus vixi, ſpacium. *Majoragius, ibid. pag.* 201.

(15) Ibid. *pag.* 199.

(16) Ibid. *pag.* 190, 213.

(17) *In the article AGRIPPA, remark* [*C*].

(18) Hankius, de Romanar. Rerum Scriptorib. *lib. i, pag.* 215, *is miſtaken, when he ſays,* In avi materni memoriam . . . . Antonius dictus eſt.

(19) Majoragius, Orat. 10. *pag.* 195.

(20) *Their names were* Fabius Lupus, *and* Macrinus Niger.

(21) Majoragius was a moderate Ciceronian: he did not deſpiſe the terms, which Cicero did not make uſe of, provided they were in other good writers of antient Rome. See the remark [*E*] towards the end.

(22) Majoragius, ibid. pag. 199, 200.

(23) In the remark [*A*], citation (3).

(24) Majoragius, ibid. *pag.* 194. *He ſays, pag.* 222. Cum præſertim Majoragii cognomentum haberem adhuc à patre hæreditarium. - - - - - *Eſpecially ſince I ſtill retained the ſirname Majoragius, by inheritance from my father.*

publickly, and gained it (*b*). He continued to teach with great application; which, without doubt, ſhortened his life; for he lived only about forty years and ſix months. He died April the fourth 1555. Mr Moreri has given the titles of ſome of his books [*E*], and has committed ſome little faults [*F*]. Thuanus has alſo committed ſome [*G*].

Majoragius ought to be put in the catalogue of thoſe, who are accuſed of being plagiaries [*H*].

‘ genus à conſuetudine Latini ſermonis abhorreret; primo vir eruditiſſimus avunculus meus, qui permultos annos Mediolani magna cum gloria publice docuit, cum elegantiæ ſermonis admodum ſtudioſus eſſet, non amplius ſe de Comitibus, ut cæteri faciebant, ſed Petrum Comitem cœpit inſcribere. . . . Hunc imitati ſunt ejus fratres Jacobus & Aloyſius, atque etiam pater meus Julianus, qui horum ſororem Magdalenam, matrem meam in matrimonio habebat (25). - - - - *As this manner of ſpeaking was not agreeable to the Latin idiom; my uncle, a very learned man, who for many years taught publickly, and with great reputation, at Milan, and was very exact as to the elegance of language, was the firſt, who wrote himſelf no longer* de Comitibus, *as the reſt did, but* Petrus Comes. . . . . *His was followed by his brothers James and Aloyſius, aud alſo by my father Julian, who had married their ſiſter Magdalen, my mother.*’ Note, that Julian and his wife were deſcended from the ſame anceſtors (26).

[*E*] *Mr Moreri has given the titles of ſome of his books.*] He forgot the harangues and prefaces, which have been printed ſeveral times. I think, the firſt edition was printed at Venice, in 1582 (27), by the care of John Peter Ayroldus Marcellinus. It contains twenty five harangues, fourteen prefaces, and the dialogue *de Eloquentia*. I make uſe of the edition of Leipſic, 1628, illuſtrated with marginal notes by Valentin Hartungus, profeſſor of Phyſic. They never ventured to publiſh in Italy the harangue of Majoragius againſt the avarice of the clergy (28). It is a very fine piece, and as well turned as poſſible. It was publiſhed at Utrecht in 1666, in 4to, from the M. S. of Mr Gudius. Mr Morhof, perceiving, that the copies of it grew ſcarce, cauſed it to be re-printed, with the diſcourſe he made upon this model, in 1690. Theſe two pieces are in the collection of harangues and programata, by Mr Morhof, publiſhed at Hamburg in 1698. You will find a very long extract of this harangue of Majoragius in Mr Seckendorf's Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm (29). Mr Moreri ought to have explained a little better the occaſion of the quarrel of Majoragius with Calcagninus, and with Nizolius. The quarrel with Calcagninus was in defence of the Offices of Cicero, againſt which Calcagninus had publiſhed twenty five diſquiſitions. Majoragius refuted them all by ſo many deciſions; which is the title he gave to his anſwers publiſhed in 1543. James Grifolus refuted alſo the diſquiſitions of Calcagninus. Theſe three pieces, I mean the cenſure of Calcagninus, and the anſwers of Majoragius, and Grifolus, were publiſhed together in 8vo, in the XVIth century. Mr Grævius has inſerted all this in his excellent edition of Cicero's Offices. Nizolius quarrelled with Majoragius through a jealouſy natural to men of the ſame profeſſion: he came off by the worſt, becauſe few learned men approved his being a rigid Ciceronian. ‘ Hunc Tullianæ elucubrationis genium cum inter cæteros ejus ætatis præferret etiam Marius Nizolius Brixellenſis, orta eſt inter utrumque de primæ laudis acquiſitione contentio, multa viciſſim ſibi publicè objectantem, ac ſua viciſſim ſcripta carpentem: in quo tamen Nizolius ideo acerbiora tulit eruditorum judicia, quod ſubacri & tetricâ ſuperſtitione, in tanta latinorum procerum fœcunditate ne hilum quidem à Ciceronis formulis recedendum arbitraretur. Sua igitur non ineptè tutatus placita Majoragius perdocti ac induſtrii ingenii nomen emeruit (30). - - - - *It happening that Marius Nizolius of Breſſello, among others of that time, affected the Ciceronian ſtyle, theſe two became rivals for the ſuperiority, objecting many things publickly againſt each other, and, by turns, cenſuring each others writings: in which conteſt however, the ſentiments of the learned were leſs favourable to Nizolius, becauſe, among ſuch a variety of Latin authors, he was for adhering ſuperſtitiouſly to the phraſeology of Cicero alone. Majoragius therefore, by his apt defence of his opinions, gained the reputation of a very learned and induſtrious man.*’ We muſt not forget, that Gaudentius Merula is to be reckoned among the adverſaries of Majoragius, who accuſeth him of being a great plagiary (31).

[*F*] *Mr Moreri has committed ſome little faults.*] I. He ſhould not have ſaid, that Majoragius was a native of a caſtle of that name; for Majoragio is only a village. If any one ſhall ſay, that this does not hinder but there might be a caſtle in that village, I will confeſs it; but then I will add, that Majoragius was not born in a caſtle; and this I prove from theſe words (32): ‘ Amphortius qui ex illis (33) natu maximus erat, Majoragium vicum extruxit, atque in eo turrim, cujus adhuc in domo mea paterna, poſt ſeptingentos atque ampliùs annos, quædam extant veſtigia atque fundamenta; hic noſtri generis auctor fuit. - - - *Amphortius, the elder of them, built the village of Majoragio, and in it a tower, the ruins of which, and part of the foundation, after more than ſeven hundred years, are ſtill to be ſeen in my father's houſe: this perſon was the founder of our family.*’ Would Majoragius have talked thus of his paternal houſe, if it had been the caſtle of the place? Add to this, that he confeſſes, his father was very poor (34); but not that he was a domeſtic of the lord of the village. II. It was not he, but his father, who, from the village Majoragio, where he dwelt, took the name of Majoragius. See the remark [*D*], citation (24). III. It is not true, that his name was *Marc-Antony Maria*. IV. Nor that he taught at Ferrara.

[G] *Thuanus alſo has committed ſome faults.*] I. He ſhould not ſay, that *Majoragio was ſo called, from a town, where his father dwelt* (35). I have already ſhewn, that his father was called Majoragius. II. His epitaph, in the *Muſæum Imperialis*, imports, that he taught for the ſpace of fourteen years; but, in the theatre of Ghilini, it tells us, that he taught only nine years. Thuanus, in Mr Teiſſier, makes the profeſſorſhip of Majoragius to ceaſe at the end of eight years, and ſuppoſes, that he quitted it, to *apply himſelf entirely to the ſtudy of Divinity.* My edition of Thuanus informs me, that Majoragius did not begin this ſtudy till he had ſpent thirteen years in inſtructing youth. III. He ſays, in the ſame Mr Teiſſier, that Majoragius lived forty two years. The Latin edition allows him but forty, tho' the truth is, he lived forty years, and near ſix months.

[*H*] *He ought to be placed in the catalogue of thoſe, who are accuſed of being plagiaries.*] Natalis Comes affirms, that he heard ſome learned Florentines ſay, that Majoragius, being indebted to Peter Victorius for illuſtrations upon Ariſtotle's Rhetoric, had not the gratitude to own it, but adorned himſelf with the ſpoils of others. ‘ Qui locus (*Ariſtotelis in* 3 *libro Rhetoricorum*) cum ante noſtram ætatem legeretur depravatus, Petri Victorii patricii Florentini ac viri clariſſimi ingenio eſt integritati reſtitutus: ut mihi, cum eſſem Florentiæ, multis rationibus probarunt viri quidam eximiæ integritatis & eruditionis, atque in primis Vicentius Borghinus, vir omnium quos unquam cognovi, multiplici rerum cognitione præſtantiſſimus. Horum gravium teſtium autoritate commotus non potui non ſummopere improbare M. Antonii cujuſdam Majoragii neſcio impudentiam ne appellem, an exquiſitam ambitionem: qui omni explicatione propè Ariſtotelicæ artis ipſius Victorii ſcriptis accepta, ut ex iiſdem viris illuſtribus cognovi, ex hac emendatione elatus, mox alibi in Victorium ipſum non ſemel inſultavit, & per hujus loci correctionem viros omnes clariſſimos ſuæ ætatis inſectatus eſt: atque in primis Hermolaum Barbarum virum præſtantiſſimum (36). - - - - *Which paſſage of Ariſtotle's Rhetorics, book the third, having been corrupted before our time, was reſtored to the true reading, by the moſt ingenious and celebrated Petrus Victorius of Florence, as was fully proved to me, when I was at Florence, by perſons of great integrity and learning, particulary Vincentius Borghinus, a man of the moſt extenſive knowledge I ever met with. Affected by the teſtimony of ſuch great men, I could not but greatly*

(*b*) *Taken from the tenth harangue of Majoragius. It is that, wherein he juſtifies the change of his name.*

(25) Ibid. *pag.* 221.

(26) Idem, Orat. 8, *pag.* 141.

(27) *It is in* 4*to*.

(28) *The title of it is* Philochryſus, ſive de Laudibus auri.

(29) Seckendorf, Hiſt. Luther. *lib.* *iii*, *pag.* 342, & *ſeq.*

(30) Joh. Imperialis, in Muſæo Hiſtor. *pag.* 126.

(31) In Apologia, *pag.* 28, apud Almelovenium in Plagiariorum Syllabo, *pag.* 27.

(32) Majoragius, Orat. 10. *pag.* 220.

(33) *He means three brothers, whom Deſiderius, king of the Lombards, their uncle by the mother's ſide, promoted to the dignity of counts, and to whom he gave a great deal of land.*

(34) Licet in tenuiſſima re familiari verſaretur. *Majoragius, ibid. pag.* 236.

(35) *I make uſe of the ſame verſion, that Mr Teiſſier uſed, Addit. to the Elogies, Tom. i, pag.* 105. *Edit.* 1696. *The Latin has it,* A Majoragio, vico in quo ejus pater habitabat, ita vocatus. *Thuanus, lib. xvi.*

(36) Natalis Comes, Mythol. *lib. ix, cap. v, pag. m.* 959.

greatly blame the impudence (ſhall I call it?) or exquiſite ambition of one Marc Antony Majoragius, who borrowing almoſt his whole explication of the Ariſtotelian art from the writings of Victorius, as the ſame illuſtrious perſons informed me, and growing vain upon this emendation, more than once inſulted Victorius, and attacked the moſt eminent men of his time, particularly the great Hermolaus Barbarus, upon the ſtrength of this correction.’

MAJUS (JUNIANUS) a Neapolitan gentleman, taught the *Belles Lettres* in Naples, towards the end of the XVth century *(a)*. Among other ſcholars, he had the famous Sannazarius [*A*]. He contributed much by his lectures and books to reſtore the elegancy of the Latin tongue [*B*]; but he diſtinguiſhed himſelf much more by interpreting dreams [*C*]. He was the greateſt Onirocritic of his age; and people flocked to him

[*A*] *He had amongſt other ſcholars . . . Sannazarius.*] This appears by the ſeventh elegy of the ſecond book of Sannazar, dedicated *ad Junianum Majum præceptorem.* I ſhall cite a long paſſage out of it below.

[*B*] *He contributed much to reſtore the elegancy of the Latin tongue.*] This is the commendation Sabellicus has given him. ‘Subjiciet his aliquis, *ſays he* (1), haud immerito Jo. Tortelium Aretinum & Junianum Parthenopæum. Juverunt illi induſtria uterque ſua, nec multum inter ſe diverſa verborum utriuſque linguæ copiam. - - - *Some one will very deſervedly add here John Tortelius Aretin, and Junianus Parthenopæus. They both, by an almoſt equal induſtry, contributed to reſtore the elegancy of both languages.*’ Majus publiſhed a book at Naples in 1475, *de priſcorum proprietate verborum*, which was reprinted in the ſame city in 1490. The ſecond edition is full of faults, occaſioned by the negligence of the Printer (2): but he greatly commends the Printer of the firſt. The words he uſes will pleaſe the curious; for they acquaint us with the name of him, who firſt began to practiſe Printing in that country. ‘Accedit ad hæc quod Germani ſolerti ac incredibili quodam invento nuper novam quandam imprimendi rationem invenerunt, præcipue Matthias Moravus vir ſummo ingenio ſummaque elegantia in hoc genere impreſſionis effloruit. Quem conſilio Blaſii Monachi Romerii viri ſacris literis inſtituti ac ſanctis moribus probati, hac noſtra urbe excepiſſe gratulamur, *&c.* (3). - - - *Add to this, that the Germans have lately found out a new method of Printing; eſpecially Matthias a Moravian, a moſt ingenious man, diſtinguiſhed himſelf in this new invention: whoſe reception in this our city, by advice of Blaſius a monk of Romerium, we congratulate.*’ Some believe, that Volaterran ſpeaks of our Majus in the words which follow: ‘Chalcidius Græcorum non erat ignarus, nec imperitus Grammaticus, attamen infans & abſque genio. Dictionibus in primis invigilabat, lexiconque condiderat quod obitu ipſius ſuperveniente Jovinianus ejus diſcipulus ſibi vindicavit (4). - - - *Chalcidius was verſed in the Greek authors, and a ſkillful Grammarian, yet a meer child, and without genius He particularly ſtudied Phraſeology, and had compiled a Dictionary, which his diſciple Jovinian, after his death, claimed as his own.*’ This Chalcidius taught at Rome. Majus would deſerve a place among the plagiaries, if he is the perſon mentioned by Volaterran. On the other ſide, Calepin made a great advantage of the book of Majus, as Toppi remarks. *Diede alla luce un libro della proprieta delle parole antiche, del quale ſe n'e ſervito Ambroſio Calepino aſſai bene* (5).

[*C*] *He diſtinguiſhed himſelf . . . . . by the interpretation of dreams.*] Alexander ab Alexandro, who had been his ſcholar, ſays wonderful things of his knowledge in theſe matters. Every morning the houſe of Majus was full of people, who came to tell him their dreams, that they might learn their interpretation; and among them there were ſome perſons of quality. He anſwered them, not, as moſt others do, in dark ſpeeches, and a few words, but clearly, and at large. Many perſons, by following his advice, ſecured themſelves from death, and prevented ſometimes very great troubles. We may ſee this more at large, if we conſult the Latin of Alexander ab Alexandro. *Junianus Majus*, ſays he (6), *conterraneus meus, vir bene literatus, in exquirendis adnotandiſque verborum & ſententiarum viribus, multi ſtudii fuit: & præterquam quod in erudiendis juvenculorum animis, imbuendiſque doctrina pueris, caſtigatiſſimæ diſciplinæ, ſomniorum quoque omnis generis ita verus conjector fuit, ut ipſius reſponſa, divina fere monita haberentur. Ad eum memini, cum puer adhuc eſſem, & ad capiendum ingenii cultum frequens apud eum ventitarem, quotidie ſomniantium turbam, homineſque celebri fama & multi nominis, de ſomniis conſultum veniſſe. Declarabat definiebatque ille, non breviter aut ſubobſcure, ut plerique, ſed expoſite atque aperte ænigmata ſomniorum, ſive boni, ſive mali prænuncia: ita apte, ut judicium factum à veridico diceres. Multi quoque illius monitu, vitæ interitum nonnunquam animi ægritudines vitarunt.* Sannazarius, another ſcholar of this interpreter of dreams, found it happy both for himſelf and his miſtreſs, that he had recourſe to ſuch an oracle. He extols him to the ſkies, and prefers him before all the antient Augurs. Let us remember, that he writes as a Poet; and therefore that he did not intend, we ſhould give credit to his words, without making ſome abatement. However, let us hear what he ſays.

At tibi venturos, Mai, prædicere caſus
  Fas eſt, & mites conſuluiſſe Deos.
Nec tantum aut aræ fumos, aut nuntia ſentis
  Fulgura, ſed Stygiis ſomnia miſſa locis,
Somnia quæ miſeram perturbant ſæpe quietem,
  Dum mens incertis pendet imaginibus.
O quoties per te vanum poſuiſſe timorem
  Me memini, & lætos continuaſſe dies.
O quoties, trepidus cum non ſpernenda putarem,
  In noſtrum cavi damna futura caput.
Sæpe meæ tibi cum narraſſem viſa puellæ,
  Dixiſti, certos haud procul eſſe metus,
Sæpe illam madidos luſtrare in flumine crines
  Juſſiſti, & miſto ſolvere farra ſale.
Quod ſi olim terris talem te fata dediſſent,
  Spreviſſet Thuſcos Martia Roma viros.
Nam te quis melius calidas deprendere fibras,
  Conſulere aërias aut potuiſſet aves?
Illa triumphatum, *&c* (7).

Favour'd by gods, to thee, my friend, 'tis giv'n
Events to ſcan, and read the will of heav'n.
Nor ſmoak alone from reaking altars ſent,
Or winged lightnings, teach thee each event;
But dreams to thee the laws of fate diſcloſe,
From Stygian darkneſs ſent, to break the mind's repoſe.
Thou from my heart vain fears haſt chas'd away,
And bad continu'd mirth prolong the day.
Secur'd by thy advice, I ſafely tread,
And dangers vainly threaten o'er my head.
Oft, when my miſtreſs, waking in a fright,
Has trembled at the viſions of the night,
Preſcrib'd by thee, due rites have baniſh'd fear,
And taught her to believe no danger near.
Rome, had'ſt thou flouriſh'd in thoſe martial days,
Above Etrurian ſeers, had ſung thy praiſe;
More ſkill'd in ſmoaking entrails fate to ſpy,
And better read i'th' language of the ſky.

Martin del Rio, who is otherwiſe ſo credulous, and ſo little wont to reject romantic ſtories, ſpeaks of Majus in another tone, and treats him with the laſt decree of contempt. ‘Cæterorum onirocriticorum veterum, non magna reipub. jactura omnes libri interierunt, præter unum Artemidorum Daldianum, delirum ſenem, qui libris quinque cuncta ab aliis tradita complexus fuit. Brevior eſt Aſtrampſychus Grecè & Latinè his annis editus: ſed æque nugax, ut & alius ille Arabs, qui Græcè barbarizans una cum Artemidoro in lucem prodiit in Gallia. Hodiè in pretio habent Apomaſaris Arabica

---

(a) *See the* Biblioteca Napoletana *of* Nicolo Toppi, *pag.* 168.

(1) Sabellicus, de linguæ Latinæ Reparatoribus, *pag.* 405. apud Anton. Nicodemum Addizioni alla Biblioteca Napoletana, *pag.* 144.

(2) Nicolo Toppi, Bibl. Napolet. *pag.* 168.

(3) Junian. Majus, Epiſtola dedicatoria ad Regem Ferdinandum, apud Nicodemum, ubi ſupra.

(4) Volaterranus, *lib. xxi, pag. m.* 776.

(5) Nicolo Toppi, ubi ſupra.

(6) Alexander ab Alexandro, Genial. Dierum, *lib. i, cap. xi, pag.* 81, 82.

(7) Sannazar. Eleg. vii, *lib. ii, pag.* 96. Edit. Amſtel. 1689.

him from all Parts, to know what ſuch and ſuch dreams preſaged. Many pretended, that his anſwers were very uſeful to them. This is not unworthy of conſideration [*D*].

‘Apoteleſmata, ex recentioribus Conra. Wimpina, vellem ne tam multa ſine antidoto congeſſiſſet †. Avorum quoque memoria, hanc in Italia vaniſſimè profitebatur artem Junianus Majus ‡: cujus extant epiſtolæ & libelli quidam Grammatici (8). - - - *All the books of the other antient Onirocritics, with no great detriment to the public, are loſt, except only Artemidorus of Daldia, a doting old man, who comprized in five books all that the reſt had delivered. Aſtrampſychus is ſhorter, who has been lately publiſhed in Greek and Latin; but he is equally a trifler, as is that other Arabian, whoſe book in barbarous Greek, lately came out, together with that of Artemidorus, in France. At preſent they eſteem Apomaſar's aſtrological works in Arabic, and among the Moderns Conr. Wimpina; I wiſh he had not made ſuch great collections without an antidote. In the memory likewiſe of our grand-fathers, Junianus Majus profeſſed this vain art in Italy; who hath left behind him ſome epiſtles, and grammatical pieces.*’

A REFLEXION on dreams.

[*D*] *This is not unworthy of conſideration.*] It were to be wiſhed, for the happineſs and quiet of an infinite number of perſons, that dreams had never been mentioned as preſages of future events; for thoſe who are once poſſeſſed with this notion, imagine that the greateſt part of the images, that paſs through their minds in their ſleep, are ſo many predictions, which very often threaten them with future evils: from whence ariſe a thouſand uneaſy thoughts; and where there is one man, who is not ſubject to this weakneſs, there are a thouſand, who are not able to free themſelves from it. I think we may ſay of dreams the ſame almoſt as of inchantments, that they are far leſs myſterious than people believe, and ſomewhat more than Free-thinkers fancy. The hiſtories of all times and places relate, both with reſpect to dreams and magic, ſo many ſurprizing things, that thoſe who obſtinately deny them all, render themſelves ſuſpected, either of want of ſincerity, or judgment to diſcern the force of the proofs. A violent prejudice, or a certain turn of mind, blinds their underſtanding, when they compare the reaſons *pro* and *con*. I have known ſome men of parts, who denied all preſages from dreams upon this principal, *viz.* None but GOD, ſaid they, know things to come, that is, ſuch as are called contingent: but dreams are generally ſuppoſed to foretel contingent futurities; GOD therefore muſt be the author of thoſe dreams, and then he muſt produce them by a miracle; and ſo, in all the countries of the world, he muſt work an infinite number of miracles, which are no wiſe agreeable to the character either of his infinite greatneſs, or ſovereign wiſdom. Theſe gentlemen inſiſt ſtrongly upon this, that the moſt myſtical dreams are as common among Pagans and Mahometans, as among the followers of the true religion. In effect, read Plutarch, and the other Greek and Roman Hiſtorians; read the books of the Arabians and Chineſe, and you will find in them as many examples of miraculous dreams, as in the Bible, or in Chriſtian hiſtories. It muſt be confeſſed, that this objection is of great force, and ſeems to lead us neceſſarily to another ſyſtem, *viz.* that, which attributes theſe ſort of dreams, not to GOD as the immediate cauſe, but to certain intelligences, who, under the direction of GOD, have a great ſhare in the government of man. It may be ſuppoſed, according to the doctrine of occaſional cauſes, that there are general laws, which ſubject a great number of effects to the deſires of ſuch and ſuch intelligences, as there are general laws, which ſubject to the deſires of men the motion of certain bodies. This ſuppoſition is not only agreeable to an opinion, which was very common among the Pagans, but alſo to the doctrine of the Scripture, and to that of the antient Fathers (9). The Pagans acknowledged ſeveral inferior gods, who preſided over particular things, and they pretended alſo, that each man had a genius that governed him. The Roman Catholics pretend, that the doctrine of a guardian-angel, and of an angel preſiding over a whole country, a city, or a province, is founded upon the Scripture. If you once lay it down for a truth, that GOD has thought fit to appoint certain ſpirits, as the occaſional cauſe of man's conduct, with reſpect to certain events, then all the difficulties that are objected againſt dreams, vaniſh away. We muſt no more wonder, that we do not find a character of greatneſs or gravity in the images, which advertiſe us in dreams (10). Tho' they be confuſed or childiſh, and though they vary according to times and places, and according to the temperament of mens bodies, this ought not to ſurprize thoſe, who know the narrow bounds of creatures, and the obſtacles which occaſional cauſes, of different kinds, muſt needs reciprocally raiſe againſt one another? Do we not find by experience, every day, that our ſoul and our body mutually hinder each other in thoſe operations that are peculiar to them? an intelligence, that ſhould act both upon our body and our mind, muſt needs find divers obſtacles in the laws, which eſtabliſh theſe two principles (11), as the occaſional cauſe of certain effects. But whence comes it, may ſome aſk, that theſe inviſible genii do not make uſe of a fitter time? Why do they not advertiſe men of things future, while they are awake? Why do they wait till they are aſleep? ‘Illud etiam requiro, cur, ſi deus iſta viſa nobis providendi cauſa dat, non vigilantibus potius det quàm dormientibus? Sive enim externus, & adventitius pulſus animos dormientium commovet, ſive per ſe ipſi animi moventur, ſive quæ cauſa alia eſt, cur ſecundùm quietem aliquid videre, audire, agere videamur, eadem cauſa vigilantibus eſſe poterat: idque ſi noſtra cauſa dii ſecundum quietem facerent, vigilantibus idem facerent; præſertim cùm Chryſippus, Academicos refellens, permulto clariora, & certiora eſſe dicat, quæ vigilantibus videantur, quàm quæ ſomniantibus. Fuit igitur divina beneficentia dignius, cùm conſuleret nobis, clariora viſa dare vigilantibus, quàm obſcuriora, per ſomnium: quod quoniam non fit, ſomnia divina putanda non ſunt. Jam verò quid opus eſt circuitione, & amfractu, ut ſit utendum interpretibus ſomniorum potiùs, quam directo? Deus, ſi quidem nobis conſulebat, *Hoc facito, Hoc ne feceris*, diceret? idque viſum vigilanti potiùs, quàm dormienti daret (12)? - - - - *I likewiſe aſk, why, if GOD gives us theſe viſions, for the ſake of fore-ſight, he does not rather give them us, when awake, than when aſleep? For, whether an external and adventitious impulſe affects the minds of the ſleepers, or their minds are moved of themſelves, or there be any other cauſe, why, in our ſleep, we ſeem to ſee, hear, or do, any thing; the ſame might be effected in thoſe that are awake: and if the gods did this for our ſakes, when we are aſleep, they would do the ſame, when we are awake, eſpecially ſince Chryſippus, refuting the Academics, ſays, that our waking ideas are much more clear and certain than our ſleeping. It were therefore more worthy of the divine goodneſs, in conſulting our benefit, to give us clearer viſions, when awake, than more obſcure in ſleep: which not being done, dreams are not to be conſidered as divine. Beſides, where is the uſe of the round-about way of conſulting interpreters of dreams, rather than the direct? For if GOD conſidered our good he would ſay,* Do this, avoid doing that: *and would preſent ſuch a viſion rather to our waking, than our ſleeping thoughts.*’ Why do they communicate their predictions to people of weak minds, rather than to thoſe of ſtronger heads? It is eaſily anſwered, that thoſe, who are awake, are not proper to be thus advertiſed; for then they conſider themſelves as the cauſe of every thing that preſents itſelf to their imagination, and clearly diſtinguiſh between what they imagine, and what they ſee. But when they are aſleep, they do not diſtinguiſh between their imaginations and ſenſations; all the objects, which they imagine, appear to them to be preſent, and they cannot retain exactly the coherence of their images (13): and ſo they cannot perſuade themſelves that they have not connected them together themſelves; from whence they conclude that ſome of them proceed from other cauſes, and were inſpired by ſome ſpirit, that would advertiſe them of ſomething. Can it be denied, that an engine is fitter to be played in a certain manner, when ſome of it's parts are at reſt, than when they are not? Let us ſay the ſame of our brain. It is more eaſy to direct in it certain motions for exciting preſaging imaginations, when the eyes, and other external ſenſes, are locked up, than when they are in action. Do we know how far the effects of ſickneſs or madneſs may aſſiſt the authors of dreams? can we doubt, but that

† *L. de divinat. cap. xiv, & lib. de inſomniis per decem capita.*

‡ *De quo Alex. ab Alex. lib. i, cap. xi.*

(8) Mart. Del Rio Diſquiſit. Magicar. *lib. iv, cap. iii, queſt. vi, pag. m.* 278.

(9) According to the Theology of St Auguſtin, which includes, as F. Thomaſin teaches, the antient tradition of all men, nothing is done in the world but by angels or by demons, or by the ſentiments, which God imprints on the minds of men. *Arnaud, againſt the Syſtem of Malebranche. Tom. i, pag.* 191.

(10) There are ſome dreams that are meer rebus's, like that, which Brantome ſpeaks of, which foretold to Margaret of Auſtria, who was to be married to Charles VIII, that Anne of Bretagne ſhould take from her the crown of France. She dreamed, that, as ſhe was walking in a garden, an aſs came to her, and took away a noſegay, which ſhe held in her hand.

(11) *Viz.* the human body, and the human ſoul.

(12) Cicero, de Divinat. *lib. ii, cap. lxi.*

(13) See the article LOTICHIUS (PETER), remark [*G*].

that the laws of motion, according to which our organs are moved, and which are only to a certain degree ſubject to the deſires of created ſpirits, trouble and confound the images, which the author of a dream would render more diſtinct? Cicero ſeems to triumph, upon pretence that theſe images are obſcure and intricate. ‘ Jam vero quid opus eſt circuitione, & amfractu, ut ſit utendum interpretibus ſomniorum potius, quam directo (14)? . . . . Venit in contentionem, ſit probabilius, deoſne immortales, rerum omnium præſtantia excellentes, concurſare omnium mortalium, qui ubique ſunt, non modò lectos, verum etiam grabatos, & cùm ſtertentes aliquos viderint, objicere his quædam tortuoſa, & obſcura, quæ illi exterriti ſomnio ad conjectorem manè deferant: an natura fieri, ut mobiliter animus agitatus, quod vigilans viderit, dormiens videre videatur (15). - - - - - *Beſides, where is the uſe of ſuch a round about way, of conſulting interpreters of dreams, rather than the direct? . . . . It is diſputed, whether it be more probable, that the immortal gods, who excel in all perfection, run up and down, and ſurround, not only the beds, but the very couches, of all men, every where, and, when they find any aſleep, preſent to their imaginations ſome intricate and obſcure ideas, which terrified by the viſion, they are to carry in the morning to an interpreter; or that it happens by a natural effect, that the mind, being put into motion, ſeems to ſee in ſleep, what it really ſaw when awake.*’ But to this it may be anſwered, that every creature is limited and imperfect: there may therefore be variations, and even ſome oddities, according to our way of judging, in the effects, which are directed by the deſires of a created ſpirit. This may ſerve us as an anſwer to ſome objections, which the free-thinkers alledge to thoſe, who talk to them about the exiſtence of magic. In fine, I ſay, that the knowledge of things future is not ſo great as is imagined, in ſuppoſing that there are dreams of divination. For if we duly examine the common relations and popular tradition, moſt of theſe dreams inform us only of ſuch things as happen in other countries, or ſuch as are quickly to come to paſs. A man dreams of the death of a friend or a relation, and it is found, ſay they, that this friend or relation died fifty leagues off at the time of this dream. To reveal ſuch a thing as this, does not imply the knowledge of things to come. Others dream of I know not what, that threatens them with ſome misfortune, as with death, if you pleaſe. The genius, who is the author of this dream, may know the plots and devices, which are framing againſt them; it may ſee, in the ſtate of the blood, a near diſpoſition to an apoplexy, a pleuriſy, or ſome other mortal diſeaſe. But this is not to know things future, which are called contingent. But ſome may ſay, there are private perſons, who have dreamed that they ſhould reign, and they did not reign till twenty or thirty years after. I anſwer, that their genius being of a very high order, active and wiſe, had a mind to raiſe them to a throne; he was reſolved to lay hold of every opportunity, and did not doubt of ſucceſs (16); and from theſe conjectures, which were almoſt certain, he imparted the dream. Men would do as much proportionably to their ability.

I do not produce theſe things as proofs, or ſtrong reaſons, but only as anſwers to the difficulties, which are propoſed againſt the common opinion: and it muſt alſo be conſidered, that I confine my ſelf within the bounds of natural light; for I ſuppoſe the diſputants would not make uſe of the authority of Scripture. I deſire alſo that it may be obſerved, that thoſe, who maintain there are dreams of divination, need only weaken the objections of their adverſaries; for they have an infinite number of facts to alledge for their opinion; as have thoſe alſo, who maintain that there is ſuch a thing as magic. And this being ſo, it is ſufficient for them, that they can anſwer objections; but it belongs to thoſe, who deny theſe facts, to prove that they are impoſſible, and without this they will never gain the cauſe. I ought alſo to put the reader in mind that I do not pretend to excuſe the antient Pagans, either as to the care they took to relate ſo many dreams in their Hiſtories, or as to the proceedings that were conſequent upon certain dreams. Sometimes they had no other foundation for appointing certain ceremonies, or for condemning the accuſed (17). ‘ Quum ex æde Herculis patera aurea gravis ſurrepta eſſet, in ſomniis vidit (*Sophocles*) ipſum deum dicentem, qui id feciſſet. Quod ſemel ille, iterumque neglexit, ubi idem ſæpius, aſcendit in Ariopagum: detulit rem. Ariopagitæ comprehendi jubent eum, qui à Sophocle erat nominatus. Is, quæſtione adhibita, confeſſus eſt, pateramque retulit. Quo facto, fanum illud Indicis Herculis nominatum eſt (18). - - - *A large golden goblet being ſtolen out of the temple of Hercules, Sophocles, in a dream, ſaw the* GOD *himſelf telling him who had done it. He diſregarded the viſion once, and twice; but it being repeated, he went to the court of Ariopagus, and gave information of the matter. The Ariopagites ordered the perſon, whom Sophocles had named, to be arreſted. Upon examination by torture, he confeſſed the fact, and reſtored the goblet. From thence that temple received the name of Hercules the diſcoverer.* One may juſtly laugh at the weakneſs of Auguſtus (19), and much more at the law which enjoined all private perſons in certain countries, who had dreamed any thing concerning the Republic, do declare it openly, either by a public advertiſement, or by a cryer (20); and, excepting ſome particular dreams, we may ſay of all the reſt what we read in Petronius (21). ‘ Hinc ſcies Epicurum hominem eſſe divinum, qui ejuſmodi ludibria facetiſſimâ ratione condemnat.

Somnia, quæ mentes ludunt volitantibus umbris,
Non delubra Deum, nec ab æthere numina mittunt;
Sed ſibi quiſque facit. Nam cum proſtrata ſopore
Urget membra quies, & mens ſine pondere ludit:
Quidquid luce fecit, tenebris agit. Oppida bello
Qui quatit, & flammis miſerandas ſævit in urbes, &c.

‘ *Hence you may know, that Epicurus was a God-like Philoſopher, who very juſtly and pleaſantly condemns theſe idle notions.*

Dreams, which delude the mind with fleeting ſhades,
Come not from temples, or the gods above:
Each his own viſions makes; for, ſtretch'd in ſleep,
When ſlumber looſens the material chains,
The active mind in airy viſions ſports,
And acts, in dreams, the buſineſs of the day.
The ſoldier dreams of war, and cities fired, &c.

And I continue in the ſame opinion, which I have declared elſewhere (22), that there is no employment more frivolous and ridiculous, than that of the Onirocritics. Our Junius Majus deſerved a ſeverer cenſure than that paſſed upon him by Martin del Rio. If we would compare, with what happens to us, an infinite number of images, that ariſe in our minds, when, being awake, we abandon our ſelves to all objects that offer themſelves, we might find in them as much relation to our adventures, as in any dreams, which we look upon as preſages. And I do not value the reaſon which appears ſo ſtrong to many people. But ſay they, we not only ſee in a dream the objects, but we hear them tell us ſuch things, as we never heard when we were awake, and conſequently of which we could have no traces in our brain. We ſometimes believe that we ſee, in a dream, a new book, which we have never heard of before, and we read the title, preface and a hundred other things in it. This reaſon is of no force. Do we not all this, while we are awake? Do we not repreſent to our ſelves ſuch and ſuch perſons, who tell us a hundred things, which we our ſelves frame? Cannot we imagine, if we pleaſe, that ſuch a one has juſt now publiſhed ſuch a book, which contains ſuch and ſuch things? And ſo this pretended great reaſon is of no weight: but I believe, at the ſame time, that we cannot doubt of certain dreams, which are mentioned by authors, neither can we explain them by natural cauſes, I mean without acknowledging an inſpiration, or a revelation. See Valerius Maximus (23), and the letters of Grotius (24). As to the objections of Cicero, which are indeed very ſtrong, and almoſt unanſwerable, they are of no ſtrength, but upon the ſuppoſition, that GOD himſelf is the immediate author of our dreams. It was the ſuppoſition of the Stoics, whence it comes to paſs, that Cotta ſpeaks thus: ‘ Quomodo iidem dicitis non omnia Deos perſequi, iidem vultis à Diis immortalibus hominibus diſpartiri ac dividi ſomnia (25)? - - - - *How comes it that you ſay, the gods do not perform all things, and at the*

(14) Cicero, ubi ſupra.

(15) Id. ib. *cap.* lxiii.

(16) *See the remark* [D], *in the article* CAINITES.

(17) *See* Cicero, de Divinat. *lib. i, fol. m.* 311. *A.*

(18) Id. ib. *cap.* xxv.

(19) Somnia neque ſua neque aliena de ſe negligebat. - - - *He neglected neither his own dreams, nor thoſe of others concerning him.* Sueton, in Auguſt. *cap. xci.*

(20) *See* Caſaubon *upon* Suetonius, in Aug. *cap. xci. who cites* Artemidorus, *lib. i, cap. ii.*

(21) Petronius, *pag.* 178. Edit. Roterod. 1693.

(22) *In the article* ARTEMIDORUS, *remarks* [B] *and* [C].

(23) Valer. Maximus, *lib. i, cap. vii.*

(24) Grotius, Epiſt. ccccv. Part. ii.

(25) Cicero, de Nat. Deor. *lib. iii.* ſub fin.

‘ *ſame time affirm, that all dreams proceed from them ?* Primum igitur, *ſays he* (26), intelligendum eſt, nullam vim eſſe divinam effectricem ſomniorum. Atque illud quidem perſpicuum eſt, nulla viſa ſomniorum proficiſci à numine deorum. Noſtra enim cauſa dii id facerent, ut providere futura poſſemus. Quotus igitur eſt quiſque, qui ſomniis pareat ? qui intelligat ? qui meminerit ? quàm multi verò, qui contemnant ; eamque ſuperſtitionem imbecilli animi, atque anilis putent ? Quid eſt igitur, cur his hominibus conſulens deus, ſomniis moneat eos, qui illa non modo cura, ſed ne memoria quidem digna ducant ? nec enim ignorare deus poteſt, qua mente quiſque ſit : nec fruſtrà, ac ſine cauſa quid facere, dignum deo eſt : quod abhorret etiam ab hominis conſtantia. Ita ſi pleraque ſomnia aut ignorantur, aut negliguntur ; aut neſcit hoc deus, aut fruſtrà ſomniorum ſignificatione utitur. Sed horum neutrum in deum cadit. Nihil igitur à deo ſomniis ſignificari fatendum eſt. - - - - - *In the firſt place, we are to underſtand that dreams cannot be cauſed by any divine power. And this is very evident, that no viſions of dreams proceed from the gods. For, the gods would do it for our ſakes, that we might foreſee future events. But how few obey dreams, how few underſtand them, or remember them ? And how many are there, who deſpiſe them, and think them the ſuperſtition of a weak and doating mind ? Why then ſhould GOD, conſulting the good of theſe men, admoniſh by dreams ſuch as think them not only unworthy of their regard, but even of their remembrance ? Nor can GOD be ignorant of the diſpoſition of each man's mind ; and it is unworthy of GOD to do any thing in vain, and without reaſon ; which is abhorrent even from human conſtancy. Therefore, if moſt dreams are either forgotten, or neglected ; either GOD knows not this, or he ſends dreams to no purpoſe. But neither of theſe can be true of GOD. We muſt therefore acknowledge, that nothing is ſignified to us in dreams from GOD.*’ This is his firſt reaſon. We have already ſeen the ſecond (27). Here follows the third (28). ‘ Jam verò quis dicere audeat, vera omnia eſſe ſomnia ? *Aliquot ſomnia vera,* inquit Ennius, *ſed omnia non eſt neceſſe.* Quæ eſt tandem iſta diſtinctio ? quæ vera, quæ falſa habet ? & ſi vera à deo mittuntur, falſa unde naſcuntur ? nam ſi ea quoque divina, quid inconſtantius deo ? quid inſcitius autem eſt, quàm mentes mortalium falſis, & mendacibus viſis concitare ? ſin vera viſa divina ſunt : falſa autem, & inania, humana : quæ eſt iſta deſignandi licentia, ut hoc deus, hoc natura fecerit potiùs, quàm aut omnia deus, quod negatis, aut omnia natura ? - - - *And now, who will venture to ſay, that all dreams are true ?* Some dreams *Ennius tells us,* muſt neceſſarily be true, but not all. *What diſtinction is this ? And how ſhall we know which are true, which are falſe ? And if the true are ſent by GOD, whence proceed the falſe ? For if they likewiſe are Divine, can any thing be more inconſtant than the deity ? And what can be more ignorant, than to ſtir up the minds of men by falſe and lying viſions ? But, if true dreams are Divine, and the falſe and empty, human, what liberty is this of diſtinguiſhing, and ſaying, that GOD does this, and nature that, rather than that all is done by GOD alone, which you deny, or by nature alone ?*’ He propoſes a fourth, founded upon the obſcurity of dreams, which has been already conſidered (29) ; but let us conſider it a little better. There is no one, ſays he, who has ſufficient capacity to expound dreams aright ; if therefore the gods ſpeak to us in this way, it will be as if the Carthaginians ſhould harangue the ſenate of Rome in their own language, and bring no interpreter with them, ‘ Vide igitur, ne etiam ſi divinationem tibi eſſe conceſſero, quod nunquam faciam, neminem tamen divinum reperire poſſimus. Qualis autem iſta mens eſt deorum ſi neque ea nobis ſignificant in ſomniis, quæ ipſi per nos intelligamus : neque ea, quorum interpretes habere poſſimus ? ſimiles enim ſunt dii, ſi ea nobis objiciunt, quorum nec ſcientiam, neque explanatorem habeamus, tanquam ſi Pœni, aut Hiſpani in ſenatu noſtro loquerentur ſine interprete. Jam verò quò pertinent obſcuritates, & ænigmata ſomniorum ? intelligi enim à nobis dii velle debebant ea, quæ noſtra cauſa nos monerent (30). - - - - *But ſuppoſing I ſhould grant you, that there is ſuch a thing as divination, which I never will, perhaps even this may not lead us to a Divine Being. For what kind of mind is that of the gods, if they neither ſignify thoſe things to us in dreams, which we may of our ſelves underſtand ; nor thoſe, of which we can find interpreters ? for if the gods throw ſuch things before us, as we have neither knowledge, nor interpreter of, it is the ſame thing as if the Carthaginians, or Spaniards, ſhould ſpeak in our ſenate without an interpreter. Beſides, to what purpoſe ſerves the obſcure and ænigmatical nature of dreams ? for the gods ought to deſire that we ſhould underſtand thoſe things, which they admoniſh us of for our own ſakes.*’

MAKOWSKI (JOHN), in Latin *Maccovius*, a Poliſh gentleman, and profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker, was born at Lobzenic in the year 1588. He began his ſtudies ſomewhat late, but he repaired this backwardneſs by his great application, and natural ſharpneſs of wit. He ſtudied Latin, and his courſe of Philoſophy, at Dantzic, under the famous Keckerman ; and he improved himſelf ſo conſiderably, that he glorioully excelled his ſchool-fellows, and particularly in diſputation ; and, when he returned to his father's houſe, he was made governor to ſome young gentlemen *(a)*. He travelled with them, and upon all occaſions improved his talent of diſputing as well againſt the Jeſuits, as the Socinians [*A*]. He ſaw the moſt flouriſhing academies of Germany, thoſe of Prague, Heidelberg, Marpurg, Leipſic, Wittemberg, and Jena ; after which he came to Franeker, where he took the degree of Doctor of Divinity, March the eighth 1614. He gave ſuch great proofs of his wit and learning, that the curators of the univerſity reſolved to detain him, and for that end they made him profeſſor extraordinary of Divinity, April the firſt 1615, and profeſſor in ordinary the next year. He diſcharged the office for almoſt thirty years, that is, till his death, which happened towards the end of the month of June, 1644 *(b)*. He married three wives, whoſe families may be ſeen, if any one deſires it, in the funeral oration, which furniſhed me with this article. Cocceius, his colleague, who ſpoke it, informs us, that Maccovius maintained, with great zeal, and even with too much heat, the good cauſe againſt the Arminians, which was to him a ſource of vexations [*B*] : They are the common conſequences of this kind of temper.

[*A*] *Upon all occaſions, he improved his talent of diſputing.*] At Prague he attacked the Jeſuits in one diſpute ; at Lublin he entred the liſts with the Socinians ; and, during his ſtay at Heidelberg, he went to Spire, on purpoſe to diſpute with the Jeſuits, in the room of of Bartholomew Coppenius, whom they had challenged, and who could never obtain leave of the elector Palatine to appear there (1).

[*B*] *His great zeal . . . . againſt the Arminians . . . was to him a ſource of vexations.*] Cocceius (2), having ſaid, that Maccovius was not a dog, that could not bark during the troubles of a church, but that he fought valiantly for the truth of grace, adds, *that theſe ſort of wars generally producing ill ſuſpicions, enmities and diſcords, thro' human infirmity ; we muſt not think it ſtrange, that the infirmity of the fleſh made Maccovius drink deep of this bitter cup, Hot ſpirits, adds he, have this fault, that altho' they defend a good cauſe, they appear ſometimes to be tranſported with paſſion. It happens to them as to good dogs* (3) *(ſuffer me ſo far to extend a compariſon borrowed from ſcripture) who, while they keep their maſter's houſe, bark againſt all ſtrangers, tho' they may be the greateſt friends of the houſe. Thus the defenders of the truth, whom the prophet Iſaiah*

commands

---

(26) Cicero, de Divinat. *lib. ii, cap. lx.*

(27) *Citat.* (12).

(28) Cicero, ibid. *cap. lxi, lxii.*

(29) *In citation* (14) *above.*

(30) Cicero, ibid. *cap. lxiv.*

(a) Their name was Sieninſki.

(b) The Diarium Biographicum *of the Sieur Witte, places it on the twenty fourth of July ; which cannot be, ſince the funeral oration was ſpoken the ſecond of July. Maccovius was dead eight days before ;* die Lunæ ante octiduum, *ſays Cocceius, in the funeral oration of Maccovius.*

(1) *Taken from* Coccejus, Orat. Funeb. Maccovii.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Concerning this compariſon, ſee, above, remark [*D*] of the article St BERNARD, and remark [*L*] of the article CASTELLAN.

temper. He had ſome trouble in the ſynod of Dort [*C*]. We ſhall ſee below the titles of the greateſt part of his printed works [*D*]. I paſs over thoſe, which were found among

commands (4) *to bark aloud, (as being the great dogs, that keep the flock) while they are employed againſt the enemy, and think of nothing but fighting, are often ſo careleſs, that they very indecently uſe harſh and bitter words againſt the innocent.* After this he makes uſe of the compariſon of mariners, who in a violent ſtorm, murmur and complain againſt one another, tho' the general aim of them all is to ſave the veſſel. This was ſufficient to declare what was the fate of Maccovius. He had raſhly laid about him both againſt the heterodox, and orthodox, and at laſt, in his turn, was attacked by them both. Theſe are the fruits of diſputing: ſtout dogs fancy they every where ſee the wolf, as often as they meet with any one that does not agree with them in all their hypotheſes; and if they find a brother, who departs from them, they leave the common enemy, and ruſh upon that fellow-labourer, as upon a traytor (5). They tell them their own; *hinc illæ lacrymæ!* Conſider theſe words of one of the Fathers of the ſynod of Dort. ‘Qui revera primo quoque auditu videbantur, exceptis uno aut altero, non fuiſſe tanti momenti, ut homo doctus de illis coram Synodo accuſaretur: complurimi ipſorum erant ex iſta receptiſſima diſtinctione agentis phyſicæ & moraliter ab accuſatore male intellecta (6). - - - *Which indeed, at the very firſt hearing, one or two of them excepted, ſeemed not to have been of ſo great importance, as that a learned man ſhould be accuſed before the ſynod upon their accounts: moſt of them were of that vulgar diſtinction of a phyſical and moral agent, which the accuſer did not well underſtand.*

[*C*] *He had ſome trouble in the ſynod of Dort.*] They read, in the hundred and thirty eighth ſeſſion, the petition, which he preſented to the aſſembly; he complained of being accuſed of Hereſy before the ſtates of Frieſland, by his colleague Sibrandus Lubbertus, and he moſt humbly prayed the ſynod, that they would determine this difference, or permit the accuſer and himſelf to chuſe commiſſioners in this aſſembly, who ſhould inform themſelves of the matter of fact, and give an account of it to the aſſembly. Lubbertus, being queſtioned about this matter, denied that he had accuſed him, and declared that he had only been the mouth of the Claſs of Franeker, who were the true accuſers of Maccovius, and therefore he would not acknowledge himſelf a party in this ſuit. It was ordered, that the acts ſhould be read, which were brought from Frieſland, relating to this affair. They were read in the hundred and fortieth ſeſſion, and there were found in them fifty errors, of which Maccovius was accuſed, and which appeared all of them to be of ſmall importance, and were founded upon the bad ſenſe, which the accuſer put upon the words of the accuſed (7). Two apologies of Maccovius were read, and ſome deputies, who were foreigners, ſaid, that the fifty heads of accuſation might have been reduced to four, and that the crime of Hereſy, imputed to Maccovius, did not appear. *Quidam ex Exteris Theologis dicebant, potuiſſe illos quinquaginta errores, ad quinque vel etiam quatuor reduci; nec ullum crimen hæreſeos, ſicut objectum fuerat, in illis deprehendi* (8). When Lubbertus gave his opinion, he broke out into a great heat againſt one of the members of the aſſembly, and produced a new liſt of the errors of Maccovius. He was anſwered, that they had heard from perſons worthy of credit, that though he would not be a party, yet it was he who had extracted, from the theſes and lectures of Maccovius, the propoſitions that were pretended to be erroneous. He was very angry, and ſwore twice, that this was not true. *Quod ut audiebat D. Sibrandus, vehementiſſime commotus, bis Deum vindicem in animam ſuam precabatur ſi iſthæc vera eſſent; adeo ut D. Præſes eum ſæpius modeſtiæ ſanctæ, & reverentiæ Synodo debitæ juſſerit meminiſſe* (9). In the hundred and forty ſecond ſeſſion, it was thought proper not to read before the ſynod the third apology of Maccovius, becauſe it contained ſeveral perſonal matters againſt Lubbertus. It was read only in a particular committee, of which Scultetus (10) would be one, though he was very unfit to be a judge, ſince the Divines of Heidelberg had already declared, that they condemned the accuſed party. *Certe Exteri mirabantur D. Scultetum nominatum fuiſſe à Provincialibus; & multo magis, D. Scultetum id munus velle ſubire, cum facultas Theologica Heidelbergenſis, cujus ipſe pars eſſet, theſes illas, quæ examinandæ ſunt, jam hactenus tanquam otioſas, metaphyſicas, & falſas damnaverit* (11). The judgment of the commiſſioners was, that Maccovius had been falſely accuſed, and that he was neither guilty of Paganiſm, nor Judaiſm, nor Pelagianiſm, nor Socinianiſm, nor of any other Hereſy; but that he ought not to have made uſe of obſcure and ambiguous phraſes, borrowed from the ſchoolmen, nor have denied certain propoſitions. They may be ſeen in the Latin, which I ſhall here ſet down. By this means it will appear, that he was a Supralapſarian, and that he expreſſed himſelf harſhly as to certain doctrines, in which he ſhould have ſtudied to pleaſe nice ears. ‘Legitur judicium deputatorum à Synodo in cauſa Maccoviana: cujus ſumma hæc erat; D. Maccovium nullius Gentiliſmi, Judaiſmi, Pelagianiſmi, Socinianiſmi, aut alterius cujuſcunque hæreſeos reum teneri, immeritoque illum fuiſſe accuſatum; peccaſſe eum, quod quibuſdam ambiguis, & obſcuris phraſibus ſcholaſticis uſus ſit; quod ſcholaſticum docendi modum conetur in Belgicis Academiis introducere; quod eas ſelegerit quæſtiones diſceptandas, quibus gravantur Eccleſiæ Belgicæ: Monendum eſſe eum, ut cum Spiritu Sancto loquatur, non cum Bellarmino aut Suarezio: hoc vitio vertendum ipſi, quod diſtinctionem ſufficientiæ & efficientiæ mortis Chriſti aſſeruerit eſſe futilem; quod negaverit humanum genus lapſum eſſe objectum prædeſtinationis; quod dixerit Deum velle, & decernere peccata; quod dixerit Deum nullo modo velle omnium hominum ſalutem; quod dixerit duas eſſe electiones. Judicant denique, liticulam hanc inter D. Sibrandum, & D. Maccovium componendam eſſe, & deinceps neminem debere eum talium criminum inſimulare (12). - - - - *The judgment of the deputies in Makowſki's caſe was read; which amounted to this, that Makowſki was neither guilty of Paganiſm, Judaiſm, Pelagianiſm, Socinianiſm, nor any other kind of Hereſy, and that he was unjuſtly accuſed: that he had offended in making uſe of certain ambiguous and obſcure phraſes of the ſchools; in endeavouring to introduce the ſcholaſtic method of teaching in the univerſities of Holland; in ſelecting thoſe queſtions to be controverted, with which the churches of Holland are burthened: that he be admoniſhed to ſpeak according to the Holy Spirit, not according to Bellarmin or Suarez: that he was to blame in aſſerting that the diſtinction of the ſufficiency and efficiency of the death of* CHRIST *was idle; in denying that fallen man was the object of Predeſtination; in ſaying that* GOD *wills and decrees ſin; in ſaying that* GOD *by no means wills the ſalvation of all men; and in ſaying that there are two elections. They are of opinion laſtly, that this little broil between Sibrand and Makowſki be made up, and that no one thenceforward ought to bring ſuch kind of accuſations againſt him.*’ The ſynod approved the judgment of the commiſſioners (13); and this was the iſſue of that ſuit. There was a deputy of Frieſland, who deſired they would proceed againſt the accuſers, and offered to prove by authentic writings, that Lubbertus had orders to be his accuſer. This motion occaſioned ſuch a tumult in the ſynod, that the political deputies were forced to knock with a hammer, to command ſilence. *Communi collegarum nomine coram Synodo proteſtari, ſalvo jure ut agant contra accuſatores; partes autem accuſatorias domino Sibrando eſſe demandatas, conſtare ex literis quibuſdam publicis, quas è ſinu deprompſit, ac coram Synodo legi poſtulavit: increbreſcenti hac in expoſtulatione plurium fervori, ac multiloquio, modum imponunt Delegati politici malleo ſuo, quo mos eſt ſilentium obſtrepentibus imperare* (14).

[*D*] *Here is the titles of . . . . his printed works.*] I have taken them out of the *Diarium Biographicum* of the Sieur Witte, where theſe words are to be found (15): *Reliquit Collegia Theologica: Locos Communes: Diſtinctiones & Regulas Theol. ac Philoſophicas: Opuſcula Philoſophica:* Πρῶτον ψεῦδος *Anabaptiſtarum:* Πρῶτον ψεῦδος *ſive oſtenſionem primi Falſi Arminianorum: Prælectiones pro Perkinſo contra Arminium: Diſceptationes de Triuno vero Deo, &c.* Note, that the greateſt part of theſe books are poſthumous, and were publiſhed by the care of a Polander (16), who was miniſter of a little town of Frieſland, and afterwards profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker. He promiſed to publiſh ſeveral others, as among his papers, and were never publiſhed. He has been accuſed of Plagiariſm [*E*].

---

(4) Chap. lvi.

(5) That it might appear, that I do not enlarge upon the thoughts of Coçceius, I would have placed them here in Latin, but I could not find again the funeral oration.

(6) G. Balcanquallus apud Epiſt. Eccleſ. & Theolog. *pag.* 573. *col. i*, Edit. in fol. 1684.

(7) Id. ib.

(8) Id. ib.

(9) Ib. col. ii.

(10) Deputy of the palatinate, and profeſſor of Divinity at Heidelberg.

(11) Balcanq. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 573. *col. ii.*

(12) Ib. *pag.* 574, *col. ii.*

(13) Legitur, & per plura Synodi ſuffragia approbatur, ſententia deputatorum in cauſa Maccoviana, qui eum ab omni hæreſi abſolvendum cenſuerunt; ſed monendum, ut Theologiam docendi modum commodiorem ſequatur, verborumque formis ex ſacra Scriptura petitis utatur; etiam juſtam eum reprehenſionem incurrere ob quaſdam propoſitiones ab ipſo crudius & rigidas aſſertas. *Ibid. pag.* 576, *col. i.*

(14) Ibid.

(15) Ad 24. Jul. 1644.

(16) Called Nicolas ARNOLDUS, of whom I have given an article.

as may be ſeen in his preface to the *Loci-communes* of Maccovius. He cauſed them to be re-printed with many corrections and additions taken out of the author's MSS. His epiſtle dedicatory is dated in 1649. The edition, which I make uſe of, is of the year 1658.

[*E*] *He was accuſed of plagiariſm.*] He, who made this diſcovery, propoſed it modeſtly, and did not forget to praiſe Maccovius; theſe are his words: 'Imo ne abſolvi quidem crimine hoc plane poteſt inter Theologos noſtros vir alioqui ſubtiliſſimus, Joannes Maccovius. Quod ſi enim inſpicere non detrectes *Exercitationes* ipſius *Remonſtrantium* hypotheſibus abhinc annos aliquot oppoſitas, docebunt te oculi tui, eximiam earum partem non tantum quoad † *materiam*, ſed quoad ipſa etiam *verba*, è Belgico *Latine* verſa, è ‡ Clar. *Molinæi* Anatome *Arminianiſmi* compilatam eſſe. Quod in Doctore, extemporanei acuminis honore alias celebratiſſimo, miratus ſemper fui (17). - - - *Even our great Divine John Makowſki ſtands convicted of this crime: for if you will take the pains to look into his* Exercitations, *oppoſed a few years ago to the hypotheſes of the Remonſtrants, your eyes will inform you, that a conſiderable part of them, not only as to the matter, but as to the very words, tranſlated out of Dutch into Latin, is compiled from Molinæus's Anatomy of Arminianiſm. I have always wondered at this in a Doctor, otherwiſe famous for the readineſs of his genius.*'

† *Maccov. Colleg. Theolog. Diſp. iv, & xi.*

‡ *Molin. Anatom. Arminianiſmi, cap. v, & xxiv.*

(17) Saldenus, de libris, *pag.* 156.

MALDONAT (JOHN), a prieſt of Burgos in Caſtile, flouriſhed about the year 1550. He wrote good Latin, and publiſhed a piece, to recommend the ſtudy of polite learning, *Parænesin ad litteras politiores.* His Abridgment of the Lives of the Saints was printed ſeveral times (*a*). We ſhall ſee below whether he had reaſon to boaſt ſo much of his correction of the Breviary [*A*].

(*a*) *Taken from Andrew Schottus,* Bibl. Hiſp. *pag.* 350, 351.

[*A*] *We ſhall ſee .... whether he had reaſon to boaſt ſo much of his correction of the Breviary.*] I find what follows in a book of Mr Thiers, publiſhed in 1699, under the title of a *Diſſertation concerning the place where at preſent lies the body of St Firmin third biſhop of Amiens.* '(1) John Fonſeca, biſhop of Burgos, the capital city of the antient Caſtile, deſigning to publiſh a new edition of the Breviary of his dioceſe, appointed three learned men, Carrera, Lara, and John Maldonat, to manage it. This John Maldonat, ... who muſt not be confounded with the famous John Maldonat the Jeſuit, took upon him to compoſe, and put into Latin, the lives of the ſaints, which were to ſerve for leſſons in that Breviary. He underſtood Latin very well, and acquitted himſelf ſo well (as he imagined) of this commiſſion, that he boaſted of his Breviary, as the moſt exact, the moſt correct, and finiſhed work that ever was.' *Theſe boaſts are contained in an epiſtle, which he printed at the end of this Breviary, and of theſe lives of the ſaints, of the Lyons edition,* 1561..... *It is addreſſed to his two colleagues Carrera and Lara* (2). Mr Thiers gives it at length, and then adds theſe words (3): 'Any one, who has read this epiſtle, would believe, that the leſſons containing the lives of the ſaints of the Breviary of Burgos are entirely free from faults: and yet that epiſtle is nothing but a Spaniſh rhodomontade, and in thoſe leſſons there are many ſilly things, which are to be found in the antient Legends.'

(1) *Pag.* 18. *of the diſſertation of Mr Thiers.*

(2) Ib. *pag.* 19.

(3) Ib. *pag.* 21.

MALDONAT (JOHN) a Spaniſh Jeſuit [*A*] was born in 1534. He ſtudied at Salamanca, and taught Philoſophy, Divinity, and the Greek tongue there, before he devoted himſelf to the ſociety of the Jeſuits in the ſame city. He did not there take the habit of the order, but at Rome in 1562. He was ſent to Paris the next year, to teach Philoſophy there, in the college, which the Jeſuits had lately obtained. He afterwards taught Divinity there [*B*] with very great ſucceſs; for what is related of the multitude of his auditors, is wonderful [*C*]. He was ſent to Poictiers with nine other Jeſuits, in 1570. There he read Latin lectures, and preached in French; but, not finding a good ſettlement there, he returned to Paris, after he had maintained ſome diſputations againſt thoſe of the reformed religion. He made a ſhort journey to Lorrain; and as he paſſed through

[*A*] *A Spaniſh Jeſuit.*] The place of his birth is called *Las Caſas de la Reina.* It is ſituated near Larena, in the province of Eſtramadura, and belongs to the great maſter of the knights of St James. Maldonat atteſts all theſe things in a writing ſigned with his own hand, which is kept at Rome in the archives of the Jeſuits (1). Therefore George Cardoſus (2), Thuanus (3), and Mr Thiers (4), are miſtaken, when they make him a Portugueſe. Alegambe was not perfectly acquainted with this, for he calls Maldonat's country *Fuente del Maeſtro in ditione Zafrenſi* (5). Nicolas Antonio (6) calls it by the ſame name. Mr Moreri has perverted this name into *Fruente deli Maeſtro.*

[*B*] *He afterwards taught Divinity there.*] I do not mean, that he taught it full ten years, though Southwell affirms it (7); for I find ſome little difficulty in this matter. This author ſays, that Maldonat firſt taught Philoſophy at Paris, whither he had been ſent in 1563, and that he went to Poictiers about 1570, and that afterwards he made a journey into Lorrain. He ſpeaks no more of his lectures of Divinity: where then ſhall we find theſe ten years? Southwell ſhould have ſaid, that, after his journey to Lorrain, Maldonat began again to be a profeſſor in the college of Paris. Maldonat was at firſt reader of Philoſophy, and began to teach it in the year 1564 (8). He ſpent two or three years in this: for at that time a courſe of Philoſophy could not be finiſhed ſooner. He afterwards taught Divinity, and finiſhed a courſe of it in four years. *Tradidit ille primum totam Theologiam compendio annis quatuor* (9). We are come now to the time, when he was ſent to Poictiers. Now, ſince a miniſter (10), who had changed his religion during the maſſacre of Paris, accompanied him in his journey to Lorrain, we cannot place this journey before the month of September 1572. It is very probable, that being returned to Paris, he began to execute his deſign of dictating a courſe of Divinity larger than the former; for if he had began to execute it after his return from Poictiers, would he have been taken from this exerciſe, and ſent into Lorrain? This larger courſe was interrupted by a proceſs of Hereſy, and of a teſtamentary cheat, which was entered againſt him. *Iterum eandem uberius tradere aggreſſus, cum jam procul eſſet progreſſus, alieniſſimo ſane tempore, ab hoſtibus variis calumniis appetitus eſt* (11). Now this ſuit was determined in 1575, and Maldonat, notwithſtanding his abſolution, quitted Paris. I know not therefore where we ſhall find thoſe ten years of his teaching Theology, which are mentioned by the two Bibliographers of the Jeſuits. I have inſiſted the longer on theſe trifles, to ſhew, that a clear and exact narrative is a work more difficult than is commonly thought. Does not Alegambe, who is accounted very exact, throw us here into confuſion? Can there be any thing more obſcure and intricate than his account? They, who write books like his, ought to know what I have criticiſed here.

[*C*] *What is related of the multitude of his auditors is wonderful.*] The Bibliographers of the ſociety ſay, that

(1) *Taken from Nathan. Sotuel,* Bibl. Script. Societ. *pag.* 473.

(2) *In* Agiologio ad diem 6. Jan apud Sotuel. ibid. pag. 475.

(3) Thuanus, *lib. liii, pag.* 1088.

(4) Thiers, Diſſertat. ſur ſaint Firmin, *p.* 18.

(5) Alegambe, Bibl. Script. Societ. Jeſu, *p.* 255.

(6) *In* Bibliotheca Script. Hiſp. *Tom. i, pag.* 558.

(7) Totos decem annos Theologiam profeſſus eſt. *Sotuel, Biblioth. Scriptor. Societat. pag.* 474.

(8) *Richeome, Apologetical Complaint, pag.* 33.

(9) Sotuel, ubi ſupra.

(10) Du Roſier. *See* Thuanus, *lib. liii. pag.* 1088.

(11) Sotuel, ibid.

through Sedan, he diſputed there with more than twenty miniſters [*D*]. He was brought into trouble at Paris; for he was not only accuſed of Hereſy, but alſo of having ſtolen an inheritance [*E*], by ſeducing the preſident St André to leave his eſtate to the Jeſuits. Peter de Gondi, biſhop of Paris, acquitted him of Hereſy [*F*], and the parliament declared

that people, leſt they ſhould not find a place, went to the ſchool two or three hours before he mounted the chair, and that he was often obliged to read his lectures in a court, and in the ſtreets, becauſe the benches were not ſufficient for all thoſe who came to hear him. They add, that there were alſo ſome miniſters of the Reformed religion preſent at his lectures. *Ne ipſi quidem Calviniſtæ, & Calviniſtarum Miniſtri ipſius prælectionibus abſtinerent. Duabus quotidie, tribuſve horis ante ſubſellia certatim implebant, quam ludum ille ingrederetur, ne excluderentur. Sæpe in aperto, atque adeo in viis publicis docere coactus eſt ob multitudinem Auditorum, quos nullæ exedræ capiebant* (12).

[*D*] *He diſputed at Sedan with more than twenty miniſters.*] Genebrard, an author whoſe teſtimony is to be ſuſpected, ſays, that Maldonat overcame them all, and that two of them were converted. ‘De quo certamine Genebrardus ſic ait; *Joannes Maldonatus Capellum, Holinum, Loqueum, & xx alios Miniſtros Calviniſtas, primum diſſerendo, deinde declamitando proſtravit: nam in declamationes diſputationem commutandam Miniſtri cenſuerant, quod ejus vim Syllogiſticam non poſſent depellere.* Additque *Launeum & Henricum Penneterium Miniſtros, qui aderant, fuiſſe converſos* (13). - - - - *Of which diſpute Genebrard thus ſpeaks:* John Maldonat vanquiſhed Capellus, Holinus, Loqueus, and twenty other Calviniſt miniſters, firſt by diſputation, and then by declamations: for the miniſters were for his turning his diſputation into declamations, becauſe they could not guard againſt the force of his ſyllogiſms. *And he adds,* that the Miniſters Launoi and Henry Pennetier, who were there, were converted.’ It is certain, that Matthew de Launoi, and Henry Pennetier, changed their religion; but this was not a conſequence of that diſpute with Maldonat. They became Papiſts in 1577, and immediately publiſhed a book of controverſy (14), which they dedicated to the French king. There they mention Maldonat, but do not ſay, that he had diſputed with the miniſters of Sedan, or that his reaſons had opened their eyes. They inform us (15), that du Roſier, a miniſter, who had changed his religion, accompanied Maldonat, and left him at Metz, to go into Germany, becauſe the miniſters of Sedan perſuaded him, that, if he returned to Paris with this Jeſuit, he would be put to death, and *that Maldonat had given ſome intimation of it, by ſaying, that he was ſtill a Heretic.* They do not ſay in what year this was done; but it may be affirmed, that it was three or four years before their abjuration; for as I have already obſerved, it was after the maſſacre at Paris, that Maldonat and du Roſier were ſent to Metz. It was believed at the court of France (16), that du Roſier, having changed his religion, and contributed very much to the abjuration of the king of Navarre, the princeſs Catherine, the prince of Condé, and the wife and mother-in-law of this prince, would be a fit inſtrument to make converts at Metz, and therefore he was ſent thither with Maldonat. The duke of Mompenſier deſired them to go to Sedan, that they might undeceive the ducheſs of Bouillon, his daughter, who was a very good Huguenot (17).

[*E*] *He was not only accuſed of Hereſy, but alſo of having ſtolen an inheritance.*] Let us quote Alegambe. ‘Alieniſſimo ſane tempore, ab hoſtibus variis calumniis appetitus eſt: nam & Præſidem Montibrunenſem St Andreæ moribundum circumveniſſe, & poſteros ejus fortunis evertiſſe, illi perſuadendo ut ſua omnia Societati legaret, dicebatur, ſeductor ſimul & prædo nuncupatus; & a nonnullis Lutetiæ zelo præpoſtero, hæreſis eſt accerſitus; verum ab hac eum injuriâ vindicavit Summi Pontificis Gregorii XIII, auctoritate Petrus Gondius Pariſienſis Antiſtes: ab illa vero publico Senatus conſulto liberatus eſt. Verum quamvis ſic ejus innocentia publice ſatis teſtata foret, ſatius tamen fore putavit, ſi paucorum æmulationi, præſertim ingraveſcente ætate viribuſque labefactatis, cederet, lucemque illam hominum fugeret (18). - - - - - *His enemies took a very improper time to attack him with calumnies: for it was ſaid, that he had impoſed upon preſident St André, as he lay upon his death-bed, by perſuading him to leave all his effects to the ſociety, and he was called both a ſeducer and a thief: Nay, ſome prepoſterous zealots of Paris accuſed him of Hereſy. But Peter de Gondi, archbiſhop of Paris, by authority of Pope Gregory XIII, vindicated him from this injurious charge; and he was acquitted of the other by a public ſentence of the parliament. Yet, though his innocence was thus publickly enough atteſted, he choſe, eſpecially as he was in the decline of life, to give way to the jealouſy of a few, and to retire from the world.*’

Antony Arnauld, pleading againſt the Jeſuits, in 1594, ſuppoſes, that Maldonat was really guilty of ſeducing the preſident St André, and that the parliament of Paris had not acquitted him. ‘Nothing comes out, *ſays he* (19), every thing goes in, whether people die inteſtate, or make their wills, which they extort every day, repreſenting on one ſide the terrors of Hell to thoſe who are near death, and on the other, propoſing Paradiſe open to thoſe, who give to the ſociety of Jeſus; as Maldonat did to the preſident Montbrun St André, drawing from him his goods and purchaſes, by a confeſſion full of avarice and impoſture; upon which Mr Pibrac appealed to the parliament in a full audience.’ I know not what the Jeſuit Richeome anſwered as to this article; for I have not the apology he publiſhed under the name of Francis de la Montagne (§ α) againſt the plea of Antony Arnauld.

[(§ α) Des Montagnes is the name, which the Jeſuit Richeome takes in his book of *The Truth defended, &c.* See the notes on the *Confeſſion of Sanci*, edition of 1699, pag. 415. REM. CRIT.]

[*F*] *Peter de Gondi . . . . acquitted him of Hereſy.*] The Bibliographers of the Jeſuits do not ſay of what Hereſy he was accuſed: but here follows ſome particulars, which Mr Simon affords me. *It was very difficult for a man of his merit, and who profeſſed to ſpeak his mind freely, without regarding the prejudices of others, to pleaſe every body. Some falſe zealots accuſed him of having taught Hereſies. Their accuſations proceeded ſo far, that they were carried to Rome, and Pope Gregory XIII ſent them back to the biſhop of Paris, to be examined upon the ſpot. His accuſation was, that, contrary to the ſentiment of the faculty of Divinity at Paris, he had taught, that it was not a point of faith, that the Holy Virgin was conceived without original ſin. The doctors purſued this affair with ſo much heat, that Maldonat, who had done ſo good ſervice to religion and the State, was forced to appear before the biſhops tribunal, who acquitted him. His brethren thought it convenient to print the ſentence of his abſolution before his commentary, in the manner it had been publiſhed: yet it is to be found only in the firſt editions,* viz. *in that of Pont a Mouſſon, which appeared in* 1596, *and in the others till* 1615, *at which time the Jeſuits reviſed that Commentary in an edition of Lyons; and I find, that, afterwards, this reformed edition was generally followed, from which the ſentence of abſolution was taken away, which I ſhall here ſet down entire, as I have read it in the edition of Pont a Mouſſon* (20). Mr Simon having ſet down the whole ſentence (21), adds, that tho' it was very favourable, Maldonat *thought it better to lay aſide his Divinity lectures, than to give occaſion to his enemies to excite new troubles againſt him. He retired to Bourges to ſtudy quietly there in the college of his ſociety* (22).

Let us ſet down here ſome extracts from the regiſters of the faculty of Divinity at Paris. John Maldonat read lectures upon the maſter of the ſentences in the college of Clermont in 1574, and diſputed earneſtly concerning the immaculate conception of the Holy Virgin againſt the faculty of Divinity, which made their members ſwear, that they would believe this conception as an article of faith. The rector of the univerſity of Paris called together the four faculties, and they reſolved unanimouſly to complain of this Jeſuit to Peter de Gondi biſhop of Paris. The faculty of Divinity being aſſembled, all the doctors, except eight or nine, declared expreſly, that they held it as an article clared him innocent of the other crime. But this did not hinder Maldonat from reſolving to hide himſelf in the college of Bourges, that he might apply himſelf entirely to his commentaries upon the ſcripture. He had a dream, which the event confirmed [*G*]. Being gone to Rome, by order of the Pope, to take care of the edition of the Greek Bible, he finiſhed there his commentary upon the Goſpels, and preſented it to the general Aquaviva, December 21, 1582. A little while after, he fell ſick, exactly according to his dream, and was found dead in his bed, on the eve of the Epiphany, 1583. There is, no doubt, but his too earneſt application to ſtudy ſhortened his days. He wrote many books [*H*], which ſhew, that he had a great capacity (*a*). Thuanus gives him

---

(12) Alegambe, *pag.* 255. Sotuel, *pag.* 574.

(13) Id. ib.

(14) *See the title of it in remark* [*D*] *of the article* LAUNOI (MATTHEW DE).

(15) *Folio* 139.

(16) Thuanus, *lib. liii, pag.* 1088, ad ann. 1572. *See alſo* Theod. Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. xvi, pag.* 475.

(17) Thuan. ibid.

(18) Alegambe, *and* Sotuel, ubi ſupra.

(19) Arnauld, *Plea againſt the Jeſuits, pag.* 37.

(20) *Simon's Critical Hiſtory of the Commentators on the New Teſtament, cap. xlii, pag.* 620.

(21) *It is dated January* 17, 1575.

(22) *Father Simon,* ubi ſupra, *pag.* 621.

article of faith, that the Holy Virgin was conceived without original ſin. Hence it came to paſs, that the biſhop of Paris publiſhed a cenſure againſt the rector, and the principal members of the univerſity; but, ſeeing that his proceeding raiſed great tumults, he changed his method, and thundered out an excommunication againſt the dean, and the ſyndic of the faculty of Divinity, the four faculties appealed from this, as a grievance, to the parliament, who diſapproved the conduct of the biſhop. This you will find in Latin in a book of Mr Joli (23): you will find there likewiſe (24) what follows. ‘ Five months and a day after the ſentence of the biſhop of Paris, by which Maldonat was diſcharged from the accuſation of Hereſy brought againſt him concerning the conception; and after that the rector, and the principal members, the dean, and the ſyndic of the faculty, were excommunicated, for acting contrary to the decree of the council of Trent afore-related: all the faculties, on the eighteenth of June 1575, declared, that the biſhop of Paris had no power to excommunicate either the rector, or the principal members of the univerſity, and condemned the words of Maldonat as heretical. Here follow the words taken out of the regiſters of the nation of France. *Rurſus XVIII ejuſdem menſis Junii eædem Facultates fuerunt convocatæ ſuper anathemate Epiſcopi Pariſienſis, qui quoniam Dominus Tiſſart Rector propoſuerat omnibus Facultatibus dictos articulos Maldonati cum & cæteri Accademiæ . . .percuſſit, declaratum eſt & concluſum Epiſcopum Pariſienſem non poſſe ferire anathemate neque Rectorem, neque cæteros Academiæ proceres, eademque Congregatione fuit condemnata opinio Maldonati tanquam Hæretica.*’ They, who know the preſent ſtate of the controverſy concerning the immaculate conception, will doubtleſs wonder that a Jeſuit was perſecuted by the Sorbonnne upon ſuch an occaſion.

[*G*] *He had a dream, which the event confirmed.*] He thought he ſaw a man, who exhorted him to go on vigorouſly with his commentary, and aſſured him he ſhould finiſh it, but ſhould not long ſurvive the concluſion of it. When he had ſaid this, he pointed to a certain part of his belly, which was the very ſame place, where Maldonat felt the ſharp pains, of which he died. ‘ Cum autem inſtituiſſet primum in quatuor Evangelia Commentarios ſcribere, per aliquot noctes viſus eſt ſibi videre quendam; qui ut ſtrenue cœptum opus proſequeretur, exhortabatur, fore enim ut illud ex ſententia perficeret: ſed operi parum diu ſupervicturum; atque hæc cum diceret, intento digito certam aliquam ventris partem illi ſignabat. Hoc viſum quanquam pro ſomni ludibrio habitum, comprobavit eventus; nam à Gregorio XIII, Pontifice Maximo è Gallia in urbem accerſitus, ut operam ſuam præſtaret ad editionem Græcam LXX Interpretum, quam parabat, non diu Romæ ſuperſtes fuit. Ibi lucubrationem illam ſuam abſolvit, & Claudio Aquavivæ recens in Præpoſitum generalem electo ad diem xxi Decembris, anno MDLXXXII obtulit; ac ſecundum id, acerrimus eum dolor inceſſit eâ corporis parte, quæ tanto jam prius illi fuerat per nocturnam ſignata viſionem (25). - - - - - *Having firſt reſolved to write a commentary on the four Goſpels, a certain perſon appeared to him for ſome nights, who exhorted him to go on vigorouſly with the work he had undertaken, for that he would finiſh it to his wiſh, but not long ſurvive his work: and when he had ſaid this, he pointed with his finger to a certain part of his belly. This viſion, though looked upon as the deluſion of a dream, was confirmed by the event. For, being ſent for, by Pope Gregory XIII, from France to Rome, to aſſiſt in publiſhing an edition of the Septuagint, which that Pope was preparing, he ſoon after died there. It was there he finiſhed his lucubration, and preſented it, the twenty firſt of December* 1582, *to Claudius Aquaviva juſt then elected general: and, according to his dream, he was ſeized with acute pains in that very part of his body, which had been pointed out to him in his ſleep.*’ It is very probable, that this was known from Maldonat himſelf, and that he did not intend to deceive thoſe to whom he related it. And it is by no means probable, that chance was the cauſe of the great conformity between the dream of this Jeſuit, and the event. Such facts as this, of which the world is full, confound unbelievers more than they are willing to own.

[*H*] *He wrote many books.*] He publiſhed nothing himſelf; all that came out was printed after his death. The firſt of his works, that was publiſhed, is his commentary upon the four Goſpels. Mr Simon has commended it much, as appears from his own words, which are both critical and hiſtorical (26). ‘ Of all the commentators, that we have mentioned hitherto, there are few, who have explained with ſo great care, and even with ſo good ſucceſs, the literal ſenſe of the Goſpels, as John Maldonat, a Spaniſh Jeſuit. Dying at Rome before he attained the age of fifty years, Claudius Aquaviva, general of his ſociety, to whom he recommended his commentray upon his death-bed, gave orders to the Jeſuits of Pont à Mouſſon, to cauſe it to be printed from the copy, which was ſent to them. Theſe Jeſuits tell us in the preface, prefixed to this work, that they have inſerted ſomething of their own, and that they were obliged to rectify the MS. copy, which was defective in ſome places, it not being in their power to conſult the original, which was at Rome. Beſides, the author having not ſet down, in the margin of his copy, the books, and places, from which he took a good part of his citations, they ſupplied this defect. It appears alſo that Maldonat had not read in the original authors a great many of thoſe places, which he cites, but that he had made uſe of the labours of former writers, as is commonly done. He is not ſo exact, as if he had put the laſt hand to that commentary (27). Notwithſtanding thoſe defects, and ſome others, which may be eaſily ſupplied, it appears plainly, that this Jeſuit took a great deal of pains in compoſing this excellent work. He lets no difficulty, paſs without examining it thoroughly. When he meets with ſeveral literal ſenſes of the ſame place, he uſually chooſes the beſt, without ſhewing too much regard to the authority of the ancient commentators, nor even to the greater number, becauſe he regarded nothing but truth. He often rejects the interpretation of St Auguſtin, *&c.*’

The commentaries of Maldonat upon Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezekiel, and Daniel, were printed at Lyons in 1609, and at Cologne in 1611. To which they added his expoſition upon the 109th Pſalm, and a letter about his diſpute at Sedan. His treatiſe, *De fide*, was printed at Mentz in 1600, and that about angels and demons at Paris, in 1605. As to the Sum of caſes of conſcience, and the controverſies about the ſeven Sacraments, two books which have appeared under his name, the Bibliographers of the ſociety look upon them as ſuppoſititious, as appears by their own words. ‘ Summa caſuum conſcientiæ, *quæ tanquam hauſta è ſcriptis & doctrina Maldonati, & collecta per Martinum Codognat Minimum prodiit Lugduni apud Hæredes Guelielmi Rovillii MDCIV, Venetiis etiam & alibi, partus ſuppoſititius eſt, erroribus ſcatens, Maldonato prorſus indignus, & merito ab Apoſtolica Sede damnatus. Similiter* Diſputationum ac Controverſiarum deciſarum circa VII Eccleſiæ Romanæ Sacramenta, *tom.* II. *Lugduni ſine Typographi nomine, nec illius nec ullius de Societate ſunt, & ſuos etiam errores continent* (28). - - - - - The *Sum of caſes of conſcience*, which, as having been extracted from, the writings, and doctrine of Maldonat, and collected

---

(*a*) *Taken from Nathanael Southwell*, Biblioth. Scriptor. Societat. *pag.* 473, *& ſeq.*

(23) *Intituled*, Preſcriptions concerning the conception of our lady, *and printed in* 1676. *See pag.* 19, *& ſeq. and pag.* 89, *& ſeq.*

(24) *At pag.* 95, *and* 96.

(25) Alegambe, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 256.

(26) Simon, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 618.

(27) *Thuanus is of the ſame opinion.* Nihil vivens publicavit, *ſays he, lib. lxxviii, pag.* 481. poſt mortem ejus, opera ac cura Clementis Puteani ex eodem ſodalitio viri doctiſſimi, prodierunt eruditiſſima Comentaria in IV Evangeliſtas Muſſiponti edita, meliora & integriora multorum judicio futura, ſi ſuperſtite auctore edita fuiſſent.

(28) Alegambe, *pag.* 257. Sotuel, *pag.* 475.

him great commendations [*I*]. Some Proteſtants have alſo much commended him (*b*); but they complain of ſome paſſionate expreſſions that have dropt from his pen. Others ſpeak of him with the greateſt contempt [*K*]. One of his lectures, concerning the exiſtence

'by Martin Codognat a minim, was publiſhed at Leyden, for the heirs of William Roville, 1604, as alſo 'at Venice and elſewhere, is a ſpurious piece, full 'of errors, altogether unworthy of Maldonat, and deſervedly condemned by the Apoſtolical See. Alſo the '*Diſputations and Controverſies decided relating to the ſeven Sacraments of the Romiſh church, printed in two volumes at Lyons*, without the Printer's name, are neither 'his nor any other Jeſuit's, and are not without faults.' They ſay nothing of a folio that was printed at Paris by Sebaſtian Cramoiſy, in 1643, with this title, *Johannis Maldonati Soc. J. Commentarii in præcipuos ſacræ Scripturæ libros Veteris Teſtamenti. Don Nicolas Antonio* makes mention of it (29), and of ſome other MS pieces of the ſame Jeſuit. Some pieces of Maldonat were publiſhed at Paris in 1677, which had never appeared before, *viz.* his treatiſe of grace, that of original ſin, that of providence and juſtice, that of juſtification and the merit of works; his prefaces, his harangues, and his letters. Theſe new treatiſes do not make three volumes in folio, as Mr Teiſſier affirms (30), but only one. The two others, printed at the ſame time by Pralard, had already been publiſhed. We are put in hopes, that ſome other treatiſes of this Jeſuit, will appear; and it is the more probable, becauſe a great number of perſons tranſcribed what he dictated at Paris (31). I think it was Mr du Bois, doctor of the Sorbonne, who procured the edition of the new treatiſes of Maldonat: he has prefixed a preface to it, which contains the elogy of this Jeſuit (32).

I have read in a book of Mr Joli, a paſſage, which I will now tranſcribe. 'The MS. Letters of Maldonat, and his book of the Sacraments, were printed 'at Paris about twenty or thirty years ago; but the 'Jeſuits buy up all the copies (33).' Father Simon has proved that this work on the ſacraments is Maldonat's (34). See the fifteenth of his Select Letters: it is full of particulars relating to this learned Jeſuit. See alſo the ſame work of Father Simon, pages 181, 182, 187, 188.

[*I*] *Thuanus commends him very much.*] According to him, the merit of Maldonat was the cauſe why the parliament of Paris decreed nothing againſt the Jeſuits, tho' they were ſuſpected by the wiſeſt heads, and the whole univerſity hated them very much. Can any man be better praiſed? *Unus in cauſſa exſtitiſſe merito creditur, ut ſodalitium illud toti Academiæ valde inviſum, & alioqui jam prudentioribus ſuſpectum, ob tanti viri gratiam ac commendationem à Senatu apud quem lis adhuc indeciſa pendebat, tamdiu toleraretur; & eouſque dum rebus ſodalium in urbe confirmatis, Maldonatus poſt conciliatam inſigni ſua unius eruditione novo ordini celebritatem, a Gregorio XIII Pontifice Romam evocatus eſt* (35). Thuanus had juſt before ſaid, that this Jeſuit joined a ſingular piety and purity of life, and an exquiſite judgment with an exact knowledge of Philoſophy and Divinity. *Qui ad exactum philoſophiæ & theologiæ ſtudium ſingularem pietatem, morum candorem & acerrimum judicium cum attuliſſet, magna cum laude & frequenti omnium Ordinum concurſu totos X annos Lutetiæ Pariſiorum, ubi & eum pueri audivimus, in Claromontana ſchola profeſſus eſt* (36). He did not know the true age of Maldonat; for he ſuppoſes him to have lived more than fifty ſix years, when indeed he did not arrive to fifty. You will wonder the leſs at this miſtake, when you know, that Richeome has made Maldonat younger than he was, at a time when the intereſt of his cauſe required, that he ſhould rather have added more years to his Life, than have taken any from it. It was objected to the Jeſuits, *that they appointed young men to teach the lower claſſes* (37). Richeome anſwers (38), *John Maldonat began to read Philoſophy, when he was twenty ſeven years of age, in* 1564. It is a miſtake: he ſhould have ſaid, when he *was thirty years old*, and by that ſome will ſay, the anſwer would have been better. It ſeems ſo at firſt; but when we conſider the matter more cloſely, this miſtake of Richeome appears to be advantageous to his cauſe; for his deſign was to prove, that a man, tho' he be young, may nevertheleſs be qualified to teach well. Maldonat, whoſe lectures were admired, is an example of this. Now the younger you make him, the more weight you give to that example. Thus Richeome was not miſtaken to his prejudice.

THAT it is a difficult taſk to make additions to a book.

I have ſaid elſewhere (39), that it is difficult to abridge a book well; I will add here, that it is difficult to make pertinent additions to it. An addition, perhaps, requires that twenty places be corrected. Patience alone does not always fit a man to make theſe emendations: he muſt be ſenſible of the moſt imperceptible connexions, and remember them a long time, and whenever it is neceſſary. An author, who enlarges his own work, has not always theſe qualifications; but commonly he ſucceeds better in the corrections, which the additions require, than one, who adds to the work of another. This fault is to be excuſed in him, when the addition is far diſtant from the place which is to be corrected. This is not Southwell's caſe, with reſpect to the following cenſure; for his addition precedes but a few lines the words of Alegambe, which wanted correction. Alegambe ſays, that Maldonat died, in the beginning of his fiftieth year, the fifth of January, 1583 (40). If he could not ſay it without telling an untruth, at leaſt he could ſay it without refuting himſelf, ſince he takes no notice of the year of his birth. Southwell, his continuator, has inſerted ſome additions in the article of Maldonat; one among the reſt, which informs us, that this Jeſuit was born in the year 1534. From hence it appears, that the words of Alegambe, which I have related, muſt be falſe, and yet Southwell has changed nothing in them; he has related them, and conſequently he is guilty either of a contradiction, or of a falſe calculation.

[*K*] *Some Proteſtants .... complain of the paſſionate expreſſions, that have dropped from his pen. Others ſpeak of him with the greateſt contempt.*] I will cite Caſaubon (41). 'Quum ubique virulentus hic ſcriptor 'in magnos viros pro ſua modeſtia, pari petulantia '& impudentia debacchetur; nuſquam tamen maledicæ linguæ ſuæ laxiores habenas indulſit, quam 'in hac diſputatione: *hæreticos* tertio quoque verbo 'nominans illos, qui eandem cum Auguſtino & aliis 'ſententiam tuentes PETRAM exponunt de 'Chriſto: cujus Majeſtatem defendere, hodie eſt 'hæreſin committere .... (42). Omnium accuratiſſime (quod equidem ſciam) ejuſmodi argumenta 'congeſſit in hunc locum Maldonatus, acris & 'magni ingenii vir; ſi affectibus, ſi linguæ, ſi odio 'veritatis, potuiſſet moderari. - - - - *This virulent 'writer, who every where, with impudence and ſcurrility, falls foul upon great men, has no where given a 'greater looſe to his ſlanderous tongue, than in this diſputation; calling thoſe, every third word, by the name 'of Heretics, who, with St Auguſtin, and others, explain the word PETRA (ROCK) of CHRIST; 'to defend whoſe majeſty at preſent is to be guilty of 'Hereſy .... Maldonat has (as far as I can judge) 'very accurately collected the arguments of all writers 'on this paſſage; and is a man of great abilities, if 'he could but moderate his paſſion, bridle his tongue, 'and reſtrain his hatred of truth.*' This judgment is at once both obliging and offenſive; but Scaliger does not obſerve this temperament: he ſays nothing but what is ill of this Jeſuit. If he allows him to have publiſhed ſome good things, yet he robs him of all the glory of them, becauſe he accuſes him of having ſtolen them. 'Maldonatus in Evangelia maledicus, 'inſignia tamen quædam habet bona. - - - *Maldonatus 'is abuſive in his commentary on the Goſpels; yet he 'has ſome remarkable good things.*' Having taken all this from Beza, he ſpeaks ill of him. 'Quando 'aliquid habet boni furatur à Calvino, & ut agnoſcas, 'maledicit ei, ut Euſebius ex Africano conatur furta 'ſua tegere (43). - - - *When he has any thing good, he 'ſteals from Calvin, and to convince you of it, he 'ſpeaks ill of him, in like manner as Euſebius endeavours 'to conceal what he has ſtolen from Africanus.*' He denoted him by the word lyon; but he denied it, when he ſaw that ſome took advantage of it. We muſt believe, that he did not remember he had uſed that word, and that he did not apprehend, when he uſed it, there

---

(*b*) See Sir Thomas Pope Blount, Cenſura Autorum, *pag. m.* 535.

(29) Bibl. Script. Hiſp. *Tom. i, pag.* 558.

(30) *Addition to the Elogies, Tom. ii, pag.* 14. *Edit.* 1696.

(31) Ex ejus ſchola prodierunt viri eruditi quamplurimi, & vix quiſpiam poſtea fuit in Gallia qui cum ejus auditor eſſe non potuiſſet, quæ in ſcholis dictaverat ſibi domi deſcripta non haberet. *Aleg. pag.* 255. *Sotuel, pag.* 474.

(32) Simon, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 620.

(33) *Joli, Preſcriptions concerning the conception of our Lady, pag.* 19. *This book was printed in* 1676.

(34) Simon, Select Letters, *pag.* 134, *Edit. of Trevoux*, 1700.

(35) Thuanus, *lib. lxxviii, pag.* 481.

(36) Id. ib.

(37) *Richeome's Apologetical Complaint, pag.* 32.

(38) Ib. *pag.* 33.

(39) *At the end of remark* [*C*] *of the article ACHILLES; and the end of remark* [*A*] *of the article ARTAXATA.*

(40) Mortuus in lectulo inventus, ætatis vixdum anno 50, ſalutis vero 1583, incunte, pervigilio Epiphaniarum. *Alegambe, p.* 256.

(41) Caſaubon. in Baronium, Exercitat. xv, *num. xii, pag. m.* 347, *col. i.*

(42) Id. id. *col. ii.*

(43) Scaligerana, *pag.* 148.

ſtence of God, occaſioned a greater outcry than the thing deſerved; and I wonder, Paſquier did not perceive the weakneſs of that objection [*L*].

there would be any thing diſobliging in the alluſion. However this be, my proofs are theſe (44). ‘ Pag. 313. Inſultas Scioppio: *Proferat fur* (inquis) *ſcriptum meum, in quo ulla veſtigia extent, quod Maldonatum* L E O N E M *vocarim.* Proh Deum immortalem! tune tam impudens es, ut id negare audeas? Cedo enim; an non hæc tua ſunt verba de Maldonato in Elencho trihæreſii adverſus Serarium, *cap. xi. fol.* 89. *Raro verum dicit, niſi in illis, quæ ab aliis accipit, quibus cum maledicit, putat ſe furta ſua occultare poſſe. Utinam viveret, non inultas ſycophantias ferret. Sed* L E O N I *non reſpondetur poſt mortem ejus.* I nunc, & Scioppium mendacii poſtula. - - - - Let the thief *(ſay you)* produce a work of mine, in which there are any footſteps of my having called Maldonat L Y O N. *Good God! are you ſo loſt to ſhame as to deny it? Pray, tell me; are not theſe your words concerning Maldonat, in the xith chap. fol.* 89. *of the Elench. Trihæreſ. adv. Serrar.* He ſeldom ſpeaks truth but where he borrows of others, by ſpeaking ill of whom he thinks he ſhall be able to conceal his thefts. I wiſh he were alive, he ſhould ſmart for his ſycophancy. But we anſwer not a L Y O N after his death. *After this, give Scioppius the lye.*’ Rivetus has followed the foot-ſteps of Scaliger; he does not allow Maldonat one good quality (45), he makes him a very ill man, and very ignorant, or at leaſt a meer pretender to learning. Pareus, in his commentary upon St Matthew, has cenſured this Jeſuit very often, and very ſharply.

[*L*] *Paſquier did not perceive the weakneſs of that objection.*] Here follows a paſſage of his plea againſt the Jeſuits in 1564. ‘ Within theſe two Months, your Metaphyſician Maldonat, in one of his lectures, endeavoured to prove a GOD by natural reaſons, and, in another, by the ſame reaſons, to prove, that there is none, he ſays and unſays on ſo worthy a ſubject. Now I would aſk, in which is the greateſt impiety and extravagance, in the firſt, or in the ſecond? Indeed, theſe are the holy myſteries, by which you become famous among the people; theſe are the good ſeed which you ſow among us (46).’ There are three faults in this objection: I. It is contrary to candor, to pretend, that one, who firſt gives the proofs of the exiſtence of a GOD, and after that propoſes the reaſonings and objections of the Atheiſts, intends to overthrow what he has eſtabliſhed. This advocate therefore cannot be excuſed. He reports unfaithfully the ſtate of the caſe; he would perſuade us, that Maldonat did equally intend to prove, that there is a GOD, and that there is none. But this was by no means the intention of this Jeſuit; for, in both diſcourſes, he intended to prove the exiſtence of a GOD: in the firſt, by propoſing the ſolid arguments of thoſe who maintain it; in the ſecond, by expoſing the weak arguments of thoſe, who deny it. II. Paſquier trifles childiſhly, when he blames this method of diſputing; for, on all ſubjects, a Philoſopher ſhould examine the objections of his adverſaries, and not weaken them through policy. Thus Maldonat, as a Metaphyſician, did but his duty, when he ſet apart one lecture for examining the arguments of the Atheiſts. III. It is an abſurdity, I will not ſay unworthy of ſo learned a man as Stephen Paſquier, but of any man of common ſenſe, to affirm, that there is as much impiety *in proving a* GOD *by natural reaſons*, as in proving, *by the ſame reaſons, that there is none.* Whoever conſiders theſe three cenſures of this paſſage of Paſquier, will eaſily believe, without farther proof, that this able advocate had the ſhame to be worſted in this cauſe. Nevertheleſs I will ſhew after what manner he was attacked.

‘ Before I ſhew here the ignorance of Paſquier, I muſt take notice of the occaſion of this calumny. Maldonat, in the year ſixty four, handled the queſtion, which is uſeful at all times, and neceſſary in ours; a queſtion, which the maſter of the ſentences, St Thomas, and all the other doctors of Divinity, have handled among the queſtions *de Deo*, viz. *Whether there be a* G O D? Which queſtion is to be decided by natural reaſons, ſuch as are fit to convince the Atheiſts, who admit no teſtimonies from Scripture, but only arguments drawn from nature. The divines, who treat ſolidly this ſubject, bring arguments *pro* and *con*, and confirm the truth by ſtrong reaſons, and by the ſame confute the falſhood and impiety of the Atheiſts, and their contrary arguments. This Maldonat has done. Paſquier, neither knowing, nor deſiring to underſtand the ſenſe of the queſtion, hath founded a calumny both upon his ignorance and malice. Now, in this queſtion, there are two contradictory propoſitions; the one is, *there is a* G O D; the other, *there is no* G O D. Paſquier calls both theſe propoſitions equally impious in a tranſcendent manner, that is beyond meaſure. And herein he firſt diſcovers, that he is beyond meaſure ignorant, not only in religion, but alſo in the firſt principle of nature: Secondly, that he himſelf is an impious man (47).’ The advocate of the Jeſuits here ſpoils his cauſe; for he miſtakes the meaning of his adverſary, and ſo confutes a chimerical impiety; for Paſquier's meaning was not, that there is as much impiety in this propoſition, *there is a* G O D, as in this, *there is no* G O D. And yet he aſcribes this to him, and ſpends a whole page in refuting it, which I do not ſet down. Paſquier meant, that there is as much impiety in proving by natural reaſons the exiſtence of a GOD, as in denying it by natural reaſons. His adverſary, attacking him in this manner, which was the only way of doing it, quite overthrows him. ‘ He is no leſs ignorant in the Chriſtian religion than in nature, to think it an impiety to prove a GOD by natural reaſons, as I ſhall ſhew very plainly. There is no Chriſtian ſo little inſtructed in our faith, but knows, that GOD demonſtrates and proves himſelf by his works. There never was any good Philoſopher, though a Pagan, who did not naturally know, and acknowledge a GOD from the works of GOD. The Scripture ſays expreſsly, that the creatures teſtify there is a GOD. St Paul purpoſely ſhews this, when he ſays, writing to the Romans, *The inviſible things of* G O D *are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the things that are made.* And ſpeaking of the Philoſophers, he ſays, *Who knowing* G O D, *did did not glorify him as* G O D (48).’

If Paſquier had been wiſe, he had continued ſilent all his life, as to his objection againſt Maldonat; but, tho' he found himſelf weak, and incapable of aſſuming on this occaſion, that triumphant air, which he ſhews in the reſt of his catechiſm, yet he would not hold his peace. He pretended (49) that the Jeſuits, who defended Maldonat, were fallen into the Hereſies condemned by the whole Gallican church, and by Pope Innocent II, namely into the Hereſy of Peter Abelard, who ſaid, that we muſt believe nothing but what may be proved by natural reaſon. This was to make his laſt condition worſe than the firſt; and it will always be the fate of thoſe obſtinate men, who, being fallen into groſs miſtakes, will neither acknowledge them ſincerely, nor hold their peace, but maintain what they have ſaid to be right. It will always be their fate to defend one falſhood by another (50). This is what Paſquier did, and he fared the worſe for it. Read what was replied to him. ‘ He had been charged with having ſaid, when he ſlandered the lectures of John Maldonat, a divine of this ſociety, that it was as great an impiety to prove by natural reaſons that there is a GOD, as to prove that there is none; which is groſs ignorance and blaſphemy againſt GOD, who proves and manifeſts himſelf by all nature. It is alſo contrary to the holy Scripture, and againſt all the creatures in the univerſe, which teſtify that there is a moſt powerful, moſt good, and moſt wiſe GOD. How does he clear himſelf of this crime? By ſaying, that the Jeſuits teach, *by the pen of Renatus de la Fon, that the Deity is to be proved by natural reaſon, and that he, who confines himſelf only to faith, is impious.* Here is a double forgery for his juſtification; for Renatus de la Fon ſays only, as Maldonat, and all divines have ſaid, that we may piouſly teach, that there is a GOD, by natural reaſons, againſt the Atheiſts, which is the Catholic doctrine;

‘ and

(44) Oporinus Grubinius, in Amphotidibus Schioppianis, pag. 254.

(45) Nos certe merito in eo & veram eruditionem, & fidem, etiam aliquando mentem & ſenſum requirimus. *Rivetus, Comment. in Pſalm. cx. Operum, Tom. ii, p.* 329.

(46) Paſquier, Recherches de la France, *livr. iii, c. xliii, pag. m.* 337.

(47) *The anſwer of Renatus de la Fon, to the plea of Simon Marion,* chap. xxxvii, pag. 173, Edit. 1599.

(48) Renatus de la Fon, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 175.

(49) *Paſquier's Catechiſm of the Jeſuits*, book ii, ch. vii, pag. m. 239, 240.

(50) *See the article LUTHER, remark* [*R*], *citation* (88).

'and not that the Deity is to be proved only by natural 'reaſon, without recurring to faith, which is the 'Hereſy of Abelard, who would believe nothing 'but what is proved by natural reaſon, and who de'ſtroyed faith, by which we believe what is above 'reaſon and ſenſe. And thus, inſtead of clearing 'himſelf, he is juſtly charged with two new calum'nies (51).'

Paſquier might have defended himſelf ſomewhat better, by ſaying, that, ſince firſt principles are not to be proved, all thoſe, who undertake to prove, there is a God, do hereby confeſs, that they do not rank among firſt principles this propoſition, *there is a GOD:* but it is impious not to reckon it among firſt principles. But this anſwer, tho' ſomewhat better than the other, would nevertheleſs have been a very bad one; for it would have accuſed of impiety the moſt holy, and moſt famous authors, and even the cuſtom of all ages, authorized by the ſtate and the church. I ſhould never have done, if I ſhould undertake to name all the authors, who have proved by natural reaſons, that there is a God. I ſay, pious authors, and ſuch as are no leſs exemplary for their virtue than learning. And every one knows, that, in all the ſchools in Chriſtendom, where Philoſophy is taught, there is always a metaphyſical chapter ſet apart for the proofs, which natural reaſon affords us, of the exiſtence of a God, and for the refutation of the ſophiſms of the Atheiſts. The greateſt part of the common-places of Divinity, that have been publiſhed, contain ſuch a chapter. It would therefore be ridiculous for any one to pretend, that all thoſe, who prove by natural reaſons, that there is a God, are impious, or do not acknowledge, as a principle, this poſition, *there is a GOD*. We muſt take notice, that all the propoſitions, which are called principles, are not equally evident. There are ſome, which are not to be proved, becauſe they are as clear, or clearer, than any medium that can be uſed to prove them. Such, for inſtance, are theſe propoſitions: *The whole is greater than a part; if from two equal quantities you take away equal parts, the remainder will be equal: two and two make four.* Theſe axioms have this advantage, that we have not only a clear idea of them in our mind, but they alſo fall under our ſenſes: daily experience confirms them, and ſo the proof of them would be altogether uſeleſs. We cannot ſay the ſame thing as to the propoſitions, which fall not under our ſenſes, or which may be oppoſed by other maxims; they want to be diſcuſſed and proved. We muſt ſecure them from objections. It cannot be denied, that this theſis, *there is a GOD*, is one of this number: it does not fall directly under our ſenſes; it has been denied in all ages by men of letters, and who made profeſſion of reaſoning, and we ſhall ſee hereafter (52), that it is denied to this day by ſome flouriſhing ſects. It is not therefore ſuperfluous to undertake the proof of it; nay, it is very uſeful and neceſſary to produce it, tho' we could not make vulgar minds ſenſible of it, as we make them ſenſible of the properties of numbers. This is what a famous miniſter pretends (53).

A REFLEXION upon the Carteſian doubting.

But ſome perhaps may ſay, is it not a ſcandalous thing to propoſe it as a problem in a metaphyſical lecture, whether there be a God or no? I have heard of a German prince, who was about to ſuppreſs an univerſity that he had founded, becauſe he was informed, this queſtion was diſputed in it. Probably ſome body alarmed him in the ſame manner that ſome perſons attempted to prejudice the parliament of Paris againſt Maldonat. We ſhall add a few words about this difficulty. It is certain, that, according to the rules or method of diſputing, we muſt reduce this great and important truth into a queſtion, as ſoon as we undertake to prove by Philoſophical reaſons, that there is a God; for the natural and juſt end of this undertaking, is to convince thoſe of falſhood, who deny this theſis. Now, according to the rules of diſputing, it may and ought to be required of them, that they ſhould lay aſide their prejudices, and that they ſhould not employ their peculiar principles againſt the reaſons, which ſhall be oppoſed to them; for, if they did it, they would fall into the Sophiſm, which the ſchools call *petitio principii*, which is an enormous fault, and ought to be baniſhed from all controverſies, as an eſſential obſtacle to the deſign of diſcovering the truth. They have the like right of requiring the ſame thing; ſince, in all diſputes, that are well regulated, the combatants ſhould be equally armed. Thus, for a certain time, that is, while each party is alledging his reaſons, both thoſe who deny, and thoſe who affirm, ought to lay aſide their theſis, and neither affirm nor deny it. It will be then a queſtion; it will be a matter of enquiry; to proceed impartially in which, we muſt not ſuffer our pre-conceived opinions to add any weight to the arguments that favour them, nor to weaken the contrary reaſons. We muſt examine every thing, as if we were a *tabula raſa*. It is not neceſſary actually to doubt, and much leſs to affirm, that all we have believed is falſe: it is ſufficient to keep it in a kind of ſuſpence; that is, not to ſuffer our perſuaſion to byaſs us, in the judgment we are to paſs upon the proofs of the exiſtence of a God, and the difficulties and arguments of the Atheiſts. This is doubtleſs what Des Cartes intended, when he would have his Philoſopher doubt of every thing, before he examines the reaſons of the certainty of it. If any one will not believe me, let him hear at leaſt a miniſter, who, in a diſpute with the Atheiſts, would have us, for a time, renounce the principles, to which they do not agree. 'Ut clare oſtendamus, *ſays he* (54), 'quæ iſta tanto pere declamata dubitatio eſt, cui tot 'retro annis tantæ lites motæ atque etiamnum mo'ventur, rem ipſam paulo altius & ab initio repete'mus. Conſtat, ab omni tempore repertus eſſe, qui 'Dei naturam, exiſtentiam, providentiam, & quid'quid horum eſt, quibus omnis plane nititur Religio, 'neſcio quibus non ſubtilitatibus aut evertere, aut dubia 'ſaltem reddere non vererentur. . . . Cui tamen malo 'quantum pote obviam eundo, iiſque quos infeciſſet, 'convincendis, haud pauci ſemper viri docti ac egre'gii ingenia calamoſque ſuos acuerunt. Quibus certe, 'ſi quid proficere volunt, non ex principiis adverſæ 'parti negatis, ſed ab eadem conceſſis neceſſario eſt 'diſputandum; utut illæ alias in ſe ipſæ poſſint eſſe 'certiſſimæ. Quod cum recte perpenderet Carteſius, 'eaque de exiſtentia Dei argumenta proferre ſtuderet, 'ad quæ pertinaciſſimus quiſque Scepticus obmute'ſceret, ecquid potuit aliter, quam ut ea omnia de 'quibus iſti dubitant, tantiſper ſeponeret? - - - - - '*That we may ſhew, what that ſo cried up doubting is,* '*which ſo many years ago occaſioned diſputes, and ſtill* '*occaſions, I will take the matter higher, and give an* '*account of it from the very beginning. It is certain,* '*there always have been perſons, who were not aſhamed* '*to endeavour to overthrow, by I know not what ſubtil*'*ties, or at leaſt to render doubtful, the exiſtence and* '*providence of GOD, and every thing on which reli*'*gion is built . . . . To obviate which evil, and refute* '*thoſe whom it had infected, ſeveral great and learned* '*men have exerciſed their wits and pens; who, if they* '*would at all ſucceed, muſt neceſſarily argue, not from* '*principles denied by the adverſe party, but from ſuch* '*as they allow; however certain they may be otherwiſe* '*in themſelves. This Des Cartes being well aware of,* '*and ſtudying to produce ſuch arguments for the exiſtence* '*of a GOD, as might confound the moſt obſtinate Sceptic,* '*could he do otherways than ſet aſide for a time ſuch* '*principles as thoſe men doubt of?*' He names Diagoras, Epicurus, and the Sceptics: he might have cited whole bodies of the Chineſe, as Mr Arnauld has done, who thus addreſſes himſelf to the Jeſuits. 'The 'moſt able miſſionaries of China, ſome of whom are 'of your ſociety, maintain, that the greateſt part 'of *literati* there are Atheiſts, and that they are 'idolaters only through diſſimulation and hypocriſy; 'like many of the Pagan Philoſophers, who adored 'the ſame idols with the common people, tho' they 'did not believe in any of them, as may be ſeen in 'Cicero and Seneca. The ſame miſſionaries inform 'us, that theſe *literati* do not believe any thing to 'be ſpiritual, and that the *King above*, which your 'Matthew Ricci took for the true God, is nothing 'but the material Heaven; and that what they call 'the ſpirits of the earth, rivers, and mountains, are 'nothing but the active virtues of thoſe natural bo'dies. Some of your authors ſay, that they fell into 'this Atheiſm ſome ages ago, by having ſuffered the 'great diſcoveries of their Philoſopher Confucius to 'be loſt. But others, who have ſtudied theſe mat'ters with greater care, as your Father Longobardi, 'maintain, that this Philoſopher ſaid many fine things 'about morality and politics; but, as to the true 'God, and his law, he was as blind as the 'reſt (55).'

---

(51) Richeome, *Apologetical Complaint, num. lvi, pag.* 200, 201.

(52) *Citat.* (55), *in a paſſage of Mr ARNAULD.*

(53) *This truth,* There is a God, *may be demonſtrated, I believe, but not by a demonſtration that is ſenſible to a vulgar mind, in like manner as every one may be convinced, though of the meaneſt capacity, that* [illegible] *is the half of twelve.* Ju[illegible] of Nature and Grace, *pag.* 248.

(54) Abraham Heidanus, Conſiderat. ad res quaſdam nuper geſtas, *pag.* 135, 136.

(55) *Arnauld, in his fifth denunciation of the Philoſophical Sin, pag.* 35. *See alſo Father Gobien, in the preface to the Hiſtory of the Edict of the Emperor of China; and, below, remark* [*A*] *of the article SOMMONA-CODOM.*

We conclude therefore, that our John Maldonat deſerved not the cenſure, which Stephen Paſquier has inſerted in his plea againſt the Jeſuits. No reader can doubt this.

I am ſorry, that Mr de St Evremond, whom I admire and honour as much as any man in the world, holds an opinion contrary to the method uſed by Maldonat, and that I muſt prefer to it that of an anonymous writer, who criticiſed him. 'Let us leave Divinity entirely to our ſuperiors, *ſays he* (56), and follow, with reſpect, thoſe who have the care of our ſouls. Though it muſt be confeſſed, that our teachers are the firſt to deſtroy this deference; and that they inſpire us with a ſort of curioſity, that leads inſenſibly into error. There is nothing ſo well eſtabliſhed among men, but what they ſubject to the extravagance of reaſoning. They burn a man, who is ſo unhappy as not to believe there is a GOD, and yet they make it a queſtion in the public ſchools, whether there be one. By this means you offend the weak, and give the diſtruſtful room to ſuſpect. By this you arm the furious, and allow them to ſeek for pernicious reaſons, with which they oppoſe their own opinions, and the true impreſſions of nature.' Let us ſee the obſervation of his cenſurer (57). *When the Divines aſk whether there be a GOD, it is not to doubt of his exiſtence, but to give certain proofs of it, and to confound the Atheiſts, as Phyſic inſtructs us in the knowledge of poiſons, in order to cure thoſe who are infected by them. . . . .* (58) *He calls all the doctors ſcandalous and imprudent men, and St Thomas himſelf, who, in the beginning of his* Summa, Quæſt. II, Art. III, *puts the queſtion, whether there be a GOD. Can Mr de S. E. imagine, that any body will take his part againſt ſo many learned Divines, who have treated this queſtion in all the moſt famous univerſities, for ſo many years, in the face of the church? &c.*

(56) *St Evremond's Judgment on the Sciences,* &c. *Vol. i, of his works, pag.* 50, *of the Lond. Edit.* 1728.

(57) *Diſſertation on St Evremond's Works, pag.* 216. *Paris Edit.* 1698.

(58) Ibid. *pag.* 308.

MALHERBE (FRANCIS DE) the beſt French Poet of his time, was born at Caen, about the year 1555, and died at Paris in 1628. I ſhall not ſay many things of him. Mr Moreri has ſaid enough for the greateſt part of readers; and thoſe, who deſire more may be eaſily ſatisfied in books, which are every where to be found (*a*). I know upon what Mr Moreri might ground what he ſaid, That Malherbe *expreſſed himſelf with a very ill grace:* but Racan affirms the contrary [*A*]. He informs us of a thing, which confirms what I have ſaid in the article LOTICHIUS (*b*), *viz.* That the Poets form to themſelves imaginary miſtreſſes [*B*], that they may have an opportunity of giving vent

(*a*) *The Life of Malherbe by Racan, printed at Paris, in* 1672. *The converſations of Balzac. A collection of the fineſt pieces of the French Poets, reprinted in Holland in* 1692, *Tom. ii, p.* 215.

(*b*) (PETER), *remark* [*F*].

[*A*] *I know upon what Mr Moreri might ground what he ſaid, that Malherbe expreſſed himſelf with an ill grace: but Racan affirms the contrary.*] Moreri might ground it upon theſe words of Balzac (1): 'What you have been told is true; Malherbe was a moſt ingenious man in converſation; but he had not a graceful elocution, and his way of reciting was very diſagreeable. We uſed to call him *Anti-Mondori*; for he ſpoiled his fine verſes in pronouncing them. Beſides, he could not well be heard, on the account of an impediment in his tongue, and the lowneſs of his voice: he would ſpit at leaſt ſix times in repeating a ſtanza of four verſes. And this occaſioned Cavalier Marini to ſay of him, that he never knew a man more moiſt, nor a Poet more dry.' Racan ſays quite the contrary. 'Such, *ſays he* (2), were the ordinary diſcourſes he had with his moſt familiar friends; but they cannot be expreſſed with ſuch a grace as he ſpoke them, becauſe they derived their greateſt ornament from his geſture, and the tone of his voice.'

[*B*] *The Poets form to themſelves imaginary miſtreſſes.*] This will appear by the following narrative. 'Racan and Malherbe one day were diſcourſing of their amours; to wit, of the deſign they had of making choice of ſome lady of great merit and quality, to be the ſubject of their verſes. Malherbe named Madam de Rambouillet; and Racan, Madam de Termes, who was then a widow, They found, that both of them were named Catherine; *viz.* the firſt, whom Malherbe had choſen, Catherine de Vivonne, and Racan's choice Catherine de Chabot (3).' They ſpent all the afternoon 'in ſeeking anagrams on this name, that might be ſoft enough for verſe, and they found but three, Arthenice, Eracinthe and Charintee. The firſt was judged the fineſt; but Racan having made uſe of it in his paſtoral, which he made immediately after, Malherbe deſpiſed the two others, and reſolved to make uſe of Rodante . . . . He was then married, and far advanced in years; wherefore his amours produced but few verſes, and, among the reſt, thoſe which begin thus, *Chere beauté, que mon ame ravie,* &c. - - - - *Dear beauty, how my ſoul is raviſh'd,* &c. and theſe others, which Boiſſet ſet to a tune, *Ils s'en vont ces Rois de ma vie.* - - - - - *Theſe kings of my life go away.* He wrote alſo ſome letters under the name of Rodante: But Racan, who was thirty four years younger than he, and a bachelor, changed his poetical love into a true and lawful one, and took ſome journies into Burgundy for that end (4).' Obſerve well the difference they make between a poetical love and a real one. At that age, honeſt Malherbe was fit only to love poetically; and yet, if one had judged of him by his verſes, one would have thought that he had a miſtreſs, who often made him ſigh, and who embraced him very cloſe; though he was ſo chilly, that he numbered his ſtockings with the letters of the alphabet, leſt he ſhould put more upon one leg than upon the other: he confeſſed one day, that he was come as far as the letter L (5). His infirmities were known, and jeſted upon. It was objected to him one day in verſe, that he was in the wrong to make women his idols, ſince he had nothing for them but words (6). Here are other verſes that concern him.

Avoir quatre chauſſons de laine,
Et trois Caſaquins de futaine,
Cela ſe peut facilement:
Mais de danſer une Bourrée
Sur une Dame bien parée,
Cela ne ſe peut nullement (7).

To wear four woollen ſocks,
And three fuſtian frocks;
He can do it at any hour:
But to dance a Bourrée
O'er a fair lady;
Alas! 'tis beyond his pow'r.

He was ſenſible of his weakneſs, and complained of it very much. 'I am not buried; but thoſe, who are, are not more dead than I am. I have no reaſon, thank GOD, to murmur at the conſtitution nature has given me: it is ſo good, that, at the age of ſeventy years, I know not one of thoſe inconveniences, to which men are commonly ſubject in old age. And if to be well, were nothing elſe but not to be ill, I ſee but few perſons, whom I ſhould envy. But what? becauſe I not am ill, ſhall I be ſo fooliſh as to make myſelf believe, that I am well. I know not what others think, but I am not [illegible] eaſily ſatisfied. Indolence is the deſire of thoſe whom the gout, the gravel, the ſtone, or ſome ſuch diſtemper, put upon the rack once a month. I deſire, not only to be free from pain, but to enjoy pleaſure; not indeed all ſorts of pleaſure; for I do not confound gold with copper; but that which men reliſh by the incomparable ſweetneſs of converſing with women (8).' He deſcribes afterwards this ſweetneſs, and then he ſays, 'Judge, if, after this, there be any misfortune equal to that of not being able to have a ſhare in their favours; and I am ſure you will hardly condemn me. But I muſt no longer continue this diſcourſe, leſt it ſhould bring me to deſpair (9).' He ſaid, one day, to the duke de Bellegarde, 'You act the part of a galant, and lover of fine ladies; can you pay a bill at ſight?

'This

(1) Balzac, Converſation xxxvii, pag. m. 355.

(2) Racan's Life of Malherbe, *pag.* 22.

(3) Id. ib. *pag.* 42, 43.

(4) Id. ib. *pag.* 43, 44.

(5) Id. ib. *p.* 17.

(6) See the article LOGES, remark [*F*].

(7) Menage's Obſervations upon the poems of Malherbe, *pag.* 497.

(8) Malherbe's letter to Balzac, *pag.* 63, of the collection of new letters, printed at Paris, 1642.

(9) Ib. *pag.* 65.

vent to their thoughts. It is very probable, that Malherbe had ſcarce any religion [*C*]. His

‘This was his uſual phraſe, to expreſs, whether he was ſtill ready to ſerve them. The duke anſwered him, yes. Malherbe replied in theſe words; as I live, Sir, I had rather reſemble you in this, than in your being a duke and a peer (10).’ Some caviller perhaps may tell men, that Malherbe reſembled one of the ancients, who would not renounce love, even when age obliged him to renounce enjoyment.

Amare liceat, ſi potiri non licet.
Fruantur alii: non moror, non ſum invidus,
Nam ſeſe excruciat qui beatis invidet:
Quos Venus amavit, facit amoris compotes:
Nobis Cupido velle dat, poſſe abnegat.

. . . .

Hæc illi faciant queis Venus non invidet,
At nobis caſſo ſaltem delectamine
Amare liceat, ſi potiri non licet (11).

Sure I may love, though I cannot enjoy;
Let others reap the bliſs, I envy not;
For he, who envies, tortures but himſelf.
Whom Venus loves, ſhe for enjoyment forms;
But fruitleſs wiſhes only are my lot.

. . . .

This may they do, whom Venus envies not.
Let me at leaſt the empty pleaſure taſte,
To love, though 'tis not giv'n me to enjoy.

I anſwer, that if Malherbe had been ſtill in a condition to have taken a real miſtreſs, he would not have made choice of Madam de Rambouillet, whoſe quality, and much more her virtue, would have left him no manner of hope. Rambouillet-houſe, which is become ſo famous, was truly a palace of honour. *There was nothing but galantry there, and no love. Mr de Voiture, giving one day his hand to Mademoiſelle de Rambouillet, who was afterwards Madam de Montauſier, was ſo bold as to kiſs her arm. But Mademoiſelle de Rambouillet ſhewed ſo ſeriouſly, that his boldneſs did not pleaſe her, that he had no inclination after that, to take the ſame liberty another time* (12). We conclude from all this, that the miſtreſſes of Poets, I mean their Chloe's, their Phyllis's, *&c.* for whom they make ſo many love verſes, are not always the objects they love. Theſe are only poetical miſtreſſes, whom they make uſe of, that they may have a fixed ſubject, to which they may apply ſome thoughts.

[*C*] *It is very probable, that Malherbe had ſcarce any religion.*] *When the poor ſaid to him, that they would pray to GOD for him; he anſwered them, that he did not believe they had great intereſt in Heaven, ſince they were left in ſo bad a condition in this world; and that he ſhould like it better if the duke de Luyne, or ſome other favourite, had made him the ſame promiſe* (13) . . . *In his Primer, he had blotted out all the particular names from the Litanies of the ſaints, ſaying it was ſuperfluous to name them all one after another, and that it was ſufficient to name them in general,* Omnes ſancti & ſanctæ Dei, orate pro nobis (14). . . . . *He would ſay ſometimes,* That the religion of gentlemen was that of their prince (15). During his laſt ſickneſs, *he had much a-do to reſolve to confeſs to a prieſt* (16); *for which he gave this reaſon,* That he was not wont to do it but at Eaſter. . . . . *He who prevailed with him to reſolve upon this, was Yvrande, a gentleman, who had been bred up a page to the great royal ſtables, and was his ſcholar in Poetry, as well as Racan. To perſuade him to receive the ſacraments, he told him, that having always profeſſed to live like other men, he muſt alſo die like them; and Malherbe having aſked him what he meant by that, he told him, that, when other men died, they confeſſed to a prieſt, communicated, and received the other ſacraments of the church. Malherbe owned he was in the right, and ſent for the vicar of St Germans, who aſſiſted him in his laſt hours* (17). Obſerve, that no motive of religion, no inſtinct of conſcience, prevailed with him to confeſs; but he yielded to a reaſon purely human, namley, that we muſt follow the cuſtom of other men, as well at the point of death, as during our life. We ſhall ſee, that at the approach of the fatal moment, which determines our condition for eternity, he ſcarce thought of Heaven or Hell. *An hour before his death, after he had been two hours in an agony, he awaked on a ſudden, to reprove his land-lady, who waited upon him, for uſing a word that was not good French; and when his confeſſor reprimanded him for it, he told him, he could not help it, and that he would defend the purity of the French tongue until death* (18). I have heard ſay, that this confeſſor having repreſented to him the happineſs of another life, with very little eloquence, and aſked of him, whether he did not feel a great deſire to enjoy quickly that happineſs; Malherbe anſwered him, ſpeak no more of it; your bad ſtile diſguſts me. But I am willing this ſhould be looked upon as a meer ſtory, and even that the truths, which Balzac thought fit to ſuppreſs (19), ſhould be thought to have no relation to the laſt hours of this Poet. Let us only inſiſt upon the facts, that are taken out of his life, written by Racan his good friend: Do they not raiſe a ſtrong preſumption, that his faith and piety were very ſlender. *Racan enquired very carefully in what manner he died,* becauſe he had heard him ſay, *That the religion of gentlemen was that of their prince* (20). This is a curioſity, which ſhews, that he was ſuſpected of irreligion, and it is alſo a good gound for theſe ſuſpicions. It is therefore to no purpoſe for Racan to tell us, that his friend *was very ſubmiſſive to the commands of the church; that he did not willingly eat meat on the forbidden days without leave, though he was very old; that he went to maſs every holy-day and Sunday, and that he never failed to confeſs, and to communicate at Eaſter at his own pariſh; that he ſpoke always of GOD and holy things with great reſpect, and that one of his friends made him confeſs one day before Racan, that he had once made a vow to go from Aix to the cave of St Magdalen bare-headed, for the diſeaſe of his wife* (21). Racan may tell us theſe things as much as he pleaſes; but he can never remove the bad impreſſions, which the other facts have produced; and if he gains any thing, it is only this, that Malherbe had determined nothing, either for or againſt religion, and that, having ſome ſort of religion in his mind, not in his heart, he conformed to the common uſage by way of precaution; as to a thing, which whatever happened, might be ſerviceable, and could do him no hurt. We may believe, that, in time of great affliction, when the ſoul is troubled, and turns itſelf on all ſides, and tries all remedies it can think of, he might have had ſome thoughts, which put him upon making vows; but that this tempeſt was calmed in his heart, after the danger was over. We may add to this, that he had reaſon to fear a real and effectual damage, by not obſerving the commands of an abſolute obligation, ſuch as thoſe of his church are, to communicate once a year, to hear maſs upon holydays and Sundays. A man of parts, who wants to make his fortune, or deſires to continue in his preſent condition, will never deſpenſe with this kind of precepts; he will ſo behave himſelf, that his neighbours, friends, and domeſtics ſhall not know, that he deſpiſes his church, and even carry the matter ſo far, that he will not, without leave, eat meat on the forbidden days. All the religious actions, that Malherbe performed, were ſo eaſy, and ſo neceſſary to his fortune, and to the reputation of an honeſt man, which he maintained in all other things, that they cannot balance the proofs of irreligion, which the relations of Racan furniſh us with. When I ſaid, that, in all other things, he maintained the reputation of an honeſt man, I had regard to the way of judging, which the corruption of the times has introduced over all the world; for mankind is ſo depraved, that the purſuit of venereal pleaſures by unlawful ways, and criminal galantries, do not hinder a man from being accounted honeſt. If we ſhould judge otherwiſe of things, Malherbe would not paſs for ſuch an one; for he deſcribes himſelf as one beſotted with thoſe kind of pleaſures. He repreſents himſelf as within an ace of deſpair, when he reflects, that old age renders him incapable of enjoying women (22). Finding himſelf in this ſtate of decay, in which nature ſeeks, but cannot find herſelf, *quærit ſe natura nec invenit*; he groaned and ſighed (23); he ſhed almoſt tears of blood, and wiſhed rather to recover his vigour that way, than to

---

(10) Racan, ibid. *pag.* 19.

(11) Apuleius, in ἀνεχόμενος, ex Menandro, in veterum Poetarum Catalectis ad calcem Petronii, *pag. m.* 220.

(12) Menage, *pag.* 186, 187.

(13) Racan, Life of Malherbe, *p.* 15.

(14) Id. ib. *pag.* 24.

(15) Ib. *pag.* 45.

(16) Ibid.

(17) Ib. *pag.* 46.

(18) Ibid.

(19) I cite his words in the remark [*D*] citation (31).

(20) Racan, ibid. *pag.* 45, 46.

(21) Ib. *pag.* 45.

(22) See his letter to Balzac, cited, and referred to, above, remark [*B*], citat. (S).

(23) Confer what has been ſaid in the article ACHILLES, remark [*L*].

His good friend, having no mind that this ſhould be believed, has taken ſuch a method as puts it out of all doubt. In the article of Madam DES LOGES, we have ſet down ſome facts relating to Malherbe. I point out the beſt edition of his poems [*D*], and I will ſay ſomething of his tranſlations [*E*]. Mr Baillet (*c*), to whom I refer my readers, has carefully collected whatever has been ſaid in favour or to the diſadvantage of

to have the dignity of a duke and peer. In this he differed very much from the opinion of the wiſe Pagans (24), who reckoned that among the advantages of old age, which he accounted a misfortune. How much did he fall ſhort of the virtue of Sophocles, a Poet, as he was, but a Pagan Poet! Being old, he was aſked one day, whether he could ſtill divert himſelf with the fair ſex: God forbid, anſwered he, I am delivered out of the hands of ſo furious a maſter, and I eſteem it the greateſt pleaſure in the world. 'Bene Sophocles, cum ex eo quidam jam affecto ætate, quæreret, utereturne rebus venereis: Dii meliora, inquit. Libenter vero iſtinc, tanquam à domino agreſti, ac furioſo profugi. Cupidis enim rerum talium, odioſum, & moleſtum eſt fortaſſe carere. Satiatis vero, & expletis, jucundius eſt carere, quam frui. Quamquam non caret is, qui non deſiderat. Ergo hoc non deſiderare, dico eſſe jucundius, quam frui (25). - - - - *For to thoſe, who are eager after ſuch pleaſures, perhaps it is hateful and troubleſome to be without them: but to thoſe, who are ſatiated with them, the want of them is more pleaſing, than the enjoyment. Though he does not want, who does not deſire. Therefore, not to deſire this, I ſay, is more pleaſing than to enjoy it.*' Malherbe is accuſed of another moral fault, or rather of two: I mean, vanity, and avarice. He is eaſily convicted of the former, by ſeveral paſſages in his poems (26); but the proofs of the ſecond are of no force. 'Some have thought, ſays Mr Baillet (27), that there are, in the poems of Malherbe, ſome marks of a meaneſs of ſoul, and of his being too much addicted to his intereſt, which ſometimes deprived him of the natural ſentiments of humanity. But I think, this accuſation has no other foundation, than the epitaph of one of his relations, call'd Mr d'Is, whoſe heir he was, in which he declared, that he wiſh'd to ſee all his kindred buried, that he might have the whole eſtate of his family. The verſes of Malherbe upon this occaſion are theſe.'

Icy gît Monſieur d'Is,
Plût or à Dieu qu'ils fuſſent dix!
Mes trois ſœurs, mon Pere, & ma Mere,
Le grand Eleaſar mon Frere;
Mes trois Tantes, & Monſieur d'Is:
Vous les nommé-je pas tous dix?

Here lies Monſieur d'En,
I would to God here were ten,
My three ſiſters, my father, and my mother,
The great Eleazar my brother,
My three aunts, and Monſieur d'En,
Don't I name you all the ten?

To judge of this impartially, this ſeems to be, not the diſpoſition of Tiberius (28), but a ſally of wit, and a poetical jeſt, in which the heart has no ſhare. Malherbe was inconſolable for the loſs of his ſon (29); and he loved his wife ſo well, that the affliction of ſeeing her ſick awaked his dormant religion, and engaged him to do a thing, which he was very much aſhamed of afterwards: For he made a vow to go bare-headed to St Baume (the cave, where St Mary Magdalen did penance); but he was not pleaſed to find it was known that he was ſo devout, and he was ſo far from boaſting of it, that he endeavoured, by all means, to keep it a ſecret (30).

[*D*] *The beſt edition of his poems.*] It is that, which Menage procured, and improved with many notes. It was printed at Paris in 1666. Mr Menage had been long before at work upon it, as appears by a letter of Balzac, dated January 23, 1651. 'The news of a commentary upon the works of Malherbe ſurpriſed me; and how comes it to paſs, that our excellent friend has given over his deſign of publiſhing Diogenes Laërtius, and many other works of great importance, which he had promiſed the public, to amuſe himſelf with explaining a poet ſo plain and intelligible as ours is? I knew him, it is true, and that very particularly; and I know ſeveral particulars of him, which all others, beſides my ſelf, are ignorant of. I have with me, as yet, one who ſaw him die, and whom I ſent him, not being able my ſelf to go and ſee him, on account of my indiſpoſition. But what I know, Sir, more than others, cannot be decently written; for there are certain truths, which are only fit to be ſuppreſs'd (31).' As I promiſed, in the the preceding remark, a part of this paſſage, it is therefore longer than my text requires. Mr Menage himſelf informs us (32), *That he was no more than twenty years old, when he firſt had a deſire to comment upon Malherbe*; and that, if his friends had not diſſuaded him, *he would have begun with that, to make himſelf known to the world.* He adds, that before his notes were publiſhed, Mr Chevreau had printed a *commentary upon the ſame poems. I do not doubt,* continues he, *but this commentary contains many very curious things, and very well worth reading: But I have deprived my ſelf of the pleaſure of reading them, leſt I ſhould be accuſed of ſtealing from Mr Chevreau, if I ſhould happen to hit upon the ſame thoughts; or of having a mind to contradict him, if I am not of his opinion.* Thoſe who have not this work of Mr Chevreau (of whom I am one), may form an idea of it from theſe words of Mr Baillet (33). 'It were tedious to run over all the other faults, which are charged upon Malherbe. Thoſe who would be fully inſtructed, may conſult a book of remarks, which Mr Chevreau has wrote, upon our poet. Mr Roſteau declares, that, having communicated theſe remarks, or rather cenſures, to Madam de Scuderi, ſhe gave him to underſtand, after ſhe had read them, that ſhe was very much ſurprized. This learned and judicious lady confeſſed, that there may be ſomething, which deſerves reproof in ſome places of Malherbe's poems; but ſhe could not have ſeriouſly imagined, that this famous poet furniſhed matter for ſo many corrections.'

Note, that Mr Chevreau will not allow, that his remarks had not been ſeen by Mr Menage. See his narrative and complaints in a letter, which I quote (34). See alſo, in the ſecond part of his miſcellanies, and of his Chevræana, many fine and ſolid obſervations againſt Malherbe.

[*E*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his tranſlations.*] He has tranſlated ſome works of Seneca, and ſome books of Livy, and, if he was not ſucceſsful in it, yet he had the happineſs to be well ſatisfied with his labour. 'His principal buſineſs was to criticize upon the French language; in which he was ſo well ſkilled, that ſome of his friends deſired him one day to make a Grammar for our tongue. . . . . He anſwered them, *That he needed not take that pains, for they might read his tranſlation of the* xxxiii *book of Livy, and he would have them write after that manner.* But every body was not of this opinion. Madam de Gournay, a learned lady of that time, uſed to ſay, *That this book appeared to her like broth of fair water.* She meant, that the language of it was too plain and ſimple, and ſome thought that ſhe was in the right (35).' Mr Huet obſerves (36), that the ſtrong deſire Malherbe *had to pleaſe courtiers, made him to invert the method of his author; that he neither followed his pointing nor his words, and that he ſtudied only to purify and poliſh our language.* Mr Racan confirms this: 'Malherbe, ſays he (37), often ſaid, and chiefly when he was reproved for not following the ſenſe of the authors, whom he tranſlated or paraphraſed, that he would not dreſs meat for cooks; meaning, that he did not much regard the praiſes of learned men, who underſtood the books he had tranſlated, provided he was praiſed by the courtiers.'

(*c*) Jugement des Sçavans, *Tom. iii, num.* 944, *and on the Poets, Tom. iv, num.* 1411.

(24) Habeo ſenectuti magnam gratiam, quæ mihi ſermonis aviditatem auxit, potionis & cibi ſuſtulit . . . . At non eſt voluptatum tanta quaſi titillatio in ſenibus. Credo: ſed ne deſideratio quidem. Nihil autem moleſtum, quod non deſideres. - - - - *I am greatly obliged to old age, which has increaſed in me the deſire of converſation, and taken away that of eating and drinking . . . But old men have not ſuch a titillating ſenſe of pleaſures. I believe it: but neither have they the deſire. Now nothing gives us uneaſineſs, which we do not deſire.* Cicero de Senectute, cap. xiv, p. m. 421, 423. Illa quanti ſunt, animum tanquam emeritis ſtipendiis libidinis, ambitionis, contentionis, inimicitiarum, cupiditatum omnium, ſecum eſſe, ſecumque (ut dicitur) vivere? - - - *What a happineſs is it to be free from the dominion of luſt, ambition, ſtrife, enmities, and every paſſion, and to be our own maſters?* Idem, ibid. *pag.* 424.

(25) Id. ib. *pag.* 423. Plato de Repub. *lib. i, Circa init. pag. m.* 572, 573, relates this anſwer of Sophocles.

(26) *See Baillet,* Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, *Part iv, num.* 1411. *pag.* 14, *& ſeq.* Conſult below, remark [*H*].

(27) Ib. *pag.* 17, 18.

(28) Identidem felicem Priamum vocabat, quod ſuperſtes omnium ſuorum exſtitiſſet. - - - - *The ſame prince uſed to call Priam happy, becauſe he ſurvived his whole family.* Sueton. in Tiberio, *cap. lxii.*

(29) See Balzac, Converſation, xxxvii, *pag. m.* 356, *& ſeq.*

(30) I have cited above, theſe words of Racan: *One of his friends made him confeſs, &c.*

(31) Balzac, Letter fourth to Conrart, *lib. ii, p. m.* 100, 101.

(32) In the preface to this edition of Malherbe.

(33) Baillet, ubi ſupra, *Part iv, num.* 1411, *pag.* 23.

(34) It is in *pag.* 103, *& ſeq.* of the firſt part of his Miſcellanies

(35) Sorel, Bibl. Françoiſe, *pag.* 259, 260. Edit. 1667.

(36) De claris Interpretibus, *lib. ii, pag.* 186. apud Baillet, Jugem. *Tom. ii, n.* 944, *citat.* 2.

(37) Racan, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 28.

of his works. I do not find, that Malherbe had any great ſhare in the affection of cardinal Richelieu [*F*].

He was of the number of thoſe authors, whom I have mentioned twice or thrice, who write with extream difficulty [*G*], and who put their mind upon the rack, in correcting their

[*F*] *I do not find, that he had a great ſhare in the affection of cardinal Richelieu.*] It was the misfortune of this great Poet, that his parſimony of wit was known to that cardinal. It was diſcovered, that, inſtead of putting himſelf to any expence in celebrating the glory of that great miniſter, Malherbe had only patched together old ſcraps, which he found among his papers. This was not the way to pleaſe a perſon of ſo delicate a taſte and ſo haughty a ſpirit; and therefore he received this homage from Mr Malherbe very ill. Read theſe words of Mr Menage. ‘ I ‘ learned from Mr Racan, that Malherbe wrote thoſe ‘ two ſtanza's above thirty years, before Richelieu, ‘ to whom he addreſſed them, was made a cardinal, ‘ and that he changed only the firſt four verſes of ‘ the firſt ſtanza, to accommodate them to his ſubject. I learned alſo from the ſame Racan, that cardinal Richelieu, who knew that theſe verſes had ‘ not been made for him, did not receive them well, ‘ when Malherbe preſented them to him, which ‘ cauſed Malherbe not to proceed (38).’

[*G*] *He was of the number of thoſe authors, who write with extream difficulty.*] He, who diſguiſed himſelf under the name of Vigneul-Marville, was not ignorant of this. *It was not*, ſays he (39), *without much watching and labouring hard, that Malherbe produced his divine poems.* They might have compared his muſe to certain women, who are ſeven or eight hours in hard labour, before they can bring forth a Child; and, ſince his pains were much longer, and more troubleſome, than thoſe, to which Balzac was expoſed in the like caſe, they muſt have been very terrible. Conſider a little theſe words: (40) ‘ At laſt it is ‘ finiſhed; I mean the diſcourſe, which was mentioned ‘ in my laſt letter, and which is one of the five that ‘ I have promiſed you. It has wearied me, ſpent ‘ my ſprits, and made me curſe the buſineſs a dozen ‘ times. Whatever you may ſay upon this occaſion, ‘ I am ſtill leſs difficult to be pleaſed, than the good ‘ man, I have often mentioned to you, who waſted ‘ half a ream of paper in making and unmaking one ‘ ſingle ſtanza. If your curioſity deſires to know ‘ what ſtanza it was, the beginning is as follows.

Comme en cueillant une guirlande,
L'homme eſt d'autant plus travaillé.

‘ Good God! what pains do we take in ſuch kind of ‘ trifles! trifles moral and political, in French and ‘ Latin, in proſe and verſe.’ This is what Mr Balzac wrote to Mr Conrart the 25th of June 1651. The good man here mentioned is our Malherbe, as plainly appears from the fifth ſtanza of his ode to the duke of Bellegarde.

Comme en cueillant une guirlande,
L'homme eſt d'autant plus travaillé,
Que le parterre eſt émaillé
D'une diverſité plus grande;
Tant de fleurs de tant de coſtez
Faiſant paroiſtre en leurs beautez
L'artifice de la Nature,
Il tient ſuſpendu ſon deſir
Et ne ſait en cette peinture
Ni que laiſſer, ni que choiſir (41).

As when a man wou'd from the field
Cull the beſt flowers it's borders yield,
The rich parterre, in ſummer pride,
With thouſand flow'rs diverſify'd,
Whoſe beauties, variouſly gay,
Great nature's artifice diſplay,
Diſtracts his eye; nor can he chuſe
Theſe flow'rs, nor can he thoſe refuſe.

If Mr Menage had known this circumſtance, which Balzac knew, concerning the pains, which that ſtanza coſt the author, he had doubtleſs inſerted it in his notes upon this place of Malherbe. I have elſewhere related (42) what is commonly ſaid of the inconceivable difficulty wherewith Mr Balzac wrote his books. We have already ſeen what he ſays of it himſelf; and here follows another paſſage out of his letters to Mr Conrart. ‘ Mr Courbé (43) thinks perhaps, that ‘ I proceed as faſt as Salmaſius, who goes faſter than ‘ the tranſcribers and Printers. One ſmall letter coſts ‘ me more pains than a large book does this devourer ‘ of books. Happy are thoſe writers, who are ſo ‘ eaſily ſatisfied, who labour only with their memory ‘ and fingers, who without chuſing, write all that ‘ they know (44). This ſerves me for a proof; for, ſince Malherbe was yet more difficult to be pleaſed than Balzac, whatever repreſents to us the pains of the latter, increaſes the idea we have of the great pains of the former. What follows is a ſhorter proof, ſince we find in it, that Malherbe ſurpaſſed Balzac in point of trouble. ‘ Honeſt Malherbe told me often, that, ‘ after having compoſed a poem of one hundred ‘ verſes, or a diſcourſe of three ſheets, one ought to ‘ reſt ten whole years. Mr Courbé is not of that opinion, neither am I. I do not want to reſt ſo ‘ long after ſo ſmall a work. But ſhould they expect ‘ from me that happy facility, which enables Mr ‘ de Scuderi to produce large volumes, they muſt ‘ know very little of me, and do me a greater honour ‘ than I deſerve (45).’

There are ſo many things to be collected in relation to this character of wit, that, after the many citations I have already produc'd (46) upon this ſubject, there remains ſtill more to be added. Caſaubon had freed himſelf from the ſlavery, under which theſe authors groan, who write their letters many times over, and do nothing but blot out. He has made an authentic declaration of it. ‘ Da mihi quæſo, *ſays he* (47), ut ‘ αὐτοφυεῖ καὶ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἀσκεπάρνῳ λόγῳ tecum ‘ loqui liceat. Polire impenſa cura quæcunque ſcribas, ‘ præſertim autem epiſtolas, & de ſingulis vocibus ire ‘ in conſilium, diligentioris eſt hominis atque, ut ingenue dicam, πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν φιλοτιμοτέρῳ ‘ quam ego ſum. ----- *Allow me to deal freely with ‘ you. This poliſhing every thing you write, and weighing ‘ every word, diſcovers more diligence, and a greater regard for politeneſs than I can pretend to.*’ The phraſe he makes uſe of to expreſs the ſcruples of a writer, who deliberates upon every word, is borrowed from Seneca the father. ‘ Illi qui ſcripta ſua torquent, qui ‘ de ſingulis verbis in conſilium veniunt, neceſſe eſt ‘ quæ totiens animo ſuo admoverint noviſſime affigant (48). ----- *They who torture what they write, ‘ and deliberate on every word, muſt at laſt fix upon ‘ what they have ſo often revolved in their minds.*’ The exceſſes, committed this way, are very much to be blamed, and are indeed a yoke, which reduces the pen ſometimes to a kind of barrenneſs. Quintilian cenſures them very juſtly, and calls this the *being condemned to the unhappy puniſhment of ſlandering one's ſelf.* ‘ Nec enim rurſus eos qui robur aliquod in ſtylo fecerint, ad infœlicem calumniandi ſe pœnam alligandos ‘ puto. Nam quomodo ſufficere civilibus officiis poſſit, qui ſingulis actionum partibus inſeneſcat? Sunt ‘ autem quibus nihil ſit ſatis: omnia mutare, omnia ‘ aliter dicere quam occurrit, velint: increduli quidam & de ingenio ſuo peſſime meriti, qui diligentiam ‘ putant, facere ſibi ſcribendi difficultatem (49). ---- ‘ *Nor again do I think, that they, who have exerted ‘ their ſtrength in writing, are to be tied down to the unhappy puniſhment of calumniating themſelves. For how ‘ can he perform the ſeveral duties of ſocial life, who ‘ dwells a long time on each particular branch of actions? ‘ Now there are ſome, who think nothing enough: they ‘ are for changing every thing, and for altering every expreſſion that has occurred to them. They are infidels to ‘ themſelves, and deſerve ill of their own wit, in miſtaking that for diligence, which is indeed only making it ‘ a difficult taſk to write.*’ It is not eaſy to determine, adds he, whether thoſe, who approve whatever they write, are more to be blamed than thoſe, who are always diſſatisfied. He obſerves, that this great niceneſs is attended ſometimes with ſpite and diſpair; and he relates what was ſaid to a young man, who was vexed for having taken a great deal of needleſs pains for the ſpace of three days to find out the exordium of his ſubject (50). Would you, ſaid one to him, write

(38) Menage, Obſervations upon the poems of Malherbe, *pag.* 545.

(39) Melanges d'Hiſtorie & de Litterature, *pag.* 223, *Edit. de Rouen*, 1699.

(40) Balzac, Letter xi, book ii, to Conrart, pag. 113, Dutch Edit.

(41) Malherbe's poems, book iv, pag. m. 102.

(42) In citat. (38) of the article **GUARINI.**

(43) He was a Bookſeller at Paris.

(44) *Balzac, Letter xii, of the firſt book to Conrart, pag.* 50. *See what he ſays in Letter xxiv of the ſecond book.* O happy writers, Salmaſius in Latin, and Scuderi in French! I admire your eaſe and copiouſneſs! You can write more Calepins, than I can Almanacks.

(45) Balzac, Letter xvi of the ſame book, *pag.* 58.

(46) Remark [*G*] of the article GUARINI; and the article LINACER, remark [*E*].

(47) Caſaubon, Epiſt. clxxiii.

(48) Seneca, Præf. lib. i, Controverſ. pag. m. 72.

(49) Quintil. *lib. x, cap. iii, pag. m.* 484.

(50) This confirms what I have ſaid in the article LINACER, remark [*F*], that the beginning of a work coſts moſt pains.

their works. The vain-glorious manner, in which he ſpoke of his own poems, would be more offenſive; were it not that Poets have always taken the liberty of praiſing themſelves exceſſively [*H*]. I do not doubt but that it is he whom Balzac ſpeaks of, when he laughs at a certain tyrant of ſyllables [*I*].

write better than you can? The words of Quintilian have more beauty and ſtrength. ‘ Nec promptum eſt ‘ dicere, utros peccare validius putem, quibus omnia ‘ ſua placent, an quibus nihil. Accidit enim etiam ‘ ingenioſis adoleſcentibus frequenter, ut labora conſumantur, & in ſilentium uſque deſcendant nimia ‘ bene dicendi cupiditate. Qua de re memini narraſſe ‘ mihi Julium Secundum, illum æqualem meum, atque à me, ut notum eſt, familiariter amatum, miræ ‘ facundiæ virum, infinitæ tamen curæ, quid eſſet ſibi ‘ à patruo ſuo dictum. Is fuit Julius Florus, in eloquentia Galliarum (quoniam ibi demum exercuit eam) ‘ princeps, alioqui inter paucos diſertus, & dignus illa ‘ propinquitate. Is cum Secundum ſcholæ adhuc operam dantem triſtem forte vidiſſet, interrogavit, *Quæ ‘ cauſſa frontis tam obductæ?* Nec diſſimulavit adoleſcens, tertium jam diem eſſe, ex quo omni labore ‘ materiæ ad ſcribendum deſtinatæ non inveniret exordium: quo ſibi non præſens tantum dolor, ſed ‘ etiam deſperatio in poſterum fieret. Tum Florus arridens, *Num quid tu*, inquit, *melius dicere vis, quam ‘ potes? Ita ſe res habet: Curandum eſt, ut quam optime dicamus: dicendum tamen pro facultate. Ad profectum enim opus eſt ſtudio, non indignatione* (51). ‘ - - - - *Nor is it eaſy to ſay, which I think the moſt to ‘ blame; thoſe, who are pleaſed with every thing of ‘ their own, or thoſe, who like nothing. For it often ‘ happens, that even ingenious young men ſink under labour, and are reduced to ſay nothing thro' too great a ‘ deſire of expreſſing themſelves well. This puts me in ‘ mind, that Julius Secundus, my equal, whom it is ‘ known I intimately loved, a man of wonderful eloquence, but extreme diligence, related to me what his ‘ uncle had told him. His name was Julius Florus, ‘ the beſt* Orator *of* France; *for it was in that country ‘ he laſt of all exerciſed that art. This Julius by ‘ chance ſeeing Secundus, who ſtill followed the ſchool, ‘ very melancholy, aſked him the reaſon of it: upon ‘ which the young man confeſſed, that he had been three ‘ days in vain endeavouring to find an exordium of a ‘ ſubject; which not only gave him a preſent concern, ‘ but made him deſpair for the future. Upon which ‘ Florus, ſmiling ſaid:* Would you write better than ‘ you can? The matter is thus: We muſt take care to ‘ expreſs ourſelves the beſt we can; but ſtill we can ‘ but do our beſt: and, to go forward, we have need ‘ of application, not indignation.’

[*H*] *The Poets have always taken the liberty of praiſing themſelves to exceſs.*] I have elſewhere (52) blamed Malherbe for praiſing himſelf in a manner more becoming a braggadochio in a play, than a gentleman: And I have cited two authors, one of whom condemns him (53), or juſtifies him only ironically (54); and the other excuſes him in earneſt, and ſhews, that the liberty of giving one's ſelf pompous elogiums, is an ancient privilege of the ſons of the Muſes (55). He obſerves, that Virgil, Horace, and Ovid, have made uſe of it. He treats this matter more largely in another work, wherein he recites (56) the places, in which Ennius, Nævius, Plautus, Catullus, Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Propertius, Lucan, Statius, and Martial, praiſe themſelves. He ſhews alſo (57), that the Moderns (58) have imitated thoſe examples. Note, that he goes back as far the Greek Poets; for he cites (59) Pindar, Heſiod, Theocritus, and Moſchus. I reproved a perſon the other day, who told me, that thoſe, who pretend, that the Greeks knew nothing but what they had learned from the Phœnicians, had forgot a remark, which favours them; which is this, That the Poets, who promiſed immortality to ſome perſons, whom they praiſed, had borrowed this idea from the Epithalamium, contained in the 45th Pſalm, which ends thus, according to the verſion of Buchanan.

Nec tu carminibus regina tacebere noſtris,
Quaque patet tellus liquido circumſone ponto
Poſteritas te ſera canet, dumque aurea volvet
Aſtra polus, memori ſemper celebrabere fama.

Nor ſhall my verſe, O queen, forget thy name,
But late poſterity ſhall ſing thy fame,
Long as the ſtars ſhall glitter round the pole,
And wide as ocean's ſwelling waters roll.

I told this perſon that his remark appeared to me childiſh, and that he was much to blame to wonder, that Mr Menage had not made uſe of it. Mr Menage had too much judgment to mix profane and ſacred authorities together.

[*I*] *Balzac ſpeaks of him when he laughs at a certain tyrant of ſyllables.*] The deſcription is very lively, and may convince us, that there are people, who are little reſpected, after their deaths, by thoſe perſons, who gave them a thouſand tokens of veneration. They fancy, that, provided they do not name them, they may be as ſmart upon them as they pleaſe. This is my proof of it. ‘ You remember the old court pedagogue, who was formerly called the tyrant of words ‘ and ſyllables; and who, when he was in a good ‘ humour, called himſelf the Grammarian with ſpectacles and grey hair. We muſt not imitate the ridiculous things which are related of this old doctor: ‘ our ambition is to follow better examples. I pity ‘ a man, who makes ſo great a difference between *pas* ‘ and *point*, who treats of *gerunds* and *participles*, as if ‘ they were two neighbouring nations, jealous of their ‘ frontiers. This doctor, in the vulgar tongue, ‘ uſed to ſay, that he had endeavoured for many ‘ years to *ungaſcon*, the court, but that he could ‘ not obtain his end. Death caught him turning a ‘ period, and he was ſurprized by his climacterical ‘ year, whilſt he was deliberating, whether *doute* and ‘ *erreur* were maſculine or feminine. With what attention did he deſire to be heard, when he dogmatized on the uſe and virtue of particles (60).’

(51) Quintil. ubi ſupra.

(52) *In the new Letters againſt Maimbourg, pag.* 123.

(53) Coſtar, *Letter L, Vol. i, pag.* 126.

(54) Idem, *Continuation of the Defence of Voiture, pag. m.* 32.

(55) *Menage's Obſervations upon the poems of Malherbe, pag.* 331, *& ſeq.*

(56) Id. Anti-Baillet, *Tom. ii, cap. cxxxix.*

(57) Id. ib. *cap. cxxxvii, cxl.*

(58) F. Caſimir Sarbieſchi, F. Vavaſſeur, F. Rapin, F. Commire, *in their Latin verſes:* Ronſard, Joachim du Bellai, Malherbe, *and* du Perier *in their French verſes.*

(59) Men. ibid. *cap. cxxxviii.*

(60) Balzac's Chriſtian Socrates, *Diſcourſe x, pag. m.* 267, 268.

MAMMILLARIANS, a ſect among the Anabaptiſts. I do not know the time, when this new Schiſm aroſe; but the city of Haerlem is ſaid to have given birth to this ſub-diviſion (*a*). It owes its original to the liberty, which a young man took of putting his hand into the boſom of a maid, whom he loved, and had a mind to marry: this touch of her breaſt came to the knowledge of the church; and thereupon they conſulted what puniſhment the delinquent ought to ſuffer. Some maintained, that he ought to be excommunicated; others ſaid, that his fault deſerved favour, and would never conſent to his excommunication. The diſpute grew to ſuch a height, that it cauſed a total rupture between the two parties. Thoſe, who declared for indulgence to the young man, were called Mammillarians (*b*) [*A*]. In one ſenſe, this does a great deal of honour to the Anabaptiſts; for it is a proof, that they are much more ſtrict in their morals, than thoſe, who are called Rigoriſts in the Spaniſh Low-countries [*B*]. I ſhall relate to this purpoſe

(*a*) *See* Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. *pag.* 1012. *Edit.* 1679.

(*b*) *See Stoupp's religion of the Hollanders, Letter iii, pag. m.* 61. *See alſo the Syntagma of Micrælius,* ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *They were called Mammillarians.*] I need not here turn Etymologiſt: all, who underſtand Latin know, that the word *mamilla* ſignifies a breaſt.

[*B*] *The Anabaptiſts are much more ſtrict in their morals than . . . . the Rigoriſts.*] The looſeſt Caſuiſts, the Sanchez's, and the Eſcobars, condemn the touching of the breaſt. They agree, that it is an impurity, and a branch of luxury, one of the ſeven mortal ſins. But, if I miſtake not, they do not impoſe upon him, who is guilty of it, any very ſevere penance; and there

are

purpoſe a certain ſtory, which is told of Labadie [*C*]. I have been informed, that ſome people of ſenſe maintained one day in converſation, that there will never be any Baſiarians, or Oſcularians among the Anabaptiſts [*D*].

are many countries in Europe, where they are forced to treat this as one of the ſmall faults, which are called *quotidianæ incurſionis*. This bad practice is ſo common in thoſe countries, and it is a thing ſo frequent even the middle of the ſtreets, eſpecially among the common people, that the moderate Caſuiſts perſuade themſelves, this prevalency of cuſtom blots out one half of the crime. They think it is not conſidered under the idea of a very indecent liberty, and that the offence the ſpectators take at it is very ſmall: upon which account they ſlightly paſs over this article of confeſſion. I do not believe, that any Rigoriſt, upon ſuch an occaſion, ever delayed the abſolution of his penitent, even in thoſe climates where this kind of toying is little uſed, and paſſes for one of thoſe liberties, at which women are obliged to be angry. Thus the Anabaptiſts are the moſt rigid of all the Chriſtian moraliſts, ſince they condemn to excommunication him who touches the boſom of a woman, whom he intends to marry, and break off eccleſiaſtical communion with thoſe who will not excommunicate ſuch a ſpark.

[*C*] *I will relate a certain ſtory, which is told of Labadie.*] All, who have heard of this man, know, that he recommended to his devotees, both men and women, ſome ſpiritual exerciſes, and that he prepared them for inward recollection and mental prayer. It is ſaid, that, having given one of his female diſciples a ſubject of meditation, and earneſtly recommended to her an entire and cloſe application to this great object for ſome hours, he approached her, when he thought ſhe was moſt recollected, and put his hand into her boſom. She briſkly repulſed him, and expreſſed to him her great ſurprize at this kind of proceeding, and was preparing to cenſure him, when he prevented her. *I perceive, my child*, ſaid he to her, without being diſturbed, and with a devout air, *that you are ſtill very far from perfection: confeſs humbly your weakneſs; beg pardon of* GOD *for having been ſo little attentive to the myſteries you were meditating upon. If you had had all the neceſſary attention, you would not have perceived what was done to your breaſt. But you was ſo little abſtracted from ſenſe, ſo little concentred with the Deity, that in a moment you knew when I touched you. My deſign was to try your fervour in prayer, whether you were raiſed above matter, and united to the ſovereign Being, the living ſource of immortality and ſpirituality, and I perceive, with much grief, that you have made but a very ſmall progreſs. Let this, my child, fill you with confuſion, and excite you to perform better for the future the holy duty of mental prayer.* It is ſaid, the maid, having good ſenſe as well as virtue, was no leſs angry at theſe words, than at the action of Labadie, and that ſhe would no more hear of ſuch a guide. I do not warrant the certainty of all theſe facts, but I affirm, that it is very probable, that ſome of thoſe ſpiritual devotees, who make people believe, that a ſtrong meditation will raviſh the ſoul, and hinder it from perceiving the actions of the body, have a mind to toy with their devout ſiſters, with impunity, and to do ſtill worſe: of which the Molinoſiſts are accuſed. In general, there is nothing more dangerous to the mind, than too myſtical, and too abſtracted devotions, and doubtleſs the body in that caſe runs ſome hazard, and many are glad to be deceived.

[*D*] *There will never be any Baſiarians or Oſcularians among the Anabaptiſts.*] Theſe would be a ſort of people, who would be cut off from their communion, for not conſenting to excommunicate thoſe, who kiſs their miſtreſſes. Thoſe who denied, that any ſuch ſchiſm can be expected, did it upon theſe grounds. Such a ſchiſm is not poſſible, ſaid they, unleſs ſome caſuiſts ſhould be ſo ſevere, as to make excommunication the puniſhment of a kiſs; as ſome have been found ſo rigid, as to make a man undergo that penanced, who has touched the breaſts of his miſtreſs. Theſe two caſes are not at all parallel. The laws of courtſhip in certain nations, continued they, have eſtabliſhed from generation to generation, and chiefly among perſons of the common ſort, that kiſſes ſhould be the firſt favour, and that touching the breaſts ſhould be almoſt the laſt, or the laſt but one. When people are educated in theſe principles, they do not believe, that they do, or ſuffer, any great harm by kiſſing; but they believe they do, or ſuffer, a great deal by the handling of the breaſts. And therefore, though they, who adminiſter the canon-laws, complained very much of the young man, who was protected by the Mammillarians, it does not follow, that they would do ſo againſt the other kind of courtſhip. No; they would allow ſomething to cuſtom, and pardon thoſe liberties, which paſs for the firſt elements, and the alphabet of endearments. I relate theſe things, only to ſhew, that there is no ſubject, to which the converſation of perſons of merit will not ſometimes deſcend. It is of ſome uſe to diſcover this weakneſs of men of underſtanding. Does ſuch a ſpeculation deſerve, in conſcience, to be examined? and after all, had it not been much better not to have given a deciſive anſwer about a thing future? *De futuro contingenti non eſt quoad nos determinata veritas*, is the judicious ſaying of the maſters of the ſchools of Philoſophy.

Obſerve, by the way, that, in ſome countries it was ſuppoſed, that the firſt kiſs a maid received from her galant, was that of her betrothing. This we read in the Hiſtory of Marſeilles (1). *It was uſual for the bridegroom to give a ring to the bride on the day of their betrothing, and make alſo ſome conſiderable preſent, in acknowledgment for the kiſs he gave her. In effect, Fulco, viſcount of Marſeilles, made a grant, in* 1005, *to Odila, betrothed to him, for the firſt kiſs, of all the demeſns he had in the territories of Sixfours, Cireſte, Soliers, Cuges, and Olieres. This cuſtom was founded, as I take it, upon the law* * 16. Si à Sponſo, *which ordained, that, when the marriage did not take effect, the woman betrothed ſhould get half of the preſents ſhe had received from the man; for the antients believed, that the purity of a virgin was defiled by one ſingle kiſs; but this law at preſent is abrogated in this kingdom.*

(1) Ruffi, Hiſtory of Marſeilles, *Tom. ii, pag.* 391, *Edit.* 1696.

* *Leg.* 16. *Cod. lib. v.*

See, above (2), the anſwer which was made by a young Florentine lady.

(2) Remark [*A*] of the article GUALDRADA.

MAMURRA, a Roman knight, a native of Formium, acquired prodigious riches in Gaul, where he attended Cæſar in the quality of ſurveyor of the workmen (*a*), if I may ſo tranſlate the *Præfectus Fabrûm* in Pliny. He uſed his riches as voluptuous men do; he heaped them up with great avarice, and a devouring extortion, and ſpent them prodigally in all ſorts of luxury: *Alieni appetens, ſui profuſus*, as is ſaid of Catiline (*b*). He built an houſe extreamly magnificent at Rome, upon mount Cœlius; all its walls were covered with marble, and he was the firſt who built one with that magnificence [*A*]. It conſiſted in placing properly little pieces of marble very thin, and of divers colours, all over

(*a*) Cicero, ad Attic. lib. vii, Epiſt. vii. Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. vi.

(*b*) Salluſt. in Bello Catilinar.

[*A*] *He built an houſe . . . . . whoſe walls were covered with marble; and he was the firſt, who built in ſo expenſive a manner.*] ‘ Primum Romæ parietes ‘ cruſta marmoris operuiſſe totius domus ſuæ in Cœlio ‘ monte Cornelius Nepos tradidit Mamurram Formiis ‘ natum, equitem Romanum, Præfectum fabrum C. ‘ Cæſaris in Gallia. Neque indignatio ſit tali auctore ‘ inventa re, hic namque eſt Mamurra Catulli Vero‘ nenſis Carminibus proſciſſus, quem & res & domus ‘ ipſius clarius quam Catullus dixit habere quidquid ‘ habuiſſet comata Gallia, &c (1). - - - - - *Cornelius* ‘ *Nepos related, that Mamurra, born at Formiæ, a* ‘ *Roman knight, and ſurveyor of Cæſar's workmen in* ‘ *Gaul, was the firſt in Rome, who covered his whole* ‘ *houſe on mount Cœlius with a cruſt of marble. Nor* ‘ *ought we to be angry, that ſuch a man invented this* ‘ *magnificence; for he is that Mamurra, ſatirized in the* ‘ *verſes of Catullus of Verona, whom his eſtate and* ‘ *houſe*

(1) Plin. *lib. xxxvi, cap. vi.*

over the walls. There was no column in this houſe, but what was entirely of the moſt precious marble. Catullus made very ſatirical verſes againſt the immenſe robberies of Mamurra, and the leud intercourſe he ſuppoſed there was between Julius Cæſar and him [*B*]. We have ſpoken of it in the article of this Poet.

‘ *houſe prove, more clearly than Catullus, to have poſ-* ‘ *ſeſſed whatever Gallia Comata afforded.*’

[*B*] *Catullus made very ſatirical verſes . . . . againſt him.*] Here follows the beginning of his thirtieth epigram:

Quis hoc poteſt videre, quis poteſt pati
Niſi impudicus, & vorax, & helluo?
Mamurram habere quod Comata Gallia
Habebat unctum, & ultima Britannia.
Cinæde Romule hæc videbis & feres,
Es impudicus, & vorax, & aleo.

Who, but a wretch as vile, can bear to ſee
Mamurra riot thus in luxury,
Rich with the ſpoils and plunder'd wealth, he bore
From long-hair'd Gaul, and diſtant Britain's ſhore?
The Pathic Roman, who, unmov'd, can ſee
Such wanton riot, is as baſe as he.

The fifty eighth epigram is yet more ſevere.

Pulcre convenit improbis Cinædis,
Mamurrhæ Pathicoque Cæſarique.

This ſuits ſuch impious Pathics well,
Cæſar and vile Mamurra . . . . .

Some interpreters of Cicero (2), think, that theſe words of the fifty ſecond letter of the thirteenth book to Atticus, *Tum audivit de Mamurra, vultum non mutavit* (3), ſignify, that Cæſar did not change his colour, when he was told, that Catullus had written verſes againſt him and Mamurra: but this explication is ill-grounded. Cæſar, being returned from the defeat of Pompey's ſons, was then at a country-houſe of Cicero's. Now what probability is there, that he was then ignorant of the verſes of Catullus, and that it was any news to inform him of them? we have ſhewn at large in another place (4), that the defeat of Pompey's ſons was long after the reconciliation of Cæſar and Catullus. Manutius imagines, that ſome at that time ſpoke to Cæſar about the neglect of the ſumptuary laws, of which Mamurra was then guilty. This is more probable than the explication of Lambinus.

(2) Corradus, *and* Lambinus.

(3) *The edition of Mr Grævius has it*, non mutavi.

(4) *In the article* CATULLUS, *remark* [*I*], *num.* 2.

MANARD (JOHN), born at Ferrara in 1462, was one of the ableſt Phyſicians of his age: you will find in Moreri, that he was Phyſician to Uladiſlaus king of Hungary, that afterwards he was profeſſor of Phyſic at Ferrara, and that, having married, when he was very old, a young wife, he run into exceſſes which killed him. The Poets did not fail to jeſt upon this affair [*A*], and chiefly thoſe who knew, that an Aſtrologer had foretold, he ſhould die in a ditch. He died at Ferrara in March 1536, at the age of ſeventy

[*A*] *He fell into exceſſes, which killed him. The Poets did not fail to jeſt thereupon.*] Paul Jovius accuſes him of great want of judgment. When he was very old and gouty, ſays he, he married a maid, whoſe beauty and youth required a man in the flower of his age. The worſt of it was, adds he, that he fell into intemperance, even at the expence of his life: he ſhewed a greater deſire to have children than to live, and he was willing to haſten the hour of his death, provided he could obtain the title of father. *Duxit autem uxorem plane ſenex, & articulorum dolore diſtortus, ab ætate, formaque, florentis juvenis toro dignam, adeo levi judicio, & letali quidem intemperantia, ut maturando funeri ſuo, aliquanto prolis, quam vitæ cupidior ab amicis cenſeretur* (1). You may find in Moreri an epigram conſiſting of ſix Latin verſes (2) upon this ſubject, by Curſius; but you will not find there this diſtich of Latomus.

In fovea qui te periturum dixit Aruſpex,
Non eſt mentitus: conjugis illa fuit.

'Twas ſaid, you in a ditch ſhou'd loſe your life;
And ſo it prov'd; the ditch was your own wife.

This diſtich was ſo much deſcanted upon, that at laſt ſome ſaid, that Manard, to ſhun the prediction kept at a diſtance from all ditches. He dreamed of nothing but the literal ſenſe, and never miſtruſted the allegorical: but he knew by experience, that it is not always the letter, which kills, and that the allegory ſometimes gives the mortal blow. He died on the night of his marriage, in the very minute of enjoyment, and thus the prediction was fulfilled. Thus ſome writers circumſtantiate the thing. I wonder they did not compare him to bees, who die by the ſtings which they give (3). *Johannes Manardus - - - - - cum ab Aſtrologo ipſi prædictum fuiſſet, vitæ periculum in* FOVEA *ipſi imminere, à foveis ſibi timuit & foſſis, non ſatis perſpecta oraculi κρύψει. Cum vero illiberis, prolis aliquanto quam vitæ cupidior, plane ſenex uxorem duceret juvenculam, prima nuptiali nocte cum dilecta concumbens, deſideratis intentus amoribus, in genitali fovea extinctus, ſuavi morte oraculi implevit ſcopum, & funus maturavit ſuum* (4). I believe they are miſtaken; for ſuch a circumſtance would never have been omitted by thoſe, who firſt ſpoke of this matter; and I obſerve, that Paul Jovius induces us to believe, that Manard did not ſink ſo ſoon. No body informs us whether his endeavours were attended with any ſecundity, and whether he had at leaſt the conſolation to leave his wife big with child. To labour much, and after all return empty, is very unpleaſant.

Αἰσχρόν τοι δηρόν τε μένειν κενεόν τε νέεσθαι.

Nam turpe diuque manere inanemque redire (5).

If it were true, that this good old man died on the night of his marriage, a Soothſayer, who had foretold him what is to be ſeen in the two verſes, which are in the cloſe of a paſſage, I am now to tranſcribe, would have anſwered much better than the author of the Latin diſtich already cited. The paſſage is taken out of Mr Chevreau, and is here very much to the purpoſe; for it relates to the imprudence of old men, who marry. ‘ If you had conſidered ſeriouſly the principal end of marriage, you ‘ would eaſily have perceived, that this principal ‘ end does not belong to us, who are eighty years ‘ old: and I offer, at a venture, to maintain at my own ‘ expence the nurſes of the firſt-fruits of your family, ‘ provided you have no helper, and do not delight in ‘ rocking other folks children in your own cradle (6). ‘ The advice of St Paul, *That it is better to marry than* ‘ *to burn*, in my opinion, does neither belong to ‘ you, nor to me: and I could relate to you many ‘ examples and authorities of the ridiculouſneſs of old ‘ men, who reſolve to marry, when they ought to ‘ think of their funerals. This ridiculouſneſs is ‘ always mortal; and you may underſtand me with‘ out a commentary, when I remind you of the verſes, ‘ which Hardy puts in the mouth of a confident of ‘ Alcyoneus, who thought that, in order to get the ‘ dominions of his king, the way was to marry his ‘ daughter.

One torch ſhall light you to your bed and grave (7).

Let us add to this a paſſage of Guy Patin. *A counſellor of the Great Chamber, being very old, and almoſt upon the brink of the grave, will needs marry a pretty young daughter of another counſellor. I believe the good man fancies he ſhall do a fine exploit; but conſider how well qualified*

(1) Paul Jovius, in Elog. *cap. lxxxi, pag.* 190.

(2) *It is in Paul Jovius, ibid.*

(3) Animaſque in vulnere ponunt. *Virgil. Georg. lib. iv, ver.* 238.

(4) Sacra Eleuſinia patefacta, *pag.* 181, 182. *Edit. Francof.* 1684.

(5) Homer. Iliad. lib. ii, ver. 298.

(6) *Chevreau's Miſcellanies, Part i, pag.* 149, *in a letter dated Octob.* 13, 1693.

(7) Ibid. *pag.* 150.

ſeventy four years [*B*], and was interred in the cloiſter of the Carmelites (*a*). It is ſaid, in the inſcription of his monument, that he had reſtored Phyſic to its antient luſtre [*C*], after he had ſeveral times put to flight the many baſe pretenders who diſhonoured it. His letters are the beſt of his works (*b*). Calcagninus commends them, and ſpeaks of their author with great eſteem [*D*].

(a) See the remark [*B*].

(b) They are divided into twenty books: you may find a ſummary of them in Geſner's Bibliotheque.

qualified theſe good men are to judge our cauſes, who commit ſuch follies (8). We have ſeen in another place (9) what Dr Patin ſaid of ſuch another amour of Dr De Lorme a famous Phyſician, and who, as ſome ſay, met with a fate very different from that of our Manard; he was the occaſion of the death of his young ſpouſe, and thereby ſhewed, that the aphoriſm, *The weakeſt goes to the wall*, is not always true.

[*B*] *He died in March*, 1536, *at the age of ſeventy four years.*] This is ſet down in his epitaph. Brother Auguſtin Superbi of Ferrara is miſtaken, when he affirms, that our Manard died in 1545 (10). Geſner, on the other ſide, who wrote his *Bibliotheque* in 1544, and who tells us, that he heard ſome ſay, that Manard died about ſix years before (11), was not well informed.

[*C*] *It is affirmed, that he reſtored Phyſic to it's antient luſtre.*] The words of his epitaph are theſe (12): ‘Ann. P. M. L. X (13). Continenter tum docendo & ſcribendo, tum innocentiſſime medendo omnem Medicinam ex arce bonarum literarum fœde prolapſam, & in Barbarorum Poteſtatem ac ditionem redactam, proſtratis ac profligatis hoſtium copiis identidem ut Hydra renaſcentibus in Antiquum Priſtinumque ſtatum ac nitorem reſtituit - - - - *By conſtantly teaching, and writing, and healing in the moſt innocent manner, he reſtored Phyſic to it's antient ſtate and luſtre, which had been ſhamefully abuſed, vanquiſhing and putting to flight it's enemies, which were perpetually ſpringing up.*’

[*D*] *Calcagninus ſpeaks of Manard with very great eſteem.*] It is in a letter he wrote to Eraſmus in 1525, wherein you may ſee that, having declared his affliction for the death of Leonicenus, he adds (14): ‘Una res mihi ſolatio fuit, quod Joannes Manardus, vir Græce & Latine doctiſſimus, rem medicam & naturæ arcana iiſdem veſtigiis proſequitur, cujus rei ſpecimen dare poſſunt epiſtolæ, quas proxime edidit: eas puto in manus tuas perveniſſe, quod ſi nondum perveniſſe ſignificaveris, dabo operam, ut quamprimum ad te perferantur. Scripſit ille quidem alia plurima digna immortalitate, ſed vir minime ambitioſus ea nondum publicam materiam fecit: hoc ſuperſtite minus Leonicenum deſideramus. - - - *One thing afforded me conſolation; namely, that Manard, a very learned man both in the Greek and Latin languages, follows Phyſic and the ſecrets of nature on the ſame ſteps; of which you may ſee a ſpecimen in the letters he lately publiſhed: I ſuppoſe they are come to your hands; but if not, I will take care they ſhall be brought to you as ſoon as poſſible. He wrote likewiſe many other things worthy of immortality; but, being a man of the leaſt ambition, he has not yet made them public: while this man lives, we the leſs want Leonicenus.*’

(8) Patin, *Letter xcvi, pag.* 383, *of Tom. i.*

(9) In the article LORME (N. de), remarks [*D*] and [*E*].

(10) F. Agoſtino Superbi da Ferrara, Theologo, e Predicatore de Minori Conventuali, Apparato de gli huomini illuſtri della Citta di Ferrara, *pag.* 74.

(11) Geſner, in Biblioth. *fol.* 455.

(14) Calcagninus, Epiſt. liv, lib. xx, inter Eraſmianas, *pag.* 1019.

---

(12) It is in *Agoſtino Superbi, ubi ſupra*, who ſays it is to be ſeen in the cloiſter of the Carmelites of Ferrara. It is more perfect in the *Itinerarium Italiæ* of Andrew Schott, *fol. m.* 114.

(13) I do not know whether theſe four letters ſignify *plus minus ſexaginta.*

MANCINELLUS (Antony) was an excellent Grammarian of the XVth century. He taught in the college of Rome, and afterwards went to Venice by the advice of Pomponius Lætus (*a*), and continued to publiſh ſeveral books of Literature [*A*]. It is ſaid, that having made an oration againſt the immoralities of Alexander VI, that Pope was ſo enraged, that he ordered his tongue to be cut out, and his hands cut off (*b*). The two authors whom I quote for this fact, are, the one a good Catholic, and the other a good Proteſtant. I ſhall quote a third, who gives us a little more particular account of the matter [*B*].

(a) See the verſes, which Geſner cites, fol. 59 *verſo, of his* Bibliotheque.

(b) Prateolus, Hiſtory of the Church, Vol. ii, fol. 304, *verſo. Creſpin, of the State of the Church, pag. m.* 502.

[*A*] *He continued to publiſh ſeveral books of Literature.*] You will find the titles of moſt of them in Geſner's *Bibliotheque*, who obſerves, that Mancinellus's Commentary on the firſt book of Cicero's Rhetorics *ad Herennium*, was printed at Venice in the year 1497, in the preſence of the author. I add, that Mancinellus made notes on Horace, Juvenal, Suetonius, *&c.* and corrections on Laurentius Valla's *Elegantiæ*. He likewiſe compoſed orations, and Latin verſes, which have been inſerted in the ſecond volume of the *Deliciæ Poëtarum Italorum*.

[*B*] *I will quote a third author, who gives us a little more particular account of the matter.*] Mr Du Pleſſis Mornai, alledging thoſe, who ſpoke againſt the papacy under Alexander VI, begins with citing a paſſage of Jerom, Paul Catalan, and then adds (1), ‘Antony Mancinellus was ſtill more bold. On a ſolemn day, juſt as the proceſſion was ſetting forward, mounted on a white horſe, according to cuſtom, he made an oration at Rome before all the people, againſt Alexander VI, openly reproving his irregular, ſcandalous, and abominable behaviour; and having finiſhed it, he threw copies of it among the people. Alexander cauſed him to be ſeized, and both his hands to be cut off: as ſoon he was cured, he made a more bold ſpeech on another feſtival; and then Alexander ordered his tongue to be cut out, of which he died *.’ Coëffeteau could anſwer nothing to this, *but that he knew not what to believe of it. There are few perſons, except ſuch as are of a melancholy diſpoſition, who ſet ſo little value on their lives* (2). Without doubt, he knew not, that the Hieronymus Marius, whom Du Pleſſis had cited, and whom he calls Hieroſme le Maire, was an author, who fled from Italy, for the liberty of profeſſing the Proteſtant religion. In a word, it is the Jerom MASSARIUS, whoſe article you will find below. The Jeſuit Gretſer (3) had but an imperfect knowledge of him; but yet he has charged him with being an enemy to the Popes. I know not whether this adventure of Mancinellus can be proved by any other teſtimony than this; but I doubt not, that the teſtimony of all thoſe, I have any knowledge of, who have ſpoken of it, is derived mediately or immediately from him. I have read in the *Diarium* of Burchard, a particular which relates to this affair: namely, that, on the firſt Sunday of Advent 1502, the duke of Valentinois, ſon of Alexander VI, ordered the hand and the end of the tongue of a man maſked, who had ſpoken ill of him, to be cut off. For two days his hand was ſeen hanging at a window, the end of the tongue being faſtened to the little finger. *Eadem die ſero quidam maſcheratus uſus eſt per Burgum quibuſdam verbis inhoneſtis contra Ducem Valentinum, quod Dux intelligens fecit eum capi & duci ad curiam ſanctæ crucis, & circa nonam noctis fuit ei abſciſſa manus, & anterior pars linguæ, quæ fuit appenſa parvo digito manus abſciſſæ, & manus ipſa feneſtra curiæ ſanctæ crucis appenſa, ubi manſit ad ſecundum diem* (4). Many things, as unlike as theſe two, have ſerved as a foundation to one another, by a metamorphoſis, to which hiſtorical facts are very ſubject. I do not affirm, that this is the preſent caſe; but, that it may be enquired into, whether ſome mixture of accidents may not have confounded matters here, I will relate a ſtory, which Thomaſi tells immediately after that of the unknown perſon, whoſe tongue and hand were cut off.

‘The Pope, and the duke of Valentinois, being informed, that a brother of one John Lorenzo of Venice, at that time famous for his learning, had tranſlated into Latin, and even ſent to Venice, to be printed there, ſome libels, which he had cauſed to be rendered into Greek (5), againſt the life of the one and the other, by the ſaid John Lorenzo, who was ſince dead, they gave orders to ſeize him, taking all the precautions to keep the matter ſecret,

(1) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 567.

* *Hieronymus Marius, in Euſebio Captivo.*

(2) Coëffeteau, Rêponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 1213, 1214.

(3) Gretſer, in Exam. Myſt. Pleſſæani, *pag.* 552.

(4) Burchard, in Diario, *pag.* 78, 79. See alſo Thomaſo Thomaſi, in the Life of Cæſar Borgia, *pag.* 367.

(5) This paſſage has not been rightly tranſlated: the original Italian imports, that theſe books had been written in Greek by John Lorenzo, and that they were found among his papers.

ſecret, and with all poſſible diligence: they ordered all his effects and papers to be taken from him, whether they belonged to him or his brother; of which the republic was ſoon apprized, being very particularly intereſted in the perſons and goods of theſe brothers: for which reaſon ſhe immediately ſent orders to her ambaſſador to intercede as powerfully as poſſible with the Pope, in her name, for the releaſe of this priſoner. The ambaſſador performed his orders as ſoon as poſſible, preſſing his holineſs in an extraordinary manner, in a long audience which he had of him, and preſenting to him the ſenate's letters, to grant him the enlargement of the perſon he demanded; to whom the Pope anſwered, that he could not have thought the republic would have intereſted itſelf ſo far in behalf of the priſoner, and that he was extreamly ſorry he could not comply with her demands; ſince the proceſs, and the life of the perſon, for whom ſhe interceded, were already at an end, he having been ſtrangled, and thrown into the Tiber ſome nights before (6).’

I have only to obſerve farther, that Auguſtin Niphus, ſpeaking of the witty ſayings, which we ought to avoid, that we may not run any hazard, makes uſe of the example of Jerom Mancionus a Neapolitan, whoſe tongue Cæſar Borgia ordered to be cut out (7).

(6) Thomaſo Thomaſi, *Life of* Cæſar Borgia, *pag*. 368, 369.

(7) Cum Hieronymus Mancionus Neopolitanus adverſus Cæſarem Borgiam uſus eſſet talibus aculeatis ſermonibus, & à Cæſare linguæ mutilatione in illum animadverſum eſt. *Aug. Niphus, de Aulico, lib. i, in fine, pag. m.* 337.

MANDUCUS. Thus the Romans called certain figures, which they produced in plays, or at other publick ſports [*A*], to make ſome laugh, and to terrify others. It is not difficult to gueſs why theſe figures were thus called. We need only remember, that they had great cheeks, a great open mouth, and long and ſharp teeth, with which they made a ſtrange cracking noiſe. Juvenal informs us, that children were very much frightened at them (*a*). And from hence doubtleſs the mothers took occaſion to threaten their children, who would not obey their commands, that Manducus would come and eat them (*b*). It therefore became a nocturnal ſcare-crow, or ſpectre. This did not ill agree with the tradition of the Lamiæ; for it was ſaid, that they alſo devoured children. If we may believe Scaliger [*B*], Manducus was called Pytho Gorgonius, by a Poet, who thus intituled a Dramatic piece. This Poet applied himſelf chiefly to the Comedies called *Atellanæ*, wherein the figures, I am ſpeaking of, chiefly took place. Our remarks contain a proof of all this. In a parallel between the ancient and modern cuſtoms, we ſhould join together Manducus and Bugbear. See the article ACCO.

(*a*) Tandemque redit ad pulpita notum
Exodium cum perſonæ pallentis hiatum
In gremio matris formidat ruſticus infans. *Juvenal, Sat. III, ver.* 174.

(*b*) *See the commentary upon the emblems of Alciatus, pag.* 717, *of the Edit. of Padua,* 1661.

[*A*] *Or at other public ſports.*] I prove it by theſe two verſes of Plautus (1).

C H. Quid ſi aliquo ad ludos me pro Manduco locem?
L A. Quapropter? C H. Quia pol clare crepito dentibus.

C H. What if I let myſelf out to the public games for a Manducus? L A. Why ſo? C H. Becauſe I make an excellent cracking with my teeth.

Upon which the commentator Philippus Paræus makes this note, which he borrowed from Scaliger (2). ‘Manducus eſt μορμολυκεῖον quod in ludis circumferebatur inter cæteras ridicularias & formidoloſas perſonas, magnis malis, lateque dehiſcens & clare crepitans dentibus. - - - - - *Manducus was a frightful figure, carried about in ſhews among other ridiculous and terrifying pageants, with great cheeks, a wide gaping mouth, and making a loud cracking with it's teeth.*’ Scaliger adds, that this was done chiefly when the *Atellanæ* were acted, and cites the paſſage I have related out of Juvenal. ‘Dentes, *continues he*, magnos & voracitatem attribuebant nocturnis illis terriculamentis; quo nomine factum ut Lamiam puerorum infantium deglutricem fingerent. - - - - - *They aſcribed great teeth and voracity to thoſe nocturnal ſcare-crows: hence it was, they feigned, that Lamia devoured young children.*’

[*B*] *If we may believe Scaliger.*] Here is the ſequel of the words, cited in the preceding remark. ‘Inde Pomponius Atellanarius Poëta inſcripſit exodium quoddam Pythonem Gorgonium, qui nihil aliud erat, ut puto, quam ille Manducus, de quo dixi. Nam Pythonem pro terriculamento, & Gorgonium pro Munduco, quia γοργόνες cum magnis dentibus pingebantur. Itaque apud Nonium ita leges, *gumiæ Guloſi*. Lucillius libro xxx.

Illo quid fiat Lamia, & Pytho oxyodontes.
Quo veniunt illæ gumiæ, vetulæ, improbæ, ineptæ.

‘*From thence Pomponius, the Atellanarian Poet, intituled, a certain interlude Pytho Gorgonius, which was no other, I believe, than the Manducus, I have been ſpeaking of; becauſe the Gorgons were painted with great teeth. Hence in Nonius you meet with* Gumiæ Guloſi, *i. e.* Gluttons; *and in Lucilius, book xxx;*’

Illo quid fiat Lamia, *&c.*

(1) Rudent. Act. ii, Scen. vi, ver. 51.

(2) Scalig. in Varron. de Ling. Lat. *pag.* 150.

MANICHEES, heretics, whoſe infamous ſect, founded by one Manes [*A*], begun in the IIId century, and eſtabliſhed itſelf in ſeveral provinces, and ſubſiſted a very long time. They taught ſuch doctrines, as ought to inſpire us with the greateſt horror.

[*A*] *A ſect founded by one Manes.*] He was a Perſian by nation, of a very mean birth, but *well-ſhaped, and of a good wit*, which was the reaſon that a widow, who bought him, *took a liking to him, adopted him for her ſon, and took care to have him inſtructed, by the magi, in the diſcipline and philoſophy of the Perſians; wherein he improved ſo much, that being otherwiſe naturally eloquent, and expreſſing himſelf eaſily, and with a good grace, he acquired the reputation of a ſubtile and learned Philoſopher* (1). He ſtudied chiefly the books of a certain Arabian called Scythianus, and took from him the greateſt part of his wicked doctrines. Terebinthus, heir to the eſtate, money, and impieties of Scythianus, had brought upon himſelf a great perſecution, for having publiſhed ſome doctrines in Perſia, and fled to this widow's houſe. He made a very tragical end; his books and money remained with the widow, and by this means Manes found in her houſe the writings of Scythianus. ‘When, according to his cuſtom, he aſcended in the night-time to the top of the houſe (2) to invoke, upon the platform, the demons of the air, which the Manichees have ſince practiſed in their execrable ceremonies, he was ſuddenly ſtruck with a blow from heaven, which threw him down from the top to the bottom upon the ground, whereby his head was cruſhed, and his neck broken (3).’ St Epiphanius relates, that Scythianus had the ſame fate; that is, that he fell from the top of the houſe (4). Others ſay, that the devil carried Terebinthus into a deſert, and there ſtrangled him, and that Scythianus was cruſhed under the ruins of his houſe at Jeruſalem. *Scythianus autem domus ſuæ ruina oppreſſus miſeri periit. Diſcipulum autem & ſucceſſorem doctrinæ ſuæ habuit quendam nomine Buddam, cognomine Terebinthum, qui & ipſe à Satana in ſolitudinem abreptus ſtrangulatus eſt* (5). They ſay alſo that Manes married the widow, who enfranchiſed him (6,) and hereby they find a continuation of the parallel they make between him and Mahomet. They add, that he was flea'd alive, becauſe of the enchantments and withcraft he uſed, to kill the king's ſon. *Poſtquam ſuis incantationibus Regis*

(1) Maimbourg's Hiſtory of St Leo, *book i, pag.* 11.

(2) *That is, the widow's houſe.*

(3) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra.

(4) Epiphan. adv. Hæreſ. *pag.* 620.

(5) Lamb. Danæus, notis in librum Auguſt. de Hæreſibus, *fol.* 118. *verſo.*

(6) Id. ib. *fol.* 120.

horror. Their weakneſs did not conſiſt, as at firſt it may ſeem, in their doctrine of two principles, one good, and the other bad; but in the particular explications they gave of it, and in the practical conſequences they drew from it [*B*]. It muſt be confeſſed, that this

gis Perſarum filium necaſſet, vivus ab eo excoriatus eſt (7). But it is much more probable, that he did all he could to cure him. It is certain, that he pretended to reſtore his health, but did not perform his promiſe. ‘ The report being ſpread every where of the great power, he ſaid he had of working miracles, he was ſent for by king Sapores, to cure his ſon who was very ſick. At firſt, this bold deceiver drove away all the Phyſicians, who had undertaken the cure of this young prince, and promiſed the king to reſtore him quickly to perfect health, without any other remedy, but that of his own prayers (8). But the child dying in his arms, the king, enraged againſt him, cauſed him to be impriſoned; but he eſcaped, and fled into Meſopotamia. There he was twice confuted in two ſolemn diſputes, by the holy and learned biſhop Archelaus *, who, with difficulty, ſaved him from the fury of the people, who would have torn him in pieces. Neverthelеſs this ſecured him but a little while; for ſoon after he was re-taken by ſome horſemen, who were ſent every where after him, and carried to Sapores, who cauſed him to be flea'd alive, and then threw his body to the dogs, to be devoured by them, and hanged up his ſkin, ſtuffed with ſtraw, before one of the gates of the city (9).’

[*B*] *The explications they gave of it, and the practical conſequences they drew from it.*] According to the Manichees (10), the two principles fought together, and this conflict occaſioned a mixture of good and evil. Ever after the good principle laboured to ſeparate what belonged to him: he ſpread his virtue among the elements, to make in them this ſeparation. The elect alſo laboured in it; for all that was impure in the meat, they did eat, ſeparated from the particles of the good principle, and then theſe particles, thus ſevered and purified, were tranſported to the kingdom of GOD, their firſt country, in two veſſelsappointed for that purpoſe. Theſe two veſſels are the ſun and moon. *Ipſam vero boni à malo purgationem ac liberationem non ſolum per totum mundum, & de omnibus ejus elementis virtutem Dei facere dicunt; verum etiam Electos ſuos per alimenta quæ ſumunt, & eis quippe alimentis, ſicuti univerſo mundo, Dei ſubſtantiam perhibent eſſe commixtam, quam purgari putant in Electis ſuis eo genere vitæ, quo vivunt Electi Manichæorum, velut ſanctius & excellentius auditoribus ſuis* (11). . . . . *Quicquid vero undique purgatur luminis per quaſdam naves (quas eſſe lunam & ſolem volunt) regno Dei tanquam propriis ſedibus reddi* (12). Theſe Heretics ‘ imagined, that, to ſave ſouls, GOD had made a great machine, compoſed of twelve veſſels, which inſenſibly carried the ſouls up, and afterwards unladed them in the moon, which, having purified theſe ſouls by it's rays, conveyed them into the ſun, and into glory, and hereby they explained the different appearances of the moon. It was in the full, when the veſſels brought thither a multitude of ſouls, and it decreaſed in proportion as theſe ſouls were removed out of it into glory (13).’ There were in theſe veſſels, ſaid they, certain virtues, which aſſumed the ſhape of a man, on purpoſe to make the women of the other party fall in love with them; for, during the motions of luſt, the light which is entangled in the members, flies away, and is received into the tranſport veſſels which reſtore it to it's natural place. *Eſſe autem in eis navibus ſanctas virtutes, quæ ſe in maſculos transfigurant, ut illiciant fœminas gentis adverſæ, & per hanc illecebram commota eorum concupiſcentia fugiat de illis lumen, quod membris ſuis permixtum tenebant, & purgandum ſuſceperant ab Angelis lucis, purgatumque illis navibus imponatur ad regna propria reportandum* (14). While ſome virtues aſſumed the ſhape of a man, others took upon them that of a woman, to entice men to love them, and ſo reciprocally to make the laſcivious fires ſeparate the ſubſtances of light from the ſubſtances of darkneſs. *Certe illi libri Manichæi ſunt omnibus ſine dubitatione communes, in quibus libris illa portenta ad illiciendos, & per concupiſcentiam diſſolvendos utriuſque ſexus principes tenebrarum, ut liberata fugia ab eis, quæ captivata tenebratur in eis divina ſubſtantia, de maſculorum in fœminas, & fœminarum in maſculos transfiguratione conſcripta ſunt* (15). If you add to this, that they fancied, that the parts of light were much more intermixed with the parts of darkneſs, in perſons that do the work of generation, than in others (16), you may underſtand the monſtrous alliance they made between theſe two doctrines, one of which was, that men muſt not marry, nor procreate children; the other that they may give the reins to the tranſports of nature, provided they hinder conception. *Et ſi utuntur conjugibus, conceptum tamen generationemque devitant, ne divina ſubſtantia quæ in eos per alimenta ingreditur vinculis carneis ligetur in prole* (17). It ſeems, they believed that Saclas, one of the princes of darkneſs, a greater devourer of children than Saturn, could not find a better way of holding in cloſe priſon the divine particles he had eaten, than that of generation, and that for this end he came near his wife, and begot two children on her, which were Adam and Eve. *Adam & Evam ex parentibus principibus fumi aſſerunt natos, cum pater eorum nomine Saclas ſociorum ſuorum fœtus omnium devoraſſet, & quicquid inde commixtum divinæ ſubſtantiæ ceperat, cum uxore concumbens in carne prolis, tanquam tenaciſſimo vinculo, colligaſſet* (18). Now becauſe they looked upon their elect as very good purifiers, I mean as perſons, who did admirably filter the parts of the divine ſubſtance, entangled and impriſoned in the aliments (19), they gave them the principles of generation to eat; and it is ſaid, that they mixed them with the ſymbols of the Euchariſt, a thing ſo abominable, that the biſhop of Meaux had reaſon to ſay, *That one dares not think, and much leſs write it* (20). The words of St Auguſtin are theſe: ‘ Qua occaſione vel potius execrabilis ſuperſtitionis quadam neceſſitate coguntur Electi eorum velut Euchariſtiam conſperſam cum ſemine humano ſumere, ut etiam inde, ſicut de aliis cibis quos accipiunt, ſubſtantia illa divina purgetur (21). . . . Ac per hoc ſequitur eos, ut ſic eam & de ſemine humano, quemadmodum de aliis ſeminibus, quæ in alimentis ſumunt, debeant manducando purgare. Unde etiam Cathariſtæ appellantur, quaſi purgatores, tanta eam purgantes diligentia, ut ſe nec ab hac tam horrenda cibi turpitudine abſtineant (22). - - - - *Upon which occaſion, or rather compelled by an execrable ſuperſtition, their elect are obliged to take as it were the ſacrament ſprinkled with human ſeed; that from thence alſo, as from other kinds of food which they take, that divine ſubſtance may be purged. . . . . They likewiſe purge this ſubſtance by human ſeed, as well as by other kinds of ſeed, which they take in their food. Whence alſo they are called Puriſts, that is purgers; purging it ſo diligently, that they abſtain not even from this horrid and ſhameful food.*’ They did not own, that they committed this abomination; but it is pretended, that they were convicted of it (23): let us recite the words of a modern writer, ‘ As they believed, that the ſpirit came from a good principle, and that the fleſh and the body were from an ill one, they taught, that men ought to hate, deſpiſe, and diſhonour it by all ways poſſible; and, upon this infamous pretence, there is no ſort of execrable uncleanneſs, wherewith they did not defile themſelves in their aſſemblies (24).’ St Auguſtin does not attribute to them this; yet I do not ſay, that Maimbourg is miſtaken, for the doctrine and conduct of the Manichees is related many different ways; which happened without doubt, either becauſe they varied their doctrine from age to age, or becauſe all their cotemporary doctors did not explain it after the ſame manner; or laſtly, becauſe all their adverſaries did not rightly underſtand them. It was thought fit to deſtroy all the books of the Manichees: which may have been of ſome uſe; but this little inconvenience ariſes from it, that we cannot be ſure of their doctrine, as we might have been by conſulting the works of their moſt learned authors. By the fragments of their ſyſtem, which we meet with in the fathers, it plainly appears, that they were not happy in their hypotheſes, when they came to particulars. Their firſt hypotheſis was falſe, and it grew worſe in their hands by the little art and philoſophical ſkill they employed in explaining and applying it.

[*C*] *This*

---

(7) Id. ib.

(8) St Epiphan. pag. 621, *ſays however, that he uſed remedies.* Τινὰ εἴδη φαρμακευτικῆς προενέγκας. Cum medicamenta quædam adhibuiſſet.

* *Hier. de Script. Eccl. in Archelao.*

(9) Maimb. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 13, 14.

(10) Auguſt. de Hæreſ. *cap. xlvi.*

(11) Id. ib. *fol.* 115. Edit. Lamberti Danæi.

(12) Ibid. *fol.* 115. *verſo.*

(13) Baſnage, Hiſt. of the Religion of the Reformed Churches, *Tom. i, p.* 125, 126.

(14) Auguſt. ubi ſupra.

(15) Id. ib. *fol.* 116.

(16) In cæteris autem hominibus, etiam in ipſis auditoribus ſuis, hanc partem bonæ divinæque ſubſtantiæ, quæ mixta & colligata in eſcis & potibus detinetur, maximeque in eis qui generant filios, arctius & inquinatius colligari putant. *Ibid. fol.* 115.

(17) Auguſtin. ibid. *fol.* 117.

(18) Id. ib.

(19) See the laſt remark.

(20) Hiſt. of the Variations, *book xi, num. xv, pag. m.* 129.

(21) Auguſt. ib. *fol:* 115. *verſo.*

(22) Ib. *fol.* 116. *verſo.*

(23) Ib. *fol.* 116.

(24) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 17, 18.

this falſe tenet, which is much more ancient than Manes [*C*], and cannot be maintained by

[*C*] *This falſe tenet is much more ancient than Manes.*] We have already ſeen, that he found it in the books which Terebinthus inherited from his maſter Scythianus. It is not true, as St Epiphanius ſuppoſes that this Scythianus lived in the times of the apoſtles (25); he ſhould have ſaid only, that he might have been Manes's grandfather: But it is very true, that the doctrine of two principles was known in the world a long time before the preaching of the apoſtles. Scythianus was indebted to Pythagoras for it, if we may believe Epiphanius (26). Some ſay (27), that Terebinthus borrowed it from Empedocles. The Gnoſtics, Cerdonians, Marcionites, and ſeveral other ſectaries, who introduced this bad doctrine into Chriſtianity, before Manes was ſpoken of, were not the inventers of it: they found it in the Pagan Philoſophers. Plutarch informs us of the antiquity and univerſality of this ſyſtem, not as a mere hiſtorian, but as a faithful follower of it. ‘It is impoſſible, ſays he (28), that one cauſe alone, whether good or bad, ſhould be the principle of all things together, becauſe God is not the cauſe of evil, and the harmony of this world is compoſed of contraries, like a harp, whoſe muſic conſiſts of high and low notes; as Heraclitus ſaid, and to the ſame purpoſe Euripides alſo:

The good was never ſeparated from the evil,
The one is always mixed with the other,
That all things in the world may go on the better.

‘Wherefore this opinion is very ancient being deſcended from Divines and Lawgivers, in times paſt, to the Poets and Philoſophers, but without its being known who was the firſt author of it; although it is ſo firmly imprinted in the minds of men, that it can by no means be defaced or rooted out: it is ſo frequently taught, not only in private diſcourſe, and common reports, but at the ſacrifices and divine ceremonies of the gods, as well in the barbarous nations, as among the Greeks in many places, that neither does this world float in uncertainty, without being governed by providence and reaſon; neither is it one reaſon alone, which maintains and governs it with I know not what rudders, and reins of obedience; but there are many of them mixed with good and evil; and to ſpeak openly, there is nothing here below, which nature brings forth and produces, that is in itſelf pure and ſimple; nor is there one only diſpenſer of the two veſſels, who diſtributes to us all affairs, as a Vintner does his wines, by mingling and brewing them one with another. Thus this life is governed by two principles and two powers contrary to one another; one of which directs and conducts us to the right hand by a right way, and the other, on the contrary, diverts us from it, and turns us back. Thus this life is mixed, and this world, if not all of it, yet at leaſt the lower and terreſtrial part of it below the moon, is unequal and variable, ſubject to all the changes that are poſſible: For nothing can be without a preceding cauſe, and what is good in it ſelf can never be the cauſe of evil; nature therefore muſt have a principle and cauſe, from which evil proceeds, as well as another, from which good proceeds. This is the opinion of the greateſt part, and the wiſeſt among the ancients; for ſome think, there are two gods acting in an oppoſite manner; the one the author of all good, and the other of all evil: Others call him God, who is author of all good, and the other a dæmon; as did Zoroaſter the magician, of whom it is ſaid, that he lived five hundred years (29) before the times of the Trojan war. He therefore called the good god Oromazes, and the other Arimanius: And moreover he ſaid, that the one reſembled light more than any other ſenſible thing, and the other darkneſs and ignorance; and that there was between them two, one called Mithres; wherefore the Perſians do ſtill call him, who intercedes and mediates, Mithres; and he taught men to ſacrifice to the one, to deſire of him all good things, and thank him for them; and to the other, to divert and keep off all evil and unfortunate things. . . . (30). The Chaldæans ſay, that, among the gods of the planets as they call them, there are two, who do good, and two who do evil, and three, which are common, and in the middle between both. And as to the opinion of the Greeks concerning this, no body is ignorant of it. That there are two parts of the world, one good, which belongs to Jupiter Olympius, that is, heavenly; the other bad, which belongs to the infernal Pluto: And they feign moreover, that the goddeſs Harmonia, that is, harmony, was born of Mars and Venus, whereof the one is cruel, moroſe, and contentious, and the other mild, loving, and fruitful. Obſerve, that the Philoſophers themſelves agree in this; for Heraclitus openly calls war, the father, king, maſter, and lord of all the world, and ſays, that Homer, when he prayed,

May all war ceaſe in earth and heaven,
Between both gods and men,

did not conſider, that he curſed the generation and production of all things, which come into being by the ſtruggle and contrariety of the paſſions, and that the ſun would not tranſgreſs the bounds, prefixed to him, leſt the furies, the miniſters and aſſiſtants of juſtice, ſhould meet him. And Empedocles ſays, the principle of good is called love and friendſhip, and often *harmonia*; and the cauſe of evil is

A bloody fight, and peſtilential noiſe.

‘As to the Pythagoreans, they denote and ſpecify this by many names, calling the good principle, one, finite, reſting, ſtreight, odd, ſquared, dexter, luminous; and the bad, two, infinite, moving, crooked, even, more long than broad, unequal, ſiniſter, dark. Ariſtotle calls the one Form, and the other Privation. And Plato, ſhadowing, as it were and covering his meaning, in many places, calls one of theſe contrary principles the Same, and the ſecond the Other: But in his book of laws, which he wrote when he was old, he no more calls them by ambiguous and covered names, nor by ſignificant notes, but in plain terms he ſays, that this world is not managed by one ſoul only, but by many, at a venture, at leaſt by two, whereof one is beneficent, and the other contrary to it, and produces contrary effects. And between theſe two there is alſo a third cauſe, which is not without a ſoul, nor without reaſon, nor unmoveable of it ſelf, as ſome think, but adjacent and adhering to the two others.’ Plutarch, in another book (31), ſays expreſly, that the nature of God does not permit him to do any thing but what is good, nor to be angry with any one, nor to hurt him. This author therefore muſt have been perſuaded, that the afflictions, which ſo often torment men, proceed from another cauſe than God, and conſequently that there were two principles, one that did nothing but what was good, and the other which did nothing but what was evil. I add, that the Perſian Philoſophers, who are much ancienter than thoſe of Egypt, have conſtantly taught this doctrine (32).

Plutarch carries it too far when he pretends, that this doctrine appeared in the public acts of religion among the Barbarians and Greeks (33), for though it be true, that the Pagans acknowledged and honoured hurtful gods; yet they taught alſo, both by their books and by their practice, that the ſame God, who ſometimes beſtowed good things upon a nation, did ſome time after afflict it, to take vengeance for ſome offence. If you read the Greek authors never ſo little, you will plainly perceive this: We may ſay the ſame thing of Rome. Read Livy, Cicero, and other Latin writers, you will clearly underſtand, that the ſame Jupiter, to whom ſacrifices were offered for a victory gained, was honoured upon other occaſions, that he might ceaſe to afflict the people of Rome: And though there was one Vejovis, much more inclined to do evil than to do good; nevertheleſs it was believed, that Dijovis, or Dieſpiter, that is, the good Jupiter, darted the thunderbolt. Aulus Gellius expreſſes himſelf in ſuch a manner, that he clearly diſtinguiſhes

(25) St Epiphan. adverſ. Hæreſ. *pag.* 620, ſuppoſes, that Scythianus went to Jeruſalem, to confer with the apoſtles. He went therefore before Titus took the city; and ſo his diſciple could not be cotemporary with Manes in the IIId century.

(26) Ib. p. 619.

(27) Suidas, in Μάνης.

(28) Plutarch, in his treatiſe of Iſis and Oſiris, *pag. m.* 1043. This paſſage in the Greek and Latin edition of Frankfort, 1620, is at *pag.* 369, and following.

(29) He ſhould ſay 5000: ſee the remark [*E*] of the article ZOROASTER, at the beginning.

(30) Ib. p. 1046.

(31) Non poſſe ſuaviter vivi juxta Epicurum *pag.* 1102.

(32) Diog. Laert. in procemio, num. viii. Agathias, Hiſt. lib. ii.

(33) Obſerve, that I cenſure Plutarch only for ſuppoſing, that by the public acts of religion the Greeks teſtified that there were ſome gods, the good Jupiter, for inſtance, who could do nothing but what was good.

by any one, who admits the Holy Scripture, either in whole or in part, would not eaſily be

diſtinguiſhes Jupiter from Vejovis (34). 'Cum Jovem igitur & Dijovem à juvando nominaſſent : eum quoque contra deum, qui non juvandi poteſtatem ſed vim nocendi haberet (nam deos quoſdam ut prodeſſent celebrabant, quoſdam ne obeſſent placabant) *Vejovem* appellaverunt, dempta atque detracta juvandi facultate. . . . . . Simulachrum dei *Vejovis*, quod eſt in æde, de qua ſupra dixi, ſagittas tenet, quæ ſunt videlicet paratæ ad nocendum : quapropter eum deum plerique Apollinem eſſe dixerunt. . . . Virgilium quoque aiunt, multæ antiquitatis hominem ſine oſtentationis odio peritum, numina læva in Georgicis quoque deprecari, ſignificantem quandam vim eſſe hujuſcemodi deorum in lædendo magis quam in juvando potentem. Verſus Virgilii hi ſunt :

In tenui labor, at tenuis non gloria, ſi quem
Numina læva ſinunt, auditque vocatus Apollo (35).

- - - *Having named Jupiter and Dijovis from* juvare *to help ; on the contrary, they called that god, who had not the power of helping, but of hurting,* Vejovis ; *for they honoured ſome gods, that they might aſſiſt them, and ſome they prayed to, leſt they ſhould hurt them. . . . . The image of the god Vejovis, which is in the temple I before mentioned, holds arrows in his hand, to ſhew his readineſs to hurt ; for which reaſon many have taken him for Apollo. . . . . . They ſay likewiſe, that Virgil, who was ſkilled in antiquity without oſtentation, deprecates the unpropitious deities in his Georgics, ſignifying, that theſe gods are more powerful to hurt, than to aſſiſt : He ſays ;*

Though mean the theme, the glory will be great,
If hurtful gods permit, and Phœbus hear my pray'r.

Plutarch is alſo miſtaken, when he thinks, that the Philoſophers and Poets are agreed in the doctrine of two principles. Did he not remember that Homer, the prince of poets, their pattern, their common original ; that Homer, I ſay, ſet only one god over the two veſſels of good and evil ?

Δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείαται ἐν Διὸς οὔδει
Δώρων οἷα δίδωσι, κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων.
Ὧ μὲν καμμίξας δώῃ Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος,
Ἄλλοτε μέν τε κακῷ ὅγε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐθλῷ
Ὧ δέ κε τῶν λυγρῶν δώῃ, λωβητὸν ἔθηκε.
Καί ἑ κακὴ βούβρωστις ἐπὶ χθόνα δῖαν ἐλαύνει·
Φοιτᾷ δ' οὔτε θεοῖσι τετιμένος οὔτε βροτοῖσιν.

Duo quippe dolia jacent in Jovis limine
Donorum quæ dat, *alterum* malorum, alterum vero bonorum :
Cui quidem miſcens dederit Jupiter fulmine gaudens,
Interdum quidem in malum ille incidit, interdum & in bonum :
Cui vero ex malis dederit, injuriis *omnibus* obnoxium facit :
Et illum exitialis dolor acerbiſſimus ſuper terram almam exercet :
Vagaturque, nec diis honoratus neque mortalibus (36).

Two veſſels ſtand before the throne of Jove,
Replete with gifts ; theſe good, the others ill.
On ſome the god that thunders pours them mix'd:
Such lead a chequer'd life of happineſs and woe.
But he, to whom the bad alone he ſends,
Harraſs'd with endleſs miſery and pain,
Wanders, an outcaſt both of gods and men.'

Mr Coſtar has juſtly cenſured theſe words of Mr Girac : *It ſeems, you imitate Homer's Jupiter, and that, drawing out of veſſels, you pour out with both hands, as he did, this diverſity of matter, by chance, and without choice.* Here follows the cenſure. The compariſon 'of Jupiter does me honour ; but it does little honour to him, who alledges it ſo impertinently. Homer *, who is the inventer of this fiction, and Plato, who relates it ‡ in his Republic, do not ſay, that Jupiter, having drawn out of his two veſſels all the goods and evils of life, ſcatters them inconſiderately upon miſerable mortals. They ſay only, that ſometimes he pours them out pure, ſometimes he mixes them ; from whence it comes to paſs, that, among men, ſome are always unhappy, and the fortune of others is nothing but a reciprocal flux of happineſs and miſery (37).' But Mr Coſtar forgot one thing, which deſerved notice : He did not ſay, that of the three things, which Jupiter could do with theſe two veſſels, he does but two of them : For he might either take out of the good veſſel, or out of the bad, or partly out of one, and partly out of the other. Homer took care not to ſpeak of theſe three offices ; for he knew too well, that the firſt never takes place, and I think he had done well to have ſuppreſſed the ſecond ; for is there any man ſo unhappy, as to enjoy no manner of good ? Plato rejected this thought of Homer, becauſe it is eſſential to GOD to do nothing but what is good ; from whence he concluded, that GOD is not the cauſe of ſome events that befal men. Οὐδ' ἄρα ὁ θεὸς, ἐπειδη ἀγαθὸς, πάντων ἂν εἴη αἴτιος, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ λέγουσιν· ἀλλ' ὀλιγων μὲν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις αἴτιος, πολλῶν δὲ ἀναίτιος. πολὺ γὰρ ἐλάττω τἀγαθὰ τῶν κακῶν ἡμῖν. καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀγαθῶν οὐδένα ἄλλον αἰτιατέον· τῶν δὲ κακῶν ἄλλ' ἄττα δεῖ ζητεῖν τα αἴτια, ἀκλ' οὐ τὸν θεὸν. *Non igitur Deus, quam bonus ſit, omnibus cauſa eſt, ut multi dicunt, ſed paucorum quidem hominibus cauſa eſt, multorum vero extra cauſam. Multo enim pauciora nobis ſunt bona quam mala. Et bonorum quidem ſolus Deus cauſa eſt dicendus. Malorum autem quamlibet aliam præter Deum cauſam quærere decet* (38). He ſays, that the Poets, who give us this fiction of two veſſels, ſpeak fooliſhly of GOD, and are guilty of a great ſin. Οὐκ ἄρα ἀποδεκτέον οὔτε Ὁμήρου, οὔτ' ἄλλου ποιητοῦ ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἀνοήτως ἁμαρτάνοντος, καὶ λέγοντος ὡς δοιοὶ πίθοι. *Neque Homeri igitur, neque alterius poëtæ admittendum eſt peccatum, ſtulte de Diis dicentis, in Jovis limine duo jacere dolia* (39). We ſhall elſewhere (40) give a larger account of the Platonic hypotheſis concerning the original of good and evil.

The Apology of Coſtar being very ſcarce in foreign countries, I ſhall make no ſcruple to cite a long paſſage out of it (41). 'Perhaps Mr Girac believed the romance of the roſe, which makes fortune a Vintner, who diſtributes by pots and pints the ſeveral liquors of theſe two veſſels, according to her caprice and fancy ;

Jupiter en toute ſaiſon
A ſur l'iſſue de ſa maiſon,
Ce dit Homer, deux pleins tonneaux,
S'il n'eſt vieulx Homs ne Garçonneaux
Ni n'eſt Dame ni Demoiſelle,
Soit vieille, jeune, laide ou belle,
Qui vie en ce monde reçoive,
Qui de ces deux tonneaux ne boive.
C'eſt une Taverne pleniere,
Dont *Fortune eſt la Taverniere*,
Et en trait en pots & en coupes,
Pour faire à tout le monde ſoupes.
Tous elle en abreuve à ſes mains,
Mais aux uns plus, aux autres moins.
N'eſt nul qui chacun jour ne pinte,
De ces tonneaux, ou quarte ou pinte,
Ou muy, ou ſeptier, ou chopine,
S'il, comme il plaiſt à la mechine,
Ou plene paulme, ou quelque goute,
Que la Fortune au bec luy boute :
Et bien & mal à chacun verſe,
Si comme elle eſt douce & peverſe.

That is,

'*Homer informs us, that Jupiter has always two full veſſels before him ; and that every one, whether old* be refuted, if it were maintained by Pagan Philoſophers, well ſkilled in diſputing [*D*].

---

(34) Aulus Gellius, *lib. v. cap. xii.*

(35) See concerning theſe two kinds of gods, a paſſage of Arnobius, in the remark [*G*] of the article PAULICIANS.

(36) Homer, Iliad. lib. ult. 527.

† Iliad. ω.

‡ Dialog. ii.

(37) Coſtar, Apol. pag. 225.

(38) Plato de Repub. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 605. *D.*

(39) Id. ib.

(40) In the remark [*L*] of the article PAULICIANS.

(41) Coſtar, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 226, 227.

It

‘ *old or young, man or boy, matron or maiden, handſome or ugly, drinks of theſe veſſels. It is a tavern* ‘ *of which fortune is the Vintner, who draws for all the* ‘ *world, and gives them to drink with her own hand, to* ‘ *ſome more, to others leſs. Every one drinks a certain* ‘ *portion, be it pint, quart, or gallon, every day out of* ‘ *this veſſel, as it pleaſes fortune, who mixes to all, good or* ‘ *evil, as ſhe happens to be in good or bad humour.*’

For the reſt, the ancient hereſy of two principles prevails ſtill in ſome oriental countries (42); and it is believed, that it was very common among the ancient barbarous people of Europe. ‘ Apud Sclavos nondum ‘ quidem Chriſti fide imbutos, ſimile dogma receptum ‘ fuiſſe, Helmoldus ‡ auctor eſt, qui malum illorum ‘ Deum *Zeevuboch* vocatum ſcribit. Paria & de aliis ‘ Germanorum populis Voſſius * conjicit. Atque ‘ hodienum, Provinciæ *Fetu* in Africa incolas perſuaſum ſibi habere, eſſe aliquod Numen, cui omnia ‘ mala, aliud cui bona accepta ferenda. Joh. Guil. ‘ Mullerus **, Danicæ in Africa Eccleſiæ quondam Paſtor, teſtatur (43). - - - *Helmoldus tells us, that the Sclavonians, before their converſion to Chriſtianity, held a* ‘ *like opinion: he informs us, that their bad god was* ‘ *called* Zeevuboch. *Voſſius conjectures the ſame of the* ‘ *other nations of the Germans. And John William* ‘ *Muller, formerly miniſter of the Daniſh church in Africa, tells us, that the inhabitants of the province of* ‘ Fetu *in Africa, at this time, aſcribe all the good they* ‘ *receive to one god, and all the bad to another.*’ The Gurdes, a nation in Aſia, worſhip two principles, one as the author of good, the other as the cauſe of evil; but with this difference, that they are infinitely more exact in the worſhip of the latter, than of the former (44).

[*D*] *It would not eaſily be refuted, if it were maintained by Pagan Philoſophers, well ſkilled in diſputing.*] By reaſons *à priori* they would quickly have been routed: but the reaſons *à poſteriori* were their ſtrong holds: with theſe they might have fought a long time, and it would have been difficult to force them. You will underſtand me better by the explication I ſhall now ſubjoin. The moſt certain and moſt clear ideas of order we have, teach us, that a Being, which exiſts by itſelf, which is neceſſary and eternal, muſt be one, infinite, almighty, and endowed with all kind of perfection. If therefore we conſult theſe ideas, we ſhall find nothing more abſurd, than the hypotheſis of two eternal principles, and independent on one another, one of which has no goodneſs, and can put a ſtop to the deſigns of the other. This is what I call reaſons *à priori*; and which neceſſarily lead us to reject this hypotheſis, and to admit only one principle of all things. If nothing but this were required to prove the goodneſs of a ſyſtem, the cauſe would be determined to the confuſion of Zoroaſter, and all his followers. But every ſyſtem requires theſe two things to make it good; one, that the ideas of it be diſtinct; the other, that it accounts for what experience teaches us. We muſt ſee therefore whether the phœnomena of nature can be conveniently explained by the hypotheſis of one principle alone. When the Manichees tell us, that, ſince we ſee in the world many things, that are contrary to one another, as heat and cold, white and black, light and darkneſs, there muſt neceſſarily be two firſt principles (45), they argue pitifully; for the oppoſition between thoſe Beings, however confirmed by what we call variations, diſorders, and irregularities of nature, cannot make one half an objection againſt the unity, ſimplicity, and immutabity of God. All theſe things may be accounted for, either by the different powers God has given to bodies, or by the laws of motion, which he has eſtabliſhed, or from the concurrence of occaſional intelligent cauſes, by which he is pleaſed to act. This does not require the quinteſſences, which the Rabbins have imagined, and which have furniſhed an Italian biſhop with an argument *ad hominem*, in favour of the incarnation. *Di queſta unione parla diffuſamente l'Autore, portando gli eſempi e le ſimilitudini, con cui la ſpiegano i Rabbini (alcune delle quale ſono le medeſime che adoprano i noſtri Theologi per eſplicar l'Incarnaſione) e con le ſteſſe loro dottrine prova evidentemente ch'ella non ſia altro che un inſefiratione, cioe due nature ſefireita, è Divinita inſieme in un ſuppoſto* (46). They ſay, that God has united himſelf to ten moſt pure intelligences called *Sefira*, and that he acts with them in ſuch a manner, that all the variations and imperfections of effects muſt be attributed to them. *Attribuendoſi à Dio ne' ſacri libri atti frà ſe contrarii e imperfetti, per ſalvare l'immutabilita e ſua ſomma perfettione, hanno poſta una Gerarchia di dieci Intelligenze puriſſime, per mezo delle quali, come inſtrumenti della ſua potenza, egli opera tutte le coſe, ma in modo che à loro ſole s'attribuiſce ogni varieta, imperfettione, e mutatione* (47). Without being at the expence of ſuch an hypotheſis, the ſimplicity and immutability of the ways of God may be ſaved; the ſole eſtabliſhment of occaſional cauſes is ſufficient for that, provided we are only to explain the phœnomena relating to bodies, and do not conſider man. The heavens, and the reſt of the univerſe, declare the glory, power, and the unity of God; man alone, that maſter-piece of his creation among things viſible, Man alone, I ſay, affords the greateſt objection againſt the unity of God. The matter is thus:

Man is wicked and unhappy: every one knows it by what he feels in himſelf, and by the intercourſe he is obliged to have with his neighbours. He, who lives only five or ſix years (48), may be perfectly convinced of theſe two things; and they, who live long, and are much engaged in worldly affairs, know this ſtill more clearly. Travels afford perpetual leſſons upon this ſubject: they ſhow every where the monuments of mens misfortunes and wickedneſſes: this appears every where by the many priſons, hoſpitals, gibbets, and beggars. Here you ſee the ruins of a flouriſhing city; elſewhere you cannot even find the ruins of it (49).

Jam ſeges eſt ubi Troja fuit, reſecandaque falce
Luxuriat Phrygio ſanguini pinguis humus (50).

Where the famed Troy once ſtood, now corn is found,
And Phrygian blood manures the fertile ground.

Read theſe fine words taken from a letter that was written to Cicero: ‘ Ex Aſia rediens, cum ab Ægina ‘ Megaram verſus navigarem cœpi regiones circumcirca proſpicere. Poſt me erat Ægina, ante Megara, ‘ dextra Piræeus, ſiniſtra Corinthus: quæ oppida quodam tempore florentiſſima fuerunt, nunc proſtrata & ‘ diruta ante oculos jacent (51). - - - - *Returning out* ‘ *of Aſia, and ſailing from Ægina towards Megara, I* ‘ *began to take a view of the countries on every ſide of* ‘ *me. Behind me was Ægina, before me Megara, on my* ‘ *right hand Piræeus, on my left Corinth: which cities* ‘ *were once in a moſt flouriſhing condition, but now lye* ‘ *in ruins.*’ Studious men, without going out of their cloſets, make the greateſt diſcoveries on theſe two articles; becauſe, in reading hiſtory, they take a view of all the ages and countries of the world. Hiſtory, properly ſpeaking, is nothing but a collection of the crimes and misfortunes of mankind; but we muſt obſerve, that theſe two evils, the one moral, and the other phyſical, do not wholly fill up hiſtory, nor all the experience of private perſons. There are every where ſome things, that are phyſically good and morally good; ſome examples of virtue, and ſome examples of happineſs: and this is that, which makes the difficulty; for if there were none but evil and unhappy men, there would be no occaſion to have recourſe to the hypotheſis of two principles; it is the mixture of happineſs and virtue with miſery and vice, which requires this hypotheſis; and this is the ſtrong hold of the ſect of Zoroaſter.

See the reaſoning of Plato and Plutarch in the paſſages I have cited above.

In order to make it appear how difficult it would be to refute this falſe ſyſtem, and that we may conclude, that it is neceſſary to have recourſe to revelation to overthrow it, let us feign here a diſpute between Meliſſus and Zoroaſter, who were both Pagans, and great Philoſophers. Meliſſus, who acknowledged but one principle (52), would ſay, at firſt, that his ſyſtem agrees admirably well with the ideas of order. The neceſſary Being is not bounded; and therefore is infinite and almighty, and conſequently one; and it would be a monſtrous thing, and a contradiction, if he had no goodneſs, but the greateſt of all vices, *viz.*

an

(42) See the words of Father Thomaſſin, in the remark [*D*] of the article PAULICIANS.

‡ *Helmold. Chronic. Sclav. cap. liii.*

* *Voſſ. de Orig. Idololatr. lib. i, cap. viii, pag.* 280.

** Guill. Muller. *Beſchreibung der Africaniſchen Landſchafft* Fetu, pag. 43, 44.

(43) Tobias Pfannerus, Syſtema Theol. Gentilis, *pag.* 258.

(44) Venerano come i Manichei due principii, uno del bene, e l'altro del male: con queſta differenza che poco penſando al primo, come quello che credono non poter loro far alcun malo, attendono ſolo al culto del ſecondo. *Giornale de Letterati, of the thirty firſt of March*, 1673, *pag.* 33, *in the abſtract of* Viaggio, &c. *of the voyage to the Eaſt Indies, of Vicenzo Maria, of St Catherine of Siena, procurator-general of the Carmelites.*

(45) *See St Epiphanius, when he ſpeaks of Scythianus, pag.* 619, adv. Hæreſ.

(46) *Joſeph Ciantes, biſhop of Marſico*, in diſcurſu de ſanctiſſima Incarnatione clariſſimis Hebræorum doctrinis ab eorumdem argumentorum oppoſitionibus defenſa, *in the Journal of Italy, Aug.* 27, 1668. *pag.* 102.

(47) *The Journal of Italy, ibid. pag.* 101.

(48) At that age he has played and ſuffered malicious tricks; he has had grief and ſorrow, and has powted many times, *&c.*

(49) See Converſation XXX, of Balzac.

(50) Ovid. Epiſt. Penel. ad Ulyſſ. ver. 53.

(51) Sulpicius ad Ciceron. Epiſt. v, lib. iv. Cicer. ad Famil.

(52) See Diogenes Laërtius, *lib. ix, num. xxiv, & ibi Menagium.*

It was a happy thing, that St Auguſtin, who underſtood ſo well all the arts of controverſy,

an eſſential malice. I confeſs to you, would Zoroaſter anſwer, that your ideas are very well connected, and I am willing to grant, that, in this reſpect, your hypotheſis ſurpaſſes mine. I will not inſiſt upon an objection, which I might make uſe of; which is this, that as infinity muſt include every thing that is real, and malice (53) being no leſs a real Being than goodneſs, the univerſe requires, that there ſhould be both wicked and good Beings; and that, ſince a ſovereign goodneſs, and a ſovereign malice, cannot ſubſiſt in one and the ſame ſubject, there muſt be in nature one Being eſſentially good, and another eſſentially evil: I do not inſiſt, I ſay, upon this objection (54); I will allow, that your ſyſtem is more agreeable to the notions of order than mine: but explain to me, I pray, by your hypotheſis, whence it comes to paſs, that man is wicked, and ſo ſubject to pain and grief? I defy you to find in your principles a reaſon of this phænomenon, as I can in mine; and now I have regained the advantage I gave you; for, as you ſurpaſs me in the beauty of ideas, and in reaſons *à priori*, ſo I ſurpaſs you in the explication of phænomena, and in reaſons *à poſteriori*. And ſince the principal character of a good ſyſtem is to account for what experience teaches us, and that the bare incapacity of explaining it, is a proof, that an hypotheſis is not good, how beautiful ſoever it appears, you muſt grant, that I have hit the mark, by admitting two principles, and that you have not hit it, by admitting but one.

Here, without doubt, lies the ſtreſs of the whole matter: here Meliſſus has a great opportunity to ſhow his parts; *Hic Rhodus, hic ſaltus. Res ad triarios rediit. Nunc animis opus, Ænea, nunc pectore firmo.* Let us hear Zoroaſter continuing his diſcourſe.

If man is the creature of one principle perfectly good, moſt holy and omnipotent, can he be expoſed to diſeaſes, to heat and cold, hunger and thirſt, pain and grief? can he have ſo many bad inclinations? can he commit ſo many crimes? can perfect holineſs produce a criminal creature? can perfect goodneſs produce an unhappy creature? would not omnipotence, joined with infinite goodneſs, furniſh his own work plentifully with good things, and ſecure it from every thing that might be offenſive or vexatious? if Meliſſus conſults the notions of order, he will anſwer, that man was not wicked when God made him. He will ſay, that man was created by God in a happy ſtate; but he not following the light of his conſcience, which was intended by the author of his Being to conduct him in the way of virtue, became ſo wicked, and deſerved, that God, who is perfectly juſt as well as perfectly good, ſhould make him feel the effects of his wrath. God therefore is not the cauſe of moral evil, but he is the cauſe of phyſical evil, *i. e.* of the puniſhment of moral evil; a puniſhment, which is ſo far from being inconſiſtent with a principle perfectly good, that it flows neceſſarily from one of his attributes, I mean from his juſtice, which is no leſs eſſential to him than his goodneſs. This anſwer, which is the beſt that Meliſſus could make, is good and ſound at the bottom; but it may be oppoſed by reaſons that have ſomething more ſpecious, and dazzling: for Zoroaſter would not fail to repreſent, that, if man were the work of a principle infinitely good and holy, he ought to have been created not only without any actual evil, but alſo without any inclination to evil, ſince that inclination is ſuch a defect, as could not have ſuch a principle for it's cauſe. It remains therefore, that we ſay, that man, coming out of the hands of his Creator, had only the power of determining himſelf to evil, and that having determined himſelf to it, he was the ſole cauſe of the crime, which he committed, and of the moral evil, which has introduced itſelf into the world. But, I. we have no diſtinct idea, that can make us underſtand, that a Being, which does not exiſt by itſelf, can nevertheleſs act by itſelf. Zoroaſter therefore will ſay, that the free will, which was given to man, is not able actually to determine itſelf, ſince it exiſts continually and totally by the action of God. II. He will put this queſtion: did God foreſee, that man would make an ill uſe of his free-will? if you anſwer yes, he will ſay, that it ſeems not poſſible, that any thing can foreſee that, which depends wholly upon an indeterminate cauſe. But I will grant you, will he ſay, that God did foreſee the ſin of his creature, and from thence I conclude, that he would have hindered him from ſinning; for the ideas of order will not ſuffer us to believe that a cauſe infinitely good and holy, which can hinder the introduction of moral evil, ſhould not hinder it, eſpecially ſince, by permitting it, God was obliged ſeverely to puniſh his own work. If God did not foreſee the fall of man, yet at leaſt he muſt think it poſſible: ſince therefore he ſaw himſelf obliged, in caſe it ſhould happen, to depart from his paternal goodneſs, and to make his children very miſerable, by exerciſing upon them the office of a ſevere judge, he would have determined man to moral good, as he determined him to that which is phyſical; he would not have left in the ſoul of man any power, which ſhould incline him to ſin; any more than he has left any to incline him to miſery as ſuch. This is what our clear and diſtinct ideas of order lead us to, when we follow, ſtep by ſtep, what a principle infinitely good ought to do: for if a goodneſs, ſo bounded as that of earthly fathers neceſſarily requires that they ſhould prevent, as much as is poſſible, the bad uſe their children may make of the good things they give them; much more will an infinite and almighty goodneſs prevent the ill effects of his gifts. Inſtead of giving them free-will, it will determine it's creatures to that which is good; or, if it gives them a free-will, it will alway effectually watch over them, to keep them from ſinning. I believe indeed, that Meliſſus would not remain ſilent; but all that he could anſwer would be preſently oppoſed by reaſons as plauſible as his, and ſo there would be no end of the diſpute (55).

If he had recourſe to retortion, he would very much perplex Zoroaſter; but by once granting him his two principles, he would leave him an open way to come at the explication of the origin of evil. Zoroaſter would go back to the time of the chaos, which is a ſtate, as to his two principles, very like that, which Hobbes calls the ſtate of nature, and which he ſuppoſes to have preceded the firſt eſtabliſhment of ſocieties. In this ſtate of nature one man was a wolf to another, and every thing belonged to the firſt poſſeſſor: none was maſter of any thing, except he was the ſtrongeſt. To get out of this confuſion, every one agreed to quit his right to the whole, that he might have a property in ſomething; they tranſacted together, and the war ceaſed. The two principles, weary of the chaos, wherein each confounded and overthrew what the other would do, came at laſt to an agreement; each of them yielded ſomething, each had a ſhare in the production of man, and in the laws of the union of the ſoul (56). The good principle obtained thoſe, which procure to man a thouſand pleaſures, and conſented to thoſe, which expoſe man to a thouſand ſorrows; and if it conſented, that moral good ſhould be infinitely leſs in mankind than moral evil, he repaired the damage in ſome other kind of creatures, wherein vice ſhould be much leſs than virtue. If many men in this life have more miſery than happineſs, this is recompenſed in another ſtate: what they have not under a human ſhape, they ſhall recover under another (57). By means of this agreement, the chaos was diſembroiled, the chaos, I ſay, a paſſive principle, which was the field of battel between theſe two active principles. The poets have repreſented this diſembroiling under the image of a quarrel ended (58). This is what Zoroaſter might alledge, boaſting that he does not attribute to the good principle the production of a creature at his own pleaſure, which was to be ſo wicked and miſerable; but only after he had found by experience, that he could do no better, nor better oppoſe the horrible deſigns of the evil principle. To render his hypotheſis the leſs offenſive, he might have denied, that there was a long war between the two principles, and lay aſide all thoſe fights, and priſoners, which the Manichees ſpeak of. The whole might be reduced to the certain knowledge of the two principles, that one could never obtain from the other but ſuch and ſuch conditions. And thus an eternal agreement might have been made upon this foot.

A thouſand great difficulties might be objected to this Philoſopher; but as he would find anſwers, and after all deſire to be furniſhed with a better hypotheſis, pretending to have ſolidly refuted that of Meliſſus, he would never be brought back into the way of truth. Human reaſon is too weak for this end: it is a principle verſy, abandoned the Manichean Hereſy; for he would have removed its groſſeſt errors, and framed ſuch a ſyſtem, as, by his management, would have puzzled the Orthodox. Pope Leo I, acted very vigorouſly againſt the Manichees; and his zeal being ſupported by the Imperial laws [*E*], this ſect received then a very great blow. It became formidable in Armenia in the IXth century, as I ſay elſewhere (*a*), and it appeared in France in the

---

(53) That is, a malicious action. I remark this, leſt any one ſhould alledge, that evil is nothing but a privation.

(54) I have read, in the Journal of Italy, of the thirty firſt of Auguſt, 1674, *pag.* 101, that Piccinardi, in the third book of his *Dogmatica Philoſophia Peripatetica Chriſtiana*, refutes this theſis, *An alius Deus ſit poſſibilis*, which was maintained by Father Peter Conti againſt Columera.

(55) All this is more largely diſcuſſed in the remarks of the article PAULICIANS.

(56) *Apply here what Juno ſays to Venus in Virgil, Æneid. lib. iv, ver.* 98.

Sed quis erit modus, aut quo nunc certamine tanto?
Quin potius pacem æternam pactoſque hymenæos
Exercemus? ....
....
Communem hunc ergo populum, paribuſque regamus
Auſpiciis. .....

Let diſcord be no more, but peace eternal
Succeed; and, when the nuptial band is tied,
One common people be our common care.

(57) Note, that all thoſe, or the greateſt part of thoſe, who admitted two principles, held the metempſychoſis.

(58) Hanc Deus & melior LITEM natura diremit.
Nature, and nature's god, this STRIFE *compos'd.*
Ovid. Metam. lib. I, ver. 21.

ciple of deſtruction, and not of edification; it is only fit to ſtart doubts, and to turn itſelf all manner of ways, to perpetuate a diſpute: and I think I am not miſtaken, if I ſay, of natural revelation, that is, of the light of reaſon, what divines ſay of the Moſaical œconomy. They ſay, that it was only fit to diſcover to man his weakneſs, and the neceſſity of a redeemer, and of a law of mercy. It was a ſchoolmaſter (they are their own words) to bring men to JESUS CHRIST. Let us ſay the ſame of reaſon; it can only diſcover to man his ignorance and weakneſs, and the neceſſity of another revelation, which is that of the ſcripture. There we find what is ſufficient to refute unanſwerably the hypotheſis of two principles, and all the objections of Zoroaſter. We find there the unity of GOD, and his infinite perfections; the fall of man, and the conſequences of it. Let any one tell us with a pompous ſhew of arguments, that it was not poſſible, that moral evil ſhould introduce itſelf into the world by the work of a principle infinitely good and holy; we ſhall anſwer, that this was nevertheleſs done, and conſequently that it is very poſſible. There is nothing more fooliſh than to reaſon againſt matter of fact; this maxim, *Ab actu ad potentiam valet conſequentia*, is as clear as this propoſition, two and two make four (59). The Manichees were ſenſible of what I have juſt now obſerved, and therefore they rejected the Old Teſtament; but what they retained of the Scripture ſupplied the orthodox with ſufficient arms againſt them. And ſo it was not very difficult to confound thoſe Heretics, who otherwiſe childiſhly entangled themſelves when they came to particulars (60). Now ſince the Scripture affords us the beſt ſolutions, I cannot be blamed for ſaying, that it would be difficult to gain the victory over a Heathen Philoſopher in this cauſe. This is the text of this remark.

How long ſo ever it be, I ſhall not conclude without advertiſing my reader, that there remains ſtill three obſervations to be made, for which I refer the reader to another article (61). In the firſt, I ſhall conſider, whether the Fathers have always reaſoned well againſt the Manichees, and whether they could always ſilence them. In the ſecond I ſhall ſhew, that, according to the doctrines of Paganiſm, the objections of Zoroaſter had no great force: and in the third, in what ſenſe it may be ſaid, that the Chriſtians do not reject the ſyſtem of the two principles. It is more difficult for them, than the Pagans, to reſolve theſe difficulties, in the way of reaſon, becauſe they have among them diſputes about liberty, in which the aggreſſor ſeems always to have the better (62); and becauſe the ſmall number of thoſe, who are predeſtinated, and the eternity of hell-torments afford ſuch objections, as Meliſſus would not very much fear.

[*E*] *The zeal of Pope Leo was ſupported by the Imperial laws.*] There were Manichees at Rome when St Auguſtin came thither in 383. 'For he lodged in the houſe of a Manichee, and converſed very often with thoſe of that ſect. . . . . . But after Carthage had been taken and deſtroyed by Genſerich king of the Vandals, in 439, the greateſt part of the Manichees in Africa fled, as well as the Catholics, into Italy, &c. and chiefly to Rome (63).' Pope Leo obliged the people to make an exact ſearch after theſe Heretics, and ſhewed by what marks they might be diſcovered (64). 'To create in all men the greater abhorrence of ſo deteſtable a ſect, he held an aſſembly, to which, together with the biſhops, who lived near Rome, he invited the chief of the clergy, of the ſenate, of the nobility of Rome, and of the common people †. There he produced the moſt conſiderable among the Manichees, and one of their biſhops, who made a public confeſſion of their abominable luſts, which I dare not declare, leſt I ſhould offend the ears, or rather the chaſte eyes of my reader; and which thoſe ſame perſons, who had been guilty of them in their ſecret aſſemblies, by order of this falſe biſhop, declared before all the world, and diſcovered at the ſame time what their biſhops and prieſts were, and the ſecret places where they aſſembled, their prophane myſteries and ſacrilegious ceremonies, all which was authentically taken down in writing. And St Leo gave an account of all this to the people a little while after in a ſermon, which he made for the faſt of the Emberweek, wherein he declared ⸸, that they were obliged in conſcience to accuſe thoſe, whom they knew to be engaged in ſo infamous and pernicious a Hereſy; that all ought to unite and act with the ſame zeal, and with equal vigilance, againſt thoſe common enemies; and that thoſe, who thought they ought not to diſcover them, would be guilty of a very criminal ſilence before the great tribunal of JESUS CHRIST, tho' they did not partake in their errors. In fine, he cauſed ſuch diligent ſearch to be made after the Manichees, and was ſo well ſeconded by the people, that none of them could eſcape; ſo that he had the good fortune to deliver Rome entirely from that Hereſy. For many of thoſe Heretics, being ſtrongly affected by his powerful exhortations, were ſeriouſly converted to GOD; and, after they had made a public abjuration of their Hereſy in the church ‡, and ſigned the form, which was preſented to them, containing a condemnation of Manes, and of his doctrine and books, they ſubmitted to the penance, which was impoſed on them. Thoſe who continued obſtinate in their error, and refuſed to ſubſcribe this condemnation, were condemned by the judges to baniſhment, according to the laws and edicts of the emperors. But, becauſe the moſt wicked and dangerous followers of this execrable Hereſy, fearing the puniſhment of their crimes, had fled away; he gave notice of it to the biſhops of Italy, and other provinces, by a circular letter, wherein, after he had declared to them all that was done at Rome in this cauſe of the Manichees, he exhorted them to proſecute thoſe fugitives, and to give all neceſſary orders to prevent their retiring into their dioceſes, proteſting, that they would be inexcuſable before GOD *, if it ſhould ever happen, that any of their ſubjects were ſeduced by theſe impoſtors, for want of due care to diſcover them, to drive them away, and to hinder them from ſpreading among the people the venom of their deteſtable doctrine. And that which finiſhed the extermination of this Hereſy, was, that the emperor Valentinian III, knowing that the holy Pope had diſcovered the crimes of the Manichees, cauſed an edict to be publiſhed **, wherein he confirms and renews all the ordinances of his predeceſſors againſt them, declares them infamous, incapable of any offices, and of bearing arms, making a will, contracting and doing any valid act in civil ſociety; forbids all the ſubjects of the empire to conceal and ſhelter any of them, and requires them to diſcover and proſecute them, that they may be puniſhed as ſoon as they ſhall be known. Thus this Hereſy, which came from Africa into Italy, was quickly baniſhed from it by the effectual zeal of St Leo (65).' Father Thomaſſin does not forget this example of the uſe of penal laws againſt Hereſy. 'St Leo the Pope, *ſays he* (66), in his firſt Decretal, ſays, that ſeveral Manichees were converted at Rome, but that ſome among them were ſo far engaged in thoſe deteſtable errors, that no remedies, that could be uſed, were ſufficient to reclaim them; that afterwards the rigour of the laws had been made uſe of, and, according to the conſtitutions of the Chriſtian princes, the public judges had condemned them to a perpetual baniſhment, leſt their contagious converſation ſhould infect the reſt of the flock.' I put in the margin the words, which he quotes from St Leo (67). A little after, he cites the Code of Juſtinian, to inform us, that the eleventh law of the fifth title of the firſt book condemns *the Manichees to loſe their head in whatever part of the Roman empire they are found.* Manichæo in loco Romano deprehenſo

---

(*a*) *In the article* PAULICIANS, *remarks* [*B*], *and* [*D*].

(59) See the article PAULICIANS, remark [*E*] towards the beginning.

(60) See the remark [*B*].

(61) To that of the PAULICIANS, remarks [*E*], [*G*], and [*H*].

(62) See the remark [*F*] of the article MARCIONITES.

(63) Maimbourg's Hiſt. of St Leo, *book i*, *pag*. 14.

(64) Id. ib. *pag*. 18.

† Ep. 93. ad Turib. Ser. 5. de jejun. decim. menſ.

⸸ Contra communes hoſtes pro ſalute communi una communis debet eſſet vigilantia; . . . . & qui tales non prodendos putant, in judicio Chriſti invenientur rei de ſilentio, etiamſi non contaminentur aſſenſu. *Ser*. 5. *de jejun. decim. menſ.*

‡ Ut damnarent Manichæum cum prædicationibus & diſciplinis ſuis publicâ in Eccleſia profeſſione, & manus ſuæ ſubſcriptione compulimus. *S. Leo. Ep. ii. ad Epiſc. per Italiam: & Epiſt.* 93. *ad Turib. Aſturic.*

* Ante tribunal Domini de reatu negligentiæ ſe non poterit excuſare quicunque plebem ſuam contra ſacrilegæ perverſionis auctores noluerit cuſtodire. *Epiſt. ii. ad Epiſc. per Italiam.*

** Nov. Valent. 3. de Manic.

(65) Maimbourg, ibid. *pag*. 20, ad ann. 443.

(66) *Thomaſſin of the Unity of the Church, Tom. i, pag*. 339.

(67) Aliquanti vero, qui ita ſe demerſerunt ut nullum his auxiliantis poſſet remedium ſubvenire, ſubditi legibus, ſecundum Chriſtianorum Principum conſtituta, ne ſanctum gregem ſua contagione polluerent, per publicos judices perpetuo ſunt exilio relegati.

the time of the Albigenſes (*b*). This cannot be denied: but it is not true, that the Albigenſes were Manichees (*c*). Theſe, among other errors, taught that the ſouls of plants are rational; and condemned Agriculture as a murdering employment; but they permitted it to their hearers in favour of their elect [*F*].

(*b*) *See the biſhop of Meaux's Hiſt. of Variations, book xi.*

(*c*) *See Mr Baſnage, Hiſt. of the Religion of the Reformed Churches, Part i, ch. iv, &c.*

NOTA BENE. As in this article, in that of the MARCIONITES, and PAULICIANS, and ſome others, there are ſome things, which have given offence to ſeveral perſons, and have made them ſuſpect, that I had a mind to favour the Manichean ſect, and raiſe doubts in the minds of my Chriſtian readers, I here GIVE NOTICE, that you will find at the end of this work, a diſſertation to ſhew, that this can by no means weaken the foundations of the Chriſtian Faith.

prehenſo caput amputare (68). The next law, continues he (69), *is of the emperor Juſtin, and it diſtinguiſhes the Manichees not only from the Heretics, but alſo from the Greeks*, that is, *from Pagans, Jews, and Samaritans. The Manichees are puniſhed with death; all others are only condemned as Heretics, who cannot be promoted to any magiſtracy, or dignity, nor diſcharge the office of judges, or patrons, or fathers of cities.*

[*F*] *They permitted Agriculture to their hearers in favour of their elect.*] The Manichees were divided into two orders, that of the elect, and that of the hearers. The former were not allowed to exerciſe Agriculture, or even to gather fruit; the later were allowed to do theſe things, and were aſſured, that the murders, they committed in this exerciſe, were pardoned them by the interceſſion of the particles of GOD, which came out of priſon, when the elect did eat them. Thus the remiſſion of theſe murders was founded upon this, that they furniſhed the elect with food, and procured liberty to the particles of the divine ſubſtance, that were impriſoned in plants. St Auguſtin relates theſe chimæras, and laughs at them as they deſerve. ‘ Cæteras animas & in pecora redire putant, ‘ & in omnia quæ radicibus fixa ſunt, atque aluntur ‘ in terra. Herbas enim atque arbores ſic putant vivere, ut vitam, quæ illis ineſt, & ſentire credant, ‘ & dolere, cum læduntur, nec aliquid inde ſine ‘ cruciatu eorum quenquam poſſe vellere, aut carpere. ‘ Propter quod agrum ſpinis purgare nefas habent. ‘ Unde agriculturam, quæ omnium artium eſt innocentiſſima, tanquam plurium homicidiorum ream ‘ dementes accuſant; ſuiſque auditoribus ideo hæc ‘ arbitrantur ignoſci, quia præbent inde alimenta ‘ electis ſuis, ut divina illa ſubſtantia in eorum ventre ‘ purgata impetret eis veniam, quorum traditur oblatione purganda. Itaque ipſi Electi nec in agris ‘ operantes, nec poma carpentes, nec ſaltem folia ulla ‘ vellentes, expectant hæc afferri uſibus ſuis ab auditoribus ſuis, viventes de tot ac tantis ſecundum ſuam vanita- ‘ homicidiis alienis (70). - - - - *As for other ſouls, they* ‘ *think that they return into beaſts and plants. For they hold,* ‘ *that herbs and trees have ſuch a kind of life, as is* ‘ *ſenſible of pain, when they are hurt, and that nothing* ‘ *can be pulled or torn from them without torturing* ‘ *them. For this reaſon they think it a crime to root* ‘ *thorns out of a field. From whence they are ſo fooliſh* ‘ *as to condemn Agriculture, the moſt innocent of arts, as* ‘ *being guilty of many murders; and they think their* ‘ *hearers are therefore allowed to practiſe it, becauſe by* ‘ *that means they provide food for their elect, that that* ‘ *divine ſubſtance being purged in their belly may obtain* ‘ *pardon for thoſe, by whoſe offering it is delivered to be* ‘ *purged. Therefore the elect themſelves, neither working in the fields, nor gathering fruit, nor pulling off* ‘ *any leaves, expect theſe things to be brought them for* ‘ *their uſe by their hearers, living, as they vainly think,* ‘ *by the repeated murders of others.*’

(68) Thomaſſin, ib. pag. 377.

(69) Ib. p. 378.

(70) Auguſt. de Hæreſ. *cap. xlvi, fol. m.* 116. *verſo.*

MANTO

MANTO, the daughter of Tireſias, and a great Diviner, as well as her father. She was ſo highly eſteemed, that, when the Argians plundered the city of Thebes, they thought they could not acquit themſelves of the vow, they had made to Apollo, to conſecrate to him the moſt excellent thing they had among their ſpoils, but by offering to him this maid. She was therefore ſent to the temple of Delphi: but this did not oblige her to make any vow of continence, or if ſhe was engaged to it, ſhe very ill obſerved her vow; for we read, that Alcmæon, who was generaliſſimo of the army that took Thebes, had two children by our Manto; a ſon, whoſe name was Amphilochus, and a daughter, who was very handſome, and was called Tiſiphone. Theſe were the fruits of a courtſhip, which had ſomething very ſingular in it, ſince it happened during the fury, which ſeized Alcmæon, after he had put his mother to death. This is what Apollodorus (*a*) tells us concerning Manto. Others ſay (*b*), that ſhe was indeed carried to Delphi with the other Theban priſoners, but that the oracle having ordered them to go and plant a colony, they went to Claros [*A*], where Rhacius had ſettled one; and that Rhacius having learned from Manto, who thoſe were, with whom ſhe had made this journey, and for what end they made it, took her to wife, and had a ſon by her named Mopſus (*c*). Diodorus Siculus (*d*), inſtead of this, tells us, that the daughter of Tireſias was called Daphne; that ſhe was ſent to Delphi as an offering, and an *Ex-voto* of the Argians; that ſhe improved the prophetic knowledge ſhe had already acquired, and wrote a great number of oracles; that it is pretended, Homer ſtole from her many verſes to adorn his Poems; and that ſhe was named Sibylla, becauſe ſhe was often ſeized with a divine ſpirit, and gave many anſwers (*e*). Pauſanias ſays, that, in his time, at Thebes, before the porch of a temple, the ſtone was ſhewn, on which Manto ſate, and which was called the chair of Manto (*f*). He ſpeaks of the tomb of Manto in another place (*g*); but there he means another perſon, who was the daughter of Polyidus. She of whom Virgil ſpeaks, is the ſame with the daughter of Tireſias [*B*]. And this ſhews, that

(*a*) Bibl. *lib. iii, pag. m.* 196, 200.

(*b*) Pauſanias, *lib. vii, pag. m.* 207.

(*c*) *See, below, citation* (2).

(*d*) *Bibl. lib. v, cap. vi.*

(*e*) *See one of her oracles in Ovid,* Metam. lib. vi, *upon occaſion of the worſhip of Latona.*

(*f*) Pauſan. *lib. ix, pag.* 289.

(*g*) Ib. *lib. i, pag.* 41.

[*A*] *They went to Claros.*] I do not underſtand why Pauſanias did not add what Pomponius Mela ſays (1), that Manto, flying from the conquerors of Thebes, built the temple of Apollo Clarius, and that her ſon Mopſus (2) built Colophon. Take notice of theſe words of Mela; *Fugiens victores Thebanorum Epigonos*; for if I am not very much miſtaken, they ſhew, that Charles Stephens, Lloyd, and Hoffman, are in the wrong to ſay, that Manto fled from the tyranny of Creon and Theſeus, when ſhe fled to build the temple of Claros. Moreri had nothing to ſay of Manto, tho', if he had ſearched well, he might have found matter enough concerning her.

[*B*] *She, of whom Virgil ſpeaks, is the ſame with the daughter of Tireſias.*] Servius (3) informs us, that ſhe was the daughter of Tireſias, for Virgil only ſpeaks of her as a propheteſs, and mentions her love for the Tiber.

(1) Lib. i, cap. xvii.

(2) Mopſus, according to Strabo, was the ſon of Apollo and Manto, and not, as Pauſanias would have it, of Rhacius and Manto. See the article MOPSUS.

(3) *In* Virgil. ubi infra.

that this poor propheteſs is made to have been a great traveller; for Virgil *(b)* tranſports her into Italy, not to preſerve her virginity there, but to make her bring forth a child, which built Mantua.

(b) Æneid. *lib.* X, *ver.* 199.

Ille etiam patriis agmen ciet Ocnus ab oris
Fatidicæ Mantûs & Tuſci filius amnis,
Qui muros matriſque dedit tibi, Mantua, nomen (4).

His country's force the valiant Ocnus leads;
Ocnus, deſcended from the genial bed
Of Manto, mixing with the Tuſcan ſtream.

The ſame Servius adds, that ſome ſaid Hercules was the father of this propheteſs. Leander Albertus relates a vaſt number of traditions concerning this founder of Mantua. Conſult him, if you pleaſe, in his deſcription of Italy (5).

(4) Virgil. Æn. lib. X, ver. 198.

(5) *Pag. m.* 602, *&* *ſeq.*

MARASCIA (JOSEPH VINCENT) born at Palermo, was of the congregation of the oratory of St Jerom de la Charitè. He wrote a book, to prove, there were two St Mamilians, archbiſhops of Palermo [*A*]. He died the ſeventeenth of January 1699 *(a)*.

(a) Taken from the Journal de Trevoux, March 1702, *pag.* 94, *Edit. of Trevoux.*

[*A*] *He wrote a book to prove that there were two St Mamilians, archbiſhops of Palermo.*] The book is intituled, *De due Santi Mamiliani, Archiveſcovi e Citadini di Palermo, Riſolutione Hiſtorica*, and was printed by the care of Mr Mongifore (1), after the death of the author. There are but one or two modern Critics, who acknowledge two Mamilians. Maraſcia confeſſes, *that he oppoſes the ſtream of Sicilian Hiſtorians; but he has on his ſide ſome antient manuſcripts, which he cites, and ſome conjectures, which he thinks very ſolid* (2).

(1) He is a doctor of Divinity.

(2) Taken from the Journal de Trevoux, *ubi ſupra*, *pag.* 94, 95.

MARCA (PETER DE) one of the moſt illuſtrious ornaments of the Gallican church, was born at Gant in Berne, January 24, 1594. He was baptized by a prieſt in the dioceſe of Tarbes [*A*], and went through his ſchool-learning *(a)*, and a courſe of Philoſophy *(b)* under the Jeſuits: then he ſtudied the Civil-law *(c)* for three years; after which he was admitted, in 1615, counſellor in the ſupreme council of Pau. He was not the firſt of his family, who bore an office in the long robe [*B*]. All his collegues were then of the reformed religion *(d)*: but the face of affairs was quickly changed; for, in a little time after, none could be admitted into that council, erected into a parliament, who was not of the Romiſh religion *(e)*. Peter de Marca had a great ſhare in the intrigues, which produced this change. He married a lady of the antient family of the viſcounts of Lavedan; but loſing her, in 1632, after he had had many children by her *(f)*, he would not marry again. He was made preſident in the parliament of Berne in 1621, and counſellor of ſtate in 1639. Three years after, the king nominated him to the biſhopric of Conſerans. He had already been employed to write a work of great importance [*C*]. He was ſent into Catalonia in 1644, to exerciſe the office of viſitor-general,

(a) At Auſch.

(b) At Toulouſe.

(c) At Toulouſe.

(d) Stephanus Baluzius, in vita *Petri de Marca*, *pag.* 12.

(e) Ib. pag. 13.

(f) The eldeſt, Galactorius de Marca, *ſucceeded in his father's office; I mean that of preſident in the parliament of Pau.*

[*A*] *He was baptized by a prieſt in the dioceſe of Tarbes.*] The exerciſe of the Romiſh religion was forbidden in Berne ever ſince the edict of 1569; ſo that the few Catholics who remained in that country, were forced, for want of prieſts, to get their children baptized in the churches of the Reformed (1). James de Marca would not follow their example. He cauſed his ſon to be carried to the monaſtery of St Peter de Generes in Bigorre. There our archbiſhop was baptized by a Benedictin monk, who was curate of the pariſh. This refutes Patin, who ſays, ſomewhere, that this prelate was born of the reformed religion. See the following remark.

[*B*] *He was not the firſt of his family, who bore an office in the long-robe.*] The family of Marca comes originally from GARCIAS de MARCA, who commanded the cavalry of Gaſton prince of Berne, at the ſiege of Saragoſſa, in the year 1118. His poſterity followed the profeſſion of arms; but, about the year 1440, there was one Peter de Marca, a good civilian, who, after he had been attorney-general to the prince, his maſter, in all his dominions, was made preſident of his councils (2). I have read in a book, which was printed in the time of the league, that one de Marqua ſecond preſident in the parliament of Pau, *could never be admitted or reſtored to his office . . . . till he had made the common proteſtation againſt the maſs, together with a profeſſion of the Calviniſt faith, appointed by the late queen of Navarre,* mother to Henry the Great (3). This refutes Guy Patin, who affirms, that our Mr de Marca was of mean birth. Let us produce the paſſage, it contains many falſhoods; for, to ſay nothing of the reſt, it is falſe, that this prelate was ever either a miniſter among the Reformed, or a Jeſuit. We ſhall here have an example of the falſe reports, which are ſpread againſt great men: one cannot collect too many ſuch examples, to bring the world to a ſpirit of incredulity in this reſpect. ‘ We are informed here, ‘ that the archbiſhopric of Toulouſe is beſtowed upon ‘ Mr de Marca, biſhop of Conſerans, by means of ‘ 50000 crowns, which he has given to cardinal Mazarin. This is a good fortune for that ambitious man. ‘ He is of a mean original: after he had ſtudied, he ‘ became a miniſter to the party of the Reformed (4), ‘ of whom he was one. After he had changed his ‘ religion, he became a Jeſuit; and then, quitting ‘ the ſociety, he married, and became counſellor in ‘ the parliament of Pau, and after that preſident: ‘ Afterwards he came to Paris, and, by the favour of ‘ the chancellor Seguier, he was made counſellor of ‘ ſtate in ordinary, after that intendant of Catalonia, ‘ and then biſhop of Conſerans, after he had a long ‘ time waited for his bulls, which he could not get ‘ from Rome, becauſe of the quarrel he had with the ‘ Jeſuits, after he had quitted them; and at laſt he ‘ had them not, till he had reconciled himſelf to them: ‘ and now he is made archbiſhop of Toulouſe. When ‘ he has paid his debts, if a red hat be offered to him, ‘ he will be ſure to purchaſe it for money. I cannot ‘ better compare Mr de Marca than to the late Mr le ‘ Jay, who from a ſmall beginning became firſt preſident in the parliament of Paris (5).’

[*C*] *He had already been employed to write a work of great importance.*] The hiſtory of Berne, which he publiſhed in 1640, confirmed extreamly the good opinion, which was conceived of his knowledge and great capacity. It was therefore believed, that he would be very fit to be employed about a nice and important matter, which offered it ſelf a little while after. The volume of the liberties of the Gallican church, which Peter du Puy had publiſhed, alarmed the partiſans of the court of Rome; and ſome of them endeavoured to make it believed, that theſe were the preliminaries of a ſchiſm, which was deſigned by cardinal Richelieu; as if his eminence had had ſome thoughts of erecting a Patriarchate in the kingdom, that ſo the Gallican church might have no dependance upon the Pope. A French Divine, under the name of Optatus Gallus (6), wrote upon this ſubject, and inſinuated, that the cardinal

(1) Stephanus Baluzius, de vita & rebus geſtis *Petri de Marca*, *pag.* 8, *Edit.* 1663, *in* 8*vo.*

(2) Id. ib. *pag.* 6, 7.

(3) An anſwer of the true French Catholics to the advertiſement of the Engliſh Catholics, *pag.* 53, *Edit.* 1589.

(4) Note, that, in order to juſtify Patin, the conſtraint that was put upon the preſident de Marca cannot be alledged; (ſee, above, citat. (3), for our Peter de Marca was the ſon of a military man. He had not therefore been obliged to make an abjuration, to preſerve an office. See the Life of Peter de Marca by the abbot Faget, *pag.* 7, 8.

(5) Patin, Letter lxix, *pag.* 294, of *Tom. i*, dated June 28, 1652.

(6) He was a prieſt of Paris, called Herſens. See the Life of F. Morin, *pag.* 52. The Jeſuit Michael Rabadeau wrote an anſwer to him, which was cenſured at Rome. See *Theophilus Raynaudus, de bonis & malis libris, num.* 514, *pag. m.* 293.

general, and intendant; which he diſcharged till the year 1651, with ſo great capacity, that

nal had gained over a great perſon, who would write an apology for this new eſtabliſhment. This great perſon was no other than Peter de Marca. ‘Sequens menſis Martius materiam præbuit novis ſermonibus, ob editionem Libelli Parænetici ad Antiſtites Regni, de cavendo ſchiſmate, quod præ foribus adeſſe nunciabat Optatus Gallus. Sub eo namque nomine latere voluit auctor; ſatis alioqui cognitus, ſi larvam illi detrahere liberet. Occaſionem turbandi ſumebat ex editione Voluminum de Libertatibus Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ, quæ anno ſuperiore prodierant curâ Clariſſ. Viri Petri Puteani; atque item ex rumore vulgi, diſſerentis eam Cardinali Richelio mentem eſſe, ut omiſſo Epiſcopo Romano, Patriarcha in Galliis conſtituatur. Ajebat præterea, magnum virum in partes tractum promiſſis ingentibus, qui ſcripto defenderet quæ pro ea cauſa Cardinalis facturus erat, neque dubitatur, quin Marcam intelligeret (7). - - - - - - *The following month of March furniſhed new matter for diſcourſe, on account of the publication of the exhortatory addreſs to the nobles of the kingdom, to guard againſt the ſchiſm, which Optatus Gallus pretended was at their doors: for under that name the author concealed himſelf, who is otherwiſe very well known, if I had a mind to take off his maſk. He took occaſion to raiſe diſturbances from the publication of the book concerning the liberties of the Gallican church, which came out the year before by the care of the learned Peter Puteanus; as alſo from the common report, that cardinal Richelieu intended to ſhake off the Pope's authority, and eſtabliſh a patriarch in France. He ſaid farther, that the cardinal had gained over a great man by large promiſes, to write in defence of his proceedings thereupon; nor is it doubted but he meant de Marca.*’ The king, underſtanding that an accuſation of this nature made him odious, by reaſon of the hatred, to which it expoſed the cardinal, gave orders to Mr de Marca to refute this Optatus Gallus, and to keep a certain Medium, which ſhould not prejudice the liberties of the Gallican church, and ſhould ſhew, that they did not leſſen the reverence due to the holy ſee. He accepted of this commiſſion, and executed it in the book, *de Concordia ſacerdotii & imperii, ſive de libertatibus Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ*, which he publiſhed in 1641 (8). He declared in his preface, that he would not enter upon the diſcuſſion of the right, but only inſiſt upon matters of fact, that is, that he would only ſhew the bounds, which at all times had parted the two empires, *viz.* that of the temporal, and that of the ſpiritual prince (9). But, tho' he collected an infinite number of teſtimonies concerning the Pope's power; yet his book diſpleaſed the ultramontanes, who have very tender ears. *Quorum aures teneritudine quadam plus trahuntur, ut ait Auxiliaris præfectus apud antiquum ſcriptorem vitæ ſancti Hilarii Epiſcopi Arelatenſis* (10). The court of Rome ſhewed itſelf very backward to diſpatch the bulls, which were deſired for this author, who was lately nominated to the biſhopric of Conſerans. They acquainted him, that he muſt, in the firſt place, ſoften ſome paſſages of his work, which they cauſed to be examined with great exactneſs. Holſtenius, one of the examiners, declared that he found ſeveral things in it, which wanted explication, and ſome others, that ſecretly wounded the rights of the church. ‘Holſtenius quidem quamplurima in eo contineri retulit, quæ explicatione indigerent; quædam etiam eſſe quæ Romana jura violent, ſed in occulto. Tanto quippe ac tam ſingulari artificio librum hunc eſſe perfectum, ut diſtingui vix poſſit, quæ pars ejus Eccleſiæ Romanæ faveat, quæve noceat (11). - - - *For that this book was ſo artfully written, that it was difficult to diſtinguiſh wherein it was favourable, and wherein prejudicial, to the Romiſh church.*’ One of the other examiners gave it a better teſtimony; he affirmed that this book proved ſo ſtrongly the authority of the ſee at Rome, that the author of it deſerved to be rewarded. His approbation was concealed and Mr de Marca could never get a copy of it. After the death of Urban VIII, cardinal Bichi earneſtly ſollicited Innocent X, to grant the bulls to the biſhop of Conſerans; but the aſſeſſor of the holy office revived the complaints, which had been made againſt the book *de concordia ſacerdotii & imperii*, which made the Pope examine the book anew. ‘Innocentius naturâ cunctator, & qui per imprudentiam nihil eorum prætermitti volebat quæ ad dignitatem Sedis Apoſtolicæ pertinere exiſtimabat, librum hunc examinandum de integro commiſit Cardinalibus Barberino &c (12). *Innocent, naturally given to delay, and who would have nothing omitted, thro' imprudence, which he thought for the honour of the apoſtolic ſee, ordered this book to be re-examined by the cardinals Barberini, &c.*’ Mr de Marca perceiving things thus drawn out to a great length, and hoping for no good iſſue, unleſs he made ſatisfaction to the court of Rome, publiſhed a book at Barcelona in 1646; wherein he explained his opinion according to the mind of the Ultramontanes, and wrote a very ſubmiſſive letter to the Pope, wherein he made great promiſes of fidelity. ‘Quo editionis librorum de Concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii conſilium exponit, opus Apoſtolicæ Sedis cenſuræ ſubmittit, & Reges Canonum cuſtodes, non vero auctores eſſe docet (13). *In which he gives the reaſons of the publication of the book* de Concordia, *&c. ſubmits the work to the cenſure of the apoſtolical ſee, and declares, that kings are the guardians, not the makers, of the canons.*’ He confeſſed, that he had diſcharged in his book the duties of a preſident in the parliament, much better than thoſe of a biſhop; but it will be better to relate the very words which he made uſe of. ‘Fateor eo in libro Principis partes pro muneris mei ratione foviſſe, Præſidemque potius impleviſſe quam Epiſcopum. . . . . . & ne libri publicati invidia deſideriis meis obeſſet, libello altero Barcinone edito, quem huic chartæ adjunxi, hallucinationes meas deprecatus ſum; Opus cenſuræ Beatitudinis Veſtræ ſubmiſi, quam prona mente amplexurum voveo, & aſſertorem vindicemque libertatis eccleſiaſticæ futurum (14). - - - - - *I confeſs, that I thought my ſelf in duty bound to ſide with my prince, and that I diſcharged the preſident's, rather than the biſhop's part. . . . . . and, leſt the publication of that book ſhould prejudice me, I begged pardon for my errors in another book, publiſhed at Barcelona, which is annexed to theſe papers: I ſubmitted the work to the cenſure of your Holineſs, which I promiſe to embrace with a ready mind, and for the future to aſſert and defend the liberties of the church.*’ He did not forget, in his book, the great ſervice he pretended to have done the Ultramontanes, by publiſhing the decretal of Pope Vigilius (15). The court of Rome, according to their uſual artifice, continued ſtill their delays, after this ample ſatisfaction: but at laſt Mr de Marca obtained his bulls in the month of January 1647. He was ordained prieſt at Barcelona in the month of April 1648, and conſecrated biſhop, at Narbonne, in the month of October following. In this year, he was put to the proof, and he made it appear, that he was ſincere in promiſing a great zeal for the intereſt of the Pope. They had a mind to know his opinion about a queſtion, which made a great noiſe (16), and he gave it ſuch as Innocent X, could wiſh. ‘Mota erat temporibus illis gravis quæſtio, de duplici capite in Eccleſia, pleriſque unicum tantum caput, videlicet B. Petrum, in ea conſtituentibus; quibuſdam vero cenſentibus Paulum quoque Eccleſiæ caput cum Petro fuiſſe. Cum hæc quæſtio diſtraheret in partes ingenia hominum eruditorum, atque interim dignitas Romanæ Sedis tentari videretur; Innocentius, qui apprime noverat Marcam in primis Eccleſiaſticæ antiquitatis peritum eſſe, ratus præterea eveniſſe occaſionem qua ejus animum erga Sedem Romanam experiretur, aperire ſententiam jubet. Ille nihil cunctatus, *Exercitationem* Barcinone V. Kalendas Junii anno MDCXLVII. ſcripſit *de ſingulari Primatu Petri*, quæ nondum edita eſt: quam Innocentio, ad quem ſtatim miſſa eſt, valde placuiſſe ex eo intellectum eſt, quod eam publice legi juſſit, ac ſingularem quandam de Marcæ in Sedem Romanam propenſione accepit opinionem (17). - - - - *At that time, an important queſtion was ſtarted, concerning a two-fold head of the church; moſt people ſuppoſing there was but one head, namely St Peter, but ſome being of opinion, that St Paul likewiſe was head of the church, together with St Peter. This queſtion dividing the learned, and it ſeeming to be an attack upon the dignity of the Roman ſee, Innocent, who very well knew, that Marca was ſkilled in eccleſiaſtical antiquities, and thinking this a proper opportunity of trying his fidelity towards the Roman*

‘*ſee*

(7) Baluzius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 23, 24.

(8) Id. ib. *pag.* 24, 25.

(9) Sic ſcriptionem ſuam temperavit, ut relicta diſcuſſione juris quod utrique Poteſtati competit, ad ſolam facti inquiſitionem, quæ finis veterum poſſeſſorum demonſtrare poſſet, ſe contulerit; ut ipſe præfatur in Admonitione ad Lectorem. *Id. ib. pag.* 25.

(10) Ib. pag. 26.

(11) Ib. pag. 28.

(12) Ib. pag. 30.

(13) Ib. pag. 31.

(14) Ib. pag. 32.

(15) See the remark [*M*].

(16) That about the two heads of the Church, St Peter and St Paul.

(17) Ibid. *pag.* 37, 38.

that the Catalans loved him to ſuch a degree, as is ſcarce to be parallelled [*D*]. He went to take poſſeſſion of his biſhopric in Auguſt 1651. The next year, he was nominated to

'*ſee, ordered him to give the world his opinion. He, without delay, wrote an* Exercitation *at Barcelona, the fifth of the kalends of June*, 1647, *concerning* The ſingular primacy *of St Peter, which is not yet publiſhed; which Innocent, to whom he immediately ſent it, was very well pleaſed with, as appeared from his ordering it to be publickly read, and conceiving an extraordinary opinion of Marca's affection for the ſee of Rome*.'

Two things may be concluded from this narrative: I. That it is a great ſlavery for the court of France, to want the Pope's bulls for the making of biſhops; for it hinders thoſe, who are capable of maintaining the liberties of the Gallican church, and the intereſts of the king in his quarrels with Rome, from exerting all their ſtrength: they aſpire to biſhoprics, and they ſee that they cannot arrive at them if they render themſelves, too odious to the court of Rome; or at leaſt that they muſt make a ſhameful ſatisfaction. It is not long (18), ſince this happened to ſome members of the aſſembly of the clergy in the year 1682. The ſecond thing I conclude is, that Mr Sallo had no reaſon to take for an artifice, what was done at Rome, in 1664, againſt the new edition of Mr de Marca's book. It was pretended, that Baluzius had publiſhed that book *ex retractatis ſcriptis Petri de Marca*. This was not without ground. Did not this prelate make a recantation in the writing publiſhed at Barcelona? Did he not write to the Pope, to aſk his pardon? Let us ſet down the very words of the decree, and the reflexion of Mr Sallo. 'Decretum ſacræ Indicis congregationis, quo damnati, prohibiti, ac reſpective ſuſpenſi fuerunt infra ſcripti omnes libri. Romæ, 17. Novembris 1664. De concordia ſacerdotii & Imperii, ſeu de libertate Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ liber, à Stephano Baluzio impreſſus Pariſiis, anno 1663. Perperam adſcriptus Petro de Marca, ex cujus retractatis ſcriptis aliorumque erroneis ſententiis operâ præfati Baluzii editus eſt (19). - - - - - - *The decree of the ſacred congregation of the Index, by which all the underwritten books were condemned, prohibited, and reſpectively ſuſpended at Rome, November the ſeventeenth*, 1664. De Concordia, *&c. publiſhed by Stephen Baluzius, and printed at Paris*, 1663; *falſly aſcribed to Peter de Marca, from whoſe recanted works, and the erroneous opinions of others, it is publiſhed by the care of the aforeſaid Baluzius*.' 'The court of Rome having always their private views, it is not very ſafe to adhere ſcrupulouſly to their cenſures. Wherefore this decree ought not to hinder us from having always as great an eſteem as we had for the book of the Liberties of the Gallican church, written by the late Mr de Marca. In effect, it contains nothing but very certain maxims, and which may paſs for the fundamental laws of this monarchy. Likewiſe we ought not to have the worſe opinion of the ſincerity of Mr Baluze, altho' he is accuſed in this decree of having falſly attributed this book to Mr de Marca. For it is plain, that the congregation made uſe of this artifice, becauſe they durſt not directly attack the memory of this great archbiſhop, and they thought it would be more eaſy to cry down his book, by ſubſtituting in his place a perſon of leſs eminent dignity in the church (20).'

To conclude the hiſtory of this book, I muſt add further, that Baluzius has procured two editions of it ſince the death of the author; one in 1663, and the other in 1669. Theſe editions are larger than the firſt, as it appears from theſe Latin words (21). 'Opus *de concordia ſacerdotii & imperii* . . . . . altero ab ipſius obitu anno auguſtiori habitu adornatum, iterum emiſit in lucem Baluzius, & non ſaltem priores quatuor libros recenſuit, additionibus ab Auctore compoſitis auxit, ac ſuis notis, ubi occaſio tulit, illuſtravit; ſed & integrum Tomum alterum nunquam antea editum ex autographo ſummi Viri deſcriptum addidit, nonnulla Antiquitatis illuſtra monumenta adjecit, integroſque in eo Libros, quod Gallice eſſent ſcripti, in Latinam linguam vertit. Cumque Opus hoc tanto favore eruditorum fuerit exceptum & communi approbatione commendatum, ut intra breve tempus diſtracta exempla fuerint, iſtud anno MDCLXIX recognitum emendatius copioſiuſque literato iterum orbi dedit. - - - - *Within one year after his death, Baluzius publiſhed a more pompous edition of the work* de Concordia, &c. *and not only reviſed the four firſt books, augmented them with the author's additions, and illuſtrated them with his own notes, as occaſion offered; but added another volume, never before publiſhed, tranſcribed from the great author's manuſcript, added ſome illuſtrious monuments of antiquity, and tranſlated whole books of it, which were in French, into Latin. And this work being ſo well received by the learned, and in ſo great eſteem, that the copies were all ſold off in a ſhort time, he republiſhed it, reviſed, corrected, and enlarged, in* 1669.' He has cauſed it to be reprinted, with additions and corrections, in the year 1704 (22).

Deckherrus has committed ſome groſs miſtakes, in ſpeaking of the writing of Optatus Gallus, and of the book of our Mr de Marca: they were criticiſed in a letter, added to the new edition of his book in 1686 (23).

Note, that the author of the famous book *de libertatibus Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ*, publiſhed in 1685, does not ſpeak favourably of the conduct of the author of the *concordia ſacerdotii & imperii*. 'He inſinuates, that Mr de Marca does not act with ſincerity, and that, tho' he wrote like a man who would make his court in France, yet he had a cautious regard for the court of Rome; for he ſeems, in certain places, by virtue of his citations, to have eſtabliſhed the point, but, on a ſudden, he gives the advantage to the other ſide, by citing examples and teſtimonies contrary to the former, or by limiting the former with a thouſand reſtrictions: and then, after all this, he leſſens alſo the advantage of the ſecond party. At firſt he grants all, and then he regains it inſenſibly, but in ſuch a manner, that he makes the balance incline towards the ſecular power (24).'

[*D*] *The Catalans loved him to ſuch a degree, as is ſcarce to be parallelled.*] This appears by the prayers and pilgrimages, which they made for his health, in 1647. The city of Barcelona made a public vow to our lady of Montſerrat, and ſent thither in their name twelve capuchins, and twelve maids. The latter travelled with their hair diſhevelled, and bare-foot. Mr de Marca was perſuaded, that ſo many vows and prayers obtained his health, and he would not leave Catalonia without going to offer up his prayers at Montſerrat (25). He went thither in 1651, and there he wrote a little treatiſe, *de origine ac progreſſu cultus B. Mariæ Virginis in Monteſerrato*, which he left in the archives of the monaſtery (26). It was loſt, becauſe perhaps the author did not admit all kind of traditions. He ſent a copy of it, in 1660, to Francis Creſpus, profeſſor of Divinity at Lerida, who was writing a hiſtory of this convent of Montſerrat. He adviſed him to uſe a little more deſcretion than the Spaniards do. 'Paucis agit de antiquitate loci; admonetque Creſpum, ne in ea hiſtoria ſcribenda, falſis, uti Hiſpani ſolent, teſtimoniis utatur; *quæ Gallis*, inquit, *fabularum iſtiuſmodi detegendarum peritiſſimis, ludibrium debent, & reliquæ narrationi, licet alioqui veræ, auctoritatem demunt* (27). - - - - *He briefly treats of the antiquity of the place; and adviſes Creſpus not to uſe falſe teſtimonies in writing that hiſtory, as the Spaniards do*; which, *ſays he*, the French, who are not eaſily impoſed upon by ſuch fables, laugh at, and which take off from the credit of the reſt of the narration, tho' otherwiſe true.' This diſſertation was publiſhed in 1681, by the care of Baluzius. Note, that Mr de Marca, this great author, did not diſdain to write about ſuch things, as were more becoming a Monk than a counſellor of ſtate: as when he wrote the hiſtory of our lady of Betaram (28), at the deſire of a devout prieſt called Charpentier, who was the founder of that chapel, as he was afterwards of that of Mont Valerien, near Paris. This hiſtory was publiſhed at Barcelona (29).

---

(18) I write this on the 18th of December, 1695.

(19) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, *Jan.* 12, 1665.

(20) Sallo, Journal des Sçavans, *ibid.*

(21) Acta Eruditor. Lipſienſ. ann. 1682, *pag.* 327.

(22) See the *Journal des Sçavans*, of the twelfth of January, 1705.

(23) *See* Deckherrus, de Scriptis adeſpotis, *pag.* 384. Edit. 1686.

(24) *News from the Republic of Letters, July* 1685, pag. 718. *of the ſecond edition.*

(25) Baluzius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 45.

(26) Ib. pag. 46.

(27) Ib. pag. 48.

(28) In Berne. in the dioceſe of Leſcar.

(29) Taken from the Life of Mr de Marca, written by the abbot Faget, *pag.* 43.

to the archbiſhopric of Toulouſe, and wrote to the Pope a letter, which deſerves a remark [*E*]. He took poſſeſſion of the archbiſhopric of Toulouſe, without any pomp, in the month of March 1655. He aſſiſted the next year at the general aſſembly of the clergy of France, where he oppoſed the Janſeniſts [*F*]. He was preparing himſelf for reſidence

[*E*] *He wrote a letter to the Pope, which deſerves a remark.*] The tranſlation of a biſhop from one ſee to another, ſtands in need of a particular favour from the court of Rome: Wherefore Mr de Marca biſhop of Conſerans, being nominated to the archbiſhopric of Toulouſe, paid his reſpects to the Pope with the greateſt addreſs that was poſſible; and tho' he knew that Exuperius, biſhop of Toulouſe, was not the ſame Exuperius, who had commanded in Spain, yet he gave it out as a thing certain, in the letter he wrote to Innocent X. By this means he drew an agreeable parallel between Pope Innocent I, and Pope Innocent X, and between himſelf and this Exuperius. ‘O me felicem, quando veteris illius atque ſanctiſſimi Sacerdotis Exuperii exemplo, (qui ex Præſidatu in Hiſpaniis acto Cathedram illam ſuſcipiens, eam deinde rexit juxta pium atque prudens Innocentii primi ad ejus conſulta reſponſum) licebit per Innocentii X decretum poſt geſtos Magiſtratus Regios in Gallia & Hiſpania, Epiſcopatus quoque curis functo mihi, Toloſanæ Sedis adminiſtrationem capeſſere (30). --- *O happy me, when, after the example of that ancient and moſt holy biſhop Exuperius,* (*who, after having commanded in Spain, took upon him that ſee, and governed it according to the pious and prudent direction of Innocent the firſt,*) *I may, by the decree of Innocent the tenth, after having born offices under the king in France and Spain, take upon me the epiſcopal function, and govern the ſee of Toulouſe.*’ And therefore he made no ſcruple to vent this falſity, with which he thought proper to tickle the Pope, and to render him more favourable to himſelf. Some body obſerved, that this was a falſhood; but Mr de Marca being told of this criticiſm, laughed at it, and called ſuch a cenſurer a low wit, who did not ſee the difference between a letter of compliment and a hiſtory. Baluzius has given us ſo good a narrative of this, and in terms ſo well choſen, that it would be an injury to the judicious reader, not to ſet down his words. There he will find much more matter for reflexions than in the ſhort account I have given of it. ‘Sciebat ſane vir eruditiſſimus diverſum ab Exuperio Epiſcopo Toloſano fuiſſe Exuperium illum, qui Præſidatum in Hiſpaniis egit. Quis enim ignorat? Verum cum argumentum eſſet accommodatiſſimum ad rem quam tractabat, ſciretque præterea Principum aures ita eſſe formatas, ut nihil niſi jucundum lætumque accipere velint, vim aliquam inferre veritati non abnuit, ut Pontificem alioqui difficilem ac moroſum ſibi faventem ac propitium habere poſſet. Quod ideo retuli, ut eatur obviam ſcrupuloſæ cujuſdam ſcriptoris diligentiæ, qui in adverſariis ſuis adnotavit lapſam heic eſſe Marcam: de quo admonitus à me vir optimus paucis ante obitum menſibus, riſit hominis ſupinitatem, qui non animadverteret cujuſmodi argumentum in ea epiſtola tractaretur. Neque enim hiſtoria ſcribebatur. Non diſplicet profecto hominibus eruditis, quod oratores veri limites nonnunquam excedunt in compoſitione verborum, aut auditorum aures aliqua voluptate permulceant, & alliciant (31). ---- *No doubt, that learned man very well knew, that the Exuperius, who commanded in Spain, was not the ſame Exuperius, who was biſhop of Toulouſe. For who is ignorant of it? But finding it an argument to his purpoſe, and knowing beſides, that the ears of princes are ſo formed, that they will receive nothing but what is pleaſing, he ſcrupled not to offer ſome violence to truth, to inſinuate himſelf into the good graces of a Pope, otherwiſe intractable and moroſe. I have related this, to obviate the ſcrupulous exactneſs of a certain author, who, in his* adverſaria, *has obſerved that Marca is here miſtaken: which when I informed the good biſhop of, a few months before his death, he laughed at the thoughtleſſneſs of the man, in not conſidering the ſubject-matter of that letter. Learned men, it is certain, are not diſpleaſed, that orators ſometimes exceed the bounds of truth, to tickle and pleaſe the ears of their auditors.*’

[*F*] *In the aſſembly of the clergy, in* 1656, *he oppoſed the Janſeniſts.*] It was an unhappy thing for them, that this great prelate met with ſuch great difficulties at Rome, when he wanted a bull to be biſhop of Conſerans. This taught him, that he muſt not loſe any opportunity of repairing the damage, which his *Concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii* had done him in that country. Now what more favourable occaſion could he expect, than that of ſeconding the court of Rome in the proceedings againſt the diſciples of Janſenius? Add to this, that he had been repreſented as a Janſeniſt beyond the Alps, and that this bad office had for a long time retarded the expedition of the bull, which was neceſſary for making him archbiſhop of Toulouſe. I do not know, whether among the many pieces, that have been written on calumny, it was ever thought fit to write one concerning the uſefulneſs of that crime. They who would employ themſelves on this ſubject, would be much to blame, if they forgot the advantage, that may be drawn from calumny in religious diſputes; for ſometimes an able and very active man would keep himſelf neuter, or endeavour to accommodate matters in a fair way, if he was not defamed as a favourer of heretics. Then, to clear himſelf, and to prevent the diſadvantage, that may ariſe from ſuch a report, he is obliged to ſet up for a perſecutor (32): Whatever might be the cauſe of Mr de Marca's zeal againſt the Janſeniſts, it is certain that they found him a terrible adverſary. Alexander VII thanked him heartily for it. Take the words of Baluzius. ‘Cleri Gallicani Comitia Pariſiis habebantur. Illuc itaque Marca ſe conferens anno M. DC. LVI. perhonorifice in eo cœtu ſuſceptus XIII Kalend. Aprileis, deinceps in plurimis occaſionibus oſtendit quanta ingenii vi polleret, & quam præclara eruditione ac doctrinâ præditus eſſet. Nam auctoritatem Romani Pontificis, quam per ſummum nefas aliqui deprimere conabantur, fortiter & ſtrenue vindicavit adverſus æmulos. Gnarum id Alexander VII qui poſt abſoluta demum Comitia, honorificas ad Marcam literas die XVII Novembris anni M. DC. LVII. ſcripſit: quibus ei grates egit, ob aſſertam Sedis Apoſtolicæ dignitatem, & ut deinceps pergeret in eadem reverentia, verbis amantiſſimis hortatus eſt. Janſeniſmum vero, tum maxime vires ſuas colligentem, ſic induſtria & auctoritate ſua repreſſit, ut ob hoc ipſum promeritus ſit iram hominum ejus ſectæ, qui ne mortuo quidem pepercerunt (33). ---- *The aſſembly of the French clergy was held at Paris. Thither Marca repairing in* 1656, *and being very honourably received in that aſſembly, on the twentieth of March, he gave many proofs of his abilities and great learning: for he ſtrenuouſly defended the authority of the Pope, which ſome wickedly endeavoured to leſſen. Alexander VII was apprized of this, and did Marca the honour of writing to him, the ſeventeenth of November,* 1657; *thanking him for aſſerting the dignity of the apoſtolical See, and exhorting him in a moſt friendly manner to perſiſt in the ſame reſpectful ſentiments. He likewiſe ſo checked the growth of Janſeniſm, which at that time exerted all it's ſtrength, by his diligence and authority, that he drew on himſelf the reſentment of that ſect, which did not ſpare him even after his death.*’ He adds, that, before the concluſion of this aſſembly (34), there appeared a ſatire againſt Mr de Marca, which was followed by another ſome time after. ‘Infauſtis auſpiciis prodiit libellus famoſus, ſub titulo Epiſtolæ ad Illuſtriſſimum Dominum de Marca Archiepiſcopum Toloſanum, quo ejus fama atrociter proſcindebatur, & auctoritas Romanæ Sedis per ſummam audaciam aperte violabatur. Libellum hunc ſecutus eſt alius, haud moderatior; & ipſe, ut prior, abſque auctoris nomine (35). ----- *An infamous libel appeared under the title of,* A Letter to the moſt illuſtrious Lord de Marca, Archbiſhop of Toulouſe, *in which his reputation was torn to pieces, and the authority of the Roman ſee very boldly and openly attacked. This libel was followed by another, not more moderate, and, like the former, anonymus.*’ Some of his friends adviſed him not to anſwer thoſe libels, and others adviſed him to do it. He conſidered with himſelf which advice he ſhould follow, and at laſt reſolved to be ſilent (36). He was contented to ſee the

(30) Baluzius, ubi ſupra, *p.* 53.

(31) Id. ib. *pag.* 53, 54.

(32) Compare with this the article FERRIER, remark [*L*], towards the end.

(33) Baluzius, ibid. *pag.* 59.

(34) It ended in the month of March 1657.

(35) Ib. *pag.* 64.

(36) Id. ib. *pag.* 65. Yet he wrote ſomething againſt thoſe libels, which Baluzius publiſhed in 1681.

reſidence in 1658; when, to remove all the ſcruples that might trouble him, if he had continued a long time at Paris, the king made him miniſter of ſtate. He followed the court in its progreſs to Lyons, and then was preſent in the ſtates of Languedoc, from whence he went to Toulouſe in the month of April 1659. He preſided in the ſtates of that province in the ſame city, while the king was there, and preſented the rolls to his majeſty. The next year he went to Rouſſillon, to regulate the limits with the commiſſioners of the king of Spain. The conferences were of a very ſingular character; for he was obliged to make ſeveral critical remarks upon ſome words of Pomponius Mela and Strabo [*G*]. He made a journey to Paris in the month of September in the ſame year, and died there June 29, 1662, a little after he had obtained the bulls for the archbiſhopric of that city [*H*], to which he was named without making any intereſt, as ſoon as the king had accepted the reſignation of cardinal des Rets. He left the care of his MSS to Baluzius, who had been in his family ever ſince the twenty ninth of June 1656 (*g*). He could not chuſe a more worthy depoſitary; for Baluzius made it appear from that time, that he had a great zeal for the glory of the deceaſed, and all the capacity requiſite for publiſhing ſuch a depoſit [*I*]. He promiſed the life of his Mæcenas, as a very large work, ſetting forth the particulars of the noble actions, and fine qualities of this prelate. I think he has not executed this deſign. The public hath loſt much by it, although the letter, I have cited (*b*), and from which I have taken the chronological narrative, which I have ſet down, does very clearly, and pretty largely declare the virtues, merits, and actions of this archbiſhop. Some time after, his life appeared, written by the abbot Faget, with three or four diſſertations; which raiſed a diſpute between him and Baluzius [*K*]. There are in the work of this abbot many particulars, which may be read with pleaſure, by thoſe who love to know all that concerns great men. There we may ſee how Mr de Marca renounced all the pleaſures of youth, out of love

(*g*) *Taken from a Latin letter of Baluzius, written to Sorbiere*, de Vita, Rebus geſtis, Moribus, & Scriptis illuſtriſſimi viri Petri de Marca, *printed at Paris in* 1663, *in 8vo.*

(*b*) *It has been enlarged and prefixed to the book* De Concordia Imperii & Sacerdotii, *of the Edit.* 1669.

agreement of the empire and the prieſthood with reſpect to thoſe two libels; for they were condemned to be burnt, both at Paris and at Rome. Here follow the titles of three pieces that appeared againſt him. *A Letter from the Author of the moſt important Rules to my Lord de Marca Archbiſhop of Toulouſe*, 1657. *An Anſwer to the Letter of my Lord Archbiſhop of Toulouſe about the Conſultation of the Clergy, November* 14, 1656. *An Anſwer to a Letter lately publiſhed about what paſſed in the Aſſembly of the Clergy, November* 14, 1656. The firſt of theſe three pieces was preceded by this; *Very important rules drawn from two paſſages, one of the Council of France, and the other of Glaber, alledged by my Lord de Marca archbiſhop of Toulouſe.* This is not at all ſatirical.

I have juſt now caſt my eyes upon a book (37), wherein I find ſomething, which ſhews, that the reſentment of the Janſeniſts is not yet over. In this book it is ſaid, that the archbiſhop of Roan (38), had a mind to compoſe the diſputes of Janſeniſm, during the general aſſembly of the clergy in 1657. ‘This negotiation did not continue long. The archbiſhop of Roan had audience upon this ſubject, May 3d, of cardinal Mazarin; who, as this prelate the ſame day informed Mr de Bagnols, declared he had a mind to accommodate this affair, and that they had agreed, his eminence and he, to treat of this matter with Mr de Marca archbiſhop of Toulouſe, who probably made no ſecret of it to F. Annat. After a ſecond audience, which the archbiſhop of Roan had of the cardinal the next day, this prelate related, that, having been two full hours in conference with that chief miniſter, and with the archbiſhop of Toulouſe, his eminence had ſhewn more firmneſs, than he had done before, and had made a greater oppoſition to the project of accommodation; and that the archbiſhop of Toulouſe ſpoke vehemently againſt it, and called the diſtinction of the Janſeniſts of right and fact, a meer chimera. This is very probable; for this prelate, being a true Politician, was the father of the inſeparability of right and fact, a true chimera which he was in love with, or ſeemed to be ſo, becauſe it ſerved his ends. This prelate would not give over his own deſigns, in order to follow thoſe of the archbiſhop of Roan. He was better ſkilled than he, in matters of policy and intrigue. He had framed his ſcheme, and taken his meaſures with F. Annat, upon a different plan from this, which could not pleaſe that father. In fine, he had, for this kind of affairs and many others, the entire confidence of the cardinal, and the whole ſupport of the court. Thus the archbiſhop of Roan took care not to puſh on this affair, upon better information (39).’

[*G*] *He was obliged to make ſeveral critical remarks upon ſome words of Pomponius Mela and Strabo.*] It was ſaid in the treaty of the Pyrenees, that the limits between France and Spain, in the county of Rouſſillon, ſhould be the ſame with thoſe, which anciently ſeparated Gaul from Spain. It was therefore neceſſary to examine where the ancient Geographers bounded Gaul on that ſide. The learning of our archbiſhop was a great help. You will find the particulars of all theſe conferences in a poſthumous work of this author (40).

[*H*] *He died at Paris .... a little after he had obtained the bulls for the archbiſhopric of that city.*] The little time that he lived, after his nomination to the archbiſhopric of Paris, engaged ſome body to write an epitaph upon him, of ſix verſes, which is known to every body.

> Cy git l'illuſtre de Marca,
> Que le plus grand des Rois marqua,
> Pour le Prelat de ſon Egliſe:
> Mais le mort qui le remarqua.
> Et qui ſe plait à la ſurpriſe,
> Tout auſſi-tot le demarqua.

Here lies the illuſtrious De Marca, whom the greateſt of kings nominated to be biſhop of his church: But, death, who obſerved it, and who takes a pleaſure in ſurpriſing men, on a ſudden cancelled the nomination.

[*I*] *Baluzius had a great zeal .... and all the capacity requiſite for the publication of this depoſit.*] To be convinced of this truth, we need only ſee the prefaces, notes, additions, *&c.* wherewith he has enriched the poſthumous pieces of his Mæcenas, as he publiſhed them. I have already ſpoken of the new editions, which he procured of that famous work, *de Concordia Imperii & Sacerdotii.* I muſt now add, that he publiſhed three or four diſſertations of that learned man in 1669 (41). They concern the authority of the Pope, and that of the patriarchs and primates; a very difficult canon of the council of Orange, and the firſt eſtabliſhment of the Chriſtian faith in Gaul. He publiſhed ſeveral others in 1681, the ſubjects whereof you may ſee in the Journal of Leipſic (42). In 1688, he publiſhed a folio, with this title, *Marca Hiſpanica, ſive Limes Hiſpanicus, hoc eſt Geographica & Hiſtorica deſcriptio Cataloniæ, Ruſcinonis, & circumjacentium populorum, auctore illuſtriſſimo viro Petro de Marca.* All the journaliſts make mention of it.

[*K*] *His life, compoſed by the abbot Faget ... raiſed a diſpute between him and Baluzius.*] The abbot Faget, late agent of the clergy, and ſon of an aunt by the mother's ſide to Mr de Marca, publiſhed at Paris, in 1668, the

(37) Printed in 1700, and intituled, *The Peace of Clement IX, &c.*

(38) Francis Harly, who died archbiſhop of Paris.

(39) *The Peace of Clement IX, pag.* 144.

(40) Intituled, *Marca Hiſpanica.* The *Bibl. Univerſ.* has an abſtract of it, at the beginning of *Tom. xv.*

(41) See the Journal of Leipſic, 1682, *pag.* 327.

(42) Ib. p. 328. *See alſo the* Journal des Sçavans, *March* 21, 1681, *pag.* 117.

love for his books, while he was a ſchool-boy. He foretold to his ſchool-fellows, who loſt their time in vain recreations, what a difference there would be one day, between their glory and his [*L*]. It was at Toulouſe, that he laid the foundations of his great knowledge. He neglected no means, whereby he might become a good Grecian [*M*]; which

the life of this prelate, together with a treatiſe of the Euchariſt, another of the ſacrifice of the maſs, another about the erection of the patriarchate of Conſtantinople, another in French about the ſacrament of the Euchariſt, and ſome other ſacraments. He was the author of the life, but not of the diſſertations, added to it: theſe were written by Mr de Marca. He could never obtain the approbation of the faculty of Divinity, without conſenting, that the French treatiſe ſhould be left out, and that ſome leaves ſhould be re-printed, to alter ſeveral things in the others. The Printer, who was of the Reformed religion, knew very well, that ſome leaves were reprinted on purpoſe to omit ſome things, which favoured the Proteſtants. What does he do? He retains all the paſſages, which were to be changed, and ſo delivered a copy to Mr Claude, juſt ſuch as he had printed it, before the commiſſioners of the faculty of Divinity made theſe changes in it (43). From this copy, or ſuch another (44), an edition of the book was printed in foreign countries, as Baluzius had foreſeen (45). To this edition were added the letters, which Baluzius and Mr Faget wrote againſt each other: For you muſt know, that, Baluzius thought he ought not to be ſilent, when he ſaw, that the probity and orthodoxy of Mr de Marca were going to be called into queſtion. He wrote therefore, two letters to preſident de Marca (46). I will here give one paſſage of the firſt (47): 'You 'know, Sir, that his enemies have wickedly pnbliſhed, that, in the affairs, which paſſed thro' his 'hands, he did not ſo much conſider truth and 'juſtice, as his own intereſt and ambition, having 'always endeavoured to riſe higher and higher in 'the church, and that theſe conſiderations were the 'reaſon, why he often betrayed the truth, to flatter the court of Rome. We did what we could 'to ſtop theſe diſcourſes, and hinder them from 'making any impreſſion on the minds of rational 'men. But Mr Faget, with one daſh of his pen, 'has overthrown, if we may believe him, all that 'the true ſervants of the late archbiſhop were able 'to eſtabliſh in the ſpace of many years.' Let us ſee another paſſage, taken out of the ſecond letter (48). 'I think my ſelf obliged to acquaint you, 'that the book, which Mr Faget has publiſhed, makes 'a great noiſe in this city, upon the account of 'ſome expreſſions that have crept into it, which 'ſeem to favour the error of the Calviniſts and 'Lutherans concerning the ſacrament of the Euchariſt; which is one of the moſt eſſential points of 'our religion, and at this day moſt controverted. 'If it be true, which I can hardly believe, that the 'late archbiſhop wrote the treatiſes, which Mr Faget 'has printed under his name, of which he boaſts 'in the preface, and in the life, to have the originals, written with the author's own hand; we 'cannot hinder the late archbiſhop's being accounted 'by many people a heretic on the ſubject of the Euchariſt, and conſequently his reputation will receive great damage. . . . . . . You cannot imagine how this edition has given occaſion to all ſorts 'of people to talk of him. The Huguenots expreſs a 'great joy, it being a thing, which comes very ſeaſonably to confirm their opinion, and the enemies of the 'late archbiſhop take occaſion from thence to blaſt his 'memory, and blacken his reputation.' The abbot Faget, being treated with the utmoſt contempt in theſe two letters, was enraged at it, and publiſhed two other letters full of rancour. I ſhall not dwell upon it, but only touch one point, which relates to a fact, I have mentioned in the body of this article. Mr Faget (49) denies, that Mr de Marca entruſted his MSS with Baluzius. Let us ſee what Baluzius did, when he found the lie given him upon this head. 'I will obſerve to 'you, *ſays he to the biſhop of Tulle*, that having cauſed 'him to be rebuked by a good prieſt of Roüergue, 'of his acquaintance, called Guibert, becauſe, to the 'prejudice of the truth well known to him, he has 'affirmed in that life, that I was guilty of forgery, 'when I publiſhed, that the late archbiſhop had given 'me his papers, when he was dying, and entruſted 'me with the edition of his works; he anſwered, that 'it concerned him in point of reputation to ſhew, that 'this was not true; becauſe, ſaid he, if this were believed, it would follow, that the deceaſed archbiſhop had not a good opinion of me, and did 'not think me capable of taking care of the edition of his works. And this he ſaid alſo, in general 'terms, to a perſon of great merit and virtue, whom 'you know, who did me the honour to tell me of it. 'This is, my lord, the fine principle, upon which he 'grounds his calumny and impoſture.' Without eſpouſing any party in this quarrel (50), I will only ſay in general, that that there are a thouſand falſhoods printed, which have no other foundation than the point of honour; for when once we perceive, that a naked declaration of the truth will do us a prejudice in the world, things are related quite otherwiſe than they happened.

[*L*] *He foretold to his ſchool-fellows . . . . what a difference there would be one day between their glory and his.*] A young man of your quality, would they ſay to him, ought not to ſhun company, nor to forſake play, dancing, and ſuch other diverſions. You are like one that is dead and buried. A time will come, anſwered he to them, when I ſhall make my name famous, but ye ſhall remain in darkneſs. *Exprobrabant adoleſcentem genere clarum non decere, à virorum & mulierum nobilium civitatis colloquiis & ſocietate recedere, nec præſtantes animi dotes exerere, non ludos, nec ludicra, neque nocturnas hyemis choreas, ut aliis ſolitum erat, frequentare, poſſeque eum, virum abſconditum jure nominari. Ad quæ ille, quum veniſſet temporis occaſio, futurum ſe omnibus pernotum, ubi latendum illis foret, peracute reſpondit* (51). The event juſtified this anſwer. Mr de Marca became one of the greateſt men of his age, and appeared on the higheſt ſtages; and perhaps not one of thoſe, who gave him this reproof, was ever known two leagues from their own pariſh. This is a good leſſon for ſcholars that are ſtudious, and for thoſe that are debauched. It is good to ſet before their eyes ſuch an example as this; which was the reaſon why I made this remark.

[*M*] *He neglected no means to become a good Grecian.*] He gave proof of this in 1642, by publiſhing a Greek MS which he found in the king's library (52), and which he tranſlated into Latin. It was the decretal epiſtle of Pope Vigilius, confirming the ſecond council of Conſtantinople: he added to it a learned diſſertation, the anathemas of the ſame council, a letter of Eutyches to this Pope, and this Pope's anſwer (53). Theſe anathemas, and theſe two letters, had never appeared before but in Latin. The Decretal had never been publiſhed in any language (54). He pretended to have done a great ſervice to the Pope by this work; for he obſerved, in the book he printed at Barcelona, in 1646, to remove the occaſion of complaint, which retarded the diſpatching of his bulls; he obſerved, I ſay, that the publiſhing of this Decretal ſerved very much to confirm the authority of the holy ſee above the œcumenical councils, which was much ſhaken in the ſchools of France. *Quid de hac editione poſtea ipſe ſenſerit, accipe ex libello ejus Barcinone edito* MDCXLVI *cujus ſupra mentionem feci:* Sane explicari non poteſt, quantum hujus Epiſtolæ publicatio profuerit ad firmandum Apoſtolicæ Sedis auctoritatem erga Concilia Generalia; quæ apud Gallicanos Academiarum Magiſtros, majorum ſuorum decretis inhærentes, valde nutabat (55). See the margin (56). The diſſertation was inſerted in the edition of the councils, which was publiſhed at the Louvre, as alſo the diſſertation of the ſame author, *De primatu Lugdunenſi & cæteris primatibus, cum notis ad Canones aliquot Concilii Claromontani ſub Urbano II celebrati* (57). I cannot believe what the abbot Faget ſays, *viz.* that de Marca, coming from his ſtudies, and returning from Toulouſe to his father's houſe, did ſo confound ſome Huguenot gentlemen, who provoked him to diſpute in a baron's houſe, that they were forced to ſend for a miniſter of Pau, a man famous for his learning, to come to their aſſiſtance; who propoſed ſome ſophiſms, of which this young ſcholar

(43) A letter of Baluzius to the biſhop of Tulle, printed at the end of the book, publiſhed by Mr Faget, Edit. 1669.

(44) Baluzius, in his ſecond letter to preſident de Marca, confeſſes, that Mr Faget *had already made preſents of his book, and that the Bookſeller had ſold ſome of them*, before there was any thought of ſuppreſſing the edition.

(45) Provided there remain but one copy in the hands of a private perſon, ten thouſand ſhall be printed from that, whenever they have a mind to make it public, which I am certain they will not fail to do ſpeedily, in Holland and at Geneva. *Baluzius's ſecond letter to preſident de Marca, at the end of the book of the abbot Faget. Edit.* 1669.

(46) Son of the archbiſhop of Paris.

(47) It is dated at Paris April 22, 1668.

(48) Dated at Paris May 27, 1668.

(49) In Vita Petri de Marca, *pag.* 118.

(50) Note, that Baluzius, in the Life of Mr de Marca, Edit. 1669, refutes Mr Faget as to the depoſit, and many other things.

(51) Fagetus, in Vita Petri de Marca, *pag.* 9.

(52) Interdum codices manuſcriptos Græcos Bibliothecæ regiæ, ut erat linguæ Græcæ periſſimus, Marca pervolvebat. *Faget, ibid. pag.* 44.

(53) Id. ib.

(54) Baluzius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 39.

(55) Id. ib.

(56) *Here are the words of the abbot Faget*, ubi ſupra, pag. 44. Eam (*decretalem*) non ſolum ut hactenus incognitam ille plurimi fecit, ſed etiam quod multum ad firmandam Apoſtolicæ Sedis auctoritatem contra quorundam Theologorum ſententiam in Concilia generalia prodeſſet.

(57) Baluzius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 40.

which very much diſtinguiſhed him from other learned men. One of his chief excellencies was, that he could explain the moſt intricate matters without ſtanding in need of a guide [*N*].

ſcholar diſcovered the weakneſs, by a paſſage of St Paul (58). The miniſter had nothing to reply, but that the text of St Paul was not ſuch as he alledged it. De Marca taking out of his pocket a Greek Teſtament, prepared himſelf to juſtify his citation; but the miniſter declared, that he underſtood nothing of that language. This ſtory of Mr Faget looks like a tale forged at pleaſure. *Allatis quibuſdam argutiis, quarum aciem citato ex Epiſtolis Divi Pauli loco novus athletes omnino retudit. A tam expreſſo rei probandæ textu* Ψευδοποίμην *nullo alio modo explicare ſe potuit, quam aliter in Divo Paulo legi pertinaciter conteſtando. Marca vero confeſtim in Novi Teſtamenti Græci abſque interpretatione Latina, quem fere ſemper ſecum ferebat, codice, laudatum locum ipſiſmet, quæ attulerat verbis, conceptum indicavit. Sed cum ſibi penitus ignotam eam linguam profiteretur Pſeudominiſter, ſi non omnino cauſſa cecidiſſe, deluſus ſaltem ab adoleſcente ſuis etiam viſus eſt* (59).

(58) Faget, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 11.

(59) Id. ib. *pag.* 12.

[*N*] *Without ſtanding in need of a guide.*] Moſt learned men are only fit to cultivate the lands, which have been already tilled: they can ſmooth or enlarge a way, which has been already made. There are but a few, *quibus arte benigna & meliore luto finxit præcordia Titan* (60), that can plough up grounds that were never tilled, and make a way through a foreſt, where no man had ever paſſed. Mr de Marca was of this ſmall ſelect number. *The rank, he held among the critics, was no leſs conſiderable in the common-wealth of learning, than that he had among the prelates in the church and ſtate* (61). The author, from whom I borrow theſe words, relates the praiſes, which Father Combeſis (62), and Father Labbe (63), have given to the great parts of this prelate, and he adds, *That the certainty of his conjectures, and the liberty of ſpeaking his thoughts . . . . would have enabled him to carry his criticiſms much further, if he had not been reſtrained by conſiderations, which every one knows.*

(60) Juven. Sat. XIV, ver. 34.

(61) Baillet, *Judgments of the Learned, Tom.* ii, *num.* 245.

(62) Combef. Recenſion. Auctor. Concionat. *pag.* 15.

(63) Labbe, Epiſt. Dedicator. Diſſertat. de Scriptor. Eccleſ. & Tomo xi, Concil. General. ad Concil. Claromontan.

MARCELLINUS (AMMIANUS) holds a very honourable rank among thoſe, who have written the Roman hiſtory. He was a Greek by birth, as he declares at the end of his laſt book [*A*], and a native of Antioch, as may be gathered from a letter of Libanius (*a*). This, together with the military life, which he followed, ought to make us excuſe the harſhneſs of his Latin. This defect, and that of ſome high-flown digreſſions, are abundantly compenſated by many excellent qualities, which are to be found in this author; as for inſtance, the little partiality he ſhewed againſt Chriſtianity, tho' he was a Pagan [*B*], and the exact enquires he made, that he might write nothing but what he was certain of, and whereby he has informed us of many things, which otherwiſe we ſhould not have known. His authority is alſo very conſiderable, becauſe he was an eye-witneſs of many things he wrote of. While he was yet very young he liſted himſelf a ſoldier, and was preſently enrolled among thoſe, who were called *Protectores domeſtici*; which may induce us to believe, that he was of a good family; ſince it was uſual for youths of the firſt quality to enter themſelves in that body (*b*); and he, who could be promoted to it, thought himſelf well rewarded for his long ſervices. This was our Marcellinus's firſt ſtep;

(*a*) *See the preface of Henry Valeſius to Ammian. Marcellin. The Printers of Moreri have put* Labienus *inſtead of* Libanius.

(*b*) Valeſius, ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *He was a Greek by birth, as he declares at the end of his laſt book.*] This paſſage will be cited elſewhere (1); I can now mention three others. One is in chap. viii, of the twenty ſecond book, ἐυήθην, *Græci dicimus ſtultum*; The ſecond is in chap. xv of the ſame book; *ad ignis ſpeciem,* τοῦ πυρὸς, *ut nos dicimus, extenuatur in conum:* The third is in chap. vi of the twenty third book, *tranſire,* διαϐαίνειν *dicimus Græci.* Voſſius (2) makes uſe of the ſecond, which wants the clauſe that he has joined to it, *nempe nos Græci.* Had he remembered the other two places, in which the author has uſed the very word *Græci,* he would rather have cited them, than this. But we ſee the greateſt memories have not that always ready at hand, which they ſtand in need of.

(1) In remark [*D*], citat. (11).

(2) De Hiſtor. Lat. *pag.* 201.

[*B*] *Although he was a Pagan.*] It is ſo eaſy for thoſe, who weigh every thing exactly to diſcover that he was one, that we muſt needs think it very ſtrange, that ſuch able men as Petrus Pithœus (3), and Claudius Chiffletius (4) ſhould take him for a Chriſtian. Would a Chriſtian, who wrote his hiſtory under the emperors who reduced Paganiſm to the laſt gaſp, have been contented with ſpeaking honourably of the Chriſtian religion, and have never carried the matter ſo far, as to declare ſometimes, that it was the only good and true religion, and that the worſhip of the Pagan deities was idolatry? Under ſuch emperors, would a Chriſtian have been ſo inconſiderate, as to praiſe Julian the Apoſtate to the ſkies (5), and never declaim ſharply againſt his apoſtacy, and his hatred of JESUS CHRIST? Would he have ſpoken of Mercury, and the goddeſs Nemeſis, and the goddeſs Themis, and the augural ſuperſtitions of Paganiſm, as Ammianus Marcellinus ſpeaks of them? I know of no Chriſtian authors who did not, even in the hotteſt perſecutions, ſpeak contemptibly of the Pagan idolatry, and in ſome manner inſult over it; and it is incomparably more eaſy to conceive, that a Pagan ſhould uſe moderation, ſpeaking of the Goſpel, than that a Chriſtian ſhould do it, when he ſpeaks of the worſhip of falſe gods. The proofs, alledged by Chiffletius for the pretended Chriſtianity of Marcellinus, need no refutation, except that one paſſage of book 27, where, having cenſured the luxury of the biſhops of Rome, he oppoſes to it the auſterity of ſome country biſhops. 'Quos, *ſays he,* tenuitas edendi potandique parciſſime, vilitas etiam indumentorum & ſupercilia humum ſpectantia, perpetuo numini veriſque ejus cultoribus ut puros commendant & verecundos. . . . . *Whom their moderation in eating and drinking, the meanneſs of their garb, and down-caſt looks, recommended to the deity, and his true worſhippers, as men of purity and modeſty.*' But all that can be inferred from theſe words, is only this, that, according to this author, ſobriety and humility recommend men to GOD, of whatſoever religion they be, and that the Pagans themſelves had a veneration for Chriſtian biſhops, who teſtified by their manner of living, that they did not ſeek any temporal advantage. As to the definition he gives us of martyrs, *qui deviare à religione compulſi pertulere cruciabiles pœnas aduſque glorioſam mortem intemerata fide progreſſi* (6), - - - - *who, when they would compel them to abandon their religion, under-went torments, even to a glorious death, with unſhaken fidelity,* it proves only, that the Pagans themſelves might admire ſuch a firmneſs of ſoul, as was not ſhaken by the moſt cruel torments. *Intemerata fides* is not oppoſed, in this place, to a falſe religion, but to changing ſides. What he had ſaid in the preceding page, that a biſhop (7), who turned informer, had forgotten, that his profeſſion adviſed him to nothing but what is juſt and gentle; *profeſſionis ſuæ oblitus, quæ nihil niſi juſtum ſuadet & lene, ad delatorum auſa feralia deſciſcebat,* proves only, that he knew what the Chriſtians made profeſſion of; and we ſhould ſay as much of the Chineſe

(3) Apud Hadrian. Valeſium, Præf. Edit. 1681.

(4) In Vita Amm. Marcellini. *It is to be found in the edition of Valeſius* 1681.

(6) Lib. ii, cap. xi.

(7) This was George biſhop of Alexandria, who periſhed in a popular ſedition, in 362.

---

(5) *The abbot de Billi,* Schol. ad Gregor. Nazianz. Orat. ii, in Julian, *ſays thus,* Hinc perſpicuum eſt Marcellinum Græcæ ſuperſtitionis cultorem plus gratiæ quam veritati tribuiſſe, cum ſcribit, nulla Juliani definitio litis à vero diſſonans reperitur. - - - - - *Hence it is plain, that Marcellinus, who followed the Greek ſuperſtition, conſulted his intereſt more than truth, when he writes, that no deciſion of Julian in matters of law was diſagreeable to truth.*

ſtep; but we do not know whether he ever roſe higher [C]; only we find that, in this employment, he followed Urſicinus, general of the cavalry, in ſeveral expeditions. He was ordered to go with him into the eaſt, when the emperor Conſtantius ſent him thither in 350. Urſicinus, being recalled from thence in 354, and obliged to come to Milan, brought back with him Marcellinus into Italy. They went into Gaul the next year, and quickly reduced the tyrant Sylvanus to reaſon; after which Conſtantius ſent for Urſicinus to Sirmium, and ſent him back again into the Eaſt. The bad offices, which ſome did Urſicinus with this emperor, were the cauſe why he was recalled, and his office given to another. He obeyed; but, being arrived in Thrace, he found orders there, which obliged him to return immediately towards Meſopotamia, though the command was not reſtored to him, which had been given to Sabinianus. Neverthele{ſ}s he did the emperor great ſervices. Marcellinus alſo, who always followed him, did the emperor much ſervice, both as a ſoldier, and as a manager of affairs, as he himſelf relates, without exceeding the bounds of modeſty. He did not quit the ſervice, when Urſicinus was utterly diſgraced, in the year 360; but, as I have already ſaid, it is not known, whether he was advanced, or whether he continued always in his poſt of Domeſtic Protector, even when he followed Julian in the war againſt the Perſians. It may be gathered from ſome places of his books (c), that he lived at Antioch under the reign of Valens. He afterwards ſettled at Rome, and there compoſed his hiſtory [D]. He recited ſeveral parts of it to his friends as he compoſed them (d), and they were received with great applauſe. It is not known when he died, but without all doubt he was alive in 390, ſince a conſulſhip, which fell in this year, was not unknown to him (e). He had ſome ſuits (f), which put him ſo out of humour with the practiſers in the Law, that he could not forbear making a long digreſſion againſt them. It is an invective almoſt as ſharp as the comedy intituled Grapinian.

(c) *Lib. xxix, cap. i. where he ſays*, that he ſaw the torments of many perſons, whom Valens put to death at Antioch in 371; *and lib. xxx, cap. iv, where he* complains of the tricks that had been put upon him in the Eaſt.

(d) Epiſt. Liban. apud Valeſium, ubi ſupra.

(e) Neotherium poſtea Conſulem tunc Notarium ad eamdem tuendam ire diſpoſuit. *Amm. Marcel. lib. xxvi, cap. v*, That man was conſul with Valentinian II, in 390. *Valeſius, ibid.*

(f) Lib. xxx, cap. iv. *See* La Mothe le Vayer, *Judgment about the principal Hiſtorians, pag.* 247, *of the third Tom. in 12mo.*

Chineſe prieſts, if we knew, that their ritual obliged them to a great purity of life. Is it neceſſary to be a Chriſtian, may not a little reaſon ſuffice, to diſcern that an eccleſiaſtic, who ſets up for an informer to princes, as this biſhop of Alexandria did, *apud patulas aures Conſtantii multos exinde incuſans ut ejus recalcitrantes imperiis*, diſhonours his character? Theſe are the ſtrongeſt proofs of Chiffletius for the pretended Chriſtianity of Marcellinus. But if he be deprived of this happineſs, which is attributed to him, yet at leaſt this praiſe is due to him, that he ſpoke very honourably of a religion he did not follow. There are but few examples of ſuch a moderation. Father Poſſevin, who is not contented with it (8), ſeems to be too nice, and we need not fear, that our poſterity will diſpute concerning the religion of thoſe, who write hiſtory at this day (9). I confeſs, that Marcellinus wrote under the Chriſtian emperors; but that reaſon did not ſet bounds to the malice of Libanius and Zoſimus.

[C] *We do not know whether he ever roſe higher.*] Moreri therefore hath too raſhly affirmed, that Marcellinus *compoſed his hiſtory, after he had gone through the moſt honourable offices of the army.* He tranſcribed this from la Mothe le Vayer (10).

[D] *His Hiſtory.*] This work contained, in thirty one books, what paſſed from Nerva till the death of Valens (11). The firſt thirteen are loſt, which brought down the hiſtory to the reign of Conſtantius, (for he enlarged leſs upon thoſe times, which he did not know but by the information of others) the eighteen, which remain have been very much abuſed, either by the ignorance of the tranſcribers, or the raſhneſs of the critics. Note, that Claudius Chiffletius maintains, upon pretty good reaſons, that this hiſtory contained thirty two books, and that there was a book between the thirtieth, and that which we now reckon the thirty firſt, which is certainly the laſt of all. He had heard that the firſt books which are now wanting of Marcellinus, were to be found in the library of cardinal Pole. Mr de Marolles publiſhed a French tranſlation of this Hiſtorian in 1672, with remarks; but the undertaking was too weighty for him.

HISTORY of the editions of Marcellinus. Faults of Moreri, &c.

Valeſius the elder ſays (12), that the firſt edition of Marcellinus was that of Rome in 1474, which was prepared by A. (13) Sabinus a Poet Laureat; that the ſecond was printed at Bologna, in 1517, by P. Caſtellus, a man void of wit or judgment; that the next year John Frobenius reprinted at Baſil this edition of Bologna; that in 1533 there appeared two new editions, one at Augſburg, corrected by Mariangelus Accurſius, the other at Baſil by the care of Sigiſmond Gelenius (14); that the edition of Accurſius was augmented with the five laſt books which had never been printed before; that the edition of Gelenius had the ſame addition, except the laſt book, and the laſt page of the laſt book but one; that, in 1546, Jerom Frobenius who had printed the edition of Gelenius, publiſhed another with the laſt book; and that, all the editions which appeared afterwards in France and Germany, till that of the year 1609, which Frederic Lindenbrogius publiſhed with notes, ſeem to have been printed from this ſecond edition of Frobenius. That of Lindenbrogius is very good; but that which Valeſius publiſhed in 4to, in 1636, is incomparably better. We ſhall hereafter ſay ſomething of that of 1681. Mr Moreri could not tranſcribe the preface of Valeſius faithfully; for he ſaw ſeveral things in it which are not there: He ſaw there that Accurſius was the firſt that publiſhed the firſt five books of Marcellinus, and that *Gelenius added the laſt book with the laſt page of the thirtieth which we had not.* All this is falſe; Gelenius was ſo far from making this addition, that, on the contrary, what he publiſhed wanted juſt this book which was in Accurſius's edition; and it is ſo far from being true, that Accurſius publiſhed the firſt five books, that to this day all the thirteen are wanting, as Mr Moreri had ſaid a little before. Valeſius commends the edition of Accurſius, but beſtows mighty encomiums on that of Gelenius: which makes me wonder, that Voſſius, who ſpeaks with approbation of the former, ſays nothing of the latter. He is extreamly dry, for what reaſon I know not, upon the article of our Ammianus Marcellinus. Accurſius, who boaſts he had corrected five thouſand faults in this author, is commended by Claudius Chiffletius, but in ſuch a general way, that he ſays nothing of his chief excellency, I mean his publiſhing the five laſt books. Is it not ſtrange, that Chiffletius ſhould ſay nothing of this, and yet that he ſhould give Gelenius the glory of being the firſt who publiſhed the twenty ſeventh, twenty eighth, twenty ninth, and thirtieth books? He obſerves, that Sebaſtian Gryphius inſerted in his edition the end of the thirtieth book, and was the firſt who publiſhed it. Valeſius ſays nothing of the firſt of theſe two facts, and refutes the ſecond by ſaying, that Accurſius publiſhed the laſt five books. Toppi, in his *Bibliotheca Neapolitana* (15), falſly aſcribes the publiſhing of the ſixth book of Ammianus Marcellinus to Mariangelus Accurſius, and ſays nothing of his publiſhing the five books of this Hiſtorian, which had never appeared before. Valeſius the younger publiſhed our Ammianus at Paris in 1681, in folio. This ought not to have been omitted in the Dictionary of Moreri. In this edition there are added, I. Many new notes of Valeſius the elder: II. Thoſe publiſhed by Lindenbrogius, in 1609, and thoſe he afterwards added to them, which were found among his papers: III. The Life of Ammianus Marcellinus by Claudius Chiffletius, profeſſor of Law at Dole. IV. Some corrections and obſervations of Valeſius the younger. Mr Gronovius reprinted this edition at Leyden in 1693 (16), and added good notes to it.

(8) Diligenter ſcripſit, ſed ea quæ pertinent ad Chriſtianos traducens ac detorquens. - - - - *He was a careful writer, but perverted whatever related to the Chriſtians.* Poſſev. Appar. Sect. iii, cap. xv.

(9) See the News from the Republic of Letters, *July* 1684, *pag.* 487, *of the ſecond edition.*

(10) Judgment on the Hiſtorians, *pag.* 240, *of Tom. iii.*

(11) Hæc ut miles quondam & Græcus à principatu Cæſaris Nervæ exorſus, aduſque Valentis interitum pro virium explicavi menſura. *Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xxxi, ſub fin.*

(12) Hen. Valeſius, Præfat. ad Ammian. Marcel.

(13) Moreri takes this *A.* for *Aulus*, but according to Konig he ſhould have ſaid *Angelus*.

(14) Moreri having ſeen in Valeſius, *Sig. Gelenius*, believed, by a miſtake, that it meant *Sigebert*.

(15) Pag. 170.

(16) In folio, and in 4to.

MARCELLUS (Christopher), a noble Venetian, and archbiſhop of Corfu (*a*) in the XVIth century, was famous for his learning, his eloquence, his piety, and his manners; and he might have expected the higheſt dignities from Clement VII. Unluckily for him, he was at Rome, when the troops of Charles V ſacked it. He fell into the hands of the Spaniards, who, after having plundered his houſe, took him priſoner, and tormented him cruelly, becauſe he could not pay the great ranſom they demanded of him. To make themſelves amends for not getting from him the ſums they expected, they chained him to the trunk of a tree, in an open field near Gæta, and tore off his nails, one each day. He expired in this ſad condition, both on account of the torture he endured, as alſo by reaſon of the inclemency of the air, to which he was expoſed night and day, without ſleeping, and without taking any nouriſhment (*b*). He made a ſpeech to the council of Lateran, the tenth of December 1512. His *Exercitationes in ſeptem priores Pſalmos* were printed at Rome in 1525 (*c*). I have ſaid elſewhere (*d*), that he publiſhed a work, which, it is pretended, he only ſtole. Florimond de Remond has committed a very childiſh blunder in citing it [*A*].

(*a*) Pierius Valerianus, *ubi infra*, expreſſes this by *primarius Corcyrenſium Flamen.*

(*b*) *Taken from Pierius Valerianus*, lib. i, de Litterat. Infelicitat. pag. m. 10.

(*c*) Konig, Bibl. pag. 506.

(*d*) In the remark [*D*] of the article GRASSIS.

[*A*] *Florimond de Remond has committed a very childiſh blunder in citing it.*] 'I am contented, *ſays he* (1), 'to repreſent part of the ceremonies, which are obſerved at the election, coronation, and conſecration 'of the Roman Pontiffs, which are to be found in 'many places, and particularly in a book intituled, '*The Sacred Ceremonies*, preſented to Pope Leo X, by 'M. Electus, and that following the council of Lyons, 'in 1273.' He believed that *Electus* was this author's family-name, and did not find out, that *Chriſtophorus Marcellus electus Corcyrenſis* meant *Chriſtopher Marcellus, archbiſhop of Corfu elect.* David Blondel has reproached him with this miſtake (2), which is certainly as groſs a one as that, with which La Mothe le Vayer has reproached Bodin. Read theſe words of the *Hexameron Ruſtique.* 'I will begin with putting you in mind 'of the inattention of Bodin, when, in order to 'prove, in the laſt chapter of the firſt book of his 'Republic, how this phraſe, *by the grace of GOD*, 'is not a mark of ſovereignty, he ſays, that we find 'in the records of France an Act, by which a meer 'biſhop of Meaux, deputed on a treaty of peace, calls 'himſelf, choſen by the grace of God. I have ſeen 'this act, which is in Latin, and I could not forbear 'laughing, to conſider that a man of Bodin's learning 'ſhould miſtake *Electum Meldenſem* for a perſon 'choſen, when it means a perſon nominated to the 'biſhopric of Meaux, and who was not yet conſecrated (3).'

(1) Florimond de Remond, chap. xviii, of the *Anti-Papeſſe*, (*Anti-ſhe-Pope*) ſub fin. fol. m. 412, verſo.

(2) Blondel, in the French treatiſe of the She-Pope, *pag.* 83, and in the Latin treatiſe, *pag. m.* 222.

(3) Hexam. Ruſtique, Journeé I, *pag. m.* 24, 25.

MARCHE (Oliver de la), ſon of a gentleman of Franche-Comté (*a*), was made page to the duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, in 1439, at the age of about thirteen years (*b*) [*A*]. He ſerved this prince, and duke Charles his ſucceſſor, with great zeal, and was ſteward and captain of the guards to the latter (*c*). He incurred the diſpleaſure of Lewis XI when the baſtard de Rubempré was made priſoner in Holland in the year 1463 [*B*]. He was one of the knights (*d*), created by the count of Charolois (*e*) at the battle of Montleheri in 1465. He fell into the hands of the enemy at the unhappy battle of Nancy (*f*), where his maſter loſt his life in the beginning of January 1477. Having paid his ranſom he was ſet at liberty, and had the office of high-ſteward to Maximilian of Auſtria, who married the heireſs of Burgundy (*g*). He held the ſame office under the archduke Philip, ſon to Maximilian (*h*). He was ſent ambaſſador to the court of France to congratulate the new king on his acceſſion to the throne, after the death of Lewis XI (*i*). He wrote ſome memoires, which were publiſhed at Lyons in 1562 [*C*], in folio, by the care of Denys Sauvage, Hiſtoriographer of France. He died at Bruſſels February 1, 1501 (*k*).

(*a*) Oliver de la Marche's Memoires, *book i, cap. i, p. m.* 76.

(*b*) Id. ib. *cap. iv, pag.* 103.

(*c*) Id. *in the preface of the firſt book*, pag. 74.

(*d*) Id. ib. *cap. xxxv, pag.* 314.

(*e*) *The ſon of Philip the Good.*

(*f*) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *book ii, cap. viii, pag.* 408.

(*g*) Id. ib. *cap. ix, pag.* 409.

(*h*) Id. *in the preface*, pag. 1, *and in* cap. xiii, *of the ſecond book*, pag. 423.

(*i*) Id. *book ii, cap. x, pag.* 415.

(*k*) Valer. Andreas, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 707.

[*A*] *He was page .... at the age of about thirteen years.*] This agrees with what he ſays in chap. i. of the firſt book (1), that he was between eight and nine years old, when, in 1434, his father put him to ſchool at Pontarli, but not with what he ſays in his firſt preface (2), that he was ſixty ſix years old when the archduke Philip was not ten. This archduke was born in 1478. Oliver de la Marche was then fifty two years of age, and ſo his ſixty ſixth year falls in with the fourteenth of the archduke. This is not the firſt time I have obſerved that authors ſpeak of their age with the utmoſt confuſion. Note here a groſs fault of Valerius Andreas. He aſſigns the year 1380, for that of the birth of our Oliver, and places his death in 1501 (3), without taking notice of ſuch an extraordinary old age. An author like this, who had lived one hundred and twenty one years, ought to be placed in the number of remarkable things. The truth is, as I have already ſaid, that the year 1426, was the year of his birth.

[*B*] *He incurred the diſpleaſure of Lewis XI, when .... the baſtard de Rubempré was made priſoner in* 1463.] He was ſeized, becauſe he was ſuſpected of having a deſign to carry off the count de Charolois (4). Our Oliver de la Marche carried the news of this ſeizure to duke Philip who was then at Hedin, where he conferred ſometimes with Lewis XI (5). The duke hearing of this, departed in all haſte, and without the knowledge of that prince. A report was ſpread, that Lewis XI had a deſign to ſecure at the ſame time both the father and the ſon (6). He ſent embaſſadors to the duke to complain of this, and demand Oliver to be delivered up to him (7); for he looked upon him as the author of all theſe calumnies, and of what thoſe ſuſpicions had produced, and had a mind to puniſh him ſeverely. The duke anſwered, *That Oliver was his ſubject and his ſervant, and that if the king, or any other perſon, had any thing to charge him with, he would do them juſtice* (8). Read the firſt chapter of Philip de Comines.

[*C*] *His Memoirs .... were publiſhed at Lyons in* 1562.] The manuſcript was taken from the library of the houſe of la Chaux in Franche-Comté (9). There was a ſecond edition of it at Ghent in 1567, in 4to, with notes and corrections in the margin, and a preface which informs us, that the author of theſe Memoirs was rather a calumniator than a hiſtorian, with reſpect to the civil wars of Flanders (10). As to the other books compoſed by this writer, printed and not printed, ſee the Bibliotheque of Du Verdier Vau-Privas (11). They have lately publiſhed in Dutch, the State of the houſe of Charles duke of Burgundy (12); which is a tranſlation of a treatiſe written by this author in French, and publiſhed at the end of his Memoirs in the edition of Louvain, 1645 (13). Gollut inſerted ſomething of it in his Memoirs of Burgundy (14). Du Cheſne will inform you that this ſtate of the houſe of duke Charles was written in 1474, and that it was printed at Bruſſels in 1616, in 4to, and that the Memoirs of the ſame author were printed at Lyons in folio, in 1612, and at Bruſſels in 4to, in 1616 (15).

(1) Pag. 76.

(2) Pag. 2.

(3) Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 707.

(4) Oliver de la Marche *book i, cap. xxxv, pag.* 312.

(5) Id. ib.

(6) Mezer. Abridg. Chronol. *Tom. iii, pag.* 292, *ad ann.* 1463.

(7) Id. ib.

(8) Oliver de la Marche, ibid. *pag.* 313.

(8) See the advertiſement to the readers.

(10) Valerius Andreas, ubi ſupra.

(11) *At* pag. 932.

(12) See the *Veteris Ævi Analecta*, publiſhed by Mr Matthæus at Leyden, in 1698.

(13) See the preface to this work of Matthæus.

(14) In chap. cix, book x.

(15) Du Cheſne, Biblioth. *of the Hiſtorians of France*, pag. m. 199.

MARCIONITES. So they call the diſciples of the Hereſtarch Marcion, who lived in the IId century [*A*]. He was born at Sinope, a city of Paphlagonia, on the Euxine ſea, and had a good and pious biſhop for his father. He applied himſelf firſt to a monaſtic life, but he obſerved very ill the laws of continency, for he debauched a young woman. His father exerciſed all the rigour of the diſcipline upon him; he excommunicated him, and would never yield either to his prayers or offers of penance. Then Marcion being expoſed to the ridicule and contempt of the whole city, went ſecretly out of it and retired to Rome, where he could never be received to the communion (*a*), although he made uſe of the artifices of a woman who went before him to prepare the way (*b*). This denial obliged him in revenge to ſet up for the head of a party [*B*]. He became

[*A*] *Marcion lived in the IId century.*] This may be ſaid for certain: but as to the year when he came to Rome, and the time when he began to vent his falſe doctrine, they cannot be cleared from the confuſions which are found on this ſubject in the antient Fathers. According to St Epiphanius (1), he came to Rome after the death of Pope Hyginus, that is, according to the account of Baronius, after the year of our Lord 157. Tertullian pretends that he came to Rome under Pope Anicetus (2), that is, if we believe Mr Wetſtein, under the empire of Antoninus Pius, *Romanis tunc imperante Antonino Pio, unde Tertull.* lib. i, cap. xix. adv. Marc. *eum* Antoninianum hæreticum, ſub Pio impium *vocat, id eſt circa annum Chriſti* 154 (3). But ſince the two paſſages of Tertullian, the one in verſe, the other in proſe, are contrary to each other, we cannot confirm the one by the other, nor refer them both to the empire of Antoninus Pius. Conſult the Annals of Baronius, and there you will find the death of this emperor under the year 163, and that of Pope Pius, and the promotion of Anicetus under the year 167; ſo that if it be true, that Marcion came to Rome under the pontificate of Anicetus, it is falſe that he came thither under Antoninus Pius, and conſequently Tertullian could not ſpeak the truth in his verſe, without telling a falſhood in his proſe, and *vice verſa*. He ſays in another place, that this Heretic was divers times expelled the communion of the faithful under Pope Eleutherius. ‘Conſtat illos (*Marcionem & Valentinum*) neque adeo olim fuiſſe, Antonini ſere principatu & in Catholicam primo doctrinam credidiſſe apud Eccleſiam Romanenſem, donec ſub Epiſcopatu Eleutherii benedicti ob inquietam ſemper eorum curioſitatem qua fratres quoque vitiabant, ſemel & iterum ejecti, Marcion quidem cum ducentis ſeſtertiis ſuis quæ Eccleſiæ intulerat, noviſſime in perpetuum diſſidium relegati venena doctrinarum ſuarum diſſeminaverunt (4)..... *It is certain that they (Marcion and Valentinus) lived not long ago, but about the reign of Antoninus; and that they at firſt profeſſed the doctrine of the Catholic church, at Rome; till, under the pontificate of Eleutherius, for their ever reſtleſs curioſity, with which they alſo corrupted the brethren, they were diverſe times expelled, and Marcion, with his two hundred ſeſterces which he had brought into the church, at laſt being ſeparated, they begun to ſpread the poiſon of their doctrines.*’ This leads us far away from the empire of Antoninus Pius, for Eleutherius was created Pope in 179. Beſides it is nowiſe probable that the excommunication of Marcion ſhould have been delayed till the pontificate of Eleutherius, ſince he had rendered himſelf ſo abominable by his hereſies, under the pontificate of Anicetus, that St Polycarp called him the eldeſt ſon of Satan. Conſult St Irenæus (5), who tells us that St Polycarp coming to Rome in the time of Pope Anicetus, reclaimed many of the followers of Marcion, and repelled this Heretic with the encomium that I have related: which ſerved as an anſwer to the queſtion that Marcion put to him, *Do not you know me* (6)? Baronius obſerves, that Marcion begun to dogmatize in the reign of Hadrian (7); which he proves by Origen, who ſays, that the Philoſopher Celſus, who wrote againſt the Chriſtians under that emperor, ſpeaks often of the errors of this Heretic. Philaſtrius ſeems to confirm this, when he ſays, that Marcion, before he went to Rome, was convicted of teaching falſe doctrines in Aſia by St John, and driven away from Epheſus (8). Suppoſe as much as you pleaſe, that he was excommunicated ſeveral times, and that he made ſeveral journies to Rome; you can never excuſe Tertullian's want of exactneſs in his account of him.

Let us ſee a paſſage of Lambert Danæus, in which there are ſome faults. ‘Venit (Marcion) Romam quemadmodum lib. i. Adverſ. eum ſcribit Tertull. ſub Antonino Pio, circa annum à Chriſto paſſo 115, ſub Hygino, ut ait Platina: Tertullian. ſub Eleutherio. Cœpit autem poſt Cerdonem innoteſcere illius hæreſis ſub M. Antonino Philoſopho imperatore, & Aniceto pontifice Romano, circa annum à paſſo Chriſto 133. quanquam Clemens lib. 7. Stromat. vult adhuc eo ipſo tempore vixiſſe Romæ Valentinum hæreticum, quem jam ſenem Marcion juvenis viderit (9)..... *Tertullian, in his firſt book againſt Marcion, ſays, that he came to Rome, in the reign of Antoninus Pius, about the year* 115 *after Chriſt's death, under Hyginus, as Platina ſays; under Eleutherius according to Tertullian: but his Hereſy firſt began to be known after Cerdon, under the emperor Antoninus the Philoſopher, and Anicetus Pope of Rome, about the year* 133 *after* CHRIST'*s death: though Clemens will have it, that Valentinus the Heretic was living at this time ſtill at Rome, being in an advanced age, and was known to Marcion, who was then but a youth.*’ In the Iſt place it is an error, not to have ſeen that Tertullian would have been miſtaken, if he had ſaid, that the Popedom of Eleutherius and the empire of Antoninus Pius were cotemporary. II. It is a fault in Chronology to place the pontificate of Anicetus under Antoninus Pius; for Anicetus was not promoted to that ſee, till five years after the death of this emperor (10). III. Clemens Alexandrinus does not ſay, that Valentinus was ſtill living under the emperor Marcus Aurelius; he ſays only that Baſilides and Valentinus having begun to ſpread their errors under Hadrian, lived unto the reign of the firſt of the Antoninus's. IV. He was ſo far from affirming that Marcion in his youth ſaw Valentinus in his old age, that he ſays Marcion converſed with theſe other Heretics as an old man with young people. Μαρκίων γὰρ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αὐτοῖς ἡλικίαν γενόμενος, ὡς πρεσβύτης, νεωτέροις συνεγένετο. *Marcion enim cùm natus eſſet eadem, qua ipſi, ætate, verſabatur ut ſenex cum junioribus* (11).

[*B*] *He could never be received to the communion at Rome..... This denial obliged him to ſet up ... for head of a party.*] I ſhould deceive my readers, if I ſhould leave theſe words without a commentary; and it would be in vain to ſay, that St Epiphanius having deceived them firſt, I need not ſcruple to do it after him: they would not approve ſo bad an apology: let us therefore ſhow wherein the fault of St Epiphanius's account conſiſts. None can read this Father but he muſt think, that the church of Rome never admitted Marcion to her communion, and that the governors of this church having told him, *We cannot admit you into communion without the leave of your father, who has excommunicated you*; he threatened them with a ſchiſm, and was as good as his word. Τὶ μὴ ἠθελήσατέ με ὑποδέξασθαι; τῶν δὲ λεγόντων, ὅτι οὐ δυνάμεθα ἄνευ τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς τοῦ τιμίου πατρός σου τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. Μία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ πίστις, καὶ μία ὁμόνοια, καὶ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἐναντιωθῆναι τῷ καλῷ συλλειτουργῷ, πατρὶ δὲ σῷ. Ζηλώσας λοιπὸν, καὶ εἰς μέγαν ἀρθεὶς θυμὸν καὶ ὑπερηφανίαν, τὸ σχίσμα ἐργάζεται ὁ τοιοῦτος, ἑαυτῷ τὴν αἵρεσιν προσησάμενος, καὶ εἰπών. Ὅτι ἐγὼ σχίσω τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ὑμῶν, καὶ βαλῶ σχίσμα ἐν αὐτῇ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Ὡς τἀληθῆ μὲν σχίσμα ἔβαλεν οὐ μικρὸν, οὐ τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν σχίσας, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ τοὺς αὐτῷ πεισθέντας. Cur me, inquit, recipere noluiſtis? Reſponderunt illi. Nobis injuſſu venerandi Patris tui facere iſtud non licet. Una ſiquidem fides eſt, & animorum una conſenſio: neque contra ſpectatiſſimum Collegam patrem tuum moliri quippiam poſſumus. At ille vehementius excandeſcens, ac ſuperbia invidiaque percitus Schiſma conflavit, ac privatam Hæreſin architectatus eſt: & Eccleſiam, ait, veſtram ego diſſociabo, in

---

(*a*) *Taken from Epiphanius,* adverſ. Hæreſ. pag. m. 302, 303.

(*b*) Romam præmiſit mulierem, quæ decipiendos ſibi animos præpararet. *Hieronym. Tom. ii, Epiſt. ad Cteſiphontem, pag.* 253.

(1) Epiphan. adv. Hæreſ. pag. m. 302.

(2) A quo Pio ſuſcepit Anicetus ordine ſortem, Sub quo Marcion hic veniens nova Pontica peſtis. *Tertull. carm. lib. iii, adverſus Marcion.*

(3) Joh. Rodolphus Wetſtenius, Not. in Origenis dial. contra Marcionitas, *pag.* 3, *Edit.* 1674.

(4) Tertull. de Præſcript. *cap.* xxx.

(5) Iren. lib. iii, cap. iii. *See alſo* Euſeb. lib. iv, cap. xiv.

(6) See the notes of Henry Valeſius upon Euſeb. *lib. iv, cap. xv,* where theſe words are not taken for an interrogation but as *ſalute me.*

(7) Baronius, ad ann. 146. num. vii.

(8) Philaſtrius, de hæreſ. *cap. xlvi.*

(9) Lambertus Danæus, in Comment. ad librum D. Auguſtini de hæreſibus, *fol.* 58. *Edit. Genevenſis* 1578, *in* 8*vo.*

(10) *See* Baronius, ad ann. 167.

(11) Clemens Stromat. lib. vii, pag. 764. *D.*

became the diſciple of Cerdon (*c*), and that he might be the better able to maintain the doctrine of two principles, which he had learned of this Heretic, he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy [*C*]. He had a great number of followers; who not only ſupported themſelves after his death, but alſo ſpread into all parts, and formed churches in emulation of the Orthodox, wherever they could [*D*]. It was found neceſſary to employ the ſecular power againſt them, when the empire was devolved to the Chriſtians; and ſome ages paſſed before this good remedy put an end to this ſect. They boaſted of their pretended martyrs. This fact gave occaſion to a diſpute [*E*], of which it will not be needleſs

(*c*) Epiph. ubi ſupra, pag. 303.

in eam ſchiſma Sempiternum immittam. Quod ille revera nec mediocre quidem injecit: non ita tamen ut Eccleſiam, ſed ut ſe potius ac ſuos diſcinderet (12). - - - - - *Why, ſays he, will not you receive me? They anſwered, we cannot do it without the conſent of thy reverend father; for the faith is one, and conformity of opinion one: nor can we attempt any thing againſt our worthy colleague thy father. But he being enraged and filled with pride and envy, raiſed a ſchiſm, and broached a hereſy of his own; and, ſays he, I will divide your church and bring an everlaſting ſchiſm among you. And indeed he was the author of a very great one; yet not ſo as to diſtract the church, but rather confound himſelf and his followers.* If St Epiphanius had conſulted Tertullian, he would have known, that Marcion was ſeveral times driven out of the communion of the Orthodox (13); which is an evident ſign, that they were more than once ſatisfied with the Proteſtations he made of renouncing his errors, and that they had reconciled him to the church. Perhaps alſo, if death had not prevented him, he had endeavoured to perform the condition required of him the laſt time he appeared penitent, which was, that he ſhould undeceive thoſe whom he had perverted from the true faith. ‘Poſtmodum Marcion pœnitentiam confeſſus, cum conditioni datæ ſibi occurrit, ita pacem recepturus, ſi cæteros quoque quos proditioni erudiſſet, Eccleſiæ reſtitueret, morte præventus eſt (14) - - - *Afterwards Marcion having manifeſted his repentance, and agreed to the terms which were propoſed to him,* viz. *that, in order to obtain his peace, he ſhould reſtore to the church thoſe whom he had ſeduced away, was prevented by death.*’ There are ſome (15) who ſay, that after he was turned out of the church with his money, he joined with the ſect of the Cerdonites; which they prove by ſome paſſages, wherein Tertullian and Philaſtrius affirm, that he was the diſciple of Cerdon. I believe they confound the times, for the expulſion they mention was the laſt, and it happened under Eleutherius (16); but it is no wiſe probable that Cerdon was then alive.

(12) Epiphanius, adverſus Hæreſes, pag. 303.

(13) See, above, citat. (4), the words of Tertullian.

(14) Tertullian. de Præſcript. *cap. xxx.*

(15) Rodolphus Wetſtenius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 4.

(16) See Tertullian above, citation (4).

[*C*] *He applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy.*] In this I have followed the opinion of a learned commentator (17). ‘Quo felicius hæreſin propagaret, Philoſophiæ ſe mancipavit, Stoicæ præſertim: Tertull. *de præſcr. hær. c,* 30. Unde idem Tertullianus, *c.* 7. *ejuſd. libri* Philoſophiam & Dialecticam exagitat, vel ut matrem hæreſeon, & Prudentius *in Hamartigenia,* Dialecticæ oſtentationem ei exprobrat, *p.* 192.

Hæc tua Marcion gravis & dialectica vox eſt.

Norunt enim omnes à Zenone (18) Stoico dialectam eſſe inventam. - - - - *In order to propagate his hereſy the more ſucceſsfully, he applied himſelf to Philoſophy, eſpecially that of the Stoics: whence Tertullian inveighs againſt Philoſophy, & Logic, as apt to produce Hereſies, and Prudentius upbraids him with oſtentation of Logic.*

This, Marcion, is thy grave and logical diſcourſe.

Every body knows that Logic was invented by Zeno the Stoic.’ But I do not blame thoſe who believe that he was already a good Stoic, when he was excluded from the communion of the church the firſt time.

(17) Wetſtenius, ubi ſupra.

(18) *This is Zeno Eleates, who paſſes for the inventer of Logic. See* Gaſſendus de Logicæ Origine, cap. i, Tom. i, Oper. pag. 37, 38.

[*D*] *Theſe Sectaries formed churches in emulation of the orthodox, where-ever they could.*] Let us cite again the ſame commentator (19). ‘Poſt ejus obitum Marcionitæ Eccleſias, in æmulationem Eccleſiæ Catholicæ, ubique locorum erexere: unde Tertull. *l.* 4. *c. Marc. c.* 5. *Faciunt favos & veſpæ, faciunt Eccleſias & Marcionitæ.* - - - - *After his death the Marcionites built churches every where, in emulation of the Catholic church; whence Tertullian ſays,* The waſps make honey-combs; and the Marcionites build churches.’ St Epiphanius teſtifies, that the hereſy of the Marcionites continued ſtill not only at Rome, and the reſt of Italy, but alſo in Egypt, Paleſtine, Arabia, Syria, in the iſle of Cyprus, in Thebais, Perſia, and in other places (20). Is it not ſtrange that Lambertus Danæus, who makes uſe of this paſſage of St Epiphanius, to prove that this ſect had made a great progreſs, did not alſo uſe it to prove that it was ſtill very numerous in this Father's time. He cites Epiphanius, as to his own time, only to prove that there were then at Rome ſome Marcionites (21). If we ſhould make a collection of ill-choſen citations, the moſt famous authors would be found there very often. This part of criticiſm would be no leſs uſeful than the reſt: It might teach us how to diſcern between thoſe who are truly learned, and thoſe who only make a ſhow of it.

(19) Wetſtenius, ibid. *pag.* 5.

(20) Epiphanius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 302.

(21) Denique Epiphanius ſcribit ſuo ſeculo adhuc quoſdam Marcionitas Romæ natos fuiſſe. *Lambert. Danæus ubi ſupra, fol.* 59.

[*E*] *This ſect boaſted of their . . . . . martyrs. This gave occaſion to a diſpute*]. Let us produce the ſeveral pieces of this proceſs, in their due order.

Sᴇᴠᴇʀᴀʟ pieces of a controverſy put together.

I. The firſt ſhall be furniſhed by Mr Maimbourg, whoſe words are theſe (22). ‘They (23) cannot be ignorant that the moſt famous of their doctors, who wrote that Heretics ought to be puniſhed, cauſed Michael Servetus, a Sabellian, who remained obſtinate until death, to be burnt at Geneva, and that according to the doctrine of the holy Fathers, who ſay it is not the ſuffering, but the cauſe that makes the martyr, he does not give him this illuſtrious title, no more than to the Marcionites, and many other antient Heretics, who ſuffered, with an incredible ardour, the moſt cruel deaths for their own ſect.’

(22) Maimbourg, Hiſt. of Calviniſm, *book i, pag.* 33.

(23) He means the Proteſtants.

II. Let us ſee what anſwer was given him (24) ‘I do not know that ever there was an example of ſuch prodigious ignorance given by any man that undertakes to write, or of ſo great a boldneſs in an author, who knows that his book is to be ſeverely examined. The Marcionites, ſays he, expoſed themſelves to the torments of death for their ſect with an incredible ardour. Now in the firſt place we muſt know that the Marcionites prevailed in the ſecond and third century, at which time the Chriſtians were under perſecution; how then could they put the Marcionites, and other Heretics to death, when they had no judges, no tribunals, and they themſelves were every day condemned to death? We muſt moreover obſerve, that, in the age of the Marcionites, the morals of the church were ſo ſevere, that moſt Chriſtians did not think that they could, with a good conſcience, execute the office of a magiſtrate. They would not have condemned wicked men to death, how then could they ſentence Heretics to loſe their lives? But chiefly we muſt obſerve, that the Marcionites were a branch of the Gnoſtics, and that the general error of the Gnoſtics, was, *That GOD did not thirſt for the blood of Chriſtians, and that JESUS CHRIST did not expect that we ſhould procure our ſalvation by our death.* Wherefore they ridiculed the martyrs, and laughed at the folly, as they pretended, of thoſe who expoſed themſelves to death for their religion. And even Tertullian tells us, that the Gnoſtics, Valentinians, and other Heretics, in the time of perſecution, were the moſt forward to perſecute others, to ſave themſelves from being perſecuted *. Quum igitur fides æſtuat, & Eccleſia exuritur de figura rubi tunc Gnoſtici erumpunt, tunc Valentiniani proſerpunt, tunc omnes matyriorum refragatores ebulliunt calentes, & ipſi offendere, figere, occidere. - - - - - *Thus when the faithful are condemned to the fire, and the church is in flames, like the burning buſh, then ſwarm the Gnoſtics, then the Valentinians creep out; then all the oppoſers of martyrdom give a looſe to their rage, and are themſelves found perſecuting, deſtroying, and burning.* And upon theſe words, *omnes martyriorum refragatores,* Rigaltus makes this obſervation: he means the Gnoſtics, and other Heretics, who endeavoured to hinder every body from ſuffering

(24) Jurieu, Apology for the Reformers, *cap. xii, pag.* 171, *of Tom. i, Edit. in* 4*to.*

* Scorpiac. cap. i.

needleſs to give a particular account. For the reſt, if we will judge charitably, Marcion died

ſuffering martyrdom, and condemned it. Such were the Heretics, who, according to the learned Father Maimbourg, embraced torments and death for their ſect with an incredible ardour. But that this declaimer may not eſcape us, we deſire him, if he will quit the age of the Marcionites, to ſhow us what Heretics ſuffered death in great numbers to maintain their Hereſy, and when this happened. For as to us, who know nothing of Hiſtory but what books teach us, we find no ſuch ages, we meet with no ſuch numbers of Heretics who died for their errors. We know only that in the fourth century ſome orthodox biſhops proſecuted certain Spaniſh Heretics to death. . . . . It is very unhappy for a man to go out of his ſphere. Father Maimbourg has been taken up of late years with copying modern hiſtories; but if he had been wiſe, he would never have ſaid any thing of antient hiſtory; for he can ſay nothing of it which does not diſcover his ignorance. And I muſt confeſs that theſe diſcoveries give us great ſatisfaction; for they ſhow that this great author, who undertakes to write antient hiſtories, as, among others, that of Arianiſm, is only a poor tranſcriber, who knows nothing of antiquity.’

III. Let us now ſee what was replied on behalf of Mr Maimbourg (25). ‘ Whatever deſire we may have, to diſcover the faults of an author by criticizing upon him, methinks we ſhould never draw up a charge againſt him in a matter which is capable of a good ſenſe as well as of a bad one. What Mr Maimbourg has aſſerted about the Marcionites, is of this nature. It may be taken in a bad ſenſe, by ſaying with the apologiſt, that the Marcionites were not forward to run in crowds to martyrdom, ſince the primitive Chriſtians, were neither able nor willing to put them to death for their ſect, both becauſe they were under perſecution, and had not courts of judicature, and alſo becauſe they were averſe to execute the office of a magiſtrate. But, on the other ſide, the Marcionites might run to torments, in order to die for their ſect, if, to ſhow that it was good, they ſuffered martyrdom for the cauſe of JESUS CHRIST, as well as other Chriſtians who were not of their opinion. This ſenſe is no leſs natural than the other, but rather more; and I doubt not but Mr Maimbourg had it in view, when he ſpoke of the Marcionites: what convinces me of it, is, that he only ſays, the Marcionites ſuffered death with an incredible ardour, and not that the Chriſtians condemned them to it. The apologiſt has added this of his own head; but we may ſay, that his commentary is not agreeable to the meaning of the author whom he interprets. If this be ſo, as I believe it is, Mr Maimbourg has not ſhown a prodigious ignorance, ſuppoſing it may be proved, that there were pretended martyrs among the Marcionites. The apologiſt maintains, that theſe Heretics were ſo far from expoſing themſelves to martyrdom, that they were of the number of thoſe who condemned it, and laughed at thoſe who ſuffered it. If I did not profeſs to baniſh from this diſpute all offenſive words, I might ſay the apologiſt is fallen into that ignorance he objects to his adverſary. But I retract the word ignorance, and will not only uſe a ſofter word, but I ſhould be glad to find another expreſſion than what I am obliged to uſe, by telling him that he is miſtaken: which I prove thus †. Euſebius tells us, that one of thoſe whom GOD raiſed up to write againſt the Phrygiſts, confuted in his third book, thoſe who boaſted of having had many martyrs among them. *After they have been convicted*, ſays this anonymous author, *of all the points I have mentioned, and have nothing to anſwer, they alledge their martyrs, affirming, that they have many, and that this plainly proves the power of the prophetic ſpirit which they pretend to in their party. But, in my opinion, they are miſtaken; for the followers of other Hereſies boaſt alſo of having many martyrs; and yet we do not go over to their opinion, nor ever confeſs that the truth is on their ſide. The Marcionites ſay, that they have many martyrs of JESUS CHRIST, notwithſtanding which they are of a religion contrary to that of JESUS CHRIST.* I might obſerve further againſt this apologiſt, that the Marcionites did not prevail ſo in the ſecond and third century, but that there were ſtill ſome of them left in the fourth, ſince St Epiphanius ┼ tells us of a diſpute he had with a Marcionite (26). But I paſs over this as a trifle, that I may come to ſomething more conſiderable . . . . (27). If it may be ſaid, as certainly it may, that one *dies for Hereſy*, who expoſes himſelf to martyrdom in hopes of promoting it, we ſhall eaſily find other martyrs beſides thoſe of the Marcionites; for inſtance, thoſe of the Phrygiſts, who are mentioned by the anonymous author in Euſebius. Several of theſe Heretics expoſed themſelves to martyrdom, and ſuffered it for the end I have mentioned, as appears by the nameleſs author who oppoſed their Hereſy. St Auguſtin relates ‡, that in the times when idols were publickly adored, great crowds of the Donatiſts would appear at the Pagan ſolemnities, and throw themſelves head-long a-croſs thoſe idolaters, that they might be killed by the adorers of the idols. Here are Heretics who ran in crowds to death.’

IV. It is but juſt we ſhould hear what Mr Maimbourg himſelf replies (28). ‘ Mr Ferrrand . . . . does only tell him, with the greateſt modeſty in the world, that he is miſtaken in all theſe heads: for, firſt, he ſhows him that I never ſaid, nor pretended, that the Marcionites were ſentenced to torments by the Chriſtians, but only by the perſecuting Pagans. Secondly, That the Marcionites were not only in the ſecond and third centuries under the Pagan emperors, but alſo in the fourth, as he proves by St Epiphanius ┼┼, and I ſay further, as I have alread proved in their hiſtory, that there were ſome alſo in the ſixth under the Chriſtian emperors, when, according to the Imperial laws †† and conſtitutions, Heretics were puniſhed with death. In the third place he ſhows him, that the Marcionites and ſeveral other Heretics, ardently expoſed themſelves to torments, to ſupport and honour their ſect by a pretended martyrdom, as I had ſaid. This he proves to him by very convincing teſtimonies, and chiefly by that of Euſebius, that he may know, that what he boldly ſays does not appear in hiſtory, is very evident in it. For Euſebius tells us in his hiſtory, when he relates what was ſaid by an antient author, whom GOD raiſed up to write againſt the Phrygiſts or Cataphrygians, Heretics who boaſted they had among them ſeveral martyrs ‡‡. *After they were convicted of all the points I have mentioned.* They are the words of that nameleſs author, as they are related by Euſebius in Greek, and by Mr Ferrand in French, *and have nothing to anſwer, they alledge*, &c. . . . (29). What will the apologiſt ſay now? Here are the Cataphrygians, and many other antient Heretics, who are expoſed to torments by ſuffering a pretended a martyrdom; and here are alſo Marcionites who ſuffer it, and they ſuffer from the Pagans, and not by the order of the Chriſtians, becauſe, as he himſelf ſays, they had not at that time any judicature. Here then is a very authentic teſtimony of hiſtory which fully juſtifies me, and overthrows him, and perfectly deſtroys all that he has ſaid againſt me on this ſubject **. And if the confuſion into which this ought to put him, would permit him to advance one ſtep further, he might find, in what is cited to him from St Auguſtin †, great numbers of Donatiſts, who ran in crowds to death, and pretended to be martyrs, when they threw themſelves head-long a-croſs the Pagans, to ſuport their ſect by receiving death from the hand of theſe Idolaters. But is it poſſible, that this apologiſt, who believes himſelf ſo learned a man, ſhould be ignorant of that which almoſt every one knows, *viz.* that, upon occaſion of the pretended martyrs of the Donatiſts, St Auguſtin has uſed, in more than one place of his works, this ſentence, ſo good, and ſo common ┼; *That it is not the torment, but the cauſe for which a man ſuffers that makes him a martyr.* This he learned from St Cyprian, who had ſaid it a long time before him, on occaſion of the Schiſmatics and Heretics, who boaſted of their martyrs ‡, *He that is not united to the church, cannot be a martyr; he may be put to death, but he cannot be crowned.* And does not our St Gregory produce to this purpoſe this fine ſentiment of St Cyprian, uſing the words of St Auguſtin, to ſtop

(25) Ferrand's Anſwer to the Apology for the Reformation, *pag.* 213, *& ſeq.*

† *Book v, cap. xvi, pag.* 182, *C. D. pag.* 183. *A. Edit. Gr. Lat. Pariſ.* 1658.

┼ Hæreſ. 48. num. 2, pag. 403.

(26) Apply to Mr Ferrand what has been ſaid above, concerning *Lamb. Danæus*, citat. (21).

(27) Ferrand, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 217.

‡ Epiſt. L. ante med.

(28) Maimbourg, Hiſt. of the Pontificate of St Gregory, *book iv, pag.* 427, *Dutch Edit.*

┼┼ Hæreſ. 48, num. 2.

†† Cod. lib. i, leg. 5, 11, 12.

‡‡ Euſeb. lib. v, cap. xvi.

(29) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 428.

** Pag. 218.

† Aug. Ep. 50, lib. 3. cont. Ep. Parm. & alibi. Optat. lib. iii.

┼ Chriſti Martyrem non facit pœna, ſed cauſa. *Lib. iii, Contr. Creſcon. cap. iv, inſp. Pſa. xxxiv, lxviii.*

‡ Eſſe Martyr non poteſt qui in unitate non eſt; occidi poteſt, coronari non poteſt. *Cypr. lib. de unit. Ep.* 52, *ad Antonian.*

died in a good diſpoſition of mind, he was not ſo dogmatical in his Hereſy as his diſciples

the preſumption and pride of the ſchiſmatical biſhops, who boaſted that they ſuffered perſecution as martyrs * ? *You ought to know,* ſays he to them, *that, according to St Cyprian, it is not the torment but the cauſe that makes the martyr : And this being ſo, it is very unjuſt, and unreaſonable, that you ſhould dare to boaſt of that perſecution which you ſuffer.* Were there not then, in the times of theſe holy Fathers, Schiſmatics and Heretics, who pretended to have martyrs in their party, ſince they are told, that they are miſtaken, and that it is neither the perſecution nor the torment, nor death itſelf, when it is ſuffered, that makes the martyr, but the good cauſe, and the truth for which one ſuffers. After all that I have ſaid, what credit can be given to people, who write ſo boldly, and even inſultingly of things which are plainly proved to be falſe.’

V. There is yet one piece to be produced, and that is, the reply of the cenſurer of Mr Maimbourg, the reply, I ſay, which he made to Mr Ferrand. He ‘ accuſes me of ignorance, becauſe I did not know a paſſage of Euſebius, wherein it is ſaid, *That the Marcionites ſay they have ſeveral martyrs of JESUS CHRIST.* I ſhould not be aſhamed to learn of Mr Ferrand in point of quotations ; but I can aſſure him, that I both read, and obſerved this paſſage of Euſebius before he gave me notice of it. Neither do I apprehend that it will oblige me to retract the leaſt thing I have ſaid againſt Mr Maimbourg. For, I. The queſtion is not what the Marcionites ſaid, but what is the real truth of the matter. I doubt not but after the danger was over, and peace was reſtored to the church, the Marcionites would boaſt as others did, of their having martyrs. This honour they would aſſume to themſelves when it coſt them nothing. But it was falſe that they had any martyrs. Tertullian, and all the other antients, are more to be believed than the Marcionites themſelves, who far from being perſecuted were the foremoſt in the crowd of perſecutors. II. Beſides I would gladly know, if a few words ſpoken ſlightly, and by the by like theſe, *The Marcionites ſay they have ſeveral martyrs of* JESUS CHRIST, be ſufficient ground to aſſert with great aſſurance, *that the Marcionites run to the place of execution with incredible ardour, in order to die for their ſect?* One that reads this would be apt to think, that Mr Maimbourg had ſeen ſome martyrology of the Marcionites, wherein he had read the hiſtory and all the circumſtances of the death of theſe martyrs, and among other things had obſerved their conſtancy and incredible zeal. Certainly, I may tell him once more, that if he had read Tertullian, he would not have aſſerted ſuch a falſhood with ſo great aſſurance : and therefore, with Mr Ferrand's leave, we may ſay, that Mr Maimbourg is neither ſolidly nor univerſally learned. In what follows Mr Ferrand makes a long digreſſion, and quotes a vaſt number of paſſages from the antients about the puniſhments of Heretics ; whereof ſome would have them left to their own conſcience ; others would have them reſtrained, but not by inflicting a capital puniſhment on them ; and laſtly, others think fit that they ſhould ſuffer death. He concludes his chapter with citing long extracts out of Optatus and St Auguſtin, which prove this maxim, *cauſa non pœna facit Martyrem.* - - - - *The cauſe not the ſuffering makes a martyr.* It looks as if Mr Ferrand were under a vow to ſay nothing to the purpoſe : for what is all this to the point? Who denies that it is not the death but the cauſe of the death that makes the martyr ? Who denies but there have been Heretics who died for their Hereſy ? The thing to be proved was, whether it is poſſible for Heretics to die for their Hereſy, I. In great numbers : II. Perſons of both ſexes, *&c* (30).’

My readers have now the proceſs as fully drawn as poſſible ; for the parties have produced all they have to ſay : It remains only that ſentence ſhould be given, who is in the right, and who in the wrong, and I hope I may be allowed to give my opinion in the caſe.

In the firſt place it ſeems to me that Mr Maimbourg did not ſufficiently weigh his words ; his expreſſions are hyperbolical ; for it is neither certain that the Marcionites had many martyrs, nor that thoſe martyrs ſuffered death as Marcionites. It had been therefore more prudent to have ſaid only, that this ſect boaſted of having martyrs. II. But if the expreſſions of Mr Maimbourg are hyperbolical, thoſe of the cenſurer are much more ſo ; for a man ought not, only for uſing expreſſions that are too ſtrong, to be accuſed either *of a prodigious ignorance, or of too great boldneſs.* III. The cenſurer hath been ſo paſſionate, that did not we perceive a great air of moderation in the whole work of Mr Ferrand, the extraordinary modeſty which he ſhows in this place, might paſs for a malicious trick, deſigned to expoſe more effectually the hideous deformity of the criticiſm he refuted. When I read this page of his book, methinks I ſee fine pearls about the neck of an Æthiopian, the luſtre of which is increaſed by the blackneſs ſurrounding them, whilſt they add new degrees of obſcurity to the blackneſs (31). IV. According to all appearance, the cenſurer knew nothing of this paſſage of Euſebius, when he publiſhed his apology for the reformers, and was ignorant that the ſect of the Marcionites ſubſiſted ſtill in the fourth century. How then comes it, may one ſay, that he *affirms he had read and obſerved this paſſage, before Mr Ferrand gave him notice of it?* Does not he himſelf overthrow all his confutation, by confeſſing that he was not ignorant of this place in Euſebius? Since therefore this confeſſion was prejudicial to him, we muſt conclude that he was ſincere in it. I anſwer, that of two evils we muſt always chooſe the leaſt. Now in comparing the prejudice which might happen to him by his confeſſion with that which might happen by a conduct quite oppoſite, the damage is leſs which he ſuffers by the firſt than by the ſecond : and therefore he boaſted of knowing what Euſebius ſays concerning the martyrdom of the Marcionites. If he had confeſſed that he knew nothing of it, all his readers would have entertained the worſe opinion of his learning ; for the moſt ſtupid might have ſenſe enough to conclude with a great deal of eaſe, that he was a meer novice in eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and that it was very indecent in him to object this fault to his adverſary with ſo much haughtineſs. The evil was great ; the danger unavoidable, and the prejudice not to be eaſily repaired. But what had he to fear in boaſting that he was well acquainted with his Euſebius? I will tell it you here in two words, and more particularly hereafter. He might fear that the readers who reaſon well, and take the pains to compare exactly the objections with the anſwers, and to conſider whether a proof that is good in itſelf does not loſe it's force by ſuppoſing this or that, would perceive the weakneſs of his criticiſm. The miſchief of this is not very great, for of a thouſand readers there are ſcarce two who will trouble themſelves with theſe enquiries, or are capable of making them ; wherefore the danger is infinitely greater, when a perſon is expoſed to be thought ignorant by every one that can read, than when he is in danger of being taken for a bad Logician by a ſmall number of readers. Did he need a greater motive to act as he did? It was worth his while to boaſt that he knew very well the pretenſions of the Marcionites related by Euſebius ; to boaſt of it I ſay, being in ſuch circumſtances wherein he was expoſed to the great inconveniences, which I ſhall now lay open. V. All the proofs made uſe of againſt Maimbourg, may be reduced to this : the Marcionites lived only in the ſecond and third centuries, therefore they had no martyrs ; for at that time the Chriſtian church had not any courts of judicature, and beſides they taught with the Gnoſtics, that it was a fooliſh thing to expoſe one's ſelf to martyrdom. This reaſoning ſuppoſes, that the followers of Marcion were neither perſecuted by the Chriſtians nor by the Pagans. Could any one be ſo bold as to ſay this, if he knew, 1. that an author cited by Euſebius, confeſſes, that they boaſted of the multitude of their martyrs ? Καὶ οἱ πρωτοί γε ἀπὸ τῆς Μαρκίωνος αἱρέσεως Μαρκιωνισταὶ καλούμενοι, πλείστους ὅσους ἔχειν χριστοῦ μάρτυρας λέγουσιν· ἀλλὰ τόν γε Χριστὸν αὐτὸν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν οὐχ᾽ ὁμολογοῦσι. Primi certe qui Marcionis hæreſim ſequuntur, vulgo Marcionitæ cognominati, quamplurimos habere ſe dicunt martyres Chriſti. Et tamen Chriſtum ipſum revera minime confitentur (32). - - - *The firſt followers of the Hereſy of Marcion, uſually called Marcionites, boaſt that they* ciples were. We may ſay of his ſyſtem the ſame thing as of that of the Manichees. He

---

* Debetis enim ſcire, ſicut beatus Cyprianus dixit, quia Martyrem non facit pœna, ſed cauſa. Dum igitur ita fit, incongruum nimis eſt de ea vos quam dicitis perſecutione gloriari. *Greg. lib. ii, ind. x, Ep. xxxvi*

(30) Jurieu, True Syſtem of the Church, *pag.* 644, 645.

(31) *Every body knows this aphoriſm of the ſchools,* Contraria juxta ſe poſita magis eluceſcunt.

(32) Euſeb. lib. v, cap. xvi, pag. m. 182. *D.*

they had a great number who died martyrs for the teſtimony of JESUS CHRIST *: and yet they do not confeſs* CHRIST *in reality*. 2. That Euſebius does not deny the fact, but only denies, that the great number of the Marcionites, that were martyrs, was a proof of the goodneſs of their ſect? VI. This paſſage of Euſebius utterly ruins the pretenſion of the critic, *viz.* that the followers of Marcion taught with the Gnoſtics, that none but fools would loſe their lives for their religion, and that *they were the moſt forward among the perſecutors, in order to keep off perſecution from themſelves*. How could they teach this, when they pretended to prove by their martyrs, that they were the true church? VII. It is impertinent to cite Tertullian, ſince he ſays nothing expreſly of that ſect, and it is ridiculous to pretend, that thoſe who join the note of Rigaltius with the words of Tertullian, dare not mention any Marcionites that were martyrs. VIII. It is very true, that Marcion agreed with the Gnoſtics in ſome things, but nevertheleſs his ſect was different from theirs; and ſo without expreſs teſtimony and particular proofs, it is not juſt to aſcribe to him the opinion of the Gnoſtics concerning martyrdom. For if ſo, it might be lawful to argue thus: *the Arminians are a branch of the Proteſtants; therefore they believe the real preſence like thoſe of the confeſſion of Augſburg, and abſolute predeſtination like thoſe of the confeſſion of Geneva*. IX. It is very ſtrange, that one who preſumed to inſult Mr Maimbourg for his ignorance of antiquity, ſhould not know that the ſect of the Marcionites flouriſhed very much towards the end of the fourth century, as St Epiphanius informs us (33). It flouriſhed ſtill in the time of Theodoret, who informs us, that he converted and baptized more than ten thouſand Marcionites (34). Note, that Lambertus Danæus was not ignorant, that theſe ſectaries boaſted of their martyrs; but with St Cyprian he pretends, that ſuch of them as ſuffered death for religion were not martyrs. ‘Martyres etiam ſe ‘habere jactant, ut ſcribit Euſebius lib. 5. cap. 16. ‘inter quos recenſet Methodorum Smyrnæ crematum, ‘lib. 4. cap. 16. ſed falſo, nam cauſa facit martyres, ‘quemadmodum Cyprianus ait, non autem pœna (35). ‘*They alſo boaſt that they have martyrs (as Euſebius* ‘*writes, among whom he reckons Methodorus burnt at* ‘*Smyrna) but falſly, for it is the cauſe that makes* ‘*martyrs, not the ſuffering, as St Cyprian ſays.*’ He ſpeaks of a Marcionite prieſt that was burnt at Smyrna at the ſame time with Polycarp. Ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ γραφῇ, καὶ ἄλλα μαρτύρια συνῆπτο κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν Σμύρναν πεπραγμένα ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν περίοδον τοῦ χρόνου τῆς τοῦ Πολυκάρπου μαρτυρίας· μεθ᾽ ὧν καὶ Μητρόδωρος τῆς κατὰ Μαρκίωνα πλάνης, πρεσβύτερος δὴ εἶναι δοκῶν, πυρὶ παραδοθεὶς ἀνῄρεται. Sed & alia martyria ſub idem tempus quo Polycarpus paſſus eſt, apud Smyrnam facta, in eadem epiſtola conjunctim leguntur. In quibus & Metrodorus quidam qui Marcionis ſectæ preſbyter dicebatur, flammis conſumptus interiit (36). - - - - - *Other martyrs are likewiſe mentioned in the ſame epiſtle, to have ſuffered at Smyrna, about the time with Polycarp, among which one Metrodorus, ſaid to be a preſbyter of the ſect of the Marcionites, was burnt.* X. I do not know whether I may not ſay, that theſe people reckoned thoſe for martyrs among them who were perhaps killed in ſome popular commotion of the orthodox. It would be no great wonder if ſome did believe, that even before the emperors were Chriſtians, the Heretics were expoſed ſometimes to the violence of the Catholics; for we learn from St Epiphanius, that Manes had like to have been killed by the common people in the city of Caſchara, where he had publickly diſputed with the biſhop of that place. He had infallibly loſt his life there, if a very honeſt man, called Marcellus, had not by his venerable preſence, put a ſtop to the burning zeal of the people. Ἐντεῦθεν ὁ Μάνης ἀποδράσας, βουλομένων τῶν δήμων αὐτὸν λιθοβολῆσαι, εἰ μὴ ὅτι παρῆλθεν εἰς μέσον Μάρκελλος, καὶ τῷ αἰδεσίμῳ αὐτοῦ προσώπῳ κατεδυσώπησε τοὺς δήμους, ἐπεὶ ἂν ὁ τάλας νεκρὸς μένων πάλαι ἐτεθνήκει. *Secundum hæc Manes fuga ſibi conſulit. Populus enim lapidibus illum obruere volebat; niſi Marcellus in medium prodiens vultu ipſo venerationis pleno aſpectuque repreſſiſſet. Quod niſi feciſſet, jam dudum infelix ipſe periſſet* (37). This honeſt man had uſed the ſame moderation before, to hinder the biſhop from cauſing Manes to be killed. This prelate was called Archelaus, he was in ſo great a rage, when he knew what Manes had writ to Marcellus, that he would immediately have ſeized this Heretic, had not Marcellus hindred him by his intreaties. Ὁ δὲ Ἀρχέλαος γνοὺς τὴν αἰτίαν, καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀναγνοὺς, ἔβρυχε τοὺς ὀδόντας, ὥσπερ λέων ὠρυόμενος, καὶ ζῆλον Θεοῦ ἀναλαβὼν ἐπειρᾶτο ὁρμῆσαι μᾶλλον ἕως αὐτοῦ, καὶ χειρώσασθαι τὸν τοιοῦτον. Archelaus re omni perſpecta dentibus fremens, rugientis leonis inſtar, ac divino quodam ardore percitus ad Manichæum potius proficiſci cupiebat, hominemque capere (38). - - - - *Archelaus being informed of the whole matter, raged like a roaring lion, being fired with a divine zeal, and reſolved to go and ſeize him.* Some days after he had occaſion again for all his eloquence to reſtrain the zeal of this prelate. Manes having received the anſwer of Marcellus, went to him. Archelaus was of opinion that he ſhould be killed like a wild beaſt, who ravaged the lord's ſheep-fold. But Marcellus, by his wiſe diſcourſes, inclined him to mildneſs, and made him agree to confer peaceably with this hereſiarch. Perhaps I ſhall not be believed, unleſs I cite the Greek, which therefore I will do. Ὁ δὲ Ἐπίσκοπος Ἀρχέλαος ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ μετὰ τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸ ζηλωτικὸν τῆς πίστεως, ἐβουλεύετο εἰ ἦν δυνατὸν, ἐξ αὐτῆς τὸν ἄνδρα ὥσπερ πάρδαλιν ἢ λύκον, ἤ τι ἕτερον τῶν θηρίων ἀγρεύσας, θανάτῳ παραδοῦναι, ἵνα μὴ λυμανθῇ τὰ θρέμματα τοιούτου θηρὸς, [ἐφ᾽ ὅδου] τὴν εἴσοδον κατανοῶν. Ὁ δὲ Μάρκελλος τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ μᾶλλον ἠξίου, καὶ ἀνεξικάκως τὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν διάλογον ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι. At Archelaus Epiſcopus præter doctrinam fidei inſuper ardore præditus, author erat, ut ſi fieri poſſet, homo ille, pardi inſtar ac lupi, vel cujuſvis alterius beſtiæ interceptus morti traderetur, ne ejuſmodi feræ incurſione pecora læderentur, cum illius ingreſſum cognoſceret. Marcellus contra patienter ac leniter potius illum in colloquio tractandum putabat (39). - - - - *But Archelaus the biſhop being not only ſound in faith, but alſo very zealous; when he heard of his coming, was of opinion, that, if poſſible, he ought to be killed like a tyger, or wolf, or any other beaſt of prey, leſt the flock ſhould be hurt, by the ravages of ſuch ſort of creatures: Marcellus, on the other hand, adviſed that he ſhould rather be diſcourſed with, and treated patiently, and mildly.* This ſhows, that under pretence that the orthodox had not any courts of judicature for the firſt three centuries, one muſt not conclude ſo magiſterially, that the Heretics could not boaſt of having martyrs. All communions agree in honouring with this title ſome of thoſe who die for their religion by the wicked attempts of the common people. XI. Laſtly I obſerve, that Mr Ferrand ſhould not have been inſulted for making long *extracts out of Optatus and St Auguſtin which prove this maxim*, Cauſa non pœna facit martyrem; for it was neceſſary for him to make them to anſwer the challenge of the apologiſt, and to ſhow his raſhneſs: once more here is the tenor of this challenge (40); ‘but ‘that this declaimer may not eſcape, we deſire him, ‘if he will quit the age of the Marcionites, to ſhow ‘us what Heretics died in crowds to maintain their ‘Hereſy, and when this happened. As for us, who ‘know nothing of Hiſtory but what books teach us, ‘we find no ſuch ages, we meet with no ſuch crowds ‘of Heretics, who died for their errors: we know ‘only, that in the fourth century, ſome orthodox bi‘ſhops proſecuted to death certain Spaniſh Heretics.’ This challenge does plainly contain this aſſertion. *In the firſt four centuries there were no other martyrs that were Heretics but ſome Priſcillianiſts.* The contrary to this was proved to him by long citations. What then can be more ridiculous, than to laugh at thoſe long extracts, and to ſay they are impertinent, and that *he does not deny that there were Heretics who died for their hereſy*, and that *the queſtion was not, whether it be poſſible for Heretics to die for their Hereſy* (41); but only whether it be poſſible in the circumſtances alledged by him, which are five in number? It is manifeſt that this challenge contains nothing relating to thoſe circumſtances, and ſo this author is notoriouſly guilty of acting inſincerely. He challenges a man to prove ſuch a thing to him; and when he ſees

2

(33) See the remark [D], citat. (20).

(34) Theodor. Epiſt. cxlvi, apud Baron. ad ann. 424, num. 19.

(35) Lambert. Danæus, ubi ſupra, fol. 59.

(36) Euſeb. lib. iv, cap. xv, pag. m. 135. *Compare this with what Mr Jurieu ſays,* It was falſe that they had any martyrs. *Conſult Baronius,* ad ann. 424, num. 14, *where he ſays,* Facilius eſt invenire Marcionitam à Gentilibus olim occidi, quam à Chriſtianis Eccleſiæ redditum. - - - - *It was heretofore eaſier to find a Marcionite killed by the Heathens, than one reſtored to the church by the Chriſtians.*

(37) Epiph. adv. Hæreſ. num. 66, pag. m. 627.

(38) Id. ib. pag. 624.

(39) Ib. pag. 625.

(40) Jurieu, Apology for the Reformers, *Tom.* i, *pag.* 172.

(41) Jurieu, Syſtem of the Church, *pag.* 645.

He did not know how to manage his principal point [*F*]: but entangled himſelf in a multitude

ſees it proved demonſtratively, he complains of the length of the proof, and ſays, the queſtion was not about this, but about another thing. What is moſt aſtoniſhing is, that a man ſo much verſed in controverſy, ſhould dare to give ſuch a challenge as this; ſince almoſt all the Romiſh controverſial writers, in anſwer to any thing that is alledged from the martyrology of the Proteſtants, ſay, that the antient Heretics boaſted of the ſame thing. I ſhall only quote a Jeſuit, who wrote againſt Peter du Moulin, and whom this miniſter and Andrew Rivet have refuted. ‘ Vetus delirium hæreticorum eſt, *ſays he* (42), Eccleſiam Catholicam in Martyrum cenſu æmulari velle. Ita de Marcionitis & de Cataphrygibus ſeu Montaniſtis ſcribit ‡ Apollinaris Epiſcopus Hierapoleos, antiquiſſimus Theologus; ipſos, cum omnia quæ pro ſe attulerant argumenta, fuiſſent rationibus conſentaneis rejecta, ad Martyres confugiſſe, & ad propheticum illorum ſpiritum. Invehuntur pariter tum ſanctus Cyprianus contra pſeudomartyres Novatianos, tum ſanctus Epiphanius contra Euphemitas: qui ob eorum multitudinem ſe Martyrianos vaniſſime appellarunt. Habuere ſuos Donatiſtæ; tantáque inſaniâ Martyrii eam larvam affectarunt, ut cum Eccleſiæ tyrannorum perſecutio deeſſet, ſe aliquoties dederint præcipites exanimaverintque; deque his Optatus Milevitanus, divus Auguſtinus, & Theodoretus meminerunt. Non caruerunt iis quoque Ariani & Priſcillianiſtæ, quorum inſiſtere veſtigiis ſatagunt Sectarii noſtri temporis, & ideo ſuos habent Martyrologos, qui mendacia intexunt ineptiis dicerem lepidiſſimis, niſi jocari in re tanti momenti facinus eſſet. - - - - - *It is an antient infatuation of Heretics, to rival the Catholic church in the number of their martyrs: ſo Apollonaris, biſhop of Hierapolis, a very antient Divine, writes of the Marcionites, and Cataphrygians, or Montaniſts; that they, when all their arguments were refuted by ſound reaſoning, uſed to take refuge in their martyrs, and their prophetic ſpirit. St Cyprian in like manner inveighs againſt the Novatian Pſeudo-martyrs, and St Epiphanius againſt the Euphemites, who, from the multitude of their martyrs, were vain enough to call themſelves Martyriſts. The Donatiſts had theirs, and to ſuch a degree of madneſs did their infatuation carry them, that when at any time the church's freedom from the perſecution of tyrants, prevented their meeting their fates from the hands of others, they would ſeek it from their own, and would throw themſelves down headlong from precipices to obtain it; as is mentioned by Optatus Milevitanus, St Auguſtin, and Theodoret. Nor were the Arians, and Priſcillianiſts, without their martyrs; in whoſe ſteps our modern ſectaries are ſo anxious to tread, and therefore they have their martyrologiſts, who weave into their fictions, ſuch ridiculous tales, which one might call moſt entertaining, and diverting, but that it would be criminal to jeſt in a matter of ſuch importance.*’ Note, Petraſancta is miſtaken, as well as Baronius (43), in thinking that Apollinaris was the author whom Euſebius quotes. Rufinus and Nicephorus are guilty of the ſame error. See how they are refuted in the firſt tome of the Bibliotheque of Mr du Pin (44), agreeable to the reaſons which Henricus Valeſius (45) and Peter Halloix (46) have alledged.

THE advantages of collecting the writings of ſuch controverſies.

It were to be wiſhed, that ſome good critic would take the pains to collect together all the pieces of ſuch like controverſies, and place them one after another, as I have done, in regard to the diſpute about the martyrs of the Marcionites. I have given here a ſpecimen of this work, to encourage thoſe who are able to undertake it. It would be a work of very great uſe, either to diſcover the diſingenuity of ſome diſputants, or to accuſtom authors to a greater exactneſs: for knowing that very few, if any, compare together the replies and rejoinders which are ſcattered in many volumes, they do not fear the conſequences of their diſingenuous practices; which they would certainly be afraid of, if they knew that ſome body would make ſuch a collection of the objections and anſwers, and of the replies and rejoinders, as will be moſt proper to ſhow in a moment the ſtrength and weakneſs both of the one and the other; which might be ſeen the more eaſily if there were added to it ſuch obſervations as I have made above. The beſt way of doing it, would be by ranging the whole in two or three columns. See the preface to the project of this Dictionary, towards the end.

[*F*] *He did not know how to manage his principal point.*] If a man of abilities equal to thoſe of Des Cartes had been to manage this affair, the ſyſtem of the two principles could not have been overturned ſo eaſily as it was by the Fathers, when they had none to oppoſe, but Cerdon, Marcion, Apelles, and Manes, who knew not how to make uſe of their advantages, either becauſe they admitted the goſpel, or becauſe they had not knowledge enough to avoid the explications, which perplexed them the moſt (47). It was the moſt ridiculous thing in the world, to maintain that CHRIST did indeed appear upon earth, but not with a true humane body, and to give this reaſon for it, becauſe the fleſh is not the work of the good principle but of the ill one. The Marcionites diſpute pitifully about this. In general, if we judge of their ſtrength by the objections they propoſe in the dialogue of Origen (48); we muſt think very meanly of them. We do not find that they preſſed home the difficulties about the origin of evil; for it ſeems, that after they were anſwered, that evil came from the bad uſe of the free-will of man, they knew not what to reply; or if they urged the fore-ſight of this miſchievous use, they were ſatisfied with the firſt anſwer, how weak ſoever it was. Origen (49) having anſwered, that an intelligent creature, if it had not enjoyed free-will, would have been immutable and immortal like GOD, ſtops the mouth of the Marcionite, for he has nothing to reply. Neverthleſs it was eaſy to refute this anſwer; for he needed only to have aſked Origen, whether the bleſſed in paradiſe are equal to GOD in the attributes of immutability and immortality. He would doubtleſs have anſwered, they are not: And conſequently, might it have been replied, a creature does not become a GOD, becauſe it is determined to good, and is deprived of that which you call free-will. You do not therefore anſwer the objection; for the queſtion was, wherefore GOD, fore-ſeeing that a creature would ſin, if it were left to its own free-conduct, did not determine it to that which was good, as he does continually determine the ſouls of the bleſſed which are tranſlated into paradiſe? You anſwer after ſuch a manner as ſhows, that you took the queſtion to have been, why GOD did not give a creature a being as immutable and independant as himſelf? But there was never any ſuch queſtion put to you. St Baſil has given another anſwer which has the ſame defect. GOD, ſays he, would not have us to love him by conſtraint, and we our ſelves do not think our ſervants well-diſpoſed to our ſervice, while we hold them in chains, but only when they obey us of their own inclination. Ὅτι καὶ σὺ τοὺς οἰκέτας, οὐχ ὅταν δεσμίους ἔχῃς, εὔνους ὑπολαμβάνεις, ἀλλ' ὅταν ἑκουσίως ἴδῃς ἀποπληροῦντάς σοι τὰ καθήκοντα, καὶ Θεῷ τοίνυν οὐ τὸ ἠναγκασμένον φίλον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐξ ἀρετῆς κατορθούμενον, ἀρετὴ δὲ ἐκ προαιρέσεως καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνάγκης γίνεται. *Quoniam & tu ſervos, non quando vinctos in cuſtodiâ tenes, benevolos eſſe tibi exiſtimas; ſed cum ſponte omnia, quæ erga te oportet, videris agere. Sic item Deo eum puta fore amicum, non qui coactus, ſed qui ſponte ſuâ virtuteque illi obtemperat. Virtus vero ex voluntate perficitur, non ex neceſſitate* (50). To convince St Baſil that his reflexion is very falſe, we need only put him in mind of the ſtate of paradiſe: GOD is there loved and ſerved perfectly well, and yet the bleſſed do not enjoy free-will; they have no longer that fatal privilege of the power to commit ſin. Muſt we therefore compare them to thoſe ſlaves who obey only by force? What was St Baſil dreaming of? And ſince he anſwers the difficulties by the parallel we have produced, it is a ſign that the followers of Marcion and Manes made no reply, when they ſaw themſelves overthrown by this argument, and that they never thought to put their adverſaries in mind of the ſtate of glorified ſouls. If there were any Marcionites at this day, as able diſputants, as either the Jeſuits or the Janſeniſts in their diſputations againſt one another, they would begin where their anceſtors left off. They would firſt of all attack the laſt intrenchment of Origen, viz. free-will, and before they had advanced

(42) Silveſter Petraſancta, in notis in epiſtolam Petri Molinæi ad Balzacum, *pag.* 36, 37.

‡ Apud Euſeb. hiſt. lib. v, cap. xv.

(43) Ad ann. 173, num. 20, *& ſeq.*

(44) Pag. 68. Dutch edition.

(45) In Euſeb. *lib. v, cap. vi.*

(46) In notis ad vitam S. Apollin. *cap. iii.*

(47) Compare what was ſaid in the article MANICHEES, remark [*B*].

(48) I mean the dialogue againſt the Marcionites attributed to Origen, of which Mr Wetſtein, profeſſor at Baſil, publiſhed an edition in 1674, being the firſt in which the Greek appeared.

(49) A Dialogue againſt the Marcionites, *Sect. iii, pag.* 79, 80. *Edit. Baſil.* 1674.

(50) Baſilius Magnus, Tom. i, in homilia, *Quod Deus non ſit auctor mali*, pag. 369.

multitude of ill-contrived explications; from whence it came to paſs, that the Fathers eaſily confounded the Marcionites. It ſeems they were overthrown by the firſt anſwer that was given them: for as ſoon as they were told of the inviolable privileges of human liberty, they were altogether ſilent and mute as fiſhes. Yet it was eaſy to reply to this [*G*]. I ſhall make a few obſervations againſt Moreri [*H*].

advanced three ſyllogiſms, would oblige the reſpondent to confeſs, that he did not underſtand what he affirmed (51), and that theſe are unſearchable depths of the ſovereignty of the Creator in which our reaſon is ſwallowed up, and nothing but faith can ſupport us. This is in reality our reſource. Revelation is the only magazine of the arguments, with which we muſt oppoſe theſe people: it is by this means only, that we are able to refute the pretended eternity of an ill principle. But when we go about to determine after what manner the Creator has acted, with reſpect to the firſt ſin of the creature, we find our ſelves very much entangled. All the hypotheſes laid down by Chriſtians, are not ſufficient to ward off the blows that are levelled at them (52). They are triumphant when they act offenſively; but they loſe all their advantage when they ſuſtain the attack. Our ideas in this matter are only juſt clear enough to make an eternal war; like thoſe princes, who cannot hinder others from ravaging their frontiers, tho' they are ſtrong enough to make incurſions into the enemy's country. It does not appear that Marcion and his followers did well underſtand the ſtrength and weakneſs of the orthodox.

Prudentius who wrote a poem about the origin of ſin, has not well anſwered the objection of thoſe heretics (53).

[*G*] *Yet it was eaſy to reply to this.*] I have already ſhown in the preceding remark, that to refute invincibly the anſwer of St Baſil, it was ſufficent to deſire him to conſider the ſtate of the bleſſed. I add here, that it was not neceſſary to put him upon ſo high a contemplation; for it was ſufficient to deſire him to conſider the ſtate of the juſt in this life. It is by virtue of the grace of the holy ſpirit that the children of God, while they are travellers, I mean while they are in this world, do love their heavenly father, and perform good works. Neither St Baſil, nor the other Greek Fathers, could deny this, tho' they did not aſſert the neceſſity of grace efficacious by itſelf ſo ſtrongly as St Auguſtin did. Does the grace of God reduce the faithful to the condition of a ſlave who obeys only by force? Does it hinder them from loving God voluntarily, and from obeying him with a good and ſincere will? If this queſtion had been put to St Baſil and the other fathers, who wrote againſt the Marcionites, would they not have been obliged to anſwer negatively? But what is the natural and immediate conſequence of that anſwer? Is it not to ſay, that, without infringing the liberty of the creature, God could infallibly determine it to good? And therefore ſin does not proceed from hence, that the Creator could not prevent it without deſtroying the free-will of the creature; but we muſt find out ſome other cauſe of it. I wonder that the Fathers of the church did not ſee the weakneſs of their anſwers, and that their adverſaries did not give them notice of it. I know very well, that theſe matters had not then paſſed thro' all the diſcuſſions which have appeared in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries; but it is certain the primitive church knew perfectly well the agreement of human liberty with the grace of the holy ſpirit (54). The moſt rigid Chriſtian ſects acknowledge at this day, that the decrees of God did not impoſe upon the firſt man a neceſſity of ſinning, and that the moſt efficacious grace does not deſtroy the liberty of a ſinful man. They confeſs therefore, that the decrees of preſerving mankind conſtantly and invariably in a ſtate of innocence, how abſolute ſoever they might have been, would have permitted all men to perform all their duties very freely. The Thomiſts maintain, that phyſical pre-determination perfects the liberty of our ſoul, far from deſtroying or weakening it; and yet they teach that this pre-determination is of ſuch a nature, that when it is given to produce an act of love, it is not poſſible *in ſenſu compoſito*, that the ſoul ſhould produce an act of hatred. I frankly confeſs, that I believe they do not very well underſtand, how the liberty of the creature is perfected by this phyſical pre-determining quality, which the firſt cauſe, ſay they, produces in the ſoul of a man before it acts; but whether they do underſtand it or no, it is certain, that they afford enough totally to overthrow the ſolution which St Baſil gave to the objections of the Manichees. As for the Moliniſts, they cannot make uſe of ſuch a ſolution, for they do not reject the grace of God, which infallibly ſecures a man's predeſtination; they do not deny but God, if he pleaſes, can ſecure a man who always acts freely from ever falling into ſin in the moſt dangerous temptations.

[*H*] *I ſhall make a few obſervations againſt Moreri.*] I. His remark, that Sinope, a city of Paphlagonia, had formerly been a city of Pontus, is very wrong ſince Sinope was at the ſame time both a city of Paphlagonia and a city of Pontus. II. It is not true, that Marcion was never received into the communion of the church of Rome (55). III. Nor that *after he had followed a long time the errors of Cerdon, he invented new ones in* 134. We have ſhown before that he came to Rome under Antoninus Pius, who did not begin to reign till 138. Baronius, building upon ſome paſſages of Tertullian, believed that Marcion began to publiſh his tenets at Rome in 146 (56); and yet there are other paſſages of this Father which teſtify, that Marcion did not come to Rome till the time of Pope Anicetus (57): which ſuppoſes that he did not arrive there till twenty years after the birth of his ſect. Tertullian was in the right when he ſaid (58), that he was not well informed of the time when this heretic began to dogmatize. IV. Since Cerdon went to Rome in Pope Hyginus's time (59), who was not created till the year 153, how was it poſſible that Marcion ſhould invent new hereſies in 134, after he had followed a long time thoſe which Cerdon taught him at Rome? V. It is falſe, that Marcion *called himſelf* JESUS CHRIST *ſent to aboliſh the law as being wicked.* Moreri ſlanders him in aſcribing this to him. If it be ſaid, that Moreri, in theſe words, *He called himſelf* JESUS CHRIST, does not refer to Marcion, but to one of the gods of this heretic, to him whom he owned *for the author of the goſpel, and the redeemer of the univerſe*; this will not clear Moreri, he will ſtill be guilty both of expreſſing himſelf ill, and of reporting amiſs the opinion of this heretic. Marcion admitting two gods, one good and the other bad, ſaid, that one made the world, and the other was the father of JESUS CHRIST (60). Perhaps the confuſion with which Baronius ſpeaks of this, deceived Moreri. *Duos poſuit Deos* (Marcion) *ſibi contrarios, quorum alter bonus, malus vero eſſe alter; alter legis veteris auctor, alter autem novæ . . . . . ab illoque malo mundum eſſe creatum, à bono autem reſtitutum atque redemptum, huncque fuiſſe Jeſum ſolventem legem atque Prophetas à Deo patre miſſum* (61). Thus this paſſage is read in my edition of Baronius (62). I know not whether the Printers have omitted ſome words, or whether we muſt attribute to Baronius the contradiction found there, which conſiſts in ſaying, that JESUS CHRIST was the good principle, and that his Father ſent him into the world.

(51) They would pretend that ſuch a confeſſion, amounts to no leſs than being reduced to a *non plus, ad terminos non loqui.*

(52) See in the article PAULICIANS, remark [*F*], what I have cited from the *Judgment of Mr Jurieu about the looſe methods of explaining Grace.* See alſo what a French miniſter anſwered to the Lutherans. Mr Beauval hath mentioned it in the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, *Nov.* 1695, *pag.* 105, *& ſeq.* but chiefly ſee the labyrinths of Bernardinus Ochinus.

(53) See the remark [*F*] of the article PRUDENTIUS.

(54) That is, of ſuch a grace as certainly produces it's effect.

(55) See the remark [*B*].

(56) Baron. ad ann. 146, num. 1.

(57) He was created biſhop of Rome in 167, according to Baronius.

(58) Adv. Marcion. *lib. i, cap. xix*, apud Baronium, ibid.

(59) Irenæus, *lib. i, cap. xxviii*, apud Baron. ibid. num. 2.

(60) See Danæus, *ubi ſupra, fol.* 36, citing Iren. *lib. ii, cap. i*, and *lib. iv, cap. lvii*, and other Fathers.

(61) Baronius, ubi ſupra, num. 9, *pag.* 117.

(62) It is that of Antwerp, 1597.

MARESTS (JOHN DES) a Pariſian, Sieur de St Sorlin, was one of the fineſt wits of the XVIIth century; but he became at laſt viſionary and fanatical. He was very much beloved by cardinal Richelieu, and we may ſay that among other offices (*a*),

---

(*a*) *He was comptroller-general of the extraordinaries of the war, and ſecretary-general of the marine of the Levant.* Hiſtory of the French Academy, pag. m. 342.

he had under his eminence an employment of wit [*A*]. He himſelf has left us a deſcription of his morals, which is not very much to his advantage; for he confeſſes, that to ſeduce the women who oppoſed him out of a concern for their ſalvation, he made no ſcruple to incline them to Atheiſm [*B*]. He was a member of the French academy at its firſt foundation, and one of its principal ornaments. He wrote ſeveral dramatic pieces (*b*), which were much applauded, and chiefly that intituled *Les Viſionaires*. He undertook an Epic Poem (*c*), which coſt him many years labour, and he believed he ſhould have taken a longer time to finiſh it, if Providence had not had a deſign to employ his pen in works of Devotion [*C*]. He alſo wrote romances, wherein he departed from thoſe ideas of virtue which were then repreſented in that kind of writings [*D*]. He died in 1676. He declared himſelf an enemy to the Janſeniſts, but certainly he had better never have meddled in that quarrel; for had it not been for this, his viſions which are ſo well deſcribed by theſe gentlemen [*E*], had lain concealed in darkneſs. He promiſed the king of France, by

[*A*] *He had under his eminence an employment of wit.*] Hear what he ſays himſelf under the name of Euſebius in one of his books. ‘(1) With the help of ſome, by whom I was ſupported to arrive at the height of the palace of fortune, I came at laſt to his apartment, who reigned in this high place. There I taſted a thouſand raviſhing pleaſures by the eſteem he had for me, by the careſſes both public and private, wherewith he honoured me, by the applauſes I received from all parts, and by the victories I often gained over my envious enemies . . . . (2) You will force me to give you a taſte of theſe delicacies whereby you may judge of the reſt, and which will ſerve to ſhow the indeſatigable ſtrength of the genius of this great man, who could not relax from one labour of the mind, but by another labour of the ſame nature. Immediately after he had ſpent ſome hours in ſettling all the affairs of ſtate, he often ſhut up himſelf with a learned Divine, to handle with him the ſublimeſt queſtions of religion, and his wit gathered a new ſtrength in theſe changes of converſation. After this he commonly called me in alone, to divert himſelf about matters more gay and nice, in which he took wonderful pleaſure. For having obſerved in me a ſort of fruitful wit to bring forth ſudden thoughts, he confeſſed to me, that his greateſt pleaſure was, when in our converſation, he excelled my thoughts. And if I propoſed another thought beyond his, then his wit made a new effort with very great ſatisfaction. . . . . . Now judge you, if I did not taſte in my turn the ſame pleaſure, which ſeemed to him ſo great, ſince it often happened, that I went beyond his thoughts.’

[*B*] *He confeſſes that to ſeduce the women . . . . . he made no ſcruple to incline them to Atheiſm.*] He does not only ſay, ‘(3) That he ſtaid ſome time in the cottage of carnal and groſs pleaſures, which had but one ſign, coarſely painted, and whereon Bacchus and Venus were repreſented; and that finding that theſe pleaſures ruined his body and his fortune, he reſolved to ſeek after thoſe which were more ſublime. *He adds*, (4) That he ought to mourn with tears of blood for the bad uſe he made of his eloquence among the women; for I made uſe of nothing but diſguiſed lies, ſubtile tricks, and infamous treacheries. I endeavoured to ruin the ſouls of thoſe whom I feigned to be in love with; I ſought out deceitful ſpeeches to diſturb, to blind, and ſeduce them, that I might induce them to believe, that vice was virtue, or at leaſt a thing natural and indifferent. I betrayed even GOD himſelf, by interpreting his laws maliciouſly, and ſetting off the falſe and damnable reaſonings of the voluptuous and impious, ſuch as you are, and I employed all the efforts of my eloquence to extinguiſh the ſenſe of Virtue in a ſoul.’ *It was proved to him* (5), *that* ‘He had denoted himſelf by thoſe individual and perſonal characters;’ ſo that what his Euſebius ſays, is his own hiſtory.

[*C*] *He believed he ſhould have taken . . . . . a longer time to finiſh his Clovis, if Providence had not had a deſign to employ his pen in works of devotion.*] It is he alſo who revealed this little myſtery; for he begins his *Delices de l'Eſprit* (6) *with a kind of prodigy, which he pretends happened to him; which was*, ſays he (7), ‘That GOD did ſo ſenſibly aſſiſt him in finiſhing his great work of Clovis, thereby to bring him the ſooner to ſuch things as were more uſeful, more nice, and more ſublime, that he durſt not ſay in what time he finiſhed the nine books which remained, and poliſhed the others.’ The gentlemen of Port Royal make the following reflection upon this paſſage. ‘Thus, according to Mr Des-Mareſts, it was the ſpirit of GOD which moved him to write theſe nine books, which aſſiſted him to poliſh the reſt, and which inclined him to publiſh this work. It was the ſpirit of Truth which aſſiſted him in publiſhing and divulging among Chriſtians ſo many impertinent and ridiculous fables. It was the ſpirit of GOD that moved him to tempt them by ſo many dangerous images, and the repreſentation of ſo many criminal paſſions. It was the ſpirit of GOD that induced him to write a romance, which differs in nothing from others, only that it is more extravagant (8).’ For the reſt, the abbot de Marolles informs us of one particular, from whence we may conclude, that our John Des-Mareſts ſet a high value upon his Clovis. He gave me his *Delices de l'Eſprit*, ſays the abbot (9), *and ſome other of his works in proſe and verſe, at ſuch a time as I had no difference with him, as I have had ſince, becauſe he underſtood what I had written of his Clovis, in a ſenſe different from what I had intended. I had not preferred it above the Æneid, although I had an eſteem for it, and thought it not unworthy of him.*

[*D*] *He wrote . . . . romances, wherein he departed from thoſe ideas of virtue, which were then repreſented in that kind of writings.*] On this account he is pleaſantly expoſed in the *Parnaſſe Reformé*, which puts this complaint in the mouth of Ariana, his heroine. ‘There are no places with me but what are infamous, each book furniſhes one at leaſt; and the heroes of the romance are ſo accuſtomed to frequent thoſe places, that one would take them for common ſoldiers or muſqueteers. To give me a viſit, and to go to, (you know my meaning) is but one and the ſame thing; the one is now confounded with the other. I am become the repertory of all good places. I do not wonder after this, if he makes me appear naked; it had been irregular to have uſed me otherwiſe; and ſince Aſtræa, who had not the advantage of place as I have, ſhows herſelf to Celadon in this condition, there was an indiſpenſable neceſſity, that I ſhould do the like (10). It is not therefore for the romance of Ariana, that Des-Mareſts can be concerned in the laſt part of the cenſure I am now to relate, and which is principally addreſſed to him. ‘A writer of romances and plays is a public poiſoner, not of the bodies but of the ſouls of the faithful, who ought to be looked upon as guilty of an infinite number of ſpiritual murders, which he has either actually committed, or might have been the cauſe of by his pernicious writings. The more care he takes to cover with a veil of decency the criminal paſſions he deſcribes, the more dangerous he renders them, and the more capable of ſurprizing and corrupting ſimple and innocent ſouls. This ſort of ſins is ſo much the more dreadful becauſe they always ſubſiſt: for books remain, and always infuſe the ſame venom in thoſe who read them (11).’ He cannot juſtly defend himſelf againſt the *Parnaſſe Reformé*, by ſaying he followed the precept of the ancient maſters, that romances ought to be probable (12); for there is a *medium* between a heroine that is not altogether virtuous, and one that is too much ſo, and this *medium* does not exceed probability. See what has been ſaid elſewhere concerning ancient romances (13).

[*E*] *His viſions which are ſo well deſcribed by the gentlemen of Port-Royal.*] When I firſt read their letters, I was

(*b*) *See the titles of them and of ſeveral other pieces of his in the* Hiſtory of the French Academy, *pag. m.* 343.

(*c*) *Intituled* Clovis.

(1) Delices de l'Eſprit, *pag.* 4.

(2) Ib. *pag.* 105.

(3) Ib. *pag.* 3.

(4) Delices de l'Eſprit, *pag.* 73. *See the new Critical Letters againſt Maimbourg, pag.* 746, 747.

(5) Meſſieurs of Port-Royal in their Viſionaires, *Letter viii, pag.* 456. *Edit. of Cologne,* 1683, *in* 8*vo.*

(6) Les Viſionaires, *Letter i, pag.* 256.

(7) *Preface to the* Delices de l'Eſprit.

(8) Viſionaires, ibid.

(9) Michael de Marolles, enumeration of the authors, who gave him their books.

(10) Parnaſſe Reformé, *pag.* 148, 149.

(11) Viſionaires, *Let. i, pag.* 253.

(12) Ficta voluptatis cauſa ſint proxima veris. *Horat. de Arte Poet. ver.* 338.

(13) Remark [*C*] of the article HYPSIPYLE, and remark [*C*] of the article LONGUS.

by his expounding of the prophecies, that he ſhould have the glory of deſtroying the Mahometans

was extreamly ſurpriſed : I could not ſufficiently wonder, that a wit, author of pieces of galantry and of plays, and ſuch as were fit for the ſtage, ſhould boaſt very ſeriouſly, *That GOD of his infinite goodneſs had ſent to him the key of the treaſure of St John's Revelation, which was known but to very few perſons before him* (14), *- - - - and that by the order of GOD he was to raiſe* 144000 *fighting men, whereof part was already muſtered to make war againſt the wicked and the Janſeniſts* (15). My ſurprize was increaſed when I reflected on the time and place where theſe chimeras were vented, and it was ſtill re-doubled when I took notice, that not only the management of his own eſtate was left to this pretended prophet, but alſo the office of an inquiſitor beſtowed on him ; and that no body intrigued more than he, or was more active for the extirpation of Janſeniſm. If I had then known what I ſaw twenty years after, I ſhould not have been thus ſurprized ; but certainly I was excuſable to think it ſtrange at that time, that one who publiſhed at Paris ſo many chimera's, ſhould obtain greater authority than ever he had before. Oh what irregularity ! ‘ The archbiſhop of Paris makes uſe of him for his apologiſt, admits him to his table, receives him into his houſe. The archbiſhop of Auch approves of the deſign of his army. He is permitted to be the founder of a new order, to ſet up, though he is wholly a layman, for the director of a great number of women and maids, to take an account of their moſt ſecret thoughts, to write for them letters of conſcience, ſtuffed with an infinite number of very dangerous and imprudent things, to ſay no more, and to frequent many convents of virgins, and publiſh there his mad fancies and new ſpiritualities. And laſtly, the archbiſhop of Paris hath caſt his eyes upon him to help him to reform the monaſtery of Port-Royal at Paris. His inſtructions are there greedily received, and they confer with him about mental prayer; they give him an account of the ſtate in which they are, whether of comfort or miſery (16).’

The book which he publiſhed, intituled, *The advice of the HOLY GHOST to the king*, has all the characters of fanaticiſm. He there explains *three prophecies of Scripture, which he pretends are to be underſtood of the Janſeniſts* ; who are to be deſtroyed by the king of France with the pomp of a great army. *This is one character, which is as the popular mark of fanatics, for if you conſider it well, how ſpiritual ſoever theſe people endeavour to appear, yet, their ſpirituality commonly aims at ſome external and ſenſible effect ; and they are never ſatisfyed till they have carried on their imaginations and allegories to ſome great event that is ſenſible, of which they fancy they are to be not only the ſpectators, but alſo the miniſters* (17). The author from whom I have theſe words, proves this by ſeveral examples, and then continues his diſcourſe after this manner (18). ‘ The imaginations of the Sieur Des-Mareſts, being of the ſame kind with thoſe of other viſionaries, muſt alſo terminate in ſomething external, and he muſt be willing, like others, to enjoy in this world the fruit of his prophecies. It is true, he does not ſeem to come to that at once ; for at firſt he did all he could to keep clear from it, by ſpiritualizing every thing, and reducing the moſt terrible beaſts in the Revelations into chimeras, or quinteſſences of myſtical Theology. But at laſt he is grown weary of thoſe airy ſpiritualities, and the natural biaſs of a fanatical imagination carries him on to frame, like others, a vaſt deſign in this world, for the execution whereof he believes he was choſen by God. The idea of it is not altogether noble and ſublime. But leſt you ſhould think that I miſrepreſent him, I will ſhew it to you in his own words. This deſign then is to raiſe an *army to combat and deſtroy impieties and hereſies every where*. The number of thoſe who are to compoſe it, *is to be, according to the prophecy of St John*, 144000, *who ſhall have the mark of the living GOD upon their foreheads* ; *that is, who ſhall make it plainly appear by their lives, that GOD lives in their hearts*. And becauſe every army has need of a general, he has provided one for that, by offering this poſt to the king, *that ſo the zeal and valour of his ſacred perſon, who ſhall be the general of this brave army, as being the eldeſt ſon of the church, and the principal king of all Chriſtians, may encourage all the ſoldiers*. As to the inferior offices, he declares to his majeſty, that they are deſigned for the knights of the order. *Your royal band*, ſays he, *of the knights of the HOLY GHOST, ought to march at their head, if they be as noble and valiant as they pretend to be*. And to animate them with the deſire of honour, he adds, *that they will gain a large ſhare, if they be as ready as the reſt of the holy army to do and ſuffer all things*. As for the means to be made uſe of in this war, by this numerous army he does not as yet diſcover them, but reſerves the declaration of them to a proper time and place, As having learned them from the Holy Ghost. He ſays only by the bye, *that they are to extirpate all impieties, not by temporal but ſpiritual arms* (19), *according to the heavenly means and methods which GOD hath appointed, and which ſhall be particularly declared*. But leſt it ſhould be thought, that this was only a chimera, and for fear the expectation of an event very remote, ſhould not make a ſufficient impreſſion upon the king's mind, he declares, that the greateſt part of this army is already raiſed. *GOD*, ſays he, *Sir, hath already anticipated your deſign, and you have a long time had an army of ſuch perſons as are faithful to him, and who are devoted to him as victims of his wrath, which has been juſtly kindled by ſo many abominations, to pray to him without ceaſing, and to ſuffer all things, that ſo it may pleaſe him to convert the falſe Chriſtians, and to extirpate, by your authority, ſo many ſects and deteſtable vices as now reign in France. This army is compoſed only of valiant and undaunted ſouls, who fight without ceaſing againſt Satan and his emiſſaries*. And in the vow of union he affirms, *that there are already ſeveral thouſand ſouls engaged*. Neverthelеſs ſince it has not yet arrived to the prophetic number of 144000, the Sieur Des-Mareſts has a commiſſion from heaven to publiſh every where, that thoſe who have a mind to liſt themſelves, may do it by his means ; and to this end the *Advices of the HOLY GHOST* are particularly deſigned. *We muſt*, ſays he, *communicate theſe holy advices to all the world, that we may encourage ſeveral faithful ſouls to offer thmſelves to GOD as victims, by liſting in this holy army*. And as it is uſual to make ſoldiers take an oath, Mr Des-Mareſts has framed one for thoſe who ſhall compoſe this army, which he has printed at the end of theſe advices with this title, *The League and Vow of each knight or ſoldier in the army of JESUS CHRIST*. He has alſo preſcribed to them an exerciſe for every day, whereby it appears, that theſe people are all KNIGHTS OF THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.’ He has foretold alſo all the exploits which this army is to perform for he expreſsly ſays, that they are to obtain a victory over the enemies of God by the deſtruction of impieties and hereſies, and that then an innumerable number of all ſorts of people and nations ſhall be openly united to the church, and ſhall pray before the throne of God within themſelves (20). *And all this is to happen under the reign of Lews XIV, who will be the Joſhua of this army, that is, the captain and general to lead on and animate the troops, and fight valiantly with them, under the inviſible conduct of the four princes of the heavenly hoſts, St Michael, St Gabriel, St Raphael, and St Uriel* (21).

The Janſeniſt author has made a reflexion upon this, too judicious to be here omitted. ‘ I am willing to believe, *ſays he* (22), that the Sieur Des-Mareſts has not yet a deſign to make his victims take up rebellious arms, and that his army is as yet wholly ſpiritual and extatic ; but he knows not what he will be for to-morrow, becauſe he knows not whither his imagination will carry him, not what it may diſcover in the Revelations. A man who like him takes all his thoughts for ſo many divine Revelations cannot anſwer for himſelf. The figures of the Apocalypſe change often in his head, and ſignify ſometimes one thing, and ſometimes another, and always by inſpiration from God.’ Then the Janſeniſt gives ſome examples of the variations which had already appeared in his prophetic doctrine. See his whole fifth letter ; wherein he expoſes ſo many chimeras

---

(14) Delices de l'Eſprit, *Part iii, pag.* 2, *in the Viſionaires, Letter i, pag.* 241.

(15) Advices of the Holy Ghoſt to the king, *pag.* 242.

(16) Viſionaires, *Letter ii, pag.* 287.

(17) Ib. *pag.* 279.

(18) Ib. *pag.* 280.

(19) *Note, that the greateſt part of viſionaries begin thus ; but they find afterwards that temporal arms ought alſo to concur : all the furies of war come into their plan, under the notion of pious actions.*

Proh ſuperi, quantum mortalia pectora cæcæ
Noctis habent ! ipſo ſceleris molimine Tereus
Creditur eſſe Pius : laudemque à crimine ſumit.

Ovid. Metam. lib. vi, ver. 472.

You gods ! how dark a blindneſs overſpreads
The ſouls of men ! whilſt to his ſin he climbes,
They think him good ; and praiſe him for his crimes.

Sandys.

(20) Viſionaires, *Letter ii, pag.* 282.

(21) Ibid. *pag.* 283.

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 286.

Mahometans [*F*]. We ſhall elſewhere ſhow his conduct againſt one Morin (*d*), who called himſelf the Son of GOD. Des-Mareſts wrote ſomething againſt the ſatires of Mr Boileau (*e*) in his later years. I ſhall ſay ſomething of his elder brother in a remark [*G*].

meras of the Sieur Des-Mareſts, that it is no otherways accountable how a man could fill his head with ſo many viſions, without loſing that part of common ſenſe, which hinders people from running about the ſtreets, but on this conſideration, which a great wit has inforced with examples. *It is one of the miſeries of mankind,* ſays he (23), *that reaſon and good ſenſe are ſometimes overthrown and dethroned, if I may ſo ſay, in one of their provinces, and continue maſters in the others, wherein a violent imagination does not prevail.* The viſionary mentioned by Horace was of this ſort; he did not run about the ſtreets, he was even reaſonable in ſeveral things.

> Cætera qui vitæ ſervaret munia recto
> More, bonus ſane vicinus, amabilis hoſpes,
> Comis in uxorem, poſſet qui ignoſcere ſervis,
> Et ſigno læſo non inſanire lagenæ:
> Poſſet qui rupem & puteum vitare patentem (24).

> *In all things elſe he ſhew'd a ſober mind*
> *A loving neighbour and an honeſt friend;*
> *Kind to his wife, and gen'rous to his ſlave,*
> *Nor when he ſaw the barrel broach'd wou'd rave.*
> *Would ſhun a precipice, and dang'rous pits,*
> *And ſeem a perfect man, and in his wits.*
>
> CREECH.

Conſult the article TULENUS. Let us now ſee ſome other inſtances of St Sorlin's Fanaticiſm.

[*F*] *He promiſed the king of France, the glory of deſtroying the Mahometans.*] 'The excellency of prophets conſiſts, firſt, in the greatneſs of the events which they foretel; and ſecondly, the clearneſs wherewith they expreſs the particular circumſtances, which ſhew them to be true prophecies, and not diſcourſes at random, among which we may by chance meet with ſomething that is agreeable to the event. This is what the Sieur Des-Mareſts takes care to avoid above all things. His language is neither obſcure nor enigmatical; he is the moſt intelligible of all prophets. He ſeems to be telling us a ſtory of times paſt. He ſets down the time, place, and circumſtances, in poſitive and intelligible terms. He does not refer us to a time very remote, to verify his prophecies; and yet they are the greateſt things that any man can ever propheſy. Let us hear him ſpeak, for he expreſſes himſelf very clearly. *This valiant prince,* foretold, according to him in Jeremiah, under the denomination of the *Son of the Juſt,* which words unfortunately are not to be found in this prophet, *is to deſtroy and drive out of his dominions impiety and hereſy, and to reform the eccleſiaſtics, the adminiſtration of juſtice and the finances. And then by common conſent, he, and the king of Spain, ſhall call together all the princes of Europe, with the Pope, to re-unite all Chriſtians to the true and only Catholic religion. He ſhall ſend for the Pope to Avignon, that there they may confer together about the means neceſſary for ſo great a good, becauſe otherwiſe,* (ſee how circumſpect he is) *he would,* ſays he, *be obliged to go to Rome with a great army worthy of a king of France, to confer there in perſon with him, and the Pope will rather chooſe to come to Avignon, than to be burdened at Rome with a great army.* Theſe are great things, and very particular, the deſtruction of all impieties, the Heretics and impious perſons driven out of France, the eccleſiaſtics, adminiſtration of juſtice, and the finances reformed, the aſſembly of the princes and Pope at Avignon, the re-union of all Chriſtians to the Catholic religion. But theſe which follow are ſtill greater. *After the re-union,* ſays he, *of all Heretics under the holy ſee, the king will be declared head of all Chriſtians, as being the eldeſt ſon of the church, and with the forces of Chriſtendom he will go and deſtroy by ſea and land the empire of the Turks and the law of Mahomet, and propagate the faith and kingdom of JESUS CHRIST al. over the world*; that is, in Perſia, in the empire of the Great Mogul, in Tartary and China. What can be deſired more, except that all theſe great things ſhould be particularly mentioned in the prophecies? And of this the Sieur Des-Mareſts does confidently aſſure us. *All this,* ſays he, *is ſpecially foretold by the propheſies, as will be made appear to the king, to whom alone GOD hath given the power to bear ſo great a ſecret, and ſo important a diſcovery, and the illuſtrious proſpect of a Life ſo glorious, during which the kingdom of GOD, which is to laſt unto the end of all ages, will be eſtabliſhed every where.* And to make theſe events the more credible, he has ſet down the means of compaſſing them (25).' He gives alſo the reaſons why other people cannot bear theſe great diſcoveries. 'The queens themſelves, *adds he* (26), would not be able to endure at firſt, that the king ſhould talk of quitting Paris, and going to Avignon, whither he is called by a ſpecial prophecy, to ſtay there ſome time with the Pope, that he may re-unite all Chriſtendom by common conſent with the king of Spain, as is ſet forth by an expreſs prophecy.'

The reflexion of the Janſeniſt is very fine; it is a picture that reſembles a great many people, and ſhows the univerſal ſpirit of the makers of predictions. 'There is doubtleſs ſomething difficult in theſe words; as the minority of the king of Spain makes him for a long time incapable of conſenting to this great deſign; ſo that the Sieur Des-Mareſts ſeems to have had in view the late king of Spain, who died, notwithſtanding this expreſs prophecy. But perhaps if Mr Des-Mareſts was preſſed upon this point, he would extricate himſelf after the ſame manner, as another prophet very like him did, from an objection of the ſame nature. He was called the prophet John, and waited upon the queen of Poland when ſhe was at Paris, and had retired to the monaſtery of Port-Royal. He endeavoured to apply to her by the Apocalypſe, that the empire of the Turks was to be deſtroyed under the reign of Lewis XIII, and the Pontificate of Urban VIII. She made an objection to this, which was very natural, *viz.* That both of them were already dead. But the prophet, without troubling himſelf about this difficulty, anſwered gravely, that he never diſputed; and thereupon he left the princeſs. The Sieur Des-Mareſts will find ſome ſuch anſwer to the difficulties of his prophecy, and will tell us, that he meant the queen regent of Spain, who acts in the name of the king. For to put us off to the time of the king of Spain's being of age, would be attended with too great inconveniencies, ſince he could not begin too ſoon, who is to conquer the whole world, and to finiſh his conqueſts during his life (27).'

[*G*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his elder brother in a remark.*] He was called ROLAND DES-MARESTS. He was born at Paris in 1594, and pleaded at the bar for ſome time; but being diſguſted with the noiſe and clamours attending the profeſſion, he conſecrated himſelf to a quiet life. Being neither covetous of riches, nor ambitious of honours, he applied himſelf entirely to the ſtudy of polite literature, and ſought his happineſs in the boſom of the Muſes, and the ſhades of his retirement. 'A cupiditate gloriæ, reique ſtudioſius augendæ deſiderio prorſus alienus, ſuæ animi conſcientiæ teſtimonio ac domeſticis copiis contentus, ſe modeſte exhibere, quam operoſis fortunæ famæque bonis avide captandis imminere maluit (28). ---- *Being entirely averſe to the ſearch of glory, or the labour of increaſing his fortune, and content with the teſtimony of a good conſcience in his paternal eſtate; he choſe rather to live privately, than ſpend his time in the laborious toil of increaſing his wealth and fame.*' Yet he cultivated a friendſhip with learned men, and conferred with them about his ſtudies. He became a very good critic, inſomuch that his friend Nicolas Bourbon, a man of an excellent taſte, feared no man's cenſure ſo much as that of our Roland's (29). He publiſhed ſome letters in Latin, which were judged to be very well written, and therefore after his death they, together with ſeveral others, written by him afterwards, and found among his papers, were publiſhed by

---

(*d*) *In the article of this MORIN.*

(*e*) *See the remark* [*R*] *of the article MACEDONIA.*

(23) Peliſſon, *Chimeres de Mr Jurieu, Part ii, Sect. ii, pag.* 69. *Dutch edition.*

(24) Horat. Epiſt. II, lib. II, ver. 131.

(25) Viſionaires, *Letter v, pag.* 395, 396.

(26) Viſionaires, ibid. *pag.* 398.

(27) Ibid.

(28) Petrus Hallæus, ubi infra, *citat.* (32).

(29) Tantum exiſtimationis in operibus aliorum examinandis ſibi quæſiverat, ut eundem Borbonium, ſe ſibi magis ab uno Mareſio, quam à cæteris omnibus cenſoribus timere, ſæpe affirmantem audiverim. *Ibid.*

by Mr De Launoi, and the two Valeſius's at Paris, in 1655 (30). They were re-printed in Germany, in 1687. He was never married: he employed ſome of his leiſure hours in the education of a niece, whom he found fit for ſtudy, and taught her the Latin and Greek tongues. *Per otium Mariam Prateam, ſororis filiam, quæ in tenera ætate domeſtici vim ingenii & acumen haud obſcure exprimebat, Latinis Græciſque literis non infelici ſucceſſu informavit* (31). There was all along a ſtrict friendſhip between him and John Des-Mareſts, his brother. His health was very good, but by ſtudying too much he ſo weakened his conſtitution, that he fell into a languiſhing diſtemper, which waſted him by degrees, till at laſt he died at Paris, about the end of December, 1653 (32). The Gentlemen of Port-Royal took advantage of the approbation he gave to their method of teaching the Latin tongue; for they printed the letter containing this approbation at the beginning of their book. It is the XVIth letter of the firſt book.

The obſervations on the letters of Rolandus Mareſius, in the *Mélanges d'Hiſtoire & de Literature*, written by Vigneul Marville (33), are curious and judicious.

(30) *Intituled* Rolandi Mareſii epiſtolarum philologicarum libri duo.

(31) Petr. Hallæus, ubi infra.

(32) Taken from his Elogy compoſed by Petrus Hallæus, and placed before the letters of Rolandus Mareſius.

(33) At *pag.* 171, and 172, of the firſt edition at Roüen.

MARESTS (ROLAND DES-) See the laſt remark of the preceding article.

MARESIUS (SAMUEL), in French Des-Marets, a miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity, was one of the moſt famous Divines of the XVIIth century. He was born at Oiſemond in Picardy, the ninth of Auguſt 1599, and from his infancy diſcovered a ſtrong inclination to ſtudy (*a*). When he was thirteen years old, he was ſent to Paris, where he improved much in the *Belles Lettres* and Philoſophy. Three years after he was ſent to Saumur, where he ſtudied Divinity under Gomarus, and Hebrew under Lewis Capel. He returned to his father in 1618, and then went to Gevena to finiſh his ſtudies of Divinity. He came back to France the next year, and to fit himſelf for preaching he went to Paris. The probation-ſermons he made at the houſe of Mr Durant, one of the greateſt preachers of that time, pleaſed that miniſter very much, who adviſed him to betake himſelf early to the holy miniſtry. His youth and his low ſtature [*A*] made him averſe to this advice; nevertheleſs he followed it, and preſented himſelf before the ſynod of Charenton in the month of March 1620; and although the examination was then very ſevere, yet he gave full ſatisfaction. The church given him was that of Laon. The circumſtances of the time and Place rendered the exerciſe of his miniſtry very difficult; yet he diſcharged his duty very well. The anſwer he wrote to a lady who had changed her religion, provoked his adverſaries ſo much, that it is thought Father de Aubigni the Jeſuit ſuborned an aſſaſſin, who gave him a ſtab with a knife on December

(*a*) See the remark [*A*] towards the end.

[*A*]. *His youth, and his low ſtature.*] There are but few perſons who at twenty years of age have not attained to the full ſtature by nature deſigned for them. Mr Mareſius was none of thoſe; he was a very Zaccheus at the age of twenty one, and was always called the little Probationer. But he grew after that till he was twenty five years old, and then he was of a moderate ſtature. ‘Mareſius qui eum (*Durantium*) ſibi maxime imitandum delegerat, nonnullas in ipſius ædibus habuit Propoſitiones, quæ ipſi adeo placuêre; ut hic author fuerit operam ſuam Eccleſiis offerendi; à quo alias conſilio ut abhorreret duo efficiebant, nempe & quod ætate valde juvenis eſſet; & quod ſtaturâ & vultu, majorem adhuc præ ſe ferret juventutem: Etſi enim nunc ſatis ſit procerus, tamen ita parvus manſit uſque ad annum 21, ſuæ ætatis, quo demum uſque ad 25, celerrime crevit, ut vulgo parvi Proponentis nomine deſignaretur (1). *Mareſius, who had choſen Durant for his pattern, made ſome probationary diſcourſes at his houſe, which pleaſed him ſo well, that he adviſed him to offer his ſervice to the churches; to which reſolution he was otherwiſe averſe for two reaſons; firſt, that he was at that time very young; ſecondly, that his ſtature and countenance made him appear ſtill younger than he was: For tho' he is now of middle ſtature, yet he was ſo little at twenty one years of age, from which time he grew a-pace till twenty five; that he commonly went by the name of the little Probationer.*’ I will remark another thing very ſingular, which may ſerve to comfort fathers and mothers who have infirm children: this is not always a certain argument, that they ſhall not attain to old age, nor that they ſhall never be ſtrong. Samuel Mareſius, who was ſo weak in his infancy, that they were obliged to feed him with milk and butter, and let him lie in his bed for ſeveral days together, becauſe his legs could not ſupport him, lived to the age of near ſeventy four, and was ſo vigorous, that the ſtrongeſt men could hardly endure the fatigues and exerciſes which he endured, without ever being ſick. When he firſt fell ſick at Groningen, he had, for the ſpace of thirty years, diſcharged there a very laborious profeſſion, and had continually been publiſhing ſeveral books (2). The Latin I ſhall here ſubjoin will give a more particular account of the infirmities of his infancy. ‘Infantiam habuit imbecillem & ita teneræ conſtitutionis, ut fere lacte & butyro fuerit educandus; Puer carne elixâ veſci non poterat, nec jure, nec ullis oleribus: & ſemper occulta quadam antipathia poma, pyra, ceraſa, fraga & id genus delicias puerorum, ita eſt adverſatus, ut in hunc diem nihil ex illis queat deguſtare. Quamvis autem pueritiam haberet languidam & valetudinariam, ex qua eum non fore vitalem augurabantur plurimi, ſæpius ex oculis, aliiſque fluxionibus laborans, aliquando ex genuum debilitate per 15 dies affixus lecto; unde metuebant parentes, eum ſi vir fieret, futurum podagricum, licet huc uſque nihil tale Dei beneficio ſit expertus; non ſemel ex lapſu aliiſque caſibus puerilibus in præſens vitæ diſcrimen adductus; tamen animo erat erecto, tenacis memoriæ, & ad ſtudia tam proclivis, ut ante ſeptennium exactum, non modo legere poſſet & literas accurate pingere, ac jam rudimentis Linguæ Latinæ operam daret, ſed etiam bis univerſa Biblia à capite ad calcem evolviſſet, ut difficilius fere ab illis occupationibus abduceretur luſus ergo, quam alii ſolent à luſu ad illa magis ſeria revocari (3). ---- *In his infancy he was ſo weak, and of ſo tender a conſtitution, that for the moſt part they were obliged to feed him with milk and butter: when a boy, he could not eat boiled meat, nor broth, nor any herbs, and always had ſo utter an antipathy to apples, pears, cherries, ſtrawberries, and the like things, which children are uſually fond of, that to this day he cannot taſte any of them; but notwithſtanding he was ſo weak and ſickly in his younger years, that few people thought he would be long lived, being often troubled with ſore eyes, and other defluxions, ſometimes confined to his bed for fifteen days together by a weakneſs in his knees, which made his parents apprehenſive, that if he lived to be a man, he would be ſubject to the gout, tho' hitherto, by GOD's grace, he has not felt any thing of it, and was more than once in immediate danger of his life, by falls, and other accidents which children are liable to, yet he was cheerful, had a ſtrong memory, and ſo great an inclination to ſtudy, that before ſeven years of age, he had not only learned to read and write a fair hand, and made ſome progreſs in the Latin tongue, but had read the whole Bible twice from the beginning to the end; that it was even more difficult to draw him from theſe employments to play, than it commonly is to bring other children from play to theſe ſerious employments.*’ You ſee in theſe laſt words the proof of what I ſaid concerning the inclination which appeared early in him to his ſtudies. It was harder for him to leave them, to divert himſelf

(1) Effigies & Vitæ Profeſſorum Groning. *pag.* 138.

(2) I have read this in his funeral oration, in MS.

(3) Effigies & Vitæ Profeſſorum Groning. *pag* 135.

ber the 13th, 1623 [*B*]. But although the wound was dangerous, yet it was cured in a ſhort time; and then it was thought fit to diſengage him from a church, which he could no longer ſerve without great danger, and to lend him for a year to the faithful of Falaiſe *(b)*. This was ordered in a ſynod of the Iſle of France in the month of March, 1624. In a little while after he accepted the call of the church of Sedan, and was inſtituted in the room of James Capel in the month of October the ſame year. He was to be miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity; but he was excuſed from the duties of this laſt office, till he had recovered the ideas of his ſcholaſtic ſtudies (*c*). He obtained alſo leave to go into Holland to take his degree of doctor of Divinity, which he did at Leyden the eighth of July 1625. Having made a ſmall tour into England, he returned to Sedan, and there began to exerciſe his profeſſion of Divinity on the twenty fourth of November in the ſame year: and continuing in that place he met with a great deal of trouble; for he had ſome ſtorms to weather, which he endured with great reſolution, by the favour of the duke of Bouillon, and the affection of the church. But he judged that one of the ſtrongeſt barriers he could oppoſe againſt his enemies, was to marry [*C*]. For that reaſon he married a widow, who had fled to Sedan for religion with her firſt huſband in 1622. The marriage was celebrated the ſecond of May 1628: In this year alſo he publiſhed his firſt book *(d)*, which was afterwards followed by a multitude of others

(b) Upon the frontiers of Champagne.

(c) Petito tamen quoad profeſſionem ſpatio aliquo ad ſtudia ſua ſcholaſtica recolligenda, quo paratior illam capeſſeret. *Vitæ Profeſſorum Groning. pag.* 142.

(d) Intituled, *A preſervative againſt Apoſtacy.* Note, that in 1623, there was printed, without his knowledge, and without his name, one of his ſermons about Predeſtination, upon 2 *Tim. ii,* 12. It was reprinted ſeveral times.

ſelf with the plays of infancy, than it is for others to leave their play, and apply themſelves to ſtudy. This is a proof that the application of the mind is not always hurtful to weak conſtitutions, and an example that affords comfort to thoſe parents, who are afraid, leſt their ſtudious and weak ſons ſhould die ſoon.

[*B*] *An aſſaſſin . . . gave him a ſtab with a knife, on December the* 13*th*, 1623.] Mareſius having heard that the wife of the governor of la Fere had changed her religion, after the example of her huſband, who turned Roman Catholic, in order to keep his government (4), wrote a letter to her full of exhortations to return to the ſheepfold. She wrote a large anſwer to him to juſtify her conduct, and ſent him a printed relation of her converſion. This relation being ſtuffed with falſhoods, he thought it his duty to refute it, and at the ſame time to anſwer the reaſons alledged by the lady. The Jeſuits had been employed to gain her over, and found the anſwer of this miniſter too bold, and threatened to puniſh him for it. This made people imagine, that the wound he received ſome time after, was the effect of this menace; and if Father d' Aubigni was chiefly ſuſpected, it was becauſe he had been the converter of this lady, and was then preaching the Advent ſermons at Laon. ‘ Nec ‘ dubitatum redemptum fuiſſe Sicarium, ob literas ‘ ſupra commemoratas, à Monachis, præſertim ab ‘ Albinio Jeſuita, illo eodem, qui duodecennio ante ‘ Ravaillaci parricidæ Henrici IV Confeſſarius fuerat, & coram Ampliſſimo Senatu dixerat, ſe dono ‘ oblivionis pollere poſt auditas Confeſſiones, excuſaturus quod Regii parricidæ Confeſſionis non amplius ‘ meminiſſet. Is enim & Hurtebizianæ defectioni ‘ fuerat obſtetricatus, & tum Laoduni ſolemnes Adventus habebat conciones. Nec aliud totâ urbe, ‘ maxime inter Reformatos, perſuaſum fuiſſe, univerſa ‘ Laodunenſis Eccleſia comprobavit adhuc non ita ‘ pridem, ſolemni ſuo Teſtimonio, conſcripto à R. & ‘ Doct. Viro D. P. GEORGIO illius Paſtore anno ‘ 1647, 18 Auguſti, paullo priuſquam ad Deum evocaretur (5). - - - - *It was not doubted but the aſſaſſin was hired, on account of the letter abovementioned,* ‘ *by the monks, particularly by D'Aubigni the Jeſuit,* ‘ *who twelve years before had been confeſſor to Ravaillac* ‘ *the murderer of Henry IV*; *and to excuſe himſelf from* ‘ *diſcovering the murderer's confeſſion, told the parliament,* ‘ *that he had the gift of forgetfulneſs after hearing confeſſions, and that he did not remember what the king's murderer ſaid. He was the perſon who drew Madam Hurtebize to change her religion, and at that time preached* ‘ *the Advent ſermons at Laon*; *and this was fully believed throughout the whole city, eſpecially among the* ‘ *Reformed, as appears by the teſtimony of the whole* ‘ *church of Laon*; *written by the reverend and learned* ‘ *D. P.* GEORGE *their paſtor, in the year* 1647, ‘ *the eighteenth day of Auguſt, a little before his death.*’ The aſſaſſin eſcaped, and the magiſtrates did not think fit to enquire further into this affair. He waited for Mareſius in the ſtreets, when he was returning home from ſupping with his uncle, and ſtruck the knife in his breaſt: by good fortune the blow did not hurt his lungs. ‘ Vulnus erat profundum & quod in thoracis capacitatem, illæſo tamen pulmone, penetraret. . . . ‘ Quamvis autem vulnus periculoſum valde fuerit, & ‘ ex quo candelam ei objectam poterat *Mareſius* extinguere, brevi tamen tempore ex eo convaluit (6). - - - ‘ *The wound was deep, and entered into the cavity of* ‘ *the thorax, but without hurting his lungs*; *but notwithſtanding, the wound was very dangerous, inſomuch* ‘ *that he could blow out a candle held to it, yet he recovered in a very little time.*’

(4) Uxor nobilis cujuſdam cui *Hurtebizio* nomen erat, & qui ut ſibi conſervaret Feræ præfecturam, jam ante biennium defecerat, maritum ſuum tandem ſequuta fuerit, circa finem anni 1622. *Ib. pag.* 140.

(5) It. *pag.* 140, 141.

(6) Id. ib.

[*C*] *He judged, that one of the ſtrongeſt barriers he could oppoſe againſt his enemies, was to marry.*] He thought that he was expoſed to the ſtorm, only becauſe he had no wife, and had refuſed one. This thought obliged him to marry, and preſently the tempeſt was calmed, and after it halcyon-days ſucceeded, and he lived in peace with all his colleagues. ‘ Cum hos fluctus decumanos ſibi videretur pati quod ‘ cœlebs eſſet, & nonnullis, ut credebatur, maneret

- - - - - - - - - alta mente repoſtum
Judicium Paridis ſpretæque injuria formæ;

‘ vita cœlibe relicta tandem vitæ ſociam ſibi adſcivit ‘ *Abigalem le Grand*, natam Aquiſgrani honeſtiſſimo ‘ loco, patre *Jaſpare le Grand* Tornacenſi, Mercatore ‘ Magnario . . . . Ab eo tempore *Mareſius* Alcyonia ‘ Sedani obtinuit, & cum Reverendis ſuis Collegis omnibus, in ſuo munere, tranquille & pacifice verſatus ‘ eſt (7). - - - *Being of opinion that he was expoſed to theſe* ‘ *ſtorms, only becauſe he was a bachelor*; *and ſome perſons believed that*

Deep graven in her heart, the doom remain'd
Of partial Paris, and her form diſdain'd.

DRYDEN.

‘ *he reſolved to live no longer ſingle, and at laſt married* ‘ *Abigail le Grand, born at Aix-la-Chapelle, of a very* ‘ *reputable family, ſhe was daughter of Jaſper le Grand,* ‘ *an eminent Merchant of Tournay . . . From that time* ‘ *Mareſius enjoyed halcyon-days at Sedan, and lived* ‘ *peaceably in his office with all his colleagues.*’ There is in this narrative one thing eaſy to be underſtood, and another, that is very obſcure. It is eaſy to conceive, that a man who has refuſed a woman, is expoſed to the ill offices of the relations of that perſon whom he refuſed to marry. It is an injury which the fair one will not pardon, and if ſhe have any intereſt, or be capable of managing intrigues, ſhe may give a great deal of trouble to a miniſter and a profeſſor. Theſe gentlemen have their friends, and their enemies, and from hence ariſe factions and diſcords, which the family that is angry for the contempt of the affinity they would have contracted, may take advantage of to ſatisfy their reſentment. It was no wonder therefore that Samuel Mareſius endured at Sedan ſeveral troubleſome perſecutions, after he had provoked a family by a judgment ſomething like that of Paris, *ſpretæque injuria formæ*, - - - *for her form diſdain'd.* But it is ſtrange, that by marrying a widow, whom he had never refuſed, he ſhould calm that ſtorm, and be reconciled to all his enemies. This is what I cannot comprehend. The marriage with the widow was a new occaſion of anger to the party deſpiſed. If Mareſius had always lived a bachelor, it might have been thought that his refuſal proceeded from a general indifference for the ſex, which was a kind

(7) Vitæ Profeſſor. Groning. *pag.* 144.

others [*D*]. He attended the duke of Bouillon into Holland in 1631, to be his chaplain in the army. The next year he returned into the ſame country, with that prince's mother, and engaged in the ſervice of the States, who appointed him miniſter to the church of Maeſtricht. He oppoſed, both by word of mouth and by writing, the efforts made by the eccleſiaſtics of Liege, to hinder the eſtabliſhment of the reformed churches in that country; and he had a thouſand difficulties more to overcome, after the duke of Bouillon had married a Catholic [*E*]. He endeavoured, but in vain, to retain him in the profeſſion of the reformed church, and by this means incurred the hatred of the ducheſs; which, being added to his other troubles, made him look upon the call which the church of Boiſleduc gave him in 1636, as a piece of good fortune, and therefore he did not refuſe it. The next year he became profeſſor in the illuſtrious ſchool of the ſame city, and diſcharged that office with ſo much application and ſucceſs, that he was called to Franeker in 1640, and to Groningen in 1642. He refuſed the firſt call and accepted the ſecond. He made his inaugural oration at Groningen the twentieth of January 1642 (*e*). And from that time to his death, he did ſo great ſervices to this univerſity, that it paſſed for one of the moſt flouriſhing in the Low-countries. The magiſtrates of Bern being well informed of his great parts, offered him with great advantages a profeſſor's chair of Divinity at Lauſanne

kind of comfort to the fair one refuſed: but after ſhe ſaw him married, ſhe could only look upon it as a peculiar indifference, and a contempt of herſelf: this is a vexatious thing, which muſt needs increaſe her anger, and bad offices. Here is therefore ſomething kept in the dark: the narrative is not exact; there are many things wanting here, which I would not relate, tho' I knew them. I know part of them.

[*D*] *He publiſhed his firſt book, which was followed by a multitude of others.*] You will find a chronological catalogue of his works at the end of his Syſtem of Theology (8). The number of them is prodigious, and the variety of the ſubjects ſhows that his mind was not confined. We may ſay, that he was both very laborious, and wrote with great eaſe and much quickneſs of thought and learning. He had a mind to collect into one body all his works, as well thoſe that were printed as thoſe that were not. He reviſed them for this end, and made additions to them. They would have made four volumes in folio. His death hindered the execution of this project. The firſt volume was to have contained all that he had publiſhed before he went to Groningen; among which would have been ſeveral pieces in Latin which had been publiſhed before only in French. The ſecond volume would have contained his *Opera Theologica didactica*; the third his *Opera Theologica polemica*; the fourth was to have had this title *Impietas triumphata*, and was deſigned to contain *Hydra Sociniani ſmi expugnata*, and *Biga fanaticorum everſa*, and *Fabula Præadamitarum refutata*. Theſe three books had been printed at different times. The Syſtem of Theology of this author was found ſo methodical, that it was uſed in other academies, and was ſeveral times re-printed. 'Hinc primum mihi 'nata eſt hæc *Synopſis Theologica*, non tam aliis, quam 'mihi & meis diſcipulis primitus deſtinata: etſi fa'vorabilius publice excepta fuerit quam putaſſem, 'adeo ut ſæpius recudi debuerit, & in omnibus ſcholis 'Reformatis vel publice explicari, vel privatim pro'poni ſibi à viris clariſſimis in cynoſuram ſuorum 'Collegiorum mos fere conſtans fuerit (9). - - - *Hence 'roſe this* Synopſis of Theology, *not deſigned at firſt ſo 'much for others as for my ſelf and ſcholars: tho' it 'was more favourably received by the public than I 'expected, and was publickly explained in all the Uni'verſities of the Reformed, or read by private men in 'their colleges*. The laſt edition was enlarged with a great number of notes, wherein the author explains his ſentiments, and refutes, with his ordinary warmth, the cenſures of his enemies. It was printed at Groningen in 1673. If I obſerve that Grotius was one of thoſe whom he attacked, it is only that I may have an opportunity to undeceive thoſe, who having read the *Acta Eruditorum*, might think that he durſt not do it without a diſguiſe. We find in the Journal of Leipſic, that Mr Ittigius cenſured Matthew Pool, who had ſaid, that Claudius Salmaſius, under the name of Simplicius Verinus, refuted Hugo Grotius's explication of ſome paſſages of the New Teſtament which relate to Antichriſt. Ittigius pretends, that it was our Mareſius, who under the name of Johannes Simplicius, refuted this explication of Grotius. *Lapſum deprehendit in Matthæo Polo, qui Hugonis Grotij Commentationem ad loca quædam Novi Teſtamenti à Salmaſio ſub Simplicii Verini nomine refutatam ſcribit, cum tamen à Mareſio ſub Johannis Simplicii nomine refutata fuerit* (10). I have three things to ſay againſt this. I. It is very certain, that Salmaſius did aſſume the name of Simplicius Verinus in two works he publiſhed againſt Grotius, in 1646; but theſe works have no relation to the treatiſe of Antichriſt: One of them is concerning the diſcuſſion of the apology of Andrew Rivet, with whom Grotius had been engaged in a long controverſy about the re-union of Chriſtians. The other is concerning Tranſubſtantiation. The title of the firſt is this, *Simplicii Verini ad Juſtum Pacium epiſtola, ſive judicium de libro poſthumo H. Grotii.* II. Mareſius did not diſguiſe his name when he wrote againſt Grotius about Antichriſt, for he put all this in the title of his book. 'Diſſertatio de An'tichriſto, quâ expenditur & refutatur nupera Com'mentatio ad illuſtriora eâ de re Novi Teſtamenti 'Loca, Il. V. Hugonis Grotii credita; ſimulque Ec'cleſiarum Reformatarum ſententia de Antichriſto Ro'mano defenditur & confirmatur; authore Samuele 'Mareſio, S. S. Theol. Doctore & Profeſſore, in Scho'la Illuſtri Sylvæducenſi, nec non ibidem Eccleſiæ 'Gallo-Belgicæ Paſtore (11). - - - - - - *A diſſertation 'concerning Antichriſt, wherein a late commentary on 'ſome remarkable paſſages of the New Teſtament con'cerning that matter, ſuppoſed to be written by the fa'mous Hugo Grotius is examined and refuted, and the 'opinion of the reformed churches, concerning the Roman 'Antichriſt is defended and confirmed: by Samuel Ma'reſius, Doctor and Profeſſor of Divinity in the illuſtrious 'ſchool of Boiſleduc, and paſtor of the Walloon church 'there*.' III. Jonas Schligtingius the Socinian diſguiſed himſelf under the name of Johannes Simplicius to write againſt Grotius's treatiſe *de Antichriſto*. This appears by the Bibliotheque of the *Antitrinitarians*, at page 128. This was doubtleſs the original of the error of Matthew Pool, who was not rightly cenſured by Mr Ittigius. You may obſerve by the by, that the work of this Socinian author was put in the vaſt collection called the Great Critics. Note, that Grotius was not ſilent with reſpect to Mareſius; for he publiſhed an 'Appendix ad interpretationem 'locorum Novi Teſtamenti quæ de Antichriſto agunt 'aut agere putantur. - - - *Appendix to the interpretation 'of the places in the New Teſtament, which treat or 'are ſuppoſed to treat of Antichriſt*;' where he uſes him very ill. He did not vouchſafe to name him, but denoted him only by the reproachful name of *Borborita*, in alluſion to the French word *Bourbe*, (that is *dirt*) which ſuits the word Marais (*Bog*) in alluſion to Mareſius. This Appendix was vigorouſly refuted by a book printed in two volumes in8vo, in 1642, with this title, 'Concordia diſcors & Antichriſtus revela'tus: id eſt, Ill. Viri HUGONIS GROTII 'apologia pro Papa & Papiſmo: quam prætextu Con'cordiæ inter Chriſtianos ſarciendæ, exhibet illius Ap'pendix ad Interpretationem Locorum Novi Teſta'menti de Antichriſto, modeſte refutata duobus Li'bris, per Samuelem Mareſium S. Theol. Doctorem '& Profeſſorem in Scholâ Buſcoducenſi & Eccl. Gallo'Belgicæ ibidem Miniſtrum. - - - - - - *The diſagreeing 'Concord and Antichriſt revealed, that is, the apology 'of the illuſtrious Hugo Grotius, for the Pope and Po'pery, which is ſet forth on pretence of reſtoring unity*
'*among*

(*e*) Taken from his Life, printed in the work intituled, *Effigies & Vitæ Profeſſorum Academiæ Groningæ*. Printed at Groningen, in 1654.

(8) It is not in the laſt edition, nor in the two firſt. It reaches to the year 1654, in the *Lives of the Profeſſors of Groningen*.

(9) Mareſ. in Præfat. Edit. 1673.

(10) Acta Eruditor. Lipſ. 1690, *pag.* 313.

(11) This work was printed in 1640, in 8vo.

Lauſanne in 1661, for which he thanked them. The univerſity of Leyden deſired him for the like profeſſion in the month of March 1673 (*f*). He accepted it, but had not time to go and take poſſeſſion of it. He died at Groningen the eighteenth of May the ſame year, leaving two ſons, of whom I ſhall ſay ſomething below [*F*]. I ſhall alſo ſay ſomething

‘*among Chriſtians, in his appendix to the interpretation of the places of the New Teſtament concerning Antichriſt, modeſtly refuted in two books by Samuel Mareſius*, &c.’ It was objected to Grotius among other things in this reply, That he had not been careful enough of the rights of kings. ‘Id præſertim tolerari non poteſt in Grotio, quod ſatis aperte negat Reges eſſe inſtitutionis divinæ; quando-quidem judicibus illis eximiis, *quorum inſtitutio à Deo*, ut apparet Num. xi. 16. opponit Reges, quos *voluntas primum populi reperit* (12). - - - - *This in particular cannot be excuſed in Grotius, that he manifeſtly denies kings to be of divine appointment, ſince in oppoſition to thoſe eminent judges, whoſe inſtitution appears to have been from* GOD, *Numb.* xi. 16. *he places kings who were firſt made by the will of the people.*’ This ſurely is ſingular, for Grotius is every day refuted, becauſe he hath too much ſubjected the people to the royal power (13). How can they ſay after this, that the Lutherans are the only perſons who approve the maxims of Grotius (14), ſince here is a Calviniſt miniſter, who thinks that Grotius has not ſpoke favourably enough of monarchy. The biſhop of Meaux (15) has obſerved the ſame thing, and many inconſiſtencies in the hypotheſis of Grotius.

[*E*] *He had a thouſand difficulties to maſter after the duke of Bouillon had married a Catholic.*] This marriage caſt Mareſius into a thouſand troubles (16). The duke had promiſed to abjure the Proteſtant religion when he married Mademoiſelle de Berghes (17), but he thought fit for many reaſons to delay the performance of his promiſe. That people might think his change proceeded from a motive of conſcience, he propoſed a thouſand doubts to his miniſter, and put off the thing for four or five years. Mareſius drew up a relation of this affair; I know not why he did not print it: There would appear ſeveral curious things in it. ‘Dum altius in conſilia & aſtutias Jeſuitarum penetrat, quam voluiſſent, ſibi accerſivit novæ Conjugis odium ſatis vehemens, & ſenſit DUCEM pedetentim ad publicam Pontificiorum communionem gradum ſibi ſtruere, in quo moliendo per mille fraudes Jeſuiticas, annos 1634, & 1635, tranſacti ſunt. Intereſſet Eccleſiæ, ſpecialem Hiſtoriam iſtius defectionis, à *Mareſio* diligenter collectam, publici juris fieri, ut conſtaret quibus artibus Egregius alias ille Princeps, Reformatam Communionem deſeruit, & ab illo tempore, non ſine occulto Dei judicio, in illas incidit calamitates continuas, quibuſcum quoad vixit, luctatus eſt (18). - - - - *By entring deeper into the deſigns and crafts of the Jeſuits than they deſired, he drew upon himſelf the hatred of the new ducheſs, and he perceived the duke was paving his way by degrees publickly to profeſs the Popiſh religion in the management, of which by a thouſand Jeſuitical frauds, the years* 1634, *and* 1635, *were paſſed. It would be of uſe to the church to have the particular hiſtory of this defection, which was carefully collected by Mareſius, made public, that it might appear by what arts this otherwiſe excellent prince was induced to forſake the Reformed communion, and from that time not without the ſecret judgment of* GOD, *he fell into thoſe continual calamities which he had to ſtruggle with as long as he lived.*’ Mr de Puyſegur informs us, that this prince became a Catholic in January 1636, and that for ſome time it was known only to few (19)

[*F*] *Leaving two ſons of whom I ſhall ſay ſomething.*] The eldeſt was born at Sedan, and was preſented to baptiſm by Elizabeth of Naſſau, ducheſs of Bouillon, who gave him the name of Henry, which was that of the prince whoſe widow ſhe was (20). He ſtudied the Civil Law, and after he had taken his Licentiate's degree, he begun to prepare himſelf for the ſtudies of the bar in the houſe of Charles Des-Mareſts, his uncle, a famous advocate in the parliament of Paris. He pleaded ſome cauſes with good ſucceſs, and yet he abandoned all on a ſudden this profeſſion, to conſecrate himſelf to the ſtudy of Theology, and to the miniſtry of the word of GOD. What follows is what his Father ſays to him in an epiſtle dedicatory: ‘Tu quidem, Henrice, tyrocinia poſueras ſacræ facundiæ in Auguſtiſſimo Pariſienſi foro, ubi poſt Licentiæ in utroque Jure gradum ſuſceptum, cœperas Advocati munere defungi, ſub Auſpiciis Conſultiſſimi & Ampliſſimi fratris mei. Et belle tibi prima illa publice dicendi initia proceſſiſſe, audivi ipſe ex ore Illuſtriſſimi Præſidis Bellevræi, cum ad Celſiſſimos Ordines Generales Legatum extraordinarium Regis Chriſtianiſſimi ageret, ſiquidem ipſo Præſide & Judice in aliqua cauſa peroraveras & triumphaveras: adeoque poſtquam tuopte nutu, nec ſine Numine, me ab initio ob cauſas ſæculares (quid diſſimulem?) diſſuadente, & Domino Patruo tuo tandem conſentiente, animum appuliſti ad ſacra ſtudia, & corpus Juris cum corpore Scripturarum permutaſti, exemplo plerorumque virorum magnorum in veteri & renaſcente Eccleſia, omnia faciliora expertus es (21). - - - *You, Henry, had begun the ſtudy of Eloquence in the illuſtrious parliament of Paris, where, after taking a Licentiate's degree in both laws, you had taken upon you the profeſſion of an advocate, under the auſpices of my eminent and learned brother, and I my ſelf have heard, that you had good ſucceſs in your firſt attempts in pleading, from the mouth of the illuſtrious Bellievre when he was ambaſſador-extraordinary from the moſt Chriſtian king to the States-General, for you have pleaded in ſome cauſes where he was preſident and judge, and gained the victory: And after that, of your own accord, but not without the will of* GOD, *I, from the beginning for worldly cauſes, (for why ſhould I diſſemble) diſſwaded you from it, and your uncle at laſt conſenting, you turned to the ſtudy of Divinity, and changed the body of the law for the body of the ſcriptures, after the example of ſeveral great men in the ancient, and in the reviving church you found every thing more eaſy.*’ He was admitted miniſter in 1652, and his firſt employment was to preach in French in the academical church of Groningen. In the ſame year he was called to Caſſel, to be miniſter there to the French church. He had a call the next year from the Walloon church of Boiſleduc, and accepted it, tho' he was very well ſatisfied with the court of Heſſe, where he received great teſtimonies of their goodneſs and eſteem. *Sylvæ ducenſes . . . . te Henrice ad ſe evocarunt Caſſellis, ubi in aula Sereniſſimi Principis Lantgravii (à quo & ægre dimiſſus es, nec ſine ſpecialibus benevolentiæ & beneficentiæ ſuarum Serenitatum teſtimoniis) linguâ Gallicâ fungebaris miniſterio ſacro, ferme à tempore tuæ hîc ad illud ordinationis* (22). He ſerved the church of Boiſleduc, until he accepted that of Delft in 1662. From that time to this (23) he has been fixed at Delft, where he has acquired the eſteem of every body. He refuſed in 1669, the call he had from the Walloon church of Leyden. Daniel DES-MARESTS, his younger brother, was born at Maeſtricht in 1635. After he was admitted to be a miniſter, he was colleague to his father in the French church of Groningen, until the year 1656, after which he was called to Middleburg, and ſerved the French church there, until he had a call from that to the Hague in 1662. His wit, eloquence, and judgment, and, in a word, his great merit, procured him ſo much eſteem at the court of the prince and princeſs of Orange, that one might properly ſay, he was in favour. The throne of England, to which their highneſſes were advanced in 1689, added a new luſtre to the favour this miniſter continued to enjoy, and which he ſtill enjoys to this day in the glorious and agreeable retirement of Hontſlaerdyke. His health not permitting him to continue in the exerciſe of his miniſtry, he retired to this fine houſe, where he ſpends his time in ſuch employments as are uſeful and agreeable to H. B. M. Theſe two gentlemen have been concerned in the edition of the Bible which is called Mareſius's, wherein the Bookſeller, Elzevir, ſpared no coſt for the beauty of the letter and paper. Their father, on his part, undertook with great labour to adorn this edition with notes, wherein he was aſſiſted by his two ſons. I add, that they publiſhed (24) ‘A curious hiſtory of the life, behaviour, and

---

(*f*) And not in 1675, as Mr Hofman, and after him Konig affirm.

(12) Sam. Mareſius, in Antichriſto revelato, *Tom. i, pag.* 345.

(13) *See the* Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, *Nov.* 1695, *pag.* 127.

(14) Important Advice to the Refugees, *pag.* 216, 217.

(15) See his fifth advertiſement againſt Mr *Jurieu*.

(16) Ex conjugio Ducis Bullionæi cum Berghenſi Comitiſſa, eximiæ formæ & ſublimis ingenii fœmina, ſed ſupra modum Pontificia, nova fuerunt certamina illi ſuſtinenda. *Vitæ Profeſſor. Groning. pag.* 148.

(17) Quam deſerturum harum nuptiarum gratia jam antea clam receperat. *Ibid.*

(18) Vitæ Profeſſor. Groning. *pag.* 149.

(19) *Puyſegur's Memoirs*, Tom. i, pag. 135, Dutch Edit.

(20) Sam. Mareſius, Epiſt. Dedicatoria, 3 Editionis Syſtematis Theologici.

(21) Id. ib.

(22) Id. ib.

(23) I write this the fourth of February 1696.

(24) At the Hague in 1670, in 12mo.

ſomething of his anceſtors [G]. We muſt not forget that in the year 1652, he was appointed ſole miniſter to the Walloon church of Groningen, where, till then, he had preached once every Sunday, to eaſe the paſtor of that church, though he was not obliged to it (g). The academy of Montauban deſigned to call him after the death of Garriſſoles; and likewiſe the univerſity of Marpurg, when it began to be reſtored (h). Among all the diſputes he was engaged in, there was none longer and hotter than that which he had with Voëtius [H]. He had one with Mr Daillé, which was very hot, but it laſted not

'and true ſentiments of John Labbadie, with a modeſt refutation of the declaration, publiſhed in form of a manifeſto by the ſaid Labbadie, to juſtify his deſigns and ſchiſmatical reſolutions, which were the cauſe of his being juſtly depoſed.'

[G] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his anceſtors.*] They had conſiderable poſts in Picardy. 'Mareſii inter ſuos Majores, Depenſes Præfectos, Gamachienſeſque Caſtellanos, poſſunt numerare; nec ita pridem *Davidis* patruelis, Breſtæ in Armorica, Sardinio Gubernatore, Propræfectum egit: *Vaucquetiorum* vero familia, totâ Picardia nota eſt. Verum in eo potiſſimum ſolet *Mareſius* gloriari, quod ex parentibus ſit ortus piis & probis, ac Religioni puriori ἀπὸ βρέφους addictiſſimis (25). - - - - *The family of Mareſius may reckon among their anceſtors, governors of Diepe and Caſtellans of Gamache; and not long ſince David's uncle was deputy-governour of Breſt in Bretagne, when Mr Sardigne was governor; and the family of the Vaucquets is noted thro' all Picardy. But Mareſius uſed to glory in this chiefly, that he was deſcended of pious and honeſt parents, who adhered to the true religion from their infancy.*' The titles and offices of David DES-MARETS the father of Samuel, were as follows. 'Pater ei fuit Ampliſſ. & Conſultiſſimus *David Des-Marets* Dominus du Feret, Avimontii ejuſque Commendæ Prætor ſive Juridicus ordinarius, Baronatus item Chepienſis, Sancti Maxentii aliorumque pagorum Judex Civilis & Criminalis; in Regia Præfectura Vimacenſi Juriſconſultus & cauſarum Actor eximius, & Notarius Regius, Regiſque Chriſtianiſſimi, Rerum Maritimarum in Occiduo Mari Commiſſarius; eoque nomine gaudens eadem immunitate à Tributis ordinariis quâ Nobiles (26). - - - - - *His father was the honourable and learned* David Des-Marets, Sieur du Feret, *juſtice in ordinary of Aumont and its appendages, and alſo Judge civil and criminal of the barony of Chept, St Maixant, and other towns, counſellor, and an eminent pleader in the government of Vineux, and notary royal, commiſſary to the moſt Chriſtian king for maritime affairs in the weſtern ſea; and, on that account, enjoying the ſame immunity from the ordinary taxes as the nobility.*' He married in 1588 Magdalen Vaucquet, the daughter of a noted man, and very zealous for the reformed church (27), and died in 1649. His widow was living in 1654. Lambert DES-MARETS, the father of David, was very zealous for the ſame religion. *Lambertus Davidis pater, Civis Blangiacenſis honoratus & opulentus, Senior fuit in Eccleſia Domeſtica Principis Porciani, ſub auſpiciis Reformationis* (28).

[H] *The diſpute . . . . he had with Voëtius.*] It begun in 1642. Voëtius had publiſhed a diſputation *de idololatria indirecta*, wherein he blamed the conduct of the magiſtrates of Boiſleduc, concerning a fraternity of the Virgin ſettled in their city for ſome ages. They had obliged the Roman catholics to admit the Proteſtants into it, after they had taken away the ceremonies, which the reformed church could not allow (29). Voëtius maintained, that the Proteſtant magiſtrates ought not to tolerate ſuch fraternities, and that private perſons who entered themſelves into them did very ill. Mareſius, who was at this time profeſſor in the *Schola Illuſtris* of Boiſleduc, was deſired to write an apology for the magiſtrates who tolerated the fraternity of the Virgin, and entered themſelves into it. His book was printed in 1642, with this title, *Defenſio Pietatis & Sinceritatis Optimatum Sylvæducenſium, in negotio Sodalitatis quæ à B. Virgine nomen habet, teſtibus veritate & charitate* (30). A little while after there appeared a book of Voëtius, intituled, *Specimen aſſertionum partim ambiguarum aut lubricarum, partim periculoſarum, ex tractatu nuperrime ſcripto pro ſodalitatibus B. Mariæ inter Reformatos erigendis aut interpolandis, titulo,* Defenſio pietatis & ſinceritatis, *&c.* Theſe were the firſt acts of hoſtility on both ſides, and after this there was no means of getting off; for the combatants had not only joined battle, but there was alſo blood ſpilt between them.

Ubi ſanguine bellum
Imbuit, & primæ commiſit funera pugnæ,
Deſerit Hiſperiam, & cœli convexa per auras,
Junonem victrix affatur voce ſuperba:
En perfecta tibi bello diſcordia triſti:
Dic, in amicitiam coëant, & fœdera jungant:
Quandoquidem Auſonio reſperſi ſanguine Teucros (31).

The fury bath'd them in each other's blood.
Then having fix'd the fight, exulting flies,
And bears fulfill'd her promiſe to the ſkies.
To Juno thus ſhe ſpeaks; Behold, 'tis done,
The blood already drawn, the war begun;
The diſcord is compleat, nor can they ceaſe
The dire debate, nor you command the peace.
Now ſince the Latian and the Trojan brood
Have taſted vengeance, and the ſweets of blood.

DRYDEN.

The battle grew hot, and the combatants often renewed the charge. Mareſius who had only ſkirmiſhed (32) in the years 1643, and 1644, gave battle in 1645. This is the title of the book he publiſhed. Samuelis Mareſii *Theologi Ultima patientia tandem expugnata* à D. G. Voetio *Ultrajectino Profeſſore & quibuſdam illius aſſeclis; ſive Modeſta & Neceſſaria defenſio tripartita, tum ſui ipſius, tum eâ occaſione cauſæ Procerum Sylvæducenſium & Decretorum Synodicorum circa illam, ipſi extorta variâ ac longâ contumeliarum ſerie, ac præſertim nupero libello famoſo, Belgicè edito, & inſcripto*, Kort ende oprecht verhael, *&c.* The profeſſor of Utrecht ſcarce appeared in the field of battle (33), but ſent thither either his ſon or his friends: But the profeſſor of Groningen would not be ſo put off, but continued to ſtrike directly at the father. You may underſtand how things ſtood, after the war had laſted as long as the ſiege of Troy; I ſay, you may underſtand it by the book which Mareſius publiſhed in 1652, with this title, Auctarium primum Bibliothecæ Theologicæ *D. Giſberti Voetii* nuper recuſæ cum virulentâ præfatione; continens, 1. Summariam deductionem litis decennalis quæ ipſi cum *Samuele Mareſio*, licet pacem & amneſtiam ſemper deprecante, hactenus interceſſit. 2. Vindicias Conditionum Amneſtiæ & Reconciliationis partibus oblatarum à R. R. Deputatis Synodi Groning. Omlandicæ, ab hoc admiſſarum & ab illo rejectarum. 3. Conditiones iniquiſſimas & impracticabiles, ab ipſo *D. Voetio* pro imperio præſcriptas; Ad ejus pertinax odium & animum invincibiliter irreconciliabilem toti Belgio demonſtrandum. - - - - *The firſt ſupplement to the Theological library, of Giſbert Voëtius, lately reprinted with a virulent preface; containing,* 1. *A ſummary deduction of a ten years controverſy; which he has had with Samuel Mareſius, who all the while ſued for peace and amneſty.* 2. *A vindication of the conditions of the peace and amneſty, offered to both parties by the reverend deputies of the ſynod of Groningen and the Omlands, which were accepted by the latter, but rejected by the former.* 3. *The moſt unjuſt and impracticable conditions, preſcribed by D. Voëtius himſelf; to ſhew to all the United Provinces, his unrelenting hatred and implacable temper.* It is a book in 8vo. It is believed, that this quarrel which laſted eighteen years, would never have ended but with the death of the parties, had not a common intereſt induced them to come to an agreement, that they might unite all their forces againſt a party of Divines (34), who were as odious to the profeſſor of Groningen as to him of Utrecht. It was obſervable in this diſpute, that on the one ſide the curators of the univerſity of Groningen, and on the other, the magiſtrates of Utrecht, not long. I ſpeak of it elſewhere (*i*). If I be not miſtaken the laſt adverſary whom he wrote againſt, was Wittichius, a great Carteſian and profeſſor of Divinity. Our Mareſius cannot be ſufficiently commended for his zeal againſt the Enthuſiaſts, and the foretellers of great revolutions. We have ſeen how he baffled Comenius (*k*), nor did he ſhow Labadie and the Millenarian Serarius any better quarter. The extracts I ſhall give out of the book wherein he refuted this Millenarian, will be acceptable to men of good ſenſe [*I*].

(g) Vitæ Profeſſor. Groning. *pag.* 153.

(h) Ibid. *pag.* 152.

(25) Vitæ Profeſſor. Groning. pag. 134.

(26) Ibid.

(27) Johannes Vaucquetius Magdalenæ pater, Prætor Sanmauvizii Fontiumque, & Juris patrii conſultiſſimus in Præfectura Vimacenſi, atque Regius Notarius, itidem columen fuit inter ſuos Eccleſiæ Reformatæ; quem Mareſius recordatur ſe admodum puerum vidiſſe, venerandâ canitie ſenem, natum 93 vel 94 annos, integris mentis & corporis viribus ſacra noſtra frequentantem. *Ibid.*

(28) Ibid.

(29) See the Life of Mr Des Cartes, written by Mr Baillet, *Tom.* ii, *pag.* 180, *& ſeq.*

(30) It is in quarto.

(31) Virgil. Æneid. lib. vii, ver. 541.

(32) See thoſe ſkirmiſhes in the Appendix of the *Tribunal iniquum*, pag. 151, 152.

(33) He appeared perſonally in it in 1648, at the beginning of his firſt volume of Theological Diſputations, (See the long preface to that volume,) and in the year 1651, in the preface to the ſecond edition of the *Bibliotheca Studioſi Theologiæ*.

(34) *Thoſe who are called Cocceians.* Mareſius, de Statu afflicto Studii Theologici, *pag.* 3, *calls it* Factionem Carteſio-Loveſteniano-Remonſtranticam.

trecht offered their mediation to the parties, and that they having accepted it, it was immediately ordered, that there ſhould be a ceſſation of all acts of hoſtility during the treaty of peace. After this, they conſulted about the preliminaries, the mediators diſpatched courier after courier to agree about the time when, and place where, the conferences ſhould be held, and on the choice of the deputies plenipotentiaries. All this was labour in vain, becauſe during theſe preliminaries, the party of Utrecht broke the truce, by publiſhing a very injurious book againſt Mareſius. The forcible carrying away of the prince of Furſtemberg did not more diſſolve the conferences about the general peace which was treating, at Cologne in 1674, than this book did the project of peace between theſe two profeſſors. If you would ſee my proofs in the original, you need only read what follows (35). ‘Caduceum injicere conati ſunt Nobiliſſimi & Ampliſſimi hujus Academiæ p. t. Curatores . . . . Scripſerunt eum in finem Ultrajectum, & ſtipulati ſunt ut interim dum ipſi convenirent cum Delegatis quibuſdam ex N. N. & A. A. illo Magiſtratu ad totum negotium componendum, armiſtitium bonâ fide ſervaretur, nec quicquam *directe vel indirecte, mediate vel immediate* ultra emitteretur. Sed vix dum in has conditiones N. N. & A. A. Magiſtratus Ultrajectinus, re communicatâ cum D. Voetio & ſuis bonâ fide conſenſerat, & adhuc de loco, tempore & perſonis conventus præliminariter agebatur per Tabellarios hinc inde inter Proceres utroſque miſſos, cum ecce novus interim libellus convitioſus & famoſus, ſub nomine Chabanæi, contra fidem publicam in me Ultrajecti prodiit. - - - - *The curators of this univerſity endeavoured at a reconciliation . . . . To this end they wrote to Utrecht, and agreed, that till ſuch time as they ſhould meet with deputies, from the magiſtrates of Utrecht, to compoſe the difference, an armiſtice ſhould be faithfully obſerved on both ſides, and nothing further ſhould be publiſhed either directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately. But no ſooner the magiſtrates of Utrecht conſented to theſe propoſals, after communicating them to D. Voëtius, and his friends, while yet they were treating by couriers, ſent to and fro, between the reſpective magiſtrates, on the preliminaries of the time, place, and perſons of the convention, when a new book full of ſcurrility and railing, under the name of Chabanæus, is publiſhed at Utrecht, in breach of public faith.*’

This quarrel (36) being one of the moſt remarkable that has been known between two Proteſtant Divines, and having produced more books than can be imagined, I deſigned to have given the whole Hiſtory of it, with a chronological catalogue of all the writings it produced; but I found that this undertaking required fuller inſtructions, and deeper inquiries than I could afford, and that it would fill up too many pages; and therefore I leave it to thoſe that write the Eccleſiaſtical Annals, or the *Hiſtoria Literaria* of the XVIIth century, and ſhall conclude this remark with a thing which I know not well how to circumſtantiate. I have heard in France from many people, that a Jeſuit (37), publiſhed a book, which contained nothing but the reproaches which theſe two famous profeſſors divulged one againſt another, and that he concluded after this manner: ‘altho’ it were ſuppoſed, that two thirds of theſe accuſations were falſe on both ſides, yet the other third being true, renders theſe two writers worthy of corporal puniſhment, who yet proteſted, during the progreſs of this quarrel, that they wiſhed a good reconciliation.’ I could find no body in Holland who knew of ſuch a book; and ſome people, worthy of credit in theſe matters, told me, that there never was any ſuch book. But at laſt Mr Grævius informed me, that a Jeſuit of the Low-Countries had publiſhed a collection of that nature.

If Mr Grævius only meant the *Munus adventitium*, publiſhed by a Jeſuit under the feigned name of W. Gutherthoma in the year 1643 he by no means proved that the book which I had in ſome ſort denied the exiſtence of, was ever printed; for this *Munus adventitium*, contains only the foul language that Voëtius uſed in his firſt book againſt Mareſius. The latter did not anſwer that ſatire before the year 1645. It was doubtleſs a very diſagreeable thing for him to find himſelf painted by a Jeſuit, in the black colours borrowed from the work of a Reformed Divine. Thus he ſpeaks of it in a book publiſhed in the year 1652. ‘Quin etiam cum eadem illâ æſtate prodiiſſet in ipſum Satira quædam Jeſuitica ſub titulo *Muneris adventitii* quam Author corraſerat ex *Specimine* Voetii, & illo authore laudato ac Speciminis paginis citatis verbiſque recitatis, Mareſium deſcribebat & traducebat, tanquam *falſarium, vulneratæ exiſtimationis hominem, ſcandalozarum ſcriptionum authorem, heterodoxum, pſeudologum, calumniatorem, mendacem, pietati & Religioni contumelioſum, Pacis Eccleſiæ & Reip. turbonem, Veritate, Charitate, & Prudentia deſtitutum, &c.* (his enim jam elogiis à Voetio fuerat inſignitus Mareſius priuſquam vel vocula durior in ipſum illi excidiſſet) nihil ei voluit reponere Mareſius (38). - - - *Nay, altho' a ſatire had been publiſhed againſt him, that ſame ſummer, by a Jeſuit, under the title of* Munus adventitium, *which the author, had compiled from Voëtius's ſpecimen, and commending that author, quoting the pages, and reciting the words of the ſpecimen, deſcribed and traduced Mareſius as a cheat*, a man of a blemiſhed character, author of ſcandalous books, heterodox, an inventer of falſities a calumniator, a lier, a reviler of piety and religion, a diſturber of the peace of the church and ſtate, deſtitute of truth, and charity, and prudence, &c. *(for with theſe elogiums had Mareſius been complemented by Voëtius, before he had dropt the leaſt hard word againſt him) Mareſius refuſed to give any anſwer.*’

[*I*] *The Millenarian Serarius. The extracts I ſhall give . . . . . will be acceptable to men of good ſenſe.*] Peter Serarius (39) publiſhed a book in 1663, wherein he declared, that the conjunction of the planets in the ſign Sagittarius foretold great revolutions. The ſame news was publiſhed in many other Latin and French books. Mareſius refuted this pretenſion in ſome Theſes which he cauſed to be maintained. Serarius wrote againſt thoſe Theſes, which obliged Mareſius to publiſh (40) a book which he intituled *Chiliaſmus enervatus*, and which contains, beſides thoſe Theſes, three diſſertations againſt one part of the anſwer of Serarius. He dedicated this book to his adverſary, and prudently repreſented to him, that the doctrine of the Chiliaſts rendered the Reformed Religion odious to the ſupreme powers; for ſince they pretend, that the proſperity of the church depends upon the deſtruction of all temporal powers, they excite the people to inſurrections that they may bring in the golden age of Chriſtianity, or the reign of a thouſand years. He repreſents to him the ſeditions that had been raiſed in England by the doctrine of the fifth monarchy men, and the mortification the Chiliaſts had lately ſuffered, by ſeeing all the hopes they had grounded upon the difference between France and the Pope, vaniſh into nothing by the peace of Piſa. The affront offered to the duke of Crequi at Rome in the year 1662, very much provoked his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty: he ſent ſome troops into Italy, and then the credulous people, chiefly the Millenarians, doubted not but the beaſt in the Revelation was then certainly to be deſtroyed, and they could not refrain from publiſhing their hopes: wherefore the treaty of Piſa, which ended this difference, without any effuſion of blood, or any real damage to the court of Rome, was like a clap of thunder to them. Mareſius takes care to put his adverſary in mind of this terrible mortification. He obſerves, that it had been publiſhed at London in the year 1656 that Rome would be deſtroyed in 1666, and that the day of judgment ſhould happen in 1711. Many people flattered themſelves, that the war which was deſigned in France againſt Alexander VII, to revenge the affront done to the duke of Crequi, embaſſador of

---

(*i*) *In the article* DAILLE', *remarks* [*K*] *and* [*L*].

(*k*) *See the remarks* [*F*] *and* [*G*], *of the article* COMENIUS.

(35) Mareſius, in Præfatione, Theologi paradoxi retecti & refutati. *This book was printed at Groningen in* 1649.

(36) Concerning t's origin, ſee Letter ccccīxiii of Voſſius.

(37) Some ſaid he was called *James Tirinus*; but that is falſe. He died before the beginning of this quarrel. Thoſe who ſaid ſo, ſeemed to have this ground for it, that Mareſius having publiſhed two volumes againſt *James Tirinus*, had probably provoked him.

(38) Sam. Mareſius, Auctario primo Biblioth. Theol. Giſb. Voëtii, *pag.* 6.

(39) I ſhall ſay ſomething of him at the end of this remark.

(40) In the year 1664.

He did a great injury to the Janſeniſts, without deſigning it [*K*], by declaring that their opinions were the ſame with thoſe of the Reformed. His Reputation gave him great authority

that crown, would verify the firſt article of the prediction: judge then whether the peace of Piſa was acceptable to them. What he ſays concerning the conjunction of the planets in Sagittarius, is curious; it happened on the eleventh of December 1662. A Dutch author, following the obſervations of the Aſtrologer Theodorus Hoen, affirmed, that the like conjunction had not been ſince that which was in the ſign Aquarius in the time of Noah's deluge (41). Serarius building on this Dutch book, and another that appeared in High-Dutch, wrote a Latin diſſertation to ſhow, that the conjunction of the planets in Sagittarius, the laſt ſign of the fiery trigon, *igneæ triplicitatis*, being well conſidered with all it's circumſtances antecedent and concomitant, foretold the approaching coming of JESUS CHRIST for the converſion of the Jews, the ruin of the Pope, and the eſtabliſhment of the millenary kingdom. Mareſius refutes him ſolidly, and obſerves, that, according to Alſtedius, this monarchy ſhall begin in 1694, and according to Theodorus Hoen, the conjunction in Sagittarius, was to produce the univerſal conflagration. He laughs at this, and ſays, that Sagittarius cannot paſs for a fiery ſign, unleſs it be becauſe it obliges people to keep good fires in their houſes to preſerve them from the cold; and he obſerves that at the time of this conjunction, it was a terrible froſt for many weeks. And whereas Serarius ſaid, that the conjunction which was in the ſame ſign, October 9, 1603, did ſtill continue it's bad effects; Mareſius anſwers him pleaſantly, that it is very ſtrange it has not yet diſcharged all it's poiſon, *mirum eſt ejus virus nondum deſerbuiſſe*. He adds, that Serarius was a good friend to Paul Felgenhawer, who printed a book in 1655 (42), wherein he aſſumes to himſelf more than once a prophetic ſpirit, and promiſes the Jews all ſorts of good news. But he does not agree with the author of a piece intituled, *Judæorum excitabulum matutinum, ſive Judæus redux*, wherein it is affirmed, that the converſion of the Jews ſhall begin in 1664, and that it ſhall quickly after be followed with their return into Paleſtine, where they ſhall live moſt deliciouſly.

REVOLUTIONS of religion hoped for by the Mahometans.

When I conſidered this multitude of Chriſtian doctors, who have foretold for ſo many ages a great revolution of the faith, I was curious to know whether there were not ſuch kind of people in other religions; and among other things I find that there are ſome Mahometans who leave legacies to an unknown prophet, who is to come and deliver the world from the tyranny of Anti-Chriſt (43). And the Perſians believe, that Mahomet Mahadi, the ſon of Hoſſen, ſecond ſon of Ali, is not dead, but lies hid in ſome place, from whence he ſhall come forth one day and refute all errors, and re-unite all men in the ſame belief. He will preach on horſe-back, and begin to do it in the city of Mazadel, where there is always a horſe kept ready for him (44). This in ſome things reſembles the opinion of ſeveral Chriſtians concerning the prophet Elias. We need not wonder that the Mahometans believe ſuch chimeras, ſince the prince of Baſſora can perſuade them that he is the chief favourite of Mahomet, and that his credit is ſo great with that prophet, that, by his bills of exchange, he can procure the bearers ſuch or ſuch a place in Paradiſe. There is a bank in his houſe for the diſpatch of theſe bills; he ſigns a policy, by which the poſſeſſion of a certain place in heaven is acquired, that is more or leſs advantageous, in proportion to the ſum payed him. *Il prencipe di Baſſora pretende eſſer de' Confidenti di Mahometto e haver maggior autorita degl' altri, in vertu della quale concede à gente ſimplice pezza di cielo, ſegnando polize di cambio di tanto e tal ſito nel Paradiſo, ſecondo il dinaro che ne riceve* (45).

We will in a few words acquaint the reader who this Petrus Serarius, or Serrurier, was, againſt whom Mareſius wrote. I find at p. 297, of a book (46) printed in 1670, that he was lately dead, and that above forty years before he was depoſed from the miniſtry for the fanatical errors of Swenckveldius, to which he was wholly addicted; that he publiſhed a ſmall piece in favour of Labadie, in 1669, and intituled it *Examen Synodorum*, and addreſſed it to the Walloon ſynod; and in the title of this book he called himſelf *a miniſter of the Goſpel of the univerſal church*, and that he was a man who communicated with no church.

[*K*] *He did a great injury to the Janſeniſts, without deſigning it.*] In the year 1651, he publiſhed a book in 4to with this title, *Synopſis veræ Catholicæque doctrinæ de Gratia & annexis quæſtionibus; propoſita partim libello qui anno ſuperiori à Janſeniſtis in Communione Romana Gallice prodiit ſub hoc titulo*, Catechiſmus Gratiæ, *& poſtea recuſus fuit ſub iſto*, Elucidationes quarundam difficultatum de gratia; *partim brevibus ad illam Scholiis Theologicis*. The next year there was publiſhed at Paris a little book written by the Jeſuits and intituled, *The Janſeniſts owned for Calviniſts by Samuel Mareſius, doctor and chief profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of Groningen, and miniſter in ordinary of the academical church, in his Latin verſion of the Catechiſm of Grace of the Janſeniſts, printed at Groningen in* 1651. The author of this book inſerted the preface which Mareſius put before his Synopſis, and took advantage of all that he has obſerved, to ſhow that in the doctrines about Grace, and thoſe that relate to them, the opinions of the Janſeniſts are the ſame with thoſe of Calvin. From that time few books appeared againſt the Janſeniſts, wherein this agreement, which the profeſſor of Groningen had owned between them and his ſect, was not objected to them. As this gave a great deal of trouble, and did great prejudice to theſe gentlemen, they writ bitterly againſt him. Mr Daillé put him in mind of it in the defence of the apology for the national ſynods of Alençon and Charenton (47). ‘Hoc ne neſciat, narro illi iſtos, quos tantopere prædicat Janſenianos, quos *cordatos* dicit, quos *graviſſimos argumentatores* cenſet, hos inquam ipſos narro jam ante quadriennium tres libellos longe ſacerrimos ac nequiſſimos, convitiis & maledictis prodigioſis refertos, contra ipſum edidiſſe; in quibus, quod credo, auſus eſſet iis male palpari ita ferociter recalcitrant, ut nihil mitius cogitaſſe videantur quam ut laudatorem hunc ſuum miſere diſcerperent ac laniarent. Scin' tu quas ei pro ſuis laudibus grates reddant? Quibus elogiis virum talibus pro meritis exornent? * *Virulentiſſimum ſcriptorem* vocant; *artis diabolicæ multoties convictum, hominem frontis ad omne mendacium proſtitutæ, Theologaſtrum, Sophiſtam, Sycophantam dira calumniandi libidine citra modum ac legem efferatum, protervum, ominoſum convitiatorem, audaciſſimum impoſtorem, fanaticum vatem*. Piget plura de teterrimis iſtorum convitiatorum venenis dicere. Hos ſuos rabioſiſſimos ac maledicentiſſimos obtrectatores, pro laudibus, quibus immerentes affecerat, turpiſſima probra rependentes, & plenis in eum plauſtris effundentes habet tamen Epicrita pro *cordatis, gravibuſque* diſputatoribus (48). - - - - *Leſt he ſhould be unacquainted with this, I tell him, that thoſe Janſeniſts, whom he ſo highly extols, whom he calls* judicious, *whom he thinks to be very* ſtrong reaſoners: *thoſe very men, I tell him, have publiſhed now four years ago, three moſt execrable and wicked books againſt him, abounding with moſt prodigious reproaches and reviling; in which, becauſe as I believe he dared to ſtroke them injudiciouſly, they kick again ſo furiouſly, that they ſeem to have thought of nothing kinder than beating to pieces and deſtroying this their panegyriſt. Would you know what thanks they return him for his praiſes, with what elogiums they extol the man for his merits? They call him* a moſt virulent writer, often convicted of diabolic arts, a man of a front hardened to all manner of lies, a Theologaſter, a Sophiſter, a Sycophant, raging with a curſed deſire of ſlander beyond meaſure or rule, a froward fellow, an ominous reviler, a barefaced impoſtor, a fanatic prophet. *I am loth to repeat any more of the venom of theſe revilers. Yet the approbator reckons theſe his mad and moſt abuſive detractors, who, for the commendations he beſtowed upon them undeſervedly, return him the baſeſt reproaches and pour them upon him by cart-loads; he reckons them I ſay* judicious and ſolid diſputants.’ The ſame apology informs us (49). I. That David Blondel wrote to Mareſius, and blamed him for meddling with the diſputes between the Janſeniſts and Jeſuits. II. That the Janſeniſt (50) who treated Mareſius ſo very ill, had forged a lye, *viz.* that the miniſters of Charenton had induced him of Groningen, to own the diſciples authority even in foreign countries; inſomuch that one who had written a very ſevere book againſt him, in Germany, was ordered to ſuppreſs it [*L*].

---

(41) According to Serarius, who built upon the ſame Hoen, and upon the tables of conjunctions, it happened in Piſces.

(42) At Amſterdam. It was intituled, *Bonus Nuncius Iſraëli.*

(43) Ne teſtamenti ſi fanno legati à certo profeta incognito, che dee venir liberar il mondo dalla tirannide del Antichriſto. *Giornale de Letterati, March* 31, 1673, *pag.* 33, *in the extract of the* Voyage to the Eaſt Indies, *by Father F. Vincenzo Maria of St Catherine of Siena, procurator-general of the bare-footed Carmelites.*

(44) Ibid.

(45) Ibid.

(46) *Intituled*, Modeſte Réfutation de la Declaration en forme de Manifeſte, *publiſhed by John Labadie.*

(47) Dallæus, in Vindiciis Apologiæ pro duabus Synodis, *part i, cap. vi, pag.* 130, 131.

* *Hier. ab Angelo forti. Epiſt. i, a. D.* 1654. *edita, pag.* 14, 15.

(48) *Mr Daillé, at pag.* 428, *of the ſame book, ſpeaks thus:* Ex his ſuis laboribus nihil ad eum pro expectatis triumphis rediiſſe vidimus, quam à Romanis quidem librorum cenſoribus eam notam, de qua non erat, quod hic tantopere gloriaretur, Janſenianis vero tria convitiorum & maledictorum plauſtra, quæ in eum ab Hieronymo illo perſonato, de quo alibi ſupra diximus, tota plaudente Lutetia effundi inviti ac dolentes ſpectavimus. - - - *From theſe his labours we do not find that he has gained any of the triumph he expected, except that mark from the Romiſh cenſors of books, of which he has no great reaſon to boaſt; here we ſee the Janſeniſts have thrown three cart-loads of ſlander on him by the feigned Hieronimus, whom we have mentioned above, with the applauſe of the whole city of Paris, and to our great ſorrow.*

(49) Pag. 428.

(50) It is Mr Hermant, who diſguiſed himſelf under the name of *Hieronymus ab Angelo forti.*

diſciples of Janſenius for orthodox, on purpoſe to render them odious to the Jeſuits, and to be revenged for the reproaches the Janſeniſts had publiſhed againſt Labadie. Mr Daillé anſwers, that thoſe who are accuſed of this trick, are ſo innocent of it, that they would have adviſed their brother of Groningen with all their heart, never to engage in that quarrel, but to leave the two parties to diſpute it out. *Quæ quam falſo, quamque mendaciter conficta ſint, nemo ſcire vel teſtari melius atque certius poteſt, quam Epicrita, qui ſui in edenda illa Janſenianæ catecheſeos cenſura conſilii unus ſibi optime conſcius eſt. Nos quidem, quos fabulator totius rei auctores fuiſſe fingit, tantum ab eo quod iſte comminiſcitur, abfuiſſe novit Deus, ut Epicritam, ſi nos ille conſuluiſſet, etiam à ſcribendo deterrituri fuerimus, ſuaſurique ut bene compoſitos cum ſuis Bitis Bacchios inter ſe digladiari, digniſque utrimque Romano ſupercilio iris ac ictibus bacchari ſineret; neve quos certandi rixandique æſtus atque libido tam commode commiſerat, eos intempeſtivo alloquio divulſos in ſe provocaret, atque converteret* (51).

[*L*] *A man who had written a ſevere book againſt him, was ordered to ſuppreſs it.*] It was intituled, *Iſmaël Gallus*. The Author, called Steinbergius, lived at Herbron, and was ſubject to the counts of Naſſau, who obliged him to ſuppreſs his book (52).

(51) Dallæus, ibid. *pag*. 133, 134.

(52) See the fifth tome of the works of James Altingius, *pag*. 393.

MARGARIN (CORNELIUS) abbot of mount Caſſin, and Archiviſt general of the order, was one of the greateſt compilers that lived in the XVIIth century. He was born in 1605, and died February 11th, 1681 (*a*). The works which he publiſhed give but an imperfect idea of his indefatigable induſtry. To make a true repreſentation of it, we muſt join to that which is printed, that which is not as yet publiſhed [*A*].

(*a*) Proſper Mandoſius, in Biblioth. Romana, *Centur. v, num.* 66.

[*A*] *To make a true repreſentation of his application, we muſt join to that which is printed, that which is not as yet publiſhed.*] Theſe are his works of the firſt kind. *Juſtinianus magnus Aniciæ familiæ reſtitutus. Diſcorſo Apologetico in corroborazione della verita di un inſtrumento concernente la famiglia de Capizucchi. Bullarium Caſinenſe* in two tomes. *Inſcriptiones antiquæ Baſilicæ ſancti Pauli de Urbe. Dictionarium Longobardicum.* His unprinted works are a large undigeſted collection of papers, which make eight volumes, that are kept in the Vatican. The title of them is this, *Theſaurus Hiſtoricus ſacræ & politicæ veritatis in S. R. E. Agro ipſis Autographis monumentis à vetuſtiſſimis antiquitatum latibulis per diurna ſæcula abſconditus, in tomos octo diſtributus, & ad ſanctiſſimos Innocentii XI. P. M. pedes ea qua decet veneratione & alacritate humillime depoſitus, per Cornelium Margarinum Abbatem Caſinenſem, ad certam Chronologiæ normam juxta Indictionum rationem ipſa teſtante veritate expoſitus* (1).

(1) Proſper Mandoſius, Bibl. Romana, *Centur. v, num.* 66, *pag*. 332.

MARGARET, queen of Navarre. See **NAVARRE**.

MARGUNIUS (MAXIMUS), biſhop of Cythera (*a*), was a native of Candia. He lived many years at Venice, and died about the end of June 1602 (*b*). He had a fine library, which he bequeathed to the monks of Candia; and, as if he had foreſeen his diſſolution, he ſent thither, a little before his death, nine trunks full of books (*c*). He had ſedulouſly collected a great number of Greek manuſcripts which were ſcarce and curious.

(*a*) An iſland of the Archipelago, now called Cerigo.

(*b*) Velſerus, Epiſt. xx, ad Scaligerum.

(*c*) Id. ib.

MARIANA (JOHN) born at Talavera, in the dioceſe of Toledo, entered into the order of the Jeſuits January 1, 1554. He was then a ſtudent at Complutum, being ſeventeen years old. He became one of the ableſt men of his age; a great Divine, a great Humaniſt, one of a profound ſkill in eccleſiaſtical and prophane hiſtory, a good Grecian, and learned in the holy tongue. He went to Rome in 1561, and there taught Theology. Four years after this he went into Sicily, and taught there for two years. He came to Paris in 1569, and there explained Thomas Aquinas for the ſpace of five years. His health would not ſuffer him to continue, and obliged him to follow ſuch ſtudies as were leſs laborious. He returned to Spain in 1574, and ſpent the reſt of his days at Toledo. He died there February 17th, 1624, being eighty ſeven years of age [*A*]. He was employed by the Inquiſition in ſeveral important affairs; but for himſelf he ſtood in need of patience [*B*], and of great courage to bear with conſtancy the ſevere trials of adverſity (*a*). What is obſerved of his chaſtity, is altogether ſingular [*C*]. He publiſhed ſeveral

(*a*) *Taken from* Nathan. Southwell, Bibl. Script. Societ. *pag*. 477.

[*A*] *He died February the 17th, 1624, being eighty ſeven years of age.*] Don Nicolas Antonio, who had read all this in Alegambe, does affirm (1), that Mariana died February 17, 1623, aged ninety years. As to this, I truſt more to two Jeſuits, who compiled the *Bibliotheque* of their order, than to him, or even to Bernardin Giraldi (2), who affirms, that Mariana died in 1632, aged ninety ſix years. ‘ Jeſuitarum quos ætas ‘ noſtra vidit annoſiſſimus, qui abhinc biennium pie ‘ obiit diem ſuum nonaginta ſex annos natus. - - - - - ‘ *The oldeſt Jeſuit of this age, did, two years ago, piouſly* ‘ *depart this life, being ninety ſix years old.*’

[*B*] *For himſelf, he ſtood in great need of patience.*] If I could have conſulted his life, (3) written by Thomas Thomaius (4) de Vargas, Hiſtoriographer to the king of Spain, I could doubtleſs have given here ſome particular account of the perſecutions which Mariana endured; but I can only now tranſcribe the words of the two Bibliographers of the Jeſuits. ‘ Ipſe ‘ viciſſim multa perpeſſus adverſa, admirabili animi ‘ æquitate, & omnium virtutum documento ſe malis ‘ ſuperiorem eſſe probavit. Exercitam ſenectutem To‘ leti produxit uſque ad diem xvii Februarii anni Do‘ mini MDCXXIV (5). - - - *He himſelf endured much* ‘ *adverſity with admirable patience, and as an example* ‘ *of all virtues ſhewed himſelf to be above the ſhocks of* ‘ *fortune. He protracted his labouring old age at* ‘ *Toledo, to the xviith of February MDCXXIV.*’ Add to this paſſage what they will tell us hereafter, when I ſhall ſpeak of the book about the alteration of money.

[*C*] *What is obſerved of his chaſtity, is altogether ſingular.*] Thoſe who have read the new letters of the animadverter upon Mr Maimbourg, have there ſeen this ſingularity expreſſed after this manner (6): ‘ You ‘ will not believe this, nor perhaps what F. Alegambe ‘ ſays of the Jeſuit Mariana, who died in 1624, ‘ after he had lived almoſt ninety years in the ‘ moſt exact chaſtity; from whence perhaps it came ‘ to paſs, adds the hiſtorian, that his hands ‡ were as ‘ ſupple and pliable after his death, as if he had been

(1) Nicol. Anton. Biblioth. Hiſpan. *Tom. i, pag.* 561.

(2) Bernardinus Giraldus Patavinus, in Apolog. pro Senatu Veneto, *dated at Padua Dec.* 1, 1634.

(3) Alegambe and Southwell, mention it in the article of MARIANA. Don Nicolas Antonio does not mention it in the long catalogue he has given of the writings of Thomaius, printed and to be printed. He calls him *Tamajus*.

(4) Mr Teiſſier, Biblioth. Bibliothecar. *p*. 308, *and* 385, calls him Tamæus.

(5) Alegambe, *pag*. 258. Sotuel, *pag*. 477.

(6) See the New Letters, *pag*. 685.

‡ *Caſtitatis cultor ſtudioſiſſimus, cujus aliquis effectus eſſe potuerit quod mortuo manus fuerint ita tractabiles ac ſi viveret.*

ſeveral books (b), and among others a hiſtory of Spain, which many look upon as a maſter-

---

(b) *See the titles of them in Moreri.*

---

been alive. I confeſs freely that I ſee no connexion between theſe two things.’ I believe with him, that it would be a difficult thing to give a natural reaſon of ſuch an effect of chaſtity; and as to miraculous reaſons, I know not by what reſemblance or analogy they can be ſupported. Perhaps they may be grounded upon an argument from contraries, and that in conſequence of a monkiſh tradition, which lays it down for a certain truth, that all thoſe who have had to do with Nuns, are accuſed after their death, and convicted of this action by a certain ſtiffneſs, which is obſerved in that part which had been made uſe of to commit the ſin. ‘Notabile eſt quod Mariani (7) dicunt, eum qui ſpurium ex moniali precrearit, ſingulariſſime à Deo poſt mortem puniri, uti celeberrimus Medicus *Leonellus Faventinus, c.* 7. *ſecundæ partis Practicæ Medicinalis* hoc myſterium naturæ aperuit, *Qui coit*, inquiens, *cum Monachâ vel moniali, quando talis moritur, remanet virga ejus tenſa*, Unde dicitur in carmine apud vulgares:

Qui monacha potitur, virgâ tendente moritur.

Cujus & meminit *Wolfgangus Hildebrandus Mag. Nat. l.* 1. *c.* 31. *p.* 34. *Erford. impreſſ.* 16. 22. Et fortean etiam moniales ſtupratæ poſt mortem peculiari ſigno notantur, quod honoris & pudoris ergo reticetur. Certe ſi miracula hæc quotidie contingerent pauciores ſpurii invenirentur (8). - - - - *What is aſſerted by the Papiſts is remarkable, that he who begets a baſtard upon a Nun, is, after death, puniſhed by* GOD *in a moſt ſingular manner; as the moſt famous phyſician* Leonellus Faventinus, c. 7. of the ſecond part of his Medicinal Practice *has diſcloſed this ſecret of nature*, He, *ſaith he*, who hath had criminal converſation with a Nun, when he dieth, the offending part remains erected; *which is alſo mentioned by* Wolfgangus Hildebrandus. *And perhaps the Nuns who have been defloured are alſo diſtinguiſhed by ſome particular mark, which, for honour and modeſty's ſake, is concealed. Aſſuredly, there would not be ſo many baſtards, if theſe miracles ſhould daily fall out.*’ The words of Leonellus Faventinus, which I have tranſcribed, were cited by Henry Korman in chap. lxvii, part iv, of the Miracles of the Dead.

PARTICULARS concerning the chaſtity of ſome Jeſuits.

I will obſerve upon this occaſion ſome very notable ſingularities which are to be found in Alegambe, concerning the chaſtity of certain Jeſuits. He ſays, that Father Gil, who died in 1622, aged ſeventy-three years, knew not any woman by ſight, ſuch a ſtrict watch did he keep over his ſenſes that they ſhould not fix upon theſe objects. He was afraid of himſelf: he could ſcarcely bear to touch himſelf; and he thanked GOD that he had a bad ſight, becauſe that had afforded him great aſſiſtance to chaſtity. *Erat ſeveriſſimus ſuorum ſenſuum cuſtos: nullam tot annis feminam de facie noverat: ſe quoque ipſum attingere quodammodò horrebat. Agebat Deo gratias pro hebetata ſibi acie oculorum; ex quo multa commoda caſtimoniæ perſentiſceret* (9). Father Coſterus declared, that his chaſtity was never overcome by any irregular motion, nor by any obſcene imagination (10). Father Coton, who was confeſſor to a very leud prince, whoſe court followed the maxim, *Regis ad exemplum totus componitur orbis*, died a virgin, and preſerved his inward purity in ſuch a manner, that he had a horror for every thing that might be offenſive to this virtue; and he had ſo nice a ſmell in this reſpect, that perſons who came near him after having violated the laws of chaſtity would excite in him the ſenſation of an intolerable ſtink. *Caſtitatem impenſe coluit, & Viginitatis decus ad extremum uſque obtinuit. Senſus frænabat accuratâ cuſtodiâ, & horrore quodam impuritatis; quam etiam in iis qui ſe illa fœdaſſent, ex graveolentiâ neſcio qua diſcernebat* (11). Father Spiga, who died in the year 1594, aged ſeventy-four years, was accounted a virgin, he had never looked upon any woman, and could not diſtinguiſh his own nieces one from another, altho' he had been their confeſſor; and nothing could induce him to enter into their houſe, when he knew they were alone. *Caſtitati tuendæ, nunquam fœminas intuitus eſt. Neptes ſuas, quas crebro confitentes audierat, inter ſe diſtinguere neſciebat; ad illas, ſi domi ſolæ eſſent non poterat induci ut intraret, quanticunque momenti negotio urgeretur. Opinio conſtans fuit, Virginitatis illi decus uſque ad extremum conſtitiſſe* (12). I am ſurprized, that Alegambe ſhould not know what is related of Poſſevin the Jeſuit, ‘That being to read Tibullus, upon account of his fine Latin, he prayed to GOD kneeling on the ground, that the verſes of this poet about love might not inſpire him with love.’ Mr Menage, who relates this (13), had ſaid juſt before, ‘That he heard Father Sirmond ſay, that having read the judgment, which Photius gave of the romance of Achilles Statius, whereby it appeared, that this romance was full of obſcenity, he would never read it.’ To this purpoſe I will add, that Melchior Canus, who was no friend to the Jeſuits, made himſelf merry one day at their coſt, at the king of Spain's court. He ſaid, that they carried about them an herb which mortified nature in ſuch a manner, that by the efficacy of this ſimple they could ſafely converſe with women. Philip II taking this in a literal ſenſe, had a mind to know what this herb was, and having given order, that the Jeſuits ſhould be preſſed to name it, he learned that it was called the Fear of GOD. ‘Feſtivum eſt quod refert Nicolaus Orlandinus libro quinto hiſtoriæ Societatis JESU. Petrus Faber & Antonius Araozius aulam Philippi ſecundi Hiſpaniarum Regis adierant, & tum primum in illud regnum Societatis nomen invexerant. *Quibuſdam autem inſtar erant miraculi, quod cum omni genere ſexuque promiſcuo tam verſarentur innoxii. Nec dubitavit in media curia Melchior Canus belle jocari, Patres Societatis JESU herbam quandam ſecum ſolitos circumferre, quæ vim haberet interimendæ libidinis: eaque velut antidoto tuto poſſe inter fœminarum verſari greges, & confitentibus puellis aurem ſalva integritate præbere*, &c. *Ea vox*, &c. *ſenſim ſparſa per curiam ad Principis pervenit aures. Qui rei auditæ curioſus inveſtigator Johannem de Zuniga (is erat ei velut morum magiſter ac cuſtos) ad Patres miſit ſciſcitatum quod herbæ genus illud eſſet*, &c. Non negavit Araoſius hujus virtutis herbam ſe habere: & cum Johannem aliquandiu ſuſpenſum reſponſi ambiguitate tenuiſſet, quo majorem audiendi cupiditatem accenderet, *Hæc, inquit, herba communi ſermone Timor Dei nuncupatur*, &c. *hoc igitur principi, velim, narres, hoc fideliter referas* (14). *What Nicolaus Orlandinus relates in his Hiſtory of the Society of JESUS, is pleaſant enough. Petrus Faber and Antonius Araoſius had come to the court of Philip the ſecond, king of Spain, and had then firſt brought into that kingdom the name of the ſociety.* But by ſome it was looked upon as a miracle, that they could innocently converſe with all ſorts and ſexes of people. Whereupon Melchior Canus pleaſantly ſaid before all the court, that the fathers of the ſociety of JESUS uſed to carry about them a certain herb, which had the virtue of extinguiſhing luſt: and thereby, as with an antidote, might ſafely frequent the company of women, and lend an ear to the confeſſing virgins, without violating their integrity, *&c.* This ſpeech, *&c.* being by degrees ſpread over the court came to the ears of the prince. Who being a curious inquirer into the truth of what he heard, ſent Johannes de Zuniga to the fathers of the ſociety, to aſk what kind of herb that was, *&c. Araoſius did not deny that they had ſuch an herb; and when by the ambiguity of his anſwer he had for ſome time held him in ſuſpenſe, that he might heighten his deſire of hearing it*, The herb, *ſaid he*, in common ſpeech, is called the Fear of GOD, *&c.* This I deſire you would faithfully report to the prince.’ Jarrige does not faithfully report the circumſtances of this ſtory. ‘Philip II, ſays he (15), their great protector, and a prince of fine wit, jeſting, aſked them one day, how they could be chaſte, having private and familiar converſations with all the fine ladies of his magnificent court, We have, ſaid they, as it is reported by their hiſtorian, an *herb* which we carry about us, by which we avoid the danger of uncleanneſs, and reſiſt all its attacks. Being preſſed by the monarch to name it, they anſwered, that it was the *Fear of GOD*; but I aſſure you, if they had it then, I am very certain they have loſt the maſter-piece [*D*]. It is he who publiſhed a book of Lucas Tudenſis (*c*), on the life to come, and againſt the Albigenſes. His treatiſe of the Alteration of Coin brought him into trouble at the court of Spain [*E*], and expoſed him to a puniſhment which is ill related

---

(7) Thus this author calls the Roman Catholics, as if they held the Holy Virgin for the head of their religion.

(8) Lyſer. Polygamia triumphat. *pag.* 314.

(9) Alegambe, *pag.* 369, *col.* 1.

(10) Virginitatem nulla unquam cogitatione aut indecoro motu oppugnatam ſe ſervaſſe faſſus eſt ipſe aliquando. *Idem, pag.* 118.

(11) Idem, *pag.* 379, *col.* 2.

(12) Idem, *pag.* 401, *col.* 1.

(13) Menage, Anti-Baillet, *cap. cxliv*, quoting Nicius Erythræus in the Elogy of Poſſevin. This Elogy is not in the three *Pinacothecæ* of Erythræus.

(14) Nicol. Abramus, Commen. in Orat. Ciceronis, *Tom. ii, pag.* 599, *col.* 1.

(15) Jarrige, Jeſuites ſur l'Echafaud, *cap. vi, pag. m.* 65.

' the ſeed of it now, and that it does not grow in ' their garden.'

This herb of Melchior Canus brings to my mind the Indian hermits, who practiſe a ſevere penance all their life-time, and renounce even the ſight of the other ſex. They hold in their hands a cane, by which they drive away all impure thoughts and temptations, as if they were chaſing away a dog. *I* Ruxis *ò Hiobioli abitano ne' deſerti paſcendoſi di foglie, e frutti ſalvatici, occupati quaſi ſempre nelle meditatione de' lor dii, profeſſano perpetua verginita, fuggendo la viſta delle donne, portano una canna in mano con la quale dicono tener lontano i diletti, tentationi, e travaglii* (16).

[*D*] *A hiſtory of Spain, which is looked on by many as a maſter-piece.*] It is divided into thirty books, after which follows an appendix. The firſt twenty were printed at Toledo, in folio, in 1592. He added to them the ten other books ſome time after (17). He tranſlated this hiſtory himſelf out of Latin into Spaniſh, and publiſhed this verſion at Toledo in 1601. It hath been often reprinted (18). He ſometimes departs from the original, as if he were writing, not a tranſlation, but a new book (19). The appendix contains only a little ſummary of ſome events from 1515, to the time it was written; for the author having finiſhed his great work at the death of Ferdinand of Arragon, in 1516, thought it would be more for his intereſt to publiſh a meer hiſtorical Index of matters ſince that time, than exact narratives of them, which he could not do without departing from that fidelity he had hitherto followed, or offending ſome perſons ſtill alive. Wherefore he took the ſureſt and honeſteſt way, and that which wiſe men have always moſt approved if (20). He would not write of what happened in his own time, or a little before. Let us ſee the encomiums which Father Rapin has beſtowed upon this hiſtory. ' None of the modern ' hiſtorians has written more judiciouſly than Mariana ' in his hiſtory of Spain. It is a maſter-piece of theſe ' laſt ages for this ſingle property. There ſhines in ' all the work a wiſdom which never ſuffers him to ' dwell too long on noble exploits, nor to neglect ' thoſe that are not ſo. This equality ſo judicious, ' which is always the ſame in the inequality of mat' ters which this author handles, is little known to ' the hiſtorians of theſe times (21).' To underſtand the full force of this encomium, we muſt add to it this deſcription. ' To write judiciouſly, *according* ' *to Father Rapin* (22), is to purſue our end on ' whatever ſubject we write, without wandring or ' amuſing our ſelves by the way: It is to expreſs ' things with a kind of wiſdom and reſervedneſs, ' without giving way either to the heat of our ima' gination, or the briſkneſs of our wit. It is to know ' how to ſuppreſs what is ſuperfluous in the expreſſion, ' as thoſe adverbs and epithets are which diminiſh ' things by heightning them; to leave nothing in it ' that is idle, languiſhing, and uſeleſs; to leave out ' generouſly what ought not to be uttered how fine ' ſoever it be; to take always leſs care of the * or' naments than of ſolid truth; not to ſhow heat or ' warmth where a man ought to be cool and ſerious; ' to examine one's thoughts, and meaſure one's words, ' with that juſtneſs of ſenſe, and accurate judgment, ' that nothing may paſs but what is exact and ju' dicious. It is to have the power of reſiſting the ' temptation we naturally have to diſcover our wit ' . . . It is to leave room for thoſe who read hiſtory, ' to imagine what ought not always to be ſaid. ' Laſtly, It is well to underſtand how to avoid con' tradictions, and to lay down probabilities in all ' that is ſaid. And this judicious ſpirit, this cha' racter of wiſdom which hiſtory requires, is a kind ' of watchfulneſs over one's ſelf; which allows of ' no exaggaration, and uſes continual precaution ' againſt thoſe bold imaginations to which a man is ' ſubject, when he has a wit too bright, or too luxu' riant; to the end that he may expreſs great mat' ters in a few words, as Salluſt does.' Father Rapin does not ſtop here, but he adds further, ' That Mariana ' is one of the moſt accompliſhed writers among the ' modern hiſtorians, becauſe he is one of the plain' eſt (23) *That nothing* gives the hiſtory of Mariana ſo ' much of that air of grandeur it hath, as the art of this ' author in bringing into it, by way of digreſſion, ' all the conſiderable things that have paſſed in the ' world, all that's admirable in the fabulous times; all ' that was remarkable in Greece, in Sicily, in the ' Roman empire; a particular account of the repub' lic of Carthage, which is no where better done ' than there; the ſieges of Saguntus and Numantia; ' the paſſage of Hannibal into Italy; the ſucceſſion ' of the emperors; the birth of Chriſtianity; the ' preaching of the goſpel; the conqueſt of the Ara' bians, and many other great tranſactions. He is a ' genius who treats of nothing but great matters, which ' always have ſome relation to the hiſtory of Spain. ' Upon which account never did any hiſtorian do ' ſo much honour to his country by any work; ' for he has attributed to his nation the greateſt ' actions that have ever been done in the world (24). ' Among the moderns, *continues Father Rapin* (25). ' I find Mariana, Davila, and Fra Paolo admirable ' for hiſtory. Mariana had the talent of thinking, ' and expreſſing nobly what he thought and ſaid, ' and of imprinting a character of greatneſs upon any ' thing he conſidered . . . . (26) None of the moderns ' exceeds Mariana, either for the greatneſs of his de' ſign, or the nobleneſs of his ſtile. He is more exact ' than others, and judges ſolidly of every thing.' Let us add to ſo many encomiums, not what is ſaid by another Jeſuit in favour of Mariana (27), but what a Proteſtant ſays of him. ' Inter Latinos omnibus ' palmam præripit Johannes Mariana Hiſpanus, re' rum Hiſpanicarum cognitione nemini ſecundus. Va' luit vero Mariana inſigni eloquentia, prudentia, & ' magna libertate dicendi: hinc & libertatis ſtudioſiſſi' mus in Reges ſuos ſæpe eſt mordax (28). - - - - - ' *Amongſt all the Latin writers of hiſtory Johannes Ma*' *riana may be reckoned the chief, being inferior to none* ' *in the knowledge of the Spaniſh affairs. Mariana* ' *was a perſon of mighty eloquence, prudence, and great* ' *liberty of ſpeech: Hence it was that he is often very* ' *ſevere upon his own kings.*'

How excellent ſoever this book of Mariana be, yet it has ſeveral faults which have been partly cenſured by a ſecretary of the Conſtable of Caſtile. This cenſurer calls himſelf Pedro Mantuano. He publiſhed his critical remarks at Milan in 4to, in 1611 (29), and intituled them *Advertencias à la Hiſtoria de Juan de Mariana*. He was then but twenty ſix years of age. Thomas Tamaius de Vargas, who anſwered in behalf of Mariana, relates a thing that is very wonderful; which is, that Mariana would never caſt his eyes upon the work of his cenſurer, nor on that of his apologiſt; tho' this latter offer'd him his MS. before he gave it to the Printer, and deſired him to correct it. *Noluiſſe Marianam legere, nec Mantuani cenſuram, nec Tamaji amiciſſimi capitis apologiam, etiam ante editionem ſibi ab authore ad pervidendum, & emendandum oblatam, quod credet vix poſteritas* (30). There was publiſhed in the *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned*, at p. 139, of the month of November 1693, the deſign of a French tranſlation of Mariana, with good notes. The public ought to wiſh they may quickly enjoy this work. There was printed in Holland, in 1694, a chronological abridgment of the Hiſtory of Spain, taken chiefly from Mariana, which is attributed to a gentlewoman of Rouen (31), now a Refugee in England for her religion.

[*E*] *His treatiſe of the alteration of coin* (32) *brought him into trouble at the court of Spain.*] Alegambe only tells us, that this work diſcovered the frauds of the times, and that at the requeſt of the ambaſſador of Spain, it was ſtopped by Paul V, but that the ſequel ſhewed, that Mariana being perſecuted for this book, was a lover of juſtice and truth. ' In tractatu ' de Monetæ mutatione cum acrius corruptelam ſui ' temporis perſtrinxiſſet, gravem in ſe concivit pro' cellam; & tractatus ipſe poſtulante Catholici Regis ' Oratore, à Summo Pontifice Paulo V tantiſper ſu' penſus fuit, donec invidia & cum ea tempeſtas con' quievit; docueruntque poſteriora tempora veri recti' que amantem fuiſſe Marianam (33). - - - - *He occa*-

I ' *ſioned*

(*c*) *Thus we muſt call him, and not* Tridentis *with Alegambe and Southwell.*

(16) Giornale de Letterati, *March* 31, 1673, *pag.* 35, *in the extract of the* Voyage to the Eaſt Indies, *by* F. Vincenzo Maria di S. Caterina da Siena.

(17) The thirty books with the Appendix are in the edition of Mentz, 1605, in 4to.

(18) At Madrid in 1616, and 1650, in folio, *& alibi Nicol. Anton. ubi infra.*

(19) *See* Nicolas Antonio, Bibl. Script. Hiſpan. *Tom. i, pag.* 560.

(20) See the remark [*D*] of the article BONFADIUS, and the remark [*E*] of the article HAILLAN.

(21) Rapin, Reflexions on Hiſtory, *num.* 3, *pag. m.* 232.

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 230.

* Delectus verborum habendus & pondera ſingulorum examinanda. *Fab. lib. x, cap. iii.*

(23) Rapin, ibid. *num.* 5, *pag.* 236.

(24) Ibid. *num.* 22, *pag.* 280.

(25) Ibid. *num.* 26, *pag.* 293.

(26) Ibid. ſub fin. *pag.* 305.

(27) Quid Mariani gravem & decoram conſtructionem, ſonantia verba, ſplendorem, narrandique ſublimitatem, copioſum ingenium in non impari materia, quæ ætas non reverebitur? *Clarus Bonarſcius, in Amphitheatro, honoris, lib. ii, cap. xiii, pag. m.* 192.

(28) Herm. Conringius de regno Hiſpan. apud Pope Blount, Cenſura Autorum, *pag.* 614.

(29) And ſince at the Royal Printing-houſe an edition more correct. *Nicol. Anton. ubi infra, Tom. ii, pag.* 170.

(30) Nicol. Anton. Bibliot. Scriptor. Hiſpan. *Tom. i, pag.* 561.

(31) *Called* Madam de la Roche.

(32) It was printed in folio, at Cologne in 1609, with ſix other treatiſes of Mariana.

(33) Alegambe, *pag.* 258, *col.* 2.

related by Mr Varillas [*F*]: but there had been more reaſon to moleſt him upon the account of another book, which Spain and Italy ſuffered to go abroad, and which was burnt at Paris by a decree of the parliament, becauſe of the pernicious doctrine it contained. There is nothing more ſeditious, nor more capable of expoſing kingdoms to frequent revolutions, and even the lives of princes to the knife of aſſaſſins, than this book of John Mariana [*G*]. It expoſed the Jeſuits, and chiefly in France, to a thouſand bloody

ſioned unto himſelf great troubles, by having ſeverely inveighed againſt the corruptions of his own time, in a treatiſe upon the alteration of the coin; and the treatiſe itſelf was kept from being publiſhed, at the deſire of the ambaſſador of the Catholic king, by Pope Paul V, till ſuch time as the malice of his enemies, and the conſequences of it were over; and the times following made it appear, that Mariana had been a lover of truth and juſtice.’ Nicolas Antonio in ſome reſpects ſpeaks more generally, tho’ he declares, that the chief miniſters of ſtate accuſed Mariana of having cenſured the government. ‘Nec tamen, *ſays he* (34), vir tot meritis ad famæ immortalitatem nitens effugere valuit lævæ famæ diſcrimina, interpretantibus quædam ejus ſcripta principibus in Curia viris tanquam iniqua exerteque injurioſa ſibi ipſis, ac publicæ adminiſtrationi. Cujus rei nomine ſolemniter accuſatus non niſi poſt agitatam diu cauſam ægreque ſtatui priſtino fuit reſtitutus. - - - - *Nor could he, tho’ a man that was ſtriving by his merits to attain an immortal fame, eſcape the danger of infamy, the prime nobility of the court blaming ſome of his writings as falſe and injurious to themſelves, and the adminiſtration of the government: upon which account he was accuſed in form, and was not, but, after a tedious defence of his cauſe, reſtored to his former eſtate.*’ But here is an author who ſpeaks out more clearly: he aſſures us, that Mariana diſcovered ſo plainly the waſting of the treaſury, by ſhowing the robberies that were committed in the coining of money, that the duke of Lerma, who found himſelf plainly pointed at, could not reſtrain his anger. It was not difficult for him to vex the author, becauſe king Philip III was clearly cenſured in this work, as a lazy prince, who left the great affairs of his kingdom to the diſcretion of his miniſters. Princes who are much governed by a Favourite, are eaſily provoked againſt thoſe, who expoſe them to public contempt by a juſt and free cenſure of this ſlavery. Mariana was caſt into priſon, and did not come out till a year was expired; but the event ſhowed that he was not miſtaken, in foretelling, that the abuſes which he reproved, would throw Spain into great confuſion. The writer who gives an account of this is called Bernardin Giraldus, whom I have cited once before. ‘Quarum (*Diſſertationum*) una fuit, (*ſays he* 35) de *Monetæ mutatione* in Hiſpania, quâ quidem fraudes, & impoſturæ Miniſtrorum Regiorum Monetas publicas adulterantium detegebantur, oſcitantia, & dormitatio Philippi III, Regis Catholici perſtringebatur, ingentia denique damna in univerſam Hiſpaniam ex improbiſſimo Regiorum peculatu certo exoritura prænuntiabantur: quem librum qui legat, & hodiernum Hiſpaniæ ſtatum non ignoret, abeſſe haudquaquam poſſit, quin Marianam divinum hominem fuiſſe agnoſcat (qui ea, quæ hodie Hiſpania experitur mala, tanto ante ut vates occinerit) vel certe prudentiam genus divinationis eſſe intelligat. Verum vehementer ea res Lermæum Ducem, Regiæ Hiſpanicæ Sejanum, pupugit: quippe qui fundi Hiſpanici calamitas eſſet, ſeque à Mariana deſignari ſatis intelligeret. Hominem ergo in vincula poſcit, in iiſque annum vertentem amplius continet. - - - *Of which* Diſſertations, *one was (ſays he) concerning the* alteration of the coin *in Spain, wherein the frauds and impoſtures of the miniſtry in adulterating the current money were expoſed, and the negligence and indolence of Philip III was cenſured, and, in fine, the great miſchiefs to the whole kingdom, from the moſt unjuſt robberies of the public by the courtiers were foretold: which book whoever reads, and is not unacquainted with the preſent ſtate of Spain, muſt needs acknowledge that Mariana (who could, ſo long before they happened, foretel the evils which Spain at this day labours under) was a true prophet, or at leaſt that prudence is a kind of prophetic ſpirit. This affair did vehemently exaſperate the duke of Lerma, the Sejanus of the Spaniſh court: he being the cauſe of the miſeries of that kingdom, and well knowing that he was the perſon intended by Mariana. Wherefore he prevailed to have him put in priſon, where he detained him more than a year.*’

[*F*] . . . . . *and expoſed him to a puniſhment which is ill related by Mr Varillas.*] This Hiſtorian pretends that Ribadeneira ‘durſt not write in Spain under the reign of Philip II, what Charles V had contributed to oblige the court of Rome to proceed to the laſt extremities againſt Henry VIII. One muſt have as little knowledge of the court of Spain as Dr Burnet has, *continues he*, who knows not that the ſame Philip II baniſhed Mariana into Sicily for fifteen years, upon a leſs important occaſion than that of writing againſt Charles V, ſince it was only for writing a treatiſe about money, which did not ſo directly concern the majeſty of the Catholic kings, as the conduct of Charles V, with reſpect to Henry VIII (36).’ There are three falſhoods in theſe words: I. Mariana was never baniſhed into Sicily; much leſs did this pretended baniſhment laſt fifteen years. II. Philip II was dead when this Jeſuit wrote about money. III. This treatiſe offended much more the king of Spain, who then reigned (37), than the book of Ribadeneira would have offended Philip II, if he had deſcribed in it the conduct of Charles V towards Henry VIII. I take no notice of the abſurdity that is in his remark upon Ribadeneira; this matter has been ſolidly refuted by the learned man who replied to him (38).

[*G*] *There is nothing more ſeditious . . . . than this book of Mariana.*] The title of it is, *de Rege & Regis Inſtitutione*, and it was printed at Toledo in the year 1598, with the king’s licence, and the uſual approbations. The author having propoſed, in the ſixth chapter of the firſt book, to conſider whether it be lawful to kill a tyrant, enters on this ſubject with a narrative of the tragical end of Henry III. He admires the courage of James Clement, and ſays, there were different opinions about the action of this young monk: ſome commended it, and thought it worthy of immortality; others blamed it, becauſe they were of opinion, that it is never lawful for a meer private man to kill a prince declared king by the nation, and anointed with the ſacred oil according to cuſtom, altho’ this prince becomes a wicked man, and a tyrant. *De facto monachi non una opinio fuit, multis laudantibus atque immortalitate dignum judicantibus: vituperant alii prudentiæ & eruditionis laude præſtantes, fas eſſe negantes cuiquam privata auctoritate Regem conſenſu populi renunciatum, ſacroque oleo de more delibutum ſanctumque adeo perimere, ſit ille quamvis perditis moribus, atque in tyrannidem degenerarit* (39). We may clearly perceive, that Mariana is one of thoſe who approved the action of James Clement; for he rejects the principle, upon which wiſe and learned men condemned it. Beſides, he affects to extol the courage and undaunted ſteddineſs of this aſſaſſin, without dropping one word that tends to render him odious to the reader. This obſervation does admirably diſcover the whole venom of the doctrine of this Jeſuit; for it is certain, that he only begins with the example of Henry III, that he might deſcend from the theſis to the hypotheſis, and to ſhow the people a notable caſe of tyranny, that ſo at all times, when they ſhould find themſelves in the like condition, they might think that their circumſtances did warrant them to make uſe of the knife againſt their monarchs. But if it be once lawful to do this, when people live under ſuch a prince as Henry III, I know not what monarchs ought not to fear that they ſhall be aſſaſſinated or dethroned: for oftentimes the good and evil of two conditions are counterbalanced when they are compared together. If the faults of government are not the ſame as they were under Henry III, yet it will be ſaid, that all things duly conſidered, they are equal, and from thence people will conclude, that they are in the ſame condition which the Jeſuit has deſcribed. However let us go on with the explication of his ſyſtem.

Mariana

---

(34) Nicol. Anton. Biblioth. Hiſpan. *Tom. i, pag.* 560.

(35) Bernardin. Giraldus Patavinus, pro Senatu Veneto apologia, ſive de juſtitia decreti, quo Senatus Venetus adoleſcentes ditioni ſuæ ſubditos ad Jeſuitarum ſcholas accedere interdixit: deque conditionibus quibus Jeſuitæ reditum ad Venetos videntur impetrare poſſe. *This piece is in a collection intituled,* Arcana Societatis Jeſu, *printed at Geneva in* 1635, *in* 8*vo*.

(36) Varillas’s Anſwer to the Criticiſms of Dr Burnet, *pag.* 84, Dutch Edit.

(37) See, in the preceding remark, the words of Bernard. Giraldus.

(38) *See the* Defence de la Critique de Mr Varillas, *pag.* 65.

(39) Mariana, de Rege & Regis Inſtitutione, *lib. i, cap. vi, pag. m.* 54.

bloody reproaches [*H*], and to very mortifying inſults, which are repeated every day, and

Mariana relates the reaſons of thoſe who blamed James Clement, that is to ſay, according to him, the reaſons of thoſe, who teach, that every one muſt patiently ſubmit to the tyrannical yoke of his lawful ſovereign; and before he anſwers them (40), he produces the arguments of the contrary party, built upon this fundamental principle, that the authority of the people is ſuperior to that of kings (41). This is his beloved poſition, for proof of which he ſpends two whole chapters (42). Having alledged the reaſons of each party, he declares, I, That according to the opinions of Divines and Philoſophers, a prince who, by main force, and without the general conſent of the people, is poſſeſſed of the ſovereign power, is one whom every private perſon has a right to kill: ‘Perimi à quocunque, vita & principatu ſpoliari poſſe (43)...... *May be killed by any one, and deprived of his life and crown.*’ II. That if a prince, who is lawfully created, or who is a lawful ſucceſſor to his anceſtors, overturns the religion, and public laws, without hearkening to the remonſtrances of the nation, he muſt be made away by the ſafeſt and ſureſt method. III. That the ſhorteſt and ſureſt way of doing it, is to aſſemble the States, and in this aſſembly to depoſe him, and there to order that an army be raiſed againſt him, if it be neceſſary for removing his tyranny. IV. That ſuch a prince may be lawfully put to death, and that each private perſon, who ſhall have the courage to attempt to kill him, has a right to do it (44). V. That if an aſſembly of the States cannot be held, and it appears nevertheleſs to be the will of the people that the tyrant ſhould be diſpatched, there is no private perſon but may lawfully kill this prince, to ſatisfy the deſire of the people; ‘Qui votis publicis favens eum perimere tentavit, haud quaquam inique eum feciſſe exiſtimabo (45). *He who to accompliſh what is wiſhed by the people, ſhall attempt to kill him, I ſhall not judge him to have acted at all unjuſtly.*’ VI. That the judgment of a private perſon, or of many, is not ſufficient; but one muſt be governed by the voice of the people, and alſo conſult grave and learned men (46). VII. That, indeed, it ſhows greater courage to riſe up openly againſt the tyrant; but there is no leſs prudence to attack him ſecretly, and deſtroy him in the ſnares that are laid for him. *Eſt quidem majoris virtutis & animi ſimultatem aperte exercere, palam in hoſtem reipublicæ irruere: ſed non minoris prudentiæ, fraudi & inſidiis locum captare, quod ſine motu contingat minori certe periculo publico atque privato* (47). He adviſes therefore, either that he ſhould be attacked in his own palace with open force, or that a conſpiracy ſhould be formed againſt him; he will have it that open war, crafty devices, frauds, and treacheries, are equally lawful: and if the conſpirators, adds he, are not killed in the attempt, they ought to be admired as heroes all their life-times: if they periſh in it, then they fall victims acceptable to God and men, and their efforts deſerve immortal praiſes. *Aut in apertam vim prorumpitur ſeditione facta armiſque publice ſumptis . . . aut majori cautione, fraude & ex inſidiis pereunt, uno aut paucis in ejus caput occulte conjuratis, ſuoque periculo reipublicæ incolumitatem redimere ſatagentibus. Quod ſi evaſerint, inſtar magnorum Heroum in omni vita ſuſpiciuntur: ſi ſecus accidat, grata ſuperis, grata hominibus hoſtia cadunt, nobili conatu ad omnem poſteritatis memoriam illuſtrati. Itaque aperta vi & armis poſſe occidi tyrannum, ſive impetu in regiam facto, ſive commiſſa pugna in confeſſo eſt. Sed & dolo atque inſidiis exceptum* (48). VIII. That altho' there ſeems to be no difference between an aſſaſſin who kills with the ſtab of a knife, and one who poiſons; yet becauſe Chriſtianity has abrogated the laws of the Athenians, which ordered criminals to drink a poiſoned cup; Mariana does not approve that a tyrant ſhould be killed by poiſon mixed with his meat; but if any would make uſe of poiſon, he would have it applied to his cloaths, or to his ſaddle. *Ergo me auctore neque noxium medicamentum hoſti detur, neque lethale venenum in cibo & potu temperetur in ejus perniciem. Hoc tamen temperamento uti, in hac quidem diſputatione licebit, ſi non ipſe qui perimitur venenum haurire cogitur, quo intimis medullis concepto pereat: ſed exterius ab alio adhibeatur nihil adjuvante eo qui perimendus eſt. Nimirum cum tanta vis eſt veneni, ut ſella eo aut veſte delibuta vim interficiendi habeat* (49).

Such is the ſyſtem of this Jeſuit. The laſt part of it is very abſurd; it is a ridiculous diſtinction: for he who drinks poiſon without knowing it, and believing it to be good food, does not any ways contract the guilt of thoſe who deſtroy themſelves; and yet to preſerve a tyrant from ſo great a crime, Mariana would not have him made to drink or eat poiſon (50). Moreover, if it were true, that in drinking off the poiſon, without knowing of it, he would be guilty of his own death; he would be no leſs guilty in putting on a poiſoned ſhirt: and yet Mariana makes no ſcruple to conſent, that his cloaths ſhould be poiſoned, his ſaddles, or any other things which act from without upon the inward parts. I ſay therefore, that the eighth article of this Jeſuit is unworthy of a man who underſtands reaſoning; and I am ſurprized, that a man who had ſo much good ſenſe, and ſo much Logic, ſhould trifle ſo childiſhly. Abating this, many people are perſuaded, that his ſyſtem is finely contrived, that the parts of it are well connected together, and that he proceeds naturally from one conſequence to another. Suppoſe once ſay they, that a king holds of the people, as being his ſupreme judge, and that he is accountable to them, all the reſt will follow of courſe. And therefore the author who refuted Mariana, laid down a principle quite oppoſite to this, *viz. That Sovereign princes depend only upon GOD, to whom alone it belongs to call them to an account* (51): I ſhall not enter upon the diſcuſſion of this queſtion; but ſhall only obſerve, that as the doctrines of Mariana are very deſtructive of the public good: it had been better that he had argued inconſequently, than to follow, like a good Logician, the conſequences of his principle. See above remark [*S*] of the article LOYOLA.

[*H*] *It expoſed the Jeſuits ...... to a thouſand bloody reproaches.*] The Catholics and Proteſtants thundred upon them, out-vying one another, upon occaſion of theſe doctrines of Mariana, and chiefly after the execrable attempt of Ravaillac: for it was ſaid, that the reading of Mariana had inſpired this cruel aſſaſſin with the infamous deſign of ſtabbing Henry IV. Wherefore Father Coton publiſhed a letter which he wrote to Mary de Medicis, the widow of that prince, wherein he quotes ſome famous Jeſuits who taught the contrary to what Mariana had maintained: he did more, for he aſſerted, that the book of this Spaniſh Jeſuit was condemned in 1606, in one of their congregations. I ſhall ſet down his own words (52). ‘Such therefore being the judgment, and ſuch the decrees of theſe grave and eminent doctors of our ſociety; how can the private opinion of Mariana prejudice the reputation of the whole order, which, according to it's inſtitution, being extreamly careful of holding faſt the holy ordinances of the church, and reſpectful to the power and authority of kings, who as to temporals depend upon God only, has of a long time diſowned the raſhneſs of a bold pen, and particularly in the provincial congregation of France, held in this city of Paris, in 1606, wherein, moreover, the reverend Father Claudius Aquaviva, general of our ſociety, was requeſted, that thoſe who had written to the prejudice of the crown of France, ſhould be reſtrained, and their books ſuppreſſed: which the ſaid reverend Father did afterwards very carefully and exactly, being very ſorry, that, thro' inadvertency, in his abſence, and without his having ſeen the work, they had made uſe of his approbation. The words which he uſed in his anſwer are theſe (53): we have approved the judgment and the care of your congregation, and are very much troubled, that this was not perceived before the printing of ſuch books; which however we have commanded forthwith to be corrected, and we will take moſt diligent care for the future, that ſuch things ſhall not happen. One copy of Mariana would ſcarce be found now, were it not for the pernicious liberality of the heirs of Wechelius, who are known to be of the pretended reformed religion, and who printed it at their own charges, not out of any deſire to ſerve the public, as may be eaſily preſumed, but from a particular deſign to and will never be ended; which hiſtorians will in paſſion tranſcribe one from another; and

---

(40) He refutes them at the end of this ſixth chapter.

(41) A republica, unde ortum habet regia poteſtas, rebus exigentibus Regem in jus vocari poſſe, & ſi ſanitatem reſpuat principatu ſpoliari, neque ita in Principem jura poteſtatis tranſtulit, ut non ſibi majorem reſervarit poteſtatem. *Mariana, ubi ſupra, pag.* 57.

(42) The eighth and ninth of the firſt book.

(43) Ibid. *pag.* 58.

(44) Principem publicum hoſtem declaratum ferro perimere, eademque facultas eſto cuicunque privato, qui ſpe impunitatis abjecta, neglecta ſalute in conatum juvandi rempublicam ingredi voluerit. *Ibid. pag.* 60.

(45) Id. ib.

(46) Neque enim id in cujuſquam privati arbitrio ponimus, non in multorum, niſi publica vox populi adſit, viri eruditi & graves in conſilium adhibentur. *Id. ib.*

(47) Ibid. *cap. vii, pag.* 65.

(48) Ib. *pag.* 64.

(49) Ibid. *pag.* 67.

(50) Crudele exiſtimarunt, atque à Chriſtianis moribus alienum, quantumvis flagitiis coopertum eo adigere hominem, ut ſibi ipſi manus afferat pugione in viſcera adacto, aut lethali veneno in cibo aut potu temperato. Perinde enim eſt, neque minus humanitatis legibus, jurique naturæ contrarium: quo in vitam ſuam ſævire vetatur omnibus. Negamus ergo hoſtem, quem fraude dedimus perimi poſſe, veneno interfici jure. *Mariana, ibid. pag.* 66.

(51) Rouſſel, in chap. xvii of his *Anti-Mariana.*

(52) Coton, Letter declaratory of the Doctrine of the Jeſuits, *pag.* 8, 9.

(53) See the following remark.

‘ prejudice our ſociety.’ As to what concerns Ravaillac's reading of Mariana, it is aſſerted in the ſame letter, that the parliament knew ‘ by the repeated depoſition of this wretch, that Mariana contributed nothing to the execrable parricide, and could not influence him, ſince the wretch had not ſufficient knowledge of the language wherein his book was written. Which diſcovers, *adds Father Coton*, the uncharitable intention of thoſe who go on ſtill to ſay, that he had it all by heart (54).’ In another book Father Coton repeats and inforces this. ‘ The Heretics of France, *ſays he* (55), will have Mariana to have induced Ravaillac to give that unhappy and execrable blow, as having learned his book by heart. To which it will be replied a hundred times, on peril of honour and life, that Ravaillac did never ſee nor read it, and did never ſo much as hear the name of Mariana, except when he was aſked whether he had read his book; and he anſwered no, and that he did not know what it was; witneſs the reverend Father Coëffeteau, witneſs alſo the verbal proceſs which was made of the matter: from whence we may infer what ſhameleſs calumny will do; for there being nothing more falſe than to ſay, that this wretch ſaw even the cover of Mariana's book frequently, yet ſome of the common people will believe, by hearing it reported, that he knew it by heart, from one end to the other, as has been ſaid. I will add, that tho' Ravaillac had read it, yet it is moſt falſe that Mariana taught the murder and parricide this wretch committed; which yet in this place and through his whole book the calumniator endeavours to perſuade. Nay, in ſome reſpect, it were to be wiſhed, that Ravaillac, had read Mariana in caſe he could have underſtood him; for Mariana teaches expreſly, as Gretſerus ſhows, that a lawful prince ought not to be killed by a private perſon upon his own private authority.’ Father Coton is miſtaken, the book of Mariana was very fit to inſpire one with the attempt of aſſaſſinating Henry IV, for that Jeſuit ſays, that the action of James Clement was good, and that if the voice of the people, and the counſel of ſome learned men concur to declare that the prince oppreſſes religion, a private perſon may kill him. By joining theſe two things together, we may conclude the juſtice of aſſaſſinating Henry IV. For if Henry III, a Catholic to the higheſt degree, was an oppreſſor of catholiciſm, becauſe he laboured for the rights of an heretical prince who was to be his ſucceſſor, one may believe in general, that every prince who is favourable to Heretics deſigns to oppreſs religion. Now if it be lawful to kill an oppreſſor of religion, it is lawful doubtleſs to kill him who has a mind to oppreſs it as ſoon as he can: for prudence will not permit that we ſhould ſuffer evil to encreaſe till it be come to ſuch a height that it is difficult to put a ſtop to it; but we ought to prevent it and attack it whilſt it is weak. Beſides, by the voice of the people we muſt not underſtand the judgment of all private perſons; it is ſufficient that in every city there are ſeveral perſons who join their voices for certain things. Now it is paſt all doubt, that the kingdom was full of people who ſuſpected that Henry IV had a mind to make the Reformed religion triumphant as ſoon as he could, and that he undertook a war againſt the houſe of Auſtria only upon this proſpect. Thus Ravaillac reaſoning upon the principles of Mariana, and joining to them, according to cuſtom, a ſenſe of *accommodation*, might very well believe, that he had no leſs a right than James Clement. There were but too many learned men, and in his judgment very prudent, who confirmed him in his pernicious deſign, and that for the good of religion. See in the remark [*K*] his anſwer to them who aſked him why he had committed this aſſaſſination, and remember that he declared before the judges, that his ‘ reſolution to kill the king was becauſe that prince had not endeavoured (as he had power) to reduce thoſe of the pretended Reformed religion, to the Catholic, Apoſtolic, and Roman church (56), and becauſe he had heard that the king intended to make war againſt the Pope, and tranſlate the holy ſee to Paris (57); for making war againſt the Pope, ſaid he (58), was to make war againſt God, and God was the Pope.’

A Catholic writer, who refuted the declaratory letter written by Father Coton, in a book intituled Anti-Coton (59), informs me of ſome things which deſerve a place here. ‘ This book of Mariana, *ſays he* (60), having been firſt printed at Toledo, was brought into France about eight years ago, and preſented to the king; and the ſeditious clauſes of this book being repreſented to his majeſty, he called for Father Coton and aſked him, whether he approved of this doctrine. But the ſaid Jeſuit, who complies with occaſions, and ſuits himſelf to the times, ſaid, that he did not at all approve it. According to which anſwer, his majeſty, by the advice of Monſieur Servin his advocate general, commanded Coton to write againſt it; but he excuſed himſelf, knowing very well, that he could not write againſt it without contradicting the general of the order, and the provincial of Toledo, and a great body of Jeſuits who had approved this book. And now he ſees that by the death of this king, the Jeſuits are loaded with an univerſal hatred, and that he is urged by the court of parliament, and by the Sorbonne, he has written an epiſtle declaratory, wherein he condemns Mariana, but in terms ſo ſoft and doubtful, that it plainly appears he is afraid of offending him, ſaying only, that it is the *raſhneſs of a bold pen*, whereas he ought to have accuſed the perſon of Hereſy, and perfidious and barbarous treaſon, and the doctrine of impiety and enmity to God and men. And if he had reproved Mariana, as he deſerves, it had been too late; but he ſhould have written when the king commanded him, and not have ſuffered this opinion to take root in the minds of the people, which coſt the king his life a few years after.’ Father Coton found eight lyes in this narrative. See his apologetical anſwer to the Anti-Coton (61). For the reſt, if the Jeſuits of France were troubled upon the account of their brother Mariana, thoſe of Germany had likewiſe a ſhare in this ſtorm, as appears by the apology which James Gretſerus was obliged to publiſh (62). Let us add this paſſage of Conringius. ‘ Prodiit & alius ejus (*Marianæ*) libellus *de Inſtitutione Regis*, multa præclara continens, in quo liberrime judicat quo modo Reges inſtituendi ſunt: Non dubitavit autem & aperte quoque docere, ſi Rex vel anathemate tactus, vel excommunicatus, ac nonnihil receſſit à *Romana Eccleſia*, licere in illum gladio, igne ſcilicet animadvertere. Ea tamen pietate videri voluit, ut dixerit Regem veneno tolli non licere, quaſi vero. Combuſtus vero hic eſt liber ob talem horrendam doctrinam *Pariſiis*, & coacti fuere Jeſuitæ diſſenſum profiteri. Non dubitavit & *Mariana* Sicarium *Henrici quarti* Regis *Galliæ* inter Sanctos memorare (63). *Another little treatiſe of* (Mariana) *was publiſhed, intituled* de Inſtitutione Regis, *containing many remarkable things, wherein he very freely gives his judgment how kings are to be inſtructed: and makes no ſcruple, to affirm, that, if a king is either excommunicated, or hath at all differed from the* church of Rome, *it is lawful to deſtroy him, yet he would appear ſo pious forſooth, as to ſay, that it is unlawful to poiſon him. This book, for ſuch execrable doctrine, was burnt at Paris, and the Jeſuits were obliged to diſown it. Mariana did not heſitate to reckon amongſt the ſaints, the aſſaſſin of Henry IV king of France.*’ I think that Conringius commits two miſtakes: Mariana did not affirm that it is is lawful to kill a prince who departs never ſo little from the Romiſh communion, or who is meerly excommunicated: and ſince his book was printed above ten years before the death of Henry IV, he could not mention Ravaillac in it. If he had ſpoken of this monſter in other books, as of a ſaint, doubtleſs this had been objected to the Jeſuits, every time that the ſeditious maxims of Mariana were repreſented to them, ſince the impreſſion of thoſe other books; but I do not think that it was ever done. There has always been a great difference put between Ravaillac and James Clement. The latter had ſome perſons that publickly approved him, nay, ſome that commended him highly; but the other never had any ſuch that I know of. The reaſon of this is plain, Henry III was excommunicated when he was killed; but Henry IV had been for a long and which appear the more plauſible, becauſe the book was printed with good approbations [*I*]. It was affirmed that Ravaillac took from it the abominable deſign he executed againſt the life of Henry IV, and that he confeſſed it in his anſwer to his interrogatories.

---

(54) Coton, Letter declaratory, *pag.* 13.

(55) Apologetical Anſwer to the *Anti-Coton*, *pag.* 34.

(56) The French Mercury, *Tom. i, fol.* 440. See alſo *fol.* 442, *verſo*.

(57) Ibid. *fol.* 442, *verſo*.

(58) Ibid. *fol.* 443.

(59) This work was falſly aſcribed to the miniſter Peter du Moulin.

(60) *Anti-Coton*, printed in 1610, *pag.* 12, 13.

(61) *Pag. m.* 37. *See alſo the anſwer of* Eudæmon Johannes, *to the* Anti-Coton, *pag.* 54.

(62) See his *Veſpertilio Hæretico Politicus*. Father Coton ſpeaks of it in his Letter Declaratory, *pag.* 7, and in his Apologetical Anſwer, *pag.* 33.

(63) Herman. Conring. de regno Hiſpan. apud Pope Blount, Cenſura Autorum, *pag.* 614.

a long time reconciled to the Pope when he was killed.

Let us upon this occaſion make a critical remark upon Mr Seckendorf. He pretends that the doctrine of Mariana conſiſts in this, that a meer private perſon, being excited either by his own zeal or the Pope's orders, may attempt the Life of an heretical king. *Dudum quoque, male audiit*, ſays he (64), *Jeſuitarum Societas propter doctrinam* Joh. Marianæ, *itidem Jeſuitæ Hiſpani, aliorumque, qui ſtatuerunt, licitum, immo laudabile eſſe, ſi quis, privatus licet aut ſubditus, Regem aut Principem hæreticum, mandato Pontificis, vel etiam ex zelo religionis quovis modo è medio tollat.* But it is certain that Mariana laid down his poſition in general terms, and ſaid nothing in particular, either of heretical princes, or the permiſſions and diſpenſations of the court of Rome; his maxims reſpect all nations and all tyrants: he excludes not from his rules the Proteſtants, who ſhould live under a tyrannical government; he excludes not from them the Mahometans nor the Pagans: he treats this queſtion altogether as Ariſtotle would have done; neither do I ſee in what Milton, and ſuch like writers, who are ſo numerous, can blame the hypotheſis of this Spaniard, unleſs they ſhould condemn the preamble which he made uſe of in favour of James Clement: but this preamble is not exactly his doctrine; it denotes only by way of conſequences, the application the author would make of his maxims (65).

[*I*] . . . . . *It was printed with good approbations.*] Peter de Onna, provincial of the regulars for the redemption of captives, having read and examined it by order of the king of Spain, praiſed it and judged it worthy to be printed. The author obtained a licence of his Catholic majeſty for ten years. Stephen Hojeda, a Jeſuit, viſitor of the province of Toledo, and authorized by the general of the ſociety, permitted the impreſſion of the work, after he knew the good teſtimony which ſome learned and grave Jeſuits gave of it. The author of the Anti-Coton took advantage of this to aſcribe the doctrine of this author to the whole ſociety. *And that you may know*, ſays he (66), *that this is not the opinion only of a few Jeſuits, in the frontiſpiece of Mariana's book, there is an approbation and permiſſion to print it, from the general of the order Aquaviva, and from Stephen Hoyeda, viſitor of the ſociety of JESUS, in the province of Toledo.* Moreover, in the ſame permiſſion to print it, it is ſaid †, *that before the permiſſion was granted, theſe books of Mariana were approved by learned and grave men of the order of the Jeſuits. From whence it follows, that though the general Aquaviva had been impoſed upon, (as Father Coton would make us believe, by forging letters at his pleaſure from this Aquaviva) yet the viſitor and Jeſuitical doctors, who examined the book before it was printed, could not be impoſed upon.* I ſhall here add the anſwer of Father Coton, which contains ſomething very ſurprizing. *The calumniator calls in queſtion the anſwer of the R. Father general Claudius Aquaviva; but the tenor of it, here inſerted in the margin* ‡, *will ſhow that I do not impoſe upon the reader as he does. And as to the doctors, of whom he makes ſo great a noiſe, who approved Mariana, they are no more than three; which is a much ſmaller number than that of thirty or forty, who have approved the thirteen or fourteen books of thoſe of our ſociety, who have taught and maintained the contrary to Mariana, agreeably to the council of Conſtance. And if the authority of the reverend Father General is to be alledged to this purpoſe, is it not more conſiderable in the permiſſion he gave to a great number of authors, to print the aforeſaid books, than in that ſingle permiſſion he gave to Mariana, which is now objected* (67)?

That which is ſurprizing in theſe words is, that Father Coton confeſſes, that the general Aquaviva approved the book of Mariana, and licenſed the impreſſion of it. But this does not appear at the beginning of this book, where we find only that the Father Viſitor, having a ſpecial commiſſion from the general, permits the book of Mariana to be printed. This proves only that the general Aquaviva had entruſted this viſitor with the office of permitting or forbidding the impreſſion of ſuch books as were written by the Jeſuits; in conſequence whereof this viſitor allowed that Mariana ſhould publiſh this book. But this does not prove, that the general knew either that Mariana had written *de inſtitutione principis*, or that this book contained a pernicious doctrine. There are cenſors of books in all countries, who exerciſe this office by authority from the prince, or from the biſhops, *&c.* If they approve a Hereſy, does it follow that the prince, or the biſhop, from whom they received their commiſſion, does alſo approve that Hereſy? By no means, unleſs it be known, either that they communicated the MS to their maſter, before it was approved, or that their approbation was ratified by him. It is very ſtrange, that neither Father Coton, nor Father Richeome (68) did ever uſe this reaſon. Their brother Eudæmon Johannes had not ſuch a miſt before his eyes in this reſpect. See what he anſwers to the author of the Anti-Coton: ‘ *p.* 15. Affirmas Marianæ librum à Generali Societatis atque à Provinciali Toletano approbatum fuiſſe: pag. 23. Apologiam meam pro Henrico Garneto editam eſſe cum approbatione Præpoſiti Generalis. Utrumque mendacium eſt. Nam moderatores noſtri libros non recognoſcunt ipſi, ſed aliis tradunt recognoſcendos; qui ſi eos probaverint, tum demum poteſtatem edendi faciunt. . . . . . Neque difficilis eſt forma diplomatis, quod legitur in libro Marianæ, cujus edendi poteſtatem Generalis non fecit, ſed Viſitator, non, ut tu ſcribis Provincialis, cui partes in ea re ſuas Generalis delegarat, ut ſi liber is deſignatis eam ad rem Theologis probaretur, imprimendi ejus facultatem dare poſſet (69). - - - *You affirm that the book of Mariana hath been approved by the general of the ſociety, and by the provincial at Toledo: pag.* 23. *that my defence of Henry Garnet was publiſhed with the approbation of the general. Both are falſe, for our governors do not themſelves reviſe books, but deliver them to others to be examined; by whom, if approved, they are allowed to be publiſhed. . . . . . Nor was it difficult to obtain the licence, which is prefixed to Mariana's book which was not given by the general, but the viſitor (not the provincial, as you ſay) whom the general had deputed, that, if the book had been approved by the examiners, he might give leave for it's publication.*’ The true way of rendring Aquaviva an accomplice to the abominable doctrine of Mariana, would be to prove that after he knew what his ſubdelegate or commiſſary had licenſed, he was content with it, and he conſented that Mariana ſhould leave in his book all that was in it. But the Jeſuits took care not to be catched this way: they acquainted the public (70), that their father-general, being advertiſed by Richeome in 1599, and by their *Fathers in France, ordered that the book of Mariana ſhould be corrected, and the public never had ſeen*, ſay they (71), *any copy without correction, had not the Heretics, who thought it would be for their advantage, preſently re-printed it.* They publiſhed a fragment of Aquaviva's letter upon this occaſion (72), and alſo the general order he ſent to all the colleges of the Jeſuits, wherein he forbids them to publiſh and teach any doctrine, which tends any wiſe to the ruin of ſovereigns (73). ‘ Præpoſitus Generalis cum de Marianæ libro à Patribus Provinciæ Franciæ accepiſſet, reſpondit; *Primum collaudare ſe ſtudium, judiciumque, Provinciæ; deinde ægerrime tuliſſe, quod libri ii ante emiſſi eſſent, quam ejus rei quicquam ad ſe deferretur. Cæterum, & ubi primum rem accepiſſet, mandaſſe uti corrigeretur, & ſedulo daturum operam, ne quid ejuſmodi in poſterum accideret.* Neque eo contentus (cogit enim me importunitas tua efferre in vulgus ea, quæ Societatis legibus vulgari non oporteret) decretum etiam addidit vehemens & grave; ne quis è noſtris hominibus aut publice quicquam ſcriberet, doceretve; aut privatim conſilii cuiquam daret, quod in principum perniciem ulla ratione vergeret. Quod, quia vulgandi ejus Præpoſitus Generalis mihi poteſtatem fecit, ipſis ejus verbis adſcribam (74). - - - - *The general, when he heard of Mariana's book, from the Fathers of the province of France, anſwered*; that in the firſt place he commended

(64) Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. iii, pag.* 332. *num.* 68.

(65) See what has been ſaid above, in the remark [*G*]; and note, that James Gretſer has ſhown, that there are books more pernicious than that of Mariana. See alſo the book intituled, *A Collection of Pieces concerning the Romiſh Doctrine and Practices of depoſing kings, and the Deſtruction of their Life and State which enſues.* Printed at Geneva, 1627, *pag.* 251, & *ſeq.*

(66) Anti-Coton, *pag. m.* 11, 12.

† Quippe approbatos prius à viris doctis & gravibus ex eodem noſtro ordine.

‡ Ad ea quæ Congregatio Provinciæ Franciæ proponenda cenſuit: reſpondeo, Probamus judicium ac ſtudium Congregationis: & ſane doluimus vehementer, ubi aliqua hujuſmodi poſt librorum tantum editionem obſervari cognovimus, & ſtatim emendari juſſimus, & in poſterum ut caveantur ſerio monuimus, acērnituri porro ſumus.

(67) Coton's Apologetical Anſwer, *pag.* 35, 36.

(68) Richeome, a categorical examination of the libel Anti-Coton, *chap. xix, pag.* 168, 169.

(69) Eudæmon Joannes, in Confutatione Anti-Cotoni, *pag.* 5

(70) Richeome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 163.

(71) Id. ib.

(72) See, above, citations (53), and ‡.

(73) Eudæmon Joannes, in the confutation of Anti-Coton, *cap. i, pag.* 39.

(74) After this we ſee in the book of *Eudæmon Joannes*, the decree of the general of the Jeſuits.

gatories. This was publickly contradicted [*K*]. Another treatiſe of the ſame Jeſuit has made a great noiſe. It is that wherein he diſcovers the faults in the government of his ſociety [*L*]; but his brethren do not acknowledge that he is the author of ſuch a book [*M*]. His ſcholia upon the Scripture have deſerved the approbation of Father

‘ mended their care, and judgment, but was exceedingly diſpleaſed that this book had been publiſhed before he was acquainted with that affair. *But*, that ſo ſoon as he had been informed of it, he gave orders that it ſhould be corrected; and that he would take care that no ſuch thing ſhould happen for the future. *Nor with this was he ſatisfyed, (for your importunity forces me to utter thoſe things, which, by the rules of the ſociety, ought to be kept from the knowledge of of the vulgar) but made a ſtrict and ſevere decree; that none of our fraternity, ſhould either publickly write or teach, or privately adviſe, what might in any manner tend to the deſtruction of princes. Which, becauſe the general hath given me leave, I will ſubjoin in his own words.*’ See the reflexions which are made upon all this by George Hornius, profeſſor at Leyden (75).

[*K*] *It was affirmed that Ravaillac took from it . . . and that he confeſſed it in his anſwer to his interrogatories. This was publickly contradicted.*] The paſſages of Father Coton related in the remark [*H*] are a ſufficient proof of this text; nevertheleſs I will add ſomething to them. The interrogatories of Ravaillac are in the Mercure François (76) but not a word of Mariana. We find that the two days he was kept at the Hotel de Raiz, he anſwered to thoſe who aſked what moved him to this attempt? ‘ The ſermons which I have heard, by which I learned the cauſes for which it was neceſſary to kill the king. *Likewiſe, as to the queſtion, whether it was lawful to kill a tyrant; he knew all the evaſions and diſtinctions about it, and it was eaſy to perceive, that he had been carefully inſtructed in this matter; for in all other points of Theology he was ignorant and wicked, ſometimes ſaying a thing, and ſometimes denying it?*’ This is no proof that he had read Mariana's book; for he might have learned either by word of mouth, or by reading ſeveral other books, whether printed, or in MS, all the principles of this Spaniſh Jeſuit. It is very poſſible that this propoſition may be true, *Such an one knows perfectly the maxims of Mariana, and yet he knows not that there was ſuch an author as Mariana.* To prove therefore that Ravaillac had read this Jeſuit's book, there muſt be ſtronger reaſons than this, *he knew the doctrine of this writer*; there muſt be other arguments than this paſſage of the Mercure François (77). ‘ The day of this execution (78), becauſe Ravaillac in all his anſwers to the queſtions which the archbiſhop of Aix, the preacher Coëffeteau, and ſeveral others put to him during his impriſonment, about the parricide he had committed, helped himſelf out very ſubtly, by the maxims of Mariana, and others, who have written, That it is lawful to kill tyrants: Before they proceeded to a new prohibition of ſuch books, the court deſired the conſultation of the faculty of Theology, and enjoyned the dean and ſyndic, *&c.*” Note, That altho' they had been moſt certain, that the aſſaſſin had never read Mariana; yet the remonſtrance might very reaſonably be made to the Jeſuits, which the abbot du Bois made to them from the pulpit. They complained of it to the queen, and accuſed this abbot: ‘ That during the octaves of the Holy Sacrament, when he preached at St Euſtachius's church, in handling the queſtion, *whether it is lawful to kill tyrants*, and refuting the book of Mariana and others, he had made an exhortation to the Fathers Jeſuits, *That they ſhould for the future take great care, that the author who might give offence to France, ſhould come forth with the name of their ſociety, and the approbation of their ſuperiors, unleſs they had a mind deſignedly to expoſe themſelves to dangers, which all their prudence, ſupported by the authority of their friends, could not avoid.* Theſe are the principal points of accuſation, upon which they told the queen, that theſe words had almoſt excited an inſurrection againſt the Jeſuits. The biſhop of Paris was ordered to examine the ſame abbot, who told him in his vindication, that it was neither enmity nor malice againſt the Jeſuits, or others, that moved him to preach as he had done, but the dreadful horror and unſpeakable grief he had for the ſurpriſing death of his very good maſter, and the probability of danger to which the king and queen were expoſed, as long as the curſed books of Mariana, and others, were ſpread among the people: which being underſtood by the biſhop, he diſmiſſed him, after he had given him a gentle admonition to live in amity with all the other ſervants of God, and chiefly with the Jeſuits; and to continue to preach the obedience due to the king and queen, and to praiſe the high merits of the deceaſed king, without offending any body (79).’

[*L*] The book *wherein he diſcovers the faults in the government of his ſociety.*] While the duke of Lerma detained him priſoner for the cauſes above mentioned (80), all his papers were rigidly examined by Francis Soſa, biſhop of Oſma, and counſellor of ſtate, who had orders to deſtroy all the MSS he ſhould find there, wherein the negligence of the king, and the tricks of the duke of Lerma were cenſured. This biſhop found a book written with Mariana's own hand *del Govierno de la Compania de Jeſus*, (of the government of the ſociety of Jeſus) wherein the author repreſented the deadly miſchiefs wherewith the ſociety was threatned, unleſs they corrected the faults in their government; concerning which he offered very good advices. The biſhop of Oſma made no ſcruple to give this MSS to his friends to read, and to permit them to take copies of it. Hence it came to paſs, that this book fell into the hands of ſome perſon (81) who ſent it into France, Germany, and Italy. A French Bookſeller printed it not only in Spaniſh, which was the language of the original, but alſo in Latin, French, and Italian. As ſoon as it was carried to Rome, the Jeſuit Floravanti, confeſſor to Urban VIII, read it and cryed out, Heu! heu! actum eſt de nobis Jeſuitis, quando nimis vera ſunt quæ liber hic cantat. *Alas! alas! we Jeſuits are undone, ſince it is too true what is ſaid in this book.* The general of the Jeſuits ſpared no pains to obtain the condemnation of this book, which at laſt was granted in 1631 (82). The author I cite alledges ſome paſſages of this book of Mariana. You may find it intire in Spaniſh and French in the ſecond tome of the Mercure Jeſuite, printed at Geneva in 1630, and you may ſee the whole ſixth chapter of it in the *Arcana Societatis Jeſu*, printed at the ſame place in 1635. Father Alegambe could not paſs over in ſilence this book of Mariana; which he mentions after this manner. ‘ Circumfertur præterea Hiſpanicè, Gallicè, Italicè, Latinè, excuſus, *Diſcurſus de erroribus, qui in forma gubernationis Societatis Jeſu occurrunt, conſtans* 20 captibus. Burdigalæ per Joannem de Bordeos 1625, in 8vo, & alibi. Sed is clam illi ſubductus à malevolo quopiam ad conciliandam ſocietati invidiam, extruſus in lucem eſt; adjectis etiam fortaſſe non paucis, ut pronum eſt exiſtimare, ab ipſius obſervationibus atque animo alienis (83). *Moreover there is handed about, a* diſcourſe of the errors in the manner of the government of the ſociety of Jeſus, *in Spaniſh, French, Italian, Latin, conſiſting of twenty chapters, printed at Bourdeaux by Johan. de Bordeos, in 8vo.* 1625, *and elſewhere. But being taken from him by ſtealth, by ſome malicious perſon, it was publiſhed to procure hatred to the ſociety, with not a few additions, perhaps, as may readily be judged foreign to his obſervations and opinion.*’ ‘ Conringius is greatly miſtaken, when he ſays that Mariana himſelf publiſhed the book. Tantam libertatem ſibi aſſumpſit ut & libellum ediderit de membris (84) ſocietatis, quem licet ſupprimerent Jeſuitæ, tamen in media Roma editum eſſe conſtat: rariſſimus hodie eſt inventu (85). - - - *He aſſumed ſuch liberty to himſelf, as to publiſh a ſmall piece concerning errors of the ſociety, which though ſuppreſſed by the Jeſuits, yet it is known to have been publiſhed in Rome: it is rarely now to be found.*’ I can hardly believe that it was printed at Rome, though Conringius affirms it.

[*M*] The Jeſuits *do not acknowledge that Mariana is the author of ſuch a book.*] This appears from the affair wherein they were concerned in 1697, which made a great noiſe. The archbiſhop of Reims publiſhed

---

(75) In Diſſertation. Hiſtor. & Politic. *pag.* 116, *& ſeq.*

(76) Tom. i, fol. 440, & ſeq.

(77) Mercure François, *Tom.* i, *fol.* 457.

(78) That is, of Ravaillac.

(79) Ibid. *fol.* 493.

(80) In the remark [*E*].

(81) And particularly into the hands of Nicolas Ricardius, a Dominican, ſirnamed *the Monſter*, upon the account of his great wit and learning. *Bernardin Giraldus, ubi infra.*

(82) *Taken from* Bernardin Giraldus, Apologia pro Senatu Veneto, *pag. m.* 104, *& ſeq.*

(83) Alegambe, *pag.* 258, *col.* 2.

(84) Perhaps it ſhould be *Moribus*, or *Morbis*.

(85) Conringius, de Regno Hiſp. apud Pope Blount, Cenſ. Autor. *pag.* 614.

Father Simon [*N*]. I had forgot to obſerve, that his ſpeaking ill of Henry III, was partly the cauſe that his book of the Inſtitution of a Prince was condemned at Paris [*O*].

I queſtion

liſhed a very learned decree the 15th of July in that year, againſt two Theſes which had been maintained by the Jeſuits of Reims, and made uſe of the treatiſe of *John Mariana, of ſuch things which require amendment (§ α) in the ſociety of the Jeſuits* (86). He ſays (87), that the Spaniſh author, who lived in the time of the congregations *de auxiliis*, informs us of the ſad conſequences that followed, from the liberty which Molina, and ſo many others, took to publiſh their viſions . . . . . Marina ſays therefore in chap. 4. ‘*That from the liberty every one took in teaching his own opinions, there followed many contentions with the Dominicans*, and he declares, *that the Jeſuits had better have owned them for their maſters.* He adds, *That upon occaſion of a book which Father Molina wrote about Grace and Free-will, theſe Fathers were ſo much offended, that they had recourſe to the Inquiſition, and from thence to Rome*, where he ſays, *That at the time of his writing, the proceſs ſtill continued, and was managed with great obſtinacy and paſſion; and that though the Jeſuits ſhould come off victorious, which was very doubtful, yet it would coſt them many great ſums, beſides the vexation of many years.*’ I paſs by the other extracts out of the ſame book, which are to be found in the decree of this prelate. But let us ſee the Jeſuits anſwer to him. They alledged at firſt two or three arguments, and then they proceeded after this manner (88). ‘But, My Lord, without ſo much arguing, I ought to tell you, that this book did not deſerve the honour to be cited in a great archbiſhop's Paſtoral Letter. This, is, in few words, the hiſtory of it, as it is related by our adverſaries, the truth of which I do not, however, pretend to vouch. This MSS, ſay they, was taken from Mariana, when he was put in priſon at Madrid, for another book he wrote about the alteration of coin, and wherewith the miniſters of Spain, and chiefly the duke of Lerma, were much offended. The thing happened in 1609, or 1610. By this it appears, that the enemies of the Jeſuits kept the MS for the ſpace of fifteen or ſixteen years; that is, during all the remainder of the life Mariana, who might have diſowned it, either as a ſuppoſititious or falſified book. It was not printed till 1625, immediately after the death of this Father, who died in 1624, being about ninety years of age. This ſingle circumſtance renders this book much ſuſpected, and ſome books have been accounted ſuppoſititious for weaker reaſons. It was printed only to defame our ſociety; and can it be doubted, that they did not at leaſt alter and add many things in it? But that which puts the cheat out of all doubt, is this, that the original was never produced, nor the place named where it was, although the Jeſuits at that time preſently complained of it as a forgery. In effect, the very place which is cited in the Paſtoral Letter, is ſo contrary to the notions of Mariana, in the matter *de Auxiliis*, that we muſt believe him mad, if we believe it to be his. For he is made to ſay in this place, that the Jeſuits had done better, as to the controverſy about Grace, ‡ *to own the Dominicans for their maſters*, than to contend with them. * And Mariana in his book intituled, *De morte & immortalitate*, which he wrote in the greateſt heat of theſe diſputes, as he himſelf obſerves, ſhowed ſo ſtrong a byaſs againſt the doctrine of the Thomiſts, that Molina himſelf could not have done more.’ See the margin (89).

[*N*] *His ſcholia upon the Scripture have deſerved the approbation of Father Simon.*] ‘The ſcholia, or notes of Mariana, upon the Old Teſtament, may alſo be very uſeful for underſtanding the literal ſenſe of the Scripture, becauſe he chiefly applies himſelf to find out the proper ſignification of the Hebrew words. Thus at the beginning of Geneſis, he has judiciouſly obſerved, that the Hebrew word *bara*, which is commonly tranſlated *to create*, does not properly ſignify *to make out of nothing*, as is commonly believed; and that even the Greek and Latin authors, who invented the word *to create*, could not uſe it in this ſenſe, for as much as that which is now called creation, the production of a thing out of nothing, was altogether unknown to them. Although theſe notes are ſhort enough, yet he might have avoided ſome remarks, which ſerve only to ſhow his learning, and not to explain the text. Yet this ſort of digreſſions happen to him but ſeldom, and we may ſay, that Mariana is one of the ableſt and moſt judicious ſcholiaſts that we have upon the Bible. It is true, that he had but a moderate knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew tongues; but the penetration of his wit, and his great application, ſupplied in ſome meaſure this want. He commonly made choice of the beſt ſenſe, neither is he tedious in the different interpretations he relates (90).’ In another book Father Simon ſays (91). ‘As for Mariana, his notes upon the new teſtament are true ſcholia, wherein there appears no leſs judgment than learning . . . . (92) It were to be wiſhed, that the obſervations of this learned man had not been ſo ſhort. Neverthelеſs, he ſays much in a few words.’ See alſo what the ſame author (93) ſays about the book of Mariana *for the vulgar edition.*

[*O*] *His ſpeaking ill of king Henry* III, *was partly the cauſe that his book of the Inſtitution of a Prince, was condemned at Paris.*] This is manifeſt by the tenor of the decree of parliament. ‘The court having ſeen . . . the book of John Mariana, intituled *de Regia & Regis inſtitutione*, printed at Mentz (94), and other places, containing ſeveral blaſphemies againſt the deceaſed king Henry III, of moſt happy memory; the perſons and ſtates of ſovereign kings and princes, and other propoſitions, contrary to the ſaid decree . . . The ſaid court hath ordained, and doth ordain . . . That the ſaid book of Mariana ſhall be burnt by the publick executioner, before the church of Paris . . . Done in parliament, June 8, 1610.’ If Mariana had only ſaid, that Henry III, in his elder years, had ſtained all the glory he acquired in his youth, he could not have been blamed; for it is certain, that no prince ever became more unlike himſelf than he was. ‘Felix futurus, ſi cum primis ultima contexuiſſet, talemque ſe principem præſtitiſſet, qualis ſub Carolo fratre rege fuiſſe credebatur adverſus perduelliones copiarum bellique dux: qui illi gradus ad regnum Poloniæ fuit procerum ejus gentis ſuffragio. Sed ceſſerunt prima poſtremis, bonaque juventæ major ætas flagitio obliteravit. Defuncto fratre revocatus in patriam, rexque Galliæ renunciatus, omnia in ludibrium vertit (95). - - - - *Happy would he have been, if the latter part of his life had been anſwerable to its beginning, and had he ſhewn himſelf to be ſuch a prince, as he was believed to be a general, under the reign of his brother king Charles againſt the rebels: upon which account it was that he was elected king of Poland by the votes of the nobility. But the virtues of his youth were obliterated by the wickedneſs of his more advanced age. His brother being dead he ſucceeded, and turned all things into confuſion.*’ There was not a greater difference between Hector victorious over Patroclus, and his carcaſe, dragged by a chariot (96), than between the duke of Anjou victorious at Moncontour, and Henry III beſet by monks and minions, and forced to quit Paris to the duke of Guiſe. Debauchery firſt began to enervate his courage; but bigotry made him perfectly effeminate.

(96) In ſomnis, ecce, ante oculos mœſtiſſimus Hector
Viſus adeſſe mihi, largoſque effundere fletus;
Raptatus bigis, ut quondam, aterque cruento
Pulvere, perque pedes trajectus lora tumentes.
Hei mihi, qualis erat! quantum mutatus ab illo
Hectore; qui redit exuvias indutus Achillei,
Vel Danaûm Phrygios jaculatus puppibus ignes!
Virgil. Æneid. lib. ii, ver. 270.

When Hector's ghoſt before my ſight appears:
A bloody ſhrowd he ſeem'd, and bath'd in tears.
-
Swoln were his feet, as when the thongs were thruſt
Through the bor'd holes, his body black with duſt.
Unlike that Hector, who return'd from toils
Of war triumphant in Æacian ſpoils:
Or him, who made the fainting Greeks retire,
And launch'd againſt their navy Phrygian fire.
Dryden.

His

[(§ α) Read therefore *mendis* in Conringius, and not *moribus* nor *morbis*. Rem. Crit.]

(86) The Ordonnance of Charles Maurice Tellier, *pag.* 55, Delft Edit. 1698.

(87) Ib. *pag.* 57.

(88) A remonſtrance to the lord archbiſhop of Reims, *pag. m.* 157, &c.

‡ Pag. 57.

* *Marianæ Opuſcula, pag.* 415, 416, 430, 431, &c.

(89) Colomiés, Biblioth. Choiſie, *pag.* 174, *of the ſecond edition obſerves, that Auger de Mauleon, Sieur de Granier, tranſlated into French*, The Treatiſe of Father Mariana about the Reformation of the government of the Jeſuits. *See concerning this Mr Granier*, Hiſtory of the French Academy, *pag.* 225.

(90) Critical Hiſt. of the Old Teſtament, *book iii, cap. xii, pag. m.* 426.

(91) Critical Hiſt. of the principal commentators of the New Teſtament, *cap. xlii, pag.* 637.

(92) Ibid. *p.* 639.

(93) Critical Hiſt. of the Old Teſtament, *book iii, cap. xviii, pag.* 463.

(94) By Balthazar Lippius, 1605. That which I uſe is of the year 1611, *Typis Wechelianis apud hæredes Joannis Aubrii*.

(95) Mariana de Rege, *lib. i, cap. vi, pag. m.* 54.

I queſtion whether he wrote the book *de Republica Chriſtiana*, which a German writer praiſes very much [*P*].

His fraternities of Penitents, and their ſack-cloths bring to my mind this place of Mr *Deſpreaux :*

> *Dans ce ſac ridicule où Scapin s'envelope,*
> *Je ne reconois plus l'Auteur du miſantrope.*

I cannot any longer, under this ſack-cloth, under this Equipage of a falſe penitent, diſcern that brave warriour who triumphed over the Proteſtants at Jarnac and Moncontour, and who deſerved the ſuffrages of the Polanders for a great kingdom. *Ultima primis obſtant, diſſimiles hic vir & ille puer.* But Mariana did not confine himſelf to the obſervation of this change.

Note, however, that it is falſly aſſerted in the laſt edition of Moreri's Dictionary (97), *that he publiſhed the book* de Rege & Regis inſtitutione, *to juſtify the aſſaſſination of Henry* III, *king of France*. That was not his deſign. He treated the matter according to the extent of the title of his book. What concerns the authority he gives to ſubjects over tyrannical kings, is but a very ſmall part of this Book, and he does not ſpeak of Henry III but occaſionally, and in few words.

[*P*] *I queſtion whether he wrote the book* de Republica Chriſtiana, *which a German writer praiſes very much.*] He ſays, that it is an excellent work publiſhed by John Mariana in Spaniſh, in 1615, and dedicated to Philip III king of Spain; and that after ſeveral other things ingeniouſly invented, and wiſely propoſed (98), he gives a deſcription of the head of a good prince, with the lawful uſe of his five external ſenſes. If the Jeſuit Mariana had publiſhed ſuch a book, would the Bibliographers of the ſociety, and Don Nicolas Antonio have paſſed it over in ſilence?

MARY, or MIRIAM, the ſiſter of Aaron and Moſes, makes no inconſiderable figure in the Scripture twice or thrice at leaſt. She was the cauſe why her mother was choſen by the daughter of Pharaoh to be nurſe to Moſes [*A*]. She put herſelf at the head of all the women of Iſrael after the paſſage through the Red-Sea, in order to ſing the ſame ſong that the men had ſung [*B*]. She joined with her brother Aaron in murmuring

[*A*] *She was the cauſe that her mother was choſen to be nurſe to Moſes.*] The ſcripture relates, that after he was expoſed, his ſiſter kept at a diſtance to ſee (1) what would become of him, and that ſhe ſaid to Pharaoh's daughter, who had the child brought to her, *Shall I go and call to thee a nurſe of the Hebrew women, that ſhe may nurſe the child for thee* (2). And that after ſhe had received an anſwer, ſhe fetched her mother, who had orders to nurſe him. Joſephus thinking that this ſtory was not ſufficiently circumſtantiated, ſuppoſes that the daughter of Pharaoh employed at firſt Egyptian nurſes, but that the infant would not ſuck any of them; and that Mary feigning to come there only out of curioſity, repreſented to the princeſs, that it was to no purpoſe to fetch any nurſe but one of the Hebrew women, and that it would be well done to try whether it would be more tractable with a woman of that nation. The young maid had orders to ſeek out one, and ſhe fetched her mother, and becauſe the child ſucked her freely, ſhe was appointed his nurſe (3). This ſupplement of circumſtances is not ill contrived, although it multiplies miracles a little. Note, that there are ſome commentators, who think, that even according to the relation of holy Scripture, there is a lie in the words of this infant's ſiſter; for ſhe feigned that ſhe would go and ſeek out another woman than her mother. Upon this occaſion they relate to us all the examples of officious or pious frauds that we read in the ſacred writers, that of Rebecca, Rachel, Michal, *&c.* and conclude, that there are ſubtile tricks that are commendable, and a deceitfulneſs that is of neceſſary uſe, not only in the profeſſion of arms, and the political adminiſtration, but alſo in domeſtic affairs (4). This you will find in the commentary of the Franciſcan John Nodinus on the ſecond of Exodus, and he grounds it upon the authority of St Baſil, and St John Damaſcen. But this is altogether impertinent; for our Mary did nothing contrary to ſincerity, ſhe denied not that the woman ſhe would fetch was her mother: She only did not confeſs it, becauſe ſhe was not aſked about it, nor obliged upon any account to tell what ſhe knew. The defenders of equivocations cannot find any thing here that favours them.

[*B*] *She put herſelf at the head of all the women of Iſrael . . . . . . in order to ſing the ſame ſong that the men had ſung.*] When I ſpeak thus, I confine myſelf to the order of the narrative in the ſcripture. You ſee in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, the whole ſong which Moſes and the children of Iſrael ſung, after the deſtruction of the army of Pharaoh, and then you read this: *And Mary the propheteſs, the ſiſter of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances. And Mary anſwered them, ſing ye to the Lord*, &c (5). The word *præcinebat* in the vulgar Latin, ſeems to me better than the word *anſwered* in the Geneva and Engliſh verſions; for it is very probable that Mary begun and ſet the ſong and led the dance of the women. Conſult Philo who ſuppoſes that Moſes appointed two choirs, one of men, and the other of women, and that himſelf directed the muſic in the former, and gave the management of the other to his ſiſter, and that theſe two chorus's anſwered one another. There are ſome who think, that Moſes, either alone, or with the men, ſung the ſong, and that the others ſung only the beginning of it, which they repeated from time to time like the chorus of it. ‘ Oleaſter hæc ſcribit. *Crediderim equidem, Moſen & viros Hebræos Canticum hoc incæpiſſe, fæminas vero reſpondiſſe: ita quod Moſes aut ſolus, aut ſimul cum viris Canticum proſequebatur, fæminæ vero reſpondebant ſeu repetebant illud exordium Cantici* Cantemus Domino, *ut conſtat ex fine hujus Cantici, ubi talia verba repetuntur à Maria. Hoc enim ſolebat in aliis etiam Canticis fieri, ut patet in Pſal.* cxxxv. *ubi unus aut duo dicebant:* Confitemini Domino, quoniam bonus, quoniam in æternum miſericordia ejus. *Et deinceps proſequebantur alios verſus: Cætus autem aliorum repetebat ſemper illud:* Quoniam in æternum miſericordia ejus. *Idem quoque obſervare licet in primo libro Samuelis capite decimo octavo. Solebant enim Prophetæ choros canentium ducere, dum laudes Dei celebrarent.* Sic Oleaſter. *Philo tamen in libro tertio de vita Moſis, ait, Moſen diſtribuiſſe omnem populum in duos choros, unum virorum, in quo ipſe viris præibat Carmen: alterum, in quo ſoror ejus Maria præcinebat fæminis. Ergo Moſes prior quemlibet verſum hujus Cantici canebat, & deinde populus eundem verſum cantabat. Sed enim idem Philo in libro de Agricultura, ſcribit, factos eſſe duos choros: unum mulierum: alterum virorum, è diverſo ſtantes, & alternis carminibus ſibi invicem reſpondentes* (6). - - - - - *Thus Oleaſter writes:* I ſhould indeed have thought, that Moſes and the Hebrew men began this ſong, and the women anſwered: and that Moſes, either alone or together with the men, proceeded with the ſong, the women anſwering or repeating that beginning, *Let us ſing unto the Lord*; as appears by the end of this ſong, where ſuch words are ſpoken by Mary. For thus it was uſual in other ſongs to do, as may be ſeen in the cxxxv Pſalm, where one or two ſaid; *O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever.* And then they went on with other verſes: But the other company repeated always that; *for his mercy endureth for ever.* The ſame alſo may be obſerved in the eighteenth chapter of the firſt book of Samuel. For it was the cuſtom of the prophets to lead up the company of dancers ſinging the praiſes of GOD. *Thus far Oleaſter.* But Philo, in his third book of the life of Moſes, ſays, that Moſes divided all the people into two choirs, one of the men, in which he himſelf did ſet the ſong; another wherein his ſiſter Mary did the like among the women. Moſes therefore firſt ſang every verſe, and the people after did the ſame. This ſame Philo, in his book of Agriculture, further writes, that there were two choirs appointed, one muring againſt Moſes [C], and was ſeverely puniſhed for doing it; for ſhe became leprous

---

(97) That of Paris, 1699.

(98) Poſt multa alia ingenioſe excogitata cordateque prolata. *Andreas Carolus, Abbas Sangeorgianus in Ducatu Wirtembergico Memorab. Eccleſ. ſæculi xvii, lib. ii. cap. xxvi, pag.* 388. He cites Selenian. Aug. J. V. A. *pag.* 393, *& ſeq.* 449 *pl. Note, that the book he cites is the ſame I have cited above, remark* [*D*] *of the article* DURER, *citation* (12).

(1) Exod. ii, 4.

(2) Ib. ver. 7.

(3) Joſeph. Antiq. *lib. ii, cap.* vi.

(4) Ex Joanne Nodino, Comment. in priora xv Capita Exodi, *pag.* 67, *Edit. Lug.* 1611.

(5) Exod. xv, 20, 21.

(6) Pererius, in *cap. xv*, Exodi Diſput. i, *pag. m.* 484.

of men, the other of women, ſtanding apart, that anſwered one the other ſinging by turns every other verſe.’ A modern Poet (7) fancies, that this great prophet placed himſelf in the middle of the two chorus's, and diſtributed the parts of the ſong, and beat time with his rod. You may ſee a deſcription of the habits and geſtures of Mary, I ſay you may ſee it in this paſſage of Father Menetrier (8). ‘After the paſſage thro’ the red ſea, Moſes and Mary his ſiſter, to thank God for the preſervation of his people, and the deſtruction of the Egyptians, who were drowned in the purſuit of them, made two great chorus's ſeparated from one another, the one of men and the other of women, and danced to the tune of a ſong, wich makes the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, a ſong of thankſgiving. A modern Poet has elegantly deſcribed this dance in the ſixth book of his Poem intituled, *Moſes Viator*.

Nunc igitur memores animos ad Carmina mecum
Adjicite; alternis ſubſultent caſtra choreis;
Littora divinas referant ad ſidera laudes.
Sic fatus jubet in partes diſcedere turmas
Adverſiſque choris medius, geſtumque, modoſque
Dividit, & virga modulans præit Enthea verba.
Hæc poſtquam ſaltata Viris, modulataque Vate
Chironomo, paribus ſtimulis agit impetus idem
Hebræas cantare nurus, Diamque Pronæam
Tinnula concuſſis ad tympana pſallere ſiſtris.
Proſiluit ſancto Moſis ſoror excita Phœbo,
Prætexta lambente pedes, cinctuque modeſto
Caſtigante ſinus: volat alto à vertice Sindon
Carbaſina & Zephyros Zona retinente coërcet,
Subtileſque tument telæ pellentibus auris,
Cœrula jam niveos compeſcit tænia crines,
Saltibus extremæ volitant per tempora vittæ.
Aſſultant digitiſque pedes, pulſuque moventur
Ora, pedes, digitique pari, non mollia ceſſant
Brachia, non humeri, aut cervix, à corpore toto
Vox ſonat, & cunctis loquitur Symphonia membris.
Exiliunt paribus ſtudiis examina matrum
Virgineique greges, hæ ſiſtra ſonantia pulſant
Hæ citharas & plectra movent, hæ nablia carpunt:
Nec vultus torſiſſe pudor, caſta omnia caſti
Obſequii decorat pietas. Jocabethia virgo
Inchoat, & geſtu cantum comitante figurat *.

Now therefore join in grateful ſong again,
And whilſt alternate meaſures mark the plain,
Let diſtant ſhores reſound the praiſe of GOD.
He ſaid; the hoſt divided at his nod;
Plac'd in the midſt, the prophet marks the bounds
Of graceful motions, and alternate ſounds;
His ruling rod the words divine precedes,
Directs the ſacred ſtrain, the meaſure leads:
Taught by the ſeer, the men firſt raiſe the ſong,
And to the notes divine the dance prolong,
With equal warmth the Hebrew matrons ſtrove,
Urg'd by their grateful zeal to ſing their love:
But chief the heav'n-inſpir'd MIRIAM *tries*
With voice and cymbal to aſcend the ſkies;
Fill'd with her GOD, *the ſiſter prophet ſprings,*
Whilſt at her feet her flowing robes ſeem wings;
Her garb in decent folds her form contains;
High o'er her head the flying lawn reſtrains
Zephyr's ſoft breath, that ſwells the floating veil
Far as the Zone admits the ſportive gale.
Her ſilver locks, in azure fillets bound,
Wave as ſhe leaps, and ſport her temples round;
Her artful fingers and her active feet
Vye with her looks in a diſpute ſo ſweet:
Not tender arms, nor neck, nor waiſt, ſhe ſpares;
Her ev'ry part breathes muſic's ſofteſt airs:
Such ſweet conſent in all ſhe does is found,
Motion ſeems harmony, and geſture ſound.
Intent on the ſame arts the matron-throng,
And virgin-tribe, repeat the dance and ſong.
Some ſtrike the ſounding cymbal, ſome the lyre;
Theſe the ſoft lute, and thoſe the harp inſpire;
Nor bluſh, whilſt ſinging, the diſtorted face,
Duty their charm, and piety their grace.
The ſacred virgin, ſprung from Jacob's line,
Leads the ſoft choir, inſtructs it when to join,
And ſuits her motions to the ſtrain divine.

Here follows another paſſage of the ſame writer, which contains many things that do not relate to Mary; but ſince the whole is curious, I will not ſeparate what concerns the ſong in which ſhe bore a part from the reſt. ‘It is the moſt ancient ſong (9) we have, and the greateſt part of the interpreters of this ſong are of opinion, that it is the firſt compoſition in Muſic, which appeared three hundred years before the birth of Linus and Orpheus, whom the Grecians make the fathers of their Poetry (10). This ſong is a meer narrative; but that which we have in the thirty-ſecond chapter of Deuteronomy, has all the beauties of Poetry and of ſublime Eloquence. God commanded Moſes to write this ſong the day before his death, to ſerve for the condemnation of the people of the Jews, whoſe ingratitude was exceeding great. This faithful miniſter of the will of God, did not only write but ſing it: And as the author of the book of the wonders of the Scripture, which is inſerted among the works of St Auſtin, thought that God wrought a miracle with reſpect to the firſt of theſe ſongs, having inſpired all the people to ſing it with a juſt harmony, and a regular conſort of ſo many voices without any confuſion; ſo ſome interpreters are of opinion, that God wrought another miracle with reſpect to the ſecond, by giving Moſes a voice ſo ſtrong and extenſive, as to be heard by all the people, how diſtant ſoever a great part of that prodigious multitude was from him (11).’

Note, That there is ſome probability, that Mr Herſant is not altogether of the ſame opinion with the Jeſuit Menetrier. *He hath printed a little book with this title*, the ſong of Moſes in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, explained according to the rules of Rhetoric. *He pretends that this piece which was written in Hebrew verſe, exceeds all that is moſt beautiful in this kind in prophane authors, and that Virgil and Horace, the moſt perfect patterns of fine poetry, have nothing that comes near it.* This we read in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* for the month of March 1700, p. 353, with this circumſtance, that *Mr Herſant is at preſent with the abbot de Louvois, and that he was before profeſſor of Rhetoric in the college of Pleſſis.* There is reaſon to believe that he looks upon the ſong of the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, as more beautiful than that in chap. xxxii of Deuteronomy. And this is not the opinion of the Jeſuit Menetrier. We ſhall conclude with cenſuring a miſtake of Mr Simon, who ſays that the ſong in chap. xv of Exodus was compoſed by Mary (12).

[C] *She joined with her brother Aaron in murmuring againſt Moſes.*] The ſcripture relates this in theſe words: *And Miriam and Aaron ſpoke againſt Moſes, becauſe of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married; for he had married an Ethiopian woman: And they ſaid, hath the Lord indeed ſpoken by Moſes? hath not he alſo ſpoken by us* (13)? In our age many readers complain, that a thing is not written ſhort enough, and accuſe all authors of prolixity, who do not leave the beſt of their thoughts to be gueſſed at. Such readers would find theſe two verſes of Moſes admirable, tho' they ſhould not believe them inſpired by God; for things are expreſſed there by halves, and parted from one another by a great gap. There are many connections wanting, which they muſt ſupply, and ſince they love this exerciſe, they may here find matter for ſuch an agreeable employment. The words of the ſacred author, which I have related, are equivalent to theſe: *Mary and Aaron ſpoke ill of Moſes, becauſe of his marriage with an Ethiopian woman, and their evil-ſpeaking was expreſſed after this manner, Does none propheſy but he? If he is a prophet we are ſo too.* We do not ſee at firſt

how

---

(7) It is a Jeſuit of Lyons, called *Antonius Milliæus.* See Alegambe, *pag.* 40.

(8) Menetrier, des Ballets anciens & modernes, *pag.* 9, & *ſeq.*

* *Anton. Milliæus, lib. vi, Moſis Viatoris.*

(9) He ſpeaks of that which was ſung after the paſſage through the Red-Sea.

(10) *Here is what Pererius ſays,* ubi ſupra, *pag.* 485, 486. Inter alias porro hujus Cantici excellentias, illa profecto perinſignis eſt, quod eſt primum omnium Canticorum, quæ fuiſſe unquam facta vel cantata, ſive in ſacris, ſive in profanis literarum monumentis proditum ſit, nam Lini, Muſæi, & Orphei, qui ante bellum Troianum fuerunt, hymnos, carmina, & cantus, plus trecentis annis poſt hoc Canticum Moſis eſſe factos, certa temporum obſervatione compertum eſt.

(11) Menetrier, Repreſentations en Muſique, *pag.* 9, 10.

(12) Simon's Dictionary of the Bible, *pag.* 514. Note, that this Simon is different from him who wrote the Critical Hiſtory of the Bible.

(13) Numb. *ch.* xii, *ver.* 1, 2.

leprous, and was ſeparated from the camp for the ſpace of ſeven days *(a)*. She would not have been delivered from this affliction, if Moſes had not implored the mercy of GOD. She died before her two brethren *(b)*, and in the ſame year with them, and was interred with pomp, and at the expence of the public in the mountain of Sin *(c)*. It is believed that ſhe lived a hundred and thirty years, or thereabout. The Rabbins make a ridiculous remark, becauſe the ſacred text does not contain the ſame clauſe concerning the death of Mary, as concerning that of her two brothers [*D*]. He that would know the reſemblance there is between this ſiſter of Moſes, and the Pagan goddeſſes needs only read Mr Huet's demonſtration *(d)*.

how the wife of Moſes was the cauſe of theſe interrogations? The leap is a little too great from the principle to the conſequence, and the mind is divided into divers conjectures to find the connexion or relation between theſe things. I think the famous Toſtatus did not conjecture amiſs, who ſuppoſes that Sephora, the wife of Moſes, was proud of the glory and prophetic authority of her huſband, and from thence took occaſion to inſult her ſiſter-in-law, and affected to exalt the merit of her huſband above that of Aaron. The ſiſter-in-law, and the brother-in-law, having no better way to humble her pride, criticized upon the marriage of Moſes with a woman of another nation, and boaſted that they had a ſhare in propheſy as well as he. 'Veriſimile eſt, quod ait 'Abulenſ. Sephoram more muliebri (hic enim ſexus, 'cum ſit imbecillis ingenii & judicii, ambitioſus eſt, '& ſui honoris ſtudioſus) voluiſſe ſe præferre Mariæ, 'eo quod uxor eſſet Moſis, Moſenque ſuum, quaſi 'populi ducem, verbis extuliſſe, ac præpoſuiſſe Mariæ & Aaroni: qua re primum concitata Maria, deinde Aaron, ſe erigere cœperunt, volentes ſe non 'tantum Sephoræ, ſed & Moſi æquare, jactitando ſe 'tam nobiles eſſe prophetas, quam erat Moſes. Id 'ita eſſe, colligitur tum ex v. ſeq. tum ex v. 6. ubi 'Deus hanc murmuris cauſam indicat, & præſcindit, 'docetque eos in ambitione ſua falli; eo quod Moſes 'præſtantiſſimus, fideliſſimus, Deoque familiariſſimus 'ſit propheta, cui nec quis alius comparari poſſit (14). '- - - - *It is probable, that Zipporah (as is the cuſtom 'of her ſex, who are of weak underſtanding and 'judgment, and ambitious of honour) would prefer 'her ſelf to Mary becauſe ſhe was the wife of Moſes, 'whom ſhe extolled as being the leader of the people, 'and more honourable than Mary and Aaron: whereby 'firſt Mary and then Aaron being ruffled, began to ſhew 'their reſentment, equalizing themſelves, not only to Zipporah, but even to Moſes himſelf; boaſting that they 'were not leſs excellent prophets than was Moſes. 'That this matter was as now repreſented, may be 'collected both from the following, and from the ſixth 'verſe, where GOD takes notice of the cauſe, reproves their ambition, and tells them that Moſes was 'the moſt excellent and moſt faithful prophet, whom 'he admitted to the greateſt familiarity with himſelf, 'and to whom no other was to be compared.'* This ſuppoſition of Toſtatus connects the disjointed pieces, and diſpels the obſcurity in the reaſoning of the ſacred hiſtorian. Note, That there are ſome commentators who maintain, that Sephora might be called an Ethiopian, tho' ſhe was of Arabia (15): But others pretend (16), that the ſeventy interpreters, and the author of the vulgar Latin, did not underſtand the true ſenſe of the Hebrew word, which they have tranſlated an Ethiopian woman. Note alſo, that this chapter of the book of Numbers is proper to prove, that the title of a propheteſs, which is given to Mary in chap. xv of Exodus, did belong to her properly, and according to the higheſt ſignification of the word; that is, that ſhe had a ſhare in the divine inſpiration (17).

[*D*] *The ſame clauſe concerning the death of Mary, as concerning that of the two brethren.*] This clauſe in the verſion of Geneva ſignifies, that Aaron and Moſes died *according to the command of GOD*; but the Jews pretend it ſignifies *by the mouth of GOD*, as if the breath of GOD had gently drawn out their ſoul. They add, that Mary died not after this manner, which is not fit for the feminine ſex, and that the worm has no power over thoſe who die ſo. What impertinence is here! *De Moſe quidem*, Deut. cap. xxxiv. ver. 5. *De Aharone autem*, Numb. cap. xxxiii. ver. 38. *dicitur, quod mortui ſint* על פי יהוה ad os, *i. in oſculo*, Domini, *quaſi anima eorum ipſius Dei halitu ſuaviſſime rapta fuerit. De eorum ſorore Mirjam dicunt, eam mortuam quidem* בנשוקה *ſed non* על פי יהוה ad os Domini, *quaſi hæc locutio ſequiori ſexui non conveniat. In hos vero vermem non habuiſſe poteſtatem in libro Jalkut legitur* (18). The Pagan ſuperſtition is well known, which made kinſmen apply their mouths to that of dying perſons. See the commentators of Virgil upon theſe words of Dido's ſiſter:

- - - - - & extemus ſi quis ſuper halitus errat,
Ore legam - - - - - (19).

- - - - - - while I in death
Lay cloſe my lips to her's, and catch the flying breath.
DRYDEN.

All thoſe who treat *de funeribus* (20) ſpeak of this cuſtom.

MARY the Egyptian, a famous proſtitute, and a famous convert. When ſhe was twelve years old, ſhe went out of her father's houſe, into the city of Alexandria, where ſhe ſpent twenty ſeven years in leud practices, and then ſhe went to Jeruſalem to continue there the ſame kind of life. But an inviſible power having hindered her from entering into the temple on the day of the exaltation of the Holy Croſs, ſhe felt ſuch a remorſe of conſcience as obliged her to proſtrate her ſelf before an image of the Holy Virgin, and to promiſe that ſhe would forſake her leud courſes. After that ſhe entered into the temple, and having adored the croſs, ſhe enquired of the holy Virgin what ſhe ſhould do to pleaſe God. She heard a voice which ordered her to go into the deſert; which ſhe obeyed, and did penance forty ſeven years, without ſeeing any body. She was there waited upon by angels for the laſt thirty years. The author *(a)* who furniſhes me with theſe materials, ſays nothing of the payment ſhe would have made to the mariners for her paſſage [*A*]. The confeſſion of Sancy has too much abridged the hiſtory of this wo-

[*A*] *Of the payment ſhe would have made to the mariners for her paſſage.*] Having no money to give them for her paſſage, ſhe offered to give them leave to uſe her body as they pleaſed. This made the famous Peter de Moulin ſay, that the authors of the Legends had no judgment, and managed the matter ſo, as if they deſigned to ridicule the ſaints they write of. *Vitas Sanctorum ſic deſcripſerunt Pontificii, quaſi propoſitum iis fuiſſet eos differre populo, & exſibilandos proponere. Mariam Ægyptiam perhibent cum non haberet unde naulum ſolveret, voluiſſe facere nautis corporis ſui copiam, ut quod non habebat in ære lueret in corpore* (1). I ſhall eaſily be believed, when I affirm that I will not take the part of the Legendary writers; nevertheleſs I will ſay, that a judicious writer might relate what Mr du Moulin alledges as a proof of indiſcretion: For if it were true, that Mary the Egyptian would have proſtituted her ſelf

---

(a) *Numb. chap. xii.*

(b) *Ib. chap. xx.*

(c) Joſeph. Antiq. *lib. iv, cap. iv, pag. m.* 109.

(d) Huet. Demonſtrat. Evangel. *prop. iv, cap. x, pag. m.* 252, *& ſeq.* & in præfat. fol. *C. ii, verſo.*

(14) Corn. à Lapide in Exod. *cap. xii, ver.* 1. *pag. m.* 856.

(15) *See* Cornelius à Lapide, ib.

(16) See Mr le Clerc upon this place of the book of Numbers.

(17) *See* Rivet. in Exod. *cap. xv, ver.* 20. *Oper. Tom. i, pag.* 963.

(18) Lomeier. genial. dierum decad. i, *pag.* 337, 338. *I have twice corrected the numbers; there is in the original xxxii inſtead of xxxiv, and xxiii for xxxiii.*

(19) Virgil. Æneid. lib. IV, ver. 684.

(20) *See among others* Kirchmannus de Funeribus Romanorum, *lib. i, cap. v.*

(a) Paul Boyer, Eſq; Sieur de Petit-Puy, *in his Dictionary ſerving for an univerſal library, printed at Paris in* 1649, *in folio, p.* 254. *(wherein he cites Sophronius biſhop of Jeruſalem.* Nicephorus Calliſtus, *book viii, ch. v, of his Hiſtory. St John Damaſcen, in his third oration of Images) and pag.* 323.

(1) Petrus Molinæus, in Hyperaſpiſte adverſus Silveſtrum Petraſanctam, *pag.* 46.

man [*B*]: It is in the chapter wherein there is a fraud concerning St Dominic, and a nun called Mary [*C*]. This name will make my remark not altogether impertinent ; but ſince

to the mariners for what ſhe owed them, becauſe ſhe had no money ; I do not ſee why any hiſtorian ſhould ſuppreſs it : Is it not very proper to exalt the mercy of God, and the efficacy of his ſpirit ? The more enormous the extravagance of a debauched woman has been, the more we ought to admire her converſion, and the long auſterities of her penance : and therefore diſcretion does not oblige an author to ſay nothing of the ſingular circumſtances of the leudneſs of the convert. Moreover it cannot be objected to the Legendary writers, that they tranſgreſs the rule of probability ; for theſe creatures, which are the victims of public impurity, as Tertullian calls them, are ſometimes reduced to the laſt farthing ; or elſe they had rather gratify their creditors with the uſe of their body, than diſcharge the debt by paying the money.

[*B*] *The confeſſion of Sancy has too much abridged the hiſtory of this woman.*] Here follow the words of d'Aubigné (2) : ‘ The legend of the ſaints is the garden of the ſoul : . . . . . . in this garden are herbs, which at leaſt give eaſe, if they do not cure. A ſpark who complies with the neceſſity of the times, knows what the country people call robbing. If he finds that his diſſolute ſoul cannot change it's life, there is in the legend, in the chap. of the annunciation, an example of a knight, who robbed, without pity, both poor and rich, and was cleared for ſaying once every day, *Ave Maria.* And as to the ſoldiers of theſe days, it is what they commonly practiſe. If a lady of the court feels in her diſſolute ſoul, that ſhe cannot leave her great, catholic, and univerſal leudneſs, has ſhe not Mary the Egyptian to comfort her, who from the age of twelve years, till ſhe became contemptible for old age, never refuſed a man ? And have not we, the example of St Magdalen, ſo famous in antient chronicles ? The writers of the legend have afterwards taught us, how ſhe, by her charms, made many men of good families ſell their goods for her ; many valient men cut their throats thro' jealouſy, and then ſhe was no ſooner tired, but preſently ſhe was canonized.' The omiſſion of this author, with reſpect to St Mary the Egyptian, and St Magdalen, is inexcuſable ; for he ſuppoſes that theſe two proſtitutes were immediately advanced from infamous places, to the rank of canonized ſaints, and by this ſuppoſition he pretends to prove, that the legend is very fit to let looſe the reins to thoſe ladies, who have a boundleſs deſire to ſpend their time with men. If he had dealt candidly, he ſhould have told us of the long penance of theſe two ſaints ; but ſince this would have ſpoiled the rallery he intended in the objection againſt the legendary writers, he thought it would be better to ſay nothing of it, or even to deny it (3). Let us learn from hence, that ſatirical writers are the people in all the world, againſt whom a reader ſhould moſt guard himſelf. Theſe are the men who reaſon the worſt of any, and by the pleaſantneſs of their wit, hinder us from enquiring into their ſophiſtical arguments. But let us remember, that if they can diſpenſe with ſeveral rules, yet they ought to be no leſs ſubject to the laws of reaſoning than grave authors (4).

[*C*] . . . *wherein there is a fraud concerning St Dominic and a Nun, whoſe name was Mary.*] I make this remark only to ſet in a clearer light what was ſaid juſt now ; and therefore it ought not to be condemned as being foreign to this place. ‘ When I was an Huguenot, they are Sancy's words, I found nothing that made me laugh ſo much as the legend of Brother Jacopon. There is alſo a book in our houſe, on which I have made fine annotations, as particularly upon making his brother confeſs his ſins by ſigns. Madam de Villeroy enquiring, how he confeſſed his whoring, had alſo the curioſity to aſk, how they called in Greek, that light oil which St Dominic ſpilt between the Nuns thighs, and called it the oil of love (5).' It is certain, that d'Aubigné falſifies the legend, that he may give the ſtory a more diverting air ; but I think that neither the laws of rallery, nor even of ſatire, do allow of this. The legend of St Dominic (6) ſays, That a Nun being in an extaſy, thought ſhe ſaw him come into her chamber, accompanied by two Friars, and that he took out from under his garment an ointment of a very good ſmell, wherewith he rubbed her leg, and called it the ſign of charity. *Maria ſanctimonialis in Ectaſi rapta vidit Dominicum cum duobus fratribus ante lectum ejus intrantem, qui de ſub cappa unguentum miræ fragrantiæ proferens, tibiam ejus inunxit, quam unctionem dilectionis eſſe ſignum dixit* (7). By comparing theſe words with thoſe in the *confeſſion of Sancy*, what falſifications do we not find ? The legend does not ſay, that Dominic applied an ointment to the Nun's leg, but it ſays, that the Nun being in an extaſy, thought ſhe ſaw this ſaint who rubbed her leg with the ointment ; and ſo it was only a dream, or a viſion. At leaſt d'Aubigné ſhould have ſtopped at the Nun's leg, and not have corrupted the text, by the falſe gloſs of ſpilling light oil between the thighs. If the queſtion was about the trunk of a tree, it would be a ſmall miſtake ; a little near to, or farther from, the earth, would make no difference ; but in ſuch a ſubject as this the difference is capital. Mr du Moulin, in his anſwer to Petraſancta, promiſes to ſpeak elſewhere of this unction of St Dominic (8). I do not know whether he kept his word ; but his brother-in-law Andrew Rivet, anſwering the ſame Jeſuit, does very candidly ſtop at the literal ſenſe of the legend ; he owns, that this anointing of the leg was only a dream ; but he declares, that theſe extatic viſions were ridiculous and juſtly ſuſpected (9). It was at this, as he pretends, that du Moulin ſcoffed, and not meerly at the uſe of ointments for healing of the ſick, a thing practiſed by the Apoſtles (10). ‘ Accuſat Molinæum, quod riſerit *Dominicum* ſanantem *mulierem* oleo, & Franciſcum *aviculis* concionantem. Primum illud non potuit ſimpliciter irridere Molinæus, qui noverat initio Chriſtianiſmi Apoſtolos unxiſſe ægros oleo, & ſanaſſe, Marc. vii. Sed riſit & merito, quod in legenda Dominici legitur, quod *Maria Sanctimonialis*, &c (11). . . . . *He accuſes du Moulin of mocking St Dominic's curing of a woman with oil, and St Francis's preaching to the birds. The firſt he could not abſolutely ridicule, knowing, that in the beginning of Chriſtianity, the Apoſtles anointed with oil, and cured the ſick, Mark vii. But he ſcoffed, and deſervedly, what is to be read in the legend of St Dominic, that Maria Sanctimonialis*, &c.' Obſerve that Petraſancta knowing that in the library of Sedan, they had laughed at this action of Dominic, did not make uſe of the anſwer which the legend could have furniſhed him with, *viz.* that it was a dream ; for he was ignorant of this circumſtance : but he anſwered very ſeriouſly, that they might as well make ſuch a rallery at Jesus Christ, who anointed a dumb man with his ſpittle. *Sedani, dum Bibliotheca, his qui mecum advenerant, oſtenderetur, nihil ferme auditum eſt, præter Sanctorum irriſiones. Riſit aliquis ſanctum Dominicum, perſanantem oleo mulierem ægram. Rideat perinde Chriſtum Dominum aut ſaliva utentem, aut luto, dum os muti aperiret, & dum oculis unius cæci nati explicaret lucem & diem* (12). This is a bad anſwer, for this is to own the fact. After all, the ralleries of d'Aubigné muſt needs be falſe, ſince they are founded upon a lie. And this ſhould teach the readers, that if they would be well inſtructed in controverſy, they muſt neither conſult ſatires, nor burleſque pieces : this were to ſit in the ſeat of the ſcorners, an action condemned in the firſt Pſalm. Such people, when they have a mind to divert themſelves, ſpare not their beſt friends (13), but they care little for truth (14). See, below, the remark [*D*]. Thus when the Poet, whom I cite, aſks this queſtion ; ‘ Can any thing hinder one who jeſts from ſpeaking the truth (15) ? *He might be anſwered*, you will find an anſwer to this in your fourth ſatire, where you ſay, that a jeſter gives no quarter to his beſt friends, much leſs does he regard the circumſtances of a ſtory.' Neverthelеſs the queſtion put by Horace is reaſonable ; for it ſignifies no more but that it is poſſible for one in rallery to ſpeak the truth, and this is inconteſtable.

But the injury done by d'Aubigné will be better diſcovered, if we conſider, that, in all probability, the ſince it is moreover deſigned to oppoſe the bad inclination men have to truſt too much to ſatirical writers [D], I hope I ſhall not be charged with irregularity for placing it here.

---

(2) Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy, *book i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 329.

(3) *This d'Aubigné does in theſe words*, She was no ſooner tired, but ſhe was preſently canonized.

(4) See the article COLOMIES, remark [*C*].

(5) D'Aubigné, Confeſſion of Sancy, *book i, cap. ii, pag.* 328.

(6) In Jacobus de Voragine.

(7) Jacob. de Voragine, in Aurea Legenda, apud Rivetum in Caſtigat. notarum in epiſtol. Molinæi ad Balzacum, *cap. vi, num.* 7, *Oper. Tom. iii, pag.* 511.

(8) De Dominico confricante femur puellæ unguento amoris ſuo loco agetur. *Molinæus ubi ſupra, pag.* 47.

(9) Ectaſes illæ monialium quæ monachos SOMNIANT ingredientes & earum ungentes tibias unguento dilectionis *de ſub cappa*, & ridiculæ ſunt & ſuſpectæ. *Rivet. Oper. Tom. iii, pag.* 511.

(10) Rivetus, in *Tom. iii, pag.* 511.

(11) You will find what follows, above, in citation (7).

(12) Petraſancta, Nat. in Epiſtol. Molinæi ad Balzacum, *cap. iii, pag.* 32.

(13) Fenum habet in cornu, longe fuge, dummodo riſum Excutiat ſibi non hic cuiquam parcet amico. *Horat. Sat. IV, lib. I, ver.* 34, 35.

(14) Compare the article BROSSIER, remark [*B*].

(15) - - - ridentem dicere verum Quid vetat ? - - - *Horat. Sat. I, lib. I, ver.* 24.

If

the apology for Herodotus was his original: in which book I find theſe words (16). 'I will not forget another act of the ſame St Dominic, related towards the end of his legend, an act truly of a good companion, at leaſt related in ſuch a manner as will make good companions laugh, and afford them matter of jeſting; which was this, that a Nun called Mary, having a pain in her thigh, endured it for the ſpace of five months, and deſpaired of curing it. Then ſhe ſaid to herſelf, that ſhe was not worthy to pray unto God, nor to be heard by him, and therefore ſhe deſired St Dominic to be a mediator between God and her, to obtain for her the bleſſing of health. And after this requeſt, being aſleep, ſhe ſaw near her St Dominic, who took from under his garment an oil of a good ſmell, wherewith he anointed her thigh. And when ſhe aſked how the ointment was called, St Dominic anſwered, that it was the Ointment of Love.' Thus you ſee that even by the confeſſion of Henry Stephens the Nun was aſleep.

[(§ a) This might perhaps be more the negligence than malice of d'Aubigné, how ſatirical ſoever he may elſewhere be. He truſted to his memory when he wrote this; and having, in all probability, forgot the word *ſignum* of the legend, he could ſcarcely otherwiſe tranſlate *unctionem dilectionis*, than by the *oil of love*, which precedes. Rem. Crit.]

Mr Jurieu confeſſes the ſame thing, but, according to his cuſtom, he takes little care to ſpeak exactly. His words are theſe (17). 'The ſame legend ſays, that a Nun, called Mary, having for the ſpace of five months a great pain in the parts next to thoſe which I dare not name, St Dominic appeared to her in a dream, and pulled from under his habit an ointment of a very good ſmell, wherewith he rubbed the part affected, and being aſked by the maid what it was, he anſwered, that it was called *unguentum amoris*. This is as chaſt as the amours of Francis for St Clara, and his paſſion for friar Maſſus, whom he embraced, and raiſed from the ground in his arms. Which put Father Maſſus in ſo great a heat, that he was like one in the midſt of a fire, ſays the book of the *Conformities*'. Note, that he puts in the margin this ſummary; *The abominations of St Francis and St Dominic*; and thence you may conclude, that he treats the controverſy as if he were playing at blind-man's-buff. I leave it to thoſe who believe it is not lawful to act deceitfully in favour of religion, that is, to tranſgreſs the duties of religion for the ſake of religion; I leave it to them, I ſay, to judge, whether honour and conſcience can permit, that the word *tibia* ſhould be tranſlated by *the parts next to thoſe which we dare not name*. It is a circumlocution which would be abſurd in all ſorts of ſubjects; for, in ſhort, the word *leg*, which anſwers that of *tibia*, has nothing in it which obliges a man to uſe any periphraſis: but to make uſe of it on purpoſe to give one an idea of impurity, is to carry the matter beyond abſurdity, and is a criminal fraud. The cheat does no leſs appear in the change of theſe terms, *ſignum dilectionis*, into thoſe of *unguentum amoris*. But what will you ſay of a writer, who rather than loſe the compariſon he had found in the apology for Herodotus (18), compares the viſion of a Nun in an extaſy, with the embraces of two men full of vigour? Tho' it were certain the Nun had dreamed that St Dominic came to bed to her, and committed uncleanneſs with her, muſt we therefore conclude that he is guilty? Are we anſwerable for the dreams of another perſon? Did the mother of Julius Cæſar loſe any thing of her merit, becauſe her ſon dreamed that he had to do with her (19)? Here is a controverſiſt, who calls the application of an ointment the *abomination of St Dominic*, which was only an apparition in a dream, as he himſelf ſays.

[D] *The bad inclination men have to truſt too much to ſatirical writers.*] Theſe writers are like thoſe jeſters who ſacrifice every thing to the pleaſure of putting off their jeſts. Horace has very well deſcribed this paſſion in the verſes cited above (20). Quintilian makes uſe of the ſame colours for drawing the picture of ſuch ſort of people, and for giving a diſtaſte of their chartacter. Let us beware, ſays he, of the maxim of thoſe, who had rather loſe their friend than their jeſt. *Ludere nunquam velimus, longeque abſit propoſitum illud, potius amicum quam dictum perdidi* (21). Cicero obſerves, that they ſlight all the conſiderations of decency, and have no regard either to perſons or occaſions, and could more eaſily keep fire in their mouths than a jeſt. *Parcebat* (Craſſus) *adverſarii dignitati, in quo ipſe ſervabat ſuam, quod eſt hominibus facetis, & dicacibus difficillimum, habere hominum rationem, & temporum, & ea quæ occurrant, quum ſalſiſſime dici poſſint, tenere. Itaque nonnulli ridiculi homines hoc ipſum non inſulſe interpretantur. Dicere enim ajunt Ennium flammam à ſapiente facilius ore inardente opprimi quam bona dicta teneat: hæc ſcilicet bona dicta quæ falſa ſint. Nam ea dicta appellantur proprio jam nomine* (22). We muſt not wonder that they do not ſpare their friends, for they do not ſpare themſelves: They make themſelves merry at their own coſt; and their character is like that of thoſe buffoons, who ſtrike indifferently themſelves and others. Ariſtotle deſcribes them by this. Ὁ δὲ βωμολόχος ἥττων ἐστὶ τοῦ γελοίου καὶ οὔτε ἑαυτοῦ, οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων ἀπεχόμενος εἰ γέλωτα ποιήσει. *Scurra autem ridiculo moderari non poteſt, cum nec ſibi nec aliis parcat, dummodo riſum moveat* (23). They ſpare neither God nor men; and the religion of their heart does not eſcape their poignant wit (24). It is too weak a barrier to keep off the irruption of a flaſh of wit. Judge then, whether the religion which they believe to be falſe can reſtrain ſuch ſallies of wit. The glory and ſatiſfaction which they expect from the boldneſs of a jeſt, tranſports them beyond all other conſiderations; and thoſe who have ſaid that a poetic vein *is a vomiting potion, whoſe operation cannot be ſtopped without great danger of choaking* (25), have given us a lively image of the paſſion of theſe people. We may add, that when they have their pen in their hand, they quit all things to run after ſome ſatirical thoughts; and when they have any glance of them, tho' at never ſo great a diſtance, they throw themſelves on that ſide: and leſt they ſhould digreſs to no purpoſe, they force in, and wind any matter till they have adjuſted it to their purpoſe; and if they find it too long and too groſs, they contract and ſmooth it as much as their intereſt requires. Theſe writers may be compared to Procruſtes, who made all his priſoners equal to the meaſure of his bed (26). Theſe words of Montagne agree to them exactly (27). 'There are ſome fools who turn out of their way a quarter of a league to hunt after a fine word, *aut qui non verba rebus aptant* †, *ſed res extrinſecus arceſſunt, quibus verba conveniant*. And that other paſſage ‡, *Qui alicujus verbi decore placentis vocentur ad id quod non propoſuerant ſcribere*.'

There is more or leſs in all this, and I do not put together all theſe ideas to prove, that all thoſe who delight in rallery and ſatire, do equally, and without exception, uſe theſe exceſſes. But it is a matter of moment to expoſe the character of wit, by which men are ſo eaſily ſeduced, by ſhewing it's deformed ſide. A writer of controverſies, who has a good wit, very much diverts the readers of his party, when he turns things maliciouſly, and with an air of rallery, ſatire, and burleſque; and the more he diverts them, the more he perſuades. Now, ſince the method he adopts, engages him into a thouſand cheats, and a thouſand falſifications, it is neceſſary one ſhould know that he is a dangerous impoſtor. This will enable us to ſtand upon our guard; we ſhould read him as one we muſt diſtruſt, take nothing upon his word, examine what he ſays, and confront his words with the originals; and if we find he has changed *ſignum delectionis* into *unguentum amoris*, we ſhall tell him, I am not your fool, addreſs yourſelf to others.

(16) Henry Stephen's Apology for Herodotus, *cap. xxxiv, pag. m.* 367, 368.

(17) Jurieu, Prejug. *part i, pag.* 398.

(18) *Chap. xxxiv, pag.* 368.

(19) Sueton. in Cæſare, *cap. vii.*

(20) Citat. (13).

(21) Quintil. *lib. vi, cap. iii, pag. m.* 288.

(22) Cicero de Orat. *lib. ii, cap. liv, fol. m.* 81. C.

(23) Ariſt. de morib. ad Nicomach. *lib. iv, cap. xiv, pag.* 42, 43.

(24) See, before, the article DIOGENES, remark [*N*].

(25) I have read this in a romance intituled, *The Queen of Æthiopia*, printed in 1670, or 1671.

(26) See in the *Critique Generale de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſm* of Maimbourg, Letter v, *pag.* 95, of the third edition, what uſe has been made of this parallel. See alſo in *pag.* 517, of Menage's Etymologies of the Italian tongue, and *chap. lxxxiv*, of his *Anti-Baillet*, another compariſon between Procruſtes and the ſonnet.

---

(27) Montagne, Eſſays, *book i, chap. xxv, pag. m.* 261.

† Who do not fit their words to things, but make things to ſuit their words. *Quint. lib. viii.*

‡ Who by the allurement of a word which pleaſes them, are carried away to that which they had no deſire to write. *Seneca, Epiſt. lix.*

If I could have conſulted the work, which is intituled *S. Maria Ægyptiaca, muſca de extremo fluminum Ægypti, ſibilo Domini evocata* [E]. I might have enlarged very much in this ſecond edition the article of St Mary the Egyptian; but not being able to get it, I can only make this addition. This ſaint lived without food, and without cloaths, the laſt thirty years of her ſolitude, and was ſo disfigured with heat and cold, that ſhe might have been taken for an Æthiopian (*b*). Two loaves and ſome herbs ſufficed her for the firſt ſeventeen years of her penance (*c*).

(*b*) Veſtibus conſumptis nuda frigore & æſtu toſta ut videretur Æthiopiſſa. *Cornel. à Lapide in Deuteron. cap. viii, ver.* 4, *pag. m.* 1010.

(*c*) *Taken from* Cornelius à Lapide, ibid.

[*E*] *The work intituled* S. *Maria Ægyptiaca, &c.*] Theophilus Raynaudus is the author of it. I have ſeen in another of his books, that he ſuppoſed the truth of the Hiſtory of this ſaint, notwithſtanding all the efforts of the centuriators of Magdeburg (28), who look upon it as a fable, that ſhe lived on two loaves ſeventeen years; that ſhe was taken up into the air; that ſhe went over the river Jordan without ſwimming, and without a boat, and that ſome lions took care of her burial. I have ſeen alſo, that Nicolas Harſfield, under the name of Alanus Copus (29), has refuted on this ſubject the centuriators, and that there is in the book of Theophilus Raynaudus, an Appendix concerning the women who left their leudneſs and became ſaints. *Porro hujus operis Mantiſſa eſt, Tractatio* de mulieribus Sanctis è cœno turpitudinum emerſis (30).

(28) Centur. iv, *cap. x, pag.* 1334.

(29) Dial.. *ii, cap. i, and xiv.*

(30) *Taken from* Theophilus Raynaudus, Syntagm. de libris propriis, *num.* 24, *pag.* 42, 43. Apopompæi.

MARILLAC (Charles de) archbiſhop of Vienne, was born in Auvergne, about the year 1510. He was advocate in the Parliament of Paris, when perceiving himſelf ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm, he followed John de la Foreſt embaſſador of Francis I to Conſtantinople. Thus he avoided the terrible perſecution, which was to be feared from the inquiſitors. He was made ambaſſador to the Sultan after the death of la Foreſt, and afterwards was entruſted with ſeveral other embaſſies (*a*) of which he acquitted himſelf very well. He was abbot of St Pere (*b*), archbiſhop of Vienne, and a counſellor in the privy-council, when the aſſembly of the Notables was called at Fontainebleau in the month of Auguſt 1560. In it he delivered an harangue, wherein learning and eloquence did no leſs appear, than his zeal for the reformation of the diſorders in the church and ſtate [*A*]. There he adviſed, among other things, the calling of a national council, and a meeting of the ſtates general [*B*]. The Guiſes were offended at his harangue, and

(*a*) In England and Germany, *&c.*

(*b*) Near Melun.

[*A*] *He .... delivered an harangue, wherein learning and eloquence did no leſs appear, than his zeal for the reformation of the diſorders in church and ſtate.*] You will find it entire in the preſident de la Place, in the third book of the ſtate of religion and the republic; and in the Hiſtory of Francis II, written by Lewis Regnier. Theſe two writers agree in ſaying, that the archbiſhop of Vienne, who gave his opinion after the other counſellors of the privy-council, carried away the prize of honour. *For as he was a perſon endowed with ſingular gifts and graces, and had been employed for a long time in embaſſies of great importance far and near with great applauſe; ſo he did not only deliver his opinion very learnedly, as was believed, but alſo gave ſatisfaction to the greateſt part of the company* (1). Theſe words of Lewis Regnier precede the harangue of Marillac, and theſe are the words that follow it: *Such was the learned, wiſe, and Chriſtian ſpeech of this great perſon, who lived not long after it, being as it is ſaid intimidated by thoſe whom he had diſpleaſed. Others ſay, that ſeeing how things grew worſe and worſe he died of grief* (2). Mr Varillas gives us an abſtract of this ſpeech, but not without ſome falſifications, of which this is one: he ſuppoſes, that Marillac repreſented, *That the antient affection of the French for their king was notably diminiſhed, and that there was no other way to reſtore it but by an aſſembly of the States, that this was the only tribunal appointed to hear the complaints of the whole nation, and to ſatisfy them, as the other tribunals were for ending differences between private perſons: that the ancient founders of the French monarchy had only reſerved to themſelves this place, wherein they might ſhare with the king in the abſolute authority they had given him; where they might be admitted to a kind of equality, which was neceſſary for repairing what the prince had uſurped over his ſubjects, and what the ſubjects had uſurped over their prince; and laſtly, where the ſupreme and unlimited power, wherewith they had inveſted him, ſhould not hinder them from negotiating and concluding treaties with him, which ſhould be obligatory on both ſides: that this moderate liberty had maintained the crown for eleven hundred years, by the wonderful counterpoiſe wherewith power and ſubmiſſion were balanced* (3). It is certain that the archbiſhop of Vienne ſaid nothing that contained theſe maxims, either formally or virtually, if I may uſe this word. How can we truſt the abſtracts which this Hiſtorian makes of MSS, when we ſee that he corrupts printed ſpeeches? You may ſee in the next remark, how far he took the liberty to alter and falſify them.

(1) Lewis Regnier, Hiſtory of Francis II, *pag.* 523, 524.

(2) Id. ib. *pag.* 553.

(3) Varillas, Hiſt. of Francis II, *book ii, pag. m.* 230.

[*B*] *He adviſed ..... the calling ..... of the ſtates general.*] He made uſe of the moſt ſolid reaſons that could be alledged, and anſwered very well the objections, and particularly that which was taken from this, *that the authority of the king would be diminiſhed.* Thoſe who ſay this, anſwered he (4), *ſeem to me not to know the hearts of the French, who have always done for their king what lay in their power; and to require more were an unjuſt exaction and an impoſſibility. And therefore to propoſe to kings things that are juſt, is to eſtabliſh their authority, and not to diminiſh it, ſince they cannot do otherwiſe without violating the name of a king; and by that means the king may expect to obtain every thing he has a mind to, ſince he has ſo good a people that they will refuſe him nothing. And if it be replied, that the king ſtints himſelf who has nothing without the conſent of the people; I anſwer that ſince without aſſembling the States, and hearing the reaſons which moved the prince to increaſe the ancient offices, the people have formerly obeyed, without contradiction; what will not they do when they believe, that the reaſons of the demand, made to the States, will be found juſt? If it be urged, that this is to make the people judges, whether what the king demands is juſt. It may be replied, that, among many people aſſembled, the greateſt part of them will ſeek the public good, and that the people are capable of underſtanding what is for their own advantage, and ſo of conſenting to it, ſince the voice of the people is commonly that which is approved by GOD.* Can any thing be more unlike, than this diſcourſe of the archbiſhop of Vienne, to the words of Varillas related before? But the better to diſcover that this Hiſtorian did not apprehend the deſign of what he undertook to abridge, I muſt here ſet down another paſſage of Marillac's ſpeech. We ſhall there ſee what were his thoughts, as well with reſpect to politics as to religion: and we ſhall find that as to the latter he reſembled Eraſmus; for he would have abuſes reformed, but not to make uſe of arms, either to ſupport the reformation of the church or to oppreſs the reformers. The fourth preparative, ſaid he, is (5). ‘ That until the aſſembling of the council, ‘ the ſeditious be checked and reſtrained, ſo that ‘ they may not diſturb the tranquillity and peace of ‘ men, and to take this for an undoubted maxim, that ‘ it is not lawful to take up arms on any pretence ‘ whatſoever, without the will, command, and permiſſion, of the prince, who has the ſole diſpoſal of ‘ them. This I ſay, becauſe of the ſad examples that ‘ have lately happened, and whereof we have daily ‘ new informations. On one ſide we have ſeen the

(4) Lewis Regnier, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 548.

(5) Ib. *pag.* 537.

and obſtructed all the good effects of his counſels. He endeavoured to take good meaſures to prevent the miſchiefs wherewith the kingdom was threatened (c); but ſeeing no probability of ſucceeding in it, he fell into a melancholy, which brought upon him a diſeaſe, whereof he quickly after died (d), on the ſecond of December, 1560, at his abbey of St Pere. **Gabriel de MARILLAC**, his brother, died advocate-general in the parliament of Paris in 1551, and was an able underſtanding man, and of an exemplary probity: conſult Thuanus (e). You will find in Moreri's Dictonary, a very long article of our Charles de Marillac, and a long account of ſeveral perſons of this family; but you will find nothing there about **Francis de MARILLAC**, advocate in the parliament of Paris, under Henry II. I ſhall ſay ſomething of him in my commentary [C]. I do not think that the advocate I have mentioned in another place (f), was a different

‘ tumult of Amboiſe, under colour of preſenting a confeſſion, whereas it ought to have been brought with all humility: on the other ſide, ſeveral preachers have endeavoured to raiſe up the people for the extirpation of the Proteſtants, under colour of a holy ſedition; as if religion allowed, that either for the planting or preſerving of it, it was lawful to make uſe of ſedition. Thus on both ſides there was a fault: for as before men were killed on pretence that they were Proteſtants; ſo, on the contrary, the judges were forced, and the ordinary courts were aſſaulted, to make them deliver up the Proteſtant priſoners: and thus under the maſk of religion, ſeveral uſurped the authority of the magiſtrate, and took up arms, which was in no wiſe lawful, but rather forbidden to them all. For the deſign of the law is to live godly, and not to offend any body: and the deſign of arms is to cauſe the law to be obeyed. The king therefore being the conſervator of the law, and for that end ordained by GOD, is conſequently the ſole diſpoſer of arms, which are given him to puniſh thoſe that tranſgreſs the law. Wherefore to conclude, he makes himſelf king, who takes up arms by his own authority, and is not ordained by GOD to be one. And hence it follows, that every body ſhould oppoſe him, as being one that reſiſts the ordinance of GOD, which has appointed a king.

WHETHER the meeting of the ſtates general is advantageous to France.

How wiſe ſoever the advices of this archbiſhop were concerning the convocation of the States, they were much cenſured by a famous Civilian: for Stephen Paſquier writes thus upon this ſubject (6). ‘ He who firſt gave this advice of holding a meeting of the States, was Charles Marillac. He, in the aſſembly at Fontainbleau (either becauſe the affairs of France were not governed according to his mind, or upon ſome other occaſion) by a ſudden impulſe of nature made a ſtrong remonſtrance, wherein after he had conſidered all ſorts of advices he could think of, he declared that he found no remedy more effectual for the preſent evil, than to call together the States. It is an old folly, that runs in the mind of the wiſeſt French, that nothing can ſo much relieve the people, as ſuch aſſemblies: Whereas, on the contrary, nothing does them greater prejudice, as I could prove by an infinite number of reaſons, but that I ſhould exceed the bounds of a letter. This opinion at firſt troubled a little the cardinal of Lorrain, who was afraid leſt it ſhould give a check to the king, and deſtroy the authority which he and the duke of Guiſe had in the government during the minority of the young king their nephew. And indeed from that time this archbiſhop was never looked upon by him with a good eye, and voluntarily baniſhed himſelf from court. Nevertheleſs after he had conſulted with his ſervants, of what conſequence this convocation of the States might be, and finding that it could be no prejudice to the king, whom he and his brother had made the moſt powerful, he was ſo far from rejecting this opinion, that he embraced it very heartily, as thinking it might prove a means for exterminating with the greater aſſurance and ſolemnity all the Proteſtants of France.’ Paſquier obſerves, that the death of Francis II ſpoiled in an inſtant the deſigns of this cardinal; and having related part of what was enacted in the meeting of the ſtates of Orleans, he adds (7): *But for a general concluſion, they have granted for five years to the king, a ſubſidy of five ſous, for each barrel of wine that is brought into the walled towns. This is for the moſt part the end and concluſion of ſuch aſſemblies, to draw money from the people, by an honeſt bargain between the king and his three eſtates.* Note, I pray you, that Paſquier boaſted that *he had an infinite number of reaſons*, to prove, that nothing is more pernicious to France, than the meeting of the ſtates general. I do not doubt but he could have produced many reaſons upon this ſubject, and I believe alſo that our Charles Marillac could have replied to them all, and that it is a matter which men may diſpute eternally *pro* and *con*. But if we appeal to experience, it is apparent, that the opinion of Paſquier muſt prevail: for it would be very difficult, to ſhow any advantage France has drawn from theſe aſſemblies, and eaſy to prove, that they only ſerved to encourage confuſions (8). The Engliſh have reaſon to ſay, that the frequent meeting of parliaments is neceſſary for the good of their country; but France cannot ſay the ſame thing of the meeting of her ſtates general. They were often called together under the reign of the ſons of Henry II, and France was never more embroiled and haraſſed than at that time; and inſtead of finding a remedy by theſe meetings, the grievances were made worſe by them. No man ought more freely to own this truth than thoſe of the Reformed religion, for in theſe aſſemblies their enemies got new ſtrength. There are ſome who compare the meeting of the ſtates general with the councils. They are, ſay they, aſſemblies that bode ill; they ſignify that the public evils are great, and that men begin to deſpair of curing them. It happens then, as in diſeaſes that are almoſt deſperate, many Phyſicians are called for and ſent for from remote places; they conſult, they diſpute, they ſeldom agree, and at laſt they muſt come to a majority of votes, and ſo manage the matter that the ſick man may ſay, *The multitude of Phyſicians has killed me* (9). Fine harangues are not wanting in theſe aſſemblies, and much leſs cabals and intrigues; and for the moſt part the concluſion is not the effect of juſtice and truth, but of the moſt powerful faction.

[C] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of Francis de MARILLAC .... in my commentary.*] He and Peter Robert were appointed council to the prince of Condé, in 1560, in the proſecution for a capital crime, which made ſo much noiſe, and which, as was thought, would have made him loſe his head upon a ſcaffold. ‘ Cum præcipiti Guiſianorum violentia, amputatas omnes moras videret Condæi uxor, libello ſupplice à rege petit & impetrat, ut marito homines ſpectatæ eruditionis ac prudentiæ darentur, quorum conſilio uteretur: Nominati à Rege Petrus Robertus & Franciſcus Marillacus celeberrimi in foro patroni (10).’ I cite theſe words of Thuanus, becauſe they diſcover the reputation of Francis de Marillac. He had been not long before advocate to Anne du Bourg. They have put in the Index to the Hiſtory of Francis II, that *Marillac the advocate betrayed du Bourg in pleading for him.* This ought to be explained, for otherwiſe it might be inferred from it, that this advocate was a traitor and a prevaricator, and this would be a great injury done to him, ſince there was nothing in all his management but an officious lie, which was deſigned to ſave his client's life. The matter of fact is thus related by the Sieur de la Planche (11). ‘ His cauſes of recuſation (12) were by a decree pronounced by Olivier, declared admiſſible, and it was ordered that he ſhould have counſel, which had been before denied him, ſo that the cardinal was confounded. The advocate Marillac was aſſigned him for counſel, and he uſed all his endeavours to make him depart from his confeſſion, alledging, that without this he could not avoid death; but not being able to prevail with him to do it, he perſuaded him to let him plead without interrupting him, and then he might

‘ ſay

(c) See, above, the article LONGVIC, remarks [*A*] and [*B*].

(d) Unde Vienneñſis in profundum mœrorem & ex mœrore in letalem morbum incidit, ex quo paulo poſt deceſſit. *Thuan. ubi infra.*

(e) Thuan. *lib. xxvi*, init. *pag. m.* 520, ad ann. 1560. *See the remark* [*E*].

(f) In citation (85) of the article HENRY III

(6) Paſquier's Letters, *book iv, pag.* 192, 193, of the firſt tome.

(7) Id. ib. *pag.* 195.

(8) *This is one of the reaſons which Charles de Marillac had to oppoſe. He denied not the fact.* Some, *ſays he, Hiſt. of Francis II, ubi ſupra, pag.* 550, have ſet forth, what happened in the time of king John, when the ſtates obliged the dauphin to take ſeveral indecent courſes.

(9) Hinc illæ circa ægros miſeræ ſententiarum concertationes, nullo idem cenſente ne videatur acceſſio alterius. Hinc illa infelicis monumenti inſcriptio, TURBA SE MEDICORUM PERISSE. *Plin. lib. xxix, cap. i, pag. m.* 667. *Compare this with what has been ſaid above, citation* (28) *of the article HADRIAN.*

(10) Thuan. *lib. xxvi, pag.* 522, *col.* 1.

(11) Lewis Regnier, Sieur de la Planche, Hiſtory of Francis II, *pag.* 53. *Beza has tranſcribed all this paſſage word for word in the* Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Churches, *lib. iii, pag.* 222.

(12) That is, thoſe which du Bourg had alledged.

a different man from that Charles de MARILLAC, of whom la Croix du Maine ſays, that he was a *gentleman of Paris, a kinſman of the archbiſhop of Vienne, an advocate in parliament,* &c. *a young man very learned in Greek, and well verſed in many ſciences, and that he died at Paris in* 1581, *or thereabouts, to the great grief of all his friends* (g). I find in Father Anſelme (*h*) one Charles de MARILLAC, who died counſellor in the parliament of Paris, April 10, 1580, and who was ſon to William de MARILLAC, brother to the archbiſhop of Vienne. There is no difference between that advocate and this counſellor [*D*]. Note, that la Croix du Maine obſerves that this prelate *wrote ſeveral books, of which there are but few printed, and that thoſe that are in print, are not licenſed, there being a reaſon for it* (*i*). Gilbert de MARILLAC, baron of Puiſac and St Geneſt, eldeſt brother to our archbiſhop of Vienne (*k*), *writ a hiſtory of the houſe of Bourbon, and, among the reſt, the life and great actions of the conſtable Charles de Bourbon, till the month of March* 1521, *when he began his revolt.* Antony de la Val, *the king's Geographer, and captain of the caſtle of Moulins — has inſerted this hiſtory in his works printed in* 1605. The true name of this family was Marlhac [*E*].

(*g*) La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 46.

(*h*) Anſelme, Hiſt. of the great Officers, *pag.* 252.

(*i*) La Croix du Maine, ubi ſupra.

(*k*) Vigneul Marville Melange d'Hiſtoire & de Literat. *Tom. ii, pag.* 17, *Dutch Edit.* 1700.

‘ ſay what he thought fit. Being therefore come before the judges, the advocate remonſtrated the merits of the cauſe, the manner of the impriſonment, which was ſuch as never had been practiſed, and much leſs the manner of Bertrand's proceeding; who, being void of all ſhame and modeſty, had acted two or three parts in preſiding and aſſiſting at the three preceding judgments. Whereby the error did not only moſt evidently appear, but alſo the nullity of the ſentences and decree; ſo that it was neceſſary to begin the proceſs anew, to null and make void all the proceedings, ſince no forms of the courts of juſtice had been obſerved. But inſtead of concluding with his appeal, he ſubmitted, and had recourſe to the mercy of the king and the court; confeſſing that his client had grievouſly offended God and holy mother the church, provoked the king, and had been diſobedient to his biſhop, to whom, and the holy Roman church, he deſired to be reconciled. Whereupon du Bourg, who was preſent, endeavouring to oppoſe what had been ſaid, Marillac made a ſign to the preſidents, deſiring that his life might be ſaved by this means, who, inſtead of giving him a hearing, to know whether he acquieſced in what had been ſaid by his counſel, ſent him preſently back to his priſon. But while they were conſulting to depute two among them, to acquaint the king with his converſion, and to beg his pardon, a paper written and ſigned by du Bourg came, wherein he diſowned the concluſions of his advocate, perſiſting in his appeal, and in his confeſſion of faith made before the king.’

We ſee in a dialogue of Antony Loiſel, that the chief advocates of the parliament of Paris (13) were *Mr James Canaye of Paris, Claudius Mangot of Loudun, and Francis Marillac of Auvergne, who was more eſteemed than the other two, becauſe he made very good replies, but he was taken away in the prime of his years, ſo that his houſe hath been reduced to nothing, at leaſt if compared to thoſe of Canaye and Mangot.* Note, that he was of the ſame family with the other Marillacs (14).

[*D*] *There is no difference between that advocate and this counſellor.*] We will ſee what is ſaid of him in the ſame dialogue of Antony Loiſel (15). *Mr Charles Marillac ought not to be paſſed over in ſilence; for he acquired as much honour in that little time he was at the bar, as others do in all their lives. It is true, anſwered Mr Paſquier, he was one of the moſt ſenſible and learned men that then were; but you know the times in which we live, and the ſmall value that is ſet upon advocates, in compariſon of the counſellors, as we complained at the beginning, and not without cauſe. His relations did not give him time to ſhew his ſufficiency, and the ſtrength of his parts as an advocate, nor death, what he promiſed as a counſellor* *; *for he was taken off in the flower of his age* †. *I would ſay more of him, if he had not learned of me.*

[*E*] *The true name of this family was Marlhac.*] *It was thus, that Gabriel de Marillac, advocate-general of the parliament of Paris, ſigned in all the public acts and in his private letters* (16). The author whom I quote aſſures us (17), that *he learned this from an antient counſellor of ſtate, who knew very well the illuſtrious houſes and families of France.* After which he brings two paſſages to prove, that this advocate-general, *was as famous for his profound knowledge as his rare probity*; one is from Thuanus, and the other from *the ſuppplement to the chronicle written by John Carion.* He ſuppoſes that in the latter it is Gabriel Marillacus, but in my edition (18) it is Gabriel Marliacus. This might have ſerved him to confirm what he had advanced. We may add to theſe two paſſages, what Maludan writ to Denys Lambin (19). ‘ Mariliacus Regius Patronus, *a. d.* ix. Kal. Maias horâ quartâ pomeridianâ exceſſit è vitâ admodum Chriſtianè. Poſtridie funus duxerunt amici & propinqui ſine ullâ pompâ, ut moriens juſſerat: ſed non ſine omnium bonorum lachrymis. Deſiderant etiam inimici nunc ejus, λόγȣς ἐπιχειρηματικȣ̀ς καὶ βιαίȣς, καὶ χρειώδεις. Eo Patrono fiſcum nemo unquam dicere potuit, lienem: ut loquebatur olim Trajanus. In demortui locum ſuffectus eſt Ridens (20). - - - - *Marillac, the king's advocate departed this life in a moſt Chriſtian manner, on the twenty third of April at four in the afternoon. The next day he was interred, as he had deſired, without any pomp, his friends and relations accompanying the funeral, as himſelf had ordered: but not unlamented by all good men. Even his enemies now found the want of his free, forcible, and uſeful ſpeeches. When he was of counſel, none could ever call treaſure a grievance, as Trajan of old was wont to ſay. Into his place a gentleman of mirth was appointed.*’ But nothing is more proper to confirm what was ſaid by a counſellor of ſtate to Mr de Vigneul Marville, than the marginal note which is in the 504th page of Antony Loiſel's ſmall pieces. Here it is entire. ‘ He (21) is called Marlhac by Miraumont, and by Coquille, who in his Commentaries on the Cuſtom of Nivernois, chap. 1, art. 5. relates from him a maxim of the French law, with great praiſe, in theſe words: *and as that very learned and good man, Mr Gabriel Marlac ſaid, who was the king's advocate in parliament, and a good model for the young advocates who uſed to be at the pleadings in the ſaid parliament,* every fraud deſerves in France extraordinary and corporal puniſhment, tho' it be managed as a civil affair.’

(13) Loiſel Dialogue des advocats du Parlement de Paris, *pag.* 520.

(14) Loiſel's Opuſcul. *pag.* 707.

(15) Ibid. *pag.* 551.

* Blanchard names two Charles de Marillacs, counſellors; one in 1541, who was . . . at laſt archbiſhop of Vienne; the other was admitted the twentieth of March 1576, and is the advocate of whom we are ſpeaking.

† In 1580, Blanchard.

(16) Vigneul Marville Melange. *Tom. ii, pag.* 16. *Dutch Edit.*

(17) Ibid.

(18) That of Paris, *ex Officina Puteana*, 1563, in 16mo.

(19) Maludan Epiſt. ad Lambinum, *pag.* 367, Epiſtol. clarorum Virorum *Edit. Lugd.* 1561. *I found this paſſage in Mr Joly's notes on Loiſel's* Opuſcula, *pag.* 707. *See there in the* 630*th page, a paſſage of the* Ciceronianus *of* Peter Ramus.

(20) That is Denys Riant made the king's advocate in 1551.

(21) That is to ſay, Gabriel Marillac who was made the king's advocate in 1543.

MARILLAC (Lewis de) marſhal of France, ſon to William de MARILLAC, who was brother to the archbiſhop of Vienne, was a poſthumous ſon, born in 1573 (*a*), or, according to others, in the month of July, 1572 (*b*). You will find in Moreri's Dictionary (*c*), the employments that he had ſucceſſively, till he was ſeized in Italy by the king's order in 1630. He was tried and condemned to loſe his head, and was executed at Paris May the 10th, 1632. The curioſity of the Pariſians was ſo great, that a hundred thouſand perſons were witneſſes of the execution, and that

(*a*) Anſelme, Hiſt. of the great Officers, *pag.* 251.

(*b*) The Paris Gazette, *May* 17, 1632.

(*c*) Correct what he ſays in it, *that he ſerved Henry III on divers occaſions.* He ſhould have ſaid Henry IV.

ſome windows were let for eight piſtoles (d). The opinion moſt common is, that he was an innocent victim, ſacrificed to the reſentment of cardinal Richelieu; but this can hardly be believed by perſons who are not governed by prejudices, and ſubmit only to certainty [*A*]. I ſhall make ſome obſervations thereupon (*e*), and I imagine I ſhall not be

[*A*] *The common opinion is, that he was an innocent victim . . . . . but this can hardly be believed by perſons who . . . ſubmit only to certainty.*] The remark [*F*] in the article of Lewis XIII, might ſuffice for a commentary upon this text. Nevertheleſs I ſhall add to it many things. And firſt I ſhall obſerve, that it is at preſent (1) much more difficult to diſcover the truth, than at the time when the cauſe againſt Mr Marillac was pleaded, for then one might have been informed of matters by an infinite number of perſons who knew this marſhal. One might then have enquired in the places where he commanded, and have learned the names, the titles, the intereſts, and reputation, of the witneſſes, and the practices that were uſed on both ſides to put them on, either to depoſe or to retract. All this, and a hundred other things which at the time of the proceſs were eaſy, are now impoſſible to be known; that generation is now wholly paſſed and gone, and we can only make uſe of the prejudice, or the books, which remain of that time. Let us enquire a little what the favourers of this marſhal might ſay, to thoſe whom they would perſuade of his innocence, and whom they perceive to be fully reſolved to admit nothing but upon good proof.

In the firſt place they might ſay, that the public was then perſuaded, and is ſtill, that he was guilty of nothing but diſpleaſing the cardinal. II. That it is notoriouſly known, that the cardinal was ſo revengeful, that he ſpared nothing to ſatisfy his reſentment. III. That he was a perſon of ſo great credit, that he could compaſs his deſigns, either by promiſes or threatenings. IV. That the proceedings were attended with ſo many irregularities, all unjuſt, and fit to oppreſs the moſt innocent perſons, that this alone is ſufficient to ſhow that the marſhal was not guilty. V. That his ſentence was reverſed by a decree of the parliament of Paris, after the death of cardinal Richelieu. The greateſt part of the people do ſo little diſpute the grounds on which they are made to believe ſome things, that they would eaſily acquieſce in the five reaſons now propoſed: but there are others who have ſo little faith, and are ſo very hard to be perſuaded, that they would not think them ſufficient grounds for their belief.

How much cardinal Richelieu was hated.

I. To the firſt reaſon they would anſwer, that the public opinion cannot be more ſuſpected on any occaſion than on this. Cardinal Richelieu was become ſo odious through all France, that all the evil that could be ſaid of his conduct, was eaſily believed without any enquiry. He was in ſuch a poſt wherein moſt men are expoſed to calumny, and the hatred of the people, and therein he hehaved himſelf in ſuch a manner as to draw upon him an infinite number of enemies; for he daily encreaſed the ſovereign authority, and puniſhed great men who durſt riſe up and cabal. This was to force them from an evil cuſtom which was very pleaſing, and had been often profitable to them. He oppreſſed the people much more than had been done in other reigns. In a word, the yoke of the royal authority, which had always been too heavy in the people's opinion, was become more inſupportable than ever, under his miniſtry. The people therefore were much diſpoſed to ſpeak ill of his perſon, and they ſwallowed down with joy, and as a kind of reſtorative, all the ſatires, complaints, and murmurings, which were ſpread againſt his reputation. France was then full of malecontents; what was formerly called the Catholicon, and which cauſed ſo many miſchiefs, had left ſome roots that remained ſtill. The greateſt part of the devout people, and all the bigots, were enraged becauſe the cardinal ſupported the Proteſtants of Holland and Germany, and hindred the houſe of Auſtria from ſubduing them. If he did good to ſome perſons, they were thought unworthy of it: if he perſecuted ſome, his enemies complained, and bewailed their being unworthily uſed (2). What relations were made of the laſt moments of thoſe whom he got condemned? What care was taken to collect all their pious diſcourſes, all their acts of love of God; it ſeemed as if they had a deſign to ſwell the martyrology, or to imitate that Fannius; whom I have mentioned in another place (3). The execution at Lyons was never mentioned, but in a ſtyle of complaints. This was very reaſonable, as to Mr Thuanus; but as to Mr de Cinqmars, it was not enough to pity him; but they ſhould alſo have deteſted his vanity, ingratitude, and rebellion. Now ſince the public was thus diſpoſed towards cardinal Richelieu, thoſe who will believe nothing but what is ſupported with good proofs, can never be gained by this argument: *The general opinion is, that marſhal de Marillac was only guilty of diſpleaſing the cardinal, therefore he was guilty of nothing elſe.*

II. The ſecond reaſon has nothing in it that is convincing, ſince the experience of all tyrannic reigns ſhows, that wicked men fall ſometimes into diſgrace under a bad prince, or a very unjuſt favourite, who ſacrifices to his revenge every body, who has the misfortune to diſpleaſe him. Read attentively Tacitus, and the other relations of the ſame time, and you will find ſome wicked men among thoſe that were puniſhed under Tiberius, and under Nero. The informers attacked ſometimes perſons of a bad life, and who could eaſily be convicted of the crimes they were accuſed of. For any one therefore to conclude, becauſe ſuch an one loſt his head upon the ſcaffold under a bad reign, therefore he was innocent, is to admit a deceitful conſequence, and to run the hazard of being deluded by a manifeſt ſophiſm. Much more ought we to take heed of this kind of reaſoning, when we ſpeak of Lewis XIII, who was a very good king, and whoſe chief miniſter, how violent and revengeful ſoever he was, was obliged to obſerve better meaſures than are obſerved in a tyrannic reign.

III. To the third reaſon the ſame anſwer may be given as to the ſecond. Thoſe, whoſe power was ſo great, that they could find witneſſes and judges enough to take away the lives of innocent men, have had ſometimes enemies who were wicked men, and whom they puniſhed with death without doing any thing that is unjuſt and unreaſonable. Thus, tho' cardinal Richelieu had been a hundred times more unjuſt and more powerful than he was, yet we cannot thence infer the innocence of any one of thoſe whom he got condemned: for perhaps this concluſion might be drawn in favour of thoſe guilty perſons, who periſh ſometimes in the courts of tyrants. We muſt therefore lay aſide all prejudices, and examine each proceſs in particular. This is the only expedient, for diſcovering whether ſuch and ſuch are innocent victims ſacrificed to the reſentment of cardinal Richelieu.

IV. Now we are come to the great and only expedient. The perſons whom I ſpeak of, who carefully enquire into the truth of what is propoſed to them to be believed, would deſire that the monſtrous irregularities might be proved, which are alledged to be in the proceedings of the commiſſioners who condemned our marſhal: and if they were anſwered, that all thoſe, who might witneſs the truth of it, are dead; they ought to reply, how then do you know this? They would undoubtedly then be referred to two printed pieces, whereof one is intituled, *A true relation of what paſſed at the tryal of marſhal Marillac, and of the execution of the ſentence given againſt him by the commiſſioners of the court of juſtice, eſtabliſhed at Ruel, and of his laſt words and actions juſt before his death*; and the other is intituled, *The happy ſoul of marſhal de Marillac, to the unhappy ſoul of cardinal Richelieu.* It is true, will the others reply, we ought to examine theſe two pieces; but withal we muſt examine a printed piece, which appeared at the ſame time with this title, *Obſervations on the Life and Condemnation of Marſhal de Marillac, and upon the libel intituled,* A Relation of what paſſed at his tryal, and at the execution of the ſentence given againſt him, &c. The author of thoſe two firſt pieces is not known; but it is certain the third was written by Mr du Chaſtelet, a man remarkable for his birth and his offices (4); for he was advocate-general in the parliament of Rennes, maſter of the requeſts, counſellor of ſtate

---

(*d*) The Paris Gazette, *May* 17, 1632.

(*e*) See the remark [*A*].

(1) I write this in Octob. 1700.

(2) See, above, citation (41) of the article **LEWIS XIII.**

(3) Above, remark [*A*] of the article FANNIUS.

(4) See the Hiſtory of the French Academy, *pag.* 246, 247, *Edit. of Paris*, 1672.

be blamed, if I ſet down part of the things which Mr du Chaſtelet publiſhed to the diſadvantage of this marſhal. Every one may believe as he pleaſes, and ſince he was his enemy, I am willing that he ſhould paſs for a very ſuſpected witneſs. I ſhall not offer theſe things but as detractions which he publiſhed, not in that Latin ſatire in rhimed proſe (*f*), wherein the flights of imagination might have too large a ſhare, but in a ſerious and grave piece, wherein he refutes the Apologiſts of his enemy. He ſays therefore (*g*), that the father of marſhal Marillac, ‘ was advanced from the office of maſter ‘ of the accounts, to that of comptroller-general of the finances, and left a very ſmall ‘ eſtate to his children. He was born with a handſome body, and a ready wit, and ‘ employed himſelf chiefly in learning his exerciſes, which he attained to perfection. ‘ Being not rich enough to ſubſiſt of himſelf, he lived commonly with the marquis de ‘ Cœuvre, who being highly in favour with the ducheſs of Beaufort, had much a-do to ‘ ſave

(*f*) See the *Hiſtory of the French Academy, pag. m.* 247.

(*g*) *Du Chaſtelet's Obſervations on the Life and Condemation of marſhal de Marillac, p.* 770. *of the Collection of ſeveral Pieces uſeful for Hiſtory, Edit.* 1643, 4to.

in ordinary, and intendant of juſtice in the royal army. His piece therefore ought to be eſteemed of greater weight than the anonymous writings, which are to be ſeen in the collection of what was publiſhed in defence of the queen-mother. Now we ſee that Mr du Chaſtelet denies and refutes all that had been alledged about unjuſt and irregular proceedings; and maintains, that the moſt exact formalities were obſerved in the tryal of marſhal Marillac: unleſs therefore you prove that he has aſſerted ſome facts that were falſe, and denyed others that were true, we cannot acquieſce in thoſe two anonymous pieces. One thing which he does not deny, and we know moſt certainly, is, that Mr Marillac was not tryed by the parliament of Paris, but by a court of commiſſioners. This is a very ſtrong prejudice to the diſadvantage of the cardinal; it is very well known what judges extraordinarily created are capable of, when they are choſen by ſuch as are enemies to the party accuſed (5). However ſince we now ſeek for inconteſtable proofs, or ſuch at leaſt as are ſtronger than great preſumptions, we do not pretend that this can determine us to believe the marſhal innocent. We have ſome inſtances under that reign, which prove, that ſome commiſſioners, choſen by Cardinal Richelieu, did all that could be expected from a court of the greateſt integrity. Thoſe who judged Mr de Cinqmars followed the practice in criminal cauſes with the greateſt exactneſs (6). Mr de Laubardemont, who was thought to be entirely devoted to the paſſions of the cardinal, was the reporter of the proceſs. His report hath been printed (7), which is as clear, exact, and agreeable to the rules, as ever was ſeen. The fact was proved by clear and full evidence, and after this no good judge in the kingdom could judge otherwiſe than the commiſſioners did who condemned Cinqmars. There was an extraordinary court appointed in the next reign for judging Mr Fouquet, and none had reaſon to ſay that it oppreſſed the innocent: much leſs could any ſuch thing be ſaid of that which prepared the proceſs of the duke of Luxembourg and judged him. If we inſiſt upon prejudices, they will be found to favour the cardinal Richelieu, as to the commiſſioners of marſhal Marillac. The chief man of the long robe, the keeper of the ſeals, was placed at the head of them: the others were either maſters of the requeſts, or preſidents, or counſellors in the parliament of Burgundy, *&c.* They referred to the council of ſtate the greateſt part of the matters that came before them, and proceeded no further in them, but by virtue of the decrees of that council: ſo that if we will ſuppoſe that marſhal Marillac was an innocent victim, we muſt ſuppoſe that his judges, in number twenty three, and the greateſt part of the counſellors of ſtate, had conſpired the ruin of an innocent man. This is hard to ſuppoſe; for common ſenſe inclines us rather to believe, that a military man has been guilty of evil practices, than to ſuppoſe that ſo great a number of ſuch magiſtrates ſhould agree to condemn an innocent man (8). Note, I pray you, that though ten of the judges did not think him worthy of death, yet all of them thought him guilty: and for this I refer my ſelf to the narrative of Mr du Chaſtelet. *After each of the judges had, with an equal affection to juſtice, proved his opinion by the beſt reaſons the ſubject could afford, and the laws and proofs had been well canvaſſed for the ſpace of two hours, all their votes were reduced to theſe two opinions. Thirteen judged him worthy of death, and ten of them were for depriving him of his honour, his offices, and eſtate, and changing the ſentence of death into perpetual baniſhment, or elſe impriſonment, at the choice of the king, and in ſuch a place as his majeſty ſhould pleaſe to keep him, as had been often practiſed with ſuch perſons* (9).’ One of the apologiſts for Mr Marillac confeſſes, that the cardinal *mixed among the new commiſſioners three or four perſons of great integrity, which he did,* as he adds, *the better to conceal his deſign, when he believed that his party was ſo ſtrong, that they would carry it for his condemnation, againſt thoſe who were for acquitting him*(10). Is not this to acknowledge that three or four perſons of great integrity judged him worthy of perpetual baniſhment, or perpetual impriſonment? And would any good man vote againſt him, whom he believes to be innocent? In fine, I obſerve, that among ſo many people, whom cardinal Richelieu perſecuted, baniſhed, and impriſoned, there were but few whom he tryed in courts: which is a ſign, that he did not think himſelf ſtrong enough to find witneſſes and commiſſioners to his mind. He did not therefore appoint commiſſioners, but when he was ſure that the behaviour of an enemy, ſuch as that of St Preuil was for inſtance, would furniſh ſufficient proofs to the commiſſioners.

V. As to the fifth reaſon, ſee hereafter the remark [*K*].

Here two objections do offer themſelves, which deſerved to be diſcuſſed. It may be alledged: 1. That we muſt not conſider the writing of Mr du Chaſtelet, and the two anonymous pieces I have cited as being of equal weight. 2. That the injuſtice of the cardinal is viſible at leaſt in this, that he cauſed a marſhal of France to be put to death, for ſuch crimes as did not deſerve ſo great a puniſhment; and which he left unpuniſhed when people had not diſpleaſed him.

As to the firſt of theſe two difficulties, I muſt obſerve, that it is not without reaſon I pretend, that the writing of Mr du Chaſtelet is of equal weight with the two anonymous pieces. I know very well, that being appointed one of the judges, he was excepted againſt as the author of a very bitter ſatire againſt Meſſieurs Marillac, and that the marſhal, when he was at the bar, did very much provoke him by his reproaches (11). I know alſo that he owned himſelf to be juſtly excepted againſt, and that he did not aſſiſt at the judgment, and that he made in priſon thoſe remarks I have mentioned, to reconcile himſelf to the court, and to procure his own liberty (12). He was therefore one, you will ſay, who wrote on one ſide to ſatisfy his hatred, and on the other, to gain the favour of cardinal Richelieu. But pray, upon what motives did the other write the two pieces, which I ſet againſt Mr du Chaſtelet's? Had not they an extreme hatred againſt the cardinal, and a paſſionate deſire to favour marſhal Marillac? Ought we to diſtruſt leſs a writer of invectives, than a flattering writer? Do you think that thoſe fugitives who wrote at Bruſſels for the queen-mother (13), thinking to make their court to the Spaniards, by defaming the cardinal, and being exceeding angry to ſee, that the advantages they expected by adhering to the intereſt of this queen, were all vaniſhed away, by the ſuperiority of the cardinal's party: do you think, I ſay that theſe writers were more credible than thoſe that were hired by this chief miniſter and flattered him. It ought not to be accounted partiality, if the one be ſuſpected as well as the other.

WHETHER flatterers corrupt the truth of Hiſtory more than ſatirical writers.

Satire and flattery are the two plagues of hiſtory, two ſources that poiſon the relations of human events; but we may ſay, that the contagion of a detracting writer, who is governed by hatred and reſentment, is more pernicious to hiſtory, than the contagion of thoſe who write panegyrics. One of the moſt celebrated hiſto-

(5) See the remark [*F*[of the article **GRANDIER.**

(6) See, at the end of the *Memoirs of Montreſor*, the advices and inſtructions which cardinal Richelieu gave concerning this proceſs, and the way how the judges managed it.

(7) See the ſame Memoirs of Montreſor.

(8) Note, that this is not given for a rule; for it is well known that many judges have been corrupted: but here I inſiſt upon the circumſtances of this particular trial.

(9) Chaſtelet's Obſervations, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 806, 807.

(10) L'Eſprit bienheureux du Marêchal de Marillac, *pag. m.* 60.

(11) See the relation of the proceſs and condemnation of marſhal Marillac, *pag.* 7.

(12) See the *Hiſtory of the French Academy, pag.* 248.

(13) Note, that the two anonymous pieces I have mentioned are printed in the *Collection of the Pieces for the Defence of the Queen-Mother.*

‘ ſave his life, and obtain his pardon, after the murder of Caboche, whom he had killed upon a ſmall provocation, and when he was not in a condition to defend himſelf. Theſe great obligations engaged him more cloſely to ſerve his benefactor, who entruſted with him the ſecret of his amours, and becauſe he was not faithful in that affair, he broke off all further converſation with him. — He lived afterwards in the court upon his good mein, and under the name of handſome Marillac, ſeeking all opportunities of ſhowing his addreſs and fine ſhape in public, and of making himſelf agreeable to the deceaſed king, who nevertheleſs treated him always as a mean perſon, and one day at Zamet's houſe turned him out from the table where he ſat, with many others. All ‘ theſe

rians of antiquity obſerves, that the hiſtories they had of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, were not faithful, becauſe they were written, either in their life-time, or little after their death: the former by perſons whom fear made to falſify the truth, the latter by ſuch as hatred, ſtill recent, did equally influence (14). He obſerves in another place, that the truth had been corrupted on one ſide by the flatterers of princes and on the other ſide by the malecontents of the government, and that both of them took little care to inform poſterity right; for the readers muſt either chooſe an hiſtorian that is officious to pleaſe, or one that is an enemy. But one can more eaſily ſecure himſelf from the impoſture of a flatterer, than of a cenſurer: mercenary pens ſoon diſguſt, and men greedily ſwallow detraction and malice. Flattery is looked upon as a vile ſlavery, and the malice of a writer as a generous love of liberty. It is impoſſible to think of theſe things more juſtly, and therefore I ſhall give you the original of ſo judicious an obſervation (15). *Poſtquam bellatum apud actium, atque omnem poteſtatem ad unum conferri pacis interfuit; magna illa ingenia ceſſere. Simul veritas pluribus modis infracta, primum inſcitia Reip. ut alienæ mox libidine aſſentandi, aut rurſus odio adverſus dominantes. Ita neutris cura poſteritatis, inter infenſos vel obnoxios. Sed ambitionem ſcriptoris facile adverſeris: obtrectatio & livor pronis auribus accipiuntur, quippe adulationi fœdum crimen ſervitutis, malignitati falſa ſpecies libertatis ineſt.* It is certain, commonly ſpeaking, that the praiſes of flatterers ſink with thoſe to whom they are given, and that poſterity is not deceived by them; but a critical hiſtory of great men, written with a well-governed malice, is never loſt. This kind of falſhood does more eaſily impoſe upon ſucceeding ages than the other, for its activity is eternal. The flatterers themſelves gather up this like manna ſeveral ages after, and make uſe of it to ſet off the merit of their heroes. They praiſe without any bounds, and to make you believe that they do not love flattery, they revile, without mercy, thoſe that are dead; and herein they are the very reverſe of old men (16). Mr le Laboureur diſcovered this trick in ſome writers, of his time. *If I purſue*, ſays he (17), *each good or bad heroe to his cradle, I will alſo examine his private actions, as well as thoſe which appeared great in the eyes of his cotemporaries; becauſe this is the only way to deſtroy all the unjuſt monuments that flattery has erected, and to break off or diſgrace the wretched trade of many writers, who are devoted to a ſervile and diſhoneſt intereſt, and are ſo indiſcreet, as to addreſs that to poſterity, which they have written only to ſerve a turn. We have many examples of it, but I find none that deſerves more to be blamed than that of ſome of the modern writers, who to make it appear, that they were forced by the truth to write in commendation of ſome perſons that are odious, or whoſe merit is very doubtful, and have nothing in them more commendable, but that that they are ſtill alive, and have it in their power to do the writer good, I ſay, to make this appear, they affect to defame the moſt accompliſhed men, from whom they have nothing to hope or fear, and treat them rather in the ſtyle of a ſatire than of a hiſtory, and freely beſpatter their memory with all the foul things, that a baſe and mercenary detraction can inſpire.*

Let us ſay ſomething of the ſecond difficulty, and let us grant, that it is very probable, that if marſhal Marillac had not endeavoured to ruin the cardinal, he would have had nothing to fear from a court of juſtice; and that if he had adhered to the intereſt of the cardinal, his embezzling of the publick money, and extortion, had not hindered the advancement of his fortune. He was not perhaps leſs guilty than ſuch and ſuch, who did not only commit the ſame crimes with impunity, but were amply rewarded for their ſervices by the recommendation of his enemy. He repreſented to his judges, ‘ that all his accuſations conſiſted in facts ſo inconſiderable, that they might be objected to every one that had the leaſt command in the army (18); *and he ſaid on the day of his execution,* That it was a ſtrange thing he ſhould be proſecuted as he had been, when the proceſs was only about hay, ſtraw, ſtones, wood, and lime, and that there was nothing in all this for which a lacquey would be whipped (19).’ Mr du Chaſtelet refutes this by very ſtrong reaſons (20); but it is certain, that the commanders of the troops at that time did commonly make uſe of a thouſand unjuſt ways to enrich themſelves. He makes a remark to this purpoſe, which is, that the marſhal's faults had paſſed unpuniſhed, if he had not incurred, upon other accounts, the indignation of the court. Weigh well theſe words (21). *The moſt rigorous ſtates have allowed, that commom crimes ſhould be paſſed over in the chief perſons: their ſplendor and eminent ſtation, together with the favour of their maſter, which is commonly annexed to it, covers common faults: but if it happen that malice and ungratefulneſs deſtroy the favour they enjoy, they are then levelled with the meaneſt of the kingdom, their faults appear equal, and they become ſubject to the penalties appointed againſt other ſubjects. All men employed in great offices, come to them only by the favour of their ſovereign, in whoſe hand all the laws are like flaming fires, to enlighten thoſe who pleaſe him, and to conſume others, when he thinks fit. Robberies and bad intrigues joyned together ruined this man.* He means that the court would have winked at ſuch-like extortions practiſed by another marſhal of France, if the reſt of his conduct had tended to the welfare of the ſtate; but ſince this man's factions tended only to ſow diviſion in the royal family for the advantage of the Spaniards (22), it was thought neceſſary to deliver him up to the rigour of juſtice. To ſpeak freely, thoſe who formed factions with Mary de Medicis, were altogether inexcuſable; for inſtead of cheriſhing in this princeſs the paſſionate deſire of dominion, they ſhould have adviſed her to be quiet and peaceable. She had taſted ſufficiently of the royal power in her husband's life-time, and during the minority of her ſon. When he became of age and was married, ſhe ought to have ſtudied only to lead a peaceable life as a queen dowager, without endeavouring to preſcribe to Lewis XIII the choice of ſuch and ſuch miniſters, and without quarrelling with them. I believe one might apply to her what Tiberius ſaid one day to the Widow of Germanicus. You take every thing for an injury that hinders you from reigning. *Nurum Agrippinam, poſt mortem mariti, liberius quiddam queſtam, manu apprehendit: Græcoque verſu,* Si non dominaris, *iniquit,* filiola, injuriam te accipere exiſtimas (23)? The Paris Gazette contains a remarkable thing, concerning the reaſons which obliged the king not to grant letters of grace upon this occaſion. *The death of marſhal Marillac, (ſo the Gazetteer expreſſes himſelf in the article from Bruſſels, dated May* 15, 1632*) makes people here talk differently: nevertheleſs the common opinion is, that thoſe who wrote in the names of the queen-mother, and king's brother, letters full of threats addreſſed to his judges to fright them, inſtead of doing him any ſervice, had been the cauſe of his ruin; becauſe they hindered the king from granting him a pardon, and, in a manner, forced his majeſty to give him up to juſtice, inſtead of affording him that clemency which he might have found, if his majeſty had not apprehended with great reaſon, that the favour would have been imputed to his weakneſs and fear, which had been owing only to his mercy* (24).

As to the queſtion, whether the embezzling of the public moneys could be puniſhed with death, I refer you to Mr du Chaſtelet (25), who maintains, that the

---

(14) Tiberij, Caijque, & Claudij, ac Neronis res, florentibus ipſis, ob metum falſæ; poſtquam occiderant, recentibus odiis compoſitæ ſunt. *Tacit. Annal. lib. i, cap. i.*

(15) Idem, Hiſtor. *lib. i, cap. i.*

(16) Horace, de Arte Poëtica, *ſays, that old men praiſe the times paſſed, and blame the preſent.* Laudator temporis acti Se puero, cenſor caſtigatorque minorum.

(17) Le Laboureur, *Pref. to the Hiſt. of Charles VI, fol. e iij, verſo. Compare what is ſaid in the* Nouvel. de la Rep. des Lettres, *June* 1686, *art. i, at the end.*

(18) Relation of the proceſs of marſhal Marillac, *pag.* 8.

(19) Ib. *pag.* 18.

(20) Chaſtelet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 821, 822.

(21) Id. ib. *pag.* 804, 805.

(22) After all the knowledge and ſtrong preſumptions that his majeſty might have, that he was partly guilty of the troubles and diviſions that were begun in France, for the only advantage of ſtrangers, will any body beſides this faithful Hiſtorian, or one of his accomplices, think it unjuſt that he was thus proſecuted? *Id. ib. pag.* 823.

(23) Sueton. in Tiberio, *cap. liii.*

(24) Paris Gazette, May 24, 1632, *pag.* 24, *Edit. of Rouen, in* 8*vo.*

(25) Chaſtelet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 807, *&c.*

‘ theſe miſadventures did not hinder him from charming one of the queen’s maids of ‘ honour [*B*].’ He married her, and thought that after the death of Henry IV (*b*), *under the government of the women, his outward ſhow, and the appearance of his virtues, being joyned with his little ſervices, his cajolling, attendance, and complaiſance, would procure him all that he could not obtain* before. —— *The difference between the profeſſion of his brother, who was the maſter of requeſts, and his running at the ring, rather than his handling the ſword, procured him the name of* Gendarme. *He was always the buſieſt man in the liſts and tournaments.* —— *The queen being concerned by her alliance to deliver him from his neceſſitous condition, gave him an office in the company of the duke of Orleans, increaſed his ſalary, and deſired the marquis d’ Ancre to make uſe of him. The marquis became marſhal of* France —— *and was ſecretly inſtructed by Marillac in the method and policy of war*, and gave him hopes of a good reward [*C*]. His death, and the removing of the queen-mother, left *Marillac* (*i*) *burdened with a wife, and with their common poverty.* —— *He had a mind to comply with thoſe who ſat at the helm, being very unwilling to depart from his pretenſions at court, which were his chief inheritance.* But he was given to underſtand, *that his preſence was not grateful to the king. Whereupon he returned to his miſtreſs, alledging a falſe pretence of ſuffering baniſhment upon her account*; and after ſome refuſals, he was reſtored to her favour, and was made marſhal de camp at Pont de Sé [*D*]. He did not well diſcharge this office, and yet it was confirmed to him by the king, upon the requeſt of the queen-mother. He conceived great hopes in 1624 (*k*), becauſe MICHAEL DE MARILLAC, his brother, was advanced to the office of ſuperintendant of the finances, and cardinal

the ſentence paſſed upon marſhal Marillac, does not exceed the rigour of the laws. This we can ſcarce grant him, and the ſentence paſſed upon the marſhal, would be better approved than it is, if it was like that which was paſſed upon Mr Fouquet. At the time of his trial there was publiſhed a learned book about embezzling the public moneys.

If it be conſidered, that even to this day there are ſome writers who plead for the innocence of Mr Marillac (26), the diſcuſſions I have now propoſed in this remark, will not be found improper in a Critical Dictionary. For it is more uſeful than is commonly believed, not to uſe one’s readers to ſuffer themſelves to be drawn by the popular opinions concerning the conduct of ſovereigns. But it is eminently dangerous to be deceived herein, when we underſtand that the common opinions are fortified by certain apophthegms that come out under great names. This is the preſent caſe; read therefore what an ingenious man has lately publiſhed. *It was under pretence of robbing the public treaſure, that cardinal Richelieu cut off marſhal Marillac’s head. They alledged againſt that lord, that he had employed the king’s money in ſumptuous buildings on his fine eſtate at Tournebu. This fine eſtate, worth about two thouſand Livers per annum is in Normandy, lying on the banks of the river Siene, between Vernon and Andely. Mr de Marillac, who inherited it from his anceſtors, began to build a houſe there worth about ten or twelve thouſand crowns but left it unfiniſhed. One day the prince of Condé, grandfather to the preſent prince, paſſing by this magnificent building, about half finiſhed, having neither doors nor windows, ſtopt on a ſudden, and having viewed it well, ſaid to the gentlemen who were with him:* This building is alledged as a reaſon why Marillac’s head ſhould be cut off; but I would not whip a a page for it (27). See how this ſaying runs about: ſome aſcribe it to cardinal Richelieu (28), others to Mr de Marillac himſelf (29), and others to the prince of Condé. If that Prince ſpoke in this manner he was not very exact; for he ſuppoſed that this building was the foundation of the accuſations, which cauſed the marſhal de Marillac to loſe his life, and perhaps in the whole trial there was not one word ſaid of the houſe of Tournebu. The judges do not concern themſelves with future expences, and it would be a fine thing to condemn a man for a houſe which is not yet built. But what need is there of diſpute? We need only read the ſentence given by the commiſſioners, and we ſhall find that the accuſation was grounded upon ſomething very different from the deſign of a building.

[*B*] *He charmed one of the queen’s maids of honour.*] The words which follow in Mr du Chaſtelet are theſe (30). ‘ She was deſcended from a branch of ‘ the houſe of Medicis, before the crown of Florence ‘ came into it. She was poor and indifferently hand‘ ſome; and had already formed ſeveral deſigns to ‘ make a more advantageous alliance, which did not ‘ ſucceed. The proſpect ſhe had of meeting with no ‘ better fortune, and the fear ſhe was in, that it ‘ would be more difficult for her being a ſtranger than ‘ for another, to live for the future with the trouble‘ ſome title of an old maid, made her reſolve to mar‘ ry him. It is true, the match was eaſily made up, ‘ ſince ſhe had nothing for an eſtate, but a great ‘ name, and her lover could afford nothing but his ‘ fine mien and galantry. But they conceived great ‘ hopes of advancement, and joined to the natural ‘ addreſs of an Italian woman educated at court, the ‘ tricks and intrigues of a man, who after he had ‘ been fifteen years there, had learned all the arts ‘ of deceiving, and appearing to be what he was not.’ This lady died during the trial of her huſband; whereof we have a proof in the ſpeech of the marſhal to his judges. He repreſented to them *What method the deceaſed lady his wife had taken to get acceſs to the king by the means and permiſſion of cardinal Richelieu*; and he added, *That ſhe was inhumanly repulſed, baniſhed, and worſe treated than if ſhe had been among Barbarians, being forced to retire into a village, and to dwell in a borrowed houſe, where ſhe died of grief, and almoſt without any relief* (31). The contract of this marriage was made December 20, 1607. They had no children (32).

[*C*] *The marquis d’ Ancre became marſhal of France ..... and gave him hopes of a good reward.*] Mr du Chaſtelet paraphraſes this maliciouſly. The new marſhal of France, ſays he, (33) *took upon him the command of the armies without going thither: and to make people believe that he was perfectly ſkilled in a profeſſion, which he had never learned, he procured Mr Marillac to inſtruct him ſecretly in the method and policy of war. After a month’s converſation, they were ſo pleaſed with one another, and ſo well ſatisfied with their courage and ſkill, that they were quickly perſuaded they could undertake any thing ſafely. This maſter of a military ſchool, who pretended nothing but to make himſelf rich, and underſtood the ways of making an advantage by the expences of war, deſired of his ſcholar, as the firſt favour, to be made commiſſary-general; together with a power which made all the commanders, or pay-maſters, of the troops tributary to him, by taking from them all means of making a prey of the ſoldiers without him. This brave office, which would have brought in ſo good a revenue, he was aſſured of, if the death of the marquis d’ Ancre had not prevented this deſign, together with many others.*

[*D*] *He was reſtored to the favour of the queen-mother, and was made marſhal de camp at Pont de Sé.*] The paraphraſe which follows is no leſs malicious than the former. ‘ The fate of diſgrace, which required all ‘ ſorts of people to be accepted and employed, the ‘ tears of his wife, the advices and little ſervices, ‘ which the party received from the other Marillac, ‘ his brother, being aſſiſted by the miniſtry of ſome ‘ religious correſpondence, cauſed all things paſt to be ‘ forgotten: He had the tone and look of a com‘ manding officer, and could talk of entrenchments, ‘ half-moons, and redoubts, and had ſo many young ‘ men about him, who could better defend than de‘ ſign them, that for want of another, and of

‘ being

(*b*) Ib. *pag.* 771.

(*i*) Ib. *pag.* 772.

(*k*) Ib. *pag.* 773.

(26) *See, above, citation* (35) *of the article* ***LEWIS XIII***, *what I have quoted from the* Mémoirs d’Artagnan, *and add thereto theſe words of page* 50, *of the ſame book:* The marſhal de Marillac, tho’ he was unfortunately ruined, was not therefore leſs eſteemed by a great many good men, who knew the occaſion of his miſfortune.

(27) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges d’Hiſtoire & de Litterature. *Tom. ii, pag.* 15. *Dutch Edit.* 1700.

(28) See, above, citat. (42) of the article LEWIS XIII.

(29) See, above, citation (19).

(30) Chaſtelet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 770, 771.

(31) A true relation of what paſſed at the trial of marſhal Marillac, *pag.* 8, 9.

(32) Father Anſelme’s Hiſt. of the great Officers, *pag.* 252.

(33) Chaſtelet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 771.

cardinal Richelieu was made miniſter of ſtate. The firſt command that he received *was to go into Champagne to the duke of Angouleſme with a commiſſion to furniſh proviſions for the army* [*E*]. ——— *As this was his firſt commiſſion, ſo it was alſo the firſt beginning of his thefts* [*F*]. They became more enormous when he was employed in the *fortification and building of the citadel of Verdun, of which the king made him governor, and appointed him lieutenant general of the three biſhoprics, with the office of pay-maſter-general* (*l*). He was employed in the war of Rochelle in 1627 (*m*). He was preſent at the defeat of the Engliſh in the iſle of Ree [*G*], and ſerved, ‘as Marſhal de Camp in the quarters of the duke of Angouleſme, with ſo bad ſucceſs, that in all the ſallies that were made, and all the attempts for taking the fort of Thadon, and blowing up with a petard the grates on the ſide of the moraſs, he was always forced to excuſe himſelf, and to juſtify his not being where he ſhould have been. He was conſtantly accuſed by the ſoldiers of ſome miſtake, and of being the cauſe why things ſucceeded ſo ill; ſo ſtrong was their opinion, that he was not ſo valiant as he was thought to be (*n*)”. It was during the ſiege of Rochelle, that he begun to cabal againſt cardinal Richelieu; which he did chiefly by endeavouring to render him odious to Mary de Medicis (*o*). *Marillac continuing at Rochelle, contributed at a diſtance, as much as lay in his power, towards carrying on the monopoly; and as he confeſſed at his tryal he wrote often to the queen-mother, and gave inſtructions to thoſe who decyphered his letters, that Mr Bouthillier, then her ſecretary, ſhould ſee none of his diſpatches; that they ſhould be conveyed by the ladies of the bed-chamber, and that this good princeſs ſhould know nothing of the diſtruſt that he had* ——— *Thoſe who formed this cabal became ſkillful men in the practice and government of women.* —— *Marillac, became the hero of the faction, and therefore a deſign was laid to* make him *marſhal of* France; and the queen-mother *was ſo well perſuaded, that it was for her honour and ſervice to puſh on this matter*, that ſhe uſed the ſtrongeſt recommendations which obliged the cardinal *to ſnatch this ſtaff from the hand of the king, and give it to this importunate ſuitor at the ſiege of Privas* (*p*). This new marſhal of France and his brother, who was then keeper of the great ſeal, continued their endeavours to ruin the cardinal, which they hoped to compaſs in Italy, and for this end they did what they could to hinder the king from approaching Piedmont; and with the ſame proſpect, the marſhal *ſlighted the orders which the king ſent him to bring the army from Champagne into Italy* (*q*) [*H*]. At laſt he *went*

(*l*) Ib. pag. 774.

(*m*) Ib. pag. 778.

(*n*) Ib. pag. 780.

(*o*) Ib. pag. 783.

(*p*) Ib. pag. 785.

(*q*) Ib. pag. 793.

‘being better known, he was made marſhal de camp at Pont de Sé. Experience quickly diſcovered, by the undertaking, performance, and keeping of the works, which were all equally bad, that he was a much better ſoldier and captain upon paper than in the field . . . . . The ill opinion which the ſoldiers had of his valour in his youth, was not made better after the loſs of the battle at Pont de Sé, which they attributed to his want of courage, and of experience (34). See the margin (35).

[*E*] *With a commiſſion to furniſh proviſions for the army.*] ‘He executed this commiſſion ſo ill, that the ſupport he had from the queen-mother, and the intereſt of his brother, who became daily more powerful, did not hinder him from being accuſed to the king from this time of miſdemeanors and thefts. In this firſt attack he had recourſe to the cardinal by letters, and afterwards at his trial, he ſhowed the cardinal's anſwer of the ſeventh of April, 1625; which was full of marks of his friendſhip. It contained an aſſurance, that he had removed out of the king's mind this bad impreſſion, and adviſed him ſo to behave himſelf for the future, that he ſhould not ſtand in need of ſuch aſſiſtance (36).’

[*F*] *This was alſo the beginning of his thefts.*] A beginning which was attended with continual conſequences of the ſame nature, if we believe our author. *And it will be found*, ſays he (37), *whatever declaration has been made of his innocence, that after this, till the time of his impriſonment, he did not manage, or treat of any affair relating to money, for his majeſty, but he practiſed all poſſible ways to make an advantage of it.* The detail he gives about this is dreadful: therein are to be ſeen ſuch exceſſive and ſordid miſdemeanors, that Mr du Chaſtelet was obliged to anſwer an objection which was very obvious, ſince he had elſewhere repreſented the marſhal as a perſon ambitious of glory. ‘It ſeems, ſays he (38), that one who minds ſuperficially this diſcourſe, would think it could not be meant of the ſame man: Therein we ſee the meanneſs of all ſorts of villainies, and the high thoughts of honour and offices. We find alſo, that Marillac applied himſelf to great things, and at the ſame time took the poor peaſants by the throat to rob them of their goods. Yet it is eaſy to underſtand that theſe fruits proceed from the ſame root, and that he might be capable of both theſe extreams, if any one will remember, that he was of a malicious and proud ſpirit, and that to bear the weight of his ambitious poverty, he muſt have had recourſe to vile practices that diſhonoured his life. And ſucceeding beyond his own expectation, he was tranſported by the impetuous current of his faction, wherein women, and many people incapable of war, had ſo much authority, that he who had a good mien, could talk much and make a noiſe, eaſily acquired the opinion of great valour with thoſe who had no experience in his profeſſion.’

[*G*] *He was preſent at the defeat of the Engliſh in the iſle of Ree.*] We ſhall now inform you who was the author of an anonymous relation, which appeared at this time. ‘It is obſervable, that the keeper of the ſeals (39) became the hiſtorian of the tranſactions in that iſle at the defeat of the Engliſh, that he might give all the glory of them to his brother. He would not put his name to it, that the relation might be the leſs ſuſpected, and that he might give it the more credit againſt the public voice of all thoſe who returned after the fight. He was very indiſcreet to make the great and only harangue of his book about him: For beſide, that he was accounted by the ſoldiers a man great only in words, but little in deeds, he juſtified the name which the ſoldiers gave him of Marillac *Gold-bridge*, becauſe he gave ſo many reaſons for not fighting. He makes him come near the enemies to take a view of them in theſe words: That he approached them in ſpite of the volleys of the advanced ſoldiers, which he was forced to ſtand. Whereupon it was ſaid, at the firſt reading of this panegyric, that he found them of a bad taſte, and ſuch as he had never taſted but this time. . . . . . In a word, he makes him the only author of all the feats of courage and conduct, and allows marſhal Schomberg only to approve his counſels, and Thoiras to make raſh and revengeful overtures for the death of his two brothers. Yet all the world knows, that after this action which the romance of his brother attributes wholly to him, he was more complained of than before, *&c* (40).’ I ſuppreſs the reſt, becauſe it is too ſatirical.

[*H*] *He ſlighted the orders the king ſent him, to bring his army from Champagne into Italy.*] He perſiſted in his diſobedience, ‘till the ninth or tenth of September, that an expreſs command came from the king to depart under a great penalty. He acquainted

(34) Id. ib. *pag.* 772.

(35) Note, that Pont de Sé, a place upon the Loire, was attacked and taken by the king, Auguſt 8, 1620, from the troops of the queen-mother, who had declared for the malecontents.

(36) Ib. pag. 799.

(37) Ibid.

(38) Ib. pag. 793.

(39) That is, Michael de Marillac, brother to him of whom I ſpeak in this article.

(40) Chaſtelet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 279.

went from thence; but he kept thoſe troops near Lyons to put in execution the *reſolutions that were taken againſt the perſon of the cardinal* (r). The king's recovery made this plot miſcarry. The marſhal went over the Alps, and obtained the ſame power over the armies that the marſhals de la Force and Schomberg had (s); but the cabal having failed in their main deſign, I mean the queen not being able to obtain the favour ſhe deſired of her ſon the king, to remove the cardinal from his council, the Marillacs were undone (t). *The king having taken away the ſeals from the eldeſt, which were powerful and dangerous inſtruments in ſo bad hands, cauſed him to be carried to Lizieux* (u), *and commanded the marſhals* de la Force *and* Schomberg *to ſeize the other, and ſend him priſoner under a ſtrong guard to the caſtle of* Sainte-Menehouſt. Theſe are ſome extracts out of the book of Mr du Chaſtelet. He mentions alſo the engagement which the eldeſt of theſe gentlemen had entered into with the League [I]. We ſee, in Moreri, that the marſhal *always refuſed* the offers his friends made him to deliver him out of priſon, and that his ſentence was reverſed by a decree of parliament after the death of cardinal Richelieu [K]. This deſerves

(r) Ib. pag. 799.

(s) Ibid.

(t) Ib. pag. 803.

(u) Father Anſelme's *Hiſtory of great Officers*, *pag.* 104, ſays, that he was carried to the caſtle of Caën, and from that to the caſtle of Chateaudun, where he died in priſon, Auguſt 7, 1632.

‘acquainted thoſe of Paris, that he was there as a ſhield to ſecure them againſt the forces of the emperor, that waited only for his removal, that they might enter into France. He filled the kingdom with letters written to his friends, containing the cauſes of his delay, which he excuſed to the king, ſometimes by falſe news, and ſometimes becauſe he could not draw troops out of the garriſons, without paying the ſoldiers and the communities which had maintained them. This delay was ſo prejudicial to the king's deſigns, that all the reſolutions of thoſe whom he entruſted with his affairs, and with the army beyond the Alps, remained in ſuſpence upon the uncertainty of his coming, which he promiſed in one diſpatch, and preſently delayed by another for reaſons frivolous and deceitful; which occaſioned ſuch a loſs of men and time, that if he had come in the beginning of July to Suza, as he might eaſily have done, and was commanded to do, the paſſage of Veillane had been ſecured, and the relief of Cazal infallible at the beginning of Auguſt. If he had obeyed, as he could have done, the men had not been there in the time of that peſtilence and mortal diſeaſe, which deſtroyed twenty thouſand French in the Autumn, in the plains of Piedmont. The ſtate of the beſieged, and of our troops had not forced the generals to admit, in September, the Spaniards into the city and caſtle, by a truce, which the event only excuſed; and the bad air of Lyons, infected with ſo many impurities and miſeries, had not put the king in danger of his life (41).’ Here you may ſee the confirmation of a reflexion I made above (42), that it was for the good and ſervice of Lewis XIII, that his troops ſhould be commanded by the friends of cardinal Richelieu; for there being nothing more proper to deſtroy this prime miniſter than the bad ſucceſs of the war, it was to be feared, that the enemies of that cardinal would favour at leaſt indirectly the enemies of France. You ſee how the Marillacs contrived the matter ſo, that the expedition to Italy, of which they had the direction, proved unfortunate (43). I am willing to believe they did not deſire the ſucceſs of the Spaniards as ſuch, but only as a means to procure the fall of the prime miniſter. Whatever motive they might have to deſire it, the intereſt of the crown, and the ſervice of Lewis XIII ſuffered by it.

[I] *The obligations which the eldeſt of theſe gentlemen had entered into with the League.*] The circumſtances of this are very remarkable. Mr du Chaſtelet affirms, that, among other things, it was repreſented to cardinal Richelieu, ‘That it would not be difficult to make people believe the ingratitude and diſguiſes of Marillac the keeper of the ſeals; that it would eaſily be credited that he, whom all the world believed poſſeſſed with ſuch a furious paſſion, as to ſign the League with his own blood; who had a mind from a Frenchman to become a Spaniard; who from counſellor in the parliament of Paris, became an aſſiſtant to an attorney, to impriſon the moſt illuſtrious perſons in the world; who departed from his pretenſion of being a gentleman, to be a deputy of the third eſtate of the League, tho' he was an officer in the higheſt court; who from a lay-counſellor, became aſſiſtant as a cleric to the bull thundered out againſt his king; and who, from a furious Leaguer became a domeſtic to the dutcheſs of Bar, and her confident ſo far as to go to a Proteſtant ſermon, might, on this occaſion, have aſſumed all the faces, changes and reſolutions that were moſt agreeable to his paſſion (44).’ The author whom M. du Chaſtelet refutes, had ſaid, that marſhal Marillac recommended to his nephew, *That he ſhould always ſerve the king faithfully next to* GOD. Which Mr du Chaſtelet criticizes thus. ‘Upon what other grounds, *ſays he* (45), was the rebellion of the League founded? Did Buſſy, the Spartacus of our age, being encouraged by the preſence and fury of Michael de Marillac, who aſſiſted him, uſe any other prologue for his driving the ſenate from their ſeats, and dragging them to priſon?’

[K] *We ſee in Moreri that . . . his ſentence was reverſed . . . . after the death of Richelieu.*] The Memoirs of Mr Puyſegur, cited in the Dictionary of Moreri, ſay, that the ſame day the marſhal was ſeized, the captain of his guards ‘propoſed to him to procure his eſcape; and *that the marſhal anſwered him*, that he would not make his eſcape, if he could; that he feared nothing; that he had always been a true ſervant to the king; that he ordered him to ſerve his majeſty faithfully, and to tell all his friends to do the ſame (46).’ Mr Puyſegur publiſhed this as having *learned it afterwards from Mr de Marillac, when he had him in his cuſtody at Pontoiſe.* Thoſe that will read what is related four pages after this, will not think that Moreri has informed us faithfully, nor that Mr Marillac had never any intention to make his eſcape. The king had a mind to know whether Mr de Puyſegur would be anſwerable for this marſhal, and conduct him to the great hall of the vicarſhip of Pontoiſe. ‘I ſay, *they are the words of Mr Puyſegur* (47), that I could not anſwer for him, that Mr de Marillac, keeper of the ſeals, had there a daughter who was a Nun, that was very powerful, and much beloved, that I would not run the hazard of carrying him thither; and that there was another reaſon which hindered me, which I would not tell, but the king knew afterwards, that by the intrigue of that Nun, and the queen-mother, Mr d' Argouges, who belonged to her, would have given me a 100000 crowns to ſet Marillac at liberty.’ The other obſervation of Moreri, *viz.* that the parliament of Paris reverſed the ſentence againſt marſhal Marillac, might have overthrown what I ſaid in the firſt remark of this article, if that parliament had revived the proceſs, and declared that the judges who condemned this marſhal, did willingly oppreſs him, or were deceived by falſe witneſſes. But I cannot believe that the decree of the parliament of Paris contained any ſuch thing. I muſt confeſs that I do not know the tenor of it, and I do not remember that I have ſeen any book except Moreri's Dictionary, wherein it is mentioned. Father Anſelme ſays nothing of it, and yet he was a man who was very careful to oblige the families he wrote about. Common ſenſe tells us, that if the parliament of Paris had declared marſhal Marillac innocent of all the crimes for which he was condemned to death, they had ſet a mark of infamy upon thoſe who had condemned him, and chiefly upon Mr de Chateauneuf their preſident. This had been a ſtain ſo black, ſo ſhameful and abominable, that I cannot underſtand how Mr de Chateaneuf could have appeared in public; and yet it was after the death of cardinal Richelieu, which, according to Moreri, was the time when the ſentence againſt Marillac was reverſed, that he was delivered from his diſgrace:

(41) Ib. pag. 793.

(42) See, above, remark [X] of the article **LEWIS XIII.**

(43) Chaſtelet, ibid. *pag.* 789.

(44) Ib. *pag.* 796, 797. *See alſo pag.* 787, *and* 836.

(45) Ibid. *pag.* 839.

(46) Puyſegur Memoir. *pag.* 83, Dutch Edit.

(47) Ib. *pag.* 87.

ſerves a reflexion.

nay it ought to be obſerved, that he was advanced a ſecond time to be keeper of the ſeals in 1650 (48). See the margin (49). I could therefore eaſily believe, that the decree which Moreri mentions, does not concern the things whereof the marſhal was accuſed, but only the method of proceeding. It could not but be diſagreeable to the parliament; for the erection of an extraordinary court to judge the officers of the crown, was a thing irregular, and contrary to the rights of parliament. Beſides, marſhal Marillac had often declared, that he did not own the commiſſioners that tried him to be his natural judges. This might afford the parliament of Paris a ſpecious reaſon, to declare that the marſhal was not lawfully tried; but this is no proof, that they declared him innocent of the crimes upon which the condemnation was grounded. Here is a convincing inſtance of what I ſay. After the battle of Rocroy, and the taking of Thionville, the court having a mind to make ſome acknowledgment to the duke of Enguien, reſtored to the prince of *Condé the fine houſe of Chantilli, and ſome other parts of the inheritance of the duke of Montmorency, to whom the princeſs of Condé was heireſs. The decree of the parliament of Paris intervening upon the letters of the grant, ſays expreſsly, that the duke of Montmorency was not rightly judged: and this is founded upon one of the moſt certain maxims of the kingdom; That the dukes and peers cannot be judged but by the king in perſon, and in his court of parliament, a ſufficient number of eccleſiaſtical and ſecular peers being preſent* (50). According to theſe maxims, the marſhal de Biron had not been rightly tried; for Henry IV did not aſſiſt in perſon at his trial. But ſetting aſide all cavils, I ſhall only obſerve, that what was inſerted in favour of the duke de Montmorency, in the decree of the parliament of Paris, does no ways hinder but that he was certainly guilty of rebellion, and cannot impeach the probity of his judges. They were incompetent, if you pleaſe; but they gave ſentence according to law, and againſt a perſon who was really guilty. It often happens that inferior judges are guilty of irregular proceedings, which are nulled by ſuperior courts, and the accuſed gains nothing by it, but only a little time; for the proceedings are renewed with all the requiſite formalities, and he is duly convicted, and the firſt ſentence is confirmed in the main.

Note, That I do not intend to deny, that the honour of ſome perſons who were puniſhed with death, has been reſtored in ſuch a manner as did import a judicial declaration of their innocence; but commonly this is the conſequence of a reviewing of the proceſs, attended with new writings in juſtification of the party, and with convincing proofs of the corruption or raſhneſs of the judges. Without this, the reſtoring of the honour of thoſe that are puniſhed with death, is nothing but a favour granted for the good ſervices that have been received, or are expected, from a conſiderable family. This is a comfort to a family, and a kind of barrier againſt the inſulting reproaches of it's enemies. I cannot tell exactly what kind of reſtoring that was which follows: ‘In 1549, a little after the death of king Francis I, James de Coucy, lord of Vervin, the king's lieutenant at Bologne, and Odoart de Biez, marſhal of France, his father-in-law, were condemned; the former to death, becauſe he had not well defended Montreuil againſt the Engliſh, the other to loſe his dignity of marſhal, becauſe he had betrayed and ſurrendered Bologne to Henry king of England. Theſe two lords were declared innocent in 1577, in the reign of Henry III, at the ſuit of James de Coucy, ſon to the ſaid lord of Vervin, and grandſon to the ſaid lord marſhal Biez: and the verification and publication of their innocence was done judicially at Bologne, June the fourteenth (51).’

To ſpeak truth, the letters-patents, edicts, and decrees of princes, contain often ſome honourable things, which, properly ſpeaking, are nothing but compliments, and muſt be underſtood after the manner of compliments. Do you think that Henry III ſpoke according to his own judgment, when he declared (52), that the duke of Alençon, his brother, the king of Navarre, his brother-in-law, the prince of Condé, and all the other lords, knights, gentlemen, officers, and inhabitants of his kingdom, who had a hand in the laſt troubles, *had been in this his good and loyal ſubjects and ſervants*; and when he teſtified, *that he was well and duly informed of the good intention of the ſaid duke of Alençon, and that there was nothing done by him, nor by thoſe concerned with him, whoſoever they were, the living as well as the dead, but what was for his ſervice?* Do you think that Lewis XIII ſpoke more ſincerely, when he declared (53), that *he believed that what was done by the prince of Condé and his followers, had been done with a good intention, and for his ſervice?* The like clauſes are commonly to be found in all the edicts of peace, ſince the firſt civil war for religion under Charles IX (54), and are now become a form that will be uſed at all times when the exigences of the ſtate ſhall require it. The heads of a party, in a troubleſome civil war, do commonly capitulate ſo happily for themſelves, and their own intereſt, that they obtain either the marſhal's ſtaff, or the blue ribbon, or the government of a place, beſides letters, I do not ſay of pardon, but wherein the king declares that he is perſuaded, that what they did was for his ſervice. Neither the prince who ſpeaks, nor the ſecretary of ſtate who draws up the writing, nor the chancellor who ſeals it, believe any thing of this to be true; yet the neceſſity of the times forces them to expreſs themſelves after this manner. But nobody underſtands this literally; people continue to ſay, or to think, that they bore arms againſt the king, and were rank rebels. The reſt muſt paſs for compliments under the great ſeal, and chancery-lies.

What kings do in their edicts and declarations, is alſo done ſometimes in a parliament, either by their order, or upon their recommendation, and ſometimes tho' they are not concerned in it. I mean, that the honour of perſons is reſtored ſometimes upon one pretence, and ſometimes upon another, ſuppoſing that this ſerves the purpoſes of the relations as well as reaſon it ſelf: but the judges who have condemned, are not accounted infamous, or looked upon as puniſhable, unleſs the re-inſtating decree, be grounded upon a review of the writings, and it be ordered, that the judges or witneſſes ſhall be immediately proſecuted. I think that nobody dare ſay, that the parliament of Paris ordered any thing like this againſt Mr de Chateauneuf, or againſt his aſſeſſors, or againſt that multitude of witneſſes whom they examined and re-examined. If Mr Moreri had cited ſome authors, he might have eaſed me, and perhaps enabled me to know, that what I have juſt now obſerved is needleſs. See the margin (55). It muſt be confeſſed, that in hiſtorical matters, thoſe who abound with exact quotations, do extreamly abridge the way of inſtruction.

(48) Anſelme, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 105.

(49) The prince of Condé remembring that Mr de Chateauneuf preſided at the trial of Mr de Montmorency, (compare what is ſaid, in remark [*G*] of the article LEWIS XIII, at the beginning), croſſed him as much as he could, and at laſt cauſed the ſeals to be taken from him. See Priolo, *lib. v, cap. xvi, & xxix, & alibi.* Would not he have alledged, if he could, the infamy wherewith the parliament of Paris had marked him?

(50) Auberi, Hiſt. of cardinal Mazarin, *book ii, pag.* 208.

(51) Richeome, Apologetical Complaint, *num.* 50, *pag.* 184, 185.

(52) The edict of the year 1576 *Art. xlix, liii.*

(53) Edict of the month of May, 1616. *Art. xvii.*

(54) See Mr Daillé's Reply to Adam and Cottiby, *part ii, cap. xviii, pag. m.* 112, 113.

(55) Balzac, in the thirteenth Letter of the firſt book to Mr Conrart, dated April 30, 1650, mentions a letter he had writen to a gentleman of Languedoc, *wherein*, ſays he, *I have ſpoke of the reviewing of the proceſs of marſhal Marillac, although nobody be named in it.* I confeſs I know not what he means by that reviewing. I want a great many books and memoirs for which I have occaſion.

MARINELLA, or MARINELLI, (LUCRETIA), a Venetian lady of a great deal of wit, who publiſhed among other books [*A*] one intituled *La Nobilta e l'eccellenza delle donne con diffetti e mancamenti de gli huomini, (The excellency and nobleneſs of women with the defects and faults of men)* (*a*). She carried the pretenſions of her ſex, not only to an equality, as ſome authors have done [*B*], but alſo to a ſuperiority above

(*a*) It was printed at Venice in 1601, in 4to.

[*A*] *Among other books.*] She wrote a book, intituled, *La Colomba Sacra, (the Holy Dove)* the Life of the Virgin Mary, and of that of St Francis. I find this in *le coſe notabili & maraviglioſe della Citta di Venetia* (1).

[*B*] *As ſome anthors have done* (2).] I ſhall name only two: one is Madam de Gournay, who wrote a little book *of the equality of men and women.* Her pretenſion was diſappoved by Mrs Schurman: ‘Nobiliſſima Gornacenſis diſſertatiunculam ..... uti ab elegantia ac lepore improbare minime poſſum: ita eam per omnia comprobare nec auſim quidem nec velim; licet ad ſapientum teſtimonia quæ illa nobis exhibuit, brevitatis cauſa provocarim (3). - - - - *The ſhort diſcourſe of the excellent Madam de Gournay .... as I cannot, becauſe of it's elegance, and gracefulneſs, diſapprove*

(1) At pag. 311, of the Venice Edit. 1655.

(2) See the article FONTE.

(3) Anna Maria, à Schurman, in Opuſcul. *p.* 85.

above the male. Mrs de Schurman did not approve the deſign of this book (*b*); and therefore ſhe would have blamed Mrs Jacquette Guillaume [*C*].

(*b*) Tanto vero abeſt ut hoc cum virginali modeſtia aut ſaltem innato mihi pudore congruere arbitrer, ut vel perlegere pigeat tractatum cætera inſignem Lucretiæ Marinellæ. - - - - - *So far am I from thinking this agreeable to the modeſty of a virgin, or my own innate modeſty, that I cannot bear to read over the treatiſe of Lucretia Marinella, though otherwiſe very ingenious.* Anna Maria à Schurman, in Opuſculis, pag. 85.

'*diſapprove it; ſo I neither dare, nor will, in all things approve it, tho', for brevity's ſake, I have referred to the teſtimonies of the men of wiſdom which ſhe hath produced*' The other author is one who publiſhed at Paris in 1673, a book intituled, *Of the Equality of the two ſexes, a diſcourſe phyſical and moral, wherein is to be ſeen the importance of clearing the mind from prejudices.* He thought that ſome would write againſt him, and he was threatened with it (4). But finding that none appeared to refute him, he himſelf wrote againſt his own book; for he publiſhed a treatiſe in 1675, *Of the excellency of men, againſt the equality of Sexes.* If you conſider well all that he ſays, you will diſcover, that he had no deſign to refute his firſt book, but rather to confirm it indirectly. However it be, theſe two books were reprinted at Paris in 1679. It was a long time before the author of them was known: It was ſaid in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for the month of October 1685 (5), that his name was Frelin; but ſome time after it was declared there (6), that he ſhould rather be called Poulain. And indeed this is his true name, altho' he aſſumed that of la Barre, at the beginning of the third edition in 1691 (7), and at the beginning of the third part of his work publiſhed in 1692. I muſt tell you, by the way, that he was an eccleſiaſtic of Lorrain, who embraced, at Geneva, the Proteſtant communion.

[*C*] *Mrs de Schurman would have blamed Mrs Jacquette Guillaume.*] Who publiſhed at Paris, in 1665, a book intituled, *The Illuſtrious Ladies, wherein is proved, by good and ſtrong reaſons, that the Female Sex in all reſpects exceeds the Male.* There was publiſhed at Paris a book in 8vo, in 1643, with this title, *The generous Woman, who proves that her Sex is more Noble, more Politic, more Valiant, more Learned, more Virtuous, and more Frugal, than that of Men, by L. S. D. L. L.* I add, that Mr Scheffer (8) informs me, that there was printed at Upſal, in 1650, a treatiſe intituled, *La donna migliore dell huomo, Paradoſſo*, written by Jacobus del Pozzo (*i. e.* de Puteo).

This Theſis had been a long time maintained by ſome wits. Jerom Ruſcelli publiſhed, in 1552, an Italian book, wherein he gave the ſuperiority of perfection to the women, CHE LA DONNA *ſia di gran lunga piu nobile & piu degna dell'* HUOMO (9). He obſerves, that Plutarch, John Boccace, *il Cortegiano, l' Agrippa, il Portio, il Lando* (10), *il Domenichi*, and ſeveral others, handled this queſtion; notwithſtanding which, we do not find, that their reaſons have made the world believe, that the women ſurpaſs the men. He quotes (11) Maggio, and Bernardo Spina, who writ in defence of the ſame opinion. I have a book, which was printed at Paris in 1617, with this title, *A Reply to the Antimalice, or Defence of Women, of the Sieur Vigoureux, otherwiſe called Brye-Comte-Robert . . . . by the Sieur de la Bruyere, a Gentleman of Berne.* This gentleman declares (12), *That his intention is to confute what* the author of the defence had *ſaid*, that *the women are better than the men, and more virtuous in all things.* Note, that this defence was the refutation of a piece of one James Olivier (13), and that he, who publiſhed it, *to have a larger field of diſcourſe, undertook to appropriate to the men . . . . what was attributed to the women*, in the book which he refuted (14). You will find other writers in the ſecond tome of Vigneul Marville's Miſcellanies, at the twenty-ſeventh and twenty-eighth pages of the Dutch edition.

(4) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, *March* 16, 1676.

(5) Article vii, pag. 1145, of the ſecond edition.

(6) On the back ſide of the laſt page of the table of the ſecond edition of the *Nouvelles* for the year 1685.

(7) *See the* Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, *Sept.* 1691, *pag.* 27, &c.

(8) Joh. Sceffer de Scriptis & Scriptor. Suecorum, *pag.* 301.

(9) Ruſcelli, Lettura ſopra un Sonetto del Marcheſe della Terza, *fol.* 14.

(10) See his article, at the end of the rem. [*A*].

(11) Fol 14. verſo, & fol. 15.

(12) In his preface.

(13) *Intituled*, Alphabet de l'imperfection & Malice des Femmes.

(14) *Preface to the* Replique à l'Antimalice. *This* Anti *is not to be found in Mr Baillet's collection.*

MARINELLO (JOHN) an Italian Phyſician in the XVIth century, publiſhed, in Latin, Commentaries on the works of Hippocrates in general (*a*), and on the Aphoriſms in particular (*b*), a Treatiſe of Fevers, and a Treatiſe of the Plague, *&c.* I have ſpoken elſewhere (*c*) of two Italian books, which he publiſhed, one of which will engage me to make a ſmall remark [*A*].

(*a*) *At Venice*, 1575, *in folio.*

(*b*) At Venice, 1583, in 16mo.

(*c*) In the remark [*C*] of the article LIEBAUT.

[*A*] *One of his books will engage me to make a ſmall remark.*] It is that which is intituled, *Le Medicine partenenti alle infermita delle Donne.* I have ſhewn, in another place (1), that there is no reaſon for ſaying, that the work of John Liebaut, on the Diſeaſes of Women, is only a tranſlation of this. Lazarus Pe, publiſhing a new edition of this work of Liebaut at Paris, in 1609, in 8vo, intituled it, *The Diſeaſes of Women, and their Cure, in three books, by John Marinello, of Formia* (2), *a learned Italian Phyſician.* He reviſed, corrected, and augmented it one third, in which he made uſe of Roderigo à Caſtro, a Portugueſe Phyſician, who had happily ſeconded John Marinello. Here is a paſſage, in which this latter is commended, and in which Liebaut is accuſed of Plagiariſm. 'Marinello . . . . has ſo ſkillfully handled this matter, that he has exceeded all the ancients and moderns: for all the parts of it, to the moſt minute, are clearly, diſtinctly, and learnedly, compriſed. A work worthy of ſo deſerving a genius as his! of which he has given proofs throughout the whole: it is he, who has continued Arculan on Rhaſis: it is he, who wrote the four books of the Embelliſhment of Women; and many other treatiſes, which the Italians and French have improperly laid claim to: as this book of the diſeaſes of women, which M. John Liebaut claimed to himſelf: notwithſtanding which, by comparing one with the other, I have diſcovered, that he took all the materials from Marinello, tranſpoſing ſometimes, and adding ſomething of his own the better to diſguiſe it. But the credit of it ought to be reſtored to the author, and John Liebaut to be nevertheleſs commended for having poliſhed, enlarged, and tranſlated this book into French; as alſo that of the Embelliſhment of Women (3).

(1) In remark [*C*] of the article LIEBAUT.

(2) In *Lindenius renovatus, pag.* 634, he is ſaid to be a Venetian.

(3) Lazarus Pe, in the Epiſtle Dedicatory.

MARIUS, ſirnamed ÆQUICOLA, becauſe he was born in the country of the Æqui in Italy [*A*], flouriſhed at the end of the XVth century, and in the beginning of the XVIth. He ſtudied at Paris, Phyſics and Mathematics under Faber Stapulenſis (*a*). He was one of the wits in the court of Francis Gonzaga, marquis of Mantua, and he wrote in Italian a hiſtory of Mantua [*B*], wherein he enlarges very much

(*a*) He himſelf ſays ſo, as I learned by a memoir which a certain perſon communicated to me, but would not be named.

[*A*] *He was ſirnamed Æquicola, becauſe he was born in the country of the Æqui.*] This is the opinion of Leander Albertus, in his deſcription of Italy. *Æquicolorum nomen ſuperiori memoria Marius Alvetius plurimum nobilitavit cognomento Æquicola* (1). The Italian words of this author are theſe; *ha illuſtrato gli Equicoli, Mario di Alveto* (2). We muſt not wonder, that Nicodemo (3) did not make uſe of them, to refute Nicolas Toppi, who placed this Mario among the Neapolitan authors (4); for there was great reaſon for placing him there. Marius Æquicola was of Alvito; and if on the one ſide, many Geographers believe, that this place was ſituate in the country of the ancient Æqui, it is certain, on the other ſide, that at preſent it belongs to the kingdom of Naples.

[*B*] *He wrote in Italian a hiſtory of Mantua.*] Let us cite the words of Leander Albertus: 'Diu inter Franciſci Gonzagæ Mantuani Marchionis familiares fuit,

(1) Leander Albertus, in Deſcript. Ital. *pag.* 225.

(2) Fol. m. 149. verſo.

(3) Nicodemo, Addiz. alla Bibl. Napoletan. *pag.* 172.

(4) Nicolo Bibl. Napoletan. *pag.* 206.

much upon what concerns the illuſtrious houſe of Gonzaga. He wrote many other books [*C*]: what he wrote about the nature of Love, was re-printed ſeveral times [*D*], and yet is very difficult to be met with. I have ſaid ſomething of him in another place (*b*), Scaliger, the father, praiſes him very much [*E*]. The epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheque* deſerves to be cenſured [*F*].

'fuit, & lingua vernacula pereleganter Gonzagarum 'vitas ſcripſit (5). - - - - *He was long honoured with 'the friendſhip of Francis Gonzaga, marquis of Mantua, 'and very elegantly wrote the lives of the family of Gon- 'zaga in his mother-tongue.*' Give no credit to what he ſays of the elegance of this book; for I know that the ſtyle of it was ſo harſh, that Benedict Oſanna was obliged to correct and poliſh it, when a new edition of that hiſtory of Mantua was made in 1608. 'Maximam vitæ partem Mantuæ egit Ma- 'rius inter familiares Iſabellæ Eſtenſis uxoris Fran- 'ciſci II, Marchionis in cujus gratiam ſcripſit de 'Mantuana hiſtoria breves commentarios a rerum Ori- 'gine ad ſua uſque tempora lingua Italica, eaque 'rudi & rancida, ut ea ætas ferebat. Verum ſeculo 'ſequenti Bened. Oſanna Mantuanus cum Marii hi- 'ſtoria recuderetur, voces obſoletas uſitatis commuta- 'vit, & ſtylum rubigine ſquallidum limavit ornavit- 'que (6). - - - *He ſpent the greateſt part of his life at 'Mantua, among the intimates of Iſabella D'Eſte, wife 'of Francis II, the marquis, to oblige whom, he wrote 'a ſhort hiſtory of Mantua, from it's original to his 'own time, in the Italian tongue, but that rude and 'unpoliſhed, agreeable to that age. But, in the next 'century, Benedict Oſanna of Mantua, when Marius's 'hiſtory was to be reprinted, changed the obſolete words 'for thoſe in uſe, and poliſhed the ſtile.*' It is divided into five books: The three firſt are dedicated to Francis II, Marquis of Mantua, who died in 1519. The fourth, being wholly deſigned for the life of that marquis, was dedicated to Frederic Gonzaga, his ſon. to whom Marius was ſecretary, if we may believe Boneſmond. The fifth contains the hiſtory of this Frederic, till the year 1521. Of this I have been informed by a memoir, which Mr . . . was pleaſed to ſend me.

[*C*] *He wrote many other books.*] A treatiſe *De opportunitate*, printed at Naples in 1507, in 4to. *Epiſtola ad Maximilianum Sfortiam Mediolani ducem de liberata Italia*, printed in 1513, in 4to. A Latin apology *againſt the ſlanderers of the French nation.* It was tranſlated into French by Michael Roſe, and that verſion was printed at Paris in 1550, in 8vo. *D. Iſabellæ Eſtenſis Mantuæ Principis iter in Galliam Narbonenſem deſcriptum.* I ſhall ſpeak hereafter of the deſcription of that journey. We find in the Bibliotheque of Draudius (7) one Marius Æquivolus Olivetanus, the author of a book of Theology (8), printed at Munich in 1584, and (9) one Marius Æquicolius, the author of an harangue *de laudibus trium Philoſophiæ facultatum.* Toppi (10) aſcribes the firſt of theſe two treatiſes to our Marius Æquicola. He gives us the title of it, with a clauſe, which Draudius has forgotten, *viz.* that Anſelm Stocklius firſt publiſhed this book, after he had corrected it. Leonard Nicodemo (11) mentions this title; *Introduzione di Mario Equicola al comporre ogni ſorte di rima della lingua volgare, con uno eruditiſſimo diſcorſo della Pittura, e con molto ſegrete allegorie, intorno alle Muſe, e alla poeſia*, at Venice 1555, in 4to. Add to this what will be ſaid in the following remarks.

Let us ſee what Mr . . . . . has informed me of, as to the relation of a journey, which Iſabella d'Eſte, marchioneſs of Mantua, made into Provence, to viſit St Baume, to which ſhe was obliged by a vow. The author declares, that he knows not the reaſon of that journey, and would not tell it, if he knew it (12). Here is his dedication. 'Marius Æquico- 'la Ferdinando Gonzagæ Franc. March. Mantuæ iiii. 'filio S. D. P. In hoc ſcribendo non minus equidem 'animo laboravi quam corpore fatigabar, cum ea 'adirem de quibus diximus loca: ſequitur enim laſ- 'ſitudo ingenii, ut corporis. Jam vero arma Itine- 'raria non Herculis ad poſtem fiximus, ſed in tem- 'plo Veneris genitricis conſecravimus. Illius ergo 'hæc ad te. Vale. - - - - *Marius Æquicola, to Fer- 'dinand Gonzaga, ſon of Francis iiii, marquis of Man- 'tua. In writing this, I have wearied my ſelf no leſs 'in mind than in body, when I came to thoſe paſſages, 'of which we ſpoke. But now I have hung up the ar- 'mour of my expedition, not on the pillar of Hercules 'but in the temple of my mother Venus. For her ſake I 'ſend you this.*' He begins his relation with inquiring into the original of vows among the ancients. After this, he leads his heroine, thro' Venice, over the Alps, into Provence, and gives a ſhort and good deſcription of the places, thro' which ſhe paſſed. The impreſſion of the book is faulty; for there is no year to it, nor is the year of the pilgrimage mentioned; but it ſeems it was before 1512.

[*D*] *What he wrote about the nature of Love was reprinted ſeveral times,*] Toppi mentions only the edition of Venice 1536, in 8vo; which is not the firſt; for he ſays, *Un libro di natura d'amore, riſtampato e corretto* (13) *Nicodemo* (14) takes notice of the edition of Venice 1554, in 12mo, which is intituled; *Libro di Natura d'amore di Mario Equicola di nuovo con ſomma diligenza riſtampato, e corretto da M. Lodovico Dolce. Con una tavola delle coſe piu notabili che nell' opera ſi contengono.* He ſays, that Doni mentions this book with praiſe, in his firſt *Libreria*, at p. 73, of the Venice edition 1550. This book of Æquicola was reprinted at Venice in 1563, and 1583. Gabriel Chapuys made a French tranſlation of it, which was printed at Paris (15): The following paſſage of Auguſtinus Niphus will not be ſuperfluous: 'Tempori- 'bus noſtris Marius Æquicola Olivetanus amiciſſimus 'noſter meo Judicio fertiliſſime de amore ſcripſit, & 'licet vulgari atque materno ſermone, tamen nihil 'intentatum præteriit (16). - - - *In our times, Marius 'Æquicola of Olivetum, my very good friend, wrote 'with a moſt fruitful genius, in my opinion, on the ſub- 'ject of love; and, tho' in the vulgar and mother- 'tongue, yet he left nothing unattempted.*' Do not take Olivetanus for an error of the preſs; for the author calls himſelf *Equicolam Olivetanum*, in his book *De opportunitate* (17). It was not becauſe he was of the order of the monks of mount Olivet, as Poſſevin affirms in his Apparatus; but becauſe he believed the place of his birth might be called *Olivetum* (18), as well as *Alvitum* or *Alvetium.*

[*E*] *Scaliger. the father, praiſes him very much.*] He inſcribed a piece of Poetry to him, which begins thus:

Maxime vir, geminas cui circum tempora laurus
    Purpurea facilis nectit Apollo manu:
Æquicola Aonidum decus, acceptiſſime rerum
    Numinibus veſtris, numinibuſque meis:
Quid faciam miſeri . . . . (19)?

O thou! the Muſes favourite! for whoſe brows
A double laurel Phœbus ſelf prepares:
Deareſt Æquicola! What ſhall I do,
Unhappy that I am? . . . . .

This Poem was written in 1517, if we believe Joſeph Scaliger (20), who adds, that his father and Matthew Bandel, a dominican, contracted a very cloſe friendſhip at Mantua, while they were both inſinuating themſelves into the favour of Æquicola.

[*F*] *The epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque deſerves to be cenſured.*] Marius Æquicola is there ſirnamed Alvelanus (21), which is a fault; it ſhould be Alvetanus. It is ſaid there, that his Italian treatiſe *De natura amoris*, corrected by Thomas Fazellus Porcaccius, was printed at Venice in 1563. I know no author, who has thoſe three names. Marius Æquicola Alvetanus, the author of that book, is impertinently diſtinguiſhed from Marius Æquicolus, 'Vir nobilis, Italus, eques 'auratus, qui ſcripſit pro Baptiſta Mantuano defenſo- 'rium in ſycophantas librum 1. Item de opportuni- 'tate. Item de natura & de amore. - - - - - *A man 'of noble birth, and an Italian, who wrote a book, in 'favour of Baptiſta Mantuanus, intituled* Defenſorium 'in Sycophantas; *another,* De opportunitate; *and 'another,* De natura & amore.'

(*b*) In the remark [*B*] of the firſt VERGERIUS.

(5) Leander Albertus, ubi ſupra.

(6) Theſe words are taken from a memoir, which Mr . . . . has been pleaſed to ſend me.

(7) At *pag.* 283, of the edition of Francfort, 1625.

(8) In quo tractatur unde antiquorum latria, & vera Catholica religio incrementum ſumpſerint: cum epiſtola Anſhelmi Stockii Equitis.

(9) At *pag.* 1451.

(10) Nicolo Toppi, ubi ſupra.

(11) Nicodemo, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 171.

(12) Cauſas norint alii, non diſſimulo ne meſcire: quod etiamſi ſcirem, diſſimularem.

(13) Toppi, ubi ſupra.

(14) Nicodemo, ubi ſupra.

(15) *See* du Verdier's Biblioth. Françoiſe, *pag.* 433.

(16) Auguſt. Niphus, de amore, *cap.* i, *pag. m.* 285.

(17) Mr . . . . in the memoir cited above.

(18) Ab Oleis, ibid.

(19) Julius Cæſar Scaliger, in Lacrymis, *part* i, *Poematum*, *pag.* 535, *Edit.* 1591.

(20) Joſephus Scaliger, Confut. Fabulæ Burdonum, *pag.* 264. *See alſo pag.* 240, 241.

(21) Epit. Bibl. Geſn. *pag.* 573.

MARLIANUS (RAIMOND), wrote an alphabetical deſcription, *veterum Galliæ locorum, populorum, urbium, montium, ac fluviorum, eorum maxime quæ apud Cæſarem in Commentariis ſunt, & apud Cornelium Tacitum*, i. e. *Of the antient places, people, cities, monntains, and rivers of Gaul, thoſe eſpecially, which occur in Cæſar's Commentaries, and Cornelius Tacitus:* which is uſually printed at the end of Cæſar's Commentaries. It was ſaid, in the year 1704, in a famous aſſembly, that he was *one of the learnedeſt men of his time, in the reign of Lewis* XII (*a*). In my edition of Julius Cæſar he is called *Vir clariſſimus, & ſui temporis eruditiſſimus*, that is, *A moſt famous man, and the greateſt ſcholar of his time.*

MARNIX (PHILIP DE) lord of Mount Sainte Aldegonde. See SAINTE ALDEGONDE.

MARNIX (JOHN DE) baron des Potes, *&c.* is not known to me but by a book intituled, *Reſolutions Politiques, ou Maximes d'Eſtat*, which he printed at Bruſſels in 1612, in 4*to*. It contains ſome good things, and chiefly in the margins. He dedicated it to the arch-duke *Albert*, ſovereign of the Low-Countries, whoſe ſubject he acknowledges himſelf to be. He put out, ſome years after, a ſecond edition of it, very much enlarged (*a*), and dedicated it to the Infanta Iſabella Clara Eugenia, this arch-duke's widow. I have not ſeen his other book, intituled *Repreſentations*, which the catalogue of Oxford mentions to have been publiſhed at Bruſſels in 1622, in 4*to*.

MAROT (CLEMENT) valet de chambre to Francis I, and the beſt Poet of his time, was of Cahors. He infinitely exceeded JOHN MAROT, his father, who was pretty good at making verſes (*a*) [*A*]. Some ſay, that *he was educated, in the quality of a page to Nicolas de Neufville, who was the firſt of his family that was ſecretary of ſtate*; but they are miſtaken [*B*]. They add, with more truth, that, about 1520, he was appointed to ſerve the princeſs Margaret [*C*], the king's ſiſter, and the duke of Alençon's wiſe.

[*A*] *JOHN MAROT, his father, ... was pretty good at making verſes.*] He was born at Mathieu, near to Caen, if we may believe Moreri. Others ſay only, that he was of Caen, and add, that he was Poet to queen Anne of Bretagne, and then valet de chambre to Francis I (1). The collection of his works contain, *The Doctrinal of Princeſſes and noble Ladies, deduced in* 24 *Rondeaux. The Journies to Genoa and Venice, victoriouſly finiſhed by king Lewis XII. Other forty-nine Rondeaux. An Epiſtle of the Ladies of Paris to king Francis I, being in Italy, after he had defeated the Swiſſers. Another Epiſtle of the Ladies of Paris to the Courtiers of France, who were then in Italy. Another Epiſtle to queen Claudia. The Church ſpeaking to France. A Royal Song about the Conception of Our Lady, and another Royal Song in honour of JESUS CHRIST* (2).

[*B*] *Some ſay, that he was educated in the quality of a page . . . . but they are miſtaken.*] Mr de Rocolles aſſerts this fact (3), againſt whom I offer two reaſons. Nicolas de Neufville, who was the firſt of his family, that was preferred to the poſt of ſecretary of ſtate, was born in 1542 (4); and therefore he could not have Clement Marot for page, who was then fifty-five years old, Nicolas de Neufville, his father, died very ancient in 1599 (5); neverthelеſs we may very well ſay, that he was born a long time after our Poet. Now, we never ſee gentlemen much younger than their pages. This is my firſt reaſon. The ſecond is taken from a Poem, wherein Marot relates, that, after he left his country, he was always in the retinue of Francis I.

A bref parler, c'eſt Cahors en Quercy,
Que je laiſſay pour venir querre icy
Mille malheurs; auſquelz ma deſtinée
M' avoit ſubmis. Car une matinée
N'ayant dix ans en France fus mené:
Là ou depuis me ſuis tant pourmené,
Que j'oubliay ma langue maternelle,
Et groſſement apprins la paternelle,
Langue Françoiſe es grand Cours eſtimée:
Laquelle en fin quelque peu s'eſt limée.
Suyvant le Roy François premier du nom,
Dont le ſavoir excede le renom.
C'eſt le ſeul bien, que j'ay acquis en France
Depuis vingt ans en labeur, & ſouffrance (6).

In ſhort, Cahors in Quercy did I leave,
Oppreſs'd with woes unnumber'd here to grieve.
Scarce ten years old, to France I was convey'd,
One morn; where, afterwards, ſo long I ſtay'd,
That I forgot my mother-tongue, to gain
Imperfectly the French, with toil and pain.
In time, I gain'd a victory entire
Or'e that fam'd language, which great courts admire;
Following the great king Francis, firſt o' th' name,
Whoſe knowledge far exceeds his royal fame.
In France, this ſole advantage cou'd I gain,
By twice ten years of ſuff'rance and of pain.

Mr de Rocolles adds, that *Marot dedicated to this lord of Neufville one of his Poems, intituled,* The Temple of Cupid; *and that the epiſtle, wherein he dedicates this Poem, is dated at Lyons, May the* 15*th*, 1538. Several editions of Marot (7), which I have conſulted, give me no ſuch account (§ *α*): The *Temple of Cupid* is placed in them at the beginning, without date, and without any dedication.

This wants reforming. See remark [*R*].

[(§ *α*). If Mr Bayle could have conſulted the old editions, particularly that of Stephen Dolet, Lyons 1542, in which this epiſtle is found, he would have ſeen, that, when Marot compoſed his *Temple of Cupid*, he was, in fact, page to Nicolas de Neufville, lord of Villeroy. For the reſt, this Poem is at leaſt as old as the year 1532, becauſe we find it among the *Juvenilia Clementina*, reprinted in 8vo, at Paris, that year, by Jeffery Tory. So that the dedication of the ſame Poem to the lord of Villeroy, in 1538, related properly to the laſt reviſal which the author made of it; and it is alſo what that dedication expreſsly ſays. REM. CRIT.]

[*C*] *He was appointed to ſerve the princeſs Margaret.*] Mr de Rocolles affirms, *that ſhe took him into her ſervice as her ſecretary* (8). But Marot, who is more to believed than any other, tells us, that he was not in that employment.

Rien n'ay acquis des valeurs de ce Monde,
Qu'une Maiſtreſſe, en qui git & abonde
Plus de ſavoir, parlant, & eſcrivant,
Qu'en autre femme en ce Monde vivant.
C'eſt du franc Lys l'iſſue Marguerite,
Grande ſur terre, envers le Ciel petite:

C'eſt

(*a*) See Memoires de Trevoux, *July* 1704, *pag.* 1133.

(*a*) It was reprinted at Rouen, in 1624, and in 1631, in 8vo.

(*a*) See Paſquier, Recherches de la France, *lib. vii, cap. vi, pag. m.* 613.

(1) La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 242.

(2) *Taken from* du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibliotheque Françoiſe, *pag.* 718.

(3) Rocolles, True Hiſtory of Calviniſm, *lib. v, pag.* 153.

(4) According to F. Anſelme, *Hiſt of the great Officers, pag.* 273, he died in 1617, aged ſeventy five years.

5) Anſelme, ib.

(6) Marot, in the poem intituled *Hell, pag.* 42, Hague Edit. 1700.

(7) That of Paris, by Nicholas du Cheſmin, 1545, in 16mo. That of Paris by Eſtienne Groulleau, 1552, in 16mo. That of Lyons by Guillaume Rouille à l'eſcue de Veniſe, 1558, in 16mo. That of Roüen, by Raphael du Petit Val, 1596, in 12mo. That of Roüen, by Claude le Vilain, 1615, in 12mo. That of the Hague, by Adrien Moetjens, 1700, in 12mo.

(8) Rocolles, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 154.

Wife. He followed that duke to the army in 1521 *(b)*. He was wounded, and taken priſoner, at the battle of Pavia [*D*]. This adventure is leſs taken notice of, than the perſecution he ſuffered from the bigots, who put him in priſon as one ſuſpected of Hereſy [*E*]. When he was delivered out of their hands, by the protection of Francis I, he

(b) See the Epiſtle of Marot from the camp of Attigny, *pag.* 104, of the Hague Edit. 1700, and the following.

C'eſt la Princeſſe à l'eſprit inſpiré,
Au cueur eſlu, qui de Dieu eſt tiré
Mieux (& m'en crois) que le feſtu de l'Ambre:
Et d'elle ſuis l'humble Valet de chambre.
C'eſt mon eſtat. O Juge Plutonique:
Le Roy des Francs, dont elle eſt ſœur unique,
M'ha fait ce bien: & quelque jour viendra,
Que la ſœur meſme au frere me rendra (9).

(9) Marot, ibid. *pag.* 43.

The only worldly benefit I found,
A miſtreſs was, in whom I ſaw abound
More wit, than her whole ſex beſide can ſhow;
Great on the earth, but to heav'n bending low.
My muſe the princeſs Margaret intends,
Into whoſe ſoul heav'n inſpiration ſends;
Whoſe pious heart GOD to himſelf does draw,
Better, I truſt, than amber does the ſtraw.
On her, her very humble ſlave, I wait;
And this, Plutonian judge, is Marot's fate.
This honour to her brother do I owe,
Who on his ſiſter did this gift beſtow:
The compliment, perhaps, ſhe may repay,
And Marot be giv'n back another day.

Theſe verſes inform us, that he was appointed by Francis I, to ſerve the princeſs, his ſiſter: which appears alſo by the following paſſage:

Ainſi je ſuis pourſuy, & pourſuivant
D'eſtre le moindre, & plus petit ſervant
De voſtre hoſtel (magnanime Princeſſe)
Ayant eſpoir que la voſtre nobleſſe
Me recevra, non pour aucune choſe,
Qui ſoit en moy pour vous ſervir encloſe:
Non pour prier, requeſte, ou rhetorique,
Mais pour l'amour de voſtre Frere unique,
Roy des François qui à l'heure preſente
Vers vous m'envoye, & à vous me preſente
De par Pothon, Gentilhomme honorable (10).

(10) Id. *in the* Deſpourveu à Madame la Ducheſſe d'Alençon, *pag.* 104.

'Tis thus, great princeſs, I aſpire to be
The humbleſt vaſſal of your high degree;
Hoping to me your favour will be ſhown,
Not for ought meritorious of my own;
But for the king your royal brother's ſake,
Who ſends me now, your bounty to partake.
Preſented thus by Mr Pothon's hand,
I humbly wait your highneſs's command.

[*D*] *He was wounded, and taken priſoner, at the battle of Pavia.*] The author of the Life of Clement Marot, inſerted in the collection of the moſt excellent pieces of the French Poets (11), has not omitted this adventure. He produces the following verſes of Marot, without telling us from what piece he had them (12).

(11) Printed at Paris by Claudius Barbin, 1692.

(12) It is from the firſt Elegy, *pag. m.* 47. It is not inſcribed to the king, as is affirmed in the Life of Clement Marot, prefixed to his works, in the Hague Edit. 1700.

Là fut percé tout outre rudement
Le bras de cil, qui t'ayme loyaument:
Non pas le bras, dont il ha de couſtume
De manier ou la lance, ou la plume:
Amour encor le te garde, & reſerve,
Et par eſcrits veult que de loing te ſerve.
Finalement, avec le Roy mon maiſtre
Delà les monts priſonnier ſe vid eſtre
Mon triſte corps, navré en grand ſuffrance.
Quant eſt du cueur, long temps y ha, qu'en France
Ton priſonnier il eſt ſans meſpriſon.

'Twas there that arm, whoſe loyalty profound
To you is known, receiv'd a cruel wound:
But not that arm, which wont to guide the pen,
Or wield the glitt'ring lance, was wounded then.
Love, for your ſake, that arm does ſtill preſerve,
It's miſtreſs, tho' removed far off, to ſerve.
Laſtly, beyond the Pyrenees convey'd,
And priſ'ner, with my royal maſter, made,
My body now's enſlav'd by cruel chance;
My heart has long your priſ'ner been in France.

[*E*] *The bigots put him in priſon, as one ſuſpected of Hereſy.*] This was done at the inſtance of Dr Bouchard, when Francis I was the priſoner of Charles V in Spain. The firſt of theſe two facts is proved by theſe words of Marot:

Donne reſponſe à mon preſent affaire,
Docte Docteur. Qui t'ha induit à faire
Empriſonner depuis ſix jours en ça,
Un tien Amy, qui onc ne t'offenſa?
Et vouloir mettre en luy crainte, & terreur
D'aigre juſtice, en diſant, que l'erreur
Tient de Luther? Point ne ſuis Lutheriſte,
Ne Zuinglien, & moins Anabaptiſte:
Je ſuis de Dieu par ſon filz Jeſu Chriſt (13).

(13) Marot's Epiſtle to Mr Bouchart, Dr of Divinity, *pag.* 116.

Anſwer me, learned ſir; what cou'd prevail
On you, to throw your friend into a goal,
Six days in hard confinement there to lye,
And tremble for the law's ſeverity;
Saying, that I with Dr Luther err?
I am no Heretic, I do aver.
Nor Zuinglius, nor Luther is my guide;
Much leſs with Anabaptiſts do I ſide.
My orthodoxy to the world is known;
I worſhip God, thro' Jeſus Chriſt his ſon.

He afterwards in this letter, continues to proteſt, that he is orthodox and a good Catholic. The proof of the ſecond fact is contained in the verſes I am going to tranſcribe. Note, that Marot relates, in them, what paſſed between his judges and him, during his impriſonment.

Or ſuis-je loing de ma Dame, & Princeſſe,
Et pres d'ennuy, d'infortune, & deſtreſſe,
Or ſuis-je loing de ſa treſclere face.
S'elle fus pres (ô cruel) ton audace
Pas ne ſe fuſt miſe en effort de prendre
Son ſerviteur, qu'on n'ha point veu meſprendre:
Mais tu vois bien (dont je lamente, & pleure)
Qu'elle s'en va (helas) & je demure
Avec Pluton, & Charon nautonnier.
Elle va veoir un plus grand priſonnier:
Sa noble mere ores elle accompagne
Pour retirer noſtre Roy hors d'Eſpagne (14).

(14) Marot, in the poem intituled *Hell, pag.* 43.

I'am abſent from my royal miſtreſs' eye,
And near to grief, diſtreſs and miſery,
Had ſhe been by, her preſence you'd have fear'd,
And guiltleſs I from durance had been ſpar'd.
But wiſely you the princeſs' abſence choſe.
(Fatal departure! cauſe of all my woes!)
She's gone, alas! and left Marot behind,
With Pluto, and with Charon, here confin'd.
She's gone, and her great mother in her train,
To bring our captive monarch back from Spain.

I know not the circumſtances of the concluſion of this proceſs; but I believe that the king and the princeſs Margaret protected our Poet. Do not tell me, that it he was ſtill in great fear of thoſe people, and ſo much the more, becauſe he had very naturally deſcribed the injuſtice of the Chatelet in one of his Poems (*c*). And therefore, when he knew, that they were again in ſearch after him, and that they had ſeized his books, he had not the courage to return to Paris [*F*]. He left Blois, where he had learned this

it is manifeſt that the letter (15), he wrote to Francis I, on the fifteenth day of his impriſonment, was very well received, and that this prince *was ſo charmed with it, that he wrote himſelf to the court of Aydes, to procure the liberty of Clement Marot* (16); for this concerns another impriſonment, not about Hereſy, which was after the king's return into France. It is eaſy, to prove all theſe particulars. Marot declares, that he had been in priſon fifteen days, and that he was accuſed of taking a priſoner out of the hands of the ſerjeants (17). It appears by the regiſter of the court of Aydes at Paris, that the letter of Francis I, concerning the enlargement of Marot, is dated from Paris, November 1, 1527 (18). This prince declares, *that he was duly informed of the cauſe of the ſaid impriſonment, which was the reſcue of certain priſoners*, and enjoins, *that all excuſes being ſet aſide*, Marot ſhould be delivered out of priſon; which orders the court obeyed. Here then is a fault to be corrected in the collection of the moſt excellent pieces of the French Poets, and in the new edition of the works of Clement Marot (19). The Life of this Poet, in both theſe works, ſays, that the letter of Francis I to the court of Aydes, delivered Marot out of priſon, where he had been put upon ſuſpicion of Hereſy. Did the court of Aydes meddle with that? This ought to teach thoſe, who write the lives of private perſons, that it concerns them to attend to the ſmalleſt circumſtances.

[*F*] *He had not the courage to return to Paris.*] Let us hear what he himſelf ſays: he tells us, that as he was returning thither, he came back, when he underſtood that the king was prepoſſeſſed againſt him. The verſes, which I cite, are in a letter, which he wrote to that monarch.

Pour revenir donques à mon propos,
Rhadamanthus aveques ſes ſuppoſts
Dedans Paris, combien que fuſſe à Blois,
Encontre moy fait ſes premiers exploits,
En ſaiſiſſant de ſes mains violentes
Toutes mes grands richeſſes excellentes,
Et beaux treſors, d'avarice delivres:
C'eſt à ſavoir mes papiers, & mes livres,
Et mes labeurs. O Juge ſacrilege,
Qui t'ha donné, ne loy, ne privilege,
D'aller toucher, & faire tes maſſacres
Au cabinet des ſaintes Muſes ſacres?
Bien eſt-il vray que livres de deffenſe
On y trouva: mais cela n'eſt offenſe
A un Poëte, à qui on doibt laſcher
La bride longue, & rien ne lui cacher (20).

- - - - - - - -

Le Juge donc affecté ſe monſtra
En mon endroit, quand les premiers outra
Moy, qui eſtois abſent, & loing des villes,
Où certains fols feirent choſes trop viles,
Et de ſcandale: helas, au grand ennuy,
Au detriment, & à la mort d'autruy.
Ce que ſçachant, pour me juſtifier.
En ta bonté je m'oſay tant fier,
Que hors de Blois party, pour à toy Sire,
Me preſenter: mais quelqu'un me vint dire,
Si tu y vas, amy, tu n'es pas ſage:
Car tu pourrois avoir mauvais viſage
De ton Seigneur. Lors comme le Nocher,
Qui pour fuir le peril de'un Rocher
En pleine mer ſe deſtourne tout court,
Ainſi pour vray m'eſcartay de la Court;
Craignant trouver le peril de durté:
Où je n'euz onc fors douceur, & ſeurté (21).

But to return to my narration true;
Fell Rhadamanthus, and his horrid crew,
At Blois their firſt attacks upon me made,
And their dire hands on all my riches laid.
They bore my books by violence away,
And my dear treaſur'd papers were their prey.
O ſacrilegious judge! What laws permit
To violate the Muſes cabinet?
Were books prohibited among them found?
Poets by ſuch reſtraints were never bound.
A looſer rein ſhou'd be indulg'd the muſe,
And bards have liberty their books to chuſe.

- - - - - - - -

Tho' abſent from the town, their ſpite I found,
Who know with keeneſt calumny to wound.
This knowing, I, my innocence to clear,
Reſolv'd before your majeſty t'appear;
And, leaving Blois, to court I took my way,
But ſome one ſtopp'd me, and began to ſay;
If you go thither, friend, you are not wiſe;
The king may ſee you with unfav'ring eyes.
Then, as a pilot, when he ſpies a rock,
Turns ſhort his veſſel, to avoid the ſhock,
So I my ſteps directed far from town,
Dreading a jail, whoſe hardſhips I had known.

Note, that he begins this letter with repreſenting that his flight is no proof that he owns himſelf to be guilty, but only that he is convinced of the bad adminiſtration of juſtice.

Je penſe bien que ta magnificence,
Souverain Roy, croira que mon abſence
Vient par ſentir la coulpe, qui me point
D'aucun mesfait: mais ce n'eſt pas le poinct.
Je ne me ſens du nombre des coulpables:
Mais je ſçay tant de Juges corrompables
Dedans Paris, que par pecune prinſe,
Ou par amis, ou par leur entreprinſe,
Ou en faveur, & charité piteuſe
De quelque belle humble ſoliciteuſe,
Ilz ſauveront la vie orde, & immunde
Du plus meſchant, & criminel du monde
Et au rebours, par faute de pecune,
Ou de ſupport, ou par quelque rancune,
Aux innocens ilz ſont tant inhumains,
Que content ſuis ne tomber en leurs mains.
Non pas que tous je les mette en un compte:
Mais la grand' part la meilleure ſurmonte.
Et tel merite y eſtre authoriſé,
Dont le conſeil n'eſt ouy, ne priſe.
Suyvant propos, trop me ſont ennemys
Pour leur Enfer, que par eſcrit j'ay mis,
Où quelque peu de leurs tours je deſcœuvre,
Là me veult on grand mal pour petit œuvre:
Mais je leur ſuis encor plus odieux,
Dont je l'oſay lire devant les yeux
Tant clervoyans de ta Majeſté haute,
Qui ha pouvoir de reformer leur faute (22).

Perhaps your majeſty may take my flight
For proof of guilt; but that wou'd not be right.
I truſt I ſhall not criminal be found:
But corrupt judges ev'ry where abound.
At Paris, money properly apply'd,
With friends, and a fair ſuitreſs on your ſide,
Will ſtop the hands of juſtice, right or wrong,
And ſave the vileſt ſlave that ever ſwung,
But, if you cannot bribe the magiſtrate,
Tho' innocent, the gallows is your fate.

I wou'd

(*c*) See the remark [*F*], citation (22).

(15) It is at *pag. m.* 149 of his works.

(16) The Life of Clement Marot in the collection of the moſt excellent pieces of the French Poets, *Tom. i.*

(17) See his letter to the king, *pag.* 149.

(18) See the *Anti-Baillet*, of Mr Menage, *Tom. ii, ch. cxii.*

(19) That at the Hague 1700.

(20) Marot, in his Epiſtle to the king, during his exile at Ferrara, *pag.* 179.

(21) Ib. pag. 180.

(22) Ib. pag. 176.

this news, and retired to the houſe of the queen of Navarre, his antient miſtreſs (*d*), and, not thinking himſelf ſafe there, he went into Italy, and ſtaid at the court of the princeſs

---

(*d*) The ducheſs of Alençon was become queen of Navarre by her marriage with John d'Albret.

I wou'd not fall into ſuch hands as theſe,
To ſuffer, or eſcape, as they ſhall pleaſe.
Not that this cenſure comprehends them all;
But ah! the number o'th' upright is ſmall.
And ſuch alone deſerve to fill the chair,
Who without favour or affection hear.
*Beſides, too many foes my Hell * has made*
Of ſuch, who fear, leſt I ſhould ſpoil their trade;
Who curſe my muſe for painting them aright,
And dragging ſome of their dark deeds to light.
But more they take offence, that I ſhou'd dare
To bring ſuch verſes to your royal ear.
They know, your majeſty has piercing eyes,
To ſee, and to reform, their villanies.

* A poem of Marot's ſo called.

He informs us afterwards of a thing his Hiſtorians take no notice of, *viz.* That he was made priſoner while he was under a great ſickneſs, and that the king gave orders he ſhould be let alone.

- - - Meſmes un jour ils vindrent
A moy malade, & priſonnier me tindrent,
Faiſans arreſt ſus un homme arreſté
Au lict de mort, & m'euſſent pis traité,
Si ce ne fuſt ta grand' bonté, qui à ce,
Donna bon ordre avant que t'en priaſſe,
Leur commandant de laiſſer choſes telles:
Dont je te rends graces treſimmortelles (23).

(23) Ibid. *pag.* 177.

One day they came, when I in bed was laid,
Sick, and in pain, and me their pris'ner made;
Arreſting one almoſt at his laſt breath,
And ſinking under the arreſt of death.
But let me thank your gracious majeſty,
Which kindly interpos'd to reſcue me.
My life and liberty to you I owe,
Who bad their envious rage no farther go.

Then he goes on, and cenſures the Sorbonne, and proteſts, that the ſuſpicions of Hereſy, they had endeavoured to raiſe in the king's mind againſt him, were altogether unjuſt. See what he ſays againſt the Sorbonne.

Autant comme eux, ſans cauſe qui ſoit bonne
Me veult de mal l'ignorante Sorbonne:
Bien ignorante elle eſt d'eſtre ennemie
De la trilingue, & noble Academie,
Qu'as erigée. Il eſt tout manifeſte,
Que là dedans contre ton veuil celeſte
Eſt deffendu qu'on ne voiſe allegant
Hebrieu, ny Grec, ny Latin elegant:
Diſant, que c'eſt langage d'Heretiques.
O povres gens de ſçavoir tous ethiques!
Bien faites vray ce proverbe courant,
Science n'ha hayneux que l'ignorant.
Certes, ô Roy, ſi le profond des cueurs
On veult ſonder de ces Sorboniqueurs,
Trouvé ſera que de toy ils ſe deulent.
Comment douloir? Mais que grand mal te veulent,
Dont tu as fait les lettres, & les arts
Plus reluiſans, que du temps des Ceſars:
Car leurs abus void on en façon telle.
C'eſt toy, qui as allumé la chandelle,
Par qui maint œil void mainte verité,
Qui ſous épeſſe, & noire obſcurité
A fait tant d'ans icy bas demeurance.
Et qu'eſt-il rien plus obſcur qu' ignorance?
Eux, & leur court en abſence, & en face
Par pluſieurs fois m'ont uſé de menace:
Dont la plus douce eſtoit en criminel
M' executer (24).

(24) Ibid.

The Sorbonne, ignorant ſociety,
Beholds Marot with no leſs jealous eye:
Thoſe ignorants, who fooliſhly withſtand
The nurs'ry, founded by your royal hand;
Where the three languages ſhould ſtudied be:
But 'tis well known, they thwart your majeſty,
Forbidding the young ſtudents to recite
Greek, Hebrew, Latin, languages polite;
But languages abus'd by Heretics,
And therefore ill befitting Catholics.
Poor wretches, laid in Pagan darkneſs low,
You verify the Proverb (well I know)
That ignorance is learning's only foe.
Certes, O king, cou'd we to th' bottom ſee
Of their diſlike, they hate your majeſty;
Under whoſe reign, auſpicious, arts ariſe,
Science uprears her head, and ignorance flies;
Learning appears in a more ſhining robe,
Than when the mighty Cæſars ſway'd the globe.
'Tis you have lit the candle, by whoſe light,
Truth, bury'd long in ignorance's night,
(For what is more obſcure, than ignorance?)
Burſts forth upon the general eye of France.
Theſe ignorants, and their ſociety,
Preſent, and abſent, oft have menac'd me,
Death was the mildeſt ſentence I cou'd hope;
And 'twas their pity doom'd me to the rope.

I do not ſet down the heroic vow, which he adds. He wiſhed he might be ſacrificed to their rage, provided the church were not ſubject to their frauds. I doubt whether he would have carried his zeal ſo far as he ſaid; but I do not doubt of what he ſays, that thoſe Doctors had a mind to keep up ignorance. This part of the XVIth century will be an eternal blot to the Sorbonne, who managed things at that rate. Let us now go on to the proteſtations this Poet made of his being orthodox.

Or à ce coup il eſt bien évident,
Que deſſus moy ont une vieille dent,
Quand ne pouvans crime ſur moy prouver,
Ont tres-bien quis (25), & tres-bien ſceu trouver,
Pour me faſcher, briefve expedition,
En te donnant mauvaiſe impreſſion
De moy ton ſerf, pour apres à leur aiſe
Mieux mettre à fin leur voulonté mauvaiſe:
Et pour ce faire ilz n'ont certes eu honte
Faire courir de moy vers toy maint compte,
Avêques bruit plein de propos menteurs,
Deſquelz ilz ſont les premiers inventeurs.
De Lutheriſte ilz m'ont donné le nom:
Qu' à droit ce ſoit, je leur reſponds que non.
Luther pour moy des cieux n'eſt deſcendu:
Luther en Croix n'ha point eſté pendu
Pour mes pechez: & tout bien adviſé,
Au nom de luy ne ſuis point baptizé:
Baptizé ſuis au nom qui tant bien ſonne,
Qu'au ſon de luy le Pere éternel donne
Ce que l'on quiert: le ſeul nom ſous les cieux
En, & par qui, ce monde vicieux
Peut eſtre ſauf. Le nom tant fort puiſſant,
Qu'il ha rendu tot genoüil flechiſſant,
Soit infernal, ſoit celeſte, ou humain:
Le nom, par qui du Seigneur Dieu la main
M'ha preſervé de ces grands loups rabis,
Qui m'eſpioient deſſous peaux de Brebis (26).

(25) The ſame as *cherché.*

(26) Ibid. pag. m. 178.

princeſs Renata of France, ducheſs of Ferrara (*e*), who was a good friend to thoſe of the Reformed religion. He obtained, of Francis I, leave to return, in 1536 [*G*]; but he was ſo well known to be a follower of what was called the new opinions, that he made his eſcape, ſome years after, to Geneva. It is pretended, that he there debauched his landlady, and that the penalty of death, which he feared, was changed into that of whipping, at the requeſt of Calvin [*H*]. He left Geneva, and went to Piedmont, where he died

Now their revengeful ſpirit plain is ſeen,
When, failing 'gainſt my life to vent their ſpleen,
A ſhort expedient they at length have found,
At once my quiet, and my fame to wound,
By robbing me of what I hold moſt dear,
Your gracious countenance, and princely ear;
That, ſtript of royal favour, I may feel
The utmoſt rage of blind and furious zeal.
This to effect, without remorſe or ſhame,
My character they blacken and defame,
And brand with Luther's Hereſy my name.
The charge is falſe, and a meer calumny;
Luther did not come down from heav'n for me,
Nor dy'd upon the croſs, from ſin to ſet me free.
In Chriſt's, nor Luther's, name, I was baptiz'd;
That name, whoſe ſound in Heav'n ſo much is priz'd,
That it procures us all we wiſh to have,
Powerful alone a vitious world to ſave:
That name, at which all knees do humbly bow,
In Heav'n above, in Earth, or Hell below:
That name, by which the Father does me keep
Safe from theſe ravenous wolves, in cloathing of a ſheep.

[*G*] *He obtained .... leave to return in* 1536.] This date is verified by his poem intituled, *A God-bleſs-you to the Court* (27), which he wrote a little after his arrival: in it he ſpeaks of the death of the Dauphin, and of the marriage of the princeſs Magdalen (28), and obſerves, that ſhe was upon her departure. Now the Dauphin was poiſoned in Auguſt 1536, and the princeſs Magdalen married the king of Scotland on the firſt day of the year 1537. Add to this, that Marot ſays he arrived at Lyons, a little after Francis I. ſet out from thence (29).

Si qu'à Dieu rends graces un million,
Dont j'ai atteint le gracieux Lyon,
Où j'eſperoys à l' arriver tranſmettre
Au Roy François humble ſalut en mettre (30)
Conclud eſtoit. Mais puis qu'il en eſt hors,
A qui le puis je, & doy je addreſſer, fors
A toy qui tiens par prudence loyale,
Icy le lieu de ſa hauteur Royale (31).

At Lyons (Heav'n be prais'd!) I am ſafe arriv'd,
But of my hopes unluckily depriv'd.
King Francis, at whoſe feet I thought to lay
His humble ſlave, and my poor duty pay,
Is gone: ſince then I've miſs'd his majeſty,
To whom can I ſo properly apply,
As you, who, by your royal maſter's grace
With loyal prudence here ſupply his place?

Mr Maimbourg ſays, that the ducheſs of Ferrara *obtained of the king the return of our Poet, upon aſſurance given, that he ſhould be more wiſe for the future* (32). Others ſay, that king Francis I. granted the ducheſs her petition, only *upon condition, that Marot ſhould return to the Romiſh religion, and ſhould be more diſcreet for the future* (33). I do not ſee in the works of Marot, that that princeſs meddled with this; and I doubt whether her zeal for the Proteſtant religion would permit her to treat of the recalling any man upon ſuch conditions. This is certain, that Marot, having begged of the Dauphin to obtain him a paſs for ſix months, declared that he had learned in Italy to be very circumſpect in his diſcourſes, and never to ſpeak of GOD.

Il le feroit (34) s'il ſavoit bien comment
Depuis un peu je parle ſobrement:
Car ces Lombards avec qui je chemine,
M'ont fort apris à faire bone mine:
A un mot ſeul de Dieu ne deviſer,
A parler peu, & à poltronniſer.
Deſſus un mot une heure je m'arreſte:
S'on parle à moy, je reſpons de la teſte.
Mais je vous pry mon ſaufconduit ayons,
Et de cela plus ne nous eſmayons (35).

The king wou'd me recal, were it but known,
How cautious in diſcourſe of late I'm grown.
Theſe Lombards, in whoſe country I reſide,
From talking indiſcreet my tongue have ty'd.
To utter the word GOD *I'm never heard;*
I dwell an hour upon a ſingle word.
If any ſpeak, I hear indeed what's ſaid,
But only nod, and anſwer with my head.
Pray let my paſſport be diſpatched away,
And of theſe things we'll talk another day.

[*H*] *It is pretended, that he debauched his landlady at Geneva, and that the penalty of death .... was changed ... at the requeſt of Calvin.*] All thoſe, who affirm this, build upon the teſtimony of Cayet, who therefore muſt be taken for the firſt, and the only perſon that affirms it. Florimond de Remond, who is alſo cited, is only his tranſcriber. *As if by reading and meditating on the Pſalms, which he tranſlated ſo ill,* they are the words of Mr Maimbourg, *he was not become a better man* †, *and afterwards, according to his former cuſtom, leading a very licentious life, he had debauched his landlady, which is puniſhed with death at Geneva. Calvin, by his intereſt, cauſed his puniſhment to be changed* ‡ *into another more mild, which was that of whipping, which he ſuffered through all the ſtreets* (36). Here follow the words of another writer. *Having committed at Geneva a notorious adultery, he had certainly been hanged, if, by the intereſt of Calvin, they had not converted the puniſhment into that of whipping through all the ſtreets of Geneva, as Cayet ſays. But Beza, conſidering he was one that followed the ſame errors with himſelf, and whoſe pſalms he had finiſhed, does not ſo clearly declare this fact* (37). It is true, Theodore Beza only obſerves in general, that Clement Marot could never reform the habit of immorality, he had got at the court of France. *Quamvis (ut qui in aula, peſſima pietatis & honeſtatis magiſtra, vitam fere omnem conſumpſiſſet) mores parum Chriſtianos ne in extrema quidem ætate emendarit* (38). This general expreſſion implies a great deal, and in particular inſinuates, that Marot did in no wiſe edify the Genevois by his chaſtity. However, I do not think it probable, what Cayet ſays; for if a poet, ſo famous as Marot, and ſo much hated in the Romiſh communion, had been whipped through all the ſtreets of a great city, all Europe would have quickly known it; he would have been inſulted, upon the account of this infamy, in ſeveral books; he would not have dared to preſent himſelf before thoſe, who commanded for the French king at Piedmont; we ſhould not have been reduced to the ſingle teſtimony of Victor Cayet, ſo many years later than this adventure. Some may ſay, that the Proteſtants themſelves would have publiſhed this puniſhment, to ſhew the ſeverity of their diſcipline at Geneva: but it muſt be granted, that this obſervation has no great weight; for, without being perfect in the moſt refined politics, any one will judge that the reputation of a brother, who is perſecuted, muſt be managed to the beſt advantage (39). For the reſt, it is ridiculous to object to the Proteſtants the publick uſe of Marot's Verſion, ſuppoſing he had been puniſhed for his adulteries: for the immorality of a Poet, who tranſlates the Pſalms of David well, ought not to prevent the ſinging of his tranſlation in churches; any more than the immorality of a Painter,

(*e*) See the Epiſtle, which Marot wrote to the king, during his exile.

(27) Pag. m. 191.

(28) He calls her Queen Magdalen: but this does not prove, that the marriage was compleated; it being ſufficient that it was agreed upon.

(29) This prince departed from thence, after the emperor Charles V retired from Provence, in the autumn of the year 1536.

(30) That is to ſay, in verſe.

(31) Marot, in his poem to cardinal de Tournon, *pag.* 189.

(32) Maimbourg, ubi infra, *pag.* 97.

(33) The Life of Marot, in the collection of the moſt excellent pieces of the French Poets.

(34) *That is,* the king would recall me.

(35) Marot, Epiſtle to the dauphin, *pag.* [illegible]3.

† Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Egliſes Ref. *lib. i.*

‡ Cayer, *in his* Formul. Flor. de Ræm. *lib. viii, cap. xviii.*

(36) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calv. *livr. ii, pag. m.* 99.

(37) The Life of Clement Marot, in the collection of the moſt excellent pieces.

(38) Beza, in Iconibus.

(39) Note, that the public records of Geneva make no mention of this puniſhment of Marot. See Jurieu, Apol. for the Reformed, *cap. vii, pag.* 124.

died in 1544, aged about ſixty years [*I*]. The Chronological fault, which, it ſeems, Mr Maimbourg is guilty of, concerning the firſt flight of Clement Marot, is very ſlight [*K*]. As to the other faults he has committed, ſpeaking of this perſon, you may ſee a refutation of them in the authors, who wrote againſt his hiſtory of Calviniſm. You may find in Sleidan (*f*), and Paſquier (*g*), a fine Elogy upon Clement Marot. It may be ſaid, without flattery, not only that the French Poetry had never appeared with ſuch natural charms and beauty, as he adorned it, but alſo that, in all the remainder of the XVIth century, there appeared nothing that came near his happy Genius, his native elegance, and the ſmartneſs of his Poems. The Poets of the Pleiad are dull in compariſon of him: And if, in the next age, a Voiture, a Sarrazin, a Benſerade, and ſome others, exceeded him, it is only becauſe they found the times improved to a better judgment, and a more refined ſtile (*h*). The incomparable La Fontaine, who owned him-

ſelf

(*f*) Sleidan, lib. xv, ad ann. 1543, fol. m. 366.

(*g*) Paſquier, Recherches, *lib. vii, cap. v, pag. m.* 613, 614.

(*h*) Mr de la Bruyere, whoſe words you will ſee in the remark [*M*] of the article RONSARD, confirms this.

Painter, or Statuary, ought to hinder thoſe, who worſhip images, from conſecrating a picture or ſtatue.

[*I*] *He died in Piedmont in* 1544, *aged about ſixty years.*] The firſt of theſe two facts is told us by Sammarthanus, and the ſecond by Theodore Beza. But we muſt not think, that Sammarthanus condeſcended to tell us, that Marot died in 1544. This had been too plain, and would not have allowed him to expreſs himſelf in pompous phraſes: therefore, in order to it, he tells us that this Poet died the year, in which the battle of Cerizolles was fought. ‘Cum extorris & rerum ‘egenus Taurini apud inſubres procul à tuorum aſpectu ‘deceſſeris, eo ipſo anno quo ad Cereſolam illius agri ‘oppidum regius exercitus Anguiano duce inſignem de ‘Cæſarianis victoriam reportavit (40). *You dying a ‘baniſhed man, far from the ſight of your relations and ‘friends, in Piedmont, that very year, in which the ‘king's army, under the duke of Anguien, gained a ſignal ‘victory over the Germans at Cerizoles, a town of that ‘country.*’ There is among the Poems of Marot (41), *a ſtanza of ten verſes to the king, ſent from Savoy in* 1543, and (42) *a ſalutation from the camp of the duke of Anguien at Cerizoles.* This ſhews, that he left Geneva the ſame year that he publiſhed his fifty Pſalms. ‘Edidit illos quinquaginta Pſalmos hoc anno ‘Genevæ, quoſeſe receperat, cum in Galliis propter ‘Lutheraniſmi ſuſpicionem parum eſſet tutus. Triginta quidem Pſalmos ediderat ante biennium (43) - - - ‘*He publiſhed thoſe fifty Pſalms this year at Geneva, ‘whither he had retired, not being ſafe in France, on ‘account of a ſuſpicion of Lutheraniſm. He had publiſhed thirty Pſalms two years before.*’ There is an Eclogue upon the victory of that duke of Anguien (44). As to the ſixty years of Marot's life, I muſt have recourſe to other witneſſes (45), for Sammarthanus does not ſtoop to take notice of it. Note, that I ſhall rectify, below in the remark [*R*], what concerns the ſixty years. The verſes, cited above in citation (5), ſeem to prove, that, in 1526, he was but thirty years of age. Note, that in his eclogue, under the name of Pan and Robin, he conſiders himſelf as on the brink of old age.

[*K*] *The Chronological fault, which, it ſeems, Mr Maimbourg is guilty of, is very ſlight.*] He ſays that Clement Marot did not run away till 1535. ‘When . . ‘he ſaw, that the king, his maſter, poſitively declared ‘in the hall of the biſhop's palace that he would ‘ſpare no body in this caſe, he was afraid leſt he ‘ſhould be ſeized, and therefore he fled quickly into ‘Berne, and after that he went farther over the Alps ‘to Ferrara, to the ducheſs Renata, who protected the Proteſtants (46).’ The King's Declation in the hall of the biſhop's palace, was in the year 1535 (47). Mr Maimbourg relates it (48) under that year with many circumſtances. Now we have ſhewn above, that Marot returned from Ferrara into France in 1536, and we find in his poems (49) a letter from Lyon Jamet to Marot, of which the laſt verſes are theſe:

C'eſt à Ferrare au huictieme an
De la ſienne proſcription.
Mais à la tienne intention
Que ce ſoit le dernier. Amen.

That is,

At Ferrara, in the eighth year of his baniſhment: but may it prove the laſt. Amen.

This is a proof will ſome ſay, that the flight of Marot could not be, at the lateſt, till the year 1528. But thoſe, who ſhall ſay ſo, are very much to blame; for Lyon Jamet marks the time of his own proſcription, and not of Marot's. It will be ſaid, that this latter, in a letter, which he wrote to Ferrara, upon the departure of Madam de Soubiſe, ſays (50), that this lady left a court, wherein ſhe had continued ſeven years. It is probable that ſhe followed Renata of France, who was married, in 1527, to the duke of Ferrara; from whence it might be concluded, that ſhe returned into France in 1534; which would prove, that Marot was beyond the Alps that year. But, I confeſs, this proof appears to me weak, when I conſider, that Rabelais, in the year 1536, mentioned the return of this lady as a piece of news (51). As I ſee nothing in the Works of Marot, which can make us believe, that he ſtayed long at the court of the duke of Ferrara, I do not think, that Mr Maimbourg is much miſtaken; for Marot himſelf tells, that he ſtayed but a little while at the court of the king of Navarre.

Si m'en allay, evitant ce danger,
Non en pais, non à Prince eſtranger,
Non point uſant de fugitif deſtour,
Mais pour ſervir l'autre Roy à mon tour,
Mon ſecond Maiſtre, & ta ſœur ſon eſpouſe,
A qui je fus des ans a quatre & douze,
De ta main noble heureuſement donné.
Puis toſt apres, Royal chef couronné,
Sçachant pluſieurs de vie trop meilleure,
Que je ne ſuis, eſtre bruſlez à l'heure,
Si durement, que mainte nation
En eſt tombée en admiration,
J'abandonnay, ſans avoir, commis crime,
L'ingrate France, ingrate, ingratiſſime
A ſon poëte (52).

I fled, tis true, the danger to avert,
But fled not to a ſtranger prince's court.
A fugitive is an inglorious thing:
I paid my duty to another king,
My ſecond maſter, and his royal ſpouſe,
The princeſs, Sir, your ſiſter, in whoſe houſe,
Full ſixteen years are paſs'd, ſince I was plac'd,
And with the title of her ſervant grac'd.
Soon after, hearing, that the fire did roaſt
Many, of better lives than I can boaſt,
Whilſt wand'ring nations ſaw, with great ſurpriſe,
The kindling flames of perſecution riſe;
France I abandon'd, that ungrateful ſoil,
But moſt ungrateful to her Poet's toil.

Comparing this paſſage with that, which I have cited above (53), we may eaſily diſcover the true epoch of the retreat of Clement Marot, and in what manner the circumſtances are to be ordered. The enemies of this poet accuſed him to the king in the time of the placards, and doubtleſs they rendred him ſuſpected of being an accomplice in the inſolence of thoſe who poſted them up. He had notice of this, and was reſolved to go and juſtify himſelf: but becauſe he was told, that he could not compaſs his end, he retired to the queen of Navarre, and, being informed there, that Francis I cauſed ſome Lutherans to be burnt, he removed farther

ſtill

(40) Sammarthanus, Elog. *lib. i, pag. m.* 24.

(41) *At pag.* 383.

(42) *At pag.* 387.

(43) Sleidanus, *lib. xv, fol. m.* 366 *verſo*, ad ann. 1543.

(44) *At pag.* 473.

(45) To Theodore Beza, who has ſaid, in his *Iconis, circiter annum vitæ ſexageſimum mortuus.* La Croix du Maine, probably upon the authority of Beza, has ſaid, *pag.* 65, that Marot died at the age of ſixty years or thereabouts.

(46) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, pag. 97.

(47) See Bouchet's Annals of Aquitain, *fol. m.* 271.

(48) *Pag.* 30, *& ſeq.*

(49) *At. pag.* 174.

(50) The works of Marot, pag. m. 209.

(51) See the article FERRARA, citat. (47).

(52) Marot's Epiſtle to the king, in the time of his exile at Ferrara, pag. 180, 181.

(53) Citat. (21).

ſelf to be his ſcholar [*L*], has contributed very much to reſtore the credit of this antient Poet's verſes. An infinite number of curious perſons ſought after his works, and could hardly find them; which obliged a Bookſeller at the Hague (*i*) to reprint them. This is a very fine edition. You may ſee, in the judgments that have been collected about Clement Marot (*k*), ‘ that the French Poets are indebted to him for the rondeau, and ‘ that they do in a manner owe to him the modern form, or the reſtoration of the ſonnet, ‘ and madrigal, and of ſome other kinds of little verſes.’ We may add, that he invented the mixture of maſculine and feminine rhymes (*l*), without which our Poetry would be very harſh and unpleaſant. There are but too many obſcene pieces among his works [*M*], and

ſtill from Paris, and eſcaped into Italy. And thus Mr Maimbourg is miſtaken only in a few months: he thought that Marot did not retire to Berne, till after the harangue of the king; whereas he ſhould have ſaid, that he retired ſome weeks before (54).

[*L*] *La Fontaine owned himſelf to be his ſcholar.*] See what he wrote to Mr de Saint-Everemond.

Vos beaux Ouvrages ſont cauſe,
Que ja'y ſceu plaire aux neuf Sœurs,
Cauſe en partie, & non toute:
Car vous voulez bien ſans doute,
Que j'y joigne les Ecrits
D'aucuns de nos beaux Eſprits.
J'ay profité dans Voiture,
Et Marot par ſa lecture
M'a fort aidé, j'en conviens.
Je ne ſçay qui fut ſon Maiſtre
Que ſe ſoit qui ce peut eſtre,
Vous eſtes tous trois les miens (55).

'Tis from your works I've learn'd to pleaſe the Nine;
But you'll allow me other wits to join
With you, as the inſpirers of my Muſe:
Voiture's and Marot's aid I can't refuſe:
I profit by them both, I frankly own.
Who Marot's maſter was, to me's unknown;
But you all three were mine. . . .

‘ I had forgot maſter Francis, whoſe diſciple I acknow‘ledge my ſelf to be, as well as Mr Vincent's, and ‘ Mr Clement's *.’ What he ſays, that he did not know whoſe ſcholar Marot was, gives me occaſion to recite a paſſage of Lewis Camerarius, which will inform us, that John le Maire de Belges was Marot's maſter. ‘ Audivi ego ex viris dignis fide, Eum illum ‘ Belgam, hominem doctum, & in linguæ Latinæ an‘tiquioribus ſcriptis multum verſatum, primum fuiſſe, ‘ qui rationem & modum demonſtraret elegantioris ſer‘monis Gallici loquendo, ſcribendi autem quaſi artis ‘ viam indicaſſe, quam cum ipſe ſequeretur uſurpando, ‘ tum aliis præcipiendo traderet: Eumque Poëtam quem ‘ Gallia habuit celeberrimum, & cujus ornatam copiam ‘ venuſtatemque imprimis admirata eſt, Clementem ‘ Marottum, eundem percoluiſſe & componendi verſus ‘ ſcientiam edocuiſſe (56). - - - - *I have been informed* ‘ *by men of credit, that John le Maire de Belges, a man* ‘ *of learning, and very converſant with the ancient La*‘*tin authors, was the firſt who poliſhed the French* ‘ *tongue, and taught others, by his own example, the art,* ‘ *as it were, of writing: and that the ſame perſon in*‘*ſtructed the famous and admired French Poet, Clement,* ‘ *Marot, to make verſes.*’ By this author's leave, theſe Latin words are very ill placed; he ſhould not have taken advantage of the liberty, which the ancient language of the Romans allows, of making uſe of expreſſions that may be underſtood in different ſenſes. We muſt conſult Chronology, to know whether he means that Clement Marot taught John le Mair, or whether John le Maire taught Clement Marot to make verſes. The latter is the true ſenſe; but we cannot diſcover it without a cloſe attention to the author's deſign, and the help of Chronology. Why does he thus unneceſſarily fatigue the mind of his readers? I will obſerve, upon this occaſion, another thing againſt the ſame writer, concerning the book, out of which I have taken the aforeſaid paſſage. It is the Latin tranſlation of the Treatiſe of Schiſms, written in French by John le Maire de Belges: It was printed at Leipſic in 1572, with notes. Lewis Camerarius knew not, that John Schardius had already publiſhed (57) a Latin tranſlation of the ſame book in 1566. Voſſius knew nothing of the Latin tranſlation of Lewis Camerarius; for he mentions only the other (58). Note, that Marot, in his letter to Madam de Soubize, ſpeaks of John le Maire, without taking notice that he had been taught by him.

Or adieu donc, noble Dame, qui uſes
D'honeſteté tousjours envers les Muſes.
Adieu par qui les Muſes deſolées
Souventesfois ont été conſolées,
Adieu qui voir ne les peult on ſouffrance.
Adieu la main qui de Flandres en France
Tira jadis Jean le Maire Belgeois,
Qui l'ame avoit d' Homere le Gregeois (59).

Adieu then, noble lady, to whoſe hand
The Muſes, for reſpect, indebted ſtand!
Adieu, from whom the afflicted Nine receive
The kindeſt conſolation, when they grieve!
Adieu the hand, which firſt from Flanders brought
Divine le Maire, inſpir'd with Homer's thought.

But here follows what I find in the Recherches of Stephen Paſquier: ‘ Our country-man Clement Marot, in ‘ the ſecond impreſſion of his works, owns, that it ‘ was John le Maire de Belges who taught him to make ‘ an eliſion of the *e* feminine in the middle of the ‘ verſe (60).

[*M*] *There are but two many obſcene pieces among his works.*] He followed in this the humour of the times, and of the beſt Poets of antiquity, and, which is worſe, his own inclinations and courſe of life; for he was not only a court Poet, but alſo a man, who loved women, and could not renounce his ſenſual pleaſures. We have ſeen in Latin, the teſtimony that Theodore Beza gives of him (61). Let us now ſee what he ſays of him in French: *Clement Marot, after his return from Italy to the court, was very much hated by the Sorbonne, for tranſlating, very happily, thirty Pſalms of David into the French tongue, which are dedicated to the king, who thought them worthy to be printed. But he was forced to make his eſcape, and retreated to Geneva, where he tranſlated twenty more of them. He had always been bred up in a very bad ſchool, and could not live in ſubjection to the reformation of the Goſpel; and therefore he went, and ſpent the reſt of his days in Piedmont, which was then in the poſſeſſion of the king, where he lived in ſome ſecurity under the favour of the governours* (62).’ Yet it muſt be confeſſed, that the obſcenities of Clement Marot are leſs groſs, and better wrapped up, than thoſe of the Roman Poets, and of many French Poets, companions of Theophile. What is ſtrange, is, that the talents of his wit, his ſmartneſs, the agreeable, lively, eaſy, ingenious turn of his Muſe, are never perceived more, than when he writes upon a laſcivious ſubject. Is it not ſtrange, that the greateſt part of the Poets have an unhappy gift of ſucceeding better on this, than on other ſubjects? Such a Poet, whoſe verſes would be inſipid, unleſs he gives a looſe to his pen, makes excellent pieces (63), when he lays aſide all modeſty. This cannot proceed from the nature of Poetry it ſelf, but muſt come from the corruption of man's heart. Whatever may be the cauſe of it, the effect appeared certain to thoſe, who have given it for a maxim, that a Poet ought to be chaſte as to his perſon, but not as to his verſes, ſince they cannot be acceptable, and ſeaſoned with ſalt, unleſs they be a little ſmutty.

Nam caſtum eſſe decet piam poetam
Ipſum. Verſiculos nihil neceſſe eſt:

(*i*) Adrian Moetjens: his edition is of the year 1700, in two volumes in 12mo.

(*k*) Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, *Tom. iii, pag.* 206.

(*l*) See the Obſervations of Mr Menage upon the poems of Malherbe, *pag.* 402. But note, that Marot ſometimes diſpenſed with this mixture.

(54) The affair of the Placards happened in the month of November 1534. The proceſſion and the harangue of Francis I, belong to the month of January 1535.

(55) La Fontaine's Poſthumous Works, pag. 107. Dutch Edit.

* Francis Rabelais, Vincent Voiture, and Clement Marot.

(56) Ludovicus Joach. F. Camerarius, in Procem. Verſionis Latinæ Tractatus de Differentiis Schiſmatum.

(57) *At Baſil, with the four books of* Theodoricus à Niem, Hiſtoriarum ſui Temporis.

(58) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. pag. 650.

(59) Marot, Epiſtle to Madam De Soubize, pag. 209.

(60) Paſquier, Recherches, *lib. vii, cap. v, pag. m.* 612. See the words of Marot below, in the remark [*R*].

(61) In the remark [*H*], citation (38).

(62) Beza, Hiſt. des Egliſes Reform. *lib. i, pag.* 33.

(63) Poetically, but not morally, ſpeaking.

and this gives juſt occaſion to blame him. I ſhall relate ſome curious things concerning his verſion of the fifty Pſalms of David [*N*]. The moſt notable particulars are to be found in

Qui tum denique habent ſalem, ac leporem,
Si ſunt molliculi, ac parum pudici,
Et quod pruriat incitare poſſunt,
Non dico pueris, ſed his piloſis.
Qui duros nequeunt movere lumbos (64).

The Bard himſelf ſhou'd chaſte and pious be:
His verſe is not reſtrain'd to chaſtity;
For ſprightly wit implies obſcenity.
Such wit, as rouzes to the feaſts of love
Mortals, who ſcarce their ſluggiſh haunches move.

Which is a falſe maxim, or at leaſt a very pernicious one, and deſerves not to be looked upon as a rule, by men who are ſincerely good. But it is with this, as with the itching deſire of uttering a jeſt. No conſideration can reſtrain it (65) and, when a poet thinks himſelf capable of doing wonders in an epigram, provided he admits ſome obſcene thoughts into it, he quits, in favour of his Wit, the ſentiments of mind. This is what Des Accords did. ‘ *I wiſh*, ſays he, I had not been ſo looſe and wanton at that age, but I cannot help it now. I will excuſe myſelf by this diſtich, which I gave to a learned and ſevere Senator of our parliament of Dijon, together with the book.

Putidulum ſcriptoris opus ne deſpice, namque
Si laſciva legis, ingenioſa leges.

Let not a little ſmut offend your ear:
Together wit and wantonneſs appear.

‘ And indeed, I never affected to appear ingenious, that I might be laſcivious; but I have been laſcivious only that I might be ingenious (66).’ Such writers may find a good leſſon in this laſt verſe of an epigram of Martial (67), *Tanti non erat eſſe te diſertum:* a leſſon, which he gave to others, and which himſelf ſtood in need of as much as any body, but which he never practiſed. Let us return to Marot, and ſay, that, in all probability, his heart and his wit agreed: however it be, he gave no ill turn to this kind of verſes. His epigram on a *wild Spouſe*, was thought worthy by Menage to be inſerted almoſt entire among his obſervations, where he endeavours to prove that it was formerly ſaid, *j'ai mors*, for *j'ai mordu* (68).

[*N*] *I ſhall relate ſome curious things concerning his verſion of the fifty Pſalms of David.*] Florimond de Remond (69) affirms, that Marot, after his return from Ferrara into France, was exhorted by Vatablus to turn the Pſalms of David into French verſe, and that, following his advice, he publiſhed a verſion of thirty Pſalms, and dedicated it to Francis I. It was cenſured by the faculty of Divinity at Paris, who, moreover, made ſome remonſtrances and complaints of it to that monarch. ‘ The king, who loved Marot for the fineneſs of his wit, made uſe of delays, and ſaid, that he had approved the firſt draughts, and deſired to ſee the reſt. Upon which account the Poet ſent him this epigram.

Puis que voulez que je pourſuive, ô Sire,
L'œuvre Royal du Pſautier commencé,
Et que tout cœur aymant Dieu le deſire,
D'y beſongner me tiens pour diſpenſé:
S'en ſente donc qui voudra offenſé:
Car ceux à qui un tel bien ne peut plaire,
Doivent penſer ſi jà ne l'ont penſé,
Qu'en vous plaiſant, me plaiſt de leur deſplaire

Since you deſire it, Sire, I can't refuſe
To cloath in metre David's royal muſe.
Let thoſe then, whom the work diſpleaſes, know,
If you're my friend, I care not who's my foe.

‘ Nevertheleſs the publication, after many remonſtrances made to the king, was forbidden. But

Des hommes plus la choſe eſt deſirée,
Quand plus elle eſt aux hommes prohibée,

We value moſt what is forbidden us.

They could not be printed ſo faſt as they were ſold off. They were not then ſet to Muſic, as they are now, to be ſung in churches; but every one gave them ſuch a tune as he thought fit, and commonly that of a balad. Each of the princes and courtiers took a Pſalm for themſelves. King Henry II loved this Pſalm, *Ainſi qu'on oyt le cerf braire*, - - - *Like as the Hart doth breathe and bray*; and took it for his own, which he ſung in hunting. Madam de Valentinois, whom he loved, took this, *Du fond de ma penſée*; - - - *Lord, to thee I make my moan*; and made choice of it for herſelf. The queen choſe the Pſalm, *Ne vueillez pas ô Sire*, - - - *Lord, in thy wrath reprove me not*; which ſhe ſung to a merry tune. Antony, king of Navarre, took the Pſalm, *Revange moy, prens la querelle*; - - - *Judge, and revenge my cauſe, O Lord*; which he ſung to the tune of a dance of Poitou, and ſo did the reſt. In the mean time, Marot, fearing leſt he ſhould be ſent to priſon a ſecond time, becauſe he could not hold his tongue, fled to Geneva, where he continued his verſion as far as fifty Pſalms (70). Beza put the remaining hundred Pſalms into verſe (71), and the Pſalms, which he rhymed in imitation of Marot's, were received by all men with as much applauſe as ever any book had. For not only all the Lutherans, but the Catholics alſo took pleaſure in ſinging them; becauſe they were pleaſant, eaſy to learn, and fit to be played upon the violin, and muſical inſtruments. Calvin took care to put them in the hands of the beſt Muſicians in Chriſtendom; and, among the reſt, he pitched upon Godimel, and another called Burgeois, to ſet them to Muſic (72). After this, ten thouſand copies of the Pſalms in rhime, ſet to Muſic, were diſperſed every where. Then every one begun, even the Catholics, to carry them about, and ſing them as ſpiritual ſongs, thinking there was no hurt in doing it. For they were not as yet, nor till ſome years after, a form of religious worſhip among the Calviniſts; but afterwards they were appointed to be ſung in their aſſemblies, being divided into ſmall ſections; which was done in the year 1553, to ſerve as a reſting-place, where they might take breath, after ſo long a devotion as theirs is. For the ſinging of Pſalms at church, for the moſt part, laſts half a quarter of an hour. After they were bound up with the Calvinian and Geneva catechiſms, the uſe of them was wholly forbidden, and the former prohibition renewed, with a ſevere penalty; ſo that to ſing a Pſalm, was to be a Lutheran (73).’ The ſubſtance of this narrative of Florimond de Remond was turned into elegant Latin, by Famianus Strada (74), who particularly obſerves, that Francis I. often ſung this tranſlation of the Pſalms (75).

As I intend here chiefly to inſiſt on matters of fact, I have not taken notice of the critical obſervations of Florimond de Remond. He pretends, that Marot has falſified the Hebrew text, tho' Vatablus gave him a very good verſion of it. The criticiſms of this Hiſtorian have been confuted not only by reaſons, but alſo by authorities (76). Mr Jurieu has produced ‘ *the approbation of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, upon which Charles IX, in the greateſt heat of perſecution, granted a Licence to Antony Vincent, a Printer at Lyons, for the printing of theſe Pſalms. The approbation runs thus:* We, Doctors of Divinity, whoſe names are here ſubſcribed, do certify, that, in a certain tranſlation of the Pſalms, preſented to us, beginning at the forty eighth Pſalm, with theſe words, *C'eſt en ſa très Sainte cité*, and ending with this verſe, *Chante à jamais ſon Empire*. We have found nothing contrary to our Catholic faith, but every thing agreeable to it, and to the truth of the Hebrew text: in teſtimony whereof we have ſigned the preſent certificate, Octob. 16, ſigned J. de Salignac. Viboult. *The Licence, granted to Plantin, for printing*

---

(64) Catullus, Epigr. xvi.

(65) See the remark [*D*] of the article MARY, the Egyptian.

(66) Des Accords, in his preface to his *Bigarrures*.

(67) The forty third of the twelfth book.

(68) Menage, Obſervations ſur la Langue Françoiſe, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 90. Edit. of Paris 1675.

(69) Florimond de Remond, Hiſt. of the Birth and Progreſs of Hereſy, *livr. viii*, *cap. xvi*, *pag. m.* 1042, & *ſeq.* See alſo Mr Varillas, his tranſcriber, *book xxi*, of the Revolutions, *pag.* 48, & *ſeq.* Dutch Edit.

(70) Id. Flor. de Remond, ibid. *pag.* 1043.

(71) Id. ib. *pag.* 1044.

(72) Id. ib. *pag.* 1049.

(73) Id. ib. *pag.* 1050.

(74) Strada de Bello Belg. *dec. i*, *lib. iii*, *pag. m.* 130, 131.

(75) Rex quamvis ejus (*Maroti*) verſiculos identidem cantitaret. *Id. ib.*

(76) See Mr Jurieu, Apology for the Reformers, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 126, & *ſeq.* Edit. in 4to.

‘ *theſe Pſalms, ſays alſo, that theſe Pſalms, before the impreſſion,* had been examined, viewed, and approved, by Mr Joſſe Schelling, Portionary of St Nicolas at Bruſſels, deputed for this end by the council of Brabant. And that, after the impreſſion was finiſhed, they were viewed again, and found to be no wiſe repugnant to the Catholic faith (77).’ That the dates may appear, we muſt add to theſe words, what the ſame author ſays three pages after; which is, that the edition, for which Charles IX granted a licence to Antony Vincent, a Printer at Lyons, ‘ *is to be ſeen at this day, bearing date* 1562; *and that the privilege of the ſixteenth of October is of the ſame year. Three years after, Plantin printed them at Antwerp, with the privilege of Philip, king of Spain* (78).’ Mr Bruguier, miniſter and profeſſor of Divinity at Nimes, has related the very words of the licence of Charles IX. The moſt authentic approbation of this work, *ſays he* (79), ‘ was that of king Charles IX, in 1561, who, after he had cauſed theſe Pſalms to be examined by ſome perſons well verſed in the Scripture, and the Languages, found that they were faithfully tranſlated according to the truth of the Hebrew text, whereupon, being in council, he readily gave his approbation, and licence for printing and ſinging of theſe Pſalms. The words of the licence, which are ſtill to be ſeen in our old Pſalms, are theſe. *By a ſpecial favour, full power, and royal authority, we have given and granted to Antony, the ſon of Antony Vincent, Bookſeller at Lyons, the privilege, leave, licence, and permiſſion, for the ſpace of ten years next following, to print, or cauſe to be printed, when, and wheresſoever he ſhall pleaſe, all the Pſalms of the prophet David,* tranſlated according to the truth of of the Hebrew text, *turned into French metre, and ſet to good Muſic, as it is well known, and has been examined by men learned in the holy Scripture, and in the ſaid languages, and alſo in the art of Muſic,* &c.’ There are ſome difficulties in all this; for it is hardly conceivable, that Charles IX ſhould have granted to a Bookſeller of Lyons a licence, dated October the nineteenth, 1562, for printing the Pſalms of Clement Marot, and Theodore Beza. The firſt civil war of religion was then in it's greateſt height. Lyons had been in the power of the Huguenots for five months, and they were actually beſieged in Roan. It is therefore more probable, that this licence was granted in 1561, as Mr Bruguier ſays: but this difference of dates between him and the other miniſters (80) is inconvenient. Beſides it is inconceivable, that, in 1561, or 1562, the tranſlation, which was ſung at Geneva, ſhould have been examined by the Sorbonniſts, without the forty ſeven Pſalms; for, according to Florimond de Remond, the fifty Pſalms, which Marot tranſlated, were bound up with the other hundred Pſalms, tranſlated by Theodore Beza, and with the Calvinian catechiſms, in the year 1553; and from that time ‘ the uſe of them was wholly forbidden, and the firſt prohibitions were renewed with ſevere penalties (81). ’Note, that the forty eighth Pſalm, which was the beginning *of the tranſlation preſented* to the doctors of the Sorbonne, was not tranſlated by Clement Marot, but by Theodore Beza. I muſt not forget, that the Sieur de Pours, in his vaſt catalogue of the Pſalms, that have been printed with licence (82). ſays nothing of the edition of Lyons approved by the Sorbonne, and authorized by Charles IX, but he obſerves, that the edition of Plantin, approved by a doctor, *deputed to that end by the council,* having a royal licence, dated June the ſixteenth, 1564, was finiſhed in the month of September next following, and that the names of Clement Marot, and Theodore Beza, do not appear in it (83) (§β). Add to this the remark [*S*].

[(§β) The privilege for the tranſlation of the other Pſams is dated, not the nineteenth of October 1562, as Mr Jurieu believed, but the nineteenth of October 1561, and it is the ſame which Mr Bruguier has cited under this date. For the reſt, tho' I am fully perſuaded, that the approbation of the Sorbonne, of the ſixteenth of October 1561, is ſtill in being, I cannot tell where it is; for the privilege of the nineteenth of October does not contain it, nor even mention it. Here is my opinion on all this, which yet does not entirely ſatisfy me.

It is paſt doubt, that king Francis I, licenſed the impreſſion of the Pſalms, the tranſlation of which Marot dedicated to him. It was, I think, in the year 1540, in conſequence of the approbation, mentioned by Sleidan, *lib.* xv, under the year 1543. But this privilege related only to the thirty Pſalms then tranſlated by this Poet. Theſe thirty Pſalms make a part of Marot's works, printed in 8vo, by Dolet, in 1542, *with a privilege for ten years,* ſays the title of this edition.

Nevertheleſs, this approbation, in the intention of the Sorbonne, muſt imply much leſs than a licence for printing, ſince, according to Sleidan's account in the ſame place, after the impreſſion of theſe thirty Pſalms procured by Marot, this Poet, as being an avowed Lutheran, was obliged to retire to Geneva, where, in 1543, he tranſlated into verſe twenty other Pſalms, which being printed the ſame year at Geneva with the firſt thirty, gave occaſion to a preface, which Calvin prefixed to this edition.

We do not find, that, 'till the year 1553, the Reformed, whether natives of France, or inhabitants, ſung any other Pſalms, than theſe fifty, excepting *eight* other *Pſalms,* the tranſlators of which are yet unknown; which eight Pſalms, with the firſt thirty of Marot, were printed, in 1542, in Gothic, *at Rome, by order of the Pope, by Theodore Druſt, a German, his Printer in ordinary, the fifteenth of February*; as we read in the laſt leaf of the book, printed in 8vo, without either name, of place or Printer. Jeremiah de Pours knew nothing of this edition, which, by the way, is the ſame with that of Straſburgh, 1545, except as to the number of Pſalms. The other hundred, put into verſe by Beza, appeared probably in 1553, ſince it was at that time, that being tacked to the Catechiſm and Liturgy of Geneva, they excited the averſion of the Catholics, who, after the example of Francis I, on his death-bed †, made no ſcruple to uſe the firſt fifty.

This averſion continued to the time of the Conference of Poiſſy, the event of which, being favourable to the Reformed, produced, the nineteenth of October 1561, the privilege of Charles IX, upon the approbation given by the Sorbonne, on the ſixteenth, for the tranſlation of the reſt of the Huguenot Pſalms; in conſequence of which, the edition of Antony Vincent appeared at Lyons, in 1562; from which, ſeveral years after, other editions, in various forms, were printed at Lyons, Rochelle, and elſewhere, all in virtue of this privilege, which ought to have been inſerted in them at length, together with the approbation of the Sorbonne.

Villemadon's letter, cited by Mr Bayle in the remark [*O*], mentions the Pſalm, *Vers l'Eternel des oppreſſez le Pere,* &c. This Pſalm, which is the 142d, and, according to the remark of Jeremiah de Pours, the 141ſt, after the reckoning of that time; this Pſalm, I ſay, is the laſt but one of the Gothic edition of 1542; and it was then juſt tranſlated into verſe, probably for the uſe of the Dauphineſs Catherine de Medicis, who, being thitherto barren, and threatned for that reaſon with a divorce, conceived hopes from thence of the birth of a prince in a ſhort time, which in effect happened the following year. REM. CRIT.]

He obſerves (84), that the fifty Pſalms of Clement Marot were printed at Straſburg in 1545, with the eccleſiaſtical Liturgy. ‘ The Muſic of thoſe Pſalms, *ſays he,* is not every where like that, which was aftewards made uſe of. The poetry is alſo in many places different from that which is in thoſe old editions .... The firſt Pſalm in it ends thus:

Car le chemin des bons eſt approuvé
Du Seigneur Dieu, qui touſiours l'a trouvé
Droit & uni: Car on ne s'y fourvoye.

The Pſalms are without ſections or marks of diſtinction. The Apoſtle's Creed, and ſome other Canticles, are ſet alſo to Muſic, and, beſides the common Decalogue, there is alſo another.

Oyons la voyx que de ſa voix
Nous a donné le Createur,
De tous hommes legiſlateur,
Noſtre Dieu ſouverain. Kyrie-Eleiſon.

(77) Ibid. *pag.* 127.

(78) Ib. *pag.* 130.

(79) Bruguier, Diſcourſe about the ſinging of Pſalms, *pag.* 32, 33. This Diſcourſe was printed in 1664.

(80) Drelincourt, in his dialogues againſt the miſſionaries, concerning the ſervice of the Reformed churches, *pag.* 59, affirms, that all the Pſalms were printed at Lyons and Paris, with an authentic licence of king Charles IX, in 1562.

(81) Flor. de Remond, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 1050.

(82) Jeremiah de Pours, Divine Melody of the Holy Pſalmiſt, *pag.* 570, & *ſeq.*

(83) Id. ib. *pag.* 571.

† Inventory of Serres, in the place where the death of king Francis I, is mentioned.

(84) Id. ib. *pag.* 570.

That is,

Let us hear the voice of our Creator, the law-giver of all men, our ſupreme GOD. Lord have mercy upon us.

‘ Which is repeated at the end of every verſe of the Decalogue.’ What follows deſerves to be conſidered. ‘ The firſt preface, prefixed to the Pſalms of Marot by the church of Geneva, is dated June the tenth, 1543, written by Mr John Calvin . . . . All the Pſalms, with their Muſic, were printed the firſt time at Geneva, with a preface concerning an agreement for the relief of the poor Refugees at Geneva; which then the other Printers, who printed from the firſt copies, ſhould voluntarily and liberally furniſh. The deacons of Geneva, in 1567, after the preface to the ſermons of John Calvin upon Deuteronomy, complain, with grief, *of thoſe, who printed, or cauſed to be printed every day, and who had heretofore printed, the Pſalms turned into metre by Beza. For every one of them knows very well, that they could not with a good conſcience, and ought not to print them, without paying to our poor, what was promiſed and agreed upon before ever they were printed the firſt time* (85).’ De Pours obſerves (86), *that Lewis Bourgeois ſet eighty threePſalms to Muſic in four, five, and ſix parts, which were printed at Lyons in* 1561; *and* (87) *that Guidomel* (88) *ſet to Muſic the Pſalms of David, printed at Paris, by Adrian le Roy and Robert Balard, in* 1565; *and that our Pſalms were ſet to Muſic in four and five parts, by Claudius Guidomel, and after that by Claudius le Jeune, who was of Valenciennes* (89).

I wonder he takes no notice of him, who was the firſt author of the ordinary Muſic; for Muſic, in ſeveral parts, was never uſed in the Reformed churches. Here is what a profeſſor of Lauſane did me the honour to write to me. ‘ I have diſcovered a thing which is curious enough: It is a teſtimonial, which Beza gave under his hand, and in the name of the other miniſters, to William Franc, the ſecond of November, 1552, wherein he declares, that it was he, who firſt ſet the Pſalms to Muſic, as they are ſung in our churches: and I have ſtill a copy of the Pſalms, printed at Geneva, where William Franc's name is; and beſides this, a licence from the magiſtrate, ſigned Gallatin, ſealed with red wax, in 1564, in which he is alſo acknowledged to be the author of this Muſic. Our Plantin, in his *Luſana Reſtituta*, gives him the ſame teſtimony (90).’

Here follows the anſwer of Mr de Pours to Florimond de Remond, concerning the conformity of the tunes of ſome Pſalms with thoſe of balads (91). ‘ Florimond ſays, the tune of our thirty eighth Pſalm;

Las en ta fureur aigue
Ne m'argue,
De mon fait Dieu toutpouſſant,

‘ agrees with this balad,

Mon bel ami, vous ſouviene,
De Piene,
Quand vous ſerez par dela.

‘ And that the tune of the 130th Pſalm agrees with this,

Languirai-je plus guere,
Languirai-je toujours!

‘ If it had pleaſed this counſellor, he might have added a ſong of the adverſity of England, changed into proſperity, to the tune of the thirty eighth Pſalm.

Tous les Huguenots de France,
Mille cinq cens & cinquante,
La Regente,
Qu'on appelle Eliſabeth.

All the Huguenots of France,
One thouſand, five hundred, and fifty,
The queen,
Whom they call Elizabeth.

‘ Of whom it is ſaid,

Comme auſſi en Angleterre,
Bonne terre,
Dieu ſa grace a fait couler,
Leur donnant en ce Royaume
Une Dame
Qui ne veut point vaciller.

As alſo in England,
A good land,
GOD has pour'd down his grace,
Giving them in this kingdom
A miſtreſs,
Who will continue ſtedfaſt.

‘ This ſeems to be more antient, intituled, to the tune de Piene, without making any mention of the aforeſaid Pſalm.

Sus Cardinaux, Archeveſques,
Et Eveſques,
Venez tous me ſecourir,
Moines, preſtres & Hermites,
Jeſuites,
Venez pour me voir mourir.
Papauté ſuis appellée,
Qui meſlée,
Me ſuis de perdre la gent,
Envoyant dedans la flamme,
Corps & ame
Du riche & de l'indigent.
Je veux que de moi on chante,
La meſchante,
Qui juſqu'au ciel s'eſlevoit,
Elle eſt cheute & abiſmée,
La damnée,
Qui tout le monde enchantoit.

Come, cardinals, archbiſhops,
And biſhops;
Come all to my aſſiſtance,
Monks, prieſts, and hermits,
Jeſuits,
Come, and ſee me dye.
My name is Popery,
Who have attempted
To ruin the nation,
Setting on fire,
The body and ſoul
Of the rich and poor.
I wou'd have them ſing of me,
The wicked,
Who lifted himſelf up to Heav'n,
She is fall'n, and ſunk,
The damned one,
Who enchanted the whole world.

‘ Now they muſt know, that theſe delicate ſtrains are taken away from the wanton Poets, as being unjuſt poſſeſſors of them; and their wantonneſs is turned into holineſs. That, which was wont to belong to them, is taken from them, and is as it were ſanctified: antiently, any thing that was of common uſe, tho' it were even the ſpoil of an enemy, being ſolemnly ſet apart and ſequeſtred, and applied to the ſervice of the ſanctuary, was reputed a holy thing.’ After this, he makes uſe of recrimination (92), and ſhews, that the tranſlation of the Pſalms into Flemiſh verſe, printed at Antwerp, by Simon Cock, in 1540, with the Imperial licence, granted at Bruſſels in 1539, contains a Muſic borrowed from balads, and that it is ſaid ſo at the beginning of each Pſalm (93). ‘ You will find, *ſays he*, in the Pſalms of Cock, theſe following inſcriptions ſet down according to the Pſalms. The 72d Pſalm is ſung to the tune of, *D'ou vient cela*. The 81ſt to the tune of, *Sur le pont d'Avignon*. The 95th to the tune of, *Que maudit ſoit ce faux vieillard*. The 103d Pſalm to that of, *Languir me faut*. The 113th to that of, *De triſteſſe & deſplaiſir*. Likewiſe,

---

(85) Id. ib. *pag.* 582.

(86) Ibid. *pag.* 575.

(87) Ibid. *pag.* 581.

(88) He ſhould be called *Goudimel.*

(89) Ibid. *pag.* 721.

(90) A MS. letter from Mr Conſtant de Rebecque, who ſhall be mentioned hereafter, in citation *(b)* of the *diſſertation concerning Junius Brutus*, at the end of this work.

(91) Ibid. *pag.* 577, 578.

(92) This recrimination was alſo made uſe of, when Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm was anſwered; for the ſongs, that are ſung at Chriſtmas, and the ſpiritual ſongs of Colletet, and thoſe, which the author of *l'Evêque de Cour* made ſuch a jeſt of, were objected. See Jurieu, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 128, 129, *and Mr Rou,* Remarks upon the Hiſtory of Calviniſm, *pag.* 39, *& ſeq.*

(93) De Pours, ibid. *pag.* 578.

in a letter written to Catherine de Medicis, a little after the death of Henry II [*O*].
We

‘ wiſe, the 120th Pſalm to that of, *Madame la regente ce n'eſt pas la façon.* The 128th Pſalm to that of, *Il me ſuffit de tous mes meaux.* The 135th to that of, *Le berger & la bergere ſont a l'ombre d'un buiſſon.* It is a Flemiſh Pſalter, and thoſe inſcriptions, which at firſt were were all in French, are placed there in Walloon, according to the Imperial ſtile, mentioned in our preface, which puts the Walloon language for good French (94).

I have quoted in the margin (95) two authors, who have objected to the Catholics the prophane tunes of their Chriſtmas ſongs, *&c.* I add, that there has been lately reprinted, at Geneva, a piece which had been publiſhed in 1645, and which affords matter for a ſharp recrimination: Out of which I ſhall tranſcribe what follows. ‘ Nullo delectu ſacra profanaque juxta habet *(hæc gens)* imo tam præpoſtero cultu divina curat, ut pios Eccleſiæ uſus nullis non ſemper inſanientis ſeculi ludis pervertat, ſordibuſque contaminet. Quæ quidem ſatis denuo experti ſumus, his Natalis Chriſti nuper exactis temporibus, cum omnia templa putidis profanarum cantionum vocibus perſonarent: ubi quotannis ipſum Incarnationis Myſterium turpiſſimis ſecularium cantuum odis conſpurcatur; tantuſque amor eſt Eccleſiaſticos hymnos ad mundanas ejuſmodi cantilenas inflectere, ut nulla quantumvis obſcœna vulgetur, quin ſtatim in Eccleſiis ridicule detorta audiatur; vixque in indignatione riſum teneo, quoties recordationem ſubit alicubi videri ſacrorum cantuum rituale, in quo hanc (ut alias omittam omnino turpes) rubricam legere eſt:

MAGNIFICAT to the tune of,

Que ne vous requinquez-vous vieille:
Que ne vous requinquez-vous donc (96)?

‘ - - - *This people makes no difference between ſacred and prophane things; nay, their care of divine things is ſo prepoſterous, that they pervert and defile them with every folly of a looſe and abandoned age. This I was ſufficiently convinced of, the laſt Chriſtmas, when every church reſounded with prophane ſongs; where every year the myſtery of the Incarnation itſelf is prophaned with moſt ſcandalous worldly ſongs; and ſo fond are they of adapting church hymns to ſuch worldly ſongs, that the moſt obſcene no ſooner appear, than they are ridiculouſly heard in the churches: and I can ſcarce forbear laughing in my anger, when I recollect that I have ſeen a ritual of Pſalms, in which (to omit others, which are quite ſcandalous) you may read this rubric.* Magnificat, *to the tune of,*

Trick up yourſelf, old dame.

The piece, I ſpeak of, was written by an advocate called Muret, who inſcribed it to the famous Gaſſendus, to repreſent to him the ridiculous ceremonies of the Provençals.

[*O*] *The moſt particulars are to be found in a letter . . . . written to Catherine de Medicis, a little after the death of Henry II.*] It is dated Auguſt 26, 1559, and was ſent to Catherine de Medicis ‘ by a gentleman, who had ſerved the deceaſed queen of Navarre, and ſubſcribed himſelf Villemadon, with whom the aforeſaid lady (97) had formerly conferred privately about her affairs, and even about points of religion (98).’ I will make uſe of the very words of the letter. ‘ (99) I ſhall begin, Madam, with telling you, that, in the reign of king Francis, and the late king, who was then Dauphin, being returned from Piedmont, where he forgot himſelf ſo far as to commit a vile and foul adultery, by the counſel and management of certain minions, wicked and unfaithful ſervants, and by whom, moreover, the wretched wife of the great ſeneſchal, Diana of Poitiers, who was the public and common receptacle of ſo many debauched and diſſolute men, ſome of whom are dead, and others are ſtill alive, was introduced to him as a fine ring, from whom he would learn a great deal of virtue: and after the news was come, that a baſtard child was born of the foreſaid adultery; you were talked of, Madam, by the foreſaid ſcoffers, and the ſaid old whore, who declared among themſelves, that you was incapable of ſo great an honour, as to be the wife of a Dauphin of France, becauſe you would never have any children, ſince you had been ſo long without bearing any, and it was not the fault of your lord and huſband. I remember that, at the caſtle of Rouſſillon upon the Rhône, they had a great deal of talk about it, notice whereof was brought to the deceaſed queen of Navarre, who loved you very well, and told me . . . . . . (100). You was not ignorant, Madam, of this miſchief, which was deſigned againſt you; but you had then a bloody wound in your heart, and you ſought after the lord with tears and prayers, becauſe you wanted him: And at that time you acknowledged him, honouring the Holy Bible, which was kept in your trunks, or lay upon the table, in which you looked, and read ſometimes. And your women and ſervants had the happy opportunity to read in it; and there was none but the nurſe, who did not love you much, no more than ſhe did GOD, who was angry at it. . . . . GOD did not anſwer you preſently, but left you for many years in a languiſhing condition, that you might ſeek after him, pray, and beſeech him, that he would awake for your aſſiſtance. . . . . The Almighty, your protector . . . . (101) prepared and opened a way, from whence all the bleſſings of the king and your ſelf were to ſpring, and to come to perfection. For this Father, being full of mercy, put it in the heart of the deceaſed king Francis, to take great pleaſure in the thirty Pſalms of David, with the Lord's-Prayer, the angelical Salutation, and the Apoſtles Creed, which the late Clement Marot had tranſlated, and dedicated to his majeſty; who commanded the ſaid Marot to preſent the whole to the emperor Charles V, who received the ſaid tranſlation graciouſly, highly valued it, and preſented him with two hundred Spaniſh piſtoles, and alſo encouraged him to finiſh the ſaid work, by tranſlating the reſt of the ſaid Pſalms, and deſired him to ſend him, as ſoon as he could, the Pſalm *Confitemini Domino, quoniam bonus,* becauſe he particularly loved it. Which ſeeing and hearing the Muſicians of thoſe two princes, nay all the Muſicians of France, ſtrove who ſhould beſt ſet the ſaid Pſalms to Muſic, and every body ſung them. But if any perſon loved them dearly, and commonly ſung them, and cauſed them to be ſung, it was the late king Henry, who loved them ſo well, that good men bleſſed GOD for it; and his minions and his whore loved them, or feigned ſo great a love for them, that they wont to ſay, Sir, ſhall not this be mine? Give me that if you pleaſe: inſomuch that this good prince had much ado to pleaſe every one's fancy, according to his deſire. Nevertheleſs kept for himſelf the following Pſalm, as you may remember:

Bienheureux eſt quiconques
Sert à Dieu volontiers, &c (102).

The man is bleſt who fears the Lord,
Nor only worſhip pays,
But keeps his ſteps confin'd with care
To his appointed ways, &c.

‘ He himſelf made a tune to this Pſalm, which was very good and pleaſant, and very ſuitable to the words. He ſung it, and cauſed it to be ſung ſo often, that he plainly ſhewed he had an earneſt deſire to be that bleſſed man, whom David deſcribes in the ſaid Pſalm, and to ſee you become the fertile vine therein mentioned. This was when he was recovering of his ſickneſs at Angouleſme. The queen, my miſtreſs, (who was then with king Francis, her brother) intreated him to uſe with pity and clemency the citizens of Rochelle, inſtead of maſſacring them, and ſent me to you to be informed of his ſickneſs; which I found ſo much abated, that he begun to ſing the ſaid Pſalms, with lutes, violins, ſpinnets, and flutes, attended with voices; and he took great delight in them, and commanded me to come near him, becauſe he knew that I loved Muſic, and could play a little upon the lute and guittar; and he

‘ ordered

---

(94) Id. ib. *pag.* 578.

(95) See, above, citat. (92).

(96) Querela ad Gaſſendum de parum Chriſtianis Provincialium ſuorum ritibus, &c. *pag.* 71. Edit. Genev. 1700.

(97) *That is to ſay*, Catherine de Medicis.

(98) Beza, Hiſt. Eccl. *book iii*, *pag.* 225.

(99) Recueil des choſes Memorables faites & paſſees pour le faict de la Religion, & Etat de ce Royaume depuis la mort du Roy Henry II, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 501, *Edit.* 1565, *in* 12*mo.*

(100) Ib. *pag.* 502.

(101) Ib. *pag.* 503, *& ſeq.*

(102) It is the 128th Pſalm.

We muſt not forget, that the church of Geneva, which was the firſt that made uſe of this verſion of the Pſalms, was the firſt that forſook it [*P*], to make uſe of another verſion

‘ ordered the tune, and the parts of it, to be given me, which I carried to the queen, my miſtreſs, with the news of the recovery of your health. I muſt not forget your Pſalm, which you often deſired to be ſung, and which was this:

Vers l'Eternel des oppreſſez le pere
Je m'en iray, luy monſtrant l'impropere
Que l'on me faict, luy ferai ma priere
A haulte voix, qu'il ne jette en arriere
Mes piteux cris, car en lui ſeul j'eſpere (103).

To thee, O Lord, my cries aſcend,
O haſte to my relief:
And with accuſtom'd pity hear
The accents of my grief.

Inſtead of off'rings, let my pray'r
Like Morning incenſe riſe;
My lifted hands ſupply the place
Of Evening ſacrifice, &c.

‘ When my ſaid queen of Navarre ſaw theſe two Pſalms, and heard how they were frequently ſung, even by the Dauphin, ſhe admired it very much, and ſaid to me, I know not how the Dauphin's lady came by this pſalm, *Vers l'Eternel*, &c. for it is none of thoſe that were tranſlated by Marot. But it is not poſſible to find another, wherein her affliction is better deſcribed, and by which ſhe may more clearly ſhew the grief that ſhe feels, and deſire of God to be eaſed of it, as indeed ſhe will be. For ſince it has pleaſed God to put this gift into their hearts, behold the time, behold the days are at hand, when the eyes ~~of the~~ king ſhall be ſatisfied, the deſires of the Dauphin ſhall be fulfilled, the hopes of the enemies of the Dauphin's lady ſhall be diſappointed, and my wiſhes alſo, and the faith of my prayers, ſhall come to an end. Within the ſpace of a year, the merciful viſitation of the Lord will appear, and I dare ſay that ſhe ſhall have a ſon for the greater joy and ſatisfaction . . . . (104). About thirteen or fourteen months after this, you brought forth our king Francis, who is now alive . . . (105). But when this good God made you fruitful, then the late king began to be negligent and forgetful of ſuch a benefit: Whence it came to paſs, that God, being provoked, permitted this poor prince to be infatuated with that old whore Diana, who admitted into his houſe a young ſerpent (106), which ſecretly licked her boſom: He was her oracle, and ſhe was the organ of it; he began to blame the ſaid Pſalms of David, which teach us to forſake all ſins, which encourage chaſtity, and ſtrengthen virtue. Then he brought in the laſcivious verſes of Horace, which excite the fleſh to all ſorts of wantonneſs and leudneſs, and other fooliſh ſongs, which were made about their infamous amours, by thoſe Poets of the devil; not only to indulge their impure and unchaſte life, but alſo to plunge them into the abyſs of all iniquity and exceſs, and even of all impiety. For ſeeing that the great ſeneſchal's lady had, in imitation of you, a Bible in French, he ſet himſelf to deſpiſe and condemn it, and making a great ſign of the croſs, and ſtriking his breaſt with his hand, and fetching deep ſighs like an hypocrite, he repreſented to her, that ſhe muſt not read it, that ſuch reading did not belong to women, and was attended with great danger; but that, inſtead of one maſs, ſhe ſhould hear two, and content her ſelf with her beads and primer, in which there was ſo much good devotion, and ſo many fine pictures. And by this means this wretched old ſinner perſuaded the late king to believe all ſhe ſaid, and you had ſuch a force put upon you, Madam, that your confeſſor Bouteiller was taken from you, who taught and adminiſtred to you the pure word of God, and, inſtead of the ſaid Bouteiller, her Dr Henuyer, a Sorboniſt, was obtruded upon you, to ſuborn your conſcience; who was alſo given afterwards to the late king, to govern his, and imprint upon it what he pleaſed. In ſhort, he robbed you both of that holy treaſure, which never periſheth, and which procures immortality to him that is poſſeſſed of it. He concealed it from you, and made you both ſlaves to vain ſuperſtitions, by the ſnares of an old woman, whom he had firſt blinded the better to carry on his deſign.’

[*P*] *The church of Geneva, which was the firſt that made uſe of this verſion, was alſo the firſt that forſook it.*] It is now a long time ſince it was perceived in France, that certain paſſages of this verſion were become barbarous; which gave riſe to Mr Conrart's deſign of reviſing it. He began this work, and Mr de la Baſtide finiſhed it. But their new verſion was never introduced into the public ſervice of the Reformed. If any propoſals were made about it, they were only examined; but the deciſion was always, that they would keep where they were (107). The French churches, ſettled in foreign countries ſince the revocation of the edict of Nantes, have continued to ſing the tranſlation of Clement Marot and Theodore Beza. At laſt it was reſolved in good earneſt, in the church of Geneva, to uſe them no more, and to introduce in their room the verſion of Mr Conrart and Mr de la Baſtide, after they had been reviſed and ſome alterations made in them. The paſtors and profeſſors of Geneva acquainted the public with their intention (108), by an advertiſement, which was prefixed to the edition they publiſhed of this new verſion in 1695; and ſome years after they quite aboliſhed the uſe of the old tranſlation, and requeſted the other churches, by their circular letters, to do the like. The churches of Heſſe-Caſſel and Neufchatel have admitted this innovation, *upon the ſame foot with the church of Geneva* (109). It is not yet known (110), what the churches in England and Brandenburg will do; but it is well known, that the Walloon ſynod, aſſembled at Rotterdam, in the month of Auguſt 1700, reſolved to retain the ancient cuſtom, and to change only ſome expreſſions or ſome words in the old Pſalter.

We have ſeen a letter of a gentleman of Montpellier, dated June the 5th, 1700, upon which I will make two obſervations. This gentleman ſays, ‘ That, after Mr Godeau had printed his paraphraſe upon the Pſalms, the Jeſuit Vavaſſeur made it a queſtion, whether he was a Poet, in a Latin diſſertation, which appeared with this title, *An Godellus ſit Poeta*.’ He is miſtaken; the diſſertation of this Jeſuit, *Antonius Godellus, Epiſcopus Graſſenſis, utrum Poëta*, contains nothing that relates to the Pſalms of Mr Godeau. He ſays, ‘ that we may apply to the Poems of Marot and Beza, what Quintilian ſays of Ennius: Let us reverence the verſes of Ennius, as we reverence the groves, that are venerable for their great age, and whoſe old and lopped oaks, though they have little beauty, yet ſtrike us with a religious awe.’ *Ennium ſicut ſacros vetuſtate lucos adoremus, in quibus grandia & antiqua robora jam non tantam habent ſpeciem, quantam religionem. Quintilian. lib.* 10. *cap.* 1. He might have found in Quintilian another paſſage more to his purpoſe, where he obſerves, that the Salian prieſts themſelves ſcarce underſtood the ſong they ſung; but that religion did not allow of any change, and that we ought to retain ſuch cuſtoms as have been conſecrated. *Saliorum carmina vix ſacerdotibus ſuis ſatis intellecta, ſed illa mutari vetat religio & conſecratis utendum eſt* (111). When it is alledged, that it is ſufficient to take from the old tranſlation ſometimes one word, and ſometimes another, according as they become obſolete, obſcene, and unintelligible; it ſeems to be founded on very plauſible reaſons: For indeed, to avoid great confuſion, all changes of this nature muſt be made inſenſibly. If many ages be ſpent in following this method, it will be with the verſion of Marot and Beza, as it was with the famous ſhip of Theſeus (112). It was preſerved as a precious thing, and no repairs were made in it but what were neceſſary, that is, in proportion as any piece rotted. Which was at laſt an inſtance made uſe of by the Philoſophers, who diſputed, whether bodies be the ſame, or no, the matter whereof has been changed.

(103) This is the beginning of Pſalm 141.

(104) Recueil, ib. *pag.* 505.

(105) Ib. *pag.* 506.

(106) He means the cardinal of Lorrain.

(107) In the Latin ſtile, we ſhould ſay, that theſe propoſitions were *antiquatæ*; for the reſult was *antiqua maneant*. Note, that the churches of France could not decide this matter, becauſe, ſince this verſion was made, they have not had leave to hold a national ſynod.

(108) *See the letter intituled,* An Anſwer to a printed Letter, which Mr Jurieu wrote to a French miniſter at London againſt the change of the Pſalms propoſed by the church of Geneva. *This Anſwer contains thirteen pages in 4to, and is dated July*, 24, 1700.

(109) Ib. *p.* 11.

(110) I write this in October, 1700.

(111) Quintil. *lib. i, cap. vi, pag. m.* 39.

(112) *See* Plutarch, *in* Theſeo, *pag.* 10. C.

ſion more ſuitable to the preſent genius of the French tongue. It is not known, whether other churches will conform to this change. I do not remember that I ever took notice, that Marot mentions his wife in his poems; but I have found in them a paſſage, which ſhews, that he was a father, and beſides it appears that MICHAEL MAROT, his ſon, wrote verſes, which were printed [*Q*].

There are ſome things, in the article of this Poet, which want to be ſet right. This will give me an opportunity to point out more at large the editions of his works [*R*]. What

I ſhall make but one remark on the letter, which Mr Jurieu has printed, wherein he condemns the innovation. He ſays, that the churches of France *received from the church of Geneva, a liturgy and a book of Pſalms, which was made and ſung at Paris, before it was at Geneva*. This is not exactly true, ſince the verſes, made at Paris, contained only thirty Pſalms, and thoſe, who ſung them, were indifferently either friends or enemies to the reformed religion. It was at the court of Francis I, that they were chiefly ſung; and it is very well known how much this prince perſecuted the reformed religion. And if, afterwards, the French ſung the other twenty pſalms of Marot, and thoſe of his ſucceſſor, it was before the Reformed diſtinguiſhed themſelves by this way of ſinging, and made it a part of their exerciſes of devotion. Now this was not done, till the whole Pſalter was ſet to Muſic at Geneva, and bound up with the Catechiſm, and from that time the Catholics left off the ſinging of theſe Pſalms, as may be ſeen above in a paſſage of Florimond de Remond (113). It cannot therefore be pretended, that theſe verſes were ſung at Paris before they were at Geneva. I ſay, this cannot be pretended in the ſenſe I ſpeak of: For the queſtion is about a ſinging peculiar to the Reformed, and making part of their pious exerciſes. In this reſpect its birth was at Geneva; and it cannot be denied, that the church of Geneva begun firſt to ſing thoſe Pſalms. I know very well what may be alledged concerning the numerous aſſemblies of the Reformed at Paris about the year 1558: of whom Beza ſpeaks in the following manner (114). ‘Thus the aſſembly daily multiplied at Paris, where it happened, that ſome being in the place called *le pré aux Cleres*, a public place of the univerſity, began to ſing Pſalms; which being heard, a great many of thoſe, who were walking, or playing at divers games, joined the company that was ſinging, ſome for the novelty of it, and others to bear a part in the Muſic. This continued for ſome days in a very great aſſembly, where were preſent the king of Navarre himſelf, with many lords and gentlemen, both of France and other nations, who fell a ſinging. And although, in a great multitude, there is frequently great confuſion, yet there was ſuch an harmony and devotion, that every one preſent was raviſhed with it; even thoſe who could not ſing, nay, the moſt ignorant, got upon the walls and the places round about, to hear the ſinging, and declared that it was ill done to forbid ſo good a thing.’ But who does not ſee that all this happened, after thoſe of Geneva had added the Pſalter to the Cathechiſm? Note, that, before Beza tranſlated a hundred Pſalms, thoſe of Marot were ſung in the eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies of Geneva; for, without doubt, the following words ought to be underſtood of an aſſembly at Geneva. ‘(115) *Beza writes thus in his Paphraſe upon the Pſalms in* 1581. It is now thirty two years (*viz from the year* 1549. (116) that this 91ſt Pſalm was the firſt that I heard ſung in the aſſembly of Chriſtians, being the firſt time that I was preſent there; and I may ſay, that I was ſo rejoiced to hear it ſung, that ever ſince I have had it as it were engraved in my heart.’

[*Q*] *He was a father* . . . . MICHAEL MAROT, *his ſon, wrote verſes which have been printed.*] You will find this in the deſcription of Clement Marot’s flight.

J’abandonnai, ſans avoir commis crime,
L’ingrate France, ingrate, ingratiſſime
A ſon Poëte: & en la delaiſſant,
Fort grand regret ne vint mon cueur bleſſant:
Tu ments marot, grand regret tu ſentis,
Quand tu penſas a tes Enfans petits (117).

Ungrateful France, without a crime, I quit,
Nor feel the leaſt regret in leaving it.
’Tis falſe, Marot; great grief does ſeize your mind,
When thinking on your children, left behind.

We may with certainty conclude from hence, that he was married; for he was not ſo profligate as to tell Francis I, in a letter, that he was ſorry for the loſs of his baſtards. La Croix du Maine relates, that Michael Marot, the ſon of Clement Marot, *wrote ſome French Poems, which were printed with the* Contredicts à Noſtradamus, *written by the lord du Pavillion* . . . *Printed at Paris in* 1560, *by Charles l’Angelier* (118).

[*R*] *There are ſome things* . . . . *which want to be ſet right. This will give me an opportunity to point out more at large the editions of his works.*] It is always wrong to deny, or call in queſtion, what is true; but ſometimes it is excuſable, becauſe there may be plauſible reaſons for ſo doing. This is my caſe here. I have contradicted (119) an author, who has ſaid, that Marot was page to one Nicolas de Neufville, *who was the firſt ſecretary of ſtate of his family*, and that he dedicated to him his Poem of the Temple of Cupid, the 15th of May 1538. I very juſtly denied, that he had been page to Nicolas de Neufville, who was ſecretary of ſtate; but I ought not to have denied that he had been page to that gentleman’s father. I grounded what I ſaid on the difference of age; I took for granted what Theodore Beza affirms, that Marot lived ſixty years. Who could have thought, that Theodore Beza was miſtaken, he, who doubtleſs was acquainted with Clement Marot at Paris (120), and who had it in his power to have informed himſelf at Geneva, of ſeveral particulars relating to this famous refugee? Now, ſuppoſing that Marot was born in the year 1484, as it ought to be ſuppoſed on the teſtimony of Theodore Beza, it was right to deny, that he had been page to one Nicolas de Neufville, who died in 1599. I drew my ſecond reaſon from a paſſage of Clement Marot, in which he affirms, that from the age of ten years, he had always been in the retinue of Frances I. Does this ſuit with one, who had been page of Nicolas de Neufville? There are very good editions of the works of Clement Marot, which have not the epiſtle dedicatory of the Temple of Cupid. Is there not good reaſon, from hence, to ſuſpect, that, if it is to be met with in ſome other editions, it is ſuppoſititious? Theſe are the principles on which I reaſoned in the remark [*B*]; they muſt be allowed to be probable: nevertheleſs I am obliged ingenuouſly to confeſs, that Marot had been page to one Nicolas de Neufville, and that he himſelf owns it in dedicating to him the Temple of Cupid. I have found this epiſtle dedicatory in the edition of Niort, by Thomas Portau, 1596. This edition (121) is the beſt of all thoſe I had conſulted: Marot’s words are theſe. *In reviſing the books of my youth, in order to publiſh them more correct than before, I recollected, that, at the very time, when I was your page, moſt honoured Sir, I compoſed, by your order, the Queſt of conſtant Love, which I found in the beſt place of the Temple of Cupid, in viſiting it, as my age then required. It is therefore fitting, that this work ſhould be dedicated to you, who commanded it; to you, my firſt maſter, and the only one (except princes) whom I ever ſerved* (122). You ſee by this, that he wrote verſes while he was a page. This circumſtance confirms me in my preſent opinion, that Marot died younger than Beza pretends; for, if he was ſixty years old when he died in 1544, he muſt have been born in 1484, and have been page to Nicolas de Neufville about the beginning of the XVIth century, and have begun from that time to make verſes. Yet we do not find that he wrote any, which can be referred to the reign of Lewis XII (123). It is more probable, that he was born in 1496. Take notice of the verſes, which I have cited in the remark [*B*]: they were made in 1526, and

(113) Citation (73).

(114) Beza, Hiſt. Eccl. *book* ii, *pag.* 141. *See alſo* Jeremiah de Pours, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 731, 732.

(115) De Pours, ibid. *pag.* 730.

(116) I do not think, that de Pours reckoned right: for Beza coming to Geneva, October 24, 1548, it is not likely that he did not begin to aſſiſt at the aſſemblies of the Faithful, till 1549.

(117) Marot, in his Epiſtle to the king at the time of his baniſhment at Ferrara, *pag. m.* 181. *Add,* that, in the poem, wherein he prays the dauphin to procure him a paſs, *pag.* 182, he ſays, *Not to go and viſit my caſtles, but to ſee my little Marots.*

(118) La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 326.

(119) In the remark [*B*].

(120) Beza, having an exquiſite talent for Poetry, no doubt got acquainted with Marot, or at leaſt got opportunities of ſeeing him.

(121) Mr Des Maizeaux obliged me with his copy in June 1702.

(122) Marot, Epiſtle Dedicatory to Meſſire Nicolas de Neufville, knight, lord of Villeroy. It is dated at Lyons, May 15, 1538.

(123) See his Eclogue of Pan and Robin, where we find that his firſt poems were made in the reign of Francis I.

What I have ſaid about certain editions of the Pſalter of the Proteſtants of Geneva, will be

and they ſhew, that he was carried to court at the age of ten years, and that he had followed it, *with labour and misfortunes*, twenty Years. We have no verſes, where he ſpeaks of his old age: he is contented to ſay, that he is in the autumn of his age.

Car l'yver qui s' appreſte
A commencé à neiger ſur ma teſte (124).

Th' approaching winter 'gins to ſhed
It's ſilver honours on my head.

He ſays in another place (125),

Plus ne ſuis ce que j'ay eſté,
Et ne le ſaurois jamais eſtre:
Mon beau Printems, & mon eſté,
Ont fait le ſaut par la feneſtre.

I am no longer, now, the ſame;
Another man, in all, but name:
My chearful ſpring, and ſummer bright,
Have out of window ta'en their flight.

The autumn of age uſually reaches to between forty and fifty-five years, more or leſs: a man is already in the winter of life at ſixty years.

ADVANTAGES of the edition of Clement Marot's works, at Niort, in 1596.

Since I have ſaid, that the edition of Niort 1596, is the beſt of all thoſe I had conſulted, it will be proper to point out what is particular in it. We find in it ſome pieces, which were wanting in ſeveral of the preceding editions, and which have been left out of ſeveral of the ſubſequent editions. The firſt of theſe pieces are, *Clement Marot's epiſtle in proſe to Stephen Dolet, of the laſt day of July*, 1538. *The ſaid Clement Marot's epiſtle in proſe of the 12th of Auguſt* 1530, *to ſeveral of his brethren, all ſons of Apollo. The ſaid Marot's epiſtle in proſe to Meſſire Nicolas de Neufville, knight, lord of Villeroy, on his piece of the Temple of Cupid. Theſe three epiſtles* (126) *of the author* were again inſerted, *becauſe they give us to underſtand, among other things, certain notable particulars, which ſerve both to preſerve his works intire in the hands of the Printer, and to ſhew us what his ſtile was in proſe*, they likewiſe inſerted *the epiſtle of Stephen Dolet, with his annotations in the margin, on the Hell of the ſaid Marot. The epiſtle of the ſaid Marot to his friend Anthony Couillart, lord of Pavillion, with an epigram of Michael Marot, only ſon of the ſaid Clement Marot.* The three firſt of theſe pieces are at the beginning of the book: the letter of Dolet is to be found at page 47, and that of Marot to the lord de Pavillon at page 211. That of Dolet, was written to Lion Jamet, and is dated at Lyons, the firſt day of the year of Grace, 1542. It informs us, that the Poem intituled *Hell*, was *printed only at Antwerp.* Note, that Clement Marot, in his letter to the ſame Dolet, makes great complaints againſt thoſe, who, printing his works, had mixed with them pieces, of which he was not the author, and ſome of which were *compoſed coldly and with a bad grace, and others full of ſcandal and ſedition. The injury they have done me*, ſays he, *is ſo great and ſo outrageous, that it has touched my honour, and endangered my perſon ..... In truth, I dare ſay it without lying, (always without reproach) that the profit of all theſe my labours accrues to them. I have planted the trees, they gather the fruit of them. I have dragged the plow, they reap the harveſt; and all I gain by it is a little eſteem among men, which yet they would rob me of, by aſcribing to me fooliſh and ſcandalous works. I know not what to call this, but ingratitude, which I cannot have deſerved, except by the fault I commit in giving them my copies. Now I am not the only one who have been thus finely ſerved. If Alain Chartier were alive, I firmly believe (my friend) he would willingly bear me company in complaining of thoſe of their art, who have added to his excellent works, the Counter-Lady without mercy, the Hoſpital of Love, the Complaint of St Valentine, and the Shepherdeſs of Granſon, works certainly unworthy of his name; and of which he was no more the author, than I am of the Complaint of the Bazoche, the Alphabet of the preſent Time, the Epitaph of the Count de Sales, and many other fooliſh pieces, which they have thrown amongſt my works. Here follows another cauſe of complaint. Nor were they ſatisfied*, continues he, *to injure me alone, but many other excellent Poets of my time, whoſe fine works the Bookſellers have joined with mine, making me, in deſpite of myſelf, the uſurper of another's honour, which I could not know, and bear at the ſame time. I have therefore thrown out of my book, not only bad, but even good things which do not belong to me; contenting myſelf with the productions of my own muſe. But that the reader may not complain, I have put twelve times as much of my own compoſitions, never before printed, in the room of thoſe I have thrown out; nay even two books of Epigrams. And after having reviſed both the old and the new, changed the order of the book for the better, and corrected an infinite number of errors of the preſs, I have reſolved to ſend you the whole, in order that, under the fine and ample privilege, which the king has given you in conſideration of your meritorious virtue, you may (in reſpect to our friendſhip) get it re-printed, not only thus correct as I ſend it you, but even ſtill more ſo: which you may eaſily do, if you will take care of it with a diligence equal to your learning.* If you would know in what the new diſpoſition of his Poems conſiſts, you need only conſider theſe words. *Moreover their additions have quite ſpoiled the order of my books, which coſt me ſo much to adjuſt, which order (learned Dolet, and the other courteous readers) I thought proper to change at this laſt reviſal, ſeparating between my youthful works, and thoſe written afterwards; ſo that you may readily find what you have a mind to read, and if you do not find it where it uſed to be, you will find it in a place more ſuitable to it.* The concluſion of this letter is very remarkable. *Putting you in mind, that of all the books, which have been heretofore printed under my name, I declare theſe to be the beſt, the moſt ample, and the beſt diſpoſed; and I diſclaim the others as baſtards, or as ſpoiled children.* This is what he wrote at Lyons the 31ſt of July 1538. It was then near eight years ſince the impreſſion of his Poems intituled, *L'Adoleſcence*, i. e. *Poems of Youth*, and to which the letter, *to a great number of his brethren, all ſons of Apollo*, ſerved by way of preface. What I am going to copy from that letter will acquaint us of the eagerneſs of the public for the productions of Marot's muſe. 'I know not, my dear 'brethren, which has moſt incited me to publiſh theſe 'little pieces of my youth; your continual intreaties, 'or the diſpleaſure it gave me to hear cryed about 'the ſtreets a great part of them, incorrect, badly 'printed, and more to the Bookſeller's profit, than 'the Author's credit. Certainly both conſiderations 'prevailed upon me, but your intreaties the moſt.' In the ſame Letter we find what Paſquier has informed us of above (127). 'Hoping ſoon to offer you ſome'thing better, and, as a pledge of that better, I now 'preſent you, after the *Adoleſcence* (128), a work of 'a better temper, and more poliſhed materials: but 'the *Adoleſcence* ſhall go before, and I will begin it 'with the firſt Eclogue of Virgil's Bucolics, tranſlated 'when I was very young, as you may perceive by the 'ſeveral ways, even by the eliſion of the *e* feminine, 'which I did not then obſerve; and which John le 'Maire de Belges, by teaching it to me, reproved me 'for (129).' This letter was written from Paris the 12th of Auguſt 1530: and it is proper to take notice of this date; becauſe it is the Æra of the firſt edition, which Clement Marot owned and directed.

Tho' the edition of Niort had no other advantage than that of informing us of the particulars I have juſt mentioned, it would deſerve to be preferred to the others; but that is not it's only advantage: the works of Marot are there ranged in very good order, and augmented with ſeveral pieces, which never before appeared. The Bookſeller informs us, that he had 'procured the whole to be thus diſpoſed by M. Francis 'Miziere of Poictou, M. D. his friend, who, loving 'the memory of the author, and the preſervation of 'his works more grave and leſs wanton, was willing 'to undertake it, by way of amuſement and relaxa'tion from other more ſerious ſtudies; giving himſelf 'the trouble farther of enlarging and explaining a good 'part of the ſhort arguments of each poem or ſubject, 'by the addition he has made of ſuitable circumſtances; 'namely, to whom, of whom, of what, in what 'place, at what time, and on what occaſion, they 'were written; as far as he could inform himſelf by 'the hiſtory of that time, and by the edition of Stephen Dolet of the year 1543, and others preceding

---

(124) Marot, Eclogue of Pan, *pag.* 38, Edit. of Niort, 1596.

(125) Epigr. *pag.* 433.

(126) Note, that the two firſt were taken from the edition of Lyons, 1543, by Stephen Dolet.

(127) In remark [*L*] at the end.

(128) On this occaſion, I ſhall remark, that the little book, which followed the *Adoleſcence Clementine*, was printed at Lyons, by Francis Juſtus, in 1534. See the edition of Niort, *pag.* 398.

(129) Marot, Epiſtle to a great number of his brethren.

be a little enlarged [*S*].

‘ that, according to which they were reſtored where ‘ they had been taken away, by ſome Printers, who ‘ too boldly maim the works of authors, and leave out ‘ their preliminary epiſtles or prefaces (130): thereby ‘ preventing the reader from readily comprehending ‘ their deſign, with the order and method they obſerve ‘ in their books, which they generally diſcover in their ‘ ſaid prefaces or epiſtles.’

[*S*] *What I have ſaid* (131) *of certain editions of the Pſalter of the Proteſtants of Geneva ſhall be a little enlarged.*] I have quoted two miniſters (132), who have ſaid, that Charles IX granted a licence for printing this Pſalter to Antony Vincent, Bookſeller of Lyons. This privilege is dated the 14th of October 1562, according to one of theſe miniſters; but, according to the other, it was granted in 1561. I learn from Mr Daillé (133), that it was given at St Germain en Laye, the 19th of October 1561 (§ *α*), that Robertet, one of the Secretaries of State, ſubſcribed it, and that that theſe Pſalms were printed at Paris, in 1562, for Adrian de Roy, Robert Balard, Martin le Jeune, and Robert Motet; and at Lyons for John Deſtournes. This date proves the obſervation of Mr Jurieu to be falſe (134); for it is not true, that the month of October 1561, was the time when the heat of the perſecutions was violent. It was the time of the conference of Poiſſy: the affairs of the Proteſtants were not then in a very bad ſituation. It will be of ſome uſe to obſerve with what view Mr Daillé mentions this privilege of the Pſalms. He was to anſwer a ſpeech, which the Clergy had made to king Lewis XIII in 1636, in which, among other things, the Proteſtants were charged with having blotted out of their Pſalms a certain paſſage, which contained a prayer for the king (135). The archbiſhop of Orleans was the ſpeaker, and recited theſe verſes of the former tranſlation:

Seigneur, plaiſe toi de defendre
Et maintenir le roi:
Veuille nos requeſtes entendre,
Quand nous crions à toi.

That is,

Be pleaſed, O Lord, to defend and maintain the king; and hear our petitions, when we cry unto thee.

He pretended, that it was not long before the pretended Reformers had changed theſe four verſes into the following:

Seigneur, plaiſe toi nous defendre,
Et faire que le roi
Puiſſe nos requetes entendre
Encontre tout effroi.

That is,

Be pleaſed, O Lord, to defend us, and make the king hear our petitions againſt all affright.

His declamation thereupon was very vehement. I omit Mr Daillé's anſwer, as to the principal point, namely to ſhew, that the Hebrew Text is more agreeable to the latter tranſlation, than to the former, which is according to the Vulgate: I only ſay, that he obſerves, that the latter verſion is that, which has always been followed ſince the Reformed obtained the firſt liberty of conſcience, by the edict of January 1562. He ſhews that it is the verſion which appeared in the Pſalter, printed with the privilege, which Charles IX granted, the 19th of October 1561. He confeſſes, that the firſt way of tranſlating is in ſome editions; but he ſays, that they never were uſed by the reformed Churches, or but a very little time. He had ſeen one, which, as far as he could remember, was of the year 1559 (136). It contained but a part of the Pſalms. Obſerve what I have ſaid above, citation (77), that the Pſalter approved by the doctors of the Sorbonne, began but at the xlviiith Pſalm. Whence is it then, that ſo many editions, mentioned by Mr Daillé, and publiſhed in virtue of the privilege granted by Charles IX, in conſequence of the approbation of the doctors, contained the xxth Pſalm? Mr Colomiés has declared for the firſt tranſlation, and has blamed Beza, for not having followed it, in his firſt edition of the Pſalms, *which appeared, if I am not miſtaken,* adds he, *in the year* 1560, he afterwards went from it (137). *In which he did very ill,* continues he, *to correct himſelf. For (beſides that this laſt tranſlation is not near ſo faithful as the firſt) referring to the people, what ought to be underſtood of the king, he has thereby given occaſion, though innocently, to a calumny, with which we are charged to this very day.*

(130) This ſhews how old this practice is, which is ſtill complained of, as may be ſeen in remark [*F*] of the article ALEXANDER AB ALEXANDRO.

(131) In the remark [*N*].

(132) Jurieu and Bruguier.

(133) Dallæus, Reſponſ. Apolog. ad Aurelianenſis Epiſcopi Orationem, *pag.* 261.

[(§ *α*) Charles IXth's privilege is not dated Octob. 19; but December 26, 1561. REM. CRIT.]

(134) See the remark [*N*], citation (77).

(135) It is in Pſalm xix according to the Vulgate, and the xxth according to the Hebrew.

(136) Dallæus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 260, 261.

(137) Colomiés, Letter to Mr Claude, at page 184 of his *Obſervationes ſacræ*, Edit. 1679.

MARSILIUS of Padua. See MENANDRINO.

MARSUS (*a*) (PETER), born at Ceſa in *Campagnia di Roma* (*b*), was eſteemed for his works about the end of the XVth century. He had been a diſciple of Pomponius Lætus and Argyropylus (*c*). He was dedicated to an eccleſiaſtical life from his youth (*d*); notwithſtanding which, he employed himſelf more in illuſtrating profane authors [*A*], than in turning over Chriſtian authors. It is true, that, remembring his vocation, and to preſerve the decorum of it, he undertook to comment on the fineſt book of Morality, which the Pagans have left us; I mean Tully's Offices [*B*]. At that time he

(*a*) He had this name becauſe he was born in the country of the antient Marſi.

(*b*) Leandro Alberti, Deſcritt. di tutta Italia. *fol. m.* 151, *verſo.*

(*c*) See the remark [*C*].

(*d*) See the remark [*B*].

[*A*] *He employed himſelf very much . . . in illuſtrating profane authors.*] His notes on Silius Italicus were printed in Folio, with the text of that Poet, at Venice, in the year 1483 and 1492, and at Paris in 1512. Add to this the editions in 8vo, which are that of Paris 1531, and that of Baſil 1543. His Notes on Terence were printed, with thoſe of Malleolus, at Straſburg, in 1506, in 4to, and at Lyons in 1522 (1). They had already been printed at Venice. The edition of his Commentary on the books of Cicero *de natura Deorum*, which has been taken notice of in Geſner's Bibliotheque (2), and which is of Baſil, *apud Jo. Oporinum* 1544, is not the firſt. This work was firſt printed at Paris, and dedicated to Lewis XII by the author, who calls himſelf a prieſt (3) in his preface, and acknowleges himſelf to be, already, very old. Father Leſcalopier had ſeen a copy of this little book only in the library of the Jeſuits at Reims (4). I am going to mention a Commentary of our Marſus, on Tully's Offices.

[*B*] *Remembring his vocation . . . . . he undertook to comment on . . . . Tully's Offices.*] This is what he ſays in his epiſtle dedicatory to cardinal Francis de Gonzaga. ‘ Ne igitur ocio; quod poſt varios labores & ‘ moleſtias ſub te tandem nactus ſum: & melius mihi ‘ ipſi jam polliceri audeo clementia tua & generoſo ‘ animo frætus abuti viderer: diu multumque cogitavi ‘ quid potiſſimum mihi cum decoro agendum eſſet qui ‘ ab ineunte ætate ſacris inſtitutis & ceremoniis initiatus ‘ eſſem & addictus. Tandem id elegi quod meæ pro‘feſſioni congrueret: & in ſe plurimum honeſtatis ha‘beret & utilitatis. Ciceronis officia, ſ. ad uſum eru‘ditionem cultumque vitæ communis inſtituta inter‘pretari (5) - - - - - *That I may not ſeem to abuſe the ‘ leiſure, which, after many fatigues and troubles, I ‘ have at length gained under you, and, depending on your ‘ clemency and generoſity, dare promiſe my ſelf ſtill better, ‘ I conſidered a long time with my ſelf, what was fitteſt ‘ for me to employ my time in, who have been from my ‘ youth, devoted to the rites and ceremonies of religion. ‘ At length I choſe what was ſuitable to my profeſſion, and ‘ moſt reputable and uſeful; namely, to explain Tully's ‘ Offices, deſigned for the uſe, inſtruction, and cultivation ‘ of common life.*’ He reviſed this Commentary ſome time after, and corrected ſeveral faults, which youth and a haſty impreſſion had introduced into it. Read what he confeſſes in the epiſtle dedicatory of the ſecond edition. ‘ Qui falſa docet atque defendit: igno‘rantiam

(1) Geſner, Bibl. *fol.* 538, *verſo.*

(2) *Fol.* 550, *verſo.*

(3) Servulum & Preſbyterum Chriſti.

(4) Leſcalop. Pref. Comment. in Ciceronis libros de Natura Deorum.

(5) Petrus Marſus, Ep. ad F. Gonzag. Card. Mantuan.

he enjoyed an honourable leiſure by the favour and liberality of cardinal Francis de Gonzaga. This good fortune had been preceded by ſeveral troubles and inconveniences. He dedicated this commentary to that cardinal; but, when he publiſhed a ſecond edition augmented and corrected, he dedicated it to cardinal Raphael Riario, who honoured him with his good offices. I cannot ſay where nor when he died (*e*); but I know, that he lived to a great age, and that he was vigorous enough even then to continue writing books (*f*). Some have ſpoke of his works with great contempt; but others have highly commended them [*C*]. The moderation, which Barthius obſerved, appears to

rantiam ſuam fatetur: & ducem ad omne ſcelus impudentiam. Horum ſacratis inſiſtens veſtigiis: licet hallucinanti ſimilis: mea commentariola recognovi. Cum in illis multa juveniliter ac minus quam decuiſſet conſiderate dicta cognoſcerem: celeritas namque partus efficit: ut manca quodammodo & haberentur & eſſent: cum Horatianæ maturitatis opportunitatem exſpectare non ſuſtinuerint: quod imprudentiæ aſcribendum eſt: præſertim hac ætate quæ per omnem Italiam perſpicaciſſimis decoratur ingeniis (6) - - - - *He who teaches and defends what is falſe, confeſſes his ignorance, and impudence, which leads to every vice. Treading in the ſacred footſteps of theſe men, tho' like one who miſtakes the way, I have reviſed my Commentary; obſerving in it many things boyiſhly and inconſiderately ſaid; for a haſty birth is generally imperfect; nor could I wait the maturity preſcribed by Horace; which is to be aſcribed to imprudence, eſpecially in this age, when the fineſt geniuſes appear in all parts of Italy.*’ All authors ought to profit by this example. They ſhould not apply to a Printer the moment they are paſſed their childhood, and they ſhould compoſe ſedately and at leiſure. They find, too late, the inconvenience of the contrary behaviour (7). But let us return to Peter Marſus. He retrenched many things, and added many others; and he acknowledges, that Cardinal Raphael Riario, his patron, had given him his advice in the reviſal. ‘Ne igitur ocio quod benignitas tua mihi conceſſit abuterer: id tentavi quod eminentiſſimum celſitudinis tuæ ingenium & ſupra ætatem in rebus omnibus judicium efflagitabant. Utilitatem: ſi quæ erit in his Petri Marſi clientis tui commentariolis: amplitudini tuæ debebunt adoleſcentes: quorum inſtitutioni: te hortante: te duce: pro viribus conſulendum duxi: quod ut aliquando conſequerer multa delevi: multa addidi: quæ ex uberrimo Platonis & Ariſtotelis fonte deducta: Ciceronis majeſtas expoſcere videbatur (8). - - - - *Therefore that I might not make an ill uſe of the leiſure you have kindly procured me, I attempted ſuch a work, as your Eminency's great abilities, and uncommon judgment required. If youth receives any benefit from the Commentaries of your client Peter Marſus, they are indebted for it to your Eminency, who encouraged and aſſiſted me in endeavouring their improvement; to effect which, I have blotted out many things, and added others, which, fetched from the plentiful ſtores of Plato and Ariſtotle, the mighty Cicero ſeemed to require.*’ Note, that he ſays, he intended to reviſe in the ſame manner what he had written on Silius Italicus; but that he waited for a convenient opportunity to publiſh his thoughts on Horace, and on Cicero's Tuſculan Queſtions, and his books *de Finibus*. Note alſo, that he commented on the treatiſes, which generally go along with the Offices, namely the Dialogues *de Amicitia*, and *de Senectute*, and the Paradoxes. The edition, which I make uſe of, is of Venice, *per Bartholomæum de Zanis de Porteſio*, 1498, in *Folio*. It is at leaſt the ſecond. Geſner mentions only that of Lyons 1514 (9).

[*C*] *Some have ſpoken of his works with great contempt; but others have highly commended them.*] Geſner (10) cites theſe words of Ludovicus Vives. ‘Petrus Marſus in Officia Ciceronis loquacitate pene intolerabilis - - - - - - *Peter Marſus in his Commentary on Tully's offices, is intolerably loquacious.*’ Let us ſee the judgment, which Dauſqueius made on Peter Marſus's Notes on Silius Italicus. ‘Silium immerentem ac de fato ſuo mœrentem conſpicati tres viri, licet humani habiti, ſuppetias ferre connixi ſunt Marſus, Modius, & Auctor Crepundiorum; ſed aut novis ſæviere plagis, aut hiantia vulnera diduxere. Ignoſcibilis quidem Marſi ignoratio, & ſeculo condonanda: ſimplicitate nocuit, nec valde (11) - - - - - *Three perſons, though eſteemed good-natured men, beheld* SILIUS *lamenting his undeſerved fate, and reſolved to help him: they were Marſus, Modius, and the author of the* Crepundia: *but they either gave him new wounds, or cruelly opened his old ones. Marſus's ignorance is indeed pardonable, and to be aſcribed to the age in which he lived; he hurt his author through folly, but not greatly.*’ Here follow ſome authors, who judge of him more to his advantage. ‘Petrus Marſus non ad poëtas ſolum explicandos, ſed ad oratores, quoque & philoſophos ſtudium adjecit. Extant ejus in Silium Italicum commentarii, multa eruditione referti: ſed longè utiliora, quæ in Ciceronis opera conſcripſit: eloquens, ut Pomponii auditorem agnoſcas, &, quod plus eſt, propemodum philoſophus: ſed quantuſcunque in philoſophia eſt, eum Argyropuli contubernium effecit. *Epitaphium* ejus tale mihi ſeſe obtulit

Quæ ſola eloquii ſuperabat gloria & illam
Perdidimus, tecum vixit & interiit (12).

(12) - - - - - *Peter Marſus applied himſelf not only to explaining the Poets, but the Orators and Philoſophers likewiſe. There are extant his Commentaries on Silius Italicus, full of learning, but what he wrote on Cicero's works is much more uſeful: ſo eloquent a writer, that you would fancy him a diſciple of Pomponius, and, what is more, almoſt a philoſopher: but he is indebted to Argyropylus, with whom he lived, for all his Philoſophy. His epitaph, as I have met with it, is as follows:*

The poor remains of eloquence are fled;
With thee alone it liv'd, with thee is dead.

Add to this theſe words of Leandro Alberti: ‘Ceſa picciolo Caſtello, patria gia di Pietro Marſo huomo molto litterato. Il quale colle ſue ſingolari virtuti ha illuſtrato queſto luogo, come chiaramente conoſcere ſi puo dall' opere da lui laſciate, & maſſimamente delli Commentari fatti ſopra Sillio Italico. Abandonò li mortali pochi anni fa (13). - - - - - *Peter Marſus, a very learned man, was born at Ceſa, a ſmall caſtle. This man has made this place famous by his ſingular virtues, as plainly appears by the works he left behind him particularly his Commentaries on Silius Italicus. He died but a few years ago.*’ See in the margin the Latin verſion, which Kyriander has given of this Italian paſſage (14), and note, by the way, that Peter Marſus had not been long dead, when Leandro Alberti wrote this; but we can conclude nothing certain concerning the year of his death, ſince this work of Alberti was finiſhed a long time before it was made public. It was printed in the year 1550, and Flaminius had read it in manuſcript in the year 1537 (15). Perhaps, the page, in which Peter Marſus is commended, had been written, a long time, when the author communicated his manuſcript to Flaminius. One ought never to make uſe of the expreſſion *not long ſince, &c.* without ſetting down the year, in which we thus expreſs ourſelves. Eraſmus, who had ſeen Marſus at Rome about the beginning of of the XVIth century, ſays, that he was very old, and that he continued to write. ‘Romæ vidi Petrum Marſum longævum potiùs quam celebrem. Non multum aberat ab annis octoginta, & florebat animus in corpore non infelici. Mihi viſus eſt vir probus & integer, neque potui non mirari induſtriam. In tanta ætate ſcribebat Commentarios in librum *de Senectute*, alioſque nonnullos Ciceronis libellos. Licebat in eo perſpicere veſtigia veteris ſeculi (16). - - - *I ſaw Marſus at Rome, who was rather an old, than a famous man. He wanted but little of eighty years, and he had a vigorous mind in no unhappy body. He ſeemed to me a man of probity and integrity, and I could not but admire his induſtry. At ſo great an age,*

(*e*) See in the remark [*C*] the words of Leander Alberti.

(*f*) See the paſſage of Eraſmus, towards the end of the remark [*C*].

(6) Petrus Marſus, Epiſt. ad Raphaelem Riarium.

(7) See the remark [*B*] of the article ZUERIUS.

(8) Marſus, Ep. ad Raph. Riarium.

(9) Geſner, Bibl. *fol.* 550, *verſo*.

(10) Ibid.

(11) Dauſq. Præf. in Sil. Ital. *folio e verſo*.

(12) Autor Dialogi de reparatione linguæ Latinæ, apud Giſanium, *pag.* 411, citante Konigio in Biblioth. *pag.* 512.

(13) Leand. Alberti, Deſcritt. di tutta l'Italia, *fol. m.* 125. *verſo*.

(14) Oppidulum Ceſa, Petri Marſi Patria, nuper vita defuncti, viri cum primis literati, prout ejus ſcripta, maximeque Commentaria in Silium teſtantur.

(15) This appears by a letter of Flaminius, dated the firſt of May, 1537. It is prefixed to Leandro Alberti's book.

(16) Eraſm. Epiſt. v, lib. xxiii, pag. m. 1210.

to me very reaſonable [*D*].

‘ *he wrote Commentaries on the book* de Senectute, *and ſome other books of Cicero. It was eaſy to diſcover in him the footſteps of antiquity.*’

[*D*] *The moderation, which Barthius has obſerved, appears to me to be very reaſonable.*] He does not pretend, that, abſolutely ſpeaking, Peter Marſus's Notes are good; but only that they deſerve praiſe, conſidering the time in which they were written. It is ingratitude, and a crying injuſtice, to deſpiſe or blame authors, who had ſuch great obſtacles to ſurmount, at a time when literature was but beginning to revive. Reaſon will have us pay a veneration to it's firſt reſtorers, though their labours are very imperfect. Such commentators, as, at preſent, ſurpaſs Peter Marſus, would not have equalled him, if they had lived in his time. It is therefore with an ill grace that they inſult him, or judge him not fit to be named. Let us produce the modeſt terms of Barthius; ‘ Vide quæ notarunt proavorum noſtrorum ævo docti homines, qualium memoriam lubenter facimus ut noſtris litteris redintegremus; fuerunt enim optime animati, & pro copia tum ſtudiorum, non male de optimis Auctoribus meriti: Petrum Marſus Comm. ad Terentium, pag. 193. Editionis Venetæ, J. Sulpitius ad Lucanum pag. 1230. Tenuibus ambo notis; ſed & talia ingenia per nos poſteritati denuo commendentur (17). - - - - - *Conſider what learned men, in the times of our fore-fathers, have remarked, whoſe memory let us willingly revive; for they had the beſt diſpoſition, and, conſidering the ſtate of learning, deſerved very well of the authors: Peter Marſus, Comment on Terence, pag.* 193, *edition of Venice, J. Sulpitius on Lucan, pag.* 1230: *both wrote but ſlender notes; nevertheleſs let ſuch geniuſes be again recommended by us to poſterity.*’

MARTELLIUS, or rather MARTELLUS, (HUGOLIN), biſhop of Glandeves, was of Florence, and one of thoſe Italians, who made their fortune on this ſide of the Alpes, by the intereſt of Catherine de Medicis. There are ſcarce any particulars left concerning his life (*a*), and I have not been able to conſult the *Gallia Chriſtiana* of the brothers *Sammarthani*. He publiſhed ſome books of Literature [*A*], and ſome treatiſes

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books of Literature.*] I find in Konig's Bibliotheque one Hugolinus Martellinus, who publiſhed a Commentary upon the ſecond Ode of the fourth book of Horace, and I am perſuaded that he ſhould be called Martellus or Martellius, and not Martellinus. The Catalogue of Thuanus's library, at p. 324 of the ſecond part, has theſe words. *Hugolini Martellii Epiſcopi Gland. epiſtola in qua Calpurnii & Nemeſiani loci aliquot illuſtrantur.* This book was printed at Florence by the Juntii in 1590. Naudé obſerves, that one Hugolinus Martellius wrote a whole treatiſe upon an Epigram of Auſonius, and ſo perplexed it with his explications, that it is impoſſible to underſtand any thing of it. If he had known that he ſpoke of a biſhop of Glandeves, he would have made a more honourable mention of him, and not have cenſured him with ſuch palpable contempt. Let us relate, at ſome length, his words; for they explain an obſcure paſſage, and on the other ſide are ſomewhat liable to cenſure (1). ‘ Auſonii . . . Muſa . . . . Demoſthenis eâ de re judicium, perbrevi ſanè hoc Epigrammate (2) ſed multis tamen obſtructo difficultatibus comprehenſum, nobis offert.

Diſcere ſi cupias, doctis quàm multa licebit.
Quæ nôſti, meditando velis inoleſcere menti,
Quæ didiciſti, haud dum, diſcendo abſumere tendas.

‘ Sic enim illud exhibent Typographi recentiores, cum tamen ante ſuptuaginta annos Aldinus codex, & Gryphius poſtea liquido haberent in primo verſiculo *doctus*, quæ vox male intellecta fucum procul dubio fecit diſertiſſimo Eliæ Vineto, cujus opera atque induſtriâ, Auſonii monumenta emendatiora explicatioraque habemus. Hic enim (uti probum Virum, atque ingenuum decebat) ſincerè fatetur, ſe mentem hujus Epigrammatis aſſequi non valuiſſe; quam paullò pòſt Hugolinus quidam Martellius, operæ pretium eſſe duxit integro volumine declarare, ſed ſatiùs illi profectò fuiſſet micare digitis, aut cucurbitas pingere, cùm huic potiùs tam ſpiſſum (velut ſepia) atramentum infuderit, ut illud vix eluere poſſit quidquid eſt aquarum in Hippocrene, & Pegaſo; adeò ſingula quæque verba malè torquendo, quo ſex in illis gradus ad expeditè diſcendum inveniret, omnem ferme Epigrammatis ſenſum corrupit, qui ſic (meo quidem judicio) reſtituendus eſt, ut nihil aliud ſibi velit Auſonius, niſi modum edocere, quo docti homines multa loqui, & dicere poſſint ex tempore, qui quidem modus in hoc tantùm conſiſtere videtur, ut, quæ jam optimè nôrunt, velint ea inoleſcere menti, id eſt, firmiter inſerere, ac imaginationi & ingenio commendare; quemadmodum eodem ſenſu dixit Agellius: *Natura induit nobis inolevitque*, quæ vero nondum bene didicerint, frequenter dicendo & repetendo adſumere, & altiùs memoriæ infigere conentur; ſicque totum Epigramma lego, & interpungo:

Diſcere ſi cupias doctus quàm multa, licebit.
Quæ nôſti, meditando velis inoleſcere menti:
Quæ didiciſti haud-dum, dicendo adſumere tendas (3).

‘ - - - - *Auſonius's muſe affords us the judgment of Demoſthenes in this matter, in a very ſhort, but obſcure, Epigram.*

Diſcere ſi cupias, &c.

‘ *So the modern editions give it, though, ſeventy years before, Aldus, and after him Gryphius plainly have it* doctus *in the firſt verſe; which word, ill-underſtood, no doubt, puzzled the learned Elias Vinetus, to whoſe pains and induſtry it is owing, that the remains of Auſonius are more correct and intelligible. He, as becomes an honeſt man, ingenuouſly confeſſed, that he could not diſcover the meaning of this epigram; which ſoon after, one Hugolinus Martellius thought it worth his while to explain in a whole volume: but he had better have trifled away his time on any thing elſe; ſince (like the Cuttle-fiſh) he has ſo darkened it with his ink, that all the water in Hippocrene and Pegaſus can ſcarce waſh it out: for, in order to find in them ſix ſteps to learn expeditiouſly, he has tortured every ſingle word, and quite deſtroyed all the meaning of the epigram, which, in my opinion, is ſo to be reſtored; as that Auſonius's meaning ſhall be, only to teach us, how learned men may converſe and ſpeak of many things off-hand; which conſiſts only in this, that they let thoſe things, which they are already well acquainted with, take deep root in their minds, and lay faſt hold on their imaginations; agreeable to what A. Gellius ſays,* Natura induit, &c. *and that they endeavour, by frequent repetitions, to infix ſtill deeper in their memories what they have not yet well learned. Thus therefore I read, and point the whole epigram.*

Diſcere ſi cupias doctus, &c.

The miſtake of Naudé conſiſts in this: he ſays, that ſeventy years before, the edition of Aldus put *doctus* in the firſt verſe; now he wrote this about the year 1633. He pretended therefore, that the edition of Aldus was in the year 1563, or thereabouts. Now this was a miſtake; for that edition was in the year 1517. If any one has a mind to put another ſenſe upon his expreſſions, he may alledge, that he means, that the modern editions, which have put *doctis*, are later by ſeventy years, than that of Aldus; but beſides that this ſenſe would be ill expreſſed, he muſt alſo be underſtood to mean certain editions, publiſhed in 1587. Now no body has obſerved any edition of Auſonius in that year, and it is certain, that thoſe in 1588, do not deſerve to be mentioned rather than the foregoing.

[*B*] . . . . *and*

---

(17) Barthius, in Statium, *Tom. iii, pag.* 610, ad Verſ. 827, libri vi Thebaid.

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(1) Naudæus, Syntagm. de Studio liberali, *pag. m.* 84.

(2) It is the cxliſt Epigram of Auſonius.

(3) According to the correction of Mr Grævius, in the edition of Tollius, there is wanting in the firſt verſe *cupis à doctis*, and in the laſt *diſcendo adſumere.*

treatiſes concerning the reformation of the Calendar [*B*]. Naudé, who knew ſo many authors, was ignorant of his being a biſhop, and took him to be a very poor writer (*b*).

(*b*) See the remark [*A*].

[*B*] .... *and ſome treatiſes concerning the reformation of the Calendar.*] Mr Thomaſſin de Mazaugues, counſellor in the parliament of Aix, was pleaſed to give himſelf the trouble to inform me of the following particulars (4). ‘ Hugolinus Martellus was a Florentine. He came into France with Catherine de Medicis, and was made biſhop of Glandeves, January the 10th 1572. The printed books which I have of his, are theſe: *De anni integra in integrum reſtitutione*, dedicated to cardinal Sirlet, and printed in 4to at Florence, in 1578. It is divided into thirty four ſmall articles, and contains in the whole but forty three pages. He reprinted this book at Lyons in 1582, in 8vo, with additions, and joined to it the following treatiſe, *Sacrorum temporum aſſertio*, which he dedicated to Lewis Martelli, his brother, a canon of Florence. In 1583, he alſo publiſhed at Lyons in 8vo, the following book, *La chiave del Calendario Gregoriano*, which he dedicated to Ottavio Bandini, Referendary, abbot of Caſanuova, which is a work of 362 pages, and the moſt conſiderable. This, Sir, is what I know of this Martellius. There are no conſiderable monuments of his in his church: he gave ſomething to pious uſes, and that is all. None of his family remain in this province. We had a famous Phyſician of his name, who wrote ſomething and died fifteen years ago, but he was not of the ſame family. This Phyſician was very learned, and always talking of the abuſes of Phyſic, and wrote upon that ſubject.

(4) Taken from a letter written at Aix in Provence, *Auguſt* 2, 1700.

MARTIN (Polonus). See POLONUS.

MARTINENGHUS (Titus Prosper) a Benedictine Monk, native of Breſcia, and of the family of a count, made himſelf famous by his ſkill in the learned languages. The reputation he acquired, made the college of cardinals ſend for him to Rome, under the pontificate of Pius IV, to give him a commiſſion to reviſe and correct the works of St Jerom, which were afterwards printed by Paulus Manutius. He reviſed alſo the works of St Chryſoſtom, and thoſe of Theophylact, and the Greek Bible, which was printed at Rome. To reward him for ſo great pains, Pius V had a mind to promote him to ſome dignities; but, as ſoon as this Monk heard of it, he retired to a convent in his own country, where he ſpent his time in publiſhing ſeveral books [*A*]. He died very old at Breſcia, in the monaſtery of St Euphemia, in 1594 (*a*).

(*a*) *Taken out of the* Libraria Breſciana nuovamente aperta da Leonardo Cozzando, Parte prima, *pag.* 307, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *He ſpent his time in publiſhing ſeveral books.*] He publiſhed *Le bellezze dell' huomo conoſcitor di ſe ſteſſo*; they are diſcourſes, which the reading of Plato furniſhed him with. He underſtood the Greek tongue, and had a great inclination to Poetry. Hence it was, that he publiſhed many poems, both in Latin and Greek, moſt of them upon matters of devotion. That, which he made in honour of the Holy Virgin, is divided into ſeveral hymns, which are equal to the number of years that ſhe lived. This poem is intituled *Theotocodia, ſive Parthenodia*. He made a panegyric upon Sixtus V in Greek and Latin (1).

(1) *Taken from* Leonardo Cozzando, Libraria Breſciana, *pag.* 308.

MARTINI (Raymond) a Dominican Monk, very well ſkilled in the Oriental Languages flouriſhed about the end of the XIIIth century. He was engaged in the ſtudy of thoſe languages upon this occaſion. Raymond de Pennafort, his general (*a*), having on one ſide a great deſire to purge Spain from Judaiſm and Mahometiſm, which infected it, and knowing on the other ſide the truth of the maxims, which the primitive Fathers have ſcattered in their works, about conſtraint in matters of religion, cauſed it to be decreed, in a chapter held at Toledo in 1250, that the Monks of his order ſhould apply themſelves to the ſtudy of Hebrew and Arabic. He impoſed this taſk upon ſome of them in particular, among whom he named our Raymond Martini, and he obtained a penſion from the kings of Arragon and Caſtile for thoſe who ſhould ſtudy theſe languages, that they might endeavour to convert the Infidels. From hence it came to paſs that Raymond Martini applied his ſtudies that way, in which he had very good ſucceſs. He was not of Barcelona (*b*), as ſome have publiſhed (*c*); but it was there he took upon him the habit of a Dominican, and he was born at Sobirats. Having attained the ſkill that was neceſſary for reading the works of the Rabbins, he extracted from them ſuch things as might ſerve him to beat the Jews at their own weapons, as he has ſhewn in his *Pugio Fidei*, which was printed at Paris in 1651 (*d*) [*A*]. It is believed, that

(*a*) *He was the third general of the Jacobins.*

(*b*) Natione Catalanus, patria Subiratenſis. *Altamura, Bibl. Ord. Prædicat. pag.* 451.

(*c*) Antonius Senenſis, in Chronico Ordinis Dominic. & Bibliotheca; Franc. Diagus, in Hiſt. Provinciæ Aragoniæ Fratr. Prædicat; Poſſevinus, in Apparatu; apud Altamur. ibid.

(*d*) Ex Altamura, ibid.

[*A*] *His* Pugio Fidei *was printed at Paris in* 1651.] Several perſons contributed to this edition. Mr Boſquet, who died biſhop of Montpellier, met with the manuſcript, as he was ſearching with great diligence, at Toulouſe, all the corners of the library of the college of Foix, about the year 1620. He read it, and tranſcribed ſomething out of it, and, after ſome years, when he had learned the Hebrew, by the care of a learned German, called James Spieghel de Roſembach; he ſhewed it to his Hebrew maſter, and gave it to him to tranſcribe. This James Spieghel, being very well verſed in theſe matters, and having frequent Diſcourſes about them with Mr de Mauſſac, put him upon publiſhing this book, from a copy of it very neat, and well pointed, which he gave him: but tho' Mr de Mauſſac was a very able man, yet he wanted an aſſiſtant, who ſhould take upon him the greateſt part of the labour. This aſſociate was Mr de Voiſin, the ſon of a counſellor in the parliament of Bourdeaux. Thomas Turc, general of the Dominicans, ſollicited powerfully the promoters of the edition, and did not only write to them letters equally preſſing and obliging, but alſo gave order, that they ſhould have all the manuſcripts of the *Pugio Fidei* that could be recovered. John Baptiſt de Marinis, his ſucceſſor, continued to take the ſame care. At laſt the Order concerned themſelves in it ſo far as to be at the expence of the impreſſion (1). The work came from the preſs in 1651, with many prefaces and approbations, which verify what I have ſaid. Mr de Voiſin compared the manuſcript of the college of Foix with three others the firſt of which belonged to the Dominicans of Toulouſe; the ſecond had been ſent from Barcelona, and the third was come from Majorca. He ſet down in the

(1) Prodiit Pugio ille Pariſiis apud Joannem Henault anno 1651, in folio, impenſis Ordinis. *Altamura, pag.* 451.

that Peter Galatinus a Franciſcan, took from this *Pugio Fidei* all that he has ſaid to any good purpoſe in his book *De Arcanis Catholicæ Veritatis*. But it is more probable, that he ſtole from a Carthuſian of Genoa, called Porchettus Salvago (*e*) [*B*], who flouriſhed about the year 1315 (*f*). It is true, that this Carthuſian had taken from Raymond Martini what he thought proper, as he acknowledges in his preface. This confeſſion acquits him of being a Plagiary, from which Galatinus cannot be cleared, who never mentions Porchettus, nor Martini. The learned Joſeph Scaliger has been guilty of ſome faults [*C*], in juſtly accuſing Francis Galatinus of being a Plagiary. Martini finiſhed his work in the year 1278 (*g*). And hereby they are refuted, who pretend, that Raymond de Pennafort was the author of it; for it is plainly proved, that he died January the ſixth, 1275 (*h*). There are ſome, who think, that Martini wrote another book entituled *Capiſtrum Judæorum*, and a refutation of the Alcoran; and that the copy of the *Pugio Fidei*, written with his own hand in Latin and Hebrew, is at Naples, in the convent of St Dominic (*i*). The great knowledge he diſcovered, in the books and

the margin the various readings, and wrote notes upon all the difficult places. He detected all the thefts of Galatinus, and made good ſupplements by way of commentary upon the preface of Raymond Martini. It is ſurpriſing, that Gabriel Naudé did not know, that Scaliger was miſtaken in ſpeaking of Galatinus and Sebondus. See below the remark [*C*]; and here follow the words of Naudé: ‘Omnium ut majori conatu, ſic etiam feliciori eventu, Petrus Galatinus Monachus ex ordine ſancti Franciſci; aut potius Raimundus Sebondus profeſſione Medicus, cujus, præter libros de Theologia naturali, duo inſuper volumina ingentia in Collegio Fuxenſi Theloſano etiamnum hodie ſub titulo Pugionis fidei conſervantur. Ex quibus, ſi Joſepho Scaligero fides eſt habenda, omnia ſua hauſit & tranſcripſit Galatinus, diſſimulato ipſius Sobondi nomine; non tam propter acerrimum, quod ſemper extitit inter Dominicanam familiam & Franciſcanam, odium, quemadmodum maligne cavillatur Scaliger, & fortaſſis etiam imperite; quam ut eruditum iſtud opus acceſſione quadam augeret & ſibi vendicaret locupletatum ita atque expolitum (2). - - *Peter Galatinus, a Monk of the order of St Francis, as he took more pains, ſo ſucceeded better; or rather Raimund Sebondus, by profeſſion a Phyſician, of whoſe writing, beſides his books on natural religion, two large volumes, under the title of* Pugio Fidei, *are ſtill preſerved in the college of Foix, at Tolouſe. From which, if Joſeph Scaliger is to be believed, Galatinus borrowed and tranſcribed all he wrote, ſuppreſſing the name of Sebondus; not ſo much on account of the inveterate hatred between the Dominicans and Franciſcans, as Scaliger ill-naturedly, and perhaps unſkillfully, ſuppoſes, as for the ſake of augmenting that work, and claiming it, ſo augmented and poliſhed, as his own.*’ There was a ſecond edition of the *Pugio Fidei*, at Leipſic, in 1687, with a learned introduction, *in Theologiam Judaïcam* (3).

[*B*] *It is more probable, that Galatinus ſtole from . . . Porchettus Salvago.*] This is proved by Father Morin, who affirms, that he found the ſame things in Porchettus, and Galatinus, in all places where he compared them together. He adds, that all the artifice, which Galatinus has made uſe of to conceal his theft, conſiſts in ſome changes of expreſſion, and of the diviſion of the chapters, in the method of the dialogue, and in his frequent citations of a Rabbi (4) unknown to Martinus and Porchettus, and alſo to the Jews. *Plagium ſane portentoſum cui vix ſimile unquam factum eſt, nam Galatini liber nihil aliud eſt quam Porcheti exſcriptio ipſiſſimis Porcheti verbis, atque etiam Hebræorum textuum tranſlationibus conſervatis, hoc ſi excipias, quod elegantiæ cauſa quædam verba & verborum conſtructiones immutantur. Eſt enim Porcheti phraſis Galatiniana multo ſimplicior. Deinde alius eſt ordo Galatini & minutius diſtinctus, ideo ex uno Porcheti capite duo vel tria componit & varie digerit, in qua dialogica ſermocinatione alium paulo colorem inducit . . . . Non id tantum ſemel deprehendimus, ſed toties quoties id periclitati ſumus, mirati ſane Galatinum Porcheto reconditæ Judæorum Hiſtoriæ nihil ſuperaddere præter frequentia teſtimonia ex libello,* &c (5). Galatinus dedicated his book to the emperor Maximilian I, and did not believe, that Porchet's book would be printed ſo ſoon. We may ſay alſo that he hoped this manuſcript would never be publiſhed; for it was exceeding rare: but Auguſtin Juſtiniani, biſhop of Nebbio, did nevertheleſs diſcover it by the help of money, and publiſhed it at Paris in 1520, with this title, *Victoria Porchetti adverſus impios Hebræos.*

[*C*] *Joſeph Scaliger has been guilty of ſome faults.*] He believed firſt, that the author of the *Pugio Fidei* was called Raymond Sebondus. 2. That Raymond Sebondus was a Dominican, and that he lived at Toulouſe about the year 1376. 3. That Galatinus ſtole immediately from the *Pugio Fidei*: Which may be ſeen in his letters, wherein he mentions this twice to Caſaubon (6), and once to Thomſon (7). ‘Scito illos libros (*Galatini*) eſſe compendium duorum ingentium voluminum quibus titulum Pugionem fidei fecit auctor Raimundus Sebond Monachus Dominicanus, eximius Philoſophus. - - - - *Know, that thoſe books of Galatinus are an abridgment of two large volumes, intituled,* Pugio Fidei, *by the author Raimond Sebondus, a Dominican monk, and an excellent Philoſopher.*’ This is what he ſays in letter 84, which he thus confirms in letter 93. ‘De Galatino ſcito me vera dixiſſe, nam non ſolum illa omnia è Raimundo Sebone expiſcatus eſt, ſed & opus ejus nihil aliud eſt quam breviarum Pugionis fidei, ita enim opus ſuum doctiſſimus Dominicanus ille inſcripſerat qui Toloſæ ante CC, plus minus annos ſcribebat, ejuſque operis duo ingentes tomi in Collegio Fuxenſi ejuſdem civitatis ante annos xxi quum ego ibi eſſem, extabant. Cum judicio tamen illi libri legendi ſunt, qui utinam typis excuſi eſſent. Hoc unicum exemplum, præter aliud quod penes Matthæum Beroaldum fuit, Toloſæ extare ſcio. - - - - - *Know, that what I ſay of Galatinus is true; for he not only fiſhed it all out of Raimond Sebondus but his work is nothing but an abridgment of the* Pugio Fidei; *for ſo that learned Dominican, who wrote at Toulouſe about two hundred years ago, intituled his work; of which there were two large volumes extant in the college of Foix, twenty-one years ago, when I was there. But thoſe books are to be read with judgment, which I wiſh were publiſhed. This copy, beſides another in the hands of Matthew Beroaldus, is extant, to my knowledge, at Toulouſe.*’ In letter 241, written in 1606, two years after the 93, he changed ſomething as to the age of Raymond Sebondus, ‘qui ante ccxxx plus minus annos, *ſays he*, Toloſæ vivebat. - - - *Raimond Sebond, who lived about 230 years ago, at Toulouſe.*’ Father Morin (8) obſerves, againſt Scaliger, that Raymond Sebondus, who does not appear to have underſtood the Hebrew tongue, was a hundred years younger than Raymond Martini the true author of the *Pugio Fidei*. He adds, that it is at leaſt three centuries ſince this Martinus wrote his book, becauſe Nicolas de Lyra ſpeaks of him. He ſhews, that Galatinus ſtole immediately only from Porchettus. Mr de Mauſſac has reckoned up yet more exactly the faults of the great Scaliger (9). He does not only ſay, that Raymond Sebondus was neither a monk, nor learned in the oriental tongues, and that, according to Trithemius and Simler (10), he died in 1432; but he ſays alſo, that the manuſcript of Raymond Martini in the college of Foix, contains three volumes; and that beſides this, and the copy of Beroaldus, there is one at Naples, one with the Dominicans of Toulouſe, one at Barcelona, and one at Majorca. If any one would deal as rigorouſly with Mauſſac, as he hath done with Scaliger, he might be told, that he unjuſtly attributed to Scaliger the firſt diſcovery of the theft of Galatinus (11). Matthew Beroaldus ſpoke of it, before the manuſcript of Touloufe was known to Scaliger; which may be thus demonſtrated. Scaliger wrote in the year 1604, that, twenty-one years before, he had ſeen

---

(*e*) Porchettus de Sylvaticis.

(*f*) Rafael Soprani, Scrittori della Liguria, *pag.* 244.

(*g*) *He ſays ſo,* Part ii, Pugion. *cap. x*, apud Altamur. *pag.* 453.

(*h*) Vide Altamuram, ibid.

(*i*) Poſſev. in Appar. Sacro.

(2) Naudæus, in Bibliographia Politica, *pag. m.* 35.

(3) *Written by* Jo. Benedictus Carpzovius, Theologiæ Profeſſor Lipſiæ.

(4) He is called *Rabenu Hakados*, and his book *Gale Razeia*, according to Father Morin. Others call him *Hakkadoſch*.

(5) Joan. Morinus, Exercit. Biblic. i, *lib. i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 16. *Vide etiam pag.* 19.

(6) Epiſt. lxxxiv, & xciii.

(7) Epiſt. ccxli.

(8) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 19.

(9) Vide Prolegomena ad Pugionem fidei.

(10) Epit. Bibl. Geſner. *But he ſays,* claruit, *and not* obiit anno 1430. *He had better have cited Geſner himſelf.*

(11) Primus Galatini furta ſubodoratus eſt. *Mr Carpzovius ſays the like.* Eique (*Scaligero*) gratias agere quod primus Galatini plagium prodidiſſet . . . . Ex quo Scaliger Galatini furta primus ſubodoratus eſt. *Introduct. pag.* 90.

and opinions of the Jews, made ſome believe, that he had been of their religion (*k*). But this is falſe.

(*k*) Auguſtin Juſtiniani, Præfat. ad Porcheti Victoriam.

ſeen at Toulouſe the *Pugio Fidei*; ſo that he ſaw it in 1583. Now Beroaldus publiſhed his Chronology in 1575, and had occaſion to obſerve, that Galatinus had publiſhed as his own the writings of Raymond Martini, having made ſome alterations in them. Let us ſet down all that he ſays. 'Galatinus (ut hoc 'obiter moneam) Martini Raymundi ſcripta pro ſuis 'edidit, commutato rerum ordine & argumento non-'nihil variato, ut plagii poſſit accuſari Galatinus: 'quod planum me facturum ſpero ſi dederit Dominus, 'ut pugionem ipſius Raimundi ſcriptum ad impiorum 'perfidiam jugulandam maxime autem Judæorum in 'lucem proferam. Is autem liber ſtudiis Hebraicis 'maxime utilis pervenit ad me ex Bibliotheca Fran-'ciſci Vatabli Mecænatis mei (12). ---- *Galatinus, 'by the way, publiſhed the works of Raymond Marti-'nus for his own, changing the method, and varying 'the ſubject a little; ſo that Galatinus may be accuſed of 'Plagiariſm: which I hope to prove beyond doubt, GOD 'willing, that I may bring to light the* Pugio *of Raymond 'himſelf, written to detect the treachery of the impious, par-'ticularly of the Jews. This book, of the greateſt 'uſe in Hebrew ſtudies, came to me out of the library 'of Francis Vatablus, my Mecænas.*' This paſſage informs us, that Beroaldus had a deſign to publiſh the *Pugio Fidei*, and that his copy came from Vatablus. Probably it was by the book of Beroaldus, that Poſſevin knew, that Vatablus had ſuch a manuſcript, and when he mentioned this particular, he accuſed Galatinus of being a Plagiary (13). Note, that Scaliger's letters were not made public till after the printing of Poſſevin's Apparatus; ſo that here we have a ſecond diſcoverer of this theft before Joſeph Scaliger. I have obſerved, that Toppi, in pag. 202, of his *Biblioteca Napoletana*, ſays, the latter diſcovered it firſt; and therefore he is miſtaken.

(12) Beroaldus, in Chronic. *cap. iii, lib. ii.*

(13) Poſſev. Apparat. Sacr. *Tom. ii, fol.* 411.

MARTYR (PETER) a Proteſtant Divine in the XVIth century. See VERMILLI.

MARULUS (MARCUS), a native of Spalato in Dalmatia, lived in the beginning of the XVIth century, as is obſerved in Moreri's Dictionary; who has not given us the right title of one of his books (*a*). It is a Latin book, which was tranſlated into French, and into ſome other languages (*b*). The French tranſlator did a thing very ſingular, which deſerves to be related [*A*]. Geſner confounds this Marulus with Marullus the Poet (*c*).

(*a*) See the remark.

(*b*) Into Spaniſh and German.

(*c*) *Geſn. in Bibl. fol.* 495, *verſo.* His abbreviators have not corrected this. See, at the end of the remark [*D*] of the article INNOCENT VIII, a little fault of Andreas Rivetus.

[*A*] *The French tranſlator did a thing very ſingular which deſerves to be related.*] This I learn from Martin del Rio. This Jeſuit having cenſured Bodin, becauſe he allowed the judges to lye, that they might draw the truth from the criminals, adds, that Marcus Marulus was of the ſame opinion with Bodin, and that the author of the French tranſlation of Marulus's book has corrected this bad doctrine. He ſuppoſes, that Marulus taught the quite contrary, and inſerts in his book a confutation of Bodin's opinion. *Fuit in ſententiâ Bodini M. Marulus lib.* 4. de Inſtit. benè vivendi cap. 4. *Sed errore animadverſo ejus interpres Gallicus plane contrariam Marulo ſententiam tribuit; & multas paginas, quæ non ſunt Maruli, Marulo inſeruit, dictorum ipſorum Maruli confutationem pro Maruli dictis continentes; quam bono exemplo & prudenter ipſe viderit* (1). Tranſlators have ſo often exceeded their privileges, that a reader is unhappy, who cannot learn things in the originals; for he always runs the hazard of being impoſed upon. See how Geſner recites the title of this book of Marulus: *De religioſe vivendi Inſtitutione lib.* 6. *per exempla ex veteri, novoque Teſtamento collecta, ex authoribus quoque D. Hieronymo Preſbytero, Gregorio Pont. Max. Euſebio Cæſarienſi, Jo. Caſſiano nonnulliſque aliis qui vitas conſcripſere ſanctorum, digeſta per capita ſive locos communes* (2). Miræus has too much abridged this; for he only ſays: *Scripſit libros ſex exemplorum, hoc eſt dictorum factorumque memorabilium* (3); and yet Moreri thought it too long; for he only ſets down *lib.* 6. *Exemplorum.* The Printers, having tranſpoſed the figures, have given us an edition of the works of Marulus in 1610, which, according to Miræus, was in 1601. Gabriel Naudæus, who wrote a diſſertation to prove, that it is lawful for Phyſicians to tell a great many lies to a ſick perſon, does not forget to cite our Marulus, who maintained, that a man, who lies in favour of the commonwealth, or for the greater glory of GOD, does an act of ſingular prudence and piety. *Marullus Spalatenſis lib.* 4. *memor. c.* 4. *ob Reipublicæ bonum vel majorem Dei gloriam mentiri fore ſummæ pietatis ingentiſque prudentiæ contendit* (4). O wicked morality!

(1) Martinus del Rio, Diſquiſit. Magicar. *Tom. iii, lib. v, Sect. x, pag. m.* 74.

(2) Geſn. in Biblioth. *fol.* 495, *verſo.*

(3) Anb. Miræus de Scriptor. culi xvi, *pag.* 9.

(4) Naudæus, in Pentade Quæſt. Jatrophilol. *pag.* 150, Edit. Genev. 1647.

MARULLUS, a Poet of Calabria, in the Vth century, went to wait upon Attila at Padua, after this king of the Huns had opened a way into Italy by taking of Aquileia, and had ruined and ſubdued all that came in his way. This Poet expected a great reward for the flatteries wherewith he had filled the panegyric of Attila. But when this prince knew by his interpreters, that the Poem, which Marullus had repeated, derived his pedigree from the gods, and called him a god, he ordered that theſe verſes, and the author of them, ſhould be burnt. He moderated this puniſhment, when he reflected, that this ſeverity might induce other authors to write nothing in his praiſe (*a*).

(*a*) Ex Callimacho Experiente, in vita Attilæ.

MARULLUS (MICHAEL TARCHANIOTA) [*A*] retired into Italy after the Turks had taken Conſtantinople, where he was born. He did not leave his country out of zeal for Chriſtianity; for his opinions in matters of religion were very far from being orthodox [*B*]. It was doubtleſs the fear of ſlavery, or the deſire he had to avoid the cruel

[*A*] *Tarchaniota.*] I believe it was the name of his mother's family; for, in the firſt book of his epigrams, there is an epitaph upon Michael Tarchaniota, his grandfather by the mother's ſide, and another upon Euphroſyne Tarchaniota, his mother; and in the third book, there is one upon Paul Tarchaniota, his uncle by the mother's ſide. As to his grandfather by the father's ſide, whoſe epitaph is to be ſeen a few pages after, he was called Philip Marullus. One of the four learned Greeks, who fled for refuge into France, under the reign of Charles VII, and were recommended by Philelphus to William des Urſins, chancellor of France, was called Nicolas Tarchaniotes (1).

[*B*] *His ſentiments in matters of religion were very far from being orthodox.*] This is what we learn from Leander Albertus (2) who makes this obſervation by the way, in ſpeaking of the river, wherein Marullus

(1) Guillet, Life of Mahomet II, *Tom. i, pag.* 258, *ex Turco-Græc. pag.* 91.

(2) Deſcript. Ital. *pag.* 44.

cruel vexation of ſeeing and hearing the inſults of an inſolent conqueror, that made him remove from Greece. He liſted himſelf a ſoldier in Italy [*C*], and ſerved in the cavalry, under Nicolas Ralla (*a*), who was of Lacedemon. He joined learning with arms, and would be no leſs a Poet than a ſoldier: and becauſe he feared, leſt his ſkill in making Greek verſes ſhould not be thought any thing extraordinary, he applied himſelf with great diligence to the ſtudy of Latin Poetry, and by this means he acquired a great reputation (*b*). His Latin verſes conſiſt of four books of Epigrams, and four books of Hymns. He began a Poem about the education of princes, which he never finiſhed. What was found of it among his papers, was printed with the Epigrams and Hymns, of all which there have been ſeveral editions. Authors are divided in their opinions about theſe Poems. For ſome critics, ſuch as the two Scaligers (*c*), ſpeak very ill of them. But other writers have commended Marullus very much (*d*). He gained many enemies by cenſuring too freely the antient Latin Poets (*e*). Floridus Sabinus undertook their defence, and treated him harſhly. Politian had a great quarrel with him upon the ſame occaſion (*f*). I ſpeak elſewhere (*g*) of the marriage of Marullus with the learned Alexandra Scala. But here I muſt take notice, that he was of a reſtleſs ſpirit, and could never find a fixed place, for his body, or for his ſtudies [*D*]. Other learned men became famous by tranſlating books: but he deſpiſed this labour (*h*) [*E*], either as a thing below him, or too hazardous, and he was thinking of ſomething of much

rullus was drowned: Flumen Cæcina *Marulli Bizantini viri docti, ſed de Chriſtiana pietate haud ſane ſentientis interitu illuſtratum.* He, who publiſhed ſome curious notes upon Sannazar, makes uſe of two proofs againſt thoſe, who pretended, that John Francis Picus aſſiſted Marullus in making his hymns. The firſt is, that Picus was ſo much addicted to the ſtudy of Chriſtian Theology, that it is not probable that he troubled himſelf about politeneſs of ſtile: The ſecond is, that there is no footſtep of Chriſtianity in the hymns of Marullus. *In hymnis adjutum fuiſſe a Joann. Franciſco Pico erant qui aſſererent Lilii Gyraldi ætate, quod tamen mihi neutiquam veriſimile ſit, cum conſtet Picum tanto ſtudio incubuiſſe Chriſtianæ Theologiæ, ut omnem prorſus ſtyli atque elocutionis ornatum neglexiſſe merito videri poſſit. Marullum verò ſi legas, nec volam, nec veſtigium hominis Chriſtiani invenias* (3). This ſeems to me good reaſoning. Pierius Valerianus relates, that this Poet uttered horrible blaſphemies when he died. *Ferunt illum primo ſtatim caſu vehementer excanduiſſe, utque erat iræ impatiens convitia & maledicta in ſuperos detorſiſſe* (4). Eraſmus would have thought Marullus's Poems tolerable, if they had contained leſs Paganiſm: *Marulli pauca legi,* ſays he in his *Ciceronianus, tolerabilia ſi minus haberent paganitatis.* This Paganiſm was not the greateſt fault of Marullus; his impieties are much more to be condemned; which doubtleſs were the cauſe why Lucretius pleaſed him ſo much, that he put out a new edition of that author, and endeavoured to imitate him (5), and ſaid, that we muſt only read other Poets, but get Virgil and Lucretius by heart (6). Joſeph Scaliger, in his notes upon Catullus, thunders againſt this edition. Here follows a proof of the impudent impiety, wherewith Marullus blaſphemed heaven:

At pia pro patria, pro diis, ariſque tuendis,
  Indueras Latium dux caput arma tibi.
Ultoreſque deos jurata in bella trahebas,
  Si modo ſunt curæ juſque piumque deis.
Sed neque fas, neque jura deos mortalia tangunt,
  Et rapit arbitrio ſors fera cuncta ſuo.
Nam quid priſca fides juvit, pietaſque Pelaſgos?
  Nempe jacent nullo damna levante Deo.
Aſpice Byzanti quondam gratiſſima divis
  Mœnia, Romanæ nobile gentis opus.
Hæc quoque jampridem hoſtili data præda furori eſt
  Solaque de tanta gloria gente manet (7).

But pious arms with holy zeal you take
For your dear country, and religion's ſake;
A zeal, which vengeful gods to battle draws,
If gods regard the juſtice of a cauſe.
But they, ſupine, in their own heaven remain,
Nor aught on earth e're gives their godſhips pain:
But this wide world's affairs at random go,
And fate and fortune govern all below.
In vain the ancient Greeks were good and brave;
Their virtues from deſtruction cou'd not ſave.
Behold Byzantium's walls of wond'rous fame,
The pride and glory of the Roman name.
To hoſtile arms a prey, they ſtrew'd the plains,
And nothing, but their memory, remains.

[*C*] *He liſted himſelf a ſoldier in Italy.*] The author of the Anecdotes of Florence (8) ſays, that Marullus went from Greece into Italy in a company of Cuiraſſiers. This may be; but Paul Jovius, whom this author follows moſt, in what concerns the learned men of that time, ſays no ſuch thing. His words are theſe. *Inter alarios* (§α) *equites deſcriptus, Nicolao Ralla Spartano duce in Italia militavit.* I do not believe, that *Alarius Eques* ſhould be tranſlated a *cuiraſſier*.

[(§α) If it were certain, that Paul Jovius wrote *alarios*, without any mark of abbreviation in the copy, *alarii equites*, in my opinion, would mean the *light-horſe*, and not *cuiraſſiers*; the light cavalry being, if I may ſo ſay, *wings* in compariſon of the others. But perhaps, inſtead of *alarios equites*, the true reading is *Alabaſtarios equites*, *Croſs-bow-men*, as the Albanian cavalry was at that time, ſince known in France by the name of *Eſtradiots* Rem. Crit.]

[*D*] *He was of a reſtleſs ſpirit, and could never find a fixed place for his body, or his ſtudies.*] I will cite for this two authors: 'Inquieto ingenio nullibi ſedem 'ſtabilem nactus, in curſu ſtudiorum ac itinerum ſemper fuit (9). - - - - *Being of a reſtleſs diſpoſition, he 'ſettled no where, but was always ſtudying and travelling.*' 'Nullius unquam principis liberalitate ita 'adjutus, ut in literarum otium ſe conferre poſſet (10). '- - - *He never gained ſo much by the bounty of princes, 'that he could retire, and devote himſelf to his ſtudies.*' I know not whether one may oppoſe to their teſtimony that of Crinitus. Let every one do as he pleaſes: Here it is in verſe:

    Et gradum
  Placuit ad urbem flectere,
Qua noſter Medices Pieridum parens
  Marulle hoſpitium dulce tibi exhibet,
Ac te perpetuis muneribus fovens
  Phœbum non patitur tela reſumere
  Laurens Camœnarum decus (11).

That is,

To that city, where Laurens de Medicis, the parent of the Muſes, kindly entertains you, O Marullus, and by his munificence towards you, ſuffers not Phœbus to reſume his darts.

Marullus therefore had a good Mæcenas in the perſon of Laurence de Medicis. Crinitus praiſes Marullus very much, particularly in his *Nænia de obitu Poëtæ Marulli.*

[*E*] *He deſpiſed the labour of tranſlating.*] Mr Varillas (12) tells us, that Laurence de Medicis deſired Marullus,

(*a*) Jovius in Elogiis, *cap. xxviii*, Militari ſtipendio ſeſe alere coactus. Pier. Valer. de Liter. infel. *lib. ii.*

(*b*) Jovius, ibid.

(*c*) Jul. Cæſ. Scaliger, Poet. *lib. vi*, *cap. iv.* Joſ. Scalig. in Catull. Epigr. lxvii.

(*d*) Crinitus de honeſta, diſcipl. *lib. xxiii*, *cap. vii.* Jo. Secundus Epigr. Jovius, ubi ſupra. Pontanus apud Jovium, ibid. Pier. Valerian. de Liter. infel.

(*e*) *See* Crinitus, ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Paulo ante Græcorum nomini favens, cum Politiano ejus gentis ingeniis infeſto, maledicentiſſimis epiſtolis lites extenderat. *Jovius, ibid.*

(*g*) In the article SCALA.

(*h*) Jovius, ubi ſupra.

(3) Not. ad Sannaz. *pag.* 189. Edit. Amſtel. 1689. *See alſo pag.* 201.

(4) Pier. Val. de Liter. infel. *lib. ii*, *pag. m.* 70.

(5) Gyral. Dialog. i, de Poët. ſui temp.

(6) Crinitus, de hon. Diſc. *lib. xxiii*, *cap. vii.*

(7) Marullus, Epigr. *lib. i*, *pag. m.* 16, 17.

(8) *Pag.* 179, the Printers, who have miſerably disfigured the proper names in this book, have put *Marcilius* for *Marullus*. At *pag.* 161, they have put *Trachamote* for *Tarchaniote*.

(9) Jov. in Elog. *cap. xxviii.*

(10) Pier. Valerian. de infel. Litter. *lib. ii.*

(11) Crinitus, *lib. ii*, Poëmat. *pag. m.* 828.

(12) Anec. de Flor. *pag.* 179.

much greater importance, when he was drowned in a river of Tuſcany [*F*], blaſpheming againſt Heaven. This was in the year 1500 [*G*]. I have read, in a late book, that this misfortune was foretold him a long time before; but the witneſs, who is alledged for it, ſays no ſuch thing [*H*].

lus, *in his letters which are ſtill extant*, to tranſlate the moral works of Plutarch, but that Marullus 'had 'ſo great an averſion for that ſort of work, wherein 'one muſt, ſaid he, make himſelf a ſlave to the ſen'timents of another, that it was impoſſible for him to 'finiſh the firſt page of that verſion.'

[*F*] *He was drowned in a river of Tuſcany.*] It is that, which runs by Volterra, and which the antients called Cecina. It ſtill retains the ſame name, as Cluverius and Baudrand affirm, ſo that I cannot underſtand why Pierius Varillas ſays, that it is now named Sicla (13), nor why Valerius calls it the river of Volterra (14). Paul Jovius ſays, that it was more ſwelled than ordinary, that day on which Marullus was drowned in it (15): But Valerianus ſays the quite contrary; and ſince he is more particular in this matter, he is more worthy of credit than the other; and it appears, that he had examined the circumſtances. Marullus, ſays he, perceiving, that his horſe ſo ſunk with his fore feet in the water, that he could not diſengage himſelf, grew angry, and ſpurred him: but he fell with his horſe, and, having his leg entangled under the belly of the beaſt, there wanted but little water to choak him. *Fluvium vel exigua tunc aqua fluentem ingreſſus, ſive equum potaturus ſive alia de cauſa tantillum immoratus, ſenſit equum anterioribus pedibus ita in arenas alvei ſemper inſidi voraginoſas abſorberi ut emergere inde non poſſet .... modica admodum ejus profluentis aqua ſuffocatus interiit* (16). The liberty, which Varillas takes in paraphraſing upon what he borrows from another, was prepoſterous upon this occaſion. To tranſlate the words of Paul Jovius, *ſolito inflatior*, he ſays, that *the rains had extraordinarily ſwelled* the river, and yet, according to him, Marullus was fording it. He was either drunk or mad, you will ſay; the adverb *extraordinarily* decides it upon this occaſion. Let us not go ſo faſt: I remember I have read in a book of Lancelotti of Perugia, that the inhabitants of the country advertiſed our Marullus not to paſs the river, becauſe great rains had fallen that night. To whom he anſwered, that he was afraid of Mars, and not of Neptune; for he relied upon the Aſtrologers (17), who had caſt his nativity, and told him, that he ought to be afraid of arms, and that he would do well not to go to the war (18). Volaterranus obſerves, that Marullus, who had lodged in his houſe, parted from him the ſame day he was drowned; and he ſpeaks honourably of him (19). Voſſius, in his treatiſe of the Latin Poets, ſays, that day was the fifteenth of June, 1511 (20). I believe, this error proceeded originally from the two haſty reading of a paſſage in Paul Jovius, wherein the day, on which Marullus died, is ſet down in this manner: 'Eo die 'quo Ludovicus Sfortia captus ut ferrato in carcere 'miſer expiraret, in ulteriorem Galliam eſt perductus. '*That day, in which Lewis Sforza, being taken, was 'carried to the fartheſt part of France, to die miſerably 'in an iron priſon.*' Somebody, not carefully attending to the words, confounded the day, on which Lewis Sforza was ſeized, with the day of his death; and, becauſe his death happened in 1511, they concluded, that our Poet died alſo in the ſame year. The ſeizing of Lewis Sforza was on the eleventh of April, 1500 (21). Mr Baillet (22) follows the Chronology of Voſſius, abating one day.

[*G*] *This was in the year* 1500.] The manner, in which Paul Jovius characteriſes this year, does not ſuffer us to doubt, that it was the laſt of the XVth century. See the preceding remark, at the end. Peter de St Romauld is miſtaken half a century; for thus he ſpeaks under the year 1545. 'Michael Marullus, a native of Conſtantinople, who wrote very 'elegantly in Latin verſe, in imitation of Catullus 'and Tibullus, and who had ſerved the emperor 'Maximilian, in the quality of a captain, was drowned 'in Tuſcany; which an Italian Poet deploring, in his 'epitaph, ſays at the end of it, that if he muſt loſe 'his life in water,

> Mergier Aonio flumine debuerat:
>
> *He ſhould have periſh'd in th' Aonian ſtream.*

'Which way of ſpeaking did not pleaſe the late Mr 'de Balzac (23).'

Sandius refutes Voſſius by this reaſon, namely, that Pontanus, who died in 1503, or 1505, made verſes upon the death of Marullus. He obſerves, that there are ſome, who place the death of Marullus, on the ſixteenth of May 1466, and he convicts them of falſhood by the epigrams of that Poet againſt Pope Innocent VIII, and upon the death of Theodorus Gaza, and John Picus Mirandula. This Pope ſat in the ſee of Rome from 1484, to 1492. Theodorus Gaza died in 1478, and John Picus Mirandula in 1494; therefore the proofs of Sandius are very good; and he had reaſon to reject the opinion of thoſe, who ſaid, that Marullus flouriſhed in the year 1520 (24).

[*H*] *I have read, in a late book, that this misfortune was foretold him . . . but the witneſs, who is alledged, ſays no ſuch thing.*] To determine this queſtion of matter of fact, we need only compare the paſſage of the modern author with the words of Pierius Valerianus, who is his witneſs. 'Suffocatus eſt Marullus in Tuſciæ amne 'Cecina fallente equum veſtigio. Miſerabile id leti 'genus multis annis ante ipſi prædictum fuiſſe, inde'que ſemper aquas timuiſſe auctor eſt Pierius Valeria'nus in Dialogis de literatorum infelicitate, qui rei 'veritatem ignorare non poterat, ipſamque adeo car'mine quodam ſuo, multò ante Marulli mortem poſte'ritati palam fecerat (25). - - *Marullus was choaked in 'the Cecina, a river of Tuſcany, his horſe's foot ſlipping. 'Pierius Valerianus, in his dialogues of the misfortune of 'learned men, tells us, that this unfortunate kind of 'death was foretold him many years before, and that 'from that time he was always afraid of water; nor 'could Pierius be ignorant of the truth of the fact, 'which he publiſhed in one of his poems, long before Ma'rullus's death.*' According to this account, we have here, not one of thoſe predictions made after the event, which are ſo frequent, but a prediction publiſhed a long time before the event; which would therefore be of great moment, if the matter of fact were certain. Now let us ſhew, that Pierius Valerianus ſays nothing of the prediction, and that his verſes were made after the misfortune of Marullus. I have cited above (26) a long paſſage out of his tract *de Literatorum Infelicitate*, the concluſion whereof was, *aqua ſuffocatus interiit*: after which words immediately follow theſe: 'Verum igitur fuit quod meus Pierius 'jam tum puer de Marullo cecinit. CAT. Quid'nam? illud muſici recita obſecro quoniam libenter 'ejus cantilenas auſculto. - - - - *It was true therefore, 'what Pierius, then a boy, ſung of Marullus.* CAT. '*pray recite theſe verſes; for I am always pleaſed to 'hear his poetry.*' Then the verſes of Pierius are related, which turn upon this thought, That Marullus ought not to be troubled at his periſhing in water. The fear which is attributed to him, reſpects only the time, in which his horſe fell under him in the Cecina. But ſome, perhaps, may ſay, Pierius was very young when he made thoſe verſes, *jam tum puer*; he made them therefore before the year 1500; for, according to Thuanus, he died in 1550, aged eighty three years. I anſwer, that Thuanus is miſtaken. Imperialis (27) places the death of Pierius in 1558, and makes him to be then no more than eighty one years of age: and thus he would have been but twenty three years old, when Marullus died. Now it is not without precedent, in good Latin authors, to call one of that age *puer*; and however it be, the verſes of Pierius did not precede the death of Marullus.

(13) Dum Siclam qui olim Cecina dicebatur. *Pier. Valer. ubi ſupra.*

(14) Anecd. *pag.* 179.

(15) Cecina amnis ſolito inflatior fallente equum cæco vado violenter abripuit. *Jovius, ubi ſupra.*

(16) Pier. Valer. ubi ſupra.

(17) A great confidence in that ſort of people makes a man ſometimes as bold as madneſs or drunkenneſs.

(18) Don Secondo Lancellotti da Perugia Abbate Olivetano, *in the book intituled,* Chi l'indovinà è Savio, *lib. i, Diſapanno iii, pag.* 64. *He cites* Paul. Cort. *lib. i.*

(19) Jo. Jovianus Pontanus diſcipulum habuit Marullum Conſtantinopolitanum hoſpitem meum, qui eodem die quo à me Volaterris diſceſſit in amne Cecina ſubmerſus eſt, vir acris cum ingenii tum judicii. *Volat. lib. xxxviii, pag. m.* 1462.

(20) Id factum xvii. Kal. Jul. an. cIↄIↄxi.

(21) Labbe, Chron. Françoiſe.

(22) Jugement ſur les Poetes, *num.* 1244.

(23) St Romuald, Abrégé du Thréſor Chronologique, *Tom. iii, pag. m.* 300. *See* Balzac, Socrate Chrétien, *pag. m.* 228.

(24) *Taken out of* Sandius, Not. in Voſſium de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 227.

(25) Not. ad Sannazari Eleg. *pag.* 191. Edit. Amſtel. 1689.

(26) In citation (16).

(27) *See his* Muſæum Hiſtoricum, *pag.* 40.

MASCARDI (Auguſtin) was a learned man, and one of the beſt Orators of the XVIIth century (*a*). He was born at Sarzana (*b*) in 1591, and died there in 1640 (*c*). You will find in Moreri, that he was chamberlain to Urban VIII, and that this Pope *founded for him a profeſſor's chair of Rhetoric in the college* della Sapienza in 1628. He granted him for life a penſion of five hundred crowns (*d*). If Maſcardi was always in want, and oppreſſed with debts, it was not ſo much becauſe he neglected his buſineſs, as becauſe he diverted himſelf too much; for it muſt be confeſſed, that his manner of living was not ſo highly eſteemed as his wit and learning [*A*]. He was for ſome time prince of the academy of the Humoriſts (*e*); and he had a paper-war with Paganinus Gaudentius, and other authors [*B*]. He printed at his own expence his treatiſe *dell' Arte Hiſtorica*, and had loſt a conſiderable ſum by it, if cardinal Mazarin had not procured many copies to be ſold at Paris [*C*]. The authors, who ſpeak of him, and to whom Moreri refers us (*f*), are quoted by Michael Juſtiniani (*g*).

There is in the works of Balzac a certain diſcourſe, wherein he ſharply cenſures our Maſcardi, without naming him [*D*].

(*a*) Michel Giuſtiniani, gli Scrittori Liguri deſcritti, *pag.* 24. Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth I, *pag.* 113.

(*b*) A town in the ſtate of Genoa.

(*c*) Giuſtiniani, ib. *pag.* 25.

(*d*) Id. ib. *pag.* 24.

(*e*) Id. ib. *pag.* 25.

(*f*) *Inſtead of* Maracci, Bibliot. Mariam, *read in Moreri*, Maracci, Bibliotheca Mariana.

(*g*) Ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *His manner of living was not ſo highly eſteemed as his wit and learning.*] To this purpoſe I ſhall cite a paſſage, whereby we learn, that Maſcardi lodged always in other peoples houſes, and that proviſionally, and ſpent his money without diſcretion. ‘Utinam ſecundiore prudentia ac SANÇTITATIS fama fuiſſet, nec in hac parte vitæ, ut fama eſt, claudicaſſet; profecto ad egregias ejus virtutes hæc quoque præſtantiſſima omnium laus acceſſiſſet. Sed homo in re familiari negligens, profuſus, nulla pecuniæ acceſſione ſuppeditare ſuis ſumptibus poterat; in ſuis nummis nunquam, in ære alieno ſemper: &, quod mireris magis, nunquam certis ac conductis ædibus habitavit, ſed incertis atque precariis (1). *I wiſh he had been more famed for prudence and* PROBITY, *and had not, as is reported, been blameable in this part of his life: the reſt of his excellent virtues, then, would have been crowned with this greateſt of praiſe. But, being careleſs in his domeſtic affairs, and profuſe, no ſums were ſufficient for his expences; he was always in debt, and lived upon other peoples money; and, what is ſtrange, he never had a ſettled habitation.*’

[*B*] *He had a paper-war with ſeveral authors.*] In his hiſtory of the conſpiracy of count Fieſche, he very often attacks the religion of Ubert Folietta. He did the like in his other books, againſt ſome writers; which was the reaſon why he was attacked in his turn. *Venendo eſſo parimente tacciato da Paganino Gaudentio, mi ſi dara motivo di far qualche refleſſione nel libro de gli Academici Humoriſti, per vedir quale di loro ſoſtien meglio le ſue accuſe* (2). To the ſecond edition of his hiſtory of the conſpiracy of the count Fieſche are added the objections that were made to him, and his anſwer to them. I know not whether his anſwer to Brunor Taverna, concerning that hiſtory, has been publiſhed: the abbot Michael Juſtiniani had read it in manuſcript (3).

[*C*] *Cardinal Mazarin procured many copies to be ſold of his treatiſe* dell' Arte Hiſtorica.] Among an infinite number of ridiculous things, which are objected to this cardinal during the troubles of Paris, it was ſaid, that he traded in all manner of merchandize, and that he even made an auction of books in the palace d'Eſtrée (4). Naudé (5) anſwered in his behalf thus: ‘I believe I have ſufficiently proved the contrary. But now to juſtify likewiſe this ſale of books, which was the beſt and moſt decent way the cardinal could uſe, to teſtify the care he always took of learned men; we muſt know, that the Sieur Agoſtino Maſcardi, who was accounted the beſt writer of Italy in his time, thought fit to print, in 1636, a book of his own writing, intituled, *Dell' Arte Hiſtorica trattati cinque* (6), in 4to, and ſo thick, that it contained near a hundred ſheets; and becauſe *la Tavola di Cebete, le Pompe del Campidoglio, la Congiura dei Fieſchi, le Proſe, i diſcorſi Academici, Silvarum ſive variorum Carminum libri iv*; and, in a word, all his works had ſold very well, he cauſed many more copies of this than of the preceding ones, to be printed: wherein he was ſo unſucceſsful, that the greateſt part of the copies were left on his hands, becauſe few people delighted in ſuch kind of matters. As he was complaining of this one day to cardinal Mazarin, he propoſed to ſend ſome bales of them to Paris, where he had a man to manage his affairs, who ſhould take care to ſell them for him, and remit him the money he took: which the Sieur Maſcardi very willingly accepted of; and by this means he prevented a great loſs, which was almoſt unavoidable. I have this ſtory from the man himſelf, who managed at that time the cardinal's affairs in that city.’

[*D*] *There is in Balzac's works . . . . . a diſcourſe, wherein he ſharply cenſures our Maſcardi, without naming him.*] It is in a diſſertation, which was printed with the *Socrete Chrétien*. It conſiſts of ſome remarks upon divers pieces: thoſe, which concern the philoſophical Orator, point at him, who is the ſubject of this article. Of this Balzac himſelf informs us, in theſe words of a letter, which he wrote to Mr Conrart, January 4, 1641. ‘It is Maſcardi, whom I mean, for certain very ill things, which I obſerved in him, before he had refined his ſtyle, and formed his judgment (7).’

(1) Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth I, *pag.* 113.

(2) Michel Giuſtiniani, gli Scrittori Liguri deſcritti, *pag.* 25.

(3) Ib. *pag.* 25.

(4) See Naudé, in his *Dialogue de Maſcurat*, *pag.* 70.

(5) Naudé, ib.

(6) Naudé had conceived a good opinion of this work. See his *Bibliographia Politica*, *pag. m.* 67.

(7) Balzac's Letter to Conrart, *pag. m.* 96.

MASCARON (Julius), one of the greateſt preachers of the XVIIth century, was born at Marſeilles in the year 1634. He inherited *from his father, the moſt famous advocate of the Parliament of Aix, the uncommon talent of Eloquence, which diſtinguiſhed him.* He entered very young into the congregation of the Oratory, *and he taught Rhetoric, from the age of twenty-two years, at Mans. Soon after he mounted the pulpit*, and preached with great great ſucceſs in the church of St Peter at Saumur. *The biſhop of Mans, deſiring to keep ſo able a preacher in his church, made him a prebend of it.* He was admired at Paris, when he preached the Advent-ſermons at the oratory. He was appointed, in 1666, to make the funeral oration of the queen-mother. Afterwards he preached at court five or ſix years, and was nominated to the biſhopric of Tulle in the year 1671. *Having pronounced, with the uſual applauſe, the funeral oration of the mareſchal Turenne in 1675, he was tranſlated to the biſhopric of Agen. He was ſent for, in 1694, to preach the Lent-ſermons at court. The year following, he opened the aſſembly of the Clergy, and returned to his dioceſe, where he died of a dropſy, and a complication of diſtempers, the ſixteenth of December*, 1703 (*a*). His life is prefixed to a collection of his funeral orations, publiſhed at Paris in the year 1704 in 12°.

(*a*) Taken from the *Memoires de Trevoux*, Jan. 1705, *pag.* 95, *& ſeq.*

MASSARIUS (Jerom), doctor of Phyſic, and native of Vicenza, lived in the XVIth century, and left his country, to ſeek for a land of liberty, where he might openly, and without fear of the conſequences, embrace the Proteſtant religion. He retired into Switzerland, and there publiſhed a controverſial work [*A*]. It is ſaid, that he taught at Straſburg, and that he died in the year 1564 (*a*). I will ſet down the titles of ſome other works, which are aſcribed to him (*b*).

(*a*) Konig, Biblioth. *pag.* 517.

(*b*) See the remark, towards the end.

[*A*] *He publiſhed a controverſial work.*] The title of it is: *Euſebius Captivus, ſive modus procedendi in Curia Romana contra Evangelicos; in quo eſt Epitome præcipuorum capitum doctrinæ Chriſtianæ, & Refutatio Pontificiæ Synagogæ: una cum hiſtoriis de Vitis aliquot Ponficum, quæ ad negotium religionis ſcitu utiles ſunt ac neceſſariæ.* He gives himſelf the name of Hieronymus Marius Vincentinus (1). Placcius has not mentioned this in his collection of pſeudonymous writers. The reaſon of Maſſarius's publiſhing this work was this: His friends took it ill that he had left Italy, to retire into Switzerland: they were of the ſame ſentiments, that he was, as to religion: but worldly motives prevailed upon them ſhamefully and publickly to abjure Proteſtantiſm. They exhorted him to follow their example, and to quit a communion, which they called heretical, and they deſired him to come and confer with them a little. He was afraid leſt they ſhould entrap him, and rejected the propoſition. Some perſons of merit gave a bad turn to this, as if he diſtruſted his cauſe. This made him take pen in hand, to ſhew, that he did not refuſe conferences for the reaſon they ſuſpected, but becauſe he did not believe, his friends propoſed them with a good deſign. He feigns in his book, that a true believer (2), a priſoner at Rome, gives an account of his faith before the Pope and the Inquiſition. The affair comprehends three days: the judges ſpeak little; the priſoner is almoſt the only ſpeaker. The work was dedicated by the author to the ſenate of Berne, and printed at Baſil, for Oporinus, in the year 1553, in 8vo, as is affirmed in the Abridgment of Geſner's Bibliotheque: but Chriſtopher Pezelius, who procured a more correct edition of it in 1597 (3), ſuppoſes, that it had been printed in the year 1555 (4).

We find, in the abridgment of the ſame Bibliotheque, that Maſſarius had compoſed an excellent grammar of the German tongue, and that his Hebrew grammar was never publiſhed. His Latin verſion and paraphaſe of the treatiſe of Hippocrates *de Natura Hominis* was printed at Straſburg in 1564 (5).

(1) See the Abridgment of Geſner's Bibliotheque, *pag.* 349.

(2) Whom he calls *Euſebius Uranius.*

(3) At Zurich, for John Wolfius, in 8vo.

(4) Editus eſt ante annos quadraginta duos. *Pezelius, Epiſt. Dedic. dated in* 1597.

(5) Lindenius renovatus, *pag.* 424.

MATMAN (Rodolphus) born at Lucerne in Swiſſerland, became a Jeſuit at eighteen years of age. He taught Rhetoric for twenty years, and died at Munich September 18, 1612, after he had been thirty years in the Society. He prepared ſeveral books for the public (*a*). He wrote againſt Scaliger, a little book, which many perſons have attributed to Scioppius [*A*].

(*a*) Alegambe, in Bibl. Script. Societ. Jeſu, *pag.* 417.

[*A*] *He wrote, againſt Scaliger, a little book, which many perſons have attributed to Scioppius.*] It was printed at Ingolſtad in 1608, in 4to, with this title; *Cornelii Denii Brugenſis tres Capellæ, ſive admonitio ad Joſephum Juſtum Burdonem Julii Burdonis F. Benedicti Burdonis N. prius Scaligerum nunc Sacrilegum.* Scioppius re-printed it in 1611, with his *Oporini Grubinii Amphotides Scioppianæ.* Scaliger ſpeaks with great contempt of this little book (1): 'Hoc mittimus, *ſays he* (2), ad Apoſtolum Japponenſem, retrimentum inſcitiæ, impurum Auctorem libelli de tribus Capellis, cujus inſcitia certat cum improbitate: quanquam non deſunt qui Furem Veſpillonis filium auctorem aſſerant. - - - *I ſend this to the Japoneſe Apoſtle, the very dregs of ignorance, and the filthy author of the book* De Tribus Capellis, *in which there is as much ſtupidity as knavery; 'tho' ſome aſcribe it to the bearer's ſon.*' Theſe laſt words ſignify, that ſome attributed this book to Scioppius. Mr Placcius obſerves, that this is the opinion of ſome perſons (3), and refutes thoſe, who ſhould deny it upon this ground, that it is not in the catalogue of the writings of Scioppius. The author of the *Decas Decadum* (4) cites a paſſage of Scioppius, to ſhew, that the Jeſuits of Ingolſtad are the true authors of the book *De Tribus Capellis*, but he knows not the name of the Jeſuit, who wrote this ſatire, and he alledges a paſſage of Scaliger (5), which does not at all prove, as he pretends, that it was Martin Delrio. Mr Baillet has already obſerved, that Denius Burgens Cornelius, is a diſguiſe for Ralph Matman (6); and, ſince Alegambe affirms it (7), we muſt believe it.

(1) It contains ſcarce more than twenty pages in the edition of 1611, in 12mo.

(2) Scaliger, Confut. Fabulæ Burdonum, *pag. m.* 324.

(3) Tres Capellæ . . . . Scioppianæ videntur nonnullis. *Placcius de Anonymis, pag.* 65.

(4) Johannes Albertus Faber, Dec. Decadum, *num. xxviii.*

(5) *Taken from the* Confutatio Fabulæ Burdonum, *pag.* 330.

(6) Baillet, Liſt of diſguiſed Authors, at the word DENIUS.

(7) Alegambe, Biblioth. Script. Societ. *pag.* 417.

MAUGIN (John), ſirnamed the Angevin [*A*], lived in the XVIth century, and publiſhed ſeveral books in French, ſome in verſe, others in proſe. The greateſt part were only tranſlations. That of Machiavel's diſcourſes on Livy was printed at Paris, in *folio*, in the year 1548, and in 16to in 1572 (*a*). He publiſhed in the ſame city, in 1546, in folio, *The Hiſtory of Palmerin of Oliva, ſon of king Florendos of Macedonia, and the fair Griana, daughter of the emperor of Conſtantinople, tranſlated from Italian* (*b*). His firſt book of the *New Triſtan, prince of Leonnois, knight of the round table, and Yſeulta, princeſs of Yrland, queen of Cornwall*, was printed at Paris in *folio*, in 1554 (*c*). He dedicated it to Mr *de Maupas, abbot of St John of Laon, counſellor and almoner in ordinary to the king*, and ingenuouſly confeſſes to him, that he choſe him for the hero of his book, becauſe he knew, that *his hand had never been cloſe to thoſe, who had preſented to him their works ſmall or great.* He alledges another reaſon; namely, that Mr de Maupas had reſtored him to liberty (*d*). This epiſtle dedicatory is dated from Laon the twentieth of June 1554, and begins with a piece of raillery, which you will ſee below [*B*].

(*a*) Du Verdier, Bibl. Franc. *pag.* 724.

(*b*) Id. ib.

(*c*) La Croix du Maine, knew nothing of this edition: he mentions only that of 1567.

(*d*) See the remark [*B*].

[*A*] *Sirnamed, the Angevin.*] He thus briefly ſigns the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his *New Triſtan*; and he puts in the title-page of this book, *made French by John Maugin, called the Angevin.* This ſhews, that he was more known by the name of his native country, than by that of his family. He was of Angers, according to la Croix du Maine, who adds, that he was ſir-named, *the little Angevin* (1). Du Verdier Vau-Privas has made the ſame remark. If there had been at that time another writer, named Maugin, native of another province, or of the country of Anjou, but more conſiderable than he, either by his ſtature, or his merit, the ſir-name, I am ſpeaking of, would not be ominous; but, as our John Maugin had not a contemporary, who wrote books, and was of the ſame name, we may reaſonably believe, that he was of mean extraction, and of ſmall ſtature, a foot-boy, a journey-man Taylor, *&c.* oftener bears the name of his province, than that of his family; and it is not without example, that a lacquey has become a diſtinguiſhed Poet and author.

[*B*] *The Epiſtle Dedicatory of his* New Triſtan *begins with the following piece of raillery.*] 'My lord, it has been the common pretence of all French authors for this twenty years, either that their copies have been ſtolen from them, or that the importunity of their friends have forced them to publiſh them. I know how commendable modeſty is: but to reckon ſimplicity, and diſtruſt of one's ſelf as ſuch, ſeems to me ſo ridiculous and contemptible, that I will not in

(1) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 244.

‘the leaſt make this ill uſe of it, tho' among ſome it paſſes for opinion and cuſtom. For this reaſon, it was always my intention and deſire, in oppoſition to theſe men, from the very hour, in which you kindly freed me from captivity and priſon, to liberty, and the freedom of your ſervice, to preſent you with the product of my pen, which may afford you ſo much pleaſure, that I ſhall have ſufficient reaſon to be ſatisfied (2).’ After the Epiſtle Dedicatory, there is an Ode to Mr de Maupas, out of which I am going to cite a ſtanza, which may induce ſome perſons to think, that Maugin was delivered out of the priſons of the Chatelet.

(2) Maugin, Epiſtle Dedicatory to the *New Triſtan*.

Maugin fut par vous racheté
D'Enfer, dont mit ſa liberté
Toute a voſtre commande :
Oultre il vous donne ſes labeurs
(Meurdriers de ſes vieigles douleurs)
N'aiant choſe plus grande.

That is,

Maugin by you from Hell (3) *was freed;*
To you his liberty is due:
The ſole amuſement of his griefs,
His labours he devotes to you.

(3) Alluding perhaps to Marot's poem intituled *Hell*.

For the reſt, the practice which Maugin laughs at, has continued to this time. An infinite number of prefaces witneſs it : we have ſeen alſo, from time to time, prefaces, which take quite another turn. In them the authors acknowledge, that of their own accord they publiſh their works. Sincerity is not the only reaſon which makes them ſpeak thus : they have a mind to rally thoſe, who complain of violence offered them.

MAUSOLUS, king of Caria [*A*], is more known as the huſband of Artemiſia, than upon any other account; although, during a reign of twenty four years, he acted very politicly, and became formidable (*a*). After the example of his predeceſſors, he was much more inclined to the party of the Perſians, than to that of the Greeks; and it appears (*b*), that, in favour of the Perſians, but chiefly out of a deſire to enrich himſelf, he committed many piracies upon the neighbouring iſles. He was one who took money with both hands, and gave no quarter to the purſe of his beſt friends, but made uſe of ſly artifices to enrich himſelf at their expence [*B*]. He engaged himſelf for money in all ſorts of wicked actions [*C*]. We muſt not therefore wonder, that his conduct was ſometimes contrary to the intereſt of the court of Perſia, and that by this means he brought himſelf into many difficulties (*c*). He was much concerned in the war which was called Confederate [*D*], and which begun in the CVth Olympiad, between the Athenians on one ſide, and thoſe of Rhodes, Chios, Cos and Byzantium, on the other. It was he that contrived this league againſt the Athenians (*d*). Among other exploits he changed during this war the democracy of Rhodes into an ariſtocracy; but neither his conqueſts, nor his good mien, nor his bravery, nor any of his actions procured him ſuch an immortal name as

(*a*) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xvi.*

(*b*) In argumento Orationis Demoſth. contra Timocrat.

(*c*) See the harangue of Iſocrates *ad Philippum*, in the place where he ſpeaks of Idrieus, and his brother. This brother was our Mauſolus.

(*d*) Libanius, in Argument. Orat. Demoſth. pro libert. Rhodior.

[*A*] *King of Caria.*] Aulus Gellius has obſerved, that Cicero gives him this title; but that ſome Greek Hiſtorians give him one that is leſs honourable. ‘Mauſolus fuit, ut M. Tullius ait, rex terræ Cariæ; ut quidam Græcarum Hiſtoriarum ſcriptores Provinciæ Græciæ præfectus, Satrapen Græci vocant (1). - - - - *Mauſolus was, according to Cicero, king of Caria; but, according to ſome Greek Hiſtorians, governor of a province of Greece: the Perſians call it* Satrapa.’ I know not who they are that have called him the governor of a province of Greece. The word Satrapa, which is Perſian, is ſufficient to prove, either that Aulus Gellius is miſtaken, or that it is not he who has ſaid, *Provinciæ Græciæ*. Charles Stephens, Lloyd, and Hofman have formed no ill ſuſpicions about this paſſage; they cite the laſt part of it, without changing any thing in it. Iſocrates (2) has given to Hecatomnus, the father of Mauſolus, the title of Καρίας ἐπίσταθμος, that is, according to the paraphraſe of Harpocration, *Cariæ Satrapes*. Mauſolus is called by the ſame Harpocration, and by Suidas ἄρχων Καρῶν, *imperans Caribus*; by Libanius Καρίας ὕπαρχος *Cariæ præfectus* (3): but by Polyænus (4), and many others, Βασιλεὺς Καρίας, *Rex Cariæ*.

(1) Aul. Gellius, *lib. x, cap. xviii.*

(2) In Panegyr.

(3) Argum. Orat. Demoſth. pro Rhod.

(4) Polyænus, Stratag. *lib. vii, cap. xxiii.*

[*B*] *He made uſe of ſly artifices, to enrich himſelf at the expence of his friends.*] Read upon this ſubject Polyænus (5) and Ariſtotle (6); where you may ſee, that if, on one ſide, the court of Perſia taxed Mauſolus at great ſums, he knew, on the other, how to indemnify himſelf, and exact the ſame ſums from others with uſury. In this he was more unjuſt than thoſe great farmers of the king's revenues, who, after they have been taxed, cauſe their ſubordinate officers to be delivered up into their hands. You may ſee moreover in Ariſtotle, that under this king of Caria, it was very well known how to make an advantage of the Lycians inclination to wear long hair. They invented a kind of a tax which was very gainful. See alſo what I cite out of Ariſtotle in the remark [*E*].

(5) Id. ib.

(6) Ariſtot. Oecon. *lib. ii.*

[*C*] *He engaged himſelf for money in all ſorts of wicked actions.*] The words of Harpocration, tranſcribed by Suidas, are theſe; Φησὶ δὲ αὐτὸν Θεόπομπος μεδενὸς ἀπέχεσθαι πράγματος χρημάτων ἕνεκα. De quo Theopompus ſcribit eum à nullo facinore pecuniæ cauſa ſibi temperaſſe. *Of whom Theopompus writes, that for money he would commit the greateſt crimes.* Without doubt theſe words are taken out of the hiſtories of Theopompus; but he took care not to ſpeak thus in the Elogium, he made upon this prince, in the Elogium I ſay, which won the prize that Artemiſia propoſed to the Orators, that would make a panegyric upon her huſband. Then for certain Theopompus made our Mauſolus a moſt accompliſhed prince, and adorned him with all ſorts of virtues; and yet you ſee what he ſays of him in another book. This double dealing, in ſaying one thing with the tongue and another with the pen, is abominable: Every thing ought to be ſuſpected in ſuch kind of people who divide themſelves into two perſons, and think it lawful when they conſider themſelves as Orators, to tell ſuch lies as they would not adopt, when they write a hiſtory, by which no prize is to be got. This diſtinction is meer ſophiſtry, and is no better than that wherewith ſome would ſave the honour of Procopius. An author of memoirs, and a writer of hiſtory, are wholly and inſeparably reſponſible for all that comes from their pen, when they are one and the ſame writer. For the reſt, although Vitruvius ſpeaks rather to the advantage than diſadvantage of Mauſolus, yet one may perceive by his words that this prince was an extortioner (7). He praiſes the magnificence, and the good contrivance of his buildings, and the great conveniences in them.

(7) Halicarnaſſi Potentiſſimi regis Mauſoli domus . . . . Parietes habet latere ſtructos qui ad hoc tempus egregiam præſtant firmitatem . . . . neque is rex ab inopia hoc fecit, infinitis enim vectigalibus erat farctus, quod imperabat Cariæ toti. *Vitruv. de Archit. lib. ii, cap.* [illegible]

[*D*] *He was much concerned in the war, which was called Confederate.*] Moreri and Hofman have falſely imagined, that there were two Mauſolus's, and that he who was concerned in the confederate war, was not the ſame with him who was the huſband of Artemiſia, buried in the Mauſoleum. If they had taken the pains to conſult the originals, they would have made but one article, which would have been for this huſband, and might have been full enough, independently of his wife.

[*E*] *He*

as his wife did (*e*) by the ſtately monument which ſhe built for him, and by the tender and friendly reſpect ſhe preſerved for his memory; of which we have ſpoke in the article of ARTEMISIA. Mauſolus died the laſt year of the CVIth Olympiad, as we have ſhown in the remarks upon the ſame article. He had ſome predeceſſors whoſe names we know [*E*], and ſome ſucceſſors, whoſe names are alſo handed down to us. The Phyſician who cured Mauſolus, demanded a great reward, but like a generous man [*F*].

The houſe of Mauſolus in Halicarnaſſus, was built with brick, and lined with marble. Pliny knew no building more antient than that which was adorned with this kind of incruſtation, and this made him conjecture that the art of ſawing marble, was an invention of the Carians; which yet he does not affirm. This houſe ſtill remained in the time of Pliny. See the proofs of all this in the remark [*G*].

(*e*) See Lucian Dial. Mort. Diog. & Mauſ.

[*E*] *He had ſome predeceſſors whoſe names we know.*] We read in Suidas (8), that Lygdamis, contemporary with Herodotus, was the third tyrant of Halicarnaſſus after Artemiſia. Now although Herodotus does not ſay, that Lygdamis, the father of Artemiſia, had been king of Harlicarnaſſus; yet it is very probable, that ſhe was the daughter of a king, and the widow of a king. We may therefore go back as far as her father, who at leaſt, according to the teſtimony of Herodotus (9) dwelt in Halicarnaſſus. She had a ſon called Piſindelus, whoſe ſon was another Lygdamis, who drove away Herodotus from Halicarnaſſus: But he returned thither and drove away the tyrant (10). It is very probable that Lygdamis, the ſecond of that name, was immediately ſucceeded by Hecatomnus, whoſe three ſons Mauſolus, Idrieus and Pexodarus, reigned ſucceſſively in Caria, (ſee the the article of ADA) but it is not certain that Hecatomnus was the ſon of Lygdamis. Who knows whether Lygdamis, driven away by Herodotus, recovered his poſt? Who knows whether Hecatomnus eſtabliſhed himſelf by uſurpation without being related to Lygdamis? One thing is very well known, that he was of Mylaſſa (11), and ſettled there the ſeat of his royalty; and there alſo Mauſolus was born. Vitruvius, who informs us of this, tells us moreover, that Mauſolus cauſed his houſe to be built in Halicarnaſſus, becauſe he found that city excellently well ſituated (12). Ariſtotle informs us of another particular (13). Mauſolus deſiring to raiſe money upon the city of Mylaſſa, repreſented to the inhabitants, that ſuch a city as theirs, which was his native place, and the capital of his kingdom, ſhould not be without walls, eſpecially ſince the Perſians threatened it. Every body contributed according to his ability: But when Mauſolus had got the money into his hands, he told them that it was not yet the will of GOD that the city ſhould have walls.

[*F*] *The Phyſician who cured Mauſolus, demanded a great reward, but like a generous man.*] This was Dexippus, a native of the iſle of Cos, and a diſciple of Hippocrates. He was ſent for by Hecatomnus king of Caria, to cure Mauſolus and Pexodarus, who were dangerouſly ill, and given over by the Phyſicians. He cured them, but upon this condition, that the king, their father, ſhould deſiſt from the war againſt the iſle of Cos. Ἐπὶ ὑποσχέσει ἰάσατο τοῦ παῦσαι πρὸς Κώους (*ſo it muſt be read, and not* Κάρας) τότε αὐτῷ ἐνεστῶτα πόλεμον. *Eos ea conditione ſanavit, ut bellum quod tum adverſus Coos gerebat deponeret* (14). Was not this very generous? Could there be a better ſubject? Was not this being throughly affected with love for one's country?

[*G*] *See the proofs of all this in the remark.*] They are contained in this ſhort paſſage of Pliny (15). *Secandi marmor in cruſtas neſcio an Cariæ fuerit inventum. Antiquiſſima, quod equidem inveniam, Halicarnaſſi Mauſoli domus* (16) *Proconneſio marmore exculta eſt lateritiis parietibus.* Vitruvius explains this more exactly. Halicarnaſſi, ſays he (17), 'Potentiſſimi regis Mauſoli domus cum Proconneſio 'marmore, omnia haberet ornata, parietes habet latere ſtructos, qui ad hoc tempus egregiam præſtant 'firmitatem, ita ſectoriis operibus expoliti ut vitri perluciditatem videantur habere. - - - *At Halicarnaſ-'ſus, the palace of the great king Mauſolus, is every 'where imbelliſhed with Proconneſian marble, and built 'with brick walls, which to this time continue exceed-'ing ſtrong, and are ſo admirably poliſhed by the art 'of the Stone-cutter, that they ſeem to ſhine like glaſs.*'

(8) Suidas, in Ἡρόδοτος.

(9) Herod. *lib. vii, cap. xcix.*

(10) Suidas, ib.

(11) Strab. *lib. xiv, pag.* 453.

(12) Vitruv. de Archit. *lib. ii, cap. viii.*

(13) Ariſt. Oeconom. *lib. ii.*

(14) Suidas, in Δέξιππος.

(15) Plin. *lib. xxxvi, cap. vi, pag.* 287.

(16) Quæ etiam nunc durat - - - *which remains to this day*, ſays he, book xxxv, ch. xiv, *pag.* 249.

(17) Vitruv. lib. ii, cap. viii, pag. 29.

MAUSOLEUM. Thus the magnificent monument was firſt called, which Artemiſia erected to Mauſolus her huſband, and which was reckoned one of the ſeven wonders of the world. See a deſcription of it in Pliny (*a*), and in the Supplement to Moreri [*A*]. Afterwards the ſame name was given to all coſtly monuments [*B*]. Thus the ſtately monument was called, which Auguſtus built during his ſixth conſulſhip, between the Via Flaminia and the Tiber, to be a burial-place for him and his family (*b*), Strabo has deſcribed it to us in his fifth book. It is alſo the name which Florus gives (*c*) to the monument of the kings of Egypt, wherein Cleopatra ſhut herſelf up, and put herſelf to death. The Latin Dictionaries of Lloyd and Hofman afford us ſeveral authorities, which ſhow, that the word Mauſoleum was given by the Romans to thoſe ſepulchres whoſe ſtructures were magnificent; but there are two verſes of Martial [*C*], which are not to be joined with thoſe authorities. The French language has adopted this word in the ſame ſenſe with the Romans. We call the monuments of the kings of France *Mauſolées*. This word is alſo extended to the repreſentations of a monument, which make part of a funeral pomp,

(*a*) Plin. *lib. xxxvi, cap. v.*

(*b*) Sueton. in Aug. *cap.* 101.

(*c*) *Lib. iv, cap. xi.*

[*A*] *In the Supplement to Moreri.*] The author has tranſcribed from Mr Chevreau, without confronting him with Pliny. If he had compared him with his original, he might have ſeen, *That the fronts of the Mauſoleum were not a little broader* than its extent from ſouth to north (1), but on the contrary a little leſs. 'Patet ab Auſtro, (*ſays* Pliny) & Septentrione 'ſexagenos ternos pedes, brevius à frontibus (2). - - - '*It extends, from ſouth to north ſixty-three foot, on the 'front leſs.*' Father Hardouin (3) ſays, that Dalecampius and Leo Allatius did not underſtand this chapter.

[*B*] *The ſame name is given to all coſtly monuments.*] Μέγεθος δὲ οὕτω δή τι ἐστι μέγας καὶ ἐς κατασκευὴν περίβλεπτος τὴν πᾶσαν, ὥστε καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι μεγάλως δή τι αὐτὸν θαυμάζοντες τὰ παρὰ σφίσιν ἐπιφανῆ μνήματα Μαυσωλεῖα ὀνομάζουσιν. Ea fuit operis magnitudo & ornamentorum magnificentia ut Romani valdè illud mirantes magnificentiſſima quæque apud ſe monimenta Mauſolea appellarint (4). *Such was the greatneſs of the work and magnificence of ornaments, that the Romans extremely admiring it, called all ſtately monuments among themſelves Mauſolea.*

[*C*] *Two verſes of Martial.*] It is an evident miſtake to think, that theſe words;

Aere nec vacuo pendentia Mauſolea,
Laudibus immodicis Cares in aſtra ferant (5).

Nor

(1) Chevr. Hiſt. of the World, *Tom. iv, pag.* 36, *Dutch Edit.* 1687.

(2) Pliny, *lib. xxxvi, cap. v.*

(3) Harduin. in Plin. ibid.

(4) Pauſan. *lib. viii, pag.* 250.

(5) Mart. Spect. init.

pomp, and laſt no longer than the time of the funeral. Mr Furetiere is in the right to call them *Mauſolées*; but he adds a thing very uncertain [*D*].

> *Nor let the Carians with exceſſive praiſe,*
> *Their lofty monuments to heaven raiſe.*

prove, that by Mauſoleum, the Latin authors underſtand in general a magnificent monument; for Martial ſpeaks there only of the firſt Mauſoleum.

[*D*] *Furetiere . . . adds a thing very uncertain.*] He ſays, that *the ſhrine of a ſaint was alſo called Mauſoleum.* I queſtion it; for although Mr du Cange may have informed him, that, in the lateſt Latin authors, Mauſoleum ſignifies *feretrum Sancti alicujus*, the coffin of ſome ſaint, and *Mauſoleare, to bury*, it does not follow, that Mauſoleum has been ſo uſed in French; however he ſhould have given ſome proofs of it.

MECCA, a town of Arabia, is not only famous as being the place of Mahomet's nativity, and becauſe the followers of this falſe prophet go on pilgrimage to it with great ſuperſtition, but alſo becauſe it had a temple, which in the times of old Paganiſm, was no leſs reverenced among the Arabians, than that of Delphos among the Grecians [*A*]. Thoſe who preſided over this temple, were very conſiderable at Mecca (*a*), and this ſhows the error of thoſe who ſay, that Mahomet was of mean extraction; for he was of a family which had for a long time enjoyed the government of the city and that of the temple [*B*]. People did not fail to tell ſtories concerning the miraculous protection which Heaven afforded to that ſacred place [*C*]. The inhabitants of

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

[*A*] *It had a temple, which, in the times of old Paganiſm, was no leſs reverenced among the Arabians, than that of Delphos among the Grecians.*] Dr Prideaux furniſhes me with this compariſon; his words are theſe (1). ‘ As to the temple of Mecca, and what it was before Mahomet, all that is true of it, is this. It was an heathen temple in the ſame veneration among the Arabs, that the temple of Delphos was among the Greeks, where all their † tribes for many ages came once a year to perform their idolatrous homage to their gods, till at length Mahomet having forced them to change their idolatry for another religion altogether as bad, made this temple alſo undergo the ſame change, by appointing it thenceforth to be the chief place for the performing of that falſe worſhip, which he had impoſed upon them, in the ſame manner as it was before of that which he had aboliſhed; and ſo it hath continued ever ſince.’ From the beginning of his impoſture he ordered his diſciples, ‘ to pray with their ⸸ faces towards Jeruſalem, whch he uſed to call the Holy City, and the City of the Prophets, and pretended to fix his pilgrimages there, and to make it the chief place where all his ſect were to worſhip. But now finding that his followers ſtill bore a ſuperſtitious veneration to the temple of Mecca, which had for many ages been the chief place of the idolatrous worſhip of the Arabians, and that it would be the moſt effectual means to reconcile his fellow-citizens to him, if he ſtill preſerved their temple in its former honour, he changed this order to ſerve his purpoſe, and therefore directed his ‡ diſciples to pray with their faces towards Mecca, and ordained the temple of that place, which from its ſquare form was called the Caaba, (that word ſignifying a ſquare in the Arabic tongue) to be the chief place of worſhip for all thoſe of his religion, to which they were ſtill to perform their religious pilgrimages as in former times (2).’ The author had juſt ſaid (3), ‘ It was uſual among the people of the eaſt, of whatſoever religion, to obſerve one particular point of the Heavens, towards which they turned their faces when they prayed. The Jews, in what part of the world ſoever they were *, prayed with their faces towards Jeruſalem, becauſe they there had their temple ††; the Arabians towards Mecca, becauſe there was their Caaba, the chief place of their heathen worſhip.’ The order which Mahomet gave his followers to turn towards Mecca when they prayed, was in the ſecond year of the Hegira: And ſince that time, adds Dr Prideaux (4), ‘ have we all thoſe fabulous ſtories invented, by this impoſtor, in order to exalt the temple of Mecca, and render it more famous. As that it was ⸸⸸ firſt built in Heaven to be the place where the Angels were to worſhip, and that Adam worſhipped at it while in Paradiſe; but being caſt down from thence, (for they place Paradiſe in Heaven) he prayed God, that he might have ſuch a temple on Earth, towards which he might pray, and go round it to worſhip him in the ſame manner as the Angels went round that which he had ſeen in Heaven: That thereupon God ſent down the reſemblance of this temple in curtains of light, and pitched it at Mecca, in the place where the Caaba now ſtands, which is, ſay they, exactly under the original, that is in Heaven: That there, after the death of Adam, Seth built it with ſtones and clay, and that the people of God there worſhipped till the Flood, by which it being deſtroyed ‡‡, God commanded Abraham again to rebuild it, having ſhown him the form of the fabric in a viſion, and directed him to the place by his viſible Shechinah reſiding on it: That accordingly Abraham and Iſmael rebuilt it in the place where it now ſtands: And that Iſmael ever after, living at Mecca, there worſhipped God with the true worſhip; but his poſterity having afterwards corrupted it with idolatry, and alſo prophaned this holy temple, he was now to purge it from idols, and conſecrate it a-new to the true worſhip of God, for which it was originally deſigned. Thus, he not only retained the temple of Mecca, but alſo the pilgrimages were continued thither, as well as the other ceremonies that had been in uſe, in the times of idolatry. For, as all theſe things had been held for a long time in great veneration by the Arabians, there was no great difficulty in perſuading them to embrace them, after he had once introduced them into his new religion.’ Add to theſe laſt words what ſhall be ſaid hereafter in the remark [*F*].

[*B*] *Mahomet was of a family which had for a long time enjoyed the government of the city and that of the temple.*] Some reckon back as far as one Coſa, as Dr Prideaux informs us (5). ‘ This Coſa ** was very famous among the Koraſhites, for eſtabliſhing in his family the keeping of the keys of the Caaba, and at the ſame time the preſidency of that temple, which is the ſame to which the Mahometans now make their pilgrimage at Mecca, and was then as much celebrated for the heathen worſhip among the Arabs, as it hath ſince been for the Mahometan; and therefore the preſidency of it was a matter of great moment, as being a ſtation, which rendered him that was in it honourable through all Arabia. It was before in the poſſeſſion of Abu-Gabſhan,’ who was ſo ſimple as to part with it for a bottle of wine, in an unhappy moment when he was in an humour to drink. He had afterwards a mind to get off from ſuch a prejudicial bargain, and was ſupported by the people of his own tribe; but both he and they were driven out of Mecca by Coſa (6). ‘ And from that time the whole poſſeſſion of Mecca remained to the Koraſhites: and Coſa and his poſterity in a right line down to Mahomet, had the preſidency of the temple, and the chief government of the town ever after (7). Coſa was great grandfather of Mahomet's grandfather.’

[*C*] *Stories were told concerning the miraculous protection, which Heaven afforded to that ſacred place.*] *About ſeventy years before the time of Mahomet, there*

(1) Prideaux, Life of Mahomet, *pag. m.* 96.

† Shareſtani Golii notæ ad Alfraganum, *pag.* 8, 9. Makriſi Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 177, 311.

⸸ Abul Feda Abul Faraghius, *pag.* 102, Johannes Andreas, *cap. vi*, Pococ. Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 175.

‡ Alc. *cap. ii*, Johannes Andreas, *cap. ii, vi.*

(2) Prideaux, ib. *pag.* 92, 93.

(3) Ib. *pag.* 92.

* Dan. *cap. vi, ver.* 10. Buxtorfii Synagoga Judaica, *cap. x.* Maimonides in Halachoth Tephillah, *cap. i, ſect. iii.*

†† Abul Faraghius, *pag.* 102.

(4) Prideaux, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 94, 95. See the remark [*F*] of the article ABRAHAM.

⸸⸸ Shareſtani Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 115. Sionita Appendix ad Geographiam Nubienſem, *cap. vii*

‡‡ Alc. *cap. ii, iii, & xxii.* Al Jannabi in vita Abrahami Shareſtani, Zamach Sharidum ad *cap. ii.* Alcorani Sharifol Edriſi Liber Agar Johannes Andreas, *cap. i.*

(5) Prideaux, ib. *pag.* 2.

** *Abul Feda. Pocock. Spec. Hiſt. Arab. pag.* 42, 50, 342. *Ecchelenſis Hiſt. Arab. pag. i, cap. iii. Fortalitium Fidei, lib. iv, Conſid.* 1.

(6) Prideaux, ib. *pag.* 3.

(7) Ibid. *pag.* 4.

of Mecca lived in very groſs ignorance [*D*], and yet they rejected the viſions and doctrines which Mahomet taught them as ridiculous (*b*). He was an inſtance of the truth of this maxim, *no prophet in his own country.* He could never make his own countrymen reliſh his pretended revelations; and both becauſe they thought them impertinent, and becauſe they ſuſpected he had a mind to deſtroy the old religion, and to aſpire to tyranny under the auſpicious title of a new prophet (*c*), they oppoſed his deſigns ſo vigorouſly, that he was forced to betake himſelf to flight (*d*); and it was only by way of military conqueſt, that he eſtabliſhed in that place his new law (*e*). There was a ſharp war between him and thoſe of Mecca for ſix years after he fled. This was followed by a truce, which was to laſt ten years; but it continued only two (*f*), for in the eighth year of the Hegira (*g*), this impoſtor accompanied with ten thouſand men, marched againſt Mecca, under pretence that it had broken the truce, and very eaſily ſubdued it. He baniſhed from thence all idolatry [*E*], and in a little while after he went upon other expeditions. He made a pilgrimage to Mecca in the tenth year of the Hegira, he entered it *on the great day of that ſolemnity. The people ran in crouds from all places of Arabia to ſee their new maſter: He instructed them in his Law, after which he returned to Medina,* and died there the next year. He had the policy, during the truce he concluded with the inhabitants of Mecca, to command his followers, to go in pilgrimage to Mecca. This was

(*b*) Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, *pag.* 22, 65.

(*c*) Ib. *pag.* 24

(*d*) Ib. *pag.* 73, 74.

(*e*) See the remark [*E*].

(*f*) Prideaux, ib. *pag.* 112.

(*g*) It is the ſame thing with the flight of Mahomet. This eighth year of the Hegira anſwers to the year 629.

there reigned over the Homerites, an ancient nation of the Arabs, lying to the South of Mecca, a certain king called † Du Nawas, who having embraced the Jewiſh religion, perſecuted, that of the Chriſtians, which had been planted there upwards of three hundred years before, and did the utmoſt he was able to extirpate it out of his Dominions (8). . . . . *This perſecution forced many of the Homerite Chriſtians to fly into Ethiopia for ſafety; where making their complaints to the king who was a Chriſtian, of the cruel perſecution of Du Nawas againſt them, prevailed with him to ſend Aryat his uncle ⸸, with an army of ſeventy thouſand men for their relief; who having overthrown Du Nawas in battle, purſued him ſo cloſe that he forced him into the ſea, where he periſhed. Whereupon the* kingdom of the Homerites *fell into the hands of the Æthiopians, and Aryat governed it twenty years. After him ſucceeded Abraham Al Aſhram, who having built a famous ‡ church at Sanaa, the chief city of the Homerites, abundance of Arabians reſorted thither to the Chriſtian worſhip, ſo that the* temple of Mecca *began to be neglected, and the Heathen Worſhip there, hitherto performed by ſo great a concourſe of people, from all parts of Arabia, fell to ruin: at which the inhabitants of Mecca were exceedingly diſturbed. For their chief ſupport depended on the great reſort of pilgrims, who went thither every year, according to cuſtom, to worſhip their Heathen deities, and to perform certain ceremonies, the ſolemnity of which drew thither a multitude of people from all parts of Arabia. And therefore to expreſs their indignation againſt* this church, *which ſo much threatned their common intereſt with total ruin, ſome of them went to Sanaa, and getting privately into the church, had the impudence to defile it with their excrements. At which Abraham was ſo incenſed, to revenge the affront, he vowed the deſtruction of the temple of Mecca: and accordingly, to effect it, marched thither with a great army and beſieged the town. But not being able to compaſs his end, (probably for want of proviſions ſo neceſſary for his numerous forces in ſo deſart and barren a country) he was forced to march back again with loſs; and becauſe he had ſeveral elephants in his Army, this was called,* the War of the Elephant; *and the* Æra *by which they uſed to reckon after that time,* the Æra of the Elephant. *To this war the* Alcoran *alludes in the* 105*th* chapter, *called the* Chapter of the Elephant, *where* Mahomet *tells us, How* the lord treated them that came mounted upon elephants to ruin the temple of Mecca, and that he defeated their treacherous deſign, and ſent againſt them great armies of birds, which threw down ſtones upon their heads, and made them like corn in the field, which is deſtroyed and trodden under foot by the beaſts. *Where * the* Commentators *of the* Alcoran *tell us, that to preſerve the temple of Mecca from the deſtruction that threatned it,* GOD *ſent againſt the Æthiopians great armies of birds, each of which carried three ſtones, one in the bill, and one in each foot, which they threw down upon the heads of the enemies; and that thoſe ſtones, altho' not much bigger than peaſe, where yet of that weight, that falling upon the helmet, they pierced that and the man through; and that on each of them was written the name of him that was to be ſlain by it; and that the army of the Ethiopians being thus deſtroyed, the* Temple of Mecca *was ſaved* (9).

† Abul Feda Al Maſudi. Ecchelenſis Hiſt. Arab. *Part i, cap. x.* Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 62.

(8) Prideaux, ib. *pag.* 79.

⸸ Al Jannabi Ahmed Ebn Yuſef. Ecchelenſis Hiſt. Arab. *Part ii, cap. i.* Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 63.

‡ Abul Feda, Al Jannabi Ahmed Ebn Yuſef. Zamachſhari Bidawi, & Jalalani in Commentar. ad *cap. cv.* Alcorani. Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 64. Golii notæ ad Alfraganum, *pag.* 54.

* Zamachſhari Bidawi, Jalalani, &c.

(9) Prideaux, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 80.

[*D*] *The inhabitants of Mecca lived in very groſs ignorance.*] Mahomet was ‘ an illiterate Barbarian ††, that could neither write nor read. But this was not ſo much a fault in him, as in the Tribe to which he belonged, with whom it was the cuſtom as to all manner of literature, to continue ⸸⸸ in the ſame ignorance in which they were born, even to their lives end. And therefore at the time when Mahomet firſt ſet up for a Prophet, there was not one man of Mecca that could either write or read, excepting only ‡‡ Waraka, a kinſman of Cadigha, who having firſt turned Jew, and afterwards Chriſtian, had learned to write Arabic in Hebrew letters. And for this reaſon, the inhabitants of Mecca were called ** the Illiterate, in oppoſition to the people of Medina, who being the one half Chriſtians, and the other half Jews, were able both to write and read; and therefore were called † the *People of the Book.* It was of them that ſeveral of Mahomet's followers, after he came to Medina, learned to read and write alſo, which ſome of them had begun to learn before of Baſhar the Cendian ⸸, who having lived at Anbar, a city of Erack, near the Euphrates, there learned that art; from whence coming to Mecca, and marrying the ſiſter of Abuſophian, he ſettled there, and from him the men of Mecca are firſt ſaid to have received letters. Among the followers of Mahomet, Othman was the greateſt proficient herein, which advanced him afterwards to ‡ be ſecretary to this Impoſtor. But for want of paper at firſt, being in a place where there was never before any occaſion for it, they were forced to make uſe * of the ſhoulderbones of mutton, and camels, to write on; which was a device antiently made uſe of by other tribes of the Arabs, who had letters, but wanted traffic to accommodate them with more convenient materials for this purpoſe; and therefore their books, in which their Poems, and other matters they delighted in, were written ††, were only ſo many of thoſe bones of ſheep and camels tied together with a ſtring (10).'

[*E*] *He very eaſily ſubdued Mecca. He baniſhed from thence all idolatry*] He marched ſo expeditiouſly to this city with his army, that he was at the gates of it *before the inhabitants were aware of his deſign* ⸸⸸; *therefore he ſurpriſed them before they had time to prepare for their defence; and ſo they were forced to ſubmit themſelves to him* . . . . *The city ſurrendered at diſcretion without making the leaſt ſhew of defence. On his entry into it having put to death ſuch as had been moſt violent againſt him, all the reſt, ſubmitted to him, and embraced his religion. He was no ſooner abſolute maſter of the place, but he ſet himſelf to purge the Caaba of it's idols, and conſecrate that Temple a-new, as if he had reſolved to preſerve it's antient ſplendor, by making it the Moſque, the moſt ſacred of all, and the chief place for the religious ſervice of his followers. There* ‡‡ *was a multitude of idols within the temple, and as many without, that ſurrounded it, all which Mahomet pulled down and deſtroyed, without exception. The chief among thoſe idols were thoſe of Abraham and Iſmael within the Temple, and that of Hoball without. The reſt were of Angels and Prophets, and others of their principal ſaints departed, whom they worſhipped only as mediators,*

†† Alcoran. *cap. vii.* Johannes Andreas, *cap. ii.* Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. 156. Diſputatio Chriſtiani, *cap. xii.* Richardi Confutatio, *cap. iii.*

⸸⸸ Ebn'ol-Athir Shareſtani. Al Motawazi in libro Mogreb. Pocock. Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 157.

‡‡ Al Bochari Pocock. ibid.

** Shareſtani Pocock. Spec. Arab. Hiſt. *pag.* 156.

† Shareſtani, & Pocock. ibid. Hottinger. Hiſt. Orient. *lib. i, cap. i.*

⸸ Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 157.

‡ Elmacin. *lib. i, cap. i.* Bartholomæus Edeſſenus.

* Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 157.

†† Ebnol Athir. Pocock. ibid.

(10) Prideaux, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 36, *& ſeq.*

⸸⸸ Abul Farag. *pag.* 103. Elmacin. *lib. i, cap. i.*

‡‡ Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 95, 96, 97, 98.

was a ſolemnity which the Arabians for many ages had held in great veneration [*F*]. He believed therefore, that by preſerving it, he ſhould diſpoſe them the ſooner to ſubmit to the new yoak he had a mind to impoſe upon them. And doubtleſs this had a good effect for his purpoſe upon the inhabitants of Mecca, ſince they reaped a very great advantage from this religious cuſtom, and an advantage which they ſtood much in need of, for they have the moſt barren and fruitleſs ſoil in the world. I have ſhown above (*i*), the lamentable ſtate to which their city was reduced in the IVth century of the Hegira. It had ſuffered in the firſt century of the ſame Æra (*k*), all that the fury of war uſually produces. Some authors ſay (*l*), that Solyman erected there an univerſity about the year 949 of the Hegira, and that the college which he built there, and the revenue wherewith he endowed it, were worthy of his magnificence. Authors do not agree as to the ſituation of Mecca. Moreri's Dictionary places it a day's journey from the Red-Sea. Mr Baudrand makes it forty Arabic miles diſtant from it; and Mr d'Herbelot three days journey. Some (*m*) place it almoſt under the line, and others in twenty one degrees, and forty minutes of north latitude (*n*). The uſe of arms is prohibited within its territory, which is ſix miles to the eaſt, twelve to the north, eighteen to the weſt, and twenty four to the ſouth: but robbers laugh at this prohibition, and plunder wherever they can, which obliges travellers and pilgrims frequently to carry arms in thoſe parts, to ſecure themſelves from the inſults of thoſe highway-men (*o*). An author whom

(*i*) In the article ABUDHAHER.

(*k*) *See* Bibliotheque Orientale, *of Mr d'Herbelot, pag.* 569.

(*l*) Gabr. Sionita & Joan. Heſronita, de nonnullis Oriental. Urbibus, *pag.* 19.

(*m*) Id. ib. *pag.* 17.

(*n*) *See* d'Herbelot. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 569.

(*o*) Gabr. Sionita & Jo. Heſron. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 20.

---

*tors, in the ſame manner as the Romaniſts now do their ſaints, and the images which they erect unto them. For the Arabians always held***, *that there was but only one* God, the Creator and Governor of all things, *whom they called Allah Taal, that is the ſupreme GOD, and GOD of Gods, and Lords of Lords, whom they durſt never repreſent by any image. But this GOD being (as they held) ſo great and ſo exalted, as not to be approached to by men while here on Earth, but through the mediation of advocates interceeding for them in Heaven; that Angels and Holy Men beatified might perform this office for them, they ſet up their images, and built them temples, and directed their worſhip and devotions to them. And in this conſiſted the whole of the Arabian idolatry, which Mahomet put an end to by deſtroying theſe idols* (11).

[*F*] *He ordered the pilgrimage to Mecca. This was a ſolemnity which the Arabians held in great veneration. for many ages.*] ‘This was a rite of the Heathen Arabs, who for many ages before uſed to go once a year to the temple of Mecca, there to worſhip their Heathen Deities. The time of this pilgrimage † was in the month of Dulhagha; and on the tenth day of that month was their great feſtival, in which the chiefeſt ſolemnities of their pilgrimage were performed . . . . . And that every body might come with full liberty and ſafety to this feſtival from all parts of Arabia, and alſo return in the ſame manner, not only this month, but alſo the preceding and following were held ſacred among them, in which it was not lawful to uſe any act of hoſtility againſt any man whatſoever, as I have before ſhewn (12). And therefore this ſolemn pilgrimage to Mecca having been a religious uſage, which all the tribes of the Arabs had been long accuſtomed to, and was had in great veneration among them, Mahomet thought not fit to exaſperate them with any innovation in this matter, but adopting it into his religion retained it juſt in the ſame manner as he found it practiſed among them, with all the ridiculous rites that accompanied it, and ſo it is obſerved even unto this day by all of that religion, as one of the fundamental duties of it. For this crafty impoſtor taught them concerning it (as he did of all the other *Heathen rites of the Arabs*, which he found neceſſary to retain) that it was a command from God to Abraham and Iſmael, annually to obſerve this pilgrimage to Mecca; and it was commanded them on their rebuilding the Caaba; now, ſays he, in the beginning, this pilgrimage was performed only to honour God, all the Arabians repairing to Mecca once a year to worſhip God together, juſt as the Jews did afterwards three times a year, going up to Jeruſalem by his order at the time of their three ſolemn feaſts. But in proceſs of time the Arabians having perverted this cuſtom, and changed it into idolatry, Mahomet made them believe he had an order from God to re-eſtabliſh it in it's former purity. By enjoining this pilgrimage, this falſe prophet laboured to preſerve to the town which gave him birth the advantages it had enjoyed a long time before. And in thus providing for the intereſt of that people in the very religion which he was a framing, he thought he might the eaſier prevail to draw them over to it. And in this he was not miſtaken. For had he aboliſhed this pilgrimage, it being the greateſt honour and benefit which that place enjoyed, and by which indeed the inhabitants did moſtly ſubſiſt; their intereſt would have engaged them to that vigorous oppoſition againſt him, that in all likelihood he would never have become maſter of that town, and conſequently have miſcarried in the whole deſign (13).’

This reflexion is very judicious; there is nothing that ſets men more againſt innovations in matters of religion, than when they ſee that the change of worſhip would put a ſtop to their trade, and be *lucrum ceſſans, & damnum emergens*, gain ſinking, and loſs riſing. I know very well, that ſuperſtition alone, is ſufficient to make a city obſtinate in retaining the worſhip of it's idols: the hope of their protection is ſometimes the only advantage that is reaped from them. The worſhip of idols is not always attended with public profit; the artificers and merchants do not always get by it, and it does not always occaſion a great concourſe of ſtrangers and devout travellers, who leave a great deal of money behind them. Without this kind of aſſiſtance, the zeal of a people for their antient Gods may inſpire them ſtrongly to oppoſe the extirpation of idolatry; but it is quite another thing, when the publick worſhip is a ſource of gain to private perſons. What was the cauſe, pray, of that popular commotion, which made that out-cry (when St Paul was preaching) *Great is Diana of the Epheſians?* Was it not from the remonſtrance of one *Demetrius, a Silver-Smith, who made ſilver-ſhrines for Diana, which brought no ſmall gain to the Crafts-men* (14)? He aſſembled them and told them, *Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth*; and gave them to underſtand, that not only their profit, but likewiſe the advantage of the whole city of Epheſus, was concerned not to ſuffer one Paul, *who perſuaded and turned away many people, ſaying they be no Gods which are made with hands.* From hence we may conclude, that the inhabitants of Epheſus would have been more tractable, with reſpect to the Goſpel, if their great Diana could have been taken away, without doing any prejudice to their gain, or to the veneration which all the world had for their temple. They would in ſuch a caſe have been infinitely more docile as to the lectures of St Paul againſt idols. We muſt confeſs therefore, that Mahomet found out a notable device to gain the inhabitants of Mecca. He preſerved the concourſe of pilgrims, which was ſo profitable and glorious to them; he left their temple its ancient privileges; he took care to indemnify them: this was an excellent remedy againſt the vexation which the ruin of their ancient idolatry might cauſe them.

Note, That Dr Prideaux in the place where he obſerves, that the Arabians had no leave to do any act of hoſtility, during the month of their great feſtival, nor in the Month *preceding, or next following*, adds this, *as I have before ſhown* (15). I believe he means that he has ſpoken of this, when, in the pages 83 and 84, he mentions the war, ‘in which Mahomet firſt bore arms, being then twenty years old ⸸. It was called

** Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 107, 108.

(11) Prideaux, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 122, *& ſeq.*

† Shareſtani. Makrizi. Golii notæ ad Alfraganum, *pag.* 8, 9. Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 177.

(12) See the laſt paragraph of this remark.

(13) Prideaux, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 113, *& ſeq.*

(14) Acts of the Apoſtles, *chap.* xix, *ver.* 24.

(15) See, above, citation (12).

⸸ Al Kodaï, Al Kamus, &c. Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 174, in margine.

whom I have already named affirms, that Mecca is ſituated near the river Betius, which is now called Chaibar (*p*). Yet a few Lines after he ſays, that all the water of that town was in the well of Zemzem [*G*], and in the ciſterns where the rain was kept; but that in the laſt century it was conveyed from mount Arafat by means of an aqueduct, which coſt a great deal of money (*q*). See the remark [*G*]. I ſhall ſay ſomething of the prince to whom Mecca belongs [*H*].

(*p*) Baudrand, *pag.* 696.

(*q*) Id. ib. *He cites* Gollius, (*it ſhould be* Golius) Not. in Alfraganum.

‘ called the *Impious War*, becauſe it proceeded to that heat and fury, that they carried it on even in thoſe months when it was reckoned impious among them to wage war. For it was ‡ an ancient cuſtom through all Arabia, to hold four months of the year ſacred, in which all war was to ceaſe: and theſe were the months of Moharam, Rajeb, Dulkaada, and Dulhagha; which are the firſt, the ſeventh, the eleventh and the twelfth of the year. And theſe months were ſo religiouſly obſerved by all the tribes, that how great ſoever the enmity of one tribe might be to another, a thing common enough amongſt them, the ſacred month was no ſooner begun, but taking off the heads of their ſpears, and laying down their arms, they forbore all manner of hoſtilities, and even carried on trade together, mingling with each other, as if there had been a ſolid peace, and perfect friendſhip between them: ſo that if a man, during thoſe months, had met the murderer of his father or brother, he durſt not aſſault him, how violent ſoever his reſentment or thirſt of revenge might be.’ This paſſage and the other do not agree together; one mentions four months, which do not immediately ſucceed one another; the other mentions three months that follow one another.

‡ Al Jauhari, Al Shareſtani, Al Kamus, Cizwini. Golius in notis ad Alfraganum, *pag.* 4, 5, 9. Pocockii Spec. Hiſt. Arab. *pag.* 174, 176.

[*G*] *The well of Zemzem.*] Others call it Zamzam, or Zanzam as I have ſhewn above (16). This well is one of the moſt ſacred rarities of Mecca. It is ſaid to be a ſpring of water, which was produced under the feet of Iſhmael, when he was dying with thirſt. The pilgrims are obliged to make uſe of this water to waſh their body and head three times: they muſt alſo drink of it, and, if they can, muſt carry ſome of it away with them. ‘ Poſtquam ſacellum illud, atque lapidem prædictum inviſerunt, ſe ad aliud intra templum ſatis amplum ſacellum conferunt, ubi puteus eſt dictus Zam Zam; & eſt inquit *Jacub Ben Sidi Aali*, fons ſeu ſcatebra quæ fluxit ſub pedibus Iſmaël dum gemeret ſitibundus, quam Hagar primo videns filio ait linguâ Copticâ Zam, Zam, hoc eſt, ſiſte, ſiſte gradum. Ex hoc puteo multi ſunt qui aquam exhauriunt, atque dant peregrinis quibus præceptum eſt corpus & caput eadem aqua ter ſe lavare, atque ex eadem bibere, ſecumque ſi poſſint deferre (17) - - - - *After they have viſited that chapel, and the ſtone* (18) *before mentioned, they go to another pretty large chapel within the temple, where there is a well called Zam Zam, and is, ſays Jacub Ben Sidi Aali, a fountain, or ſpring, which guſhed out under the feet of Iſmael, when he was ready to dye with thirſt, which Hagar preſently ſeeing ſaid to her ſon in the Coptic tongue, Zam, Zam, that is, ſtay, ſtay. Many draw water out of this well, and give it to pilgrims, who are commanded to waſh their head and body with it three times, and to drink of it, and, if they are able, to carry ſome of it away with them.* Mahomet, to render the town of Mecca, the place where he was born, more conſiderable, to raiſe the devotion of the poeple, and draw thither a greater multitude of pilgrims, beſtowed great encomiums upon the water of this well. For there is a tradition of him received by the Kalif Omar, which ſays, that the water of the well of Zemzem ſerves for a cure, and gives health to thoſe that drink of it; but that thoſe who drink plentifully of it, and quench their thirſt with it, obtain the pardon of all their ſins. And it is reported of Abdallah, ſirnamed Al Hafedh, becauſe he knew by heart a great many traditions, that being aſked about his memory, he anſwered that ever ſince he had drank great draughts of the water of Zemzem, to ſtrengthen it, he had forgot nothing that he had learned (19).’ Mr de Herbelot, from whom I have theſe words, has collected many particulars concerning this well. Conſult his *Bibliotheque Orientale* at the word Zemzem. I ſhall take from it only this: ‘ The town of Mecca continued a long time without any other water, than that of the well of Zemzem, till the great concourſe of caravans obliged the Kalifs to build an aqueduct, which affords now a ſufficient quantity of it (20).’ This ſuppoſes that the aqueduct is more ancient than Mr Baudrand affirms upon the credit of Golius (21).

(16) In the text of the article ABUDHAHER, and remark [*K*] of the article AGAR.

(17) Gabr. Sionita & Jo. Heſronita de nonnullis Oriental. Urbibus, *pag.* 19.

(18) That is, the ſtone ſpoken of before, remark [*K*] of the article AGAR.

(19) D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. *pag.* 928, *col.* 2.

(20) Id. ib.

(21) See the text of the article towards the end, citation (*q*).

[*H*] *We ſhall ſay ſomething of the prince to whom Mecca belongs.*] He is deſcended from Haſcem, great grandfather of Mahomet, and ſtiles himſelf the head of the Haſcemeans. He alſo gives himſelf the title of Scerif or Emir. He formerly held of the Soudans of Egypt, and afterwards of the Turkiſh ſultans, but he always preſerved his own dominion and power. *Et quanquam olim Ægypti ſultanorum, ac modo Othomannorum pareat imperio* (22), *nunquam tamen ſuo dominio auctoritateque fuit ſpoliatus* (23). The Grand Signior is ſo far from aſſuming the title of the ſovereign of Mecca and Medina, that he calls himſelf their humble ſervant. The Emir or Scerif of Mecca is commonly poor; although he has large incomes, and receives many preſents from princes and pilgrims; but he has always ſome quarrels with his brothers who aſpire to dominion, and with the Arabian Beduins. He receives from the Grand Signior a third part of the revenues of Egypt, on condition that he ſhall protect the pilgrims of Mecca, and ſecure them from the inſults and robberies of the Arabians (24). This I have taken from the Appendix to the *Geographia Nubienſis*. Mr d'Herbelot affirms, ‘ That the moſt antient original of the Emirs or Scerifs of Mecca, as they are now called, is that which is related by Ben Schouhnah, under the reign of the Aioubites, or princes of the poſterity of Saladin, who reigned in Jemen in Arabia. For he writes, that at that time, there was a prince at Mecca, and another at Medina, who had the title of Emir, and that in the year 633 of the Hegira, one Cotadah, the ſon of Edris, of the race of Ali, of the branch of Hoſſain, was Emir of Mecca (25).’ I remember, that during the laſt war (26), the news-writers of the allies, publiſhed from time to time, that the affairs of the Turks went very ill in Aſia, and that Mecca had been taken from them (27). The news-writers of Paris were vexed at it, and gave to underſtand in the firſt place, that this was not true, and in the ſecond, that the conſequence drawn from it was not good, ſince Mecca does not belong to the Turk, and the Porte receives no revenue from thence, but rather ſends thither preſents and penſions.

(22) That is, as appears by the whole ſequel of the diſcourſe, *that he is under the protection of the great Turk.*

(23) Appendix Geogr. Nubienſis, ubi infra.

(24) Gabr. Sionita & Jo. Heſronita, ubi ſupra, ſive in Appendice Geograph. Nubienſis, *pag.* 21.

(25) D'Herbelot, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 569, *col.* 2.

(26) I write this in Octob. 1700.

(27) Compare this with the above citat. (13), of the article MAHOMET, II.

MEY (JONH DE) a doctor of Phyſic, profeſſor of Divinity, and miniſter at Middelburg in the XVIIth century, wrote ſeveral books in Dutch (*a*). He wrote alſo a Latin book intituled *Sacra Phyſiologia* (*b*), wherein he explains the paſſages of Scripture which concern Natural Philoſophy. There are ſome who have ſpoken of that treatiſe with a great deal of contempt [*A*]. This author died the eighth of April 1678, being fifty nine years

(*a*) They are all collected in one volume in folio, printed at Middelburg in 1681.

(*b*) Printed at Middelburg in 1661, and not at Venice in 1602, as Konig ſays.

[*A*] *There are ſome who have ſpoken of that treatiſe with a great deal of contempt.*] Valentine Henry Voglerus accuſes him of collecting without judgment the opinions of other authors, and of ſuffering himſelf to be too much drawn away by novelty. Another accuſes him of being a plagiary. Here follows the proof: ‘ Induſtriam ſuam non approbavit Valentino Henrico Voglero, qui in ſuo commentario poſthumo de eodem argumento cenſet *Maium non tam ſuam ſcientiam declaraſſe, quam alienas ſententias exſcripſiſſe, idque nullo fere delectu novitate præcipue opinionum pellectum.* Quod judicium inclementius aliquanto videri poterat, cum in ejuſmodi ſcriptoribus aliter fieri vix oportebat, quibus non tam induſtriæ gloria quam legentis utiliyears of age, as Witte obſerves in the 116th page of the ſecond part of his *Diarium Biographicum.*

'tas ſpectatur, niſi id reprehenſione dignum eſt quod 'Maius ex eo hominum genere eſſe videtur, qui ſup'primendis autorum nominibus unde ſua exſcripſerunt, 'neſcio quam ingenii laudem affectant (1). - - - - *His 'induſtry has not been approved by Valentine Henry Vog'lerus, who, in his poſthumous commentary upon the ſame 'ſubject, thinks,* that Mey had not ſo much ſhown his 'own learning as copied the ſentiments of others, and 'that almoſt without diſtinction, being chiefly led 'away by the novelty of opinions. *Which judgment 'might ſeem a little too ſevere, ſince writers of that kind 'ought ſcarcely to do otherwiſe, who conſider the benefit 'of the reader more than the glory of induſtry, unleſs 'that Mey deſerves cenſure, becauſe he ſeems to be one 'of thoſe, who, ſuppreſſing the names of authors from 'whence they have tranſcribed their own materials, af'fect, I cannot tell how, to be thought men of parts.*'

(1) Godofredus Vockerodt, in Præfat. Diſputationes de Fœtura artificioſa Jacobi. *This book was printed at Iena in* 1689, *in* 4*to.*

MEYNIER (HONORATUS DE) the author of a book intituled, *Les demandes curieuſes & les reſponſes libres*, (*curious Queſtions and free Anſwers*), which he publiſhed at Paris in 1635. He had born arms thirty ſix years (*a*). This book runs upon political and military ſubjects, and contains ſome conſiderations and examples which are not extraordinary, but do not want good ſenſe. I have cited it ſometimes (*b*).

(*a*) See his advertiſement to the French nobility.

(*b*) Above, citation (26) of the article FRANCIS I, and citation (34) of the article LEWIS XI.

MELAMPUS, a great ſoothſayer among the antient Pagans, was the ſon of Amythaon and Aglaia [*A*]. He had a brother called Bias, for whom he expreſſed a great affection upon two occaſions; firſt in procuring him a wife, and in the ſecond place in procuring him a crown. Neleus, who reigned at Pylos in Peloponneſus, required of thoſe who would marry his daughter, that they ſhould bring to him the fine oxen of Iphiclus, which were fed in Theſſaly. Melampus, to enable his brother to make this preſent to Neleus, undertook to carry off thoſe oxen (*a*). In this deſign he did not ſucceed, for thoſe who kept them made him priſoner; but becauſe he propheſied in priſon, concerning ſuch things as Iphiclus deſired an explication of, he obtained, as a reward the oxen (*b*). Thus he was the cauſe of the marriage of his brother [*B*], and procured

(*a*) Pauſanias, *lib. iv*, ſub fin.

(*b*) Id. ib.

[*A*] *He was the ſon of Amythaon and Aglaia.*] See, in the remark [*A*] of the article AMPHIARAUS, the genealogy of Amythaon. It would be needleſs to repeat it here. I ſhall only ſay, that Melampus's mother called Aglaia by Diodorus Siculus (1) is called Eidomene in Apollodorus (2), who adds, that ſhe was the daughter of Pheres the ſon of Cretheus (3).

[*B*] *Thus he was the cauſe of the marriage of his brother.*] The narrative of Pauſanias, which I have followed, does not agree with that of Apollodorus, which I ſhall now abridge. Bias deſired in marriage Pero, the daughter of Neleus, who was at that time courted by ſeveral others. Neleus told them, that he would not marry her to any, but to him that ſhould bring him the oxen of Phylachus, that were kept by a dog which no man or beaſt durſt approach. Bias implored the aſſiſtance of Melampus, who promiſed to bring him thoſe oxen, after he had continued a year in priſon. Accordingly he was ſeized as he endeavoured to commit this robbery; he was loaded with chains and made a cloſe priſoner. He had already been near a year in this captivity, when he heard the noiſe of worms eating the beam of the roof of the houſe. He aſked them how much was eaten of it; they anſwered, there remained but a very little. Thereupon he deſired to be carried to another place, which was done, and in a little while after the houſe fell. Phylachus admired this, and knowing that Melampus was a very good diviner, he ſet him at liberty, and aſked him how his ſon Iphiclus might have children: The prophet promiſed him every thing that depended on his knowledge, provided he would grant him the oxen. He uſed ſome ceremonies to call forth the birds; a vulture preſented itſelf, which informed him, that when Phylachus gelded ſome rams, he had left near Iphiclus the bloody knife; and that Iphiclus being ſeized with fear, fled away, and fixed the knife in a tree; and that he muſt take it away from thence, and ſcrape off the ruſt of it, and make Iphiclus drink it ten days ſucceſſively in wine. Melampus did as the vulture told him; Iphiclus became the father of Podarces, and the diviner brought to Pylos the oxen which were to be given to Neleus, after which he cauſed the marriage to be celebrated between Bias and Pero, and ſtayed at Meſſina (4).

Let us obſerve two things from Pauſanias; one is, that in thoſe ages, the greateſt care of rich people, was to have a great number of oxen and horſes (5). That this was the chief deſire of that time, he proves, 1. By the conditions which Neleus ſtipulated with the admirers of his daughter. 2. By the order which Euryſtheus gave to Hercules to bring him oxen from Spain. 3. By the conditions of the combat between Eryx and Hercules. The firſt, if he was overcome was to loſe his kingdom, and if he did overcome he was to gain the oxen which Hercules had carried away from Erythia. 4. By the preſent of a hundred oxen, which Iphidamas, the ſon of Antenor, made to his father-in-law when he married. The ſecond obſervation from Pauſanias is this, that thoſe who married their daughters, demanded a wedding preſent from their ſons-in-law (6). This puts me in mind of Saul, who obliged David to bring him an hundred foreſkins of the Philiſtines (7). But I muſt add, that Pauſanias has omitted ſomething, which hinders us from judging exactly in this affair. By this narrative it would ſeem, that it was the ſole ambition of having fine oxen, a ſign of vain-glorious wealth at that time, that moved Neleus to require of the lovers of Pero, that they ſhould bring him the oxen of Iphiclus. But the truth is, it was another thing which prompted him to act after this manner. Part of the eſtate of Tyro, his mother, had been uſurped by Iphiclus (8); he had a mind to have the loſs repaired, and to be revenged upon the uſurper. And therefore he deſired, that he who would marry his daughter ſhould do this exploit. There is ſcarce any omiſſion, but makes hiſtory deceitful: and this fault is very common in moſt of the relations of antient Mythology. The only way to make them good, is to join together the ſeveral pieces which are diſperſed in divers authors: which Muretus hath done as to this expedition of Melampus, and by that means has given us a full account of it. I ſhall extract from him thoſe circumſtances which Pauſanias and Appollodorus have omitted.

Melampus was ſerved in priſon by a very good man, married to a very bad wife: from the former he received a thouſand civilities, and from the latter abundance of bad uſage. The worms which corroded the beam, having diſcovered that the houſe would quickly fall, he pretended to be ſick, and deſired to be tranſported elſewhere with his bed. The huſband went before, the wife followed after; and as ſoon as the bed was almoſt out of doors, the houſe fell down and cruſhed the wife to pieces. The huſband having learned of Melampus the whole ſecret of this affair, acquainted Phylachus with it, who informed Iphiclus. Iphiclus knowing the ability and deſign of Melampus, was very kind to him: You ſhall have my oxen, ſaid he to him, provided you will enable me to get children. The Diviner gave him hopes; he ſacrificed, he marked out the regions of the auguries. All ſorts of birds came thither except the vulture; but none of them could tell

(1) Diodor. Siculus, *lib. iv, cap. lxx, pag.* 258.

(2) Apollod. *lib. i, pag.* 45.

(3) Id. ib. *p.* 51.

(4) Taken from Apollodorus, *lib. i, pag.* 47. See alſo *Homer. Odyſſ. lib. xv, pag. m.* 462.

(5) Ἐσπουδάκεσαν δὲ ἄρα οἱ τότε πλοῦτόν τινα συλλέγεσθαι τοιοῦτον ἵππων καὶ βοῶν ἀγέλας. Fuit hoc præcipuum illis temporibus divitiarum ſtudium luculenta habere equorum & boum pecuaria. *Pauſan. lib. iv. ſub fin.*

(6) Ἕδνα ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ ᾔτει τοὺς μνωμένους. A filiæ procis ſponſalitium munus depoſcebat. *Ibid.*

(7) 1 Sam. xviii, 25.

(8) *See* Muretus in Propertium, Eleg. iii, *lib. ii.*

procured to him a kingdom in the following manner. Being deſired to cure the women of Argos of a furious diſeaſe, he would not do it, but on condition they would give him half the kingdom of Argos. This condition at firſt was denied him, but when the diſeaſe increaſed, they returned to him and promiſed him what he demanded: but not being ſatisfied with this, he would have them alſo reſign up to his brother the third part of the kingdom, to which they conſented. This adventure is differently related [C]. He was the firſt who taught the Greeks the ceremonies of the worſhip of Bacchus (c). He was not the inventer of them, if we believe Herodotus, but he acquired the knowledge of them by the converſation he had with the Phœnicians [D]. It is pretended that he underſtood

tell him what he muſt do to enable Iphiclus to get his wife with child. At laſt a vulture preſented himſelf, and did more than all the reſt: he ſhowed the cauſe of the barrenneſs, and then the remedy. Phylachus, ſays he, being one day angry with his ſon, purſued him with ſword in hand, and not being able to overtake him, he fixed his ſword in a pear-tree, and there it continues from that time wrapped up in the bark. You will find it in ſuch a place, take it from thence, and make Iphiclus drink the ruſt of it ten days together in wine. The fear wherewith he was ſeized that day, is the cauſe of his impotency; you may cure it by the receipt I have preſcribed (9).

PROPERTIUS criticized.

This narrative ſerves as a commentary upon ſome verſes of Propertius, which deſerve a little cenſure, for a fault which Muretus did not perceive. Propertius having ſaid, that love is a paſſion which conſtrains young men to endure all things, proves it by the impriſonment of Melampus.

> Ac veluti primo taurus detractat aratra,
> Mox venit aſſueto mollis ad arva jugo:
> Sic primo juvenes trepidant in amore feroces,
> Dehinc domiti poſt hæc æqua, & iniqua ferunt.
> Turpia perpeſſus vates eſt vincla Melampus
> Cognitus Iphicli ſubripuiſſe boves:
> Quem non lucra, magis Pero formoſa coëgit,
> Mox Amythaonia nupta futura domo (10.)

> *The bull at firſt declines to plough the field,*
> *But to the yoke uſe makes him tamely yield:*
> *So fiery youths, tho' firſt love's power they fear,*
> *Yet afterwards the greateſt hardſhips bear.*
> *Iphiclus to priſon Melampus ſent,*
> *Becauſe to ſteal his oxen the prophet went.*
> *Captivity he bore, and chains beſide,*
> *To have the beauteous Pero for his bride.*

This example is impertinently alledged; for it was not the love of a maid, but brotherly kindneſs which induced Melampus to expoſe himſelf to the diſgrace of a priſon. Theocritus ſerved as a guide to lead Propertius aſtray. He has placed Melampus alſo among the examples of the power of love.

> Τὰν ἀγέλαν χ᾽ ὡ μάντις ἀπ᾽ Ὄθρυος ἄγε Μελάμπους
> Ἐς πύλον· ἁ δὲ Βίαντος ἐν ἀγκοίνῃσιν ἐκλίνθη
> Μάτηρ χαρίεσσα περίφρονος Ἀλφεσιβοίας.

> Egit & vates Melampus armentum ab Othry monte
> In Pylum. In amplexu vero Biantis jacuit
> Pulcherrima *Pero* mater ſapientis Alpheſibœæ (11).

And the prophet Melampus drove the oxen from mount Othrys to Pylos. But yet Bias enjoyed the beautiful Pero, mother of the wiſe Alpheſibœa.

The oſtentation of learning hath drawn ſeveral impertinent things from the antient Poets. Ronſard, and many others, in the XVIth century have ſplit upon this rock.

[C] *This adventure is differently related.*] I have followed the relation of Herodotus, but here is another. Prœtus having diſputed the kingdom of Argos with Acriſius, his brother, was driven out of the country, and could not ſettle again but at Tyrinthus. He had three daughters who grew mad, as a puniſhment for ſome irreligious act (12). The fury that ſeized them was ſo violent, that they run through the fields with all ſorts of indecency (13). Melampus, who underſtood not only the art of Divining, but alſo Phyſic, promiſed to cure them, provided their father would give him the third part of his kingdom. Prœtus finding that the cure of his daughters would coſt him too much, would not purchaſe it at this price. Their diſtemper grew worſe, and became contagious: the other women of Argos were ſo tormented with it, that they killed their children, and went into the deſarts. The malady increaſed every day more and more, ſo that Prœtus was willing to pay Melampus for the cure according to his own demand: but the Phyſician raiſed the price, and demanded another third of the kingdom for his brother. This was granted him; for it was feared leſt a refuſal ſhould engage him to demand a greater recompence afterwards. He picked out the moſt vigorous young men to run with loud cries after thoſe poor diſtempered women. They were purſued as far as Sicyon: The eldeſt of the daughters of Prœtus died by the way, the two others were purged; Melampus married one, and Bias the other. Some time after there was born to Prœtus a ſon, who was called Megapenthes (14). We may obſerve, that it is ſaid, Melampus, beſides part of the kingdom, demanded in marriage one of the three daughters he ſhould cure (15).

Another account of it is this Under the reign of Anaxagoras, the ſon of Argeus, the ſon of Megapenthes, the women were ſeized with ſuch a malignant fury, that they ran up and down the ſtreets and thro' the fields. Melampus having cured them, found Anaxagoras ſo thankful, that he received of him two thirds of his kingdom; that is, this prince divided it equal with him and Bias. Since that time the kingdom of Argos was poſſeſſed by three kings, till the poſterity of Melampus and Bias failed; the former in the ſixth generation, and the later in the fourth. The poſterity of Anaxagoras at laſt re-united all the three parts of the kingdom, and continued till Cylarabes, who died without children. After which Oreſtes, the ſon of Agamemnon, ſeized on Argos (16). Thus you ſee there is a great difference in Chronology between Pauſanias and Apollodorus.

Some think that the diſtemper of theſe women, was nothing elſe but the *Furor Uterinus*, which is the opinion of Mr Menjot. (17) Their imagination was ſo diſordered, that they fancied themſelves cows.

> Prœtides implerunt falſis mugitibus agros:
> At non tam turpes pecudum tamen ulla ſecuta eſt
> Concubitus: quamvis collo timuiſſet aratrum,
> Et ſæpe in levi quæſiſſet cornua fronte (18).

> *The Prœtides with fancied lowings fill'd*
> *The paſtures; yet of them none ſought ſuch foul*
> *Embraces: tho' they fear'd the plough, and oft*
> *In their ſmooth foreheads, dubious, felt for horns.*
> TRAPP.

However it be, the antients relate, that religious remedies were uſed to cure this malady. Pauſanias ſays, that the daughters of Prœtus hid themſelves in a cave, and that Melampus drew them out by virtue of ſome myſterious ceremonies, and expiations, and brought them to a village called Luſi, where he cured them in the temple of Diana. Ἄς ὁ Μελάμπους θυσίαις τὲ ἀποῤῥήτοις καὶ καθαρμοῖς κατήγαγεν ἐς χωρίον καλούμενον Λυσοὺς . . . . καὶ ἠκέσατο τῆς μανίας ἐν Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερῷ. *Quas Melampus arcanis quibuſdam ſacris & expiationibus eduxit in vicum quos Luſos nuncupant . . . . & ab inſania liberavit in Dianæ templo* (19). We ſhall ſee hereafter (20) that he made them alſo take ſome remedies.

[D] *The converſation he had with the Phœnicians.*] I mean with Cadmus, and thoſe who accompanied him into derſtood the language of birds, and learned of them what was to come to paſs [*E*]. Some ſay alſo, that the worms which eat wood, anſwered his queſtions (*d*). And yet, thoſe who built him a temple (*e*), after his death, and who offered him ſacrifices, and celebrated his feſtival every year, did not attribute to him any kind of divination (*f*). I could eaſily refute the argument that was made uſe of to prove, that he certainly foretold future things [*F*]. If the Poets had not made pleaſant digreſſions upon what concerns him, they would only have told us, that he was an able Phyſician [*G*], and if Statius ſpoke hiſtorically,

---

(c) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. xlix.*

(9) *Taken from* Muretus, ubi ſupra.

(10) Propert. Eleg. III, *lib. ii.*

(11) Theocrit. Eidyll. III, *ſub fin. pag. m.* 25.

(12) *See, beſides* Apollodorus, ubi infra, Servius in Virgil. Eclog. VI, ver. 48.

(13) Μετὰ ἀκοσμίας ἁπάσης διὰ τῆς ἐρημίας ἐτρόχαζον Omni dedecore per deſerta diſcurrebant. *Apollod. lib. ii, pag.* 85.

(14) Taken from Apollodorus, *lib. ii, pag.* 85, *& ſeq.*

(15) Servius, in Virgil. Eclog. VI, ver. 48.

(16) Taken from Pauſanias, *lib. ii, pag.* 60.

(17) Antonius Menjotius, Diſſertat. Patholog. *Part i, pag.* 122.

(18) Virgil. Eclog. VI, ver. 48.

(19) Pauſanias, *lib. viii, pag.* 252, 253.

(20) See the remark [G].

into Bœotia (21). I ſhall obſerve two faults in Barthius: He ſays, that Plutarch affirms, Melampus taught the Grecians ſeveral things that were borrowed from the Egyptians (22). Plutarch is ſo far from ſaying ſo, that, on the contrary, he blames Herodotus for ſaying this, and taxes him with a wicked prevarication, for endeavouring to rob Greece of part of it's glory (23). You muſt know, that the Grecians did not own, that they were the diſciples of the Phœnicians in matters of religion. Pauſanias had a long conteſt with one of that country about it (24). The ſecond fault of Barthius is, that he ſays Herodotus affirms, that Melampus brought from Egypt the feſtivals and worſhip of Bacchus. *De* Bacchi ſacris *ex Ægypto in Græciam allatis ab Melampode, non tamen perfectis ſcribit etiam libro ſecundo Herodotus* (25). Herodotus does not ſay that Melampus made a journey into Egypt, but, on the contrary, ſuppoſes that Cadmus and his companions who came into Bœotia, were thoſe who inſtructed Melampus. It is neceſſary to cenſure ſuch faults in order to ſhow, that it is not ſufficient to have the authors we cite before our eyes; for if we do not examine them very narrowly, even to the leaſt word, we ſhall make them ſay a thouſand things which they never thought of. Take notice, I do not abſolutely deny, that our Diviner travelled into Egypt: I know that the Egyptians affirmed it (26).

[*E*] *It is pretended, that he underſtood the language of birds, and learned of them what was to come to paſs.*] I have already ſpoken of this in other places (27), but I ſhall here ſet down the very words of Apollodorus. Μελάμπους ἐπὶ τῶν χωρίων διατελῶν, οὔσης πρὸ τῆς οἰκήσεως αὐτοῦ δρυὸς, ἐν ᾗ φωλεὸς ὄφεων ὑπῆρχεν, ἀποκτεινάντων τῶν θεραπόντων τοὺς ὄφεις, τὰ μὲν ἑρπετὰ, ξύλα συμφορήσας, ἔκαυσε· τοὺς δὲ τῶν ὄφεων νεοσσοὺς ἔθρεψεν. οἱ δὲ, γενόμενοι τέλειοι, παραστάντες αὐτῷ κοιμωμένῳ τῶν ὤμων ἐξ ἑκατέρου, τὰς ἀκοὰς ταῖς γλώσσαις ἐξεκάθαιρον. ὁ δὲ, ἀναστὰς, καὶ γενόμενος περιδεὴς, τῶν ὑπερπετομένων ὀρνέων τὰς φωνὰς συνίει· καὶ παρ᾽ ἐκείνων μανθάνων, προὔλεγε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ μέλλοντα. προσέλαβε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερείων μαντικήν. περὶ δὲ τὸν Αλφεῖον συντυχὼν Απόλλωνι, τὸ λοιπὸν ἄριστος ἦν μάντις. Melampus cum ruri ageret, ac pro ipſius ædibus quercus eſſet, in eaque ſerpentium latebra eſſet, occiſis a miniſtris ſerpentibus, cætera quidem reptilia congeſtis lignis concremavit, at ſerpentium pullos educavit: qui cum ad juſtum corporis modum ſuccreviſſent, ipſum jam dormientem circumſtabant, & ex utroque humero illius aures linguis extergebant. Tandem expergefactus, excitatuſque, ac perterrefactus, ſupervolitantium avium voces intelligebat, & quæ ab iis futura edocebatur, mortalibus prædicebat, per haruſpicinam præterea vaticinari ab iis didicit. Ad hæc Apollini prope Alpheum obviam factus, circa cætera vaticinandi peritiſſimus evaſit (28). - - - - *Melampus living in the country, and there being an oak before his houſe, in which ſerpents uſed to lurk, he made a fire of wood, and burned the other reptiles, but his ſervants having killed the old ſerpents, he preſerved, and brought up the young ones; which being grown to their full bigneſs, ſtood round him as he lay aſleep, and from each ſhoulder liked his ears with their tongues. At length waking, and getting up in a fright, he underſtood the voices of birds, and, as they taught him, he foretold to men what was come to paſs. Beſides, he learned of them to propheſy by the art of Divination. And moreover meeting Apollo near Alpheus, he became moſt ſkillful in other methods of prognoſticating.* You will find ſeveral collections concerning this faculty of ſerpents in the book which I direct you to (29).

[*F*] *I could eaſily refute . . . . the argument that was made uſe of to prove that he foretold future things.*] The force of that proof lies in this: The reputation of this Diviner would not have laſted for ſeveral ages, if he had not convinced the world, by inconteſtable proofs that he had the gift of prophecy. 'Permultorum exemplorum & noſtra plena eſt reſpublica & 'omnia regna omneſque populi, cunctæque gentes, 'augurum prædictis multa incredibiliter vera ceci'diſſe: neque enim Polidæ, neque Melampodis, 'neque Mopſi, neque Amphiarai, neque Calchantis, 'neque Heleni tantum nomen fuiſſet, neque tot na'tiones id ad hoc tempus retinuiſſent Arabum, Phry'gum, Lycaonum, Cilicum, maximeque Piſidarum, 'niſi vetuſtas ea certa eſſe docuiſſet. Nec vero 'Romulus noſter auſpicato urbem condidiſſet, neque 'Accii Navii nomen memoria floreret tam diu, niſi hi 'omnes multa ad veritatem, & mirabilia dixiſſent (30). '- - - - *Both our own republic, and all kingdoms, and 'nations, and countries are full of inſtances, that many 'more incredible things have happened true according 'to the predictions of Soothſayers: for the fame of 'Polidas, Melampus, Mopſus, Amphiaraus, Calchas, 'and Helenus, would not have been ſo great, nor have 'been preſerved to this time by ſo many nations, as the 'Arabians, Phrygians, Lycaonians, Cilicians, and eſpe'cially the Piſidians, if antiquity had not averred thoſe 'things for truth. Nor would our Romulus have 'luckily founded the city, nor the memory of Accius Na'vius remain ſo long, if all theſe had not told many 'wonderful things according to truth.'* This reaſon is like the objection which Cicero recites in favour of the oracle of Delphos. You may read it in the Miſcellaneous Thoughts on Comets (31), with ſome reflexions which refute it. Thither therefore I muſt refer you for an anſwer to the paſſage in the ſecond book *de Legibus*. There is in Cicero a maxim, which might be brought to aſſiſt this paſſage; he ſays, that time deſtroys fictions, but confirms the judgments that are founded upon nature. *Opinionum commenta delet dies, naturæ judicia confirmat* (32). From whence it may be inferred, that the oracles, having continued many ages, were not a fiction. But let us refute Cicero by Cicero himſelf. He acknowledges in his ſecond book *de Legibus*, that the art of the Augurs did not then continue. 'Dubium non eſt, quin hæc 'diſciplina & ars augurum evanuerit jam & vetuſtate, '& negligentia. Itaque neque illi aſſentior, qui hanc 'ſcientiam negat unquam in noſtro collegio fuiſſe, ne'que illi qui eſſe etiam nunc putat (33). - - - - *Un'doubtedly this ſcience and art of Divination is vaniſhed 'thro' length of time and negligence. Therefore I nei'ther agree with thoſe that deny this ſcience ever to 'have been in our college, nor with thoſe that think it 'ſtill ſubſiſts.'* It had therefore the fate of the opinions which human wit brings forth, ſince time, inſtead of confirming it, deſtroyed it.

[*G*] *He was an able Phyſician.*] Apollodorus makes him the inventer of purgatives, and ſays, he uſed them in curing the daughters of Prœtus (34). Μελάμπους . . . . . . μάντις ὢν τὴν διὰ φαρμάκων καὶ καθαρμῶν θεραπείαν πρῶτος εὑρηκώς (35) . . . . . Ταῖς δὲ λοιπαῖς τυχούσαις καθαρμοῦ σωφρονῆσαι συνέβη. Melampus . . . . vaticinandi cognitione inſignis & qui potionandi expurgandique rationem primus invenit . . . . reliquæ vero repurgatæ reſipuerunt. - - - - *Melampus . . . . famous for his ſkill in divining, and who firſt invented the method of purging, and giving potions . . . . but the reſt being thoroughly purged, came to their ſenſes.* Servius obſerves, that he was ſir-named Καθαρτής, that is, *The Purger* (36). But let us not build upon this, ſince the ſame Grammarian intimates, that the purifications invented by Melampus, and

---

(*d*) See the remark [*B*].

(*e*) It was in a city called *Ægiſthena* in the country of Megara. *Pauſan. lib. i, ſub fin.*

(*f*) Καὶ θύουσι τῷ Μελάμποδι καὶ ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἑορτὴν ἄγουσι. μαντεύεσθαι δὲ οὔτε δὶ ἐνειράτων αὐτὸν, οὔτε ἄλλως λέγουσι. Melampodi ſacrum faciunt & feſtum diem quotannis celebrant: futura vero prædicendi neque è ſomniis neque ex ulla ratione ei ſcientiam tribuunt. *Idem, ibid.*

(21) Herod. *lib. ii, cap. xlix.*

(22) Barthius, in Statium, *Tom. ii, pag.* 834.

(23) Plut. de Malignit. Herodoti, *pag.* 857.

(24) Pauſan. *lib. vii, pag.* 230. See, above, citation (87) of the article JUPITER.

(25) Barthius, ubi ſupra.

(26) Diodor. Siculus, *lib. i, cap. xcvi, pag. m.* 83.

(27) In the remark [*C*] of the article CASSANDRA, and the remark [*B*] of the article TIRESIAS.

(28) Apollodor. *lib. i, pag.* 47.

(29) The Hierozoicon of Bochartus, *book i.*

(30) Cicero, *lib. ii*, de Legibus, *fol.* 334. *D.*

(31) Penſées diverſes ſur les Cometes, *num.* 45.

(32) *Cicero, de Natura Deorum,* See, above, citation (71) of the article LAUNOI (JOHN DE).

(33) Idem, *lib. ii*, de Legibus, *cap. xiii.*

(34) Apol. *lib. ii, pag.* 85.

(35) Id. ib. *pag.* 85.

(36) Servius, in Virgil. Georg. *lib. iii, ver.* 550.

cally, we ought to believe that Melampus arrived to a great age [*H*]. He left ſome children behind him (*g*). Heſiod commended him in a book that is loſt (*b*).

and uſed for the daughters of Prœtus belonged to religion. *Prœtidas ipſe purgavit luſtrationibus quas invenerat, hoc dicit, convaleſcente morbo, nec medicinam prodeſſe nec religionem* (37). That is, by theſe words

Ceſſere magiſtri
Phillyrides Chiron, Amythaoniuſque Melampus (38),

We muſt underſtand, that diſeaſes in a certain ſtate are above the power of Phyſic and Religion. Chiron is therefore repreſented there as a Phyſician, while Melampus is repreſented as the diſpenſer of ſupernatural remedies. But I will rather keep to Servius upon the eclogues of Virgil, where we find Melampus repreſented as a mixed perſon, partly as a Phyſician, and partly as a Prophet. He firſt appeaſed Juno, and then made his patients take a certain medicine. ‘ Quas (*Prœtidas*) Melampus .... placata Junone, ‘ infecto fonte ubi ſolitæ erant bibere, purgavit & in ‘ priſtinum ſenſum reduxit (39). - - - - *Whom (the ‘ daughters of Prœtus) Melampus .... having firſt ap‘ peaſed Juno, purged, by putting phyſic in the fountain ‘ where they uſed to drink, and ſo brought them to their ‘ ſenſes.*’ Note, that καθαρμὸς ſignifies not only a purgative medicine, but alſo that which we call an exorciſm, or rather a magical form of words.

There is a kind of hellebore, which upon his account is called *melampodium* (40): which is a ſign that he made uſe of it, and one may very well believe that he did not omit it in the grand cure, which was to purchaſe him a kingdom. Yet Pliny intimates nothing of this; he ſpeaks of Melampus only as a prophet; he does not attribute to him the cure of the daughters of Prœtus, but ſays, it was aſcribed to a ſhepherd. ‘ Melampodis fama divinationis artibus ‘ nota eſt. Ab hoc appellatur unum ellebori genus ‘ Melampodion. Aliqui paſtorem eodem nomine in‘ veniſſe tradunt, capras purgari paſto illo animad‘ vertentem, datoque lacte earum ſanaſſe Prœtidas ‘ furentes (41). - - - - *The fame of Melampus is well ‘ known by his ſkill in Divination. From him one kind ‘ of hellebore is called Melampodion. Some relate, that ‘ a ſhepherd of the ſame name invented it, having ob‘ ſerved his goats to purge by eating of it, and that, by ‘ giving their milk to the daughters of Prœtus, he cured ‘ them of their madneſs.*’ If Voſſius (42) built upon this paſſage, when he ſays, that our Melampus cured the fury of the daughters of Prœtus, by mixing black hellebore with goats milk, he has not faithfully related it, and he ſhould produce ſome authorities for what he ſays. He is in the right to cenſure Peter Caſtellan and John Neander, for making Melampus poſterior to Empedocles. In this they were guilty of a miſtake; for Melampus lived before the Trojan war. As to the writings we have under his name, they are ſuppoſititious. We have *Melampi ex Palpitationibus Divinatio*, printed in Greek at Rome in 1545. *Ex Nævis Corporis Divinatio*, printed at Rome in Greek the ſame year, and in Latin at Venice in 1552. (Nicolas Petreius is the author of that verſion) and in Latin and Greek, with the Metopoſcopia of of Cardan at Paris, in 1658. See *Lindenius Renovatus*, at p. 804. The abridgment of Geſner's *Bibliotheque* informs me, that ‘ Melampus hierogrammateus ‘ ſcripſit de auguriis ex ſaltibus corporis, quæ Augu‘ ſtinus Niphus in librum primum de auguriis tran‘ ſtulit. - - - *Melampus, an excellent author, wrote on ‘ Divination from the palpitations of the body, which ‘ Auguſtinus Niphus tranſcribed in his firſt book* de ‘ Auguriis.’

[*H*] *We ought to believe that Melampus arrived to a great age.*] Statius ſuppoſes, that Amphiaraus was aſſociated with Melampus for conſulting the auguries concerning the war of Thebes:

- - - - ſolers tibi cura futuri
Amphiaraë, datur, juxtaque Amythaone cretus
Jam ſenior ſed mente virens Phœboque Melampus
Aſſociat paſſus: dubium cui dexter Apollo
Oraque Cyrrhæa ſatiarit largius unda (43).

- - - - - - *This was thy ſcene*
Amphiarâus, with old Melampus join'd
Amythaon's ſon, who flouriſh'd ſtill in mind,
And Phœb's great preſence; 'twas a doubt, it ſeems,
Who beſt belov'd, drunk moſt of Cyrrha's ſtreams.

STEPHENS.

Melampus was the great grandfather of Amphiaraus: the latter had then ſeveral children, and one among the reſt, who was Generaliſſimo of the Argivi ten years after; from whence we may conclude, that Melampus muſt have been very old. But the Poets make no ſcruple of anachroniſms. Statius ſuppoſes in another place, that Thiodamas, the ſon of Melampus, was choſen to ſucceed Amphiaraus in overſeeing the auguries. He repreſents him as the ſecond in that art, but yet of ſo great modeſty, as obliged him to own himſelf unworthy of the ſucceſſion, juſt as the ſon of a great king is afraid in his infancy, that he cannot ſupply the place of his deceaſed father.

Concilium rex triſte vocat: quæruntque gementes,
Quis tripodas ſucceſſor agat? quo prodita laurus
Tranſeat? atque orbum vittæ decus. haud mora, cuncti
Inſignem fama, ſanctoque Melampode cretum
Thiodamanta volunt. qui cum ipſa arcana deorum
Partiri, & viſas uni ſociare ſolebat
Amphiaraus aves, tantæque haud invidus artis
Gaudebat dici ſimilem, juxtaque ſecundum.
Illum ingens confundit honos, inopinaque turbat
Gloria, & oblatas frondes ſubmiſſus adorat,
Seque oneri negát eſſe parem, cogique meretur.
Sicut Achæmenius ſolium, genteſque paternas
Excepit ſi forte puer, cui vivere patrem
Tutius, *&c* (44).

Would he have made ſuch compariſons if he had known that Thiodamas was brother to the grandfather of Amphiarus? Add to this, that Statius is the only perſon, if I be not miſtaken, who gives ſuch a ſon to Melampus. The two which Homer gave him, were called Antiphates and Mantius (45). To mention this by the by, the father of Amphiaraus was the ſon of the later, if we may believe Pauſanias (46). But the common opinion is, that Antiphates was the father of Oicles.

MELANCHTHON (PHILIP) born at Bretten in the Palatinate of the Rhine, Febr. 16, 1497, was one of the wiſeſt and greateſt men of his age. He gave ſo early marks of his capacity, that they begun betimes to inſtruct him; which was done by the care of his grandfather by the mother's ſide, more than by his father's [*A*]. He ſtudied

first

[*A*] *They begun betimes to inſtruct him, which was done by the care of his grand-father by the mother's ſide, more than by his father's.*] As I do not pretend to commend one of them to the prejudice of the other; I will ſhew, why George Schwartſerdt (1), the father of our Philip, did not take care of the education of his ſon. He was taken up with the affairs of the elector Palatine, his maſter, whom he ſerved as engineer, or commiſſary of the artillery. ‘ Huic (*avo materno*) pa‘ tre occupato negotiis principum, præcipue educatio ‘ & inſtitutio Philippi curæ fuit (2). - - - - *The inſtru‘ ction and education of Philip, was chiefly committed to ‘ the care of the grand-father by the mother's ſide, the fa‘ ther being employed in the affairs of princes.*’ Camerarius is my authority for the words I have uſed, for thus he ſays: ‘ Orto pernicioſo bello inter Palatinos & ‘ Bavaros cognatos Principes cum Georgius patriæ ſuæ ‘ Principi Philippo operam officiumque quod debebat, ‘ fideliter præſtaret, inprimis machinarum tormento‘ rumque ratione adminiſtranda (3). - - - - *A bloody war*

‘ *broke*

(*g*) See the remark [*H*].

(*b*) Pauſan. *lib. ix, pag.* 306.

(37) Id. ib.

(38) Virgil. Georg. *lib. iii, ver.* 549.

(39) Servius, in Virgil. Eclog. VI, ver. 48.

(40) Plin. *lib. xxv, cap. v, pag. m.* 380.

(41) Id. ib.

(42) Voſſius, de Philoſophia, *cap. xi, num.* 17, *pag. m.* 84.

(43) Statius, Thebaid. *lib. iii, ver.* 451.

(44) Id. ib. *lib. viii, ver.* 275.

(45) Homerus, Odyſſ. *lib. xv, pag. m.* 462.

(46) Pauſan. *lib. vi, pag.* 195.

(1) This word ſignifies *black earth*, and therefore Reuchlin gave our Philip the name of Melanchthon, which in Greek ſignifies the ſame thing as Schwartſerdt does in the German language.

(2) Melch. Adam. in Vit. Philoſoph. *pag.* 184.

(3) Joach. Camerarius, in Vita Philip. Melancht. *pag. m.* 3.

firſt in the place of his nativity, at a public ſchool, and then under a tutor, when it was known that the maſter of that ſchool had the Pox *(a)*. He was ſome time after ſent to Pfortſheim, where there was a famous college, and lodged with a relation of his, who was ſiſter to Reuchlin. Upon this occaſion it was that he was quickly known to this learned perſon, who loved him with great tenderneſs (*b*). Having lived there about two years, he was ſent to Heidelberg (*c*) in the year 1509 (*d*), and there made ſuch conſiderable improvement (*e*), that he was intruſted to teach the ſons of a certain count (*f*), though he was under fourteen years of age. He has been juſtly reckoned among illuſtrious youths [*B*]. Being vexed that he was refuſed his degree of maſter of Philoſophy, on account of his youth,

‘ *broke out between the Palatine and Bavarian princes, who were related to one another, whilſt George was faithfully employed, eſpecially as Engineer, in the ſervice of his own prince.*’ I think this Engineer was at firſt only a Gunſmith, who growing very ſkillful in his art, came to be known and beloved by princes. He invented the moſt uſeful arms, as well offenſive as defenſive, both for tournaments and battles. It is pretended that Maximilian the emperor made good uſe of thoſe inventions in a duel. This ſingular matter of fact I ſhall here relate, to excite my readers to ſearch curiouſly into the circumſtances of it. Read therefore carefully this encomium on the father of Melanchthon: ‘ Ipſe Georgius & probitate, integritate, taciturnitateque & fide, etiam prudentiâ atque ſolertiâ, & quod admirabili artificio opera armorum elaborare ſciret, quibus & defenderentur contra vim adverſariorum in conflictu, & inſtruerentur ad hos percellendum ſternendumque qui manum ſive in acie cum hoſtibus, ſeu in ludis equeſtribus, cum ſuis (quæ exercitationes tum in aulis Principum ſtudioſiſſime frequentabantur) conſerere vellent: Harum igitur artium ille peritus, & iis virtutibus quas commemoravimus ornatus, in notitiam pervenit maximorum & potentiſſimorum Principum, iiſque carus fuit, in quibus nominaſſe ſatis ſit & Regem optimum & bellatorem Invictiſſimum Divum Maximilianum Imperatoris Friderici filium. Quem Georgius aliquando cum glorioſo provocatore Italo, cui nomen Claudio Bataro, certamine ſingulari congreſſurum ita inſtruxit, & ſic arma ipſius machinando paravit, ut fortiſſimo Viro Maximiliano victoria certa facile etiam & celeriter contingeret. Claudius enim non diu repugnans, cum quanto omnibus rebus eſſet inferior ſentiens, ad pedes Maximiliani ſe adjeciſſet, ita in poteſtatem ejus ſe tradidit (4). - - - - - - *George himſelf was a man of probity, integrity, ſecrecy, and fidelity; he was likewiſe prudent and induſtrious, and very ingenious in making arms both offenſive and defenſive, either for battles or tournaments, which kind of exerciſe was then very common in the courts of princes. Upon the account of thoſe good qualities I have mentioned, and of his ſkill in theſe arts, he came to be known and beloved by the greateſt and moſt powerful princes, particularly that excellent king, and invincible warriour, Maximilian, ſon of the emperor Frederic. Maximilian, being to fight a duel with one Claudius Batarus, an Italian bully, who ſent him a challenge, George equipped and fitted him with arms ſo ingeniouſly contrived, that he quickly and eaſily obtained the victory. For Claudius, not being able to reſiſt long, and finding himſelf inferior in every reſpect, threw himſelf down at Maximilian's feet, and ſurrendered.*’ He was born at Heidelberg, but he ſettled at Bretten by marrying the daughter of John Reuterus, who had been mayor of that town ſome years (5). He died eleven days after his father-in-law, the twenty ninth of September 1508. His widow did not marry again till after ſhe knew that Melanchthon, her ſon, was married. She was diſpleaſed with it, and this diſcontent obliged her to marry a citizen of Bretten, about the year 1520 (6). She died the ſixth of June 1529 (7). Her ſon George, younger, about four years, than Melanchthon (8), ſurvived his brother (9), and was employed in the higheſt offices of his country (10).

That this remark may be not only hiſtorical, but alſo critical. I will add, that the Jeſuit Maimbourg is to be blamed for ſaying, that Melanchthon was *of a little village in the lower Palatinate*, and of *a mean extraction* (11). This is refuted by what I have already ſaid. See alſo Mr Seckendorf in the ſecond book of the Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm, pag. 158.

[*B*] *He has been juſtly reckoned among illuſtrious youths.*] The chapter which Mr Baillet has beſtowed upon him in his *Hiſtorical Treatiſe of young men, who became famous by their ſtudies or writings*, was due to him, and is very curious. There we ſee, that at the age of thirteen years he dedicated to Reuchlin *a Comedy which he wrote without any aſſiſtance.* This young ſcholar being at Pfortſheim, made his ſchool-fellows learn the ſeveral parts of a kind of comedy, which Reuchlin had lately publiſhed. His deſign was to act that piece in the preſence of the author, and this was performed very prettily: *Tunc & æqualibus ſuis ſcriptum quoddam ludicrum Reuchlini inſtar Comœdiæ illis diebus editum ediſcendum diſtribuit, & ſuas cuique partes aſſignavit, ut coram Reuchlino ad ſe reverſo fabula ea ageretur. Quod etiam factum eſt cum ſumma ipſius voluptate atque lætitiâ* (12). He might then be in his thirteenth year, or he might be younger, for he ſtayed two years at Pfortſheim, and went from thence to Heidelberg, where he was matriculated, October 13, 1509 (13). Mr Baillet adds, *that he was employed to make the greateſt part of the harangues and diſcourſes of eloquence, that were ſpoken in public* in the univerſity of Heidelberg. This agrees with the words of Melchior Adam: ‘ Scripſit jam adoleſcentulus profeſſoribus in eâ ſcholâ orationes, quæ publice recitatæ ſunt (14). - - - - *He wrote, whilſt he was but a lad, orations for the profeſſors in that college, which were ſpoken in public.*’ Here follows a paſſage which is not exactly true. ‘ At the age of thirteen he wrote a comedy to the honour of Reuchlin. He was but nineteen years when he publiſhed his Rhetoric: the next year he put out his Logic, and in his twenty fourth his Grammar. Immediately after he wrote many pieces of Theology, and at twenty ſix years of age he publiſhed his Common-places, which were equally eſteemed by * Proteſtants and Catholics: for being publiſhed under the name of *Meſſer Philippo di terra nera*, and carried to Rome, all the copies were preſently ſold (15).’ You have already ſeen what I have to ſay about this comedy *to the honour of Reuchlin*; which I will not repeat. I only ſay, that Mr Teiſſier did not rightly attend to theſe Latin words. ‘ Anno decimonono evulgavit Rhetoricam; ſequenti Dialecticam: viceſimo quarto Grammaticam, aliis deinde annis alia (16). - - - - - *In the year nineteen he publiſhed his Rhetoric, the next year his Logic, the twenty fourth his Grammar, and in the following years other things.*’ They refer to the years of the century, and not of Melanchthon; and therefore Mr Teiſſier ſhould have ſaid that he was twenty two years old when he publiſhed his Rhetoric, *&c.* He ought not to have aſſerted, that he wrote ſeveral pieces of Theology, only after the publiſhing of his Grammar; for he put out ſeveral treatiſes of that nature in the year 1521 (17), three years before his Grammar was printed. In fine, it is falſe that he publiſhed his Common-places at the age of twenty ſix, for he publiſhed them in the year 1521 (18), when he was but twenty four years old.

Note, that all the pieces which Melchior Adam has juſt named, are poſterior to his being profeſſor at Wittemberg. But we muſt remember what he ſays elſewhere, that Melanchthon publiſhed ſome books whilſt he was profeſſor at Tubingen. ‘ Privatim ac publice cum magna laude & admiratione docuit (*Tubingæ*) & ſcripta quædam ceu primos fœtus ex quibus ſatis apparuit qui proventus in poſterum expectandi forent, in lucem edidit (19). - - - - *He taught,* (at Tubingen) *both in public and private with great applauſe and admiration, and publiſhed ſome works as firſt fruits, from which it ſufficiently appeared what a a crop might be expected afterwards.*’ There is reaſon therefore to believe, that he was an author in print before the age of twenty or twenty one, and ſo he deſerved very well to be placed in the catalogue of Mr Baillet. I have read in the parallel which John James Grynæus made between the prophet

---

(*a*) Joach. Camerarius, in Vita Melanchthonis, *pag. m.* 5.

(*b*) Id. ib. *pag.* 7, *& ſeq.*

(*c*) Id. ib. *pag.* 10.

(*d*) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. German. *pag.* 328.

(*e*) Id. ib. *pag.* 329.

(*f*) It was the count of Leonſtein.

(4) Id. ib. *pag.* 2, 3.

(5) Id. ib.

(6) Mater vidua manſit annis totis 12. poſtea cum Philippum duxiſſe uxorem audiiſſet, non ſine quadam offenſiuncula, nupſit iterum viro honeſtiſſimo civi Brettano. - - - - *His mother remained a widow twelve whole years, &c.* Id. ib. *pag.* 5.

(7) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 328.

(8) Camerarius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 4.

(9) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſ. *pag.* 184.

(10) Camer. ib. *pag.* 8.

(11) Maimb. Hiſt. of Lutheran. *book ii, pag.* 181. *Dutch Edition.*

(12) Camerar, ibid. *pag.* 9.

(13) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſoph. *pag.* 185.

(14) Id. ib. *pag.* 186.

* Scaligerana.

(15) Teiſſier, addit. to the Elog. *Tom. i, pag.* 188.

(16) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. *pag.* 331.

(17) Id. ib.

(18) Id. ib. *pag.* 332.

(19) Id. in Vitis Philoſoph. *pag.* 186.

youth, and finding that the air of Heidelberg did not agree with his conſtitution, he left that univerſity in 1512, and went to ſee that of Tubingen (g) where he ſtaid ſix years (h). There he heard the lectures of all ſorts of profeſſors, and publickly explained Virgil, Terence, Cicero, and Livy; and being very laborious, he found time alſo to ſerve Reuchlin in his quarrels with the Monks, and to overſee a Printing-houſe (i) [*C*]. He moreover applied himſelf very much to the reading of the word of GOD [*D*]. He accepted in 1518, the profeſſorſhip in the Greek tongue, in the univerſity of Wittemberg, which Frederic the elector of Saxony offered him upon the recommendation of Reuchlin (k). He made ſo fine an inauguration ſpeech four days after his arrival, that he not only removed the contempt to which his ſtature and mien expoſed him, but alſo raiſed great admiration of himſelf (l). The lectures he read upon Homer, and upon the Greek text of the epiſtle of St Paul to Titus, drew a great croud of auditors, and excited in them an earneſt deſire of underſtanding the Greek tongue (m). One of the greateſt ſervices he did to the ſciences, was to reduce them into a ſyſtem (n), which was then difficult, conſidering the confuſion wherewith they had been taught for a long time. There was quickly an intimate friendſhip contracted between him and Luther (o), who taught Divinity in the ſame univerſity. They went together to Leipſic in the year 1519, to diſpute with Eccius. The following years were to Melanchthon a complication of hard labours; he wrote many books, he travelled in order to found colleges, and viſit churches (p). But nothing coſt him more pains than the taſk that was given him in the year 1530, to draw up a Confeſſion of Faith; which is called the Augſburg Confeſſion, becauſe it was preſented to the emperor at the diet in that city. All Europe was convinced, that he was not ſo averſe as Luther, to an accommodation, and that he would have ſacrificed many things for the ſake of peace [*E*]. Wherefore Francis I. judged him a proper perſon to pacify the diſputes

prophet Daniel and Melanchthon, a fine encomium upon the latter it deſerves to be tranſcribed. ‘ At Deum immortalem, quam non ſpem de ſe præbet, admodum etiam adoleſcens & pene puer, Philippus ille Melanchthon, utraque literatura pene ex æquo ſuſpiciendus! Quod inventionis acumen? quæ ſermonis puritas? quanta reconditarum rerum memoria? quam varia lectio? quam verecunda regiæque prorſus indolis feſtivitas (20). - - - *But, good GOD, what hopes may we not conceive of Philip Melanchthon, tho' as yet very young, and almoſt a boy, equally to be admired for his knowledge in both languages, what quickneſs of invention? What purity of diction? What vaſtneſs of memory? What variety of reading? What modeſty and gracefulneſs of behaviour?*’ This is what Eraſmus ſaid in the year 1515.

[*C*] *And to overſee a Printing-houſe.*] This remark is, properly ſpeaking, an appendix to the preceding, for it relates to Melanchthon, as he wrote books in his youth: for to put in good order a confuſed heap of collections, is, in effect, to make a book. So Mr Baillet thought; for having obſerved that Melanchthon ‘ made it his recreation to correct the printing-preſs of the place, *he adds*, that to ſuch a paſtime we owe, among other books, the edition of Nauclerus at Tubingen. It was a ſilly heap of chronicles and fables bundled together among hiſtories in a ſtrange confuſion. Melanchthon took the pains to purge it, and to ſelect out of it what was tolerable and put it in order? ſo that one may ſay, this book is the work of Melanchthon (21).’ Camerarius obſerves, I. That the labour of Melanchthon upon Nauclerus, conſiſted, not only in putting things in order, and new moulding them, but alſo in enlarging them. II. That the corrector of this book took upon him to reviſe all the books which Thomas Anſhelmus ſhould print. *Librum hunc* (Naucleri) *exprimendum ſuſceperat Thomas Anſhelmus qui Typographicam officinam habebat Tubingæ. A quo perfectum fuit, ut & illius ſcripti & aliorum, quæ à ſe ederentur, curam reſpectumque Philippus ſuſciperet, quo prodirent correctiora. Is tunc & in hoc opere Naucleri partim diſponendo, partim augendo, partim etiam retexendo id præſtitit, ut lectio libri iſtius à plurimis expeteretur, & fructu voluptateque non careret* (22). Note, that this edition of Nauclerus was the firſt of all.

[*D*] *He applied himſelf much to the reading of the word of GOD.*] He had a copy of the Bible, which John Frobenius had lately printed at Baſil in a ſmall volume, which he carried always about him, and chiefly when he went to church. Thoſe who ſaw that during divine ſervice, he held always in his hands a book much larger than a prayer-book, believed that he was reading quite another thing than what the time and place required of him. Thoſe that envyed him took occaſion from hence to make him odious. This is what we learn from Camerarius (23). Another author obſerves, that Reuchlin made him a preſent of that Bible (24).

[*E*] *Would have ſacrificed many things for the ſake of peace.*] This appears chiefly by the book he wrote concerning things indifferent; which was ſo ill received by the faction of Illyricus. ‘ Suaſerat Philippus *de Adiophoris* ne ſcrupuloſe contenderent, modo nihil idololatriæ illi ritus ac ceremoniæ haberent adjunctum, & ſervitutem aliquam, quæ ſine impietate ſit, ſuſtinendam (25). - - - - *Philip adviſed them not to contend ſcrupulouſly about indifferent things, provided thoſe rites and ceremonies had nothing of idolatry in them, and to bear ſome hardſhips, if it might be done without impiety.*’ Illyricus, on the contrary, cryed out, that people ſhould rather deſert all the churches, and threaten an inſurrection, than to bear a ſurplice. *Contra* Flacius *vociferabatur potius vaſtitatem faciendam in templis, & principes metu ſeditionum terrendos quam ſaltem* linea veſtis *admittatur* (26). Some Roman Catholics have been inſpired with the ſame ſpirit, if we may believe the anonymous author of a letter publiſhed by Mr Jurieu. ‘ I enquired, *ſays he* (27), as much as poſſibly I could, whether a Proteſtant would be received into the Romiſh communion, upon the biſhop of Meaux's explication of the Romiſh doctrine, as it was made uſe of to inſtruct thoſe who ſeek to comply with the times. Every one told me no, and ſome body added that no abjuration was to be ſigned, but that in which the whole farago ſhould be included. Theſe are the very words he made uſe of. This calls to my mind what a Jeſuit ſaid, that they would not put out one wax taper, though it were to convert all the Hugonots.’

What Melanchthon ſaid to his mother, plainly ſhews, that he hated diſputes in religion, and that he was only engaged in them by the part he was to act in the world. Being gone to the conferences at Spire in the year 1529, he made a little journey to Bretten, to ſee his mother. This good woman aſked him what ſhe muſt believe amidſt ſo many diſputes, and repeated to him the prayers ſhe was wont to make, and which contained nothing that was ſuperſtitious. Continue, ſaid he, to believe and pray as you have done hitherto, and never trouble your ſelf about controverſies. *Ab ea cum interrogatus eſſet:* quid ſibi in ejuſmodi controverſiis credendum? *reſpondit, auditis illius precibus, quæ nihil ſuperſtitionis habebant, ut* pergeret hoc credere & orare quod credidiſſet & oraſſet hactenus: nec pateretur ſe turbari conflictibus diſputationum (28). This refutes invincibly a ſilly ſtory which Florimond de Remond publiſhed. *It is written,* ſays he (29), *that Melanchthon being at the point of death in the year* 1560, *his mother, being extremely old, ſpoke to him after this manner:*

(g) Ib. pag. 329.

(h) Id. in Vitis Philoſoph. pag. 186.

(i) Id. ib. & in Vit. Theol. pag. 330.

(k) Camerar. ubi ſupra, pag. 24.

(l) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theologorum, 330.

(m) Id. ib.

(n) Id. ib. pag. 331.

(o) Camerar. ibid. pag. 30, 31.

(p) In 1527.

(20) Eraſmus, *Paraphraſe in* 1 Theſſ. *cap. ii*, apud Jo. Jac. Grynæum Epiſt. ſelect. *pag.* 302.

(21) Baillet's Enfans celebres, *Art xl.*

(22) Camer. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 16. *See alſo* Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſoph. *pag.* 186, 187.

(23) Camer. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 15.

(24) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Philoſoph. *pag.* 185.

(25) Id. ib. *pag.* 195.

(26) Id. ib. *pag.* 196.

(27) Suite du Preſervatif contre le changement de Religion, *pag.* 173. *of the Hague Edit.* 1683.

(28) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 333

(29) Florimond de Remond, Hiſtory of the Birth and Progreſs of Hereſy, *book ii, ch. ix, pag. m.* 186, 187.

putes about religion in his kingdom, and deſired him to come thither [*F*]. The king of England alſo deſired to ſee him (*q*), but neither of theſe two monarchs did ever ſee him. As I intend to mention, but ſome of his principal actions, I ſhall only ſay, that, in 1541, he aſſiſted at the conferences of Ratiſbon, where the controverſies between the Catholics and Proteſtants were warmly diſputed, and that, in the year 1543, he went to the archbiſhop of Cologne, to aſſiſt him in introducing a reformation into his dioceſe, which turned to no account. The affair of the Interim took up much of his time. He attended at ſeven conferences upon this ſubject in the year 1548, and wrote all the pieces that were preſented there, and the cenſure of that Interim (*r*). He was one of the deputies whom Maurice, elector of Saxony, was to ſend to the council of Trent in the year 1552. He waited ſome time at Nuremberg for a ſafe conduct, but becauſe of the war which was ready to break out, he returned from thence to Wittemberg (*s*). His laſt conference with the Doctors of the Romiſh communion was at Worms, in 1557; and of the diſſenſions which afflicted him, there was none more violent than that which was raiſed by Flacius Illyricus. He died at Wittemberg April the nineteenth, 1560, which was the ſixty third day of his ſixty fourth year (*t*). He was buried near Luther in the church of the caſtle, two days after. His funeral oration was ſpoken by Winſhemius, a Doctor of Phyſic, and profeſſor of the Greek tongue. The teſtimonies of piety with which he ended his days, were admirable (*u*); and it is obſervable, that one thing which made him

(*q*) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 336.

(*r*) Id. ib. *pag.* 343.

(*s*) Id. ib. *pag.* 343, 346.

(*t*) Ætatis ſuæ climactericum diebus LXIII egreſſus. *Thuan. lib. xxvi, ſub fin. pag. m.* 538. *Du Rier, in Teiſſier's Elogies, Tom. i, pag.* 183, *tranſlates it ill by* he died the ſixty third day of his climacterical year.

(*u*) *See* Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſ. *pag.* 202.

'* *My ſon, you ſeem to me to be upon the point of* '. . . . *leaving this world, to go and give an account* '*to the great judge of what you have done. You know* '*I was a Catholic, and you induced me to change my* '*religion, and to embrace one that is different from that* '*of my fore-fathers. I adjure you by the living GOD,* '*to tell me now which is the beſt, and do not conceal* '*it from me. Ha!* ſaid *Melanchthon, the new doctrine* '*is more plauſible, but the old is more ſafe and certain:* '*And turning himſelf about, he ſaid aloud,* Hæc plauſibilior, illa ſecurior, *this is the more plauſible, that* '*the more ſafe.*' It is falſe, that Melanchthon induced his mother to change her religion, and it is certain ſhe died above thirty years before her ſon.

* *See* Morus, *lib. ii*, de Miſſ. & Francis Montagnes, *in his book intituled*, la Verité defendue.

[*F*] *Francis I, thought him a proper perſon . . . . . . and deſired him to come into France.*] Let us here recite the paraphraſe which Maimbourg has made upon the narrative of Florimond de Remond. *The queen of Navarre, who knew that the king her brother paſſionately deſired the peace of the church, hoped ſhe might be able to gain him by that means: For that end, ſhe often talked to him of a very good man, as ſhe ſaid, who was called Philip Melanchthon, whom ſhe was continually praiſing as the moſt learned man of his time, who does not indeed approve, added ſhe very dextrouſly, certain abuſes which are manifeſtly to be ſeen in the doctrine, manners, and diſcipline of the Chriſtians of theſe latter ages; but then he deteſts the ſchiſm which has been made upon this occaſion in Germany, and which he has always endeavoured to extinguiſh by all ſorts of means. She aſſured him that he was a peaceable man, of a mild temper, who had nothing of that fierce and violent ſpirit of Luther and Zuinglius, one who had always endeavoured to reconcile them among themſelves, and with the Catholics, that he might re-unite all mens minds in one and the ſame belief, and reſtore to the church peace and union, which he continually wiſhed for; that ſhe did not doubt but if ſo holy and able a man could confer with the Doctors of the Sorbonne, who deſired alſo nothing but peace, they would quickly find the means of procuring it to the church, and of deſtroying a ſchiſm, which might eaſily ſpread from Germany into France, and produce there the ſame troubles and diſorders, which were to be ſeen in the empire. In fine, ſhe told him ſo many things to Melanchthon's advantage, and gave him ſo great hopes of being able to put an end, by his means, to the differences which begun to ariſe in France, as well as in Germany, about ſeveral articles of religion, that he was perſuaded to it. Whereupon this prince, who otherwiſe had a great deſire to bring into France the ableſt men of his time, wrote to Melanchthon* ‡, *and invited him to come to Paris, to join his endeavours with our divines to reſtore the ancient diſcipline of the church* (30). He relates afterwards how the cardinal of Tournon warded off the blow, and perſuaded the king *to revoke immediately the leave he had granted to Philip Melanchthon* (31). In fine, he affirms, that this change at firſt aſtoniſhed the Heretics; but *that as ſoon as they had recovered themſelves from this ſurprize . . . they had the confidence* to poſt up placards full of blaſphemies *at the gates of the Louvre, and even at the king's chamber-door*. You ſee then the order in which this Jeſuit placed theſe particulars. 1. The queen of Navarre perſuaded the king to ſend for Melanchthon. 2. The king wrote to this Doctor. 3. The cardinal of Tournon changed this deſign of the king. 4. The innovators ſet up placards. 5. Theſe four things happened in the year 1534. Florimond de Remond places them in the ſame order. Now I will ſhew they are miſtaken, and I am much ſurprized that Beza ſhould commit the ſame error; he ſays alſo (32), that the buſineſs of the placards was poſterior to the reſolution which Francis I. had taken to ſend for Melanchthon. Note, that he obſerves that thoſe placards were fixed up in the month of November 1534.

‡ Epiſt. Franciſc. Reg. ad Phil. Melanc. apud Flor. Ræm. *lib. vii, cap. iv.*

(30) Maimb. Hiſt. of Calviniſm, *book i, pag.* 25, at the year 1534.

(31) Id. ib. *pag.* 29.

(32) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *book i, pag.* 15, 16.

Here follows a better Chronology of all theſe matters. The placards were poſted up at the time obſerved by Theodore Beza. Francis I. aſſiſted at a famous proceſſion January 21, 1535, and cauſed ſome Heretics to be burnt. Melanchthon was exhorted to endeavour to mitigate the king's anger: He wrote a letter to John Sturmius, who was then in France, and another to John du Bellai, biſhop of Paris (33). A gentleman (34) whom Francis I. had ſent into Germany ſpoke to Philip Melanchthon of the journey to France, and aſſured him, that the king ſhould write to him about it himſelf, and would furniſh him with all neceſſary ſafe conducts (35). When he returned into France, he aſſured the king, that Melanchthon would undertake the journey, if the king would do him the honour to write to him about this matter (36). The prince diſpatched immediately the gentleman to carry to Melanchthon the letter he wrote to him. It is dated at Guiſe the twenty-eighth of June 1535 (37), and declares the pleaſure the king had when he underſtood by the gentleman, and by the letter which William du Bellai had received from Melanchthon, that this Doctor was diſpoſed to come into France, to endeavour to pacify the controverſies. Melanchthon wrote to the king the twenty-eighth of September the ſame year (38). He aſſured him of his good intentions, and that he was ſorry he could not as yet ſurmount the obſtacles to his journey. The gentleman who carried this letter to the king, found him very buſy about his preparations for the war in Italy (39), and beſides Melanchthon could never obtain leave from the duke of Saxony to go to the court of Francis I (40), although Luther had earneſtly exhorted that elector to conſent to this journey, by repreſenting to him, that the hopes of ſeeing Melanchthon had put a ſtop to the perſecution of the Proteſtants in France, and that there was reaſon to fear, they would renew the ſame cruelty when they ſhould know that he would not come (41). The elector had very good reaſons not to ſuffer this journey (42), for he was afraid to expoſe himſelf to the reſentment of Charles V, and he ſaw no probability that Melanchthon could do any thing for the intereſt of religion. He wrote to Francis I, an excuſe that he could not ſuffer Melanchthon to go into France (43). His letter is dated the twenty-eighth of Auguſt 1535. Note, that, in the month of December the ſame year, Langei ſollicited

(33) Camerar. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 144.

(34) *Called* Barnabas Voré, Sieur de la Foſſe.

(35) Camerar. ib. *pag.* 146.

(36) Id. ib. *pag.* 151.

(37) It is the twenty ninth of the firſt book among the letters of Melanchthon.

(38) This letter is the thirtieth of the firſt book of thoſe of Melanchthon.

(39) Camerar. ibid. *pag.* 153.

(40) Id. ib. *pag.* 151.

(41) Luther, *Tom. vi, fol.* 491, apud Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. iii, pag.* 107.

(42) *See* Seckendorf, ibid. *pag.* 109.

(43) Seckendorf, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 110.

him look upon death as a happineſs, was, that it delivered him from Theological perſecutions [*G*]. He had married the daughter of a burgomaſter of Wittemberg, in the year 1520, who died in the year 1557 (*x*). He had two ſons and two daughters by her [*H*]. As the deſcription of his moral accompliſhments, may be found in a book more eaſie to be conſulted than this Dictionary (*y*), I ſhall ſay nothing of them. But I will obſerve, that he was credulous, as to prodigies, Aſtrology (*z*), and Dreams (*aa*); and I will make ſome reflexions upon the inclination to Pyrrhoniſm,

licited in Germany, that Melanchthon, or ſome other Divines, ſhould be ſent to the king, his maſter (44). How will you make this agree with the narrative of Maimbourg, or with the account of Mezerai, who affirms (45), that, in 1533, the king wrote to Melanchthon by William du Bellai Langei (46), but that the cardinal of Tournon, and the Divines of Paris, perſuaded him to ſend word, *that he did excuſe him from this trouble?* I do not meddle with the confuſions of Mr Varillas; they ſhall be ſhewn afterwards (47). Note alſo, that Melanchthon ſent into France, a ſmall piece, which contained his advices about the reconciling of the controverſies. He did not publiſh it, but it is to be found in the collection of Pezelius (48).

I have read in a letter written to Eraſmus by Sir Thomas More (49), that Tyndal had ſent word that Melanchthon was at the court of France, that he ſpoke to him, and that he had ſeen him enter Paris accompanied with 150 Horſe. ‘ Tyndalus hæreticus noſtras, qui & nuſquam & ubique exulat, ſcripſit huc nuper *Melanchthonem* eſſe apud Regem *Galliæ:* ſemet collocutum cum eo, qui illum vidiſſet exceptum *Pariſiis*, comitatu C L. equorum: addebat ſe timere *Tyndalus*, ne ſi *Gallia* per illum reciperet verbum Dei, confirmaretur in fide Euchariſtiæ contra *Vicleſicam* ſectam. - - - - *Tindal added he was afraid, if France ſhould receive the word of GOD by him, it would be confirmed in the faith of the Euchariſt contrary to the ſect of the Wickliffites.*’ Is it poſſible that perſons of merit dare to ſend ſuch lies to their friends?

[G] *He ſaid . . . . that death would deliver him from Theological perſecutions.*] Some days before he died, he wrote upon a piece of paper in two columns the reaſons why he ought not to be ſorry for leaving this world. One of thoſe columns contained the bleſſings which death would procure him; the other contained the evils from which death would deliver him (50). He put only two articles into the latter; I. That he ſhould ſin no more. II. That he ſhould be no longer expoſed to the vexations and rage of the Divines (51). The other column contained ſix heads: I. That he ſhould come to the light. II. That he ſhould ſee GOD. III. That he ſhould contemplate the Son of GOD. IV. That he ſhould underſtand thoſe admirable myſteries which he could not comprehend in this life. V. Why we are created ſuch as we are. VI. What is the union of the two natures in JESUS CHRIST (52). Note, that the ſtate of man appeared to this great Divine one of the moſt incomprehenſible myſteries of religion; and yet there is not one among thoſe who believe without examining, who imagines there is any difficulty in it. From hence it came to paſs, that ſome were ſo ſurprized to find by my Dictionary, that the Manichees could raiſe puzzling objections. But let us keep to our text, and add, that nature which gave Melanchthon a peaceable temper, made him a preſent ill ſuited with the time in which he was to live. His moderation ſerved only to be his croſs. He was like a lamb in the midſt of wolves; no body liked his mildneſs, which expoſed him to all ſorts of ſlander, and deprived him of the means of anſwering a fool according to his folly. The only advantage it procured him was to look upon death without fear, by conſidering that it would ſecure him from the *Odium Thelogicum* - - - *hatred of Divines*, and from the *infidos agitans diſcordia fratres* (53) - - - *diſcord of falſe brethren*. I ſhall ſpeak below (54) of the ſlavery wherein he lived. He ſaid in one of his works, that he had held his profeſſor's place forty years, without ever being ſure that he ſhould not be turned out before the end of the week. *Publice non dubitavit affirmare* †, *ego jam ſum hic, Dei beneficio, quadraginta annos: & nunquam potui dicere aut certus eſſe me per unam ſeptimanam manſurum eſſe* (55).

[*H*] *He had two ſons and two daughters.*] I find nothing concerning his two ſons; but I know that Anne, his eldeſt daughter, was the wife of George Sabinus, one of the beſt Poets of his time. He married her at Wittemberg, November 16, 1536 (56), when ſhe was but fourteen years old. Her huſband carried her into Pruſſia to the great grief of Melanchthon, in the year 1543 (57). There had been ſeveral quarrels between the father-in-law and the ſon-in-law, becauſe the latter being very ambitious, wanted to raiſe himſelf to civil employments, and did not like the humility of Melanchthon, who confined himſelf to literary employments, and would be at no trouble to advance his children (58). Anne underſtood Latin well, and was very handſome (59). Her father loved her tenderly (60). Judge then of the grief he had when ſhe went ſo far from him in the year 1543 (61), and afterwards when ſhe died at Konigſberg in the year 1547 (62). And infer from all this, that he was neither happy at home nor abroad. ‘ Narrationem talium ideo nequaquam omittendam duco . . . . ut hujuſmodi quaſi vulneribus inſpectis quam miſera interdum vita ſit magnorum virorum intelligatur, cum ad onera Reipublicæ pondus etiam domeſtici doloris adjicitur (63). - - - - *I think all theſe things ought to be mentioned, and by no means to be omitted . . . that by viewing, as it were, ſuch wounds, we may ſee how miſerable ſometimes the life of great men is: ſince to the burden of the commonwealth the weight of domeſtic trouble is likewiſe added.*’ His other daughter was married in the year 1550 to Gaſpar Peucer, who was an able Phyſician, and very much perſecuted (64). If you ſhould doubt whether Melanchthon was a good father, I would deſire you to conſider, that a Frenchman found him one day holding a book in one hand, and rocking a child with the other. Melanchthon ſeeing him ſurprized at this, made ſuch a pious diſcourſe to him about the duty of a father, and the ſtate of grace in which children are with GOD, that this ſtranger went away much more learned than when he came in (65).

Let us not forget this reflexion. It is a great happineſs to ſtudious men to be free from ambition and avarice. This ſaves them much time, preſerves them from mean ſubmiſſions, and many troubles. But that a man may enjoy the benefit of this good diſpoſition, it is not ſufficient that he himſelf poſſeſs it; his kindred alſo muſt be provided with it; for a wife, a ſon-in-law, a ſon, a near kinſman, who want to get an eſtate, or advance themſelves to honours, will not ſuffer the man of learning to be at reſt; they will have him to ſollicit, to canvaſs, to make his court, and if he does it not they grumble and quarrel. Melanchthon and his ſon-in-law are a proof of this. ‘ Inter ſocerum ac generum non quidem odium aut ſimultas, ſed alienatio tamen quædam & prope diſſidium ortum fuit . . . . Fons autem erat omnium, quod Sabinus ſocero nimia cupiditate Illuſtris fortunæ videbatur ardere. Ille autem non tantum adjuvari & quaſi promoveri ſe ab ipſo quantum optabat & poſſe arbitrabatur, ægre ferebat (66). - - - - *There happened between the father-in-law, and the ſon in-law, not indeed hatred or enmity, but a kind of averſion, and almoſt an open breach . . . . The foundation of all was, becauſe the father-in-law thought Sabinus to be too ambitious of honour. And Sabinus took it ill, that he was not ſo much aſſiſted, and, as it were, promoted by the other, as he wiſhed and imagined might have been done.*’ From whence I conclude, that it is a difficult matter to live happily in this miſerable world, ſince a happy life requires not only that a man ſhould govern his own paſſions, but alſo that thoſe of his relations ſhould be well governed.

(*x*) Id. ib. *pag.* 190.

(*y*) In the additions of Mr Teſſier to the Elogies taken out of Thuanus, *Tom. i, pag.* 187, *Edit.* 1696.

(*z*) See the proofs of it in the Hiſtory of the Variations by the biſhop of Meaux, *lib. v, num.* 34.

(*aa*) *See* Melch. Adam, in ejus Vita paſſim.

(44) Id. ib.

(45) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. *Tom. vi, pag. m.* 407, 408.

(46) It was not he who carried the king's letter.

(47) In the remark [*N*].

(48) Seckendorf, *lib. iii, pag.* 108.

(49) It is the tenth in the twenty ſeventh book of the letters of Eraſmus, *pag.* 1510.

(50) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſ. *pag.* 202.

(51) Diſcedes à peccatis, liberaberis ab ærumnis & à rabie Theologorum. *Id. ib.*

(52) Id. ib.

(53) Virgil. Georg. *lib. ii, ver.* 496.

(54) In the remark [*L*].

† *Tom. i, Enarrat. Evangel. pag.* 358.

(55) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 357.

(56) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſ. *pag.* 227.

(57) Camerar. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 206.

(58) Id. ib. *pag.* 207.

(59) Melch. Adam. ibid.

(60) Camerar. ibid. *pag.* 208.

(61) *See what he wrote to* Camerar. apud Melchior Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 358.

(62) Id. Ib.

(63) Camerar. ib. *pag.* 207.

(64) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Medic. *pag.* 377.

(65) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſ. *pag.* 198.

(66) Camerar. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 207.

niſm, for which he is blamed [*I*]. Some have falſly accuſed him of hating the Peripatetic

[*I*] *I will make ſome reflexions upon the inclination to Pyrrhoniſm for which he is blamed.*] 'He ſeemed to have been brought up in the ſchool of Pyrrho, for a thouſand doubts beſet his ſoul, for fear, ſaid he, of erring. His writings were a continual jumble of uncertainties (67).' The author who ſays this, cites ſome authorities, and tells us no more than what an infinite number of writers have obſerved. See in the laſt place the biſhop of Meaux in his *Hiſtoire des Variations*. I believe they exaggerate the matter, but at the ſame time I think Melanchthon was not free from doubts, and that there were many points about which he could not poſitively ſay, *It is ſo, and it cannot be otherwiſe*. He was of a mild and peaceable diſpoſition, he had a great deal of wit, much reading, and a vaſt knowledge. Such a mixture of natural and acquired qualities is commonly a ſource of irreſolution. A great genius, ſupported with a vaſt knowledge, will ſcarce find error to be altogether on one ſide. He diſcovers a ſtrong and a weak ſide in each party, he underſtands what is moſt ſpecious in the objections of his adverſaries, and what is not ſolid in his own proofs; he does, I ſay, all this, provided he be not of a choleric temper; for if he be, he is ſo prepoſſeſſed in favour of his own party, that his knowledge is of no ſervice to him. He does not only perſuade himſelf that he is in the right, but he has ſuch a fondneſs for his own ſentiments, as moves him to hate bitterly the doctrine that oppoſes them. From the hatred of opinions he quickly proceeds to hate the perſons; he aſpires to triumph, and being heated with diſpute, he is fretted till he obtains the victory: he is angry with thoſe who repreſent to him, that it is for the intereſt of heavenly truth, that we ſhould not have recourſe to expedients of human policy. He is no leſs troubled if he hears any body ſay, that his doctrines are not certain and evident, and that the contrary party can alledge good reaſons. Being of ſuch a temper, he examines things only for this end, that he may be more and more convinced, that the doctrines he has embraced are true, and he does not fail to find much ſolidity in his own arguments; for there is no mirror ſo flattering as prepoſſeſſion: it is a paint that embelliſhes the uglieſt faces; it does the ſame offices to a doctrine that the Venus of the Roman Poet did to her ſon.

Reſtitit Æneas, claraque in luce refulſit;
Os humeroſque Deo ſimilis: namque ipſa decoram
Cæſariem nato genitrix, lumenque juventæ
Purpureum, & lætos oculis afflarat honores.
Quale manus addunt ebori decus, aut ubi flavo
Argentum, Pariuſve lapis circumdatur auro (68).

Confeſs'd Æneas ſtood, and ſhone in light
Serene, in ſhape, and features like a God:
For Venus with the roſy bloom of youth
Had fluſh'd her ſon, with graceful looks adorn'd,
And breath'd a ſparkling luſtre on his eyes.
Such is the beauty which the artiſt's hands
To poliſh'd iv'ry lends: ſo ſilver ſhines,
Or Parian ſtone, enchas'd in yellow gold. TRAPP.

Melanchthon not having this temper, could not be ſo ſteady in his opinions. He was ſo cool, that he examined matters freely *pro* and *con*; and becauſe he loved peace, and deplored the confuſions which the ſchiſm gave birth to, he was more diſpoſed to judge favourably of ſeveral doctrines, which hot men made the foundation of a rupture, and which he would have had tolerated to facilitate a re-union. His modeſty and experience rendered him a little diſtruſtful. He was perſuaded that his knowledge might increaſe every day, for he remembered that he had corrected many things in his own writings, which he believed to be good when he firſt publiſhed them; but time taught him to withdraw his approbation, and to apply to himſelf a fine paſſage of Terence

Nunquam ita quiſquam bene ſubducta ratione ad vitam fuit.
Quin res, ætas, uſus, ſemper aliquid apportet novi,
Aliquid moneat: ut illa, quæ te ſcire credas neſcias
Et quæ tibi putâris prima, in experiundo ut repudies.
Quod mihi evenit nunc - - - - (69).

No man ever formed a plan of life ſo exactly, but that experience, age, and practice, always taught him ſomething new, and convinced him, that he was ignorant of what he thought he knew, and that he was to reject what he imagined was chiefly to be approved. This happens to be my caſe.

Could he warrant that time would not teach him ſtill better? This is what hindered him from being peremptory in his opinions. He lived among a ſort of people who appeared to him paſſionate, and too forward to mix human methods, and the authority of the ſecular power with the affairs of the church. His tender conſcience made him fear there was a mark of reprobation in it (70). Wherefore then did he continue in that party, will you ſay, if he had no poſitive aſſurance that it was the cauſe of God? It may be anſwered, whither would you have him go? Would not he have found in the Romiſh communion more things to be condemned, and more heat and oppreſſion of conſcience? Do not you think he had well weighed all inconveniences, when he caſt his eyes upon Paleſtine, to retire thither in caſe his enemies ſhould drive him away. 'Non frangor animo, propter crudeliſſimam vocem meorum hoſtium, qui dixerunt, ſe mihi non relicturos eſſe veſtigium pedis in Germania. Commendo autem me filio Dei. Si ſolus expellar: Decrevi Palæſtinam adire, & in illis Hieronymi latebris, in invocatione Filii Dei, & teſtimonia perſpicua de doctrina ſcribere, & in morte Deo animam commendare (71). - - - - *I am not dejected at the cruel clamour of my enemies, who have threatned they will not leave me a footſtep in Germany. But I commit my ſelf to the ſon of* GOD. *If I ſhall be driven away alone, I am determined to go to Paleſtine, and in thoſe lurking places of Jerom, by calling upon the ſon of* GOD *to write clear teſtimonies of the Divine doctrine, and in death to recommend my ſoul to* GOD.' Compare with this the deſign that Abelard had to retire among the Infidels (72).

ADVANTAGES of vice, and bad conſequences of virtue on ſome occaſions.

Let us here admire a peculiar character of the fate of man: his virtues are liable to conſequences that are ſomewhat vicious, and have their inconveniencies; his bad qualities, on the contrary, produce good effects on ſeveral occaſions. Modeſty, moderation, love of peace, form in the minds of the moſt knowing men, a certain principle of equity, which makes them in ſome meaſure luke-warm and unreſolved. Pride and paſſion make a great Doctor ſo dogmatical and ſelf-conceited, that he does not entertain the leaſt doubt, and will undertake and endure any thing for the advancement and propagation of his own opinions. If by good luck he lights upon the truth, what ſervices will he not do it? They will doubtleſs be greater, than they would be if he were of a more moderate temper. The ties of prejudice, or, if you pleaſe, the weight of the paſſions, do more ſtrongly faſten the ſoul to the truth, than the charms of light. Note, that I ſay nothing of the good effects of grace, both upon conſtitutions that are too phlegmatic, and too choleric. I conſider the matter only philoſophically, and under this notion we may truly ſay, that as to what concerns the intereſt of a ſect, a man who is obſtinate and violent, is preferable to a wiſe man. And if any founder of a ſect, deſires that his diſciples ſhould labour with ſucceſs in ſpreading and propagating his doctrine, he ſhould wiſh that they were of ſuch a temper, as never to depart from any thing, and to eſpouſe for all their life the firſt party they embrace. If they pitch upon it before they are capable of weighing well the reaſons on both ſides, ſo much the better; they will be the farther from doubting for the future, and the leſs they doubt, the more obſtinate and fiery they will be: whereas thoſe who propoſe to inform themſelves more and more every day, do not think themſelves obliged to ſhow a very great zeal; for they imagine, that what appears true to them to day, will appear to them at another time leſs probable than what they do not at all believe. Cicero, expreſſes very well theſe different characters, ſpeaking of the Sceptics and Dogmatiſts. 'Neque noſtræ diſputationes, *ſays he* (73), quicquam aliud agunt, niſi ut in utramque partem dicendo, & audiendo eliciant & tanquam exprimant aliquid, quod aut verum ſit, aut id quàm proxime accedat. Neque inter nos & eos qui ſcire ſe arbi-

'trantur

(67) Flor. de Remond, ubi ſupra, *book ii, cap. ix, pag.* 181.

(68) Virgil Æn. *lib. i, ver.* 588.

(69) Terent. Adelph. act v, ſc. iv, init.

(70) Conſult the paſſages cited by the biſhop of Meaux, *Hiſt. des Variations, book ii, num.* 44; *book iv, num.* 23; *book v, num.* 33.

(71) Melanchth. apud Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 357.

(72) See the article ALCIATUS (JOHN PAUL) at the remark [*E*].

(73) Cicero, de Academ. Quæſt. *lib. ii, cap.* iii.

Peripatetic Philoſophy [*K*]. There is infinitely more reaſon to pretend that he did not believe

trantur quicquam intereſt, niſi quod illi non dubitant quin ea vera ſint quæ defendunt: Nos probabilia multa habemus, quæ ſequi facile, affirmare vix poſſumus. Hoc autem liberiores & ſolutiores ſumus, quod integra nobis eſt judicandi poteſtas, neque ut omnia quæ præſcripta & quaſi imperata ſint, defendamus, neceſſitate ulla cogimur. Nam cæteri primum ante tenentur aſtricti, quam quid eſſet optimum, judicare potuerunt. Deinde infirmiſſimo tempore ætatis aut obſecuti amico cuidam, aut una alicujus quem primum audierunt, ratione capti, de rebus incognitis judicant, & ad quamcunque ſunt diſciplinam quaſi tempeſtate delati, ad eam tanquam ad ſaxum adhæreſcunt. Nam quod dicunt, omnino ſe credere ei, quem judicent fuiſſe ſapientem, probarem, ſi id ipſum rudes & indocti judicare potuiſſent. Statuere enim quid ſit ſapiens, vel maxime videtur eſſe ſapientis. Sed ut potuerunt omnibus rebus auditis, cognitis etiam reliquorum ſententiis judicaverunt, aut re ſemel audita ad unius ſe authoritatem contulerunt. Sed neſcio quomodo plerique errare malunt, eamque ſententiam quam adamaverunt, pugnaciſſime defendere, quàm ſine pertinacia quid conſtantiſſime dicant exquirere. - - - - *The deſign of our diſputations is nothing elſe, but by arguing and hearing both ſides of the queſtion, to draw forth, and as it were to ſqueeze out, the truth, or what comes very near it. Nor is there any difference between us and them, who think themſelves knowing, but that they entertain no doubt about the truth of what they defend: and we think many things probable, which we can readily follow, but can hardly aver for certain. In this however we are more free and independent, that we have entire liberty to judge, and are by no means compelled to defend all that is preſcribed, and in a manner commanded. For the others are pre-engaged before they could judge what was beſt. And moreover, being ſwayed in the weakeſt time of life by ſome friend, or led away by the firſt that inſtructed them, they judge of things without examination, and whatever opinion they are caſt upon, as it were by a tempeſt, they cleave to it as to a rock. And as to what they ſay, that they entirely believe him, whom they judge to have been a wiſe man, I ſhould approve it, if ignorant and illiterate perſons were capable of judging that. For to determine what a wiſe man is, ſeems chiefly to be the province of a wiſe man. But I know not how it is, moſt people chuſe rather to err, and ſtiffly to defend the opinion they love, than, without partiality, to ſearch out what they may ſtedfaſtly maintain.*'

[*K*] *Some have falſly accuſed him of hating the Peripatetic Philoſophy.*] I have cited elſewhere (74) Father Rapin, who places Melanchthon in the catalogue of the modern Heretics, who have declamed againſt Ariſtotle and his Philoſophy. This accuſation is not well grounded, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter (75), and would be ſufficiently refuted by ſetting down here what Melanchthon wrote to the chancellor of Bavaria in 1535. ‘ Vere judicas plurimum intereſſe Reipublicæ ut Ariſtoteles conſervetur, & extet in ſcholis ac verſetur in manibus diſcentium. Nam profecto ſine hoc autore, non ſolum non retineri pura philoſophia, ſed ne quidem juſta docendi aut diſcendi ratio ulla poterit (76). - - - *You judge truly that it very much concerns the State, that Ariſtotle be preſerved, and that it remains in ſchools, and be much read by ſcholars. For indeed without this author, neither pure Philoſophy, nor even a juſt method of teaching and learning can be kept up.*' The Logic of the ſchools, of all the parts of Philoſophy, was that which was leaſt grateful to the Reformers; for they looked upon it as the ſource of vain ſubtilties, which made young people loſe a great deal of time, and corrupted Theology; yet Melanchthon declared for Logic. His teſtimony was cited by Caramuel in the catalogue he has given us of ſome Proteſtant Doctors, who recommend the ſtudy of that part of Philoſophy. ‘ Philippus Melanchthon, *ſays he* (77), Lutheri diſcipulus fuit, & tametſi Magiſter parvi Logicam penderet, ipſe maximi eam fecit, & inter alia in præfatione Erotem. Dialect. hæc ſcripſit. *Hos & adhortor, & propter gloriam Dei, ac propter Eccleſiæ ſalutem obteſtor ne dialecticen negligant, nec applaudant inſulſis ſermonibus eorum qui vituperant eam & Eccleſiæ inutilem eſſe &c. imo Dialectica opus eſt non ſolum ut doctrina lucem habeat, ſed etiam ut ſit concordiæ vinculum - - - Philip Melanchthon was the diſciple of Luther, and tho' his maſter undervalued Logic, he himſelf had a vaſt opinion of it; and, among other things, he wrote thus:* I exhort and beſeech them, both for the glory of God, and the welfare of the church, not to neglect Logic, nor applaud the fooliſh diſcourſes of thoſe who reproach it, and ſay it is uſeleſs to the church, *&c.* Nay, Logic is not only neceſſary, that the doctrine may receive light, but alſo that it may be the bond of peace.' The Jeſuit James Gretſer, deſigning to combat the hatred which Luther expreſſed againſt the Philoſophy of Ariſtotle, oppoſes Melanchthon to him and cites a long paſſage out of this diſciple of Luther: ‘ A quo, *ſays he* (78), hanc Apologiam mutuabimur, niſi ab illo, cui Lutherus plurimum tribuere ſolebat: quique ea, quæ olim in Ariſtotelem conjecerat, maledicta laudibus poſtea diſpunxit? Is eſt Melanchthon qui in oratione de Ariſtotele * à Flocco quodam Norimbergenſi recitata his verbis Logicam Ariſtotelicam adverſus Lutheri criminationes nobis dat defenſam. *Nunc quædam de genere Philoſophiæ addam cur Ariſtotelicum maxime nobis in Eccleſia uſui eſſe arbitremur. Conſtare arbitror inter omnes, maxime nobis in Eccleſia opus eſſe Dialectica, quæ methodos recte informat, quæ dextre definit, juſte partitur, apte connectit, judicat, & divellit monſtroſas connexiones. Hanc artem qui non norunt lacerant materias explicandas, ut catuli panniculos. Libet enim uti Platonis ſimilitudine. Vere eam Plato laudibus effert, inquiens igniculum eſſe, quem Prometheus è cœlo attulerit, ut in mentibus hominum lumen accenderet ad recte judicandum. Sed artis præcepta nuſquam tradit. Carere igitur Ariſtotelis monumentis non poſſumus. Stoica non extant, & apparet intricatos Labyrinthos, & corruptelas artis fuiſſe, non ſimplicem diſſerendi viam, utilem explicationi magnarum rerum.* Hæc Philippus pro Ariſtotelis Logicâ contra Lutheri amentiam. - - - *From whence ſhall we borrow this apology, but from him, for whom Luther uſed to have a vaſt eſteem; and who afterwards cancelled with praiſes, thoſe reproaches he had formerly thrown upon Ariſtotle? It is Melanchthon, who, in an oration on Ariſtotle, ſpoken by one Floccus of Nuremberg, defends, the Logic of Ariſtotle againſt the charge of Luther in the following words:* Now I will add ſomething concerning Philoſophy, why I judge that of Ariſtotle to be moſt uſeful in the church. I think it is agreed by all, that Logic is moſt neceſſary for us in the church, becauſe it teaches method and order, it defines fitly, divides juſtly, connects aptly, judges, and ſeparates monſtrous connexions. Thoſe who are ignorant of this art, tear the ſubject to be treated on, as puppies do rags. For I like to uſe Plato's ſimilitude. Plato juſtly extols it by calling it the fire, which Prometheus brought from Heaven, to kindle a light in the minds of men to enable them to judge rightly. But he no where gives the precepts of the art. We cannot therefore be without Ariſtotle's Logic. That of the Stoics is not extant, and it appears to have been intricate, and a corruption of the art, not a ſimple way of reaſoning, fit for explaining great things. *Thus far Philip for Ariſtotle's Logic againſt the madneſs of Luther.*' The ſequel of this paſſage of Melanchthon recited by Gretſer, contains great praiſes upon the Phyſics and Moral Philoſophy of Ariſtotle.

It is not therefore neceſſary to juſtify Melanchthon upon this head, his own works ſufficiently juſtify him; but I muſt not forget a miſtake of Father Rapin. He cites (79) a Theſis maintained by Luther at Heidelberg in the year 1518, wherein Ariſtotle was ill-uſed. ‘ Luther, continues he, lets no occaſion ſlip in his books of inveighing againſt this Philoſopher, wherein he is followed by Zuinglius, Peter Martyr, Zanchius, Melanchthon, and by all thoſe who have oppoſed the doctrine of the Romiſh church; which made Melchior Canus ſay, *&c.*' All this, and what he had juſt ſaid of the Anabaptiſts, is taken out of a book of George Hornius, which he cites. Now the words of that author are theſe: ‘ Ibique (*Lutherus*) pluribus Ariſtotelem exagitat. Zuinglius etiam, P. Martyr, Zanchius & alii excelſiſſime

(74) In the remark [*Y*] of the article ARISTOTLE.

(75) At the end of this remark.

(76) Melanchth. Epiſt. ad Leonhardum Eccium. *It is the* 116*th of the firſt book, pag. m.* 165.

(77) Jo. Caramuel, Theolog. Rational. *Tom. ii, pag.* 42. Edit. Francof. 1654, *in folio.*

(78) Jacob. Gretſer. inaugur. Doctor. *pag.* 60, 61.

* *Melanchth. Tom. iii, Declamat.*

(79) Rapin, Reflexions ſur la Philoſophie, *pag. m.* 451.

believe the real preſence [*L*], nor that Grace was irreſiſtible (*bb*). Frier de St Romuald affirms,

‘florebant Philoſophiæ laudibus. Omnes tamen exſuperavit divinum *Philippi* Melanchtonis ingenium, qui ſcriptis ſuis totam Philoſophiam ita illuſtravit, ut vere author ejus & fatalis in Germania inſtaurator dici poſſit. Illuſtravit Dialecticam, Ethicam, Phyſicam, & Mathematicas diſciplinas: expurgavit ſpinas Philoſophorum: id denique effecit, ut Philoſophia mox florentiſſima efficeretur (80). - - - - *And there Luther inveighs much againſt Ariſtotle. Zwinglius alſo, P. Martyr, Zanchius, and others eminently diſtinguiſhed themſelves in Philoſophy. But the divine genius of Philip Melanchthon ſurpaſſed them all, who by his writings has ſo illuſtrated all Philoſophy, that he may be truly called the author, and deſtined reſtorer of it in Germany. He has illuſtrated Logic, Ethics, Phyſics, and Mathematics: he has cleared the intricacy of the Philoſophers, and, in fine, brought Philoſophy to the moſt flouriſhing condition.*’ The particle *etiam* being put a little after the words which ſignify that Luther inveighed againſt Ariſtotle, made Rapin think, that Zuinglius, and the other reformers named by Hornius, inveighed alſo againſt Ariſtotle; but he might eaſily have known that this was far from the thoughts of Hornius. The elogium he beſtowed upon Melanchthon might be ſtill further enlarged; for this great man did not only illuſtrate all the parts of Philoſophy; but there is ſcarce any art or ſcience about which he did not write, and endeavour to facilitate the ſtudy of them by eaſy and plain methods. What ſhall we ſay then of thoſe who were ſo impudent as to publiſh, that Melanchthon and Carloſtad cried down all the ſciences, that they turned artificers, and rendered all the ſchools like a deſart, ſo that there was nothing to be ſeen in them but cobwebs (81)? It would be difficult to find profeſſors who read ſo many lectures, and to ſo many people as he did (82). He often read three or four lectures in a day (83), and there is reaſon to believe, that when he married he did not interrupt his academic exerciſes, except on his wedding-day, which may be inferred from this diſtich:

A ſtudiis hodie facit ocia grata Philippus,
Nec vobis Pauli dogmata ſacra leget.

Reſt from your ſtudies: Philip ſays you may.
He'll read no lectures on St Paul to day.

This was the notice which was given on that day to his auditors (84). He was the principal ſupport of the univerſity of Wittemberg. ‘Sua induſtria atque eruditione Wittembergicam Academiam præcipue ſuſtinuit: nec paſſus eſt vel bellis civilibus, vel inteſtinis odiis ſeſe ab ea abſtrahi: binas, ternas, quaternas quotidie ſcholas habuit eaſque frequentiſſimas: nullam autem horam vacuam à legendo, ſcribendo, differendo, conſulendo (85). - - - - *By his induſtry, and learning he principally ſupported the univerſity of Wittemberg: nor did he ſuffer himſelf to be drawn away from it either by civil-wars or inteſtine quarrels: he gave lectures twice, thrice, or four times a day, and that to a numerous audience, and not an hour did he ſpend without reading, writing, diſcourſing, or conſulting.*’

To ſpeak the truth without diſſimulation, I muſt here declare, that Melanchthon at the beginning followed the dance that Luther led him, and ſpoke ill of Ariſtotle: but he quickly changed his tone, and continued to recommend the Philoſophy of this founder of the Lyceum. Wherefore Father Rapin had no ground for the accuſation mentioned in the beginning of this remark; for we muſt not judge of a man by thoſe opinions which he quickly forſakes; but by thoſe wherein he continues all the reſt of his life. Father Gretſer might have taught Father Rapin how to ſpeak about this matter. See what I have already cited from that German Jeſuit, and what I am going to take from the ſame author. ‘Quid ad nos, quid Ariſtoteles impurus homo dicat? *vociferatur Philippus* †. *Et in Locis Anno Chriſti, MDXXIII, Argentorati editis:* ‡ Ariſtotelis doctrina eſt in univerſum quædam libido rixandi ut eum inter pareneticæ philoſophiæ ſcriptores ne poſtremo quidem loco dignemur. Quid ad me quid ſenſerit ille rixator? *inquit in iiſdem locis* ‡‡ *Philippus. Quanquam poſtea Vertumnus iſte ſtylum vertit, & maledicta in benedicta convertit* (86). - - - - *What is it to us, what Ariſtotle, that vile fellow, ſays?* cries Philip. And in his Common-places publiſhed at Straſburg, in the year 1523: *The doctrine of Ariſtotle is in general a certain violent deſire of quarrelling; ſo that I do not think him worthy even of the laſt place among the writers of the Parenetic Philoſophy.* What is it to me, *what the opinion of that quarrelſome fellow was?* Says Philip in the ſame Common-places. Tho' afterwards that turn-coat changed his ſtile, and turned his curſes into bleſſings.’ See the margin (87).

[*L*] *There would be more reaſon to pretend that he did not believe the real preſence.*] Peucer was heard to ſay (88), I. That Melanchthon, his father-in-law, having read the dialogue of Oecolampadius *de Cœna Domini*, forſook the opinion of the oral manducation, and that afterwards he triumphed in the argument from the authority of the Fathers. ‘Patribus doctrina Synuſiaſtarum fuit ignota: Auguſtinus craſſiſſimus fuit Swinglianus, ergo, &c. - - - *The doctrine of Conſubſtantiation was unknown to the Fathers: Auguſtin was a thorough-placed Zwinglian, therefore,* &c.’ II. That he did not believe a man could die with a greater glory than for the doctrine of the Euchariſt, and that he was angry with himſelf that he did not ſhow a greater courage in making an open profeſſion of his opinion. ‘Ah utinam poſſem eſſe fortior in confeſſione iſtius cauſæ, & alibi eſſem. Sed his moribus, his temporibus inter hos homines fieri id non poteſt, & habeo graves rationes mei conſilii. Interim dico ſententiam meam ubi video opus eſſe. - - - - - *I wiſh I could be more courageous in the profeſſion of that cauſe, and that I were ſomewhere elſe. But in theſe times, and conſidering the manners of theſe men, it cannot be done, and I have weighty reaſons for thinking ſo. In the mean time I declare my ſentiments when I ſee it neceſſary.*’ III. That in the year 1544, he explained himſelf freely to an Hungarian, who aſked his thoughts about the Euchariſt, and that the thing being reported to Luther and Pomeranus, the latter one day addreſſed himſelf in this manner to the people in a ſermon. *Moſt dear brethren, the church is in great danger, pray to God Almighty for ſome great perſons that are fallen into error.* IV. That Melanchthon underſtanding this was meant of him, could not ſuppreſs his anger, but went out of the church in the ſight of all the congregation; that he related this affair to Cruciger, and that they concluded to withdraw from Wittemberg; which they would have put in execution, if Luther had not paſſed his word, that the court of Saxony ſhould do them no hurt upon this occaſion. V. That Melanchthon lived under hard bondage at Wittemberg, and run the riſque three times of being ſent to priſon (89). VI. That he diſapproved the Concordate made in the year 1536, and the fearfulneſs of Bucer, which made him yield too much to Luther. ‘Nec tacebat de concordia Wittembergica inter Lutherum & Bucerum anno 1536, inita. Melanchthonem aiebat Bucerum ſæpe hortatum fuiſſe ne tantum Luthero largiretur, ſed Bucerum fuiſſe timidum, circumſeptum ab inimicis. Reliquos etiam ſuperioris Germaniæ Theologos nimis fracto & demiſſo animo fuiſſe. - - - - - - *Nor did he conceal his diſlike of the Concordate, made at Wittemberg in the year* 1536, *between Luther and Bucer. He ſaid Melanchthon had often exhorted Bucer not to yield ſo much to Luther, but that Bucer was fearful, being ſurrounded by enemies. That the other Divines of Upper-Germany were likewiſe too mean ſpirited.*’ Theſe are the diſcourſes which Peucer had with Scultetus, who went to ſee him at Deſſau in the year 1589.

But if one would be aſſured of the ſincerity of this relator, he needs only read the works of Peucer (90), and particularly that which was printed in 1596, by the care of Quirinus Reuterus, which is intituled, Tractatus hiſtoricus de clariſſimi viri Philippi Melanchthonis ſententia de controverſia cœnæ domini, à D. Caſparo Peucero ante plures annos ſcriptus, ſed jam primum ſeparatim boni publici ergo excuſus: Cum appendice ſelectarum epiſtolarum & judiciorum aliquot Philippi, aliorumque præſtantium virorum de eadem materia. - - - - - *An hiſtorical treatiſe of the opinion of of the famous Philip Melanchthon, on the controverſy about the Lord's Supper, written ſeveral years ago by the D. Caſparius Peucer, but now firſt printed by itſelf, for the*

(*bb*) See the article SYNERGISTS.

(80) Georg. Hornius, Hiſt. Philoſ. *lib. vi, cap. ix, pag.* 315.

(81) The Jeſuit Creſollius is one of them. *See* Morhoff. Polyhiſt. *pag.* 7, 8.

(82) See, below, in the remark [*P*] what Sabinus anſwered to cardinal Bembus.

(83) Konig. Bibl. *pag.* 527. *See below, citation* (85).

(84) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Philoſ. *pag.* 190.

(85) Id. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 355.

† Phil. in Apolog. pro Luth. & in Ludo contra Pariſienſ.

‡ Tit. de Peccato.

‡‡ Tit. de Lege.

(86) Jacob. Gretſer. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 45.

(87) *This may be confirmed by theſe words of Eraſmus,* Epiſt. ad fratres Germaniæ inferioris, *pag. m.* 2127. Nonne Melanchthon aliquando damnavit ſcholas publicas? Nunc hic dicit, maneant ſcholæ quæ bonæ ſunt, vitia corrigantur. - - - *Did not Melanchthon once condemn the public ſchools? Now he ſays, let good ſchools remain, and faults be corrected.*

(88) Abraham Schultetus, Narrat. Apologet. *pag.* 20, *& ſeq.*

(89) A Joanne Friderico Electore ter illi decretum fuiſſe carcerem. - - - *John Frederic the elector, determined three times to put him in priſon.* Id. ib.

(90) *As the* Hiſtoria Carcerum, *and the preface to the treatiſe* De præcipuis divinationum generibus.

affirms, that his body was burnt at Munich [*M*]. This appears to me to be a very groſs fiction. Mr Varillas has publiſhed ſuch ſtrange falſhoods [*N*], that it may be juſtly

the benefit of the public: with an appendix of ſome ſelect epiſtles and opinions of Philip, and other great men, on the ſame ſubject. Hoſpinian (91) will prove to you at large, that Melanchthon was undeceived and turned from Lutheraniſm, as to the point of the real preſence, although the fear of oppreſſion did not ſuffer him to declare his judgment openly. He hath collected together ſeveral proofs of this fear (92). The famous Melanchthon being threatned with baniſhment, declared at laſt, that he wiſhed for it as a kind of deliverance (93). He 'knew of no other remedy for all thoſe evils, but flight, and his ſon-in-law Peucer †† informs us, that he was reſolved upon it. He himſelf writes ⸸⸸, that Luther was ſo enraged againſt him, about a a letter received from Bucer, that he thought of nothing but withdrawing himſelf for ever from his preſence. He lived under ſuch continual conſtraint with Luther, and the heads of the party, and was ſo oppreſſed with labour and vexation, that, being quite ſpent, he wrote to his friend Camerarius: *I am*, ſays he ‡‡, *in bondage, as if I were in the cave of the Cyclop; for I cannot diſguiſe my ſentiments to you, and I have often thoughts of making my eſcape.* Luther was not the only perſon that was violent againſt him. Every one has the command at certain times among thoſe who forſake the lawful authority, and the moſt moderate are always the moſt enſlaved (94).' Note, that this paſſage of the biſhop of Meaux does not concern the conſtraint Luther was in, with reſpect to his doctrine of the Lord's Supper.

[*M*] *St Romuald affirms, that his body was burnt at Munich.*] 'Philip Melanchthon, a native of Breſſe (95) in Germany, died at Wittemberg, being a little above ſixty three years of age. He was the conſtant companion of Martin Luther. He was buried like him, honourably enough by people of their own ſtamp; but ſome time after, the Catholics * dug up his body and burnt it with great zeal at Munich: And becauſe in the mean time the caſtle took fire, and the lyons eſcaped, not without great danger to the inhabitants of the city, Du Pleſſis-Mornai took occaſion from thence to cry out, Juſta Domini judicia, *the juſt judgment of God.* This is in a letter he wrote to the Sieur Languet of Burgundy (96).' This good Monk quotes no body, and ſets down the year 1597, which is a good proof of his ignorance; for Languet died in 1581.

[*N*] *Mr Varillas has publiſhed ſuch ſtrange falſhoods.*] 'They give no leſs different accounts of Melanchthon's death, which happened almoſt at the ſame time; he was then ſixty three years and three days old (97). His mother, who attended him, having conjured him at his death to declare which of the religions was the beſt; he anſwered her, that the new was more plauſible, but the Catholic was more ſafe. Yet that which was moſt ſurprizing in him was, that his inconſtancy in matters of religion, did not hinder him from ſhowing a great firmneſs of ſoul under adverſity. He ſpent all his life in ſtudy, and ſeemed not to be capable of any other labour. He ſubſiſted with his wife and ſeveral daughters he had (98), upon the ſalary he received from John Frederic elector of Saxony, as profeſſor of Divinity, in the univerſity of Wittemberg. This ſalary was juſt ſufficient to maintain Melanchthon's family, who receiving it punctually every quarter, never troubled himſelf much about the time to come, becauſe he ſuppoſed this would be an inexhauſtible ſpring to ſupply him. But it happened, as we have ſhown in the 16th book of this hiſtory, that the elector of Saxony loſt his dominions and his liberty, and Melanchthon's ſalary was no longer paid. His houſhold-goods were of ſo little value, that they were not ſufficient to maintain him for any long time; and within a few months he was reduced to the neceſſity of begging or importuning his friends, every one of whom had ſuffered conſiderable loſſes in the general revolution of Saxony. Both theſe extremities were equally unpleaſant to him; and therefore he choſe rather to get his livelihood with the ſweat his brows, by going into a profeſſion very different from his own. He hired himſelf to a Brewer of beer, and ſerved three whole years in the brew-houſe, till duke Maurice being put in poſſeſſion of the electorate of Saxony, re-eſtabliſhed the univerſity of Wittemberg, and the ſalary of Melanchthon (99).' Note, that the mother of Melanchthon died in 1529, how then could ſhe aſk any queſtion in 1560? See, above, what I have ſaid in the remark [*E*] (99*). againſt Florimond de Remond. I will not trouble my ſelf with proving that he never hired himſelf to a Brewer: This is a ſtory whoſe falſity may be diſcovered by the bare inſpection of the courſe of the life of this learned Perſon. I ſhall add, by the by, that thoſe who ſay that, in the year 1524, *Luther took Melanchthon out of a Baker's ſhop* (100), *to whom he had bound himſelf apprentice to get a livelihood* (101) with the ſweat of his brows, are groſly miſtaken.

Not to ſeparate the faults of Varillas, I referred to this place the narrative he has given us of the deſign of Francis I, with reſpect to Melanchthon. He ſuppoſes that the ſiſter (102), and the miſtreſs (103) of this prince, intrigued mightily to introduce the new religion into the kingdom (104), and that not ſucceeding in their attempt, built upon a ſermon of the curate of St Euſtache, they made uſe of another device, which was to perſuade the king to gain the Proteſtants of Germany, which would be very advantageous to him for oppoſing the too great power of Charles V, and they repreſented to him, that nothing would be more effectual to gain them, than to ſhew a great deſire of having a conference with Melanchthon (105). The firſt ſtep which this prince made in 'this affair, was the order which Langey received, who had known this divine in Saxony, to ſound him if he were inclining to change his chair of Theology at Wittemberg, whoſe income was only two hundred crowns a year, for a Royal Profeſſor's chair in the univerſity of Paris, at twelve hundred crowns a year (106).' The ſecond ſtep that he made was 'to commiſſion Langey to uſe his endeavours at the court of Saxony, *to obtain the leave that Melanchthon deſired*, and to give him a letter for this famous divine, ſigned with the king's own hand . . . . The elector of Saxony did no ſooner hear what the moſt chriſtian king deſired of him to let Melanchthon come, but he imagined that this would make all France turn Lutheran . . . . . He did not deliberate an inſtant upon the requeſt that was made to him, and not only parted with a man, whom he believed to be ſtill very neceſſary to him, but alſo exhorted him to ſet out immediately on his journey. But Luther, who could not be without Melanchthon, detained him a long time, upon pretence that he was to concert, or, to ſpeak more properly, to poliſh with him, his laſt book againſt the Anabaptiſts (107).' Melanchthon wrote a civil anſwer to Francis I, and concludes 'with an excuſe for not coming away the minute the elector, his maſter, had given him leave (108).' The cardinal of Tournon had the courage *to oppoſe this intrigue of the queen of Navarre, and the ducheſs of Etampes* (109). He made a diſcourſe which Francis I. reliſhed well; 'but the virtue which this prince affected moſt was to keep his word, and he ſuppoſed that it would be thought the more ſtrange, if he ſhould break it with reſpect to Melanchthon, becauſe that divine had not attempted of himſelf to come to Paris, neither had he conſented to do it, till he was invited in an honourable way. There was nothing therefore reſolved upon, and his majeſty's indifference had probably continued longer, if the ſame Lutherans who had ſo dextrouſly inſpired him with the deſire of ſeeing Melanchthon, had not made him averſe to it by an inſolent action, which put him quite out of conceit with them (110).' They had already poſted up ſome placards at his cloſet door, which had made him very angry; but he was much more offended 'at the printed bills which they ſlipt into the caſket that contained the linnen for the king's table, by means of Ferret a ſervant to his Apothecary. It was ſuſpected that they were compoſed by Farel . . . . The reading of theſe bills finiſhed the work which the cardinal of Tournon had begun, and Melanchthon was countermanded. The ſpreaders of theſe bills were ſearched for, and a very ſevere edict was publiſhed, which

(91) *See his ſecond volume* Hiſtoriæ Sacramentariæ, *pag.* 234, & paſſim alibi. *Conſult alſo the biſhop of Meaux*, Hiſt. des Variat. *livr. viii, num.* 39.

(92) See particularly, *pag.* 428. *& ſeq. Hiſt. Sacrament. Tom. ii.*

(93) Hoſpin. ib. *pag.* 430.

†† *Peuc. Ep. ad Vit. Theod. Hoſp. pag.* 2, *fol.* 193, *& ſeq.*

⸸⸸ *Mel. lib. iv, Epiſt.* 315.

‡‡ *Lib. iv,* 255.

(94) *The biſhop of Meaux*, Hiſt. des Variations, *livr. v, num.* 16.

(95) He ſhould have ſaid Bretten.

* *In the year* 1597.

(96) Peter de St Romuald, Abrégé Chronol. *Tom. iii, pag. m.* 328. ad ann. 1560.

(97) He ſhould have ſaid ſixty three days.

(98) He had but two.

(99) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, *Tom. v, book xxiv, pag.* 277, *Dutch Edit.*

(99*) Citat. (29).

(100) Florimond de Remond, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, *livr. i, cap. ii, pag.* 95.

(101) Id. ib. *book ii, cap. ii, pag.* 126.

(102) Margaret queen of Navarre.

(103) The ducheſs of Etampes.

(104) Varillas, ibid. *Tom. ii, book x, pag.* 312.

(105) Id. ib. *pag.* 317, 319.

(106) Id. ib. *pag.* 321.

(107) Id. ib. *pag.* 322.

(108) Ib. *pag.* 323.

(109) Ib. *p.* 324.

(110) Ib. *p.* 325.

juſtly thought a needleſs labour to confute them. The violence wherewith Melanchthon was calumniated during his life, perſecuted him even after his Death (*cc*). It is aſtoniſhing, that amidſt ſo many other occupations he could write ſo many books. The number of them is prodigious; a Chronological catalogue of them was publiſhed in the year 1582 (*dd*). As he ſaw that his works, tho' he did not finiſh them, nay tho' he publiſhed them pretty imperfect, were nevertheleſs profitable to the youth, he rather choſe to print many of them, than to perfect a ſmall number (*ee*). And ſo he preferred the advantage of the public to his own glory. We may believe alſo that the happy genius wherewith he was naturally endowed, gave him ſome aſſurance that his works would be eſteemed, tho' they were not finiſhed (*ff*). His Latin verſes pleaſed the hypercritical Julius Cæſar Scaliger (*g g*). He ſometimes aſſumed a falſe name in the title of his books [*O*]. Cardinal

(*cc*) *See* Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. *pag.* 357, 358, & Bucholcher. Ind. Chron. ad ann. 1560, *pag. m.* 600.

(*dd*) Mar. Mylius is the author of that catalogue. See *Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. pag.* 347.

(*ee*) *See* Melch. Adam. ibid. *pag.* 361.

(*ff*) *See* Eraſmus, in Ciceroniano.

(*gg*) Jul. Cæſar Scalig. Poët. *lib. vi, pag. m.* 736.

‘ the cardinal, chancellor Duprat, had drawn up againſt the Lutherans. On the twenty ninth of January 1535, there was a ſolemn proceſſion, at which the king aſſiſted on foot bare-headed, and with a wax-taper in his hand (111).’

There are many falſhoods in this narrative. In the Iſt place I deſire a good warrant, before I believe upon the authority of Varillas (112), that the ducheſs of Etampes concerned herſelf out of love to the Proteſtants, among other intrigues, in that of Melanchthon's journey, and that he was offered the chair of Regius profeſſor. II. It appears by the kings letter to Melanchthon, that he who carried it was called la Foſſe: And therefore it was not given to Mr de Langey. III. The elector of Saxony was ſo far from believing that Melanchthon's journey would make all France Lutheran, that one of the reaſons why he would not conſent to it, was, that he thought it would rather hinder than further the progreſs of the Reformation. This appears by the original letters which he wrote upon this occaſion (113.) IV. He was ſo far from granting Melanchthon the liberty that was neceſſary without deliberating a moment, and moreover from *exhorting him to ſet forward on his journey preſently*, that, on the contrary, he could not be prevailed upon, neither by the intreaties of that Profeſſor, nor by thoſe of Luther, nor by the good offices of the ambaſſador of France (114.) He wrote his excuſes to Francis I, the 28th of Auguſt 1535 (115). The ambaſſador continued ſtill to ſollicit, and all to no purpoſe, till the month of December the ſame year (116). V. Luther did not *detain Melanchthon a long time*, but, on the contrary, made repeated inſtances to the court of Saxony for his journey. ‘ Extant Lutheri ad electorem literæ d. 17. Aug. datæ tom. vi. fol. 491. in quibus repetitis & enixiſſimis precibus contendit ut Philippus ad tres menſes dimittatur (117). - - - - - - *Luther's letter to the elector dated the 17th day of Auguſt, is to be ſeen tom.* vi. *fol.* 491. *in which he moſt earneſtly begs, again and again, that Philip might be ſent in three months time.*’ VI. It is horrible impudence to ſay, that Melanchthon in a letter to the king, *concluded with an excuſe that he had not come away the very minute the elector, his maſter, had given him leave*. There is no ſuch thing in his letter, and he could not, without telling a lye, mention the permiſſion of his maſter. VII. The time of the placards ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from that wherein the bills were ſlipt into the caſket of Francis I, and if Varillas had a mind to have made a diſtinction, the bills ſhould have preceded the placards. And indeed Florimond de Remond, whom Varillas here does only paraphraſe upon, ſuppoſes that the Heretics did not poſt up any placards (118), till after they had *diſperſed ſeveral books here and there . . . . . and cauſed their articles of faith to be thrown into the king's cloſet by his Apothecary's ſervant called Ferret, and even little bills into the caſket that contained the linnen for his table* (119). VIII. The ſharpeſt things that were ſaid againſt the maſs and the prieſts, were not in thoſe bills, but in the placards (120). IX. Varillas cannot prove that Francis I. countermanded Melanchthon; he ſtill deſired to have him in the month of December 1535, after the letter he received from the elector of Saxony, full of excuſes for not granting to this doctor leave to go into France. It is therefore very probable that Francis I. was never under a neceſſity to countermand him. X. It is very certain that the placards did not induce him to it, for they were poſted up in the month of November 1534. The king puniſhed this inſolence, and expiated that affront to the hoſt, in the month of January following; and he wrote to Melanchthon five months after. Can one ſufficiently wonder at the negligence of Mr Varillas? He gives the ſubſtance of the letter which Francis I. wrote to Melanchthon, and he might have ſeen that it is dated the twenty eighth of June 1535. He ſays (121), that the expiatory proceſſion for the placards was made the twenty ninth of January 1535 (122), and yet he affirms, that the occaſion of the proceſſion was the cauſe why the German Divine received a counter-order.

If he had complained that his Hiſtory of Hereſy had been taken for a Romance, he would hardly have had more reaſon for doing ſo, than *la Calprenede* had, who took it very heinouſly, that his Caſſandra and Cleopatra were not looked upon as Hiſtories. ‘ Nay, I will ſay, for the honour of theſe works, *ſays he* (123), that juſtice is not done them by the name that is given them, though perhaps they have been pretty well received in the world, and that inſtead of calling them Romances, as the Amadis, and other ſuch like, wherein there is neither truth, nor probability, nor Geography, nor Chronology, they may be looked upon as hiſtories embelliſhed with ſome invention, which by theſe ornaments loſe nothing of their beauty. And indeed I can juſtly ſay, that in Caſſandra and Cleopatra, there is not only nothing contrary to truth, although there be ſome things beyond it; but that there is not any place wherein I can be convicted of a lie, and which I am not able to maintain, by all the circumſtances of the hiſtory, to be true when I pleaſe. And there are ſeveral intelligent perſons too, who have formed the ſame judgment of them, and who have looked upon me as a man better ſkilled in the affairs of the courts of Auguſtus and Alexander, than thoſe who have writ their hiſtories.’ This is an arrant rodomontade, and there are very few things more romantic than this in the works of that author. Nevertheleſs I dare repeat it, that Mr Varillas could not make the like complaints with much more reaſon. For the reſt, it is matter of aſtoniſhment, that ſo many French writers ſhould be guilty of the ſophiſm *à non cauſa pro cauſa, to aſſign for a cauſe what is not ſo*, ſpeaking of this affair of Melanchthon. They pretend that the fixing up of placards by the Proteſtants hindered his journey; and yet it is certain that by accident it was the cauſe why he was ſent for. How much ſoever they are to blame; they are leſs ſo than the Jeſuit Sandæus (124), who durſt call in queſtion what Thuanus relates, that Francis I. wrote to Melanchthon, *&c.* Conſult Mr Crenius, who ſolidly refutes the impudence of this writer, and his unjuſt contempt of Melanchthon (125).

[*O*] *He ſometimes aſſumed a falſe name in the title page of his books.*] He called himſelf Didymus Faventinus in the anſwer he wrote in 1520, to an oration which Thomas Rhadinus, a Dominican and Profeſſor of Divinity at Rome, had publiſhed againſt Luther. You will find an abridgment of that anſwer in Mr Seckendorf (126). But let no man think, becauſe the author declaims very ſharply againſt the errors of the ſchool-men, that I was to blame in maintaining, that he did not diſapprove Ariſtotle's Philoſophy. To know exactly the ſentiments of an author, we muſt not inſiſt upon what he ſays in an invective written againſt another invective; but we muſt learn his judgment from his didactical writings or his letters, or, in general, from ſuch works as do not ſavour of declamation. Every one knows how a man grows warm and exaggerates matters in harangues. After all, becauſe a man cenſures very ſharply the dangerous impertinencies wherewith the ſchool-mens Philoſophy is ſtuffed, it does not follow that he condemns Ariſtotle's Philoſophy. Mr Placcius having obſerved (127) that Hoornbeeck attributed to Melanchthon

(111) Ib. *p.* 326.

(112) Note, that Florimond de Remond, *book vii, cap. iii*, ſays the ſame thing, but his authority requires another to ſupport it.

(113) *See* Seckendorf, Hiſtor. Lutheraniſmi, *lib. iii, pag.* 109, 110.

(114) Seckend. ib. *pag.* 107.

(115) Ib. *p.* 110.

(116) Ibid.

(117) Ib. *p.* 107.

(118) Florimond de Remond, ubi ſupra, *book vii, cap. v, pag.* 859.

(119) Varillas attributes this to the ſervant, and ſo does not keep to his original.

(120) Florimond de Remond, ubi ſupra.

(121) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 326.

(122) Beginning the year with the month of January.

(123) La Calprenede, *preface to* Pharamond.

(124) Maximil. Sandæus in pædia Academici Chriſtiani, Commentat. vii, *pag.* 250, Edit. Colon. 1638, in 8vo, *apud Crenium ubi infra.*

(125) Crenius, Animadv. Philolog. *Part ii, pag.* 24, *& ſeq.*

(126) Seckendorf, ubi ſupra, *lib. i, pag.* 108, *& ſeq.*

(127) Placcius de Pſeudonymis, *pag.* 185, 186.

Cardinal Bembus aſked three queſtions which deſerve to be related [*P*].

Melanchthon the Greek verſion of the Augſburg Confeſſion, which appeared under the name of Paul Dolſcius (128), believed that the tranſlation of Eccleſiaſticus and the Pſalms into Greek verſe, was the work of Melanchthon, though the name of Paul Dolſcius is prefixed to them. This opinion of Placcius, which was adopted by Mr Teiſſier (129) and Mr Crenius (130), is found to be falſe. Mr Lyſerus (131) eccleſiaſtic counſellor to H. E. H. the duke of Hanover, has proved, that the tranſlations of the Pſalter, Eccleſiaſtes, and Eccleſiaſticus, into Greek verſe, and of the Augſburg Confeſſion into Greek proſe, do really belong to Paul Dolſcius (132), whoſe name they bear. See the letter which he wrote to Mr Crenius (133). Here let us obſerve a piece of negligence in Melchior Adam. He affirms, that in 1559 Melanchthon wrote in Greek to the patriarch of Conſtantinople, and ſent him a copy of the Greek verſion of the Confeſſion of Augſburg (134), which verſion, adds he, had been made by Melanchthon, although it was publiſhed under the name of Dolſcius: And preſently after he cites theſe words. ‘ Mitto tibi ‘ interpretationem Græcam confeſſionis ſine meo con‘ſilio editam. Probo tamen phraſin, ac miſi Conſtan‘tinopolim (135). - - - *I ſend you the Greek verſion of* ‘ *the Confeſſion, which was publiſhed without my advice.* ‘ *However, I like the ſtile, and have ſent it to Con*‘*ſtantinople.*’ Theſe words are Melanchthon's, and ſhow that he did not make this verſion. Wherefore we may ſay, that Melchior Adam produces a witneſs againſt himſelf, when he thought to prove what he had affirmed.

It is pretended, that Melanchthon ſometimes called himſelf Hippophilus Melangæus (136); but I have ſeen nothing of his under this diſguiſe.

[*P*] *Cardinal Bembus aſked three queſtions which deſerve to be related.*] Melanchthon wrote to him a letter, to recommend to him George Sabinus, who was going to ſee Italy (137). The cardinal had a great regard to this recommendation, he ſhowed much civility to Sabinus, and invited him to dine with him. He aſked him ſeveral queſtions during the time of dinner, and particularly theſe three: *What is the ſalary of Melanchthon? What is the number of his auditors? And what is his judgment concerning another life and the reſurrection?* To the firſt Sabinus anſwered, that Melanchthon's ſalary was but three hundred florins a year. O ungrateful Germany, ſaid the cardinal, which purchaſes at ſo cheap a rate ſo many works of ſuch a great man! The anſwer to the ſecond queſtion was, that Melanchthon had commonly fifteen hundred auditors. I cannot tell how to believe it, replied the cardinal, for I know not in all Europe any univerſity, beſides that of Paris, where the auditory of a profeſſor is ſo numerous. Yet Melanchthon had often two thouſand five hundred perſons at his lectures. To the third queſtion it was anſwered, that the writings of Melanchthon teſtify ſufficiently his full perſuaſion as to thoſe two articles. I ſhould have a better opinion of him, replied the cardinal, if he did not believe this (138). I give you this ſtory as I find it in Melchior Adam.

(128) *Hoornbeeck* Summa Controverſ. *lib. ii, pag.* 979, Edit. 2.

(129) Teiſſier, Addit. aux Elog. *Tom. i, pag.* 192.

(130) Crenius, Animadv. Philol. & Hiſtor. *Part ii, pag.* 23.

(131) Great grandſon of Polycarp LYSERUS, of whom I have given an article.

(132) He was rector of the college of Hall in Saxony, and then Phyſician, and at laſt burgo-maſter of the ſame city. He died in the year 1589.

(133) It is at the end of the third part of the Animadverſions of Mr Crenius.

(134) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 351.

(135) Melanchth. Epiſt. ad Bordingum apud Melch. Adamum, ibid.

(136) See Moreri at the word *Melanchthon*, and Mr Baillet in the catalogue of authors diſguiſed.

(137) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 360.

(138) Haberem virum prudentiorem ſi hoc non crederet. - - - *I ſhould have a better opinion of his judgment, if he did not believe this.* Id. ib.

MELCHIORITES, an imaginary ſect, wherewith Prateolus, and the Jeſuit Gaultier have enlarged their catalogues of Heretics, the latter upon the authority of the former, and he again by copying the very words of Lindanus. They pretend that the founder of this ſect was the Anabaptiſt Melchior HOFMAN, of whom I have ſpoken in his place. But the Printer of Father Gaultier, having put *Hoſmannus* inſtead of *Hofmannus*, was the reaſon that Mr Moreri has given us (*a*) a chimerical Hereſiarch called *Melchior Hoſman.* And thus it is that typographical errors multiply perſons. If he had read the writer whom he quotes (*b*), he would perhaps have avoided this fault.

(*a*) *Under the word* Melchior.

(*b*) *He quotes* Prateole V. Melch. *Now it is in Prateolus,* Melchiore Hofmanno, *and not* Hoſmanno. *Note, that in the Paris edition* 1699, *inſtead of* V. Melch. *it is put* Vit. Melch. *This is a fault. The letter* V *ſignifies there* Voce, *i. e.* the word, *and not* Vita, *i. e.* Life.

MEMNON, General of the army of Darius the laſt King of Perſia, was of the iſle of Rhodes. He underſtood the art of war perfectly well, and gave his maſter the beſt advices that could be given him in the conjuncture of Alexander's expedition. Had he lived but a few years longer, the ſucceſſes of this conqueror had not been ſo ſwift, and even the whole face of affairs perhaps might have been changed. His deſign was to carry the war into Macedonia [*A*], whilſt the Macedonians were making war againſt the king

[*A*] *His deſign was to carry the war into Macedonia.*] This was the way the Romans uſed to force the terrible Hannibal to abandon Italy: they ſent a good army into Africa under the conduct of Scipio, which ſo alarmed Carthage, that they recalled Hannibal. This ſort of diverſion has been practiſed a hundred times to good purpoſe. Memnon, who intended to make uſe of it, thought it to be the ſureſt expedient that he could take for ſupporting the affairs of Perſia. He conſidered that no deciſive battle could be fought againſt the Macedonian forces, as long as they were only oppoſed in Aſia; there would be only interchanged blows, towns beſieged, and ſieges raiſed. At the beginning of the war he had attacked Cyzicus, and could not make himſelf maſter of it (1); but a little while after he forced Parmenio to raiſe the ſiege of Pitane (2). Theſe little ſucceſſes on each ſide ſerve only to perpetuate the war. And therefore when it was debated what courſe ſhould be taken againſt the king of Macedonia, who had already paſſed the Helleſpont, and was advancing as far as he could toward the provinces of the king of Perſia, his advice was, that they ſhould deſtroy all the frontiers, and embark all the troops to tranſport them into Macedonia. By this means Europe would be made the ſeat of war; Aſia would be at peace; the enemy not finding any means of ſubſiſtence in a country that had been waſted, would be forced to march back and return into Europe to ſecure his own kingdom. And certainly it was the ſafeſt courſe the Perſians could take; but the other generals did not like this advice; they thought it not becoming the grandeur of their monarch, and therefore they concluded that they ought to fight the enemy. *Perſarum duces . . . . quam belli contra Alexandrum gerendi inirent rationem, congreſſi deliberarant. Memnon ibi Rhodius, imperatoriis artibus perquam celebris, ne collatis ſignis dimicarent, ſed agris longe lateque pervaſtatis, neceſſariorum inopiâ ulterius progrediendi facultatem Macedonibus intercluderent, navalibuſque ſimul & terreſtribus copiis in Macedoniam deportatis, totam belli molem in Europam transferrent cenſebat. Etiamſi vero conſilium hujus viri optimum erat (ut eventus poſtea docuit) reliquorum tamen ducum aſſenſionem impetrare nequivit, ac ſi conſuleret ea quæ magnitudini animorum in Perſis neutiquam convenirent. Quare cum ſententia de conflictu cum hoſtibus ineundo perviciſſet, accitis undique copiis,* &c (3). The governour of Phrygia declared, that he would never ſuffer the ſmalleſt cottage under his government to be ſet on fire (4). Arſanes was wiſer ſome time after, for he practiſed in Cilicia, what Memnon had adviſed (5). O how ſtrange a thing is war! when the

(1) Diodor. Siculus, *lib. xvii, cap. vii.*

(2) Id. ib.

(3) Id. ib. *cap. xviii, pag. m.* 826, 827.

(4) Arſites Phrygiæ Satrapa ne unum quidem tugurium eorum qui ſibi ſubeſſent incendi ſe paſſurum adfirmaverat, inque ejus ſententiam à ceteris itum erat. *Freinſhem. Suplem. ad Curtium, lib. ii, cap. v, num.* 10. He cites Arrian. 1, 4, 20.

(5) Q. Curtius, *lib. iii, cap. iv.*

king of Perſia in Aſia. He had already performed great exploits in the iſle of Leſbos, which had very much terrified the other iſles; and he ſowed diſcord among the Grecians, to make a party there againſt Alexander: but this great deſign was ruined by his death. He had the advantage to know, by the conduct of Alexander with reſpect to him [*B*], that he was highly eſteemed, and even much feared by this great monarch. He performed his duty very well at the battle of Granicus (*a*), where the Perſians were ſo unfortunate as not to hinder the enemy from paſſing over the river, and getting the victory. He ſignalzed himſelf afterwards in the defence of Halicarnaſſus (*b*). He acted like a perſon of honour and a brave ſoul, in chaſtiſing a ſoldier who railed at Alexander [*C*]. His widow

the moſt charitable thing that can be done, is very often to ſet fire to great cities, and to burn all in many provinces, becauſe without this the whole kingdom would be loſt; and the pity which one ſhould ſhow to one of the members, would be a cruelty to the whole body (6). It is then pity to the whole, which inſpires men with cruelty to a part. Unhappy neceſſity! This is a fatal maxim when applied to matters of religion, as was done by Catherine de Medicis. 'The king being ſomewhat doubtful, the queen to encourage him, among other things, ſpoke theſe words; *Will it not be better*, ſaid ſhe, *to tear in pieces thoſe rotten members, than the boſom of the church, which is the Spouſe of our Lord?* She concluded with a ſentence taken from one of the ſermons of the biſhop of Bitonto, in theſe words: *Che pieta lor ſer crudela? Che crudelta lor ſer pietoſo* (7)? ---- *Pity would be cruelty. Cruelty would be pity.*' Let us return to Memnon. After the battle of Granicus, he retired to Miletus (8); he defended like a brave and ſkillful general the city of Halicarnaſſus: and not being able to force the enemy to raiſe the ſiege, he left a good garriſon in the citadel, and tranſported the inhabitants, with their effects, to the iſle of Cos (9): He thought always of the project he had propoſed in the great council of war, and that he might move Darius to put an entire confidence in him, he ſent to the court of Perſia his wife and children, as a pledge of his fidelity (10). Having received great ſums of money, and the poſt of generaliſſimo (11), he made great preparations by ſea and land; he ſubdued the iſles of Chios and Leſbos; he threatened alſo Eubœa; he held correſpondence with the Grecians, and corrupted many of them with his preſents. In a word, he was ready to cut out a great deal of work for his king's enemies in their own country, when a ſickneſs ſuddenly ſeized him, and carried him off in a few days. 'Chium itaque ſibi adjungit, & Leſbum cum claſſe petens, Antiſſam, Methymnum, Pyrrhum & Ereſſum, non magno negocio, capit. Sed Mitylenen & Leſbum, quia major erat, magnoque apparatu & propugnatorum multitudine probe inſtructa, per multos dies oppugnatam, poſt magnam ſuorum jacturam difficulter tandem expugnat. Cujus ſtrenuitatis fama, cum ſubito percrebuiſſet, Cycladum Inſularum pleræque de pactionibus ineundis legationes miſerunt. Rumor tunc allapſus erat Græciæ, Memnonem totâ cum claſſe Eubœam invaſurum: unde factum, ut magno Inſulæ civitates metu perculſæ eſſent, & Græcorum nonnulli Perſarum ſocietatem amplexi, animos rerum novarum ſpe arrectos haberent. Huc acceſſit, quod Memnon Græcorum non paucis largitione corruptis, ut ſuas ad Perſarum ſpes aggregatas vellent, perſuaſerat. Atqui viri hujus virtutem ad ampliora progredi fortuna non permiſit, cum enim in valitudinem adverſam incidiſſet, periculoſo quodam morbo correptus, è vita deceſſit, ejuſque morte res Darii labefactatæ ſunt. Rex enim totam belli molem ex Aſiâ in Europam tranſlatum iri ſperaverat (12). ---- *So he ſubdued Chios, and going to Leſbos with a fleet, he took Antiſſa, Methymna, Pyrrhus, and Ereſſus, without great difficulty. But as Mitylene was larger, and well fortified and defended with a numerous garriſon, it coſt him much trouble. However at laſt he forced it to ſurrender, after he had beſieged it a long time, and loſt a great number of his men. The fame of his bravery was ſoon ſpread abroad, which induced moſt of the iſlands of the Cyclades to ſend ambaſſadours to treat of an accommodation. At the ſame time a report was ſpread in Greece, that Memnon was coming with his whole fleet to invade Eubœa; which ſtruck the cities of that iſland with great fear, and ſome Grecians, having made an alliance with the Perſians, had great expectations from a change of affairs. And moreover, Memnon having corrupted many of them with preſents, perſuaded them to join the Perſians. But fortune ſtopt the progreſs of this great man's valour; for he was ſeized with a dangerous illneſs which put an end to his life, and, by his death, the affairs of of Darius were brought low. For the king had hopes to carry the whole ſtrength of the war out of Aſia into Europe.*'

[*B*] *The conduct of Alexander with reſpect to him.*] This young prince marching with his army near the territories of Memnon, ſtrictly forbad his ſoldiers to commit the leaſt diſorder in them. His deſign was either to render him ſuſpected to the Perſians, or to draw him to his own party. 'Alexander quum inter progrediendum agrum à Rege Perſarum Memnoni dono datum adtigiſſet, *maleficio* † *abſtineri* jubet, *coloniſque & fructibus parci:* callido commento ſuſpectum facturus hominem induſtrium, & quem ⸸ ex omnibus hoſtium ducibus unum non contemneret; ſi in ſuas partes tranſducere nequiviſſet. Quumque *lenitatem regis* admirati quidam, *acerrimum* ‡ *callidiſſimumque Macedonum hoſtem, quam primum in poteſtatem redactus eſſet, interficiendum, atque interim quibus poſſet cladibus vexandum eſſe* dicerent: *quin*, inquit, *potius beneficiis ſupplantamus hominem, & amicum ex inimico facimus, eadem virtute & ſolertia pro nobis ſtaturum* (13). --- *And as ſome wondered at* the king's lenity, *and ſaid*, that ſuch a violent and ſubtile enemy of the Macedonians ought to be put to death as ſoon as he was in their power, and in the mean time to be diſtreſſed by all ways poſſible: but, *anſwered he*, we rather undermine him by good turns, and make him a friend of an enemy, that he may uſe the ſame valour and ſubtilty in our behalf.' I have put in the margin the words of Quintus Curtius, which Freinſhemius refers to (14).

[*C*] *He chaſtiſed a ſoldier who railed at Alexander.*] I have not taken you ſaid he to him, ſtriking him with his javelin, to rail at this prince, but to fight againſt him. Μισθοφόρον τινὰ ϖολλὰ βλάσφημα καὶ ἀσελγῆ ϖεgὶ Ἀληξάνδρȣ λέγοντα τῇ λόγχῃ ϖατάξας, Ἐγώ σε (εἶπε) τρέφω μαχȣ́μενον, ἀλλ᾽ ȣ̓ λοιδορȣ́μενον Ἀλεξάνδρῳ. *Militem quendam mercenarium ſuum, qui multis & impuris conviciis Alexandrum proſcindebat, lancea feriens, Ego, inquit, te alo, non ut maledicas Alexandro, ſed ut contra eum pugnes* (15). This is a good maxim, but it was not much practiſed in the time of Francis I, and Charles V, and I know not whether it be more practiſed at preſent. Freinſhemius obſerves, that Memnon vigorouſly oppoſed ſome fugitive Grecians, who were ſo full of hatred againſt the Macedonians, that they were not for ſuffering Alexander to bury his dead, though by that permiſſion they might boaſt of the victory. Memnon would not liſten to the paſſion of theſe fugitives, and granted a ceſſation of arms, and the dead bodies which Alexander demanded. This was done at the ſiege of Halicarnaſſus. Read what follows: 'Alexander quamquam ea res opinione Græcorum * de victoria concedentis videretur; corpora ſuorum, qui ſub ipſis mœnibus oppetierant, induciis poſtulatis ab hoſte repetere, quam inhumata dimittere maluit. At ** qui cum Perſis erant, Ephialtes & Thraſybulus Athenienſes, quum plus apud ipſos odium adverſus Macedonas, quam humanitatis ratio valeret, negabant *indulgendum hoc eſſe infeſtiſſimis hoſtibus.* Non tamen permoverunt Memnonem, quin *Græcorum moribus indignum eſſe* diceret, *ſepulturam invidere cæſis hoſtibus. ARMIS ET viribus in adverſos & obſiſtentes utendum: neque contumeliis pugnandum in eos, quos bonis maliſque noſtris ſua dies exemiſſet* (16). ------ *Alexander, tho' it might ſeem in the opinion of the Greeks to be yielding the victory, choſe rather to de-*

(*a*) He commanded the left wing in that battle. *Diodor. Sicul. lib. xvii, cap. xix.*

(*b*) Id. ib. *cap. xxiv, & ſeq.*

(6) See in the Supplements of Freinſhemius to Q. Curtius, *lib. ii, cap. iv*, the reaſons upon which Memnon built his opinion.

(7) D'Aubigné, *Tom. ii, book i, cap. iv, pag. m.* 542.

(8) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xvii, cap. xxii.*

(9) Id. ib. *cap. xxiv, & ſeq.*

(10) Id. ib. *cap. xxiii.*

(11) Ibid. *cap. xxix.*

12) Ib. *pag. m.* 834, 835.

† *Polyæn.* 4, 3, 15.

⸸ Curtius, 3, 1, 31.

‡ *Them. Orat.* 9.

(13) Freinſhemius, ubi ſupra, *lib. ii, cap. v, initio.*

(14) Nondum Memnonem vita exceſſiſſe cognoverat (*Alexander*) in quem omnes intenderat curas, ſatis gnarus cuncta in expeditio fore ſi nihil ab eo moveretur.

(15) Plut. in Apoph. *pag.* 174.

* *Juſtin.* 6, 6, 9.

** Diodor. 17, 25.

(16) Freinſheim. ibid. *cap. ix.*

widow was the firſt woman whom this conquerour knew [*D*]. Mr Moreri has not clearly expreſſed himſelf [*E*], when he mentions the advice which this General gave, to deſtroy all the country through which the enemies troops were to march. I ought not to forget, that Mentor, the brother of Memnon, did very great ſervices to king Artaxerxes Ochus, and was well rewarded for it (*c*). He reſtored his brother and brother-in-law (*d*) to the favour of this Monarch; for he cauſed them to be recalled from the Court of Macedonia, whither they had fled, after their bad ſucceſs in a civil war (*e*).

Mr Chevreau affirms (*f*), that MEMNON, *general of an army, who is mentioned at the end of the twelfth book* of the expedition of Cyrus, *by Xenophon*, was deceitful, covetous, ambitious, a ſlanderer, and an impoſtor. Thus he gives the character of this wicked wretch; but he ſhould have obſerved that Xenophon calls him *Menon*, and not *Memnon*.

(*c*) See Diodorus Siculus, *lib. xvi*.

(*d*) He was called *Artabazus*; and married the ſiſter of Memnon, and had by her eleven ſons and ten daughters. *Id. ib. cap. liii.*

(*e*) Id. ib.

(*f*) Chevræana, *Part ii, pag.* 55, *Dutch Edit.*

'*mand a truce of the enemy and to fetch away the bodies of his men, who died under the very walls, than to leave them unburied. But Ephialtes and Thraſybulus, both Athenians, who were then with the Perſians, being ſwayed more by their hatred to the Macedonians, than by the conſideration of humanity, were againſt* granting this indulgence to their mortal enemies. *But yet they could not prevail upon Memnon, who told them*, it was unworthy the manners of the Greeks to refuſe their ſlain enemies burial. We ought to uſe ARMS AND forces, *ſays he*, againſt ſuch as oppoſe and reſiſt us; and not to inſult thoſe, whom death has removed from the good and evil we can do them.'

[*D*] *His widow was the firſt woman whom Alexander knew.*] Plutarch aſſures us of this: Οὔτε τȣτων ἐθιγεν ὔτε ἄλλην ἔγνω γυναῖκα πρὸ γάμȣ, πλὴν Βαρσήνης. Nec has attigit, nec mulierem ante nuptias cognovit ullam, excepta Barſene (17). - - - - - *Neither did he touch them, nor did he know any woman before marriage except Barſene.* She was called Barſene, and was the daughter of Artabazus, whoſe mother was a daughter of a king of Perſia. She was mild and civil, and underſtood Greek and the manners of the Grecians, and was very beautiful: So that Parmenio conſidering that, beſides all this, ſhe was of high birth, exhorted the king, his maſter, to divert himſelf with this priſoner (18). She was taken at the ſame time with the mother, the wife, and daughters, of Darius (19). The counſel of Parmenio was followed, which had fruitful conſequences, ſince Barſene bore a ſon (20) to Alexander. She had two ſiſters (21) whom this prince married very advantageouſly.

[*E*] *Mr Moreri has not clearly expreſſed himſelf.*] Theſe are his words in the article of Alexander: *Darius would not make a devaſtation in Aſia, according to the advice of Memnon.* This is equivocal; for if I ſhould write to a man, *I have not anſwered that letter according to your advice, or following your advice*, thoſe who ſhould read theſe words, would rather think that he adviſed me not to anſwer, than to do it. At leaſt they would think the firſt ſenſe as good as the other; and therefore I may affirm, that if one did not know what Memnon adviſed, he could not certainly underſtand what Moreri meant. So neceſſary it is to place our words right, if we would be underſtood, even when we uſe the reader's mother-tongue.

(17) Plut. in Alexand. *pag.* 676.

(18) Id. ib.

(19) Curtius, *lib. iii*, ſub fin. Plutarch, ibid. *ſays that ſhe was taken at Damaſcus.*

(20) *Called* Hercules, Plut. ubi infra.

(21) One was the wife of Eumenes, and the other of Ptolomy. *Plut. in Eumene, init. pag. m.* 583.

MENAGE (GILES), in Latin *Ægidius Menagius*, was one of the moſt learned men of his time, and the Varro of the XVIIth century. It would be needleſs here to give his elogium and an abridgment of his life; which is to be found in books that are every where diſperſed (*a*), and which may be more eaſily tranſported into the remoteſt countries, than this great Dictionary. His illuſtrious friends erected a very glorious monument to him, in the collection intituled *Menagiana* [*A*], which has already paſſed through every one's hands. Had it not been for this, I ſhould have taken pleaſure, and thought it my particular duty to put here a long article of Mr Menage. I ſhould have inſiſted upon the

(*a*) In the Journal des Sçavans, Aug. 11, 1692. In the *Mercure Galant* of the ſame year. In the continuation of the *Menagiana* at the beginning.

[*A*] *The collection, intituled* Menagiana.] Thoſe who can judge of things aright, will confeſs, that this collection is very proper to ſhew the extent of genius and learning, which was the character of Mr Menage. And I may be bold to ſay, that the excellent works which he publiſhed will not diſtinguiſh him from other learned men ſo advantageouſly as this. To publiſh books of great learning, to make Greek and Latin verſes exceeding well turned is not a common talent, I own; neither is it extremely rare. It is incomparably more difficult to find men, who can furniſh diſcourſe about an infinite number of things, and who know how to diverſify them an hundred ways. How many authors are there, who are admired for their works upon the account of the vaſt learning that is diſplayed in them, who are not able to ſuſtain a converſation? Some have a memory full of holes like a ſieve, or like the caſk of the Danaides, which receives every thing, but retains nothing; all would run out, and be entirely loſt, if they had not ſome reſervoirs juſt ready. Theſe are their collections, which are treaſures that fail not in time of need, when one writes a book, but are very needleſs in familiar diſcourſes about learning. Thoſe who know Mr Menage, only by his books, might think he reſembled thoſe learned men: but if you ſhew the MENAGIANA, you diſtinguiſh him from them, and make him known by a talent that is given to very few learned men. There it appears, that he was a man who ſpoke off-hand a thouſand good things. His memory extended to what was antient and modern, to the court and to the city, to the dead and to the living languages, to things ſerious and things jocoſe; in a word, to a thouſand ſorts of ſubjects. That which appeared a trifle to ſome readers of the Menagiana, who did not conſider circumſtances, cauſed admiration in other readers, who minded the difference that is to be made between what a man ſpeaks without preparation, and that which he prepares for the preſs. This Menagiana contains things of that kind, whereof one may ſay what one of the antients ſaid of inſects. 'Turrigeros elephantorum miramur humeros, taurorumque colla, & truces in ſublime jactus, tigrium rapinas, leonum jubas, cum rerum natura nuſquam magis, quam in minimis, tota ſit (1). - - - *We admire the tower-bearing ſhoulders of elephants, and the necks of bulls, and the furious toſſings of their heads, the ravenings of tygers, and the manes of lions, tho' nature is never more compleat, than in the ſmalleſt animals.*' Ariſtotle alſo ſaid, Μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐλαττόνων ἢ μειζόνων ἴδοι τις ἂν τὴν τῆς διανοίας ἀκρίβειαν. Magis in minore genere (*brutorum*) quam in majore videris intelligentiæ rationem *. - - - *You may ſee more underſtanding in the ſmaller kind of brutes than in the greater.* And therefore we cannot ſufficiently commend the care which his illuſtrious friends took to erect to him a monument ſo capable of giving him immortal glory. They were not obliged to rectify what they had heard him ſay; for in ſo doing, they had not been faithful Hiſtorians of his converſations. The moſt happy memories are liable to be deceived, and beſides Mr Menage ſpoke ſometimes concerning certain perſons, what other people, being ill informed, had told him. We muſt not therefore wonder, that there are ſome miſtakes in the Menagiana, and ſome things falſe in point of perſonality. He is miſtaken in what he ſays of me.

(1) Plin. *lib. xi, cap. ii.*

* Ariſtot. Hiſt. Animal. *lib. ix, cap. vii.*

the diſputes he had with perſons of great merit; but I would have paſſed lightly over the difference he had with the count de Buſſi Rabutin [*B*].

Some perſons, whom I infinitely eſteem, did not approve of making the article of Mr Menage ſo ſhort in this Dictionary, and oppoſed the reaſons I have given for my brevity. They think, that the three books to which I refer the reader, will not be in the hands of all thoſe who will ſeek here for the hiſtory of this learned man. I do not agree to their opinion; and if I enlarge this article in this ſecond edition, it is only to ſet down a circumſtance which the three authors referred to (*b*) do not relate; it concerns the good fortune of Mr Menage as to his memory. This was a gift which he eminently poſſeſſed and which he preſerved to old age, and what is more rare, he recovered it after ſome interruption [*C*]. There

(*b*) Add to thoſe three, two others that have appeared ſince the firſt edition of my work, *viz.* Moreri of the Paris Edition, 1699, and the Elogies of Mr Perrault.

[*B*] *The difference he had with the count de Buſſi Rabutin.*] This difference may paſs for a quarrel of authors, altho' this count was a military man, and had a high poſt in the French army. This affair was decided by the ſtrokes of the pen. He firſt attacked Mr Menage in writing, and offended him grievouſly; but the verſes which Mr Menage printed againſt him, were the moſt contumelious and bloody that could be made. Here is the attack; afterwards we ſhall ſee the return. 'Menage being in love with Madam de Sevigny; his birth, his age, and his figure, obliged him to conceal his love as much as he could: and being one day with her, when ſhe was going out to buy ſome things, as her woman could not attend her, ſhe bid Menage go in the coach with her. He ſeeming to be in jeſt, but, in reality, being vexed, told her, it was very hard for him to find, that ſhe was not ſatisfied with the ſeverity ſhe had uſed him with for ſo long a time, but ſtill deſpiſed him, by thinking that none could ſpeak ill of him and her. Come, ſaid ſhe, come into the coach, if you vex me, I will go and viſit you at your own houſe (2).' Thus you ſee that the provocation was very great; but the Latin epigram of the perſon provoked far exceeded it.

FRANCORUM proceres, media (quis credat?) in aula
  Buſſiades ſcripto læſerat horribili
Pœna levis: LODOIX nebulonem carcere claudens,
  Detrahit indigno munus equeſtre Duci.
Sic nebulo, gladiis quos formidabat Iberis;
  Quos meruit, Francis fuſtibus eripitur (3).

Buſſi Rabutin in writings vile,
Had, ev'n at court, the peers of France abus'd.
Lewis to priſon the worthleſs ſcoundrel ſent,
And from him took his military poſt.
Slight puniſhment! for, this the raſcal ſav'd
From Spaniſh ſwords, which coward-like he fear'd,
And from French cudgels, which he had deſerv'd.

If the author of theſe Latin verſes had had a benefice with cure of ſouls; if he had been not only a curate, but a true curate; he would have taken the meer accuſation of making love to Madam de Sevigny, as a horrid injury; but as his engagement in the clerkſhip, went no farther than his being qualified to enjoy ſome penſions out of benefices, without acting againſt the modern diſcipline, that which vexed him in the diſcourſe of count Rabutin, was ſomething elſe than what is contained in the firſt four or five words. He made no ſcruple to confeſs, that he had been in love, which I do not prove by his poems, for that proof would be ambiguous, that language is deceitful; but he affirms it in a very ſerious Epiſtle Dedicatory. 'I pray you to remember, *ſays he, ſpeaking to the chevalier de Meré* (4), that when we made our court together to a lady of great quality and merit, whatever paſſion I had for that illuſtrious perſon, I willingly ſuffered that ſhe ſhould love you more than me, becauſe I loved you more than myſelf.' He promiſed a work which he never publiſhed, wherein he would have given an account of his amours: and the reaſon why I believe ſo, is taken from theſe words: 'Why did he not mention Madam de la Fayette and Madam de Sevigny, who are his acquaintance?' It is Father Bouhours who aſked this queſtion. Mr Menage anſwered him:

Pater Bohurſe, flos Scholæ Pariſius,
Deſideramus hic tuam prudentiam.

Father Bouhours, the ornament of Paris, in this I want your diſcretion.

'The reverend Father Bouhours accuſes me in this place of having been in love with Madam de Sevigny and Madam de la Fayette. I will anſwer this accuſation in the defence of my behaviour; and I will make ſuch an anſwer, that the laugh which Father Bouhours courts ſo much, ſhall not be on his ſide (5).' After all, the friendſhip between Mr Menage and ſome ladies of great wit, have done him much honour in the world, and will be glorious to him hereafter: For it is ſo rare, that ſo much Greek and Grammar as he had, ſhould not quite ſtifle the talents which are neceſſary for a polite and genteel converſation with ladies of quality, that this is a kind of prodigy. For the reſt, the keen reſentment which he expreſſed in his Latin verſes, did not hinder him from acknowledging the merit of the author who had offended him. 'Mr de Buſſy Rabutin is a fine wit, *ſaid he* (6), and I cannot but do him this juſtice, altho' he has endeavoured to ridicule me in his *Hiſtoire des Gaules*. No man can write with more ſpirit and fire than he has done in that hiſtory.' This looks like a man that is very ready to be reconciled. Such a reconciliation would not have been thought ſtrange, ſince Madam de Sevigny, who had been ſo ill treated in the ſame work, forgot the affront, and lived with the author as a very good kinſwoman. This appears by the letters ſhe wrote to him, and which were printed with thoſe of Mr de Rabutin.

[*C*] *Memory was a gift which he eminently poſſeſſed, and which he preſerved . . . . and which he recovered after ſome interruption.*] That he ſhould remember things happily in his youth is not a rarity: but it was a peculiar favour of his ſtars, that when he began to grow old he did not perceive his memory to decay much, which is the too common misfortune of learned men. We will here cite a thing which was publiſhed in the year 1685. Several Hiſtorians are guilty of a very abſurd fault, which is this: 'They relate the ſame thing ſometimes one way, and ſometimes another. It would be more for the honour of their memory, that they were always miſtaken; but on the other ſide it may be ſaid, that ſince the memory is the firſt thing that dies in a learned man, and the faculty which is the leaſt poſſible to be retained, we muſt not examine too rigorouſly the ſlips which forgetfulneſs may occaſion. Methinks we ought to have the ſame indulgence for theſe faults, as for thoſe which divines call *quotidianæ incurſionis, daily infirmities*; ſince it is certain, that forgetfulneſs is an imperfection into which we relapſe every moment. From whence it appears, that the ſciences are not proper to make a man happy in this life; for as that which is moſt agreeable in learning, is to remember many things, and as this talent is the ſooneſt weakened and deſtroyed, a learned man ſees himſelf every day expoſed to the mortification of finding that what was moſt comfortable to him, forſakes him. Happy is the man, who, like the illuſtrious Mr Menage, makes no fine verſes to complain of the decay of his memory, till after he has enjoyed it a long time (7).' What has been juſt now ſaid, that *memory is the firſt thing that dies in a learned man*, was obſerved by Thuanus, 'Memoria in longævis ex omnibus animi facultatibus prima debilitatur & vacillat (8). - - - - *Memory in old men is the firſt of all the faculties of the mind that fails and declines.*' Seneca, the father, made the ſame obſervation, after he had experienced in his own perſon this bad effect of old age. 'Cum multa jam mihi,

(2) Hiſtoire Amoureuſe des Gaules, *pag. m.* 189, 190.

(3) Menage, Epigr. cxxxviii, *pag.* 147, 148, Edit. Amſtel. 1687.

(4) Menage, Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Obſervations upon the French tongue, *fol. a iij*. See alſo what he confeſſes in a dialogue of Sarraſin, *pag. m.* 146, and which is mentioned in the new letters againſt Maimbourg, *pag.* 777.

(5) Id. Obſervations upon the French Tongue, *Tom. ii, pag.* 211, 212.

(6) Continuation of the *Menagiana, pag.* 336, Dutch Edit.

(7) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *June* 1685, *art.* 1, *pag.* 602, *of the ſecond edition.*

(8) Thuan. *lib. cxxxiv, pag. m.* 1082, *col.* 2.

There are many people who wiſh, he had publiſhed ſome of his pleas [*D*].

‘ mihi, *ſays he* (9), ex me deſideranda ſenectus fecerit, oculorum aciem retuderit, aurium ſenſum habetaverit, nervorum firmitatem fatigaverit, inter ea quæ retuli memoria eſt, res ex omnibus partibus animi, maxime delicata & fragilis: in quam primam ſenectus incurrit. - - - - *As old age has already brought many infirmities upon me, as dimneſs of ſight, dulneſs of hearing, and weakneſs of nerves, among the reſt is the defect of memory, which is the moſt delicate and brittle of all the faculties of the mind, and which old age attacks the firſt.*’ The paſſage which I have cited from the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, informs us, that Mr Menage made ſome verſes, complaining of the decay of his memory: they are to be ſeen in the firſt book of his poems at p. 13, of the Amſterdam edition, 1687. My reader, if I miſtake not, will be glad to ſee ſome of them here; and they will not be ſuperfluous, ſince they contain a deſcription of this fine talent, whereof Mr Menage, as I have ſaid, was poſſeſſed. Here follows then the beginning of the hymn which he addreſſed to the goddeſs of Memory.

Muſarum veneranda parens, quam Juppiter ipſe,
Ille pater Divûm, magno dilexit amore,
MNEMOSYNE, fidum tu me patrona clientem
Deſeris? Ah memini, juvenis cùm mille Sophorum,
Mille recenſerem Sectarum nomina: mille
Stemmata narrarem, totaſque ex ordine gentes.
Nunc oblita mihi tot nomina. Vix mihi nomen
Hæret mente meum. Memini, cum plurima Homeri,
Plurima Peligni recitarem carmina Vatis:
Omnia Virgilii memori cum mente tenerem.
Nunc oblita mihi tot carmina. Non ego poſſim,
Condita quæ nuper mihi ſunt, meminiſſe meorum,
Gallia quem ſtupuit, ſtupuit me maximus ille
BIGNONIDES, legum capita omnia commemorantem.
Fabellas lepidas & acute dicta Sophorum,
Narrabam juvenis, juvenum mirante caterva,
Ingenii pars illa mei, placuiſſe puellis
Quâ potui, periit: nunc illis fabula fio.
Pendebant olim, memini, narrantis ab ore.
Fabellas eaſdem, verſus eoſdem repetentem
(Has narraſſe ſemel, ſemel hos recitaſſe putabam?
Id me hodie monuit fiduſque vetuſque ſodalis)
Nunc me faſtoſæ medio in ſermone relinquunt (10).

O venerable parent of the nine,
Belov'd by Jove, the father of the gods,
MNEMOSYNE, *my patroneſs moſt kind,*
Me, thy faithful client, doſt thou forſake?
Ah! I remember in my youthful days,
I could by heart rehearſe and reckon up
A thouſand ſages, and a thouſand ſects;
Whole nations in order, with their kings
Ev'n to a thouſand I could tell, but now
Scarce one of all thoſe names do I retain.
I know the time, when many an hundred lines
Of Homer, and of Ovid I could ſay,
And Virgil's whole poem with eaſe repeat;
All which I have forgot. What I myſelf
But lately wrote, I cannot recollect.
That great man, BIGNON'S SON, *whom France admir'd,*
Was much ſurpriz'd to hear me ſay by heart
All the heads of law. Crowds of wondring youth,
Then but a youth myſelf, attentive heard
When merry tales and apophthegms I told.
Young maids with liſt'ning ears upon me hung,
But now to them I am a joke become.
Now with contempt they leave me as I tell
The ſelf-ſame ſtories, and as I repeat
The ſelf-ſame verſes, which I thought but once
I had to them rehears'd. A faithful friend,
And old, with this acquainted me to-day.

You ſee, that among other things, he owns he was informed, that he repeated the ſame ſtories, thinking it was the firſt time he had told them. Aftewards he ſupplicates the goddeſs, either that ſhe would not abandon him, or that ſhe would ſo utterly forſake him, that he ſhould not ſo much as remember he had ever known any thing.

Si tales tu, Diva, preces audire recuſas
Diva, precor, memorem omnem nobis eripe mentem.
Orbilius fiam, cunctarum oblivio rerum:
Nec meminiſſe queam, tot rerum non meminiſſe (11).

If theſe my prayers thou doſt refuſe to hear,
O goddeſs, take all mem'ry from me quite,
That of my loſs I may not conſcious be.

His prayer was heard in the moſt favourable ſenſe, his memory returned to him; and he did ſolemnly and publickly thank the deity which was ſo propitious to him. Here follows the beginning of the thankſgiving, which he publiſhed November 27, 1690, aged ſeventy ſeven years, three months, and ſeven days.

MUSARUM veneranda parens; quam Juppiter ipſe,
Ipſe pater Divûm, tenero dilexit amore;
Audiſti mea vota. Seni memorem mihi mentem
Diva redonaſti. Magnorum nomine mille,
Et proceres omnes ab origine Sabloienſes,
Leges Romanas, Sectas memorare Sophorum,
Tulli mille locos, & Homeri carmina centum,
Et centum poſſum verſus recitare Maronis.
Ingenii pars illa mei, juvenis placuiſſe
Quâ potui, ecce redux. Tua ſunt hæc munera, Diva.
Ingenii per te nobis renovata juventa eſt.

O venerable parent of the nine,
Belov'd by Jove, the father of the gods,
My prayers are heard; thou haſt to me reſtor'd
The gift of mem'ry. Now I can relate,
Tho' far in years, a thouſand famous names,
And all the nobles of the Sablyan race,
The Roman laws, and various ſects of old,
A thouſand paſſages of Tully's works.
Of Homer's poem, and of Virgil's too,
An hundred lines I can by heart repeat:
That faculty, with which I gave delight
When young, is now return'd. It is thy gift,
Who haſt renew'd the vigour of my mind.

Let us alſo ſet down the concluſion of this little poem, wherein the author ſupplicates the deity, which had reſtored to him the remembrance of ſo many things, to take from him the remembrance of the injuries he had received.

Muſarum veneranda parens, quam Juppiter ipſe,
Ipſe pater Divûm, tenero dilexit amore;
O diva, ô noſtræ meritò pars maxima famæ,
Eſt aliud ſupplex quod ego tu numina poſco.
Si te non pigeat, ſi non indebita poſco,
Quæ mihi tot rerum, rerum mihi jucundarum
Quas oblitus eram, rurſum meminiſſe dediſti,
Da, Dea; da nobis, atrocia tot nebulonum,
Immeritum qui me pergunt vexare libellis,
Dicta obliviſci, memori mihi condita mente.

O venerable parent of the nine,
Belov'd by Jove, the father of the gods,
O thou, to whom I chiefly owe my fame,
Another thing I humbly thee beſeech,
If it be lawful, and without offence.
O goddeſs kind, who haſt again beſtow'd
The precious gift of memory, which was loſt,
Grant, I pray thee, grant, that I may forget

---

(9) Seneca Pater Præfat. *lib. i*, Controverſ. *pag. m.* 70.

(10) Menage, Poëmat. *lib. i*, *pag. m.* 13.

(11) Id. ib. *pag.* 4.

And blot out from my mind the vile abuſe
With which baſe wretches in their books me load.

But notwithſtanding this happy reſtoration, there is proof that Mr Menage did not ſpeak exactly of the affair. Conſider a little theſe words of the Menagiana. ‘ I ſaid ſome years ago, that I had loſt one half of ‘ my memory, becauſe I remembered very well what ‘ I had lent, and did not at all remember what I ‘ had borrowed. This was reported in Holland, ‘ and thoſe who knew me, bewailed my condition, ‘ thinking that I had entirely loſt it. Yet ſtill I retain ‘ it pretty well, and have given ſufficient proofs of it ‘ by the books I have publiſhed ſince that time (12.)’ How could he think, that the report of a diſcourſe in converſation ſhould perſuade any in Holland, that he had entirely loſt his memory? had they not ſeen his hymn to Mnemoſyne, wherein he declared to all the world that he remembered nothing. To know the ſtrength and reach of his memory, one needs only conſider what he ſays of it, and what the abbot du Bois adds at the 309, 310, 311, pages of the firſt Dutch edition of the Menagiana.

[*D*] *Many people wiſh he had publiſhed ſome of his pleas.*] His firſt profeſſion was that of an advocate, as we learn from himſelf in this paſſage of his Origines. *In 1632, I was admitted advocate at Angers, which is the place of my birth, and there I pleaded my firſt cauſe againſt Mr Ayrault, my couſin-german, who was ſince counſellor in the parliament of Bretagne, and commiſſary in the chamber of Juſtice. I came to Paris the ſame year held I was alſo admitted advocate. and where I pleaded for ſeveral years. In 1634, the parliament of Paris were their extraordinary ſeſſions at Poitiers, where I pleaded alſo. And this made Mr Coſtar ſay, that as there where ſerjeants ſerving warrants through all the kingdom, ſo I was an advocate pleading through all the kingdom, and upon the ſame account Father Jacob, a Carmelite, told me, in one of his catalogues of new books, which he did me the honour to inſcribe to me,* Atque erit in triplici par tibi nemo foro (13). - - - - - *And at the triple bar you'll find no match.* The memoirs for the Life of Menage, printed at the beginning of the continuation of the Menagiana, inform us, that he pleaded ſeveral cauſes in the parliament of Paris, *one among the reſt for Mr Sengebere, who taught him the Civil-Law, and had a mind to divorce his wife for adultery.* I am ſure this plea would be very acceptable to many people, if it were printed.

MENANDRINO (Marsilius de) better known by the name of Marſilius of Padua, the city where he was born, was one of the moſt learned Civilians of the XIVth century (*a*). He ſtudied at the univerſity of Orleans (*b*), and was counſeller to the emperor Lewis of Bavaria, and wrote an apology for this prince in the year 1324 [*A*], in which he maintained that the Pope ought to be ſubject to the Emperor, not only with regard to temporal things, but likewiſe with regard to the outward diſcipline of the church. He diſplayed in a lively manner the pride, luxury, and the other irregularities, of the court of Rome, and proved that, by divine right, all biſhops are equal to the Pope. John XXII, who poſſeſſed at that time the ſee of Rome, was ſo enraged at this doctrine of Marſilius of Padua, that he iſſued out againſt him a long decree, wherein he endeavoured to refute him, and by which he excommunicated him in the year 1327. Our Marſilius died in the month of September in the year 1328, at Montemalto (*c*). He is quoted by cardinal Zabarella (*d*), among thoſe who wrote to prove that the monks of St Francis could have no property in any thing. I do not believe that he taught, as it is affimed in Moreri, that neither biſhops nor prieſts can poſſeſs eſtates. In this, as well as all the reſt of the article, Moreri copied Father Gaultier, the tranſcriber of Prateolus.

[*A*] *He wrote an apology for* the emperor Lewis of Bavaria *in the year* 1324.] The Proteſtants have frequently quoted it, and took care to publiſh it ſoon; for, in the year 1522, they put forth an edition of it, in folio at Baſil, with a preface, the author of which calls himſelf, *Licentius Evangelius ſacerdos* (1). Mr Wharton (2) has taken notice not only of this edition, but alſo of thoſe of Francfort 1612, 1623, in 8vo; and has not forgot to obſerve, that this work was inſerted by Goldaſt in the ſecond tome of his Monarchy; but makes no mention of the edition of Franckfort, 1592, in 8vo, *apud Jo. Wechelum*, which was procured by Francis Gomarus. The title of it is this: *Defenſor Pacis, ſive adverſus uſurpatam Rom. Pontificis Juriſdictionem, Marſilii Patavini pro invictiſſ. & conſtantiſſ. Rom. Imperatore Ludovico IV Bavarico, à tribus Rom. Pontificibus indigna perpeſſo, Apologia, qua Politicæ & Eccleſiaſticæ poteſtatis limites doctiſſime explicantur: circa annum Domini 1324 conſcripta, nunc vero ad omnium Principum, Magiſtratuum, & Eccleſiæ Catholicæ, ac nominatim Chriſtianiſſ. Galliarum & Navarræ Regis &c. Henrici IV (à tribus etiam Rom. Pontificibus inique oppugnati) ejuſque Regni & Eccleſiarum autoritatem ac libertatem demonſtrandam utiliſſima. Franciſcus Gomarus Brugenſis recenſuit, Capitum Argumentis & Notis ad marginem illuſtravit.* I have compared this edition with that which is intituled. *Marſilii de Menandrino, Patavini vulgo dicti,* Defensor Pacis, *ſive Apologia pro Ludovico IV Imp. Bavaro. Tractatus de Tranſlatione Imperii, ante CCC prope annos ſcripta. Ex Bibliopolio Commeliano MDXCIX*; and they ſeem to me to differ only with regard to the preambles; that is to ſay, the title only, and not the body of the book was reprinted: the epiſtle dedicatory in verſe, ſubſcribed *Franciſcus Gomarus*, and addreſſed to the elector Palatine Frederic IV, was taken away: the advertiſment to the reader was a little changed: and the *Teſtimonia Autorum*, and the treatiſe *de Tranſlatione Imperii*, which contains but twenty ſix pages, were added. This treatiſe was wrote by our Marſilius of Padua, who beſides that compoſed a book *de Juriſdictione Imperiali in Cauſis Matrimonialibus*.

Note that the Parentheſis (3), where it is obſerved in the title of the *Defenſor Pacis*, that Lewis of Bavaria, had been perſecuted by three Popes, could not have been in the manuſcript of the author; for when he wrote this book, Lewis of Bavaria had quarrelled only with Pope John XXII. This work having been *tranſlated into French by an anonymous author*, Pope Gregory XI (4) *complained of it to the deputies of the faculty of Theology at Paris, who declared by an authentic act, that none of their members had been concerned in this verſion, and that Marſilius of Padua, and John de Jande, who was thought likewiſe to have had a hand in writing that book, were not of their body* (5).

MENDOZZA (John Gonzales de) an Auguſtin Frier of the province of Caſtille, was choſen by the king of Spain to be embaſſador to the emperor of China in the year 1584. He was made biſhop of Lipari in Italy in the year 1593, biſhop of Chiapa in New Spain in the year 1607, and biſhop of Popajan in the Weſt Indies in the year 1608. He wrote in Spaniſh an Hiſtory of China [*A*], which has been tranſlated into ſeveral

[*A*] *He wrote an Hiſtory of China.*] One may form a general idea of it by the bare title of the French tranſlation, which is to this purpoſe: *The Hiſtory of the great kingdom of China, in the Eaſt-Indies, in two parts:* the

---

(12) Menagiana, *pag.* 31, 32, of the firſt Dutch Edition.

(13) Menage Origines de la Langue Françoiſe, *at the word* Rachat, *pag.* 611, *Edit. of* 1694. See the Memoires of Mr Marolles, *pag.* 96.

(*a*) *Father* Gaultier *deceived by* Prateolus, *and* Moreri *deceived by both have placed him wrong, in the beginning of the XIIth century.*

(*b*) Marſilius Patavinus, in Defenſore Pacis, *part ii, cap. xviii, pag. m.* 296.

(*c*) *Taken from the* Appendix *of Dr Cave's* Hiſt. Litterar. Script. Eccleſ. *pag.* 23.

(*d*) Zabarella, in Clementin. *Exivit & de Electione.*

(1) *See the* Biblioth. de Geſner, *fol.* 499 *verſo: and the* Epitome, *pag. m.* 574, 575.

(2) Wharton, in Append. ad Cave, *pag.* 23.

(3) It is even in the edition of Baſil of the year 1522.

(4) He ſat in the Papal chair, from the year 1370 to 1378.

(5) Du Pin, Biblioth. *Tom. xi, pag.* 127. *Amſterd. Edit.*

ſeveral languages (*a*). The French tranſlation, done by Luke de la Porte, a Pariſian, Doctor of the Laws, was printed at Paris in the year 1589 in 8vo.

the firſt containing the ſituation, antiquity, fertility, religion, ceremonies, ſacrifices, kings, magiſtrates, manners, cuſtoms, laws, and other memorable things of the ſaid kingdom: and the ſecond three voyages to it in the years 1577, 1579, *and* 1581, *with the moſt remarkable rarities, either ſeen or heard of there: together with an Itinerary of the New World, and the diſcovery of New Mexico in the year* 1583.

(*a*) *Taken from* Philip Elſſius, Encomaſt. Auguſtin. *p g.* 379.

MESPLEDE (Lewis) a French Dominican, and provincial of his order in the province of Languedoc in the XVIIth century, publiſhed ſome books [*A*], as will be ſeen below.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] He printed at Paris in the year 1643 *Catalonia Galliæ vindicata, ſive Diſſertatio Hiſtorica de legitimo Regum Francorum in eam Provinciam imperio*, in 8vo. Mr Chantereau le Febvre aſſures us, that it is a book full of *learned and uſeful inquiries, which tend to ſhew the right that the crown of France, has to the county of Catalonia, and the city of Barcelona, and to prove the forgery and falſehood of the titles which the enemies of the crown produce againſt it, in order to cloke their uſurpation of this county to it's prejudice* (1). Whilſt Father Meſplede was provincial, he dedicated a piece to the chapter-general of his order, concerning the reformation which he thought was neceſſary to be introduced into it (2). He got this piece approved *by five profeſſors, three of which were priors.* I ſhall quote a paſſage out of it, which acquaints us with the diſſentions of the Dominicans. 'The doctrine of St Thomas would be ſufficient alone 'to form great men, if it were taught altogether 'pure, and ſuch as it is in it's ſource. But I am afraid 'by making us follow the ſtreams, we are made to 'drink muddy water. Our ordinary method of teaching Philoſophy and Divinity is very bad: We do 'not keep to the originals. In the ſchools of St Thomas, diſputations are held about the true ſenſe of 'his doctrine, and our authors write againſt one another with as much heat as the Schotiſts and Thomiſts 'did formerly. . . . . We ruin our ſelves. Nations 'blindly engage againſt one another. The new interpreters condemn the old. Cajetan thinks only of 'refuting Capreolus, Herveus, and others who were 'before him. Bagnez, and thoſe who are after him, 'think only of refuting Cajetan (3).

(1) Chantereau le Febvre, Queſtion Hiſtorique ſi les Provinces de l'ancien Royaume d'Auſtraſie doivent eſtre appellées Terres de l'Empire, *pag.* 81, *Paris Edition* 1644, *in* 8*vo*.

(2) *See the* Errata de l'Hiſt. des Congreg. de Auxil. *pag.* 46, *Edit. of Liege* 1702, *in* 8*vo*.

(3) Meſplede, in Commonitorio ad Capitulum Generale de Reformatione in Ordinem inducenda: *I uſe the tranſlation which is given of this Latin paſſage, by the author of the* Errata de l'Hiſtoire des Congregations de Auxiliis, *writ by the abbot* Le Blanc.

MESTREZAT (John), a miniſter of the church of Paris, and deſcended from a very good family [*A*], was born at Geneva in the year 1592. He was ſent very young to the academy of Saumur; and there he gave ſingular proofs of his excellent genius at a public diſputation [*B*]. He was but eighteen years old when he was offered a profeſſorſhip in Philoſophy; and he was appointed to be miniſter to the church of Paris, as ſoon as he was admitted into Orders [*C*], a thing altogether extraordinary. They had no cauſe to repent of having called him ſo early; for his conferences with the Roman Catholics [*D*], his deputations, [*E*], his ſermons and his books [*F*], ſhewed him to be one of the ableſt men

[*A*] *He was deſcended from a very good family.*] AMI MESTREZAT, his father, was firſt ſyndic of Geneva, and had another ſon who was ſyndic of the ſame city; which is one of the principal offices of that ſtate. PHILIP MESTREZAT, nephew to the miniſter of Charenton, was a famous profeſſor of Divinity at Geneva (1). His eldeſt ſon, who died a few years ago (2), had exerciſed the office of ſyndic of the Republic with great honour. N. MESTREZAT, the other ſon of Philip, is at this time an able Phyſician in his own country (3).

[*B*] *He gave proofs of his excellent genius at a public diſputation.*] He obſerved, that the profeſſor of Philoſophy, who preſided at the diſputation, anſwered to an argument, *tranſeat major, nego minorem*, - - - - *let the firſt propoſition paſs, I deny the ſecond*, and he roſe up to argue, after the opponent had made an end. His ſubject was, that the ſecond propoſition could not be denied, if the firſt was granted, and he maintained this with ſo much ſtrength of reaſon, that he obliged the profeſſor to own it was a fault. Mr du Pleſſis Mornai was preſent at this Act (4).

[*C*] *He was appointed miniſter of the church of Paris as ſoon as he was admitted into Orders.*] He preſented himſelf to the ſynod of Charenton to be received into the miniſtry. Mr du Moulin, who was commiſſioned to find a paſtor for the church of Orleans, had caſt his eyes upon him for this office; but young Meſtrezat being examined in the conſiſtory of Charenton, ſhewed ſo much learning, that this church thought fit to keep him for their own ſervice (5).

[*D*] *His conferences with the Roman Catholics.*] I have been told that his conference with F. Veron was printed, and that he gloriouſly triumphed over this famous diſputant. That which he had with the Jeſuit Regourd, in the preſence of queen Anne of Auſtria, was never publiſhed, and it is a common tradition among the Reformed in France, that this princeſs, being aſtoniſhed to find that this Jeſuit who had boaſted he could eaſily confound all the miniſters, was reduced to the greateſt confuſion by Meſtrezat, required that the acts of this diſpute ſhould not be printed, which thoſe of the Reformed religion punctually obeyed (6).

[*E*] *His deputations.*] It is ſaid, that being deputed by a national ſynod to Lewis XIII he anſwered admirably to three queſtions, which cardinal Richelieu ſuggeſted to that monarch to be put to him. I. Why do you make uſe of the liturgy of Geneva? II. Why do you join in your prayers the Papiſts with the Turks and Pagans? III. Why do you ſuffer miniſters that are not natives of France? He anſwered, I. That ſince they profeſſed the ſame religion with thoſe of Geneva, it was not ſurpriſing that they ſhould make uſe of the ſame liturgy. II. That it was no wonder, that at a time when thoſe of the Romiſh communion treated the Proteſtants as Turks and Pagans would have done, they ſhould join the Papiſts with thoſe Infidels; but that they had taken the word Papiſts out of the new editions, even under the reign of Henry IV, and that if it remained ſtill in ſome, they had not been printed in France. III. That it were to be wiſhed, that ſo many Italian Monks who were then in France, had as great a zeal for his majeſty, as theſe foreign miniſters had, who acknowledged no other ſovereign in the kingdom but the king. Whereupon cardinal Richelieu, putting his hand on his ſhoulder, ſaid, *behold the boldeſt miniſter in France* (7).

[*F*] *His ſermons and his books.*] His language did not come near the polite and clean ſtyle of Mr Daillé, but he preached with greater depth of reaſoning, and with more learning than he did. There are no ſermons that contain a more ſublime Theology than thoſe he preached upon the epiſtle of St Paul to the Hebrews, which were printed in ſeveral volumes. It is ſaid (8), that having met in the ſtreet an eccleſiaſtic of his acquaintance, who had preached a whole Lent with applauſe, and having congratulated him upon it, *I took*, anſwered the other, *out of your ſermons, the beſt things that I ſaid in mine.* He handled the controverſy about the authority of the ſcripture (9), and the authority of the church (10), with a peculiar ſtrength of reaſon, and refuted upon thoſe important ſubjects all the ſubtilties of Father Regourd and Cardinal du Perron. He ſhowed by theſe works that he was very well verſed in the Fathers, and underſtood Philoſophy and the Scripture very well. His treatiſe concerning our *communion*

(1) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of a volume of his uncle's *ſermons upon the Epiſtle to the Hebrews.*

(2) I write this in 1697.

(3) Taken from a Memoir ſent by Mr Pictet. Note, that ſince this Memoir was communicated to me, I heard that Mr Meſtrezat, the Phyſician, was promoted to the office of counſellor to the republic.

(4) A Memoir communicated by Mr Pictet.

(5) Ibid.

(6) *See* du Moulin, des Traditions, *pag.* 79.

(7) A Memoir of Mr Pictet.

(8) Ibid.

(9) *In the book intituled*, A treatiſe of the Holy Scripture, wherein is ſhown the certainty and fulneſs of the faith, and it's independence on the authority of the church. *At Geneva* 1632, *in* 8*vo*.

(10) In his treatiſe of the church, printed at Geneva in 1649, in 4to.

men the Reformed had in France. They relate a very particular circumſtance in a tryal he had in the parliament of Paris [*G*]. He died the ſecond of May 1657, in the forty third year of his miniſtry. He left but one (*a*) daughter (*b*).

munion with Jeſus Chriſt in the ſacrament of the Euchariſt (11), is highly eſteemed. His heirs have ſtill by them ſeveral manuſcripts, which were found in his ſtudy (12), his ſermons upon the Catechiſm (13), the explication of the Epiſtle of St Paul to the Galatians, and of ſome chapters of the Epiſtle to the Epheſians; ſome ſermons upon divers texts, and ſeveral ſmall pieces. Note, that he publiſhed at Sedan a volume of ſermons in the year 1625, in 8vo. Thoſe he wrote upon the firſt Epiſtle of St John are in two volumes.

[G] *They relate a very particular circumſtance in a tryal he had in the parliament of Paris.*] The preſident of the court, where the cauſe was pleaded, having obſerved by his looks that he was not well ſatisfied with his advocate, interrupted him, and addreſſing himſelf to the miniſter, methinks, ſaid he to him, you do not ſeem pleaſed with what is alledged for your cauſe; the court gives you leave to plead for your ſelf. It is ſaid, that Mr Meſtrezat urged his arguments ſo finely, that he carried his cauſe without any difficulty (14).

(*a*) He married her to James Maubert, Sieur de Boiſgibaut.

(*b*) Taken from a Memoir ſent to me from Geneva by Mr Pictet, profeſſor of Divinity.

(11) Printed at Sedan 1625, in 8vo.

(12) Memoir of Mr Pictet.

(13) Some of them are printing at Geneva, with others of Mr Daillé. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, November 1700, *pag.* 586.

(14) Memoir of Mr Pictet.

METEL (JOHN) was of Franche-Comté, and made a figure among the learned of the XVIth century. He ſtudied the Law at Bologna, and there contracted a very intimate friendſhip with Anthony Auguſtin and Jerom Oſorius. This appears by the dialogues of the latter *de Gloria*, wherein the two others are the interlocuters (*a*). Metel was in ſeveral places with Anthony Auguſtin, at Florence, Venice, Rome, and in the Low-Countries, and he accompanied him to England, when Auguſtin was ſent thither by the Pope to Philip II (*b*). He likewiſe correſponded much with Caſſander. Some letters that he wrote to him are publiſhed, which are pretty curious.

(*a*) Oſorius de Gloria, *lib. i, pag. m.* 87.

(*b*) Bartholom. Bodegem. Delphus, *Epiſt. Dedic. Libri* Oſorii de Gloria, *in Edit. Baſil.* 1584.

METELLA. There were ſome ladies of this name in ancient Rome, who had a very bad reputation. CAECILIA METELLA, the ſiſter of Quintus Cæcilius Metellus Numidicus, married Lucius Lucullus. From their marriage proceeded the famous Lucullus, who made war againſt Mithridates (*a*). We learn from Plutarch, that this Metella was infamous for her bad life (*b*). I cannot believe that it was ſhe whom Horace and Valerius Maximus have mentioned [*A*]. CAECILIA METELLA, the daughter of Quintus Cæcilius Metellus Pius, the ſon of Numidicus, married firſt Marcus Æmilius Scaurus, and in a ſecond marriage the famous Sylla. She had by her firſt huſband, a ſon and a daughter. The ſon, Marcus Æmilius Scaurus, diſtinguiſhed himſelf on many accounts, and chiefly by the magnificent theatre which he built. The daughter, called Æmilia, was firſt married to Marcus Acilius Glabrio, and afterwards to Pompey the Great, and died in child-bed (*c*). Theſe two children found Sylla, the ſecond huſband of their mother, to be a good patron; for though Metella did not behave herſelf well, nevertheleſs ſhe was much reſpected by Sylla (*d*). This was, as it is ſaid, becauſe he knew nothing of the debauchery of his wife, which he firſt heard the news of at the ſiege of Athens. He treated this city very harſhly becauſe of the abuſive language they uttered againſt Metella upon the ramparts (*e*). Having had twins by this wife, a ſon and a daughter, he gave the name of Fauſtus to the ſon, and that of Fauſta to the daughter (*f*). The

latter

(*a*) Plut. ubi infra.

(*b*) Ἠδόξησεν ὡς ȣ̓ βεβιωκυῖα σωφρόνος Fuit ob vitam probroſam infamis. *Plut. in Lucullo, init. pag.* 491.

(*c*) Plut. in Sylla, *pag.* 473.

(*d*) Ib. *p.* 455.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Ib. *p.* 473.

[*A*] *I cannot believe that it was ſhe whom Horace and Valerius Maximus have mentioned.*] Horace tells us, that Æſop's ſon diſſolved in vinegar a pearl of great price, and drank it off; and he obſerves that this pearl had ſerved for an ear-ring to Metella (1). An old ſcholiaſt upon Horace ſays, that this Metella was the wife of Æſop's ſon. I ſhould rather believe that there was only an unlawful commerce between them; and this is alſo the opinion of Mr Dacier. He doubts *whether this Metella was not the ſiſter of Q. Cæcilius Metellus Numidicus, who was married to L. Lucullus* (2). I cannot believe it was ſhe, for the wife of this Lucullus was probably old, when the ſon of Æſop begun to be capable of making love. She had a grand niece who married Sylla in the year 665 of Rome, and who had by another huſband two children fit for marriage. We have ſeen (3) that the daughter of Sylla's wife was married to Pompey: but ſhe had been married to another huſband; and we know that Sylla, who cauſed her to marry Pompey, died in the year 672. If the grandniece was a grandmother at that time, we may reaſonably think, that the great aunt was ſcarce a fit object to be courted. Add to this, that Lucullus the ſon of Metella, the great aunt, commanded the Roman army againſt Mithridates, as conſul in the year of Rome 679; and that Cicero, ſome years after the battle of Pharſalia, (4) makes mention of Æſop's ſon, as one that created him much trouble (5). It is not eaſy therefore to adjuſt the times of the love of theſe two perſons.

As for what concerns Valerius Maximus, I find in the Onomaſticon of Glandorp a period that is liable to cenſure; which is this: *Eamdem eſſe volunt de qua Valerius libro primo capite quinto, auctor de viris illuſtribus capite ſexageſimo ſecundo, ut viris duobus nuptam fuiſſe intelligamus* (6). He means that Metella, the ſiſter of Metellus Numidicus, and mother to Lucius Lucullus (7), was the ſame with her, whom Valerius Maximus and Aurelius Victor have ſpoken of. This is not amiſs as to the laſt author, ſince it is certain that he ſpoke expreſsly of Metella, the ſiſter of Metellus Numidicus: but the other writer ſpoke in ſuch an indefinite way, that he may be conjectured to be as well for as againſt it; and ſo Glandorp ſhould not have ſtuffed his paper with conjectures about the things he mentions. But I may relate the matter of fact, which is curious.

Cæcilia, the wife of Metellus, had a niece fit for marriage: ſhe carried her one night into a chapel to ſeek for nuptial preſages. This was the cuſtom when a young woman was intended for marriage. The aunt ſat down and the niece ſtood by her: they liſtened a long time without hearing any thing. The young lady finding herſelf weary with ſtanding, deſired her aunt to let her ſit down a few minutes: *with all my heart*, replyed the aunt, *I will give you my place*. Theſe words were the omen they ſought for: Cæcilia died quickly after, and her huſband married the young niece. This is what Valerius Maximus (8) relates. Cicero (9) mentions it alſo: He had it from Lucius Flaccus a prieſt of Mars (10). There is a note of Pighius in Valerius Maximus Variorum, which ſays, that this Lucius Flaccus was conſul in the year 622. But this was a long time before Cicero was capable of converſing with great men. Pighius adds, that Cæcilia, the ſiſter of Metellus Numidicus, is meant here, and he proves it by Aurelius Victor, who ſays, that this Metellus would not make a funeral oration for Metellus, his brother-in-law (11). But Aurelius Victor has not named this brother-in-law, and ſo the

(1) Filius Æſopi detractam ex aure Metellæ (Scilicet ut decies ſolidum exſorberet) aceto Diluit inſignem baccam. *Horat. Sat. iii, lib. ii, ver.* 239.

(2) Remarks upon that paſſage of Horace, *Tom. vii, pag. m.* 301, 302.

(3) In the text of this article.

(4) It was fought in 705.

(5) Quin etiam Æſopi filius me excruciat. *Cicero ad Atticum, Epiſt. xv, lib. xi.*

(6) Gland. *pag.* 170.

(7) He who overcame Mithridates.

(8) *Lib. i, cap. v, num.* 4.

(9) De Divinat. *lib. i, cb. xlvi.*

(10) L. Flaccum flaminem Martialem ego audivi quum diceret. *Ibid.*

(11) Ipſam vero Cæciliam Q. Numidici ſororem fuiſſe ex auctore de viris illuſtribus eſt colligere, qui *cap. lxii*, ſcribit Numidicum ſororis ſuæ virum Metellum laudare noluiſſe, quod is olim ſuum judicium & leges detrectarat. *Pighius in Val. Maximum, lib. i, cap. v, num.* 4.

latter did not at all degenerate [*B*]: but even out-did her mother. Since Metella was of an age to have children, I do not underſtand the reflexion of Plutarch [*C*]. Metella fell dangerouſly ill, at a time when her huſband gave entertainments to the people upon occaſion of a great vow. He had conſecrated to Hercules the tenth part of his whole eſtate, and treated the people magnificently for ſeveral days. The prieſts declared to him that it was not lawful for him to go and ſee his wife, nor to ſuffer his houſe to be defiled by the death of any one whatſoever. Whereupon he ſent a letter of divorce to Metella, and

learning of Pighius is founded upon a falſe ſuppoſition. ‘ Metellæ ſororis ſuæ virum laudare noluit, quod is ‘ ſolus judicium contra leges detrectaret. - - - *He would ‘ not commend his ſiſter Metella's huſband, becauſe he alone declined judgment againſt the laws.*’ Theſe are the words of Aurelius Victor in the good editions. What ſeems to me moſt memorable in this fact, is the ſtrange ſuperſtition of ancient Rome. Not only ſervant maids ſought after omens for marriage, but ladies of the firſt quality, and thoſe who were of a rank equal to that of our ducheſſes, amuſed themſelves with thoſe fooleries, and went to lie upon the catch of the firſt word that fortune ſhould make them hear. Even at this day the quality of a ducheſs does not free one from theſe fortune-telling ſuperſtitions, wherewith the citizens wives are infatuated.

[*B*] *Fauſta did not at all degenerate.*] She was one of the moſt lewd women of her time; and it was at leaſt true with reſpect to her and Metella, her mother, that the world grows worſe and worſe. Metella was a looſe woman; but *mox datura progeniem vitioſiorem* (12). - - - *Was ſoon to bring forth a child more vitious.* Fauſta had for a third huſband the famous Milo, whom the murder of Clodius and the oration of Cicero have made ſo well known. It was not ſafe to meddle with him; however his wife did not fear him much; for ſhe admitted her galants with ſo little precaution, that one of them was one day catched by Milo. He would have been killed if he had not had a good deal of money; but he redeemed his life by paying the ſum to which Milo condemned him, after he had ſoundly laſhed him. *M. Varro in litteris atque vita fide homo multa & gravis, in libro, quem ſcripſit* Pius aut de pace, *C. Salluſtium ſcriptorem ſeriæ illius & ſeveræ orationis, in cujus hiſtoria notiones cenſorias fieri atque exerceri videmus, in adulterio deprenſum ab Annio Milone loris bene cæſum dicit, & quum dediſſet pecuniam, dimiſſum* (13). It is a ſad thing that this ſhameful diſgrace ſhould happen to a great author; for it was Salluſt the Hiſtorian who was ſo ill treated at Fauſta's houſe. But the galants did not profit by this example; for one Villius is ſaid to have been heartily cuffed in the ſame place, and to have narrowly eſcaped being ſtabbed.

Villius in Fauſta Syllæ gener (hoc miſer uno
Nomine deceptus) pœnas dedit uſque ſuperque
Quam ſatis eſt pugnis cæſus, ferroque petitus
Excluſus fore quum Longarenus foret intus (14).

Some ſay, it was Milo that treated him after this manner (15). It was well for him that he was robuſt, for if he had not, his arms would not have been able to drub as often as was neceſſary ſuch as came to kiſs his wife. But others think with more probability, that he who thus treated the unfortunate Villius, was another galant of Fauſta, who being with her when Villius came in, drove him away diſgracefully. This Villius kept company with Fauſta, chiefly becauſe ſhe was of the firſt quality. Horace laughs at this fooliſh conceit, and ſhows that it does not proceed from nature, and that greater charms are often found among the meaner ſort

Huic ſi Mutonis verbis mala tanta videntis
Diceret hæc animus: quid vis tibi? nunquid ego à te
Magno prognatum depoſco conſule cunnum
Velatumque ſtola, mea cum conferbuit ira?
Quid reſponderet? magno patre nata puella eſt,
At quanto meliora monet pugnantiaque iſtis
Dives opis natura ſuæ . . . . (16).

Nec magis huic inter niveos virideſque lapillos.
(Sit licet hoc Cerinthe tuum) tenerum eſt femur aut crus
Rectius, atque etiam melius perſæpe togatæ (17).

This cenſure proved uſeleſs, and Perſius was obliged to renew it.

- - - - - Nunc nunc impenſius unge
Unge puer caules. Mihi feſta luce coquatur
Urtica, & fiſſa fumoſum ſinciput aure;
Ut tuus iſte nepos olim ſatur anſeris extis,
Cum moroſa vago ſingultiet inguine vena,
PATRICIÆ immejat vulvæ (18).

Pour oil, and pour it with a plenteous hand
Upon my ſallads, boy; ſhall I be fed
With ſodden nettles, and a ſing'd ſow's head?
'Tis holiday, provide me better chear,
'Tis holiday, and ſhall be round the year.
Shall I my houſhold gods, and genius cheat,
To make him rich, who grudges me my meat?
That he may loll at eaſe, and pamper'd high,
When I am laid, may feed on giblet pye?
And when his throbbing luſt extends the vein,
Have wherewithal his whores to entertain?

DRYDEN.

‘ And there are ſtill many people like Villius, ‘ who like nothing in their miſtreſs but their name ‘ and their quality.’ Theſe are the words of an able commentator (19). I have not yet named all the galants of our Fauſta, whoſe memory is tranſmitted to us in books. She had two at the ſame time, whoſe names gave occaſion to a witty ſaying of her brother. *Fauſtus Syllæ filius cum ſoror ejus eodem tempore duos mœchos haberet, Fulvium fullonis filium & Pompejum Maculam, miror, inquit, ſororem meam habere Maculam cum fullonem habeat* (20). *I wonder*, ſaid he, *that my ſiſter ſhould have a ſpot, ſince ſhe has a ſcourer.* But the Latin is infinitely more graceful.

[*C*] *I do not underſtand the reflexion of Plutarch.*] He ſays, that Sylla before he married Metella had three wives, whereof the laſt called Cœlia, was decently divorced upon pretence of barrenneſs; but, adds Plutarch, the marriage which Sylla contracted a few days after with Metella, ſhows that he had unjuſtly alledged againſt Cœlia this reaſon of divorce. ’Ολίγαις δὲ ὕϛερον ἡμέραις ἀγαγόμενος τὴν Μετέλλαν ἔδοξε διὰ τοῦτο τὴν Κοίλιαν οὐ καλῶς αἰτιάσασθαι. *Verum quod paucis diebus poſt Metellam duxit, apparuit eum immerito illam cauſam in Cæliam prætendiſſe* (21). To make this reaſoning of Plutarch good, we muſt ſuppoſe, that a man who has divorced his wife for barrenneſs, if he acts naturally and diſcreetly, will not make haſte to take another: but common ſenſe tells us, that this cannot be ſuppoſed without falling into an error; for every one that divorces his wife, and does it only upon account of barrenneſs, teſtifies by that, that he wiſhes to have children. And therefore reaſon requires that he ſhould marry again quickly another woman, who is like to be fruitful: and if he ſhould not marry again at all, or delay for a long time to do it, he would thereby plainly declare, he had given a falſe reaſon for his divorce. What did it ſignify, might one ſay, whether his wife was barren or no, ſince after her divorce he continues unmarried? And therefore it is not true, that Sylla's marrying quickly Metella, was a confutation of the reaſon for which he ſaid he divorced Cœlia; on the contrary, that marriage did confirm it, and juſtify his conduct. The reaſon of Plutarch would be good, if Metella had been paſt the age of child-bearing; but he informs us himſelf that ſhe was brought to bed of twins. That which deceived him, ſeems to be this: he reaſoned in this manner with himſelf; Sylla would not have concluded his marriage with Metella a little while after Cælia's divorce, if he had not been in love with her ſome time before, and even prepared things for his

(12) *See* Horace, Ode VI, lib. iii.

(13) Aul. Gellius, *lib. xvii, cap. xviii.*

(14) Horat. Sat. II, lib. i, ver. 64.

(15) Vetus interpres Horatii.

(16) Horat. Sat. II, lib. i, ver. 68.

(17) Ib. ver. 80.

(18) Perſius, Sat. VI, ſub fin.

(19) Mr Dacier on Horace, *Tom. vii, pag.* 145.

(20) Macrob. Saturn. *lib. ii, cap. ii, pag.* 324.

(21) Plut. in Sylla, *pag* 453.

and ordered that ſhe ſhould be carried out of his Houſe before ſhe died. Superſtition moved him to do all theſe things againſt his inclination; for he was much afflicted to loſe his wife, and he made her a very magnificent funeral to eaſe his grief (*g*). Upon the ſame account he made great feaſts for his friends, without any regard to the ſumptuary laws, which he himſelf had enacted (*h*). Theſe he tranſgreſſed boldly, tho' he durſt not violate the ridiculous and barbarous ceremonies which the prieſts had taught him. If the ſon of Æſop was beloved by one Metella [*D*], as there is ſome probability, I am ſtrongly inclined to think, that the two gallant ladies I have ſpoken of, are not the only perſons of that name who behaved themſelves ill.

Some authors have given the name of METELLA to one of Pompey's wives, whom he divorced on account of her leudneſs (*i*); but ſhe ſhould rather be called Mucia: and I ſpeak of her under that word.

(*g*) Καὶ τοῦτο μὲν ἀκριβῶς τὸ νόμιμον ὑπὸ δεισιδαιμονίας ἐτήρησε· τὸν δὲ τῆς ταφῆς ὁρίζοντα τὴν δαπάνην νόμον αὐτὸς παρεισενηνοχὼς παρέβη μηδενὸς ἀναλώματος φεισάμενος. Atque hac in re leges curioſe ex ſuperſtitione ſervavit: at legem funerariam, quam tulerat ipſe, convulſit nullo habito ſumptus modo. *Ibid. pag.* 474. *B.*

(*h*) Id. ib.

(*i*) *See* Biſſelius, Ruinar. illuſtr. *Decade iv, part iv, pag.* 2984.

his new marriage before the diſſolution of the former. It was therefore his deſire to marry Metella, that puſhed him on to a divorce; and ſo the barrenneſs of Cœlia was only a vain pretence. Plutarch might have reaſon at the bottom; perhaps the only motive of Sylla was the deſire he had to marry Metella. However, ſince Plutarch builds his propoſition upon a very ambiguous proof, and which, according to the order of nature and good ſenſe, muſt needs be falſe, he is guilty of a paralogiſm. I have ſaid elſewhere, that ſuch a criticiſm as this, which may be called logical, may do young readers more ſervice than a grammatical criticiſm.

[*D*] *If the ſon of Æſop was beloved by one Metella.*] That which makes me expreſs myſelf after this manner is, that the words of Horace do not neceſſarily imply, that the lady whoſe pearl was ſwallowed by Æſop's ſon, was in love with him. Horace might have mentioned Metella, in caſe ſhe had been a lady who delighted to be pompouſly adorned with jewels; for ſince he deſigned to expoſe the extravagant prodigality of Æſop's ſon, he was to deſcribe the pearl by ſuch ſtrokes as might affect the reader. If then there had been a lady called Metella, famous for the magnificence of her jewels, he would have given a great idea of the value of a pearl, by ſaying, it was the earring of ſuch a lady; and ſo the expreſſion of Horace, *detrectam ex aure Metellæ, - - - - taken from Metella's ear*, would not be uſeleſs, even tho' it ſhould be ſuppoſed that the ſon of Æſop did not become maſter of that pearl but by purchaſe. Yet I think it very probable, that this Metella behaved herſelf very ill with the ſon of this comedian: and it may very well be that ſhe was the ſame with that Metella who is mentioned in Cicero's letters. There are ſome commentators who think, I. that when Cicero complains of being tormented by the ſon of Æſop (22), he means that this man was a companion of Dolabella in the debaucheries which ſo much vexed Tullia (23), and which were one of the cauſes of diſſolving her marriage with Dolabella. II. That theſe debaucheries were the intrigues of Dolabella with ſome ladies of pleaſure, and particularly with Metella. This conjecture is grounded upon a paſſage in another letter of Cicero, wherein Metella is reckoned among the cauſes of the divorce of *Tullia*. *Melius quidem in peſſimis nihil fuit diſcidio: aliquid feciſſemus ut vivi, vel tabularum novarum nomine, vel nocturnarum expugnationum, vel Metellæ, vel omnium malorum* (24). Some (25) think that this Metella was ſhe whom Lentulus Spinther divorced, and that the Metella of Æſop's ſon was ſhe that was divorced by this Lentulus (26). What is certain is, that there was about that time a very intriguing lady called Metella, whoſe amours afforded as much matter to the Poets, as Madam d'Olonne has done to the writers of the XVIIth century. Here follow two verſes of Ovid, taken out of the ſecond elogy of the ſecond book *de Triſtibus*, ver. 437.

> Et quorum libris modo diſſimulata Perillæ
> Nomine nunc legitur dicta, Metelle, tuo.
>
> *And thoſe who falſly put Perilla's name,*
> *With whom, we read, Metella is the ſame.*

We learn from Apuleius, how the author was called who diſguiſed the name of Metella by that of Perilla. ' Eadem opera accuſent, *ſays he*, p. 279 *of his apology*, C. Catullum quod Leſbiam pro Clodia nominavit, & Ticidam ſimiliter quod quæ Metella erat, Perillam ſcripſerit. - - - - *The ſame works accuſe C. Catullus of naming Leſbia inſtead of Clodia, and likewiſe Ticida of writing Perilla inſtead of Metella.*'

(22) Quin etiam Æſopi filius me excruciat. *Cicero ad Attic. Epiſt. xv, lib. xi.*

(23) Quia ſocius Dolabellæ in adulteriis Pellicum Tulliæ, ut Metellæ de qua Epiſt. xxiii. *Popma, in Editione, Epiſt. Cicer. ad Atticum Græviana, Tom. ii, pag.* 248.

(24) Cicero, ad Attic. *lib. xi, Epiſt. xxiii.*

(25) Corradus, in Cicer. ad Attic. *Epiſt. vii, lib. xiii.*

(26) Et Lentulum cum Metella certe feciſſe divortium. *Cicero, ibid. Epiſt. vii, lib. xiii. See alſo Epiſt. lii, lib. xii.*

METELLUS CELER (QUINTUS) conſul in the year of Rome 693, diſcharged the office of pretor in the year of Cicero's conſulſhip (*a*), and did good ſervice to the commonwealth in oppoſing the troops of Catiline, which intended to paſs into Gallia Ciſalpina (*b*). He obtained the government of that province after his pretorſhip. He was a perſon of merit, but very unhappy in chooſing a wife; for he married a ſiſter of Clodius [*A*], who firſt diſgraced him by her leudneſs, and then poiſoned him. She was his couſin german (*c*). It is ſhe that, under the name of Leſbia, is ſo much defamed by

(*a*) In 690.

(*b*) Salluſt. in Bell. Catilin. *pag. m.* 81, 176.

(*c*) Cicero pro Cœlio, *pag.* 518. Edit. Abrami.

[*A*] *He married a ſiſter of Clodius.*] This is the Clodia whom Cicero has ſo well deſcribed in his defence of Cœlius, a fine country youth, who was accuſed of ſeveral crimes, and among the reſt of having a deſign to poiſon Clodia, that he might not be obliged to pay the ſums of money which he had borrowed of her. Cicero was his advocate, and pleaded for him with ſo much ſtrength of reaſoning, that he was acquitted. Clodia undertook this affair, only to be revenged upon him for a grievous affront he had put upon her, which was, that Cœlius, after he had taken his pleaſure with her as much, and as long as he would, at laſt grew weary of her, and forſook her, in order to make his courtſhip elſewhere. Plutarch (1) relates, that ſhe was ſirnamed Quadrantaria, becauſe one day one of thoſe who had lain with her, paid her in very bad money. He put into his purſe, not pieces of ſilver, but ſmall pieces of copper (2), much like farthings. Apuleius (3) informs us, ſhe was the lady whom Catullus has ſo much celebrated under the name of Leſbia: and ſo ſhe deſerved, for many reaſons, the title Plutarch has given her; for the Leſbia of Catullus was, at laſt, a ſtreet-walker, and waited for her prey at the corner of the ſtreets. She was for the firſt ſhe met, and without doubt took what was offered her. She would accept of a glaſs of the ſmalleſt liquor, and proſtitute her ſelf for a trifle, *Scortum diobolare, aut triobolare*; - - - *a penny, or a three half-penny whore.* Did ſhe not therefore deſerve the ſirname of Quadrantaria: See in the margin the verſes of Catullus, which were probably addreſſed to Cicero's client (4). She purchaſed a garden on the banks of the Tiber, that ſhe might have an opportunity of ſeeing thoſe that came to ſwim in the river, and the better to choſe the prey ſhe had a mind to draw into her net. *Habes hortos ad Tiberim: ac diligenter eo loco paraſti quo omnis juventus natandi cauſſa venit, hinc licet conditiones quotidie legas* (5). Of all the ſiſters of Clodius this was the moſt ſuſpected of inceſt with him (6). Being yet very young, he pretended to be fearful, that he might have leave to ſleep with his ſiſter. *Propter neſcio quam, credo, timiditatem, & nocturnos quoſdam inanes metus, tecum ſemper puſio cum majore ſorore cubitavit*

(1) Plutarch. in Ciceron. Vita, *pag.* 875.

(2) Which they called at Rome *Quadrantes.*

(3) *Apuleius, in Apol. pag. m.* 279. I have cited his words in the remark [*D*] of the preceding article.

(4) Cœli, Leſbia noſtra, Leſbia illa,
Illa Lesbia quam Catullus unam
Pluſquam ſe atque ſuos amavit omnes; Nunc in quadriviis & angiportis Glubit magnanimos Remi Nepotes.
Catull. Epigr. lix.

(5) Cicero, pro Cœlio, *pag.* 445. Edit. Abrami. *Compare with this what has been ſaid in the article LEWIS VII, citat.* (5).

(6) Plut. ubi ſupra.

by Catullus (*d*). Cicero loſt a very good friend by the death of this Metellus in 694 [*B*]. I ſhall obſerve a miſtake of Turnebus [*C*]. Our Metellus was of the college of the Augurs (*e*).

(*d*) See the remark [*A*], citation (3).

(*e*) Cicero in Vatinium, *pag.* 306, ejſudem Edit.

---

tavit (7). There is an epigram in Catullus (8) which ſhews, that he loved Clodia; and that he fell out with her before the death of her huſband.

Leſbia mi, præſente viro, mala plurima dicit,
 Hæc illi fatuo maxima lætitia eſt.
Mule (9), nihil ſentis. Si noſtri oblita taceret,
 Sana eſſet, quod nunc gannit & obloquitur
Non ſolum meminit, ſed quæ multo acrior eſt res
 Irata eſt: hoc eſt uritur & loquitur.

Before her huſband, Leſbia calls me names,
And at the leudneſs of the town exclaims;
This tickles the poor cuckold to the life,
And he thanks Heav'n for ſuch a virtuous wife.
Contented fool! . . . . indeed, you reaſon wrong,
If ſhe vere virtuous, ſhe would hold her tongue.
Scandal and noiſe do not her virtue prove,
But are the marks of unextinguiſhed love.

[*B*] *Cicero loſt a very good friend by the death of this Metellus in the year* 694.] I will ſet down his own words, that we may know the merit of this Metellus, and his friendſhip for Cicero; and alſo the difference there is often between a man and a huſband. Metellus, with reſpect to Cicero, is an illuſtrious Roman; for Cicero conſiders him only as he is a man. But the ſame Metellus, with reſpect to Catullus, is a dunce, a fool, a mule (10), becauſe Catullus conſiders him only as a huſband. Catullus was convinced that the wife of Metellus was a worthleſs wretch. He knew ſo well all the effects of love, that he was perſuaded, that ſince ſhe ſpoke ſo ill of him, it was a ſign ſhe ſtill felt the flames of her paſſion. What eſteem then could he have for Metellus, who was catched in ſuch a miſerable trap, and ſuffered himſelf to be hornified, and then bubbled by his wife? Let us ſee the words of Cicero (11). ‘Pro Dii immortales cur interdum in hominum ſceleribus maximis aut connivetis, aut præſentis fraudis pœnas in diem reſervatis? Vidi enim, vidi, & illum hauſi dolorem vel acerbiſſimum in vita, quum Q. Metellus abſtraheretur è ſinu, gremioque patriæ: quumque ille vir, qui ſe natum huic imperio putavit, tertio die poſtquam in Curia, in roſtris, in Republica floruiſſet, integerrima ætate, optimo habitu, maximis viribus eriperetur indigniſſime bonis omnibus, atque univerſæ civitati. Quo quidem tempore ille moriens, quum jam cæteris ex partibus oppreſſa mens eſſet, extremum ſenſum ad memoriam Reipublicæ reſervabat: quum me intuens flentem ſignificabat interruptis, atque morientibus vocibus: quanta impenderet procella urbi, quanta tempeſtas civitati: quum parietem ſæpe feriens eum, qui cum Q. Catulo fuerat ei communis, crebro Catulum, ſæpe me, ſæpiſſime Rempublicam nominabat: ut non ſe tam emori, quam ſpoliari ſuo præſidio quum patriam, tum etiam me doleret. Quem quidem virum ſi nulla vis repentini ſceleris ſuſtuliſſet, quonam modo ille furenti fratri ſuo patrueli Conſulari reſtitiſſet, qui conſulem incipientem furere atque conantem, ſua ſe manu interfecturum, audiente Senatu dixerit? Ex hac igitur domo progreſſa iſta mulier de veneni celeritate dicere audebit? nonne ipſam domum metuet, ne quam vocem eliciat? non parietes conſcios, non noctem illam funeſtam ac luctuoſam perhorreſcet? - - - - *O immortal gods, why do ye ſometimes connive at the greateſt crimes of mankind, or defer the puniſhment of them? For I have ſeen, I have ſeen and endured the moſt bitter affliction of life, when Q. Metellus was dragged from the heart and boſom of his country; when he, who thought himſelf born for the ſervice of this Empire, on the third day after he had diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the ſenate, the roſtra, and the commonwealth, in the very prime of his age, and of a vigorous and healthy conſtitution, was moſt baſely ſnatched away from all good men, and from all the citizens. In his dying moments, tho' his mind was in other reſpects oppreſſed, he retained the memory of the commonwealth: and, beholding me in tears, ſignified, with broken and imperfect words, how a great ſtorm threatened the city and ſtate: and ſtriking frequently the wall, which had been common to Q. Catullus and him, he often named Catullus and me, and very often the commonwealth: intimating, that he did not ſo much regret his own death, as that his country and I ſhould be deprived of his aſſiſtance. Had he not been violently and wickedly carried off, how would he have reſiſted his furious brother that had been conſul, who ſaid, in the hearing of the ſenate, that he would ſlay, with his own hand, the conſul that began to rage and diſpute. Will that woman then go from this houſe, and dare to plead the cauſe about poiſoning her huſband? Will ſhe not be afraid of the very houſe, leſt it utter ſome word againſt her? Will ſhe not dread the conſcious walls, and that fatal and ſad night?*’ Cicero obſerves in another place, that Clodia lived ill with her huſband. ‘Ea eſt ſeditioſa: ea cum viro bellum gerit, neque ſolum cum Metello, ſed etiam cum Fabio (12). - - - *She is a contentious woman: ſhe not only wages war with her huſband Metellus, but likewiſe with Fabius.*’

[*C*] *I ſhall obſerve a miſtake of Turnebus.*] He believed that Catullus ſpoke of our Metellus Celer in epigram 68. *Ita Cæcilio placeam, cui credita nunc ſum.* - - - *So may I pleaſe Cæcilius to whom I am truſted.* The Poet brings in the door of a debauched woman ſpeaking thus: but this woman was not Leſbia, or Clodia, for the woman meant in this epigram, had married an impotent man, whoſe father was ſo officious, as to conſummate the marriage which his ſon had contracted. It is not known whether he did it becauſe he loved his daughter-in-law, or becauſe he was perſuaded his ſon was not able to do it. Conſult theſe verſes of Catullus:

Primum igitur virgo quod fertur tradita nobis,
 Falſum eſt: nonque illam vir prior attigerat,
Languidior tenera cui pendens ſicula beta,
 Nunquam ſe mediam ſuſtulit ad tunicam;
Sed pater ipſius nati violaſſe cubile
 Dicitur, & miſeram conſceleraſſe domum:
Sive quod impia mens cæco flagrabat amore,
 Seu quod iners ſterili ſemine natus erat:
Et quærendum aliunde foret nervoſius illud,
 Quod poſſet zonam ſolvere virgineam
Egregium narras mira pietate parentem,
 Qui ipſe ſui gnati minxerit in gremium (13).

Scaliger refutes Turnebus by two reaſons: the firſt is, that the ſcene of this adventure was Verona, and not Rome. The ſecond is, that nobody ever ſaid that Clodia committed inceſt with her father. Cicero had certainly objected it to her, if her character had ſuffered upon that account (14). Theſe two reaſons of Scaliger are very good; but he did not obſerve that it was with her huſband's father, and not with her own, that the woman, mentioned by Catullus, loſt her maidenhead.

(7) Cicero, ibid.

(8) It is the lxxxivth.

(9) It is not a proper name as ſeveral have believed. See Muret upon this Epigram.

(10) See Epigram lxxxiv, in the preceding remark.

(11) Cicero, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 514.

(12) Id. Epiſt. i, ad Attic. *lib. i*, *pag. m.* 175.

(13) Catul. Epigr. lxviii.

(14) Alienum à vero prorſus ſcribit Adr. Turnebus, Gallorum doctiſſimus, hunc eſſe Cæcilium, cui Clodia nupſerit. Hoc enim non Romæ, ſed Veronæ manifeſto actum ſcribit Catullus. Deinde nihil tale de Clodia narratur, ut conſuetudinem ſtupri nefandam cum patre ſuo habuerit. Hoc enim non tacuiſſet capitalis hoſtis ejus fratris Clodii Cicero. *Scalig. Not. in Catull. Epigr. lxviii.*

METELLUS (Lucius) a tribune of the people, when Cæſar made himſelf maſter of Rome, at the beginning of the civil wars, had more courage than all the other magiſtrates. The city of Rome appeared ſo ſubmiſſive to the will of Cæſar at the very firſt [*A*], that it ſeemed as if ſhe had been a long time accuſtomed to the yoke of bondage. Metellus was the only perſon that durſt oppoſe Cæſar, who had a mind to ſeize the treaſure that was

[*A*] *The city of Rome appeared ſo ſubmiſſive to the will of Cæſar at the very firſt.*] We muſt not wonder at this, for he was conſidered as a man that with an armed force had ſeized Rome, and it was feared he would have pillaged it.

was kept in the temple of Saturn. Cæſar laughed at the oppoſition, and the laws which were objected to him [*B*], and went ſtreight to the place where the treaſure was depoſited. He found it ſhut, and becauſe the keys were refuſed him he ordered the doors to be broke open; whereupon Metellus renewing his oppoſition Cæſar threatened to kill him: *Young man*, added he, *you know it would be more eaſy for me to do it than to ſay it.* The tribune reſiſted no longer [*C*], but went away very quietly; and Cæſar took out of this treaſury whatever he had a mind to (*a*). He was very careful not to tell how the thing happened; for he diſguiſed it ſo in his Hiſtory of the civil war (*b*) [*D*], that you can perceive

(*a*) Plut. in Cæſare. *pag.* 725.

(*b*) *Lib. i.*

Namque ignibus atris
Creditur, ut captæ rapturus mœnia Romæ
Sparſuruſque Deos: fuit hæc menſura timoris,
Velle putant quodcunque poteſt (1).

(1) Lucan. Pharſ. lib. III, ver. 99.

They think he comes to ravage, ſack, and burn,
Religion, gods, and temples to o'erturn.
Their fears ſuggeſt him willing to purſue
Whatever ills unbounded power can do.

Rowe.

The good fortune of Rome ſet bounds to his power, when the ſenate and people had ſet none to their ſubmiſſion. This will not be the laſt time, that even in circumſtances, wherein effeminacy is more inexcuſable than at that time, ſome will be leſs aſhamed to ſuffer things to be taken, than others to take them, and that they will be beholden for their preſervation to the diſcretion of others.

Omnia Cæſar erat, privatæ Curia vocis
Teſtis adeſt. Sedere patres cenſere parati
Si regnum, ſi templa ſibi, jugulumque Senatus
Exiliumque petat. Melius quod plura jubere
Erubuit, quam Rome pati (2).

(2) Id. ib. ver. 108.

Cæſar is all things in himſelf alone,
The ſilent court is but a looker on;
With humble votes obedient they agree
To what their mighty ſubject ſhall decree;
Whether as king or god he will be fear'd,
If royal thrones or altars ſhall be rear'd.
Ready for death or baniſhment they ſtand,
And wait their doom from his diſpoſing hand.
But he by ſecret ſhame's reproaches ſtaid
Bluſh'd to command what Rome would have obey'd.

Rowe.

[*B*] *Cæſar laughed at .... the laws which were objected to him.*] Appian (3) tells us, that after the fatal wars which the Romans had with the Gauls, certain ſums of money were laid by at Rome, which it was forbid to touch, under pain of a public execration, except it were in caſe of a war againſt the Gauls. It was remonſtrated to Cæſar, that their anceſtors had given the curſe of the country to any one that ſhould touch this money, unleſs in this neceſſity. He made a jeſt of this curſe, and ſaid, that having ſubdued the Gauls, he had delivered Rome from the obligation, under which ſhe might lie when ſhe founded this treaſury. Lucan has made an ingenious reflexion indeed, but I think it is a little ſtrained. He ſays, that people have the laws, privileges, and liberty leſs at heart than money, and that it was only for the ſake of this treaſure that they attempted to reſiſt Cæſar (4). He means the oppoſition of Metellus.

(3) *Lib. ii*, Bell. Civil. *pag. m.* 241.

(4) Uſque adeo ſolus ferrum, mortemque timere Auri neſcit amor, pereunt diſcrimine nullo Amiſſæ leges: ſed pars viliſſima rerum Certamen moviſtis opes. *Lucan. ubi ſupra, ver.* 118.

[*C*] *The tribune reſiſted no longer.*] Lucan ſuppoſes, that Metellus was ambitious of the glory of being ſacrificed to the violence of the tyrant, but that Cæſar did not think him worthy of that honour, and told him:

Vanam ſpem mortis honeſtæ
Concipis: haud (iniquit) jugulo ſe polluet iſto
Noſtra, Metelle, manus. Dignum te Cæſaris ira
Nullus honor facit, te vindice tuta relicta eſt
Libertas? non uſque adeo permiſcuit imis
Longus ſumma dies, ut non, ſi voce Metelli
Serventur leges, malint à Cæſare tolli (5).

(5) Ib. ver. 134.

Sooth not thy ſelf with hopes of death ſo vain,
No blood of thine my conquering ſword ſhall ſtain,
Thy titles and thy popular command
Can never make thee worthy Cæſar's hand.
Art thou thy country's ſole defender! Thou!
Can liberty and Rome be fallen ſo low!
Nor time nor chance breed ſuch confuſions yet,
Nor are the mean ſo rais'd, nor ſunk the great;
But laws themſelves would rather chuſe to be
Suppreſs'd by Cæſar, than preſerv'd by thee.

Rowe.

This Poet ſuppoſes another thing, *viz.* that Metellus did not retire till after the ſtrong remonſtrances of Cotta. Liberty, ſaid Cotta, ruins liberty, when the monarchical power curbs it; and if you would not quite deſtroy it, if you deſire at leaſt to retain the ſhadow of it, appear willing to do what is commanded you. This thought is very fine, and Lucan expreſſes it nobly.

Tum Cotta Metellum
Compulit audaci nimium deſiſtere cœpto.
Libertas, inquit, populi, quem regna coërcent,
Libertate perit; cujus ſervaveris umbram,
Si, quicquid jubeare, velis (6).

(6) Ib. ver. 143.

When Cotta to prevent the kindling fire,
Thus ſooth'd the raſh Metellus to retire.
Where kings prevail, all liberty is loſt,
And none but he who reigns can freedom boaſt.
Some ſhadow of this bliſs thou ſhalt retain
Chuſing to do what ſovereign powers ordain.

Rowe.

[*D*] *Cæſar ..... diſguiſes this action in his hiſtory of the civil war.*] It is rather a total ſuppreſſion than a diſguiſing of it; for he is ſo far from granting, that he uſed threats againſt Metellus, and that he carried off in ſpite of him the money that was in the treaſury, that he declares he went out of Rome, that he might not be a long time entangled in the diſputes that his enemies raiſed againſt him by means of Metellus. Is not this an inſinuation that he was ſo gracious and complaiſant, that he choſe rather to leave his country than to ſtruggle with this tribune of the people? 'Subjicitur etiam L. Metellus Tribunus plebis ab inimicis Cæſaris, qui hanc rem diſtrahat, reliquaſque res quaſcunque agere inſtituerit, impediat. Cujus cognito conſilio, Cæſar fruſtra diebus aliquot conſumptis, ne reliquum tempus omittat, infectis iis quæ agere deſtinaverat, ab Urbe proficiſcitur (7). ---- *Lucius Metellus, tribune of the people, was engaged by Cæſar's enemies to protract the time, and oppoſe whatever Cæſar ſhould offer; which reſolution as ſoon as he perceived, having already ſpent ſome days to no purpoſe, he quitted the city that he might loſe no more time, leaving the deſigns uneffected which had brought him thither.*' If he mentions the public treaſure, it is not to tell us that he ſeized upon it; but only, that the falſe report of his arrival ſo frighted his enemies, that the conſul Lentulus, who went to the treaſury to take thence the money he could find in it, in order to ſend it to Pompey, departed ſuddenly without putting his deſign in execution. According to all the editions of Cæſar, the fear of this conſul was ſo great, that it did not give him leave to ſhut up the public treaſury (8); but a judicious critic (9) is of opinion, that this paſſage ſhould be corrected by inſerting the particle *non*, and then the meaning of Cæſar will be, that the conſul fled away before he had opened the treaſury.

(7) Cæſar. de Bello Civ. *lib. i*, *pag. m.* 250.

(8) Quibus rebus Romam nunciatis tantus repente terror invaſit, ut cum Lentulus conſul ad aperiendum ærarium veniſſet ad pecuniam Pompejo ex Senatuſconſulto proferendam, protinus aperto ſanctiore ærario ex urbe profugeret, Cæſar enim adventare jam jamque, & adeſſe ejus equites falſo nunciabantur. *Ib. pag.* 239.

(9) Philip Rubeins Elector, *l. b. i, cap. xxiv*, apud Voſſium de Hiſtor. Lat. *pag.* 63, *would have it read* protinus non aperto.

perceive nothing of injuſtice or violence in it. This is the method of thoſe who write their own lives; they conceal ſuch circumſtances as do not tend to their honour.

treaſury. According to the editions, Cæſar tells a thing very different from what all the other Hiſtorians affirm. They obſerve, that he cauſed the doors of the public treaſury to be broke open, or that he threatened to do it when the keys were denied him (10). The common reading ſuppreſſes this violence, becauſe it ſuppoſes that the doors were left open. If we follow the conjecture of Rubeins, we ſhall leſſen the inſincerity of Cæſar's pen: But yet he will always be guilty of a notorious concealing of the truth; for he ſays nothing of his taking advantage of this circumſtance, and of his entring the treaſury which Lentulus had not ſhut. Voſſius, I think, has given no good reaſon againſt this correction of Rubeins. 'Sed profecto, '*ſays he*, ſequentia refellunt, nam quia mirum poterat 'videri, quod relinqueret apertum ærarium profu'giens, eo ſubjungit: *Cæſar enim adventare*, &c (11). '- - - - *But indeed the following words refute it; for 'as it might ſeem ſtrange that he ſhould leave the 'treaſury open when he fled away, he adds: for it was 'reported that Cæſar was juſt a coming*, &c.' This reaſon is taken from the words which Cæſar uſes to ſhow the cauſe of Lentulus's fright: But it is not very ſtrong; for it is very ſtrange, that when a great war is coming on, a conſul who is ready to take out the money of the treaſury, in order to ſend it to the general, ſhould fly away before he ſecures that money. So that if Cæſar had made uſe of a negative particle, as Rubeins ſuppoſes, he would have been obliged to give a reaſon for the fear of Lentulus; a fear which would not have allowed him the time neceſſary to provide himſelf with money. Voſſius therefore, without good ground, ſuppoſes that a needleſs reaſon would be alledged, if the fact which Cæſar relates was agreeable to the criticiſm of Rubeins. It appears to me alſo, that the common reading carries the matter to an hyperbole. For what probability is there, that a Roman conſul ſhould have been ſo frighted, that he could not ſee that the time which was neceſſary to ſhut up a door, was not a time to be made much of, I mean that it would not be ſo long as to hinder him from making his eſcape?

(10) *See* Lucan, Plutarch, *and* Appian, ubi ſupra, *citat. (a)*, (3), (4). Dion, *lib. xli, pag.* 181. Cicero, ad Attic. *lib. x, Epiſt. iv.* Florus, *lib. iv, cap. ii, num.* 21.

(11) De Hiſt. Latinis, *pag.* 63.

METHYDRIUM, in Greek Μεθύδειον, a city of Peloponneſus in Arcadia, was ſo called upon the account of its ſituation between two rivers (*a*). Orchomenes, who was the founder of it, built it upon a riſing ground. There was near Methydrium a temple of Neptunus Equeſtris, and a mountain which was called *Thaumaſius* [*A*], that is, *miraculous*, to which it is pretended that Cybele fled, being got with child by Jupiter, and that Hoplodamus, and the giants in his retinue, prepared to aſſiſt her, in caſe Saturn, her huſband, ſhould offer her any violence [*B*]. It was not denied that ſhe was delivered upon mount Lyceus, but ſome maintained that ſhe deceived her huſband upon mount Thaumaſius [*C*], by giving him a ſtone inſtead of a child. On the top of this mountain the cave of Cybele was ſhown, in which no perſon was ſuffered to ſet a foot, except the women conſecrated to that goddeſs (*b*). Methydrium was nothing but a village in the time of Pauſanias, and belonged to the Megalopolitans (*c*). This article will diſpleaſe a great many people, becauſe it ſhews there were in the times of Paganiſm certain places of devotion, whoſe pretended ſanctity was grounded only upon ridiculous tales: for there are many reſemblances which are not liked at all. Pauſanias is a troubleſome author, and deſerved to be reviſed by the commiſſioners, *Librorum expurgandorum*, *appointed to purge books.*

(*a*) One was called Malœta, and the other Mylaon.

(*b*) *Taken from* Pauſanias, *lib. viii, pag.* 266.

(*c*) Id. ib. *pag.* 246.

[*A*] *There was near Methydrium a temple . . . . and a mountain . . . . . called Thaumaſius.*] I make this remark only to correct a word in the text of Pauſanias. This author ſays, that the town of Methydrium was ſituated between the river Malœta, and the river Mylaon (1), and that there was a temple upon the river Mylaon, and a mountain upon the river Molottus. It is plain, that here is a river too much, and that this paſſage of Pauſanias has been corrupted by the tranſcribers. I will ſet down the Greek. Ἔςι δὲ ἐν Μεθυδρίῳ, Ποσειδῶνός τε Ἱππίε ναὸς, ἔτος μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ Μυλάοντί ἐςι, τὸ δὲ ὄρος τὸ Θαυμάσιον καλέμενον, κεῖται μὲν ὑπὲρ τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν Μολοττόν. *Eſt Methydrii Neptuni equeſtris ædes ad Mylaontem fluvium: mons vero Thaumaſius dictus ſupra Molottum amnem eſt.* I believe, that inſtead of Μολοττὸν, we ſhould read Μαλοιτάν, which is the name of the other river, whereof Pauſanias had ſpoken a little before. Note, that upon reading this a long time after it had been written, I thought it neceſſary to conſult Pauſanias printed at Leipſic in 1696, which did not come to my hands till a few months ago: and there I found a note which informs me, 1. That Stephanus Niger believes, that Malœta and Molottus, or Moloſſus, in Pauſanias were two different rivers; but that others think the fault of the tranſcribers happened in the word Μαλοιτᾶ. 2. That Kuhnius is not poſitive in the caſe, and knows not what to make of certain names which occur but once.

(1) Μαλοιτᾶ τε ποταμοῦ καὶ Μυλάοντος μέσος. Medio loco inter Malœtan & Mylaontem flumina. *Pauſan. lib. viii, pag. m.* 266.

[*B*] *Hoplodamus, and the giants in his retinue, prepared to aſſiſt Cybele, in caſe Saturn . . . ſhould offer her . . . violence.*] Natalis Comes underſtood not the paſſage of Pauſanias; for he ſuppoſes that the giants called in to the aſſiſtance of the goddeſs the mountain Thaumaſius. *Qui mons fuit ab Hoplodamo, aliiſque illius ſociis Gigantibus in auxilium accitus, ſi forte Saturnus illi vim inferre paraviſſet* (2).

(2) Natalis Comes, Mythol. *lib. ix, cap. v, pag. m.* 950.

[*C*] *It was not denied that ſhe was delivered upon mount Lyceus, but ſome maintained that ſhe deceived her huſband upon mount Thaumaſius.*] This is the true ſenſe of the words of Pauſanias, and tho' it be not very clear with reſpect to the grammatical conſtruction, yet it is evident enough from the context, or the intention of the author. You ſee, however, what it is to expreſs one's ſelf ambiguouſly by the wrong placing of words, which leads aſtray the moſt learned men. I have juſt read a commentary which is full of profound learning, and there I find (3) it attributed to Pauſanias, that he ſaid, the cave of Rhea (4) was to be ſeen upon the brow of mount Lyceus, and that no perſon was permitted to enter into it, but only the women who ſacrificed to this goddeſs. Pauſanias ſays ſo only of mount Thaumaſius, for he affirms two things of the ſame mountain; one is, that Saturn was deceived there, taking a ſtone for the child his wife had brought forth; the other is, that the cave of that goddeſs was to be ſeen there. Now it was upon mount Thaumaſius that Saturn was thus deceived; Stephanus Byzantinus ſays ſo (5) therefore, &c. I know very well, that Pauſanias relates ſeveral wonders concerning mount Lyceus, that Jupiter was brought up in it; that there was to be ſeen there a fountain which cauſed rain, when a great drought obliged people to have recourſe to this remedy, by uſing the requiſite ceremonies; that there was alſo to be ſeen a place conſecrated to Jupiter, which all perſons were forbidden to enter, and that if any one was ſo bold as to enter it, in contempt of religion, he died infallibly the ſame year; and that the beaſts as well as men, which entered into it caſt no (6) ſhadow (7). But all this does no prejudice to the wonders of the other mountain.

(3) Ezekiel Spanhemius, Obſervat. in Callimachum, *pag.* 5. Friſchlin *is in a like error.* Not. in Hymn. Callim. in Jovem, *pag.* 372, Edit. Græv.

(4) She is the ſame with Cybele.

(5) Stephan. Byzantinus, in Θαυμάσιον.

(6) Οὐ παρέχεσθαι σκιάν. Nullas è corporibus ſuis umbras reddere. *Pauſan. lib. viii, pag.* 269.

(7) *Taken from* Pauſanias, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 268, 269.

METRODORUS of Chios, a diſciple of Democritus, had among other diſciples the Philoſopher Anaxarchus and Hippocrates the Phyſician (*a*). Others affirm that he was the diſciple of Neſſas, who had been the diſciple of Democritus, and that he was maſter to Diogenes, who had been the maſter of Anaxarchus (*b*). He taught the eternity of the world; for if the world, ſaid he, had a beginning, it would have been produced out of nothing. He made it alſo infinite for a reaſon drawn from its eternity; and immovable, for a reaſon drawn from its infinity. He ſaid that the clouds, and afterwards the rain, were formed of condenſed air, and that the rain which fell upon the ſun extinguiſhed it, but that the rarefaction which ſucceeded this extinction kindled it again; that by length of time it grew thick with drineſs, and that the ſparkling water ſerved it for matter to produce ſtars. Thus he accounted for the alternate ſucceſſion of day and night, and in general for the eclipſes (*c*). He is thought to be one of thoſe who denied Certainty; and a paſſage of Cicero is cited to that purpoſe [*A*]. There is no certain proof that Pliny quoted our Metrodorus, for he never gives the ſirname Chius to the perſon whom he cites. That ſirname is given him by Athenæus, together with a work intituled Τρωϊκὰ, *that is* An Account of the Affairs of Troy (*d*).

[*A*] *He is thought to be one of thoſe who denied Certainty, and a paſſage of Cicero is cited to that purpoſe.*] Mr Menage commenting upon theſe words of Diogenes Laërtius: Ὃς (Μητρόδωρος) ἔλεγε μεδὲ αὐτὸ τοῦτο εἰδέναι ὅτι οὐδὲν οἶδε: Hic (*Metrodorus*) ſe ne id quidem ſcire dicebat quod nihil ſciret (1), --- *Metrodorus ſaid he did not even know that he knew nothing*, has theſe words: ‘ Chius Metrodorus initio libri qui eſt de natura: nego, inquit, ſcire nos, ſciamuſne aliquid, an nihil ſciamus, ne id ipſum quidem neſcire aut ſcire, ſcire nos, nec omnino ſit ne aliquid, an nihil ſit. --- *Metrodorus of Chios, in the beginning of the book concerning nature ſays: I deny that we know, whether we know any thing or nothing, or that we can even determine that we know, whether any thing exiſts or nothing exiſts.*’ His citation is out of the fourth book (2) of the Academic Queſtions of Cicero. I have read again and again this paſſage, and it always ſeemed to me that it was Democritus, and not Metrodorus, of whom Cicero ſays this. It is true indeed, that Metrodorus was a Sceptic; for Sextus Empericus (3) reckons him among thoſe who admitted no criterium, or rule, whereby the truth may be diſcerned. I cannot conceive how either Democritus or Metrodorus, or any other, could be ſo extravagant as to maintain, that they knew not whether any thing exiſted; for they could not doubt whether they doubted, nor imagine, that what doubts is nothat they does not exiſt. It muſt therefore be owned, thing, and pretended to except their own exiſtence. Note, that Ariſtocles may confirm the ſenſe which Mr Menage gives to the words of Cicero; for after he had obſerved that Metrodorus of Chios admitted, as Democritus, his maſter, did, a Plenum and a Vacuum for two principles, one as a being, and the other as nothing (4); he adds that his book of nature began thus: Οὐδεὶς ἡμῶν οὐδὲν οἶδεν, οὐδ᾽ αὐτο τοῦτο πότερον οἴδαμεν, ἢ οὐκ οἴδαμεν. Nemo noſtrum quidquam novit, ne hoc ipſum quidem utrum aliquid noverimus necne. ---- *None of us knows any thing, not even whether we know any thing or not.* It cannot be pretended that Metrodorus contradicted himſelf, affirming this on one ſide, and maintaining, on the other, that we muſt only believe our ſenſations and imaginations (5): for theſe two doctrines agree very well together. He ſaid that all things are in a perpetual flux, and that upon this account Homer derived their original from the ocean. Protagoras inferred from this principle (6), that man is the meaſure of all things, that each of them is juſt what it appears to be, and that we can make no judgment of others. This is perfect Pyrrhoniſm; for there you find on one hand, that our ſenſes are the only rule of our opinions; and, on the other, that nothing is certain, that there is nothing in the nature of things conſtant, nothing that does not undergo infinite changes.

(*a*) Suidas, in Δημόκριτος.

(*b*) Euſeb. Præpar. Evangel. *lib. xiv, cap. xvi, pag.* 758.

(*c*) *Taken out of* Plutarch, in Stromatis, apud Euſebium, ubi ſupra, *lib. i, cap. viii, pag.* 24, 25.

(*d*) Athen. *lib. iv, cap. ult. pag.* 184.

(1) Diog. Laërt. in Anaxarcho, *lib. ix, num. lviii.*

(2) It is in my edition the ſecond book, *fol.* 207. *D.*

(3) Sextus Empiricus, adverſ. Mathemat. *pag.* 146, 153.

(4) Ariſtocles, apud Euſebium, Præpar. Evang. *lib. xiv, cap. xix, pag.* 765.

(5) Idem, apud eumdem, ibid. *cap. xx, pag.* 766.

(6) Ibid.

METRODORUS, a good Painter, and a good Philoſopher; was choſen by the Athenians, to be ſent to Paulus Æmilius, who, after he had taken Perſeus king of Macedonia, deſired them to ſend him two men, the one to inſtruct his children, and the other to paint his triumph. He told them he wanted a tutor that was an excellent Philoſopher. The Athenians ſent to him Metrodorus who excelled both in Philoſophy and Painting, Paulus Æmilius was very well ſatisfied with their choice, as Pliny tells us [*A*]. We ſhall ſee in the remarks, whether it be true that Cicero ſpeaks of this Metrodorus, as Father Hardouin pretends [*B*]. I ſhould rather believe that he ſpeaks of **METRODORUS**

[*A*] *The Athenians ſent him .... to Paulus Æmilius, who was very well ſatisfied with their choice, as Pliny tells us.*] The reader will be pleaſed to ſee his own words: *Ubi* (Athenis) *eodem tempore erat Metrodorus pictor, idemque Philoſophus, magnæ in utraque ſcientia auctoritatis. Itaque cum L. Paulus devicto Perſeo petiſſet ab Athenienſibus ut ſibi quam probatiſſimum Philoſophum mitterent ad erudiendos liberos, itemque pictorem ad triumphum excolendum, Athenienſes Metrodorum elegerunt profeſſi eundem in utroque deſiderio præſtantiſſimum: quod ita Paulus quoque judicavit* (1). Voſſius is miſtaken when he affirms, that this Metrodorus was a Phyſician (2).

[*B*] *We ſhall ſee .... whether it be true that Cicero ſpeaks of this Metrodorus as Father Hardouin pretends.*] Father Hardouin imagines, that this paſſage of Pliny concerns a man, who was a hearer of Carneades, and who wrote a book *de Architectonice*, and another *de Poetis* (3). Here are three things which he aſſerts of him; the firſt is founded upon the authority of Cicero in the firſt book *de Oratore*; the ſecond upon the authority of Pliny, in the index of the thirty fifth book; and the third upon the teſtimony of Plutarch, in the book againſt the Epicureans. I ſhall examine theſe three things, by going backwards. It is plain, that that the Metrodorus cited by Plutarch (4), as having written concerning the Poets, is he who was a friend to Epicurus. He did not live therefore in the time of Perſeus; for Epicurus, who ſurvived him ſeven years (5), died in the ſecond year of the CXXVIIth Olympiad (6), but Perſeus was not taken by the Romans till about the end of the CLIId. The index of the thirty fifth book of Pliny contains nothing that obliges us to think the Metrodorus of Perſeus, to be the author of the book about Architecture: and as to the paſſage of Cicero, which here follows, it does not ſeem to agree to this Metrodorus: ‘ Audivi ſummos homines quum quæſtor ex Macedonia veniſſem Athenas florente Academia, ut temporibus illis ferebatur, quod eam Carneades, & Clitomachus, & Æſchines obtinebant. Erat etiam Metrodorus qui cum illis una ipſum illum Carneadem diligentius audierat (7) ---- *When I came quæſtor from Macedonia to Athens, I was a hearer of the greateſt men, the academy being at that time in much repute, becauſe Carneades, Clitomachus, & Æſchines, taught there. Metrodorus alſo was a diligent hearer of Carneades with the other.*’ It is the Orator Craſſus that ſpeaks. The time he points to, in all appearance, is the year 650 of Rome. How then can one imagine that Perſeus's Metrodorus was ſtill alive, ſince he was ſent to Paulus Æmilius about the year 585, as one of the

(1) Plin. *lib. xxxv, cap. xi, pag. m.* 230.

(2) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis, *pag.* 389.

(3) Harduin. in Plinium, ubi ſupra.

(4) Plutarch. non poſſe ſuaviter, vivi, *pag.* 1094, *E.*

(5) Diog. Laërt. *lib. x, num.* 23.

(6) Id. ib. *num.* 15.

(7) Cicero, de Orat. *lib. i, cap. xi.*

RUS of Stratonice [*C*], who forſook the Epicurean ſchool and followed Carneades.

moſt excellent Philoſophers that could be choſen in Athens? It is more eaſy to refute Volaterran, who did not only think that the Metrodorus, who was ſent to Paulus Æmilius, was the diſciple of Carneades mentioned by Cicero, but alſo that his artificial memory was commended by Cicero (8). The Metrodorus who was commended upon this account, was a native of Scepſis, and different from the diſciple of Carneades; of which I will here give you demonſtrative proof. Craſſus heard the latter in Athens (9), and the other in Aſia. ‘Paulum, ſitiens, *ſays he,* (10) iſtarum artium de quibus loquor, guſtavi quæſtor in Aſia quum eſſem æqualem fere meum ex academia rhetorem nactus Metrodorum illum de cujus memoria commemoravit Antonius. - - - - - *Thirſting after thoſe arts, of which I ſpeak; I taſted a little when I was quæſtor in Aſia, having found Metrodorus, the Rhetorician, almoſt of the ſame age with my ſelf, whoſe memory Antonius has mentioned.*’ It is plain that he ſpeaks of Metrodorus of Scepſis; for Antonius the Orator had ſaid: ‘Vidi ego ſummos homines & divina prope memoria, Athenis Carneadem, in Aſia quem vivere hodie ajunt Scepſium Metrodorum, quorum uterque tanquam literis in cera, ſic ſe ajebat imaginibus in iis locis quos haberet, quæ meminiſſe vellet, perſcribere (11) - - - - *I ſaw at Athens Carneades and Metrodorus of Scepſis, who is ſaid to live now in Aſia; men of the greateſt abilities, and endowed with a memory almoſt divine; both which ſaid they wrote down in images, like letters on wax, thoſe things they deſired to remember.*’ A little after Craſius ſpeaks after this manner: ‘Audivi . . . . . & Athenis cum eſſem doctiſſimos viros, & in Aſia iſtum ipſum ſcepſium Metrodorum quum de his ipſis rebus diſputaret (12). - - - - *I heard . . . when I was at Athens men of very great learning, and in Aſia Metrodorus of Scepſis, when he diſcourſed of theſe very things.*’

[*C*] . . . . *I ſhould rather believe that he ſpeaks of METRODORUS of Stratonice.*] We have already ſeen (13) that his Metrodorus followed Carneades with great application. He ſays in another book, that Metrodorus of Stratonice might very well know Carneades (14). It may therefore be imagined, that theſe two places concern the ſame perſon. Beſides, we ſee in Diogenes Laërtius, a Metrodorus of Stratonice, who forſook Epicurus to follow the ſchool of Carneades. The Hiſtorian is miſtaken as to the time, for the death of Epicurus preceded the birth of Carneades; but, however, his error ſerves to make one believe, that Metrodorus mentioned by Craſſus the Orator, was Metrodorus of Stratonice. As to the miſtake of Diogenes Laërtius, ſee Mr Menage (15); and the pieces inſerted in the Journal des Sçavans which I have cited in another place (16).

(8) Volaterr. *lib. xvii, pag. m.* 426.

(9) See citat. (7).

(10) Cicero, ubi ſupra, *lib. iii, cap. xx.*

(11) Id. ib. *lib. ii, cap. lxxxviii.*

(12) Id. ib.

(13) In the preceding remark, citation (7).

(14) Bene autem noſſe Carneadem Stratoniceus Metrodorus putabatur. *Cicero, Academic. Quæſt. lib. ii, fol.* 203. *B.* Note, that theſe words have ſcarce any connexion with the preceding, ſo that one would think that there is ſomething left out.

(15) Menag. in Diog. Laërt. *lib. x, num.* 9.

(16) In the remark [*N*] of the article CARNEADES.

MEZIRIAC (CLAUDIUS GASPAR BACHET LORD OF) was one of the greateſt men of the XVIIth century. *He was of Breſſe, of a noble and antient family* (*a*) [*A*], as Mr Pelliſſon informs us, with ſeveral other curious particulars which I will not tranſcribe becauſe they are in a book (*b*), which is in every body's hands. I ſhall only take out of it two things; the firſt is, that *Mr de Meziriac in his youth ſpent a great part of his time at Paris and at Rome, and that in this laſt place he made many Italian verſes, in emulation of Mr Vaugelas, who was there alſo.* The ſecond is, *that when he was at Paris, and it was ſaid that he was to be made preceptor to Lewis XIII,* that *this was the reaſon why he left the court in haſte; and he ſaid afterwards, that he never was in ſo much pain, for he thought he had already upon his ſhoulders the heavy burden of a whole kingdom.* It is ſaid in Moreri's Dictionary (*c*) that *afterwards he returned to Paris, and was a member of the French Academy.* The latter of theſe two facts is true, and the former falſe (*d*): this learned man was choſen to fill up one of the places in the academy at its birth, although he was abſent; and when his turn came to make a diſcourſe there, he ſent one which was read in the aſſembly by Mr de Vaugelas (*e*). In a book of Colomiés we meet with a particular, which is not mentioned by Mr Pelliſſon, which is this, that *Mr de Meziriac had been a Jeſuit at twenty years of age, and went thro' his firſt claſs at Milan, where falling ſick he became once more a ſecular* (*f*). He died at Bourg in Breſſe (*g*), February the twenty ſixth 1638 (*h*), and left ſeveral children by his marriage with Philiberta de Chabeu (*i*). It will appear by the remark, which will be ſeen below concerning his writings [*B*], that he was a man of ſuch a large capacity,

(*a*) Pelliſſon, Hiſtory of the French Academy, *pag. m.* 256.

(*b*) The Hiſt. of the French Academy.

(*c*) At the word *Bachet.*

(*d*) I do not deny that Meziriac made journies to Paris, but only that he came to ſettle there, which is Moreri's meaning.

(*e*) Peliſſ. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 104.

(*f*) Colomiés, Recueil de Particularitez, *pag. m.* 109, 110. *He obſerves that he learned this from Mr Patin.*

(*g*) Guichenon, Hiſt. de Breſſe, *Part iii, pag.* 10

(*h*) Peliſſ. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 262.

(*i*) Guichenon, ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *He was of a noble and antient family.*] It owes its nobility to learning. ‘Peter Bachet, lord of Meyſeria, Vauluyſant, and Lyonnieres, whom the family of the Bachets owns for their ſtock, was a counſellor, and lieutenant-general in the bailliwick of Breſſe, under king Henry II, and then chief-judge, after reſtitution was made to duke Emanuel-Philibert of his dominions. He did homage to this prince in the year 1563, for the lordſhips of Meyſeria, Vauluyſant, and Lyonnieres, his laſt will is dated September 5, 1565. He was one of the great men of his time, admired for his probity and learning; a noted Civilian whom the people came to conſult from all the neighbouring countries; and a great Latin Poet. There are ſtill to be ſeen two manuſcript tomes of his conſultations, a collection of his Latin Poems, and a book of epiſtles which he wrote to the moſt learned men of his age, and their anſwers to him, the publication whereof would confirm the teſtimony I give to his memory (1).’ He married, the tenth of December 1540, Frances de Soria, the daughter of Antony de Soria a Portugueſe gentleman, and chief Phyſician to Beatrix of Portugal, ducheſs of Savoy. From this marriage came John Bachet, who was counſellor to the duke of Savoy, *and judge of the appeals of Breſſe, which was the chief magiſtracy in that county while it was under the duke of Savoy; he was a perſon of as much learning and integrity as his father, his laſt will is dated July the 5th* 1586. He left, beſide other children, our Mr de Meziriac, and William Bachet (2), Lord of Vauluyſant, *counſellor to the king, and preſident in the election of Breſſe, who made his will April* 22, 1631, *and died without children. Among other qualities which recommended him, he was a very good French and Latin Poet, of which he has left us many proofs, particularly in that excellent and natural tranſlation of ſome of Ovid's Epiſtles, which are printed with thoſe of Claudius-Gaſpard Bachet, Lord of Meyſeria, his brother* (3). You may obſerve, that Guichenon, the Hiſtoriographer of that country, always calls the lordſhip Meyſeria, which the author, of whom I here give an article, always calls Meziriac in the title of his books. Doubtleſs he took the liberty to change the name to make it more ſmooth, and leſs grating to the ears of the French, and more capable of being brought into Poetry.

[*B*] *It will appear by the remark . . . . concerning his writings.*] The firſt book he publiſhed was printed in 1613, with the title of *Problemes plaiſans & delectables qui ſe font par les nombres.* He publiſhed it *as well to give an eſſay of his ability, as to try what judgment would be made of his works, and that it might ſerve as a forerunner to his Diophantus* (4). Eleven years after he put out a ſecond edition (5) of it, *corrected, with the addition of ſeveral propoſitions and problems.* And becauſe he feared leſt, his *Diophantus* being already publiſhed, any one ſhould wonder, *that he who wrote a work ſo ſerious,* and full of profound ſpeculations as his *Diophantus* was, ſhould trifle away his time in reviſing his Problems, he gave this anſwer among others in

(1) Guichenon, Hiſt. of Breſſe, *part iii, pag.* 9.

(2) He was the eldeſt.

(3) Id. ib.

(4) Meziriac, Preface to the ſecond edition of his Problems.

(5) At Lyons, by Peter Rigaud, 1624, in 8vo.

capacity, that he could find convenient room for the ſciences which have no relation to one another. He was a pretty good Poet in French, Italian, and Latin, an excellent Grammarian, an eminent Grecian, and a great Critic. He knew the ſmalleſt particulars relating to fables: he was ignorant of nothing in Mythology. He was *a Philoſopher, and a Divine well verſed in controverſies* (*k*), and underſtood admirably well the moſt abſtracted queſtions of Algebra and Mathematics. Guichenon ſays, that ‘ without doing any injury to his memory, one may give him the elogium which Quintilian gave to a great perſon of his time, that he might have left better works if he had pleaſed, *Felix ingenium, quod voluit potuit! ô utinam meliora voluiſſet* (*l*).’ I ſhall ſpeak, in a ſeparate remark, of his writings which he deſigned for the preſs [*C*]. It is a miſtake to affirm

(*k*) Id. ib.

(*l*) Id. ib.

in his Preface (6): ‘ That books are the children of our minds, and that beſides the natural diſpoſition which all fathers have to love their children in general, they have a particular affection to their firſt born; wherefore this book being the firſt that came from my hand, and as it were the firſt born child of my mind, I have reaſon to cheriſh it particularly, as not to be contented with having brought it into the world, but moreover to take care of its preſervation and growth.’ Mr Pelliſſon obſerves (7), 1. That the book of *Arithmetical Recreations*, is a work, wherein *Mr de Meziriac taught all manner of ſubtleties, in playing with numbers, and from whence is taken part of the* Recreation Mathematiques (8). 2. That his *Diophantus* tranſlated out of Greek into Latin with a Commentary, is a work, *which Mr de Fermat, and all thoſe who underſtand Algebra, do highly eſteem*, and that Mr de Meziriac ſaid himſelf, *he wondred how he could compaſs this work, and that he had not finiſhed it had it not been for a melancholy and ſtubborneſs, proceeding from a quartan ague, of which he was then ill.* Voſſius (9) is miſtaken as to the year of this edition of *Diophantus*, which he places in the year 1623, he ſhould have placed it in the year 1621. The Hiſtoriographer of Breſſe was not guilty of this fault; but he too much multiplied the editions of his book. The works which Meziriac printed, ſays he (10), are, ‘ *Diophanti Alexandrini Arithmeticorum libri ſex, & de numeris multangulis liber unus*, a book very rare, which he reſtored in a great meaſure, and enriched with very learned Commentaries: it was printed firſt at Paris in the year 1621, and dedicated to the great Oracle, Antony Faure, firſt preſident of Savoy; afterwards it was reprinted ſeveral times in Germany. *Problems of Arithmetic and Mathematics. A tranſlation of ſome Epiſtles of Ovid into French verſe, with very curious Commentaries. A Treatiſe of Tribulation, tranſlated from the Italian of Cacciaguerra.* Epiſtolæ, & Poemata Varia. *The Life of Alexander Luſaga. The Life of Æſop*, wherein, according to the judgment of all the learned, there are very excellent and fine remarks.’ Mr Pelliſſon clears what is there ſaid confuſedly of the Poems of our author. *There is a little book of Italian poems done by him, wherein are imitations of the beſt compariſons, which are in the eight firſt books of the* Æneids. *Another of Latin poems; ſeveral poems in French; ſome of which have been inſerted in the collection printed in* 1621, *with this title*, Delices de la Poeſie Françoiſe, *and in that of the year* 1627 (11). Note, that *Diophantus* had never appeared but in Latin. Xylander publiſhed it in this language, in the year 1575. Theſe words of Mr Konig, ‘ Caſp. quoque Bachetus An. 1613. profundiſſimis ſpeculationibus eum *(Diophantum)* illuſtravit (12). - - - - *Caſp. Bachet likewiſe illuſtrated* Diophantus *with moſt profound ſpeculations in the year* 1613,’ would be right, if inſtead of 1613, it had been 1621. I believe his Printers inſtead of 1623, have put 1613, for doubtleſs Mr Konig had it from Voſſius; and of this I am the more eaſily perſuaded, becauſe I find theſe words in Voſſius: ‘ Anno CIↃ IↃ CXXIII. Gaſper Bachetus *Diophantum* illuſtravit. Imo profundis in eum ſpeculationibus immortalem ſibi gloriam comparavit ut judicium eſt Jacobi de Billy Compendienſis, præfatione in Algebram (13). - - - - *In the year* 1623, *Gaſper Bachet illuſtrated* Diophantus: *Nay, by his profound ſpeculations on it, he has acquired to himſelf immortal honour, according to the opinion of James de Billy of Compiegne, in the Preface to his Algebra.*’ As to the Remark of Mr Konig, that Bulialdus publiſhed an edition of *Diophantus*, I believe it to be falſe. I will here give you a blunt expreſſion of Malherbe. ‘ Mr de Meziriac, attended with two or three of his friends, brought him a book of Arithmetic, written by a Greek auther, called *Diophantus*, whom he had commented upon. His friends praiſed the book exceedingly, as being very uſeful to the public; whereupon Malherbe aſked them, whether it would bring down the price of bread (14).’ We ſhall ſee, in the next remark, what eſteem Mr Des Cartes had for that work of Mr de Meziriac.

(6) Meziriac, ubi ſupra.

(7) Pelliſſon, Hiſt. of the French Academy, *pag. m.* 263.

(8) It is the title of a book which was printed many times. I have an edition of it printed at Paris, 1630, in 8vo, with the remarks of *Claudius Mydorgius.*

(9) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 341, 464.

(10) Guichenon, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 10.

(11) Pelliſſon, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 262.

(12) Konig, Bibl. *pag.* 252.

(13) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 341.

(14) The Life of Malherbe, *pag.* 10.

[*C*] *I ſhall ſpeak of the writings which he deſigned for the preſs.*] ‘ He had undertaken a new tranſlation of all the works of Plutarch, with notes, wherein he intended to ſhow the faults which Amyot had committed in his verſion of this author, to explain many paſſages which had never been underſtood, and to lay open to us the treaſures of antiquity. There wanted but a ſmall matter of this great and laborious work to be done, when he died, which is an inexpreſſible loſs to the public; all learned men expected it with impatience, which was increaſed by the fine letter which he wrote to the Academy of Paris, to thank them for the honour they had done him, to admit him into their ſociety, wherein he gave an account of his deſign. He has alſo left us many pieces finiſhed, but not printed, which it were to be wiſhed the public might no longer be deprived of, viz. *Elementorum Arithmeticorum, lib.* 13. *Tractatus de Geometricis quæſtionibus per Algebram.* Theſe are the two works which he promiſed at the end of his Preface upon *Diophantus. The reſt of Ovid's epiſtles without Commentaries. Apollodori Athenienſis Grammatici Bibliotheces, ſive de Deorum Origine libri tres*, tranſlated by himſelf, with very learned obſervations. Agathemeres, a Greek Geographer not yet printed (15).’ This paſſage of Mr Guichenon is not very exact; for he give us, as a letter of thanks, written to the gentlemen of the French Academy, a diſcourſe which Mr de Meziriac compoſed in conformity to the rules of the Academy. ‘ They made by lot with billets, a catalogue of the members of the Academy; it was ordered, that every one ſhould be obliged to make in his turn a diſcourſe upon ſuch a ſubject, and of ſuch a length as he pleaſed (16) . . . . . There were twenty of theſe diſcourſes ſpoken ſucceſſively in the Accademy (17) . . . The ſeventeenth was ſent by Mr de Meziriac, and read in the aſſembly † by Mr de Vaugelas: It was intituled *De la Traduction.* In this diſcourſe the author who was reckoned very ſkillful in the *Belles Lettres*, and chiefly in the Greek Tongue, after he had commended the genius, the pains, and the ſtyle, of Amiot in his verſion of Plutarch, and, as it ſeems, with ingenuity enough, pretended to ſhow that in divers paſſages which he obſerved, to the number of two thouſand, this great tranſlator has committed very great faults of divers ſorts, of which he gives ſeveral examples (18).’ I know that the abbot Nicaiſe, whoſe zeal for the advancement of learning is very well known, has been very buſy in finding out the Apollodorus of Meziriac, and it is none of his fault that the Bookſellers have not printed it.

Here follow ſome matters of fact, which concern another work of this writer. Mr Baillet relates that Mr de Des Cartes *in a very particular manner eſteemed the genius and capacity of Mr Meziriac, chiefly for Arithmetic and Algebra, which he was maſter of to ſo great a degree, as equalled him to Vieta . . . His work on Diophantus of Alexandria, is more than ſufficient to juſtify the eſteem which Des Cartes had for him: but it is likely that the public would have ſtill out done him in this eſteem, if they had ſeen the treatiſe of Algebra of Mr de Meziriac, and ſome other manuſcripts of this author, the chief of which is that of the* ⸸ *thirteen books, of the* Elements of Arithmetic ſubſervient to Algebra, *written in Latin, and purchaſed of the heirs of Mr de* Meziriac

(15) Guichenon, ubi ſupra.

(16) Pelliſſon, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 99.

(17) Id. ib. *pag.* 100.

† *The tenth of December* 1635.

(18) Pelliſſon, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 104.

⸸ *A catalogue of the manuſcripts of Meziriac, ſent to me from Bourg in Breſſe.*

affirm that he was not *much above forty five years old* when he died [*D*]: but I cannot preciſely tell the number of his years. It is ſaid (*m*), that ‘Mr *D. S.* who is . . . of the ‘ family of this famous academiſt, ſeems to have inherited his knowledge of Mytho‘ logy: he is writing the hiſtory of it, every circumſtance of which will be ſupported by, ‘ or adorned with, ſome paſſages of a Greek or Latin Poet.’

One of his ſons was preſident of the preſidial of Bourg in Breſſe. He was admired by all the court, when he went, in the year 1660, to compliment His Majeſty at Lyons (*n*). He was ſtill alive in the year 1704.

Meziriac about fifteen or ſixteen years ago, by one of the Reformed religion, who did not fail to carry it out of the kingdom, at the time of that revolution, in which the Proteſtants were before the revocation of the edict of Nantes (19). There is in this narrative a circumſtance that ſhould be rectified, about which I have received the following memoir (20). *Beſides the three books which Mr Bachet de Meziriac wrote about numbers, and which he prefixed to his commentaries upon Diophantus, he wrote the Elements of Arithmetic, divided into thirteen books, which were never printed. After his death Mr de Meziriac, his ſon, was ſollicited to publiſh them, but he ſet ſo great a price upon the manuſcript, that no body would buy it. At laſt he ſold it to Mr d'Alibert, Treaſurer of France at Montauban, for* 1500 *livres. Mr d'Alibert intended to print it at his own expence, but being ſurprized by death before he could execute his deſign, he gave this manuſcript as he was dying to one of his friends, which is all written with the hand of Mr de Meziriac the father. This friend gave it afterwards to Mr Caſe, who gave it to Mr Picard one of the royal academy of ſciences. In the year* 1679, *Mr Picard gave it to the abbot Galloys, who, to fulfil the good intentions of Mr d'Alibert, offered it to ſeveral Bookſellers to print it. But becauſe theſe elements are of an abſtracted ſcience, and in Latin, he has not as yet met with any Bookſeller, that would undertake the printing of it. There is therefore ſomething to be corrected in the* 291*ſt page of the firſt part of the Life of Des Cartes; for he who purchaſed this manuſcript was not of the Reformed religion; and he to whom it was given, did not carry it out of the kingdom; and the manuſcript is ſtill at Paris.* It appears by a letter of Sarravius (21), that Mr Morus had undertaken to collect the manuſcript books of Mr de Meziriac, and that it was wiſhed he would perform his promiſe. Doubtleſs Sarravius had inſpired him with this good deſign, when he deſired him to buy for him all the works of that learned man (22), for he ſpoke of them with peculiar encomiums. This was in a letter which he wrote March the fourteenth 1644. He thought that Meziriac had been dead about ten years; and conſequently was ignorant of the true time.

THE decay of learning.

For the reſt it is not to be wondered, that no Printer could be found for the commentary of Meziriac upon Apollodorus. The taſte for this kind of learning is wholly loſt, and it is very probable, that if Meziriac was now alive, they would not do him the honour to go to ſeek for him in Breſſe, to give him a place in the French Academy. That which formerly procured him this advantage, would now be a reaſon for not thinking of him. The politeneſs of his ſtile, the beauty of the French verſes, were not the cauſe why he was thought worthy to be one of the academy; for it muſt be ingenuouſly confeſſed, that neither his proſe nor his verſes in our language had any thing that was exquiſite, and in this reſpect he was much inferior to almoſt all his fellow members. It was the only reputation of his knowledge, and the proofs he gave of his vaſt learning that made him be choſen. The times are changed; and an author is now of no account who perfectly underſtands Mythology, the Greek Poets, their ſcholiaſts, and can make uſe of them to clear, or correct, ſome difficult paſſages, a point of Chronology, a queſtion of Geography, or of Grammar, a variation of narratives, *&c.* Men not only prefer to the works of ſuch an author, thoſe that have no ſuch thing in them; but alſo call this kind of learning pedantry (23). Which is the ready way to diſcourage all young people of good parts from following the ſtudy of Philology. There is no greater affront than to be called a Pedant, and therefore men will not take the pains to acquire much learning; becauſe they are afraid of being expoſed to this ſcandalous treatment if they ſhould make it appear, that they have read the ancient authors. And where is the man who does not love to be reſpected for his knowledge, and who is not animated by the hope of glory? take away this hope, and you cool the moſt ardent, you increaſe the lazineſs of thoſe who fear a painful application. Without doubt, one of the principal reaſons why the ſtudy of the Belles Lettres is ſo much diſuſed, is, that ſeveral who either pretend to be, or really are, fine wits, have introduced a cuſtom of condemning, as a ſcience fit only for the ſchools, and a groſs piece of pedantry, all citations of Greek paſſages, and learned remarks. They have been ſo unjuſt as to extend their railleries to writers who were polite, and knew the world; as Coſtar for inſtance. Who would after this have aſpired to the glory of a fine wit, by ſetting off his reading and critical remarks? If they had only condemned thoſe who cite impertinently Plato and Ariſtotle, Hippocrates and Varro, to prove a thought common to all ages and nations (24), they had not diſcouraged ſo many people; but in a diſdainful manner they have baniſhed thoſe from the number of fine gentlemen, and confined them to the colleges, who durſt declare that they had made collections: they laughed at the Coſtars, and even at the letters of Voiture, which were intermixed with Latin. The effect of this cenſure was ſo much the greater, becauſe it was cloaked with a very fair pretence, which was, that we ſhould labour to poliſh our mind, and form our judgment, and not heap up in our memory what others have ſaid. The truer this maxim is, the more it flatters ſuperficial and lazy tempers, and puſhes them on to ridicule all ſhew of learning. Their principal motive was, perhaps, to undervalue the merit of others, in order to magnify their own; for if one ſhould tell them, *You condemn this author who cites Greek and Latin: Could you do as much? Lay your hand upon your heart, would you blame him if you were able to imitate him?* It is very probable, their ſincerity would be put to an hard trial. But let us abridge this digreſſion, and conclude, that things are come to ſuch a paſs, that the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Letters* for the laſt month (25) inform us, that the Bookſeller of Paris, who would print the verſion of Homer, made by Madam Dacier, will not print the original with it. He is afraid, no doubt, that the ſight of the Greek character will fright the readers, and hinder the ſale of the book. Conſider, I beſeech you, what was written from Paris to Mr Bernard, and what he has inſerted in his Nouvelles for the month of October laſt. The *Telemacomania* is a book *full of wit and fire* (26). It is divided into two parts: the author (27) ſhows, in the firſt part, that the church had always an averſion for romances. *The ſecond part is much longer than the firſt, but it is alſo more tedious, becauſe the author makes it his only buſineſs to ſhow the anachroniſms and faults in Hiſtory and Mythology which are in Telemachus* (28). By this you may judge what is the prevailing humour, and conclude, that the commentary upon Apollodorus would be laughed at in Paris; and this the Bookſellers know very well, and therefore will not print it. It is a work of too much learning.

[*D*] *It is a miſtake to affirm that he was not much above forty five years old when he died.*] This age only is aſſigned him in the Hiſtory of the French Academy. Others ſay, he lived forty ſeven years (29). But it is certain he died not ſo young; for his father who had him by the firſt marriage, married again in 1586. The contract of this ſecond marriage is dated September 27, as Mr Guichenon informs us. I wiſh he had been as careful to ſet down the day of people's birth, as the day of their marriage and wills. The one would not have been more difficult to him than the other as to the family of Mr de Meziriac. He knew the ſon of this learned man, and by him probably he recovered the memoirs which taught him what he relates of this family. Why then did he not aſk him the days of their births? If he had done it, we might have known certainly how long this member of the French academy lived.

(*m*) Diverſitez Curieuſes, *Tom. vii, pag.* 121, 122, Dutch Edit.

(*n*) *Taken from the* Mercure Galant *of January* 1705, *pag.* 132.

(19) Baillet, Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. i, pag.* 291.

(20) Drawn up by the abbot Galois, and ſent by Mr Simon de Valhebert.

(21) It is the 185th, at *pag.* 190, of the edition of Utrecht.

(22) See his LXXth letter, at *pag.* 68, he calls him always *Mezeriacus* inſtead of *Meziriacus.*

(23) See La Bruyere, in the chapter of *Judgments, pag. m.* 498, *& ſeq.*

(24) Herillus will always cite whether he ſpeaks, harangues, or writes. He makes the prince of Philoſophers ſay, that wine inebriates, and the Roman Orator, that water tempers it. If he falls upon the ſubject of Morality, it is not he but the divine Plato, who affirms, that virtue is amiable, and vice odious, and that both the one and the other grow into a habit. The moſt common and trivial things, which he himſelf is able to think of, he will be indebted to the Antients for, to Latin and Greek authors. *La Bruyere, ibid. pag.* 525.

(25) Bernard, Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *Nov.* 1700. *pag.* 586, 587.

(26) Idem, Nouvel. *for the month of October* 1700, *pag.* 385.

(27) That is, the abbot Faydit.

(28) Id. ib. *pag.* 389, 390.

(29) Baillet, Judgm. on the Poets, *num.* 1432.

MICRÆLIUS (JOHN) profeſſor of Divinity at Stetin, was born at Cuſlin in Pomerania the third of September in the year 1597. He began his ſtudies in the college of his own country, and, in the year 1614, he continued them at Stetin under Daniel Cramer who taught Theology there (a), and under Joachim Prætorius, &c. He there maintained a diſpute *de Deo uno & trino* in the year 1616, which procured him great eſteem. He went the year following to the univerſity of Konigſberg, and there held a diſpute *de Veritate tranſcendentali.* He received in the year 1621 at the univerſity of Griphſwald the degree of Maſter in Philoſophy, after having maintained a theſis *de Meteoris:* ſome time after, he went to Leipſic to finiſh his ſtudies, and was made profeſſor of Rhetoric in the Royal College at Stetin in the year 1624, and rector of the ſenate ſchool in the year 1627, and rector of the Royal College and profeſſor of Theology in the year 1649, having received the degree of Doctor of Divinity in the univerſity of Griphſwald the ſame year 1649 [*A*]. He had obtained by his ſollicitations in the 1642, that there might be profeſſors of Law, Phyſic, and Mathematics, in the Royal College, and that a certain number of ſtudents might be maintained there at the public charge. He made a journey to Sweden in the year 1653, and had the honour to pay his reſpects to queen Chriſtina, who gave him very obliging marks of her liberality. He died the third of December in the year 1658. He had been married three times (b) [*B*]. I ſhall ſet down the titles of his principal works [*C*], and make ſome obſervations [*D*] on the additions to his

[*A*] *He was made Doctor of Divinity .... in the year* 1649.] He was put upon aſking this degree, becauſe in a famous diſpute he had had with John Bergius (1), the latter arrogantly boaſted of his being an old Doctor in Divinity, to which Micrælius could only anſwer, that he had received the degree of Maſter in Philoſophy before Bergius. Queen Chriſtina was at the charge of promoting Micrælius to the degree of Doctor of Divinity (2). The diſpute I ſpeak of related to the differences between the Lutherans and Calviniſts.

[*B*] *He was married three times.*] He married his firſt wife in the year 1627. She was daughter to Joachim Prætorius, archdeacon, and profeſſor at Stetin. He loſt her at the end of one year with a child he had by her. He married again in the year 1630 a daughter of David Reutz, ſuperintendant of eaſtern Pomerania, and had by her nine children, of which there were but two (3) alive when he died. He took a third wife in the year 1642, by whom he had ſix children who all ſurvived him. She was daughter of Michael Hecken, ſuperintendant of Primiſlaw (4). All theſe marks of the fruitful bleſſing which GOD ſhed upon him having been ſpecified in his funeral Programma, I did not think it proper to paſs them over in ſilence.

[*C*] *I ſhall ſet down the titles of his principal works.*] His *Ethnophronius contra Gentiles de Principiis Religionis Chriſtianæ* was printed at Stetin in the years 1647, 1651, and 1674, in 4to. He publiſhed a continuation of it in the year 1652 in 4to, *contra Judaicas depravationes.* His *Lexicon Philoſophicum* was printed in the ſame city in the years 1653 and 1661, in 4to. *Heterodoxia Calviniana de Prædeſtinatione*, at Stetin in the year 1651 in 4to, and 1665 in 12mo. *Syntagma Hiſtoriarum Eccleſiæ*, in the ſame city in the years 1630, 1644, and 1660, in 8vo. It has been ſince printed in 4to, with the continuation of Mr Hartnac. I make uſe of the fifth edition which is of Leipſic 1699, in two volumes. *Monſtroſæ opinionis Iſaacii Peyrerii ſcriptoris Galli de Præ-Adamitis abominanda fœditas*, at Stetin in the year 1656, in 4to. *Syntagma Hiſtoriarum Politicarum*, at Stetin in the years 1627, 1633, in 8vo, and 1654 in 4to. I ſhall ſpeak of it in the following remark. Thoſe who have a mind to ſee the titles of the other works of Micrælius, both Latin and German, need only read the Sieur Witte (5).

[*D*] *I ſhall make ſome obſervations on the additions to his Political Hiſtory.*] The laſt edition is of Leipſic in the year 1702, in two volumes in 4to. The whole title of it is as follows: *Johannis Micrælii Pomerani Hiſtoria Politica, qua Imperiorum, Regnorum, Electoratuum, Ducatuum, Rerumque publicarum omnium origines, incrementa, fata, bello paceque geſta ad annum à Chriſto nato* 1648 *deſcribuntur, cum Continuatione Danielis Hartnaccii Pomerani, qui ad exitum uſque ſuperioris ſeculi eandem eadem methodo juxta annorum ſeriem pertexuit, & totum Opus Autoribus in margine, unde iſthæc deſumta, adductis, Tabulis Chronologicis & Genealogicis Indicibuſque plane novis & locupletiſſimis exornavit.* I am perſuaded Mr Hartnac will not take it ill that I point at ſome things, which ſeem to me faulty in his additions, and by that means do all I can, that thoſe who reprint general hiſtories may give us good Appendixes. It is their cuſtom to add to them ſuch things as have happened between the former edition and their own (6): and when they find a continuation ready done, as that for inſtance of Mr Hartnac, they chuſe rather to copy it than be at the trouble to compoſe a new one: but they will at leaſt endeavour to correct what they copy, when they are advertiſed of the faults.

I ſay then in the firſt place, Mr Hartnac does not ſufficiently diſtinguiſh perſons, their proper names, titles, &c. He tells us of one Condé, *Condæus*, who took Gernſhac in Germany in the year 1691, and the fort of Haberſtein (7). But there was no general of the name of Condé that year in the armies of France. He ſays, prince Eugene, a Frenchman, is a brother's ſon of the duke of Savoy (8): which is a miſtake; for this duke has no brother, and the relation between theſe two princes ariſes only from their being deſcended of Charles Emanuel, duke of Savoy, great-grand-father of prince Eugene. He gives to the mareſchal de Lorge, the title of Marquis (9), which ſhould have been that of count.

II. I obſerve, he does not ſufficiently characterize events: he ſometimes forgets the moſt eſſential circumſtances, or at leaſt thoſe the reader ought to be informed of, in order to judge rightly of the ſtate of affairs. I ſhall inſtance but in one example: he affirms prince Eugene forced the marquis de Catinat to raiſe the ſiege of Suſa in the month of July 1693, that he bombarded Pignerol in the month of September, and blew up, by mines, the fort of St Brigitt: that he fought a battle in the month of October, in which both ſides loſt a vaſt number of men, and yet the victory was doubtful; and laſtly that he drove the enemy beyond the Alps. *Marchionem de Catinat Eugenius Dux ab urbis Suſæ obſidione Julio Menſe fortiter repulit: Septembri Pignarolum injectis ignibus globiſque majoribus vaſtavit, fortalitium Brigittæ actis Cuniculis evertit; Octobri denique ambiguo marte & plurimis utrinque cæſis pugnavit, hoſtem denique difficillimo montes niveſque gradu finibus excedere coegit* (10). Theſe are the words of Mr Hartnac, and may be cenſured in many reſpects, for, I. Prince Eugene did not command all the troops, he commanded only thoſe of the emperor, the duke of Savoy commanded in chief, and in perſon, the whole army: to him therefore he ought to have aſcribed all the exploits, ſince he did not enter into particulars, but only took notice of the moſt remarkable ſucceſſes of the campaign. II. It is not true that Mr de Catinat was ever forced to raiſe the ſiege of Suſa. He took this town in the month of November 1690, and kept it till it was reſtored by the peace in the year 1696. It may be thought that Mr Hartnac by miſtake put *Suſa* inſtead of *Coni.* I allow it; but, III. I obſerve that the ſiege of Coni was raiſed in the year 1691, and not in the year 1693. I obſerve, IV, that Mr de Catinat was not there in perſon: V. that prince Eugene did not force the lines of the beſiegers: he did not even attack them. Mr de Dulonde who commanded the beſiegers

---

(*a*) He was afterwards ſuperintendant of the churches of Pomerania.

(*b*) Taken from his Life, writ by Daniel Hartnac. It is prefixed to his *Syntagma Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ*, and to his *Syntagma Hiſtoriæ Politicæ*. I have alſo taken ſomething from Witte, *Memor. Theolog. pag.* 1282, *& ſeq.*

(1) Firſt preacher at the court of the elector of Brandenburg.

(2) Ex Dan. Hartnaccio, in Vita Micrælii.

(3) A daughter, who was married, and a ſon who ſtudied Divinity.

(4) *Taken from his* Funeral Programma, apud Witte, Memor. Theolog. *pag.* 1286, 1287.

(5) Witte, ibid. *pag.* 1289, *& ſeq.*

(6) Compare what I ſay in the Diſſertation on defamatory Libels, *num. viii*, and remark [*A*] at the beginning.

(7) Hartnaccius, *Tom. i, pag.* 565.

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 566.

(9) Ibid. *Tom. ii, pag.* 134.

(10) Hart. *Tom. i, pag.* 568, 569.

his political hiſtory.

beſiegers retired out of hearing, and that without any neceſſity as the French believed: and indeed he was taken up, and turned out of favour (11). Therefore the expreſſions of the Hiſtorian, *ab obſidione. . . . fortiter repulit Marchionem de Catinat*, are deceitful, ſince they lead one to think that Mr de Catinat raiſed the ſiege in perſon after he had been ſoundly beaten. An exact Hiſtorian always chuſes his words with ſo much care; that he does not leave his readers to gueſs whether the beſigers retired of themſelves, or waited to be attacked. VI. The circumſtance ſhould not have been ſuppreſſed, that the fort of St Brigitt was beſieged in form, and that the French defended it many days and afterwards retreated to Pignerol. VII. He ought not to have confined himſelf to the bombarding of Pignerol, nor have ſaid that the bombs utterly deſtroyed that place, *vaſtavit*. Fair dealing required of him to intimate, that the allies beſieged it, and were not able to take it, and that their bombarding did no great miſchief to it (12). VIII. Sincerity will not permit one to reckon the battle of Marſaglia among thoſe whoſe ſucceſs is doubtful. The writers againſt the French acknowledge, whether they will or no, that the mareſchal de Catinat gained it (13). Mr Hartnac makes the ſame confeſſion in other parts of his book, and that where he owns the raiſing of the ſiege of Pignerol (14). IX. It is falſe, that Mr de Catinat was forced by the Allies to return beyond the Alps; and therefore it is an improper expreſſion to ſay, *finibus excedere coegit:* they could not hinder him from ſtaying in Piedmont, and from conſuming the forage there as long as he thought fit, nor did he depart from thence but by the orders of the king his maſter (15).

It is eaſy to ſee after all this, that I might have ſaid, not only that he omits ſome eſſential circumſtances, but likewiſe that he ſubſtitutes falſe ones, which alter the nature of the fact. He has committed this fault very palpably where he ſpeaks of the taking of Valenciennes; for, not contented with concealing that this place was carried by aſſault the eighth day of the ſiege; he ſays, that the French became maſters of it by treachery (16). If I had a mind to ſet down all the miſtakes like that which follows, I ſhould have a long catalogue to make. He affirms that John Barth, having beat the Dutch Fleet in the year 1694, found a great quantity of corn in the ſhips he took from them (17). Here is a falſe circumſtance ſubſtituted by ſuppreſſing a true one. He ſhould have ſaid that John Barth was convoy to ſeveral veſſels loaded with corn, and that having beat the Dutch men of war he ſaved the corn and carried it to France (18).

I ſay, in the third place, he does not always obſerve the order of time: he ſometimes tranſpoſes, he anticipates, he confounds the dates. I ſhall give ſome inſtances. He aſſerts that Lewis XIV having taken Grave in the month of July in the year 1672, beſieged and ſubdued Maeſtricht, ravaged the country of Triers, ſeized on ſeveral towns there, and became maſter of the principality Orange, and of the county of Burgundy; but that the town of Groningen defended itſelf vigorouſly againſt the biſhop of Munſter (19). Every body may ſee, that this is confounding of the times. Maeſtricht was not ſubdued till the year 1673, nor the Franche-Comté conquered till the year 1674. But the taking of Grave, and the reſiſtance of Groningen belong to the year 1672. Our author adds, that France received a very great blow by the loſs of Philipſburg, and by that of mareſchal de Turenne, and yet that after this ſhe laid Haguenau in aſhes, and many other towns, and took Condé and Bouchain. Obſerve that Mr de Turenne was killed in the year 1675, and Philipſburg fell into the hands of the Germans in the month of September 1676, and Condé and Bouchain were taken in the ſpring of the year 1676, and that Haguenau was a town which the French made to ſerve as a rampart (20). They were far from burning it. I ſhall give two examples more. He ſays that in the year 1689 the duke de Noailles took Campredon in Catalonia (21), and that the marquis of Bouflers having almoſt ruined Kocheim, at laſt took Mentz (22). Every body knows that Mentz, without having been in the leaſt attacked, received a French garriſon in the month of October in the year 1688, and that Cocheim was taken by the marquis de Bouflers the twenty ſixth of Auguſt in the year 1689, and that the French loſt Mentz after a long ſiege the eighth of September in the year 1689 (23). The laſt example contains a fault in Geography. Mr Hartnac tells us that in the month of September in the year 1688, the French, under the conduct of the Dauphin, entring the dominions, of his highneſs the elector Palatine by Fort-Louïs, which is built on an iſland of the Rhine, took Neuſtad and Keiſerſluthern, and afterwards Spire and Worms (24). It is obvious to every one, that the taking of theſe places ſhould have preceded the paſſage of the Rhine, and that however it is not by Fort-Louïs that one is to paſs in order to ſeize on Neuſtad.

It is certain, that, in order to rank things according to their dates, it is not ſufficient to be provided with good Chronological tables; it is neceſſary even to conſult a very good Journal, and in this the news papers may be uſeful. It would be of great ſervice to the compilers of Hiſtory, if Chronological accounts were publiſhed like that of Father du Londel (25).

(11) See the Life of prince Eugene, printed at the Hague, in the year 1702, *pag.* 109, & *ſeq.*

(12) See the Life of prince Eugene, *pag.* 180, & *ſeq.*

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 300.

(14) Sabaudi anno 1692, (*it ſhould have been* 1693) à Pignaroli obſeſſione rejecti, iterumque fœderati illorum prope Marſigliam gravi clade mulctati ſunt. *Hartnac. Syntagma Hiſt. Polit. Tom. ii, pag.* 54. *See alſo pag.* 134.

(15) See the Life of prince Eugene, *pag.* 205, 206.

(16) Valentinianam proditione ceperunt. *Ibid. pag.* 131.

(17) Per Johannem Barthium quoque Batavorum naves, numero licet ſuperiores profligat (*Rex Galliæ*) èque captis magnam frumenti copiam aufert. *Ibid. pag.* 134.

(18) *See the* Faſtes *of Father* du Londel, *under the twenty ninth of June* 1694.

(19) Hart. *Tom. ii, pag.* 130, 131.

(20) Montecuculi had beſieged it in the year 1675.

(21) Hartnaccius, *Tom. ii, pag.* 133.

(22) Kocheimium graviter affligit, Moguntiam denique expugnat. *Ibid.*

(23) See Mr Hartnac himſelf, *Tom. i, pag.* 561, 562.

(24) *Tom. i, pag.* 561.

(25) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republiq. des Lettres, *Feb.* 1699, *pag.* 223.

MICYLLUS (JAMES) born at Straſburg, April 6, 1503, holds a very honourable place among the learned men of his age. He ſtudied in the moſt famous univerſities of Germany, and ſpent near five years at that of Erford, where he contracted a very cloſe friendſhip with Joachim Camerarius, which laſted as long as his life. His family name was Moltzer (*a*). The name of Micyllus was given him, becauſe he admirably acted the part of Micyllus [*A*] in a piece upon the ſtage, wherein a Dialogue of Lucian (*b*) was repeated before a great number of auditors. He was ſoon known to be very well qualified to make a college flouriſh; for, in the year 1527, he taught the Latin and Greek tongues in that of Francfort: and he acquitted himſelf ſo well in that ſtation that at Heidelberg he was choſen profeſſor of the Greek tongue in the year 1532. Thither he went; but he ſtayed not long there, for the magiſtrates of Francfort having recalled him

(*a*) Moreri ſays *Moltzel*; Mr Teiſſier, in his additions to Thuanus, *Melcher*, Konig, in his Biblioth. *Motzlerus.*

(*b*) That whoſe title is *Somnium, ſeu Gallus.*

[*A*] *He acted . . . . the part of Micyllus.*] Hagius in the Life of Peter Lotichius, gives an exact account of this adventure; but inſtead of ſaying he had it from one who was a ſpectator of it at Francfort (this was John Lonicerus Greek profeſſor at Marpurg) he ſhould have cited Micyllus himſelf (1), as Melchior Adam has done.

Fortuito quondam Micylli nomina caſu
  Repperi, & in mores tranſiit ille meos.

It was by chance I found the name
Micyllus, which my own became.

There is in Moreri *fortitudo* inſtead of *fortuito*, which was corrected in the Dutch Edition, by *Ludendo*. For the reſt I have every where put Micyllus, tho' I know that d'Ablancourt, who calls him Micyle in his tranſlation of Lucian, was approved by Mr Menage (2). If I had been condemned for this by that learned man, yet I ſhould not have been cenſured with regard to orthography; for I do not ſay, *Mycillus, as the greateſt part of the German writers call him when they ſpeak of Jacobus Micyllus, wherein*, ſays he, *they are ſo much the more to blame, becauſe this name was given him, for acting well the part of Micylus in Lucian, when he was a ſchool-boy.* Menage is not the only perſon who has ſaid that Micyllus was then a ſchool-boy (3), which is very likely: but it is not very eaſy to reconcile this with what is related above, that this piece was acted at Frankfort; for it does not appear, that Micyllus ſtudied there. Melchior Adam makes

(1) *Lib. i*, Sylvarum.

(2) Obſervations upon the French tongue, *vol. i, pag.* 346.

(3) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 78. Teiſſier, Addit. *Tom. i, pag.* 139. Konig. Biblioth. *pag.* 540.

him, he re-aſſumed his former poſt in their city. He returned to Heidelberg [*B*], when the Reformation was received there (*c*); and taught publickly the Greek tongue, and and at his own houſe the Latin tongue with good ſucceſs, till he died, which happened the twenty eighth of January 1558 [*C*]. He had not long before a conference with Melanchthon who was come to Heidelberg at the deſire of the elector Otho Henry, to concert the new ſtatutes of the univerſity. Micyllus was one of the beſt Poets of his time in Germany [*D*]. He had a great many children; but he left only two ſons, whereof one ſtudied the Law, and was chancellor to the elector Palatine; the other was a Taylor by trade in Heidelberg (*d*). I ſhall ſay ſomething of his works [*E*].

(*c*) *That is, in* 1546, ex Sleidano, lib. xvi.

(*d*) *Taken from* Melch. Adam, in Vitis Philoſoph.

makes him go from Straſburg to the moſt famous univerſities of Germany.

[*B*] *He returned to Heidelberg.*] Melchior Adam deſcribes the time of this return only by the two circumſtances of the war of Smalcald, and the reception of the Goſpel in Heidelberg. *Donec ſub bellum Smalcaldicum cum variis Germania concuteretur motibus, atque Heidelbergæ Evangelii doctrina reciperetur, eodem ad Græcanicæ linguæ profeſſionem accerſitus rediit.* This denotes the year 1546, or 1547, and agrees with the marginal note, wherein this author ſays, that Micyllus was twenty years in the ſervice of the city of Francfort, and more than ten, tho' with ſome interruption, in the ſervice of the electors Palatine.

[*C*] *He died the twenty eighth of January* 1558.] This ſhows that John Hagius, who ſays (4), that Micyllus, Melanchthon, and Lotichius Secundus, died the ſame year, is miſtaken: he ſhould have ſaid it only of the two laſt, for they indeed died in 1560. Moreri is miſtaken only in the day, who ſays, that Micyllus died the twenty third of January: probably the *duodetrigeſimo* of Melchior Adam had dazzled him.

[*D*] *He was one of the beſt Poets of his time in Germany.*] Neverthleſs the critics have obſerved a great many faults in his verſes, and even ſome in reſpect of quantity. See the cenſure or the *Promulſis Critica* of John Peter Lotichius, in chap. 14, wherein there is an error of the preſs concerning the year of the birth of Micyllus, which is ſaid to be 1553, inſtead of 1503. We learn from that book, that Micyllus after the example of the Poets of antiquity, had a very ſmall ſhare in the favours of fortune: *Variam ac novercantem, dum viveret, expertus fortunam . . . quæ ſors illi cum majorum gentium veteribus poëtis fuit communis.*

[*E*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his works.*] His treatiſe *De re metrica*, is a maſter-piece, as Melanchthon ſays. See what he ſays of it (5). 'De re metrica extant 'eruditiſſimi & conſummatiſſimi libri tres Jacobi Micylli, 'quo nemo Latinè ſcripſit proſodiam eruditius aut 'diligentius. - - - - *There are three books of the moſt 'learned and accompliſhed James Micyllus about quantity, than whom none ever wrote a proſody in Latin 'more learnedly or accurately.*' His other works are notes upon Ovid (6) and Lucan, the tranſlation of ſome pieces of Lucian with ſcholia; ſome notes upon the genealogy of the gods compoſed by Boccace; ſeveral Greek and Latin verſes; a tranſlation of Tacitus into the German tongue; *Arithmeticæ logiſticæ libri duo*, &c (7).

(4) In Vita Lotichii Secundi, *pag.* 69.

(5) Apud Melch. Adam. *pag.* 181, Philoſoph. German.

(6) The Epitome of the Bibliotheque of Geſner, excepts the Metamorphoſis; but we ſee in the catalogue of the Bodleian library, the notes of Micyllus upon the fifteen books of the Metamorphoſis.

(7) See the titles of his other works in the Epitome of the Biblioth. of Geſner.

MILLETIERE (THEOPHILUS BRACHET SIEUR DE LA) acquired a reputation much greater than good for meddling in matters of religion, and endeavouring to reconcile the Catholics and Proteſtants in France. One of his antagoniſts deſcribed him after the following manner (*a*): that after he had ſtudied the Law ſuperficially at Heidelberg, he was admitted advocate; that he was ſo much in love with an attorney's daughter, that he fell dangerouſly ſick, and that he neither would nor could be cured but by marrying her; that he hoped to find cauſes by means of his father-in-law, and upon this account applied himſelf to the bar, but being at a ſtand in one pleading (*b*) he was ſo diſguſted with the practice of the Law, that he ſet up for a Divine; that he was heard to diſpute about matters of religion in the court, whither he went ſtill as a hearing advocate, and there ſputtered out Hebrew; that he affected a great zeal againſt Arminianiſm; that he occaſioned the conference of Cameron with Tilenus; and that by all theſe motions he obtained the office of an elder in the conſiſtory of the church of Paris, and afterwards was made deputy of the province to the aſſembly of Rochelle; that he had the chief hand in the tumultuous reſolutions of that aſſembly, which overturned the ſtate of the churches; that his conduct in this deputation is very well known, and with what heat he wrote againſt Tilenus, his particular enemy [*A*], and how little the ſucceſs of his journey to the States-General anſwered the hopes he had raiſed in the aſſembly at Rochelle; that being returned home, he ſollicited the affairs of the duke of Rohan at court, and that he was ſuſpected of being concerned in enterprizes pernicious to his country, and of holding correſpondence with foreigners; that he was apprehended and ſent to Toulouſe where, after he had endured the torture and a long impriſonment [*B*], he framed the firſt plan of the Syncretiſm;

(*a*) Samuel Mareſius, in Antichriſto revelato, *lib. ii, cap. ult. pag.* 562, & *ſeq.*

(*b*) Cum obmutuiſſet in frequenti ſenatu. *Id. ib.*

[*A*] *It is known . . . with what heat he wrote againſt Tilenus, his particular enemy.*] In the beginning of the month of March, 1621 (1), there came forth, under the name of Abraham Elintus, an advertiſment to the aſſembly of Rochelle (2), wherein the Reformed were earneſtly exhorted to ſubmit to their prince, and not to undertake to preſerve to themſelves by a war the poſſeſſion of the edicts. Elintus was the anagram of Tilenus, who was the author of this advertiſement. La Milletiere, ſecretary to the aſſembly of Rochelle, wrote an anſwer to this piece, and intituled it, *A Diſcourſe of the true Reaſons why thoſe of the Reformed religion in France can, and ought in conſcience to, reſiſt with force of arms the open perſecution of the enemies of their religion and the State.* Tilenus replied in a little book which was intituled, *An Examination of a Book intituled, A Diſcourſe of the true Reaſons why thoſe of the Reformed Religion*, &c. See in the eighth volume of the French Mercury (3) the contents of theſe two pieces. Note, that the *Chamber of the Edict*, ſitting at Beziers, cauſed the anſwer of La Milletiere to the advertiſement of Tilenus, to be burnt by the hand of the hangman, and ordered an enquiry to be made after the name of the author; which decree was made October 6, 1626. See the twelfth volume of the French Mercury (4). For the reſt Father Ange de Raconis, a Capuchin preacher, made uſe of ſeveral extracts out of thoſe writings of Tilenus and La Milletiere; and he informs us (5), that Du Moulin *choſe among all the reſt, La Milletiere, as his champion, to oppoſe him againſt Raconis* (6), *when the baroneſs de Courville was inſtructed.* Note, that Grotius did not approve of La Milletiere's publiſhing a work ſo capable of rendring the cauſe of the Reformed odious to princes (7).

[*B*] *That he was ſent to Toulouſe, where after he had endured the torture, and a long impriſonment.*] He himſelf informs us of a very peculiar circumſtance in his proceſs. *I had in my hands*, ſays he (8), *the ſentence of my death,*

(1) French Mercury, *Tom. vii*, ad annum 1621, *pag.* 223.

(2) It is inſerted in the French Mercury, ibid.

(3) At *pag.* 155, & *ſeq.* See alſo the Hiſtory of the edict of Nantes, *book viii*, *pag.* 423.

(4) At *pag.* 607, & *ſeq.*

(5) Ange de Raconis Glaive de Jezabel, *cap. iii*, *pag.* 313.

(6) Nephew to the Capuchin.

(7) Grotius, Epiſt. 174, *part* 1, *pag.* 65. *See also the* 715*th letter.*

(8) La Milletiere, *in chap. xii of the* Catholique Reformé, *pag.* 197, 198.

Syncretiſm; that having recovered his liberty by the clemency of the prince, and the interceſſion of his friends, he engaged to make all the Reformed return to the Romiſh communion, and that by this means he thought he was to ſhew his gratitude for the annual penſion of a thouſand crowns that were given him; that he printed many books about the re-union of the religions [C], and becauſe he did not pay a deference to the remonſtrances of the conſiſtory of Charenton, he was at laſt excommunicated, which did not hinder him from going to church conſtantly; that he maintained his family another way, which was by ſolliciting, as a brother-in-law, the ſuits of a famous courtezan, to whom he was indeed related in this degree of affinity, for ſhe was a baſtard of the Attorney whoſe daughter he had married (c); that no body denied, but he was grafted into honourable families, yet it was well known what trade his grandfather followed in Orleans (d) [D]. This I have taken out of a book printed in the year 1642. The reader may ſee elſewhere (e), that La Milletiere continued ſtill in the external profeſſion of the Reformed religion in the year 1645, at the time of the national ſynod of Charenton. The proceedings of the aſſembly againſt him obliged him to declare himſelf openly (f); that is, he embraced the Romiſh communion. He abjured towards the end of March 1645. He continued ſtill to write upon the controverſy, and to ſay that the re-union of the two religions was eaſy to be effected [E]. The firſt work he publiſhed after his

drawn up by the hand of the firſt preſident Maſuyer, under the authority of the parliament of Toulouſe, in which I found my ſelf condemned as one accuſed and convicted of the crimes charged upon me, and this ſentence was put into the hands of the recorder, before the conſultation about it in parliament, which, by their interlocutory, was the occaſion of the delay, whereby afterwards I obtained my liberty and preſervation from the ſovereign authority.

[C] *That he printed many books about the re-union of the religions.*] He began with a letter which he publiſhed in French in the year 1634, and it was followed two years after by a work in Latin divided into two parts. In the firſt he examined the diſpute about St Peter's ſupremacy, about juſtification, prayers for the dead, the invocation of ſaints, and the euchariſt. In the ſecond, he treated of nature and grace, and of predeſtination. This book he ſent to the ableſt miniſters; and ſeveral anſwers were made to it: Among the reſt that of Mr du Moulin was very ſharp, to which he wrote a reply in French, which Grotius did not deſpiſe (9). In my opinion, none anſwered the ſecond book of La Milletiere better than Mr Daillé, whoſe anſwer is intituled, *An Examination of the Advice of Mr de la Milletiere, about the Accommodation of differences in Religion*; which he publiſhed in Latin and French in the year 1636. This examination was refuted by Mr de la Milletiere, and that refutation obliged Mr Daillé to write an apology; but he did not publiſh it (10). His adverſary publiſhed a new book after the holding of the national ſynod of Alençon in the year 1637, with this title, *The means of Chriſtian Peace by the Re-union of the Catholics and Proteſtants as to the Differences of Religion* (11). After this he publiſhed ſeveral other books, whoſe titles need not be ſet down. I will only add, that he became ſo captious, that he wrote an apology for the method of Peter Veron. He thought he had juſtified it by reaſons which no miniſter could anſwer: Of which he boaſts in the ninth page of his *Catholique Reformé*, printed at Paris in the year 1642.

Let us ſee the judgment that is given of him by the Hiſtorian of the edict of Nantes (12). 'La Milletiere 'was a raſh conceited man, who thought that none came 'near his great merits and capacity. Moreover, either 'the fear that the court, remembring what was paſſed, 'would give him trouble, or the hope of acquiring 'much honour, or making a great fortune by the 'ſucceſs of that enterprize, or the praiſes which the 'Jeſuits gave him to draw him over to their party, 'ſo byaſſed his mind, that he came entirely into the 'project of the cardinal, and drew up a plan of an 'accommodation exactly in the terms which that 'prelate deſired. He vindicated the Romiſh church 'almoſt in every thing; and in thoſe which he did 'not take the trouble to juſtify, he made uſe of 'the ſofteſt expreſſions, under pretence of explain'ing them, giving them out as queſtions, which 'ought not to hinder the Reformed from being re'conciled.'

[D] *No body denied that he was grafted into honourable families, but his grandfather's trade was well known . . . . in Orleans.*] Let us relate the very words of him who affirms this. 'Homo male feriatus putavit non 'aliter quam alios contemptim deprimendo, imagina'riam ſuam Nobilitatem poſſe commendari. Quaſi 'neſciretur quam artem avus ipſius Aureliæ exercue'rit; ipſum vero à ſuis collactaneis ſemper cum riſu 'exceptum, quoties nobilitatis ſuæ ſermonem pro 'inſita ſibi vanitate auſus eſt injicere; quamvis non 'negem eum honeſtis eſſe inſitum familiis, quas de'honeſtat quantum in ſe eſt (13). - - - - *He prepoſterouſly thought, that his own imaginary nobility could not be commended, but by contemptuouſly abaſing others. 'As if people did not know what trade his grandfa'ther had followed at Orleans; and that he himſelf was 'always laughed at by his foſter-brothers, whenever his 'natural vanity prompted him to talk of his nobility; 'though I do not deny that he is grafted on good fami'lies, which he diſgraces as much as he can.*' The abbot Marolles informs us, that La Milletiere was the *ſon of Ignatius Brachet, lord of la Milletiere, and of Antoinette Faye, the daughter of Bartholomew Faye, lord of Eſpaiſſes, counſellor in the parliament, and preſident of the inqueſts in* 1541 (14). By this marriage our reconciler of religions was related to ſeveral illuſtrious families, as this abbot ſhows at large.

[E] *He continued ſtill to write upon the controverſy, and to ſay, that the re-union of the two religions was eaſy to be effected,*] 'After divers admonitions which did 'no good, the ſynods declared, that he was no longer 'a member of the Reformed churches; and there 'was not one of them who would receive him in'to their communion. He became therefore a Ca'tholic out of neceſſity, that he might be of ſome 'religion; and after this he conſtantly acted the 'part of a miſſionary, and looked out for conferen'ces, at which he was always ſo ill treated as to daſh 'his boldneſs, if he had not been ſo ſelf-conceited that 'nothing could daunt him. Charles Drelincourt 'one of the colleagues of John Daillé, and the true 'ſcourge of ſuch as were of Milletiere's temper, quite 'confounded him in a conference, the acts whereof 'was publiſhed (15).' Among other books he publiſhed at Paris, Le Triomphe, &c *The Triumph of Truth for the Peace of the Church, to invite the King of Great Britain to embrace the Catholic Faith.* Of this I ſhall ſpeak in the laſt remark.

Here follows a pretty curious paſſage: *The firſt conference that offers, is concerning the deſign of Mr de la Milletiere, to re-unite the churches that are divided. This virtuous man thinks it eaſy to bring about the return of the Proteſtants to the Catholic church. And when I ſeveral times aſked him the grounds of his perſuaſion, ſince the great differences of opinions, which occur in certain points, were difficult to be reconciled; he anſwered me with a ſpirit of charity, which gives him as much zeal as knowledge, that this reconciliation depended only upon a good reformation on our part, and on knowing the motives of the ſeparation of thoſe who have left us; which he has ſhown in ſeveral books written to that end. One needs only read his* Flambeau de l'Egliſe, *and his* Flambeau de la vraye Foye, *to which no anſwer has been made, neither is it poſſible to make a good one, becauſe they are ſo many invincible demonſtrations; and if the adverſaries do not allow it, one needs only enquire what they ſtick at, and try to bring them to a regular conference. In the mean time Mr de la Milletiere is perſuaded, that he has demonſtrated, or that it* his abjuration was that which contained the motives of his change (g). He begun ſeveral other books afterwards, but did not finiſh them, either becauſe his firſt thoughts ceaſed to charm him, or becauſe the neceſſity of obtaining the approbation of the Doctors was a conſtraint upon him; for they did not agree to all his opinions, and he oppoſed their remonſtrances. He was ſo offended at a ſermon preached by a biſhop, who in a parallel drawn between the Virgin Mary and JESUS CHRIST ſet her in all things above, or at leaſt equalled her to, the ſon of GOD, that he declared freely, he would return to the pale of the Proteſtant church, in caſe he was obliged to hear many ſuch ſermons (h). See the Memoirs of the abbot de Marolles, who had a great eſteem for him. He never was a miniſter, although Father Jacob makes him a miniſter of Charenton (i). Neither was he a Phyſician, as Mr de Vigneul Marville, at *pag.* 229 of his Miſcellanies, has imagined. He would not own that one of his books had been cenſured by the Sorbonne, and yet Mr Rivet publiſhed an act which did bear the name of that Faculty [*F*]. I have been told that Mr de la Milletiere had a ſon who was killed in the wars

---

(c) Taceo aliud culinæ ſuæ ſubſidium ex publica ſollicitatione in Curia negotiorum famoſæ cujuſdam meretriculæ tanquam affinis ſuæ, eſt enim ſoceri ſui ſpuria. *Id. ib. pag.* 565.

(d) Id. ib. *pag.* 561.

(e) In the article AMYRAUT in the text.

(f) See letter cx, and cxiv, of Sarravius, Edit. of Utrecht, 1697.

(9) Molinæus diu expectato miſſum ad ſe librum excepit duro reſponſo, ut & priorem fecerant tum ipſe tum Rivetus Reſcripſit Mileterius Molinæo falſe ſatis, quippe Gallico ſermone quo plus valet, & quædam dixit ad Molinæum pertinentia non vane. *Grotius, Epiſt.* 541, *inter Epiſtol. Eccleſ. & Theolog. pag* 793, *Edit. in fol.*

(10) The Life of Mr Daillé, *pag.* 21.

(11) Hiſt. of the Edict of Nantes, *Tom. ii, lib. x, pag.* 515.

(12) Id. ib. *pag.* 514, 515.

(13) Samuel Mareſius, in Antich. revelato, *lib. ii, pag.* 561.

(14) Abbot de Marolles, Mémoires, *pag.* 322, 323.

(15) Hiſt. of the Edict of Nantes, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 515, 516. *Add to this theſe words of book xi, pag.* 578, his writings were condemned at *the national ſynod of Alençon, in the year* 1637, and they wrote to this reconciler, that if he did not give within ſix months an authentical declaration of his repentance to the conſiſtory of Paris, he ſhould be no longer accounted a member of the Reformed church.

(g) Sarravius, Epiſt. 118, *pag.* 121.

(h) Ex eodem Sarravio Epiſt. 170, *pag.* 173, 174.

(i) Ludovicus Jacob à Sancto Carolo, Carmelita, Biblioth. Pontific. *pag.* 471.

---

it is not impoſſible for him to demonſtrate the infallibility of the Catholic church, whoſe primitive and abſolute authority reſides in the holy ſee, and in the perſon of the Pope, without the concurrence of a general council. . . . . I ſay he is perſuaded, that, in his book of the Euchariſt and Tranſubſtantiation, he hath clearly demonſtrated the true doctrine which we always profeſſed, according to the deciſions of the holy councils, and the pure word of GOD, which is ſo expreſs in this point, together with tradition: And therefore they muſt no longer require of us the teſtimony of the ſenſes and of reaſon, to prove that there is no other Tranſubſtantiation than that of paſſing from the knowledge of a ſenſible ſubſtance to the knowledge of an intelligible ſubſtance (16). Thus the abbot de Marolles ſpoke of him in the year 1656.

[*F*] *He would not own, that one of his books had been cenſured by the Sorbonne, and yet Mr Rivet publiſhed an act which did bear the name of that Faculty.*] This miniſter anſwering a little book of Grotius (17), put in an appendix (18) twelve theſes which he extracted from a treatiſe of la Milletiere about the power of the Pope, and the cure of ſchiſms, to which he added a decree of the Sorbonne againſt the *Means of Chriſtian Peace*, &c. This decree bearing date the fifteenth of December 1637, ſhould have been publiſhed at Paris (19), but was not. Nevertheleſs Andrew Rivet having got a manuſcript copy of it, printed it in Holland, in 1642, in the appendix I have mentioned. La Milletiere was much vexed at it, and affirmed that this piece was ſpurious, and that it was only the particular cenſure (20) of Mr Chappellas, *a native of Bourdeaux, and formerly a Jeſuit* (21), who was created ſyndic of the faculty of Theology, in the month of December 1637. *At the very inſtant he was confirmed, being deſirous to be talked of for ſome reputable act, worthy of the humour of his climate, and his fiery temper, he propoſed the examination of my book to the ſociety.* La Milletiere adds (22), that his book was never examined, and that Chappellas, who had alledged an order from the ſovereign authority, found himſelf very much out in his reckoning. ‘ The reaſons ‘ of theſe different motions being afterwards repre‘ſented in the place from which the ſyndic pretend‘ed to ſupport his deſign with a ſuperior authority, ‘ his proceeding was found ſo impertinent, that he ‘ and Mr du Val, the ſub-dean, received an expreſs ‘ command to deſiſt from it. Nevertheleſs he uſed the ‘ authority that his office of ſyndic gave him, to have ‘ his private cenſure inſerted in the regiſter of the ‘ Faculty, which was dated December 15, ſigned by ‘ him and Mr du Val, by whoſe means he obtained ‘ the place of ſyndic. It is therefore the cenſure of ‘ Mr Chappellas, which Mr Rivet has printed, and ‘ not the cenſure of the faculty of the Sorbonne.’ He ſhows, by ſeveral marks, that this piece did not proceed from the Faculty. Mr Rivet (23) was not able to ſhow that this account was falſe. But as to other things, he ſolidly refuted his adverſary, and promiſed to give a fuller anſwer; for he intituled his book, *Prodromus ad pleniorem refutationem calumniarum*, &c (24). - - - *The Fore-runner to a fuller Confutation of the Calumnies*, &c. La Milletiere replied in Latin, by a diſſertation, intituled, *Crurifragium Prodromi* - - - - *The legs of the fore-runner broken.* Rivet, altering his mind, did only publiſh a letter of Cuthbert Higlandius (25), which contained an advice, not to enter the liſts any more with ſuch an adverſary, and a long catalogue of the faults of the Latin which were in the *Crurifragium*. Yet I find in a letter of Grotius (26), the title of a French book which Rivet printed at Rouen, in the year 1642. *An Anſwer to three Letters, with the Defence of the Sieur Rivet againſt the Calumnies and Forgeries of Mr la Milletiere.*

Note, that in 1644, the cenſure of one of la Milletiere's books by the Sorbonne appeared at Paris. It had been ſoftened twice or thrice in favour of the approvers. The letters of Sarravius will tell you more of it (27). Grotius acquainted his brother, that the three doctors of the Sorbonne, who had approved the book of this reconciler, were ſuſpended for a year (28), and that Mr Arnaud wrote a book againſt la Milletiere out of policy. *De Arnaldus ſcripſit contra Miletерium ut ejus odio ſuum elueret* (29). - - - *Mr Arnaud wrote againſt Milletiere, that he might divert the hatred they had to him by that of the other.* La Milletiere was alſo of the ſame opinion as to the motive of this doctor of the Sorbonne. Read the words of Sarravius (30): ‘ Arnaldus etiam, quem ſibi clam adſtipulari Bache‘tus (31) arbitrabatur, epiſtolam edidit ad Præſules ‘ ſui libri Approbatores ſcriptam, in qua damnatum ‘ poſtea librum erroris, falſitatis, & hæreſeos accuſare ‘ prævertit. Hæc tamen omnia κατ' οἰκονομίαν fieri, ‘ jactat Henotes. *Credat Judæus Apella.* Sed quid ‘ huic homini facias? Eum ego, qui tam inſanum ‘ ſapit, Deo irato ſuo relinquo. - - - - *Arnaudus alſo, ‘ whom Brachet thought had privately joined with him, ‘ publiſhed an epiſtle writ to the prelates, the approvers ‘ of his book, in which he anticipates the accuſation of the ‘ book that was aftewards condemned of error, falſhood, ‘ and hereſy. Yet the reconciler brags, all this was ‘ done out of policy.* Let the circumciſed Jew believe it. ‘ *But what can one do with this man? For my part, I ‘ leave him, ſince he is ſo like a madman, to his angry ‘ GOD.*’

Since the printing of what you have read, I have run over the piece which is mentioned above, *viz.* that which was printed at Rouen in 1642. It's title is *Reſponſes*, &c. *An Anſwer to three Letters of the Sieur de la Milletiere on his Means of a Re-union in Religion; by Andrew Rivet . . . . with the Defence of the ſaid Sieur Rivet againſt the Calumnies and Forgeries of the ſaid Sieur de la Milletiere, in his pretended Catholic Reformed, with a Letter of a learned Perſon of this time concerning the ſame Treatiſe.* There is one chapter in it concerning the account which Mr de la Milletiere had given, *of the pretended falſe cenſure attributed to the faculty of the Sorbonne.* Mr Rivet proteſts (32), *that neither Mr Chappellas, nor any one in his name,* had *put* that cenſure *into his hands,* or *procured it to be printed* . . . . (33). *He that gave him the copy of it in Holland,* told him *that it was ſent by Grotius.* He leaves to Mr Chappellas the trouble and care *of defending himſelf againſt what was objected againſt him;* but he refutes two objections which la Milletiere had made to prove the nullity of the cenſure of the Sorbonne (34). ‘ The firſt is, *That they are not uſed to ‘ talk at random, and without a due application and ‘ ſpecification of the errors contained in the writings ‘ they cenſure.* The ſecond, *That it is not their cuſtom ‘ to ſound an alarm againſt books which they cenſure, ‘ and to end with reprimands to the prelates of the church* ‘ . . . . (35). I ſhall give him two examples ſuffi‘ciently known of the contrary to what he ſays, ‘ eſpecially when they condemn the book of an author ‘ who is out of their communion. In the year ‘ cIↄIↄcxi, the twenty ſecond of Auguſt, they pub‘liſhed a cenſure againſt the book of the late Mr du ‘ Pleſſis, of happy memory, which was intituled,

(16) Abbot de Marol. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 241, 242. See alſo *pag.* 129, 193.

(17) Notes upon the Conſultation of Caſſander.

(18) See the third volume of the works of Andrew Rivet, *pag.* 976, 977.

(19) Ne hujus operis condemnati quemquam lateat, cenſuram hanc typis vulgandam eſſe decrevit. *Ib. pag.* 978.

(20) La Millet. Cathol. Reformé, *pag.* 194.

(21) Id. ib. *pag.* 188.

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 193.

(23) See *pag.* 1037, of the third tome of his works.

(24) It is at *pag.* 1035, of the third volume of his works.

(25) At *pag.* 1114, of the ſame volume. Sorbiere is the author of this letter. See the preface of the *Sorberiana*.

(26) Grotius, Epiſt. 640, *Part* ii, *pag.* 949, *col.* 1.

(27) Sarravius, Epiſt. 85, 86.

(28) Grotius, Epiſt. 712, *part* ii, *pag.* 969. *It is dated July* 2, 1644.

(29) Idem, Epiſt. 714, *pag.* 969. *It is dated July* 16, 1644.

(30) Sarravius, Epiſt. 85, *pag.* 85, 86.

(31) It is a fault of the Printer for *Brachetus*. There are many other ſuch like faults in the letters of Sarravius.

(32) Rivet, Reſponſes au trois Lettres, *pag.* 163.

(33) Ib. p. 164.

(34) Ib. p. 167.

(35) Ib. p. 168.

wars (k), and that one of his daughters was married to Mr Catelan ſecretary to the council, and that from this marriage came a daughter, who was married to the count of Jonſac. I muſt not forget the work which he dedicated to the king of England [G].

‘*The Myſtery of Iniquity*, &c. There they ſpecify nothing, but ſay in general, *That being of opinion that the book bearing that abominable title, ought to be condemned, deteſted, and the reading of it wholly forbidden to Chriſtian people, as being heretical, very extravagant, and ſeditious, contrary to the divine and natural law, to the writings of the antient Fathers*, &c. And a little after they add a caution in theſe words, that *they adviſe good people, who are zealous for the defence of the holy church*, &c. of the danger which may accrue by the reading of that book; *praying, and conjuring* (pray mark this) *in a moſt humble manner, the prelates of the Catholic church, and the civil magiſtrates*, &c. *that they would endeavour with all their power, generouſly and effectually to ſtop the courſe of ſuch a dangerous and terrible peſtilence*. This is a cenſure exactly agreeable in thoſe two points to what the perſon cenſured by the diligence of the Sieur Chappellas, formerly denies to be the ſtyle of the Sorbonne. Will he ſay, *that this cenſure, injurious to the perſon of the author, and which does not ſpecify any ſentence or maxim of the book which it ſtrikes at, in order to qualify them by a name, which denotes the reaſon of the cenſure, did not proceed from the judgment of that ſociety?* Here is another without any ſpecification, and without making any formal application, of the year cIↄ Iↄ cxxix, againſt the ſmall pieces of Peter Picherel, who died in the communion of the Romiſh church, in a little priory of the abbey of Eſſome, wherein, without any ſpecification, on the firſt of September, they *condemn Picherel's book* (36) *as wicked and abominable, infected with the ſtinking leproſy of Calviniſm, and ſtinking like the pit of hell: and will have this cenſure to be publiſhed, leſt the houſhold of faith ſhould ſhipwreck their conſciences as it were in a ſtorm, and be circumvented by the reading of that deceitful book*. It is alſo *injurious to the perſon of the author*, for it calls him *Deſertor & Perduellis, - - deſerter and rebel*; and theſe two cenſures are publiſhed, being ſigned by the ſecretary to the recorder of the Sorbonne.’

Mr Rivet declares, at the end of this chapter, that he had *received the cenſure printed at Paris*, with *the Extract of the regiſters of the Faculty, on the manner of proceeding, with theſe words at the end*, Excerpta ex monumentis præfatæ facultatis, &c. ſigned Philip Bouvot, firſt beadle and ſecretary of the Faculty, the firſt of July 1642. He makes afterwards (37) *ſome reflexions on la Milletiere's new ſally in his* ‘remonſtrance to the doctors of the faculty of Divinity aſſembled in the Sorbonne, the firſt of Auguſt 1642, on the nullity of the cenſure of the Sieur Chapellas, &c.’ He ſays (38), that the act of this cenſure ‘put Mr de la Milletiere into a great paſſion, and made him leave no ſtone unturned to beat down the Sieur Chapellas if he could; that he accuſes him of having forged it himſelf, and cauſed it to be printed contrary to the intention of the college, by a meer ſurprize, not having declared to them for what reaſon he demanded that act, and to what purpoſe he would make uſe of it.’ This informs us of two things; I. That Mr Chapellas being deſirous to refute the ſlanders of M. de la Milletiere, let the public ſee all the proceedings of the Faculty. II. That the latter continued to clamour and wrangle. Now as this may ſerve to ſhow us his bold, vain, ſtubborn, and ſhuffling humour, it was not improper to let you ſee it; and I am perſuaded in general, that theſe abſtracts which I have given of Andrew Rivet's letters, will be thought curious and inſtructive.

[G] *I muſt not forget the work which he dedicated to the king of England.*] The title of it is mentioned above; and tho' I have not read it, I imagine, that the character of the author, the eager deſire of making himſelf neceſſary upon ſignal occaſions, and the love of oſtentation and vain-glory, appear in it as much or more than in any book he has publiſhed. My conjectures are grounded upon ſome places of the anſwer which was made to his Epiſtle Dedicatory. This anſwer is the work of an Engliſh biſhop who was with king Charles II during his exile. It was printed at Geneva in the year 1655, in 8vo. The preface to the reader contains this, among other things, *Mr de la Milletiere having once paſſed this rubicon*, ‘became one of our moſt cruel adverſaries, and there was not a miniſter whom he did not harraſs, and by an infinite number of little volumes, he imagined that he had drained the whole ocean of controverſies, of which ſo many great men of both religions have been tired. The greateſt part of his works were neglected, and finding but few antagoniſts that would run ſuch a career with him, it was thought, that being fully ſatisfied with the titles of honour, which his great ſufficiency had obtained for him from the liberality of the prince, he was reſolved to keep a perpetual ſilence, till Mr Aubertin having writ a learned treatiſe of the Euchariſt, according to the ſentiments of the Fathers, this book which gave an alarm into the very heart of *the great city*, did, as it were, with a ſudden ſurprize, awake Mr de la Milletiere, and made him put pen to paper to refute it after his manner. But that which more aſtoniſhes all the wiſe men of both religions, is to ſee him ſo far forget himſelf, as to dedicate his book to the king of Great-Britain, a prince whom he very well knew to be of a belief quite contrary to that which he eſtabliſhed in his book, and to whom he could not addreſs things of that nature, without drawing upon himſelf his juſt indignation, and fomenting unjuſt ſuſpicions in his rebellious ſubjects. His Epiſtle Dedicatory is nothing but a torrent of reproaches againſt the church which he hath forſaken, after having torn her bowels, of horrible prejudices againſt the memory of the late king of England, of flattering inſinuations to his ſucceſſor, and imaginary victories over thoſe, whom neither he, nor the heads of his party durſt fairly look in the face: and all this fine ſtuff, together with the pretended refutation of Mr Aubertin, bears the ſpecious and pompous title of, *The Triumph of Truth for the peace of the church*. Tho' the king of England at firſt took this dedication very ill, yet he was inclined to follow the advice of thoſe who perſuaded him to deſpiſe it, and not to ſhew any reſentment of it in public: but conſidering afterwards that this attempt gave occaſion to the inſults of his enemies, he commanded a learned biſhop, who was then near his perſon, to write an anſwer to it, without touching, except by the bye, upon that lofty book to which it was prefixed.’ This is ſufficient to ſhow that la Milletiere wrote without judgment. All the world knew, that the enemies of Charles I. accuſed him of being a favourer of Popery, and that nothing was more fit to foment the averſion of the Engliſh republicans to the family of this prince, than the opinion, that he had not been a Proteſtant; and yet here is a writer who had the boldneſs to dedicate to king Charles II a book wherein he ſuppoſes, that Charles I. died an inviſible member of the Romiſh church (39). The author that wrote an anſwer to him, made a very moderate remonſtrance upon it. *Many, and the wiſeſt men think*, ſays he to him (40), *that it was very indiſcreetly done to publiſh a treatiſe of ſuch a nature as your's is, under the protection of his majeſty, without his leave, and againſt his conſcience. Is it poſſible that you ſhould be ignorant, that ſuch inſinuations as your's, and the reports raiſed without any ground, about the deſign which the late king, his father, had to unite himſelf to the Romiſh church, made him loſe the affection of many of his ſubjects? And if you knew this, how durſt you tread in the ſame ſteps, on purpoſe to take from the ſon all hopes of ever recovering it?* The anſwer he makes him in another place is a little briſker. (41) ‘You have the impudence to affirm, that this prince died a true *inviſible* member of your church, as it is diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the Chriſtian world. This is an old pious fraud (42), and one of your Machiaveliſtical tricks, to gain credit to your religion by any means whatſoever, lawful or unlawful: but it is quite contrary to the confeſſion he made at his death, contrary to what thoſe do certainly know who aſſiſted at the murder of this pious monarch; and all this, as I imagine, upon the vain preſumption, *That there is no other church but your's that is capable of begetting ſuch a child*.’ Note, that the author oppoſes to this maxim a very remarkable doctrine, which the biſhop of Chalcedon (43) maintained

---

(k) In Germany in the year 1644. See *Sarravius, Epiſt.* 53, *pag.* 51.

(36) *See Mr* Colomiés, *his* Bibliotheque Choiſie, *about this book of Picherel, pag.* 21, 22, *of the ſecond edition.*

(37) Rivet, ibid. *pag.* 177.

(38) Ibid.

(39) An Anſwer to the Epiſtle Dedicatory of La Milletiere, *pag.* 34.

(40) Ib. p. 35.

(41) Ib. p. 163.

(42) See, above, the remark [*E*] of the article ABULPHARAGE.

(43) Spoken of before, remark [*A*], of the article KNOT.

tained ‘ in two treatiſes that he publiſhed, *viz.* That ‘ *if thoſe who live in the communion of the Proteſtant church, endeavour to learn the truth, and cannot attain to it by reaſon of their inſufficiency, but implicitly embrace it by preparing their hearts to receive it, which they are always ready to do, whenſoever it ſhall pleaſe GOD to reveal it to them,* [which is the duty of every good Chriſtian], *they cannot fail of the true church, of faith, and ſalvation* (44).’ This is a maxim (45) which might afford many reflexions for a ſupplement to the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe words, *Compel them to come in.* But this by the bye.

If la Milletiere had not been engaged in the ſtudy of controverſies above twenty five or thirty years, what we read in this paſſage of his antagoniſt, ſhould be looked upon as a greater piece of boldneſs than the firſt. ‘ You take upon you to enquire, or rather to decide, *why the hand of GOD, and of the parliament, was ſo heavy upon the head of the late king, and of his ſon*; and particularly that of GOD; *becauſe*, ſay you, *he had aſſumed the title of head of the church: GOD intending by this puniſhment to teach other princes who live in ſchiſm, with what ſeverity he can vindicate his glory againſt the injury done to the unity and authority of the church*: and as to the hand of the parliament, *becauſe this prince would not give his conſent to the abolition of Epiſcopacy, and the ſuppreſſion of the liturgy and ceremonies of the church of England* (46).’ However, I think this raſhneſs is more excuſable than the other, in a man that had been ſo long accuſtomed to diſputes of religion; for it is hardly poſſible, that ſuch a man ſhould not contract a habit of attributing the proſperities of the orthodox to their zeal for the faith, and the misfortunes of Heretics to their falſe religion. It is not neceſſary to obſerve how mean, little, and vulgar, thoſe thoughts are, and yet they eaſily admit of the falſe ornaments of Rhetoric, which give them emphaſis and pomp. Let us rather take notice of the modeſty of the Engliſh prelate who anſwered la Milletiere. ‘ By applying theſe particular afflictions according to your ill-grounded fancy, what a pit have you dug for the boldneſs and liberty of other men? Who, if they would aſſume the liberty that you have taken, of judging of the misfortunes of other princes, might as well ſay, that GOD afflicts them becauſe they will not turn Proteſtant, as you ſay of the late king, that GOD puniſhed him becauſe he would not turn Papiſt (47).’ Thus you ſee what was the concluſion of the anſwer of the prelate, to this part of the indiſcreet and raſh reflexions of our Theophilus Brachet. This anſwer contains many other judicious conſiderations which I do not mention. It was ſufficient for me to take notice of that which is moſt proper to undeceive all reaſonable men; for to diſcover the falſhood of this bad common-place (48), we need only obſerve that all ſects make uſe of it, and, if I may ſo ſay, it is a ſaddle that fits all horſes. To which we may add ſtill this defect, that it may be retorted againſt thoſe who alledge it with the greateſt confidence. La Milletiere found it ſo by experience. ‘ Till you make appear the truth of what you ſay, *replied the Engliſh prelate* (49), give me leave to obſerve, that neither the conſtancy which queen Mary (50) ſhewed ſo much for the Roman Catholic religion, nor the change of Henry IV to the ſame religion, could exempt them from a cruel and bloody death. What reaſon then have you to impute the miſchiefs, which the king ſuffered, to the errors of his religion? Be you your own judge.’

But nothing ſhows more clearly the vanity of *la Milletiere*, and his unbounded deſire of being diſtinguiſhed, than the method he propoſes to the king of England to recover his dominions. His Tongue, if you will believe him, was ſufficient to produce this great revolution. He affirms, on the one hand, that this monarch will be reſtored to his kingdoms, *provided he would turn Roman Catholic* (51); and on the other hand he ſays, that if this prince would be preſent at a diſpute between ſome Catholic doctors and the miniſters of Charenton, he would quickly be converted. By this means he gives us to underſtand, that if there were ſuch a diſpute, he would be one of the chief diſputants for the Romaniſts, and conſequently the principal cauſe of a triumph, the effects of which would be wonderful. Conſider a little his chimeras, according to all the gradations to which the Engliſh author has reduced them. ‘ But now we are come to the fineſt part of your whole epiſtle; which is this ridiculous propoſal you make *of a conference by the authority of your monarch, and at the requeſt of our king, before the Archbiſhop of Paris and his coadjutor, between ſome Roman Catholic doctors, and the miniſters of the church of that great city*, to whom you juſtly give an ample teſtimony *of their zeal and ſufficiency*. You go on further, for you ſuppoſe, *That thoſe miniſters will accept of a diſpute, or elſe by their ſhuffling, they will betray the weakneſs of their cauſe*: And you conclude with a prodigious aſſurance, *That theſe ſame miniſters will be convinced of the falſhood of their religion, and that their converſion or conviction will give an ample occaſion to the king of Great Britain to embrace the Romiſh Communion, and that his converſion will bring back all the Proteſtants who have yet any conſcience left, into the boſom of the church, and the obedience of the Holy See.* Give me leave to ſum up theſe fine conſequences: If the king of Great Britain deſires a ſolemn conference, the king of France will order it: If he orders it, the miniſters will accept it: If they accept it, they will certainly be overcome: If they are overcome, the king of England will change his religion: If he changes his religion, all the Proteſtants will do the ſame (52).’ One may eaſily gueſs, that the anſwer from which I take this paſſage, contains a ſtrong confutation of theſe illuſions, and that it did not coſt the Engliſh prelate much pains.

(44) Anſwer to la Milletiere, *pag.* 165.

(45) Compare what Caramuel ſays, in Nicolle's treatiſe of the Unity of the Church, *pag.* 71.

(46) Anſwer to la Milletiere, *pag.* 42.

(47) Ib. *pag.* 45, 46.

(48) See, above, remark [*O*] of the article MAHOMET II, and what was ſaid in the *Critique Générale de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme, letter* xix, *num.* 3, *pag.* 351, of the third edition, as to what Maimbourg ſaid of the prince of Condé killed at Jarnac.

(49) An Anſwer to la Milletiere, *pag.* 166, 167.

(50) He means the queen of Scotland, mother to king James I, and grandmother to Charles I, kings of England.

(51) See the Anſwer to La Milletiere, *pag.* 150.

(52) Ib. *pag.* 132, 133.

MILTON (JOHN) a famous Apologiſt for the death of Charles I. king of England, was born at London in the year 1608 [*A*]. He himſelf informs us (*a*), that after he

(*a*) Defenſ. ii, pro Populo Anglic. *pag.* 60, & *ſeq.* Edit. Hagæ Comitis, 1654.

OBSERVATIONS about the ſtature and mien of Milton.

[*A*] *He was born at London in* 1608.] This we learn from an inſcription which is at the bottom of his picture in one of his books (1), for it ſays, that in 1671 he was 63 years old. He had intimated his age in too indefinite a manner, in his ſecond apology written in 1653, or in 1654, where he only ſays, that he was above forty years old (2). It will not be improper here to obſerve, why he informs the public of this circumſtance, ſince it will give us occaſion to take notice of ſome falſities. Some had upbraided him with being a little ſhort man, who had nothing but ſkin and bones, and it was a corrective added to the application that had been made to him of theſe words of *Virgil.*

> Monſtrum horrendum, informe, ingens cui lumen ademptum (3).
>
> *A frightful, ill-ſhaped, blind monſter.*

To which he anſwered (4), he did not believe that ever his perſon was eſteemed ugly; that his ſtature was rather of a middle ſize than little; that he felt ſtill the courage and ſtrength which he had formerly, when he wore a ſword, and thought himſelf able to look ſuch men in the face as were much ſtronger than himſelf; that his countenance was ſo far from being pale, thin, and wrinkled, that it did him a great deal of honour, ſince at the age of above forty years, he ſeemed to be younger by almoſt ten years; that to witneſs all this he appealed to an infinite number of people, who knew him by ſight, and might juſtly ridicule him if he did not ſpeak the truth. He owned he was blind, but at the ſame time took notice that his eyes did not appear to have the leaſt defect. No body after this can doubt, but Mr Morus and Salmaſius were impoſed upon with reſpect to the ſtature and ſhape of Milton; I ſay, Salmaſius, for he has alſo told us in his reply, that he heard, his adverſary was as little as a dwarf, &c. ‘ Relatum quippe eſt mihi ab illis qui viderunt te, eſſe ſtatura pumilionem (5). Ab ea laborioſa & anxia longaque meditatione languorem etiam videtur contraxiſſe delicatum illud & infirmum corpuſculum tuum (6). - - - - *For it was told me by thoſe who have ſeen*

(1) It is his Logic.

(2) Quadragenario Major. *Milton, Defenſ. ii, pag.* 31.

(3) Quamquam nec ingens quo nihil eſt exilius, exſanguius, contractius. *Epiſt. Dedicat: Clamor. Regii Sang.*

(4) Milton, Defenſ. ii, *pag.* 30.

(5) Salmaſ. Reſponſ. ad Milt. *pag.* 3.

(6) Id. ib. *pag.* 15, 16.

he had ſtudied the languages, and a little Philoſophy in the place of his birth, he was ſent to Cambridge where he continued ſeven years, at the end of which he returned to his father's houſe [*B*], who then lived in the country. That having ſpent five years there in reading the beſt Greek and Latin authors, he travelled into France and Italy, in which he ſpent more than three years. That finding England at his return involved in the confuſions of a Civil-War, he thought fit to ſhut himſelf up in his cloſet, and to leave events to the care of Providence. That the authority of the biſhops being weakened, and every body ſpeaking againſt them, he hoped that this great beginning of liberty might deliver mankind from the yoke of bondage. That he thought himſelf bound to contribute to it to the utmoſt of his power. That to this purpoſe he wrote two books about the means of reforming the church of England; and after that two others againſt two biſhops who had written in favour of Epiſcopacy. That having ſeen the end of this diſpute, he conſidered, that beſides Eccleſiaſtical liberty, for which he and ſo many others had laboured ſucceſsfully, there were two others, *viz.* The domeſtic and civil, which were of no leſs importance. That he made uſe of his pen for the domeſtic liberty, while the magiſtrates were labouring very earneſtly for civil liberty. That having conſidered that domeſtic liberty related to three things, to marriage, the education of children, and the right of philoſophizing without reſtraint, he wrote upon divorce [*C*], and ſhowed that the Goſpel had not changed the laws under which the Jews

‘ *ſeen you, that you are a dwarf in ſtature. That delicate and infirm little body of your's ſeems to have contracted a languor from your laborious, anxious, and long application of thought.*’ Mr Morus did not diſpute this, only he proteſted (7), that he never pretended to reproach Milton for being blind, ſince he did not know it but by his anſwer, and that if he had ſaid any thing that ſeemed to relate to blindneſs, he meant the blindneſs of his mind. By he owns himſelf the author of the Epiſtle Dedicatory to *Clamor Regii Sanguinis* - - - *The cry of royal blood.* Now ſince he had ſaid there, that there could be nothing more ghaſtly and lean than Milton, I believe he would have found it very difficult to reconcile his Epiſtle Dedicatory with that place of his anſwer where he ſays, he believed Milton was a handſome Man, eſpecially ſince he ſaw his picture ſo curiouſly done before his Poems. *An deformitatem* tibi vitio verterem, *qui bellum etiam credidi maxime, poſtquam tuis præfixam poematibus comptulam iconem illam vidi* (8)*?* Salmaſius ſeems to boaſt of having been the cauſe that Milton loſt his good plight of body, and his eyes, by anſwering the Apology for Charles I, and is ſo far from upbraiding him with any natural deformity, that he pities him maliciouſly for having no longer that beauty, which rendered him ſo lovely during his abode in Italy. ‘ Inde etiam forſaſſe cerebrum tibi nimis inquies in oculis diſtillaverat eoſque afflixerat. Malo iſto magnam partem tuæ pulchritudinis deperiiſſe, pro eo ac debeo doleo. Nam in occulis maxime viget ac valet formæ decus. Quid Itali nunc dicerent ſi te viderent cum iſta fœda lippitudine. Non haberent amplius quod in te laudarent. Non ergo miror ſi Salmaſium iſtum odiſti, propter quem tantum tibi laboris & oneris impoſitum eſt, unde ægritudo tibi corporis & mentis hæc accidit, & præterea detrimentum tantum priſtini decoris paſſus es (9). - - - - *Perhaps too you will ſay, that was the cauſe that your brain diſtilled too much in your eyes and weakened them. I am ſorry, as I ought to be, that you have loſt a great part of your beauty by that calamity. For beauty chiefly exerts it's force and vigour in the eyes. What would the Italians now ſay, were they to ſee you with thoſe frightful running eyes. They would find nothing more in you to commend. Therefore, I do not wonder if you hate that Salmaſius, who was the cauſe of ſo much labour and trouble to you, which has occaſioned this diſorder of your body and mind, and ſo much diminiſhed your former beauty.* Iſte jam lippulus vel cœculus potius, olim bellulus puſio (10). - - - - - *That little fellow, now blear-eyed, or rather half blind, but formerly a pretty minion.*’ He expreſſes himſelf more plainly in another place (11). I do not know what Milton anſwered to this laſt ſlander, when he had occaſion to ſpeak to his friends concerning the poſthumous reply of Salmaſius: But I have heard ſay, that when he was informed his enemy boaſted that he had made him loſe his ſight, he anſwered, *and I have made him loſe his life.* This ſtory is very probable, ſince we find the ground of it in theſe two writers books as you may ſee. ‘ Sunt, *ſays Milton* (12), qui nos etiam necis ejus *(Salmaſii)* reos faciunt, illoſque noſtros nimis acriter ſtrictos aculeos, quos dum repugnando altius ſibi infixit, dum quod prœ manibus habebat opus vidit ſpiſſius procedere, tempus reſponſionis abiiſſe, operis gratiam periiſſe, recordatione amiſſæ famæ, exiſtimationis, principum denique favoris, ob rem regiam male defenſam erga ſe imminuti, triennali tandem mœſtitia & animi magis ægritudine quam morbo confectum obiiſſe. - - - - - *Some impute his* (Salmaſius's) *death to me, and to thoſe ſtings I gave him that were too violently thruſt; which, by reſiſting, he fixed deeper in himſelf, whilſt he ſaw the work he had in hand proceed ſlowly, and the time of anſwering paſt, and the merit of the work gone, reflecting on his loſt fame and reputation, and that the favour of princes towards him was diminiſhed, for having badly defended the royal cauſe; at laſt being ſpent with continual grief for the ſpace of three years, he died by a diſtemper of the mind rather than of the body.*’

[*B*] *He was ſent to the univerſity of Cambridge .... from whence he returned to his father's houſe.*] The author of *Clamor Regii Sanguinis* affirms, upon a hearſay (13), that Milton being expelled the univerſity of Cambridge, for his miſdemeanors, forſook the country and retired into Italy. Milton denies all this, and gives another account, which is extreamly to his advantage. Now ſince neither Morus, in anſwering the book which contains this account, nor Salmaſius, in his reply, wherein are many defamatory ſtories againſt Milton, have ſaid nothing of this diſgraceful leaving of Cambridge, which was objected to him, we have reaſon to believe it is a fable; for certainly there muſt be, for ſuch kind of accuſations, ſome principles that cannot be denied, and which prove the falſity of the charge. And what principles are more worthy of this rank, than to ſee a man publickly accuſed of things which it is eaſy to prove, deny thoſe things publickly, while none of the adverſe party dares maintain the accuſation againſt him? Whatever evaſion men may find in metaphyſical ſubtleties to defend themſelves againſt this proof of falſhood, it muſt be granted, that, morally ſpeaking, it is a convincing one: ſeeing therefore Milton did produce ſuch a proof for himſelf, we may reckon as one of the lyes that were ſpread abroad againſt him, that which concerns his pretended expulſion from Cambridge.

[*C*] *He wrote upon Divorce.*] It appears by his ſixteenth letter written in the year 1654, that Aitzema had a mind to get that book of Milton tranſlated into Dutch, and that the author deſired rather to have it tranſlated into Latin, having experienced that the people were prejudiced againſt all opinions that were not common. He there informs us, that he had written three treatiſes upon this ſubject; whereof the firſt (14) was intituled, *The Doctrine and Diſcipline of Divorce*; the ſecond (15) was intituled *Tetrachordon*, wherein the four principal paſſages of Scripture were explained which concern this matter; the third (16) was intituled *Colaſterion*, wherein he refutes a certain ſcribbler. It had been objected to Milton (17) that he had called the doctrine of JESUS CHRIST concerning Divorce, diabolical, as it is explained by the Fathers, by antient and modern divines, and by all the univerſi-

ties

---

(7) Fid. public. *pag.* 31.

(8) By the anſwer which Milton wrote to theſe words, *pag.* 84: it appears that theſe poems were publiſhed, in 1645, and that he was not ſatisfied with his Engraver.

(9) Salmaſ. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 15, 16.

(10) Ib. *p.* 19.

(11) Tu quem olim Itali pro fœmina habuerunt, cuiquam audeas, quod parum vir ſit, objicere? - - - *Dare you, whom the Italians formerly uſed as a woman, object to any one, that he is not a man?* Ibid. *pag.* 23.

(12) Milt. Defenſ. II, *pag.* 11.

(13) Ajunt hominem Cantabrigienſi Academia ob flagitia pulſum, dedecus & patriam fugiſſe, & in Italiam commigraſſe, *pag.* 8.

(14) Printed at London in 1644.

(15) Printed at London in 1645.

(16) Printed in 1645.

(17) In a preface of George Crantzius, Doctor of Divinity, prefixed to the ſecond Apology of Milton, of the Dutch Edition. 1654. See alſo *Clam. Reg. Sang. pag.* 8.

Jews lived as to this matter; and that it would be in vain to cry liberty, liberty, in the public aſſemblies, if a man was a ſlave at home to that ſex which is inferiour to ours. That afterwards he wrote about the education of children, and laſtly about the liberty of the preſs; that a ſmall number of injudicious men, who moſt commonly are reſolved to ſuppreſs every thing that is not conſiſtent with popular opinions, may not determine by a final judgment, what ought, and what ought not to be printed. That after the ſentence of death was paſſed upon King Charles I, he wrote upon the general Theſis of the right of the people againſt tyrants [*D*], and made a collection of the opinions of ſeveral grave divines upon this ſubject, to put thoſe to ſilence who ſaid, that the doctrine of the Proteſtant churches was contrary to the late tranſactions at London. That after this, while he was writing a Hiſtory of England [*E*], the council of ſtate which was then eſtabliſhed by authority of parliament, having a mind to make uſe of his pen, ordered him to confute the *Icon Baſilike*, which went under the name of the deceaſed king. That he intituled his confutation *Iconoclaſtes* (*b*). That being appointed to refute a book which Salmaſius had publiſhed againſt the the parliament of England, he engaged in that work though he had almoſt loſt one eye (*c*), and the Phyſicians foretold it as a thing certain, that he would loſe the other if he engaged in it (*d*). This is what he tells us of himſelf: and we may add, that he became, in effect, blind about this time, and that his anſwer to Salmaſius's book made him talked of over all the world (*e*) [*F*]. He anſwered ſome time after a book intituled *Regii Sanguinis Clamor ad*

(*b*) I have the French verſion of it made from the ſecond edition in Engliſh, and printed at London in the year 1652.

(*c*) Defenſio, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 35.

(*d*) See the remark [*A*].

(*e*) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 95.

---

ties and churches of England, Holland, and France; and that for his own part he pretended, that Divorce ought to be allowed, even when a contrariety of humours is the only ground of it. To this he anſwers only theſe two things (18). Firſt, that the ſenſe given, by the generality of interpreters, to the words of Scripture, whereby they are made to ſignify, that after a divorce made in a caſe of neceſſity, it is not lawful to proceed to a ſecond marriage, might very well be called a diabolical doctrine. II. That it is not true, that all the Fathers, the antient and modern Divines, and all the univerſities, &c. are agreed about this matter, and that he has ſhown in his *Tetrachordon*, that his doctrine was the ſame with that of ſome of the Fathers, of Bucer, Fagius, Peter Martyr, and Eraſmus. See his ſecond Apology, p. 58. It is remarkable that Milton, who tells us ſo many particulars of his life, ſays nothing of his marriage. Nevertheleſs Salmaſius had heard ſome ſay that he was married, and not only ſo, but that he had divorced his wife at a year's end, becauſe ſhe was of a bad temper (19). In another place he ſuggeſts, that jealouſy, or even horns, were concerned in the matter (20). Milton therefore was not ſo diſintereſted in his pleading for Divorce and Polygamy as Lyſerus (21); his perſonal intereſt moved him to do ſo (22).

[*D*] *He wrote upon the general Theſis about the right of the people agianſt tyrants.*] This is probably the book he mentions in his ſecond Apology (23), where he ſays, ‘ Id fuſius docui in eo libri qui noſtro idiomate ‘ *tenor* ſive *tenura regum & magiſtratuum* inſcriptus ‘ eſt . . . . Illic ex Luthero, Zuinglio, Calvino, Bucero, Martyre, Paræo, citantur ipſa verbatim loca, ‘ ex illo denique Knoxo quem *unum* me *Scotum* ais *innuere, quemque hac in re reformatos omnes præſertim* ‘ *Gallos illa ætate condemnaſſe.* Atqui ille contra, quod ‘ ibi narratur, ſe illam doctrinam nominatim à Calvino, ſummiſque aliis ea tempeſtate Theologis, qui‘ buſcum familiariter conſueverat, hauſiſſe affirmat. - - - ‘ *I have ſhewn it more fully in that book, which, according to our idiom, is intituled,* The Tenure of the kings ‘ and magiſtrates . . . . *There the very places are quoted* ‘ *verbatim, from Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Bucer,* ‘ *Martyr, Paræus, and laſtly from that Knox, whom,* ‘ *you ſay,* I inſinuate to be a Scotch-man, and whom ‘ all the Reformed at that time, eſpecially the French, ‘ condemned in this matter. *But he, on the other hand,* ‘ *in that place affirms, he had that doctrine particularly* ‘ *from Calvin, and other great Divines of that age, with* ‘ *whom he had been intimately acquainted.*’ As to what the author of *Clamor Regii Sanguinis* accuſes Milton of (24) his having writ to the Parliamentarians to determine them in a point about which they were in doubt, I mean the death of the king, Milton denies it, and pretends that he never wrote upon thoſe queſtions till after the death of that monarch.

[*E*] *While he was writing an hiſtory of England.*] He was, according to Salmaſius (25), a little School-Maſter in London; ‘ Ludi trivialis magiſter Londinenſis; ludimagiſter in ſchola triviali Londinenſi, de ‘ pedaneo magiſtro Secretarius Parlamenti rebellis factus. ‘ *From being a petty School-Maſter in London, he was* ‘ *made Secretary to the Rebel-Parliament.*’ But ſince in the *Clamor Regii Sanguinis*, which gives a ſhort account of his adventures, it is not ſaid that he was a School-maſter, and beſides it is probable, that he durſt not have related, very particularly, the ſeveral conditions and employments of his life, without ſaying any thing of his being a School-Maſter, if he had been really ſo, it ſeems that Salmaſius was but ill ſerved by his ſpies. Nevertheleſs we muſt not altogether truſt to theſe probabilities: We ſhall ſee (26), hereafter that there was ſome ground for what he ſaid.

[*F*] *His anſwer to . . . . Salmaſius, made him talked of over all the world.*] I believe that all the books in proſe, which Milton publiſhed before the confutation of Salmaſius, were in Engliſh; yet it appears by this confutation, that he was very ready at the Latin tongue. It cannot be denied that his ſtile is ſmooth, lively, and florid, and that he dextrouſly and ingeniouſly defended the cauſe of the anti-royaliſts; but without offering here to give my opinion about the matter, I think it may be ſaid, that the manner in which he managed this great ſubject, appears to be very bad, becauſe he did not obſerve any decent gravity. He is every minute, I do not ſay throwing out cutting jokes againſt Salmaſius, for this would not ſpoil his work, and might ſerve very much to get the laugh on his ſide; but he every where acts the part of a droll and buffoon. This fault reigns more viſibly in his two anſwers to Mr Morus, which are ſtuffed with quibbles and over-ſtretched jeſts: and here, the character of the author appears without diſguiſe; he was one of thoſe ſatirical wits, who pleaſe themſelves very much in gathering up all the reports which are ſpread abroad to the diſadvantage of any perſon, and in inviting his enemies to write all the ſlanders they know about him; but much more do they pleaſe themſelves in inſerting theſe calumnies in the firſt book they publiſh againſt him. His anſwer to Salmaſius was burnt at Paris and at Toulouſe, by the hand of the hangman (27), which ſerved only to procure him more readers. It was not the parliament of Paris, as is affirmed in the *Clamor Regii Sanguinis*, which condemned his book to the fire, but the civil judge. Milton did not ſuffer this miſtake of his adverſary to paſs unobſerved (28). He boaſted that queen Chriſtina, as he pretends, ſo highly eſteemed this book of his, that ſhe even deſpiſed Salmaſius, who was then at her court (29). It is certain, that this book was read with great eagerneſs, as Mr Ziegler, who ſpeaks of it with an extreme contempt, aſſures us in the preface to his *Exercitationes ad Regicidium Anglorum*. The anonymous author, who publiſhed an apology, *Pro rege & populo Anglicano contra Johannis Polypragmatici (alios Miltoni Angli) defenſionem deſtructivam regis & populi Anglicani* (30), complains very heavily of the unequal fate of Salmaſius and Milton. It has not been poſſible, ſays he, without a thouſand difficulties, to procure an edition of Salmaſius's book; but that of Milton has been printed ſeveral times. ‘ Quod ornatiſſimus Salmaſius ad tuen‘ dum

(18) Defenſio pro ſe, *pag.* 40, Edit. Lond. 1655, in 12mo.

(19) Uxorem ſuam poſt annum à nuptiis dicitur res ſuas ſibi habere juſſiſſe ob graves tantum mores. *Salmaſ. Reſp. ad Milton. pag.* 253. See alſo *pag.* 3.

(20) Si Eunuchi omnes fuiſſent qui domum tuam frequentabant, uxorem fortaſſe non repudiaſſes. - - - *If they had been all eunuchs that frequented your houſe, perhaps you would not have divorced your wife.* Ibid. *pag.* 23.

(21) *See the* Nouv. de la Repub. des Lettres, *April* 1685.

(22) See, below, the remark [*L*].

(23) *Pag.* 101.

(24) *Pag.* 9.

(25) Reſp. *pag.* 1, 3, 14.

(26) In the remark [*K*].

(27) Defenſ. II, *pag.* 93.

(28) Ibid.

(29) Ib. *pag.* 8, 52, 96.

(30) I make uſe of the edition of Antwerp 1651, in 12mo.

ad Cælum, which he aſcribed to Mr Morus, although it was Peter du Moulin, the ſon, that wrote it. As this anſwer defamed Mr Morus horribly, he would not let it paſs without a reply: But Milton wrote a ſecond anſwer no leſs virulent than the former. He lived very quietly under the uſurpation of Cromwell, and by a good fortune, which was very extraordinary, he was not diſturbed nor called to an account after the reſtoration of Charles II, but was ſuffered to live peaceably at his houſe, though no writer did ever more inſult a crowned head, than he did king Charles I, and his baniſhed family. His impunity did not proceed from the good nature of Charles II, but from his not being excepted out of the general pardon. Some of his Latin letters were printed in the year 1674 at London, and ſome orations which he ſpoke in Latin when he was ſchool-boy. The Latin letters which were printed in 1676 *(f)*, and had been written by the uſurpers of England to ſeveral princes, were drawn up by him. He loved Poetry [*G*], and many of his poems both in Latin and Engliſh have been publiſhed either in his life-time, or after his death. Patin has vented a great many lies [*H*].

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, there has been publiſhed (*g*) at London the life of John Milton, written in Engliſh by Mr Toland. I have cauſed ſeveral extracts of it to be done into Latin which will afford me a pretty long ſupplement to this article. Milton was born a gentleman [*I*], and had an education ſuitable to that rank (*b*). He had an inſatiable paſſion for learning, inſomuch, that from the age of twelve years, he was wont to ſit up till midnight, and neither the weakneſs of his ſight, nor the frequent

pains

(f) They were reprinted at Leipſic in 1690.

(g) In the year 1699, prefixed to the works of John Milton in folio, and by it ſelf in 8vo.

(b) So I am told the words in Engliſh uſed, by Mr Toland, ſignify, *a gentleman by his education and family*. But as Milton, who ought to know better than any body elſe the quality of his own family, only ſays, *Defenſ. II, pag. m.* 60, that he was deſcended *genere honeſto, of an honourable family*, I do not know whether the Engliſh word *gentleman*, has not a larger ſignification than the word *gentilhomme*.

‘ dum jus & honorem Caroli Britanniæ Monarchæ, Sceleratorum manibus interfecti, prudenter ſcripſerat, unâ tantum impreſſione, idque, magnâ cum difficultate in lucem erupit: tanto odio hiſce ultimis temporibus, veritatem mundus perſequitur. Sed quod ſceleſtiſſimus Miltonus, ad lacerandam famam Regis defuncti, & ſubvertendum in ſubditos dominium hæreditarium, invidioſe elaboravit, illius tot ſunt exemplaria, ut neſcio cui lectorem remitterem, ſic mendaciorum & convitiorum amore flagrant homines; volumine in decimo ſexto perditiſſimi pretii, uſus ſum (31). - - - - *What the excellent Salmaſius had ingeniouſly wrote, in defence of the right and honour of Charles King of Great Britain, who was murdered by the hands of miſcreants, was printed but once, and that not without great difficulty; ſo much does the world hate truth in theſe latter times. But as to what the execrable Milton maliciouſly wrote to aſperſe the memory of the deceaſed king, and overturn his hereditary dominion over his ſubjects, there are ſo many editions of it, that I know not which of them to refer my reader to, ſo much are men in love with lies and calumnies; I have made uſe of a volume in* 16*mo of a very ſmall price.*’

[G] *He loved Poetry.*] Salmaſius having ſaid (32), that ſome who knew Milton thoroughly, did very ſeriouſly maintain, that he underſtood not Latin, that he was not capable of writing in Latin, adds, that for his own part he is of quite another opinion, and that Milton being a Poet, might alſo be an Orator. Whereupon he ſcoffs at his Poems, in which he ſays the laws of quantity are violated; and this he proves by examples; and concludes, that although the author had not told at what age he wrote them, it had been eaſy to perceive, that they were the work of a ſchool-boy. But Milton, ſays he, is anſwerable for theſe faults of his youth, ſince he printed them a few years ago at London. By the ſecond letter of Milton it appears, that he publiſhed ſome Latin verſes in the year 1628, and by the tenth, which is dated April 21, 1647, that he lately publiſhed a collection of Engliſh and Latin Poems. That collection came out in the year 1645. This would not ſavour very much of a man who gave no credit to falſe reports concerning Milton, if Salmaſius were rigorouſly dealt with. He ſays, that in the opinion of many people Milton did not write the Apology for the people of England, and that he only lent his name to the book of a French ſchool-maſter, who taught children at London (33). All this is a fable which I am glad to relate, that authors may learn to give no credit to calumnies, wherewith people fill their heads againſt their antagoniſts. Some think to make their court by this means to a man, and occaſion his publiſhing an hundred impertinencies. I do not place in this rank the four thouſand livres *per ann.* which Milton got by writing for the parliament, if we may believe Salmaſius (34); for it is very probable, that Cromwell amply rewarded him. For the reſt, Milton has written two Poems in blank verſe; one upon the temptation of Eve; the other upon the temptation of JESUS CHRIST. The firſt is intituled, *Paradiſe Loſt*; the ſecond, *Paradiſe Regained*. The former paſſes for one of the beſt pieces of Poetry that ever was ſeen in Engliſh. The famous Poet Dryden made a play out of it, which was extreamly applauded. The other is not near ſo good, which made ſome wags ſay, that Milton is eaſily found in Paradiſe loſt, but not in Paradiſe regained. Theſe Poems were tranſlated into Latin verſe, and publiſhed in the year 1690, by William Hog, a Scotchman.

The ſame Dryden admiring *Paradiſe Loſt*, declared, that Greece, Italy, and England, have produced three Poets in different ages, Homer, Virgil, and Milton; that the firſt excelled in ſublimity of thought, and the ſecond in majeſty; and that nature not being able to advance further, framed the third by a concurrence of the perfections of the other two. This is the ſubject of an epigram of Mr Dryden (35), inſerted by Mr Toland, at p. 129 of the life of Milton.

Three Poets, in three diſtant ages born,
Greece, Italy, *and* England, *did adorn:*
The Firſt *in loftineſs of thought ſurpaſs'd;*
The Next *in majeſty; in both the laſt.*
The force of nature cou'd no further go,
To make a Third, *ſhe join'd the former* Two.

[*H*] *Patin vented many lies.*] ‘ Mr Mothe de la Vayer, who is juſt gone out, has brought me one of his books lately written, and tells me, that Milton's book againſt the late king of England was burnt by the hand of the hangman; that Milton is a priſoner, and like to be hanged; that Milton writ this book only in Engliſh; and that one called Peter du Moulin, the ſon of Peter, miniſter of Sedan, who had put it in good Latin, is in danger of his life (36).’ Mind the perſon who vented this news to Guy Patin. It was not a ſorry hackney news-monger, it was the preceptor to the king's brother; it was the French Cato, a man very learned: he honeſtly believed, that Du Moulin run the hazard of his life for having tranſlated Milton's book into Latin. And yet this du Moulin was one of the confeſſors of the royal party; he wrote againſt the rebels, and his fidelity was quickly rewarded by Charles II.

[*I*] *He was born a gentleman.*] John Milton, his father, deſcended from the family of the Miltons, which was conſiderable in Oxfordſhire, was the ſon of a Roman Catholic, and was diſinherited becauſe he turned Proteſtant. Chriſtopher Milton, his other ſon, ſtudied the law, and had no great genius. He was ſuperſtitious, and adhered to the royal party; but yet they ſuffered him to live in obſcurity after the royal family was reſtored. But king James II, intending that the judges ſhould declare him to be above the laws of the kingdom, created him a ſerjeant at law, and baron of the Exchequer, and after that judge of the Common-pleas. Theſe employments came quickly after to an end by the death of him who was poſſeſſed of them (37).

[*K*] He

(31) In Monito ad Lectorem.

(32) Reſp. *pag.* 4, 5.

(33) Eam & multi negant illum auctorem debere agnoſcere niſi ſolo titulo, conſcriptam enim eſſe à ludimagiſtro quodam Gallo de trivio qui Londini pueros nihil ſapere docet, *pag.* 4.

(34) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 16.

(35) It is in Engliſh.

(36) Patin, letter 187, *Tom. ii, pag.* 135. It is dated July 13. 1660.

(37) Taken from the Latin Extracts of the Life of Milton, written by Mr Toland in Engliſh.

pains in his head, were capable of abating his ſtudious inclination. He was ſent to Cambridge at fifteen years of age, and in the ſame year he paraphraſed ſome Pſalms in Engliſh verſe. He wrote at ſeventeen years of age ſeveral pieces of Poetry, ſome in his mother-tongue, and others in Latin, and all of them of ſuch a character and beauty as was much above his age. He took his degree of Maſter of Arts at Cambridge, and returned to his father's houſe. Thoſe who have ſaid, that he returned thither, having been expelled the univerſity of Cambridge for ſome crime, or at leaſt that he was full of reſentment, becauſe he could not get any preferment there, have maliciouſly wreſted ſome verſes contained in a Latin elegy which he addreſſed to his good friend Charles Diodati. Upon the ſame ground it was given out, that he ſpent his time with ladies of pleaſure at London, and went every day to a play. His journey to Italy procured him the friendſhip of the fineſt wits, and the moſt famous learned men that were in that country (*i*). He underſtood the Italian tongue ſo well, that he deſigned to write a Grammar of it, and made very good Italian verſes. He intended to have gone into Sicily and Greece, but being informed of the beginning of the troubles in England, he did not think fit to ſpend his time in travelling for pleaſure, while his countrymen were bearing arms in defence of their liberty. He returned therefore into his own country, and as he paſſed thro' Geneva, he contracted an acquaintance with ſome conſiderable people there, who informed him afterwards of the adventures of Alexander Morus, againſt whom he had occaſion to write. He arrived in England at the time of King Charles Iſt's ſecond expedition into Scotland, and becauſe he was entruſted to be a guardian to his own nephews (*k*), he reſolved to be their tutor, and taught alſo ſome other youths [*K*]. He married in 1643, Mary Powell, the daughter of a juſtice of peace in Oxfordſhire. It was not long before this young woman took a diſlike to him [*L*]: whereupon ſhe left him at a month's end, and plainly declared, ſhe would not return to him at all. Whereupon he took his meaſures accordingly, and after he had publiſhed a book about divorce, he prepared for a ſecond marriage; but ſhe thought better of it, and deſired him ſo earneſtly to take her back again, that he ſuffered himſelf to be prevailed on. After this reconciliation, within

(*i*) *Such as* Carlo Dati, Gaddi, Freſcobaldi, Francini, Bonmattei, Coltellini, Chimentelli, John Baptiſt Manſo.

(*k*) His ſiſter's ſons.

[*K*] *He became tutor to his nephews, and .... ſome other youths.*] This is the foundation of what was ſaid above (38). I thought that Salmaſius had been miſinformed by his ſpies, but now I know that he is not to be blamed, but only for giving an odious turn to what he ſaid, that Milton was a petty ſchool-maſter. Mr Toland confeſſes, that Milton being intreated to do the ſame ſervice to ſome of his friends children, as he did to his nephews, that is, to teach them the Languages, Hiſtory, Geography, *&c.* granted them this favour. It is true therefore, that he kept a ſchool in his houſe, and tho', properly ſpeaking, he could not be called a ſchool-maſter, as the expreſſions of his enemy inſinuate; he was in truth a tutor, and acted the part of a ſchool-maſter. But this was no juſt occaſion of inſulting him, even tho' his poverty had reduced him to that painful taſk, provided he acquitted himſelf of it faithfully, and like an able maſter. Conſult his Hiſtorian upon this.

[*L*] *It was not long before this young woman took a diſlike to him.*] Several conjectures are alledged as to the cauſe of her quick return to her father's houſe. She had been educated in pomp and pleaſure, and that was probably the cauſe why ſhe could not like Milton's Philoſophical way of living. Perhaps alſo the perſon of her huſband was diſagreeable to her; or ſhe being of a royaliſt family, could not endure the republican principles of Milton: and it is not impoſſible but her father might expect ſome preferment from the king by diſſolving the knot of this marriage. However it be, his daughter returned to his houſe a month after the celebration of the marriage, upon pretence of ſpending the reſt of the ſummer in the country. Her huſband conſented to it, upon condition that ſhe ſhould return at Michaelmas; and becauſe ſhe did not return at that time, he wrote her ſeveral letters, to which ſhe did not vouchſafe to give any anſwer; but at laſt ſhe declared in plain terms, that ſhe would not return at all, and ſent back the meſſenger from Milton with contempt. At this he was ſo angry, that he reſolved never to own her more for his wife; and to ſhow the public the juſtice of this deſign, he publiſhed a book about Divorce in the year 1644. The reaſons which he there propoſes, to prove that marriages ought not to be indiſſoluble, may be ſuſpected, as coming from one intereſted in the cauſe; but his Hiſtorian obſerves, that this cannot weaken them, for otherwiſe this muſt be a prejudice againſt the apologies of the primitive Chriſtians, ſince they were written by perſons who groaned under the rigor of perſecution. He adds, that to judge right of the advantages of a temperate country, a man ſhould ſpend part of his life in climates that are either too hot or too cold; and that, in like manner, no man can ſo exactly give the reaſons which favour a good cauſe, as he that has experienced the inconveniences of a bad one. Thoſe who treat of a matter in which they are not perſonally concerned, produce nothing but the conceits of their fancy, and do nothing but amuſe themſelves at their leiſure hours, or, which is worſe, they declaim without that ſtrength and vigor which experience inſpires. From whence we muſt conclude, that thoſe who never tried the inconveniences of marriage, are infinitely leſs fit than Milton to lay down and maintain the arguments againſt the tyranny of the indiſſolubility of the marriage-bond. It might have been thought, that the treatiſes he publiſhed about Divorce were either the effect of his reſentment, or of a deſire to diſplay his wit in maintaining ſuch a paradox, rather than the effect of real perſuaſion. But to prevent any ſuch judgment of him, he reſolved to ſhow that he was in good earneſt, and to put in practice his own hypotheſis (39). To this end he courted a young woman of great wit, and very handſome. But being one day at a friend's houſe, whom he went often to ſee, all on a ſudden his wife came in and threw herſelf at his knees, and, with tears in her eyes, acknowledged her fault, and begged his pardon. He was at firſt inflexible, and one would have thought, that he would be inexorable; but this hard heartedneſs was quickly ſoftened. His natural generoſity, and the interceſſion of his friends, ſoon brought him to a reconciliation, and to forget all that was paſt. He retained no reſentment in his mind. He received into his houſe the father, mother, brothers, and ſiſters of his wife, when the royal party was falling in pieces, and protected and maintained all this kindred till they ſaw better times (40). Is there not therefore ſufficient reaſon to reckon him among good huſbands, and to make him a proof of the remark which ſo many people have made, that there is no man more kind than a huſband is to his ſpouſe who has offended, and even diſgraced him? He had upon his hands, not only the reſentment of a huſband, but alſo the intereſt of an author: he was, as I may ſay, tied up by his writings: his doctrine of Divorce ſupported by his replies, obliged him to keep to his reſolution. Add to all this, that he felt new flames for

(38) In the remark [*E*].

(39) *Viz.* That a huſband may not only part with his wife, but alſo marry another.

(40) Taken from the Extracts of Milton's Life.

within a year, he had a daughter by her, and after that many other children [*M*]. This wife dying in child-bed, he married another *(l)*, who died after the ſame manner at a year's end. He continued a widower for ſome years, and married not again till after the reſtoration of Charles II and the amneſty which he obtained from that monarch. He had offended him, as by other books, ſo by that which is intituled *Iconoclaſtes*, which is the refutation of a book attributed to Charles I. He maintained, that this monarch was not the author of it. Time has ſhown that he maintained this upon good grounds [*N*]. He lay concealed when Charles II was called home again, and

(l) Captain Woodcock's daughter.

[N] this does not appear so clear as is ascertained by Mr Bayle

for a young lady of a charming beauty and wit; and yet two or three tears of his wife overcame him, and he conſented to every thing ſhe had a mind to. His former reſolution, never to ſee her more, his obligation as an author, his new amours, every thing ſubmitted to the victorious force of *peccavi*, ſpoken by a crying wife. See the margin (41).

(41) Thoſe who have a mind to ſee part of Milton's reaſons for divorce, need only read the abſtract of his Life in the journal of Mr de Beauval, for February 1699, *pag.* 81, *&c.*

[*M*] *He had by her a daughter . . . . and after that many other children.*] A ſon who died in the year 1652, and three daughters who ſerved him as readers. He taught them to pronounce exactly Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, French, and Spaniſh; and as he had occaſion for a book, one of them read it to him. And becauſe they did not underſtand the meaning of what they read, this exerciſe was very unpleaſant to them, he perceived it by their murmuring; and foreſeeing that for the future this taſk would become more and more tedious to them, he excuſed them from it, and taught them ſuch things as were more ſuitable to their condition and ſex (42).

(42) Taken from the extracts of Milton's Life.

[*N*] *He maintained that Charles I was not the author of* Icon Baſilike: *and time has ſhown, that he maintained this upon good grounds.*] Perhaps there never happened any thing more ſingular than this, in what concerns the hiſtory of books. The diſpute that was raiſed about this matter of fact, has been very fruitful in books. The parties thinking that this point would be attended with ſeveral notable conſequences, grew hot, and uſed all manner of induſtry in their diſcuſſions. This warrants me to give a particular account of this affair. I begin with the book itſelf, whoſe title is Εἰκῶν Βασιλικὴ. It has been tranſlated from Engliſh into divers languages. The Sieur Porrée tranſlated it into French, and added to it a very long preface, and dedicated his tranſlation to the king of England, Charles II. I make uſe of the Paris edition by Lewis Vendoſme, 1649, in 12mo. Milton, who refuted this book, ſuppoſed that ſome friends of Charles I, were the true authors of it, and that they publiſhed it on purpoſe to render the conduct of the Parliamentarians more odious. I have a French verſion of his anſwer in 12mo: and the title runs thus: 'ΕΙΚΩΝΟΚΛΑ'ΣΤΗΣ, *Ou Reponſe*, &c. that is, An anſwer to a book intituled, ΕΙ'ΚΩ`Ν ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ: or, the portraicture of his ſacred majeſty during his ſolitude and ſufferings. By Mr JOHN MILTON. Tranſlated from the ſecond Engliſh edition, enlarged and reviſed by the author. To which are added divers pieces mentioned in the foreſaid Anſwer, for the greater convenience of the reader. At London, by William du-Gard, a Printer to the council of State, in the year 1652. And are to be ſold by Nicolas Bourne, at the ſouth-gate of the Old-Exchange.' I will here ſet down a paſſage of the anſwer of Milton to *Clamor Regii Sanguinis*, which concerns the order that the king gave upon the ſcaffold to the biſhop of London, which was to acquaint his ſon, that he would never have him puniſh the authors of his death. This biſhop being preſſed by the judges to declare what the king had recommended to him, confeſſed at laſt what it was. Whereupon Milton made this remark. 'O magis, regemne dicam pietatis, an Epiſcopum rimarum plenum! qui rem tam ſecreto in pegmate ſuæ fidei commiſſam ut effutiret, tam facile expugnari potuit At ô taciturne! jampridem Carolus hoc idem inter alia præcepta filio mandaverat, in illa Icone Baſilica, quem librum ideo ſcriptum ſatis apparet, ut omni cum diligentia nobis vel invitis ſecretum illud, qua oſtentatione ſimulatum erat, eadem paulo poſt evulgaretur. Sed video plane decreviſſe vos Carolum quemdam abſolutiſſimum, ſi non Stuartum hunc, at ſaltem hyperboreum aliquem & fabuloſum, fucatis quibuſlibet coloribus depictum, imperitis rerum obtrudere: ita fabellam hanc velut acroama quoddam, diverbiis & ſententiolis pulchre diſtinctam, neſcio quem ethologum imitatus, ad ineſcandas vulgi aures putide concinnaſti (43). - - - - *Oh! which ſhall I ſay, that the king was more pious, or the biſhop more a blab! that could be ſo eaſily prevailed on to diſcover what had been entruſted to him in ſuch a ſecret manner upon the ſcaffold. But O thou ſilent man! Charles had ſome time before given this very order, among others, to his ſon, in that* Icon Baſilike, *which appears evidently to have been writ on purpoſe, that his ſecret might a little after be induſtriouſly divulged to us, even againſt our wills, with the ſame parade, as it had been counterfeited. But I plainly ſee you determined to obtrude upon the ignorant a Charles, that was abſolutely perfect; if not this Stuart, at leaſt ſome hyperborean and fictitious perſon, drawn in falſe colours: you have ſo affectedly forged this ſtory like a romance, beautifully intermixed with quaint ſayings and phraſes. in imitation of ſome buffoon, with deſign to captivate the ears of the vulgar.*' The opinion of this writer made no impreſſion in foreign countries: every body there was perſuaded that king Charles I. wrote the book which bears his name. Which did ſo much honour to his memory, and appeared ſo fit to make him be looked upon as a true martyr; that it was thought that Milton, endeavouring to rob him of it, did only uſe the trick of Lawyers, who deny every thing that is too favourable to the contrary party. Thoſe of the Cromwellians, who remained in England, agreed to Milton's judgment: but their opinion was ſuſpected for the reaſon I have juſt now given. All the partizans of the cauſe of Charles I. oppoſed this opinion very warmly; and becauſe their believing that this prince was the true author of Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ, was a thing that favoured the intereſt of their cauſe, they might have been ſuſpected as well as the others of uſing the artifice of Lawyers. Nevertheleſs their opinion prevailed in England, and could not be combated by matters of fact, till at laſt ſome things happened which have deſtroyed it. Here follows the beginning and progreſs of that affair, according to the narrative of Mr Toland.

(43) Milt. Defenſ. II, *pag. m.* 86.

In the year 1686, Mr Millington happening to ſell the late lord Angleſey's library by auction, put up an *Icon Baſilike*; and a few bidding very low for it, he had leiſure to turn over the leaves, when to his great ſurprize he perceived written with the ſame noble lord's own hand the following Memorandum. *King Charles II and the duke of York, did both (in the laſt ſeſſions of parliament,* 1675, *when I ſhewed them in the Lord's houſe the written copy of this book, wherein are ſome corrections and alterations written with the late king Charles the firſt's own hand) aſſure me, that this was none of the ſaid king's compiling, but made by Dr Gauden biſhop of Exeter: Which I here inſert for the undeceiving of others in this point, by atteſting ſo much under my own hand.*

ANGLESEY.

After this particular came to be known, there was much diſcourſe about it, and ſome aſked Dr Walker about this matter, becauſe they knew he had been well acquainted with that biſhop of Exeter. He owned to them what he knew of it, and being provoked and much offended by Dr Hollingworth, he publiſhed, for his own juſtification, a narrative relating to this book. He declared that Dr Gauden communicated to him the whole project of that affair, and ſome chapters of the *Icon Baſilike* and the plan of ſome others: he related the evaſion which this doctor made uſe of, when he told him he did not approve of this way of deceiving the public. He told ſeveral other facts and, particularly theſe three, which he ſaid he had from Dr Gauden. I. That the biſhop of Saliſbury took upon him to write two chapters of that book. II. That Dr Gauden ſent to the king in the iſle of Wight by the marquis of Hertford, a copy of the *Icon Baſilike*. III. That the duke of York knew very well, that and did not ſhow himſelf till after the amneſty was proclaimed. He obtained a pardon, and was only puniſhed by being excluded from all public offices. Some have thought that this moderation proceeded rather from the king's forgetfulneſs than his clemency. But others ſay, that Milton had friends in the houſe of commons and the privy council, who interceeded for him. He did not finiſh his great Poem, Paradiſe Loſt, without many interruptions; for his poetical vein did not happily flow at all times, but only in the ſpring and autumn. He publiſhed his Hiſtory of England *(m)* in the year 1670. It comes down to William the conqueror, but we have it not altogether according to the author's original; for the licencers of books expunged ſeveral paſſages out of it, wherein he expoſed in a lively manner the ſuperſtition, pride, and craft, of the antient clergy,

(m) It is in Engliſh.

Dr Gauden was the author of it. He added, that the ſon of this doctor, his wife, and Mr Gifford, who tranſcribed this book, did firmly believe it had been compoſed in the place where they lived. He affirmed that it was the common opinion of the family that Dr Gauden wrote it; and that the family always ſpoke of him as the author of it, whether he were preſent or abſent, and that he never denied it. I paſs by ſeveral other proofs and circumſtances which are in the account of Dr Walker.

His narrative was ſome time after confirmed in ſuch a manner as paſt for a full demonſtration of the impoſture: which happened thus. A merchant of London, called Arthur North, a man of very good credit, and a member of the church of England, having married a ſiſter of the wife of Charles Gauden, ſon to the doctor, after the death of his brother-in-law, had the management of the widow's affairs. He found among the papers of the deceaſed a bundle, which only concerned the affair of the *Icon Baſilike.* The widow of Dr Gauden had left this packet with her ſon John Gauden, whom of all her children ſhe loved moſt tenderly, and he left it to his brother Charles. In this bundle there was found, I. A letter of ſecretary Nicholas, written to Dr Gauden. II. The copy of a letter which this doctor wrote to chancellor Hyde, wherein, among other ſervices he had done, he mentions one that was truly royal, and worthy of a royal reward, ſince he deſigned by it to ſtrengthen and encourage the king's friends, and to detect and convert his enemies. III. The copy of a letter which he wrote to the duke of York, ſtrongly repreſenting the good ſervices he had done. IV. A letter written with chancellor Hyde's own hand, dated March 13, 1661, wherein the chancellor declares, that he is ſorry for his importunity, and excuſes himſelf that he cannot as yet do him ſervice. The concluſion of this letter is remarkable, which is in theſe words: 'The particular you mention has indeed been imparted to me as a ſecret; I am ſorry I ever knew it: and when it ceaſes to be a ſecret, it will pleaſe none but Mr Milton.' The ſame bundle contains, among other papers, a long narrative written by Dr Gauden's wife. This relation proves irrefragably, that her huſband was the author of *Icon Baſilike*: it contains a full confirmation of Dr Walker's account, and moſt of the facts above related, with ſeveral other circumſtances very curious and extraordinary. This narrative being tranſcribed from the original, in the preſence of ſome perſons of learning and integrity, was printed in a book intituled, *Truth brought to light.* Theſe are the means by which this impoſture was fully diſcovered. This great ſecret which had been contrived with much artifice, and which the perſons concerned to conceal it, had improved ſo dextrouſly, happened to be diſcovered by very inconſiderable and caſual incidents. If Dr Gauden had not been diſappointed of the biſhopric of Wincheſter, he had not inſiſted ſo much upon the ſervice he had done by writing this book. His widow would not have written a narrative if ſhe had been gratified with one half year's rent after her huſband's death. The two princes, the ſons of Charles I, laid open the ſecret by a caſual ſurprize, when my lord Angelſey ſhowed them ſome writing of the king their father. And if another than Millington had ſold that lord's books, the declaration which was then made by thoſe two princes had never been known. And if Dr Hollingworth had not by his indiſcreet zeal provoked Dr Walker, he had never publiſhed his account; and if he had never publiſhed it, the papers of Mr North which compleat the irrefragable proofs of this matter of fact, had never been made uſe of for the diſcovery (44).

Note, that in all this, I neither ought nor can be conſidered but as a meer tranſlator of the Latin extracts which I cauſed to be made from the Engliſh book I quote. Note alſo, that this paſſage of the Life of Milton has been oppoſed; for Mr Wagſtaff publiſhed ſome obſervations to weaken the teſtimony of my lord Angleſey, the narrative of Dr Walker, and the papers of Mr North: but Mr Toland has refuted them all in his Amyntor, wherein he has further diſcuſſed all the teſtimonies that are alledged to prove that Charles I was the author of the *Icon Baſilike.* I have been told that as to both theſe parts of his apology (45), he has omitted nothing that was neceſſary to maintain the full evidence of his proofs, and all the ſtrength they appeared to have, before any one wrote againſt them. This is all that I can ſay, having never read any thing that was written againſt him, nor what was replied by him, and not being able to underſtand it for all thoſe books are in Engliſh.

I will conclude this remark with a thing that Mr Milton made a great noiſe about, and which was renewed in the laſt diſpute about the *Icon Baſilike.* Which is this, that the prayer king Charles I. *delivered to Dr Juxton, immediately before his death, intituled* a prayer in the time of captivity, *which is printed at the end of the beſt editions of his book* (46), is perfectly like a prayer which is found in a romance, I mean in Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia. This will appear by the parallel which Milton placed at the end of his Anſwer (47) after the following manner.

The prayer of king Charles, ſtiled, a prayer in time of captivity.	The prayer of Pammela, taken word for word from the Arcadia of the counteſs of Pembroke, p. 248.
O powerful and eternal GOD, *to whom nothing is ſo great that it may reſiſt, or ſo ſmall, that it is contemned; look upon my miſery with thine eye of mercy, and let thine infinite power vouchſafe to limit out ſome proportion of deliverance unto me, as to thee ſhall ſeem moſt convenient: Let not injury, O Lord, triumph over me, and let my faults by thy hand be corrected; and make not my unjuſt enemies the miniſters of thy juſtice. But yet, my GOD, if in thy wiſdom this be the apteſt chaſtiſement for my unexcuſable* tranſgreſſions; *if this* ungrateful *bondage be fitteſt for my over-high deſires; if the pride of my not enough humble heart be thus to be broken, O Lord, I yield unto thy will, and* chearfully *embrace what ſorrow thou wilt have me ſuffer; only thus much let me crave of thee (let my craving O Lord, be accepted of thee, ſince it even proceeds from thee) that by thy goodneſs, which is thy ſelf, thou wilt ſuffer ſome beam of thy*	O *all-ſeeing light and eternal life of all things,* to whom nothing is either ſo great that it may reſiſt, or ſmall, that it is contemned; look upon my miſery with thine eye of mercy, and let thine infinite power vouchafe to limit out ſome proportion of deliverance unto me, as to thee ſhall ſeem moſt convenient. Let not injury, O Lord, triumph over me, and let my faults by thy hand be corrected; and make not mine unjuſt enemy the miniſter of thy juſtice. But yet, my God, if in thy wiſdom this be the apteſt chaſtiſement for my unexcuſable *folly*; if this *low* bondage be fitteſt for my over high deſires; if the pride of my not enough humble heart be thus to be broken, O Lord I yield unto thy will, and *joyfully* embrace what ſorrow thou wilt have me ſuffer. Only thus much let me crave of thee, (let my craving, O Lord, be accepted of thee, ſince even that proceeds from thee

(44) Taken from the Latin extracts of Milton's Life.

(45) That is to ſay, the anſwer to the objections of Mr Wagſtaff, and the anſwer to the direct proofs alledged by the partizans of king Charles.

(46) Milton, in his *Iconoclaſtes, pag. m.* 24.

(47) That is to ſay of his *Iconoclaſtes.*

clergy, which they imagined might be applied to the modern clergy. The laſt book which he publiſhed, is a treatiſe *of true Religion, Hereſy, Schiſm, Toleration, and the beſt means that may be uſed to prevent the growth of Popery.* I ſhall ſet down a paſſage out of it [*O*]. Thoſe who ſay that poverty forced him to ſell his library, are groſsly miſtaken; for he did not ſell it upon that account, but becauſe he believed he could make more money of it than his heirs could do; and it is certain he left a conſiderable ſum behind him (*n*). The Gout was the diſeaſe that troubled him moſt, and he died of it without great pain in the the year 1674, being ſixty ſix years old. He was a man of an agreeable converſation, of a mild and equal temper, extraordinarily ſober, and who

thy majeſty ſo to ſhine in my mind, that I, who in my greateſt afflictions acknowledge it my nobleſt title to be thy creature, may ſtill depend confidently on thee. Let calamity be the exerciſe, but not the overthrow of my virtue. O let not their prevailing power be to my deſtruction; and if it be thy will, that they more and more vex me with puniſhment, yet, O Lord, never let their wickedneſs have ſuch a hand, but that I may ſtill carry a pure mind, and ſtedfaſt reſolution ever to ſerve thee without fear or preſumption, yet with that humble confidence which may beſt pleaſe thee; ſo that at the laſt I may come to thy eternal kingdom, thro' the merits of thy ſon, our alone ſaviour, JESUS CHRIST, Amen.

thee) let me crave even by the noble title, which in my greateſt affliction I may give my ſelf, that I am thy creature, and by thy goodneſs, which is thy ſelf, that thou wilt ſuffer ſome beams of thy majeſty to ſhine into my mind, that it may ſtill depend confidently on thee. Let calamity be the exerciſe, but not the overthrow, of my virtue. Let their power prevail, but prevail not to deſtruction. Let my greatneſs be their prey. Let my pain be the ſweetneſs of their revenge: let them, (if ſo it ſeem good unto thee) vex me with more and more puniſhment; but, O Lord, let never their wickedneſs have ſuch a hand, but that I may carry a pure mind in a pure body. *And pauſing a while*; and O Moſt Gracious Lord, *ſaid ſhe*, whatever becomes of me, preſerve the virtuous Muſidorus.

[*O*] *I ſhall ſet down a paſſage out of his book on true religion,* &c.] This I do, to the end, that the principles of this writer may be known, which is as neceſſary as any other thing in the articles of of an hiſtorical dictionary concerning authors. 'It is a human frailty to err, *ſays he*, and no man is infallible here on earth. But ſo long as all the Lutherans, Calviniſts, Anabaptiſts, Socinians, and Arminians, profeſs to ſet the word of God only before them as the rule of faith and obedience; and uſe all diligence and ſincerity of heart by reading, by learning, by ſtudy, by prayer for illumination of the holy Spirit, to underſtand this rule and obey it, they have done whatever man can do: God will aſſuredly pardon them, as he did the friends of Job good and pious men, tho' much miſtaken (as there it appears) in ſome points of doctrine. But ſome will ſay, with Chriſtians it is otherwiſe, whom God has promiſed by his ſpirit to teach all things. True, all things abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation: but the hotteſt diſputes among Proteſtants, calmly and charitably inquired into, will be found leſs than ſuch. the Lutheran holds conſubſtantiation; an error indeed, but not mortal. The Calviniſt is taxed with predeſtination, and to make God the author of ſin; not with any diſhonourable thoughts of GOD, but, it may be, over zealouſly aſſerting his abſolute power, not without plea from Scripture. The Anabaptiſt is accuſed of denying infants their right to baptiſm; they ſay again, that they deny nothing but what the Scripture denies them. The Arian and Socinian are charged to diſpute againſt the Trinity; yet they affirm that they believe the FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST, according to Scripture and the Apoſtolic Creed. As for the terms of *Trinity, Triunity, Coeſſentiality, Triperſonality*, and the like, they reject them as ſcholaſtic notions not to be found in Scripture, which, according to a general Proteſtant maxim, is ſufficiently clear, ſupplying the moſt fit and proper words for explaining the doctrines it contains. The Arminian laſtly is condemned for ſetting up free will againſt free grace; but that imputation he diſclaims in all his writings, and grounds himſelf largely upon Scripture only. It cannot be denied that the authors, or late revivers, of all theſe ſects, or opinions, were learned, worthy, zealous, and religious men, as appears by their lives written, and the fame of their many eminent and learned followers, perfect and powerful in the Scriptures, holy and unblamable in their lives: and it cannot be imagined, that GOD would deſert ſuch painful and zealous labourers in his church, and often times great ſufferers for their conſcience, to damnable errors and a reprobate ſenſe, who had ſo often implored the aſſiſtance of his ſpirit; but rather, having made no man infallible, that he has pardoned their errors, and accepts their pious endeavours, ſincerely ſearching all things according to the rule of Scripture, with ſuch guidance and direction as they can obtain of God by prayer. What Proteſtant then, who himſelf maintains the ſame principles, and diſavows all implicit faith, would perſecute, and not rather charitably tolerate ſuch men as theſe, unleſs he means to abjure the principles of his own religion? If it be aſked how far they ſhould be tolerated? I anſwer, doubtleſs equally, as being all Proteſtants; that is, on all occaſions to be permitted to give an account of their faith, either by arguing, preaching in their ſeveral aſſemblies, public writing, and the freedom of printing (48).' After this Milton ſhows, that Popery ought to be wholly deprived of the benefit of a toleration, not as it is a religion, but as it is a tyrannical faction which oppreſſes all others. He ſhows alſo, that the moſt effectual means of hindering it's increaſe in England, is to tolerate all ſorts of Proteſtants, and in general all other ſects whoſe principles neither countenance vice nor ſedition.

By this ſpecimen of Milton's doctrine, it plainly appears, that no man was more zealous for a toleration than he; for thoſe who do not exclude Popery from it, and conſequently limit it much leſs than he does, are not, as one might think, his moſt faithful followers. The latter by an exceſſive fondneſs of toleration, are not for tolerating in the leaſt the perſecuting ſects: and ſince Popery has been time out of mind the ſect which perſecutes moſt, and inceſſantly torments both the body and ſoul of other Chriſtians whereſoever it can do it, the moſt zealous advocates for toleration do chiefly deſign it's excluſion. They pretend to reaſon conſequentially, and they do not underſtand, how the edict of the emperor of China can agree with that high wiſdom for which he is commended. I mean the edict for a toleration which he has granted to the Chriſtians, of which a Jeſuit has given us a fine hiſtory (49). They think that a wiſe prince ſhould not have allowed the Pope's miſſionaries, and their new converts, liberty of conſcience, before he knew their methods of making converts and how their predeceſſors have made uſe of them. If he had inquired into them, as a good Politician would have done, he would never have allowed the miſſionaries what he granted them; for he would have known that they pretend to be the people whom JESUS CHRIST has appointed to *compel to come in*, that is, to baniſh, impriſon, torture, kill, and dragoon, all thoſe who refuſe to be converts to the goſpel, and to dethrone the princes who oppoſe it's progreſs. We do not ſee how the emperor of China could clear himſelf from an inexcuſable indiſcretion, if having known this, he had nevertheleſs granted ſuch an edict (50). We muſt therefore believe for his honour, that he knew nothing of it, and he is to blame for that very thing, that he did not ſufficiently inform himſelf of what he ought to have known. In all probability he will not live long enough to have ground to repent of his

WHETHER the emperor of China acted a wiſe part in granting the Roman Catholicks an edict of toleration.

(*n*) 1500 *l.* beſides other things.

(48) Milton, in his treatiſe of True Religion, Hereſy, *&c.* as cited by Mr Toland, in his Life of Milton, *pag.* 144, *& ſeq.* in 8vo.

(49) Father *Charles le Gobien*: his book was printed at Paris in the year 1698, in 12mo. I have quoted ſomething out of it before, citat. (33) of the article BRACHMANS.

(50) See the Philoſophical Commentary on the words *Compel them to come in, Part i, pag.* 81, *& ſeq.*

who delighted infinitely in Muſic. The ſect which pleaſed him moſt in his youth was that of the Puritans; but in his middle age he was beſt pleaſed with the Independants and Anabaptiſts, becauſe they allowed more liberty to every private perſon, and in his opinion ſeemed to come neareſt to the primitive Chriſtians: but in the latter part of his life, he ſeparated himſelf from all communions, and did not frequent any Chriſtian aſſembly, nor made uſe of their peculiar rites in his family. As for the reſt, he expreſſed the profoundeſt reverence to God as well in deeds as words (*o*). There was an edition of all his works (*p*) at London in the year 1699, in three volumes in folio. The two firſt contain what he wrote in Engliſh, and the third his Latin treatiſes. You will ſee, in the remark [*N*], the parallel which Milton made between a prayer that is in king Charles the firſt's book, and a prayer that is found in the famous romance intituled *The counteſs of* Pembroke's Arcadia.

his neglect: but we cannot anſwer, that his poſterity will not curſe his memory; for they may poſſibly find themſelves obliged ſooner than we think, to ſtruggle with dangerous ſeditions, excited by the followers of a new religion, and to cut their throats to ſave their own. Poſſibly they may be forced to play the ſame ſly game that thoſe of Japan played before (51). Do not think the miſſionaries will fall out among themſelves, when they are to put in practice the doctrine of compelling, of rebelling, and dragooning. The Thomiſts, the Scotiſts, and the Moliniſts, will then forget all their differences, and jointly concur to execute the command, *compel them to come in*. All Europe at this time (52) rings with their diſputes; they accuſe one another at Rome; the congregation of cardinals, the Sorbonne, princes, and authors, are in a ferment upon that account. And it is very ſtrange, that the diviſions of the miſſionaries, their diſputes, their *devouring one another*, which cannot be unknown to the new Chriſtians of the Levant, ſhould ſuffer them to make the great progreſs they boaſt of (53). There would be no miſunderſtanding, if the only queſtion among them was how to oppreſs and torment the idolaters of China. But let us break off this ſubject, which diſturbs the tranquillity of a writer, and that of many a reader. They are ſufficiently vexed, that they cannot read over a Gazette without finding accounts in it of multitudes perſecuted in France, in the Palatinate, *&c.*

But to return to Milton, I muſt ſay, that it would be a hard matter for me to point out the reaſons why he ſeparated from all Chriſtian communions: his own Hiſtorian leaves the queſtion undecided, whether it was on account of an infinite number of diſputes among them, void of all charity; or by reaſon of a ſpirit of tyranny, and an inclination to perſecution he obſerved in them, which he looked on as a piece of Popery inſeparably annexed to all ſects; or whether from an opinion, that one may be a good man without ſubſcribing to the confeſſions of any ſect, and that all ſects had in ſome meaſure corrupted the laws of JESUS CHRIST (54).

MINUTOLI (*a*). The moſt famous perſons of the family Minutoli of Lucca, which removed thither from Florence about the year 1300, after having enjoyed all the dignities of the republic of Florence, are thoſe that follow, not to ſpeak of the Antianato and office of Gonfaloniere, which was common to them.

JAMES MINUTOLI, born in the year 1434, and ſon to FRANCIS MINUTOLI Senator, and Margaret Balbani, who was alſo of a very noble family, became very learned in the Civil and Canon Law, &c. Being gone to Rome, Pope Pius II made him abbreviator of the apoſtolic letters in the year 1460; and Pope Paul II having made him one of the commiſſaries of the Papal army in the war of the holy ſee againſt Robert Malateſta, lord of Rimini, he behaved himſelf ſo prudently and courageouſly in that office, that he brought all Umbria into ſubjection, and eſpecially Spoleto and Citta di Caſtello: which gave occaſion to the learned Antonius Campanus to ſpeak of him thus, in one of his letters to Gentil of Urbino, ‘Audio Minutulum
‘noſtrum cooptatum eſſe Collegio tuorum: id ſi eſt, pugnacem Collegam accepiſti,
‘& qui jampridem didicit tueri communem dignitatem, nam picena illa fuga non
‘pugna fuit, & ipſe inter primipilos dimicans eâ die virum ſe præbuit. ——— *I hear*
‘*our friend Minutoli is taken into your college; if it be ſo, you have got a ſtout colleague,*
‘*and who learned long ſince to defend the common dignity; for that affair of Ancona was a*
‘*flight and not a fight, and he himſelf ſhewed he was a man of courage that day, fighting*
‘*amongſt the firſt captains.*’

Sed quò poſt pugnam victricia moverit arma!
  Quâ victis pacem conditione dedit
Anne Faventinis etiam nunc finibus inſtat?
  Aut fractis illis altera bella parat?

But whither mov'd he his victorious arms!
What terms of peace did he the conquer'd give?
Faenza's frontiers does he now approach?
Or them ſubdu'd, another war prepare?

After the war of Rimini he was made ſecretary of the apoſtolic penitentiary, and count of the ſacred palace of St John de Lateran by Paul II.

The emperour Frederic III, careſſed him much, and honoured him with the title of count Palatine, which at that time was a conſiderable dignity.

In the pontificate of Sixtus IV, he was made governor of Spoleto; and having done ſeveral ſervices to the holy ſee, Sixtus thought that he ought to recompenſe him for it by giving him the biſhopric of Nocera in Umbria, and in a little time after he ſent him

---

(*o*) Taken from the Latin extracts of Milton's Life by Mr Toland, in Engliſh. I have been told by thoſe who underſtand Engliſh, that it is well writ, and intermixed with very curious reflexions. See the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, Feb.* 1699, *pag.* 78, *& ſeq.*

(*p*) Except his poems.

(51) Compare what has been ſaid above, remark [*E*] of the article JAPAN.

(52) I write this in November 1700.

(53) See the Supplement to the Philoſophical Commentary on the ſame words, *pag.* 117, *& ſeq.*

(54) Taken from the extracts of Milton's Life, by Mr Toland.

(*a*) Memoir concerning the houſe Minutoli. See the advertiſements on the ſecond edition.

with the cardinal legate, John la Balue, to Lewis XI king of France, who had ſuch an eſteem for him that he made him his agent with the Popes, and got him to be tranſlated from the biſhopric of Nocera to that of Agde in Languedoc: and in the ſame year, 1481, he was ſent, with the king's ambaſſadors, to perſuade the ſenate of Venice to join in the pacification of Italy, which had been juſt reſolved upon at Rome. The king mereover rewarded him for it by giving him a rich abbey in Poitiers, and by allowing him to enjoy the archbiſhopric of Cambray. He died in France very much regretted. There are ſeveral of his Latin letters in the collection of thoſe of the cardinal of Pavia James Amannati Picolomini, to whom he gave an account by way of journal of the ſucceſs of the war of Rimini, becauſe this cardinal had deſired memoirs for the Hiſtory of his own time, which he had begun to write. The brothers Sammarthani mention him in their *Gallia Chriſtiana*; but they have not ſpelt his name right in the catalogue of the biſhops of Agde, where he is called *Jacobus de Munitolis Lucenſis*, inſtead of *de Minutolis*.

FRANCIS MINUTOLI, nephew to this biſhop, did ſuch ſignal ſervices to the republic of Piſa, that he was admitted into the number of it's noble families in the year 1496.

JOHN BAPTIST MINUTOLI, ſon to this Francis and Angela Micheli, wrote ſeveral letters in Latin, which are to be found in a collection made by John Michael Brutus, under the title of *Epiſtolæ Clarorum Virorum*. There are ſome in it written by Dennis Lambinus, Angelus Bargæus, and others, and one in particular by John Michael Brutus, which is an elogy on and apology for commerce, in order to convince the ſaid John Baptiſt, that it would be no diſparagement to his nobility, if he ſhould overcome his repugnance to trade, to which they would have perſuaded him, after the example of the Bonviſi, Arnolfini, Micheli, and ſeveral others, who were not reckoned the leſs noblemen for carrying on a great trade: and this learned letter might deſerve a place in the Code of Merchants, as proper to do them a great deal of honour.

PAULINUS MINUTOLI, ſon of Paul and Angela Poggi, become an eccleſiaſtic among the canons of St John de Lateran, and obtained by degrees all the dignities of his order, whereof Pope Alexander VII made him at laſt abbot-general. It was he that left the fine library at Lucca in the monaſtery of St Fredian, where his memory has been honoured with a buſt of marble and the following inſcription; it gives him the name of Jerom, which he took when he entered into the order.

DOMINO *HIERONYMO MINUTOLO*
NOBILI LUCENSI.

Ob eximias dotes ad cuncta Lateranenſis
Congregationis munera evecto
Iiſdemque ſtrenuè perfuncto, Denique
Alexandri VII Pontif. Max.
Providentiâ Abbati Generali,
Quòd Domus hujus ſplendori
Alumnorum utilitati conſulens
Ipſe univerſalis literaturæ
Vivens promptuarium
Bibliothecam erexerit annuiſque
Reditibus communierit,
Domino Joanne Santino Præſide,
P. P. P. P.
Vixit annos 63. Obiit totius
Urbis mærore 1667.

NICHOLAS MINUTOLI, brother of the former, embraced likewiſe a religious life in the congregation of the Olivetani, of the order of St Benedict, where he took the name of *Dominicus*. He became abbot of St Pontianus of Lucca, and afterwards general of his order, in the viſitation of which he received diverſe honours throughout Italy, and principally at Naples, where the noblemen that had titles of honour and were of the name Minutoli in that kingdom, owning him for their kinſman, got the chief of the nobility and people to go and meet him in a body. The elogium on his adminiſtration during his generalſhip you will find at large in the IVth Tome of *Italia Regnante* by Sieur Leti, with this title.

Reverendiſſimi Patris D. Dominici Minutoli Lucenſis Congregationis Olivetanæ
Abbatis Generalis Illuſtris in benedictione Memoria.

A pretty remarkable paſſage is related there upon the ſubject of his works: before his generalſhip, one of his predeceſſors having appointed him to write ſomething upon the bull *In Cœna Domini*, the commentary he compoſed upon it made a large book *in folio*, which was printed, not under the name of the author, but that of the abbot who had ordered him to write: ſo that when the author made a preſent of one of the copies to his brother, to put it in his library of St Fredian, the brother refuſed to accept it, unleſs the true author would make himſelf known; which he did by writing extempore theſe ſix verſes on the back ſide of the firſt page.

Hunc ego conſcripſi librum, tulit alter honores,
Veſte mihi tantùm & nomine conſimilis:
Nam mihi Luca eſt Patria, Frater ſum illius à quo
Nobilis erecta hæc Bibliotheca fuit.
Ipſe dedi librum, retulit pro munere Frater
Quod placuit libris adnumerare ſuis.

This book I wrote, another reap'd the fame
Like me in habit only and in name.
For Lucca is my native place, and he
Who did erect this noble library
My brother is: by adding to his own
This book I gave, his gratitude is ſhown.

Two volumes only appeared under his name, printed at Venice and intituled: *Affetti di devotione che devono ſentir li ſacerdoti avanti e doppo la celebratione, cavati dalli Evangelii correnti*; but he left ſeveral manuſcripts which would be well worth the publiſhing.

JOHN PHILIP MINUTOLI, brother of the two forgoing, having followed the profeſſion of a ſoldier, was made general of the Militia of Ranucius II, duke of Parma, who committed to his charge his fortreſs of Placenza, where, after he had commanded ſeveral years, he died in the year 1675 much lamented by the duke, who made one that was a prince of Parma his ſucceſſor.

FRANCIS MINUTOLI, ſon to that John Baptiſt of whom we have ſpoken, married Anne Antelminelli, the laſt heireſs of the famous houſe of the Antelminelli, of which was Caſtrucius Caſtracani, who became chief of the Gibelines and prince of Lucca.

ANTHONY III MINUTOLI, was a Phyſician of note, to whom *Reinerus Solenander*, Phyſician to the dukes of Cleves, wrote ſome letters, which we find in his works intituled *Conſilia Medica*.

JAMES V MINUTOLI, after he had diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the practice of Phyſic, turned Jeſuit and became confeſſor to Pope Gregory XV, who placed an entire confidence in him, and left upon his account a rich legacy to the ſociety.

BONAVENTURE II MINUTOLI, ſon of MARC ANTHONY II and Catherine del Portico, was treaſurer-general to Ranucius I duke of Parma.

BERNARDINUS IV MINUTOLI, ſon to FRANCIS IV and Mary Bottini, being Apoſtolic Protonotary and prior of St Paulinus and St Donatus at Lucca, died twenty years ago in great reputation for his ſanctity, having contracted the diſtemper whereof he died, at the ſame time as a couſin-german of his of the houſe of Spada and knight of Malta did, from the ſtench of the ſick perſons whom they daily viſited and ſerved in the hoſpitals and priſons, employing all their income to relieve them.

CHARLES MINUTOLI, brother of the ſaid Bernardinus, and who has been ſeveral times already Gonfaloniere, is ſtill alive, father of ten ſons ſome of which are already Monks.

VINCENT II MINUTOLI, ſon to PAULINUS III and Laura Cenami, coming to Geneva in the year 1594, and there embracing the Proteſtant religion, ſoon after married Suſanna daughter of Michael Burlamachi and Clara Calandrini, which produced the branch of the Minutoli that is now ſettled at Geneva, of which is

VINCENT III MINUTOLI, ſon of PAUL II and Magdalen des Perrot of Paris.

The Minutoli of Lucca made likewiſe a branch three hundred years ago at Meſſina, the chief of which is now Don JOHN MINUTOLI Baron of Calari. This branch has produced ſeveral prelates, and ſeveral knights of Malta. It wears the ſame arms as thoſe of Lucca, which are partly, 1, Or, charged with an half eagle ſable, crowned, armed, and becquée Or, and 2, Argent charged with three ſtakes gules, and for the creſt an unicorn naiſſant, pattée, and membrée Or: whereas the Minutoli of Naples wear gules, a lion rampant, Or, vairé azure and argent, and charged with a ducal coronet.

Their origin is ſo ancient that it is not known. Some derive it from the family Capece, which, having incurred the diſpleaſure of the houſe of Anjou for their fidelity to the kings of the Suabian branch and particularly to Conradin, were obliged to depart the kingdom, after the defeat of the latter, to avoid the reſentment of king Charles I, who had vowed their utter deſtruction: ſo that they ſpread themſelves in ſeveral parts of Italy, where, it is pretended, they changed their name and arms, ſome calling themſelves Aprani, others Sconditi, others Guindazzi, others Zurli, others Piſcicelli, others Galeoti, others Minutoli, &c; after which the Pope, not being able to bear the diſperſion and deſolation of ſuch a family, reconciled them with the houſe of Anjou. But ſeveral maintain that thoſe names exiſted at Naples, not only before the coming of the Angevins, but alſo in the time of the Suabians, Normans, and even the Greek emperors, and eſpecially the name of the Minutoli, as they prove by authentic acts both in the archives and ſeveral monaſteries, of Naples. Now, whether they were only ſirnames of the houſe Capece, or families independent of it, it is certain the Minutoli were in ſuch a flouriſhing ſtate in the reign of Charles I, of Anjou, that we find he knighted twenty eight lords of that name, and he particularly loved CONSTANTIN and ROGER Minutoli, making the former general of his croſsbow men, and giving him the barony of Urſimarſo in Calabria, and allowing the latter to put a coronet of Gold in his coat of arms.

To ſee how fruitful this family has been in illuſtrious perſons, both in the church and in the army, one need only go to their chapel called the chapel ſo St Anaſtaſia, which is in the cathedral on the right hand as you go in where one may ſee paintings in freſco, ſtatues, and relievos, of forty remarkable perſons, with the enſigns of their great employments Eccleſiaſtical and Military, from the year 1062 to the year 1466: the reſt of the family, who died ſince and could not be placed there, having been put in other chapels and churches founded by their anceſtors, and of which they had the right of patronage.

The Eccleſiaſtics are

JOHN MINUTULUS, cardinalis Stæ. Mariæ Tranſtiberinæ anno 1062.

PHILIPPUS MINUTULUS, archbiſhop of Salerno 1273. He died in the year 1303, and this epitaph was made on him:

Magnanimus, ſapiens, prudens, famaque ſerenus
Philippus Præſul morum dulcedine plenus
Minutulus Patriæ decus & flos alta propago
Hîc ſilet, hîc tegitur, jacet hîc probitatis imago.

The prelate, Philip Minutol by name,
His country's glory, and of ſpotleſs fame,
Brave, wiſe and prudent, affable and juſt,
Here lies at reſt, and covered with the duſt.

URSUS MINUTULUS, archbiſhop of Salerno, who died in the year 1327 with this inſcription on his tomb:

Hoc jacet in tumulo Dominus *Minutulus Urſus*
Pontificalis apex quem profert linea rurſus
Virtutum Vitis Philippi vera propago,
Pontificum gemma & cuncta probitatis imago,
Parthenope natum, Salernum Pontificatum
Flentque tale datum, Moritur ſuper omnia gratum.
Parthenopéque tibi Salernum Praeſulis hujus
Commendat corpus animam Deus accipe cujus.

Urſus Minutol lies within this ſhrine
Glory of biſhops, ſprung from virtue's line,
True branch of Philip, that moſt noble vine
At Naples born, he to Salerno went
To be archbiſhop; now they both lament.
Parthenope to thee, Salerno, ſends
His body, and to GOD his ſoul commends.

HENRICUS MINUTULUS, archbiſhop of Trani, then of Naples, and afterwards cardinal biſhop of Tuſculum and after that Sabinum. He died at Bologna the ſeventeenth of June in the year 1412, and his body was carried to Naples. It was he who built the beautiful portal of the cathedral church adorned with ſo many fine relievo's, and where people ſo much admire that the two principal pillars and the architrave of porphyry conſiſt only of three pieces. It is before this portal we ſee the cardinal in marble kneeling, and in the architrave this inſcription is cut.

Nullius in longum & ſine Schemate tempus honoris
Porta fui rutilans nunc janua plena decoris
Me meus & Sacrae quondam Minutulus *Aulae*
Excoluit propriis Henricus *ſumptibus hujus*
Praeſul, Apoſtolicae nunc conſtans cardo columnae.
Cui precor incolumem vitam poſt fata perennem.
Hoc opus exactum mille currentibus annis
Quo quater & centum ſeptem Verbum caro factum eſt ;

Which ſhews it was built in the year 1407.

PETRUS MINUTULUS, biſhop of Rapallo, in the year 1470.

PETRUS MINUTULUS, biſhop of Abruzzo, and prince of Teramo, 1478.

There is moreover a great number of laymen, who were very famous both at court and in the army. Campanile reckons up thirty of them, who had been viceroys or governors of provinces.

By the chappel before mentioned, there is a marble tomb of John Baptiſt Minutoli with his ſtatue and this epitaph:

Joanni Baptiſtæ Capyccio Minutolo Equiti pietate & magnanimitate inſigni qui quòd in ſe videret *Henrici Capyccii Minutuli Cardinalis Ampliſſimi* lineam deſinere, legatis raro Charitatis exemplo vicies mille Ducatis ad reliquæ Familiæ perpetuam utilitatem & decus inſtitutoque ſuorum bonorum hærede Hoſpitali D. Mariae Annuntiatæ, in crucis tandem ſe humili Sacello, condi voluit. *Beatrix Torella* Mater infelix ſuperſtes, *Julia Caracciola* viro Incomparabili amoris monumentum P. Obiit anno Domini 1586 ætatis ſuæ LV. —— *Beatrice Torella, the unfortunate ſurviving mother, and Julia Caracciola as a monument of her love to her incomparable huſband erected this to John Baptiſt Capyccius Minutoli knight, famous for his piety and magnanimity, who ſeeing the line of his eminency the cardinal Henry Capyccius Minutoli to end in himſelf, and having bequeathed twenty thouſand ducats, a rare inſtance of charity for the perpetual uſe of the remaining family, and appointed the Hoſpital of the Annunciation heir to his eſtate, ordered that he ſhould be buried in the mean chapel of the croſs. He died in the year* 1586, *in the fifty fifth year of his age.*

In the church of St Demetrius, where of the family Minutoli has the patronage, is to be ſeen the following inſcription:

Ædicula Nobiliſſimæ Gentis Minutulæ ante annos CD extructa, dotata Divis'que Simeoni & Demetrio dicata. Demum cum in anno M. & D. ad ſucceſſores Scipionis Andreæ filii perveniſſet ad prolatandum Templum hoc areamque diruta P. P. Congregationis Oratorii grati animi ergo ſacellum intra Templum eidem familiæ conceſſerunt *Horatius Minutulus* Hieroſolymitani Ordinis jus vetuſtate exoletum, ac ferè amiſſum reſtituit & monumentum hoc gentilitiæ pietatis P. C. Anno MDCXIV. —— *The chapel of the moſt noble family Minutoli, built above four hundred years, endowed and dedicated to St Simeon and St Demetrius. At length, in the year one thouſand five hundred, when it came to the ſucceſſors of Scipio the ſon of Andrew, being pulled down in order to enlarge this church and porch, the fathers of the congregation of the Oratory, out of gratitude, granted to the ſame family a chapel within the church. Horace Minutoli of the order of Jeruſalem reſtored the right, through length of time forgotten and almoſt loſt, and erected this monument of hereditary piety in the year MDCXIV.*

They were always with their kings in councils and expeditions. They have poſſeſſed and do ſtill poſſeſs great eſtates and great fieſs. They are allied to all the beſt families of the kingdom, as among others to thoſe of Sanſeverino, Aquino, Caſtriote, Brancace, of Capua, Loffredo, Filanghieri, Filomarini, Pignatelli, Rota, Revertera, del Tufo, Caraſſo, Caraccioli, there having been twenty reciprocal marriages of the two laſt with the houſe Minutoli.

LIVIA MINUTOLI, daughter to ANDREW and Lucretia de Vulcano, was married to Don Lewis de Silva of the dukes of Paſtrano, knight of the order of St James and commander of the caſtle of Capuana. When ſhe became a widow, the emperor Charles V choſe her upon the account of her virtue and good ſenſe for the education of Margaret of Auſtria his daughter; and by her prudent conduct ſhe got into great favour with his Imperial Majeſty. We find her epitaph at Naples in the chapel belonging to the family of Silva, which ſhe had cauſed to be added to the ſee of Capuana, to which belongs that of the Minutoli.

Livia Minutula Conjux Loyſii Alphonſi Sylvæ Luſitani & Chriſti Equitis, Arciſque Capuanæ Præfecti hanc ſibi & ſuis elegit ſepulturam, anno Saltnis 1536.

In the cathedral, behind the great altar, there is a marble monument of Mariella Minutoli married to Giles Safirera Viceroy of Naples for king Alphonſus:

Hic jacet Corpus Mariellæ Minutulæ uxoris Domini Ægidii Safireræ Viceregis Sereniſſimi Domini Domini Alphonſi Dei gratiâ Aragonum & Siciliæ Regis &c, in regno Neapolitano, quæ obiit die 3 *Menſis Novembris anno Domini* 1430.

Thoſe who would deſire a fuller account of the poſts and actions of the perſons of this family, of which there are ſtill at Naples three branches, viz. that of DON ANTONY MINUTOLI, that of FRANCIS MARIA MINUTOLI duke of Valentino, huſband to Diana Caraſſa, and that of the princes of Ruoid, may read what has been lately written of them by the count Biaggio Aldimari in his Hiſtory of the noble families of Naples, wherein he has followed, digeſted, and enlarged what had been writ of them by Philibert Campanile.

MYRRHA, the mother of Adonis, and daughter of Cinyras [*A*] king of Cyprus or of Aſſyria, fell in love with her father, and never reſted till ſhe had lain with him. Her nurſe, whom ſhe had made her confident, contrived the means of ſatisfying her paſſion; ſhe took her opportunity during the feaſt of Ceres, while the queen was for nine days to abſtain from her huſband's bed [*B*], and made this prince believe that a beautiful young maid longed to grant him the laſt favour, without being ſeen. The propoſal was accepted; the young Myrrha was introduced by night to her father's chamber. When the ſport was pretty well over, he had a deſire to ſee the maid he had enjoyed he cauſed a light to be brought, and found he had lain with his own daughter (*a*). Cinyras, took his ſword to kill her. Myrrha ran away, and eſcaped into the country of the Sabeans, where ſhe was transformed into a tree which yields myrrh. The child ſhe had conceived grew nevertheleſs, and came out of the trunk of this tree [*C*] when her time of delivery came. The Naiades took care of it; it was the moſt beautiful boy in the world: in a word, it was Adonis, of whom I have ſpoken in his proper place (*b*). Some authors ſay, that Myrrha did not conceive this paſſion of herſelf; but that the misfortune proceeded from a higher cauſe, to wit, the wrath of ſome offended deity [*D*]. Thus you ſee how the Pagans repreſented their gods, under the idea of beings which puniſhes one crime, by inducing the offender to commit another. Ovid has not followed theſe authors in this particular caſe of Myrrha; on the contrary he declares that Cupid cleared himſelf of it (*c*), and lays all the blame on the infernal furies. They who think that Myrrha was the wife of Cham, the ſon of Noah [*E*], take the ſtory a little too high.

(*a*) Cum tandem Cinyras avidus cognoſcere amantem,
Poſt tot concubitus illato lumine vidit
Et ſcelus & natam. *Ovid. Metam. lib. X, ver.* 472.

(*b*) Ex Ovidio Metam. *lib. X. See alſo Plutarch in his Parallels, pag. m.* 310. *citing the Metamorphoſes of Theodorus.* Servius, in Eclog. X, Virg.

(*c*) *See the remark* [*D*].

[*A*] *The daughter of Cinyras.*] Antoninus Liberalis (1) calls her Smyrna, and ſays ſhe was the daughter of Theias and the nymph Orithya and born upon mount Libanus: but, according to others, ſhe was the daugh- of Cinyras and Cenchreis. Ovid was of this opinion, and I wonder Meziriac (2) ſhould deny it as to Cenchreis. This Poet obſerves, I. that the mother of Myrrha was the wife of Cinyras, when Myrrha was in love with her father:

- - - Conataque ſæpe fateri,
Sæpe tenet vocem, pudibundaque veſtibus ora
Texit, & O, dixit felicem CONJUGE MATREM!

- - - *And would have oft confeſs'd,*
As oft by ſhame with-held, ſhe hid her head,
And cried, O mother, happy in thy bed.

SEWELL.

II. That the nurſe of Myrrha took her opportunity when Cinyras lay alone, his wife Cenchreis being buſied with other women in the myſteries of Ceres:

- - - Turba Cenchreis in illa
Regis abeſt conjux, arcanaque ſacra frequentat.
Ergo legitima vacuus dum conjuge lectus.

The queen among the reſt her lord forſakes,
And one in this enjoin'd devotion makes.

SEWELL.

Is not this to ſay, that Cenchreis was the mother of Myrrha?

[*B*] *The queen was for nine days to abſtain from her huſband's bed.*] What prodigious difference between thoſe times and ours! for ſince the nurſe took this critical opportunity, it is an argument, that the king lay with his wife all other nights in the year, as regularly as the meaneſt citizen. In our days any month in the year would be as proper a time for this nurſe, had ſhe ſuch a trick to play.

[*C*] *The child however . . . . . came out of the trunk of this tree,*] Some (3) ſay, that the daughter of Cinyras was changed into a tree while her father purſued her with ſword in hand in order to kill her. They add, that the cut he gave that tree made it bring forth Adonis. Others (4) ſay that Myrrha was delivered of the fruit of her womb, after her inceſt had been detected; and that Jupiter afterwards changed her into a tree, on her earneſt prayer, that ſhe might not have a being among the living or the dead.

[*D*] *Several authors ſay that this misfortune proceeded from the wrath of ſome offended deity.*] Some (5) ſay, that the anger of the Sun was the cauſe of this inceſtuous paſſion. Others (6) have recourſe to Venus who was incenſed, that Cenchreis the mother of Myrrha, ſhould prefer the beauty of her daughter to that of this goddeſs; or at Myrrha's ſaying as ſhe combed her head, that her hair was finer than that of Venus (7). All theſe accounts are full of impiety; it was playing with the Divine Nature, and taking a greater freedom than an honeſt Hiſtorian would do with the reputation of the worſt men, unleſs he had convincing proofs. See the margin (8), and take notice that Ovid has cleared Cupid, and lays all the fault of Myrrha on the Furies:

Ipſe negat nocuiſſe tibi ſua tela Cupido
Myrrha, faceſque ſuas à crimine vindicat iſto.
Stipite te ſtygio tumidiſque adſlavit Echidnis
E tribus una ſoror (9).

Myrrha, thy wound the god of love diſclaims,
And from ſuch horrors vindicates his flames.
A brand from Hell ſtirr'd up thy lawleſs pains,
And furies ſwell'd with viper's blood thy veins.

SEWELL.

[*E*] *Some think that Myrrha was the wife of Cham, the ſon of Noah.*] They ſuppoſe (10), that the wife of Cham accompanied by Adonis *the youngeſt of her family*, was the firſt who ſaw the nakedneſs of Noah, and that ſhe ſpoke of it to Cham, *who told it again to his brothers.* Now ſince in the ſtile of the Hebrews, *to ſee or diſcover the nakedneſs of any one* (11), ſignifies two things, either the ſimple ſight or the enjoyment, it happened that Myrrha, who only ſaw her father's nakedneſs, came under the ſcandal of having proceeded to the laſt act. This explication is confirmed (12) by a paſſage, wherein we read, that the nurſe of Myrrha found Cinyras drunk.

Nacta gravem vino Cinyram male ſedula nutrix (13).

Robb'd of his conſort and with wine oppreſs'd,
To Cinyras th' officious beldame preſs'd.

SEWELL.

But ſince ſome authors ſay Myrrha made her father drunk, that ſhe might lie with him, it would ſeem more proper to take her for one of the daughters of Lot, than for one of the daughters-in-law of Noah, if the other circumſtances could be reconciled with this conjecture.

(1) *Cap. xxxiv.*

(2) Comment. on Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 397.

(3) Hygin. *cap. clxiv.* Fulgent. Mythol. *lib. iii, cap. viii.*

(4) Anton. Liberal. *cap. xxxiv.*

(5) Servius in Eclog. X. Virg.

(6) Hygin. *cap. lviii.*

(7) Schol. Theocriti in Eidyll. I.

(8) Compare the article ALCINOE, and the article EGIALEA, at the remark [*C*].

(9) Ovid. Metam. lib. X, ver. 311.

(10) *See the* Bibliotheque Univerſ. *Tom. iii, pag.* 8.

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 21.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 20.

(13) Ovid. Metam. lib. X, ver. 438.

MODREVIUS.

MODREVIUS (ANDREAS FRICIUS) ſecretary to Sigiſmund Auguſtus, king of Poland, gained great eſteem by his learning and his writings. He reliſhed betimes what they called the new opinions (*a*), and tho' he carried himſelf diſcreetly, yet he was ſuſpected by the Catholics, and at laſt detected ſo far, that they looked upon him as an apoſtate [*A*]. By a letter (*b*) he had writ to John Laſki in the year 1536, it appears that he was no enemy to the Lutherans. His treatiſe *de Eccleſia*, deſigned to be the fourth book of his work *de Republica emendanda*, which he ſent to be printed at Cracow in the year 1551, met with cenſors who put a ſtop to the impreſſion for two or three years (*c*). He publiſhed it afterwards with an apology explaining thoſe points at which ſome took offence. He was to go to Trent with the ambaſſadors of Poland, but this nomination was changed (*d*). The Anti-Trinitarians of Poland have placed him in the catalogue of their authors. We ſhall ſee below the titles of his principal books [*B*], with

(*a*) Staniſlas Lubieniecius, Hiſt. Reformat. Polon. *lib. i, cap. v, pag.* 18.

(*b*) It is the ixth, of the firſt century in the collection of letters publiſhed by *Simon Abbes Gabbema.*

(*c*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory, and the preface to the fourth book *de Republica emendanda.*

(*d*) Modrevius, Præfat. *lib. iv,* de Repub. emendanda, *pag.* 193. Edit. Baſil. 1554, *in fol.*

[*A*] *The Catholics looked on him as an apoſtate.*] See after what manner Simon Starovolſcius ſpeaks of him: ‘ Regius Secretarius, ſeu mavis lutulenti illius ſubulci Lutheri, cujus nefariis dogmatibus imbutus, infeſtabat eccleſiæ portas, dicendo quæ non oportuit, ſcribendo quæ non licuit, & agendo quæ non decuit (1). *The king's ſecretary, or if you will, of that dirty ſwine-herd Luther, with whoſe impious doctrines he was tainted, infeſted the gates of the church, by ſpeaking what he ought not, by writing what was not lawful, and acting what was not becoming.*’ It appears from a Preface of Modrevius, that Pius V ordered him to be puniſhed; for thus he complains to this Pope: ‘ Non abs re mihi facere viſus ſum, ſi ipſe ad te has controverſias deferrem, tibique hunc librum dicarem, qui occaſionem præberet tibi eas dijudicandi: ſimulque ſtudia mea exilia tibi commendaret. De quibus tu videris ſiniſtram opinionem concepiſſe: ac propter ea iis, penes quos eſt poteſtas, edixiſſe, ut me de poſſeſſiunculis meis dejicerent: fortunis everterent: ac extorrem facerent domo, foro, penatibus, congreſſu hominum. Hoccine eſt præmium bene meritorum? Hoccine humanum factum ſanctiſſime Pater (2). - - - - - *I think it will not be improper to bring theſe controverſies before you, and dedicate this book to you, which may give you an opportunity to judge of them, and at the ſame time recommend to you my poor ſtudies. About which you ſeem to have conceived an ill opinion: and therefore have ordered thoſe, in whoſe power it is, to turn me out of my ſmall poſſeſſions, to ſeize on my goods, to drive me from my country, my houſe, and the ſociety of men. Is this agreeable to humanity, moſt holy father?*’ Pope Paul IV, adds he, had diſpatched the like orders to the Biſhop of Vladiſlaw, but recalled them when he heard my reaſons. ‘ Non ſum oblitus, à Paulo Papa ejus nominis quarto ſimile edictum in me ſcriptum fuiſſe ad Joannem Droievium Epiſcopum Wladiſlaviæ. Cui quidem Papæ reſcripſi ego libro illi dicato de ordinibus eccleſiæ. In quo rationem illi reddidi vitæ, & actionum mearum: ſimulque cauſas oſtendi quamobrem in me non debuerit eſſe immitis & adeo ferox. Aſſenſus eſt ille orationi noſtræ non obſcure, nec ullam deinceps perniciem nobis machinatus eſt. Droievius quoque nihil in me cogitavit, quam quod virum bonum & optimum principem deceret (3). - - - - - *I have not forgot that the like order againſt me, was ſent by Pope Paul the* IV*th, to John Droievius, biſhop of Vladiſlaw. To which Pope I wrote again, in the book dedicated to him concerning the orders of the church. In this book I gave him an account of my life and practice, and at the ſame time ſhewed him ſome reaſons why he ought not to be unmerciful and ſo cruel to me. He granted my requeſt, and never afterwards intended any miſchief againſt me. Droievius alſo did nothing but what became a good man and an excellent prince.*’ I am perſuaded, that neither this Preface of Modrevius, nor the treatiſe which follows it, would have moved Pius V, to recal his order, and that the condition of the author was no better after he wrote this book, than while he was compoſing it. He informs us that he wrote it in the midſt of a thouſand troubles, often forced to change his lodgings, and diſtracted with the apprehenſions of loſing all he had. ‘ Partim labores domeſtici, partim cura liberorum, partim negotia civilia, maxime autem frequens curſitatio domicilii quærendi cauſa me ſibi vendicarunt (4). Hæc ſcripſi ſolicitus de bonis meis patriis avitiſque, de quibus periclitor authoritatis tuæ prætextu quæ abs te tanquam fulmen quoddam vulnificum vibrata eſt (5). *Partly domeſtic troubles, partly the care of my children, partly my affairs, but eſpecially the frequent changing of my lodgings, take up my whole time. Theſe things I have writ, being apprehenſive of loſing my paternal eſtate, under the pretence of your authority, which, like a fatal thunderbolt, is thrown out againſt me.*’

[*B*] *We ſhall ſee . . . . the titles of his principal books*] His five books *de Republica emendanda*, whereof the firſt treats *de Moribus*, the ſecond *de Legibus*, the third *de Bello*, the fourth *de Eccleſia*, and the fifth *de Schola*, were printed at Cracow in the year 1551, if we believe the abridger of Geſner (6), but we muſt not rely on him (7). They were reprinted at Baſil by Oporin in 8vo, and in fol. in the year 1554, with two dialogues of the ſame author, *de utraque ſpecie Euchariſtiæ à Laicis ſumenda*, and an explication of the words of St Paul (8). *It is good for a man not to touch a woman.* There was publiſhed at Baſil in 1562, in 4to, another collection of his pieces, which contains three book, *De peccato originis, de libero arbitrio, de providentia & prædeſtinatione*; three books, *De Mediatore, quibus acceſſit narratio ſimplex rei novæ & ejuſdem peſſimi exempli: ſimul & querela de injuriis, & expoſtulatio cum Staniſlao Orichovio Roxolano* (9). He wrote another book by order of the king, his maſter, to compoſe the differences which reigned in Poland concerning the Trinity. It is divided into four *Sylvæ*. The firſt is dated in December 1565, and treats *de tribus Perſonis & una Eſſentia Dei*. The ſecond is of the ſame date, and treats *de neceſſitate conventus habendi ad ſedandas religionis controverſias*. The third is dated in June 1568, and treats *de Jeſu Chriſto filio Dei, & hominis eodemque Deo & Domino noſtro*. The fourth is dated in June 1569, and treats *de Humouſio & de iis quæ huc pertinent*. Theſe four *Sylvæ*, together with an Appendix upon the queſtion, *Quomodo unio divinæ & humanæ naturæ Chriſti facta ſit in perſona non in natura, cum tamen eadem prorſus res ſint natura & perſona in Domino noſtro*, were printed at Racovia in 1590 (10). The abridger of Geſner mentions this laſt work in the year 1583, as a book not printed, and which contained only three *Sylvæ*, whereof the laſt treated of Infant Baptiſm (11). The firſt of theſe three facts is true, the two others are falſe. Note, that Modrevius had ſent his *Sylvæ* to be printed by Oporin at Baſil, who was to ſend copies of them to the Catholic, Lutheran, and Calviniſt, univerſities (12). But Trecius having a mind to hinder the publication of this book, deſired Oporin to ſhow him the manuſcript, and having once got it into his hands would never reſtore it (13). The author complained of this to the Palatine of Cracow, and earneſtly ſollicited that the Plagiary ſhould be obliged to reſtore it. This he could not obtain, and ſo was obliged to compoſe the work over again. *Tandem potentiæ Palatini Trecio patrocinantis cedere: poſtremo ſcrinia ſua excutere & rejecta omnia mora, opus illud ex adverſariis & chartis fere rejectaneis denuo moliri, & abſolvere, antequam mors eum occuparet. Atque ita tandem præſtantiſſimum illud, licet mole perexiguum Sylvarum opus, ab interitu vindicatum habemus* (14). The author of this Latin ſuppoſes, that Trecius ſerved him thus, becauſe Modrevius gave more force to the arguments of the Anti-Trinitarians, than to thoſe of the Trinitarians. *Ille prædam petitam in caſſes ſuos nactus & inibi argumenta veritatis reſponſionibus, exceptionibus & objectionibus Trinitariorum longe fortiora animadvertens, Baſilea protinus exceſſit, evaſit, erupit, & librum Fricianum bona fide ſibi commodatum abſtulit & ſic editionem libri ſufflaminavit* (15). Zanchius had ſeen the firſt of theſe four *Sylvæ* in manuſcript, and finding it dangerous, anſwered it in his book *de tribus Elohim*. He does not point out the author, but by the

(1) Simon Starovolſcius, in centum Polonorum Elogiis, *pag.* 81.

(2) Modrevius, in Præfat. Sylvæ tertiæ, *pag.* 152, 153.

(3) Id. ib. *pag.* 154, 155.

(4) Id. in 2 Præfat. Sylvæ III, *pag.* 157.

(5) Id. in fine Sylvæ III, *pag.* 216.

(6) Epitome Biblioth. Geſneri, *pag. m.* 43.

(7) There were only the three firſt printed at that time. See the preface of the fourth.

(8) 1 Epiſtle to the Corinthians, chap. vii.

(9) Epit. Geſn. ibid.

(10) Bibl. Antitrinit. *pag.* 36.

(11) Epitome Geſn. ubi ſupra.

(12) Modrev. Præf. Sylvæ IV.

(13) Staniſl. Lubieniecius, Hiſtor. Reform. Polonicæ, *lib. iii, cap. ix, pag.* 221.

(14) Id. ib. *pag.* 222. *See alſo* Biblioth. Antitrin. *pag.* 38.

(15) Id. ib. *pag.* 221.

with ſome particulars concerning them. Grotius reckons him among the reconcilers of religions (e)

(e) Grotius, in Conſultat. Caſſandri.

the name of Mediator, and he has an eſteem for him, as appears by his epiſtle dedicatory to Edmund Grindal (16). The ſceptical manner of Modrevius's examining the myſteries, diſpleaſed both Catholics and Proteſtants. However, it is true, that he was obliged to uſe this method in obedience to the command he had received from the king of Poland. He had been charged with the drawing up a ſtate of the caſe, as mediator of the argeement (17). It behoved him faithfully to repreſent the arguments on both ſides, and diveſt himſelf of all prejudice. He had heard Dudithius ſay one thing, which to him appeared very ſolid, that a man who had eſpouſed either ſide, for or againſt the Trinity, was not fit for an arbiter or judge between thoſe who deny, and thoſe who believe it. ‘ Is negabat eum qui alterutri ſeu de Trinitate ſeu de quavis re alia ſententiæ adhæreſcat, medium ſe inter ‘ partes ipſas inferre, controverſiamque dirimere atque ‘ ſedare poſſe. Neutri parti addictum eſſe oportere ‘ qui vel partes ipſas in concordiam reducere vellet ‘ æqualitate decernendi, vel ſecundum partem alteram ‘ decernere quod juſtum & legibus conſonum eſſe judicaret. Qui ad eum modum neuter non eſſet, eum ‘ partes judicem capere non ſolere, & ab alio datum ‘ ejurare conſueſſe : nimirum quem ex opinione imbibita pendentem veriſimile eſſet vel tacita reprehenſione contrarium ſentientes condemnaſſe. Nam ut ‘ pius eſſet & eruditus qui & diſſereret & judicaret, ‘ fieri tamen poſſe ut opinione præjudicata nitens falſum ‘ judicaret (18). - - - - - - *He denied that he who adhered to either opinion, whether about the Trinity or ‘ any thing elſe, could be a mediator between the contending parties, or decide and ſettle the controverſy. He ‘ ſaid, he ought to eſpouſe neither ſide, who would ‘ bring the parties to an agreement by an impartial ‘ judgment, or determine on one ſide, what he thought ‘ juſt and agreeable to the laws. That parties were not ‘ wont to take him for a judge, who was not thus neutral, ‘ and commonly rejected him if appointed by another : becauſe it is likely, his imbibed opinion would byaſs him ‘ tacitly to condemn thoſe of a contrary ſentiment. For ‘ though he were both pious and learned, yet poſſibly ‘ he might judge wrong by relying on his prejudiced opinion.*' This notion of Dudithius is very conſonant to cuſtom, for where is the man who would chuſe for arbitrators or judges of his differences, thoſe he knows are perſuaded he is in the wrong ? It is even true, that ſuch men are ſcarce capable of pronouncing an equitable ſentence. It is a misfortune, that ſuch a rule as this cannot take place in the diſputes of religion ; but the ſtate of things is ſuch, that theſe diſputes muſt neceſſarily be determined in the very church where they grow, which inevitably makes the ſame perſons judges and parties. It would be to no purpoſe to murmur at this, for neceſſity has no law. Note, by the way, one of the reaſons which fruſtrates the endeavours of all mediators in religion, and renders them odious. If they are believed to be perfectly neuters, they are deteſted as irreligious men ; if they are thought to incline more to one ſide, they are ſuſpected and odious to one of the parties, and do not fully ſatisfy the other : They will have all or nothing.

(16) See the preface of the publiſher of the four Sylvæ.

(17) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his firſt Sylva.

(18) Modrevius, Præfat. Sylvæ I.

As for the reſt, his books *de Republica emendanda* are much eſteemed : They have given the author a rank amongſt the moſt judicious writers upon Politics. ‘ Gravioribus politicis haud dubie annumerandus eſt, ‘ egregie enim diſputat, magnaque libertate in vulgares errores politicos invehiter (19). - - - - - *He is undoubtedly to be reckoned amongſt the moſt conſiderable Politicians, for he reaſons excellently, and with great ‘ freedom inveighs againſt popular errors in Politics.*' I add to this a paſſage of the oration Cunæus made to ſhew that the univerſity of Leyden had reaſon to puniſh a ſcholar with death, who had killed a townſman. The prince Janutius Radziwil, who ſtudied then at Leyden, had declaimed ſharply againſt the judges : ‘ Novit illuſtriſſimus Princeps Razevilius, *it ‘ is Cunæus ſpeaks* (20), noverunt omnes qui ejus ſtudiis præſunt quam ſint pulcra & luculenta ea quæ de ‘ cede cujuſcunque hominis in regno Poloniæ ultimo ‘ ſupplicio punienda ſcripſit vir ampliſſimus & rerum ‘ civilium ac Reipublicæ regundæ gnariſſimus Andreas ‘ Fricius Modrevius ad Sigiſmundum ſecundum Poloniæ regem. - - - - - *The moſt illuſtrious Prince Radziwil, and all who have the direction of his ſtudies ‘ know, how finely and excellently that great man and ‘ ſkillful Politician, Andreas Fricius Modrevius, wrote to ‘ Sigiſmund the ſecond, king of Poland, about puniſhing ‘ with death the murder of any perſon in the kingdom of ‘ Poland.*' Modrevius, in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Book *de Republica emendanda*, makes mention of a book, in which he largely explains the neceſſity of puniſhing murderers with death. This tract is intituled *Laciſius*, and conſiſts of four orations, which have been added to the volume *de Republica emendanda*, in the Baſiil edition 1559.

I deſire I may be permitted not to blot out a thing I had written before I could conſult the book *de Republica emendanda*. It is this ; ‘ It was doubtleſs for ‘ this book, that Modrevius received the praiſes contained in the *Bibliotheque* of the Anti-Trinitarians (21). ‘ This doubtleſs was that book of his which was tranſlated into French, High-Dutch, and Spaniſh. I ‘ could ſpeak more poſitively, if I had the preface in ‘ my hands, a piece of which is recited in that *Bibliliotheque*. Sandius, who cites it, is inexcuſable ‘ for leaving us in ſuſpence. He ought to have uſed ‘ a parentheſis to fix the indeterminate meaning of ‘ theſe words of Modrevius, *eſt qui laudando librum ‘ meum dicat*, &c. I am perſuaded they are very clear ‘ in the original : What goes before them, does, no ‘ doubt, explain which is the book in queſtion. But ‘ when they are cut off from the context, they become obſcure. It was Sandius's duty to have remedied it, and this is a good caution to thoſe who cite ‘ authors, and an anſwer to ſuch as pretend, that I ‘ make too long citations. I only do it, that what I ‘ cite may be clearly underſtood.' They who know how to judge of things will own that I might have left this in the ſtate I found it, after I had ſeen, by reading Modrevius, that the Book in queſtion is that *de Republica emendanda*.

(19) Joh. Andreas Boſius, Diſſertat. Iſagogica de comparanda Prudentia civili, *pag. m.* 361.

(20) Cunæus, Orat. XVII, *pag.* 341, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1693. This oration was delivered the eleventh of February 1632.

(21) *At the 37th pag.* ex Præfatione Sylvæ tertiæ Modrevii.

M O L I E R E, a famous Comedian. See P O Q U E L I N.

M O L I O N I D E S ; thus they call two brothers who have a good ſhare in the fabulous Hiſtory. They were the ſons of Actor and Molione [*A*], the name of one was Eurytus, and that of the other Cteatus. Some pretend, that Actor was only the ſuppoſed, and Neptune their real father (*a*). Others will have it quite contrary that, Actor was the real and Neptune the ſuppoſed father (*b*). We may ſee under the word Actor, that he whom I here ſpeak of reigned in Elis jointly with Augias. The Molionides were the braveſt men of their time ; it was to them Augias gave the command of his troops, when he underſtood that Hercules was coming to attack him. A diſtemper having ſeized Hercules in the beginning of the expedition, he was glad to make peace with the Molionides ; but they being afterwards informed of his indiſpoſition, made uſe of the opportunity ; ſurprized his army, and killed a great number of his men. Some time after Hercules played them a trick ; he laid an ambuſh for them at Cleone, when they were deputed by the Eleans to aſſiſt at the general ſacrifices of Greece, during the celebration of the Iſthmian Games, and ſlew them. This we learn from Apollodorus (*c*). Pauſanias aſcribes this heroe's bad

(*a*) Scholiaſt. Homeri in Iliad. lib. xi, ver. 749, 750.

(*b*) Apollod. Bibl. lib. ii.

(*c*) Ibid. *See alſo* Pind. Olymp. Od. X.

bad ſucceſs neither to his diſtemper, nor to the treachery of the Molionides, but to their valour alone (*d*), and the neceſſity which forced him to deliver himſelf from ſuch enemies by ſo baſe a way. He cauſed them, as I ſaid, to be killed at Cleone, when they were going to aſſiſt at the Iſthmian Games. Molione, their mother, laboured ſo induſtriouſly to diſcover the authors of the murther, that ſhe found them out; but the Argians would not deliver up Hercules (*e*) to the Eleans. The latter deſired the Corinthians to exclude the Argians for the future from the Iſthmian Games, as infractors of the ſacred laws obſerved in them: but they could not obtain it. Whereupon Molione imprecated a curſe on all the Eleans, who ſhould be preſent at this ſight; which made ſuch an impreſſion on them, that even in Pauſanias's time the champions of this nation never appeared at the Iſthmian games. The Molionides had married the two daughters of Dexamenus king of Olene (*f*). Each left a ſon; that of Eurytus was called Talpius, and that of Cteatus, Amphimachus. They reigned after Augias's death jointly with his ſon Agaſthenes. Furthermore, the fables ſay, that the Molionides were two coachmen, who had two heads, four hands, and four feet, and only one body betwixt them; one held the reins, and the other the whip; they kept up a prefect good underſtanding, ſo that Hercules could never conquer them but by artifice. This emblem was probably deſigned to repreſent the power of concord (*g*). Some have ſaid, that theſe two brothers came into the world in a ſilver egg [*B*]. I do not know whether Suidas's two Molons were taken from the Molionides [*C*].

(*d*) Ἅτε γὰρ καὶ τόλμῃ καὶ ταῖς ἡλικίαις τοῦ Ἄκτορος τῶν παίδων ἀκμαζόντων, ἐτρέπεθ' ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀεὶ τὸ συμμαχικὸν τοῦ Ἡρακλέους. Herculis enim auxilia ab Actoris filiis audacia & ætate vigentibus facile rejiciebantur. - - - - *For the auxiliaries of Hercules were eaſily routed by the ſons of Actor, who were young and courageous.* Pauſan. *lib. v, pag. m.* 148.

(*e*) He lived then at Tirynthus.

(*f*) Idem, *pag.* 149.

(*g*) See Plutarch at the beginning of his *Treatiſe of brotherly love, & Adr. Junius, Adag. xxxi, cent. v.*

[*A*] *They were the ſons of Actor and Molione.*] It is commonly believed, with Pauſanias, that they were called Molionides from their mother (1). Homer's ſcholiaſt does not think, that they were called Μολίονε for this reaſon in the 749th verſe of the eleventh book of the Iliad, but ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν μάχην μολύνσεως. He goes upon a principle which Euſtathius enforces on another occaſion; to wit, that Homer deſcribes no body by names borrowed from the mothers.

[*B*] *Some have ſaid, that theſe two brothers came into the world in a ſilver egg.*] See the verſes of Ibicus cited by Athenæus (2), but take notice that Dalechamp's tranſlation is neither free from faults of omiſſion, nor commiſſion. It does not expreſs the τέκνα Μολίονας of the original, and it tranſlates κτανόντα by *interfecerunt*, inſtead of *interfectorem*.

[*C*] *I do not know whether Suidas's two Molons were taken from the Molionides.*] This author having ſaid, that Molon is a proper name, cites a paſſage of Ariſtophanes (3), which ſhews there was an old ſaying, by way of proverb, *As little as Molon.* This might be ſaid by the rule of contraries, or by an irony, as when country people ſay, *As nimble as a cow:* but Suidas takes the thing literally; he ſays theſe words were applied to men of a low ſtature, and that there were two Molons who were jugglers and robbers. Eraſmus (4) has followed Suidas's explication; but he makes him ſay, that one of theſe two Molons was a juggler, and the other a robber. Suidas does not ſay ſo, ; he makes not that diſtinction; and far from favouring Eraſmus's conjecture, which is, that theſe two Molons were of a dwarfiſh ſtature, known to every body, he oppugns it in ſome ſort by the word λωποδύται, which ſignifies thoſe who rob upon the high-way; thoſe who rifle and ſtrip people, which little fellows dare hardly venture on; it is rather the buſineſs of a huge thundring villain. Adrian Junius (5), who underſtood Greek very well, has taken Ariſtophanes's proverb in an ironical ſenſe; ſo that Molon, according to him, is a man of a gigantic ſtature. I believe he has more reaſon on his ſide than Suidas. Mr Hofman (6) ſays, that according to Didymus, there were two Molons, one a juggler of an exceſſive ſtature, the other a pilferer of cloths, *fur veſtiarius*, and a very little fellow.

(1) Καλουμένων ἀπὸ Μολίονης τῆς μητέρος. Pauſan. in Arcad. *pag.* 248.

(2) Athen. *lib. ii, cap. xvi.*

(3) In Ranis, Act. I, Sc. II.

(4) Adag. lvii, Chil. iii, cent. v.

(5) Adag. xxxi, cent. v.

(6) In the firſt volume, *pag.* 1047.

MOLSA (FRANCIS MARIA) one of the good Poets of the XVIth century, was of Modena. His Latin and Italian verſes brought him into ſuch reputation, that if it had been ever ſo little ſeconded by a prudent conduct, he might have riſen to a great fortune; but he behaved himſelf ſo ill, that the patrons of wit could never advance him, how much ſoever diſpoſed in his favour (*a*). He was ſo debauched, that he ſlighted thoſe precautions which are abſolutely neceſſary, in order to avoid the utmoſt contempt [*A*]. He added vileneſs and impudence to his debaucheries, ſo that we need not wonder he died of the Pox (*b*). He had one favourable opportunity of ſhewing he was a good Orator, and that his Proſe was equal to his Poetry. Seeing the Roman people full of indignation againſt Lorenzo de Medicis, who had cut off the heads of ſeveral ancient ſtatues; he charged him with this outrageous act, and thereupon made an oration ſo ſtrong that it filled him with confuſion and deſpair [*B*]. He did not die in the year 1548

(*a*) See the remark [*A*].

(*b*) Ab illa (*Venere*) meritum pudendo contactu miſerabilis morbi quo periret venenum hauſit. *Paul. Jovius, Elog. cap. civ, pag. m.* 244.

[*A*] *He was ſo debauched that he ſlighted thoſe precautions which are abſolutely neceſſary, in order to avoid the utmoſt contempt.*] The prodigious corruption reigning in the world does not hinder people even of little virtue from conceiving a contempt and averſion, for ſuch as obſerve no decency in the purſuit of unlawful pleaſures. Hence Molſa loſt his reputation, and ſtopped the current of his fortune; which would not have happened, if his debaucheries had been managed with more diſcretion. Let us hear Paul Jovius. ‘ Latinis Elegiis, & Etruſcis rythmis pari gratia ludendo ‘ Muſas exercuit: tanta quidem omnium commendatione, ut per triginta annos, qui Romæ Mecœnatis ‘ nomen tulêre, inſigni liberalitate, ſtudioque adjutum ‘ adipiſcendis honoribus efferre contenderint: prægravante ſemper ejus Genio, quum redivivis toties ‘ amoribus occupatus, par ingenio ſtudium ſubſtraheret, neque habitu, vel inceſſu, ullove nobili commercio carminum famam tueretur; fœde prodigus, ‘ honeſtique neſcius pudoris, neglectum rerum omnium ‘ ad innoxiæ libertatis nomen revocabat uſque adeo ‘ ſupine, ut ſummæ laudis, & clarioris fortunæ certiſſimam ſpem facile corruperit (1). - - - *He exerciſed ‘ his muſe with equal grace in Latin elegies and Italian ‘ verſes, and indeed with ſuch applauſe from every ‘ body, that the patrons of wit at Rome for thirty ‘ years endeavoured, by their great liberality and intereſt, to get him advanced. But being always ſwayed ‘ by his natural inclination, he gave himſelf up to unlawful pleaſures, and neglected thoſe ſtudies that were ‘ ſuitable to his genius, and did not maintain the reputation of his poems, either by his habit, gait, or ‘ any creditable company. He was ſhamefully, prodigal ‘ and impudent, and ſo unconcerned about the character ‘ of innocence and decency, that he effectually fruſtated ‘ the certain hopes of a great name and illuſtrious fortune.*’

[*B*] *He made a ſpeech of ſuch energy againſt L. de Medicis, that he filled him with confuſion and deſpair.*] It was believed that Lorenzo de Medicis, was ſo

(1) Paul. Jovius, in Elogiis, *cap. civ, p. m.* 243.

1548 *(c)*, as Thuanus affirms, but in February 1544 [*C*], and left a ſon who was father of

ſtruck at the infamy with which that oration branded him, that to efface it, he reſolved to reſtore the city of Florence to it's liberty, by the aſſaſſination of Alexander de Medicis, his near relation (2). *Sempiternam ingenii laudem retulit* (Molſa) *non à jucundo tantum carmine, quo laſciviſſe videtur, ſed pedeſtri etiam gravique facundia, qua Laurentium Medicem, nefaria libidine antiquis ſtatuis noctu illuſtria capita detrahentem, apud Romanos ab ea injuria dolore percitos accuſavit. Ea enim perſcripta oratione, Laurentium uſque adeo pudore, & metu perennis probri conſternatum ferunt, ut atroci animo, quo inuſtam ignominiæ notam novitate facinoris obſcuraret, interficiendi Principis, amicique ſingularis immane conſilium ſuſceperit ; ſcilicet ut Diis invitis patriæ libertas pararetur* (3).

[*C*] *He did not die in the year* 1548, *as Thuanus affirms, but in February* 1544.] I had for ever, perhaps, been ignorant of this error of Thuanus, if I had not by chance light upon the volume of Luke Contile's letters. In which I met with one to Bernardo Spina, dated from Modena the 14th of February, 1543 (4). Contile there tells him he had ſeen Molſa that morning, and found him ſeized with an incurable diſtemper. It was a dropſy, which had not only ſwelled his legs, as uſual, but his very head. Trifon kept always by his bed-ſide, and diverted the patient the beſt he could. *Sta ſempre al capezzal del letto il buon Trifone, & burla, & giamba co'l Molza, & io me ne piglio ſpaſſo, & perche in ſomma lo tengon per morto, voglio verderne il fine, perche io, come mi rallegrai della ſua vita, voglio dolermi della ſua morte* (5). Theſe Italian words give us to underſtand, that Contile had a mind to ſee his end, which every body judged to be near at hand. Nor were they miſtaken; for we learn by a letter he wrote from Milan the twenty firſt of February, 1543, to Claudio Tolomei, that he had aſſiſted at Molſa's funeral: *Havrete ſaputa la morte dell' unico Molza. io gionſi à tempo di vederlo vivo & mi fu lecito d' accompagnarlo al ſepolcro morto* (6). I did not doubt on reading theſe particulars, that Thuanus had been miſtaken, nevertheleſs I was willing to have good evidence, and therefore addreſſed myſelf to Mr de la Monnoie, who was pleaſed to write me ſeveral particulars concerning Molſa; it will be a ſatiſfaction to my reader to ſee them in this place (7), ‘Molza did not die in 1548, but in 1544. This is proved by three letters of Annibal Caro, his intimate friend; the firſt written from Rome to Molza ſick at Modena, is of the ſecond of January 1544, the ſecond of the eleventh of February the ſame year, being an anſwer to that which it appears Molza had written to him, and the third of the ſixth of March following, in which he ſends an account to Varchi of the death of Molza as a thing that had lately happened: Con le lagrime à gli occhi, *theſe are the words he begins with*, vi dico che'l noſtro da ben Molza è morto, è per lo graviſſimo dolore ch'io ne ſento, non ne poſſo dir altro - - - - - - *With tears in my eyes I acquaint you with the death of our good friend Molza, and becauſe of the exceſſive ſorrow I feel on that account, I can ſay no more*. . . . . This Molza was a man of good natural parts, which he perfected by ſtudy. He added learning to politeneſs, the knowledge of Greek, and as Lilius Gyraldus ſays, of Hebrew too, to that of Latin, and his own tongue. He ſucceeded in proſe, in verſe, in the grave and comic ſtile: ſo that going far beyond the judgment his country-man Sadolet had made of him, that he might excel in any kind of compoſition, which he would apply himſelf entirely to, he excelled in all, without confining himſelf to any one. Father Rapin looks upon him as a pattern of Latin elegy among the Moderns. His character was that of Tibullus, upon which you may ſee Bartholomew Riccius *de imitatione*. His pieces would, perhaps, have been more correct, if death had not prevented him. . . . It is hard to excuſe him with reſpect to his licentious life, without admitting that corrupt morality, upon the principles whereof he perſuaded himſelf, that provided he abſtained from great crimes, ſuch as atheiſm, theft, murder, and all kinds of violence, he might, with an innocent liberty, taſte ſenſual pleaſures. Taking the matter thus, he was purer than ſnow, and no life was more irreproachable than his. He flatters himſelf, that ſome hereafter, taking a thorow view of it, would propoſe it for an example, and that this will be the ſubject of his panegyric:

Tum faciles *memoret mores,* & puriter *acta*
Percurrat vitæ tempora quæque meæ,

ſays he, in that fine elegy he made a few days before his death. His prediction met with a ſpeedy accompliſhment. Paul Panſa, a good Latin Poet, preceptor to the famous John Lewis de Fieſque, gave him ſuch praiſes as he deſired.

Hoc-ne meret *probitas ?* hoc-ne meret *pietas ?*

Is this the reward of probity ?
Is this the reward of piety?

ſays he; and four verſes after,

Quid prodeſt vixiſſe *pium*, aut odiſſe profanum
Vulgus, & à *ſævis* abſtinuiſſe malis ?

What, tho' he pious liv'd, tho' he diſdain'd
Th' ignorant mob, and violence refrain'd.

What is more, Schraderus and Swertius mention a glorious inſcription conſecrated to his memory in the cathedral of Modena in theſe words: Si animarum auctio fieret, Franciſcum Molzam licitarentur Virtutes, Patria, & Catharina ejus uxor, quæ illi & ſibi vivens hoc poſuit - - - - - - *Were there to be an auction of ſouls, the price of Francis Molza would be enhanſed by virtue, his country, and Catharine his wife, who in her life-time erected this monument for him and herſelf*. . . . . Guidiccione, afterwards biſhop of Foſſombrona, has ſpoken no leſs honourably of Molza's virtue. Datemi novelle del Molza, *ſays he in a letter to Tolomei*, ch'io lo deſidero fuor di miſura, cioè ſe egli vuol fare povero il mondo, e ricchi i cieli con la ſua anima, perche intendo che egli è infermo d' una acuta febre. - - - *Send me ſome news about Molza; I deſire extremely to know, whether he will make the world poor, and Heaven rich with his ſoul, for I hear he is ill of an acute fever*. Paul Jovius, who after all blamed him only for not preſerving a decorum, ſhould not have been ignorant, that he, whoſe conduct he cenſured, had been parallelled even for his morals with himſelf, and a great many worthy gentlemen his cotemporaries, by Longolius in his ſecond defence. Quid hic Paulum Jovium commemorem ? Angelum Colotium, Antonium Maroſticum ? Quid Marium Molzam, Hieronymum Nigrum, M. Antonium Flaminium, Georgium Sauromanum, viros tum ab omni elegantiore doctrina inſtructiſſimos, tum ingenua animorum probitate optimos, atque totius vitæ innocentia integerrimos ? - - - *Why ſhould I mention here Paul Jovius? Angelus Colotius, Antonius Maroſticus? Or Marius Molza, Hieronymus Niger, M. Antonius Flaminius, and Georgius Sauromanus, men endued with excellent learning, great uprightneſs of heart, and innocence of life?* Yet Molza was then in the height of his debauchery. He had a miſtreſs named Furnia, whom he paſſionately loved, even to the calling himſelf Furnius, and perhaps it was from her he took the diſeaſe he died of. We have a letter of the ſame Longolius to Furnius Marius Molza, wherein are theſe curious words: Cujus quidem rei me primum ſuis literis certiorem fecit Flavius Chryſolinus, deinde Q. Lælius Maximus, quem Quinti prænomen ſecutum eſſe arbitror, quod Quintiæ alicujus, ut tu Furniæ, conſuetudine iſtic teneatur. - - - - *Whereof Flavius Chryſolinus firſt informed me by his letters, and afterwards Q. Lælius Maximus, which name of Quintus I ſuppoſe he took, becauſe he had a miſtreſs called Quintia, as you have one called Furnia*. She quickly after turned common proſtitute. This is another particular we learn from Longolius. Nam de agreſti illâ, *ſays he, book iv, writing to Flaminius*, in quam ſe abſtruſurum eſſe Furnius Molſa affimaret, ſpeluncâ, factus ſum à Briſſone noſtro certior. Ac de Furnio quidem non valde ſum miratus, vult enim Furniam ſuam imitari, quam ſeſe in recentem iſtum luparum furnum jam abdidiſſe intelligo. - - - - *For as to that wild cave, in which Furnius Molza ſaid he would ſhut himſelf up, I have been in-*

(c) Thuan. *lib. v, circa fin.*

(2) He committed it in the year 1537.

(3) Jovius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 244.

(4) Obſerve, that both here, and in the paſſage of citat. (6), it muſt be 1544, and not 1543: I ſhall take notice below, that perhaps *Contile* followed the date of thoſe who do not begin the year with the month of January. It may be too, that the date of the year was not in the original of this letter, and that having been added when it was printed they put 1543, inſtead of 1544.

(5) Luca Contile, Lettere, *lib. i, fol.* 85, *Edit. of Pavia* 1564, *in 8vo.*

(6) Id. ib. *fol.* 86.

(7) La Monnoie, MS letter.

of an illuſtrious daughter: I ſhall ſpeak of her by and by. Boccalini has highly diverted himſelf at Molſa's coſt [*D*].

I have

formed of it by our friend Briſſon. And indeed I do not much wonder at Furnius, for he has a mind to imitate his Furnia, who I hear is retired to that new cell of whores. At the end of this letter, as he was ready to ſeal it up, he mentions in a poſtſcript the ſurprize he was under at the news of a wound which Molza had received. ‘ His ſcriptis, nec dum datis, accepi à Mariano literas ex quibus cognovi quid Molſæ noſtro iſtic accidiſſet. O caſum acerbum. Ait ille quidem à medicis hominem nondum eſſe deploratum, quanquam ad ſeptum transverſum vulnus pertineat. Verum me ſolicitum habet continens iſta febris, quæ niſi cito diſſolvitur..... Sed non queo plura præ dolore ſcribere. - - - *After I had writ this, but not ſent it, I received a letter from Marianus, by which I underſtand what had happened there to our friend Molza. Oh! ſad misfortune. He ſays, indeed, the Phyſicians are not yet without hopes, tho' the wound reaches to the midriff. But I am in pain about that continual fever, which unleſs it ſoon abates..... But I can ſay no more for grief.* We may ſee alſo a letter which follows this, and an Italian one of Sanga, in a collection of Atanagi, written from Tortoſa, the twenty ſeventh of June, 1522, to John Baptiſt Mentebuona, where this wound is mentioned, and Molza is ſaid to be diſguſted with his Furnia. It is eaſy to gueſs at the reaſon, from the paſſage I have cited out of Longolius's letter to Flaminius. Che non crederò io horamai, *ſays Sanga*, poiche il Molza ha ſoſtenuto di mutare amore, e laſciare quella, quella tanto unica S. Furnia, e laſciarſi cadere in amore, dove havra men bella materia di ſcrivere? In un tempo medeſimo ho inteſo che fù ferito, e che era ſenza pericolo; poiche così è, manco me ne duole. Pregovi vendendolo che mi raccomandiate a lui, & al reſto della compagnia beſtiale, e benche ſia il fior d' eſſa, pur ſeparatamente mi raccomandarete al divino, diviniſſimo M. Gabriello, &c. - - - - *What ſhall I not believe hereafter, ſince Molza could bear to change his love, to forſake that ſo much beloved Furnia, and to ſuffer himſelf to fall again into love, whereby he will have leſs occaſion to write? At the ſame time I heard he was wounded, and that he was out of danger; and as it is ſo, I am the leſs concerned about it. I beg of you, when you ſee him, to recommend me to him, and the reſt of the* campagnia beſtiale, *and tho' he be the flower of it, yet particularly recommend me to the divine, the moſt divine, Gabriello,* &c. Hence it appears, that there was then at Rome an academy of wits under the name of *compagnia beſtiale*, becauſe of the indolence and ſupineneſs in which they profeſſed to live. I have not as yet been able preciſely to determine at what age Molza died. I only conclude he was not far advanced in years, from theſe verſes of the fine elegy I have cited:

Hic jacet ante annos crudeli tabe peremptus
  Molſa: ter injecto pulvere paſtor abi.

Here Molſa lies, before his time cut off
By dire conſumption: paſtor, do thy charge,
Three times throw in the duſt, and then be gone.

‘ And upon himſelf towards the end:

Ante diem Elyſios cogor cognoſcere campos.

Th' Elyſian fields too ſoon I'm forc'd to know.

‘ This is alſo the ſenſe of that fine place of Paul Panſa, in his elegy on the death of this famous man,

Cur Atropos auſa es
Pendula adhuc tereti rumpere penſa colo?

Atrophos, why durſt thou cut
His thread of life, before it was ſpun out.

I thought I ſhould have found a great many particulars concerning our Molſa in the *Iſtoria della volgar Poëſia*, lately publiſhed by the abbot Giovanni Mario de Creſcimbeni; but I have only found (8) that this Poet lived after the year 1540, and died pretty old at the court of cardinal Farneſe. This is indefinite, and not conſonant to Contile, an eye-witneſs, who ſays he died at Modena, in February 1544. I know, indeed, that his letter is dated in 1543, but this muſt be ſuppoſed according to their calculation, who begin the year at March, or Eaſter; for otherwiſe there would be a miſtake in the date. See Mr de la Monnoie's proofs, and add to them this paſſage of a letter, which was written from Rome the fifteenth of January 1544, to Trifon Benzio (9). ‘ Raccomandatemi, vi prego, caldamente al Molſa e datemi auviſo de la ſanità ſua, perch'a giorni paſſati n'havevo udite diſpiacevoli nuove (10). - - - *Pray, recommend me heartily to Molſa, and ſend me an account of his health, becauſe theſe days paſt I have heard diſagreeable news of him.*' They are Claudio Tolomei's words. He had written the eleventh of December, 1543, a letter to the ſaid Trifon, deſiring him to give his ſervice to Molſa (11), and to make a ſonnet, or epigram, on the death of a certain illuſtrious lady (12). I obſerve this by the way, to let my readers know that Trifon was a Poet.

[*D*] *Boccalini has highly diverted himſelf at Molſa's coſt.*] He introduces Chriſtopher Columbus, Fernand Cortez, Magellanus, Vaſco de Gama, Americus Veſpuſius, *&c.* petitioning Apollo, that, in conſideration of their diſcovery of a new world, the great advantages of which they ſet off, their memory might be conſecrated to immortality, by monuments proportioned to their ſervices. The chancellor of Parnaſſus was already minuting the decree, when Molſa ſtood up to oppoſe their requeſt. His head was quite bald, his chin without one hair, his noſe rotten, and his face covered all over with ſcabs and plaiſters. See here cryed he, ſhewing his wounds, theſe are the jewels and fine preſents which theſe gentlemen have brought us from their new world; they have brought us a curſed diſeaſe unknown to our anceſtors (13), contagious, ſcandalous (14), fatal to procreation; the damned Neapolitan diſeaſe, the effects of which you ſee upon my face, and with which my whole body is overrun. Upon this he turns to Chriſtopher Columbus, and begins to unbotton his breeches; but the Muſes who feared, that an object ſo foul ſhould defile the purity of their eyes, got an order of court, forbidding him to produce any farther proofs. He ſtopt his hand, but went on with his ſpeech, declaiming with ſuch vehemence againſt the miſchiefs the diſcovery of the new world had brought along with it, that Apollo told the petitioners, they would do well to withdraw immediately with their ſilver, and gold, and pox: *Comparue Mario Molza, Poeta di molto grido, ma per non haver nel capo, e nella barba pelo alcuno fatto molto diforme oltre che piu moſtruoſo lo rendeva l'eſſer ſenza il naſo, pieno di Gomme, e di Croſte, e di doglie, il quale col dito moſtrando le ſue piaghe, con alta voce, queſte diſſe (ô Sire) che qui vedete nella mia faccia ſono i nuovi Mondi, i nuovi riti, & i nuovi coſtumi de gl' Indiani . . . . Con queſte gioie, delle quali tutta mi videte bollata la faccia, & impiagata la perſona queſti temerarii, hanno abbellito, & arrichito il Mondo; con queſte croſte, e con queſte eterne, e crudeliſſime doglie ch'ho per tutta la vita; queſti implacabili nemici del genere humano, hanno corrotta la ſteſſa humana generatione. Poi voltatoſi il Molza verſo il Colombo cominciò a ſciorſi le brache, quando le Sereniſſime Muſe, per non contaminare con la viſta di qualche coſa oſcena, i puriſſimi occhi loro, a i Lettori commendarano, ch' gli foſſe impedito* (15).

There are a great many who comparing this chapter of Boccalini with a ſcene of Moliere's Precieuſes, would make no ſcruple to affirm, that our Comedian had pirated the Italian author; but I am far from any ſuch thought. Moliere's own genius could eaſily furniſh him with ſuch an incident; a thouſand meaner wits than he might have hit upon it. The ſcene is this; Jodelet and Maſcarille reckon up their pretended notable exploits, before the two Precieuſes. The firſt ſpeaks thus (16): ‘ In good faith I have reaſon to remember it: I was wounded there in the thigh with a hand granado, the marks of which I ſtill retain, feel a little, pray Madam, feel what a bang it was.

CATHOS.

---

(8) At *pag.* 106.

(9) We have ſeen above, citat. (5), that he ſat by the patient to divert him.

(10) Lettere di M. Claudio Tolomei, *libro terzo, fol.* 114, *Edit. of Venice* 1553.

(11) Ib. *fol.* 93.

(12) E morta la Mancina eſſempio e idolo raro d'honeſta & di bellezza ...... eſſendo ella morta per cagion di parto, dite, &c. - - - *Mancina is dead, a rare example of chaſtity and beauty... She dying in child-bed, tell, &c.* Ibid.

(13) Ignote à tutta la Medicina, e à tutta la Chirurgia paſſata. - - - *Hitherto unknown to Phyſic and Surgery.* Boccalin, Ragguagli di Parnaſſo, *centur. ii, cap. xc, pag. m.* 272.

(14) Appeſtare il genere humano di un morbo tanto contagioſo, coſi crudele, e vergognoſo, che gran diſputa è tra i dotti s'egli piu deturpi il corpo, ò ſvergogni la riputatione. - - - - *To infect mankind with a diſtemper ſo contagious, ſo cruel and ſhameful, that it is a great queſtion among the learned, whether it more defiles the body, or ſullies the reputation.* Ibid. *pag.* 271.

(15) Ibid. *pag.* 271, 272.

(16) In the eleventh Scene of the *Precieuſes Ridicules.*

I have ſeen letters of his (*d*), in which he complains ſadly of his poverty, and the avarice of Pope Paul III. His Latin pieces came out under the name of *Franciſcus Marius Molza*; for he thought that the feminine *Maria*, made *maſculine* by the *Tuſcans*, would hardly ſuit with the Latin tongue (*e*). His *Capitolo in lode de' Fichi*, went under the name *del P. Siceo*, and was honoured with a commentary by *Ser Agreſto*; that is to ſay, by *Annibal Caro*. This commentary was printed in 4to in the year 1539 (*f*) [*E*]. Molſa took the ſirname of Furnius, from a miſtreſs of his named Furnia. She afterwards turned courtezan. See the remark [*C*], where you will find ſome further encomiums beſtowed upon this author, with ſeveral other particulars. It was ſaid of him, among other

(*d*) They were written in the year 1538, and are printed with thoſe of cardinal Sadolet, *lib. xvi, pag.* 643, and the following, of the Lyons edition of 1554.

(*e*) Giovanni Mario de Creſcimbeni, iſtoria della volgar poëſia, *pag.* 106.

(*f*) *Ex eodem, ibid. pag.* 328. We ſhall ſee below, that the Printer of the edition of 1584, ſays, that the firſt edition is of the year 1538.

‘ CATHOS. A great gaſh indeed. MASCARILLE. Lend your hand here, Madam, and feel a little here, Madam, juſt in the pole of my neck. Do you feel? MAGDELON. Yes, I feel ſomething. MASCAR. It is a muſket ball I received the laſt campagne I made. JODELET. Here was a ſhot which went quite through me at the attack of Graveling. MASCAR. *(laying his hand on the button of his breeches)* I will ſhew you a terrible wound. MAGDEL. You may ſpare your ſelf the trouble, we will believe without ſeeing it. MASCAR. Theſe are honourable badges, which ſhew what a man is. CATH. We do not doubt what you are.’

Boccalin has not ſaid without ſome ſecret meaning, that Molza died by eating too many figs (17); for we muſt know this Poet had writ ſome verſes on this fruit, with alluſion to the nameleſs parts. Theſe verſes are at leaſt as obſcene as thoſe of John de la Caza, which have made the Proteſtants exclaim ſo much; but as Molza was never made a judge of the Inquiſition, nor enjoyed any Eccleſiaſtical preferments, his impurities have not been objected to the Romiſh communion. ‘ It is certain if the employments which Monſeigneur de la Caza's merit procured him, had not obliged him, in quality of nuncio, to proſecute ſome perſons of his time, who prevaricated in religion, his Capitolo would no more have been taken notice of, than thoſe of Bernia, of Mauro, and Molza, which are no leſs licentious; and which the ſole good fortune of having been written by authors of no conſequence has ſaved from the cenſure of the Proteſtants.’ This is what Mr de la Monnoie wrote to the abbot Nicaize, and which was communicated to Mr Menage (18). Note, that the book in which Voëtius met, with the *Capitolo del forno*, that is John de la Caſa's verſes, which have made him reckoned as a panegyriſt on Sodomy, is a collection of obſcence pieces, compoſed by ſeveral Poets, and particularly by our Molza. This appears by the title. *Il primo libro dell' opere burleſche di M. Franceſco Berni, di M. Gio della Caſa, del Varchi, del Mauro, di M. Bino, del Molza, del Dolce, e del Firenzuola* (19). This book was printed at Florence by Bernard Junta, in the year 1548. Voëtius lodged his copy in the library of Utrecht, as in a place of ſafety (20); but his precautions were uſeleſs: this book diſappeared, and it is not doubted, but the French took it out of this library, whilſt they were maſters of Utrecht in the year 1672, and 1673 (21). This by the by. I have occaſion for another paſſage of Mr Menage. The *Capitoli in terza rima*, ſays he (22), *upon innocent ſubjects, but which had relation to things diſhoneſt, were very much in vogue at that time; as appears by Mauro's* Capitolo della Fava, *and by Molza's* Capitolo delle Fiche, *famous for the Commentary of Ser Agreſto, that is Annibal Caro.* Let us ſee Boccalin's judgment upon the *Capitolo's*, *della Fava* and *delle Fiche*. He introduces the famous Laura Terracina, who being taken into a ſacred college of the Poets, and deſiring to chuſe either Molza or Mauro for her huſband, examined the figs of the former, and the bean of the latter, and determined for the bean; finding it much more luſcious and juicy than the figs. *Volle prima, che amendue le moſtraſſero le Poeſie loro, le quali dapoi, che con eſſatiſſima diligenza piu volte ella hebbe rilette, e ben conſiderate, tralaſciate le Fiche del Molza, come contate con ſtile enervato, e molto languido, ſi attaco alla Fava del Mauro, nella quale le parue di trovar maggior ſucco di concetti, e che quell' argomento foſſe diſteſo con piu ſodezza di verſo* (23). I do not believe Boccalin deſigned by this to give us a favourable idea of Laura's chaſtity.

[*E*] *This Commentary was printed in 4to in the year* 1539.] It was reprinted in 8vo, in 1584, to ſerve as a companion to Aretin's *Raggionamenti*; and by this you may judge of the quality of the book. The intire title of it is: *Commento di Ser Agreſto da Ficarvolo, ſopra la prima Ficata del Padre Siceo. Con la diceria de Naſi.* The Printer taking the title of Barbagrigia's heir, promiſes himſelf that this new edition would be no leſs agreeable, than that of the year 1538, which was the firſt, and declares he gives it to perform a promiſe he had made a little before, when he publiſhed Aretin's *Raggionamenti*. *Ecco (Amorevole Leggitore) che io non mi domentico punto della promeſſa che ti feci a meſi paſſati, quando per mezza della ſtampa mia ti preſentai i Ragionamenti di Pietro Aretino, concioſia coſa che da quella moſſo, hoggi io mi ſia riſoluto di preſentarti anchora il piacevole, & ſottil Commento del valente Ser Agreſto da Ficarvolo, ſopra la prima ficata del Padre Siceo, il quale mi giova di credere, che non ti debba eſſer punto hoggi men caro di quello che egli ti foſſe l'anno* 1538 *quando, dalla felice memoria del mio babbo, ti fu preſentato la prima fiata, ne (credo) che ti debba eſſer men caro, che ti ſieno ſtati i prenomati Ragionamenti.* The Printer of the firſt edition called himſelf Barbagrigia, and addreſſed his preface jointly to the author Molſa, and the commentator Annibal Caro, telling them, that, in compariſon of many Greek, Latin, and Italian pieces, their work might be reckoned very modeſt, ſince their obſcenities were not barefaced, but veiled from head to foot, and that after all, they had done prudently, to deliver themſelves of them upon paper; for if they had kept them in, they might have diſordered their heads, or at leaſt have corrupted their chaſtity, it being almoſt neceſſary that what a man does not ſay he muſt do. *Quanto alla laſcivia . . . Meſſer Lodovico Fabbro da Fano, che, m'è . . . . conſiglier dell'opere, che io ſtampo: mi dice, che gli hanno pur tanto di gentilezza, & di modeſtia: che dove quelli de gli altri in queſto genere, tanto de' Greci, quanto de' Latini, & de' Volgari, vanno la piu parte ignudi, & ſenza brache: eſſi vanno tutti veſtiti, & con le mutande. Et quello, che piu importa, è, che eglino non vi ſtanno piu in corpo. che coſi: oltre al pericolo detto di ſopra di farvi impazzare: potrebono al meno far divenir laſcivi, & ſcorretti voi quali eſſi ſono. Sendo quaſi forza, che quello, che non ſi dice, ſi faccia.* The commentator has begun with a prologue worthy of the piece. He repreſents in it, firſt, that the author of the *Ficheide*, or *Ficheido*, having taken figs for his ſubject, aſcribe to them both ſexes, and promiſcuouſly uſes the litteral, and the allegorical ſenſe. *Baſtivi per hora di ſapere, che'l Poeta, non ſenza miſterio li battezza hermafroditi: & che per tutta l'opera troverete, che hanno confuſamente due ſeſſi, & dui ſenſi, & di queſti uno è ſecondo la lettera, l'altro ſecondo il miſterio, come di ſotto vedrete* (24). II. That he is a very competent judge in this matter, that he has ſpent more time in examining it, than Endymion in contemplating the motions of the moon, and that if he has not been able to go to the bottom of it, he has gone farther than all before him. ‘ Ma per monſtrare quanto ſia competente giudice in queſta cauſa (come dicono i Legiſti) mi par ſolamente da dirvi: che egli, oltre all'eſſer gran Poeta, e grandiſſimo Filoſofo naturale: & ha ſpeſo piu tempo a inveſtigare i ſegreti della Natura Ficale, che Endimione à ſpeculare i moti della Luna. Et ſe quello ne fu tenuto dalla Luna per innamorato: queſto n'è ſtato chiamato dal mondo per padre: come ſe ognuno li foſſe figlivolo. Et come Alberto fu detto Magno per havere ſcoperti i ſegreti delle donne: eſſo è cognominato Divino, & Perfetto, per haver rivelati i ſegreti de' Fichi. Et con tutto, che di

‘ ſotti

(17) All' hora che Mario Molza per lo ſoverchio uſo de fichi paſsò all' altra vita. *Raguag. xxxiii, centur. i, pag. m.* 90.

(18) *See the* Anti-Baillet, *cap. cxx.*

(19) See the Theological Diſputations of Giſbert Voëtius, *Tom. i, pag.* 205.

(20) Exemplar illud intuli in Bibliothecam publicam, ut ſub publica cuſtodia perpetuum Sanctitatis Romanæ monimentum exſtaret, & perfracte negantibus oſtendi poſſet. - - - - *I put that copy into the public library, that there might be in the cuſtody of the public a monument of the Romiſh ſanctity, which might be ſhewn to thoſe that obſtinately denied it.* Voët. ibid.

(21) *See* Lomeyer, de Bibliothecis, *cap. x, pag.* 300.

(22) Anti-Baillet, *cap. cxix.*

(23) Boccalin, *Raguag. xxxv, centur. ii, pag.* 130.

(24) Proemio del Commentatore, *pag.* 10.

other things, that he died ſo much like a Chriſtian, that it could not be douted but his ſoul went directly to Heaven [*F*].

‘ ſotti confeſſi di non haverne tocco anchor fundo, ſi vede pure, che s'è diſteſe piu a dentro, che neſſun' altro (25). - - - - *But to ſhew what a competent judge he is in this cauſe (as the Lawyers ſay) I ſhall only tell you, that beſides being a great Poet, he was a very great Natural Philoſopher, and ſpent more time in ſearching out ſecrets of the nature of figs, than Endymion in obſerving the motions of the moon. And if the latter was therefore looked upon by the moon to be a lover: the former was called by the world father, as if every one had been his ſon. And as Albertus was named Magnus, for having diſcovered the ſecrets of the women, he was called* divino *and* perfecto, *for having revealed the ſecrets of figs: and it muſt be confeſſed that he has gone further than any body elſe.*’ I mention theſe particulars only to ſhew what judgment was made of Molza. We may further infer from them that there reigned a great licentiouſneſs among the Italian Poets of that age. They vyed with one another in exerciſing their wits on ſubjects which bore a double meaning; Mr Menage might have added the famous Bembo to the examples he has cited (26), who choſe an herb for his ſubject, the very name of which diſcovered the drift and deſign of his poem. I will explain my ſelf in the words of another writer. *There was one Petrus Matthæus, a doctor of both laws, who, in the year* 1587, *made a collection of ſeveral Latin poems of the Italian Poets .... Amongſt theſe fineſt pieces were the moſt obſcene; Bembo's Priapus, where he exerciſes all his wit, ſpeaking of the herb which is called in Latin* Mentha *(mint) upon the affinity between this word and the Latin Mentula; and alſo the Siphilis of Fracaſtor, in which he deſcribes the origine and progreſs of the pox, &c* (27).

[*F*] *It was ſaid .... it could not be doubted but that his ſoul went directly to Heaven.*] Contile makes uſe of this among other reaſons, to comfort thoſe who were afflicted at the death of this fine wit. He had firſt alledged the reaſons, why they ought to lament him, and afterwards turns the tables thus: ‘ Debbano adunque i ſuoi parenti e amici piangerlo con dolore intenſo. Non debbano poi dolerſene, perche hanno conoſciuto, che quella era la ſua hora nella quale moſtro tanto zelo chriſtiano, che dicono à viva voce eſſer lui ſalito in cielo. era la ſua hora parimenti inquanto alla età, la quale ſtanca di queſta vita, hà moſtro il ſuo determinato fine, fuggendo il pericolo delle morti ſubbitane, le quali ſuccedono quaſi ſempre à quella età. So che voi in prima fronte vi dorrete di quello honorato amico, dipoi non vi dorrete, ma reſtarete contento di quel fine, che certifica la ſalute di quell' anima, che in queſta vita valſe tanto (28). - - - *His relations and friends ought therefore to lament him with great ſorrow. They ought not afterwards to be grieved at it, becauſe they knew what his latter end was, in which he ſhewed ſo much Chriſtian zeal, that they ſay he went directly to Heaven. His laſt hour was ſuitable to his age, which being weary of this world ſhewed his end to be determined, ſhunning the danger of ſudden deaths, which commonly ſucceed that age. Tho' at firſt you will lament this honoured friend, afterwards you will not lament, but remain ſatisfied with that end, which certifies the ſalvation of his ſoul, which was of ſuch value in this life.*’ To conſider this man's morals, one would think he needed ſeveral years ſtay in Purgatory, notwithſtanding the good diſpoſitions he ſhewed at his death.

(25) Ibid.

(26) Above, citation (22).

(27) Paſquier, Catechiſm of the Jeſuites, *lib. iii, cap. ix, pag. m.* 378.

(28) Luca Contile, Lettere, *lib. i, fol.* 86 *verſo.*

MOLSA (TARQUINIA)

MOLSA (TARQUINIA) grand-daughter to the preceding, was one of the moſt eminent ladies of her age. Her wit and learning, joined to the gracefulneſs of her perſon, were ſupported by an uncommon virtue [*A*]. Having loſt her huſband, without having had any children (*a*), ſhe never would marry a ſecond, tho' ſhe was ſtill very young. The ſorrow ſhe expreſſed for him did juſtly found a parallel between her and Artemiſia [*B*]. Her father finding that ſhe was born with a talent for the ſciences, cauſed her to be inſtructed by the beſt maſters that could be found [*C*]. She was in great

(*a*) Hilarion de Coſte, Elog. des Dames illuſtres, *Tom. ii, pag.* 800. *He tranſlates the Elogy of this lady compoſed by Peter Paul de Ribera.*

[*A*] *Her wit and learning, joined to the gracefulneſs of her perſon, were ſupported by an uncommon virtue.*] Francis Patricius, one of the learnedeſt perſons of that time, is my authority; here is what he ſays in one of his letters to her, after having ſpecified the things ſhe underſtood. ‘ His tot tantiſque ingenii ornamentis comites ſeſe addiderunt nobilitas generis, pulchritudo eximia, mores animi inſignes, pudicitia ſingularis (1). - - - - *Beſides ſo many and ſo great ornaments of the mind, ſhe was of an antient family, of ſingular beauty, of an excellent temper, and uncommon virtue.*’ A canon of Lateran has drawn out this elogy to a greater length. *She was naturally agreeable*, ſays he (2), *and exceeding beautiful, ſo that when ſhe was ſomewhat advanced in years, her face, her genteel manner, and graceful behaviour, confirmed the ſaying of Euripides, that not only the ſpring, but alſo the autumn of true beauties is agreeable: and yet the perfections of her mind did very much ſurpaſs thoſe of her body, having equalled the moſt eminent perſons in virtue and learning. Nor has ſhe come behind any of her ſex in chaſtity and modeſty, virtues ſhe always made profeſſion of, with ſo much the more glory and advantage, as ſhe was honoured with the viſits of the moſt accompliſhed perſons of ſeveral countries* (3), *who hearing of her rare virtues and endowments, had a mind to ſatisfy their curioſity, and came from far to ſee and diſcourſe her, as the wonder of her age. This kind of vanity, which ſo eaſily intoxicates the minds of the female ſex, had never been able to affect her's; on the contrary, ſhe ſhunned, with great prudence and modeſty, all occaſions which might betray her into a reliſh of it, preferring a retired life to the condition her extraordinary qualities might have raiſed her to; the temper ſhe had happily found, ſavoured neither of confidence of her ſelf, nor contempt of others.* Theſe are the words of the Minime Hilarion de Coſte, tranſlated from the Italian of a canon of Lateran. Add to them a citation which I am juſt going to give from the ſame Monk.

[*B*] *She deſerved to be compared with Artemiſia.*] This I ſay of her upon the authority of a great Philoſopher: ‘ Proh dolor! *ſays he* (4), poſtquam maritus tuus Paulus Porrinus, virorum optimus ad ſuperos migravit, Muſas omnis ac Gratias, luctu ac tenebris obduxiſti. Artemiſiam alteram te factam dolemus. Fuit quidem ille tibi maritus incomparabilis. Sed & tu uxor illi incomparibilis & admiranda. Da locum prudentiæ, ac fortitudini tuæ, da finem lachrymis - - - - - *Alas! when your huſband, Paulus Porrinus, the beſt of men, departed this life, you overwhelmed all the Muſes and Graces with ſorrow and darkneſs. We lament you, as another Artemiſia. He indeed was an incomparable huſband to you. But you was likewiſe an admirable and incomparable wife to him. Give place to your prudence and fortitude, and put an end to your tears.*’ The Epiſtle Dedicatory from whence I have taken theſe words has no date; but the book, in which it is found, was printed at Baſil, in the year 1581.

[*C*] *Her father .... cauſed her to be inſtructed by the beſt maſters that could be found.*] ‘ (5) Camillus Molza, Knight of the order of St James of Spain, and ſon to the great Francis Maria Molza of Modena, an Orator, and an excellent Latin and Italian Poet .... obſerving from her youth the force and excellency of her genius ſent her with her brothers to learn the rudiments of Grammar. John Politiano, a native of Modena, admirably ſkilled in all the ſciences, a man of great virtue and piety, was her maſter. She learned the *Belles Lettres*, as alſo to write well, and compoſe correctly, under the care of Lazaro Labadini, a famous Grammarian of thoſe times, which ſhe elegantly reduced to practice in her compoſitions in proſe, and Latin verſe. She acquired great knowledge in Ariſtotles Rhetoric, under Camillo Corcapani. The

(1) Franciſcus Patricius, in Epiſt. Dedicat. tertii Tomi Diſcuſſionum Peripateticarum.

(2) Peter Paul de Ribera, ubi infra, *citat.* (7), *according to the verſion of* Hilarion de Coſte, Elog. des Dames Illuſtres, *Tom. ii, pag.* 800.

(3) *Let us confirm this by the words of* Francis Patricius, *ubi ſupra.* Elegantes ac docti viri quique non cives tantum tui, ſed quotquot Italia, quotquot Europa protulit, Mutinam viſunt, ut te Mutinæ viſant, ut mirentur, ut colant, cerebrum Jovis pene ſupremi alteram Minervam. - - - - *Polite and learned men, not only of your own country, but throughout all Italy and Europe, come to Modena to ſee you, to admire and adore another Minerva the offſpring of Jupiter's brain.*

(4) Francis Patricius, ibid.

(5) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 799, 800, *& ſeq.*

great eſteem at the court of the duke of Ferrara: In a word, her merit was ſo illuſtrious, that the city of Rome preſented her with a privilege, of which there never had been a precedent, to wit, that of the freedom of the city of Rome [*D*]. You will find theſe things in the remarks.

‘The Mathematician Antony Guarini, taught her the doctrine of the Sphere. She learnt the art of Poetry under Francis Patricio a famous Philoſopher; Logic, and all the parts of Philoſophy, under P. Latoni, as alſo the entire and perfect knowlege of the Greek tongue. Rabbi Abraham taught her the principles of the Hebrew tongue: this Rabbi's grandfather had been a Hebrew maſter to her grandfather, the Great Molza, ſo that by her own induſtry, and the inclination to ſtudy, which theſe great men obſerved in her, ſhe made ſo extraordinary a progreſs, that the ſubtleſt queſtions in Divinity were no difficulty at all to her. John Maria Barbier, a man of great learning and judgment, perfected her in the purity of the Tuſcan tongue; ſhe compoſed not only ſeveral fluent and elegant Poems in it, but alſo ſeveral letters, and other works eſteemed by the politeſt and and moſt learned men of Italy. She has mixed abundance of tranſlations from books, Greek and Latin, with her own productions, and has ſo happily and ſo properly expreſſed the thoughts of her authors, that her readers have doubted whether ſhe had not a more perfect knowledge of thoſe tongues than of her own. She began to learn Muſic to entertain and unbend her mind from her more ſerious ſtudies; ſo that ſhe excelled by far all the ladies, who had ſung with the greateſt applauſe, and raviſhed all their hearers. The way of managing her voice, which ſhe had acquired by the true rules of good books and of the beſt maſters, many of which had the laudable ambition to ſhow her ſomething curious in that art, was admirable. Amongſt others of theſe maſters were Giaches d'Uuerto, Luſaſco Luſachi, and Horatio called *of the Violin*, on which inſtrument, as well as on the Lute, Tarquinia uſed to play a part, joining another with her own voice, and that with ſo much art and ſkill, that nothing ſeemed to be wanting, ſo ſo that Alphonſo II, duke of Ferrara (6), a moſt judicious prince, and who had an extreme paſſion for all fine and good accompliſhments, was raviſhed with admiration, finding more perfections in this lady, than had been reported of her. A little after ſhe inſtituted that famous Concert of Ladies which has done her ſo much honour, and who after her huſband's death, always invited her to their company, that by her preſence ſhe might perfect the choir of Muſic, which ſhe had ſo happily begun.’ Theſe words of Hilarian de Coſte, are tranſlated from the Italian of a regular Canon of St John of Lateran (7). He does not clearly enough ſignify what Patricius taught this lady: and therefore I rectify his narration by the words of Patricius himſelf, who tells us he taught her the Greek tongue, and read Plato to her. All he has ſaid in praiſe of Tarquinia, with reſpect to her learning is worth relating, and may ſerve for a Supplement to Ribera's narration. ‘Non tu, *ſays he* (8), ut aliæ ſolent, ſummis labris libros attigiſti. Tu non modo Hetruſcam politiſſimam linguam, ſed Latinam, ſed Græcam, optime calles. Tu in hac non modo Hiſtoricos atque oratores, ſed & Philoſophos, ſed & Platonem ipſum, Jovis eloquium æmulantem, ſed & Poetas quoſlibet, ſed & Pindarum, ſine hæſitatione ulla & legis & intelligis. Hanc tu, quod omnium hominum admirationem vincat, in Platone, tribus menſibus me prælegente edidiciſti. Tu in Latina omnium generum carmina pangis, in Hetruſca poemata condis, quam ſalita, Jupiter, atque arguta! Tu logicas omnes ſpinas demetiſti. Tu moralem Philoſophiam, Plutarchicam, Ariſtotelicam, Platonicamque ebibiſti. Tu magnos profectus in Phyſiologia feceſti. Tu Theologiam catholicam, toto pectore hauſiſti. Quid Muſicen omnis generis referam? In qua te omnis non modo Muſicorum, ſed & Muſaram chorus & admiratur, & ſtupet. Te ne virorum quidem ullus in muſica præſtantiſſimorum, non modo non ſuperat, ſed nec adæquat. Cum ad hendecachordum canis cum acutam gravemque eodem utramque tempore, alteram ad lyram pulſas, alteram cantas, Gratiæ te omnes ornant, circumſtant, ſtupeſcuntque. Quas utinam poſſem ita exprimere, ut qui hæc legeret, te audire putaret. Sed Dii boni, quæ eloquentia? quæ argutiæ? qui ſales? quæ jucunditas in converſando? quæ humanitas? quæ urbanitas? Longe meritò judiciociſſimus Benedictus Manzolius civis tuus, & Epiſcopus Regienſis te, non ſolum patri tuo Camillo viro eloquentiſſimo, ſed etiam avo tuo, viro uſquequaque magno Franciſco Mario Molziæ audet præferra. - - - - - *You have not ſuperficially read books as other ladies uſe to do. You have not only a perfect knowlege of the Tuſcan tongue in its greateſt purity, but likewiſe of the Latin and Greek. In the laſt of which you can read and underſtand not only Hiſtorians and Orators, but alſo Philoſophers and Plato himſelf, Jove's rival in eloquence, and likewiſe the Poets of any kind, even Pindar, and that without any difficulty. And what ſurpaſſes the admiration of all, you learned this language by my reading Plato to you, in three months time. In Latin you compoſe verſes of all ſorts, and in Tuſcan you write Poems, good God! how full of wit and ingenuity! You can ſolve all the difficulties in Logic. You are a perfect miſtreſs of the Ethics of Plutarch, Ariſtotle, and Plato. You have made vaſt proficiency in Phyſics, and have wholly exhauſted Catholic Divinity. What need I mention Muſic of every kind? In regard to which, the whole band, not only of Muſicians but likewiſe of the Muſes, look on you with admiration and aſtoniſhment. The moſt skillful man in Muſick is ſo far from excelling, that he does not ſo much as equal you. When you ſing to the Lute, when you perform Baſs and Tenor at the ſame time, the one on the Lyre and the other with your voice; all the Graces adorn, ſurround, and admire you. Which I wiſh I were able ſo to expreſs, that thoſe who read this might imagine they heard you. But, Lord! what wit, what ſpirit, what agreeableneſs in converſation, what ſweetneſs of temper, what politeneſs of behaviour? The moſt judicious Benedictus Manzolus your countryman, and Biſhop of Reggio, very juſtly prefers you, not only to your moſt eloquent father Camillus, but alſo to your grandfather Francis Marius Molza, a great man in every reſpect.*’

[*D*] *The city of Rome preſented her . . . . . with the Roman freedom.*] ‘(9) All the world has given an univerſal applauſe to her merit, but particularly the ſenate and people of Rome, by an authentic teſtimonial and acknowledgment, having in a decree of the ſenate, (wherein mention is made of all her qualities and perfections) honoured her with the title of *Only Perſon*, giving her the privilege of a a Roman citizen, and for her ſake to all the family of Molza, as you will ſee by the words of the grant or patent . . . . . . Quod Fabius Matheus Franciſcus Soricius Equ. Dominicus Coccia Conſ. de Tarquinia Molſa Mutinenſe Camilli filia Civitate Romana donanda ad Senatum retulere S. P. Q. R. de ea re ita fieri cenſuit. Etſi novum atque inuſitatum eſt in civium numerum à Senatu fœminas cooptari, quarum virtus, ac fama domeſticorum parietum finibus contineri cum debeat, raro publicis in negotiis uſui Reipublicæ eſſe ſolet; tamen ſi aliqua inter eas unquam extiterit, quæ non ſolum ceteras ordinis, ſed viros etiam virtutibus pene omnibus ſupergrediatur, æquum eſt, ut novo exemplo, noviſque inuſitatiſque meritis, novi itidem honores inuſitatique perſolvantur. Cum itaque Tarquinia Molza Mutinæ antiquiſſima ac florentiſſimi Populi Romania Colonia, Camillo Patre in equitum ordinem D Jacobi ab Hiſpaniæ Regibus, inſtitutum, ob merita ac nobilitatem adjecto genita, celebres illas Romanas Heroinas æmuletur, virtutibuſque exprimat, ut ei nihil præter patriam Romanam deeſſe videatur, ne hoc unum ad abſolutam ejus gloriam deſiderari poſſit, Senatus Populuſque Romanus Civitate donandum cenſuit, *&c.* - - - - - *As Fabius Matheus Franciſcus Soricius, knight, and Dominicus Coccia, conſul, have propoſed to the ſenate to grant the freedom of the city of Rome to Tarquinia Molſa, of Modena, the daughter of Camillus. The ſenate and people of Rome have thus decreed. Though it be new and uncommon for the ſenate to admit women into the number of citizens, whoſe excellencies and fame, as they ought to be confined to family affairs, are ſeldom of ſervice to the Common-wealth in public matters; yet if there be any among them that not only ſurpaſſes the reſt of her own ſex, but even men in almoſt all virtues, it is reaſonable that by a new example, new and unuſual honours ſhould be paid to new and unuſual merit. Since therefore Tarquinia Molza, a native of Modena, a moſt ancient*

(6) *Confirm this by theſe words of Patricius, ubi ſupra, citat.* (3). Quanti te ſereniſſimus Alphonſus Ateſtinus II Princeps noſter? Quanti te principes mulieres Lucretia atque Leonora, ſorores ejus faciunt? - - - *How much does his moſt ſerene highneſs Alphonſus of Eſte II our prince? How much do the princeſſes Lucretia, and Leonora his ſiſters, eſteem you?*

(7) *Called* Peter Paul de Ribera de Valencia. *He has written the Elogy of our Tarquinia in the fourteenth book of a work intituled,* Le Glorie immortali de' Triomfi, & Heroiche impreſe d'ottocento quaranta cinque Donne illuſtri antiche, e moderne, dotate di conditioni e ſcienze ſegnalate: Cioè in ſacra Scritura, Theologia, Profetia, Filoſofia, Retorica, Grammatica, Medicina, Aſtrologia, Leggi Civili, Pittura, Muſica, Armi, & in altre virtu principali.

(8) Patricius, ubi ſupra.

(9) Hilarion de Coſte, *Tom. ii, pag.* 802, 803.

‘ *cient and flouriſhing colony of the people of Rome, and*
‘ *daughter of Camillus, who for his merits and nobility*
‘ *was made knight of the order of St James, inſtituted*
‘ *by the kings of Spain, imitates, and, by her virtues,*
‘ *reſembles thoſe famous Roman heroines, ſo that ſhe ſeems*
‘ *to want in nothing except her not being born in Rome, that*
‘ *this alone might not be wanting to compleat her glory,*
‘ *the ſenate and people of Rome have decreed to preſent*
‘ *her with the freedom,* &c. Ribera has only put theſe
‘ Latin words in Tarquinia Molza's Elogy, and all
‘ the patent in Italian, wherein are related all the qualities
‘ and ſtudies of this heroine, the nobility of
‘ her family, and the deeds of her anceſtors which I
‘ have ſpoken of above. The decree was made in
‘ the Capitol the eighth of December MDC. Curtio
‘ Martolo being for the time chancellor of the ſenate,
‘ and of the Roman people, Angelo Foſco being chancellor
‘ of the ſenate and people.

MONANTHEUIL (HENRY DE) in Latin *Monantholius* [*A*], a native of Reims in Champagne, was king's profeſſor of Mathematics at Paris, in the year 1577 (*a*) [*B*]. He was alſo dean of the faculty of Phyſic at Paris (*b*). He had been educated under Ramus in the college of Prele, and was a very zealous ſtickler for the Philoſophy of this new founder of a ſect. Thuanus, who informs us of this paticular (*c*), makes an honourable mention of Monantheuil, who had taught him Arithmetic and Geometry. He had been preceptor to the learned Peter de Lamoignon (*d*), whoſe Epitaph Theodore Beza has written in Latin verſe. He publiſhed at Paris, in 1599, his Latin tranſlation of Ariſtotle's Mechanics (*e*) [*C*], and added to it a very learned commentary. Death prevented his finiſhing a large work of Mathematics, upon which he had laboured a long time, and which was to be intituled *Heptatechnon Mathematicum*. We ſhall take notice of his other works in the remarks. He was one of du Vair's, the keeper of the ſeals, particular friends, and is the *Muſæus* mentioned by du Vair in his book of Conſtancy. He had a ſon called THIERRI DE MONANTHEUIL who was advocate in the parliament of Paris, and compoſed a book intituled *de Puncto* [*D*], which he dedicated to his father. This Thierri died at Paris in 1621, being fifty years of age. His ſiſter CATHARINE was married to Jerome Goulu, as we have already obſerved (*f*). See Mr Menage (*g*).

(*a*) Du Breul, Antiq. de Paris, *pag.* 567.

(*b*) Menage, Remarques ſur la Vie de P. Aurault, *pag.* 254.

(*c*) Thuan. de Vita ſua, *lib. i.*

(*d*) *Uncle to the firſt preſident de Lamoignon.* Menage, ibid.

(*e*) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 306.

(*f*) Above, remark [*A*] of the article GOULU (JEROME).

(*g*) Ubi ſupra.

[*A*] *In Latin* Monantholius.] This is doubtleſs his true Latin name; but becauſe Voſſius, I know not why, calls him Monatholius, Mr Moreri has not only omitted his French name, which he ought to have given, but has alſo put him under a Latin name, ſomewhat diſguiſed, I mean that of Monatholius. He has added nothing to the ſhort account, which he found of him in Voſſius.

[*B*] *He was the king's profeſſor . . . in the year* 1577.] I could eaſily believe he entered upon this profeſſion in 1574, being at that time a profeſſor of Phyſic; I could eaſily believe this, I ſay, from the title of the oration inſerted by du Verdier Vau Privas, in the ſupplement to the epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque. *Henrici Monantholii Rhemi Scholarum Medicinæ Profeſſoris, oratio pro Mathematicis artibus, Pariſiis habita, ibidemque excuſa* in 4to. *apud Dionyſium à Prato* 1574. But this other title of an oration at the 367th page of the ſecond part of Thuanus's catalogue might keep me in ſuſpence, *Henrici Monantholii Oratio pro ſuo in regiam Cathedram ritu* 8. *Pariſ.* 1585.

[*C*] *He publiſhed . . . his Latin tranſlation of Ariſtole's Mechanics.*] When I find on one hand, that the Sieur Konig (1), upon Cardan's teſtimony, tells us of one Francis Monantholius author of a book intituled *Ludus iatromathematicus*, and on the other, that Henry de Monantheuil wrote a book called *Ludus iatromathematicus, Muſis factus ad averruncandum tres Academiæ perniciosſimos hoſtes*, πόλεμον, λιμὸν, λοιμὸν (2), I am ſomewhat diſpoſed to believe, that here are two authors made of one, and that the Petrus Monatholius, mentioned immediately after, as an author who publiſhed Commentaries at Paris upon Ariſtotle's Rhetoric, in the year 1599, is a new multiplication of the ſame writer, and a miſtaking of his Rhetoric for a treatiſe of Mechanics. However, I venture not to determine the point, not having a library ſufficiently furniſhed at my command.

[*D*] *THIERRI . . . . his ſon . . . . wrote a book intituled* de Puncto.] Monantheuil, the father, had writ upon the ſame ſubject: ſee in Thuanus's catalogue this title, *Henr. Monantholii de Puncto primo Geometriæ principio* 4. *Ludg. Bat. Commel* 1600. The Oxford catalogue does not mention this treatiſe; but we find it in a Panegyric, Henrico IV Galliarum Regi dictus, printed at Paris in 1594, and an *Admonitio ad Jac. Peltarium de augulo contactus*, printed at Paris 1581.

(1) Biblioth. *pag.* 548.

(2) *See* Lindenius renovat. *pag.* 397.

MONARDES (NICHOLAS) a Phyſician of Seville, flouriſhed in the XVIth century, and came into great reputation by his practice (*a*), and by the books he publiſhed [*A*]. Some think he died in the year 1588. But it is more probable he died in

(*a*) See the remark.

[*A*] *He acquired a great reputation . . . . by the books he publiſhed.*] The book intituled *De ſecanda vena in pleuritide inter Græcos & Arabes Concordia*, was printed at Seville in the year 1539 in 4to. His treatiſe *De roſa & partibus ejus; de ſucci roſarum temperatura; de roſis perſicis ſeu Alexandrinis; de malis, citris, aurantiis, & limoniis*, was printed at Antwerp in the year 1565, in 8vo (1). The Spaniſh book wherein he explained the virtues of American drugs: *de las drogas de las Indias*, was extreamly uſeful to mankind, for it contained remedies for many diſeaſes. It alſo got Monardes a deal of glory. Let us hear what he ſays upon it. *Quæ* (prima pars) *ſuperioribus annis tam felicibus auſpiciis in publicum prodiit, ut inde hominum vita tot morborum periculis objecta multiplicia eademque præſentanea remedia ſibi paraverit, atque ego bonorum judicio non mediocrem eruditionis & diligentiæ laudem reportaverim* (2). Thus he ſpeaks concerning the firſt part of this work in an Epiſtle dedicatory to Pope Gregory XIII (3). He adds, that the deſire of promoting the public good, weighed much more with him, than the applauſes he received in compoſing a ſecond part, and he obſerves that it was of vaſt ſervice to the public. *Poſtea non tam auræ popularis (quamquam ea ſecundiſſime afflabat) ſuavitate illectus, quam communis utilitatis amore commotus alterum ejuſdem argumenti Syntagma concinnavi: in quo innumera medicamenta quæ hactenus intra naturæ arcana delituerant, magno humanæ ſalutis emolumento in lucem produxi* (4). Note, that before he publiſhed any thing on this ſubject, he was acquainted by a long experience with the ſovereign virtues of the American medicines. *Quum rerum medicinalium ab occidentali uſque India, ad nos convectarum utilitates adeo mirabiles ut ægrotos quamplurimos pœne jam deploratos ſanaverint, aſſidua medendi periclitatione atque longinqui temporis uſu percepiſſem; eas res . . . . via ac ratione tractare conſtitui* (5). Obſerve alſo, that Don Nicolas Antonio ought to have told us, that the two firſt parts of this work were printed one after another. This he did not know; for he would have us believe they were publiſhed both together, and that the firſt edition was in the year 1569 in 8vo. *De las drogas de las Indias*, ſays he (6), *duobus tomis, qui primum editi ſunt ab authore anno* 1569. What he adds is not more exact, ‘ Poſtea adjuncto tertio, unum ‘ ex tribus majoris formæ volumen publicavit anno ‘ 1580, 4to. - - - - *Afterwards having added a third, he*

(1) Nicol. Anton. Biblioth. Script. Hiſpan. *Tom. ii, pag.* 122.

(2) Nicol. Monardus, Epiſt. Dedicat.

(3) It is before the edition of Seville, 1574.

(4) Id. ib.

(5) Id. ib.

(6) Nicol. Anton. ubi ſupra.

in 1578 (*b*). We ſhall ſhew in the remark, that the editions of his books have not been rightly told by Don Nicholas Antonio.

(*b*) Nicol. Antonius, in Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. *Tom. ii, pag.* 122.

‘ *he publiſhed one of the three volumes in a larger ſize,* ‘ *in the year* 1580, *in 4to.*’ It is certain that the third part was printed, with the two others in 4to, in 1574, at Seville, by Alonzo Eſcrivano. I have this edition: it is dedicated to Pope Gregory XIII. And it was to oblige this Pope, that the author publiſhed it in this manner. ‘ Quæ meorum ſtudiorum monumenta quum ‘ ejuſcemodi Genium habuerint, ut ſanctitati tuæ ſumme placuerint, eaque Romam ex ultima Hiſpania deferenda curaveris, operæ pretium me tibi facturum ‘ exiſtimavi, ſi utramque hujus operis partem conjungerem, ac nunc primum tua potiſſimum cauſſa tertiam adjicerem (7). - - - - *Since the fruits of my ſtudies* ‘ *are of ſuch a nature as to pleaſe your Holineſs, and* ‘ *that you cauſed them to be brought to Rome from* ‘ *the remoteſt part of Spain, I thought it would oblige* ‘ *you, if I ſhould join both parts of this work together,* ‘ *and now for the firſt time add a third, chiefly on* ‘ *your account.*’ He added to it three dialogues; the firſt, *de la piedra Bezaar, y de la yerva Eſcuerçonera:* The ſecond, *de la nieve y del bever frio:* The third, *de las grandezas del Hierro, y de ſus virtudes medicinales.* The two firſt had been publiſhed before (8), but not the third. Nicolas Antonio did not know of any other edition of the third than that of the year 1580. All theſe Spaniſh works of our Monardes have been tranſlated into Latin by Cluſius, and into Italian by Annibal Brigantus. The ſame Cluſius hath alſo tranſlated into Latin Monardes's three books, *De varios ſeceretos y experiencias de Medicina.* Thoſe of American drugs were tranſlated into Engliſh by I know not whom, and into French by Anthony Colin, ſworn Apothecary to the town of Lyons. The *Lindenius renovatus* does not mark the year of any Spaniſh edition.

(7) Nicol. Monardus, ubi ſupra.

(8) *That* De la piedra Bezaar, &c, *at Seville,* 1569, *in 8vo: that* De la nieve, *&c, at Seville,* 1571, *in 8vo.* Nicol. Anton. ubi ſupra.

MONIMA, wife to Mithridates, ſmote the heart of this prince from the firſt moment he ſaw her. It was in the town of Stratonicea, ſoon after the great advantages obtained by him over the Roman Generals Oppius, Manius, &c. He thought this young woman ſo handſome, that he ſecured her perſon, and put her into his ſeraglio (*a*). Others ſay, that ſhe was of Miletus, and that Mithridates never could obtain the laſt favour, but by taking the fair way, that is, by marrying her. He attacked her by ſtrong ſollicitations; he made her a preſent at one time of fifteen thouſand crowns, but all in vain, he was forced to come to a marriage contract; nor would ſhe ever bed with him, till he had fairly ſigned it, and adorned her with the royal diadem and title of Queen (*b*) [*A*]. This conduct made her famous throughout all Greece. Her condition after all was nothing but meer ſhew; the ſolid part of happineſs was wanting. The poor Monima often regretted her native country and made a ſad end [*B*]; for Mithridates being overcome by Lucullus, and fearing leſt his wives, ſhould fall into the hands of the enemy, ordered them all to be put to death. He had given the government of Epheſus to Philopœmen Monima's father (*c*). It cannot be doubted but that his paſſion for this beautiful perſon was conſtant; ſeeing after his death there were found amongſt his papers ſome wanton letters which had paſſed between them (*d*).

(*a*) Appian. in Mithridaticis, *pag. m.* 123.

(*b*) Plutarch. in Lucul. *pag.* 503. *A.*

(*c*) Appian, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 134.

(*d*) Plut. in Pompejo, *pag.* 639.

[*A*] *Mithridates . . . . did not lie with her . . . . till he had adorned her . . . . . with the title of Queen.*] Ταύτης ὁ πλεῖστος ἦν λόγος ἐν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ὅτι τοῦ Βασιλέως πειρῶντος αὐτὴν· καὶ μυρίους πεντακισχιλίους χρυσοῦς προπέμψαντος, ἀντέσχεν, μέχρις οὗ γάμων ἐγένοντο συνθῆκαι καὶ διάδημα πέμψας αὐτῇ, βασίλισσαν ἀνεγόρευσεν. *Erat hujus celebre inter Græcos nomen, quod quum eam Rex attentaret, & quindecim millia aureorum miſiſſet, eatenus fuerit reniſa, dum ſponſaliis factis miſſoque diademate appellavit reginam* (1).

[*B*] *The ſolid part of happineſs was wanting: ſhe regretted . . . . her native country, and made a ſad end.*] All this Plutarch tells us in the place, where he relates how Mithridates, flying from Lucullus, ſent Bacchides, one of his eunuchs, to his ſiſters and wives, with orders to put them to death. ‘ The poor lady, ‘ *ſays he* (2), *ſpeaking of our Monima,* ever ſince this ‘ barbarous king had married her, lived in great diſcontent, continually deploring her unfortunate beauty, which inſtead of a huſband, had procured her a ‘ maſter, and inſtead of that conjugal ſociety, which ‘ was beſitting a lady of honour, had given her a ‘ guard and garriſon of Barbarians, who kept her as ‘ a priſoner, far from the ſweet country of Greece, in ‘ a place where ſhe had only the dream and ſhadow ‘ of the happineſs ſhe hoped for; and, on the contrary, had really loſt the ſubſtance, which before ‘ ſhe enjoyed in her native country: and when this ‘ Bacchilides came to them, and had laid before them ‘ the king's command, that they might chuſe that ‘ way of dying, which each thought the eaſieſt, and ‘ leaſt painful, ſhe ſnatched her royal diadem from off ‘ her head, and tying it about her neck, hanged her ſelf ‘ therewith; but the wreath not being ſtrong enough, ‘ immediately broke, whereupon ſhe cried out, O! ‘ curſed and unfortunate ſtring, wilt thou not do me, at ‘ leaſt, this one ſad piece of ſervice? At which words, ‘ ſhe threw it upon the ground, and ſpit upon it, and ‘ then ſtretched out her fine neck that Bacchilides ‘ might cut her throat.’

(1) Plutach. in Lucullo, *pag.* 503, *A.*

(2) Id. ib.

MONIN (JOHN EDWARD DU) a native of Guy, *in the county of Burgundy* (*a*), publiſhed a great many Poems [*A*], in the reign of Henry III. He has been placed in the catalogue of extraordinary wits [*B*]. He was killed at twenty ſix years of age (*b*). It

(*a*) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Biblioth. Franc. *pag.* 729.

(*b*) See the remark [*B*].

[*A*] *He publiſhed a great many Poems.*] Here is the catalogue of them, as we find it in Du Verdier's Bibliotheque (1): ‘ A Philoſophical compariſon of the ‘ ſun and moon with our ſoul and intellect, according ‘ to Merc. Triſmegiſtus, and ſome Platoniſts. Together with ſome Poetical diſcourſes and ſonnets; the ‘ whole printed at the end of the Latin verſion he ‘ has made of the Week of William de Saluſte, Sieur ‘ du Bartas, which he intituled, *Ber ſithias ſive mundi creatio,* publiſhed at Paris in 8vo, by Hilary le ‘ Bouc, 1579. The new works of John Edward du ‘ Monyn, Philoſophical Poet, containing Diſcourſes, ‘ Hymns, Odes, Amours, Counter-amours, Eclogues, ‘ Elegies, Anagrams, and Epigrams, printed at Paris ‘ in 12mo, by John Parent in 1582. *Uranologia,* ‘ or the Heavens; containing, beſides the ordinary ‘ doctrine of the ſphere, ſeveral fine diſcourſes, printed ‘ at Paris in 12mo, by William Julian, 1583. *Miſcellaneorum Poeticorum libri. Pariſiis* 8vo.’ Claude du Verdier (2), ſon to him who has furniſhed me with this paſſage, has cenſured our du Monin in ſeveral things, and Father Leſcalopier obſerves, with reſpect to du Bartas's Latin tranſlation, ‘ Moninus . . . nimis ‘ incultus Poëta viſus eſt, interpreſque parum fidus (3). ‘ *Monin - - - ſeems to be a very unpoliſhed Poet, and an* ‘ *unfaithful tranſlator.*’

[*B*] *He has been placed in the catalogue of extraordinary wits.*] Gabriel Naudé deſigning to prove (4) that Picus, count of Mirandola, was not the only perſon who had made a prodigious progreſs in learning in his youth, ſays, (5) that Paul de la Scala *maintained in the year* 1553 *at Bologne, one thouſand five hundred forty-three* *concluſions*

(1) Du Verdier, *pag.* 729.

(2) *See his book intituled,* In Auctores pene omnes, antiquos potiſſimum, Cenſio.

(3) Leſcalop. in Cicer. de Natur. Deorum, *pag.* 234.

(4) Naudé, Apologie des grans Hommes, *pag.* 499. *See alſo his* Syntagma de Studio liberali, *pag. m.* 87, *and his* Dialogue of Maſcurat, *pag.* 468.

(5) Ib. *p.* 503.

It is ſaid, that du Perron was accuſed of being an accomplice in his murther [*C*], and that he was forced to ſue for his pardon. I think d'Aubigné has been guilty of an anachroniſm in ſpeaking of du Monin [*D*].

concluſions upon all ſorts of ſubjects, and this before he had attained to the age of two and twenty years. He produces afterwards the examples of Poſtel, Geſner, Eraſmus, Agrippa, and Maldonat, ‘ and laſt of all, that of this Edward du Monin, who, we may ſay, was compounded only of fire and ſpirit, ſince he had acquired before the twenty-ſixth year of his age, in which he was killed, the knowledge of the Italian, Spaniſh, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, tongues, and of Philoſophy, Phyſic, Mathematics, and Divinity, with ſuch facility in the Poetry of all theſe languages, that he tranſlated into Latin verſe du Bartas's work of the Creation, in leſs than fifty days, and ſaw printed before his death five or ſix conſiderable volumes of his Poems, which were highly commended by the fineſt wits of the laſt age, Fumeus, du Perron, Goulu, Auratus, Morel, Baif, and du Bartas.'

[*C*] *Du Perron was accuſed of being an accomplice in this murther.*] This I find in a book of Giſbert Voëtius, in the place where he relates the progreſs of cardinal du Perron's fortune. ‘ Perronus, *ſays he* (6), ſi cum illo (*Pleſſæo Mornæo*) comparetur, quis qualiſve fuerit, judicent illi qui virum propius norunt; Miniſtri reformati filium fuiſſe conſtat, cui nomen Perroni fuit inditum à vico ejuſdem nominis in quo Genevæ habitaverat pater, priuſquam in Normandiam veniret. A patre initio fuiſſe educatum in ſpem Miniſterii, ſed à D. de Matignon, cui carmina quædam obtulerat inductum fuiſſe ut Lutetiam ſe conferret, ubi fortunæ lautioris poëtæ ſpes eſſet ſub Henrico III ibi innotuiſſe, & cum aliis nonnullis poſtulatum fuiſſe cædis Eduardi du Monin, etiam poëtæ, qui verſibus ſuis eum perſtrinxerat, adeo ut literas gratiæ, quas vocant, à Rege obtinuerit; cui a lectionibus fuit, donec oratione apud eum habita, qua probabat Deum eſſe, (7) obtulit ſe die ſequenti contrarium probaturum, ſi Regi adlubeſceret. Quam ob cauſſam juſſus aula excedere, paulatim tamen ſe nonnullis inſinuavit, maxime Cardinali Vindocinenſi. Et tandem ſe immiſcuit iis qui Regem Henricum IV ad religionis mutationem pertraxerunt, unde ei ad Epiſcopatum primo, deinde ad Cardinalatum patuit via. - - - - *Who or what ſort of man Du Perron was, if compared with Du Pleſſis Mornai, let thoſe judge who knew him beſt: it is certain, he was the ſon of a Reformed miniſter, and had the name of Du Perron given him from a ſtreet ſo called at Geneva, where his father had lived, before he went into Normandy. That he was at firſt educated by his father, with a view to the miniſtry, but was perſuaded by Mr de Matignon, to whom he had preſented ſome verſes, to go to Paris, where a Poet might hope to advance his fortune under Henry III; that there he became noted, and with ſome others was accuſed of murdering Edward du Monin, who was alſo a Poet, and had handled him ſeverely in his poems, ſo that he was obliged to get letters of pardon, as they call them, from the king; to whom he uſed to read lectures, till one day after he had made a ſpeech before him, in which he proved there was a GOD; he offered, if the king pleaſed, to prove the contrary the next day. For which reaſon he was ordered to leave the court; however, by degrees, he inſinuated himſelf into the favour of ſome, and particularly the cardinal de Vendoſme. And at laſt joined himſelf to thoſe who induced king Henry IV to change his religion, by which means he came firſt to be made a biſhop, and afterwards a cardinal.*' Note, that he cites no body, and yet he was very fond of making citations.

[*D*] *I think d'Aubigné has been guilty of an anachroniſm in ſpeaking of du Monin.*] He ſays (8), that du Monin, whom the king named the *Poet of the Light Horſe*, played a lady a malicious trick, who had deſired him to write an elegy upon the diſturbance the coaches cauſed in the ſtreets. He excuſed himſelf, and telling her, *He was going to Lyons, concealing that he was going to ſurrender himſelf to the duke of Savoy* (9), *ſhe deſired him to get her a ſuit of tapeſtry wove in emblems. He diſcharged his commiſſion, and got her a ſet repreſenting four triumphs, each of which conſiſted of three pieces; the firſt was the triumph of impiety; the ſecond of ignorance; the third of cowardice; the fourth of beggery* (10). *The embroidery of the groteſque work, adds the author, is a writing in cypher, which no body underſtood: But du Monin, who having nothing more to fear, ſince he had paſſed the mount du Chat, ſent the explication and account of it all at length to the* little knight.' The lady, whom d' Aubigné deſigned to ridicule, is doubtleſs the Sieur de la Verenne's wife, he ſuppoſes ſhe had told du Monin, that the king had taken from Madam a ſuit of tapeſtry, worth a hundred and fifty thouſand crowns, to give it theducheſs, and that it would be *more becoming his majeſty, now ſhe was dead, to make a preſent of it to Monſieur* (11), *than to make himſelf the heir of the deceaſed.* The ducheſs here mentioned is Gabriela d' Eſtrée, miſtreſs to Henry IV, who died in the year 1599. D' Aubigné muſt therefore imagine, that du Monin was alive that year. But how can this hypotheſis be reconciled with what we have ſeen above (12), that he was killed in the reign of Henry III, at twenty-ſix (13) years of age, and that his chief works were printed before the year 1584 (14)? He was ſtill living that year, as la Croix du Main aſſures us (15). Either d'Aubigné perplexes and confounds times, or elſe he ſpeaks of another du Monin.

(6) Giſbert Voëtius, Deſper. Cauſa Papatus, *pag.* 677, 678.

(7) See the Journal of Henry III, *ad diem* 25 *Nov.* 1583, and the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Confeſſion of Sancy.

(8) D'Aubigné, in the fourth book of the baron *de Feneſte*, *cap. xvi*, *pag. m.* 285.

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 286.

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 288.

(11) We are by this word to underſtand the huſband of the lady who ſpoke to Du Monin.

(12) In the remark [*C*].

(13) In the remark [*B*].

(14) In the remark [*A*].

(15) Pag. 221, of his *Bibliotheque.*

MONSERRAT MONTANNES (MICHAEL) lived in the XVIIth century. He was a Spaniard, who forſook the church of Rome to go over to the Proteſtant communion, and publiſhed ſome ſmall pieces of controverſy. I have ſeen one of them (*a*), intituled *Aviſo ſobre los Abuſos de la Igleſia Romana.* He ſhews in it that he had read the Scripture much, for he cites it at every turn. He concludes his book by exhorting his nation to convert themſelves, by deſcribing the diſorders which the vows of celibacy cauſed in Spain [*A*]. He obſerves, among other things, that the confeſſors allow the Nuns a moſt criminal remedy for incontinence, when they declare they burn (*b*). All this is followed by a great number of ſcripture paſſages in praiſe of marriage. He had printed another tract in the year 1631 (*c*).

(*a*) Printed at the Hague in 1633, it was approved by Henry Arnold miniſter of Delft.

(*b*) Y a las encerradas Monias, ſus Confeſſores les conſeden que tengan ſu viril de barro para ſus concupicentias por que dizen que ſe queman, y aſſi las remediam con eſte grand pecado. *Aviſos, &c. pag.* 126.

(*c*) At the Hague, with the approbation of the ſame Arnold. It is written in Spaniſh with this title, *That the Pope is Anti-Chriſt.*

[*A*] *He deſcribes the diſorders which the vows of celibacy cauſed in Spain.*] He affirms, that the ſecular and regular clergy walk abroad well armed, and fight ſo deſperately when they are attacked, that the officers of Juſtice are afraid of them. *Quanto al voto, bien ſabeys lo que los religiozos y clerigos hazen, que ſalen de ſus caſas con eſpada y broquel, que la miſma juſticia y corxetes temen de encontranſe con ellos, por que dan golpes dezatinados por cauſa del gran ardor libidinoſo, y tambien por no ſer preſos y conocidos. Y muchos Canonigos, por mas modeſtia, ſe van a los partidos, deſpues de los maytines a purgarſe con las rameras, para poder dormir. Los demas de la Clereſia tienen ſus deſguaceros y concubinas y muchos hijos dellas* (1).

(1) *Monſerrate Montannes*, *pag.* 126. I copy him word for word, and the very errors of the preſs, that may be in it.

MONSTRELET (ENGUERRAND DE) author of a Chronicle of France, which has often been printed [*A*], and which reaches from the year 1400 to 1467, lived in the XVth century. He *deſcended from a noble and ancient Family* (*a*), and was governor of the town of Cambray. As that town ſtood neuter betwixt the French, the Engliſh, and Burgundians, he enjoyed all the repoſe that an Hiſtorian could deſire, and the opportunity of hearing the relations of all ſides. Some ſay, that he wrote *with the more fidelity, as he was in a place, where nothing obliged him to ſeek the friendſhip of one party, or fear the hatred of the other* (*b*); but it is more certain, that he ſhewed himſelf a little too partial to the houſe of Burgundy [*B*]. He kept a correſpondence with the heralds, with the agents, and with other perſons, that *were conſiderable for their ſtation*, and helped out his *intelligence by the publick reports* (*c*). He has *enriched his Hiſtory with edicts, the letters of kings and princes, remarkable ſayings, articles of peace, and of truces, capitulations of towns, challenges, ſummons*, &c (*d*). I do not know the year of his birth, nor that of his death.

(*a*) Bullart, Academ. des Scien. *Tom. i, pag.* 129.

(*b*) Id. ib.

(*c*) Id. ib.

(*d*) Id. ib.

[*A*] *His Chronicle has often been printed* (*a*).] I know no older edition than that of the year 1512 at Paris (1). There was another in the ſame city in the year 1572. The latter was reviſed and corrected *by the copy in the king's library* (2). Du Cheſne ſpeaks of an edition of Paris 1603 (3). Add to theſe the edition of the Louvre.

[(§ α) Monſtrelet paſſes for an injudicious Hiſtorian, and Rabelais, L. III. Ch. xxiv, cenſures him as an idle talker, who, in the very beginning of his hiſtory, had tranſgreſſed the rules preſcribed to Hiſtorians by Lucian. As for the reſt, of all the editions of Monſtrelet, thoſe wherein Dennis Sauvage had a hand are the worſt, becauſe of the liberty he took in changing many words and phraſes, whereof he has not always given the ſenſe. At the end of theſe interpolated editions, are ſome additions, printed under the title of *a Continuation* of Monſtrelet. REM. CRIT.]

[*B*] *He ſhewed himſelf a little too partial to the houſe of Burgundy.*] Spondanus calls him *Burgundi fautorem* (4), *a favourer of the houſe of Burgundy*; tho' in another place (5) he owns he is a ſincere writer, and very exact in ſetting down the times. La Popeliniere makes him ſuſpected, for thus he ſpeaks: *Enguerrand de Monſtrelet collecting the moſt notable tranſactions in France after Froiſſard, has hardly ſhewn himſelf a better or more judicious writer, tho' ſomewhat truer, and leſs paſſionate* (6). As he had juſt accuſed Froiſſard of extreme partiality for the Engliſh againſt the French, he does not pretend that we ſhould reckon Monſtrelet very impartial. An Hiſtorian who is ſomewhat leſs prepoſſeſſed than another who is ſo to exceſs, is none of the faithfulleſt. He adds, that Monſtrelet continued his hiſtory to Lewis XII, and places him in the year 1500. I believe he is miſtaken as to this laſt date; and I am ſure, that Monſtrelet's Chronicle is not carried further down than the five or ſix firſt years of the reign of Lewis XI, for it ends at the funeral of Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy. La Popeliniere made uſe of an edition, to which the Bookſellers had added ſupplements, as far as Lewis XII. This was the occaſion of his error.

(1) La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 75.

(2) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franc. *pag.* 277.

(3) Du Cheſne, Biblioth. des Hiſtor. de France, *pag. m.* 50.

(4) Spondan. ad ann. 1415. *num.* 52, *pag. m.* 753.

(5) Id. ad ann. 1467, *num.* 2.

(6) La Popeliniere, Hiſtoire des Hiſtoires, *livr. viii, pag.* 435.

MONTAIGU (JOHN DE) high-ſteward of France under Charles VI, had the misfortune to diſpleaſe the duke of Burgundy, who abuſed the authority he had obtained in the kingdom to ſuch a degree of violence, that he cauſed him to be beheaded the ſeventeenth of October 1409 (*a*). Some ſay, that the memory of this high-ſteward was juſtified three years after [*A*], when the power of his oppreſſor was at an end, and that his bones were honourably interred by a public order. Francis I. made a reflexion upon this, which gave occaſion to a very judicious anſwer. We ſhall ſee it below [*B*]. Conſult the Continuation of the Menagiana (*b*).

(*a*) And not the ſeventh of October 1408, as Moreri affirms. According to him this man had been arreſted, tried, put to the queſtion, ſentenced to loſe his head, and actually beheaded all in one day.

(*b*) Pag. 87, 88, Edit. of Holl.

[*A*] *Some ſay, that his memory . . . . . was juſtified three years after.*] Mr Menage denies it: theſe are his words which are full of curious particulars: '(1) James du Breuil, in his Paris Antiquities, at the chapter concerning the foundation of the Celeſtines of Marcoucy, has written that John de Montaigu's corps was carried to Monfaucon, in a ſack filled with ſpices; and that all the time it was at Monfaucon, the celeſtines of Marcoucy daily gave a certain ſum to the executioner of Paris to look after it, and that four years after his execution, his memory having been vindicated at the ſollicitation of Vidame de Laonnois, his ſon, ſon-in-law to the conſtable d'Albret, his eſtate was reſtored to his heirs. It is true, the body of John de Montaigu was taken down from the gallows the twenty-ſeventh of September 1412, after it had hung ſome years at Monfaucon. But what du Breuil ſays of the ſack filled with ſpices, and the executioner's having a charge of his body, is a fable. Nor is it true, that his memory had been vindicated. As for his eſtate, tho' he had been condemned without the knowledge of Charles VI, yet this prince granted the forfeiture of it to Lewis duke of Guienne, the dauphin. But it is certain, (as I have learned from Mr Perron (2), who has been particularly curious about the life of John de Montaigu) that his eſtate was at laſt reſtored to his heirs.'

[*B*] *Francis I . . . . gave occaſion to a very judicious anſwer.*] I will give it in Stephen Paſquier's words. 'The ſame king, *ſays he, ſpeaking of Francis I* (3), paſſing by the Celeſtines of Marcoucy, and aſking ſome of the Monks within, Who founded that monaſtery? was anſwered, that it was John de Montaigu, high ſteward of France, in the reign of Charles VI. This lord had been hanged on a gibbet at Paris, at the inſtance of the duke of Burgundy, who then domineered over all France. King Francis, as it was his uſual way, always to hold ſome profitable, diſcourſe ſaid to the company, that he greatly wondered, how he who had ſo long governed the king, his maſter, ſhould be condemned to death; conſidering, that after ſome years, his bones were honourably interred in this place, by a decree of juſtice: from whence it was eaſy to conclude, that the judges had paſſed an unrighteous ſentence. Upon which a monk anſwered the king pretty bluntly, that his majeſty was in ſome meaſure miſtaken, for the Sieur de Montaigu's trial was not by judges, but by commiſſioners; meaning, in his rough way, that commiſſioners packed to the humour of a lord whoſe power was then exorbitant, ſeldom preſerved in their judgments the conſcience of good judges. Whether this was ſpoken by the monk from meer ſimplicity, or an artful deſign, it gave occaſion of laughter, how much ſoever it ought to have turned to edification: for, to ſay truth, commiſſioners, tho' they are not corrupted, yet are ever ſuſpected by all ſober perſons, and moſt people think that ſuch judges are choſen to the liking of thoſe who cauſe them to be delegated, only to obtain ſome advantageous decree, or to execute ſome projected revenge under the maſk of juſtice. Which the parliament having taken into conſideration, to prevent ſcandal, and the oppreſſion of the people, which commonly happen on all ſuch occaſions, upon a preſident's ſpeech in our own time, it was by a ſolemn oath decreed, that no counſellor of that court ſhould ever accept or act in any ſuch commiſſion, unleſs all the commiſſioners were taken from the ſame body, and not picked here and there out of ſeveral courts. Which however is not giving the diſeaſe an intire cure, but only ſome abatement (4). Theſe good conſiderations are but ill obſerved.'

(1) Menage, Hiſtoire de Sablé, *livr. x, chap. v, pag.* 271.

(2) *He has publiſhed a book intituled*, L'Anaſtaſe de Marcouſſy, ou Recherches curieuſes de ſon origine, progrès, & agrandiſſement. *Journal des Sçavans, of the thirteenth of June* 1695, *ſpeaks of it.*

(3) Paſquier, Recherches de la France, *livr. vi, chap. viii, pag. m.* 471.

(4) See the article GRANDIER, remark [*F*].

MONTAUBAN, a city of Guienne in Querci, upon the river Tarn, is famous on ſeveral accounts. A Gentleman of note (*a*) has already communicated to me ſome very good memoirs concerning this town; but as he has given me a promiſe of others much larger, and more exact, I ſhall defer this article, in hopes of putting it one time or other into the beſt condition. I only touch upon one thing, which is ſomewhat extraordinary, it relates to a ſmall book, which the abbot de la Roque has inſerted in his Memoirs of the Church [*A*].

(*a*) Mr YSARN, heretofore miniſter of Montauban, now of Amſterdam. His merit is well known, even by good books publiſhed by him.

[*A*] *A ſmall book, which the abbot de la Roque has inſerted in his Memoirs of the Church.*] The title of it is, *Montauban juſtified, or an anſwer to the faithful of the P. R. R. who aſk,* 1. *Whether Salvation may be had in the Roman church.* 2. *Whether it be lawful for any temporal advantages, and particularly in times of affliction, to change one's religion, by J. D. B. and J. L. J. miniſters of the Holy Goſpel.* To ſhew upon what occaſion this work was publiſhed, we muſt know that there happened a popular tumult at Montauban about the year 1661. Soldiers were ſent thither ſome months after, and quartered for the moſt part in the Proteſtants houſes; and as they were ſuffered to commit diſorders, and live at diſcretion, and a great many had billets upon the ſame houſe, their landlords began to apprehend that they ſhould ſoon be reduced to beggary. On the other hand, all the inhabitants who turned Catholics, were eaſed of quartering; which induced a great many burghers of Montauban to embrace this religion (1). This gave occaſion to the book we ſpeak of, wherein the author undertook the apology of the inhabitants, who rather choſe to go to maſs, than to ſee their families ruined. It was eaſy to diſcover in this writing, the trace of a miſſionary's pen; and yet the abbot de la Roque, ſeveral years after, inſerted it intire in his Memoir of the Church (2) as the work of a good Proteſtant. He advances with a moſt egregious confidence, that this book was publiſhed by two miniſters of Upper Guienne, in the face of all their churches, and all their brethren; whilſt none of the party was at the pains to undeceive the public, as to the point which theſe two Divines had advanced, that the Huguenots might without ſcruple of conſcience turn Catholics, *&c.* With the ſame aſſurance, he affirms that this work pacifyed the troubles and diſturbances in their conſciences and families, when ſeveral inhabitants of Montauban abjured the Proteſtant religion, to be freed from quartering ſoldiers: for which reaſon, adds he, I inſert it intire in my Memoirs, as well becauſe it is a curious piece, as becauſe it is very ſcarce, there being hardly a copy of it to be found. This conduct is the effect either of groſs ignorance, or inexcuſable fraud. No Proteſtant ever took the book of *Montauban juſtified* to be written by a miniſter. Father Meynier, a great cavilling perſecutor, was ſuſpected to be the author of it; as alſo of an oration, which had been ſpread ſome time before (3), and which Mr Euſtache, miniſter of Montpellier, anſwered by a little book intituled *the Orator Tertullus convicted.* The ſuſpicion was well grounded; for Alegambe's continuator aſcribes the book we ſpeak of to the Jeſuit Meynier. Could the abbot de la Roque be ignorant of this fact? And were not there ſufficient marks of impoſture in this whole work? As for the reſt, it is ſo full of paſſages of Proteſtant authors, wherein the true church is acknowledged to be diſperſed in ſeveral communions without excepting the Romiſh, that it is ſtrange Mr Nicole ſhould look upon Mr Jurieu's ſyſtem as a new thing.

(1) Moſt of them returned to the Proteſtant religion as ſoon as the ſtorm was over.

(2) Publiſhed at Paris in the year 1690.

(3) It bore the title of *Harangue des Sages de la R. P. R. à la Reine.* See, above, remark [*A*], of the article EUSTACHE.

MONTECATINUS (Antony) a native of Ferrara, flouriſhed in the XVIth century. He read public lectures upon ſeveral ſubjects in his own country, and afterwards was made firſt profeſſor of Philoſophy there. He was very particularly favoured by Alphonſus II, duke of Ferrara, who deputed him to the courts of Rome and France, and honoured him with ſeveral other employments [*A*]. He died at Ferrara in 1599, being ſixty three years of age (*a*). We have ſeveral volumes of his compoſing [*B*].

(*a*) *Taken from* Agoſtino Superbi da Ferrara, *pag.* 83, 84, dell' Apparato de gli Huomini illuſtri della Citta di Ferrara.

[*A*] *The duke of Ferrara .... honoured him with ſeveral .... employments.*] This is what was put in Montecatinus's epitaph, as it is recited by Agoſtino Superbi (1). ‘ Alfonſo II Duci ſereniſſimo aures, ‘ conſilia, operam fideliter præſtitit. Legationes pro ‘ illo ad Regem Gall. Ad ſummos Pont. perfecit. ‘ Urbem Regii rexit; non ſemel univerſam ditionem ‘ Conſiliarius pro dux adminiſtravit. Ferrariæ tribu‘natum geſſit. - - - - *He was a faithful confident, coun‘ſellor, and ſervant, to the moſt ſerene duke Alphonſus II. ‘ He was deputed by him to the court of France and ‘ Rome. He was governor of the city of Regio, and ‘ frequently had the whole adminiſtration of affairs un‘der the duke. He was chief magiſtrate of Ferrara.*’

[*B*] *We have ſeveral volumes of his compoſing.*] He publiſhed at Ferrara in 1587, a Commentary upon the firſt book of Ariſtotle's Politics. It is one volume in folio, dedicated to cardinal Ruſticucci, and printed by Victorio Baldino, Printer to the duke. At the beginning, there are twenty two tables, containing an analyſis of Ariſtotle's entire work of Politics. He made ſuch another commentary on the ſecond book of the ſame work of Ariſtotle, which was printed at Ferrara by Benedict Mammarellus in the year 1594, in folio with this title, *Ariſtotelis Politicorum, hoc eſt, civilium librorum liber ſecundus, ab Antonio Montecatino in Latinam linguam converſus, & partitionibus, reſolutionibus, ſcholiis illuſtratus.* He dedicated it to cardinal Peter Aldobrandino, nephew to Thomas Aldobrandino, who tranſlated Diogenes Laërtius; he ſays that a diſcourſe he had had at Rome with this tranſlator, twenty eight years before, determined him to dedicate his book to this young cardinal. The year does not appear in the date of the Epiſtle dedicatory, but doubtleſs we are to underſtand the year 1594. He adds three other treatiſes to this volume, namely, *Platonis libri decem de Republica, & Antonii Montecatini in eos partitiones, & quaſi paraphraſis quædam: Platonis libri duodecim de legibus, vel de legumlatione & Epinomis, & leges quæ in libris illis ſparſim ſunt diffuſæ, ab Antonio Montecatino in epitomen & ordinem quemdam redactæ: quinque veterum rerumpublicarum Hippodamiæ, Laconicæ, Creticæ, Carthaginienſis, Athenienſis contra quas Ariſtoteles in poſteriori parte ſecundi politici diſputavit, antiqua fragmenta.* His Commentary upon the third book of Ariſtotle's Politics, was printed at Ferarra in the year 1597, in folio, by Victorio Baldino. He had in 1591 printed (2) his Commentary there *in octavum librum phyſicæ Ariſtotelis.* I do not know the year of the impreſſion of his Commentary *in primam partem libri tertii Ariſtotelis de anima.* Let us ſee whether Naudé ſpeaks advantageouſly of this author. ‘ Ad Platonem quod attinit, *ſays he* ‘ (3), tres, quos noverim, commentatores ſolummodo ‘ nactus eſt, Antonium nempe Montecatinum qui li‘bros de republica Platonis & Ariſtotelis diexodicis ‘ notis, tabulis, diſtinctionibus explicare conatus, nun‘quam neque ſibi, neque lectori ſuo ſatisfecit - - - - ‘ *As to Plato, there are only three commentators upon ‘ him, that I know of, viz. Antonius Montecatinus, who, ‘ by endeavouring to explain the books of Plato's and ‘ Ariſtotle's Republic, with large notes, tables, and di‘viſions, could never ſatisfy himſelf nor his reader.*’

(1) *In his* Apparatus to the Illuſtrious Perſons of Ferrara, *pag.* 84.

(2) In folio.

(3) Naudæus, Bibliogr. Polit. *pag. m.* 27.

MONTFLEURI, a famous Comedian, who was for a long time admired on the theatre of the Hôtel of Burgundy, left one ſon, who did not follow the profeſſion of a Comedian, but wrote ſeveral plays which were well received. They were all collected together in the year 1705, twenty years after the death of the author. They are in two volumes, and in number fourteen (*a*)

(*a*) *Taken from the* Mercure Galant, *of Aug.* 1705, *pag.* 324.

MONTGAILLARD (Bernard de) known by the name of the *Little Feuillant* [*A*] in the times of the League, ſon of Bertrand de Percin lord of Montgaillard [*B*], was born in the year 1563. He became a Feuillant in the year 1579, and immediately fell to preaching, tho' he had not ſtudied Divinity. He preached at Rieux, at Rhodez, and Toulouſe, with ſuch ſucceſs, that theſe words of Scripture were applied to him, *bleſſed is the womb that bare thee.* The court of France was no leſs charmed with his ſermons, than the province of Languedoc. He went to Paris, when king Henry III invited the order of the Feuillants thither; and had not preached twice, before this prince and the queen-mother appointed him to preach the ſermon at the Auguſtines, the day that the knights of the Holy Ghoſt were inſtalled. He ſucceeded admirably in this ſermon, and came off with no leſs reputation in preaching at the Louvre, and elſe-where; which made the king deſire that he ſhould preach all the Lent, in the royal pariſh of St Germain de Lauxerrois. Theſe ſermons, and thoſe he preached at St Severine, got him the reputation of the moſt famous preacher, that *had been known at Paris in the memory of man, ſo many talents he had for the pulpit, and eſpecially for moving and maſtering the paſſions, and ſubduing ſouls.* Some devout women, and amongſt others Dame Acarie, choſe him for their only director [*C*]. He exerciſed ſo many acts of mortification amongſt the Feuillants, that the Pope commanded him to quit that order, to prevent the ſhortning his life. Having eſpouſed the intereſts of the League with too much heat [*D*], he retired into the Netherlands, where he was in great eſteem. He ſpoke ſome funeral *orations* (*a*) by order of the archduke Albert, and afterwards that of this prince in the year 1622 (*b*). He was then abbot of Orval. He died of a dropſy in that abbey the eighth of June 1628. *He had always deſired to be buried under a gutter, and it was only to avoid the charge of*

(*a*) That of the archduke Erneſt, brother of the archduke Albert, and that of the empreſs their mother.

(*b*) The archduke died the thirteenth of July 1621. His funeral was ſolemnized the twelfth of March following; the abbot d'Orval preached the ſermon.

[*A*] *He was known . . . . by the name of the* Little Feuillant.] This would induce us to believe, that he was a very little man, and yet he was of a middle ſtature; but the name was given him, when he firſt began to be known at Paris. He was then very little, and tho' he was twenty years old, he had not done growing (1). This name ſtuck by him, even when a riper age had put him out of the number of little men. This account comes to me from the ſame hand which ſent the body of the article, I am indebted for both to the curious and learned author of the notes upon Sancy's Confeſſion, and the Catholicon of Spain.

(1) Compare what has been ſaid in the article MARETS (Samuel des-) remark [*A*].

[*B*] *He was ſon of Bertrand de Percin lord of Montgaillard.*] And of Antoinette du Vaillet, both of noble and ancient families in the city of Toulouſe. The family of Montgaillard ſtill ſubſiſts in ſplendor. The biſhop of St Pons, ſo well known by his writings, and ſo much eſteemed by the Proteſtants, for his openly diſapproving the violence that was done the Reformed, by forcing them to communicate (2), is of this family.

(2) The two letters he wrote on that ſubject were inſerted in the *Lettre Paſtorale* of Mr Jurieu of the firſt of March 1688. He wrote them to count d'Uſſon (brother of Mr de Bonrepaux, ambaſſador of France, to Denmark and Holland) who commanded the troops in thoſe parts, and who was made lieutenant-general in the year 1696. You will find one of theſe letters, with ſeveral reflexions in praiſe of this prelate's conduct, in the preface to a very good book, which was printed in the year 1689, intituled, *L'Impiété des Communions forcées.* Mr Le Page, who is the author of it, and who had been miniſter at Dieppe, died miniſter of the Walloon church at Rotterdam, the nineteenth of November 1701.

[*C*] *Some devout women and . . . . Dame Acarie choſe him for their only director.*] She was wife to the Sieur Acarie, maſter of accompts. He was called, *ironically, the lacquey of the League; becauſe, being lame of a leg, he was one of thoſe who went and came, and beſtirred himſelf with the greateſt zeal for the intereſts of the party; he was the huſband of the Bleſſed Mary of the incarnation, by whoſe good example he profited little* (3). The author of the new notes upon the Catholicon, has communicated to me a reflexion he has made. As this furious leaguer's wife, ſays he, was under the direction of the Little Feuillant, ſhe was far from diſapproving the League: It was not therefore on this account, that her huſband profited ill by her example. The better to know this woman, we muſt read what follows: *Mary Alais* (§ *a*), *this man's wife, was a devotee* †, *known at preſent by the name of the Bleſſed Mary of the Incarnation: in her widowhood ſhe retired to the houſe of the Beguines, called the chapel of St Avoye; which is a houſe for widows, where ſhe was made ſuperior* ⸸.' Her Life is printed at Paris by Thierry (4).

[(§ *a*) This paſſage, which concerns me, ought to be rectified, at leaſt with reference to what we read in p. 400 of the *Catholicon d'Eſpagne*, Edit. of 1699. Dame Acarie and Mary Alais are two very different perſons. Rem. Crit. [of Mr le Duchat.]

[*D*] *Having eſpouſed the intereſts of the League with too much heat.*] The author of the Notes upon the Confeſſion of Sancy informs me, that this part of the life of the Little Feuillant is very ſlightly touched, in the book, the extracts of which he has communicated to me. Wretched law of panegyric, which permits the ſuppreſſing the infamy of thoſe who are to be praiſed! but in vain are they ſuppreſſed in this book; they are to be found elſewhere. Here is a paſſage from the Catholicon, where a proceſſion of the League is deſcribed. 'Amongſt others there were ſix Capuchins, having each a helmet on his head, with a plume of feathers on the top, they were dreſſed out in coats of maile, with ſwords by their ſides, girt on over their habits; one carrying a lance, another a croſs, a third a javelin, a fourth an arquebuſs, a fifth a croſs-bow, all covered with ruſt out of a Catholic humility: the reſt had pikes, which they often brandiſhed for want of better paſtime, except one lame Feuillant ‡, who, being armed cap-a-pee, made himſelf way with a back ſword and a battle-ax at his girdle, his breviary ſlung behind him, and drew the eyes of all the ſpectators, whilſt ſtanding on one foot, he flouriſhed his ſword before the ladies (5).' I have put in the margin the note of the edition of 1677. The author of the new Notes has obſerved at the 308th page, that *this action of Brother Bernard de Montgaillard is very true*, but that it was not done in the proceſſion for the ſtates of the League in 1593, as the author of the Catholicon ſuppoſes, but *at the muſter of the Eccleſiaſtics and Monks at the ſiege of Paris in the year* 1590. He refers us to Thuanus, whoſe words I am going to cite: 'Omnium oculos in ſe convertebat Bernardus è Foliaceno ordine adhuc juvenis nuper Henrico III Rege concionibus notus apud populum, qui altero pede claudus nuſquam certo loco conſiſtens, ſed huc illuc curſitans, modo in fronte, modo in agminis tergo latum enſem ambabus manibus rotabat, & claudicationis vitium gladiatoria mobilitate emendabat (6). - - - *Bernard, a Feuillant, well known among the people for his ſermons when very young, in the time of Henry III, drew the eyes of all upon himſelf, becauſe, tho' lame of one foot, he was continually running up and down, ſometimes in the front, ſometimes in the rear, and never ſtood ſtill, flouriſhing a back-ſword with both his hands, and rectifying the defect of lameneſs by the motions of a Gladiator.*' Mr Maimbourg

‡ This was brother Bernard, called the Little Feuillant, who afterwards retired into Flanders, where he lived a long time, and enjoyed an abbey.

(5) Catholicon, *pag.* 15.

(6) Thuan. *lib.* xcviii, *circa fin. pag. m.* 359, *ad ann.* 1590.

---

(3) *Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, livr. i, pag.* 57. He cites the Notes on the Catholicon; that is, the Notes of the edition of 1677. But theſe Notes ſay only that he was called *Lacquey ironically, becauſe he was lame.* This is a bad reaſon: what *Maimbourg* ſupplies is more probable; but he ſhould not have mentioned the circumſtance of lameneſs as one part of the reaſon why he was called Lacquey.

† Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, *livr. i, in* 1584.

⸸ Bonfons, Antiq. of Paris, *fol.* 165. Edition of 1605.

(4) Notes upon the Catholicon, *pag.* 478, *Edit. of Holland* 1696.

of affectation, that he at laſt conſented, that his body ſhould be laid at the foot of the ſtairs which go from the great dormitory to the church. His life has been publiſhed; and all the great miracles are recounted in it, which God had wrought for him and by him [*E*]. No body will offer to deny but he had gone through a great deal of evil report [*F*]: but they affirm that it was all calumny, and that he never made any attempt upon the life of Henry the Great (*c*) [*G*]. We muſt ſay a word or two of a print

Maimbourg will tell us, what ſhare this Monk had in the horrible crimes of the Leaguers (7): ‘The preachers, the moſt famous whereof were the curates Pelletier, Boucher, Guinceſtre, Pigenat, and Aubry, Father Bernard de Montgaillard, ſirnamed the Little Feuillant, and the famous Franciſcan Feuardent, preaching in the pariſhes of Paris, during the feſtival of Chriſtmas, changed their ſermons into invectives, againſt the ſacred perſon of the king, *&c.*... (8). The ducheſs was received at Paris with all imaginable honour, and an incredible joy of the people, who reverenced her as the mother of two holy martyrs; and the Little Feuillant preaching * one day before her, forgat himſelf ſo far, as to ſay, turning about to her, but addreſſing his words to the late duke of Guiſe, *O holy and glorious martyr of God, bleſſed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps that thou haſt ſucked!*’ Nor was he content to be a trumpeter of ſedition in the pulpit, but ſuborned an aſſaſſin to murther Henry IV. See the remark [*G*].

[*E*] *The great miracles are recounted in it, which God had wrought for him and by him.*] He was cured twice by a miracle, at the interceſſion of the Holy Virgin, his protectreſs. The firſt of theſe miracles, ‘was wrought at Paris about the year 1589 by Roze biſhop of Senlis, who, at the ſollicitation of the provincial of the Jeſuits, conſented at laſt to touch this man's tongue, whoſe ſpeech had been taken away by a mortal catarrh; ſo that upon pronouncing the word *Effata*, by the holy Roze, followed with the hymn *Ave maris ſtella*, ſung by Meſſieurs de Mayenne and Nemours, with the Monks of the convent, when they came to the words *ut videntes Jeſum*, the dying perſon (for whom the prayer *Egredere anima Chriſtiana* had already been ſaid), repeated *Jeſum*, ſpoke afterwards, and preached the Sunday following, the ſecond day after the miracle. The other adventure is of the year 1619; at which time F. Bernard being almoſt given over, having had a ſtoppage of urine for fourteen days, the Virgin of Montaigu, to whom nine days devotion had been made in his behalf, delivered him of twenty two pounds of water, and a ſtone, which he voided at the ſame time (9).’ Moreover, this Monk's panegyric is ſtuffed with ‘revelations, contemplations, and extaſies, which were ſo frequent with the deceaſed, that they deſtroyed his appetite for eating and drinking, and he would have died of them, if he had not himſelf prevailed with God, that he might be delivered from any violent degrees in this kind..... Scarce had he expired, when a Dropſy, of which he died, gave occaſion to a miracle. As he was prodigiouſly ſwelled up, his body could not be got into the leaden coffin deſigned for him. And, in the mean time, whilſt they were making it wider, a Monk took that opportunity to kiſs once more his poor abbot: at that moment he perceived to iſſue from the face of the dead, ſo divine and miraculous an odour, that he ſeemed to him to be perfectly revived in body and ſoul..... A Religious of great merit and quality, having always had the profoundeſt veneration for the holy abbot, ſpake to him in his ſleep, Sure you are happy; to which he anſwered, Yes, I am happy. His panegyriſt was beſides ſo perſuaded, that he had not paſſed through the fire of Purgatory; that, during the three maſſes, which he celebrated to his memory, during the three days of his obſequies, it never came once into his thoughts to pray to God for his ſoul (10).’ By theſe ſamples, the reader may eaſily judge, that our panegyriſt has not belied his character. I wonder the Catholics dare reproach the Proteſtants, that England ſwarms with Fanatics ſince the reformation.

[*F*] *It cannot be denied that he had gone thro' a great deal of evil report.*] ‘Tho' he never chiefly to be thought very chaſte and good-natured, yet he was accuſed more than once, of giving women of a leud life frequent acceſs to his houſe (a ſcandal which his pnegyriſt complains he had himſelf ſhared in common with him). It is ſaid alſo, that the Little Feuillant had put one of his Monks to a cruel death: as ſoon as it was heard that this Monk, who, as it was ſaid, had the charge of one of the forges of the abbey of Orval, was fallen into the forge, and burnt to aſhes, it was preſently given out that he had thrown himſelf into it: but, upon further enquiry, it was not at all doubted in France, that this abbot had cauſed him to be caſt into it, to revenge ſome affront received from him. Another time he was accuſed by a gentleman, at two different times, of deſigning to aſſaſſinate him: it is true, this gentleman is ſaid to have been caſt in his accuſations, but whether for want of proof, or through the exceſs of the archduke's favour to this abbot, does not appear (11).’

[*G*] *They affirm, that he never made any attempt upon the life of Henry the Great.*] If we attentively conſider theſe words of Peter Victor Cayet, one can hardly acquit him of this horrible deſign. ‘The next day after the prior of the Jacobins was taken, the Sieur de Rougemont was alſo ſeized, who underſtanding that king Henry IV was in the ſuburbs of Paris came thither: but upon ſome advice the king had rereceived of his deſign, he was ſecured, and carried away, together with the ſaid prior, to the goal of Tours. Being examined, he confeſſed, that being of the pretended Reformed religion, he had retired in the year 85 to Sedan, from whence the neceſſity of his family obliged him to return to his houſe, by becoming a Catholic. But in the month of July laſt, meeting with the Little Feuillant at Paris, after much diſcourſe about his converſion, falling from one ſubject to another, on the neceſſities and indigence of the ſaid Rougemont, the Feuillant told him it was in his power to do a piece of ſervice to God and the church: he anſwered him, That he ſhould think himſelf very happy if he knew how: the ſaid Feuillant told him, it was by killing the king of Navarre, by executing which, he could aſſure him he ſhould never want a comfortable livelihood; that having had much diſcourſe at ſeveral times with the ſaid Feuillant, upon this propoſition, and the means of accompliſhing it; at laſt it was agreed, that he ſhould go into the king's army, and pretending once more to turn Heretic, would find an opportunity to ſhoot the king of Navarre with a piſtol. But he telling him, that he had not money to put himſelf in an equipage to go into the army, the Little Feuillant gave him four hundred crowns; upon the receipt of which, he retired to his houſe near Corbeil, promiſing to execute their conſpiracy: but, inſtead of that, gave notice of it to Monſieur de la Noüe, that he might acquaint the king with it. That when the ſaid Little Feuillant had ſome time after written to him, ſolliciting him to execute the deſign: he kept his letters, and ſent him excuſes for his money, and was now come to the ſuburbs of Paris, only to do the king ſervice. All theſe excuſes had been impertinent, if he had not proved what he had diſcovered to Monſieur de la Noüe:

(*c*) *Taken from the* Memoir *communicated to me by the author of the* Notes upon the Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy, *and* upon the Catholicon d'Eſpagne. *He had it from a book, the title whereof he ſent me in theſe words:* Les ſaintes montagnes & collines d'Orval & de Clairevaux: vive repreſentation de la vie exemplaire & religieux trepas du reverend Pere en Dieu Dom Bernard de Montgaillard, Abbé de l'Abbaye d'Orval, de l'Ordre de Ciſteaux, au païs de Luxembourg, Predicateur ordinaire de leurs Alteſſes Sereniſſimes, ſur le modele de l'incomparable Sainct Bernard Abbé de Clairevaux, & du grand Legiſlateur Moïſe. Au jour & celebrité de ſes exeques faites ſolemnellemént trois jours durant, en l'Egliſe d'Orval les 10, 11, & 12 jours d'Octobre l'an 1628. Par reverend Pere en Dieu Meſſire F. André Valladier, Docteur en Theologie, Conſeiller, Aumoſnier, & Predicateur ordinaire du Roy Très-Chreſtien, Abbe de l'Abbaye Royale de Sainct Arnould de Metz, de l'Ordre de Sainct Benoiſt. Imprimé à Luxembourg chez Hubert Reuland 1629.

(7) Maimbourg, Hiſt. de la Ligue, *livr. iii, pag.* 295.

(8) Id. ib. *pag.* 305.

* Journal de Henri III.

(9) *From the* Memoir *communicated by the author of the* Notes on the Confeſſion of Sancy.

(10) Ibid.

(11) Taken from the aforeſaid *Memoir*.

print of him [*H*]. Nor ought we to forget that Juſtus Lipſius has much extolled this monk's piety and eloquence (*d*).

(*d*) See the ſeventy ninth letter of the century of *Lipſius. ad Germanos & Gallos.*

'after a long impriſonment, he was forbidden, by a 'decree, to come within ten leagues of the king's 'perſon; theſe are horrible deſigns for church-men to 'be guilty of.' This paſſage is found in the 228th leaf of the firſt tome of the *Chronologie Novenaire* of Peter Victor Cayet, under the year 1589, and was ſhewn me by the author of the new Notes upon the *Catholicon*. The Little Feuillant's panegyriſt inſiſts but ſlightly on the years of the League: he ſpeaks of them in a rambling manner, and ſhews every thing on the faireſt ſide; he declares in general, that this Monk 'had the glory of being the moſt powerful, the moſt thundering, and zealous, as well as the 'moſt ſincere and diſintereſted inſtrument in bringing 'Henry IV into the pale of the church. It is true, 'he inſinuates, that he was accuſed of being an accomplice in ſome conſpiracies againſt this prince's 'life, but adds, that this prince cleared him by his 'ambaſſadors to Clement VIII, to whom they were 'alſo ordered to ſignify Henry IV's eſteem for Father 'Bernard (12).' This needed a citation of ſome printed book of undoubted authority.

[*H*] *We muſt ſay a word or two of a print of him.*] 'Our abbot's panegyriſt tells us, that he always lay 'upon a plank, and that a joint-ſtool ſerved him for 'a pillow. But to make himſelf amends, it appears 'he took his eaſe in the day-time; for his print repreſents him ſeated in a fine eaſy-chair, filled with 'a noble cuſhion, which ſeems to be ſtuffed with the 'fineſt downe. Before his eyes is placed a picture 'of the Virgin Mary, to whom the holy abbot addreſſes theſe words, which flow from his pen: 'O Domina mea, quid hic facio? educ è carcere 'animam meam, ad confitendum nomini tuo. - - - - '*O my lady, what do I here? bring my ſoul out of 'priſon, that I may confeſs thy name.* At a diſtance 'is ſeen a heap of volumes on fire (13), and by the 'ſequel of the book, we find they are the volumes 'compoſed by the Little Feuillant, which this abbot 'himſelf ſet fire to out of humility, upon recovering from a fit of ſickneſs, ſeeing one of his Monks, 'whom he had commanded to do it, expreſs a reluctance thereto. On one ſide of him is a lamb, 'which the book ſays had appeared to him, after he 'heard a voice, juſt before the raiſing ſome calumnies 'againſt him in Flanders, cry out thrice in one night, '*have a care.* At his feet are four mitres, that of 'the biſhopric of Angers, which a little after the 'arrival of the Feuillants at Paris, Henry III offered him by Meſſ. *de Monthelon* and *Miron*, counſellors in the court, and which he refuſed; thoſe of 'the biſhopric of Pamiez, and of the famous abbey 'of Marimond, which he alſo refuſed, and even 'employed his intereſt to get them beſtowed on others; 'and that of the abbey of Nizelle, which the archduke gave him, that he might always be near him, 'but which he kept no longer, than the firſt vacancy 'of the great and opulent abbey of Orval (14).'

(12) From the *Memoir* communicated by the author of the *Notes on the Confeſſion of Sancy.*

(13) The only piece which appeared under his name, is the funeral oration on archduke Albert.

(14) Taken from the *Memoir* of the author of the *Notes upon the Confeſſion de Sancy.*

MONT-JOSIEU (*a*) (LEWIS DE), in Latin *Demontjoſius* or *Demontjoſus*, a gentleman of the country of Roüergue in the XVIth century, diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his learning, and publiſhed ſome books [*A*]. He taught the king's brother (*b*), and the duke de Joieuſe (*c*), the Mathematics, and accompained the latter to Rome in the year 1583 (*d*). He wrote a book there which ſhewed he was an excellent Antiquary [*B*]. Being returned to France, he applied himſelf to illuſtrate the Mechanics of the ancients, and to render them uſeful to the public. He took upon him to cleanſe the city of Paris from all dirt and naſtineſs; but this undertaking almoſt ruined him. Another misfortune much greater followed it, for he married a very bad wife who was the cauſe of his death. He would have executed many more things than he did, had fortune been more favourable to him. He was of a ſweet and affable temper, and had a genius altogether fit for the liberal arts. This is the elogium Thuanus gives him.

(*a*) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 806, *calls him* Montjouziou.

(*b*) La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 497.

(*c*) Id. ib. *pag.* 296.

(*d*) Thuan. *lib. lxxviii, pag.* 478.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] We find this liſt of them in Du Verdier Vau-privas (1): *Traité des Semaines de Daniel, & des paroles du prophete Ezechiel*, printed at Paris in the year 1582. Item, *Traité de la nouvelle Coſmographie*, in which he ſhews the errors of Aſtronomers as to triplicities and ſigns. *Item*, two books *de la Doctrine de Platon, & de l'Explication des Nombres Platoniques*; an excellent and very learned work. He wrote alſo in Latin a moſt uſeful book, *De re Nummaria & Ponderibus.* Item, *les Preceptes de Rhétorique*; put exactly in a table, by a ſingular method. There wants in this liſt the chief work of this author; is that which I am going to ſpeak of, and which was not printed till after the *Bibliotheque Françoiſe* of Du Verdier Vau-privas was publiſhed.

[*B*] . . . *wrote a book, which ſhewed he was an excellent Antiquary.*] This book is intituled, *Gallus Romæ Hoſpes*, and was printed at Rome, in the year 1585, in 4to, and dedicated to Pope Sixtus V. Thuanus ſpeaks of it thus: 'Ludovicus Demontioſius rara rei antiquariæ 'doctrina inſignis, ... Romæ hoſpes multa ad urbis 'terrarum olim dominæ illuſtrationem, atque interdum 'plura, quam multi Romani Cives, paucorum menſium, 'quo in ea fuit, ſpatio contulit, V Libellis Sixto V inſcriptis, in quibus de Obeliſcis, Jano Bifronte, Septizonio, Pantheo, Symmetria templorum, Caryatidibus, quas Gallus Italos docuit, de Sculptura veterum, cælatura, Sculptura gemmarum, pictura, foro 'Romano, aliiſque urbis locis non aliis ſcripta, & 'recentiorum pleroſque errores notat (2). - - - *Lewis 'de Montjoſieu, famous for his ſingular knowledge in 'antiquities . . . . . a ſtranger at Rome, has, during the 'ſpace of a few months he was there, contributed much, 'and even more than many Roman citizens, to the illuſtration of the city which was formerly miſtreſs of the 'world, by the five books he dedicated to Sixtus V, 'wherein he gives an account of what was omitted by 'others, and ſhews moſt of the errors of the Moderns, 'concerning the Obeliſks, Janus Bifrons, Septizonium, 'Pantheon, Symmetry of the Temples, Caryatides, which 'a Frenchman taught the Italians, the Sculpture of the 'Antients, Carving, the Sculpture of Gems, Painting, 'the Forum Romanum, and other places of the city.'* There is in this work a treatiſe *de Pictura & Sculptura Antiquorum*, which was re-printed at Amſterdam in the year 1649, with Vitruvius.

(1) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 806.

(2) Thuan. *lib. lxxviii. pag. m.* 478.

MONTMAUR (*a*) (PETER DE) profeſſor of the Greek tongue in the college royal of Paris, in the reign of Lewis XIII, was reckoned the greateſt paraſite of his time [*A*], and made himſelf ſo odious to the wits; that they employed againſt him all the

(*a*) *I have found this name ſpelt different ways in printed books,* Monmor, Mommor Monmaur, Mommaur, Montmor. *I have followed that which he himſelf uſed.*

[*A*] *He was reckoned the greateſt paraſite of his time.*] I will only cite four verſes of Mr Boileau.

Tandis que Pelletier, croté juſqu'à l'échine,
S'en va chercher ſon pain de cuiſine en cuiſine,
Sçavant en ce metier, ſi cher aux beaux Eſprits,
Dont Monmaur autrefois fit leçon dans Paris (1).

While Colletet, a vot'ry of the Nine,
Thinks himſelf happy, if he's ſure to dine.
Thoſe leſſons which at Paris Montmaur read,
Still ſtand him and his brother wits, inſtead,
And get them oft a meal in time of need.

(1) Boileau, Sat. I, ver. 77.

the art and ſtrokes of the moſt virulent ſatire [*B*]. He ſtudied the *Belles Letters* under the Jeſuits of Bourdeaux, (*b*), and as he had an extraordinary memory, he gave ſuch hopes of his progreſs that they prevailed with him to take the Jeſuits habit. He was ſent to Rome, where he taught Grammar for three years with great reputation (*c*). He was afterwards diſmiſſed, on account of his weakly conſtitution. He ſet up for a Druggiſt at Avignon, and got a great deal of money that way (*d*); then he came to Paris, and not finding his account at the bar (*e*), he betook himſelf to Poetry (*f*), hoping to ſhare in the favours which cardinal Richelieu beſtowed on good Poets; he cultivated the moſt childiſh part of that art, I mean anagrams, and ſuch like playing with words [*C*]. He ſucceeded Goulu in the royal profeſſor's chair of the Greek tongue (*g*). Theſe are the true facts I thought I might borrow from his life, compoſed by Mr Menage, and intermixed with many ingenious and ſatirical fictions. I have not been able to diſcover in it his native country, but if we believed ſome words of another ſatire, we muſt ſuppoſe him born in Querci; this would be a miſtake, for Limouſin was the place of his birth [*D*]. I have read in the Memoirs of the abbot de Villeloin, that, in 1617,

he

(*b*) Menage, in Vita Gargilii Mamurræ, *pag. m.* 10.

(*c*) Id. ib. *pag.* 11.

(*d*) Id. ib.

(*e*) Id. ib. *pag.* 12.

(*f*) Id. ib. *pag.* 15.

(*g*) Id. ib. *pag.* 17.

[*B*] *He made himſelf ſo odious to the wits, that they employed againſt him all the ſtrokes of the moſt virulent ſatire.*] The commentary on this text ſhall be taken from the Valeſiana. *The profeſſor Montmaur loved to live well at another's expence. He was admitted to the houſes of all the great men, who kept open table, by the help of ſome Greek and Latin ſentences, the coin in which he always paid for his ordinary. After he had eat and drank plentifully, to divert his hoſts, he fell to ſlandering all the learned both living and dead, and not one of them could eſcape his laſh. Moſt of the learned thought themſelves obliged to ſet him forth as he deſerved, and to do him juſtice. Mr Menage was the firſt who ſounded, as I may ſay, the alarm againſt him. He compoſed his life in Latin, and at the end of this piece, in a ſmall epigram of five verſes* (2), *he exhorted all the learned to take arms againſt this common enemy. I* (3) *was not willing to be one of the laſt, that ſhould engage in ſo pleaſant a war; I printed two Latin pieces of this profeſſor, one in proſe, and the other in verſe, with notes: and tho' theſe two pieces together contain but eight pages, I divided them into two tomes. I added afterwards his life, written by Mr Menage, and all the Latin and French verſes I could collect from ſeveral hands, to which I joined ſome Latin epigrams, that I had made upon him. As every one took fictitious names, I did the like, taking that of* Quintus Januarius Fronto, *Theſe three names fitted me perfectly well*; Quintus, *becauſe I was the fifth brother*; Januarius, *becauſe I was born in* January; *and* Fronto, *becauſe I have a large and high forehead. This book was printed at Paris, in* 1643, *in 4to, with this title*, Petri Monmauri Græcarum Literarum Profeſſoris Regii Opera in duos Tomos diviſa, iterùm edita & notis nunc primùm illuſtrata à Quinto Januario Frontone. *It is very ſcarce* (4).

As ſcarce as it is, I have ſeen one copy of it. Mr Simon de Valhebert (5) did me the favour to ſend it me. The ridicule, to which poor Montmaur was expoſed, would touch the moſt ſtupid. For they give as the firſt tome of his works, a piece, intituled, *Nemeſis in maledicos calumniatoris Buſbequii Manes, ob convicia ab eo temerè, malignè, falsò, & contra jus gentium Epiſtolæ XLII inſerta adverſus Auguſta Galliæ Parlamenta*, which only contains two pages. In this there is nothing but proſe; but the ſecond volume contains a mixture of proſe and verſe. The proſe conſiſts in a letter of three pages, *amiciſſimo, doctiſſimo, & ſupra ſæculi fidem & morem candido D. D.* MAIGNE, DUCIS FRONTIACI μακαρίτȣ *præceptori.* The reſt is of the ſame length, and conſiſts of an elegy, the title whereof is almoſt as long as the piece itſelf; which is this: *Epicedion Generoſiſſ. & Illuſtriſſ. Principis* ELEONORI AURELIANENSIS DUCIS FRONTIACI, *quem XXXV vulneribus confoſſum in obſidione Montiſpeſſulani fortiter & ſtrenuè dimicantem acerba & immatura mors oppreſſit annos natum XVII, paucis ante diebus quam pax firmaretur. Et matris mœſtiſſimæ Illuſtriſſ. Princip.* ANNÆ NOMPARIS CALMONTIÆ *Proſopopœia.* This had been printed in the year 1622, ten years before the ſhort invective againſt *Buſbequius*. I have ſeen alſo, by the favour of Mr Simon de Valhebert, a book in 12mo, printed in Germany (6) in the year 1665. It is intituled *Epulum paraſiticum, quod eruditi conditores, inſtructoreſque* Car. Feramuſius, Ægid. Menagius, Jo. Franciſcus Saracenus, Nic. Rigaltius, & Jo. Lud. Balſacius *hilarem epulantibus in modum* Macrino Paraſitogrammatico, Gargilio Mamurræ Paraſito Pædagogo, Gargilio Macroni paraſitoſophiſtæ, G. Orbilio Muſcæ, L. Biberio Curculioni atque Barboni *jucunde appararunt & comiter.* All this is preceded by a very learned Preface, and very well ſuited to the ſubject. This collection contains the five ſharpeſt ſatires that have appeared againſt Montmaur. Thus you ſee, that men of profound learning were concerned in it: you ſee Mr Rigault in the title of this collection: it is he who made the *Funus Paraſiticum, ſive L. Biberii Curculionis Paraſiti Mortualia ad ritum priſci funeris.* This is one of the five pieces. It has been joined to Kirchmannus's treatiſe *de Funeribus Romanorum*, in the Amſterdam edition, 1672. The ingenious Sarraſin, who engaged in this war, was one of the braveſt combatants. We ſee great politeneſs, and a literature happily choſen, and finely applied in his *Attici ſecundi G. Orbilius Muſca, ſive bellum Paraſiticum, ſatira.* This alſo is one of the five pieces. It has not been omitted in the collection of Sarraſin's works.

I ſhall mention ſome other pieces, that were made againſt Montmaur, beſides thoſe I ſhall ſpeak of below. Mr de Vion d'Alibrai made ſeventy three epigrams *againſt this paraſite: the collection is intituled* Anti-Gomor, *and is one of the Anti's, which Mr Baillet has forgotten* (7). You will find two of theſe ſeventy three epigrams in the ſecond edition of the Menagiana, with ſome verſes of Malleville upon the ſame ſubject. Hadrian de Valois was not the only perſon, who undertook to publiſh this paraſite's writings with notes; for I find theſe words in the life of Mamurra, written by Mr Menage (8): 'Præter eos 'autem *(libros Mamurræ)* qui in vulgus ſunt editi, 'in quos doctiſſimæ juxta atque elegantiſſimæ extant 'M. DENTONIS Notæ, ſcripſit & alios (9). - - - - '*But beſides the books of Mamurra that are publiſhed,* '*upon which there are very learned as well as very elegant* '*notes, by Dento; he wrote likewiſe others.*'

[*C*] *He cultivated anagrams, and ſuch like playing with words.*] Here is a paſſage out of Mr Menage's origin of the French tongue (10): 'MONTMO-'RISME. So we have called of late all quibbles, 'which conſiſt only in playing upon words, which 'the Latins calls *annominationes*. And this name we 'give them from Peter Montmaur, king's profeſſor of 'Greek, who affected this way of punning. The 'Greeks in like manner termed it γοργιάζειν, from 'the Rhetorician Gorgias, the Leontine, who affected 'theſe annominations (11). See Philoſtratus in his 'epiſtle to Julia Auguſta.' Add to this a paſſage out of the catalogue of authors, who preſented their works to the abbot of Marolles. 'Peter de Montmaur, 'profeſſor royal in the Greek tongue; for ſeveral 'Latin devices and inſcriptions, which generally con'ſiſt in alluſions to names, and in words of a double 'meaning, in which he pleaſed himſelf highly (12).

[*D*] *If we ſuppoſe him born in Querci. This would be a miſtake, for Limoſin was the place of his birth.*] Feramus, advocate in the parliament of Paris, was one of Montmaur's moſt bitter ſatiriſts. He writ a Latin poem called *Macrini paraſitogrammatici* ΗΜΕΡΑ *ad Celſum*, which Mr de Valois the younger inſerted in his collection, and Mr Menage afterwards printed in his book of Miſcellanies (13). It is alſo one of the five pieces of the Nuremberg collection. Here is a fragment of this poem: we ſhall give ſome others in the following remarks.

Tu,

(2) *You will find it below, in remark* [*I*].

(3) *That is to ſay*, Hadrian de Valois.

(4) Valeſiana, *pag.* 36. *& ſeq. Dutch Edit.*

(5) Abbé Bignon's library-keeper. See, above, citat. (60), of the article ESOP.

(6) At Nuremberg.

(7) Menagiana, *pag.* 314, *of the ſecond Dutch Edit.*

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 314, 315.

(9) Menag. in Vita Gargilii Mamurræ, *pag.* 31.

(10) Menage, Origines de la Langue Françoiſe, *pag.* 510, *Edit.* 1694.

(11) It was not in this that the character of Gorgias conſiſted, nor the γοργιάζειν.

(12) Abbé de Marolles, Denombrement des Auteurs, *pag.* 425.

(13) Printed at Paris in the year 1652, in 4to.

he was made tutor to the Mareſchal de Praſlin's eldeſt ſon [*E*]. I ſhall relate a curious paſſage, which will at once ſhew his own romancing, and the falſity of a ſtory publiſhed againſt him [*F*]. It may, in my opinion, be ſaid without any danger of miſtake, that this

Tu, MEMMI, decus Aonidum immortale Sororum,
Qui famam ingentem meritis ſuperantibus imples,
Tu deſperatis reſtas ſpes unica rebus.
Et Muſas quòd doctus amas, quòd Pallade Græcâ
Inſignis, mediis clarum caput inſeris aſtris,
Macrinum pateris bonus, & miſereris egeni
Tabentiſque fame, nullo miſerante, Sophiſtæ.
Græca etenim cùm verba ſonat, licet ore Cadurco,
Illa placent, ſeris didicit quæ Græculus annis.
Ecce tibi properatus adeſt, & Κοίρανε χαῖρε
Ingeminans, menſæ optatum ſortitur honorem (14).

Memmius, immortal honour of the Nine,
Whoſe merit anſwers to thy mighty fame,
Thou art the only refuge in diſtreſs.
Thy love of learning, and thy wiſdom great
Up to the ſkies thy reputation raiſe.
That wretched Sophiſt, poor and hunger-ſtarv'd
Macrin, whom none laments, thy bounty ſhares.
The little Greek, which very late he learnt,
Tho' ſpoke in Querci-tone, gives thee delight.
Here he comes, gingling Κοίρανε χαῖρε
(Your ſervant Sir) and gets an hearty meal.

But the anonymous author of the Hiſtory of the life and death of the great Mogor (15), expreſſes himſelf more clearly, and poſitively affirms, that Montmaur was born at Cahors, and that his mother was a noted proſtitute. I miſtruſted theſe ſatirical writings, and applied my ſelf for better information to Mr Simon de Valhebert, who I thought might have heard Mr Menage mention ſeveral particulars, and might be furniſhed with ſeveral pamphlets about Montmaur at the Abbé Bignon's. He was pleaſed to inform me of this particular, amongſt other things (16), that this *profeſſor was a native of the pariſh of Betaille, in the lower Limouſin.* I have ſince read a poem of Balzac, which ſhews that the province of Limouſin was his native country.

Ne jactet nimis Auratum, cunaſque Mureti:
Nobilis hunc quoque tam claris natalibus, aſper
Eduxit pago Lemovix; dein magna Tholoſa
Civem habuit, propriumque tenet nunc maxima rerum,
Haud cedens Dominæ formoſa Lutetia Romæ (17).

We may obſerve, by the way, that thoſe who have ſatirically written his life, ſend him firſt to Bourdeaux, without mentioning his journey to Toulouſe: But Balzac ſends him directly from Limouſin to Toulouſe, and then to Paris.

[*E*] *He was made tutor to the mareſchal de Praſlin's eldeſt ſon in* 1617.] The abbot de Marolles obſerves, that the three ſons of the duke of Nevers, had but 'one tutor called G. G. of Orleans, a man of no genius, who yet was preferred before many, and amongſt others before Peter Montmaur, ſirnamed 'the Grecian, who ſucceeded the other as tutor to the eldeſt ſon of the mareſchal de Praſlin.' What Mr Menage ſays, that he was ſirnamed the Grecian ironically, is only a ſatirical pleaſantry. *Sed quod fidem omnem ſuperat, Græcè tunc neſciebat, GRÆCUS enim ea tempeſtate per antiphraſim, quod minime Græcus eſſet, ab Invidis ac Malevolis vocabatur* (18).

[*F*] *I ſhall relate a paſſage .... which will ſhew his own romancing, and the falſity of a ſtory publiſhed againſt him.*] I have read this ſtory in a book, ſcarce known out of the country where it was printed. This encourages me to give it entire. There is no need of tranſlating it, it will ſuffice to obſerve on their behalf, who underſtand not Latin, that our Montmaur having told the chancellor, that ſuch and ſuch things were to be found in ſuch and ſuch authors, had the confuſion of not being able to prove it, when the books were laid upon the table. *Mommorius Græcarum literarum Profeſſor Regius, ſolus ſui ordinis eques, & apud Urbis Proceres inexhauſtæ dictionis, eruditionis, ac memoriæ, ideoque gratus menſarum aſſecla, coram Illuſtriſſimo Cancellario, (is repente me acciri juſſum, & curru ſuo humaniter acceptum, in villulam amici, paulò ultra ſuburbia, exſpatiatum duxerat) multos authores laudavit, Græcos & Latinos, ad locum quemdam D. Pauli, ubi ad beſtiarios & damnatos alluditur. Ego ſubdubitavi de fide laudantis, alioſque qui aderant, in meam ſententiam adduxi, nonniſi conſultis libris ei credendum. Poſtridie, ubi diluxit, ſcripſi ad unum è familiaribus & domeſticis Illuſtriſſimi Cancellarii, me animi causâ, domum veſperi reverſum adiiſſe authores ab eo citatos, nil eorum quæ dixerat, reperiiſſe: Non credideram fore, ut id reſciret Dominus, aut porrò ſuâ curâ dignum duceret. Biduo pòſt ad ſolitum prandium ivit Mommorius, multis jocis ſuper menſam exagitatus eſt, tanquam falſi ſuſpectus, aut planè reus. Illico homo miræ confidentiæ partes agere, velut in ſcena, cavillari, vociferari, vix exſpectare dum è menſa ſurgeretur, appellare ſingulos & univerſos. Præſertim Illuſtriſſimam Matronam, quæ ad latus viri erat, ut, quæ teſtis & conſcia objectorum fuiſſet, ſuo de Accuſatore triumpho intereſſe vellet: & cedo, inquit, libros, Heſychium, Manilii Aſtronomica, Strabonem, alios qui cùm ſat citò reperiri non poſſent à novo nomenclatore, quamvis in refertiſſima Bibliotheca, mittitur confeſtim ſervus à pedibus meos poſtulatum, mox etiam currus, qui me adveheret. Adventu meo non parva expectatio omnium, quorſum res evaderet, nam, tametſi hominis hiſtrioniam ſatis intelligebant, ob ingentem tamen fiduciam, vel à me ipſo vera dicere prope credebatur. Itum eſt in cubiculum ſuperius, prolato omni librorum inſtrumento, ſedit Illuſtriſſ. Cancellarius tamquam ſupremus judex, aſſidebant duo Libellorum Supplicum Ex-magiſtri, Conſiſtoriani Comites, aliquot Abbates, & viri honeſti complures utrimque: Totam controverſiam expoſuit diſertè & dilucidè Heros ille maximus, laudatâ nonnihil etiam modeſtiâ meâ, tum juſſit Mommorium ex libris, quorum jam copia fieret, ſuas authoritates petere. Ibi noſter tergiverſari, aliena concionari, verborum diverticula quærere, conceſſo ſemel quod petierat, mox aliud requirens, eas editiones parum commodas cauſari, nec interim de ſententia decedere, nec manus dare; cum urgeretur à Cancellario, nihilominus comperendinationem petere. Seſqui-horam ferme tenuit ea declinatio, donec pronuntiatum eſt, falſi manifeſtum eſſe, & ſoluta riſu concione, Bataviæ Ex-legatus ad ignem, ex tempore hos vernaculos recitavit à ſe factos.*

Mommor, c'eſt fait de ta memoire,
Tu bronches ſous le vieux Bourbon,
Tous les Autheurs te font faux-bond,
Si tu n'as recours au Grimoire (19).

Thy mem'ry, Montmaur, is undone,
Thou ſtumbleſt under old Bourbon,
All authors fail, as to quotation,
Without thy book of conjuration.

Nicholas Bourbon's letter, from whence I take this ſtory, is dated the third of November, 1637. The thing happened five or ſix days before (20). Montmaur was not therefore forbid the chancellor's houſe, at the time that his life was ſatirically written by Mr Menage in the year 1636 (21). It is therefore probable, that the words I am going to cite are a pure fiction, or founded on a falſe report. 'Mamurram 'è Convivio propter neſcio quid infandum Magnus 'Nomophylax turpiter ejecit: quo infortunii genere 'acerbius homini Paraſito accidere nullum poteſt. Ariſtippum quidem Dionyſius olim conſputavit, ac 'poſtremus ut accumberet juſſit: ſed tamen ut accumberet juſſit, nec cenâ, ut Mamurra, privatus eſt Ariſtippus (22). - - - - *The great judge turned Mamurra 'ſhamefully from table upon the account of ſome horrible 'thing, I do not know what: than which no kind of diſgrace could happen more grievous to the paraſite. Dionyſius indeed formerly ſpit in the face of Ariſtippus, and 'ordered him to ſit the loweſt at table; but yet he allowed him to ſit at table, and Ariſtippus was not deprived, as Mamurra, of a dinner.*' Mr Feramus, who wrote a poem againſt Montmaur, before Mr Menage publiſhed the life of Gargilius Mamurra (23), ſuppoſes in ſeveral places, that the chancellor had forbid this profeſſor his houſe. He expreſſes this admirably well.

(14) Menagii Miſcellan. *pag.* 11, 12, *libri adeptivi.*

(15) It is in the collection of *Hadrian de Valois.*

(16) Which he had learned of Mr Baluſe.

(17) Balzac, at *pag.* 162, of the Barbon.

(18) Menagius, in Vita Gargilii Mamurræ, *pag.* 16.

(19) Nicolaus Borbonius, Epiſtola V ad Claudium Memmium, Avauxium, *pag.* 471. *It is to be found at the latter end of Charles Ogier's book, intitaled,* Iter Danicum, Suecicum, Polonicum, *printed at Paris* 1656, *in* 8*vo.*

(20) Dies erat Simoni & Judæ Apoſt. Sacer. *Ibid. pag.* 473.

(21) The Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Life of Gargilius Mamurra, is dated from Angers the twentieth of October 1636.

(22) Menagius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 22.

(23) This appears from the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Life of Mamurra.

this man was not near ſo contemptible as he is repreſented. He loved good eating too well, he went to dine with great men oftener than he ought to have done; he talked to them I do not doubt, with too great oſtentation; but if his happy memory, if his reading, if his ready wit, had not recommended him [G], would he have had ſuch acceſs to the chancellor, to the preſident de Meſmes, and to ſome other perſons eminent for their rank, their good judgment and learning? Let us beware how we take the ſatirical deſcriptions of his perſon and actions, for a faithful picture. The beſt Poets and wits of his time gave each other the word, conſpired againſt him, and endeavoured to outdo one another in turning him into ridicule, ſo that they have invented numberleſs untruths of him. We muſt therefore look on what they have ſaid as pieces of wit, meer romances, and not as an hiſtorical narration [*H*]. Balzac liſted with ſo much zeal in this kind of cruſade, that he vouchſafed to deſcend from the altitudes of his gravity,

Sed plurimus hæret
Claras ante domos atque alta Palatia magni
SEGUERII, cum fortunæ, ſortiſque recordans
(Qua licuit quondam divinæ accumbere menſæ)
In vetitas audax irrumpere cogitat ædes.
Ah! quoties votis precibuſque, & ſupplice fletu
Admitti petiit. ſed inexorabilis ille
Janitor, Helvetiæ duris de rupibus ortus,
Arcet ab ingreſſu, prohibetque, & juſſa minatur
Verbera, & offenſi Domini pro crimine pœnas,
Intentans fuſtem, ſumptamque iratior haſtam,
Ni cedat procul & retro veſtigia vertat (24).

- - - - But, he oft repairs
Before the gates of great SEQUERIUS' houſe,
And thinking on the noble cheer, which he
Was wont before to have, intends to ruſh
Into the houſe which he had been forbid.
How oft, alas! with humble ſuits and tears
Did he admittance beg; but all in vain.
The cruel porter, bred of hardeſt rocks,
Denies acceſs, and threatens him with blows
As he was bid, and to revenge the crime
Of that affront his maſter had receiv'd.
At laſt enrag'd, he takes a club and pike
To knock him down, unleſs he will be gone.

[G] *If his happy memory, if his reading, if his ready wit, had not recommended him.*] See what Mr Menage was forced to confeſs: 'Cum felici adeo Mamurra eſſet 'memoria, ut legentis modo, cuncta quæ olim in 'libris didicerat, poſſet referre, memorem illum 'convivam MEMMIUS non oderat (25). - - - - *As 'Mamurra had ſuch a happy memory, that he could repeat, like one reading, all he had learned formerly in 'books, MEMMIUS did not diſlike him for his gueſt.*' In all probability, Montmaur created himſelf many enemies by the excellence of his memory. It made him bear the ſway in all companies, or rather it ſet him up as a tyrant over them. He who can tell whatever he has read, and aſſumes magiſterial airs, rolling a torrent of literature from his lips, with the greateſt eaſe, ſilences and ſtuns other learned men in converſation. They look little and meer dwarfs by him: they cannot hinder his engroſſing the whole diſcourſe, nor dare they attempt it: they ſometimes ſuſpect he is in the wrong, but have not the aſſurance to contradict him, diſtruſting their own memory, and dreading his, even in things, which they fancy he miſtakes. We have ſeen above, that the learned Nicolas Bourbon, though full of doubts as to ſome citations of Montmaur's, yet durſt not attack him, till he had at leiſure conſulted his library. If you add to this, that Montmaur was apt to ſlander, and full of vanity, you will eaſily conceive, that he muſt needs be hated. A haughty beauty, who obſcures and eclipſes all others in the circle, is an odious object to the ladies. The learned are little better diſpoſed in like caſes. They who ſaw they were not able to make head againſt this profeſſor with their tongue, had recourſe to the pen, and ſtrove which ſhould defame him moſt with their writing.

I have heard ſay, that an advocate, the ſon of a tipſtaff in one of the courts, made an agreement one day with ſome of his friends, to mortify Montmaur, who was to dine with the preſident de Meſmes. The conſpirators met betimes at the preſident's. The advocate and his friends had agreed not to let this profeſſor have a word of the diſcourſe, but relieve each other, and the moment one had done ſpeaking, another was to take up the diſcourſe. Montmaur no ſooner appeared in the room, but the advocate cried out, *war, war*. You degenerate mightily, ſays Montmaur, your father never cried any thing but *peace, peace* (26). This was a thunder-ſtroke, that diſconcerted the whole plot. The advocate was ſo daſhed, that he had not a word to ſay all dinner-time. I believe Montmaur by his talkativeneſs and confidence eaſily diſengaged himſelf from the ſnares that were laid for him. I do not know whether it was by accident or deſign, but as he dined one day with the chancellor Seguier, the ſervant ſpilt a diſh of ſoop on him as he was taking it away. He kept his temper to a wonder, and looking at the chancellor (whom he ſuſpected to have been the author of this trick) he told him: *Summum jus, ſumma injura*, by which extempore alluſion, he turned all the laughter on his own ſide (27). It was an ingenious turn, but the humour of it cannot be expreſſed in Engliſh. It was a pun, as the chancellor of France is the chief judge, and the word *jus* in Latin ſignifies two things, *juſtice* and *ſoop*.

Note, that a great many blamed Mr Menage for compoſing ſo ſatirical a piece upon Montmaur (28); but he excuſed himſelf by this among other reaſons, that he did not pretend to give the deſcription of any particular paraſite, but the character of a paraſite in general by touches of invention. This was juſtifying himſelf by a lie (29). *Non paraſitum unum aliquem, non aſſentatorem, ſed omnes paraſitos, omnes aſſentatores ſub Mamurræ fictis conquiſitiſque vitiis deformati perſona, deſcribere mihi mens fuit* (30). I do not think Mr Menage ever wrote any thing wherein learning, wit, and fineneſs of language, have been better mixed than in this. Mr Simon de Valhebert writes to me, that he has a piece by him which *ſeemed to be Mr Menage's: It is exactly the ſtyle of his Requête des Dictionaries:* Written in a hand which he does not know, *but with ſome corrections in Mr Menage's hand*, and intituled, *The petition of Petrus Montmaur, king's profeſſor in the Greek tongue, to the parliament.* It contains above three hundred verſes, *wherein his Hiſtory ſeems to be very well written, and theſe verſes are of the ſame meaſure with thoſe of his Requête des Dictionaires.* I have obſerved, that Mr Menage has not eſpouſed the ſtory, which is found in ſome pieces of the collection of Hadrien de Valois, to wit, that Montmaur gave the porter of the college of Boncour ſuch a ſtroke over the head with a billet, that the fellow died of it. See the following remark.

[*H*] *We muſt look on what they have ſaid as pieces of wit . . . . and not as an hiſtorical narration.*] But what ſhall we ſay to the fact juſt before mentioned? One would think the moſt virulent ſatiriſt incapable of publiſhing ſuch a falſhood, as that a man is actually in priſon for murder. And yet ſome of Montmaur's adverſaries affirmed, he was impriſoned for a crime of this nature. Did they ground themſelves on any reality? It were infinitely more hazardous to affirm than deny it; eſpecially when we take notice, that moſt of the ſatiriſts were ſilent as to this murder, which yet was the moſt favourable handle imaginable for rendering Montmaur, as they propoſed, the horror and execration of the public. However, let us ſee the accuſation:

Quoy qui ce ſoit, le Paraſite,
Eſt mieux traicté qu'il ne merite:

(24) Miſcellan. Menag. *pag.* 9. *libri adoptivi. See alſo pag.* 16, 19.

(25) *Menag. in Vita Mamurræ, pag.* 19. Compare with this the beginning of the paſſage of *Nicolas Bourbon*, quoted above, citation (19).

(26) This is the employment of the tip-ſtaff, while the court ſits.

(27) See the continuation of *Menagiana, pag.* 201, *Edit. Holl.*

(28) Næ igitur in nos iniqui fuere qui hunc nobis de Mamurra ludum . . . . velut atrox & flagitioſum facinus objecerunt. *Menag. ſub fin, Epiſt. Dedicat. Vitæ Mamurræ.*

(29) *Mr Menage ſpoke againſt his conſcience; and Mr de Balzac too, when he ſaid in the preface to his Barbon, that* the notion he formed to himſelf was general, and had no particular object . . . It was a ghoſt and phantom of my own making, an artificial man that I had formed and organized. And conſequently not being of the ſame ſpecies as other men, and not having one relation in the world; no body could intereſt themſelves in it's behalf, nor take offence at it's infamy.

(30) Menagius, ſub fin. Epiſt. Dedicat. Vitæ Mamurræ.

gravity, and give his thoughts an air of pleaſantry: which was much a harder taſk upon him, than it would have been for Scarron to write in the ſerious and bombaſt ſtyle. He did more, he ſounded the alarm; he animated his friends to take pen in hand, and to furniſh their quota [*I*]. It is pretty remarkable, that the members of the Faculty of

On ne luy peut faire d'ennuy;
Metamorphoſer ſa perſonne
En Loup, en Porc, en une Tonne,
C'eſt encor trop d'honneur pour luy.
Qu'il le ſoit en une Marmite,
En Tournebroche ou Leichefrite,
En Perroquet, en un Corbeau;
C'eſt une grace très-viſible
Le bien façonner n'eſt poſſible
Qu'aux pieds delicate d'un Bourreau.
Auſſi ce Meſſer Cicoſante,
Pour monſtrer que c'eſt ſon attente,
Fit l'autre jour un joly tour,
Caſſant d'une buſche flottée
La lourde caboche eſvantée
Du gros Janitor de Boncour.
Mais ce grand chercheur de lippée
N'euſt pluſtoſt fait cette équipée,
Qu'il ſe vit abſous du peché:
Car il receut telle mornifle
Sur ſon gras muzeau qui renifle,
Que ſon œil en reſta poché.
Et qui pis eſt, Dame Juſtice
Pour chaſtier ſon malefice,
Grippant ce Cuiſtre en triſte arroy,
Les pieds nuds, un torchon en teſte,
Conduiſit cette malle beſte
Dans la noire maiſon du Roy.
Tous ſes compagnons de cuiſine,
Et ceux qui craignent la famine,
S'oppoſent à ſa liberté,
Crians par tout que ſa preſence
Sans doute affamera la France,
Et qu'elle a cauſé la cherté (31).

The following Latin is ſuch another quibble (32).

Horatii Gentilis Peruſini in MAMURRAM, *ob cæſum ab eo Collegii Harcurtii* (33) *Janitorem.*

CÆDE nocens, hominiſque reus Mamurra perempti
Emiſſus vinclis eſt, Genoveſa, tuis.
Et potuit reperire vades, quia plurima crimen
Elevat hoc ratio, nil graviuſque meret.
Janitor occiſus nimirum haud penditur aſſis,
Nec propter dabitur talio vile caput:
Cumque illi Mamurra petitum ſtipite grandi
Comminuit cerebrum, perdiderat proprium.

On MAMURRA, for killing the porter of the college of Harcourt, by Horatius of Peruſia.

Mamurra's free, who was confin'd
With horrid murder being charg'd.
But he with eaſe could ſureties find
By which he might have been enlarg'd.
For many reaſons at that time
Could be produc'd in his excuſe,
Which did extenuate his crime
Deſerving no ſevere abuſe.
The murder'd porter was not worth,
A pin, nor retaliation,
And when Mamurr his brains daſh'd forth,
He had entirely loſt his own.

[*I*] *Balzac liſted himſelf . . . . was willing . . . . to deſcend from the altitudes of his gravity . . . . and animated his friends to take pen in hand, and to furniſh their quota.*] He was not the firſt who preached up this Cruſade: that honour is due to Mamurra's hiſtorian; as we have ſeen above (34). This Hiſtorian concludes his book with an epigram, in which by his exhortations and imprecations, he invites the whole world to come in to the war againſt Montmaur.

Quiſquis legerit hæc, poeta fiat:
Et de Cenipeta mihi jocoſos
Scribat Gargilio repente verſus.
Qui non ſcripſerit, inter eruditos
Inſulſiſſimus ambulet patronos.

Who e're reads this, ſtraight let him be
Employ'd in works of Poetry;
Againſt that ſtinking paraſite
Gargilius, let him quickly write.
May he who will not be concern'd
Be reckon'd aſs among the learn'd.

Here you ſee the concluſion of the Hiſtory of Mamurra. It may therefore be ſaid with a great deal of reaſon, that Mr Menage rang the alarm-bell, and by another metaphor, that he beat up for volunteers. Mr Balzac failed not to liſt himſelf, and exhort his friends to take up arms. He ſerved both in the infantry and cavalry. The Barbon (35), a work in proſe which he ſent to Mr Menage, was accompanied with two poems, one of which is intituled, *Indignatio in Theonem Ludimagiſtrum Ex-Jeſuitam laudatorem ineptiſſimum Eminentiſſimi Cardinalis Valetæ* (36); the other is a letter to Mr Boiſrobert, in which he intreats him to attack Montmaur, and to approve his inviting Mr Feramus to the ſame enterprize.

Nec ſolum tibi Semidei dicantur, at ipſe
Therſites, ipſe antiquo qui dictus Homero,
Ore animoque canis; pridem cui ſenſus Honeſti eſt,
Extinctuſque in fronte pudor. Fœdiſſima longas
Beſtia det pœnas. Deſcende ad probra Latini
Nominis, ac turpes Mamurra interprete Graios,
Pollutumque notis omni ex Auctore volumen.
Monſtra refer verborum, alio quæ vexit ab orbe,
Terribiles Griphos, &c (37).
- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -
Hîc docto te Marte potens, Ferrame, vocamus,
Ante alios: (ea vota meo ſint grata Metello)
Cum tot tela volent, tot in unum tela parentur,
Otia agas, tuaque arma neges communibus armis?
Vana pium-ne putet deformi parcere Monſtro,
Relligio? Tu-ne invictos torquebis Iambos
In caput alterius? Vivet-ne obſcœnus amator,
Atque hoſtis Muſarum, omnis temerator Honeſti,
Pindi terta lues? Peſtem tamen ille minorem
Scaligeri Tullique cliens, & Cæſare læſo
Conſpicuus Sæclis, nigro devovit Averno:
Nec tales Verona tulit ſine vindice chartas (38).

Not only demigods deſcribe, do thou
Therſites too ſet forth, by Homer call'd
In mouth and mind a dog, and who long ſince
All ſenſe of ſhame and honeſty has loſt.
Let th' filthy beaſt long puniſhment endure,
Deſcend to thoſe, who of the Latin name
The ſcandal are, and to thoſe ſhameful Greeks
Interpreted by Mamurr, and that book.
Which is with notes from every author ſtain'd.
Relate the monſtrous words that he has brought
From another world, hideous Gryphi, &c.
- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - -
Here we, Ferramus, chiefly thee invite,

(31) The hiſtorical Elegy of the Sieur Gomor, in the collection of Hadrian de Valois.

(32) In the ſame collection, at the end of the *Orbilius Muſca* of Sarraſin.

(33) According to the preceding paſſage, it ſhould be *the college of Boncour*, and not *Harcourt*, as likewiſe according to the author of a Latin Ode to *Balzac*, which is in the collection of *Hadrian de Valois*, and which ſays, that Montmaur, guilty of the murder of this porter, eſcaped the gallows only by bribing the judges.

(34) In the remark [*B*], at the paſſage of the *Valeſiana*. To which join this paſſage of *Furetiere, pag.* 101, of the *Nouvelle Allegorique*: the moſt unhappy of all was *Montmort*, captain of the *Alluſions*, and who had alſo a regiment maintained by the *Equivokes*. He was delivered over to *Menage*, a ſtrict and ſevere judge, who examined his life from the beginning to the end, and canvaſſed every action. After having convicted him of ſeveral crimes, he condemned him to ſuffer death by *poetical arms*, being firſt toſſed in a blanket as uſual. He was even the firſt who ſhot at him; afterwards all the reſt of the learned went in file, *&c.*

(35) It was printed at Paris in 8vo, in the year 1648.

(36) It is in the collection which *Hadrian de Valois*, publiſhed in 1643.

(37) Balzac, *pag.* 160, 161, of the *Barbon*.

(38) Id. ib. *pag.* 165.

of Arts in the univerſity of Paris, did not come in to the aſſiſtance of their brother Peter Montmaur. It is a ſign he could not gain the love either of the regents of the college, or of the wits. What a ſtrange hurly-burly had there been, if theſe regents had made a counter-league in his favour, and obliged themſelves to bend all their Grammar and Rhetoric, in proſe and verſe, againſt his perſecutors. There were ſome men of merit, who condemned the bitter invectives of the latter. The paſſages I ſhall mention on this head,

In learned war moſt potent (and I pray
This may to my Metellus grateful be)
Whilſt darts ſo many fly, and are prepar'd
Againſt one ſingle foe, can'ſt thou ſit ſtill
And help deny in ſuch a common cauſe?
To ſpare an ugly monſter can'ſt thou think
Religion bids? or at another's head
Invincible Iambics wilt thou fling?
A lover vile ſhall we permit to live,
An enemy to virtue, and the muſe,
Peſt of Pindus? And yet a leſſer plague
Verona's Poet to black Avernus damn'd.

Conſidering the methods theſe gentlemen took to ſtrengthen their league, and raiſe the whole poſſe of the Republic of Learning, one would think the queſtion was, not how to make Barbarians raiſe the ſiege of Parnaſſus, when determined to give up the Muſes to the ſoldiers diſcretion; but how to re-take it from theſe uncircumciſed, and reſtore to their liberty the chaſte daughters of memory, detained in the dark dungeons of a ſacrilegious, impure, and abominable, nation.

There were thoſe who cenſured ſomething in theſe verſes of Balzac. They taxed them with inhumanity and obſcurity. The obſcurity conſiſted in the words, which deſign the Poet Catullus. We have ſeen above (39) what Balzac anſwered; and you may ſee in his diſcourſes, his anſwer to the charge of inhumanity. He there ſhews, how unjuſt it is to ſay that he is more inhuman to the new Mamurra, than Catullus was to his enemies. ‘I have meant, *ſays* ‘*he* (40), only a ſimple Poetical curſe, or at ‘moſt a ſimple death; for in good Latin to ‘devote to Hell, or Avernus, means no more than ‘death; and hemlock, a halter, or the ſword, may give ‘it. But the vindictive Catullus exceeds theſe com‘mon puniſhments: he ſpeaks of the greateſt and ‘moſt cruel torments: He condemns his bad Poet to ‘be burnt alive, as a Sorcerer or Atheiſt.

Infelicibus uſtulanda flammis.

And lower,

Et vos interea venite in ignem.

Others blamed him for meddling with a kind of compoſition which they did not think him fit for. Conſider, pray, theſe words of Mr Gueret: ‘Men have, ‘beſides, that diſtempered fancy to pretend to ſucceed ‘in every thing: they are not willing to be reckoned ‘of a ſtinted genius: as there is hardly any Poet but ‘extends his juriſdiction from the epigram up to the ‘epic poem, ſo there is no Orator who from pane‘gyric does not deſcend to the billet-doux . . . . Scar‘ron, whom nature had framed intirely burleſque, and ‘whoſe mind and body ſeemed deſignedly turned for ‘this character, had yet the boldneſs to attempt a ‘tragedy, and would doubtleſs have finiſhed it, if ‘death had not prevented the temerity of his enter‘prize: in fine, Balzac himſelf has followed this bad ‘example, and not content with the glory of the ſub‘lime ſtyle, would fain have ſhewn by the Barbon, ‘that he was no leſs fit for raillery: but he was much ‘miſtaken on this head; the niceſt judges diſapprov‘ed his taſte, and his Barbon has only ſpoiled his ‘other works. Let us always follow our genius, and ‘never wander out of our own province, nor envy ‘others a glory for which we our ſelves are not for‘med (41).’ Mr de Balzac had received much more agreeable news about his Barbon, for they informed him, that this work met with great ſucceſs, and was admired at Paris. See this beginning of one of his letters to Mr Menage. *Bene eſt, abunde eſt, plus ſat eſt etiam mihi. Quæ ſcripſi ego olim, municipalis ille & Orator & Hiſtoricus, probata nuper ſunt Lutetiæ Pariſiorum. In ampliſſimo orbis Terrarum theatro Barbo meus* Saltavit & Placuit (42). In my opinion Mr Gueret's judgment is not the moſt equitable. The Barbon I confeſs, is of too ſerious a ſtyle: the raillery has not all that eaſy and gay turn which others would have given it; but his ridicule on pedantry is expreſſed happily and to the life by many ſingular characters.

If any one would ſee an excuſe for the ſharpneſs of Balzac's reſentment, let him conſult Feramus's poem where we may read that Montmaur not only exerciſed his ſlandering faculty againſt the Scaligers, the Salmaſius's, and the Grotius's, but alſo treated Mr de Balzac with the laſt contempt.

Te quoque BALZACI, noſtræ decus addite genti,
Urbe vetat, patriâque jubet torpeſcere villâ,
Indecorem Regique tuo nova condere Regna
Quærere & effıcto Virtutes Principe dignas (43).

Thee Balzac too, an honour to our tribe,
From city he debars, and to remain
Stupid in thy own native village bids,
To found new kingdoms for thy king to ſeek
Thoſe virtues, which the fab'lous prince become.

Here you ſee that the affront was perſonal, and that the public cauſe was not the only one he had to defend. I have ſome ſuſpicion, that the paſſage I have cited in the article DESBARREAUX (44) concerns our Montmaur. That would be ſtill a ſtronger proof of the violence of Balzac's reſentment.

[*K*] *There were ſome men of merit who condemned the outrages of Montmaur's perſecutors.*] Three authorities will ſuffice on this head. I ſhall firſt cite Mr Couſin: ‘Amongſt the poems, *ſays he* (45), that ‘Mr Menage compoſed at that time, there were two ‘which made a great noiſe. One was the metamor‘phoſis of the paraſite-Pedant into a parrot. Under ‘this name he meant a profeſſor of the Greek tongue, ‘againſt whom ſeveral other Poets had bitterly inveigh‘ed, reviling him in ſport and merriment, with in‘jurious and inhuman ſatires. The other was the famous *Requête des Dictionaries*.’ Thus he ſpeaks in his pretended elogy of Mr Menage, where you may pleaſe to obſerve, that he ſays nothing of the Life of Mamurra, which is a much more conſiderable work, than the Metamorphoſis he has cited. But I wonder leſs at his ſilence, than at Mr Menage's friends, who have prefixed an abridgment of his Life to the Continuation of the Menagiana. They ſay nothing of this Life of Mamurra.

My ſecond witneſs, his fictitious name, is Vigneul-Marville. We will tranſcribe a part of his diſcourſe (46). ‘The profeſſor Montmaur was not ſo deſpicable a ‘man as moſt believed him. He was an excellent ‘genius, and had great talents. The Greek and La‘tin tongues were, as it were natural to him. He ‘had read all the good authors of antiquity; and ‘being favoured by a prodigious memory, joined to ‘a great vivacity, he made the juſteſt applications of ‘whatever he had obſerved moſt curious. It is true, ‘there was generally a touch of ill nature in them, ‘which provoked the fury of thoſe who were the ‘objects of his wit: by theſe talents he eaſily intro‘duced himſelf to perſons of quality, who loved the ‘recreations of Parnaſſus. His avarice ruined him; ‘for he had an eſtate which he made no uſe of; and ‘he was too great an admirer of good eating. He ‘uſed to tell his friends; gentlemen, do you find diſhes ‘and wine, and I will find ſalt. And the truth is, ‘he ſcattered it about plentifully, at the good tables

(39) In the remark [*K*] of the article CATULLUS.

(40) Balzac, Entret. xvii, *pag. m.* 204.

(41) Gueret, Guerre des Auteurs, *pag. m.* 137, 138.

(42) Balzac, Epiſt. Select. *pag. m.* 182.

(43) Feramus, apud Menagium in libro adoptivo, *pag.* 14.

(44) Citat. (20).

(45) Journal des Sçavans, *of the eleventh of Auguſt* 1692, *pag.* 542, *Edit. of Holl.*

(46) Vigneul Marville, Mêlange d'Hiſtoire & de Litérature, *pag.* 86, *de la* 1 *Edit. de Roüen.*

head, contain things that will explain this article. Montmaur lodged in the college of Boncour, and this circumſtance furniſhed matter of raillery [*L*]. He died in the year 1648

‘ which he frequented. His ſatirical humour had no bounds, he was a Lucian all over. But he chiefly exerciſed it upon the bad Poets. . . . Never were ſo many ſatires in proſe and verſe written againſt any one man, as againſt Montmaur. Every body ſpent his whole ſtock this way upon him. Entire collections are ſtill extant of them. The beſt are thoſe of Mr Menage. Montmaur's friends adviſed him to print his witiciſms upon theſe troubleſome writers: but the love of quiet tied up his hands, and he was contented to laugh at thoſe trifles and deſpiſe them. One of his friends having told him, that Mr Menage had metamorphoſed him into a parrot: very well, ſaid he, I ſhall not want wine then to cheer my heart, nor a beak to defend me; and as this metamorphoſis was much praiſed, no wonder, added he, that ſuch a great prater as Mr Menage ſhould make a good parrot. Montmaur took much more to heart Meſſ. Dupuy refuſing him admittance into their cloſet, which was the center of the fineſt gentlemen of Paris. Theſe gentlemen, of a gravity like that of Cato, took the ſciences by the moſt ſerious handle, and could not eaſily bear thoſe who were only (as one may ſay) the Punchinello's of learning. They did not underſtand raillery: It was ſafer committing a ſoleciſm in the face of a whole univerſity, than deſcending to humour and drollery in their preſence (47).’

My third witneſs is Vavaſſor. He has not named Montmaur, but deſcribes him in ſo clear a manner, that we may be ſure he is the man he means. He gives him no encomium; he charges him with ſome very great and odious faults; but otherwiſe does him juſtice as to his learning, and condemns not only the authors who ſo virulently abuſed him, but even the magiſtrates who permitted ſuch licentiouſneſs. He afterwards makes a reflexion that is judicious enough; to wit, that by a juſt judgment of God it often happens, that princes and their miniſters who neglect to puniſh the boldneſs of ſatiriſts and libellers, are puniſhed ſoon or late for their unconcernedneſs, in the ſame kind, and expoſed to the fury of ſlandrous tongues. I give but a rough draught of this Jeſuit's thoughts. He has very nobly expreſſed them in a work which is hardly now to be met with in the Bookſellers ſhops. And therefore I ſhall be excuſed if I ſet down his own words. *Vidimus quemdam nuper non expertem literarum, ſed cui nihil placeret, nec pulcrum videretur, niſi quod eſſet ſuum. Hunc propter ipſius odioſiſſimos mores, nemo tum poeta ſive ſcriptor alius nefas duxit conſcindere omnibus probris. Quanquam non recte nec ratione, mea quidem ſententia, & peſſimo exemplo. Non enim, ſi dignus is contumelia; perhoneſti, graves & literati viri digni tamen, qui contumeliam inferrent. Et erant alioquin in iſto, quæ amare poſſes ſine moribus, memoria, cognitio ſermonis Græci, varietas aliqua doctrinæ & copia; unde diſcerent nonnihil etiam periti, quamvis hominem non probarent. Sed valuit nimirum maledicentia, grata cunctis, etiam iis, qui neque ſibi maledici, neque maledicere ipſi aliis velint. Atque hanc, ut a me ante dictum eſt, maledicentiam vetant, natura, ratio, mos, diſciplina, jura, leges: ubique gentium ac terrarum, atque in omni memoria pœnæ maledicis graves propoſitæ, crimen tamen impunitum perſæpe & olim fuit, & nunc eſt, & erit, vel veterno & ſocordia, vel prævaricatione eorum, a quibus oportuerit pro officio vindicari. Ac multa peccant principes, & in his illud, quod tantam petulantiam, ita ut meretur, quantumque poſſunt, non coërceant, nec populo caveant ſatis, nec privatos conſervent ab injuria. Interim nutu divini numinis & providentia quid fit? Ne ab iſtis quidem abſtinetur tam lente ferentibus probra in alios: immo linguas hominum magis infeſtas habent, minuſque ſermones effugiunt obtrectatorum: & audire plerumque coguntur ipſi, quæ nolint, quia de aliis patiantur dici, quæ non debeant* (48).

Thus I have given you the three authorities I promiſed. If we barely conſider the formal and expreſs declarations, the Jeſuit Vavaſſeur paſſes the ſevereſt ſentence on our gentleman's adverſaries: but if we conſider the force of the expreſſions, Vigneul Marville is the ſevereſt judge, for declaring that *Montmaur was an excellent wit*, who had read all the good authors of antiquity, *and who had great talents*, a profound underſtanding of Greek and Latin, *a prodigious memory joined with a great vivacity*, &c. He charges the ſatires that were made on him, with extream injuſtice. All his conceſſions in favour of Montmaur, are as ſo many ſtrokes with a rod of iron on the heads of theſe ſatiriſts, ſince they all conſpire to make this profeſſor paſs for the moſt ignorant blockhead in nature: and note, that the praiſes he has given him, ought to have the more weight, becauſe he has not concealed his faults. What he obſerves of his inſenſibility is ſurprizing, and I know not what could have been imagined wiſer, than to laugh, as Montmaur did, at the writings of his enemies. But it is prodigious, that a man of ſo much reading, wit, and memory, ſhould write nothing on that occaſion, or hardly ever publiſh a book in all his life. We muſt believe, that the fire of his wit required the preſence of living objects, and that his vaſt memory ſunk in a great meaſure, when he was to compoſe in ſolitude, and in the ſhade of a cloſet (49). We muſt believe I ſay, that Montmaur found by experience, as ſeveral others do, that it is infinitely eaſier to diſcourſe off-hand, than to write a good book. The way to make this profeſſor's knowledge uſeful to the public, would have been to give him a judicious diſciple, who ſhould conſtantly have attended him, and collected whatever he had heard him ſay. In that caſe we ſhould have had a Montmauriana, which perhaps would have been a good book. I believe there were ſome who diſapproved that contempt which our Montmaur expreſſed for the ſatires made upon him, and who could have wiſhed he had demanded juſtice of the courts; for his adverſaries not content to accuſe him of ignorance, and of being a vain trifler in anagrams, and ſilly puns, charges of which the public juſtice takes no cognizance, *nihil hæc ad edictum prætoris*; reflected on him as a baſtard and murderer, as we have ſeen above (50), and here is a paſſage charging him with forgery and ſodomy.

Jadis dans un fameux procez,
Dont il eut un honteux ſuccez,
Il appella d'une Sentence,
Qui n'eſpargnoit que la potence,
Quand de tout point il eut eſté
Convaincu d'une fauſſeté:
Car il imitoit de nature
Toute ſorte de ſignature,
Et gagna tout en jugement
Quand il ne tint qu'à ſon ſerment.
Il eut d'autres vices encore
Que je tairay, car je l'honnore.
L'on dit que ſon valet un jour
L'accuſa de la ſale amour,
Imputant à ce Paraſite
Le crime d'eſtre Sodomite (51).

This exceeds raillery: A man is anſwerable for ſuch an accuſation in a court of juſtice. The *actio injuriarum* lies againſt him in this caſe (52), and the accuſed may plead the law of the Code, *ſi quis famoſum*, according to which the defamer, who does not produce good proofs, is puniſhed as a ſlanderer.

[*L*] *He lodged in the college of Boncour, and this furniſhed matter of raillery.*] Let us prove this fact from Mr Menage's Words.

Quà collis Genovefa tuus ſupereminet Urbem,
Stat Becodina domus, docti celeberrima quondam
Atria Gallandi, ſummo Rectore juventæ.

. . . .

Quà exiguo conduxerat ære penates
Gargilius (53).

And by theſe fine verſes of Feramus,

Quà poſuit ſtabiles Pariſina Academia ſedes
In monte excelſo, mons eminet altior, illic

Exiguâ

---

(47) Id. ib. *pag.* 83.

(48) Franciſcus Vavaſſor, de Epigrammate, *cap. x*, *pag.* 98, 99. *This book was printed at Paris in* 1672, *in* 8*vo*.

(49) Compare what has been ſaid above, remark [*B*] of the article CREMONIN.

(50) In the remarks [*D*] and [*H*].

(51) Hiſtoire de la Vie & de la Mort du grand Mogor, *pag.* 25, 26, *in the collection of* Hadrian de Valois.

(52) *Compare with this theſe words of Horace, Epiſt. I, ver.* 152, *lib. ii.* Quin etiam lex Pœnaque lata, malo quæ nollet carmine quemquam Deſcribi.

(53) Menag. Miſcell. *pag.* 7, 8.

1648 [*M*]. He publiſhed ſomething againſt Buſbequius (*b*). It is ſaid he had five thouſand livres *per ann.* and was very covetous (*i*).

(*b*) Buſbequium mortuum nec reſponſurum invaſit. - - - *He fell upon Buſbequius who was dead and could not anſwer him.* Menag. in Vita Mamurræ, *pag.* 30. *See the remark* [*B*]. (*i*) Suite du Menagiana, *pag.* 200, *Dutch Edit.*

Exiguâ parvos habitat mercede penates.
Non illuc ſtudia, & docti vicinia Phœbi
Pellexere hominem, ſed ut hinc toti incubet Urbi,
Majoreſque alto ſpeculetur vertice fumos,
In tua jejunus ruiturus prandia, MEMMI,
Vel famoſa tuæ, BONELLI, *fercula menſæ,*
Seu veſtras, HANEQUINE, *dapes tantâ arte paratas.*
Et quicumque alij menſâ præſtatis opimâ
Luculli illuſtres, Mæcenateſque beati (54).

(54) Feramus, in Macrini Paraſitogrammatici ἡμέρᾳ, init. apud Menagium ibid. in libro adoptivo, *pag.* 7.

You ſee they pretend that he lodged in this college, the better to diſcover the ſmoke of the kitchens of Paris, it being the higheſt part of the town. But if it was convenient on this ſcore, it was very inconvenient in another reſpect, by being at too great a diſtance from the houſes where the paraſite uſed to dine. This put him to the expence of keeping a horſe. Mr Menage talks very pleaſantly upon it. ‘Verum ‘cum ſummo in cacumine montis Genoveſani tunc ‘temporis habitaret, ut hinc ſcilicet culinarum fumos, ‘ex quibus auguria captabat, commodius proſpicere ‘poſſet; atque adeo horum omnium quos aſſiduè colebat, ab ejus tugurio domus longè diſtarent: ne ad ‘illorum cœnas ac prandia tardius accederet, Equum ‘ſibi comparavit: qui quoniam Becodiana in Schola, ‘* quam *Parnaſum Pariſienſem* Ronſardus vocare ſolebat, ſtabulabatur, *Pegaſus* eſt appellatus; de quo Carmen eſt SPESSEI (55). - - - - *But as he then lived ‘on the top of Mount Genevieve, that from thence he ‘might the more conveniently obſerve the ſmoke of the ‘kitchens, from which he took his omens: and as the ‘houſes he daily frequented were a great way off from ‘his own cottage; that he might not come too late to ‘dinner or ſupper, he bought an horſe, which being ‘ſtabled in the college of Bancour, called by Ronſard ‘the* Parnaſſus of Paris, *was named* Pegaſus: where‘upon SPESSEUS *wrote a poem.*’ The thought in the beginning of this paſſage is pleaſant enough; to wit, that Montmaur, in conſulting the auguries, did not wait for the appearance of vultures, or any other kind of birds, but was attentive to the ſmoak of the kitchens only. He ſhould conſequently have ſaid (56), that Montmaur having an opinion of the augural art, applied himſelf chiefly to Capnomancy (57). Theſe gentlemens raillery is become a common-place to all who would characteriſe a paraſite. A paraſite ſay they, going out of his lodgings, without knowing where he ſhall dine, guides his ſteps through the ſtreets of Paris by the ſmoak of the kitchens, and this ſmoak is his compaſs and polar ſtar, &c.

* *Binetus, in Vita Ronſ.*

(55) Menagius, in Vita Mamurræ, *pag. m.* 20.

(56) That is, in the place where Mr Menage gives a liſt of the arts and ſciences which Mamurra had a mind to underſtand.

(57) That is the the art of divination by ſmoke.

[*M*] *Montmaur died in the year* 1648.] This I look on as unqueſtionable, though I have not found it in any author, for Mr Simon de Valhebert has been pleaſed to inform me, that he was told ſo by the abbot Gallois, who conſulting the regiſters of the college royal, found that Montmaur in the year 1623, obtained the reverſion of the place of Profeſſor of the Greek tongue, after Jerome Goulu (58), that he died in the year 1648, and was ſucceeded by James Pigis.

(58) A Pariſian who died in the year 1639.

MONTPENSIER (THE DUCHESS OF) favourite to Catherine de Medicis. See LONGWIC.

MOPSUS. There are two perſons principally of this name in the books of the ancients. One was ſon to Ampycus and Chloris; the other was the ſon of Tireſias, according to ſome, or of Manto daughter to Tireſias, according to others (*a*). We ſhall ſay ſomething of each. MOPSUS, the ſon of Ampycus, was inſtructed by Apollo in augury, and became very conſiderable by means of this art during the expedition of the Argonauts (*b*). He was ſirnamed Titareſian (*c*), from the place of his birth, a village in the country of the Lapithæ in Theſſaly. However his own country was not the ſcene where he accquired moſt honour, but that of Africa. He landed there, having loſt his way in his return from Colchos, and died by the bite of a ſerpent (*d*). They ſay he was buried near Teuchira one of the towns of the Pentapolis (*e*) [*A*], and honoured with a temple in the province of Cyrene [*B*], which became famous for an oracle. The firſt inſtitution of which is attributed to Battus the Cyrenean (*f*). Ammianus Marcellinus tells us (*g*) that the heroical manes of Mopſus, buried in Africa, aſſwaged ſeveral kinds of pain, and commonly cured them. This Hiſtorian is guilty of an error in this point which

(*a*) Hygin. *cap. xiv*, Scholiaſt. Apollon. *in lib. i, ver.* 65.

(*b*) Hygin. ibid. Apollon. Argonaut. *lib. i, ver.* 65. Valer. Flaccus, Argon. *lib. i, ver.* 383, & paſſim alibi. Statius, Theb. *lib. iii, ver.* 521.

(*c*) Apollon. ibid. Heſiod. in Scuto.

(*d*) Apollon. *lib. i, verſ.* 80, & *lib. iv, ver.* 1520.

(*e*) Lycophron. Caſſand. *ver.* 877. Clem. Alexandrin. Stromat. *lib. i.*

(*f*) Clem. Alex. ibid.

(*g*) *Lib. xiv, cap. viii.*

[*A*] *Teuchira, one of the towns of the Pentapolis.*] Here I have followed the opinion of the learned Valeſius (1), who has proved from Lycophron, that Mopſus was buried near Teuchira. However, I muſt ingenuouſly own, that in examining the paſſage of this obſcure Poet, I could not think but that our Argonaut's tomb was rather characterized in it, with regard to Auſigda upon the river Ciniphas, than with regard to Teuchira. Now this river is not far from Pentapolis (2). Beſides I own I cannot conceive, why Valeſius pretends, that if Mopſus had been buried in Pentapolis, Ammianus Marcellinus ought not to have mentioned *the ſhoar of Africa, and the Punic glebe* (3); he may eaſily be juſtified by their authority, who ſay that Mopſus died in Africa, amongſt which are Tertullian and Apuleius, to whom we may join Apollonius and Seneca (4) who make him die in Libya. This reaſoning ſuppoſes, that Pentapolis was not a part of Africa; but I cannot imagine, conſidering how many great men have maintained the contrary, why Ammianus Marcellinus ſhould not be permitted to do the ſame: he ſometimes runs into poetical phraſes, wherein the general name is preferred before the particular. After all, in Lycophron's Caſſandra, we ſee that the coaſt of Teuchira is called the manſions inhabited by Atlas. Is not this intended to ſignify in general the coaſts of Africa?

(1) Henric. Valeſius, in Marcel. *pag.* 41.

(2) *See* Mela, *lib. i, cap. vii.*

(3) Quod ſi ita eſt male hic Africæ littus, & ceſpitem Punicum poſuit Marcellinus. *Valeſ. ubi ſupra.*

(4) See the remark [*E*].

[*B*] *He was honoured with a temple in the province of Cyrene.*] If we had rather have the teſtimony of a heathen, than that of Clemens Alexandrinus, we need only read theſe words of Apuleius: ‘Tantum ‘eos Deos appellant qui ex eodem numero juſte ac ‘prudenter vitæ curriculo gubernato, pro numine ‘poſtea ab hominibus proditi fanis & cerimoniis vulgo ‘advertuntur, ut in Bœotia Amphiaraus, IN AFRICA ‘MOPSUS, in Ægypto Oſiris, alius alibi gentium ‘(5). - - - - *They only call thoſe gods, who having led ‘a juſt and prudent life, are afterwards reported by men ‘to be deities, and are honoured with temples and ceremonies, as Amphiaraus in Bœotia,* MOPSUS IN AFRICA, *Oſiris in Ægypt, and others elſewhere.*’ Lutatius, the Scholiaſt of the Poet Statius, ſays, in ſpeaking of the ſame Mopſus: ‘In tantum magnus fuit in ‘augurali peritia ut poſt mortem templa ei dicata ſint, ‘à quorum adytis ſæpe homines reſponſa accipiunt. ‘- - - - - *He was ſo famous for his ſkill in Divination, ‘that*

(5) Apul. de Deo Socratis.

which is common to him with ſome other authors [C]. As to the other **MOPSUS**, I find that the ſame Strabo, who makes him the ſon of Tireſias at the end of the ninth book, makes him the ſon of Apollo and Manto in his thirteenth and fourteenth books. And that Pauſanias (b) makes him the ſon of Manto and Rhacius, the head of a colony which paſſed from the Iſle of Crete into Aſia. Nothing of all this can be eaſily reconciled with his being king of Argos, or with the national epithet of Argian which has been given him [D]. All who mention him, make him a great maſter in the art of Divination. It is ſaid that he broke the heart of Calchas, the famous Calchas who was ſuper-intendant of the augurs, during the long war of Troy, that he fairly broke his heart in a diſpute between them which was the beſt Diviner [E]. Calchas went on foot from Troy to Claros, in company of Amphilochus, and to try Mopſus's ability he aſked him, ſhewing him a big-bellied ſow, how many young ſhe carried, he anſwered three, one of which was a ſow-pig. The thing proved true. Mopſus aſked Calchas in his turn, how many figs there were on ſuch a fig-tree. Calchas could not tell, and died of grief (i). No body, ever ſo little verſed in books, will wonder, that this ſtory ſhould be differently related; for to judge of things by experience, there is a fatality in this which humane nature cannot avoid. There are authors then who ſay (k), that it was Calchas aſked the number of figs (l), and that Mopſus anſwered ten thouſand, and that they might all, one only excepted, be contained in a certain meaſure which he named. This anſwer, found exactly true upon trial, made Calchas die of vexation. Others will have it, that Calchas bid him tell how many young ones the ſow went with, and that the truth of his anſwer to this queſtion was that only which broke his heart, ſo that there was

no

(b) *Lib. vii, pag. m.* 207.

(i) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag. m.* 442. Lycophr. *ver.* 425.

(k) Strabo, ibid.

(l) Servius, in Eclog. VI, Virgil. *ver.* 72. *Grounding himſelf on the Poet* Euphorion, *ſays they were apples.*

'*that after his death temples were dedicated to him,* '*from which men often received Oracles.*' We have already ſeen (6) Marcellinus's teſtimony.

[*C*] *Ammianus Marcellinus commits a fault which is common to him with ſome other authors.*] It is his confounding Mopſus the Argonaut with the ſon or grandſon of Tireſias. Barthius (7) obſerves, that even the ancient writers put one for the other, and he expreſsly accuſes Servius to have done it: but he does him wrong, ſince Servius (8) ſpeaks only of Mopſus in general. The charge would be much juſter againſt Ammianus Marcellinus, from whom Barthius cites that paſſage, as a good proof of theſe two things: I. That Mopſus's tomb was in Africa. II. That it was not poſſible for Strabo to have ſeen it in Cilicia. He leaves us to judge which of theſe two ancient authors is miſtaken, and does not perceive Ammianus Marcellinus's error in the paſſage he cites. Valeſius is the perſon who obſerves it. The thing is plain. This hiſtorian ſays on one hand, that the city of Mopſus was the place or habitation of Mopſus the Diviner; and on the other, that this Mopſus having been driven on the coaſt of Africa, in his return from the conqueſt of the Golden Fleece, died there, and that his tomb wrought miracles. He who gave his name to Mopſueſtia, and he that founded ſeveral towns in Cilicia, are doubtleſs the ſame Mopſus, now the latter was cotemporary with Calchas and Amphilochus, and flouriſhed after the Trojan war; it was not he therefore who went with the Argonauts. Clemens Alexandrinus has not taken notice of this, ſince, as Valeſius obſerves, he thought the Mopſus, who flouriſhed at the time of the Trojan war, had been in this expedition. I do not object to him what others might do (9), that great age, which this ſuppoſition would infer; but he ought to have remembered, that this perſon loſt his life in his return from Colchos. Pamelius (10) takes him for the Argonaut who gave out oracles in Cilicia. We ſhall preſently ſee a ſlip or two of Meurſius. They diſtinguiſh in Calepin three Mopſus's. I. The Augur, who founded the town of Phaſelus upon the confines of Pamphylia. II. The Lapithyte, the ſon of Ampycus. III. He who diſputed againſt Calchas.

[*D*] *The national epithet of Argian was given him.*] Valeſius (11), to diſtinguiſh our two Mopſus's, names the firſt *Lapitham* (12), or *Theſſalum*, and the latter *Argivum*. But whem I conſider that Tireſias was a Theban, and think on the fierce and bloody war which the Argians made twice upon the Thebans, during the life of Tireſias, we cannot ſee how he could have a ſon, who, for diſtinction's ſake, ſhould be called the Argian. If Manto was a prieſteſs of Delphos, and Apollo begat Mopſus upon her, why ſhould this Mopſus be called an Argian? Or why, if he ſprung from the marriage which ſhe contracted with Rhacius in Aſia, ſhould he bear this title? There would be leſs difficulty in this, were he her ſon by Alcmeon (13). However, Cicero affirms, he was king of Argos: 'Amphilochus & Mopſus Argivorum Reges fuerunt, ſed 'iidem Augures, iique urbes in ora maritima Ciliciæ 'Græcas condidere (14). - - - *Amphilochus and Mopſus* '*were kings of the Argives, and, at the ſame time, Au-* '*gurs, and built Grecian cities on the ſea-coaſt of Cilicia.*' If ever Meziriac's Commentary on Apollodorus comes out, which I rather wiſh than expect, we ſhall learn many things about the two Mopſus's (15).

[*E*] *It is ſaid that he broke the heart of Calchas . . . in a diſpute which was the beſt Diviner.*] Moreri's continuators have been guilty of ſeveral faults in relating this diſpute. I. They have repreſented Mopſus as the aggreſſor, which they ought not to have done, ſince he does not appear ſo in any of the different relations, which Strabo has given. II. They ought not to have cited Heſiod, without adding, that what he has ſaid upon this head, is to be met with in Strabo. This addition is neceſſary as often as we cite an author whoſe work is loſt, and is known only from the citations of others. III. They ought not to have cited Heſiod on any account, ſince they do not relate the matter as he does. They ſay, that Mopſus put the Queſtion to Chalcas about the number of figs. Whereas Heſiod ſays it was Calchas aſked Mopſus that queſtion. They were doubtleſs deceived by Charles Stephens after Mr Lloyd and Hofman. 'Dolore contabuit quod propoſita ſibi à Mopſo 'caprifico (ut refert Heſiodus) aut (ut Pherecydes, mavult) ſue gravida, conjicere not potuiſſet, quot in illa 'ficus eſſent, quotve hæc utero ſuculas gereret: quos 'tamen Mopſus ſine ullo errore divinavit (16). - - - *He* '*pined away with grief, becauſe a queſtion being put to* '*him by Mopſus about a figtree, (as Heſiod ſays) or (as* '*Pherecydes will have it) a big-bellied ſow, he could not* '*tell how many figs were on the former, nor how many young* '*the latter carried, which, however, Mopſus divined* '*right.*' IV. They ought not to have cited the firſt book of the Iliad, which has nothing of what they ſay. I am leſs ſurpriſed at all this, than at the ſtrange miſtake of Meurſius. This learned man (17) imagines, that Mopſus was worſted in this diſpute, if we be decided by Seneca the Tragedian. *Seneca Mopſum inferiorem factum vult in Medea:*

Omnibus verax ſibi falſus uni
Concidit Mopſus, caruitque Thebis
Ille qui verè cecinit futura.

Firſt, he does not ſpeak in this place of Mopſus Calchas's antagoniſt, but of Mopſus the Argonaut. Secondly, Seneca ſays no more than this, that Mopſus with all his prophetical ſkill, died in the expedition. I will ſet you down the whole paſſage, ſince it is not free from falſhood on another ſcore.

Ite nunc fortes, perarate Pontum
Sorte timenda.
Idmonem, quamvis bene fata noſſet,
Condidit ſerpens Libycis arenis.
Omnibus verax, ſibi falſus uni

Concidit

(6) In the body of this article.

(7) In Statium, *Tom. ii, pag.* 818.

(8) In Eclog. VI, *ver.* 72.

(9) *Lloyd who alledges againſt thoſe who confound the two Mopſus's*, quod Argonautica expeditio generatione integra bellum Trojanum anteceſſit. - - - *that the expedition of the Argonauts preceded the Trojan war a whole generation*; & Barth. ubi ſupra, *who aſſerts, that* ille Argonautarum vates attingere minime potuit tempora à reditu Trojæ. - - - *the augur of the Argonauts could not reach to the time of the Trojan war.* Calviſius maintains the contrary, *ad ann. mundi* 2727.

(10) In Tertull. de Anima, *cap. xlvi.*

(11) In Ammian. Marcell. *lib. xiv, pag.* 40, 41.

(12) This is the epithet *Strabo* gives him.

(13) *See* Apollodorus, Bibl. *lib. iii, pag. m.* 200.

(14) Cicero, de Divinat. *lib. i, cap. xl.*

(15) See his Commentary on Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 911.

(16) Car. Steph. in voce Calchas, *pag. m.* 546.

(17) Comment. in Lycophron. *pag.* 205.

no need of Mopſus's propoſing a queſtion in his turn, which Calchas could not reſolve. There are ſome who maintain that all this happened not at Claros, but in Cilicia (*m*). Mopſus loſt his life in another kind of conteſt [*F*], for it is ſaid (*n*) that he and Amphilochus ſet out together from Troy, and built the town of Mallus in Cilicia. That Amphilochus left him there to go to Argos: that miſſing his aim he came back again to Mopſus, who would have no more to do with him: that they fought a duel in which both of them fell, and that their tombs, which were ſhewn at Margaſa near the river Pyramus, were ſo ſituated, that one of them could not be ſeen from the other. It is certain that Cilicia was not the leaſt theatre of Mopſus's actions: he built ſeveral towns in it (*o*), that which was called Mopſueſtia (*p*) had a particular relation to his perſon: Cilicia was principally the place where he was worſhipped as a God, and where he gave out oracles (*q*). Plutarch tells a ſtory of them, which confounded the incredulity of the Epicureans (*r*).

Note, that Mopſus's applying himſelf to Divination did not hinder his begetting children. He had three daughters, Rhode, Meliade, and Pamphylia. Their names were given to ſome countries (*s*).

(*m*) Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 464.

(*n*) Id. ib. & Lycophr. *ver.* 439.

(*o*) Cicero, *lib. i*, de Divinat. Pompon. Mela, *lib. i, cap. xiv*, & ibi Iſac. Voſſius.

(*p*) Μόψου ἑστία, quaſi lares Mopſi. *See* Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 465. Mopſueſtia vàtis illius domicilium Mopſi, *ſays* Ammianus Marcellinus, *lib. xiv. St Jerome calls it*, Mopſi viculum. *See* Berkelius, in Stephan. *pag.* 567, & Photius, Biblioth. *num.* 176, *pag.* 392.

(*q*) Tertull. de Anima, *cap. xlvi.* Origines, *lib. iii*, contra Celſum. Euſeb. de laudibus Conſtant.

(*r*) De Oracul. defectu.

(*s*) Photius, Bibl. *num.* 176, *pag.* 392, ex Theopompo.

Concidit Mopſus, caruitque Thebis
Ille què veri cecinit futura.

Here are three examples of the ſad Fate of the moſt famous ſooth-ſayers. The laſt is that of Tireſias, who died a fugitive, and baniſhed from Thebes. The firſt is that of Idmon, who died in Africa by the bite of a ſerpent; the other is that of Mopſus, of whom Seneca is content to ſay, in an indefinite manner, that he died. But here he takes one for the other: he attributes to Idmon what does not belong to him; for Mopſus was he who died in Africa of the bite of a ſerpent. Beſides Apollonius, whom I have cited, obſerve how Hyginus ſpeaks of him (18). ' Mopſus ' Ampyci filius ab ſerpentis morſu in Africa obiit. - - - ' *Mopſus the ſon of Ampycus died in Africa by the bite of* ' *a ſerpent.*' I am not ignorant what ſtrains are given to this paſſage, and how many different ways of pointing it the Critics have invented. Rhodiginus (19) doubtleſs applauded himſelf on having put a point after *condidit*, and taking *ſerpens* for a participle. But I do not believe any judicious perſon thinks this more likely than ſaying, that the Latin Poet was under a miſtake. Do not we ſee the beſt hiſtorians confound facts which are near their own time, and ſuch as are no leſs remarkable, than the death of the ſooth-ſayer of an army could be in the imagination of a tragic Poet? Did Gruterus (20) who refers the *caruit Thebis* to Mopſus, think, that Mopſus was a Lapithyte? He changes I know not how many preter-tenſes into futures: he will have it that Seneca tranſgreſſed againſt hiſtory; but not that the temptation of crouding many great examples of morality into a chorus, has made him have recourſe to the aſylum of a prolepſis, or confound his Chronology. I can beſides all this maintain, that Seneca's words are no proof of what Valeſius alledges them for, I mean Mopſus's death in Africa. The paſſages he produces from Tertullian and Apuleius, only prove that Mopſus was honoured as a God in that country; but he ought to have alledged ſomething more expreſs from his authors, before he offered them as witneſſes of a man's deceaſe in ſuch or ſuch a place.

[*F*] *Mopſus loſt his life in another kind of conteſt.*] This by no means reſpecting Chalchas, I ſhall venture to ſay, that Strabo's tranſlator has not rendered theſe words right, οὐ μόνον δὲ τὴν ϖερὶ τῆς μαντικῆς ἔριν μεμυθεύκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς. Neque de divinatione duntaxat eos contendiſſe fabulantur, ſed etiam de imperio (21). - - - - - *And it is reported, they not only contended about divination, but likewiſe about command.*' This *eos* neceſſarily refers to Calchas and Mopſus; we muſt therefore expect to ſee them diſpute for command, yet nothing of this appears by the ſequel; it is Mopſus and Amphilochus that fall out. Strabo has expreſſed himſelf in ſuch a manner as not to have any ſhare in this ſmall cenſure.

(18) Fabula xiv, *pag. m.* 46, 47.

(19) Antiq. Lect. *lib. xxix, cap. xv.*

(20) Apud Senecam Scriverii, *pag.* 237.

(21) Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 464.

MORGUES (**Matthew de**) Sieur de St Germain, preacher in ordinary to Lewis XIII, and firſt almoner to Mary de Medicis, this king's mother, made himſelf very much known by ſeveral libels he publiſhed againſt cardinal Richelieu. He was born in Vellai in Languedoc (*a*), and was of a family which had been praiſed by Lewis Pulci preceptor to Leo X (*b*). He turned Jeſuit, and taught ſome claſſes at Avignon in the college of the ſociety (*c*). He quitted this profeſſion ſome time after, and dextrouſly leaping over the walls of the college (*d*), he capitulated at liberty, and made up the buſineſs as well as he could [*A*]. He employed in his juſtification a kind of dilemma, which was retorted upon him [*B*]. He preached in Paris with great ſucceſs

(*a*) Matthieu de Morgues, Lettre de change proteſtée, *pag. m.* 946.

(*b*) Id. ib. *pag.* 947.

(*c*) Prémiere Lettre de change de Sabin à Nicocleon, *pag.* 711, *of the* Pieces pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire, *Edit.* 1643, *in 4to.*

(*d*) Ibid. *pag.* 713.

[*A*] *He leaped over the walls of the Jeſuits college at Avignon . . . . and made up the buſineſs as well as he could.*] What he advances on this ſubject, is inconſiſtent with what was objected to him. This objection imports, *That he became a prieſt in a ſtate of apoſtacy, before he had by any diſpenſation diſengaged himſelf from the bonds which ſtill tied him by one end, to an order he had deſerted* (1). *Many*, continue they, *may have heard cardinal Spada ſay ſometimes as much, before whom you ſtood crying a long time to ſee if you could move him to ſome compaſſion.* Now hear what he anſwered to an author, who called him an apoſtate Jeſuit: *He whom you accuſe, declares he was very young when he entered into the ſociety, and that he neither quitted it out of levity, nor libertiniſm. He might have married after his retreat, if he pleaſed, or have choſen any other profeſſion than that he took, being in no ſacred orders, nor of an age to take them* (2). Does not this imply, that he quitted the Jeſuits before he had made any vow? How then could he be tied to their order by one end? Note, that he anſwers nothing, to what was ſaid of his teaching ſome claſſes in the Jeſuits college at Avignon. We muſt therefore believe the accuſation true. Whence it follows, that he diſguiſes things, in ſaying, he was free to marry when he left the ſociety.

[*B*] *He employed a kind of dilemma which was retorted upon him.*] ' He tells us, that if the Jeſuits ' be men of probity, he ought to be praiſed for ' having kept good company; if not, he deſerves no ' reproach for having left them. But it is true, they ' are men of probity, and it were wrong not to ' have continued with them, ſuppoſing either that ' a man left them to turn libertine, or that he could ' not leave them with a good conſcience, or that ' they themſelves could not juſtly diſpenſe with one ' who had not made profeſſion againſt them (3).' This is his anſwer: let us ſee what was replied to him: ' Your argument reſembles thoſe daggers ' which were antiently made uſe of in tragedies: it ' enters into itſelf without giving the leaſt wound. I ' turn it againſt you, and ſay; if the Jeſuits are ' wicked, you deſerve blame for having kept ill com' pany; if good, you cannot deny, but you are to ' blame in having left them. There is nothing to ' to be ſaid againſt this.' But it is true, they are men of probity, ſay you. ' This has always been ' my opinion; but it has not always been your's. ' You

(1) Prémiere Lettre de change de Sabin à Nicocleon, *pag.* 716, *of the* Recueil des Pieces pour ſervir à l'Hiſtoire, *Edit.* 1643, *in 4to.*

(2) Morgues, Reparties ſur la Rêponſe à la Remonſtrance, *pag.* 7.

(3) Id. ib. *pag.* 8.

ſucceſs [*C*], and in the year 1613, was appointed preacher to queen Margaret (*e*). He was afterwards preferred to be preacher to the king in the year 1615, in Father Portugais's place, and in the year 1620, was preacher to the queen-mother. He had the cure of Notre-Dame des Vertus near Paris. They who writ againſt him accuſed him of having ſold this cure, but he denied it [*D*]. He was named to the biſhopric of Toulon by Lewis XIII, but never could obtain his bulls. He gave his anſwer to the reproaches, which were made him on this occaſion, the beſt turn that could poſſibly be given it [*E*]. He retired to his father's houſe upon the confinement of Mary de Medicis. Cardinal Richelieu who had taken meaſures to make him priſoner in that retreat [*F*], failed of his aim ;

‘ You did not ſpeak in this manner, when having weighed the Jeſuits and Huguenots in a balance, you equally condemned them to depart the kingdom. Your diſcourſe is ſtill to be ſeen in print (4).’ Let us add to this another paſſage, which more diſtinctly informs us, that he hated the ſociety he had left. ‘ Tell us of what order was that young monk of your claſs, whom you got to hold your writings a top of the wall while you leaped down ; for it is not certain, whether he was a Carmelite, or a Jacobin . . . . . Tell us, what was the true reaſon of that ſentence, by which, in one of your books, you have ſince condemned thoſe whom you deſerted, to be baniſhed France ? Who ſays, that it was only the vexation of ſeeing one of the ſociety at the king's ear, who did not much recommend your preaching to his majeſty ? who pretends, that it was only out of pure ſpite to him ? But it is moſt certain, that another of their enemies having aſked you, why baniſhing miniſters and Jeſuits together, you would ſend theſe good Fathers into a better country than their fellow-exiles, to whom, however, you wiſhed much leſs harm ? You anſwered, it was, that finding themſelves in a better condition, they ſhould think leſs of returning into the country from which you expelled them (5).’ Some pages before he had been taxed with writing a book *againſt a Jeſuit, which he could not defend before the king in the Louvre* (6), and had been reminded (7), *that of the three words of which he compoſed his fine title, the two firſt were borrowed from Rome, and the third from Athens.*

[*C*] *He preached in Paris with great ſucceſs.*] He affirms in a ſmall piece, publiſhed in the year 1631, that he had preached two thouſand times in the capital city of the kingdom (8), and ſays elſewhere (9), that there was not a pariſh in this great city, but he had preached in. *All the court*, adds he (10), *valued my ſermons ; the Doctors, Bachelors, Regulars, and the moſt celebrated Lawyers of Paris enquired after them : many of the curious have filled their table-books with them, and a great number of citizens of good ſenſe have found great ſatisfaction in them.*

[*D*] *His enemies accuſed him of having ſold this cure, but he denied it.*] John Sirmond, under the falſe name of Sabin, addreſſes him after this manner (11): *You underſtand not ſo much as the two languages, which common uſe makes moſt familiar to well-bred men. And therefore I look upon it, as a kind of ſpiritual prodigality in that honeſt man, who to recompenſe that little, you were capable of teaching thoſe children, he had committed to your inſtruction, gave you this cure* (12), *which you ſold after a few years, to go and put off your bad French near the table of the late queen Margaret.* Note, that it is obſerved (13) he had been curate of Aubervilliers. Let us ſee how he defends himſelf againſt the charge of ſelling his cure of Nôtre-Dame des Vertus. *I reſigned it*, ſays he (14), *into the hands of the deceaſed Mr Galemant, firſt director to the Carmelite Nuns in France. It was not poſſible to commit Simony with a ſaint, who did ſo many miracles in his life, and after his death, that they talk of canonizing him. Thus, in order to thruſt me into hell, Sabin would drag a bleſſed ſaint out of Paradiſe. The truth is, queen Margaret de Valois took me from that place, where the great reſort of people, kept a continual noiſe, enemy to the neceſſary repoſe of a man of letters. The cardinal de Joyeuſe commanded me, from that princeſs, to reſign the benefice into the hands of Mr de Galemant, who had been his great vicar at Rohan: he reſigned it preſently after, to the Fathers of the oratory, who poſſeſs it ſtill, and who know I never had any recompence for it.*

[*E*] ***He gave his anſwer to the reproaches made him upon the refuſal of the bulls, the beſt turn that could poſſibly be given it.***] One of his adverſaries publiſhed this (15) : ‘ He is a renegado Jeſuit, who in his converſation commonly inveighed againſt the power of the Pope, under pretence of defending the privileges of the Gallican church, by that means ſowing, as much as he could, the ſeeds of diviſion between the church and ſtate. . . . . The moſt intimate friend he ever had was Fancan, a man notorious for his impiety, a reputed Atheiſt ; and who was convicted of having always favoured the intereſts of Hereſy, both within and without the kingdom. This kind of converſation and company got him ſo ill a reputation, that the king having, at the recommendation of ſome, who did not thoroughly know the man, nominated him to the biſhopric of Toulon ſome years ago, he could not procure teſtimonials from men of worth, ſufficient to induce his holineſs to grant him his bulls ; ſo that he has been forced to quit his biſhopric.’ I paſs over Matthew de Morgues's anſwer concerning his intimacy with Fancan (16), and only relate what concerns the refuſal of the bulls. ‘ He whom he accuſes, aſſures him he never entered into a diſpute either for or againſt the privileges of the Gallican church. Nor was that the thing which ſtopped his bulls, but the ill offices of the cardinal, who was perſuaded by two malicious men, that the dignity of a biſhop, would render more conſiderable with the queen, a perſon whom they had always kept at a diſtance from her, becauſe they were jealous of his capacity and courage. If Mulot did once fall out with the cardinal, he would lay open his management with the late Mr Herbault, ſecretary of ſtate ; and if the biſhop of Mande du Pleſſis were alive, and would ſpeak the truth, we ſhould know all the tricks the cardinal played in this affair. His holineſs knew the malice ; and one of the wiſeſt gentlemen of France can witneſs, what the Pope ſaid upon this ſubject in granting the bulls, which were demanded, when leave was deſired to require a free gift from the biſhopric upon other conſiderations (17).’ He anſwered much the ſame to the Sieur Sirmond. ‘ Sabin ſays alſo, that the bulls for the biſhopric of Toulon were refuſed me : he is miſtaken. Cardinal Richelieu has retarded them by his artifices, but has not been able to get them refuſed. His holineſs is too juſt to deny me the recompence of the ſervices I have done the church theſe twenty years, and the king too generous to ſuffer his nomination to be condemned. Some, againſt the rules of charity, ſtruck in with the cardinal who oppoſed me : but the difficulty was removed, when, of my own accord, I begged of the king, that he would permit me to recommend a biſhop : which his majeſty granted with regret. I kept a part of the revenue, which the revenge of the cardinal has deprived me of, becauſe I defended the reputation of the princeſs, who has given him an hundred times more (18).’ He does not diſown his friendſhip and intimacy with Mr Servin, Gillot, and Derivaux, *thoſe true Frenchmen, worthy magiſtrates, and uncorrupt judges* (19).

I relate theſe things, only to ſhew the ſpirit which advanced or retarded promotions at that time. I believe theſe baſe intrigues will laſt as long as the world.

[*F*] *Cardinal Richelieu had taken meaſures to make him priſoner in that retreat.*] Cardinal Richelieu *diſpatched a commiſſion to the Sieur de Machault, intendant of Languedoc, to ſeize the perſon of Matthew de Morgues.* The intendant charged the provoſt of Niſmes, and that of Vellai with the execution of it, and wrote ‘ to the judge Mage of Puy, and ſome lords, to aſſiſt the king's officers in taking him. *The commiſſion was* to take St Germain dead or alive, to ſeize all ‘ his

(*e*) Matthieu de Morgues, Reparties ſur la Réſponſe à la Remonſtrance au Roi, *pag.* 7.

(4) Prémiere Lettre de change de Sabin à Nicocleon, *pag.* 716.

(5) Ib. *pag.* 730.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 710.

(7) Becauſe he had blamed his adverſary for taking the name of Cleonville, half Greek, half Latin.

(8) Morgues, Reparties à la Rêponſe, *pag. m.* 11.

(9) Id. Lettre de change proteſtée, *pag.* 925. 926.

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 940.

(11) Prémiere, Lettre de change de Sabin, *pag.* 725.

(12) In *pag.* 714, he had been reproached with *ſelling his cure of Notre-Dame des Vertus.*

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 729.

(14) Morgues, Lettre de change proteſtée, *pag.* 923, 924.

(15) Réſponſe au Libelle intitulé très-humble, &c. Remonſtrance au Roi, *pag.* 560, *of the* Recueil des Pieces.

(16) It is to be found at the eleventh and twelfth pages of his *Reparties.*

(17) Morgues, Reparties, *pag.* 10.

(18) Idem, Lettre de change proteſtée, *pag.* 924, 925.

(19) Id. ib. *pag.* 925.

aim; for St Germain made his eſcape before the archers arrived. The queen-mother having left Compiegne (*f*), and deſigning to publiſh an apology, ſent for him and commanded him to anſwer a writing, intituled *The defence of the king and his miniſters*, in which the honour of this princeſs had been treated with great liberty. He publiſhed in 1631 the anſwer ſhe deſired [*G*], and afterwards ſeveral others againſt the flatterers of the cardinal Richelieu (*g*). The worſt was, that he had before publiſhed books full of this cardinal's praiſes [*H*]. This gave his enemies room to beat him with his own weapons. He followed Mary de Medicis out of the kingdom, and returned not into France,

(*f*) Ibid. *pag.* 5.

(*g*) Du Chatelet, Sirmond, Balzac, Dupleix, *&c.*

‘ his papers, without making an inventory of them, and ſend them to Beaucaire; whilſt the priſoner ſhould be conducted to Mande, to be put into the hands of the biſhop (20).’ The author believes that this prelate, who had been valet to the cardinal, would have got him *ſtrangled or poiſoned without noiſe.* He had notice of the deſign *the night before* the intended execution, quitted his father's houſe, and found a retreat *in the wildeſt country of France, where he was concealed for ſix weeks, with all manner of inconveniencies to his health. . . . . What was cruelleſt,* ſays he, *in all this proceeding, was the affliction which the ſight of the provoſt and archers* gave my father and mother, who were very old, for I was *the youngeſt of eight children, and had grey hairs.* He pretends that the cardinal deſigned to diſpatch him, to prevent his writing a Hiſtory. ‘ This good lord, *ſays he* (21), well knew that St Germain was not a man of the times, that GOD had given him a little ſenſe to obſerve how things were managed, that his ſoul was juſt enough not to ſuffer innocence to be overwhelmed without a ſigh, and that his courage was not ſo mean as to forſake his miſtreſs in her ſufferings. The cardinal was jealous of theſe qualities, which are not for his turn: he ſuſpected what was not, but what might be. . . . . He reſolved to impriſon a man, who did nothing that could juſtly diſpleaſe him, but who one day might give a true hiſtory of the times, and frankly declare what he had known good in the queen's conduct, and evil in the cardinal's.’

It is very probable the cardinal dreaded St Germain's pen, and had ſome ſuſpicion of the libels it would produce, and which afterwards ſadly mortified his Eminence. We ſee that in all the negotiations for recalling the queen-mother, he ſtipulated that St Germain, who *by defamatory libels, had omitted nothing to rob him of his reputation,* ſhould be delivered up to the king (22). This great man had the weakneſs to be extreamly vexed by ſatires, as I have related elſewhere (23).

[*G*] *He publiſhed in* 1631 *the anſwer ſhe deſired.*] It is intituled, *True and wholeſome advices of Francis Loyal, concerning the calumnies and blaſphemies of the Sieur des Montagnes, or an examination of a libel, intituled, a defence of the king and his miniſters.* It is one of the principal tracts of the collection of pieces in defence of the queen-mother, which has been ſo often reprinted.

[*H*] *He had before publiſhed books full of this cardinal's praiſes.*] The author of the anſwer to his remonſtrance to the king (24), cites ſeveral paſſages of them, to convict him of a contradiction, which might deſtroy all his credit. An extract alſo of a letter, which he wrote the ſeventh of June 1627, to the cardinal, was alledged (25), in which he promiſed him a perpetual and inviolable adherence, founded on the remembrance of the great benefits he had received, and on his admiration of the eminent qualities of this miniſter. This was ſomewhat puzzling to our de Morgues, let us ſee what he ſays in his own juſtification. In the firſt place he ſuppoſed that his adverſaries repreſented him as a ſatirical author, from the books he had written before his rupture with the cardinal. But this was not their thought, they only inſiſted on the books he publiſhed for the queen-mother, after ſhe was at variance with this miniſter. He might ſo eaſily have underſtood their meaning, that there is ground enough to ſuſpect him of inſincerity in this point. In the ſecond place he pretended, that the cardinal's ill deſigns did not ſhew themſelves, till after the perſecution ſtirred up againſt the queen-mother. Let us cite his own words to each of theſe points.

St Germain never writ any thing but two pieces concerning public affairs, one by command of the cardinal, and the other at his earneſt requeſt. The firſt was intituled Chriſtian Truths *in the year* 1620, *maintaining that the queen had reaſon to complain of thoſe, who robbed her of the education of her children. . . . . The cardinal highly approved this piece, which was the maniſeſto of Angers: poſſibly he calls that at preſent a defamatory libel, which he once declared was a work full of Divine and human reaſons, and which has ſerved his deſign. . . . The ſecond piece, which he would ſtigmatize with the name of an* infamous libel, is, the Divine without paſſion, *written in defence of the cardinal, and to ſilence abundance of foreign writers, aſſiſted with the memoirs of ſome Frenchmen, who had given ſo much trouble to this good lord, that his mind and body were equally indiſpoſed. If he owns this book is wicked, which is to be ſeen poſtſcripted and enlarged with his own hand, in the original copy drawn up from memoirs furniſhed by himſelf, ſacrificed to his entreaties, and to the command he cauſed the queen-mother to give the author (who as a good miſtreſs, was willing to ſave the cardinal from deſpair) the writer will condemn himſelf rather for having exceeded in praiſes, than offended by calumnies. Moreover it ought to be conſidered, that this piece was written in the year* 1626, *at which time the cardinal kept within ſome bounds, was in the good graces of his miſtreſs, and concealed his deſigns, till ſuch time as he had obtained power to make them take effect: ſo that it cannot be ſaid, that the things which have been ſaid to his advantage, before he threw the kingdom and all Europe into confuſion, can ſerve to juſtify him, when accuſed only of more recent crimes; nor to convict a man, who eſteemed the cardinal, before he was changed or detected* (26). . . . . *If you ſay that St Germain changed his note, he will tell you, the cardinal changed his way of life, that* GOD *himſelf treats us in a different manner when we are ſinners, from what he does when we are in his grace. The cardinal had not yet diſcovered his deſigns. . . . He whom you accuſe of levity . . . . has learned, ſince the year* 1626, *the ill actions the cardinal had committed before that time; and thoſe which are public and which we have ſeen, induced us to inform our ſelves with more exactneſs of thoſe tranſacted in the dark . . . . . Contradiction muſt relate to the ſame time, and to the ſame action* (27).

It muſt be allowed, it was hardly poſſible to make a better apology than this, for that inconſtancy of pen which he was accuſed of. Whether he acted ſincerely in this defence, is another queſtion. We may venture to ſay by way of conjecture, that if the intereſts of the cardinal had always been the ſame with thoſe of the queen-mother, and he had been guilty of every thing elſe, except the hardſhips ſhe endured, St Germain would have continued to praiſe and to defend him, againſt the libels of the Auſtrians and French male-contents. The diſcoveries he might have made of this great miniſter's actions, would never have been deſigned for the information of the public. Let it however be confeſſed, that he was to be commended on ſeveral accounts; for he would never have been ill treated by the cardinal, if he had not manifeſted a ſteady ſoul, unſhaken by cowardice, and capable of ſacrificing his fortune to his fidelity, for the intereſts of his miſtreſs. We ſhall ſee below (28) the praiſes a critic has given him.

Note, that he owns in a letter of the ſeventh of June 1627, he had great obligations to the cardinal, and had received ſeveral benefits from him. Neverthelcſs in a work publiſhed in the year 1631 (29), he ſpeaks thus, ‘ this good prelate, who calls the pen *mercenary, which had written for the cardinal.* . . . . has forgot to aſk him, what he gave St Germain for *the Divine without paſſion,* and what in recompence of many other ſignal ſervices; as particularly, for an exact ſearch made by him within and without the kingdom; for papers, memoirs, inſtructions,

(20) Id. Reparties, *pag.* 4.

(21) Id. id. *pag.* 3, 4.

(22) See the Life of cardinal Richelieu, *Tom. ii, pag.* 162, 175, *Dutch Edit.* 1694.

(23) In the article GRANDIER, in the text, between the remarks [*D*] and [*E*].

(24) It is in the collection of Mr du Chatelet.

(25) Ibid. *pag. m.* 560, 561.

(26) Morgues, Reparties, *pag.* 8.

(27) Id. ib. *pag.* 12.

(28) In the remark [*K*].

(29) Morgues, Reparties, *pag.* 9.

France, till after the death of the cardinal. He forced Father Sirmond's nephew, one of his principal antagoniſts, to quit the field [*I*], and, as he had foretold during his diſgrace (*b*), he obtained the royal privilege to publiſh his books. He lived to the year 1670 (*i*). He lodged a long time at the Incurables, in the ſuburbs of St Germain, and died there being eighty eight years of age (*k*). He preached there every year the penegyric of St Joſeph [*K*]. He boaſted much of the Hiſtory he had written of Lewis XIII, and ſaid he would enjoin his heirs to print it after his death. Patin has ſpoken more than once of this work [*L*]. Balzac treats Matthew de Morgues very ill in the firſt letter

(*b*) See the remark [*I*].

(*i*) Patin, Lettre DXXX, *pag.* 580, *Tom. iii.*

(*k*) Id. ib. *pag.* 579.

‘ and treatiſes, which might give him an inſight into foreign affairs; and for a great number of curioſities (30), and ingenious inventions, which he was fond of, and received with thanks, but which were followed the next, or even the ſame, day, by ill offices with the queen, and eſpecially with his holineſs's nuncio; to whom he ſignified, that St Germain was author of *the Divine without paſſion*, in which he himſelf was ſtruck at under covert expreſſions, tho' the cardinal had added, with his own hand, the paſſage that could offend him. This is the coin in which he has paid the pen, which is called Mercenary.’ This is not only curious, but even highly probable. The cardinal had ſuch diſtant views, ſo much ambition, and ſo many enemies to deal with, ſo many ambuſhes to prevent and to lay; that he was forced to ſpread his ſnares every where, and always have two ſtrings to his bow.

[*I*] *He made . . . . . Father Sirmond's nephew quit the field.*] This I find in the hiſtory of the French academy. ‘ Mr Sirmond . . . . wrote ſeveral pieces for the cardinal, upon the affairs of the time, and moſt of them under feigned names. The abbot de St Germain, who was a writer of the oppoſite ſide, uſed him very ill in the piece which he intituled the *Chimerical Embaſſador*. He writ an anſwer to it, which is inſerted in Mr du Chaſtelet's collection. The abbot de St Germain replied, and treated him ſtill more injuriouſly, which obliged him to write a new piece in his defence. But cardinal Richelieu and king Lewis XIII happening to die in this juncture, he could never obtain, under the regency, a licence to print this book. This troubled him mightily, and ſeeing at the ſame time his enemy returned to court, and the favour veering to the oppoſite ſide, he retired into Auvergne, where he died being about ſixty years old (31).’ This Mr Sirmond was a member of the French academy, and you ſee he had the mortification to be forced to yield to a rebel-writer, who had not only uſed him ill, but even attacked the whole body of the academy, which had almoſt the ſame deſtiny as Sirmond; for it found no redreſs, it ſaw the triumph of it's cenſor, and the works of this haughty critic printed with the royal licence. Mr Pelliſſon ſupplies me with proofs, ‘ The firſt that wrote againſt the academy, *ſays he* (32), was the abbot of St Germain, who was then at Bruſſels, accompanying the queen-mother, Mary de Medicis, in her exile. As he never left inveighing in his writings, and that with the greateſt animoſity againſt every action of cardinal Richelieu, he fell upon the French Academy in a very injurious manner, confounding it with that other academy, which the Gazetteer Renaudot had erected in the office of intelligence; whether he deſigned this miſtake, or whether he was actually miſinformed of what paſſed in Paris. The academy would not anſwer him by a book on purpoſe; but Mr du Chaſtelet, who was a member of it, and whoſe pen the cardinal made uſe of to anſwer moſt of theſe Bruſſel libels, was deſired, upon an offer firſt made to the aſſemby by himſelf, to add a few lines on this head; which were afterwards read, and approved by the ſociety *. The pieces of the abbot de St Germain againſt cardinal Richelieu, have been ſince printed at Paris (33) in two volumes, after the death of the late king Lewis XIII: Mr du Chaſtelet's anſwers were part of a work, which he had not finiſhed, being prevented by death, and which has never been printed.’

[*K*] *He preached there every year the panegyric of St Joſeph.*] This I learn from a moſt ingenious criticiſm, which is a continuation of Parnaſſus Reformed, and is intituled, *The war between the antient and modern authors*. Mr Gueret there ſuppoſes that upon the arrival of abbot de Morgues at Parnaſſus, cardinal Richelieu and Balzac would oppoſe *his taking a place among the Hiſtorians*; and that his Eminence made the following ſpeech. *Behold, behold, here is the man, who alone has attempted to diſturb the glory of my miniſtry; behold the only pen, which I was never able to gain, and yet I now have met with him, after whom I have ſometimes marched entire legions in vain, and the purſuit of whom has made me loſe more than one campaign. I well knew, continued he, that I ſhould catch him in one world or the other; it is but fit he ſhould now pay for all the damage he has done me, it is fit I revenge my ſelf of that invincible malignity, which neither the fear of puniſhments nor the hopes of rewards could correct in him; and if the god, which preſides here, does not do me juſtice, I will quickly make him him ſenſible, that I have not ſpent all my force againſt Rochelle* (34).’ He ſuppoſes that this abbot ‘ with an undaunted look, and above all fear, only ſhook his head, and looking upon his Eminence, your haughty carriage, *ſays he*, is out of date; you have no armies here to back it, the day of your reign is over, and I have this advantage of you, that truth marches by my ſide, and that I am in a place, where you hold no other rank, than that of an author (35). Mr Gueret *adds* (36) *that the abbot eſcaped the* ‘ ſtorm, that was intended to be raiſed againſt him but there enſued a great conteſt, what place he ſhould hold, whether among the Hiſtorians or the libellers during the wars. Each ſide offered very ſtrong arguments on this head, and the diſpute had never been ended, if he himſelf, tired out with this troubleſome formality, had not bethought him of gaining a little riſing ground which joined to Parnaſſus, where all the learned of his character and profeſſion, place themſelves out of the way, that they may have no fellowſhip with the reſt, whom they term profane. Biroüat, who firſt deſcryed him, ran forward to meet his friend, and after ſeveral mutual embraces, you renounce then, ſays he to him, the panegyric of St Joſeph, and this good ſaint has loſt in you, one of the moſt zealous of his adorers, and his preacher in ordinary **.’

If I have collected more particulars than the text of this remark required, it was by the way of an introduction, which informs us, what the opinion of a fine wit had been of our Matthew de Morgues.

[*L*] *Patin has ſpoken more than once of his Hiſtory of Lewis XIII.*] Here is an extract of his 351ſt letter, dated the twentieth of March 1665. ‘ Yeſterday, being the feſtival of St Joſeph, Mr Matthew de Morgues, who is eighty two years of age, preached the ſermon at the Incurables, where he lives, in honour of St Joſeph, before the queen's majeſty: he is the author of the pamphlets publiſhed at Bruſſels againſt cardinal Richelieu, in vindication of the queen-mother, whoſe almoner he was: he is a learned great man, and has by him a juſt hiſtory of the late king Lewis XIII, which he does not deſign for the preſs till after his death; he has got ſix manuſcript copies of it, which he has committed to ſix of his beſt friends, who will not fail to execute his intentions in due time (37)’. Let us ſee alſo what he has ſaid in the 458th letter. ‘ It is probable this Hiſtory (38) will be confuted by that which we are promiſed by Mr Matthew de Morgues, Sieur de St Germain, who begins from the birth of Lewis XIII, and continues it to his death: this gentleman will not ſuffer his Hiſtory to be printed in his own life-time, but he tells me he has put it into the hands of thoſe who will be faithful to him: you muſt know he is eighty four years old; I am far from wiſhing his death, and I ſhould be very ſorry for it, yet I ſhould be glad to ſee this Hiſtory, whereof I have heard him tell ſome very notable particulars and ſurprizing truths, letter of the eighth book (*l*). *To crown his inconſtancy*, ſays he, *of a deſerter, as we have known him from more than a dozen parties, he muſt, for his laſt trade, turn paraſite to the Spaniards, and ſecretary to the diſaffected French at their court.* Note, that he was not diſpoſed towards cardinal Mazarin, as he had been towards cardinal Richelieu; for if we may believe the Patiniana, he wrote *the libel intituled* Bons Avis ſur pluſieurs mauvais avis. *It is a defence of cardinal Mazarin*, to which it is thought Mr le Laboureur *wrote an anſwer for the prince of Condé. Both theſe pieces are good for nothing* (*m*).

---

(30) *Add to this theſe words of the* Lettre de change proteſtée, *pag.* 941: Cardinal Richelieu, whom all his flatterers hold for the moſt learned, and the fineſt genius of the time, has often employed and experienced mine, in ſolid and curious matters, in Latin, in French, in proſe and verſe.

(31) Pelliſſon, Hiſtoire de l'Acad. Françoiſe, *pag. m.* 305.

(32) Id. ib. *pag.* 67, & *ſeq.*

* *Reg.* 9. & 30. *Juillet* 1635.

(33) Matthieu de Morgues *hoped for it*; *for in the preface of* the collection of his works, *which he publiſhed at Antwerp, he has theſe words*, I hope that my writings one day will be printed at Paris very correctly under the licence of the great ſeal.

(34) Guerre des Auteurs, *pag.* 104. *Dutch Edit.*

(35) Id. ib. *pag.* 106.

(36) Id. ib. *pag.* 109.

** Every year he preached at the Incurables on the feſtival of St Joſeph.

(37) Patin, Lettre cccli, *pag.* 39. *Tom. iii.*

(38) That of cardinal Richelieu, by Father le Moine.

(*l*) In the edition in folio. It is dated the fifteenth of July 1625; but it ought to be 1635.

(*m*) Patiniana, *pag.* 107, Edit. Paris 1701.

‘ both to cardinal Richelieu's diſhonour, and in defence ‘ of the queen-mother (39). *This man, ſays he, in another place* (40) ‘ knows moſt of the court in‘ trigues for ſixty years paſt, part of which he has ‘ been an eye witneſs to, having lived in the fa‘ mily of the queen-mother: the Hiſtory he has writ‘ ten will be very curious, and will bring to light ‘ ſeveral memoirs hitherto concealed, and very ſad ‘ truths concerning the miniſtry of this cardinal, who ‘ ruled France moſt cruelly, & *in virga ferrea*, and ‘ with a rod of iron.’ Here you ſee two men, one of which was not fit to write, the other not the beſt diſpoſed to read the Hiſtory of cardinal Richelieu impartially. Patin hated all abuſe of ſovereign power; reaſon and nature endued him with this paſſion, which threw him into an exceſſive averſion for the cardinal; he gave credit to all the ſlanders an Hiſtorian could invent of him, and therefore could not judge as he ought to do, of the merit of this Hiſtory: for to paſs an equitable judgment, a man muſt be entirely free from affection or hatred. With much more reaſon muſt we ſay, that Matthew de Morgues was wholly unqualified to write the Hiſtory in queſtion. He had been perſecuted by his Eminence; he hated him mortally; he would conſequently have miſrepreſented matters, every thing muſt have appeared criminal to him; and if any thing had looked fair in his own eyes, he would have ſuppreſſed or tarniſhed it's luſtre. It is certain, that they who have had to do with the cardinal, have left us wretched pictures of him; ſome have ſaid too much good, and others too much ill; ſome meant to acknowledge, or to obtain, his favours, and others to revenge themſelves for his injuries; they all wanted that diſintereſtedneſs, which is eſſential to a good Hiſtorian; they either hoped, or feared, or hated (41). Matthew de Morgues would however have had this advantage, that moſt readers would have given a ſpecious name to the licence he had taken. You will find above (42), in a paſſage of Tacitus, the confirmation of what I have ſaid. It muſt be owned, that we are naturally more inclined to ſuſpect the Hiſtorians who praiſe, than thoſe who blame. See the remark [*A*] of the article of the marſhal de MARILLAC.

(39) Patin, Lettre ccccLVIII, *pag.* 345, *Tom. iii.*

(40) Idem, Lettre DXXIX, *pag.* 574, of the ſame volume.

(41) Statui res geſtas populi Romani . . . perſcribere eo magis quod mihi à ſpe metu, partibus Reip. animus liber erat. - - - *I reſolved to write the tranſactions of the Roman people . . . ſo much the rather as I was not engaged to any party, and was perfectly free from the influence of hope or fear.* Salluſtius, in Proœm. Belli Catilin.

(42) In the article MARILLAC (LEWIS DE), citat. (14).

MORINUS (JOHN BAPTIST) Phyſician and royal profeſſor of mathematics at Paris, was born the twenty third of February 1583, at Ville Franche in Beaujolois. He went through his courſe of Philoſophy at Aix in Provence, afterwards ſtudied Phyſic at Avignon, and was admitted Doctor there in that Faculty in the year 1613. The year following he went to Paris, and was entertained in Claude Dormi biſhop of Boulogne's family, who ſent him to make diſcoveries about the nature of metals in the mines of Hungary. He went down into the very deepeſt pits, and thinking he had diſcovered that the earth is divided like the air into three regions; he wrote a treatiſe on this ſubject [*A*]. Upon his return to his prelate, who entertained a Scotch Aſtrologer, he began to reliſh Judicial Aſtrology [*B*], and by the rules of his art calculated the events of the year 1617. He found that the biſhop of Boulogne was threatend either with death or impriſonment, and failed not to acquaint him with it. The prelate only laughed at it (*a*), but meddling ſoon after in ſome intrigues of ſtate, and miſtaking the right ſide, he was treated as a rebel, and caſt into priſon. Morinus was entertained by the duke of Luxemburg, brother to the conſtable de Luines, in the year 1621 [*C*], and lived in his

(*a*) And yet he was infatuated with Aſtrology. *Morin. Aſtrolog. Gall. lib. xxiii, pag.* 648.

[*A*] *He wrote a treatiſe on this ſubject.*] It was the firſt he publiſhed; it came out in the year 1619, under the title of *Mundi ſublunaris Anatomia*. They who have written his life, pretend that he proved by ſo many ſolid arguments, that the bowels of the earth are divided into three regions, that he gave a vogue to this opinion, without ſupporting it by the authority of any antient Philoſophers (1). An opinion has a vogue, when it finds followers, and this is all I mean by it. As for the reſt, this work was dedicated to Mr du Vair, keeper of the ſeals (2), who had been patron to our Morinus at Aix in Provence, when he was firſt preſident there, and who was alſo his diſciple in the Mathematics in the year 1608. Finding how well qualified Morinus was for the ſciences, he encouraged him to reſume his ſtudies. Morinus himſelf relates this. ‘ Anno quippe 160[illegible] illuſtriſſimus D. ‘ Du Vair, Senatus Aquenſis Protop[illegible]ſes, fuit meus ‘ in Mathematicis diſcipulus; qui obſervata mei inge‘ nii ad ſcientias aptitudine, tam validè mihi perſuaſit ‘ ſtudia mea per decennium intermiſſa repetere, ut ‘ anno 1609, Aquis Sextiis ingreſſus ſim Philoſophiæ ‘ curſum, ſub D. Marco Antonio, tunc temporis ‘ Philoſopho celeberrimo; & anno 1611, curſum Me‘ dicinæ ſub Profeſſoribus Regiis Fontano & Merin‘ dolo, viris etiam librorum editione famoſis (3). - - - ‘ *For in the year* 1608, *the moſt illuſtrious Mr du Vair,* ‘ *firſt preſident of the parliament at Aix, was my ſcholar* ‘ *in Mathematics, who, obſerving my capacity for* ‘ *the ſciences, ſo powerfully perſuaded me to reſume my* ‘ *ſtudies, which had been diſcontinued for ten years, that,* ‘ *in the year* 1609, *I entered upon a courſe of Philoſophy* ‘ *at Aix, under Mr Marc Antony, a very famous Phi*‘ *loſopher at that time: and in the year* 1611, *a courſe* ‘ *of Phyſic under the royal profeſſors, Fontaine and Me*‘ *rindol, who were likewiſe famous by the books they* ‘ *have publiſhed.*’

[*B*] *His prelate entertained a Scotch Aſtrologer; he began to reliſh Judicial Aſtrology.*] His name was Daviſon, he renounced Aſtrology, applied himſelf to Phyſic, and became very famous by his works, and by the courſe of Chemiſtry, which he publickly taught in the royal garden of Paris (4). He was invited into Poland (5), and had the honour to be firſt Phyſician to the queen (6). One thing I muſt not forget, which is very remarkable, that Daviſon grew out of conceit with Aſtrology, becauſe of the uncertainty of this art, and betook himſelf to Phyſic. Morinus, on the contrary for a like reaſon, was diſguſted with Phyſic, and applied himſelf to Aſtrology, and both with ſuch ſucceſs, that they deſerve to be ranked among the famous men of that age. *Eſt vero quod in ipſo* (Daviſſono) *ac Morino non leviter admiremur, artium nempe quas profitebantur factam ab utroque veluti permutationem: Aſtrologiam Scotus, ſcientiam alter Medicam ſectabatur; uterque proceſſu temporis, poſt experimenta complura in arte propria, nil ſubeſſe certi deprehendit, unde animus amborum fluctuans, in quo pedem figeret, non inveniebat. Tædet itaque hunc & illum aberrantis plerumque judicii, Medicus ergo in Aſtrologum vertitur, & in Medicum Aſtrologus, tam ſecundo exitu ut beati transfugæ, inter hujus ætatis viros inſignes annumerari mereantur* (7).

[*C*] *Morinus was entertained by the Duke of Luxemburg . . . . in the year* 1621.] They who have given us his life leave a chaſm here, which betrays their want

(1) Ut enim tres in regiones aër diſtinctus eſt, ſic etiam triplex regio in terræ viſceribus animadverti poteſt ſumma, media, infima, & id quidem validiſſimis rationum momentis adeo ſtabilivit, edito hujus argumenti ad annum 1619 libello, ut hæc ſententia etſi nulla Philoſophorum veterum authoritate fulciatur, ſuos tamen habeat ſectatores. *Vita Jo. Bapt. Morini, pag.* 3, *num.* 16.

(2) Vincentius Panurgus, in Epiſtola de tribus Impoſtoribus, *pag.* 14.

(3) Morinus, in Defenſione ſuæ Diſſertationis de atomis, & vacuo, *pag.* 5.

(4) It was printed at Paris in the year 1635.

(5) Vita Morini, *pag.* 4, *num.* 21.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid.

his family eight years. As ſoon as he heard of the death of Sainclair (b), royal profeſſor of Mathematics, he put in for his place and carried it. He took the oath of profeſſor in February 1630. He was adviſed to marry his predeceſſor's widow; but the firſt viſit he made her, he found ſhe was juſt going to be buried [*D*]. From that time he took a firm reſolution never to marry, and kept it all his life. He made himſelf many friends. He had acceſs to great men, and even to cardinal Richelieu [*E*]: and he obtained

want of judgment. They ſay, the impriſonment of the biſhop of Boulogne had left Morinus deſtitute of ſupport, if he had not been entertained by that duke in 1621; and they had juſt before ſaid that this biſhop was impriſoned in 1617. What became then of Morinus in this interval of four years? This ought at leaſt to have been ſhewn. Let us fill up this chaſm by a paſſage of Morinus himſelf, who tells us, that after his prelate's fall, he lived with the abbot de la Bretonniere, as Phyſician in ordinary, till he was entertained by the conſtable's brother during the ſiege of Montauban. 'Manſi, *ſays he*, (8) apud Epiſcopum 4 annis, tum ſolicitatus à reverendiſſimo D. de la Bretonniere ſancti Ebrulphi in Normania Abbatis optimi, 'me cum ipſo durante gravi peſte Pariſienſi in Normaniam contuli, ejus Medicus ordinarius. Anno 'autem 1621, dum Rex obſideret Montem Albanum, 'vocatus fui in Aulam ab illuſtriſſimo mihique valde 'amico Domino Ludovico Tronſono, Regi à ſanctioribus Conſiliis & ſecretis, ut eſſem Medicus ordinarius Ducis à Luxemburgo, quod ægrè tulit optimus Abbas. ---- *I continued with the biſhop four 'years, and then being ſollicited by the very reverend Mr 'de la Bretonniere, the excellent abbot of St Evroul in 'Normandy, I went with him into Normandy as his 'Phyſician in ordinary, during the time of the great plague 'at Paris. But in the year* 1621, *whilſt the king beſieged Montauban, I was called to court by my good 'friend the moſt illuſtrious Mr Lewis Tronſon, privy-counſellor to the king, that I might be Phyſician in ordinary 'to the duke of Luxemburg, which the good abbot took 'ill.*' He often complains of this duke's ingratitude, and ſays, it was the reaſon of his quitting him; and as he was taking his leave, he threatened him with a diſeaſe, which carried him off in two years (9).

[*D*] *He had been adviſed to marry his predeceſſor's widow ..... He found ſhe was juſt going to be buried.*] Morinus governed himſelf by the ſtars; and finding they did not adviſe him to marry, he reſolved to live a bachelor. However, the perſuaſions of his friends ſhook him in ſuch a manner, that he thought on matrimony in good earneſt, the rather, becauſe Sainclair's widow was reputed rich, and a favourable occaſion offered of ſucceeding, not only to this profeſſor's chair, but alſo to his bed and caſh. He was going to pay his devoirs to the widow, and to make the firſt overture of his deſign. But ſeeing the door of the houſe in mourning, and underſtanding from the neighbours that the gentlewoman was juſt going to be buried, he was ſeized with an extream aſtoniſhment, and immediately ſet a fixed reſolution never to marry. No doubt this confirmed the good opinion he had conceived of Aſtrology; 'Hoc honore magiſterioque pollentem familiares amici conjugio propoſito ſtabilire 'firmius voluerunt: vivebat anteceſſoris conjux memorati modo Sanclari, non abjicienda quidem illa 'plane, & quam opibus non contemnendis inſtructam popularis fama jactabat, par eſt, inquiunt 'ut quemadmodum Sanclari cathedræ, ſic & ejuſdem 'opibus ducta ipſius uxore ſuccedas: conſilio iſtiuſmodi ſæpius repetito Morinus tandem acquievit, 'Dominamque inviſere ea mente conſtituit, & procum gerere prima vice: propior factus ædibus nigra veſte videt limen obſeptum, docentque vicini 'Sanclari conjugem eſſe mox ad tumulum efferendam. Id audiens quantum obſtupuerit, cogitate: 'tum vero de cœlibatu perpetuo conſilium ſibi quondam ducibus aſtris injectum, certiſſimum fore decrevit, omnibuſque in poſterum renunciare nuptiis, & 'quicquid vitæ reliquum eſſet in doctrinis ac librorum 'ſeu lectione, ſeu ſcriptione placido tenore tranſigere, 'atque in amicorum convictu ſuaviſſime conſeneſcere. 'Hoc fixum apud ſe ratumque nunquam poſtea violavit. Quid enim libero lectulo jucundius? numquid 'uni conjugi moleſtiarum plerumque ſeminario tot 'amicos tamque illuſtres anteferret? (10)---- *And he 'determined to ſpend the remainder of his life quietly in 'ſtudy, in reading and writing books, and in the agreeable converſation of friends. This firm and fixed reſolution he never afterwards broke. For what could be 'more comfortable to him than a free bed? Should he 'not prefer ſo many, and ſuch illuſtrious friends, to a wife, 'who is commonly the ſource of trouble and vexation?*' All this is worthy of a profeſſor of Mathematics. His friends had been often forced to return to the charge in perſuading him to marry; they backed and ſupported the motives of duty in the caſe, by thoſe of intereſt; and when at laſt they had gotten his conſent, he prepared for his firſt viſit with ſo much tranquillity, that the Lady had time enough to die before ſhe received it. He was ſo little inquiſitive about his miſtreſs, that he heard nothing of her ſickneſs, before he knew ſhe was going to the grave; nor did he know that, but by coming himſelf to the place, to make the firſt declaration of love. This has much of the Philoſopher in it.

The ſcheme of his nativity preſaged him nothing but misfortunes from the female ſex (11). He confeſſes that in the year 1605, he received two dangerous wounds on account of a woman (12), and that next to the grace of GOD, he owes to Aſtrology the happineſs of ſtopping the fatal conſequences of his conſtellation: for having diſcovered the influence of a certain ſtar in the exaltation of Venus, which was found in his horoſcope, he took ſpecial care of himſelf, being apprized from whence all the misfortunes came, which he had gone through on account of women. *Tot mala, infortunia, magnaque vitæ pericula mihi propter mulieres acciderunt in juventute, ut jam illa recogitando ſtupeam, multoque plura & forſan deteriora mihi accidiſſent, niſi Deus Opt. Max. mei miſertus fuiſſet, ab eiſque me liberaſſet, & Aſtrologia circa* 35 *meæ nativitatis annum quo huic ſcientiæ ſtudere cœpi, infauſtæ & mihi per experientiam periculoſæ illius conſtitutionis monuiſſet* (13).

[*E*] *He had acceſs to great men, and even to cardinal Richelieu.*] The author of Morinus's life, ſpeaks of it in theſe terms (14): 'Richelieus Cardinalis immenſus ille genius, judicio nunquam, ubi quempiam 'pertentaſſet, errante, dignum ea exiſtimatione Morinum duxit, ut ipſum ad ſecretius Muſæum admitteret, deque negotiis momenti graviſſimi conſuleret. '--- *Cardinal Richelieu, that vaſt genius, who was 'never miſtaken in forming a judgment of any man, 'thought Morinus ſo deſerving, that he admitted him 'to his ſecret councils, and conſulted him in matters of 'the greateſt moment.*' This is a very mangled ſtory, and ſuch as panegyriſts uſually give: we do not find in it the cardinal's change to Morinus, nor this Aſtrologer's furious rage againſt the cardinal. Let us ſupply this omiſſion. Morinus being poſſeſſed with the falſe notion, that he had found out the true ſcience of longitudes, and that the cardinal did him a very great injuſtice by refuſing him the recompence which ſuch a diſcovery deſerved (15); conceived an extream indignation, and a moſt lively reſentment againſt him, which laſted as long as he lived. He went no more to wait on his Eminence, and it was only out of love to Mr Chavigny, his patron, and for the glory of Aſtrology, that he made a prognoſtication which the cardinal deſired of him. 'Priuſquam Pariſiis diſcederet (16) optavit ſcire quid de ſua valetudine atque 'vita ſentirem eo in itinere, non quidem per ſe (quem 'ab annis 4, non videram ob denegatam mihi remunerationem ſcientiæ longitudinum à me inventæ (17), utcunque ſuo ſcripto eam mihi pollicitus fuiſſet) ſed interpoſito Magnate ſibi fidiſſimo, '& mihi amico, ſcilicet illuſtriſſimo D. Comite de 'Chavigny, qui ad tertiam uſque vicem meum ea de 're judicium petiit, quod libenter recuſaſſem ſi potuiſſem: at ipſius Magnatis obſtrictus beneficiis, & 'pro honore Aſtrologiæ tandem reſpondi Cardinalem eo in itinere cum vitæ periculo ægrotaturum (18). ---- *Before he left Paris, he deſired to 'know what I thought concerning his health and life in 'that journey, not indeed directly himſelf (for I had 'not ſeen him for four years, becauſe he refuſed me the 'recompence, tho' promiſed under his own hand, for find-*

'ing

(b) He died the twenty ninth of June 1629.

(8) Morin. in Defenſ. ſuæ Diſſertationis de atomis, *pag.* 106, 107.

(9) Quem demum fui coactus deſerere ob ſummam ejus ingratitudinem, prædicens illi ante diſceſſum morbum lethalem intra biennum ex quo etiam mortuus eſt. *Morin. Aſtrolog. Gallica, lib. xvii. pag.* 398.

(10) Vita Morini, *pag.* 6, *num.* 32.

(11) See the remark [*O*].

(12) Die nona Julii 1605, duo periculoſiſſima vulnera propter famoſam mulierem .... *He received on the ninth of July* 1605, *two very dangerous wounds, upon the account of a famous woman.* Morin. Aſtrolog. Gall. *lib. xxiii, pag.* 617. It is likely he takes the word *famoſus* here in a bad ſenſe.

(13) Id. ib.

(14) *Pag.* 6, *num.* 33.

(15) See the remark [*H*], at the end.

(16) This relates to his journey to Rouſillon in 1642.

(17) Teſtantur quidem omnes Aſtronomi me ſcientiam illam perfecte demonſtraſſe, ſed Cardinalis Richelius perfidia & proditione Commiſſariorum meorum me promiſſo præmio iniquè fraudavit. *Morin. ubi ſupra, lib. xxiv, pag.* 687.

(18) Morin. i *lib. xxiii, pa* 613.

obtained from cardinal Mazarin a penſion of two thouſand livres, which was always duly paid him. He was conſulted as to future events by ſeveral perſons, and it is ſaid that his figures frequently indicated what came to paſs [*F*]. He was not very fortunate in his predictions concerning a ſecretary of ſtate, who depended very much on his Aſtrological

'*ing the ſcience of Longitudes*), *but by the moſt noble and illuſtrious count de Chavigny, his confident, and my good friend, who aſked me three times to give my opinion in that matter, which I would fain have declined if I could: but having obligations to this nobleman, and for the honour of Aſtrology, at laſt I anſwered, that the cardinal would be ſeized with a dangerous illneſs in that journey.*' He ſpeaks diſadvantagiouſly of his Eminence in his books, and imputes to him all the misfortunes of Europe, and eſpecially the war between France and Spain in 1635. 'Qui bellis per totam Europam excitatis pluribus hominum millionibus ferro, flamma, fame, peſte aliiſque modis cauſa mortis extitit (19). - - - *Who, by ſtirring up wars throughout all Europe, was the cauſe of the death of many millions, by ſword, famine, peſtilence, and other ways.* . . . Pluribus per totam Europam ferro, flammis, ſanguine, fame, peſte, & cadaveribus horridam, idem contra Cardinalem deprecantibus, quod olim Brutus poſt cladem Philippicam noctu aſtra intuens contra Antonium, ex Apiano,

Jupiter ut ferias qui horum eſt cauſa malorum *.

'*Many, over all Europe, which is become frightful to look at, by reaſon of the ſword, fire, blood, famine, peſtilence, and dead carcaſſes, imprecate the ſame curſe upon the cardinal, which Brutus formerly after the overthrow of Philippi, lifting up his eyes to the ſtars by night, imprecated upon Antonius from Appian,*

O Jove, ſtrike the man, who is the author of all
theſe calamities.

He obſerves that the cardinal declared this war without conſulting either the ſtates of the kingdom, or the parliaments. *Galliâ bellis civilibus, & extraneis adhuc vigentibus, admodum attenuatâ, Cardinalis Richelius, inconſultis Regni comitiis, aut Senatibus, ſed ſponte propria, horrendum bellum inter Reges Galliæ & Hiſpaniæ declaravit, quod adhuc perdurat, quamvis omnia paſſim ad extremam deſolationem redacta conſpiciantur* (20). See what Mr Bernier anſwered, who accuſed him of ingratitude, and of ſpeaking evil of the perſon of Lewis XIII, and even of invalidating the royal authority: 'An-ne, quamtumve ſit crimen publice efferre, non poſſe Chriſtianiſſimum Regem indicere bellum, inconſultis comitiis, aut Senatibus, diſceptare meum non eſt . . . . verum jus belli indicendi abſtuliſſe Regi, ut illud transferres in Cardinalem Richelium, non video qui poſſit id crimen à publicis ac Regiis animadverſoribus tolerari. Prætereo quam injurius, & ingratus ſis adverſus tantum Cardinalem, à quo tot bona accepiſti, & cui maledicere tamen tam privatim quam publice non deſinis, eo dumtaxat nomine, quod exſatiare immenſam tuam aviditatem noluerit, dum, ob tuam illam chimæram longitudinum inventarum, contendiſti tibi ab illo deberi montes aureos. Nempe hoc loco illi attribuis non modo uſurpatam tyrannice authoritatem, *&c* (21). - - - *Whether it be, or how great a crime it be, openly to publiſh, that the moſt Chriſtian king cannot declare war without conſulting the ſtates of the kingdom, or the parliaments, it is not my buſineſs to diſpute* . . . . . *but to take the right of declaring war from the king, in order to transfer it to cardinal Richelieu, is a crime of ſuch a nature, that I do not ſee how it can be tolerated by the public magiſtrate, who derives his authority from the king. I paſs by your injuſtice and ingratitude to the cardinal, from whom you have received ſo many favours, and whom notwithſtanding you are continually reviling, both in public and private, only forſooth becauſe he would not gratify your immenſe avarice, whilſt you pretended he owed you mountains of gold for that whimſical notion of your's of having found out the Longitude. For here you charge him not only with an uſurped tyrannical authority,* &c.'

[*F*] *It is pretended, that his figures indicated what came to paſs.*] His firſt eſſay was that of foretelling the impriſonment of the biſhop of Boulogne; but his maſter-piece this way, and what gave him a mighty reputation in his art, was the foretelling that Lewis XIII ſhould be ſeized with a dangerous diſtemper at Lyons, but not die of it. *Præſignificatus Bononienſi Præſuli carcer* . . . . *quaſi primum in hac facultate ſpecimen Morino fuiſſe dici poteſt. Ab hoc tyrocinio magiſterium aſſecutus eſt Ludovico XIII Lugduni ægrotante* (22). The queen-mother alarmed at the fatal prædictions of ſome other Aſtrologers, writ to cardinal de Berulle, deſiring he would prevail with John Baptiſt Morinus to calculate the king's nativity. Morinus readily obeyed, and found by the ſtars that the king's ſickneſs ſhould be great, but not mortal. His prediction was right, and met with a royal recompence. The other Aſtrologers were ſent to the gallies. 'Quod cum ex prædicto contigiſſet ſplendidam vati ſuo mercedem ac Rege dignam contulit, cæteris qui malè monuerant, ad remum amandatis (23), forſitan quod minimè juſſi in annos Principis inquiſiſſent (24). - - - *Perhaps becauſe they had, without orders, calculated how long the king ſhould live.*' Hereupon we are aſſured he was the only perſon permitted to contemplate the king's ſtars, as heretofore there was only one perſon, who had the privilege of painting Alexander the Great (25). One of the Phyſicians of Lewis XIV (26) propoſed the erecting a new place of Court-Aſtrologer in favour of Morinus, who ſhould be a kind of aſſiſtant to his majeſty's Phyſicians. His having frequently experienced the truth of this man's predictions, was what induced him to make this motion. However the project did not take. *Is Morinum vera ex ſideribus vaticinantem cum ſæpius comperiſſet, ac crebro ejus operam feliciter atque utiliter expertus eſſet, multis eum meritis ſibi plane addixit, hocque agitaverat animo, & ipſa re jam ſatagebat eum Aſtrologum inter aulica miniſteria conſtituendum eſſe, qui primario medicorum Regis comes eſſet adjumento futurus, & quidem ex Galeni * placito.* Morinus having ſent word that Lewis XIII was threatened with ſome ill accident, this prince was adviſed not to ſtir abroad that day. He kept up all the morning, but after dinner, being weary of his confinement, he would go out to catch birds, and had a fall. *Do not let Morinus know it,* ſays he, *it will make him too proud. Pomeridiano tempore contineri pertæſus aviculis poni retia jubet, dumque ipſe attentius ea tenderet non advertens concidit, fune arctius tibiis alligato, qui ſcindi nec mora debuit. Rex aſſurgens, cavete, inquit, Morinus neſciat, nimium ex caſu meo tumoris admitteret* (27). Cardinal Richelieu, deſirous to know whether Guſtavus Adolphus was long lived, ſent the hour of this prince's nativity to Morinus, who miſſed but by a few days of foretelling the time of this great warriour's death, and that miſtake happened only for want of noting the hour of his birth with the neceſſary exactneſs; ſome minutes were amiſs in it over or under (28). Something like this we are told of Guſtavus's ſword, which fell into Morinus's Hands: the figures are deſcribed which the Aſtrologer obſerved on it, for he was ſkilled it ſeems in the Taliſmanic art. They add, that cardinal Richelieu had a very good opinion of our Morinus's ſkill, that he got him to calculate his own nativity (29), and would not ſet out on his journey to Perpignan before he had conſulted this Aſtrological oracle, who was miſtaken only ten hours as to the time of his Eminence's death (30). Having ſeen the ſcheme of Cinqmars's nativity without knowing whoſe it was, he ſaid that man would loſe his head. I omit a world of other inſtances, a catalogue of which is given us, and only ſay, that it is pretended the greateſt objections againſt him were, that he was miſtaken ten days in the death of Lewis XIII (31), and ſixteen in the death of the conſtable de Leſdiguieres (32), and had not given his benefactreſs Mary de Medicis the requiſite aſſiſtance in his way; for this good queen often complained, that the Aſtrologers had been the cauſe of her misfortunes. The anſwer on the laſt of theſe heads is this, that Morinus never had conſulted the ſtars about the deſtiny of this queen, and being ordered to do it a few days before ſhe left the kingdom, he had not time to finiſh his calculations: the queen departed without giving Morinus notice, and without

---

(19) Id. ib.

* Ib. *pag.* 647.

(20) Id. in Diſſertat. de atomis & vacuo, *pag.* 31.

(21) Berner. Anatom. ridiculi muris, *pag.* 192, 193.

(22) Vita Morini, *pag.* 13, *num.* 61.

(23) Compare with this what has been ſaid in the article LUTORIUS, citation (4).

(24) Id. ib.

(25) Morino ſoli regalem horoſcopum intueri ac examinare liceat, ut olim uni Apelli conceſſum eſt Alexandrum in tabula pingere. *Vita Morini, ibid.*

(26) Vautier, who had been firſt Phyſician to Mary de Medicis.

* *Lib. iii, de diebus decretoriis.*

(27) Vita Morini, *pag.* 13, *num.* 62.

(28) Ibid. *pag.* 14, *num.* 65. *See alſo* Morin. Aſtrolog. Gall. *lib. xvii, pag.* 399.

(29) Vita Morini, *pag.* 15, *num.* 74.

(30) Ibid. *num.* 73.

(31) Ib. *pag.* 13, *num.* 63.

(32) Ib. *num.* 64.

Aſtrological oracles [*G*]. He publiſhed a great number of books [*H*], but had not the

without ſtaying till her nativity was rectified. *Cur amabo ſiderum ille adeo peritus, & per ea rerum futurarum acerrimus indagator, Dominam ſuam* Mariam Medicæam *meritam de ipſo quam optime nulla opitulatione ab ſtellis obtenta juvit? Sic ajunt æmuli: nonne ſæpius exaggerant iidem de ſuis faticanis aſtrologis conqueſta eſt, ſe tanquam à præſtigiatoribus deceptam in tot calamitatum incidiſſe voragines, unde emergere nequiverit! Enimvero quidnam iſti caperata fronte Cenſores dicturi ſunt, ubi audierunt Reginæ hujus nativitatem nunquam à* Morino *exploratam fuiſſe? cum tamem paucis ante diebus quam ad exteros ſe fuga reciperet, id ipſum fieri juſſerit, aſtrologo autem* Morino *non admonito re infecta diſceſſiſſe* (33). We ſhall ſpeak below of his predictions againſt Gaſſendus. I am very ſure the moſt incredulous cannot but be pleaſed with the paſſages which I have here related; becauſe they ſhow how the greateſt ſtateſmen ſuffer themſelves to be infatuated with judicial Aſtrology, and that even in the XVIIth century they have not been exempt from this folly, at the courts of the greateſt princes in Europe (34). Queen Chriſtina wanted to ſee Morin the firſt time ſhe had been at Paris, and declared ſhe took him to be the ableſt Aſtrologer in the world (35). It is a ſign ſhe had employed him in ſome figures, or had taken the pains to conſider thoſe he had erected. I obſerve that the miſtake of ſix days in the death of Lewis the Juſt, ſeems nothing, when we conſider it only in a general view; but when we know the circumſtances of it as related by Gaſſendus, we cannot forbear ſaying, that it was one of the greateſt mortifications an Aſtrologer could receive.

Gaſſendus ſays, that Morinus paid him a viſit the twenty ninth of April 1643, and told him, I remember you confeſſed to me five or ſix months ago, that if I could notify the day on which a great perſon ſhould die, on whoſe nativity I had taken much pains, and who was then indiſpoſed, you will look on it as a convincing proof, both of my capacity, and of the excellence of my art. I now come to acquaint you that the king will die upon the eighth of May next. Gaſſendus has not forgot to obſerve, that Morinus had given him no anſwer concerning this great perſon, who was ill at that time, and who died ſoon after (36). He obſerves alſo, that about the end of April 1643, the Phyſicians declared, that Lewis XIII would die in a ſhort time, but as to the day of his death, there was a diſagreement among them. Morinus declared to Gaſſendus, that the third of May would be extreamly dangerous to this monarch, who however ſhould linger out five days longer and no more. Gaſſendus, without dwelling on the conſideration, that this prognoſtic was made at a time when there was no hopes of the king's recovery, waited for the event as a thing that might be of ſome conſequence, with reſpect to Aſtrology, ſince he had no reaſon to ſuſpect that the ſymptoms obſerved by the Phyſicians, ſerved as a foundation to Morinus's prediction, and knew withal, that this Aſtrologer had ſtudied the nativity of Lewis XIII, with infinite application, and boaſted that he had by it diſcovered the days of each particular incident in the courſe of this monarch's life. If therefore this art had any kind of certainty, it muſt be in relation to the laſt day of the king's life. And obſerve Gaſſendus was informed, that Morinus had told others, that, by the rules of Aſtrology, the king was in danger of dying not only the eighth of May, and ſome days preceding, but alſo on the ſixteenth and ſeventeenth of the ſame month. He ſaid nothing of the fourteenth, which yet was the day of his death (37). Thus we manifeſtly ſee, that his pretended ſcience was illuſive, and that the miſtake of ſix days is in this caſe a deciſive blow.

[G] *He was not fortunate in his predictions concerning a ſecretary of ſtate .... who depended much on his Aſtrological oracles.*] I mean the count de Chavigni, and ſhall give an inſtance of his credulity with relation to Aſtrology. Having determined to go into Provence in the year 1646, he deſired to have Morinus along with him; but as this Aſtrologer never undertook any thing without the approbation of the ſtars, he would not venture upon this journey, except they promiſed him good ſucceſs. He therefore deſired time to conſult them, and after that, promiſed to accompany his Mecenas (38). He deſired he would leave it to him to chuſe a propitious hour for their departure, and aſſured him, that experience would teach him, how material a thing it is to ſet out in an enterprize under a favourable diſpoſition of the ſtars (39). Mr de Chavigny would conteſt no ſuch point with him, but aſſured him of his intire ſubmiſſion. Morinus found, that the beſt time to ſet out would be upon the ninth of May, nine minutes after four in the morning, and deſired that every thing might be ready that moment. The orders of the ſecretary were ſo punctual and ſo well executed, that every thing was accordingly ready at that inſtant. He had four good dials in his garden, on which they obſerved for half an hour together, the approach of the critical minute, and took coach preciſely at the time when the ſhadow on the dial had reached this minute. They arrived happily at Antibes: and when Mr Chavigny, who was count of it, was about to return to Paris, he was informed by his Aſtrologer, that it was requiſite to conſult the Heavens about the hour of their departure. He was no leſs tractable now than he had been the firſt time, he ordered every thing to be got ready with ſuch exactneſs, that he and his retinue were on horſeback preciſely at twenty ſeven minutes after four in the morning of the ſecond of July. 'Fuerunt rurſus omnia pro diſceſſu parata ad 'ipſum momentum, expectavitque mecum illuſtriſſimus Dominus in ſuo cubiculo, feneſtris ad Orientem 'apertis donec ſolem ortum conſpexit, tuncque ſine 'more conſcendit equum cum toto comitatu (40). - - - '*All things were again got ready againſt the moment 'prefixed, and the moſt noble count and I waited in his 'bed-chamber, the windows towards the eaſt being open, 'till he ſaw the ſun riſen, and then immediately he took 'horſe with all his retinue.*' Their return was very proſperous, the maſter, and ſervants, and horſes, arrived all in good health, notwithſtanding the heat of the ſeaſon. But when he came to Paris, he diſcovered ſome intrigues of the cabinet againſt his fortune. He was accuſed among other things, of having taken an Aſtrologer with him to conſult about the deſtiny of the king, the queen, and cardinal Mazarin, &c. (41). Finding that his adverſaries had made him greatly ſuſpected, he twice deſired Morinus to tell him whether the ſtars threatned him with any misfortune. Morinus anſwered him they did not, and adviſed him to wait on the cardinal; but precautioned him, that all hours were not alike propitious, and that he would chooſe him one by the rules of Aſtrology. He choſe him an hour in which the tenth houſe, which is that of dignities, went very well (42). Chavigny followed his directions, and was very well received by the cardinal (43). I only relate all theſe things to ſhew the weakneſs of thoſe who ſometimes ſit at the helm. The deſtiny of nations and kingdoms is in their hands, whilſt their own depends upon the caprices and viſions of an Aſtrologer. Their paſſions and ideas have commonly a greater ſhare in the government, than the will of the monarch, becauſe they dextrouſly infuſe into him whatever they have a mind to. And thus whilſt they are managed by the counſels of an Aſtrologer, may it not be ſaid, that the happineſs and miſery of the people depend on this Aſtrologer? This ſecretary of ſtate was named in the year 1645, for the embaſſy to Munſter (44). It is probable he would have taken Morinus along with him, to know the critical minute when this or that memorial ought to be preſented, or this or that anſwer given. Would not this have been hazarding a thouſand good opportunities of advancing the general peace ſo neceſſary to all Europe? Morinus made ſuch account of the doctrine of elections (45), that he believed, there was nothing more uſeful to kings, or their firſt miniſters, than a council of three Aſtrologers who ſhould have the ſchemes of nativity, not only of all the neighbouring princes, but alſo of all the great men of the court (46). By this means, ſaid he, we ſhould know the favourable conjuncture to begin a war, what confederate prince would act firſt, and what generals ought to be choſen. We ſhould not give the chief directions, as is uſually done, to an unſucceſsful prince; we ſhould not take the year that is moſt adverſe to him, and moſt propitious to the prince, his enemy; we ſhould not chuſe unfortunate generals: and what I have ſaid, adds he, of war, ought to be applied to the marriages of kings, embaſſies, &c.

(33) Ib. *pag.* 15, *num.* 76.

(34) See the following remark.

(35) Qua primum vice Lutetiam venit Morinum ad videndum accerſiri juſſit, quem in Aſtrologicis omnium perſpicaciſſimum palam & clare teſtata eſt. *Vita Morini, pag.* 16, *num.* 80.

(36) This was undoubtedly cardinal Richelieu.

(37) *I take this from the* 128*th and* 129*th page of Mr Berniere's* Anatomia ridiculi muris; *but it is a paſſage which Mr Bernier gives from Gaſſendus's Apology*, Adverſus alas Jo. Morini.

(38) Morin. Aſtrolog. Gallica, *lib. xxvi, cap. vii.*

(39) Illuſtriſſimum Dominum .... ab Aſtrologia non alienum rogavi, ut ipſi placeret me diem & horam ad proficiſcendum fortunatam eligere, ſeque experturum quanti eſſet momenti ſuſcepta ſub congruo cœli ſtatu inchoare. *Ibid. pag.* 778.

(40) Ibid. *pag.* 782.

(41) Ibid. *pag.* 783.

(42) Ibid. *pag.* 784.

(43) Ibid.

(44) Ibid. *pag.* 779. This nomination was revoked.

(45) Thus the Aſtrologers call the choice of the times, according to the aſpects of the planets, and the poſition of the Heavens.

(46) Morin. ibid. *cap. iii, pag.* 773.

the ſatisfaction to ſee his favourite work printed, which had coſt him thirty years labour, and

Let us now come to the falſities of his predictions concerning the count de Chavigny.

He had foretold that lord ſhould have a fit of ſickneſs, but ſaid nothing of his impriſonment: Yet Mr de Chavigny continued in good health, but was made a priſoner. Now ſee how they excuſe this Aſtrologer: They pretend that he foreſaw both the impriſonment and and the ſickneſs, and was more inclined to determine for the former, but did quite the contrary, becauſe Mr de Chavigny had declared, that he would laugh at any prediction of impriſonment. ‘ Ultimum ‘ quod inſimulant Chavignii carcer eſt, quæ ſolum fuit ‘ erroris interceptio: cum enim in annua ipſius revo‘ lutione ex aſtris & morbum & carcerem colligeret, & ‘ ad carcerem prædicendum proclivior fuiſſet Aſtrologus, ‘ ægritudine tamen rem decidit. Namque & ipſe Cha‘ vignius hujus forte qui carceris eſſet, metus diſſimu‘ lator, aut tale nihil ſibi metuens (ſe quippe apud au‘ lam gratioſiſſimum eſſe confidebat) carcerem ſibi fru‘ ſtra intentari dixerat; vates itaque noſter arti ſuæ ‘ non ſatis credulus hac vice hallucinatus eſt (47) - - - ‘ *For Mr de Chavigny believed he was in very great* ‘ *favour at court: and therefore our Aſtrologer diſtruſt*‘ *ing a little his own art, was for this time miſtaken.*’ A poor excuſe! He was likewiſe reproached with being deceived about the marriage of this lord's daughter. I relate Mr Bernier's words ſomewhat at length, becauſe they let us ſee the impoſtures of this ſort of people: ‘ Illis *(quos habere amicos vultis & à quibus mag*‘ *nam mercedem ſperatis)* ſcilicet omnia fauſta, ac vi‘ tam præcipue longævam pollicemini; nam aliqua ‘ quidem hiſce, illiſque temporibus occurſura pericula; ‘ ſed benignos eſſe ſiderum aſpectus, qui malignis po‘ tentiores, illa ſuperanda præmonſtrent. Quamquam ‘ ne ſic quidem defugere odium, ac infamiam poteſtis; ‘ cum loquuti ad gratiam, & juxta inania veſtra placita, ‘ ſpe inani illos lactatis, quâ ſe deluſos dum ſentiunt, ‘ mirum quibus vos, artemque veſtram diris devoveant. ‘ Id vero, ut tibi imprimis contingat, familiare eſt, cui ‘ publicitùs exprobrata ſunt innumera prope, & nota ‘ publicè exempla, ut circa filiam illuſtris Comitis Chia‘ vinii; ut circa filium illuſtris Præſidis Gobelini; ut ‘ circa Præfectum ærarii Bullonium; ut circa illum, cu‘ jus cauſâ cæſus fuſtibus, litem intentaſti coram Judice ‘ ſanctæ Genovefæ. (48). - - - - *For, to thoſe (whom you* ‘ *would make your friends, and from whom you expect great* ‘ *rewards) you prognoſticate every thing fortunate, and* ‘ *eſpecially long life; and though they will meet with ſome* ‘ *dangers in theſe times, yet the aſpects of the ſtars being* ‘ *kind and more powerful than thoſe that are unkind, ſhew* ‘ *that they will overcome them. But not even thus can* ‘ *you eſcape hatred and infamy; for as you ſpeak according* ‘ *to the favour of your own ſilly imaginations, you feed* ‘ *them with vain hopes, whereby when they find them*‘ *ſelves deluded, they damn you and your art both to the* ‘ *pit of hell. But this commonly happens to you in parti*‘ *cular, who are reproached with a thouſand notorious* ‘ *inſtances, as with regard to the count de Chavigny's* ‘ *daughter, the illuſtrious preſident Gobelin's ſon, the trea*‘ *ſurer Buillon, and him upon whoſe account being cud*‘ *gelled, you entered an action before the judge of St Ge*‘ *nevieve.*’

[*H*] *He publiſhed a great number of books.*] Since I have already ſpoken of the firſt (49), I ſhall here begin with the ſecond. It was printed in the year 1623, under the title of *Aſtronomicarum domorum cabala detecta*. In 1624 (50), not being able to anſwer by word of mouth (as he had prepared for it) the Theſes which Antony Villon (51) would maintain, he anſwered them in writing. This Villon, who commonly went by the name of the Philoſophical Soldier, had poſted up theſes againſt Ariſtotle's doctrine, which were to be defended at the late queen Magaret's palace. The aſſembly was very numerous, when the firſt preſident ſent an order to Villon and his two companions, not to maintain their propoſitions. There was afterward a decree of parliament againſt them, and againſt their theſes. See the French Mercury (52), where you will find an abſtract of Morinus's treatiſe againſt the doctrine of thoſe Innovators. It is ſaid in his life (53), that this book got him the reputation of an able Chemiſt, and a ſubtle Philoſopher, and upon this occaſion we are told a thing which is worth relating. Morinus had applied himſelf to Chemical Operations at the biſhop of Bolougne's, and afterwards had conferences with the greateſt maſters concerning this art; he had alſo converſed about the great work with two famous perſons, one of which had ſeen the Philoſopher's Stone, and the other had been preſent at the experiments, which one Sylvius had made of his powder of projection before the king. This Sylvius was condemned for his crimes; but his art was no ways cenſured: his writings were kept by Cardinal Richelieu, who made uſe of them for finding the Philoſopher's Stone at his houſe at Reuel. *Alter Sylvio quodam ipſimet regi ſui pulveris experimentum præbente interfuerat, quod quidem ennarre prolixius non eſt hujus loci; noſſe ſuffecerit ob ſcelera damnato Sylvio, artis tamen ejus myſterium minime damnatum eſſe, cum poſtea Richeliæus Cardinalis ex hujus diſciplina damnati, ſcriptis ab eodem tradita, in fornaculis Ruellianis juſſerit multa tentari* (54). In the year 1633, Morinus publiſhed *Trigonometriæ canonicæ libros tres*; and in 1635, a book intituled *quod Deus ſit* (55). He compoſed it in a Geometrical method, to recover one of his friends, who was fallen into Atheiſm. He dedicated it to the clergy of France, and thought he deſerved a handſome penſion for it all his life (56). He enlarged it in 1655, and re-printed it with this title, *De vera cognitione Dei ex ſolo naturæ lumine* (57), it is the firſt book of his *Aſtrologia Gallica*. One Peter Baudouin, Sieur de Montarcis, his old diſciple appeared againſt him on occaſion of this treatiſe, pretending that it was only the copy of a treatiſe of Richard de St Victor. He charged him with the ſame crime of Plagiariſm, with reſpect to ſeveral other of his writings. This the author of Morinus's life tells us (58), but Morinus himſelf ſays nothing of the matter, but, on the contrary, that this Mr de Montarcis had pirated on him (59). This accuſation was doubtleſs the reaſon of his adverſary's recriminating and maintaining, that John Baptiſt Morinus was a Plagiary. It were to be wiſhed, there was leſs confuſion, and more Chronological order, in the catalogue that is given us of his works. This confuſion hinders me from doing what I would in this place: for it would require more time and more books to rectify it, than I have by me. Let us go on however. Morinus publiſhed a book in the year 1631, which engaged him in ſome replies; he intituled it, *Famoſi problematis de telluris motu vel quiete hactenus optata ſolutio*. He declares againſt Copernicus, and maintains this firſt work againſt a Phyſician called Lanſbergius, and againſt Bullialdus, for he publiſhed, in 1634, *Reſponſio pro telluris motu*; and in 1642, *Tycho Brahæus in Philolaum pro telluris quiete*. The year following he wrote againſt Gaſſendus upon the ſame ſubject, as we ſhall ſee below. His diſpute upon the Longitude was no leſs obſtinate: he pretended he had found it; this appears by his book *Longitudinum terreſtrium & cæleſtium nova & hactenus optata ſcientia*, publiſhed in 1634. The Hollanders had promiſed a hundred thouſand livres to him that could make the diſcovery: the king of Spain had promiſed three hundred thouſand (60). Morinus pretended he had merited the reward, for he believed he had diſcovered the Longitude, and had given a demonſtration of it in an aſſembly held in the Arſenal at Paris the thirtieth of March 1634 (61), but that glory was diſputed with him. Some ſkillful perſons, nominated by cardinal Richelieu, were of a different opinion. George Frommius (62) maintained, that that invention was due to Longomontanus: Father du Liris, the Recollect, boaſted that he himſelf had come nearer the matter. Vallangrenus, Coſmographer to his Catholic majeſty at Bruſſels, boaſted of it alſo (63). Morinus had all theſe adverſaries upon his back, and was obliged to defend himſelf by certificates againſt the report made by cardinal Richelieu's commiſſioners (64). He was not diſturbed at it in the leaſt, but maintained the affirmative without flinching: ſee the book he publiſhed in the year 1640. *Aſtronomia jam à fundamentis integrè & exactè reſtituta*. His great comfort was, that he obtained a penſion in 1645, of two thouſand livres. ‘ Hunc denique la‘ borem velut in agro ſterili non periiſſe common‘ ſtrat præmium ab ipſo rege, conſilioque ipſius ſe‘ cretiore tandem obtentum, cum enim ipſis anno ‘ 1645, libellum ſupplicem obtuliſſet, bina librarum ‘ millia in penſionem annuam ex Regii montis abba-

‘ tia

(47) Vita Morini, *pag.* 16, *num.* 79.

(48) Berner. Anatomia ridic. muris, *pag.* 138. Morin. Defenſ. Diſſert. *pag.* 121, *anſwering Bernier, denies what concerns the daughter of Mr de Chavigni.*

(49) In the remark [*A*].

(50) See his Life, *pag.* 9, *num.* 38.

(51) *He was of Provence.* Vinc. Panurgus, de tribus Impoſtoribus, *pag.* 57.

(52) *Tom.* x, *pag.* 504, and the following, *ad ann.* 1624.

(53) *Pag.* 9, *num.* 38.

(54) Vita Morini, ibid. *num.* 39.

(55) Ib. *num.* 40. The judgment Des Cartes gave of this book is to be ſeen in his Life written by Mr Baillet, *Tom. II, pag.* 118.

(56) Propter quod penſionem congruam in reliquum meæ vitæ tempus meruiſſem à Comitiis Gallicani Cleri convocatis ann. 1635. *Morinus, Defenſ. ſuæ Diſſert. de atomis & vacuo, pag.* 90.

(57) Vita Morin. *num.* 40.

(58) Ibid.

(59) Morin. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 90, 91. *He ſays this plagiary had been publiſhed in* 1651. Tractatus de fundamentis Scientiæ generalis & univerſalis.

(60) Vita Morini, *pag.* 11, *num.* 50.

(61) Ibid. *num.* 51.

(62) Profeſſor at Copenhagen.

(63) Ib. *pag.* 8, *num.* 34.

(64) Ibid. *pag.* 12, *num.* 52.

and did not come out till after his death. I ſpeak of his *Aſtrologia Gallica* (c). He had among other adverſaries the famous Gaſſendus [*I*]. He died at Paris the ſixth of November

tia conſecutus eſt (65). - - - - *At laſt, the reward he obtained from the king and his privy-council, ſhewed, that his labour was not loſt as on barren ground, for having humbly preſented to them a petition in the year* 1645, *he obtained a yearly penſion of two thouſand livres upon the abbey of Royaumont*.' Let us not omit his Aſtrological notes againſt the marquis de Villennes (66), nor his Confutation of the Preadamites (67). This marquis pretended to Aſtrology, and was willing the public ſhould know it; for he got a book on this ſubject printed, which is aſcribed to Ptolomy (68). About four years after Morinus attacked him with a little too much heat, as the writer of his life confeſſes (69), excuſing him however on his great zeal for the truth (70). I am indebted to Mr Clement, who ſo well deſerves the place he is in (71) on account of his learning and obliging temper; I am, I ſay, indebted to him for a catalogue of John Baptiſt Morinus's works, wherein I have found ſome treatiſes not mentioned by the writer of his life: Here are two of this nature. *Ad auſtrales & boreales aſtrologos pro aſtrologia reſtituenda epiſtolæ* (72). Letters written to the Sieur Morinus, approving his diſcovery of the Longitude, and his anſwer to Herigone (73).

I ſhall lengthen out this note to give more light to Morinus's pretenſions about the Longitude. He maintained (74) with the greateſt aſſurance, that the commiſſioners named by the cardinal ſtarted a thouſand cavils upon him the day of the experiment; but that he came off ſo happily as to force them to own to the aſſembly, that his demonſtrations were good. Ten days after, continues he, the Sieurs Paſchal, Mydorge, Beaugrand, Boulenger, and Herigone (75) met by order of the cardinal to examine this doctrine a-new upon the four points, which his Eminence preſcribed them. They gave a judgment quite contrary to their firſt declaration, and ſhewed it the cardinal, who commanded them to publiſh it. Morinus appealed from them to the moſt famous Aſtronomers of Europe, and obtained their deciſion, condemning the ſecond ſentence of the commiſſioners. ‘Ab illis commiſſariis proditus, & à Cardinali Richelio fraudatus promiſſo præmio, de illa ſecunda ſententia provocavi ad celebriores Europæ Aſtronomos quibus ſcripſi librumque meum tranſmiſi, qui omnes ſuis ad me reſponſis primam ſententiam approbarunt, ſecundum vero falſitatis & iniquitatis unanimiter condemnarunt (76). - - - *Being betrayed by thoſe commiſſioners, and deprived by cardinal Richelieu of the promiſed reward, I appealed from the ſecond ſentence to the moſt eminent Aſtronomers of Europe, to whom I wrote and tranſmitted my book, all of whom, in their anſwers to me, approved the the firſt ſentence, but condemned the ſecond as falſe and unjuſt*.' This did him no kindneſs as long as the cardinal lived, but was not uſeleſs after his death; for Morinus addreſſing himſelf to the king's council, and publiſhing a long narrative, obtained juſtice by a penſion of two thouſand livres. He made it appear, that the commiſſioners had betrayed their conſcience to pleaſe the cardinal. I relate this, as I find it in his own book; but I give little credit to it. *Poſtulationem meam narratoriam quanta potui arte compoſui, ut evidentiſſime pateret injuſtitia in me perpetrata à Cardinali Richelio, quem conſtabat excitaſſe Commiſſarios meos ut ſuam in me ſecundam ferrent ſententiam primæ ac veræ prorſus contrariam* (77). He eſpecially meant the Sieur Herigone, and wrote violently againſt him. He denies that he had ever been his diſciple. ‘Fallitur dum ait Herigonum fuiſſe meum in Mathematicis præceptorem. Nam dum in illum ſcripſi, quod fuiſſet ignarus, perfidus & proditor Judex in mea Longitudinum cauſa: pro ſua defenſione mihi reſpondens inania, non oblitus fuiſſet mihi exprobrare, quod ejus fuiſſem diſcipulus ingratiſſimus (78). - - - - *He is miſtaken, in ſaying that Herigone had been my maſter in Mathematics. For having ſaid in my book againſt him, he was an ignorant, falſe, and perfidious, judge in my cauſe of the Longitude: in his frivolous anſwer by way of defence, he would not have forgot to upbraid me with having been his ungrateful diſciple*.'

[*I*] *He had amongſt other adverſaries the famous Gaſſendus*.] The original of the diſpute was this. In the year 1642, Gaſſendus printed two letters which he had written to Peter du Puy, *de motu impreſſo à motore tranſlato*. Here he ſtrongly combats the objections of thoſe, who ſay the earth does not move: Morinus was one of them, and ſtrenuouſly oppoſed the Copernican ſyſtem. He therefore believed himſelf the perſon attacked, and complained, that Gaſſendus, violating the the laws of their antient friendſhip, became the aggreſſor. In a word, he took pen in hand and publiſhed a book againſt Gaſſendus in 1643 (79). Gaſſendus confuted it the ſame year, without any heat, but with much ſtrength of reaſon (80). He did not publiſh this book, and even engaged to ſuppreſs it, when he was reconciled to Morinus by the mediation of the baron of Tourves (81). It was printed for all this in 1649, with a violent preface compoſed by Neuré, the author's friend. Gaſſendus excuſed himſelf upon it to Morinus and proteſted he knew nothing of the printing of his work (82). His letter was publiſhed by Morinus who joined it to a book which he printed. Gaſſendus writ him another letter, complaining of his having publiſhed the former. But Morinus printed alſo a fragment of this ſecond letter, together with a new libel. Hereupon Gaſſendus broke off all correſpondence with him, and would take no more notice of the writings of ſuch an adverſary: but his friends took the thing in another manner; they publiſhed his ſecond letter entire, and reſolved to ſtrike this Aſtrologer home. Accordingly, when his Diſſertation came out *de atomis & vacuo*, publiſhed at Paris in 1650, againſt Epicurus's Philoſophy, which Gaſſendus had put out (83), they handled it umercifully. Bernier publiſhed a book (84) intituled, *Anatomia ridiculi muris*, which was followed two years after by the *Favilla ridiculi muris*, in which he quite demoliſhes the apology which Morinus printed (85) for his Diſſertation. This enraged him to that degree, that he put out (86) a book with this title; *Vincentii Panurgi epiſtola de tribus impoſtoribus*. Theſe three impoſtors were Gaſſendus, Bernier, and Neuré.

He was chiefly expoſed on his preſuming to foretel that Gaſſendus ſhould be ſeized with a mortal diſtemper in the year 1650, and that the effects of it ſhould appear, either at the end of July, or the beginning of Auguſt. This Aſtrological prediction was falſe, and drew on the author a terrible peal of reproaches and inſults. ‘Qua providentia factum dicam, *they are Mr Bernier's words* (87), ô rerum bonarum inaniſſime, futiliſſimeque Morine! ut ultro mihi præbueris anſam, quam captare ab aliquot elapſis menſibus geſtiebam (neque ego ſolus, ſed multi etiam alii, quibus veritas cordi eſt) ut propalarem, ſcilicet mendaciloquium illud inſigne, quo in æternum opprobrium tuæ damnatæ aſtrologiæ auſus es ſecure atque impudenter prædicere ter, & publicis etiam ſcriptis evulgare, *Gaſſendum mortali morbo laboraturum, & vim morbi extremam, ex qua deberet ejus mors conſequi, futuram in ipſomet Julii, Auguſtique confinio ſuperioris anni milleſimi ſexcenteſimi quinquageſimi*. - - - - *By what providence ſhall I ſay it happened, O Morinus, thou vaineſt and ſillieſt of mortals! that of your own accord you ſhould give me the handle I was deſirous to take theſe ſeveral months paſt (and not only I, but many others too, who love the truth) to publiſh that notorious lie, whereby, to the eternal diſgrace of your condemned Aſtrology, you dared impudently to foretel three times, and even in writings to publiſh, that* Gaſſendus would be ſick, *&c*.' Morinus (88) anſwered, as all falſe prophets do, that he did not poſitively foretel Gaſſendus's death that year, but only warned him of a mortal danger, which might be avoided by good precautions. One of his antagoniſts was more exact than Mr Bernier, for he acknowledged the Aſtrologer's reſtrictions. ‘Aſtrologus Morinus ad ſtabiliendam amplius ſuarum prædictionum certitudinem judicat ex aſtris ac divinat, ſed cum præcautionibus conſuetis Almanachiſtarum quod D. Gaſſendus morietur anno 1650 (89). - - - - - *Morinus the Aſtrologer, to confirm the certainty of his predictions, judges and divines by the ſtars, but with the uſual precautions of Almanack-makers, that Gaſſendus will die in the year* 1650.' But no withſtanding all his little precautions, this Aſtrologer deſerved to be expoſed as he was. I ſhall not relate all that Gaſſendus has obſerved

(c) See the remark [*K*].

(65) Ibid. *num*. 54.

(66) See the *Mercure Galant*, *Tom. i*, where the academy of Aubignac is ſpoken of, and that for the month of February 1678, *pag*. 93.

(67) Refutatio compendioſa erronei ac deteſtandi libri de Præadamitis. *Vita Morin. pag*. 10, *num*. 45.

(68) Centiloquium Ptolemæo vulgò adſcriptum. *Ib. num*. 43.

(69) Si quid in eis eſt quod quiſpiam jure poſſit carpere, non diffitebor contra Authorem hunc nobilem calentis ingenii leves quoſdam inſultus haberi. *Ibid*.

(70) Præfervidi erat, neque ſat tolerantis animi, ſed qui amore veritatis caleret ardentius. *Ibid*.

(71) At Paris in the king's library.

(72) Printed in the year 1628, in 8vo.

(73) Printed in 1635, in 4to.

(74) Morin. Aſtrologia Gall. *lib. xxiii*, *pag*. 623.

(75) They were commiſſioners in this cauſe.

(76) Morin. ubi ſupra.

(77) Id. ib.

(78) Morin. in Defenſ. Diſſert. *pag*. 107.

(79) *Intituled*, Alæ telluris fractæ.

(80) *His confutation is contained in the third letter of the treatiſe* de motu impreſſo à motore tranſlato, *Oper. Tom. iii*, *Edit. Lugdun*. 1658.

(81) Morin. in Defenſ. Diſſertat. *pag*. 21.

(82) Ibid. *See alſo the* Anatom. ridiculi muris, *pag*. 8.

(83) At Lyons in the year 1649, in three volumes in folio.

(84) At Paris in the year 1651.

(85) At Paris in the year 1651.

(86) At Paris in the year 1654.

(87) Bernerius, in Anatom. ridiculi muris, *pag*. 127.

(88) Morin. in Defenſ. Diſſertat. *pag*. 114.

(89) Apud Morin. ibid. *pag*. 112.

November 1656, and was buried in his pariſh church of St Stephen du Mont (d). What

---

(d) Taken from his Life, printed in Latin before his *Aſtrologia Gallica*. I could not find that which was printed in French, at Paris, in 1660, in 12mo.

ſerved upon it (90), but content my ſelf with theſe words of his abridger (91). 'Here I might particularly mention the ſcheme of the nativity of Mr Maridat (92), a member of the great council, in which we might ſee that the Aſtrologer John Baptiſt Morinus who erected it, has ſucceeded much like Noſtradamus in that of Mr Suffredy; but all this is ſo full of fooleries and impertinences, and falſe events, and ſmells ſo ſtrong of the juggler and gipſy, whoſe end is only to deceive and get a piece of money, that I can hardly think of it with patience. I ſhall only ſay to the eternal ſhame of this Aſtrologer, Morinus, that ſeeing Gaſſendus, who made a jeſt of his judicial Aſtrology, was infirm, and ſeized with a defluxion on his lungs, he was ſo impudent as to foretel, and publiſh to the world in a printed paper, that he ſhould die about the latter end of July, or the beginning of Auguſt, 1650; pretending hereby to erect a trophy to his Aſtrology; and yet Gaſſendus was never in better health than at that time, and ſo recovered his ſtrength, that on the fifth of February the next year (93) we walked I remember up the mountain of Toulon to make the experiment of a Vacuum.'

MORINUS's ſubterfuges when his prophecies proved falſe.

It is pleaſant enough to ſee how many evaſions Morinus made uſe of, when his predictions failed. He ſuppoſed, that the influences of the ſtars did not act neceſſarily, and that a wiſe man could over-rule them. 'Poteſt qui ſciens eſt (hoc eſt qui propria vel alterius ſcientia monitus eſt) multos ſtellarum effectus avertere, ex Ptolomæo Aphor. 5. centiloquii. *Qui eſt ipſemet Aphoriſmus quem citat D. Thomas, dum ſuperius dixit* ſapiens dominabitur aſtris (94). - - - - *A wiſe man (that is, he who is warned by his own or another's knowledge) may avert many effects of the ſtars, according to the fifth aphoriſm of Ptolomy's Centiloquium.* Which is the very aphoriſm cited by S. Thomas, where he ſaid, the *wiſe will over-rule the ſtars*.' Applying this to his prediction againſt Gaſſendus, he obſerves that this Philoſopher avoided the blow by good and ſalutary precautions, by a regular diet, and moderate exerciſe, and by removing to Toulon where the air was more agreeable to his conſtitution (95). He adds, that perhaps the fear of the prediction made him pray to GOD more earneſtly to preſerve his health, and that his prayers being heard contradicted Aſtrology, which otherwiſe would not have been erroneous (96). 'Deinde etiamſi data prædictio mea Tabellioni, fuiſſet quò ad effectum ab Aſtris naturaliter inevitabilis, nonne Gaſſendus prædictionis meæ conſcius ex ſupra poſitis, potuiſſet ut Ezechias lib. 4. Reg. cap. 20. rogare DEUM ſecretò, quo ipſum à morbo vel morte liberaſſet ſupernaturaliter, ſicque deluſus & adhuc pro falſo propheta habitus fuiſſem? Nonne ægroti & nautæ in procella de vita naturaliter deſperantes votis liberantur . . . . His ergo omnibus ſupernaturaliter liberatis, nunquid Aſtrologus mortem eo tempore prædicens ex cauſis naturalibus, pro falſo Propheta erit habendus? Certe non magis quam Jonas, qui ex ipſius DEI verbo Ninivitis, & urbis & hominum univerſalem prædixit ſubverſionem; quæ tamen non eſt ſubſecuta, quod inſigni pœnitentiâ à Rege ad minimum pecus, ſibi precaverint adverſus iram DEI, qui illorum miſertus eſt (97). - - - - *And then, tho' my prediction had been naturally infallible with regard to the influence of the ſtars, might not Gaſſendus, being forewarned of it, have followed the example of Hezekiah,* 2 *Kings* xx. *and prayed to GOD in ſecret, that he would deliver him from death and diſeaſe in a ſupernatural way, and thus I ſhould have been deceived, and looked upon as a falſe prophet? Are not ſick perſons and mariners in a ſtorm, who naturally deſpair of life, ſometimes delivered by prayers . . . . All theſe then being in a ſupernatural way preſerved, muſt an Aſtrologer, who foretels death at that time from natural cauſes, be accounted a falſe prophet? Surely no more than Jonas, who, by the command of GOD, propheſied the utter deſtruction of the city and people of Nineveh, which however did not happen, becauſe, by a ſignal repentance, they all, from the king to the ſmalleſt of the cattle, guarded againſt the wrath of GOD, who took compaſſion on them.*' Cheer up, gentlemen Aſtrologers, you can never be baffled, while you ſhelter your ſelves under Scripture examples. Threaten what you pleaſe, death, exile, impriſonment; promiſe on the contrary, health, riches, honours: happen what will, you have an anſwer at hand. Thoſe whom you promiſed good fortune to, which they never enjoyed, did not carry themſelves aright: they did not pray to GOD devoutly: they whom you threatned with misfortunes were prudent and devout: this puts me in mind of the commentators on the Revelations, who having promiſed a deliverance that never came to paſs, impute it to the bad lives of their neighbours. This is a ſure ſanctuary. Let us not forget two good reflexions of Gaſſendus's diſciples. I. That it is a piece of impudence puniſhable by the magiſtrate, to publiſh, that this or that perſon ſhall die in ſuch a year; for how many are there whom ſuch a threatning is able to kill? 'Fieri nihil poſſe impudentius, quam mortem homini viventi publico ſcripto prædicere, eſſe nihil virgâ cenſoriâ publicique cognitoris animadverſione dignius, quam captandæ mortis occaſionem ingerere, quam oculos omnium in unum, quaſi in communi aliquod ſpectaculum, convertere; quam illi ſi credulus fuerit, (uti nemo fere non eſt) cauſam mortis objicere; cum conſtet multos ex ſolo mortis hoc modo prænunciatæ metu, morbum, mortemque contraxiſſe (98) . . . Ecqua eſt certè vindictæ ſpecies adverſus credulum inimicum major, quam ut illi prædicatur ab Aſtrologo futurum, ut tali tempore moriatur, aut in gravi mortis periculo ſit; cum exinde nihil fieri poſſit illius animo ærumnoſius, nihil, quod, ob cauſam jam dictam, poſſit illi magis & morbum, & mortem inducere (99). - - *Nothing can be more impudent than to foretel a man's death by public writings, nothing more deſerves puniſhment, and the animadverſion of the civil magiſtrate, than to lay ſnares for one's death, than to turn the eyes of all people upon one perſon as ſome extraordinary ſpectacle; than to make him run ſuch an hazard, if he be credulous (as almoſt every body is); for it is certain, that many from the meer apprehenſion of death foretold in this manner, have contracted diſtempers, and died . . . . Can there be a greater piece of revenge uſed againſt a credulous enemy, than for an Aſtrologer to tell him, that he ſhall die ſuch a time, or be in very great danger of death; ſince nothing can give greater anxiety to his mind, and nothing can be more effectual, for the reaſon already given, to bring diſtempers and death upon him.*' II. That ſuch prophets are almoſt unavoidably engaged in unchriſtian practices, which is to be curiouſly inquiſitive after the ſtate of thoſe they have threatned; and to be grieved at their health: for where is the man who had not rather ſee the perſon go to his grave, whoſe death he has foretold, than to find himſelf expoſed to the infamy of being a falſe prophet? *Permiſit Deus durare adhuc te, ſi forte acturus pœnitentiam fores; cum ob mala alia, tum ob id, quod ipſemet volens feciſſes tibi neceſſitatem expetendi mortem tui proximi, ne cogereris deluſæ artis, prædictioniſque falſi convictæ eam confuſionem ſuſtinere, quæ ad deſperationem te adigeret* (100).

During this quarrel ſeveral ſtories were publiſhed againſt Morinus. They reproached him amongſt other things; I. With having been a ſchool-maſter, till forty years of age, and then having been ſeen with a pen behind his ear, and his ink-horn at his girdle, aſking from door to door if any one would learn to read and write, or caſt accounts, for ſo much a month (101). II. That he promiſed a young gentleman, whoſe ſcheme he had erected, great ſucceſs in arms, and eſpecially in duels; which occaſioned the youth's growing quarrelſome, and fighting one for a ſmall offence who killed him. They added, that the gentleman's elder brother hearing of Morinus's prediction, diſcharged his fury on the Aſtrologer's ſhoulders, that the blows were ſo heavy as to oblige the Surgeons to draw up a verbal proceſs, and that the complaint was brought into the court of St Genevieve; but that the Fathers of the Chriſtian doctrine interpoſed to ſtop the ſuit, cauſing a good ſum to be given to the baſtinadoed perſon, which he received as

(90) Gaſſend. Phyſicæ, *Sect. II, lib. vi, pag.* 747, *Tom. i, Operum.*

(91) Bernier, Abregé de la Philoſophie de Gaſſendi, *Tom. iv, pag.* 485, 486, *Edit. de* 1684.

(92) *See it in* Gaſſendus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 746, 747.

(93) That is to ſay, in the year 1650, which is the following year with regard to the time when Morinus publiſhed his prophecy, he publiſhed it in 1649. Mr Bernier, in abridging, forgot to remove this equivoque.

(94) Morin. in Defenſ. Diſſertat. *pag.* 114.

(95) Ibid. *pag.* 116, 117.

(96) Fortaſſis Gaſſendus mortem admodum metuens, nec omnino ſuæ confidens rigidæ diætæ, DEUM precatus eſt, qui ipſum exaudivit. *Ib. pag.* 120.

(97) Ibid. *pag.* 119.

(98) Bernerius, Anatomia ridiculi muris, *pag.* 133, 134.

(99) Ibid. *pag.* 137.

(100) Ibid. *pag.* 136.

(101) Me calamo ſupra aurem & ſcriptorio in latere, oſtiatim mendicaſſe Scholaſticum, ut ſtipendio menſurno docerem legere, ſcribere & computare. *Morin. in Defenſ. Diſſertat. pag.* 106.

What Guy Patin has ſaid of him deſerves relating [*K*]. He ſpeaks of him as of a mad man ; and it is certain there was a ſpice of madneſs in that head of his. Morinus was ſtrangely perplexed about his ſaying, that Antichriſt was born [*L*]. But as abſurd as he was

as the ſweeteſt conſolation (102). III. That he was ſordidly covetous, and ſet his ſchemes only to get money by them. He anſwers the firſt reproach by proving, that from the time he was admitted Phyſician, till he was made profeſſor of Mathematics, he had lived either with the biſhop of Boulogne, or the abbot of la Bretonniere, or the duke of Luxemburg (103). Obſerve, that he was but thirty years old when he was made Doctor of Phyſic. See the laſt remark (104). He confutes the ſecond reproach, by maintaining, that if they enquire of his neighbours, and particularly of Mr Colletet, or of the judges of St Genevieve, or of the Fathers of the Chriſtian doctrine, they will find that they never heard of this adventure (105). Laſtly, he ſays, that he is not covetous, nor never was, and that the ſtars ſhew him to be as liberal as Gaſſendus is niggardly, according to the ſcheme of his nativity. He maintains, that his private lectures of Aſtrology had been worth to him an hundred thouſand livres, if he would have taken all the ſcholars he might have had : But that he had always refuſed even thoſe who were eminent for their quality : That he need only inſtance his nieces : GOD has provided for them, ſays he, by my labours and expences. I have put two of them into the convents of Ville-Franche ; and as to the third who intends to marry, I have a thouſand crowns in ready money for her portion when ever a match offers. *Nec curent amplius de pecuniis neceſſariis ad conjugia nepotularum mearum . . . Placuit enim DEO ſuam erga illas providentiam exercere meis laboribus atque expenſis : duas enim feci Religioſas Francopoli, in Monaſteriis B. Mariæ Viſitationis, & Divæ Urſulinæ ; & quia nubere vult tertia, ad hujus præſentaneam dotem, ſeorſim repoſita ſunt à me librarum tria millia. Quod abſit à me dici vanitatis gratia : ſed duntaxat ad repellendum à me tetrum illud avaritiæ ſordidæ crimen, quod mihi imponit Anatomiſta murium. Etenim pro tenuitate mea etiam à puero fui ſemper liberalis ; quippe tantum natus ad liberalitatem, quantum Gaſſendus ad avaritiam, ut ex utriuſque figuris cæleſtibus atque vitâ patebit, nulliſque unquam peperci ſumptibus pro veritatis & honoris mei defenſione. Sique lucri & pecuniarum fuiſſem cupidus, plus quam centum millia librarum mihi comparaſſem Pariſiis, ex privatis ſolum Aſtrologiæ lectionibus ; ſed nullos habere volui diſcipulos etiam Magnates, mihi qualem voluiſſem mercedem offerentes* (106). In another book (107) he acquaints the public, that he had married her as ſhe deſired, notwithſtanding the misfortunes of the war. This is no ſuch mighty matter, for he confeſſes his annual income was about four thouſand livres (108). He acknowledges he was obliged to Aſtrology for this fortune : It was by that he got into the good graces of Mary de Medicis, who procured him the profeſſorſhip (109).

[*K*] *What Guy Patin has ſaid of him deſerves relating.*] ‘ I hear that the *Aſtrologia Gallica* of the Sieur John Morinus a native of Ville-Franche in Beaujolois, formerly Doctor of Phyſic at Valence (110), the king's profeſſor in Mathematics in our college royal, is at laſt printed at the Hague in Holland. I am told there are a great many abuſive reflexions in it on the Phyſicians of Paris, and others who do not approve judicial Aſtrology, or Chemiſtry ; and I do not wonder at it, for the man was mad : there are two volumes of it in folio. The queen of Poland has given two thouſand crowns towards the charge of the edition, at the inſtance of a ſecretary of her's who is fond of Aſtrology. Thus you ſee how princes are chouſed : if it were a good book that might be uſeful to the public, no Printer would have been found, nor any body elſe that would have undertaken it (111).’ He had ſaid in another letter (112), ‘ I have yet another death to tell you of. It is that of the Sieur Morinus of Beaujolois, king's profeſſor in Mathematics. So that you ſee him dead at the year's end as well as Mr Gaſſendus : but there is no danger of their biting one another now ; for one lies at St Nicolas in the Fields, the other at St Stephen's on the Hill. One was a very ſober man, the other crack-brained and half mad ; but be it how it will, it is certain they will be upon the level in the other world in ſpite of all the Mathematics, and all the pretended judicial Aſtrology, which Morinus was bewitched with.’ It is true, that Morinus's *Aſtrologia Gallica* was printed at the Hague in the year 1661. But it is only one volume in folio, divided into twenty ſix books. The author was thirty years about it : he hoped to have lived to ſee it out of the preſs (113) ; for he had already ſent the fourteen firſt books to the Dutch Bookſeller who was to print it, but death came and cut off that hope. There are two Epiſtles Dedicatory before this volume ; one is the author's to Jeſus Chriſt, the other is by an anonymous hand (114) to Louiſa Mary de Gonzague, queen of Poland. This princeſs encouraged Morinus to this great labour, and paid the charges of the impreſſion. *Authori animum ne tanto operi deeſſet, ſubſidium ut illud in publicum proferret, regali cura, regali munificentia addidiſti* (115). When there was a talk of marrying her to ſome prince, Morinus declared, that this marriage would never take effect, and that ſhe was deſtined to marry a monarch. This was one of his beſt predictions ; and the author of his life makes the moſt of it. ‘ At quam omnibus ſuis partibus abſolutum fuit vaticinium illud *Mariæ*, tunc Principi, nunc vero Reginæ Poloniæ ab *Morino* editum ! de futuro ipſius conjugio cum illuſtriſſimo Principe didebatur rumor, quod quidem potiſſimum illi fuiſſet, ac plurimæ dignitatis : nihilominus tamen haud ineundum fore noſter aſſeruit, cum Regem ei conjugem aſtra pollicerentur (116). - - - - - *But how exactly accompliſhed was that prophecy of Morinus, with regard to Mary, then a princeſs, but now queen of Poland! a report was ſpread that ſhe was to be married to a moſt illuſtrious prince, which indeed would have been a very conſiderable and honourable match for her : Morinus however affirmed it would never happen, becauſe the ſtars promiſed her a king for her huſband.*’ I could eaſily believe, that he had the aſſurance to give out this prediction : for beſides that this princeſs was a royal match, and probably enough might marry a king ; we muſt know, that Morinus, was naturally very fool-hardy, and had a great many back doors to creep out at, in caſe his prediction proved falſe (117). Beſides this lady had great faith in Aſtrology, and it is to ſuch that the Aſtrologers moſt confidently promiſe dignities. The abbot de Marolles, who perfectly knew her, deſerves to be cited. ‘ Another time, *ſays he* (118), ſpeaking againſt judicial Aſtrology at the princeſs's, who was very much inclined in favour of it, becauſe of the advantage and ſatisfaction there was in knowing futurities, I had againſt me not only her ſecretary, who was a man of ſenſe, and verſed in this ſcience, and her firſt Phyſician Auguſtine Corade, who practiſes with ſo much ſucceſs, but alſo the abbot of Belozane, and ſome others.’ We need not wonder at her expences on a book, the author of which had flattered her with the hopes of a crown, which ſhe actually obtained. It is poſſibly to this Aſtrological promiſe ſhe alluded, when ſhe gave the following anſwer. ‘ She was at the palace of Orleans, where as the abbot de la Riviere told her, he paſſionately deſired to ſee her Monſieur's wife ; ſhe replied laughing, that Monſieur was not a king, and that ſhe was deſtined to be a queen (119).’ The abbot de Marolles tells this, where he relates the viſits ſhe made after the ceremony of her marriage with the king of Poland.

[*L*] *He ſaid that Antichriſt was born.*] And even that he was immediately to appear, and in a little time to make all the conqueſts which tradition promiſes him. When Morinus was aſked, how it was poſſible for Antichriſt to ſeize on ſo many fortified towns in ſo ſhort a time, he anſwered, that he would ſend an army of Magicians from the clouds, who ſhould kill the ſoldiers and inhabitants. Almoſt half mankind, added he, are Magicians, as they aſſure us, who have been at the Devil's aſſembly ; and all Magicians are military men. *Eccui enim jam fabula non* es *ob famoſam illam non modo adventantis, ſed etiam jam pro foribus exiſtentis Antichriſti prædictionem ; de qua dum ex te quæreretur, qui poſſet tam cito, ac ipſe efferres, expugnare Antichriſtus tot arces munitiſſimas ; Solitus* was in moſt of his principles, he very well underſtood one thing, in which the Peripatetics are never to be undeceived, viz. that all they teach concerning ſubſtantial forms, is exceeding impertinent [*M*]. We muſt not forget, that he received ſeveral marks of Mr Des Cartes's eſteem [*N*]; and that he very nearly equalled Cardan, by an ingenuous

---

(102) Ibid. *pag.* 108.

(103) Ibid. *pag.* 106, 107.

(104) Citat. (137).

(105) Ibid. *pag.* 108.

(106) Ibid. *pag.* 120.

(107) In Præfat. Aſtrolog. Gallicæ, *pag.* 31. *See his words*, Tertiam ad votum ſuum marito copulavi etiam difficillimis bellorum noſtrorum temporibus.

(108) Ibid.

(109) Ibid.

(110) He ſhould have ſaid, at Avignon.

(111) Guy Patin, Letter ccxxxiii, dated the eighteenth of February 1661, *pag.* 319, *Tom.* ii.

(112) The cviiith. It is dated the ſeventh of November 1656. See *pag.* 419, of the firſt Tome of Patin's Letters.

(113) Jam editionis hujus operis triginta annos integros accuratiſſimè limati ſtabat in procinctu, libroſque quatuordecim priores ad Typographum Batavum tranſtulerat cum id meditantem mors oppreſſit. *Vita Morin. pag.* 12, *n.* 55.

(114) Who points out his name by theſe letters, G. T. D. G. V.

(115) Epiſt. Dedicat.

(116) Vita Morini, *pag.* 14, *num.* 72.

(117) See the remark [*I*] of this article.

(118) Memoires, *pag.* 148, ad ann. 1643.

(119) Memoires, 166. ad ann. 1645.

fuiſti excipere; cum ex relatu eorum, qui ex Sabbatis Magorum adveniunt, dimidia pene hominum pars in Magis ſit, ac Magi omnes milites ſint, qui Sathanæ nomen dedere, quique ab Antichriſto, tanquam ſummo Duce deducendi in militiam ſunt; fore, ut cum volet Antichriſtus expugnare urbes, quæ ſpontaneam ſui deditionem non fecerint, eam Magorum nubem emittat ſurſum in aërem, quæ ſuperne irruens ſtragem tam civium, quam militum immanem edat (120). - - - *For the magicians* are liſted in the ſervice *of Satan, and are to be commanded by Antichriſt, as their chief-general.* The author of his Life makes three excuſes for him. 1. That he had read in a book of cardinal Cuſanius, that the oracles of Scripture fix the end of the world to the year 1675. In the ſecond place, that Alabaſter, a man excellently verſed in the Cabala and the Bible, had publiſhed the ſame thing. 3. That ſeveral poſſeſſed with the devil in ſeveral countries had declared to their exorciſts, that the beaſt of the Revelation was born, which the wickedneſs of the time made very credible. *Cardinalis* Cuſani *ſcriptoris minime contemnendi* conjecturam de ultimis temporibus *legerat, quo libro ad annum* 1675 *totius orbis terminus ac interitus ex literis aſtruitur inſpiratis. Idem ſcripſit Anglus* Alabaſter in tubarum ſpiraculis *libro edito, author, inquam, Orientis idiomata, & ſcripturas & Cabalam mirifice callens. Complurium exorciſmorum qui habentur excuſi volutarat* Morinus *hiſtorias, in quibus paſſim Energumeni in variis regionibus natam eſſe beſtiam proclamarunt, quod creditu facile nequitia temporis noſtri præſtat & ſuadet* (121). Three very fine reaſons!

[*M*] *He very well underſtood. . . . that all the Peripatetics teach, concerning ſubſtantial forms, is exceeding impertinent.*] If we did not know it by experience, we ſhould hardly believe it poſſible for men of ſenſe, who ſpend all their life in philoſophizing, to maintain (122), that a ſubſtance diſtinct from matter, is nevertheleſs material, and ſubſiſts only dependently on matter; that it is produced from the power of matter without exiſting in it previouſly; that it is not compounded either of matter, or any other pre-exiſting thing, and that notwithſtanding it is not a created being: laſtly, that without the aſſiſtance of any knowledge to direct it in it's operations, it produces the machines of animals and plants. They ſtill maintain all theſe monſtrous doctrines, after having been confounded with the objections of a Father Maignan, of a Gaſſendus, *&c.* and this appears very wonderful to me. Morinus diſcovered all theſe abſurdities, and abandoned the Peripatetic ſect upon all theſe points. ‘Quæſtionem de ortu vel productione formarum ſubſtantialium ‘ eſſe totius Phyſices difficillimam; quæque maximorum ‘ Virorum ac præſertim Neotericorum ingenia torſit. ‘ Dum alii volunt eas educi de potentia materiæ, a‘ lii ipſas de novo creari, alii eas produci à corporibus ‘ cœleſtibus, alii eas eſſe tantùm quandam elementa‘ lium qualitatum proportionem; ſicque eas eſſe acci‘ dentales, & alii alia. Ego verò in Aſtrologia Gal‘ lica lib. 20. Qui inſcribitur, de actione univerſali ‘ corporum cœleſtium, ſectione 4. capite 7: om‘ nes haſce opiniones Rationis examini ſubjicio, ac ‘ evidenter probo nullas ipſarum eſſe poſſe veras: om‘ nium autem abſurdiſſimam, eſſe eductionem formæ ‘ de potentia materiæ (123). - - - - *The queſtion about ‘ the riſe and production of ſubſtantial forms is the moſt ‘ difficult in all the Phyſics, and which has puzzled ‘ the parts of the greateſt men, eſpecially the Neoterics. ‘ Whilſt ſome will have it that they are produced from ‘ the power of matter, others that they are created a‘ new, others that they are produced by the celeſtial bo‘ dies, others that they are only a certain proportion of ‘ elementary qualities, and conſequently are accidental; ‘ and others, other things. But in my* Aſtrologia Gal‘ lica, *lib.* 20, *intituled* de actione univerſali corpo‘ rum cœleſtium, *ſect.* 4. *cap.* 7, *I have examined all ‘ theſe opinions by the rules of right reaſon, and have ‘ evidently proved that none of them can be true; but ‘ that the moſt abſurd of all is the production of form ‘ from the power of matter.*’ The worſt of it is, he ſubſtituted in the room of theſe doctrines, an hypotheſis ſurrounded with difficulties. He eſpouſed the notion he thought he had found in the books of a Dane (124), namely, that the ſubſtantial form of each body is an immaterial ſpirit, which God at the beginning of the creation inveſted with the neceſſary knowledge for framing the organs, to which this form was to be united. ‘Arbitor formam Phyſicam ſubſtantia‘ lem corporum mixtorum, (anima rationali excepta) ‘ aliud non eſſe, quam ſpiritum immaterialem ſeminis ‘ cujuſque rei; cui Severinus ipſe proprias & ſpeci‘ ficas attribuit ſignaturas internas coloris, odoris, ſa‘ poris; mirabilemque ſcientiam à Deo inditam ini‘ tio creationis; quâ ſeminis cujuſque ſpiritus quilibet ‘ ad generationem excitatus à cauſis efficientibus, con‘ grua ſibi primo adſciſcit rei generandæ principia ‘ corporis ac elementa, quæ ſunt ipſius rei materia, ‘ à qua ipſa forma primo & per ſe differt; deinde‘ que corporis ſui fabricæ & organiſationi incumbit ‘ per innatam ac eſſentialem ſibi ſcientiam ipſam a‘ deo regulariter; ut ejuſdem plantæ omnes flores in‘ ter ſe, folia inter ſe, & fructus inter ſe, conveniant ‘ in omnibus ſignaturis, & ſimiliter conveniant, cum ‘ foliis, floribus & fructibus cujuſvis alterius plantæ ‘ ejuſdem ſpeciei: quod ſane cum ſcientia mechanica, ‘ talis ſeminis virtuti indita, ejuſque ſignaturis eſſentia‘ libus, concipi facile poteſt; quaſi mentis alicujus re‘ gulare opus, quod in aranearum telis, apum alveo‘ lis, cæteriſque animalium actionibus patet adhuc e‘ videntius: aliter vero concipi nequit cum aſſenſu ‘ rationis (125). - - - - *I take the phyſical ſubſtantial form ‘ of mixt bodies (the rational ſoul excepted) to be no‘ thing elſe than the immaterial ſpirit of the ſeed of each ‘ thing: to which Severinus himſelf aſcribes proper and ‘ ſpecifical internal ſignatures of colour, ſmell, and taſte, ‘ and a wonderful knowlegde infuſed into it by God at ‘ the beginning of the creation, whereby the ſpirit of each ‘ ſeed, excited by efficient cauſes to generation, firſt aſ‘ ſumes to itſelf principles and elements of body, ſuita‘ ble to the thing to be generated, and thoſe are the ‘ matter of the thing itſelf, from which the form is at ‘ firſt and in itſelf really diſtinct: and then it falls to ‘ the formation and organization of it's body, by it's in‘ nate and eſſential knowledge, ſo regularly, that all the ‘ flowers, leaves and fruits of the ſame plant agree ‘ with one another in all their ſignatures, and likewiſe ‘ with the leaves, flowers, and fruits, of every other ‘ plant of the ſame ſpecies: which indeed, upon the ſup‘ poſition of mechanical knowledge infuſed into the virtue ‘ of ſuch ſeed, and it's eſſential ſignatures, may be ea‘ ſily conceived; as if it were the regular work of ſome ‘ intelligent mind, as it ſtill more evidently appears in ‘ cobwebs, honey-combs and other actions of animals: ‘ but otherwiſe it cannot be conceived conſiſtently with ‘ reaſon.*’ He has ground enough to ſay, that nothing is more abſurd, than maintaining, that the bare motion of atoms is able to produce that wonderful regularity in plants, that conformity in fruits and leaves of trees of the ſame ſpecies, *&c.* It is a thouſand times harder to form the leaf of a tree, than to print a page of Cicero (126): ſeeing then, no poſition of the letters, which is not directed by any choice, could ever produce a page of Cicero; we muſt not believe, that a fortuitous ranging of atoms could produce a leaf of a tree, or an apple. We muſt therefore give an intelligent elective principle to plants, capable of diſpoſing the materials of the leaves in their due order, *&c.* (which is Morinus's opinion) or elſe ſuppoſe the plant to be organized in the ſeed, which is the opinion of ſeveral Carteſians. ‘Nihil excogi‘ tari poteſt abſurdius quam quod illa ſimilitudo flo‘ rum, foliorum & fructuum ejuſdem arboris in colore, ‘ odore, ſapore, & conformatione, prodeat ex ſolo ‘ motu atomorum, à quo ſunt ſitus & ordo ipſarum: ‘ Nec inter omnes flores, folia, & fructus pomi, ullus ac‘ cidat flos, folium, vel fructus pyri aut alterius plantæ ab ‘ ipſo atomorum motu. Hic enim niſi per aliquam ‘ regatur ſpecificam ſcientiam, quæ in atomis conci‘ pi vel explicari nequit, cauſabit duntaxat fortuitos ‘ ſitus & ordines atomorum, qui vel nunquam efficient ‘ aliquam determinatæ ſpeciei plantam; vel ſaltem

‘ hanc

(120) Bernerius, Anatomia ridiculi muris, *pag.* 185.

(121) Vita Morini, *pag.* 16, *num.* 77.

(122) See the remark of the article GORLÆUS (DAVID).

(123) Morinus, in Defenſ. Diſſert. *pag.* 66.

(124) Petrus Severinus, in idea Medicinæ philoſophicæ.

(125) Morinus, ibid.

(126) Compare with this what has been ſaid above, remark [*D*] of the article CAÏNITES.

ingenuous relation of ſeveral things which were to his own diſadvantage [*O*].

‘ hanc multis extraneis foliis, floribus, & fructibus inficient, ſi tantum planta generetur, & non potius chymæra diverſarum genere rerum (127). - - - - - *Nothing can be more abſurd than to imagine, that the ſimilitude of flowers, leaves and fruits of the ſame tree, in colour, ſmell, taſte, and figure, ſhould proceed from the meer motion of atoms, from whence proceed their poſition and order. And among all the flowers, leaves, and fruits of an apple-tree, there never happens to be a flower, leaf, or fruit of a pear tree, or other plant from the motion of atoms. For unleſs this motion be regulated by ſome ſpecific knowledge, which cannot be conceived in atoms, it will only cauſe the fortuitous ſituation and order of the atoms, which either will never produce any plant of a determinate ſpecies ; or elſe will infect it with many heterogeneous leaves, flowers and fruits, if only a plant be generated, and not rather a chimerical mixture of things of a different kind.*’

[*N*] *He received ſeveral marks of Mr Des Cartes's eſteem.*] He became acquainted with him in the year 1626 (128). Some time after he preſented him with his book of Longitudes, and was thanked for it in a moſt obliging letter from him (129). He ſent him objections concerning light, in the year 1638 (130). Theſe words of his letter are remarkable. ‘ I have ever been one of your favourers, who by my temper naturally hate and deteſt thoſe raſcally invidious men, who ſeeing ſome exalted genius, like a new ſtar, appear above them, inſtead of taking kindly his labours and new inventions, ſwell with envy againſt him, and have no other deſign but to eclipſe or extinguiſh his name, his glory and his merits ; tho' they themſelves are retrieved by him from ignorance, and receive the knowledge of things from him gratis. I have paſſed through theſe trials, and know exactly what they are. Poſterity will reſent my misfortune, and ſpeaking of this iron age, will truly ſay, that fortune did not favour learned men. I wiſh however, ſhe may be more favourable to you, than me.’ What pride and vanity is here ! Mr Des Cartes anſwered the objections ; Morinus replied (131), ‘ And we have this ſecond writing inſerted in the firſt tome of Mr Des Cartes's letters *, and followed by a new anſwer that Mr Des Cartes made to it in September, with a diſpatch which ſurprized him, but which let him know that he had a value for him. Morinus ⸸ pretended not to be entirely ſatisfied with this ſecond anſwer, and thence took an occaſion of making him a new reply ‡ in October, that he might have the honour of writing laſt. Mr Des Cartes, who was ever very free from the ambition of ſo falſe a glory, did by that mark perfectly diſcover Mr Morinus's character of mind. He would not refuſe him the ſatisfaction he propoſed to himſelf, ſince it coſt him ſo little. And * therefore writ to Father Merſenne, about the middle of November, that he would not give any farther anſwer to Mr Morinus, ſince he did not deſire it.’ It is certain Mr Des Cartes did not deſpiſe this man's objections. ‘ He judged them worth his notice as ſoon as he had received them, and preferable to thoſe of Mr Petit, as well for their ſolidity, as for the nature of the difficulties in them. He ** wrote more than once to Father Merſenne, to deſire him to let Morinus know from him, that he not only took his writing kindly, but that he was obliged to him for his objections, as being very proper to make him ſearch for truth with greater application ; and †† that he would not fail to anſwer them in the moſt punctual and civil manner, and as ſoon as poſſible (132).’ Let us not end this remark without relating a thing which may edify the readers, as much as the haughty complaints of the royal profeſſor in Mathematics muſt have ſcandalized them. We have ſeen that Morinus ‘ had finiſhed his objections by . . . . complaints of the misfortune he was under from the practices of his ſpiteful enemies, wiſhing that fortune might be more favourable to him than ſhe had commonly been to the generality of the learned. Mr Des Cartes, who could hardly reliſh this language, was harder put to it to anſwer this concluſion than all the reſt ⸸⸸. *I no ways pretend, ſaid he to him on this ſubject, to deſerve the civilities you expreſs to me at the end of your writing, and yet it would not become me to confute them. Therefore I can only ſay, that I condole with you on the blindneſs of fortune, in that ſhe does not ſufficiently acknowledge your merit. But as for my own particular, I thank God ſhe has never yet done me either good or ill : and I know not for the future, whether I ought rather to deſire her favours, or to fear them. For as it does not ſeem honeſt to borrow any thing which a man cannot return with intereſt, I ſhould think it a great burthen upon me to find my ſelf indebted to the public* (133).’ Here you ſee what ought to be the language of a true Philoſopher. Mr Des Cartes would have merited this title by that one quality he here ſpeaks of. But as for Morinus, he diſgraced Philoſophy by his murmurs againſt the injuſtice of his time. He manifeſted a ſoul that was mercenary and greedy of penſions and rewards. A ſham Philoſopher ! a ſham ſcholar !

[*O*] *He gave an ingenuous account of ſeveral things to his diſadvantage.*] He ſays (134), that his mother, on her death-bed, diſinherited him, and denied him her bleſſing. She was ſomewhat recovered from this averſion to him ; the prieſts and relations repreſented to her, that her will would be null, and that ſhe would beſides run a great riſk of damnation, ſo ſhe conſented to give him her bleſſing, and leave him a legacy though the ſmalleſt that could be. He pretends, that the cauſe of this hatred, was his having ſaid to his elder brother, when their father and mother were both ſick, that he had rather have his father than his mother live, if one of them muſt needs die. The mother died two days after, in the diſpoſition of mind juſt now mentioned againſt her ſon. Here you ſee a fact not much to the honour either of the mother or ſon ; but nothing coſt an Aſtrologer too dear, when he can aſſign the reaſons of it by his principles. This is Morinus's caſe ; he finds (135) in the ſcheme of his nativity, that his mother was to hate him. He finds he was to be often impriſoned, and confeſſes that in his youth he found himſelf very near to this misfortune, upon the account of his whoring, and vindictive temper (136). The malignant influence of ſome planets in his nativity having been corrected by the favourable aſpect of ſome others, the priſon was changed into an evil of another kind, which had ſome affinity to a captive ſtate ; for from the age of ſixteen to forty ſix, Morinus was always under ſome maſter. He ſerved no leſs than ſixteen ſuccceſſively ; he lived with notaries, with writing-maſters (137), with preſidents, biſhops, abbots, and at laſt with the duke of Luxemburg. The reaſon of his changing his ſervice ſo often, was, that he quarrelled with the miſtreſs of the houſe, or ſome unforeſeen accident happened, or the maſters were guilty of intolerable ingratitude. *Quod autem per carceres fieri non potuit per ſervitutem effecit, cumulus ille Planetarum in duodecima domo . . . eſt enim ſervitus . . . ſpecies quædam incarcerationis quod homo in aliena domo non liber, ſed alteri mancipatus vivere teneatur. Siquidem ab anno* 16 *ad* 46 *vita mea fuit perpetua ſervitus, dominoſque habui* 16 *quos omnes dereliqui vel ob jurgia cum dominabus, quarum imperium cum ferre nollem odia paſſus ſum . . . vel ob caſus repentinos, vel ob dominorum intolerabilem ingratitudinem* (138.) He finds the cauſe of all theſe events in the ſcheme of his nativity ; his wranglings with the miſtreſs, the ingratitude of his maſters, the mean condition of ſome, the middle ſtate of others, and the high dignity of a third ſort. No ſtars hit truer, tho' to his coſt, than thoſe that threatened him on the ſcore of women (139). I have already mentioned (140) two wounds he received for a woman of pleaſure. This, perhaps, was in a houſe of ill fame. I reckon as nothing the violence offered him by ſome ſoldiers, who, at the inſtigation of ſome whores, entered his houſe (141). An honeſt man is not ſecure from ſuch affronts : let us alledge nothing that is ambiguous. He confeſſes (142), that having had the honour to be known to kings and queens, to princes and cardinals, and the principal men of the kingdom, there were at moſt but five perſons of high rank who loved him, or did him any good ; whether becauſe of his ſkill, or the candour of his nature, or by ſympathy ; and that, on the contrary, envy and antipathy had expoſed him to the hatred of ſo many people,

that

(127) Morin. in Defenſ. Diſſert. *pag.* 67.

(128) *See Mr* Baillet, Vie de Des Cartes, *Tom. i, pag.* 138.

(129) It is the fifty eighth of the firſt volume of Des Cartes. See the Life of Des Cartes by Mr Baillet, *Tom. i, pag.* 265.

(130) See the fifty eighth letter of the ſame volume.

(131) Baillet, ib. *pag.* 357.

* *Pag.* 221, *Tom. i.*

⸸ *Pag.* 234. *Tom. i.*

‡ This writing is to be found in the firſt volume of the letters of Mr Des Cartes, *pag.* 242.

* *Pag.* 416, *Tom. ii.*

** *Tom. iii, of the Letters. pag.* 390.

†† *Pag.* 396, *Tom. iii, &* *pag.* 360.

(132) Baillet, Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. i, pag.* 355.

⸸⸸ *Pag.* 219, 220, *Tom. i.*

(133) Baillet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 356.

(134) In Aſtrologia Gallica, *lib. xvii, pag.* 398.

(135) Ubi ſupra.

(136) Parumque abfuit quin in mea juventute verificatum fuerit ob vindictæ & libidinis paſſiones. *Ibid.*

(137) This is doubtleſs the ground of the reproach mentioned before, citation (101).

(138) Morin. ubi ſupra.

(139) Propter ☽ & ♀ in duodecima quæ mihi ex parte mulierum multa mala damna vitæque pericula pepererunt. - - - *Becauſe of the Moon and Venus in the twelfth houſe, which on the ſcore of women procured me many calamities and dangers of my life.* Id. ib.

(140) In the remark [*D*], citation (12).

(141) Ib. *lib. xxiii, pag.* 649.

(142) Ib. *lib. xvii, pag.* 398.

that it frighted him to think of it. *Horret memoria referre quot inimicos habuerim vel ob invidiam, vel ob antipathiam* (143). To ſay no more, can we conceive a greater piece of folly than that of a man, who complains he had been the object of envy, and boaſts of being beloved by great men, for the ſake of his learning? His greateſt accuſers on the topic of vanity, and a mercenary temper, are his own books. He boaſts, in one of his anſwers, that he had maintained a perpetual war for ſeventeen years together, againſt fifteen Mathematicians or Philoſophers, and had forced them all to a diſhonourable retreat. He ſays, that in the year 1636, his fame was ſpread almoſt over all Europe (144). At every turn he tells us of his pretended demonſtration of the Longitude, as a thing publickly acknowledged by the moſt famous Mathematicians. He ought therefore to have been content; the glory of the invention was his own, and the public did him juſtice by it's praiſes. Nevertheleſs Morinus hardly ever ſpeaks of this; but he brutiſhly flies out againſt the prime miniſter, who had not let him have the money this diſcovery deſerved. Was not this betraying a mercenary, baſe, and ſordid, ſoul, which inſtead of labouring for glory, or rather from motives wholly diſintereſted, reckons glory nothing, when penſions, and pecuniary recompences are not a part of it? As for the reſt, he was not ſo well known throughout all Europe from the year 1636, as he pretends. His name and books have found no place in a book of Voſſius (145), in which we ſee a long catalogue of Mathematicians and Aſtrologers, &c. both antient and modern.

(143) Ibid. *pag.* 398, 399.

(144) Tunc vero nominis mei fama per totam ferme Europam diffuſa eſt. *Ibid. lib. xxiii, pag.* 649.

(145) That *de Scientiis Mathematicis.* It reaches to the year 1646, and farther.

MORINUS (SIMON) a fanatic, burnt at Paris in the year 1663. His mind had been diſordered a long time [*A*]. He affirmed (*a*), that there would quickly be a *general reformation of the church, and that all nations ſhould be converted to the true faith.* He pretended that *this great renovation was to be accompliſhed by the ſecond coming of JESUS CHRIST in his ſtate of glory, incorporated in Morinus himſelf; and that for the execution of the things, to which he was deſtined, he was to be attended with a great number of perfect ſouls, and ſuch as participated in the glorious ſtate of JESUS CHRIST, whom he therefore called the champions of glory.* The Sieur John Des-Mareſts of the French academy, feigned himſelf his diſciple, and thereby diſcovered this horrible Enthuſiaſm [*B*]. Morinus had already ſome

(*a*) See the preface of the *Lettres Viſionaires.*

[*A*] *His mind had been diſordered a long time.*] See the book intituled, *Thoughts of Simon Morinus*; it was printed in the year 1647. It has neither the name of the Printer, nor place where it was printed. The author was in priſon at Paris for the errors of the Enthuſiaſts, when Gaſſendus's friends writ againſt the Aſtrologer John Baptiſt Morinus, whom they reproached with either being the brother or relation of this priſoner. The Aſtrologer will have this to be the ſecond of their lies. *Secunda* (impoſtura) *dum aſſerit quendam Simonem Morinum in carceribus Archiepiſcopatus hujuſce aſſervatum, ob illuminatorum doctrinam quam profitetur, eſſe meum conſanguineum ſive fratrem* (1).

[*B*] *Des-Mareſts .... feigned himſelf his diſciple, and diſcovered his Enthuſiaſm.*] He himſelf was a great Enthuſiaſt (2), and waited for a wonderful and holy revolution; but imagining it would not happen the way that Morinus declared, nor in that of another viſionary, named Charpy de Sainte Croix (3), he took it in his head to oppoſe them both. 'Charpy pretended, that all theſe wonders were to be brought about by a certain lieutenant of JESUS CHRIST, of the race of Judah, to whom he applied the cleareſt prophecies of the Meſſiah (4)' We have ſeen, in the body of this article, Morinus's pretenſion, and here follows that of the Sieur Des-Mareſts. I relate it in the words of an author, who makes uſe of the preſent tenſe; 'The Sieur Des-Mareſts teaches with them, that it is true, the world is about to be reformed, that all ſects ſhall be united to the Catholic religion; but that all this muſt be done by the great prophet Eliachim Michael, which is no other than the Sieur Des-Mareſts of Sorlin, and by an army of a hundred forty four thouſand victims, or humble ſouls, which he is to muſter, and give up to the king, that they may execute this great enterprize under his command, according to the lights which the Sieur Des-Mareſts is divinely inſpired with. It is very plain, that this laſt prophet could not agree with the two others, and that he had in his viſions wherewithal to deſtroy theirs. For, as we have ſeen one mad-man, who fancied himſelf GOD the Father, confute, in a convincing manner, another mad-man, who fancied himſelf GOD the Son, becauſe, ſaid he, I, who am GOD the Father, know very well that I have not begotten you: ſo the Sieur Des-Mareſts could, with the greateſt eaſe, prove to himſelf, that Morinus's and Charpy's notions were falſe. Charpy, ſaid he, imagines that the world muſt be reformed by a lieutenant of JESUS CHRIST joined with the Jews: and Morinus ſays, this will be by JESUS CHRIST himſelf incorporated in him, and accompanied by the combatants of glory. Now I am very certain that they are both miſtaken, ſince it is by my ſelf, Des-Mareſts of St Sorlin, Eliacim Michael, and by my victims that all this muſt be wrought. After having thus condemned them of illuſion by this moſt demonſtrative proof, he thought himſelf obliged to perſecute them with all his might, and never reſted till he had deſtroyed Morinus by the the baſeſt treachery, unbecoming both an honeſt man and a Chriſtian. And he himſelf boaſts in his anſwer, that he had been the cauſe of Charpy's impriſonment (5).'

See what methods he took: he declares (6), that he had ſome diſcourſe with Dame Margaret Langlois, called La Malherbe, and with another called Madam de la Chapelle; '*That at firſt ſhe was ſhy of diſcovering any thing, but by degrees he prevailed with her to communicate herſelf to him, and ſhe began by ſpeaking of this Morinus and his wife; that ſhe told him it was certain, the ſpirit of JESUS CHRIST was incorporated, and raiſed again in Morinus, for his ſecond coming upon earth; that he was the Son of Man to whom GOD had given all judgment upon the earth.* After this, he relates his interview with Morinus, which happened the day after, and ſays, that at firſt Morinus *would fain appear to him as a very holy man, and of a very compoſed ſpirit; but after ſome diſcourſe, finding, that if he humbled himſelf ſo much before him, who would be thought ſo high, he might treat him a long time as a novice, and that he had not ſo much time to loſe, he told him plainly what he knew of the internal ſtates according to their degrees, and of ſpirituality: that then Morinus, overjoyed, took him by the hand, and preſſing it betwixt both his, told him, he ſaw very well, that he was a ſpiritual man, and in a ſtate of Grace, and that he wanted but little of being perfect, and in a ſtate of Glory* ... (7). He relates in the ſequel of his depoſition ſeveral errors, which he learned from Morinus's own mouth in another diſcouſe he had with him; *as that he muſt no longer think of the death of JESUS CHRIST; that impeccability is a property of thoſe who are divine and perfect; that all ſorts of works are indifferent.* During theſe viſits, which the Sieur Des-Mareſts paid to Morinus and his gentlewomen, he ſtill feigned himſelf deſirous of being his diſciple .. But Morinus, to be more ſecure of him, ſent him, as he ſaid in this depoſition, *a letter the 21ſt of December* (8), *being St Thomas's day, which was brought him by his eldeſt daughter, by which the ſaid Morinus demanded of him a blind and ſincere ſubmiſſion, implicitly, and ſincerely, to obſerve whatever he commanded, without reſerve of time or thing, as may be ſeen in the ſaid letter. This demand of Morinus bred ſome ſcruples in his mind, not being willing to give any conſent to a thing that might be ill .... But at laſt .... judging, that if he did not comply with every thing, in order to diſcover the ſecrets of the cabal, all commerce beewixt them would ceaſe of courſe, he reſolved to ſend him his conſent in writing, implicitly, and ſincerely, to obſerve whatever Simon Morinus ſhould command him:* To which he added theſe words; *on the part of GOD, 'and*

(1) Jo. Baptiſta Morinus, in Defenſione ſuæ Diſſertationis de atomis & vacuo, *pag.* 105. *This book was printed in the year* 1650.

(2) See his article above.

(3) He is author of a book intituled, *L'ancienne nouveauté de l'Ecriture Sainte,* which Mr Arnaud confuted. The *Journal des Sçavans,* of the firſt of March 1666, makes mention of this confutation. This viſionary renounced his errors. See the *Queſtion curieuſe ſi Mr Arnaud eſt héretique?* pag. 147, Edit. 1695.

(4) Preface to the *Lettres Viſionaries, pag. m.* 226.

(5) Ibid.

(6) See the ſecond *Lettre Viſionaire, pag. m.* 266. The depoſition of the Sieur Des-Mareſts is there cited.

(7) Ib. *pag.* 267.

(8) 1661.

ſome followers. I have heard ſay, I. That he had promiſed to riſe again on the third day, and that hereupon a great mob got together at the place where he was burnt (b). II. That the firſt preſident Lamoignon aſked him, whether it was any where written, that the great prophet, or new Meſſias, ſhould be burnt, and Morinus being already condemned, cited this verſe of the ſixteenth Pſalm, *Igne me examinaſti, & non eſt inventa in me iniquitas. Thou haſt tried me by fire, and no iniquity was found in me.* The author whom I cite in the remarks obſerves, that the XVIIth century was fruitful in Fanatics [*C*]. I have juſt received a moſt curious Memoir concerning our Morinus [*D*].

Since the ſecond edition I have learned ſome circumſtances of his trial, which will ſerve for a ſupplement and corrective to his article [*E*].

'and according to GOD: by which he ſhewed, that he only ſubmitted to what ſhould be commanded him on the part of GOD, and according to GOD . . . (9). This was not the laſt of the Sieur Des-Mareſts diſguiſes. He held ſeveral other conferences with Morinus in the ſame ſpirit of diſſimulation and deceit. He wrote to him ſeveral letters as his diſciple, he received ſeveral from him as from his maſter. He ſuffered this Fanatic, and theſe abuſed gentlewomen, to conſider him as being entirely of their cabal. And at laſt proceeded to that prodigious extravagance, which I am going to relate in his own words. *To hinder Morinus and his wife, who was tormented by her Devil upon his account, from ſuſpecting him, he reſolved to give him a declaration, by the firſt letter he writ to him, that he acknowledged him for the Son of Man, and for the Son of GOD in him, knowing well that Morinus was the ſon of a man, and that the Son of GOD was in him, as every where elſe. This letter,* ſays he, *of the firſt of February,* 1662, *was ſo acceptable to Morinus, that to make him an acknowledgement for that declaration, which he believed very expreſs, he writ an anſwer to him the ſecond of February, by which he gave him, as by a great grace, the title of his forerunner, calling him a true John Baptiſt riſen again.*'

The Janſeniſt whom I copy, does afterwards confute this treachery of the Sieur Des-Mareſts, by the principles of St Auguſtin. He ſays almoſt the ſame things, which Mr Arnold has ſince obſerved, in complaining of the impoſture of a falſe Arnold, by which a profeſſor of Douay was drawn into a ſnare.

[*C*] *The author whom I cite . . . . obſerves that the XVIIth century was fruitful in Fanatics.*] See the words of this author (10): 'Our age, which has been as fruitful as any other in extraordinary things, has particularly been ſo in Fanatics: and it looks as if mens heads were turned I know not how, this way, and that they had a natural biaſs towards it; for, as in contagious diſeaſes, we commonly ſee all other diſtempers degenerate into plagues and carbuncles, ſo we have frequently ſeen in this age irregular devotions, and ſuch as are built upon human caprice, degenerate into fanatical illuſions. The ſtory of the hermits of Caen has been celebrated all over the kingdom; and if they had made a due enquiry into the ſociety of the Holy Sacrament, they might perhaps have diſcovered a great many things of this nature.' He afterwards ſets forth the viſions of Charpy de St Croix, of Morinus, and Des-Mareſts. If he had added thoſe which at the ſame time were vented in Holland (11), he would have much ſtrengthened his poſition. The cloſe of this age does not bely the other parts of it, *dignum patella operculum, - - - like cup, like cover.*

[*D*] *I have juſt received a moſt curious memoir concerning our Morin* (12).] Here are ſome paſſages of it in the words of the original: 'Simon Morinus was a native of Aumale, and had heretofore been commiſſioner to Mr Charron, extraordinary-treaſurer for the war. He was a man of no letters, and groſsly ignorant, who, pretending to ſpirituality, fell into great errors. He was not content to publiſh them in private to ſeveral perſons, who looked on him as a mad-man, but ſet forth part of them in a book which he printed ſecretly in 1647, in 8vo, under the title of Morinus's thoughts, dedicated to the king: It is a mixture of viſions and nonſenſe, which include the principal errors ſince condemned in the Quietiſts, except that he carries them further than any other has done; for he formally teaches, that the greateſt ſins do not deſtroy grace, but ſerve, on the contrary, to humble human pride. He applies the words of St Paul, which are commonly underſtood of temptations to the higheſt enormities. He ſays, that in every ſect and nation, GOD has his elect, which are true members of the church. That among the means of depriving themſelves of all property and preſumption, a director may forbid his penitent from coming to maſs on holy-days, or to the communion, &c. order him the communion without confeſſion, forbid what is commanded, and command what is forbidden.

'That GOD permitted that Peter ſhould deny him to humble his preſumption; that his deſire of dying for JESUS CHRIST, was not a perfect virtue; nor his denial, a vice deſtructive of virtue; that he denied him with his lips, and not with his heart.

'He denies that St Peter's ſin was a ſin unto death.

'He ſays, that St Paul was not only in the infirmity of the fleſh, but that he ought to be ſo, and ſubmit to it, and that he had given way to the temptations of the fleſh.

'That frequent communion is profitable only to beginners, becauſe JESUS CHRIST is much better found on the bread of croſſes, than under the milk of bread.

'That one may eat before the communion, not only for infirmities ſake, but by advice of the director, in order to mortify himſelf.

'That every fall preceded by fear, and followed by pleaſure, is not a ſin, but a teſtimony of our weakneſs, which ought to humble us.

'This is pretty nigh the tenour of this Fanatic's doctrine, which is void of any principles.

'He printed with theſe thoughts ſome hymns, the ſtile of which is pitiful. . . . . He was for ſome time in priſon, and releaſed as a viſionary, till 1661. At which time Des Mareſts St Sorlin, who had had great intimacy with him, and pretended, as he himſelf confeſſes in his writings, to own him for the Son of Man, raiſed from the dead; informed againſt him, and became his accuſer . . . Upon this occaſion he was tried, and condemned to be burnt alive; which was executed in March 1663. It is ſaid that he had ſome diſciples, who were ſent to the gallies; and the late Mr de Neuré ſaid that he had ſeen one of them at Marſeilles, who believed Morinus was riſen from the dead. But they who knew Mr de Neuré, knew there was no great dependance on the ſtories he told, when they tended to Libertiniſm. For he repreſented this man, as fully convinced of Morinus's reſurrection. This man died with conſtancy enough, and it was then ſaid, that the judges had been very rigorous, and that it had been enough to have confined him in a mad-houſe. They defended themſelves by the numerous impieties, which he had owned for his opinions, and which he maintained, not indeed with wit, but however in cold blood, and with great obſtinacy.'

[*E*] *I have learned ſome particulars of his trial, which may ſerve by way of ſupplement, and corrective to his article.*] 'The fourteenth of the ſame month (of March 1663) one named Simon Morinus, a native of Richemont near Aumale *, by a decree of the court of parliament, after having made the *amande honorable* in his ſhirt with a rope about his neck, and a torch in his hand, before the principal gate of the church of Noſtre Dame, to which he was carried in a cart, and from thence to the place de Greve, and there tied to a ſtake in order to be burnt alive, with his book intituled *Thoughts of Morinu*, and all his writings and his proceſs, and afterwards his aſhes were ſcattered in the air, as a puniſhment for having taken the title of SON of GOD; and his accomplices were condemned to be preſent at his execution, and then to be galley-ſlaves for ever, having firſt been whipt by the hands of the hangman,

---

(b) It was at the Greve.

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 268.

(10) *Preface of the* Lettres Viſionaires, *pag.* 225.

(11) See the remark [*I*] of the article MARETS (SAMUEL DES).

(12) It was communicated to the Bookſeller by the abbot R.

* His ſentence ſays alſo that he was of Richemont near Aumale.

‘ hangman, and branded with the mark of flower-‘ de-luces on the right and left ſhoulder.’ *This is what we are told by Francis Colletet, ſon of William, in his abridgment of the Annals of Paris, printed in* 1664 *in* 12*mo at the* 452*d page. For a fuller information as to what concerns Morinus, I ſhall add what has been extracted from the ſentence of death paſſed upon him: he was condemned the ſeventh of March, but the execution was put off till the fourteenth, in order to confront him and his accomplices, and to endeavour to diſcover more of them. Francis Rondon, curate of la Madeleine les Amiens, who had committed, as the ſentence ſays,* wicked and enormous acts; *Marin Thouret, prieſt, and John Poictou, ſchoolmaſter, were preſent at the execution, and from thence ſent to the Gallies. Margaret Langlois, widow of the late Claude Nadot, called Malherbe, was whipped at the foot of the ſtake. Joan Honatier, wife of the ſaid Simon Morinus, and Claude Morinus their ſon, were acquitted and ſet at liberty* (13).

(13) Memoir, manuſcript communicated by Mr Lancelot.

MORISON (**Rorert**) a Phyſician and profeſſor of Botany at Oxford, was born at Aberdeen in 1620. He took his maſter of arts degree in 1638, and a little after taught Philoſophy in that Univerſity. He ſtudied Mathematics at the ſame time, and afterwards applied himſelf to Botany, and his father and mother being deſirous to have him a Divine, he learned Hebrew, and compoſed even a Hebrew Grammar for his own uſe. But his inclination for Botanical knowledge was ſo ſtrong, that they were obliged to let him turn all his ſtudies that way. He had made a great progreſs in it, when the civil wars forced him to leave his country, which however he did not do before he had ſignalized both his zeal for the royal cauſe, and his courage in a battle fought upon a bridge (*a*) betwixt the inhabitants of Aberdeen, and the Preſbyterian forces. He there received a dangerous wound in his head. As ſoon as he was cured of it, he went to France, and ſettling in Paris, applied himſelf with great diligence to Botany and Anatomy. He took his doctor of Phyſic's degree at Angers in 1648, and as he had the reputation of an excellent Botaniſt, he was ſent for by the duke of Orleans, who, in the year 1650, gave him the direction of the royal garden of Blois. He continued in this employ till the death of this prince, and then went over into England in Auguſt 1660. Charles II, to whom the duke of Orleans had preſented him at Blois in the month of February of the ſame year, called him to London, and gave him the title of his Phyſician, and of Regius profeſſor in Botany, with a penſion of two hundred pounds ſterling. The *Præludium Botanicum*, which he publiſhed at London in 1669, made him ſo eſteemed, that the univerſity of Oxford invited him to the profeſſorſhip in Botany; he accepted it, with the approbation of the king, and diſcharged the duties of it with wonderful application and ability. He died at London in 1683, in the ſixty third year of his age. The public has ſeen a very conſiderable part of the works he compoſed [*A*], wherein he followed a method entirely new, which has been very much commended by good judges (*b*).

(*a*) Ad pontem fluminis Deæ. - - - *At the bridge of the river Dee.* Vita Rob. Moriſoni. *The Dee, is a river near whoſe mouth Aberdeen is ſituated.*

(*b*) *Taken from his Life before the third part of* Plantarum Hiſtoria Oxonienſis univerſalis.

[*A*] *The public has ſeen a .... part of the works he compoſed.*] Being in the ſervice of Gaſton of France, duke of Orleans, he brought into the garden of Blois 250 plants, never before deſcribed, and invented a new method of explaining Botany. He communicated it to this prince, who encouraged him to undertake a hiſtory of plants upon this plan, and promiſed to ſupply the expences, and to leave him all the profit. That prince's death prevented the execution of this deſign. But when Moriſon had a penſion from the king of England, he thought more than ever of this great work. I have mentioned (1) the *Præludium Botanicum*, which he publiſhed in 1669. I add that, in 1672, he publiſhed the ninth ſection of the ſecond part of his Hiſtory of Plants. The univerſity of Oxford contributed largely to the charge of printing this book, which the author gave as a ſpecimen of his great work. He was ſo encouraged by the praiſes and exhortations written to him, that he publiſhed in 1680, the ſecond part of his Hiſtory of Plants. It is a large volume in folio, intituled, *Plantarum hiſtoriæ Univerſalis Oxonienſis, pars ſecunda, ſeu Herbarum, Diſtributio nova per tabulas cognationis & affinitatis ex libro naturæ obſervata & detecta.* This work was much eſteemed: we may ſee what commendations Mr Herman (2) gives it in the preface to his *Hortus Lugduno-Batavus.* Some blamed that part of this volume intituled, *Hallucinationes Caſpari Bauhini*, &c. They thought there was ſomething of pride in the liberty he had taken to cenſure writers, who had done ſuch great ſervices to Botany. Our author, encouraged by the ſucceſs of this great volume, laboured diligently on a continuation, but died before he could put the laſt hand to the third part. It was neceſſary therefore to put it under the care of ſome other perſon. Jacob Bobart (3) was pitched upon, a moſt able Botaniſt, and excellently verſed in the method he had learned from Moriſon. It is by his labour, this third part has at laſt ſeen the light in 1699. It is in folio. We do not know what became of the firſt (4).

(1) In the body of the article.

(2) Profeſſor of Phyſic and Botany at Leyden.

(3) He is director of the Phyſic garden of the univerſity of Oxford.

(4) Taken from the Life of Moriſon, prefixed to the third part of his Hiſtory of Plants.

MORLIN (**Joachim**) a riged follower of Luther [*A*], was born in 1514. He diſcharged the ſacerdotal function in ſeveral places (*a*), and particularly at Arnſtadt, from whence the magiſtrates expelled him in 1543 (*b*), not being able to bear his too flaming zeal [*B*]. He was called to a profeſſorſhip at Konigſberg in Pruſſia, and it was there

(*a*) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 456.

(*b*) Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib.* iii, *pag.* 468, *num.* 9. *See alſo* Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *pag.* 771.

[*A*] *A rigid follower of Luther.*] This I learn from Melchior Adam. ‘ Fuit Lutheri ſectator & acer ‘ doctrinæ ejus in toto miniſterio ſuo cuſtos .... in ‘ articulo de Cœna ſententiam Lutheri retinuit, quod ‘ Chriſti corpus in, ſub, aut cum pane ſit (1). - - - - ‘ *He was a follower and ſtrenuous defender of Luther,* ‘ *in the whole courſe of his miniſtry, ... he main-* ‘ *tained Luther's opinion as to the Euchariſt, that the* ‘ *body of Chriſt was in, under, or with, the bread.*’

[*B*] *His too flaming zeal.*] Melanchthon, who undoubtedly knew him, repreſents him of too fiery a temper, and too much addicted to diſputing. Having heard that Heſhuſius was returning to Roſtock, with deſign to be preſent at the diſpute of Bremen, he thought that Morlin was the author of all this managment. I often foretold, adds he, that he would excite more tempeſts than he would ever be able to lay. ‘ Cogitavi horum conſilio-‘ rum architectum eſſe Morlinum, & is habet ſocios ha-‘ rum technarum artifices. Scribam Davidi Chytræo ne ‘ inſtituant diſputationem theatricam, quæ non parvos ‘ motus excitatura ſit, ſi procedat. Tibi etiam hor-‘ tator ſum, ut ſi te in certamen vocabunt poſtules ti-‘ bi quoque concedi ut accerſas Petrum Martyrem, ‘ me, & alios quoſdam amicos. Novi geneſim Mor-‘ lini: & ſæpe ei prædixi, eum moturum, quæ ſedare ‘ non poterit (2). - - - *I am perſuaded, Morlin is at* ‘ *the*

(1) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. *pag.* 457.

(2) Philipp. Melanch. Epiſt. ad Albertum Hardenbergium, apud Melchior. Adam. ibid.

there he oppoſed Oſiander, who maintained a new doctrine about Juſtification. He impugned that novelty with extream heat both in his writings and ſermons; but was born down by the credit of his adverſary, who got him expelled out of Pruſſia in 1552, notwithſtanding the interceſſions of the people (c). He retired to Brunſwic, where he was colleague to the famous Chemnitius. He entered into the diſputes of the times [*C*], and was at almoſt all the conferences, where the queſtions concerning Free-will, and the neceſſity of good works, &c. were diſcuſſed. He returned into Pruſſia 1566, and was there made biſhop of the province of Sambia by Sigiſmund Auguſtus, king of Poland, and by Albert, duke of Pruſſia, who was no longer infatuated with his Oſiander. He continued in that poſt all the reſt of his life, and died in 1571, being cut for the ſtone againſt the advice of his Phyſicians. He publiſhed ſeveral books (d) [*D*], and left a ſon as great a lover of Theological diſputes as himſelf [*E*]. I forgot to ſay, that when he was admitted Doctor of Divinity at Wittemberg in the year 1540, a queſtion drawn up by Luther was propoſed to him, concerning the uſe of church-revenues [*F*].

‘ *the bottom of all this contrivance, and has ſome aſſociates, who are ſkilled in theſe artifices. I will write to David Chytræus to prevent a public diſputation, which will raiſe great diſturbances, if it proceeds. I would adviſe you alſo, if they ſhould challenge you into the controverſy, to demand the liberty of calling in Peter Martyr, myſelf, and ſome other friends. I know Morlin's temper; and have often foretold him, he would raiſe what he could not lay.*’

[C] *He entred into the diſputes of the times.*] The author cited in the preceding notes, might well ſay, there was hardly any age wherein the diſputes of Divines were more frequent than in the time of our Morlin. Let us paſs by the great diſputes between the Roman Catholics and the Proteſtants; and only conſider Lutheraniſm. Good God! what diviſions were not ſeen among the Divines of that party; and with what heat and virulence maintained? All the fiery ſpirits Africa and Aſia ever produced, were but phlegm in compariſon to theſe German doctors. It is ſaid, that our Morlin oppoſed the burial of thoſe who attended the ſermons of Andrew Oſiander, and would never be perſuaded to baptize their children. ‘ Dogma *Oſiandri* quantopere deteſtentur qui confeſſionis Auguſtanæ cenſeri volunt, cum ex Wittenbergenſium Doctorum cenſura, tum ex Matthiæ Flacci, & Joachimi Merlini non ſcriptis magis quam factis, abunde cuivis perſpicere licet. Nam quo loco Merlinus habuerit eos, qui cum gregis ſui eſſent, Oſiandri ſermones audiebant, obſcurum non eſt. Nec ſepultura mortuos dignabatur, nec infantes eorum ut baptizaret, adduci potuit (3). - - - *How much the doctrine of Oſiander was deteſted by thoſe who declared themſelves of the Augſburgh confeſſion, may be abundantly diſcovered, both from the cenſure of the Wittemberg doctors, and from the practices as well as writings of Matthias Flaccus, and Joachim Morlinus. For the behaviour of Morlinus to thoſe of his flock, who attended the ſermons of Oſiander, is ſufficiently known. He refuſed them the rites of burial, and their children thoſe of baptiſm.*’ Can there ever be a prepoſſeſſion more extravagant, or a zeal more furious than this? What is wonderful is, that Lutheraniſm ſhould ſtand it's ground in the midſt of ſo many violent diſputes. It is a contradiction to the maxim, *Concordiâ res parvæ creſcunt; diſcordiâ maximæ dilabuntur* (4). We might hence draw a proof of God's particular providence; for, according to the courſe of human affairs, it ſeems neceſſary to admit the truth of our Saviour's maxim in the goſpel, *Every kingdom divided againſt itſelf is brought to deſolation, and every city or houſe divided againſt itſelf ſhall not ſtand* (5): In whatever caſe therefore this does not happen, we ought to ſuppoſe the finger of GOD. This way of reaſoning is very ſpecious, and very probable: but let us obſerve by the way, that JESUS CHRIST has not alledged this maxim, as univerſally true in a metaphyſical, but in a moral ſenſe; and I am even of opinion he urged it only *ad hominem* againſt the Jews. The growth of the Roman commonwealth in the midſt of violent and continual diviſions, is as remarkable an exception to this general rule, as the preſervation of Lutheraniſm amidſt the ſchiſms which diſtracted it, and which furniſhed ſo much matter to the common enemy to inſult and reproach it. Let us return to our Morlin, and relate what Melchior Adam ſays of him: ‘ Brunſvigæ dùm eccleſiaſten agit, variæ, ut *nullum ferè ſeculum feracius fuit Theologicarum rixarum, quàm ſuperius,* excitatæ fuerunt, ſuper variis capitibus religionis controverſiæ, utpote *de neceſſitate bonorum operum: de libertate voluntatis humanæ: de Adiaphoris: de particula ſola in enunciatione illa:* Fide juſtificamur: & de aliis. Harum cauſa pleriſque conventibus actionibuſque inſtitutis interfuit Morlinus (6). - - - - *While he was miniſter at Brunſwic, no age being more fruitful of Theological controverſies than the paſt, ſeveral diſputes were raiſed on various articles of religion,* as on the neceſſity of good works, on free-will, on things indifferent, on juſtification by faith alone; *and ſome others.* Morlin was preſent at moſt of the meetings and tranſactions theſe occaſioned.

[D] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Melchior Adam gives theſe titles of them. *Pſalmorum Davidis enarratio. Catechiſmus Germanicus. Poſtilla & explicatio ſummaria Evangeliorum dominicalium. Refutatio mendacii Theologorum Heidelbergenſium, de Luthero. De vocatione Miniſtrorum, & quatenus magiſtratui fas ſit eos ab officio removere. Defenſio adverſus accuſationem novorum Wittembergenſium Theologorum. De peccato originis contra Manichæorum deliria. Epiſtola ad Oſiandrum.* Mr de Seckendorf (7) ſpeaks of a book publiſhed by our Morlin in 1565, which contains ſeveral particulars at large, which Luther uttered in the preſence of ſome perſons a little before his death.

[E] *He left a ſon as great a lover as himſelf of Theological diſputes.*] He was called MARC JEROM MORLINUS. He joined with Wigandus's faction, againſt Heſhuſius in the diſpute *de abſtracto* (8).

[F] *A queſtion was propoſed to him . . . . concerning the uſe of church-revenues.*] Mr de Seckendorf has inſerted in his Hiſtory of Lutheraniſm (9), the queſtion as it was propoſed. It was aſked, whether the revenues, which were deſigned for the maintenance of the miniſters of the Goſpel and for ſchools, ought to be taken away from thoſe who oppoſe the Goſpel, that is the monks and Romiſh clergy (10). He who propoſed the queſtion, added the reaſons of his doubts. On the one hand, ſays he, the miniſters of the goſpel have no right to force any body, nor can eſtates be taken away from impious men without committing violence. On the other hand, we know that St Auguſtin maintained, that the emperor was in the right to give the eccleſiaſtical revenues of the Donatiſts to the Orthodox. The magiſtrates are obliged to take care, that every body ſhould enjoy what belongs to him. But the revenues in queſtion do not belong to impious canons, but to the true church; and therefore Orthodox magiſtrates ought to treat theſe impious men as robbers (11). If they do not, the good paſtors and poor ſcholars muſt ſtarve. If Morlinus had liked to anſwer agreeably to the ſentiment of Luther, he might eaſily have decided that queſtion; for it appeared plainly Luther was of opinion, that the revenues of the Romiſh church ought to be applied to the maintenance of miniſters and ſchools.

MORUS (ALEXANDER), one of the greateſt preachers of his age among the Reformed, was the ſon of a Scotchman, who was principal of a college which the Proteſtants had at Caſtres in Languedoc. He was born in 1616, in that city, and being of a very quick apprehenſion, the progreſs of his ſtudies was very ſwift. When he was ſcarce twenty

---

(c) Etſi plebs ad principem pro eo ſupplex intercederet. *Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra.*

(d) *Taken from* Melch. ubi ſupra.

(3) Hoſius, de expreſſo verbo Dei, apud Prateolum, Elencho Hæret. *pag. m.* 512.

(4) Salluſt. de Bello Jugurth. *pag. m.* 214.

(5) St Matthew chap. xii, ver. 25.

(6) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. *pag.* 456.

(7) Seckendorf, Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. iii, pag.* 693.

8) Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *pag.* 771.

(9) *Lib. iii, pag.* 313, *num.* 10.

(10) Ei (*Morlino*) ut moris eſt, quæſtio propoſita fuit per ephebum à Luthero conſcripta, his verbis, utrum reditus donati Eccleſiis ad Evangelii Miniſtros alendos, &c. *Ibid.*

(11) Hi reditus non ſunt impiorum Canonicorum, ſed ſunt veræ Eccleſiæ. Quare Magiſtratus Eccleſiæ debet etiam pœnam ſumere de impiis tanquam prædonibus. *Ibid.*

twenty years old (*a*), he was ſent to Geneva, there to continue his ſtudies in Theology; and finding that the Greek profeſſor's place, then vacant, was to be diſputed for, and that the curators of the academy by their programma had invited ſtrangers as well as citizens to enter the liſts; he ſtood for it among ſeveral other competitors, Miniſters, Advocates, and Phyſicians, who were almoſt all of them twice his age; and was ſo much admired for his fine and eloquent manner of turning every ſubject in this learned trial, that he obtained the prize (*b*). Having diſcharged this office about three years, he ſucceeded Spanheim in thoſe of Divinity profeſſor in the academy and miniſter in the church of Geneva, which, on being called to Leyden (*c*), he had quitted (*d*). As he was a very celebrated preacher, and had added to this talent a great ſtock of learning (*e*), it is not to be wondred at if all his colleagues were not his friends. But it muſt be confeſſed, there were many other things which created him trouble; for beſides his manners, which in all places where he had lived, were a ſubject of ſlander in regard to his love of women, his beſt friends allowed he was both very imprudent and impatient [*A*]. However there were two parties formed in Geneva; one for, and the other againſt him. And doubtleſs the firſt of theſe parties was compoſed not only of ſuch as had an eſteem and friendſhip for Mr Morus, but of others alſo, who, without any real love or eſteem for him, ſaw their enemies at the head of the contrary party. Every day afforded inſtances of this kind. I know not how Mr Morus procured the favour of Salmaſius; but it is certain that the latter drew the other into the United Provinces. Some pretend it was to mortify Mr Spanheim [*B*] who had been at variance with Mr Morus at Geneva. At firſt Salmaſius endeavoured to procure him a profeſſorſhip in Divinity at Harderwic (*f*), but this not ſucceeding, he got him called to Middelburg. Mr Morus accepting the call

[*A*] *His friends allowed he was both very imprudent and impatient.*] It is owned in a preface (1), written in behalf of Mr Morus, that his too warm temper, his too great liberty of ſpeech, and his too earneſt deſire of riſing above others, had often given room to thoſe continual enmities which reigned betwixt him and his rivals. The author adds, that he had never heard Mr Spanheim ſay any thing worſe againſt Morus than that he was proud: he ſays alſo, that in the judgment of Salmaſius, Mr Morus truſted too much to his falſe friends, and was indolent, but otherwiſe had a fine genius and univerſal capacity. Mr Diodati in a letter (2), he wrote in favour of Mr Morus to Salmaſius confeſſes, that this miniſter 'aimed at nothing more than making an innocent defence, but that he did this with a warmth and vigour which had often been prejudicial to thoſe who had attacked him. . . . . That he was good natured, without fraud or malice, free and generous . . . . . warm and very ſenſible of affronts, but eaſily reconciled; one who never was the aggreſſor, but had terrible weapons to defend himſelf withal. I ſcarce ever knew any one, *continues he*, who had reaſon to boaſt of attacking him. *Conſcia virtus*, and if you add to it, *genus irritabile vatum*, furniſh him a compleat ſuit of armour againſt his aſſailants.' I beg leave to make a ſhort reflexion upon the illuſions, occaſioned by friendſhip. Here you ſee that Mr Diodati, from a tender reſpect for Mr Morus, reckons that as nothing, which is indeed a capital and moſt unbecoming vice in a miniſter; I mean a vindictive ſpirit in the higheſt degree, and extreme pride and paſſion. It is in effect blackening a miniſter, and diveſting him entirely of the ſpirit of the Goſpel, which ought to be inſeparable from his character, to confeſs what Mr Diodati has here ſaid of him; and yet he thought this abated but little from the praiſes he plentifully beſtowed upon his friend. He excuſes, as well as he can, this vindictive humour of Mr Morus. *The importunity*, ſays he (3), *of his enemies ſeemed to deſerve that they ſhould be ſeverely rebuked now and then, to teach them to be quiet.*' I every day meet with ſuch who have the ſame blind ſide, with reſpect to a miniſter they have conceived an opinion of, under the cover of his great abilities, they ſpeak of his very *Iſmaeliſm* (4) almoſt with commendation. *He is a dangerous enemy*, ſay they, *he has teeth and nails, and woe to them who provoke him* (5) as if they were deſcribing, after the heathen manner a colonel of dragoons, or as if a miniſter of the Goſpel were a knight of the Thiſtle, armed with a threatning device, *Nemo me impune laceſſit: nul ne s'y frotte* (6).

Qui me commorit, (melius non tangere, clamo)
Flebit & inſignis tota cantabitur urbe (7).

Take warning, urge me not, or in lampoon
Your name ſhall ſhine, a jeſt to all the town.

It is hard to believe, that ſuch miniſters are attached to religion by any other ties than thoſe of vanity; and becauſe it furniſhes them with a pretence of ſetting up for petty tyrants. Once more, examine all the depravities to which human nature is ſubject, and you will find none more oppoſite to the ſpirit of Chriſtianity, than the violence that appears in the quarrels of ſome of theſe gentlemen. This ſhews that in all their proceedings, they have a mind to make known their power, ſo that no perſon for the future may preſume to reſiſt them. Without having read Homer, they put in practice the words of Agamemnon, much better than any text of Scripture.

Ἐγὼ δὲ κ' ἄγω Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρῃον
Αὐτὸς ἰὼν κλισίηνδε, τὸ σὸν γέρας. ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς
Ὅσσον φέρτερός εἰμι σέθεν, στυγέῃ δὲ καὶ ἄλλος
Ἶσον ἐμοὶ φάσθαι, καὶ ὁμοιωθήμεναι ἄντην.

Ego autem abducam Briſeïda pulchram-genas,
Ipſe profectus ad tentorium, tuum præmium: ut bene intelligas
Quanto potentior ſum te: timeat autem & alius
Æqualem ſe mihi dicere, & comparari contra (8).

But then prepare, imperious prince! prepare,
Fierce as thou art, to yield thy captive fair:
Ev'n in thy tent I'll ſeize the blooming prize,
Thy lov'd Briſeïs with the radiant eyes.
Hence ſhalt thou prove my might, and curſe the hour,
Thou ſtoodſt a rival of imperial pow'r;
And hence to all our hoſt it ſhall be known,
That kings are ſubject to the gods alone.

Pope.

See Milton at p. 44, and 190, of his Reply. See alſo the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes, where it is confeſſed, that Morus, *among all his good Qualities, had ſome which did him no honour*; that *he was imprudent, imperious, ſatirical, contemptuous*, and that *he ſcarce allowed any thing good but his own works, and the praiſes of his admirers* (9).

[*B*] *Some pretend it was to mortify Mr Spanheim.*] Sorbiere ſhall be my voucher, who writes thus to Mr Patin (10). *I can only tell you of Mr Spanheim, what was publiſhed at the time of his death, that Salmaſius had killed him, and that Morus was the dagger. The ſtory is long, but to give it you in a few words, I ſhall only ſay, that Salmaſius hated the late Spanheim from an emulation of wit and reputation in the ſchools; that to mortify him, he cauſed Morus to be ſent for into Holland, tho' he knew him only by name, becauſe he was the ſcourge and averſion of his colleague: That the doctor moved Heaven and earth to hinder his coming, and died when he received*

(*a*) Alex. Mori Fides publica, *pag.* 225.

(*b*) See the Life of Stephen le Clerc, one of the competitors, printed at Amſterdam 1685, before the *Quæſtiones Sacræ of David le Clerc, &c.*

(*c*) He went thither in 1642.

(*d*) Mori Fides publica, *pag.* 226.

(*e*) See what *Tanaquillus Faber* wrote to him *Epiſtolar. lib. i, pag.* 219.

(*f*) See the remark [*C*].

(1) Before the ſecond apology of Milton, *Edit. Hagæ Comit.* 1654. George Crantzius, Doctor of Divinity, is the author of this preface.

(2) *Produced in the* Fides publica, *pag.* 111, *&c.*

(3) Fides publica, *pag.* 114.

(4) *Milton, Defenſ. pro ſe, pag.* 134, produces a letter, which ſays of Mr Morus what was propheſied of Iſmaël, that *his hand would be againſt every man, and every man's hand againſt him.*

(5) Δυσμενέων παῖδες τῷ σῷ μένει ἀντιασίαν. *See* Homer. Iliad. *lib. vi, ver.* 127.

(6) *It was that of a king of Navarre. See* Bouhours, Entret. des Deviſes, *pag. m.* 463, 464.

(7) Horat. Sat. I, lib. II, ver. 45.

(8) Hom. Iliad. lib. I, ver. 184.

(9) Hiſt. de l'Edit de Nantes, *Tom. iii, pag.* 454.

(10) Sorbiere, Lettre lxiv, *pag.* 442.

call left Geneva in 1649, and carried a good teſtimonial of his Orthodoxy [*C*]. He preſented himſelf before the ſynod of the Walloon churches aſſembled at Maeſtricht (*g*), preached with the the applauſe of the whole auditory, and then went to take poſſeſſion of the Divinity profeſſorſhip in the illuſtrious ſchool of Middelburg, and of the paſtorſhip of the church of the ſame city. The magiſtrates of Amſterdam, at his arrival in Holland, offered him the Hiſtory-profeſſorſhip (*h*), which was become vacant in their illuſtrious ſchool by the death of Voſſius; but not being able to draw him from the engagements he was under to the city of Middelburg, they ſent for David Blondel: and yet three years after, hearing that Mr Morus was offered a Divinity profeſſorſhip in France, they renewed their offers to him. He then accepted this employment, and diſcharged it with great ability. He diſappeared for ſome time, taking a journey into Italy that proved pretty long [*D*], which it is ſaid he had no cauſe to repent [*E*]. During this journey he wrote a fine Poem (*i*), on the defeat of the Turkiſh fleet by the Venetians. This Poem procured him a chain of gold, which the republic of Venice preſented him. He returned to diſcharge his office, and after having weathered ſome ſtorms in the Walloon ſynods [*F*], he went into France, to be miniſter of the church at Paris, where a great many people wiſhed for him: ſeveral others oppoſed him, and appeared at ſome provincial ſynods, and afterwards at the national ſynod of Loudun (*k*), with bags full of papers againſt Mr Morus. All their accuſations were eluded or found null [*G*]; for he was admitted miniſter of the

(*g*) Fid. publica, pag. 157.

(*h*) Ibid. pag. 213.

(*i*) See it's encomium in the letters of *Tanaquillus Faber, lib. ii, pag.* 157.

(*k*) It began the tenth of November 1659, and ended the tenth of January 1660.

received the news that his adverſary was on his journey. ..... To this he joins a ſhort Elogy on Mr Sphanheim, and then, concerning Mr Morus, he adds, *I cannot give my judgment of him without being thought partial, becauſe he has been my intimate friend ever ſince we were ſchool-fellows, that is, for above five and twenty years, and I engaged in his battles againſt Father Jarrige: but it is certain, and confeſſed by all the world, that he has a lively genius, vaſt thoughts, that he ſhines and makes a great figure.*

The letter which Mr Sphanheim wrote to Voſſius in March 1648 (11) deſerves to be conſidered, and may ſerve for a confirmation of ſome things which Mr Sorbiere, has juſt ſaid. We there meet with this particular, that Mr Godefroy (12) had not given ſo advantageous and glorious a teſtimony to Mr Morus, but out of hatred to Mr Spanheim. The latter threatned to publiſh all the tranſactions at Geneva relating to the good teſtimonials Morus had obtained there, and what had been his manner of life and behaviour in that city. I find in the ſame letter, that Mr Morus proteſted upon oath to the magiſtrates of Geneva, that he had not any thought of Mr Spanheim in the oration hereafter mentioned (13).

[*C*] *He left Geneva, and carried a good teſtimonial of his Orthodoxy.*] This teſtimonial was given him by the church of Geneva, January 25, 1648. It is at full length in Latin and French in the *Fides publica* of Mr Morus (14), where we alſo find, the enemies of this miniſter to fruſtrate the good intentions of Salmaſius, who had a mind to ſettle him as profeſſor of Divinity in Guelderland, had given out that Mr Morus was a pernicious Heretic, who not only believed, that, according to the intention of God, JESUS CHRIST ſuffered equally for all men; and that the ſin of Adam is not imputed to us; but alſo that the Holy Ghoſt is not God, or that we are not bound to believe he is. Upon this occaſion the church of Geneva gave the perſon accuſed a teſtimonial ſo full of praiſes, that it looked rather like a rhetorical panegyric than a ſentence of abſolution. Mr Morus appeared in it whiter than ſnow in all reſpects, both as to liſe and doctrine. They affirm, that his moſt inveterate enemies can object nothing to him that deſerves any cenſure (15). Yet we ſhall ſhow hereafter (16), that Milton received ſeveral memoirs from Geneva, which blacken our Morus terribly.

[*D*] *He diſappeared, taking a journey into Italy which proved pretty long.*] We find in a Latin oration which he ſpoke at Amſterdam, after his return from Italy, the reaſon why he returned no ſooner. He there mentions ſeveral dangers he had met with. For the reſt, they who ſay he undertook this Journey without acquainting his ſuperiors with it, are not much in the wrong; for the leave given him at Amſterdam the twentieth of December 1654, was only for a journey into France, for three or four months. But upon his return he appeared before the ſynod of Leyden in May 1656, and ſaid he ſaw great probability of advancing the glory of God in Italy, by the preaching of the Goſpel; and was thanked for his good advice.

[*E*] *He had no reaſon to repent his journey into Italy.*] It is reported, that falling dangerouſly ill at Florence, he ſaid ſo many fine things to the Phyſician who attended him, that this Phyſician was wholly ſtruck with admiration of him, and giving an account of it to the Great Duke, raiſed his curioſity to ſee this learned ſtranger: ſo that Mr Morus, being recovered, was introduced to an audience of his highneſs, and ſo charmed him with his diſcourſe, that he afterwards received ſeveral marks of his particular favour and eſteem. Others will have it, that Mr Morus was known to this prince before he fell ill. This is what we find in a ſmall book juſt publiſhed (17). ‘The great duke ‘of Tuſcany received Mr Morus very graciouſly in his ‘dominions and capital city; he favoured him with ‘his friendſhip and eſteem; he ſent him his own Phyſician when he was ſick at Florence; and made him ‘rich preſents, worthy both of him that gave, and of ‘him that received them ...... It is ſaid, that the ‘Phyſician whom the duke ſent, to viſit and take ‘care of him in his illneſs, was ſo ſurpriſed, in ‘the converſation he had with him, to hear him reaſon with ſuch force, judgment, and penetration, on ‘all the ſciences, and particularly that of Phyſic, ‘that he owned, how able ſoever he himſelf was in ‘his own profeſſion, his patient knew more of it ‘than he did, who had beſtowed all his thoughts and ‘ſtudies on that ſcience.’

[*F*] *After he had weathered ſome ſtorms in the Walloon ſynods.*] In effect, the ſynod of Tergou ſummoned him in April 1659, to anſwer certain articles exhibited againſt him. He went to Tergou, but did not think fit to appear before the ſynod, and only acquainted them, that he no longer depended on any church but that of France, to which he had engaged himſelf. This did not prevent his condemnation as he had expected; for the ſynod declared him incapable of exerciſing the Miniſtry in that country, to the edification of the people, or of receiving the communion in it (18). The ſynod of Nimeguen confirmed this cenſure in September 1659 (19), notwithſtanding the letters of the church of Paris, concerning the admiſſion of Mr Morus into their church, accompanied with an act of the ſynod of Aï, dated May 8, 1659, ratifying this admiſſion. Mr De Thuanus, who was then ambaſſador of France at the Hague, took part in favour of Mr Morus, by preſenting a long memorial to the States-General, who, by an act of April 6, 1660, communicated to the ſynod of Haerlem, ordered informations to be laid before them, of all which had paſſed in this affair. The ſynod deputed three paſtors and two elders to the States, to give them the account which they deſired. And here I think the matter reſted.

[*G*] *All their accuſations were eluded or found null.*] We ſhall relate what is found on this ſubject, in the Hiſtory of the edict of Nantes. The king's commiſſioner to the national ſynod of Loudun, ‘did not oppoſe the ‘reading of the informations ſent from Holland a‘gainſt Alexander Morus, whoſe miniſtry was then de‘ſired by the church of Paris. He even was of opi‘nion that in their judgment they ought to have regard ‘to theſe acts, and to ground their reſolutions upon ‘them: but he cauſed to be inſerted in the decree of ‘the ſynod a kind of proteſt, importing that judgment ‘ſhould be given according to the liberties of the edict, ‘the laws of diſcipline, and cuſtoms of the king‘dom, without being ſubject to any foreign authority, ‘juriſdiction,

(11) It is the cccclviith of thoſe which were written to Voſſius.

(12) Profeſſor of the civil-law at Geneva.

(13) In the remark [*L*].

(14) *Pag. m.* 81.

(15) Si vitæ integritatem ſpectes, hinc te niveus morum candor retrahit, illinc admirabilis & ſibi ſemper conſtans innocentia. Apoſtolus vult Epiſcopum eſſe ἀνέγκλητον. Nihil utique illi vel ab infenſiſſimis hoſtibus & livoris felle maligno turgentibus meritò objici queat, quod juſtæ ſit reprehenſioni obnoxium.

(16) In the remark [*M*], citation (30).

(17) Panégyrique de Mr Morus, *printed at Amſterdam* 1695, *pag.* 14.

(18) *Theſe are the words of the Synod, article xxvii:* The aſſembly declares, that the ſaid Alexander Morus is incapable of exerciſing any function of the holy miniſtry of the Goſpel among us, or of partaking of the Lord's holy ſupper, till by a ſincere repentance of his ſins, and a blameleſs converſation he makes a reparation as well for the ſcandals he has given us, *&c.*

(19) The aſſembly has judged, that the former aſſembly had ſufficient reaſons to pronounce this ſentence; and therefore the preſent Synod has approved, ratified, and confirmed a-new the xxviith article of the former Synod. *Acts of the Synod of Nimeguen of the month of September* 1659. *Art. xxi.*

the church of Paris. Mr Daillé who had ſerved him with all his intereſt in ſeveral ſynods [*H*], ſoon after repented what he had done; for there aroſe a violent quarrel between them, which produced a thouſand partialities in the flock. In general, Mr Morus in the midſt of the applauſes which his inimitable way of preaching [*I*] procured from an extraordinary croud of auditors, had the mortification at Paris to ſee his reputation attacked by perſons of merit, who accuſed him a-new to the ſynods [*K*], from

'jurisdiction, or deciſion; or remitting the party accuſed to the juriſdiction or judgment of others out of the kingdom, contrary to the ordinances and edicts, to the prejudice and diſadvantage of the king's ſubjects. By this means the commiſſioner decided the affair rather than the ſynod, becauſe the proceſs not being finiſhed in the country where the accuſation was firſt brought, and the proteſt of the commiſſioner hindering Morus being remitted thither, to juſtify himſelf upon the place, there were not ſufficient informations to convict him: he was therefore abſolved and his vocation confirmed. But it would be difficult to ſay, whether this vocation did more hurt or good, becauſe it made ſuch a diviſion in the conſiſtory and in the church, that what one of the parties called edification, the other called ſcandal: ſo that there appeared great exceſſes on one ſide, and paſſion on the other; too ſtrict an inquiry to deſtroy Morus, and too violent proceedings to ſupport him. A provincial ſynod of the province of Berry ended the affair by the king's permiſſion, and was accuſed of being ſomething too partial in favour of the accuſed, and of taking a little too much pleaſure in mortifying a conſiſtory ſo famous as that of Charenton, which by the merits and capacity of the members who compoſed it, was then as it were the oracle of all the churches, (20).

[*H*] *Mr Daillé . . . . . had ſerved him with all his intereſt in ſeveral ſynods.*] I think myſelf obliged to ſet down here the inſults which Mr Daillé's adverſaries offered him upon this occaſion, and the anſwer he gave them in his own juſtification; for this is a part of Mr Morus's adventures. Here then is what Mr Cottiby, formerly miniſter of Poitiers, objected to Mr Daillé (21). 'That which ſurprizes me moſt, is to ſee my ſelf accuſed by you, Sir, for whom I might have hoped for the greateſt protection and ſupport, if by misfortune I ſhould have happened to commit any fault, which ſhould oblige me to appear before theſe tribunals, in which you generally hold ſo eminent a place; for what might I not reaſonably expect from a man, who, in the perſon of one of his brethren, is the declared defender and advocate of one of the impureſt lives in the world, and who, after he had pleaded his cauſe in a provincial ſynod of the iſle of France, was hardy enough in a national ſynod, whereof he was the head, (a worthy head of ſuch a body!) to patronize him openly, I will not ſay againſt the faithful memoirs of the miniſters of Rohan, of Caen and Lyons, but which is more aſtoniſhing, againſt a multitude of accuſations from ſome entire provinces, and all this by I know not how many turns, much leſs innocent than thoſe of the tongue.' Father Adam made him almoſt the ſame reproaches, whom Mr Daillé thus anſwered (22): 'Wherefore would you have me condemn him, and judge him unworthy of thoſe charitable offices which we owe our neighbour in caſe of need; I who have heard him, and not only heard him, but, after an exact enquiry into the cauſe with all the diligence and application I was capable of, have been convinced of his innocence? If theſe little kindneſſes had been even owing only to my own conſcience, the teſtimony of this would ſufficiently juſtify me againſt thoſe violences and ſtrange calumnies, with which your proſelyte inveighs againſt me in this place. But both you and he do me the more wrong in blaming my conduct in this affair, as I did him thoſe offices you reproach me with, not properly from my own private opinion, but by the order of my ſuperiors; firſt by order of the conſiſtory of my own church, which entruſted me and the other deputies with this affair, in this ſynod of the iſle of France mentioned by your proſelyte, which was held at Ferté by Juare in 1657; and then two years after, not only by order of my own conſiſtory and church, but alſo by that of the whole ſynod of theſe provinces held at Aï in Champagne, in 1659. I have done good as well as I was able, what the aſſemblies, on which I depend, expreſsly enjoined and commanded; and what my own conſcience, far from being ſhocked at, approved as juſt and reaſonable. What crime have I committed in all this? Certainly if the defendant were even as guilty, as I believe him innocent, yet it is evident I could not be to blame for the two judgments by which he has been acquitted; for I have defended a cauſe which I did, and ſtill do believe to be very juſt. I neither had, nor could have any vote in the ſentence given; for I acted as advocate and not as judge. Beſides, I muſt add, that I acted neither as the one, nor as the other in the national ſynod, which made the laſt decree about this affair; for this defendant himſelf being preſent there, pleaded his own cauſe in five or ſix full hearings, with ſo much force and evidence, that thanks be to God he had no need of any other aſſiſtance.' See below the remark [*M*] towards the end.

[*I*] *His inimitable manner of preaching.*] It conſiſted in certain flights of imagination, which contained ingenious alluſions, and I know not what air of paradox very proper to ſurprize the hearer, and engage his conſtant attention. But his manner of delivery was what was moſt taking. Hence it came to paſs, that his ſermons in writing were not near ſo much admired; and that the greateſt part of thoſe who endeavour to imitate him, only make themſeves ridiculous. The deſire of following his method, which began to corrupt many of the young miniſters, obliged the ſynod of the iſle of France in the year 1675, to make an act which was read in the pulpit of Charenton and elſewhere, forbidding all flights of imagination, and playing with words, *&c.* in expounding the word of God. It will not be diſagreeable in this place to ſee the opinion of an Hiſtorian, who is, beyond compariſon, a better judge than my ſelf. *He was*, ſays he ſpeaking of Morus (23), *extremely followed by the people, and they who leaſt knew why he deſerved admiration, were yet his moſt paſſionate admirers. It is a diſpute among perſons of good judgment, whether his excellency lay in any thing ſolid, or only in ſhew, whether it deſerved to be called a flaſh of lightning, or a ſteady light. But even thoſe who gave ſentence againſt him, could not but hear him, with great pleaſure, and feel in themſelves the ſame paſſions, which he raiſed in others. Some have thought that he had much leſs learning than is commonly imagined: But none doubt his capacity of diſplaying to the beſt advantage that which he was maſter of, and of giving a luſtre to any thing he expoſed to the judgment of the public. However, never did any man receive more flattering applauſes than he, nor could that which was ſaid of another be better applied to any man than him; that if he did not deſerve the advantageous character given of him, at leaſt he diſabled his hearers from giving him a bad one.* He had ſaid p. 316, *that Morus's method did not pleaſe all the world, and that they who affected to imitate him, had ſeldom or never ſucceeded.*

[*K*] *He was accuſed a-new to the ſynods.*] It may be ſaid, Mr Morus did not live at quiet in the church of Paris; for after the month of September 1661, complaints were brought againſt him before the conſiſtory, which came to nothing, and perhaps the reaſon was becauſe he aſked leave to go to England in December 1661. He returned in the month of June 1662. And then the complaints being immediately renewed, the conſiſtory ordered that he ſhould be heard; but that, in the mean time, he ſhould forbear preaching. His partizans would make him preach in ſpite of the conſiſtory, and to that end ſeized upon all the avenues to the pulpit, and would not ſuffer Mr Daillé's ſon to get up into it, which cauſed ſo terrible a commotion, that there was no preaching that Sunday morning. Some maſters of families had recourſe to the parliament, which upon July 27, 1662, ordered a conference to be held upon it. This aſſembly ſuſpended Mr Morus for a year. The ſynod of the iſle of France confirmed and even aggravated

(20) Hiſt. of the Edict of Nantes, *Tom. iii, livr. v, pag.* 315, *ad ann.* 1659.

(21) Cottiby, Reply to Mr Daillé, *pag.* 17.

(22) Daillé, Reply to F. Adam, *Part iii, pag.* 154.

(23) Hiſt. of the Edict of Nantes, *Tom. iii, livr. vii, pag.* 455.

from which he was ſaved only as by fire. His death, which was very edifying, and the marks of piety which he diſcovered in his laſt ſickneſs, blotted out the remembrance of what might have been irregular in his behaviour. He died at Paris, in the houſe of the ducheſs of Rohan, in the month of September 1670. He was never married. We ſhall ſee below the titles of his works [*L*].

I ſhall ſay ſomething of his quarrel with John Milton [*M*]: and obſerve, that there are ſome things in the *Menagiana* very much to his honour, and others to his diſadvantage [*N*]. One

gravated the ſuſpenſion; but that of the province of Berry, to which this miniſter appealed, reſtored him to his office (24). This kind of appeals were allowed by the regulations of the national ſynods.

[*L*] *We ſhall ſee below the titles of his works.*] There is a treatiſe of his, *de Gratia & Libero arbitrio*; another, *de Scriptura ſacra ſive de cauſa Dei*; a commentary on the fifty-third chapter of Iſaiah; notes, *ad loca quædam novi fœderis*; an anſwer to Milton, intituled, *Alexandri Mori fides publica*; Orations and Poems in Latin. Some fragments of his ſermons have been printed ſince his death, and even ſome entire ſermons (25). We ſhall add one word concerning his orations. He ſpoke three of them at Geneva, which are very fine. The Latin of them is rather learned than elegant: He affected uncommon phraſes, and ſuch ſignifications of words as are almoſt without example. Of theſe three orations, one is a panegyric upon Calvin; another is intituled *de Pace*, wherein he ſeverely condemns, without naming any body, Amyraldus and Spanheim, who were at open war about univerſal grace. He gives them their due. This was a home reprimand, and rejoiced his very heart. Let us alſo ſay a word about his Latin Poems. That which he made on the birth of our Saviour was much eſteemed, and ſo was that which was a thankſgiving to GOD after a great ſickneſs. Mr Perachon, who was then a Proteſtant, tranſlated them into French verſe, and publiſhed them at Paris in the year 16 . . . . . I do not remember, that I ever ſaw any other French verſes of Mr Morus's, except the anſwer he made on the ſame rhimes to a ſonnet which Corras addreſſed to him after his abjuration.

[*M*] *His quarrel with John Milton.*] The occaſion of the quarrel was this; in 1652, Mr Morus publiſhed a book of Peter du Moulin the ſon (26), at the Hague, and dedicated it, in the Printer's name (27), to the king of Great Britain. This book which is intituled, *Regii ſanguinis clamor ad cœlum adverſus parricidas Anglicanos*, is a bitter invective againſt the parliamentarians, and Milton in particular is extremely ill treated in it. The epiſtle dedicatory gives him no better uſage, but he is abuſed much more furiouſly in ſome verſes at the latter end of the book. Milton, who had let ſeveral violent books publiſhed againſt the parliamentarians paſs without any reply, could not contain when he ſaw this, in which he was perſonally concerned, as well by the vaſt elogiums given in it to Salmaſius, as by the terrible reproaches heaped upon himſelf. He anſwered it therefore, and ſuppoſed, either ſincerely or craftily, that he might have the greater advantage againſt the perſon whom he refuted, that Morus was the author (28) of this book. He treats him as a dog, or rather as a goat; for he accuſes him of a thouſand leud actions, and particularly of having debauched a maid-ſervant at Geneva, and of having kept her ſince ſhe had a huſband, and of having got with child a chamber-maid of Salmaſius's wife under promiſe of marriage. He accuſes him of being convicted of ſeveral hereſies at Geneva, and of having ſhamefully abjured them with his mouth, but not with his heart. He accuſes him of having been deprived at Geneva of his ſalary for eight or ten months, and of his offices of profeſſor and miniſter, on account of a charge brought againſt him for adultery, &c. the iſſue whereof was, that he muſt have been condemned, if he had not avoided the definitive ſentence, by declaring he would quit the city. He accuſes him alſo of being forbidden the exerciſe of the miniſtry by the magiſtrates of Amſterdam. In fine, he defames him after the crueleſt manner in the world, intermixing the ſtories he tells of him with a parcel of buffoon jeſts. Mr Morus defended himſelf by a long liſt of teſtimonials, of his orthodoxy and good life, which the conſiſtories, the univerſities, the ſynods, and the magiſtrates of the places where he had lived, had given him. He made it appear, that the judges as well Civil as Eccleſiaſtical, which took cognizance of the pretenſions of the chamber-maid of Salmaſius's wife, had declared them null, and clearly acquitted him in this affair, notwithſtanding the contrivances of this lady who had employed all her craft againſt him (29). He makes it appear by the authentic certificates of the magiſtrates of Amſterdam, of the Walloon conſiſtory, and of the curators of the illuſtrious ſchool of the ſame city, that he was never prohibited the exerciſe of his miniſtry. I am not ignorant that ſome exceptions may be alledged againſt his certificates of a good life, and that it is a little ſtrange, that thoſe which Morus obtained at Geneva ſhould be ſo different from the teſtimony of public fame: for after all, it is certain, that Milton received memoirs from Geneva, and that he produced (30) a letter written from that town, which aſſures, that all the world admired how he came to be ſo faithfully informed about the conduct of Mr Morus. He was not ſilenced by his certificates; for he ſays (31) in particular as to thoſe of Geneva, that they were given before thoſe who accuſed Mr Morus of adultery had formally proſecuted him. Beſides, it is well known, that the greateſt ſtorm this miniſter met with at Geneva, was raiſed after his obtaining the teſtimonials of January 25, 1648; and a certain perſon has publiſhed (32), that the magiſtrates of that city cancelled the act of depoſition againſt Mr Morus decreed againſt him by the conſiſtory, and commanded the conſiſtory to give this miniſter a teſtimonial of good life. But after all, there are infinitely more exceptions to be made to the defamatory reports, which ſuch an author as Milton is capable of collecting, than againſt theſe certificates and teſtimonials. So that upon the whole, I ſhould be of opinion, that conſidering thoſe certificates which have been produced by his adverſary, and the inconveniences juſtly to be apprehended, if ſuch accuſations as are uncertain and without judicial proof, ſhould be preferred before juſtifications drawn up in due form, that he ſhould be ſtigmatized as a public calumniator, except as to thoſe facts in which he can defend himſelf by the help of ſome authentic acts. I ſhould think in particular, that the diſtich he has inſerted in the London Gazette, ought to be declared a diabolical ſilly jeſt. That diſtich is in theſe words, for I cannot think Mr Colomiés (33) meant any other.

Galli ex concubitu gravidam te Pontia (34) *Mori,*
Quis benè moratam morigeramque neget?

Milton's hatred was inveterate enough, as appears by a letter (35) he wrote when Mr Morus's affair was depending before the ſynod of Loudon. He was of opinion, that if they ſhould decree even nothing more than the depoſing this miniſter, that ſynod would meet with what no other had ever done, that is, with a happy iſſue. *Synodo interea proteſtantium Laodunenſi* (36), *propediem, ut ſcribis, convocandæ, precor id quod nulli adhuc Synodo contigit, fœlicem exitum, non Nazianzenicum; fœlicem autem huic nunc ſatis futurum ſi nihil aliud decreverit quàm ejiciendum eſſe Morum.* This letter is dated December 20, 1659. The ſynod had already ſat near two months, and yet Mr Milton ſpeaks of it as an aſſembly which was to meet, which ſhows, that he had very little correſpondence in France. In another letter (37) he ſpeaks yet more harſhly of Mr Morus's call to Charenton, but without naming him.

[*N*] *There are ſome things in the* Menagiana *which are very much to his honour, and others to his advantage.*] 'Mr Morus declared ſome time before his death, that no one had tempted him to change his religion ſo much as I. The ducheſs of Aiguillon ordered me to offer him, in her name, a penſion of four thouſand livres, I communicated

---

(24) All this is related at large in the *Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes*, at the end of the ſeventh book of the third Tome.

(25) At the Hague in 1685. See the *Nouv. de la Repub. des Lettres*, for the month of March, 1685, *pag.* 333, of the ſecond edition. Eighteen of his ſermons have been printed on the eighth chapter of the Epiſtle to the Romans, at Amſterdam in 1691.

(26) See Daillé, Reply to F. Adam, *Part ii*, *pag.* 127. *Colomiés, Biblioth. Choiſ. pag.* 19.

(27) There were ſome copies to which Mr Morus had put his name, as Milton ſays, *Defenſ. pro ſe, pag.* 23, 25.

(28) The Oxford catalogue aſcribes it to Morus.

(29) Illa mihi graviter jamdudum infenſa . . . nihil intentatum reliquit ut me in naſſam infauſtiſſimi matrimonii compingeret. Quod ubi ſenſit innotuiſſe vulgo, me vero palam vehementiſſimeque reluctari, *Acheronta movebo*, inquit, & *perdam ipſum*, quâ ſæpe formulà utitur. *Morus, Fides publica, pag.* 190.

(30) Milton, Defenſ. pro ſe, *pag.* 132.

(31) Ibid. *pag.* 92, 141.

(32) Ludov. Molinæus, Parænefi ad ædificat. *pag.* 433.

(33) Biblioth. Choiſie, *pag.* 19.

(34) Thus he called the chambermaid of Salmaſius's wife. Mr Morus, without telling what her name was, denies that Milton called her by her right name. See *Miltoni Defenſ. pro ſe, pag.* 164.

(35) It is the xxixth.

(36) *He ſhould have ſaid* Juliodunenſi, *or* Lauſdunenſi, &c.

(37) It is the xxivth, and dated the firſt of Auguſt 1657.

One of his laſt panegyriſts relates a fact which is falſe [O].

The opinion which Mr Chevreau has given of the character of Mr Morus, is very agreeable to that of ſeveral other good judges, and proves at the ſame time, that thoſe things which are written to a perſon himſelf, are ſometimes very different from thoſe which are ſaid of him, in letters addreſſed to others (l) [P]. I ſhall not paſs over in ſilence, that the illuſtrious Huetius gives very great elogiums to Mr Morus in ſome Latin Poems which he inſcribed to him. See p. 30, and 77, of the poems of this learned prelate, of the Utrecht edition 1700 (m).

(l) See, above, the remark [*M*] of the article GROTIUS.

(m) It is the fourth; his *Notes on the Anthologia* are joined to it.

‘nicated this affair to Mr Perefix, then archbiſhop of Paris by abbot Gaudin, and Mr Perefix ſpoke of it to the king. His majeſty ſaid, that it was not a proper time, and that it would do an injury to Mr Morus, becauſe he was then at variance with his brethren. Mr Morus occaſioned diviſions wherever he lived: this he did in Holland and elſewhere, and even at Paris. I compare him to Helen, who kindled a war wherever ſhe came (38) . . . Marſhal Grammont having been, by the king's order, to viſit the miniſter Morus in his laſt ſickneſs, was aſked by his majeſty at his return how he found him. Sire, ſays the marſhal, I ſaw him die; he died a good Huguenot: But what I think him moſt to be pitied for is, that he died in a religion which is now as much out of faſhion, as a high-crowned-hat (39).

[O] *One of his laſt panegyriſts relates a fact which is not true.*] ‘The Sorbonne one day were all ſurprized (40), by an accident which did great honour to Mr Morus, and made all their doctors bluſh, and was eſteemed a ſort of inchantment. A certain perſon whoſe face was altogether unknown to them, and whom they took at firſt ſight for ſome country prieſt, being preſent at their diſputes, deſired the profeſſor, who preſided in that aſſembly, to give him leave to propoſe ſome arguments. Which being granted, he acquitted himſelf ſo well, that he ſoon gained the eſteem of all the doctors: and as this new antagoniſt urged his arguments with a ſurprizing force, and beyond what could be expected from him, their eſteem was changed into admiration. But when they ſaw that this powerful enemy puſhed them too hard, and that they could ſtand againſt the force of his reaſons no longer, all their admiration and eſteem was changed into anger and indignation; and the diſpute grew ſo hot, that if he had not wiſely got out of ſo dangerous a place, he had reaſon to apprehend ſome miſchief. But he imitated JESUS CHRIST our great maſter, when he went out of the temple to avoid the ſnares of the Phariſees, whom he had confounded. In like manner our Morus, after he had ſtopped the mouths of the Phariſees of theſe latter ages, amuſed them with ſoft words, went out of their ſynagogue, and ſo left them. After he had made his eſcape, they ordered one of their ſcholars to follow him at a diſtance, and watch where he went in, and afterwards enquire what kind of man this was who knew more than all the Sorbonne together: which being obſerved by him whom they ſo much deſired to know, he turned about to him who followed him, and ſaid only theſe two words *memento Mori*; from whence thoſe who ſent him preſently concluded, that he who had given them ſo much trouble, was that famous man who was one of the pillars of the church of Charenton, and the terror of the Romiſh church (41).’ This is what I find in a book publiſhed about a year ago, well worth reading. It is now five and twenty years ſince I told this ſtory in the preſence of a doctor of Divinity, curate of R. . . . . a man of wit, and well verſed in the cuſtoms of his religion. I was perſuaded of the truth of the fact, for I had heard it told upon ſeveral occaſions by men of good ſenſe; and at the age I was then of, I ſcarce diſtruſted any thing that came from ſuch perſons. The doctor anſwered me, it is a very good ſtory, and the concluſion is very ingenious; but aſſure your ſelf it is a romance, for they who propoſe arguments againſt the theſes that are maintained in the Sorbonne, are always ſuch perſons as are well known, and graduates in the Faculty, and obliged to wear the habits or robes belonging to their degree. Had the author of this ſtory known thus much, he would have changed his ſcene.

[P] *The opinion of Mr Chevreau . . . . . is very agreeable . . . . and proves at the ſame time, that thoſe things which are written to a perſon himſelf, are ſometimes very different from thoſe which are ſaid of him in letters addreſſed to others.*] Read the two letters which he wrote to Morus himſelf in 1660 (42), the one in French, and the other in Latin, and compare them with this paſſage of his letter to Tanaquil Faber: ‘You know there are ſome who naturally love incenſe from what hand ſoever it comes, who demand it as a debt, and who are ſo accuſtomed to it, that it is impoſſible to pleaſe, unleſs one has always a cenſer in his hand. This is a failing that deſerves to be pitied; but it is a human failing; beſides, that the profound erudition of our friend (43) in polite learning, his exact knowledge of the Greek, and of all the oriental languages, do juſtly render him conſiderable and diſtinguiſh him from ſo many others who reſemble him only in his defects. That which pleaſed me in the frequent converſations we had together, was, that he always told me ſincerely he thought himſelf infinitely inferior to Mr Daillé, whom he believed to be a more ſolid Divine than your Calvin. But withal, a certain ſtudent, whom you know, lately aſſured me, that Mr Morus was preferred before Mr Daillé by a general conſent, that his flights of imagination pleaſe people much more by their novelty, than the eloquence of Mr Daillé, who was fit to be his maſter (44). . . . What I fear is, that he will be intoxicated by theſe extraordinary applauſes that he has not the power to offer the leaſt violence to his free humour, and that he will give way to his inclination . . . . without any regard for his character, his reputation, or his fortune (45). Mr Morus, ſays he, in another letter (46), has a deal of wit and learning, but little religion and judgment. He is, ambitious, reſtleſs, changeable, bold, preſumptuous, and wavering. He underſtands Latin Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic, but does not underſtand human life.’

(38) Menagiana, *pag.* 153, of the ſecond edition of Holland.

(39) Suite du Menagiana, *pag.* 82.

(40) That is to ſay, at the force of Mr Morus's genius.

(41) Panégyrique d'Alexandre Morus, *printed at Amſterdam by John du Freſne*, 1695, *pag.* 14, 15, 16.

(42) Oeuvres mêlées de Mr Chevreau, *pag.* 40, & 50.

(43) That is to ſay, Mr Morus.

(44) Chevreau, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 48.

(45) Ibid. *pag.* 49.

(46) Ibid. *pag.* 409.

MOSYNIANS, or MOSYNOECIANS (*a*).

Thus certain Mountaineers were called, who lived in trees (*b*) or in wooden towers (*c*) in the neighbourhood of the Euxine ſea (*d*). Their cuſtoms were ſo oppoſite to thoſe of other nations, that thoſe things which others do privately in their houſes, they did in public vew; and what others do in public, they did in their private dwellings (*e*). They did not except the act of generation from this prepoſterous rule [*A*]. Their higheſt wooden tower was the habitation of their king, a miſerable prince; for he was obliged to determine all their differences as judge, and

(*a*) *That is to ſay*, inhabiting towers. *See* Apollonius, Argon. *lib. ii, ver.* 1020, *& ſeq. and* Strabo, ubi infra.

(*b*) Strabo, *lib. xii, pag.* 378.

(*c*) Id. ib.

(*d*) Pomponius Mela, *lib. i, cap. xix*, & Dionyſius Perviegetes, *ver.* 766.

(*e*) Apollon. Argon. *lib. ii, ver.* 1020, & *ſeq.*

[*A*] *They did not except the act of generation from this prepoſtererous rule.*] Apollonius was in the right to compare them to ſwine, ſince they were not aſhamed to do this act before the eyes of their neighbours.

Οὐδ᾽ εὐνῆς αἰδὼς ἐπιδήμιος, ἀλλὰ σύες ὣς
Φορβάδες, οὐδ᾽ ἠβαιὸν ἀτυζόμενοι παρεόντας,
Μίσγονται χαμάδις ξυνῇ φιλότητι γυναικῶν.

Nec eos in populo pudet cœtus Venerii: ſed, in vicem porcorum
Gregalium, nihil quicquam reveriti arbitros
Humi

and if he happened to give a wrong judgment, they impriſoned him immediately, and ſtarved him to death *(f)* [*B*]. Their kingdom was elective, and they always kept their prince in chains and under a ſtrong guard (*g*). They lived upon acorns and the fleſh of wild beaſts, and laid ambuſhes for travellers (*h*), and treated ſtrangers very ill (*i*). They marked themſelves all over the bodies (*k*). Conſult Xenophon in the fifth book of the Expedition of Cyrus the younger. He has there given a long account of their manner of arming and feeding themſelves, &c. He ſays, that when alone they talked, laughed, and danced, as if they had been in company.

Humi & in propatulo commiſcent cum uxoribus corpora (1).

The ſcholiaſt obſerves, that we muſt not underſtand this as if they lay in public with all women indifferently, but each with his own wife. Pomponius Mela makes no ſuch diſtinction. ‘ Propatulo veſcuntur, *ſays he* (2), PROMISCUE concumbunt & palam. - - - *They eat abroad, and their Venery is* PROMISCUOUS *and public*.’ I know not what ground the ſcholiaſt had for this diſtinction. Perhaps he had a mind to make uſe of the maxim, that in doubtful matters we ſhould always embrace the more favourable opinion, and paſs *in mitiorem* the mildeſt ſentence. But the phraſes of Apollonius ſeem very clear againſt this exception, and do plainly confirm the authority of Pomponius Mela; as Diodorus Siculus has alſo done (3). Note, that we find in Xenophon, that the Moſynœcians, with whom he made an alliance had a great mind to lie with the wenches who followed the camp of the Grecians, and that publickly according to their own cuſtom (4). For the reſt, this monſtrous immodeſty has been known in other nations (5).

[*B*] *They impriſoned him immediately, and ſtarved him to death.*] We ſhall give the very words of Apollonius.

- - Ἢν γάρ ϖȣ τὶ θεμιςεύων ἀλίτηται,
Διμῷ μεν᾽ κεῖν᾽ ἦμαρ ἐνικλείσαντες ἔχȣσιν.

- - Nam ſi quid alicubi in jure dicundo deliret,
Ipſum eodem die in cuſtodiam datum ſuffocant inedia (6).

But in his judgment ſhou'd he chance to ſwerve,
The ſelf ſame day ſees him ſhut up to ſtarve.

Pintianus accuſes Pomponius Mela of not rightly underſtanding the meaning of Apollonius; he pretends, that what this Greek Poet ſays is, that the Moſyncœcians ſhut up their king the ſame day he gave the unjuſt ſentence, and condemned him to die of hunger. Pomponius Mela only ſays, that upon his giving any unjuſt ſentence, they condemned him to faſt a whole day. ‘ Reges ſuffragio deligunt, vinculiſque & arctiſſima cuſtodia tenent: atque ubi culpam prave quid imperando meruere, inedia diei totius afficiunt (7). - - - - - *They elect their kings by vote, and keep them in chains, and under the ſtricteſt confinement, and ſhould they offend by decreeing any thing unjuſt, they deprive them of ſuſtenance for one whole day*.’ Pintianus builds upon the teſtimony of two authors quoted by the ſcholiaſt, and on that of Nicolas Damaſcenus, which he had met with in the collections, of Stobæus. ‘ Mela verba illa *ad famem illo die*, pro *illius diei* accepit. At Apollonii enarratores contra intelligunt, eo ipſo die quo contra jus pronunciaverit in carcerem trudi, quoad fame pereat, citantque ſuæ expoſitionis aſſertores Ephorum & Nymphodorum. Addo ego aſtipulari interpretibus Apollonii, Nicolaum de moribus gentium, referente Joanne Stobæo (8). - - - - *Mela underſtood the words hunger in that day to mean of that day. But the commentators of Apollonius underſtand it quite contrary, that their king on that very day, that he pronounced the unjuſt ſentence was impriſoned till he died of hunger, and ground their expoſition on the authorities of Ephorus, and Nymphodorus. I add, that of the ſame opinion with the commentators of Apollonius, is Nicolaus in his piece on the cuſtoms of nations, preſerved in Stobæus's collections*.’ This is the intire paſſage of the ſcholiaſt: Ἱςορεῖ Ἔφορος καὶ Νυμφόδωρος ϖερὶ τȣ́των, ὅτι τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν ἄδοκόν τι κρίναντα, ἐγκλείȣσι καὶ λιμαγχονȣ͂σι. *Ephorus and Nymphodorus on this ſubject relate, that they ſhut up and ſtarve their king to death on giving a falſe judgment*. I have related this on purpoſe to ſhow, that the critic has ſtrained his authority a little too far; for it is not true, that the ſcholiaſt gave the explication of Pintianus to the words of the text, and afterwards proved it by the authority of Euphorus and Nymphodorus; for he barely cites what theſe two authors ſay. I am however of Pintianus's opinion, and find that Iſaac Voſſius has refuted it wretchedly. He ſuppoſes, that the Moſynœcians condemned their king for ſlighter faults to faſt a day, and that for greater faults they condemned him to die of hunger (9). He gives this as the true ſenſe of the words of Apollonius, and maintains they were well interpreted by Pomponius Mela (10). ‘ Interpretatio Melæ, *adds he*, ut facilior ita quoque melior. - - - - *Mela's interpretation, as it is moſt natural, is alſo moſt accurate*.’ This is very ſtrange indeed! That Apollonius ſhould mean to inform us of the diſtinction this people made between the ſmall and the greater faults of their prince, that for the former the prince was to faſt a whole day, and for the latter to be famiſhed to death; and yet that there ſhould not be the leaſt phraſe or word in his relation which inſinuates any ſuch diſtinction. That Pomponius Mela ſhall be ſaid to have given the ſenſe of Apollonius faithfully, and yet that he ſhall not mention a word of the puniſhment of the greater faults; that he ſhall dwell on terms the leaſt diſadvantageous to the nation, which Apollonius meant to decry, and be wholly ſilent with regard to facts which might render it the moſt odious; in a word, that there ſhall not be in any of his expreſſions the leaſt footſtep of the diſtinction in queſtion. Who can ever digeſt this? What does Iſaac Voſſius take his readers to be? A thouſand ſuch faults might be found in the beſt writers, by any who would take the trouble of giving their works a critical examination.

Note, it muſt be granted, that Apollonius has expreſſed himſelf very confuſedly, which gave occaſion to Pomponius Mela's miſtake. I am ſurpriſed Diodorus Siculus ſhould ſay nothing of this law, when he obſerves, that theſe Barbarians kept their prince ſhut up all his life-time in the tower of their capital (11).

MOTHE LE VAYER (FRANCIS DE LA). See VAYER

MOTTE, or MOTHE (LA) a town in Lorrain. Moreri deſcribes the ſituation of it, and ſays that it was taken by the French in 1634 [*A*], and that it has ſince been ruined.

[*A*] *It was taken by the French in* 1634.] This is a particular account. Lewis XIII ordered the marſhal de la Force, ‘ who had always ſome troops on the frontiers of Lorrain; to reduce all thoſe places under his obedience, which had not yet ſubmitted. La Motte being the ſtrongeſt place was firſt attacked, and alone gave the marſhal more trouble than all the reſt; although, for want of a ſufficient garriſon, as well as ammunition and proviſions, and the accidents of the ſeaſon in thoſe parts being ſo favorable to the king as to make it impoſſible to throw in any ſuccours, it did not defend itſelf ſo long as

---

(f) Taken from Apollonius, ibid.

(g) Pompon. Mela, *lib. i, cap.* 19. *See alſo* Diodorus Siculus, *lib. xiv, cap. xxxi.*

(h) Strabo, *lib. xii, pag.* 378.

(i) Pomp. Mela, *lib. i, cap. xix.*

(k) Id. ib.

(1) Apoll. Argon. *lib. ii, ver.* 1025, *pag. m.* 243, 244.

(2) Pompon. Mela, *lib. i, cap. xix, pag. m.* 22.

(3) Diod. Siculus, *lib. xiv, cap. xxxi.*

(4) Xenophon, de Expedit. Cyri, *lib. v, pag. m.* 209.

(5) See the remark [*D*] of the article HIPPARCHIA.

(6) Apollon. Argon. *lib. ii, ver.* 1030.

(7) Pompon. Mela, ubi ſupra.

(8) Pintianus, Caſtigat. in Pomponium Melam, *pag. m.* 37.

(9) Iſaacus Voſſius in Melam, *pag. m.* 104.

(10) Hic quidem videtur ſenſus eſſe verborum Apollonii quæ recte interpretatus eſt Mela, licet contrarium exiſtiment Pintianus aliique viri magni. *Id. ib.*

(11) Locus iſte aliorum caſtellorum veluti caput & primaria regionis arx, fuit: in cujus parte editiſſima rex aulam habebat. Patrius autem hic mos pro lege erat, ut per totam inibi vitam rex ſubſiſtens mandata populis inde diſtribueret. *Diodor. Siculus, lib. xiv, cap. xxxi, pag. m.* 592.

ruined. This is too general, and a more particular account is not unneceſſary. We ſhall ſay therefore that this place was reſtored to the duke of Lorrain by a treaty of peace in 1641; but as this prince did not execute that treaty, cardinal Richelieu had a ſtrong deſire to have taken la Motte away from him: but he did not however ſucceed in it, for the French troops which blocked it up were forced to retire [*B*]. It was not afterwards reſolved in earneſt to reduce it till 1645. Cardinal Mazarin ordered his nephew Magalotti to beſiege it, who attacked it with great vigour, but the place held out the longer becauſe it was believed he would not obſerve the articles of the capitulation he ſhould grant [*C*]. The Marquis de Villeroi, who ſucceeded him in the command of the army, obliged the governor to capitulate: he promiſed among other things that it ſhould be neither raſed nor diſmantled; but this article was not obſerved: the reſentment of the queen-mother prevailed over the obligation of keeping his word [*D*].

'it otherwiſe might have done, being the ſtrongeſt 'place in all Lorrain, both for it's ſituation on a 'rock, which made the approaches very difficult, and 'for it's not being commanded by eminences on any 'ſide. It was ſurrendered however at the end of three 'months, after Mr d'Iche, the governor who defended 'it, was taken off by a cannon ball (1).'

(1) Memoirs of the marquis de Beauvau, *pag.* 55.

[*B*] *The French troops which blocked it up, were forced to retire.*] 'The king's forces being employed 'in ſeveral places againſt Spain, all that Mr du 'Hallier could do with the few troops left with him, 'was to form a ſort of blockade, in hopes to ſtarve it, 'knowing it was not well ſupplied with proviſions: 'but the duke did not give him time enough, for ap'prehending the extremities of the beſieged, he raiſed 'the ſiege of Tanes which he had attacked, to come to 'its relief, and forced Mr du Hallier, after ſome ſkir'miſhes to retire with the loſs of his baggage, hav'ing before ſent his cannon to Chaumont for greater 'ſecurity (2).'

(2) Ib. *pag.* 79.

[*C*] *It was believed that Magalotti, would not obſerve the capitulation he ſhould grant.*] Here follows the reaſon the marquis de Beauvau gives for it. *Magalotti having made himſelf maſter of the counterſcarp, luckily found ſo many veins in the rock that he was very ſoon able to ſpring a mine, under one of the baſtions, but his good fortune did not laſt long; for having reduced the beſieged, either to ſtand an aſſault or to capitulate; Clicot, that his honour might be irreproachable, tho' he ſaw himſelf without any probability of ſuccours, and apprehending alſo that Magalotti would not obſerve any capitulation he might grant, as he had ſworn he would not in a rage he had been in on account of the ſevere reflexions thrown out during the ſiege againſt the queen-mother, the cardinal, and himſelf, reſolved to defend himſelf to the laſt extremity* (3).

(3) Ib. *pag.* 85.

[*D*] *The reſentment of the queen-mother prevailed over the obligation of keeping his word.*] We now come to ſee what was the cauſe of this princeſs's indignation, and what alſo were it's conſequences. 'The capitu'lation was exactly obſerved as to the garriſon and 'effects of the duke; but the fortifications, and the 'whole town, not excepting even the church, were ſo 'intirely raſed that there is not now the leaſt mark 'of them remaining: the queen-mother having ſo 'deeply reſented the ſcandalous reflexions thrown out 'againſt her, that ſhe rather choſe to forfeit her word 'than loſe her revenge. . . . . Behold the end of 'la Mothe, which, for ſituation, and the ſtrength of 'it's ramparts cut out of a rock, ſeemed impregnable, 'and the materials of this unfortunate place, as a ſort 'of juſt ſatisfaction for the damages it had done the 'neighbouring villages, by incurſions and robberies, 'were made uſe of for their reparation (4).'

(4) Ib. *pag.* 87.

The marquis de Beauvau juſtly blames this reſentment of the queen-mother. *It is ſurprizing*, ſays he (5), *that ſo great and virtuous a princeſs, who had been always ſo eminently religious, and naturally generous, ſhould be ſo little able to bear abuſes, ſo common to the inſolence of ſoldiers, which are never capable of wounding reputation: and that to revenge herſelf for an injury more imaginary than real, ſhe ſhould chooſe to run the hazard of blaſting her honour by a breach of faith, and of ruining a great many innocent perſons by the deſtruction of a whole town, the ruins of which can never be ſo far concealed from poſterity, as to bury this action in oblivion.* Her majeſty had much better have deſpiſed thoſe reflexions of the ſoldiers, and have imitated Catherine de Medicis (6). But if to make an example of them, ſhe was reſolved by all means to puniſh this place which had given way to this exceſs of rage and brutality, ſhe ſhould not have admitted it to capitulate, ſhe ſhould have taken it by ſtorm, or obliged it to ſurrender at diſcretion, coſt what it would; and then, without breach of public faith, ſhe had been at liberty to have taken the vengeance ſhe deſired.

(5) Ibid.

(6) *See the* Diſſertation on defamatory libels, *num. xiii, at the end of this* Dictionary.

MOTTE-AIGRON (JAMES DE LA) became famous in the quality of an author during the famous conteſt betwixt Balzac, and Father Goulu, general of the Feuillant Monks. He wrote a preface to Balzac's Letters, and was commiſſioned, jointly with Mr Vaugelas [*A*], to carry to Father Goulu a copy of Balzac's Apology, in which he treated a certain young Feuillant very harſhly. As Father Goulu took the ſending of this copy for a challenge (*a*), he immediately ſet himſelf to write againſt Balzac in a very outrageous manner, and ſpent ſome of his ſmall ſhot upon Mr Motte-Aigron; among others theſe following, that *he was the ſon of a very honeſt Apothecary, and that he commonly lived at Balzac's table* (*b*). It is pretended, that this was in ſome meaſure violating the laws of Hoſpitality, ſince Father Goulu had more than once lodged at Mr Motte-Aigron's father's (*c*): but, on the other ſide, it may be a proof, that he knew things from the firſt hand. Be that as it will, he touched his adverſary to the quick, and occaſioned the public to be informed ſoon after, in the dedication of a book, that the pretended Apothecary of Father Goulu was Abraham Aigron, Eſq; counſellor to the king, and judge of the taxes for Angoulême. This epiſtle dedicatory is not ill written (*d*); but being in Latin, and prefixed to the anſwer which Motte-Aigron wrote in French to Father Goulu, there is an affectation in it which only ſerves to beget a diſlike of the grand elogiums which the author very liberally beſtows on his father, and which he turns in ſuch a manner, as might moſt effectually remove all ſuſpicion of Pharmacy. Not ſatisfied with this preamble, he informs us in the body of the book (*e*), that his *great-grandfather having accompanied*

(*a*) Preface to the ſecond part of the *Lettres de Phyllarque, and the firſt letter of the ſecond part.*

(*b*) Lettre XIII de Phyllarque, *Part i.*

(*c*) La Motte-Aigron, Réponſe à Phyllarque, *pag.* 318, 322. *See the article* GOULU (JOHN), remark [*N*].

(*d*) See among the letters of Balzac, that which he wrote in 1622 to la Motte-Aigron, where he compliments him highly, eſpecially on his fine Latin, in a manuſcript work.

(*e*) *Pag.* 306, 307.

[*A*] *Jointly with Mr Vaugelas.*] Father Goulu in the preface to the ſecond part of his Letters, ſays, that he who accompanied Motte-Aigron was the prior of Chives; (there are ſome letters to this prior among thoſe of Balzac) but Motte-Aigron informs us (1), that he who went with him to viſit Father Goulu was Mr Vaugelas.

(1) Réponſe à Phyllarque, 299.

[*B*] *Malleville*

accompanied Henry II, in his expedition to Germany, was one of the chief captains which the king left in Mets, and one of thoſe who defended that place with the greateſt bravery againſt Charles V. He adds, that his great-grandmother, Catherine de la Barde, was *of as noble a family as any in her country, and that his great-uncle by the mother's ſide, had the honour to be ſecretary of ſtate, and prime miniſter to Margaret wife of Henry d'Albret king of Navarre.* Father Goulu had already changed his note, for before the publiſhing of this book he had ſaid, *that Mr* La Motte-Aigron *was too much a gentleman to deny,* &c *(f).* Let who will conſider whether this amounts to a full recantation. I do not think it is. And I have been told it was true, that the father of Mr Motte-Aigron had been an Apothecary, but mended his condition by buying the place of a commiſſioner of the taxes, and at laſt became mayor of Coignac in Angoumois. Mr Malleville has given a hint of this in an epigram which was not inſerted in the collection of his poems [*B*]. I never could diſcover what became of our author [*C*], after the publiſhing his anſwer in 1628, or what became of the deſign he ſeemed to have, after he had humbled the general of the Feuillants, of retrieving the fruits of his labours which a fire had deſtroyed. Theſe were pieces relating to the Hiſtory of Spain, and ſome other ſubjects *(g).* It belongs to thoſe who ſhall write the Bibliotheque of Angoumois, to inform us of them.

I ſaw ſome days ago a book, which affirms that the pains Motte-Aigron took in writing aginſt Phyllarchus, and in favour of Balzac, laid the foundation of a miſunderſtanding between him and the latter; becauſe Balzac would fain have been thought the true author of the work which was to appear under the name of Motte-Aigron [*D*].

[*B*] *Malleville . . . . in an epigram which was not inſerted in the collection of his poems.*] Sorel having obſerved, that Motte-Aigron *to ſhow the intelligent reader where he was pinched, and to create a great opinion of his family, dedicated his book to his father in a Latin epiſtle with very high titles,* adds theſe words: *If it were proper in this place, we ſhould ſet down the epigram Mr Malleville made upon that occaſion; but certain perſons in office in France being concerned in it, it would look like inſulting their misfortunes at the preſent juncture* (2). As for me who know not what this juncture might mean, and am ſatisfied, however, that it muſt be by this time entirely over, I ſhall make no ſcruple to ſet down that epigram, which is as follows:

Objet du mepris de Goulu,
Que ton inſolence eſt publique,
Depuis que ton pere eſt Elu,
Et qu'il a fermé ſa boutique:
Mais bien que cette qualité,
Si l'on en croit ta vanité,
N'en trouve point qui la ſeconde;
Il n'en eſt pourtant pas ainſi:
C'eſt un beau titre en l' autre monde;
Mais on s'en moque en celui-ci.

In vain you thus publiſh, to humour your pride,
And to claim Father Goulu's reſpect,
That your Sire, all his gallipots laying aſide,
Is preferr'd to be one of th' * *elect:*
For as high as you value the name of this place,
It will ſcarce your gentility ſhow;
We allow it in Heaven a title of Grace,
But no title of honour below.

Since the writing of this article, I have happened on a book (3) where theſe Verſes are to be found.

[*C*] *I never could diſcover what became of our author.*] I only find by a letter of Balzac, dated July 29, 1634 (4), that Motte-Aigron was married at Rochelle, that he had ſome place in the government, and that there had been ſome quarrel between them two. The Menagiana (5) informs us, that he was a counſellor in the preſidial court of Rochelle.

[*D*] *Balzac would fain have been thought the true author of the work, which was to appear under the name of Motte-Aigron.*] You will ſee the particulars of all this in theſe words of Javerſac (6): 'This does not hinder my being ſenſible how highly he has offended me by his requeſt, and manner of proceeding: which however, I thought, the leſs ſtrange, after conſidering in what manner he had treated Mr Motte-Aigron, who has always followed his fortunes with the fondneſs of a brother. The obligation of a thouſand good offices, which his amiable frankneſs had rendred him, from the firſt beginning of their innocent acquaintance, to this preſent hour, were not ſo conſiderable with him as his own vanity. After they had communicated to one another their deſign of writing againſt Phyllarchus, and Balzac had taken to himſelf the largeſt field and moſt matter, as being the more barren of invention, as well as more intereſted than the other; he was not ſatisfied with having above a year's time and liberty to advance his work, while his friend was all that while forced to attend his judges, on account of an arreſt which has proved very honourable to him. He would needs for ſeveral reaſons ſuppreſs a book, which, after this ſuit was over, his friend had leiſure enough to ſend to the preſs. He does well, in order to monopolize the title of Eloquent, to hinder all others from writing, that in order to be a Nonſuch, there may be no others with whom to compare him. I believe he would be for going as far as that crafty Maſter Poet who put to death the moſt ingenious of his ſcholars, for fear they ſhould excel him in his art. He is ſo jealous of the reputation, even of his friends, that he never would rightly confeſs, that Mr Motte-Aigron wrote the preface to his Letters he being unwilling to admit any partner in glory: and even at this day I am certain, that, by an ungrateful and vain impoſture, he endeavours obliquely to inſinuate, that the book which is now expected, has only its name from Mr Motte-Aigron as godfather, but that he himſelf is the true father. Which I know to be ſo much the more falſe, as I know it to be moſt true that Mr Motte-Aigron has broke off all correſpondence with Mr Balzac, and rejoices in being diſobliged by him, to have a juſt reaſon to ſhun him, and grow wiſe at the coſt of his Apologiſt (7), whoſe reputation he has blaſted, which was eſteemed much greater than his own.' Mr Motte-Aigron's preface may ſerve for ſome proof of this account; thus he begins it: *The intelligence I receive from ſeveral hands, that though this book is not extraordinary, yet ſome would aſſign it another maſter according to their fancy, obliges me to inform you, that this adventure is wholly my own, and there is nothing here of a Roger who fights under the arms of Leo. Though I cannot indeed ſufficiently commend the complaiſance of thoſe who ſuffer children to be fathered upon them, and am even raviſhed with their good nature; yet I do not find I have generoſity enough to be of their opinion, nor can I endure that any one ſhould make books for me. I cannot ſo far command my fancy, as to perſuade my ſelf, that a work of this kind is really mine; nor ſhould I make more conſcience of taking another man's goods, than of receiving benefits of this nature* (8). The concluſion of this preface is of the ſame ſtrain with the beginning, for it contains what follows: *But to return to what concerns me, although it be very true, that I have not led my life, in ſuch a manner as to be without friends, and among them, even ſome who underſtand the art of writing, yet be it known to you, that as to what concerns the compoſing this work, they are as much ſtrangers to me, as they who live in the furthermoſt parts of the world; or, as thoſe were formerly who paſſed in the opinion of ſome for the authors of the preface* (9), *which I have ordered to be reprinted at the end*

(f) Preface to the ſecond part of the *Lettres de Phyllarque.*

(g) See his Epiſtle Dedicatory.

(2) Bibliotheque Françoiſe, *pag.* 132, *of the ſecond Edit.*

* The French word *Elu, elect,* ſignifies an officer of taxes.

(3) Menagiana, *pag.* 132, *of the firſt Dutch Edit.*

(4) It is the xxxixth of the ſixth book, edition in folio.

(5) *Pag.* 131.

(6) Javerſac, Diſcours d'Ariſtarque à Calidoxe, *pag.* 158, & *ſeq.*

(7) See the remark [*D*] of the article BALZAC.

(8) La Motte-Aigron, *advertiſement to the readers, in his* Réponſe à Phyllarque. *See the remark* [*D*] *of the article* BALZAC.

(9) That is to ſay, the preface to Balzac's Letters.

end of this diſcourſe. This is ſpoke like a man of honour: none but the meaneſt ſpirited creatures would paſs for the authors of a book they never had wrote. It is a fine excuſe indeed, to ſay their love of praiſe is ſo ardent, that when they cannot procure it by iſſue of their own, they are for attaining it by adopting that of others; when this love of praiſe itſelf, is a ſure ſign of a mean ſpirit. The Cuſtodinos of a biſhopric have leſs of the poltron than the Cuſtodinos of a book. Theſe latter are guilty of wilful cuckoldom; let them ſay as much as they pleaſe, that it is only a cuckoldom in the commonwealth of wit, it is nevertheleſs a blot, it is a ſhameful thing.

MOUGNE (Roberta) publiſhed in 1616 (*a*) a book intituled, *The Cloſet of a Chriſtian widow, containing prayers and meditations upon divers ſubjects of the holy Scripture*, and dedicated it *to the moſt prudent and virtuous lady Benigne de Rabutin, baroneſs of Huban, lady of Eſpeville and Brinon.* She informs us in the epiſtle dedicatory, dated at Blois July the ſeventh 1615, that ſhe had been a *widow twenty ſix years.* After this epiſtle we find a ſonnet *to Madamoiſelle du Cheſne Belon my mother, upon her Cloſet of a Chriſtian widow.* Nicolas Vignier, a miniſter of the Holy Goſpel, is author of this ſonnet, and informs us, that *the immortal pen* of the huſband of our *Mougne deſcribes in his learned writings the virtues of that woman.* She was of the reformed religion, and ſhows in her book a judicious piety, nurſed at the breaſt of the word of God. The lady Rabutin, whom ſhe calls *a rare patron of piety, chaſtity, and charity, and a pattern to all Chriſtian widows*, was alſo of the reformed religion.

(*a*) At Paris by Antony Joallin, in 16mo, with the king's licence.

MOULIN (Peter du) one of the moſt famous miniſters that the Proteſtants of France ever had, was born. . . . .

. . . .

It is to be obſerved that he did not believe the ſtory of Pope Joan [*A*].

[*A*] *He did not believe the ſtory of Pope Joan.*] Sarravius tells us ſo in a paſſage which I have given elſewhere (1), and which contains an argument drawn from hence, that Mr du Moulin, who was a perſon ſo fit to rally, had never made mention of the She-pope, tho it was a ſubject that might have furniſhed him with matter enough for raillery. I ſhall bring another proof. The Jeſuit Petra Sancta publiſhed, in 1634, ſome notes upon a letter of du Moulin to Balzac, and added to it the refutation of ſome things, which this Miniſter had ſaid touching the ceremonial of Rome with regard to the Pope's inauguration. He had not forgot to mention the cloſe-ſtool. The Jeſuit took this opportunity of refuting, in a few words, the ſtory of the She-pope. Du Moulin made a reply to him (2), and beſtowed a whole chapter (3) in juſtifying, what he had affirmed concerning the ceremonies of the Popes inauguration; but ſaid not a word, either of the cloſe-ſtool, or of the She-pope. This evidently proves that he believed nothing of the matter; for had he believed it, he could not poſſibly avoid diſputing on this occaſion. Rivertus a partiſan of the tradition of the She-pope, did not forget to have a puſh in anſwering this ſame piece of Petra Sancta (4).

(1) In the remark [*L*] of the article BLONDEL (David), towards the end.

(2) *His book is intituled,* Hyperaſpiſtes ſive Defenſor veritatis adverſus calumnias, &c. *it is printed at Geneva* 1636, *in* 8vo.

(3) It is the twenty ſecond, of the firſt book.

(4) See the third tome of his works, *pag.* 587.

MUCIA, the wife of Pompey, was the third daughter of Quintus Mutius Scevola (*a*), and the ſiſter of Quintus Metellus Celer [*A*]. She committed adultery with ſo little reſerve, that her huſband was forced to diſmiſs her, although ſhe had brought him three children (*b*). It was while he was gaining ſo much glory in the war againſt Mithridates, that Mucia proſtituted her ſelf. When he firſt heared this ill news, he was not much moved at it; but as he came nearer Italy, he conſidered more ſeriouſly the conſequence of this diſhonour, and was ſo touched with it, that he ſent his wife a bill of divorce (*c*). It has been obſerved that providence intended this as a counterpoiſe to the glory he had juſt acquired [*B*]. He complained of Julius Ceſar as the corrupter of Mucia [*C*], and

(*a*) Aſconius Pedianus, in Argum. Orat. Ciceronis pro Scauro, *pag. m.* 170.

(*b*) See the words of Suetonius in the remark [*C*].

(*c*) Plut. in Pompeio, *pag.* 641.

[*A*] *She was the ſiſter of Quintus Metellus Celer.*] Cicero informs us of this in a letter he wrote to Metellus. 'Egi cum Claudia, *ſays he* (1), uxore tua, & 'cum veſtra ſorore Mucia, cujus erga me ſtudium pro 'Cn. Pompeii neceſſitudine multus in rebus perſpexe'ram, ut eum (2) ab illa injuria deterrerent. - - - - - '*I made intereſt with Claudia your wife, and with your 'ſiſter Mucia, whoſe regard for me on the ſcore of my 'friendſhip with Pompey, I had on many occaſions ex'perienced, in hopes that they might have diverted him 'from this injuſtice.* This paſſage ſhows, that Q. Metellus Celer, and Q. Metellus Nepos were brothers to Mucia, that is according to Manutius (3), either her couſin-germans, or her brothers by the mother's ſide. The laſt opinion ſeems to me moſt probable. I believe the mother of Mucia married Quintus Mutius Scevola, after having had by Quintus Metellus Nepos the two brothers I have been mentioning. See, below, a paſſage of Dion.

[*B*] *It has been obſerved, that Providence intended this as a counterpoiſe to the glory Pompey had juſt acquired.*] Plutarch has made this obſervation, *So certainly did he expect*, ſays he (4), ſpeaking of Pompey, *to have been honoured at his return into Italy, the moſt of any man in the world, and to have been welcomed home by his wife and children, with all imaginable duty: but God, who always chuſes to checquer the greateſt and moſt remarkable inſtances of good fortune, with ſome mixture of ill, laid wait for him by the way, and in his own family formed an ambuſcade of ſorrow to greet his return; for his wife Mucia, during his abſence had diſhonoured his bed: however, whilſt he was at a great diſtance, he gave little heed to the report; but when he drew nearer to Italy, and had by that means, I imagine, more lieſure to deliberate on this ill news, he then ſent a declaration to her, that he renounced and repudiated her as his wife, without writing at the ſame time, or ever afterwards ſpeaking a ſyllable of the reaſon of his ſo doing it; but the cauſe is mentioned in Cicero's Epiſtles.* Hence we learn, that Plutarch's memory was rather great than faithful. He remembered that Cicero had writ ſomething about the divorce of Mucia, and that not without commending Pompey's conduct. Upon the credit of his memory, and without ever conſulting Cicero's Letters, he affirmed, that they contained the cauſes of this divorce: but there he was miſtaken, and if we had all the authors he has cited, we ſhould find him very often guilty of the like faults. All that Cicero ſays is this: *Divortium Muciæ vehementér probatur* (5) - - - - - *Divorcing Mucia is highly to be commended,* This is in a letter written in the year of Pompey's triumph; that is in the year of Rome 692.

[*C*] *He complained of Julius Cæſar as the debaucher of Mucia.*] Suetonius having named ſeveral ladies Cæſar had loved, ends with Mucia and expreſſes himſelf thus: 'Etiam Cn. Pompeji Muciam. Nam certè 'Pompejo & à Curionibus patre & filio, & à mul'tis exprobratum eſt quòd cujus cauſſa poſt tres liberos 'exe-

(1) Cicero, Epiſt. ii, *lib. v*, ad Famil. *pag.* 229, 230.

(2) That is to ſay, Quintus Metellus Nepos, brother of him to whom Cicero writes.

(3) Manutius, in Cicero, Epiſt. ii, *lib. v*, ad Famil.

(4) Plutarch in the Life of Pompey, *pag.* 641.

(5) Cicero, Epiſt. xii, *lib. i*, ad Atticum, *pag.* 67.

and was wont, not without ſighing to call him his Ægyſthus, in alluſion to the galant of Clytemneſtra, the wife of Agamemnon; and yet for all this he joined with him ſome time after. The views of his ambition obliterated ſo juſt a reſentment [*D*]. This occaſioned him ſome ſevere reflexions (*d*). Mucia quickly found another huſband; ſhe became the wife of Marcus Scaurus, and had children by him. Pompey was a little diſguſted at this new huſband: he took it ill that any one ſhould pay ſo little reſpect to his judgment [*E*]. Auguſtus made uſe of this Mucia, to prevail upon Sextus Pompeius, her ſon, not to join with Marc Antony againſt him, but rather with him againſt Marc Antony (*e*). No doubt he had a very great regard for her, ſince after the battle of Actium he gave Marcus Scaurus, this lady's ſon, his life (*f*), and uſed him with all this clemency purely on Mucia's account. This ſhows us that moſt great lords in all ages have looked upon cuckoldom as a diſgrace only among citizens, and that the ladies who have only loſt their good name, have met with little loſs in reſpect to their fortune and intereſt. I ſhall obſerve by the way that Pompey was not happy in his marriages. [*F*].

exegiſſet uxorem, & quem gemens Ægyſthum appellare conſueſſet, ejus poſtea filiam potentiæ cupiditate in matrimonium recipiſſet. - - - - *Alſo Mucia the wife of Pompey. For it is certain Pompey was upbraided both by the Curio's, father and ſon, and many others, for taking to wife, out of thirſt of power, the daughter of him, on whoſe account he had divorced a former, after bringing him three children, and whom he, ſighing, uſed to call his Ægyſthus.*'

[*D*] *The views of his ambition obliterated ſo juſt a reſentment.*] Men of the greateſt courage act upon ſeveral occaſions like the greateſt cowards. They forget the moſt ſtinging reproaches, provided their ambitious deſigns may find their account in a reconciliation. Pompey, at his return from the war of Mithridates, was deſirous of having all his conduct approved, and lands diſtributed to his ſoldiers (6). This ſhewed he had vaſt deſigns in view. He got two perſons choſen conſuls, from whom he expected the greateſt favour: but he was miſtaken; the one, Afranius, was better at dancing than any thing elſe; the other, Metellus Celer, reſenting the divorce of his ſiſter Mucia, oppoſed him in all things and in all places (7). Thus Pompey obtaining nothing, and finding his credit declining, formed a league with Craſſus and Cæſar, which was the curſed ſource of the overthrow of the ſtate. Behold the chain of almoſt all the greateſt revolutions. Trace them to their original, and you find them generally ſpring from adultery. If Mucia had been chaſt Cæſar had not lain with her, nor had Pompey divorced her: if he had not divorced her, Metellus Celer had continued his friend, if he had been his friend, Pompey would never have formed an aſſociation with Craſſus and Cæſar; a fatal aſſociation! as Cato wiſely foretold (8). New marriages were projected the better to cement the league. Cæſar who had promiſed his daughter to Servilius Cepio, broke his word, and gave her to Pompey, and fed Servilius with hopes of Pompey's daughter, although ſhe was deſigned for the ſon of Sylla . . . Piſo's daughter was married to Cæſar, which procured Piſo the conſulſhip. Then it was that Cato could not refrain exclaiming againſt this ſort of pimping, this baſe traffic of dignities, bought by marriages. Ἐνταῦθα δὴ καὶ σφόδρα μαρτυρομένου Κάτωνος, καὶ βοῶντος, οὐκ ἀνεκτὸν εἶναι, γάμοις. διαμαστροπευομένης τῆς ἡγεμονίας, καὶ διὰ γυναίων εἰς ἐπαρχίας καὶ στρατεύματα καὶ δυνάμεις ἀλλήλους ἀντεισαγόντων. *Quo tempore palàm teſtatus eſt Cato, clamavitque rem indignam eſſe, ut addiceretur nuptiarum lenociniis imperium, ac per mulieres mutuo ſe ad provincias, imperia, exercitus proveherent* (9).

[*E*] *Pompey took it ill that any one ſhould pay ſo little reſpect to his judgment.*] He made Scaurus feel the effects of his indignation when he was accuſed of extortion in the year of Rome 699 (10). Scaurus had a great confidence in Pompey's good offices (11). He had a ſon who was brother by the mother's ſide to Pompey's ſons; this was the foundation of his hope. But he was deceived, for Pompey did him no ſervice at all. He did not ſo much regard the relation of conſanguinity between his ſons, and thoſe of the perſon accuſed, as the affront put upon him by Scaurus's expreſſing a great eſteem for a woman he had diſgraced. I ſay nothing here but what I have read in an antient Writer, and what is probable enough. 'In eo judicio neque Pompejus propenſum adjutorium præbuit, (videbatur enim apud animum ejus non minus offenſionis contraxiſſe, quod judicium ejus in Mutiam crimine impudicitiæ ab eo dimiſſam, levius feciſſe exiſtimaretur, cum eam ipſe probaſſet, quam gratiæ acquiſiſſe neceſſitudinis jure, quod ex eadem uterque liberos haberet) neque Cato ab æquitate ea, qua & vitam ejus, & magiſtratum illum decebat, quoquam deflexit (12). - - - - *In that judgment neither did Pompey ſhew any partial favour (for with him Scaurus ſeemed to have become rather an object of diſpleaſure, by paying ſo little regard to his divorcement of Mucia for adultery as to eſteem her a proper wife, than of favour by the ties of relation, from their having each of them children by the ſame woman) nor did Cato deviate in the leaſt from that equity which had adorned his whole life, and ſo well became his office.*

[*F*] *Pompey was not very happy in his marriages.*] He had five wives. The firſt was called Antiſtia. He divorced her much againſt his will, to comply with Sylla the dictator, who would have him marry Æmilia the daughter of Scaurus and of Metella, who was then the wife of Sylla. Æmilia was married to another, and big with child: for which reaſon Pompey took her to wife in pure obedience to the imperious will of the dictator. He did not in his own mind approve the forcing away Æmilia big with child from her own huſband, and the obliging him ſo cruelly and infamouſly to divorce Antiſtia (13), whoſe father had been killed only on ſuſpicion of his favouring the party of Sylla for the ſake of Pompey. The mother of Antiſtia killed herſelf upon hearing the tragical end of her huſband. Pompey did not live long with Æmilia, for ſhe died in her lying in of that child, which ſhe was big of when ſhe married Pompey (14). He afterwards married Mucia, and after her divorce, Julia, the daughter of Cæſar, who was to have been married to Cepio in a few days (15). Whether he really loved, or was tenderly beloved by her, he never would ſtir from her: he amuſed himſelf in carrying her about from place to place, and ſhowing her the fineſt ſeats in Italy, without concerning himſelf in buſineſs. Ταχὺ μέντοι καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαλάσσετο τῷ τῆς κόρης ἔρωτι καὶ προσεῖχεν ἐκείνῃ τὰ πολλὰ καὶ συνδιημέρευεν ἐν ἀγροῖς καὶ κήποις, ἠμέλει δὲ τῶν κατ᾽ ἀγορὰν πραττομένων. *Brevi tamen ipſe quoque uxoris juvenculæ emollitus eſt amore, ac ferè aſſiduus cum ea ruri, & in hortis egit. Poſtmiſit etiam negotia forenſia* (16). This effeminate life did him hurt, and expoſed him to calumny. But it did not laſt long. One day, at an aſſembly of the people, a murder happened to be committed near him, and ſome of the blood having ſtained the cloaths he had on, he was obliged to put on others. Julia happening to ſee them all bloody in the hands of his ſervants, was ſo affected, that ſhe fell into a ſwoon, and miſcarried. Some time after ſhe was big with child again, and died in child-birth of a daughter (17), which lived but a few days (18). At laſt he married Cornelia; and tho' ſhe was a perſon of great merit, he had the mortification to hear, that this marriage was much condemned. The following quotation from Plutarch, is very curious: 'No ſooner did Pompey return into the city, but he married Cornelia the daughter of Metellus Scipio, not a virgin, but the new fallen widow of Publius Craſſus the ſon, who was killed by the Parthians, and who was her firſt huſband. This lady had a great many charms to make her beloved, beſides thoſe of her beauty, for ſhe was finely accompliſhed in letters, played well upon the lyre, was ſkilled in Geometry, and took great pleaſure in hearing diſcourſes of Philoſophy, not without great benefit and improvement: but what is above all, nothing of this made her vain or aſſuming, as young ladies commonly are with ſuch

(*d*) See the remark [*C*].

(*e*) Dio, *lib. xlviii, pag. m.* 418, *ad ann.* 714.

(*f*) Id. *lib. li*, *pag.* 508.

(6) Dio, ubi infra.

(7) Μέτελλος δὲ ὀργῇ ὅτι τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ, καίτοι παῖδας ἐξ αὐτῆς ἔχων, ἀπεπεμπετο, καὶ πάνυ πρὸς πάντα ἀντέπραξεν. Metellus vero Pompejo iratus qui ejus ſorori, ſuſceptis etiam ex ea liberis nuntium remiſiſſet, in omnibus ei actionibus obſtitit. *Dio*, *lib. xxxvii*, *pag.* 58, *ad ann.* 693.

(8) Plutarch. in Cæſare, *pag.* 713. *See alſo in* Pompeio, *pag.* 644.

(9) Id. ib. *pag.* 714. *A.*

(10) Aſconius Pedianus, in Argum. Orat. Cicer. pro Scauro, *pag.* 168.

(11) Id. ib. *pag.* 170.

(12) Id. ib.

(13) Ἐξελαυνομένης τῆς Ἀντιστίας ἀτίμως καὶ οἰκτηρῶς. Expellitur Antiſtia ignominioſe miſereque. *Plut. in Pompeio*, *pag.* 613. *B.*

(14) Taken from Plutarch, ibid.

(15) Plut. ibid. *pag.* 644.

(16) Id. ib. *pag.* 647. *B*, and *pag.* 644. *F.*

(17) Ex. Plut. ibid. *pag.* 647.

(18) Id. in Cæſare, *pag.* 719. *C.*

‘ parts and qualifications. Beſides, ſhe was the daughter of one who was unexceptionable both for the nobility of his family, and integrity of his life: yet this marriage was condemned by ſome as unequal in years; for Cornelia was young enough to have made a properer wife for Pompey's ſon: and the wiſer ſort thought this a neglect of the public, at a time of ſuch great confuſions; for the remedy of which he was applied to as the Phyſician, and the whole is put under his ſole protection; and yet he entertained himſelf with celebrating nuptials and feſtivals, when he ought rather to have conſidered his conſulſhip as a public calamity, which would never have been conferred on him ſingly in ſo extraordinary a manner, contrary to cuſtom and the laws, had his country been in a flouriſhing ſtate (19).’ This illuſtrious lady repented ſhe did not execute the reſolution ſhe had taken to kill herſelf upon the loſs of her firſt huſband (20). She repented, I ſay, when ſhe ſaw Pompey in a wretched condition on the coaſt of Mitylene, after the battle of Pharſalia. She had been left in this city during the war, and there received ſuch good news of the battle of Dyrrachium (21), that ſhe thought it deciſive, and expected to hear of nothing after but her huſband's purſuing Cæſar. The loſſes of the enemy were magnified to flatter and pleaſe her according to cuſtom. Judge of her affliction, when ſhe ſaw her huſband flying for refuge to the iſle of Leſbos in a borrowed ſhip (22). She was his faithful companion in his flight, even to Egypt (23), and having collected his aſhes, ſhe buried them on mount Albanus (24). But this fidelity proved accidentally to be his deſtruction; for if ſhe had not accompanied him, he had fled into Parthia, and not into Egypt, where he was murdered. It is affirmed, that the only thing which made him change his deſign of going towards the Euphrates, was the fear of diſhonour to which the beauty and youth of Cornelia might expoſe her among a laſcivious people. He was ſo nice upon this head, that he could not bear even the moſt groundleſs ſurmiſe. This ſhows that he was not over happy in his laſt marriage, and that a young and beautiful wife is not at all convenient for a traveller (25). Be that as it will, the following paſſage of Plutarch will not be diſagreeable. *Theophanes the Leſbian thought it madneſs to ſlight Egypt, which was not above three days ſailing .... and to throw himſelf into the hands of the Parthians, and .... to expoſe a young lady, deſcended from the noble family of the Scipio's, among ſuch a barbarous people, who meaſure their power and greatneſs only by the liberty of committing all the villanies and injuries they pleaſe: for ſuppoſing ſhe ſhould not ſuffer any diſhonour, yet the very thought of the poſſibility of ſuch a thing, by being in the hands of thoſe who had the power to do it, is no ſmall indignity. This argument alone is ſaid to have been ſo perſuaſive, as to divert his courſe, which was deſigned for the Euphrates, if it may be allowed, that any reaſoning, and not his ill fate, led him to take the courſe which he followed* (26).

I know not to which of theſe five wives of Pompey, what we read in Suetonius ought to be applied. A very learned Grammarian had for his patrons Pompey and Caius Memmius. He carried a love-letter from Memmius to Pompey's wife. The lady gave it her huſband, who forbad him his houſe (27). All things rightly conſidered, this ought not to be taken for good fortune in marriage, but rather for a misfortune. It is a trouble to be betrayed by a learned man, for whom we have a kindneſs; to be betrayed, I ſay, by a ſtudious man, and a man of learning of his own family. It is far from agreeable to think, that ſuch a man as Caius Memmius ſhould endeavour to debauch your wife, and write her a *billet-doux*, to propoſe an aſſignation. It is agreeable enough, that, inſtead of giving him a meeting, ſhe ſhows her huſband the letter, and names the bearer; but after all, it were better no ſuch thing ſhould ever happen. The imagination does not ſtop where a man would have it. Who can anſwer that ſuch meſſages have been always, or will always be repulſed after this manner? Who can anſwer, that it ought not here to be ſaid, *Non amo nimium diligentes, too much precaution is a trick*; you diſcover one intrigue that you may conceal others, and cover yourſelf from all ſuſpicion. The imagination, I tell you, is a very rambler, running about on all ſides when once awaked. It is much more to be wiſhed, that it might ſleep on and take it's reſt.

If any ſhould think it ſtrange, that I inſert ſome things here which are foreign to the article of Mucia, I would have them know I do it, that every thing which concerns the marriages of Pompey may be found together. The article of this great man will be ſo long, that I am obliged in prudence to take off ſome parts from it in order to make it leſs prolix. I have already done the ſame thing on the like occaſions.

(19) Id. in Pompeio, *pag.* 648.

(20) Id. ib. *pag.* 659. *A.*

(21) Id. ib. *pag.* 658.

(22) Id. ib. *pag.* 652.

(23) Id. ib. *pag.* 659, *& ſeq.*

(24) Id. ib. *pag.* 662.

(25) See the remark [*G*] of the article SARA.

(26) Id. ib. *pag.* 660.

(27) Curtius Nicia hæſit Cn. Pompeio & Cajo Memmio; ſed quum codicillos Memmii ad Pompei uxorem de ſtupro pertuliſſet, proditus ab ea Pompejum offendit, domoque ei interdictum eſt. *Sueton. de Clar. Gramm. cap. xiv.*

MUNUZA, (*a*), a valiant Mooriſh captain [*A*], and governor of Cerdaigne for the Saracens, who had juſt then conquered Spain in the beginning of the VIIIth century, entered into a ſecret alliance with Eudo duke of Aquitain, to the prejudice of theſe conquerors. He complained that they treated the Moors ill: but beſides this reaſon, which perhaps was only a pretence for covering the treaſon he was meditating, he had another much more powerful. He was paſſionately in love with the princeſs of Aquitain [*B*], and knew very well, that he could not obtain her, but by making her a princeſs

(*a*) Others call him *Munioz*. Roderic de Toledo calls him *Muniz*.

[*A*] *A Mooriſh captain.*] Auguſtin Curio (1) ſpeaks of two Gothic captains, ſubjects of the king of Spain, who favoured the Saracens, one of which was called Mugnuza, and the other Mugnos: the latter lord of Cerdaigne, *Cerdaniæ Regulus*, obtained of the Saracens the government of the neighbouring places; and as he knew the country, and alſo was very cruel, he did much damage to the Spaniards (2), who from the mountains and woods, in which they ſheltered, made incurſions upon the Saracens. Having made ſome complaints, that the treaty made by his mediation with Eudo his father-in-law, was not obſerved; he was beſieged by Abderama; but eſcaped, and was afterwards taken and beheaded: thus, ſays my author (3), did theſe traytors to their country quickly periſh! What contradictions are here in this Hiſtory! Some ſay, that Munuza was a Mahometan Moor, who rebelled againſt his Calif; others, that he was a Spaniard and a Chriſtian, who went over to a party of the Saracens, and continued faithful to them, except as to ſome complaints. Roderic of Toledo (4) ſays, that Muniz, ſon-in-law of Eudo, put ſeveral Chriſtians to death, and burnt the biſhop Anambaldus.

[*B*] *He was in love ... with the princeſs of Aquitain.*] She was the daughter of Eudo: but I confeſs, I do not know her name, altho' I have read in Mezerai (5), that her name was Lampagia, and in another author (6), that ſhe was called Menina, or Numerana (7). What keeps me in ſuſpence as to Lampagia, is, to find that the chronicle of the biſhops of Auxerre (8), gives this name to the daughter of another Eudo, the wife of Aimon, king of Saragoſſa. ‘Contigit eo tempore (*thus ſpeaks this Chronicle*) Pipinum filium prioris Karoli Aquitaniam ex vocatione Eudonis Aquitanorum Ducis adverſus Aimonem Cæſarauguſtæ Regem perrexiſſe, qui Lampagiam ipſius Eudonis filiam in conjugium ſumpſerat, & fœdus conjugii ruperat. - - - *It happened at this time, that Pepin ſon of the former Charles was advanced to Aquitain, by the invitation of Eudo duke of Aquitain, againſt Aimon king of Sarragoſſa, who had married Lampagia the daughter of Eudo, but had broken his marriage-contract.*’ It is very certain, that the author does not mean the father-in-law of Munuza in this paſſage; for beſides, that he died ſome years before Pepin ſucceeded Charles Martel, no perſon has ſaid, that he had ever recourſe to his neighbours, to revenge the injury done his daughter by her huſband. Here then is a Lampagia, who was never the wife of Munuza. However, ſince there are writers (9) who apply to Eudo the father-in-law of Munuza, the words of the Chronicle of Auxerre, and who conſequently make him the father of Lampagia, it is not improbable, that, by the like error, ſome have ſaid, that the daughter which was given to the governor of Cerdaigne, was called Lampagia. So that by this we can diſcover nothing certain concerning the true name of the wife of Munuza.

(1) Hiſtor. Sarracen. *lib. i, pag. m.* 81.

(2) Contra quos exercitum duxit Mugnoces vir immaniſſimus, qui quod regionum & locorum peritus eſſet, magnis eos cladibus afflixit. *Auguſt. Curio, Hiſt. Sarracen. lib. i, pag. m.* 88.

(3) *Lib. ii, pag.* 112.

(4) Hiſt. Arab. *cap. xiii.*

(5) Abrég. Chronol. *Tom. i, pag. m.* 192. *Moreri has copied this fault.*

(6) Audigier, Origine des Françoiſe, *Tom. ii, pag.* 244.

(7) Oihenart, *pag.* 191, *ſays* Momerana.

(8) *See the extracts of it in the firſt tome* Veterum Franciæ Hiſtoricorum, *publiſhed by du Cheſne.*

(9) Oihenart, Notit. Vaſcon. *pag.* 367. Audigier, Orig. des François, *Tom. ii, pag.* 220. *Note, that Audigier, pag.* 240, *ſays very right, that Lampagia was the daughter of Hunaud ſon of Eudo.*

princeſs, and by promiſing to enter into a war againſt the Saracens, in order to prevent their giving Eudo duke of Aquitain any diverſion, while he was attacking Charles Martel. Love therefore was the great principle of the revolt of Munuza. He was the uglieſt man in the world; on the contrary, the daughter of Eudo was a very great beauty. Beſides, he was a Mahometan, whereas the princeſs was a zealous Chriſtian. Yet all could not hinder her being given to him: the ambition of the father prevailed over the averſion of the daughter. Munuza was as good as his word, he took up arms as ſoon as the marriage was concluded; but with ill ſucceſs. Abderama the governor of Spain (*b*) puſhed him ſo briſkly, that he was forced to ſhut himſelf up in Puycerda. Munuza had ſome hopes of holding out here, as Don Pelagius had done in the mountains of Aſturia; but beginning to want water, and finding himſelf odious to the inhabitants, he quitted this poſt, and endeavoured by ways which he thought unknown, to retire with his wife to the duke of Aquitain. He was cloſely purſued, and found his condition ſo wretched, that he fell into deſpair, and threw himſelf headlong from the top of the mountains (*c*), that he might not fall alive into the hands of his enemies. His head was brought to Abderama. His wife was alſo carried to him [*C*]; but Abderama thinking her too beautiful for himſelf, ſent her to the Caliph (*d*). He choſe rather to make this preſent to his ſovereign in favour of his ambition, than to keep her for his own private pleaſures. There is no doubt but he diſcovered the alliance between Munuza and Eudo and that among other motives, he deſigned to chaſtiſe the father in law who had been the promoter of this ſon-in-law's rebellion. Accordingly we find that no one was more alarmed than Eudo at this expedition of Abderama, and that no one ſuffered ſo much by it as he, which may ſerve

(*b*) The Caliph Iſcam had given him this government.

(*c*) In 731.

(*d*) *See the* Hiſtory of France by Cordemoi, *Tom. i, pag.* 403.

nuza. Let us now conſider the other names given her. They pretend that ſhe was called Menina, or Numerana (10), and endeavour to prove it from monuments in Biſcay, upon the credit of which Garibai relates that Eudo had a daughter called Menina, or Numerana, who was the wife of Froila king of the Aſturias. To make ſomething of this proof, we muſt ſuppoſe, that the princeſs of Aquitain, with whom the governor of Cerdaigne fell in love, was married a ſecond time to Froila, king of the Aſturias. And this is what they ſuppoſe (11). *She was married twice; the firſt time to Munioz king of Cerdaigne, a Saracen revolted againſt Iſcan Miramolin, who, under the conduct of Abdirama, his lieutenant-general in Spain, and of Froila king of the Aſturias, then in alliance with Miramolin, defeated Munioz, who was left among the dead in the field of battle, in* 737 (12), *and left behind him this beautiful widow in the power of Abdirama, who deſigned her for the ſeraglio of Iſcan . . . . . But king Froila being paſſionately in love with her, Miramolin, very honourably ſent her back to him, and Froila married her . . . . The French and Spaniſh authors have therefore falſly aſſigned two daughters to Eudo; one by the name of Menina, married to Froila, the other by the name of Numerana, married to Munioz; it being certain that this was one and the ſame perſon, who was married ſucceſſively to theſe two kings, whoſe name had ſuffered ſome little variation in the Spaniſh and Mooriſh idioms, but is in reality the ſame perſon.* This ſuppoſition is founded only upon theſe words of Sebaſtian of Salamanca. 'Nuninam quandam adoleſcentulam è 'Waſconum præda ſibi ſervari præcipiens (Froila) 'poſtea eam in regale conjugium copulans (13). . . . '*Froila having given orders to reſerve for himſelf a 'certain young maid taken among the Gaſcon captives, 'afterwards, made her his queen.*' But who does not perceive the weakneſs of this proof? In the firſt place, the wife of a governor of Cerdaigne, a Moor by nation, could not be a part of the booty taken from the Gaſcons. In the ſecond place, the wife of this governor was delivered up to Abderama, who ſent her to his Calif. She was not therefore the Nunina of Sebaſtian of Salamanca; for ſince Froila gave order, that this Nunina ſhould be ſet a part for himſelf, it is plain, that Abderama had not the diſpoſal of her. Nay it is even to be preſumed, that if he had been preſent in the action wherein this Nunina was taken priſoner, Froila could have given no commands as to this part of the booty. In the third place, if theſe words, *Froila commanded, that a certain young maid, who was found among the booty, taken from the Gaſcons, ſhould be kept for himſelf, and afterwards married her,* could be explained after this manner, *Froila became paſſionately in love with the widow of the governor of Cerdania, who was fallen under the power of Abderama, and had been ſent to Miramolin, by whom ſhe was ſent back very honourably, and Froila married her.* If, I ſay, theſe kind of explications were once allowed, there is nothing but what may be found in any words, nor would it be at all difficult to prove black to be white. I do not here aſk, whether it is probable, that any author would deſcribe the daughter of a duke of Aquitain, the widow of a governor of a province, who was become head of a party, and the fineſt princeſs of her time, in the ſtyle of *quandam adoleſcentulam è Waſconum præda, - - - a certain young maid among the Gaſcon priſoners.* I do not aſk this, I ſay, how reaſonable ſoever it may ſeem, for I fear I ſhould be anſwered, that the authors of theſe times wrote in a very ſimple and careleſs manner. I have ſeveral other proofs beſides this againſt the ſuppoſitions of Mr Audigier. For without making much ado, one need only conſider the words immediately preceding thoſe which he cites (14), to demonſtrate the falſhood of his imaginations; 'Vaſcones rebellantes ſuperavit 'atque edomuit, Nuninam quandam adoleſcentulam 'ex Vaſconum præda ſibi ſervari præcipiens, *&c.* - - '*He defeated and reduced the rebellious Gaſcons, commanding Nunina, a certain young maid among the booty 'taken from the Gaſcons, to be reſerved for himſelf,* &c.' It is manifeſt, that this booty was taken, not when the governor of Cerdaigne threw himſelf headlong from the top of the mountains, but when the king of the Aſturias puniſhed the rebellion of ſome of his own ſubjects. Now ſince this king of the Aſturias, as to himſelf, could have no rebellious ſubjects beyond the Pyrenean mountains, it is plain the Gaſcons, whom he overcame, were not under the obedience of Eudo the duke of Aquitain: How then could the daughter of Eudo be a part of the booty? The learned Ambroſius Morales (15) has ſhown, that the Gaſcons mentioned in this paſſage of Sebaſtian of Salamanca, are the inhabitants of Alava, *Alavanſes.* Let us conclude, I. That it is not at all probable, this beautiful widow ever ſaw Europe again, after ſhe ſet foot in the ſeraglio of Calif Iſcam. He would never have cared to part with ſo ſweet a morſel in favour of Froila, whoſe alliance with Miramolin I take to be very doubtful. II. That the daughter of Eudo, wife to Froila, king of Aſturias, mentioned in the monuments of Garibai, is different from her who was married to Munuza. III. That the Nunina whom Froila ordered to be kept for him, and whom he afterwards married, is not the ſame with Menina or Numerana, the daughter of Eudo, who was the wife of Froila, according to the monuments of Garibai. IV. That without giving ourſelves too much trouble to reconcile Garibai and Sebaſtian of Salamanca, it will be beſt to ſay, that one of the two was miſtaken, and in all caſes to prefer the latter before the former. Catel obſerves (16), that *the name* of the daughter of Eudo married to Munios lord of Cerdaigne, is not known.

[*C*] *His wife was alſo carried to Abderama.*] Here are two expreſs paſſages to this purpoſe (17), the firſt of Roderic of Toledo, the ſecond of Iſidorus of Badajos. 'Viri exercitus caput Muniz præcipitio 'jam

(10) Audigier, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 245.

(11) Id. ib.

(12) See the following remark.

(13) Oihenart, Not. Vaſcón, *pag.* 191, *ſays, that in the manuſcript of the college of Navarre at Paris, it is* Muniam, *and in the printed edition* Muniminam.

(14) He has cited the paſſage entire, *pag.* 224.

(15) *Lib. xiii, cap. xvii, & xxv, apud Oihenart. pag.* 192.

(16) Hiſt. du Languedoc, *pag.* 525.

(17) Cited by Audigier, *Tom. ii, pag.* 220. He attributes, at *pag.* 245, to Iſidore of Badajos, what he had attributed to Roderic of Toledo, at *pag.* 220.

ſerve to refute thoſe who accuſe him of having invited the Saracens, as I have elſewhere obſerved (*e*).

'jam colliſum cæde ſecunda detruncant, & cum filia Eudonis regi ſuo læti præſentant. Abdiramen autem de rebellis interitu jucundatus, ejus uxorem, cum eſſet pulcherrima, ſummo regi trans maria honorificè deſtinavit. . . . . *Muniz being dead by throwing himſelf down headlong, the ſoldiers of the army, as it were killing him over again, cut his head off from his body, and joyfully preſented it, together with the daughter of Eudo, to their king. But Abdiramus being ſufficiently pleaſed with the death of that rebel, honourably appointed the wife, as ſhe was ſo perfect a beauty, to be carried over ſea as a preſent to the great Caliph.*' Let us now hear Iſidorus of Badajos; 'Cujus caput ubi eum jacentem repererunt trucidant, & regi una cum filia Eudonis memorati ducis præſentant, quam ille maria tranſvectans ſublimi principi procurat honorificè deſtinandam. - - - - *Whoſe head, finding him lying dead, they cut off, and preſented it to their king, together with the daughter of Eudo, the before mentioned duke, whom he carrying over ſea, procured to be delivered as an honourable preſent to his ſublime ſovereign.*' By this it appears, that Mr Audigier is miſtaken when he ſays, that Munioz *remained among the dead in the field of battle in* 737: For firſt the death of this governor preceded the expedition of Abderama, and therefore happened before the year 732. And ſecondly, this governor was not killed in a battle; for he was making his eſcape by ways unknown, and finding himſelf purſued, and reſolving not to fall alive into the hands of the Saracens, he threw himſelf head-long from the top of a rock. Mezerai is miſtaken, when he ſays, that Abderama took Munuza priſoner in Cerdania (18).

MUSAC, a gentleman of Burgundy, compoſed an academical conference, which was printed at Paris in 1629. It is divided into three parts, and contains 334 pages in 8vo. I ſhall give ſome extracts of it, which may ſerve for a ſupplement to the Hiſtory of the diſpute between Balzac and Father Goulu [*A*]. I am ſurprized Mr Sorel has ſaid nothing of

[*A*] *I ſhall give ſome extracts of it which may ſerve for a ſupplement to the Hiſtory of the diſpute between Balzac, and Father Goulu.*] The perſons engaged in this academical conference are eight. Some of them ſpeak for or againſt Balzac, others for or againſt Father Goulu; and laſtly, one acts the part of a judge. We find at pag. 47, that *the judicious Valentine, who has raiſed the tomb of the French orator, and followed the Thraſo ſtep by ſtep, examining the Apology* (1) *page after page, has found a great many faults in it.* We ſhall ſee in what manner ſome books which Balzac was about to publiſh were ſpoken of: it is the ſureſt way in the world to make them appear bad, though they were ever ſo good: becauſe in the event they muſt fall infinitely ſhort of the idea given of them. Neither the friends nor the enemies of an author can do him a greater diſſervice, than by proclaiming his works, under ſo pompous a character. It is ſuffocating the child under pretence of careſſing it. 'He will make it appear, if he has but leiſure and others patience, that he can ſucceed as well in long as in ſhort performances, and that he is ſo great a maſter of the weapons of Eloquence, as to handle both the long ſword and dagger with equal dexterity. This will be found, when they are produced on the ſtage of the world. This prince at whoſe appearance the glory of all others muſt vaniſh, in the ſame manner as the ſtars fade away at the riſing of the ſun. This admirable retirement, which will eclipſe the luſtre of Plato's commonwealth. This dreadful judgment which in imitation of the final one will examine all the univerſe, and render to every one according to his works; and this incomparable Hiſtory where, as in a magic glaſs, will appear the moſt ſecret actions of human Life, and which will ſerve for a moral and political rule to be moſt certainly depended on by all poſterity as an invariable principle (2).' This ſame raillery has been expreſſed in other terms: 'All the world waits with very great impatience, to ſee quickly the works of the author of the letter, ſwell with this grand piece, which he has ſpoken of ſo much, and promiſed ſo long, and expects that he will diſplay the top-gallant ſail of his incomparable eloquence, and ſtrain all the ſtrings of his wit to diſcover the whole ſtrength of his learning, this retirement or hermitage where will be admitted, more pieces than in Plato's commonwealth. This prince, an inimitable work, a fragment of which being publiſhed by way of ſpecimen, has been taken all to pieces by Phyllarchus, will ſhew whether he will be able to maintain the empire of wit, or whether his reign will not be as ſhort as that of the king of Bohemia. This terrible judgment of the living and dead (if we may be allowed to uſe this expreſſion without blaſphemy, and without invading the office of the Son of God, to whom the Father has committed all judgment) this judgment which muſt ſurpaſs that of the angel Michael, and even of the archangel, if he pleaſes to have it ſo, and weigh all men's actions in ſo nice a ſcale as to equal that of the ſanctuary. This laſt judgment of the firſt in eloquence, who is to cenſure the whole univerſe, and without mercy, arraign criminals whom parliaments adore, that is kings, with a far greater liberty, and in a much more dreadful tone than that of the letters, wherein Popes, kings, cardinals, princes of Italy, and of other nations are touched to the quick, and undoubtedly this terrible judgment, where eloquence will be ſeated on a throne of fire, with thunder in her hand, and her miniſter covered with laurels like another Alexander; ſhall make both the dead and the living to tremble, and paſs ſentence after the manner of Aretin, whoſe tongue and pen ſpared none but thoſe whom he did not know (3).' That which follows relates to Mr Javerſac (4). *As to this laſt Phyllarchus's Achates writing to Palemon, ſeems to have ſucked in the wind ſo as to have loſt his ſpeech, and to have ſhut his mouth without the preſent of the ſcarlet hat* (5). . . . . *It is not for want of having a very good opinion of his wit, and a much better of his valour, that he has dreſſed up his ſecond diſcourſe of Ariſtarchus (for ſo it is called) to Calidoxus, in colours which give it the air of a romance, tho' he affirms this Hiſtory is no fable. But in his firſt diſcourſe addreſſed to Nicander, it muſt be confeſſed that having undertaken to engage two powerful enemies at once, he comes off in his attack upon the principal with ſo little advantage, that one would think the other, whom he had not touched at all but juſt by the by, might have ſpared himſelf the taking ſo ſevere a revenge as that deſcribed in the adventure of the enchanted iſland* (6). *But it is his buſineſs to decide this quarrel with Narciſſus, who has waited for him a long time at the* pré aux Clercs, *under ſhelter however from all ſtorms, and like the ſun in the night, or in cloudy days, far enough off from the field of battle. Reſolved to fight with ſwords, whoſe blades are not of the true Damaſcus temper but of ſatin, and with piſtols charged with ſugar plumbs, and Cyprus powder. . . . . A more potent and conſiderable adverſary is, in my opinion, the author of the anſwer to Phyllarchus* (7) *who is alſo author of the preface to the fine letters, and alſo, as ſome think, of that noble work which bears the title of the Defeat of the Knight Errant. This anſwer is a concerted piece, in which, tho' the author affirms the contrary, it is believed Narciſſus had a large ſhare, tho' not altogether ſo large a one as in the Apology which is univerſally aſcribed to him* (8).

The parties having delivered all their reaſons for and againſt Balzac and his adverſary, he who was to judge the cauſe, paſſed the following ſentence:

Je vous juge tous deux dignes de la geniſſe
Tant vous eſtes eſgaux en ce bel exercice
De parler & reſpondre, aſſez braves guerriers
Tous deux également couronnez de lauriers

Eſlevez

(*e*) In the remark [*I*] of the article ABDERAMA.

(18) Abrég. Chronol. Tom. i, *pag.* 192.

(1) That is, the Apology of Balzac, written by the prior Ogier.

(2) Conférence Academique, *pag.* 194.

(3) Ib. *pag.* 133, & *ſeq.*

(4) Ib. *pag.* 266, & *ſeq.* *See alſo pag.* 207.

(5) In alluſion to a cuſtom of the court of Rome, where the Pope ſhuts the mouths of the new cardinals, and opens them again in another conſiſtory.

(6) It is that deſcribed in the *Defeat of the knight-errant Javerſac.* See the remark [*A*], of the article JAVERSAC.

(7) That is, LA MOTTE-AIGRON. See his article. He is called the Sieur d'Aigremont, in *pag.* 193, of the *Confér. Academique.*

(8) Confér. Academique, *pag.* 269.

of this work, when he gave the particulars of that famous quarrel (*a*).

(*a*) *In his* Bibliotheque Françoiſe, *pag.* 120, *& ſeq.*

Eſlevez noſtre langue au plus haut de ſa gloire
Et conſacrez vos noms au Temple de Mémoire (9).

Both noble warriours in words we own.
Go hand in hand, grac'd with the laurel crown,
Compleat the glories of our tongue, and Fame
Shall in her temple eternize your name.

You both deſerve the Heifer (10) *as your prize,*
Both equal in this learned exerciſe,

MUSCULUS (Wolfgang) one of the moſt famous Divines of the XVIth century, was born at Dieuze in Lorrain September 8, 1497. His father, who was a Cooper by trade, finding he had an inclination to learning, deſigned him for a ſcholar; but the young man muſt be forced to provide his own ſubſiſtence, that is, to beg his bread by ſinging from door to door. He ſung one evening at Veſpers in a convent of Benedictins (*a*) with ſuch ſucceſs, that they offered him gratis the habit of the order. He accepted the propoſal, and was then but fifteen years of age. He applied himſelf hard to his ſtudies, and became a very good preacher. He approved Luther's opinions, and maintained them vigorouſly on all occaſions; which made a great impreſſion upon ſeveral of his brother friers, for the greateſt part of the Benedictins of this convent quitted the habit. On the other hand he made himſelf a great many enemies, and was expoſed to ſeveral dangers; but at laſt delivered himſelf out of theſe difficulties, by making an open profeſſion of Lutheraniſm. He eſcaped to Straſburg towards the end of the year 1527, and there married publickly, on the twenty ſeventh of December of the ſame year, Margaret Barth, to whom he was contracted before he quitted the monaſtery. Having nothing to ſubſiſt upon, he placed his wife as a ſervant to a miniſter's family, and bound himſelf apprentice to a Weaver, who turned him away about two months after (*b*). He had reſolved to earn his livelihood by working at the fortifications of Straſburg (*c*); but the evening before he was to begin this drudgery, he was informed that the magiſtrates deſigned him to preach every Sunday in the village of Dorliſheim. He was very glad of this, and diſcharged the office with great care; it did not oblige him to reſidence, for he went from Straſburg every Saturday, and returned on Monday. He lodged the reſt of his time at Martin Bucer's houſe [*A*]. Some months after his affairs took another turn, for it was thought neceſſary he ſhould reſide; accordingly he removed to Dorliſheim, and there ſuffered extreme poverty with great conſtancy [*B*]. He was recalled to Straſburg at a year's end, to ſerve as miniſter in the principal church. Having diſcharged this office about two years he was called to Augſburg, and began to preach there January 22d 1531. The duties of the miniſtry there incumbent on him, were very painful during the firſt years; for he had not only the Roman Catholics to diſpute with, but alſo the Anabaptiſts. He oppoſed thoſe who were of opinion, that the latter ſhould be put to death, and by degrees obtained of the magiſtrates, that Popery ſhould be wholly baniſhed [*C*]. He ſerved the church of Augſburg till ſuch time as the magiſtrates were ſo

[*A*] *He lodged the reſt of the time at Martin Bucer's houſe.*] There he got his board by tranſcribing; for Bucer's hand was ſo bad, that the Printers could not read it; and he himſelf was often puzzled to make it out. But Muſculus who could read it with eaſe, tranſcribed it in a wonderful good hand, and by this means did Martin Bucer a great deal of ſervice, who was at that time employed on ſeveral works for the preſs. I ſhall repeat the words of Melchior Adam, which mention ſome particulars. 'Adeò malè pingebat Bucerus; ut quæ ſcriberet, à Typographis, imò ab ipſomet ſæpè Bucero, difficillimè legerentur: Muſculus verò ea legebat expeditiſſimè, & pingebat elegantiſſimè. Deſcripſit itaque ei cum alia plura, tùm verò potiſſimum explicationem *Zephaniæ* Prophetæ, quæ extat, in cujus fronte ejus leguntur carmina, & *Pſalterium* illud totum, quod ſub *Aretii Felini* nomine in lucem edidit (1). - - - - *Bucer's writing was ſo very bad, that the Printers, and even he himſelf, could hardly read it: But Muſculus read it eaſily, and copied it elegantly. He tranſcribed therefore for him, among many other things, his Expoſition of the prophet Zephaniah, which is in print, and in the beginning of which are to be ſeen his verſes, and that whole Pſalter, which he publiſhed under the name of Aretius Felinus.*' Eraſmus, Lipſius, and ſeveral other great authors, had the ſame defect as Martin Bucer; and there were very few learned men who could write ſo well as Muſculus. This was much more rare in the XVIth than in the XVIIth century.

[*B*] *He removed to Dorliſheim and there endured extreme poverty with great conſtancy.*] He had no houſehold goods, but a little bed which he had brought from his convent. His pariſhoners were ſo charitable as to offer him neceſſary utenſils; but he lay on a little ſtraw ſpread upon the floor (2). The Hiſtorian obſerves, that his wife was then about to be brought to bed (3), and it is from hence Mr Baillet takes occaſion to ſay, *That the Proteſtants reckon it amongſt the moſt heroical mortifications of Muſculus, that he lay on the hard ground, and had the generoſity to reſign to his wife the bed he brought from his convent, when ſhe came to want it for her delivery* (4). He ſerved a year in the church of this village, without receiving one farthing of his penſion. At laſt the magiſtrates of Straſburg took pity on him, and aſſigned him ſomething out of their public treaſury. 'Annum totum in illa eccleſia docuit, cum ne teruncium quidem à quoquam ſtipendii loco acciperet, nec etiam peteret; ſed in ſumma paupertate patientiſſimè & tranquillè viveret. Quo minus autem illi ſtipendium ſolveretur; in cauſa erat Abbas Cœnobii *Hohenforſt*, qui cum omnes illius eccleſiæ decimas, & cenſus annuos colligeret; miniſtro tamen evangelii ſtipendium pendere recuſabat; tandem verò Argentinenſes ut ipſius penuriam ſublevarent, aliquam illi pecuniæ ſummam, è publico ærario benignè numerarunt (5). - - - - *He taught a whole year in that church, while he neither received nor ſollicited one farthing of a ſalary from any one; but lived patiently and quietly in the greateſt poverty. The non-payment of his ſtipend was owing to the abbot of Hohenforſt, who collected all the tithes, and annual revenues of that church, and refuſed to pay the miniſter; but at laſt the Straſburghers, to relieve his neceſſities, generouſly ordered him a ſum out of their public treaſury.*'

[C] *He obtained . . . . of the magiſtrates of Augſburg, that Popery might be wholly baniſhed.*] Muſculus was at firſt a miniſter of the church of the Holy Croſs. The Catholics who ſtill poſſeſſed the church of Notre Dame, and ſeveral others better than that, and the greateſt part of the convents, uſed all their endeavours, not only to maintain their poſſeſſion, but alſo to expel the Lutherans. They were ſtrongly oppoſed by all the miniſters; but the zeal of Muſculus was much greater than that of his ſo weak as to receive the *Interim* in the year 1548. Then he quitted this city, and retired into Swiſſerland. His wife and eight children followed him ſome weeks after; he went to meet them at Conſtance the thirtieth of July, and having waited at Zurich till ſome convenient call ſhould offer, he was at laſt invited in the year 1549 by the lords of Berne to be profeſſor of Divinity. He accepted it with much pleaſure, and diſcharged the duty of the place with all poſſible diligence; and to teſtify his acknowledgment to the city of Berne, he always refuſed the employments which were offered him in other places [*D*]. He confined himſelf to Theological lectures, and would not accept of a preacher's place which was offered him [*E*]. He died at Berne Auguſt 30, 1563 (*d*). He was a very laborious and very learned man, and publiſhed a great many books [*F*]. He was alſo employed in ſome Eccleſiaſtical deputations, of very great importance [*G*]. He made himſelf

---

(9) Conf. Academique, *pag.* 328.

(10) In imitation of the like judgment, at the end of the third Eclogue of Virgil, *Et vitula tu dignus & hic, &c.*

(*a*) In the country of Lutzelſtein.

(*b*) The reaſon of this was becauſe Muſculus would be always diſputing with an Anabaptiſt miniſter who lodged with this Weaver.

(*c*) Compare above, remark [*I*] of the article JUNIUS (Francis).

(1) Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theolog. German. *pag.* 374.

(2) Parum autem ſtraminis ſolo inſtratum illi pro lectica erat. *Id. ib.*

(3) Cum uxor ejus jam partui vicina eſſet. *Id. ib.*

(4) Baillet, Artic. XI, §. II, *of his* Anti.

(5) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) *Taken from* Melchior Adam, in Vita Muſculi, *pag.* 367, *& ſeq.* Vitar. Theolog. *All that he has ſaid, is taken from the Life of Muſculus, written by Abraham Muſculus his ſon. It is prefixed to the* Synopſis feſtalium Concionum Wolfgangi Muſculi, *Edit. of Baſil,* 1595, *in* 8*vo.*

his colleagues. Hence it came to paſs that the Catholics chiefly hated him. He did ſo much by his ſollicitations, that, on the twenty ſecond of July 1534, the ſenate and people of Augſburg abſolutely forbad them to preach in any part of the city, and left them only eight places where they were permitted to ſay maſs: they aboliſhed it every where elſe, together with the images: and at laſt the great council on the ſeventeenth of January 1537, expelled all the prieſts and monks, and purged theſe eight places of idolatry, and conſecrated them to the ſervice of the Proteſtants. Upon this Muſculus was made miniſter of the church which had been conſecrated to the holy Virgin. He began to preach there July 15, 1537, and continued to do ſo quietly till the thirtieth of July 1547 (6). But from that day, to the time of his quitting Augſburg, his miniſtry was expoſed to great troubles. Charles V, having made his public entry into that city, cauſed the church of Notre Dame to be reſtored to the Catholics. Muſculus preached in the other churches with his uſual zeal and freedom. He was watched, he was accuſed to the emperor as a ſeditious and calumniating preacher. Michael Sidonius, ſuffragan to the archbiſhop of Mentz, went often to hear his ſermons, and took notes of them in his table-book. The ſenate fearing leaſt this miniſter ſhould be affronted, appointed three men to guard him conſtantly to church, and home again. There were often tumults at his door; the domeſtics of the cardinal of Augſburg raiſed mobs there, which committed a thouſand inſolences, and broke Muſculus's windows with ſtones, The Spaniards and prieſts laid ſnares for him, and bore him down with ſlanders and clamour (7). Thus the things of this world riſe and fall. Every one has his turn.

[*D*] *He always refuſed the employments which were offered him in other places.*] Three attemps were made to bring him over to England, and chiefly after the death of Martin Bucer. The city of Augſburg having recovered it's former liberty in 1552, reckoned him amongſt the number of it's baniſhed miniſters whom it recalled. The Straſburghers, the electors Palatine Otho Henry, and Frederic, and the landgrave of Heſſe, often ſollicited him to come and exerciſe the duties of his function in their churches and univerſities, and promiſed him great penſions. He excuſed himſelf among other reaſons, chiefly becauſe he had a mind to conſecrate the reſt of his life to the ſervice of the republic of Berne, who had ſo kindly received him in the time of his exile (8). This conduct is very commendable, and there are not many who have the reſolution to follow it.

[*E*] *He confined himſelf to Theological lectures, and would not accept of a preacher's place which was offered him.*] This ſhows that Thuanus ought not to have ſaid, that he exerciſed the office of paſtor at Berne, *Paſtoris munere defungens* (9).

[*F*] *He publiſhed a great many books.*] He began with tranſlations out of Greek into Latin. The firſt work of this nature which he publiſhed (10), was St Chryſoſtome's Commentary upon the epiſtles to the Romans, Epheſians, Philippians, Coloſſians, and Theſſalonians. He publiſhed (11) afterwards the ſecond tome of the works of St Baſil, and then the Scholia of the ſame Father upon the Pſalms, and ſeveral treatiſes of St Athanaſius and St Cyril; the Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory of Euſebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius: and Polybius. The principal books of his own compoſing are theſe: two ſermons, *de Miſſa Papiſtica*, preached at the time of the Diet at Ratiſbon in 1541, which were printed at Wittemberg, and then at Augſburg, *cum additione de externis Miſſæ abuſibus.* Cochlæus wrote againſt this book in 1544, and this occaſioned the Anti-Cochlæus (12), which Muſculus publiſhed in Latin and High Dutch the ſame year at Augſburg. He publiſhed five years after four dialogues under the name of Eutychius Myon, and with the title of Proſcerus (13), upon this queſtion, whether a Proteſtant can hold external communion with Popiſh ſuperſtitions? They were tranſlated into French at London, and publiſhed unper the title of, Le Temporiſeur, *The Temporiſer*, by V. Poullain, in the year 1550, in 12mo. Note, that the word *Proſcerus* is an alluſion to the Greek word πρόσκαιρος, *Temporarius.* His Commentary on the Pſalms was printed in 1550; that upon Geneſis in 1554; one upon the epiſtle of St Paul to the Romans in 1555; and another upon Geneſis in 1557: one upon the epiſtle to the Corinthians in 1559; and one upon the epiſtles of St Paul to the Galatians and Epheſians in 1561. His commentary upon the epiſtles to the Philippians, Coloſſians, and Theſſalonians, and upon the firſt chapters of the firſt to Timothy, was after his death publiſhed by his heirs. His common-places are a work which employed him ten years, and were publiſhed by him in 1560 (14). A certain writer obſerves, that in it he has diſcovered the ſordid abuſes in the rates of the Romiſh Chancery. This obſervation would be loſt by a bare tranſlation, we ſhall therefore give it in the original. 'Minimè ridiculus hic MUSCULUS Papiſtis habetur, præcipuè cum turpiſſimam illam Nundinationem, Taxarum ſcilicet Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ, id eſt ſcelerum omnium & blaſphemiarum theſaurum toti Mundo in Locis ſuis Communibus aperuerit, quo facto craſſi illi Romani Elephanti, inſatiabiles ventres, furere videntur, non ſecus ac ſi ipſorum in proboſcidas, mures, ad rabiem uſque eoſdem vexantes, irrepſiſſent. Magnus igitur MUSCULUS exiſtimandus, qui in Romani Plutonis Purgatoriique Regis auream Cameram atque Adyta penetravit (15). - - - *This MUSCULUS is not looked upon by the Papiſts as in the leaſt contemptible, eſpecially when he lays open to all the world in his common-places that moſt abominable trade, the bank of the taxations of the Apoſtolical Chancery, that is of all degrees of wickedneſs and blaſphemy*; *the diſcovery of which has ſet thoſe monſtrous Romiſh elephants, thoſe inſatiable brutes, into ſuch a rage, as if ſome mice had got into their trunks, and made them quite mad. MUSCULUS, therefore, ought to be very much eſteemed, for having penetrated into the the treaſury and cabinet of the Romiſh Pluto, the king of purgatory.*' I paſs over the books which Muſculus wrote in the German tongue; but ſhall add, that he wrote all this vaſt number of volumes with his own hand, and never had any Amanuenſis (16), and that if his works were very uſeful to the Proteſtants in thoſe days, as doubtleſs they were, they are no longer ſo now: they have not been read this great while, tho' perhaps that is owing to too refined a taſte, and too great a fondneſs for more faſhionable performances. The works of Muſculus and other Divines of thoſe days, are given away almoſt for nothing at all auctions of Libraries.

[*G*] *He was employed in ſome Eccleſiaſtical deputations of very great importance.*] He was deputed, together with Boniface Lycoſthenes, by the ſenate of Augſburg in 1536, to the ſynod which was to be held at Eiſenac, where he was to treat of the re-union of Proteſtants as to the doctrine of the Lord's-ſupper. There was nothing done at Eiſenac: Luther wrote to the Divines who were met there, that his health would not permit him to undertake a long journey, and therefore deſired them to come a little nearer. They therefore left Eiſenac, and advanced as far as Wittemberg, and there prepared and concluded a Concordat. Muſculus, himſelf a pretty good maſter of the Greek and Hebrew Languages, tho' he began very late to ſtudy them [*H*]. We ſhall take notice of ſome judgments which have been paſſed on his writings [*I*]. It is obſerved, that he renounced the doctrine of Zuinglius, in the Concordat of Wittemberg, and embraced it again after he retired from Augſburg (*e*). See the remark [*G*]. We muſt not miſtake him for ANDREW MUSCULUS a Lutheran author, and profeſſor of Divinity at Frankfort upon the Oder, and ſuperintendant-general of the churches of the March of Brandenburg in the XVIth century. He was born at Schneberg

---

(6) Ib. *p.* 377.

(7) *Taken from* Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 380, 381.

(8) Ex eodem, ibid. *pag.* 384, 385.

(9) Thuan. *lib.* xxxv, (*and not* 36, *as Konig cites*) ſub fin. *pag. m.* 716.

(10) At Baſil by Hervagius, in 1536.

(11) Ibid. ann. 1540.

(12) *See Mr.* Baillet, ubi ſupra.

(13) Epit. Biblioth. Geſneri, *pag. m.* 825.

(14) *Ex Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra. pag.* 383. I wonder *Melch. Adam*, takes no notice of the Commentary of Muſculus on the goſpel of St Matthew, and on that of St John.

(15) Jac. Verheiden, in Effigiebus & Elogiis præſtantium Theologorum, *pag.* 101.

(16) Melch. Adam, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 383.

culus, and ſeveral others, tho' fully perſuaded of the falſhood of Luther's doctrine about the real preſence, yet conſented to the articles of agreement, by which they quitted thoſe clear and diſtinct explications they had hitherto made uſe of. They had ſome good reaſons for this condeſcenſion, for they hoped, they ſhould, by this means, to the great benefit of the church and ſtate, put an end to a conſiderable controverſy, and reſtore peace which had been ſo long wiſhed for: but the event making it appear to them, that all theſe turnings and windings of words did not at all ſatisfy the obſtinate, but miſled the ſimple, and gave room for thinking that the followers of the figurative ſenſe had changed their opinions, they reſumed their firſt expreſſions, explained themſelves fully and clearly, and openly declared their ſentiments. You ſee I am relating a very nice affair, and if I did not ſhow that I faithfully tranſlate the very words of the author of the life of Muſculus, I might be expoſed to the cenſure of ſome readers. To prevent their malice, I ſhall tranſcribe the original Latin. *Quibus autem rationibus, cùm ipſe* (Muſculus) *tùm alii multi boni viri, impulſi ſint; ut, cum in hac cauſa craſſam quorundam ſententiam minimè amplecterentur, in hanc tamen concordiam conſentirent, deque ſua, qua hactenus, docuerant, perſpicuitate nonnihil decederent, prudentes viri facilè intelligunt. Nimirum quod perſuaſum hoc illis eſſet, facturos ſe id ſummo cum eccleſiæ & Reip. bono. Sic enim ſolum gravem & malè conſultam illam de hac cauſa controverſiam tolli, eccleſiis diu deſideratam pacem reſtitui, & Reſpub. etiam firmius conjungi & conſociari poſſe. Poſtquam verò, rerum eventu edocti, his quaſi fucis verborum pertinacioribus non ſatis fieri, ſimpliciores verò in errorem abduci, ſeque apud omnes bonos in ſuſpicionem mutatæ ſententiæ venire cernerent, ad priſtinam ſuam perſpicuitatem reverſi, & palàm quid ſentirent, profeſſi ſunt* (17). Can they who preach up with a declamatory air the neceſſity of putting an end to controverſies by indeterminate, ambiguous, and intricate, forms of expreſſion, wherein each party may find their own account, produce many treaties of peace in religion concluded by this method? Was not that done at Wittemburg which they think ſo uſeful (18)? We have juſt now ſeen, that the fruits of it were but of a ſhort duration.

Muſculus was deputed from the ſenate of Augſburg to aſſiſt at the conferences held between the Proteſtant and Catholic Divines during the Diet of Worms, and during that of Ratiſbon in 1540, and 1541. He was one of the ſecretaries at the conference of Ratiſbon, between Melanchthon and Eccius, and drew up the acts of it (19). The inhabitants of Donawert having embraced the Reformation in 1544, intreated thoſe of Augſburg to ſend them a Divine, who might form a church among them, and lay the foundations of the true faith. Muſculus was made choice of for this office, and preached his firſt ſermon December 28, to thoſe new converts, and afterwards preached to them the word of GOD every day for three months together (20).

[*H*] *He made himſelf maſter of the Greek and Hebrew languages, tho' he began very late to ſtudy them.*] He began to ſtudy Hebrew when he was miniſter of Straſburg, being then full two or three and thirty years of age. He is ſaid to have made a very ſwift progreſs in this language. 'Tantam brevi ejus linguæ 'cognitionem ſibi comparavit: ut non ſacra ſolùm 'Biblia; ſed & Rabinorum obſcuriſſimos commentarios, & Chaldaicos etiam interpretes, perfectè intelligeret (21). ---- *He very ſoon made ſuch a proficiency in the knowledge of this tongue, that he not only perfectly well underſtood the ſacred writings, but alſo the 'moſt obſcure Rabinical commentaries, and Chaldaic interpreters.*' It is added (22), that while he was miniſter at Augſburg he learned Arabic pretty well, without the help of a maſter. He was forty years old when he began to ſtudy the Greek tongue. Xyſtus Betuleius, firſt regent in the college of Augſburg, taught him the firſt rules of it (23). It is to be wondered at, that Muſculus beginning ſo late to ſtudy the Greek tongue, ſhould acquire ſo great a knowledge of it.

[*I*] *We ſhall take notice of ſome judgments which were paſſed on his writings.*] Huetius commends his tranſlations in ſome reſpects, but does not think him learned enough either in Greek or Latin. 'Wolffgangus 'Muſculus, vir bonus, ſed Græcæ linguæ notitiâ imparatus, neque Latinâ valdè inſtructus, brevitate '& nitore, ſimplicitate etiam ac fide commendatur: 'nam & *ea quæ intelligebat, & ea quæ non intelligebat, uti poterat, expreſſit: nihil videas illum ſtudio 'prætermittere, nihil alienum ſubſtituere* *: cæteroquin 'halucinatur ſæpe, utpote earum artium rudis, quas 'qui colunt, eruditi appellantur (24). --- *Wolfgangus 'Muſculus, a very good man, but not very knowing 'either in Greek or Latin, is commended for his ſhortneſs, clearneſs, ſimplicity, and faithfulneſs: for* he 'has expreſſed both thoſe things which he did un'derſtand, and thoſe which he did not underſtand, 'as well as poſſible; you find nothing eſcapes his in'tention, nothing is ſubſtituted that is foreign, *but 'he makes frequent miſtakes, for want of a greater 'knowledge in learning.*' You would do well to conſult the whole paſſage of Caſaubon which Huetius pointed at, there you will find a parallel between Perotus and Muſculus, as to their tranſlation of Polybius. Let us ſee what has been ſaid of another verſion of this miniſter. 'Muſculus, a Proteſtant, undertook a 'new tranſlation of the hiſtory of Euſebius, which 'he performed happily enough: he adheres very 'much to the letter, and has tranſlated the text with 'great clearneſs and brevity: but he did not always 'rightly underſtand his author, and there are ſeveral 'faults in his verſion (25).' He is thought in his commentary upon the Pſalms, 'to have ſhown much more 'modeſty, and alſo more reſpect for antiquity, than 'the greateſt part of other Proteſtants . . . . that the 'method he followed . . . . is very exact . . . . . that 'it may be ſaid, this author knew the true way of 'explaining Scripture, but had not all the helps which 'were neceſſary to ſucceed in it to perfection, for want 'of being ſufficiently verſed in languages and critical 'learning. He examines, however, without prepoſ'ſeſſion the antient Greek and Latin tranſlations, and 'had a knowledge ſufficient to diſcover that the points, 'which are at this day in the Hebrew text, were not in 'it at the time of the Septuagint and of St Jerome (26).' You will ſee elſewhere (27) what opinion ſome have of his Commentary upon the goſpel of St John, and upon the epiſtle to the Romans. Baudouin obſerves, that Muſculus publiſhed in his common-places ſeveral things which ſhould have moderated Calvin's ſpirit as to the puniſhing of Heretics, but that they rather inflamed it the more; inſomuch, that, writing upon Zacharias, he carried this doctrine ſo far, that he ſeems as if he were for putting the ſword into the hand of private perſons, in order to take away the lives of Heretics (28). I do not warrant this to be matter of fact, but I relate it only to ſhow my readers, that it is thought Muſculus diſapproved the puniſhment of Servetus. Some think, that, by a fault very common to diſputants, he took ſo much care to avoid one extreme, that he came too near the other; as when in oppoſing the Anabaptiſts, he runs down more than he ought the paſtoral authority. See the paſſages which Mr Crenius has collected upon this ſubject (29).

Note, that Father Simon pretends, that Muſculus in his Commentary upon the epiſtle to the Romans obſerves a neutrality between the different methods of explaining predeſtination. 'He recites upon the 'places which are moſt intricate, the expoſitions of 'the antient commentators, and does not ſeem for'ward to give any deciſion of his own. For which 'reaſon upon theſe words of chap. ix. Itaque non 'volenti

(*e*) Micrælius, Synt. Hiſt. Eccl. *pag.* 781, *Edit.* 1699.

(17) Id. ib. *pag.* 379.

(18) Compare this with the above remark [*B*], of the article BUCER.

(19) Melch. Adam. ibid. *pag.* 379, 380.

(20) Id. ib.

(21) Id. ib. *pag.* 376.

(22) Id. ib. *pag.* 378.

(23) Id. ib.

* *Caſaub. Præfat. ad Polyb.*

(24) Huet. de claris Interpret. *pag. m.* 225.

(25) Du Pin, Biblioth. *Tom. ii, pag.* 4, *col.* 1, *Edit. of Holland.*

(26) Father Simon, Critical Hiſtory of the New Teſtament, *book iii, ch. xiv, pag. m.* 438.

(27) *Idem*, Critical Hiſtory of the Commentators on the New Teſtament, *ch.* 50, *pag.* 749, and the following.

(28) *See* Fr. Balduini, Reſponſio altera ad Jo. Calvinum.

(29) Crenius, Animadverſ. *Part. vii, pag.* 149, *& ſeq. See alſo pag.* 148.

Schneberg in Miſnia, and died in 1580 (f). He was a zealous promoter of the doctrine of the Ubiquity, and explained it after a very bold manner [K]. He publiſhed a very great number of books (g), and being perſuaded that he ſhould ſoon ſee great revolutions in Germany, and that the end of the world was near at hand; he wrote on theſe matters with the aſſurance of one who pretends to have a key to all the prophecies of the Old and New Teſtament. The Romiſh controverſiſts have found in one of his works on this ſubject, one thing which they have ſufficiently exaggerated [L].

volentis neque currentis, &c. - - - *So then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth*, &c. he gives an abridgment of the various interpretations he had read, without declaring himſelf at the ſame time for any ſide. He endeavours to reconcile grace with free-will, by attributing to each of them what is its due. Ab hujuſmodi contentionibus, *ſays he*, nos libenter abſtinemus, credentes homini quidem eſſe voluntatem & conatum, ſed quatenus ad velle & currere divinitus, vel ex gratia, vel ex indignatione Dei fuerit motus. - - - *I am willing to avoid entring into this kind of diſputes, being of opinion, that there is actually in man a will and an endeavour; but as to the heavenly willing and running, this muſt ariſe no doubt from the grace or diſpleaſure of GOD.* He condemns notwithſtanding the opinion of thoſe who, with the Greek Fathers, have recourſe to the preſcience of GOD, and thinks that this cannot be reconciled with the judgment of St Paul: Hæc ſententia plèna aliena eſt à Paulo, qui omnia tribuit miſerentis Dei liberæ voluntati & gratiæ (30). - - - *This opinion is plainly contrary to that of St Paul, who aſcribes every thing to the free-will and grace of a merciful GOD.*’ I do not underſtand the moderation of this miniſter; for the Latin paſſage which Mr Simon mentions, contains in effect whatſoever is moſt rigid in Calvin's hypotheſis. They who oppoſe free-will with the greateſt ſtrictneſs, never denied but that the ſoul of man wills or inclines this or that way, ſo far as it is moved by GOD.

[K] *Andrew Muſculus . . . . was a zealous promoter of the doctrine of the Ubiquity, and explained it after a very bold manner.*] Hoſpinian obſerves, that this doctrine was invented by Brentius, and that James Andreas added to it the hypotheſis of the *majeſtatic body of JESUS CHRIST*; but withal, that it appeared Eutychian, and Monophyſitical, or aſſerting only one nature in CHRIST, even in the judgment of many of the Lutherans, and that in effect it is plainly refuted by that article of the Apoſtle's Creed, *He aſcended into Heaven.* For which reaſon, adds he, Andrew Muſculus coming to the relief of James Andreas, at ſo hard a pinch, maintained, that the Aſcenſion of JESUS CHRIST was nothing more than a ceſſation of the viſibility of his body. He aſſerted, that this body was ſtill in the clouds where the Apoſtles loſt ſight of it, and that, according to the ſtyle of Scripture, and the propriety of the words Aſcending and Deſcending, no change of place ought to be imagined in the Aſcenſion of JESUS CHRIST. I ſhall give you the words of Hoſpinian ſomething more largely, becauſe in the relation of ſuch paradoxes, the more a writer abridges, the more danger he runs of impoſing upon his reader. ‘Idcirco Jacobo Andreæ ſuccenturiatus eſt in gravi iſto periculo *Andreas Muſculus*, qui aſcenſionem Chriſti in cœlos dixit eſſe *diſparentiam, & evaneſcentiam* duntaxat carnis Chriſti in his nubibus, ubi adhuc ſit, & verſetur, ſed non viſibili modo, forma, & eo converſationis genere, quo ante aſcenſionem & mortem converſatus eſt cum ſuis Apoſtolis. Sic enim Sectione 3. Articulorum Marchiticorum, Articulo 6. ſcribit; *Conſtare ex Spiritus ſancti Grammatica, & vocabuli Deſcendere vel Aſcendere proprietate, Filii hominis aſcenſionem in cœlum nihil aliud eſſe, quàm viſibilem diſparentiam, ac ut propriiſſimè loquitur Lucas Actor.* 1. *Subductionem per nubem ex oculis Apoſtolorum, diſceſſionem ex hac mortali hominum vita, tranſmigrationem ex viſibili converſatione hominum, evaneſcentiam ex oculis hominum palpabilis & viſibilis hujus vitæ converſationis, ingreſſum in cœlum, regnum Dei Patris glorioſum.* Et Artic. 7. *Hanc, dicit, aſcenſionem non factum eſſe motione Phyſicâ de loco in locum*, &c (31). - - - *Therefore,* James Andreas *in this extremity was relieved by* Andrew Muſculus, *who affirmed, that the Aſcenſion of CHRIST into Heaven was nothing more than a vaniſhing or diſappearing of the body of CHRIST in thoſe Clouds where it yet remains to this day, tho' not in that viſible manner and form, nor with that ſort of converſation which he uſed with his diſciples before his death and aſcenſion. For he thus writes;* That it is evident from the Grammatical conſtruction of the inſpired writings, and the propriety of the words to *Aſcend* and to *Deſcend*, that the Aſcenſion of the Son of Man into Heaven was nothing more than a ceaſing to be viſible, and as St Luke in the 1ſt of the Acts, accurately expreſſes it, a withdrawing in a cloud from the ſight of the Apoſtles, a departing out of this mortal life, a removing from the viſible converſation of men, a vaniſhing of this manifeſt and open intercourſe from the eyes of mankind, an entring into Heaven, the glorious kingdom of GOD the Father. And afterwards, he ſays, that this Aſcenſion is not performed by any phyſical motion, or change of place, &c.’ Thus the Carteſians reaſon about the motion of ſpirits; they do not admit them to undergo any change of place, they pretend, that the departure of the ſoul out of the body is nothing elſe, but the ceaſing of the relation, which, during the life of the man, was carried on between the modifications of the brain, and the thoughts of the ſoul. But when people advance ſuch hypotheſes as theſe concerning beings, which are really extended, as the body of JESUS CHRIST, it is impoſſible to make them underſtood by any one whomſoever. The ſame Muſculus declares in a ſermon in 1564, that they who teach that JESUS CHRIST died only as to his human nature, belong to the devil both body and ſoul, and that the orthodox doctrine is, that he died both as to his human and divine nature. ‘Andreas Muſculus *quoque hoc anno feria quarta ſeptimanæ magnæ ante Paſcha publicè pro ſuggeſtu ad populum hæc verba inter alia locutus eſt.* Hic eſt Diaboli, qui docet Filium hominis paſſum & mortuum eſſe: Et quiſquis in hac ſententia perrexerit, Diaboli eſt. Iterum dico: Quicunque docent, Chriſtum ſecundùm humanitatem tantùm mortuum eſſe, anima & corpore, Diaboli ſunt. Hæc autem vera eſt ſententia, Chriſtum ſecundùm utramque naturam, divinam & humanam, mortuum eſſe (32). - - - *He is of the devil who teaches, that the Son of Man ſuffered and died: and whoſoever ſhall perſiſt in this opinion, is of the devil. I repeat it again: whoſoever teaches, that CHRIST died only, as to his human nature, is of the devil both body and ſoul. For this is the true doctrine, that CHRIST died both as to his humane and divine nature.*’ He publiſhed a book in 1575, to prove that it is by no means neceſſary, that the glorious body of JESUS CHRIST ſhould phyſically fill up any ſpace: *Contra neceſſitatem phyſicæ locationis in corpore Chriſti clarificato & glorioſo* (33). What is very ſtrange and melancholy in all this is, that theſe abſurd doctrines which ariſe one from another, when you have once aſſerted the real preſence of JESUS CHRIST in the Sacrament, &c. have met with patrons, who neither wanted wit, nor eloquence, nor learning, and who have invented a thouſand ſhifts to elude the objections of their adverſaries. It muſt be ingenuouſly confeſſed, that to anſwer the arguments of the Ubiquitarians, ſome things are neceſſary to be aſſerted no leſs unconceivable than Ubiquity it ſelf.

[L] *The Roman Catholics have found in one of his works on this ſubject one thing which they have ſufficiently exaggerated.*] The epitome of the Bibliotheca of Geſner (34) informs me, that Andreas Muſculus publiſhed a book at Frankfort upon the Oder in 1577, *de Meſech & Kedar, de Gog & Magog, de magna calamitate ante finem mundi*; and that, in 1578, he had printed in the ſame place, *Conſiderationes appropinquantis ultimi judicii.* Theſe two pieces had been preceded by an expoſition of a prophecy of Jeſus Chriſt, applied to the miſeries then impending over Germany. *Prophetiam Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, de imminenie Germaniæ infortunio, expoſuit anno* 1557. *Francoford ad Viadrum* (35). It is in this laſt piece the paſſage is found which the Romiſh controvertiſts have ſtrained to make the world believe that the Proteſtants deſpiſe their miniſters to that degree, that they refuſe all affinity with them by marriage. An Iriſh Jeſuit having given this title, *Quam infamis ſit ubi-vis conditio Miniſtrorum*, to one of the chapters of his *Britannomachia Miniſtrorum* (36), alledges in the firſt place the following paſſage of Andrew Muſculus, and cites the twenty ſeventh page of the treatiſe of Prophecy. ‘ Ut jam quis prædicantem agere velit, præoptaret, ſcio, nunquam ſe in lucem hanc prodiiſſe. Parentes quoque in primo lavacro aquis ſuffocatum eſſe mallent. Quod ſi etiam aliqui ex noſtris liberis prædicantes fieri fortaſſe cuperent, infamiæ & turpitudinis metu adſpirare non poſſunt. Uſu venit etiam, cûm quis juvenis virginem aliquam ſibi in matrimonio locari poſcit ; ut eum parentes virginis aut etiam virgo ipſa, ſciſcitentur, utrùm prædicans fieri cogitet. Habemus etiam (quod multò magis horrendum eſt auditu) eorum exempla, qui ne repudiarentur, hac lege & conditione matrimonium contraxerunt, ut ſe prædicantes nunquam fore jurejurando promitterent. - - - - *So that he who would become a preacher, had better, to my knowledge, wiſh he had never been born. His parents alſo ought to chuſe rather to have ſeen him drowned in the water he was baptized in. But if ſome of our children ſhould be deſirous perhaps of coming into that order, they will be prevented from aſpiring to it by the fear of infamy and diſgrace. It is even now become a cuſtom, that if any young man offers to court a young woman for his wife, the parents, or perhaps the very young woman herſelf, will immediately aſk if he has any thoughts of the Miniſtry. Nay, (what is much more horrid to relate) we have alſo examples of ſome, who for fear they ſhould be refuſed, have conſented to marry upon this agreement and condition, that they ſhould promiſe upon oath never to become preachers.*’ He ſays afterwards, that Downham at p. 67, of his ſermons makes the ſame complaint as to England. I believe this Downham had in view the firſt times of the reformation under queen Elizabeth ; for Sanders relates, that the *new preachers were at the beginning ſo negligent or unhappy in chooſing their wives, that they met with leud women and adultreſſes, which gave ſcandal to the meaner ſort of their own ſect, and was the ſport of the Catholics. Queen Elizabeth put forth a proclamation that the biſhops and prieſts ſhould take no woman in marriage that was not of good and honeſt reputation in the judgment of ſome* ; *but,* adds he, *this did not remedy the evil, becauſe, on the one hand, many could no more live without wives, than they could without bread, to uſe their own expreſſions* ; *and, on the other, they could find no man either among the Catholics or the Heretics themſelves, who would give his daughter in marriage to a preacher* ; *for it was counted a ſcandalous thing to be the wife of a prieſt, and according to the laws of the kingdom, ſuch marriages are no better than adulteries, and ſuch women have no place allowed them according to the rank or degree of their huſbands, which is directly contrary to the nature of true marriage. Queen Elizabeth,* ſays he, *does not admit the wives of prieſts into her court: women of quality will not converſe with them* ; *they are not called archbiſhops wives, and their huſbands ſhould keep them at home, as inſtruments and veſſels of their uncleanneſs and neceſſities* (37). All the world knows that Sanders wrote this book with ſo much rancour and paſſion, that he deſerves very little credit. But things are in all reſpects changed much for the better ſince thoſe days, as to the article we are now upon : and as to the paſſage of Andreas Muſculus, it is plain his adverſaries have miſrepreſented it. It is eaſy to conjecture that this Lutheran doctor being big with this hypotheſis, that Germany was going to feel the ſcourge of Divine juſtice, contained in a prophecy of Jeſus Chriſt, exaggerated the contempt that was ſhown to the word of God, and declaimed too vehemently againſt the want of a due reſpect to his miniſters. Being heated with theſe ideas, he repreſented in hyperbolical figures the averſion the people had to the miniſtry ; as if a father ſhould rather chooſe to ſee his ſon die in the cradle, than ſee him a preacher ; and as if the parents of a young maid, and the young maid herſelf ſhould carefully aſk him who ſought her in marriage, *have you any thoughts of being a miniſter ?* In fine, as if to prevent a refuſal in courting a maid a man muſt proteſt upon oath, that he never would enter into holy orders. The enemies of the Proteſtants have not failed to make an advantage of theſe exaggerations (38). But to allow them to make the moſt of it, it may be truly ſaid, that the Proteſtants of France have given no occaſion to ſuch a reproach : they have always obſerved a very good and laudable cuſtom of honouring and reſpecting their paſtors ; and it is certain, that they who were miniſters of the goſpel, married to more advantage, than if they had been laymen.

(f) Ex Micrælio, ibid.

(g) See the Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque, *pag.* 46, 47.

(30) Father Simon, Critical Hiſtory of the Commentators of the New Teſtament, *chap.* 50, *pag.* 750.

(31) Hoſpin. Hiſtor. Sacrament. *Part* ii, *pag.* 492, *ad ann.* 1561.

(32) Id. ib. *pag.* 553, ad ann. 1564.

(33) Id. ib. *pag.* 600. *See alſo Beza in his treatiſe* de Unione hypoſtatica, *pag.* 89, *Tom.* iii, *Operum.*

(34) *At pag.* 47.

(35) Epitome Biblioth. Geſner. *pag.* 47.

MUSSO (CORNELIO) biſhop of Bitonto, one of the greateſt preachers of his age, was born at Placentia in Italy, in the month of April 1511. He dedicated himſelf to the order of St Francis, to fullfil a vow of his mother [*A*], and when he was nine years old entered into a monaſtery of that order at Placentia. The vivacity of his wit, the ſtrength of his memory, and his great qualifications for preaching [*B*], induced Father James Roſa of Candazzo to take him for his diſciple. He carried him to Carpi and other places and made him ſtudy under good maſters. The young man went very well through his Claſſical learning, and preached ſo eloquently, that he ſoon acquired a great reputation, and the friendſhip of Leonello Pio of Carpi (*a*) who ſent him to Venice with letters of recommendation, to give him an opportunity of preaching before the ſenate, and to obtain a ſettlement in the univerſity of Padua. This affair proved very ſucceſsful.

[*A*] *He dedicated himſelf to the order of St Francis, to fullfil a vow of his mother.*] Note firſt, that he was born upon Wedneſday in Eaſter week. His mother, by a ſtrict obſervance of the faſts of Lent, had impaired her health, ſo that it was thought ſhe could not out-live the pains of child-birth. In this weak condition ſhe implored help from on High, and had recourſe to the interceſſion of the holy Virgin, and to that of St Francis, and having a particular devotion for this ſaint, ſhe made a vow, that if her pains went off, and ſhe ſhould bring forth a ſon, ſhe would conſecrate him to God as a member of his ſeraphic order. As ſoon as ſhe had made this vow ſhe found herſelf relieved, and was brought to bed of our Cornelio. He was named Nicolas after his grandfather by the father's ſide ; but being entred into a religious order, would be called Fra. Cornelio, becauſe his mother's name was Cornelia. He knew of the vow ſhe had made when ſhe was in labour of him, and thought very much of it after her death, and it was this conſideration which engaged him to become a monk (1).

[*B*] *The ſtrength of his memory, and his great qualifications for preaching.*] After he had heard a ſermon he was perfect maſter of it, and could repeat it ſo readily, that one would have thought he had made it. This deſerved admiration. ‘ Si ſcopri di ſpirito coſi gentile, e dotato di memoria coſi eccellente, ch' era di gran maraviglia, e di ſtupore à tutti, intanto che ſtando egli ad udir le prediche che ſi facevano tal' hora nella Chieſa, le apprendeva coſi bene e le recitava poi con prontezza tale che pareano veramente coſe ſue (2). - - - - *He diſcovered ſo fine a genius, and was endowed with ſo excellent a me-memory, that he was greatly admired, and wondered at by every body, inſomuch that as he ſtood to hear the ſermons which were preached in the church at the uſual hour, he remembered them ſo perfectly, and repeated them afterwards with ſo much readineſs that they ſeemed to be his own.*’ When he was made to repeat ſuch ſermons, he would perfectly imitate the way and geſtures of the preacher. They tried him this way more than once before the preacher in ordinary to the Conventual Franciſcans, who was very much ſurprized to find himſelf ſo well imitated. ‘ Queſto commoſſe di modo il figlivolo, che oltre il farle vedere più volte iſperienza delle ſue prediche, ch' egli recitava in refettorio, l'immitava talmente con i movimenti e co' geſti, che parea fuſſe ſtato nel predicar aſſiduamente ammaeſtrato e eſſercitato da lui (3). - - - - *The youth could act him in ſuch a manner, as he made appear by* ſucceſsful. Cornelio Muſſo, little and lean as he was [*C*], was admired for his ſermons; and Peter Zeno, Lewis and James Cornaro, eſpouſed him with ſo much zeal, that they procured him an honourable poſt in the convent of the Franciſcans of Padua; where, without neglecting the art of Rhetoric, he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy, under the famous Zimara, and to that of Divinity under Father Simonetta. He took the degree of Bachelor, and read lectures, and held diſputations which got him the reputation of an uncommon genius. He preached a courſe of Lent-ſermons at Padua with great applauſe, He maintained theſes for ſeveral days together, and was at laſt promoted to the degree of Doctor in Divinity, as a reward of his merit. Peter Bembo, who was afterwards a cardinal, honoured him with his friendſhip, and gave him good advice as to Rhetoric, and concerning the Latin and Italian ſtyle. Lampridius (*b*) inſtructed him in the Greek tongue, and others in the Hebrew and Chaldee, for the underſtanding of the text of Scripture. He was appointed to preach a whole Lent in the convent of his order at Venice. He performed the ſame office in the moſt illuſtrious pulpits in Italy, and particularly at Milan, where he was much eſteemed by the duke (*c*). He was made profeſſor in ordinary of Metaphyſics in the univerſity of Pavia, and had this prince ſeveral times for his auditor. This univerſity being diſperſed after the death of that duke, by the confuſions of war, he was called to Bologna, to be profeſſor of Metaphyſics, and had a greater ſalary ſettled upon him, than was ever before given to any Regular; but ſeveral cities contending with one another to have him for their Lent-preacher (*d*), his academical lectures were diſpenſed with during that ſeaſon. However to make amends, he was obliged to read lectures upon the Scripture on the feſtival days at other times of the year. The epiſtles of St Paul were the ſubject of theſe lectures. A competitor ſtarted up who by explaining the ſame epiſtle after a heterodox manner raiſed great tumults, for he drew after him a great many followers. Cardinal Campegio, biſhop of Bologna, was obliged to employ his authority, to put a ſtop to this diſorder, by expelling the innovators, and impoſing upon this competitor the penance of a public recantation. From this time he conceived a particular eſteem for Cornelio Muſſo, and preſented him to Paul III, who kept him at Rome to preach at St Laurence *in Damazo*, and to live in quality of Theologer with the cardinal, his grandſon. Not long after, Ochinus, who had preached in this church, retired from Rome, after he had diſputed with our Cornelio, who convicted him of being a falſe brother. The new preacher of St Lawrence drew a great crowd to his auditory, and being about four years after promoted to the biſhopric of Bertinoro, he did not diſcontinue his preaching, except when he was deſired to read lectures upon the Epiſtles of St Paul in the ſame church. They were very well reliſhed, and as the Pope had a mind to hear him ſometimes, but could not, with convenience, out of the Apoſtolical palace, he took him from theſe public exerciſes, and gave him another office, which was to preach in Latin upon the goſpel for the day, in his Holineſs's chamber, or at his table, and immediately after to maintain a diſpute, and anſwer the objections which ſhould be propoſed to him. There was an extraordinary concourſe of Eccleſiaſtics regular and ſecular at theſe exerciſes: ſome cardinals and ſeveral prelates were preſent at them: The Pope himſelf propoſed ſometimes both anſwers and objections; and being very well ſatisfied of the ability of Muſſo, he promoted him to the biſhopric of Bitonto (*e*), and ſent him to the council as a proper perſon to diſpute among the reſt of the learned Divines upon any matters which might offer [*D*]. The article about Juſtification paſſed through the

---

(36) The tenth ſection of the fifth chapter of the third book of Henry Fitz-Simon, *pag.* 342.

(37) Sanders, Hiſtory of the Schiſm of England, *pag.* 238.

(38) *See the* Hypocriſis Marci Antonii de Dominis detecta auctore Fideli Annoſo Verementano Theologo, *pag.* 87, *where this paſſage of Muſculus is quoted. See alſo* Juſtus Calvinus, in Analyſi Tertulliani de Præſcript. adverſ. Hæret. *cap. xli, num.* 5, *pag. m.* 132, *& Sylveſter Petra Sancta* Not. in Epiſt. Molinæi ad Balſacium, *cap. i, where they ſpeak of the contempt of the miniſtry.*

(*a*) He had a ſon who became a cardinal.

(1) Taken from his Life written by *Don Gioſeppe Muſſo.*

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ibid.

(*b*) Lampridio Maeſtro, in quei tempi delli illuſtriſſimi Signori Gonzaghi. *Gioſeppo Muſſo, ubi infra, citation* (*b*).

(*c*) This was Francis Sforza.

(*d*) Accio che poteſſe predicare e ſodisfare alle Cittadi, che a gara l'una dell' altra un' anno ò due avanti lo ricercavano ſempre. *Id. ib.*

(*e*) By exchange for that of Bertinoro.

'*frequent tryals of his ſermons, that he repeated them in the hall at dinner time, and imitated him ſo exactly in all his motions and geſtures, as tho' he had been conſtantly brought up under him, and inſtructed in his way of preaching.*' It was eaſy for ſuch a young man to become a good orator. He had nothing more to do than propoſe to himſelf for a model the action of ſome great maſter. Note, that Muſſo had the talent of declaiming without much preparation. A funeral oration, a panegyric upon a ſaint, coſt him but a very little time: whenever his ſuperiors had occaſion for ſuch extemporary diſcourſes they addreſſed themſelves to him (4).

[*C*] *Little and lean as he was.*] The firſt time he was ſeen in the pulpit at Venice, the audience expected nothing from one of his little figure; but they were undeceived as ſoon as they began to hear his voice. 'Quivi invitati li primi ſenatori di Vinegia, lo fece ſalire in pulpito, ove veduto da loro coſi giovanetto, di picciola ſtatura, languido e eſtenuato nell' aſpetto, ogn' uno fra ſe ſteſſo faceva giudicio ch' egli non haveſſe nè ſcienza, nè forze, per negocio tale, ma udita c'hebbero la voce, e che furono ſentiti i ſuoi alti concetti, con quella ſingular' attione naturale datagli da Dio, tutti all' hora l'eſaltarono (5). - - - - - *The principal ſenators of Venice, being invited to hear him, he mounted the pulpit, where appearing to them ſo very young, of a diminutive ſtature, and of a ſickly and thin viſage, they all immediately judged that he could neither have learning, nor ſpirits, for ſuch an undertaking, but as ſoon as they heard his voice and obſerved his ſublime conceptions, and the extraordinary natural abilities God had endowed him with, they give him great commendations.*' There are ſome preachers who may be compared to the nightingale; ſuch as tho' meagre and ſmall, have yet ſo ſounding a voice, that they make all the vaults of a church reſound; ſo that one who hears without ſeeing them, would think they were perſons of a gigantic ſtature. Look at them and you are as much ſurpriſed as if you were to compare the ſmallneſs of a nightingale with the ſtrength of it's notes. There is, if I am not miſtaken, a fable to this purpoſe, and I remember the obſervation of a Lacedemonian, who having plucked off the feathers of a nightingale, defined it to be a thing which was nothing but voice (6). How happy a forerunner in favour of him who ſpeaks in public is a good mein! it diſpoſes the aſſembly to give great attention, and engages their approbation before he opens his mouth. He has not occaſion for half the eloquence which is neceſſary to procure applauſe to a preacher of a mean aſpect. This is a high encomium on the action and ſentiments of our Muſſo. Therefore this remark will not be thought uſeleſs. It deſerves to be remembred, that he is called the *Chryſyſtom of the Italians*, as Mr Drelincourt obſerves (7).

[*D*] *Paul III ſent him to the council as a proper perſon to diſpute among the reſt of the learned Divines upon all matters which might offer.*] Let us here collect all Muſſo's tranſactions at the council of Trent. He was one

(4) Hinc factum ut funebribus cujuſpiam encomiis inopinato dicendis, vel ſanctorum facta ſtatis diebus præpropero patrum ſuorum monitu celebrandis præter Muſſum ſufficeret nemo. *Imperialis in Muſæo Hiſtor. pag.* 68.

(5) Gioſeppe, in the Life of Cornelio Muſſo.

(6) Plut. in Laconicis apophth. *pag.* 233. *A.*

(7) *Drelincourt, Demandes à l'Evêque de Belley. pag. m.* 37. He cites a ſermon of the biſhop of Bitonto on the *Magnificat*, in which the preacher invokes the virgin in the words of Terence, *Lucina, Lucina fer opem.* - - - *Help oh Lucina.*

the hands of Muſſo; it was he who digeſted it, and explained it with very great diligence and application. The council being tranſlated from Trent to Bologna, was at laſt interrupted. Paul III died. Julius III ſucceeded him, who ſhewed a great deal of kindneſs to the biſhop of Bitonto, and made choice of him for his domeſtic prelate and aſſiſtant. He would not part with him to go to the council till he was informed by the legate, that the preſence of ſo learned a biſhop was abſolutely neceſſary. After the council was broke up, Muſſo went to ſee his biſhopric, and reſided upon it till the inauguration of Pius IV: then he made a journey to Rome, and was again employed by that Pope after the ſame manner as he had been under Julius III, and Paul III; for Pius IV appointed him to preach, and to maintain diſputes at his table. He remembered, that when he was *in minoribus*, he had often diſputed with him in the ſame place, under the papacy of Paul III. Some time after *(f)* he ſent him with his nephew into Germany, which gave him an opportunity of procuring himſelf a great reputation at the court of Ferdinand. He was afterwards employed at Rome in the affairs of the Inquiſition, and in the examination of matters which were treated of at Trent. This prelate departed from Rome after the concluſion of the council, and retired to Bitonto, where he applied himſelf to the reformation of abuſes, and to all the functions of a good biſhop. He had a mind to eſtabliſh a ſeminary, but was forced by the oppoſition raiſed againſt it to give over that deſign. After a reſidence of ten years, he reſolved to go and pay his duty to Pius V, then to viſit his native country, and afterwards to take a journey to Venice, in order to put ſome books in the preſs. He arrived at Rome after Gregory XIII, had ſucceeded Pius V. The new Pope detained him for his aſſiſtant, and would not ſuffer him to continue his journey till the opening of the Jubilee. Muſſo did not live ſo long: he died at Rome January 9, 1574, near ſixty three years old *(g)*. He is very much commended for his

(f) In 1560.

(g) And not 64, as Moreri has it after Ghilini.

---

one of the firſt who went thither: the legates found only the biſhop of Cava at Trent, but were quickly followed by Thomas Campeggio biſhop of Feltro, and by Cornelio Muſſo (8). This latter preached in Latin at the opening of the council (9). His ſermon, the ſubſtance of which you will find in Father Paul (10), was criticiſed (11). Palavicin has much ado to anſwer and confute this criticiſm, altho' he employs all his learning to do it (12). A ſet of people more troubleſome than cenſurers of a ſermon aroſe againſt the biſhop of Bitonto; for his creditors, I mean thoſe who had penſions out of his biſhopric, proſecuted him in the moſt rigorous manner, of which this account is given by Father Paul: 'In the congregation of the fifth of March 1546, the biſhop of Bitonto, who had been lately cited to Rome by the auditor, at the requeſt of his penſioners, who endeavoured to force him by an excommunication, according to the ſtile of that court, to pay what was owing to them, complained of this way of proceeding, and ſaid, that the demands of his penſioners were juſt; but that he was not to be blamed, becauſe he could not live at the council, and pay his penſions: ſo that he muſt either be diſcharged, or be ſupported with an equivalent ſum †. The poor prelates intereſted themſelves for him, looking upon it as a common cauſe; and ſome ſpoke out plainly, that it was an affront to the council, that an officer of the court of Rome ſhould proceed by cenſures againſt a biſhop who aſſiſted at it: that after ſuch an extravagant proceeding the world would have reaſon to ſay, that the council was not free: that to vindicate their honour, they ought to cite the auditor to Trent, or at leaſt to give ſuch a demonſtration of their reſentment againſt him as might ſecure the dignity of the council. Others ſet themſelves to ſpeak againſt penſions, and ſaid, it was very juſt, that the rich churches ſhould relieve the poor ones, but in a way of charity, and not by conſtraint, nor ſo as to deprive themſelves of neceſſaries; and that St Paul has taught the ſame thing ‡: that it was unjuſt the poor biſhops ſhould be forced by cenſures to retrench themſelves of neceſſaries to accommodate the rich; and that this abuſe deſerved very well to be provided againſt by the council, and the antient uſage re-eſtabliſhed. But the legates conſidering whither ſuch juſt complaints might tend, put an end to them, by promiſing that they would write to Rome, to ſtop the proceedings againſt the biſhop, and to grant him wherewithal to ſubſiſt at the council (13).' Palavicin affirms (14), that the acts of this ſeſſion take no notice of theſe complaints, or of theſe reflexions of the prelates; and he adds, that they would have been ill grounded, ſince it would be very unjuſt to diſpenſe with the payment of debts, under the pretence of aſſiſting at a council. He does not deny that Muſſo being cited before the auditor, repreſented modeſtly to the legates his neceſſities, and deſired their aſſiſtance. He obtained his requeſt. They recommended him to the Pope, who, for that time, readily conſented to relieve him with a preſent of a hundred pieces of gold.

It is obſerved (15), that this biſhop vigorouſly maintained, that the Scripture and traditions deſerved an equal reſpect; but at laſt relaxed, and propoſed, that inſtead of an *equal reſpect*, it ſhould be ſaid, *a like reſpect*; but his propoſition was rejected. Palavicini blames his conceſſion. 'Ben è di maraviglia, *ſays he*, che il Muſſo havendo per sè la bontà della cauſa, la forza della ragione, e'l numero de'ſeguaci, ſi ritiraſſe nella vegnente congregazione, dalla ſentenza felicemente difeſa è proponeſſe che in luogo d' *uguale*, ſi poneſſe, *ſimigliante*: Il che non ſorti approvazione. - - - *It is much to be wondered at, that Muſſo having on his ſide the juſtice of the cauſe, the force of the argument, and the number of followers, ſhould yet, in the next congregation, relinquiſh an opinion ſo ſucceſsfully defended, and propoſe inſtead of* equal *to put* like: *which did not meet with approbation*.' This prelate was more orthodox as to the matter of Reſidence, for he maintained, by many arguments, that it was *jure divino* (16). He practiſed this doctrine tolerably well. 'Finito ultimamente, e chiuſo il ſacro Concilio, e deſiderando eſſo Monſignore di ritornar alla ſua Chieſa, far la rezidenza, e mettere in oſſervanza il ſacro Concilio, anzi quello ch' egli haveva ſempre predicato al mondo, mantenuto nel medeſimo ſacro Concilio, e perſuaſo à ſua Beatitudine in materia della reſidenza, con dire ſpeſſo, ubi oves, ibi paſtor; ibi paſtor ubi oves . . . chieſe licenza à ſua Beatitudine, e l'hebbe, coſi parti per Bitonto (17). *At laſt the ſacred council being at an end, and broke up, and our biſhop deſiring to return to his church, to perform reſidence, and put in practice the rules laid down by the council, according to what he had always preached to the world, and maintained in the ſame council, and perſuaded his Holineſs as to the obligation to reſidence, by frequently repeating*, ubi oves, ibi paſtor; ubi paſtor, ibi oves, *where the ſheep are, there ought to be the ſhepherd; where the ſhepherd is, there ought to be the ſheep . . . . he aſked leave of his Holineſs, and having obtained it, ſet out accordingly for Bitonto*.' His explications of the doctrine of Juſtification were applauded in the council (18). He rejected the rigid hypotheſes as to the point of Predeſtination (19), and made an apology for the court of Rome againſt thoſe who aſcribed the abuſes in the elections of biſhops, and thoſe in the plurality of benefices to the Popes (20). In a word, he was regarded as the right-hand of the council (21). He and the archbiſhop

(8) Palavicin, Iſtor. del Concilio, *lib. v, cap. viii, num.* 9, ad ann. 1545.

(9) Id. ib. *cap. xvii, num.* 9.

(10) Fra-Paolo, Hiſt. du Concile de Trente, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 121, ad ann. 1545.

(11) Id. ib. *pag.* 122.

(12) Palavic. ubi ſupra, *cap. xviii.*

† Out of 600 crowns which his biſhopric was worth, he paid 200 in penſions.

‡ Veſtra abundantia illorum inopiam ſuppleat. 2 *Cor. viii.* Unuſquiſque prout deſtinavit in corde ſuo, non ex triſtitia, aut ex neceſſitate. Hilarem enim datorem diligit Deus. 2 *Cor. ix.*

(13) F. Paul, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 140, 141.

(14) Palavic. *lib. vi, cap. xiii, num.* 4, *pag. m.* 636.

(15) Id. ib. *cap. xiv, num.* 3, *pag.* 639.

(16) Ib. *lib. vii, cap. vi, num.* 7, *pag.* 709.

(17) Gioſeppe Muſſo, ubi ſupra.

(18) Palavicin. ubi ſupra, *lib. viii, cap. iv, num.* 14.

(19) Fra-Paolo, *lib. ii, pag.* 195.

(20) Id. ib. *pag.* 231, 232.

(21) Palavicini, ubi ſupra, *lib. viii, cap. vii, num.* 4, *pag.* 780.

his chaſtity, his ſobriety [*E*], his forgetting of injuries [*F*], his devotion, &c. He compoſed ſeveral books, ſome of which have been publiſhed (*b*) [G].

(*b*) Taken from his Life, written in Italian by *Gioſeppe Muſſo, ſua creatura.* It is printed before the *Prediche Quadrageſimali, &c. di Cornelio Muſſo.* I make uſe of the Venice edition in 1603.

archbiſhop of Matera were the two to whom the diſpatches from the legates gave the greateſt commendations (22).

(22) Id. ib.

The following paſſage contains both an error and an omiſſion. ‘ Inde Bertinori, mox Bitonti antiſtes electus: Germaniam ad ſuadendum Ferdinando Imperatori concilium tranſmiſſus: ad id porro Tridenti illa totius orbis celebritate initum Julii tertii, mox Pii quarti Pontificum nutu bis profectus, diſputatoris, arbitri, examinatoris ſuſceptam acriter provinciam exercuit (23). - - - *Being then made biſhop firſt of Bertinoro, and afterwards, of Bitonto, he was ſent to Germany, to recommend the holding a council to the emperor Ferdinand, and went himſelf twice to that which met at Trent with ſuch univerſal ſolemnity, the firſt time by the order of Pope Julius III; and the ſecond, by that of Pope Pius IV, where he diſcharged the office he had undertaken of diſputant, arbiter, and examiner, with great abilities.*’ Muſſo was ſent to the council by Paul III, and was not ſent thither by Pius IV. He has not therefore ſaid that which he ſhould have ſaid, but has ſaid that which he ſhould not have ſaid. If you would have another error, you need only conſider, that it is ſuppoſed here he was ſent to Germany before Julius III deputed him to the council, which is palpably falſe; for it was Pius IV who ſent him to the court of Ferdinand.

(23) Imperia is, ubi ſupra.

[*E*] *He is extreamly commended for his chaſtity, his ſobriety.*] It is pretended that he never knew a woman. ‘ Poſcia egli viſſe caſtiſſimo, e continentiſſimo in tutto il tempo ſuo, e ſi tiene che di quella integrità virginale, che nacque, ſi moriſſe ancora, poiche non ſi ſcorſe mai in eſſo nè detto, ne fatto men c'honeſto in tutta la vita ſua, di che n'hanno fatto fede quelli che l'hanno ſervito dalla gioventu ſino alla ſua morte. Nel mangiare, è nel bere fu molto ſobrio, poiche bevea piu acqua che vino, e di una ò di due ſorte ſole di cibi, e quelli ſemplici, ſi contentava (24). - - - *Since he lived the moſt chaſte and continent, during his whole life, inſomuch that he carried the ſame unſpotted virginity out of the world, which he brought into it, ſince he never once either in word or deed tranſgreſſed the rules of virtue as long as he lived, as is teſtified by thoſe who attended him from his infancy to his death. In eating and drinking he was extreamly ſober, ſince he drank more water than wine, and contented himſelf with only two ſorts of meat, and thoſe the moſt ſimple.*’

(24) Gioſeppe Muſſo, ubi ſupra.

[*F*] - - - - *his forgetting of injuries.*] He was expoſed to the perſecution and calumnies of envious men, yet never ſhowed the leaſt reſentment. ‘ Come anco patientiſſimo, e modeſtiſſimo in ſupportar le peſecutioni e le calumnie de' ſuoi emuli e adverſarii che gli erano fatte, rendendo à ciaſcuno ſempre bene per male, e pregando il ſignore che a loro perdonaſſe (25). - - - - - *As alſo the moſt patient and modeſt in ſuffering the perſecutions and calumnies of envious men, and his adverſaries, always returning to every one of them good for evil, and praying to* GOD *to forgive them.*’ His calumniators, who endeavoured to oppreſs him, did not ſucceed in their deſign; on the contrary, all the confuſion they intended fell upon themſelves (26). Yet they put a ſtop to the advancement of his fortune; they prevented his attaining the dignities (§ α) which he had reaſon to promiſe himſelf (27). If we knew all the particulars of theſe proceedings, we ſhould the better underſtand how far it is to be wondered at, that ſuch a man obtained as a reward of ſo great labours nothing more than the biſhopric of Bitonto.

(25) Id. ib.

(26) *See* Ghilini, Teatro, *Part i*, *pag.* 39.

(27) Communi literatorum fato livoris tetros expertus aculeos deſtinata ſibi honorum faſtigia non attigit. *Imperialis, ubi ſupra.*

[(§ α) Particularly to that of cardinal, which was refuſed the biſhop of Bitonto by the Pope, it having been whiſpered in his ear, that this biſhop was a baſtard. See the notes on the Confeſſion of Sanci, edition of 1699, pag. 431. REM. CRIT.]

[*G*] *He compoſed ſeveral works, ſome of which have been publiſhed*]. His treatiſe *de Viſitatione & de modo Viſitandi*, was printed under the title of *Synodus Bitontina*. The author who informs me of this, adds, that the three books *de Deo, & de Divina Hiſtoria*, would ſoon be printed (28). I find in Ghilini (29), that there are five books of Cornelio Muſſo, *de Hiſtoria Divina*. But the principal works of this prelate are his ſermons. Several volumes of them were publiſhed after his death. ‘ Scriſſe molti volumi di prediche, chiamati quadrageſimali, oltre quelle ſtravaganti che vanno fuori di diverſe materie e ſoggetti (30). - - - - *He wrote a great many volumes of ſermons, called Lent-ſermons, beſides thoſe which he publiſhed on different ſubjects and occaſions.*’ There is prefixed to the firſt volume a diſcourſe of Bernardin Tomitano, concerning the beauty, the method, and the character, of the ſermons of our Cornelio. The *Prediche Quadrageſimali, the Lent-ſermons*, were dedicated to cardinal Farneſe, in 1586, by Gioſeppe Muſſo. You may ſee in Moreri, that Gabriel Chapuis publiſhed a French tranſlation of the ſermons of this prelate in 1584.

(28) Gioſeppe Muſſo, ubi ſupra.

(29) Ghilini, Teatro, *Part i*, *pag.* 40.

(30) Gioſeppe Muſſo, ubi ſupra.

MUSTAPHA, emperor of the Turks ſucceeded his brother Achmet, who died November the fifteenth 1617 (*a*). The people ſoon found their miſtake in thinking him more capable of reigning than Oſman the ſon of Achmet. They therefore depoſed him two months after, and placed Oſman upon the throne of his father. We ſhall ſee elſewhere (*b*) how Muſtapha was reſtored, and then depoſed a ſecond time.

(*a*) Mercure François, *Tom. v*, ad ann. 1617, *pag. m.* 185.

(*b*) In the article OSMAN.

MUSURUS (MARC), a native of Candia, diſtinguiſhed himſelf among the learned men who appeared in Italy towards the beginning of the XVIth century. He taught Greek in the univerſity of Padua with great reputation, and with ſo much application in the diſcharge of his office, that he ſcarce miſſed reading public lectures four days in a year (*a*). He read them commonly at ſeven a clock in a morning. He was admirably ſkilled in the Latin tongue, which had ſcarce ever been obſerved before of any Greek tranſplanted into the Weſt (*b*), and he ſtudied Philoſophy with extraordinary application. This is what is ſaid of him by one who knew him perſonally [*A*]. Some ſay,

(*a*) Eraſm. Epiſt. V, *lib. xxiii*, *pag.* 1209.

(*b*) Id. ib.

[*A*]. *One who knew him perſonally.*] It is Eraſmus I mean; and I am perſuaded a great many will read here with pleaſure what he ſays of Muſurus. ‘ Patavii neminem vidi celebrem, mortuos tantum commemoro, præter *Raphaëlem Regium* hominem admodum natu grandem, ſed cruda viro viridiſque ſenectus. Erat tum, ut opinor, non minor annis ſeptuaginta, & tamen nulla fuit hyems tam aſpera quin ille mane hora ſeptima adiret *M. Muſurum Græcè* profitentem, qui toto anno vix quatuor intermittebat dies quin publicè profiteretur. Juvenes hyemis rigorem ferre non poterant, illum ſenem nec pudor nec hyems abigebat ab auditorio. *Muſurus* autem ante ſenectutem periit, poſteaquam ex benignitate *Leonis* cœperat eſſe Archiepiſcopus, vir natione *Græcus*, nimirum *Cretenſis*, ſed *Latinæ* linguæ uſque ad miraculum doctus, quod vix ulli *Græco* contigit præter *Theodorum Gazam*, & *Joannem Laſcarem* qui adhuc in vivis eſt. Deinde totius Philoſophiæ non tantùm ſtudioſiſſimus, vir ſummis rebus natus, ſi licuiſſet ſupereſſe (1). - - - *At Padua I ſaw nobody of note, I ſpeak only of thoſe who are now dead, but Raphaël Regius, a man of great age, yet vigorous and ſtrong. He was then, I imagine, not leſs than ſeventy years old, and yet the ſevereſt winter did not hinder him from attending Muſurus, who read Greek lectures every*

(1) Eraſm. Epiſt. v, *lib. xxiii*, *pag.* 1209.

ſay, that the deſire of preferment induced him to go to Rome [*B*], to make his court to Leo X. His journey was not unſucceſsful, ſince he obtained of this Pope the archbiſhopric of Malvazia in the Morea, but he was ſcarce dignified with this high title, when he died at Rome in the Autumn of the year 1517 (*c*). It was of a Dropſy, if we may believe Paul Jovius (*d*), who adds, that his grief at not being promoted to a cardinal's hat, threw him into a languiſhing diſtemper. They add, that he was a good Poet, and that the elogium of Plato, which he wrote in Greek verſe, and prefixed to the works of this Philoſopher, was received with great applauſe, and looked on as a piece which equalled the beſt Poems of antiquity. The ſame Paul Jovius pretends, that the league which made war againſt the Venetians, obliged Muſurus to quit his profeſſor's place, and to keep himſelf retired in his ſtudy. This is not relating matters accurately (*e*). Mr Varillas has a very pleaſant ſtory upon our Muſurus (*f*); but till he produces ſufficient proof of the account he has given, almoſt all his fine flouriſhes ought to eſteemed no better than a romance [*C*]. We ſhall make ſome

‘ *morning at ſeven a-clock, without omitting that office* ‘ *four times all the year round. The young ſcholars could* ‘ *not bear the coldneſs of the winter, but neither the* ‘ *cold, nor the ill opinion ſome might have of it, could* ‘ *keep this old man from his auditory. But Muſurus* ‘ *died before he arrived at old age, after having been* ‘ *juſt made an archbiſhop, by the favour of Pope Leo,* ‘ *being a Grecian by birth, namely a Cretan, but ſur-* ‘ *prizingly ſkilled in the Latin tongue, which ſcarce* ‘ *ever happened to any other Grecian, except Theodore* ‘ *Gaza, and John Laſcaris, who is yet alive. Beſides* ‘ *this, he was not only a great Philoſopher, but qualified* ‘ *for the higheſt attainments, if he had lived.*’ The letter from whence I take theſe words, was written in 1524. Eraſmus ſays ſomething in it of the father of Marc Muſurus, a good old man, who knew only his mother-tongue (2). It is ſomething ſtrange, and very much to the honour of our Greek profeſſor, that ſo learned a man as Raphaël Regius ſhould frequent all his lectures at ſeventy years of age. If all the elogiums, which Muſurus has received from Cœlius Rhodiginus in an epiſtle dedicatory (3), be true, it would be unjuſt to deny him the title of a very great man.

I am going to cite an author who aſcribes to him great reading, a prodigious memory, a great penetration, an admirable clearneſs, and an exceeding tenderneſs for his father. ‘ Nihil erat tam reconditum, ‘ quod non aperiret, nec tam involutum quod non ‘ expediret Muſurus, vere Muſarum cuſtos & antiſtes. ‘ Omnia legerat, excuſſerat omnia. Schemata lo- ‘ quutionum, fabulas, hiſtorias, ritus veteres ad un- ‘ guem callebat. Hanc tam conſummatam eruditio- ‘ nem etiam inſignis pietas commendabat, dum pa- ‘ trem Græculum jam grandævum amanter ſeduloque ‘ foveret (4). - - - - *There was nothing ſo difficult which* ‘ *he did not comprehend, nothing ſo obſcure which he did* ‘ *not clear up, being truly the patron and protector of the* ‘ *Muſes. The phraſes, the fables, the hiſtories, the rites* ‘ *of the Antients, he had at his fingers end. This con-* ‘ *ſummate knowledge was alſo ſet off with as remark-* ‘ *able a piety, while he treated his poor Grecian father* ‘ *with the moſt tender inſtances of filial duty.*’

[*B*] *The deſign of preferment induced him to go to Rome.*] According to Paul Jovius (5), it was the war which forced him to quit his profeſſorſhip at Padua, when a formidable league was entered into againſt the republic of Venice (6). He muſt therefore have left Padua in 1509. Paul Jovius would have Muſurus, after this retreat, to live quietly in his ſtudy, till he went to Rome, whither Leo X, attracted by rewards the moſt celebrated genius's. But as I find in a letter written to Eraſmus in 1518, that the ſenate of Venice had given public notice, that at the end of two months they would chuſe a profeſſor of the Greek tongue in the room of Marc Muſurus (7), I am very much tempted to reject what Paul Jovius ſays; for I think it by no means probable, that, after the Venetians had in 1509, repulſed the emperor Maximilian who had beſieged Padua, and their affairs were ſettled again in a pretty good condition, they ſhould not think of filling the Greek profeſſor's chair till 1518. But the following paſſage of Aldus Manutius informs us, that Paul Jovius did not ſpeak with exactneſs. It ſhews, that Muſurus read lectures in Venice upon the antient Greek authors, at the time when he was invited by Leo X. ‘ Hæc autem à nobis præſtari tibi potuerunt ‘ ſuaſore adjutoreque M. Muſuro, quem nuper héroi- ‘ carum literarum decus Venetiis propagantem Græciæ ‘ priſcis autoribus partim illuſtri juventuti enarrandis ‘ non ſine laude, partim emendatione caſtigationeque ‘ in priſtinum nitorem quoad ejus fieri poterat, reſti- ‘ tuendis, Leo X Pont. Opt. Max. ſponte ſua nihil ‘ tale cogitantem admirabili conſenſu ſacroſancto- ‘ rum Cardinalium in Archiepiſcopalem dignitatem ‘ evexit (8). - - - *But theſe we might have performed for* ‘ *you by the perſuaſion and aſſiſtance of Muſurus, who* ‘ *as he was promoting learning at Venice, partly by ex-* ‘ *plaining to the young illuſtrious ſtudents the antient* ‘ *Greek authors, not without great applauſe, and partly* ‘ *reſtoring them to their original purity, as far as was* ‘ *poſſible, with his corrections and emendations, was ad-* ‘ *vanced to the archiepiſcopal dignity, which he never* ‘ *had once dreamt of, by the ſole act of Leo X, with* ‘ *the unanimous conſent of the ſacred college of cardinals.*’ Aldus Manutius owns there the aſſiſtance he had received from Muſurus, for the edition of Pauſanias. I ſhall add by the way, that at the beginning of this edition, there is a Greek letter of Muſurus to John Laſcaris, which Mr Perrault might have made an advantage of, for it refutes thoſe who admire only the antients.

To rectify this account of Paul Jovius, we ought to ſuppoſe, that Marc Muſurus, at his leaving Padua, retired to Venice, and there read lectures till ſuch time as he went to Rome. We ought alſo to affirm, that the ſucceſſor, whom the ſenate of Venice intended to appoint in his place in 1518, was to fill not the profeſſor's chair at Padua, but that at Venice. We ſhall ſee hereafter (9) in a paſſage of Pierius Valerianus, that Muſurus taught firſt at Padua, and afterwards at Venice. He taught at Venice in 1513 and in 1514, as we learn from Aldus Manutius in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Athenæus.

[*C*] *All the fine flouriſhes in Varillas's ſtory on him, ought to be eſteemed no better than a romance.*] He informs us, that Muſurus had already ſignalized himſelf in Candia by his criticiſms upon the Greek authors when the Republic of Venice gave him a profeſſor's chair at Padua; *That the number of his auditors in this laſt place was ſo great, that it was found neceſſary to enlarge the public ſchool, and to give Muſurus leave to teach Grammar in the morning and Poetry in the afternoon, to ſatisfy thoſe who were deſirous of hearing him explain thoſe two liberal arts: that he continued profeſſor till the war diſperſed his hearers, and obliged himſelf to provide for his own ſecurity: that he retired to Rome, where he wrote* a poem (10), which was thought too excellent to be his performance: *that it was therefore rather ſuſpected he had found it in ſome ancient manuſcript, and publiſhed it under his own name:* that this *ſuſpicion was founded on an impoſſibility that any author ſhould in thoſe days compoſe a work, in which the ſtile and beauty of the Greek poetry in the age of Alexander the Great were retrieved in their higheſt degree of perfection:* That Muſurus himſelf helped to confirm this opinion, *for he would write nothing more of that kind leſt by ſome inferior or leſs finiſhed piece, he might be in danger of forfeiting the high reputation he had obtained all of a ſudden, and beyond his expectation: that he contented himſelf to make it appear, by explaining to his Roman auditories the moſt beautiful paſſages of Homer, Heſiod, Theocritus, and Anacreon, that he was able to imitate them, ſince he underſtood ſo perfectly the turn and delicacy of their verſe: and to lead ſo unexceptionable a life, that this ſuſpicion of fraud was inſenſibly forgotten: that he was in this ſituation when Leo X, was choſen Pope*: that he experienced the earlieſt liberalities of this

---

(*c*) Paulus Bombaſius, Epiſt. ad Eraſmum xxiii, *lib. ii*, inter Eraſmianas.

(*d*) In Elog. *cap. xxx.*

(*e*) See the remark [*B*].

(*f*) Anecdotes de Florence, *pag.* 180, 181, 182.

(2) Quodam die cum domi ipſius cænaturus eſſem & adeſſet pater ſeniculus, qui nihil niſi Græce ſciebat. *Id. ib.*

(3) Before the fourteenth book of his *Antiquæ Lectiones.*

(4) Beat. Rhenan. in Vita Eraſmi, *pag. m.* 33, 34.

(5) Jovius, in Elogiis, *cap. xxx.*

(6) Sæva conjuratione externarum gentium afflictis bello Venetis inde exturbatus. *Id. ib.*

(7) Scias in Senatu *Veneto* ſancitum eſſe, atque etiam præconio publicatum, eligendum eſſe ſucceſſorem *Marco Muſuro*, qui publicè *Græcas* literas auditores doceat, ſtipendiumque centenorum aureorum decretum. *Epiſt. Eraſm. xxviii, lib. x, pag.* 530.

(8) Aldus Manutius, Præfat. in Pauſaniam.

(9) In the remark [*F*].

(10) It was the Elogy of Plato.

ſome reflexions upon his narrative [*D*], and on the abridgment given of it in the Supplement to Moreri [*E*]. Muſurus has not been forgotten in the catalogue of unfortunate learned men [*F*]; but he is there repreſented as a man ſo far from all ambition, that dignities appeared to him an unſupportable incumbrance. Thus you ſee how much we differ from other authors who ſpeak of him. He publiſhed only a ſmall number of Greek

this Pope, and was promoted to the archbiſhopric of Raguſa: that he preſently ſet about *canvaſſing to be made a cardinal: that he quitted his books to ſtudy intrigues: that he became ſo great a maſter this way, that the Pope, aſtoniſhed at this change, uſed to teize, and rally him: that he perſiſted however in this way, and took ſuch new meaſures with thoſe whom he ſaw in greateſt favour at court, that they aſſured him of a cardinal's hat the firſt promotion; but that the Pope took a pleaſure in diſappointing them, purely to have the opportunity of laughing to ſee what part Muſurus would act next: that Muſurus did not fail to furniſh his houſe, to increaſe his train, and even prepare his intended ſpeech of thanks:* that not being included in the promotion *of thirty one, who were added to the ſacred college, his virtue proved too weak to digeſt the affront he thought he had received: that he complained of it as a contempt ſhewn to the whole Greek nation in his perſon, and that, to carry his reſentment as far as it could poſſible go, he fell ſick of a Dropſy and died.*

[*D*] *We ſhall make ſome reflexions upon his narrative.*] In the firſt place I can hardly imagine, that if it had been neceſſary to enlarge the public ſchool, to make room for a greater number of auditors, Eraſmus, who could not be ignorant of this, ſhould ſay nothing of it in the paſſage above cited (11), where he tells us at what hour, and with what exactneſs, Muſurus read his lectures; how great was the diligence of an old man of ſeventy years of age to be preſent at them, and how much it exceeded that of the young ſtudents during the cold weather. II. I have already ſaid (12), that Muſurus quitting Padua, when the Venetian ſtate was ravaged by the enemy in 1509, did not wholly withdraw himſelf from the ſervice of the republic of Venice. I add, that, according to Paul Jovius, he wrote his panegyric upon Plato before he went to Rome. Where then has Mr Varillas found that this poem was written at Rome? III. If this poem be only one of the epigrams printed before the works of Plato, as Voſſius (13) and Mr Baillet (14) affirm: it is an exaggeration beyond all the bounds of true Rhetoric, to ſay ſo much as Mr Varillas has ſaid of it. He had better have tranſlated Paul Jovius litterally; an author who does not much ſtand in need of a paraphraſe, he himſelf being a paraphraſt upon his own thoughts, ſo greatly does he love to ſpin them out in a great number of affected words. Now ſee what he ſays of this elogium of Plato: ‘ Extat id ‘ poëma, & in limine operum Platonis legitur, com‘ mendatione publica cum antiquis elegantia comparan‘ dum (15). - - - - *That poem is extant, and to be ‘ met with at the head of Plato's works, and is pub‘ lickly commended as comparable for elegance with thoſe ‘ of antiquity.*’ But once more, if this poem be nothing but an epigram, what can be more childiſh than the remark of Paul Jovius, that the war did not reduce Muſurus to ſuch a ſtate of idleneſs, but that he made verſes in the praiſe of Plato (16). It is indeed a fine proof that a profeſſor who has been forced to quit his place, has not wholly given himſelf to idleneſs to ſay that he has made an epigram. I ſhall not conceal what Voſſius has declared, that it was believed, Leo X promoted Muſurus to the archbiſhopric, chiefly on account of this epigram (17). Conſider the exhortation which I ſhall make below (18). IV. It is a poor way of proving one's innocence as to the ſtealing of other men's thoughts to alledge, that he leads a good life; it never was obſerved that a plagiary is leſs regular, with reſpect to morality than they who cite their authors, and ſcorn to adorn themſelves in borrowed feathers. It is doubtleſs a breach of morals, and an actual ſin to pirate authors; but it is a ſin of ſuch a nature, as prevails neither more nor leſs in one who is ſenſual and debauched, than in one who is chaſte and ſober. V. Muſurus did not obtain the mitre till 1517: and therefore it is not true, that he experienced the earlieſt liberalities of Leo X, who was made Pope in 1513. VI. He was not promoted to the archbiſhopric of Raguſa, but to that of Malvaſia in the Morea. *Archïepiſcopus Epidaurenſis* in Paul Jovius, ſignifies neither the old nor the new Raguſa; but is the ſame ſee which others call *Monembaſienſis*. Thus we find that a friend of Eraſmus (19), writing to him about the death of Muſurus, makes uſe of theſe words, ‘ Marcus Muſurus qui paulo ante (20) Monovaſienſis Ar‘ chiepiſcopus eſſe cœperat, hoc autumno Romæ agens ‘ in communem abiit locum. - - - - - *Mark Muſurus, ‘ who had been juſt before made archbiſhop of Malvaſia, ‘ died this autumn at Rome.*’ Lorenzo Craſſo (21), who knew nothing almoſt of Muſurus but what he had read in Paul Jovius, has taken *Archiepiſcopus Epidaurenſis* for *archbiſhop of Raguſa*: and ſeveral others have fallen into the very ſame error. VII. There was ſo little time between the nomination of Muſurus to the archbiſhopric of Malvaſia, and the promotion of the thirty one cardinals, that the part Mr Varillas makes him act in this interval, all his canvaſſing for votes, and all the meaſures he took to procure a cardinal's hat, can be nothing but pure romance. For the reſt Muſurus would not have been the laſt who complained of the ſmall regard which was ſhewn at Rome for the Greek nation, upon making a promotion of cardinals. We have already ſeen (22), that Arſenius made this complaint to Paul III. VIII. The paſſage I cite (23) proves, that Mr Varillas has miſrepreſented the complaint made by Muſurus. I grant, that an Hiſtorian may be allowed to repreſent perſons according to what they think, altho' they do not openly expreſs their ſentiments: but this requires two conditions; one is, that it ſhould be evident, or at leaſt very probable, that they think ſuch a thing; the ſecond, that the Hiſtorian ſhould give notice, that thoſe ſentiments have not been actually expreſſed in words, but have however been ſufficiently made appear. Mr Varillas has not obſerved the laſt of theſe two conditions; he repreſents Muſurus not as complaining inwardly in his heart, but as expreſſing his complaint *viva voce*, and in proper terms, that the Greek nation had been ſlighted in his perſon. But he did not complain thus, he contented himſelf with ſaying, that to create above thirty cardinals in one day, without including among them ſo much as one Grecian, was an affront to that nation. Here is nothing as to theſe words which at all concerns the perſon of Muſurus: the expreſſions may admit of this ſenſe, that if any Greek had been promoted, Muſurus would not have complained that he was forgotten. It plainly appears, you will ſay, what was his ſentiment. I own it, but then we ought to ſay he thought ſo, and not that he ſaid ſo.

[*E*] . . . . *and on the abridgment given it in the Supplement to Moreri.*] I have nothing more to ſay of it, than that the author of the Supplement has not corrected, in any one particular, the Anecdotes of Mr Varillas.

[*F*] *He has not been forgotten in the catalogue of unfortunate learned men.*] Theſe are the words of Pierius Valerianus: ‘ Neque Marci Muſuri ſortem quiſquam ‘ lætam dixerit, qui licet & Patavii, & Venetiis apud ‘ nobilitatem veſtram ſumma omnium commendatione, ‘ & gratia complures annos Græcas litteras docuiſſet, ‘ & doctrinæ nomine ab Leone Decimo Pontifice ‘ Maximo duplici flaminis honore decoratus, à Julio ‘ ejus Pontificis fratre tunc Cardinali ſacerdote, qui ‘ nunc eſt ſummus Pontifex, in amicitiam ſuſceptus ‘ magna omnium dilectione coleretur, neſcio qua tamen ‘ animi mœſtitia clam exulceratus, ut qui non modo ‘ non dignitatem ullam, aut beneficii commodum in ‘ eo vitæ colore duceret, qui hominum opinione judi‘ catur ampliſſimus, ſed ſibi ſumma in libertate var‘ ſari ſolito ſummam etiam deformitatem, & miſeriam ‘ arbitraretur, in occultum ex ea cura incidit mor‘ bum, cujus nulli Medicorum cauſa cognita, interque ‘ tacitas anxietates, miſerrimaſque fortunæ ſuæ deplo‘ rationes diutiſſime vexatus expiravit (24). - - - - *Nor ‘ can we eſteem the fortune of Marc Muſurus proſperous, ‘ who tho' he taught the Greek language at Padua ‘ and at Venice among your nobility, with univerſal ap‘ plauſe and favour for many years, and was promoted ‘ by*

(11) In the remark [*A*], citation (1).

(12) In the remark [*B*].

(13) Voſſius, de Poët. Græc. *pag.* 84.

(14) *Jugemens ſur les Poëees, num.* 1248. There is nothing of Muſurus in the edition of Plato at Francfort in 1602, tranſlated by Ficinus, nor in that of 1578, of Henry Stephens, tranſlated by de Serres.

(15) Jovius, Elogior. *cap. xxx.*

(16) Inde exturbatus ita tranquillum otium quæſivit, ut Græco carmine divi Platonis laudes decantaret. *Id. ib.*

(17) Voſſius, de Poëtis Græcis, *pag.* 84. *Konig in relating this, puts Leo XI, by miſtake for Leo X.*

(18) In the remark [*G*].

(19) *Paul Bombaſius.* His letter among thoſe of Eraſmus, is the twenty third of the ſecond book, and dated the ſixth of December 1517.

(20) *Paul Jovius ſays in the ſame ſenſe,* Vix oſtentatis mitræ inſignibus expiravit.

(21) Iſtor. de' Poeti Greci.

(22) Above, citation (1) of the article ARSENIUS, Arch. of Monembaſia.

(23) Quum ſæpe quæreretur Græci generis neminem quaſi probro gentis lectum fuiſſe, quando princeps in donanda purpura maxime liberalis, uno comitiali die ſupra triginta nationum omnium delecta capita galero purpureo perornaſſet. *Jovius, Elog. cap. xxx.*

(24) Pier. Valer. de Literat. Infelicit. *lib.* i, *pag.* 11.

Greek verſes, and ſome prefaces in proſe [*G*]. The public is indebted to him for the firſt edition of Ariſtophanes and for that of Athenæus [*H*]. We ſhall mention the judgment Eraſmus has given of him [*I*]. Andreas Schottus ought not to have aſcribed to him the *Magnum Etymologicum* [*K*]. Paulus Freherus has committed a groſs miſtake

‘ *by Leo X, on account of his learning, to the archiepiſcopal honour, and received into friendſhip by Julius the* ‘ *brother of that Pope, then cardinal prieſt, and now* ‘ *Pope, and highly reſpected by all, yet languiſhed under* ‘ *I know not what inward chagrin, as one who not* ‘ *only did not reliſh the dignity and advantage of that ſtation of life, which in the opinion of men is eſteemed* ‘ *the moſt honourable, but even looked upon it as diſagreeable and unfortunate to him who was uſed to delight* ‘ *ſo much in the moſt perfect freedom, ſo that falling* ‘ *from thence into a lingring diſtemper, the cauſe of which* ‘ *could not be diſcovered by the Phyſicians, after having* ‘ *long laboured under the ſecret anxieties of his mind,* ‘ *and the grievous ſenſe of his misfortunes, he expired.*’

[G] *He publiſhed only a ſmall number of Greek verſes, and ſome prefaces in proſe.*] Theſe words of Geſner appear to me remarkable: ‘ Marcus Muſurus Cretenſis ‘ ſcripſit Epigrammata aliquot, præcipuè in Græcos ‘ libros per Nicolaum Blaſtum Venetiis impreſſos circa ‘ annum 1500, quibus ipſe opinor corrigendis præfuit: ‘ item præfationes aliquas proſa, ut in Etymologicon ‘ Græcum, &c (25). - - - *Marc Muſurus, the Cretan,* ‘ *wrote ſome epigrams, eſpecially on thoſe Greek books,* ‘ *printed by Nicolas Blaſtus at Venice about the year* 1500, ‘ *for which I believe he corrected the preſs; alſo ſome* ‘ *prefaces in proſe, as that before the* Etymologicon ‘ Græcum, &c.’ They appear to me remarkable for two reaſons; becauſe they give me an opportunity to exhort thoſe who have the advantage of proper libraries, to ſatisfy us in the firſt place, whether the epigram upon Plato is to be found among the others which Muſurus publiſhed towards the year 1500; in the ſecond place, whether he was corrector of Blaſtus's Printing-preſs at Venice, as Geſner believed. Paul Jovius, and ſome others, would very juſtly deſerve to be laughed at, if it ſhould appear that this epigram preceded the famous league of Cambray againſt the republic of Venice.

I was in hopes that the exhortation juſt now mentioned might have procured me all the information I wanted; and yet no body has had the goodneſs to give me any aſſiſtance: however I have found ſomething to my purpoſe in the book of Mr Chevillier. There I find that our Muſurus was really corrector of the Printing-preſs (26), and *that it was he who corrected the great* Etymologicòn, *which was printed at Venice, in folio in* 1499, *by Zachary Calliergus, at the expence of Nicolas Blaſtus* (27). I find there alſo, ‘ that *Aldus* ‘ *Manutius, by whom he was employed to correct the* ‘ *Greek manuſcrips, and reviſe the printed ſheets, in-* ‘ *ſerted his elogy in theſe words in the Greek Plato of* ‘ 1513. Muſurus Cretenſis, magno Vir judicio, mag- ‘ nâ doctrinâ, qui hos Platonis Libros accuratè recog- ‘ novit, cum antiquiſſimis conferens Exemplaribus, ut ‘ unà mecum, quod ſemper facit, multum adjumenti ‘ afferret & Græcis & noſtris hominibus. - - - - *Mu-* ‘ *ſurus, the Cretan, a man of ſound judgment, and great* ‘ *learning, who accurately corrected theſe books of Plato,* ‘ *having compared them with the moſt ancient copies,* ‘ *that together with me, as he makes it his conſtant bu-* ‘ *ſineſs, he may give all poſſible aſſiſtance both to his* ‘ *countrymen and mine.*’ I was ſtill at a loſs as to the ‘ poem wherein Muſurus has given Plato's elogium, but am ſet right by the good offices of Mr Villemandi (28), who has taken the pains to conſult the copy in the library at Leyden. He has aſſured to me, that the Plato printed at Venice, *iu ædibus Aldi & Andreæ Soceri*, in 1513, contains after the Epiſtle Dedicatory (29) a Greek poem of two hundred hexameter and pentameter verſes, which take up four pages, compoſed by Muſurus, and is an elogium of Plato. We may conclude from hence, that Voſſius ought not to have called it an epigram: however, it is certain that Paul Jovius has drawn a ridiculous proof from it of the authors not being idle after his departure from Padua. Philip Munckerus publiſhed this poem of Muſurus at Amſterdam, in 1681, *cum verſione latina & elegantiſſima Zenobii Acciaioli metaphraſi poëtica.* It contains forty pages in 4to.

[*H*] *The public is indebted to him for the firſt edition* . . . . . *of Athenæus.*] We have already obſerved in it's proper place (30), that Caſaubon found this edition very defective: yet Aldus Manucius who printed it greatly commends the care of Muſurus. Thus he ſpeaks; ‘ Muſurus noſter libros hos ſic accurate recenſuit col- ‘ latos & cum multis exemplaribus, & cum epitome, ut ‘ infinitis pene in locis eos emendaverit, carminaque quæ ‘ veluti proſa in aliis legebantur, in ſua metra reſtituerit. ‘ Adde quod primus & ſecundus liber, qui in aliis dee- ‘ rant, ex epitome additi ſunt cum bona parte tertii libri: ‘ erat enim hic ſine capite, quo factum eſt, ut iidem ferè ‘ hi exiſtimari poſſint, qui erant integri, quoniam ea ‘ eſt materia, ut non multa ſubtrahi ex eis potuerint ‘ (31). - - - - - *Our Muſurus corrected theſe books ſo* ‘ *accurately, by collating them both with a great many* ‘ *copies, and alſo with the epitome, that he has recti-* ‘ *fied almoſt an infinite number of paſſages in them, and* ‘ *reſtored the verſes to their meaſure, which were read* ‘ *for proſe in other editions. Beſides this, he has added* ‘ *from the Epitome the firſt and ſecond book, which were* ‘ *wholly wanting in others, and a great part of the* ‘ *third, the beginning of which was wanting, ſo that* ‘ *by this care, they may all be thought to be very near-* ‘ *ly the ſame with the complete originals, for the ſub-* ‘ *ject is ſuch that it is eaſy to ſee there cannot be* ‘ *much wanting.*’

[*I*] *The judgment which Eraſmus has given of him.*] See what I have already cited (32) out of one of his letters; and add to it what here follows: ‘ M. Mu- ‘ ſurum propius novi, virum inſigniter eruditum in ‘ omni diſciplinarum genere, in carmine ſubobſcurum ‘ & affectatum: oratione proſa præter unam alteram- ‘ ve præfationem nihil, quod ſciam, reliquit. Mira- ‘ bar hominem Græcum tantum ſcire Latine. Et ‘ hunc fortuna retraxit à Muſis, dum Leonis favore ‘ Romam accitus incipit Archiepiſcopus eſſe, fato ‘ præreptus eſt (33). - - - - *Muſurus was my intimate* ‘ *acquaintance, a man eminently ſkilled in all kinds of* ‘ *learning, in his poetry ſomething obſcure and affect-* ‘ *ed; in proſe he left nothing that I know of beſides a* ‘ *preface or two. I have wondred that a Grecian could* ‘ *become ſo great a maſter of Latin. It is preferment* ‘ *interrupted his commerce with the Muſes, and being* ‘ *called to Rome by the favour of Leo as he was juſt* ‘ *made an archbiſhop he died.*’ Theſe words incline us to believe, that Muſurus renounced the profeſſion of letters from the time that Leo X, did him the favour to invite him to Rome; yet it is certain that he was profeſſor at Rome, as appears by theſe verſes:

Ce mien Pere (34) Angevin, gentilhomme de race,
L'un des premiers François qui les Muſes embraſſe,
D'ignorance ennemi, deſireux de ſçavoir,
Paſſant torrens & mons juſqu'à Rome alla voir
MUSURE Candiot: qu'il ouït pour apprendre
Le Grec des vieux auteurs, & pour docte s'y rendre:
Où ſi bien travailla, que dedans quelques ans
Il ſe fit admirer, & des plus ſufiſans.

My Sire, in Anjou born, of no mean race,
Among French ſcholars ſought an early place,
Sworn foe to Ignorance, and Learning's friend,
Where rapid ſtreams, and Alpine hills defend
The tedious way, he bent his ſtudious courſe,
And trac'd the Muſes up to Rome their ſource:
Where great MUSURUS *from the chair explain'd,*
Each noble thought in Grecian works contain'd;
Where ſuch a pupil, under ſuch a guide,
Soon with the foremoſt ſons of ſcience vy'd.

[*K*] *Andreas Scottus ought not to have aſcribed to him the* Etymologicum magnum.] It is Mr Menage (35) who has taken notice of this miſtake, and refuted it by obſerving that Euſtathius has cited this *Etymologicum.* This very well deſerved the parentheſis I am now going to quote. ‘ Auctor magni Etymologi- ‘ ci quiſquis tandem ille ſit (Nicam eſſe ſcribit amicus ‘ noſter Iſaacus Voſſius in notis ad Pomponium Me- ‘ lam: quod an verum ſit neſcio: certe falſum eſſe ‘ ſcio,

(25) Geſner. in Bibliot. *fol.* 495, *verſo.*

(26) See, above, citation (28) of the article LASCARIS (JOHN).

(27) Chevillier, Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris, *pag.* 194.

(28) *Who is mentioned above, citat.* (4) *of the article ARRIAGA; and in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *Octob.* 1685, *Art. V, & Auguſt* 1686, *Art. VI.*

(29) Addreſſed to Leo X.

(30) *Above, remark* [*D*] *of the article ATHENÆUS.*

(31) Aldus, in Præfat. Athenæi.

(32) *Above, remark* [*A*].

(33) Eraſm. in Ciceroniano.

(34) *It is Antony de Baif who ſpeaks of Lazarus de Baif, his father, in a letter to Charles IX: prefixed to his works printed at Paris in* 1573, *in* 8vo.

(35) Notis ad Diog Laërtium, *lib. iii, num.* 7, *pag.* 141.

miſtake [*L*].

‘ ſcio, quod vir doctiſſimus Andreas Schottus, in præfatione ad proverbia Græcorum, exiſtimabat auctorem hujus libri eſſe Marcum Muſurum, ſiquidem ab Euſtathio Magnum Etymologicum laudatur) Auctor, inquam Etymologici conditorem Academiæ, & Academum & Ecademum fuiſſe dictum ſcribit. - - - - - *The author of the great* Etymologicon, *whoever he is, (our friend Iſaac Voſſius, in his notes on Mela, ſays it was Nicas, which whether it be true I know not, but I am ſure what the learned Andreas Schottus ſuggeſted in his preface to the Greek proverbs is falſe, that Marc Muſurus was author of this work, becauſe the* Etymologicum magnum *is quoted by Euſtathius) the author, I ſay, of the* Etymologicum *affirms, that the founder of the Academy, was called both Academus and Ecademus.*’

[*L*] *Paul Freherus has committed a groſs miſtake.*] He has not only ranked Muſurus in the number of cardinals, but has built his aſſertion on the teſtimony of Paul Jovius. He cites only this author, and ſets down his words, which plainly prove, that Muſurus died of grief, for his not obtaining the purple. And yet Paul Freherus ſays, ‘ Vix deguſtata Cardinalatus dignitate Romæ exſpirarit (36). - - - - *He died at Rome after having juſt been made a cardinal.*’

(36) In Theatro Viror. erudit. *pag.* 25.

MUTIUS (HULDRIC) (*a*) profeſſor at Baſil in the XVI century was a Swiſs by birth (*b*). He publiſhed ſeveral works, the moſt conſiderable of which, if I am not miſtaken, is a Hiſtory of Germany [*A*], which he printed at Baſil in the year 1539, in

(*a*) And not *Henry* as in *Konig*.

(*b*) In Villario Stocken proxime Epiſcopicellam urbem Turgoviæ Helvetiorum ut Goldaſtus, lib. i, Bohem. pag. 14, ſcribit, natus. - - - - - *Born in the village Stocken near Biſchoffzell, a town in Turgou in Swiſſerland, as Goldaſtus, lib. i, Bohem. pag.* 14, *writes.* Michael Hertzius, in Biblioth. Germanica, *num.* 40.

[*A*] *He publiſhed . . . . a Hiſtory of Germany . . . . Mr du Pleſſis Mornai quotes ſome paſſages of it, ... which may ſerve for a ſupplement to the article of Gregory VII.*] The title of it is, *de Germanorum prima origine, moribus, inſtitutis, legibus, & memorabilibus pace & bello geſtis omnibus omnium ſæculorum uſque ad menſem Auguſti anni trigeſimi noni ſupra milleſimum quingenteſimum, libri Chronici XXXI, ex probatioribus Germanicis ſcriptoribus in latinam linguam tralati* (1). Mr du Pleſſis Mornai undertaking to prove that the ordinance of Gregory VII, on the celibacy of prieſts, was very ill obſerved in Germany, relates among other things what follows. ‘ Huldricus Mutius, who treats of this hiſtory at large, in his fifteenth book, collected from the moſt approved authors of the German Hiſtory, tells us; that the biſhop of Conſtance not being willing to impoſe this ordinance, Pope Gregory diſcharged his clergy from their oath to that biſhop †: *That biſhop however,* ſays he, *as ſeveral affirm, was an enemy to the fornicating prieſts tho' a protector of the married ones:* that the archbiſhop of Mentz was of the ſame opinion, but diſſembled it for fear of the Pope: that the clergy defended themſelves on the authority of the goſpel, that of the apoſtle, and God's inſtitution; and even ſubmitted themſelves to the judgment of the church, from which they would never depart; *Modo non apertè contra Domini inſtitutionem faciat; provided ſhe did not in any thing apparently derogate from the Inſtitution of our Lord.* The Pope on the contrary threatened them with his excommunication: *Animabus Sathanæ traditis, corpora ſuplicio afficienda, poteſtati ſæculari traditurum; that after having delivered over their ſouls to Satan, he would deliver over their bodies to be puniſhed by the ſecular arm.* He goes on that, *Quo quiſque vir melior aut ſacerdos ſanctior, hoc pluribus vehementius repugnabat; That the beſt and moſt pious among the prieſts were they who formed the ſtrongeſt oppoſition.* So far were the holy miniſters of the church in thoſe days from thinking this law capable of adding to their ſanctity! and to come to the ſucceſs of this council ⸸; *That a great many oppoſed and diſputed very loudly againſt the determination of the ſee of Rome: ſome however, though but few, whether it was out of fear of being obliged to ſtarve if they were to loſe their cures, or whether it was from a deſire of getting rid of wives they did not at all love, and obtaining concubines in their room, anſwered, that they would obey the Eccleſiaſtical conſtitutions of the holy council. Of whom,* ſays he, *ſome ſtill made uſe of their wives in private, and by this means preſerved both their wives and their cures: and thoſe who did not love their wives, lay with their maids or with other men's wives, whom they debauched in great numbers, or perhaps with common whores inſtead of their wives. But they who did not think it lawful or conſiſtent with good conſcience, to comply with human conſtitutions, contrary to the ſolemn contract made with their wives, and contrary to the Divine commandments and inſtitutions, gave only for anſwer ſome paſſages out of Scripture, and by their diſputes created a great deal of trouble to the Apoſtolical legate, who had ſhut his ears againſt their arguments. Therefore they were commanded to quit the churches which had been committed to their charge, and to retire elſewhere, and not to give any diſturbance to thoſe who ſhould be ſent in their places. If any one ſhould refuſe to comply with thoſe terms, that he muſt expect to be excommunicated and to be ruined both in body and ſoul. But the greateſt part of the prieſts in the church of that dioceſe remaining firm, upon their returning back to their people, had the courage to plead their cauſe before them, and to aſſert it in their pulpits againſt the Romiſh Pontif, every one of them teaching their pariſhioners on the ſubject of marriage, what they had learned one of another, out of the Scripture, and refuting the opinion of the Pope, to which they gave very hard names. And thoſe things they ſet about preaching, as ſoon as they were got back to their pariſhes, for four or five hours at a time without intermiſſion; for they very well knew that their time for preaching would be but ſhort, if they did not immediately prepare and diſpoſe their people to oppoſe the new opinion which was coming from Rome.* So that in concluſion the Pope's party found it neceſſary to procede to bloody ſeverities: for ſays he ‡, *when they ſaw that the prieſts paid no regard to their threats, nor to their execrations, ſeizing on ſome of the moſt eminent among them, they put them to death, with a view of intimidating the reſt by ſuch examples.* But, ſays he, it fell out quite otherwiſe, inſomuch that * *theſe being executed, who had been by them eſteemed good men, and religious worſhippers of* GOD, *and defenders of the truth, they began to deſpiſe the whole power and authority of the Roman ſee, and to ſpeak diſreſpectfully of it, ſo as to entertain a ſuſpicion of every thing which they underſtood to be appproved of by the ſaid Pontif. And a great many even in other dioceſes joined with them. So that at laſt ſuch great numbers, not only in Germany but in France, ſtood againſt the biſhop of Rome, that they every where both ſpoke and acted againſt that ſee with impunity.* And obſerve what he ſays; *both in Germany and in France*; where in direct oppoſition to the deſign of the Pope and his ‘ council

(1) Geſner. in Biblioth. *folio* 342.

† *P. Huldricus Mutius, lib. xv, pag.* 132. Sunt authores qui dicunt Epiſcopum illum Conſtantienſem omnino infenſos habuiſſe ſcortatores, patrocinatumque conjugio Sacerdotum.

⸸ *Item, pag.* 133. Quidam audacioris ſpiritus contra ſententiam Romanæ ſedis, multis magna voce differebant: Nonnulli, pauci tamen, vel timentes famem, ſi eſſent Sacerdotia relinquenda, vel alioqui non amantes uxores, libenter uxores concubinis commutantes, reſponderunt ſe Eccleſiaſticis conſtitutionibus ſacro-ſanctæ Synodi obtemperaturos. Horum quidam poſtea clam uſi ſunt uxoribus ſuis, retinuereque ſic uxores & ſacerdotia. Ii vero qui ſuas uxores non amabant, vel cum ancillis ſuis, vel cum adulteris mulieribus, quas multas ipſi fecerunt, vel cum vulgari immunda meretricum turba conſuetudinem habuerunt loco uxorum. Ii autem qui contra præſtitam fidem uxoribus, & adverſus Dei conſtitutionem, putabant ſalva conſcientia, Dei præcepto deſpecto, hominum conſtitutionibus obſequi non licere, nihil aliud reſponderunt quàm ſententias ex Scriptura, & diſputando, moleſti Apoſtolico Legato fuerunt, qui occluſerat aures ſuas ad eorum argumenta. Itaque mandatum eſt illis, ut relictis ſuis quibus præerant Eccleſiis aliò ſe conferrent, ne turbarent eos qui in eorum locum eſſent mittendi. Si quis aliter faceret, excommunicationem animæ & corporis interitum præſentiſſimum expectaret. Sed ſacerdotum illius Eccleſiæ major pars (neſcio qua fiducia) obdurata, domum reverſa, apud plebem ſuam cauſam ex ſuggeſtu, contra Pontificem Romanum egerunt, & quod diu alius ab alio audierat de matrimonio ex Biblia, ſinguli plebem ſuam docebant, refellentes opinionem Domini Papæ, quam odioſiſſimis nominibus appellabant. Hæcque prædicarant quamprimum veniebant domum per aliquot dies, continuis quatuor aut quinque horis: nam ſciebant illis non diu fore locum concionandi, niſi populum pararent, ut novam è Roma venientem opinionem non admitterent.

‡ *Et paulò poſt.* Ubi animadverterunt Parochos nihil minis, nihil execrationibus moveri, aliquos præſtantiores diverſæ partis captos interfecerunt, hoc exemplo alios deterrere volentes.

* *Et paulò poſt.* Supplicio affectis quos ipſi bonos, & Deum timentes viros, veritatemque defendentes judicabant, inceperunt omnem poteſtatem & autoritatem Romanæ Sedis contemnere, male de ea loqui, & quicquid Pontifici Romano intelligebant placêre, illis ſuſpectum erat, conſpirabantque multi cum eis etiam ſub aliis Epiſcopatibus, donec tanta multitudo non ſolum in Germania, ſed etiam in Gallia, in eam contra Romanum Pontificem ſententiam adducta ſit, ut impunè ubique & facerent & dicerent, contra Sedem Apoſtolicam Romæ, &c.

in folio. Mr du Pleſſis Mornai quotes ſome paſſages of it which I ſhall produce below, becauſe they may ſerve as a ſupplement to a remark in the article of Gregory VII (*c*).

‘ council holden at Rome ††, *they watched their unmarried prieſts; and if they found them guilty of fornication, they convicted them with proofs out of Scripture, and the Papal Conſtitutions, and accuſed them publickly before the people, requiring a compariſon to be made between a Fornicator, entertaining a common whore, a member of Satan, and a perſon living chaſtly in marriage, bringing up and inſtructing his children, according to God's holy religion. In ſhort the weſtern church was at this time greatly diſturbed, and Heaven and Earth confounded together. And this diſcord was the cauſe of great numbers going over to the eaſtern church.*’

Fronto Ducæus (*Fronton du Duc*), in anſwer to this book of du Pleſſis, has contented himſelf with this general remark. *We pay no manner of regard to what du Pleſſis has heaped up here out of the hiſtory of Hulric Mutius, who is known to have been a Proteſtant by religion, a German by nation, and an impudent lyer by profeſſion, and yet he cannot deny but that the emperor at laſt complied with the Pope's opinion; and convening a council at Mentz, gave all poſſible encouragement to the ſeverity of eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, and ordering the recuſants to be condemned, reſtored the peace of Germany, and the holy celibacy of the church* *; *which is quite contrary to what du Pleſſis would make us believe of a certain emperor* (3).

(*c*) It is the remark [*C*].

†† *Ibid.* Sacerdotes non uxoratos obſervabant, deprehenſos in ſcortatione ſententiis ex Bibliis & Pontificum conſtitutionibus confutabant, & accuſabant palam coram populo, conferre jubebant ſcortatorem meretricis Sathanæque membrum, & maritum caſte viventem, & liberos juxta Dei inſtitutionem educantem. Breviter, erat magna illo tempore in Eccleſia Occidentali turbatio, cœlum miſcebatur terræ. Atque hæc diſcordia fecit ut multi Orientali Eccleſiæ acceſſerint.

* Cæſar Roma reverſus in Concilio Moguntiæ habito, eis qui Sacerdotum conjugia ſublata volebant, acceſſit, aliis qui ei opinioni reſiſterent condemnatis: ſic pacem in Germaniam conſtitutam. *Eſpencæus de Continentiâ, lib. i, cap. xii, ex Mutio.*

(3) Fronton du Duc, Réfutation de la pretendue Verification du Sieur du Pleſſis, *pag.* 542.

* * *

N.

NANNIUS (*a*) (JOHN) a famous Dominican Monk, commonly called Annius Viterbienſis, was promoted to the office of maſter of the ſacred palace in the year 1499. He died on the thirteenth of November 1502, at the age of ſeventy years (*b*). The city of Viterbo was ſo proud of being the place of his nativity, that in the year 1618 they repaired his epitaph (*c*). He was a perſon who wanted not learning for the times he lived in: he underſtood even the oriental languages (*d*), and wrote commentaries on the Scripture (*e*). He was a long time profeſſor of Divinity: but nothing contributed ſo much to his being talked of, as his publiſhing ſome very ancient authors whoſe works were ſuppoſed to have been loſt [*A*]. It is true, the learned in general have but little valued this publication [*B*], as finding all thoſe pieces to be only ſuppoſititious; the world is now more convinced of it than ever; and although there aroſe from time to time certain authors who have vindicated him [*C*], yet even the Dominicans for the moſt part acknowledge theſe works to be ſpurious. They content themſelves

[*A*] *His publiſhing ſome very antient authors, whoſe works were ſuppoſed to be loſt.*] Here follows a catalogue of the pieces contained in this collection of Annius: *Archilochi de temporibus Epitome lib. I. Xenophontis de Æquivocis lib. I. Beroſi Babylonici de Antiquitatibus Italiæ ac totius orbis lib. V. Manethonis Ægypti ſupplementa ad Beroſum lib. I. Metaſthenis Perſæ, de judicio temporum, & Annalibus Perſarum lib. I. Philonis Hebræi de temporibus lib. II. Joannis Annii de primis temporibus, & quatuor ac viginti regibus Hiſpaniæ, & ejus antiquitate lib. I. Ejuſdem de antiquitate & rebus Ethruriæ lib. I. Ejuſdem Commentarirum in Propertium de Vertumno ſive Jano lib. I. Q. Fabii Pictoris de aureo ſæculo, & origine urbis Romæ lib. II. Myrſili Leſbii de origine Italiæ, ac Turrheniæ lib I. M. Catonis fragmenta de originibus lib. I. Antonini Pii Cæſaris Auguſti Itinerarium lib. I. C. Sempronii de Chorographia ſive deſcriptione Italiæ lib. I. Joannis Annii de Ethruſca ſimul & Italica Chronographia lib. I. Ejuſdem Quæſtiones de Thuſcia lib. I. Cl. Marii Aretii, Patricii Syracuſani de ſitu inſulæ Siciliæ lib I. Ejuſdem Dialogus in quo Hiſpania deſcribitur.* The firſt edition of this work was publiſhed at Rome by Eucharius Silber in 1498. The ſecond was printed at Venice in the ſame year by Bernardino Veneto; but it has not the commentaries of John Annius. It paſſed afterwards thro' a great many other editions, in different places: I make uſe of that of Antwerp, printed in 1552 in 8vo. The author dedicated thoſe books to Ferdinand and Iſabella; becauſe, as he tells them, they were diſcovered at the time their majeſties ſubdued the kingdom of Granada. He pretends to have found them at Mantua, when he was there with his patron Paul de Campo Fulgoſo cardinal of St Sixtus (1). For the reſt, this work is not divided into twenty-ſeven books, as Moreri aſſerts, but into ſeventeen. This miſtake, however, may not be Moreri's, but his Printers.

[*B*] *The learned in general have but little valued this publication.*] The article Annius of Viterbo in Voſſius, is very well filled, and Mr Moreri has not a little profited by it. From whence it comes, that we find in his Dictionary ſo ample and curious an account of this Dominican. We there alſo meet with the names of ſeveral learned men who have confuted him; but it is much better to have recouſe to Voſſius himſelf, who has alſo named ſome other Critics, and quoted their words. Pineda alſo names ſeveral others (2). Andrew Schot has inſerted in one of his books (3) two learned digreſſions. The firſt, is a ſhort account of the antiquities of Antwerp, publiſhed by Goropius Becanus. The ſecond is a tranſlation of the cenſure which Gaſpar Barreiros publiſhed upon Annius. This was firſt publiſhed by its author at Rome in Latin (4), and afterwards in his mother-tongue, which was the Portugueſe. This cenſure was inſerted, according to the Latin edition, in Annius's collection printed in Germany by the Commelins; but Andrew Schot has given it us from the Portugueſe edition, which he himſelf tranſlated into Latin. Don Nicolas Antonio did not know that Gaſpar Barreiros had publiſhed this cenſure in Latin; he ſpeaks only of the Portugueſe edition (5). Barreiros and Goropius Becanus clearly demonſtrate the forgery of Annius. La Popeliniere has alſo written againſt this author (6), but I know not whether his work was ever publiſhed. The learned Onuphrius Panvinius, declared openly againſt theſe writings (7); and there appeared at Bologna, in the year 1638, a letter of John Baptiſt Agucchi, wherein theſe pretended antient authors are ſtrongly refuted. Father Noris has quoted (8) a perſon (9), who had lately written againſt this work of Annius. I think Volaterranus and Sabellicus were the firſt who declared they looked upon theſe authors to be ſpurious.

[*C*] *There aroſe from time to time certain authors who have vindicated him.*] When I ſay the greateſt part of the learned have looked upon theſe pieces, publiſhed by Annius, as ſpurious, I do not pretend to deny, but that ſome very celebrated authors have eſteemed them genuine. Voſſius (10) names among theſe laſt Leander Alberti, Nauclerus, Driedo, Valerius Anſelmus, Joannes Lucidus, Medina, and Sixtus Senenſis. If we believe Altamura (11), Pineda ought alſo to be joined with them: but Theophilus Raynaud (12) reckons him among thoſe that have rejected the writers of Annius. I find that Albert Krantz, and even Sigonius have eſteemed theſe writers genuine. Here follows a paſſage of Sigonius: ' Quibus Epitomis *(Catonis)* merito tantam ego tribuo auctoritatem, quantam incorruptis veteribus monumentis merito tribuenda eſt (13). - - - *To which* ' *epitomes* (of Cato) *I attribute as great an authority,* ' *as is juſtly due to the genuine remains of the Antients.*' An Italian Dominican, named Tomaſo Mazza, publiſhed a folio (14) at Verona in the year 1673, whoſe title is, *Apologia por Frate Gioanni Annio Viterbeſe.* His chief deſign is to prove, that if there were any fraud in that matter, it ought not to be imputed to Annius: but he goes farther, and maintains thoſe writings to be genuine, and endeavours to anſwer all the objections againſt them. This apology having been criticized, Father Macedo fell upon the Critic, not with a deſign to maintain, that the Beroſus, &c. publiſhed by Annius, was the true Beroſus, but to ſhow that Annius had not forged thoſe manuſcripts (15). A more modern apologiſt pretends to prove both the one and the other: his name is Didimus Rapaligerus Livianus. He publiſhed at Verona in the year 1678, a work in folio, intituled, *I Gothi illuſtrati, overo Iſtoria de i* Gothi

---

(*a*) *He is ſo named in his epitaph.* Altamura, in Bibliotheca Dominican. *pag.* 223.

(*b*) *He was not therefore born in the year* 1437, *as Moreri aſſures us, after* Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 609.

(*c*) Altamura, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Leand. Albert. in Deſcript. Italiæ, *pag. m.* 115.

(*e*) *See the catalogue of them in the* Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque.

(1) *See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his* Queſtions: *it is at pag.* 594, *edition of Antwerp* 1552, *in* 8*vo.*

(2) *Lib. vii,* de Solomone, *cap. xxvii, num.* 4, apud Theophil. Raynaud. de malis & bonis Libris, *num.* 269, *pag. m.* 164.

(3) *Intituled,* Hiſpaniæ Bibliotheca. *See there, pag.* 354, & *ſeq.*

(4) Schottus, in Hiſpaniæ Bibliotheca, *pag.* 355.

(5) *Printed in the year* 1557. *See the* Bibliotheca Hiſpan. Script. *of* Nicolas Antonio, *Tom.* 1, *pag.* 398.

(6) The Hiſtory of Hiſtories, *pag.* 209.

(7) In Antiquitatibus Veronenſibus.

(8 In Cenotaph. Piſanis, *pag.* 5. *This work was printed in the year* 1681.

(9) *His name is* Francis Sparaverius, *he is a native of Verona.*

(10) De Hiſt. Latinis, *pag.* 609.

(11) In Bibliotheca Dominic.

(12) De malis & bonis Libris, *pag.* 164.

(13) Sigonius, de antiquo Jure Italiæ, *lib.* 1, *cap. xxv, fol. m.* 54, *verſo.*

(14) *The* Italian Journal *of the twenty eighth of February* 1674, *mentions it.*

(15) *See the* Italian Journal *of the twenty ſixth of January* 1675.

themſelves with affirming, that their Annius acted a ſincere part in them, and was no impoſtor [*D*], as he is commonly ſtigmatized. A perſon who had ſeen him ſaid he was not in his ſenſes (*f*).

(*f*) Scaligerana, Voce Annius.

Gothi antichi (16). In which he collects all the reaſons he can, to prove that the writers which Annius publiſhed are genuine, and that they were not however counterfeited by this Dominican. It is very well known, ſays he, that Beroſus was given him at Genoa, by Father George of Armenia a Dominican; and that he found all the reſt, except Manetho, at one Mr Williams's of Mantua. So that, tho' we know not whence he had Manetho, yet ought we not to believe he forged it: his candour with regard to the others ought to ſecure him againſt cenſure in this reſpect. As he had been accuſed of trumping up marble tables, pretending them to be antique, tho' he himſelf had forged them, this author defends him, and proves that accuſation to be calumnious; ſince ſome of theſe tables had been diſcovered before Annius's birth, and others by perſons who preſented them to Pope Alexander VI. ‘ E tacciato per impoſtore d'alcune tavole di marmo dalle quali diede in luce la ſpiegazione. Se pero ſi deve ponderare la verita, con ſodi argomenti queſt' Autore libera dall' impoſture de ſuoi Auverſarii Annio, con provar evidentemente eſſer le due tavole da lui chiamate Libiſcille dal luogo, ove furono trovate, ſtate diſſepellite molto tempo avanti che Annio naſceſſe . . . E in quanto alle due Cibelarie, e la Longobarica, furono da altri trovate e preſentate ad Aleſſandro VI, per tacere dell' Oſiriana che avanti che naſceſſe Annio, fu reſa alla luce (17). - - - *He is accuſed of forging ſome tables of marble, whereof he has publiſhed an explanation. If therefore the truth deſerves examining, this author clears Annius by ſubſtantial arguments from his adverſaries charge of impoſture, proving beyond contradiction, that two of thoſe tables called Libiſcillæ, from the place where they were found, had been dug up a long time before Annius was born. . . . And as to thoſe two called Cibelariæ, and that called Longobarica, they were diſcovered by others and preſented to Alexander VI, to ſay nothing of that called Oſiriana, which was brought before the time of Annius.*’

[*D*] *The Dominicans . . . . . content themſelves, with affirming, that Annius was no impoſtor.*] I have juſt been mentioning ſome authors who undertook to defend him, and I refer my reader to the appendix of Altamura (18), where he will meet with the names of ſeveral other apologiſts. I was ſurprized to find there, that Altamura was not acquainted with any author before *Petrus à Valleclauſa* who had accuſed Annius of Viterbo of impoſture. We muſt not forget, that this *Petrus à Valleclauſa*, author of a book, *De immunitate Cyriacorum à cenſuris*, is no other than Theophilus Raynaud. Now it is certain, that before him an infinite number of authors had accuſed Annius of impoſture. See in Moreri the paſſage of Antonius Auguſtinus. What is moſt to be admired is, that in a book, where Theophilus Raynaud was not in ſo ill an humour with the Dominicans, as when he concealed himſelf under the name of *Petrus à Valleclauſa*, he declares, that conſidering John Annius, was a Dominican, he was inclinable to believe him innocent (19). Let us conclude with the words of a Lutheran, who believed the authors publiſhed by Annius to be genuine; and, that if there were any faults to be found in them, they were not to be imputed to this Monk, but to the ignorance or inſincerity of the tranſcribers and tranſlators. ‘ Quod enim, *ſays he* (20), per Deum immortalem, prodigium fuerit clauſtralem illum & minimè tam profunde doctum Monachum talia comminiſci poſſe? Ais multa ineſſe ficta, minime pro iis auctoribus. Nec nos negamus interpolatos univerſos illos auctores, ruptos, fractos, minime bona aut fide aut intelligentia tranſlatos; tamen antiquitus ex legitimis veriſque auctoribus excerptos, talia argumenta ſunt, ut quæ contra afferuntur omnia evaneſcant. Vel unum Catonem mihi vide. Cenſe, recenſe, damna etiam ut libet, videbis tamen veri illius Catonis, & fateberis etiam, ingenium ſtilumque hic ſupereſſe, quos mentiri aut fingere non fuit talium hominum. - - - *For what a prodigy muſt it be in GOD's name, for a cloiſtered and not over-learned Monk to be capable of contriving ſuch pieces. You ſay, they diſcover many marks of forgery, no way reconcileable to thoſe authors. Nor do we deny, but that they are all of them interpolated, caſtrated, imperfect, and neither tranſlated with fidelity nor judgment: and yet, that they were antiently extracted from thoſe true and legitimate authors, there are ſuch arguments as can admit of no contradiction. To inſtance only in Cato. Examine it again and again, condemn it as you will, yet you muſt ſee and confeſs that it diſcovers the wit and ſtile of the true Cato, which are not to be imitated or counterfeited by ſuch ſort of perſons.*

(16) *See the eighth* Italian Journal *of the year* 1678, *pag.* 120.

(17) Giornale VIII, de Letterati 1678, *pag.* 122.

(18) Append. Bibliothecæ Dominic. *pag.* 527.

(19) Fortaſſis tamen ab alio quopiam impoſitum eſt ipſi Annio, quem doli expertem fuiſſe malo exiſtimare, cum Religioſum inſtitutum Prædicatorum ſit profeſſus. *Th. Raynaudus, de malis ac bonis Libris, num.* 269, *pag. m.* 164.

(20) Barthius, in Animadverſionibus ad Gallum, *pag.* 62.

NAOGEORGUS (*a*) (Thomas) a native of Straubingen in Bavaria, lived in the XVI century. He compoſed a great many Latin verſes [*A*], which did not pleaſe the Roman Catholics, becauſe they deſcribed their irregularities in a ſatirical manner. A doctor of the Sorbonne (*b*), who, in the year 1670, publiſhed ſome treatiſes againſt the rejoycings of the Twelfth-Day, obſerves that Naogeorgus had not omitted to reproach the Catholics with the ſuperſtitions and exceſſes of that feaſt. The German name of this author was *Kirchmaier* (*c*). He was a perſon who underſtood Greek indifferently well [*B*]. He was born in the year 1511, and died in the year 1578, or thereabouts (*d*).

One

(*a*) *And not* Naogeorgius, *as* Borrichius *calls him; nor* Neageorgius, *as he is named by* Konig.

(*b*) John Deſlyons, *dean and theologal of Senlis, pag.* 139, 241, 242, *quoting the fourth book of* Regnum Papiſticum.

(*c*) Epitome Biblioth. Geſneri.

(*d*) Baillet, Judgment on the Poets, *num.* 1323.

[*A*] *He compoſed a great many Latin verſes.*] The moſt famous of his poems was that intituled *Bellum Papiſticum*. He publiſhed it in the year 1553, and dedicated it to Philip landgrave of Heſſe. It is in hexameter verſe, and divided into four books. The author reſided at Baſil when he printed it. He compoſed alſo ſome tragedies which may be ſtiled controverſial. Such is that intituled *Pammachius*, which he dedicated to Cranmer archbiſhop of Canterbury; the prologue of which begins with theſe four verſes:

Quid adferamus ſi vacat cognoſcere
Spectatores, paucis exponam ſingula:
Pammachium, qui Romanus eſt Epiſcopus,
Evangelicæ doctrinæ cepit tædium.

Of our intended feaſt, Sirs, by your leave,
We beg you'll firſt a bill of fare receive.
Pammachius, biſhop of Rome's pamper'd ſee,
Is ſurfeited with Chriſtianity.

It came out in the year 1537: ſuch another is this following (1), *Incendia, ſive Pyrgopolinices Tragœdia, nefanda quorundam Papiſtarum facinora exponens.* His Mercator (2) is of the ſame kind (§*a*), whoſe title runs thus, *Mercator, ſeu Judicium in qua* (tragœdia) *in conſpectu ponuntur Apoſtolica & Papiſtica doctrina, quantum utraque in conſcientiæ certamine valeat & efficiat, & quis utriuſque futurus ſit exitus.* He compoſed five books of ſatires, *An abridgment of Eccleſiaſtical Tenets*, and ſome other poems (3).

[(§*a*) There is a tranſlation of this poem in French verſe, of which Criſpin is perhaps the author. The title of it is, Le Marchand converti, *The Merchant converted*, and among other editions, there is one in 16mo by Francis Foreſt, 1591. Rem. Crit.]

[*B*] *He underſtood Greek indifferently well.*] He tranſlated into Latin ſeveral pieces of Plutarch, and Dion Chryſoſtom, and the letters of Syneſius.

(1) *Publiſhed at Wittemberg in the year* 1538.

(2) *Publiſhed in the year* 1539.

(3) *See* Borrichius de Poëtis, *pag.* 134; *or rather the* Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque.

One of his dramatic pieces was repreſented at Heidelberg under ſo benign a conſtellation, that it was pretended the Heavens declared in its favour [*C*]. This particular deſerves to be related.

[*C*] *One of his dramatic pieces was repreſented, ... and it was pretended that the Heavens declared in its favour.*] This dramatic piece of Naogeorgus is intituled *Haman*. It was repreſented at Heidelberg on the twenty-fourth of Auguſt. The ſcholars maintained by the Elector (4) were the actors in it. A theatre was erected in a court of the monaſtery of the Franciſcans. There was ſo great an appearance of much rain, when the firſt actor was preparing to begin his part, that it was thought it could not be played: but all of a ſudden the ſky cleared up, the ſun appeared, and ſo continued, not for a moment, but during all the time of the repreſentation. ‘ Ibi ſubito qui poſt nubila latuerat ſol, quaſi ad ſpectaculum invitatus ridens pro‘rupit, nec uſque dum ludi exacti eſſent vel minimæ ‘ nubeculæ locum conceſſit (5). - - - *Then all at once* ‘ *the ſun, who had concealed himſelf in the clouds, as* ‘ *tho' he had been invited to the entertainment, ſhone out* ‘ *with a chearful countenance, and would not admit of* ‘ *the leaſt ſhadow of a cloud ſo long as the performance* ‘ *laſted*.’ But the play was no ſooner over than the air began to be gloomy again; and ſo remained for great part of the winter (6). Mr. Fabricius, profeſſor at Heidelberg, relates this in a diſſertation, wherein he maintains that a good uſe may be made of ſtage-plays. This obſervation he oppoſed to a certain popular notion, that whenever plays are acted, there always ſuddenly ariſes a tempeſt. ‘ Quoniam nuper inaudivi te ‘ neſcio quas jactare obſervationes de tempeſtatibus ‘ quoties Comœdiæ edebantur ex improviſo obortis, ‘ operæ pretium fuerit brevem tibi narrare hiſtoriolam ‘ qua & imaginaria tua experientia confutetur, & quid ‘ olim hic factum ſit edocearis. - - - *Becauſe, I have* ‘ *lately heard you pretend I know not what obſervations* ‘ *of the ſudden riſing of tempeſts as often as any plays are* ‘ *acted, it will be worth while to produce a ſhort hiſtorical* ‘ *fact, which will both confute your imaginary experience,* ‘ *and inform you of what happened here ſome time ago*.’ This remark is uſeful as it ſhews us that thoſe who condemn any practice, are uſed to ſuppoſe that the celeſtial prodigies declare in their favour. This they eaſily make people believe, and thereby keep their minds in ſlaviſh ſubjection. The ſhorteſt courſe will always be to put them upon making good their aſſertions, or elſe to oppoſe them with contrary obſervations.

(4) *It was Frederic the Pious.*

(5) Joannes Ludovicus Fabricius, de Ludis Scenicis, *pag.* 101.

(6) Ipſa vero hora qua ſpectatores domum redierant, redierunt & nimbi, nec ab illo die (erat autem XXIV Auguſti) in adultam uſque hiemem ceſſarunt. *Id. ib.*

NAPLES (Joan I. Queen of) deſcended from Charles of Anjou brother to St Lewis [*A*] king of France, ſucceeded king Robert her grandfather in the year 1343. She was already married to her couſin Andrew, ſon of Charles king of Hungary [*B*]. They reigned together for the ſpace of three years (*a*), at the end of which it is pretended that ſhe cauſed him to be ſtrangled; and, if we believe ſcandalous reports, the cauſe was his not being man enough to ſatisfy that princeſs [*C*]. She was ſoon married again

(*a*) Felinus Sandeus, Epitome de Regibus Siciliæ, *pag.* 34. *See the remark* [*D*].

[*A*] *She was deſcended from Charles of Anjou, brother to St Lewis.*] Charles of Anjou, created king of Naples and Sicily by the Pope in the year 1266, did not obtain the peaceable poſſeſſion of that kingdom till he had defeated Manfred (1) and Conradin (2). He died in the year 1285. Charles, the lame, his ſon, ſucceeded him, and married Mary of Hungary, ſiſter and heireſs of Uladiſlaus IV, king of Hungary. From this marriage came ſeveral children. The eldeſt, known by the name of Charles Martel, was king of Hungary: the ſecond, named Robert, was king of Naples: the third, named Philip, founded the branch of the princes of Taranto: and the fourth, named John, founded that of the dukes of Durazzo. Robert king of Naples was father of Charles duke of Calabria, who died the tenth of November 1328, and had two daughters, namely Joan, who is the ſubject of this article, and Mary married to Charles of Durazzo her couſin. Robert was therefore grand-father to Joan, he made her his heir, and died at Naples the nineteenth of January in the year 1343 (3). Pandolphus Collenuccio is miſtaken, when he ſays, that Charles duke of Calabria, left three daughters (4). Tomaſo Coſto has corrected this miſtake in his ſupplements to the hiſtory of that author (5).

[*B*] *She was already married to Andrew ſon of Charles king of Hungary.*] Here we have another miſtake of Collennuccio: he pretends, that Joan married Andrew after the death of Robert, and that in obedience to the will of her deceaſed grandfather (6). He ſhould have ſaid that Robert, a little after the death of the duke of Calabria, thought of marrying his grand-daughter to one of the ſons of Charobert king of Hungary, his Nephew. The propoſal he made to the king of Hungary was accepted. Charobert ſet out for the kingdom of Naples in the year 1333, with Andrew his ſecond ſon, aged about ſeven years. The nuptials were ſolemnized at Naples with great pomp on the twenty ſixth of September 1333. The year following the king of Hungary returned to his dominions, leaving his ſon at Naples with king Robert (7). I never could yet find, in what year the marriage was conſummated: perhaps, this happened too early, which might probably be the cauſe of that weakneſs which was ſo fatal to the huſband. I have read in an Italian author, that he was but ſeven years old when he married the princeſs Joan: but I find in Father Anſelm (8), that [illegible] was born the thirtieth of November 1327. He could not therefore be full ſix years old at the time of his marriage. There is a great deal of probability that he conſummated it too early, and that having an Italian wife, ſomething elder than himſelf, and conſequently more ripe for marriage, he could not be able to perform the duties of matrimony without weakening himſelf; which gave occaſion to thoſe reproaches of effeminacy we ſhall take notice of in the following remark. Spondanus ſays, that it is reported that queen Joan began to diſpiſe her huſband, becauſe being but nineteen years of age, he could not content her. ‘ Sunt porro qui dicant ‘ Joannam in contemptum viri deveniſſe, tum ob ſubbarbaros mores Hungariæ, tum ob ignaviam, & quod ‘ uſu Veneris libidini ejus non ſufficeret adoleſcens tunc ‘ annorum undeviginti (9). - - - - *There are ſome alſo* ‘ *who affirm Joan's contempt of her huſband, to have* ‘ *riſen both from ſome of his barbarous Hungarian cuſtoms,* ‘ *and from his inactivity and inability to anſwer her* ‘ *deſires, tho' he was then a youth of nineteen years of* ‘ *age*.’ If ſhe complained of him when he was nineteen years old (10), could ſhe be ſatisfied with him when he was but fifteen? However it be, they lived together on very ill terms in the year 1343. The queen of Hungary, the mother of Andrew, made a journey to Italy this ſame year, and returned much diſſatisfied with the behaviour of her daughter-in-law, and the unfortunate condition in which ſhe found her ſon. ‘ Elizabeth Regina mater Ludovici viſitavit ſedem Apoſtolicam, tranſivit per Apuliam, cui fuit obvius Andreas filius ſuus cum Johanna Regina con‘ſorte ſua: & ex Neapoli veniens fuit valde honorata ‘ etiam a populo Romano. Ex Neapoli rediit in Hungarian male contenta de moribus Johannæ nurus ſuæ, ‘ quam vidit male tractare Andræam filium ſuum in ‘ regno Apuliæ (11). - - - - - *Queen Elizabeth, the mother of Lewis, made a viſit to the Apoſtolical See, ſhe* ‘ *paſſed through Apulia, where ſhe was met by Andrew* ‘ *her ſon with queen Joan his conſort; and going from* ‘ *Naples to Rome, ſhe was received in this place with* ‘ *great honours. She returned thro' Naples to Hungary,* ‘ *not at all pleaſed with the conduct of Joan her daughter-in-law, who ſhe found behaved very ill to her ſon* ‘ *Andrew in the kingdom of Apulia.*

[*C*] *. . . it is pretended that ſhe cauſed him to be ſtrangled . . . becauſe he was not man enough to ſatisfy her.*] Let us ſee how Brantome relates this (12) ‘ Joan the eldeſt ‘ daughter (13) of king Robert . . . had for her firſt huſband Andrew, her firſt couſin (14); of whom, after ‘ having reigned ſome time together, ſhe began ‘ to grow tired: and being both of them in the ‘ city

(1) The twenty ſixth of February 1266. *Anſelme, Hiſt. Genealog. pag.* 336.

(2) The twenty third of Auguſt 1268. *Id. ib.*

(3) *Taken from Father Anſelm's* Genealogical Hiſtory of the Houſe of France, *chap. xiv.*

(4) Pandolphe Collenuccio, Hiſt. del Regno di Napoli, *lib. v, fol. m.* 82. *verſo.*

(5) Tomaſo Coſto, Cittadino Napoletano, Annotazioni e Supplementi, *fol. m.* 111.

(6) Collenuccio, ubi ſupra.

(7) Tomaſo Coſto, Annotaz. e Supplementi, *fol.* 108 *verſo. He quotes Michael Ricci, and the two Johns Villani, the Neapolitan, and the Florentine.*

(8) Hiſt. Genealog. de la Maiſon de France, *pag.* 343.

(9) Spondanus, ad ann. 1345, *num.* 4.

(10) Note, he never arrived at this age.

(11) Felinus Sandeus, Epitome de Regibus Siciliæ, *pag.* 69. *Spondanus ſpeaks of this journey,* ad ann. 1343, *num.* 6, *quoting Thuroſ. part iii, cap. iv. Bonfin.* 2, *Dec.* 10.

(12) Brantome's Lives of Illuſtrious Women, *pag.* 347.

(13) He ſhould have ſaid grand-daughter.

(14) He is miſtaken, he ſhould have ſaid they were ſecond couſins.

again [*D*], and took for her huſband Lewis ſon of Philip prince of Taranto (*b*). But ſhe did not peaceably enjoy the pleaſures of her ſecond marriage: for Lewis king of Hungary, reſolving to revenge the death of his brother, marched into the kingdom of Naples with a conſiderable army in the year 1348, and forced the queen to retire for ſafety into Provence (*c*), where ſhe ſold Avignon to the Pope for a very inconſiderable ſum (*d*). Her huſband, who followed her, did not obſerve a neceſſary moderation in his careſſes [*E*], for he thereby deſtroyed his health, and died very ſoon, if we may believe Collenuccio. But it is certain this author is too haſty; for the ſecond marriage of Joan laſted fifteen years. She was recalled into her kingdom as ſoon as the king of Hungary who had ſuddued it in few days, was returned home (*e*), after his having cauſed to be hanged Charles of Durazzo, the principal promoter of the tragical end of Andrew, and who was violently ſuſpected to be the queen's galant (*f*). This princeſs, accompanied by her huſband, re-entered Naples in the month of Auguſt 1348, and recovered part of her towns; but the king of Hungary returning in the year 1350, diſtreſſed her. The Pope ended this war to the advantage of Joan: for he obliged the king of Hungary to leave her in quiet poſſeſſion of her dominions. Both ſhe and her huſband were afterwards crowned at

‘ city of Averſa, ſhe ſent for him one night, under pretence of wanting to conſult him about ſome affairs which had newly happened; and as he was going to her, and paſſing under a beam, he was taken and hanged up to the ſame, by order of the queen. It is the opinion of ſeveral, that this was occaſioned by his not being able to ſatisfy her inordinate luſt, though he was young, briſk, and in good health. It has alſo been reported, both at Naples and elſewhere, that the ſame lady making one day a gold ſtring of more than ordinary ſize, her huſband Andrew aſked her what ſhe was making it for; ſhe anſwered, to hang him with. It ſeems ſhe made ſo little account of him, that ſhe cared not what ſhe ſaid to him; whilſt he, poor eaſy man, took no notice of her threats; tho' the event proved ſhe was as good as her word.' Montagne, ſpeaking againſt thoſe who ſo much complain that wives are not ſatisfied with their huſbands, ſays, among other things, (15): *Inconſtancy is, perhaps, more pardonable in them than in us: they may alledge, as well as we, a common inclination to variety and novelty, and even in the ſecond place, more than we can, that they are forced to purchaſe a pig in a poke. Joan queen of Naples, cauſed her firſt huſband, Andrew, to be ſtrangled at the grates of her window, with a gold and ſilk ſtring twiſted with her own hand, becauſe in the matrimonial exerciſe, ſhe did not find his ſhape, beauty, youth, and diſpoſition, anſwer the expectation ſhe had conceived of them.* A little after he quotes ſome verſes out of Martial, which are applicable to this princeſs (16); yet he does not ſay all that a modern author ſeems to aſcribe to him. Theſe are the words of this modern (17). ‘ Andrew king of Naples .... never ſaw either the riſing or ſetting of the ſun: that planet always found him in bed: he went to bed betimes, and alway roſe very late: his wife alſo had but little kindneſs for him, becauſe he could not ſatisfy her, ſays Michael Montagne, book III.' Note, Bramtome has only tranſlated *Pandolphus Collenuccio*, whoſe words are theſe: ‘ La cagione per molti ſi dice che fu, perche detto Andreaſſo, ancor che fuſſe molto giovene, non era ſi bene ſufficiente alle opere veneree, come lo sfrenato appetito della Regina haveria voluto (18).---*The reaſon aſſigned by many was, that this ſame Andrew, though he was very young, yet he was not ſo well provided for venereal encounters, as the queen's looſe inclinations expected to have found him.*' Tomaſo Coſto (19) obſerves, that Collenuccio is too little verſed in affairs to deſerve any credit. He adds, I. That Villani the Florentine, has not related the ſtory of the death of Andrew, but on the report of an Hungarian, who was then in the ſervice of that unfortunate prince; II. That Petrarch has given a deſcription exceedingly diſadvantageous to the Hungarian barons, who governed the kingdom under Andrew. III. If we join this with the hatred they had for queen Joan, we ſhall eaſily conceive how much the relation of Villani may be ſuſpected of falſity. IV. That Boccace has not ſaid that this queen had any hand in that execution. ‘ Il Boccacio ne' caſi de gli huomini illuſtri da tutta la colpa a congiurati, e niente alla Reina (20). ---- *Boccace, in his Misfortunes of Illuſtrious Men, charges the whole guilt on the conſpirators, and nothing at all on the queen.*' Mr Mezerai ſeems to me to have made choice of a much more probable medium. ‘ Andrew not being much in the good graces of Joan, and having cauſed himſelf to be crowned king by the Pope, as pretending the kingdom belonged to him; ſome conſpirators took him away from her in the night-time, and hanged him at a window. Charles prince of Durazzo, who was alſo of the blood of the kings of Sicily, and had married Mary the ſiſter of Joan, was the adviſer and author of this infamous action. Joan her ſelf was not wholly innocent. She might expreſs as much ſorrow as ſhe pleaſed, but her tears and lamentations were not ſuch ſtrong proofs of her innocence; as her ſubſequent marriage with Lewis her couſin-german, a fine prince, and agreeable to her appetite, was of her guilt (21).'

[*D*] *She was ſoon married again.*] King Andrew was ſtrangled the eighteenth of Semptember 1346. Queen Joan was big with child, and brought to bed of a ſon the twenty-ſixth of December following (22). She married her ſecond huſband the twentieth of Auguſt 1347 (23). This is according to the calculation of Tomaſo Coſto. He does not make the queen's widowhood continue a full year: but it is neceſſary to obſerve, that he has falſely ſet down the year of king Andrew's death, and it is a matter of great wonder, that in caſes of this nature, Hiſtorians are not more exact as to the circumſtance of time. Villani (24) aſſures us, that king Andrew was ſtrangled the eighteenth of September 1346. They who pretend that this prince was nineteen years old (25), and that he lived three years with his wife after the death of Robert (26), ought to ſuppoſe that he died in the year 1346. It is nevertheleſs certain, he was murdered in the year 1345. This is a demonſtrative proof of it. Queen Joan his widow, ſome few days before her lying-in, requeſted the Pope to ſtand godfather to her child (27), to which his Holineſs returned a favourable anſwer (28), dated from Avignon the firſt day of February, in the fourth year of his pontificat. Now he was created Pope the ſeventh of May 1342. His anſwer therefore muſt have been dated the firſt of February 1346; and conſequently this princeſs, who was brought to bed on Chriſtmas-day, as appears by another letter from the ſame Pope (29), was brought to bed the twenty-fifth of December 1345: her huſband therefore could not be murdered in 1346. See the Acts and the Lives of the Popes who reſided at Avignon; which Mr Baluze has publiſhed and embelliſhed with very fine notes.

[*E*] *Her ſecond huſband .... did not obſerve a neceſſary moderation in his careſſes.*] ‘ She afterwards married, and that very quickly, one of her couſins, ſon of the prince of Taranto, with whom ſhe had been in love during her huſband's life: ſhe uſed him well, and lived with him three years in great affection; but he died wholly exhauſted, as it was thought, by his exceſſive and too frequent engaging with the queen in venereal combats (30)'. The author from whom I have theſe words, declares himſelf an apologiſt for the queen on this head; and this is the turn he gives it (31): *As for her couſin, ſon of the prince of Taranto, who died by exhauſting himſelf in her ſervice, it was no fault of her's, ſince it is impoſſible to prevent a man from getting drunk with his own wine: and if this wine muſt afterwards neceſſarily inſpire a hot fit, the liquor is not to blame, but the drinker of it. I make no doubt but the great beauty of this queen, her air, her majeſty, her*

(*b*) Id. ib.

(*c*) Id. ib.

(*d*) Bouche's Hiſt. of Provence.

(*e*) Tomaſo Coſto, *in his Supplements to* Collenuccio, *fol.* 113, *&c.*

(*f*) Era ſtato conſapevole & conſentiente alla morte d' Andreaſſo, e era opinione che ancor' egli haveſſe havuto comercio venereo con la Regina. *Pandolfo Collenuccio, Hiſtoria del Regno di Napoli, lib. v, fol. m.* 83.

(15) Montagne's Eſſays, *book iii, chap. v.*

(16) Deinde experta latus, madidoque ſimillima loro Inguina, nec laſſa ſtare coacta manu; Deſerit imbelles thalamos mollemque maritum. *Martial. Epigr. LVII, lib. vii.*

(17) Cæſar de Rochefort, Dictionaire General & Curieux, *pag.* 130, *col.* 1.

(18) Collenuccio, *lib. v, fol.* 82, *verſo. Edition of Venice* 1601. *in 4to.*

(19) Annotaz. e Supplem. *fol.* 111.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Mezerai's Chronological Abridgment, *Tom. iii, pag.* 30.

(22) He died an infant in Hungary, whither king Lewis, brother of Andrew, had ſent him. *Tomaſo Coſto, ibid. fol.* 112 *verſo.*

(23) Taken from Tomaſo Coſto, ibid. *fol.* 112.

(24) Apud Tomaſo, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 111.

(25) See, above, citation (9), the paſſage of Spondanus.

(26) See *Felinus Sandeus* quoted in the body of this article.

(27) See the Lives of thoſe Popes who have reſided at Avignon, publiſhed by Mr Baluze; printed at Paris in 1693, *Tom. ii, pag.* 689.

(28) It is related by Mr Baluze, ibid.

(29) It is given ibid. *pag.* 690.

(30) Brantome, Vies des Dames Illuſtres, *pag.* 348, 349.

(31) Id. lib. *pag.* 353.

at Naples on Whitſunday 1352 (*g*). Having loſt her huſband in the year 1362, ſhe quickly married again to the Infant of Majorca, whoſe head ſhe cauſed to be cut off as ſoon as ſhe came to know he had a miſtreſs [*F*]. At length in the year 1376, ſhe married again to a German prince; with whom ſhe lived very happily; but Charles of Durazzo, general of the Hungarian troops, conquered and took him priſoner: ſoon after which ſhe was forced to ſurrender herſelf. Some ſay ſhe was hanged [*G*], and others that ſhe was ſtifled with a cuſhion. This happened in the year 1382 (*h*) [*H*] She.

behaviour, her charms and allurements, her bewitching embraces, and ſoft touches, might make this young man endeavour at performing more than nature would allow: but ſtill this effort was owing to himſelf, and not to her; for in theſe caſes a man is not to be forced, not even with a cudgel, as one may ſay, for all muſt come from the humour of the perſon himſelf, from his ability, his own act, and, above all, from the ardency of his paſſion. And ſuppoſe it were not ſo, how could he die better, than in the ſervice of his queen and lady, in ſhowing the heighth of his affection for her, ſince he neither ſpared pains, vigour, nor exceſs to content her, and to give her pleaſure fell a ſacrifice to love on the amorous field of battle, her bed, where he had ſo valiantly fought and expoſed his life under the banner of Venus. We read how Medor and Claridan, when they ſo furiouſly aſſaulted the camp of Charlemagne, killed a certain lord, Albert, in his tent, in the arms of his miſtreſs, where he had been entertained that night, nor could e'er a one of them forbear envying him ſo delicious a death: how much more then ought this prince to be envied, who died ſo happily in the ſervice of his queen, his wife and couſin. Collenuccio obſerves, that Lewis did not enjoy above three years, the royalty he acquired by his marriage. ‘ Da ‘ tre anni ſtette il Re Lodovico Tarentino in ſignoria, ‘ e eſtenuato per lo inordinato e frequente uſo delle ‘ coſe veneree con la Regina, che di quella ſola era ‘ vaga, finalmente mori; ne molto ſtette la Regina ‘ poi la ſua morte, che preſe il terzo marito, chiamato Giacomo Tarraconeſe infante di Majorica, il ‘ quale era tenuto il più leggiadro e bell' huomo, che ‘ in quel tempo ſi trovaſſe (32). - - - - *Lewis of Tarento* ‘ *continued king three years, and then died quite emaciated,* ‘ *by his inordinate and too frequent commerce with the* ‘ *queen, who was infinitely fond of him: nor did ſhe* ‘ *ſtay long after his death without taking a third huſband,* ‘ *called James of Tarragon, Infant of Majorca, who* ‘ *was eſteemed the genteeleſt and handſomeſt man in his* ‘ *time.*’ But Tomaſo Coſto ſhows, on this ſubject, the malice or ignorance of the author juſt mentioned (33). Lewis married Queen Joan in the year 1347: he was crowned with her at Naples in 1352, and he did not die till the year 1362: and there happened in his reign a great many conſiderable affairs wherein he acquitted himſelf like a brave prince, the particulars of them you may find in Tomaſo Coſto.

[*F*] *She cauſed the head of her third huſband to be cut off, as ſoon as ſhe knew he had a miſtreſs.*] Collenuccio does not affirm this poſitively; he contents himſelf with ſaying, it is the opinion of ſome Hiſtorians. ‘ Mori queſto Giacomo infra pochi anni, chi ſcrive ‘ per morte naturale, e chi dice che la regina li fece ‘ tagliar la teſta per havere uſato con un' altra femina. ‘ Come ſi ſia egli mori, e la regina tolſe il quarto ‘ marito (34). - - - - - *This James died in a few years,* ‘ *ſome ſay of a natural death, others that the queen had* ‘ *his head cut off, for having kept company with another* ‘ *woman. However it be, as ſoon as he was dead, the* ‘ *queen took a fourth huſband.*’ Let us ſee what Brantome ſays (35) ‘ She married afterwards, for her third ‘ huſband one James of Tarencen (36), Infant of Majorca, who was one of the moſt prudent and handſomeſt perſons that country had produced: yet ſhe ‘ would not ſuffer him to aſſume the title of king, but ‘ made him content himſelf with that of duke of Calabria; for ſhe had not a mind to part with the ſupreme authority, nor could endure any rival in it: ‘ but both exerciſed it, and made him feel it, for ‘ being informed of his familiarities with another woman, unhappy as he was, ſince he could not enjoy ‘ a finer than his queen, ſhe cauſed his head to be ſtruck ‘ off; and ſo he died.’ The beſt is, that though Brantome was perſuaded the queen had not put her third huſband to death (37); yet he has made a long apology for the ſuppoſed murther. *As for her third huſband*, ſays he (38), *the Infant of Majorca, whom ſhe cauſed to be beheaded for violating her bed, and forſaking her for another woman, though ſome hiſtorians ſay he died a natural death; ſuppoſing it be true, had ſhe not reaſon to puniſh the adultery, ſince he had no more right or authority to commit it againſt her, than ſhe had againſt him? For the law of God is equally binding to both, and no leſs ſevere to the huſband than the wife: Moreover, if he had ſurpriſed her in ſuch an act, what would he not have done to her? I appeal to the jealous, and ſuch perſons as are nice in that particular. Although he was not abſolute king, nor had any power, but what he derived from her, yet I do not doubt but in ſuch a caſe he would have murthered her; and therefore ſhe was in the right to uſe her royal and abſolute authority, in executing that juſtice on him, which ſhe herſelf muſt have ſuffered, had ſhe been the offender. And if we ſhould lay aſide all theſe reaſons, what judge could be ſo favourable, as not to condemn this unfortunate delinquent, for violating his faith to the moſt beautiful queen and greateſt princeſs in her time; and to forſake her for another, who was not in the leaſt particular to be compared with her? Wretch that he was, like one who might drink his fill out of a clear and pure fountain, yet chooſes to quench his thirſt in a naſty and muddy pond.*

[*G*] *Some ſay ſhe was hanged.*] Charles Durazzo, having made himſelf maſter of the kingdom, and of the perſon of queen Joan, informed the king of Hungary of the ſtate of affairs, and deſired to know his pleaſure, what he ſhould do with the queen. The king of Hungary, ‘ ſent to Charles two of his barons to congratulate him upon his victory: and to let him know ‘ his pleaſure was, he ſhould carry the queen to the ‘ place where ſhe had ſtrangled her huſband Andrew; ‘ and there, in the ſame place, and after the ſame manner, to cauſe her to be hanged and ſtrangled; which ‘ was accordingly done: and her dead body, being carried to the nunnery of St Clara at Naples, after it had ‘ remained there three days, was buried; and the two ‘ barons having ſeen this execution performed, returned to carry the news to their maſter. Afterwards was beheaded Mary, the queen's ſecond ſiſter, ‘ a leud woman, and charged with having a hand in ‘ the death of Andrew. This Mary, was wife to Robert of Artois, and beloved by Boccace, who flouriſhed ‘ at that time: upon whom he wrote thoſe two excellent books in his mother-tongue, intituled, *Flammetta* and *Philocopo* (39).’ This is the tranſlation which Brantome gives of the Italian of Collenuccio: but Tomaſo Coſto obſerves, I. That Collenuccio is the only author who ſays the queen was hanged (40). II. That the name of the earl of Artois's wife was Joan, and not Mary; III. That ſhe was niece, and not ſiſter to this queen; IV. That ſhe who was celebrated, and beloved by Boccace, was neither niece nor ſiſter to Joan, but natural daughter of king Robert. ‘ La Maria per cui ſcriſſe il Boccac. fu figliovola baſtarda del Re Ruberto avanti ch'ei fuſſe Re: vedilo ‘ chiaramente eſpreſſo nel principio del Filocopo (41). ‘ *That Mary of whom Boccace writes, was the baſtard-* ‘ *daughter of king Robert, before he was king: You* ‘ *may find this clearly expreſſed in the beginning of the* ‘ *Filocopo.*’

[*H*] *This happened in the year* 1382.] This cannot be denied: it is therefore a little ſtrange her obſequies were not celebrated in Avignon, by order of the Pope, before the fifth of May 1385; and that the notification of her death was not ſent to the inhabitants of Marſeilles by the ſame Pope before that time. Mr Baluze had reaſon to wonder at this. I inſert the extract which he gives us of the journal of John Le Fevre, biſhop of Chartres, with his obſervation upon it. ‘ *The fifth day the Pope cauſed a maſs of ſolemn Requiem to be ſaid for Joan queen of Sicily, put to death* ‘ *by Charles de Durazzo. The maſs was ſaid by the* ‘ *cardinal of Coſenza; who, at the ſame time, preached* ‘ *an excellent ſermon upon the occaſion. The king was* ‘ *preſent, and was afterwards conducted home by the* ‘ *cardinals of Coſenza and Ambrun.* Sed mirum eſt ‘ tum

---

(*g*) Id. ib.

(*h*) Mezerai, Abrég. Chronol. *Tom. iii, pag.* 119.

(32) Collenuccio, *lib. v, fol.* 83, *verſo.*

(33) Tomaſo Coſto, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 115, *&* *ſeq.*

(34) Collenuccio, *lib. v, fol.* 83, *verſo.*

(35) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 349.

(36) The Italian words of Collenuccio, *chiamato Giacomo Tarraconeſe*, ſhould have been rendered *called James of Tarragona*, that is, *of Arragon.*

(37) He relates, as a fact, which he believes, what Froiſſard ſays concerning the natural death of the infant of Majorca.

(38) Brantome, ibid. *pag.* 355.

(39) Ibid. *pag.* 351.

(40) In quanto al morire della Reina Giovanna, chi dice ch' ella fu ſtrangolata, e chi affogata: ma impiccata lo dice ſolo il Collenuccio. *Tomaſo Coſto, ubi ſupra, fol.* 121.

(41) Tomaſo Coſto, ubi ſupra.

She was about fifty eight years of age. There are ſome Hiſtorians who give her great commendations, and deny moſt of the facts I have been relating. See her Elogium in one of the books of Father Maimbourg (*i*). Conſult alſo Brantome who has done all he could to excuſe her [*I*], though he faithfully relates the ſatirical reports which were ſpread of her: he makes mention of a book wherein ſhe is compared to Mary Stuart queen of Scotland [*K*]; nor has he forgot to inſert the ſhort, but thundering, anſwer ſhe received from the king of Hungary [*L*]. No great ſtreſs ought to be laid on the favourable ſentence it is pretended ſhe obtained of the Pope [*M*]; for if ſhe obtained it of Clement

tum primum in his regionibus auditum nuntium de morte iſtius Reginæ quam conſtat anno ſaltem milleſimo CCCLXXXII. occiſam fuiſſe die XXII. menſis Maji. Et tamen primum auditum hinc liquet, quod paulo poſt verba quæ mox deſcripſimus ex diario Epiſcopi Carnotenſis ſequitur: - - - *But it is ſurprizing that this ſhould be the firſt account in theſe parts of the death of that queen, who was undoubtedly put to death on the twenty-ſecond of May, in the year, at the lateſt,* 1382. *And yet that this was the firſt account is evident from hence, that a little after the words I have quoted out of the journal of the biſhop of Chartres, there follows: alſo it was determined to ſend a ſolemn meſſage to Marſeilles to ſignify the death of the queen; and that there ſhould be a ſermon* (42).’

[*I*] *Brantome has done all he could to excuſe her.*] See (43) what he ſays concerning the death of the ſecond and third huſband; and add to it what he obſerves concerning that of the firſt, and her many marriages. *For as to reproaching her with having four huſbands, and on that account to believe her unchaſte, it cannot be, we ought by no means to do it, ſince marriage is good and holy, having been ordained of* GOD: *and farther, it was much better for her to marry than to burn, or what is worſe, to proſtitute and abandon herſelf to firſt one, and then another, as a great many queens, princeſſes, and Ladies of quality have done, and ſtill do, both maids and widows, who are continually purſuing amours and intrigues with thoſe in their kingdom they like beſt, in preference to matrimony, chuſing to fly this allowed and holy ordinance, rather than whoredom, tho' prohibited; which queen Joan never practiſed; for how much ſoever ſhe might burn with a deſire after the fleſh, yet ſhe always ſatisfied it lawfully with her huſbands. As for Andrew, her huſband, whom ſhe put to death, it was ſaid, he was a drunken, malicious, and dangerous Hungarian, while he acted the part of a ſimple and weak man, as ſuch ſort of people are ſooner inclined to be, than thoſe of greater ability and reputation, and that he would have murdered her, to ſecure the throne to himſelf; but ſhe was before-hand with him, and did that kindneſs for him, which he had deſigned for her, as the law of nature allows, that it is better to get the ſtart than to be overtaken, and eſpecially in matters where life is concerned* (44).

[*K*] *Brantome makes mention of a book, wherein ſhe is compared to Mary Stuart.*] ‘I have ſeen a book printed in England, intituled, *A Defence of the lawful Sentence, and moſt juſt Execution of the deceaſed Mary Stuart, late queen of Scotland.* In this book there are ſeveral compariſons made between queen Joan of Naples, and the queen of Scotland, as well in regard to their lives, manners, and amours, as to the manner of their deaths. They are to be ſeen painted by the ſame Crayon, ſo that nothing is ſo like as theſe two, according to this author (45).’ He gives an abſtract of the parallel of theſe two queens, which is divided into twelve heads.

[*L*] *The .... anſwer ſhe received from the king of Hungary.*] It was this: ‘Thy former diſorderly life, the ſovereignty of thy kingdom, which thou haſt always kept to thy ſelf, thy not proſecuting the murderers of thy huſband, thy marrying ſoon after to another man, together with the excuſe thou afterwards ſenteſt me, are to me plain indications that thou wert an acceſſary and accomplice in thy huſband's murder (46).’ They who have a mind to ſee it in the Latin, may read what follows: *Johanna, inordinata vita præcedens; retentio poteſtatis in regno; neglecta vindicta: vir alter ſuſceptus; & excuſatio ſubſequens; necis viri tui te probant fuiſſe participem & conſortem* (47).

[*M*] *The favourable ſentence .... ſhe obtained of the Pope.*] We ſhall cite the words of Father Maimbourg; ‘As to the death of her firſt huſband, Andrew of Hungary, which many have imputed to her, ſhe has fully acquitted herſelf of it, as well by the ſevere juſtice ſhe made the murderers undergo, not one of whom offered to accuſe her while under the greateſt torments, as by her eloquent apology which ſhe made in a full conſiſtory before Pope Clement VI, all the ambaſſadors from the Chriſtian princes being preſent, with that energy and force, that the holy Father afterwards declared her, in an authentic act, not only innocent of that crime, but that there could not be the leaſt ſuſpicion of her having any hand in it (48).’ This Hiſtorian quotes nobody as to this particular fact. Obſerve that Brantome, who copies from Froiſſard the harangue which this queen made to the Pope (49), with the Pope's anſwer, ſays not a word of the ſentence of abſolution. I ſhall give you the reaſon preſently; he contents himſelf with ſaying (50), that the Pope engaged himſelf to protect the heir of this princeſs. Obſerve likewiſe, that the harangue, which Froiſſard puts into the mouth of queen Joan, contains divers falſities. I. That Joan was daughter to Robert. II. That ſhe was not married to Andrew of Hungary, till after the death of Robert. III. That ſhe had never a child by that prince. IV. That Andrew died young at Aix in Provence. V. That her ſecond huſband became a priſoner to the king of Hungary, and died in that kingdom, being carried thither by that king. And, VI. That the daughter which ſhe had by her ſecond huſband, and whom ſhe married to the earl of Artois, died in priſon with her huſband; and that afterwards queen Joan, and her fourth huſband, Otho of Brunſwic, entered into a treaty of peace, whereby they recovered their liberty, and the kingdom of Naples, by giving up Apulia and Calabria to prince Charles of Durazzo, their conqueror. All theſe are very great falſities, as may appear by what I have already ſaid in my former remarks, and what I am going to ſay. The two daughters which queen Joan had by her ſecond huſband, died infants. The wife of the earl of Artois was niece to this queen, being the daughter of Charles of Durazzo, whom the king of Hungary put to death, and of Mary ſiſter of Joan. This Mary had been a long time dead, when her ſiſter was ſtrangled, ſo that Mr Mezarai is miſtaken, when he aſſures us, that queen Joan and her ſiſter Mary, ſurrendered themſelves to Charles of Durazzo, who ordered them both to be ſtrangled in priſon (51). The earl of Artois, and Joan his wife, died the twentieth of July 1387, as their epitaph (52) ſhows, and conſequently they muſt have ſurvived queen Joan. It is alſo falſe, that this queen enjoyed either her liberty or kingdom, after ſhe had ſurrendered herſelf to the duke of Durazzo. We muſt conclude therefore, that her harangue to Pope Clement, is a mere forgery of Froiſſard; and that Brantome laid a ſnare for us, into which he fell firſt himſelf, when he ſays, *Let us then believe Froiſſard, who has made this queen confeſs herſelf to the Pope, and who has been curious to collect her own words, pronounced from her own mouth, by which he plainly deſigned to make her life known* (53), we ſhall conclude by relating what he ſays preſently after: *I do not ſay but Froiſſard touches on ſome paſſages of her life, as the death of Andrew, and ſome other little matters, as her amours, and the like; but however ſhe was by no means ſo wicked and debauched as that fine fooliſh Neapolitan Hiſtorian would make her.*

The better to comprehend the confuſed relation of Froiſſard; we muſt obſerve that he ſuppoſes queen Joan went to wait on the Pope at Fondi; and that it was there ſhe made him that harangue. But it is certain Clement VII left Italy in the year 1379, to go and reſide at Avignon. How then could queen Joan make an harangue to him at Fondi, after ſhe was made a priſoner, which was in the year 1381. For the reſt, it is not to be wondered at, that we ſhould not find the ſentence of abſolution in Froiſſard, ſince it is plain, he pretended only to ſpeak of ſuch matters as paſſed

---

(*i*) Schiſm of the Weſt. *Lib. ii, pag.* 150, *Edit. of Holland.*

(42) Stephanus Baluzius, in Notis ad Vitas Paparum Avenionenſium, *pag.* 1257, 1258.

(43) Above, remark [*E*], citation (31); and remark [*F*], citation (38).

(44) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 352, 353.

(45) Ibid. *pag.* 380.

(46) Id. ib. *pag.* 348.

(47) Felinus Sandeus, de Regibus Siciliæ, *pag.* 35. Collenuccio, *lib.* v, *fol.* 83.

(48) Maimbourg, Schiſm of the Weſt. *Lib. ii, pag.* 151, 152, *ad ann.* 1382.

(49) She humbled herſelf greatly before Pope Clement at Fondi, confeſſing herſelf to him, and diſcovering to him all her exploits and tricks fairly and without reſerve. (Theſe words raiſe a great many wanton ideas). Froiſſard makes uſe of theſe very words, and diſcovered her ſecrets to him, and afterwards began her harangue; which I ſhall deliver in the ſame terms as the author preſents them, without altering them. *Brantome, ubi ſupra, pag.* 359.

(50) Ibid. *pag.* 363.

(51) Mezerai, Chronol. Abridg. *Tom. iii, pag.* 119. Brantome *is in the ſame error: ſee, above, remark* [*G*], *citation* (39).

(52) *It is to be ſeen in a chapel of the church of St Laurence at Naples, in theſe words:* Hic jacent corpora Illuſtrium Dominorum Domini Roberti de Artois, & Domine Johanne Duracii, conjugum, qui obierunt anno Domini Mccclxxxvii, die xx menſ. Julii. *Tomaſo Coſto, Annotaz. & Supplem. fol.* 121.

(53) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 363.

ment VI, it may be objected ſhe gave him Avignon, or as good as gave it him. If ſhe obtained it of Clement VII, it may be ſaid he was an Anti-Pope, who having occaſion for the good reputation of thoſe princes who acknowledged his title, would certainly neither condemn her himſelf not ſuffer her to be expoſed to infamy. The other Anti-Pope did not treat her ſo kindly, he declared ſhe had forfeited her crown for ſeveral crimes *(k)*, and principally for taking the part of Clement VII *(l)*. She had a ſiſter, with whom Boccace was in love [*N*], as ſome authors affirm. But I will ſhow that they are miſtaken; and that Froiſſard has related a great many falſities *(m)*. In the following article may be ſeen who were the ſucceſſors to this queen. Her death was revenged in Hungary, if we may believe Brantome; but, when he ſpeaks of that, he falls

(*k*) *In the year* 1379. Per ſententia privo del regno di Napoli la Regina Giovanna per molti delitti, e maſſimamente per haver preſtato luogo e favore alla ſciſma, & havere preſtato obedientia a Clemente VI. *Collenuccio, ubi ſupra, fol.* 84, *verſo.*

(*l*) It is ſo he ought to have ſaid; and not VI, as Collenuccio has it.

(*m*) See the remark [*M*].

paſſed between Clement VII, and queen Joan. Now it was by Clement VI that ſhe was abſolved, as you may find hereafter: but all this is very confuſed. Brantome ſays, we may read in the hiſtory of Anjou, that in the great *ſchiſm of the church . . . among other princes who declared for Clement, were the king of France, his brothers, and good queen Joan . . . . who went to viſit Pope Clement; by whom, and all the Cardinals, ſhe was honourably received . . . . And that after ſhe had remained ſome time at his Holineſs's court, ſhe requeſted he would be pleaſed to hear her confeſſion, and abſolve her from her ſins, which the good Pope willingly and kindly granted, as it is certain ſo very agreeable a requeſt was not to be denied to one who ſo highly deſerved a ſecret, auricular, and ocular, confeſſion, and a penance light and eaſy to be born. After this confeſſion made in preſence of his Holineſs, and the ſacred college of cardinals, the ſaid queen . . . . . remonſtrated the many ill turns, and inſtances of ingratitude ſhe had met with from her nephew Charles of Durazzo; and that he had many times ſought her life to enjoy her kingdom. She therefore deſiring to obſerve the laſt will of her father and grandfather, did, in preſence of all the nobility there aſſembled, reſign and yield up into the hands of his Holineſs, as well her kingdoms of Sicily and Naples, as her duchies of Apulia, Calabria and the earldom of Provence. All this agrees with the words of Froiſſard. The Pope having accepted this, thro' the ill advice of his council, ſhe adopted Lewis of Anjou for her ſon; to whom were given charters and authentic letters; but the Pope, however, had a deed of conveyance of the county of Avignon from her to himſelf . . . . This being done, the queen took her leave of his Holineſs, and returned to her kingdom, where Charles of Durazzo, having ſome time after taken her priſoner, cauſed her to be ſecretly ſtifled between two feather-beds, being informed of the adoption ſhe had made* (54). If this relation were to be allowed, it would incline one to believe, that the fact which Father Maimbourg ſpeaks of, belongs to the pontificate of Clement VII, and not to that of Clement VI. But I would not adviſe any body to rely either on the account Brantome has taken from Froiſſard, or that which he borrows from the hiſtory of Anjou. It is impoſſible to reconcile them, they are full of confuſion and uncertainty: let us therefore hold to what I am going to ſay. It is certain that queen Joan having made her apology, in the year 1348, before the Pope and cardinals, was declared innocent of the murder of her huſband (55), yet this declaration was but ſlightly expreſſed, and there is great probability it proceeded from the paſſion the Pope had to acquire Avignon. In ſhort, the ſame affair having been brought in queſtion in three years after, the queen was obliged to confeſs ſhe had been induced by witchcraft not to love her huſband, which gave encouragement to ſeveral perſons to conſpire againſt him. The judges being remarkably inclined to mercy, declared that ſhe ought not to be eſteemed guilty of this unhappy enchantment, nor of it's conſequences. When recourſe is had to ſuch ſort of contrivances in accuſations of this nature, it is a ſign the criminal has but a very bad cauſe. It is plain, the Pope, who was choſen judge in this matter, had a mind to preſerve to her, at all events, the kingdom of Naples, which he could not have done, unleſs he had found her innocent; for the truce he had mediated between her and the king of Hungary, in the year 1350, imported, that if Joan were found guilty, ſhe ſhould ſurrender her kingdom to that monarch, and that he ſhould quit all pretenſions to it, if ſhe were declared innocent (56). Conſider well this whole paſſage of Spondanus. ‘Cum remiſſa ex pacto Cauſa Johannæ Reginæ ad judicium Sedis Apoſtolicæ, ægre inveniretur modus aſſerendæ ejus innocentiæ, nec tamen juſtum juſtum videretur famam ejus diutius in dubium relinquerere; demum admiſſa eſt ejus excuſatio de maleficio ſeu faſcinatione, cujus vi fragilis ejus natura coacta fuiſſet minus amare virum quam deceret, indeque alii conſpirare in eum auſi eſſent: productiſque pluribus ejus rei teſtibus, declarata eſt à benevolis Judicibus innocens eorum omnium quæ ex ejuſmodi faſcinatione ſecuta eſſent (57). - - *The cauſe of queen Joan being by agreement referred to the judgment of the Apoſtolical ſee, and there appearing ſome difficulty in the vindicating her innocence, and yet at the ſame time no ſmall injuſtice in ſuffering her reputation to remain any longer in queſtion: at laſt her plea of witchcraft or enchantment was allowed of, by the force of which her frail nature had been wrought upon to love her huſband leſs than ſhe ought to have done, which had put others upon conſpiring againſt him: and ſeveral witneſſes being produced to this fact, ſhe was declared by theſe merciful judges innocent of all the conſequences of this enchantment.*' Father Maimbourg has not therefore acquitted himſelf like a faithful Hiſtorian, ſince he has not mentioned one word of the reviewing of this proceſs.

[*N*] *She had a ſiſter with whom Boccace was in love.*] Tomaſo Coſto has ſhown that this miſtreſs of Boccace was a baſtard of king Robert. I have quoted him before (58), but Brantome knew not ſo much: He makes ſeveral reflexions upon this little amour, without touching the principal point, which was to prove, that Boccace had not aſpired ſo high, as to make love to a legitimate ſiſter of ſo great a queen. Perhaps the reader will be glad to find here ſome paſſages of Brantome (59). ‘If what is wrote of him be true, that he loved her ſiſter Mary, counteſs of Artois, and that he wrote his two books, *Flammetta* and *Philocopo* for her ſake, then I think he ought to have treated more amply and advantageouſly of both the ſiſters than he has done; for no man knew better how to do it than he, by reaſon of his great learning: but I believe, as we may learn from great talkers, he never had ſo violent a paſſion for that lady as his writings ſeem to intimate, and that he only formed this fine object in his mind, the better to help his imagination in writing. As Poets, and other compoſers (60), have always ſome imaginary miſtreſs or patron to raiſe their fancy, or make the world believe their fortune is greater than it really is; that they may procure to their works the greater reſpect. Beſides, it is highly improbable that ſo great a princeſs would have gone ſuch lengths, as he deſcribes in his *Flammetta*; for then you muſt believe ſhe was raviſhed with him, would die for him, or be forced to run after him where-ever he went. Very likely indeed, if he were ſo very handſome as his picture repreſents him, which I have ſeen at Florence, Naples, and a great many other places, and which ſhew that he was by no means either lovely or agreeable; and at the ſame time her huſband, the earl, was a hundred times more deſirable.' Brantome adds, that this princeſs might have loved him *for his great wit*, and not for any thing ſhe had ſeen in his perſon, as he ſays he has *known ſeveral great ladies to be fond of men of letters:* and upon this head he relates what a certain Dauphineſs once anſwered after ſhe had kiſſed a Poet, who was aſleep (61); and then goes on thus (62): ‘*It is poſſible alſo that this princeſs Mary may in the ſame manner have loved Boccace for his excellent parts, and fine pen, to the end he might render her immortal, by celebrating her virtues to the whole world: however, her galant deceived her, for he wrote nothing but theſe two lying books, which rather ſcandalized than praiſed her, tho' he never enjoyed her. But it is a common thing for authors,*

(54) Ibid. *pag.* 365, *&c.*

(55) *See* Spondanus, ad ann. 1348, *num.* 3. *He quotes John Villani, lib. xii, cap. cxiv.* Matthew Villani, *cap. xviii, and* Sammonte, *lib. iii, cap. iv.*

(56) Spondanus, ad ann. 1350, *num.* 6, *pag.* 505. *He quotes Matthew Villani, lib. i, cap. lxxxix, xci, & ſeq.*

(57) Id. *ad ann.* 1351, *num.* 1, *pag. m.* 509.

(58) Remark [*G*], towards the end.

(59) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 370, 371.

(60) This confirms what I have formerly ſaid in the article LOTICHIUS, remark [*F*], as alſo in remark [*H*] of the article MALHERBE.

(61) Alain Chartier. *See the* Continuation of the General Criticiſm upon Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm. *Letter xviii, pag.* 591.

(62) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 372.

falls into ſome errors [*O*]. To conclude, the barbarity committed upon the unhappy Andrew, was a plain indication he had rendered himſelf odious to others beſides his wife [*P*].

authors, poets, and courtiers, to boaſt thoſe favours they have never enjoyed, tho' I have known ſome Poets, who have had favours conferred on them (63), *which I deſign to ſpeak of hereafter.*’

[O] *When Brantome ſpeaks of* the revenging of the death of Joan, *he falls into ſome errors.*] This is what he ſays, ‘ alſo GOD, the juſt avenger of innocent deaths, revenged her's, both upon the Hungarian, and upon Charles of Durazzo, whom Margaret, eldeſt ſiſter of queen Joan, and grand-daughter of king Robert, whilſt he was at Buda, where the queen invited him to a banquet, with much diſſembled kindneſs, during his drinking a glaſs of wine, cauſed to be ſtruck in the nape of the neck with a hatchet, which thus diſpatched him (64).’ The confuſion in this ſentence, does not prevent our ſeeing clearly, that Brantome affirms four things: 1. That Charles Durazzo was killed by order of the queen of Hungary. 2. That this queen's name was Margaret. 3. That ſhe was eldeſt ſiſter to queen Joan. 4. That ſhe was grand-daughter to king Robert. Now theſe are four falſities; beſides, in the laſt, Brantome contradicts himſelf (65). When Charles of Durazzo went into Hungary, after he had put queen Joan to death he there found theſe two queens, namely, the widow and daughter of the deceaſed king Lewis. Now the widow's name was Elizabeth, daughter of the king of Boſnia, and the daughter's Mary (66). They had both conſented, that Charles ſhould be crowned king of Hungary; but ſome time after, the widow gave orders to have him murdered. ‘ Fu coronato in Alba Regale di volonta della Regina Iſabetta, & del Re Maria ſua figliovola, le quali ogni loro ragione li rinuntiarono; ma poi andato a Buda, e con finte blanditie della Regina invitato ad un convito, mentre bevea li fu dato d'una ſecure nella coppa per ordinatione della Regina, e fu morto dell' anno 1386, a di 3 di Giugno (67). - - - *He was crowned in Stul Weiſſenburg, or Alba Regalis, by the conſent of queen Elizabeth, and of king Mary, her daughter, who both of them renounced all their right to him; but afterwards going to Buda, and being invited to an entertainment by the diſſembled kindneſs of the queen, while he was drinking he received a blow of a hatchet on his neck, of which he died the third day of June, in the year* 1386.’ This is what we learn from the author, whom Brantome follows. From whence we may infer another falſity of Brantome; for it was by no means to revenge the death of Joan, that the queen of Hungary cauſed Charles of Durazzo to be murdered. She propoſed only to gratify her own ambition, and that of king Mary. Let us obſerve by the way, that Urban VI, who had many ill offices done him on the part of Charles, and who, for that reaſon, excommunicated and depoſed him in the year 1385, was wonderfully pleaſed with the news of his death. It is ſaid he contemplated with a great deal of pleaſure, the inſtrument juſt newly ſtained with the blood of that prince (68). His death did not long remain unrevenged; for a lord of his party having ſurprized the two queens in the country, cauſed queen Elizabeth to be thrown into the river (69). It is an error to believe the world grows every day worſe and worſe (70); ſince, it is certain, the age, wherein we live (71) has not been able to furniſh us in the Weſt a ſeries of enormities in a few years, comparable to thoſe which were committed, between the years 1345 and 1390.

[P] *Andrew . . . . . had rendered himſelf odious to others beſides his wife.*] There are ſome Hiſtorians, who ſay, that his threatning to puniſh ſeverely ſome lords of his court, who had ill behaved themſelves; to puniſh them, I ſay, ſeverely, as ſoon as he ſhould be crowned, cauſed thoſe offenders to conſpire againſt him. *Occaſio autem hujus ſceleris ſpecialiter fuiſſe dicitur, quia ipſe, tanquam virtuoſus & audax, verbo & facto monſtrabat ſe velle punire aliquos quos videbat criminoſos & malè ſe habentes, quam primum per coronationem plenum dominium dicti regni ad ipſum perveniſſet. De quo malè ſibi conſcii & merito formidantes cogitaverunt adverſus eum modo præmiſſo ſibi ipſis præcavere* (72). But theſe conſpirators muſt needs have been animated by a perſonal hatred, beſides the deſire of preventing their own puniſhment, by their proceeding to ſuch a heighth of inhumanity. They tormented him barborouſly in all his members, and were ſo far from ſparing thoſe we forbear to name, that they exerciſed their greateſt cruelties upon them. The informations Clement VI, cauſed to be exhibited againſt the murderers, contain ſo many barbarous particulars, that they cannot be read without horror. ‘ Statim cùm per eos vocatus venit ad gayphum vel deambulatorium quod eſt ante cameram, aliqui poſuerunt manus ad os, ut clamare non poſſet, & ita impreſſerunt illos ganteletos ferreos circa os ejus, quod etiam veſtigia & characteres apparebant poſt mortem. Alii vero funem in collo poſuerunt ut ſtrangularent eum, ſicut etiam characteres poſt mortem oſtendebant. Alii vero receperunt eum per genitalia, & adeo traxerunt quod multi qui dicebant ſe vidiſſe retulerunt mihi quod tranſcendebant genua. Alii capillos de capite evulſerunt. Alii eum in pratum trahendo projecerunt. Alii dicunt quod cum fune cum qua eum ſtrangulaverant eum quaſi ſuſpenſum in pratum projecerunt. Alii ſuper cum cum genibus aſcenderunt, & eum uſque ad compaſſionem cordis oppreſſerunt. Et audivi quod etiam de hoc veſtigia exterius apparebant. Fuit etiam nobis dictum quod volebant eum projicere in puteum profundum, ſicut projectus fuerat ille ſanctus Jeremias in foveam, & poſtea dicere quod iverat extra regnum de conſilio aliquorum fidelium ſibi, qui diſpoſuerunt poſtea capere & mittere Regi Ungariæ captivos ac ſi ſcirent ubi eſſet. Et perfeciſſent, niſi nutrix dicti Regis ociùs occurriſſet (73). - - - - *As ſoon as he was come, according to their meſſage, as far as the gallery leading to the chamber, ſome clapped their hands before his mouth to prevent his crying out, and preſſed his face ſo hard with their ſteel gauntlets, that the marks and impreſſions of them remained viſible after his death. Others put a rope about his neck, and ſtrangled him; the marks of which, were alſo to be ſeen after his death. Others laid hold of his genitals, and pulled them with ſuch violence, that, as I have been informed by ſeveral who ſay they ſaw them, they hung down below his knees. Others tore the hair from his head. Others dragged him out and threw him into a field. Others ſay, that he was thrown into the field with the rope he was ſtrangled with, as if he had been hung up. Others got upon him with their knees, and bruiſed his breaſt with all their force. And I have heard, there alſo appeared external marks of this violence. It has been likewiſe reported to us, that they intended to have thrown him into a deep well, as the prophet Jeremiah was into a pit; and afterwards, to give out that he was gone out of the kingdom by the advice of his favourites, who they determined afterwards to take and ſend captives to the king of Hungary, as if they had known where he was. And that they had executed this deſign, if the nurſe of the ſaid king had not ſurprized them.*’

(63) See the Continuation of the General Criticiſm upon Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, *Letter xviii, pag.* 590, *& ſeq.*

(64) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 364, 365.

(65) He had ſaid, that queen Joan was daughter of king Robert.

(66) It was ſhe whom the Hungarians called king Mary. *Collenuccio, lib. v, fol.* 88, *verſo.*

(67) Collenuccio, ibid. *fol.* 89.

(68) Exultaſſe ferunt Urbanum ad nuncium mortis, cultrumque quo ictus fuerat ad ſe delatum, recenti ſanguine reſperſum, avidiſſime conſpexiſſe. *Pogius, apud Felinum Sandeum de Regibus Siciliæ, pag.* 36.

(69) Maimbourg, Schiſm of the Weſt. *Lib. iii, pag.* 223. *He quotes Thuroſius and Bonſinius.*

(70) Rampale has compoſed a diſcourſe in oppoſition to this error.

(71) That is to ſay, the XVIIth.

(72) Prima Vita Clementis VI, *pag.* 246, *Edit. Baluzianæ* 1693.

(73) Clem. VI, in Collatione facta contra interfectores Andreæ, apud Baluzium, Notis ad Vitas Paparum Avenionenſium, *pag.* 860.

NAPLES (JOAN II QUEEN OF) deſcended from Charles of Anjou, brother of St Lewis [*A*], was the daughter of Charles of Durazzo, who cauſed queen Joan I, to be

HISTORY of the Branch of Durazzo.

[A] *She was deſcended from Charles of Anjou, brother of St Lewis.*] The relation was thus. She was daughter of Charles of Durazzo the third of that name, who was ſon of Lewis of Durazzo, count of Gravina, whoſe father was John of Durazzo, brother of Robert king of Naples, and ſon of Charles the Lame, ſon and ſucceſſor of Charles of Anjou, brother of St Lewis (1). It is eaſy to apprehend by this Genealogical account, that John of Durazzo, brother of Robert, founded the branch of Durazzo: he died the fifth of April 1335, leaving three ſons, Charles, Lewis, and Robert.

Charles married Mary ſiſter of Joan, the firſt of that name, queen of Naples: he was both adviſer and

(1) See Father Anſelme's Genealogical Hiſtory of the Houſe of France, *pag.* 354, *&c.*

be put to death. She was born in 1371, and married to William of Auſtria (*a*) about the year 1403. She became a widow in 1406 (*b*). Ladiſlaus, her brother, king of Naples, dying without lawful iſſue in 1414, ſhe ſucceeded him in his kingdom, and the year following was married to James of Bourbon. This prince, not being able to endure her ſcandalous life, deprived her both of her galant, and of all her authority [*B*]. But

(*a*) *Correct Father Anſelme*, Hiſt. Geneal. de la Maiſon de France, *pag.* 358, *who calls him* duke of Auſtraſia.

(*b*) Father Anſelme's Chronological Hiſtory of the Houſe of France, *pag.* 358.

actor in the death of king Andrew (2). *He was made lieutenant-general, and governour of the kingdom of Naples*, when Joan retired into Provence, *upon the coming of Lewis king of Hungary into Italy* (3). He was not able to oppoſe the Hungarians, but was vanquiſhed, taken, and beheaded (4). Others (5) ſay, that he made no reſiſtance but went over with other lords, to pay homage to the king of Hungary; and, that the king having convicted him of the death of Andrew, firſt put him to death, and afterwards hanged him. The greateſt evidence againſt him was a letter he had written to the count of Artois: ‘Dicendo al Duca di Durazzo che gli moſtraſſe il luogo, dovè fu morto ſuo fratello. E benche il Duca negaſſe di ſaperlo il Re lo convinſe con moſtrargli una lettera ſcritta da eſſo Duca a Carlo d'Artois, intorno al trattato della detta morte, e chiamandolo traditore lo fece in quell' inſtante occidere e buttar dal medeſimo verone, ond'era ſtato buttato Andrea (6). - - - - - *The king commanding the duke of Durazzo, to ſhew him the place where his brother was killed, which the duke pretending to be ignorant of, he convicted him by producing a letter under his own hand to Charles of Artois, containing the particulars of that murder, and calling him traitor, ordered him that inſtant to be put to death, and expoſed in the very ſame place where Andrew had been thrown.*’ Charles of Durazzo left no ſon, whatever Collenuccio pretends, but only four daughters.

Lewis of Durazzo, his brother, count of Gravina, *was impriſoned in the caſtle dell' Ovo at Naples, by order of queen Joan I, on a ſuſpicion ſhe had, that he intended to invade her dominions, and had poiſon given him of which he died in the year* 1362. *He was buried in the monaſtery of the Nuns of Santa Croce at Naples. Some place his death in the month of June, and others on the twenty-ſecond of July* (7). He left one ſon named Charles, who retired to the court of Lewis king of Hungary; to whom he did very great ſervices, being general of his army againſt the Venetians. He happily ended that war, which procured him the honourable ſirname, *de la Pace*. It was he who was ſent to Naples to expel queen Joan, when the king of Hungary was ſollicited by Pope Urban to take poſſeſſion of that kingdom. Charles *was under infinite obligations* to this *queen; ſhe had brought him up tenderly in her court, as her own ſon; ſhe had married him to the princeſs Margaret her niece; ſhe deſigned him for her ſucceſſor, and even at that very time had his children with her. Yet the execrable ambition of reigning made him ungrateful, and broke thro' all thoſe ties.* He was *crowned king of Sicily at Rome, in the beginning of the year* 1381. *He afterwards marched for Naples; where, having been received without reſiſtance, he beſieged the queen in the caſtle dell' Ovo, and forced her at laſt to ſurrender herſelf, after having defeated and taken, Otho of Brunſwic, her huſband, and* cauſed her *to be ſtrangled in priſon in the year* 1382 (8). In the mean time Lewis of Anjou, brother of Charles V, king of France, had been adopted by queen Joan, and crowned at Avignon by Pope Clement VII. The news of the tragical death of this queen, did not hinder him from leading a fine army into the kingdom of Naples, to drive Charles thence; but he was ſo unfortunate, that famine deſtroyed his troops, and he died of grief in the year 1384 (9). Charles, by this means, remained in quiet poſſeſſion of that kingdom. He afterwards fell out with the Pope; but having been invited by the Hungarians, who were diſſatisfied with the government of the daughter and widow of their king, he went into Hungary, and was crowned by the archbiſhop of Gran. He was ſoon after taken off by the contrivance of the queen-dowager, as has before been ſaid (10). His ſon, Ladiſlausr ſucceeded him, and vanquiſhed Lewis II, duke of Anjou, who endeavoured to maintain his father's right. This Ladiſlaus was a brave and bold prince, and had he lived longer might have done great things. He died the ſixteenth of Auguſt in the year 1414, aged thirty-eight years (11). We ſhall ſee hereafter (12), how he was put to death. His ſiſter Joan, treated of in this article, ſucceeded him.

Robert of Durazzo ‘took upon him the title of prince of the Morea. He was arreſted in the city of Averſa, and carried priſoner into Hungary, together with his brother the count of Gravina, by order of the king of Hungary. Having been ſet at liberty in the year 1352, he came into France, where he challenged Lewis king of Hungary, accuſing him of having put to death his brother Charles of Durazzo, without any cauſe or reaſon. Some time after, being in the retinue of king John, he was at the fatal battle of Poictiers; where he died * honourably in the field the nineteenth of September 1356 (13).’

[*B*] *James of Bourbon deprived her both of her galant, and of all her authority.*] When ſhe went home to her huſband ‘ſhe carried along with her a Neapolitan gentleman, named Pandolfo Alopo; whom ſhe exceedingly countenanced, and created her chamberlain: her chamberlain he was indeed, for he waited on her conſtantly and generally in her chamber both day and night; but not without ſevere reflexions of the courtiers and people. To appeaſe them therefore, and to purſue the advice of her ſtates, ſhe reſolved to marry, and took for her huſband James of Narbonne, as the hiſtory of Naples ſays: but Meſſire Olivier de la Marche, a great lord and faithful Hiſtorian, calls him James of Bourbon; which I believe is more agreeable to truth, ſince he lived in that time. In treating this marriage, it was ſtipulated, that he ſhould not bear the title of king, but only that of prince, duke, or count, but he never would make uſe of any other than his accuſtomed title. At length the queen's captains, who envied and hated both Pandolfo, her minion, and Sforza, put it into his head to aſſume the title of king; wherefore, going one day to wait on him, they all ſaluted him by that title, except the brave Sforza, who would ſtile him only count: upon which, by the advice of thoſe about him, Sforza was ſent to priſon and whipped with cords, and Pandolfo beheaded. . . . . As for the queen, he laid her aſide, leaving her no manner of authority, and, in a manner, ſhut her up and confined her to her chamber, ſeldom or never admitting her either to his preſence or bed; but driving her from him, and even giving her a great many hard names, while the queen artfully and very maliciouſly diſſembled her reſentment (14). Brantome has taken all this from Pandolfo Collenuccio (15). ‘Tutto il governo di ſe, della corte, e del regno poſe in mano à Pandolfello Alopo Napolitano: Conte Camerlengo e belliſſimo giovene, e ſuo creato, il quale ella ſommamente amava; e havendolo menato ſeco quando andò a marito al Duca di Sterlic (16), morto il Duca il rimenò a Napoli, e ſempre lo tenne con publica infamia di venereo commercio con lei . . . (17) il Conte Giacome . . . poſta la Regina da parte non le laſciava maneggiar coſa alcuna, e in alcune camere quaſi relegata la teneva, non ammettendola molte volte ne'anche a gli atti matrimoniali, e con repulſe e villane parole da ſe lontana la teneva. - - - *The whole government of her perſon, of her court, and of her kingdom, ſhe put into the hand of Pandolfo Alopo, a Neapolitan, lord chamberlain, a moſt beautiful young man, and her favourite, with whom ſhe was extremely in love; and having taken him along with her when ſhe went to her huſband the duke of Auſtria, when that duke was dead ſhe brought him back to Naples, and conſtantly kept him with public ſcandal of admitting him to her bed . . . count James ſet the queen aſide, not permitting her to concern her ſelf in any affairs, and kept her as it were a priſoner in her chamber, rarely admitting or lying with her, repulſing her with opprobrious language.*’

Note, that Brantome imagined falſely that Olivier de la Marche and Pandolfo Collenuccio diſagree concerning the huſband of queen Joan. It is eaſy to ſee they agree very well. The former ſays, *that this queen*

(2) Mezerai's Chronological Abridgment, *Tom. iii, pag.* 30.

(3) Anſelme, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 355.

(4) Collenuccio, *lib. v, fol.* 83.

(5) Tomaſo Coſto, *in his Supplements to* Collenuccio, *fol.* 112, *verſo, who quotes Matthew Villani.*

(6) Id. ib.

(7) Father Anſelme, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 356, 357.

(8) Mezerai's Chronological Abridgment, *Tom. iii, pag.* 118.

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 128.

(10) In the remark [*O*] of the foregoing article.

(11) Anſelme, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 359.

(12) In the remark [*E*], in the paſſage of Mezerai.

* Chron. of Brother Ptolemy of Lucca.

(13) Anſelme, ibid. *pag.* 355.

(14) Brantome, Vies des Dames Illuſtres, *pag.* 384.

(15) Pandolfo Collenuccio, Hiſt. del Regno di Napoli, *lib. v, fol.* 93, *verſo.*

(16) *Neither* Brantome, *nor* Collenuccio, *have underſtood this word* Sterlic. *According to* Baudrand, Auſtria *is called in High-Dutch* Oeſtereich, *and pronounced* Eſterich, *whence* Collenuccio *had his* Duca di Sterlic, *and* Brantome, *pag.* 348, *his* Ducheſſe de Sterlich.

(17) Id. Collenuccio. ibid. *fol.* 94.

But he was not politic enough to maintain himſelf againſt the ſtratagems of this princeſs [*C*]: for ſhe got the better of him, and proſecuted her advantage ſo cloſely, that ſhe obliged him to return to France, where he turned Monk (*c*). The queen having rid her ſelf of ſuch a huſband, ſoon found her ſelf involved in new troubles; for ſhe had ſo far diſobliged the brave Sforza of Cotignola, that he ſollicited Lewis of Anjou to make a conqueſt of the kingdom of Naples, and he put himſelf at the head of the malecontents. Pope Martin V favoured Lewis of Anjou, who laid ſiege to Naples both by ſea and land, and had certainly made himſelf maſter of it, had not Alphonſus of Arragon ſent a powerful ſuccour to the queen. He gave her this aſſiſtance on account of her having promiſed to adopt him. She was as good as her word; but ſhe was ſo ill treated by this ungrateful prince that ſhe revoked her adoption, and transferred it to Lewis of Anjou (*d*). This prince reduced all the cities which held for Alphonſus, and behaved himſelf ſo well towards the queen, that when he died in the month of November 1434 (*e*), the grief ſhe conceived for the loſs of him was the occaſion of her own death not long after (*f*) [*D*]. She appointed for her heir Renatus of Anjou (*g*), who had not a force ſufficient to poſſeſs himſelf of the kingdom. And therefore left his deſcendants only a bare title. He was better qualified to make a quiet ſtate happy, than to reduce a rebellious one; and ſpent more time in painting than in preparing for an expedition [*E*]. The true

(*c*) Brantome, in his Lives of Illuſtrious Women, *pag.* 388, & *ſeq.* rallies him ſeverely.

(*d*) See Father Maimbourg's Hiſtory of the great Schiſm, *lib. vi.*

(*e*) And not 1431, as Mezerai ſays in his Chronological Abridgment, *ad hunc ann.*

(*f*) The ſecond of February 1435.

(*g*) He was brother of Lewis.

queen was married to a very handſome and virtuous knight of the blood royal of France, and of the houſe of Bourbon, both by name and arms, called Meſſire James of Bourbon, Count de la Marche (18). The latter ſays, ‘ eleſſe Giacomo di Narbona Provenzale, Conte della Marca, e di ſtirpe regale di Francia ancor' egli (19). ‘ - - - *She pitched upon James of Narbonne in Provence, count de la Marche, and alſo of the blood royal of France.*’ They both ſpeak of the ſame man, and draw his character in a very plain manner; all the difference conſiſts in this, the Italian author makes him of Provence, and calls him James of Narbonne. He was certainly miſtaken in the firſt reſpect; but as to the laſt, I believe it is only an error of the preſs, in putting *Narbona* for *Borbone*. If the Printer of Collenuccio did not make this miſtake, it might very probably be found in the authors which Collenuccio copied, and that either thro' the negligence of the Tranſcribers or Printers. We muſt not quit this ſubject without rectifying two miſtakes of Mezerai. *Although Joan,* ſays he (20), *was firſt married to James of Bourbon, ſon of John count de la Marche, yet was ſhe nevertheleſs governed by the counſels of Pandolfo Alopo, and Mutio Sforza, the ſtock of the Sforza's dukes of Milan, who were ſaid to be her friends.* This is to ſuppoſe, 1. That Joan had never been married before ſhe was wife to James of Bourbon; and, 2. That ſhe married another huſband, after ſhe had loſt this. Now theſe ſuppoſitions are falſe. If I were to take notice of the incorrectneſs of his ſtile, I ſhould make a third remark on this Hiſtorian; for the order of his words would incline us to believe, that the Sforza's dukes of Milan were eſteemed friends of queen Joan.

[*C*] *He was not politic enough to maintain himſelf againſt the ſtratagems of this princeſs.*] ‘ She played her part ſo well, that one Giulio Ceſare of Capua, who had formerly offended her, to make his peace, offered to kill her huſband James; ſhe, not leſs crafty than malicious, took hold of this occaſion, as well to revenge herſelf on Giulio, as to regain the confidence of her huſband, and to recover her former liberty. Seeming therefore to hearken to the propoſal, ſhe bid him conſider well the buſineſs, and do it diſcreetly and ſafely, and put him off for eight days. In the mean while, acquainting the king with the whole matter, ſhe concealed him with ſome of his moſt faithful domeſtics well armed in her cloſet; and the eighth day being come, ſhe ordered Giulio to come privately into her chamber, where ſhe made him repeat to her loud enough to be heard, his whole contrivance, and the manner of executing it; all which James having underſtood ruſhed out upon him, and had him publickly beheaded, and at the ſame time took occaſion from hence to expreſs the higheſt opinion and regard for the queen, as the moſt loyal of wives. *Coſi ſi pigliano le volpe*, ſays the Italian proverb, *This is the way to catch the fox*. Soon after therefore he ſet the queen at liberty, and gave her leave to keep her court as formely, and enjoy herſelf, and govern every thing at her pleaſure; by which means, being one day at a banquet prepared for him on purpoſe; ſhe ſeeing her opportunity, contrived the matter ſo well, by the aſſiſtance of her friends and accomplices, that ſhe grew the ſtrongeſt, and, with great acclamations of the people, and of ſome of the grandees, ſhe cauſed the French officers to be ſeized, put to death and plundered, and the king her huſband to be impriſoned in the caſtle dell' Ovo, where he found means to embark in a Genoeſe ſhip, which happened to be then in in the port, and was hired to carry him to Taranto, where the queen ordered him to be beſieged, but he not being able to hold out long againſt her ſurrendered it, and got away into France, where he turned Monk, and paſſed the remainder of his days in a monaſtery (21).’

[*D*] *The grief ſhe conceived at the loſs of Lewis of Anjou, deprived her of life.*] Her concern was the more afflicting, in that ſhe had not anſwered by a like treatment, the reſpect he had all along paid her (22).

[*E*] *Renatus of Anjou . . . . ſpent more time in Painting, than in preparing for an expedition.*] See what an Italian author ſays on this head. ‘ Qualis avorum memoria Renatus Neapolitanus Rex fuit. Hic enim pictura maxime delectabatur, & ob ejus ſtudium res maximas conficere negligebat. Illum & familiares, & propinqui reguli admonebant, è dignitate regia non eſſe dies noctesque in pingendo conſumere, ſemperque tabellas contemplari, & de figuratione corporum diſceptare. Ad quos reſpondebat ſe non minus pictorem quam Regem natum eſſe. At quàm melius conſuluiſſet ſibi & poſteris ſuis, ſi tantam curam non egiſſet artis illius pulcerrimæ quidem, ſed Regibus nunquam admodum neceſſariæ, profecto ex illo regio ſolio non excidiſſet, nec privatus in Galliam Narbonenſem navigaſſet (23). ‘ - - - - - *Like what Renatus, king of Naples, was in the memory of our anceſtors. For he was moſtly delighted with Painting, and for the ſake of that neglected matters of the greateſt conſequence. His friends and neighbouring princes adviſed him that it was below the regal dignity to waſte the day and night in Painting, and to be always contemplating pictures, and diſputing about the proportion of figures. To whom he anſwered that he was as much born a Painter as a King. But how much better would he have conſulted both himſelf and his poſterity, if he had beſtowed leſs application upon an art which is very engaging indeed in itſelf, but very unneceſſary to kings; he certainly would never have loſt his crown, nor have ſailed in a private ſtation into Provence.*’ Let us add to this teſtimony another of a French Hiſtorian. ‘ He ſpent his time in drawing pictures ſo excellent * that they are yet to be ſeen in the city of Aix. He was painting a partridge when news was brought him of the loſs of the kingdom of Naples, yet would not give over his work; ſo much pleaſure did he take in it (24).’ Balzac, having ſaid that Lewis XIII, did not miſpend his time in exerciſes unbecoming a king, adds theſe words (25): *I do not doubt but he had read with a great deal of indignation the ſtory of king Renatus, laſt earl of Provence, who was found finiſhing the picture of a partridge, by the perſon who brought him news of the loſs of his kingdom of Sicily; and I likewiſe aſſure my ſelf that if Selim, emperor of the Turks, had not in that picture*

(18) Olivier de la Marche, Memoires, *lib. i, cap. i, pag. m.* 76.

(19) Collenuccio, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 93, *verſo.*

(20) Mezerai, Hiſtory of France, *Tom. ii, pag.* 627.

(21) Brantome, Dames Illuſtres, *pag.* 386.

(22) Sero nimis exiguæ tam patientis & obſequentis filii habitæ curæ, mortiſque ei ſummâ ingratitudine conciliatæ ingentibus gemitibus ſeſe incuſavit. *Spondan. ad ann.* 1434, *num.* 16.

(23) Petrus Alcyonius, in Medice Legato poſteriore de Exilio.

* Michael de Montagne in his Eſſays, book ii, chap. xvii, upon preſumption, ſays, that being at Bar le Duc, he ſaw a picture which Renatus king of Sicily had drawn of himſelf, preſented to king Francis II.

(24) Matthew's Hiſtory of Lewis XI, *lib. ix, pag. m.* 503.

(25) Balzac, in his Prince, *ch.* 126, *pag. m.* 88, 89.

true ſucceſſor of this princeſs was Alphonſus of Arragon, of whom I ſpeak in the following article. None deny but the queen diſhonoured her ſelf greatly by her laſciviouſneſs [*F*]. Brantome vindicates her very poorly [*G*]. It was perhaps to expiate this crime, that ſhe

picture he drew and made public, repreſented a battle ** *he had gained, this king would not eaſily have pardoned him the diſcovering to the world that he was a Painter.* Mr de Scuderi obſerves, that Selim ſent this battle, *painted with his own hand, to the Venetians, who preſerve it to this day in their treaſury* (26). This employment of Selim did no injury to his memory, becauſe it did not hinder him from conquering ; but a like application diſhonoured the good king Renatus, who loſt almoſt all his dominions. ‘ A certain ‘ Painter having ſeen a picture of this king Renatus at Aix, ſaid, after having admired it, that it ‘ was a great pity Renatus was a king, and that he ‘ had not been a Painter by profeſſion (27). Note the inhabitants of Provence were very happy under this painting king (28), who lived a long time (29).

[*F*] *No body will deny but this queen diſhonoured herſelf greatly by her laſciviouſneſs.*] Let us alledge firſt, the words of Pandolfo Collenuccio : *Fama Laſcio di ſe inſtabile e impudica, dicendoſi di lei, che nella inſtabilita ſola fu ſtabile, e che ſempre era ſtata innamorata, havendo in piu modi e con molti la ſua laſcivia macchiata ; ma ſopra tutto con Pandolfello Alopo, e Urbano Auriglia, e M. Giovanni Caracciolo gran Siniſcalco, tutti tre Gentilhuomini, e molto deſtri, virtuoſi, e coſtumati ; ma ſopra ogni coſa di perſona e effigie belliſſima* (30). Brantome (31) has tranſlated this after the following manner. ‘ Now the hiſtory of Naples ſays, this queen ‘ left behind her the character of a woman of great ‘ lewdneſs and inconſtancy ; inſomuch, that it was ‘ ſaid of her, that ſhe was conſtant in nothing but in ‘ inconſtancy, and that ſhe was always in love with ‘ ſome body or other, indulging herſelf in carnal pleaſures with various perſons, and in various ways.’ Thus far Brantome : Collenuccio concludes thus, ‘ but ‘ above all, with Pandolf Alopo, Urban Auriglia, and ‘ John Caracciolo high-ſteward, all three gentlemen, ‘ and of great abilities, virtues, and accompliſhments, ‘ but more particularly remarkable for their handſomeneſs.’ Collenuccio is ſo well known for partiality againſt the houſe of Anjou, that not only the French Hiſtorians, but alſo ſome Italians (32) have cenſured his virulency and calumnies, and principally in regard to queen Joan, the firſt of that name. But they paſs over and even follow his account of Joan II. Is not this a plain ſign that the irregularities of the former are doubtful, and that thoſe of the latter are inconteſtable ? The paſſage I am going to quote is very curious : As Ladiſlaus ‘ (33) was very much given ‘ to women, and exceedingly hated for his cruelties, ‘ he was this year poiſoned after a baſe manner, receiving his death from the very ſource of pleaſure and ‘ life. A Phyſician perceiving his familiarity with his ‘ daughter, gave her a poyſonous drug to rub herſelf ‘ withal, which ſhe thought was a philtre to raiſe a ‘ greater deſire in her lover, but it proved the cauſe ‘ of both their deaths (34). The king's ſiſter Joan II, ‘ relict of William of Auſtria, ſucceeded him. She ‘ was then four and forty years old ; and yet this age ‘ far from abating her paſſions, had inflamed them to ‘ the greateſt degree.’ See what I quote from Spondanus (35) ; and alſo obſerve, that tho' the Jeſuit Maimbourg played ſo much the panegyriſt and apologiſt in favour of the firſt Joan, yet he confeſſes of this, that *ſhe diſhonoured her reign by her exceeding ſcandalous life ; and that ſhe at length abandoned both her perſon and kingdom to John Caracciolo, whom, of all her favourites, ſhe loved moſt tenderly* (36).

[*G*] . . . . *Brantome vindicates her very poorly.*] Theſe are his words : ‘ The hiſtory of Naples ſays, that ‘ this queen . . . . . was always in love with ſome ‘ body or other, indulging herſelf in carnal pleaſures, ‘ with various perſons, and in various ways ; ‘ but as to this it is the moſt excuſable and inconſiderable fault a great and fair princeſs can be guilty ‘ of, whereas that is the moſt ſhocking, when ſhe is ‘ wicked, revengeful, and tyrannical, as ſome are, to ‘ the very great damage of their poor ſubjects, who ‘ ſuffer little or nothing from their amours ; which ‘ is an argument I have known publickly urged by ‘ a certain great man (37).’ It is much after the ſame manner that Paul Jovius has endeavoured to defend the voluptuous life of Leo X, as I have before obſerved (38), the reflexions I have made on ſuch kind of apologies may there alſo be ſeen. But I muſt add, that there is a great deal of difference betwen the public laſciviouſneſs of a king, and the ſcandalous amours of a queen. Without doubt it would be much better for the ſubjects that their prince ſhould ſcandalize them with a great number of baſtards, than load them with taxes, and tyrannize over them : and it is very poſſible a prince, inordinately given to women, may preſerve order in his dominions, make juſtice and commerce flouriſh, and no way injure any of his ſubjects. I confeſs alſo a people may be more happy under an unchaſte queen, in caſe ſhe treats them gently and prudently, than under one who is chaſte, yet withal covetous, cruel, and ambitious : This admits of no difficulty, but it ſeems to me morally impoſſible, that, in a country where the laws of religion, and of worldly honour, are ſo ſevere againſt female unchaſtity, as they are in our weſtern parts of the world, a people ſhould be happy under a queen who tramples under foot modeſty and that virtue, which is the greateſt ornament of her ſex. The allowances uſually given to the unlawful amours of a monarch, hinder us from concluding, that his giving ſuch a looſe to that paſſion, will likewiſe make him uncapable of governing himſelf in any other affairs. Whereas the ſeverity of the laws of worldly honour againſt the public indecencies of a woman, of what quality ſoever, induces us to believe, that a queen who has tranſgreſſed thoſe bounds, will ſtop at no exceſs whatſoever. She muſt neceſſarily have loſt all manner of ſhame, ſhe muſt be inſenſible of glory, ſhe muſt have a mean ſoul, who can reſolve to ſacrifice her honour and conſcience, and the eſteem of the public, to a criminal paſſion, which ſhe has conceived either for one of her domeſtics or vaſſals. Can the ſubjects of ſuch a princeſs have any regard for her, after they have formed ſuch an idea of her, from ſuch plauſible reaſons ? Can they avoid having the laſt contempt for her ; and is not ſuch a contempt the cauſe of ſeditions ? Beſides, it is next to impoſſible but that ſuch an immodeſt conduct in a queen muſt likewiſe debauch all the ladies of her court, and thus ſpread throughout her kingdom a pernicious neglect of theſe laws of decency and modeſty, which ſo greatly contribute to the preſerving in the world that remnant of chaſtity which it is yet in poſſeſſion of. By this means what was only deſpiſed before will immediately become inſufferable and abominable to all who have that regard they ought to have to the public good. What can be expected from all this, but factions and revolts ? The amours of a king are not liable to the ſame inconveniences. Ambition, a deſire of growing more powerful, a falſe idea of grandeur, have almoſt always had a greater ſhare in the downfal of their favourites, than love : where as an amorous queen is wholly plunged into thoſe diſorders, which debaſe her, by the brutal paſſion for carnal pleaſures. We may add this farther conſideration. A queen who abandons her ſelf to her galants, becomes their ſlave ; ſhe can deny them nothing ; it is not ſhe, but they, properly ſpeaking, who reign. Their vanity, and their other paſſions, which are a ſource of diſorders, fruitful enough of themſelves, become yet more fatal thro' the jealouſies they raiſe in the minds of men of higheſt rank. They concert meaſures to ſupplant them, they cabal, they form parties, and inflame the people. Can any ſubjects be happy under ſuch a government ? experience confirms what I ſay ; for hiſtory ſcarce furniſhes us with any examples of amorous queens, who have given a looſe to their luſt, whoſe reigns have not been unfortunate. What troubles were there not in the kingdom of Naples during the reigns of theſe two Joans ? What wars of all kinds ? What plundering ? ſo that we may conclude, contrary to the opinion of Brantome, that leudneſs in a queen is a very blameable vice, and a capital defect. It is an offence from which the people have reaſon to apprehend the moſt dreadful conſequences.

A civilian

** This was the battle he gained over Iſmaël king of Perſia.

(26) Scuderi, Illuſtre Baſſa, *Tom. i, pag.* 326.

(27) Le Pays, Nouvelles Oeuvres. *Part ii, livr. i, Letter xxxv, pag. m.* 71, 72.

(28) See Matthew, Hiſt. of Lewis XI, *pag.* 503 ; and Ruffi, Hiſtory of Marſeilles, *Tom. i, pag.* 269, *& ſeq.*

(29) He died in the year 1480.

(30) Collenuccio, *lib. v, ſub fin. fol.* 100, *verſo.*

(31) Dames Illuſtres, *pag.* 395.

(32) Tomaſo Coſto, Summonte, *&c.*

(33) Mezerai, Chronolog. Abridg. *Tom. iii, pag.* 190, in the year 1414. See alſo his great Hiſtory, *Tom. ii, pag.* 627.

(34) *Collenuccio* relates this at large, *lib. v, fol.* 93, and *Brantome* after him, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 404.

(35) In the remark [*H*], citation (45).

(36) Maimbourg, Hiſtory of the great Schiſm of the Weſt. *Book vi, pag. m.* 284.

(37) Brantome, Dames Illuſtres, *pag.* 395.

(38) Remark [*O*] of the article LEO X.

CONSIDERATIONS upon the unlawful amours of queens.

ſhe was liberal to the church, and that ſhe permitted Capiſtran to oppreſs the Jews [*H*]. I have elſewhere (*b*) ſpoken of Caracciolo, one of her galants. What Brantome has ſaid of her is taken from Collenuccio. I muſt here add a word or two concerning Bartolomeo Coglione [*I*].

A Civilian who lived at that time, made this quibble in Italian againſt the firſt Joan. She has been, ſays he (39), not the *Regina*, but the *Rovina* (40), of the kingdom of Naples, there was alſo a prophetic verſe made on the ſecond Joan, importing that ſhe ſhould be the deſtruction of her country. *Della quale un verſo profetico per il reame ſi diceva :*

Ultima Durazzi fiet Deſtructio Regni (41).

Of whom was made this prophetical verſe, which was current in that kingdom.

Under the conduct of this royal whore,
Durazza's realm ſhall fall to riſe no more.

This Civilian was for the Salique law: he was not for admitting women to the throne (42) All things duly weighed and conſidered, one ſhould be obliged to confeſs that the laws which permit kingdoms to fall to the diſtaff, have not been wiſely eſtabliſhed. It is not that women have leſs wit or leſs capacity than men: there have been ſome who have reigned with ſo much glory, and who have aſcended the throne, with ſuch courage, wiſdom, and ability, that the greateſt of kings have ſcarce deſerved to be compared with them: but then it happens accidentally that thoſe ſtates which obſerve not the Salique law, are expoſed to ſeveral inconveniences for want of it ; of which this is not the leaſt, that he who marries the heireſs of the crown, is almoſt always at variance both with his ſubjects and with his queen. They, for the moſt part, look upon him only as the huſband of their queen and not their king, while ſhe is not diſpleaſed to have them do ſo, but even ſometimes refuſes to allow him the title of king. It is from hence that infinite diſorders aroſe in the kingdom of Naples, during the reign of the two Joans. Conſult the Hiſtory of England under the reign of queen Mary, wife of Philip II. The father and grand-father of this latter under-went a like tryal, the one in Spain, and the other in the Low-Countries.

Father le Moyne furniſhes me with a ſupplement: he has refuted by very good arguments the looſe morality of Taſſo: he ſuppoſes that this famous Poet being in love with the princeſs Eleonora d'Eſt, ſacrificed the intereſts of virtue to thoſe of his paſſion, in maintaining that chaſtity was not neceſſary to any but women of low rank (43). This wicked Philoſophy was vigorouſly attacked, and among other remarks on it with this. ' The honour of the public is inſeparable from that of private perſons, contrary to ' this new morality of Taſſo. Immodeſty is not ' only more baſe and odious in perſons of figure : but ' alſo more contagious and of more dangerous conſequence. An ill example is like an infected air, ' which is always to be dreaded, from what quarter ' ſoever it comes, and by what wind ſoever it is ' ſpread. But it is attended with a more ſubtle poiſon, and a more penetrating malignity when it ' comes from great families ; when it is blown from a ' mouth of authority ; when it is propagated in rich ' and golden robes : and if at this very day princeſſes, ' and thoſe who approach their quality, ſhould declare for Taſſo's wicked doctrine ; to morrow every body would believe it honourable to copy after ' their amours, and the licentiouſneſs of theſe ladies ' would come into faſhion, as well as their cloaths and ' head-dreſſes (44).'

[*H*] *It was perhaps to attone for her leudneſs, that ſhe was ſo kind to the church, and that ſhe permitted . . . . . to oppreſs the Jews.*] Spondanus ſays thus much expreſsly, in relation to the ſmall pomp ſhe ordered for her own funeral. ' Sepulta eſt, *ſays he* (45), ' in Eccleſiâ Virginis Annunciatæ ignobili ſepulturâ, ' ut ipſa juſſerat, in pœnitentiam luxurioſæ vitæ quâ ' vehementer infamata eſt. - - - - *She was buried in ' the church of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary, ' without any pomp, as ſhe herſelf had commanded, by ' way of penance for her profligate life, which had been extremely ſcandalous.*' See what he adds in reſpect to the care ſhe took of the concerns of religion. ' Inter vitia quibus fœdata eſt, egit & multa pia opera, ' tam in Eccleſiarum quàm in ſtatus regni utilitatem, ' quæ Summontius Neapolitanus enumerat. Inter quæ ' fuit, quod poteſtatem fecit Fr. Joanni Capiſtrano inſigni Ordinis S. Franciſci profeſſori, interdicendi Judæis uſuras & alia ab Eccleſia prohibita ; & cogendi ferre ſignum Thau, ut dignoſcerentur à Chriſtianis (46). - - - - *Among her many vices, ſhe alſo did ' a great many pious works, as well for the benefit ' of the church as the ſtate, which are enumerated by ' Summontius a Neopolitan. Among which one was her ' impowering John Capiſtran, an eminent monk of the ' order of St Francis, to prohibit the Jews, their uſury ' and other practices condemned by the church, and to oblige them to be marked with a Thau, to diſtinguiſh ' them from Chriſtians.*' So furious a zealot as was this Franciſcan, being appointed inſpector of the conduct of the Jews, and who made them wear the letter Thau, to diſtinguiſh them, was like enough to make them undergo a great many troubles.

[*I*] *I muſt here add a word or two concerning Bartolomeo Coglione.*] He was one of the moſt celebrated captains of his time. ' He was born in the neighbourhood of ' Bergamo, and his family had been entirely deſtroyed ' in the quarrel between the Guelphs and Gibelins. ' He had begged till he was eighteen years old, when, ' coming to Naples, and no body daring to diſpute with ' him the prize in wreſtling or running, by reaſon of his ' prodigious ſtrength, and incomparable agility, queen ' Joan II, who valued men only for their vigour, ' made him her minion : but he was quickly weary ' of this infamous employment, and ſtealing from the ' court, went to learn the exerciſe of arms, under ' the famous Braccio (47).' It will not be amiſs to acquaint the reader, that this ſtory is to be met with among the Elogies of Paul Jovius, ſince the bare authority of the French Hiſtorian would not be ſufficient to hinder us from doubting the truth of it. See the words of the original he has made uſe of. ' Fuit ' coleo corporis ſtatura erecta atque habili, adeoque ' formoſus atque agilis ut Regina Joanna, ingenio procaci mulier, avidaque virorum fortium Coleonis amore ' caperetur, quum ea ſpectante cunctos in palæſtra ' jactuque ferrei vectis & ſaltu curſuque certantes cum ' magno ſpectantium plauſu ſuperaret (48). - - - - *Coglione was of a very ſtrait and ſtout habit of body, ' and ſo handſome and nimble, that queen Joan, a diſſolute woman and fond of ſtrong men fell in love with ' him, when ſhe ſaw him exceed every body in wreſtling, ' caſting the iron bar, leaping, and running, to the great ' ſatisfaction of the ſpectators.*' You may know by this the nature of this queen. During the ſolemnity of publick games, ſhe ſpies an adventurer of a good figure and complexion, who bore away the prize of of wreſtling, running and jumping, from all thoſe who contended with him, and who threw the javelin farther than all of them. She enquires no farther of him, but immediately chuſes him for her favourite. To her therefore may be applied the fable of the mare, related in the *Mercure Galant* of the year 1673, which, if I remember right, concludes with this moral.

Maintes conois qui trompent à leur mine,
Et ſont du goût de la jument :
Il n'importe qui ni comment,
Pourveu qu'il ait bon rable & bonne échine.

Truſt no features tho' ever ſo fine,
But follow the taſte of the mare,
Do but chuſe a ſtrong back and ſtout chine,
This only will anſwer your care.

NAPLES (ALPHONSO I, KING OF) by his valour and conduct joined the kingdom of Naples to the dominions he inherited from his father Ferdinand king of Arragon, who died in the year 1416. Joan II, queen of Naples, being beſieged in her

---

(*b*) Above, in the article of the firſt CARACCIOLO.

(39) Collenuccio, *lib. v, fol.* 86, *verſo.*

(40) That is to ſay, not the queen, but the ruin.

(41) Collenuccio, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 92, *verſo.*

(42) Ponendovi queſti due verſi in biaſimo del feminil governo. *Regna regunt vulvæ, gens tota clamat ſimul oh! veh! Interitus regni eſt à muliere regi.* I quali verſi in vulgar noſtro ſuonano coſi, ' La vulva regge, ohime gridan le lingue, ' Il feminil governo il regno ' eſtingue.' *Id. fol.* 86, *verſo.*

(43) *Father* Le Moyne, Galer. des Femmes fortes, *pag. m.* 192.

(44) Id. ib. *pag.* 19.

(45) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1435, *num.* 3, *pag.* 831. *He had ſaid in the year* 1414, *num.* 6, *pag.* 734. Succeſſit in regnum ſoror ejus *Joanna* hujus nominis ſecunda, vidua Guillelmi Auſtrii, annum agens jam 44, ſed amore cujuſdam Pandolfelli Alopi Neapolitani conſpicuâ formâ juvenis à multo tempore infamis.

(46) Id. ib. *ad ann.* 1435, *num.* 3.

(47) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, *pag.* 35.

(48) Jovius, Elogior. Virorum bellica virtute illuſtrium, *lib. iii, pag. m.* 237.

capital city by Lewis of Anjou, had recourſe to our Alphonſo, promiſing to adopt him for her ſucceſſor, in caſe he ſhould deliver her from her enemies. Alphonſo, who had juſt then ſignalized himſelf in Sardinia, did not let ſlip ſo fair an opportunity of aggrandizing himſelf; he ſent his fleet to Naples, raiſed the ſiege, and was thereupon adopted by the queen in September 1420. This friendſhip however between the queen and her adopted ſon, did not laſt long; for the adoption was annulled in June 1423, after ſome great quarrels, which were at laſt converted into violent hoſtilities. Lewis III, of Anjou, was adopted by the queen, and Alphonſo reſolved to return into Spain. He embarked at Naples, in October 1423, and took Marſeilles in his way. This conqueſt of his was owing to the good counſel which had been given him, to puſh his point after he had poſſeſſed himſelf of the harbour, and to attack the city all night without giving the inhabitants time to recover out of their firſt ſurprize. During his abſence the faction of Anjou got the upper-hand again at Naples; but as queen Joan, was a perſon of no great conſideration, and beſides was ſurrounded by thoſe who had no other views but to ſupplant one another, and whoſe paſſions were always wavering with their intereſt, the faction of Arragon recovered its ground again when it was the leaſt expected. Alphonſo then found himſelf earneſtly ſollicited to return. The duke of Anjou died in November 1434, and queen Joan followed him ſome few months after. So that every thing favoured Alphonſo, although the people of Naples had already proclaimed Renatus of Anjou king, for he was no formidable rival. France was unfortunate at that time [*A*]. But notwithſtanding all theſe favourable appearances, Alphonſo's enterprize was at firſt very unſucceſsful. He firſt beſieged Gaeta, but was defeated and taken priſoner in a ſea-fight with the Genoeſe (*a*), who were come to relieve that place. Then was ſeen an inſtance that there are ſome people over whom misfortune has no power, ſince good fortune declares for them even in the midſt of adverſity (*b*). The duke of Milan was the principal cauſe of Alphonſo's advancement to the throne of Naples: the duke of Milan, I ſay, whoſe priſoner Alphonſo was, did not content himſelf with giving him his liberty, but alſo furniſhed him with troops for the conqueſt of the kingdom of Naples. But this was not the work of a day: the preſence of Renatus of Anjou (*c*) ſupported his party for ſome time; but at laſt the city of Naples fell into the hands of Alphonſo in the year 1442, and thus the difference was decided. This prince entered that city in triumph after the manner of the antient Romans, the twenty-ſixth of February 1443, and found the temper of Eugenius IV very favourable to him. He had been oppoſed by that Pope ſo long as fortune had forborn declaring for him, but as ſoon as ever ſhe had pronounced ſentence againſt France, Eugenius did not pretend to the virtue of Cato (*d*), but immediately acknowledged Alphonſo to be the lawful poſſeſſor of the kingdom of Naples, in conſideration of a certain annual tribute. This conqueſt procured Alphonſo a great reputation, and gave him an opportunity to make the Florentines, and ſome other ſtates of Italy, feel the force of his victorious arms; ſo that he found himſelf careſſed by all the princes who were under apprehenſion of the Ottoman power. He met with ſo many charms in Italy, that he had no thoughts of returning to Arragon. He was a prince of great accompliſhments, and a very great honour to Spain (*e*). He was a great lover of letters and learned men [*B*], and many extraordinary things are related of him

---

(*a*) The fifth of Auguſt 1435.

(*b*) *See* Jovian. Pontanus, de Principe, *fol. m.* 62.

(*c*) He arrived at Naples in the month of May 1438.

(*d*) Victrix cauſa Diis placuit; Sed victa Catoni. *Lucan. lib. i, ver.* 128.

(*e*) Princeps ſua ætate clariſſimus, nulli veterum poſthabendus, Hiſpanæ gentis lumen decuſque perpetuum. *Mariana, lib. xxii, cap. xviii. See Varillas*'s Hiſtory of Charles VIII, *lib. ii, pag.* 178, *Edit. of Holland.*

[*A*] *France was very unfortunate at that time.*] If we might be permitted to ſpeak of Fortune as the the Heathens did, who, for want of evidence which we now have, never rightly underſtood that word to mean a direction of the moſt wiſe and juſt hand of Providence, we ſhould be apt to accuſe her of too great partiality towards Spain, in oppoſition to France; for it is impoſſible to read the hiſtory of the XVth and XVIth centuries, with regard to the affairs of Italy, without obſerving the aſcendant and ſuperiority the former had over the latter; which is enough, even at this day, to cover the French with confuſion and to ſwell the Spaniards with pride. In all this management, the finger of God is moſt evidently to be admired. He is the common Father of all people, and thoſe temporal bleſſings he affords one nation in one century, he deprives them of in another. The XVth and XVIth centuries gave a turn to Spain to be uppermoſt, and the XVIIth, to be undermoſt. The aſcendant and ſuperiority of France was reſerved for that century. I only explain and paraphraſe on the Text of Mariana (1): ‘ Sic fortuna ludit in rebus humanis: ſic nos noſtraque verſamur. Aragonio nimirum cœlum viam ad regnum ſtruebat cui nihil eſt arduum. . . . . Multum ei familiæ (*Andegavenſi*) ſuperi per hæc tempora adverſati videntur, Gallorum genti infenſi, ac Aragoniis propitii. Sed eſt fere ut aliarum rerum ſic felicitatis orbis: per varias gentes atque familias inerrat, nulli propria (2). - - - - *Thus Fortune diverts herſelf with human affairs: thus do we with our appurtinences take our turns. The Arragonian, for inſtance, had his way to the throne paved by Heaven, to which nothing is difficult. The Gods ſeem to have been at this time on ill terms with that family (of Anjou) angry with the French, and favourable to the Arragonians.*’ What may comfort France, is, that ſhe was even then thought infinitely more formidable than Spain; and for that reaſon, ſtronger alliances were formed to hinder her eſtabliſhing herſelf in Italy, than to prevent Spain from making any conqueſts in that country. The princes of Italy hoped they might put a ſtop to the Spaniards, but deſpaired of reſiſting the French. It is on this account, that in all times, and in this age more than ever, the confederacies againſt France will be difficult to be diſſolved, the apprehenſions of each member ſerving for an excellent cement, to unite them the ſtronger.

Whilſt this page is reprinting (3), I underſtand, by the public news, that the duke of Anjou, ſecond ſon to the dauphin of France, ſucceeds not only to the crown of Naples, but likewiſe to all the dominions of the Spaniſh monarchy. This confirms what I have ſaid concerning the XVIIth century's bringing on the turn of France; ſince the laſt year of it confers on a prince of the blood royal of that kingdom the whole dominions of the king of Spain (4).

[*B*] *He was a great lover of letters and learned men.*] Beſides, what ſhall be mentioned in the following remark, I ought to ſay here, that he honoured with a particular eſteem and friendſhip Laurentius Valla, Antonius Panormita, Georgius Trapezuntius, and Bartholomæus Faccius. But it is better to take it from Mariana (5). ‘ Literas in pretio habuit, viriſque eruditione præſtantibus tantum tribuit, ut iis ſe inclinata quamvis ætate recoquendum præberet. Laurentio Valla familiariter eſt uſus, Antonio Panhormita, him on that account [*C*]. He died at Naples the twenty-ſeventh of June 1458, aged ſixty-four years (*f*), leaving his dominions in Spain to his brother, and the kingdom of Naples to Ferdinand, his natural ſon (*g*). What Mr Moreri ſays is not true, ‘ that ‘ Antony of Palermo wrote a very compleat Hiſtory of king Alphonſo, intituled, *De* ‘ *Factis & Dictis Alphonſi Regis:*’ for the work which bears this title is only a collection of judicious repartees, witty ſayings, and ſome extraordinary actions of this prince: and altho' the circumſtances wherein he is mentioned to have ſaid or done thoſe things, may inform us of ſeveral particulars of his life, yet ſuch a work cannot properly be called the complete *Hiſtory of this king.* Paul Jovius is guilty of a ſtrange negligence, he was ignorant that Alphonſo was eldeſt ſon of Ferdinand king of Arragon [*D*], and that he had

---

(1) Mariana, *lib. xxi, cap. vii.*

(2) *Confer quæ Horatius, Od. XXIX, lib. iii.*

Fortuna ſævo læta negotio &
Ludum inſolentem ludere pertinax,
Tranſmutat incertos honores,
Nunc mihi nunc alii benigna.
Fortune but ſports with human pain,
To ſtop her game is all in vain.
Whileſhe revolves her various wheel,
Now you, now I, her favours feel.

(3) I write this the twenty-fifth of November 1700.

(4) Charles II, who died the firſt of November 1700.

(5) Mariana, *lib. xxii, cap. xviii.*

‘ hormita, Georgio Trapezuntio immortali laude viris. ‘ Bartholomæum Faccium cujus extant de rebus Al‘ fonſi commentarii, menſe Novembri ſuperiori (6) ‘ extinctum tulit ægerrimè. - - - *He admired learning;* ‘ *and had ſuch a fondneſs for learned men, that he put* ‘ *himſelf again under their tuition, tho' in the decline* ‘ *of his age. He was very intimate with Laurentius* ‘ *Valla, Antonius Panhormita, Georgius Trapezuntius,* ‘ *men of immortal fame. He lamented extremely the* ‘ *death of Bartholomæus Faccius, in the month of No*‘ *vember laſt paſt, whoſe Commentaries on the tranſ*‘ *actions of Alphonſo are now extant.*’ Philelphus having brought him his ſatires, returned loaden with preſents, and honoured with the order of knighthood. *Philelphum Poëtam ad ſe ſatyras diutiſſime evigilatas deferentem illaſque canentem ac prope agentem, non prius quàm militiæ honore decoratum præmiiſque auctum remiſit* (7). He held a correſpondence by letters with Leonard Aretin, and endeavoured to bring him to his court: but the old age and bad health of that learned man, would not permit him to accept of thoſe offers. Poggius, a Florentine, tranſlated the Cyropædia of Xenophon, by king Alphonſo's order, and was conſiderably rewarded for it. In a word, this prince invited from the moſt remote countries, a great number of learned Divines, and advanced ſome of them to the moſt conſiderable employments. His court was full of all ſorts of learned men, who all ſhared in his liberality. He was at the expence (8) of maintaining a great number of ſcholars in their ſtudies (9), who were of a promiſing genius, but in mean circumſtances. I had almoſt forgot Bracellius, who was one of the learned men of his court, and has left a Hiſtory of the wars of this monarch (10).

[*C*] . . . . *and many extraordinary things are related of him on that account.*] During an indiſpoſition he laboured under at Capua, every one ſtrove to bring him ſuch things as they thought might divert him. Antonius Panormita (11) made choice of books, and among others of Quintus Curtius. This prince liſtened with ſo much pleaſure to the Hiſtory of Alexander the Great, that he almoſt intirely recovered the very firſt day it was read to him, to the great ſurprize of the Phyſicians. He continued this exerciſe thrice every day, till ſuch time as Panormita had read the book thro': and then rallied the Phyſicians, bantering their Avicenna, and infinitely commending Quintus Curtius. Having heard, that there was to be ſeen near Formium, the tomb of Cicero, with an epitaph in antique characters, he could not reſt for joy till he had ſeen it: but immediately haſtened to the place, and tore away the buſhes that grew about the ſepulchre with his own hands: but inſtead of the name of Cicero, he found that of one M. Vitruvius. *Quod rex ut primum accepit lætitia pene perditus ire nihil cunctatus eſt, & ſentibus rubiſque primo tumulum purgans, mox legere inceptans, non M. Tulli, ſed M. Vitruvii epigramma eſſe comperit* (12). At the ſiege of Gaeta, when he was told there were no more of thoſe large ſtones, with which he loaded his mortars, to be found, except at an old country ſeat, which, according to antient tradition, had once been Cicero's; he anſwered, he would rather chuſe to let his artillery remain uſeleſs, than to profane any thing that had belonged to ſo great a man (13). We ſhall ſee elſewhere (14) the reſpect he had for Livy, and the honour he paid to the remains of that great author, and to the country of Ovid (15). He collected with great care the medals of the Roman emperors, and above all thoſe of Julius Cæſar, preſerving them almoſt as carefully as reliques in a cabinet of ivory (16). He always carried with him in his travels, Cæſar's Commentaries, and never paſſed a day without reading ſome part of them attentively (17). He took for his device, *An open Book* (18). His ſoldiers were ſo well acquainted with his paſſion for books, that whenever they plundered any place, they ſtrove who ſhould firſt carry him all thoſe they could meet with (19). One day, upon mention made of the loſs of ſome things of value, he proteſted he had rather loſe his jewels, how much ſoever the world might eſteem them, than the meaneſt of his books (20). He always cauſed ſeveral to be laid by his bed-ſide; and whenever he waked, would order one of them to be given to him to read (21). He would ſometimes go on foot to the lectures of profeſſors, though never ſo diſtant from his palace (22). He eſteemed that day loſt which he had ſpent without reading (23); and would not ſuffer the time ſet apart for reading to be any otherwiſe employed, let whatever buſineſs happen. ‘ Antonio poetæ incredibili ‘ quadam voluptate operam dabat, aliquid ex priſco‘ rum annalibus referenti, quinetiam veterum ab eo ‘ ſcriptorum lectiones ſingulis diebus audiebat, ac licet ‘ multis magniſque interim gravaretur curis, nunquam ‘ tamen paſſus eſt horam libro dictam à negociis aufer‘ ri (24). - - - - *He attended to Antony the Poet with in*‘ *credible pleaſure, while he read to him ſomething out* ‘ *of the Annals of the Antients, nor did he paſs a day* ‘ *without hearing a lecture from him out of ſome old* ‘ *author; and tho' affairs of ſtate might happen to in*‘ *terfere, yet he would never permit any appointment* ‘ *made for books, to be interrupted by buſineſs.*’ He had read the Bible, with the Gloſſes and Commentaries upon it, fourteen times, and could repeat a great part of it by heart (25). Finding one day the door of his library locked, and not having patience to wait his library-keeper's return, he took ſome inſtruments himſelf to break open the lock; and being aſked by one of his attendants with ſome ſurprize, *If his majeſty would condeſcend to do that with his own hands?* He anſwered him with this other queſtion, *What! do you think GOD and Nature has given hands to kings for nothing* (26)*?* He read with ſo much attention, that he did not not ſeem to be ſenſible, that they either danced before him, or played upon the Muſic (27). The following particular will ſhew with what pleaſure and attention he could liſten to a piece of oratory. Jannot Manetti envoy from Florence, making him one day a learned and long harangue, the king not only kept his eyes all along fixed upon him, but alſo continued ſo fixed and immoveable that he did not ſo much as drive away a flie which had placed itſelf on his noſe at the very beginning of the ſpeech: the orator could not forbear admiring at his patience; but as ſoon as he had done ſpeaking Alphonſo drove away the flie, which he had ſuffered to be at reſt during all that long diſcourſe (28). Such a thing at this time of day would be eſteemed ridiculous; and I imagine, there might be ſome perſons, who, at that time, treated this as ſuch.

[*D*] *Paul Jovius was ignorant, that Alphonſo was the eldeſt ſon of Ferdinand king of Arragon.*] This is what Mariana obſerves in expreſs terms; I ſhall repeat his words, becauſe they contain ſomething relating to the life of our Alphonſo. ‘ Interea, *ſays* ‘ *he* (29), Valentiæ Rex Aragonius Alfonſi MAJORIS ‘ filii nuptias inſigni celebrabat apparatu . . . Sponſam ‘ è Caſtella Sanctius Rogius deduxit . . . . nuptiæ con‘ fectæ pridie Idus Junii. - - - *The king of Arragon cele*‘ *brated the nuptials of his* ELDEST *ſon Alphonſo at Va*‘ *lencia with great pomp . . Sanctius Rogius conducted the* ‘ *bride from Caſtile . . . the marriage was conſummated* ‘ *on the twelfth day of June.*’ In the following chapter he ſpeaks after this manner. ‘ Alſonſum NATU ‘ MAXIMUM regni hæredem ſcripſit. - - - - *He ap*‘ *pointed his* ELDEST SON *Alphonſo ſucceſſor to his* ‘ *dominions.*’

(*f*) Jovius Pontan. de Bell. Neapol. *lib. i.*

(*g*) Taken from Mariana's Hiſtory of Spain.

(6) That is to ſay, in 1457.

(7) Anton. Panormit. de Dict. & Fact. Alphonſi, *lib. iii, num.* 11.

(8) Ibid. *lib. ii, ſub fin.*

(9) Ibid. *num.* 52.

(10) Et qui bellorum ejus Hiſtoriam non illepidè perſcripſit Bracellius Ligur. *Jovius, Elog. lib. iii.*

(11) *See his book*, de Dictis & Factis Alphonſi, *lib. i, num.* 43.

(12) Ib. *lib. i, num.* 47.

(13) Ib. *num.* 48.

(14) In the article TITUS LIVIUS.

(15) In the article of that Poet.

(16) Id. Anton. Panormit. de Dictis & Factis Alphonſi, *lib. ii, num.* 12.

(17) Ib. *num.* 13.

(18) Ib. *num.* 14.

(19) Ib. *num.* 15.

(20) Id. *lib. iv, num.* 34.

(21) Cum libris ſub ſponda ſolitum dormire regem ſcimus experrectum illos cum lumine poſcere ac lectitare. *Ibid. num.* 31.

(22) Ib. *lib. i, num.* 39.

(23) Diem illam in qua nihil legeret ſe perdidiſſe dicebat. Sed & cum audiſſet Veſpaſianum Cæſarem (*he ſhould have ſaid* Titum) eam diem ſe perdidiſſe ſolitum dicere in qua nihil quicquam alicui donaſſet, egiſſe gratias rex dicitur immortali Jeſu Chriſto, quod eo modo nec diem ipſe perdidiſſet. *Ib. num.* 16.

(24) Jovian. Pontanus, de Principe, *fol. m.* 63.

(25) Panorm. ubi ſupra, *lib. i, num.* 17. Gratiani, de Caſibus Viror. *pag.* 19, *ſays* quadragies, *forty times: but he is miſtaken.*

(26) Panorm. ibid. *num.* 37.

(27) Id. *lib. iv, num.* 15.

(28) Ib. *lib, i, num.* 46.

(29) Mariana, *lib. xx, cap. vii, ad ann.* 1415, *pag.* 223, *Edit. Mogunt.* 1619, *in* 4*to.*

had been married [*E*], and had reigned a good deal longer than two and twenty years. Mr Varillas, without doubt, intended to ſpeak of this prince in the preface to his Anecdotes, though he has falſely deſcribed him in point of Chronology. What he ſays of him is very curious [*F*]. It is not true that our Alphonſo ſent ſuccours to Scanderbeg for

‘ *dominions.*’ The words of Antonius Panormitanus deſerve alſo a place here, becauſe they contain a very remarkable particular. ‘ Ferdinandus pater & ipſe inclytus rex, moriens Alphonſum filium iis pene verbis allocutus fertur: *optime fili, quoniam regna quæcunque dum Deo placuit obtinui, ad te* ÆTATIS PRÆROGATIVA *deferri & ſcio & volo, optarim eas modo terras quas ea parte Hiſpaniæ quam Caſtellam vocitant habemus, Joanni fratri tuo, ſi modo per te liceat, relinquere. Quod ne moleſtè feras abs te peto, & ſi pateris etiam rogo.*’ Ferdinand deſires to leave ſome lands to his younger ſon, and entreats in a manner Alphonſo to conſent to it: Alphonſo anſwers like a hero, that if ſuch is his father's pleaſure he conſents with all his heart, that his brother ſhall inherit the crown; and that, for his part, he does not pretend to ſucceed to it any otherwiſe than thro' grace and favour. *Ego, mi pater ac domine, ſatis intelligo iſthæc regna & tua ferè omnia ad me quidem pertinere, ſed non aliter quam beneficio tuo. Idcirco & pluris ſemper voluntatem tuam & feci & facturus ſum, quam ætatis privilegium. Imo vero ſi pro tua ſingulari prudentia regnis ita demum proſpicis iri conſultum, ſi Joannem regni ſucceſſorem reliqueris, nihil recuſo, quin ipſum vel ad omnia inſtituas hæredem: non aliter (mihi credas velim) voluntati per me tuæ uſque ad poſtremum ſpiritum parebitur, quam divinæ* (30). Muſt it not be acknowledged, that Paul Jovius took a great deal of care to inform himſelf of all particulars relating to thoſe whoſe elogies he compoſed. ‘ Ad magnum imperium novumque regnum . . . . vehementiſſimè contendebat, poſtquam ipſum naturæ jus ad Joannem fratrem majorem natu paterni Tarraconenſis imperii hæreditatem detuliſſet (31). - - - *After he had reſigned to his elder brother John what was indeed his birthright, and paternal inheritance, the kingdom of Arragon, he puſhed his way with all poſſible expedition to new and very conſiderable dominions.*’ I ſhould not be backward to believe, that it appeared to him a nobler thing for a younger ſon to become a king, than for one king to conquer the kingdom of another.

[*E*] . . . . *and that he had been married.*] We have already quoted Mariana on this head; and here is a ſecond teſtimony, which will inform us that Alphonſo had met with an excellent wife. ‘ Acceperat aliquando à Maria ſingularis exempli uxore literas quas cum ſemel atque iterum attentiſſimè perlegiſſet, mox inquit, *inſtitueram olim nihil de uxore extra thalamum dicere, ne benedicens uxorius aut immodeſtior haberer. At nunc mihi prorſus mutandum conſilium, & quidvis homines obloquantur quocunque in trivio cuique obvio, ſine modo & modeſtia de uxoris virtute atque conſtantia prædicandum* (32).’ He once reſolved never to ſpeak any thing of the merit of his wife, leſt he might be thought too fond of her, a thing perſons of his rank have no great reaſon to fear; but after having read a letter he had received from her, he changed his mind, and reſolved to publiſh her virtues on all occaſions. This deſign was both juſt and honourable, but then he ſhould have remembered her in his will, where he never once mentioned her; which has given occaſion to ſay, he would have divorced her, in order that he might marry his miſtreſs. *Reginæ nulla mentio: fama fuit & magni viri teſtantur ea repudiata Lucretiam Alaniam pellicem ducere cogitaſſe* (33). This miſtreſs was in hopes the Pope would have conſented to her marriage, and therefore took a journey on purpoſe to Rome, with the equipage of a queen, but ſhe did not obtain her deſire (34). Others ſay only, that Alphonſo would have married her if his queen had died. This Lucretia was a fair Neopolitan, who knew ſo well how to cajole the good old king, that he granted every thing ſhe requeſted. ‘ Hæc eſt illa Lucretia, cujus per orbem terrarum amores fuere quàm notiſſimi. Eam Alphonſus adamatam propter formæ qua præſtabat excellentiam, ſuaviſſimis etiam puellæ illecebris ſenex ipſe delinitus, divitiis, opibus, authoritate ita extulerat, ut plerique arbitrarentur, ſi Maria vita exceſſiſſet, legitimæ uxoris eam loco habiturum (35). - - - *This is that Lucretia, whoſe amours were ſo notorious to all the world. Alphonſo doated on her for her beauty, and ſhe ſoothed the old man in ſuch a manner by her bewitching behaviour, that he advanced her to ſuch height of riches, grandeur, and power, as to make moſt people believe he would certainly have married her, in caſe his wife Mary had died.*’ I do not well know by what woman Alphonſo had thoſe two daughters, who were married advantageouſly by their father, one to the duke of Ferrara, and the other to the duke of Seſſa (36). Mariana agrees that Alphonſo was guilty of incontinence (37). Ferdinand, who ſucceeded him in the kingdom of Naples, was a natural ſon he had in Spain (38), and who had no great reaſon to be pleaſed with Lucretia, the laſt miſtreſs of Alphonſo, becauſe ſhe embraced the faction of Anjou (39). I repeat it again, is it not ſtrange that Paul Jovius ſhould ſpeak of the celibacy of this prince? ‘ In cælibatu ſingularem eamque paucis incompertam liberi & tranquilli animi felicitatem repoſuit, ſic ut eum nunquam pœnituerit connubia rejeciſſe, quum filium Ferdinandum regiæ indolis ex nobili concubina in ſpem regni ſuſcepiſſet (40). - - - *He found in a ſingle life the particular ſatisfaction of a free and eaſy mind, known but to few, ſo that he never repented of his having declined matrimony, when he had brought up Ferdinand, a ſon of a very noble diſpoſition, whom he had by a miſtreſs of quality, with a deſign to make him his ſucceſſor.*’ Antonio Maria Gratiani has been almoſt as much miſtaken as Paul Jovius. He believed Alphonſo ſoon became a widower. ‘ Ex uxore quam juvenis duxit Caſtellæ Regis propinqui ſui filia liberos non tulit, eaque brevi amiſſa cælebs inde permanſit (41). - - - *He had no children by the daughter of the king of Caſtile his neighbour, whom he married in his youth, but loſing her ſhortly after, he remained a widower all the reſt of his life.*’

[*F*] *What Mr Varillas ſays of him is very curious.*] ‘ There never was a king ſo concerned about what ſhould be ſaid of him after his death, as the laſt Alphonſo, who wore the crown of Naples. He not only laboured to win battles, and to perform ſuch actions as border upon the romantic, but alſo made it his buſineſs to find out ſuch pens as were able to record and embelliſh them. There was not a writer of any note, whom he did not attempt to gain or corrupt, and all thoſe who were famous, received from him penſions or preſents in whatſoever country of Europe their birth or fortune had fixed them. And yet there never was any monarch whoſe faults have been more particularized than his. The leaſt of his foibles is not unknown, and one may read as long as one will in Pontanus, Panormitanus, Benedicti, and in ſixty-four other Hiſtorians, that he poſſeſſed all the great qualities which can form a hero, yet people will not believe it, but rather chuſe to rely on Bernardino Cerico, who allows him only very common abilities, tho' this Cerico was otherwiſe but a very pitiful Hiſtorian (42).’ I cannot perſuade myſelf that this relates to the laſt Alphonſo, who was ſon of Fardinand the baſtard; for on the one hand his reign was ſo ſhort (43), that it could not allow him time to make all thoſe enquiries for writers which Mr Varillas ſpeaks of; and on the other, this prince was ſo notoriouſly vitious, and deſtitute of thoſe great qualities, which cover or counter-balance great vices, that he was not a ſubject proper for ſo many flattering Hiſtorians to diſplay for an hero. It muſt therefore be Alphonſo the grand-father, who is to be looked upon as the perſon deſcribed in ſuch ſort of hiſtories. See what Mr Varillas has ſaid (44) of the laſt Alphonſo, after having given a terrible account of the life of Ferdinand. ‘ It remains only to be obſerved that his ſon, Alphonſo II, imitated, and even ſurpaſſed, him, by uſing leſs precaution to conceal his vices: he read no ſort of laws, either divine or human; nor had he any other claim to be called a Chriſtian, but becauſe he had been baptized: the raviſhing ladies of the greateſt quality and virtue, paſſed with him for galantry: he called violence and extortion the prerogatives of royalty; and it is believed, for certain, that it was he who adviſed his father to maſſacre ‘ the

(30) Anton. Panormitanus, de Dictis & Factis Alphonſi, *lib. ii, num.* 30.

(31) Jovius, Elog. bellica virt. illuſtr. *lib. iii.*

(32) Panormit. ubi ſupra, *lib. ii, num.* 39.

(33) Mariana, *lib. xxii, cap. xviii.*

(34) Mariana, ibid.

(35) Pontanus, de Bello Neapolit. *lib. ii, fol. m.* 145, *verſo.*

(36) Gratianus, de Caſibus Virorum illuſtrium, *pag.* 23.

(37) Id maxime intemperantiæ vitium in Alfonſi moribus accuſare licet. *Mariana, ubi ſupra.*

(38) Alfonſo mortuo Ferdinandus ſuccedit quem hæredem in regno Neopolitano Pater inſtituerat, natum Valentiæ in Hiſpania citeriore, atque ex muliere ſuſceptum quam Valentiæ cum ageret in deliciis habuiſſet. *Pontanus, ibid. lib. i, fol.* 108.

(39) Id. *fol.* 145.

(40) Jovius, in Elogiis, ubi ſupra.

(41) Gratian. ubi ſupra.

(42) Varillas, Preface to the Anecdotes of Florence.

(43) It laſted about a year.

(44) In the Life of Charles VIII, *lib. iii, pag.* 281, *Edit. of Holland.*

for the ſiege of Belgrade; and if he did once ſend him word that the Italians were not leſs formidable as gueſts than as enemies, it was not however at the time of that ſiege [*G*]. He had more of the character of a great king than a good huſband; and in his old age he kept a miſtreſs, whom he would have married [*H*], if he could have obtained his point in divorcing his wife.

I have juſt met with a fact which ſeems to me very curious, and informs us of the cauſe of the miſunderſtanding between Alphonſo and his queen [*I*]. It is neceſſary to ſay ſomething of his deſcendants [*K*], and of the pretenſions of the houſe of Trimouille [*L*].

‘ the ſenators of Naples in the church of St Leonard.’ Would any one ſay of ſuch a prince, as Mr Varillas does of him he ſpeaks of in the preface to his Anecdotes, that an Hiſtorian, who was no flatterer, *has particularized his faults*, has informed us of *the leaſt of his foibles*, and has only allowed *him very common abilities?* Without doubt the author of the Anecdotes intended to ſpeak of the king of Naples, treated of in this article; but then he ſhould not have deſcribed him by theſe words, *the laſt Alphonſo who wore the crown of Naples*; for if Alphonſo II, his grandſon, ſhould be reckoned as a cypher, then there could have been but one Alphonſo king of Naples, and conſequently it would be needleſs to call him the *laſt*.

[*G*] *It was not however at the time of that ſiege.*] The moſt ignorant of my readers will be apt to gueſs there may be Hiſtorians who affirm what I deny in the text of this remark: but as every one is not able to diſcover thoſe Hiſtorians, it would be neceſſary for me to point them out. See then what I find in a quotation out of Barlet, in the Hiſtory of Mahomet II (45). ‘ Scanderbeg undertook the ſiege of ‘ Belgrade, a city of Albania, which the Turks had ‘ taken from him. The better to ſucceed in his de‘ſign, he beſought the aſſiſtance of Alphonſo king ‘ of Naples, the moſt zealous of his allies, and ſent ‘ an expreſs to deſire of him, among other things, ‘ Miners and Engineers, telling him, by way of mirth, ‘ and with the freedom of an old friend, that the ‘ Albanian ſoldiers were only fit to fight with men, ‘ but that he very well knew the Italians were able ‘ to force ſtone-walls. Alphonſo ſent him a ſupply ‘ of men, money, and artillery, adding, by way of ‘ anſwer, agreeably enough, that the Italians who were ‘ come to join him, were not only qualified to engage ‘ with men and walls, but alſo to make conqueſts of ‘ the ladies of Albania; and therefore adviſed him to ‘ let his countrymen take care they did not entertain ‘ domeſtic conquerors, inſtead of foreign friends. Scan‘derbeg ſhewed this anſwer to his army, and laughed ‘ heartily at it as well as his ſoldiers. But he repented ‘ his having beſieged Belgrade, and never was any ‘ enterprize of his ſo unfortunate.’ It is plain, here muſt be one prince, or one time miſtaken for another; for in 1465, when this letter is ſaid to have been ſent, there was no king of Naples of the name of Alphonſo.

[*H*] *He had a miſtreſs whom he would have married.*] This appears by the paſſage I have quoted before out Mariana (46). But we are not to believe, as a conſequence of the amours of this prince, that his reader (47) has told an untruth, where he has acquainted the world, that his maſter never uttered an obſcene expreſſion, nor ever ſuffered the ſecret parts of his body to be ſeen by any. All licentiouſneſs is not without bounds; laſciviouſneſs does not always extend itſelf to the tongue and eyes; and it is not impoſſible but Alphonſo and Lucretia might have reciprocally excluded the ſight from their amorous myſteries. It would not avail any thing to affirm, that when one grants the moſt, one grants the leaſt; that objection will admit of a great many good anſwers. See the *Capitulaire* of Sebaſtian Rouillard (48). Our king Alphonſo thought there was no greater folly than to look for a wife after ſhe had eloped, *hos maxime inſanire dicebat qui uxorem à ſe digreſſam fugitivamque perquirerent* (49). This is a ſign he would not have given himſelf much trouble after Mary his queen, in caſe ſhe had left him. He could not therefore be ſuppoſed to love her extraordinarily.

[*I*] *The cauſe of the miſunderſtanding between Alphonſo and his queen.*] Don John Vitrian, who has added a great many notes to his Spaniſh tranſlation of the Memoirs of Philip de Comines, maintains, that a very jealous humour in ladies turns their heads, and is of very great ſervice to kings. *Paſion es eſta de los celos y ſoſpechas, que à las Damas ſuele quitar el juicio, y à los Principes darlo en lo concerniente à ſu imperio* (50). Donna Juana of Caſtile, adds he, loſt her prudence by giving way to a jealouſy of her huſband, Don Philip, one of the firſt gentlemen in the world. The queen, Donna Maria of Arragon, was a woman of extraordinary judgment, yet a like jealouſy made her commit a thouſand extravagancies. She cauſed Donna Margarita de Ixar, one of her maids of honour, and who was ſuppoſed to be the mother of Ferdinand I, king of Naples, to be ſtrangled; as alſo Lopez de Concut, whom ſhe ſuſpected to be manager of the amours of her huſband king Alphonſo V, and by this ſtep occaſioned that king to go from her to Naples, where he died without ever ſeeing her more (51). This therefore furniſhes us with a reaſon why he made no mention of her in his will. We muſt conclude, that the reciprocal diſguſt to each other muſt have been very great, ſince it could make him rather abandon his kingdom of Arragon, than live with his wife; and her to chuſe rather to have no part in the crown of Naples than to go home to her huſband. It was very fortunate for Alphonſo, to find in Italy what might make him amends for the dominions he quitted on the other ſide of the Pyrenees; but, perhaps, if he had not met with ſo good a reception at Naples, he would rather have choſen to turn knight-errant all the reſt of his days, than ever think of reigning in Arragon with his queen. The neceſſity of living under the bonds of wedlock is ſometimes ſo irkſome, that a man to free himſelf from them would go to the end of the world.

Ultra Sauromatas fugere hinc libet & gracialem
Oceanum (52).

To ſhun this plague, with all my ſoul,
I'd fly far as the icy pole.

[*K*] *It is neceſſary to ſay ſomething of his deſcendants.*] Ferdinand I, his natural ſon, ſucceeded him, and was married twice, firſt to Iſabella of Clermont, and afterwards to Joan ſiſter to the king of Spain. The children by his firſt wife were Alphonſo duke of Calabria; Frederic prince of Altamura; John who was a cardinal; Francis duke of St Angelo; Donna Beatrix wife of Matthias king of Hungary; and Donna Leonora ducheſs of Ferrara. He had only one daughter by his ſecond wife, namely, Donna Giovanna, who was married to king Ferdinand II, his nephew. He had likewiſe ſome natural children, and reigned thirty five years, dying in the beginning of the year 1494, aged ſeventy-one years.

Alphonſo II, duke of Calabria, his eldeſt ſon, ſucceeded him, and married Hippolita Maria, daughter of Francis Sforza duke of Milan, by whom he had two ſons and one daughter, Don Ferdinand, Don Pietro, and Donna Iſabella ducheſs of Milan. His three natural children were Don Alphonſo duke of Biſegli, Don Cæſar, and Donna Sancia wife of Geofrey Borgia. The fear he was under on account of Charles VIII of France, made him reſign his dominions to his eldeſt ſon Ferdinand. He did not reign above a year.

Ferdinand II ſucceeded by the abdication of his father Alphonſo II, and was driven out of his kingdom by the French; he was re-eſtabliſhed at laſt by the aſſiſtance of the Great Captain; but died ſoon after in 1495. He left no children: he had married his aunt Donna Giovanna.

Frederic ſon of Ferdinand I, ſucceeded Ferdinand II, and was deprived of his dominions in the year 1501, without ever being able, either he, or any of his children, to recover them (53).

[*L*] . . . *and of the pretenſions of the houſe of Trimouille* (54).] To ſhew the foundation of theſe, I need only produce

---

(45) By Mr Guillet, *Tom. ii, pag.* 83, *ad ann.* 1465. He quotes Barlet. *lib. vii, & viii.*

(46) In the remark [*E*], citation (33).

(47) Antonius Panormitanus *diſcharged this office to king Alphonſo: now ſee what he ſays in article* 41, *of his fourth book.* Ab ore Alphonſi nunquam omninò verbum obſcœnum excidiſſe ſcimus, nunquam interiora membrorum ejus quempiam vidiſſe.

(48) In the 4th page we read theſe words; *Le force & contraint à leur honte commune de reveler ce vergogneux ſecret de marriage*; quod rectè factum ſic appetit ſciri, ut tamen erubeſcat videri. *And at the tenth page theſe,* Si la loy divine defend à la femme de ne jetter les yeux ou les mains petulantes aux parties oû la honte de ſon mary ſe cache, à moindre raiſon doit il eſtre permis à l'inthimée de divulguer qu'elle ait ce reſſentiment de celles de ſon eſpoux, *Non enim* (ſays Quintilian) *ſocietate conjugali omnia adeo miſcentur, ut animus non habeat aliquod ſecretum.*

(49) Panorm. *lib. iv, num.* 8.

(50) Vitrian, *Notes upon* Philip de Comines, *chap. i, letter E, pag.* 2.

(51) Le hiço irſe à Napoles, y morir ſin jamas verla. *Id. ib. pag.* 3.

(52) Juven. Sat. II, ver. 1.

(53) *Taken from* Tomaſo Coſto, *in his book, intituled,* Nomi delle Provincie citta . . . . del regno di Napoli, de Reiche vi regnarono con le lor diſcendenze figurate in alberi, *&c.*

(54) It is commonly ſpelt thus, in conformity to the pronunciation; but the true and antient Orthography is *Tremoille.*

produce the extract of a memoir, which informs us of the fate of king Frederic and his family.

‘ (55) This prince, after having reigned ſome years, had the misfortune to find Lewis XII of France, and Ferdinand king of Arragon, ſirnamed the Catholic, entered into a confederacy to diſpoſſeſs him: their armies invaded his kingdom, made themſelves maſters of it, and divided it.

‘ The king ſeeing himſelf dethroned, choſe rather to truſt to Lewis XII, whoſe probity was univerſally known, than to Ferdinand the Catholic; and retired into France, where he died. 1504.

‘ Frederic was twice married, firſt to Anne of Savoy, daughter of Amadeus IX, duke of Savoy and of 1478. Yolande of France, ſiſter of Lewis XI. By this firſt marriage he had only Charlotte of Arragon, who, in her father's life-time, and during his peaceable poſſeſſion of the kingdom of Naples, was married in France to Guy XVI, count of Laval, one of the greateſt lords of Europe, 1500. and one of the moſt illuſtrious families.

‘ King Frederic married for his ſecond wife Iſabella de Beaux, by whom he had three ſons, Alphonſo, Cæſar, and Ferdinand; and two daughters, Iſabella, and Julia. Of theſe five children there were but two married, namely, Ferdinand and Julia: this laſt to George Marquis of Montferrat, but ſhe died the very day her nuptials were to have been conſummated. 1533.

‘ Ferdinand duke of Calabria, defended the city of Taranto againſt the Spaniards, who took it after a long ſiege; and, notwithſtanding the capitulation, which gave this prince leave to retire whither he pleaſed, they carried him into Spain, and forced him to marry two old princeſſes: the firſt, Mencia de Mendoza, widow of Henry of Naſſau; and the ſecond, Germaine de Foix, relict of Ferdinand the Catholic. He had no children by either of theſe two wives, and died in 1559.

‘ Alphonſo, called the infant of Arragon, came from Naples into France; 1512. where, after having received the honours due to his birth, 1515. he died without iſſue, as well as Cæſar and Iſabella.

‘ Of all the children of the unfortunate Frederic, laſt king of Naples, there was not one except Charlotte of Arragon, his daughter, by the firſt venter, who left any poſterity: ſhe had by Guy XVI, count of Laval, one ſon, who was killed in a fight at Bicoque 1522, without [illegible]er been married; and two daughters, C[illegible]and Anne of Laval.

‘ Cathe[illegible]married to Claudius de Rieux, who took the name of Laval, and whoſe family has been entirely extinct by the deceaſe of Guy XX, count of Laval, dying without having ever been married, in the year 1605.

‘ Anne of Laval, ſecond daughter of Charlotte of Arragon and of Guy XVI, was married to Francis 1521. de la Tremoille, ſon of Charles de la Tremoille, prince of Talmond, killed at the battle of Marignan, and grand-ſon of Lewis II de la Tremoille, killed at that of Pavia.

‘ It is certain, that the daughters and their deſcendants ſucceed to the kingdom of Naples; and therefore Mr de la Tremoille has an unqueſtionable right to that kingdom, as deſcendant in a right-line from Frederic of Arragon, laſt king of Naples; and that with ſo much the more reaſon, becauſe by Charlotte of Arragon's marriage-contract with Guy XVI, count of Laval, that princeſs had expreſly reſerved to herſelf and her heirs, all the right to the ſucceſſion of king Frederic, and his children, for want of heirs male. It was on this foundation, the houſe of Tremoille thought proper to ſend their plenipotentiaries to the congreſs of Munſter and Nimeguen, 1648. to ſet forth their right, 1678. and deſire juſtice from the mediators: which having been refuſed them, they entered their proteſts.’ This is what I have taken from a Memoir printed in France, with the neceſſary proofs. It was ſhown to the mediators at the peace of Nimeguen in the year 1678, and of Ryſwick in the year 1697, by Monſieur Sanguiniere, counſellor of the Chatelet at Paris, and deputy from the duke of Tremouille. You may ſee, in the beginning of the fourth tome of *the Acts and Memoirs of the Negotiation of the peace of Nimeguen* (56), all that relates to the commiſſion of this envoy.

(55) A Memoir containing the right of Mr de la Tremoille to the kingdom of Naples, *pag.* 2, & *ſeq.*

(56) Printed at the Hague, by Adrian Moetjens in the year 1680.

NARNI, an Italian Capuchin, and a great preacher, flouriſhed at the beginning of the XVIIth century. Some think Balzac ſpoke of him in the paſſage which will be ſeen below [*A*]. He had admired him in the pulpit, but did not ſo when his ſermons were printed (*a*): ſee the judicious criticiſms he has made on the ſermons of this Capuchin (*b*). I have elſewhere ſaid (*c*) that they have been publiſhed in French; and that d'Ablancourt, who tranſlated them, has yielded the whole honour and profit of them to Father du Boſc. I have alſo (*d*) ſaid that our Narni and Balzac's father were like one another. I have juſt now conſulted an author, who tells me the name of this monk was Jerom Mautini of Narni (*e*); that, after having made himſelf famous in ſeveral cities of Italy, and even at Rome itſelf, he was made choice of to preach before the Pope and cardinals; and that he had all the qualifications required in an excellent preacher, a good figure, fine languague, great purity of manners, and ſo vehement a zeal in cenſuring the vices of mankind, that he rendered himſelf odious to impenitent ſinners. When he ſaw he could gain

(*a*) Balzac, letter xxvii, book iii, *to Chapelain.*

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Above, remark [*A*] of the article DU BOSC (N). See *Colomiés, Biblioth. Choiſie, pag.* 171.

(*d*) Above, citation (*e*), of the article BALZAC (JOHN LEWIS).

(*e*) It is the name of his country: Narni is a city of Italy.

[*A*] *Some think that Balzac ſpoke of him in the paſſage which will be ſeen below.*] ‘ And when that excellent Capuchin of Pope Gregory, preaching one day at Rome, concerning the obligation of reſidence, ſtruck ſo great a terror into thirty or forty biſhops who heard him, that they all hurried away to their reſpective dioceſes. And when at another time, he converted a whole city with one of his Lent-ſermons; and that the people going out of the church cryed out Mercy, as they paſſed through the ſtreets; and that it was computed two thouſand crowns were expended in the holy-week in cords for diſcipline; though theſe are no very dear ſort of goods; pray tell me, did this poor Chriſtian Philoſopher fall ſhort of any thing eſſential to Monarchy, and of that perfect ſubmiſſion it requires from it's ſubjects? Did not he triumph in his rags, and tattered cloaths? Was not his mean condition full of grandeur, and environed with majeſty. Was not he lord, and almoſt a tyrant over thoſe who gave him alms (1)?’ It is a great fault to deſcribe people by ſuch indeterminate characters. There were fifteen Popes of the name of Gregory; how therefore ſhould one gueſs in what time this *Capuchin of Pope Gregory* performed ſuch wonderful exploits by his eloquence? Ought not Balzac, who intended no doubt to write not only for the time preſent, but for that to come, to have managed matters ſo, that after his death his readers might underſtand who the perſons were whom he had commended? Father Rapin has avoided this fault. ‘ (2) We are told of a certain Capuchin, ſays he, named Philip (3) de Narni, who, under the pontificate of Gregory XV, preached at Rome with ſo much force, action, and zeal, that he never ſpoke in public, but he made the people cry out Mercy, all thro' the ſtreets, as they went home from his ſermon (4). It is alſo ſaid, that as he was one day preaching before the Pope, concerning the obligation of biſhops to reſidence, he ſo frightned, by the vehemence of his diſcourſe, thirty biſhops who were his auditors, that they hurried away next morning to their reſpective dioceſes.’

Peter de St Romuald ſeems to make a wrong uſe of the teſtimony of Balzac, for he applies it not to Father Narni but to another Capuchin. Nay, he does worſe, he falſifies it, and pretends to find things in it which are really not there. This will eaſily be diſcovered, and needs nothing more than comparing the words of Balzac, with theſe following. ‘ About this time Father Alphonſo le Loup, a Capuchin, and a native of the city of Medina Sidonia, died. It was ſaid of Father gain nothing upon the corruption of his auditors [*B*], he reſolved to appear no more in the pulpit; and having obtained leave for that purpoſe, he ſhut himſelf up in a cell, where he applied himſelf to writ the Hiſtory of the Capuchins: but the granting him this diſpenſation was ſoon repented of, and he was forced to reſume his function of a preacher. He appeared again in the pulpit, and had the ſame uneaſineſs as before; to ſee the fruitleſſneſs of his cenſures and exhortations; and that people came to hear him only to gratify their curioſity. His ill ſtate of health, procured him at laſt an entire diſcharge. As his good life had raiſed his reputation, no leſs than his eloquence, he was interred with greater pomp than had ever been before beſtowed on any monk of his order. His ſermons were printed as ſoon as he was dead but did not at all come up to the expectation of the public [*C*]: which had entertained too advantageous a notion of them. This turned very much to their prejudice, and beſides they were deſtitute of the advantages of action. This is what I have learnt from Nicius Erythræus (*f*).

---

(1) Balzac, Miſcellaneous Works, diſcourſe VI, intituled, *Paraphraſe ou de la grande Eloquence, pag. m.* 164.

(2) Rapin, Reflexions on the Eloquence of the Pulpit, *num.* 15, of the firſt edition, *pag.* 122, and *num.* 18, *pag.* 83, *Dutch Edit.* 1686.

(3) Nicius Erythræus, *calls him Jerome.*

(4) Balzac ſays this only of a Lent-ſermon, and does not mention it's being preached at Rome.

(*f*) In Pinacoth. I, *pag.* 135, 136.

‘ Father Tollet a Jeſuit, that he taught well, and of ‘ Panigarolus, another great preacher, that he pleaſed; ‘ but of this Capuchin, that he touched the heart, and ‘ that very juſtly, for Balzac aſſures us in his Miſ‘ cellaneous Works, that having preached one day be‘ fore Pope Gregory, concerning the reſidence of bi‘ ſhops, he ſtruck ſuch a terror into thirty or forty ‘ biſhops, his auditors, that they hurried away the next ‘ morning to their reſpective dioceſes: as likewiſe that ‘ upon his preaching at Salamanca, the chief univer‘ ſity in Spain, eight hundred ſcholars renounced all ‘ the honours, riches, and pleaſures of this world, to ‘ profeſs a religious life in ſeveral orders, and eſpecial‘ ly in that of St Francis (5).’

[*B*] *He could gain nothing upon the corruption of his auditors.*] This is very different from the relation Balzac has publiſhed, and which you have juſt now read. I leave it to thoſe who have leiſure to reconcile theſe matters, I ſhall content my ſelf with producing the following paſſage of my voucher. ‘ Vitio‘ rum incuſatio & querela ita acris ac vehemens, ut ‘ iis, qui eiſdem adhæreſcerent, cum nollent extrahi ‘ gravis & moleſta accideret: quamobrem ille, cum ‘ intelligeret aliquando, ſe operam perdere, & ſurdis, ‘ ut dicitur, fabulam canere, valetudinis excuſatione, ‘ eo ſe munere abdicandi & in ſolitudinem aliquam ‘ abeundi poteſtatem ſibi fieri poſtulavit: qua impe‘ trata, totum ſe ad hiſtoriam ſui ordinis ſcribendam ‘ contulit: ſed rurſus, ad eandem provinciam revoca‘ tus, cum, non minore libertate, in corruptos eorum ‘ mores, apud quos diceret, inveheretur; ita ab ali‘ quibus audiebatur, ut qui delectationem ex eo quæ‘ rere, non autem vitiorum, quibus laborabant, me‘ dicinam aliquam petere, aut oblatam accipere velle, ‘ fixum ac deliberatum haberent. Itaque in perpetuum ‘ (præſertim infirma valetudine cum eſſet,) ejus vaca‘ tionem muneris obtinuit (6). - - - - *He reproved and ‘ complained of vice with ſo much ſharpneſs and vehemence ‘ that he became diſagreeable and troubleſome to thoſe ‘ who were ſo far gone in it, as to reſolve not to be re‘ formed: when therefore he came to underſtand, that ‘ his labour was all loſt, and that he was only preach‘ ing to the winds, he deſired leave, under pretence of ‘ ill health, to quit that function, and to retire into ‘ ſolitude: which having obtained he applied himſelf ‘ wholly to write the hiſtory of his order: but being ‘ again called to the office of preaching, and inveighing ‘ with as great freedom as before againſt the corrupt ‘ manners of his auditors, he found the attention of ſome ‘ of them, was only grounded on the view of being pleaſ‘ ed with his diſcourſe, without any deſire to ſeek a reme‘ dy for their vices, or accepting one when offered, againſt ‘ both which they appeared obſtinately fixed and deter‘ mined.*’ A great many people will give more credit to Nicius Erythræus than to Balzac.

[*C*] *His ſermons were printed, but did not come up to the expectation of the public.*] I have obſerved the ſame thing with regard to Mr Morus (7), to whom we may apply this paſſage of Nicius Erythræus, as well as to Father Narni: ‘ Liber ejus concionum, ſi‘ mul ac diem obiit, ſtatim impreſſus apparuit; cui ‘ nihil tam obfuit, quam expectatio, quæ de ejus in‘ genio & eloquentia habebatur; quæ efficiebat, ut ‘ omnia quantumvis magna, minora expectatione vi‘ derentur. In quo etiam factum eſt palam, quanta ‘ in actione vis inſit, & quam jure primas illi Demoſt‘ henes, ſecundas, & tertias dederit, cum ea deficiente ‘ oratio eadem alia eſſe exiſtimetur (8). - - - - - *His ‘ ſermons, which were printed, immediately after his ‘ death, laboured under no diſadvantage ſo great as the ‘ high opinion which had been conceived of his wit and ‘ eloquence, for this made every thing, how fine ſoever ‘ in itſelf, fall ſhort of expectation. Hence alſo it is ‘ evident, how much depends upon the force of action, ‘ and how juſtly Demoſthenes has aſcribed to it the firſt ‘ ſecond, and third parts of Oratory, when without it ‘ the ſame oration ſhall appear quite different.*’

(5) Peter de St Romuald, Abridgment of the Chronological Treaſury, *Tom. iii, pag. m.* 385, *ad ann.* 1600.

(6) Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. I, *pag.* 136.

(7) Above, remark [*I*] of the article MORUS.

(8) Nic. Erythr. ubi ſupra.

NAVAGIERO (Andrew), in Latin *Naugerius*, a noble Venetian, was one of the illuſtrious men in the XVI century. He rendered himſelf conſiderable, not only by his eloquence and learning, but alſo by the ſervices he did his country in affairs of ſtate. He ſtudied the Latin tongue under Marcus Antonius Sabellicus at Venice, and the Greek under Marcus Muſurus at Padua (*a*). He propoſed for his model the ſtyle of Cicero, and by his funeral orations on Bartholomew d'Alviano, and on the Doge Leonard Loredano, he diſcovered himſelf to be an exellent Orator. He met with no leſs ſucceſs in Latin, and Italian poetry. His taſte for epigram was very different from that of Martial (*b*). I have taken notice elſewhere (*c*), of the averſion he had againſt that antient poet. He had no leſs averſion againſt Statius [*A*]. It is pretended that a too cloſe application to the ſtudy of the antients ſomething diſordered his head, and that he prevented the ill conſequences of this diſorder by going to the wars with Bartholomew d'Alviano; for he broke off by this means his attachment to books.

It

(*a*) Jovius, in Elogiis doctorum Virorum, *cap. lxxviii, pag. m.* 180.

(*b*) Ex eodem, ibid.

(*c*) In the remark [*C*] of the article OVID.

[*A*] *He had no leſs averſion againſt Statius.*] Having read in an aſſembly of the Poets, ſome poems of his called Sylvæ, they told him the ſtyle was very much after the manner of Statius. This ſo diſturbed him, that he threw them into the fire, as ſoon as he got home; and his fancy being warmed at the ſight of this ſpectacle, he compoſed ſome extemporary verſes in Latin. Which excellently well expreſſed his indignation. He read it to the next poetical aſſembly (1). Famianus Strada relates it (2): *Cum Sylvas aliquot ab ſe conſcriptas legiſſet, ut ſolebat, in Concilio Poëtarum, audiſſetque Statiano Characteri ſimiles videri, iratus ſibi, quod à Martiale fugiens, alio declinaſſet à Virgilio, cùm primùm domum ſe recepit, protinus in Sylvas conjecit ignem; ejuſque calore ſucceſſus, Verſiculos propè extemporarios fudit, quos in eodem Conventu, qui proxime coactus eſt, ſub Ruſtici Acmonis perſonâ recitavit in hunc modum:*

Has, Vulcane, dicat Sylvas tibi villicus Acmon,
  Tu ſacris illas ignibus ure, Pater.
Creſcebant ducta è Stati propagine Sylvis,
  Jamque erat ipſa bonis frugibus umbra nocens.

Uro

(1) Strada, Proluſione V, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 335.

(2) Ibid.

It is added, that this remedy did not reſtore to him that ſtrength he had occaſion for, to diſcharge an employment the republic had conferred on him with a very great ſalary. It was that of compoſing a Hiſtory of Venice. Others ſay he began it very happily, but quitted it upon finding that the reſearches it required were too troubleſome and fatiguing (*d*). Others aſſure us (*e*) that he continued it, and that having begun it from the irruption of Charles VIII into Italy, he brought it down to his own time: but that not being able to put the finiſhing hand to it, he gave order, a little before his death, that it ſhould be burnt, together with his other works; for not having leiſure to reviſe them, he was afraid they might not anſwer what his character had given the world reaſon to expect from him [*B*]. He was ambaſſador from the republic to the emperor Charles V; and was ſcarce returned from this long embaſſy, when he was diſpatched to the court of Francis I. He performed this journey with great expedition; but ſoon after his arrival, was ſeized with a ſpotted fever, and died of it in a few days. This happened at Blois, the eighth day ofMay 1529. He was but forty-ſix years of age. Francis I. ordered him a magnificent funeral. His corps was carried to Venice, and buried in the ſepulchre of his anceſtors. BARTHOLOMEW and PETER NAVAGIERO, his brothers, were his heirs (*f*). BERNARD NAVAGIERO, the ſon of Bartholomew, is, if I miſtake not, the Cardinal Navagiero, whoſe article you will find in Moreri (*g*). You will there alſo meet with one ANDREW NAVAGERO *eſteemed for his capacity and eloquence, who died in* 1516, *on his return from an embaſſy into Spain.* I believe he has pretended to deſcribe the ſame perſon, whoſe article I here give, and conſequently has committed a great miſtake in the time of his death. Vianoli obſerves, that the funeral oration of *Andrea Gritti*, Doge of Venice, who died the ſeventeenth of December 1538, was pronounced by *Bernardo Navagiero apice degl' ingegni eruditi di quei tempi* (*h*). - - - - *The top wit of his time.* Nothing can more fully demonſtrate the eſteem Andrew Navagiero met with among the learned in Italy, than what is to be found concerning him in Pierius Valerianus (*i*).

(*d*) Ex Jovio, in Elogiis doctor. Virorum, *cap. lxxviii, pag.* 180.

(*e*) Fracaſtor. de Morbis contagioſis, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 158. *See the remark* [*B*].

(*f*) Ibid. *pag.* 156, *& ſeq.*

(*g*) *At the word* Navagero.

(*h*) Vianoli, dell' Hiſtoria Veneta, *Tom. ii, pag.* 191.

(*i*) Pierius Valerianus, de Litterat. Infelicitate, *lib. ii, init.*

Ure ſimul Sylvas, terra ſimul igne ſoluta,
  Fertilior largo fœnore meſſis eat.
Ure iſtas, Phrygio nuper mihi conſita colle,
  Fac, Pater, à flammis tuta ſit illa tuis.

Vulcan to thy dread fire, ſo will the Fates,
His Sylvæ, ruſtic Acmon dedicates.
From Statius's, their ill ſtarr'd birth they drew,
And thence luxuriant and unfruitful grew.
But may thy flames, while they devour the ſpoil,
For kinder harveſts warm the barren ſoil.
Rage on my Sylvæ, but oh! ſpare the crop,
Which late I choſe to plant on Ida's top.

This is giving a great looſe to prejudice.

[*B*] *He gave order . . . . that his hiſtory ſhould be burnt, together with his other works; for . . . . he was afraid they might not anſwer what his character had given the world reaſon to expect from him.*] Fracaſtorius, his friend (3) and admirer, acquaints us with all theſe particulars. *Vir ſummi ingenii*, ſays he (4), *ſummique etiam ſpiritus, aſſiduis Patriæ occupationibus diſtentus, ut nullum ferè ſpatium Literarum ſtudiis ſupereſſet, ut qui ſe ipſum probè noſceret, quæ feciſſet, cum non eſſe hujuſmodi putaret, ut evulgari citra ſui nominis jacturam poſſent, dum tantæ exiſtimationi, quanta jam ipſe apud omnes eruditos omnium ferè Nationum agebat, utpote nec polita ſatis, nec unquam recognita, non uſquequaque reſponderent, quæcumque apud ſe habuit, paulo ante mortem igne delevit. Quare ejus Libri de Venatione duo pulcherrimi, in Bartholomæi Liviani gratiam Heroïco Carmine eleganter ſcripti, & unus de ſitu Orbis eodem ſtylo confectus, quos alias legimus, periere: atque ut omittam Laudationem illam, quam in funere Catharinæ Cypriæ Reginæ, Marci Cornelii Senatoris ampliſſimi filiæ, de Veneta Corneliorum Gente nobiliſſima, ad Leonardum Lauretanum, Venetiarum Principem & Senatum publicè habuit, & alia multa, quæ eodem igne concremata ſunt, quo piaculo dixerim luculentiſſimam Hiſtoriam, ab ingreſſu Caroli VIII, Gallorum Regis, in Italiam, ad ea uſque tempora tot vigiliis, tantoque labore ampliſſimorum Decemvirum juſſu deductam concidiſſe.* He adds that nothing could be preſerved, but two funeral orations (5), and ſome verſes, of which ſome copies had been taken. Theſe were printed at Venice in 1530 in folio, as we learn from Geſner (6). See in the remark [*M*] of the article BEMBUS, a confirmation of what relates to the burning the works of our *Naugerius.*

(3) *See* Fracaſtorius's *dialogue, intituled,* Naugerius, ſive de Poetica.

(4) Fracaſt. de Morbis contagioſis, *pag. m.* 157.

(5) That of Bartholomew d'Alviano, and that of the Doge Lauredano.

(6) Geſner, in Bibliotheque, *folio* 40.

NAVARRE (Margaret de Valois Queen of) ſiſter to Francis I, was born in the city of Angouleſme the eleventh of April 1492 (*a*). She was a princeſs of extraordinary merit, and much admired for her virtue, piety, wit, and the productions of her pen. She was educated at the court of king Lewis XII, with very particular care, and married to the duke of Alençon in the month of December 1509 (*b*). She became a widow in April 1525 (*c*). Her affection to her brother king Francis I, was extraordinary. She went into Spain, when he was priſoner there, and did him all the good offices a kind and prudent ſiſter was capable of [*A*]. She was very ſerviceable to

(*a*) Anſelme, Hiſt. Genéal. *pag.* 183.

(*b*) Hilarion de Coſte, Elogy of Illuſtrious Ladies, *Tom. ii, pag.* 269.

(*c*) Id. ib.

[*A*] *She did Francis I, all the ſervices a kind and prudent ſiſter was capable of.*] Brantome's words will ſerve for a comment on this text. ‘When the king was ſo very ill in Spain, being a priſoner there, ſhe went to viſit him, as a kind ſiſter and friend, with the leave and paſſ-port of the emperor; and found her brother in ſo wretched a condition, that had ſhe not come he had died; becauſe ſhe underſtood his temper and conſtitution better than all his Phyſicians could do, and cauſed him to be treated accordingly, which entirely recovered him: ſo that the king would often ſay, that without her he muſt have died; and that he was ſo much obliged to her for it, that he ſhould for ever acknowledge it, and love her (as he did) to his dying-day: and ſhe ſo well returned this love, that in his laſt ſickneſs, I have heard, ſhe ſpoke to this purpoſe. Should the courier, who brings me the news of the king my brother's recovery, be never ſo tired, haraſſed, and dirty, I would embrace and kiſs him as the fineſt prince and gentleman of France: and ſhould he want a bed and not be able to find one to repoſe himſelf, I would give him mine, and gladly lie on the hard ground for the ſake of the good news he would bring: but, when ſhe heard of his death, ſhe fell into ſo great lamentations, and ſuch an extreme of ſorrow, that ſhe never after recovered it, nor took any farther care of her affairs; as I have heard from my relations. At the time of her being in Spain, ſhe ſpoke ſo courageouſly and handſomely to the emperor, to him in the affairs of government [*B*]. He had alſo an inexpreſſible friendſhip and regard for her; whereof he gave proofs even before the recovery of his liberty [*C*]. He married her in 1527 to Henry d'Albret II, king of Navarre, and gave him great advantages in the marriage contract [*D*]. She diligently applied her ſelf in conjunction with her huſband to all the meaſures which were capable of raiſing their dominions to a more flouriſhing condition [*E*], and there was a time when ſhe would gladly have introduced into them the reformation of the clergy. She very much inclined to what they called the new opinions, and protected thoſe who were perſecuted on that account [*F*]. She wrote a book which was cenſured by the Sorbonne, and found herſelf

emperor, concerning his ill treatment of the king her brother, that he was amazed at her . . . . Theſe words pronounced ſo gravely, and with ſo much paſſion, brought the emperor to conſider the matter ſo well, that he moderated himſelf, and viſited the king, and promiſed him a great many fine things, which, he did not however perform for that time. But if this queen ſpoke ſo well to the emperor, ſhe did much more ſo to thoſe of his council, where ſhe had audience, and where ſhe triumphed with her fine ſpeaking, and graceful manner in which ſhe was not wanting (1). . . . . . She prevailed ſo far at laſt, that her arguments were allowed to be good and to the purpoſe; and ſhe continued in great eſteem with the emperor, his council and court (2).

[*B*] . . . *ſhe was very ſerviceable to him in the affairs of government.*] We ſhall here again make uſe of the words of Brantome. 'Such was her diſcourſe, that the embaſſadors, who addreſſed her, were extremely taken with it, and gave a high character of it to their countrymen at their return, and by this ſhe became a good aſſiſtant to the king her brother; for they always waited on her after their principal audience, and frequently, when he had affairs of importance, he referred them intirely to her determination, ſhe ſo well knowing how to entertain and engage them with her fine ſpeeches, and being very artful and dextrous in pumping out their ſecrets: theſe qualifications the king would often ſay, made her of great uſe to him, in the eaſing his affairs. So that I have heard there was an emulation between the two ſiſters, who ſhould ſerve their brother beſt; the one, the queen of Hungary, her brother the emperor, the other her brother king Francis; but the former by war and force, the latter by the activity of her fine wit and compliſance (3).' Add to this, another paſſage in the ſame author. *During the impriſonment of the king her brother, ſhe was greatly aſſiſtant to the regent her mother in governing the kingdôm, in keeping the princes, and grandees, eaſy, and gaining upon the nobility; for ſhe was of a very eaſy acceſs, and won the hearts of all people by the fine accompliſhments ſhe was miſtreſs of* (4).

[*C*] *Francis I, gave her proofs of his friendſhip for her . . . . even before the recovery of his liberty.*] He ſubſtituted her after his mother *to be regent and governeſs of Dauphiné . . . . . with the ſame honours and powers as he declares in theſe words*, in his edict made at Madrid in November 1525. 'And if it happen that our ſaid lady and mother by ſickneſs, and indiſpoſition, or other impediment, or by death (which GOD of his mercy and goodneſs prevent), ſhall not be able to exerciſe the ſaid command, with reſpect to our ſaid ſon, and other children: WEE, in that caſe, will and ordain, that our moſt dear, moſt beloved and only ſiſter, Margaret of France, ducheſs of Alençon and Berry, ſhall, in all things reſpecting the ſaid command, ſucceed in the room of our ſaid lady and mother; and do all that is above-ſaid, and have the like power, command and authority, as our lady and mother aforeſaid (5).'

[*D*] *And gave him great advantages in the marriage contract.*] 'By the treaty of this marriage, concluded in the caſtle of St Germain en Laye, king Francis, promiſed and agreed, that he would demand the emperor to reſtore to this prince his kingdom of Navarre, with it's antient juriſdictions; and, upon his refuſal, furniſh him with a ſufficient army to make himſelf maſter of it. Beſides this, the king gave him for her portion, the duchies of Alençon and Berry, and the county of Armagnac, intailing this fine county on his deſcendants, whether males or females proceeding from this marriage (6).'

[*E*] *She applied herſelf . . . . to all the meaſures which were capable of raiſing their dominions to a more flouriſhing condition.*] Let us go on with the words of the Minim, who has furniſhed us with the commentary on the two preceding remarks. *This new married couple deliberated . . . how to put Bearn in a quite different condition from what it then was. This country, naturally good and fruitful . . . . lying in a bad ſtate, uncultivated and barren, through the negligence of it's inhabitants, quickly changed it's face by their management. They invited huſbandmen out of all the provinces of France, who occupied, improved, and rendered the lands fruitful: they cauſed the towns to be adorned and fortified; ſeats and caſtles to be built; that of Pau, amongſt others, with the fineſt gardens which were then in Europe. After having fitted up a handſome place of reſidence, they gave order about laws and good government; they eſtabliſhed, for the differences of their ſubjects, a court to determine them without appeal; and they reformed the common law of Oleron* (7), *which was made uſe of in that country, and which, ſince it's laſt reformation in* 1288, *had been greatly corrupted. By their converſation and court they civilized the people. And to guard themſelves againſt a new uſurpation from Spain, they covered themſelves with Navarrins, a town upon one of the Gaves, which they fortified with ſtrong ramparts, baſtions, and half-moons, according to the art then in uſe* (8). This is one of the fineſt encomiums, that can be given on this queen of Navarre.

[*F*] *She very much inclined to . . . the new opinions, and protected thoſe that were perſecuted for them.*] Neither Catholic nor Proteſtant writers diſpute this point, both ſides confeſs it. The teſtimony of Beza ſhall be firſt alledged: I take it from the place where he relates the firſt perſecution which the reformed ſuffered in France, which was that of Meaux in 1523. *And ſuch was the iſſue of this perſecution, that the biſhop of Meaux deſiſted from going any farther: Martial publicly retracted . . . . . Fabri* (9) *retired to Blois, and from thence at laſt to Nerac in the duchy of Albret by the favour of the king's only ſiſter, afterwards queen of Navarre, a princeſs of excellent underſtanding, and at that time raiſed up by God, to break, as much as was poſſible for her, the cruel deſigns of Antony Duprat, chancellor of France, and others who incenſed the king againſt thoſe they called Heretics* (10). The ſame author having given an account of ſome perſons who ſuffered martyrdom and carried on his narrative to the year 1533, procedes thus (11): 'During theſe tranſactions, Margaret queen of Navarre, only ſiſter to king Francis, did all that was poſſible for her to mollify the king her brother; wherein ſhe did not wholly loſe her labour, making uſe of William Parui, doctor of the Sorbonne, biſhop of Senlis, and confeſſor to the king; who, to gratify her, and not out of any true zeal he had for religion, printed the Primmer in French, after having firſt ſtruck out ſome part of that which was moſt ſuperſtitious. After this impreſſion ſhe herſelf publiſhed a tract of her own in French rhime, called *The Mirrour of the Sinful Soul*, which was compoſed in a ſtrain very unuſual in the church of Rome, there being no mention made in it either of male or female ſaints, or of merits, or of any other purgatory, than the blood of JESUS CHRIST; and even the prayer, commonly called *Salve Regina*, is there applied in French to the perſon of JESUS CHRIST . . . . . (12). The queen of Navarre, purſuing her point, had ſucceeded ſo well that Paris was furniſhed with three excellent preachers (13), declaring the truth with a boldneſs ſomething greater than uſual.

We ſhall now ſee all this more particularly in the following account of Florimond de Remond (14): *The queen of Navarre, a good, but too eaſy, a princeſs, lends an ear to them, receives their books, at firſt by the hands of her ladies, cauſes the Latin prayers of the church to be tranſlated into French, by the biſhop of Senlis, the king's confeſſor. She talks to him of the Lutherans, and* *diſcourſes* herſelf expoſed to the indignation of the Divines [*G*], ſo that the king, her brother, was forced to employ his authority to reſtrain their inſolence. She had taken ſuch meaſures, as would perhaps have induced him to favour the Reformation (*d*), if the extravagance of ſome hot-headed people, who poſted up ſome placarts in the year 1534, had not exaſperated him to ſuch a degree, as to make him become afterwards a violent perſecutor of Lutheraniſm (*e*). She was obliged from that time to act with caution, and to conduct herſelf in ſuch manner as the Calviniſts have highly condemned, and which gave occaſion

---

(1) Brantome, Memoirs of Illuſtrious Ladies, *pag.* 313, 314.

(2) Id. ib. *pag.* 315.

(3) Id. ib. *pag.* 312.

(4) Id. ib. *pag.* 316.

(5) Hilarion de Coſte, Elog. des Dames Illuſtres, *Tom. ii, pag.* 271.

(6) Id. ib.

(7) The original has it *le Fort d'Oleron*; it ſhould be *le Fors.* The word is derived from the Latin *Forum:* where the courts were kept in Rome.

(8) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, *Tom. ii, pag.* 272, 273.

(9) *That is* James Faber Stapulenſis.

(10) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *book i, pag.* 5.

(11) Id. ib. *pag.* 13.

(12) Id. ib. *pag.* 14.

(13) Viz. Gerard Rouſſel, doctor of the Sorbonne, and Bertault and Courault Auguſtin monks.

(14) Flor. de Remond, Hiſtory of the Birth and Progreſs of Hereſy, *book vii, chap. iii, pag. m.* 848.

diſcourſes with him of the articles of their religion, hoping to make him more ſoft and complying ; out of commiſeration ſhe opens her houſes to ſuch as were baniſhed and proſcribed, and commands that they ſhould be their retreat and ſanctuary. This is particularly obſerved by all the Hiſtorians of both parties, that this princeſs was the ſole cauſe, without deſigning any ill, of the preſervation of the French Lutherans, and that the church, which afterwards took the name of Reformed, was not ſtifled in the cradle : for beſides that ſhe lent an ear to their diſcourſes, which at firſt were ſpecious, and not ſo bold as afterwards ; ſhe, with a good intention, maintained a great many of them in ſchools at her own expence, not only in France, but alſo in Germany. She took a wonderful care to preſerve and ſecure thoſe that were in danger for the Proteſtant religion, and to ſuccour the Refugees at Straſburg and Geneva. Thither ſhe ſent to the learned, at one time, a benefaction of four thouſand livres . . . (15). *I have read in the private regiſters of our parliament* (16), *that coming into court as governeſs, in the abſence of the king her huſband, ſhe made it her earneſt requeſt, that the court would releaſe one Andrew Melancthon, accuſed of Hereſy, and priſoner in the court-goal, which Philip Melancthon, ſhe ſaid, counſellor to the duke of Saxony, had ſtrongly ſollicited of her by his letters : this Andrew was he, who under the pretence of teaching ſchool, came to propagate his kinſman's doctrine in the Agenois ; ſettling in the town of Tonneins, where he ſo ſucceſsfully ſowed his Hereſy, according to the Auſburg confeſſion, that the roots of it could never ſince be extirpated. In ſhort, this good-natured princeſs had nothing more at heart for thoſe nine or ten years, than to procure the eſcape of ſuch as the king expoſed to the rigour of juſtice. She frequently talked to him of it, and by little touches endeavoured to impreſs on his ſoul ſome pity for the Lutherans.* This Hiſtorian gives alſo this account (17). ‘ Rouſſel being returned from his travels, and received at Bern by this good princeſs, and entertained in her houſhold, pleaſed her with his diſcourſes on the Proteſtant religion. He perſuades her to read the Bible, then rudely turned into French ; which ſhe did with ſo much pleaſure, that ſhe compoſed a tragi-comical tranſlation of almoſt all the New-Teſtament, which ſhe cauſed to be repreſented in the hall before the king her huſband ; having for that end obtained the beſt Comedians who were then in Italy. And as theſe buffoons are only to make ſport, and, like apes, to be pleaſant imitators of the humours and deſires of their maſters ; ſo they, perceiving the queen's inclination, intermingled in their playing ſeveral ſtanzas and roundelays upon the ſubject of Eccleſiaſtics. Some poor Monk or Friar had always ſome part in the comedy or farce. It ſeemed they could not be merry without laughing at GOD, and his miniſters. But theſe laughings will be turned into tears. The king her huſhand, a prince as good-natured as the queen, went from the comedy to ſermons, which they called exhortations, which were delivered in his chamber, both by Rouſſel, and a fugitive Carmelite of Tarbe, called Solon. Theſe ſermons, particularly thoſe of Solon, who was more ſharp and violent than his companion, abounded with abuſes againſt the Pope and church-men. A brave and courageous monk, who, before he died, diſpatched five wives. They mingled ſome appearance of piety and devotion, with an oſtentation of the true underſtanding of the Goſpel. This occaſioned the Cardinals de Foix (18) and Gramont, being no longer able to bear theſe extraordinary proceedings of the king, who went to church only for form ſake, to retire from his court. But, as from the comedies in his hall, he was led to the exhortations in his chamber ; ſo from theſe prayers he was made to deſcend to the manducations in the cave, or at leaſt in the ſecret places of the mint ; which is upon the deſcent of the terras of the caſtle of Pau. This was the name they then gave their ceremonies, which at preſent they call the Supper.’ He added (19), *that Francis I, being informed of this fine trade which was driven at Pau*, was angry. and ſent for his ſiſter ; that ſhe *came to him, conducted by the lord de Burie, governour of Guienne, who was ſeized with the ſame folly :* that at her *coming* the king reprimanded her, tho' he *loved her infinitely* ; that ſhe anſwered *like a Catholic* ; that ſhe nevertheleſs propoſed to the king the introduction of a reformed Maſs, which was called *the Maſs in ſeven points* ; that ſhe cauſed him to hear the ſermons of three Lutheran preachers ; that at her requeſt Rouſſel, one of them, who had been put in priſon, was releaſed ; that the king was *ſomething ſhaken upon the propoſal of* a Maſs of ſeven points (20), and had it not been for the placarts, it was to be feared his ſiſter's addreſs would have made a great progreſs.

[G] *She wrote a book which was cenſured by the Sorbonne, and found herſelf expoſed to the indignation of the Divines.*] This book was intituled, *The Mirrour of the ſinful Soul*, and was printed in 1533. I have ſpoken of it above (21). The contents of it ‘ extreamly provoked the Sorbonne, and eſpecially Beda, and others of his humour ; ſo that they could not forbear attacking her in their ſermons ; and in particular, a comedy was acted in the college of Navarre, wherein ſhe was transformed into a Fury of Hell ; what is more, they condemned her book : of which, ſhe having complained to the king her brother, ſome of the actors of this comedy were impriſoned ; and the king demanding upon what reaſons the condemnation of this book was founded, the univerſity, who then had Nicolas Cop for their rector, expreſsly diſowned the cenſure of the Sorbonne ; which, in ſome meaſure abated the fury of our maſters, and greatly ſtrengthened the ſmall number of the Faithful. At that time alſo John Calvin, upon his return from his ſtudies of the Law, came to Paris, where he greatly promoted the work of the LORD, not only by teaching the truth, but alſo by oppoſing Heretics, whom the Devil endeavoured to thruſt into the church, particularly that wretched monſter Michael Servetus, who, among other blaſphemies, denied the Holy Trinity, and the Eternity of the SON of GOD ; which Servetus having appointed to diſpute with Calvin at a certain day and hour, durſt not however appear. It was then alſo that he firſt repulſed the Libertines, who, in our time, have renewed the abominable ſect of the Carpocratians, removing all diſtinction between good and evil. It happened at the ſame time, that it being the cuſtom of the univerſity of Paris to aſſemble at All-Saints in the church of the Mathurins, where the rector is to harangue ; Cop, whom we have before-mentioned, ſpoke an oration, which had been made for him by Calvin, in a quite different ſtile from what was uſual. This being reported to the parliament, the rector was ſent for with a deſign to detain him, and ſerjeants were alſo ſent to the college of Forteret, where Calvin then reſided (22).’ This we learn from Beza. You will find a fine account of this, with all the particular circumſtances, in a letter written by Calvin to Francis Daniel in 1533 (23). There, among other things, you will find, that after the ſatisfaction, which was made by the rector of the univerſity, the king commanded that the biſhop of Paris ſhould appoint the preachers in the pariſhes. This was in order to hinder the Sorboniſts from continuing to manage them, according to their caprices, and to make choice of the moſt outrageous preachers. *Allatum eſt regium diploma, quo Pariſienſi Epiſcopo permittitur præficere quos velit ſingulis parochiis concionatores, qui prius pro libidine illorum eligebantur, ut quiſque erat clamoſiſſimus & ſtolido furore præditus quem illi zelum vocant* (24). We have ſeen in another place (25), the furious inſolence with which a guardian of the Franciſcans preached againſt this queen.

[*H*] *She*

(*d*) See Beza, Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Churches, *book i, pag.* 15.

(*e*) This was the name in France, of what has been ſince called Calviniſm.

(15) Id. ib. *pag.* 849.

(16) That is, the parliament of Bourdeaux.

(17) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 849.

(18) *Florimond* is here miſtaken ; there was no Cardinal de Foix : others ſay the Cardinal d'Armagnac. See *Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, pag.* 273.

(19) Florimond de Remond, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 849.

(20) Id. ib. *pag.* 854.

(21) In the remark [*F*], citation (11).

(22) Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 13.

(23) It is the firſt in the collection of Calvin's Letters.

(24) Calvinus, Epiſt. i, *pag. m.* 3.

(25) Above, remark [*B*] of the article JUNIUS (FRANCIS) Profeſſor.

occaſion to the Papiſts to ſay that ſhe perfectly renounced her errors [*H*]. There are proofs

[*H*] *She conducted herſelf in ſuch a manner, as the Calviniſts have highly condemned, and which gave occaſion to the Papiſts to ſay that ſhe perfectly renounced her errors.*] Beza, relating the conſequences of the rigorous proſecution to which the Faithful were expoſed, after the affair of the placarts, ſays, ‘ that the greateſt misfortune was, that moſt of the grandees began to ſuit themſelves to the humour of the king ; and by degrees grew ſuch ſtrangers to the ſtudy of the Scriptures, that at laſt they became worſe than all others ; nay, even the queen of Navarre began to behave her ſelf in a quite different manner, falling into Idolatry like the reſt ; not that ſhe approved ſuch ſuperſtitions in her heart, but becauſe Ruffi, and others like him, perſuaded her they were indifferent things : the conſequence of which was ſuch, that at laſt ſhe was blinded with a ſpirit of error, having admitted into her houſe two deſperate Libertines, Quintin and Pocques, whoſe blaſphemies and errors, with an ample confutation of them, are to be ſeen in John Calvin's works (26).’ He ſpeaks more favourably of her in his Icones ; for having, in a few words repreſented the good ſervices ſhe had done the Reformed, he contents himſelf to add, that ſhe a little eclipſed her glory by her credulity in her later years. *Quamvis ipſius gloriæ nonnullam in ultima tandem ipſius ætate credulitas labem aſperſerit* (27). Many are perſuaded, that in complaiſance to the king her brother, ſhe obſerved all the externals of Popery, with an exactneſs which deceived this great monarch. Read the following paſſage: *The conſtable of Montmorenci diſcourſing . . one day with the king, made no difficulty or ſcruple to tell him, that if he would quite exterminate the Heretics of this kingdom, he muſt begin with his court, and with his neareſt relations, naming the queen his ſiſter ; to which the king anſwered, Let us not ſpeak of that ; ſhe loves me too much ; ſhe will never believe but what I believe, nor take up a religion to the prejudice of my ſtate* (28). Brantome had been ſaying (29), that this queen was ſuſpected *of Lutheraniſm, but out of reſpect and love to the king her brother, who loved her entirely, and always called her his darling, ſhe never made any profeſſion or appearance of it ; and if ſhe believed it, ſhe always kept it to herſelf with very great ſecrecy, becauſe the king violently hated it, declaring that this, and every new ſect, tended more to the deſtruction of kingdoms, monarchies, and dominions, than to the edification of ſouls.* Others believe, that it was not poſſible for Francis I, to be ignorant the queen of Navarre was a Lutheran in her heart ; her attachments to the party, and the protection ſhe gave the fugitives for this cauſe, were not ſuch things as could be concealed from the king of France : he only ſeemed not to know them, and was ſatisfied with the exterior of a princeſs whom he loved and was not willing to make uneaſy. But if ſhe inwardly adhered to the Roman communion, it was not however till towards the concluſion of her life ; for it is certain that Rouſſel (30), whom ſhe made biſhop of Oleron, was nothing leſs than a Papiſt (31), tho' he did not come to an open rupture. However it be, let us ſee what a Catholic writer ſays of the end of this queen. *But not*, ſays he (32), *to obſcure the honour and glory of ſo great a princeſs . . . . it is certain that ſome years before her death, ſhe acknowledged her error, and withdrew from the precipice from which ſhe was falling, reſuming her former piety and catholic devotion, proteſting to her death, that ſhe had never departed from it ; that what ſhe had done for them, proceeded more from compaſſion, than any ill-will to the antient religion of her fathers . . . . Lying upon her death-bed, ſhe received the body of her Creator, and reſigned her ſoul, embracing the croſs ſhe had upon her bed, as I have heard it related by Giles Caillau, a good Franciſcan, who gave her the extreme unction, and aſſiſted her in her laſt moments. The lady de Riberac, a good and virtuous woman, of the family of Candalle, who was educated with her, told me, that Calvin . . . . frequently exhorted her, both by letters and meſſages, to maintain the truth ; and that ſhe deſired him to come to her, to make her ſee and acknowledge her error, and to place her in the way of ſalvation.* Hilarion de Coſte ſays, ‘ that in her later years ſhe frequented the ſacraments of confeſſion, and of the altar, in the church of the White-Friers at Paris, where . . . . ſhe confeſſed to Francis le Picard . . . . doctor of Divinity . . . communicated from the hand of this holy perſon, after having heard his maſs and ſermon (33). He adds, that ſhe built, and founded *at her own expence, towards the concluſion of her life* *, *churches and hoſpitals, among others that of the red-coat boys at Paris, for the maintenance and education of orphans, whom ſhe ordered to be called* the Children of GOD the FATHER. Here is yet a ſtronger teſtimony : ‘ She died a good Chriſtian and Catholic, againſt the opinion of many : but as for my own part, I can affirm myſelf, being a little boy in her court, with my grand-mother and mother, never to have ſeen her do any contrary act ; ſo that when ſhe retired into a nunnery, in Augoumois, after the death of the king her brother, which was called Tuſſon, where ſhe performed her quarantine, and reſided a whole ſummer, and built a fine houſe, ſhe was often ſeen to do the office of the abbeſs, and to chant with the nuns at their maſſes and veſpers (34).’

From all this we may infer, that Mezerai did not much examine things, when he writ (35), that the queen of Navarre, being cenſured by the king her brother, in 1535 (36), *proteſted to him, that ſhe would never more depart from the Catholic religion, and even declared herſelf an enemy to it's oppoſers ; nevertheleſs, towards the end of her days, in* 1549, *ſhe ſeemed to repent of her repentance, and deſired Calvin by letters, to come and inſtruct and comfort her.* Such ſtrange falſhoods raiſe great prejudices againſt this author ; and if ever his hiſtories ſhould happen to be criticiſed by ſome able pen, I am certain it will be wondered, how they came to be ſo much eſteemed. We ſhall obſerve, by the by, two other faults of his. He ſays, that after the recantation of Briçonnet (37), James le Fevre retired to Nerac to queen Margaret (38), and that Rouſſel was biſhop of Oleron at the time ſhe was reprimanded by Francis I (39). All this is falſe. Briçonnet recanted in 1523, and our Margaret was not married till 1527 to the king of Navarre, lord of Nerac : Rouſſel was not made biſhop till a long time after the reprimand here in queſtion.

Beza's words, which we have ſeen at the beginning of this remark, greatly want to be explained. He gives us plainly to underſtand, that the queen of Navarre ſuffered her mind to be corrupted by two wretched libertines, whoſe illuſions and blaſphemies Calvin confuted. This ſhould not have been ſo expreſſed ; for Beza himſelf has owned, in another book, that this queen did not follow the myſtical doctrines of theſe men (40) ; and that ſhe was deceived no farther by them, than to believe them honeſt men. What he there ſays rectifies the former paſſage, and ſtands in need of a farther ſoftening ; for the term of faſcinating or bewitching is too ſtrong on this occaſion. ‘ Offenſa eſt iſto libro in Libertinos edito Navarrena, quod ab illius horrendæ ſectæ Anteſignanis duobus Quintino & Pocqueſo, quos nominatim Calvinus arguerat, (rem pene incredibilem) eo uſque fuiſſet faſcinata, ut quum alioquin illorum myſterium non teneret, pro bonis viris illos haberet, ac proinde ſeſe quodammodo per eorum latus confoſſam arbitraretur (41).- - -*The queen of Navarre was diſpleaſed at this book publiſhed againſt the libertines, becauſe ſhe was ſo incredibly bewitched with Quintin and Pocques, two ringleaders of that horrid ſect, whom Calvin had confuted by name, that tho' ſhe did not profeſs their opinions, yet ſhe took them to be good men, and therefore, in ſome meaſure, thought herſelf wounded through their ſides.*’ He ought not to have made it ſuch a wonder, that this queen, tho' not conforming to the ſpiritualities of theſe devotees, and myſtical people, believed them however to be honeſt men, ſincerely convinced within themſelves of the truth of what they delivered, and poſſeſſed with a true deſire of ſerving GOD, according to the beſt of their underſtanding. Her charity induced her to protect them, and it was not difficult for her to make a good uſe of their maxims, which tended to quicken the inward man. It was much leſs to be wondered that ſhe was provoked againſt Calvin, who with that cutting ſtile, peculiar to him, had ſeverely handled the perſons, whom ſhe had protected and maintained. She complained to him of it, and he wrote a reſpectful letter to her to juſtfy his conduct (42). Note, that at the time he wrote to her, that is, on the twentieth of April, 1545, ſhe was ſtill acknowledged as the proofs that ſhe took a very great pleaſure in reading the Bible [*I*]. She met with ſome mortification from her huſband, and did not love to hear any mention of death [*K*]. The curioſity which induced her to an attentive obſervation of a dying perſon, clearly ſhews, that her ideas concerning the nature of the ſoul were very far from being truly Philoſophical [*L*]; though there have been ſome very great Wits, and very great Philoſophers, who have thought no better than ſhe upon that important ſubject. Her Heptameron, which is a book after the taſte of Boccace's novels, has ſome beauties in that kind which are ſurprizing.

---

(26) Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 22.

(27) Idem, in *Iconibus, folio* T iij.

(28) Brantome, Illuſtrious Ladies, *pag.* 310.

(29) Id. ib. *pag.* 309.

(30) The ſame whom Beza calls Ruffi.

(31) *See* Florimond de Remond, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 850, 851.

(32) Id. ib. *ch. iv, pag.* 855, 856.

(33) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 275.

* *I. Du Breuil in his Antiquities of Paris.*

(34) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 318.

(35) Mezerai, Chronological Abridgment, *Tom. vi, pag.* 409.

(36) He ſhould have ſaid in 1533.

(37) Biſhop of Meaux.

(38) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 406.

(39) Id. ib. *pag.* 408.

(40) It is thus I interpret theſe words, *illorum myſterium non teneret*, in the paſſage of Beza, cited below, citation (41). Thoſe who would have them ſignify, that ſhe did not diſcover their hypocriſy, ſeem to me to be miſtaken ; and if they would have them mean, that ſhe underſtood nothing of the jargon of theſe Fanatics, they come up to my ſenſe of them.

(41) Beza, in Vita Calvini, *ad ann.* 1544.

(42) It is Calvin's ſixty-ſecond Letter.

the protectreſs of the Reformed. ‘ Cum acceptis illis literis ſtatim ad hanc reſponſionem me contulerim, qua eo tibi nomine à me ſatisfactum curarem, ne quid de eo affectu remitteres, quem erga pios hactenus abunde præ te tuliſti & reipſa exhibuiſti (43). - - - - *When immediately on the receipt of thoſe letters, I diſpatched this anſwer, that I might give you full ſatisfaction on this account, leſt you ſhould abate any thing of that zeal, which hitherto you have made profeſſion of, and in reality expreſſed.*’

[*I*] *There are proofs that ſhe took very great pleaſure in reading the Bible.*] See in the remark [*F*] (44) of this article, the words of Florimond de Remond, and in the remark [*O*] of the article Marot, what was written to Catherine de Medicis, and confirm all this with the teſtimony of Peter Olhagaray. *Bern*, ſays he (45), *was the ſanctuary of the perſecuted, and king Henry would not permit them to be diſturbed. James Faber Stapulenſis, the light of his time, as his Philoſophical writings witneſs, was very welcome there, and received an honourable penſion from Margaret, that learned queen, the greateſt in the world; that happy inſtrument, who retrieved king Francis, her brother, from priſon, and is always attentive to reading, particularly the holy Scriptures; which our Elias* (46), *in his collection declares to have obſerved of her, in her city of Appamyers, where he received this grave advice from that brave and wiſe princeſs: that he ſhould never let paſs a day, without applying ſome part of an attentive reading of ſome pages of this holy book, which, watering our ſouls with a celeſtial liquor, ſerves us*, ſays ſhe, *for faithful preſervatives againſt all ſorts of miſchiefs and temptations of the Devil.* The author relates Bertrand Elias's words; which I doubt not a great many readers will be glad to meet with. *Cujus etiam manibus ſanctiſſimum illud veteris novique Teſt. volumen, quod Bibliam appellant, nunquam vel raro exit, ſemper divinis ut verè Chriſtianam decet intenta libellis: nihil unquam niſi divinum cogitat, ſuadetque adeo ut ipſe etiam meminerim me aliquando ab ea cum Appamyam veniſſet humaniſſime ſubmonitum, juſſumque partem aliquam vel veteris vel Novi Teſtamenti maximo affectu, orationis inſtar quotidie legere, quo ſane, ut ipſa ajebat, noſque etiam poſtea experti ſumus, noſtra mens à vitio averteretur, & ad virtutes facilius accederet* (47).

[*K*] *She met with ſome mortifications from her huſband, and did not love to hear any mention of death.*] Hilarion de Coſte ſays (48), that Henry II, king of Navarre, ‘ having been informed, that there was uſed in his wife's chamber ſome form of prayer and inſtruction contrary to that of his fathers, entered it, with a reſolution to puniſh the miniſter, but finding they had contrived his eſcape, the weight of his anger fell upon the queen, to whom he gave a box of the ear, ſaying to her, *Madam, you want to be too knowing*, and immediately gave advice of it to king Francis.’ Brantome having given ſome inſtances of matrimonial diſcord betwixt princes, adds this (49): ‘ And lately king Henry d'Albret with queen Margaret of Valois, as I have it from good hands, who treated her very ill, and would have done ſtill worſe, had it not been for king Francis her brother, who ſpoke home and rough to him, and charged him with threatnings to honour the queen his ſiſter in regard to the rank ſhe bore.’ Note, by the way, what little reliance there is upon an epitaph. That of this princeſs ſays in great characters, that her huſband lived, with her in the moſt perfect unity, CONCORDISSIMUS. I have ſaid ſomething elſewhere (50) concerning falſities of this kind.

As for the other part of the text of this remark, I am going to cite a paſſage out of Brantome: ‘ this queen uſed to reply, to thoſe who diſcourſed to her of death and happineſs, all this is true, but we remain ſuch a long time dead in the earth, before we come at it: inſomuch that I have heard my mother ſay, who was one of her ladies, and my grandmother her maid of honour, that when it was told her, in her extreme ſickneſs, that ſhe muſt die, ſhe thought that ſaying very ſevere, and immediately repeated what I have been ſaying, and that ſhe did not think herſelf yet ſo very antiquated, but that ſhe might ſtill live ſome years (51).’ She had inherited this from her mother, as you will find from this paſſage in the ſame writer. *I will only alledge*, ſays he (52), *the* example *of the late queen regent, mother of the great king Francis I. She was in her time, as I have heard many ſay, who have ſeen and known her, a very fine lady, but very worldly withal, and was the ſame in her declining age, and hated the diſcourſe of death, even from preachers in their ſermons: as if (ſaid ſhe) we did not ſufficiently know, that we muſt all die ſome time or other; and theſe preachers, when they have nothing elſe to ſay, in their ſermons, like ignorant perſons, fall to talking of death. The late queen of Navarre, her daughter, liked no more than her mother, theſe repetitions and preachings concerning death.* We have ſeen elſewhere (53) the weakneſs of Lewis XI, upon a like ſubject.

[*L*] *Her curioſity, which induced her to an attentive obſervation of a dying perſon, clearly ſhews that her ideas concerning the nature of the ſoul, were very far from being truly Philoſophical.*] Here is ſomething very ſingular: *I have heard ſay of her*, it is Brantom who ſpeaks, *that one of her maids of honour, for whom ſhe had a great affection, being at the point of death, ſhe had a mind to ſee her die; and at the time ſhe lay in her extremity, ſhe ſtaid cloſe by her, fixing her eyes ſteadfaſtly upon her till ſhe was quite dead. Some of her moſt intimate ladies, aſked her why ſhe viewed with ſo much earneſtneſs this dying creature; ſhe anſwered, that having heard ſo many learned men diſcourſe, that the ſoul and ſpirit departed from the body, at the time of death; ſhe had a mind to ſee, whether there proceeded from it any wind or noiſe, or the leaſt ſound in all the world at the ſeparation, but that ſhe perceived nothing like it; and ſhe mentioned a reaſon given her by the ſame doctors, why the ſwan ſung when dying, for on her aſking the queſtion, they anſwered, it was owing to the ſpirits, which ſtruggled to paſs through his long neck: in like manner, ſhe ſaid ſhe had had a mind to ſee the ſoul go out, or perceive and hear what this ſoul or ſpirit did at it's departure; and added, that if ſhe was not well-ſettled in the faith, ſhe ſhould not know what to think of this diſlodgment, and ſeparation of the ſoul and body; but that ſhe reſolved to believe, what her God and his church commanded her, without entering farther into other curioſities; as indeed ſhe was one of the devouteſt ladies in the world, who had not only the name of God in her mouth, but alſo the fear of him in her heart* (54). A great many reflexions might be made on this paſſage; but we will content ourſelves with obſerving two things; the one, that this princeſs is very excuſable for conceiving the ſoul of man as a being, which ſeparates locally from the body at the moment the man expires; for in that age, this was the univerſal opinion of the Divines and Philoſophers, and is yet even at this very day the opinion of all the doctors, who are not Carteſians. They ſuppoſe that the ſoul is locally preſent in the organs of the human body, and is co-extended with the matter which it animates; but that at the moment of death, it ceaſes to poſſeſs that place, and paſſes really and phyſically into another. I confeſs this does not prove, that we ought to believe this tranſmigration to be accompanied with any noiſe or ſibilation as the queen of Navarre imagined; but it is not ſtrange that a lady, who carried her views farther than the generality, ſhould ſuſpect, that a ſubtle, inviſible, and yet actually extended ſubſtance, muſt fly out of the body with ſome ſort of noiſe, like that of the flight of an arrow, or of ſpiritous liquors, when they find vent through ſome chink of the veſſel they are contained in. The other thing I have to ſay, is, that the queen of Navarre conducted herſelf in her doubts in the wiſeſt manner poſſible. She impoſed ſilence on her reaſon, and on her curioſity,

(43) Calvin. Epiſt. 62, *pag. m.* 151.

(44) Citat. (17).

(45) Peter Olhagaray, Hiſtory of Foix, Bearn, and Navarre, *pag.* 502.

(46) This is an author who has writ the Hiſtory of the counts of Foix in Latin.

(47) Elias, *folio* 103, *quoted by* Olhagaray, ibid.

(48) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 274. *He cites* P. Matthieu.

(49) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 242.

(50) In the remark [*G*] of the article HERLICIUS.

(51) Brantome, ubi ſupra.

(52) Idem, Memoires of Gallant Ladies, *Tom.* ii, *pag.* 331.

(53) Above, remark [*O*] of the article LEWIS XI.

(54) Brantome, Memoirs of Illuſtrious Ladies, *pag.* 319, 320.

ſurprizing. She died in the month of December 1549 [*M*], and was honoured with an infinite number of panegyrics (*f*). Out of four children, which ſhe had by her ſecond marriage, one ſon and three daughters, only one daughter ſurvived her (*g*). I ſpeak of her in the following article. The two others were born before their time, and died on the day of their birth. The ſon died at the age of two months (*h*). I deſign a remark for what concerns this queen's writings [*N*], and I will not forget the baſe attempt

curioſity, and humbly ſubmitted herſelf to the light of revelation.

[*M*] *She died in the month of December* 1549.] Theſe words are from Brantome (55), and he adds that *ſhe died in Bearn in the caſtle Dandaus* (56), and that *ſhe took her illneſs looking at a comet, which then appeared upon the death of Pope Paul III, and ſhe herſelf was of that opinion, but poſſibly it appeared for her and immediately her mouth was a little diſtorted, which her Phyſician, Mr d'Eſcuranis, ſeeing, had her removed and put to bed, and took care of her, for it proved a catarrh, and ſhe died within eight days after* (57). Brantome is miſtaken as to the place, but does not mention the day. She died in Bigorre and not in Bearn. Olhagaray calls the place Eudos (58), and others Odos (59). *Odoſii Bigerronum deceſſit.* - - - *She died at Odos in Bigorre*, ſays Thuanus (60). *Fato functa eſt Odoſii Tarbellorum.* - - - *She died at Odos in Guienne*, ſays Scevola Sammarthanus (61). Thuanus's words have not been well tranſlated by du Rier, nor Sammarthanus by Mr Teiſſier. The former makes it *Ortez in Bigorre* the latter *Tarbes in Gaſcogne* (62). Peter de St Romuald is the moſt miſtaken of all, for he will have it that this queen died in Bretagne (63). I believe Spondanus, who was of thoſe parts, is more to be relied on, than all the other writers as to the name of the caſtle where ſhe died. He calls it Audos. *Apud Audoſſium caſtrum in Bigerronibus vitam finivit* (64). - - - - - *She departed this life at Audos in Bigorre.* I have ſaid elſewhere (65) that the Pariſians pronounce the dipthong *au* like *o*; which might perhaps deceive Thuanus. There is ſome variation, as to the day of her death. Father Labbe has fixed the twenty fourth of December (66): du Tillet the fourteenth (67). Thuanus the twenty firſt. This laſt is the account we muſt hold to, it being the date in queen Margaret's epitaph. It is there alſo ſaid that ſhe lived fifty nine years, but this cannot agree with the Hiſtorians, who all ſay ſhe was born in April 1492.

[*N*] *I deſign a remark for what concerns this queen's writings.*] She compoſed ſeveral works of poetry; the titles whereof we have in du Verdier Vau-Privas (68). They were collected into one body by John de la Haye, her Valet de Chambre, and publiſhed in the year 1547, under the title of *Marguerites de la Marguerites des Princeſſes, tres illuſtre Royne de Navarre.* Du Verdier gives this title very exactly; but he has made ſome groſs miſtakes upon other points; for he ſays that this queen's *poetical works, were collected and put together after her deceaſe, by the diligence of Simon Sylvius, called de la Haye, her Valet de Chambre, who printed them in 8vo at Lyons, by John de Tournes* 1547. I have ſeen this edition, and obſerved that the privilege granted by the parliament to J. Sylvius, called de la Haye, is of the year 1546. This then is one miſtake of du Verdier Vau-Privas to call him Simon, whoſe name was John: but this is not ſo groſs as the following. He pretends that a book printed in 1547, came out after the death of the queen of Navarre. If he had read the epiſtle before the book (69), he would have known that this queen was ſtill alive, when John de la Haye, the author of this epiſtle, printed Margaret de Valois's Poems. Mr Moreri has committed ſome errors. He ſays, that this queen publiſhed amongſt other works, '*La Marguerite des Marguerites*, which contained ſome 'poems and ſeveral other Comedies. *The Mirrour of 'a ſinful Soul. The Triumph of the Lamb. The Heptameron.*' There is nothing exact in this. This title, *la Maguerite des Marguerites* is falſe: the true one is *Marguerites* (70) *de la Marguerite des Princeſſes.* Paſquier (71), and a great many other writers, have been guilty of the ſame fault. Theſe words, *contained ſome poems and ſeveral other comedies*, are quite wrong: and I wonder Moreri's reviſors have not yet perceived it. There is no oppoſition betwixt poems and comedies; for comedies are generally in verſe, and there were hardly any other ſeen among the French in that age. He ſhould not then have made a diſtinction between the queen of Navarre's poems and comedies. Much leſs ought he to have ſaid *other comedies*; ſince this ſuppoſes, that other pieces had been ſpecified which were comedies; which had not been done. But the moſt conſiderable miſtake is to ſay, that *the Mirrour of the Sinful Soul*, and *the Triumph of the Lamb*, are two different works from the pretended *Marguerite des Marguerites.* When one of them is the firſt work which appears in that collection intituled *Marguerites de la Marguerite*, &c: and the other is to be met with from folio 182 verſo, to folio 212 in the ſame collection (72). Note, that du Verdier Vau-Privas, by ſaying that Simon Sylvius collected the poems of the queen of Navarre, has occaſioned another error in Mr Moreri; for this made him believe that Simeon Boſius (73), whoſe learned notes we have upon Cicero's epiſtles to Atticus, was called *de la Haye*, and had been Valet de Chambre to Margaret queen of Navarre. He might have avoided this miſtake, had he conſidered, I. That this princeſs's Valet de Chambre was old (74) when he publiſhed the Marguerites, *&c.* II. That Simeon Boſius died young, as Sammarthanus, cited by Mr Moreri, informs us. Note, that there was printed at Pau in 1552 in 4to, an eclogue which had not appeared in the collection of the Marguerites; and which was compoſed by the ſame queen (75). Dr Silveſtre in 1693, ſent me from London a copy of the *Tombeau de Marguerite Royne de Navarre*, &c. Some body had written in it, that this princeſs was the author of a book, intituled, *the pious Meditations of a Chriſtian Soul*, which was tranſlated into Engliſh by queen Elizabeth, and printed at London in 8vo, in 1548.

We ſhall now ſpeak of the Heptameron, and firſt cite Brantome: 'She wrote in her gay hours a book, 'intituled *The Novels of the queen of Navarre*, in a 'ſtile ſo ſoft and flowing, and ſo full of excellent language and fine reaſoning, that I have heard ſay the 'queen-mother, and the ducheſs of Savoy, when they 'were young, undertook to write novels ſeparately, 'in imitation of this queen of Navarre, well knowing 'that ſhe was writing ſome; but when they had ſeen 'her's, they were ſo diſguſted with their own, which 'were not to compare to them, that they threw them 'into the fire, and would not publiſh them . . . She 'compoſed moſt of theſe novels in her litter, as ſhe 'travelled; for her hours of retirement were employ'ed in affairs of importance. I have heard this account 'alſo from my grand-mother, who always went with 'her in her litter, as her lady of honour, and held 'her ſtandiſh for her; and ſhe wrote them down as 'quick and as readily, or rather more ſo, than if they 'had been dictated to her (76).' This confutes the uncertainties of la Croix du Maine: you will find them at the end of the following paſſage. *The Heptameron*, ſays he (77), *or the queen of Navarre's ſeven days, is a book full of various hiſtories, for the moſt part fabulous, in imitation of John Boccace, a Florentine. This book has been methodized by Claude Gruget of Paris, and intituled the Heptameron, or the hiſtory of Fortunate Lovers; Novels of the moſt illuſtrious and excellent princeſs Margaret de Valois queen of Navarre, &c. Printed at Paris by Giles Robinot in the year* 1567 (78). *I queſtion whether this princeſs compoſed this book; foraſmuch as it is full of bold diſcourſes, and ticklish expreſſions.* If la Croix du Maine had read the epiſtle dedicatory of Claude Gruget's edition, he could not have formed the leaſt doubt; for this Gruget, addreſſing himſelf to Jane d'Albret, only daughter to queen Margaret, declares, that he had reſtored the book of this queen's novels to it's firſt ſtate; becauſe the firſt edition *had, as it were, totally transformed it, and omitted or concealed the name of this princeſs. Wherefore*, adds he, *to make it worthy of it's author, as ſoon as it was publiſhed, I collected from all parts, the manuſcripts which could be recovered, and collated them with my copy; and I have taken care to reduce them to the true order, in which ſhe wrote them. Since that, by the king's permiſſion, and your conſent, they have been put to the preſs to be publiſhed,*

(*f*) Hilarion de Coſte, Eloges des Dames Illuſtres, *Tom. ii, pag.* 275, 276. Thuan. *lib. vi, pag.* 117.

(*g*) Hilarion de Coſte, ibid. *pag.* 272.

(*h*) Id. ib.

(55) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 318.

(56) I believe, that Brantome had writ *d'Audaus*, or rather *d'Audos*; and that the tranſcribers or Printers have corrupted this word.

(57) Id. ib. *pag.* 318.

(58) Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 505.

(59) Hilarion de Coſte, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 275.

(60) Thuan. *lib. vi, pag.* 117.

(61) Sammarth. Elog. *lib. i, pag. m.* 28.

(62) See Mr Teiſſier, Elog. *Tom. i, pag.* 17, & 19, *Edit.* 1696.

(63) St Romuald, Abridgment of the Treaſ. of Chron. *ad ann.* 1549, *pag. m.* 306.

(64) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1549, *num.* 6.

(65) Above, remark [*A*] of the article LOGNAC.

(66) Labbe, Chron. *Tom. v, pag.* 761.

(67) Du Tillet, Chronicle of the Kings of France, abridged, *pag. m.* 196.

(68) In *pag.* 843, 844, of his French Biblioth.

(69) It is addreſſed to Madam, the princeſs of Navarre, daughter to queen Margaret.

(70) It muſt be obſerved, that Marguerite is the name of a flower-daiſy; and that, by a metaphor, florid diſcourſes, compliments of a high and ſtudied ſtrain, were formerly called *Marguerites*.

(71) In the Searches of France, *book vii, ch. v, pag. m.* 614.

(72) In the Paris edition by Stephen Grouleau 1552, in 16mo.

(73) See Moreri in the article BOIS (SIMEON DU).

(74) This appears by the Epiſtle Dedicatory.

(75) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Françoiſe, *pag.* 844.

(76) Brantome, Dames Illuſtres, *pag.* 320, 321.

(77) La Croix du Maine, French Biblioth. *pag.* 309.

(78) When he ſpeaks of Claude Gruget, *pag.* 58, he only mentions the edition of 1561, by Giles Robinot. And note, that du Verdier Vau-Privas, *Biblioth. Françoiſe, pag.* 844, only quotes the edition of 1578, by the ſame, in 4to.

attempt of admiral de Bonnivet [O]. It would be needleſs to advertiſe my reader here, that the *Hiſtory of Margaret de Valois queen of Navarre, ſiſter to Francis I*, printed at Amſterdam (i), in two volumes in 12mo, in 1696, is a contexture of fictions and romantic chimeras from the beginning to the end, with ſome few Hiſtorical facts. It had been much better that the perſon, who thus abuſed his leiſure in forging ſuch fables, had employed it in giving the true and perfect hiſtory of this illuſtrious princeſs. Such an Hiſtory had been more for the honour of this queen, than the character of a heroine of a romance in love with a prince (k), whoſe wife ſhe was not certain of being, and to whom ſhe never was married. There is infinitely leſs Heroiſm in ſuch a paſſion, invented

as they ought. Such a preſent, continues he, *will not be new to you, you will only recognize it, as your mother's heireſs: however I perſuade my ſelf, that it will be acceptable to you to ſee it by this ſecond impreſſion reſtored to it's primitive ſtate: for (as I have heard) the firſt diſpleaſed you*; *not but that he who undertook it was a learned man, and had taken pains in it*; *and, as is eaſy to believe, would not have thus diſguiſed it without ſome reaſon for it*; *yet his labour proved diſagreeable*. Theſe paſſages of Claude Gruget's epiſtle dedicatory may ſerve for two purpoſes: they acquaint us with ſomething of the hiſtory of the Heptameron, and invincibly confute all thoſe who believe the queen of Navarre, did not compoſe theſe novels. Would any one have ventured to talk to the princeſs, her daughter, as he does in the epiſtle dedicatory, if this book had been ſuppoſititious, or if the liberty had been taken to add to it thoughts or expreſſions too free and licentious? Thuanus does not doubt, but that queen Margaret was the author of this work; he does not think it becoming the gravity and later conduct of this heroine; but he excuſes her upon the time and youth in which ſhe writ it. *Ejus nomine & fabellarum volumen imitatione Joa. Bocatii editum circumfertur, ſi tempora & juvenilem ætatem, in qua ſcriptum eſt, reſpicias, non prorſus damnandum, certe gravitate tantæ heroinæ, & extrema vita minus dignum* (79). The Sieur Sorel denies that this princeſs was the author of the Heptameron. I relate his words, becauſe they contain a bad reaſoning, which ought to be refuted. ‘We have the novels of the queen of Navarre; in which there is a ſtory of a gentleman, who lay with his mother, and afterwards married the daughter that he had by her, who was at once his ſiſter, his wife, and his daughter. There are alſo in it a great many execrable ſtories of prieſts and Franciſcans; all which things never had exiſtence, but were the inventions of a Huguenot, who was the author of the book (80).’ The argument this writer alledges, has two great defects. In the firſt place it proves too much; for if it were juſt, we muſt ſay that Boccace, and ſeveral other Italians, who have written novels, and filled them with an hundred bad actions of the Monks, were Lutherans. In the ſecond place; if it were peculiar to a Huguenot to write ſuch ſtories, the queen of Navarre might do it; for ſhe was a good friend to the party, ſecretly at leaſt, for a great many years together.

Note, that the Heptameron was grown very ſcarce; which cauſed the Bookſellers of Amſterdam to reprint it in 1698. They publiſhed two editions of it, one by that of Claude Gruget, the other metamorphoſed into new French: the latter will pleaſe foreigners, who only underſtand the modern language, and many ignorant and lazy Frenchmen, who care not to be at the pains of informing themſelves, how they ſpoke in the reign of Francis I. I ſhall ſay ſomething elſewhere (81) againſt the falſe and ſhameful delicacy of theſe people. The other edition is the only one which will be uſed by Frenchmen of good taſte and Judgment.

But we ſhall not conclude without making a more conſiderable obſervation. Behold here a prudent, very virtuous, and moſt pious queen, who nevertheleſs compoſes a book of ſtories pretty free and ſmutty, and yet would have the world to know her to be the author. How many ladies are there actually plunged in the diſorders of a filthy gallantry, who would not, for all the world, write in that ſtrain? What they write, and even what they ſpeak, has the air of an extraordinary modeſty: one would ſay, their imagination durſt not approach within a hundred leagues of obſcenity; diſcourſes never ſo little free, which a man ſhould offer in their preſence, would put them to the bluſh, and make them aſſume a gravity, which would have all the appearances of an extream indignation. It is not impoſſible but they might be inwardly ſhocked, and diſguſted with ſuch a converſation; for there are ſtrange inequalities within a human ſoul, and extravagant diſparities betwixt the head and heart. One has a greater purity in his heart and morals, than in his tongue: another has his heart corrupted, keeps a concubine or two, and at the ſame time is extreamly diſguſted at the tales of Boccace, and all writings which bear not the character of a rigid gravity. This is the turn of his head, but his taſte goes no farther, and has no influence on his heart and morals. The queen of Navarre was of a different make (82): ‘She frequently compoſed comedies and moral interludes, which at that time were called paſtorals; which ſhe cauſed to be acted and repreſented by the young ladies of her court. She delighted much in compoſing ſpiritual ſongs, for ſhe had her heart much devoted to God, and ſo took for her device the Marigold (83) . . . with this inſcription, *Non inferiora ſecutus*, to ſignify that ſhe directed and addreſſed all her actions, thoughts, will, and affections, to this great ſun, which is God; and for this reaſon ſhe was ſuſpected of Lutheraniſm.’ Theſe laſt words are very remarkable, and do as much honour to the Reformed, as diſhonour to the Catholics: but that is not the point in queſtion. I would only obſerve, that a princeſs, fully poſſeſſed with divine love, did not however forbear employing her pen upon obſcene ſubjects, as are thoſe of the Heptameron.

[O] *The baſe attempt of admiral de Bonnivet.*] He loved our Margaret de Valois; and it is related (84), *that this princeſs's virtue, inſtead of conquering* this lover's *paſſion* by *extinguiſhing all hope*, made him *commit follies*, which were unſucceſsful, and which had been puniſhed, *if the king had not ſhewn greater condeſcenſion to him, than juſtice to his ſiſter*. Mr Varillas, who gives us this fact, has theſe words in the margin: ‘He made three attempts to force her; againſt which ſhe defended her ſelf ſo well, that after the ſecond, he was obliged to keep his chamber above five weeks, by reaſon of his ſcratches.’ This Hiſtorian obſerves, in another place (85), that Charles V, pardoning the crime of Mary de Padilla (86), would have the cauſe of it declared in the act of indemnity: but that Francis I *did not uſe that formality in the outrageous action, which Bonnivet's love made him commit. The court coming to viſit him at one of his eſtates, he had the addreſs to lodge a great princeſs, with whom he was in love, in a chamber ſo contrived, that he might enter it from his own by a trap-door, which he ſlipped through in the night; but the princeſs awaking at the noiſe he made in raiſing up the trap-door, called her women, and by their appearance ruined Bonnivet's deſign. The king, when he heard it, only laughed at it, and gave immediate orders for removing, to ſave his favourite the ſhame he would have had, if the court had remained any longer at his houſe* Brantome reports this, with a circumſtance which overthrows the latter part of the account of Varillas: for he ſuppoſes that Francis I, did not know of this adventure. He ſays (87), that the princeſs deſigned to complain to the king, her brother, but the widow of Mr de Chatillon (88), her lady of honour, induced her not to ſpeak of it; and alledged good and prudent reaſons, which the queen of Navarre has related in one of her novels (89). It is her own adventure, that ſhe recounts in that novel. *And if you would know*, ſays Brantome (90), *who is meant in the novel, it was the queen of Navarre herſelf, and admiral de Bonnivet, as I had it from my deceaſed grand-mother* (91). *In which, methinks, the queen ought not to have concealed her name, ſince the other could gain nothing upon her chaſtity, but was forced to retire in confuſion; and ſhe would have divulged the fact, but for the handſome and prudent remonſtrance of this lady of honour, Madam de Chaſtillon.* Brantome was more reſerved in the elogy of admiral de Bonnivet; he, indeed, aſcribes to him an enterprize related in the queen invented by the writer (*l*), than in the generoſity, wherewith our Margaret de Valois actually protected ſeveral perſons of merit preſecuted for the ſake of religion [*P*].

(i) According to the Paris edition.

(k) The conſtable de Bourbon.

(79) Thuan. *lib. vi, pag.* 117, *col.* 2. *D.*

(80) Sorel, Remarks upon the thirteenth book of the Extravagant Shepherd, *pag.* 720.

(81) In the remark [*E*] of the article OSSAT.

(82) Brantome, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 308, 309.

(83) Brantome ſays here, that this flower has a nearer relation to the ſun than any other; and that it turns always with the ſun from eaſt to weſt.

(84) Varillas, Hiſtory of Francis I, *book iv, pag.* 256, *Holl. Edit.* 1690.

(85) Id. ib. *book xiii, pag.* 397.

(86) See the article of this PADILLA.

(87) Brantome, Gallant Ladies, *Tom. ii, pag.* 154.

(88) He who died at Ferrara of the wound he received at the battle of Ravenna.

(89) It is the 4th of the firſt day of the *Heptameron.*

(90) Ubi ſupra. *pag.* 155.

(91) She was recommended for lady of honour to the queen of Navarre, by Francis I, after Madam Chaſtillon's death. *Id. ib.*

(*l*) Note, that, according to the ordinary courſe of human actions, virtue is compatible with the love of a maid for a man, though ſhe knows not whether ſhe ſhall ever be married to him. But according to the idea of perfection, ſuch a love is contrary to virtue. It ought not then to be found in a lady formed at pleaſure to ſerve for a model of perfection. This is what the writers of romances cannot conform to, for they take it for a rule, that love is the ſoul of their works.

---

queen of Navarre's novels, but he adds, he will not publiſh the name of the princeſs, whom this favourite had endeavoured to ſurprize.

[*P*] *The generoſity wherewith our Margaret . . . protected ſeveral perſons of merit perſecuted for the ſake of religion.*] I do not examine whether Florimond de Remond has it from good authority, that ſhe proteſted at her death, that *what ſhe had done for* the followers of the new opinions, *proceeded rather from compaſſion, than from any ill will to the antient religion of her fathers* (92). But granting her proteſtation to be ſincere, I maintain, there was ſomething more heroical in her compaſſion and generoſity, than there would have been, had ſhe been perſuaded that the fugitives ſhe protected were orthodox. For a princeſs, or any other woman, to do good to thoſe, whom ſhe takes to be the houſhold of faith, is no extraordinary thing, but the common effect of a moderate piety. But for a queen to grant her protection to people perſecuted for opinions which ſhe believes to be falſe; to open a ſanctuary to them, to preſerve them from the flames prepared for them, to furniſh them with a ſubſiſtence, liberally to relieve the troubles and inconveniencies of their exile, is an heroical magnanimity, which has hardly any precedent: it is the effect of a ſuperiority of reaſon and genius, which very few can reach to: it is the knowing how to pity the misfortune of thoſe who err, and admire at the ſame time their conſtancy to the dictates of their conſcience: it is the knowing how to do juſtice to their good intentions, and to the zeal they expreſs for the truth in general: it is the knowing that they are miſtaken in the hypotheſis, but that in the theſis they conform to the immutable and eternal laws of order, which require us to love the truth, and to ſacrifice to that love the temporal conveniencies and pleaſures of life: it is, in a word, the knowing how to diſtinguiſh in one and the ſame perſon, his oppoſition to particular truths which he does not know, and his love for truth in general; a love which he evidences by his great zeal for the doctrines he believes to be true. Such was the judicious diſtinction the queen of Navarre was able to make. It is difficult for all ſorts of perſons to arrive at this ſcience; but more eſpecially difficult for a princeſs like her, who had been educated in the communion of Rome, where nothing has been talked of for many ages, but faggots and gibbets for thoſe who err. Family prejudices ſtrongly fortified all the obſtacles which education had laid in the way of this princeſs; for ſhe entirely loved the king her brother, an implacable perſecutor of thoſe they called Heretics, a people whom he cauſed to be burnt without mercy, wherever the indefatigable vigilance of informers diſcovered them. I cannot conceive by what method this queen of Navarre raiſed herſelf to ſo high a pitch of equity, reaſon, and good ſenſe: it was not through an indifference as to religion, ſince it is certain ſhe had a great degree of piety, and ſtudied the Scriptures with a ſingular application. It muſt therefore be the excellency of her genius, and the greatneſs of her ſoul, that diſcovered a path to her, which ſcarce any one knows. It will be ſaid, perhaps, that ſhe needed only conſult the primitive and general ideas of order, which moſt clearly ſhow, that involuntary errors hinder not a man who entirely loves God, as he has been able to diſcover him after all poſſible enquiries, from being reckoned a ſervant of the true God, and that we ought to reſpect in him the rights of the true God. But I might immediately anſwer, that this maxim is of itſelf ſubject to great diſputes; ſo far is it from being clear and evident. Beſides, that theſe primitive ideas hardly ever appear to our underſtanding without limitations and modifications, which obſcure them a hundred ways, according to the different prejudices contracted by education. The ſpirit of party, the attachment to a ſect, and even zeal for orthodoxy, produce a kind of ferment in the humours of our body; and hence the medium through which reaſon ought to behold thoſe primitive ideas, is clouded and obſcured. Theſe are infirmities which will attend our reaſon, as long as it ſhall depend on the miniſtry of organs. It is the ſame thing to it, as the low and middle region of the air, the ſeat of vapours and meteors. There are but very few perſons who can elevate themſelves above theſe clouds, and place themſelves in a true ſerenity (93). If any one could do it, we muſt ſay of him what Virgil did of Daphnis:

Candidus inſuetum miratur lumen (94) Olympi,
Sub pedibuſque videt nubes & ſidera Daphnis (95).

Daphnis, the gueſt of Heav'n, with wondring eyes,
Views in the milky-way the ſtarry ſkies:
And far beneath him, from the ſhining ſphere,
Beholds the moving clouds, and rolling year.
Dryden.

And he would not have ſo much the appearance of a man, as of an immortal Being, placed upon a mountain (96) above the region of winds and clouds, *&c.* There is almoſt as much neceſſity for being above the paſſions to come to the knowledge of ſome kind of truths, as to act virtuouſly. Now we know that this mountain is the emblem of a good man, whom no paſſion can withdraw from the paths of juſtice.

- - - - - - Sed ut altus Olympi
Vertex, qui ſpatio ventos hiemeſque relinquit,
Perpetuum nulla temeratus nube ſerenum,
Celſior exſurgit pluviis, auditque ruentes
Sub pedibus nimbos, & rauca tonitrua calcat:
Sic patiens animus per tanta negotia liber
Emergit, ſimiliſque ſui; juſtique tenorem
Flectere non odium cogit, non gratia ſuadet (97).

But as Olympus' tow'ring ſummit knows,
Nor diſcompoſing ſtorms, nor hoary ſnows,
And in ſuperior region is ſeen
Far above clouds, eternally ſerene;
While at it's ſteady foot the ruſhing rain,
And rattling thunder ſpend their force in vain:
So the juſt man, diſdaining all controul,
In perfect peace preſerves his conſtant ſoul;
Always himſelf, enjoys his ſeat above,
Nor chill'd by hatred, nor inflam'd by love.

I think I have given a fine view of the queen of Navarre's heroiſm.

(92) Flor. de Remond, Hiſt. de l'Hereſie, *lib. vii, cap. iii, pag. m.* 856.

(93) Munita tenere
Edita doctrina ſapientum templa ſerena. *Lucret. lib. II, ver.* 7.

(94) *Moſt editions ſay* limen.

(95) Virgil. Eclog. V, ver. 56.

(96) *That of Olympus. See* Apuleius, in Libro de Mundo, *pag. m.* 73, *and Homer's verſes, which he cites.*

(97) Claudian. de Mallii Theod. Conſulatu, *pag. m.* 6, *col.* 2.

NAVARRE (Joan d'Albret Queen of) daughter of the preceding queen was one of the moſt illuſtrious princeſſes of her age. She was not yet eleven years of age when Francis I, married her to the duke of Cleves (*a*). This marriage, celebrated at Chattelleraud with an extraordinary pomp [*A*], the fifteenth of July 1540 (*b*), was declared null ſome time after. And indeed it had been concluded in oppoſition to the proteſtations of the young lady, and againſt the conſent of Henry d'Albret, and Margaret de

(*a*) Spond. *ad ann.* 1541, *num.* 5.

(*b*) Olhagaray, Hiſtory of Foix, Bearn, and Navarre, *pag.* 504. Spondanus is miſtaken about a year: he hath placed this marriage in June 1541.

[*A*] *Her marriage was celebrated with an extraordinary pomp.*] Spondanus obſerves that the coronation of Charles V, did not coſt ſo much as this wedding; and he juſtly condemns the laviſh humour of Francis I, in regard to theſe vain magnificences (1). William Paradin has deſcribed the *juſts* which were performed at that time, and the *triumphal palaces, and after the antique manner, in which were armed knights, who ſtood* each

(1) Spond. *ad ann.* 1541, *num.* 5.

de Valois her father and mother [*B*]. She was married at Moulins in October 1548, to Antony de Bourbon, duke of Vendome. *They had in the three or four firſt years of their marriage, two ſons who both died in the cradle by extraordinary accidents* (*c*) [*C*]. She found herſelf with child again the third time in the year 1553, being in Picardy with her huſband, who was governour of that province, and commanded an army againſt Charles V (*d*). As ſoon as Henry d'Albret her father, underſtood that ſhe was with child he *recalled her home to him* (*e*). She departed from Compiegne the fifteenth of November, and arrived at Pau the fourth of December, and was brought to bed of a ſon (*f*) the thirteenth of the ſame month (*g*). She diſcovered under the pains of childbirth an extraordinary courage and reſolution [*D*]. She became queen of Navarre, by the death of her father, the twenty fifth of May 1555 (*h*), and had, as well as her huſband, much indulgence for the reformed religion (*i*); and it is very probable, they would not have been backward in profeſſing it publickly, if the menaces of the king of France, and thoſe which cardinal d'Armagnac alarmed them with of the Pope's indignation, had not reſtrained them (*k*). The deſign of preventing the ill intentions of Henry II, obliged them to make a journey to the court of France in 1558 (*l*). They paſſed through Rochelle, and there happened an adventure, during their ſtay there, which is very curious [*E*].

It

each of them in honour of their ladies, &c (2). See alſo William du Bellai's Memoirs (3).

[*B*] . . . . . *was declared null ſome time after. And indeed it had been concluded in oppoſition to the proteſtations of the young lady, againſt the conſent of . . . . . her father and mother.*] Olhagaray (4) tells us, that Francis I, cauſed Joan d'Albret to be educated at Pleſſis in Tours, and ſuffered her not *to go from thence*; for he feared that her father would marry her to Philip the ſon of the emperor. He adds, that ſhe was tired to death in this place, and filled *her chamber with complaints*, and and ſighs: *Which king Francis hearing, married her to the duke of Cleves, without the conſent either of her father or mother . . . . Upon which ſhe proteſted, and cauſed her proteſt to be made in form, in the preſence of John Sieur d'Abere*, &c. . . . *Hence this forced marriage*, continues this author, *produced no other fruit than ceremonies . . . . and our prince Henry* (5) *cauſed this marriage to be condemned, together with the form which had been uſed, by the Pope's authority; ſo that quickly after, on an Eaſter-day, it was declared null, in the cathedral-church of Tours, and both parties were left at liberty to marry whom they pleaſed. Whereupon the duke of Cleves married the daughter of Ferdinand king of the Romans, the emperor's brother.* Note, by the way, an error of Spondanus: he will have Joan to be diſengaged from her contract, only becauſe the duke of Cleves had married Ferdinand's daughter.

Brantome relates a fact, which proves, that the queen of Navarre, the bride's mother, was preſent at the marriage: the thing is curious. ‘The day on which Madam the princeſs of Navarre was married to the duke of Cleves at Chaſtelleraud, as ſhe was to be led to church, being ſo heavily laden with jewels, and cloth of gold and ſilver, that by reaſon of the weakneſs of her body ſhe could not walk, the king commanded the conſtable to take his little niece in his arms, and carry her to the church; at which the whole court was very much ſurprized, as being an office not ſuitable or honourable enough in ſuch a ceremony for the conſtable, and which might have been given to ſome other: wherewith the queen of Navarre ſeemed not at all diſpleaſed; and ſaid, there is a man who would ruin me with the king my brother (6), who ſerves, at preſent, to carry my daughter to church. I have this ſtory from the perſon I have mentioned; and alſo that the conſtable was much diſpleaſed with this office, and greatly mortified to be made ſuch a ſpectacle to all the company; and ſaid, there is an end of my favour, farewel to it; as it happened: for after the entertainment, and the wedding-dinner, he was diſmiſſed, and departed immediately. I have this alſo from my brother, who was then page at court, who ſaw this myſterious tranſaction, and remembered it very well; for he had a very happy memory (7).’

[*C*] *She had two ſons, who both died in the cradle by extraordinary accidents.*] ‘The firſt was ſtifled with heat, becauſe his governeſs, who was chilly, kept him too hot. The ſecond loſt his life by the foolery of a nurſe; for one day, as ſhe and a gentleman were playing with the child, and throwing it one to another, they let it fall to the ground, from which accident it languiſhed, and died (8).

[*D*] *She diſcovered an extraordinary courage and reſolution.*] The king of Navarre her father promiſed to put his will into her hands, as ſoon as ſhe ſhould be delivered, *but upon condition that in her delivery ſhe ſhould ſing a ſong*; to the end, *ſays he*, that you may not bring me a crying and ill-humoured child. *The princeſs promiſed him ſhe would, and had ſo much courage, that, in ſpite of the great pain ſhe ſuffered, ſhe kept her word, and ſung in her Bearniſh language, as ſoon as ſhe heard him enter her chamber* (9). Theſe are the words of the ſong. *Noſte Donne deou cap deou pon, adjouda mi en aqueſte houre*; that is, *Our lady at the end of the bridge, aſſiſt me at this hour* (10).

[*E*] *During their ſtay at Rochelle, there happened an adventure, which is very curious.*] Mr Vincent has found in Peter Pacteau's journal a large account of the *Magnificent Reception* the Rochellers gave the king and queen of Navarre in 1558. He has there alſo met with theſe very words: ‘whilſt the king of Navarre was in this city, the word of GOD was miniſtered to us in St Bartholomew's church by his preacher Mr David, who was a wiſe and good preacher (11).’ But here follows the adventure mentioned in this remark. ‘Whilſt the king and queen of Navarre ſtaid at Rochelle, there came a company of comedians. One day that they had a notable Comedy to repreſent (as they had publickly given out) the king and queen came with their court; and there was alſo an extraordinary affluence of people: they repreſented a woman a-dying, who fetched deep ſighs and groans, and demanded immediately to be confeſſed. The curate of the pariſh was ſent for; he came with all his equipage, and did all he could; but the ſick woman continued ſtill in great uneaſineſs, ſaying ſhe was not well confeſſed. Other Eccleſiaſtics came after the curate, and had no better ſucceſs than he. After them came the Monks of the ſeveral orders in their turn, and ſpared neither for relics nor indulgences, executed in due form, whereof they had ſack-fulls, and which they read one by one to the ſick, who, for her laſt remedy, was cloathed in St Francis's habit. All this operated nothing towards the giving her conſcience any repoſe; ſhe ſaid, lamenting herſelf, that none of them all underſtood the buſineſs of confeſſion. Hereupon one of her acquaintance came upon the ſtage, and looking about on all ſides, as having a ſecret to tell, which he would not have any body to hear, he acquainted the ſick perſon, that he knew one who would confeſs her as he ought, and reſtore her to her health; but that appearing in public being prejudicial to him, he only came out by night: the ſick woman prayed and preſſed he ſhould be ſent for. After having waited ſome time, this perſon came in an ordinary habit, and approaching her bed-ſide, he ſpoke to her without letting thoſe preſent hear what he ſaid; they only obſerved by the woman's geſtures that ſhe appeared to be very well ſatisfied. At laſt he drew a little book out of his pocket, which he gave her ſaying aloud, that this book contained infallible receipts againſt her diſtemper, and that if ſhe would uſe it, ſhe ſhould in a few days find her health perfectly reſtored. When the man was gone, the woman aroſe ſound and entirely cured; and, having taken two or three turns upon the ſtage, ſhe told the ſpectators, that this unknown

‘ perſon,

(*c*) Perefixe, Hiſt. of Henry the Great, *pag. m.* 13.

(*d*) Id. ib. *pag.* 14.

(*e*) Id. ib. *pag.* 15.

(*f*) Who was afterwards Henry IV, king of France.

(*g*) Perefixe, ubi ſupra.

(*h*) Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 508.

(*i*) See the remark [*G*].

(*k*) Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 517.

(*l*) Id. ib.

(2) William Paradin, Hiſt. of our Time, *book iv, pag. m.* 406, *& ſeq.*

(3) In book viii, *ad ann.* 1540, *pag. m.* 909.

(4) Olhagaray, Hiſt. of Foix, Bearn, and Navarre, *pag.* 503, 504.

(5) That is, the king of Navarre, father to the bride.

(6) See the remark [*H*] of the foregoing article, citat. (28).

(7) Brantome, Memoirs of Illuſtrious Ladies, *pag.* 311.

(8) Perefixe, Hiſt. of Henry the Great, *pag. m.* 13.

(9) Id. ib. *pag.* 16.

(10) Hilar. de Coſte, Elogies of Illuſtrious Ladies, *Tom. i, pag.* 614. He cites A. Favin in his Hiſtory of Navarre.

(11) Philip Vincent, Enquiries into the Beginning and Progreſs of the Reformation in the town of Rochelle, *pag.* 31.

It is remarkable that queen Joan ſhewed her ſelf more luke-warm than her huſband [*F*], both whilſt, they were at the court of France, and after they returned to their dominions; but that at laſt he totally renounced Calviniſm, and became its perſecutor; and that ſhe made open profeſſion of it, and declared herſelf it's protectreſs [*G*], with all imaginable

perſon had done what was impoſſible for all the reſt; and that it muſt be confeſſed his book contained admirable receipts, as might be ſeen from the ſpeedy effect ſhe had found from it; that if any of them was ſeized with the ſame diſtemper, ſhe would adviſe them to have recourſe to this book; which ſhe would gladly lend them, but admoniſhing them withal, that in touching it, they would find it ſomewhat hot; and that there proceeded an ill ſcent from it, ſavouring of the faggot: that, for the reſt, if the aſſiſtants deſired to know her name who ſpoke, and the name of the book, thoſe were riddles, which ſhe left to their own ſolution. The king and queen of Navarre ſhewed that they were pleaſed with this comedy, and ſo did all the court; and after their example a great number of the ſpectators, many of whom were already diſguſted with the Romiſh religion. They did not find it difficult to diſcover that this ſick perſon was truth; That the firſt who had not well confeſſed her, were ſuch as took the title of doctors and paſtors; and who, inſtead of confeſſing the truth of GOD, held it in unrighteouſneſs: that this laſt comer was one of the pretended Heretics, who, by the ſeverity of the times, were obliged to hide themſelves; and who alone, when they were called, duly confeſſed the truth, which they had underſtood: laſtly, that the hot book, which ſmelt of the faggot, was the New Teſtament, which they were forbidden to have and read in the vulgar tongue, upon peril of being burnt. But that which ſo well pleaſed ſome, as much diſpleaſed others. Eſpecially the eccleſiaſtics were offended, and went to make their complaints to the king of Navarre himſelf, and afterwards to the magiſtrates of the town, who already talked of drawing up an information. So that the Comedians thought it their beſt way to depart as ſilently and as ſuddenly as poſſible; and they would not have come off ſo, had it not appeared that they belonged to this prince, and to his queen (12).’ See the margin (13).

We muſt ſay a word or two of the preacher David, who followed the court of Navarre in their progreſs to Paris. He was a monk who came into Guienne with the mareſchal de St Andre in 1555, when this mareſchal *came to conſult that excellent Phyſician Julius Cæſar de l'Eſcale* [*Scaliger*] (14), *about his health.* This Monk's ſermons *awakened the minds of many, who began to meet ſecretly.* This cauſed the biſhop of Agen *to force him to be gone: but God made uſe of this abſence for the benefit of the city of Nerac, where preaching was allowed in the great hall of the caſtle, by the king and queen of Navarre, who began to have ſome reliſh, which, from hence took ſuch root in that country (though there was no mention as yet of any ſettled miniſter) that it could never ſince be extirpated* (15). You ſee here that in the year 1555, the king and queen of Navarre clearly manifeſted their inclination to the Reformation. We ſhall ſee divers facts of this nature in the remark [*G*].

[*F*] *She ſhewea herſelf more luke-warm than her huſband.*] Brantome relates (16) that the king of Navarre cauſed his miniſter David to preach in the towns *he paſſed through*; and that *he brought him to the court which was then at Fontainbleau*; and that king Henry did not like his bringing with him this miniſter. *The queen of Navarre at that time*, continues Brantome (17), *who was young, handſome and a moſt worthy princeſs, and who loved a dance as well as a ſermon, was not pleaſed with this novelty of religion, not ſo much as has been ſaid; and this I have from good hands, that ſhe remonſtrated one day to the king her huſband, and roundly told him, that if he had a mind to ruin himſelf, and have his eſtates confiſcated, ſhe would not loſe her's, nor the little which remained to her of the kings her predeceſſors dominions, who for hereſy had loſt the kingdom of Navarre.* Theodore Beza agrees well enough with this. See his words in the following remark (18).

[*G*] *She declared herſelf the protectreſs of Calviniſm.*] We ſhall here give a ſhort account of the progreſs the Proteſtant religion made in Bearn under this queen. We have ſeen (19) what was done at Nerac in 1555 I find that in 1557 (20) the Sieur de St Martin went to Geneva to provide a miniſter (21) *for the king of Navarre's court, to preach to all the houſhold.* The court of France having notice of it, threatened the king of Navarre to make war upon him (22) if he continued *to give the Proteſtants liberty to preach publickly in Bearn. This made him deſire in a very obliging manner, the miniſter Boiſnormand to retire elſewhere.* The miniſter retired, but he *continued to preach ſome time after, being prevailed on by the entreaties of the courtiers at Mazeres les Pau, one of the moſt antient families of Bearn, and moſt faithful to the Proteſtant intereſt.* The king and queen of Navarre going into France in the year 1558 took with them Peter David; *and made him generally preach in a prieſt's habit without a ſurplice* (23). We have ſeen above that he preached at Rochelle; and it appears by the prayer (24) at the beginning and end of his ſermon, that his language was that of a miniſter. This king having ſeen Henry II at Fontainebleau, returned to Paris (25) and *took courage, ſo as to appear in ſome meetings amongſt people of mean condition. Which is more, it happening that two miniſters of Paris were ſurprized in their chamber; one of whom was diſmiſſed by the ſerjeants, upon dropping ſome crowns into their hands; the other named Antony Chandieu . . . was impriſoned in the Chaſtelet: this king went himſelf the next day to own him as one of his family, and brought him off ſafe and ſound* (26). He aſſiſted at the public field-aſſemblies of the *Pre aux Clercs*, where David's pſalms were ſung (27). The cardinals of Bourbon and Lorrain, having promiſed a large benefice to Peter David, he undertook to reſtore his maſter and miſtreſs to the Roman communion more firmly than ever. This coming to his maſter's ears, he turned him a-drift (28). When this prince left Bearn with this queen, he put his ſon under the direction of Suſanne de Bourbon wife of John d'Albret, and under that of Lewis d'Albret biſhop of Leſcar (29). *the abſence of* the king and queen, *by the protection of the regents tho' Roman Catholics, encouraged the Proteſtants: inſomuch that they held conſiderable aſſemblies in the country, by the permiſſion of the governors; a thing, ſays the original, very remarkable. That by means of a child, a biſhop, and a woman, the principal foundations of religion were laid in Bearn. This news was ſpread every where; the king of Navarre pretended to be ſorry, though he had given his conſent; ſo that he permitted, that George Cardinal d' Armagnac ſhould come to Bearn, and made him lieutenant-general with his highneſs the prince. Being arrived there, he was ſo far from hindring the pretenſions of the Proteſtants by a conference, which he ſaid he would hold at Bearn; that, on the contrary, they reſolved amongſt themſelves not to give way to the violence of their lieutenant, who began with impriſoning Henry de Barran, their miniſter, who had been a Dominican, but reſerved, without any injury, to be preſented to the king at his return; who commanded him to go on with the faithful exerciſe of the office, which God had given him* (30). The king of Navarre was retired from the French court, much diſcontented; and that, amongſt other reaſons, becauſe no care was taken of his intereſts at the treaty of Cateau. He returned to Paris after the death of Henry II. It is true, he did not uſe that haſte, which the conſtable of Montmorenci adviſed him to: he arrived a little too late, and could not maintain his privileges during the minority of Francis II. Let us hear Theodore Beza: ‘at laſt he ſet out on his journey, and made wonderful promiſes to the miniſters of the churches, through which he paſſed, who remonſtrated his duty to him, both as to the ſtate in general, and to the poor churches, which he knew to have been ſo long ill treated, by thoſe who abuſed the late kings: but upon his coming to court, though he was very ſufficiently attended to have aſſumed the authority due to his rank; in which he would have been aſſiſted with the countenance and principal forces of the kingdom; yet ſuffering himſelf to be governed by two of his train, namely the Sieur d'Eſcars, and the biſhop of Mande, who were dealt with by his enemies, after he had ſuffered a thouſand indignities, he ſeemed not ſo much as to reſent them; and after he had aſſiſted at the coronation of the king at Reims the eighteenth of September the ſame year, he was ſent

FACTS concerning the progreſs of Calviniſm, by means of the king and queen of Navarre.

(12) Id. ib. *pag.* 36, *& ſeq.*

(13) Mr Vincent, ibid. *p.* 42, conjectures that Joan d'Albret calling to mind the *outrage done* to the queen, her mother, (ſee, above, citation (22) of the preceding article), *was willing, in her turn alſo to make uſe of the liberty of the ſtage, to cauſe ſuch things to be told, as the Romiſh doctors had juſtly deſerved*; but by what was ſaid above, citation (17) of the preceding article, it appears that ſhe only imitated her mother in making uſe of like comedies.

(14) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *book ii*, *pag.* 102.

(15) Id. ib.

(16) Brantome, Life of French Captains, *Tom. iii*, *pag. m.* 237.

(17) Ib. *p.* 238.

(18) Citation (36).

(19) In the remark [*E*], citation (15).

(20) Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 517.

(21) *Named* Francis le Guay, *otherwiſe* Beau-Normand (*Beza calls him* Boiſnormand) *and commonly* La Pierre. *Id. ib.*

(22) Id. ib. *See alſo pag.* 362.

(23) Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 103.

(24) You will find them in Mr Vincent's book, *pag.* 31, *& ſeq.*

(25) Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 140.

(26) Id. ib.

(27) Above, citation (114) of the article MAROT.

(28) Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 103.

(29) Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 518.

(30) Id. ib.

ginable zeal (*m*). They returned to Bearn before the death of Henry II. This abſence of the king of Navarre favoured the Guiſes, in the uſurpation of the government in the reign of Francis II. He did not make ſo much haſte to Paris as the conſtable of Montmorenci deſired, and being at laſt arrived there, he was by no means capable of eſtabliſhing himſelf in the exerciſe of the privileges, which his quality of firſt prince of

---

(*m*) Beſides all that ſhall be ſaid in the remark [*G*], I ſhall here obſerve, that ſhe cauſed the New Teſtament, the Catechiſm, and the Liturgy of Geneva, to be tranſlated into the Biſcay language, that it was printed at Rochelle by Peter Hautin on a fine letter. See *Thuanus*, *lib. li*, *pag.* 1058, and *de Vita ſua*, *lib. ii*, *pag.* 1182, where he ſays that he ſaw in 1582, at the Baſtide de Clarence, John Licarragues miniſter of the place, and author of the aforeſaid tranſlation.

'back into his country with a commiſſion to conduct 'the queen of Spain, the king's ſiſter, to the king 'of Spain her huſband (31). After having conducted the queen of Spain, *he retired to Bearn, and for ſome time deſpiſed the court, openly countenancing the Proteſtants, and a Monk adminiſtring the Sacrament, in his habit on Eaſter-day, in Pau Church, where he had preached during the Lent, whoſe name was Arnauld-Guilhem Barbaſte, a Carmelite, he would there communicate, altho' Francis le Gay, who was recalled into Bearn, was to celebrate it the Tueſday after in the houſe of Caſſe, where was a great concourſe of nobility, and particularly a lady of the family of Carmaing, who had been a Nun in Caſſes* (32). After the affair of Amboiſe, the king of Navarre, and the prince of Condé, his brother, had orders to come to the court of France. They came: the prince was immediately put into priſon, and would have been beheaded, if Francis II, had not died (33). The king, his brother, was alſo in a ſort of confinement. He had ſhewed before his journey, that he highly favoured the Reformed. '(34) He publickly 'complained of the houſe of Guiſe, and found him'ſelf well attended with gentlemen, almoſt all pro'feſſing the Proteſtant religion, who promiſed him, 'upon that complaint, ſuccour and aſſiſtance..... A 'few days after (35) came Theodore Beza to Nerac, 'who had been ſent for by the king of Navarre 'from Geneva, and preached in the church, which 'wonderfully ſurprized the adverſaries..... (36). 'At that time alſo was printed a petition in French, 'addreſſed to the king of Navarre, and other prin'ces of the blood, for the liberty of the king and 'queen, and the kingdom, againſt the uſurped go'vernment of the Guiſes, which ſerved but to inflame 'the cardinal the more: And, as this made a 'great noiſe, the cardinal d'Armagnac came alſo to 'Nerac, bringing a great Bull with him, by which 'the Pope excommunicated Boynormand, the Sieur 'de la Gaucherie, preceptor to the prince of Navarre, 'and their adherents; but no great account was 'made of him or his benedictions, which he gave at 'his entrance into the town, which were laughed at 'by every body. The king of Navarre at that time 'ſhewed himſelf very zealous for the Proteſtant reli'gion; inſomuch that he would have no more maſs, 'and talked of nothing but GOD (thinking only, as 'every one affirmed, of the means of advancing the 'kingdom of Chriſt). But his queen behaved herſelf 'very coldly, fearing to loſe her eſtate, and being 'unwilling to leave ſo many good things of this 'world, to put herſelf under the more certain rule of 'the pure religion: in which at laſt appeared the in'ſcrutable depth of the judgments of GOD. For the 'king a little after quitted all, upon the bare arrival 'of the Sieur de Curſol; and had little concern after 'that time for the Reformed religion. The queen, 'his wife, on the contrary, began a little after to pro'feſs it entirely, with ſuch perſeverance, that ſhe be'came an example to all the princeſſes in Chriſtendom. 'The cardinal de Bourbon, and the Sieur de Cruſſol, 'came alſo to Nerac to forward the conſpiracy 'which was formed againſt the two brothers; at 'whoſe arrival all went backwards. For the king 'and queen of Navarre ordered maſs to be ſaid at 'the convent of the Franciſcans; at which they were 'preſent, and obliged their ſon, the little prince, to 'be there too..... (37) The queen of Navarre af'ter her huſband's departure, retired to Bearn, where 'ſhe had notice in a few days of the taking of the 'prince at Orleans, and the conſpiracies againſt her 'huſband, and how ſome councils were held in Spain, 'to ſurprize her principality of Bearn, and the remain'der of Navarre. Thus ſeeing all the confidence ſhe 'had in men loſt, and all human aſſiſtance failing her, 'being inwardly touched with the love of GOD, ſhe 'made her recourſe to him with all humility, lamen'tation and tears, as her only refuge; proteſting to 'obſerve his commandments, inſomuch that at the 'time of her greateſt tribulation, ſhe made public pro'feſſion of the pure doctrine, being encouraged by 'Francis le Guay, alias Boinormand, and N. Henry, 'faithful miniſters of the word of GOD, and referring 'all to his mercy, took a maſculine and courageous 'heart, going to viſit and ſupply with proviſions for a 'long time her fortreſs of Navarreins in Bearn. For 'the report was, that the Spaniards intended to ſur'prize it; in which place ſhe heard of the king's 'ſickneſs (38), and quickly after of his death: upon 'which news, on the Chriſtmas-day following (39), 'ſhe again made a public and clear confeſſion of her 'faith, and communicated in the Lord's-ſupper. And 'quickly after ſhe ſent to the king her confeſſion of 'faith, drawn up, written and ſigned with her own 'hand, as being a woman of extraordinary ſenſe.'

What Beza affirms, that the king of Navarre, after the Sieur de Cruſſol had engaged him to go to the court of Fance, *was little concerned for the Reformed religion*, is very falſe; for this prince, after the death of Francis II, kept ſtrictly united for ſome time with the admiral, and other Huguenot-leaders, and by their means obtained the poſt of *lieutenant-general, repreſenting the perſon and authority of the king throughout the kingdom* (40), and that the regent Catharine de Medicis ſhould do nothing without his conſent. They made a great advantage of this: I will deſcribe it in the words of Mr Maimbourg (41). 'The king of Navarre, 'who openly declared for them, made no ſcruple to 'ſay to the Daniſh ambaſſador, that he might aſſure 'his maſter that in a year's time, he would cauſe 'the pure goſpel to be preached all over France. 'And whereas the ambaſſador, who was a Lutheran, 'had deſired that it might be according to the 'doctrine of Luther, and not of Calvin; Antony 'anſwered, that theſe two doctors were agreed in 'forty articles againſt the Pope, and only differed in 'two or three points; and therefore the firſt thing to 'be done, was for the Lutherans and Calviniſts to 'unite in deſtroying the Papacy, and after that they 'ſhould apply themſelves to find means of accommo'dation with one another. Such an open declaration 'of the king of Navarre, inſpired the Huguenots 'with ſo much preſumption, that they thought they 'might, in ſpight of all the edicts, openly exerciſe 'their religion, with impunity, as they did publicky 'at Fontainebleau, whilſt no body durſt oppoſe them, 'ſince it was permitted at the court. And indeed 'the princeſs, and the admiral, who made no doubt, 'that the queen would keep her word, cauſed ſer'mons to be preached in the chambers they had in 'the caſtle; and then it was.... (42) that hereſy 'was ſeen to enter, as in triumph, into the palace 'of the moſt Chriſtian Kings, there to erect the throne 'of its empire. And it may be ſaid, that it then exer'ciſed an abſolute and entire dominion, being ſupported 'by the authority of the two firſt princes of the blood, 'and the favour of the queen.' This author adds (43), that *not only* the queen *permitted the miniſters to preach in the apartments of the princes, where all the people ran in crowds to hear them; whilſt a poor Jacobin, who preached the Lent-ſermons at Fontainebleau, was deſerted**; *but ſhe was alſo preſent herſelf with all the ladies at the ſermons of the biſhop of Valence, who preached openly in one of the halls of the caſtle the new doctrines he had drawn from the hereſies of Luther and Calvin.* Compare with this the remark [*F*] of the article of the chancellor de l'HOSPITAL (44): you will there ſee that the proſperous condition of the Proteſtants of France, in the year 1561, proceeded from the king of Navarre's attachment to their party; and that the decline of their affairs dated its

(31) Beza, ubi ſupra, *book iii*, *pag.* 226.

(32) Olhagaray, *pag.* 520.

(33) See the remark [*H*].

(34) Beza, ubi ſupra, *lib. iii*, *pag.* 324, *ad ann.* 1560.

(35) That is, about the end of June 1560.

(36) Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 325.

(37) Id. ib. *lib. ii*, *pag.* 326.

(38) That is, of Francis II.

(39) This was then the twenty-fifth of December 1560. Note, that Olhagaray, *Hiſt. of Foix*, &c, *pag.* 530, ſays, that this queen had *always made profeſſion of the Romiſh religion, till the year* 1565, *when on Eaſter-day at Pau having publickly proteſted, ſhe received the Lord's-Supper.* This date 1565, is either a fault of the Printers, or a groſs blunder of the author. He ſhould have ſaid 1561.

(40) Maimbourg, Hiſt. of Calviniſm, *pag.* 189, *Holl. Edit. ad ann.* 1561.

(41) Id. ib. See alſo Varillas, Hiſt. of Charles IX, *book i*, *pag. m.* 37.

(42) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſm, *pag.* 190.

(43) Id. ib. *pag.* 192.

* La Popelin. Duplaix, &c. Brantome.

(44) Above, in the ſaid article.

of the blood gave him. He was ſent away under the pretence of conducting the queen of Spain (*n*) to the frontiers of the kingdom; and when he was recalled, with the prince of Condé, his brother, it was only in order to oppreſs them [*H*]. The death of Francis II ſaved them. They diſputed their authority with the Guiſes the firſt year of Charles the ninth's reign; and no doubt if they had not been divided, they would have carried their point; but the king of Navarre leaguing with the Catholic party, periſhed by it in a little time. He died the ſeventeenth of November 1562, of the wound he had received at the ſiege of Roüen the twenty-fifth of October the ſame year. The embaſſy of obedience, which he and Joan d'Albret had ſent to Pope Pius IV, in 1560, had been favourably received, notwithſtanding the oppoſition of the king of Spain (*o*). This queen, ill-uſed by her huſband (*p*), after his renouncing the Proteſtant religion, retired from the court of France, and arrived in Bearn in ſpight of Monluc's endeavours to ſtop her paſſage. This was a man that deſigned her much miſchief [*I*]. She did not content herſelf with eſtabliſhing the Reformed religion in her dominions,

(*n*) Elizabeth of France, daughter of Henry II, married to Philip II, king of Spain in 1559.

(*o*) Spond. *ad ann.* 1561, *num.* 6.

(*p*) See, above, the remark [*L*] of the article HENRY IV.

its origin from this king's change. He was gained by the chimerical hopes of the kingdom of Sardinia: he was drawn into the ſnares of love by the ſtratagems of a coquet maid of honour of Catherine de Medicis. Hence he changed from white to black; he became an enemy to the Proteſtants, and would conſtrain the queen, his wife, to abandon them (45); but he did not uſe her in this manner till after the conference of Poiſſy (46). She was preſent at it, and we have ſeen elſewhere (47), with what pomp ſhe cauſed ſermons to be preached in the borough of Argenteuil the twenty ninth of September 1561. Note, that before ſhe left Nerac to go to the court of France, in Auguſt the ſame year, ſhe had given the *convent of the Franciſcans, which was then void, for the entertainment of the miniſters, and to be made a college of* (48); and that paſſing through Perigueux, ſhe *committed* the miniſter Braſſier to the protection of the canons, who had put him in priſon, and aſſured *them that if they did him any injury, they ſhould anſwer for it, which preſerved him for that time* (49). Note alſo, that it is very probable that the king of Navarre only made an outward change, and grew a perſecutor only with the view of obtaining the advantages which the court of Rome and Philip II, had given him hopes of; for when he ſaw death was like to cut off his hopes, he threw off the maſk. 'He died repenting (as ſome ſay) that he 'had changed his religion, and reſolved to carry 'on the Reformation more than ever, as he ſent 'word to the prince his brother by one of his 'chamberlains, called Oſquerque, whom he had ſent to 'viſit him. This was reported among ſome of our 'party (50)'. Thuanus (51), Mezerai (52), Varillas (53), and ſeveral other hiſtorians, relate in general the ſame thing more or leſs. See alſo d'Aubigné (54).

The conſtancy wherewith Jane d'Albret reſiſted both the ill uſage of her huſband, and the ſollicitations of Catherine de Medicis, has been related in another place (55). Let us continue our account of what ſhe did for her religion. She returned to Bearn ſome time after her huſband's relapſe; and underſtanding that many violences had been committed againſt the Huguenots in the county of Foix (56), ſhe was *very much offended at it, and wrote warmly upon it to the* Sieur de Paillés; *and remembring her ſubjects of Foix, de Gibel, Hauterive, and other places, ſhe obtained for them an entire pardon of all they were charged withal, and encouraged them by her letters filled with notable conſolations taken from Scripture. This raiſed their hearts, much ſunk by the extreme afflictions they had ſuffered: and ſeeing Bearn reſolved to comply with her will, ſhe abſolutely forbid the exerciſe of the Romiſh religion, cauſed the images and altars to be pulled down, and ſent to Geneva for the Sieur du Merlin; and a little after, at a great expence, ſhe recalled twenty miniſters of Bearn to preach in the country language, and ſome Biſcains* (57) *to inſtruct the lower Navarre; and eſpecially prohibited all public proceſſions.* The cardinal d'Armagnac wrote to her thereupon a long letter the eighteenth of Auguſt 1563. She returned him a very fine anſwer *off-hand* (58); and calling a ſynod at Pau, ſhe communicated to all the miniſters both theſe letters (59). She cauſed regulations to be made for the receipt of the eccleſiaſtical dues, and for the giving up of accounts, and for her academy, and commanded her ſeneſchal *to hold aſſizes thro' her country of Bearn, which are ſomewhat like thoſe called les Grands Jours in France.* Whilſt ſhe was at the court of France in 1566, there was held in Bearn, in the month of June, *an aſſembly of thoſe of the Proteſtant religion; in which it was concluded* to depute to her Michael de Vignaux miniſter of Pau, *to beſeech her to proceed to the entire abolition of the ceremonies of the Romiſh church, and to regulate the country, according to laws agreeable to the goſpel, againſt all whore-maſters, robbers, uſurers, drunkards, tavern-haunters, card-players, and contemners of diſcipline. She received the deputy very graciouſly, and immediately cauſed her council to proceed in the examination of all his remonſtrances: and in July ſhe gave her anſwer to them, by letters-patents containing a certain regulation for the time, that the Proteſtants were allowed their exerciſes, forbidding all ſwearing, blaſphemies, whoredoms, games of hazard, diſſolute dances, public or private, public proceſſions, interrments in churches, and enjoyning the Eccleſiaſtical ſenate, eſtabliſhed by her majeſty, to find out a good number of children, capable of letters, and to maintain them at the college, at the public charge, that they might be ſerviceable to the republic, and the attorney-general to proſecute uſurers, ordaining, that excommunicated perſons, who remained above a year ſo, ſhould be proſecuted and fined by the ſame ſenate: ſhe took away the power from Eccleſiaſtics of conferring benefices, impowering the patron to preſent whom he pleaſed, provided he profeſſed the Proteſtant religion: ſhe ordered a penſion for the miniſters, reſerving the reſt till her return* (60). Being informed that Grammont, who feared ſome diſorder, had ſuſpended the publication of her patents for ſome time, ſhe returned to Bearn; and as ſoon as ſhe was ſettled at Pau, ſhe cauſed them to be fully executed (61). She appointed *commiſſioners to proceed every where in the aboliſhing of images, and altars, in all places of her dominions* (62). The Roman Catholics roſe in ſeveral places and formed conſpiracies, but were defeated by the queen. The ſtates of Bearn aſſembled at Pau, inſtantly petitioned for a revocation of her letters patent; but ſhe only granted an amneſty for *the rebels of Oleron, who were in the hands of the executioner, ready to be executed,* and abſolutely refuſed the reſtrictions or limitations, which they deſired (63). She loſt her dominions by the rebellion of her Catholic ſubjects, ſupported by the troops of France in the third war; but the count of Montgomery recovered them; and willing to complete *his trophies with a new victory over ſcandals and impieties, he called a ſynod at Leſcar the tenth of October* 1569, *where the diſcipline in the ſoveraignity of Bearn was renewed* (64). I imagine that the queen alſo then renewed her edict, concerning the the abolition of the maſs, and the confiſcation of all Eccleſiaſtical eſtates; and that this is the reaſon why almoſt all the hiſtorians (65) fix the date of it in the year 1569, though the true time of it is the month of July 1566.

[*H*] *It was only in order to oppreſs them.*] The prince of Condé was tryed, and condemned to loſe his head; and it is believed, he would have loſt it by the hand of the executioner, if Francis II, had lived a little longer. It is ſaid, that the Guiſes had perſwaded Francis II to ſtab the king of Navarre; and that he promiſed them to do it, but that his heart failed him at the moment of the execution: it is added, that they endeavoured to poiſon him; and that miſſing of their aim, they bethought themſelves of another expedient, which was to cauſe him to be aſſaſſinated, as he was hunting (66). See, above, the remark [*B*] of the article GUISE (FRANCIS) (67).

[*I*] *In ſpight of Monluc's endeavours . . . . This was a man who deſigned her much miſchief.*] The King of Navarre quitting *the profeſſion of the Proteſtant religion,* would force the queen, his wife, to do ſo too: *ſo that being ſomewhat ill-treated at his court, ſhe took the road to Bearn, where ſhe thought fit to retire, but not without* being

(45) See the remark [*L*] of the article HENRY IV.

(46) The laſt ſeſſion of this conference was the 26th of September 1561.

(47) Citation (39) of the article (MICHAEL DE L') HOSPITAL.

(48) Beza, ubi ſupra, *book v, pag.* 793.

(49) Id. ib. *pag.* 794.

(50) Brantome, Vies des Capitaines François, *Tom. iii, pag.* 244.

(51) Thuan. *lib. xxxiii, pag.* 668.

(52) Mezerai, Abr. Chronol. *Tom. v, pag.* 64.

(53) Varill. Hiſt. of Charles IX, *Tom. i, pag. m.* 267.

(54) D'Aubigné, *Tom. i, book iii, ch. x, pag.* 220.

(55) Above, citation (42) of the article HENRY IV.

(56) Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 535.

(57) See, above, the note (*m*).

(58) Theſe letters are at large in Olhagaray's Hiſtory.

(59) Id, id, *pag.* 552.

(60) Id. ib. *pag.* 563.

(61) Id. ib. *pag.* 565.

(62) Id. ib.

(63) Id. ib. *pag.* 569.

(64) Id. ib. *pag.* 622.

(65) The hiſtorian of the Edict of Nantes, *Tom. i, pag.* 35, is one of them.

(66) See Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 525, *& ſeq.* Thuanus, *lib. xxvi, pag.* 522. Jurieu, Apology for the Reformation, *Tom. i, pag.* 444, *& ſeq.*

(67) *Pag.* 287.

dominions, but alſo aboliſhed Popery, and ſeized the effects of the Eccleſiaſtics (q) and applied them for the ſupport of miniſters and ſchools (r). The Pope cited her to Rome in 1563, *and cauſed the citation to be fixed on the gates of St Peter, and thoſe of the Inquiſition, declaring that if ſhe did not appear, all her lands and lordſhips ſhould be confiſcated, and that her perſon would incur all the pains appointed for Heretics*; but the court of France thought this procedure ſo contrary to the liberties of the Gallican church, that they cauſed the citation to be revoked (s). This queen met with much diſobedience from her Catholic ſubjects; they frequently rebelled, and it is even ſaid, that they formed a horrid conſpiracy to put her and her children into the hands of the king of Spain [*K*], who would have delivered them up to the Inquiſition; but ſhe defeated all their conſpiracies, and never complied nor abated any thing of the prerogatives of ſovereign authority. She left her dominions in 1568, in order to go and join the chiefs of the Proteſtant religion. She had a conference at Cognac with the prince of Condé, her brother-in-law, and preſented *to him her ſon the prince of Navarre, whom ſhe devoted, as young as he was, to the defence of the cauſe, with her rings and jewels, which were afterwards mortgaged to raiſe money for the charges of the army, and ſhe wrote to foreign princes; and, retiring to Rochelle, ſhe ſent to the queen of England, an ample account of the deſolations of France, and it's great miſeries, praying her to have compaſſion on ſo many people, unjuſtly oppreſſed in the midſt of the Kingdom of France, and to believe, that ſhe was not induced to take up arms, but upon great and extreme neceſſity. She wrote to her by the Sieur de Chaſtelier the fifteenth of October* 1568 (t). The Chatholics of Bearn took advantage of her abſence; and, with the ſuccours they received from Charles IX, they ſeized on the greateſt part of the country; but the count de Montgomery, whom ſhe ſent thither, re-took the places, and fully reſtored the queen's authority. He put ſome leaders of the rebellion to death, though they had obtained the promiſe of their lives in their capitulation. The queen would not have that article of the capitulation obſerved, in which, without doubt, ſhe was to blame, and gave occaſion to Monluc to make a great ſlaughter at Mont de Marſan [*L*]. If any thing could excuſe her, it would

(q) Gramond. Hiſtor. Galliæ, *lib. vi, pag. m.* 316.

(r) Mezerai, Abridgment of the Hiſtory of France, *Tom. vi, pag. m.* 425.

(s) Spond. *ad ann.* 1563, *num.* 50, *pag. m.* 652.

(t) Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 578.

being purſued by the Sieur de Monluc, who had undertaken to arreſt her at Nerac; of which being advertiſed, ſhe gave advice of it to her ſubjects of Bearn, who, under the conduct of the Sieur d'Audaux went to receive her upon the bank of the river Garonne (68). Theodore Beza tells a circumſtance, which ſhews Monluc's animoſity, and is expreſſed in terms that ſavour more of the ſoldier, than a reaſonable gentleman. I will cite the hiſtorian's words ſomewhat at large, becauſe they contain a fine elogy upon this queen (69). *GOD* raiſed *up to the poor people, afflicted for the ſake of his name . . . . . three ladies, amongſt others, whoſe memory ought to be precious for ever for their great charities.* One (70), *and the firſt of them, was the queen of Navarre, verifying in effect the ſaying of the prophet, that queens ſhould be the nurſing-mothers of the church of GOD, though at that time ſhe was menaced and terrified, as much a queen as ſhe was, all manner of ways, ſo far as to let her underſtand that ſhe ſhould be divorced by the Pope, deprived of her kingdom and eſtates, and condemned at leaſt to perpetual impriſonment. What is more: Monluc, puffed up with the victory obtained againſt Duras, and, forgetting that he was a little muſhroom, ſtarted up of a ſudden, had the aſſurance to ſay publickly, that he hoped when he had made an end in Guienne, the king would command him to go to Bearn, where he had a great deſire to try, whether it was as good to lie with queens, as with other women; a ſaying truly becoming ſuch a man, but wholly unworthy of ſuch a queen and princeſs, whom GOD reſerved from that time for the preſervation of his poor children, and for yet greater things, as ſhe ſhewed afterwards, even to the time of her death; being very juſtly to be eſteemd a precious jewel in the world, and one of the moſt accompliſhed queens and princeſſes, in good ſenſe, piety, and all extraordinary virtues, that ever was ſeen.* Olhagaray relates (71), that in 1568, the cardinal de Lorrain *ordered Loſſec, that if he could not perſwade the* queen of Navarre, *to come to* France, *he ſhould uſe force, aud take the prince her ſon from her; in which the Sieur de Monluc was to aſſiſt him.* This deſign miſcarried: the queen having received the ſacrament the ſixth of September, *paſſed the river Garonne, the eighth* . . . . . (72) *under the noſe of the Sieur de Monluc, whom ſhe knew how to lull aſleep, accompanied only with fifty gentlemen, and almoſt all her own domeſtics. And this old and ſkillful warriour formed his troops at Villenabe d'Agenois les Toneins.* See in Monluc's Memoirs (73) how he excuſes himſelf for not hindering her paſſing this river.

(68) Olhagaray, ibid. *pag.* 530.

(69) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. ix, pag.* 795, 796, *ad ann.* 1562.

(70) The other two were Madam d'Aſſier, daughter to Meſſire Galliot, grand-maſter of the artillery of France, and mother of the Sieur de Curſol; and the third Madam de Biron. *Id. ib. pag.* 796.

(71) Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 574.

(72) Id. ib. *pag.* 575.

(73) Monluc's Memoirs, *Tom. ii, pag. m.* 242, *& ſeq.*

[*K*] *It is ſaid that her Catholic ſubjects . . . . formed a horrible conſpiracy to put her . . . . into the hands of the king Spain.*] The author of the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes (74) delivers this fact as very certain, and applies it to the year 1564. Thuanus relates all the particulars of it very circumſtantially (75). Spondanus looks upon it as a thing ſomewhat doubtful, or rather as a fable, invented by the Huguenots (76). He ſays (77) nevertheleſs, that he had ſeen letters written by the king of France to Monluc, which ſhewed that this monarch had an account, that the king of Spain made certain offers to the ſubjects of the queen of Navarre, from which it might be concluded, that there was ſome conſpiracy on the anvil. This hiſtorian had been ſaying, that the king of Spain being advertiſed by the court of France of what the Pope had done againſt the queen of Navarre, anſwered, he was ſo far from approving this conduct of the court of Rome, that he offered his protection and aſſiſtance againſt all who ſhould ſeize Joan d'Albret's dominions. This anſwer of Philip II was communicated by Catherine de Medicis to the queen of Navarre; who, in conſequence thereof, ſent a gentleman to thank his Catholic majeſty, and to deſire the continuance of his friendſhip. Spondanus declares, that he ſaw the letters of theſe two queens (78) and he concludes with theſe words, *Quam dubia ſunt Regum Conſilia! How hard is it to judge of the conduct of kings!* Here you ſee one of them offers to oppoſe who ſhould attack the queen of Navarre; and in the mean time the court of France is informed, that he is contriving ſomething againſt her dominions.

[*L*] *The queen would not have that article of the capitulation obſerved; in which, without doubt, ſhe was to blame, and gave occaſion to Monluc to make a great ſlaughter at Mont de Marſan.*] If I had only read this fact in the libel of the furious Lewis Dorleans, I ſhould not believe it; for this author has added to it a calumny ſo manifeſtly falſe, as to render himſelf unworthy of all credit. He affirms in the ſame page, where he alledges this action of Montgomery, that the queen of Navarre was perfectly inhuman. *What honour,* ſays (79), *did ſhe do to the memory of king Henry d'Albret, her father, in ſuffering his tomb at Caſtelgeloux to be broken open? and after the Huguenots had plundered it of that golden collar wherewith it was buried, to leave his body to be devoured by dogs? Who knows not in that country, that the Catholics gathered up her father's bones, and buried them ſecretly, to preſerve them from the barbarity of his cruel daughter, and her pretended Reformers?*

(74) *At pag.* 35, *of the firſt Tome.*

(75) Thuan. *lib. xxxvi, pag.* 728.

(76) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1564, *num.* 8.

(77) Id. *ad ann.* 1563, *num.* 51.

(78) Vidimus de his literas earundem Reginarum, & Navarræ quidem propria ejus manu ſcriptas quæ id diſerte teſtentur. *Spondan. ibid.*

(79) Advertiſement of the Engliſh Catholics, *pag. m.* 53.

would be to ſay, that at this time, the violation of capitulations was ſo frequent, that it was looked upon only as a ſort of diverſion. There are two things in this princeſs's life, which are a ſort of prodigy; the one is, that ſhe had a ſufficient courage to aboliſh the maſs in her dominions; the other is, that ſhe ſo well ſucceeded in it that the regulations ſhe made againſt Popery, ſubſiſted either in the whole or in part till Lewis the thirteenth's perſonal expedition to Bearn in 1620. I believe indeed that an Amazon, the brave Pentheſilea (*u*), would have ventured to have aboliſhed a religion ſhe believed to be falſe; but in thoſe ages they did not know, what our Joan d'Albret could not be ignorant of. They did not know, that the people, whoſe altars are deſtroyed, have directors of their conſcience, who encourage them to rebellion, and find an hundred ways to conſpire againſt the lives of kings. If it be ſtrange that the queen of Navarre was ſo undaunted as not to fear ſuch dangers, which ſhe was perfectly acquainted with; it is ſtill more ſurprizing that ſhe maintained herſelf ſurrounded as ſhe was by two powerful princes, the king of Spain on the one hand and the king of France on the other, both poſſeſſed with ſuch a cruelty againſt the Sectaries, as has but few examples, both animated and puſhed on by the ſtrong ſollicitations of the court of Rome (*x*). But if ſhe had all the neceſſary vigour to quell the ſeditions of her ſubjects, and to triumph over the forces ſent to their aſſiſtance by the court of France, ſhe had not a ſufficient foreſight to diſcover the treachery which was contrived againſt her, under the ſpecious propoſal of the marriage of the prince, her ſon, with the ſiſter of Charles IX. She conſented to it, and came to Paris, where ſhe was poiſoned, as it is believed (*y*), while ſhe was making preparations for the marriage. She died the tenth of June 1572 in the forty-fourth year of her age (*z*). That death could not but be very ſeaſonable to this princeſs, who would have been inconſolable, had ſhe ſeen the Paris maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day, and heard the reproaches which would have been caſt on her, for being the innocent cauſe of the loſs of ſo many brave people, by the misfortune of her falling into the ſnare. She could not have found much comfort in the anſwer ſhe might have made, that it was not probable, the wickedneſs of Catherine de Medicis would run ſuch lengths, or that Charles IX, whoſe paſſion had no bounds, ſhould be capable of ſo long, ſo profound, and artful, a diſſimulation; and that after all, the treachery could not be very diſcoverable (*aa*), ſince the wiſe admiral de Coligni was likewiſe deceived by it. The virtue of this queen was very great; and had we no other teſtimony of it than her deſire to draw her future daughter-in-law immediately out of the corruption of the court of France [*M*], we muſt conceive a very high opinion of it. Her laſt will contained ſome things which diſplayed the generoſity of her ſoul, as well as her prudence and ardent zeal for the religion ſhe profeſſed (*bb*). I will examine below (*cc*) what Moreri ſays, that *ſhe compoſed ſeveral pieces both in proſe and verſe.* She left a ſon, of whom I have ſpoken in his place (*dd*), and a daughter, who perfectly imitated her example in virtue and religion; for her conduct was moſt prudent and regular

in

Reformers? This is the anſwer that Mr du Pleſſis has given to that paſſage of the Engliſh Catholic: King Henry d'Albret *was buried at Leſcar in Bearn, with his predeceſſors, where his body and his tomb are ſtill entire; and thereby judge either of the ignorance, or the notorious malice of the petitioner* (80). Notwithſtanding this, I muſt ſay, that Lewis Dorleans does not lie, in what he immediately relates concerning the murder of Montgomery's priſoners; for if he had miſrepreſented that matter, he would have been confuted by du Pleſſis, as well as in the other falſhoods which he has aſſerted. But it is certain, that du Pleſſis obſerved a profound ſilence in this particular; and we find that Thuanus expreſsly notes, that the capitulation obtained by Terride imported, that the garriſon ſhould have their lives, and particularly Sainte Colombe, and others, who were afterwards put to death (81). La Popeliniere (82), a Proteſtant Hiſtorian makes the ſame confeſſion without exception or reſerve. D'Aubigné makes uſe of ſome ſhifts and evaſions (83), but it is eaſy to perceive, that he does not believe they will avail any thing. I have found in Thuanus a groſs miſtake in Geography, which I ſhall occaſionally take notice of. He ſays (84), that Montgomery having croſſed the county of Foix, paſſed the Garonne at St Gaudens, and a little after, the Ariege, and made great marches towards Bigorre. We need only caſt our eyes upon the meaneſt map of France, to ſee plainly, that Montgomery could not paſs the Garonne till after he had paſſed the Ariege. Here is Monluc's paſſage, which will ſerve me for a proof of this fact (85). 'Hereupon arrived 'Monſieur de Savignac, and captain Fabien, and ſome 'other gentlemen with them, to tell me, that the 'garriſon (86) would ſurrender, and to ſee whether I 'would give them quarter, and capitulate with them: 'perceiving Monſieur de Savignac, and captain Fabien 'had a mind to ſave Favas, and to act honourably 'by him, as he had the reputation of a good ſoldier, 'I told them they might make what capitulation they 'thought fit, I would ſign it, tho' I had a great de'ſire to diſpatch them out of the way. For this 'reaſon, when they were gone, I ſent after them a 'gentleman, with ſecret orders to the ſoldiers, and 'ſome captains, that as they were parlying, they ſhould 'be ſure to enter on one ſide or other, and put all 'to the ſword: for the death of thoſe gentlemen 'was to be revenged, who had been ſo miſerably 'maſſacred at Navarreins; becauſe, contrary to the 'faith of capitulation, they had ſtabbed the Sieur de 'Sainte Colombe, and ſeven or eight others, who 'had yielded at Orthez, upon condition of life, when 'Monſieur de Terride was taken. This execution 'was made upon pretence that they were the queen of 'Navarre's ſubjects.' The thing ſucceeded very nearly according to Monluc's deſire. The ſoldiers ſcaling the walls on one ſide, whilſt they were parlying on the other, entered, *and put all to the ſword they could meet with* (87).

[*M*] *Her deſire to draw her future daughter-in-law out of the corruption of the court of France.*] Here is an extract of a letter ſhe writ to her ſon, whilſt ſhe was at the court of France, to marry him with Margaret de Valois. 'She is handſome and prudent, and 'of a good mien, but bred in the moſt curſed and cor'rupt company in the world; for I ſee nobody with'out a tincture of it. Your couſin, the marchioneſs, 'is ſo changed by it, that ſhe has no appearance of 'religion . . . This meſſenger will tell you how licen'tious the king is; it is great pity. I would not 'for any thing in the world that you ſhould make 'any ſtay here. You ſee the reaſon why I deſire you 'to marry, and that you and your wife ſhould get 'out of this corruption: for, tho' I believed it very 'great, I find it ſtill greater. The men here do not

importune

(*u*) Ducit Amazonidum lunatis agmina peltis Pentheſilea furens, mediiſque in millibus ardet. *Virgil. Æneid. lib. i, ver.* 494.

(*x*) *See* Spond. *ad ann.* 1568, *num.* 26.

(*y*) *See d'Aubigné, Tom. ii, book i, chap. ii, pag. m.* 531, *and* Olhagaray, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 627.

(*z*) Thuan. *lib. li, pag.* 1058.

(*aa*) Mezerai, *Abr. Chron. Tom. v, pag. m.* 149, pretends, that if God had not blinded the eyes of the Proteſtants, they would eaſily have perceived the knives which were ſharpened to cut their throats.

(*bb*) Vide Thuanum, *lib. li, pag.* 1058.

(*cc*) In the remark [*Q*], at the end.

(*dd*) In the article HENRY IV.

(80) Du Pleſſis Mornai's Memoirs, *Tom. i, pag.* 638.

(81) Capitibus inter Terridam & Montgomerium perſcriptis comprehenſi Sancolumbus, & VI, alii torquati equites, qui vita ſalva dimitti debebant. *Thuan. lib. xlv, pag.* 915, *col. i.* D.

(82) See his Hiſtory of the Troubles, *book viii, fol. m.* 244.

(83) In Tome I, of his Hiſtory, *book v, ch. xiv, pag. m.* 420.

(84) Thuan. ubi ſupra.

(85) Monluc's Memoirs, *Tom. ii, book vii, pag.* 369, 370.

(86) *That is, of the caſtle* Mont de Marſan.

(87) Monluc, ibid. *pag.* 371.

in the midſt of the bad examples of that time; and no match with the condition of going to maſs was ever agreeable to her [*N*]. Henry IV, her brother, who had a moſt particular affection and eſteem for her, in vain exhorted her to turn Catholic. He married her to the duke of Bar, eldeſt ſon of the duke of Lorrain in 1599. She found no great ſatisfaction in that alliance [*O*], and was forced to go and receive the ſacrament out of the

‘ importune the women, but the women importune the men (88).’ Mr Jurieu (89) uſes theſe words (90) to ſhew the corruption of the court of France at that time.

[*N*] *No match, with the condition of going to maſs, was ever agreeable to her daughter.*] There are very few princeſſes who had more offers than Madam Catherine de Navarre, only ſiſter of Henry IV. Here follows a long detail upon this ſubject; I have it from a perſon of good authority, for he was miniſter to this princeſs. He ſays, that there were great difficulties in the negotiation of the duke of Bar's marriage, both becauſe ſhe would not *depart* from the religion ſhe was bred in, and becauſe *ſhe could not prevail with herſelf to go out of France* (91). *And indeed*, continues he (92), ‘to ſay the truth, ſhe had been courted by many great princes; to whom, for one or other of theſe two cauſes, or for both together, ſhe would not give her conſent. Firſt, to trace this as high as poſſible, as ſoon as ſhe was born, which was the ſeventh of February, 1558, there was a talk of marrying her to Francis, who was afterwards duke of Alençon, and earl of Flanders; and that by the kings their fathers, Henry II, moſt Chriſtian king of France, and Anthony I, moſt Faithful * king of Navarre ... Which Francis endeavoured to bring to effect, by ſolliciting Catherine's conſent, in the year 1582: but the difficulty was then too great in point of religion, there being at that time an attempt made on the king of Navarre, her brother, to reduce him to the Catholic religion, by force of arms. Alſo before this, king Henry III returning to Poland, had thoughts of her: and it is believed, that if ſhe had been on her journey to Lyons at his return, and the king had ſeen her, he would infallibly have married her; but the queen-mother, Catherine de Medicis, repreſented her as a dwarf, and crooked, which was very falſe; for ſhe was of a middle ſize, and finely ſhaped: it is true, ſhe had one leg a little ſhorter than the other (which is a mark of the family of Albret, and was obſervable in Alain Sire d'Albret, father of king Dom Joüan, great-grand-father of this princeſs Catherine). The queen-mother, did that ill office to her god-daughter to prejudice the king of Navarre .... This great match failing, the duke of Lorrain (who was afterwards her father-in-law) would have married her with the king's conſent, but found the king of Navarre very much averſe to it. Upon her departing from court, after the king of Navarre, her bother, ſhe was much loved by the late prince of Condé. King Philip of Spain ſent alſo in the year 1580 to ſee her; promiſed the king of Navarre great advantages on his part, ſo far as to adviſe him to make himſelf king of Gaſcogny, to which purpoſe he would aſſiſt him with men and and money; and even kept for a long time eight hundred thouſand ducats in Ochagavy, a village of the upper Navarre, above Roncevaux, if the ſaid king of Navarre would have accepted them to make war againſt France. This failing, the duke of Savoy, in 1583, ſent twice to her, with a promiſe no ways to diſturb her religion: his agent arrived at Viſezenſac in Bigorre; from whence, being refuſed, he went to Spain, and there concluded a match between the infanta Catherine Michelle and this duke. In 1586, the king of Scotland ſent Mr Melvin, a Scotchman, the Sieur de Iſle Groſlot, a Frenchman, and the Sieur de Barthas, with ſuch importunity, that the queen of England wrote to her in theſe terms; *That if ſhe would come over into her iſland, for her ſake,* (addreſſing her by the ſtile of her ſiſter of France, as a lucky omen) *ſhe would, in her life-time, ſecure her being queen of England after her deceaſe.* The prince of Anhalt coming to the aſſiſtance of the king, her brother, upon his advancement to the crown of France, deſired her himſelf in perſon; but, by reaſon of the war, which was ſo very general in France, he returned as he came, not without diſcontent. During theſe ſame wars, two princes of the blood ſought her likewiſe, the count of Soiſſons (93), and the duke of Montpenſier (94); but the nearneſs of relation, the difference of religion, and the unſettled poſture of affairs, would not ſuffer their inclinations to take effect.’ The ſame Hiſtorian relates, that after the ceremony of the marriage, the princeſs Catherine (95) *ſhewed all poſſible ſatisfaction .... coming to that which ſhe was uſed to ſay,* Grata ſuperveniet, quæ non ſperabitur hora (96). *For this lady underſtood Latin very well; and remembered this Latin verſe, the rather becauſe ſome people had ſaid,* ſhe would never be married: *others one day had placed a hemeſtich oppoſite to another, which ſhe had written with her own hand in her houſe of Caſtelbeziat at Pau (which the queen her mother had built on purpoſe for her) namely, upon a certain commotion happening there, during theſe latter wars: finding herſelf obliged to go to her brother, (which the Bearnois did not eaſily conſent to) ſhe wrote theſe words,* Quo me fata vocant. *Immediately waſhing her hands to ſit down to the table, ſhe found the verſe filled up thus,* Ne quo te fata vocarent. *Now this was an ambiguity by way of antiperiſtaſis, to diſſuade her from her journey, yet they who did it got nothing by it, for ſhe was fully reſolved to go into France to her brother, when he ſhould order it.*

If we may believe Clement VIII, what I have ſaid is liable to ſome exception: there was a time when the princeſs Catherine was ready to change her religion, provided ſhe could have the huſband ſhe had a mind to. We will quote a paſſage out of the 348th letter of cardinal d'Oſſat, written from Rome the ſixteenth of June, 1603. ‘One of the greateſt objections which he (97) put to me, was, that when that marriage (98) was in treaty, Madam, the king's ſiſter, cauſed his Holineſs to be told, that in caſe he would uſe his intereſt with the king to get her married to the count of Soiſſons, ſhe would be a Catholic: from whence his Holineſs ſaid he had good reaſon to judge, that it was not conſcience which kept her to her ſect, but a certain oſtentation and preſumption, which ſhe had, that the holy See, and all things elſe, ought to accommodate themſelves to her deſires. And becauſe that objection was put very home, I waved it, and made uſe of it, to ſhew him, that the princeſs would be ſo much the eaſier to convert; the hopes of which I had reckoned as one of the ten cauſes of the diſpenſation which we deſired (99).’

[*O*] ... *ſhe found no great ſatisfaction in that alliance.*] If ſhe was a good Huguenot, her huſband was as zealous a Papiſt. This different zeal for religion had made them very indifferent as to the propoſals of marriage, and had raiſed ſome difficulties which had ſpun out this affair *for above two years together ..... Both the parties were uneaſy to be ſacrificed by their relations to the intereſts of ſtate, againſt the ſentiments of their conſcience* (100). The huſband's zeal abated for the firſt ſix months of the marriage; but then it grew ſo warm, that the duke of Bar looked upon the conjugal act as a great ſin, and religiouſly abſtained from it. Let us make uſe of Mr Mezerai's expreſſions (101): ‘he ſuffered his confeſſor to raiſe ſo many ſcruples in his conſcience, that he ſeparated himſelf from her company, and took the opportunity of the Jubilee to go and aſk the Pope's abſolution, and diſpenſation for the future. The Pope flatly refuſed him this laſt point, without Catherine's converſion; and for the other, he put his ſcrupulous conſcience ſo much upon the rack, that he promiſed to return to his wife no more but to divorce her, unleſs ſhe turned Catholic. By means of this proteſtation he was ſecretly reſtored to the communion of the Faithful; for in order to be received into it publickly, the fault being public, he muſt have undergone penance for the ſame. A ſharp word or two from the king would have obliged the court of Rome to remove all thoſe difficlties, and ſuffer the huſband to return to his wife: for want of this reſolution the poor princeſs remained a widow for ſome time in the midſt of marriage.’ Can any thing be more tyrannical than the yoke ſo many Chriſtians have ſuffered to be impoſed upon them by the court of Rome? Here is a prince married by the duke, his father, to a lady authorized by her ſuperiours: the marriage is ſolemnly celebrated,

(88) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau, *Tom. i, pag.* 903, 904.

(89) Jurieu, Apology for the Reformation, *Tom. i, pag.* 413, 414. *He cites* le Laboureur's Additions, *book iii.*

(90) He hath changed ſome words, but without changing the ſenſe: this is nevertheleſs a want of exactneſs.

(91) Cayet, Septennial Chronology of the Hiſtory of the Peace, *fol.* 50, *verſo*, *ad ann.* 1598.

(92) Id. ib. *fol.* 51.

* *Moſt Faithful* is a title given to the kings of Navarre, as *Moſt Chriſtian* is to the kings of France.

(93) See, above, the remark [*L*] of the article CAYET.

(94) See the Memoirs of Du Pleſſis, *Tom. ii, pag.* 295.

(95) Cayet, Chronologie Septenaire, *fol.* 63, *ad ann.* 1599.

(96) It is a verſe of Horace, Epiſt. IV, *lib. i, ver.* 14. See in the New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Calviniſm, *pag.* 663, what was ſaid of a marriage ſhewn at a diſtance, and as the empire was ſhewn to Galba, by theſe words, *& tu Galba quandoque deguſtabis imperium.*

(97) That is, Clement VIII.

(98) That is, the marriage of the duke of Bar, and the princeſs Catherine.

(99) Lettres du Cardinal d'Oſſat, *Tom. ii, pag.* 625.

(100) Mezerai, Chron. Abridgment, *Tom. vi, pag.* 194.

(101) Id. ib. *pag.* 222.

the city of Nanci, *and was allowed only preaching and prayers in her houſe for her ſelf and domeſtics* (*ee*). She died in the beginning of the year 1604, with the falſe opinion of her being with child. The duke of Lorrain, and the duke of Bar, *conjured her in the extremity of her ſickneſs to think of her ſalvation*; *but ſhe told them, that ſhe was reſolved to die as ſhe had lived*; and ſo ſhe departed not, at the laſt moment of her life, from the conſtancy ſhe had always ſhewn for her religion, which had reſiſted the ſtrongeſt temptations, and the moſt obſtinate importunities in the world. She had had for her preceptor the ſon of Salmonius Macrinus (*ff*), and underſtood the Latin tongue very well. (*gg*) Du Verdier Vau-Privas (*hh*) calls her a *princeſs of a high ſpirit*: *ſhe began ſo early*, adds he, *to imitate* thoſe two learned *queens of Navarre*, Margaret of France, and Joan d'Albret, *grand-mother and mother* . . . *to produce at one and the ſame time both the flowers and the fruit which the Muſes ſow, that ſhe compoſed garlands of them of all the colours that could be required, when ſhe was ſcarce twelve years of age: nay (which is more wonderful) ſhe made verſes in her ſleep, as it is aſſirmed in an ode made on that occaſion, and addreſſed to her Excellency by one of her preceptors.* He recites ſome ſtanzas of it. We ſhall examine a thought of Scaliger [*P*]. It is a baſe falſehood to ſay, as has been done in a public work, that queen Joan d'Albret contracted a marriage of conſcience with a man, whoſe name is not told; and that d'Aubigné the Hiſtorian was the fruit of that marriage [*Q*]. It is ſaid, that in ſome tapeſtry, which ſhe wrought with her own hands, ſhe

(*ee*) Matthieu, Hiſtory of the Peace, *Tom. ii, pag. m.* 677, *ad ann.* 1604.

(*ff*) Sammarth. Elog. *lib. i, pag. m.* 21.

(*gg*) See the remark [*N*], citation (95).

(*hh*) Biblioth. Françoiſe, *pag.* 144.

celebrated, and bleſſed by an archbiſhop; and yet you ſee the huſband go to Rome ſix months after, only to beg pardon for having ventured to enjoy his wife, and leave to do it for the future: he obtained favour upon very harſh conditions on the firſt point, but the ſecond was rigorouſly and abſolutely denied him. See in the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes (102) the whole train of diſcontents and diſguſts which the princeſs Catherine was obliged to put up with. It had been much better if thoſe who foretold, that ſhe would never be married, had proved true prophets: the anſwer ſhe made them that this time coming, when it was leaſt thought on, would occaſion a moſt agreeable ſurprize (103), was not ſo juſt as ingenious. This maxim could not be better applied, generally ſpeaking; for commonly an old maid, who is paſt all hopes of marriage, receives with joy the news of a huſband: ſhe receives, I ſay, the news with ſo much the more joy, as being unexpected. But the particular fate of the princeſs Catherine contradicted the general rule.

For the reſt, I ſhould be deſirous to know, whether her huſband would have been expoſed to the ſame ſcruples with reſpect to the enjoyments of a handſome concubine, and whether his confeſſor would have been able to govern him in the caſe of adultery, as magiſterially as he governed him in a marriage contracted with an heretical wife. We ſeldom find, that a confeſſor's authority has the ſame effect with reſpect to the gallantries of princes, as was obſerved in the conduct of the duke of Bar. Not but that the miſtreſſes of princes are very liable to be diſcharged, but the confeſſors are very rarely the cauſe of it. Diſguſt, the diſcovery of an unfaithful conduct, or of ſome intrigue, the charms of a new object, commonly produce all the diſgraces of a miſtreſs.

Since the printing of what I have been ſaying, I have diſcovered a thing which confirms the ſuſpicions I had, and which I durſt not declare. It ſeemed to me that the duke of Bar, acted not ſo much out of a ſcruple of conſcience, as out of a deſire he had to be unmarried, becauſe he was grown weary of his wife. This was his true motive, as I have learned from the new edition of cardinal D'Oſſat's letters. That duke's confeſſor inſiſted on the alternative either of a diſpenſation, or of an order to ſend the ducheſs back again (104). Now Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie comments on it thus: 'the duke of Bar covered with the veil of religion and conſcience, the diſlike he had for his wife, whom he did not love, nor was beloved by her. And as he durſt not ſend her back for fear of drawing upon himſelf the diſpleaſure of the king, his brother-in-law; he endeavoured cunningly to engage the Pope to command him to divorce her, that he might lay all the odium on him, and be at liberty to marry another princeſs. But the Pope was wiſer and more cunning than either the duke of Bar, or the Franciſcan, his confeſſor, who, according to the uſual ſaying of his Holineſs would catch a ſerpent with another man's hand (105)'. This author has given a more ample account of it in the life of cardinal D'Oſſat (106), and refutes Mezerai, who, as we have ſeen before, did not believe that the affair of the diſpenſation was ſo difficult.

[*P*] *We will examine a thought of Scaliger.*] 'Madam Catherine, ſiſter to king Henry IV, was very vain; ſhe deceived me, I did not think ſhe would have been ſo conſtant in her religion as ſhe proved to be (107)'. Theſe are Scaliger's words; his diſtruſt was founded upon his having obſerved this lady to be conceited with her grandeur, and entertaining high and lofty thoughts; and it is certain, this might give ſome reaſon to conclude that ſhe would turn to that ſide, where moſt worldy grandeur and advantages appeared; that is to ſay, that ſhe would imitate Henry IV, who, in caſe ſhe would have abjured her religion, would have raiſed her to the higheſt pitch of glory, and have married her to the greateſt advantage in the world; but finding her to perſiſt in Calviniſm, he was obliged, by maxims of ſtate, to neglect her (108). However, as there are different kinds of vanity, or of fondneſs of grandeur, Scaliger's argument might be turned to a quite contrary ſenſe. There are ſome proud and ambitious people, who, to ſatisfy their vanity, ſtoop to an hundred mean actions; but there are others who find no readier way to gratify their paſſion, than to appear inflexible, whatever ill conſequence their ſtiffneſs may draw after it. It is not unuſual to ſee perſons of quality very virtuous, and very zealous for their religion, and at the ſame time ſo jealous of their rank, and ſo fond of receiving a great deal of honour, that they are always upon their punctilios on that account. Madam de Turenne is an example of it. Her virtue and piety are not more memorable, than her exact precautions to preſerve the privileges of highneſs, and the precedence ſhe pretended to above the ducheſſes. Madam Catherine de Navarre might very well be ſeized with this kind of infatuation, as virtuous and pious as ſhe was. How could ſhe, who was deſcended from ſo many kings, who was the only daughter of a queen adored by the Proteſtants, who was ſiſter to their leader, afterwards king of France, forbear aſſuming a ſtrain of grandeur and loftineſs, which Scaliger, and ſeveral others, thought too vain? It ſhould not however have been concluded, as a thing certain, that ſhe would change her religion; for beſides the conſiſtency of this character with a ſtrong perſwaſion of the truth of her party, and an averſion to a religion which perſecuted that ſhe profeſſed, an averſion which, to take it right, very frequently makes up three fourths of the love we have for our religion: beſides this, I ſay, is not pride ſometimes the cauſe of our doing nothing which may expoſe us to the reproaches of inconſtancy? I ſay this, without eſpouſing the narration of Peter Victor Cayet (109): *Madam Catherine* . . . . . *would not change the pretended reformed religion, in which ſhe was bred, for the ſake, as ſhe ſaid, of her deceaſed mother queen Joan of Navarre, to whom ſhe owed her life and the original of her actions: this was one of the cauſes that moſt ſtrongly retained her in that religion, as ſhe many times declared. Beſides, ſhe was apprehenſive of being accuſed of levity in her age, as ſhe ſaid, if ſhe changed her religion, having returned to this, after ſhe had been for ſome time a Catholic.*

[*Q*] *It is a baſe falſehood to ſay* . . . . . *that queen Joan d'Albret contracted a marriage of conſcience* . . . . *whereof d'Aubigné, the Hiſtorian, was the fruit.*] I have read

(102) Hiſt. of the Edict of Nantes, *Tom. i, pag.* 268, *& ſeq.*

(103) See, above, the citations (95) and (96).

(104) Letters of Cardinal d'Oſſat, *Tom. ii. pag.* 251, *Paris edition* 1698.

(105) Amelot de la Houſſaie, Notes on the 247th Letter of cardinal d'Oſſat, *pag.* 251, *Tom. ii.* See alſo *pag.* 173, of the ſame tome.

(106) *Pag.* 30, 31.

(107) Scaligerana, *pag. m.* 46.

(108) See the Hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes, *Tom. i, pag.* 267.

(109) Cayet, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 62.

ſhe affected to ſhew the monuments of that liberty, which ſhe eſteemed herſelf to have acquired by ſhaking off the yoke of the Pope [*R*]. We will conclude with the words of Peter Matthieu (*ii*): ‘She would have the ſafety of conſcience preferred before the aſſurances ‘of honours, grandeur, and life itſelf; and was uſed to ſay to thoſe of her party, ‘that arms ought never to be laid down, but upon theſe three conditions, either of a ‘ſafe peace, or an entire victory, or an honourable death (*kk*).

(*ii*) Matthieu, ibid. *Tom. i, pag. m.* 198, *ad ann.* 1599.

(*kk*) Here follows Peter Matthieu's marginal note, *Joan d'Albret, queen of Navarre, cauſed twelve medals to be ſtruck at Rochelle with this inſcription*, Safe Peace. Intire Victory. Honourable Death. *See the Journal of Trevoux, Jan.* 1702, *Art. XI, pag.* 122, *Edit. of France.*

---

read in a book printed more than once (110), that *a Genealogiſt had orders to make Madam de Maintenon deſcend from Joan d'Albret queen of Navarre, who, after the death of the king her huſband, married ſecretly to one of her gentlemen, who was, as is pretended, the father of Mr d'Aubigné, grand-father of Madam de Maintenon.* To confute this ſtory undeniably, we need only attend to theſe two points of Chronology; one is, that the king of Navarre, Joan d'Albret's huſband, died not till November 1562: the other, that Mr d'Aubigné was born in 1550, as appears by his epitaph (111), which every one may read in the Cloiſter of St Peter's church at Geneva. He made this epitaph himſelf a little before his death, at eighty years of age, and died the twenty-ninth of April 1630; whence it follows, that he was born in 1550. He ſays ſo himſelf in expreſs words, at the beginning of his Hiſtory (112). It is not therefore poſſible that he ſhould be the ſon of Joan d'Albret, and of a man married to this queen after the death of Antony king of Navarre. There is in the Mercure Galant for the month of September 1688, a Genealogy of the d'Aubignés. If you conſult it, you will find no ſhadow nor foot-ſtep of this pretended extraction, related by the author, whom I am confuting. If, in his excuſe, it ſhould be ſaid, that it ought to be Margaret inſtead of Joan, this would be as groſs a miſtake; for Margaret queen of Navarre, Joan's mother, died (113) before the king her huſband, and before d'Aubigné was born. If we take the thing by another handle, and ſuppoſe him to be the natural ſon of the king of Navarre, Joan's father, this could not be confuted by Chronological arguments, ſince it is certain this prince died not till 1555, and that he had a miſtreſs (114). But it might be overthrown, by what d'Aubigné has written concerning his father (115).

Having confuted the falſities inſerted in the Galantries of the kings of France, it is neceſſary to touch upon a ſort of tradition, which makes Joan d'Albret to be clandeſtinely re-married, but not without the approbation of her miniſters; to whom ſhe confeſſed, as it is ſaid, that ſhe could not contain. I never heard this affirmed but by ſuch as had no ſort of proof to alledge: This made me one day aſk an advocate, very well verſed in the Hiſtorians of the XVIth century, whether he had met with any thing relating to this fact in the libels ſpread about by the Catholics againſt this queen of Navarre: he anſwered, he had not; but that he had not read all the pieces of that kind, nor the greateſt part of them; but otherwiſe, he found nothing in it improbable, nor injurious to the memory and honour of Joan d'Albret; that continence and incontinence, being rather qualities of conſtitution, than of morality, it was not the acknowledgment of a vice, to confeſs ſhe was incontinent, and reſolved only to make uſe of lawful remedies; that ſuch a reſolution joins chaſtity and incontinence together; and whereas many miniſters of that time, the better to manage their diſputes againſt the vow of celibacy, had treated of continence as of a very particular, and even extraordinary, grace of the ſpirit of GOD, it was no more a ſhame for the queen of Navarre to acknowledge her incontinence, than for a primitive Chriſtian to confeſs he had not the gift of tongues or prophecy; and that, laſtly, it was to the glory of this princeſs to have had ſo tender a conſcience, as not to ſuffer her to ſatisfy the neceſſities of nature by ways which the word of GOD prohibits. I anſwered him if he had no other reaſons to alledge, he could not deliver me from my doubts; and that I only conſulted him to know whether he had any printed or manuſcript authorities; and that ſince he had none, it was to no purpoſe to talk any more upon the ſubject. I have not from that time found any light, and I confeſs, that, in compoſing this article, I have not been able to conſult any work, in which Joan d'Albret's actions are cenſured. However it be I much doubt the truth of that tradition, or rather believe it to be falſe.

I have found no foot-ſtep of it in Mr le Laboureur, who is one of the French Hiſtoriographers beſt acquainted with ſuch ſort of particulars. He knew that this queen made *an extempore ſtanza the twenty firſt of May* 1566, *when ſhe went to ſee Robert Stephens's preſs* (116). He gives it thus:

Art ſingulier, d'icy aux derniers ans,
Repreſentez aux enfans de ma race,
Que j'ai ſuivi des craignans Dieu la trace,
Afin qu'ils ſoient les meſmes pas ſuivans.

Egregious art! thou wonder of our age!
Shew my deſcendants in thy printed page,
How boldly in religion's path I trod,
That they from me might learn to fear their GOD.

He alſo gives us the ſonnet, which Robert Stephens (117) *who was a Proteſtant, made in anſwer to it in the name of the preſs.* He has likewiſe publiſhed at length a long letter this lady wrote to the prince, her ſon, the eighth of March 1572 (118). I have cited ſome part of it in the remark [*M*]. He obſerves *that, among other languages, ſhe ſpoke Latin and Spaniſh* (119). But he ſays nothing of this clandeſtine marriage. For the reſt I doubt not but this ſtanza, and the letter he has inſerted in his book, were the occcaſion of Mr Moreri's ſaying, that Joan d'Albret *compoſed ſeveral pieces in proſe and in verſe.* This is making an author of her and miſleading us; for the letters that a prince writes, let them be never ſo fine, are not looked upon as the compoſition of an author (120), unleſs they receive the form of a book, deſigned for the Republic of letters.

[*R*] *It is ſaid that in ſome tapeſtry . . . . ſhe affected to ſhew the monuments of that liberty, which ſhe eſteemed herſelf to have acquired by ſhaking off the yoke of the Pope.*] I have no other commentary to give beſides the words of a Jeſuit. *As ſhe naturally had a fine, curious, and intelligent mind, ſays he,* (121), *ſhe deſired to ſhew not only with her pen in printed books, which are intituled the Tales of queen Joan* (122), *the liberty which ſhe pretended to take according to her own belief; but alſo with the point of her needle on canvas and in tapeſtry; for as ſhe very much loved devices, ſhe wrought with her own hand fine and large pieces of tapeſtry, among which was a ſuit of hangings of a dozen or fifteen pieces, which were called* THE PRISONS OPENED; *by which ſhe gave us to underſtand that ſhe had broken the Pope's bonds, and ſhook off his yoke of captivity. In the middle of every piece is a ſtory of the Old Teſtament which ſavours of liberty; as the deliverance of Suſannah; the departure of the children of Iſrael out of Egypt; the ſetting Joſeph at liberty,* &c. *And at all the corners are broken chains, ſhackles, racks, and gibbets, and over them in great letters, theſe words of the third chapter of the ſecond epiſtle to the Corinthians,* UBI SPIRITUS IBI LIBERTAS. *And to ſhew yet more fully the averſion, ſhe had conceived againſt the Catholic religion, and particularly againſt the ſacrifice of the maſs, having a fine and excellent piece of tapeſtry, made by her mother Margaret, before ſhe had ſuffered herſelf to be cajolled by the miniſters, in which was perfectly well wrought the ſacrifice of the maſs, and a prieſt, who held out the holy Hoſt to the people, ſhe took out the ſquare in which was this hiſtory; and inſtead of the prieſt, with her own hand, ſubſtituted a fox, who, turning to the people, and making an horrible grimace with his paws and throat, delivered theſe words,* DOMINUS VOBISCUM. The ſame thing is found in the continuator of Florimond de Remond (123) at the fifth and ſixth pages of the ninth book.

(110) Galantries of the Kings of France, *Tom. ii, pag.* 293. *Bruſſels Edit.* 1694, *and pag.* 84, *of the Cologne edition* 1695.

(111) It is in Spon's Hiſtory of Geneva, *pag.* 504, 505, of the Utrecht edition 1685.

(112) In the middle of the XVIth century, the year from which both the book and the author take their birth. *D'Aubigné, pag.* 1.

(113) In December 1549.

(114) Mr de Perefixe, Hiſt. of Henry IV, *pag. m.* 15, *obſerves, that in* 1553, Joan d'Albret had a great deſire to ſee her father's will, becauſe it had been told her, that it was made to her diſadvantage in favour of a lady, the good man had been in love with.

(115) See his Hiſtory, in the places marked in the table, under the word *Aubigné, the author's father.*

(116) Le Laboureur, Additions to Caſtelnau, *Tom. i, pag.* 901.

(117) This could not be Robert Stephens, Henry's father, but Henry's brother.

(118) Addit. à Caſtelnau, *Tom. i, pag.* 902, & *ſeq.*

(119) Ibid. *pag.* 901.

(120) Confer above, remark [C] of the article CHARLES V.

(121) Garaſſe, Curious Doctrine, *pag.* 225, 226.

(122) I believe that it is a falſity, and that Joan d'Albret queen of Navarre, is miſtaken for Margaret de Valois, ſiſter of Francis I.

(123) Claude Malingre, General Hiſtory of the Progreſs and Fall of Modern Hereſy.

NAVARRE (MARGARET DE VALOIS QUEEN OF) daughter-in-law to the preceding, and daughter to Henry II, was born the fourteenth of May 1552 [*A*]. She was a princeſs of infinitely more wit and beauty than virtue. Her violent zeal for Popery, whereof ſhe gave very ſtrong proofs from her infancy [*B*], was of no ſervice to her, as to good morals. She was married to the king of Navarre the eighteenth of Auguſt 1572, a few days before the horrid maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day. They attempted ſoon after to diſſolve this marriage; for they who had formed the conſpiracy of butchering the Proteſtants, were diſpleaſed at the the ſaving the lives of the king of Navarre, and the prince of Condé (*a*): they found by this that they *had failed in their principal deſign, which was not ſo much againſt the Huguenots as the princes of the blood*; *and knowing that* the king of Navarre, being married to Charles the ninth's *ſiſter*, *no body would attempt any thing againſt him, they contrived another plot*, and perſuaded Catherine de Medicis that the princeſs Margaret *ought to be unmarried* (*b*). This deſign miſcarried by the anſwer the new bride made when ſhe was aſked, whether her marriage had been conſummated [*C*].

Her

[*A*] *She was born the fourteenth of May* 1552.] Hilarion de Coſte, citing du Tillet, makes this her birth-day: and ſo does Father Labbe, Father Anſelme, and many others. There is reaſon therefore to believe that ſhe was above ſeven years old in June 1559, and yet ſhe affirms (1); that ſhe was *but about four or five* when ſhe made a repartee to the king her father, who held *her in his lap to make her prattle*, a few days *before that fatal blow which gave him his death* (2). She ſuppoſes the ſame thing when ſhe ſays, that in 1561, at the time of the conference of Poiſſi, ſhe was but *ſeven or eight years old* (3). It is very ſtrange that a daughter of a king of France ſhould be miſtaken two years in the account of her age: can princeſſes be ignorant of what every body knows, when their birth-days are noted in the almanacks, in the copper-cuts of the picture-ſellers, and in adundance of common books; or dare they make themſelves younger than they are? this little piece of coquetry may be of uſe to citizens daughters, who cannot eaſily be contradicted; but it can be of none to the daughters of kings. It ſeems however, that our queen of Navarre was ſo uſed to leſſen her age, that by habit ſhe obſerved the ſame ſtile in compoſing her Memoirs.

[*B*] *She gave very ſtrong proofs of her zeal to Popery from her infancy.*] The particulars ſhe gives us of it are very curious, and contain a ſample of the whimſical inconſtancy of Henry III. Never man had more averſion for the Huguenots than this monarch, and yet he had zealouſly imbibed their notions, and endeavoured to make them reliſhed by others. Our Margaret thinks (4) that among her *childiſh actions*, there were ſome, *as worthy to be recorded, as that of the childhood of Themiſtocles* (5) *and of Alexander*; *the one expoſing himſelf in the midſt of the ſtreet to the horſes feet of a carman, who would not ſtop at his requeſt*; *the other deſpiſing the honour of the prize at the race, if he did not diſpute it with kings.* To prove this, ſhe alledges amongſt other things, the *reſiſtance I made*, ſays ſhe (6), ‘to preſerve my religion at the time of the conference of Poiſſi, when all the court was infected with Hereſy, to the imperious perſuaſions of many court lords and ladies, and even of my brother of Anjou (7), who was afterwards king of France, whoſe infancy could not eſcape the contagion of wretched Huguenotiſm, who importuned me continually to change my religion, often throwing my Primmer into the fire, and inſtead of it giving me the Huguenots pſalms and prayers, and forcing me to take them; which, as ſoon as I had received, I immediately gave to Madam de Curton, my governeſs, whom GOD of his mercy to me had been pleaſed to preſerve a Catholic, who took me often to the good man, cardinal de Tournon, who adviſed and encouraged me to ſuffer all things for the maintenance of my religion, and ſupplyed me with a primmer and beads, inſtead of thoſe my brother of Anjou had burnt. And his other particular friends, who had endeavoured to ruin me, finding them about me, paſſionately reproached me, ſaying, it was folly and childhood made me do ſo; that it was plain I had no underſtanding; that all people of ſenſe, of whatever age or ſex, upon hearing charity preached had forſaken the corruptions of this bigottry: but that I was as fooliſh as my governeſs. And my brother of Anjou adding threatnings, ſaid, the queen, my mother, would have me whipped. This he ſaid of his own head, for the queen, my mother, knew not of the error he was fallen into. As ſoon as ſhe underſtood it, ſhe ſeverely reprimanded him and his governors; and cauſing them to be inſtructed, conſtrained them to reſume the true, holy, and antient religion of our fathers, from which ſhe had never once departed. I anſwered theſe his menaces, melting into tears, as the age of ſeven or eight years which I was then of is but tender, that he might cauſe me to be whipped, and killed, if he pleaſed; that I would ſuffer all that could be inflicted on me, rather than damn myſelf.’ Add, that, by reaſon of the difference of religion, ſhe was very much averſe to the marrying Henry IV. We ſhall prove this by a very curious paſſage: I take it from a letter written to this prince. *She told me*, it is Joan d'Albret who ſpeaks concerning our Margaret, *that when theſe propoſals were ſet on foot, it was known that ſhe was a Catholic, and a zealous one. I told her that thoſe who had engaged in it, did not ſay ſo; and that the buſineſs of religion was repreſented very eaſy, and that ſhe herſelf had ſome affection for it; that otherwiſe I ſhould not have proceeded ſo far, and I deſired her to conſider of it. At other times that I ſpoke to her, ſhe did not anſwer me ſo abſolutely, nor ſo roughly. I believe ſhe ſpeaks as ſhe is prompted, and alſo that the declarations that have been made to us, concerning her liking to the Proteſtant religion, were only to make us agree to it* (8).

[*C*] *The anſwer the new bride made when ſhe was aſked whether her marriage had been conſummated.*] We ſhall make uſe of queen, Margaret's own relation. ‘They would perſuade the queen, my mother, that I ought to be unmarried. With this reſolution, as I was one holy-day at her levee, where we were to perform our Eaſter devotions, ſhe preſſed me upon oath to tell her the truth; and aſked me whether the king, my huſband, was a man, ſaying, if he was not, ſhe had it in her power to unmarry me. I beſeeched her to believe, that I was not ſufficiently ſkilled to give her an anſwer. (For I could then ſay, as that Roman lady, whom her huſband chid for not acquainting him with his ſtinking breath; that ſhe thought all men had the ſame, having never come near any other than himſelf.) But be it as it would, I would abide where ſhe had placed me; very much apprehending, that the deſign of taking me away, was to do him an ill turn (9).’ It is not probable, that this princeſs could ſincerely hold ſuch diſcourſe. She was above twenty years old; ſhe had been bred in a court every way corrupt, and particularly in the article of immodeſty (10). Obſerve how a man of wit (11) characterizes this court, *Saint André .... maid of honour to Catherine de Medicis, is of ſo tractable a virtue, that the prince of Joinville will teach her nothing new in marrying her. This is not a thing*, continued he, *which ought to ſurprize you; ſhe is handſome, educated amongſt the great ones, where example is ſome ſort of authority; ſhe is almoſt ſixteen years of age: this is an age, in which the honour of a maid begins to enjoy it's rights: we ſee even very few who carry their continence ſo far; and good ſenſe will not ſuffer you to wonder at a thing that cuſtom has rendered ſo familiar. But, couſin, here is ſomething that ought to ſurprize you*, &c. Judge whether our Margaret was like to remain in an ignorance, which the chaſteſt of all the veſtals, and the holieſt of all the nuns, in the moſt ſimple and innocent ages, could hardly boaſt, conſult what has been ſaid above (12). But to prove that her account is unfaithful, and that ſhe has retrenched ſeveral circumſtances; it is ſufficient to ſay, that

her

(*a*) Memoirs of queen Margaret, *pag.* 66, *Paris edition* 1628.

(*b*) Ib. *pag.* 67.

(1) Memoirs of queen Margaret, *pag.* 7.

(2) He received this blow in a tournament the thirtieth of June 1559.

(3) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 12.

(4) Ib. *pag.* 7.

(5) *It is of Alcibiades, and not of Themiſtocles, that this was ſaid.* *See* Plutarch in Alcibiade, *pag.* 192. *D.*

(6) Memoirs, ubi. ſupra, *pag.* 9, *& ſeq.*

(7) See the remark [*B*] of the article CIPIERE.

(8) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 904.

(9) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 67, 68.

(10) See, above, the remark [*M*] of the preceding article.

(11) The author of a romance, intituled, *The Prince of Condé*, *pag.* 32, *Holl. Edit.* 1681.

(12) Remark [*A*] of the article GONZAGUA (ISABELLA DE).

Her anſwer is very different from the calumnies that are to be met with in printed books [*D*]. She was advertiſed by a Catholic gentleman named Mioſſans (*c*), that her huſband, and her brother, the duke of Alençon, deſigned to eſcape, and put themſelves at the head of ſome troops, whilſt the court, who had accompained the duke of Anjou king of Poland as far as Beaumont, were on their return to Paris. She diſcovered this deſign to Catherine de Medicis, and Charles IX, and made them promiſe to be contented with preventing their eſcape without doing any injury to theſe two princes. They kept their word with her till the conſpiracy was known, for which *la Mole and the count de Coconas* loſt their lives; but after this diſcovery they arreſted them, *and commiſſioners were deputed to try them* (*d*). Margaret *drew up in writing what* her huſband *was to anſwer.* She was at very ill terms with Henry III, and at very good with her other brother the duke of Alençon. This duke and the king of Navarre were in love with Madam de Sauve, which very much weakned the union there was between them. Buſſy, the duke's favourite, grew ſuſpected of being Margaret's galant, and this princeſs was

her mother was not a woman to be ſatisfied with ſo ambiguous and oblique an anſwer. Catherine de Medicis being reſolved to diſſolve the marriage, in caſe it had not been conſummated, would have put, or cauſed to have been put, a ſecond queſtion, which would have capacitated her daughter to explain the matter, and ſufficiently inſtructed her for it, in ſpite of that profound and very extraordinary ignorance ſhe intrenched herſelf in. She would have taught her the definition of a man, not by the attributes of a rational creature, as in the books of Philoſophers, but by the particular attributes, belonging to the individual or ſpecifical relation of a huſband; and afterwards would have exactly compared with this definition, all the paſſages which had happened in her nuptial-bed. You ſay, you do not underſtand what a man is, be it ſo; but you very well remember whether, &c. Has the king of Navarre, &c? anſwer ay, or no. Thus Catherine de Medicis would have preſſed, or cauſed to have been preſſed this pretended ignorant lady; and, though her daughter had continued to declare that ſhe did not know how the affair in queſtion could be known by ſuch ſigns or marks, yet ſhe would not have failed to reſolve the queſtion, and give full ſatisfaction to the queen-mother. But as lame as her narration is, we may infer from it, that Catherine de Medicis was fully convinced by her daughter's anſwer, that there was not the leaſt ground to commence a proceſs of impotence againſt her ſon-in-law. I do not think that any one ever ventured to ſay, that the marriage was not conſummated; and yet this reaſon would have been one of the ſtrongeſt among thoſe that were ſo carefully collected, when they proceeded to declare the marriage null. Let us here ſet down a paſſage of the *Satirical Divorce*. *This manifeſto* (it is Henry IV, who is made to ſpeak) (13), *will one day inform the lovers of truth what I was willing to conceal, out of modeſty to our holy Father, and cardinal Joyeuſe, his commiſſioner, deputed to hear me upon the ſubject of our divorce; not having on the twenty two articles of his interrogatory anſwered any thing that might look like ſcandal or diſhonour, unleſs perhaps on that wherein he enquired, whether ever, during the marriage, we had any commerce together: to which I anſwered, conſtrained by truth, that we were both ſo young, when we were married, and ſo laſcivious, that it was impoſſible to forbear.* That which is ſaid of Margaret's conſtitution very well agrees with the hiſtory of her adventures. Now there is nothing more proper than that ſort of complexion to awaken a certain curioſity, which very ſoon expels the ignorance ſhe pretended to boaſt of: it is a curioſity which has ſuch ſudden effects as to amaze the whole world. Read theſe words of the count de Buſſi: *you have heard of the paſſion of . . . . for her huſband when ſhe married him. This they ſay is much changed. The little lady can no longer bear him. It is ſaid in her excuſe*: that which appears of the man, is not the man. *And this makes every body inquiſitive, how a young maid of thirteen or fourteen years of age, came to learn what was requiſite to make a man, to be a man* (14).

[*D*] *Her anſwer was very different from the calumnies that are to be met with in printed books.*] What a vaſt difference there is betwixt Margaret's own relation of her conduct, and what others have publiſhed of it. She pretends to the ignorance of a child, upon the theory of marriage; and might have been impoſed upon, according to her own ſtory, and ſhe never the wiſer. But caſt your eyes a little upon theſe words of the Satirical Divorce; in which, as I have already ſaid, Henry IV, is introduced ſpeaking. 'I was not able to avoid my misfortune, tho' king Charles, who reigned at that time, who well knew his ſiſter's temper, gave me ſome intimation of it under this prophecy, when aſſuring the Huguenots of a pretended peace, to allure and deceive them, he proteſted with a thouſand oaths, that he gave not his Marget for a wife only to the king of Navarre, but to all the Heretics of his kingdom. Oh the prophecy, too full of truth and worthy a holy and divine inſpiration! If it had been general inſtead of particular, and in the room of the Huguenots only: had comprehended all mankind; for there is no ſort nor quality of men in all France, with whom this wretch has not exerciſed her laſciviouſneſs; nothing comes amiſs to her pleaſures, and ſhe values not age, greatneſs, nor extraction, provided her luſts be ſatisfied and ſatiated; and never ſince ſhe was eleven years old, has ſhe denied any body: at which age Antragues and Charins (for they both of them thought they had firſt obtained this favour,) had the firſt-fruits of her heat; which augmenting daily, and they being unable to extinguiſh it, tho' Antragues made an effort, which afterwards ſhortened his life, ſhe caſt her eye on Martigues, and fixed it there ſo long, as to liſt him under her banner, and they were both ſo public in it, that it was the common diſcourſe and converſation of all the ſoldiers in the army, where Martigues was known as well as his valour, as colonel of foot (15).' It is added, that after Martigues's death, *the duke of Guiſe was obliged to go through her hands, by the mediation of Madam de Carnavalet, a young, brave, and ambitious prince, who already beginning to build that machine, which being too ſuddenly ſhaken, will fall upon him, expected from his laſcivious embraces to have procured a marriage, and thereby fortified his pretences and deſigns, having dexterouſly broke off her treaty of marriage with the king of Portugal, already far advanced . . . . She quickly after added her young brothers to her ſalacious conqueſts; one of whom, namely Francis, continued this inceſt all his life; and Henry grew ſo out of conceit with her, that he could never love her afterwards, having at length perceived, that years, inſtead of cooling her deſires, augmented her fury, and that, being moveable as Mercury, ſhe ſhook at the leaſt object that approached her. Here is a virgin for you! which my relations and the public good obliged me to take for good and virtuous, to the great mortification of herſelf and her favourites; amongſt whom Antragues, as the marſhal de Retz formerly told me, was like to dye of grief, or of a loſs of blood, which the violence of his anguiſh to ſee us married forced out in ſeveral places* (16). If you would ſee another teſtimony, read the firſt dialogue of Euſebius Philadelphus Coſmopolita, where you will find this paſſage at the forty fourth page of the Edinburgh edition 1574 (17). *Hereupon the king pretended to be vexed with ſo many delays, blaſpheming and raging, ſwore, that he would have the marriage conſummated without more ado: that if cardinal de Bourbon would not marry them, he would lead them himſelf to a Huguenot, meaning to have them married by a miniſter; and that, by Chriſt, he would not have his Marget (for ſo he called his ſiſter) kept any longer in this languiſhing condition:*

Ali. The good lady took care not to ſtay ſo long: her brother very well knew that he had her maidenhead.

Hiſt.

(*c*) Ib. *pag.* 69.

(*d*) Ib. *pag.* 74.

(13) Satirical Divorce, among the pieces printed with the Journal of Henry III, *pag. m.* 206, 207.

(14) Buſſi, Letter 316, of the fourth part, *pag.* 421, of the Holl. Edit.

(15) Satirical Divorce, *pag.* 189.

(16) Ibid. *pag.* 190.

(17) Reveille-matin des François & de leurs voiſins, *pag.* 44; *the interlocutors are Philalithia, Alithia, and the Hiſtoriographer.*

was obliged to ſend away Mademoiſelle de Torigni her confident [*E*]. She took this very heinouſly, as what might bring a great *ſcandal on her reputation* (*e*), and declared her reſentment to her huſband, who for his part had but little regard for her (*f*). *They neither lay together, nor converſed with each other.* She knew the reſolution her huſband and brother had taken to depart from court. Her brother was the firſt who made his eſcape (*g*): her huſband did the ſame ſoon after without taking leave of his wife (*h*). Henry III, imagining that ſhe would go and join them, or that if ſhe was left at liberty at court, ſhe would be their ſpy, arreſted her. She received very obliging letters from her huſband, and ſome civilities from the king her brother, who was obliged to act in that manner, becauſe the duke of Alençon would not diſarm, unleſs ſhe was ſatisfied. She accompanied the queen, her mother, to the conferences, that were held near Sens, and where was concluded (*i*) the treaty of peace with the duke of Alençon. After this ſhe deſired to retire to the king her huſband, who earneſtly demanded her, but Henry III, refuſed to give her leave (*k*). Under the falſe pretence of an indiſpoſition ſhe took a journey to the Spaw waters, in order to favour the deſign that had been put into the duke of Alençon's head of getting himſelf elected ſovereign of the Netherlands. Being returned into France, ſhe teſtified afreſh her deſire to go to her huſband. It was conſented to at laſt, and the queen, her mother, conducted her to the king of Navarre (*l*). Who came to receive them at la Reolle (*m*), and paid great regard to his wife during the ſtay of Catherine de Medicis in Gaſcogny (*n*). They attended her as far as Caſtelnaudarri, on her return; and afterwards went to reſide at Pau in Bearn, where they quickly fell out, both on account of Margaret's preſſing her huſband to diſgrace a ſecretary, and alſo on account of the Galantries he engaged in [*F*]. The reaſon of her demanding this ſecretary's

(*e*) Ib. *pag.* 119.

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) In 1576.

(*h*) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 129.

(*i*) In 1576.

(*k*) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 157, 162.

(*l*) In the year 1578.

(*m*) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 313.

(*n*) Ib. *pag.* 315.

Hiſt. I did not know that; but I have heard ſay, that ſhe was ready to lye-in, when the queen was at Xainctes.

Ali. It is ſo, I aſſure you.

[*E*] *She was obliged to ſend away Mademoiſelle de Torigni her confident.*] Le Guaſt, Henry the third's favourite, repreſented to him, *that he ought not to ſuffer young princeſſes to have maids, with whom they had ſuch a particular friendſhip* (18), and ſo fully convinced him of that maxim, that this prince declared to the king of Navarre, *that he would never love him him more*, if Mrs Torigni was not removed *the next day* (19). The king of Navarre was therefore forced to deſire his wife, and even *to command her* to diſmiſs this maid. The queen of Navarre did not obey without the greateſt reluctance. Mrs Torigni *departed the ſame day*, and retired to her couſin, Mr Chaſtelas (20). The king, ſome time after, *to give* his ſiſter *the cruelleſt mortification imaginable*, ſent ſome people to Chaſtelas's houſe, *under pretence of taking Mrs Torigni, and bringing* her to court, *to drown her in a river hard by* (21): but ſome gentlemen, who went to join the duke of Alençon, delivered her (22). We may affirm, generally ſpeaking, that the principle which Guaſt reaſoned upon, is good; for princeſſes could never ſucceed in any intrigue of galantry, if they had not their chamber-confidents: and it is a ground of ſuſpicion to ſee much intimacy between them and their waiting-maids. A great lady deſires to be waited on in form, and is uneaſy, and chides, if the the leaſt punctillio be wanting. This is the way to be little beloved by her domeſtics. Liberality itſelf is not a very certain means of procuring their affection, unleſs it be attended with careſſes and civilities. But a lady ſeldom ſtoops ſo low, unleſs in ſome certain caſes of neceſſity, in which ſhe has occaſion for the diſcretion and mediation of her women. Careſſes are not then ſpared; opening the heart to them, and treating them with reſpect and familiarity then diſpoſe theſe inferiors to love their ſuperiors, *Facinus quos inquinat, æquat* (23), - - - *An ill deſign levels the undertakers.* Thoſe ladies muſt be excepted from this rule, who, by a prudent conduct, have obtained an unexceptionable reputation: but as our queen of Navarre was none of thoſe, it cannot be thought ſtrange, that her intimacy with Mrs Torigni were ſuſpected by Henry III. It is a point of nice policy in a king to place about his children not ſuch perſons as aſpire to be confidents, but ſuch as are contented with being honeſt ſpies. And therefore ſuch people are generally made uſe of, and others removed who anſwer not thoſe intentions. Once more, Henry III would not have been to blame in following the counſel which was given him, if he had only aimed at reforming his ſiſter, and removing from her ſome evil inſtruments; but the violence he uſed was inexcuſable: he would have drowned the confident; and from thence it may be ſuſpected that his motives were criminal. He was willing to ſatisfy his jealouſy; he was enraged that his brother poſſeſſed the heart of queen Margaret. Common fame makes them both to love her criminally, and to have been beloved by her one after the other; but, that at laſt, ſhe gave the preference to the younger, and not to the right of elderſhip: a right, that looſe women pay very little regard to (24).

[*F*] *She and her huſband fell out . . . on account of the galantries he engaged in.*] The paſſion he had for Dayelle, maid of honour to Catherine de Medicis (25), did not embroil him with his wife. But when queen Catherine was gone, he began to ſeek out Rebours, *who was a malicious young creature that could not abide Margaret, but did her all the ill offices ſhe could* with her huſband (26). She remained ſick at Pau, when the king of Navarre left it; and, as with this prince, it was, *out of ſight, out of mind, he began to engage with Mrs Foſſeuſe* (27). The Duke of Alençon alſo fell in love with her (28). *This had like to have excited* the king of Navarre *to break* with his wife: for he believed, that *ſhe did good offices to her brother againſt him*; which, when *ſhe underſtood, ſhe was ſo importunate with her brother* to deſiſt, that he ſpoke no more to Foſſeuſe. The later, to remove from the king of Navarre, whom ſhe extreamly loved, his jealouſy of the duke of Alençon, *gave herſelf up ſo entirely to oblige him in every thing he deſired, that ſhe had the misfortune* to prove with child. *Finding herſelf in this condition, ſhe quite altered her behaviour to me,* (it is queen Margaret who ſpeaks) (29); *and whereas ſhe uſed to appear without any reſerve, and to do me all the good offices ſhe could with my huſband, ſhe began to conceal herſelf from me, and do me as many bad offices as good ones ſhe had before done. She ſo poſſeſſed the king, my huſband, that in a little time I perceived him quite altered. He grew out of humour, and reſerved, and my preſence was no longer ſo agreeable to him, as it had been for the four or five happy years I had ſpent with him in Gaſcogny, whilſt Foſſeuſe behaved herſelf there with honour.* She relates afterwards, that Foſſeuſe put it into the king of Navarre's head, *for a cloak to her big belly, or at leaſt to get rid of it, to go to the hot-well waters at Bearn.* This prince *earneſtly preſſed his* queen to *go thither*, telling her, *that his daughter (for ſo he called Foſſeuſe) had occaſion to drink the waters for a diſorder ſhe had in her ſtomach, and that there was no probability ſhe would go thither without her miſtreſs, and that this would occaſion ſuſpicion where there was no reaſon for it.* All that he could obtain, was, *that two of her companions ſhould go with her, Rebours, and Villeſavin, and the governeſs. They went with her; and I,* ſays queen Margaret (30), *ſtaid at Baviere* (31). *I heard every day from Rebours, (who was a corrupt and deceitful creature, that he had loved, and only deſired to exclude Foſſeuſe, in hopes to ſucceed her in the favour of the king my huſband) that Foſſeuſe did me all the ill offices ſhe could, commonly abuſing me, and perſuading herſelf that if ſhe had a ſon, and could make away with me, ſhe ſhould marry the king . . . . At a month or five weeks end, we*

returned

(18) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 117.

(19) Ibid. *pag.* 118.

(20) Ibid. *pag.* 119.

(21) Ibid. *pag.* 131.

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 135.

(23) Lucan. Pharſ. lib. V, ver. 290.

(24) The author of the romance, intituled, *The Prince of Condé*, ſuppoſes, *pag.* 120, that this prince being beloved by the mareſchal de St André's lady, who had refuſed the heart of the king of Navarre, the king told that lady, *I plainly ſee that the being my younger brother by ſeven or eight years, is a conſiderable recommendation to your favour.*

(25) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 314.

(26) Ib. *p.* 321.

(27) Ib. *p.* 322.

(28) Ib. *p.* 346.

(29) Ib. *p.* 347.

(30) Ib. *p.* 350.

(31) It ſhould be at Bagnieres.

ſecretary's diſgrace, deſerves to be known, and will give occaſion to obſerve the unjuſt extravagance of thoſe who allow no toleration [*G*]. The war began afreſh againſt the Proteſtants, and proved not very advantageous to the king of Navarre. The queen his wife obtained, that the city of Nerac, where ſhe reſided, *ſhould enjoy a neutrality, and that no hoſtilities ſhould be committed within three leagues of it:* ſhe obtained this, I ſay, *upon condition*

returned to Nerac, where finding that every body talked of Foſſeuſe's being with child, and that it was not only the common converſation in our court, but all round the country; I was reſolved to try if I could ſuppreſs this rumour, and ſpeak with her about it (32). The queen made her the offer of her aſſiſtance, and to *do her the office of a mother* (33), that is, to remove her to ſome remote lodging; and whilſt the king ſhould go a hunting another way, *not to ſtir from her till ſhe was delivered. She, inſtead of thanking me, with an extream arrogance ſaid, ſhe would make all thoſe liars, who had reported it; that for ſome time I had not loved her, and only ſought a pretence to ruin her: And, ſpeaking as high as I had ſpoke low to her, ſhe flies in a paſſion from my cloſet, and went to fetch thither the king my huſband; ſo that he was very angry with me for what I had mentioned to his daughter, ſaying, ſhe ſhould make all her accuſers liars; and kept his countenance with me a long time, even for ſome months, till the time of her delivery. As ſhe was taken in the morning at break of day, lying in the chamber of the maids of honour, ſhe ſent for my Phyſician, and deſired him to go and acquaint the king my huſband; which he did. We lay in the ſame chamber, in different beds, according to our cuſtom. As the Phyſician told him this news, he was in great trouble, not knowing what to do, fearing on the one hand that ſhe would be diſcovered, and on the other, that ſhe would be ill aſſiſted, for he loved her very much. He reſolved at laſt to confeſs the whole to me, and prayed me to go to her aſſiſtance* (34) . . . *I told him . . . that I would go, and do as much for her as if ſhe was my daughter; that in the mean time he ſhould go a hunting, and carry all the people abroad, that no body might hear of it. I quickly got her removed out of the maid's chamber, into a diſtant one, with my Phyſician and women to aſſiſt her, and had her well taken care of. As* GOD *would have it, ſhe brought only a daughter, and that ſtill-born. Being delivered, ſhe was carried back to her chamber; where, tho' all poſſible diſcretion was uſed, the report could not be prevented from being ſpread all over the caſtle. The king my huſband returning from hunting, went to ſee her, as he uſed to do. She deſired him that I would come and viſit her as I uſed to do all my maids when they were ſick, thinking by that means to ſtifle the report. The king coming into my chamber, found me laid upon the bed, being weary with riſing ſo early, and with the pains I had taken to aſſiſt her. He deſired me to riſe and go and ſee her. I told him, that I had done this when ſhe had occaſion for my help, but that at preſent there was nothing more to do for her; that if I went, I ſhould rather diſcover than conceal the matter, and that all the world would point at me; he was very angry with me, and what diſpleaſed me moſt was, that I thought I did not deſerve this recompence for what I had done in the morning. She often put him into ſuch humours as theſe againſt me* (35).

We have ſeen elſewhere (36), that Andromache, the valiant Hector's wife, was ſo complaiſant and obliging, as to give ſuck to her huſband's baſtards. But here you ſee a queen of Navarre, who was almoſt as good-natured; ſhe almoſt did the office of Midwife to her huſband's miſtreſſes. We muſt confeſs, that thoſe who have ſo much blamed this prince's conjugal patience, ſhould have conſidered that he of all men leaſt deſerved a faithful ſpouſe, and that his conduct would have been able to ſpoil the beſt diſpoſitions to virtue in his wife. A certain author has ſaid, *that in the ordinary cauſes of ſeparation, the blame is laid upon the wife, but that the huſband is often the cauſe of the wife's being to blame* (37). This may be ſaid in part of Henry IV. How little is he in this place of queen Margaret's Memoirs! He is here much more little, than he is great on ſome other occaſions. For a king, for the leader of a great party, making head againſt the Guiſes, and the whole court of France, to go away to the bath with a young lady he has got with child; to be angry with his wife, who was willing to inform herſelf of this big belly, the better to conceal it; to cry it is a calumny againſt a maid, whoſe innocence time would diſcover; to go a little while after, and humbly entreat his wife to aſſiſt her in her labour, are meanneſſes below the ſtation of a tradeſman.

[*G*] *The reaſon of her demanding this ſecretary's diſgrace deſerves to be known, and will give occaſion to obſerve the unjuſt extravagance of thoſe who allow no toleration.*] This is her account (38): 'We returned to Pau in Bearn, where having no exerciſe of the Catholic religion, I was only permitted to have maſs ſaid in a little chapel, not above three or four paces long, which was ſo ſtreight, as to be filled with ſeven or eight of us. At the time we went to maſs, the bridge of the caſtle was taken up, for fear the catholics of the country, who had no exerciſe of their religion, ſhould come to hear it. For they were infinitely deſirous to be preſent at the holy ſacrifice, of which they had been deprived for many years. Led with this holy and juſt deſire, the inhabitants of Pau found means, on Whitſunday, before the bridge was taken up, to enter the caſtle, and creep into the chapel, where they were not diſcovered till towards the end of the maſs, when half opening the door to let in one of my domeſtics, ſome Huguenots, who were there upon the watch, perceived them, and went and told du Pin, the king my huſband's ſecretary, (who had an entire influence over his maſter, and exerciſed great authority in his houſe, abſolutely managing the affairs of the Proteſtants) who thereupon ſent my huſband's guards; by whom after being dragged out, and beaten in my preſence, they were hurried away to priſon, where they were a long time confined, and paid a great fine. This indignity was infinitely reſented by me, who expected nothing like it. I went to complain to the king my huſband, beſeeching him to releaſe theſe poor Catholics, who did not deſerve ſuch a puniſhment, for deſiring, after being ſo long deprived of the exerciſe of our religion, to take the advantage of my coming to hear maſs on ſo great a feſtival. Du Pin puts in, without being called, and, without paying ſo much reſpect to his maſter as to give him leave to anſwer, replies himſelf, and tells me, that I ought not to trouble the king my huſband with this affair, for whatever I might ſay, it would be ordered no otherwiſe; that they had well deſerved what they had ſuffered, and that my interpoſing could ſignify nothing one way or other; that I ought to be contented with the liberty of having maſs for myſelf, and my domeſtics. This diſcourſe highly offended me from a man of ſo low a rank; and I begged of the king, if I was ſo happy as to have any ſhare in his favour, to let me ſee that he reſented the indignity I had received in his preſence from this mean perſon, and that he would do me juſtice. The king, my huſband, ſeeing me in ſo juſt a paſſion, ordered him to depart the room, telling me, that he was very ſorry for du Pin's indiſcretion, that it was his zeal for his religion which had thus tranſported him, and that he would make me what ſatisfaction I pleaſed; that as for the catholic priſoners, he would adviſe with his counſellors of the parliament of Pau, what could be done to content me. After having ſaid this he went into his cloſet, where he found du Pin, who having ſpoken with him, entirely changed him again. So that, fearing leſt I ſhould deſire his diſmiſſion, he ſhunned my company, and put on an angry look. At laſt, finding that I obſtinately inſiſted that, he would either diſmiſs du Pin or me, which he thought moſt agreeable; all who were preſent, and hated du Pin, told him, that he ought not to diſoblige me for ſuch a perſon, who had ſo highly offended me; that if this ſhould come to the knowledge of the king, and of the queen, my mother, they would highly reſent it, that he ſuffered him to continue about him any longer: which oliged him at laſt to diſmiſs him. But he continued to uſe me ill, and to give me angry looks.' I believe ſhe made an infinite number of reflexions upon this, for it was a caſe which muſt ſeem very ſtrange and perfectly injurious to her: but I am of opinion, that the moſt natural, the moſt legitimate, and

(32) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 352.

(33) Ib. *p.* 353.

(34) Ib. *p.* 354.

(35) Ib. *p.* 356.

(36) Above, citation (1) of the article ANDROMACHE.

(37) Amuſemens ſerieux & comiques, *pag.* 56, *Amſterdam Edit.* 1699.

(38) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 315, *& ſeq.*

condition that the king her huſband was not in the town (o). This exception cauſed the marſhal de Biron to cannonade the town one day when the king of Navarre came into it. This extremely diſpleaſed the queen of Navarre [*H*]. She met with yet farther mortifications from that time till the journey ſhe made to the court of France in 1582. It is with this journey ſhe ends the Memoirs ſhe has left us of her life, and from which I have taken what we have juſt now ſeen. There was reaſon to ſay, that ſhe addreſſed them to Brantome [*I*], and not to Charles de Vivonne, Baron de la Chaſtaigneraye, or to Monſieur de Rendan. It is a work which deſerves to be read, containing ſome things very curious; and it is to be wiſhed that it had extended to the laſt years of the author's life. A great many omiſſions are to be found in it, but could it be expected that queen Margaret would confeſs ſuch things as might ſtain her reputation? Thoſe acknowledgments are reſerved for the tribunal of confeſſion; they are not deſigned for Hiſtory. We need not wonder then not to find in her work any ſhadow of the galantries, in which ſhe engaged both herſelf, and her maids of honour, in order to oppoſe Catherine de Medicis by way of countermine (p). But to reſume the thread of our narration, I muſt take notice, that in leaving the court of France in 1583, ſhe received a cruel affront by order of king Henry III [*K*]. It may be very juſtly ſaid, that

and the moſt reaſonable reflexion that could offer itſelf, was the only one ſhe never once made. She ought, above all things, to have conſidered from thence, how blameable the injuſtice of her grand-father, her father, and her brothers, had been, in their barbarous edicts againſt the Proteſtants; and this is what, without doubt, ſhe was far from thinking on. It is even very probable, that the Catholics of Bearn, who had been beaten and impriſoned, perſiſted in believing, that it was juſt to perſecute the Huguenots, and to deprive them of the exerciſe of their religion; for it is likely, they ſaid, the court of France is orthodox, and that of Navarre heretical; the former therefore ought to perſecute, and not the latter (39). But they might be anſwered, go, and ſtate your fine arguments to the Sieur du Pin, he will only convert the propoſitions: the court of Navarre is orthodox, that of France is heretical; the former therefore ought to forbid going to maſs, and the latter ought to permit going to ſermons. Wretched perſecutors! Your diſeaſe muſt needs be extravagant, which cannot be cured by retaliation.

[*H*] *The marſhal de Biron cannonaded the town .... This diſpleaſed the queen of Navarre.*] I would make no comment upon theſe words, did I not find here an occaſion to ſhew, that the beſt Hiſtorians deceive us. This is the queen of Navarre's account: *The marſhal de Biron diſcharged ſeven or eight vollies of cannon upon the town, one whereof reached even to the caſtle; which having done, he retires, ſending me a trumpeter to excuſe himſelf to me, ſaying, that if I had been alone he would not for all the world have done this; but that I knew it had been concluded in the neutrality,* &c (40). Margaret was not ſatisfied with theſe excuſes, but anſwered the trumpeter, that ſhe was highly affronted with the marſhal de Biron's conduct, and that ſhe would complain of it to the king (41). The duke of Alençon went into Guienne ſome time after, and having ended the civil war, induced the marſhal de Biron *to take the command of his army in Flanders* (42). He reconciled the king of Navarre and the marſhal de Biron, and would have this marſhal at the *firſt interview* give queen Margaret ſatisfaction *by a modeſt excuſe for what was done at Nerac, and commanded* this queen *to treat him with all the rude and contemptuous expreſſions ſhe could think of. I executed this paſſionate command of my brother*, ſays ſhe, *with the diſcretion requiſite in ſuch caſes, as very well knowing that he would one day be ſorry for it, ſince he might have great expectations from the aſſiſtance of ſo brave a gentleman.* This is the rule by which we ought to compare the accounts of other Hiſtorians, which can be true only in proportion to their conformity with this of queen Margaret; for ſhe knew the affair better than any body, and could have no manner of reaſon to diſguiſe it. Let us ſee what Brantome ſays: ‘ For the greater bravado, the ‘ marſhal diſchaged ſome vollies of cannon againſt ‘ the town; ſo that the queen who had run thither, ‘ and ſtood upon the walls for her diverſion, had ‘ like to have had her ſhare of them; for a ball happened to fall hard by her, which extreamly provoked her, both for the little reſpect the marſhal ‘ had ſhewn her, to come to brave her in her own ‘ town, and becauſe he was commanded by the king ‘ not to commit hoſtilities within five leagues round ‘ the place where the queen of Navarre was, which he ‘ did not then obſerve; for which ſhe conceived ſuch ‘ a reſentment and enmity againſt the marſhal, that ‘ ſhe reſolved to reſent it, and to be revenged of him. ‘ A year and a half after, ſhe came to court, where ‘ the marſhal was, whom the king had re-called ‘ from Guienne, for fear of new commotions; for ‘ the king of Navarre threatened to arm, if he did not ‘ remove him. The queen of Navarre ſtill reſenting the ‘ marſhal's affront, paid him no reſpect, but treated ‘ him with contempt, every where villifying him, ‘ and reciting the injury he had done her. At laſt ‘ the marſhal, fearing the fury and hatred of the ‘ daughter and ſiſter of the kings, his maſters, and ‘ knowing the temper of this princeſs, bethought himſelf of waiting on her, and begging her pardon, acknowledging and repenting of what he had done, ‘ which, as ſhe was of a generous temper, ſhe did not ‘ refuſe, but received him into her favour and friendſhip, and forgave all that was paſt (43).’ The firſt fault of this author is the ſaying, that the queen of Navarre ran the riſk of her life upon the ramparts: ſhe would not have omitted a circumſtance of this nature had it been true. The ſecond fault is, to extend to five leagues what was but three. The third is a fault of omiſſion, charging Biron with having moſt injuſtly exceeded his orders. He did nothing but what he might do, conformably to the inſtructions he had received from Henry III. For the neutrality granted the queen of Naverre had no place, but in her huſband's abſence. Brantome's laſt error is a fault of Chronology: the marſhal de Biron made his peace in Guienne. It is therefore falſe that queen Margeret uſed him ill at the court of France eighteen months after; and that he then pacified her by his humiliation. Mezerai is miſtaken in two things. The marſhal de Biron, ſays he (44), *diſcharged ſome vollies of canon againſt the walls, upon which the queen was beholding the ſkirmiſh, which ſo offended this princeſs, that ſhe never afterwards pardoned him.*

[*I*] *The memoirs ſhe left us of her life ...... ſhe addreſſed them to Brantome.*] Auger de Mauleon, Sieur de Granier, publiſhed them at Paris, in 1628, in 8vo (45). There were ſome other editions of them afterwards. He affirms, in the preface, that the baron de la Chaſtaigneraye is the perſon, queen Margeret addreſſed them to; and that thoſe who *believe they were addreſſed to Mr Rendan*, have no probable grounds for their opinion. Mr Colomiés has very plainly proved (46), that they were addreſſed to Mr Peter de Bourdeille, abbot de Brantome. You will ſee his reaſons in Moreri's Dictionary.

[*K*] *She received a barbarous affront, by the order of king Henry III.*] It is thus Mezerai relates it: ‘ The ‘ king ...... baniſhed from her preſence two ‘ ladies her confidents, writing to the king of Navarre with his own hand, that *he had expelled them* ‘ *as moſt pernicious vermin, and not to be ſuffered* ‘ *near a lady of ſuch extraction*: And ſome days after ‘ he commanded her to return to her huſband, without permitting her to come to take leave of him. His ‘ hatred went ſtill much farther: he ſent after her a captain of guards, with ſixty archers, who having ſtopped her retinue beyond Palaiſeau, and rummaged her ‘ litter, ſo as to make her pull off her maſk, he ſeized ‘ her gentleman of the horſe, her Phyſician and Apothecary, whilſt Larchant went to ſeize thoſe two ladies ‘ upon another road. He cauſed all theſe perſons to be

(o) Ibid. *pag.* 332.

(p) See the remark [*O*] of the article HENRY IV.

(39) See the Philoſophical Commentary upon *Compel them to come in, Part i, pag.* 187, & *ſeq.* & *Part iii, pag.* 122, & *ſeq.*

(40) Queen Margaret's Memoirs, *pag.* 336.

(41) Ibid. *pag.* 338.

(42) Ibid. *pag.* 343.

(43) Brantome, Memoirs of Illuſtrious Ladies, *pag.* 264, 265.

(44) Mezerai, Chron. Abridgment, *Tom. v, pag.* 246, *ad ann.* 1580. He ſays, *pag.* 493, *Tom. iii,* of his great hiſtory, that a canon-ball fell at the feet of this princeſs within the diſtance of a yard.

(45) See Colomiés, *Bibliotheque Choiſie, pag.* 173, of the ſecond edition.

(46) Idem, Hiſtorical Miſcellanies, *pag.* 86, & *ſeq.*

that her huſband had ſo little delicacy upon the point of domeſtic honour, that he was not content to ſhut his eyes, but proceeded even to the approbation of his wife's galantries. *The practice ſhe made of love was not at all concealed*; *pretending by this*, *that a public profeſſion beſpoke ſome virtue*, *and that ſecrecy was the ſign of vice*. Henry IV *quickly learned to careſs his wife's galants*, *and ſhe to careſs her huſband's miſtreſſes* (*q*). But if he was blameable in a thouſand inſtances for this baſe complaiſance, he diſcovered, upon the occaſion we are now ſpeaking of, a great deal of ſpirit and ſenſibility. He preſſingly required of Henry III, either that his wife ſhould receive ſatisfaction for the affrontg iven, or that he might be at liberty not to receive her [*L*]. He obtained neither of theſe two demands,

be brought to him in the abbey of Ferrieres, near Montargis, ſeparated them into different chambers, queſtioned each of them apart concerning the life, morals, and converſation, of his ſiſter, and would have their depoſitions in writing; upon his departing from thence, he ſent ſome to the Baſtile, who were examined before the provoſt-lieutenant, and let his ſiſter go (47).' Varillas (48) has related this adventure with all the ſame circumſtances, as Mezerai. I am ſurprized that a Hugenot Hiſtorian, who lived in that time, and could let nothing of this nature eſcape, has given a much ſhorter account, than that which may be read at the beginning of this remark. Conſider, I pray, the Sieur d'Aubigné's brevity, and the little agreement between his narration and that of others, in reſpect to the circumſtances of place. *The queen of Navarre*, ſays he (49), *returning to court with the queen*, *her mother* (50), *it happened that her reſtleſs ſpirit remained not long without offending the king her brother*, *and his minions*; *combining at court*, *with thoſe who defamed this prince*, *imputing to him moſt filthy pleaſures*, *in which*, *it ſeemed*, *the ladies were concerned*. *Hereupon this princeſs received ſome affronts*; *the laſt of which was*, *that Salern*, *captain of the guards*, *made her unmaſk at St James's gate*, *as ſhe left Paris*, *to return to Gaſcogny*, *with her huſband*; *with whom*, *at the ſame time*, *ſhe was at very ill terms*.

[*L*] *Henry IV preſſingly required of Henry III*, *either that his wife ſhould receive ſatisfaction for the affront given her*, *or that he might be at liberty not to receive her*.] See what d'Aubigné relates immediately after the paſſage I have juſt quoted (51). ‘The king of Navarre, taking advice of his council in that affair, they all unanimouſly agreed, that he ought to reſent it; and for that end to ſend and demand of the king a notable ſatisfaction, with a clauſe ſomething bidding defiance, or at leaſt a ſeparation of friendſhip in caſe of refuſal: all adviſed this, and all refuſed the execution, except Aubigné; who, after he had remonſtrated how he was accuſed of having ſaved his maſter, and of ſome free writings and offenſive diſcourſes; and that what might be born with from another, would become mortally odious in his mouth; yet perceiving the paſſion of this offended prince, he reſolved to undertake the journey. He finds the king at St Germains, who, having given the meſſenger all the appearances of terror, heard him harangue upon the conſequences attending the injuries of princes: how this act of infamy had been played before the moſt magnificent company, and upon the moſt exalted ſtage in Chriſtendom . . . . However, at laſt, not upon the refuſal of juſtice, but upon the delay which beſpoke a refuſal, the meſſenger renounced the honour of the king's alliance and friendſhip.' He afterwards relates the menaces contained in the king's anſwer, the vigorous reply he made to them (52), his anſwer in the ſame ſtrain to the queen-mother, and the diligence wherewith he returned, and prevented the aſſaſſins of the court of France. This being ſo, it cannot be denied, that Henry IV, expreſſed his indignation with all the reſolution of a brave and magnanimous prince. But we are going to ſee another account, where he does not ſhow ſo bold a reſolution, ‘(53) The king of Navarre having received this news (54) at Nerac, concluded that he ought not to receive her (55), till he knew the cauſe of this affront, which being offered and received at noon-day, could not be diſſembled: in order, therefore, to have it fully explained or repaired, he reſolved to ſend Mr du Pleſſis to the king, who was gone to Lyons, whither he went after him, riding poſt. This negotiation, ſo thorny and full of precipices on all ſides, where the honour of a huſband and wife were concerned, of ſuch a quality; and between two kings, one his maſter, and the other his prince, is found entire in his Memoirs: but this is the ſum of it. Having repreſented to the king the heinouſneſs of the fact, he demanded two things, in the name of the king of Navarre. One was, *that he would pleaſe to declare the cauſe of his diſpleaſure*, *which had carried him to ſuch indignities againſt his wife*, *who had the honour to be his ſiſter*; *ſince the meaneſt woman in the world meets with no attempt againſt her honour*, *till ſhe has firſt loſt it*, *which he could not believe*, *ſuſpending*, *in the mean time*, *his judgment with his uſual prudence and moderation*. *The other was*, *that at leaſt*, *as the head of the family*, *he would do juſtice*; *and*, *as a good maſter*, *adviſe him what was to be done in ſo perplexed an affair*. The king ſhuffled, and perhaps finding himſelf guilty of too much precipitation, was willing to throw the cauſe upon the ladies abovementioned, whom he accuſed of a bad life: but Mr du Pleſſis replied to him, *that it was not his buſineſs to plead their cauſe*, *that the king his maſter did not do him ſo much wrong*, *as to ſend him in their favour*: *that the queſtion was concerning the queen his ſiſter*, *if ſhe had committed a fault deſerving ſuch an affront*, *he demanded juſtice on her*; *if not*, *he deſired him to do her juſtice upon thoſe*, *who were the authors of this ill advice to the diſhonour of the royal family*, *and his own* . . . (56). That he was commanded, in brief, to tell his majeſty, that he had done too much or too little; Too much, if the fault was leſs than extreme; Too little, if eſteeming her to deſerve the loſs of honour, he ſuffered her to ſurvive it. *To this the king anſwered*, that he was obliged to the king of Navarre for the ſteps he had taken; that he had a mother and a brother intereſted in this affair, as well as himſelf, to whom he would communicate it . . . . . Mr du Pleſſis plainly perceived, that he could draw nothing more from him: but there remained one ſcruple, that, in the mean time, the queen, his ſiſter, continued her journey. Upon which he ſaid: *But what will Chriſtendom ſay*, *Sir*, *if the king of Navarre receives her*, *embraces her without ſcruple*, *thus returned to him ſtained and diſhonoured?* To which the king replied, *What? but that he will receive the ſiſter of his king*; *what can he do leſs? But of a juſt and equitable king*, ſays Mr du Pleſſis, *who would not require this obedience from ſuch a ſubject at the expence of his honour and courage*. Hereupon the king reſolved to write to the queen, his mother, that ſhe ſhould cauſe her to ſtay by the way in ſome town.' The iſſue of all this was, that Bellievre deputed to the king of Navarre, obliged him, at laſt, to receive his wife, without giving any ſatisfaction at all to his demands. Read the letter which was written to Mr de Montagne (57), by Mr du Pleſſis Mornai, in 1584. It begins thus: ‘Sir, we have heard Mr de Bellievre. To tell the truth, he has propoſed no other ſatisfaction for the indignity done to the queen of Navarre, than the authority (58) and liberty which a king has over his ſubjects. A reaſon, as you know, that has more vinegar than oil in it, and very improper for ſo ſenſible a wound, and in ſo nervous a part: and I know not whether I may venture to ſay, little ſuitable to the grandeur of our French princes, who have always tempered their ſovereign power with a gracious equity, and have never diſpoſed of the honour of the leaſt of their ſubjects, but with their approbation. However, the king of Navarre has reſolved to ſhew, that he choſe rather to give the king ſatisfaction than himſelf. And to this purpoſe he is determined to make his honour ſubmit under the reſpect to his commands: being come to a reſolution to viſit and receive the queen, his wife, at his houſe at Nerac (59).

But

(*q*) D'Aubigné, Univerſal Hiſt. *Tom. ii*, *book iv*, *chap. v*, *pag.* 988, 989, *ad ann.* 1579.

(47) Mezerai, Hiſt. of France, *Tom. iii*, *pag.* 546, 547.

(48) Varillas, Hiſt. of Henry III, *book vii*, *pag.* 232, 233, *Holl. Edit. ad ann.* 1584, wherein he is miſtaken, for the thing happened in Auguſt 1583. See the Memoirs of du Pleſſis Mornai, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 275.

(49) D'Aubigné, Univerſal Hiſt. *Tom. ii*, *book v*, *ch. iii*, *pag.* 1083.

(50) D'Aubigné is miſtaken, Margaret went thither alone, and without her mother. See her Memoirs towards the end. It is true her mother came to meet her.

(51) Ubi ſupra.

(52) He relates it alſo in Sanci's Catholic Confeſſion, *book ii*, *ch. vii*, *pag.* 447, *Edit.* 1699.

(53) Mr du Pleſſis Mornai's Life, *pag.* 71.

(54) That is, that queen Margaret had received the affront mentioned in the preceding remark.

(55) That is to ſay, the queen his wife.

(56) Vie de Du Pleſſis Mornai, *pag.* 72.

(57) Michael de Montagne, author of the Eſſays.

(58) There is an error of the preſs in this paſſage in the French.

(59) Du Pleſſis Mornai's Memoirs, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 297, 298.

demands, but was obliged to receive Margaret in Nerac with all her diſgrace [*M*]. Henry IV being ſome time after excommunicated by Pope Sixtus, ſhe made uſe of this pretence to leave him, and make war upon him (*r*). She *poſſeſſed herſelf of the Agenois, which was given her in dowry* (*s*); but ſhe found very little ſatisfaction in that war, and was obliged to leave Agen precipitately [*N*], and to fly into Auvergne, where ſhe

But behold here a very perplexing riddle. D'Aubigné poſitively affirms, that he was the only perſon employed to demand reparation for this inſult, all the others having refuſed to undertake ſuch a commiſſion. Du Pleſſis Mornai, affirms as ſtrongly, that he was the only perſon ſent to the court of France on this affair. D'Aubigné makes no mention of du Pleſſis, nor du Pleſſis of d'Aubigné; but contents himſelf with ſaying, that the king of Navarre *ſpoke firſt of ſending the Sieur de Frontenac* (60). It cannot be ſuppoſed that there are two affairs in queſtion; for though we may ſpeak in the plural number of affronts received by queen Margaret, it can by no means be pretended, that d'Aubigné demanded ſatiſfaction for an affront before or after that, which obliged the king of Navarre to depute Mr du Pleſſis. Both theſe authors, who relate their commiſſion, have in view the action of the captain of the guards, who ſtopped queen Margaret's litter, &c. He is called *Saliers* in the life of du Pleſſis (61), and *Salern* in the hiſtory of d'Aubigné (62). This ſhews that they mean the ſame man; but that, by an error of the preſs, or by ſome little ſlip of memory, his name is differently written or ended. I confeſs, that, according to Mr du Pleſſis, the exploit of this captain of the guards, happened four leagues from Paris (63), between Palaiſeau and St Cler (64), and, according to d'Aubigné, at St James's gate. I confeſs alſo, that in d'Aubigné's account, the complaint and demand of ſatisfaction was made to the king at St Germains, but at Lyons, according to du Pleſſis. And yet I cannot conceive, that on this occaſion the king of Navarre ſent two deputies to Henry III, ſince Mr du Pleſſis affirms, that he was the only perſon charged with this negotiation. If I were to diſtruſt either the memory or probity of one of theſe two, it would be Mr du Pleſſis I ſhould ſuſpect. However, I will not determine to the prejudice of the other. I chuſe rather to ſuſpend my judgment (65), and I am not ſufficiently ſatisfied in my conjectures to give them a place here. For the reſt, I am not the firſt that has been perplexed with the account of this adventure (66). Note, that d'Aubigné, when he publiſhed the ſecond edition of his book (67), might have known what is related contrary to his narrative in du Pleſſis's Memoirs (68).

[*M*] *He was obliged to receive Margaret in Nerac with all her diſgrace.*] Here we may apply to the king of Navarre, *Parturiunt montes, naſcetur ridiculus mus.* - - - - *Mountains in labour will bring forth a mouſe.* If it be true that he ſent a challenge to the king of France, as is related above by d'Aubigné (69); but if the matter be reduced to the terms of Mr du Pleſſis's negotiation, the fall will appear much leſs inglorious. The ill ſtate of his affairs did not permit him to be ſo unſeaſonably haughty. Bellievre, deputed from Henry III, ſpoke with ſo much the more loftineſs, as the garriſons placed round about Nerac made him believe the king of Navarre durſt refuſe him nothing. This prince therefore was forced to ſubmit whether he would or no: and to aſk, as a favour, that at leaſt the garriſons might be ſent away, here follows the ſequel of the paſſage we have ſeen above (70), I mean the words of the letter from Mr du Pleſſis Mornai: 'Reſolving to viſit and receive the queen, his wife, in his houſe at Nerac, on condition only, that the garriſons might be removed which were placed round about, both that this reception might have no appearance of force, and for the ſecurity of their ſtay. You know whether it be civil to receive her in a borrowed houſe, or incivil to demand liberty in his own. Mr de Bellievre notwithſtanding made a very great difficulty of it: hereupon, this day, Mr de Clervant was diſpatched to the queen of Navarre; and from thence will proceed to their majeſties, who, in my opinion, conſidering the matter paſt, and conſidering in it the perſon of the king of Navarre, will not refuſe him ſo trifling a circumſtance, ſince in a thing of ſuch importance he has granted the principal. Judge in what ſtreights theſe people put us. We had reduced the matter almoſt to the beſt point that could be hoped for; and now they ſtand upon a meer trifle, and would make us loſe all our credit, if our ſincerity towards our maſter was not very well known (71).' Let us therefore excuſe for this once the king of Navarre, and not ſuffer this particular paſſage of his life to lye under the cenſure related by a modern Hiſtorian: *The malicious*, ſays he (72), 'ſpared not his domeſtic affairs. They highly blamed his conduct in abandoning queen Margaret to her gallanting humour; *more patient than the emperor Claudius*, ſaid they, *he ſuffered this new Meſſalina, known to be his lawful wife, to diſhonour him publickly. Had he a mind, at his own coſt, to teach thoſe, whoſe wives he debauched, to become contented cuckolds?*' If he had with marks of eſteem received his wife, diſhonoured by the public affront the king her brother had put upon her, we might reaſonably accuſe him of the moſt cowardly tameneſs: but he took not that method; he plainly gave her to underſtand, that he deſpiſed her; and this was one of the motives that induced her to break with him. Read theſe words of Mr du Pleſſis's Life: *Queen Margaret, whether ſhe could not bear to be* deſpiſed, *or whether ſhe returned to her old practices, threw herſelf into Agen, and there made war for the League* (73). After all, it muſt be remembered, that there are princes, who are much more at a loſs than other men, what reſolution to take when they are dignified with horns. It is a very difficult part to act: patience and impatience are equally the object of laughter; and it is not eaſy to find a juſt medium between the ſeverity of Henry VIII, and the good-nature of Henry IV. Let every one in caſes of this nature, remember the old maxim,

Il eſt bien aiſé de repondre,
Mais mal aiſé de faire mieux.

'Tis eaſy to find a fault,
But difficult to do better.

[*N*] *Being obliged to leave Agen precipitately.*] 'She was very ill ſerved there, by means of Madam de Duras, who had a great command over her, and under her name authorized heavy exactions and contributions: the people of the town were exaſperated with them, and, under-hand, contrived their liberty, and the means of expelling both their lady and her garriſons; upon which diſcontent, the marſhal de Matignon took occaſion to make an attempt upon the town; as the king, being acquainted with the opportunity, commanded him, with great joy, to oppreſs his ſiſter, whom he did not love, with more and more mortifications: wherefore the enterprize which miſcarried the firſt time, was ſo dextrouſly managed the ſecond, by the ſaid marſhal and the inhabitants, that the town was taken and forced in ſuch a manner, and with that ſuddenneſs and alarm, that all this unfortunate queen could do, was to get behind a gentleman, and Madam de Duras behind another, and to ſave themſelves by flight, riding twelve leagues the firſt day, and as many the next, and to eſcape into the ſtrongeſt fortreſs of France, which is Carlat (74).' Queen Margaret obſerves, in the beginning of her Memoirs, *that this account of* Brantome is wrong; but we do not know how ſhe would have rectified it. Let us ſee how the author of the Satirical Divorce makes Henry IV ſpeak: *She ſuffered herſelf again to be carried away by her laſciviouſneſs and exceſſive leudneſs, leaving me without ſaying a word, and going to Agen, a town oppoſite to my intereſt, to ſet up her trade there, and to continue her diſorderly life with greater liberty: but the inhabitants preſaging as ill ſucceſs from ſo ill a life, occaſioned her to depart in ſo much haſte, that ſhe could ſcarce find a horſe that would carry double, to take her up behind, nor*

(*r*) Mezerai, Hiſt. of France, *Tom. iii, pag.* 596.

(*s*) Ibid.

(60) Ibid. *pag.* 275.

(61) *In pag.* 71.

(62) *At pag.* 1083.

(63) Du Pleſſis's Life, *pag.* 71.

(64) Du Pleſſis's Memoirs, *Tom. i, pag.* 275.

(65) See, below, remark [*Q*].

(66) See the Notes upon Sanci's Catholic Confeſſion, *book ii, chap. vii, pag.* 469, *Edit.* 1699.

(67) In 1626.

(68) Printed in 1624.

(69) In the remark [*L*].

(70) In the remark [*L*], citation (59).

(71) Du Pleſſis's Memoirs, *Tom. i, pag.* 298.

(72) Le Vaſſor, Hiſt. of Lewis XIII, *book i, pag.* 54.

(73) Du Pleſſis's Life, *pag.* 90.

(74) Brantome, Illuſtrious Ladies, *pag.* 254, 255.

ſhe *conſumed the reſt of her youth in adventures more becoming a woman, who had abandoned her huſband, than a daughter of France (t).* Lignerac, conducted her *with ſome gentlemen in great diſorder*, to the town of Carlat, where his brother was Chaſtelain (*u*). Henry III took ſuch meaſures that the inhabitants prepared to betray her (*x*). She had ſome notice of it and eſcaped; but ſhe was taken by the marquis of Canillac, and caried to the caſtle of Uſſon. He fell in love with her, and ſuffered himſelf to be ſo bewitched with her fine diſcourſes, that ſhe ſecured the place to herſelf, and expelled him thence (*y*). In this fortreſs ſhe lived a recluſe till ſhe came to the court of France in 1605. She had been ſollicited to conſent to the diſſolution of her marriage; but ſhe refuſed it, during the life of the ducheſs of Beaufort (*z*); but afterwards ſhe gave her conſent, and herſelf began the proceſs by a petition preſented for this purpoſe to Pope Clement VIII. The beſt reaſon ſhe alledged was the want of conſent, and that was good for nothing; for beſides, that this was declaring that ſhe was guilty of a horrid perjury in Notre-Dame church at Paris, where cardinal de Bourbon performed the nuptial ceremonies (*aa*), ſhe manifeſtly contradicted what ſhe has written in her Memoirs. We there find (*bb*) that ſhe rejected the propoſal of a divorce; and that ſhe had nothing more at heart than to teſtifie her affection, regard, and obedience to her huſband, even ſo far as to be preſent at the delivery of his miſtreſſes (*cc*), to aſſiſt them to her utmoſt, and to take all poſſible care of him when his exceſſes with other women caſt him into a fainting fit (*dd*). Her marriage having been declared null, Henry IV married Mary de Medicis. He, and his ſecond wife, gave our Margaret a very honourable reception in 1605. *She was firſt lodged in the caſtle of Boulogne, and afterwards in the palace of Sens, which ſhe quitted to go and live in the ſuburbs of St Germains, where ſhe built a palace anſwerable to the majeſty of the kings ſhe was deſcended from* (*ee*). She there led a life full of variety; it was a mixture of galantry, devotion, and ſtudy [*O*]. She died the twenty-ſeventh of March 1615. It is impoſſible to forbear condemning her panegyriſts, who have boldly ſuppreſſed her faults and ill actions, notwithſtanding they were ſo very notorious; and I think the Hiſtorian, Scipio du Pleix, has not deſerved all the cenſures, which were caſt on him for ſpeaking of this queen's baſtards. But this I ſhall examine in another place (*ff*), this article being too long already. I will not conclude without ſaying, that the wiſe and famous Pibrac was her chancellor and galant [*P*].

I am

(*t*) Ib. *pag.* 598. See the article USSON.

(*u*) Id. ib.

(*x*) Brantome, Illuſtrious Ladies, *pag.* 255.

(*y*) Id. ib. See alſo d'Aubigne, *Tom. iii, book v, chap. iv.*

(*z*) D'Aubigné, ibid.

(*aa*) Memoirs of queen Margaret, *pag.* 49.

(*bb*) Ib. *pag.* 68. See the remark [*C*] at the beginning.

(*cc*) See the remark [*F*].

(*dd*) Memoirs, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 115.

(*ee*) Hilarion de Coſte, Elogies of Illuſtrious Ladies, *Tom. ii, pag.* 306.

(*ff*) In the article USSON, where I relate many things which have been ſaid of this queen's ill morals.

nor hackney or poſt-horſes for half her maids; many of whom followed one after another, ſome without maſks, ſome without aprons, and ſome without both; all in ſo wretched a condition, that they rather reſembled the whores of foot-ſoldiers in the rout of a camp, than the attendants of a noble houſe. She was accompanied by ſome gentlemen unequipped, who half without boots, half on foot, conducted her under the guard of Lignerac, to the mountains of Auvergne into Carlat, where Marze (75), *his brother, was governor, a ſtrong fort, but more reſembling a den of thieves, than the habitation of a princeſs, the daughter, ſiſter, and wife, of a king* (76). There are ſome circumſtances in the Scaligerana, which are not in the Satirical Divorce: (77) *She got behind a gentleman without a pillion. She chafed off the ſkin of her thighs, which diſordered her for a month with a fever. The Phyſician, who took care of her, is at preſent with the king, ſhe ordered him to be laſhed. . . . . She was forced to borrow a ſmock of a ſervant-maid in a neighbouring place, until ſhe came to Uſſon, at the entrance into Auvergne* (78). Obſerve, by the by, that too much liberty is taken in the General and Curious Dictionary; for it is there affirmed, that Scaliger ſays, the Phyſician, who had this princeſs in cure, when ſhe had chafed off her ſkin, *was laſhed for ſpeaking too freely* (79). Theſe laſt words are not in my edition of the Scaligerana; and I do not believe they are to be met with in others, or that Cæſar de Rochefort had any grounds to add them of his own head, though it is probable that Scaliger had ſuch a meaning. We are by no means to cite an author according to our probable imaginations of what he meant to ſay, but according to what he has ſaid; for otherwiſe things would be quickly multiplied and falſified; before this came to a fourth or fifth hand, it would import, that the Phyſician had ſaid this and that, he had made a draught, and a kind of a topographical map.

[*O*] *She there led a life full of variety; it was a mixture of galantry, devotion, and ſtudy.*] Mezerai relates (80), that queen Margaret, *engaging very deeply in intrigues to diſcover the ſecret practices of the count d'Auvergne, gave frequent intelligences of them to the king, ſo that at laſt he reſolved to comply with her requeſt*, that ſhe might come to Paris. She arrived there in Auguſt, 1605, 'and had the caſtle of Madrid, in the foreſt of Boulogne, aſſigned her for her lodgings. She lived 'there ſix weeks, afterwards ſhe removed to the palace of Sens: but there an unfortunate accident happening to one of her minions, who was killed at 'the boot of her coach, by a young gentleman, enraged that this ſpark had ruined his family with 'this princeſs (§ a): ſhe quitted that unfortunate 'palace, and bought another in the ſuburbs of St Germain, near the river, and the Pré aux Clercs, where 'ſhe began great deſigns of building and gardening. 'Here it was ſhe kept her little court the reſt of her 'days, mixing together with an odd variety, pleaſures, 'and devotion, the love of letters, and the love of vanity, Chriſtian charity, and injuſtice: for as ſhe prided 'herſelf in being ſeen frequently at church, entertaining learned men, and giving the tenth of her revenues to the Monks, ſhe gloried in having ſtill ſome 'galantry, inventing new diverſions, and never paying her debts.'

[(§ a) The name of this minion was *Datte*, and young Vermond killed him, by the expreſs command of the king, ſay ſome memoirs againſt all probability, which are in manuſcript in the king's library, and ſome of them in the royal libraries at Berlin. The queen of Navarre lamented him under the name of *Atys*, in ſome verſes contained in thoſe Memoirs, where, in the ſame volume intituled *Memoirs of State under Henry IV*, may be met with ſome other verſes ſhe had made before that, under the ſame name of *Atys*, on the death of Aubiac, one of her galants who was hanged at Aigue-Perſe. REM. CRIT]

[*P*] *The wiſe and famous Pibrac was her chancellor and galant.*] See the remark [*O*] of the article HENRY IV. I have read in Thuanus (81), that, in 1582, Pibrac communicated to him a draught of the anſwer he deſigned to make to a ſmart letter, which he had received from the queen of Navarre: in which this princeſs reproached him, among other things, with being too much addicted to love, and preſuming to caſt his eyes even upon her. Pibrac recited his intended anſwer, with ſo much heat to Thuanus, that he gave occaſion to believe that Margarets reproach was well grounded (82). Truſt after this thoſe venerable magiſtrates, who compoſe moral ſtanza's ſo grave and ſententious, that Cato himſelf would be proud of being the author of them. Here is a paſſage of queen Margaret's Memoirs (83): *Monſieur de Pibrac played a double game, telling* this princeſs, *that ſhe ought not to ſuffer herſelf to be braved by ſuch an inconſiderable man as he was* (84), *and that whatever*

came

(75) Others call him Marie.

(76) Satirical Divorce, *pag. m.* 196, 197.

(77) Scaligerana, *at the word* Navarræ, *pag. m.* 166.

(78) Scaliger is miſtaken, ſhe went not to Uſſon till after ſhe had ſtaid a conſiderable time at Carlat.

(79) Cæſar de Rochefort, General and Curious Dictionary, *pag.* 415, *col.* 1.

(80) Mezerai, Chronological Abridgment, *Tom. vi, pag.* 316.

(81) Thuan. de Vita ſua, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 1186.

(82) Adeo accuratis verbis, tantaque contentione & affectus vehementia, ut Margaritæ exprobrationi fidem aſtrueret. *Id. ib.*

(83) Memoirs of queen Margaret, *pag.* 321.

(84) That is to ſay, the ſecretary du Pin, of whom we have ſpoken in the remark [*G*].

I am now enabled to clear up the difficulties which occur in the relations I have given, concerning the affront ſhe received, and the ſatisfaction that was demanded (gg) [*Q*]. I ſhall make ſome reflexions on the true account which has been communicated to me [*R*].

(gg) See, above, the remarks [*K*], [*L*], and [*M*].

---

came on it, ſhe muſt get him to be removed; and telling the king of Navarre, that there was no probability that ſhe would deprive him of the ſervice of a man, who was ſo neceſſary to him. Which he *did to induce* her, *by her diſcontents, to return into France, where he was fixed in his place of preſident and counſellor to the king.* We muſt add, that as he loved the queen, he could not reſolve to return to Paris without her.

[*Q*] *I am now enabled to clear up the difficulties which occur in the relations I have given, concerning the affront ſhe received, and the ſatisfaction demanded.*] I have had communicated to me ſome extracts (85) of a ſpeech of Pibrac †, which will adjuſt the whole train of this affair in very perfect order. Pibrac delivered this ſpeech to Henry III, to ſhew, by a particular account of the conduct of the king of Navarre, that there was no room to complain of him. Theſe are the facts he mentions:

I. That in 1582, queen Margaret made a journey to the court of France, and that the king of Navarre accompanied her, till he left her in the hands of the queen-mother, who came to meet them half way.

II. That during her ſtay at court, king Henry III ſent one of his wardrobe to the king of Navarre, to acquaint him that Margaret's behaviour had given him ſome uneaſineſs. He wrote to him with his own hand, the fifth of Auguſt, 1583, and informed him, that he had removed from about her the ladies de Duras, and de Bethune, as *very pernicious vermin* ⸸.

III. That the king of Navarre having received this letter as he was hunting at Saintefoi, on the Dordonne, made choice of Pibrac to diſpatch him to the court of France. He inſtructed him to ſay, that he would come himſelf to meet his wife as far as Poitou, and named the ladies who ſhould be placed about her.

IV. That Pibrac did not ſet out, becauſe news immediately came of the affair that happened two leagues *beyond Bourg la Reine*, that is to ſay, the affront put upon queen Margaret when Soler ‡, *who commanded a regiment of the guards* *, ſtopped her litter.

V. That the king of Navarre ſent the Sieur du Pleſſis to the king, to know the cauſe of this inſult, and to demand ſatisfaction for it.

VI. That the Sieur du Pleſſis, who was entruſted to ſpeak only to the king himſelf, was ſent back with very great civilities; ſatisfaction being promiſed him, and aſſurance given him that a proper perſon ſhould be ſent to the king of Navarre, who ſhould carry him ſuch an anſwer, as ſhould make him entirely eaſy.

VII. That the king of Navarre, not hearing any thing of this deputy, was diſpleaſed, and ſent to forbid his wife to come any farther, till ſatisfaction ſhould be given. He diſpatched *one of his* attendants to the king, and upon this ſecond meſſage Mr de Bellievre was ſent to him.

VIII. That at the ſame time marſhal de Matignon put a garriſon into Bazas, and ſome other places near Nerac, where the king of Navarre reſided; that this prince complained of it, and inſiſted that the negotiation concerning his wife ſhould be ſuſpended, till thoſe appearances of force were removed; that he ſent a third meſſenger to the court of France, named Diolet; and that he acquainted Mr de Bellievre, who had retired to Bourdeaux, that he was ready to *give him audience*.

IX. That Mr de Bellievre preſented himſelf, and maintained, before him, that no indignity had been offered to the queen, and that his maſter was not at all obliged to give an account to the king of Navarre of the inquiry he had made, that it was his good pleaſure, and, in a word, that he was the king of the king of Navarre.

X. That the king of Navarre replied, that he was ready to take his wife again, and to receive her at Nerac; but on condition that the garriſons ſhould be removed, which were placed in the neighbouring towns; that this was neceſſary as well for his ſecurity, as to prevent it's being ſaid, that he received his wife only by force.

XI. That Monſieur de Bellievre declared to him, that this could not be done, and that the king would be obeyed; that the king of Navarre might receive his wife in what place he pleaſed, if Nerac did not ſeem ſafe for him in the midſt of thoſe garriſons.

XII. That the king of Navarre, uneaſy at this treatment, ſent Pibrac to Henry III, as his fourth meſſenger, who rendered an exact account of the manner in which every thing had been tranſacted, from the beginning of the affair, to Bellievre's negotiation. This is the ſubject of his ſpeech. He demands juſtice in terms both ſtrong and ſubmiſſive at the ſame time.

(85) Mr Marais, advocate to the parliament of Paris, was ſo kind to communicate them; the marginal notes that accompany this remark [*Q*] are his.

† It is to be met with in a collection of pleadings, harangues, and remonſtrances, of the moſt illuſtrious and famous Politicians of our time; printed at Paris by Adrian Tiffaine, in 1618, in 12mo.

⸸ Note, that this letter of Henry III, made no mention of the inſult committed againſt the queen of Navarre: the author of the *Notes on the Confeſſion of Sanci*, is miſtaken in affirming it.

‡ So Pibrac names him.

* He was not therefore a captain of the guards, but rather the colonel of the regiment of the guards.

[*R*] *I ſhall make ſome reflexions on the true account which has been communicated to me.*] It is a little ſtrange that Pibrac, who gives the names of the firſt and third meſſenger, ſhould not give that of the ſecond. It is very probable that d'Aubigné was the perſon whom Pibrac does not name: we may ſay, therefore, that d'Aubigné does not advance an untruth, in ſpeaking of his own deputation; but he is not to be excuſed for ſpeaking of that only. To judge of the affair by his account, there could be none but himſelf who carried the complaints of the king of Navarre to Henry III, and yet they had been already carried by du Pleſſis, and ſo they were afterwards by two other envoys. Mr du Pleſſis is more excuſable in ſpeaking only of his own deputation: for in the firſt place he does not give an univerſal hiſtory, as d'Aubigné has done, but only the Memoirs of his life; and in the ſecond place, it was not he himſelf who reduced them into order, and put the finiſhing hand to them. Perhaps if he had publiſhed them himſelf, he would have given us this paſſage more at large, in order to make this part of the domeſtic hiſtory of the king of Navarre the better underſtood. However, it muſt be confeſſed, that he would have done well to have beſtowed a few paragraphs on the other deputations, in his firſt compoſing this chapter.

We muſt remark alſo, that Pibrac ſays nothing of Clervant, who was diſpatched to the queen of Navarre after the declarations of Bellievre, and was after that to go to the court of France, to demand the removal of the garriſons (86). It is certain that he negotiated this affair; for Mr du Pleſſis aſſures us, in a letter of the twentieth of February, 1584, that, being at the palace of the queen-mother, he ſaluted the duke of Alençon, who aſked him, *if the queen of Navarre was with* her huſband? his anſwer was, *that they waited the return of Mr de Clervant* (87). The queen-mother, imagining, that du Pleſſis was come *on the affairs of the queen of Navarre*, told him, *that ſhe was very ſure* the king of Navarre *would receive entire ſatisfaction from the diſpatch of Mr de Clervant* (88). It cannot be ſaid that Pibrac meant him, when he ſpeaks of a ſecond meſſenger without naming him: it is too evident that the ſecond meſſenger ſet out before the arrival of Bellievre, and that Clervant was not diſpatched till after Bellievre had executed his commiſſion. It is probable that he was diſpatched after Pibrac; and if ſo, there is no reaſon to wonder at the ſilence of the latter.

(86) See, above, remark [*M*].

(87) Mémoir. de Du Pleſſis, *Tom. i, pag.* 306.

(88) Ibid. *pag.* 307.

NAUCRATIS, a city of Egypt upon the Nile. Some authors have placed it upon the moſt weſtern branch of that river [*A*]; but every one is not of their opinion [*B*]. It

---

[*A*] *Some authors have placed it upon the moſt weſtern branch of that river.*] This branch was that which was called *Oſtium Canopicum*, the mouth of Canopus, near which Alexander the Great built the city of Alexandria. It is plain, that Herodotus has placed Naucratis upon this branch of the Nile. See in the body of the article what I cite from the 179th chapter of his ſecond book. Salmaſius embraces this opinion (1).

[*B*] *Every one is not of their opinion.*] Indeed Pliny (2) obſerves that the branch of the Nile, which, by reaſon of the city Naucratis, was called *Naucraticum*, came

(1) Salmaſ. Exercit. Plin. in Solin. *pag.* 476.

(2) Plin. *lib. v, cap. x.*

It was a colony of Mileſians [*C*], if we will believe Strabo. He is not the only one who has affirmed it (*a*); but he is not conſiſtent with himſelf; and there are a great many arguments to be urged againſt his opinion. Dioderus Siculus does not agree with him

came immediately after that of Canopus. *Naucratis, unde oſtium quidam Naucratiticum nominant, quod alii Heracleoticum, Canopico, cui PROXIMUM eſt, præferentes.* Let there be a fault, if you pleaſe, in the word *præferentes*, it will ſtill be true, that, according to Pliny, the mouth of Naucratis, and that of Canopus, are not the ſame. Tacitus (3) is perfectly of this opinion; for, after having ſpoken of the mouth of Canopus, he adds, 'Inde proximum 'amnis os dicatum Herculi, quem indigenæ ortum 'apud ſe & antiquiſſimum perhibent. - - - - - - *That 'branch of the river next to this, was dedicated to Hercules, whom the inhabitants pretend to have been born 'amongſt them, and to be extremely antient.*' Dionyſius Periegetes affirms the ſame thing (4). But let us ſee a little what Strabo ſays. He obſerves (5), that the Bolbitic mouth is next to that of Canopus; and that the Sebennytic comes immediately after the Bolbitic. In this he agrees with Pliny, *proximo Alexandriæ Canopico*, ſays this latter (6), *deinde Bolbitino, Sebennytico*; from whence we may infer, by the by, that, according to Pliny, *Heracleoticum, Bolbitinum, Naucratiticum oſtium*, are one and the ſame branch of the Nile. Strabo adds, that the Mileſians entred with thirty ſail into the Bolbitic mouth, at the time of Pſammitichus and Cyaxares, the former king of Egypt, the latter king of the Medes; and that making a deſcent, they built what was called the Mileſians Wall, Μιλησιων τεῖχος, a place between the Bolbitic and Sebennytic mouths. Another time, continues he, they ſet ſail towards Sais, and having obtained a naval victory againſt Inarus, they built the city of Naucratis, a little above Schedia. The city of Saïs, was, according to him, farther from the Bolbitic branch, than the city Sebennys. It ſeems therefore, that ſince they built Naucratis, after their conducting their fleet towards Saïs, Naucratis muſt be imagined pretty near Saïs; and this would not only refute thoſe, who ſay that Naucratis was built upon the moſt weſtern branch of the Nile, but alſo thoſe who place it upon the ſecond branch, reckoning from weſt to eaſt. But we muſt not fix the true ſituation of Naucratis by the place where the Mileſians ſet ſail, and vanquiſhed Inarus, ſince Strabo explains himſelf, and gives us another rule. They built, ſays he, Naucratis a little above Schedia. The queſtion at preſent is, concerning the poſition of Schedia. Salmaſius (7) places it upon the mouth of Canopus, but he is miſtaken; for Strabo has placed a canal betwixt this mouth and Schedia; and conſequently a town might have been built above Schedia, upon the ſecond branch of the Nile. The diſtance of Alexandria from Schedia, was about twelve or fifteen of our leagues (8). See another paſſage of Strabo (9), which deſerves to be obſerved. They who went up the Nile from Schedia to Memphis, found, on the right, Hermopolis, Momemphis, *&c.* with ſome canals leading to the lake Mareotis; on their left they found Naucratis upon the river, in the Delta itſelf, and Saïs at ſome diſtance from the Nile. This you ſee is deciſive againſt the poſition of Naucratis upon the moſt weſtern branch of this river. I do not think Salmaſius ever conſidered this paſſage of Strabo. Nor has he well conſidered the other, but has ill inferred from it, that Naucratis was where Herodotus placed it; namely, upon Canopus, the moſt weſtern mouth of the Nile. What he adds, that this Canopic mouth, and the Herculean, are the ſame in Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Ptolemy, Solinus, and Ammianus Marcellinus, only ſerves the better to convince us of the confuſion in which the antient writers have left Geography; ſome ſaying one thing, and others affirming the quite contrary. This is moſt commonly the fruit we reap, after having laboured hard to reconcile theſe people; we bring their wanderings and darkneſs more into view.

[*C*] *It was a colony of Mileſians.*] Here is a proof of what I have been obſerving. Herodotus is ſo far from ſaying with Strabo, that the Mileſians built Naucratis after their naval victory over Inarus, that he obſerves (10), that king Amaſis (11), out of his great favour to the Greeks, conſented that ſuch of this nation as pleaſed, might live at Naucratis; and that thoſe who had a more rambling humour, and loved rather to ſail up and down, might build temples in certain places. This Hiſtorian adds, that, in purſuance of this grant, many Grecian cities built a temple at the common charge, and that the Mileſians, in particular, built that of Apollo. He inſinuates that the places, where theſe temples were, became ſo many magazines or ſtore-houſes, for the merchandizes of the Grecians, and that thus they abridged the privileges Naucratis enjoyed of being the ſole trading city of Egypt. I do not think it eaſy to reconcile with this paſſage of Herodotus, that which I have cited from Strabo in the preceding remark. It would be much if this Geographer could be reconciled with himſelf. He ſpeaks (12) of two expeditions of the Mileſians. The conſequences of the firſt were the building in Egypt a city called the Mileſians Wall. The conſequences of the ſecond were the building the city Naucratis. He does not reckon the years which intervened between theſe two enterprizes: but he places the firſt under Pſammitichus, and the ſecond under Inarus; and he makes Pſammitichus cotemporary with Cyaxares, king of the Medes. It follows from hence, that the Mileſians made their firſt expedition into Egypt, between the XXXVIIth and XLth Olympiad; for that is the time wherein the reigns of theſe two princes concur (13); and perhaps this expedition ſhould not be diſtinguiſhed from that mentioned by Herodotus (14), when he tells us, that Pſammitichus having taken the Ionians and Carians, who landed in his country, into his ſervice, by their means overcame all the other kings of Egypt; after which he gave lands to theſe foreigners, who had ſo well ſerved him. It is true, they were placed pretty far from the eſtabliſhment of Strabo's Mileſians (15). As for the expedition made in Inarus's time, it muſt fall about the LXXXth Olympiad, being the time in which the Egyptians elected him their king, in order to deliver themſelves from the ſevere yoke of the Perſians. Now if Naucratis was not built till the Mileſians had conquered Inarus, this city muſt have been founded after Xerxes's expedition: whence comes it then, that Strabo (16) relates, that Charaxus, Sappho's brother, traded in Leſbian wine at Naucratis? Did not Strabo know, that Alcæus and Sappho flouriſhed at the ſame time; that is, 150 years, more or leſs, before the reign of Inarus? It muſt therefore be confeſſed, that this Geographer's account of Naucratis is indigeſted, and very doubtful. I ſhould rather believe what Euſebius ſays of it, namely, that it was built towards the end of the VIth Olympiad, at the ſame time as Rome. I find that Athenæus (17) upon the teſtimony of an author, a native of Naucratis, relates, that in the XXIIId Olympiad, Heroſtratus, a merchant of that city, was wont to trade by ſea into ſeveral countries. This does not beſpeak a city built but the other day. Scaliger, who depends rather on Strabo than Euſebius, accuſes the latter of a prodigious Anachroniſm (18); he finds an *hiatus* of about 150 years betwixt the year of the foundation of Naucratis, according to Euſebius, and the year that this town was actually built; for he believes that the Mileſians built it towards the end of Pſammitichus's reign, or the beginning of Cyaxares's. He cites Strabo, without ſeeming to have taken notice of the victory obtained over Inarus: he therefore draws a falſe conſequence from his citation, ſince it is manifeſt, that if Naucratis was not built till after the defeat of Inarus, cotemporary with Artaxerxes Longimanus, it is impoſſible that Scaliger has rightly fixed the time when this city was founded. Salmaſius takes this Inarus of Strabo for a city (19). Upon this foot the Mileſians might have built Naucratis, at the time which Scaliger has fixed. But where ſhall we find the city Inarus? What Geographers have ſpoken of it? We muſt not ſay, that this city was perfectly obſcure; for Strabo, in that caſe, would not have barely named it: when we ſay briefly, that conquerors have taken ſuch, or ſuch a town, we ſuppoſe it to be known.

(*a*) Euſebius, Stephanus Byzantin. *and* Suidas *alſo affirm it.*

(3) Annal. *lib. ii, cap. lx.*

(4) Heracleoticum nominat quod Canopico proximum fuit, ut Dionyſius Periegetes cenſuit teſte Euſtathio ad illius verſum 13. *Harduin. in Plinium, Tom. i, pag.* 563.

(5) *Lib. xvii, pag.* 551.

(6) *Lib. v, cap. x.*

(7) Exercit. Plin. *pag.* 476.

(8) Of four ſchœni, according to *Strabo*; now one ſchœnus, according to *Herodotus, lib. ii, cap. vi*, contained 60 ſtadia; eight ſtadia a mile. See *Strabo, lib. xvii, pag.* 553, who obſerves, that this meaſure varied according to the different places.

(9) *Lib. xvii, pag.* 552.

(10) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. clxxviii.*

(11) He began his reign forty-two years after the death of Pſammitichus. *Helvic. Chron.*

(12) *Lib. xvii, pag. m.* 551.

(13) See Helvicus in his Chronological Tables.

(14) *Lib. ii, cap. lii.*

(15) A little above the town of Bubaſtus, upon the channel of Peluſium, which is the moſt oriental mouth of the Nile. *Herod. ibid. cap. cliv.* See what ſhall be cited from Diodorus Siculus in the remark [*D*].

(16) *Lib. xvii, pag.* 556.

(17) *Lib. xv, pag.* 675.

(18) Μέγα χάσμα ἀναχρονισμοῦ. Scalig. in Euſeb. Chron. *pag.* 74.

(19) Expugnato Inaro condiderunt Naucratim. *Salmaſ. Exercit. in Solin. pag.* 476.

him [*D*]. What is moſt certain is, that Naucratis was a very famous city. Herodotus ſays (*b*) that it was antiently the only trading city in Egypt; and that to preſerve this privilege, no merchant-ſhip was ſuffered to unlade in any other port. All who put into any other mouth of the Nile, were obliged to ſwear it was againſt their intention, and to ſet ſail for the mouth of Canopus in the ſame veſſel. That if they could not arrive there by reaſon of contrary winds, they unloaded their effects in barges, which they brought up the Nile, through all the windings of that river, quite to Naucratis. It is not a little ſtep towards the proving the great wealth of that city, and the mighty concourſe of foreigners, to obſerve, as Herodotus does, that the courtezans there took great care to appear charming (*c*). Though this Hiſtorian confutes thoſe who have ſaid, that Rhodope, by her proſtitutions, got money enough to build one of the principal pyramids of Egypt; yet he owns ſhe acquired immenſe ſums, and clearly enough inſinuates, that ſhe got the greateſt part of her wealth at Naucratis. Athenæus accuſes him of confounding this Rhodope with Dorica. It was the latter, according to Athenæus, who had Sappho's brother for her galant; but, according to Herodotus, ſhe that was beloved by Sappho's brother, was called Rhodope. Let them diſpute it out. Athenæus ſeems to draw an advantage from this, that Naucratis, his native place, had produced moſt famous and moſt handſome ladies of pleaſure (*d*). He forgets not to mention Archidice (*e*), who, as Herodotus relates (*f*), was very famous throughout all Greece. She ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from her, who had a ſuit with her galant. I have ſpoken elſewhere (*g*) of what the courtezan Lamia thought of the judgment, which was given in that cauſe. This city pretended to have a great ſhare in the protection and favour of Venus (*b*), and boaſted of poſſeſſing a miraculous image of this goddeſs, which was conſecrated in her temple, after it had done a great miracle in a violent ſtorm. The ſtory was to be found in a book compoſed by Polycharmus, concerning the goddeſs Venus. If we had this book, we might ſee very probably many things, of which ſome ſtories of our legendaries would ſeem only a copy; and if we had the work of Apollonius Rhodius concerning the foundation of Naucratis, it would be eaſy to make a long and curious article concerning this city. Origen (*i*) has obſerved, that the god Serapis was particularly adored there, though antiently they worſhiped other gods. Athenæus (*k*) relates ſome cuſtoms that were practiſed there. He is not the only author who was born in this city. Polycharmus (*l*), Julius Pollux (*m*), Lyceas (*n*), and, according to ſome, Philiſtus (*o*) and Ariſtophanes (*p*) were born there alſo. Philiſtus had compoſed ſomething concerning this city (*q*). It drew infinitely more wealth from its Potters ware and nitre [*E*], than from its ingenious men, though theſe have moſt contributed to its glory.

[*D*] *Diodorus Siculus does not agree with him.*] He tells us (20), that Pſammitichus, one of the twelve princes who governed Egypt for fifteen years, was obliged, in order to maintain himſelf againſt his partners, to take ſtrangers into his pay; by whoſe means he gained a battle, which ſubjected to him the whole kingdom. Theſe ſtrangers were Arabians, or Carians, or Ionians. From that time ſtrangers were had in great eſteem with him, whether they liſted for ſoldiers, or came only to ſee Egypt. He made an alliance with the Athenians, and with ſome other Grecian nations; and was the firſt who permitted foreigners to traffic in Egypt: for, under the preceding reigns, all ſtrangers, who landed in this country, were either murdered or made ſlaves. Now, according to Athenæus, the city Naucratis was already conſiderable in the XXIIId Olympiad: it is therefore impoſſible, according to Diodorus's hypotheſis, that it ſhould have been built by Mileſians, ſince, according to that hypotheſis, no ſtranger could ſafely land in Egypt, before the reign of Pſammitichus; that is to ſay, before the XXXth Olympiad, more or leſs (21). Judge whether Euſebius could find his account in this hypotheſis; he who would have Naucratis to have been built by the Mileſians in the VIth Olympiad. There is nothing but confuſion in all this.

[*E*] *It drew . . . wealth from it's Potters ware and nitre.*] The paſſage where Athenæus (22) ſpeaks of theſe Potters wares, has not been well tranſlated. Πολλοὶ δ' ἐν τῇ Ναυκράτει κεραμεῖς, ἀφ' ὧν καὶ ἡ ϖλυτίον τῶν κεραμείων ϖύλη Κεραμικὴ καλεῖται. His meaning is, that there were a great number of Potters at Naucratis, and that the gate of the city, which was called Ceramic, took it's name from it's neighbourhood to the Potteries. Inſtead of this ſenſe, it is turned thus, that the arm of the Nile, in the neighbourhood of theſe Potteries, was called the Ceramic mouth. Dalechamp (23) has been ſo fond of this verſion, as to make uſe of it to change the word *Canopicum*, in a paſſage of Pliny, into that of *Ceramicum*. It ſhould be read, ſays he, *Naucratis, unde oſtium quidam Naucraticum nominant, quod alii Ceramicum*, &c (*non Canopicum*). If there was any change to be made, it ſhould not have been *Canopicum*, but *Heracleoticum*, which ought to be changed into *Ceramicum* (24). But, as Salmaſius very well obſerves (25), Athæneus does not ſay, that the mouth of the Nile, upon which Naucratis was built, was called *Ceramicum*, I ſhall take notice, by the by, that there was in Athens a fine ſtreet called *Ceramica*, and a ſuburb which went by the ſame name (26); the ſtreet ſtill retains it's antient name, which it took from a hero named Ceramus, the ſon of Bacchus and Ariadne: but the ſuburb was called ſo from the great quantity of earthen pots made there. They paſſed through it to go to the academy. As to what concerns the nitre of Naucratis, I ſhall content myſelf with citing Pliny (27).

NAUSICAA or NAUSICAE, daughter of Alcinous king of the Phæacians, in the iſle of Corcyra (*a*), appears with great luſtre in Homer's Odyſſes. The Poet has been very liberal of his favours to her, and repreſented her as a goddeſs both in body and ſoul (*b*), and woud have his hero, after his ſhipwreck, receive from her the firſt aſſiſtance he wanted. Naked, as he was born, he was laid upon the earth in a place, where the thick branches of two trees ſecured him from the eyes of the paſſengers; and he ſlept very quietly by the favour of Minerva, when the cries of ſome maids awaked him.

(*b*) Lib. ii, cap. clxxx.

(*c*) Φιλέουσι δὲ πως ἐν τῇ Ναυκράτι ἐπαφρόδιτοι γίνεσθαι αἱ ἑταῖραι. Gaudent autem quodam modo in Naucrate proſtibula fieri gratioſa. *Herod. lib. ii, cap. cxxxv.*

(*d*) Ἐνδόξους δὲ ἑταίρας καὶ ἐπὶ κάλλει διαφερούσας ἤνεγκε καὶ ἡ Ναύκρατις. Celebres quoque meretrices & inſigni forma tulit Naucratis. *Athen. lib. xiii, cap. vii, pag.* 596.

(*e*) Id. ib.

(*f*) Herod. lib. ii, cap. cxxxv.

(*g*) In the article LAMIA, a courtezan, remark [*K*].

(*b*) Athen. lib. xv, cap. vi, pag. 676.

(*i*) Contra Celſum, lib. v, pag. m. 257.

(*k*) Pag. 149, 150, 675.

(*l*) Athen. pag. 675.

(*m*) Philoſtr. de Sophiſt. lib. ii, Suidas.

(*n*) Athen. pag. 616.

(*o*) Suidas.

(*p*) Heliodorus Athenienſis, apud Athenæum, lib. vi, pag. 229.

(*q*) Suidas.

(20) *Lib. v, cap. ii.*

(21) Helvicus begins this reign in the ſecond year of the XXVIIth Olympiad, and doubtleſs excludes not the time that Pſammitichus reigned with his aſſociates.

(22) *lib. xi, pag.* 480.

(23) Not. in Athen. *ad pag.* 480.

(24) Salmaſ. in Exercit. Plin. *pag.* 476.

(25) Ibid.

(26) Taken from Guillet, Old and New Athens, *pag. m.* 212, 268.

(27) Nitrariæ Ægypti circa Naucratim & Memphim tantùm ſolebant eſſe, circa Memphim deteriores. *Plin. lib. xxxi, cap. x.*

(*a*) Now Corfu.

(*b*) Ἀθανάτῃσι φυὴν καὶ εἶδος ὁμοίη. Immortalibus indole & forma ſimilis. *Homer. Odyſſ. lib. vi, ver.* 16.

him. They were Nauſicaa, and her maids, who were playing at Tennis [*A*], while the linen, they had waſhed and hung out, was drying in the ſun. Ulyſſes firſt of all covered his privy parts with leaves, and then went to ſee what was the matter. The ſight of him put all thoſe poor girls to flight, except Nauſicaa, who had received from Mercury, by inſpiration, the courage to ſtand her ground and hear what the naked man had to ſay to her. Ulyſſes, fearing to diſpleaſe her if he ſhould embrace her knees, made his complement to her at a little diſtance, telling her, that, ſeeing her ſo beautiful, he did not know whether ſhe were a goddeſs, or a woman; that her father, mother, and brothers, were happy in her; but yet much happier would he be who ſhould marry her: and after a prelude ſo handſomely concerted, implored her aſſiſtance, eſpecially in relation to his nakedneſs, praying the gods to make her as happy as ſhe could wiſh in a huſband, children, and domeſtic concord. Nauſicaa anſwered, like a young lady of quality, calling back her ſervants, and commanding them to give the man meat and drink, and to waſh his body. Immediately they led him to the bath, and brought him both cloaths and oil, bidding him to waſh himſelf in the river; but he deſired them to retire at a little diſtance, being aſhamed to appear naked before ſo many young women. Upon this they retired. He waſhed and rubbed himſelf all over, and then dreſſed himſelf, and went to Nauſicaa, who was ſo well pleaſed with him, that ſhe told her ſervants ſhe ſhould be charmed with ſuch a man for her huſband. After he had eaten with all the ravenous precipitation of a perſon, who had faſted a long while (*c*), ſhe told him he muſt go with her ſervants to a certain place near the city, and wait there till ſhe ſhould have entered her father's palace with all her attendants. She gave him her reaſons for this very frankly; which were, that ſhe would give no occaſion for tattling to any ſlanderers, of whom that city was full, and who would not fail to ſay in caſe they ſaw him go in with her ſervants, that ſhe had been to ſeek him for a huſband; upon which they would make a hundred malicious jeſts in prejudice to her reputation, and that ſo much the more, as ſhe herſelf ſhould be provoked againſt another, who, without the conſent of either father or mother, and before marriage, ſhould lie with a man. Ulyſſes, in obedience to theſe remonſtrances, waited at the place appointed him; from whence he was afterwards inviſibly conducted by Minerva to the palace of Alcinous [*B*], who received him very graciouſly. He there again ſaw Nauſicaa, who deſired him to remember at his return home, that ſhe had ſaved his life. He anſwered he would every day pay his vows to her as to a goddeſs (*d*). It will be ſeen below, why I have enlarged upon this epiſode of Homer [*C*]. There is in the cabinet of the Sieur Nigri at Bologna, an exceeding rare medal of this heroine (*e*).

There are ſome grave authors (*f*) who affirm that Telemachus, the ſon of Ulyſſes, was married to our Nauſicaa, and that he had a ſon by her, whom ſome name Perſeptolis, and others Ptoliportus.

(*c*) Ἤτοι ὁ πῖνε καὶ ἤσθιε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς, Ἁρπαλέως· δηρὸν γὰρ ἐδητύος ἦεν ἄπαστος. Atque ipſe bibebat & edebat prudens divinus Ulyſſes, rapaciter; jampridem enim cibum non guſtaverat. *Id. ib. ver.* 249.

(*d*) Τῷ κέν τοι κἀκεῖθι θεῷ ὣς εὐχετοῴμην, αἰεὶ ἤματα πάντα. Sic enim tibi etiam illic velut Deo vota faciam ſemper diebus omnibus. *Odyſſ. viii, ver.* 467.

(*e*) Spon's Voyage, *Tom. i, pag.* 99, *Edit. Holl.* There is a print of it in Wheeler's Travels.

(*f*) Ariſtoteles de Republ. Ithacenſi; & Hellanicus, apud Euſtath. in Odyſſ. *lib. xvi*; Dictys Cretenſis, *lib. vi, pag. m.* 204.

[*A*] *Nauſicaa and her maids, who were playing at Tennis.*] You ſee that Homer is contented with making Nauſicaa divert herſelf at this play with her attendants; but Anagallis, a Grammarian, has made her the inventor of it (1). It is true, that Athenæus contradicts her, and ſuppoſes, that being herſelf of Corcyra, ſhe was willing to pay a compliment to Nauſicaa her country-woman (2). It is true alſo, that it ſeems to be rather the invention of a dance, than of Tennis, that is aſcribed to her: but theſe things lie too deeply concealed in the obſcurity of antient times.

[*B*] *He was . . . conducted by Minerva to the palace of Alcinous.*] This is what neither Charles Stephens, Mr Lloyd, nor Mr Hoffman have taken any notice of; for they all make Nauſicaa introduce Ulyſſes to Alcinous. There has been more care taken in Calepin; for inſtead of ſaying with others, *In Regiam patris ſui eum perduxit, - - - She introduced him into his father's palace*, it is there ſaid, *In Regiam Patris ſui ire juſſit, - - - - ſhe commanded him to go into her father's palace.* The two verſes of Martial which are quoted,

Si mihi Nauſicaë patrios concederet hortos,
  Alcinoo poſſem dicere malo meos,

Nauſicaë's gardens I ſhou'd, like a clown,
Refuſe, and cry, I've finer of my own.

are not in the ſecond book, as that quotation ſays; but in the thirty-firſt epigram of the twelfth book, where Martial commends the gardens of his wife. I have obſerved, in another place (3), an error much groſſer than this.

[*C*] *It will be ſeen below, why I have enlarged upon this epiſode.*] It is to give ſuch a demonſtration, as may be underſtood by every capacity, of Homer's ſimplicity, and of the difference there is between the character of his age, and that of ours.

(1) Suidas, in Ἀναγαλλίς, & in Ὄρχησις.

(2) Athen. *lib. i, cap. xi: he calls her* Agallis.

(3) In the remark [C] of the article ALCINOUS.

NAUSITHOUS, king of the Phæacians. See the article **ALCINOUS**.

NAZIANZEN (Gregory) one of the moſt celebrated fathers of the church, in the IVth century. I could make a very long article of him; but I muſt then repeat what ſome great authors (*a*), have ſaid before me, whoſe works are in every body's hands, and ſtill retain the grace of novelty. I ſhall be very ſhort. An error has been commited in Chronology by one who cenſured Gregory Nazianzen for writing againſt the emperor Julian [*A*]. Some over-nice critics pretend that he has corrupted the

---

(*a*) Mr du Pin in his New Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, *Tom. ii, pag.* 201, *& ſeq. Edit. of Holland*; and Mr Le Clerc, in the beginning of the eighteenth Tome of *Bibliotheque Univerſelle.*

[*A*] *An error in Chronology has been committed by one who cenſured Gregory Nazianzen, for writing againſt the emperor Julian.*] It was Cunæus, profeſſor in the univerſity of Leyden, who committed this error. Theſe are his words (1): ‘ Fuit profectò, fuit Græ‘ corum quorundam, qui eâ tempeſtate Eccleſiam rexere, ‘ magna

(1) Cunæus, Præfat. in Juliani Cæſares, *pag. m.* 119.

the purity of the Greek tongue and given occaſion to the barbariſm of the Latin Divines [*B*]. They alſo complain that his Greek verſes were ſubſtituted for the inſtruction of youth, in the room of the antient Pagan Poetry, which was burnt at the inſtigation of the prieſts [*C*].

magna imprudentia. Etenim, uti cauſæ ſuæ ſervirent, principem Chriſtianis infeſtum laceſſebant, quem tolerare ſatius fuiſſet. Sunt in hominum manibus orationes eorum, in quibus, tanquam in ſcena, palam eum omnibus ludibrium fecere, & faciem illius, formamque corporis, atque geſtus, tum alia fortuita, quæ vulgus & imperitiſſimus quiſque notat, traxerunt in culpam. Qui viri, ſi meminiſſent temporum, quibus nati erant, ſanè neceſſitati, quæ pertinax regnum tenet, ſine contumacia paruiſſent, &, quod magnæ prudentiæ eſt, obſequio mitigaſſent imperia. *There were indeed, it muſt be owned, ſome Greeks who then ruled the church, very much to blame for their imprudence. For, in order to ſerve their cauſe, they abuſed a prince who was an enemy to Chriſtianity, when it would have been much better to have born with him. We have their ſpeeches ſtill left, in which they have expoſed him, as it were, on a ſtage, to univerſal ridicule, and have reflected upon his aſpect, the ſhape of his body, his geſtures, and other accidental matters, of which the vulgar, and every ignorant perſon, is apt to take notice. Theſe men, if they had remembered the times they were born in, would certainly have obeyed, without reflexion, the neceſſity of a ſevere reign, and what is always the part of great prudence, they would have rendered it the leſs ſo by their ſubmiſſion.*’ This was animadverted on in a book which appeared in 1690. ‘A famous profeſſor, as is there ſaid (2), has been guilty of falſifying Hiſtory, by accuſing thoſe prelates of very great imprudence, whoſe invectives againſt Julian are ſtill extant. They had much better, ſays he, have complied with the neceſſity of the times, by an humble ſubmiſſion, and have born with the ſeverity of that prince againſt the Chriſtians, than to have exaſperated him yet more by their writings. Now is not this ſuppoſing that St Gregory Nazianzen, and St Cyril, the only two whom Cunæus could ſpeak of, publiſhed their Invectives during the life of that emperor; which is however a very apparent falſity; for St Gregory did not write his till after the death of Julian, and St Cyril did not live till a conſiderable time after the deceaſe of that prince. Where was then the great imprudence of theſe two prelates?’ Petavius in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to his edition of the works of Julian, is very angry with this Cunæus, and reproaches him, among other things, with the error in Chronology before-mentioned. See what he ſays, after having copied the Latin words of Cunæus which I cited: ‘Hæc ille non ſolum imprudenter talibus de viris, ſed etiam imperite. Etenim Græci illi Patres, quos imprudentiæ arguit: quorumque contra Julianum extare orationes aſſerit, ſunt omnino duo. Gregorius Nazianzenus, & Cyrillus; quorum alter haud paucis poſt Juliani obitum annis vixit, ac ſcripſit, alter æqualis quidem fuit illius. Sed eo mortuo στηλιτευτικοὺς, illos duos conſcripſit, ex quibus, cæteriſque fide dignioribus liquet; fuiſſe Imperatorem iſtum multis, veriſque vitiis præditum, *&c.* - - - - *He has thus cenſured thoſe great men not only imprudently but ignorantly. For thoſe Greek fathers, whom he taxes with indiſcretion: and whoſe, declamations againſt Julian he affirms to be yet extant, are but two. Gregory Nazianzen and St Cyril, one of whom neither wrote nor lived till many years after Julian's death; the other was cotemporary indeed with him, but did not compoſe thoſe two invectives till after his death, from which, as well as from other writings leſs liable to exception, it is plain that this emperor was actually guilty of many real vices.*’ It is poſſible Cunæus might have replied to the other ſarcaſtic complaints of Father Patavius, but he muſt have been obliged to own himſelf in the wrong in regard to this.

(2) An Important Advice to the Refugees, *pag.* 43, 44.

[*B*] *Some critics . . . . pretend that he has corrupted the purity of the Greek tongue, and given occaſion to the barbariſm of the Latin Divines.*] I have read this complaint in a work of Alcyonius. You will find there a fine encomium upon St Gregory; but which concludes with theſe words (3). ‘Utinam incorruptam Græcæ linguæ integritatem ſervaſſet in tanta rerum ſilva & tam magna librorum vi, certe ſanctiſſimum illum pontificem omni laude cumulatum judicarem . . . . ex illius maxime ſcriptis barbariem irrepſiſſe in Theologiam Latinam arbitror. Nam veteres noſtri interpretes mediocris literaturæ, nullius fere judicii homines, cum animadverterent Theologum hunc frequenter uſurpare voces quaſdam novas eaſque non ſatis apte fictas, neceſſe ſibi eſſe crediderunt illas latine reddere, atque hunc in modum ſordida barbarie eſt lingua Latina infuſcata. - - - - *It were to be wiſhed that he had preſerved the purity of the Greek tongue incorrupt, in ſo large a field of matter, and in ſo great a number of books, this would have made me judge that moſt holy Father, worthy of all poſſible praiſe . . . . from his writings principally in my opinion, has that barbariſm crept into our Latin Divinity. For our antient interpreters, being men of little learning, and ſcarce any judgment, obſerving this Father frequently to make uſe of new terms, and thoſe not very well adapted, thought it neceſſary for them to be rendered into Latin, and by this means it happened that the Latin tongue became ſo much defiled with impure expreſſions.*’ It is the cardinal John de Medicis who here ſpeaks.

(3) Petr. Alcyonius, in Medice Legato priore, *fol. ciij, verſo.*

[*C*] . . . *and alſo complain that his Greek verſes were ſubſtituted in the room of the antient Pagan poetry, burnt at the inſtigation of the prieſts.*] Let us continue to hear the ſame John de Medicis. ‘Audiebam etiam puer ex Demetrio Chalcondyla Græcarum rerum peritiſſimo, ſacerdotes Græcos tanta floruiſſe auctoritate apud Cæſares Byzantios, ut integra illorum gratia complura de veteribus Græcis poemata combuſſerint in primiſque ea ubi amores, turpes luſus, & nequitiæ amantum continebantur, atque ita Menandri, Diphili, Apollodori, Philemonis, Alexis fabellas, & Saphûs, Erinnæ, Anacreontis, Mimnermi, Bionis, Alcmanis, Alcæi carmina intercidiſſe. Tum pro his ſubſtituta Nazianzeni noſtri poemata, quæ etſi excitant animos noſtrorum hominum ad flagrantiorem religionis cultum, non tamen verborum atticorum proprietatem & græcæ linguæ elegantiam edocent. Turpiter quidem Sacerdotes iſti in veteres Græcos malevoli fuerunt, ſed integritatis, probitatis, & religionis maximum dedere teſtimonium (4). - - - - - - *I was informed even while I was a boy, by Demetrius Chalcondylas, that the Greek prieſts had ſo much influence over the Conſtantinopolitan emperors, that they obtained leave from them to burn a great many antient Greek poems, eſpecially ſuch as were of the amorous kind, and deſcribed the looſe entertainment and ſtratagems of lovers, and ſo came the plays of Menander, Diphilus, Apollodorus, Philemon, and Alexis, and the verſes of Sapho, Erinna, Anacreon, Mimnermus, Bion, Alcman, and Alcæus, to be loſt. Then in the room of theſe were ſubſtituted the poems of our Nazianzen, which tho' they excite the preſent age to greater zeal in religious worſhip, yet do not teach the true propriety and elegance of the Greek language. Thoſe prieſts have indeed given a ſhameful inſtance of their malice againſt the antient Greeks, at the ſame time that they produce ſo great a teſtimony of their uprightneſs, probity, and devotion.*’

(4) Id. ib.

NEMESIUS, a Chriſtian Philoſopher, author of a book *De natura hominis* [*A*]. It is pretended that he was biſhop of Emeſa a city of Phœnicia, and that he lived towards

[*A*] *He is author of a book,* De natura hominis.] The firſt edition is that of Antwerp by Plantin, in 1565, in 8vo. Nicaſius Ellebodius Caſletanus (1), who procured it, added it to his Latin verſion; his Epiſtle Dedicatory to Antony Perrenot, Cardinal, is in Greek and dated at Padua. In it he treats with the utmoſt contempt

(1) See concerning this author, who was a native of Caſſel in Flanders, the *Bibliotheca Belgica*, of Valerius Andreas, *pag.* 678, and Moreri, at the word *Ellebodius.*

towards the end of the IVth century: others make him flouriſh a century after (*a*). He eſpouſed the errors of Origen concerning the pre-exiſtence of the ſoul, and the article of Free-will, and diſputed againſt the fatality of the Stoics with great force. Some have been of opinion that St Gregory Nyſſenus was the true author of the work which goes under the name of Nemeſius, but their arguments are of no great weight (*b*).

contempt the Latin verſion which Georgius Valla had made of it, and had been printed at Lyons by Gryphius in the year 1538. This work was inſerted in the *Auctarium* of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* in the year 1624, and is in all the following editions of the ſame Bibliotheca. It was printed ſeparately at Oxford in Greek and Latin, in the year 1671, in 8vo with notes.

(*a*) See du Pin, *Biblioth. Tom. iii, Part ii, p.* 280, *Edit. of Holland.*

(*b*) *See* Theoph. Raynaud, Erotem. de malis ac bonis Libris, *num.* 339, *pag. m.* 150.

NEPHES OGLI. This name among the Turks ſignifies, *The ſon of the HOLY GHOST*, and is given to certain perſons, born after an extraordinary manner, I mean of a virgin-mother. There are, it is ſaid, ſome Turkiſh virgins who live in ſuch retirement, that they never ſee a man. They go but very rarely to the moſques; and when they do, they tarry there from nine at night till mid-night, and join to their prayers ſuch contorſions of body, and howlings, that they exhauſt all their ſtrength and oftentimes happen to fall down to the ground in a ſwoon. If they find themſelves with child from that time, they give out they are ſo by the grace of the Holy Ghost; and upon this account the children, they bring forth, are called *Nephes Ogli* (*a*). They are looked upon as a ſort of people who have the gift of miracles [*A*].

(*a*) Georgiewitz, *cap. i.* Ita mihi narratum eſt, *ſays he*, à pediſſequis earum, *nam nec ipſe vidi, nec aliquis virorum eorundem huic ſpectaculo intereſſe poteſt.*

[*A*] *They are looked upon as a ſort of people who have the gift of miracles.*] A monk, who lived a long while in Turkey, aſſures us, that it was ſaid, there was always two or three of theſe Nephes Ogli's in the city of Bruſczia (1), whoſe hair, and pieces of their habits, cured all ſorts of maladies. 'Dicuntur tales, '*adds he* (2), prodigioſè naſci, id eſt ſine virili ſemine, & per conſequens tota eorum vita & actio ſupernaturalis & mirabilis credenda eſt. - - - *Such are 'ſaid to be born after a miraculous manner, that is without human ſeed, and by conſequence their whole life and 'behaviour is to be thought ſupernatural and miraculous.*'

(1) It was undoubtedly the city of Pruſa in Bithynia, the firſt ſeat of the Ottoman empire.

(2) Septemcaſtrenſis, de Moribus Turcorum, *pag.* 47, apud Hottinger. Hiſtor. Orient. *pag.* 295.

NERO (Bernard del), a nobleman of Florence, was puniſhed with death in the year 1497, for not having diſcovered a plot which Peter de Medicis had contrived againſt the government (*a*) [*A*]. We ſhall ſee in the remark that the laws of the country ſubjected him to that puniſhment, and therefore Lewis XI, is not the firſt who made a like ordinance (*b*). Mr Varillas, much leſs to be credited than Guicciardin, ſuppoſes (*c*) that Bernard Nery (for ſo he calls him) was the chief director of the enterprize, and (*d*) that Savonarola was of opinion that the guilty perſons ought to be pardoned (*e*).

(*a*) Guicciardin, *lib. iii, fol. m.* 97.

(*b*) See rem. [*M*] of his article.

(*c*) Varillas, Anecdotes of Florence, *pag.* 212, *& ſeq.*

(*d*) Ib. *p.* 219.

(*e*) You will find quite the contrary, in remark [*F*] of the article SAVONAROLA.

[*A*] *He was puniſhed with death . . . . for not having diſcovered a plot . . . againſt the government.*] Every body may remember the fate of Mr de Thou (1), ſon of the Hiſtorian, and many people will not be pleaſed to ſee the parentheſis of Guicciardin in the paſſage I cite. *When the conſpiracy of Peter de Medicis had been fully proved. They not only condemned to death Nicolas Ridolphi, Laurence Tornaboni, Janot Pucci, and John Cambi, who had ſollicited him to come, and whom Laurence for that purpoſe had ſupplied with money; but alſo Bernardin de Nero, whom they charged with nothing elſe but that having known this plot he had not diſcovered it, which fault (being of itſelf capital by the laws of the Florentines, and by the interpretation which the greateſt part of the Civilians gave to the common laws) was found to be ſo much the greater becauſe he was ſtandard-bearer, when Peter came before Florence: as if he had been obliged to diſcharge the office of a public rather than of a private perſon* (2).

(1) See remark [*M*] of the article LEWIS XI.

(2) Guicciardin, *lib. iii, fol. m.* 123.

NESTORIUS, biſhop of Conſtantinople, was depoſed as a Heretic, by the council of Epheſus, in the year 431. The reaſon of this was, that he maintained that the holy Virgin ought not to be called, the Mother of God. There are ſome people, who maintain, that the ſenſe in which he rejected this epithet is reaſonable and orthodox [*A*]; and that therefore this pretended Hereſiarch was condemned very unjuſtly.

At

[*A*] *There are ſome people who maintain that the ſenſe in which he rejected this epithet is . . . . orthodox.*] This is the manner in which Neſtorius ſets forth his opinion in a letter he wrote to Celeſtin biſhop of Rome: he ſays 'that having met with ſome perſons at Conſtantinople who corrupted the orthodox faith, he 'endeavoured to reclaim them by ways of lenity, al'though their Hereſy came very near that of Arius 'and Apollinaris, becauſe they made the union of 'the two natures of Jesus Christ to degenerate in'to confuſion and commixtion, holding the divine na'ture to be born of Mary, and changing the body of 'Christ into his Deity: that upon this foundation 'they gave the Virgin-Mother of Christ the title 'of Mother of God; that this term, though it was 'improper, might be born with on account of the 'union of the word with the fleſh, did not they un'derſtand it of the Deity, and ſuppoſe that the Virgin 'is the mother of the word of God, which is un'warrantable (1).' In another letter (2) *he commends St Cyril for diſtinguiſhing the two natures in JESUS CHRIST; but he accuſes him afterwards of deſtroying this truth, and of rendering the Deity paſſible and mortal. He confeſſes the two natures are united, but denies, that, by reaſon of that union, the qualities that belong only to one of the two, can be attributed to the other, and he ſays, that as often as the holy Scripture ſpeaks of the paſſion and death of JESUS CHRIST, it is aſcribed to the Human nature and not to the Divine.* St Cyril acknowledges (3), that Neſtorius owns the word was incarnate, and that it was *in the womb of the Virgin* together with the man who was born of Mary; but he ſays, that this man *is not naturally God; and that it is the man only who died and roſe again. We own*, ſays St Cyril (4), *the word of GOD to be immortal, and life itſelf; but we believe at the ſame time he became fleſh, and that being united with a body animated with a rational ſoul, he has ſuffered in that body as is ſaid in the Scripture: and, becauſe his body has ſuffered, we ſay he has ſuffered likewiſe, although he be of an impaſſible nature; and becauſe his body was raiſed again, we ſay he was raiſed again alſo. But Neſtorius is not of this opinion; for he ſays it was the man who was raiſed again, and that it is the body of the man which is offered to us in the holy myſteries: we believe, on the contrary, that it is the fleſh and blood of the word which enlivens all things.*

(1) Du Pin, Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, *Tom. iii, Part ii, pag.* 287, *Dutch Edit.*

(2) This was the ſecond anſwer he made to St Cyril. See Du Pin, ibid.

(3) Du Pin, ibid. *pag.* 289.

(4) Du Pin, ibid.

It

At leaſt it muſt be owned, that the procedings of St Cyril, his adverſary, were altogether irregular. There never was a judgment more precipitate, nor more to be ſuſpected of paſſion, than that which was given by the council of Epheſus againſt our Neſtorius [*B*]. Nevertheleſs

It is eaſy to comprehend that there was only a diſpute about words between them; for St Cyril did not pretend that the word, as word, had ſuffered death; he acknowledged that the word was of an impaſſible nature; but he would have it, that becauſe a human body, united to the word, died and roſe again, it might be ſaid the word died and roſe again. The conteſt therefore was only about a turn of phraſe; the diſpute did not concern the thing itſelf. Both Neſtorius and St Cyril agreed, that the word, as word, was not born of Mary, and did not die on the croſs; but that it was united with the fleſh, which was formed in the womb of the holy Virgin, and which had been crucified. They diſputed therefore, whether in conſequence of this doctrine, it might be allowable to uſe certain phraſes. Neſtorius would not conſent to it, becauſe he feared the conſequences of ſuch expreſſions. St Cyril would have it ſo, becauſe he apprehended the conſequences of rejecting thoſe phraſes. So that, to judge charitably, they were both orthodox, and animated with a true zeal; but they had the misfortune to explain themſelves ill, and not to underſtand one another. One who had been accuſtomed to give things an ill conſtruction, would perhaps ſay, that they did underſtand each other very well, but that finding themſelves once in the career, like two famous champions they would not own their conteſt was grounded on a trifle: this would have taken away all pretence for combating. They behaved like thoſe brave duelliſts in their expoſtulations, who, for fear of being ſuſpected of cowardice, will neither own their giving or putting up an affront. By giving ſatisfaction they might confeſs a ſort of deſire not to draw, and they might teſtify the ſame deſire by acquieſcing in the ſatisfaction. However it be, the whole doctrine of the hypoſtatic union, may be retained, and the title of *Mother of GOD*, be nevertheleſs rejected, not only becauſe it may furniſh Infidels with an occaſion of joking (5) as the primitive Chriſtians, though with greater reaſon, did upon Cybele, but becauſe in a rigorous ſenſe, it is not true that the holy Virgin is the mother of GOD. It is very poſſible for an angel to be united with a human body, at the time of conception, in ſuch a manner that this angel and this human body, may make a man juſt as the body and ſoul of Adam made one. The woman, who ſhould conceive and bear in her womb this body, to which this angel was united, would be the mother of the perſon which proceeds from the hypoſtatic union of this angel with this body; but ſhe would not be the mother of the angel. We cannot even ſay that Eve was the mother of the ſoul of Abel, though ſhe was the mother of Abel. Let us ſay the ſame of the holy Virgin: She was the mother of JESUS CHRIST, but not of the word; which, by uniting with a body, formed a whole, which is called JESUS CHRIST. To ſay therefore that the holy Virgin ought to be termed the mother of JESUS CHRIST, but not of GOD, is not an argument that one rejects the hypoſtatic union, but only that one prefers the exact language of the Philoſophers to that of the vulgar, and to the ſynecdoches (6) of Rhetoricians. I am of opinion however, that Neſtorius was blameable for oppoſing the torrent: he ought to have contented himſelf to make his adverſaries explain what they underſtood by the mother of GOD (7). St Cyril on his part was alſo very blameable for not being content with making the Neſtorians explain what they meant by the mother of CHRIST. They might have ſaved the church great troubles, if they would have underſtood each other: there needed nothing more than to give reciprocally a juſt definition of their terms. I remember upon this occaſion a chapter in the *Art of Thinking* (8) where it is ſhown, that a thouſand diſputes would ceaſe, would but the diſputants take the trouble of explaining what they mean by the terms they employ. As for the reſt, it ſeems to me, that the abuſes, in reſpect to the worſhip of the holy Virgin were equally to be feared, whether ſhe was called the mother of JESUS CHRIST, or the mother of GOD. For, doubtleſs, the moſt violent votaries did never believe that the word, as ſuch, received from the holy Virgin it's life and ſubſiſtence, in the ſame manner that children receive them from their mother. And it is certain, that by urging the conſequences of the title of mother of JESUS CHRIST, as much as thoſe of mother of GOD have been urged, one might with equal readineſs have introduced the worſhip of the holy Virgin, and the ' O felix puerpera Noſtra pians ſcele- ' ra Jure matris impera Redemptori, - - - *O bleſſed* ' *be thy delivery, expiating our ſins, by thy mother's* ' *right command our Redeemer.*' I ſhall ſpeak of this hereafter (9). This refutes thoſe who find in the conduct of Neſtorius ſomething which was capable of preventing idolatry (10) Here is a fact which may perſuade us, that, at the bottom, his opinion was orthodox; which is, that he offered (11) *to call the Virgin Mary the mother of GOD, provided the error of Apollinaris, maintained by St Cyril, was condemned.*

[*B*] *There never was a judgment more precipitate, or more ſuſpected of paſſion, than this . . . . againſt Neſtorius.*] But one ſeſſion was employed in citing Neſtorius, examining his writings and thoſe of St Cyril, hearing witneſſes, and depoſing him. He who preſided in this aſſembly was St Cyril, Neſtorius's adverſary. He made the council begin to act, without waiting for the oriental biſhops, or the Pope's legates; *and notwithſtanding the oppoſition of ſixty eight biſhops, who inſiſted upon the ſtaying for the arrival of John of Antioch, and of the eaſtern and weſtern biſhops* (12). Count Candidian, the emperor's commiſſioner, had alſo demanded that nothing ſhould be done before the arrival of the oriental biſhops alledging, *that the emperor his maſter's intent was, that a general council ſhould be held, and not particular and ſeparate aſſemblies* (13). But as his remonſtrances were not taken notice of, he retired, having firſt proteſted againſt the council. St Cyril, over-ruling all theſe proteſts and remonſtrances, opened the council, and in the firſt ſeſſion condemned and depoſed his antagoniſt, altho' he had promiſed to appear *as ſoon as all the biſhops ſhould be arrived.* All this ſhews, that the emperor did not write to St Cyril without being well informed of the matter, *that he looked upon him as the author of all this diſturbance.* It was not without reaſon that he reproached him *with diſturbing the church, with having a mind to divide the Imperial family, by writing ſeparately to the empreſſes, with meddling with what did not concern him, and with acting with too great authority and too little prudence* (14).

We ſhall make uſe of Monſieur du Pin's words to ſet forth the irregularities of St Cyril (15). *There are many objections made againſt the nature of this council, and the conduct obſerved in it. They ſay, it cannot paſs for any thing but a tumultuous and raſh aſſembly, where nothing reigned but faction and paſſion, and that it cannot be termed an Oecumenical Council. That St Cyril held it in ſpight of the commiſſioners the emperor ſent to convene it; that not only Neſtorius, and thoſe of his party, but alſo ſeveral other Catholic biſhops oppoſed it; that he reſolved not to wait for the oriental biſhops, tho' they were juſt upon their arrival, and had deſired that he ſhould ſtay for them; that he did not even wait for the coming of the Pope's legates, or of any of the weſtern biſhops; that his ſynod was only compoſed of Egyptian biſhops, and ſome others of Aſia, all entirely devoted to his will. That he alone did all and governed all, in that council. Tho' he was an enemy to Neſtorius, and had refuſed him for his judge, becauſe he looked on him as his enemy, had not Neſtorius the ſame reaſon to refuſe him? The manner in which he acted againſt Neſtorius, and the precipitation with which he cauſed him to be condemned, ſeem to make it plain, that he was animated by nothing but paſſion. He cited Neſtorius twice in one day: Neſtorius anſwered, that he was ready to come as ſoon as the biſhops of the Eaſt and Weſt ſhould arrive, and the council was full; that he did not refuſe to be judged, but did not care to be judged by his enemies only. Theſe excuſes appear reaſonable. St Chryſoſtome alledged no other for not appearing before the ſynod of Theophilus. Nevertheleſs St Cyril, in imitation of his uncle and predeceſſor Theophilus, received the accuſation, formed the proceſs, delivered his own opinion firſt againſt his enemy, and cauſed him to be condemned. This is what Iſidorus of Damiata reproached St Cyril with, acquainting him,* ' *that there were a great many who* ' *laughed*

(5) *Might they not ſay, that according to the Chriſtians, God has a father, and a mother, a grand-father, and a grand-mother, a great grand-father, and a great grand-mother, and ſo go throughout all the degrees of parentage, both lineal and collateral? and then ſay with Cicero,* Si (*Saturnus*) eſt Deus, patrem quoque ejus, Cœlum, eſſe Deum confitendum eſt. Quod ſi ita eſt, Cœli quoque parentes Dii habendi ſunt, Æther, & Dies, eorumque fratres, & ſorores, qui à genealogis antiquis ſic nominantur, Amor. Dolus, &c. *De Natura Deor. lib. iii, cap. xvii, pag. m.* 625.

(6) This is a figure by which the name of the whole is given to the part, or the name of the part to the whole; that of the genus to the ſpecies, or of the ſpecies to the genus, &c.

(7) Neſtorius might have ſaid that the councils never made uſe of the term, Mother of God; but yet this term was in uſe, ſo that the people of Conſtantinople, being accuſtomed to hear it, were extremely diſpleaſed when the Neſtorians affirmed it ought not to be made uſe of. See *du Pin, ubi ſupra, pag.* 61.

(8) It is the 12th of the firſt part.

(9) In the remark [*L*].

(10) See the remark [*H*], citation (58).

(11) In a letter he wrote to the emperor, during the holding of the council of Epheſus. See *Du Pin*, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 297. Neſtorius had been already depoſed by the biſhops, who adhered to St Cyril; but the latter had alſo been depoſed by thoſe who adhered to John of Antioch.

(12) Du Pin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 293. *He quotes* Collect. of Lupus, *chap. vii.*

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 292. *He quotes* Collect. of Lupus, *chap. ix.*

(14) Id. ib. *pag.* 294. *He quotes pag.* 1, Act. Conc. *cap. xxxi.*

(15) Id. ib. *pag.* 320, 321.

Nevertheleſs St Cyril, who preſided in it, and was the ſoul of that tumultuous ſentence, has preſerved his rank and dignity [*C*], and has ever ſince, throughout all ſucceeding ages, been venerated as a great ſaint; whereas Neſtorius miſerably ſpent the remainder of his days, and his memory ſtill continues odious, they have not failed to ſay, that the manner of his death carried the marks of the Divine puniſhment and malediction [*D*].

His

‘ *laughed both at him and the tragedy he acted at Epheſus; that it was publickly ſaid he ſought only to revenge himſelf upon his enemy; that he herein imitated his uncle Theophilus; and that, altho' there were a great difference between the parties accuſed, yet the conduct of the accuſers was the ſame; that he would have done better to have ſat down quietly, and not to have revenged himſelf for particular affronts, at the expence of the church in general, and by exciting an eternal diſcord amongſt it's members under a falſe pretence of piety.' Theſe are the very words of Iſidorus of Damiata, which he ſpoke to him as a friend. Gennadius biſhop of Conſtantinople, compares likewiſe the conduct of St Cyril with that of Theophilus, and calls him the ſecond ſcourge of Alexandria. The manner after which this affair of Neſtorius was determined, ſeems to prove plainly, that it was paſſion only which influenced St Cyril, and the biſhops of his party; that they were reſolved, at what rate ſoever, to condemn Neſtorius, and that they apprehended nothing ſo much as the arrival of the oriental biſhops, for fear of not having then the power of doing what they pleaſed; for in the very firſt ſeſſion they cited Neſtorius twice, read the teſtimonies of the Fathers, the letters of St Cyril, with his twelve chapters, and the writings of Neſtorius, and gave all their opinions. Never was any affair determined with ſo much precipitation, ſince the leaſt of theſe matters required an intire ſeſſion. How could the twelve propoſitions of St Cyril be examined in ſo ſhort a time, which needed ſo many explanations, and which have cauſed ſo many diſputes? How could ſo many paſſages out of the ſermons of Neſtorius be compared with what preceded, and followed, to find out the true ſenſe? How could ſo ſhort a time be ſufficient to explain the opinions of the antient Fathers? All theſe matters required a long and ſerious examination of ſeveral days; but the biſhops of this council were ſo afraid of not finiſhing that matter in this one ſeſſion, that they remained ſhut up from morning till night, to judge that affair by themſelves, for fear if they ſhould delay it till next morning, things might take another turn. The ſentence they notified to Neſtorius, was directed in ſuch terms, as expreſs the paſſion which animated them,* To Neſtorius, the new Judas. *Was it not enough to condemn and depoſe him, without inſulting over him yet further with injurious words? In concluſion; this council, very far from procuring peace, procured nothing but diſturbance, diviſions, and ſcandal to the church of* CHRIST; *and there never was a council of which might more truly be ſaid, what St Gregory Nazianzen obſerved of thoſe of his time; ‘ That he had never known any aſſemblies of biſhops conclude happily; that they had always rather increaſed the malady, than cured it* (16). *That the obſtinate heats, and deſire of conqueſt and dominion, which commonly reigned amongſt them, rendered them prejudicial; and that for the moſt part, thoſe who undertook to judge others, were induced to it more out of ill-will, than out of any inclination they had to reform their errors.' This ſeems to ſuit with the council of Epheſus, more than with any other aſſembly of biſhops. The hiſtory of the troubles which followed this council ſufficiently demonſtrate it, and we may ſay that theſe troubles were not appeaſed, but by ceaſing to talk any more of what had been done in this council.* Monſieur du Pin has forgot nothing, in order to anſwer theſe objections; but the ſubject was ſo little favourable to him, that it may very juſtly be ſaid, his anſwers are weakneſs itſelf.

Why have we not a hiſtory of this council, written by a Father Paul! And what obſervations might there not be made in an hiſtorical comment on the words of St Gregory Nazianzen? for it ought not to be imagined, becauſe in other councils, there has not been ſo great a precipitation uſed as that of St Cyril, at the council of Epheſus; that therefore paſſion and caballing have had a leſs ſhare in them. It is highly neceſſary that the Holy Ghost ſhould preſide in theſe aſſemblies, for without this all would be loſt. This extraordinary aſſiſtance, and much more powerful than uſual, ought to aſſure and perſuade us firmly, that the Holy Ghost has done his work, amidſt the irregularities of human nature, and drawn from the darkneſs of paſſions the light of truth, not in all the councils, but in ſome only.

[*C*] *Cyril . . . . . . preſerved his rank and dignity.*] We have ſeen in the preceding remark, that he did not wait for the arrival of the oriental biſhops, before he opened the council. They arrived five days after the depoſing of Neſtorius, and held a council, where John of Antioch preſided, and where St Cyril was depoſed. Each party deputed ſome perſons to the emperor, to give him an account of what had paſſed. The oriental biſhops ſent him a relation, wherein *they complained that the church of St John had been ſhut upon them; inſomuch that they were forced to ſay their prayers without doors, and that in their return they had been ill treated. They beſeeched the emperor to baniſh from Epheſus St Cyril and Memnon, the heads of that perſecution. A little after they diſpatched alſo count Irenæus with another information againſt St Cyril, concerning an act of violence they complained of, in having been hindred, by ſtones thrown at them, from entering the church of St Paul* (17). St Cyril's party deputed three biſhops to the emperor; whereas the orientials contented themſelves with deputing only count Irenæus, *who ſucceeded ſo well, that he perſuaded that prince, that the ſynod held by St Cyril, ought not to be eſteemed a lawful council, and had almoſt prevailed upon him to confirm the proceedings of the oriental biſhops, and to baniſh St Cyril. But John, the emperor's Phyſician, and St Cyril's friend, intervening, ſoon gave a change to the face of things, by gaining the majority of the miniſters; ſome of whom were of opinion, that what had been done on both ſides was lawful; the others thought, that the whole ought to be declared void, and that diſintereſted biſhops ſhould be convened to examine the grounds of the faith, and all that had paſſed at Epheſus. In this confuſion Theodoſius was of opinion to approve the depoſing of Neſtorius, St Cyril, and Memnon, on account of their factions . . . . And he ſent count John to execute that order and to re-unite all the biſhops in one ſynod, after having expelled Neſtorius, St Cyril, and Memnon* (18). The party of John of Antioch, acquieſced in the emperor's pleaſure (19); but the other party oppoſed it in ſuch a manner, that count John was obliged to commit *Neſtorius to the cuſtody of count Candidian, and St Cyril to that of count James,* and to write to the emperor, *that he found the minds of the biſhops ſo exaſperated againſt each other, that he ſaw no way to reconcile them* (20). The emperor ordered, that each party ſhould ſend him deputies; to whom he gave audience at Chalcedon, and ſeemed very favourable to the oriental biſhops (21); but he began *by degrees to turn againſt them . . . . His council had been entirely gained. Acacius of Berœa, in a letter to be found in the collection of Lupus, chap.* 41, *accuſes St Cyril of having changed the ſentiments of the court, by giving money to a certain ſcholaſtic eunuch: He ſays alſo that this eunuch dying, and leaving a great deal of money, the emperor found a memorandum which imported that he had received ſeveral pounds of gold from St Cyril, which had been paid him by Paul, St Cyril's nephew* (22). Mr *du Pin* obſerves, that *there is no reaſon to believe what Acacius of Berœa ſays, ſince he was not one of St Cyril's friends.* I confeſs it; But what better reaſon can be given for that ſudden change of the emperor? He acknowledged for orthodox the biſhops of both parties (23), and yet he declares (24), that *Neſtorius* (25) *had been juſtly condemned*; that St Cyril and Memnon ſhould continue in their ſees, and that all the other biſhops ſhould return alſo to their churches: he declares, I ſay, all this, after he had ſhown himſelf favourable to the oriental biſhops who had ſubmitted to his orders; whereas the party of St Cyril had haughtily refuſed to ſubmit to them. This proceeding looks very much like the effect of money given by St Cyril to the emperor's counſellors; and thus in ſome caſes a perſon is orthodox or heretical, according as he has or has not money to give.

[*D*] *They have not failed to ſay, that the manner of his death carried the marks of the Divine puniſhment and malediction.*]

(16) Compare with this what has been ſaid of the aſſemblies of the ſtates-general of France in the remark [*B*], citation (6), of the article MARILLAC (Charles de).

(17) Du Pin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 297.

(18) Ib. *p.* 301.

(19) Ib. *p.* 302.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Ib. *p.* 303.

(22) Ib. *p.* 304.

(23) Ib. *p.* 305.

(24) Ibid.

(25) He had already received an order to retire to his monaſtery. *Ibid. pag.* 303.

His ſect multiplied exceedingly, and ſtill ſubſiſts. It is very probable, that it owes its preſervation to the toleration given to it by the Mahometan princes [*E*]. Some ſay that other

malediction.] ‘After the ſentence of the council, Neſtorius durſt not return any more to Conſtantinople, but retired to his old monaſtery at Antioch, whence he was taken four years after in 435, by the emperor's orders, and baniſhed to Oaſis. But the Barbarians having taken and deſtroyed that city he was obliged to retire to Panopolis in Thebais, where he was not ſuffered to be long at quiet; he was ſo often obliged to remove from place to place, that he got his death in a journey by the misfortune of a fall. Evagrius, who relates theſe paſſages, taken out of Neſtorius's own letters, written during his exile, ſays, he had met with a certain author, who affirmed, that, before Neſtorius died, his tongue was eaten by worms, as a puniſhment for the blaſphemies he had uttered. But he does not ſupport that circumſtance, which might very well be the invention of this anonymous author; ſince it has ever been cuſtomary to ſuppoſe, that all heretics come to a tragical end (26).’

[*E*] *The toleration given to it by the Mahometan princes.*] I have ſaid ſomewhere (27) that they have always had more humanity for other religions, than the Chriſtians, and I have added, that the different communions in the Greek church, which have preſerved themſelves under their empire, would have ſoon been extirpated, if they had lived under Chriſtian kings, who had not been of the ſame belief. I ſhould have quoted upon that occaſion a Father of the Oratory, who is of the ſame opinion, but not having then his paſſage ready at hand, I referred the reciting of it to another place. This is a proper opportunity. ‘It will be concluded alſo from thence with the ſame evidence, how neceſſary the Imperial laws were for the preſervation of the church, ſince Egypt, and the neighbouring provinces, have been ſo over-run and ſubjugated by the Eutychians, that they have never ſince been well reconciled, or re-united, to the Catholic church (28). - - - - If the emperors had not ſupported the faith againſt the Eutychians, the whole world would have been over-run by them. They ſpread themſelves very much over the provinces of Africa and Æthiopia, and the countries moſt remote from the eaſt, for no other reaſon but becauſe the emperors of Conſtantinople were no longer maſters of them, or had never been ſo. I might ſay the ſame thing of the Neſtorians: as ſoon as they had been fulminated by the firſt council of Epheſus, the emperor, Theodoſius the younger, made very near the ſame edicts againſt them: they were exiled with Neſtorius into frightful ſolitudes; yet they multiplyed prodigiouſly towards the eaſt and the north, the emperors not being able to purſue them beyond the limits of their empire. The Saracens or Mahometans a little after over-ran Africa and all Aſia, ſeizing upon I know not how many provinces of the Roman empire; and through the favour of the Mahometan princes, all theſe heretics gave an incredible extent to their ſects. GOD preſerved the Catholic faith only in the Roman empire; which was owing merely to the care and edicts of the Chriſtian and Catholic emperors. Without this aſſiſtance from Heaven, the Eutychians, Neſtorians, and Arians, not to mention ſo many other antient ſects, would doubtleſs have eſtabliſhed themſelves in the greateſt part of the provinces of the Roman empire, as they did in thoſe which were out of its juriſdiction; and the followers of all the new ſects, which have ſprung up only within theſe hundred years, would not have been able to find a church, which they might firſt be born in, and afterwards ſeparate from. They muſt have come into the world among the Arians, Neſtorians, or Eutychians, and would have been infected with the ſame errors from their birth. They would have taken the word for a meer creature, with the Arians; JESUS CHRIST for a mere man, with the Neſtorians; and for them, as well as for the Eutychians, JESUS CHRIST would be GOD, but he would not be truly man. Why therefore do they quarrel with the Chriſtian emperors, or kings, and their ſevere laws, for the antient religion, ſince it is by their aſſiſtance only that the Divine Providence has delivered them from all theſe errors? They ought rather to give thanks to him who has not permitted that they ſhould be ſo far ſeparated from us, as the antient deſerters of the Catholic church are, who departed from it above a thouſand years ago, and are not yet altogether returned from their errors (29). - - - - We muſt not omit mentioning the cauſe of the long delay of the eaſtern ſects from returning to the Catholic church. It is, as we have already ſaid, their diſperſion into provinces and kingdoms, which now no longer belong to the Chriſtian empire; but to Arabian princes, to the kings of Perſia, the Moguls, and the Tartars. The Catholic biſhops, whether Greeks or Syrians, but chiefly the miſſionaries from the holy See, have all along made ſome converts, and ſome progreſſes among them; but all theſe efforts having not been ſupported, by the power and favour of temporal princes, they could never obtain either much extent, or duration (30).’

When I ſaid the Mahometans have been leſs rigorous to the Chriſtians, than theſe to the heretics, I was ſupported by the teſtimony of a miniſter (31). I now build upon that of a prieſt; and by this means my opinion will appear the more reaſonable, ſince it is confirmed by the teſtimonies of two witneſſes of ſo oppoſite a character. Theſe two evidences agree in another thing, which is a little ſcandalous; for they both confeſs, that if the Chriſtian princes had not employed the rigour of the laws againſt the enemies of the orthodox faith, falſe religions would have over-run the whole world. By this rule, when our Saviour promiſed he would maintain his church againſt the gates of hell, he only promiſed that he would raiſe up princes who ſhould ſubdue the enemies of the truth, by depriving them of their eſtates, thruſting them into priſons, baniſhing them, ſending them to the gallies, hanging them, &c. There is no doctrine, how abſurd ſoever, but by theſe means might brave all the infernal powers that would oppoſe it. This brings into my mind what has been ſaid of Mahomet the impoſtor: it is reported, that when he was upon his death-bed, he left his diſciples a prediction, which ſavours not at all of a falſe prophet, *My religion ſhall laſt as long as your victories* (32).

WHETHER Heretics oppreſſed in the councils by the Imperial authority are obſtinate becauſe of that oppreſſion.

I cannot part with Lewis Thomaſſin before I aſk him upon what grounds he goes, when he ſays the Eutychian hereſy would have over-run all the world, had not the emperors ſupported the faith. What had this hereſy ſo charming? Did it favour the paſſions of the heart? Did it enervate the morality of the goſpel? Not at all: it was not upon the doctrine of morality that this heretic combated the Orthodox: he contended with them about a myſtery which reaſon cannot well comprehend; but he explained it after a manner leſs to be comprehended than that of the Orthodox, and manifeſtly abſurd. Perhaps it would be no miſtake to ſay, that the Eutychian hereſies found ſo many followers, only becauſe the proceedings of councils ſhocked an infinite number of perſons, and gave a very diſadvantageous prepoſſeſſion againſt the orthodox party. Father Thomaſſin ſuggeſts this thought: The Syrians, ſays he (33), the Jacobites, the Armenians, and all the Eutychian ſects, *would no longer call us Catholics, but invented for us the name of Melchites, that is to ſay, Royaliſts or Imperialiſts, as if it had not been the ancient faith of the church which the Catholics had defended, but that of the emperor; and as if it had been only the Imperial authority, and not that of the council of Chalcedon, compoſed of above ſix hundred biſhops, that had kept us in the faith and union of the Catholic church.* This ſhows that thoſe heretics had imprinted in their minds this ſtrong perſwaſion, that their patriarch had been oppreſſed by the factions which were formed againſt him at the Imperial court. We may paſs the like judgment on the ſect of Neſtorius. A vaſt number of people embraced it from the abhorrence they had of the injuſtice which they believed was done Neſtorius, by ſacrificing him to the credit of St Cyril. They could not perſwade themſelves that a cauſe, which triumphed by ſuch irregular ways, and through ſo unjuſt a partiality of the emperor, could have any right on its ſide. We ſhould ſee more clearly into this affair, if we had the relations of the Neſtorians, and thoſe of the other ſects; but we ſcarce know any thing of thoſe matters otherwiſe than from the report of a victorious party, and yet we know enough to judge, that the

(26) Ibid. *pag.* 62.

(27) In the article of MAHOMET, remark [*AA*].

(28) Thomaſſin, Of the Unity of the Church, *Tom. i, Part ii, chap. ix, pag.* 374.

(29) Ibid. *pag.* 375, 376.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 376, 377.

(31) See, above, citations (157), (158), of the article MAHOMET.

(32) Veritati maxime conſonum eſt Muhammedis morientis præſagium, quod Ludovicus Vives (*de Verit. Rel. lib. iv, in fine*) citat, tamdiu nempe legem ſuam duraturam, quamdiu victoriam ſuorum. Quod enim lex non in recti perſuaſione ſed violentia conſiſtat, victoriis ceſſantibus, legem quoque ceſſaturam ſatis conjicere potuit. *Samuel Schultetus, in Eccleſiâ Muhammedanâ, pag.* 22.

(33) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 374.

other infidel princes had already taken them under their protection to vex the Orthodox [*F*]. Something ſingular has happened in the Low-Countries ſince the year 1690 (*a*). Almoſt at the ſame time that the Jeſuits accuſed the Fathers of the Oratory at Mons of renewing Neſtorius's hereſy [*G*], a miniſter of Rotterdam brought the ſame accuſation againſt a miniſter of Utrecht [*H*]. The ſucceſs of both theſe accuſations has been

Imperial power has always had too large a ſhare in the deciſions. See with what force Pighius falls upon the council of Conſtantinople (34), where Pope Honorius was condemned as a favourer of Monotheliſm: and conſider this apology. Pighius 'ſays nothing againſt this council, but what might have been ſaid againſt the firſt council of Nice, and againſt that of Chalcedon; all his objections being grounded on this, that the emperor Conſtantine aſſiſted at it with his officers, and that he there regulated the order and manner of proceeding. It cannot be denied but Conſtantine I, did the ſame at the council of Nice, and that in that of Chalcedon the emperor's commiſſioners attributed to themſelves more authority, and meddled more with affairs belonging to that council, than the emperor himſelf did in this. So that it is impoſſible to reflect on this council, without reflecting at the ſame time on the others; and this is attempting to overthrow the moſt ſolid foundations, on which our faith is built, in order to maintain a pretended infallibility in the perſon of Honorius (35).'

[*F*] *To vex the Orthodox.*] It is ſaid that Coſroës, king of Perſia, having a mind to vex the emperor Heraclius, his inveterate enemy, deprived the Catholics of all the churches they had in his dominions, and gave them to the Neſtorians. It is added, that Heraclius finding the Neſtorians favoured by the king of Perſia, thought he ſhould mortify that prince by favouring the Heretics who were moſt oppoſite to theſe; and that it was on this account he ſet himſelf about cheriſhing Eutychianiſm, not directly, for he durſt not openly oppoſe the council of Chalcedon, but by approving Monotheliſm, which was one article among the errors of Eutyches. Read what follows: *Aumentò non poco l'Ereſia de' Monoteliti la ragione politica, che ne ſciſmi della Religione per ordinario vi aſſiſte, poſcia che ſendo Coſroe Re de' Perſi capital nemico di Eraclio, protegeva, e procurava di dilatare la fazzione de' Neſtoriani, e per far coſa di ſommo diſpetto ad Eraclio, levò à Cattolici le chieſe tutte della Perſia, e le diede à Neſtoriani, dal che ſtimolato l'Imperatore Eraclio per render pari diſguſto al Perſiano, ſi moſſe à tutto potere à fomentare la contraria Ereſia di Eutichete, non in quanto alla ſola natura di Chriſto, per non opporſi affatto al Concilio Calcedoneſe, che l' havea definito; mà benſi in quanto alla ſola volontà è operazione, errore parimente de gli Eutichiani* (36).

[*G*] *The Jeſuits accuſed the Fathers of the Oratory of Mons of renewing Neſtorius's Hereſy,*] Upon their complaining *to the archbiſhop of Cambray of a great many calumnies which had been ſpread againſt them* (37), that prelate commiſſioned Monſieur Steyaert, doctor and profeſſor of Divinity at Louvain, *to enquire into the reports ſpread againſt their doctrine and conduct* (38). This doctor made a juridical return *by a liſt of forty articles of accuſation*; whereof the eighteenth was *this* (39), *That the Fathers of the Oratory would not allow* the *holy Virgin the title of the Mother of GOD, but only that of Mother of CHRIST* (40). Let us attend a little to the progreſs of this malicious ſlander. 'It is not to be doubted but it had it's riſe at Mons; but paſſing from thence to the Jeſuits at Liege, it was they who firſt made uſe of it, in order to hinder the Fathers of the Oratory from being admitted into that city. To oppoſe the reſolution of the chapter, who had agreed to receive them, theſe Jeſuits forged a Memorial againſt thoſe Fathers, which they feigned to have been brought to them by a perſon worthy of credit; and pretending to debate what they ſhould do in the matter, it was reſolved, that, not being able in conſcience to paſs by the informations it gave them, they ought immediately to acquaint the chapter with it. Hereupon Father Iſerin was ordered to put it, as he did, into the hands of the ſcholaſter . . . . They engaged the chapter and burgomaſters of Liege to write to the chief magiſtrates of Mons, as perfectly acquainted with all thoſe facts (41).' The letter from the chapter imported, that a rumour had prevailed *that the Fathers of the Oratory, appointed to come to Liege . . . . made profeſſion of ſome particular and dangerous opinions, which they had taught in ſeveral propoſitions condemned by the holy church; that JESUS CHRIST did not die for all men; that the bleſſed Virgin Mary is the mother of CHRIST, but not of GOD* (42). Father Iſerin went ſoon after to Mons, *and ſollicited the anſwers which were required from the magiſtrates of Mons to the letters of the Chapter and Burgomaſters of Liege* (43). The anſwer to the burgomaſters contained, among other things, *as to the worſhip of the holy Virgin, the ſaid eccleſiaſtics have ſaid, that the Fathers of the Oratory were enemies to it, and the common report is ſuch* (44). It is not doubted, but the anſwer ſent to the chapter contained the ſame article (45). What followed upon it? Why, the chapter of Liege *revoked the permiſſion given to the Fathers of the Oratory to eſtabliſh themſelves in that city* (46). The impreſſion which *the calumnies of the Jeſuits Memorial, confirmed by the anſwer of the magiſtrates of Mons made upon them,* no doubt inclined the chapter to this alteration of opinion; and *there is a great deal of reaſon to believe that the article relating to the Divine motherhood of the holy Virgin, was, of all others, that which gave the greateſt horrour, and contributed moſt to incline them to the excluſion of thoſe Fathers . . . .* (47). *The Jeſuits had ſo violently accuſed the Fathers of the Oratory of Neſtorianiſm, that they omitted nothing which might confirm that calumny, and ſpread it amongſt the people, as well at Bruſſels as at Mons . . . . Father Coemans, a Jeſuit, preaching in Flemiſh* (48) *in the church of Sablon, during the octave of the dedication of that church, employed part of his ſermon to ſtir up the people againſt ſome pretended innovators; who, as he aſſured them, were then upon reviving the Hereſy of Neſtorius, which conſiſted in denying the holy Virgin to be the mother of GOD.* In the work I have quoted, may be ſeen very ample proofs of the care the Jeſuits have taken to decry the Fathers of the Oratory in Mons, as rank Neſtorians.

[*H*] *A miniſter of Rotterdam brought the ſame accuſation againſt a miniſter of Utrecht.*] See the book intituled, *An Apology for the Sieur Saurin, miniſter of the Walloon church at Utrecht, againſt the accuſations of Monſieur Jurieu.* It was printed in 1692. There are to be found in it three articles of accuſation; the laſt of which contains four hereſies, namely, Pelagianiſm (49), Neſtorianiſm (50), the civil toleration of ſects (51), and the hereſy of the Sacramentarians (52). As our preſent ſubject relates only to the ſecond of theſe, I ſhall take no notice of the other three. Let us ſee therefore what the perſon accuſed anſwers as to Neſtorianiſm. He declares plainly that he condemns this hereſy; but that he firmly believes Neſtorius innocent of it. *In the aſſembly at the Hague, convened to examine Monſieur Jurieu's accuſation of Monſieur Jacquelot, I declared,* ſays he (53), *for Neſtorius againſt St Cyril; but I did not declare for Neſtorianiſm againſt the ſentiment of the church. I ſaid Neſtorius ſeemed to me more orthodox than St Cyril, becauſe the doctrine of the former appeared more conformable to ours, than that of the latter. It is plain, that if I err, it is an error in fact, and not in opinion* (54) *. . . . But, it will be ſaid, what intereſt can you have for thus maintaining the reputation of Neſtorius, in oppoſition to a Father, who has been acknowledged for a ſaint, and to a general council? To which I anſwer, the intereſt of truth and juſtice. I am verily perſuaded, that whoever ſhall read without prejudice what we have remaining of St Cyril's and Neſtorius's writings, will find the latter orthodox, and the former an Heretic, and an Eutychian, or at leaſt that he will agree it to be infinitely more eaſy to give an orthodox interpretation to the propoſitions of Neſtorius than to thoſe of St Cyril. I am neither the only one, nor the firſt of this opinion, and whenever it ſhall be neceſſary, I can produce ſome authors, both antient and modern* (55), *whoſe authority will at leaſt ſplit the difference between theſe two patriarchs. If Neſtorius then be orthodox, and St Cyril an Heretic, my zeal for the truth in general, obliges me not to conceal this in particular: we ought to call light light, and darkneſs darkneſs. Moreover, this is a truth from whence we may draw two great advantages againſt the church of Rome. The firſt is, that it annuls the authority of St Cyril, one of the chief introducers of idolatry* into

---

(*a*) I write this the tenth of February 1696.

(34) Held in the year 680. This is called the ſixth œcumenical council.

(35) Du Pin, Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Authors, *Tom. vi, pag.* 67, *Edit. of Holland.*

(36) *The IXth* Giornale de Letterati 1678, *pag.* 135, *in the abſtract of a poſthumous book of* John Baptiſta Tamagnini, *a Venetian, printed at Paris in* 1678, *and intituled,* Celebris Hiſtoria Monothelitarum atque Honorii controverſia ſcrutiniis octo comprehenſa.

(37) Difficulties propoſed to Monſieur Steyaert, *Part i, pag.* 9. This book was printed in 1691,

(38) Ib. *pag.* 3.

(39) Ib. *p.* 48.

(40) Ibid. *pag.* 64, 68.

(41) Ib. *p.* 65.

(42) Ib. *pag.* 65, 66.

(43) Ib. *p.* 67.

(44) Ib. *p.* 49.

(45) Ib. *p.* 67.

(46) Ib. *p.* 68.

(47) Ib. *p.* 69.

(48) At Bruſſels in the year 1690.

(49) The Apology of the Sieur Saurin, *pag.* 72.

(50) Ib. *p.* 78.

(51) Ib. *p.* 88.

(52) Ib. *p.* 92.

(53) Ib. *p.* 78.

(54) Ib. *p.* 79.

(55) See the article RODON.

been alike. The accuſations were ſet aſide, without the accuſers being cenſured [*I*]. It ſeems thoſe that were brought againſt a certain tranſlator of the Homilies of St Chryſoſtome in the year 1693 were better grounded; for he wrote a letter to the archbiſhop of Paris, *in which he acknowledged that through inadvertency he had committed ſome faults in his tranſlation, which, contrary to his intention, might ſtrike at the eſſential parts of religion. Wherefore he thought himſelf obliged to make a ſolemn recantation of them to ſecure the reputation of his faith; declaring that his errors are purely perſonal, and that they ought* to

into the Chriſtian church. The ſecond, that by convicting the Fathers of the council of Epheſus of the Eutychian hereſy, equally condemned by the Proteſtants and Papiſts, we undermine the foundation of Popery, which is the infallible authority of general councils. Juſtice and charity alſo oblige us to defend oppreſſed innocence, and to make it appear, that Neſtorius may have been condemned by a council without being guilty; and that our modern Divines may take the part of Neſtorius, rejecting the errors attributed to him (56) . . . . *As for what regards the intention of Neſtorius, I muſt judge it innocent, becauſe I can ſee no reaſon to judge it guilty. But Monſieur Jurieu has choſen, with a great many others, the ſtrongeſt ſide. Neſtorius had neither the majority nor authority for him; he was born down by the weight of St Cyril's cabal. We muſt then, for form-ſake, conclude he was an Heretic, whether he will or no, and go dive into his heart to find there ſome wicked intentions, whereof no foot-ſteps appear either in his words or actions.* This ſame author ſhows, in another book of his, that he is more againſt Neſtorius than his accuſer. *I have proved*, ſays he (57), *in my apology, that the title of* Mother of GOD *is agreeable to the holy Virgin, and that it is grounded on the word of GOD, and the nature of the myſtery; whereas Monſieur Jurieu, in his Paſtoral Letters, flies out with extream violence againſt this way of ſpeaking in the language of the church, looking upon it as the cauſe of the moſt criminal hereſy.* Some few pages after, he ſets down the paſſage out of thoſe Paſtoral Letters; which I ſhall ſet down after him, as well for the information of my reader, as to make it appear I have good authority for what I have ſaid of Neſtorius. *He was, without doubt, unadviſed, and, GOD forbid, we ſhould fall into the ſame error, if it be true, that he has aſcribed two perſons to JESUS CHRIST, as well as two natures. Neither do we deny, that the holy Virgin may, in a good ſenſe, be termed the* Mother of GOD, *ſince ſhe is mother of JESUS CHRIST, who is GOD. But it was, however, an unhappy temerity in the Fathers of the Vth century, to introduce new terms. The holy Virgin is no where in the New Teſtament called the* Mother of GOD, *but only the* mother of JESUS. *They ought to have ſtopped there. For this title of* Mother of GOD *has ſomething in it that ſhocks, and is repugnant to the idea of GOD, who cannot have a mother. And indeed GOD did not think fit to beſtow his bleſſing on the falſe wiſdom of thoſe Fathers. On the contrary, he has permitted the moſt extravagant and criminal of all the idolatries of Antichriſt, to take it's riſe from thence* (58). Let us conclude with the following words of Mr Saurin. 'The zealous and charitable Mr Jurieu, animated by his informing ſpirit, will needs have me examined upon this head. I am contented to be ſo; for I fear not to come to the touch as he does. I will not fly, as he has done, from ſeveral ſynods. I will not make uſe of a thouſand fetches, nor have recourſe to artifice, or violence to exempt myſelf from a law, impoſed on all the Faithful, eſpecially upon Divines, to give an account of their faith. I am for an anathema with all my heart, not againſt Neſtorius, but againſt Neſtorianiſm (59).' I ought not to omit, that before Monſieur Saurin obtained a teſtimony of his Orthodoxy from the ſynods, the public was very well ſatisfied that he was an Anti-Neſtorian.

Conſult a letter which was printed at Amſterdam in 1701 (60), under the title of *The Scrupulous Proteſtant, or an Explanation of the fourth chapter* of the Adventures of Madonna; *by way of Anſwer to a Letter, written to the Author* (61) *by Mr Jurieu, concerning the Title of* Mother of GOD, *and the Reputation of Cyril of Alexandria, and the firſt Council of Epheſus.*

[*I*] *The accuſations were ſet aſide without the accuſer's being cenſured*, &c.] The proofs I ſhall bring, relate only to the Fathers of the Oratory. One of the articles in the liſt upon which Monſieur Steyaert had a commiſſion to make a juridical inqueſt, was, that theſe Fathers refuſed to give the holy Virgin the title of Mother of GOD. We have ſeen that this ſlander contributed very much towards hindering their obtaining at Liege, the eſtabliſhment that had been granted them. The accuſation in itſelf was one of the moſt important, according to the principles and practices of the Romiſh communion (62). It is natural therefore to expect, that the commiſſioner neglected nothing to diſcover the authors of this accuſation, and yet we are going to ſee he never once troubled his head about the matter. Obſerve how he was treated: 'The buſineſs 'was to know, whether the Fathers of the Oratory were new Neſtorians, who held, and taught thoſe under their inſtruction, that the holy Virgin was not mother of GOD, or whether they had been falſely charged with this hereſy, as well by public ſermons as reports ſpread abroad; and who were thoſe that ſo charged them with this accuſation. What juridical proceedings have you obſerved in making an enquiry, which might give the archbiſhop, who commiſſioned you, an occaſion to puniſh the Fathers of the Oratory, if they were convicted of this damnable hereſy; or, in caſe they were found innocent, to make them reparation for the ſlander, from thoſe who had ſo falſely ſlandered them, and to ſubject their accuſers to canonical penalties? But this enquiry you never made in any legal manner, becauſe you could find none guilty but the Jeſuits, and ſome magiſtrates of Mons, who had lent them their names, to confirm what the Jeſuits of Liege had made the chapter of that city believe, *that the Fathers of the Oratory in the Low-Countries, founded by cardinal de Berulle, held ſeveral opinions, diſallowed by the holy church; and, among others, that the holy Virgin is not the mother of GOD* (63).' The author names afterwards (64) a counſellor, who had been conſiderably concerned in the accuſation, and who *preſſed him to proceed againſt him, to the end he might be fully juſtified by the diſcovery of the firſt author of this defamation*; but it is objected to him, that notwithſtanding the many inſtances and requeſts repeated to him ſeveral times by this counſellor, he obſtinately refuſed to make any enquiry. Let us hear the Janſeniſt ſpeak (65). 'An accuſation of hereſy, and of an hereſy ſo impious, as that of Neſtorius, may be a good thing, and even neceſſary, providing it be true and well-grounded; whereas it muſt be abominable when it is falſe. Now being required by a man of honour to do him juſtice, upon an accuſation which had been fathered upon him, you told him that was not neceſſary, aſſuring him, *that there was not the leaſt foundation imaginable to charge the Fathers of the Oratory, nor their adherents, on the point of the Neſtorian hereſy; and, that the report which had been raiſed, appeared to you altogether extravagant, none of their adverſaries having preſumed to maintain, or attempted to prove what they aſſerted.* Why then was nothing of this to be found in the account you gave in of your charge (66)? Why was no mention made there, *that you had acknowledged, that the eighteenth article (which was, that the Fathers of the Oratory refuſed to give the holy Virgin the title of* Mother of GOD, *allowing her only that of* Mother of CHRIST) *is a manifeſt calumny againſt thoſe Fatherss none of their adverſaries having dared to maintain, or attempted to prove, what they aſſerted?* You could not deny, but that there was a great noiſe about this Neſtorian hereſy, which was charged upon the Fathers of the Oratory: and tho' you was ſenſible this report was falſe, yet you contented yourſelf with only a verbal declaration to a private man, *that it ſeemed altogether extravagant to you.* Is it then a meer piece of extravagance, which deſerves only to be laughed at, and not a diabolical malice, that ought to be puniſhed, to ſpread abroad a report, that a congregation of prieſts believe a thing which they could not believe, without having loſt all ſenſe of religion (67)? . . .
'There

(56) Ib. *p.* 82.

(57) Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 866.

(58) Jurieu, *cited by* Saurin, ibid. *pag.* 869. See the 16th Paſtoral Letter of the year 1687, *pag.* 364, *Edit. in 12mo.* In the fourth Paſtoral Letter of the following year, he ſpeaks more ſtrongly againſt thoſe who were for introducing the epithet of Mother of God.

(59) Saurin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 795, 796.

(60) *It contains thirty-two pages in 8vo. See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *Nov.* 1701, *pag.* 578, *&c.*

(61) His name is Mr *Renoult.*

(62) See the Difficulties propoſed to Monſieur Steyaert, *Part I*, *pag.* 106.

(63) Ib. *p.* 98.

(64) *Pag.* 99.

(65) Ibid. *pag.* 104.

(66) It is a Latin treatiſe of Monſieur Steyaert's, where he gives an account of his commiſſion to the archbiſhop of Cambray.

(67) Difficulties, &c. *pag.* 106, 107. See alſo the ſecond part of the Difficulties, *pag.* 161, 163, and elſewhere.

to be attributed to none but himſelf (b) [*K*]. You will find at large in Moreri's Dictionary what relates to Neſtorius, and his followers; for which reaſon I ſhall ſay nothing of them. Conſult alſo Monſieur du Pin, who has met with ſome inconveniences in acting the part of an impartial hiſtorian [*L*]. I am willing to believe the encomium of Mother of God, has contributed to the extraordinary honours which have been paid to the holy Virgin; but it ſeems to me, that they might have fallen into the ſame worſhip, if no other title had been given her than that of mother of Jesus Christ [*M*].

(b) Beauval's Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, *Nov.* 1693, *pag.* 138.

Divers

'There being thus found, a ſet of men ſo wicked, as, 'without any proof, to charge a thing ſo little credible, 'and ſo very ſcandalous, upon the Fathers of the Oratory, it was of the laſt importance for appeaſing the 'diſturbances in the city of Mons, and undeceiving the 'common people in the ill opinion they had been made 'to conceive of theſe Fathers, that the authors of this 'diabolical calumny ſhould be detected, to the end 'they might be puniſhed, purſuant to the canons; and 'that a ſtop might be thereby put to all future ſlanders, 'which occaſion the committing of ſo many ſins. 'Why then, being legally required to give an account of what you had in charge, and which your 'duty obliged you to do, did you refuſe it? Why 'alſo, not being able to ſay any thing upon this accuſation, the moſt important of all, but what would 'be to the advantage of the Fathers of the Oratory, 'and to the confuſion of the Jeſuits, did you chuſe to 'ſpeak nothing at all of it in your Memorial? See 'how great is your juſtice, and pretended exemption 'from all partiality, in that which ought to have been 'the chief point of your commiſſion.'

This author having thus preſſed hard the archbiſhop of Cambray's commiſſioner, and having ſhown, with the cleareſt evidence, the fraudulent manner in which this commiſſion was executed, points out the main ſpring of this unfairneſs. *Thoſe who know you better*, ſays he (68), *than the archbiſhop of Cambray, who choſe you for this employ, expected nothing elſe from you. They know your policy and love for your honour, make you act two different parts. You would think yourſelf diſhonoured, if in the poſt you are in, you did not maintain the ſound doctrine of your Faculty againſt the evil opinions of their adverſaries; and this is what you have done in ſeveral of your theſes. But the apprehenſion of bringing ſuch troubles upon yourſelf, as might diſturb your repoſe, makes you buckle to thoſe very perſons, whoſe opinions you condemn, leſt they ſhould injure you by their credit. Never did this cunning of your's ſhow itſelf more than on this occaſion. The Fathers of the Oratory had neither the power, nor the will to hurt you; and you could not do them juſtice without offending thoſe who would have had both, if you had not pleaſed them. You were in a manner under a neceſſity of abandoning the weaker ſide, that you might not diſoblige the ſtronger. You were obliged, to ſlight the proofs of the former's innocence, as you did, and to favour the latter, by diſſembling their horrible ſlanders and calumnies. This is to know how to live, according to the way of the world: but ought not you to apprehend this reproach of the GOD of Judges*, * uſque quo judicatis iniquitatem, & facies peccatorum ſumitis? *How long will ye judge unrighteouſly? How long will ye have regard to the power of ſinners, by making them appear innocent while they are moſt criminal? This is what that Hebraiſm*, facies peccatorum ſumere, *ſignifies: and it is this reſpect of perſons, which is ſo often, and ſo ſeverely condemned in the holy Scriptures; when, thro' timidity, or ſuch like conſiderations, the balance is made to incline to that ſide, which has the greater power, tho' the other has the better cauſe.*

(68) Ibid. *pag.* 107.

* Pſalm 82. lxxxvii, ver. 2.

This picture repreſents a great many people. They are ſenſible of the wrong done by a falſe accuſer; they deteſt him, and whiſper all the ill imaginable of him in their friends ears; but yet, if it be in his power, either to hurt or diſſerve them, they will be ſure, in caſe of their being his judges, to pronounce no ſentence that may diſgrace him. They have a thouſand artifices of evading, a thouſand methods of embarraſſing and perplexing matters: which ſhows, that the influence of power over juſtice, is a malady almoſt incurable in mankind; and therefore men in power will never be afraid of ſpreading uſeful calumnies. You ſee how a ſlander, cunningly managed, has ſhut the gates of Liege againſt the Fathers of the Oratory.

Note, That the archbiſhop of Cambray, did by a definitive ſentence on the twelfth of November 1692, declare theſe pretended Neſtorians innocent; yet he condemned no perſon by name to make them reparation. See the ſixth chapter of the eighth tome of, *The Practical Morality of the Jeſuits.*

[*K*] *The tranſlator of the Homilies of St Chryſoſtome has declared, that his errors ought to be attributed to no body but himſelf.*] The author who recanted after this manner was Mr Fontaine, and *had formerly been ſecretary to Mr Arnaud and Mr de Sacy* (69). It was this gave occaſion to the Jeſuit, who publiſhed a book intituled, *Neſtorianiſm revived*, to confound the tranſlator of the Homilies of St Chryſoſtome, with the Gentlemen of Port-Royal; and that was the reaſon which induced this tranſlator to declare expreſsly, that there was no body guilty but himſelf.

(69) Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, *for Nov.* 1693, *pag.* 138.

[*L*] *Monſieur du Pin, who ſuffered ſome inconveniences in acting the part of an impartial Hiſtorian.*] I am not very well acquainted with the particulars of the matters which were laid to his charge; and therefore I have only touched upon them by the by, but I refer my reader to one of our Journaliſts (70) who has mentioned ſome of them, and particularly the accuſation of his having too much favoured Neſtorius.

(70) Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, *for Nov* 1692, *pag.* 140, 141, 142; *and for May* 1693, *pag.* 526, 527, 528. See alſo in the Hiſtorical Mercury, *for June* 1693, *pag.* 660, & *ſeq.* The diſcourſe of Monſieur Lamoignon advocate-general, requiring the ſuppreſſion of Monſieur du Pin's book, which he obtained.

[*M*] *They might have fallen into the ſame worſhip, if no other title had been given her than that of Mother of JESUS CHRIST.*] I have already ſpoken of this in my firſt remark, but it will not be amiſs here to touch it over again. I believe, I may ſay, that the diſputes between Neſtorius and St Cyril, have not ſerved to augment the honours of the Holy Virgin but by accident. Theſe two prelates did not contend about any point of devotion: their quarrel had no relation to worſhip; and ſuppoſing, that, at that very time, the Holy Virgin had been invocated, Neſtorius did not pretend to alter that cuſtom, nor did St Cyril require it to be enlarged. The difference between them was about a ſpeculative opinion: one apprehended the confounding the two natures of Jesus Christ; and the other feared the human nature of our Saviour would be looked upon as a perſon. Worſhip had nothing to do in this matter: *Neſtorius, as infatuated as he ſeemed to be with his opinion, was ſo inclinable to grant the Holy Virgin the honours which were publickly paid her, that, in his diſgrace, he ſeemed diſpoſed to reſtore to her the title of* Mother of God, *rather than give occaſion of leſſening her worſhip by perſiſting in that refuſal* (71). Theſe are the words of a French prieſt, who wrote a treatiſe of the devotion due to the Holy Virgin, as rationally as any one of his profeſſion could do. He confeſſes Neſtorius required no diminution of her worſhip; and he might likewiſe have acknowledged, that this Heretic retained all the foundations of worſhip, which St Cyril would have: for the worſhip of the Holy Virgin can be founded only on a ſuppoſition that God had done all for her in Heaven, which an elected king could do for his mother on earth, if he ſhould declare and inſiſt that he would have her who gave him life, whatſoever might be her former condition, to be acknowledged for queen-mother, and that he would grant her whatſoever ſhe ſhould aſk of him. From that very minute ſhe would be raiſed to ſuch a degree, as ſhould place her above all princeſſes, ducheſſes, and other perſons of the kingdom, except the king; and her intereſt would have no bounds. The honours paid her would exceed all the ſubmiſſion paid to other ſubjects. No body would go about to amuſe himſelf with inquiries, whether ſhe were the real mother of the king's ſoul or not: it would be thought ſufficient to acknowledge her to be the king's mother, and in poſſeſſion of all the authority due to ſo high a rank. The application of this to Neſtorius is not very difficult. If, in rejecting the title of *Mother of GOD*, he retains that of Mother of Christ, he

(71) Baillet, Of the Devotion due to the holy Virgin, *pag.* 3, 4.

Divers conſiderations incline me to believe the juſtneſs of this thought; for the more I enquire into the reaſons that could favour the progreſs of the worſhip of the Virgin Mary, the more I find that there is in the nature and conſtitution of man a very ſtrong diſpoſition to produce that worſhip [*N*], and to increaſe it prodigiouſly, and from thence I conclude, that even without the aſſiſtance of thoſe epithets, which have been very uſeful to it, it might have rooted itſelf deeper and deeper, and produced fruit in abundance. As

he retains all the foundations of worſhip; for, he will ſay, to be the Mother of JESUS CHRIST is the ſame thing as to be the mother of him, to whom *all power has been given both in Heaven and in Earth* (72), who reigns over all things, as well over angels as men: and conſequently, if GOD has been pleaſed, that the mother of JESUS CHRIST ſhould be inveſted with the quality of queen-mother and queen-regent, and that ſhe ſhould fully enjoy a maternal authority over her ſon: ſhe muſt be above all other creatures; and, in a condition, to ſhower down on mankind whatever benefits ſhe pleaſes. I cannot ſee, that St Cyril could place the worſhip of the holy Virgin upon a more ſolid foundation than this (73). It was not on account of the Divine nature, that JESUS CHRIST, on the day of his aſcenſion, declared, that all power was given him; for, as he was GOD, he could acquire nothing, being in poſſeſſion of all things from all eternity. It was then on account of his being man that he was eſtabliſhed plenipotentiary: it was on his ſoul that GOD conferred that power, in as much as it was his pleaſure that all the deſires of his ſoul ſhould be efficacious and operative: and conſequently, to be aſſured of the univerſal authority of the holy Virgin, it is ſufficient to believe, that the humanity of JESUS CHRIST refuſes his mother nothing, and that it is as obedient to her as the beſt ſon could be. If the devotion of the Socinians ſhould ever incline to feſtivals, proceſſions, images, pilgrimages, *&c.* they would do the ſame for JESUS CHRIST, as the church of Rome practiſes towards his holy mother. It matters not that they do not believe him to be GOD; for it is enough, if he reigns with full power, and is the diſpenſer of all good things thro' the Divine inſtitution. If Mr Baillet will but take the pains to reflect on what I have ſaid, I am ſatisfied he will alter ſomething in the following paſſage of his work. *When the church maintained the holy Virgin, at the council of Epheſus, in the quality of* Mother of GOD, *againſt the injuſtice of the hereſiarch Neſtorius, who endeavoured to rob her of that glorious title, it was no leſs her intention and view to preſerve the foundation of the worſhip, which the Faithful paid to the holy Virgin, than to eſtabliſh a belief of the unity of the perſon of CHRIST* (74). Perhaps, he would furniſh me with views which I have not, and which would make me change my opinion. Now obſerve how, I believe, the diſputes between Neſtorius and St Cyril have by accident augmented the honours of the holy Virgin upon Earth. The title of *Mother of GOD*, conteſted for ſome time, and at length victorious, and confirmed by the canons of the councils, made more impreſſion than it did before: it became a matter of great importance; the vanquiſhed party was looked upon as impious, and the conquerors as the patrons of piety; the victory was boaſted of, and this part of the faith fortified, as a breach, whence the enemy had been repulſed, and where he might give a ſecond aſſault. Run thro' the whole Hiſtory of the church, and you will find, that in all ages thoſe diſputes, which have not been victorious, have only ſerved to redouble abuſes. I have given the reaſon of it: and this puts me in mind of ſeveral cities, which, in order to preſerve their privileges, have oppoſed burthenſome edicts: they have only given a pretence to the ſovereign for bridling them with citadels; which has rendered their condition yet worſe than it was before. The author of the maxim, *Nunquam tentabis ut non perficias*, was no fool. See the margin (75).

To confirm what I have been ſaying, that thoſe who attack old errors in religion, run the hazard of cauſing them, by accident, to take deeper root; I obſerve, that the followers of a falſe worſhip may be oppoſed, either during the hotteſt effort of their zeal, or when a lukewarm remiſſneſs has brought them to indifference (76). In the firſt caſe, is to be apprehended, what may happen, where one is oppoſed in the height of his fury. The reſiſtance he meets with does but render him more furious.

Bacchæ bacchanti ſi velis advorſarier,
Ex inſana inſaniorem facies, feriet ſæpius:
Si obſequare, unâ reſolvas plagâ (77).

When the mad prieſteſs runs about the ſtreets,
And deals her blow to ev'ry one ſhe meets,
Take it in peace, and let the dame march on,
Her fury croſs'd will give you ten for one.

Hunc avus, hunc Athamas, hunc cætera turba ſuorum
Corripiunt dictis, fruſtraque inhibere laborant.
Acrior admonitu eſt; *irritaturque retenta*
Et creſcit rabies, moderaminaque ipſa nocebant.
Sic ego torrentem, qua nil obſtabat eunti,
Leniùs, & modico ſtrepitu decurrere vidi:
At, quacunque trabes, obſtructaque ſaxa jacebant,
Spumeus, & fervens, & ab obice ſævior ibat (78).

Thus did th' unhallow'd wretch thoſe rights profane
His friends diſſuade his blaſphemies in vain;
In vain his grandſire urg'd him to give o'er
His impious threats, the wretch but raves the more.
So have I ſeen a river gently glide,
In a ſmooth courſe, and inoffenſive tide;
But if with dams its current we reſtrain,
It bears down all before, and foams along the plain.
SEWELL.

In the ſecond caſe the danger is of waking a ſleeping dog, I mean of reviving a dying paſſion.

Conſider a little the conduct of thoſe huſbands, whoſe conjugal love is almoſt extinguiſhed. They poſſeſs their wives as if they poſſeſſed them not: they have for them a great deal of indifference, and it may be a great deal of averſion. But if any one ſhould be for tempting them away, if they hear at their return home that they have eloped with ſome young galant, then they loſe all manner of patience, are full of deſires to recover them, and fill the air with complaints.

My poor wife, alas! what is become of her (79)?

Then they preſently ſet the ſerjeants or bailiffs at work, and involve themſelves in vexatious ſuits. There is no more lukewarmneſs nor indifference to be found in their behaviour. They took no notice of their wives while no body diſputed the poſſeſſion with them; now that is conteſted, they cannot live without them (80).

[*N*] *There is in the .... conſtitution of man a very ſtrong diſpoſition to produce that worſhip.*] The life of man is nothing but a ſcene of viciſſitudes; but notwithſtanding that inconſtancy, there are certain things which being once introduced, grow up very faſt, and go on for many ages, in a continual progreſs. This is what cannot be ſaid of innovations, which tend to the reforming public abuſes, or correcting immoralities. The laws made from time to time againſt luxury and gaming are of force only at firſt; they are quickly broke thro' and tranſgreſſed. Reformations in religion will ſometimes laſt long in reſpect of ſpeculative opinions; but, in regard to practical morality, they come ſpeedily to their perfection, and to their full growth, and then ſucceeds as ſwift a relapſe, and a ſtate of corruption which requires a new reformation. The ſtrict morals of the primitive Chriſtians, their ſobriety, their chaſtity, their humility, *&c.* appeared in their greateſt luſtre, during the lives of the apoſtles; but from that time they degenerated every day; ſo that, in the IVth century, there was no great difference between the morals of Chriſtians, and thoſe of other people. The Reformed in France, in the XVIth century, were at firſt very regular in their morals: they abſtained from gaming, drinking, ſwearing, dancing, *&c.* The military laws, which the prince of

---

(72) Goſpel of St Matthew, *chap. xxviii, ver.* 18.

(73) *Note, theſe words of Monſieur Baillet* de la Devotion à la St Vierge, *pag.* 1, 2. The rank which the quality of *Mother of God* gives the holy Virgin above all other creatures is not only given to ſhow the point of elevation in the glory ſhe is poſſeſſed of; but we look upon it as a poſt where ſhe may intercede with her ſon, for all ſuch as through the grace of that Divine Saviour are called to the ſame ſtate of glory.

(74) Baillet, ibid. *pag.* 3.

(75) Omittere potius prævalida & adulta vitia, quam hoc adſequi, ut palam fieret quibus flagitiis impares eſſemus. *Tacit. Annal. lib. iii. cap. liii.*

(76) If I do not ſpeak of the middle conditions between theſe two extreams, it is becauſe every one may apply to them in proportion what I ſay of the extreams.

(77) Plautus in Amphit. *Act. II. Sc. II. ver.* 71.

(78) Ovid Metamor. lib. III. *ver.* 564.

(79) *See the* Memoirs of the ducheſs of Mazarin.

(80) *Among the remedies of love* Ovid, de Remedio Amoris, *ver.* 769, *does not forget this, viz. that a man ought to think that he has no rival.* At tu rivalem noli tibi fingere quemquam, Inque ſuo ſolam crede jacere toro. Acrius Hermionem, *&c. See the ſequel above, remark* [G] *of the article* HELENA. *See alſo citat.* (143) *of the article* LUTHER.

As for the reſt, I muſt not forget, that, ſince the firſt edition of my Dictionary, there has been publiſhed an Hiſtory of Neſtorianiſm (*c*) compoſed by Father Lewis Doucin (*d*), in a marginal note of which, may be ſeen (*e*) what I have ſaid above (*f*) concerning the miſunderſtanding of Neſtorius and St Cyril. To this the following remark is there ſubjoined, viz. that *I ground myſelf upon the authority and teſtimony of Mr du Pin, doctor of the*

of Condé cauſed to be obſerved in the beginning of the civil wars, in the reign of Charles IX, were admirable (81). The ſoldiers were obliged to live in the greateſt regularity imaginable, and their leaſt faults were puniſhed ſeverely: but all theſe fine things were of ſhort duration, like children that die in their cradles (82), or plants, which ſhoot up prodigiouſly in a few days, and yet wither and die away before the end of the ſummer (83). It would be better for them to grow by little and little, after the manner of trees, which are deſigned by nature to be of long duration (84). The reaſon is eaſily given why a rigid diſcipline, and a great reformation of manners is like a ſtraw-fire, which quickly blazes, but as quickly loſes its force: it is becauſe too ſtrict an attachment to modeſty, temperance, and auſterity, is a violent ſtate: now, according to the Philoſophers maxim, ſuch a ſtate cannot be laſting, *nullum violentum durabile*. They (85) mean, by a violent ſtate, a ſtate contrary to the inclinations of nature, a place of exile, an external and ſuperior force, which detains a body out of its proper element, but which cannot prevent its tendency to return to it, and its continual reſiſting and weakening this external force, till at laſt it overpowers it, and then moves to the place, where its natural inclination carries it. Heavy bodies, thrown from the earth, which fall again when the impulſe which carries them becomes of leſs force than their own internal gravity, are made uſe of by the Philoſophers for an example to explain this doctrine. We may therefore compare the reformation of manners to the impulſe that carries a ſtone upwards. The paſſions, naturally implanted in mankind, continually oppoſe the practice of a ſevere morality, and are a gravity that will bring men quickly down to their primitive condition, ſhould any fit of zeal or reformation ſhoot them up towards Heaven.

Naturam expellas furca tamen uſque recurret (86).

Strive to expel ſtrong nature, 'tis in vain,
With doubled force ſhe will return again,
And conquering riſe above the proud diſdain.

From whence we muſt conclude, that the innovation, introduced into Chriſtianity, by eſtabliſhing the worſhip to the Virgin three or four hundred years more or leſs, after the aſcenſion of Jesus Christ (87), has been countenanced by the natural and mechanical diſpoſitions of mankind, ſince it has made a continual and prodigious progreſs, and ſtill ſubſiſts at this very time in all the full vigour it ever obtained. There is no conceiving that if it had not met with very great diſpoſitions in the human paſſions, it could have made ſuch progreſs, deſtitute as it was of all ſupport from Scripture and authentic tradition. This has moved ſome curious wits to enquire what thoſe natural modifications of the ſoul of man might be, which have favoured the innovations here ſpoken of; and this is the reſult of their enquiries.

Conjectures upon the cauſes of the progreſs of the worſhip of the holy Virgin. In the affair of religion, there is nothing which better ſuits with the groſs genius of the people, than repreſenting Heaven to them as reſembling the earth. This was the reaſon, that the fancies and caprices of the Poets, concerning the marriage of the gods, their councils, their diviſions and intrigues, paſſed ſo eaſily upon the Greeks, and afterwards upon the Romans, for articles of faith. It was impoſſible to raiſe man to the gods; and therefore they were to be brought down to man; and thus was formed the point of contact and center of union. Had it been ſaid, that God governed the world by ſimple acts of his will; and that he was alone in Heaven: this would not have ſatisfied the imagination of the people, who have no example of ſuch a thing. But if you tell them, that a God aſſiſted with ſeveral other Divinities governs the world, that the court of Heaven is pompous and magnificent, that every one there has his poſt, and does not ſuffer another to encroach upon his employ, they will eaſily believe you; becauſe the mind of man is accuſtomed to the like ideas borrowed from what they daily ſee in the government of the ſtates, and the courts of great kings. Such courts are not without females: we there find a queen-mother, and a reigning queen whoſe authority is ſometimes equal to that of the king. Thus the people eaſily believed what was told them of Cybele and Juno; and becauſe amongſt men the power of a queen-dowager is generally leſs than that of the reigning queen; hence the worſhip of Cybele, mother of the gods, was eſteemed inferior to that of Juno, ſiſter and wife of Jupiter. This wife of Jupiter had abundance of temples under different titles (88). It is no wonder, ſince ſhe was conſidered as the queen of the world, and as a queen who intereſted herſelf in the government: and beſides it is the cuſtom to pay our reſpects to the ladies, with greater care and ceremony, than to men of equal quality (89).

By ſuch prejudices as theſe the Chriſtians have been eaſily perſuaded, without any example, or command, or permiſſion of Scripture, without any authority of the tradition of the firſt ages, that the ſaints in heaven are continually employed as mediators betwixt God and man. We find in the courts of princes, and proportionally in thoſe of governors, and intendants, that nothing is done without the recommendation of a favourite, either of a ſecretary of ſtate, or a ſteward of the houſhold, or a lady in waiting, &c. We ſee innumerable inſtances of thoſe miſcarrying who neglect theſe interceſſors, and venture to apply directly to the head (90), and it is of abſolute neceſſity to make choice of ſome ſubaltern patrons. Nothing has contributed more than this to eſtabliſh the cuſtom of worſhipping the ſaints: all the arguments of a Proteſtant controverſiſt will hardly have the ſame weight with an Huguenot, as with a courtier; and in general all thoſe who are a little acquainted with the way of the world, will be affected with the parallel they hear made by their pariſh-prieſt betwixt the mediation of ſaints, and the recommendation of a great prince's officers. Popular notions do very well ſuit with a celeſtial court, where the angels, apoſtles, and martyrs, are perpetually employed in recommending terreſtrial affairs to God, in ſolliciting the diſpatch of a decree, and putting him in mind of this and that, as is uſually practiſed in the courts of princes.

But whilſt you only ſtock Heaven with ſaints and angels, maſculine ſollicitors and mediators, you do not compleat the popular ideas. Theſe require a queen as well as a king (91): a court without women is ſomething abſurd, and ſhocks the natural taſte with it's irregularities. Conſequently it was natural that the people ſhould applaud the new invention of a mother of Jesus Christ, eſtabliſhed in Heaven the queen of men and angels, and of all nature. This hypotheſis filled up the chaſm which was before apparent in the celeſtial court, and corrected all it's irregularity. From hence it muſt follow, that the peoples devotion would immediately flame out for this almighty and moſt merciful queen. It is a general and reaſonable pre-poſſeſſion, that women are more diſpoſed to charitable actions than men. They are incomparably more officious towards the poor, the ſick, and the priſoners; and if there be any favour to be begged, as the life of a deſerter, they are the perſons who ſollicit, and take upon them to ſoften thoſe in whoſe power it is to ſave him. A more certain ſucceſs was therefore to be expected from the invocation of the holy Virgin, than from any other. We need not wonder that the honours paid to her, exceed thoſe which the Heathens paid to Juno: for the dignity of queen-mother and reigning queen did not center in the perſon of Juno; and beſides ſhe was looked upon as proud, moroſe, and revengeful: whereas the holy Virgin was at once queen-mother and queen-conſort, free from all faults, and abounding with unſpeakable goodneſs. It is very well known, that courtiers grow cold and become diſcouraged when a queen has too much pride, and is too prone to puniſh. This is the

(*c*) Printed at Paris in 1698, in 4to.

(*d*) A Jeſuit.

(*e*) *Pag.* 551, 552.

(*f*) In the remark [*A*].

(81) See Varillas's Hiſtory of Charles IX. *Tom. i. pag. m.* 163. *ad ann.* 1562.

(82) Compare this with citat. (13) of the article ALESIUS.

(83) Gourds for example.

(84) Creſcit occulto velut arbor ævo. *Horat. Od. XII, lib. i.*

(85) This is according to the doctrine of the ſchool-Philoſophers.

(86) Horat. Epiſt. X, lib. I, ver. 24.

(87) See Mr Baſnage's Hiſtory of the Church. *book xviii, chap. xi.*

(88) See Pauſanias in the Index under the word *Juno.*

(89) See remark [*M*] of the article JUNO.

(90) See the remark [*E*] of the article DASSOUCI.

(91) Finally, a court without ladies is a court without a court to ſpeak truth. *Brantome Elogy of Francis I, in Tom. i, of the Memoirs of the French Captains, pag. m.* 281, 282

the Faculty of Paris, who has indeed ſaid many things of that kind, amongſt others, that Neſtorius, in his declaration, *publiſhed before the council of Epheſus,* gives a good ſenſe to what he had advanced in his ſermons. *But* that I *take no notice that all theſe things have been*

the reaſon that Juno could not have ſo many adorers, as ſhe would have had, upon the perſuaſion of her being a goddeſs, purely beneficent. My reader already imagines with what zeal the people contributed to build chapels and altars to the holy Virgin, and to offer her jewels and ornaments of all ſorts; for, according to the vulgar notions, theſe are things that pleaſe women, and this is the way that leads to their favour. Let us now take a view of a new device, which thoſe liberalities and offerings have given riſe to.

The monks and pariſh-prieſts perceiving that the devotion to the holy Virgin brought in a great revenue to their cloyſters and churches; and that it increaſed in proportion, as the people were more ſtrongly perſuaded of the authority and goodneſs of this queen of the world, laboured with all their induſtry to enlarge the notion of this power and inclination to do good. The preachers made uſe of all the hyperboles and figures that Rhetoric could furniſh. The legendaries made a collection of all ſorts of miracles: the Poets engaged in the deſign; and annual prizes (92) were eſtabliſhed, for thoſe who made the fineſt poems in praiſe of the mother of GOD. What was at firſt an oratorical ſally, or a poetical rapture, became afterwards an aphoriſm of devotion. The Divinity profeſſors laid hold on theſe ſubjects, and were not the leaſt concerned in corrupting them. It became a cuſtom in all deſperate diſeaſes, and all other dangers which ſeemed inevitable, of making vows to our lady of ſuch or ſuch a place, as alſo when they deſired children, or any other bleſſing. It happens every where, both amongſt Infidels and Chriſtians, that ſome patients, given over by their Phyſicians, recover from their diſtempers againſt all probability, and others by unforeſeen incidents avoid misfortunes which were thought to be unavoidable. We ſee in all countries of the world, that women, who have been barren many years, at laſt conceive. The vows I am ſpeaking of are a wonderful artifice; for if they effect not a deliverance, there are a thouſand evaſions; as that they were not made with a faith ſufficiently fervent; *&c.* There is no regiſter kept of thoſe ill ſucceſſes, and people are not allowed to attend to them. If the ſick perſon recovers, if barren women happen to be with child, *&c.* this is attributed to the vow: the liſt of miracles is enlarged with it in the new edition; offerings are multiplied, and devotion ſpreads farther and farther. We have lately learned from the Gazettes, that the king of Spain, who was at the very point of death, towards the end of September 1700, eſcaped this danger; and becauſe, amongſt other objects of devotion, there was brought to him an image of our lady of Beelen, which has but very lately been in vogue, his recovery was aſcribed to the efficacy of this image. If he had not relapſed ſome weeks after, and died the firſt of November following, this Notre-Dame had acquired a reputation that would have eclipſed the reſt; for the preachers would have ſet off this miracle with all the circumſtances which the conjuncture of public affairs might have furniſhed in abundance. Theſe gentlemen have been the great promoters of this worſhip: it was they, I ſuppoſe, who firſt advanced, that JESUS CHRIST had reſerved judgment to himſelf, and had left to his mother the whole diſtribution of graces: a ſure method to bring over to the Virgin all the acts of the moſt tender devotion. This maxim is no longer a meer flight of a Rhetorician, grown warm in his pulpit; it is got into the books which are put into the hands of the votaries (93). Is any thing more likely to ſtrengthen the worſhip of the holy Virgin, than to affirm that GOD gives her *an infinite number of ſigned blanks, that ſhe may diſtribute as ſhe pleaſes the things that appertain to GOD* (94). The world therefore is indebted to her for ſalvation and all other good things, and not to GOD; ſince it is ſhe who chooſes the perſons, and puts them down with what gratification ſhe thinks fit, in the void ſpace of the grant. You will find an infinite number of ſuch thoughts in the book I cite (95). The Heathens did not deal thus with Jupiter: they ſaid that in regard to puniſhment he acted by the advice of the other gods; but that he conſulted none of them in the caſe of benefits and rewards (96). This is a conduct which wiſe men have recommended to monarchs; and we ſee that worldly kings are the immediate authors of a pardon, but they appoint judges for the condemnation of criminals. 'Εγὼ ἒν φημι. ἀνδρὶ ἄρχοντι τὸ μὲν ἀνάγκης δεόμενον, ἄλλοις προςακτέον εἶναι κολάζειν. τὸ δὲ τὰ ἆθλα ἀποδιδόναι, δι αὐτȣ̃ ποιητέον. *Cenſeo itaque viro principi ſic agendum, ut ſi quis eget coactione, hunc aliis puniendum tradat: cæterum cum præmia reddenda ſunt his qui rem bene geſſerunt, id per ſeipſum faciat* (97). When we call to mind, that the devotion to the Virgin is a fruitful ſource of gain to the churches and convents, we ſhall eaſily diſcover the reaſon that has occaſioned a diviſion ſo different from this, betwixt JESUS CHRIST and his holy mother, with reſpect to warrants of juſtice, and patents of grace (98). Nothing is more proper than this to make the holy Virgin the principal, and almoſt the ſole, object of prayers and vows, and pilgrimages, and even of love and of gratitude, and of all the internal acts of piety. Let us once more conſider the court of princes, the grand model of moſt religions. There are ſome princes who ſuffer themſelves to be ſo engroſſed by a favourite, that they beſtow no place but upon his recommendation. Preſent a petition to them yourſelf; particularize all your ſervices; humbly beg, but as a juſt recompence, the government of a town, and they will refuſe it you. Let but the favourite ſpeak for you the next day, and they will grant it you immediately. When things are reduced to this ſtate in a court, much more pains are taken to gain the good graces of the favourite, than thoſe of the monarch; and there is a good deal of reaſon for this conduct, prudence enjoins it. Nay I will go farther yet, and maintain, that both reaſon and juſtice require, that ſuch as have obtained the government of a town, by the method I have been mentioning, ſhould think themſelves obliged for it not to the prince, their maſter, but to his favourite, and ſhould reſerve all their gratitude and friendſhip for the favourite as the true cauſe of their promotion. The prince is only a remote and indirect cauſe, an accidental, indefinite, and general, cauſe. He is the fountain of authority, but it is another who determines it, and applies it to the benefit and advantage of ſuch and ſuch perſons. By this parallel you ſee, that, according to the hypotheſis of thoſe doctors, who ſay, that no favours are beſtowed upon earth, but at the nomination and recommendation of the holy Virgin, it is to her, and not to GOD, that each private man owes his good fortune, and that it is for her and not for GOD he ought to have a ſuitable degree of love and gratitude. He could obtain nothing of GOD, if the Virgin did not intereſt herſelf in it: conſequently it is ſhe who ought to be the object of his devotion: this is founded on good ſenſe, and the reaſons of it are demonſtrative (99). Is it to be wondered at after this, that the acts of religion have taken in the Romiſh church that turn which we find they have? Is not this a true diſcovery of their foundation? However it be, the worſhip of the holy Virgin is grown to ſuch a prodigious height, and maintains itſelf to ſo great a degree, that the Janſeniſts, who would be offering their opinion upon this ſubject, have gained nothing by it: and for one man who conforms to their limitations, there are two thouſand, literally ſpeaking who follow, Father Craſſet (100). Conſider, I pray the obſtacles, met with in the Sorbonne, when the book of a Spaniſh nun was cenſured there (101). The moſt proper means to put a ſtop to the miſchief, would be to lay an interdict on panegyrics, and to oblige the votaries, who deſire to teſtify their gratitude by their liberalities, to ſend them not to the Virgin's chapels, but to the hoſpitals. A preacher is not ignorant that his auditors have been often preſent at the panegyrics of our lady, and have read the fineſt ſermons that have been publiſhed upon that ſubject. If therefore he would be heard and admired, he muſt take a new flight, and ſoar higher than all thoſe who went before him; and this is a great cauſe of errors. The principal thing would be to forbid, under the pain of Simony, all thoſe who

(92) There are ſome at Rouen, Caen, *&c.*

(93) See Mr Baſnage, Hiſt. de l' Egliſe, *lib. xviii, cap. xi. pag.* 1082; and Mr Arnauld, Objections propoſed to Steyaert, *Part i, pag.* 60.

(94) The Jeſuit Oſorius has ſaid this in a ſermon. See Mr Drelincourt's reply to the biſhop of Belley, *pag.* 374.

(95) See Mr Drelincourt, *ibid.*

(96) See Seneca *Nat. Quæſt. lib. ii, cap.* 42, 43. See the remark [*K*] of the article PERICLES.

(97) Xenophon in Hierone, *pag. m.* 584.

(98) Note, that it is pretended that the holy Virgin not only diſtributes all graces, but frequently diverts the acts of the juſtice of God; and thus ſhe poſſeſſes her own dominion entire, and beſides extends her authority to that which Jeſus Chriſt has reſerved to himſelf.

(99) Note, that a prince, who gives at the recommendation of a favourite, what he would refuſe without this to a gentleman, does not give it to the gentleman, but to the favourite; therefore the gentleman's acknowment muſt be to the favourite and the prince has no pretenſions but to the favourite's gratitude.

(100) I make uſe of this example, becauſe the Jeſuit Craſſet is one of thoſe who have moſt highly condemned the author of the *Virgin's wholeſome Advice to her indiſcreet Votaries.* See Mr Jurieu in his Preſervative, *pag.* 108, *& ſeq.* and Mr Arnauld, in his Reflexions upon that Preſervative, *pag.* 19.

(101) See the article AGREDA.

been condemned in Mr du Pin, and that he himſelf has retracted them. I ſhall make an Obſervation hereupon [*O*]. It will not be improper to relate what a miniſter of Paris alledged againſt a biſhop who ſeemed to accuſe the Proteſtants of renewing the hereſy of Neſtorius [*P*], with reſpect to the epithet of Mother of God.

who ſerve privileged altars, and who preſide over the worſhip, to receive ſo much as the value of a penny from any votary. This would be the way to dry up the ſources of the legendaries, and preachers, and of pretended miracles: but is not this an impracticable method? *Hoc Opus, hic labor eſt.*

[*O*] *I will make an obſervation upon a note of Father Doucin.*] When I compoſed the article of Neſtorius, I knew in general that Mr du Pin had been brought into trouble, among other reaſons, for ſome things he had ſaid concerning this hereſiarch: but I knew nothing in particular, either concerning the propoſitions which had been condemned, or the recantations he had been forced to make. I ſcarce know any thing farther at preſent; all the informations I have met with are only from the note of Father Doucin. However, I ſhall ſay, that to deſtroy the conſequences of this doctor of the Sorbonne's teſtimony, it is not ſufficient to alledge his retractation; for there are ſome perſons who retract for fear of being oppreſſed; and there are others who do ſo from their having been dazzled with ſome ſort of reaſonings, which are yet of leſs weight than the proofs of their firſt opinion. Upon ſuppoſition, that Mr du Pin has changed his opinion, it remains to be enquired, whether it was, from his having examined the controverſy of Neſtorianiſm, that he was convinced by internal proofs, of his being miſtaken; or whether it was from his knowing in general, that Neſtorius was condemned by a general council, that he thought it the duty of a good Roman Catholic to acquieſce in that, without giving any encouragement to dangerous and pernicious diſtinctions of fact and of right. In this laſt caſe, his retractation does not prevent his firſt opinion from being of ſome weight in favour of Neſtorius: for we may conclude from it, that ſo able a Divine, who had examined the ſubject, muſt have been convinced by internal proofs, I mean proofs as the proceſs affords, that he had been ſome ſuch way miſunderſtood: but I confeſs, that this does not form ſo ſtrong an objection as what Father Doucin relates, concerning the complaints of the antient diſciples of Neſtorius. They maintain, ‘that the diſpute betwixt this prelate and St Cyril, was only a diſpute about words, and that the explication he gave to his firſt ſermons was conformable to what we at preſent believe . . . . nay farther, they produced ſeveral of his writings; in which he complains, that his propoſitions * *have been mutilated and falſified*; that eſſential words have been ſuppreſſed, and others added which were none of his own; that a ſenſe has been foiſted in quite contrary to his own; and that by theſe *deteſtable artifices Celeſtin, and others*, that is, the Fathers of Epheſus, were ſurprized; that he makes no ſcruple to give Mary the title of *Mother of GOD*, provided it be not taken only in the ſenſe of Arius and Apollinarius. † What Neſtorius had ſaid, was conſtantly repeated by Helladius, Theodoret, Ibas, Irenæus, and others; that a thouſand falſhoods had been fathered on Neſtorius; that neither he, nor any one that they knew, had ever divided Chriſt, or acknowledged more than one only Son of God; that the term, ‡ *hypoſtatic union*, had indeed been rejected as unknown to the antients, and as ſignifying a neceſſary and purely natural union betwixt the two natures; but that St Cyril himſelf had yielded to the force of his reaſons, by ſuppreſſing this term, when the peace of the church was treated of (102).’ It is certain, that to diſ-engage Cyril from the burden this lays upon him we muſt have recourſe to the infallibility of councils as to the determinations of matters of fact. See the obſervations that Father Doucin has advanced to maintain it, and to refute the diſtinctions of the Gentlemen of Port-Royal.

[*P*] *A miniſter of Paris anſwered a biſhop who ſeemed to accuſe the Proteſtants of renewing the hereſy of Neſtorius, with regard to the epithet of Mother of GOD.*] Theſe are the words of Mr le Camus, biſhop of Belley, addreſſing himſelf to Mr Drelincourt: ‘You muſt give me leave, by the by, to tell you, that I never met with the term *Mother of GOD*, in your writers; that you yourſelf, who ſeem more favourable to this Divine Mother, ſtudiouſly avoid it, as a rock; and that in the conferences and converſations I have had for thirty years with thoſe of your confeſſion, I have found ſuch an averſion to this title, that they never make uſe of it; inſomuch, that ſome of them being preſſed, have denied it not without warmth; as if the Mother of Christ, and the Mother of God were two different things, and that Christ was not God; which ſhocks and ſtrikes the foundation of the hypoſtatic union, and the communication of idioms: you may conſider of it, if you pleaſe (103),’ Mr Drelincourt anſwered (104), 1. That the belief of the Reformed churches is perfectly conformable to that of the antient church, with reſpect to the two natures of Jesus Christ in the unity of perſon: 2. That, *tho' this term*, Mother of God, *is not to be found in* Scripture; *the thing ſignified by it, is there very clearly expreſſed* (105): 3. That above ten years ago he had printed a little book, *concerning the honour due to the holy and bleſſed Virgin*; in which treatiſe are theſe words, *We make no ſcruple to ſay with the antients, that the Virgin Mary is the Mother of GOD* (106): 4. That the biſhop of Belley having read this book, and yet nevertheleſs expreſſing himſelf in the manner he has done, has publiſhed *a thing, the contrary whereof is an evident truth* (107): 5. That none of the Proteſtant *doctrines* could be impugned *by this title of* Mother of God; and that *no man well inſtructed in* their *religion will refuſe to give it to the Virgin Mary* (108). 6. ‘That if this title of *Mother of GOD*, is not to be met with ſo frequently in our authors, as that of *Mother of JESUS*, it is not that they are ſo ignorant as to imagine that theſe are two different things, or two expreſſions which have not the ſame ſignification; or that they are ſo impious as not to believe, that Jesus Christ is God. But they uſe this method with religious prudence. They conſider that, God be thanked, this kingdom is not afflicted with the Neſtorian peſt: and that there is no need at preſent of ſeeking precautions againſt an error which is aboliſhed. But that there are ſome perſons who *deify* the Virgin Mary, and make her a *goddeſs*: and that it is to be feared, that the things which are in themſelves moſt true, moſt holy, and innocent, may help to encourage them in their error (109).’ Finally, that miniſter makes this declaration: *I proteſt before GOD, and his holy angels, that I firmly believe the holy Virgin to be the* Mother of God: *and that I am ready to ſign this truth with my own blood. Nevertheleſs, I declare, with the greateſt freedom, that, for fear of ſcandalizing ignorant perſons, I do not delight to make uſe of theſe terms, without explaining them at the ſame time. For all are not capable of underſtanding what your and our ſchools mean by the* communication of idioms. *Inſtead of attributing to the perſon what belongs to the two natures, whether by miſtake or groſs ignorance, they aſcribe to one of the natures what only agrees to the other. When they hear that the Virgin* is the mother of God, *they do not preſently comprehend that ſhe is not his mother, as he is GOD: but by a confuſed notion they imagine ſhe is as properly the mother of his Divinity, as of his humanity. I have met with ſome of your communion, who conceive this title,* Mother of God, *in the groſſeſt manner that can be imagined* (110).

This will ſerve to confirm what has been inſinuated in the remark [*A*], concerning Neſtorius's fear, that this epithet, of *Mother of GOD*, ſhould be abuſed; and manifeſt at the ſame time the circumſpections of the miniſters, as well as their reaſons.

* Synodic. *cap. vi.*

† Synodic. *cap. iii, iv.*

‡ Oriental. Object. ad Cyril. Anathem. 3.

(102) Doucin, Hiſt. du Neſtorianiſme, *pag.* 552.

(103) Le Camus, biſhop of Belley, Anſwer to Drelincourt *pag.* 83.

(104) Drelincourt, Reply to the biſhop of Belley's Anſwer, *pag.* 292.

(105) Id. ib. *pag.* 293.

(106) Id. ib. *pag.* 294.

(107) Ib. *p.* 295.

(108) Ib. *p.* 296.

(109) Drelinc. *pag.* 297.

(110) Ibid.

NEVERS (JOHN OF BURGUNDY COUNT OF) in the XVth century, was very ill treated by the laſt duke of Burgundy, though he had the honour to be his relation [*A*]. This duke obliged him to renounce the duchies of Brabant and Limbourg, and the lands beyond the Meuſe, by a forced contract the twenty-ſecond of March 1465 (*a*). He degraded him alſo from the order of the Golden Fleece [*B*]. This count died at Nevers the twenty-fifth of September 1491 (*b*), at ſeventy-ſix years of age (*c*). He was born at Clameci the twenty-fifth of October 1415 (*d*). He came to inherit the county of Eu deſcended to him from his maternal uncle (*e*) in the year 1472 (*f*). He was thrice married, and left only two legitimate daughters, and three natural ſons (*g*) [*C*].

(*a*) Labbe, Tableaux Généal. *pag.* 263. Anſelme, Hiſtory of the Royal Family, *pag.* 218.

(*b*) Fabert, Hiſtory of the Dukes of Burgundy, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 155.

(*c*) Labbe, Tableaux Généal. *pag.* 263.

(*d*) Anſelme, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Charles of Artois, brother to Bonna of Artois, the mother of this count de Nevers.

(*f*) Anſelme, ibid.

(*g*) Labbe, ibid. *pag.* 264.

[*A*] *He was very ill treated by the laſt duke of Burgundy . . . his relation.*] He was the ſon of Philip of Burgundy, count de Nevers, de Rethel, and d'Étampes, who was killed at the battle of Azincourt in 1415, and whoſe father was Philip the Hardy, duke of Burgundy, the ſon of king John. This Philip, count of Nevers, married, for his ſecond wife, the daughter of the count of Artois; by whom he had two ſons, Charles, and John (1). The former died without legitimate poſterity, the latter is the ſubject of this article. It is eaſy to perceive the degree of his relation to Charles the laſt duke of Burgundy, when we remember that Philip the Hardy, duke of Burgundy, was great-grandfather to this Charles.

(1) *Taken from* Pontus Heuterus, *lib. vi*, Rerum Burgundicarum. *See alſo Father* Labbe, *in his* Tableaux Généalogiques, *pag.* 262.

[*B*] . . . . *he degraded him alſo from the order of the Golden Fleece.*] Peter Matthieu will preſently acquaint us with this important fact. *Philip de Crevecœur lord of Eſquerdes*, ſays he (2), *received the collar of the Golden Fleece, in the firſt ſolemnity of the order that the duke Charles performed at Bruges after the death of his father, when the count of Nevers was degraded with greater indignity than might reaſonably have been expected, with regard to his family, from a prince, his near relation.* His marginal note is more particular than the text; it is this: 'Duke Charles of Burgundy renewed the order of the Fleece the ſeventh, eighth, and ninth of May at Bruges, and cauſed the place to be painted black, where the arms of the count de Nevers were to be placed, with theſe words, which are to be found in a manuſcript chronicle in the king's library. *The count de Nevers, being ſummoned by the letters-patents of the moſt high and moſt excellent prince, and my redoubted lord the duke, ſealed with the ſeal of his order of the Fleece, to appear in perſon in the preſent chapter, there to anſwer upon his honour, concerning a caſe of Magic, and for abuſing the holy ſacraments of his church, has not preſented himſelf, nor appeared; but has made default. And to avoid the proceſs and ſentence of privation of the order from paſſing againſt him, has ſent back the collar; and for this cauſe has been, and is declared, expelled the order, and not invited to the offering.*' A modern Hiſtorian (3) affirms, that Philip the Good being *diſpleaſed to find* our count of Nevers in the party of Charles VII, king of France, cauſed him to *be razed out of the order of the* Fleece. Note, that this count was made a knight in the ninth chapter held at the Hague the twelfth of May 1456; and that the firſt chapter held by duke Charles, was the eleventh (4). It was held at Bruges in 1468 (5).

(2) Peter Matthieu, Hiſt. of Lewis XI, *book xi, pag. m.* 750.

(3) Fabert, Hiſt. of the Dukes of Burgundy, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 155.

(4) Gollut, Memoirs of Franche Comté, *pag.* 738.

(5) Id. ib. *pag.* 740.

[*C*] *He was thrice married, and left only two legitimate daughters, and three natural ſons.*] I. In the year 1435, he married Jacqueline d'Ailli, the daughter of Raoul, Vidame of Amiens, and lord of Pequigny, by whom he had one daughter, who was the wife of John duke of Cleves. II. In 1475, he married Paula de Bretagne, the daughter of John de Broſſe count de Penthieure, by whom he had one daughter, who was married to John d'Albret, Sire d'Orval. III. In 1480 he married Francis d'Albret, the daughter of Arnauld-Amanjeu Sire d'Orval (6), and ſiſter to this John (7). She had no children.

(6) *Taken from Father* Labbe, *in his* Tableaux Généal. *pag.* 263; *and from Father* Anſelme, *pag.* 218, & *ſeq.*

(7) Pontus Heuterus, ubi ſupra.

NEUFGERMAIN (LEWIS DE) a French Poet, a little crack-brained, to ſay no worſe of him, lived in the reign of Lewis XIII. He was a laughing-ſtock to the duke of Orleans, cardinal Richelieu, and the wits of that time. He ſtiled himſelf *Heteroclite Poet to Monſeigneur only brother to his majeſty* [*A*]. His darling method was to make verſes that ended with the ſyllablles of the names of thoſe whom he celebrated. This was a rack which forced him to ſet down a thouſand impertinencies, and ſuch ridiculous nonſenſe, that we need not wonder it ſhould be thought a diverſion to propoſe ſuch names to him as might gave him ſome exerciſe. I do not know however whether he might not be made uſe of to intermix ſome ſatirical touches amongſt his praiſes, I mean that ſome abler wits might ſometimes aſſiſt in the compoſition of his verſes. This conjecture ſeems to be probable with regard to thoſe he made for Mr Godeau and Mr Conrart. The one was neither of a mien nor perſon at all advantageous; the other did not undeſtand Latin: it looks therefore as if there was ſomething of ſatire in their elogium, and as if an abler maſter than Neufgermain had a hand in it. I leave my readers to judge of it. They will find below the verſes I have been ſpeaking of [*B*]. There are hardly any among the works of Voiture, more ingenious than thoſe which

[*A*] *He ſtiled himſelf Heteroclite Poet to Monſeigneur.*] Let no one imagine that the wits, who by his means diverted the duke of Orleans, cardinal Richelieu, &*c.* gave him this title without his accepting it: it is certain he took it very ſeriouſly, and made it one of his titles in the front of his works. And, indeed, theſe are the words of the licence which he obtained of the king for the impreſſion of his poems in 1637. *Our well-beloved Lewis de Neufgermain, hath repreſented unto Us his deſire of publiſhing a ſecond impreſſion of the firſt part, and alſo the ſecond part of a book, intituled,* The Poems and Jokes of the Sieur de Neufgermain, Heteroclite Poet to our moſt dear and only brother the duke of Orleans; *but being afraid that others ſhould print it, which might turn to his prejudice, requeſting our letters-patent to this purpoſe*: for theſe cauſes, *we being willing to gratify the ſaid Neufgermain, have permitted, and do permit him*, &c.

[*B*] *They will find below the verſes I ſpeak of.*] We will firſt ſet down thoſe he made for Mr Conrart. He calls him Conrat; whether it was that the pronunciation of the Pariſians (1) made him miſtake the orthography of this name; or that the ſyllable *rat* ſeemed more favourable to him than that of *rart*.

(1) That is, of ſeveral Pariſians.

To Monſieur CONRAT.

The ſyllables of the name ending the verſes.

Ainſi que l'on parloit des rats de Taraſcon,
Quelqu'un me dit, tout mont peut engendrer un rat;
A quoy je reſpondis, exceptez Helicon,
Car il eſt ſacro-ſainct, autre que Monſerat (2),
Et c'eſt ſur Helicon que fut nourry Conrat.

(2) It ſhould be *Monſerrat.* See, above, remark [*D*], of the article MARCA.

which he compoſed to ridicule this heteroclite Poet [*C*]. Neufgermain's anſwer ſhews that he was quite diſabled [*D*]: the blow had ſtunned him. He never was ſo little maſter of what he ſaid as upon this occaſion.

Il ſçait parler latin, il ſçait parler gaſcon,
Grave, ſententieux, diſert, nunquam errat,
Juſques-là qu'il vainquit diſputant dans Macon
Un Docteur Maconnois, & l'envoya au grat (3)
Chercher ſon Calepin pour ſe prendre à Conrat.
S'il ne harangue en chaire, il harangue en Balcon ;
Zelateur de vertu, contraire au ſcelerat,
Puis boit l'eau d'Hipocrene à plein broc ou flacon,
Aux vivans & defuncts, fuſt-ce au grand-Amurat,
Ayant ſoif & ſans ſoif, cet excellent Conrat.
Il ſçait de quel genre eſt dans Deſpautere Icon,
Seigner, tater le poux, appliquer le cerat :
Si quelque belle il voit, il dit, ô bon bocon !
Ses beautez admirant, & ſon bel apparat,
Puis de ſes beaux diſcours les charme ce Conrat.
Plus qu'Orphée puiſſant, il peut ſans Lexicon
Arreſter de propos le ſoleil, dum migrat,
L'Aigle volant en l'air, le Duc & le Faucon,
Par terre le Lion, & l'eſcumant Verrat,
Baleines prendre en mer par ſes accens Conrat.
Dans un livre il fait voir qu'au pris d'un patacon
Les teſtes des proſcripts mit le Triomvirat :
Et comme il les joüoit à la chance & tricon,
Recompenſant celuy qui hæc attulerat,
Tant eſt ſcientieux & rare ce Conrat (4).

Let us proceed to thoſe he made for Mr Godeau. I am perſuaded it will not be taken amiſs that I relate theſe two examples: for it was neceſſary to ſet down ſome, ſince otherwiſe in foreign countries ſcarce any one could have a juſt idea of the character of this heteroclite Poet.

To MONSIEUR GODEAU,
The ſyllables of the name ending the verſes.

La belle & gentille Margo,
Trouvée n'aguere au bord d'eau
Puiſſant, puiſa un eſcargo,
Dont elle fit ſi bon chaudeau,
Qu'il n'en reſta point à Godeau.
Dedans ſon lict en ſon gogo,
Encourtinée d'un rideau,
Remuans la gigue, ou gigo,
Chantoit un air en go, en d'eau,
En faveur de Monſieur Godeau.
Luy ſeul à trouvé le mugo
D'éloquence, proſe, & rondeau ;
Car plus charmant qu'un Larigo,
Meinte fere marche en bedeau ;
Portant maſſes devant Godeau.
Venus luy donna ſon mago,
Atlas luy offrit ſon fardeau,
Diane, Taïol & Rago,
Et le beau Phebus, ce blondeau,
Donna ſes chevaux (5) *à Godeau.*
D'un nom ſi divin, origo
Eſt, que liée d'un cordeau,
Diſoit un pie, ou margo,
Got eo, ſive God eo *,
Voyant marcher Monſieur Godeau.
Ses feſtins couſtent un lingo,
En Nectar, lapin, hetoudeau,
Puis qu'enſemble à tirlarigo,
Boivent, mangeans le fezandeau,
Apollon, Minerve, & Godeau (6).

[*C*] *Thoſe which Voiture compoſed to ridicule this heteroclite Poet.*] He wrote, 1. A ballad *in favour of Neufgermain's works.* 2. An anſwer to the *complaints* (7) *of the conſonants, which have not the honour to enter into Neufgermain's name.* 3. *A requeſt to Monſieur de Puylaurens in the name of Neufgermain.* 4. Some *verſes in the way of Neufgermain to Monſieur d'Avaux, the letters of the name ending the verſes.* All theſe pieces are full of wit: the anſwer to the complaint of the conſonants was compoſed in the name of Jupiter. It is an excellent piece ; and yet Mr de Girac found ſome faults in it, which Mr Coſtar could hardly apologize for with all his ſubtilties and collections.

[*D*] *Neufgermain's anſwer ſhews that he quite diſabled.*] Mr de Girac, amongſt other things, criticized, as a falſhood, what Jupiter affirmed concerning the vowels, that they were all of them in Neufgermain's name. This cannot be true, but by ſuppoſing the true ſpelling to be *Nœufgermain*. You will ſee preſently what ſtrange nonſenſe this heteroclite Poet built upon this fault of Voiture: ' (8) Take it which way you ' will, Mr de Voiture is ſtill to blame ; for if he did ' not uſe an *o* in the word Neufgermain, he is out ' in his reckoning, ſince there wants a vowel ; and ' if he did, he deſerves correction, ſince it ought not ' to be there, as Neufgermain himſelf urges againſt ' him.

Il bâtit en l'air des chaſteaux,
Par diphtongue il fait mots nouveaux,
Par oe de Næeufgermaniſe,
Et brouillant un nom glorieux
Bedelneufgermicopſantiſe (9).
Au mépris des hommes & Dieux.
Qui deut monſtrer qu'en ce beau nom
Toutes voyelles ſont ſi non
O, qui par ſa forme Spherique
Environnant cét Univers,
Rend le caractere d'Afrique
Confrere de celuy d'Anvers.

(3) *Furetiere*, at the word *Grat*, tells us, that *envoier au grat* (*ſend to the grat*), ſignifies to give a rebuff, to drive away, to ſend about one's buſineſs.

(4) Neufgermain, *Part ii, of his* Poëſies & Rencontres, *pag.* 102, 103.

(5) Probably an error of the preſs inſtead of *cheveux*.

* Incedo Deus.

(6) Neufgermain, ibid. *pag.* 125, 126.

(7) It is amongſt Voiture's poems. Mr Patris was the author of it.

(8) Girac, Anſwer to the Defence of Voiture's Works, §. *xxvi*, *pag.* 196.

(9) Note, that in the Anſwer to the Complaint of the Conſonants, Jupiter declares, that this Poet's name ought to be *Bedelneufgermicopſant*.

NEVIZAN (JOHN), an Italian Civilian, a native of Aſti, was diſciple of Francis Curtius, profeſſor in the Univerſity of Padua (*a*). He publiſhed among other works a treatiſe intituled, *Sylva Nuptialis* [*A*], in which he diſcovered an inclination to ſhew his parts

(*a*) Panzirol. de claris Legum Interpret. *cap. cliv.*

[*A*] *He publiſhed .... a Treatiſe, intituled,* Sylva Nuptialis.] Mr Marais, advocate in the parliament of Paris, was ſo obliging as to write me word that he has a Gothic edition of this work, printed at Paris by Kerver in the year 1521 : that it cannot therefore be true, that Nevizan finiſhed it in the year 1522, as we are aſſured by Mr. Simon (1), who compoſed a little Bibliotheque of Civilians ; that the title of this Paris edition contains what follows ; ' Sylva nuptialis, bonis ' referta non modicis, nunc te lector obnixe rogat ut ' ſe aſpicias, deinde quod ſcriptum eſt legas, & proti' nus viſis opuſculi annotamentis, cum indice alpha' betico contentorum narrativo, lætaberis gaudio maxi' mo ---- *The matrimonial collection, being complete' ly furniſhed with choice materials, now earneſtly re' commends itſelf to the reader's view, aſſuring him that ' if he will take the trouble to peruſe it with the anno' tations and alphabetical index of the contents, he will ' ſoon find it a moſt agreeable diverſion* ;' that the author has collected all that is ſaid for and againſt women ; that there are a great many original things in this book ; that the author ſays, that GOD became man, and pardoned mankind, only becauſe the holy Virgin was handſome. *Imo Deus optimus maximus ob pulchræ & decoræ filiæ Jeruſalem immaculatam virginitatem generi humano ſibi infeſto pepercit & homo factus eſt* ; that for this the counſels of Romanus are cited, with the page, line, and word ; that theſe words are alſo to be found in it : ' Si mulieri non ſatisfit de ve' ſtibus & carnibus, ipſa ſatisfacit de cornibus ; ---- ' *If a woman is not ſatisfied in her carnal dues, and in ' fine cloaths, ſhe will ſoon ſatisfy herſelf by dignifying ' her huſband with horns* ;' that God, if we believe Nevizan, did not caſt all the bad angels into Hell, but ſent

(1) Counſellor in the preſidial court of Beauvais. See the 15th Journal of the Learned 1693, *pag. m.* 246 ; *and* 1695, *pag.* 270.

parts on ſubjects of wit and humour, and alſo a ſtock of learning ſeaſoned with diverting curioſities. He interwove with it large collections of ſlanders againſt the fair ſex. Some ſay that the ladies of Piedmont, did not take it as a jeſt, and that they revenged themſelves upon him very cruelly [*B*]. He was never married, but he kept a miſtreſs, and had a ſon

ſent ſome of them into womens bodies to make men mad. This compilation, adds Mr. Marais, abounds with ſuch things as theſe.

I do not believe the Paris edition in 1521 to be the firſt (§ *α*), and I wonder that Geſner and his continuators have been ſo negligent with reſpect to the *Sylva Nuptialis*. They mention no edition nor any particulars concerning it; and yet it has been looked on as a moſt curious book, and ſeveral editions have been made of it. I have that of Lyons, *apud Antonium de Harſy* 1572 in 8*vo* (§ *β*). The whole title runs thus: *Sylvæ Nuptialis libri ſex, in quibus ex dictis Moder. materia matrimonii, dotium, filiationis, adulterii, originis, ſucceſſionis, & monitorialium pleniſſimè diſcutitur: unà cum remediis ad ſedandum factiones Guelphorum & Giebelinorum. Item modus judicandi & exequendi juſſa principum. Ad hæc, de authoritatibus doctorum, privilegiiſque miſerabilium perſonarum. Quæ omnia ex quæſtione, an nubendum ſit, vel non, deſumpta ſunt. Joanne Nevizano Aſtenſi, Juriſconſulto clariſſimo, authore. Omnia multò quàm antehac caſtigatiora: indice etiam locupletiſſimo, ac argumentis in ſingulos libros additis, auctiora reddita.* The firſt thing we meet with after the title, is a letter of the Civilian Achilles Alionus to the author: it was written in 1522, and begins thus: ‘ Habuiſti aliquot ante annos (2), Johannes Nevizane vir clariſſime, tuis genialibus atque ingenialibus nuptiis, in amœniflua illa tua Sylva, frequentes quotquot palatum habent interioris hominis, literariis pabulis, ac verſatili libri gerulæque menſæ addictum, atque eductum. Qui, poſtquam abſumpta fames, & amor compreſſus edendi, ita ad unum hilaritus tibi applauſere, ut Alcinoi Phæacum regis epulum à Smyrneo Marone illuſtratum, & Didonis convivium, à Noſtrate Meleſigene celebratum, longo poſtpoſuerint intervallo. - - - - *Moſt learned Nevizan, you have had for conſtant readers of your matrimonial and anti-matrimonial lucubrations in your diverting Sylva, all who have any taſte for a learned diet, and a table furniſhed out with variety, and yet portable about one in an agreeable book. And theſe after ſatisfying their appetite, and making a plentiful repaſt, have, to a man, applauded your entertainment with ſo much pleaſure, as to prefer it very far before the feaſt of Alcinous, king of the Phæacians, ſung by the Smyrnean Maro, or that of Dido celebrated by our Latin Homer.*’ This letter informs us, that Nevizan had made ſeveral additions, which he reſolved not to publiſh. Alionus adviſed him to change his reſolution, and to give, as ſoon as poſſible, this new entertainment to curious readers; and aſſures him, that Gabriel de Laude, chancellor to the duke of Savoy, will be his patron, and drive into outer darkneſs, as not having the wedding-garment, all thoſe, who ſhall ſhew their diſlike of ſuch a work. ‘ Eſt jam fama conſtans, te prioribus nuptiis ampliores ac longè ornatiores (ſi conſummatis atque abſolutis rebus acceſſio fieri poteſt) ſuperconcinnaſſe: te tamen inaudito conſilio atque inſolenti ad eas neminem admiſſurum. . . . . Is (Gabriel Laudenſis) tibi aſſertor ac vindex comparatus, ſi quem viderit tuis accubantem nuptiis, ex his quibus ob ſtomachi moroſitatem, etiam odoratiſſima pigmenta putere ſolent; tanquam non habentem indumentum nuptiale, in tenebras detrudet exteriores. Et tunc te vel rigidi legant Catones. - - - - *There is a ſtrong report that you have very much enlarged and adorned your former edition of the* Sylva Nuptialis, *if it be poſſible to add any thing to ſo compleat a work, and yet that by an unheard of and unprecedented determination you will communicate it to no body. . . . . He (Gabriel de Laude) will patronize and protect the impreſſion, and if he find any readers of it, who, by the badneſs of their taſte, are uſed to find fault with the niceſt dainties, he will caſt them into utter darkneſs, as wanting a nuptial garment. And then the moſt rigid Cato's may read you without offence.*’ After this letter of Alionus comes the epiſtle dedicatory of the author to the chancellor of Savoy. We there find that Nevizan had reſiſted the preſſing ſollicitations of his friends, and refuſed them the publication of his ſupplements, and amongſt other reaſons which induced him to ſuppreſs them, this was none of the leaſt, that by the ill reports which were ſpread concerning his book, a great many ladies (3) had been ſet againſt him. However he ſuffered himſelf to be prevailed on by Alionus's civilities. We ſhall recite the beginning of this epiſtle dedicatory; it may ſerve to let us into the hiſtory of the book: ‘ Petierunt à me, Cancellarie illuſtris, & propè quotidianis conviciis efflagitarunt plerique, ut lucubrationes & ſuppletiones quas ad Sylvam meam otioſiori ſtudio glomeravi, in publicum ederem. Ingenuè fateor, repugnavi ſemper: adeo ut contra meos mores quibuſdam ſim viſus nimis auſterus. Non quòd me præteriret opus ipſum mutilum eſſe & mancum, quandoquidem impreſſorum incuria repentinè adeò emerſerit, quòd fecit abortum: etſi aliqui, in Sylvam ne ligna feras, quia copioſa videretur, aſſererent. Ego tamen illam introſpiciens cogebar dicere, quàm pauper Achaiå noſtra eſt. Sed differebam, quia otium non daretur, &c. - - - - *I have been almoſt daily teized, and clamoured at, moſt illuſtrious Chancellor, by a great many perſons to publiſh the ſupplemental lucubrations I have had the leizure to compoſe for my Sylva. I confeſs ingenuouſly I have always put them off, inſomuch that ſome may think me diſobliging, contrary to my natural diſpoſition. Not that I am ignorant that the work itſelf is very defective and incomplete, which the haſtineſs of the preſs, and the ſuddeneſs of the edition, has been the occaſion of: though ſome have aſſerted that my wood was ſo compleatly furniſhed, as to admit of no more ſticks. However, I am forced to own, when I look into it my ſelf, that my ſtore is too ſcanty of materials. But I have delayed complying for want of leiſure, &c.*’ Of ſix books the work is compoſed of, the two firſt run upon the theſis, *That we ought not to marry*; and the two following upon the theſis, *That we ought to marry*. And therefore it cannot be ſaid, that the author condemns marriage; he only relates the arguments *pro* and *con*.

[(§ *α*) I am of the ſame opinion with Mr Bayle, that the edition of the *Sylva Nuptialis* in 1521, was not the firſt, but not having met with one more antient, what I can ſay to the matter is, that if there be an older, it can go no farther backward at moſt than the year 1517, ſince in *lib.* i. *num.* 202, of this work, the author quotes from the Civilian *afflictus* or *de afflictis*, a form of ſummons dated the 17th of February in that year. Beſides, it is not very certain, as Mr Simon, counſellor in the preſidial of Beauvais pretends, that the *Sylva Nuptialis* in VI books, ſuch as we now have it, was completed in 1522, ſince in *lib.* iv. *num.* 147, it appears that the author was then only upon the reviſion of that place of his work, ſome time after Chriſtmas 1522, the day of the taking of Rhodes. Laſtly, one remark to be made on this book, and which I had forgot, is that the errors of the preſs, ſo numerous in the new editions, among which is included that of 1545, are owing to the Printers miſtaking the abbreviations of the Gothic editions. For example, *lib.* iv. *num.* 33. *pag.* 281, of the edition of Lyons 1545, the epitaph of the famous courtezan *Imperia* runs: *Impiæ meretricis - - - - - - Impia cognata*, in the room of *imperiæ meretricis - - - - imperia Cortiſana*, as this place has been corrected, *Tom.* i. *pag.* 108, of the new *Menagiana* of the Paris edition. It is viſible that ſo groſs a miſtake ariſes from the miſtaking the abbreviations of this paſſage in the Gothic way of expreſſing it in former editions. Rem. Crit.]

[(§ *β*) My edition, which is of Lyons of the ſame year alſo in 8*vo* has: *apud Bartholomæum Vincentium*, which is an evident proof that theſe two Bookſellers undertook it at their common expence. Rem. Crit.]

[*B*] *Some ſay that the ladies of Piedmont . . . revenged themſelves upon him very cruelly.*] I have read this only in a work of Francis de Billon. It is a book that was printed at Paris in 1555, and intituled, *The impregnable fortreſs of the honour of the female ſex*: we find in it theſe words (4): ‘ To return to my priſoners, the ſecond is one Mr John Nevizan, (a Civilian, as it is ſaid, but ill adviſed) who in the city of Turin, ſome years ago, diſcovered himſelf ſo mad as to meditate an attack, afterwards put in execution by him in a Latin book,

(2) This proves that Nevizan's book was printed ſome years before 1521.

(3) Accedebat quorundam ſiniſtra ad mulieres relatio, qui de bono opere & in commendationem matrimonii, excuſo me, nonnullas earum concitaſſet. *Nevizan. Epiſt. Dedicat. I do not correct the faults of the edition I make uſe of.*

(4) Billon, Impregnable Fortreſs, *fol.* 17, *verſo.*

ſon by her, who was an advocate, and was deprived of all his eſtate [*C*], and to aggravate his misfortune, from his extreme poverty fell into madneſs. John Nevizan died in 1540. He had taken care to marry his miſtreſs (*b*).

(*b*) *Taken from* Panzirol. ubi ſupra, *cap. clv.*

‘ book, upon the honour of the fair ſex, herein vindicated, and eſpecially upon that of the Piedmonteze ladies, which book was intituled, *The foreſt of marriage*, intirely filled with matters of ſcandal. Which book, being found by the ladies of Turin to be a defamatory libel; its author (here a priſoner) was immediately ſeized, and by them ſhamefully driven away by ſtones. It is true, ſome time after he obtained his return from exile, by means of ſubmiſſion, and the *honorable Amende* which he made them on his knees. Theſe two Latin verſes being fixed on his forehead, for an apparent ſign of penance.’

Ruſticus eſt verè qui turpia dicit de muliere,
Nam ſcimus verè, quod omnes ſumus de muliere.

Who rails at women is a very clown,
For our deſcent from them we all muſt own.

‘ This Latin rhyme ought not to be thought ridiculous; for tho’ it was not made upon one who was very prudent, yet it was at leaſt made by a man, who in regard to his great chaſtity was capable of an angelical mind; conſidering that after the affair beforementioned, he could never meet with a woman (though ever ſo old) who would make his bed for him; and the noiſe of it is not yet ceaſed in the country. Thus good Mr John received his juſt reward; for having taken the pains to ſlander the ladies.’

[*C*] *He had a ſon . . . . who was deprived of all his eſtate* (5).] Panzirolus informs me of this, as alſo that Nevizan had a great ſuit with Paul Viſca; that he died whilſt it was depending, and made the count de Montafia his heir. I doubt not but he was related to this count; for his mother was the daughter of Godfrey, lord of Montafia (6).

(5) Bonis omnibus ſpoliatus ad extremam inopiam ac demum inſaniam pervenit. *Panzirol. de claris Legum Interpret. lib. ii, cap. clv, pag.* 332.

(6) Joannes Nevizanus Aſtenſis avum maternum habuit Gofredum Montafiæ dominum. *Ibid. He cites* Nevizan, *lib. iv.* Sylvæ Nuptial. *ſub. num.* 111.

NEWTON (ADAM) author of the Latin tranſlation of the Hiſtory of the council of Trent, compoſed by Father Paul, was a Scotchman. He taught the firſt claſs in the college of St Maixant in Poitou under the reign of Henry III, and then pretended to be a Catholic. He returned into his own country, and was preceptor to prince Henry the eldeſt ſon of James I, king of Great Britain. He died dean of Saliſbury (*a*).

(*a*) *Taken from the* Funeral Oration of Andrew Rivet, *compoſed by* John Henry Dauber.

NICAISE in Latin *Nicaſius* (CLAUDIUS), a native of Dijon, was very well known among the learned of the XVII century. He died in the month of October 1701, aged ſeventy-eight years. Thoſe who would be acquainted with ſome particulars of his life, his good qualities, and his writings, need only read the *Journal de Trevoux* (*a*), and the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (*b*).

(*a*) For the months of Jan. and Febr. 1702, *pag.* 40, *Edit. Amſterd.*

(*b*) For April 1702, *pag.* 471, Octob. 1703, Art. I, II.

NICOLLE (PETER), one of the fineſt pens in Europe, was born at Chartres in 1625. His family had been conſiderable there for a long time [*A*]. He adhered to the party of the Janſeniſts, and wrote ſeveral books in concert with Mr Arnauld (*a*), whoſe *faithful companion he was in the ten or twelve laſt years* of his retirement (*b*). It was he who tranſlated Mr Paſcal's Provincial Letters into Latin, and added to them a commentary [*B*]. He

(*a*) *See the book intituled,* A Curious Queſtion, whether Mr Arnauld be an Heretic, *pag.* 150, *& ſeq. Edit.* 1695.

(*b*) Ibid.

[*A*] *His family hath been conſiderable there.*] I prove it by the teſtimony of Mr. Devizé. *I mention not,* ſays he (1), *the family of the Nicoles. Every body will tell you it is very antient at Chartres, and has furniſhed magiſtrates there for above two hundred years. At preſent its worthy head is lieutenant-general of that town.* A little before he had been ſpeaking of Mr Nicolle the father of him who is the ſubject of this article, and this is what he ſays of him (2). I am to tell you of the death of ‘ Mr Nicole, whom the city of Chartres had choſen for its advocate. The men of letters will have a conſiderable loſs of him. Though he was of a very great age, he maintained the high reputation, his eloquent pieces had acquired him, with as great conſtancy as politeneſs. He had procured himſelf the eſteem of many perſons of the nobleſt extraction. He complimented in the name of the city their royal highneſſes, when they paſſed through Chartres, and always with an univerſal applauſe. He was the father of the illuſtrious Mr Nicole, known to all the world for his learned and pious works, which he has publiſhed within theſe thirty years; among others for his *Perpetuity of the Faith*, and lately for his *Moral Eſſays*.’

[*B*] *It was he who tranſlated Mr Paſcal's Provincial Letters into Latin, and added to them a commentary.*] We ſhould ſay, *Letters to a Provincial*, and not *Provincial Letters*, if we choſe rather to conform to exactneſs, than to the caprice of cuſtom. But laying aſide Grammar, let us ſay hiſtorically, that Mr Nicolle, under the falſe name of Gullielmus Wendrockius, is the author of the Latin tranſlation of Mr Paſcal's letters againſt the Jeſuits; to which he ſubjoined a commentary. The doctor of the Sorbonne, who publiſhed the *Préjugez légitimes contre le Janſeniſme* in 1686 (3), did not know the time in which Mr Nicolle had publiſhed this verſion. This ignorance would have done him no injury, had he not grounded the reaſons of his conduct upon it: but making that uſe of it, he has been taken to taſk a little ſeverely. We will relate his words, and thoſe of his adverſary: ‘ Theſe gentlemen have newly compiled in their *Venderokius*, all their moſt ſubtile and enſnaring writings in defence of Janſenius; they have put them into Latin, and publiſhed them through all Europe, without fear of diſturbing that profound peace, for which they pretend to be great zealots, when they are written againſt. It is therefore juſt, that the children of light ſhould not ſuffer themſelves to be excelled in wiſdom by the children of darkneſs: they would doubtleſs be chargeable with a moſt criminal negligence, if they had leſs zeal for the defence of truth, than the enemies of the church have for the defence of errors (4).’ Mr Arnaud anſwered him as follows; *If our Savoyard doctor had himſelf read the book, of which probably he ſpeaks only from ſome wretched memoir that has been given him, he would have known that the author does not call himſelf Venderokius, but Wendrockius; that it is not a compilation of what was moſt ſubtilly written in defence of Janſenius, but a Latin tranſlation of the Provincial Letters, with notes and diſſertations, wherein the greateſt principles of Chriſtian morality are explained, not only in an eloquent, but alſo in an edifying and ſolid manner: and that this book having been written and publiſhed above ten years before the peace, nothing is more ridiculous, than to ſuppoſe it to be NEWLY that theſe gentlemen* have compiled and publiſhed it thro' all Europe, without any fear of diſturbing the peace: *as if there was any danger of troubling the peace ten years before it was made. Nevertheleſs he triumphs, after ſo many falſhoods and impertinences, and draws this abuſive concluſion.* It is therefore juſt that the children of light ſhould not ſuffer themſelves to be excelled in wiſdom by the children of darkneſs: They would doubtleſs be chargeable with a moſt criminal negligence, if they had leſs zeal for the defence of truth than the enemies of the church have for the defence of error. *We leave it to thoſe who have read Wendrock, and the Savoyard doctor,*

(1) Devizé, Mercure Galant, *for October* 1678, *pag.* 22, *Edit. of Holland.*

(2) Id. ib. *pag.* 20.

(3) See the News from the Republic of Letters, *June* 1686, *Art. III.*

(4) Préjugez légitimes contre le Janſéniſme, *Pref. pag.* ††6.

He did not follow Mr Arnauld when he left the kingdom in 1679, and he even conſented, as it is ſaid, to an accommodation with the Jeſuits; which conſiſted in engaging to do nothing againſt them, but not to break with his old friends. One of his fineſt works is that intituled *Moral Eſſays*. What he wrote againſt the Proteſtants is very ſubtile; never were the objections againſt ſchiſm nor the difficulties of the method of enquiry urged with greater force: but many wiſe men are of opinion, that he had better have ſuppreſſed than publiſhed this; for beſides that the Romiſh church is no gainer by it, ſince all the arguments of Mr Nicolle are retorted againſt her; his works, together with the anſwers made to them, may unhappily confirm in their evil diſpoſitions all thoſe who have a biaſs towards Scepticiſm [*C*], and who conſider not with ſufficient attention the

doctor, to give each of them the place they ſhall think in their conſcience belongs to them, amongſt the children of light, *or amongſt the* children of darkneſs . . . . *What is certain, is, that the Savoyard doctor reckoning it a piece of prudence and zeal to have writ ſince the peace, without concerning himſelf whether he diſturbed it or not, it is moſt falſe that he could be induced to this ſort of* prudence, *by the example of Wendrock, who wrote a long time before the peace* (5). Father Honoratus Fabri, a famous Jeſuit, anſwered this work of Mr Nicolle: His anſwer was printed under the fictitious name of Bernardus Stubrockius (6). He inſerted it afterwards entire in a book intituled, *R. P. Honorati Fabri Societatis Jeſu Theologi Apologeticus Doctrinæ moralis ejuſdem Societatis* (7). This work of Strubrock was put into the index; and, what is very ſtrange, that of Wendrock was not, though the Jeſuits had endeavoured to get it put in, and the Provincial Letters had been put into it. This occaſioned a Janſeniſt to ſay, that they were only put into the index, becauſe they were in French, and without the name of the author, &c. Theſe are his words (8): ‘ The general applauſe that was, and is ſtill given to the Provincial Letters, and the fruit the church has reaped from them, no body, before that author, having ſo well diſcovered the pernicious degeneracy of the modern Caſuiſts, are a juſt reaſon to believe they were only put into the catalogue of prohibited books, becauſe they came out without the author's name, without approbation, or the place of the impreſſion; or elſe becauſe, being in the vulgar tongue, it was feared they might give occaſion to the people to leſſen their eſteem for a celebrated ſociety; and not becauſe there was any bad doctrine or calumny to be found in them. It is plain that this muſt be ſo, ſince the ſame letters having been tranſlated into Latin by William Wendrock, with notes, which juſtify the citations, though this book had been brought to the Inquiſition at the ſame time with the *Apology of the Caſuiſts*, as Father Fabri witneſſeth in his *Notæ in Notas*, promiſing himſelf that Wendrock's book ſhould not eſcape the cenſure: *Nullus dubito*, (ſaid he, ſpeaking to Wendrock) *quin tuus in Catalogum Librorum prohibitorum referendus ſit*: I do not doubt but your book will be ſoon in the catalogue of thoſe that are prohibited: Yet he was found to be a falſe prophet, Wendrock's book having not been cenſured, whilſt that Jeſuit's *Notæ in Notas* were.’ They confeſs in the new anſwer made to the Provincial Letters, that Wendrock's book met with wonderful ſucceſs. *Theſe letters, after the tenth, were not meer attacks; for Paſcal was obliged to put himſelf on the defenſive, becauſe the Jeſuits pretended to have convicted the Port-Royal of a great many impoſtures, about which it had not been honourable to be altogether ſilent. Mr Nicolle, under the name of Wendrock, came ſome time after to his aſſiſtance; or rather he was let looſe by the party to compleat the rout of the Jeſuits. He diſcharged that taſk with a high hand in the Latin commentaries which he added to his tranſlation of the Provincial Letters: In which he treats the Jeſuits as wretched creatures. All this ſucceeded beyond what could be expected* (9).

[*C*] *His works . . . . may confirm . . . . thoſe who have a biaſs towards Scepticiſm.*] I have in view here only two works of Mr Nicolle: one is intituled, *Well-grounded prejudices againſt the Calviniſts* (10); and the other, *The pretended Reformed convicted of Schiſm* (11). In the firſt I have an eye only to the fourteenth chapter, where the author pretends to ſhew, *That the way propoſed by the Calviniſts to inſtruct men in the truth, is ridiculous and impracticable.* He ſays there is no man who can reaſonably be inſtructed this way, without being certain; 1. *Whether the Scripture paſſages, alledged to him, are taken from a canonical book.* 2. *Whether they agree with the original.* 3. *Whether there are not ſeveral ways of reading them which weaken their authority.* After this Mr Nicolle plays all the engines of his Rhetoric, to ſhew in particular the difficulties that are to be met with in the examination of theſe three points. He urges this much further in the other book, in which he pretends that they who left the Romiſh communion in the XVIth century, could not do it without extreme raſhneſs, unleſs they had an exact knowledge of the reaſons for and againſt it; and in general of all the objections which might be formed upon the paſſages of Scripture produced on both ſides. He ſhews what it was their duty to do, in order to acquire a well-grounded certainty that they ought to leave the Romiſh church, and come over to the Proteſtants: and he introduces ſo many examinations into the enquiry which ought to lead to ſuch a certainty, that every one of his readers muſt perceive, that among ten thouſand perſons, it would be hardly poſſible to find four capable of diſcharging this duty. What fruit has he reaped from ſo many meditations? An advantage which terminates in his own perſon; he has acquired the reputation of a ſubtile diſputant, and of a Philoſophical Divine, who is able to maintain any cauſe, let it be what it will, and to carry difficulties as far as they can poſſibly go. But he has done no ſervice to his party: For Mr Claude, who has anſwered his firſt book, and Mr Jurieu, who has anſwered the ſecond, have evidently demonſtrated that a man is expoſed to all the ſame difficulties in the Romiſh communion: and that, over and above all this, he muſt launch into the ocean of tradition, and run through all the ages of the church, the whole hiſtory of the councils, and alſo that of the diſpute concerning the Pope's authority, inferior to councils, according to ſome, and ſuperior to them, according to others: So that the way of authority, according to which the Roman Catholics profeſs to direct their ſteps, is the high road to Scepticiſm. A man who would be juſtly aſſured that he ought to ſubmit to the authority of the church, is obliged to know, whether the Scripture will have it ſo. Behold him therefore expoſed to all the examinations of Mr Nicolle (12). And he ought farther yet to know whether the doctrine of the Fathers, and of all the ſeveral ages of Chriſtianity, is agreeable to the ſubmiſſion he would have. He muſt be ſtrangely indefatigable, if he ſhould not chooſe rather to doubt of every thing, than to engage in ſo many enquiries; and he muſt be very ſubtile, if after he has taken all the pains which this requires, he ſhould at laſt diſcover the light. This is therefore the way to Scepticiſm (13). Mr Claude's anſwer to Mr Nicolle, intituled, *A defence of the reformation* (14), is a maſterpiece. He has not only retorted very handſomely his adverſary's objections, but has alſo directly cleared them up in ſuch a manner as to edify pious ſouls, without furniſhing the Libertines with arguments to inſult religion. A great many perſons would be glad we could ſay as much of Mr Nicolle's other adverſary: but this cannot be done without groſs flattery. He has not contented himſelf with teaching the Jews how to convict of extreme raſhneſs thoſe of their anceſtors, who embraced the Goſpel, and finally declared the ſynagogue to be no longer a true religion (15). He has hammered out for us I know not what ridiculous diſtinction of an enquiry of examination, and an inquiry of attention (16), as abſurd at leaſt as that of formal quantity in order to itſelf, and actual quantity in order to place; *Quantitas formalis in ordine ad ſe, & quantitas actualis in ordine ad locum*, with which the Romiſh ſchools ring: and he has granted that the Faithful do not embrace Orthodoxy, by evident proofs, but by proofs of ſentiment, and that they diſcern truth by taſte, and not by diſtinct ideas. This diſpute has been the ſpirit and character of the Chriſtian religion. His treatiſe concerning the Unity of the Church

---

(5) Phantome, du Janſeniſme, *chap. i*, *pag.* 4, 5. This book was printed in 1686.

(6) See the 4th Denunciation of the Philoſophical Sin, at the end of the preface.

(7) Ib. *p.* 22.

(8) Difficulties propoſed to Mr Steyaert, *Part ix*, *pag.* 40, 41.

(9) Anſwer to the Provincial Letters, or Dialogues between Cleander and Eudoxus, *pag.* 21, *of the Dutch Edit.* 1696.

(10) Printed at Paris in 1671, and in Holland in 1683.

(11) Printed at Paris in 1684, and reprinted in Holland in the ſame year. See the *News from the Republic of Letters*, *Nov.* 1684, *Art. I.*

(12) See the ſame News, &c. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 888.

(13) *Mr Turretin, the ſon, maintained ſome fine theſes at Leyden,* Author & reſpondens, *in* 1692, *intituled,* Pyrrhoniſmus Pontificius, ſive Theſes Theologico-Hiſtoricæ de variationibus Pontificiorum circa Eccleſiæ infallibilitatem. *See alſo Mr de la Placette's book,* de Inſanabili Romanæ Eccleſiæ Scepticiſmo. *Printed at Amſterdam in* 1696, *in* 4*to. The Leipſic Journaliſts give the extract of it in their month of June,* 1697, *pag.* 264, *& ſeq. It was printed in Engliſh at London, in* 1683.

(14) It was printed at Roüen in 1673, and in Holland in 1682.

(15) See the book of Mr Jurieu, intituled, *The True Syſtem of the Church*, printed at Dort in 1686, *chap. xiii*, *book ii*, *pag.* 333, *& ſeq.*

(16) Ibid. *chap. xxii*, *pag.* 402.

carried on: on the one hand Mr Peliſſon (17), and the author of the commentary on thoſe words, *Compel them to come in*, and Mr Papin (18) have written books to ſhew further and further the inſurmountable difficulties of the way of examination; and on the other ſide, ſome miniſters have made ſevere complaints againſt the anſwer to Mr Nicolle with regard to the foundation of faith. The author of this anſwer, inſtead of retracting or flinching in the leaſt, has explained himſelf a new with greater preciſeneſs. He has lately wrote a great book to maintain not only that the proofs of the Divinity of the Scripture are not evidently propoſed by the ſpirit of God, who converts us; and that it is not evident that God reveals ſuch and ſuch a myſtery in his word; but alſo that thoſe who lay the foundations of faith upon the evidence of teſtimony, teach a pernicious and moſt dangerous doctrine (19). There are a great many perſons of opinion, that this is bringing religion to the brink of a precipice, and that if the Celſus's and Porphyry's had found it in ſuch a ſituation, had they been to engage with Chriſtian doctors, who would have made them ſuch advances and conceſſions, it could never have been maintained againſt ſuch powerful enemies one quarter of an hour. I do not think them in the right, or that they have ſufficiently conſidered the nature of Chriſtianity. I do not know however what might be the conſequence of this diſpute between the two miniſters of Rotterdam and Utrecht: but it ſeems to me, that if we were now living in a time of a criſis, and at a conjuncture attended with a fermentation of humours, which have produced ſo many effects in divers ages, we ſhould have great changes to apprehend: *Deus omen avertat* (20).

Hopes of certain perſons that religious diſputes and perſecutions would ceaſe, if, &c.

There are ſome perſons perhaps who could wiſh the doctrine of the miniſter of Rotterdam were embraced by all doctors. They imagine that after this there would be no more diſputing, and that this would prove the true grave of controverſies: for as we do not diſpute concerning taſte, we ſhould not diſpute concerning religion, when all Divines ſhould reduce the analyſis of faith to taſte. I believe, one would ſay, I am in poſſeſſion of truth, becauſe I have the taſte and perception of it; and I alſo do the ſame, would another ſay. I do not pretend, would one ſay, to convince you by evident reaſons, I know you are able to elude all my proofs: nor I neither, would another ſay. My conſcience is convinced, would the latter ſay, it taſtes a thouſand comforts, tho' my underſtanding is not clearſighted in theſe matters: and it is the ſame with me, would the former ſay. I am perſuaded, would the firſt add, that the internal operation of the ſpirit of God, has led me to Orthodoxy; and ſo am I, would the ſecond affirm. Let us then diſpute no more, let us perſecute one another no more, would be their mutual reſolution. If I propoſe any objections which you cannot anſwer, I have no reaſon to hope to convert you: for ſince you do not pretend that evidence is the character of Theological truths, the obſcurity of your reaſons, and the weakneſs of your arguments will never ſeem to you a mark of falſhood. It would be in vain therefore for me to reduce you to ſilence. Your taſte would ſerve you in the room of a demonſtration; juſt the ſame thing as in the article of eatables, we truſt more to our palates, and the good effects they have upon our health, than to the ſpeculative arguments of a Cook or a Phyſician; though we are not able give any reaſon why theſe meats either pleaſe or ſtrengthen us. Let us therefore agree on all ſides not to diſturb one another, and let us content ourſelves with praying to God one for another. Behold the fruit that would ſpring from this doctrine, as ſome pretend, who call to mind a maxim of St Auſtin; which is, that the diſtinguiſhing truth and falſhood, being a very difficult thing, we ought not to be violent againſt thoſe that err. ‘Illi in vos ſæviant, *ſays he* (21) *to the Manichees*, qui neſciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur, & quàm difficile caveantur errores. Illi in vos ſæviant, qui neſciunt quàm rarum & arduum ſit, carnalia phantaſmata piæ mentis ſerenitate ſuperare. Illi in vos ſæviant, qui neſciunt cum quanta difficultate ſanetur oculus interioris hominis, ut poſſit intueri ſolem ſuum .... Illi in vos ſæviant, qui neſciunt quibus ſuſpiriis & gemitibus fiat, ut ex quantulacumque parte poſſit intelligi Deus. - - - - *Let them perſecute you, who know not with what labour truth is to be diſcovered, and with what difficulty error is to be avoided. Let them perſecute you, who know not how rare and difficult it is to overcome the imaginations of the fleſh, by the ſerenity of a pious mind. Let them perſecute you, who know not how very hard it is to clear up the blind eyes of the inward man, ſo as to enable them to ſee their proper ſun. .... Let them perſecute you, who know not with how many ſighs and groans, and in how very imperfect a manner God is to be underſtood.*’ This, I ſay, is the fruit which this doctrine might produce, if we believe ſome perſons; *Sed non ego credulus illis*: but I am in ſome doubt of it, when I conſider that the miniſter of Utrecht (22), whoſe opinion is that the Scripture contains an evident teſtimony of our myſteries, does not approve of the perſecution of Heretics; and, on the contrary, his adverſary, whoſe opinion is that we can alledge no good proofs (23) either of the Divinity of the Scripture to Infidels, or of the teſtimony of our myſteries to the Socinians, does highly approve of the magiſtrates perſecuting Heretics (24). What contradictions are theſe! we muſt depend upon nothing, at the ſame time that we ſuppoſe men will act according to their principles, and build their whole ſyſtem in conſequence of them. My meaning is not that the miniſter of Utrecht reaſons ill, in joining theſe two propoſitions together; one that there is in the Scripture, an evidence of teſtimony for ſuch as God enlightens, the other, that civil puniſhments ought not to be inflicted upon thoſe who do not believe the myſteries of the Trinity, Incarnation, *&c.* I fix the charge of inconſiſtency only upon his adverſary. It is manifeſt: for he who acknowledges, on one hand, that we can have no good proofs (25), that God clearly reveals the exiſtence of his myſteries in his word, muſt be very much in the wrong to pretend, that a man who does not believe them, deſerves to forfeit his eſtate, liberty, and country: for he has the lights of reaſon on his ſide, and you cannot deny but he acts reaſonably in refuſing to renounce this light, unleſs it appears to be evidently contradicted by the teſtimony of God. He is ready to ſacrifice his moſt diſtinct ideas, as ſoon as it ſhall clearly appear that the authority of God requires it. You own yourſelf incapable of making this appear to him; and confeſs that grace indeed may perſuade him it is ſo, but not diſcover it to him evidently. All therefore that reaſon and charity require of you is to pray to God for him (26); and by the ways of ſober inſtruction, to let him ſee that there is a greater degree of probability in your opinions, than in his own, If you cannot ſucceed this way let him enjoy his eſtate and country, and do not attempt to arm the ſecular power againſt him. Theſe are natural and clear conſequences, and yet the miniſter I am ſpeaking of ſeparates them from their premiſſes: ſo incomparably is he for the ſpirit of contradiction. For, to mention it by the by, was ever any thing more fantaſtical than to raiſe ſuch out-cries as he did againſt the Philoſophical commentator, and afterwards to adopt the whole foundation of his ſyſtem? it might be eaſily ſhewn, that his hypotheſes are the moſt proper that could be thought of to confirm thoſe of the Commentator (27): but this would carry me too far from Mr Nicolle; to whom I return.

Let it not be ſaid, that this author has ſufficiently gained his point, ſince his books have bred ſuch diſputes amongſt the miniſters of Holland. This is a chimerical advantage with regard to his communion; and has cauſed a real miſchief to Chriſtianity, in general by raiſing controverſies which demonſtrate, that neither by the way of authority, nor by that of examination (28), can a man chuſe his opinion with the ſatisfaction of aſſuring himſelf that he hath made a good uſe of his reaſon: for this good uſe conſiſts in ſuſpending his judgment, till the evidence of proofs ſhall preſent itſelf. Philoſophical minds would think it a great reproach to them eaſily to acquieſce in the belief of truths that ſhould be but obſcurely propoſed to them. They would not forgive themſelves for having paſſed a right judgment in a cauſe, before a ſevere examination of all the pleas of the contending parties. They give the contemptible term of *opiniators* to ſuch as engage on one ſide, without being as it were forced to it, by indiſputable arguments. They maintain, that this can produce nothing but a falſe ſcience, and they ſay, ‘that ignorance is very much preferable to this falſe ſcience; which makes a man imagine he

---

(17) *In his* Reflexions on the Differences of Religion. *See the* News from the Republic of Letters, *July* 1686, *Art. I.*

(18) *A miniſter who turned Papiſt; ſee his book intituled*, The Toleration of Proteſtants, and the Authority of the Church. *Mr de Beauval ſpeaks of it in the* Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, *Jan.* 1693, *Art. VII.*

(19) *See the book of Mr Jurieu, intituled*, The Defence of the Univerſal Doctrine of the Church .... againſt the Imputations and Objections of Mr Saurin, *printed at Rotterdam* 1695. *Mr Saurin is miniſter of the Walloon church at Utrecht.*

(20) I ſpoke thus in the firſt edition of this work, when this diſpute was not yet ended; but at the time of the ſecond edition, that is, in December 1700, I cannot ſay that it is no more now talked of than the controverſies of Flaccianiſm, which have been forgotten above theſe hundred years.

(21) Auguſtin. contra Epiſt. fundam. *cap. ii.*

(22) Mr Saurin.

(23) By good proofs are meant ſuch as lead to evidence.

(24) See his treatiſe concerning the Rights of two Sovereigns; and his eighth letter of the Picture of Socinianiſm.

(25) See, above, citation (23).

(26) See the preface to the Supplement of the Philoſophical Commentary, where it is ſhewn, that the obſcurity of controverſies is an invincible argument for Toleration. See alſo the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, *Jan.* 1693, *pag.* 209, *& ſeq.*

(27) The commentator has ſhewn in the preface to the fourth part, that with reſpect to the rights of an erring conſcience, Mr Jurieu, thinking to confute him, has confuted himſelf: this might be extended to other articles.

(28) His adverſary has renounced the method of examination, and his pretence to evident arguments.

Church ſhews a maſterly hand, and yet he has not attacked his adverſary in the weakeſt parts [*D*]: which is a manifeſt proof that with all his penetration he did not diſcover them. He died at Paris the ſixteenth of November 1695, a few days after his treatiſe of the Quietiſts was publiſhed. He was a great proficient in polite learning. The *Delectus Epigrammatum*, which has been ſeveral times printed, and the learned preface accompanying

‘ he knows what he does not know. For, as St Auſtin has moſt judiciouſly obſerved, in the book concerning the uſefulneſs of belief, this diſpoſition of mind is very blameable for two reaſons: one is, that he who is falſely perſuaded he knows the truth, thereby renders himſelf incapable of deſiring to be taught it, the other is, that this preſumption and raſhneſs is a ſure ſign of an untoward mind. *Opinari, duas ob res turpiſſimum eſt: quod diſcere non poteſt qui ſibi jam ſe ſcire perſuaſit: & per ſe ipſa temeritas non bene affecti animi ſignum eſt.* For the word *opinari*, in the purity of the Latin tongue, ſignifies that diſpoſition of mind, which too lightly aſſents to uncertain things, and ſo thinks it knows what it does not know; for which reaſon all the Philoſophers maintained, *ſapientem nihil opinari.* - - - *That a wiſe man believed nothing haſtily*; and Cicero blaming himſelf for this fault, ſaid, he was *magnus opinator* (29).’ ‘ *one greatly given to credulity.*’ Not only the Philoſophers, but all the world in general muſt acknowlege this maxim, *that to avoid the imputation of raſhneſs, it is not ſufficient to ſpeak truth; but a man ought alſo to know that he ſpeaks truth. He who ſhould affirm, that the number of the ſands of the ſea is even, might ſpeak truth; but he could not avoid being certainly chargeable with raſhneſs* (30). Thus the book of Mr Nicolle, has ſerved only to confirm the irreſolution of men that are indifferent, and to furniſh new pretences to the Sceptics in religion. We might ſay perhaps of the firſt work that appeared upon theſe ſubjects, what the Antients ſaid of the firſt ſhip: would to God the tree that ſerved to build it were ſtill ſtanding! Cicero applies, that thought to reaſon: ‘ O utinam igitur, ut illa anus optat,

- - - - - ne in nemore Pelio ſecuribus
Cæſa cecidiſſet abiegna ad terram trabes:

‘ ſic iſtam calliditatem hominibus dii ne dediſſent! qua perpauci bene utuntur; qui tamen ipſi ſæpe à male utentibus opprimuntur: innumerabiles autem improbe utuntur (31). - - - - *We might juſtly wiſh, as the old woman did,*

O that ſafe in the Pelian wood,
The fatal maſt might ſtill have ſtood.

‘ *That* GOD *had never given to men this ſubtilty, which few uſe as they ought, and even thoſe liable to be impoſed upon by others who make an ill uſe of it, and who are infinitely the greater number.*’ But as things have two faces, there is ſome reaſon to hope, that well-turned minds will make an advantage of ſo unlucky a controverſy. They will learn to keep within due bounds, Des Cartes's maxim concerning the ſuſpenſion of our judgment (32). They will learn to diſtruſt natural light, and to have recourſe to the conduct of the ſpirit of God, ſince our reaſon is ſo imperfect. They will diſcover the neceſſity of adhering to the doctrine of grace, and how much God is pleaſed with our humility, ſince he had been willing to mortify us even in the poſſeſſion of his truths; having denied us the knowledge of them by the ways of a philoſophical enquiry, by which we arrive to the certain knowledge of ſome things.

[*D*] *He has not attacked his adverſary in the weakeſt parts.*] Mr Nicolle publiſhed a book in 1687, intituled, *Of the Unity of the Church, or the refutation of Mr Jurieu's New Syſtem* (33) In this he diſplayed his learning, wit, and eloquence; and, like an able man, took advantage of every thing he could find fault with in the particular opinions of the author of the New Syſtem: but he did not think fit to examine the powerful objections of this miniſter againſt the way of authority. This looks a little like artifice. It might be imagined that a leſs able writer had overlooked the importance of theſe objections, and had deſpiſed them from an ill-grounded pride. But ſuch a judgment as this could not be paſſed on Mr Nicolle; his underſtanding was too exact and penetrating not to comprehend the full extent of the objections which had been propoſed to him upon this article, whether by retortion or directly. It muſt be ſaid, therefore that his ſilence proceeded only from his being conſcious he ſhould ſink under the burden, if he undertook to anſwer them; he very well knew that theſe were inſuperable difficulties, and that his own reputation, and the intereſt of his church required he ſhould take no notice of them. From whence we may conclude, that there are every where a great many perſons who believe not all they make profeſſion of, or who remain perſuaded that their religion is good, tho' they are conſcious that upon ſome certain capital points their adverſaries objections are unanſwerable (34). However it be, Mr Nicolle did not anſwer the whole ſyſtem of Mr Jurieu. He made choice of ſuch parts as ſeemed eaſy to be refuted (35), and confined his views to theſe, excepting ſome objections which could not be ſeparated from them, and which by conſequence he was obliged to anſwer. It is not therefore to be wondered at that he ſhould obtain ſuch an advantage, and that his antagoniſt could not deprive him of it by his reply (36). But it muſt be thought a little ſtrange, that he ſhould not be aware of the greateſt fault in the book he refuted.

The deſign of this work was to prove, that the Proteſtants did not deſerve to be called Schiſmatics, and yet it is directly calculated to prove the contrary: for we are neceſſarily led to this by author's principles, *viz.* that the church of Rome did always belong to the true church. So that this author, in building his ſyſtem, has himſelf deſtroyed the end for which he built it. What could be a greater fault? Nor did he ſtop there, but laid down ſome aphoriſms and maxims, from which he drew certain conſequences manifeſtly proving that ſalvation may be obtained in all religions. This was a ſecond eſſential and capital fault, which Mr Nicolle did not perceive. See the book intituled *Janua Cælorum reſerata cunctis religionibus* (37). You will there find the demonſtration of what I have been juſt now ſaying, concerning the faults of this ſyſtem. The miniſters who have informed the ſynods againſt Mr Jurieu's falſe doctrine, have not forgotten to complain of ſome errors they found in his ſyſtem of the church (38), but they overlooked the principal of them: for example, they have taken no notice of this propoſition. *God cannot permit great ſocieties of Chriſtians to be involved in mortal errors, and to continue long in them; at leaſt, if we judge of things by experience, we ought not to believe this poſſible, ſince it has never yet happened* (39). This is overturning with one daſh of a pen, the whole fabric of Luther and Calvin: for ſince it is certain that all the doctrines of the Romiſh communion, with regard to which they thought it neceſſary to eſtabliſh the Reformation, have ſubſiſted for many ages; it evidently follows, that they are not mortal errors. Now they ought not to have ſeparated from that church, if none of it's errors were mortal. Larebonius (40) has proved this very largely. To ſee then the faults and blunders with which this ſyſtem abounds, you muſt not only read Mr Nicolle's anſwer, but alſo the *Janua Cælorum reſerata.*

Some will aſk, how it is poſſible, that this work ſhould contain ſo many imperfections, and yet be looked upon as the maſter-piece of its author? I refer you to a little book (41) that was printed in 1692, where you will find an anſwer to this queſtion. The author of this ſmall piece having deſcribed the ridiculous figure in which Larebonius had made this New Syſtem of the Church appear, propoſes himſelf the following objection: ‘ but why then has it been formerly owned that this book was the maſter-piece of this miniſter? We do not contradict it; we own ſtill, that this, of all his other books, is that in which he has moſt ſignalized the extent of his imagination and his great faculty of inventing proofs, and urging objections. All this may be found in a work, which is in other reſpects very faulty, and in which the author, dazzled with the great fright he had taken, has not obſerved that he went too far, that he paſſed into the enemy's camp,

and

---

(29) Art of Thinking, *Part i, chap. iii, pag. m.* 54, 55.

(30) Nicolle, Pretended Reformed convicted of Schiſm, *lib. i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 15.

(31) Cicero, de Nat. Deor. *lib. iii, cap. xxx.*

(32) Concerning the fatal effects of this maxim introduced into religion, ſee the New Letters of the author of the General Criticiſm, *pag.* 779, *& ſeq.* Mr Jurieu, True Syſtem of the Church, *pag.* 373, *& ſeq.* News from the Republic of Letters, *Nov.* 1684, *Art. I, pag.* 889; *and July* 1686, *Art. I, pag.* 745. See alſo the remarks of the article PELISSON.

(33) See the article COMENIUS, remark [*N*].

(34) See the remark [*D*] of the article PELISSON.

(35) He found ſome errors of fact, and ſome pitiful reaſonings in it.

(36) *The reply is intituled,* A treatiſe concerning the Unity of the Church, and the fundamental points; *at Rotterdam* 1688, *in* 8*vo.*

(37) Printed at Amſterdam 1692, in 4to. I have mentioned it in the remark [*N*] of the article COMENIUS.

(38) See Mr Saurin, Examination of Mr Jurieu's Theology, *pag.* 6, *& ſeq.*

(39) Jurieu, Syſtem of the Church, *pag.* 236.

(40) It is under this name the author of *Janua Cælorum reſerata,* has diſguiſed himſelf.

(41) *Intituled,* New Advice to the little author of little books.

ing it are aſcribed to him [*E*]. For the reſt I ſhall enlarge (*c*) upon the conſequences of one of his books, becauſe ſome perſons of judgment have aſſured me that ſuch facts, accompanied with reflexions, belong to this Dictionary; and that they will furniſh agreeable varieties for the entertainment of the reader. This is the true reaſon why here, and on ſeveral other occaſions, I uſe this method.

The ſupplement which I have to add to this article relates only to certain works of Mr Nicolle, which I had not mentioned [*F*].

‘ and loaded his edifice with more materials than the foundations could bear. In a word, there are ſome men who by turns afford two very different ſorts of admiration: one is, that having made ſo many high diſcoveries, they ſhould not be aware of a multitude of inconveniences, and contradictions that are obvious to the moſt ſtupid: and the other is, that while they want light for things ſo eaſy to be remarked, they ſhould yet have it for great diſcoveries. The miniſter I am ſpeaking of, might have contributed very uſefully to the conſtruction of a new ſyſtem; he might have invented a great many things, and afforded a great many views: but it muſt have required a man of judgment to ſeparate all the diſagreeing pieces, and, after a ſkillful choice, to connect the parts together (42).’

[*E*] *The* Delectus Epigrammatum .... *with the learned preface is aſcribed to him.*] It is ‘a collection of Latin epigrams, and Greek, Spaniſh and Italian ſentences, printed in 12mo, at Paris in 1659 (43).’ At the head of it is placed (44) *a Latin diſſertation upon epigrams, which deſerves a place amongſt the beſt pieces written on the art of Poetry. It is a treatiſe concerning* Poetical Beauty; *wherein this author has undertaken to diſtinguiſh true and ſolid beauty from the falſe and apparent* ...... (45) *in his enquiry after this beauty he has confined himſelf to the epigrammatic kind. He treats of the excellencies of the epigram with great accuracy and judgment. He ſhews, that the number of excellent epigrams is much leſs than many imagine, and he boldly ranks amongſt the vicious, ſuch whoſe ſubject is falſe, fabulous, equivocal, hyperbolical, deciſive upon a conteſted point, foreign, accidental, far-fetched, ſhocking, diſhoneſt, ſordid, mean, and odious. He places in the ſame rank, thoſe that are virulent, verboſe, vulgar, and trivial, and ſuch as have childiſh, and ridiculous ſubtilties, or affected alluſions, and playing with words. Father Vavaſſeur hath cenſured ſeveral paſſages of this diſſertation, and has found fault not only with ſome of his ſentiments, but alſo with ſome expreſſions* (46) *in Latin**. Mr Menage, ſpeaking of ſome critics who condemned the uſe of quibbles in verſe, adds, ‘that it is ſaid, Mr Nicolle, or Mr Lancelot, was the firſt who publiſhed this notion againſt quibbles, in a collection of verſes and epigrams of the Antients (47).’ Mr Menage therefore did not certainly know that Mr Nicolle was the author of the preface placed before this collection.

Note, that the Gentlemen of Port-Royal, have publiſhed ſeveral books for the uſe of youth. It was principally with regard to their own ſcholars; for it is certain, they had ſome. *The Latin Method*; *the Greek Method*; *the Garden of Greek Roots*; *the Art of Thinking*; *the* Delectus Epigrammatum, *&c.* are works purpoſely compoſed by them for the inſtruction of ſome diſciples whoſe education they had undertaken. They had a war upon their hands with the Jeſuits on this ſubject: ſo that all the quarrels of theſe two parties did not turn upon the doctrine of grace, and on the corruptions of morality. We have ſeen that Father Vavaſſeur criticized Mr Nicolle on the nature of the epigram: he publiſhed a very fine treatiſe upon this ſubject; and we may be ſure his deſign was only to take an opportunity of cenſuring Mr Nicolle's Diſſertation: he well knew that it came from Port-Royal. Before him Father Labbe made it his buſineſs to contradict the grammatical works of theſe gentlemen who attacked him a little roughly in a Preface (48). If he is to be credited, they had ſeveral ſchools. *I was ſhewn*, ſays he, *at the ſame time a little book, intituled,* The Garden of Greek Roots, put into French, with a tract of Prepoſitions, and other undeclined Particles, and an alphabetical Collection of French words derived from the Greek Tongue, *and printed in the year* 1647, *by the care, as was ſaid, of ſome patriots of Janſeniſm, for the familiar inſtruction as well of the little ſchools, which they then had in three houſes about the abbey of Port-Royal in the Fields, as of thoſe which were diſperſed in ſeveral villages and caſtles in the neighbourhood of this great city, the capital of the kingdom, and elſewhere in the provinces. We have in this college of Clermont ſome ſcholars, who have learnt them there themſelves, and ſeen them taught their ſchool-fellows; as alſo in the college of one of the good cities of Picardy, which is not one of the moſt remote from Paris* (49). Some pages after he tells us, that the king had lately broke all their ſchools. I will relate his obſervation ſomewhat at large; in which we ſhall ſee the effects of prepoſſeſſion and hatred. Father Labbe imagined theſe gentlemen were capable of cauſing a thouſand diſorders, by this little collection of French words, derived from the Greek, which they had joined to the Garden of Greek Roots. He repreſented (50) to the French academy the heinouſs of this attempt, and inſiſted, that this ſect of new Helleniſts ought to be ſuppreſſed *I have called*, ſays he (51), *their deſign by* the name *of a ſect, becauſe what has been done by the preceding Helleniſts, produced no ill conſequences, nor occaſioned any great miſchief among our French youth: but the enterprize of thoſe* Port-Royaliſts, *who may take for their motto,* Legio nomen noſtrum eſt, - - - *Our name is legion, if it had met with all the ſucceſs they aimed at, would have directly ruined the Latin and French tongues, and under pretence of teaching their ſcholars Greek, would have thrown them into intolerable abſurdities and blunders, which muſt, in the end, have made us ridiculous and contemptible to foreigners, and to their lateſt poſterity. They have compoſed this famous collection after their rhiming roots, and their Greek and Latin methods, in order, that the youth whom they educated (not only, as we have before obſerved, in the three houſes adjacent to the Abbey of Port-Royal in the Fields, which we ſhall name when there is occaſion, and in many other little blind ſchools in ſome villages and caſtles in the country round about this great city of Paris, but alſo at a diſtance in ſeminaries and colleges of cities and provinces more remote) might draw, as out of a public fountain, and open to all their party, the firſt principles, and the moſt obſcure originals of the French tongue; learning by heart, with great diligence, the words they pretend to have been borrowed, and derived from the Greek by our anceſtors. But* GOD *has oppoſed their pernicious deſigns, by inſpiring our moſt Chriſtian monarch Lewis XIV with the reſolution of prohibiting and ſuppreſſing all the unlawful aſſemblies of this ſect, where our youth were inſtructed in the dangerous maxims of Janſeniſm, and ſucked from their cradle, as we may ſay, the milk of one of the moſt damnable hereſies, that ever attacked the church.* This is flying into a rage for a very trifle, and diſcovering in the conduct of his enemies a pernicious enterprize, which is nothing but a phantome. It is uſeful to collect examples of this wicked prepoſſeſſion.

[*F*] *Certain works of Mr Nicolle, which I had not mentioned.*] ‘The relation Mr de Marca had made, in in his way, of all that had been done ſince the year 1653, in the aſſemblies of the biſhops on the ſubject of the five propoſitions, was no ſooner publiſhed in the name of the clergy; but Mr Nicolle, ſurprized to find in it a compilation of falſhoods and impoſtures, thought himſelf obliged to make them known, to prevent the world from being deceived by them (52).’ This piece of Mr Nicolle was intituled, ‘Belga Percontator: five Franciſci Profuturi Theologi Belgæ, ſuper Narratione rerum geſtarum in Conventu Cleri Gallicani circa Innocentii X Conſtitutionem, Scrupuli, iſtius Narrationis opiſici Propoſiti, 25 Februarii 1657. - - *The Belgic Enquirer*; *or, the Scruples of Francis Profuturus, a Dutch Divine, on the relation of the Tranſactions in the Aſſembly of the Gallican Church, concerning the Conſtitution of Innocent X, propoſed to the Author of that Relation, February* 25, 1657. Some days after, appeared two Latin diſquiſitions of the ſame author, under the name of Paul Irenæus; in which he demonſtrated, that there was no ſuch thing as a Janſenian hereſy; and that it was a meer fiction made uſe of by the Jeſuits (53).’ Theſe two diſquiſitions were followed

(*c*) In the remark [*C*].

(42) Ibid. *pag.* 60, 61.

(43) Baillet, Judgments on the Poets, *Tom. i, num.* 1080.

(44) Ibid.

(45) Ibid.

(46) He has taxed him even with ſome ſoleciſms. The new Anſwer to the Provincial Letters, in the ſeventh dialogue, *pag. m.* 297, ſays, that Wendrock has now and then committed ſome very egregious ſoleciſms among thoſe fine Latin phraſes, which made thoſe who are not judges look upon him as the Cicero of his party.

* See Father Vavaſſeur, Treatiſe on the Epigram.

(47) Menagiana, *pag.* 301, 302, of the firſt edition of Holland.

(48) That of the Garden of Greek Roots.

(49) Labbe, preface to his Etymologies of ſeveral French words. This book was printed at Paris in 12°, in 1661.

(50) In the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his *Etymologies.*

(51) Ibid. Pref.

(52) Hiſtory of Janſeniſm, *Tom. ii, pag.* 329, Edition of Amſterdam 1700.

(53) Ibid. *pag.* 331.

by four others in the ſame year (54). He wrote in 1662 againſt the Theſis in which the Jeſuits of Paris had maintained, the twelfth of December 1661, *that the Pope had the ſame infallibility as JESUS CHRIST, to determine queſtions of fact as well as queſtions of right* (55). He ſhewed (56) ‘how contrary this new opinion of the Jeſuits was to the laws and cuſtoms of France. But this writing falling into the hands of one who ſtuffed it with impertinencies, and printed it with this title, *A Defence of the Liberties of the Gallican Church againſt the Theſes of the Jeſuits of the college of Clermont of the twelfth of December*, 1661, this work was diſowned and ſuppreſſed by the Janſeniſts, who ſubſtituted in it's room, the firſt of February, *the pernicious conſequences of the new hereſy of the Jeſuits againſt the king and the ſtate*: to which was added, *a refutation of the cavils wherewith ſome Divines endeavour to elude the authority of the councils of Conſtance and Baſil.*’ Note, that the eighteen letters concerning the imaginary hereſy (57) which appeared in 1664, and 1665 (58), are aſcribed to him.

Let us add a word or two of his poſthumous works. The tenth tome of his Moral Eſſays was printed at the Hague in 1700, with an advertiſement, *that the executors of this famous author have in their hands ſeveral of his writings not yet printed, and that they will take care to have them ſpeedily publiſhed.* See Mr Bernard in his *News from the Republic of Letters* (59), and Mr de Beauval in his *Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned* (60). I do not know whether they reckon amongſt thoſe writings the *interlineary gloſs, and the Greek notes that Mr Nicolle wrote with his own hand on the Greek text of Lycophron* (61). But I believe, that they reckon the Treatiſe of Grace he compoſed ſome years before his death. It is affirmed in the Hiſtory of the five Propoſitions (62), that he wrote it, *againſt the ſyſtem of Janſenius, Mr Arnauld, and Father Q....; and that he confutes nothing in all this treatiſe, but* phyſical *neceſſity, that is, the inevitable and abſolute neceſſity of doing the ill we do: and in order to confute it, he acknowledges in all ſinners a ſufficient grace, which delivers them from this neceſſity, by giving them a* phyſical *power, entire and abſolute, of avoiding evil; without which power they could not be culpable for what they do; and by virtue whereof it may be truly ſaid of the moſt obdurate, that they may abſtain from evil; as it is true, that a man of honour, who is in his ſenſes, may, if he pleaſes, in the face of the world, commit the greateſt extravagances. This is the inſtance Mr Nicolle makes uſe of.* This treatiſe, of Mr Nicolle, upon Grace, was printed in 1699, and re-printed the year following. It contains only 105 pages in 12mo. You will find the abſtract of it in the Journal of Trevoux (63).

(54) Ibid. *pag.* 334, 335, 371, 374, 375.

(55) Ibid. *Tom. iii, pag.* 3.

(56) Id. ib. *p.* 6.

(57) Ten of them are intituled *Les Imaginaires*, and eight of them *Les Viſionaires.*

(58) *See the* Hiſtory of the five Propoſitions of Janſeniſm, *pag.* 293.

(59) Auguſt 1700, *pag.* 213, 214.

(60) Auguſt 1700, *pag.* 357. *& ſeq.*

(61) *See the preface of the* Telemacomanie, *pag. m.* 6.

(62) Hiſtory of the five propoſitions, *pag.* 139, 140. *Edit. of Liege* 1695.

(63) *For the months of March and April* 1701, *pag.* 182, *& ſeq. of the Dutch edition.*

NIDHARD (*a*) (JOHN EVERARD), confeſſor to the queen, mother of Charles II, king of Spain, was born the eighth of December 1607, in the caſtle of Falkenſtein in Auſtria [*A*]. He entred himſelf a Jeſuit the fifth of October 1631, and having finiſhed all his ſtudies taught Morality, Philoſophy, and the Canon-Law, in the univerſity of Gratz. He would alſo have read School-Divinity, if the emperor Ferdinand III, had not ſent for him to his court [*B*]. He was at firſt confeſſor to the arch-ducheſs Mary-Anne; and afterwards confeſſor and preceptor to the arch-duke Leopold (*b*). He followed this princeſs into Spain, when ſhe went thither to be married to king Philip IV (*c*); for the emperor Ferdinand would not ſuffer her to change her confeſſor. the king of Spain had ſo great an eſteem for this Jeſuit, that he was deſirous of procuring him a cardinal's hat in 1665; but Nidhard beſeeched him not to have any thoughts of it. After the death of this prince he was honoured with the poſt of Inquiſitor-general by the queen-mother (*d*), and he had a great ſhare in the government. The party which was formed againſt him, which was headed by John of Auſtria natural ſon of Philip IV, was ſo potent, that notwithſtanding the queen's protection, her confeſſor was forced to retire [*C*]. He left Madrid in the midſt of the curſes of the populace the twenty-fifth of February 1669 (*e*).

(*a*) It is pronounced *Nitard.*

(*b*) Who was elected emperor in 1658.

(*c*) In 1650.

(*d*) *Taken from* Nathaniel Southwell Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jeſu, *pag.* 441, 442. See alſo the Epiſtle Dedicatory of that work.

(*e*) Bouhours, *ubi infra, pag.* 289, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *He was born .... in the caſtle of Falkenſtein.*] The Bibliographer of the Jeſuits does not take any notice to us (1) of the religion of John Everard Nidhard's parents: he contents himſelf with telling us they were noble. There are accounts which affirm, that they were ſtrict Lutherans. Madam d'Aunoi having ſaid, that the miniſters of ſtate were diſguſted, that the queen-mother (2) *had, without conſulting them, diſpoſed of a very important place* (3), *and in favour of a ſtranger* (4), *who was born, and bred up, till fourteen years of age, in the Lutheran Religion*, puts theſe words in the margin: ‘Tho' it was true that he had been a Lutheran, and that it was objected to him, yet he ſtoutly denied it, becauſe that would have excluded him from this poſt (5).’ Father Southwell dedicating his *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jeſu* to Cardinal Nidhard, ſpeaks in a very different manner: ‘Quando claræ memoriæ, *ſays he*, Genitor Eminentiæ veſtræ à principibus Auſtriacis Commiſſarius Generalis conſtitutus ad expellendos ex hæreditariis ipſorum provinciis hæreticos (6), id ille ingenti animi fortitudine ac zelo præſtitit, quantumvis non ſine diſcrimine vitæ ſuæ, & jactura fortunarum non exigua.---- *When*, ſays he, *your Eminence's father, of illuſtrious memory, was conſtituted by the Auſtrian princes, their commiſſary, to expel the Heretics out of their hereditary dominions, he diſcharged that truſt with great intrepidity and zeal, though not without the hazard of his life, and no ſmall loſs of his eſtate.*’

Father Baron relates that he had heard a credible perſon ſay, that our Nidhard had been a captain of horſe, and that he was a man grown when he abjured Lutheraniſm, which he had imbibed in his infancy (7).

[*B*] *If the emperor Ferdinand III, had not ſent for him to his court.*] Madam d' Aunoi does not ſpeak in that manner: This is her account. ‘Among ſeveral others whom the emperor appointed to attend the queen, his daughter, he choſe Father John Everard Nidhard, a German Jeſuit, for her confeſſor. His birth was obſcure; and his wit was almoſt the only means of making his fortune: he was ſupple and complaiſant; he ſtudied the character of thoſe he had occaſion for, and never oppoſed their ſentiments. He performed his ſtudies in the Jeſuits college at Vienna, where he took the habit of the order, and they ſent him afterwards to ſome of their houſes, which he governed very well. When he returned to Vienna, he began to make himſelf known, and a great many ladies of the court took him for their confeſſor: They omitted nothing to do him good offices with the emperor; and they ſpoke ſo advantageouſly of him, that he was pleaſed the queen ſhould take him along with her (8).’ There are, perhaps, ſome circumſtances in this account which are not true; I leave the examination of it to the reader.

[*C*] *Notwithſtanding the queen's protection, he was forced to retire.*] The accounts of the differences between Don John of Auſtria and the queen-regent, are ſo common in every body's hands, that I ſhall not give the particulars. Madam d'Aunoi, whoſe works have been ſo often printed, has ſpoke very exactly of them. It is pity the public cannot be perſuaded that ſhe deſerves much credit. It has prevailed, as a general opinion, that her works are a mixture of fictions and truths, half romance, and half hiſtory; and there is no other way to diſtinguiſh fiction from true matter of fact, but by comparing her's with other books. It is an inconvenience which daily gets ground by the liberty that is taken to publiſh the ſecret amours, the ſecret hiſtory, *&c.* of ſuch and ſuch lords famous in Hiſtory. Bookſellers and authors do all they can to make it believed that theſe ſecret Hiſto-

(1) That is in the article of *John Everard Nidhard*; but you will find at the end of this remark what he ſays in his Epiſtle Dedicatory.

(2) Memoirs of the court of Spain, *Part i. pag.* 6. *Hol. Edit.*

(3) That of Inquiſitor-general.

(4) That is of Father Nitard.

(5) Memoirs of the court of Spain. *Part i, pag.* 7.

(6) Note, that it may be pretended he does not contradict Madam d'Aunoi. For from Nitard's father's being commiſſioned to proſecute the Lutherans, it does not follow that he was not a Lutheran till 1621, when his ſon was fourteen years old.

(7) Vincent Baronius, Apolog. Ord. Præd. *Tom. i. pag.* 524.

(8) Memoirs of the court of Spain. *Part i, pag.* 2, 3.

The queen *ſigned with a ſteddy countenance* the decree that had been brought her *ready drawn up for this expulſion* (*f*). We ſhall ſee, below, the contents of it [*D*], and the better to ſalve appearances ſhe made a declaration the next day *by which her majeſty gave the miniſters of ſtate to underſtand, that being no longer able to withſtand her father-confeſſor's frequent importunities to retire: ſhe had permitted him to go to Rome in the quality of embaſſador extraordinary, and ſhe deſired it might be known that he went thither with all the honours, penſions, and employs, that he before enjoyed* (*g*). He went to the court of Rome where he was ambaſſador extraordinary from Spain to Clement IX (*h*) [*E*]. In the following Pontificate he was ambaſſador ordinary from the ſame crown; and in order that the might be able to ſupport that character with greater luſtre, he was promoted to the dignity of archbiſhop (*i*). At laſt he obtained the cardinal's hat in 1672 (*k*) He publiſhed ſome books, and prepared ſome others for the preſs, which run all upon the controverſy concerning the immaculate conception of the holy Virgin (*l*) [*F*].

We

ries have been taken from private manuſcripts: they very well know, that love-intrigues, and ſuch like adventures, pleaſe more when they are believed to be real, than when they are thought to be mere fables. From hence it is, that the new romances keep as far off as poſſible from the romantic way: but by this means true hiſtory is made extreamly obſcure; and I believe the civil powers will at laſt be forced to give theſe new romancers their option; either to write pure hiſtory, or pure romance; or at leaſt to uſe crotchets to ſeparate the one from the other, truth from fiction (9).

[*D*] *We ſhall ſee, below, the contents of this decree of expulſion.*] The queen ſigned it (10), ſaying, 'ſhe never had deſired any thing but what was for the advantage of the ſtate; and ſince this was of that nature, ſhe would have it executed. This was done very honourably: for, to expreſs her majeſty's eſteem for this Jeſuit, the decree was drawn up in theſe terms: *John Everard Nitard, a Religious of the ſociety of JESUS, my confeſſor, counſellor of ſtate, and Inquiſitor-general, having intreated me to permit him to retire out of the kingdom: though I am very well ſatisfied of his virtue, and of his other good qualities, as well as of his zeal and care for my ſervice; yet having regard to his requeſt, and for other conſiderations, I have given him the permiſſion he deſires to retire whither he ſhall think fit: but deſiring he may do it with all the decency and honour that are due to his dignities, and eſpecially to his merit, I have reſolved to give him the title of ambaſſador extraordinary from this court to Germany or Rome, which he ſhall chuſe, without reſigning any of his employs, or of the profits he draws from them. Madrid the twenty-fifth of February* 1669.

THE QUEEN.

[*E*] *He went from thence to the court of Rome, where he was ambaſſador extraordinary from Spain to Clement IX.*] As Father Southwell, whom I have followed, has paſſed lightly over the condition in which Father Nidhard at firſt found himſelf at Rome, what is wanting in his account, ought to be ſupplied. 'This Jeſuit flattered himſelf that he ſhould no ſooner come to Rome but he would be made a cardinal; but for want of being provided with credential letters for his embaſſy, he was extreamly out in his imagination. All that he could do was to ſend an account to Madrid of his arrival at Rome, and to deſire letters, by virtue of which he might act. Many conſultations were had on this account; and at laſt, as they knew his character, they ſent him an order to procure a deciſion on the queſtion of the Conception, and granted him an appointment of about four thouſand livres; with which he was made ambaſſador capone. But the marquis of St Romain, who, in that conjuncture, was our ambaſſador in ordinary to his holineſs, judging the glory of this crown to be concerned in it, aſſiſted him with all his power; and lent him his train and his equipage, that he might appear with ſome grandeur: but this hindered not the court of Rome from diſcovering very quickly what ſort of man he was (11).' The Pope having a cardinal's hat to diſpoſe of to the Spaniards, deſired they *would nominate ſome perſons worthy of it* (12). The council of ſtate propoſed three to him: the queen pretended to approve this choice, *and writ herſelf about it to the Pope, and the marquis of St Romain*; but by the ſame courier *ſhe ſecretly deſired the Pope to beſtow the hat on Father Nitard.* The Pope declared to this marquis, '(13) That Father Nitard had no hat to hope for; and that farther, he was inſtantly to be diſmiſſed from his employ of Inquiſitor-general, in favour of Don Diego Sarmiento Valladares, preſident of Caſtile, who had been nominated to it; which Father Nitard would by no means hearken to. It is ſaid, that the reaſon of his obſtinacy proceeded from this; that Father Salinas, his confident in this kingdom, had ſent word, that affairs were diſpoſing in ſuch a manner, that he might promiſe himſelf a very ſpeedy return, and that he ſhould have an apartment in the palace, with private ſtairs, by which he might, whenever he pleaſed, have admittance to the queen, and that he might govern the monarchy without any trouble; ſo that it would be moſt prudent for him not to part with his place of Inquiſitor-general. This letter ſo agreeably flattered his imagination, that he reſolved to follow that advice, being beſides perſuaded, that he ſhould quickly be a cardinal. But, in the interim, the marquis of St Romain ſignified his Holineſs's order to him; ſo that the poor man, who flattered himſelf with being made a cardinal and regent of Spain, was ſo ſurprized with this ſudden change, that he turned as cold as marble: It is ſaid too, that he fell into a ſwoon, and was above an hour before he came to himſelf. It is affirmed for certain, that the general of his order, ſeeing him deprived of all his employments, and that when he came to Rome, he had not paid that duty he owed to his reverence, ordered him to depart from Rome immediately, and to retire into a neighbouring convent, called . . . . and that as ſoon as he was there he diſcharged all his domeſtics . . (14). This news (15) ſo ſurprized the queen, that it threw her into a Tertian Fever, which diſordered her very much.'

[*F*] *He prepared ſome books . . . . which run all upon the controverſy concerning the immaculate conception.*] The author of the apology of the Nuns of Port-Royal, printed in 1665, drew a very merry parallel betwixt the conduct of Father Annat, in the affair of Janſeniſm, and that of Father Nidhard in the diſpute concerning the immaculate conception. He ſhews many reſemblances betwixt theſe two father-confeſſors, and the two affairs they proſecuted, one in France, the other in Spain. The only difference he finds is, that the Jeſuit Nidhard (16), *did not appear altogether ſo violent as Father Annat* (17), *and exceeded him in ſubtilty*. The Jeſuits having obtained *of her Catholic majeſty an order to ſollicit the definition of the immaculate conception at Rome, this propoſal was ſeriouſly hearkened to at Rome, but they contented themſelves with putting off the Spaniſh Jeſuits, with a proviſional bull.* 'It is expreſsly forbidden by this bull, upon pain of excommunication, to accuſe of mortal ſin or hereſy, ſuch as did not hold the opinion of the immaculate conception: and hereby the Dominicans thought themſelves ſafe from the inſults of the Jeſuits. But Father Nidhard . . . . has quickly found the way of ſhaking off theſe fetters, and of ſetting himſelf at liberty to accuſe the Dominicans of hereſy and mortal ſin. The Pope's injunction, ſays he, is only againſt thoſe who do it *affirmatively*; but he has not forbidden to do it *problematically, and ſeveral other ways:* ſo that, when the Dominicans ſhall complain, that they are charged with hereſy in a queſtion not ſubject to it, the Jeſuits will be clear, by ſaying they do not call them Heretics *affirmatively*, but *problematically, and ſeveral other ways*. Afterwards, leſt the doctrine

(*f*) Relation of the difference between Don John of Auſtria, and cardinal Nitard, *Tom. ii, pag.* 13. *Edit. of Cologne* 1677.

(*g*) *Father Nitard's Departure from Spain*, tranſlated from the Spaniſh, by Father Bouhours. See his Opuſcules, *pag* 292.

(*h*) Southwell, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 442.

(*i*) He was made titular archbiſhop of Edeſſa.

(*k*) *See the book intituled*, Memoirs of the Intrigues of the court of Rome, from 1669, to 1676, *pag.* 130, *& ſeq. Paris Edit.* 1677.

(*l*) Southwell, *ubi ſupra.*

(9) *Compare with this what is ſaid in the* News from the Republic of Letters, *October* 1684, *Art. viii, of the catalogue of new books.*

(10) Relation of the difference of John of Auſtria with cardinal Nitard, *Tom. ii. pag.* 13. *Edit. of Cologne* 1677.

(11) Ibid. *p.* 112.

(12) Ibid. *p.* 113.

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 116, 117.

(14) Ibid. *p.* 117.

(15) That is, that the cardinal's hat was given to Don Lewis Fernandez de Portocarrero dean of Toledo.

(16) Apology for the nuns of Port-Royal. *Part iv, in the preface. fol.* † 3.

(17) Ibid. *fol.* †† 2, *verſo.*

We are told a pleaſant reaſon of the friendſhip the queen-mother of the king of Spain conceived for this Jeſuit [*G*].

‘ of the immaculate conception ſhould not be thought more certain after the Pope's bull, than it was before, the good Father Nidhard, has, by his arguments, raiſed it to the higheſt point of human certainty. He thought it was doing nothing, to maintain, that it is morally certain, becauſe thereby it would not be abſolutely impoſſible but it might be falſe, which ſeems to him a great inconvenience. He therefore goes farther, and maintains in the ſecond place, that it is *phyſically certain*. One would think he might have fairly ſtopped there, and that there needed no more, than that it was as certain the Virgin was conceived without original ſin, as it is certain the ſun ſhines. But Father Nidhard is not yet contented with this degree; he will have this opinion to be *metaphyſically certain*, that is, as certain as theſe firſt principles: every thing is, or is not: the whole is greater than one of its parts. What could be deſired after this? Yet Father Nidhard nevertheleſs deſires ſomething more, becauſe there was nothing but what was natural in all this certainty; whereas he was willing it ſhould have ſomething ſupernatural. For which reaſon he eſtabliſhes a fourth degree, which he calls *infallible certainty*, pretending that this doctrine was immediately derived from a propoſition of faith. But if you demand of this good Father the foundation of all theſe certainties *moral*, *phyſical*, *metaphyſical*, and *infallible*, which he aſcribes to this opinion; he will tell you in a word, *it reſts on the infallibility of the Pope*, *in the inſtitution of feaſts and fraternities*. From whence he concludes, that the Pope permitting or ordaining their inſtitution in honour of the immaculate conception, this doctrine muſt be certain in all theſe ways.’ The Nuns apologiſt adds to this, that the Jeſuits *have diſtinguiſhed two things in this opinion*; *the* truth *and* piety, *or* laudability. *It is not material to faith*, *ſay they*, *that it be true*, *but it is material to faith that it be pious and laudable. And thus the Dominicans are Heretics*, *not becauſe they do not believe this opinion true*, *but becauſe they do not believe it pious.* Father Nidhard, coutinues he (18), *enforces as much as poſſible the new article of faith*, *concerning the* laudability *of the opinion of the* conception. He ſhews, *That the Dominicans were obliged to pronounce the formula* (19), *whatever private notions they had of this opinion. . . . . He ſuppoſes the Pope to have a right to confer upon opinions*, *the truth whereof he does not yet define*, *a certain degree*, *as he calls it*, *of* indubitability, *by forbidding the calling them in queſtion*, *directly or indirectly*, *and the teſtifying by any ſign*, *the leaſt doubt one might have about them. He ſuppoſes*, *that by the bull of the conception*, *tho' the truth of that opinion be not defined as a matter of faith*, *yet it is eſtabliſhed in this degree of indubitability.* The Pope, *ſays Father Nidhard*, will have this opinion to be indubitable. VULT illam eſſe indubitabilem, vult ut nemo dubitet. He will have every thing ſuppreſſed which might occaſion the leaſt doubt about this privilege of the holy Virgin. VULT taceri quodcunque in dubitationem poſſet Virginis privilegium revocare. *This foundation being laid*, *he adds*, *that the ſilence of the Dominicans*, *and their refuſal to pronounce this formula. brings this privilege in queſtion. Therefore*, *ſays he*, *the Dominicans are not only blameable when they ſpeak*, *but even by their ſilence they oppoſe the order of the Pope*, *ſince there is a* ſpeaking ſilence, *which gives as great offence as words themſelves.* Non tantùm loquentes culpantur Dominicani, ſed etiam tacentes adverſus totam Pontificis diſpoſitionem obloquuntur. Quapropter eſt loquens ſilentium quod non minus quàm vox ipſa producit ſcandalum. *From all which he concludes*, *that they commit a mortal ſin by this ſilence*, *and that they ought to be forced to pronounce this formulary.* It cannot be doubted, ſays he, but that this ſilence violates the bull, and conſequently that he who violates the bull by his ſilence, is guilty of a mortal ſin. Laſtly, he undertakes to prove (20), ‘ that there is no lie in the external pronunciation of the words of the formulary, tho' a man does not believe the contents of it. He who ſpeaks, ſays he, conformably to a probable opinion, tho' he believes the contrary to be alſo probable, does not lie. Now, it is probable, that the Virgin was conceived without original ſin. And therefore the Dominicans may ſpeak conformably to this opinion. But if their judgment cannot comply with the probability of the opinion of the immaculate conception; What is to be done? Would they not then be guilty of a lie? No, ſays Father Nidhard, becauſe it ſuffices to conform our affection to our words, without conforming to them our underſtanding, *etiam cum retentione proprii judicii*.’

I thought it would not be diſagreeable to the reader, to find here an analyſis of Father Nidhard's works upon the immaculate conception. See the margin (21).

But I muſt not paſs over in ſilence, that the Jacobin Vincent Baron, having imputed to this Jeſuit almoſt the ſame things which have been juſt now mentioned, retracted them in another work, printed in 1666, and made a moſt reſpectful ſatisfaction to this father-confeſſor of the queen-mother of his Catholic majeſty. ‘ Lætor, *ſays he* (22), datum mihi occaſionem retractandi quæ temerè de illo ſcripſeram, & quam ex nimiâ credulitate religioſiſſimo viro intuli injuriam ſanè atrocem, quâ poſſum, reſarciendi. - - - - - *I am very glad to meet with an opportunity of retracting what I had raſhly written concerning him*, *and of repairing by all means poſſible the intolerable injury I had done that moſt religious man by my too great credulity.*’ He confeſſes, 1. That he had not read the book that bore the name of Father Nidhard. 2. That he had truſted to the deceitful relation of a certain author, who pretended to have taken from a work printed at Doüay the interpretation this Jeſuit gave to the bull of Alexander VII, concerning the conception of the holy Virgin. 3. That he had ſought for the book in queſtion, amongſt the Bookſellers of Paris, and had ſollicited the Dominicans of Doüay to let him ſee a copy of it, but that he could never obtain it; and therefore his opinion is, that it is wrongfully imputed to Father Nidhard. He gives ſeveral reaſons for his opinion, which are not very convincing, and which I ſhall not give myſelf the trouble of examining. I will only relate one thing, which ſhews, that the book which he will not have attributed to the queen-mother's confeſſor, is the ſame from which the writer of Port-Royal has taken what we have ſeen above: ‘ Incideram in Authorem neſcio quem: is forte aliorum dictis, ſicut ego ipſe ejus lectione deceptus, quam citato loco adnotavi, Pontificii de Conceptione decreti præpoſteram omninò interpretationem retulit ex libro hujus Authoris, ut narrabat, Duaci edito, aſcitam Conceptionis Immaculatæ *Laudabilitatem* ex Pontificiis ſanctionibus, Catholicis indubitatam, contendebat ad certitudinem fidei proximam, per quatuor gradus ſuprà Moralem, ſuprà Phyſicarum dignitatum, & Metaphyſicarum demonſtrationum, imo ſupra principiorum per ſe notorum, & indemonſtrabilium evidentiam arcanum Immaculatæ Conceptionis proveniſſe: unde inferebat, quamvis ultima Alexandri VII Conſtitutione cautum ſit, ne ſecùs ſentientes damnentur, aut vexentur, aſſertive & fide certâ, poſſe tamen illis notam erroris inuri, & pœnas problematicè infligi (23). - - - - - *I have met with a certain author*, *who perhaps being deceived by the repreſentation of others*, *as I was by his*, *which I have taken notice of in the paſſage quoted*, *has given a very prepoſterous interpretation of the Pope's decree concerning the conception*, *from the book of this author*, *publiſhed*, *as he affirmed*, *at Doüay: it aſſerts*, *that the* laudability *aſcribed to the immaculate conception by the pontifical conſtitutions*, *and believed without ſcruple by the Catholics*, *amounts to a certainty next to faith*, *thro' four degrees*, *above moral certainty*, *above phyſical dignities*, *and metaphyſical demonſtrations*, *even above ſelf-evident principles*; *from whence it inferred*, *that tho' by the laſt bull of Alexander VII*, *it be decreed*, *that thoſe who believed otherwiſe ſhould not be ſentenced or diſturbed*, *aſſertively*, *and by a determination of faith*, *yet they may problematically be accuſed and puniſhed as Heretics.*’

[G] *We are told*, *a pleaſant reaſon of the friendſhip the queen-mother of Spain conceived for this Jeſuit.*] This is a ſtory I find in a letter of Mr Bourſault, and I relate it without any alteration. ‘ Cardinal Nidhard roſe (24) by a method, which never before was taken, and perhaps never will be again, and paſſed from the ſociety of JESUS to that of the cardinals, which he

---

(18) Ibid. *fol.* †† 3.

(19) *That is to conform to the cuſtom of ſeveral Spaniſh preachers. who ſay at the beginning of their ſermons*, praiſed be the holy Sacrament of the holy altar, and the pure and immaculate conception of the Virgin mother of God, conceived without original ſin, in the firſt inſtant of her being. *Ibid. fol.* †† *verſo.*

(20) Ibid. *fol.* †† 3 *verſo.*

(21) It is manifeſt from this Analyſis, that Father Nidhard was very much acquainted with the moſt abſtract and ſubtile diſcuſſions of the ſchools.

(22) Vincent. Baron. Apolog. ordinis prædicat. *lib. iii. Art. ultimo, pag.* 524, 525.

(23) Id. id. *pag.* 525.

(24) That is, to his greatneſs.

‘he liked better. The late queen of Spain, mother to the preſent king, and ſiſter to the emperor, carried him along with her when ſhe went to be married to Philip IV. This princeſs, who in Germany enjoyed a great liberty, and was gratified with every thing ſhe deſired, did not find the ſame ſatisfaction in Spain. Every thing there is ſo exactly determined, that their queens can neither eat nor drink but what is appointed by the general officer, to whom that care is committed; and if they are thirſty between meals, they are treated with a glaſs of water. It was difficult for her to conform to a manner of life ſo different from what ſhe had led: and Father Nidhard, who was a Jeſuit, *ergo* a man of addreſs, having obſerved it, brought her majeſty every morning when he went to maſs, a bottle of the beſt wine he could meet with, which he committed to a truſty perſon, and which the queen had the pleaſure to drink of, as often as ſhe had occaſion. This Father's aſſiduity, in doing her this little ſervice, ſo ſtrongly affected her, that ſhe reſolved to recompenſe ſo great a zeal, if ever it lay in her power: and in effect, being declared regent after the king's death, ſhe raiſed him to ſo high a pitch, that Don John of Auſtria growing jealous of him, and the grandees of Spain demanding his removal, he could not be diſmiſſed but by making him a cardinal (25), and ambaſſador extraordinary at Rome; where he died (26).’ What has been ſaid, that a great fortune is a great ſlavery, *magna ſervitus eſt magna fortuna* (27), is moſt remarkably verified in a queen of Spain, who has been educated in France or Germany, or in any other country which allows the ſex liberty.

NIGIDIUS FIGULUS (PUBLIUS), one of the moſt learned men of antient Rome [*A*], flouriſhed at the ſame time with Cicero. He wrote ſeveral books upon various ſubjects [*B*]; but they were found ſo ſubtile and difficult, that they were neglected [*C*]. Some authors ſay he underſtood Phyſic perfectly well (*a*): I do not find any proofs of it. The other things they ſay of him are atteſted by the antients, as that he was a good Humaniſt, a good Philoſopher [*D*], and a great Aſtrologer

[*A*] *One of the moſt learned men of antient Rome.*] Aulus Gellius has expreſſed this elogy ſeveral ways: He ſays in one place, ‘P. Nigidius homo in omnium bonarum artium diſciplinis egregius (1) - - - - *P. Nigidius, a man eminently endowed with univerſal knowledge:*’ in another, ‘Verba ſunt hæc ipſa P. Nigidii, hominis in ſtudiis bonarum artium præcellentis (2) - - - *Theſe are the words of P. Nigidius, a man of excellent taſte in all uſeful arts;*’ or, ‘In diſciplinis doctrinarum omnium præcellentis (3) - - - *Excellent in all branches of learning:*’ in another place, ‘P. Nigidius homo impenſe doctus non minus arguto ſubtilique ἐτύμῳ interpretatur (4). - - - *P. Nigidius, a man exceedingly learned, gives a no leſs curious and ingenious etymology.*’ He ſays ſomewhere, that next to Varro, he was the moſt learned man in Rome (5); but in another place he affirms it without exception (6). Servius has ſo divided the pre-eminence betwixt theſe two, as to give it to Varro in Divine ſubjects, and to Nigidius in human learning. Both of them, adds he, have writ upon both theſe ſubjects. *Nigidius Figulus ſolus poſt Varronem: licet Varro præcellat in Theologia, hic in communibus litteris: nam uterque utrumque ſcripſerunt* (7). I ſhall cite other elogies in the following remarks.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral books upon various ſubjects.*] He wrote ſome *de Augurio privato*: *de Animalibus*: *de Extis*: *de Vento*: Aulus Gellius has ſometimes cited them, but not ſo often as the great work of Grammar I ſhall ſpeak of preſently. Macrobius (8) cites Nigidius's nineteenth book *de Diis*, who had alſo written *de Sphæra barbarica & græcanica*, as Servius affirms (9). Pliny has often cited Nigidius, and tho' he does not mention the title of the books, yet we know he means thoſe *de Animalibus*, except in one place (10), where, according to all appearance he had in view a work of Aſtronomy, the ſame perhaps out of which the Commentator upon Aratus has cited ſeveral paſſages. The book *de Animalibus* has been honourably mentioned by Sammonicus Serenus: ‘Quod ait Plinius de acipenſeris ſquamis, id verum eſſe maximus rerum naturalium indagator Nigidius Figulus oſtendit, in cujus libro de animalibus quarto ita poſitum eſt (11). - - - *What Pliny ſays of the ſcales of the ſturgeon, is ſhewn to be true by Nigidius Figulus, the moſt curious enquirer into Natural Hiſtory, in whoſe fourth book of Animals it is ſo affirmed.*’ The Commentary upon Cicero's epiſtles in Grævius's edition (12) furniſhes a note aſcribed to Paulus Manutius (13). This note is very learned, but yet erroneous in giving as for Macrobius's words, thoſe that he has cited from Sammonicus; and the author ſhould not have conjectured that Nigidius has written *de Deis*, nor have quoted for it only Arnobius (14); for we have expreſs teſtimonies of this fact (15). It is ſaid in the ſame note, that Donatus affirms, that Nigidius had explained Terence's Comedies: *interpretatus eſt Comœdias Terentii teſte Donato.* But Rutgerſius thinks, that all that Donatus cites from Nigidius, was taken from his Commentaries on Grammar (16). Note, that Rutgerſius (17) has collected all the fragments he could find of Nigidius; and has alſo publiſhed a Greek tranſlation of a treatiſe of this author, done by John Laurentius of Philadelphia. It is a kind of Almanack, containing preſages of thunder for each particular day.

[*C*] *They were found ſo .... difficult that they were neglected.*] The words of Aulus Gellius are remarkable: ‘Ætas M. Ciceronis & C. Cæſaris præſtanti facundia viros paucos habuit: doctrinarum autem multiformium variarumque artium, quibus humanitas erudita eſt, columina habuit M. Varronem & P. Nigidium. Sed Varronis quidem monumenta rerum ac diſciplinarum, quæ per litteras condidit, in propatulo frequentique uſu feruntur. Nigidianæ autem commentationes non proinde in vulgus exeunt: & obſcuritas ſubtilitaſque earum tamquam parum utilis derelicta eſt, ſicuti ſunt quæ paulo ante legimus in commentariis ejus quos grammaticos inſcripſit (18). .... *The age of Cicero and Cæſar produced few inſtances of extraordinary eloquence: but for the many various arts and ſciences regarding human literature, the great ornaments of it were M. Varro & P. Nigidius. The remains of Varro's writings on theſe ſubjects are indeed every where to be met with, and in frequent uſe. But the works of Nigidius are not ſo public: their obſcurity and ſubtilty as being of very little uſe makes them neglected; as are thoſe which we have a little before read in the commentaries which he has intituled grammatical.*’ Here you ſee an example in favour of the maxim, *qui non vult intelligi debet negligi.* I ſhould eaſily believe that this diſcouraging and dark ſubtilty might belong in a more particular manner to his treatiſe of Grammar, divided into a great many books (19).

[*D*] *He was a good Philoſopher.*] This cannot be better proved than by theſe words of Cicero: ‘Multa ſunt nobis & in academicis conſcripta contra phyſicos, & ſæpe cum P. Nigidio, Carneadeo more & modo diſputata. Fuit enim vir ille quum cæteris artibus, quæ quidem dignæ libero eſſent, ornatus omnibus; tum acer inveſtigator, & diligens earum rerum, quæ à natura involutæ videntur. Denique ſic judico, poſt illos nobiles Pythagoreos, quorum diſciplina extincta eſt quodammodo, quum aliquot ſecula in Italia, Siciliaque viguiſſent, hunc extitiſſe qui illam renovaret (20). .... *There are a great many things wrote by me and in the academies, againſt Natural Philoſophers, which have alſo very often been debated with Nigidius in the way and manner of Carneades. For he was a man not only adorned with all other branches of learning becoming a liberal mind, but alſo a diligent and penetrating enquirer into the moſt obſcure myſteries of nature. In ſhort, according to my judgment, after thoſe illuſtrious Pythagoreans whoſe doctrines were in ſome meaſure extinct, tho' they had prevailed for ſome ages in Italy and Sicily, it is to him we owe the reſtoration of them.*’ Here we learn, that Nigidius was the reſtorer of Pythagoriſm, and that he delighted

---

(25) Mr Bourſault is miſtaken in this; for Father Nidhard had not the hat till three years after his departure from the court of Spain.

(26) Bourſault, New Letters, *pag.* 378, 379. *Dutch Edit.* 1698.

(27) Seneca de Conſol. ad Polybium, *cap. xxvi, pag. m.* 722.

(*a*) Non humanarum modo literarum, ſed & philoſophiæ, & aſtrologiæ, & rei medicæ conſultiſſimus extitit. *Glandorp. Onom. pag.* 625. He has been copied by the author of the additions to Charles Stephens, and afterwards by Lloyd and Hoffman.

(1) Aulus Gellius Noct. Attic. *lib x, cap. xi.* Macrob. Saturn. *lib. vi, cap. viii. pag. m.* 565, uſes the ſame words, citing Nigidius.

(2) Id. Aulus Gellius, *lib. xi, cap. xi.*

(3) Id. *lib. xiii, cap. xxiv.*

(4) Id. *lib. xiii, cap. x.*

(5) Nigidius Figulus homo, ut ego arbitror, juxta M. Varronem doctiſſimus. *Id lib. iv, cap. ix.*

(6) P. Nigidius civitatis Romanæ doctiſſimus. *Id. lib. xvii, cap. vii.*

(7) Servius in Virgil. Æn. lib. X. ver. 175.

(8) Macrob. Satur. *lib. iii. cap. iv. pag. m.* 391.

(9) Servius in Georg. lib. I, ver. 19, 43, 218.

(10) Plin. *lib. vi. circa fin.*

(11) Sammonicus Serenus apud Macrobium Saturn. *lib. ii, cap. xii. pag. m.* 364.

(12) Page 217 of the firſt volume *ad Familiares.*

(13) There is at the end of the Note, P. *Manutius in argum. ep.*

(14) Arnobius *lib. iii. pag. m.* 119, 123, 124. cites Nigidius for things relating to the Heathen deities.

(15) That of Servius in *Eclog. iv. ver. x.* that of *Macrob. Saturn. lib. iii, cap. iv.* and that of *Nonius Marcellus* at the word *obſecundanter*, and at the word *liba.*

(16) Janus Rutgerſius Variar. Lect. *lib. iii. pag.* 269.

(17) Ibid. *pag.* 246, *& ſeq.*

(18) Aulus Gellius, *lib. xix, cap. xiv.*

(19) Nonius Marcellus, at the word *nixurire*, has cited the thirtieth if we believe Rutgerſius *pag.* 265. But my edition, which is that of Paris 1614, has 25. *Gellius lib. x, cap. v.* has cited the 29.

(20) Cicero de univerſitate init. *fol. m.* 379. *B.*

(b) See the remark [F].

Aſtrologer [*E*]. This hindered not his concerning himſelf in government (*b*), and advancing himſelf to great offices in the Republic; for he was Prætor (*c*), and ſenator (*d*). He ſeconded

(c) Vives in Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, *lib. v, cap. iii.* Glandorp. ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Dio, *lib. xlv, circ. init.*

---

to treat things after the manner of the Academics: He diſcuſſed them *pro* and *con*, but determined little. Let us note here a fault of *la Popeliniere: It is alſo ſaid that Nigidius renewed in Sicily and Italy the loſt ſect of the Pythagoreans* (21). This is miſtaking Cicero, who yet ſaid plain enough, not that Nigidius reſtored this ſect in Sicily and Italy; but that it formerly had flouriſhed in Italy and Sicily. Note, that Euſebius has given Nigidius the titles of Pythagorean Philoſopher and Magician; ‘ Nigidius Figulus Pythagoricus & ‘ Magus in exilio moritur (22). . . . . *Nigidius Figulus ‘ a Pythagorean and Magician died in exile.*’ Dion will preſently inform us of ſomething in regard to the latter; and Apuleius, whom I ſhall alſo cite, will give us a farther account.

(21) La Popeliniere, Hiſt. of Hiſtories, *book v, pag.* 302.

(22) Euſeb. in Chron. *num.* 1973.

[*E*] . . . . *and a great Aſtrologer.*] He was ſo perfect in the knowledge of the ſtars, and ſo ſucceſsful in erecting figures, that he was ſuſpected of being a Magician. I think Dion's words will bear this ſenſe (23). Νιγίδιος Φίγουλος βουλευτὴς παραχρῆμα αὐτῷ τὴν αὐταρχίαν ἐμαντεύσατο, ἄριστα γὰρ καθ' ἑαυτὸν τήν τε τοῦ πόλου διακόσμησιν, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀστέρων διαφορὰς, ὅσα τε καθ' ἑαυτοὺς γιγνόμενοι, καὶ ὅσα συμμιγνύντες ἀλλήλοις ἔν τε ταῖς ὁμιλίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς διαστάσεσιν ἀποτελοῦσι, διέγνω· καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο καὶ αἰτίαν, ὥς τινὰς ἀπορρήτους διατριβὰς ποιούμενος, ἔσχεν. Infanti recens edito Nigidius Figulus ſenator ſtatim imperium vaticinatus eſt, qui ea tempeſtate omnem cœli deſcriptionem, ſiderumque differentias, & eorum proprietates, quatque coituum, intervallorumve ſuorum ratione effectiones ea edunt, adeo callebat, ut arcanis ſtudiis eum uti crederetur. . . . *To the new born infant Nigidius Figulus, a ſenator, preſently foretold the empire, who at that time ſo well underſtood every deſcription of the heavens, the differences and properties of the ſtars, and the effects they produce by their diſtances and conjunctions, that he was believed to deal in the Magic art.* The new born child, to whom he predicted the monarchy, was the emperor Auguſtus. This hiſtorian reports, that Nigidius meeting Octavius, aſked him why he came ſo late to the ſenate. Becauſe my wife, ſaid he, is brought to bed of a boy. You have given us a maſter, immediately cried out Nigidius. This exclamation troubled Octavius to that degree, as even to make him reſolve to kill his ſon; but the Aſtrologer diverted him from it, by telling him it was impoſſible to execute his deſign. It is not poſſible, ſaid he, for the child to ſuffer any thing like it (24). I do not believe that Dion relates the thing exactly; for it is not the cuſtom of great Aſtrologers to predict before they have erected their ſchemes of nativity. Now this is a work of application. You will anſwer, that as there are ſome who perform the rules of Arithmetic by the ſole ſtrength of memory (25), or play at Cheſs without men, why may not an Aſtrologer erect within himſelf the ſcheme of a nativity without any ſenſible object? To which I reply, in the firſt place, that ſuch Arithmeticians, or Cheſs-players, are very rare; and, in the ſecond place, that all theſe effects of imagination require time, and a recollection of mind, and cannot be done *extempore*, as Nigidius gave his anſwer, if we believe Dion. Let us ſay then that the hiſtorian maims his narration, and confounds the circumſtances: we muſt ſuppoſe, that Nigidius, finding by Octavius's anſwer the moment of the birth, contemplated on this figure, or erected it at his leiſure, and afterwards made the prediction. Suetonius permits us to believe that this was not done in ſuch great haſte. ‘ Quo natus eſt die (*Auguſtus*) *ſays he,* cum de Ca‘ tilinæ conjuratione ageretur in curia, & Octavius ob ‘ uxoris puerperium ſerius adfuiſſet, nota ac vulgata ‘ res eſt, P. Nigidium comperta moræ cauſa, ut ho‘ ram quoque partus acceperit, affirmaſſe, dominum ‘ terrarum orbi natum (26). . . . . *On the ſame day ‘ Auguſtus was born, the ſenate being debating on ‘ Cataline's conſpiracy, and Octavius coming thither late, ‘ on account of his wife being brought to bed, it is a com‘ mon and known ſtory, that Nigidius being told the rea‘ ſon of his coming no ſooner, and the time of the birth, ‘ foretold that the child was born to be emperor of the ‘ world.*’

(23) Dio, *lib. xlv, init. pag.* m. 306.

(24) Ὅτι ἀδύνατόν ἐστι τοιοῦτόν τι αὐτὸ παθεῖν. Quod ei infanti tale quid evenire impoſſibile foret. *Id. ib.*

(25) See the Journal of the Learned of the twenty firſt of November 1678, *pag.* 416, *Dutch Edit.*

(26) Sueton. in Auguſto, *cap. xciv.*

The objection I have ſtarted againſt Dion would have leſs force, if he had conſidered Nigidius as a Magician; for in that caſe it might be ſaid, that his Dæmon inſtantly revealed to him the deſtiny of Auguſtus. And therefore it muſt be obſerved, that I principally inſiſt upon Dion's obſerving, that Nigidius, a great Aſtrologer, only delivered his prediction the ſame inſtant in which he knew that Octavius's ſon was born at ſuch an hour. But I ought not to paſs over in ſilence, that what is told of magical operations, ſuppoſes almoſt always ſome application of the Magician to certain ceremonies; without which it is not pretended he diſcovers futurities. I might therefore attack Dion's account alſo on that ſide.

REFLEXION on what is ſaid of Nigidius's prediction concerning Auguſtus's being emperor.

I do not enter into the queſtion whether Nigidius, erecting at his leiſure the figure of the nativity of Octavius's ſon, actually predicted that he would be emperor. This queſtion would draw on another: viz. how a great aſtrologer can diſcover ſuch events. This is the order to be obſerved: we muſt firſt of all agree upon the fact, and afterwards ſeek for the cauſes; for it is miſpending our time to examine how it is poſſible for certain things to be produced, which there is room to doubt whether ever they exiſted (27). If we were once well aſſured, that on the very day Auguſtus was born, his exaltation to the empire was predicted by Nigidius, it would be very reaſonable to enquire how ſuch a prediction could be made, and to ſeek for a good anſwer to this queſtion. It is true, this enquiry does not ſeem to admit any poſſibllity of an anſwer; for, in the firſt place, it would be abſurd to ſay, that the knowledge of the influence of the ſtars can reveal futurities. 2. It ſeems unworthy of GOD to reveal himſelf to a man, who only prepares himſelf for this favour, by the ridiculous labour of erecting a figure. 3. It does not ſeem poſſible for an angel to reveal ſuch caſual events; for if he could foreſee them by his natural ſcience, there could be no free-will; all our thoughts would be as mechanical as the motions of bodies; and if he foreſaw them by an infuſed ſcience, GOD would have revealed them to him for no other purpoſe than to make a Prophet of a wretched Aſtrologer, which ſeems altogether inconſiſtent with the wiſdom of GOD. If therefore it was true, that Auguſtus's elevation was foretold the day of his birth, the fact ought not to be diſputed, much leſs the poſſibility of predictions; for there is nothing more fooliſh than to contradict experience by arguments *ab impoſſibili:* When the fact is agreed, after having attempted to diſcover its cauſe, we muſt fairly confeſs, that the manner or foundation of Nigidius's prediction exceeds the reach of our underſtanding, and that it is inexplicable. We are not reduced to theſe terms: *Suetonius's nota ac vulgata res eſt,* is no very ſtrong proof: he does not ſay that this was divulged before Auguſtus was emperor. If he had ſaid, I have read public and authentic acts, dated on his birth-day, which teſtify that Nigidius had made this prediction, he had alledged a conſiderable proof; but he is contented to ſay, that it was given out that Nigidius had done it. I do not doubt of it: I am certain that after Auguſtus was ſettled on the throne, there were ſpread infinite ſtories of the predictions of his greatneſs. Nigidius could not be forgotten, who was the moſt famous Aſtrologer of his time. He was brought into the party; and his diſcourſe with Octavius was circumſtantiated. All the city rung with it; orators, poets, and even hiſtorians, mentioned it. Suetonius found monuments of it: he has ſpoken of it as of a thing manifeſt; but the worſt is he has forgotten the dates, the moſt eſſential thing of all. It is thus hiſtorians are to be preſſed: give us uncontroverted proofs, that the Aſtrologer's prediction was current, when there was yet no probability of its accompliſhment. We ſhall preſently ſee that Lucan, going only upon probability, ſays a great many fine things of Nigidius's gift of prophecy.

(27) Divers Thoughts upon Comets, *num.* 49.

Here is another proof of Nigidius's great reputation in regard to Aſtrology. Lucan reckons him among thoſe who preſaged the miſeries of the Roman people, when the rupture was upon the point of breaking out between Cæſar and Pompey: He attributes to him abundance of ſpeculations hereupon.

ſeconded Cicero with great prudence in defeating Catiline's conſpiracy, and did him great ſervices in the time of his adverſity [*F*]. He engaged himſelf in Pompey's intereſt againſt Cæſar *(e)*, which reduced him to the condition of an exile all the reſt of his life, for he died in his exile (*f*). Cicero, who had always a very great eſteem for him (*g*), wrote a fine letter of conſolation to him, in the 707th year of Rome. It is the thirteenth of the fourth book *ad Familiares*. We find in St Auſtin the reaſon of his ſirname *Figulus* [*G*]. Some Critics, without any great foundation, affirm, that Nigidius wrote annals [*H*]. A certain

At Figulus, cui cura Deos, ſecretaque cœli
Noſſe fuit, quem non ſtellarum Ægyptia Memphis
Æquaret viſu, numeriſque moventibus aſtra,
Aut hic errat (ait) nulla cum lege per ævum
Mundus, & incerto diſcurrunt ſidera motu:
Aut, ſi fata movent, orbi, generique paratur
Humano matura lues, &c (28).

But Figulus exclaims (to ſcience bred,
And in the Gods myſterious ſecrets read;
Whom nor Egyptian Memphis' ſons excell'd,
Nor with more ſkill the rolling orbs beheld:
Well could he judge the labours of the ſphere,
And calculate the juſt revolving year.)
The ſtars (he cries) are in confuſion hurl'd,
And wand'ring error quite miſguides the world;
Or if the laws of nature yet remain,
Some ſwift deſtruction now the Fates ordain, &c.

Add to this the paſſage which I ſhall relate (29) from St Auſtin.

What Apuleius reports is conſiderable. He ſays, that he has read in Varro, that the Trallians informed themſelves, by Magic art of the events of the Mithridatic war; and that a child, who beheld the image of Mercury in the water, repeated a hundred and ſixty verſes, which contained all that was to come to paſs; and that Fabius, having loſt five hundred Denarii, went to conſult Nigidius, who, by the power of inchantments, made little boys tell where the purſe was buried that contained ſome of them, and how the reſt were diſtributed, and that Cato the Philoſopher had one of them: it is added, that Cato confeſſed he had received one of a ſervant. *Itemque Fabium, cum quingentos denarios perdidiſſet, ad Nigidium conſultum veniſſe: ab eo pueros carmine inſtinctos indicaſſe ubi locorum defoſſa eſſet crumena, cum parte eorum, cæteri ut forent diſtributi: unum etiam denarium ex eo numero habere M. Catonem philoſophum, quem ſe à pediſſequo in ſtipem Apollinis accepiſſe Cato confeſſus eſt* (30). I would fain know whether Varro gave his judgment upon all theſe ſtories; for he was a man whoſe learning was incomparably greater than his credulity.

[*F*] *He ſeconded Cicero . . . . in defeating Cataline's conſpiracy, and did him great ſervices in the time of his adverſity.*] The letter he received from Cicero in his exile contains theſe words: 'Careo cum familiariſſimis 'multis, quos aut mors eripuit nobis, aut diſtraxit 'fuga, tum omnibus amicis quorum benevolentiam 'nobis conciliarat per me quondam, TE SOCIO, de'fenſa reſpublica (31). - - - *I am not only at a loſs for 'many of my moſt intimate acquaintance, of whom either 'death or flight have deprived me, but alſo for all thoſe 'friends whom I had gained by defending the common'wealth in conjunction with your ſelf.*' Corradus's note upon this paſſage tells us, that Nigidius had drawn up the interrogatories that were ordered to be put to the informers of the conſpiracy (32). The letter I have cited ends thus: 'Ego quæ pertinere ad te intelligam 'ſtudioſiſſime omnia diligentiſſimeque curabo: tuorum'que triſtiſſimo meo tempore meritorum erga me me'moriam conſervabo. - - - *I ſhall take a very particu'lar care of every thing wherein I can find you to be 'concerned; and ſhall never forget your favours to me 'in the time of my adverſity.*' Plutarch obſerves, that Cicero was animated againſt the conſpirators by Terentia his wife, by Quintus his brother, and by Publius Nigidius, his companion in Philoſophy, and his ordinary counſellor in the affairs of ſtate. Ἡ δὲ Τερεντία . . . . . παρώξυνεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Κόϊντος ὁ ἀδελφὸς, καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας ἑταίρων Πόπλιος Νιγίδιος, ᾧ τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ μέγιστα παρὰ τὰς πολιτικὰς ἐχρῆτο πράξεις. *Terentia . . . . in conjuratos incendit: Quintus item ejus frater & in philoſophia ſocius P. Nigidius, cujus fere graviſſimis in negotiis publicis utebatur conſilio* (33). Add to this the paſſage of Plutarch (34), in which Cicero owns that he concerted with the Philoſopher Nigidius, the moſt important deliberations, that ſaved the republic in his conſulſhip. Aulus Gellius had reaſon to ſay, that Nigidius was much reſpected by Cicero for his ſenſe and learning; but he ought alſo to have ſaid, he was ſo for his ſervices. 'Verba ſunt hæc ipſa P. 'Nigidii, hominis in ſtudiis bonarum artium præcel'lentis: quem M. Cicero ingenii doctrinarumque no'mine ſumme reveritus eſt (35). - - - *Theſe are the 'very words of Nigidius, a man eminent for univerſal 'knowledge; and who was moſt highly eſteemed by M. 'Cicero for his great parts and learning.*' Note, that when Cicero went to govern Cilicia, Nigidius waited for him at Epheſus, Nigidius, I ſay, who was returning to Rome, after his diſcharge of a public employ in that country. Theſe two friends met with great pleaſure, and had long philoſophical conferences with Cratippus, a moſt famous Peripatetic. I obſerve this as a proof of Nigidius's intimacy with Cicero, and as an inſtance of his being employed in ſtate-affairs. 'Nigidius quum me in Ciliciam proficiſcentem Epheſi 'expectaviſſet, Romam ex legatione ipſe decedens, 'veniſſetque eodem Mitylenis me ſalutandi, & viſendi 'cauſa Cratippus, peripateticorum omnium, quos qui'dem ego audierim, meo judicio, facile princeps, per'libenter & Nigidium vidi, & cognovi Cratippum. 'At primum quidem tempus ſalutationibus, reliquum 'percontatione conſumpſimus (36). - - - - *As Nigidius 'waited for me at Epheſus, on my way to Cilicia, being 'himſelf returning to Rome from his embaſſy, and Cra'tippus was alſo come thither from Mitylene to make me 'a viſit, who, in my judgment, is the moſt learned of all 'the Peripatetics I ever yet converſed with, it was doub'ly agreeable to me to meet with my friend, and to be'come acquainted with Cratippus. The firſt part of our 'time was taken up in ſalutations, the remainder in 'philoſophical ſubjects.*'

[*G*] *We find in St Auſtin the reaſon of his ſirname Figulus.*] St Auſtin, confuting Aſtrology by the argument of the different fate of two twins, propoſes Nigidius's anſwer to this difficulty. This Aſtrologer maintained, that the motion of the Heavens, is ſo rapid, that though there is but a ſmall interval betwixt the birth of the firſt and ſecond of the twins, yet they are born under celeſtial points very different from each other: and to prove it, he turned with all his ſtrength a Potter's wheel, and made two marks on it whilſt it turned: it was thought that the marks were made upon the ſame part of the wheel; but when it reſted, they appeared to be at a good diſtance from one another. This was the reaſon of his being ſirnamed the Potter, *Figulus*. Theſe are the words of St Auſtin (37): *Fruſtra itaque affertur nobile illud commentum de figuli rota, quod reſpondiſſe ferunt Nigidium hac quæſtione turbatum, unde & Figulus appellatus eſt. Dum enim rotam figuli vi quanta potuit intorſiſſet, currente illa bis numero de atramento tanquam uno ejus loco ſumma celeritate percuſſit: deinde inventa ſunt ſigna, quæ fixerat deſiſtente motu, non parvo intervallo in rotæ illius extremitate diſtantia. Sic, inquit, in tanta cœli rapacitate, etiam ſi alter poſt alterum tanta celeritate naſcatur, quanta rotam bis ipſe percuſſi, in cœli ſpatio plurimum eſt. Hinc ſunt, inquit, quæcunque diſſimillima perhibentur in moribus, caſibuſque geminorum. Hoc figmentum fragilius eſt quam vaſa quæ illa rotatione figuntur.* St Auſtin had reaſon to think this anſwer as fragil as a Potter's veſſels. He ſolidly confutes it. See alſo his commentators (38).

[*H*] *Some Critics affirm . . . . that Nigidius wrote annals.*] You will find ſome fragments of his amongſt thoſe which Riccobon has collected from the antient hiſtorians, and which he pretends Livy has followed. Voſſius declares, that he is not of this Critic's opinion, but that he ought however to be ſo, if what la Popeliniere affirms was true, that Nigidius compoſed annals

---

(*e*) See Cicero, Epiſt. xiii, *lib. iv*, ad Familiares.

(*f*) Euſeb. in Chron. *ad ann.* 4, *Olymp.* 183, *that is, in* 709 *year of Rome.*

(*g*) See the remark [*F*].

(28) Lucan. Pharſ. lib. I, ver. 639.

(29) In the remark [*G*].

(30) Apuleius, in Apologia, *pag. m.* 301.

(31) Cicero, Epiſt. xiii, *lib. iv*, ad Familiares, *pag.* 218, *Græv. Edit.*

(32) Quippe qui indicum dicta, interrogata, reſponſa perſcripſeris. *Corrad. in hunc locum Cicer.*

(33) Plut. in Vita Cicer. *pag.* 870, *D.*

(34) Id. an ſeni ſit gerenda Reſp. 797. *D.*

(35) *Aulus Gellius, lib. xi, cap. xi, where he relates the difference Nigidius made betwixt* mentiri & mendacium dicere. *Nonius Marcellus* voce mentiri, *pag. m.* 445, *relating the ſame difference gives the ſame elogy*, Mentiri & mendacium dicere quemadmodum diſtent P. Nigidius ſtudiis bonarum artium præcellentiſſimus maniſeſtiſſime ſeparavit.

(36) Cicero, de Univerſitate, *initio, fol. m.* 379. *B.*

(37) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, *lib. v, cap. iii.*

(38) Ludovicus Vives, & Leonard. Coquæus.

certain obſcure author fathers on him a treatiſe concerning the Remedies of Love [*I*]. I ſhall ſum up in one ſingle remark the miſtakes of Mr Moreri, and thoſe of ſome other authors [*K*]; but I will ſet down here a ſtrange blunder of Father Rapin. He ſays in the thirteenth paragraph of his Reflexions upon Philoſophy, that Nigidius was baniſhed by Auguſtus for the crime of Magic. I do not by this pretend to deny that he paſſed for a Magician. See the paſſage of Apuleius at the end of the remark [*E*].

nals (39). La Popeliniere is of no authority here, ſince he has committed ſo many faults in a few lines. *Paul. Nigidius Figulus*, ſays he (40), *was in no leſs eſteem in his time for learning than Varro. But the confuſion and obſcurity of his writings prevented their being preſerved and recommended to poſterity*; *which is the reaſon theſe annals came not down to us*. He adds what I have already confuted (41). What dependance is there upon a man, who thinks that *Paulus* was a prænomen in antient Rome, and knows not that Nigidius's prænomen was Publius? Plutarch has given it him twice at full length (42). I queſtion much whether Aulus Gellius has been rightly underſtood. He inſinuates that Nigidius became obſcure by his ſubtilty: his little grammatical punctillios were not underſtood, and were thought uſeleſs; and therefore his writings were ſuffered to be loſt. There is no likelihood that his books *de Animalibus* periſhed on this account. They doubtleſs contained many curious reſearches, and eaſy to be underſtood This we may be aſſured of from what remains of them. There is yet much more reaſon for us to believe, that if he had written annals, they would have been found intelligible. Therefore let us reject what la Popeliniere has ſaid. We ſhall ſee, by and by, the origin of theſe pretended annals (43).

[*I*] *A certain obſcure author fathers on him a treatiſe concerning the Remedies of Love.*] A judicious reader reaps advantage from every thing; for which reaſon I do not think this remark uſeleſs: it proves by an example in print, that there are no lies, tho' ever ſo groſs, extravagant, and fooliſh, but that ſome authors will make no ſcruple to relate them ſeriouſly. The caſe is this: ‘ Nigidius, Ovid, and Samocratius, have ‘ compoſed a great many volumes, and ſerious wri‘tings, concerning the remedy of love; but the jeſt ‘ is, that they could invent many remedies for ‘ others, but could find out none for themſelves: ‘ becauſe they all three died, proſecuted, and de‘ſtroyed, not for the crimes they committed at ‘ Rome, but for their amours at Capua. Now let ‘ Nigidius tell his diſcoveries, and Ovid his thoughts, ‘ and Samocratius ſay what he pleaſes; the beſt ‘ remedy at laſt will be to avoid converſations, and ‘ to ſhun the occaſions (44); for in the caſe of Love, ‘ we ſhall obſerve but very few who ſtand their ‘ ground to continue exempt from its chains, where‘as thoſe who fly, may preſerve their liberty (45)’. You will find in the margin the name and titles of him who has ſaid this, and alſo the title of his book. I can tell you that he publiſhed it at London, but not in what year: he dedicated it to Charles prince of Wales, the only ſon of the king of England; from whence you may certainly conclude, that he lived in the reign of James I. Is it not a pity that a paſſage, which ends with ſo very good a reflexion, ſhould contain ſuch abſurdities? For the reſt, this conjunction of Nigidius with Ovid, puts me in mind that Pierius Valerianus aſcribes to them jointly the ſame poem. ‘ Ovidius eo volumine quod ‘ Halieuticon inſcribitur, quod opus olim à Nigidio ‘ elucubratum ajunt (46). - - - - *Ovid in that volume* ‘ *which he intitles Halieuticon, which work is ſaid* ‘ *to have been formerly compoſed by Nigidius.*’

[*K*] *The miſtakes of Mr Moreri, and thoſe of ſome other authors.*] He is miſtaken in ſaying that Nigidius was baniſhed for being ſuſpected to be a Magician; for it is certain his exile was occaſioned only from his not daring to return to Rome, after Cæſar was maſter. He had followed Pompey, and not being able to obtain his pardon, he was afraid of being ſacrificed to Cæſar's reſentment. This was the whole of his exile. The fact is notorious to any one that reads Cicero's thirteenth letter of his fourth book *ad Familiares*. Glandorpius (47) does not faithfully report the thought of Aulus Gellius: he makes him ſay, that the obſcurity and ſublimity of Nigidius's writings were the reaſon of their being unknown. He adds that ſome quote the twenty-fourth book of Nigidius's Compoſitions of Grammar. This is an error. If he means that none but that is cited, he is miſtaken. If he would tell us that the work contained at leaſt twenty-four books; he is equally miſtaken. Aulus Gellius has cited the twenty-ninth. Theſe words of Glandorpius, *citantur . . . . præterea de annalibus*, contain an error of the preſs; which probably was the cauſe that ſeveral moderns have made Nigidius an annaliſt: it ſhould be *de Animalibus*, and not *de Annalibus*. Laſtly, Glandorpius ſays, that Cicero, in his ſecond Philippic, obſerves, that Nigidius died in exile. I do not think this is to be met with in that oration. We can only infer from another book of Cicero (48) that Nigidius was dead. What Glandorpius has ſaid of Nigidius, has been inſerted word for word in Charles Stephens's Dictionary; and after this Mr Lloyd has altered nothing from Stephens, nor Hofman in this article from Lloyd. So true it is, that if you cut not off the thread of generations, theſe faults multiply from book to book ſucceſſively without ceaſing.

(39) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Lat. *lib.* i, *cap. xii*, *pag.* 56.

(40) La Popeliniere, Hiſtory of Hiſtories, *lib.* v, *pag.* 301.

(41) In the remark [*D*].

(42) In the paſſages above cited, remark [*F*].

(43) In the laſt remark.

(44) Confer remark [*N*] of the article FONTEVRAUD.

(45) Francis Voilleret, Sieur de Florizel, counſellor, notary, and ſecretary to the king, the houſe, and crown of France, *pag.* 83, of *The Meadow of Miſcellaneous Flowers*.

(46) Pierius Valerianus, Hieroglyph. *lib. xxx*, apud Rutgerſ. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 289.

(47) Glandorp. Onomaſt. *pag.* 625.

(48) That *de Univerſitate*, in the beginning.

NIHUSIUS (BARTHOLD) obtained repute by his works in the XVIIth century [*A*]; and I do not know whether he may not very properly be called a *famous-convert, and a famous converter (a)*. He was born at Wolpe in the duke of Brunſwick's territories in 1589, and having ſtudied ſome time in the colleges of Verden and Goſlar, he went to the univerſity of Helmſtad about the year 1607. As he was but ill furniſhed with money he was obliged to ſeek a maſter for his ſubſiſtance. He entered into the ſervice of Cornelius Martinus, who read Logic (*b*). He continued there four years, and made a progreſs in the ſciences; for his maſter did not ſo fully employ him, but that he left him ſome hours for ſtudy (*c*), and even took the pains to inſtruct him. The youth, obtaining favour by his good qualities and wit, was recomended to the biſhop of Oſnabrug, and obtained a penſion from him. To teſtify his gratitude, he wrote verſes upon this prelate's birth-day; but as he was no Poet, he made uſe of a borrowed Poem, and

(*a*) See the remark [*B*] of the article LAMBECIUS.

(*b*) Tenuis & inops, & ut vitam tolerare poſſet . . . Cornelio Martino Antwerpio, Logices Doctori, famulitium ſuum addixit. *Calixtus, De Arte Nova*, *pag. m.* 6.

(*c*) Quibus (*diſciplinis*) inter domeſtica miniſteria, ſub tanto hero & magiſtro quantus Cornelius erat, ſatis feliciter imbuebatur. *Ibid. pag.* 7.

[*A*] *He obtained repute by his works.*] Theſe are ſuch as have come to my knowledge. *Proſphonematicus ad Senatores Brunſwigios & Luneburgicos de Conrado Hornejo*, Cologne 1646, in 8vo. *Moroſophus, ſeu Vedelius in ſuo* Rationali *prorſus irrationalis*, ibidem. *Synacticus*, ibidem. *Epiſtola de cruce ad Thomam Bartholinum*, ibidem 1647. *Hypodigma quo diluuntur nonnulla contra Catholicos diſputata in Cornelii Martini tractatu de analyſi logica*, ibidem 1648, *in* 8vo. *Programmata duo ad Proteſtantium Academicos*, Moguntiæ 1655, *in* 8vo. *Annotationes de communione Orientalium ſub ſpecie unica, in 4to*. This work was printed at Cologne in 1648, at the end of Leo Allatius's book, *De perpetua conſenſione Eccleſiæ Occidentalis & Orientalis*, the edition of which was procured by Nihuſius. He alſo procured the publication of Allatius's *Symmicta* at Cologne in 1653 in 8*vo*, and of ſome other pieces of the ſame author at Cologne in 1645; amongſt others a treatiſe, intituled, *Confutatio fabulæ de Joanna Papiſſa ex monumentis Græcis*; to which he added ſomething. In 1658 was publiſhed and publiſhed it in his own name [*B*]. His patron's liberality did not prevent his being reduced to ſtraits, though he taught in private the richeſt ſcholars, after he had taken his maſter's degree in Philoſophy in 1612. He wavered betwixt the ſtudy of Phyſic and Divinity, becauſe he feared a very powerful faction, which oppoſed all thoſe who had been diſciples of Martinus and Caſelius [*C*]. He experienced the ill will of this faction, when he was to maintain metaphyſical theſes 1614. He met with a terrible affront, which began to diſguſt him againſt the Lutheran church. Two years after he was made Tutor to two gentlemen, whom he brought to the univerſity of Iëna. He afterwards obtained the like employ at the court of Weimar (*d*). He had there a good ſalary, and made an honourable figure: nevertheleſs he retired from thence without ſaying a word to any perſon and came to Cologne, where he turned Catholic about the year 1622. His firſt employ was the direction of the college of Proſelytes [*D*]. He wrote ſome letters of controverſy to Horneius and Calixtus (*e*), in which he laid the whole ſtreſs upon the neceſſity there is that Chriſtians ſhould have a judge to determine diſputes *viva voce* infallibly; for the Scripture being a law, which can only ſpeak by the interpretation that is given to it, and controverſies being founded upon the different interpretations that are given to the Scripture; there is a neceſſity, ſaid he, either that the diſputes of Chriſtians ſhould never have an end, or that there ſhould be a ſpeaking authority in the church, to which all private perſons ſhould be obliged to ſubmit (*f*). He placed this authority in the perſon of the Pope; and when the bad life of many Popes was objected to

(*d*) According to Voſſius, *Epiſt.* *CCCLXXX*, *pag.* 349. He was preceptor to the famous duke of Weimar, who commanded under Guſtavus.

(*e*) Famous Divines at Helmſtad.

(*f*) See the article MAIMBOURG, remark [*D*].

---

liſhed a book in 8*vo*, with this title; *Bart. Nihuſii Tractatus Chorographicus de nonnullis Aſiæ Provinciis ad Tygrim, Euphratem, & Mediterraneum ac rubrum mare* (1). I ſhall ſpeak below of his new method of controverſy.

[*B*] *He made uſe of a borrowed poem, and publiſhed it in his own name.*] The biſhop of Oſnabrug, who contributed to his maintenance, entered into his 43d year the firſt of July 1610. He was called Philip Sigiſmund, and was of the houſe of Brunſwic. Calixtus made this poem for Nihuſius. ‘ Natalem ejus principis quadrageſimum tertium carmine celebrare voluit. Sed quum aridiore eſſet venâ, quàm ut quicquam inde poſſet elicere, meam qualemcunque operam commodavi, carmenque confeci, quod ipſius nomine typis deſcriptum Principique oblatum fuit (2). . . . . *He had a mind to celebrate the birth-day of this Prince, on his entering into his 43d year, with a piece of poetry. But having no genius for poetry, I lent him my aſſiſtance, ſuch as it was, and compoſed a Poem, which was printed and preſented to the prince in his name.*’ Calixtus tells this himſelf.

[*C*] *A faction . . . . which oppoſed all thoſe who had been diſciples of Martinus and Caſelius.*] This faction conſiſted of ſome perſons, who would not allow a Divine to be either a good Humaniſt or good Philoſopher: and therefore they prevented the admiſſion of ſuch to eccleſiaſtical preferments, who had ſtudied Humanity under Caſelius, and Philoſophy under Martinus. This not a little puzzled young Nihuſius; he durſt not ſtudy Divinity, fearing to meet with this faction in his way to Church-preferment. His caution was ſo great, that when he maintained a theſis, dedicated to the biſhop of Oſnabrug, and accompanied with ſome Greek verſes in praiſe of the reſpondent, he would not permit the author of this elogy to inſert the name of Martinus. He was afraid, leſt the praiſes of this Philoſopher ſhould provoke theſe gentlemen. He therefore rather choſe to be ungrateful, than expoſe himſelf to the ill-offices of thoſe, who might one time or other oppoſe his little fortune. Calixtus blames him very juſtly, for this ſelf-intereſted conduct, and declares this was courting the favour of a certain party, which men of worth and honour choſe rather to diſoblige. ‘ Quod vereretur ne id ſibi apud *μισολόγȣς καὶ μισοσόφȣς* inſcitiæ patronos fraudi eſſet. Tanta erat ejus ſive puſillanimitas, ſive creſcendi cupiditas, ut nomen viri eximii, è cujus domo & diſciplinâ prodiiſſe gloriæ verti oportebat, taceri mallet, quam abjicere qualemcumque ſpem iis placendi, quibus ut diſplicerent rectæ & præſtantes animæ totâ vitâ ſeſe adlaboraſſe nunquam diffitebuntur (3). . . . . *Becauſe he was fearful this might do him ſome injury among the decriers of Learning and Philoſophy, thoſe patrons of ignorance. Such was his meanneſs of ſpirit, or his earneſtneſs to make his fortune, that he choſe rather to avoid mentioning the name of that great man, to whom he ought to have gloried in having been a pupil, than forfeit his views in pleaſing thoſe, whoſe diſpleaſure all upright and ingenuous minds will always own to have been the point they have aimed at.*’ He obſerves, that there are always to be found more or leſs of theſe capricious men, who oppoſe the advancement of youth, unleſs they ſtudy under ſuch or ſuch maſters. ‘ Non deerant tunc (quamquam vix unquam deſunt, niſi quod alio atque alio tempore plus minuſve poſſunt) qui accuratiora literarum & philoſophiæ ſtudia odiſſent, & cum Theologiâ conjungi nollent, ne in aliis admirari, quæ in ſe deſiderarent, cogerentur. Et quum inter illos unus primario loco ſederet, iis qui è ſummorum virorum Caſelii & Cornelii diſciplinâ prodierant, aditus ad officia & dignitatem muneris eccleſiaſtici vel omnino intercludebat, vel difficillimum ſaltem reddebat. Quæ res hominem meticuloſum adeo terruit, ut ſacra Theologiæ ſtudia animo diffidente & vacillante tractaret (4). . . . . *There were not wanting at that time, (nor indeed are they at any time, tho' their power may happen to be greater at one time than another) thoſe who had an averſion to the politer ſtudies of Humanity and Philoſophy, and oppoſed their being joined with Divinity, that they might not be obliged to admire thoſe talents in others, which were wanting in themſelves. And as there was one of this claſs in a very high ſtation, the way to eccleſiaſtical preferments and dignities was either quite ſtopped, or rendered very difficult to all thoſe who had been educated under thoſe great men, Caſelius and Martinus. Which ſo terrified a man of his timorous diſpoſition, as to make him purſue his Theological ſtudies with great diffidence and inconſtancy.*’ The unfortunate Nihuſius loſt all his advances; his policy did him no ſervice: the faction which he had ſo carefully courted, gave him notwithſtanding a ſevere mortification, which had unlucky conſequences; for from that time he became diſguſted againſt Lutheraniſm. ‘ Anno 1614, inſignis ei illata erat injuria diſputaturo è lumine naturæ principiiſque philoſophicis de Deo. Quam tamen è fonte, quem digito ante indicavimus, manaſſe, & intelligentibus ac bonis omnibus, non minus quam ipſi, doluiſſe, nunquam potuit ignorare. Et hæc, niſi vehementer fallor, animum ejus à reformatâ religione primùm cœpit abalienare (5). . . . . *In the year* 1614, *being about to diſpute concerning the Deity from the light of nature, and the principles of Philoſophy, he met with a very high affront, which he could not be ignorant of having proceeded from the ſame ſpring before mentioned, to the great concern of all learned and good men, as well as of himſelf. And this, if I am not greatly miſtaken, was the firſt occaſion of alienating his mind from the Proteſtant religion.*’

[*D*] *He had . . . . the direction of the college of Proſelytes.*] They educated in this college, at the charge of the Arch-fraternity of the Holy Croſs, the young people who turned Catholics; but then it was neceſſary that one of their fraternity ſhould have a hand in their converſion (6). The duke of Bavaria was then the head of this fraternity: Albert of Auſtria had been in that ſtation before him, and Cardinal de Zollern, biſhop of Oſnabrug, had firſt of all enjoyed this dignity. ‘ Mihi id negatum hactenus, ut pote cujus curæ ac ſollicitudine perpetuæ demandatum Collegium,

(1) The Sieur Witte, *in Diario*, *ad ann.* 1657, makes mention of ſome tracts of Logic by Nihuſius.

(2) Georgius Calixtus, in Digreſſione de Arte nova, *pag.* 7.

(3) Ib. *pag.* 9.

(4) Ib. *pag.* 8.

(5) Ib. *pag.* 12.

(6) Ita tamen ut nemo in Collegium illud ſive Seminarium recipiatur, niſi ab aliquo Archifraternitatis iſtius membro in viam ſalutis adductus. *Nihuſius*, *Epiſt. ad Nicolaum Granium Helmſtadii Phyſices Profeſſorem*, *apud Calixtum*, *ibid. pag.* 16.

to him, he had the confidence to retort this objection againſt the authors of the Scripture [*E*]. The letter he wrote to Calixtus has been printed more than once. That celebrated profeſſor, unwilling to anſwer him in writing, undertook to refute him in his auditory; of which he gave notice to the ſtudents, by a written paper poſted up. This paper was printed without the author's knowledge in 1625; and being very ſevere did extremly incenſe Nihuſius, who returned ſome time after into the country of Brunſwic to be director of a convent of nuns (*g*). He was made abbot of Ilfeld in 1629, after that monaſtery had being juſt then taken from the houſe of Brunſwic who had made a ſchool of it; in which Michael Neander, and his ſucceſſours, had educated very good ſcholars. The next year he publiſhed a book in High-Dutch, in which he violently inveighed againſt Calixtus: and at laſt, in 1633, his darling work came to light. It was a new method to confound the Heretics (*h*) [*F*], which was very learnedly refuted by Calixtus. Nihuſius knew ſo well how

(*g*) Monialibus Cœnobii Haldenſlebienſis præpoſitus eſt. *Calixtus, ubi ſupra, pag.* 26.

(*h*) Taken from *Calixtus* in his digreſſion *de Arte nova.*

‘gium, ubi ſelecti omnium Facultatum ſtudioſi, ad fidem catholicam converſi, jamque à ſuis omni ope deſtituti, aluntur atque ad altiora diriguntur, & quidem ſumptu Archifraternitatis Sanctæ Crucis, cujus caput hodie Elector Bavariæ, &c (7). .... *This is what I have not hitherto been able to obtain, as being intruſted with the care and concerns of the college, where the choice ſtudents in every faculty who are converted to the Catholic faith, and now deprived of all ſubſiſtence elſewhere, are maintained and encouraged to make farther advances, and this at the expence of the archfraternity of the Holy Croſs, whoſe preſent head, the duke of Bavaria, &c.*’ Theſe words are taken from a letter of Nihuſius. By this we perceive with what vigilance the church of Rome has for a long time minded the buſineſs of converſions.

[*E*] *He had the confidence to retort this objection againſt the authors of the Scripture.*] A curſed effect of prepoſſeſſion! A man who is once engaged in an hypotheſis, and has made it his darling, ſpares nothing ſacred or profane to maintain it, and get clear of an objection. He will rather have the Scripture ſuffer, than be found without reply; and, provided his opinions be ſecured from inſults, he is little concerned about the ſacred writers ſuffering in their credit: he endeavours to ſave himſelf at their coſt; and oppoſes them to the breach, that they may be trampled on, before the enemy comes at him, or that the reſpect for them may prevent his being attacked. He makes uſe of the ſtratagem that was ſo advantageous to the Spaniards, when they re-took Maeſtricht in 1576. They placed the women of Wich (8) before their ſoldiers, ſo that the inhabitants of Maeſtricht durſt not fire upon the Spaniards: For they feared they ſhould kill their relations, or at leaſt their country-women (9). However it be, when Nihuſius was to anſwer Calixtus, who ſaid it became not the Divine Wiſdom to eſtabliſh religion upon the authority of ſuch wretches as the Popes had been for whole ages, he urged that the authors of the Bible were very wicked men, either bare-facedly, as David, or perhaps ſecretly. ‘Objeceram ego, non eſſe probabile nec divinæ providentiæ, quæ ſuaviter omnia diſponat & gubernet, conſentaneum, certitudinem univerſæ doctrinæ quæ ad pietatem Deique cultum faciat, ab auctoritate & arbitrio hominum impiorum & flagitioſorum, quales aliquando integris ſeculis (audiatur de decimo teſtis Baronius) Romani Pontifices fuerint, ſuſpendere: ab auctoritate inquam & arbitrio hominum, quos ipſi eorum clientes an patroni, & inter hos princeps Baronius, *monſtra horrenda, apoſtaticos, fures & latrones, vitâ turpiſſimos, moribus perditiſſimos, uſquequaque fœdiſſimos* ex re & vero proclament. Ut hoc telum declinet, de auctoribus Sacræ Scripturæ idem pronunciat. *Scripturæ*, inquit, *conditæ à meris hominibus, & partim apertè, ut erat David, partim forſan etiam occultè facinoroſis* (10). .... *I had objected, that it was not probable, nor agreeable to the Divine Providence, which governs and diſpoſes all things in the moſt beautiful regularity, to found the certainty of the whole ſyſtem of knowledge, relating to piety and the worſhip of God, upon the authority and decrees of impious and wicked men, ſuch as the Popes of Rome have been for whole ages, I appeal to Baronius himſelf, as a witneſs againſt the tenth; upon the authority, I ſay, and decrees of men, whoſe very advocates or patrons, and among theſe Baronius in the firſt place, cry out upon with reaſon and truth*, as horrid monſters, apoſtates, thieves, and robbers, moſt ſcandalous in their lives, moſt abandoned in their morals, and every way moſt abominable. *To defend himſelf from this blow, he declares the ſame thing of the authors of ſacred Scripture.* The Scriptures, *ſays he*, are compoſed by mere men, either openly, as David, or perhaps privately wicked.’ It was no difficult taſk for the profeſſor of Helmſtad to confound him, upon ſo falſe and deteſtable a retortion (11). There is a great deal of difference between a holy man who commits heinous ſins, of which he ſpeedily repents, and thoſe who continue all their lives in a ſinful courſe.

[*F*] *He publiſhed .... a new method to confound the Heretics.*] It was printed at Hildeſheim, with this title: *Ars nova dicto ſacræ Scripturæ unico lucrandi è Pontificiis plurimos in partes Lutheranorum, detecta nonnihil & ſuggeſta Theologis Helmſtetenſibus, Georgio Calixto præſertim & Conrado Hornejo.* Calixtus did not write a book on purpoſe to refute it; he contented himſelf with anſwering it by way of digreſſion, in a work he had then in the preſs, namely, an Epitome of Moral Divinity, which was publiſhed in 1634. This digreſſion was printed apart by the Frankfort Bookſellers in 1652, in a volume of 344 pages in 4to. The author addreſſes himſelf to the profeſſors of the Roman Catholic univerſities in Germany, and all along treats them very civilly. He obſerves (12) that Nihuſius was not the firſt who had invented methods of controverſy; and ſays, that Renatus Benoit, Doctor of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris, propoſed a particular method of that kind in 1565 (13). He adds, that this doctor grew milder afterwards, and publiſhed a French book at Caen (14), to ſhew that the Proteſtants could not be convicted of hereſy, either as to their doctrine or their worſhip; and that the council of Trent, which condemned them, was not clear of faults, neither has it been received in the kingdom. Calixtus does not doubt but this book was written by Renatus Benoit; for, ſays he, Thuanus (15) tells us, that Henry IV, being at laſt reſolved to go to maſs, had a mind to be inſtructed by that doctor; who, coming to the king, had like to have loſt his benefice (16), as being a favourer of the ſectaries, and one who had preached what was contrary to the Faith (17). Theſe reaſons appear to me not to be of ſufficient force to make me believe that Renatus Benoit was the author of the book printed at Caen. Had he been the author of it, he had never kept his living of St Euſtache, till the king's abjuration. The doctors of the Sorbonne, who moved to have him excommunicated, when he went from Paris to wait on the king of Navarre, would have inſiſted chiefly upon this book, and not upon certain things alledged to have been delivered by him in the pulpit. I believe therefore, that, by a trick familiar to the writers in thoſe days, ſome author, who was either a good Huguenot, or, out of policy, engaged in the intereſt of Henry IV, publiſhed that book in Benoit's name. This, I very well know, is not the opinion of the author of the eleventh volume of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*; for he poſitively aſcribes it to the curate of St Euſtache (18). To turn to the hiſtory of methods:

Calixtus obſerves (19), 1. That about forty years after Renatus Benoit had publiſhed his Method, Father Gonteri the Jeſuit appeared with his. He was followed by Father Arnoux, and Father Francis Veron, both Jeſuits. 2. That Vedelius (20) is perſuaded that cardinal du Perron drew the plan of theſe Jeſuits method; which conſiſts in obliging the Proteſtants to prove what they teach in oppoſition to the council of Trent, not by the aſſiſtance of conſequences, but by expreſs words of Scripture. 3. That he cannot perſuade himſelf (21) that this cardinal approved that method, ſince it differs ſo widely from that we meet with in his controverſy with king James. 4. That in 1605, Antony

(7) Id. ib.

(8) It is that part of the town which is beyond the bridge.

(9) Captas quas potuêre, loci mulieres ante ſeſe ſtatuunt objiciuntque: atque eo promoto veluti vallo ſubeunt pontem muliebriter clypeati, ſclopos ſubter earum brachia axillaſque in hoſtem collineantes. In quos dum explodere cives trepidant, ne conſanguineas affineſve, populares certe ſuas, antequam Hiſpanos, impeterent, audiunt, &c. *Strada, de Bello Belgico, Decad.* i, *lib.* viii, *pag. m.* 503. *See alſo* Valerius Maximus, *lib.* v, *cap.* i, *num.* 5.

(10) Calixt. ubi ſupra, pag. 19.

(11) Ib. p. 20.

(12) Ibid. pag. 126.

(13) *In a book intituled,* Stromata in univerſum Organum Biblicum, ſeu Panoplia adverſus omnes nunc vigentes Hæreſes.

(14) In the year 1590.

(15) Thuan. *lib.* cvi.

(16) He was curate of St Euſtache.

(17) Thuan. *lib.* cvii.

(18) See pag. 546, of Tome xi, of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle.* In the ſubſequent pages you will find the title, and the abſtract of the pretended book of Renatus Benoit.

(19) Calixt. ibid. *pag.* 129.

(20) In Rationali Theologico.

(21) Calixt. ibid. *pag.* 130.

how to improve his intereſt, that he came to be titular biſhop of Myſia, and was made ſuffragan of the archbiſhopric of Mentz (*i*). In the exerciſe of this office he died the beginning of March 1657 (*k*). He had made himſelf friends at Rome, and he procured in Germany the edition of ſome books compoſed beyond the Alps (*l*). I muſt not forget to acquaint you, that, being driven from his abbey by the Swedes, he fled into Holland, where he continued ſeveral years (*m*) [*G*]. In that country he converſed frequently with Voſſius, and among other things told him, that the principal reaſon of his adhering to the communion of Rome, was his obſerving that the ſects which had ſeparated from it proved nothing by demonſtration [*H*].

Nicholas

Faber, publiſhing a Code, prefixed to it a new method of overthrowing the Heretics. ‘Codex Antonii Fabri Sebuſiani, Senatoris & Conſiliarii Sabaudici, quem à ſuo nomine Fabrianum inſcripſit, bonum factum exiſtimans, ſi in veſtibulo voluminis hæreticos, quos vocat, inſigni & majore, quam Juriſconſultorum captus eſſe ſolet, audaciâ conficeret. Cui conatui primum librum impendit; eliſo tamen, ut accepimus, alterius Juriſconſulti, Jacobi videlicet Lectii, operâ & oppoſito ſcripto (22). - - - *The Code of Antony Faber of Breſſe, a ſenator and counſellor of Savoy, which, from his own name, he intituled* Codex Fabrianus, *eſteeming it a good work, to attack in the beginning of the volume thoſe he calls Heretics, with greater violence than is uſually to be met with from the capacity of Civilians. Upon this undertaking he ſpends the firſt book; ſtifling at the ſame time, as I have been informed, the work and oppoſite writings of another Civilian, namely, James Lectius.*’ Every plaintiff, ſaid he, is obliged to bring proof, whether he inſiſts on the negative or the affirmative: this is the maxim of Law; and he is more eſpecially obliged to it, when he diſturbs thoſe who are in the peaceable poſſeſſion of the eſtate for which he ſues. This Civilian concludes, that the Proteſtants are bound to prove all that they deny; and in caſe of failure of good proof, ought to be non-ſuited. This is the whole of Nihuſius's invention, and is nothing more than the method of preſcription. ‘Primum & præcipuum caput artis Nihuſianæ, aut potiùs Fabrianæ, hoc ipſum eſt, probationem omnium eorum, quæ Pontificii hodie affirmant, declinare & à ſe alienam dicere, atque adeo nihil eorum, quæ de Pontificis principatu & infallibibitate, de ſacrificio Chriſti in Miſſâ quà ſpeciem & ſubſtantiam iterando, de ſtatuis adorandis, de purgatorio, ſeptem ſacramentis, indulgentiis & plurimis ſimilibus adſerunt, vel è Scripturâ, vel è traditione Eccleſiaſticâ probare velle: nempe quia ipſi ſint in poſſeſſione ſuorum dogmatum; quin, ait, ſe & majores ſuos, cum quibus & noſtri aliquando fecerint, ab aliquot ſeculis in poſſeſſione fuiſſe, ſuaſque adeo de religione opiniones ſive ſententias uſucepiſſe, vel, ut recentiores loquuntur, præſcripſiſſe. Se igitur & ſuos non teneri ad probationem eorum, quæ ipſi doceant & affirment, ſed probationis, & quidem prævalidæ vicem eſſe, quod affirment: nos verò teneri, ut quæ negamus, demonſtremus, & quidem demonſtremus è Scripturâ, id eſt, Scripturam continere negantes, ipſorum affirmantibus oppoſitas (23). - - - *The principal and fundamental point of Nihuſius's, or rather, Faber's method, is this, to decline, and to deny, their having any thing to do with the proof of all thoſe things which the modern Catholics affirm, and therefore not to undertake the proving, either from Scripture, or from the tradition of the church, any of thoſe things which they maintain concerning the Pope's primacy, infallibility, the ſacrifice of* CHRIST *in the maſs ſpecifically and ſubſtantially repeated, the adoration of images, Purgatory, the ſeven ſacraments, indulgences, and ſeveral others of the like nature: and for this reaſon, becauſe they are in poſſeſſion of theſe their doctrines; for he ſays that they, and their anceſtors, with whom ours alſo formerly joined, have enjoyed this poſſeſſion for ſome centuries, and therefore have gained a right to their religious doctrines and opinions, or, as the moderns expreſs themſelves, have obtained a preſcription-right. That therefore they, and ſuch as remain with them, are not under any obligation of proving theſe things, which they teach and maintain; but that it is incumbent upon us to demonſtrate what we deny, and to demonſtrate it from Scripture, that is, to ſhew that the Scripture contains the direct negatives to thoſe propoſitions which they maintain in the affirmative.*’ Thus far has Dr Calixtus carried the hiſtory of theſe methods. See the ſequel or continuation of it in Mr Heidegger's *Hiſtoria Papatus* (24). For the reſt, Grotius was mightily pleaſed with Calixtus's Refutation of Nihuſius. ‘Bertholdo Nihuſio de nova illa, qua diſſentientes impetit via, eruditè & prudenter reſpondit Calixtus libro de Arte nova; quem ſubjunxit libro de Theologia morali. Hoc anno Helmæſtadii editum id opus. Summa hæc eſt, in iis quæ de rebus ſive humanis ſive divinis credimus nulla eſſe poſſeſſionis privilegia: aſſerentibus incumbere probationem. Probari autem non tantum quod totidem literis oſtenditur, ſed & quod per legitimas & homini non inſano neque pertinaci fidem facturas illationes deducitur . . . Calixti librum ut legas rogo: multa ſunt in eo utilia: multa ab aliis dicta quidem, ſed à nemine exactius (25). - - - *The new method of Barthold Nihuſius in attacking the Proteſtants, has been learnedly and prudently anſwered by Calixtus, in his book concerning the new Method which he added to his work on Moral Theology. It was publiſhed this year at Helmſtad. The ſubſtance of it is this, that in thoſe things which regard our belief, either of human or divine matters, poſſeſſion gives no privilege at all: but that the proof of them lie entirely upon thoſe who maintain them. And that thoſe propoſitions may be ſaid to be proved not only which are ſhewn in Scripture in ſo many words, but which are inferred from thence by ſuch fair and juſt reaſoning, as will always influence the belief of every man in his ſenſes, and free from prepoſſeſſion. . . . . I deſire you would read Calixtus's book: there are a great many very uſeful things in it: there are ſeveral things taken notice of by others, but by nobody with greater exactneſs.*’ I have not ſeen Nihuſius's reply; all I know, is, that it is intituled, *Apologia contra Andabatam Helmeſtetenſem* (26).

[G] *He continued ſeveral years in Holland.*] He was at Amſterdam in the month of May 1634, and had then lived there above a year, if we credit Voſſius. ‘Jam annus, & credo, ultra eſt, quod in urbe hac degit Bartholdus Nihuſius, vir doctus, & ſubtilis, Lutheranus quondam, & Calixto Theologo perfamiliaris, poſtea Pontificius, atque ad Abbatis dignitatem evectus; ſed ea, bello hoc Suevico exutus, & nunc extorris (27) - - - - *It is now a year, and I believe more, ſince Barthold Nihuſius came to live in this city, a man of great learning and ſubtilty, formerly a Lutheran, and very intimate with Calixtus the Divine, but ſince that a Catholic, and preferred to an abbey; but deprived of that by the Swediſh war, and now an exile.*’ He was ſtill there in 1640, as we are informed by the ſame Voſſius; Voſſius, I ſay, who, through the weakneſs of his memory, which is not at all to be wondered at, thought Nihuſius had not ſtayed at Amſterdam above three or four years (28). He was ſtill there in 1647 and 1649, as we gather from the date of his letters to Father Morin (29).

[H] *Proved nothing by demonſtration.*] We have already ſeen that Voſſius found him a learned and ſubtile man; to which I add, that he found him alſo very facetious and complaiſant, *Vir doctus & perhumanus nec infacetus* (30). Nihuſius, pre-poſſeſſed with an opinion of his new method, and fancying that nobody would be able to withſtand it, deſired a conference with Voſſius, and declared to him, that, provided the Lutherans or Calviniſts would give him ſome proof that ſhould leave him under no doubt, he would turn Proteſtant again. Let them chuſe, ſaid he, what ſubject they will, that, for inſtance, upon which they think themſelves ſtrongeſt, I aſk of them but one good argument; but if they can offer me nothing but probabilities, they will give me leave to maintain, that we ought to return to the church, from which our anceſtors ſeparated. *Poſcit* ἀπόδειξιν, *invictumque aliquid, quodque animum poſſit, aut debeat reddere,* ἀμετάπτωτον, καὶ ἀμετακίνητον. *Negat opus de ſingulis diſputare*

(*i*) Tuldenus, Part iii, Hiſtor. pag. 165, apud Konig, *Biblioth. vet. & nova, pag.* 577.

(*k*) Id. ib. apud eundem, ibid.

(*l*) See the remark [*A*].

(*m*) Voſſius, Epiſt. ccxxviii, pag. 240.

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 156.

(23) Ibid. *pag.* 159, 160.

(24) In Periodo ſeptima, *num.* 218.

(25) Grotius, Epiſt. cccxxxix, *Part. i, pag.* 122. This letter is dated Aug. 2, 1634.

(26) See Voſſius's ccclxxxth Letter, *pag.* 349.

(27) Voſſius, Epiſt. ccxxviii, *pag.* 240, *dated from Amſterdam, May* 28, 1634.

(28) Abbatia ſua à Sueco milite ejectus, ac inde in Bataviam profugus, ubi nunc tertium quartumve annum agit. *Voſſius, Epiſt. ccclxxx, pag.* 349, *dated April* 12, 1640.

(29) See the ſixty-ſeventh, and ſeventy-fourth Letters in the collection, intituled, *Eccleſiæ Orientalis antiquitates.*

(30) Idem, Voſſius, *pag.* 349.

Nicolas Ritterſhuſius being charged with ſtealing things from Nihuſius, returned an anſwer that deſerves conſideration [*I*]. The author of *Memorabilia Eccleſiaſtica Sæculi Decimi*

diſputare. Eligere ſuos Lutheranos, vel etiam Calvinianos, & quoſvis alios, poſſe, ubi maximè exiſtiment ſuæ Eccleſiæ cauſam triumphare. Si unum viderit argumentum, velle redire ad eos, unde malum pedem extulerit. Sin diſputando intelligant, nihil ſolidi crepare, quicquid hactenus obtenditur, æquum videri, ut redeamus ad Romanæ Eccleſiæ ſinum (31). His ſtrongeſt argument was this: Tell me, Mr Voſſius, why your father quitted the church of Rome? give me one juſt reaſon for it. Voſſius inſiſted on the difference that was to be met with between that church and the primitive church; but after ſeveral diſcourſes he fixed upon this: the doctors of the church of Rome interpret Scripture in ſuch a manner, that they put upon it a ſenſe manifeſtly forced, and ſometimes contradictory, and, in general, widely different from the doctrine of the antient Fathers; and not content with this, they put to death thoſe who will not adopt ſuch interpretations: there was juſt reaſon therefore to come to a rupture with ſuch interpreters of the word of GOD, and to form new aſſemblies, as well for obtaining a worſhip agreeable to one's conſcience, as for preſerving a life that may be ſerviceable to one's country, church, and and family (32). *Illo igitur poſcente cauſam juſtam, cur parens meus à Romana abierit Eccleſia, reſpondi multa, de veteris, præſentis Romanæ Eccleſiæ diſcrimine. Sed tandem in eo pedem figebamus; Romanæ Eccleſiæ Doctoribus, ita ſcripturas interpretantibus, ut manifeſta iis vis fiat, planeque abeant à primorum ſeculorum Doctoribus, imo interdum (ut in tranſubſtantiationis dogmate) ſenſus interpretationi reclamet, manifeſtaque ſit contradictio: nec ſolum ſic interpretantibus, ſed etiam, niſi ſimpliciter* (33) *interpreteris, ferro te, & flamma perdere paratis: jure ab ejuſmodi Doctoribus receditur, ac ſeorſim cultus Dei celebratur, partim conſcientiæ ſtudio, partim vitæ conſervandæ, quam Patriæ, Eccleſiæ, Familiæ, & amicis conducibilem exiſtimamus.* Tho' Voſſius's anſwer was highly reaſonable, he did not entirely rely upon it; for he deſired his good friend Grotius to examine the caſe, and communicate his thoughts to him. 'Si valetudo, ſi otium tibi, ſi res etiam 'tuæ ſic ferant, ut hujuſmodi tractes, quod arbitror: 'quæſo paucis ſaltem perſcribe, quid tibi de hac re 'videatur, & quam potiſſimum viam, cum iſtiuſmodi 'hominibus inſiſtendam putes. - - - - *If your health, if 'your leiſure, if your affairs, will permit you to conſider 'this opinion of mine; I beg you will write to me in as 'few words as you pleaſe, what you think of the matter, 'and which is the beſt way of dealing with this ſort of 'perſons.*' All the anſwer that was given him was, that he very well juſtified the ſeparation of the Proteſtants (34).

PARAPHRASE upon the ſentiments of Nihuſius.

It is plain, that Nihuſius reaſoned thus: When we find ourſelves by birth and education in a certain communion, the inconveniencies we therein undergo are not a warantable reaſon for quitting it, unleſs we can be gainers by the change; that is, remove to another where we may be eaſier. For to what purpoſe ſhould we abandon the communion that gave us being and education, if in ſo doing we only change the diſtemper? Let us put this caſe to the trial; I agree to it: let us imitate thoſe poor patients, who, when weary of the bed, think they ſhall be much better by being ſet in an eaſy chair. Let us leave the church of Rome, and embrace Proteſtantiſm; but then as theſe ſick perſons are no ſooner undeceived, in finding the eaſy chair of no ſervice to them, but they go to bed again: ſo ought we to reſume the profeſſion of Popery, as ſoon as we find that the Proteſtant doctors do not remove our difficulties. They alledge nothing to us but diſputable reaſons, nothing that is convincing, nothing that is demonſtrative: they prove, and they object; but both their proofs and their objections are anſwered: they reply, and meet with replies again. There is no end of this. To what purpoſe then ſhould we form a ſchiſm? Did we meet with any thing in the church we were born in, that is more inconvenient? We there wanted demonſtrations; we had nothing offered to us that could fix our mind upon a foundation of certainty; we ſtill found objections againſt all the doctrines, and all the replies, *in infinitum*. This was our great diſadvantage; and we meet with the ſame among the Proteſtants: we ought not therefore to ſtay among them. Let us return to that body that has on it's ſide the advantage of poſſeſſion; and if we muſt be ill lodged, is it not better to be ſo in our own country, and in our father's houſe, than in the inns of foreign countries? Beſides, the controverſy is attended with more inconveniencies on the Proteſtant ſide, than on the Popiſh. The latter has all it's enemies before it; the ſame arms that ſerve it for attacking and repulſing one, are of uſe for attacking and repulſing others. But the Proteſtants have enemies both before and behind them; they are like a ſhip engaged between two fires; Popery attacks them one ſide, and Socinianiſm on the other. The arms they make uſe of againſt Popery, do them hurt inſtead of doing them ſervice in their controverſy with the Socinian; for this Heretic turns upon them all the arguments they make uſe of againſt the church of Rome: ſo that a Proteſtant, coming off from the attack of a Papiſt, and preparing to attack a Socinian, is obliged to change his armour, or at leaſt part of it. Theſe, without doubt, were the chimera's with which Nihuſius fed himſelf; and which influenced him to think, that in order to convince the Proteſtants that they had done wrong in abandoning the church of Rome, it was ſufficient to aſk of them a demonſtrative proof of their belief: a proof, I ſay, that admits of no reply, any more than a mathematical demonſtration. He knew very well they would never take him at his word. Moſt Divines agree, that the controverſies of religion cannot be carried to that height of evidence. A famous miniſter has lately informed us that to aſſert, that the holy Spirit gives us an evident knowledge of the truths of religion, is not only a dangerous error, but a doctrine hitherto rejected by the Proteſtants (35). He maintains, that a faithful ſoul embraces theſe truths, without the evidence of reaſon, and even without knowing that it is evident that GOD has revealed them; and he ſays, that they are pernicious innovators, who aſſert, that at leaſt the holy Spirit makes us ſee evidently the teſtimony which GOD has given to theſe truths. I am very ſure, that Nihuſius did not expect to have a demonſtrative argument offered him. What did he think of, then, when he promiſed to return to Lutheraniſm upon that condition? Did he act the part of a grave man? Had he been a man of reaſon, he would fully have acquieſced in the anſwer that Voſſius gave him, which is very judicious, and very ſolid. But we muſt confeſs, that Nihuſius did not always ground his thoughts upon chimera's. He made a bad application of a good principle, which is this, *We ought not to depart from the place where we are, if the change be uſeleſs*. The miniſter I have been now mentioning, makes uſe of that axiom. He is a rigid Predeſtinarian, and a great Particulariſt, and groans under a load of objections, to which his ſyſtem is expoſed; but he does not change his hypotheſis, becauſe he finds none that relieves him from the oppreſſion. He would find nothing to ſatisfy his reaſon in the hypotheſis of the Moliniſts, nor in the other looſe ways of explaining grace; ſo chooſes to continue where he is, rather than take another ſituation that would not cure him (36). This is wiſely judged.

[*I*] *N. Ritterſhuſius .... returned an anſwer that deſerves conſideration.*] His place obliging him to harangue at the promotion or graduation of a doctor, he choſe for the ſubject of his ſpeech the voyage of Hanno. He was charged with copying a letter that Nihuſius had writ upon this matter (37). He returned for anſwer, that this letter had ſerved him for a guide nineteen years before; but that he lay under no obligation to cite Nihuſius: for, added he, I do not make uſe of Nihuſius's words: I quote the expreſſions of the authors whom I have conſulted, and do accordingly mention their names; only two indeed I have made uſe of, without the opportunity of peruſing them. 'Tu Nihuſii ne ſemel quidem mentionem facis. Fa'teor, nec cauſa fuit, cur allegarem cujus verbis non 'utor, ſed ſemper auctorum quos ille citat, & illa 'ipſa verba non ex Nihuſio, ſed ex ipſis auctoribus ex'ſcripſi, excepto Hieronymo & Tranſylvano anonymo. 'Illum ad manus non habui, hunc videre nunquam 'contigit (38). - - - - *You never once ſo much as mention 'Nihuſius's name. I confeſs it, nor was there any reaſon 'for me to mention a perſon whoſe words I make no uſe 'of, but always thoſe of the authors he quotes, and I*

'have

(31) Idem, Epiſt. ccxxviii, *pag.* 240.

(32) Id. ib.

(33) We ought to read *ſimiliter*. Several ſuch faults are ſlipped into Voſſius's Letters. They miſtook his manuſcript, and your correctors commonly mind nothing but the orthography. They let one word paſs for another, provided it does not mar the ſenſe, ſo as to make it manifeſtly abſurd.

(34) Diſceſſionis cauſa quæ abs te redditur, optima eſt, non potuiſſe vivi ſub tali Dominatu, neque integras nationes aut magnas Nationum partes ideo debuiſſe à conventibus abſtinere. *Grotius, Epiſt. cccxxxix, primæ partis, pag.* 122.

(35) The queſtion of right is, whether Mr Saurin is in the right, when he ſays, *faith obtains it's certainty by the way of evidence, eſpecially in the article of the Divinity of the Scriptures.* The queſtion of fact, is, whether Mr Saurin's opinion is the opinion of the whole Reformed church; and whether that of Mr Jurieu is new and peculiar to himſelf and to Mr de Beaulieu, his maſter and profeſſor. Upon the firſt queſtion, it is no wonder that Mr Saurin is miſtaken. There are groſſer errors than that, tho' ſcarce any more dangerous: but upon the queſtion of fact, we can never wonder enough, that a man, who ſets up for an author ſhould fall into ſuch an error, as to call that *a new opinion, a budding error*, which is as antient as the world, and of equal extent with the Chriſtian religion; and which, till this our age, was never attacked by any but Heretics. *Jurieu, Défenſe de la Doctrine univerſelle de l'Egliſe contre les imputations de Mr Saurin, pag.* 3, of the Rotterdam edition in 1695.

(36) *See the book intituled,* Jugement ſur les Méthodes rigides & relâchées d'expliquer la Providence & la Grace, *pag.* 23.

(37) Thomaſius, de Plagio Literario, *pag.* 239.

(38) Nicol. Ritterſhuſius, Epiſt. ad Georgium Richterum, *pag.* 206, Epiſtolarum Richterianarum. *See* Thomaſius, ibid. *pag.* 73, and 240.

Decimi Septimi, has not given the right time when Nihuſius publiſhed a new notion upon the invocation of ſaints [*K*].

‘ *have tranſcribed them from thoſe authors themſelves, except only Hieronymus and an anonymous Tranſylvanian. The firſt I had not by me, the laſt I never happened to meet with.*’ We muſt own, that this juſtification is very fair in ſome reſpects. An author who goes to the ſpring-head, and compares all the paſſages that others have alledged, becomes a lawful poſſeſſor. He is not obliged to cite any but the original writings which he has conſulted; it would be a piece of injuſtice to call him a plagiary, upon pretence that he relates the ſame things with others. But after all, I am of opinion, that honour, equity, and gratitude, demand an acknowledgement of the obligations we are under to thoſe who have directed us to the ſources. When an author therefore is convinced in conſcience; that, if he had not read the diſſertations of ſome Moderns, who have quoted antient authors, he had not known to whom he could have applied in order to procure the original authorities; he would do very well to make a public acknowledgment of the good offices done him by theſe Moderns. Having once done this in a preface, he may cite, upon his own bottom, the Antients he has conſulted, and act the part of a true proprietor. I muſt obſerve here, by the by, that writers, who religiouſly cite the chapters and pages, in regard to every thing they borrow from others, have more honeſty than policy: they neglect the intereſts of vain-glory; they deprive themſelves of the pleaſure of being cited; for by this means they render it ſo eaſy to verify them, that every writer will turn to the reſpective places when he has occaſion for the ſame proofs, or to mention the ſame matters of fact, that are contained in their books; after which he contents himſelf with citing the antient author. Whereas, if they brought in curious things, without ſaying from what particular place they have them, and only mention the names of their authors, others would ſcarce dare to vent the ſame things any otherwiſe than under their authority, at leaſt except writers of the firſt rank. They would ſee their names in the margins of many books; and that honour would be for a long time paid them. How many authors do this day pay this honour to Alexander ab Alexandro, and to Cælius Rhodiginus, who practiſed the politics we are now ſpeaking of?

A REFLEXION upon a certain way of quoting.

[*K*] *The author of the* Memorabilia - - - *has not given the right time when Nihuſius publiſhed a new notion upon the invocation of ſaints.*] He ſays, that about the year 1614, Nihuſius, a new Papiſt, coined a new error, *viz.* that the ſaints departed, live ſtill in reſpect of their bodies; and therefore are to be adored in their relics. *Novum cudit ac protudit Errorem, dum conatu magno quidem ſed irrito, probare nititur:* Sanctos hac vita defunctos, non eſſe mortuos vel quoad corpus, vel quoad reliquias ſeu exuvias corporis. *Formata enim quæſtione: ‘ An adorandi ſint Sancti ſuis in reliquiis? affirmat, ‘ quia, inquit, Sancti in exuviis corporum non ſunt mor‘ tui, ſed omnino vivunt adhuc* (39).’ The conſequence, that this proſelyte drew from his hypotheſis, went a great way; for, not contented to prove from thence, that the ſaints merit our adoration, he found a ſort of Atheiſm in the opinion oppoſite to his own, and pretended that they, who deny the bodies of the ſaints to be living, deſtroy, at the bottom, the reſurrection. *Quoniam itaque Sancti ſuis in corporibus adhuc vivunt, certatim nos illuc agglomeremur, & adoremus amoroſiſſimè, ſpem reſurrectionis noſtræ ſimul quaſi ſatiantes, & mortis metum puerilem abjicientes, nequaquam verò ſuperbè quicquam ejus reſpuentes; hæreſeos ac atheiſmi pars eſt, opinio illa feralis & luctuoſa, de mortuis ac non viventibus Sanctorum corporibus, utpote reſurrectionem impiè negans in receſſu* (40). My author does not inform me whether theſe words are taken from a didactic piece, or from an oration; but, I imagine, Nihuſius ſpoke theſe words in ſome declamation. We are referred to two authors who refuted him (41); one named Himmelius, and the other David Chriſtianus. The latter is cited by my author when he ſpeaks of the death of Nihuſius in 1657, and when he relates that about 1614 he was brought over to the communion of Rome, by the Jeſuit Martinus Becanus, and that he taught, that the ſaints in paradiſe live ſtill in their bodies: a thought which he called a divine oracle, and a clear light into a profound myſtery, and a ſublimer Philoſophy touching ſleeping and waking, than that of Ariſtotle and the other Philoſophers. David Chriſtianus owns, that it was a new oracle, not prophetical, but poetical, and ſo ſubtile that it was unknown to all the Fathers, and was neither underſtood by Ariſtotle, nor Scaliger, nor any of the moſt penetrating Philoſophers, unleſs perhaps by Rodolphus Goclenius, who ſomewhere affirms, that certain portions of life remain in dead bodies, of which GOD will form a new body at the reſurrection. *Oraculum novum hoc eſt, ſed non Propheticum, Poëticum autem ac Nihuſianum, tam ſubtile, ut nulli vel S. S. Patrum, vel Lutheranorum, vel Pontificiorum, viſum fuerit; nec intellectum vel ab Ariſtotele, vel Scaligero, vel à quovis alio, acutiſſimo etiam Philoſopho, niſi forſan à Rudolpho Goclenio, alicubi aſſerente: in humano corpore demortuo quaſdam adhuc vitæ reliquias ſupereſſe, ex quibus in reſurrectione novum corpus formandum ſit* (42). Here by the way, we may take notice of a notion of Goclenius, that is very fantaſtical and ſingular: but it is good to be informed of ſuch notions, that we may have a fuller view of the extent of the whims and viſions of the human mind. From what I have ſet forth in this remark, we may conclude, that Nihuſius was one of thoſe lively preſumptuous men, who eaſily ſuffer themſelves to be dazzled by the falſe luſtre of a paradox, and labour with eargerneſs to communicate to all the world their own prepoſſeſſions. They magnify the ideas of ſmall things; and recommend them with ſuch warmth, as if they were treating of a matter of the laſt importance; the true reverſe of the Roman Poet, who ſaid,

> Non equidem hoc ſtudeo bullatis ut mihi nugis
> Pagina turgeſcat, dare pondus idonea fumo (43).

> *'Tis not indeed my talent to engage*
> *In lofty trifles, or to ſwell my page*
> *With wind and noiſe.* - - - - -
>
> DRYDEN.

By this ſign we may diſtinguiſh thoſe who enter the liſts riding in the chariot of vanity,

> *Quos tulit in ſcenam ventoſo gloria curru* (44).

To diſcover the Chronological error of the author of the *Memorabilia Eccleſiaſtica*, we need only call to mind, that Nihuſius did not abjure Lutheraniſm till about the year 1622.

NYMPHODORUS of Amphipolis, the author of a book which has been twice cited by Clemens Alexandrinus [*A*], and now loſt, flouriſhed we know not when. The ſcholiaſt upon Apollonius has cited the ſame work to prove, that the Tibarenians (*a*), as ſoon as their wives were brought to bed, went to bed themſelves, and made their wives wait on them in every thing after the ſame manner as women in child-bed are waited

[*A*] *Author of a piece which has been twice cited by Clemens Alexandrinus.*] Νυμφόδωρος ὁ Ἀμφιπολίτης ἐν τρίτῳ νομίμων Ἀσίας. Nymphodorus Amphipolitanus in tertio de legibus Aſiæ (1). - - - - *Nymphodorus of Amphipolis in his third book of the Aſian laws.* Νυμφόδωρος ἐν νομίμοις βαρβαρικοῖς. Nymphodorus in libro de legibus barbaricis (2). - - - *Nymphodorus in his book of Barbarian laws.* We cannot reaſonably doubt, but that both theſe paſſages relate to the ſame author; but, it is not ſo certain, that they refer to the ſame book. I believe, however, with Voſſius, that the Treatiſe of the Laws of Aſia, compiled by Nymphodorus, differed no otherwiſe from the books of the laws of the Barbarians, than only as a part from waited on in other countries. Politian is very much miſtaken upon the words of this ſcholiaſt [*B*].

---

(39) Andreas Carolus, Memor. Eccleſiaſt. Sæculi XVII, *lib. ii, cap. xviii, pag.* 352, *ad ann.* 1614.

(40) Ibid.

(41) Himmelius in Tractatu de Natura invocationis Religioſæ, *pag.* 520, 525, ſeq. confer diſput. inauguralem Dn. Davidis Chriſtiani, de R. Pontificis Infallib. & S. S. Canoniſatione, *pag.* 66. ſeq. *Id. ib. pag.* 353.

(42) David Chriſtianus, ubi ſupra, apud Andream Carolum ibid. *lib. vi, cap. li, pag.* 165, *ad ann.* 1657.

(43) Perſius, Sat. V, ver. 19.

(44) Horat. Epiſt. I, lib. II, ver. 177.

(*a*) A people that lived near the Euxine ſea. See that article.

(1) Clemens Alexandr. Stromat. lib. i, pag. 322.

(2) Id. in Admonit. ad Gentes, pag. 43.

from the whole (3). This work was not ſmall; for the ſcholiaſt upon Sophocles (4) has cited the thirteenth book of it.

[*B*] *Politian is much miſtaken upon the words of Apollonius's ſcholiaſt.*] Ἐν δὲ τῇ τῶν Τιβαρήνων γῇ αἱ γυναῖκες ὅταν τέκωσι, τημελοῦσι τοὺς ἄνδρας ὥσπερ λεχοὺς· ὡς ἱστορεῖ Νυμφόδωρος ἐν τισι νόμοις (5). *In the country of the Tibarenians, the women, as ſoon as they are delivered, nurſe their huſbands, as tho' they had been delivered. As Nymphodorus relates in ſome laws.* Theſe are the words of the ſcholiaſt upon Apollonius. Now Politian's words are theſe. 'Addunt Interpretes Apollonii ſcriptum id etiam à Nymphodoro in 'Tiſinomis (6). - - - *The Commentators on Apollonius 'add, that this is aſſerted by Nymphodorus in his Tiſinomis.*' According to this, Nymphodorus muſt have writ a book, intituled, *Tiſinomi*. But nothing is more ridiculous than that ſuppoſition. The occaſion of Politian's miſtake was undoubtedly this: His manuſcript of the ſcholiaſt made but one word of τισι and νόμοις; for if the tranſcribers had parted theſe two words, he would readily have ſeen that they ſignify *in quibuſdam legibus, - - - in ſome laws*; and ſo would not have fallen into the miſtake that he has been ſo often charged with. Note, That Rutgerſius diſliking ἐν τισι νόμοις, ſuppoſes, that it ſhould be read ἐν τοῖς νόμοις (7). His conjecture is ſo likely, that we may very well take it to be juſt: but he is wrong, when he ſays, that Politian's error was followed by John Hartungus; for all that can be laid to Hartungus's charge is, that he made uſe of the reading, ἐν τισι νόμοις (8), which reading is rational enough, and has been adopted by Hoelzlinus in his edition of Apollonius, publiſhed ſince the work of Rutgerſius. Let us obſerve, by the way, that Hartungus, who has diſcovered ſo many falſe quotations, has made one of the ſame kind himſelf in the place I have been now citing. He there affirms, that Cælius Rhodiginus relates, upon the teſtimony of the ſcholiaſt of Apollonius, the fooliſh cuſtom of the Tibarenians. This is not true; Rhodiginus only cites Nymphodorus (9).

(3) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis, *lib. iii, pag.* 393.

(4) Schol. Soph. in Oedip. Colon.

(5) Scholiaſtes Apollonii in lib. ii, Argonaut. ver. 1012.

(6) Angelus Politianus, Epiſt. XVI, *lib. i, fol. m.* 26.

(7) Rutgerſius, Variar. Lection. *lib. iv, cap. xx, pag.* 443.

(8) Joh. Hartungus, Locorum Memorabilium, Decuria I, *cap. ix, pag.* 658. *Tom. ii.* Theſauri Gruteri.

(9) Cælius Rhodigin. Antiq. Lection. *lib. xviii, cap. xxx, pag. m.* 1023.

NIPHUS (AUGUSTIN) one of the moſt celebrated Philoſophers of the XVIth century, was born at Jopoli in Calabria, and not at Seſſa in the Terra di Lavoro, though he very conſtantly gives himſelf the epithet *Sueſſanus* [*A*]. Finding himſelf ill uſed at home upon his father's ſecond marriage (*a*), he left the houſe, and went away to Naples, where he had the good fortune to pleaſe one of the inhabitants of Seſſa, who placed him among his own children. He ſtudied with them, and accompanying them to Padua, he applied himſelf very cloſely to the ſtudy of Philoſophy. Returning afterwards to Seſſa, and Naples, and being informed that his father after waſting all his ſubſtance was departed this life, he thought no more of Jopoli, the place of his birth, but took a wife in the town of Seſſa, and taught Philoſophy in Naples for ſeveral years (*b*). He engaged ſo ſtrongly in the dangerous opinions of Nicoletus Vernias, his profeſſor in Philoſophy at Padua, that having the aſſurance to write upon that ſubject in the year 1491, he brought himſelf into ſuch ill terms, with the monks, that it was very near coſting him his life [*B*]. This profeſſor Vernias maintained with great warmth the opinion of Averrhoës on the unity of the intellect (*c*) [*C*], ſo that the lower claſs of Philoſophers every where gave out, that he had propagated this error almoſt over all Italy (*d*). Niphus having laid this ſtorm by the aſſiſtance of the biſhop of Padua, and by ſome corrections of his work *de Intellectu & Dæmonibus*, printed in the year 1492, publiſhed ſucceſſively ſeveral other books, which gave him ſo great a reputation, that the moſt famous univerſities made him the offer of a profeſſorſhip in Philoſophy

(*a*) He might ſay with the ſhepherd in Virgil, Eccl. III, ver. 33. *Eſt mihi namque domi pater eſt injuſta noverca.*

(*b*) Gabriel Barrius, in Antiquit. Calabriæ, apud Naudæum, in Judicio de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 16.

(*c*) See the remark [*E*] of the article AVERRHOES.

(*d*) See, below, the remark [*C*], citat. (9).

[*A*] *He very conſtantly gives himſelf the addition of* Sueſſanus.] Upon this we may obſerve, that having ſaid in one of his books, that he was born in Calabria, he ſuppreſſed this paſſage in the ſecond edition. *Ipſe in Sinueſſanorum* (1) *gratiam quòd apud eos aliquando degerit, uxoremque duxerit, Sinueſſanum* (2) *ſe ſcribebat. Quamquam ſæpius in Gymnaſia palam Calabrum ſe eſſe fateatur, & in Epiſtola quæ eſt ad Joannem Arenarum Principem, in Commentario ſuper Peri Hermenias, ſe Calabrum eſſe teſtatur, id quod tamen in ſecunda operis editione ſublatum fuit* (3). This ſhews, that he preferred Seſſa, his adopted place, before Jopoli, his native place. Paul Jovius had but a confuſed notion of the native place of Auguſtin Niphus: he makes him a native of Seſſa, and originally of Trophea (vulgarly Tropea) in Calabria (4). Jerome Marafioti, who publiſhed in Italian the Antiquities of Calabria in the 1601, pretends that Niphus performed the principal part of his ſtudies at Tropea (5). His grand-children, and ſeveral of his relations, adds he, are yet living in a country village not far diſtant from that town.

[*B*] *He brought himſelf into ſuch ill terms with the monks, that it was very near coſting him his life.*] This was by a book on the Intellect, and on Dæmons. He therein maintained, that there is but one intellect, and that there are no other ſubſtances diſtinct from matter, but the intelligences which move the Heavens. He brought himſelf into great trouble and danger upon this ſcore, and had very probably loſt his life, if Petrus Barocius, biſhop of Padua, had not diverted the ſtorm. From hence it is, that Tiberius Ruſſilianus introduces Philoſophy repreſenting to Leo X, that ſhe has ſaved from the flames Auguſtin Niphus, and Pomponacius. Niphus was obliged to ſuppreſs certain paſſages in his work, when he cauſed it to be printed in the year 1492 (6). *Voluit etiam* Niphus *ingenium ſuum in hac præceptoris ſui ſententia, qua explicanda, qua ſtabilienda periclitari; verùm hanc ob rem, aut certò propter negatas à ſe diſtinctas à motricibus cælorum intelligentiis, ſubſtantias omnes à materia ſeparatas, oppido cucullatos Patres contra ſe in caput, & nominis famam vehementiſſimè commovit; à quibus ſe explicare haud facili negotio potuiſſet, niſi eum ab ancipiti illo diſcrimine celeriter exemiſſet, Petrus Barocius Epiſcopus Patavinus* . . . . *quæ* (dica hæreſeos Auguſtino Nipho inuſta) *non ita de nihilo fuit, quin Tyberius* Ruſſilianus *Calaber Philoſophiam inducat, in oratione quam habet ad Leonem X. dicentem,* Nec longo pòſt tempore Sueſſam (7) noſtrum fidiſſimum alumnum, ac Pomponatium mediis ex ignibus eripuimus (8).

[*C*] *This profeſſor Vernias maintained, with great warmth, the opinion of Averrhoës on the unity of the intellect.*] Naudæus is my author. 'Nicoletus Vernias opinionem Averrois de unico Intellectu, confirmare argumentis, eo uſque validis & numeroſis conſueverat, ut omnes plebei & minuti Philoſophi, quemadmodum Riccobonus libro 6. de Gymnaſio Patavino ſcribit, dictarent in vulgus, eum totam pene Italiam in hunc pernicioſum errorem compuliſſe (9). - - - *Nicolet Vernias uſed to confirm the opinion of Averrhoës with ſo many and powerful arguments that all the lower claſs of Philoſophers, as Riccobonus writes in his ſixth book,* de Gymnaſio Patavino, *reported it among the common people, that he had drawn almoſt all Italy into that dangerous error.*' The biſhop of Padua, whom I have named, engaged this Vernias by his gentle remonſtances to write an orthodox book. This piece treats of the immortality of the ſoul, and was printed in the year 1499. The author therein maintains, not the unity of the ſoul of all mankind, as he had done very obſtinately for thirty years together, but the multiplication of ſouls, according to the multitude of bodies.

(1) It ſhould be *Sueſſanorum.*

(2) It ſhould be *Sueſſanum.*

(3) Gabriel Barrius, in Antiq. Calabriæ, apud Naudæum, in Judicio de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 16.

(4) Jovius, in Elogiis, *cap. xcii, pag. m.* 215.

(5) Apud Naudæum, ibid. *pag.* 17.

(6) Naudæus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 28.

(7) I think it ſhould be read *Sueſſanum.*

(8) Naud. ibid. *pag.* 27, 28.

(9) Id. ib. *pag.* 27.

Philoſophy with a conſiderable ſalary [*D*]. Pope Leo X paid a very great regard to him, and permitted him to bear, in his eſcutcheon, the arms of the family de Medicis, and alſo created him a count Palatine. The letters patent granting theſe honours are to be met with (*e*); but it does not appear from them that he was allowed to take the name of Medicis: though it is certain that this favour was granted him, and that Niphus accordingly made public uſe of it (*f*). He was commanded by the ſame Pope to write in the affirmative ſide of the queſtion, whether upon the principles of Ariſtotle the ſoul be immortal (*g*). He was very much careſſed by the principal perſons of quality of both ſexes, to which his talent of diverting them with merry ſtories, and witty ſayings, extremly contributed. He had a very clumſy air, and ungenteel appearance; but yet for all that, he ſpoke with a good grace, and eſpecially when he inclined to be merry [*E*]. It was ſurprizing to obſerve how very much he differed from himſelf, by ſpeaking, or not ſpeaking. He was of an amorous diſpoſition, and made himſelf ridiculous in his old age by the extravagances of his paſſion for young girls [*F*]. I have taken notice of this

Qui (Petrus Barocius Epiſcopus Patavinus) *Nicoletum quoque amicè poſteà compulit, ut edito de animæ immortalitate libello, eam non unicam eſſe, quemadmodum totos annos triginta pertinaciſſimè docuerat, ſed multiplicem, & pro ratione corporum diviſam, oſtenderet* (10).

[*D*] *The moſt famous univerſities made him the offer of a Profeſſorſhip in Philoſophy with a conſiderable ſalary.*] According to Paul Jovius, he taught in almoſt all the univerſities of Italy on very advantageous terms, at the ſame time that Achillinus and Pomponacius flouriſhed (11). Theſe two Profeſſors taught Philoſophy in Padua, and if we believe Gauricus they had Auguſtin Niphus for their colleague (12). However he is not named in the Catalogue of the Profeſſors of Padua publiſhed by Riccobon. But Niphus intimates himſelf, that he taught in that univerſity. 'Ceſſantibus enim his turbulentiis, *ſays he* (13), quas 'ocyſſimè ceſſandas arbitror, adſum qui Patavii ubi 'mea ſedes ſemper parata eſt, aut ſicubi boni Principes 'florere ſtatuent ſtudia, bonas artes, profiteri polliceor. '- - - - *For as ſoon as this ſtorm ſhall be blown over*, ſays 'he, *as I expect it very ſhortly will, I promiſe to come and 'teach ſtudents, either at Padua, where I have a chair 'always prepared for me, or wheresſoever encouraging 'princes deſire to have learning flouriſh.*' It is certain at leaſt that he had the offer both at Padua and Bologna of a ſalary of a thouſand gold crowns a year, which was the ſum appointed him in the univerſity of Piſa. He tells us this himſelf. 'Præceptores qui 'has *(artes & ſcientias)* diſcipulos docent, pecunias 'multas accumulare cernimus: nos primi à Bononienſibus, 'à Venetis, ſi in eorum Gymnaſiis philoſophi'am docere vellemus, millenarium aureorum nume'rum pro mercede ſingulis annis acciperemus, ſicuti à 'Florentinis accepimus, Piſis philoſophiam profeſſis '(14). - - - - *We ſee thoſe who teach ſtudents theſe* '(arts and ſciences) *heap up great riches: I am the 'firſt who have had ſo large a ſalary as a thouſand 'gold crowns a year offered me by the Bononians and Venetians, 'if I would agree to teach in their univerſities, 'as I had the ſame actually paid me by the Florentines 'for teaching Philoſophy in their univerſity of Piſa.*' Note that he was Profeſſor at Piſa about the year 1520 (15). The Preface to his *Dilucidationes Metaphyſicæ*, a work which he began to compoſe at Salernum, about the year 1507, informs us, that while he was obliged upon account of public misfortunes to teach in his native country (16), he was invited to Salerno by Robert de Sanſeverino, who had a deſire to make that univerſity flouriſh. He accepted the Philoſophy profeſſorſhip, and during his exerciſe of it he received orders from that prince to explain all Ariſtotle's works (17). I obſerve this, that the reader may know the time of his being Profeſſor at Salerno. It is ſaid that he was called to Rome by Leo X, to teach Philoſophy in the college della Sapienza (18). It may be doubted whether ever he taught in the univerſity of Bologne, ſince he does not appear in the liſt given by Alidoſius of the Profeſſors of that univerſity.

[*E*] *He had . . . . an ungenteel appearance; but yet for all that, he ſpoke with a good grace, and eſpecially when he inclined to be merry.*] This is what Paul Jovius informs us. 'Erat ingenio fertili, *ſays he* (19), ada'perto, liberali, ſermone autem Campanum pingue 'quoddam reſonanti maximè libero, & ad ſerendas 'fabulas in ſuggeſtu, coronaque ad voluptatem aurium 'perjucundo; ſed vel toto ore ſubagreſti, & penitus 'infaceto ita ſe ad urbanos jocos componebat, ut valde 'mirarentur, qui mox tacentis ſupercilium, auſte'raque labra, & lineamenta conſpiceret. - - - - *He had 'a fertile, free, and open, wit, and a voice very loud, 'and ſounding mellow like a bell, extremely agreeable 'for delivering pleaſant ſtories from the pulpit, or for 'diverting any audience; but his jokes were accompanied 'with a countenance ſo entirely ruſtic, and perfectly diſ'agreeable, that it was very ſurprizing, to obſerve the 'aukward and ſtern figure of his features after he had 'done ſpeaking.*'

[*F*] *He was of an amorous diſpoſition, and made himſelf ridiculous in his old age, by the extravagances of his paſſion for young girls.*] He confeſſes that the fair ſex had been always agreeable to him, but that in his youth, if he met with a girl that was perfectly chaſte, he loved her without any deſire of enjoying her: but, on the contrary, if he found her amorous, he was inclinable to indulge the ſame diſpoſition himſelf. *Teſtor à juventa uſque ad præſens tempus, ſemper mihi fuiſſe puellas gratas: in juventa enim amabam aliquando aliquas ſine illicito appetitu, in quibus cognoſcebam pudorem atque puritatem, expertibus omnino cupidinei amoris: interdum nonnullas deperibam, quas cupidineus amor facilè tangeret; illas igitur amore blanda conſuetudinis, has cupidinis proſequebar, nec aliam ob cauſam, niſi quia mores mihi earum jucundiſſimi erant* (20). He adds, that, in his old age, he continued to love modeſt girls with the ſame pure affection, but as to thoſe of a different diſpoſition, he mortally hated them. *Hac verò ætate puellas in quibus pudorem Sabinarum modeſtiamque agnoſco, quippe quæ ſint ab inhoneſtis illecebris abhorrentes, ſine turpi voluptate ſummopere amo, ſecus autem quæ amore cupidineo accenduntur, has enim hac ætate non modò non amo, ſed odio proſequor immortali capitalique* (21). Though we ſhould give credit to this laſt declaration, yet we could not forbear condemning him with a great deal of juſtice, for having in his old days put on all the appearances of a whining lover. He proſtituted by this means his character as a Philoſopher, and loſt even the eſteem of thoſe who took the greateſt pleaſure in ſeeing him act this part. Beſides how is this declaration of his to be reconciled with the confeſſion he has made, that his paſſion for a young girl who waited upon Hippolyta of Arragon, counteſs of Venafro made him pine away, though this young creature had not only beauty enough to excite the old, and even the dead themſelves, to love, but alſo an unparallelled chaſtity? He had acted this farce to divert Pompey Colonna; but at laſt found the paſſion real. Let us hear him relate this himſelf. *Ut voluptate afficeremus Pompeium Columnam, qui in hujuſmodi nos amoris rete implicitos videndo ſummopere delectabatur, ſimulavimus perditos cum* Quintia (22) *amores . . . . cum hac igitur amores ſimulando, ſæpe colloquendo, congrediendo, atque amores deſcribendo, quotidie convivebamus. Crevit amor tandem adeo ut non ad inſanias modò, ſed ad mortem compellerer, nec immeritò quidem: nam ea erat, eſtque etiam nunc frontis, oriſque ſerenitas, is candor, is oculorum ſplendor, ac rutilans jubar, ea denique totius corporis ſpecies, gratia, ac Venus, ut non modò ſenes, ſed vel ipſi mortui ſuſcitentur allicianturque ad amorem: tanta quoque ipſi cum venuſtate pudicitia, morum ſua vitas, comitas, atque affabilitas ineſt, ut mundi ſpeculum, ſiduſque fulgentiſſimum meritò ſit cenſenda* (23). Note, that he compares himſelf to the famous Proſper Colonna, who at the age of ſeventy years fell in love with Clara Viſconti, and whoſe paſſion beginning like that of old men, with much more view to the pleaſures of converſation than thoſe of enjoyment, increaſed after-

---

(*e*) See them in *Naudæus*, at the head of the *Opuſcula* of Niphus, which he cauſed to be printed at Paris in 1645.

(*f*) *See* Naud. in Judicio de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 24, 25.

(*g*) See remark [*B*] of the article POMPONATIUS.

(10) Id. ib. *pag.* 28.

(11) Quum in omnibus ferè Italiæ gymnaſiis, Achillino, & Pomponatio florentibus, opima ſtipendia meruiſſet. *Jovius, ubi ſupra.*

(12) Gauricus, in Themate natalitio Pomponatii, apub Naudæum in Judicio de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 31.

(13) Niphus, in Dilucidation. Metaphyſ. apud Naudæum, ibid.

(14) Niphus, de Divitiis, *pag.* 88, *Edit. Pariſ.* 1645.

(15) *See* Naud. in Jud. de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 29.

(16) That is, at Seſſa.

(17) *See* Naud. in Jud. de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 29, 30.

(18) Opmer. in Chron. apud Naud. ibid. *pag.* 30.

(19) Jovius, ubi ſupra.

(20) Niphus, de Muliere aulica, *cap. vii, pag. m,* 345.

(21) Id. ib.

(22) Her true name was Hippolyta, but it was changed to that of Lucretia, becauſe the counteſs of Venafro's name was Hippolyta. He calls her *Quintia*, becauſe ſhe was the fifth of his miſtreſſes. *Niphus de Viro aulico, cap. xxxiii, pag.* 286.

(23) Id. ib.

this in another place (*h*). His wife was named Angelella, he mentions her in ſeveral places of his works, and relates an uncommon inſtance of her affection for him [*G*]. He had children by her as we ſhall ſee below (*i*). He died of a diſtemper in his throat which he contracted by a cold he catched in travelling in the night [*H*]. Paul Jovius informs us that it was the ſame night on which Alexander de Medicis duke of Florence was aſſaſſinated, that is the ſixth of January 1537; but Naudæus proves that Niphus was ſtill living in the year 1545 [*I*]. He endeavours to excuſe his errors, and obſcenities,

afterwards to ſuch a degree as to carry him to public extravagances (24). The exceſſes of our Philoſopher may be ſeen in theſe verſes of Latomus:

Apagete vos, Philoſophiam qui tetricam
Putatis: & boni indignam
Leporis, ebriæ horridamque Cypridis.
Quid? Niphus an non melleus,
Perplexa ſuetus inter enthymemata,
Et ſyllogiſmos frigidos
Narrare ſuaves, Atticaſque fabulas:
Multumque riſum ſpargere?
At quàm venuſtum hoc: ſeptuagenarium
Quod undulatis paſſibus,
Ex curioſo, flexuoſoque capite
Saltare coram cerneres
Modò Dorium, modò Phrygium, vel Lydium:
Amore ſaucium gravi?
Tractare ſic philoſophiam inviſam, arbitror
Summi fuiſſe philoſophi (25).

Away ye fools, who think Philoſophy
Too grave for jokes and wanton venery.
What, does not florid Niphus think it beſt,
Amidſt dry ſyllogiſms to crack a jeſt;
With crabbed moods to mix a pleaſant ſtory,
To entertain his laughing auditory?
How wondrous pleaſant muſt it be to ſee
This great Philoſopher at ſeventy,
Inſpir'd by love with ſhaking head advance,
And trembling knees to grace the airy dance?
Much like a grave Profeſſor muſt he look,
Who thus his learned character forſook.

The Italians have preſerved by tradition ſeveral ſtories relating to the amorous follies of old Auguſtin Niphus. Naudæus had heard them; but beſides that he was not aſſured they were true, however probable they might be, he thought it neither conſiſtent with charity nor juſtice to publiſh them. I quote his words with ſo much the more pleaſure, as they give an example of what ought to be done, with regard to ſuch ſtories as are grounded only upon hear-ſay. ‘ Amoribus præſertim indulſit (Niphus) quos cum puellis honorariis quarumdam Heroïnarum, quibus cum familiariter verſabatur, tam liberè, adeoque intemperanter exercuit, ut non modò virginibus illis quas obſequio ſuo demereri ſtudebat, ſed omnibus qui tanti nominis Philoſophum, à petulcis illis & laſcivientibus puellis ita deludi faſcinarique videbant, ludos de ſe maximos faceret. Et hercle, niſi vellem ejus pudori per me nihil detractum iri, poſſem hic multa ridicula recenſere, quæ licèt incertis rumoribus per Italiam de illo ferantur, adeò tamen moribus amantium proxima ſunt, ut nullo negotio vera quoque cenſeri poſſunt: ſed abſit, ut privati cubiculi ſecreta, & dulces illas nequitias, ineptiaſve, quas ſibi quiſque pro diræ libidinis modo fingit ad libitum, è latebris quas faventes habuerunt, in odioſam lucem proferam. Adde quòd tam alienum eſt à natura mea, rebus certis & exploratis, dubios rumores miſcere, ut nequidem in aliqua ludicra narratione, & oblectationis tantùm de cauſa, facere illud ullo modo vellem (26). - - - - *He (Niphus) gave himſelf up more particularly to amours, which he purſued with ſuch eagerneſs and extravagance among certain maids of honour belonging to ſome great ladies, with whom he had the liberty of converſing, that he made himſelf the jeſt not only of the young girls themſelves, whom he took ſo much pains in endeavouring to pleaſe, but alſo to all others who ſaw a Philoſopher of his great reputation enſnared and made a fool of by a company of frolickſome wanton girls, And indeed, if I was not reſolved to have no hand in detracting any thing from his gravity, I could take this opportunity to recount a great many ridiculous ſtories, which, tho' they are reported all over Italy, upon no better evidence than hear-ſay, are yet ſo natural to the conduct of a lover, that they may very eaſily be ſuppoſed to be true: but far be it from me to drag out of their favourite lurking holes, thoſe ſweet ſins and follies which every one indulges at pleaſure, in proportion to his curſed luſt, and to expoſe them to a diſagreeable light. Beſides that it is ſo contrary to my diſpoſition to mix doubtful reports with certain and evident facts, that I would not do it in the leaſt degree ſo much as in a merry ſtory, intended purely for diverſion.*’ There are ſome perſons perhaps who have commended his ſilence for the reaſon contained in theſe four verſes of Malherbe:

Sieroit-il bien à mes écrits
D'ennuier les races futures
Des ridicules avantures
D'un amoureux en cheveux gris (27).

My writings might, in ſuch a caſe,
Bring ſcandal on ſome future race,
Should they without reſerve diſcover
The follies of a gray-beard lover.

[*G*] *He relates an uncommon inſtance of his wife's affection for him.*] While he was compoſing a work intituled, *Theſſerologium Aſtronomicum*, he ſhut himſelf up ſo cloſely among his books that he ſaw no body. His wife imagined he was grown melancholy, and vainly tried ſeveral ways to cure him. She at laſt fancied that the pleaſures of Love would prove an effectual remedy; for this reaſon ſhe ſent into his ſtudy to him all alone a handſome girl that ſhe had been very jealous of, and hated heartily upon that account. She begged of her earneſtly to refuſe him nothing he ſhould deſire, not even the laſt favour. Niphus took no notice of her; upon which his wife betook herſelf to her prayers and tears: which laſted till he had finiſhed his book. After which he reſumed his uſual gaiety, and ſaw company as before. The good woman alſo recovered her good humour, *ipſa quoque è mortuis in vitam rediit* (28).

[*H*] *He died of a diſtemper in his throat, which he contracted by a cold he catched in travelling in the night.*] Paul, Jovius is my author for this. ‘ Periit in patria nocturno itinere refrigeratus, quum ſero è Sinueſſa rediiſſet, obortis ſcilicet tonſillis quæ fauces obſederant (29). . . . . *He died in his own country by a cold he got upon the road in the night, as he was returning late from Seſſa, the glands of his throat ſwelling and ſtopping up the paſſage.*’ Since, according to Paul Jovius, Seſſa was Niphus's country, how could he ſay that in returning too late from Seſſa, he contracted a diſtemper which carried him off in his own country? This queſtion will only let us ſee that the author has not been ſufficiently exact in his account; but it is eaſy to clear up the difficulty. He meant, without doubt, that Niphus having ſtaid too late at Seſſa, returned in the night to a country houſe he had not far from that place. This houſe was undoubtedly that which he called *Niphanum*, from whence he dated ſeveral Books. It is not ſo eaſy to prove that Paul Jovius has truly related the place of his death; for Leander Albertus affirms, that Niphus died at Salerno, where he had taught Philoſophy a long time (30). He continued there in the year 1534, as appears from the date of his treatiſe *de Re Aulica*. He dedicated his book *de Rege & Tyranno*, printed at Naples the ſame year, to Ferdinand de Sanſeverino, prince of Salerno.

[*I*] *Naudæus proves that Niphus was ſtill living in the year* 1545 (31).] For he ſays, that Niphus dedicated

(*h*) See the remark [*C*] of the article ARRAGON (JANE OF).

(*i*) In the following article.

(24) Amare cœpit Claram Viſcontiam amore ſenum, qui magis converſationum eſſe ſolet quàm libidinis: cum tamen ipſe continentiſſimus foret, & cùm paſſim in colloquiis cum ea quotidie verſaretur, tanto amore affectus eſt tandem ut uſque ad inſanias apertiſſimas deveniret. *Id. ib.*

(25) Latomus, apud Jovium in Elogiis, *cap.* *xcii*, *pag.* 217.

(26) Naudæus, in Judicio de Nipho, *pag.* 31, 32.

(27) Malherbe, Poëſ. *pag.* 85, *Edit. of* Menage, *Paris* 1666.

(28) Niphus, de Amore, *cap. cii*, *pag.* 428.

(29) Jovius, in Elog. *cap. xcii*, *pag.* 217.

(30) Obiit annis ſuperioribus Salerni qua in urbe diu regali illius præmiis honeſtiſſimis philoſophiam docuerat. *Leand. Albert. Deſcript. Ital. pag. m.* 244.

(31) Naudæus, in Jud. de Nipho, *pag.* 34.

ſcenities [*K*], and commends him (*k*) for having been the firſt who refuted the threatnings of a deluge which the Aſtrologers had given out for the year 1524, and which had cauſed very great alarm all over Europe (*l*). He names three antagoniſts of Niphus, who treated him with a great deal of reſpect, and good manners [*L*]. If Guy Patin has no better authority for ſaying that Niphus received a viſit from the emperor Charles V, than he has for adding, that Niphus died of a diſtemper he contracted by dancing too much *at his ſecond wedding* (*m*), what he ſays of it is not to be credited. We ſhall take notice of ſome miſtakes in Moreri's Dictionary [*M*].

dicated his Book *de Animalibus* to Paul III, in the year 1545. He concludes from thence, that the author was then 70 years of age, and he grounds this upon a very probable ſuppoſition, that he muſt be 21 years of age at the time of the diſpute mentioned above (32), and which belongs to the year 1491. He might have found a more direct proof in the epiſtle dedicatory of a Book written by this Philoſopher in 1534, in which he declares himſelf to be 60 years old (33). I am ſurpriſed Naudæus ſhould not cenſure Paul Jovius in relation to the time of Niphus's death.

[*K*] *Naudæus endeavours to excuſe his errors and obſcenities.*] He lays the fault of them upon the licentiouſneſs of that age, and demonſtrates by examples that before the decrees of the Council of Trent concerning the examining and cenſuring of Books, an extreme liberty uſed to be taken in maintaining erroneous propoſitions, and in publiſhing tales and ſatires without any regard to chaſte ears. He confeſſes that Niphus made an ill uſe of this cuſtom in the writings he compoſed for the polite part of the world, and even in ſome philoſophical treatiſes, but not in ſo very looſe a manner as ſome other authors. 'Eum (*Sermonem Niphi*) talem eſſe (*inæqualem & immundum*) nullus 'unquam inficias ire poterit, cui lectæ fuerint jucundæ 'illæ narrationes, quas ſub finem libri de viro aulico 'creberrimas juxta, fœdiſſimaſque attulit. Neque 'tantùm iſtis uſus eſt, cùm Aulici ſui urbanitatem per 'ejuſmodi facetias urbaniorem reddere ſatagit; ſed interdum etiam in Porticu & Academia, cùm adverſus 'viros graviſſimos diſputat, in dicteria quædam prorumpit, neque loco, neque tempori ſatis convenientia; eaſque hiſtorias refert, quas ob rerum fœtidarum 'mentionem, nemo vel inter lixas & ruſticos, abſque 'honoris præfatione referre vellet (34) . . . . . (35) Philologis præſertim adeò familiaris erat ſermonum obſcœniſſimorum licentia, ut qui *Bocatium, Pogium, 'Aretinum, Caſam, Caſtalionem, Pacificum Aſculanum, 'Julium Grotum, Puccium, Ludovicum Cinthium, Philelphum, Codrum, Septabinam, Mazzuccium Francum,* '& id genus alios (36) legerit, impudentiam tunc, 'malitiam, fœditatem, impietatem, virus ſuum omne 'plenis buccis, aut potiùs pleno jure, ſive in Deum, 'ſive in ejus Miniſtros, aut publicas, privataſque perſonas, & in omnem denique honeſtatem aut verecundiam effudiſſe, fateri cogatur. Unde nihil mihi, aut 'aliis mirum videri debet, ſi cùm hi mores, hæc tempora vivente *Nipho* fuerint, ipſe etiam, qui petulanti 'ſplene cachinno factus à natura fuerat, qui cum Heroïnis & Principibus viris continuò vivebat, quem ſagaces puellæ, miris illecebris in ſui amorem pelliciebant, ſui ſæculi moribus, & inſtitutis, longè tamen 'quàm cæteri parciùs, uſus fuerit; quandoquidem ſi 'aliter feciſſet, paratum ejus nomini, & gloriæ exitium erat, quod viris Academicis nimia ſtoliditas, & 'rerum civilium ignorantia, ſuique potiſſimum incuria 'afferre ſolet. - - - - *That it* (*the diſcourſe of Niphus*) '*was ſuch* (impure and obſcene) *none can deny, who 'have read thoſe merry ſtories which he has added, no 'leſs numerous than ſmutty, towards the end of his book 'on the Courtier. Nor has he introduced theſe only, when 'he attempts to ſet off his Courtier to greater advantage 'by pleaſantries, but ſometimes alſo in the Schools and 'Univerſity, when he is diſputing againſt perſons of the 'greateſt gravity, he breaks out into little jeſts neither 'becoming the place nor occaſion; and tells ſuch ſtories, 'as no Porter would repeat without apologizing for their 'immodeſty. . . . . Thoſe who ſtudied polite learning were 'ſo uſed to this licentious obſcenity in their diſcourſes, that 'whoever will read* Boccace, Poggius, Aretine, Caſa, 'Caſtiglione, Pacificus Aſculanus, Julius Grotus, Puccius, Ludovicus Cinthius, Philelphus, Codrus, Septabina, Mazuccius Francus, *and others of that claſs, 'muſt be forced to confeſs that at that time impudence, immorality, obſcenity, and impiety, ſpit out 'all their venom with full mouths, or rather with full 'authority, either againſt GOD, or his miniſters, or 'againſt perſons both public and private, and in ſhort 'againſt all manner of virtue and decency. From whence 'it is not at all to be wondered at, as Niphus lived in 'ſuch times, and among ſuch cuſtoms, that he alſo, who 'was naturally of a merry diſpoſition, who ſpent his 'life continually among perſons of quality of both ſexes, 'and was drawn into the ſnares of love by the ſurpriſing 'ſtratagems of cunning girls, ſhould make ſome uſe, tho' 'not near ſo great as others had done, of the uſages and 'practices of the age; ſince otherwiſe he muſt have remained in obſcurity, as univerſity-men generally do by 'too great a diſregard and ignorance of the world, and 'above all by a neglect of themſelves.*'

[*L*] *He names three antagoniſts of Niphus who treated him with a great deal of reſpect and good manners.*] The firſt is a Monk of the order of St Francis. He publiſhed ſome Theorems of Philoſophy againſt Niphus. His name was Franciſcus Lychettus (37). The ſecond writes himſelf Lucas Praſſicius: he was of a Patrician family of Averſa, and publiſhed at that place in 1520, *Confutationes in quaſdam Niphi Commentationes pro defenſione Catholicæ ac Peripateticæ veritatis nec non pro defenſione doctorum ab eo non jure condemnatorum.* The third is Pomponacius who did not anſwer Niphus in a jeſting way, as he had done the other cenſurers of his treatiſe *de Animæ Immortalitate ex Ariſtotelis mente*; but with the collected ſtrength of his whole genius (38). *Pomponatius cum multorum adverſus ſuum . . . . libellum cenſuras dicteriis quibuſdam aut excipiat, aut prorſus eludat; unius Auguſtini argumenta tanquam fortiſſimi ducis tela, non contemnere, ſed levi corporis flexu declinare, aut ſi aliter non poſſet, collectis viribus, objectoque umbone ſuſtinere viſus eſt* (39). This is a mark of his eſteem for Auguſtine Niphus.

[*M*] *We ſhall take notice of ſome miſtakes in Moreri's Dictionary.*] I. It would be very hard to prove that Leo X would have had Niphus continually with him. II. Phauſina was not a courtezan (40), but a maid of honour to the Princeſs of Salerno (41). The good man Niphus did not enjoy her: I do not affirm this from his ſaying that he loved her only for her chaſtity (42), and aſſuring us, that when a modeſt girl was the object of his love, he never was ſenſible of any impure deſires (43), my reaſon is, that the Prince and Princeſs of Salerno permitted this gallantry only to divert themſelves with the extravagances of that old dotard: the young girl was alſo diverted with him, and this was the whole affair. III. He did not dedicate a book to her *under the name of Aurora*, but under that of *Phauſina*, a name he had deviſed to ſignify that ſhe was the Aurora (44). This maid was called *Phœbe Rhea*. IV. This work is intitled *de Re aulica*, and not *de Viro aulico*: it is true it contains two books, the firſt *de Viro aulico*, the ſecond *de Muliere aulica*. V. Moreri had very rightly ſaid, that he called another of his miſtreſſes Quintia, becauſe ſhe was the fifth (45); but in the Dutch editions, and in that of Paris 1699, it is erroneouſly printed Quinta. VI. He has followed the error of Paul Jovius concerning the time of Niphus's death. VII. And ſince he would copy him, he had better have ſaid with him, *the ſame night in which Alexander de Medicis was aſſaſſinated*, than to ſay, *about the ſame year*.

(*k*) Naudæus, in Judicio, de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 43, 53.

(*l*) See the remark [*B*] of the article STOEFLER.

(*m*) See the *Patiniana*, *pag.* 83, of the Holland edition.

(32) In the remark [*B*].

(33) Nec mirentur qui hunc legerint librum, Philoſophum ſenex ſexagenarium & pene capularem eum puellæ dicaſſe. *Niphus, Epiſt. Dedicat. Libri* de Re aulica, *pag. m.* 238.

(34) Naud. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 54.

(35) Id. ib. *pag.* 56.

(36) See the words of Mr *Magliabechi*, in the remark [*E*] of the article VAYER.

(37) *See his* Elogy *in* Leonardo Cozzando, *at pag.* 122, *of the firſt part of* Libraria Breſciana.

(38) *Taken from* Naudæus, *in* Jud. de Auguſt. Nipho, *pag.* 42.

(39) Id. ib.

(40) Note, that according to *Moreri* ſhe is called only *miſtreſs*; but according to the Dutch editions *courtezan*.

(41) *See* Niphus, de Re aulica, *lib. i, cap. xxviii.*

(42) Niphus, ib. *lib. ii, cap. vii.*

(43) See, above, citat. (20).

(44) Non Phœbam (quod nomen tibi luſtrico die fuit inditum) ſed PHAUSINAM hoc eſt Auroram, me tuo exiſtente Phœbo, nuncupare te dignam putavi. Es enim inter puellas Aurora, quæ formæ excellentia & morum compoſitione foves, ac omnes illuſtras. Et etiam cognomine Rhea, quòd facilis, blanda ac jucunda ſis. *Niphus, Epiſt. Dedicat. de Re aulica, pag.* 237.

(45) *Id.* de Re aulica, *lib. ii, cap. viii.*

NIPHUS (Fabius) grandſon of the preceding, was the ſon, if I am not miſtaken, of that JAMES NIPHUS, to whom Auguſtin, his father, dedicated his book *de Divitiis* in the year 1531. He was learned and eloquent, but of a ſpirit a little too fretful, and he took occaſion from every thing to complain of his ill fortune. He publiſhed a *Proœmium Mathematicum* at Paris in the year 1569, at the ſame time that he taught the Mathematics to two youths who were brothers, Peter Alexander, and Albret Delbene. He dedicated it to John Cavalcante, uncle by the mother's ſide to his two pupils, and gives him an account of the misfortunes he had ſuffered (a) [A]. He ſucceeded Nicolas Curtius in the ſecond profeſſorſhip of Practical Phyſic at Padua, in the year 1575; and having been impriſoned ſome months after upon ſuſpicion of Lutheraniſm (b), he found means to eſcape, and retired to Vienna in Auſtria [B]. He went afterwards into England, and there proved very unfortunate. From thence he came to Holland, and there alſo met with misfortunes [C]. I do not know whether he ſucceeded or not in the expectation he had of defeating the proſecutions of his enemies by the protection of the States. I have not been able to trace this beyond an Epiſtle Dedicatory where this expectation is expreſſed. Naudæus conjectures that he retired into the Spaniſh Netherlands, and that he there abjured Calviniſm, and married a wife by whom he had FERDINAND NIPHUS, who printed at Louvain, in 1644, Caramuel's *Severa Methodus diſputandi*, to which he added a letter wherein he calls himſelf great-grand-ſon of Auguſtin Niphus. Mr Moreri, who knew no more of all theſe things, than what he had read in Naudæus, has changed into affirmations, what the other had only delivered with a *perhaps*. This is a very ill example, and a very common fault. He has copied ſome miſtakes from the ſame

[A] *He gave an account to John Cavalcante of the misfortunes he had ſuffered.*] He teſtifies his gratitude for the good offices he had done him. *Tu enim*, Cavalcantium nempe ſic alloquitur, *cùm in tantas rerum anguſtias atque aſperitates, quadam fortunæ amentia incidiſſem, ut penè de ſalute deſperandum putarem, non tantùm hac rerum mearum offenſione doluiſti, verùm etiam neque ſumptibus, neque amicis, in mea adverſitate lenienda, te conceſſurum confirmaſti* (1).

[B] *He found means to eſcape, and retired to Vienna in Auſtria.*] This is a circumſtance which I have met with in a letter of Languetus, dated from that place the 15th of March 1576. Languetus wrote it to his maſter the elector of Saxony, and informed him among other things, that this grandſon of Niphus would be glad to accept of an employ in the public ſchools of that elector. He added, that tho' he was a young man, yet he ſpoke very well, being very well verſed in the impoſtures of the Romiſh church, but not ſufficiently inſtructed in the true religion, which made him wiſh to be eſtabliſhed in ſome place where he might have an opportunity of coming to a more perfect knowledge of it. The envy of his colleagues who found him commended by the ſcholars, inſtigated them to accuſe him to the Inquiſition for an heretic: he was impriſoned, but ſome young Germans reſcued him, and he went from thence to Vienna. He had taught Philoſophy in France and Italy, and had been crowded with auditors before he was made Profeſſor in Phyſic at Padua. This is the intire paſſage of Languet. *Venit huc ex Italia Marcus Antonius Niphus, nepos illius Auguſtini Niphi, qui patrum noſtrorum ætate fuit valde celebris in Scholis Italicis. Hic Marcus Antonius per aliquot annos docuit Philoſophiam in Gallia & Italia cum maximo auditorum concurſu, & tandem factus eſt Patavii artis medicæ Profeſſor. Quoniam autem magno applauſu audiebatur a Studioſis adoleſcentibus, quidam ex Profeſſoribus metuentes, ne præ ipſo in contemptum venirent, eum tanquam de Religione Pontificia non bene ſentientem detulerunt ad Inquiſitionem, à qua eſt conjectus in carcerem, ex quo opera quorundam adoleſcentum Germanorum evaſit, & huc ſe contulit. Contraxi hic cum eo notitiam, & cum viderem eum eſſe moderato ingenio, & nihil eſſe in eo illius arrogantiæ, qua raro carent Itali, & ex aliorum ſermonibus ſcirem, ipſum eſſe inſigniter doctum, percontatus ſum ex eo, ſi forte vocaretur in aliquam ex ſcholis publicis Veſtræ Celſitudinis, an eſſet conditionem acceptaturus. A qua re cum viderem eum non abhorrere, promiſi ipſi me id Veſtræ Celſitudini indicaturum a qua humiliter peto, ut mihi ſignificare dignetur, quæ ſit ſua in ea re voluntas. Eſt adhuc Juvenis & valde facundus. Intelligit quidem impoſturas Religionis Pontificiæ, ſed in puriore Religione nondum eſt ſatis inſtitutus, quare cupit venire ad ea loca ubi poſſit inſtitui* (2). If Naudæus had known any thing of this letter of Languetus, he would have found no fault with the account of Riccobon (3), but would have owned that our Niphus ſucceeded Curtius in the year 1575. Languetus's calling the Niphus he was ſpeaking of Marcus Antonius, ought to be no pretence for imagining that he was any other than the Fabius Niphus of this article. The argument which Naudæus founds upon Niphus's complaining while he was at Paris in 1569, of the dangers to which he had been expoſed (4) is of no weight: for it is not at all neceſſary to refer this, as Naudæus does, to his being impriſoned in Padua (5); he was a man who met with troubles where-ever he went, and without doubt his evil genius had croſſed him in ſome thing or other before he retired into France. We muſt remember that, according to Languetus, he had taught Philoſophy before he was promoted to the Profeſſorſhip in Phyſic at Padua.

By the way I ſhall take notice of another miſtake of Naudæus. He ſays (6), that Niphus had retired into France, upon the ſame account that Peter Martyr had retired into England, and Simeo Simonius into Germany. It is certain that Peter Martyr took refuge in Switzerland, and ſettled at Straſburg, and did not go into England, till ſome years afterwards by accident, that is, upon his being invited thither to aſſiſt in the new Reformation under the reign of Edward VI. And as to what relates to Simonius, I am very well aſſured that he did not make choice of Germany for his firſt retreat. He was profeſſor at Geneva, before he exerciſed that office at Heidelberg. See his article.

[C] *He was very unfortunate in England, and . . . met alſo with misfortunes in Holland.*] It is Gabriel Naudæus, who informs me of this: I have not the book from whence he takes it. 'In *Angliam* & demum in *Ollandiam* trajecit; cum tamen utrobique, reflantibus fortunæ ventis agitatus, non aliter quam ſi quartâ Lunâ natus fuiſſet, quacumque tandem ſe reciperet, illic etiam gravi ſemper aliquo infortunio mactaretur, ſic enim ille in præfatione Ophini ſui ad conſociatarum Belgii provinciarum Ordines: *Equidem cum in Angliam nullo meo crimine, ſed nefario quorundam ſcelere, magna calamitate oppreſſus eſſem, ejuſque calamitatis reliquiæ, quaſi procellæ ad vos me detuliſſent, ecce veſtræ virtutis, & humanitatis non inanis ſpes effulſit.* Ac paulò poſt, *Cumque injuſte in mearum rerum, quaſi in fractarum navium reliquias, nonnulli impetum feciſſent, Senatus veſtris auſpiciis conſtitutus, ſingulari virtute obſtitit, meque in integrum, quantum in eo erit, reſtitutum iri, non inanem mihi ſpem oſtentavit* (7). - - - *He paſſed over into England and afterwards into Holland, in both which places he was ſo ruffled by the ſtorms of fortune, as if he had been born under ſuch an unlucky planet, that wherever he ſhould go, he muſt meet with misfortunes, for ſo in the preface to his Ophinus he expreſſes himſelf to the States-General of the United Provinces.* Indeed when I found myſelf under great troubles in England, not for any crime of my own, but thro' the wickedneſs of others, the concluſion of which drove me, like a ſort of tempeſt, into your provinces, behold I conceived no ſmall hopes from your goodneſs and humanity. *And a little after*, And when ſome perſons very injuſtly made an attack upon the remain-ſame author [*D*], and has advanced without any proof at all (*c*) that Fabius Niphus *taught ſome time at Leyden.*

(a) Naudæus, in Judicio de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 36, 37.

(b) Riccobonus, de Gymnaſio Patavino, *lib. iii, cap. xxxix*, apud Naudæum, ibid.

(1) Apud Naudæum, in Jud. de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 37.

(2) Languetus, Epiſt. lxvii, ad Elect. Auguſt. *Part ii, pag.* 166.

(3) Naudæus, ubi ſupra.

(4) See the preceding remark.

(5) Ipſe . . . tam expreſſe calamitates ſuas enumerat, ut dubitari non poſſit, quin de Patavinis intelligendæ ſint. *Naudæus, ubi ſupra.*

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid.

(*c*) That is, without having read it in *Naudæus.*

‘ der of my fortunes, as a ſort of ſhipwreck, your ‘ ſenate with ſingular goodneſs has interpoſed, and ‘ given me great expectation of being fully relieved, as ‘ far as their power ſhall extend.’ Naudæus ſuppoſes that the *Ophinus ſeu de cœleſti animarum progenie Dialogus* (8) was not printed at Leyden till 1617. Yet the Oxford Catalogue takes notice of it as printed at Leyden in 1599 in 4to.

(8) It is *Divinatio* in the *Oxford Catalogue.*

[*D*] *Moreri . . . has copied ſome miſtakes of Naudæus.*] He has ſaid, I. that Niphus profeſſor in Phyſic at Padua, being expelled from thence came to Paris, and went into England. II. That the work intituled *Ophinum*, he ſhould have ſaid *Ophinus* (9) was not publiſhed till 1617. Note, that the author there calls himſelf *Fabius à Nipho.*

(9) Mr *Konig* ought to have given it the ſame title, and not ſaid that *Elucubravit Ophnium*, he compoſed a piece called *Ophnium.*

NONIUS (*a*) (PETER), in Spaniſh *Nunnes*, a learned Portugueſe, and one of the greateſt Mathematicians of the XVIth century, was born at Alcaçar [*A*]. He was præceptor to Don Henry (*b*) ſon of king Emanuel, and taught the Mathematics in the univerſity of Conimbra (*c*). He publiſhed ſome pieces which procured him a great reputation [*B*]. He ſet the greateſt value on his treatiſe of Algebra, which he had compoſed in Portugueſe, but tranſlated it into Caſtillan, when he was reſolved upon making it public (*d*); for he conſidered that the Caſtillan language was more generally known than the Portugueſe, and that conſequently his book would be of leſs uſe if he ſhould leave it in its original form. He dedicated it to his former pupil prince Henry the cardinal infant. His epiſtle dedicatory is dated from Liſbon the firſt of December 1564. He was then principal *Coſmographer to the king of Portugal, and mathematical profeſſor in the univerſity of Coymbra.* This work is intituled *Libro de Algebra en Arithmetica y Geometria*, and contains 341 pages in the edition of Antwerp 1567 in 8vo. Nonius died in 1577 at eighty years of age, and left only one daughter (*e*). I have no where read except in Thuanus, that he was a Phyſician by profeſſion.

(*a*) And not *Nonnius*, as in *Moreri*; or *Nonnus* as in Mr *Teiſſier.*

(*b*) Who was a cardinal, and reigned after the death of Don Sebaſtian.

(*c*) Thuanus, *lib. xliv, pag. m.* 204.

(*d*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of that book.

(*e*) Thuanus, *lib. lxiv, pag.* 204.

[*A*] *He was born at Alcaçar.*] Thuanus ſays that Alcaçar is a village, *Vicus* (1). Mr Baudrand (2) gives it the title of *Pagus*; but Reſendius, a Portugueſe author, calls it a town, tho' he owns it no otherwiſe conſiderable than for being the native place of Nonius. *Salacia eſt*, ſays he (3), *quæ à Saracenis nomine mutato, nunc* Alcaſſar Salis (4) *vocatur, urbs noſtro tempore non admodum clara, niſi civem haberet* Petrum Nonium *Mathematicum cumprimis nobilem.* The antient name of this place was *Salacia* (5), and it was formerly a town of note: it is mentioned by Pomponius Mela and Pliny. Joachim Vadianus has not rightly underſtood what they ſay of it. Reſendius proves him guilty of a very groſs blunder (6).

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſome pieces which procured him a great reputation.*] His book *De arte navigandi* was received ſo much the more favourably, as it ſerved the grand deſigns projected at the court of the king, his maſter, to carry on the maritime expeditions into the Eaſt (7). Furetiere's Dictionary (8) remarks, that Peter Nonius was *the firſt who in* 1530, *invented the angles of forty five degrees made with each meridian, and* which *he calls* rhumbs *in his language*, and which *he calculates by ſpherical triangles.* Simon Stevinus (9) has ſhewn that Nonius, whom he acknowledges on other accounts to be ſcarce inferior to the very greateſt Mathematicians, is ſometimes miſtaken in his calculation of Loxodromics. This learned Portugueſe has explained a great many problems, and particularly the mechanical problem of Ariſtotle on the motion of veſſels by oars (10). His notes, *in Theoricas Planetarum Purbachii*, upon Purbachius's Theory of the Planets, are very much to be eſteemed; for he there explains ſeveral things which had either not been taken notice of, or not been rightly underſtood (11). He publiſhed in 1542 a treatiſe *de Crepuſculis*, on the Twilight, which he dedicated to John III, king of Portugal, and added to it what Alhazen an Arabic author had compoſed on the ſame ſubject. We muſt not forget that he corrected ſeveral mathematical miſtakes of Orontius Finæus.

This is the judgment of Father Dechales: ‘ In the ‘ year 1530, Petrus Nonius, a celebrated Portugueſe ‘ Mathematician, upon occaſion of ſome doubts pro‘ poſed to him by Mortinus Alphonſus Soſa, wrote a ‘ treatiſe of Navigation, divided into two books. In ‘ the firſt, he anſwers ſome of theſe doubts; for exam‘ ple, whence it happens that the ſun being in the e‘ quator, riſes in the eaſtern rhumb, according to ‘ which however if we ſteer the ſhip, we ſhall never ‘ arrive at this circle, but deſcribe a parallel; and in ‘ his anſwer, he explains the nature of Loxodromic ‘ lines. In the ſecond book, he treats of rules and ‘ inſtruments proper for Navigation, particularly ſea‘ charts, and inſtruments which ſerve to find the ele‘ vation of the pole. Obſcurity is the character of this ‘ author: which makes him of little uſe to his rea‘ ders (12).

(1) Thuanus, *lib. lxiv, pag. m.* 204.

(2) In Lexico Geograph. Voce Salacia.

(3) Reſendius, Commentar. in Vincentium, *pag.* 78, *Tom. ii*, Operum.

(4) *Vulgarly* Alcaçar de Sal.

(5) This ſhews why Petrus Nonius is ſirnamed *Salacienſis.*

(6) Reſend. ubi ſupra.

(7) *See* Andrew Schot, Biblioth. Hiſpan. *pag.* 477.

(8) *At the word* Loxodromies.

(9) In Appendice Loxodromiarum, apud Voſſium de Scient. Mathem. *pag. m.* 300.

(10) Schottus, ubi ſupra. Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 299.

(11) Id. ib. *pag.* 191.

(12) Claudius Francis Millet Dechales, *Preface to his* Art of Navigation.

NORADIN, the ſon of Sanguin, Sultan of Aleppo and of Nineveh [*A*], ſurpaſſed his father in every thing, though he had been the beſt accompliſhed and moſt puiſſant prince among the Turks in his time (*a*). Sanguin being killed by ſome of his eunuchs, while he laid ſiege to Cologembar upon the Euphrates, in 1143 (*b*), Noradin divided his paternal inheritance with his brother (*c*); by virtue of which diviſion he became Sultan of Aleppo, and in a little time one of the moſt powerful princes in all Aſia. He had nothing of the Turk or Barbarian, but the name; and was poſſeſſed of all the qualities of a great general. He was equally prudent, bold, and ſucceſsful; the moſt vigilant man in the world, and the readieſt to lay hold of all opportunities that might offer for putting in execution a brave action. He was not deſtitute of the qualities of a man of honour: he had a great ſhare of probity and even piety in the way of his falſe religion. One of his firſt exploits was the defeat of Joſſelin de Courtenai, count of Edeſſa, whoſe troops he ſo routed, that Joſſelin had much ado to eſcape to Samoſata where he arrived almoſt all alone. The greateſt part of his territories fell under the ſovereignty of Noradin, who afterwards made a great many other conqueſts, when the Cruſade, to which St Bernard had predicted ſo much ſucceſs, miſcarried in a diſmal manner in the ſiege of Damaſcus, anno 1148,

(*a*) Towards the middle of the XIIth century.

(*b*) And not in 1145, as *Maimbourg* has it, *Tom. i*, of the *Cruſades, pag.* 305, Dutch Edition.

(*c*) He was the elder brother, and his name was *Cotebedein.*

[*A*] *Sultan of Aleppo and of Nineveh.*] But not of Egypt, as Mr Huber has affirmed (1). Mr Perizonius has taken notice of this fault (2).

(1) Hiſtor. Civilis, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 475.

(2) Perizonius, in Specimine Errorum, *pag.* 129.

[*B*] *Syra-*

1148, and returned with the greateſt diſgrace to Europe. Noradin knew very well how to improve ſo favourable an opportunity. He invaded the principality of Antioch with a powerful army; gained a victory over prince Raimond, who was killed there; made himſelf maſter of the fortreſs of Harenc, and moſt of the other places of that principality; took the count of Edeſſa above-mentioned in an ambuſcade, and put him to death in irons at Aleppo; diſlodged the Greeks from that whole country, into whoſe hands the counteſs, and Baudouin king of Jeruſalem, had reſigned it, in order for them to protect it; and conquered the city and territory of Damaſcus. Baudouin made a very vigorous oppoſition to ſtop this conqueror's progreſs, and even defeated him more than once; and that in ſuch a manner as to make him admired by his enemy: for we are aſſured, that when Baudouin was poiſoned by his Phyſician at thirty-two years of age (*d*), Noradin would never take advantage of the conſternation raiſed all over his kingdom by his death, but ſaid with equal modeſty and greatneſs of ſoul, that *it behoved him to condole with them, and bear a ſhare in ſo juſt a mourning, ſince they lamented the death of a prince who had not left his equal in the world.* Some time after he made himſelf maſter of the city of Paneas. In a word, he poſſeſſed almoſt all Syria and Meſopotamia, and extended his conqueſts even beyond Cilicia to the ſtates of the Sultan of Iconium, whom he had defeated in battle. Fortune preſented to him a fair opportunity of carrying his arms into Egypt, when Sanar, Sultan of that kingdom, being diſpoſſeſſed by Dorgan, applied to him for protection. Accordingly he ſent into Egypt a numerous army, under the command of Syracon, general of his forces [*B*]. Amauri, king of Jeruſalem, very indiſcreetly [*C*] aſſiſted Dorgan, who had promiſed him a large tribute. Syracon, amidſt many viciſſitudes, was obliged to quit Egypt twice, but at laſt carried it, after having cauſed Sanar to be aſſaſſinated, and got himſelf to be made Sultan in his room, by the calif of Grand Cairo. Noradin, whoſe creature he was, ſuffered all this. This new Sultan died that ſame year [*D*], leaving for his ſucceſſor the great Saladin his nephew [*E*]. Noradin died likewiſe in 1173. His widow married Saladin, and his ſon was diſpoſſeſſed of his dominions by the ſame Saladin (*e*).

(*d*) In 1163.

(*e*) *Guill. Tyrius, & alii, apud* Maimbourg, Hiſtory of the Cruſades, *Tom. i, ii.*

[*B*] *Syracon general of his forces.*] Father Maimbourg (3), ſays, he was a little man, and that his merit raiſed him to the higheſt poſt in the kingdom, notwithſtanding the obſcurity of his birth, and his being a ſlave: but Calviſius (4) aſſures us he was Noradin's brother.

[*C*] *Very indiſcreetly.*] I have made uſe of this expreſſion out of reſpect to a great many perſons, who attribute to this the loſs of Jeruſalem. The grounds they go upon, are, that Saladin, who expelled the Chriſtians from thence, found them and the Saracens linked together, by reaſon of the wars that his predeceſſor, Syracon, carried on in Egypt againſt king Amauri. However we muſt not forget that this young prince met with ſuccceſs in the beginning of theſe wars. I find ſome Hiſtorians make him the cauſe of a more preſent evil: for they ſay, his expedition to Egypt occaſioned Noradin's invaſion of Antioch. I mean that invaſion in which Boemond, prince of Antioch, and Raimond count of Tripoli were defeated, and taken priſoners by Noradin. Cluverius puts this invaſion after Syracon's expedition (5), but Calviſius places it 1165, and the expedition in 1168 (6).

[*D*] *Died that ſame year.*] Father Maimbourg places his death in 1168; but Calviſius more juſtly places it in 1170.

[*E*] *His nephew.*] Or rather his grand-ſon; *Nepos ex filio,* as Calviſius aſſures us (7).

(3) Cruſades, *Tom. ii, pag.* 46.

(4) *Ad ann.* 1169.

(5) Jo. Cluverius, Hiſtor. Epitome.

(6) Vide Calviſium, *ad ann.* 1169.

(7) *Ad ann.* 1170.

NULLY (*a*): STEPHEN DE NULLY, firſt preſident of the court of Aids at Paris, was the ſon of CHARLES DE NULLY and of Anne de Paris.

CHARLES DE NULLY was at firſt lay-counſellor to the parliament of Paris, he was admitted there the tenth of October 1541.

The twenty third of July 1543 he was promoted to the office of maſter of requeſts (1) and received the ſame day by the parliament. I have ſeen the extract of his admiſſion. At that time there were but few maſters of requeſt, and thoſe offices were conferred only upon perſons of note.

In the year 1544, he was named Plenipotentiary for king Francis I, at the peace of Creſpy, together with marſhal d'Annebault, and Gilbert Bayard, Sieur de la Fond ſecretary of State and comptroller-general of the wars. Charles de Nully was the ſecond of the three. The treaty was ſigned the eighteenth of September 1544; and the ſame day king Francis I, wrote him a letter under his ſignet, wherein his majeſty commanded him to notify to the parliament the concluſion of the peace.

During the conferences it happened that a Spaniſh Jacobin, of the noble family of the Guſmans, who was plenipotentiary for Charles V, ſpoke too haughtily againſt France: Charles de Nully gave him a box on the ear, and by this action which appeared too violent, he was diſappointed of the office of chancellor which had been deſigned for him, cardinal de Tournon having remonſtrated that ſuch a ſpirit would not be at all agreeable to the head of the law.

In 1547, he was one of the eight maſters of requeſts who aſſiſted at the funeral ceremonies of Francis I.

In 1548, the reſolution he had ſhewn at the treaty of Creſpy, occaſioned his being pitched upon by Henry II, to go and arraign the whole city of Bourdeaux, which had rebelled ſo far as to aſſaſſinate the Sieur de Monneins, one of the king's officers and lieutenant of the province. The conſtable Montmorency went thither with an army, and entered the city by the breach. Two days after Charles de Nully began the proceſs on his part, and pronounced that famous judgment againſt the rebels, by which the city was declared guilty of rebellion, its privileges forfeited, the parliament ſuſpended, the

(*a*) An article communicated by Mr *Marais,* and cited at the end of remark [*C*] of the article PLACE (PETER DE LA.)

(1) He had the office of preſident Oliver.

the bells taken away, the jurates and an hundred burgeſſes condemned to dig up with their nails the body of the Sieur de Monneins, and ſeveral other remaining particulars which may be met with in every Hiſtory.

Here follows what Thuanus ſays of him under the year 1548, Libr. V.

‘ Tertiâ die a *Stephano* Nullio Libellorum ſupplicum Magiſtro de ſeditione quæſtio habita eſt. Is, a Mommorantio in eam rem cum aliis a rege delectis judicibus adductus alioqui magnae authoritatis vir ſed vehemens & iracundus & qui in pacis ad Crepiacum factæ negotio, Dominicano Monacho cujus mutuâ operâ Cæſar & Franciſcus utebantur arrogantius utquidem ipſi videbatur loquenti injurioſe manus intulerit, quo facto ampliſſimâ Cancellarii dignitate quæ ultrò deferebatur indignus habitus eſt, monente Turnonio nequaquam ſummo Magiſtratui impotens & violentum ingenium convenire. - - - - *On the third day began the proceſs for ſedition, before Stephen Nully, maſter of requeſts. He was brought thither for that purpoſe by Montmorency with other judges appointed by the king; and was, in other reſpects, a perſon of great merit, but warm and paſſionate, and who during the treaty of peace at Creſpy, by ſtriking a Dominican Monk, employed both by the emperor and king Francis, for ſpeaking as he thought too arrogantly, had been judged unworthy of the high dignity of Chancellor, which before that accident was deſigned for him without being aſked, cardinal de Tournon having intimated that ſo haſty and violent a diſpoſition would by no means become a chief magiſtrate.*’

Thuanus, and, after him, Mezerai, have been miſtaken in calling him Stephen inſtead of Charles. They both of them agree that he who went to Bourdeaux was at the treaty of Creſpy: now it was Charles de Nully moſt certainly who was plenipotentiary at that peace, and beſides there never was a Stephen de Nully maſter of requeſts, except the preſident who was not ſo till 1571.

Blanchard, in his book of maſter of requeſts p. 278, calls him Charles. He dates his admiſſion on the twenty-third of July 1543; but he makes another miſtake, for he calls him Milly inſtead of Nully, in which it was eaſy for him to be deceived by the joining and the number of letters. Nor did this miſtake come afterwards from him; for in the editions of the treaty of Creſpy, I have ſeen Milly put inſtead of Nully, and it was certainly Nully who was at that treaty on the part of Francis I, as Thuanus and Mezerai both agree, and as it is yet more evident from the king's letter under his ſignet which I have ſeen in the original.

The twenty-third of October 1549, Charles de Nully died: he was interred in the church of the Holy Innocents, and by an extract from the parliament regiſter it appears that his relations deſired the court to be preſent at his funeral, and that their petition was granted.

He left his widow, Anne de Paris, in poſſeſſion of the eſtate of Neuilly upon Marne, three leagues from Paris, and this eſtate afterwards deſcended to the preſident de Nully, his ſon, as being his mother's jointure: there is nothing to be met with concerning the birth of the preſident, and there is no other proof beſides this circumſtance of the jointure, that he was the ſon of Charles.

The preſident was named STEPHEN: he was firſt counſellor in the parliament of Bretagne, his commiſſion is dated the twelfth of April 1559.

Afterwards he was attorney to the king in the chaſtelet of Paris, and provoſt of the merchants in that city.

In 1569, king Charles IX having removed all the officers of the Proteſtant religion, Mr de la Place, firſt preſident of the court of Aids, was turned out of his place, and Mr de Nully put in his room and admitted the laſt day of February 1569.

In 1571, Mr de la Place was reſtored by the Edict of Pacification; and to make Mr de Nully amends, the king gave him the place of maſter of requeſts: the commiſſion is dated the ſeventeenth of April 1571.

In 1572 happened the maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day. Mr de la Place was murthered, and Mr de Nully entred a ſecond time on the poſt of firſt preſident of the court of Aids: the ſecond commiſſion was dated the ſecond of September 1572, eight days after St Bartholomew's day.

The league was formed: the preſident de Nully was one the the moſt violent leaguers. He was preſent among the eſtates of Blois in 1588. The cardinal and duke of Guiſe were there aſſaſſinated: the preſident de Nully was arreſted, and conducted to Amboiſe, from whence he was delivered by paying a thouſand crowns ranſom which he borrowed.

After the death of Henry III, the preſident de Nully continued always firſt preſident of the court of Aids. The duke de Mayenne made him ſecond preſident *à Mortier* at the erection of his parliament by virtue of letters patents, whereof I have ſent a copy (2). But he gave him letters of diſpenſation for the holding thoſe two offices together: ſome of them were dated the ſeventh of December 1593, and others in preceding years.

The duke de Mayenne made him alſo library-keeper to the king, after the death of Mr Amiot grand Almoner and biſhop of Auxerre.

It is to be obſerved, that he took alſo the title of counſellor of ſtate, and that his warrant for it had been given him by Henry III.

(2) This copy may be ſeen above, remark [2] of the article of the third duke of GUISE.

In 1594 Paris was reduced, but we do not find that he continued to exerciſe his office of firſt preſident, nor do we know when he quitted it. He was ſtill living in 1606; for he was preſent at the marriage of his ſon James de Nully, Eſq; lord of Neuilly, in the ſame year.

From **JAMES DE NULLY** deſcended **PETER DE NULLY**, Eſq; lord of Neuilly, who married Dame Mary le Bert.

And from this Peter de Nully iſſued another Peter de Nully now living, who, upon his being proſecuted in the Heralds-office, proved all theſe titles of dignity to belong to his family, and was ſupported in his claim of Nobility with honour and diſtinction.

The family of de Nully bears Gules a croſs flower-de-luce or cantoned between four billets or alſo, with two ſwans for ſupporters. Theſe arms may be ſeen in the arched roof of the church of St John en Greve where ſome of their anceſtors have been interred.

The ſame arms are alſo to be met with on the tomb of Foulques curate of Neuilly upon the Marne, that great man mentioned in every chronicle, who in the XIIth century having preached the Croiſade under the orders of St Bernard, and of Pope Innocent III, returned to die in his cure (3). He is buried in the church of Neuilly, and on his tomb, which is a work of that age, are engraved the arms of Nully, probably becauſe ſome perſon of that family had attended him in that holy expedition, and that they were then in poſſeſſion of that lordſhip.

(3) Geoffroy de Ville Hardouin, publiſhed by Mr du Cange.

NUMANTINA, wife of Plautius Silvanus whom I mention elſewhere (*a*), was accuſed of having occaſioned her huſband's diſtraction by Divinations, or Witchcraft [*A*], but declared innocent. She lived under the emperor Tiberius, and had been divorced by her huſband.

(*a*) In the article **URGULANIA.**

[*A*] *She was accuſed of having occaſioned her huſband's diſtraction by Divinations and Witchcraft.*] This is the true ſenſe of the words of Tacitus: *Mox Numantina prior uxor ejus accuſata injeciſſe carminibus & veneficiis vecordiam marito, inſons judicatur* (1). A French Phyſician (2) has quite miſunderſtood it; for he pretends that Numantina *was accuſed of having rendered her huſband impotent and bewitched, by the ſole pronouncing of ſome words*, and he proves from this example the vulgar notion, that there are *certain words* which prevent *a man's enjoying a woman. . . . . Daily experience*, adds he, *of thoſe who are codpiece tied*, confirms this. Since he would cite Tacitus, he ought to have examined him with a little more attention.

(1) Tacit. Annal. *lib. iv, cap. xxii, ad ann.* 777.

(2) John de Renou, *lib. i, of his* Inſtitutions Pharmaceutiques, *cap. xiii, pag.* 23, Edition of Lyons 1637.

* * *

N. B. A tranſpoſition of certain monoſyllables, occaſioned by an accident, having perplexed the ſenſe of a paſſage in the 198th page of this volume, at line the ſixth from the top of the ſecond column, the reader is deſired to correct it after the following manner, *viz.*

I came to Paris the ſame year, where *I was alſo admitted advocate, and where I pleaded for ſeveral years. In* 1634, *the parliament of Paris* held *their extraordinary ſeſſions at Poitiers, where I pleaded alſo. And this made Mr Coſtar ſay, that as there* were *ſerjeants ſerving warrants through all the kingdom,* &c.

O.

OBSEQUENS (Julius) a Latin writer, whoſe country is unknown, as well as the age he lived in. It is only conjectured that he lived ſome time before the reign of Honorius. Scaliger inſinuates (*a*) that he lived before the time, in which St Jerome, compoſed his ſupplements to Euſebius's Chronicon (*b*). Friſius is groſsly miſtaken [*A*]. We are no leſs at a loſs as to the religion of Obſequens; but the fragments we have remaining of his Collection of Prodigies ought to perſwade as that he was a Heathen. This work was chiefly a liſt of the prodigies inſerted by Livy in his Hiſtory [*B*]. What we have left of it begins with the conſulſhip of Lucius Scipio and Caïus Lælius, that is, about the year of Rome 561 [*C*]: we have ſeveral editions of it [*D*]. Lycoſthenes has endeavoured to ſupply what is loſt of the original. Mr Moreri's quotation is wretched [*E*].

[*A*] *Friſius is groſsly miſtaken* (1).] He has ſaid, that this Obſequens lived in the time of Panetius and Polybius, 240 years before Christ. This cannot be, ſince Obſequens makes mention of Auguſtus.

[*B*] *His work was . . . . a liſt of the prodigies inſerted by Livy in his Hiſtory.*] This we are convinced of by two reaſons. 1. This collection ends at the 743d year of Rome, as Livy's Decades do. 2. The author frequently makes uſe of the ſame terms with that Hiſtorian.

[*C*] *That is, about the year of Rome* 561.] Some authors place this conſulate in that year, others in 563. No body would dare to fix it in 505, and yet Beatus Rhenanus has ſaid in the title of his book, that what we have of Obſequens begins with the year of Rome 505. Balthaſar Bonifacius has copied after him the ſame error (2). The learned Schefferus was not ignorant that theſe two authors had ſaid this (3), and yet he does not cenſure them at all, nor give the leaſt notice of their miſtake. We likewiſe meet with it in the Epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheca.

[*D*] *We have ſeveral editions of it.*] Theſe are the editions mentioned by Schefferus (4). Aldus Manutius was the firſt who publiſhed this work; he printed it at Venice in 1508 (5). Beatus Rhenanus reprinted it ſix years after at Straſburg, with ſome other tracts. Aſulanus, father-in-law to Aldus Manutius, publiſhed a new edition of it in 1518. Some time after Robert Stephens publiſhed another at Paris. John Oporin printed it at Baſil in 1552, with the Supplements of Lycoſthenes, who was then corrector and director of Oporin's Printing-houſe (6). Care was taking to diſtinguiſh by aſteriſks what was added by Lycoſthenes. The following year John de Tournes, Printer at Lyons, copied this edition of Oporin's, and carefully obſerved all the aſteriſks. But ſince Voſſius (7) ſpeaks of an edition by John de Tournes, where Lycoſthenes's additions were confounded with the work of Obſequens, without any mark of diſtinction, there is room to believe that this Printer was more careleſs in an after edition. This careleſſneſs has been the occaſion of great miſtakes. The phraſes of Lycoſthenes have been cited as of an antient author; his authority has been alledged as that of an antient writer (8). This diſorder is remedied in Mr Schefferus's edition (9); in which, what belongs properly to Obſequens is printed in a Roman letter, and Lycoſthenes's Supplements in Italic. We ſhall give an inſtance of theſe miſtakes: Alexander ab Alexandro affirms, that when Tarquin was expelled Rome, a dog ſpoke, and a ſerpent barked (10). Tiraquellus who has diſcovered the originals from whence this author had made his extracts, obſerves, that Livy ſaid no more, than that a ſerpent fell from a wooden ſtatue (11). Julius Obſequens, adds he, relates the ſame prodigy, and has all that Alexander ab Alexandro has ſaid upon this head. But it is Lycoſthenes, and not Alexander ab Alexandro that ſays a dog ſpoke and a ſerpent barked. Doubtleſs he took this prodigy from Alexander ab Alexandro; and thus by a ſtrange reciprocation the copier is made uſe of as a proof for the original. Is not this what the ſchools call *mutua cauſalitas? - - - - where two things are made the cauſes of each other.*

[*E*] *Mr Moreri's quotation upon this head is a very ſorry one.*] He cites *Sebaſtian, Conrad.* in Quæſt. p. 41. This would make one believe that there are two authors, one of whom is called Sebaſtian, and the other Conrad, who will furniſh us with a great many particulars relating to Julius Obſequens, if we do but take the pains to conſult them. But theſe authors are not yet born. If he had cited Sebaſtian Corradus, he had ſtill led us into an error; for that author gives us only the bare name of Obſequens. He cannot be quoted for any other end than to ſhew us, that he was of the opinion, that Oroſius lived before Obſequens. This is the only uſe that Voſſius makes of the citation of Corradus (12).

(*a*) Scalig. Animadv. in Euſeb. *num.* 1886, *pag. m.* 147.

(*b*) He compoſed them in the reign of Valens the emperor: now Valens died in 379.

(1) Joh. Jacobus Friſius, in ſua Bibliotheca apud Schefferum, in Præfat. in Jul. Obſequentem.

(2) Balth. Bonifac. de Script. Hiſt. Rom. *Note, that Zeiller in* Hiſtoricis, *Part i, pag.* 55, *in quoting him, puts* 55 *inſtead of* 505.

(3) See what he ſays after his preface, and the firſt of his remarks.

(4) In the preface to his edition.

(5) From the manuſcript that Jocundus of Verona had given him.

(6) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latinis, *pag.* 711.

(7) Id. ib.

(8) See Voſſius, ibid.

(9) At Amſterdam 1679, in 8vo.

(10) Satis conſtat . . . canem loquutum fuiſſe, ſerpentemque latraſſe. *Alex. ab Alexandro, Genial. Dier. lib. iii, cap. xv, pag. m.* 733.

(11) Tiraquellus, Not. in hunc locum Alex. ab Alexandro.

(12) Sebaſtianus Corradus, in quæſtura ſua, *pag.* 41. Videtur in alia fuiſſe ſententia (*quàm quæ ſtatuit antiquiorem Obſequentem Oroſio*) quia utrumque nominans Oroſium præmittit. *Voſſius, ubi ſupra.*

OCHINUS (Bernardin) was one of the Eccleſiaſtics of Italy who fled their country in the XVIth century, in order to embrace the Proteſtant religion. He was of Sienna. He had been firſt a Franciſcan, and then a Capuchin (*a*). He continued in the order of Capuchins from 1534 to 1542 (*b*). They who ſay he was the founder of the order, or one of the four who firſt engaged in it, are miſtaken [*A*]; but it is true that he was elected general of the order. I do not believe he was the Pope's confeſſor (*c*), as ſome have affirmed. He obſerved the rules

[*A*] *They who ſay he was the founder* of the order of the Capuchins . . . *are miſtaken.*] Zachary Boverius proves it by authorities and arguments (1). Among other things, he ſays it is certain the order of the Capuchins commenced in 1525, and above three hundred perſons had embraced it before Ochinus entered into it in 1534. Mr Varillas (2) makes uſe of theſe reaſons to confute the biſhop of Amelia (3) who affirms the ſame thing with Theodore Beza (4) that Ochinus was the founder of that order. You have this paſſage of Mr Varillas in the Supplement to Moreri.

(*a*) Spond. *ad ann.* 1547, *num.* 22.

(*b*) Id. *ad ann.* 1525, *num.* 27.

(*c*) See the remark [*D*] towards the end.

(1) In his Annals of the Capuchins, *apud Spondan. ad ann.* 1525, *num.* 27.

(2) Hiſt. of Hereſy, *book xvii, pag.* 59, *Dutch Edit.*

(3) *Antonius Maria Gratiani,* Hiſtory of cardinal Commendon, *lib. ii, cap. ix.*

(4) Bernardinus ille Ochinus maximi prius in Italia nominis monachus, & Capucinorum (quos vocant) Ordinis auctor. *Beza, in Iconibus, in Petro Martyre.*

[*B*] *He*

rules of his order with wonderful auſterity [*B*], and preached with incomparable zeal [*C*]; and probably he thought of nothing leſs than quitting his habit and his church, when the converſation of a Spaniſh Civilian (*d*), who had taken a liking to Luther's doctrine in Germany, raiſed ſome doubts in his mind. It was at Naples that he converſed with this Civilian, and began to preach up doctrines which appeared very new [*D*]. He became ſuſpected, and was ſummoned before the court of Rome (*e*). He ſet out upon his journey thither, but at Florence he met with his good friend, Peter Martyr [*E*], to whom he communicated the advices he had received of the danger he ſhould incur by ſurrendring himſelf to the diſcretion of the Pope. After a mature examination of the matter, they both reſolved to retire to a place of ſafety. Ochinus ſet out firſt, and took the road to Geneva; two days after Martyr began his journey and went for Switzerland (*f*). A continuator of Baronius aſſures us, that Ochinus carried along with him a woman who followed him to Geneva, and that he married her publickly in order to give an authentic proof of his renunciation of Popery (*g*). But if we were to judge of this fact, by ſome others related by

[*B*] *He obſerved the rules of his order with wonderful auſterity.*] The biſhop of Amelia in the chapter above cited of the Hiſtory of cardinal Commendon, obſerves, that Ochinus was reſpected as a ſaint, and practiſed very exactly the externals of mortifications. *His age,* ſays he, *his auſtere way of life, his rough Capuchin habit, his beard that hung down below his breaſt, his grey hair, his pale meagre countenance, a certain appearance of infirmity and weakneſs that was very artfully affected, and a general opinion of his ſanctity, occaſioned his being looked upon as an extraordinary man .... Not only the common people, but great lords and ſovereign princes reverenced him as a ſaint. When he came to their houſes, they met him and received him with all the honour and affection imaginable; and at his departure re-conducted him in like manner. For his own part, he made uſe of all the artifices poſſible to confirm them in their good opinion of him. In his travels he always walked on foot; and, though he was infirm both as to years and conſtitution, he was never ſeen on horſeback. When princes forced him to lodge with them, the magnificence of palaces, the Luxury of dreſs, and all the pomp of the age, could never make him abate of his poverty, nor of the auſterity of his profeſſion. At feaſts he never eat but of one diſh, and that always the ſimpleſt and moſt common, and ſcarce ever taſted of wine. He was frequently preſſed to lie in ſoft and rich beds, for the more convenient refreſhing of himſelf after the fatigue of his travels; but he would only ſpread his cloak, and lay himſelf down upon the ground. The reputation he acquired, and the honour and reſpect he met with through all Italy, are incredible.*

[*C*] *He preached with incomparable zeal.*] Let us once more hear the biſhop of Amelia. *We may juſtly ſay* (5) *he had ſome knowledge; but he applied himſelf more to eloquence and the beauty of words, than to learning and the force of reaſoning. He underſtood little of Latin; but when he ſpoke in his mother-tongue, he explained himſelf, with ſo much grace, politeneſs, and fluency, that the ſoftneſs and purity of his diſcourſes raviſhed all his hearers. When he was to preach any where* (it is the biſhop of Amelia who ſtill ſpeaks) *the people flocked thither; whole cities came to hear him: there was no church large enough to contain the multitude. The women were generally more numerous than the men. When he was to paſs through any city, an infinite number of people went to meet him, and receive his inſtructions.* Bzovius has comprehended a great encomium in few words: ‘In tanta tum erat exiſtimatione *(Ochinus)* ut unus optimus totius Italiæ concionator haberetur, ut qui admirabili quadam cum actione, tum linguæ facundia auditorum animos quocunque vellet raperent, ac tanto magis quod vita doctrinæ reſonaret (6). - - - - - - *Ochinus was at that time in ſo great eſteem, as to be reputed the very beſt preacher in all Italy, being able to affect the minds of his auditors juſt as he pleaſed, with his admirable action and eloquence, and ſo much the more as his life was agreeable to his doctrine.*’

[*D*] *It was at Naples ...... that he began to preach up doctrines which appeared very new.*] Tomaſo Coſto (7), who wrote the Hiſtory of the troubles in Naples, occaſioned by attempting to erect the Tribunal of the Inquiſition in that kingdom, pretends that Ochinus's ſermons had ſown the ſeeds of theſe commotions (8). The biſhop of Amelia does not ſay, that this Capuchin was perverted by any heretic who came from Germany, John Valdes for inſtance; he will have it that vanity ruined him, and that the mortification of not being promoted to a cardinal's cap, moved him to *drop very artfully ſome words and ſentiments in his ſermons, that tended to run down or leſſen the authority of the holy See* (9). Bzovius ſays in general that Ochinus let fall ſome grating expreſſions in a ſermon, *quod pro concione quadam ſecus dicta effudiſſet* (10); and the comment that has been made upon his words is this. They pretend that on Palm-Sunday he preached before the Pope, and cenſured his pride and pomp in a very lively manner by making a parallel between JESUS CHRIST and him. They add, that when the ſermon was over, one of the cardinals gave Ochinus notice of the Pope's reſentment, and adviſed him to fly immediately. *Nimirum (prout alii ſcripto conſignarunt) quod in dominica palmarum faſtum Papæ Romani in ipſius præſentia ex ſuggeſtu acriter perſtrinxerit (facta comparatione Domini Jeſu in pauperi ſtatu Hieroſolymam ingredientis) & Pontificum Romanorum vitam. Qua concione finita unus Cardinalium Papam offenſum eſſe ipſi ſignificat, atque ut protinus præſenti periculo fuga ſeſe eripiat ſuadet* (11). Some ſay he propoſed his cenſures of the pride and pomp of the papal court, only as objections ſtarted by the Heretics; but that having ſpent the whole time of his ſermon in ſtating them, he concluded without confuting them. The author to whom I owe this remark tells us, that Ochinus was the Pope's confeſſor and preacher. *Fuit is patria Senenſis, conditione monachus, & Pontifici Rom. à ſacris concionibus & confeſſionibus. Is ob parrheſiam qua motus in auribus ſummi Pontificis & totius Aulæ Romanæ Pontificiam arrogantiam & tyrannidem antichriſtianam, velut ex mente Lutheranorum, non addita objectionum, poſtquam eis ſtudio præſtitutam horam impendit, ſolutione, Italia cedere ..... neceſſe habuit* (12). I relate theſe ſeveral things without pretending to warrant them to be true; for inſtance, I have read in the great work of the learned Mr Seckendorf (13), that there were printed in Germany twenty ſermons which Ochinus had preached in his monk's habit; in which he came very little ſhort of the pure doctrine of the Proteſtants, upon juſtification, good works, confeſſion, ſatisfaction, indulgences, purgatory, and other points. One doubt remains, namely, whether theſe ſermons were printed in Germany, exactly as they were preached in Italy. But be that as it will, they were printed at Newburg in 4to in 1545, being tranſlated into Latin by Joſeph Hochſteter.

[*E*] *At Florence he met with Peter Martyr, his good friend.*] I believe it muſt be ſo; for nothing could tempt Peter Martyr to give a falſe account of the circumſtance of the place. He has therefore given us a faithful relation of it in the Memoirs from which his life has been written. And for that reaſon Joſias Simler, who compiled that life, is more to be credited than the biſhop of Amelia, who tells us, 1, That Ochinus was at Verona *when the Pope's orders were ſignified to him.* 2. That Matthew Giberti biſhop of Verona adviſed him to go and juſtify himſelf. 3. That Ochinus, who complied with his advice with ſome reluctancy, *advanced as far as Bologna where cardinal Gaſpar Contarini was at that time legate.* 4. That this legate being ſo ill, that he could not adviſe with him upon his affairs, Ochinus reſolved to betake himſelf to

---

(*d*) His name was *Johannes Valdeſius.*

(*e*) Spond. ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Joſias Simler, in Vita Petri Martyris, apud Melch. Adam. *pag.* 36.

(*g*) Spondan. ubi ſupra.

(5) Mr Varillas, in his Hiſtory of Hereſy, *book xvii, pag.* 59, 60, has paraphraſed this and the preceding paſſage with his uſual liberty.

(6) Bzovius, *ad ann.* 1542, *num.* 34.

(7) Supplem. ad Mambrin. *lib. iv*, apud Spondanum, *ad ann.* 1547, *num.* 22.

(8) Eos ſeminatis ab impio Ochino dum ante aliquot annos publice concionaretur in Eccleſia Metropolitana falſis dogmatibus attribuat, quibus à mentibus & linguis hominum iis infectorum reſecandis, Prorex Inquiſitionis remedium afferre voluerit. *Spond. ibid.*

(9) Ant. Maria Gratiani, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 205, *according to Mr* Flechier's *tranſlation, printed at Paris in* 12*mo.*

(10) *Ad ann.* 1542, *num.* 34, *apud* Bibliothec. Anti-Trinitariorum, *pag.* 3.

(11) Id. ib.

(12) Staniſlaus Lubieniecius, Hiſt. Reformat. Polonicæ, *lib. ii, cap. v, pag. m.* 110. *See likewiſe the* Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum, *pag.* 2.

(13) In Hiſt. Lutheran. Supplem. Indicis I.

by the ſame author, we ſhould not believe that he made uſe of good authorities [*F*]. Ochinus's flight made the Pope extremely uneaſy [*G*]. Ochinus did not fix at Geneva, but went to Augſburg, where he publiſhed ſome ſermons. He and Peter Martyr made a voyage to England in 1547 (*b*). Cranmer archbiſhop of Canterbury had invited them both, when, upon the death of Henry VIII, he ſaw every thing prepared for a Reformation (*i*). But the change of religion which happened in that country after the death of king Edward, obliged theſe two doctors to depart from thence. So they repaſſed the ſea in 1553, and retired to Straſburg (*k*) [*H*]. Ochinus was at Baſil in 1555 [*I*]; but he was called to Zurich the ſame year to be miniſter of an

(*b*) Sleidan. *lib. xix, fol. m.* 538, *verſo.*

(*i*) Simler, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 40.

(*k*) Sleiden, *lib. xxv, fol.* 721, *verſo.*

to flight; and *that very night threw off his monk's habit, put on a ſecular one, and fled towards the Heretics* (14). Mr Varillas, who pretends that Ochinus, before his departure from Verona, conſulted Peter Martyr by letters, hath probably invented that circumſtance. This we may reject as a falſity; ſince there is no room to doubt, but that theſe two men did, in a perſonal interview at Florence, concert their retreat towards the Proteſtants.

[*F*] *We ſhould not believe that he made uſe of good authorities.*] In effect, Spondanus gives us a very ſorry recital of the adventures of Ochinus (15). He makes him in the firſt place an Arian, who durſt not diſcover his Arianiſm in a city that had put to death Michael Servetus. We have quoted Sleidan, who, in matters of this nature, ought to paſs for unexceptionable evidence all the world over: we have quoted him I ſay, upon the aſſurance he gives us that Ochinus went from Geneva to Augſburg before his voyage to England. Now this voyage was in 1547; ſo that he could not depart Geneva upon the account of the puniſhment of Servetus: for that Heretic was not burnt till 1553. Spondanus adds, that Ochinus concealing his ſentiments, for the reaſon above-mentioned, left Geneva, either of his own accord, or elſe becauſe, as ſome ſay, Calvin got him expelled (16). But if Calvin had been the author of his expulſion, he would not have given him the good character that we find he did in 1550 (17); for he muſt have cauſed him to be expelled before the year 1547, in which Peter Martyr and Ochinus went to England. The Annaliſt continues thus; Ochinus leaving Geneva retired to Zurich, and ſoon after was likewiſe forced to depart from thence in the ſame manner. He met with the like reception at Baſil: then he went to England in company with Martyr; and leaving that kingdom in the reign of queen Mary, retired to Germany, and afterwards to Poland, and to Tranſilvania. Now, here are a great many miſtakes. A man that was forced to leave England in the reign of a Roman Catholic queen, muſt doubtleſs have gone thither while the government was under a Proteſtant. Ochinus muſt therefore have gone to England in the reign of Edward; but before he went to England, he had left Geneva, according to Spondanus, for fear of undergoing the ſame fate with Servetus; his leaving Geneva therefore at the ſooneſt could not be before 1553. Then, how could he be in England in the reign of Edward; ſince that prince died in July 1553, and Servetus was not burnt till October in the ſame year? The Annaliſt does here betray a very great degree of negligence. Beſides, it is falſe that Ochinus was expelled Zurich and Baſil, before he went from England in the reign of Mary. He was not forced out of Zurich till 1563. He compoſed in Poland, ſays Spondanus, a Dialogue againſt the ſect of the Gods of the Earth, (meaning the Switzerland and Geneva Clergy) and after that ſome other dialogues, full of Atheiſm; in which he not only vindicated Polygamy, but alſo attacked the holy Scriptures, the Divinity of our Saviour, the Trinity, and even the Deity. This is no more exact than the former. The dialogues he ſpeaks of were the occaſion of his expulſion out of Switzerland, and his retiring to Poland. Therefore he did not compile them in Poland. They contain, without doubt, ſeveral errors, but no impieties; and it is not true, that Ochinus, one of the interlocutors, always owns himſelf baffled by the adverſary he brings in (18). Bzovius has committed errors of the like nature. He would have it, that Ochinus being forced to depart from Cracow, fled to Tranſylvania, and there compoſed dialogues, and that theſe dialogues were afterwards tranſlated into Latin by Caſtalio (19). Here are three errors. For 1. Theſe dialogues were compoſed before the author went to Poland. 2. He did not go from Poland to Tranſylvania. 3. Caſtalio was dead before Ochinus left Poland.

[*G*] *His flight made the Pope extreamly uneaſy.*] He was ſo greatly incenſed upon it, that he had once a mind to diſcharge his anger upon the whole order of the Capuchins; he had a great mind to have aboliſhed that order, and it was with difficulty that he was appeaſed, even after he knew that the offence was only perſonal. *Cujus apoſtaſia adeo animus Pontificis perculſus eſt, ut de extinguendo univerſo Ordine tractaverit, vixque placari potuerit cognita Ordinis innocentia* (20). Mr Varillas (21) could not believe this, becauſe he imagined that Paul III . . . . *was a better Politician than to give Ochinus the opportunity of boaſting that the Catholics had ſo great a regard to him, as to revenge upon the whole order the loſs they ſuſtained in his perſon.* This author's incredulity is more excuſable than the liberty he has taken of paraphraſing upon Spondanus; for we cannot doubt his having that author before him, when he ſpoke of Ochinus. Conſider but well the words of Spondanus juſt now cited. Can any one find there that the Pope's anger was occaſioned by Ochinus's imprudence in putting into his writings *the greateſt affronts imaginable upon the religion he was about to renounce, and the moſt virulent reflexions upon the holy See in general, and the perſon of Paul III in particular?* And yet Mr Varillas has found all theſe things in them. I do not deny but that Spondanus has obſerved (22) that this monk's apology was full of outrages againſt the holy See and the Catholic church.

[*H*] *Peter Martyr and he retired to Straſburg.*] We ſhall here meet with an Hiſtorian, whoſe exactneſs is no greater than that of Spondanus; I mean Father Maimbourg. He pretends that Ochinus being expelled from England, deſerted Peter Martyr, and retired into Poland, in order to have the liberty of profeſſing Arianiſm (23). *It was there*, ſays he, *that he compoſed his dialogues, ſtuffed with a thouſand execrable blaſphemies agaiſt JESUS CHRIST, and the Holy Ghoſt: But having had the impudence to preach up Polygamy, and to dedicate a book in vindication of it to king Sigiſmund Auguſtus, he was forced to leave Poland, the people there riſing up againſt him.* Ochinus continued in Switzerland about ten years after his return from England, and would gladly have ended his days there, if they would have ſuffered him to ſtay, upon the recantation he offered: which ſhews, that the free profeſſion of Arianiſm in Poland was not much in his view. This author's ſecond fault conſiſts in going further than he ought to do, in characteriſing the errors with which Ochinus's dialogues are interſperſed. In fine, he knew not that this book of Polygamy was written before his journey to Poland. I doubt very much whether Ochinus dedicated any treatiſe upon that ſubject to king Sigiſmund. The biſhop of Amelia would not have forgot ſuch a notable circumſtance; the Socinians could not have been ſo great ſtrangers to it; they know nothing of that book, but what they read in Bzovius, that Ochinus wrote it in Poland, and dedicated it to the king (24). I ſay once more, I make no doubt but that Bzovius upon that head, delivers a falſity; and I do not believe that Ochinus ever preached up Polygamy. If I am not miſtaken, he contented himſelf with writing his thoughts of it; and if he had preached that doctrine in Poland, the biſhop of Amelia, who was then upon the ſpot, muſt needs have perfectly known it, and would certainly have fully publiſhed it.

[*I*] *Ochinus was at Baſil in* 1555.] This appears by the letters of Olympia Fulvia Morata. *Salutem dic meis verbis tuæ familiæ & D. Bernardino Ocello quem in Chriſto valde diligo.* This is the concluſion of a letter

(14) Hiſt. of Cardinal Commendon, *pag.* 205, *& ſeq.*

FAULTS in Spondanus.

(15) *Ad ann.* 1547, *num.* 22.

(16) Cum non auderet eam ibi profiteri ubi Servetus illam igne luiſſet, ſive ſponte, ſive ut quidam habent, à Calvino pulſus. *Ibid.*

(17) Quos hac noſtra ætate monachos habuit Germania, qui vel doctrina vel ſanctitate cum Luthero, Bucero, Oecolampadio, & ſimilibus conferre ſe niſi nimis impudenter audeant? Quos Itali Bernardino Ochino & Petro Vermilio opponent? *Calvin. de Scandalis, Opuſculor. pag.* 96.

(18) Ita ſe iis gerens, ut quamvis omnia Catholica dogmata defendere præ ſe ferret, demum ſe tamen adverſarii argumentis victum profiteretur. *Spond. ibid.*

(19) Bzovius, ad ann. 1542, n. 30, pag. 88.

(20) Spondanus, ad ann. 1547, n. 22.

(21) Hiſtory of Hereſy, *book xvii, pag.* 64.

(22) *I quote his words in remark* [*Q*] *citat.* (58).

(23) Maimbourg, Hiſtory of Arianiſm, *Tom. III, pag.* 353, *Dutch Edit.*

(24) Liber de Polygamia in Polonia conſcriptus, & Sigiſmundo II Regi Poloniæ dedicatus, teſte Bzovio ſub ann. 1542, n. 30. *Biblioth. Anti-Trin. p.* 5

an Italian church formed there. This church conſiſted of ſome refugees of Locarno (*l*), who could not obtain the liberty of profeſſing the Reformation in their own country, by reaſon of the oppoſition of the Roman Catholic Swiſs-Cantons. Ochinus readily ſubſcribed the Confeſſion of Faith of the church of Zurich, and found there Bullinger who proved a very good friend to him (*m*). He officiated in the Italian church at Zurich till 1563. At that time the magiſtrates expelled him by reaſon of ſome dialogues printed by him; which contained among other errors that of Polygamy [*K*]. He retired to Baſil, and entreated the miniſters and profeſſors of the place to ſollicit leave from the magiſtrates for his ſtaying there. Some put queſtions to him upon the doctrine of theſe dialogues; and he made anſwer that upon theſe points he was of the ſame opinion with them; nay, he agreed to the propoſal made to him, of giving a clear and preciſe declaration of his faith: this he agreed to, upon condition of obtaining leave for himſelf and his children to paſs the winter at Baſil. But the magiſtrates having heard his demands, and the report of the doctors, with reference to his doctrine, ordered him to be gone immediately; and reſolved to take into conſideration at ſome other time the dialogues themſelves, and the diſhonour he had done their city, in cauſing them to be printed there (*n*). Andreas Dudithius complained to Theodore Beza of their ſeverity to that old man [*L*], whom they forced to go and ſeek for ſhelter, wherever he could find it, in the hardeſt ſeaſon

(*l*) This is one of the four bailiwics that the Swiſs poſſeſs in Italy.

(*m*) Joſias Simlerus, in Vita Bullingeri, *fol.* 28, *verſo.*

(*n*) Id. ib. *fol.* 38, *verſo*, & 39.

---

letter ſhe wrote from Heidelberg to Curio, the ſeventh of May, 1555 (25). Curio lived at Baſil, and writ her an anſwer, dated the twenty-ſixth of Auguſt following, in which he acquaints her that he had executed her commiſſion. *Tuo nomine ſalutavi .... Bernardinum Ocellum ſenem doctiſſimum & ſanctiſſimum* (26). We read in another letter (27): *Audio Bernardinum Ocellum Senenſem virum ſincerè Chriſtianum ex Anglia Genevam profugiſſe.* This letter is not dated in 1555, as they would have it in the Bibliotheca of the Unitarians (28), but in 1554.

[*K*] *His dialogues .... contain, among other errors, that of Polygamy.*] This work conſiſts of thirty dialogues, the twenty-firſt of which is that which treats of Polygamy. Ochinus wrote, and publiſhed them in Italian; and Caſtalio tranſlated them into Latin, and printed them at Baſil in 1563. Some of the ſenators of Zurich, were informed by letters from foreign countries, that Ochinus had publiſhed a book containing heretical doctrines, particularly that of Polygamy. This occaſioned the ſenate to ſend for the miniſters; who declared, that when they heard that Ochinus had ſome works in the preſs, which it would have been much better for him to have ſuppreſſed, they went and exhorted him to remember the promiſe he had made not to publiſh any thing without the approbation of the ſynod. They added, 1. That as ſoon as they knew his book was actually printed, they charged him with a contempt of their remonſtrance. 2. That he pleaded, by way of excuſe, that his book was gone to the preſs before their firſt admonition. 3. That tho' he argues *pro* and *con* upon the ſubject of Polygamy, it is evident he approves it (29). 4. That they had received letters, highly complaining of his other dialogues, and that they intended to enter into a ſtrict examination of the whole work. They exhorted the author, in a particular manner, both before and after the ſentence of the ſenate, to give an orthodox explanation of his ſentiments; but they could not in the leaſt prevail with him. The ſentence ran thus (30): 'Quoniam Ochinus contra Leges & Edicta Magiſtratuum librum publicaſſet quem ſatius erat ſupprimi (31) & cujus nomine Eccleſia & Reſpublica male audit, ideo ſe velle & jubere ut quam primum ex urbe & agro Tigurino diſcedat. ---- *Foraſmuch as Ochinus, contrary to the laws and edicts of the magiſtrates, had publiſhed a book, which it would have been much better to have ſuppreſſed, and on the account of which, both the church and ſtate have been reflected on, therefore they will and command, that he do immediately depart out of the city and dominions of Zurich.*'

[*L*] *Andreas Dudithius complained .... of their ſeverity to the old man.*] Since this is not a book of controverſy, I hope it will not be taken amiſs, if I ſay that Beza does not give a very fair anſwer to Dudithius: he ſeeks only ſome turns of wit, and endeavours to throw duſt in his eyes. 'Ochinum præterea narras indicta cauſa, hyeme acri, decurſa jam ætate ſenem cum uxore & liberis Tiguro ejectum. ---- *You alſo tell me, that without any trial, Ochinus was expelled Zurich in the depth of winter, and the decline of old age, together with his wife and children.*' Thus it is that Beza has repeated the objection (32). This renders the ſentence of Zurich odious upon three accounts: 1. Becauſe the cauſe was not tried. 2. Becauſe no regard was had to the rigour of the ſeaſon. 3. Becauſe of their having expoſed to the inconveniences of the winter a man incumbered with years, and with a family. Upon the firſt head Beza makes anſwer, that it is a falſe and ſcandalous reflexion upon a juſt and pious ſenate, to offer to ſay, that the cauſe of Ochinus was not tried: that, it is true, they did not narrowly examine every thing, ; but that was the effect of their great clemency (33). Upon the ſecond, that Ochinus had not a day's journey to travel (34). Upon the third, that the more aged he was, the more criminal he was (35), and beſides, that his wife was dead. Now the firſt anſwer is very lame; for it is certain, the ſenate of Zurich condemned Ochinus, not only without hearing him, but without ordering an examination of his dialogues. The miniſters, conſulted by the ſenate, anſwered poſitively upon nothing but the article of Polygamy; they ſaid in general, that they had received letters, complaining of his dialogues, and promiſed to inquire maturely into the matter: but what did the ſenate do in the mean time? Why, they enjoined Ochinus to depart out of the city, and out of the canton forthwith. Simlerus, who, as a Zurich profeſſor, was more intereſted than Theodore Beza to ſet the affair in a favourable light, relates the thing exactly in the manner I have done. To ſay, that if every thing was not narrowly inquired into, it was the effect of a very great clemency, is a poor pretence, which all the judges in the world may equally make uſe of, when they condemn any one party without giving him a hearing. Nor is the third anſwer better than the firſt: it runs counter to the maxims of common ſenſe, and the general practice of mankind. Regard is had to age, even in criminal caſes; and if two men be ſentenced to be put to the torture, one of ſeventy, the other of forty years of age, it would be ordered more moderate to the former than to the latter. So that our Ochinus's great age ſerved to expoſe the ſentence very much, but not to excuſe it. If Beza would have made a right uſe of his wit, he ſhould have owned Dudithius's plea of age, and made anſwer, that, in effect, the magiſtrates of Zurich had a regard to Ochinus's years, in only baniſhing him; which they would not have been content with had he been a young man. This is what he ought to have replied, and not to have had recourſe to a maxim, which aſſerts, that the more aged Heretics are, the more unworthy are they of the clemency of their judges. The ſecond anſwer is not ſincere; for it ſuppoſes that all Ochinus's trouble conſiſted in travelling five or ſix leagues. That pretence might paſs for good, if he could have found a retreat in the neighbourhood; but we have ſeen that he could not obtain leave to paſs the winter there. Beza knew this very well; he was not ignorant that Dudithius could have enforced this objection by the uſage Ochinus met with at Baſil. So that upon the whole we cannot admit this anſwer to Dudithius to be a juſt one. Dudithius's deſign was only to tax the Proteſtants beyond the Rhine with ſeverity to their Heretics: and among other inſtances, he brings that of the city of Zurich to Ochinus, in baniſhing him in the middle of the winter. The anſwer given is, that his exile expoſed him only to the fatigue of travelling five or ſix leagues. Why then

(25) *Lib. ii, pag. m.* 168. The date of the year is not there; but Curio's Anſwer, dated Aug. 26, 1555, ſhews, that I have added the right year.

(26) Curio, ibid. pag. 169.

(27) Pag. 178.

(28) Pag. 3.

(29) Quod dialogum de Polygamia attinet, diſputari in utramque partem, ſed ita ut facile appareat quonam ipſe inclinet, præſertim cum ita concludat, & moneat eum qui plures ducere volebat, ut ſi non poſſit ſe continere & una contentus eſſe, ſequatur inſtinctum ſpiritus in hac re. *Simlerus, in Vita Bullingeri, fol.* 39.

(30) Id. ib.

(31) Would they talk after this rate of that book, if it were ſuch as Father Maimbourg repreſents it, who, undoubtedly never ſaw it? ſee the remark [*P*] at the end.

COMPARISON of Dudithius's objection, with the anſwer of Theodore Beza.

(32) Beza, Epiſt. prima Oper. *Tom. iii, pag.* 190.

(33) Delatus ad Magiſtratum, pro eo quod ſeveram pœnam pro tantis ſceleribus merebatur, non ſane indicta cauſa (quod qui dicunt magnam juſto & pio Magiſtratui injuriam faciunt) ſed non ad vivum reſectis omnibus, ut cum illo quam clementiſſime ageretur, juſſus eſt è Tigurinorum agro faceſſere. *Ibid.*

(34) At hyems erat: nempe longa fuit non unius integri diei via. *Ibid.*

(35) At ſenex erat: tanto nocentior veterator. *Ibid.*

ſeaſon of the the year. Ochinus was then ſeventy-ſix years of age [*M*]. He retired to Poland, but the Nuncio Commendon quickly drove him out of that kingdom, by virtue of an edict granted him againſt all foreign heretics. Upon which they retired to divers places. Ochinus went to Moravia, and died there ſoon after. The Plague ſwept away not only him, but his wife, and his two daughters, and his ſon (*o*), if we give credit to the Hiſtory of Cardinal Commendon [*N*]. The circumſtances of his death are variouſly related [*O*], and authors are not agreed upon the hereſies he embraced after his departure from Switzerland: ſome ſay, that he turned Anabaptiſt, after preaching openly the hereſy of Macedonius (*p*): others ſay in general, that he attacked the myſtery of the Trinity. The Anti-Trinitarians reckon him in the number of their authors. He writ ſeveral books; a catalogue of which is inſerted in their Bibliotheca [*P*]: but they have forgot to put into that catalogue the apology he publiſhed

Ochinus muſt have found a ſanctuary at the end of the five or ſix leagues; for if inſtead of having ſhelter there, he, on the contrary, met with another good Proteſtant ſenate who expelled him, Dudithius's objection, taken from the ſeaſon of the year, remains in full force, with reference to his aim, which was to ſhew, that Ochinus is a remarkable inſtance of the ſevere temper of the Reformed. It is morally impoſſible, but that Beza muſt have known all this; and yet he choſe rather to give ſuch an anſwer than to ſay nothing. He took care not to ſeem as if he knew any thing of what was done at Baſil (36): the ſmall extent of the canton of Zurich furniſhed him with a ſpark of fire, a little point of wit; and he made uſe of it, in hopes, no doubt, to dazzle his readers with it.

[*M*] *Ochinus was then ſeventy-ſix years of age.*] Peter Perna aſſures us of it in his letter to Czechovicius. This letter I never read, I have only ſeen it quoted (37). At this rate, Gratiani muſt be miſtaken, when he ſays, that Ochinus turned Heretic at ſixty years of age; *without conſidering*, ſays he (38), *either his age, or his profeſſion, or his vow of continence, being a Prieſt, a Capuchin, and ſixty years of age, he inſtantly married a young girl.* Ochinus left his cloiſter, and retired to Geneva in 1542; at which time he was not ſixty, but about fifty-five years of age, if it be true that he was but ſeventy-ſix in 1563, when he was baniſhed Zurich.

[*N*] *The plague ſwept away not only him, but his wife . . . . if we are to believe the hiſtory of cardinal Commendon.*] I make uſe of this caution, becauſe he is miſtaken as to the wife. Ochinus was a widower when he was baniſhed Zurich; and it is by no means probable that he married again. It is Theodore Beza informs me of his being a widower: he even enters into the inſcrutable judgments of Providence, and aſſures us, in a Theological ſtyle, that the Divine juſtice purſuing that wretch in his family, before his impiety was made public, his wife broke her neck. This is one part of Dudithius's objection. *At uxorem & liberos habebat*; to which Beza anſwers thus (39). *De uxore falſum eſt, quod ex bono Alciato ſive quovis alio cognoviſti. Fregerat enim collum horrendo Dei judicio domi impium ſenem perſequente, priuſqam foras productum eſſet ipſius ſcelus.* Staniſlaus Lubienietſki (40) gives us the following account of the latter part of Ochinus's life. Ochinus retired into Moravia, and into Poland, where he was ſtill within the reach of John Calvin's letters. He returned from Poland to Moravia, upon the edict of king Sigiſmund, who, in 1564, baniſhed all thoſe who were called Tritheiſts, Arians, &c. Some gentlemen endeavoured to perſuade Ochinus to ſtay, but he anſwered them, that he was bound to obey the magiſtrates, and that he would obey them, even tho' he were reduced to the neceſſity of being devoured by the wolves in the woods. While he was upon the road, he was ſeized with the Plague at Pinczow; where he met with many charitable offices from one of the bretheren, named Philippovius. His two ſons and his daughter (41) died of the Plague. But he recovered himſelf, and continuing his journey towards Moravia, died three weeks after at Slavonia (42). Theſe are all the circumſtances we have from Lubienietſki. I cannot find in any good author that Ochinus was ever in Tranſylvania: for Father Maimbourg, who affirms that he was, is not a ſufficient witneſs of it. *He was forced*, ſays he (43), *to quit Poland . . . . and after wandring ſome time in Tranſylvania, he retired at laſt, oppreſſed with miſery and poverty, to a village, where he died of the Plague, abandoned by all the world.* Some quote the biſhop of Amelia, who ſpeaks neither of that poverty, nor of his being thus univerſally forſaken; but on the contrary aſſures us (44), that he died at the houſe of one of his old friends. He left a conſiderable fortune to his heirs, if we believe Theodore Beza. ‘ Ochinus . . . . ‘ familia non mediocri ſumptu circumducta tandem ‘ obiit, tam inops & egens ſcilicet, cui nec petere nec ‘ accipere unquam Religio fuerat, ut plus ſane reliquerit hæredibus quam bona collegii noſtri pars poſſideat (45). - - - - - *Ochinus . . . . having brought up* ‘ *his Family at a very great expence, at laſt died, ſo* ‘ *poor and low, as you muſt imagine of one who had* ‘ *never made it any ſcruple of conſcience either to aſk or* ‘ *receive, that he left more money to his heirs, than a* ‘ *great part put together of our college are worth.*’ This is the laſt fling he has at him in his anſwer to Dudithius: he never had been aſhamed either to aſk or receive, and by that means had ſcraped together a great deal of money.

[*O*] *The circumſtances of his death are variouſly related.*] Of this I have given ſeveral proofs in the preceding remark. I ſhall here give another. The annals of the Capuchins affirm, that he died a good Catholic (46). And, on the contrary, others (47) make him die, not only *abandoned by all the world, and in extreme miſery*, but alſo *an Atheiſt*.

Theophilus Raynaud tells us, that ſome people were offended at him for writing, that Ochinus died miſerably in the communion of the Arian Heretics, and not a martyr at Geneva, repenting of his apoſtacy. Theſe people made their complaints to John de Montecalier, general of the Capuchins. Which put that general upon peruſing Raynaud's book (48); but he met with nothing which appeared to him to deſerve cenſure. You may judge by this of the extravagant humour of the Capuchins. They are angry if any one refuſes to credit their ſtory, that Bernardin Ochinus had a mind to return to their order, and that he was put to death for that reaſon. The author, of whom they complained to their general, obſerves, that in relating the unfortunate exit of this Heretic, he followed the narration of Andreas Fruſius; and that Toſſinianus, in the ſecond book of his Seraphic Hiſtory; Florimond de Remond, in the fifth chapter of the third book of his Hiſtory of Hereſy; and Artus of Munſter, in his Martyrology of the Franciſcans, under the fourth of January, paragraph 3d; and in general, all the writers who lived before the year 1630 (49), have given the ſame account of the death of Ochinus (50).

[*P*] *He wrote ſeveral books; a catalogue of which is inſerted in the Bibliotheca of the Anti-Trinitarians.*] He publiſhed ſix volumes of ſermons in Italian; an Expoſition on the Epiſtle of St Paul to the Romans; a commentary upon the Epiſtle to the Galatians; a treatiſe *de Cœna Domini contra Joachimum Weſtphalum*; *Labyrinthi de Prædeſtinatione & Libero Arbitrio*; ſome Apologues (51): a dialogue about Purgatory, &c. I do not believe he publiſhed any thing in Latin; he compoſed all his works in Italian, and afterwards met with tranſlators. Some of his works have been tranſlated into ſeveral languages. It is not above one day ſince I run over his Labyrinths tranſlated into Latin; and they ſeemed to me to be the work of one who had a clear and penetrating head. There Ochinus ſhews, with great ſtrength of argument, that thoſe who ſtand up for free-will in the actions of men, involve themſelves in four great difficulties; and that thoſe who make man a neceſſary agent, are equally gravelled with other four great difficulties: ſo that he forms eight labyrinths; four againſt free-will, and four againſt neceſſity.

(*o*) The Life of Cardinal Commendon, by Antonius Maria Gratiani, *lib. ii, cap. ix.*

(*p*) In Poloniam cum perveniſſet dicitur palam illic oppugnaſſe hypoſtaſin Spiritus Sancti. Sed nec illic ei diutius conſiſtere licuit. Quare ſe in Moraviam ad Anabaptiſtarum conventicula recepit, & illic obiit. *Simler. ubi ſupra, fol.* 40.

(36) I mean the baniſhing of Ochinus; for he owns that the tenets of this Heretic were condemned there. *Baſileam igitur venit, ubi quum itidem ſuos errores damnatos videret, tandem ad ſuos ſive Tritheïtas, ſive Arrianos, ſive Samoſatenianos ſe contulit.* Would not one be apt to gather from theſe words that he left Baſil of his own accord? and yet he was ordered to depart that city. Can the ſuppreſſing of this matter of fact be fair or ſincere?

(37) Anno 1563 natus annos 76 (teſte Petro Perna in Epiſtola ad Czechovicium) à Tigurinis pulſus eſt. *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar. pag.* 3.

(38) Life of Cardinal Commendon, *pag.* 208.

(39) Oper. *Tom. III, pag.* 190.

(40) Hiſt. Reformat. Polonicæ, *lib. ii, cap. iv, pag.* 110. *See likewiſe* Budzinius, Hiſtor. Eccleſiar. Polonicar. MS. *cap. xxvi, apud* Biblioth. Anti-Trin. *pag.* 3.

(41) Gratiani *ſays, on the contrary,* his two daughters and his ſon.

(42) As I take it, we ought to read *Slaucovia.*

(43) Hiſtory of Arianiſm, *Tom. iii, pag.* 352.

(44) Hiſtory of Cardinal Commendon, *pag.* 213.

(45) Beza, in his Epiſtle to Dudithius, *Tom. iii, pag.* 190.

(46) Eum tamen immenſa Dei benignitate ante mortem reſipuiſſe, & hæreſes abjuraſſe, ac peccata ritu Catholico confeſſum eſſe, denique vere pœnitentem obiiſſe, Annales Capucinorum multis diverſorum teſtimoniis affirmant. *Spondanus, ad ann.* 1547, *num.* 22. He quotes the Annals of the Capuchins, *ad ann.* 1543. See the remark [*AA*].

(47) Moreri is one of them.

(48) *Intituled,* Judæ poſteri, apoſtatæ à religioſis Ordinibus.

(49) Such is the date he gives to the Annals of the Capuchins, compoſed by Boverius.

(50) Ex Theoph. Raynaudo, Syntagm. de Libris propriis, *num.* 23, *pag.* 42. Apopompæi. *See the remark* [*AA*] *hereafter.*

(51) Which were tranſlated out of Italian into High-Dutch, by *Chriſtopher Wirſungus.*

publiſhed for changing his religion [Q]. He inſcribed it to the Pope; and filled it full of things altogether injurious to Popery. This piece met with an anſwer. The public acknowledgement he made is remarkable: he confeſſed in a preface, that if he could have continued to preach the truth, as he had done for ſome time, without the hazard of his life, he would never have quitted the habit of his order (q); but that finding he had not courage enough to expoſe himſelf to martyrdom (r), he had fled to the Proteſtants. They do him wrong who aſſure us, that he was the author of the book *de tribus Impoſtoribus* [R]. It is ſaid that he promiſed the cardinal de Lorrain to convince the Proteſtant churches of twice twelve errors [S]. I find that authors have oftentimes exaggerated what relates to Ochinus [T]. Mr Varillas has

neceſſity. He turns and winds all ways imaginable in order to find an out-let, and meeting with none, he concludes every time with a fervent prayer to God, that he would be pleaſed to deliver him from thoſe abyſſes. However, in the ſequel of the work, he attempts to furniſh out-lets from this priſon; but he concludes, that the only way is to ſay with Socrates, *unum ſcio quod nihil ſcio*. We ought to be ſilent, ſays he, and to think, that in points of that nature, God requires of us, neither the affirmative, nor the negative. The title of the laſt chapter is this: *Qua via ex omnibus ſupradictis Labyrinthis cito exiri poſſit, quæ docta ignorantiæ via vocatur*. De Aubigné mentions a book of Ochinus, which he repreſents as a very curious piece. His words are theſe (52): firſt, *that the ſervice ſhould be in French, provided ſome jeſts were taken out, that would ſet the people a laughing; as to begin the maſs by an,* &, *and other abſurdites, which are handſomely and ſubtilly written by Bernard Ochinus in his treatiſe* della Nativita della Miſſa: *as for the ornaments, that the moſt ridiculous ſhould be laid aſide; and as for the reſt, it ſhould be anſwered,* ſays Ochinus, *that it is the LORD's Supper diſguiſed, which turned a nun,* per parer più ſanta, - - - *in order to be more holy*. To ſpeak properly, I fancy he ought to have ſaid not *treatiſe* but *ſermon della Nativita della Miſſa*; for in running over Ochinus's twelve ſermons upon the Lord's Supper (53), I find the title of the ſeventh runs thus, *Miſſæ tragœdia, ac primum quomodo concepta, nata, baptizata fuerit,* - - - *The Tragedy of the Maſs, and firſt how it was conceived, born, and baptized*. The title of the eighth is, *Quemadmodum nutrita educataque fuerit Miſſa, adoleveritque, & ornata, ditataque ad ſummam dignitatem præſtantiamque pervenerit*. - - - *How it was maintained, educated, and brought up to it's dignity and ſplendor*. The title of the ninth is, *Miſſæ accuſatio ejuſdemque reſponſio, & adverſus eam acta*. - - - *The Accuſation and Defence of the Maſs, with the whole Trial* The title of the tenth is, *Sententia à Deo contra Miſſam lata*. - - - - *The Sentence pronounced by GOD againſt the Maſs*. This dramatic way of preaching ſavours too much of the genius of the Italians. Sleidan obſerves, that, in 1549, there appeared a bloody ſatire againſt Paul III, which was not compoſed by Ochinus, tho' his name was put in the title. He gives an abſtract of it: *Prius quam decederet libellus exiit Italicus vehemens in illum atque gravis, titulo quidem Bernardini Ochini, ſed ab aliis, ut creditur, compoſitus cum præfatione ad Aſcanium Columnam quem ille profligarat* (54). I have already taken notice of the thirty dialogues which were the cauſe of Ochinus's baniſhment: but I muſt add here, that Mr Simon ſpeaks of them very much to the purpoſe (55). He owns, that the author does not openly declare his Anti-trinitarian Hereſies: *he docs not there declare himſelf altogether an Unitarian; he only ſtates the arguments* pro *and* con . . . . In the dialogue of the Trinity *he produces at length the arguments of the Catholics, and of the Anti-Trinitarians; thoſe of the latter he puſhes very far, under pretence of anſwering them* (56). Bullinger aſſures us (57), that theſe dialogues were burnt in a conſiderable city.

[Q] *The apology he publiſhed for changing his religion.*] One of the continuators of Baronius ſpeaks of it in this manner: 'Genevam appulſus apologiam de fuga ſua 'ad Pontificem ſcripſit, maledicentiis & calumiis in 'ſedem Apoſtolicam & Eccleſiam Catholicam Rom. 'refertiſſimam (58). - - - - *Being arrived at Geneva, he 'wrote an apology to the Pope for his flight, ſtuffed with 'reflexions and calumnies againſt the Apoſtolical See, and 'Catholic church of Rome.*' Cardinal John Peter Caraffa, who was afterwards Pope by the name of Paul IV, wrote an anſwer to Ochinus, which was inſerted in the hiſtory of the Theatins. 'Contra Ochini apo'logiam nonnulli ſtylum acuerunt; inter quos Joannes 'Petrus Caraffa Cardinalis Theatinus, qui deinde fuit 'Paulus Papa IV paræneticam egregiam ſcripſit epi'ſtolam, quam Joannes Baptiſta Acerrarum Epiſcopus 'Hiſtoriæ Theatinorum inſeruit (59). - - - - *Some 'took up their pen againſt the apology of Ochinus: among 'whom John Peter Craffa, cardinal of the order of 'the Theatins, who was afterwards Pope Paul IV, 'wrote an admirable Exhortatory Epiſtle, which John 'Baptiſta, biſhop of Acerra, inſerted in the hiſtory of the 'Theatins.*'

[R] *They do him wrong who aſſure us that he was the author of the book* de tribus Impoſtoribus.] He who wrote the notes upon the *Religio Medici* does not affirm it; he only doubts of it, 'neſcio an Bernardinus 'Ochinus . . . . an alius hujus auctor ſit (60). - - - *I 'know not whether Bernardus Ochinus . . . or ſome other 'perſon was the author of it.*' Micrælius alſo proceeds no further (61), but Scavenius affirms it. See what Rhodius ſays upon this head (62) towards the end of Placcius's book *de Scriptoribus Anonymis*. Among other things he declares, he does not know that ever any objection was raiſed againſt the other twenty-nine dialogues of Ochinus. It is ſtrange that ſo learned a man as he ſhould ſay ſo. I have already (63) produced ſeveral inſtances which evince the contrary.

[S] *It is ſaid that he promiſed the cardinal de Lorrain to convince the Proteſtant churches of . . . . errors.*] The matter of fact, as we have it from Simlerus, is this (64); Ochinus met the cardinal upon the road to Schaffhouſen, and told him he was ſo unhappy as to be baniſhed for a book, which he had writ with intent to vindicate, againſt the objections of the adverſaries, thirty difficult points of faith he had met with in the Reformed religion. He preſented the cardinal with ſome copies of his Dialogues, and prayed him to read them. *We ſhall conſider them,* replied the cardinal, *and if they do not pleaſe us, we ſhall throw them into the fire*. Ochinus added, that he would engage to convince the Reformed churches of twenty-four errors. *Throw twenty of them aſide,* replied the cardinal, *and the remainder will be but too many*. Beza relates the ſame fact, and gives it for certain; but he carries the number of falſe doctrines much higher, which Ochinus promiſed to refute. This cardinal deſpiſed a monk, who relapſed ſo often into apoſtacy. *Vix Baſilea egreſſo (quod narro ſcito me non ut rumorem incertum, ſed ut certam hiſtoriam narrare) occurrit Lotharingus Cardinalis ex Italia rediens, cui ſeſe operamque ſuam omnem obtulit, pollicitus ſeſe centum errores iſtorum inter quos tamdiu hæſiſſet hæreticorum demonſtraturum. Sprevit hominem toties apoſtatam Cardinalis* (65).

[T] *Authors have oftentimes exaggerated what relates to Ochinus.*] Beſides what I have hinted in other remarks (66), I ſhall add here, that they do not faithfully repreſent his doctrine, when they ſay, with Gratiani, that *he endeavoured to prove by examples, and by arguments taken from Scripture and Politics, that it was proper every one ſhould endeavour to people the world, and beget a numerous family; and that it is not only allowable, but a duty incumbent upon Chriſtians to marry as many wives as they pleaſe* (67). If you read the beginning of his dialogue *de Polygamia*, you will find the ſtate of the queſtion to be this: *A man who wiſhes for children, and is married to a wife barren, ſickly, and with whom he cannot agree, may he marry another wife without a divorce from the firſt?* Ochinus ſuppoſes that he is conſulted upon this caſe of conſcience; he declares himſelf on the negative ſide: and, after putting into the mouth of the perſon, who conſults him, the moſt plauſible arguments for a plurality of wives, and faintly returned ſome pretty good anſwers, concludes with adviſing him to have recourſe to prayer; and aſſuring him, that, if he prays with faith to God for the gift of continence, he will obtain it; and in fine,

(q) Non diſſimulans manere ſe voluiſſe, modo Chriſtum, etſi occultius & veluti obvelatum, prædicare ſibi licuiſſet. *In the preface to the ſermons he had preached in Italy, which were printed in Germany in 1545. See* Seckendorf, in Supplementis Indicis I, Hiſtoriæ Lutheran.

(r) Cum ſe ad mortem ſponte obeundam non ſatis firmum eſſe deprehenderet. *In eadem Præfatione.*

(52) Confeſſion Catholique de Sancy, *book ii, chap. ii, pag.* 390, 391. See likewiſe, *chap. vi, of the firſt book, pag.* 346.

(53) Tranſlated into Latin, and printed at Baſil, with the Labyrinths of the ſame author.

(54) Sleidan, Hiſt. *lib. xxi, fol. m.* 602, *verſo.*

(55) He is miſtaken in dating Ochinus's call to Zurich from the year 1562, and in attributing the Life of Bullinger to Melchior Adam; for that Life was written by Joſias Simler.

(56) Simon, Hiſtoire Critique des Commentat. du Nouv. Teſtam. *chap. lv, pag.* 831.

(57) Apud Boxhorn. Hiſtor. Univerſ. *pag.* 74, *ad ann.* 1552.

(58) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1547, *num.* 22.

(59) Id. ib. See likewiſe Varillas's Hiſtory of Hereſy, *book xvii, pag. m.* 64.

(60) In Sect. xix, pag. m. 126.

(61) Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. m. 863.

(62) Pag. 33.

(63) See the remarks [*F*], [*H*], and [*K*].

(64) In Vita Bullingeri, *ol.* 40.

(65) Beza, ubi ſupra.

(66) The above remarks [*F*] and [*H*].

(67) Life of Cardinal Commendon, *pag.* 211.

has told a great many falſities of this Ex-Capuchin [*U*]. Mr Moreri has not always done him juſtice [*X*]. Palearius (*s*) has beſtowed great encomiums upon this monk.

In fine, by telling him, that, if GOD does not grant him continence, nor the faith that is neceſſary for praying for it with ſucceſs, he may, without ſin, follow the inſtinct which he will certainly know to come from GOD. Now, does this amount to a poſitive aſſertion, that the Goſpel commands *Chriſtians to marry as many wives as they pleaſe?* Doubtleſs Ochinus is in an error, and introduces Enthuſiaſm; but ſtill we muſt do juſtice to all the world, and own that there is a great deal of unfairneſs in the writings that mention his doctrine.

[*U*] *Mr Varillas tells a great many falſities relating to this Ex-Capuchin.*] We ſhall draw them up in diſtinct articles.

I. I do not doubt but his whole account of quarrels between Calvin and Ochinus is a romance, that he has either invented or ſtole: but I will warrant for truth that he is in error, when he affirms (68), that, at Geneva, Ochinus *writ againſt the Trinity, and renewed the hereſy of the Arians .... and that he publiſhed upon that ſubject an hundred extravagances, in libels compoſed by him in Italian, and tranſlated by his friends into Latin.* This I can demonſtrate to be falſe. Ochinus left Geneva before 1547, as we are aſſured by the words of Sleidan quoted above. Calvin ſpeaks of him with an encomium in a book (69) he publiſhed in 1550. He was not therefore at that time apprized of thoſe horrible hereſies of Ochinus; and beſide, would an unfrocked Capuchin who had been known to adhere to Tritheiſm or Arianiſm, have been ſent into England in 1547? But we need no other proof againſt Varillas, than the paſſages of Beza, which teſtify, that Ochinus concealed for a long time the hereſies he entertained in his mind, and that they were not diſcovered till the impreſſion of his dialogues. Now this impreſſion was not before 1562. ‘Sceleratus hypocrita ‘Arianorum clandeſtinus fautor, polygamiæ defenſor, ‘omnium Chriſtianæ religionis dogmatum irriſor, ‘quum eo tandem audaciæ erupiſſet ut ſua portenta in ‘publicum ederet (juſto ſanè Dei judicio ne LATERE ‘diutius tantum malum poſſet) delatus ad Magiſtratum ‘... juſſus eſt è Tigurinorum agro faceſſere (70). - - - ‘*This wicked hypocrite, the ſecret favourer of Arianiſm, ‘the patron of Polygamy, the burleſquer of all the doctrines ‘of the Chriſtian religion, when he had attained to that ‘pitch of inſolence as to publiſh his monſtrous opinions (by ‘the juſt judgment indeed of GOD, that ſo great a degree of wickedneſs might no longer* LIE CONCEALED), ‘*being carried before a magiſtrate ...., was commanded ‘to depart out of the canton of Zurich.*’ It is with theſe words that Beza begins his anſwer to Dudithius's complaints. This paſſage evidently proves, that the opinions of Ochinus were not diſcovered till his dialogues were printed. The friendſhip Bullinger (71) had for him till this edition, is another inconteſtable evidence of the ſame fact. Beza ſeldom mentions Ochinus, without taking notice that he was a long time a hypocrite. ‘Favit etiam illis, ſed NIMIUM SERO de‘tectus, Bernardinus ille Ochinus, impuriſſimus hypo‘crita (72). - - - - - - *One favourer of theirs, but diſ‘covered too late, was that Bernardinus Ochinus, a ‘moſt abominable hypocrite.*’ When he ſays that Peter Martyr made a voyage to England, in 1547, and that Ochinus accompanied him, he adds (73), ‘Maxi‘mi prius in Italia nominis monachus & Capucino‘rum (quos vocant) ordinis auctor, idemque quod ‘MULTIS demum POST annis patefecit, ſceleratus ‘hypocrita. - - - - *A monk, formerly of great reputation ‘in Italy, and founder of the Capuchins (as they are called), ‘and who a great* MANY YEARS *after appeared to ‘be a wicked hypocrite.*’

II. Another fiction is this: ‘It is aſtoniſhing that ‘Calvin contented himſelf with cauſing him to be ex‘pelled Geneva, and did not put him into the hands ‘of juſtice to be burnt, as he ſince did Servetus for ‘the ſame crime (74).’ Mr Varillas enquires into the reaſons of ſuch different conduct, and alledges two or three for it; after which he adds, that Ochinus *was baniſhed Geneva by a decree of the ſenate, and retired to Baſil.* A man muſt have had a great deal of leiſure time upon his hands when he ſearches after reaſons for a chimera. He ſhould firſt have proved the fact, and then have ſearched for the cauſes of it. Ochinus was not baniſhed Geneva, neither did he divulge his hereſies there.

III. *At Baſil* (continues Varillas) *he would have ſuffered a long perſecution, becauſe Calvin's friends were very powerful there, if Bucer, who accommodated, himſelf to all ſorts of Heretics, had not procured him from the magiſtrates of Straſburg, the offer of a Divinity-chair, which he accepted. The ſame Bucer carried him and Vermilli along with him to England.* I have neither time, nor the neceſſary books for gathering full evidence againſt this account of Varillas; but I aſſure myſelf that men of reaſon will be ſatisfied with Sleidan's ſilence. Would that famous Hiſtorian, who reſided at Straſburg, have contented himſelf, in ſpeaking of Peter Martyr's and Ochinus's voyage to England, to ſay only (75), that the latter had retired to Geneva, and then to Augſburg? Would not he have mentioned ſomething of that Divinity-chair, *the offer of which* Bucer is ſaid to have *procured from the magiſtrates of Straſburg*, and which Ochinus is ſaid to have accepted? He does not forget to acquaint us in expreſs terms, that Peter Martyr had been profeſſor in the ſame city. I have juſt now met with ſomething that is yet more convincing. Ochinus was at Augſburg in 1546, and preached there in Italian (76). As for Bucer's carrying Ochinus and Vermilli with him into England, it is a falſhood; for Bucer did not go thither till 1549, whereas the other two went to England about the end of 1547.

IV. *The Duke of Somerſet* .... had no reaſon to *be pleaſed with their conduct .... Ochinus vented, underhand, his extravagant notions upon the myſtery of the Trinity* (77).] This is a fact advanced at random, for which no proof can be brought; neither is it conſiſtent with the Elogium that one of the warmeſt Anti-Papiſts in England gives of Ochinus (78).

[*X*] *Mr Moreri has not always done him juſtice.*] I. He is wrong in ſaying that *Ochinus aſſumed the monaſtic habit among the Capuchins about* 1525 *or* 1526: he ſhould have ſaid 1534. II. It was not in 1543, but in 1542, that Ochinus and Martyr forſook their order. III. No body that ever I heard of ever charged Ochinus with juſtifying Polygamy upon his own private account; or becauſe *he was not ſatisfied with one wife, and had a mind to marry other women.* IV. And it is a falſe aſſertion, *that, to juſtify his Libertiniſm and Incontinence, he gave out Polygamy to be lawful.* When he publiſhed his dialogues, he was a widower and ſeventy-ſix years of age (79). He had therefore no occaſion to preach up Polygamy to gratify his own paſſions. As he was a widower he might have married according to law; and conſidering he was ſeventy-ſix years of age, one wife would have cut him out more work than he could have done. He ought to have been contented, and to have eſteemed himſelf a very extraordinary man, if, at that age, he had been able to anſwer all the wants of one wife. So that it is without any manner of judgment, and with extreme ignorance of all the circumſtances, that Moreri gives out that this man preached up that doctrine, with intent to juſtify his deſire to have ſeveral wives. It is ſaid of ſome looſe Caſuiſts, that they did not indulge their own perſons ſo much as thoſe of others: and this we can affirm of ſome authors that have maintained Polygamy. One Lyſerus (80) ſacrificed his time, his health, and his life, to the vindication of that doctrine; and yet had no occaſion for a plurality of wives, it being generally believed that he would have found enough to do with one. I would not be ſo unjuſt to affirm, that the author of the *Lettres Paſtorales* was of the ſame mind with Lyſerus: it is ſufficient to ſay, that his morals are too looſe upon that head, and too favourable to incontinence. I ſpeak of the morals he has laid down, in endeavouring to excuſe the reformers for allowing a landgrave of Heſſe to have two wives at one time (81). Now, of all miniſters, he is perhaps one who had the leaſt perſonal occaſion for Polygamy. V. It is not true, that Ochinus made himſelf the *head of thoſe infamous Libertines, who go by the name of Polygamites.* Theſe people never formed a ſect; and Ochinus left no ſociety of

disciples

(*s*) Orat. III, pag. 91, 92, Edit. 1696. See likewiſe, pag. 505.

(68) Hiſt. of Hereſy, *book xvii, pag. m.* 65.

(69) That *de Scandalis.*

(70) Beza, ubi ſupra.

(71) See his Life done by Joſias Simlerus, *fol.* 28 *verſo*, 39 *verſo.*

(72) Epiſt. lxxxi, Operum, *Tom. iii, pag.* 295.

(73) In Iconibus, in Petro Martyre.

(74) Varillas, ubi ſupra.

(75) *Lib. xix, ad ann.* 1547.

(76) *See* Seckendorf, Hiſt. of Lutheran. *book iii, pag.* 613.

(77) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 66.

(78) Deum immortalem, quales illi duo ſenes peregrini, quos in urbem veſtram recepiſtis (*he ſpeaks to the citizens of Zurich*) Petrus Martyr & Bernardinus Ochinus, Quæ duo luminaria? quorum alterum ſi aliæ haberent Eccleſiæ, magno theſauro & ornamento ditatæ & beatæ viderentur. Felix Anglia dum hæc paria habuit, miſera dum amiſit. *Balæus, Præfat. in Act. Rom. Pontific.*

(79) See, above, remark [*L*].

(80) *See the* Nouv. de la Republiq. des Lettres, *for April* 1685, *Art. II.*

(81) See the article LUTHER, remark [*R*].

In the firſt edition of this article there was nothing ſaid againſt Florimond de Remond. Yet he is a writer who has not been exact with reſpect to Ochinus [*Y*]. It was on his authority that Bzovius ſaid, that the wife of this Monk was forced to turn laundreſs for bread [*Z*]. But he has enriched himſelf more amply with the ſpoils of the Annaliſt of the Capuchins. He borrows from him a long narration of the apoſtacy and pretended martyrdom of our Ochinus [*AA*]. This deſerves to be conſidered.

diſciples behind him, any more than Lyſerus. VI. It is falſe, that Ochinus retired from Germany to Tranſylvania; and yet falſer, that he made that retreat, becauſe he *could not find means in Germany to ſatisfy his ambition and vanity*. After having been baniſhed from Zurich, he fled to Baſil, from whence he was likewiſe baniſhed. He would have met with the ſame uſage in all the cities of the world where the miniſters had any intereſt: ſo that he had no choice left; the only way he had left was to march towards Poland, and throw himſelf into the arms of the heretics in that part of the world. If GOD has not been merciful to him, thoſe who were ſo zealous in baniſhing him and promoting his exile, are accountable for the loſs of his ſoul. VII. He ſhould not have quoted *Prateolus V. Polig.* for he ſays not a word of Ochinus in that place.

[*Y*] *Florimond de Remond . . . . has not been exact upon the head of Ochinus.*] He ſays (82) that this Monk quitted Geneva, and retired to Zurich, from whence he was ſoon after baniſhed as well as from Baſil; *of which Dudithius complains in his letter to Beza*. This man, adds he, being expelled Switzerland, went from thence to Germany, and after that to Poland. *He wrote a book of Polygamy, dedicated to king Sigiſmund II. That doctrine was preached by him at Cracow, as Reſcius the Polander informs us. All the female ſex in that country, took the alarm, as hot as the Roman dames of old, when deceived by young Papyrius. So that poor Ochinus, whom they charged with having left his wife at Geneva, though indeed ſhe had died of her fall, was conſtrained to fly the city, and retire to Tranſylvania. He publiſhed ſome dialogues, that have ſince appeared in divers languages. Caſtalio tranſlated them into Latin.* All this is full of anachroniſms and falſities; of which any one may be convinced by reading what I have ſaid, either againſt Spondanus or againſt Varillas, or againſt the other copiers of Florimond de Remond, who is the purveyor-general of the Roman catholic writers, who ſpeak of the reformers of the XVIth century.

[*Z*] . . . . *It was from him that Bzovius ſaid, that the wife of this Monk was . . . a laundreſs.*] There is nothing that Florimond de Remond loves ſo much as to banter Monks wives. Let us ſee how he expreſſes himſelf upon the ſubject now before us. *Their arrival at Zurich and Baſil*, ſays he (83), ſpeaking of *Peter Martyr and Bernardin Ochinus, gave ſome ground of ſuſpicion. The people ſurpriſed to ſee theſe two preachers, whoſe names rung all over Italy, feared they might be ſly Sinons that came creeping into their cities, with intent to form ſome treacherous deſign, and to ſeduce the ſouls they had reformed. They were freed from this their jealouſy by Bernardin Ochinus's bringing along with him a handſome young Italian wench, whom he had debauched under a promiſe of marriage; and by his habit, for inſtead of his former hairy garment he was dreſſed like a ſoldier. To enter into an indiſſoluble contract with hereſy, he gave his hand to that girl, and married her. This is the Gordian knot which attaches to this party thoſe whom the tranſports of pride and luſt eject out of convents. This Ochinus ſojourned ſome time at Geneva, with his wife, who was ſoon after forced to earn her bread by mean and abject ſervices; for neither the one nor the other had brought with them much money. This was Madam Ochinus the laundreſs* . . . . . . (84) *Martyr had brought along with him* (85) *his Nun to alleviate his watchings and fatigues. He had not done like Ochinus, who, weary of his laundreſs, had made away with her: for, though Beza ſays ſhe broke her neck, calling to witneſs Alciatus, that other Arian who did ſo much miſchief in Poland, it was not without the ſuſpicion of Ochinus's having accelerated her end, which they would not inquire narrowly into, becauſe he had not yet declared himſelf an Arian, but behaved himſelf as a good brother in CHRIST.* This is what Florimond has the aſſurance to ſay, without the allegation of any one proof, great or ſmall, and without citing any author whatſoever. This ſaves me the trouble of any farther criticiſm.

Bzovius (86) has copied faithfully, and word for word, almoſt ſix pages (87) of the hiſtory of Peter Martyr and of Benardin Ochinus out of Florimond de Remond (88). He has not forgot the paſſage which imports, *That Martyr was poſſeſſed with the ſame paſſion with Luther, transferring his devotions upon theſe Nuns, according to the cuſtom of thoſe who throw off their monaſtic habit: And conſequently has ſighed ever ſince for theſe cloyſtered laſſes, who by the help of their veils the better preſerve the beauty of their Complexion.* But, he has not copied, which I wonder at, this other paſſage (89), though Peter Martyr 'was already very much 'in years, yet not being able to bridle his luſt, he 'went to Geneva to meet a Nun, whom the ſame 'paſſion had drawn out of her convent; namely, 'Catherine Meranda, one who was recommended to 'him, and whom accordingly he married. He would 'have no other but the ſpoil of monaſteries . . . . 'Brentius attacked him very roughly; and Martyr 'nettled at the boldneſs of Brentius, who had uſed 'him with no great meaſure of Chriſtianity, was pre'paring a reply, when, worn out with the ſervices he 'was obliged to perform for his new Nun, he ſicken'ed and died in the ſame city of Zurich.'

As for the reſt, if it was true that Ochinus paſſed the Alps with the woman who was afterwards his wife; we ought to judge charitably, that he only carried her along with him to Switzerland; becauſe he was apprehenſive ſhe would not meet with an opportunity of getting out of Babylon. For he muſt have been guilty of too much folly and forecaſt, if he had thought it neceſſary to provide againſt the want of women in a reformed country. That ſcarcity is not to be feared there, any more than in any other climates; and he muſt have been perſwaded that in caſe marriage ſhould be neceſſary for him at the age of fifty-five, either to ſatisfy the deſire of nature, or to undeceive thoſe who might ſuſpect that he ſtill maintained the validity of his monaſtic vows, he would meet with officious perſons enough to procure him a wife. I believe we have no example of any converted Monk who continued a bachelor for want of finding a woman that he might marry.

[*AA*] *Bzovius borrows from the Annaliſt of the Capuchins, a long narration of the apoſtacy, and pretended martyrdom of Ochinus.*] I ſhall here confine myſelf to what concerns his martyrdom. Bzovius repeating the very words of Zecharias Boverius, the author of the Annals of the Capuchins, relates, that Ochinus living at Geneva fell ill, and was troubled with great remorſes, which obliged him to ſend privately for a neighbouring curate; to whom he confeſſed his ſins, and deſired to be re-united to the boſom of the Catholic church, as repenting of his departure from it, and of his having preached hereſy about fifteen years (90). The curate adminiſtered to him the ſacrament of repentance; and repreſented to him that he ought to make a public recantation of his hereſies. Ochinus promiſed to do it as ſoon as he ſhould recover; or if he did not recover, to make a free declaration of his converſion to his diſciples and viſiters. Upon this condition he was abſolved and re-united to the church. He deſired to communicate; but the Prieſt finding it hazardous to carry the Viaticum to him, comforted him with theſe words of St Auguſtin, *crede & manducaſti, believe and you have eaten it.* The ſick man quickly declared his converſion to the diſciples who came to ſee him, and earneſtly exhorted them to follow his example in quitting the hereſies he had taught them. They thought at firſt he was light-headed; but finding afterwards that he was in earneſt, they gave notice of it to the magiſtrates. The magiſtrates enjoined them to obſerve whether he perſiſted in thoſe ſentiments, and if he did, to kill him. The diſciples executed their orders: for after hearing the fine diſcourſes he made to them concerning repentance, they ſtabbed him in his bed. Others affirm, that, by virtue of a decree of the magiſtrates, he was dragged out of the city and ſtoned (91). The Annaliſt of the Capuchins alledges

(82) Flor. de Remond, Hiſt. de l'Héréſie, *book iii, ch. v, pag. m.* 293, 294.

(83) Id. ib. *pag.* 293.

(84) Id. ib. *pag.* 296, 297.

(85) That is, when he went to England.

(86) Bzovius, Annal. *Tom. xx, pag.* 87, *& ſeq. ad ann.* 1542. He cites the author, whom he copies.

(87) That is, in the edition in quarto, of Florimond de Remond.

(88) Flor. de Remond, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 293.

(89) Id. ib. *pag.* 297.

(90) Obſerve this date; it would prove that Ochinus was killed at Geneva in 1557, or thereabouts; and we can prove, that he was expelled Zurich in 1563.

(91) Quare mox illi arreptis pugionibus quos occultos geſtabant in lecto jacentem & manus ad Cœlos tendentem confodiunt. Alii vero eum Magiſtratus edicto extra Urbem raptatum, lapidibuſque obrutum fuiſſe tradunt. *Bzovius, ad ann.* 1542, *num.* 68, *pag.* 96.

alledges the teſtimony of ſeven perſons, whoſe names and ſtations he ſets down. The firſt of theſe ſeven witneſſes is a Doge of Venice; and the reſt are perſons conſiderable, either by birth or by the offices they bore in monaſteries. But not one of them affirms any thing otherwiſe than upon hear-ſay. To theſe teſtimonies the Annaliſt adds, what Theodore Beza owned (92), that at laſt Ochinus diſcovered himſelf to be a great hypocrite (93); but, as Theophilus Raynaud (94) has very well proved by a letter of Theodore Beza (95), this hypocriſy did not conſiſt in any return to Popery, but in adopting the hereſy of the Anti-Trinitarians, &c. Pray take notice with how little judgment the Monks compile the Chronicles of their orders. There are expreſs and unexceptionable proofs that Ochinus fled to the ſectaries in Poland, and died in thoſe parts; and yet the Capuchins make no ſcruple to publiſh, that he died a Roman Catholic martyr at Geneva, and think it very ſtrange we ſhould doubt of it; as we have ſeen above (96).

(92) Beza, in Iconibus, in Petro Martyre.

(93) Bzovius, *ad ann.* 1542, *num.* 70, *& ſeq.*

(94) Theoph. Raynaud, in Syntagm. de Libris propriis, *num.* 23, *pag.* 42. Apopompæi.

(95) That which he wrote to Dudithius. See the remark [*L*].

(96) In the remark [*O*], citation (48).

OCTAVIA, grand-niece of Julius Cæſar (*a*), and the ſiſter of Auguſtus, was one of the moſt illuſtrious ladies of antient Rome. She was married firſt to Claudius Marcellus, who was conſul in the year 704 of Rome, and died not long after the Peruſian war. Soon after his death ſhe married Marc Antony [*A*]; their common friends having deſired this marriage (*b*) as a proper expedient to eſtabliſh and confirm the peace which was juſt concluded between Auguſtus and Marc Antony. This virtuous lady was very well qualified for producing ſo good an effect: but her huſband gave himſelf up ſo entirely to his paſſion for Cleopatra, that nothing could prevail with him to hearken to reaſon. Before he fell into this ſlavery, his wife's counſels were very ſerviceable (*c*). He left her in Italy (*d*), after an interview with Auguſtus at Tarentum in the year 717, and returned into the Eaſt. Some time after ſhe ſet out, in order to meet him; and perceiving from his letters to her that he deſired ſhe would ſtop at Athens, ſhe accordingly ſtaid there, till ſhe ſaw plainly that he impoſed upon her. Upon this ſhe returned to Rome, and would not ſtir out of her huſband's houſe, though Auguſtus deſired it. She continued there, and took care of every thing juſt as if ſhe had been perfectly well ſatisfied with her huſband (*e*). She treated the children of Marc Antony and Fulvia with the ſame affection as before, and continued to educate them with equal vigilance (*f*). She would not have permitted, upon any account in the world the affronts ſhe received from Marc Antony to become the cauſe of a civil war (*g*); and from thence it was, that, when in obedience to his orders ſhe removed from his houſe, ſhe melted into tears (*h*), only becauſe ſhe ſaw ſhe ſhould be looked upon as one of the occaſions of the war. By this her excellent conduct ſhe did her huſband much harm though againſt her will (*i*); for the people obſerving that he preferred to her ſuch a woman as Cleopatra

(*a*) She was the daughter of Caius Octavius, and of Atia, the daughter of Atius Balbus, and Julia, the ſiſter of Julius Cæſar.

(*b*) Plut. in Antonio, *pag.* 929.

(*c*) See the remark [*A*].

(*d*) Plut. in Antonio, *pag.* 932.

(*e*) Ib. *p.* 940.

(*f*) Ib. *p.* 941.

(*g*) Ib. *p.* 940.

(*h*) Ib. *p.* 942.

(*i*) See the remark [*B*], citation (8).

[*A*] *Soon after her firſt huſband's death ſhe married Marc Antony.*] The Roman laws prohibited widows to marry during the firſt ten months of their widowhood; but Octavia had a diſpenſation from that rule by a decree of the ſenate (1). This the publick good required; for there was but too much reaſon to fear that Marc Antony and Auguſtus would quarrel for ever, and perpetuate the civil war, unleſs peace were eſtabliſhed between them by ſome good mediator; and no expedient appeared ſo proper to form this happy mediation, as the marriage of Marc Antony with Octavia. Upon this account the marriage was haſtened, without even waiting till Octavia was brought to bed (2). Every thing was hoped for from her prudence and beauty. Τουτον ἅπαντες εἰσηγοῦντο τὸν γάμον, ἐλπίζοντες τὴν Ὀκταβίαν, ἐπὶ κάλλει τοσούτῳ σημνότητα καὶ νοῦν ἔχουσαν, εἰς ταυτὸ τῷ Ἀντωνίῳ παραγενομένην, καὶ στερχθεῖσαν, ὡς εἰκὸς, τοιαύτην γυναῖκα, πάντων πραγμάτων αὐτοῖς σωτηρίαν ἔσεσθαι καὶ σύγκρασιν. Has nuptias ſuaſerunt omnes, quòd Octaviam ſperarent, quæ excellentiæ formæ gravitatem & prudentiam habebat adjunctam, ubi Antonio conjuncta eſſet, atque ut talis fœmina haud dubiè ab eo adamata, omnium rerum ipſis ſalutem & concordiam allaturam (3). ---- *All agreed in promoting this marriage, out of a perſwaſion, that Octavia, who was as prudent and grave as ſhe was beautiful, by being married to Antony, muſt needs be beloved by him for thoſe admirable qualities, and conſequently conclude a general and laſting peace.* This marriage was conſummated in the year 714 (4). Three years after they ſaw the accompliſhment of the hopes they had conceived. Auguſtus waged war with the ſon of Pompey, and wanted ſuccours from Antony. Antony came from the Eaſt to Italy, with a much greater intent to inform himſelf of the ſtate of affairs, and to take advantage of this juncture, than to ſecond Auguſtus. Their correſpondence grew colder and colder every day: they complained one of another, and their jealouſies were like to have run higher; but Octavia dexterouſly ſtruck in to reconcile them, and compaſſed her end (5). Plutarch is much more circumſtantial in his account of this than Dion: he relates, that after theſe Triumviri had made peace with Pompey's ſon, one ſtaid in Italy, and the other went to Greece with Octavia his wife. He paſſed the winter with her at Athens; and being incenſed againſt Auguſtus by ſome ill reports, ſet ſail for Italy; and being denied entrance into the haven of Brunduſium, put into Tarentum; from whence he ſent Octavia to Auguſtus. The lady met her brother on the road, and affected him in ſuch a moving manner, that he went entirely reconciled to Tarentum. The interview between the two brothers-in-law was attended with a thouſand demonſtrations of friendſhip. Plutarch's words are theſe: Ἡ δὲ ἀπαντήσασα καθ᾽ ὁδὸν Καίσαρι, καὶ παραλαβοῦσα τῶν ἐκείνου φίλων Ἀγρίππαν καὶ Μαικήναν ἐνετύγχανε, πολλὰ ποτνιωμένη καὶ πολλὰ δεομένη μὴ περιϊδεῖν αὐτὴν ἐκ μακαριωτάτης γυναικὸς ἀθλιωτάτην γενομένην. νῦν μὲν γὰρ ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς αὐτὴν ἀποβλέπειν, αὐτοκρατόρων δυοῖν, τοῦ μὲν γυναῖκα, τοῦ δὲ ἀδελφὴν οὖσαν. Εἰ δὲ τὰ χείρω κρατήσειεν, (φ) καὶ γένοιτο πόλεμος, ὑμῶν μὲν ἄδηλον ὅτῳ κρατεῖν ἢ κρατεῖσθαι πέπρωται, τὰ ἐμὰ δὲ ἀμφοτέρως ἄθλια τούτοις ἐπικλασθεὶς ὁ Καῖσαρ, ἧκεν εἰρηνικῶς εἰς Τάραντα. Hæc occurrens Cæſari in itinere, adjunctis illius amicis Agrippa & Mæcenate, convenit eum. Multis autem oravit queſtibus ne permitteret ex fortunatiſſima fœmina miſerrimam ſe evadere. Nunc enim omnes mortales ait ſuſpicere ſe duorum Imperatorum alterius conjugem alterius ſororem. Quod ſi deteriora conſilia, inquit, valuerunt, & extiterit bellum: utri veſtrum, incertum eſt, in fatis ſit vincere an vinci; mea verò ſors utrinque erit miſera. His fractus Cæſar venit pacatus Tarentum (6). ---- *Having met with Cæſar upon the road, ſhe had a conference with him and his friends Agrippa and Mecenas. She intreated him, with much lamentation, not to ſuffer her to become, from the moſt fortunate, the moſt wretched of her ſex. For, ſays ſhe, all the world now conſider, me as related to two emperors, the wife of one, and ſiſter of the other. But if evil counſels ſhould prevail, and a war ſhould commence; it is uncertain which of your fortunes it may be to conquer or be conquered, but it muſt be mine both ways to be miſerable. Cæſar quite overcome by theſe arguments came pacified to Tarentum.*

(1) Plut. in Anton. *pag.* 929, 930.

(2) Dio, *lib. xlviii, pag. m.* 429, *ad ann.* 714.

(3) Plut. ibid. *pag.* 929, *F.*

(4) 713 according to Calviſius.

(5) See Dio, *lib. xlix, ſub fin.*

(6) Plut. in Antonio, *pag.* 931, E.

[*B*] *They*

Cleopatra [*B*], conceived a very great indignation and contempt for him. This war, as every one knows, ended in the entire ruin of Marc Antony. Fortune ſeemed to promiſe Octavia the higheſt pitch of human felicity. She had a very deſerving ſon, who married the daughter of Auguſtus, and was looked upon as the preſumptive heir of the empire. But he died in the flower of his age [*C*]; which proved ſo ſevere a blow

[*B*] *They conceived great indignation againſt Antony, upon finding that he preferred to her ſuch a woman as Cleopatra.*] Thoſe who had ſeen Cleopatra deplored, above all others, Marc Antony's infatuation, becauſe they found her neither ſo young nor ſo handſome as Octavia. He therefore diſcovered a great deal of folly in not giving the preference to Octavia, who infinitely ſurpaſſed the other in virtue and wiſdom. Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ ᾤκτειρον οὐκ ἐκείνην ἀλλ᾽ Ἀντώνιον, καὶ μᾶλλον οἱ Κλεοπάτραν ἑωρακότες, οὔτε κάλλει τῆς Ὀκταβίας οὔτε ὥρᾳ διαφέρουσαν. *Populum vero Romanum miſerebat non ita illius* (Octaviæ) *ut Antonii, atque impenſius eos qui Cleopatram viderant, neque forma Octaviæ neque ætatis flore præcellentem* (7). The high eſteem they had for Octavia, who did all the good offices ſhe could to her huſband's children and friends, without reſenting his affronts, did Marc Antony a great deal of harm; inſomuch, that, contrary to her intention, this illuſtrious lady expoſed him extremely to the hatred of the Romans. Ἄκουσα δὲ ἔβλαπτε διὰ τούτων Ἀντώνιον· ἐμισεῖτο γὰρ ἀδικῶν γυναῖκα τοιαύτην. *Enim vero hiſce rebus offecit invita Antonio. Invidia namque flagrabat, quod talem fœminam violaret* (8). Accordingly it is ſaid that Auguſtus conſented to Octavia's voyage to her huſband, only out of hopes that he would put ſome great affront upon her; and he knew very well that ſuch an affront would paſs for a ſufficient ground for renewing the war. To this, we may add, that he did not doubt but it would complete the indignation of the people of Rome againſt Marc Antony. Ἐν δὲ Ῥώμῃ βουλομένης Ὀκταβίας ϖλεῦσαι ϖρὸς Ἀντώνιον ἐπέτρεψε Καῖσαρ, ὡς οἱ ϖλείους λέγουσιν οὐκ ἐκείνῃ χαριζόμενος, ἀλλ᾽ ὅπως ϖεριυβρισθεῖσα καὶ καταμεληθεῖσα, πρὸς τὸν ϖόλεμον αἰτίαν εὐϖρεπῆ ϖαρασχοί. *Romæ inſtituenti ad Antonium navigare Octaviæ annuit Cæſar, non, ut plerique tradunt, quo illi indulgeret: verum quo contumelia affecta deſpectaque colorem præberet bello movendo honeſtum* (9). Whatever good opinion Cleopatra might have of her own charms, ſhe was extremely apprehenſive of thoſe of Octavia; and for that reaſon had recourſe to the deepeſt artifices to hinder Marc Antony from ſuffering her to come near him. Αἰσθομένη δὲ ἡ Κλεοπάτρα τὴν Ὀκταβίαν ὁμόσε χωροῦσαν αὐτῇ, καὶ φοβηθεῖσα μὴ τοῦ τρόπου τῇ σεμνότητι καὶ τῇ Καίσαρος δυνάμει ϖροσκτησαμένη τὸ καθ᾽ ἡδονὴν ὁμιλεῖν καὶ θηραπεύειν Ἀντώνιον, ἄμαχος γένηται, καὶ κρατήσῃ ϖαντάπασι τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, ἐρᾶν αὐτὴ ϖροσεποιεῖτο τοῦ Ἀντωνίου. *At Cleopatra conferre ſecum pedem animadvertens Octaviam, veritaque ne cum gravitate morum & Cæſaris potentia placidam adjungens conſuetudinem & Antonii obſervantiam, inſuperabilis eſſet & ſemel potiretur viro, deperire ſimulabat ſe Antonii amore* (10). She made her galant believe that ſhe could not live if he left her: ſhe took care to repreſent to him, that it was enough for Octavia to be a lawful wife, while Cleopatra, the queen of ſo great a people, bore only the name of his concubine: a name which ſhe could willingly bear (11), provided that Marc Antony's abſence might not throw her into deſpair. Ὀκταβίαν μὲν . . . τὸ τῆς γαμετῆς ὄνομα καρποῦσθαι· Κλεοπάτραν δὲ, τοσούτων ἀνθρώπων βασιλεύουσαν, ἐρωμένην, Ἀντωνίου καλεῖσθαι· καὶ τοὔνομα τοῦτο μὴ φεύγειν μεδ᾽ ἀπαξιοῦν ἕως ὁρᾶν ἐκεῖνον ἔξεστι καὶ συζῆν, ἀϖελαυνομένην δὲ τούτου μὴ ϖεριβιώσεσθαι. *Octaviam enim . . . . nomine frui uxoris. Cleopatram vero, tam multorum Reginam mortalium, pellicem Antonii nominari: neque eam hoc defugere vel dedignari nomen quoad aſpicere illum & una liceat vivere: quo ſi orbaretur non ducturam ultra ſpiritum* (12). Marc Antony's friends adviſed him to ſend Cleopatra back to Egypt, ſhe having followed him to Epheſus when every thing was preparing for the laſt rupture: but ſhe fearing that Octavia would once more reconcile her brother to her huſband (13), found out a man who perſuaded Antony to carry her a long with him wherever he went. Her emulation was ſo ſtrong, that, coming to Athens, where Octavia had been received with very diſtinguiſhing marks of honour, ſhe was very liberal to the people in hopes to obtain the like (14).

[*C*] *Her ſon died in the flower of his age.*] His name was Marcus Claudius Marcellus; and his elogy is inſerted in the Æneid with ſo much ſkill, and ſo admirably well turned, that no reader can be ſo ſtupid as not to be moved with it. I have read it above a hundred times, and always with tranſports of admiration: and now that I read it once more in tranſcribing it here, I think it finer than it ever appeared to me before. Several excellent judges have aſſured me that they are of the ſame mind. I doubt not therefore but I ſhall be pardoned for giving it here entire.

Atque hic Æneas (unâ namque ire videbat
Egregium formâ juvenem, & fulgentibus armis;
Sed frons læta parùm, & dejecto lumina vultu)
Quis, pater, ille virum qui ſic comitatur euntem?
Filius? anne aliquis magnâ de ſtirpe nepotum?
Quis ſtrepitus circa comitum! quantum inſtar in ipſo
  eſt!
Sed nox atra caput triſti circumvolat umbrâ.
Tùm pater Anchiſes lacrymis ingreſſus obortis:
O nate, ingentem luctum ne quære tuorum:
Oſtendent terris hunc tantum fata; neque ultra
Eſſe ſinent: nimium vobis Romana propago
Viſa potens, Superi, propria hæc ſi dona fuiſſent.
Quantos ille virûm magnam Mavortis ad urbem
Campus aget gemitus! vel quæ, Tiberine, videbis
Funera, cum umulum præterlabêre recentem!
Nec puer Iliacâ quiſquam de gente Latinos
In tantum ſpe tollet avos: nec Romula quondam
Ullo ſe tantum tellus jactabit alumno.
Heu pietas! heu priſca fides! invictaque bello
Dextera! non illi quiſquam ſe impunè tuliſſet
Obvius armato; ſeu cùm pedes iret in hoſtem;
Seu ſpumantis equi foderet calcaribus armos.
Heu miſerande puer! ſi qua fata aſpera rumpas,
Tu Marcellus eris: manibus date lilia plenis:
Purpureos ſpargam flores, animamque nepotis
His ſaltem accumulem donis, & fungar inani
Munere (15).

Æneas, here, beheld, of form Divine,
A godlike youth, in glitt'ring armour ſhine:
With great Marcellus keeping equal pace;
But gloomy were his eyes, dejected was his face.
He ſaw and wond'ring aſk'd his airy guide,
What, and of whence was he, who preſs'd the hero's
  ſide?
His ſon, or one of his illuſtrious name?
How like the former, and almoſt the ſame!
Obſerve the crowds that compaſs him around:
All gaze, and all admire, and raiſe a ſhouting ſound.
But hov'ring miſts around his brows are ſpread,
And night, with ſable ſhades involves his head.
Seek not to know (the ghoſt replied with tears)
The ſorrows of thy ſons, in future years.
This youth (the bliſsful viſion of a day)
Shall juſt be ſhewn on earth, and ſnatch'd away.
The gods too high had raiſed the Roman ſtate,
Were but their gifts as permanent as great.
What groans of men ſhall fill the Martian field!
How fierce a blaze his flaming Pile ſhall yield!
What fun'ral pomp, ſhall floating Tiber ſee,
When riſing from his bed, he views the ſad ſolemnity!
No youth ſhall equal hopes of glory give:
No youth afford ſo great a cauſe to grieve.

---

(7) Ib. *p.* 942. *D.*

(8) Ib. *p.* 941.

(9) Ib. *p.* 940, *B.*

(10) Ibid. *C.*

(11) Compare what Heloïſa ſaid above, in the remark [*U*] of her article.

(12) Plut. ibid. *pag.* 942, *D.*

(13) Φοβουμένη τὰς δὲ Ὀκταβίας πάλιν αὐτοῦ διαλύσεις. Novam interprete Octavia timens reconciliationem. *Id. ib. pag.* 941. F.

(14) Ib. *p.* 942, C.

(15) Virgil. Æneid. lib. VI, ver. 860, & ſeq.

blow to the mother, that ſhe remained ever after inconſolable [*D*]. She gave herſelf up entirely to ſolitude, and to a terrible melancholy all the reſt of her days. She died in the year 744 (*k*), leaving two daughters by Marc Antony, who were married very advantageouſly (*l*). They who ſay ſhe had not the ſame mother with Auguſtus [*E*], are miſtaken.

The Trojan honour, and the Roman boaſt;
Admir'd when living, and ador'd when loſt!
Mirror of antient faith in early youth!
Undaunted worth, inviolable truth!
No foe unpuniſh'd in the fighting field,
Shall dare thee foot to foot, with ſword and ſhield.
Much leſs, in arms, oppoſe thy matchleſs force,
When thy ſharp ſpurs ſhall urge thy foaming horſe.
Ah! cou'dſt thou break through fate's ſevere decree,
A new Marcellus ſhall ariſe in thee!
Full caniſters of fragant lilies bring,
Mix'd with the purple roſes of the ſpring;
Let me with fun'ral flowers his body ſtrow,
This gift which parents to their children owe,
This unavailing gift I may at leaſt beſtow.

DRYDEN.

The recital of theſe verſes made the Emperor and Octavia melt into tears; and Virgil was obliged to acquaint them that he was come to the end of the book, otherwiſe they would have ſtopped his reading. He was liberally rewarded for them (16). Others ſay, Octavia ſwooned away at the words, *Tu Marcellus eris*, and was brought to herſelf again with great difficulty. She ordered the Poet a good ſum for each verſe (17). Marcellus died in the 731ſt year of Rome (18). All authors agree that he was very young; but few give his exact age. Propertius indeed has done it (19), and he allots him twenty years of age, in which point he is more to be credited than Servius, who makes him but eighteen (20). Glandorp is miſtaken in affirming that Servius makes him twenty-three (21). In another place (22), without citing any author, he aſſerts, that Marcellus died at the age of twenty-four.

[*D*] *She remained ever after inconſolable.*] The circumſtances of her affliction were, in my opinion, well worth the notice of all Hiſtorians who have occaſion to mention her and her ſon: for they have a character of ſingularity which has all the appearance of ſomething very extraordinary. Octavia became ſuch a man-hater that ſhe courted nothing but ſolitude; the very glory of her brother was a trouble to her. The being a mother was enough to make one become the object of her indignation. She kept no picture of her ſon, and would not ſuffer any one to ſpeak of him, rejecting all the verſes that were made upon him (23). Seneca is the only author who informs us of theſe circumſtances. He is ſo very particular upon this ſubject that it will not be improper to tranſcribe his words. ‘ Octavia Marcellum, cui & avunculus & ſocer incumbere cœperat, in quem onus imperii reclinare: adoleſcentem animo alacrem, ingenio potentem; ſed & frugalitatis continentiæque in illis aut annis aut opibus non mediocriter admirandum; patientem laborum, voluptatibus alienum; quantumcumque imponere illi avunculus, & (ut ita dicam) inædificare voluiſſet, laturum. Benè legerat nulli ceſſura ponderi fundamenta. Nullum finem, per omne vitæ ſuæ tempus, flendi gemendique fecit: nec ullas admiſit voces, ſalutare aliquid afferentes: ne avocari quidem ſe paſſa eſt. Intenta in unam rem, & toto animo affixa, talis per omnem vitam fuit, qualis in funere: non dico non auſa conſurgere, ſed allevari recuſans: ſecundam orbitatem judicans, lacrimas omittere. Nullam habere imaginem filii cariſſimi voluit, nullam ſibi fieri de illo mentionem. Oderat omnes matres, & in Liviam maximè furebat: quia videbatur ad illius filium tranſiſſe, ſibi promiſſa felicitas. Tenebris & ſolitudini familiariſſima; ne ad fratrem quidem reſpiciens, carmina celebrandæ Marcelli memoriæ compoſita, alioſque ſtudiorum honores rejecit, & aures ſuas adverſus omne ſolatium clauſit, à ſolemnibus officiis ſeducta, & ipſam magnitudinis fraternæ nimis circumlucentem fortunam exoſa, defodit ſe, & abdidit. Aſſidentibus liberis, nepotibus, lugubrem veſtem non depoſuit; non ſine contumeliâ omnium ſuorum, quibus ſalvis orba ſibi videbatur (24). - - - - *Octavia continued all her life long lamenting and bewailing Marcellus, upon whom his uncle and father-in-law had begun to rely for his ſucceſſor in the empire, a youth of a chearful diſpoſition, and great parts: but frugal and temperate to a degree which in his years and ſtation is not a little to be admired; patient under fatigues, and averſe to pleaſures; and able to bear all that his uncle intended to lay, and (if I may ſo ſay) build upon him. He had laid ſo good a foundation that nothing could ſhake. Neither would ſhe permit any body to comfort her, or ſuffer herſelf to be diverted. Being intent upon this one thing, and her whole mind, taken up with it, ſhe appeared thro' the whole courſe of her life, as if ſhe had been at a funeral: I do not ſay not daring to riſe, but refuſing to be lifted up: eſteeming her loſs to be renewed, if her tears were to be interrupted. She would have no picture of her favourite ſon, nor allow him to be mentioned to her. She hated all mothers, and moſt of all raved againſt Livia; becauſe her promiſed happineſs ſeemed to be transferred upon her ſon. She courted darkneſs and ſolitude; not ſo much as regarding her brother: ſhe rejected all verſes compoſed in memory of Marcellus, and all other ſuch honours; and ſhut her ears againſt all conſolation; retiring from all ſort of ſolemnities, and hating even her brother's too ſhining greatneſs, ſhe hid and buried herſelf. She appeared in deeep mourning, even in the preſence of her children, and grand-children, which gave great offence to her family, as it had an appearance of her thinking herſelf deprived of them while they were living and in health.*’

[*E*] *They who ſay, ſhe had not the ſame mother with Auguſtus are miſtaken.*] Plutarch is guilty of this miſtake: he takes our Octavia to have been the daughter of Ancharia, the firſt wife of Caius Octavius, and Atia the ſecond wife of this Octavius to have been momother of Auguſtus (25). But there are ſeveral reaſons to evince the contrary. Glandorp (26) furniſhes us with two very good ones: the firſt is grounded upon a paſſage of Cicero, and the ſecond upon a paſſage of Dion. The latter ſays, that Caius Marcellus preferred to the conſulſhip in the year 703 (27), was an enemy to Julius Cæſar, tho' he was his kinſman. Τῷ Καίσαρι καίπερ ἐξ ἐπιγαμίας προσήκων ἐχθρὸς ἦν. *Cæſaris quamquam cum eo ipſi affinitas intercedebat, inimicus erat* (28). Now that kindred or relation ſprung from the marriage of this Marcellus with Octavia; ſo that his wife muſt have been the daughter of Atia; for had ſhe been the daughter of Ancharia ſhe could not have been related to Julius Cæſar. If Glandorp had confirmed this by a paſſage out of Suetonius, he had rendered his proof demonſtrative. Suetonius tells us, that Julius Cæſar had a mind to give Octavia, the wife of Caius Marcellus, and grand-child to his ſiſter, in marriage to Pompey. *Ad retinendam autem Pompeji neceſſitudinem ac voluntatem, Octaviam ſororis ſuæ neptem quæ C. Marcello nupta erat, conditione ei detulit* (29). As for the paſſage of Cicero, it imports, that Lucius Philippus was married to a woman of Aricia, whoſe daughter had been married to Caius Marcellus. This wife of Lucius Philippus was the mother of Auguſtus (30); ſo that it is inconteſtable that the wife of Caius Marcellus was ſiſter by the mother-ſide to that emperor: for, to uſe the words of a Journaliſt, *It will never enter into any perſon's head whatever, to imagine it to be falſe*, that the wife of this Marcellus was the daughter of the wife of that Philip, *ſince it is contrary to common ſenſe, that Cicero ſhould advance ſuch a thing before the ſenate, without being well aſſured of the truth of it* (31). It is in the third Philippic that Cicero has that paſſage; and undoubtly Lucius Philippus and Caius Marcellus were preſent when he ſpoke it, as Mr Perizonius obſerves (32). ‘ Sed hoc clariſſimi viri viderint, L. Philippus qui habet Aricinam uxorem, C. Marcellus qui Aricinæ filiam: quos certo ſcio dignitatis optimarum feminarum non pœnitere (33). - - - - *But let thoſe illuſtrious men anſwer to this point L. Philippus who married an Arician wife, and C. Marcellus who married the daughter of an Arician: who I am very ſure have no mean opinion of the dignity of thoſe excellent women.*’ This is the concluſion of

---

(*k*) Dio, *lib. liv*, *pag.* 625.

(*l*) See the article ANTONIA.

(16) Et conſtat hunc librum tanta pronuntiatione Auguſto & Octaviæ eſſe recitatum, ut fletu nimio imperarent ſilentium: niſi Virgilius finem eſſe dixiſſet, qui pro hoc ære gravi donatus eſt, id eſt, maſſis. *Servius, in Virgil. Æn. lib. vi, ver.* 862.

(17) Tres omnino libros recitavit, ſecundum videlicet, quartum & ſextum; ſed hunc præcipue ob Octaviam, quæ cum recitationi intereſſet, ad illos de filio ſuo verſus, *Tu Marcellus eris*, defeciſſe fertur, atque ægrè refocillata, dena ſeſtertia pro ſingulo verſu Virgilio dari juſſit. *Donatus, in Vita Virgilii.*

(18) Dio, *lib. liii, circa fin.*

(19) Propert. Eleg. XVII, *lib. iii.*

(20) Servius, ubi ſupra.

(21) Glandorp. Onomaſt. *pag.* 233.

(22) Ib. *p.* 434.

(23) This does not agree with what I have mentioned in the preceding remark.

(24) Seneca, Conſol. ad Marciam, *cap. ii*, *pag. m.* 736, 737.

(25) Plut. in Antonio, *pag.* 929, *D.*

(26) Glandorp. Onomaſt. *pag.* 86.

(27) According to others in 704.

(28) Dio, *lib. xl*, *pag.* 166.

(29) Sueton. in Cæſare, *cap. xxvii.*

(30) Sueton. in Auguſt. *cap. viii.*

(31) Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, *for June* 1685, *Art. I*, *pag.* 597.

(32) Animadv. Hiſt. *pag.* 116.

(33) Cicero, Philipp. III, *pag. m.* 782.

Cicero's anſwer to an objection of Marc Antony againſt Octavius, and grounded upon his mother's being born in Aricia (34). Suetonius's evidence is poſitive againſt Plutarch: ' Decedens Macedonia (*C. Octavius*) prius ' quam profiteri ſe candidatum conſulatus poſſet, ' morte obiit repentina, ſuperſtitibus liberis, Octavia ' majore, quam ex Ancharia, & Octavia minore, item ' Auguſto, quos ex Atia tulerat (35). - - - *Caius Octa-* ' *vius departing from Macedonia, before he could de-* ' *clare himſelf candidate for the conſulſhip died ſuddenly,* ' *leaving behind him Octavia the elder, his daughter by* ' *Ancharia, and Octavia the younger, and Auguſtus, his* ' *children by Atia.*' See Mr Perizonius, who has ſet all theſe arguments in a clear light, in order to ſhew the error of Plutarch, adopted by Antonius Auguſtinus, by Juſtus Lipſius, and ſome other learned men (36). The author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, has inſiſted at large upon this criticiſm, in giving an abſtract of Perizonius's book. But he has made a conſiderable miſtake in ſaying that Marcellus's wife was *the daughter of Aricina* (37). This expreſſion imports, that Aricina was the name of that lady's family, which is very falſe, it being only an epithet given her in regard to her native country Aricia. The learned Manutius pretends, that the mother of Octavia was not born in that place, and wonders how ſhe came to be deſcribed by that addition. ' Miror autem A- ' ricinam Atiam eſſe dictam, cum nec ipſa nec pater ' ejus Balbus Ariciæ natus eſſet, fuit enim, Suetonio ' teſte, paterna ſtirpe Aricinus (38). - - - - *I am ſur-* ' *prized that Atia ſhould be called an Arician, when* ' *neither ſhe nor her father Balbus was born in Aricia,* ' *for he was, if we believe Suetonius, an Arician by* ' *the father's ſide.*' But he is under a great miſtake; for if Atius and his daughter had not been of Aricia, Cicero would not have overlooked ſuch a fair plea to diſprove Marc Antony, who upbraided Octavia's mother with being born in that place. He was too well verſed in the art of refuting, and too dexterous in taking advantage of the leaſt circumſtances, to ſuffer his adverſary to run away with a falſity of this nature. Since therefore he grants the matter of fact, and only refutes the conſequence which Marc Antony drew from it, we need not doubt but that Manutius in this place has made a very falſe remark. But it may be aſked what ſhall we do with the paſſage of Suetonius? I anſwer, that Suetonius's phraſe in this place is of a piece with a way of ſpeaking uſual among the French writers. They ſay that ſuch a one is *originaire* (originally) of ſuch a place (39); by which expreſſion they mean, that not only his anceſtors, but himſelf was born there. I own indeed that in this latter ſenſe the expreſſion is not very exact. *Originaire*, in the politeſt authors, relates only to the country of one's father or grand-father, *&c.* But whoever told us that Suetonius was a nice obſerver of exactneſs in his ſtyle?

Perizonius has very juſtly cenſured Triſtan, who thought, that the mother of Marcellus, Auguſtus's ſon-in-law, was never married to Marc Antony. This thought he grounded upon the words of Seneca, touching that lady's affliction upon the death of her dear ſon. *All that is here ſaid of Octavia,* (it is Triſtan that ſpeaks (40) after rehearſing the paſſage of Seneca) *can by no means, as I take it, be underſtood of her, of the two Octavia's, Auguſtus's ſiſters, who had Antony for her ſecond huſband. For that ſingular and ſavage way of living, of a woman who drowned her days in tears, and ſtifled the ſplendor and luſtre of her family in darkneſs, in retirement, and in flying ſociety and day-light as much as poſſible, covering that continual ſorrow with deep mourning, can never ſuit with what is ſaid of her marriage with Marc Antony, and what followed thereupon, of the diſtinguiſhing love and honour, ſhewn her by Auguſtus, of the marks of honour paid to her elſewhere, particularly at Corinth, where, as Pauſanias informs us, in his Corinthiaca, a temple was built to her honour; of the reputation ſhe had juſtly merited, for being a courageous, virtuous, and conſtant lady, and for having brought up the ſeven children of Marc Antony, which he had by her and by Cleopatra* (41), *as if they had been all her own, notwithſtanding his caſting her off; and in fine, of all the other honourable circumſtances relating to her, recorded by hiſtorians.* He believes therefore, that of Auguſtus's two ſiſters, the eldeſt married Marcellus, and fell into the affliction mentioned by Seneca; and the youngeſt married Marc Antony. This is a falſe notion, and only raiſing ſcruples from nothing: for if he had but called to mind, that the marriage of Octavia with Marc Antony happened about ſeventeen years before the death of young Marcellus, he had found no difficulty in reconciling Seneca with the other authors (42). In the *Journal des Savans* (43) there is a learned *diſſertation upon the true degree of conſanguinity between Auguſtus and Octavia.* It was communicated to the journaliſt by a learned Antiquary (44), and a very honeſt gentleman. In that diſſertation he ſets the truth in a clear light, but he is a little out in his ſtating Triſtan's objection. *Marcellus's Octavia,* ſays he (45), *whom Suetonius calls the younger Octavia* (†), *had been already propoſed for a wife to Pompey by her great uncle; ſo that ſhe was twice looked upon as an inſtrument of reconciliation. And this furniſhes us with an anſwer to the objection of ſome moderns, who finding in Seneca* (‡) *that Marcellus's widow was inconſolable upon the death of her huſband, will not allow her being married a ſecond time to Marc Antony: for we very well know that perſons of that rank are commonly victims of ſtate. Octavia, notwithſtanding her mourning, was forced to conſent to this ſecond marriage for the public good, and for her brother's intereſt; and it is very probable that on Marc Antony's ſide, it was pure Politics that moved him to marry a lady, whoſe extraction he had decried. And accordingly we ſee he threw her off ſoon after, to give himſelf intirely to Cleopatra.* You ſee plainly he ſuppoſes that Triſtan quoted Seneca, to prove that this lady was inconſolable upon the death of her huſband. And yet he neither does, nor can, quote him for any thing elſe than to ſhew her extreme affliction for the death of her ſon. You ſee likewiſe, he ſuppoſes that Octavia doing violence to herſelf, married Marc Antony in the midſt of the affliction repreſented by Seneca. But if you conſult Seneca, you will ſee how groundleſs that ſuppoſition is.

(34) Ignobilitatem objicit C. Cæſaris filio: cujus etiam naturalis pater, ſi vita ſuppeditaſſet, Conſul factus eſſet. Aricina mater. *Ibid. pag.* 781.

(35) Sueton. in Auguſt. *cap. iv.*

(36) Jacob. Perizonius, Animadverſ. Hiſtoric. *pag.* 116, *& ſeq.*

(37) Nouv. de la Repub. des Lett. ubi ſupra.

(38) Paulus Manutius, in Cicer. Philipp. III, *pag. m.* 782.

(39) Moreri often makes uſe of this expreſſion.

(40) Triſtan. Comment. Hiſtor. *vol. i, pag.* 54.

(41) Why does not Triſtan take notice of the children of Marc Antony and Fulvia, which Octavia brought up? how comes he to be ignorant of what Plutarch ſays *in Antonio, pag.* 955, that of the ſeven children left by Marc Antony, including the two daughters he had by Octavia, the eldeſt was put to death by Auguſtus, and the other ſix were brought up by Octavia?

(42) *See* Perizonius, Animadv. Hiſt. *pag.* 120; *and the* Nouv. de la Repub. des Lettres, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 598.

(43) Of the 21ſt of January 1686, *pag.* 25, *& ſeq. of the Dutch edition.*

(44) Mr Rainſſant, Phyſician of Rheims, keeper of the medals in the king's cloſet.

(45) Journal des Sçavans, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 27, 28.

† Sueton. Jul. 27.

‡ Senec. Conſ. ad Marc.

OCTAVIA, the daughter of Claudius the emperor, and of Meſſalina, was born in the 795th year of Rome [*A*]. She was betrothed very young to Lucius Silanus; but that contract was broke by the ambitious artifices of Agrippina, who had a mind ſhe ſhould be married to her ſon Nero. Some pretence or other was neceſſary to be made uſe of, and that ſhe was not without. Vitellius, a dexterous courtier, and a great flatterer, undertook the management of that affair, and invented ſpecious accuſations [*B*], by virtue of which he got Silanus diveſted of the Senatorial dignity.

Soon

[*A*] *She was born in the 795th year of Rome.*] If we believe Tacitus; but there is ſome reaſon to think he is miſtaken. He ſays (1), that ſhe was in the twentieth year of her age when ſhe was put to death, and that ſhe was put to death in the conſulſhip of P. Marius, and L. Aſinius; that is, in the year of Rome 815, This ſhews therefore that ſhe was born in the year 795. But ſince he has placed (2) her marriage with Nero, under the conſulſhip of D. Junius and Q. Haterius, that is in the year of Rome 806, we muſt conclude ſhe was then at leaſt twelve years of age; and conſequently was born in 794. Add to this, that her father betrothed her to Silanus in the firſt year of his reign (3), that is in the year of Rome 793, and that Suetonius informs us that Britannicus was born after her (4). Now Britannicus was born the twentieth day of his father's reign (5).

[*B*] *Vitellius, a dexterous courtier . . . . invented ſpecious accuſations.*] One of the happieſt qualities of a courtier is to foreſee at ſome diſtance, who they are for whom fortune is preparing her moſt conſiderable favours: for the ſervices done them before-hand, while they are upon the execution of their ſcheme of grandeur, inſpire them with much more gratitude, than thoſe which are done after the actual poſſeſſion of authority. It was Vitellius's talent to foreſee the ad-

(1) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xiv, cap. lxiv.*

(2) Ib. *lib. xii, cap. lviii.*

(3) Dio, *lib. lx, pag.* 668, apud Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. *Tom. i, pag.* 1019.

(4) Sueton. in Claud. *cap. xxvii.*

(5) Ibid.

Soon after Octavia was betrothed to Agrippina's ſon, to whom ſhe was afterwards married as ſoon as he arrived at ſixteen years of age (*a*): but becauſe Claudius had adopted him, ſhe *paſſed into another family by a feigned adoption* (*b*); for without this their marriage had been inceſtuous. She was very unfortunate; her huſband grew preſently weary of her [*C*], and divorced her under the pretence of ſterility. Poppæa, whom he married preſently after, ſuborned a man who accuſed Octavia of having been too familiar with one of her ſlaves (*c*). The women ſervants of this princeſs were put upon the rack, to oblige them to depoſe againſt their miſtreſs. Some unable to reſiſt the violence of the torture charged her with it; but moſt of them had the reſolution to declare her innocent; and one of them made uſe of a very remarkable expreſſion [*D*]. However Octavia was ſent to ſome remote place and kept under a ſtrong guard. The common people, who are uſually bolder than thoſe who have places to loſe (*d*), murmured to that degree that Nero reſolved to bring her back again. It is impoſſible to expreſs the joy which appeared at Rome upon her being recalled; or the honours which the people paid to that princeſs (*e*). Poppæa thought herſelf undone if ſhe did not ruin her; for which reaſon ſhe threw herſelf at Nero's feet, and backed her petitions with ſuch political reaſons that ſhe obtained her point (*f*). Nero engaged the man who had got him rid of his mother [*E*], to declare
that

vancement which fortune was meditating. By this talent he knew that the emperor Claudius would marry Agrippina, and that ſhe would manage her huſband as ſhe pleaſed. The lady's cunning, and the huſband's weakneſs, were ſure foundations for this prognoſtic. It could not therefore be thought ſtrange that Vitellius left no ſtone unturned to ruin Silanus; for Agrippina's intereſt called for that ſacrifice: ſhe wanted to have Octavia at liberty to be betrothed to Nero, and that could not be done but by breaking her contract with Silanus. Silanus had a ſiſter very remarkable for her beauty and wantonneſs. They could not convict him of having lain with her: but Silanus had not been careful enough to conceal his paſſion for her. This gave Vitellius a handle to turn him out of the ſenate: for he was cenſor, and his poſt impowered him to degrade thoſe who miſbehaved themſelves. As ſoon as Silanus had received this mortification, Claudius broke off the contract of marriage, and obliged him to quit his prætorſhip. The words of Tacitus relate all this in a manner much more noble than I am able to expreſs. *Igitur Vitellius nomine Cenſoris ſerviles fallacias obtegens, ingruentiumque dominationum proviſor, quo gratiam Agrippinæ pararet, conſiliis ejus implicari, ſerere crimina in Silanum, cui ſane decora & procax ſoror Junia Calvina haud multum ante Vitellii nurus fuerat: hinc initium accuſationis, fratrumque non inceſtum, ſed incuſtoditum amorem ad infamiam traxit. Et præbebat Cæſar aures, accipiendis adverſum generum ſuſpicionibus caritate filiæ promptior. At Silanus inſidiarum neſcius, ac forte eo anno prætor, repente per edictum Vitellii ordine ſenatorio movetur, quanquam lecto pridem ſenatu, luſtroque condito. Simul affinitatem Claudius diremit; adactuſque Silanus ejurare magiſtratum, & reliquus præturæ dies in Eprium Marcellum collatus eſt* (6). Silanus killed himſelf on Claudius's and Agripina's wedding day: his ſiſter was baniſhed, and expiations were enjoined for their inceſt. Every one ridiculed theſe expiations, in regard that the emperor, who injoined them, had himſelf ſo lately contracted an inceſtuous marriage (7).

[*C*] *Her huſband grew preſently weary of her.*] His friends repreſented to him how much he was in the wrong in contemning his wife ſo ſoon, and depriving her of thoſe rites which the ſtate of matrimony required from him. *Let her content herſelf* (replied he) *with bearing the name of my wife; that is an honour, that is a dignity, which ought to ſatisfy her*: A fine conſolation! ‘ Octaviæ conſuetudinem cito adſpernatus, corripientibus amicis, ſufficere illi debere reſpondit uxoria ornamenta. Eandem mox ſæpe fruſtra ſtrangulare meditatus, dimiſit ut ſterilem: ſed improbante divortium populo, nec parcente convitiis, etiam relegavit. Denique occidit ſub crimine adulteriorum, adeo impudenti falſoque, ut in quæſtione pernegantibus cunctis, Anicetum pædagogum ſuum indicem ſubjecerit, qui dolo ſtupratam a ſe fateretur (8). --- ‘ *Having ſoon ſhewn a diſlike to Octavia's embraces, upon his friends upbraiding him for it, he anſwered, that ſhe ought to eſteem it honour enough to be his wife. In a little time after, upon being diſappointed in ſeveral deſigns he had formed to ſtrangle her, he divorced her under pretence of being barren: but the people diſapproving of this divorce, and not forbearing even to clamour him for it, he took her again. At laſt he put her to death on an accuſation of adultery, ſo ſcandalous and falſe, that upon its being denied by all the witneſſes, when put to the torture, he ſuborned his ſchool-maſter, Anicetus, to confeſs he had by ſtratagem debauched her.*’ It was without doubt a freſh matter of trouble to Octavia, to ſee Nero paſſionately in love with a maid-ſervant, and the wiſeſt heads conniving at that diſorder: for they choſe rather to ſee him gratifying his laſcivious paſſion with ſuch a creature as did not meddle with the affairs of the government, than to ſee him invade the honour of the greateſt ladies; which he would infallibly have done, if he had not been ſo much attached to this ſervant-maid, for he was a man who had not the gift of continence, and who made no uſe of his wife. He did not love her; whether it was that he had ſome natural antipathy againſt her, or that he preferred unlawful pleaſures to thoſe which are lawful. To ſhew the antiquity of that curſed nicety which is now ſo much in faſhion, let us quote a Roman author. *Delapſo Nerone in amorem libertæ cui vocabulum* Acte *fuit .... ne ſeverioribus quidem principis amicis adverſantibus, muliercula nulla cujuſquam injuria cupidines principis explente: quando uxore ab Octavia nobili quidem, & probitatis ſpectatæ, fato quodam, an quia prævalent illicita, abhorrebat: mutuebaturque ne in ſtupra feminarum illuſtrium prorumperet, ſi illa libidine prohiberetur* (9).’

[*D*] One of her women *made uſe of a very remarkable expreſſion.*] Tigellinus, the moſt devoted creature in all the world to the luſts, as well as to the cruelties, of Nero, aſſiſted at the torture of Octavia's women ſervants; and preſſed them to confeſs what their miſtreſs was charged with (10). One of them gave this anſwer, *Her private parts are chaſter than thy mouth* (11). Dion tells us her name was Pythias; but he pretends that ſhe was the only ſervant who continued faithful to Octavia, and that all the reſt betrayed her to make their court to Poppæa. He adds, that Pythias, ſpeaking the above-mentioned words, ſpit in Tigellinus's face. Dion's words in the Greek are full as free as Tacitus's in the Latin. Μόνη δ᾽ ἡ Πυθιὰς οὔτέ τι κατεψεύσατο αὐτῆς, καίπερ πικρότατα βασανισθεῖσα, καὶ τέλος ὡς ὁ Τιγελλῖνος ἐνέκειτο αὐτῇ, προσέπτυσέ τε αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπε, Καθαράτερον, ὦ Τιγελλῖνε, τὸ αἰδοῖον ἡ δέσποινά μου τοῦ σοῦ στόματος ἔχει. *Sola Pythias, licet acerrimis tormentis coacta, noluit in eam mentiri: quumque Tigellinus inſtaret vehementius, faciem ejus conſpuit, Mundior eſt, (inquit) Tigelline, vulva dominæ meæ, quam os tuum* (12). For the reſt, the domeſtic ſervant, with whom they charged that princeſs to have been too familiar, was a player on the flute. *Quemdam ex miniſtris Octaviæ impulit, ſervilem ei amorem objicere. Deſtinaturque reus cognomento Eucærus, natione Alexandrinus, canere tibiis doctus* (13). Muſicians are lucky fellows; and I do not believe that among all the profeſſions of this rank, there is any ſo fertile as this, in inſtances of being ſuſpected by kings and princes. However, Nero did not think this adultery of Octavia's likely; the condition of the man did not ſeem proper to colour the ſuſpicion (14).

[*E*] *Nero engaged the man, who had got him rid of his mother.*] This man, if we believe Suetonius (15),

2

was

(*a*) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xii, cap. lviii.*

(*b*) Dio, *lib. lx, pag.* 687, apud Tillemont, *Tom. i, pag.* 391.

(*c*) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xiv, cap. lx.*

(*d*) Inde crebri queſtus, nec occulti per vulgum, cui minor ſapientia, & ex mediocritate fortunæ pauciora pericula ſunt. *Ibid.*

(*e*) Ib. *cap. lxi.*

(*f*) Ibid.

(6) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xii, cap. iv, ad ann.* 801.

(7) Die Nuptiarum Silanus ſibi mortem conſcivit, ſive eo uſque ſpem Vitæ produxerat; ſeu delecto die, augendam ad invidiam. Calvina ſoror ejus Italia pulſa eſt. Addidit Claudius Sacra ex legibus Tullii Regis piaculaque apud lucum Dianæ per Pontifices danda: inridentibus cunctis quod pœnæ procurationeſque inceſti id temporis exquirerentur. *Ib. cap. viii.*

(8) Sueton. in Nerone, *cap. xxxv.*

(9) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xiii, cap. xii.*

(10) Xiphilin. in Nerone, *pag. m.* 176.

(11) Actæ ob id de ancillis quæſtiones, & vi tormentorum victis quibuſdam, ut falſa annuerent, plures perſtitere ſanctitatem dominæ tueri. Ex quibus una inſtanti Tigellino, caſtiora eſſe muliebria Octaviæ, reſpondit, quam os ejus. *Tacit. Annal. lib. xiv, cap. lx.*

(12) Xiphil. ubi ſupra.

(13) Tacit. ubi ſupra.

(14) Parum valebat ſuſpicio in ſervo. *Ib. cap. lxii.*

(15) I have quoted his words above, in the remark [*C*].

that he had lain with Octavia; upon which ſhe was confined to an iſland, and in a few days after forced to have her veins opened. Her head was cut off, and preſently carried to her rival (g). Nero changed his language ſtrangely; he had before complained that Octavia was barren, but then he accuſed her of having made herſelf miſcarry [*F*]. This princeſs's lot was ſcarce any thing elſe, but a continued ſeries of misfortunes. [*G*].

was Nero's tutor; but according to Tacitus, he commanded the emperor's fleet at Miſenum. After Nero had employed him in deſtroying Agrippina, he uſed him firſt a little coldly, and at laſt hated him: for the ſight of thoſe who have been inſtrumental to others in the execution of great crimes, is ſo far from being agreeable to them, that it ſeems to load them with continual reproaches (16). But now, having a freſh occaſion to employ him again, he careſſed him, taking notice of the former ſervice he had done, as being of the laſt importance; and told him an opportunity preſented of doing him another piece of ſervice, which was not leſs neceſſary, and which required no more of him, but a bare confeſſion that he had lain with Octavia. He promiſed him a good reward, but which it was not proper to give him for the preſent, and threatned to kill him if he refuſed. *Accitum eum Cæſar operæ prioris admonet; ſolum incolumitati principis adverſus inſidiantem matrem ſubveniſſe; locum haud minoris gratiæ inſtare, ſi conjugem infenſam depelleret. Nec manu aut telo opus. Fateretur Octaviæ adulterium. Occulta quidem ad præſens, ſed magna ei præmia, & ſeceſſus amœnos promittit; vel ſi negaviſſet, necem intentat* (17). This villain undertook to do all that was deſired, and even told more lies than was required of him. He was baniſhed to Sardinia, for form's ſake, where he lived at his eaſe, and died a natural death (18).

It will not be improper, I imagine, to make ſome reflexions upon the relation of Suetonius. We cannot deny that author the glory of a ſkillful abbreviator, but ſometimes his art of contracting is carried too far; by which means it comes to paſs, that the times and diſtinctions of events do not always appear in his work. Of this we have an inſtance in the caſe now before us. He carries Nero's injuſtice to Octavia only through three degrees (19). She was firſt divorced under pretence of barrenneſs; then baniſhed, becauſe the people cried out againſt this divorce; and at laſt puniſhed with death upon pretence of adultery, though all who were tortured upon that head denied it, and there was no other evidence but only Anicetus, who owned he had lain with her by ſtratagem. Now, do but conſult Tacitus, and you will preſently perceive that Suetonius is here faulty. According to Tacitus, the misfortunes of that princeſs ought to be ranged in the following order. Nero's love for Poppæa inſpired that diſguſted huſband with the thoughts of a divorce. Accordingly, Octavia was divorced, as being barren, and he married Poppæa. After that, by virtue of Poppæa's intrigues, Octavia was charged with adultery; her ſervant-maids were put upon the rack; moſt of them maintained that ſhe was a woman of honour: yet the divorce ſtood; and after ſhe had received ſome preſents (20), ſhe was baniſhed to Campania, and there confined. The murmurings of the common people, or elſe ſome remorſe of conſcience, obliged Nero to re-call her. This was ſo acceptable to the people, that Poppæa did not think herſelf ſafe, unleſs Octavia were made away with. With this view ſhe applied ſo dexterouſly to the emperor, that he engaged Anicetus to declare he had lain with Octavia. After that, the unfortunate princeſs was tranſported to the iſland Pandataria, where ſhe was put to death. It does not appear that ſhe returned to Rome after her divorce; ſhe was ſtill in Campania, when the people gave ſuch expreſſions of joy upon her being recalled (21). And as theſe expreſſions of joy moved Poppæa to ſollicit Nero to make away with her, which was a point ſhe obtained, it is not probable that the order for her return was ever put in execution. So that theſe words of Tacitus, *Conjugem revocavit Octaviam* (22), *he recalled his wife*, are ſomewhat fallacious. But Suetonius's faults are much more inexcuſeable. It is viſible that he has confounded events, and omitted things, the ſuppreſſion of which is not to be allowed in regard to any deſign of brevity. What probability is there that Nero's falſe-witneſs depoſed he had made uſe of ſtratagems to compaſs his end with Octavia? Was not that extenuating this princeſs's crime? This is what Nero did not deſire! Note, that Triſtan ſuppoſes Octavia came actually back to her huſband's houſe, and even that ſhe was recalled from the iſland Pandataria (23): the firſt of which is not likely, and the other is notoriouſly falſe.

[*F*] *Nero .... accuſed her of having made herſelf miſcarry.*] I have known ſome perſons who found fault with Tacitus for taking theſe two pretences of Octavia's diſgrace for a contradiction. 'At Nero 'præfectum in ſpem ſociandæ claſſis corruptum, & in'cuſatæ paullo ante ſterilitatis oblitus, abactos partus 'conſcientia libidinum, eaque ſibi comperta, edicto 'memorat (24). ---- *But Nero declares by an edict, that 'his admiral had been corrupted in hopes of engaging 'the fleet, and forgetting the pretence of ſterility he had 'before made uſe of, alledges that ſhe had forced herſelf 'to miſcarry to conceal her luſts, all which he had diſ'covered.*' Nero grounded Octavia's divorce upon the plea of her barrenneſs; and ſoon after he declared, that, to his certain knowledge, ſhe had taken things to make herſelf miſcarry. Now, here is no contradiction. When we do not obſerve that a married woman comes to be with child, we have reaſon to account her barren: but if we happen to diſcover that ſhe forces herſelf to miſcarry, we incur no contradiction in denying her ſterility. Where then is Nero's contradiction? To theſe critics I made anſwer, that the hiſtorian does not charge the emperor with a formal contradiction; he only alledges, there was a great deal of imprudence in making uſe of the plea of miſcarriage after having inſiſted ſo lately upon that of barrenneſs. The imprudence did not conſiſt in Nero's giving the world ground to believe he was miſinformed of Octavia's conduct when he divorced her; for he might have anſwered, that the wiſeſt of princes are very often not quick-ſighted enough to penetrate into all the ſecrets of their wives chamber, and that ſometimes chance diſcovers in an hour what the moſt vigilant ſpies could not obſerve for many years: ſo many are the tricks of the ſex for concealing their galantries. But the injuſtice of the divorce lay here. He manifeſtly diſcovered to all the world, that he had not diſcharged the conjugal duties to Octavia; for if he had, ſhe need not to have had recourſe to miſcarriages to hide her adultery. Now, is it not a flagrant inſtance of injuſtice to divorce a woman upon pretence of barrenneſs, after having lived with her without any matrimonial commerce (25). For this reaſon, Tacitus ſays nothing that can reflect upon his great judgment, when he obſerves a contradiction between the emperor's firſt and ſecond pretence. We muſt not forget one thing, which aggravates the iniquity of the huſband, and that is, his being convinced of Octavia's virtue. The expreſs words have been recorded, which he uttered, when he thought the opportunity of marrying Poppæa was come. 'Ipſa principis verba referam, *ſays Tacitus* (26), quin *in'quit* Nero depoſito metu nuptias Poppææ ob ejuſmodi 'terrores dilatas maturare parat, Octaviamque conjugem 'amoliri, quamvis modeſte agat, & nomine patris, & 'ſtudiis populi gravem? -- *I ſhall repeat the very words 'of the emperor. Well,* ſays Nero, *my fear is over, and 'I will now have the nuptials celebrated forthwith, 'which have been all this while delayed upon that ac'count, and my wife Octavia diſmiſſed, for all her modeſty, 'and great popularity, both for her father's ſake and her 'own.*'

[*G*] *This princeſs's lot was ſcarce any thing elſe but a continued ſeries of miſfortunes.*] The inhabitants of the iſland, to which ſhe was baniſhed, were more affected with her diſgrace, than they had ever been with the misfortunes of the other Roman ladies who had been exiles in the ſame place. Thoſe ladies were more advanced in years, and conſequently more capable to bear the reverſe of Fortune; beſides, they might receive ſome comfort from the remembrance of their former felicity. But Octavia was ſcarce above twenty years of age, and had always been unfortunate. The firſt years of her married ſtate were ſpent in deep mourning for the ſad fate of her father, and her brother, who were poiſoned. A miſtreſs engroſſed all the affection of her huſband; ſhe herſelf was divorced; and afterwards

(g) Ib. *cap. lxiii, lxiv.*

(16) Levi poſt admiſſum ſcelus gratia, dein graviore odio: quia malorum facinorum miniſtri quaſi exprobrantes adſpiciuntur. *Id. ib.*

(17) Id. ib.

(18) In Sardiniam pellitur, ubi non inops exſilium toleravit, & fato obiit. *Ibid.*

(19) See his words in the remark [*C*].

(20) Domumque Burri & prædia Plauti, infauſta dona accipit. *Tacit. Annal. lib. xiv, cap. lx.*

(21) *This appears from theſe words of Poppæa:* Vitam ipſam in extremum adductam à clientelis & ſervitiis Octaviæ, quæ plebis ſibi nomen indiderint, ea in pace auſis quæ vix bello evenirent. Arma illa adverſus principem ſumpta. Ducem tantum defuiſſe, qui motis rebus facile reperiretur. Omitteret modo Campaniam & in urbem ipſam pergeret, ad cujus nutum abſentis tumultus cierentur. *Ibid. cap. lxi.*

(22) Ibid. *cap. lx.*

(23) Triſtan. Commentat. Hiſtor. *Tom. i, pag.* 138.

(24) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xiv, cap. lxiii.*

(25) See, above, remark [*A*] of the article GUISE (CLAUDIUS DUKE OF).

(26) Tacit. Annal. *lib. xiv, cap. lix.*

wards expoſed to the violent hatred of the new wife; and at laſt baniſhed for a crime, the brand of which was more afflicting than death itſelf. Yet, after all, ſhe was very unwilling to reſign her life, tho' ſhe ſaw herſelf every minute under the point of the ſoldiers ſwords, who were her guard; and when ſhe received orders to put an end to her life, ſhe prayed and begged inceſſantly, in order to ſhun the fatal hour. But all was to no purpoſe: they bound her, and opened her veins; but her fright was ſo great that ſhe could ſcarce be made to bleed, inſomuch that they were obliged to ſtifle her with the ſteam of a hot bath. Tacitus is ſo great a maſter in painting the paſſions, that every line is an inimitable ſtroke. We ſhall therefore make uſe of his own words (27). *Non alia exſul viſentium oculos majore miſericordia affecit. Meminerant adhuc quidam Agrippinæ, à Tiberio; recentior Juliæ memoria obverſabatur, à Claudio pulſæ. Sed illis robur ætatis affuerat. Læta aliqua viderant, & preſentem ſævitiam melioris olim fortunæ recordatione allevabant* (28). *Huic primus nuptiarum dies loco funeris fuit, deductæ in domum, in qua nihil niſi luctuoſum haberet, erepto per venenum patre, & ſtatim fratre. Tum ancilla domina validior. Et Poppæa non niſi in perniciem uxoris nupta. Poſtremo crimen omni exilio gravius. Ac puella viceſimo ætatis anno, inter centuriones & milites, præſagio malorum jam à vita exempta, nondum tamen morte acquieſcebat. Paucis dehinc interjectis diebus, mori jubetur: cum jam* viduam ſe & tantum ſororem *teſtaretur, communeſque* Germanicos, *& poſtremo* Agrippinæ *nomen cieret,* qua incolumi infelix quidem matrimonium, ſed ſine exitio pertuliſſet. *Reſtringitur vinculis, venæque ejus per omnes artus exſolvuntur: & quia preſſus pavore ſanguis tardius labebatur, præfervidi balnei vapore enecatur.* He has forgot to obſerve, that before ſhe was married, ſhe was witneſs to the violent death of Meſſalina, her mother. It is with this ſhe commences the recital of her miſfortunes in the tragedy which is called by her name, and which is printed with thoſe of Seneca. From thence ſhe proceeds to the ſeverity of Agrippina, who was doubly her mother-in-law (29), and of a temper admirably well ſuited for acting the part of a ſtep-mother, and for verifying all that is ſaid of the antipathy of women to their daughters-in-law. If Homer could not admit, that there are any perſons who are ſerved by Jupiter, out of no other but the bad veſſel (30), yet he might at leaſt have allowed, that Jupiter does not mix above two or three drops out of the good veſſel, in a full bowl, which he obliges them to drink out of the bad one. Such was the lot of our Octavia, and yet ſhe had a mind to live: death was more frightful to her than all her calamities; for which ill taſte her youth ought to plead her excuſe.

OECOLAMPADIUS (John) one of the reformers of the Church in the XVIth century, was born at Winſperg in Franconia, in the year 1482. His mother was the cauſe of making him a ſcholar; for his father had deſigned him for a merchant, but at the requeſt of his wife altered his reſolution. They ſent him to the college of Heilbrun, and afterwards to the univerſity of Heidelberg; he there received the degreee of Bachelor at fourteen years of age. After this he was ſent to Boulogne to ſtudy the Civil-Law, and after a reſidence of ſix months, he returned from thence to Heidelberg, where he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Divinity. The authors whom he read with greateſt aſſiduity were Thomas Aquinas, Richard, and Gerſon: he deſpiſed the ſubtilities, of Scotus, and did not follow the humour which at that time prevailed in the univerſities. He had little regard to the wrangles of the ſchoolmen, and abſtained from diſputations: his endeavour was to furniſh his mind with uſeful knowledge, without troubling himſelf about the honour that is to be gained by the public exerciſes in univerſities. He did nevertheleſs obtain the character of a very learned young man. This reputation, joined to that of virtue and prudence, induced the elector Palatine to appoint him preceptor to his younger ſons. Having diſcharged this office ſome time, he grew weary of the court, and reſumed his ſtudies in Divinity.

OENONE, the daughter of a river in Phrygia, named Cebren (*a*), and wife of Paris, was, according to ſome, a noted ſorcereſs [*A*]. Others content themſelves with ſaying, that ſhe was perfectly well acquainted with the virtues of herbs, and that this knowledge was imparted to her, by way of exchange for her virginity [*B*]. It

[*A*] *She was .... a noted ſorcereſs.*] By the force of her enchantments the moon deſcended from the heavens, the lions became tame and gentle as ſheep, and the rivers flowed back towards their ſources. Paris declares himſelf an eye-witneſs of it (1).

Quod ſi vertendæ ſpem mentis concipis hujus;
  Cur ceſſant herbæ, carmina curve tua?
Nam te nec Phœbi ſollertior artibus ulla eſt;
  Phœbeæque Hecates ſomnia vera vides.
Te cum ſideribus, te cum deducere Lunam
  Nubibus, & memini ſurripuiſſe diem.
Paſcebam tauros: interque armenta leones
  Obſtupui placidos vocibus ire tuis.
Quid retro Xanthum, retro Simoënta vocatum
  Adjiciam curſus non tenuiſſe ſuos?
Ipſe pater Cebren, natæ male tutus ab ore,
  Cantatus quoties reſtitit inter aquas!

But if you hope to diſengage my love;
Why do you not your Magic ſecrets prove?
For Phœbus ſcarce in theſe more knowing ſeems,
Nor Hecate, his ſiſter, ſkill'd in dreams.
At your command, I've ſeen, with wond'ring eye,
The day grow dark, and the moon quit the ſky.
At your command, I've ſeen, in great amaze,
Tame lions tend my bullocks as they graze.
Why need I add, that, as you bade them go,
Xanthus and Simoïs wou'd backward flow?
Even your father Cebren check'd his flood,
And by his daughter's charms enchanted ſtood!

It is very probable that Apollodorus wrote that this nymph practiſed Magic; and conſequently we may regard, as a falſe reading, thoſe words of book III, Ἡ γὰρ Οἰνώνη ἰατρικὴν καὶ μουσικὴν ἤσκει, Siquidem Oenone medendi canendique artem callebat (2). *For Oenone was ſkilled in the arts of Phyſic and Muſic.* If we put μαγικὴν in the room of μουσικὴν, we ſhall make the author reaſon very juſtly. He had juſt ſaid, that Oenone carried remedies to Paris when dangerouſly wounded; and if he ſubjoins, as the editions have it, *for ſhe practiſed Phſiyc and Muſic*, he loads his reaſoning with a groſs ſuperfluity: but, if he ſays, *for ſhe practiſed Phyſic and Magic*, it becomes much more proper and agreeable. Paſſerat took the matter very right; for he turned that paſſage thus; *for ſhe was perfectly well verſed in Phyſic, and in the art of enchanting diſeaſes* (3).

[*B*] *This knowledge was imparted to her by way of exchange for her maidenhead* (4).] Read the letter which Oenone wrote to Paris; and there you will find this nymph boaſting

---

(27) Ibid. *cap. lxiii.*

(28) *This was purſuant to the precepts of Epicurus. On the other hand, a great many aggravate their adverſity by calling to mind the proſperity they have been in; and ſay with one of the French Poets,*
Felicité paſſée,
Qui ne peus revenir,
Tourment de ma penſée,
Que n'ai-je en te perdant perdu le ſouvenir!
Paſs'd happineſs which can return no more,
By memory torments me o'er and o'er.

(29) Tulimus ſævæ juſſa novercæ,
Hoſtilem animum, vultuſque truces.
Illa illa meis triſtis Erinnys
Thalamis Stygios prætulit ignes,
Teque extinxit miſerande pater.

(30) See the article MANICHEES, remark [*C*], from citation (35) to the end.

(*a*) Apollod. *lib. iii*: & Parthen. in Eroticis, *cap. iv.*

(1) In the letter feigned by Sabinus, as written by Paris, in anſwer to that feigned by Ovid from Oenone to him.

(2) Apollod. Biblioth. *lib. iii*, *pag.* 227.

(3) See Meziriac, upon the Epiſtles of Ovid, *pag.* 460.

(4) Compare this with what is ſaid before of CASSANDRA, in remark [*A*] of her article.

It is likewiſe ſaid that ſhe had the gift of prophecy (*b*). With that advantage of knowing what was to come, ſhe did not fail to foreſee that her huſband's voyage to Helena would be the cauſe of an infinity of miſchiefs; and therefore ſhe uſed her utmoſt endeavours to divert Paris from that expedition. Finding her remonſtrances fruitleſs, ſhe foretold him that he ſhould be wounded [*C*], and that then he would be forced to have recourſe to her as the only perſon that could cure him (*c*). When he had received a wound from Philoctetes at the ſiege of Troy, he called to mind Oenone's prediction, and ordered himſelf to be carried to mount Ida, in order to get the remedy which ſhe alone could give him; but he died before he could get ſo far as to be relieved by Oenone (*d*). And ſome ſay, that, in order to have the pleaſure of revenge, ſhe made ſo little haſte [*D*], that ſhe gave death opportunity to prevent the remedy; and yet that ſhe made away with herſelf upon ſeeing her huſband's corps. This ſtory is variouſly related [*E*], and care has been taken to inform us, that ſhe applyed herſelf betimes to find out means of revenge. Upon this project ſhe employed her ſon [*F*]: ſome ſay ſhe ſent him to Greece, to excite the

boaſting of being courted by the Satyrs, and by Faunus himſelf; but that ſhe diſappointed all their amorous deſigns. She owns that Apollo robbed her of her virginity, tho' ſhe ſtruggled as much as ſhe could, and ſcratched him all over the face. In fine, ſhe remarks that ſhe required of him no recompence, in gold or jewels, but that Apollo communicated to her all the ſecrets of Botany; inſomuch that ſhe could perform a thouſand wonderful cures, but without being able to find out any remedy for her love, there being no herbs of ſufficient virtue for that purpoſe.

Me fide conſpicuus Trojæ munitor amavit,
  Ille meæ ſpolium virginitatis habet.
Id quoque luctando, rupi tamen ungue capillos;
  Oraque ſunt digitis aſpera facta meis.
Nec pretium ſtupri gemmas aurumve popoſci.
  Turpiter ingenuum munera corpus emunt.
Ipſe, ratus dignam, medicas mihi tradidit artes;
  Admiſitque meas ad ſua dona manus.
Quæcumque herba potens ad opem, radixque medendi
  Utilis in toto naſcitur orbe, mea eſt.
Me miſeram, quod amor non eſt medicabilis herbis (5)!

Troy's faithful fortifier ſought my charms,
And boldly triumph'd in my virgin arms.
Nor did I tamely ſtoop to his embrace;
My nails mark'd my reſiſtance in his face.
Nor did I either gold or jewels claim;
Such baſe amends only increaſe the ſhame.
But of himſelf, the god, with grateful heart,
Made me his partner in the healing art.
Whatever cure in Phyſic can be done,
Either by herb or root, to me is known.
Yet wretched I this ſcience uſeleſs prove;
Since neither herbs nor roots are cures for love!

Ovid is not over and above obſervant of decorum and probability. Such confeſſions are ſeldom made to an huſband, nor was this a likely way to make Paris repent of his inconſtancy. To be told that he was taken for a cully, and that he had flattered himſelf with a falſe notion of having gathered the firſt flower of the nuptial-bed, could be no very agreeable news: the ſcratching of the ſpark's face, on one hand, and the ſecrets of Phyſic, on the other, are not ſufficient to repair the breach. What was Ovid therefore thinking on? If he had even added the gift of propheſy (6) to the knowledge of herbs, among the preſents beſtowed upon her by Apollo, he would not ſufficiently have gilded the pill. Clemens Alexandrinus was not ignorant that this nymph pretended to propheſy. See in the margin a conjecture upon his words (7).

[*C*] *She foretold him he ſhould be wounded.*] Conon has confounded the circumſtance of time, and by that means greatly ſhocked the probability. He ſuppoſes, that Oenone did not make this prediction, nor ſtir from her huſband's houſe, till after Paris had killed her ſon Corythus (8). Now we muſt know that Corythus, the ſon of Paris and Oenone, was ſo great with Helena, that Paris grew violently jealous of him, and was from thence induced to diſpatch him. It is not at all likely, that Oenone would continue with her huſband after Helena had taken poſſeſſion of the houſe: ſo that Conon has unluckily entangled himſelf in a Chronology different from that of other authors.

[*D*] *She made ſo little haſte.*] The meſſenger who went to tell her, that Paris had ordered himſelf to be carried to mount Ida for a cure, was roughly ſent back with this jealous anſwer, *That he might go and have his wound dreſſed by his Helena* (9). A return of tenderneſs ſoon made Oenone repent of her unkindneſs: ſhe reſolved to go and meet her huſband, with the neceſſary remedies; but ſhe came too late. The anſwer ſhe gave to the meſſenger was faithfully reported to Paris, and ſhocked him in ſuch a manner that he expired immediately (10). When Oenone arrived, the firſt thing ſhe did was to kill the meſſenger, by throwing a ſtone at him, for daring to tell her that ſhe was the cauſe of her huſband's death. Then ſhe tenderly embraced the corps of her faithleſs huſband; and after much lamentation ſtrangled herſelf with her girdle (11).

[*E*] *This ſtory is variouſly related.*] We told you juſt now that ſhe ſtrangled herſelf with her own girdle. Apollodorus ſays (12) barely that ſhe hanged herſelf. Parthenius (13) contents himſelf with ſaying, that ſhe killed herſelf. Quintus Calaber (14) aſſures us, that ſhe threw herſelf into the funeral pile upon which her huſband's corps was burnt. Lycophron (15) ſays, ſhe threw herſelf headlong from the top of a tower. ‘Dictys Cretenſis relates, that Paris being dead, his ‘relations ordered his corps to be carried to Oenone, ‘for her to take care about his funeral, but that ‘Oenone was ſo affected with the ſight of the corps, ‘that ſhe thereupon loſt her ſenſes, and being gradu‘ally overwhelmed with ſorrow, ſhe died of grief, ‘and was buried with Paris. This paſſage of Dictys ‘makes me ſuſpect, that the Latin tranſlation of this ‘author, though very antient, is not extreamly juſt, ‘or rather is corrupted in ſeveral places: for Tzetzes ‘upon Lycophron ſays expreſly, that, according to ‘the opinion of Dictys, Oenone ſtrangled herſelf; and ‘Cedrenus, who always follows Dictys, in what ‘relates to the wars of Troy, makes Oenone die the ‘ſame kind of death: from whence I conjecture, that ‘theſe two authors had Dictys's work in Greek, and ‘that the Latin verſion, which we have, does not ‘always agree with the Greek text (16).’ This is ſo curious a piece of literature, that it deſerves to be inſerted here, as we have it in Meziriac. As for the reſt, Quintus Calaber ſuppoſes, that Oenone treated her huſband with the laſt degree of inhumanity (17), when he lay proſtrate at her feet (18), and almoſt at the laſt gaſp (19), imploring her aſſiſtance, and aſking a thouſand pardons for his faithleſneſs; but that afterwards ſhe was extreamly concerned at his death, that ſhe threw herſelf upon the funeral pile, and was burnt alive with Paris's corps.

[*F*] *She employed her ſon.*] The reflexions which the river Cebren caſt upon Oenone, his daughter, for loving ſuch a faithleſs huſband, rouzed her in ſuch a manner to revenge, that ſhe ſent Corythus, her ſon, to the Grecian princes, with orders to excite them to a war againſt Troy, and to conduct them in that expedition (20). So ſays the Scholiaſt upon Lycophron (21). Conon (22) makes Corythus the inſtrument of Oenone's revenge after another manner. He ſays that Corythus was handſomer than Paris, his father,

---

(*b*) Apollodorus, & Parthenius, ibid.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Ibid.

(5) Ovid. in Epiſt. Oenon. ad Parid.

(6) According to *Apollodorus*, *lib. iii*, it was from Rhea that Oenone learned the art of Divination.

(7) Ἕλενος ἤδη καὶ Λαοκόων, καὶ Οἰνώνη, καὶ Βρῆνος ἐν Ἰλίῳ. Jam Helenus, & Laocoon, & Oenone, & Brenus in Ilio. *Clem. Alexandr. Storm. lib. i*, *pag.* 334. Inſtead of καὶ Βρῆνος, *Canterus* would read Κεβρῆνος. But the better reading would be ἡ Κεβρῆνος, which would ſignify *Oenone the daughter of Cebren.* *See* Canterus *upon* Lycophron, *ver.* 57.

(8) Conon, apud Photium, *num.* 186, *pag.* 434, 436.

(9) Conon, ibid.

(10) Parthen. in Eroticis, *cap. iv.*

(11) Conon, ubi ſupra.

(12) *Lib. iii*, *pag.* 227.

(13) Ubi ſupra.

(14) *Lib. x*, *ver.* 467.

(15) In Caſſandra, *ver.* 61.

(16) Meziriac upon the Epiſtles of Ovid, *pag.* 509.

(17) Quint. Calaber. *lib. x*, *ver.* 306, *& ſeq.*

(18) Ὁ δ' ἄρ' αἶψα πέσεν παρὰ ποσσὶ γυναικός. Ipſe vero ſtatim ad pedes uxoris ſe abjecit. *Ibid. ver.* 272.

(19) Καὶ ῥ' ὀλιγοῦ ῥανέων τοῖον ποτὶ μῦθον ἔειπεν. Atque vix trahens animam hoc tandem ſermone illam affatur. *Ibid. ver.* 283.

(20) Meziriac upon Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 508, quoting the Scholiaſt upon Lycophron.

(21) *Upon theſe words of Lycophron*, *ver.* 58. Στείλασα κοῦρον τὸν κατήγορον χθονός. Miſſo juvene terræ proditore.

(22) Apud Photium, *num.* 86, *pag.* 436.

the princes to a war againſt the Trojans; others ſay ſhe concerted matters ſo, that he touched Helena's heart, in order to affect Paris with the torments of jealouſy.

father, and was ſent by Oenone to Helena, both to make Paris jealous, and to watch an opportunity of making away with Helena. She was preſently ſmitten with Corythus's charms, and grew more familar with him than was agreeable to Paris. The father became ſo jealous of his ſon, that catching him one day in the company of Helena, he killed him. Oenone muſt needs have been born under a very malignant planet: the means ſhe made uſe of to be revenged on her rival, coſt her the life of her only ſon, and contributed only to make Helena paſs ſome agreeable moments. Some ſay (23), Corythus was indeed beloved by Helena, and that he loved her again, and that Paris killed him; but they do not ſay that his mother had ſuborned him to enſnare her rival: they ſay he went to the relief of Troy. Others pretend (24) that Corythus was the off-ſpring of Paris and Helena's amours: which is very abſurd: for from the rape of Helena to the death of Paris, the time was not long enough to allow any of their ſons to attain an age ſufficient for the careſſes of a woman: and it is plain from the father's jealouſy, and Corythus's commerce with Helena, that Corythus was of ſuch an age when he was killed. However it be, here is a monſtrous inceſt (25) of that handſome woman, which few writers have mentioned.

(23) Hellanicus in Troicis, & Cephalon Gergithius, apud Parthenium, *cap. xxxiv.*

(24) Nicander apud Parthenium, ibid.

(25) Upon the ſuppoſition, that Corythus was Helena's ſon; for if he was only her ſon-in-law, her crime had often been precedented.

OGINSKI (CHARLES) a gentleman of Lithuania, made a Latin tranſlation of Faret's *Honnête Homme*, and publiſhed it at Franeker in the year 1643 (*a*). He dedicated it to SAMUEL OGINSKI, his father, who had a conſiderable office in the palatinate of Trocko in Lithuania. There is no reaſon to doubt but that Mr OGINSKI, of whom the public news papers have taken ſo much notice within theſe five or ſix years laſt paſt (*b*), and who is at the head of the party in oppoſition to the houſe of Sapieha, is of the ſame family with the tranſlator of Faret. If Mr Konig had ſeen this tranſlation, he would not have ſaid that Charles Oginſki invented in 1643 the *Art of Pleaſing at Court* (*c*), for the title of it would have informed him to the contrary (*d*). There was a certain perſon (*e*), who wrote a French ſonnet in praiſe of the tranſlator. This ſonnet is to be met with at the the head of the work, and is full of the groſſeſt faults that can be committed againſt the rules of Proſodia. The author of it obſerves that this book of Faret's had been already tranſlated into Italian, Spaniſh, Engliſh, and High-Dutch. The Latin tranſlation is a very good one; it is a pity it abounds with ſo many errors of the preſs.

(*a*) In 12mo: it contains 188 pages.

(*b*) I write this in 1703.

(*c*) Excogitavit Artem placendi in Aula, *ann.* 1643. *Konig. Biblioth. pag.* 586.

(*d*) *The title is,* Honeſtus Homo, ſive Ars placendi in Aula, ex Gallico opere Fareti verſa in Latinum. - - - - *The honeſt Man, or Art of pleaſing at Court, tranſlated into Latin from the French work of Faret.*

(*e*) *His name is* A. Theſſerre.

OKOLSKI (SIMON) a Dominican Friar lived in the XVIIth century. He publiſhed a book intituled *Orbis Polonus*, which is worth reading. Mr le Laboureur quotes it more than once (*a*).

(*a*) See his Relation of the Voyage of the Queen of Poland, *Part ii*, *pag.* 50, 58.

OLEN, a Greek Poet, more antient than Orpheus (*a*), was a native of Xanthus a city in Lycia [*A*]. He compoſed ſeveral hymns, which were ſung in the Iſland of Delos upon grand religious ſolemnities (*b*), particularly in honour to the goddeſs Lucina (*c*), whom he called the mother of Cupid (*d*). He was the firſt who affirmed that Achaia came from the country of the Hyperboreans to the iſland of Delos (*e*). Others ſay (*f*) that he was one of the Hyperboreans who founded the oracle of Delphos, and that he firſt performed there the function of prieſt to Apollo, I mean, that of giving reſponſes to thoſe who conſulted the oracle. Theſe he delivered in Hexameter verſes. He is taken notice of in a paſſage of Pauſanias, which Romulus Amaſeus has not corrected [*B*]. We muſt make ſome remarks upon the Supplement to Moreri [*C*].

(*a*) Pauſan. *lib. ix*, *pag.* 302.

(*b*) Herodot. *lib. iv*, *cap. xxxv.*

(*c*) Pauſan. *lib. i*, *pag.* 16.

(*d*) Ib. *lib. ix*, *pag.* 302.

(*e*) Ib. *lib. v*, *pag.* 154.

(*f*) Ib. *lib. x*, *pag.* 320, 321.

[*A*] *He was a native of Xanthus a city of Lycia.*] Herodotus and Pauſanias inform us, that he was a Lycian; but they do not tell us of what city. You will preſently ſee the name of it in theſe two verſes of Callimachus.

Οἱ μὲν ὑπαείδουσι νόμον Λυκίοιο γέροντος
Ὅν τοι ἀπὸ Ξάνθοιο θεοπρόπος ἤγαγεν Ὠλήν.

Namque ſenis Lycii recinunt hi carmina ſacra,
A Xantho quondam quæ vates vexerat Olen (1).

They ſung the Lycian Prophet's ſacred ſong,
Which Olen had from Xanthus brought along.

[*B*] *A paſſage of Pauſanias, which Romulus Amaſeus has not corrected.*] The paſſage is this: Λύκιος δὲ ὃς ἦν ἀρχαιότερος τὴν ἡλικίαν Δήλιος ὕμνȣς καὶ ἄλλοις ποιήσας, καὶ ἐσ' Εἰλειθυιάν τε, Ἔυλινόν τε αὐτὴν ἀνακαλεῖ. At Lycius qui *multo* fuit ætate ſuperior patria Delius hymnis & in alios deos & in Lucinam ipſam conſcriptis Eulinon (*quaſi dicas lanificam*) appellat (2). - - - - *But Lycius who was* much *more ancient, a Delian by birth, in hymns compoſed both upon other deities and upon Lucina herſelf, calls her Eulinon*, that is to ſay *Spinſter*. Gregorius Gyraldus conjectures, that we ſhould read ὠλήν inſtead of Δήλιος (3), but it is not there that the correction ſhould be made; it ſhould come in immediately after Λύκιος δὲ, for inſtead of ὃς ἦν, we muſt read ὠλήν, and then inſtead of Δήλιος, Δηλίοις. This conjecture came into my head, before I met with the new edition of Pauſanias, which I have ſince ſeen, and there found a note of Mr Kuhnius's, which offers the ſame explication of this paſſage. Here we ſee one of the cauſes that have produced a great many chimerical authors; for here is a very ancient Poet, one Lycius of Delos that owes his being only to an error of the tranſcriber.

[*C*] *We muſt make ſome remarks upon the Supplement to Moreri.*] I. It is a fault to ſay barely, that Olen was *of the city of Dyme in Achaia*; for, though it is true, that Suidas call him Δυμαῖος, *Dymæus*, yet he adds, that it would be better to make him a native of Xanthus in Lycia, as Callimachus and Polyhiſtor have deſcribed him. II. There is not much exactneſs in theſe words. The Hymns of Olen *were ſung in the iſland of Delos, during the ceremonies obſerved for the ſick, by throwing upon them duſt gathered from the ſepulchre of the goddeſs Ops or Cybele, whom the Greeks called Hecaerge.* This ſeems to have been copied from a book of Gyraldus (4), where we are told, that the Hymns of Olen were ſung at Delos, while the duſt of the ſepulchre of Opis, ſirnamed Hecaerge, was thrown on an innumerable company of ſick perſons, who crowded near the altar. For this he quotes Herodotus,

(1) Callimachus, Hymno in Delum, *ver.* 304, *pag.* 132. *Edit. Græv.* 1697.

(2) Pauſanias, *lib. viii*, *pag.* 253.

(3) Pro Delion Olena *legendum.* Lilius Gregor. Gyraldus, de Poetar. Hiſtor. Dialogo III, init. *pag. m.* 118.

(4) Gyraldus, ubi ſupra.

Herodotus, and adds, that Pauſanias ſays much the ſame thing (5): but it is certain, Gyraldus has been impoſed upon by Laurentius Valla's faulty verſion. The Greek text of Herodotus (6) does not ſay this; he is a little intricate, and may be underſtood in a ſenſe oppoſite to that of Laurentius Valla, as appears by another tranſlation, that has been put in the margin. Herodotus does not ſay, that Ops, or Opis, was ſirnamed Hecaerge; he does not ſpeak of Ops, the mother of the gods, but of a young woman that came from the country of the Hyperboreans, to the iſle of Delos, in company with another called Arge. Theſe two young women had undertaken this voyage to Delos, with intent to offer to Lucina, the preſents which had been dedicated to her, in order to obtain a ſpeedy and happy delivery in child birth (7). Pauſanias ſcarce takes any notice of all this; how then can it be ſaid, that he relates much the ſame thing with what Herodotus is ſuppoſed to have ſaid upon this head? The Continuator of Moreri would perhaps be hard put to it, if he were obliged to prove, that the goddeſs Cybele was ſirnamed Hecaerge; that is, one who poſſeſſes the virtue of operating at a diſtance: but if the ceremony he ſpeaks of were true, ſhould we not find an Aſh-day in Paganiſm as well as in Popery, and that attended with very ſingular characters of ſuperſtition? All ſorts of ſick perſons would have expected a cure by virtue of the aſhes taken from the ſepulchre of Opis; but ſtill they had been obliged to approach the altar, and that does not ſuit with the epithet of Hecaerge. See the learned notes of Spanhemius upon Callimachus (8), where you will find ſtrong proofs that Hecaerge was not the epithet of Cybele, or of that Opis who was one of the Hyperborean girls bringing offerings to Delos, but the name of her companion in that voyage.

(5) Idem fere ſcribit Pauſanias. *Ibid.*

(6) Herodot. *lib. iv, cap. xxxv, pag. m.* 236.

(7) Ἀντὶ τοῦ ὠκυτόκου. Pro partu maturando. *Ib. pag.* 235.

(8) Ezech. Spanhemius, in Callimachi Hymnum in Delum, *pag.* 503.

OLYMPIAS, the mother of Alexander the Great, gave Philip king of Macedonia, her huſband, ſuch violent ſuſpicions of unchaſtity, that he divorced her [*A*]. It is even pretended ſhe owned to him that he was not the father of Alexander, and that ſhe embraced a ſerpent when ſhe conceived that ſon (*a*) [*B*]. Nor is ſhe the only woman who is ſaid to have received thoſe ſort of embraces (*b*). They who pretend that Nectanebus, who had been driven out of Egypt, and had received ſhelter in

(*a*) See the remark [*A*].

(*b*) See the remark [*H*].

[*A*] *She gave ſuch violent ſuſpicions of unchaſtity to Philip . . . . that he divorced her.*] Juſtin goes no farther in the fifth chapter of his ninth book (1); but in another place he aſſures us, that the matter was carried ſo far as to conviction, and that the divorce was grounded thereupon. ‘Namque mater ejus Olympias confeſſa viro ſuo Philippo fuerat, Alexandrum non ex eo ſe, ſed ex ſerpente ingentis magnitudinis concepiſſe. Denique Philippus ultimo prope vitæ ſuæ tempore, *filium ſuum non eſſe* palam prædicaverat. Qua ex cauſa Olympiadem, velut ſtupri compertam, repudio dimiſerat. - - - - (2) *For his mother Olympias had confeſſed to her huſband Philip, that ſhe had conceived Alexander, not by him, but by a very great ſerpent. And Philip himſelf, toward the latter end of his life, publickly declared that Alexander was not his ſon, for which reaſon he had divorced Olympias as an adultereſs convict.*’ Some wanton wives are ſtill mild and complaiſant to their huſbands; and that atones in ſome ſome meaſure for the ſin: but Olympias was croſs and peeviſh (3); ſo that it would have been too hard upon Philip to bear at once both the ill humours and adulteries of his wife.

[*B*] *And that ſhe embraced a ſerpent when ſhe conceived that ſon.*] Beſides the teſtimony of Juſtin juſt now mentioned, we may alledge what Plutarch relates, that a great ſerpent was ſeen extended upon Olympias while ſhe ſlept; that the king viewing this through a ſmall chink in the door, loſt the eye that he made uſe of for this purpoſe (4); that from this time he found his affection for Olympias to diminiſh, and lay with her but very ſeldom, whether it was that he feared ſhe would bewitch him, or out of regard to the god who had been thus embracing the queen, under the form of a ſerpent. Ὤφθη δὲ ποτε καὶ δράκων, κοιμωμένης τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος, παρεκτεταμένος τῷ σώματι. καὶ τοῦτο Φιλίππου τὸν ἔρωτα καὶ τὰς φιλοφροσύνας ἀμαυρῶσαι λέγουσιν, ὡς μηδὲ φοιτᾷν ἔτι πολλάκις παρ' αὐτὴν ἀναπαυσόμενον. εἴτε δείσαντα τινὰς μαγείας αὐτῷ καὶ φάρμακα τῆς γυναικὸς εἴτε τὴν ὁμιλίαν, ὡς κρείττονι συνούσῃ ἀφοσιούμενον. *Viſus eſt draco etiam ad dormientis Olympiadis corpus exporrectus: idque præcipue Philippi erga eam amorem & familiarem conſuetudinem ajunt extenuaſſe, ut raro cubitum ad illam commearet, quia vel timeret faſcinationes ejus & veneficia, vel conſuetudinem ejus, ut quæ conſueſceret cum majore, devitaret* (5). We are likewiſe told, that Eratoſthenes declared that Olympias diſcovered this great ſecret to none but Alexander, and that ſhe waited till he was going upon his war-like expedition, before ſhe made the diſcovery. Approve your ſelf worthy, ſaid ſhe, of ſo high a birth. Ἡ δὲ Ὀλυμπιὰς (ὡς Ἐρατοσθένης φησὶ) προπέμπουσα τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπὶ τὴν στρατείαν, καὶ φράσασα μόνῳ τὸ περὶ τὴν τέκνωσιν ἀπόῤῥετον, ἐκέλευεν ἄξια φρονεῖν τῆς γενέσεως. *Olympias (ut Eratoſthenes eſt autor) quum euntem ad bellum proſequeretur Alexandrum, arcanum ortum ejus ſoli detexit, hortata ut pro natalibus gereret animos* (6). Note, that, according to Juſtin, the commerce of the ſerpent with Olympias was only a dream. The queen dreamed that a great ſerpent enjoyed her that night that ſhe conceived Alexander (7). One of our beſt Critics, commenting upon this paſſage of Juſtin, obſerves, that there were ſerpents in Macedonia which grew ſo tame and familiar, that the women put them round their arms and necks, like bracelets and necklaces, either for diverſion, or to cool themſelves. He alledges upon this the authority of Lucian. *Hoc autem non abs re fuerit meminiſſe, (nam ex nihilo, ut ajunt, nihil) reperiri in Macedonia ſerpentes, qui tam facile manſueſieri poſſint, ut ex iis olim & puellæ & matronæ ſibi armillas, ſibi monilia facerent, vel ut animulas ſuas oblectarent, vel ad corpuſculum frigerandum. Hujus rei auctorem ciere poſſum Lucianum in Alexandro, ſive Pſeudomanti* (8). Lucian ſpeaks neither of thoſe bracelets or necklaces, but he ſays what is equally ſtrange. He affirms, that the women of Pella brought up great ſerpents ſo very tame, that they ſuckled them, and let them lie with their children. He conjectures, that the vulgar traditions about Olympias was grounded upon this reaſon. Ἐνταῦθα ἰδόντες δράκοντας, παμμεγέθεις, ἡμέρους πάνυ, καὶ τιθασσοὺς, ὡς καὶ ὑπὸ γυναικῶν τρέφεσθαι, καὶ παιδίοις συγκαθεύδειν, καὶ πατουμένους ἀνέχεσθαι, καὶ θλιβωμένους μὴ ἀγανακτεῖν, καὶ γάλα πίνεν, ἀπὸ θελῆς κατὰ ταυτὰ τοῖς βρέφεσι, πολλοὶ δὲ γίνονται τοιοῦτοι παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὅθεν καὶ τὸν περὶ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος μῦθον διαφοιτῆσαι πάλαι εἰκὸς, ὁπότε ἐκύει τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον, δράκοντος τινὸς οἶμαι τοιούτου συγκαθεύδοντος αὐτῇ, ὠνοῦνται τῶν ἑρπετῶν ἓν τὸ κάλλιστον, ὀλίγων ὀβολῶν. *Ibi cùm immani magnitudine dracones conſpicerent, cicures ac manſuetos, adeo ut à mulieribus alerentur, & cum pueris cubarent, & ſe conculcari ſuſtinerent neque ſe premi indignè ferrent, denique infantum more lac è papilla ſugerent (quales apud illos ſunt permulti) unde veriſimile eſt olim de Olympiade fabulam increbruiſſe, quando concumbente cum illa hujuſmodi puto quopiam dracone, Alexandrum conceperat, unum ex his ſerpentibus, qui eſſet pulcherrimus, paucis obolis emunt* (9). According to Plutarch (10) the women of that country made uſe of thoſe ſerpents in the feſtivals of Bacchus, which they affected to celebrate with all the appearances of the moſt furious Enthuſiaſm. They made theſe creatures creep upon the Thyrſus's they carried in their hands, and the crowns they had upon their heads; under the notion that this would ſtrike a greater terror into the men. He obſerves, that Olympias affected more than all the reſt to be tranſported with fury at this anniverſary. Ἡ δὲ Ὀλυμπιὰς μᾶλλον ἑτέρων ζηλώσασα τὰς κατοχὰς, καὶ τοὺς ἐνθουσιασμοὺς ἐξάγουσα βαρβαρικώτερον, ὄφεις μεγάλους χειροήθεις ἐφείλκετο τοῖς θιάσοις. *Olympias autem, præ cæteris motum lymphaticum æmulans, & fanaticum peragens ritum horridiore ſpectaculo, ſerpentes manſuefactos trahebat thiaſis ingentes* (11).

(1) Cujus (*Attali*) ſororem nuper expulſa Alexandri matre Olympiade propter ſtupri ſuſpicionem, in matrimonium receperat. *Juſtin. lib. ix, cap. v.*

(2) Ib. *lib. xi, cap. xi.*

(3) Ἡ τῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος χαλεπότης, δυσζήλου καὶ βαροθύμου γυναικός. Olympiadis acerbitas ſuſpicioſæ mulieris, & triſtis. *Plut. in Alexandro, pag.* 669. *A.*

(4) Ἀποβαλεῖν δὲ τῶν ὄψεων αὐτὸν τὴν ἑτέραν, ἣν τῷ τῆς θύρας ἁρμῷ προσβαλὼν, κατώπτευσεν ἐν μορφῇ δράκοντος συνευναζόμενον τῇ γυναικὶ τὸν Θεον. Amiſiſſe vero eum alterum oculum, quem rimæ oſtii admovens Deum conſpexit ſerpentis figura cum uxore ſua concubantem. *Plut. in Alex. initio, pag. m.* 665.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Qua nocte eum mater Olympias concepit, viſa per quietem eſt cum ingenti ſerpenti volutari (*others read* voluptari.) *Juſtin. lib. xii, cap. xvi.*

(8) Tanaquillus Faber, in Juſtin. *pag.* 291. *Edit. Grævianæ* 1683.

(9) Lucianus, in Pſeudomanti, *pag.* 863. *Tom. i, Edit. Salmurienſis* 1619.

(10) Plutarch. ubi ſupra.

(11) Ibid.

[C] *Thoſe*

in the court of Macedonia, debauched Olympias are miſtaken [*C*]. She was ſo incenſed againſt her huſband, for marrying another wife, that ſhe inſtigated Pauſanias to kill him. Nay, ſhe was deſirous the world ſhould know what part ſhe acted in that parricide [*D*]. At firſt ſhe did not ſeem diſpleaſed to have the world believe that Jupiter was the father of Alexander (*c*): but afterwards ſhe made a jeſt of that opinion. This appears from a letter ſhe wrote to that prince [*E*], when ſhe heard that he publickly called himſelf the ſon of Jupiter, and aſſumed divine honours [*F*]. In Alexander's abſence Antipater was almoſt always at variance with her;

[*C*] *Thoſe who pretend that Nectanebus . . . debauched Olympias are miſtaken.*] We learn from Plutarch (12), that Nactanebus, or Nactanabus, abandoning his kinſman Tachus, who had given him the command of his army, cauſed himſelf to be proclaimed king of Egypt (13); and that Ageſilaus took his part. The Perſians defeated him and drove him out of Egypt. Some alledge, he fled to Æthiopia, others ſay he went to the court of Macedonia, in hopes of a powerful aſſiſtance from king Philip againſt the Perſians; but he was, ſay they, ſo ungrateful to that prince for his kind reception, that he left no ſtone unturned to debauch Olympias; and for that end had recourſe even to the impoſtures of Magic, of which he was a great maſter. (14). By this means he overcame the queen, and begot Alexander upon her. They add, that Philip diſcovered ſomething of the matter, and from that time very much ſuſpected his wife's adultery, and that this was the true reaſon of the divorce. But theſe are all fables. For Chronology demonſtrates to us, that Alexander was ſix years old when Nectanebus was expelled his kingdom. This I have from the learned Freinſhemius, to whom I give all the honour of the diſcovery. *Nec deſunt*, ſays he (15) *qui* fabuloſum id quidem: non tamen adulterium matris falſo jactatum *adſerant*. Quippe pulſum Ægypti regno Nectanebum, non, ut vulgo arbitrantur, in Æthiopias conceſſiſſe; ſed quum adverſus vim Perſicam in Philippo maxime præſidium ſperaret, in Macedoniam vectum, magicis præſtigiis inluſiſſe Olympiadi, torumque hoſpitis temeraviſſe. Suſpectam quidem exinde Philippo, neque aliam tam intimam divortii, quod inter eos ſequutum eſt, cauſſam, pro comperto poſtea fuiſſe. . . . (16) *Ceterum Nectanebi fuga temporibus hiſce non congruit: ſexennis enim jam erat Alexander, quum ille ab Ocho victus, avitis opibus excideret.*

[*D*] *She was deſirous the world ſhould know what part ſhe acted in that parricide.*] The ſcandal of her divorce, and her huſband's marrying again (17) provoked her ſo extremely, that ſhe ſollicited the king of Epirus, her brother, to declare war againſt Philip. And ſhe had obtained her end, if Philip had not prevented it by marrying his daughter to that monarch (18). She put Pauſanias upon the aſſaſſination of her huſband; ſhe took care to have horſes in readineſs for that aſſaſſin; and the very night that ſhe returned into Macedonia to be preſent at the funeral of this prince, ſhe cauſed a crown to be put upon the head of Pauſanias, who was then hanging upon a croſs. Some days after ſhe gave him a funeral, then built him a tomb, and inſpired the people with a religious obſervation of an anniverſary ſolemnity to the honour of this murderer. After that, ſhe cauſed her huſband's daughter by Cleopatra to be killed on her mother's lap, and then had the mother hanged in her own preſence (19). In fine, ſhe conſecrated to Apollo the dagger with which Pauſanias had killed Philip, and gave the ſame name to the dagger, which ſhe herſelf had born in her infancy. All theſe things ſhe did ſo publickly, that one would think her chief fear was, that there ſhould not be ſufficient evidence of her being the author of them. See if this be not the ſenſe of Juſtin (20). *His ſtimulis irarum utrique* (21) *Pauſaniam, de impunitate ſtupri ſui querentem, ad tantum facinus impuliſſe creduntur. Olympias certe fugienti percuſſori equos quoque præparatos habuit. Ipſa deinde, audita regis nece, cum titulo officii ad exequias cucurriſſet, in cruce pendentis Pauſaniæ capiti, eadem nocte qua venit, coronam auream impoſuit: quod nemo alius audere, niſi hæc, ſuperſtite Philippi filio, potuiſſet. Paucos deinde poſt dies, refixam corpus interfectoris ſuper reliquias mariti cremavit, & tumulum ei eodem fecit in loco, parentarique eidem quotannis, incuſſa populo ſuperſtitione, curavit. Poſt hæc Cleopatram, à qua pulſa Philippi matrimonio fuerat, in gremio ejus prius filia interfecta, finire vitam ſuſpendio coëgit, ſpectaculoque pendentis ultionem potita eſt, ad quam per parricidium feſtinaverat. Noviſſime gladium, quo rex percuſſus eſt, Apollini ſub nomine Myrtalis conſecravit: hoc enim ante Olympiadis parvulæ fuit. Quæ omnia ita palam facta ſunt, ut timuiſſe videatur, ne facinus ab ea commiſſum non probaretur.*

[*E*] *This appears from a letter ſhe wrote to that prince.*] In writing to his mother he had taken upon him the title of the ſon of Jupiter Hammon; and the anſwer ſhe ſent him was this. *Pray, my ſon, be quiet, do not accuſe me before Juno, ſhe will do me ſome great miſchief, if you own me for her rival in your letters.* The knowledge of this we owe entirely to Aulus Gellius; for we have not Varro's book, out of which he copied it, nor the ſeveral other pieces in which it was mentioned. Aulus Gellius's words are theſe (22). *In pleriſque monumentis rerum ab Alexandro geſtarum, & paulo antè in libro M. Varronis, qui inſcriptus eſt* Oreſtes vel de inſania, *Olympiadem Philippi uxorem feſtiviſſimè reſcripſiſſe legimus Alexandro filio. Nam quum is ad matrem ita ſcripſiſſet: Rex Alexander Jovis Hammonis filius Olympiadi matri ſalutem dicit. Olympias reſcripſit ad hanc ſententiam:* Amabo, *inquit*, mi fili, quieſcas: neque deferas me neque crimine adverſum Junonem. Malum mihi prorſum illa magnum dabit, quum tu me litteris tuis pellicem illi eſſe confiteris. Freinſhemius is miſtaken when he affirms, that Olympias wrote to Alexander, that ſhe had not deſerved to be expoſed to Juno's reſentment: *Miſſaque epiſtola petiviſſe*, ne ſe nihil tale commeritam odiis Junonis objectare pergeret (23). Moreri, who never went to the ſpring-head, has, by truſting to the tranſlation of Freinſhemius, given us a falſe account of the contents of this letter (24). I own indeed, that Olympias's words carry with them an air of raillery; but when all is done, if we keep to the literal ſenſe of the words, we muſt firmly and poſitively maintain, that this princeſs does not deny her former converſation with Jupiter, and that ſhe only deſires her ſon would not boaſt of it; for fear Juno, who perhaps would otherwiſe never hear of it, or not trouble herſelf about it, while no noiſe was made of it, ſhould rouſe up all the fury of her jealouſy, upon finding this new baſtard of her huſband, proclaiming all over the earth the favours ſhewn to Olympias. Since therefore, according to the literal ſenſe of them, Aulus Gellius's words imports no more, they ought not to be quoted in Italic, as if they contained a formal declaration of Olympias's innocence. The terms (25) made uſe of by Plutarch, import only that ſhe would have her ſon hold his peace: now there is a great deal of difference between ſaying, *I would not have an accuſation be brought againſt me before Juno*, and ſaying, *I have done nothing to offend Juno.* Ἕτεροι δὲ φασιν αὐτὴν ἀφοσιοῦσθαι καὶ λέγειν, Οὐ παύσεταί με διαβάλλων Ἀλέξανδρος πρὸς τὴν Ἥραν. *Alii hoc illam ajunt abdicaſſe ac dixiſſe, non deſinet Alexander in crimen me apud Junonem vocare* (26). Ælian tells us one thing which ſhews, that one day Olympias reflected with great concern upon Alexander's weakneſs in deſiring to paſs for a god. Being told that he had been dead ſome days, and was not yet interred (27), ſhe cried out, *Oh, my poor ſon! you have uſed all your efforts to have a place among the gods, and now you have not ſo much as the honour of a ſepulture, which is common to all mortals.* Ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν οὐρανοῦ μετασχεῖν βουλόμενος, καὶ τοῦτο σπεύδων, νῦν οὐδὲ τῶν κοινῶν δήπου, καὶ ἴσων πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις μετασχεῖν ἔχεις, γῆς τε ἅμα, καὶ ταφῆς. *Tu vero quum inter cælites locari volueris, & id perficere ſummo ſtudio conatus ſis, nunc neque illorum quidem, quorum omnibus mortalibus æquale & par jus eſt, particeps fieri potes, terræ ſepulturæque* (28). This puts me in mind of a piece of raillery of Theocritus the Sophiſt (29), who hearing of Alexander's death ſaid to his countrymen, *Take courage, gentlemen, you ſee the gods die ſooner than the men.*

[*F*] *Alexander called himſelf the ſon of Jupiter, and aſſumed divine honours.*] He had ſeveral views in this uſurpation of divine honours, and among others that of vindicating Olympias, who had been eſteemed irregular in the article of chaſtity. Of this I ſhall produce

(*c*) See the remarks [*A*] and [*B*].

(12) Id. in Ageſilao, *pag.* 617.

(13) See the article TACHUS.

(14) We read of a certain Magician, called Nectanebus, who having made ſeveral ſhips and gallies of wax, made his enemies ſhips ſink every time he drowned his wax veſſels in a large baſin of water. *Vigenere on the ſtatue of Æſculapius in Philoſtratus, fol.* 157, *Tom. ii, Edit. in 4to.*

(15) Freinſhemius, Supplem. in Q. Curtium, *lib. i, cap. i, num.* 15.

(16) Ib. *n.* 19.

(17) He married Cleopatra, the daughter of Attalus, according to *Juſtin, lib. ix, cap. v*, or niece, according to *Plutarch in Alexandro*, and *Diodor. Siculus, lib. xvi, cap. xciv.*

(18) Taken from *Juſtin, lib. ix, cap. vii.*

(19) Juſtin's words will bear this ſenſe, but they may likewiſe be underſtood, as if Olympias had only ſeen Cleopatra hanging.

(20) Ib. *pag. m.* 204, 205.

(21) That is, Olympias and Alexander *her ſon.*

(22) Aulus Gellius, lib. xiii, cap. 4.

(23) Freinſhem. Supplem. lib. i, cap. i, n. 20. *He cites* Agel. 13, 4.

(24) *Done by* du Rier, *and joined to* Vaugelas's Q. Curtius.

(25) *That is, thoſe which he attributes directly to Olympias.*

(26) Plutarch. ubi ſupra.

(27) *See* Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib. xii, cap. 64.

(28) Ælian. ibid. lib. xiii, cap. 30.

(29) Clem. Alex. Admonit. ad Gentes, *pag.* 61.

her; and indeed it was very difficult for a woman of ſuch a jealous and ill temper (*d*), to agree with the governour of Macedonia. This was the poſt Alexander beſtowed upon Antipater, when he went upon the expedition to conquer Aſia. After the death of this conqueror his mother was obliged to retire into Epirus; from whence Polyperchon recalled her ſix years after. Arideus, and his wife Eurydice, who then reigned in Macedonia, oppoſed her return: but their efforts were in vain; for the Macedonians declared for her, and by her orders made away with both of them (*e*). She put to death Nicanor, Caſſander's brother, and having ſingled out a hundred Macedonian nobles who were Caſſander's friends, cauſed them all to be maſſacred. This cruelty quickly loſt her the affection of her ſubjects, and then every body called to mind Antipater's laſt words; and regarded, as an oracle, the exhortation he made upon

produce a witneſs, who at the ſame time will be an evidence of the venality of the Pagan oracles. I am going to ſhew you, that Alexander bribed the prieſts of Jupiter Hammon, to engage them to anſwer, as he would have them, in regard to his filial relation to Jupiter. ‘ Igitur Alexander cupiens originem divinitatis acquirere, ſimul & matrem infamia liberare, ‘ per præmiſſos ſubornat antiſtites, quid ſibi reſponderi velit. Ingredientem templum ſtatim antiſtites ‘ ut Hammonis filium ſalutant. Ille lætus dei adoptione hoc ſe patre cenſeri jubet. Rogat deinde, an ‘ omnes interfectores parentis ſui ſit ultus; reſpondetur, patrem ejus nec poſſe interfici, nec mori; regis Philippi peractam plene ultionem eſſe (30). - - - - *Alexander therefore deſiring to be thought of divine extraction, and at the ſame time to clear the reputation ‘ of his mother, ſuborns the prieſts, by meſſengers ſent before-hand, to anſwer him according to direction. ‘ As ſoon as he entered the temple, the prieſts ſaluted ‘ him as the ſon of Jupiter Hammon. He overjoyed ‘ with this divine adoption, commanded that all ſhould ‘ give him this title. Then he aſked, if he had revenged himſelf of all the murderers of his father; they ‘ anſwered, that his father was neither dead nor capable of being murdered; but that he had completely revenged the death of Philip.*’ I have ſaid elſewhere (31) that it was a fine piece of policy which moved Alexander to deſire to paſs for a god: he owns it to his father in one of Lucian's dialogues (32). I have likewiſe obſerved, that he was more reſerved, touching that pretenſion toward the Greeks than toward the Barbarians: but I muſt add here, that at laſt he threw off that caution, and would have the Grecian cities paſs decrees relating to his deity. The reſolutions they took upon this head were different: the decree of Lacedæmon was conceived in theſe terms; *Since Alexander has a mind to be a god, let him be a god.* Ἄλλοι, μὲν οὖν ἄλλα ἐψηφίσαντο. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ἐκεῖνα, ἐπειδὴ Ἀλέξανδρος βούλεται θεὸς εἶναι, ἔστω θεός. *Itaque aliis aliter ſtatuentibus, Lacedæmonii decretum ejuſmodi fecerunt: Quoniam Alexander Deus eſſe vult, eſto Deus* (33). The author I here cite did not know all that the Athenians did; he only tells us of their oppoſition to the decree propoſed to them by Demades, that Alexander ſhould be from thenceforth the thirteenth of the great gods (34). He was fined for daring to propoſe ſuch an impiety. Ælian knew nothing more than this; but it is very probable that Demades purſued his propoſal further, and that the decree paſſed at laſt (35). He repreſented to the Athenians, that they ought to take care not to loſe the earth, by their ſhewing too ſcrupulous a regard to heaven. Eraſmus has not rightly underſtood the ſenſe of this orator. ‘ Quum Athenienſes, *ſays he* (36), ‘ vellent Alexandro divinos honores decernere, videte ‘ inquit (*Demades*) ne dum cœlum cuſtoditis, terram ‘ amittatis. Alexander enim ambiebat monarchiam. ‘ Abſurdum autem erat eos ſic alium donare cœlo, ut ‘ ipſi terra ſua pellerentur. - - - - *When the Athenians ‘ were for decreeing divine honours to Alexander, take ‘ care, ſaid Demades, while you would appear the ‘ keepers of heavenly rights, that you do not become loſers ‘ of earthly ones. For Alexander was aiming at monarchy. And it was abſurd for them to make ſuch a ‘ preſent of heaven to any one, as might give him a ‘ pretence to claim their earth.*’ Eraſmus ſuppoſes that Demades oppoſed Alexander's divine honours, and makes him reaſon confuſedly. Here are two faults. The truth is, that Demades adviſed this deification, and inſiſted upon this argument, that it was to be feared Alexander would conquer Attica, to chaſtiſe thoſe who had refuſed him heaven. See Diogenes Laërtius, book 6, *pag.* 345: you will there find that the Athenians decreed to Alexander the divinity of Bacchus. Ψηφισαμένων Ἀθηναίων Ἀλέξανδρον Διόνυσον, κάμὲ. ἔφη Σάραπιν ποίησατε. Athenienſibus Alexandrum Liberum Patrem decernentibus, & me, inquit (*Diogenes*) Serapin facite. - - - - *Upon the Athenians decreeing Alexander to be Bacchus, pray, ſaid Diogenes, deify me too, and make me Serapis.* I have ſaid, in the remark [*F*] of the article of this conqueror, that there is ſcarce any probability of his ever being able to be firmly perſuaded of his own pretended divinity; for he owned that two things principally reminded him that he was a man; his lying with women, and his ſleeping; which two infirmities he took to be incompatible with the divinity. How therefore could he believe that Jupiter had begot him? A wound alſo gave him to know that he was a man, and from thence he took occaſion to rally a little thoſe flatterers who paid him divine honours.

This is true blood, which flows from mortal veins,
Not Ichor which from wounds immortal drains,

ſaid he, ſhewing them what flowed from his wound (37). Some ſay it was not he, but Calliſthenes who was the author of this raillery. See, upon this whole matter, Freinſhemius's commentary upon the ſeventh Chapter of the fourth book of Quintus Curtius. What Zonaras ſays, that this prince finding himſelf at the point of death, deſired to be thrown into the Euphrates, to make the world believe his tranſlation to heaven, is not at all improbable; for what arts did not he uſe, to perſwade the world that he was a god, and to eſtabliſh the worſhip of his pretended divinity? ‘ Jamque omnibus præparatis quod olim prava mente ‘ conceperat tunc eſſe maturum, quonam modo cœleſtes honores uſurparet, cepit agitare. Jovis filium ‘ non dici tantum ſe, ſed etiam credi volebat, tanquam ‘ perinde animis imperare poſſet ac linguis. Itaque ‘ more Perſarum Macedonas venerabundos ipſum ſalutare proſternentes humi corpora, &c. (38). - - - - *And now having prepared every thing neceſſary for ‘ executing the impious ſcheme he had formed, he began ‘ to think of aſſuming divine honours. He determined ‘ not only to be ſtiled, but alſo to be eſteemed the ſon of ‘ Jupiter, as if he could command mens thoughts as ‘ well as their tongues. Therefore the Macedonians were ‘ forced to ſalute him after the manner of the Perſians, ‘ by proſtrating their bodies to the ground, &c.*’

Here Naudé furniſhes me with matter for a criticiſm. *Alexander,* ſays he (39), *gave out .... that when he came into the world, the goddeſs Diana aſſiſted ſo aſſiduouſly at his mother's delivery, that ſhe forgot to take care of the temple ſhe had at Epheſus, which, in that interval was intirely conſumed by an accidental fire* (40). *Some captives having acquainted him with a remedy proper to be made uſe of againſt the Indians poiſoned arrows, he gave out, before he publiſhed it, that GOD had revealed it to him in a dream. But this inſatiable deſire having carried him ſo far as to require adoration, he was at laſt convinced, by the remonſtrances of Calliſthenes, by the obſtinacy of the Lacedemonians, and the wounds he received every day in engagements, that all his power would never be ſufficient to eſtabliſh that new Apotheoſis; and that a greater fortune is required for gaining a ſmall place in heaven, than for vanquiſhing here below, and lording it over all the earth.* It is not true that Alexander ſaid Diana was ſo overbuſy at Olympias's delivery, that ſhe ſuffered her temple at Epheſus to be burnt. That was the thought of an hiſtorian whom Plutarch banters (41): no body ſays it came from Alexander. Did the Lacedemonians oppoſe

---

(*d*) See the remark [*A*], citation (3).

(*e*) See the article EURYDICE, the daughter of Amintas in the text.

(30) Juſtin, *lib. xi, cap. xi, pag. m.* 241, 242. See likewiſe Oroſius, *lib. iii, cap. xvi.*

(31) In the article MACEDONIA, at the remark [*F*].

(32) Lucian. *Tom. i, pag. m.* 256.

(33) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. ii, cap. xix.*

(34) Ib. *lib. v, cap. xii.* See likewiſe *Athenæus, lib. vi, pag.* 251.

(35) *See Plutarch, in* Vita Lycurgi Oratoris, *pag.* 842. *Clem. Alexandr.* Admonit. ad Gentes, *pag.* 61. *Chryſoſt.* Homil. XXVI, in poſter. ad Corint. (*where, by an overſight, he attributes to the Romans what he ſhould have ſaid of the Athenians, as Salmaſius obſerves,* in Lamprid. Alexandr. Sever. *cap. lxiii.*) *St Cyril,* in Julian. *lib. vi.*

(36) Eraſm. Apophthegm. *lib. vi, pag. m.* 499.

(37) Τοξεύματι δὲ πληγεὶς εἰς τὸ σκέλος, ὡς πολλοὶ συνέδραμον τῶν πολλάκις εἰωθότων αὐτὸν Θεὸν προσαγορεύειν, διαχυθεὶς τῷ προσώπῳ. Τουτὸ μὲν, αἷμα, εἶπεν ὡς ὁρᾶτε καὶ οὐκ ἰχὼρ, - - - οἷός πέρ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν. Jaculo crus ictus multis concurrentibus eorum qui ipſum ſæpenumero ſolebant Deum ſalutare, renidente vultu, hoc quidem, inquit, ſanguis eſt, ut videtis, non ille *Humor qui ſuperum manat de corpore divum.* Plut. in Apophthegm. *pag.* 180, *D.*

(38) Q. Curtius, *lib. viii, cap. v.*

(39) Naudé, Coups d'Etat, *ch. iii, pag. m.* 318.

(40) It was not accidental; for a villain confeſſed he had ſet fire to the temple to make the world ſpeak of him.

(41) See the article FONTARABIA, citat. (9).

upon his death-bed never to ſuffer a woman to aſcend the throne [*G*]. Olympias, miſtruſting the affection of her people, went and ſhut herſelf up in Pydna, as ſoon as ſhe heard of Caſſander's arrival. There ſhe was beſieged, and obliged by famine to capitulate. She was promiſed her life; but Caſſander did not obſerve that article of the capitulation. He called a general convention of the people, and put the queſtion to them what ſhould be done with that princeſs. Upon this ſome perſons who had been ſuborned by him, and who were near relations of thoſe ſhe had put to death, demanded that ſhe ſhould be puniſhed for her cruelties. In compliance with their demand, ſhe was condemned to die (*f*). She bore the execution with great courage and marks of modeſty [*H*]. I have no where read, but in a modern

(*f*) Taken from *Juſtin, lib. xiv, cap. v, vi.* See likewiſe *Diodorus Siculus, lib. xix, cap. li.*

poſe his deification? Did not they make a decree in his favour (42)? And though they gave it an unlucky turn, we cannot ſay that they were any obſtacle to his deſign.

[*G*] *The exhortation* Antipater *made upon his death-bed, never to ſuffer a woman to aſcend the throne.*] This is a fact preſerved to us by Diodorus Siculus (43). Lambinus has inſerted, in one of his books, the whole chapter in which that ancient hiſtorian diſplays all the barbarities of Olympias, and without doubt his only end in inſerting it, was to add the greater weight to the concluſion. ‘ Talibus & tam atrocibus, atque injuſtis facinoribus iram ſuam explens *(Olympias)* citò hoc efficit, ut Macedones ejus crudelitatem abominarentur. Omnes enim Antipatri verba memoria repetebant, qui tanquam oracula fundens, & vaticinans, Macedones moriens hortatus eſt, UT NE UNQUAM MULIEREM SINERENT REGNI CLAVUM TENERE. Hactenus Diodorus. - - - - *Olympias taking her revenge by ſuch lawleſs and terrible methods, ſoon made herſelf odious to the Macedonians for her cruelty. For they all remembered the words of Antipater, who, as he was dying, delivered this caution as an oracle, or prophecy,* THAT THEY NEVER SHOULD SUFFER A WOMAN TO ASCEND THE THRONE.’ Now ſee what he adds to juſtify this remonſtrance of Antipater. ‘ Præclare verò Antipater. Nam ſi mulieres omnes jure civili propter infirmitatem conſilii in tutorum ſunt poteſtate, neque ſuarum rerum gerendarum ſunt dominæ aut arbitræ, & quod mulier ſine tutore autore promiſerit, id ratum non eſt, neque debetur, quanto minus debet mulieri reipub. procuratio, & regni adminiſtrandi poteſtas permitti, aut committi? & ſi viri interdum, quorum maximè propria eſt fortitudo, quique ſapientiores & cordatiores ſolent eſſe natura, imperium adepti, tamen licentia corrumpuntur, ac depravantur: quid à mulieribus, quibus nihil natura finxit mollius, neque mobilius, neque infirmius, expectandum (44)? - - - - *And very juſt was Antipater's advice. For if all women, by the Civil Law in regard to the weakneſs of their reſolutions, are in the cuſtody of guardians, and not miſtreſſes of themſelves in the management of their affairs, and what a woman without her guardian contracts for, is void, how much more unreaſonable is it, that a woman ſhould ever be permitted to take upon her the public government, and adminiſtration of a kingdom? and if men ſometimes, whoſe proper character is fortitude, and who are naturally wiſer and ſteadier, when once they become governors, are yet corrupted and depraved: what can be expected from women, who are formed by nature ſo weak and inſtable?*’ There cannot be a ſtronger cenſure on the conduct of thoſe people, who lodge the ſovereign authority in the hands of women; and yet Lambinus publiſhed his book at Paris, by the king's authority, and even dedicated it to Charles IX, when Catherine de Medicis governed all. It is no wonder that ſuch thoughts ſhould come into his head in thoſe days; for this queen's ill conduct was enough to infuſe them into thoſe very people, who were leaſt preposſeſſed in favour of the Salic law: but it is ſurpriſing that he ſhould have the courage to publiſh theſe thoughts of his, and that he did not ſuffer by ſo doing. There was no notice taken of his reflexion, and thence it comes that Francis Hotomanus (45) aſked his adverſaries why they made ſo much noiſe againſt his *Francogallia* (46) printed beyond the Alps, and took no notice of Lambinus, whoſe work had been printed at Paris itſelf.

[*H*] *She bore the execution with great courage and marks of modeſty.*] So true it is, that the moſt reprobate ſouls do more readily renounce virtue itſelf, than the appearances of virtue. Here we have a woman divorced for her adulteries, and beſides guilty of the greateſt crimes, who employs her laſt care in ſo compoſing herſelf, that her cloaths, when ſhe was upon the ground, might cover what modeſty forbids to expoſe. ‘ Inſuper exſpirans capillis os, veſte crura contexiſſe fertur, ne quid poſſet in corpore ejus indecorum videri (47). - - - - *It is further remarked, that when ſhe was dying, ſhe covered her face with her hair, and gathered her garments about her legs, that her body might not be ſeen in any indecent manner.*’ The like care is leſs to be admired at in Polyxena, who was a young girl and a very virtuous perſon. Euripides has not failed to obſerve, that ſhe took the utmoſt care to have her fall accompanied with decency (48).

- - - - Ἡ δὲ, καὶ θνήσκουσ᾽, ὅμως
Πολλὴν πρόνοιαν εἶχεν εὐσχήμως πεσεῖν.
Κρύπτειν θ᾽, ἃ κρύπτειν ὄμματ᾽ ἀρσένων χρεών·

- - - - Hæc vero etiam moriens, tamen
Magnam ſollicitudinem habuit decenter ut caderet,
Et occultaret, quæ occultare occulos virorum convenit (49).

Yet dying ſhe employ'd her utmoſt care,
To form her fall with ſuch a decent air,
That no rude eye might now behold her bare.

Pliny the younger makes the ſame remark upon the famous veſtal virgin, whom Domitian condemned to be buried alive. ‘ Quinetiam quum in illud ſubterraneum cubiculum demitteretur, hæſiſſetque deſcendenti ſtola, vertit ſe, ac recollegit. Cumque ei carnifex manum daret, adverſata eſt, & reſiluit: fœdumque contactum quaſi planè à caſto puroque corpore noviſſima ſanctitate rejecit: omnibuſque numeris pudoris, πολλὴν πρόνοιαν εἶχεν εὐσχήμως πεσεῖν (50). - - - - *Beſides as ſhe was letting down into her ſubterraneous cave, her cloaths ſticking and gathering up about her, ſhe turned herſelf round and compoſed them in order again. And when the executioner offered his hand to aſſiſt her, ſhe ſtarted back and refuſed his help; rejecting his baſe touch, with the laſt degree of ſanctity, as tho' her body had been wholly pure and undefiled; and agreeably to the moſt conſummate chaſtity, ſhe took great care to fall decently.*’ I ſay nothing of the Amazon Pentheſilea; for the poet obſerving that ſhe fell from her horſe ſtretched out at full length, without making any diſcovery, leaves us room to believe it might be the effect of chance.

- - - Ἡ δ᾽ ὦκα μίγη κονίῃ, καὶ ὀλέθρῳ,
Εὐϛαλέως ἐειποῦσα κατ᾽ οὔδεος· οὐδέ οἱ αἰδὼς
Ἤσχυνεν δέμας ἠΰ· τάθη δ᾽ ἐπὶ νηδύα μακρήν.

- - Quæ mox cum pulvere & morte commiſcetur,
Compoſitè cadens ad terram, nec pudor
Formoſum corpus dedecorat, ſed extenditur in latum ventrem (51).

Her dying body was conceal'd ſo well,
That the moſt prying eye no tale cou'd tell,
While prone to earth, at her full length ſhe fell.

But what ſhall we ſay of Cæſar, the moſt unchaſte man upon earth, who yet uſed the ſame precaution with that of Polyxena? ‘ Utque animadvertit undique ſe ſtrictis pugionibus peti, toga caput obvolvit: ſimul ſiniſtra manu ſinum ad ima crura deduxit quo

(42) See Ælian, above, citation (33).

(43) Diodor. Sicul. *lib. xix, cap. xi.*

(44) Dionyſ. Lambin. in Cornel. Nepot. *pag.* 345, *Edit. of Paris* 1569.

(45) *See* Matagonis de Matagonibus adverſus Italogalliam ſive Antifrancogalliam Antonii Matharelli, *pag.* 245, 246.

(46) It is a piece, in which he condemns the regency of women. See HOTMAN, citat. (19), and remark [*I*].

(47) Juſtin, *lib. xiv, ſub fin.*

(48) She had likewiſe the courage to ſee the fatal blow given. See Drelincourt, *pag.* 126, of his *Achilleus Index*, the third edition. You will there meet with an accurate and extenſive learning upon Polyxena.

(49) Euripides, in Hecuba, *ver.* 568, *pag. m.* 35. *See likewiſe* Ovid's Metam. *lib. xiii, where he ſays of Polyxena,*
Tunc quoque cura fuit partes velare tegendas
Cum caderet, caſtique decus ſervare pudoris.

(50) Plin. Epiſt. XI, *lib. iv, pag. m.* 240.

(51) Quintus Calaber, in Supplem. Homeri, *lib. i, ver.* 619, *pag. m.* 168.

modern author, that the ſerpent, which lay with her, left upon her body ſuch ſpots as were never defaced [*I*]. It was ſo ſaid of the mother of Auguſtus.

‘ honeſtius caderet, etiam inferiore corporis parte velata (52). - - - - *And as he obſerved himſelf attacked on all ſides with drawn daggers, he covered his head with his gown, and at the ſame time with his left hand gathered the lower part of it about his legs, that he might fall the more decently, with his whole body covered.*’ We muſt needs own, not only that leudneſs has its bounds in thoſe over whom it gets the aſcendant; but alſo that there are ſome perſons very diſſolute and irregular in their actions, who in their words and all other external demeanour, are at the ſame time religious obſervers of decency (53). As for the courage which Olympias ſhewed at her exit, it is finely deſcribed in the following words: ‘ Sed Olympias ubi obſtinatos venire ad ſe armatos vidit, veſte regali, duabus ancillis innixa ultro obviam procedit. Qua viſa, percuſſores attoniti fortuna majeſtatis prioris, & tot in ea memoriæ occurrentibus regum ſuorum nominibus, ſubſtiterunt; donec à Caſſandro miſſi ſunt, qui eam confoderent, non refugientem gladium, nec vulnera, aut muliebriter vociferantem, ſed virorum more fortium, pro gloria veteris proſapiæ, morti ſuccumbentem, ut Alexandrum poſſes etiam in moriente matre cognoſcere (54). - - - *But Olympias when ſhe ſaw ſome perſons armed advancing in a reſolute manner, went to meet them in her royal robes, and attended by two of her maids. The aſſaſſins upon ſeeing her, made a full ſtop, aſtoniſhed at the thought of her former majeſty, and with the memory of ſo many of their kings, whoſe names her perſon recalled to their mind: till others were ſent by Caſſander, who ſtabbed her, while ſhe, without either ſhrinking from their ſwords, or making the leaſt female outcry, ſubmitted to death with the valour of a hero, to the glory of her great family, ſo that even in the dying mother you might eaſily behold an Alexander.*’ This ſhews, that thoſe who ſay cruelty is a mark of cowardice, and that nothing is ſo mean and cringing as a barbarous and criminal ſoul when reduced to the laſt extremity, may be confuted by great examples.

[*I*] *I have no where read, but in a modern author, that the ſerpent which lay with her, left upon her body ſuch ſpots as were never defaced.*] The modern author I here ſpeak of is Savaro, whoſe words I ſhall inſert after firſt giving the text of Sidonius Apollinaris, upon which he has commented.

Magnus Alexander, nec non Auguſtus, habentur
Concepti ſerpente Deo: Phœbumque, Jovemque
Diviſere ſibi: namque horum quæſiit unus
Cyniſia ſub Scyrte patrem maculis genitricis.
Alter Phœbigenam ſeſe gaudebat haberi,
Pæonii jactans Epidauria ſigna draconis (55).

Their birth from ſerpents of celeſtial frame,
Both Alexander and Auguſtus claim:
And ſharing to themſelves the gods above,
One chuſes Phœbus, and the other Jove.
To clear his mother's ſpots, in Lybian ſands,
The former an immortal ſire demands.
The latter to atteſt his father's rays,
The ſerpent's Epidaurian marks diſplays.

Savaro's remark upon the fourth of theſe ſix verſes is this. ‘ Hæc de Alexandro dicta ſunt, non de Auguſto, ut vir doctus (56) ſcribit, qui quidem Alexander quærebat patrem ſuum inſignitum ſerpentis maculis, quibus inſignita erat Olympias mater, qua cum Jupiter Hammon ſub ſpecie ſerpentis concubuerat, & ſerpentinas maculas inuſſerat ſui concubitus teſtes. Idem, de Accia Auguſti matre, Sueton. cap. 94. - - - - *This is ſaid of Alexander, not of Auguſtus as a learned author writes, for it was Alexander who ſought a father diſtinguiſhed by ſpots like a ſerpent, his mother having been marked with ſuch, ever ſince Jupiter Hammon lay with her in the form of a ſerpent, and left the impreſſion of thoſe ſerpentine ſpots upon her as a proof of his embraces.* He is in the right to maintain that this verſe relates to Alexander, and not to Auguſtus. But where did he ever read that Olympias bore upon her body the marks of the animal, whoſe form Jupiter aſſumed? no author mentions any ſuch thing, therefore I take the ſpots, ſpoken of by the Poet, to be the blemiſhes of the queen's reputation: his meaning without doubt is, that Alexander ſought for his father in the temple of Jupiter Hammon in order to wipe off thoſe ſpots, that is, to ſcreen his mother's honour: the words of Juſtin, quoted above (57), lead us to this ſenſe. This obſervation I had made before I conſulted Freinſhemius's Commentary, where I meet with the ſame cenſure on that thought of Savaro. ‘ Neſcio num ita potius accipiendus ſit Sidonius Carm. 2. 124. ubi dicit quæſiſſe Alexandrum *Cyniſia ſub Syrte patrem maculis genitricis*, quam, ut explicat Vir doctiſſimus, de maculis à concubitu draconis, in matris corpore relictis; ut nimirum Sidonius velit, eum per infamiam matris, quam eo modo adulterii ream agebat, Hammonem ſibi patrem quæſiviſſe. Certe enim de maculis ejus generis ſerpentinis nihil recordor legiſſe, quod ad Olympiadem pertineat (58). - - - - *I am uncertain whether we ought not rather to underſtand in this ſenſe Sidonius Apollinaris, where he ſays that Alexander ſought in the ſands of Africa a father for the ſpots of his mother, than as a learned author explains it, by marks left upon his mother's body, by her lying with a ſerpent; Namely that Sidonins's meaning is, that he ſought Hammon for his father in regard to the infamy of his mother, whom he therefore looked upon as guilty of adultery.*’ If this related to Atia, the mother of Auguſtus, we muſt ſpeak otherwiſe; for we read in Suetonius, that the ſpots ſhe had upon her body after her believing that a ſerpent had embraced her, hindered her all the reſt of her life from going into a bath: ſhe durſt not appear naked with ſuch a checkered ſkin. This adventure is ſo ſtrange and aſtoniſhing, that, if it were certain, it would puzzle all our wits. Give me leave to copy the paſſage. ‘ In Aſclepiadis Mendetis Θεολογουμένων libris lego, Atiam, cum ad ſolenne Apollinis ſacrum media nocte veniſſet poſita in templo lectica, dum cæteræ matronæ dormirent, obdormiſſe, draconemque repente irrepſiſſe ad eam, paulloquepoſt egreſſum, illamque expergefactam quaſi à concubitu mariti purificaſſe ſe, & ſtatim in corpore ejus extitiſſe maculam, velut depicti draconis, nec potuiſſe unquam exigi, adeo ut mox publicis balneis perpetuo abſtinuerit (59). - - - - *In the work of Aſclepiades of Mendeſium, intituled* Θεολογουμένων, *we read that Atia going at midnight to Apollo's feſtival, there being a bed placed in the temple, while ſhe and the other matrons ſlept, a dragon ſuddenly crept upon her, and leaving her a little after, ſhe awaked and purified herſelf as if ſhe had lain with her huſband, and preſently there appeared upon her body a ſpot reſembling a dragon, nor could it ever be taken off, ſo that ſhe from that time continually abſtained from the public baths.*’ If ſuch ſtories had been vented only once, and in a Philoſophical Age, we ſhould not ſo readily venture to make a jeſt of them: but when we reflect that they owe their original to fabulous times, and have only been revived in ſeveral ſucceeding ages, we never ſcruple to affirm, that they derive their being from poetical fictions; and that ſeveral copies of them have been drawn by flatterers, ſometimes in favour of one and ſometimes of another. The Meſſenians gave out that Ariſtomenes was born of a god, metamorphoſed into a ſerpent. The Sicyonians declared the ſame thing of Ariſtodamas (60). The Romans were willing their Scipio ſhould partake of the ſame privileges with Alexander; and after that there were flatterers who did Auguſtus the like honour. This ſort of birth appeared ſo glorious, that the emperor Galerius, the ſon of a peaſant (61), boaſted of it (62) to render himſelf ſomething extraordinary. Obſerve that Scipio was willing ſuch a ſtory ſhould be believed of his mother; and I do not know whether the wiſer Romans did not contribute in ſome meaſure to promote this opinion: for in the circumſtances to which Rome was reduced by Hannibal, it was uſeful that thoſe popular errors ſhould revive the hopes of the people, and make them look upon Scipio, as a man deſigned by the gods for great things. Conſider theſe admirable words of Livy. ‘ Fuit enim Scipio, non veris tantum virtutibus mirabilis, ſed arte quoque quadam ab juventa in oſtentationem earum compoſitus: pleraque apud multitudinem aut per nocturnas viſa ſpecies, aut velut divinitus mente monita, agens: ſive & ipſe capti quadam

---

(52) Sueton. in Cæſare, *cap. lxxxii.*

(53) Compare the article NAPLES (ALPHONSO), remark [*H*].

(54) Juſtin, *lib. xiv, cap. vi, pag. m.* 328, 329.

(55) Sidon. Apollinaris, Carm. II, *ver.* 121.

(56) *That is*, Caſaubon, in Sueton. Auguſt. *cap. xciv.*

(57) In the remark [*F*], citation (30).

(58) Freinſhemius, in Q. Curtium, *lib. iv, cap. vii, num.* 25.

(59) Sueton. in Auguſto, *cap. xciv.*

(60) Velandæ ignominiæ repetitum ex antiquis fabulis de dracone commentum: idem enim olim de Ariſtomene Meſſenios, de Ariſtodama Sicyonios jactaviſſe. *Freinſhem. Supplem. in Quint. Curtium, lib. i, cap. i, num.* 17.

(61) Aurel. Victor. in Epitome, *pag. m.* 222.

(62) Is inſolenter affirmare auſus eſt matrem more Olympiadis Alexandri Magni creatricis compreſſam dracone ſemet concepiſſe. *Ibid.*

‘ ſuperſtitione animi, ſive ut imperia conſiliaque velut ſorte oraculi miſſa, ſine cunctatione aſſequeretur. Ad hoc jam inde ab initio præparans animos, ex quo togam virilem ſumſit, nullo die prius ullam publicam privatamque rem egit, quam in Capitolium iret, ingreſſuſque ædem conſideret : & plerumque tempus ſolus in ſecreto ibi tereret. Hic mos, qui per omnem vitam ſervabatur, ſeu conſulto, ſeu temere, vulgatæ opinioni fidem apud quoſdam fecit, ſtirpis eum divinæ virum eſſe ; retulitque famam, in Alexandro Magno prius vulgatam, & vanitate & fabula parem, anguis immanis concubitu conceptum, & in cubiculo matris ejus perſæpe viſam prodigii ejus ſpeciem, interventuque hominum evolutam repente, atque ex oculis elapſam. His miraculis nunquam ab ipſo eluſa fides eſt : quin potius aucta arte quadam, nec abnuendi tale quicquam, nec palam affirmandi. Multa alia ejuſdem generis, alia vera, alia aſſimulata, admirationis humanæ in eo juvene exceſſerant modum : quibus freta tunc civitas, ætati haudquaquam maturæ tantam molem rerum tantumque imperium permiſit (63). - - - - - *For Scipio was not only to be admired for his real virtues, but was alſo remarkable from his youth for the art of ſetting them forth : pretending almoſt every thing he tranſacted with the people, to be either the warning of ſome dream, or the effect of a divine inſpiration : whether he was inclined to ſuperſtition himſelf, or that his counſels and commands might be more readily obeyed by being believed to be a ſort of oracles. For this purpoſe having prepared his meaſures from the beginning, as ſoon as he was of ſufficient years to be his own maſter, he never on any day undertook a thing, either public or private, without firſt entring the capitol, and ſtaying ſome time there, and he ſpent moſt of his time there all alone. This cuſtom which he obſerved all his life long, whether contracted deſignedly or accidentally, gave riſe to a vulgar notion, that he was of divine original; and revived a ſtory formerly told of Alexander the Great, and no leſs vain than fabulous, that he was conceived from the embraces of a ſerpent, and that ſuch a monſtrous appearance has been often ſeen in his mother's chamber, and upon any body's coming in, has ſuddenly vaniſhed and diſappeared. He never impeached the credit of theſe miracles : but rather promoted it, by his artful way of neither denying, nor openly affirming them. Many other things of the like kind, ſome true, others pretended, which were ſaid of this young man, exceeded all bounds of human admiration : it was from the credit of theſe, that the city at that time committed into the hands of ſo very young a man, ſo weighty a charge and ſo great a command.*’ There are ſome great families in Europe, which pretend to be ſprung from the commerce of a woman with a ſpirit. The marſhal de Baſſompierre relates this of the head of his family. See his Memoirs, and *Le Comte de Gabalis*. See likewiſe the article PLATO.

(63) T. Livius, *lib. xxvi, pag. m.* 442. *See alſo* Aulus Gellius, *lib. vii, cap. i.*

OMNIBONUS, in Italian *Ognibuono*, was one of the noted Grammarians of the XVth century. He took the ſirname of *Leonicenus* from his being born at Lunigo (*a*), in Latin *Leonicum*, in the Vicentine. He was a diſciple of Victorinus of Feltri one of the firſt reſtorers of antient Latin (*b*). He ſtudied Greek at Venice under Emanuel Chryſoloras (*c*). He wrote commentaries on Lucan, Saluſt, Valerius Maximus, Quintilian, Cicero de Officiis, and Oratore, &c. He tranſlated into Latin part of Æſop's Fables ; Xenophon's treatiſe *de Venatione*, and that of St Athanaſius *contra Gentes & Hæreticos* (*d*). Theſe are only part of his writings.

(*a*) Leandro Alberti, Deſcription of all Italy, *folio* 470, *Edit. Venice* 1561, *in* 4*to*.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Geſner. in Bibliotheca, *folio* 527.

(*d*) Epitome Biblioth. Geſneri, *pag*. 641.

OREGIUS (AUGUSTIN) a great Philoſopher, was ordered by cardinal Barberini (*a*) legate of Bologna, to examine whether Ariſtotle taught the mortality of the ſoul. The legate's intention was, in caſe Ariſtotle had been found guilty of that impiety, to induce the Pope to forbid the reading lectures upon that Philoſopher relating to this head. But Oregius declared him innocent. See his book *De immortalitate Animæ* (*b*). He wrote a book, *de Angelis*, and another *de Operibus ſex dierum*, which was printed at Rome in 1632.

(*a*) He who was ſince made Pope by the name of Urban VIII.

(*b*) In chap. v. Conſult Fromondus, *Philoſ. Chriſt. de anima, pag*. 761.

ORICELLARIUS (BERNARD) a Florentine, related to the houſe of Medicis (*a*), was advanced to the beſt poſts in his native country (*b*). He flouriſhed towards the end of the XVth century. By what you will find quoted in the remarks, it is evident that his works are written in a very good ſtyle. He wrote the expedition of Charles VIII into Italy, with great partiality (*c*). I take him to be the ſame perſon with Bernard OCRICULARIUS (*d*), of whom Eraſmus has ſaid one thing worth knowing [*A*]. Pierius Valerianus mentions

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(*d*) Konig makes them two ſeveral authors.

(*b*) Vir conſularis graviſſimus. *Pocciantius, de Sciptor. Florent. pag*. 32. (*c*) Qua in Hiſtoria moderatio ſcriptori probo conveniens, & alienus à ſtudiis partium animus deſiderantur. *Mabill. Muſæi Ital. Tom. i, pag*. 169.

[*A*] *Eraſmus has ſaid one thing worth knowing.*] He could never engage him to ſpeak Latin; not that Ocricularius did not underſtand it, but becauſe he had ſtudied the purity and beauty of it, and was afraid of ſlipping into barbariſms, if he ventured to ſpeak it *extempore*. Eraſmus takes occaſion to tell us this from an apopthtegm of Pollio. This orator owned that, by pleading well, he had acquired the facility of pleading, and that by pleading often he had rendered himſelf the leſs capable of pleading well. Now, the ſame thing happens to thoſe who ſpeak Latin often ; they acquire the facility of ſpeaking, and loſe the habit of ſpeaking exactly and politely. ‘ Pollio dicebat, *Commode agendo factum eſt, ut ſæpe agerem : ſed ſæpe agendo factum eſt ut minus commode, quia ſcilicet aſſiduitate nimia facilitas magis quam facultas, nec fiducia ſed temeritas paratur*. Quod accurate factum velimus, raro faciendum eſt. Hac ratione duci videntur Itali quidam eruditi, qui licet pulchre calleant Latine, tamen vix unquam adduci poſſunt ut in familiari congreſſu Latine loquantur. At ſi quando compellit neceſſitas, dicunt exacte, quaſique de ſcripto. Novi Venetiæ Bernardum Ocricularium civem Florentinum, cujus hiſtorias ſi legiſſes, dixiſſes alterum Salluſtium, aut certe Salluſtii temporibus ſcriptas (1). Nunquam tamen ab homine impetrare licuit, ut mecum Latine loqueretur ; ſubinde interpellabam, ſurdo loqueris vir præclare, vulgaris linguæ veſtratis tam ſum ignarus quam Indicæ. Verbum Latinum nunquam quivi ab eo extundere (2). - - - - *It was a ſaying of Pollio,* pleading eloquently was the cauſe of my pleading frequently ; but pleading frequently was the cauſe of my pleading leſs eloquently : for by too great frequency we acquire a readineſs rather than an ability, and a raſhneſs rather than a freedom. *What we would do accurately, ſhould be done but rarely. This reaſon ſeems to prevail with ſome learned Italians, who tho' they are great maſters of the Latin tongue, yet can ſcarce ever be perſuaded to ſpeak it in common converſation. But if they happen to be obliged to it, they ſpeak it as exactly, as if they were reading what they had compoſed. I knew at Venice one Bernard Ocricularius, a citizen of Florence, whoſe Hiſtories if you had ever read, you would call him another Salluſt, or think them written at leaſt in the time of Salluſt. And yet I never could prevail with him to ſpeak to me in Latin : ſometimes, I have preſſed him. Learned Sir, I do not*

‘ *underſtand*

(1) *Here is what Pocciantius ſays of Bernardus Oricellarius, pag*. 33, de Script. Florent. Dictavit quinetiam Florentinas hiſtorias, quas adeo phraſi extulit eloquentiſſima, quod (teſte Michaele Urbinate) ipſum Saluſtium ſuperaſſe videatur.

(2) Eraſm. Apophth. lib. viii, pag. 634, Edit. 1556.

mentions our Bernard [*B*], and ſo does Petrus Crinitus [*C*]. John della Caſa had a ſiſter who was married to one Oricellarius. The ſons of this ſiſter took care of their uncle's funeral and manuſcripts. I make this remark only to have the opportunity of correcting an error that relates to Naogeorgus [*D*].

Thuanus

‘ *underſtand your Italian any more than Chineſe. But I never could get one Latin word from him.*’ This precaution of the Italians continued a long time; for we learn from Scioppius that it was impoſſible to force three or four Latin words out of Paulus Manutius without a great deal of trouble; which occaſioned the Germans, who went to ſee him, to value their own learning more than his. They talked Latin more readily than he, and from thence concluded that he was not equal to them. Father Maffeus durſt not enter into converſation with Scioppius, becauſe he was obliged to anſwer him in Latin. The unwillingneſs of theſe gentlemen did not proceed ſo much from the difficulty of explaining themſelves, as from the fear of accuſtoming themſelves to barbariſms, which are almoſt unavoidable to thoſe who ſpeak Latin in converſation. I aſſure myſelf that it will not be diſagreeable to have Scioppius's words inſerted here after that paſſage of Eraſmus. The conformity of the ſubject authoriſes me to do it. ‘ Nihil non faciunt (*Itali*) ut evitent omnia, unde aliquid infuſcandæ & contaminandæ orationis periculi oſtenditur. Latine igitur nunquam loquuntur, quod fieri vix poſſe perſuaſum habeant, quin quotidianus ejus linguæ uſus, ad inſtar torrentis lutulentus fluat, & cujuſquemodi verborum ſordes ſecum rapiat, quæ poſtea quodam familiaritatis jure, ſic ſe ſcribentibus ingerant, ut etiam diligentiſſimos fallant, & haud dubie pro Latinis habeantur. Hoc eorum conſilium cum haud intelligant Tranſalpini, id eorum inſcitiæ perperam adſignant. Sic recte Paulo Manutio uſu venit, ut quoniam vix tria verba Latina in familiari ſermone proferre poterat, eum Germani complures, qui loquentem audituri ad eum venerant, vehementer præ ſe contemnerent. Huic tamen nemo, qui ſanus ſit, ad puritatis & elegantiæ latinæ ſummam quicquid defuiſſe dixerit (3). . . . Mihi quoque Petrus Maffeus Jeſuita nomini atque famæ parum reſpondere viſus eſt, cum ad eum Romæ undeviginti abhinc annis ſalutatum veniſſem. Neque enim inducere animum poterat, ut Latine mihi reſpondendi aleam ſubiret. Poſtea vero lecta, relectaque ejus hiſtoria, quam de rebus per Luſitanos in India geſtis condidit, conſilium hominis ſibi parum fidentis, labemque nomini ſuo metuentis intelligere mihi viſus ſum, quod etiam facere non potui, quin prudentiſſimum judicarem (4). - - - *The* (Italians) *take all the pains imaginable to avoid every thing, that may hazard the obſcuring and corrupting their ſtile. For this reaſon they never talk Latin, which they are of opinion can never be done, but that the daily uſe of this language will make it flow muddy, like a torrent, and ſweep along with it the impurity of any ſort of words, which afterwards by becoming familiar, will inſinuate themſelves in writing, and even deceive the moſt cautious compoſers, by paſſing currently for true Latin. The learned on this ſide the Alps not knowing this motive, of theirs, falſely aſcribe it to their ignorance. Paulus Manutius was a remarkable inſtance of this, for becauſe he could ſcarce ever be brought to ſpeak three Latin words in common converſation, ſeveral Germans, who went to make him a viſit in expectation to hear him ſpeak, looked on him as not near ſo learned as themſelves. But no perſon in his ſenſes will ſay, that he came ſhort of the very ſummit of purity and elegancy in the Latin tongue. . . . I thought myſelf that Peter Maffæus, the Jeſuit, was far from anſwering his great character and reputation upon my going to ſee him at Rome about nineteen years ago. For he could not prevail upon himſelf to run the hazard of anſwering me in Latin. But afterwards when I came to read over and over again his Hiſtory of the Tranſactions of the Portugueſe in the Indies, I then found it was the effect of his modeſty and great caution, not to ſtain his high reputation by any unpolite expreſſion, for which I could not but extremely commend his prudence.*’ I believe I may juſtly ſay, that Thuanus obſerved the ſame conduct with theſe Italian Puriſts; for in a modern author I meet with theſe words. *The Jeſuit Maffeus . . . . . repeated the Breviary in Greek, for fear the ſoleciſms and the low and ſimple way of ſpeaking, as Origen calls it *, in which the ſcriptures are delivered, ſhould prejudice the elegancy and beauty of ſtyle which we admire in his writings: and for the ſame reaſon, Thuanus, who ſpoke Latin with the fluency and majeſty of Livy, never anſwered the harangues and compliments made to him in that language, but by an interpreter* (5).

[*B*] *Pierius Valerianus mentions our Bernard.*] It is when he mentions the deceitful expectations of John Oricellarius the ſon of Bernard. He aſpired to a cardinal's cap, under Leo X, and yet more under Clement VII. But after divers delays, which ſowred him, but did not tire out his patience, death came and mowed down his fortune both preſent (6) and to come. ‘ Eodem in albo reponendus Johannes Oricellarius ſummæ vir integritatis, quique literarum ſtudia vel à teneris unguiculis ſectari cœperat, & apud Bernardum patrem eruditiſſimum virum, & apud Mediceos hujuſmodi ſtudiis in ea domo florentibus educatus fuerat. Erat is Leoni Decimo Pont. Max. amitinus frater, neque ullus erat, qui tum morum, tum literaturæ, nobilitatis, & conſanguinitatis gratia non eum ſperaret ad cardinalatus apicem in in horas evehendum. Sed fortuna illi quoſdam oppoſuerat (7) . . . . . Adridere mox Joanni viſa ſors melior . . . . Hic igitur Oricellarius, dum ſe totum litterarum ſtudiis reſtituit, & fortunæ demum fallacias declinaſſe haud temerè ſibi perſuadet, dumque Clemens de more quodam ſuo cunctator ordinandi hominis diem de die ducit. Ille in rapidiſſimam illapſus febrem magnæ doctorum hominum ſpei præreptus eſt (8). - - - - *In the ſame claſs is to be ranked John Oricellarius, a perſon of the greateſt integrity, and who was a ſcholar from his cradle, having been educated by his father Bernard, among the family of Medicis, which was then famous for it's love of learning. He was couſin-german to Pope Leo X, and all the world was in hopes of ſeeing him ſoon advanced to the purple, in regard to his virtue, learning, nobility, and family. But fortune raiſed him up enemies . . . John's expectations afterwards ſeemed to take a more favourable turn . . . . This ſame Oricellarius therefore while he was retiring cloſely to his ſtudies, and at laſt very prudently reſolving to give fortune no farther opportunity of deceiving him, and while Clement after his uſual manner was putting off his deſign of promoting him from day to day. He fell into a violent fever, which cut him off from all thoſe expectations which the learned world had conceived for him.*’

[*C*] . . . . . *and ſo does Petrus Crinitus.*] Poccianti having ſaid that the letters of Marſilius Ficinus, and thoſe of Petrus Crinitus, atteſt the learning and abilities of Bernard Oricellarius, adds; ‘ Poſteritati tranſmiſit (teſte eodem Crinito) in primis libros quos de urbe Roma intitulaverat, in quibus admodum elaboravit in illuſtrandis atque obſervandis antiquorum monumentis (9). - - - - *The principal work he tranſmitted to poſterity, was that he intituled Of the City of Rome, in which he took great pains in illuſtrating and remarking on the antient monuments.*’

[*D*] *An error that relates to Naogeorgus.*] By the inſcription upon the tomb of John della Caſa (10) it appears that HORATIUS ORICELALRIUS took care to have that monument built for his uncle by the mother's ſide. *Horatius Oricellarius avunculo optime merito P.* A German author obſerves, that the Latin verſes which were made by John della Caſa, againſt thoſe who accuſed him of praiſing Sodomy, are not to be met with in the collection of his works intituled, *Joannis Caſæ Latina monumenta.* He believes, that Alexander Strozza, Inquiſitor of the faith, was the cauſe of leaving them out of that collection. He recites the licence for printing, granted by that Inquiſitor the ſeventh of June 1564, and ſays, that Hannibal Oricellarius was the collector of theſe remains of John della Caſa (11). He gives us tke verſes which were ſuppreſſed; and fancies that the author made them, in anſwer to a ſatire which Naogeorgus had added to the

Why ſome learned men decline the ſpeaking of Latin.

---

(3) Scioppius, in Judicio de Stilo Hiſtorico, *pag. m.* 57.

(4) Ib. *p.* 58.

* Περὶ σολικισμοῦ καὶ εὐτελοῦς φράσεως τῆς γραφῆς.

(5) Girac, Reponſe à la Défenſe des Oeuvres de Voiture, Sect. xviii, pag. 120.

(6) He was governour of the caſtle of St Angelo under Clement VII. *Pier. Valerian. de Literator. Infelicitate, lib. ii, pag. m.* 74.

(7) Ib. *p.* 73.

(8) Ib. *p.* 74.

(9) Pocciant. de Scriptor. Florentin *pag.* 32.

(10) *See* Imperialis, in Muſæo Hiſtor. *pag.* 28. Ghilini Theatr. *Part i, pag.* 79.

(11) Daniel Francus, Diſquiſit. Academ. de Papiſtarum Indicibus Librorum prohibitorum, *pag.* 111.

Thuanus mentions one **HORATIUS ORICELLARIUS** a Florentine, who amaſſed prodigious riches by managing the taxes of France; and perceiving he became odious on account of his great gains, he returned to his own country. The Great Duke ſent him as proxy for his marriage with one of the daughters of the duke of Lorrain in 1588 *(e)*. There was at the ſame time one **CHARLES ORICELLARIUS**, a member of the academy of Florence, and canon of the Metropolitan church, very much eſteemed by Peter Victorius, who gives him a large encomium in the preface to his commentary on the third book of Ariſtotle's Ethics *(f)*. Note that the common name of that family is Rucellai. I ſhall bring proofs of it, not ſo much to clear a doubtful fact, for this is not ſo, as to have an opportunity of mentioning ſome perſons of that name [*E*].

I add, that 'Catherine de Medicis introduced the firſt of this family into France, 'which is now eſtabliſhed there, and that it is not long ſince an envoy from Florence '(*g*) . . . . claimed ſome privileges which were due to him on account of his anceſtors 'when they firſt ſettled in the kingdom . . . . ;' that this queen *had a very tender affection for this whole family*; that ſhe regarded them *in ſome meaſure as relations*, for they were deſcended, on the female ſide, from the Viconti's, and were related by this means *to the houſe of Medicis* (*h*).

ſecond edition of his *Regnum Papiſticum* (12). But he is miſtaken; for John della Caſa wrote that poem, only with intent to take from the Germans the bad impreſſions which Vergerius had given them of him, in charging him with being the author of an elogium upon Sodomy. I ſhall here ſubjoin a paſſage which proves manifeſtly, that he does not complain of a ſatire publiſhed by a German, but of the diſcourſes of a fugitive.

Quare habere transfugæ
De me fidem nolite perditiſſimo:
Sed enecate eum indies magis ſiti,
Pedoribuſque & eſuritionibus:
Quod belle adhuc feciſſe vos exiſtimo,
Virtute natio & fide atque induſtria
Et literis clara, ingeniique gloria (13).

As to myſelf, I hope you'll ne'er believe
The ſlanders of a curſed fugitive.
I doubt not but you will diſpatch him firſt,
By ſlow degrees, with hunger, dirt, and thirſt.
All glorious nations ſuch examples make,
Where virtue, faith, and learning, are at ſtake.

Paul Vergerius is the fugitive he ſpeaks of. See at the end of the Anti-Baillet the diſcourſe in proſe which John della Caſa made againſt him.

[*E*] *The name of that family is Rucellai. I ſhall bring proofs of it. . . . . . to have an opportunity of mentioning ſome perſons of that name.*] Mr Rilli, in his Hiſtory of the Academiſts of Florence, calls the ſame learned man Carlo Rucellai, whom Peter Victorius names Carolus Oricellarius. You have ſeen in the preceding remark one Horatius Oricellarius, and one Annibal Oricellarius, who were the ſons of a ſiſter of John della Caſa. They are called Rucellai in cardinal d'Oſſat's letters (14): 'the ſecond thing wherewith '. . . . cardinal Aldobrandin charged us, on the 'part of the Pope, was, that the king would be 'pleaſed to let the biſhop of Carcaſſone enjoy the 'fruits both of the ſaid biſhopric, and of an abbey '(15) which he has in Champagne: adding, that his 'holineſs acknowledged the ſaid biſhop, and his brother Horatio Rucellai to be his friends and to have 'been always friends to his family, and well affected to 'France.' Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie, commenting on this, tells us (16). I. That this biſhop of Carcaſſonne was *Annibal Rucellai, a gentleman of Florence, formerly governor of Rome, and known at the French court by the negotiations in which he had been employed by the Popes, Paul IV, and Pius V.* That *in the year* 1567, *he was ſent by Charles IX to Venice, to demand of the ſenate money, but he could obtain none, becauſe of the Turkiſh war with which the Republic was then threatened.* 2. That Horatio Rucellai *was high-ſteward to Ferdinand, grand-duke of Tuſcany.* 3. That *the Aldobrandins, and the Rucellai's were always of that party, which was called in Florence,* THE LIBERTINES (17), *that is to ſay, good Republicans, and Anti-Mediceans; who were for preſerving the liberty of their country. From hence proceeded the great affection, which Clement VIII had for theſe two brothers, whoſe father, as well as his own, had ſuffered very much under the pontificate of Leo X, and Clement VII, by whom the ſovereignty came into the houſe of Medicis.* This biſhop of Carcaſſonne died the 28th of January, 1601 (18). Horatio Rucellai, his brother, one of *the ableſt men in the world* (19), ſent immediately a courier to the French court (20). Catel takes notice that *Hannibal d'Oricellai was biſhop of Carcaſſonne in the year* 1569 (21). The abbot Rucellai, who was ſo much ſpoken of in France, under the reign of Lewis XIII, was, without doubt, the ſon of this Horatio; for John della Caſa was his great uncle (22), and (23) *he was born of a father, who enriched himſelf* (24) *by the correſpondence he had with Zamet, Bandini, Cenami, and other Italians, who then had farms in France.* You will find in the Miſcellanies of Vigneul de Marville (25) what Mr de Baſſompierre, and the author of the duke of Epernon's Life, have ſaid that is curious, concerning this abbot. Here is a paſſage which concerns one of that family. 'We are promiſed from Florence a 'work, in which the author, who is named Rucellai, 'has included all that the Antients have writ on that 'ſcience, and has collected no leſs than ſix and thirty 'ſyſtems of Natural Philoſophy, all different from each 'other. As this work which he writ in Italian, and 'contains twelve volumes, could not appear before his 'death, there is reaſon to fear that it will not be 'publiſhed very quickly, after the loſs which learning 'has ſuſtained in the perſon of cardinal de Medicis, 'who alone was capable of forwarding the impreſ'ſion (26).' The book from whence I take theſe words was printed in 1676. I do not doubt but that they mean the ſame Horatio Rucellai, of whom Mr de Creſcimbeni ſpeaks thus: 'Il Sonetto moderno lo tor'remo dal ſecolo del ſecento ora corrente, e da uno 'de' più illuſtri Letterati, ch'egli abbia annoverato, 'cioè dalle Rime ſcritte a mano appreſſo di me del 'leggiadro Poëta, e profondo Filoſofo Orazio Rucellai 'Florentino Cavaliere, e priore di ſua Patria, il quale 'à fiorito a noſtri tempi, ed a laſciato all' eruditiſſimo 'Signor Prior Luigi ſuo figlivolo un' opera nobiliſſima 'di Dialoghi filoſofici, la quale ſe un giorno vedrà la 'luce, conoſceranno i Poſteri quanto per ſi chiaro in'telletto queſto ſecolo ſia degno d'invidia (27). - - - - '*The late Poem compoſed about the concluſion of the XVIth* '*century, by one of the moſt celebrated ſcholars of his time,* '*that is, the verſes in manuſcript of that excellent Poet,* '*and profound Philoſopher, Horatio Rucellai, a Florentine* '*knight, who was in high authority in his country, and* '*flouriſhed in our memory, and left behind him, to his* '*learned ſon, an admirable work of Philoſophical Dia*'*logues; which, whenever it comes to be publiſhed, will* '*ſhew poſterity how much the preſent age deſerves to be* '*envied for producing ſo great a genius.*' The ſame author tells us, that Giovani Rucellai compoſed at Rome in 1524, a poem, intituled, *le Api*, which was printed in the year 1539, and afterwards at Florence, by Philip Giunti 1590, with notes of Robert Titius, and with la Coltavazione of Lewis Alamanni (28). He does not ſpeak of the Paris edition in 1546, by Robert Stephens. It is to be found in the library of Thuanus (29). This John Rucellai was a Florentine (30), and we have no reaſon to doubt that he was of the family of the Oricellarius's. See the article RUCELLAI.

ORICHOVIUS

(*e*) Thuan. *lib. xcii, pag.* 230.

(*f*) *See the 247th page of* An Hiſtorical Account of the famous Men of the academy of Florence, printed at Florence in 4to, in the year 1700, and compoſed by Jacobo Rilli.

(*g*) He was of the family of Rucellai.

(*h*) Mercure Galant, *for Febr.* 1703, *pag.* 318, *& ſeq.*

(12) Scripſerat in iſtum *Caſæ* juvenilem, ut ipſe quidem excuſat, librum Thomas Naogeorgus, ſatyram regno papiſtico ſecundæ editionis quæ Baſileæ 1559 prodiit, adjectam. In hunc ergo *Caſa* ſequenti quod ſubjiciemus carmine inſurrexit. *Ibid. pag.* 109.

(13) Theſe verſes are the concluſion of the poem recited by Daniel Francus. It is to be met with in *Tom. i, Delitiarum Poëtarum Italorum, pag.* 702.

(14) The thirty-fourth letter of d'Oſſat, pag. 176, of the firſt Tome, Paris Edit. 1698. This letter is dated the twenty-fifth of October 1595.

(15) It was that of Jard near Melun. *Amelot de la Houſſaie, ubi infra.*

(16) Amelot de la Houſſaie's Notes upon this paſſage of Cardinal d'Oſſat.

(17) Corroborate this with the paſſage above quoted, citat. (12) of the article MACHIAVEL, concerning COSIMIN RUSCELLAI.

(18) D'Oſſat, Letter CCLVII, *pag.* 299, *Tom. ii.*

(19) Ib. Letter CCLXVII, *pag.* 341.

(20) Ib. Letter CCLVII.

(21) Catel, Memoirs of the Hiſtory of Languedoc, *pag.* 1009.

(22) See Vigneul Marville, in the firſt Tome of his Miſcellanies, pag. 173, of the firſt edition at Roan.

(23) Vigneul Marville, pag. 271, of the ſecond Tome, Dutch Edition.

(24) He got 1700000 livres by the exciſe of France. *Scaligerana* at the word *Rucellai.*

(25) Tom. i, ii, ubi ſupra.

(26) Rapin's Reflexions upon Phyſics, *num.* 7, *pag.* 418, *Dutch Edit.*

(27) Giovanne Mario de' Creſcimbeni l'Iſtoria della volgar Poëſia, *pag.* 35, *Edit. of Rome* 1698, *in* 4to.

(28) Ib. *pag.* 327.

(29) At pag. 339, of the ſecond part of the catalogue.

(30) Creſcembeni, ubi ſupra, 272.

ORICHOVIUS, or ORECHOVIUS (STANISLAUS), a Poliſh gentleman, was born in the dioceſe of Premiſlau, in Ruſſia, about the beginning of the XVIth century. He was called the Poliſh Demoſthenes on account of the freedom and force of his eloquence. He ſtudied at Wittenberg under Luther and Melancthon, and afterwards at Venice under John Baptiſt Egnatius. Returning home to his country, he dedicated himſelf to the church, and became canon of Premiſlau. He made no ſecret of his attachment to Luther's doctrine, and was often cenſured for it in full chapter by his biſhop; but he made a jeſt of thoſe cenſures, and abandoned his benefice, and married. He was anathematized by his prelate, and ſo little regarded it, that he not only took up the pen againſt the Eccleſiaſtics, but alſo diſturbed them in the poſſeſſion of their eſtates, and putting himſelf at the head of their antagoniſts, by the readineſs of his wit, and the great command of his tongue, he cauſed violent commotions. He changed his meaſures ſome years after, and was again received into the boſom of the Catholic church at the ſynod of Warſaw in the year 1561. Some time after he delivered publickly the confeſſion of his faith in the ſynod of Petricow, and printed it, from which time he appeared very zealous againſt the ſectaries, both in his writings, and verbal diſputations. He diſputed againſt Andrew Fricius in the preſence of the archbiſhop of Gneſna, and then againſt Stancarus before the king of Poland, and afterwards upon ſome other occaſions, but always triumphantly (*a*), if we are to believe the author who furniſhes me with what I have been relating. I have obſerved elſewhere (*b*), that Orichovius would inſinuate that if he had married while he was a prieſt, he would not have broke with his church upon that account, becauſe he would have ſubmitted to the penalty which ſhe impoſes, by abſtaining from his ſacerdotal function: but he contradicted himſelf very groſsly; for he had put at the head of his book a confeſſion of his adherence to the Lutheran party [*A*]. I ſhall cite ſomething of a treatiſe he compoſed to procure liberty for prieſts to marry [*B*]. I ſhall alſo give the titles of his writings [*C*].

(*a*) *Taken from* Starovolſcius, in Elogiis centum Polonorum. *num.* 58, *pag. m.* 78, 79.

(*b*) In the remark [*M*] of the article STANCARUS.

[*A*] *He had put at the head of his book a confeſſion of his adherence to the Lutheran party.*] The book I am ſpeaking of is intituled, *Chimæra, ſive de Stancari funeſta Regno Poloniæ Secta.* It was printed at Cologne *apud Maternum Cholinum*, in the year 1563, in 8vo. At the beginning of it is to be ſeen a declaration of the author, by virtue of which he ſubmits both his perſon and writings to the moſt holy council of Trent. He compares hmſelf to the prodigal ſon returning home to his father's houſe. It will be ſufficient to recite ſome of his expreſſions. ‘ En ego à finibus terræ ad vos clamo dum anxiatur cor meum ..... ſupplex manus tendo cum principe publicanorum illo, in conſpectu, conſeſſuque veſtro fraudata compenſans quadruplo. Namque ego honorem debitum, non homini, ſed ordini veſtro, ſæpe detraxi: atque commune veſtrum patrimonium multum vexavi, dicendo in vos, quæ non oportuit: ſcribendo de vobis, quæ non licuit: agendo contra vos, quæ non decuit agere, dicere ſcribere. Defraudavi igitur vos, cum hæreticis dum conjuro, dicto ſcripto, facto. In quibus tot, ac tantis damnis, detrimentiſque veſtris, ex auctoritate veſtra reſarciendis, nolite, pro indulgentia veſtra, aliud à me expectare velle, præter illud quadruplum, *Pater peccavi in cœlum coram te* (1). ---- *Behold I cry unto you from the ends of the earth while my heart is in trouble .... I ſtretch out my ſupplicant hands with that great publican, reſtoring four-fold what I have unjuſtly taken from your aſſemblies; for I have often detracted from the honour due not only to your perſons, but to your order: and have greatly diſturbed your common patrimony, by ſaying thoſe things againſt you, which ought not to have been ſaid; by writing thoſe things of you, which it was not lawful to write: by acting thoſe things which it was not lawful to act, ſpeak, or write. Therefore by my adherence to Heretics, I have injured you in ſpeaking, writing, and acting. All which my ſo many and great offences againſt you, that they may be forgiven by your authority, I beſeech you to expect no more from me out of your great indulgence than this ſatisfaction,* Father, I have ſinned againſt heaven, and before thee.

[*B*] *I ſhall cite ſomething of a treatiſe he compoſed to procure liberty for prieſts to marry.*] ‘ Staniſlaus Orichovius, biſhop of Ruſſia, preſented a petition to Pope Julius III, in the year 1551, for liberty to marry; remonſtrating to him the injuſtice of Syricius's law, as contrary to all divine right; alledging even that Pope Paul II had condemned it among his friends; eſteeming it hard to be obliged to regard as a baſtard, a daughter of his own, whom the divine law would allow him to acknowledge as legitimate; inſomuch that he was reſolved to break through it had not death prevented him: reproaching him with the children of Paul III, worthy, *ſays he*, of *a legitimate marriage*, and not ſparing even his own particular leudneſs (2).’ Theſe are the words of Mr du Pleſſis Mornai: I do not find that the title of biſhop is due to Orichovius: and however if it was, he ought to have determined it to ſome particular ſee, and not to deſcribe it by the general name of a country: for if any one ſhould ſay that ſuch a perſon is biſhop of Italy, or of France, it would be thought a very improper expreſſion. Mr du Pleſſis publiſhed another book ten or twelve years after, in which he has mentioned a baſtard of Paul II: he quoted two verſes of Pannonius, and added, *and in fact, Stephen Orichovius, biſhop of Ruſſia, tells us, that ſhe being acknowledged for his by every body, it often created in him a deteſtation of Celibacy, which obliged him to look upon her with diſhonour, who might have been otherwiſe his legitimate daughter* (3). Bulengerus and Fronto du Ducæus, who animadverted upon the faults of the firſt book of this learned Proteſtant, and Coëffeteau, who wrote an anſwer to the laſt, have made no remark upon the pretended title of biſhop given to Orichovius. But Gretſer, in his Examination of the Myſtery of Iniquity (4), criticiſes Mr du Pleſſis for metamorphoſing into Stephanus Orichovius (5) biſhop of Ruſſia, him whom Bale names Staniſlaus Ruthenus. The author of the State of the Church relates (6), that it is *affirmed in a book of Staniſlaus Ruthenus, that Paul II having ſome verſes made againſt him and his daughter, began to lament and condemn among his friends the rigour of the law of his predeceſſors.* I conjecture from thence, that this author has followed the rigour of the letter more ſtrictly than Mr du Pleſſis has done, in copying the paſſage of Bale. Note, that Mr Rivet believed Orichovius to have been a Ruſſian biſhop, and named Stephen (7).

[*C*] *The title of his writings.*] Let us make uſe of the very words of Starovolſcius. ‘ Scripſit multa, & in re civili, & in noſtrorum hominum laudibus; ſed præcipuè tamen in Oſores Religionis Catholicæ, ut puta: *Quincuncem, Latinè & Polonicè. Apologiam Quincuncis. Fidei Confeſſionem. Hymæram.* Hanc Concilio Trid. dedicavit. *Mediatorem. Fricium. Dialogos Lat. & Polonicè. Fidelem ſubditum. Orationes de notis Eccleſiæ. Exequias Tarnovii. Geſta ſui temporis,* id eſt regnantibus apud nos Sigiſmundo Seniore & Auguſto F. ſuo. *Panegyrim nuptiarum ejuſdem Regis Auguſti. Panegyrim nuptiarum Jo. Tarnovii Exercituum Generalis. Orationem pro dignitate Sacerdotali. De præſtantia Legum Polonicarum. In obitum Sigiſmundi ſenioris. Turcicas, ad Regem, Senatum, & Equites. Pro*

---

(1) Orichovii Chimæra, *fol.* 2, *verſo.*

(2) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Inſtitution de l'Euchariſtie, *livr. ii, chap. x, pag. m.* 322. *He quotes* St Orich. de Lege Syricii ad Jul. 3. Orich. Epiſc. Ruſſienſ. de Celibat.

(3) Du Pleſſis, Myſt. d'Iniquité, *pag.* 544.

(4) Pag. 536.

(5) It was perhaps *Orichonius* in the Latin edition, which Gretſer refuted; but it is *Orichovius* in the French edition.

(6) Pag. m. 484, ad ann. 1465.

(7) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Reſponſe au Myſt. d'Iniquité, *Tom. ii, pag.* 618.

‘*& contra Celibatum. Pro Eccleſia Chriſti, contra M. Lutherum præceptorem ſuum. Inſtitutionem Principis. Apocalypſim ſuam, ſeu faciem perturbatæ & afflictæ Reipubl. ejuſque reſtaurandæ rationem,* quæ nuper Anno 1625, prodiit, edita in lucem à Nicolao Orichovio nepote ſuo. *Epiſtolas familiares* quoque ſcripſit, ſed harum pars maxima adhuc in obſcuro eſt ut & Liber *de ſumma Regni.* Audio & alia quædam de Repub. authographa ipſius à quibuſdam privatim, cum nominis ejus forſan certe cum publicæ utilitatis jactura, detineri (8). - - - *He wrote a great many things, as well on civil ſubjects, as in praiſe of our party; but principally in oppoſition to the adverſaries of the Catholic religion; as for inſtance, the Quincunx, in Latin and Poliſh. The Apology for the Quincunx. A Confeſſion of Faith. Hymæra;* this he dedicated to the Council of Trent. *The Mediator. Fricius. Dialogues in Latin and Poliſh. The Faithful Subject. Orations on the Marks of the Church. The Funeral Solemnities of Tarnovius. The Hiſtory of his own Times, that is, during the reigns of our kings, Sigiſmund the elder, and Auguſtus his ſon. An Epithalamium on the Marriage of the ſame Auguſtus. An Epithalamium on the Marriage of John Tarnovius, General of the Army. An Oration on the Sacerdotal Dignity. On the Excellency of the Laws of Poland. On the death of Sigiſmund the elder. Turkiſh Letters to the King, to the Senate, and to the Knights, for and againſt Celibacy. A Defence of the Church of* CHRIST *againſt M. Luther his Maſter. The Inſtitution of a Prince. His Apocalypſe, or a Repreſentation of the troubled and afflicted State of the Republic, and the manner of reſtoring it;* which was lately publiſhed in the year 1625, by Nicolas Orichovius his nephew. *He wrote alſo* familiar Epiſtles, *but the greateſt part of theſe are ſtill unpubliſhed, as is alſo a book on the* Sum and Subſtance of Government. *I hear there are other manuſcripts of his in private hands, perhaps to the detriment of his own fame; but certainly to that of the public.*’

(8) Simon Starovolſcius, in Elogiis centum Polonor. *pag.* 79. *I ſuſpect the pointing to be inaccurate throughout, and take* Hymæram *to be a miſtake for* Chimæram.

ORIGEN, one of the moſt copious writers, and one of the fineſt genius's that flouriſhed in the primitive church, lived in the IIId century. He is mentioned ſo largely in Moreri's Dictionary, and ſo many authors are there pointed out (*a*) eaſily to be met with, who give his whole Hiſtory, that I ought to be but ſhort upon this article. I confine myſelf to theſe four things. I. I point out two French authors (*b*), who give us a full account of the actions and opinions of Origen. In the IId place, I ſay that a remark of Daillé upon Mr Cottibi's quoting *St Origen*, was attended with conſequences which deſerve to be known [*A*]. III. I obſerve, that

(*a*) Eſpecially in the Dutch Edit.

(*b*) La Motte, The Lives of Tertullian and Origen, printed at Paris in 1675, in 8vo. Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ. Tom.* i, *pag.* 121, *& ſeq*; the Dutch Edit. 1690, in 4to. The Dutch Edit. of Moreri does not cite theſe two authors.

[*A*] *A remark of Daillé upon .... St Origen, was attended with conſequences which deſerve to be known.*] Mr Cottibi, miniſter of Poitiers, having changed his religion in 1660, wrote a letter to his Conſiſtory, containing ſome reaſons for his change. Daillé was deſired to anſwer it, which he did with great accuracy. His anſwer was printed in 1660, with the letter of Mr Cottibi, under this title, *Lettre eſcrite à Mr le Coq Sieur de la Talonniere ſur le changement de Religion de Monſieur Cottiby.* Among other things he obſerved, that the new convert, who had pretended to ſpeak of the Fathers, and to cry up the Primitive Church, knew but very little of them. This he convicts him of by divers proofs; the ſecond of which is taken from the epithet of *Saint*, which he had given to Origen. *This language betrays him, and ſhews that he is ſtranger both in the Republic of Antiquaries, who never ſpeak in that manner of a man condemned by an œcumenical council; and above all in the archives of the Popes, in which poor Origen was ſo far from obtaining the title of ſaint, that from the year* 494, *he has been there ſtiled Schiſmatic; and all his works, excepting a very few, were condemned by Gelaſius* †. *It is not quite* 200 *years ſince, that Johannes Picus Mirandulanus, having publiſhed at Rome, among his nine hundred propoſitions, that* it is more reaſonable to believe Origen's ſalvation than his damnation, *was thereupon reprimanded by the doctors of Divinity, who affirmed, that* this concluſion is raſh and blameworthy, that it favours of Hereſy, and is contrary to the determination of the univerſal church; *as we have it from himſelf in his Apology* ‡. *What would they not have done, if he had placed Origen among the ſaints, as Mr Cottiby has done? They who could not ſuffer him to doubt of his damnation, or to think that his ſalvation was more probable than his damnation* (1). This is what we call a victorious criticiſm; and if we were not otherwiſe ſatisfied, that the miniſter of Poitiers knew nothing of the doctrine of the Fathers, but what he had acquired by reading ſome books of controverſy; this very remark of Daillé would convince us of it. Let us continue the hiſtory of this cenſure, we ſhall learn from hence that an author diſcovered in an error, and manifeſtly convicted of being miſtaken, can take no wiſer courſe than frankly to own it, or at leaſt to ſay nothing; for the efforts he makes to juſtify himſelf, are almoſt always down-right extravagances. Mr Cottibi replied, that perhaps the title of Saint was not in the original of his letter, *or that with a ſtroke of his pen he might let it paſs in the croud, Origen being placed among many other antient Fathers, to whom the epithet of Saint is really due* (2). Here are two evaſions which were invincibly refuted. Daillé maintained, that the words Saint Origen, ſtood in the author's original manuſcript, and proved that they could not ſlip in by overſight. *Who will believe,* ſays Mr Daillé (3), *that he did not copy over fair, and reviſe oftner than once, a letter written to a conſiſtory, the religion and miniſtry of which he had abandoned? A letter in which he undertook to perſuade them to follow his example, which he knew muſt affect them both with grief and indignation? A letter, which, of conſequence, he could not doubt, would be narrowly examined by perſons provoked and angry with him? Certainly, he either has not common ſenſe, or he has carefully poliſhed and corrected this letter, and reviſed the copy ſeveral times before he ſent it, in order to let nothing paſs, which might furniſh matter of deriſion to his enemies, or of diſguſt to his friends. And yet, after all this, Saint Origen ſtands in the letter, ſuch as he ſent, and ſuch as we ſaw. Aſſuredly the author was not appriſed that this was not Origen's lawful title. Had he been ſo, he would have daſhed it out of his letter: and if he could not find out a ſecret, that is ſo common among thoſe who are no ſtrangers in Antiquity, I cannot ſee how I can truſt the promiſes he made me,* &c. The ſequel of Mr Cottibi's Apology is yet worſe, for he falls into the common place of the hatred that Miniſters bear to the ſaints, and ſays a hundred things quite foreign to the purpoſe, as appears from the following paſſage. ‘But, as the Miniſters ſeem hired to make war upon the ſaints, ſo you thought it your duty to attack this one, tho' he had only the out-ſide and appearance of ſaintſhip; for to appear in that habit, and bear that name, is enough to expoſe one to your attacks. If you diſpute this glorious title with thoſe who have highly merited it, and whoſe praiſes are ſung by the church every day, it is no wonder you could not bear it in a man to whom it never was formally given. So that I am in no danger of being ſurprized at your charge againſt me; for I find, in effect, it is highly your intereſt to oppoſe the augmentation of the number of ſaints: you very well foreſee, that the more ſaints there are in Heaven, the more enemies will you have, and the more interceſſors will the church have. I would only have thoſe who make St Paul ſay ‡, *The children of the Faithful are ſaints from their mothers womb*, not to refuſe this elogium to him who was the ſon of a father and mother, who were not only faithful, but Martyrs; and who, after ſuffering perſecution himſelf, in his moſt tender youth, for the name of CHRIST, gave teſtimony of ſuch pious and ardent deſires to crown his firſt labours with the glory of martyrdom. That fine genius *, whoſe authority you reſpectfully make uſe of, had ſo much eſteem for the wiſdom of Socrates, that

† Conc. Rom. Gelaſ. Tom. 3, Concil. p. 662. col. 2. B. C.

‡ Joan. Pic. Apol. c. 7. p. 199.

(1) Daillé, Lettre à Monſr. le Coq, p. 70, 71.

(2) Cottibi, Reply to Daillé, pag. 221, 222.

(3) Daillé, Reply to Adam and Cottibi, *Part iii, chap. ix, pag.* 190.

‡ In the form of the adminiſtration of Baptiſm.

* Eraſmus.

that a miniſter in Holland has lately made a very ſolid obſervation upon one of

that, every time he thought of that great man, he was very near crying out in his tranſports, *St Socrates, pray for us.* It would not therefore be an unpardonable ſin in me, if my ſoul ſhould be touched with the veneration of the virtues of a Chriſtian, which are rendered precious by the Goſpel; ſince the eyes of your friend were dazzled by the actions of a Pagan, which, after all, were no more than ſhining ſins ††: If ſome have found ſpots in the ſun, I think it not ſtrange that this doctor had his; and I ſhall not undertake his apology, ſince ſentence has been pronounced againſt him by councils. However, I ſhall ſay with that noble writer ⸸⸸, who offered to defend him publickly at Rome, at twenty-four years of age, that Origen was above ſixty before he determined his opinions in his writings, and he might have entertained errors without the imputation of hereſy, as having never obſtinately retained them, nor rebelliouſly defended them, ſince they were not condemned till after his death; and even he himſelf had repented of them before he died. It is in vain therefore that you ſtrive to raiſe up againſt me all the doctors of Divinity: that young count gives me encouragement, who informs me, that he had the Pope on his ſide ‡‡, with a great number of the members of the Apoſtolical ſenate, while ſome envious heads muttered againſt his propoſitions. But at the worſt; if I were to incur the diſpleaſure of the holy Conclave, by your intereſt and ſollicitations, I had much rather it ſhould be, for innocently putting an extraordinary doctor in the catalogue of ſaints, without their approbation, or conſent, than for oppoſing, as you do, the glory of thoſe whom they have canonized, and endeavouring, by the moſt enormous ſacrilege, to raze their names both out of the calendar of the church, and out of the memory of men (4).' All this deſerved no other anſwer than what follows. Teach him (5) *what difference there is in the ſtile of the Romiſh court and church, between a conſiſtory and a conclave. This is a pardonable fault in a novice. The miſchief is, that in all theſe wild digreſſions, into which he rambles out of the road of our diſpute, he can find no ſort of proof that men learned in Antiquity ever call Origen a ſaint.*

Father Adam reſolved to enter the liſts upon this article, in the defence of Cottibi, and performed it ſo ſorrily, that more impertinent ſophiſtical turns were, perhaps, never ſeen. The paſſage I am going to quote is pretty long, but becauſe it contains ſome facts relating to the hiſtory of Origen, and beſides may ſerve for a remedy to thoſe writers who are apt to write at random, I ſhall give it you entire. Daillé, addreſſing himſelf to the Jeſuit, John Adam, ſpeaks thus (6). 'Finding this a ſlippery place (7), you do not care to keep in it; and as you are as bold and reſolute as any man can be in your coat, you quit that inconvenient poſt and fall foul upon me, according to your wonted ſtrain, charging me ** with ignorance, and a *magiſterial boldneſs that is only a ſwelling, and not real knowledge and good plight.* Then † deſiring me to weigh what you are going to ſay, you give me a lecture upon the difference between the perſons who err, and their errors, bringing in St Auguſtin and St Jerom, Janſenius and St Cyran, and their opinons. Then you fall upon Origen, and the errors of which he was ſuſpected, particularly Arianiſm; from which you ſay St Athanaſius vindicated him. In the next place ⸸ you praiſe the incomparable innocence of his youth, his chaſtity, his zeal: you ſay ‡ that, if I have read Hiſtory, I muſt know, that when he ſaw martyrs carried out to execution, he went out of his houſe, and, falling upon his knees before the *executioners, conjured them to behead him with the other Chriſtians.* You alſo ſay, I know very well, that he filled the world with his works; that his father and his mother were martyrs, and *that oftentimes his mother, drawing the curtain of his bed, as he lay aſleep, kiſſed her ſon's breaſt with theſe words, I kiſs the temple of the Holy Ghoſt.* You mention St Gregory of Neocæſarea, Chryſoſtom, and Baſil, who had a great eſteem for him: (I ſuffer Chryſoſtom, tho' junior to St Baſil, to take place of him, to ſhew you I am not ſo cenſorious as you repreſent me.) You aſk me what proof I can give that this great man died without repentance, and trump up an old ſtory, in order to confute that opinion. This is the abſtract of your diſpute upon Origen. In regard to which I ſhall obſerve to you in the firſt place, that you do me wrong in imputing to me the knowledge of his entreating the executioners to cut off his head. This is what I knew nothing of, having read no ſuch thing in Euſebius *, who, in his ſixth book, gives the hiſtory of Origen at large. You charge me again with equal injuſtice, with knowing that his mother kiſſed his breaſt while he lay aſleep. I have learned indeed from Euſebius, that Leonidas, his father, did ſometimes carreſs him after that rate in his infancy, kiſſing his breaſt with reſpect, as being a ſanctuary conſecrated to the holy Spirit, and that he called himſelf happy for having ſuch a wonderful child. I do not doubt but you have met with theſe ſtories exactly as you relate them, in the ſame author who taught you that Athanaſius was once highly eſteemed and commended by the Arians. But the moſt cruel injury you have done me, is, that to gain an opportunity of venting theſe common places and hiſtories, you charge me †† with believing, and affirming for a certain truth, that Origen is damned. *You make the errors of his doctrine,* ſay you ⸸⸸ to me, *to affect his perſon, and ſpeak of his damnation, as if you had been in Hell beforehand, and had found Origen there:* and two pages lower ‡‡, *I cannot bear,* ſay you, *that you ſhould take part with thoſe who maintain that Origen is damned;* and at the end of the chapter, *you have embraced,* ſay you, *the opinion of thoſe who hold that Origen is damned.* But to wave theſe ſallies of your paſſion, who told you that I hold that *Origen is damned?* Where have I declared that to be my opinion? God forbid that ſuch an unjuſt preſumption ſhould ever enter into my mind. I leave to the Almighty his own ſecrets, and am not ſo raſh as to take the liberty to determine what no man can know with a certainty of faith. But, to conclude, if it is lawful for us to judge of things by appearances, I believe of Origen what I wiſh, that God, whoſe mercies are infinite, has pardoned his errors, and not ſuffered to periſh, among unbelievers, a veſſel which he had adorned with ſo many admirable gifts, and whoſe genuine works, ſo much as we have left of them, breathe only an extraordinary faith and piety; the very errors with which they are ſometimes ſtained, (for that is undeniable) being always accompanied with a raviſhing modeſty and humility; not to ſpeak of his virtues, and the purity of his life. This is my opinion, and I never entertained any other; and thoſe who are intimately acquainted with me, know to what degree I have always admired that great and incomparable genius; and what I have wrote in ſome paſſages of my little works may give teſtimony of it. If I have related what the count of Mirandola wrote **, that the Divines of Rome would not ſuffer his damnation to be doubted of, it is manifeſt I did it only to ſhew, how far the doctors, whoſe communion Mr Cottibi has embraced, are from calling him a *Saint.* This is by no means out of any approbation of their inhuman preſumption. If I took notice of the title of *Saint,* given him by Mr Cottibi, I did it only to ſhew his ignorance in matters of antiquity, and in the way of ſpeaking uſual among thoſe who are verſed in it. I did not accuſe him upon that head of offending againſt faith or good manners. The ignorance of Antiquity is not incompatible with either the one or the other: I allow him, with all my heart, to entertain as advantageous ſentiments of Origen, as he pleaſes. But the laws of your church, and thoſe of its ſtyle, and the common and notorious cuſtom of all the learned, that is to ſay, the ſovereign law of their language, not permitting him to ſay *Saint Origen,* whatſoever opinion he has of his perſon, he cannot ſpeak in this manner without betraying the ignorance which I have laid to his charge.'

We meet with a thouſand examples of this nature in Polemical writings; and, as I have ſaid already, oftner than once, it would not be amiſs to make a collection of them. This might be of uſe to check the liberty which ſome authors take in ſtraggling to the right and left from the ſtate of the queſtion. I cannot tell whether any other example can equal this in the multitude of digreſſions.

†† *St Auguſt.* ſplendida peccata.

⸸⸸ Joann. Picus Mirandulæ Comes, in Apolog. Conc. 7.

‡‡ Summi Pontificis & ex Apoſtolico Senatu complurium judicio contentus, videbar facile & odium poſſe negligere, & convicia hominum improborum. *In Præfat. Apol.*

(4) Cottibi, ubi ſupra, pag. 222, & ſeq.

(5) Daillé, addreſſing himſelf to Father Adam, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 191.

(6) Daillé, ibid.

(7) That is, the ſuppoſition that Mr Cottibi had uſed an equivocal expreſſion.

** *Ad. p.* 267.

† *Ibid. pag.* 268.

⸸ *Pag.* 269.

‡ *Pag.* 270.

* *Euſeb. Hiſt. lib. vi, cap. ii, pag.* 203, *A.*

†† *Ad. p.* 267.

⸸⸸ *Ad. p.* 269.

‡‡ *Pag.* 271.

** *L. à M. de la Tal, pag.* 70, 71.

of Origen's opinions [*B*]. If the author of *Janua Cœlorum Reſerata* had made uſe

[*B*] *A miniſter . . . has made a very ſolid obſervation upon one of Origen's opinions.*] Before I recite the words of the miniſter, I ſhall firſt give you a copy of thoſe of his adverſay, which gave occaſion to his reflexion. *It is a conſiderable fault to compare the opinion of Origen, concerning the non-eternity of puniſhments, with the doctrine of the Socinians upon that article. Origen did not deny the immortality of the ſoul, and never taught that the wicked ſhould periſh, body and ſoul, after death. Origen's error is dangerous, but at leaſt it has no impiety in it; but the Socinian opinion is the Epicurean impiety* (8). Now the cenſure of this paſſage is as followeth. ‘ (9) There is more danger, as to Morality, in ſaying, *the reprobate ſhall be one day ſaved*, than in ſaying, *they ſhall be annihilated.* Origen has put the devils and the damned almoſt in the ſame claſs, where the Papiſts put the faithful and the regenerate, who die under the guilt of a great number of venial ſins, and have not wherewithal to procure maſſes for ſhortening or mitigating their puniſhment in purgatory; the fire of which differs from that of Hell only in the duration. So that the Libertines who continue to death in their Libertiniſm and crimes, may, according to Origen's Theology, have very nearly the ſame hopes and the ſame fears, which the beſt Catholics have, according to the doctrine of their Prieſts and Monks. Time is nothing in compariſon to eternity. A temporal Hell can never be made to balance an eternal Paradiſe. It is true, preſent evils deface the idea of future good in the minds of worldly people; and the ſenſe of the former is commonly ſtronger and livelier, than the deſire and hope of the latter. But this proceeds from the folly and corruption of men, and not from the nature of the objects. Beſides, we muſt know, that future evils are conſidered almoſt after the ſame manner with future good; that is, heedleſs and brutiſh people are ſcarce touched either by the one or the other: but the wiſe and reflecting part of mankind take a nearer view of the pains and joys of the other life, and form to themſelves a juſt idea of them. The conſequence of which is, that the former will not be more frighted by the hell or purgatory with which Origen threatens them, than they will be encouraged and comforted by the end of their torments, and the enjoyment of an eternal beatitude in paradiſe, which this doctor gives them room to expect: and, that, on the other hand, thoſe who have more ſerious and penetrating thoughts, will judge of future eaſe and torment by their duration, and will readily reſolve to paſs through ſome ages of uneaſineſs, if they are aſſured to find, after that, an eternity of happineſs and infinite pleaſure. As for the doctrine of the Socinians, it gives no other conſolation to hardened ſinners, beſide their annihilation. But ſuch is the make of men, that they had rather be unhappy and happy ſucceſſively, than not to be at all. And according to the rule of right reaſon, there is an infinitely greater advantage in being eternally gratified with happineſs, after ſuffering ſome time, than in returning into nothing, and ſeeing one's ſelf deprived for ever of an infinite beatitude, the poſſeſſion of which might be inſured, and is only loſt by negligence . . . . (10) Origen's error may inſpire ſome with a contempt of repentance, and that of the Socinians may retain others in impiety. However both the one and the other is very pernicious: and it is making uſe of falſe weights, and falſe meaſures, and a too viſible reſpect of perſons, to ſay, that Origen's error, though dangerous, has nothing of impiety in it; but that the Socinian error is the Epicurean impiety. Had Origen annihilated the reprobate after a long purgatory, his Theology had indulged impenitent ſinners leſs than that of the Socinians, who annihilate them without making them undergo any conſiderable puniſhment (11). But the paradiſe which he promiſes them at the end of their hell, and which will render them for ever like to the apoſtles, the martyrs, and the greateſt ſaints, is a powerful counterpoiſe againſt the terror of a puniſhment, which is to be ſucceeded by eternal joy and felicity.’

If you would know the cauſe of this reſpect of perſons, you need only read theſe words of the ſame author (12): *The charity which we have for* thoſe who died ſeveral ages ago *ſcarce coſts any thing; becauſe their merit does not excite our jealouſy and envy, and we do not look upon them as our competitors. But to judge charitably of an adverſary, who ſpeaks and writes againſt us, and whoſe reputation clouds our glory, we muſt mortify ſelf-love a little; and that is a ſacrifice we do not eaſily make. As Mr Jurieu had no quarrel with Origen, and has perſonal enemies in the Socinian party, we muſt not think it ſtrange if he has more toleration for the former than for the latter.* This thought has been ſeveral times made uſe of to account for the conduct of thoſe who have maintained, that Sophocles, Euripides, Ariſtophanes, Ariſtotle, *&c.* did much ſurpaſs Corneille, Racine, Moliere, Des Cartes, *&c.*

[*C*] *If the author of* Janua Cœlorum Reſarata *had made uſe of it.*] This author ſhews by ſeveral proofs, that if Mr Jurieu would reaſon conſequentially, he ought to teach that Socinianiſm does not merit damnation. One of his reaſons is taken from what that miniſter owns, that the Arians belonged to the church, in which ſalvation may be obtained. Now this would be a weak reaſon, if the doctrines of the Socinians which were not taught in Arianiſm, were mortal. And, accordingly the author of the *Janua Cœlorum* propoſes that objection to himſelf, and ſhews, that, putting the caſe, the hereſies, common to the Socinians and the Arians, were not mortal, we cannot reaſonably maintain, that the doctrines, peculiar to Socinianiſm, merit damnation. In enumerating theſe peculiar hereſies, he begins with the denial of the eternity of hell, and takes it for granted that none would damn Origen or Arnobius, purely upon the ſcore of that error. ‘ Quis auderet, *ſays he* (13), morti æternæ addicere Origenem, ideò præciſè quod de divina miſericordia magnificentiùs ſentire volens, crediderit tandem fore ut omnes mali, ne Diabolis quidem exceptis, ſatis pœnarum Deo dederint, & Deum placatum experiantur? At hoc multo plus videtur nocere juſtitiæ divinæ quàm dogma Socinianum de annihilatione reproborum poſt longas pœnas; nam deſtructio illa ſi minùs pœnæ genus eſt gravius, ut quidam exiſtimant, quàm æternitas infœlix, rationem tamen habet pœnæ, idéoque non officit juribus ſeveri & juſti Legiſlatoris. Quidquid id eſt, nemo præjudiciis exutus, & ad rectæ rationis amuſſim rem expendens, doctrinam mortalem judicabit, ſi quis veritus lædere divinas perfectiones, malit ſibi Deum repræſentare ut judicem ultimo ſupplicio reos afficientem, quàm ut judicem vitæ reorum parcentem quo per multos annos exquiſitis cruciatibus & perpetuis eos torquendo, longiore alieni doloris ſpectaculo fruatur: nemo, inquam, ſolidè ratiocinatus talem opinionem mortalem crediderit, qui ſemel agnoverit Arianam hæreſim non eſſe mortalem. Quis auderet Arnobium in Inferis collocare, quia crediderit animas reproborum flammis ultricibus tandem penitùs conſumi? - - - - *Who would dare to pronounce ſentence of eternal damnation againſt Origen, for this only crime, becauſe, out of a deſire to entertain higher notions of the divine mercy, he believed, that at laſt all the wicked, not even the devils excepted, would ſatisfy God by their puniſhment, and find him appeaſed? But this ſeems to be more inconſiſtent with the divine juſtice, than the Socinian doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked after a long courſe of puniſhment; for tho' this annihilation may be a milder degree of puniſhment, as ſome think, than an eternity of unhappineſs, yet it appears to be a ſort of puniſhment, and conſequently not inconſiſtent with the laws of a ſevere and juſt legiſlator. However it be, no perſon who is exempt from prejudices, and weighs the thing exactly by the rule of right reaſon, will judge it to be a damnable doctrine, if a perſon out of the apprehenſion of thinking injuriouſly of the divine attributes, chooſes to repreſent the Deity to himſelf, as a judge deſtroying the criminal outright, rather than protracting his life for no other end, but that by making him undergo the moſt exquiſite and perpetual puniſhments for many years, he may have the ſatisfaction of beholding for a longer time the torments of his creature: no perſon, I ſay, who reaſons ſeriouſly will ever believe ſuch an opinion damnable, who ſhall once have acknowledged the* uſe of it [*C*], he would have greatly enforced one of his objections. IV. That there are a great many Divines in the Romiſh communion who believe that this Father is in Hell [*D*].

---

(8) Jurieu, apud Saurin, ubi infra.

(9) Saurin, Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 688.

(10) Saurin, ibid. *pag.* 690.

(11) Mr Saurin ſeems to agree with what his adverſary advances, that the Socinians teach, that the ſouls of wicked men are annihilated at the very moment of their death. But the doctrine of that ſect is otherwiſe related below, citation (18). But it is true Mr Saurin expreſſes himſelf after ſuch a manner, as may import that he does not impute that to this ſect.

(12) Saurin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 688.

(13) Carus Larebonius, in Janua cœlorum reſerata, *pag.* 96, 97.

Since

‘ *the Arian hereſy not to be ſo. Who would dare to place* ‘ *Arnobius in hell, for believing that the ſouls of the* ‘ *wicked are at laſt conſumed by the fires in which they* ‘ *are puniſhed.*’ You ſee he obſerves, that Origen's doctrine confines the divine juſtice more than that of the Socinians, in regard the latter end the puniſhment with an act of ſeverity, namely, the annihilation of the ſinner; whereas Origen makes it terminate in an act of ſovereign bounty, namely, the tranſportation of the damned ſpirits to the enjoyment of ſovereign bliſs: You ſee, I ſay, that he obſerves this difference; but he does not lay it open with ſo much accuracy as Mr Saurin has done. Beſides, he ſtarts an objection to himſelf, which he might have overthrown by Mr Saurin's remark, and yet has given it a quite different anſwer. He ſuppoſes (14), it will be objected to him, that the denial of the Trinity is not ſo pernicious to the common-wealth, as the denial of the eternity of future torments; and contents himſelf with anſwering, that we muſt not judge by that rule whether an hereſy is fundamental or not; for otherwiſe it might be alledged, that the groſſeſt and moſt ſcandalous errors would be but a trifle, provided they were but proper to keep the ſubject in obedience (15). This is all the anſwer he gives. He has forgot the beſt part of the reply to this objection; he has not ſaid that Origen's opinion is more pernicious to the common-wealth, than that of the Socinians: Origen's opinion, I ſay, which Mr. Jurieu looks upon as an error very excuſeable (16). Had Larebonius thought of Mr Saurin's reflexion, he would have charged home upon his adverſary. Let us recite one paſſage more of the Utrecht paſtor. ‘ Mr Jurieu would fain *excuſe the errors of* ‘ *Origen, by reaſon of his great zeal; but if any one* ‘ *ſhould at this time of day undertake to broach the whims* ‘ *of that antient author, Mr Jurieu would not think* ‘ *himſelf obliged to allow him any toleration.* If theſe ‘ whims are hereſies and inſtances of impiety, which ‘ change Hell into a purgatory, and by that means ‘ annihilate the fear of eternal puniſhments, and the ‘ fear of God, why ſhould they be countenanced in ‘ Origen? Where is that doctor's great zeal if he ‘ was an heretic, and a teacher of hereſy? If theſe ‘ errors were not fundamental in Origen, and in the ‘ third century, by what contrivance are they be‘come fundamental in the ſeventeenth Century, and ‘ in the modern doctors? We ſhall ſee preſently that ‘ there is a difference between Origen's opinion, and ‘ that of the Socinians, with reference to the pains of ‘ Hell; and that this difference, which Mr Jurieu ‘ would turn in favour of Origen, is altogether againſt ‘ him (17).’

If the author of *Janua Cœlorum* has not made uſe of his advantages; ſo Mr Saurin, on the other hand, has ſuffered two groſs faults to paſs uncenſured in his adverſary: One is, in charging the Socinians with teaching, that the ſoul dies with the body; and the other, in affirming their doctrine of the deſtruction of the ſoul to be the Epicurean impiety. The firſt of theſe faults is a lie, or rather a calumny (18). The ſecond is an inexcuſeable ignorance The Socinian ſect do not teach that the wicked ſhall ſuffer nothing after death: they only ſay, that their torments will at laſt terminate in the annihilation of their ſouls. And, granting there were ſome Socinian authors (19), who taught the annihilation of the ſoul immediately upon its quitting the body, his doctrine would not be the ſame with that of Epicurus; for that Philoſopher believed, on the one hand, that the Gods had no concern either in the life or death of men; and, on the other, that the ſoul dies with the body, as conſiſting only in a certain mixture of atoms. Now, the Socinians we are ſpeaking of, on the contrary, would maintain, that the ſouls of the wicked are naturally immortal, and that they only ceaſe to be, becauſe God, in puniſhment of their crimes, annihilates them. The Divines who are moſt orthodox with reſpect to the nature of the ſoul, agree, that God can annihilate it every moment. Here take notice, that it is an indiſpenſable rule of natural equity, not to impute to a ſect the opinions of ſome particular perſons.

[*D*] *There are a great many Divines in the Romiſh communion, who believe that Origen is in Hell.*] We have already ſeen the complaints which were made againſt Picus Mirandula, for maintaining the contrary ſentiment: The Jeſuit Stephen Binet publiſhing a book at Paris in 1629, concerning the ſalvation of Origen, durſt not take the affirmative ſide without trembling. He examines the matter in the form of a rehearing of his trial. He produces the witneſſes, and pleaders *pro* and *con*, and intermixes the *concluſions of the king of Heaven's counſel.* At laſt he pronounces this judgment. *Conſidering all that has been ſaid on the one ſide and on the other, together with the concluſions of the king of Heaven's counſel, it is decreed, that the affair be left to GOD's ſecret determination, to whom the definitive ſentence is reſerved. Neverthele ſs, by proviſion, and for the benefit of Origen, it is judged, upon the balance of the whole, that the proofs of his ſalvation are ſtronger and more concluſive than thoſe of his damnation; and therefore his ſalvation is more probable than his damnation* (20). The witneſſes he produces for Origen, are, James Merlin (21), and Eraſmus (22). The advocates whom he makes to plead for that Father, are Genebrard (23), and John Picus of Mirandula (24). After that, Cardinal Baronius (25), in the name of Cardinal Bellarmin and all Origen's accuſers, harangues the judges, demanding ſentence againſt the perſon accuſed, whoſe hereſies and crimes he enumerates. Some of his hereſies are theſe. 1. That ſouls had ſinned before they entered the body (26). 2. That after the reſurrection, the bodies of the ſaints would become round and luminous like the ſun (27). 3. That the ſun, the moon, and the ſtars are living. 4. *That at the day of judgment the guardian angels will be chaſtiſed, if they have not well performed their duty in guarding the men committed to the care of their charity* (28). 5. *That before the creation of this world there were ſeveral others, and when this ſhould be reduced to duſt, ſeveral would be created one after another* (29). 6. That the ſtars are books in which may be read *the good fortune of mankind, that the angels by them calculate the nativity of men, and learn their fortune, and that they have taught men part of that judicial Aſtrology, in order to calculate nativities, but without reſtraining free-will or doing any violence to liberty* (30). 7. *That the earth is a large animal capable of good and evil* (31), *and in conſequence, worthy of reward or puniſhment; whence it is that GOD bleſſes or curſes it, according as it behaves itſelf well or ill, and renders it ſelf capable of the one or the other* (32). 8. ‘ That after the day ‘ of judgment the women will be transformed into ‘ men, and the human bodies into very pure ſouls, ‘ and that there will be then no more men with ‘ glorified bodies; but that all will be pure ſpirits ‘ like the angels in Heaven.’ Baronius's chief reaſon is this (33): ‘ The general council did not content it‘ſelf, as uſual, with condemning his doctrine, but ‘ proceeded ſo far as even to condemn his perſon, ‘ thundering an anathema againſt him perſonally, and ‘ condemning him by name *, theſe are the words of ‘ the holy council. The emperor having required, *ut* ‘ *cum erroribus ſuis autor ipſe Origenes damnaretur,* - - - ‘ *that Origen might be condemned together with his er*‘*rors.* The holy council, † after mature conſideration ‘ of the affair, and invocation of the aſſiſtance of the ‘ Holy Ghoſt, did, in fine, pronounce theſe words, ‘ or rather theſe claps of thunder. In the firſt place, ‘ it ‡ diſcharged ten anathemas againſt the vene‘mous doctrine of Origen; and then going farther ‘ pronounced, *Anathema etiam ipſi Origeni qui dicitur* ‘ *Adamantius,*- - - *curſed be Origen himſelf who is called* ‘ *Adamantius.* They added this laſt word on pur‘poſe, leſt the world ſhould miſtake, as if they ſpoke ‘ of the other Origen, and not of the true Origen, ‘ whom they covered with anathemas as a reprobated, ‘ condemned, and damned perſon.’ Let us ſee a ſpecimen of the eloquence of that time. Binet ſuppoſes, that Baronius making uſe of a viſion which is related in the *Pratum Spirituale*, ſpoke after this manner (34): *Muſt we at laſt come to this extremity, that I ſhould be forced to open Hell, and ſhew you that Origen is there, otherwiſe you will not believe it? Is it not enough that I have ſhewn you his guilt, his miſerable death, his ſentence of condemnation pronounced by the Emperors, by the Popes, by the Saints,*

and

---

(14) Ib. *p.* 97.

(15) Alioquin mutatis vicibus pro innocuis deberemus habere errores non paucos craſſiſſimos atque fœdiſſimos, unde multum emolumenti capit Reſpublica, in multas perturbationes caſura per introductionem quarumdam veritatum. *Ibid.*

(16) See Saurin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 682.

(17) Saurin, ibid. *pag.* 683, 684.

(18) The author was advertiſed of it in 1690, in the *Avis ſur le Tableau du Socinianiſme, pag.* 44.

(19) There are ſome ſuch.

(20) Stephen Binet, of the Salvation of Origen, *pag.* 468.

(21) In Præfat. ad Originem, *ann.* 1512.

(22) In Vita Origenis.

(23) In Origen.

(24) Apologia, *Q. VII*, de Salute Origenis.

(25) Binet, *pag.* 155, *cites him*, Annal. Tom. iii, ann. 533, &c.

(26) Binet, pag. 158, ex S. Leone Epiſt. decret. 11.

(27) Ib. pag. 160, & ſeq. ex Niceph. lib. xvii, cap. xxvii. Præf. in Conc. v, Conſtantinop.

(28) Orig. Hom. 20, in num. apud Binet. pag. 166.

(29) Orig. in cap. i, Eccl. ex Methodio & Genebr. apud Binet. pag. 168.

(30) Orig. in Geneſ. Philocal. cap. xxv, apud Binet. pag. 168.

(31) Compare, with the above, remark [*D*], of the article KEPLER.

(32) Orig. Hom. 4, in Ezech. apud Binet. ibid.

(33) Binet, *pag.* 191.

* Baron. an. 400. an. 538. an. 553.

† 5. Synod.

‡ Niceph. lib. xvii, cap. xxvii, xxviii. Sur. 11. Janu. Cedren. in Annal. Caſſiod. 1, div. inſt. Prat. ſpirit. cap. xxvi, Baron. an. 532.

(34) Binet, *pag.* 195, *& ſeq.*

ORIGEN.

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary two pieces have been publiſhed, which oblige me to make ſome additions to this article. One of them, under the title of *Parrhaſiana*, was publiſhed at Amſterdam in 1699, by a learned perſon who diſguiſes himſelf by the name of Theodorus Parrhaſius. The other was printed at Paris in 1700, and intituled, *Hiſtoire des Mouvemens*, &c. That is, *The Hiſtory of the Commotions which have happened in the church on account of Origen and his doctrine.* Father Doucin, a Jeſuit, is the author of the latter. In the Parrhaſiana we meet with ſome reflexions upon the controverſy between the Manichees and the Orthodox. They are uſhered in with an obſervation which is as agreeable as could be expected from a very honeſt man (*c*). They are uſhered in, I ſay, with a judgment every way agreeable to equity, truth, and reaſon, with reference to the views with which I took the liberty to ſtate the objections of the Manichees, and to own that natural light is not ſufficient to enable Chriſtians to reſolve them, whether they follow St Auſtin's ſyſtem, or that of Molina and the Remonſtrants, or have recourſe to that of the Socinians. Theodorus Parrhaſius maintains the contrary, and pretends (*d*), that an Origeniſt may *ſtop the mouth of the Manichees* . . . . *If a man of this character*, continues he, *can put a Manichee to ſilence, what would not they do, who ſhould reaſon infinitely better than the diſciples of* Origen? We ſhall examine below, what he ſuppoſes an *Origeniſt could ſay, after having conſidered all the objections of the Manichees* [*E*].

As

(*c*) Parrhaſiana, *pag.* 302.

(*d*) Ibid. *pag.* 304.

---

and by the fifth general council, beſides others, and as it were by the mouth of God himſelf? But ſince it remains only to deſcend to Hell, to give you a ſight of this reprobate, this damned Origen: Let us go, gentlemen, I am content to do it, to run the matter to the laſt concluſion: let us go, in God's name to Hell, to ſee whether he is there or not, and ſo give the laſt deciſion of the point. The fifth general council † *has cited a book, and by citing it has authorized it, as a book proper to furniſh good and effectual arguments for confirming the deciſions of the council upon the article of Images. And why ſhould not we make uſe of it after the council, to determine this queſtion, which is already otherwiſe but too plain and evident? There it is ſaid, that a good man, under great concern for the ſalvation of Origen's ſoul, did, after ſome ardent prayers of a holy old man, manifeſtly ſee a ſort of Hell laid open to him, where he diſtinguiſhed and knew the Hereſiarchs, who were all called over before him by their names, and in the midſt of theſe he ſaw Origen, who was damned among the reſt, and covered with horror, flames, and confuſion.* Now let us inſert part of the anſwer which was made to this objection. ‘ Does the church ground her canons upon the viſions of a hermit; ſhe who teaches, that the viſions of private perſons lay no obligation upon any one to believe them, and that articles of faith are never founded upon ſuch viſions? So that I admit, the *Pratum Spirituale* tells us, a good honeſt Abbot ſaw Origen in Hell; but is he the firſt who has been miſtaken? What Origen does he ſpeak of, our Origen, or the other infamous Origen? And of what authority is this book, the *Pratum Spirituale?* Let us put the caſe, that the ſeventh general council quoted it for ſome particular purpoſe, as upon the article of Images, does that imply that they rendered it canonical as to every thing that is in it: and how many ſimple things, are there in that little book, which appear ridiculous and incredible to the wiſer part of mankind (35)?’ Juſt one word more: *Here the viſion of a ſimple Abbot is alledged, and I alledge the viſion of a great Saint, called Mechtildis* **, *to whom God revealed that he would not let the world know what was become of Samſon, Solomon, and Origen, in order to ſtrike the greateſt terror into the ſtrongeſt, the wiſeſt, and the moſt learned, men of this world, by keeping them in ſuſpence and uncertainty* (36).

Note, That Robert de Corceone, an Engliſh Cardinal who flouriſhed in the beginning of the XIIIth century, wrote a book upon the queſtion of Origen's ſalvation. Bale ſpeaks of it.

[*E*] *We ſhall examine . . . . what he ſuppoſes an Origeniſt could ſay, after having conſidered all the objections of the Manichees.*] Though the arguments he puts into the Origeniſt's mouth are ſhort and cloſe, yet I imagine, I ſhall preſerve their full force in reducing them to theſe three propoſitions. 1. God ‘ has made us free, to make room for virtue and vice, for praiſe and reproach, for reward and puniſhment (37).’ 2. He *damns nobody purely for having ſinned, but for not having repented* (38). 3. *The phyſical and moral evils* of mankind, are of ſo ſhort a duration, in compariſon to eternity, that they cannot hinder us from eſteeming God *as beneficent, and as a friend to virtue* (39). It is in this laſt propoſition that the whole force of the Origeniſt conſiſts, and the reaſon is this: he ſuppoſes that the torments of Hell are not of eternal duration; and that God, after judging that free creatures have *ſuffered enough, will render them eternally happy* (40). The eternal happineſs which will be beſtowed upon them, fills up the idea of infinite mercy, tho' preceded by ſeveral ages of ſufferings; for ſeveral are nothing in compariſon with infinite duration; and *there is infinitely leſs proportion between* the time of the duration of this earth *and eternity, than there is between a minute and a hundred millions of Years* (41) . . . ‘ Among men, thoſe who have the care of a child that is ill, and who cure him by a bitter remedy, only ſmile at the complaints he makes of this bitterneſs, becauſe they know it will be taſted but a very little time, and that the remedy will do him good. There is an infinitely greater diſproportion between God and the moſt knowing men, than there is between theſe and the ſimpleſt children. So that we cannot reaſonably think it ſtrange that God looks upon the evils we ſuffer as almoſt nothing: he, who alone has a compleat idea of eternity, and looks upon the beginning and end of our ſufferings as infinitely nearer, than the beginning and end of a minute. After the ſame manner ought we to reaſon about vices and vicious actions; which, with reſpect to God, are of ſhort duration, and at the bottom, cauſe no change in the univerſe. If a Clockmaker ſhould make a clock, which being once wound up, would go very well for a whole year, abating two or three ſeconds, which might not be exactly equal on its firſt ſetting out; could any one ſay, that this workman ſhould not pretend to ſkill and exactneſs in his workmanſhip? In like manner, if God does one day, for all eternity, redreſs the diſorders which the ill uſe of liberty ſhall have cauſed among men, can we think it ſtrange that he ſuffers them to continue, during the moment that we ſhall continue here on earth (42).’

Let us ſee what a Manichee might anſwer to this diſcourſe of an Origeniſt.

I. The firſt thing he might ſay is, that we do not find in our minds the idea of two ſorts of goodneſs; one of which conſiſts in making a preſent, whoſe bad effects are foreſeen, without preventing them, though that is in the power of the giver; the other, in granting a favour of ſuch a nature as will always be advantageous to the receiver. It is needleſs to obſerve, that by the idea of goodneſs we do not underſtand an imperfect ſort of goodneſs, ſuch as we meet with in the heart of a ſinner; but a goodneſs which in a logical abſtracted ſenſe is clear of all failure. This ideal goodneſs is not a genus containing under it the two ſpecies juſt now deſcribed. Its eſſential and diſtinguiſhing attribute is ſo to diſpoſe its ſubject as to beſtow favours, which by the ſhorteſt and ſureſt means it can make uſe of, may render the condition of the receiver happy. This ideal goodneſs eſſentially and neceſſarily excludes all that can ſuit with a malicious being. Now it is certain that ſuch a being would readily incline to

diſpenſe

† Baron. an. 532, Moſch. in Prat. cap. xxvi.

(35) Binet, *pag.* 129.

** Lib. vitæ S. Mecht. Edit. an. 1627.

(36) Binet, *pag.* 219.

(37) Parrhaſiana, *pag.* 306.

(38) Ib. *p.* 307.

(39) Ib. *p.* 308.

(40) Ib. *p.* 312.

(41) Ib. *p.* 309.

(42) Ib. *pag.* 310, 311.

As for Father Doucin's book, I ſhall content myſelf with ſaying that it contains a large and curious diſcuſſion of the ſubjects mentioned in the title, and alſo an epitome of the life of Origen. One cannot read it without deploring the extravagancies to which the human mind is ſubject. Origen's converſation and manners were admirably pure:

diſpenſe favours, the uſe of which it knew would prove fatal to thoſe who ſhould receive them. We read of a certain Roman who preſented very fine cloaths to thoſe whom he hated.

> Eutrapelus, cuicunque nocere volebat,
> Veſtimenta dabat pretioſa: beatus enim jam
> Cum pulchris tunicis ſumet nova conſilia & ſpes:
> Dormiet in lucem: ſcorto poſtponet honeſtum
> Officium, nummos alienos paſcet: ad imum
> Thrax erit, aut olitoris aget mercede caballum (43).
>
> *Eutrapelus, whene'er on miſchief bent,*
> *A preſent of the richeſt garments ſent:*
> *Fine cloaths will make the fop new meaſures take:*
> *Change day for night: grow a conſummate rake:*
> *Becomes the uſurers prey, then in deſpair*
> *Turn Gladiator, or cry garden-ware.*

Bad princes, who want a fair opportunity of gratifying their deſire to ruin ſome great lord, would gladly give him the government of a province, if they knew that by abuſing that truſt he would render himſelf moſt odious to all mankind, and moſt worthy of an exemplary puniſhment: But a romantic heroe formed for a model of royal perfection, a prince, I ſay, drawn after ideas even more exactly than Cyrus by Xenophon (44), will never lay a ſnare by his liberalities. When he diſpoſes of places, he pitches upon ſuch as are moſt ſuitable to thoſe he has a mind to gratify, and does not give them ſuch places as he apprehends they will miſmanage. He gives quickly, which is a character of goodneſs that multiplies the favour beſtowed (45). He does not oblige the ſuitors to long ſollicitations; this deſtroys the merit of the benefit (46), and is only ſuitable to ſuch an indifferent ſort of goodneſs as ſcarce deſerves to be diſtinguiſhed from unkindneſs. Thoſe who have given us the character of Cardinal Mazarin, have mentioned as a conſiderable foible, the cuſtom he had of ſpinning out the execution of his promiſes to ſuch a length of time, that all the pleaſure was waſted in the expectation, and his favours were all cancelled by the application which was neceſſary in order to extort them. *Promiſſis largus, quibus multoties non ſtetit; aut ſi implevit faſtidio & mora diu libratum beneficium improbe extortum elumbavit, longo voto conſumens gaudia* (47). Had they deſigned his panegyric, and meant to flatter his memory with the character of a conſummate liberality, they would have ſaid, that his readineſs to oblige prevented ſollicitations, and ſpared his clients the trouble of aſking. *Illud atque in vulgus, principem obiiſſe .... liberalem in primis, & qui raro exemplo hujus ævi preces anteverteret, ut conſuleret accipientium pudori* (48). A panegyriſt that means to keep cloſe to ideal perfection, in order to attribute it to his heroes, would not fail to preſerve in the character their liberality, an inſeparable connection between beſtowing the art of making good uſe of a favour, and granting the favour itſelf.

Thus we ſee what are the properties of ideal goodneſs, what it excludes, what it includes. Now, if we conſider this idea of goodneſs, we do not find that God, who is a principle of infinitely good, could put off the felicity of his creatures till the termination of ſeveral ages of miſery (49), or beſtow upon them a free will, which he was very ſure they would uſe to their own deſtruction. Had they deſired any ſuch preſent of him, he could not have granted it without contradicting his own eſſence. And much leſs could he give it, when it was not aſked. Would they have willingly taken it, if they had been aſked the queſtion? And if they had known the conſequence of it, would they not rather have cried out (50).

> *May ſuch kind preſents fall to thoſe we hate.*

But if the infinite goodneſs of the Creator did permit him to endow his creatures with a liberty, of which they might make a bad as well as good uſe, we muſt at leaſt ſay, that it would engage him to watch their ſteps in ſuch a manner, as not to ſuffer them to be guilty of actual ſin. His infinite love for virtue, his infinite hatred for vice, in a word, his ſanctity, would unite its intereſts with thoſe of his goodneſs, and by the concurrence of thoſe two divine attributes, the bad uſe of free-will would be diverted as often as it ſhould be ready to appear. Thoſe fathers who cannot refuſe their children to go all alone, or to clime a ladder, or to mount a horſe, when it is viſible they will fall, if they are not taken care of, never fail to give ſuch orders, that which way ſoever they reel they may always find a ſupport. If a finite goodneſs, a goodneſs which cannot inviſibly communicate its aſſiſtance to the faculties of a little child, does always prevent the child's falling, when it can, or hinder its wounding himſelf with a knife which muſt be given him to prevent his crying; how much more ought we to be perſuaded that God would have hindered the ill uſe of Free-will; he who is infinitely good, infinitely holy, and can infallibly incline his creature towards good, without violating the privileges of liberty (51). Such is the anſwer that a Manichee might give to an Origeniſt, upon the firſt of theſe propoſitions laid down above. It is eaſy to apprehend, without my mentioning it, that he would ſometimes make uſe of what are called *Argumenta ad hominem*.

As for the reaſon alledged by the Origeniſt, that there is a neceſſity of allowing the creature free-will in order *to make room for virtue and vice, for praiſe and reproach, for reward and puniſhment*: it might be very eaſily and effectually refuted. It would ſuffice to reply, that ſuch a reaſon is ſo far from obliging a being infinitely holy and infinitely liberal, to grant free-will to creatures, that, on the contrary, it ought to divert him from it. Vice and reproach ought to have no place in the works of a cauſe infinitely holy; all the avenues to them ought to be ſtopped, all ought to be laudable; virtue ought to fortify every poſt in ſuch a manner, that her adverſary might never be able to make any invaſion. And as all ought to be happy under the empire of a ſovereign Being infinitely good and infinitely powerful; ſo pains or troubles ought to have no place in the ſame. In travelling thro' this vaſt empire, we ought to meet with no valley of tears, no *veſtibulum*, ſuch as a great Poet has thus deſcribed.

> Veſtibulum ante ipſum, primiſque in faucibus Orci,
> Luctus, & ultrices poſuêre cubilia curæ:
> Pallenteſque habitant morbi, triſtiſque ſenectus:
> Et Metus, & maleſuada Fames, & turpis Egeſtas,
> (Terribiles viſu formæ) Lethumque, Laborque:
> Tum conſanguineus Lethi Sopor: & mala mentis
> Gaudia, mortiferumque adverſo in limine Bellum:
> Ferreique Eumenidum thalami; & diſcordia demens,
> Vipereum crinem vittis innexa cruentis (52).
>
> *Juſt in the gate, and in the jaws of Hell,*
> *Revengeful cares, and ſullen ſorrows dwell:*
> *And pale diſeaſes, and repining age,*
> *Want, fear, and famine's unreſiſted rage;*
> *Here toils, and death, and death's half brother ſleep,*
> *Forms terrible to view, their centry keep:*
> *With anxious pleaſures of a guilty mind,*
> *Deep frauds before, and open force behind:*
> *The furies iron beds, and ſtrife that ſhakes*
> *Her hiſſing treſſes, and unfolds her ſnakes.*

Without paſſing through Places filled with horror, we ought at firſt ſetting out to fall in with the ſcenes of felicity.

> Devenêre locos lætos, & amœna vireta
> Fortunatorum nemorum, ſedeſque beatas.
> Largior hic campos æther, & lumine veſtit
> Purpureo: ſolemque ſuum, ſua ſidera norunt (53).

---

(43) Horat. Epiſt. XVIII, lib. I, ver. 31.

(44) Cyrus ille à Xenophonte non ad hiſtoriæ fidem ſcriptus, ſed ad effigiem juſti imperii. *Cicero, ad Q. fratrem, Epiſt. I, lib. i, fol. m.* 98, *D.*

(45) Bis dat qui cito dat.

(46) Gratia quæ tarda eſt, ingrata eſt; gratia namque
Cum fieri properat, gratia grata magis. *Auſon. Epigr. lxxxii.* See likewiſe Epigr. lxxxiii; and the authors quoted in the commentary upon theſe words of Auſonius of the Amſterdam Edition 1671.

(47) Priolus, de Rebus Gallicis, *lib. xi, ſub fin. pag. m.* 392.

(48) Famian. Strada, Proluſ. II, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 255. *He ſpeaks of Leo X.*

(49) This we ſhall touch upon in paragraph IV.

(50) Hoſtibus eveniant talia dona meis.

(51) See, above, remark [*G*] of the article MANICHEE.

(52) Virgil. Æneid. lib. VI, ver. 273.

(53) Ibid. ver. 638.

pure: his zeal for the goſpel was ardent to the laſt degree. He ruined his health with

- - - - - - - - - - *They took their way,*
Where long extended plains of pleaſure lay.
The verdant fields with thoſe of heaven may vye,
With Æther veſted, and a purple ſky:
The bliſsful ſeas of happy ſouls below,
Stars of their own, and their own ſuns they know.

Virtue, praiſe, and happineſs, may very well exiſt, though vice, reproach, and puniſhment, have no other exiſtence, than what we call ideal and objective. This the Origeniſt cannot deny, ſince he acknowledges an eternal felicity for all free creatures, which ſhall ſucceed after ſome ages of ſuffering. Virtue, praiſe, and benefits, will take place, during the infinite duration of that happineſs; but vice, blame, and puniſhment, will there have no exiſtence out of the intellect. If the Origeniſt replies, that theſe benefits would not be rewards, if the creatures had not been endowed with liberty; we ſhall anſwer, that there is no proportion between an eternal felicity and the good uſe man makes of his free-will; and for that reaſon the eternal happineſs which God beſtows upon a good man cannot be conſidered, properly ſpeaking, as a reward; it is a favour, a free gift. So that, taking the terms in a ſtrict ſenſe, we cannot pretend that free-will was neceſſary to be given men, in order that they might merit the happineſs of paradiſe, and obtain it as a reward. This might as well be ſaid, if there were only a ſubordination between virtue and eternal happineſs; that is a chain or connection of thoughts neceſſarily virtuous, in which happineſs would be the conſequent, and virtue the antecedent. Not to mention that the more eternal felicity were remote from the notion of reward, the more it would ſuit with the character of infinite Goodneſs.

II. The anſwer to the ſecond propoſition cannot ſtop us long. The Manichee would not fail to obſerve, that impenitence being nothing but the bad uſe of liberty, it is all one, whether you ſay that God condemns men for not repenting, or that he damns them purely for having ſinned. I own, that, generally ſpeaking, it has an appearance of mercy, to be ready to remit the puniſhment of thoſe who are ſorry for their fault: but when a promiſe of Pardon, upon condition of repenting, is made to thoſe of whoſe impenitence we are well aſſured; this, properly ſpeaking, is promiſing nothing, and the reſolution to puniſh them is juſt as abſolute as if no favour had been offered them: if you would in good earneſt exempt them from puniſhment, you ſhould hinder their impenitence, which is a very eaſy matter to him who has the command of their hearts. Here again *Argumenta ad hominem*.

III. As for the third propoſition and its proofs, the Manichee might aſk, in the firſt place, whether the Origeniſt would dare to determine the duration of the torments which precede the happy eternity. He would not venture the determining it, not only becauſe he is ignorant of it, but alſo becauſe he would be afraid to make it either too ſhort or too long. If he made it too ſhort, an hundred years, for inſtance, he would apprehend the being accuſed of giving a looſe to ſinners; and if he made it a million of years, he would dread the not having given a juſt idea of God's mercy, and the not having removed all the ſcandal of the pretended cruelty of the doctrine of hell. He can never truſt therefore to the nullity of proportion between a million of ages, and an infinite duration; and the difficulty does not appear to be removed by ſaying, *There is infinitely leſs proportion between* the duration of the earth *and eternity, than between a minute and a hundrea millions of years.* This may be equally affirmed of as many millions of ages as there are drops of water in the ocean. This number of ages multiplied as often as you will, is a finite thing, but there is no proportion between a finite and an infinite; and conſequently there is none between eternity and any number of ages whatſoever. Yet, no body can forbear judging, that the Divine Juſtice would be leſs ſevere, if it put an end to the miſery of the reprobate, in order to introduce them into paradiſe, at the termination of an hundred years, than if it did not make this change till after an hundred thouſand ages. Take what pains you will, you can never ſatisfy reaſon, by telling it, that God will indeed be appeaſed at laſt, but not till the infernal puniſhments, ſuch as they are uſually deſcribed, ſhall have laſted as many millions of years, as there are drops of water in the ſea. This number of years, which is nothing in compariſon with eternity, appears nevertheleſs a very long duration, when conſidered by itſelf, and with reſpect to the perſon ſuffering. Let this proceed from what it will, whether it be that our reaſon is too dull to be deceived, or that there is really ſome ſource of illuſion and ſophiſm in the ideas of time: you can never beat it out of the head of a Philoſopher, who reaſons only philoſophically, that the puniſhment of a creature continued for a hundred thouſand million of ages is incompatible with the ſovereign bounty of the Creator. We muſt ſuppoſe that an Origeniſt is ſenſible of this, and for that reaſon he would not venture to ſay, that the purgatory of the damned ſhall laſt ſo long. But ſee how a Manichee might, in my opinion, urge him. Since you think ſo long a puniſhment cruel, take half the time only, and if you find any thing elſe in that ſuppoſition, but a diminution of the ſeverity, you impoſe upon yourſelf; for fifty millions of years differ only in the degree of more or leſs from a hundred thouſand millions, and we can never riſe from cruelty to infinite goodneſs, by a bare diminution of cruelty. Qualities *in ſummo gradu* (54), for inſtance, heat does abſolutely exclude all the degrees of cold; and therefore goodneſs, *in ſummo gradu*, muſt needs exclude all degrees whatſoever of the oppoſite quality. You cannot therefore riſe to the ſupreme goodneſs of God, but by abridging to the very laſt minute the puniſhments of hell. For what God can be for a moment, that he may be for two hours, and two ages, and through all eternity; but whatever would be incompatible with his nature in eternity, is always ſo in every inſtant of the duration of things. The qualities of a creature are ſuſceptible of the degrees of more or leſs, and incapable of perfection; but we call them perfect, when their imperfection is not very ſenſible. We commend the exactneſs of a Clockmaker, if his pendulum does not err above two or three ſeconds in a year. But the exactneſs of an artificer infinitely perfect, abſolutely excludes all exceptions; his holineſs, his wiſdom, &c. are abſolutely ſimple, and without any mixture of contrary qualities: I ſay, without the leaſt mixture which can be conceived, or which can poſſibly exiſt in the nature of things.

IV. The idea of this goodneſs excludes all the weakneſſes which are commonly met with in the way of mens doing good to one another. Some take pleaſure in delays (55), others cannot be ſerviceable without going about, and in ſpite of their own wills, are conſtrained to make thoſe paſs through evil, whom they mean to lead to good. Fathers who cannot correct the bad inclinations of a child without the laſh of the rod, make his body feel the ſmart of it; but this they would by no means do, were they perſuaded that a boundleſs complaiſance would be a more effectual means of correction. They force him to ſwallow a medicine, which is intolerably bitter to the taſte, and griping in the operation, but this they would not do, if they knew how to cure him otherwiſe. They would give ſugar and every thing agreeable to the taſte, if they thought they would prove a more certain remedy. The adminiſtring a diſagreeable potion being unavoidable, they ſweeten and qualify the bitterneſs as well as they can with little cheats (56); and though they regard the complaints made of the ill taſte, as a ridiculous weakneſs, becauſe they know *the bitterneſs will ſoon go off, and the remedy do good*, yet notwithſtanding this, I ſay, theſe would very gladly ſave the child this trouble, and cure him, if they could, with the moſt palatable liquors in the world. One may be ſenſible of ſuch a tender diſpoſition of ſoul without being a father. There is neither a Phyſician nor an Apothecary, who does not apologize for the bitterneſs of his remedies, and proteſt, that if it were poſſible, he would grudge no pains to make them as pleaſant as the moſt agreeable ſweatmeat which the Confectioner can prepare, but that a neceſſity, inſurmountable by all the art of man, obliges him to give diſagreeable medicines. Without doubt this language is ſincere, even when uſed to a patient he never ſaw before. Put this queſtion to a Surgeon who ſets the arm of a perſon unknown with faſtings and watchings. Thirſting after martyrdom (*e*) he underwent, with incredible conſtancy, the torments which the perſecutors of the faith inflicted upon him [*F*]; torments

---

(54) I ſhall ſpeak more of this below, citat. (59).

(55) See, above, citat. (47). Theſe delays are ſometimes ſo uneaſy, that at laſt a ready denial is aſked as a favour. *Jam, ſatis eſt, finem O Cæſar pro munere poſco Remque meam ſeu das, perfice ſive negas.* See Balzac, Entret. XXVII, *pag. m.* 276.

(56) Pueris abſinthia tetra medentes
Cùm dare conantur, priùs oras poculo circùm
Contingunt mellis dulci flavoque liquore,
Ut puerorum ætas improvida ludificetur
Labrorum tenùs, intereà perpotet amarum
Abſinthi laticem, deceptaque non capiatur;
Sed potiùs tali facto recreata valeſcat. *Lucret. lib. I, ver.* 935, *& lib. iv, ver.* 11.

- - - - - *For as Phyſicians uſe,*
In giving children draughts of bitter juice,
To make them take it; tinge the cup with ſweet,
To cheat the lip; this firſt they eager meet,
And then drink on, and take the bitter draught,
And ſo are harmleſsly deceiv'd, not caught:
For by ſuch cheats they get their ſtrength, their eaſe,
Their former health, and baffle the diſeaſe.
Creech.

known to him, *if you could perform this operation without cauſing any pain, would you not do it?* He will reply, that there is no queſtion to be made of it, and that it muſt be taken for granted, that a man of his profeſſion, who knows how to dreſs a wound two ways, equally good, the one painful and the other eaſy, and ſhould prefer the former to the latter, would be a monſter of cruelty, a tyger, a cannibal, that ought to be immediately broke upon the wheel (57). Generally ſpeaking, your Schoolmaſters are none of the beſt tempered men in the world; and yet I doubt whether there is any pedantry ſo ſavage, as to prefer the rod to good words, even where it is certain that mildneſs and complaiſance would improve their ſcholars as much as correction. Do they not give ſugar-plums to little boys, to conquer their ſtubbornneſs (58). To have recourſe to chiding and the *ferula* without neceſſity, I mean, without finding that method more profitable than good words and preſents, is certainly brutiſh.

This induction might be amplified without end, and will furniſh a conſequence ſufficient to put an Origeniſt out of countenance; for we may from hence conclude, that both the ideas of experience and metaphyſics concur in demonſtrating, that to hurt any one, though it be for never ſo ſhort a portion of time, and in order to procure him the greateſt benefit, is altogether incompatible with goodneſs, unleſs it be abſolutely impoſſible to find out a ſtrait path to lead him from good to good, in a conſtant and invariable manner. Let it be urged never ſo much, that the torments of the damned, after laſting for a certain time, which is ſhort in compariſon with eternity, ſhall be followed with endleſs felicity: yet this will appear to be ſo much the more incompatible with the goodneſs of God, as his goodneſs is infinite, and infinitely perfect, which cannot ſuffer the leaſt diminution or interruption without ceaſing to be perfect. Let us but call to mind the doctrine of the ſchoolmen about the nature of firſt qualities. Heat, *in ſummo gradu* (59), or *ut octo*, as they expreſs it, ceaſes to be a firſt, ſimple, and perfect, quality, as ſoon as it is joined to the leaſt degree of cold which can poſſibly exiſt. From that moment it aſſumes the nature of ſecond or compound qualities. Eſſences conſiſt *in indiviſibili*, in an indiviſible point, take never ſo little from them, and you deſtroy them entirely. They muſt have all or nothing; ſo that how ſmall ſoever the mixture may be of the bad quality with the good, this goodneſs loſes the eſſence of perfect goodneſs: it changes its ſpecies, and paſſes into that of imperfect qualities. This is evident from the philoſophical axiom quoted in the margin (60). It is neceſſary therefore, if the Origeniſts mean to get clear, they muſt add a new Hereſy to the former; they muſt maintain, that it was impoſſible for God to lead free creatures to eternal happineſs, without their previous ſuffering the miſeries of this life, and afterwards for a limited time, thoſe of hell. They might allege, that as fiſh cannot live in the air, nor men under water, ſo the ſouls of men cannot ſubſiſt in paradiſe, while they are incumbred with the filth which ariſes from their union with elementary matter; that there is a neceſſity therefore of purifying them in the infernal furnaces, after which they are qualified to live happy in the cœleſtial regions. According to this ſuppoſition the goodneſs of God, may be entirely conſiſtent with the torments of the creature, juſt as a Surgeon preſerves his friendſhip for the patient who undergoes his operation, notwithſtanding the violent pain he puts him to, which it is not poſſible for him to prevent. But the having recourſe to this hypotheſis, is only adopting part of the error of the Manichees; it is ſaving the goodneſs of God at the expence of his power, and admitting that Matter is an uncreated principle ſo eſſentially bad, that it is not in the power of God to rectify its defects. This therefore inſtead of anſwering the objections of the Manichees, is making them triumph. The obſervations made upon phyſical evil, with reſpect to the goodneſs of God, may eaſily be applied to moral evil, with regard to the divine ſanctity.

V. We muſt take notice, that if Origen could anſwer the objection of the Manichees, it would not follow, that they might be ſolved yet more effectually, by principles much better and more orthodox than his. For all the advantage he can have in his controverſy, proceeds from the falſe poſitions, peculiar to him, which, on the one hand, give a large extent to the power of free-will, and on the other hand, ſuppreſs everlaſting miſery, and ſubſtitute in its place eternal bliſs. The ſtrongeſt argument of the Manichees is grounded on this hypotheſis, that all men, except a very few, ſhall be eternally damned.

VI. There is no ſect now in being, which gives ſo ſmall a handle to the Manichees, as the Socinian; and that is only owing to their departing farther than all the reſt from the hypotheſis of the *Particulariſts* (61). But ſo long as they ſcruple to go yet further, they will ſucceed no better in this diſpute than the Origeniſts; they muſt ſink under it, unleſs they join to their other impieties, that of holding matter to be a principle which God can only diſpoſe of to a certain degree, beyond which he muſt of neceſſity yield to its reſiſtance, and accommodate himſelf to the incorrigible defects which he finds in it. If the Socinians do not farther charge themſelves with that piece of blaſphemy, they will ſee themſelves reduced to an abſurdity, I mean to deny truths evident from experience; and that after this manner. They deny the eternity of Hell, becauſe they cannot conceive how it ſhould conſiſt with the infinite goodneſs of God. They cannot conceive that ſuch goodneſs is compatible with a Hell of a hundred times a hundred thouſand millions of years. So many ages of miſery appear to them a moſt horrid cruelty. But as they will never riſe from cruelty to infinite gooodneſs by retrenching a thouſand ages, and then another thouſand, *&c.* ſo long as they leave any years of torment behind (62); they muſt ſay, if they mean to avoid the inconſiſtency, that under a God infinitely good there can be no Hell. This proves too much; for after this theſis is laid down, it is not conceivable that men can be liable to diſeaſes and afflictions. So that from theſe principles there would follow a falſhood, and even the impoſſibility of a thing which exiſts beyond all diſpute, and of which we have but too ſad experience. If you ſay, that under the beſt monarchs there are dungeons, tortures, gibbets, and executioners, frequently made uſe of: I anſwer, that none of theſe things could take place, if it were in the power of thoſe monarchs to inſpire all the world with a firm reſolution of demeaning themſelves as they ought. How can you get clear of this labyrinth, if God diſpoſes of matter as he thinks fit, and is the free author of the laws that ſubject man to ſickneſs and uneaſineſs? There is no eſcaping therefore, but by ſaying, that God cannot do every thing he would; and that matter contains the ſeeds of evil, which ſhoot up one way or other, whether he will or not, and in ſpite of any combination or texture whatſoever, which he may may make of its particles.

VII. This is the way of teaching thoſe their duty, who mean to ſubject Theology to Philoſophy. You muſt ſhew to them the abſurd conſequences of their method, and by that means bring them back to this maxim of Chriſtian humility. That metaphyſical notions ought not to be the rule, by which we are to judge of the conduct of God; but that we ought to conform our ſelves to the oracles of the ſcripture. As for thoſe who may apprehend any danger to the true faith, from ſhewing, that by the bare light of Philoſophy we cannot make a ſtand againſt the objections of the Manichees; I refer them to the explanations which I thought proper to ſubjoin to the end of this work.

[*F*] *The torments which the perſecutors of the faith inflicted upon him.*] Of all the martyrs put to death under the ſeventh perſecution (63), *none was attacked with more obſtinacy than Origen* . . . . *He was thrown into a dark dungeon,* * *chained with a large collar of iron round his neck, extended for ſeveral days upon a ſort of a rack, which, by pulling his feet aſunder, diſlocated his members, in ſuch a manner, that he paſſed the reſt of his life in extreme pain. He was then ſixty-ſeven years old . . . . Every day they invented new cruelties, related by himſelf in his letters, to which the ancients refer us, but which are ſince loſt. They often threatened to burn him gradually, and at ſeveral times*; *and, during this cruel and long martyrdom, which laſted, ſo far as*

(*e*) See, above, remark [*A*], citat. ‡.

(57) Compare what I quote from Seneca, in the article CALLISTRATUS, citations (7) and (8).

(58) Ut pueris olim dant cruſtula blandi Doctores, elementa velint ut diſcere prima. *Horat. Sat. I, lib. I.*

(59) Compare what is ſaid above, citation (54).

(60) Bonum ex integra cauſa, Malum ex quocunque defectu. *Good conſiſts in all perfection, Evil in any imperfection.*

(61) Theſe are the men who inſiſt moſt ſtrictly upon the literal ſenſe of St Paul, about the doctrine of abſolute Predeſtination, the neceſſity of Grace, and the loſs of Free-will.

(62) See the proofs of this above, remark [*E*]. paragraph III.

(63) That of the emperor Decius, ann. 250.

* *Euſeb. lib. vi, cap. xxxix. Niceph. lib. v, cap. xxxii.*

torments ſo much the more inſupportable becauſe they were of long duration; for there was great care taken to prevent *his expiring in the midſt of the torture* (*f*). His genius was great, fine, and ſublime, his knowledge and reading were vaſtly extenſive, and yet he fell into a *prodigious number of Hereſies*, *the very leaſt of which is monſtrous* (*g*), and probably he fell into them by endeavouring to protect the truths of Chriſtianity from the *Inſults of the Pagans*, and to render them *credible even to the Philoſophers*; *which he wiſhed for with the moſt ardent zeal*, *not doubting*, *but that with them he ſhould convert the univerſe* (*h*). So many virtues, ſo many admirable talents, and ſo great a degree of zeal, could not prevent his dying a Heretic, and his memory from being abhorred by an infinite number of Chriſtians. There are but few in the Romiſh communion who dare to doubt of his eternal damnation. And yet how many voluptuous, worldly, lazy, and vicious doctors are there, who being at the ſame time very orthodox, receive every day thouſands of benedictions for their unſhaken conſtancy in the true faith? So impenetrable are the judgments of GOD! It is not commonly apprehended that the errors of Origen have any connexion with one another; they ſeem to be the product of a wandering and irregular mind: but it is more rational to aſſert, that they all ſpring from one ſource [*G*], and that they are ſyſtematical falſities, which form a chain of conſequences. Some of his followers have carried them even to the ſenſualities we have ſince ſeen among the Molinoſiſts [*H*]. But that

as we can judge, till the death of Decius, he never let ſlip one ſyllable unworthy of a ſoldier of JESUS CHRIST. *Happy! if in ſurrendering his ſoul in ſo glorious a fight, he could have waſhed off the errors of his doctrine with his blood. But* GOD *did not permit it ſo to be.* † He ſuffered much, *ſays St Epiphanius*, and did not arrive at the point to which martyrdom leads. *He touched the crown with his hand, without being able to ſet it upon his head; and he, who in all appearance was only ſhort of martyrdom, in not expiring in the midſt of his torments, the marks of which he bore to his death, is an Hereſiarch, rejected and abhorred by the church, for not believing as ſhe does. But this ought not to ſurpriſe us, ſince we read in the acts of the holy prieſt Pionius, who ſuffered martyrdom at that time at Smyrna, that a Marcionite was burnt by his ſide, whoſe ſect was not leſs heretical, though it inſpired him with a deſire of martyrdom; for theſe falſe martyrs died, adhering to their errors. What makes the martyr, ſays St Auguſtin admirably well, is not the puniſhment, but the faith which makes him bear it. Now there is no faith in him who riſes in oppoſition to the doctrine of the church. Where are the men of this character, whom they would give us for ſaints, tho' we meet with nothing in their lives that comes near the virtue, or the ſufferings of the martyrs; but only a more notorious obſtinacy, than that of the ancient Hereſiarchs* (64).

I have inſerted this long paſſage of Father Doucin, without omitting the reflexion; for I thought it would ſerve for a ſupplement to what I have related above (65) concerning the charge againſt Maimbourg, with regard to the Marcionite martyrs. I apprehended farther, that this would afford me an opportunity of remarking, that the eaſieſt means of diſcerning a good cauſe, ſlip from us ſooner or later. It would ſuit the capacity of the people much more, to diſtinguiſh the true religion by certain external marks, than to enter into a ſevere ſcrutiny of the doctrine. Now of all external marks, the conſtancy of martyrs is the moſt capable of making an impreſſion. It was altogether ſerviceable in advancing the Chriſtian faith; the aſhes of martyrs were the ſeeds of juſt men, and produced innumerable proſelytes to the goſpel. But this proof became equivocal after Chriſtianity was ſplit into ſeveral communions: each of them had their reſpective martyrs; and ſo, to avoid the being impoſed upon, there was a neceſſity of entering into the diſcuſſion of their doctrine, and to diſclaim this compendious rule of truth, *viz.* ſuch a communion has martyrs, therefore it is good.

[*G*] *It is more rational to aſſert, that all* the errors of *Origen ſpring from one ſource.*] It is in his three books of principles (66) that he has *explained and eſtabliſhed them, and ſo connected one with another, that they may all be ſeen to ſpring from one ſole principle* (67). ‘It is eaſy to demonſtrate, in the firſt place, that what is heretical and deſerves cenſure, in his books of principles, is not one or two propoſitions foreign to his ſubject, but the very body of the doctrine, the ſubſtance of the work, the fundamental propoſitions upon which the whole ſyſtem is ſupported, and which cannot be removed without overturning the whole edifice. It is demonſtrable, in the ſecond place, that the ſame errors which ſtain his book of principles, are diſperſed through all the other writings of the author; inſomuch, that the ſame ſpirit reigns throughout, the ſame ideas every where appear. In order to remove his errors you muſt deſtroy the very firſt elements of his doctrine (68). . . . . Such is the condition of any one who dares to ſteer a new courſe in religious matters: a dreadful ſeries of abyſſes and precipices opens, every ſtep he goes. The more ingenious he is, the more does the itch of reaſoning conſequentially oblige him to ſwallow abſurdities; and that which at firſt view ſeemed only a ſlight ſingularity, and not worthy to be taken notice of, proves in the end the general overthrow of all the Chriſtian doctrines. So fatal it is to indulge invention, where we have nothing to do but to believe (69).’ The author from whom I have theſe words, ſays in another place; ‘That which principally deſerves our regard, is the imperceptible, and yet real, connexion of all theſe errors, which from one to another obliged the author to invent that terrible multitude of novelties, of which his ſyſtem is compoſed. For, as St Jerom has very well ſaid, upon this ſubject, we muſt not imagine, that Origen was either a madman or a fool; † and moſt of thoſe who have read him, would not have charged him with ſuch frequent contradictions, if they had conſidered him more cloſely. It is true, his book of principles, as it now appears, is not always conſiſtent with the reſt of his works; but that is not chargeable upon the author himſelf ‡. We all know what pains Rufinus took to ſuppreſs in his tranſlation whatever he thought might occaſion its being condemned in the Weſt. It is by this means that Origen, in Latin, ſometimes attacks thoſe very errors, which he eſtabliſhes in Greek in his other writings. As for the reſt, we ſhall find Origen clear of ſelf-contradictions, if we trace him to the ſource of his ideas, and ſearch for the key, as we may call it, of his writings; for aſſuredly they have one, and we muſt not think that ſuch a train of hereſies is any thing elſe, but the conſequences of the firſt error; the diſcovery of which ſeems as yet not to have been duly purſued (70).’ Father Doucin afterwards propoſes his conjectures, and the manner in which *he conceives the doctrine of Origen to be connected.* This is worth the reading in the original.

[*H*] *Some of his followers have carried them even to the ſenſualities we have ſince ſeen among the Molinoſiſts.*] I ſhall make uſe of Father Doucin's own words. They are full of grounds of reflexion, and point out the uſe we may make of them, with relation to the preſent time. ‘While thoſe who read him leſs attentively fell inconſiderately into all the chimera's of Origen; others who were more diſcerning, and at the ſame time more corrupted, perceived their conſequences to be very favourable to their diſorderly lives; and from this poſition, that the fleſh is only the priſon of the ſoul, and by no means any part of us ſanctified by the union with Chriſt, or appointed to reign with him in glory, they concluded that the uncleanneſs

---

(*f*) Doucin, Hiſtoire de l'Origeniſme, *pag.* 81.

(*g*) Id. ib. *pag.* 36.

(*h*) Id. ib. *pag.* 37.

† *L. de Ponder. & Menſuris.*

(64) Doucin, Hiſtoire de l'Origeniſme, *pag.* 81, *& ſeq.*

(65) In the remark [*E*] of the article MARCIONITES.

(66) He compoſed them, ann. 217. See Father Doucin, ubi infra.

(67) Doucin, Hiſtoire de l'Origeniſme, *pag.* 31.

(68) Ib. *p.* 36.

(69) Ib. *p.* 37.

† Non eſt fatuus Origenes. Et ego novi. Contraria ſibi loqui non poteſt. *Hier. Apol. lib. ii.*

‡ Quæ cùm legiſſem contuliſſemque cum Græco, illicò animadverti quæ Origenes de Patre & Filio & Spiritu ſancto impiè dixerat, & quæ Romanæ aures ferre non poterant, in meliorem partem ab interprete commutata. *Hier. Apol. lib. i.* Si ideò interpretaris ut eum hæreticum arguas, nihil de Græco mutes. *Ibid. lib. ii.*

(70) Doucin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 323, *& ſeq.*

that carnal Origeniſm was but of ſhort duration, and was eaſier to ſuppreſs than the ſpiritual Origeniſm which was a ſort of Quietiſm [*I*]. We muſt remember that one of the things which gave Origen's ſect the greateſt run, was, that his errors ſeemed to be of ſufficient force to refute the Manichees [*K*], who by their objections very

uncleanneſs of the fleſh could not taint the purity of the ſpirit, or deprive it of the grace of the Creator. It is very evident to what abominations this deteſtable principle leads, which formed in the Eaſt a ſecond ſort of Origeniſts, whoſe leudneſs was ſo notorious, that they were named *infamous* and *diſſolute* ‡. This double Origeniſm, the one carnal, the other ſpiritual, is atteſted by St Epiphanius. So that it ought not to be taken for the invention of an hiſtorian who would diſcover in paſt ages, the original picture of what happens in ours. Much leſs ſhould it be looked upon as a piece of artifice to procure an opportunity of entering into an explanation upon the preſent ſtate of affairs . . . . If the execrable Molinos, as much the reverſe as he was of the chaſte Origen, yet became as well as he the head both of a ſpiritual, and of a carnal hereſy, we need not wonder at it. ‡‡ The moſt ſpiritual hereſy, if it has never ſo little relation to the rule of morality and practice, opens the way to the moſt monſtrous diſorders. One groans and accuſes himſelf after the commiſſion of a bad action, which, he ſays, he could not avoid, God having denied him his grace. Another, from that notion, that God denied him the means of avoiding that action, concludes that it cannot be criminal, and ſo he commits it without bluſhing. The difference between the one and the other is often only in the way of ſpeaking. This ſpeaks as he thinks himſelf, and the other as he would have the world to think of him (71).'

[*I*] *That carnal ſort of Origeniſm . . . . was eaſier to ſuppreſs than the ſpiritual Origeniſm which was a ſort of Quietiſm.*] 'This ſeems incredible, and yet deſerves to be carefully obſerved, viz. that a carnal hereſy is leſs to be feared by the church (72), than thoſe which follow the ſtricteſt regulation of morals. Of this the double Origeniſm is alone a ſufficient evidence. The carnal laſted but a very ſhort time, and was abhorred by all the world; even thoſe who were infected with it did not dare to produce ſuch a dreadful doctrine in the face of the world: whereas the ſpiritual Origeniſm, the followers of which were, according to * St Epiphanius himſelf, irreproachable as to the purity of their lives, could not be extinguiſhed till two centuries after its firſt appearance: ſo effectually did the probity of thoſe who profeſſed it, cover obſtinacy and pride, under the ſpecious appearance of an exemplary piety (73).'

I ſhall borrow one paſſage more from Father Doucin. *Evagrius . . . . deacon of the church of Conſtantinople went to Jeruſalem, and from thence to Egypt, to ſhut himſelf up in ſolitude . . . . His head was full of nothing but his Origen . . . . Scarce had he entered his deſert, when the Origeniſt Monks, ſenſible of his worth, placed him at their head, and for that reaſon the church has ſince condemned him as one of the heads of that ſect. He ſpent his time in writing ſpiritual books which were infinitely eſteemed, and by the fragments remaining of them to this day appear in reality to be very fine. By this means the error made inconceivable progreſs, which was ſoon perceived by St Epiphanius, and St Jerome, on his ſide, cautioned the faithful againſt it.* '*Evagrius, ſaid he, that man who comes from the North, who from his ſolitude writes letters all over the world, ſends inſtructions to virgins, to monks, and to her whoſe name ſeems to import the darkneſs and blackneſs of hereſy (he ſpeaks of Melania) that man has thought fit to publiſh a book of maxims, by which he pretends to ſtrip man of all ſenſe of paſſions.*' *This is juſt the pretended perfection of the Quietiſts.* '*That is to ſay, adds St Jerome, Evagrius will, of his perfect man, make either a god or a ſtone* (74).'

[*K*] *The errors of Origen ſeemed to be of ſufficient force to refute the Manichees.*] Upon this head eſpecially it will be proper for me to make uſe of borrowed expreſſions. *Palladius was brought up by Evagrius in a monaſtic life; and he knew at leaſt as well as he* how to ſucceed in the art of making the moſt of a ſect. 'The women, eſpecially ſuch of them as could read, loved to converſe with him, and were eaſieſt gained by his artful language. His cuſtom was to begin with raiſing a ſuſpicion of the orthodox belief by repreſenting it as full of abſurdities, from which it could not be cleared but by Origen's principles. He would aſk them, for inſtance, ** What ill has that child done, who you ſee is ſo tormented and poſſeſſed by the Devil? At what age ſhall we riſe again? Muſt it be the ſame age at which we die? &c (75). . . . . Thus it was, that Palladius made Origeniſm paſs for a ſyſtem neceſſary to the eaſy and plain explication of that, which till then had ſeemed to be the ſtumbling-block of our religion. A doctrine, thus ſet forth by the greateſt men of the age, could not but meet with great reception, eſpecially conſidering the diſpoſition of the minds of men which then prevailed. Their whole ſtudy at that time was to anſwer the Manichees, whoſe ſect was become more numerous and more flouriſhing than ever. If there is but one God, ſaid thoſe heretics, who is omnipotent and infinitely good, how can he permit this deluge of evils which happen in the world, and in which ſo many are involved from their nativity, while others are born in proſperity and affluence of fortune. Notwithſtanding the apparent abſurdity of the doctrine of two principles, the one good, the other bad, equally powerful and independent of one another, it found an infinite multitude of followers, who were of the opinion that the evils of this life could not be accounted for, without it. It is well known what efforts St Auſtin made to ſatisfy them upon that head. We know likewiſe, that Pelagius, who came after him, and whoſe doctrine was preſently very much reliſhed, applyed himſelf particularly to remove that very ſcandal, and to anſwer the queſtion then ſo much canvaſſed: Whence comes evil, and what is the origin of it? Now this origin of evil, and of the diverſity of what each perſon ſuffers, was accounted for by none with more probability than by the Origeniſts (76).'

Note, That the Origeniſt of the *Parrhaſiana* makes an eternal beatitude to ſucceed the torments, which the damned ſhall undergo for ſome ages (77). That takes off the moſt ſhocking of all the difficulties urged by the Manichees, namely, the eternity of the moral and phyſical evil of Hell. But Father Doucin gives a different account of Origen's doctrine, and makes it leſs appoſite for anſwering theſe heretics; for he affirms, that he equally rejected the eternity of bliſs. Beſides that Origen 'thought it ſavoured of cruelty to make the puniſhment of the damned eternal, this eternity of puniſhment appeared to him inconſiſtent with the eſſential character of created Beings, which is inſtability. He would have it therefore that juſt as much as God is incapable of change, ſo much the creature is incapable of being fixed to any thing that is permanent and eternal, whether it be happineſs or miſery. Accordingly he pretended, that when all the ſpirits purified from their ſtains, ſhould have re-entered the divinity †† of which, according to him they are an emanation, they would go off anew from his boſom, like ſparks from a furnace, and by way of puniſhment for this levity ⸸⸸ be condemned to re-enter new bodies; for which there would be a neceſſity of creating new worlds, and ſo through all eternity there would be nothing but periodical revolutions, like to thoſe of the ſeaſons (78).' Father Doucin's marginal note is worth our reciting, for it informs us, that there was in the Origeniſm a branch of Spinoſiſm, namely, the identity of all ſpirits with the Deity. This is what this author obſerves, After citing St Jerome: 'That Ruffinus has ſuppreſſed this paſſage in his tranſlation. Read the laſt chapter of the third book, where theſe words, *& erit Deus omnia in omnibus*, are explained at large. St Jerome goes on thus: 'Ne parvam eſſe putaremus impietatem eorum quæ præmiſerat, in ejuſdem voluminis (quarti) fine, conjungit omnes rationabiles naturas, id eſt, Patrem & Filium & Spiritum ſanctum, Angelos, Poteſtates, Dominationes, cæteraſque Virtutes, ipſum quoque hominem ſecundum animæ dignitatem unius eſſe ſubſtantiæ . . . . Et qui in alio

---

‡ *Hæreſ.* 63, 64. Horum vero hæreſis ad Epiphanis dogma conformata videtur de quo in Gnoſticorum ſecta ſermonem antea fecimus . . . nuptias repudiant neque tamen obſcœnis libidinibus modum ullis adhibent, adeoque omni genere ſpurcitiæ & corpus ſuum, & mentem animumque contaminant. *Ib.*

‡‡ See what Huetius ſays to prove that there was only one Origen.

(71) *Doucin, ubi ſupra, pag.* 139.

(72) *See the* Penſees Diverſes ſur les Cometes §. clxxxix, cxc.

* Nam licet nullum ſectatoribus ſuis uſum turpitudinis imponat. *Hæreſ.* 64.

(73) *Doucin, ib. pag.* 141.

(74) *Doucin, ubi ſupra, pag.* 177. *& ſeq.*

** *Hier. Ep.* 27.

(75) *Doucin ib. pag.* 180.

(76) *Doucin, ib. pag.* 182.

(77) See the remark [*E*], citat. (40).

†† In libro quoque tertio περὶ ἀρχῶν & poſt diſputationem longiſſimam ad extremum intulit, *& erit Deus omnia in omnibus*, ut univerſa natura corporea in eam redigatur ſubſtantiam quæ omnibus melior eſt in divinam ſcilicet, quâ nulla eſt melior. *Origen. apud Hier. Epiſt. ad Avit.*

⸸⸸ Hier. Ep. ad Avit. & Apol. 2.

(78) *Doucin, ubi ſupra, pag.* 338.

very much embarraſſed the Orthodox. One of the beſt books of this author, is his anſwer to Celſus the Philoſopher, which was publiſhed in French, ann. 1700 [*L*].

I have ſpoken of ſome other editions in remark [*A*] of the article PERSONA. See the margn (*i*).

(*i*) His treatiſe of Prayer, never printed before, was publiſhed in Greek and Latin at Oxford in 1686. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for June 1686, Art. VIII. It is ſaid in the Preface, that Iſaac Voſſius had bought the manuſcript at Stockholm; but the truth is, as I have ſince learned from a letter of Mr Huet that was ſhewn me, that Voſſius carried it to Stockholm, having bought it about the year 1636, of Mr Rums, the queen of Bohemia's Phyſician, who had bought it of the ſoldiers who had pillaged the library of Worms. This manuſcript paſſed from the hands of Iſaac Voſſius to Herbert Thorndike, and then to Dr Gale, who put it into the archives of Trinity-College in Cambridge. See *Dr Cave, de Script. Eccleſ. Part. ii, pag.* 30. *Edit. Genev.* 1699.

'loco Filium & Spiritum ſanctum non vult de Patris 'eſſe ſubſtantia, ne divinitatem in partes ſecare videa'tur, naturam omnipotentis Dei Angelis hominibuſ'que largitur. Ex quo concluditur (inquit) Deum & 'hæc quodammodo unius eſſe ſubſtantiæ. Unum ad'dit verbum, quodammodo, ut tanti ſacrilegii crimen 'effugeret. See *l.* 3. cap. 16 (79). - - - - *That we 'may not ſuppoſe thoſe things which he had premiſed in 'the end of that fourth volume, to have contained a ſmall 'degree of impiety, he ſubjoins that all rational natures, 'that is, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, Angels, Pow'ers, Dominions, and other Virtues, and alſo even man 'himſelf, as to the dignity of his ſoul, are of one ſubſtance. '. . . . And he who in another place will not allow 'the Son and Holy Ghoſt to be of the ſubſtance of the Fa'ther, for fear the Divinity ſhould ſeem divided into 'parts, diſpoſes of the nature of the omnipotent GOD to 'angels and to men. From whence we may conclude '(ſays he), that GOD and theſe Beings are all in ſome 'meaſure of one ſubſtance. He adds, that cautious ex'preſſion, in ſome meaſure, the better to avoid the charge 'of that ſacrilegious impiety.*

(79) Doucin, Hiſt. de l'Orig. *pag.* 339.

[*L*] *Origen's anſwer to Celſus the Philoſopher, was publiſhed in French.*] The author of that verſion is Mr Bouhéreau (80) ſo well known by the learned letters written to him by Tanaquillus Faber of Samur. The merit of that performance being ſufficiently made known by our Journaliſts (81), it is unneceſſary for me to take notice of it. I ſhall only ſay one thing to confirm an obſervation I have oftentimes made, that we ought not to depend very much upon facts related in converſation. I have heard a great many perſons ſay, that ſome of great authority in the reformed church of Paris, and particularly Mr Claude, diſſuaded Mr Bouhéreau from tranſlating that book into French, in regard that it was not proper for all the world to ſee the Pagan Philoſopher's objections, and compare them with Origen's anſwers. But Mr Bouhéreau relates this in a different manner. He ſays (82) *ſome perſons of diſtinguiſhed worth, and* among others *the famous Mr Claude, thought* (83) *it dangerous to put Origen in every one's hands, on account of ſome peculiar opinions, which he has always been reproached with.* Here you ſee a very wide difference between what I have ſo often been told, and what I learn from Mr Bouhéreau himſelf, who muſt know the matter of fact better than any one elſe. And yet, though he has not ſaid one word relating to that pretended reaſon of Mr Claude's advice, our Journaliſts however have mentioned and condemned it (84). Without doubt they had heard it as well as I. I have likewiſe been told, that the tranſlator was fully perſuaded, that, the tacking together all the paſſages quoted out of Celſus by Origen, would reſtore Celſus's book entire. But ſince he makes no ſuch obſervation, either in his preface or in his remarks, I give no credit to the authors of this aſſertion. Nothing could more effectually have demonſtrated Origen's ſincerity; why therefore was not this obſerved in his favour in the preface to that tranſlation?

(80) He is a native of Rochelle. In the epiſtles of Tanaquillus Faber he his called Elias Boherellus.

(81) *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans, *Dec* 1699. *pag.* 519, *and the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *Jan.* 1700, *p.* 3.

(82) In his preface.

(83) See what has been offered againſt a reflexion of the ſame kind, in the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres*, for June 1686. *pag.* 691.

(84) Hiſt. des Ouv. des Savans, *Dec.* 1699, *pag.* 522, *and* Nouvell. de la Republ. des Lettres, *Jan.* 1700. *pag.* 11.

OROBIO (ISAAC) a Jewiſh Phyſician, died at Amſterdam in 1687. See the Bibliotheque Univerſelle (*a*).

(*a*) *Tom. VII, pag.* 289. *& ſeq.*

OROSIUS (PAUL) a Spaniſh prieſt, flouriſhed in the beginning of the Vth century. Conſult Moreri; to avoid the repetition of what he has ſaid, I ſhall forbear giving the Hiſtory of Oroſius, but ſhall content myſelf with correcting ſome errors relating to him. Thoſe who have made him a monk, and placed his death in the year 471 [*A*], are even more miſtaken than thoſe who have made him a Pagan [*B*], and as much as ſome others who have made him a biſhop. It is falſe, that St Auſtin deſired him to *write the Hiſtory of the moſt remarkable events ſince the time of* JESUS CHRIST [*C*], and that Oroſius compoſed that Hiſtory after the death

[*A*] *Thoſe who have made him a Monk, and placed his death in the year* 471.] You will find their names in Philip Elſſius, whoſe credulity did well deſerve this cenſure of Father Labbe: 'Ut omittam fabuloſos quoſ'dam Hiſpanos ſcriptores, quos citat ſequiturque Phi'lippus Elſſius, qui Auguſtinianis ſuis Eremitis ac'cenſet, vitamque ejus prorogat uſque ad annum 471, 'quo centenario majorem in Carthagine Spartaria in 'Hiſpaniis obiiſſe contendit, atque inde Romam aſpor'tatum, & in Eccleſia S. Euſebii, ubi partruus ejus ja'cebat, ſepultum. Sed hæc penitus incerta dubiæque 'fidei. Quid quod & nonnulli Legionenſem Epiſco'pum fuiſſe putent (1)? - - - - *That I may paſs by ſome 'fabulous Spaniſh writers, quoted and credited by Philip 'Elſſius, who places him among his Monks of St Auſtin, 'and extends his life to the year* 471, *inſiſting that he 'died above an hundred years old at Carthagena in Spain, 'from whence he was carried to Rome, and buried in 'his uncle's grave, in the church of St Euſebius. But 'all this is of very doubtful and uncertain credit. As alſo, 'what ſome have believed, that he was Biſhop of Leon.*

(1) Philippus Labbe, Diſſert. de Script Eccleſ. *Tom. II. p.* 175.

[*B*] *Theſe who have made him a Pagan.*] Father Garaſſe has been guilty of this blunder, and that upon the occaſion of his endeavouring to convince impious men from the teſtimony of infidels. *The ſecond wonder of nature,* ſays he (2), *which I ſhall here bring for an evidence, ſhall be the aſhy apples of Gomorrah, and the pillar of ſalt, two authentic facts, atteſted not only by the ſacred Hiſtorians, and the Fathers who have written on the* 19*th chapter of Geneſis, but likewiſe by all the profane hiſtorians who ſpeak of the lake Aſphaltites, ſuch as Joſephus, Solinus, Oroſius, Pliny, and Tacitus.* Here obſerve another blunder of Garaſſe; he falſely aſſerts, that Solinus, Pliny, and Tacitus, have made mention of the pillar of ſalt.

(2) Garaſſe, Somme Theologique, *pag.* 192.

[*C*] *It is falſe that St Auſtin deſired him to write the hiſtory of the moſt remarkable events, ſince the time of Jeſus Chriſt.*] 'The city of Rome being 'taken in 410 by Alaric king of the Goths, the Hea'thens, to render the Chriſtians odious, charged them 'with being the cauſe of that misfortune, and of all 'the calamities which oppreſſed the Roman empire. 'It was in vindication of the Chriſtians from that aſ'perſion, that Paulus Oroſius undertook at St Au'ſtin's deſire to compile the hiſtory of the moſt re'markable events from the coming of our Saviour to 'his own time; in order to ſhew, that great calami'ties had always happened in the world from time to 'time; and that the Roman empire had never been 'freer from them, than ſince the nativity of Jeſus 'Chriſt (3).' I recite Mr du Pin's words ſomething 'the more at length, becauſe they will be able to ac'quaint my readers with the occaſion and deſign of that work of Oroſius: but I muſt have leave to obſerve, that St Auſtin did not confine himſelf to the events which appeared after the nativity of our Saviour; he

(3) Du Pin Nouv. Biblioth. *Tom. III. p* 156. *Edition of Amſterdam.*

death of St Auſtin [*D*]. Iſaac Caſaubon is not juſtly to be blamed for his contempt of

he deſired an univerſal collection of the greateſt calamities, which had been recorded in hiſtory. ‘ Præceperas mihi, *it is Oroſius that ſpeaks* (4) uti adverſus vaniloquam pravitatem eorum, qui alieni à civitate dei, ex locorum agreſtium compitis & pagis pagani vocantur, ſive gentiles, quia terrena ſapiunt: qui cum futura non quærant, præterita autem aut obliviſcantur, aut neſciant, præſentia tantum tempora veluti malis extra ſolitum infeſtiſſima, ob hoc ſolum, quod creditur CHRISTUS, & colitur deus, idola autem minus coluntur, infamant: præceperas ergo ut ex omnibus, qui haberi ad præſens poſſunt, hiſtoriarum atque annalium faſtis, quæcunque aut bellis gravia, aut corrupta morbis, aut ſanè triſtia, aut terrarum motibus terribilia, aut inundationibus aquarum inſolita, aut eruptionibus ignium metuenda, aut ictibus fulminum plagiſque grandinum ſæva, vel etiam parricidiis flagitiiſque miſera, per tranſacta retrò ſæcula reperiſſem, ordinato breviter voluminis textu explicarem. - - - - *You enjoined me, in order to oppoſe the malicious and vain clamours of thoſe, who being ſtrangers to the city of God, from the ſtreets and villages in the country, take the name of Pagans, or that of Gentiles, becauſe of their regarding only the things of this world; who making no enquiries into futurity, and either forgetful or ignorant of the paſt, defame only the preſent times as more than ordinary calamitious, for this ſole cauſe, becauſe CHRIST is confeſſed, GOD worſhipped, and Idolatry declining: you enjoined me therefore, to extract out of all the hiſtories and annals now remaining, as many inſtances, as I could find, of times paſt, either diſtracted with wars, or viſited with diſtempers, or truly tragical, or alarmed with earthquakes, or extraordinary for inundations, or terrified with fiery eruptions, or puniſhed with hail and thunder, or made miſerable by crimes and parricides, and to compoſe a volume of them in a ſhort and regular method.*’ Of the ſeven books of which that volume of Oroſius conſiſts, only the laſt treats of thoſe events which happened ſince the time of Chriſt. Beſides, I make ſome doubt whether this author undertook to ſhew, that the Roman empire was never more exempt from misfortunes than ſince Chriſtianity. He would have found it a very difficult taſk to prove this. Gennadius ſeems to me to give a much better account of this Hiſtorian's deſign, he makes it appear, ſays he, that the Chriſtian religion is the cauſe why the Roman government, which did not deſerve ſo long a duration, continued ſtill in being (5). I know very well, that Oroſius challenges the Infidels to mention any period of time, ſo remarkable for proſperity, as that under Honorius; but this does not juſtify what I have been here criticiſing. ‘ Ex quo utcunque conceſſerim, ut licenter Chriſtiana tempora reprehendantur, ſi quid à conditione mundi uſque ad nunc ſimili factum felicitate doceatur. Manifeſtavimus, ut arbitror, atque oſtendimus non magis verbo pene quàm digito innumera bella ſopita, plurimos extinctos tyrannos, compreſſas, coanguſtatas, addictas, exinanitaſque immaniſſimas gentes minimo ſanguine, nullo certamine, ac pene ſine cæde (6). - - - - *From whence however I may grant, that the Chriſtian times may freely be branded, if any age ſince the creation of the world can be ſhewn comparable to the preſent, in regard to proſperity. We have proved I think and demonſtrated, not only by deſcribing in words but by pointing out even with the finger, what a great number of wars have been ſuppreſſed, how many tyrants have been taken off, and the moſt barbarous nations reſtrained, reduced, ſubdued, and extinguiſhed, almoſt without blood or reſiſtance.*’ Perhaps Mr du Pin, in ſpeaking of Oroſius's ſcheme, was thinking of a paſſage of another Father which he did not remember ſo diſtinctly as to forbear aſcribing it to Oroſius. It is aſſerted in this paſſage, that the goſpel had abated the fury of war, which had cauſed ſo many deſolations in the world before the time of the apoſtles. ‘ Quanquam iſta quæ dicitis bella Religionis noſtræ ob invidiam commoveri, non ſit difficile comprobare, poſt auditum Chriſtum in mundo non tantum non aucta, verum etiam majore ex parte furiarum compreſſionibus imminuta. Nam cum hominum vis tanta magiſteriis ejus acceperimus ac legibus, malum malo rependi non oportere; injuriam perpeti quam irrogare eſſe præſtantius; ſuum potius fundere, quam alieno polluere manus & conſcientiam cruore: habet à Chriſto beneficium jamdudum orbis ingratus, per quem feritatis mollita eſt rabies, atque hoſtiles manus cohibere à ſanguine cognati animantis occœpit. (7). - - - - *Altho' you charge our religion with being the cauſe of wars, it is not difficult to prove, ſince the time of CHRIST, wars are not only not increaſed, but very much abated as to their fury. For ſince the violence of men had been reſtrained, by it's maxims, that evil ſhould not be repaid with evil; that it is better to bear with injuries, than to return them; that we ſhould rather part with our own, than pollute our hands and conſciences with the blood of others: the ungrateful world has long ſince received this benefit from CHRIST; that thro' him barbarity has been aſſuaged, and men have begun to leave off embrewing their hands in the blood of their fellow creatures.*’ The argument of Arnobius may be reduced to this: thoſe who have embraced the goſpel have learned to bear injuries, and not to oppoſe force to force; they have thrown off the ſentiments of violence; they are become meek and peaceable: ſo that ſince the publication of the goſpel, the effuſion of human blood, and the fury of war, are leſs than before, ſince a great number of perſons have embraced Chriſtianity. Arnobius adds, that the reaſon why wars are not altogether at an end, is, becauſe all men have not followed the precepts of of Chriſt Jeſus. *Quod ſi omnes omnino, qui homines ſe eſſe non ſpecie corporum, ſed rationis intelligunt poteſtate, ſalutaribus ejus pacificiſque decretis aurem vellent commodare pauliſper, & non faſtu & ſupercilio luminis, ſuis potius ſenſibus, quam illius commonitionibus crederent: univerſus jam dudum orbis mitiora in opera converſis uſibus ferri, tranquillitate in molliſſima degeret, & in concordiam ſalutarem incorruptis fœderum ſanctionibus conveniret* (8). Now if an author ſhould miſtake the one for the other, I mean aſcribe to Oroſius what belongs really to Arnobius, he might eaſily advance, that Oroſius makes it appear, that the Roman empire was never freer from misfortunes, than ſince the nativity of Jeſus Chriſt. But after all it ought to be obſerved, that Arnobius does not at all prove this; for, beſides that a bare aſſertion, without any deduction of particular facts, is not of ſufficient force to ſatisfy the complaints then made by the Heathens, it muſt be agreed, that Arnobius here offers but a very ſlender proof. Suppoſing part of the inhabitants of a vaſt empire ſhould diſclaim all revenge, and induſtriouſly cultivate the meek ſpirit of the goſpel, can that hinder foreigners from invading and ravaging that empire, and introducing ſuch confuſion and calamity as it never felt before? Now this is the very complaint that Arnobius pretends to refute (9). He alledges other very pertinent reaſons againſt the ſame aſperſion of the Heathens, as well as againſt that which was founded upon the peſtilences and famines which infeſted the Roman empire: but at the ſame time we muſt acknowledge, that he likewiſe makes uſe of ſuch ſcandalous arguments, that I do not believe Epicurus or Lucretius could have attacked the Divine providence with greater force, or have ridiculed thoſe who attribute the afflictions of mankind to the divine wrath, more than he has done.

[*D*] . . . . *and that Oroſius compoſed that hiſtory after the death of St Auſtin.*] Andreas Schottus, the Jeſuit, falls into this error. ‘ Defuncto, *ſays he* (10), hac mortali vita S. Auguſtino Romæ degebat, ubi *ſeptem contra Gentes libris* res Græcorum Romanorumque domi militiæque geſtas fideliter eo potiſſimum conſilio contexuit, quo ethnicorum calumniam quæ Chriſtianis mala calamitateſque temere imputabat refelleret. . . . floruit autem anno à nato Chriſto CCCCXL. . . . . *He lived at Rome after the death of St Auſtin, where he compoſed ſeven books againſt the Gentiles containing the tranſactions of the Greeks and Romans, the principal view of which was to refute the calumny of the Gentiles, in raſhly imputing all misfortunes and calamities to the Chriſtians. . . . He flouriſhed in the year of Chriſt* 440.’ St Auſtin died in 430. Now, it is certain that Oroſius put the finiſhing hand to his book (11), when Vallia, king of the Goths, was concluding a treaty of peace with the emperor Honorius, that is, in 416. The laſt words of his hiſtory are addreſſed to St Auſtin, as being then in perfect health; and we learn from another paſſage (12), that St Auſtin had publiſhed no more than the ten firſt books of his *De Civitate Dei*, when Oroſius was compiling his work, according to the ſcheme laid down for him by that ſaint.

[*E*] *Ca-*

---

(4) *In Proœmio Libri i.* See likewiſe the concluſion of the work.

(5) Oſtendit magis Chriſtianæ obſervantiæ eſſe quod contra meritum ſuum Reſp. Romana adhuc duraret, & pace culturæ Dei pacatum retineret imperium. *Gennadius in vita Oroſii.*

(6) Oroſius, *lib.* vii.

(7) Arnobius, *lib.* i. *pag.* 5.

(8) Id. ib. *p.* 6.

(9) Nam quod nobis objectare conſueſtis bellorum frequentium cauſas, vaſtationes urbium, Germanorum & Scythicas irruptiones, cum pace hoc veſtra & cum bona venia dixerim, quale ſit iſtud quod dicitur, calumniarum libidine non videtis. *Id. ib. pag.* 5.

(10) Bibliotheca Hiſpanica, *pag.* 206.

(11) See the concluſion of his *Hiſtory.*

(12) Oroſius *in Proœmio* Hiſtoriæ.

of this performance [*E*], though after all it is in ſome meaſure uſeful, and has bore ſeveral editons [*F*]. That which I make uſe of is of Cologne, in 1572, and does not contain ſo many of Francis Fabricius's notes as I could wiſh.

It is believed Oroſius gave his work the title *De Miſeria Hominum*; which is a very proper one, and agreeable to Hiſtory in general, as a judicious author has very well obſerved [*G*].

[*E*] *Caſaubon's contempt of this performance.*] He has expreſſed it in very civil terms, and with great encomiums on Oroſius's zeal. ' Oroſium ex quo multa in hoc ſermone deſcribit, ſcriptorem alioquin optimum & zelo domus Dei plenum, ſi nimiæ facilitatis in talibus credendis poſtulaverimus, non deerunt viri præſtantiſſimi, quorum exemplo factum tueamur: non rationes validiſſimæ, quibus ſanctum virum ταχυπειθίας, & nimiæ credulitatis, reum peragamus. Taceo rerum Romanarum ignorationem aliquando mirificam; etiam Baronio teſte non ſemel (13). . . . . *If we ſhould accuſe Oroſius of too great credulity, in regard to a great many things delivered in this work of his, tho' otherwiſe an excellent writer, and full of zeal for God's houſe, there would not be wanting either the authority of the greateſt men, to ſupport this charge by their own example, or the moſt powerful arguments to prove this holy man guilty of a too eaſy and ſuperſtitious belief. I paſs by the ſurpriſing ignorance he ſometimes ſhews in the Roman affairs; which even Baronius more than once acknowledges.*' Lipſius has not treated him ſo gently; for after taking notice that Oroſius thought that Tiberius had impriſoned Druſus, he adds, ' At me non valde movent ejuſmodi ſcriptores legitimæ hiſtoriæ (dicam iratis quorumdam auribus) dehoneſtamenta (14). - - - - *But I am not much concerned about ſuch ſort of writers, who are the diſgrace of true hiſtory.*' In another place, after regretting the loſs of ſome books of Tacitus, he cries out in this apoſtrophe. ' Adeo bonis illis patribus cura otiumque fuit deſcribere Oroſios & Vopiſcos & hujuſmodi quiſquilias præ tuo auro (15). - - - - *So much care and pains did thoſe good fathers take to deſcribe the Oroſius's and Vopiſcus's, and ſuch ſort of trumpery before thy valuable treaſure.*' This ſally of Lipſius does not pleaſe me ſo well as the moderate cenſure of Caſaubon and Voſſius. The latter contents himſelf with telling us, that Oroſius did not underſtand Greek; that he often errs in Chronology, and that he is too apt to rely on popular reports. *Eſt Oroſius ſcriptor plane utilis: ſed qui ſcriptores Græcos non legerit: imo Græcarum literarum expers fuerit. In temporibus etiam crebro fallitur. Ut vel illa oſtendunt, quæ in eo caſtigavit Scaliger in animadverſionibus Euſebianis. Sæpius etiam vulgares ſectatur opiniones, quam hiſtoricum* (16). *Perquirat, cujus eſt omnia ad veritatis trutinam expendere* (17).

[*F*] *It has bore ſeveral editions.*] The hiſtory of Paulus Oroſius was printed at Paris in 1506, by Petit, as Mr du Pin aſſures us (18). Geſner (19) does not mention that edition. The moſt antient that he ſpeaks of, is that of Paris in 1524, *apud Johannem Parvum aut Petrum Vidovæum in folio*. He adds, that a more correct edition was printed at Cologne in 1536, *apud Cervicornum* in 8vo, and ſince that another at the ſame place, in 1542, *apud Jaſparem Genepæum*, in 8vo. This laſt I have ſeen: Johannis Cæſarius wrote the Epiſtle Dedicatory to it, and made ſome corrections of the text. Francis Fabricius of Duren publiſhing this book in 1561, at Cologne, *apud Maternum Cholinum*, in 8vo, ſpeaks of two former editions which were full of faults; one of which two editions muſt be that of 1526 (20), as appears from Fabricius's words (21); ' Hoc dico, dolendum fuiſſe, tanti viri tam fructuoſam Hiſtoriam adeo mendoſe hactenus in manibus verſari. Contulerat eam cum aliquot manuſcriptis exemplaribus ante annos XXV Gerardus Bolſuinge: laboravit deinde in eadem emendanda doctiſſ. vir Johannes Cæſarius: ſed profecto neceſſe eſt, ut vel eorum exemplaria non fuerint diligenter ſatis deſcripta, vel ipſi parum accurate opus perſpexerint. Tot menda relicta ab illis deprehendi, poſtquam eorum libros cum tribus manuſcriptis conferre cœpi. - - - - *This I ſay, that it was much to be lamented, we ſhould hitherto have met with no more correct editions of ſo uſeful a hiſtory, compoſed by ſo great a man. Gerard Bolſuinge had collated it with ſome manuſcript copies twenty-five years before: then the moſt learned John Cæſarius undertook the correction of it: but in good truth it muſt have happened, either that their copies were very incorrect, or themſelves very careleſs in their performances. So many errors have eſcaped them, as I have found upon comparing their editions with three manuſcripts.*' The edition of Fabricius was publiſhed again at Cologne in 1572, in 8vo, and printed by the ſame Bookſeller; to which was added the apology *de Arbitrii libertate* (22). Father Labbe (23) ſpeaks of this laſt edition, as if it had been publiſhed in 1574. I have a copy which bears that date. Mr du Pin (24) refers it to the year 1582. Father Labbe (25) makes mention of an edition at Paris in 1526, and of another at Mentz in 1615, *cum notis Latii & Schotte* (26), *quam nondum vidi*, adds he. I am apt to believe the figures are wrong printed, and ſo for one edition we have two or three. For inſtance, Mr du Pin's edition of 1506, and Father Labbe's of 1526, ſeem to me to differ only by an error of the preſs. But I leave the determination of this matter to thoſe who can come at the ſeveral editions, and have the opportunity of comparing them.

Mr Van Dale, Phyſician at Haerlem, and famous for his treatiſe *de Oraculis*, &c. has been ſo kind as to acquaint me, that he has an edition of Oroſius, printed at Venice, *Opera & expenſis Bernardini Veneti de Vitalibus anno ab incarnatione Domini MD. die XII, Menſis Octobris regnante Domino Auguſtino Barbadico.*

[*G*] De Miſeria hominum *was a very proper title, and agreeable to hiſtory in general, as a very judicious author has very well obſerved.*] This author is James Bongars: See the preface he has prefixed to the collection he has made of ſeveral Hiſtorians of the Cruſades. He advertizes his reader, that there are none but impious and wicked men, who can ever urge in prejudice to virtue the inſtances of the wickedneſs, ſuperſtition, and impiety, recorded by thoſe writers; for Hiſtorians, continues he, do not relate what ought to be done, but what is actually done: *Annalium Conſcriptores*, ſays one of them (27), *non qualia optant ipſi, ſed qualia miniſtrant tempora, mandare ſolent literis ex officio.* Hiſtory is the mirrour of human life; now the condition of human life is ſuch, that the number of wicked and impious men, as well as that of fools muſt be infinite; hiſtory is nothing elſe but a repreſentation of the miſery of mankind. ' Eſt humanæ vitæ ſpeculum, Hiſtoria: humanæ vero vitæ, ea ratio, ut non ſtultorum tantum, ſed improborum etiam atque impiorum infinitus ſit numerus. Itaquæ rectè omnino ſuam Paulus Oroſius de *Miſeria hominum* inſcripſit *. Etenim quid aliud Hiſtoria? cujus in ipſo limine, primi parentis ſtultum cupidinem, impium animum horreas: mox madefactam ſanguine fraterno magnam Matrem: inde in omne ſcelus præcipitatum genus humanum. . . . . Itaque, ex uſu & multitudine qui patrocinium vitiis quærit, is omnium ætatum, omniumque gentium hiſtoriographos, is hodie hominum univerſitatem, à ſe habeat. Idem vero ſciat: cum de Veritate, cum de Virtute quæritur, illud diſceſſionem locum non habere: *Hæc pars major eſſe videtur*; ideo enim pejor, qui major (28).' Obſerve carefully what Bongars ſays, that at the beginning of Hiſtory we meet with the folly and impiety of the firſt man; this is the firſt ſtep the reader takes: the next ſtep is upon the earth ſoaked with the blood of one brother, ſhed by the other. What conformity is here to be ſeen between the foundation of the univerſe, and that of Rome (29)! I have taken notice elſewhere (30) of Malherbe's reflexion on the action of Cain.

(13) Caſaub. exercit. I. *in* Baronium *n*. 12. *pag. m.* 85.

(14) Lipſius, in Tacit. Annal. *lib. iv. pag. m.* 193.

(15) *Id.* in *lib. v.* Annal Taciti, *pag.* 232.

(16) Here is a groſs error of the preſs: Voſſius had ſaid without doubt, *quam Hiſtorici officium requirat*, or ſomething like it. A little after, there follows, I think, another miſtake, *Haut inutilis Oroſius. Sed Tranquillus ad Tacitum?*

(17) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Latinis, *pag.* 217.

(18) Du Pin, Nouvelle Bibliotheque, *Tom. III. pag.* 156.

(19) In Biblioth. fol. 539, *verſo.*

(20) In effect, it is ſo, for I have ſeen and peruſed it. It is printed at *Cologne apud Eucherium Cervicornum in fol.*

(21) Franciſcus Fabricius Marcoduranus in *Epiſt. nuncupatoria* Oroſii.

(22) *See* Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Lat. *pag.* 218.

(23) De Script. Eccleſ. *Tom II, pag.* 176.

(24) Nouv. Bibl. *Tom. III. pag.* 156.

(25) De Script. Eccleſiaſt. *tom. ii. pag.* 175.

(26) *He ſhould have ſaid*, Ludovici Lautii & Andreæ Schotti.

(27) Gulielmus Tyrius.

* Ita in antiquiſſimo libro inſcriptam Oroſii Hiſtoriam vidimus.

(28) Bongarſius, *Præfatione ad* Geſta Dei per Francos, *in fine.*

(29) Fraterno primi maduerunt ſanguine muri. *With brother's blood the firſt form'd walls were ſtain'd.* Lucan. Parſ. lib. i, ver. 95.

(30) In the remark [*E*] of the article CAIN.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

OSMAN.

OSMAN, emperor of the Turks, was excluded the ſucceſſion to Achmet, his father, by reaſon of his non-age: but Muſtapha, his uncle, who was placed on the throne after the death of Sultan Achmet, in November 1617 (*a*), ſoon manifeſting himſelf unworthy of ſo high a poſt, was remanded to his cell, and the empire conferred upon Oſman. He propoſed to ſignalize his reign by a grand expedition againſt Poland; but it proved unfortunate. This made him conceive an averſion to the Janizaries; and it was believed that, under the pretence of a religious journey, he ſought a fair opportunity of diſbanding that Militia. But they prevented him; for in 1622 they mutinyed in ſuch a manner that they expelled him from his throne [*A*], *non ſine Theſeo*, I mean that religious intrigues had a good ſhare in it (*b*). Muſtapha being reſtored put him to death, and governed ſo fooliſhly, that he was once more depoſed (*c*). This ſecond depoſing ought to be placed to the account of the Alcoran [*B*]; for it was effected in purſuance of a decree of the Turkiſh Pope: as the Mufti may very properly be called.

[*A*] *The Janizaries . . . mutinyed in ſuch a manner, that they expelled Oſman from the throne.*] The particulars of that action, which we meet with in the hiſtory of Baptiſta Nani, are not too long to be here inſerted. ‘The Turks have no ſort of mean or moderation in their paſſions; either they adore their princes as gods, or put them to death as tyrants. The emperor Oſman, who ruled that vaſt ſtate, was in the flower of his age, and not meeting with the ſucceſs he expected in Poland, nor the glory which he had promiſed himſelf from his arms, very much hated the Janizaries, to whom alone he imputed all his ill fortune, and accuſed them of having been as cowardly in the field, as they were inſolent in Conſtantinople. After having concluded a peace upon terms not very honourable, he gave out that he would make a voyage to Mecca, on account of religion, which was looked upon by ſome as an idle diſcourſe, and only a pretence to find an opportunity for continuing longer at quiet in the Seraglio. Others imagined, that he concealed under it a deſign he had to remove the Janiſſaries from the capital city; to lead them into Aſia, and there deliver them up to the Spahi's, their competitors and enemies; to diſband them, and form a new militia. The baggage was ſhipping in the gallies; tents, pavillions, and ſtore of treaſures were carrying thither to ſerve for their voyage, and to honour the ſepulchre of their Prophet with preſents; when the Janizaries began to repreſent to one another, in their diſcourſes, the fatigue and hardſhips, to which, in ſo long a way, they were going to be expoſed, and of the conveniencies they left behind; what made them moſt uneaſy was, their imagining, that the farther they went, the more they ſhould be expoſed to the hatred and cruelty of Oſman. From murmuring in their quarters, they quickly came to mutiny; it was begun by a few, but, all following, they rendevouzed in the place of the Hippodromus, to the number of thirty thouſand. From thence one party ran to the houſe of the Coza, ſo they call the Sultan's preceptor, who was thought to be the promoter of the voyage, but not finding him, they pillaged it in revenge; the reſt haſtened to the Seraglio with loud cries, demanding the heads of the Viſier, of the Chiſlar Aga, and of the Coza. They within were not only deſtitute of force, but alſo of counſel: and they, who by their authority, might have oppoſed the enraged multitude, were the objects of their hatred, and the very perſons demanded, in order to be torn to pieces. The emperor, to appeaſe them, gave orders to tell them he had countermanded the voyage; but this availed nothing towards diſperſing this multitude, which is not to be appeaſed even by the conceſſion of things which were pretended to be the ground of their mutinying, nor would they have ſeparated at all, had there not happened to fall a violent rain, which that ſuperſtitious people look upon as a very unlucky omen. The night, probably, might have extinguiſhed this fury, if ſome men of the Law, who are very much regarded by the ignorant vulgar, had not ſtirred up the Janizaries a-new, declaring Oſman fallen from the empire, for having violated the Alcoran, by ſacrilegious actions. After this, having loſt all reſpect for their prince, they threw ſtones at their Aga, who put them in mind of their oath of fidelity, and repulſed Cuſſain Baſſa, who, to quiet them, offered three hundred thouſand ſequins. Tho' the Seraglio, during the night, had been extraordinarily fortified, yet they found means to force it. They killed at the firſt entry ſome eunuchs, with Chiſlar Aga their chief, and afterwards ſought for Muſtapha, uncle to Oſman, who had formerly ſerved rather as the ſhadow, than as the real head of that empire. They cut off the heads of all thoſe who did not ſhew them where he was, without informing themſelves whether they knew it or not. At laſt, conjecturing, by certain ſigns, that he muſt be in a cave under ground, they ſought him out, and found him there almoſt half dead, having been already kept for two days without ſuſtenance, when he was acquainted with their deſign to make him emperor: he begged above all things that they would give him a few drops of water; but no ſooner was he upon the throne, than he diſcovered that his thirſt was not altogether ſatisfied, but wanted to be quenched with the blood of his nephew. Oſman had hid himſelf, but being found in the night, and committed to the cuſtody of the Buſtangi Baſſa, he was afterwards conducted to the houſe of the Aga of the Janizaries, where was Caſſain Baſſa. Compaſſion began to ſucceed reſentment in the minds of ſome, upon ſeeing this young prince fall from ſo high a ſtation, into ſo great a reverſe of ill fortune, who, in order to gain them over to him effectually, offered the Janizaries fifty ſequins a man. Several of them liſtened to this propoſal, and their chiefs conſulted together about the means to preſerve him, and to re-eſtabliſh him on the throne, when the furious multitude took him out of their hands, and preſented him to Muſtapha. Oſman, with tears, begged his life of his uncle, putting him in mind of the kindneſs he had ſhewn him, contrary to the cuſtom of the Ottomans, in preſerving him for the throne. But, in imitation of the Barbarians, who make deſtiny the author of their villanies, Muſtapha excuſed himſelf, by ſaying, that he knew he had oftentimes decreed his death, but that GOD would never permit it. Thus was he abandoned to the Janizaries, and conducted to the Seven Towers, amidſt the execrations of the people, who having, during his reign, endured famine, peſtilence, and war, deteſted him, as the cauſe of all theſe calamities; and he was no ſooner got to his priſon, but his head was cut off (1).’ We find in the *Mercure François* (2), a much more ample relation of the death of Oſman, and which does not in every point agree with that of Nani. I ſhall only borrow from it two particulars; one is, that the men of the law, and of the ſword, gave Oſman to know, that he could not go to Mecca, without violating the law of Mahomet (3). They had procured this deciſion in writing from the Mufti; but Oſman, paying no regard to it, tore the paper in pieces. The other circumſtance is, that after the election of Muſtapha, there were ſome ſome perſons, who cried up and down the city, *Long live Muſtapha, Sultan of the Turks*, and read, in a ſheet of paper, the cauſes of the depoſing of the Sultan Oſman, *ſetting forth, that he was depoſed for being a* Jour, *that is, an Infidel, and for deſigning to put the empire of the Turks into the hands of the Chriſtian dogs, which they affirmed in order to render him the more odious to the people* (4).

[*B*] *To the account of the Alcoran.*] Muſtapha was a weak prince. The Prime Viſier, and other favourites, hid his weakneſs; they called it ſanctity, devotion, reſignation to the will of GOD. They obliged him to lift up his eyes towards Heaven, when he appeared in public; and forged ſome miracles. The Mufti was not catched in the nooſe. He cauſed a public declaration

---

(*a*) See the *Merc. François*, Tom. v, pag. m. 185, of the year 1617, and pag. 211, of the year 1618.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*].

(*c*) Note, that the firſt depoſing conſiſted in forcing him to ſay, that he voluntarily reſigned the empire. Oſman, in the letter he wrote to Lewis XIII, ſays, that Muſtapha had voluntarily laid down his dignity and deſpiſed it. That Letter is inſerted in the *Mercure François*, ad ann. 1618, pag. 208, 209.

(1) Nani, Hiſtory of Venice, book iv, pag. 126, of the ſecond Tome.

(2) Tom. viii, pag. 357, & ſeq. ad ann. 1622.

(3) Mercure Françoiſe, ibid. pag. 360.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 366.

ration to be made, that the Alcoran forbad obedience to a fool, and that in the reign of ſuch a monarch all prayers were uſeleſs, all marriages invalid. It was become neceſſary therefore to depoſe Muſtapha; Amurath, the brother of Oſman, was advanced in his room. *Il qual (Muſtapha) era huomo ſtolido, e la ſtolidezza di lui ſi ſpacciava per Saintità, e raſſegnatione in Dio da Daret Primo Viſir, e da gli altri corteggiani, facendolo ſempre guardar in cielo, quando uſciva in publico, e fingendo miracoli: fu depoſto, havendo il Mufti promulgato, che l' Alcorano vietava l' obbedienza ad un Re inſenſato, durante il quale erano inefficaci l' orationi, e invalidi i matrimonii* (5). There is no nation in the world that ſpeaks more advantageouſly of their monarchs, and of the obedience due to them, than the Turks: they are utter ſtrangers to the great diſputes of the weſtern Politicians, concerning the origin of ſovereignty: they never ſpeak one word of any original contract between kings and their people; they never enquire whether the right of governing is derived from the people, nor how far it is communicable. According to their maxim, the beſt form of government is the deſpotic power of a monarch; to die in obedience to the Sultan, is a ſtep by which they are to aſcend to the higheſt ſtations of Paradiſe (6). Who would not believe, from all this, that the throne of the Grand Seignor is fixed upon an immovable foundation? And yet, if we conſult hiſtory, we ſhall find there are no monarchs in the world whoſe authority is more precarious than that of the Ottoman emperors. Their ſubjects are not ſatisfied with mutinying againſt them, with dethroning them, and ſtrangling them before the concluſion of their rebellion; they likewiſe make uſe of other means: they depoſe them very often by a legal proceſs; they deliberate upon their fate with tranquillity and gravity, they put it to the vote, and condemn them to perpetual impriſonment. Thus they ſerved Mahomet IV, in 1687; and we have now ſeen, that in 1622, they paſſed the ſame ſentence upon Muſtapha. The Alcoran is conſulted upon theſe occaſions, as the prophecies of the Sibyls were formerly at Rome: and if they can engage the head of their religion in their intereſts, they may be ſure of ſucceſs. If the Mufti declares, that the law of GOD does not allow them to pay allegiance to a prince who is ſick, fooliſh, unhappy, or in priſon (7), it amounts to as much, or more, than if the Pope ſhould excommunicate a Chriſtian prince.

(5) Giornale de Letterati, *for Jan.* 28, 1675, *pag.* 3, *in the abſtract of the* Memoire Iſtoriche de Monarchi Ottomani di Giovanni Sagredo Cavaliere, *printed at Venice in* 1673, *in* 4*to.*

(6) *See* Rycaut, Preſent State of the Ottoman Empire, *book i, chap. i, ii.*

(7) Ne' libri di Mahometto ſi vieta l'obbedienza à Re fatti prigioni per obligarli à defenderſi. - - - *The books of Mahomet prohibit obedience to kings taken priſoners, in order to oblige them to defend themſelves.* Giornale de Letterati, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 4.

OSORIUS (JEROME)

. . . .

. . . .

His treatiſe *de Gloria*, and that *de Nobilitate Civili & Chriſtianâ* are much eſteemd [*A*].

[*A*] *His treatiſe* de Gloria, *and that* de Nobilitate Civili & Chriſtiana *are much eſteemed.*] They are each of them divided into five books, and have been printed ſeveral times. The edition of Cologne, 1577, has prefixed to it an Epiſtle Dedicatory, by Bartholomew Bodegemius, to Matalius Metellus Sequanus; in which are mentioned an edition printed at Florence, and another in Germany. This Epiſtle Dedicatory is to be ſeen in the edition of Baſil, *ex Officina Pernea*, in 1584, in 8vo; but not in that of Antwerp, *apud Henricum Aertſſens*, in 1635, in 12mo. But there is added to this laſt, the Life of Jerome Oſorius, compoſed by his nephew.

‘ OSSAT (ARNAUD D') was left at nine years of age without father or mother,
‘ or eſtate. Some years after he was taken into the ſervice of the lord of Caſtelnau de
‘ Magnoac in the dioceſe of Auch who was likewiſe an orphan, and ſtudied along
‘ with him; but ſoon ſurpaſſed him. After they had finiſhed their ſtudies, the young
‘ lord's guardian [*A*] thought fit to ſend him to Paris; and judged he could not
‘ do better than commit him to the care of *Mr Arnaud d' Oſſat ~~his preceptor~~ and*
‘ *governour*, as appears from the account this guardian gave to his nephew. Thus
‘ he became maſter to his maſter. They arrived at Paris on Friday the fifth of
‘ May 1559. After that two other minors [*B*], who were firſt-couſins to the young
‘ lord, were ſent to be under his care. They continued at Paris under the conduct
‘ of Mr d'Oſſat till the month of May 1562; and then Mr d'Oſſat ſending them back
‘ to Gaſcogny wrote to their uncle in ſuch terms, as deſerve mentioning [*C*]. Mr
‘ d'Oſſat applying himſelf to the Bar, was known and eſteemed by a great many
‘ perſons

[*A*] *The young lord's guardian.*] This pupil of Mr d'Oſſat was named John de Marca, being deſcended from the houſe of Marca in Bearn, by Jerome de Marca, the ſon of Peter de Marca, and of Margaret d'Andoins. Jerome was captain of fifty croſs-bow-men, and governour of Furnes in Flanders, as appears from his contract of marriage with Dame Ameline de Riviere, Lady of Doublet and of la Paliſſe, and of ſeveral other lands in the neighbourhood of Caſtelnau de Magnoac. This contract was ſigned at Cominges the twelfth of February 1341, in which, among other things, it is covenanted, that the ſaid Jerome ſhall make his ordinary reſidence upon the eſtate of the ſaid lady. From this marriage was born a ſon called Peter de Marca, who was contracted in marriage with the lady Catherine de Mun, the daughter of Bernard de Mun, and of Paula de Sariac, the ſeventh of May 1398. I am not acquainted with the ſequel of this Genealogy; but all that is here inſerted I (1) have copied from the originals.

The name of de Marca, which is the true name of this family, was changed into that of de la Marque, by the authority of Mr d'Oſſat. And that he did after this manner. In the ſuperſcription of the firſt letter, he ſent from Paris to his pupil's guardian, who appears, by thoſe he wrote to him, to have been a very conſiderable man; he directed, *A Monſieur Thomas Marca.* But thinking that too country-like, he changed it, and wrote afterwards, *Monſieur la Marca*, and at laſt, *Monſieur de la Marque.* And this is the name they now go by. But the late Madam de la Marque, Margaret d'Eſpenan, cauſed one of her ſons, whom ſhe deſigned for the church, to be called, *The Prior de Marca.* I have a letter of that lady, written to her ſon, the prior, December 12, 1659; in which ſhe tells him, that the late Mr de la Marque, her huſband, had often given her a very exact account of the Genealogy of the family of Marca in Bearn, and how the family of Caſtelnau deſcended from them; and that her huſband had learned all this from his father, who was above an hundred years old when he died. Mr d'Oſſat, being a cardinal at Rome, ſent his picture to la Marque, where it is ſtill preſerved.

[*B*] *After that two other minors were ſent to be under his care.*] Of whom Mr d'Oſſat, being himſelf at that time but twenty years of age, writing to their uncle, December 27, 1559, ſays thus to him; *As for me, I promiſe to furniſh your nephews with good learning, and a good example, and with every thing elſe that is in my power, to the laſt moment of my life; which I would ſooner part with than ſuffer them to want the leaſt thing that I ſhould think neceſſary for them.*

[*C*] *In ſuch terms as deſerve mentioning.*] They are theſe: *Laſtly, Sir, as for the thanks you give me for the care I have taken of your nephews, I look upon it as the reſult of your wonted goodneſs; the conſideration of which makes me eſteem all the trouble and pains I have been at on their account very well employed: and I do aſſure you, Sir, that my conſcience ſhall never check me for having failed in doing for them all that was in the compaſs of my knowledge and ability.* From whence we may obſerve the honeſty, and good ſenſe, of Mr d'Oſſat, which already began to diſcover themſelves in matters of little conſequence.

(1) That is, Mr Baluze. Apply this note throughout, wherever there is occaſion for it, in this article.

[*D*] *They*

‘ perſons of note, and among others by Meſſire Paul de Foix, who was then coun- ‘ ſellor in the parliament of Paris. His merit, aſſiſted by the intereſt of his friends, ‘ procured him the poſt of counſellor in the Preſidial of Melun, which he continued ‘ to be poſſeſſed of in 1588, as appears from a Letter of Attorney ſent by him to ‘ Paris, in order to receive a gratuity granted him by the king. In the king's ‘ warrant for that gratuity, he is ſtyled Abbot de Notre Dame de Varennes, which ‘ is an abbey in the dioceſe of Bourges. From whence it is eaſy to conclude, that ‘ they are miſtaken, who write that he was dean of Varenes in the dioceſe of ‘ Rhodez [*D*], when he was made biſhop of Rennes. The reſt of his life is ‘ ſufficiently known (*a*). Several original letters of Mr d'Oſſat, written towards ‘ the latter end of 1584, are to be ſeen in Mr Colbert's library, which have not ‘ yet been printed. They were written to the king, queen, and others (*b*).’

The beſt edition of this cardinal's letters (§*a*) is that of Paris in 1698 in 4to Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie has added ſome notes to it, together with the author's life, very accurately and judiciouſly written. We are obliged to him for refuſing to follow the bad counſel of thoſe, who would have had him reformed Oſſat's language [*E*]. It is a ſcandal to the nation that there ſhould be ſo many perſons in France,

(*a*) This article, and the remarks belonging to it, are only a tranſcript of a Memoir communicated by the illuſtrious Mr Baluze. I have made no alteration in it.

(*b*) Ibid.

[(§ *a*) They have not, however, reſtored in it, a certain paſſage in a letter of the tenth of February, 1603, where this prelate tells the king, *that he did not think his majeſty ought to procure his promotion* (to the cardinalſhip) *becauſe, by this means, becoming a creature of the Pope, it might be doubted, whether for the time to come, perhaps, he might be able to ſerve his majeſty at Rome, with ſo much fidelity as he had done in the time paſt.* The author, who, in 1664, diſcovered and gave notice of the ſuppreſſion of this paſſage *, thinks it probable that it was not done without deſign; and according to my notion, it is very likely to be owing to Cardinal Richelieu. The ſuppreſſion we are ſpeaking of, happened in the year 1624. It is well known what were the views, and what the authority of this Cardinal from that time. As to the letter itſelf, ſuch as Mr Amelot de la Houſſaye has publiſhed it, according to the caſtrated editions, it contains only a complaint to the king, and in truth a very moderate one, that a penſion of 4000 crowns, granted the Cardinal out of the treaſury, had been very ill paid, principally, for two years laſt paſt; and this complaint falls upon the duke de Sulli, lord-treaſurer, againſt whom the editor has inſerted a note, as if this duke, by an unexampled barbarity, had ſtopped the courſe of the king's favours, in regard to ſo faithful a ſervant as cardinal D'Oſſat. But who knows whether the duke de Sulli was as well ſatisfied of the fidelity of this cardinal after his promotion, as the author of the note? Perhaps he was not, and it might be to evince the contrary, that the cardinal inſinuates, that, as to himſelf at leaſt, it would be doing him wrong, to believe that his being a creature of the Pope could ever prevent his ſerving the king, with as much fidelity as before. REM. CRIT.]

* Traité des Legats à latere, *pag.* 52, *of the ſecond number, of* Traité de l'origine des Cardinaux, *Edit. of Cologne* 1665.

[*D*] *They are miſtaken who write, that he was dean of Varennes in the dioceſe of Rhodez.*] In this paſſage of Mr Baluze's Memoir, there is ſomething to rectify, as I learn from a book (2) which has appeared ſince the firſt edition of this Dictionary. Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie obſerves (3), that the firſt benefice Mr d'Oſſat *ever had*, was *the priory of St Martin du Vieux-Belleſme*, which was given him by cardinal de Joyeuſe, *in January or February* in 1588. And as to what relates to the abbey of Notre-Dame de Varennes, he never was poſſeſſed of it, *though indeed he was nominated to it by Henry III.* The proofs upon which Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie builds appear ſtrong. The laſt is taken from it's being affirmed in the funeral oration on this cardinal, *that having with a good intention, accepted a conſiderable benefice, which Henry III had given him, and ſome difficulties being ſtarted about the poſſeſſion, he forthwith reſigned it, not being willing to have diſputes with any one. And it is probable the abbey of Varrennes which this oration hints at* (4) : *and conſequently*, adds Mr Amelot, *they are miſtaken themſelves, who have written, that it is a miſtake to ſay, that Mr d'Oſſat was dean of Varen, in the dioceſe of Rhodez, as he ſtiles himſelf in the petition he preſented to the Pope in the name of Henry IV, as being his ſpecial proxy and deputy in the affair of his abſolution* (5).

(2) The Life of Cardinal d'Oſſat, prefixed to the edition of his Letters, publiſhed by Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie, in 1698.

(3) Amelot de la Houſſaie, Life of Cardinal d'Oſſat, *pag.* 5.

(4) Ib. *pag.* 6.

(5) Ib. *pag.* 5.

[*E*] *We are obliged to him for refuſing to follow the bad counſel of thoſe who would have had him reform Mr d'Oſſat's language.*] Thus he expreſſes himſelf in his advertiſement to the reader : ‘ We have not at ‘ all altered the language, and thoſe who give out ‘ otherwiſe are the very perſons who would have had ‘ it altered ; and taking it ill that their advice was ‘ not followed have maliciouſly ſpread that report, ‘ with intent to depreciate this edition among thoſe ‘ who they know are admirers of cardinal d'Oſſat, ‘ as are all ſtateſmen in particular. And this ill ‘ counſel I oppoſed the more ſtiffly, becauſe I always ‘ thought, the nervous ſtyle of an author, who was ‘ born for negotiations, and whoſe way of ſpeaking ‘ is entirely conſecrated to the cuſtoms of the cabinet, ‘ would be quite ſpoiled by making him expreſs him- ‘ ſelf differently from what he really ſpoke and wrote. ‘ Beſides that no body would have ſhewn the ſame ‘ reſpect for my ſtyle, which they have for that of ‘ this great cardinal. Witneſs what Mr Boileau has ‘ ſaid of a member of the French Academy, who had ‘ reviſed ſome of Plutarch's lives tranſlated by ‘ Amyot. Witneſs alſo the refuſal of ſeveral ‘ of the moſt knowing Bookſellers in Paris, to my ‘ knowledge, about twelve years ago, to print the ‘ Memoirs of Comines which an ingenious lady had ‘ put into better French. So true it is, that the ‘ world is invincibly perſuaded, that there are ſome ‘ books which cannot be reviſed without ſpoiling ‘ them; and which reſemble thoſe natural beauties ‘ that never ſhine more than in their undreſs. *Ver- ‘ bum non amplius addam.*’ I am of opinion that Comines, Montagne, and ſome other writers, whoſe principal beauties are inſeparable from their ſtyle, will be proof againſt the attempts of reviſers. I am likewiſe of opinion, that the Heptameron of the queen of Navarre, which is now done into modern French, will be rejected by perſons of good taſte (6), but I am of opinion at the ſame time that the Bookſellers will take more liberty with reſpect to many other books : they will give editions reviſed and corrected as to the antiquated phraſes, and by that means will encourage more and more the falſe delicacy and lazineſs of an infinite number of readers : for it is a ſhame that thoſe who pretend to read, ſhould not have a deſire to know how their anceſtors ſpoke. This abuſe increaſes and grows ſtronger every day : nothing that was written in the reign of Lewis XIII, will now bear reading. The Bookſellers find it neceſſary, in order to gain cuſtomers, to get the ſtyle of the writing of thoſe times reviſed or moderniſed. Thus they ſerved, in 1699, the hiſtory of the laſt duke of Montmorenci compoſed by the Sieur du Cros (7). This practice has been long in uſe. I have ſeen an edition of Joſephus tranſlated into French by Genebrard, which the Paris Bookſellers had got emended as to ſeveral words, and antique expreſſions, and yet I do not think Genebrard had been dead thirty years. They have taken the ſame liberty with reſpect to Amyot's Plutarch, which the Sieur Sorrel very juſtly diſapproves. *It is ſufficient*, ſays he (8), *to knew that Amyot's language was eſteemed by the brighteſt wits of his age. They do him a great deal of injuſtice in thinking to correct him by pruning ſome of his old words, and ſubſtituting others in their place. That is robbing him of all his ſtrength and ſimplicity. And yet it ſo happenned, that ſome Paris Bookſellers ſome years ago publiſhed an impreſſion of that antient tranſlation in a large folio, in which they have here and there lopped off the old words. Some were of opinion, that this would make the book more agreeable to read, that*

(6) See, above, the firſt article NAVARRE, remark [*N*].

(7) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *Decemb.* 1699, *pag.* 670, *& ſeq.*

(8) Sorel, Bibl. Françoiſe, *pag.* 220, *the Paris edition* 1667.

France, who are not able to bear the ſtyle of the XVIth century; however this bad taſte is not ſo univerſal, but that a great many readers may yet be met with, who are for preſerving the writings of that time, ſuch as they were compoſed by the authors. This appears from the apprehenſions the Paris Bookſellers were under, of not finding their account in printing Philip de Comines's Memoirs in modern French. This will be ſeen below in the remark [*E*]. I wiſh Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie had not even taken a fancy to alter the orthography of the original. It is not probable that Mr d'Oſſat checquered his writings with ſo many circumflex accents, and ſuppreſſed the letter *ſ* in ſo many places (*c*). This want of probability is not agreeable to a reader that loves exactneſs. I cannot paſs over in ſilence Mr de Wicquefort's judgment of our d'Oſſat's merit [*F*]. See alſo Mr Perrault's ſecond part of the Illuſtrious Men of the XVIIth century (*d*).

(*c*) Compare this with the remark [*D*] of the article ESPAGNET.

(*d*) Pag. 12, & ſeq. of the Dutch Edit.

and that they had done well to permit it. But others imagine, that greater veneration is due to good ands antient books, and that it is a ſort of ſacrilege to uſe them after that manner, eſpecially conſidering that thoſe who were employed in that work, were but ſorrily qualified for it. They think that the old tranſlation ſhould either continue as it is, or elſe another be made entirely new, if any one pretends to be able to publiſh a better according to the preſent taſte. Neither does he approve of the alteration of the original of Joinville. We ſhall give his own words (9). ‘It is true, we find in the Hiſtory of Joinville a great appearance of the ſimplicity of the age he lived in, and that thoſe of his rank, were but little acquainted with the manner of compoſing a diſcourſe. Neverthelefs, I think they have done us an injury in changing many of the old words in his book, as we ſee they have done in divers impreſſions, becauſe it is no longer the ſame work, but an entire tranſlation of the old language into the modern language. This may in the end occaſion the loſs of the original, ſo that we ſhall be at a loſs to know with any exactneſs, how they ſpoke in the time when it was compoſed. It would have been much better to leave it in it's firſt dreſs: if there were any paſſages in it no longer intelligible, they might have been explained in the margin, or elſe in notes annexed; this variety had been very agreeable.' He had ſpoke much to the ſame purpoſe, in pag. 252, where note, he obſerves that *Commines's Hiſtory*, as well as that of Joinville, has been printed *in ſeveral different forms*, and that *ſuch words as were taken to be obſolete* were changed. How ancient this cuſtom has been among the French, you will ſee by the following paſſage of Stephen Paſquier. ‘The like fault we meet with in our antient manuſcripts of our Roman de la Roſe, in each of which the French language is ſuch as was ſpoken when the copies were taken, except only in the rhyme of the verſes where they could not make any alteration. Nay, you will there ſee a ſtrange hobbling of what the copiers have put in, I mean ſome words of Picardy, Normandy, or Champagne. Which are things that a reader ought to have a great regard to, before he interpoſes his judgment (10).

[*F*] *Mr de Wicquefort's judgment of our d'Oſſat's merit.*] He has in this done a great deal of honour to his own judgment. Theſe are his words (11): *I have nothing to ſay of Arnauld cardinal d'Oſſat, becauſe it is impoſſible to ſpeak of him without doing him injuſtice, ſince Antonius Muretus, the moſt eloquent perſon of his age, comes ſhort in endeavouring to make his elogy in his funeral oration. I ſhall ſay nothing more of him, but that no miniſter ever diſcharged his truſt with ſo much affection, ſo much zeal, ſo much application, and ſo much fidelity, for the king, his maſter, as this prelate did. As for his capacity, we may judge of that by what we have of his negotiations; for which, as well as for ſeveral other excellent treatiſes, the public is obliged to the late Meſſieurs du Puy, who are the honour and ornament of our age. He has given proofs of his addreſs in his negotiation with the great duke of Tuſcany for the reſtitution of the iſland d'If: in that with Clement VIII, for the reconciliation of Henry IV, to the church of Rome, for the declaration of the nullity of that king's marriage with queen Margaret de Valois, which had ſtood thirty years, and for the diſpenſation of the marriage of Catherine de Bourbon, king Henry's ſiſter, with the duke of Bar, and for ſeveral other very important and very difficult affairs. His diſpatches are not leſs neceſſary to an embaſſador, who expects to ſucceed in his poſt, than the Bible and the* Corpus Juris *are to Divines and Lawyers who would be eminent in their profeſſion.* This judgment is given by a great maſter, for Mr de Wicquefort underſtood theſe matters very well; and quotes Mr d'Oſſat's letters ſo often, that it appears he had read them over and over very attentively. We muſt excuſe his miſtake in believing that Muretus made this cardinal's funeral oration. That Orator had been dead a long time, when the Jeſuit Gallutius in 1604, pronounced at Rome cardinal d'Oſſat's funeral oration. We muſt obſerve, that thoſe very letters which Mr de Wicquefort valued ſo much, are highly recommended to the Politicians by the Sieur Naudé. ‘Omnium meritò cenſentur utiliſſime digniſſimæque, quæ Politicorum mentibus atque oculis perpetuo obverſentur, *Cardinalis Oſſati* Epiſtolæ: utpote quæ graviſſimô ac planè ſenili cultu exaratæ ſunt, feraciſſimoque graviſſimarum rerum ac ſententiarum ingeniô, nuſquam laxæ, nuſquam molles, ſemper æquales, ſemper lectoris animum demulcentes, detinentéſque jucundiſſimâ rerum ac rationum varietate (12). - - - - - *Cardinal d'Oſſat's letters are juſtly eſteemed above all others moſt uſeful, and worthy to be perpetually read and meditated on by Politicians: as being compoſed with the greateſt gravity and the moſt conſummate advantages of old age, and with the moſt extenſive knowledge of important facts and ſentiments, never looſe, nor ſoft, but always of a piece, always entertaining and engaging the mind of the reader with the moſt agreeable variety of things and reaſonings.*'

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 321, 322.

(10) Paſquier, Recherches de la France, *book viii, ch. xliv, pag.* 756: *Edit. of Paris* 1621, *in fol.*

(11) Wicquefort, de l'Ambaſſadeur, book ii, §. xvii, pag. m. 423, 424. See alſo §. x, of the ſame book; and §. vii, of the firſt book, pag. 173.

(12) Naudæus, Bibliogr. Politica, pag. 558, Edit. Crenii 1692.

OTHO III, was not above twelve years of age, when he ſucceeded his father, who died in 983. This was the cauſe, that the beginning of his reign was not exempt from troubles: but all theſe diſorders were happily ſuppreſſed; and when his years qualified him for ruling by himſelf, he ſhewed himſelf worthy of that poſt. His preceptor was the famous Gerbert a native of Auvergne (*a*), whom he made archbiſhop of Ravenna, and afterwards Pope by the name of Sylveſter II. The moſt perplexing affairs he had upon his hands were at Rome, where Creſcentius endeavoured to retain to himſelf the ſovereign power, and baniſhed from thence Pope Gregory V, the emperor's near relation [*A*]. Creſcentius made preparations for a vigorous defence, upon the news of Otho's march towards Rome to puniſh him; but he ſcarce made any reſiſtance, being obliged, in a few days, to ſurrender himſelf with the Anti-Pope he

(*a*) Du Cheſne, Lives of the Popes.

[*A*] *Gregory V, the emperor's near relation.*] His name was Bruno, and he was the ſon of Otho of Saxony, duke of Franconia and Suabia, which Otho was the ſon of Ludolphus and grand-ſon of Otho I: ſo that Bruno was great grand-ſon of Otho I, grand-father of Otho III. Thoſe who make him the preceptor of Otho I have been ſeverely reprehended (1). Some may doubt whether the critic be in the right in giving

(1) See the *Specimen Errorum*, publiſhed by Perizonius in 1693, pag. 119.

he had created. The Anti-Pope was whipped, and had his eyes put out, and at laſt was killed by the mob before the emperor had time to condemn him [*B*]. We ſhall ſee what was the puniſhment of Creſcentius [*C*]. This happened in 998. Pope Gregory V being then reſtored, died ſome months after; and then it was that Otho preferred Sylveſter II to the pontifical chair. The Romans taking courage from the abſence of the emperor, upon his return to Germany, made a new inſurrection; for they did not like to be governed by the Germans. Otho was under the neceſſity of trying once more to reſtore the tranquillity of that city; but he took the wrong courſe: he was in hopes, that if he appeared *ſola Majeſtate armatus*, - - - *armed only with majeſty*, every one would return to their allegiance; but he experienced the contrary. His example has ſhewn, that no prince ought ever to expoſe his majeſty unguarded, to the diſcretion of a mutinous mob. The people of Rome took ſo great advantage of Otho's having no troops about him, that they blocked him up in his palace; and if Hugh marquis of Tuſcany, and Henry duke of Bavaria, had not ſpeedily repaired to Rome, and amuſed the people with ſeveral propoſals of accommodation, till they concerted proper means for the emperor's eſcape, it is not known what might have become of him in that his unavoidable captivity. This happened in 1001. But as this prince had a body of good troops in Italy, whither he returned, only to expel the Saracens, from whom he retook Capua, he was not long in returning to Rome [*D*] with ſuch a force that he puniſhed them at pleaſure. In the beginning of 1002 he ſet out upon his return to Germany, but died at Paterno, before he got out of Italy, on the twenty-eighth of January in the ſame year. His death was attributed to poiſoned gloves, which the widow of Creſcentius, one of the handſomeſt women of that age, gave him, to revenge his breach of promiſe. He enjoyed her upon a promiſe of marriage, and after he had gratified his paſſion, he made a jeſt of his promiſe (*b*). He was not fortunate in relation to women [*E*], for the lady whom he married (*c*) joined to her debaucheries another crime, for which he cauſed her to be

(*b*) *Taken from* Maimbourg, Decad de l'Empire, *lib. ii.*

(*c*) MARY OF ARRAGON. See her article.

giving the quality of duke of Bavaria to Otho the ſon of Ludolphus; for it is certain, on the one hand, that Bavaria being given, by Otho I, to his brother Henry, continued in the poſſeſſion of the deſcendants of that Henry; and, on the other, that Otho the ſon of Ludolphus was duke of Suabia after his father: but at the ſame time it is equally certain, that Otho II, being at war with Henry II, duke of Bavaria, gave Bavaria to Otho the ſon of Ludolphus (2).

[*B*] *The Anti-Pope . . . was . . . . killed by the mob, before the emperor had time to condemn him.*] Some ſay (3) that the mobb ſeized upon the Anti-Pope before Otho was received in Rome; that they pulled out his eyes, that they cut off his ears and his noſe; that they ſet him upon an aſs, with his face to the aſs's tail; and that Otho, *to whom they afterwards opened the gates, baniſhed him to the remoteſt parts of Germany, where he died of grief ſoon after.* Thus you ſee ſome apply to the Anti-Pope part of what others ſay of Creſcentius. Some will have it (4), that it was Otho who ordered the Anti-Pope's noſe to be cut off, his eyes to be put out, and thrown headlong from the caſtle of St Angelo. Theſe variations give a cruel diſreliſh to the ſtudy of hiſtory, and are the diſhonour of mankind; for if men deſerved any regard, there would be a perfect uniformity among Hiſtorians upon facts ſo remarkable as theſe. But how ſhould ſeveral Hiſtorians agree, when we find very often one and the ſame Hiſtorian differ with himſelf? Conſult Matthias's *Theatrum*: there you will find in page 888, *That the Anti-Pope was whipped, blinded, and at laſt killed by the Pope, before Otho had condemned him* (5); and in the very next page you have it, *that the emperor having cauſed the Anti-Pope's noſe to be cut off, and his eyes put out, threw him head-long from the Capitol. Imperator anno Chriſti 998 Romam profectus eſt, antipapam naſo & oculis privavit, & de capitolio præcipitem dedit, uti ſupra prolixius diximus.* Theſe laſt words are very ſtrange; the author makes a falſe quotation of himſelf, for he had given a quite different account from what he gives in this place.

[*C*] *We ſhall ſee what was the puniſhment of Creſcentius.*] They mounted him upon an aſs, with his face to the aſſes's tail, and in that poſture carried him through the city; and then cut off ſeveral of his limbs, and hanged him. His accomplices were puniſhed, ſome one way, ſome another (6). Here follows the account ſome writers give of the matter (7) Creſcentius having defended himſelf as long as he could in the fortreſs of Rome, endeavoured to prevent his deſtruction by going to throw himſelf at Otho's feet; but that prince ordered him to be carried back to the caſtle, that he might take him by main force. There Creſcentius held out to the laſt extremity; at laſt the place was taken by ſtorm, and all was put to the ſword, *excepting Creſcentius, who was taken much wounded, and thrown head-long from the higheſt part of the fortreſs, dragged through the dirt, and then hanged up on ſo high a gibbet* (8), *as to be expoſed to the view of all the city* (9). According to Moreri he was only beheaded; but Heiſs (10) ſays, that both he and twelve of his accomplices were hanged upon the higheſt tree that could be found.

[*D*] *He was not long in returning to Rome.*] After having maturely weighed the account of ſeveral Hiſtorians, it ſeems evident to me, that Matthias is miſtaken, when he ſays, that Otho deſigned to retire to Germany with intent to raiſe an army there, which might enable him to puniſh the rebellion of the Romans; but that he died by the way. Upon this foot he muſt have died without being revenged; but this is contradicting good authors (11). But after all, it would be very great raſhneſs to rank this in the liſt of faults; for the hiſtory of that middle age is ſo perplexed, and has paſſed through ſo many bad hands, that we meet with authorities *pro* and *con*, and for a thouſand ſorts of variations. This deprives me of a large field of materials; for if I ſhould venture to cenſure thoſe who relate matters of fact one certain way, there would not be wanting authorities to oppoſe me. It is almoſt impoſſible to frame a lye (12) for theſe centuries. Do but tell the circumſtances of any fact, according to your own fancy, or entirely at random, and you will ſeldom happen to be without an author to favour your account.

[*E*] *He was not fortunate in relation to women.*] In general it ſeems the ſex was unlucky to him; for beſides what I hinted of his wife and his miſtreſs, I have read ſomewhere (13), that it was for the love of this miſtreſs, I ſpeak of the widow of Creſcentius, that he entered Rome with ſo ſorry a retinue, as to run the riſque of a perpetual priſon. Add to this, that Theophania, his mother, the daughter of an emperor of Conſtantinople, rendered him odious to a great many of the nobles (14); and that after the death of his mother (15), being bred up by Adelais, his grandmother, he found himſelf obliged to ſend her from court. This was not, in all probability, by advice of the wiſe men of his court, but out of an opinion, that it was neceſſary for the good of his affairs. But this did not hinder him from entruſting governments to women: during his expedition to Rome in 996, he gave the government of Saxony to Matilda, his mother's ſiſter, and after her death to his ſiſter Adelais.

(2) See the Hiſtory of Bavaria, by Blanc, *Tom. ii, pag.* 138.

(3) Petr. Damian. Epiſt. II, ad Cad. Ciaconius, Sigonius *cited by* Maimbourg, Decadence de l'Empire, lib. ii.

(4) Heiſs, Hiſtory of the Empire, *Tom. i, pag.* 122.

(5) Antipapa à vulgo virgis cæſus, oculis privatus, & demum confoſſus, priuſquam de eo Otto ſententiam tulit.

(6) Ex Setho Calviſio.

(7) Glaber. lib. i, & Dithmar, lib. iv, *cited by* Maimbourg, ubi ſupra.

(8) See the remark [*B*] of the article BABELOT.

(9) Maimb. ibid. *pag. m.* 123.

(10) Hiſt. de l'Empire, *Tom. i, pag. m.* 122.

(11) *See* Dithmar. apud Calviſ. ad ann. 1001, 1002.

(12) That is, to advance things without proof or authority.

(13) Huber. Hiſtor. Civil. *Tom. i.*

(14) Cluver. Univerſal Hiſtory in Otho III.

(15) Which happened according to Cluverius in 989, or according to Calviſius, Matthias, &c. in 991.

be burnt; and this lady whom he did not marry [*F*] was the author of his death. Thoſe, who ſay that the college of the ſeven electors was erected in his time, are miſtaken (*d*), whether they attribute it to Otho himſelf, or to Pope Gregory V. It may be ſaid with more reaſon, that Poland was made a kingdom by this emperor, as I have obſerved in the article of Boleſlaus I. There is a wonderful account given of this Otho's penitence [*G*]. He was ſo very devout as to undertake pilgrimages (*e*); and it is even ſaid that he made a promiſe to turn Monk (*f*). I ſhall not inſtance for a proof of his devotion, his garment, upon which the whole ſtory of the Revelations was embroidered (*g*).

[*F*] *This lady whom he did not marry.*] A certain Hiſtorian, whoſe name is Glaber, ſays, Otho did marry her. But this is very certain, that after he had admitted her into his bed, he diſliked her and put her away.

[*G*] *There is a wonderful account given of this Otho's penitence.*] It is pretended, that he faſted a whole week, excepting Thurſday, and that he cried bitterly to expiate the guilt of his ſins. The Latin will expreſs it beſt. *Plurima ingemiſcens facinora noctis ſilentio, vigiliis & orationibus intentus, lacrimarum quoque rivis abluere non deſtitit, ſæpenumero omnem hebdomadam excepta quinta feria jejunium producens, in eleemoſynis valdè largus* (16). Add to this what I have related elſewhere (17) of his pilgrimages.

(*d*) See the proofs for it in Maimbourg, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) See the article BOLESLAUS I.

(*f*) Calviſ. ad ann. Chriſti 1001.

(*g*) Matthias, Theatr. Hiſtor. *pag. m.* 886.

(16) Dithmar. *lib. iv*, apud Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 128.

(17) In the remark [*A*] of the article BOLESLAUS I.

OTTOBONI (PETER)

OTTOBONI (PETER) a native of Venice, was Pope in the XVIIth century, under the name of ALEXANDER VIII. Marc Ottoboni, his father, grand chancellor of Venice, bought a patent of nobility, which coſt him an hundred thouſand ducats, in 1646. Peter Ottoboni having purſued his ſtudies firſt at Venice, and then at Padua, and taking the degree of Doctor of Law at the latter of thoſe two places, went to Rome at the age of twenty. He had, under Pope Urban VIII, the government of Terni, Rietti, and Citta-Caſtellana, and the poſt of auditor of the Rota. He received the cardinal's cap under Innocent X, in the year 1652. Two years after he was made biſhop of Breſcia. He was datary under Alexander VII, and was at laſt choſen Pope, October the ſixth 1689, after the death of Innocent XI (*a*). The war which was kindled with ſuch violence between the houſe of Auſtria and France, contributed not a little to the election of Ottoboni; for the neutral cardinals did juſtly fear they ſhould too much expoſe the Catholic religion, by creating a Pope born a ſubject to the king of Spain, as the late Pope was, whoſe partiality againſt France had done infinite ſervice to the Proteſtants. They thought therefore, that Ottoboni, who was qualified for the chair, would be a more proper perſon than any other in that juncture, in regard he was a Venetian. The only advantage which France reaped from this election, was, that Pope Alexander VIII, did ſo ſtrenuouſly animate the Venetians to wage war with the Turks, and encouraged them with ſuch effectual aſſiſtance, that he quite fruſtrated all hopes of a peace, which the emperor was deſirous of concluding with the Porte, in order to employ all his troops againſt France. As for the reſt, Alexander VIII thought of nothing but the aggrandizing of his family [*A*]. He gave himſelf ſcarce any manner of concern about the differences between France and the court of Rome [*B*]. He

(*a*) Mercure Galant, *for October* 1689.

[*A*] *He thought of nothing but the aggrandizing of his family.*] What is commonly ſaid of beaſts, that they are never more dangerous than in their dying bites (1), may very properly be applied to Nepotiſm. As it ſtood upon its laſt legs, under Alexander VIII, ſo it gathered together all its ſtrength, to be the more capable of devouring. It might have been ſaid of the uncle, he is old, he makes haſte, knowing that he has but a ſhort time to ſtay. Mr Menage told a ſtory, that will come in here very *à propos*. *Alexander* VIII, (ſaid he) *being elected Pope at ſeventy-nine years of age, and having preferred all his nephews in three weeks after, aſked one of his domeſtics, what people ſaid of him. The domeſtic made anſwer, that people ſaid he loſt no time in the advancement of his family.* Oh, oh, *ſaid the Pope*, ſono vinti tre hore e mezza, *I have but half an hour left out of four and twenty* (2). To behave himſelf, as he did, with reſpect to an abuſe that his ſucceſſor ſhould have aboliſhed, was giving it an honourable funeral. Perhaps Pope Ottoboni's great age was not the only reaſon that obliged him to ſuch quick diſpatch in loading his whole family with riches; he conſidered perhaps, that Rome had had time to forget in ſome meaſure the diſorders of Nepotiſm, which had never appeared under the long reign of Innocent XI. Upon this conſideration the complaints of the people might be fainter, and he had to do with ſubjects, who had enjoyed an interval of repoſe after their antient fatigues. This calls to my mind the ſharping tricks of flatterers, and the dexterity with which, like true jugglers, they paſs backwards and forwards the moſt ſacred things: but that this criticiſm, which does not ariſe from my own bottom, may have more weight and authority, I ſhall give it from a book printed with licence at Paris (3). 'Among the Encomiums he (4) beſtows upon 'Innocent XI, that which he is moſt full of, is, his 'having kept his nephews in a private ſtation, in 'imitation of our Saviour, who knew no other rela'tions, but thoſe who did the will of his father. 'Alexander VIII, having had views directly oppoſite 'to thoſe of his predeceſſor, Palatio has found out a 'method to juſtify his ſollicitouſneſs in loading his re'lations, with riches and honours; and maintains, 'that in that point alſo the Pope imitated the example of 'our Saviour, who honoured his relations according to 'the fleſh, with the participation of his prieſthood, 'and intruſted them with the diſpenſation of his 'Goſpel: So fertile is eloquence in inventions, when 'it is employed in flattering the paſſions of gover'nors, and excuſing the greateſt irregularities in their 'conduct.'

[*B*] *He gave himſelf ſcarce any manner of concern about the difference between France and the court of Rome.*] And yet that affair was of ſuch conſequence, as to require a ſpeedy concluſion; and if Alexander VIII, had had as much zeal for the intereſts of St Peter's chair, as for thoſe of his family, his conſidering as he did of the ſhort time he had to live, would have induced him much more to make haſte in accommodating the difference with France, than in enriching his relations. By delaying it he left to his ſucceſſor, the glory of re-eſtabliſhing in France the authority of the Pope upon the ancient foot; which it had been impoſſible to effect, had they waited till the king of France had been at peace with his neighbours. True Policy required,

(1) Ut quam maxime mortiferi eſſe morſus ſolent morientium beſtiarum, ſic plus nogotii fuit cum ſemiruta Carthagine quam integra. - - - - *As beaſts are uſed to give the moſt dangerous bites when dying, ſo Carthage, when half ruined, gave a great deal more trouble than in it's proſperity.* Florus, lib. ii, cap. xv. *Add to this theſe words of Seneca, Controv. Epit. IX.* In gladiatoribus quoque conditio dura victoris eſt cum moriente pugnantis. Nullum magis adverſarium timeas quam qui vivere non poteſt, occidere poteſt. Concitatiſſima eſt rabies in deſperatione, & morte ultima in furorem animus impellitur. - - - *In gladiatorial encounters, it is a very hard condition, that the victor muſt fight with a dying man. No adverſary is ſo much to be dreaded as he who cannot live, but yet can kill. Deſpair furniſhes the moſt violent rage, and the agonies of death drive the ſoul to madneſs.*

(2) See the *Menagiana*, pag. 208, Dutch Edit.

(3) Journal des Sçavans, *Decemb.* 15, 1692, *pag.* 731, *Dutch Edit.*

(4) That is, John Palatius, author of a book in five volumes in folio, printed at Venice in 1691, and intituled, *Geſta Pontificum Romanorum.*

He did nothing but amuſe the miniſters of Lewis XIV, and all of a ſudden, by the publication of a bull a little before his death [*C*], he diſcovered, that he had only deceived them. France changed her ſtyle, in hopes to procure his favour; for ſome time they had ſaid but little in praiſe of Innocent XI, and after that they had expreſſed a great many hard things of him: the Poets and the Orators began to cry up his ſucceſſor. But they found by experience that the ſureſt game, with reference to encomiums, would be to obſerve the maxim recommended by Solon for determining a man's felicity [*D*]. Cardinal Peter Ottoboni was ſo old when he came to the chair, that it is no wonder his reign was ſo ſhort. He enjoyed the papal dignity but fifteen or ſixteen months; for he dyed on the firſt of February 1691. A prediction was handed about in relation to his death, which has very much the air of an impoſture [*E*].

quired, that the court of Rome ſhould make the beſt uſe of the entangled ſtate of France; and that Innocent XII did very dextrouſly. Some fanatics who had conceived hopes, that the league formed againſt France in 1688, would be fatal to the Papacy, and that the approaching ruin of Catholiciſm would begin with the reformation of the court of France, were very much out in their meaſures; for that league has made France more Popiſh than it was in 1682 and 1688, and conſequently occaſioned the reparation of one of the breaches of Popery. What fools are they who credit ſuch creatures. See the Remark [*C*] of the Article Braunbom.

[*C*] *By the publication of a Bull a little before his death.*] The Bull was ready the fourth of Auguſt, 1690; for it bears date on that day; but it was not publiſhed till January the thirtieth 1691. It thunders againſt all that had been done to the prejudice of the Pope's authority in the aſſembly of the clergy of France in 1682. It was not publiſhed ſooner, becauſe the Pope had a mind to amuſe Lewis XIV, and gain ſome advantages by the delay; but when he ſaw himſelf at the brink of the grave, he obſerved no further meaſures, but let fly his Bull. This was of very good uſe to the expounders of St Malachy; they did not know how to apply to Peter Ottoboni the Symbol *Pœnitentia Glorioſa*, which concerns him in the predictions of that pretended Prophet. They were not content with ſaying, that the election of this Pope was made on St Bruno's day, or that he bore the name of Peter, though the penitence of theſe two ſaints was altogether glorious: this they looked upon as too forced and far fetched: but the Bull gave them occaſion to ſay, that at laſt Alexander VIII, had *glorious repented* of his indulgences for the court and clergy of France (5). I obſerve here, that the decree of the Inquiſition of the ſeventh of December, 1690, againſt thirty-one propoſitions, vexed the Divines of the Gallican church. See the letter of an abbot to a Prelate of the court of Rome (6).

[*D*] *The maxim recommended by Solon to determine a man's happineſs.*] This maxim is, that we can form no judgment of a man's felicity before he is dead; for thoſe who appear happy to us, may perhaps be plunged into the deepeſt miſery, before they leave this world. Ovid has expreſſed this thought of Solon very finely.

——— Sed ſcilicet ultima ſemper
Expectanda dies homini: dicique beatus
Ante obitum nemo ſupremaque funera debet (7).

But no frail man, however great or high,
Can be concluded bleſt before he die.

Garth.

The inſtability, or depravity, of the heart of man, ought to induce us to delay the giving encomiums, till the perſon is no more. By this caution we ſhall ſave ourſelves the trouble of altering our language, and a great many other inconveniences. Salvian was not unacquainted with this maxim. *Sapientia, inquit ſermo divinus,* in exitu canitur. *Cur eam non dixit cani in pueritia, non in juventute, non in ſtatu rerum incolumium, non in proſperitatibus ſecundorum? Silicet quia in his omnibus quicquid laudatur incertum eſt. Quàm diu enim quis ſubjacet mutationi, non poteſt cum ſecuritate laudari. Et ideo, ut ait,* ſapientia in exitu canitur. *Exiens enim quis de incertis periculorum, certum merebitur evaſa omni rerum varietate ſuffragium: quia tunc ſtabilis & firma laus eſt, quando meritum non poterit jam perire laudati.* Sapientia, *inquit*, in exitu canitur (8).

[*E*] *A prediction was handed about in relation to his death, which has very much the air of an impoſture.*] A Frenchman, whoſe name I conceal, had written from Geneva to his friends in Holland, towards the beginning of the winter of the year 1690, that at Milan a man had been with his confeſſor, to acquaint him, *That he found his own end approaching; that he ſhould die in two days, his brother in four, the Pope at Chriſtmas, and the king of France at Eaſter.* The writer of that news added, that the two brothers died at the time mentioned. As ſoon as they knew that the Pope was not dead at Chriſtmas, the news was dropt; but at the ſiege of Mons (9) it was revived again: and to give it the more weight, Chriſtmas was no longer mentioned as the time prefixed for the Pope's death, but it was given out, that the man at Milan only ſaid that the Pope would die in a few weeks. It were to be wiſhed, that ſome body had given himſelf the trouble of keeping a regiſter of theſe idle predictions. Had they been marked down year after year in our Chronicles, we ſhould perhaps have been leſs ſubject to be impoſed upon by them.

---

(5) See the Leipſic Journal for 1691, pag. 151.

(6) It contains ſixty-ſix pages in 12mo, in my edition, which is the ſecond. The title bears, *according to the edition of Toulouſe* 1691.

(7) Ovid. Metamorph. lib. III, ver. 135.

(8) Salvianus, contra Avaritiam, *lib. iv, pag. m.* 145.

(9) In the month of March 1691.

OVIDIUS NASO (Publius)

OVIDIUS NASO (Publius) a Roman knight, was one of the beſt Poets of the Auguſtan age. I have a great collection of materials for this article, but am not able to digeſt them at preſent: I ſhall only give a ſmall part of them. Nature inſpired him with ſuch a ſtrong diſpoſition to Poetry that, out of love to the Muſes, he renounced all that application which is neceſſary for thoſe who would arrive at dignities. But if his inclination to Poetry extinguiſhed in him all the fire of ambition, on the contrary it fed and inflamed that of love. He was exceſſively addicted to venereal pleaſure [*A*], and that was almoſt his only vice. He did not conten himſelf

[*A*] *He was exceſſively addicted to venereal pleaſure.*] He informs us himſelf of the qualifications with which nature had endowed him for that exerciſe, and the uſe he had made of them.

Exigere à nobis anguſta nocte Corinnam,
Me memini numeros ſuſtinuiſſe novem (1).

He found himſelf freſh and gay in the morning, after paſſing a whole night in amorous embraces, and wiſhed to die in the actual fruition of that pleaſure. Nothing ſeemed to him more ſuitable to the life he had led, than to make his exit in the like exerciſe.

Sæpe ego, laſcivæ conſumto tempore noctis,
Utilis & forti corpore mane fui.
Felix, quem veneris certamina mutua perdunt!
Dî faciant, leti cauſa ſit iſta mei!
Induat adverſis contraria pectora telis
Miles, & æternum ſanguine nomen emat.
Quærat avarus opes; & quæ laſſarit arando
Æquora, perjuro naufragus ore bibat.
At mihi contingat Veneris langueſcere motu;
Cùm moriar, medium ſolvar & inter opus:

Atque

---

(1) Ovid. Amor. lib. III, Eleg. VII, ver. 25.

ſelf with loving and making conqueſts in the way of galantry; but likewiſe taught the public the art of loving, and of making themſelves beloved: that is, he reduced into a ſyſtem a pernicious ſcience, of which nature gives us but too many leſſons, and which only tends to the diſhonour of families, and of the poor huſbands in particular. He was baniſhed for writing ſuch books; but in all appearance, that was rather the pretence than the true cauſe of his exile [*B*]. He employed in vain all the turns of his wit to pacify the emperor, whoſe favour nothing could procure. He dyed in the country of the Getæ, where he had been confined. Of three wives whom he married, he divorced the two firſt (*a*), and thought himſelf very happy in the third (*b*). There have been ſome Critics who have contemned his Latin [*C*]. They

> *Atque aliquis noſtro lacrymans in funere dicat,*
> *Conveniens vitæ mors fuit iſta ſuæ* (2).

What can one ſay, what can one conceive more proper to expreſs the fury of a laſcivious conſtitution to the laſt degree? I do not believe that Laïs the courtezan (3), who died in the manner that Ovid calls ſo happy; I do not believe, I ſay, that ſhe deſired that fate. This Poet's writings on love are the obſceneſt pieces we have remaining of antiquity: not that we find in them the obſcene expreſſions of Catullus, Horace, and Martial, or the ſcandals of the ſin againſt nature, of which theſe three Poets ſpeak ſo freely; but the delicacy, the choice of terms, which Ovid has excelled in, render his works the more dangerous, in regard they, by this means, repreſent in a very intelligible and elegant manner all the moſt laſcivious tricks and impurities of love. He does not ſpeak upon the credit of others, but from his own practice. It is true, in his apology, which he compoſed in the place of his exile, he proteſts he had not committed the actions he deſcribed, and that his head had a greater ſhare in thoſe deſcriptions than his heart. He boaſts that he had engaged in no love intrigues which had given occaſion for ſcandal, and that among the common people he had given none of them occaſion to doubt their being the fathers of their wives children.

> *Sed neque me nuptæ didicerunt furta magiſtro:*
> *Quodque parum novit, nemo docere poteſt.*
> *Sic ego delicias, & mollia carmina feci,*
> *Strinxerit ut nomen fabula nulla meum.*
> *Nec quiſquam eſt adeo mediâ de plebe maritus,*
> *Ut dubius vitio ſit pater ille meo.*
> *Crede mihi; mores diſtant à carmine noſtro.*
> *Vita verecunda eſt, Muſa jocoſa mihi.*
> *Magnaque pars operum mendax & ficta meorum*
> *Plus ſibi permiſit compoſitore ſuo.*
> *Nec liber indicium eſt animi, ſed honeſta voluptas,*
> *Plurima mulcendis auribus apta ferens* (4).

To reconcile this with the nineteenth elegy of the ſecond book *de Amoribus*, we muſt conceive that what he ſays there of himſelf, is a fiction. He there exhorts his miſtreſs's huſband to be jealous, and not to rob him by his indolence of the choiceſt ſweets of his good fortune. He would have that man not to be a contented huſband, but a rival.

> *Quid mihi cum facili, quid cum lenone marito?*
> *Corrumpis vitio gaudia noſtra tuo.*
> *Quin alium, quem tanta juvet patientia, quæris?*
> *Me tibi rivalem ſi juvat eſſe, veta* (5).

It is certain, that a great many Poets relate as fortunate adventures, what are only fictions of their brain; but we are at a loſs to determine whether this is Ovid's caſe. We are at too great a diſtance from the age in which he lived, and we cannot doubt but that ſome people, when called in queſtion (6), will boaſt of their innocence, though they are guilty.

[*B*] His books . . . , were *rather the pretence than the true cauſe of his exile.*] He owns in ſeveral places of his works, that the two cauſes of his miſery, were, that he had compoſed ſome books on the art of love; and that he had ſeen ſomething. He does not tell us what it was that he ſaw, but gives us to underſtand, that his books contributed leſs to his diſgrace than that did; for he ſuppoſes, that upon his complaining to love, that, after labouring to enlarge his empire, he had obtained no other reward but that of being baniſhed among Barbarians. Love made anſwer to him. You know very well that was not the thing that did you moſt harm.

> *Utque hæc, ſi utinam defendere cætera poſſes,*
> *Scis aliud quod te læſerit, eſſe magis* (7).

He compares himſelf to unfortunate Actæon.

> *Cur aliquid vidi? cur noxia lumina feci?*
> *Cur imprudenti cognita culpa mihi eſt?*
> *Inſcius Actæon vidit ſine veſte Dianam,*
> *Præda fuit canibus non minus ille ſuis* (8).

He repeats in ſeveral places the ſame complaint (9) of having ſeen, without deſign, the crime of another; and declares, that it is not lawful for him to reveal this myſtery (10). Attempts have been made to conjecture what it was; and the more ſilent he is, the greater has been the curioſity to penetrate into this ſecret. Some perſwade themſelves, that he ſurpriſed Auguſtus in a flagrant crime with Julia, his daughter, and confirm this by a paſſage of Suetonius, from which they pretend to gather, that Caligula deſpiſed his mother, becauſe he believed her to be the offspring of the inceſtuous commerce of Auguſtus with Julia. *Alteram ſubjiciunt alii, nempe eum vidiſſe Auguſtum turpiter cum Juliâ filiâ jacentem. . . . . Cui opinione favere viſus eſt Caligula, dum matrem ſuam ſpernebat, quaſi ex inceſto concubitu Auguſti, cum filia ſua Julia, prognatam* (11). It is certain, Suetonius (12) relates, that Caligula would not own Agrippa for his grandfather by the mother-ſide: he thought he was of too mean a rank for that character, and affirmed, that his mother was the daughter of the emperor Auguſtus and Julia: but this did not give him any diſ-reſpect to his mother Agrippina; for, on the contrary, he would have deſpiſed her, if he had thought ſhe had been born legitimately. The abbot de Marolles (13) having ſaid, that *Ovid ſurpriſed Auguſtus uſing too much familiarity with his daughter Julia,* adds, upon the teſtimony of Suetonius, that it was believed the mother of Caligula ſprung from the inceſtuous embraces of Julia and Auguſtus. But, it is not true that Suetonius ſays any ſuch thing; he only ſays Caligula gave it out ſo. The ſame abbot (14) tells us, that Ovid was baniſhed for having read to Julia, Auguſtus's grand-daughter, the laſt verſes of his book *de Arte Amandi*, and for having *ſurpriſed* Auguſtus, *uſing* that young princeſs *with too much familiarity*. There is room to doubt of all theſe conjectures; for Ovid having, in the verſes he compoſed in his exile and ſent to Rome, omitted no manner of ſubmiſſion and flattery which might ſeem capable to mollify Auguſtus, we cannot think that he would affect to inſert in them what was moſt proper to aggravate the emperor's diſpleaſure. Now, if we ſuppoſe the Emperor's diſpleaſure to have been grounded upon the Poet's ſeeing ſome infamous action, we muſt likewiſe ſuppoſe, that Ovid could not but offend him grievouſly by the affectation of ſaying, that his eyes, being the witneſſes of a ſecret he durſt not reveal, were the cauſe of his exile. But I confeſs, that this is not a convincing reaſon. See, below, remark [*K*].

[*C*] *There have been ſome Critics who have contemned his Latin.*] Paſſerat owns, that he had been a Profeſſor of the learned languages a long time without having explained any of Ovid's pieces; and that becauſe he found a reigning prejudice againſt that Poet: ‘ Inveteravit enim opinio, vulgique fama percrebuit, ‘ eum poetam eſſe non multæ doctrinæ, humiliſque & ‘ nimium luxuriantis ſtyli; atque etiam, ſi diis placet, ‘ Latinæ linguæ elegantiam nitoremque in eo requiri: ‘ adeo

---

(*a*) Ovid. lib. iii, Triſtium, Eleg. X.

(*b*) Ib. lib. i, Eleg. iii, & alibi.

(2) Ib. lib. II, Eleg. X, ver. 27.

(3) See, above, citat. (60) of the article LAÏS.

(4) Ovid. lib. II, Triſt. ver. 347.

(5) Id. Amor. lib. II, Eleg. XIX, in fine.

(6) That is, when they find their own poems brought in as evidence againſt them.

(7) Ovid. de Ponto, lib. III, Epiſt. III, ver. 71.

(8) Id. lib. II, Triſtium, ver. 103.

(9) Inſcia quod crimen viderunt lumina plector: Peccatumque oculos eſt habuiſſe meum. *Ib. lib. III, Eleg. V, ver.* 49.

(10) Perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen & error, Alterius facti culpa ſilenda mihi eſt. *Ib. lib. II, ver.* 207. Et quid præterea peccarim quærere noli, Ut pateat ſola culpa ſub arte mea. *Ib. lib. II, de Ponto, Epiſt. IX, ver.* 73.

(11) Brietius, de Poet. Latin.

(12) Sueton. in Calig. *cap. xxiii.*

(13) In the Life of Ovid.

(14) In his notes upon the laſt verſes of the third book, *de Arte Amandi*, which are ſo looſe that he did not tranſlate them into French.

They would have met but with a ſorry reception from Alphonſo king of Naples [*D*]. I refer ſeveral things to the place where I cenſure Mr Moreri [*E*].

The

'adeò ut Italus quidam vel hac re inprimis nobilis, 'cum humanioribus literis unicum gnatum imbueret, 'illa miro artificio contexta mutatæ ter quinque vo- 'lumina formæ in patrium ſermonem converterit, ne, 'ſi Latine legeret, ex Ovidii ſcriptis ſordes & barba- 'riem colligeret beata pueri vena, quæ jam tum ad 'exemplum Maronis properabat (15). ---- *For an opi- 'nion had prevailed, and was in every body's mouth, 'that he was a Poet of no great learning, that his ſtile 'was low and too luxuriant, and alſo, God bleſs their 'judgment, that his language wanted politeneſs and ele- 'gance : ſo that while a certain Italian who was emi- 'nent for his knowledge this way, was inſtructing his 'only ſon in polite learning, he tranſlated theſe fifteen 'books of the Metamorphoſis compoſed with ſuch wonder- 'ful art into his mother-tongue, leſt his ſon's happy ſtile, 'which very cloſely followed that of Virgil, ſhould be 'corrupted by Ovid's incorrectneſs and barbariſms, if he 'was to read them in the original Latin.'* Balzac was not ignorant of the whimſical taſte of this Italian. *I knew*, ſays he (16), *that under the pontificate of Leo X, a Venetian gentleman* (17) *who was much eſteemed by Fracaſtorius, and whoſe name he gave to his dialogue on Poetry, had a cuſtom on his anniverſary birth-day of ſolemnly burning the works of Martial, as an annual ſacrifice to the manes and memory of Catullus. And I am not ignorant, that another nice cotemporary of his, maintained that the corruption of the Roman language commenced in the perſon of Ovid, whoſe Metamorphoſis he tranſlated on purpoſe for the uſe of his ſon, that he might learn the Mythology without any danger from the locution, and that in ſeeking after the riches of poetry he might not endanger the nobleneſs of his own ſtyle by a contagious reading.* Scaliger obſerves, that Peter Victorius and Lambinus contemned Ovid extremely. 'Petrus Vi- 'ctorius de Ovidio non veritus ſit dicere, eum ut ora- 'tione & verſibus, ita vita & moribus enervatum . . . 'Non longe ab hac temeraria ſententia diſcedit Dio- 'nyſius Lambinus, qui imperitiſſime eum malum La- 'tinitatis auctorem vocat (18). ---- *Petrus Victorius 'did not ſcruple to ſay that Ovid was equally corrupted 'in his ſtile and poetry, as in his life and morals. . . . . 'Dionyſius Lambinus does not come much ſhort of this 'raſh judgment, when he fooliſhly calls Ovid the author 'of corrupt Latin.'* Another learned Critic (19) complains of the ſame taſte, without mentioning any body.

[*D*] *They would have met but with a ſorry reception from Alphonſo king of Naples.*] That Prince being with his army in the neighbourhood of Sulmo, aſked if it was certain, that Ovid was born there, and the people anſwering, that he certainly was, he ſaluted that town, and paid his acknowledgments to the genius of the country which had produced ſo great a Poet. He added, that he would willingly reſign part of his territories, to call to life again that man, whoſe memory was dearer to him than the poſſeſſion of Abruzzo. *Urbem ſalutavit, gratiaſque genio loci egit, in quo tantus olim poeta genitus eſſet, de cujus laudibus cum non pauca diſſeruiſſet, tandem famæ ejus magnitudine commotus : Ego, inquit, huic regioni quæ non parva regni Neapolitani, nec contemnenda pars eſt, libenter ceſſerim, ſi temporibus meis datum eſſet hunc poetam ut haberent, quem mortuum pluris ipſe faciam, quam omnis Aprutii dominatum* (20).

[*E*] *I refer ſeveral things to the place where I cenſure Mr Moreri.*] I. His firſt fault is a miſrepetition of the diſtich, in which our Poet declares, that he will do honour to his country (21).

Mantua, Virgilio gaudet, Verona Catullo,
Pelignæ (22) dicar gloria gentis ego (23).

Mantua, Verona, ſhare their Poets fame,
And I my ſelf will honour Sulmo's name.

II. In the ſecond place it is a terrible barbariſm to ſay he was *of the Equeſtrian family* (24). III. It is not true, that Ovid in the ſecond elegy of the firſt book *de Triſtibus*, ſays, that *when he was young he bore arms under Marcus Varro, in his expedition to Aſia.* The two verſes cited by Moreri does not imply that. They are theſe :

Non peto quas quondam petii ſtudioſus Athenas,
Oppida non Aſiæ, non mihi viſa prius.

I ſeek not Athens thy known learned ſhore,
Nor Aſian towns, nor places ſeen before.

The beſt editions put it *non loca viſa prius*, inſtead of *non mihi viſa prius* ; which two readings are much the ſame, ſo that I cannot ſee how Ciofanus, who follows the ſecond reading, could find in this diſtich a proof, that Ovid bore arms under Marcus Varro, with whom he went into Aſia, and being returned from thence made a voyage to Athens to ſtudy there. *Sub M. Varrone, qui cum Aſiam petiit militavit : inde reverſus ſtudii cauſa Athenas ſe contulit. Qua de re ſic lib.* 1. *Triſt.* Non peto quas quondam, *&c.* (25). Any one may ſee, that this diſtich proves, neither that Ovid bore arms under Marcus Varro, nor that he went with him to Aſia, nor that he went to Aſia before he went to Athens. The Poet, praying the Gods to put an end to the ſtorm, repreſents to them; among other things, that he was come to ſea upon an afflicting occaſion, to go to Scythia, and not to Greece, or any other place he had ſeen before. IV. It is not true, That *Seneca was of opinion that he had pleaded ſome cauſes at the bar.* When Seneca is cited without any addition, we take it for Seneca the Philoſopher, and without doubt Mr Moreri meant it ſo ; and yet we meet with nothing in Seneca the Philoſopher able to prove, that Ovid pleaded at the bar. It is more likely to be found in Seneca's father ; but neither is it there ; for there we only find, that our Poet ſtudied the art of Oratory under Arellius Fuſcus, and declaimed very ſucceſsfully in his ſchool. 'Hanc controverſiam me- 'mini me videre *Naſonem* declamare apud Rhetorem 'Arellium Fuſcum cujus auditor fuit . . . . Oratio 'ejus jam tum nihil aliud poterat videri quam ſolutum 'carmen. Adeo autem ſtudioſe Latronem audivit, ut 'multas ejus ſententias in verſus ſuos tranſtulerit . . . . 'Tunc autem cum ſtuderet, habebatur bonus decla- 'mator. Hanc certe controverſiam ante Arellium 'Fuſcum declamavit, ut mihi videbatur longe ingenio- 'ſius, excepto eo quod ſine certo ordine per locos diſ- 'curreret (26). ---- *Upon this ſubject I remember to 'have heard Ovid declaim before Arellius Fuſcus the 'Rhetorician, whoſe ſcholar he was . . . . His oration 'at that time could be thought no other than poetical 'proſe. He heard Latro with ſo much care, that he 'inſerted a great many of his ſentences in his verſes . . . . 'At that time of his ſtudies, he was eſteemed a good 'Orator. Upon this ſubject it is certain he declaimed 'before Arellius Fuſcus, in my judgment, much the moſt 'ingeniouſly, except only that he was too ſubject to di- 'greſſions and want of method.'* Mr Moreri is probably beholden for this fault to the abbot de Marolles (27), who has cited Seneca to prove, that Ovid pleaded at the bar. The fact is certain ; but inſtead of having recourſe to the pretended teſtimony of Seneca, he ſhould have cited Ovid himſelf, who affirms, that he has pleaded for people, arraigned at the tribunal of the *Centumviri*, and that being choſen arbitrator upon ſome law-ſuits, he decided them like a man of honour.

Nec male commiſſa eſt nobis fortuna reorum
Uſque decem decies inſpicienda viris.
Res quoque privatas ſtatui ſine crimine judex ;
Deque mea faſſa eſt pars quoque victa fide (28).

Before the Decemviri I've appear'd,
And for the guilty with ſucceſs been heard.
In private matters I've explain'd the laws,
Nor cou'd he blame his judge, who loſt his cauſe.

V. Moreri ſhould not have ſaid, that, *after the death of his father he applied himſelf intirely to poetry* ; for in giving an account of himſelf, he mentions no ſuch circumſtance. He only ſays, that out of deference to the remonſtrances of his father, he checked in his infancy his inclination to verſifying, and applied himſelf to ſuch offices as were proper for a young perſon of his rank (29). He takes notice (30) even of the

death

(15) Paſſeratius, Orat. & Præfat. *pag. m.* 218, 219.

(16) Ouvr. diverſes, *pag. m.* 406.

(17) *His name was* Andrew Naugerius. *See* Strada, Proluſ. V, *lib. ii*, *pag. m.* 334, 335 ; & Paul Jovius, in Elog. *cap. lxxviii*, *pag. m.* 181.

(18) Scalig. in Confutat. Fabulæ Burdonum, *pag.* 217.

(19) Muretus, in Senec. Quæſt. Nat. *lib. iii*, *cap. xxvii.*

(20) Jovianus Pontanus, de Principe, *fol.* 54, *verſo*, Oper. *Tom. i*, *Edit. Florent.* 1520, *in* 8*vo.*

(21) Ovid. Amor. lib. III, Eleg. XV, ver. 7.

(22) Ovid was born at Sulmo in the country of the Peligni.

(23) *Moreri has* ero *inſtead of* ego.

(24) This is corrected in the Dutch edition.

(25) Hercules Ciofanus, in Vita Ovidii.

(26) Seneca pater, Controverſ. X, *ſive II*, *lib. ii*, *pag. m.* 153.

(27) In the Life of Ovid.

(28) Ovid. Triſt. lib. II, ver. 93.

(29) Sæpe pater dixit ſtudium quid inutile tentas ?
Mæonides nullas ipſe reliquit opes.
Motus eram dictis, totoque Helicone relicto,
Scribere conabar verba ſoluta modis.
Sponte ſuâ carmen numeros veniebat ad aptos.
Et, quod tentabam ſcribere, verſus erat.
Ovid. Triſt. lib. iv, Eleg. X, ver. 21.

(30) Ibid.

The fineſt of Ovid's works is his Metamorphoſis. This was the judgment of the author himſelf; and it was from thence that he principally expected his name would be immortalized. He foretold that this performance would be proof againſt the injuries of ſword, fire, thunder, and time [*F*]. And that prediction has not yet proved falſe. The exordium, or beginning, of that poem is one of the fineſt parts of it. It is a deſcription of the Chaos, and of the manner in which the univerſe was formed out of it. Nothing can be clearer or more intelligible than that noble deſcription, if we confine our ſelves only to the Poet's phraſes; but if we examine his doctrines, we ſhall find them incoherent and contradictory; they will make a more frightful Chaos than that which he deſcribes. This gives me the opportunity of performing a promiſe I have made (*c*). I ſhall enquire whether the ideas of the antients who ſpoke of the Chaos were juſt; and whether they could ſay that this ſtate of confuſion ſubſiſted no longer [*G*]. I ſhall make it appear, that the

death of his eldeſt brother, as preceding his return to Parnaſſus; but he ſays no ſuch thing with reference to the death of his father. And indeed how could he have ſaid any ſuch thing, ſince he declares, that he ſoon re-imbarked in poetry, and that his father lived ninety years (31). VI. The emperor did not baniſh him *to the province of Pontus in Aſia.* He ſent him to Tomi an European city upon the Euxine ſea, near the mouths of the Danube. VII. He ſhould not have mentioned without cenſure the opinion of thoſe, who ſay he was baniſhed *for having made love to Julia the daughter of Auguſtus, whom he loved under the name of Corinna.* This opinion is very ancient; Sidonius Apollinaris approves of it.

> Et te carmina per libidinoſa
> Notum Naſo tenet, Tomoſque miſſum,
> Quondam Cæſareæ nimis puellæ
> Falſo nomine ſubditum Corinnæ (32).
>
> *And Ovid too for wanton verſes known,*
> *Baniſh'd to diſtant Tomi's wretched town,*
> *His daring love, not ſparing Cæſar's fame,*
> *But claſping Julia in Corinna's name.*

But Aldus Manutius (33) has refuted it by three arguments. The firſt is, that Ovid inceſſantly repeats, that his exile was owing to two cauſes, namely, his writing amorous verſes, and a fault which he does not reveal, and was accidental and involuntary (34). This is what cannot be ſaid of his amours with Auguſtus's daughter, which were carried to the pitch of enjoyment. Our Poet went that length with Corinna, as he tells us himſelf (35).

> *Singula quid referam? nil non laudabile vidi:*
> *Et nudam preſſi corpus ad uſque meum.*
> *Cætera quis neſcit? laſſi requievimus ambo.*
> *Proveniant medii ſic mihi ſæpe dies* (36).

Aldus Manutius's ſecond argument is borrowed from Ovid's being very young when he ſerved his Corinna.

> Carmina cum primum populo juvenilia legi,
> Barba reſecta mihi biſve ſemelve fuit.
> Moverat ingenium totam cantata per Urbem
> Nomine non vero dicta Corinna mihi (37).
>
> *When firſt around my amorous verſes flew,*
> *My chin but once or twice the razor knew;*
> *Fir'd by Corinna, ſo admir'd by fame,*
> *I drew her beauties, but conceal'd her name.*

Theſe verſes import, that Ovid was but about twenty years of age when he ſung his amours with his pretended Corinna. Now, when Auguſtus baniſhed him he was fifty years old. What probability is there that this emperor would be ſo ſlow in diſcovering the commerce of his daughter with a Poet, and in puniſhing him? Laſtly, Manutius obſerves, that Ovid would not have mentioned his Corinna in his verſes juſt now quoted, with ſo much complaiſance, if ſhe had been the cauſe of the diſgrace, which he ſo heavily deplores. VIII. I do not know of any who ſay that he *made his addreſſes to Livia,* Auguſtus's wife, and *that he compoſed his books* de Arte Amandi, *for her.* They would deſerve to be refuted more ſeverely than Sidonius Apollinaris. IX. Thoſe who ſay, that the city Tomi, near which *he was buried,* is now called Kiour (38), are as groſsly miſtaken as thoſe who ſay it is called Tomiſuar. For which reaſons Mr Moreri ſhould not have mentioned theſe things, without acquainting his reader that they are falſe. The town of Tomi, to which Ovid was baniſhed, was on this ſide the Danube, with reſpect to Italy (39). This does not ſuit either with Kiovia, which is ſituated upon the Boryſthenes, or with Temiſwar, a city in Tranſylvania. X. What Moreri relates of Ovid's tomb being found at Sabaria, or Stain in Auſtria, upon the Save, is altogether falſe, as I ſhall make it appear ſome time or other. XI. It was in 1540, and not in 1548, that the queen of Hungary ſhewed our Poet's pen. ‘Iſabella Pannoniæ ‘Regina circiter annum M. D. XL. Ovidii calamum ex ‘argento Tauruni, quæ eſt urbs inferioris Pannoniæ, ‘oſtendit Petro Angelio Bargæo, qui hoc ipſum mihi ‘narravit, cum hac inſcriptione OVIDII NASONIS ‘CALAMUS; qui non multo ante id tempus ſub ‘quibuſdam antiquis ruinis fuerat repertus. Eum Re‘gina ipſa plurimi faciebat, & veluti rem ſacram, ‘carum habebat (40). - - - *Iſabella, queen of Hungary,* ‘*about the year* 1540, *ſhowed to Peter Angelius Bar*‘*gæus, as he told me himſelf, the pen of Ovid, at Tau*‘*runum, a town of the lower Hungary, with this in*‘*ſcription,* OVIDII NASONIS CALAMUS; *which had* ‘*been diſcovered but a little before under ſome antient* ‘*ruins. The queen ſet a great value on it, and eſteemed* ‘*it as ſome holy relic.*’ In the article of this queen, I have taken notice of her learning.

[*F*] *He foretold that his Metamorphoſes would be proof againſt the injuries of ſword, fire, thunder, and time.*] The nine verſes which make the concluſion of it are theſe.

> Jamque opus exegi, quod nec Jovis ira, nec ignes,
> Nec poterit ferrum, nec edax abolere vetuſtas.
> Cùm volet illa dies, quæ nil niſi corporis hujus
> Jus habet, incerti ſpatium mihi finiat ævi:
> Parte tamen meliore mei ſuper alta perennis
> Aſtra ferar, nomenque erit indelebile noſtrum.
> Quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris,
> Ore legar populi: perque omnia ſecula famâ,
> Si quid habent veri vatum præſagia, vivam (41).
>
> *The work is finiſh'd, which nor dreads the rage*
> *Of tempeſts, fire, or war, or waſting age;*
> *Come ſoon or late, death's undetermin'd day,*
> *This mortal being only can decay;*
> *My nobler part, my fame, ſhall reach the ſkies,*
> *And to late times with blooming honours riſe:*
> *Whate'er th' unbounded Roman power obeys,*
> *All times and nations ſhall record my praiſe:*
> *If 'tis allow'd to Poets to divine,*
> *One half of round eternity is mine.*
>
> WELSTED.

[*G*] *I ſhall enquire whether the ideas of the Antients who ſpoke of the Chaos were juſt, and whether they could ſay, that this ſtate of confuſion ſubſiſted no longer.*] To proceed methodically in this taſk, I muſt firſt of all give you Ovid's deſcription of the Chaos; which is only an imitation, or rather a paraphraſe, of what he had met with in the writings of the antient Greeks.

Ante

(*c*) In the remark [*H*] of the article ANAXAGORAS.

(31) Ibid.

(32) Carm. xxiii, ver. 157. Savaro *approves of this opinion*, Not. ibid. & in Epiſt. X, lib. ii.

(33) In Vita Ovidii.

(34) See the remark [*B*], citation (7), and (8).

(35) *He flattered himſelf with the opinion of being the father of the child with which ſhe went.* Et tamen aut ex me conceperat, aut ego credo. Eſt mihi pro facto ſæpe, quod eſſe poteſt. *Ovid. Amor. lib. ii, Eleg. XIII, ver.* 5.

(36) Ovid. in Amor. lib. I, Eleg. V, ver. 23.

(37) Ib. lib. IV, Triſt. Eleg. X, ver. 37.

(38) *It ſhould be* Kiow, *or* Kiova. Hofman *has likewiſe called it* Kiour. *Mr de* Marolles *in the* Life of Ovid *calls it* Xiovia.

(39) Ne timeam gentes quas non bene ſubmovet Iſter. *Ib. Triſt. lib. ii. See likewiſe lib. III, Eleg. X.*

(40) Hercules Ciofanus, in Vita Ovidii, *pag. m.* 29.

(41) Ovid. Metam. *lib. xv, in fine.*

the ſtruggle of the four elements did not ceaſe at the time of the production of the world,

Ante mare & terras, & quod tegit omnia cœlum,
Unus erat toto naturæ vultus in orbe,
Quem dixêre Chaos; rudis indigeſtaque moles:
Nec quicquam, niſi pondus iners, congeſtaque eôdem
Non bene junctarum diſcordia Semina rerum.
Nullus adhuc mundo præbebat lumina Titan,
Nec nova creſcendo reparabat cornua Phœbe,
Nec circumfuſo pendebat in aëre tellus,
Ponderibus librata ſuis: nec brachia longo
Margine terrarum porrexerat Amphitrite.
Quâque erat & tellus, illic & pontus, & aër.
Sic erat inſtabilis tellus, innabilis unda,
Lucis egens aër: nulli ſua forma manebat.
Obſtabatque aliis aliud: quia corpore in uno
Frigida pugnabant calidis, humentia ſiccis,
Mollia cum duris, ſine pondere habentia pondus (42).

Before the ſeas, and this terreſtrial ball,
And Heav'n's high canopy, that covers all,
One was the face of nature; if a face:
Rather a rude and indigeſted maſs:
A lifeleſs lump, unfaſhion'd, and unfram'd,
Of jarring ſeeds; and juſtly Chaos nam'd.
No ſun was lighted up, the world to view;
No moon did yet her blunted horns renew:
Nor yet was earth ſuſpended in the ſky;
Nor pois'd, did on her own foundations lie:
Nor ſeas around the ſhores their arms had thrown;
But earth, and air, and water, were in one.
Thus air was void of light, and earth unſtable,
And water's dark abyſs unnavigable.
No certain form on any was impreſt;
All were confus'd, and each diſturb'd the reſt.
For hot and cold were in one body fix'd;
And ſoft with hard, and light with heavy mix'd.
DRYDEN.

You ſee, that by the Chaos they underſtood a maſs of matter without form, in which the ſeeds of all particular bodies were jumbled together in the greateſt confuſion. The air, the water, and the earth, were every where confounded; the whole was at war; each part oppoſed each part; the cold and the heat, moiſture and drineſs, levity and gravity ſtruggled one with another, in one and the ſame body all over the vaſt extent of matter. Now let us ſee how Ovid ſuppoſes that this ſtate of confuſion was diſintangled.

Hanc Deus, & melior litem natura diremit.
Nam cœlo terras, & terris abſcidit undas,
Et liquidum ſpiſſo ſecrevit ab aëre cœlum.
Quæ poſtquam evolvit, cæcoque exemit acervo,
Diſſociata locis concordi pace ligavit.
Ignea convexi vis & ſine pondere cœli
Emicuit, ſummâque locum ſibi legit in arce,
Proximus eſt aër illi levitate, locoque.
Denſior his tellus, elementaque grandia traxit,
Et preſſa eſt gravitate ſui. Circumfluus humor,
Ultima poſſedit, ſolidumque coërcuit orbem.
Sic ubi diſpoſitam, quiſquis fuit ille Deorum;
Congeriem ſecuit, ſectamque in membra redegit:
Principio terram, &c (43).

But GOD, or nature, while they thus contend,
To theſe inteſtine diſcords put an end;
Then earth from air, and ſeas from earth were driv'n,
And groſſer air ſunk from æthereal heav'n.
Thus diſſembroil'd, they take their proper place;
The next of kin contiguouſly embrace;
And foes are ſunder'd, by a larger ſpace.
The force of fire aſcended firſt on high,
And took it's dwelling in the vaulted ſky:
Then air ſucceeds, in lightneſs next to fire;
Whoſe atoms from unactive earth retire.
Earth ſinks beneath, and draws a num'rous throng
Of pondrous, thick, unweildy ſeeds along.
About her coaſts, unruly waters roar;
And riſing, on a ridge, inſult the ſhore.
Thus when the GOD, whatever God was he,
Had form'd the whole, and made the parts agree,
That no unequal portions might be found,
He moulded earth into a ſpacious round, &c.
DRYDEN.

You ſee he ſays this war of the confuſed and intangled elements, was determined by the authority of a GOD who parted them, and aſſigned to each their proper place; ranking fire in the uppermoſt region, the earth in the lowermoſt, the air immediately below the fire, and the water immediately below the air; and then forming a bond of friendſhip and concord between the four elements thus ſettled in ſeparate ſtations. By conſequence the analyſis of our Poet's diſcourſe may be reduced to theſe ſix propoſitions.

I. Before there was a heaven, an earth, and a ſea, nature was one homogeneous whole (44).

II. This whole was only a lumpiſh maſs (45), in which the principles of things were heaped up together in confuſion and without ſymmetry, and after a diſcordant manner.

III. Heat ſtruggled with cold in the ſame body; moiſture and drineſs had the ſame quarrel, and levity and gravity had no leſs.

IV. GOD put an end to this war by parting the combatants.

V. He aſſigned them diſtinct habitations, according to the gravity and levity peculiar to them.

VI. He formed a ſtrict alliance between them.

I ſhall give a general view of the faults to be met with in this doctrine of Ovid. I do not know whether it was ever criticized upon, or whether the commentators have ever examined this part of the metamorphoſis, philoſophically: but methinks they might eaſily have perceived,

In the Iſt place, that the firſt propoſition is little conſiſtent with the ſecond; for if the parts of a whole are compoſed of contrary ſeeds or principles, that whole cannot paſs for homogeneous.

In the IId place, that the ſecond propoſition does not agree with the third; for we cannot call that whole a meer heavy maſs, in which there is as much levity as gravity.

In the IIId place, that this heavy maſs cannot be looked upon as inactive, *pondus iners*, ſince contrary principles are blended in it without ſymmetry; whence it follows, that their actual ſtruggle muſt terminate in the victory of one or the other.

In the IVth place, that the firſt three propoſitions being once true, the fourth and fifth are ſuperfluous; for the elementary qualities are a principle of ſufficient force to diſentangle the Chaos without the intervention of another cauſe, and to place the parts at a greater or leſſer diſtance from the center, proportionably to their gravity or levity.

In the Vth place, that the fourth propoſition is falſe upon another account; for, ſince the production of the heavens, of air, water, and earth, the ſtruggle of cold and heat, moiſture and drineſs, gravity and levity, is as great in the ſame body as ever it could be before.

In the VIth place, that for the reaſon laſt mentioned, the ſixth propoſition is falſe.

From whence it is manifeſt, that the deſcription of the Chaos, and of it's extrication, is compoſed of propoſitions more oppoſite to one another, than the elements were oppoſite to one another during the Chaos.

It is needleſs to enlarge upon each of theſe falſe doctrines of Ovid; but there are ſome of them which require a pretty long illuſtration.

REFUTATION of the doctrine of the Chaos, upon the ſuppoſition of its having been Homogeneous.

I. I ſay then, that nothing can be more abſurd than to ſuppoſe a Chaos, which has been homogeneous during all eternity, notwithſtanding it had the elementary qualities, both thoſe called *Alteratrices*, which are heat, cold, moiſture, and drought; and thoſe called *Motrices*, which are levity and gravity; the former cauſing motion upwards, and the other downwards. A maſs of this nature cannot be homogeneous, but muſt neceſſarily contain all ſorts of heterogeneity. Heat and cold, moiſture and drought cannot be together,

(42) Ib. lib. I, ver. 5.

(43) Ib. ver. 21.

(44) Unus erat toto naturæ vultus in orbe.

(45) Nec quicquam niſi pondus iners, &c.

world, as they ſuppoſe; and I ſhall ſhew, that however they ought to have excepted mankind

ther, but that their action and re-action muſt temper them and convert them into other qualities which make the form of mixed bodies: and foraſmuch as this temperament may ariſe, according to the innumerable diverſities of combinations, the Chaos muſt have contained an incredible number of ſpecies of compounds. The only way to conceive an homogeneous Chaos, would be to ſay, that the *alteratrices* qualities of the elements would modify themſelves to the ſame degree in all the *moleculæ*, or ſmall particles of matter, inſomuch that there would be all over preciſely the ſame luke-warmneſs, the ſame ſoftneſs, the ſame ſmell, the ſame taſte, *&c.* But this would be pulling down with one hand what is built with the other; this would be, by a *contradictio in terminis*, calling a Chaos the moſt regular work, the moſt marvellous in it's ſymmetry, and the moſt admirably well proportioned, that can be conceived. I own, that a diverſified work ſuits better with the fancy and reliſh of mankind, than what is uniform; but at the ſame time our ideas teach us, that the harmony of contrary qualities preſerved uniformly all over the univerſe, would be a perfection as wonderful as the unequal partition that ſucceeded to the Chaos. What knowledge, what power, would not that uniform harmony, ſpread all over nature, require? To put into each mixed body the ſame quantity of each of the four ingredients, would not ſuffice; ſome would require more, ſome leſs, according as the force of ſome is greater or leſſer for acting than for reſiſting (46); for it is well known, that the Philoſophers diſtribute action and re-action to the elementary qualities in a different degree. Upon the whole, every thing conſidered, it would be found that the cauſe which metamorphoſed the Chaos, would have taken it not out of a ſtate of war and confuſion, as is here ſuppoſed, but out of a ſtate of regularity which was the moſt accompliſhed thing in the world, and by which, by reducing the contrary forces to an *Æquilibrum*, kept them in a repoſe equivalent to peace. It is manifeſt therefore, if the Poets would ſave the homogeneity of the Chaos, they muſt ſtrike out all they have added concerning that phantaſtical confuſion of contrary ſeeds, and that indigeſted mixture, and perpetual war of jarring principles.

Refutation of the Chaos, upon the ſuppoſition of it's having continued an infinite ſpace of time.

II. But to wave this contradiction, we ſhall find matter enough to attack them in other points. We ſhall encounter them on that of eternity. Nothing can be more abſurd than to admit the mixture of the inſenſible parts of the four elements for an infinite time: for ſince you ſuppoſe in thoſe parts the activity of heat, the action and re-action of the four firſt qualities, and beſides that, the motion of the particles of earth and water towards the centre, and the motion of thoſe of fire and air towards the circumference, you, at the ſame time, eſtabliſh a principle, which will neceſſarily ſeparate thoſe four ſpecies of bodies, one from another, which will require for this purpoſe no more than a certain limited time. Do but reflect a little upon what is called the phial of the four elements. In that phial we put up little metallic particles, and then three liquors much lighter one than another. Shake all theſe together, and you will diſcern none of the four ingredients, the parts of each being blended one with the other; but then let the phial ſtand ſtill, and you will find each of them reſume their proper ſtations: all the metallic particles will meet at the bottom, thoſe of the lighteſt liquor in the uppermoſt ſtation; thoſe of the liquor which is heavier than the laſt, and lighter than the firſt, will poſt themſelves in the third; thoſe of the liquor which is heavier than the two laſt, but lighter than the metallic particles, in the ſecond: and thus you recover the diſtinct ſituations which had been confounded by ſhaking the glaſs. In making this experiment, you do not need much patience; a ſhort ſpace of time will ſerve for recovering the repreſentation of the ſituation which nature has given to the four elements in the world. Now, comparing the univerſe to this phial, we may conclude, that if the earth, reduced to powder, had been mixed with the matter of the ſtars, with that of the air, and of water, ſo that the very inſenſible parts of each of thoſe elements had been blended together, all of them would preſently have ſtrove to be diſentangled, and at the end of a certain prefixed time, the parts of the earth would have formed a maſs, thoſe of fire another, and ſo on, in proportion to the gravity and levity of each ſpecies of bodies.

We may yet make uſe of another compariſon, and ſuppoſe the Chaos like new wine fermenting. This is a ſtate of confuſion: the ſpirituous and terreſtrial particles are jumbled together, inſomuch that neither ſight nor taſte can diſtinguiſh what is properly wine, and what is tartar or lees. This confuſion excites a furious ſtruggle between theſe different parts of matter. The ſhock is ſo violent, that ſometimes the veſſel is not able to ſtand it: but in two or three days, more or leſs, this inteſtine war ceaſes. The groſs parts diſengage themſelves, and ſink by virtue of their gravity. The more ſubtile parts get likewiſe looſe, and evaporate (47) by their levities; and thus the wine comes to it's natural ſtate. This is the very thing which would have happened to the poetical Chaos. The contrariety of the principles confuſedly jumbled together, would have produced a violent fermentation, which, however, at the end of a certain ſpace of time would have cauſed the precipitation of the terreſtrial bodies, and the exaltation of the ſpirituous part; and in a word, the proper arrangement of each body according to it's gravity and levity. So that there is nothing more inconſiſtent with reaſon and experience than to admit a Chaos of eternal duration, tho' it had comprehended all the force which has appeared in nature ſince the formation of the world. For it ought to be well obſerved, that, what we call the general laws of nature, the laws of motion, the mechanical principles, is the very ſame thing with what Ovid, and the Peripatetics call heat, cold, moiſture, drought, gravity, and levity. They pretended, that all the force, and all the activity of nature, all the principles of the generation, and alteration of bodies, were comprehended in the ſphere of theſe ſix qualities. Since therefore they admitted them in the Chaos, they neceſſarily acknowledged in it all the ſame virtue which produces in the world generations and corruptions, winds, rains, *&c.*

Whether it was a conſiſtent way of reaſoning to have recourſe to God for diſentangling the Chaos.

III. From hence ariſes another objection of almoſt as much weight as the preceding ones. Ovid, and thoſe whoſe opinions he has paraphraſed, had recourſe, without any neceſſity, to the miniſtry of God for diſentangling the Chaos; for they acknowledged, that it included all the internal force, which was capable of ſeparating the parts, and of allotting each element its proper ſituation; what occaſion therefore had they after this for calling in an external cauſe? Was not this imitating the bad Poets, who in their dramatical pieces introduced a god upon the ſtage, to remove a very inconſiderable perplexity? To reaſon right upon the production of the world, we ought to conſider God as the author of matter, and as the firſt and ſole principle of motion. If we cannot raiſe our thoughts to the idea of a creation, properly ſo called, we ſhall never get clear of all the difficulties which ſurround that ſubject; and to which ſoever ſide we turn, we muſt affirm things to which our reaſon cannot reconcile itſelf: for if matter is ſelf-exiſtent, we cannot well conceive, that God either could, or ſhould give it motion: it would be independent of any other thing, as to the reality of its exiſtence: why therefore ſhould it not have the power to exiſt always in the ſame place with reſpect to each of its parts? Why ſhould it be conſtrained to change its ſituation at the pleaſure of another ſubſtance? Add to this, that if matter had been moved by an external principle, it would be a ſign that its neceſſary and independent exiſtence are ſeparate and diſtinct from motion; the reſult of which is, that its natural ſtate is that of reſt, and conſequently God could not move it without diſordering the nature of things, there being nothing more ſuitable to order, than to follow the eternal and neceſſary inſtitution of nature. Of this I ſpeak more at large in other places (48). But of all the errors which are conſequent from that of rejecting the creation, there is none, in my opinion, ſo ſmall, as the ſuppoſing, that if God is not the cauſe of the exiſtence of matter, he is at leaſt the firſt mover of bodies, and in that quality the author of elementary properties, the author of the order and form we ſee in nature. The ſuppoſition of his being the firſt mover of matter, is a principle from whence this conſequence naturally flows, that he formed the heavens and the earth, the air and the ſea, and is the architect of this great mankind from their general rule, ſince this is ſubject to the moſt dreadful confuſions

---

(46) Calor, qui maximè eſt activus, minimus eſt in reſiſtentia; è contrario autem ſiccitas minor in activitate, major in reſiſtentia; frigus, quod ſecundo loco eſt activum, tertio eſt reſiſtitivum: humor denique penultimo loco activus, ſecundo reſiſtitivus. *Arriaga, Diſputat. III, de Generat. §. xi, n. 178, pag. m.* 500.

(47) We always find an empty ſpace in the caſk after the fermentation is over, which is an evident proof, that ſeveral parts evaporated thro' the chinks of the caſk.

(48) See, above, the remark [S] of the article EPICURUS. See alſo the remark [*A*] of the article HIEROCLES, the Philoſopher.

great and marvellous edifice which we call the world. But if you ſtrip him of that quality, of firſt mover, if you affirm, that matter moved itſelf independently of him, and had the diverſity of forms of itſelf; that, with reſpect to ſome of its parts, its motion tended to the center, and with reſpect to others, towards the circumference; that it contained particles of fire, particles of water, particles of air, and particles of earth: if, with Ovid, I ſay, you affirm all theſe things, you employ God needleſsly and to no purpoſe in the conſtruction of the world. Nature might have done very well without the aſſiſtance of God, it had ſufficient power to ſeparate the particles of the elements, and to aſſemble thoſe of the ſame claſs (49). Ariſtotle apprehended this truth very well, and had a much juſter notion of it than Plato, who admitted a diſorderly motion in the elementary matter, before the production of the world. Ariſtotle makes it appear, that this ſuppoſition deſtroyed itſelf, ſince unleſs we have recourſe to a progreſs *in infinitum*, motion in the elements muſt have been natural. If it was natural, ſome tended to the center, and others to the circumference; and conſequently ranged themſelves in ſuch a manner as was neceſſary for forming the world ſuch as it now appears: ſo that, during the time of that diſorderly motion, there was a world antecedent to the world, which is a contradiction. Theſe are his words: which I thought proper to produce, in order to give the reader an opportunity of examining more readily whether or not I have given their true ſenſe. Τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο συμβαίνειν ἀναγκαῖον' κἂν εἰ καθάπερ ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ γέγραπται, πρὶν γενέσθαι τὸν κόσμον, ἐκινεῖτο τὰ στοιχεῖα ἀτάκτως· ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἢ βίαιον εἶναι τὴν κίνησιν, ἢ κατὰ φύσιν. εἰ δὲ κατὰ φύσιν ἐκινεῖτο, ἀνάγκη κόσμον εἶναι, ἐάν τις βούληται θεωρεῖν ἐπιστήσας· τό, τε γὰρ πρῶτον κινοῦν ἀνάγκη κινεῖν αὐτὸ, κινούμενον κατὰ φύσιν· καὶ τὰ κινούμενα μὴ βίᾳ, ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις ἠρεμοῦντα τόποις, ποιεῖν ἥνπερ ἔχουσι νῦν τάξιν· τὰ μὲν βάρος ἔχοντα, ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον· τὰ δὲ κουφότητα, ἀπὸ τοῦ μέσου· ταύτην δ' ὁ κόσμος ἔχει τὴν διάταξιν. Hoc idem accidat neceſſe eſt, & ſi, ut in Timæo eſt ſcriptum, elementa inordinatè movebantur anteà quàm mundus ortus eſſet. Motum enim aut violentum, aut ſecundum naturam eſſe, neceſſe eſt. Quod ſi ſecundum naturam movebantur, mundum eſſe neceſſe eſt, ſi quiſpiam velit cum diligentia contemplari. Primum nanque movens movere neceſſe eſt, ipſum ſecundum naturam ſubiens motum, & ea, quæ moventur non vi in ſuis quieſcentia locis, eum, quem nunc habent ordinem facere: ea quidem, quæ pondus habent, ad medium: ea verò, quæ levitatem habent, à medio ſuopte pergentia nutu. Hunc autem ordinem Mundus habet (50). - - - - *The very ſame thing muſt neceſſarily happen; even though, as it is affirmed in Timæus, previouſly to the forming of the world, the elements had been moved irregularly: for motion muſt of neceſſity be either violent or natural. But if they were moved according to nature, there muſt be a world in courſe, if any perſon of judgment will conſider it. For the firſt mover muſt itſelf of neceſſity move, being moved according to nature: and thoſe things which moved without force, ſettling in their proper places, muſt compoſe the order which they now obſerve; thoſe which are heavy towards the centre; but thoſe that are light from the centre. Now this is the very order of the preſent world.* He obſerves in conſequence of this, and with a great deal of reaſon, that Anaxagoras who admitted no motion antecedent to the firſt formation of the world, had a clearer idea of this matter than the reſt (51).

The modern Peripatetics, the moſt zealous for Evangelical Orthodoxy, could find no fault in this diſcourſe of Ariſtotle; for they own, that the alterative and motive qualities of the four elements are ſufficient for the production of all the effects of nature. They only introduce God as the preſerver of theſe elementary qualities, of which he is the firſt cauſe, or elſe make him only interpoſe his general concurrence; and they agree, that excepting this they perform the whole, and in the quality of a ſecond cauſe, are the compleat principle of all generations (52). So that a ſcholaſtic divine would readily own, that if the four elements had exiſted independently of God, with all the faculties which they now enjoy, they would have formed of themſelves this machine of the world, and kept it up in the ſtate wherein it now appears. He muſt therefore acknowledge two great faults in the doctrine of the Chaos: one, and indeed the principal is, that it takes from God the creation of matter, and the production of the qualities peculiar to fire, to the air, to the earth, and to the ſea: the other, is, that after taking this away from him, it introduces him without neceſſity upon the ſtage of the world to adjuſt the places of the four elements. Our new Philoſophers, who have rejected the qualities and faculties of the Peripatetic Philoſophy, would find the ſame faults in Ovid's deſcription of the Chaos: for what they call general laws of motion, principles of mechaniſm, modifications of the matter, figure, ſituation and order of the particles, import nothing elſe but that active and paſſive virtue of nature, which the Peripatetics underſtand, under the terms of alterative and motive qualities of the four elements. Since therefore, according to the doctrine of the Peripatetics, thoſe four bodies, placed according to their natural levity and gravity, are a principle ſufficient for all generations; the Carteſians, the Gaſſendiſts, and other modern Philoſophers, muſt maintain, that the motion, ſituation, and figure of the parts of matter, are ſufficient for the production of all natural effects, without excepting even the general diſpoſition which has placed the earth, the air, water, and ſtars, where we now ſee them. Thus, the true cauſe of the world, and of the effects produced in it, is not different from the cauſe which gave motion to the parts of matter, whether it aſſigned at the ſame time to each atom a determinate figure, as the Gaſſendiſts will have it, or that it only gave thoſe parts, being all cubical, an impulſe, which, by the duration of motion, reduced to certain laws, would afterwards make them aſſume all ſorts of figures, purſuant to the hypotheſis of the Carteſians. Both the one and the other muſt conſequently agree, that if matter had been ſuch before the generation of the world, as Ovid pretends, it would have been capable of diſengaging itſelf from the Chaos by its own proper power, and to aſſume the form of the world, without the aſſiſtance of God. They muſt therefore charge Ovid with having committed two blunders; one in ſuppoſing, that matter, without the aſſiſtance of the Deity, contained the ſeeds of all the mixt bodies, heat, motion, *&c.* and the other in ſaying, that without the divine interpoſition, it could not have brought itſelf out of its ſtate of confuſion. This is giving too much and too little on theſe two reſpective occaſions; it is neglecting help when it is moſt wanted, and ſeeking it when it is not neceſſary.

Reflexion upon Des Cartes's notion of the manner in which the world might have been made.

I know ſome do not approve of Des Cartes's fiction concerning the manner how the world might have been formed (53). Some ridicule it, and think it, injurious to God; others charge it either with falſities, or with impoſſibilities. To the former it may be anſwered, that they do not underſtand the ſubject, and that, if they did, they would own, that nothing is more proper to give a lofty idea of the infinite wiſdom of God, than to affirm, that out of a matter that had no manner of form, he could make this world in a certain time, by the bare preſervation of the motion once given, and reduced to a few ſimple and general laws. As to what concerns thoſe who reject the particulars of Des Cartes's ſyſtem, as containing ſome things contrary to the laws of Mechanics, and the real ſtate of the celeſtial vortices as they have been diſcovered by Aſtronomers, I ſhall only reply to them, that this does not hinder the main of his hypotheſis from being juſt and reaſonable; and I am fully perſuaded, that Mr Newton *, the moſt formidable of all the animadverters upon Des Cartes, does not doubt but that the actual ſyſtem of the world might be the production of a few mechanical laws, eſtabliſhed by the author of all things: for if you ſuppoſe bodies determined to move in ſtreight lines, and to tend either towards the center, or towards the circumference, as often as the reſiſtance of other bodies obliges them to a circular motion, you eſtabliſh a principle which will neceſſarily produce great varieties in matter; and if it does not form this ſyſtem, it will form another.

Observation upon the Epicurean hypotheſis.

The very Epicurean hypotheſis, though ſo fooliſh, and extravagant, affords wherewith to form a certain world. Do but once allow them the different figures of atoms, with the inalienable power of moving themſelves,

---

(49) Compare what was ſaid above, remark [*G*], num. VIII, of the article ANAXAGORAS.

(50) Ariſt. de Cœlo, *lib. iii, cap. ii, pag. m.* 370, G.

(51) I have cited theſe words of Ariſtotle, above, citation (161) of the article EPICURUS.

(52) We muſt except the ſoul of man.

(53) *See Des Cartes's* Principia, *Part iii, num.* 46, *& ſeq.*

* Sir Isaac Newton.

ſelves, according to the laws of gravity, and mutually repelling one another, and reflecting in ſuch or ſuch a manner, according as they ſtrike one another in a perpendicular or oblique direction: grant them but this, and you cannot deny that the fortuitous concourſe of theſe corpuſcles may form maſſes, containing hard and fluid bodies, cold and heat, opacity and tranſparency, vortices, &c. all that can be denied them, is, the poſſibility of chances producing ſuch a ſyſtem of bodies as our world; in which there are ſo many things which perſevere ſo long in their regularity, ſo many animal machines a thouſand times more ingenious than thoſe of human art, which neceſſarily require an intelligent direction.

We ſhall examine, by the By, a notion of the Sieur Lami, Doctor of Phyſic at Paris, who is as great a ſtickler for atoms, as he is an adverſary to the Peripatetics, and to Des Cartes. All this appears by his work *de Principiis rerum* (54). Now this is the anſwer he gives to an objection commonly ſtarted againſt Epicurus's hypotheſis. The argument is built upon this compariſon; by throwing letters together at a venture, you would never compoſe Homer's Iliad, therefore the caſual concourſe of atoms could never produce a world. He anſwers that there is a very wide difference between theſe two things. The Iliad cannot be formed but by the preciſe and determinate junction of a certain number of letters; the method of compoſing it therefore is but one, out of an infinite number of various ways of ranging and adjuſting letters; ſo that we muſt not think it ſtrange, that chance ſhould never be able to hit upon this one way among an infinity of others. But for making a world in general, this or another, there is no neceſſity that the atoms ſhould meet and combine in one certain, preciſe, determinate manner; for in what manner ſoever they lay hold of one another, they will neceſſarily form heaps of bodies, and conſequently a world. He does not ſtop here, he gives the compariſon another turn. Let the junction of ſeveral letters, ſays he, be never ſo caſual, they will neceſſarily form ſyllables and words, therefore the fortuitous concourſe of atoms will neceſſarily form bodies. If you object to him, that theſe words, formed by chance, will have no ſignification, his anſwer will be that this is owing to words having no other ſignification but what man is pleaſed to give them; and that thence it comes, that in order to be ſignificative they muſt be ranged in conformity to human inſtitution: but that the virtue of atoms being independent of man, they producing conſiderable effects which may merit his admiration in whatſoever order they ſhall appear (55). There is no great neceſſity of diſcuſſing all this: we may grant him part of his pretenſions, and yet at the ſame time deny that our world, in which there are ſo many regular things tending to certain ends, can be the effect of chance. Obſerve, that Epicurus found himſelf obliged to own one inſtance of chance, at leaſt as wonderful as the Iliad would be, if produced by the fortuitous concourſe of certain letters. He aſſigned to the gods the figure of man, and believed them to be eternal: So that he was under a neceſſity of owning, that the fortuitous concourſe of atoms, by which the firſt men were compoſed, was an exact copy of a certain determinate and ſingle original, namely, the figure of the gods. Let us ſee what Cicero ſays on this head: ‘Hoc dico, non ab hominibus formæ figuram perveniſſe ad Deos: Dii enim ſemper fuerunt, & nati nunquam ſunt, ſiquidem æterni ſunt futuri. At homines nati: antè igitur humana forma, quàm homines eâ quâ erant formâ Dii immortales. Non ergo illorum humana forma, ſed noſtra divina dicenda eſt. Verùm hoc quidem, ut voletis: illud quæro, quæ fuerit tanta fortuna, (nihil enim ratione in rerum naturâ factum eſſe vultis) ſed tamen quis iſte tantus caſus, unde tam felix concurſus atomorum, ut repentè homines Deorum formâ naſcerentur? Semina Deorum decidiſſe de cœlo putamus in terras, & ſic homines patrum ſimiles extitiſſe? vellem diceretis: Deorum cognationem agnoſcerem non invitus. Nihil tale dicitis: ſed caſu eſſe factum ut Deorum ſimiles eſſemus (56). - - - - *This I affirm, that the gods could not receive their form from that of men: for the gods always exiſted, and never were born, their duration being eternal. But men are born: therefore before men had their human form, the immortal gods muſt have had their form ſuppoſing it were the ſame. Therefore their form ought not to be ſtiled human, but ours divine. But be this as you will: I aſk this queſtion, by what particular fortune, (for you allow reaſon no ſhare in the production of the univerſe) from what ſtrange chance, and lucky concourſe of atoms could it happen, that men ſhould all of a ſudden be born in the ſame form as the gods? Are we to ſuppoſe that the ſeed of the gods fell from heaven upon earth, and ſo men came to be like their fathers? I ſhould be glad you would allow me this: for I ſhould be proud to acknowledge this relation. But inſtead of making this ſuppoſition; you will have it that we are like the gods by meer accident.*’ This reſemblance between the Gods and men, formed thus by chance, is more ſurpriſing and wonderful, than it would be to ſee a child, by running a pencil upon a piece of paper, according to its little whims, draw a picture of Cæſar, as good and as like, as the beſt that ever Michael Angelo could draw of Cæſar.

REFUTATION of the doctrine of Ovid, ſo far as it ſuppoſes the war of the four elements, to have ceaſed when the Chaos was cleared.

IV. The laſt obſervation which remains to be illuſtrated, relates to what Ovid ſays, that the war of the four elements having been continual in the Chaos, was terminated by the authority of GOD who formed the world. Does not this imply, that ever ſince that time the elements have been at peace with one another? And is not this a pretenſion very ill founded and contradicted by experience? Has war ever ceaſed between heat and cold, moiſture and dryneſs, levity and gravity, fire and water, &c.? Since Ovid complied with the hypotheſis of the four elements, he ought to have known, that the antipathy of their qualities never dies, and that they never agree either by peace or truce, not even when they compoſe a temperament of mixt bodies. They never enter into ſuch compoſitions, but after a ſtruggle where they have reciprocally diſabled one another; and if their quarrel happens to be interrupted for ſome moments, it is becauſe the reſiſtance of the one is preciſely equal to the activity of the others. When they can do no more, they take breath again; but are always ready to harraſs and deſtroy one another, as ſoon as their ſtrength permits. The æquilibrium cannot laſt long; for every minute there comes ſome aſſiſtance to one or to the other; and of neceſſity the one muſt loſe what the other gains. So that Ovid muſt have ſeen that ſtill, as well as at the time of the Chaos, their war extended throughout, and in the ſmalleſt receſſes of the ſame mixed bodies:

- - - - Corpore in uno
Frigida pugnabant calidis, humentia ſiccis,
Mollia cum duris, ſine pondere habentia pondus (57).

Internal war thro' ev'ry maſs exiſts.
The cold and hot, the dry and humid fight,
The ſoft and hard, the heavy and the light.

SEWELL.

The laws of this engagement, are, that the weakeſt may be entirely ruined, according to the full extent of the power of the ſtrongeſt. Neither clemency nor pity have there any place; there is no hearkening to any propoſals of accommodation. This inteſtine war makes way for the diſſolution of the compound, and ſooner or later compaſſes that end. Living bodies are more expoſed to it than others, and would quickly ſink under it, if nature did not furniſh them with recruits; but at laſt the conflict of natural heat, and radical moiſture proves mortal to them. The power of time, which conſumes every thing, and which Ovid deſcribes ſo well in the fifteenth book of his Metamorphoſis, has no other foundation, but the conflict of bodies.

Tempus edax rerum, tuque invidioſa vetuſtas,
Omnia deſtruitis, vitiataque dentibus ævi
Paulatim lenta conſumitis omnia morte (58).

All things at laſt ſhall ſink beneath the rage,
Of ſlow devouring time, and envious age.

Our Poet in making this deſcription, had forgot what he had advanced in the chapter of the Chaos. We need only compare the beginning of his work with the end of it, to prove him guilty of contradiction. In the firſt book he affirms, that a ſtop was put to the diſcord of the elements; and in the fifteenth he tells us they deſtroy one another by turns, and that nothing perſeveres in the ſame ſtate.

---

(54) The *Acta Eruditorum*, for 1682, pag. 155, contain an abſtract of it, and obſerve, that it was printed at Paris, in 1680: but that was a new impreſſion; for I read it in 1678, and then it was no new book.

(55) Taken from the thirty-ninth chapter of the third book of William Lami, *de Rerum Principiis*.

(56) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, *lib. i, cap. xxxii.*

(57) Ovid. Metam. lib. I, ver. 18.

(58) Ovid. Metam. lib. XV, ver. 234.

Hæc quoque non perſtant, quæ nos elementa vocamus (59).

. . . .

. . . .

Omnia fiunt
Ex ipſis, & in ipſa cadunt: reſolutaque tellus
In liquidas rareſcit aquas; tenuatus in auras
Aeraque humor abit; dempto quoque pondere rurſus
In ſuperos aer tenuiſſimus emicat ignes.
Inde retro redeunt, idemque retexitur ordo:
Ignis enim denſum ſpiſſatus in aëre tranſit;
Hic in aquas; tellus glomerata cogitur undâ.
Nec ſpecies ſua cuique manet; rerumque novatrix
Ex aliis alias reparat natura figuras (60).

Nor do thoſe things which elements we name,
Perſiſt immutable, and ſtill the ſame.

. . . .

. . . .

From theſe a being is beſtow'd to all,
And into theſe again the whole muſt fall.
By rarefaction, earth to water flows;
Vapours, refin'd from water, air compoſe;
The airy particles ſublim'd, acquire
The higheſt rank, and brighten into fire.
Nor do they long in thoſe new ſhapes remain;
But in like order return back again.
For by condenſing fire to air give's birth;
Air melts to water; water ſinks to earth.
Thus nature loves thro' different forms to range;
And varies all her works with endleſs change.

He afterwards produces ſeveral inſtances of the conqueſt made by the water over the earth, and by the earth over the water, *&c.* Where is this pacification then, which he was ſo full of, in his firſt book? See the margin (61).

Nay, though he had not contradicted himſelf, we might cenſure him with a great deal of reaſon; for the world being a ſtage of viciſſitudes, nothing could be more improper than to give peace to the four elements; and the ceſſation of the Chaos ſhould be ſo far from putting an end to their quarrels, that, on the contrary, it ſhould have ſet them one againſt another, if they had been in mutual peace during the Chaos. It is by their conflict that nature becomes fruitful; their concord would keep her barren, and without the implacable war which they make againſt one another, wherever they meet, we ſhould have no generations. The production of one thing, is always the deſtruction of another.

Nam quodcunque ſuis mutatum finibus exit,
Continuo hoc mors eſt illius quod fuit ante (62).

For when things change, and keep their form no more,
This is the death of what they were before.

Generatio unius eſt corruptio alterius. This is a philoſophical axiom. So that Ovid ſhould have pre-ſuppoſed, that the god, who allotted diſtinct ſtations to the four elements, enjoyned them to fight without quarter, and to act the part of ambitious conquerors, who leave no ſtone unturned to invade the poſſeſſions of their neighbours. The orders given them ſhould have been like Dido's wiſh.

Nunc, olim, quocunque dabunt ſe tempore vires,
Littora littoribus contraria, fluctibus undas
Imprecor, arma armis, pugnent ipſique nepotes (63).

Our arms, our ſeas, our ſhores, oppoſ'd to theirs,
And the ſame hate deſcend on all our heirs.
Dryden.

And in effect, they act juſt as if they had received ſuch orders, and as if they were inſpired with the warmeſt paſſion to put them in full execution. Cold enlarges its ſphere as much as ever it can, and there deſtroys its enemy: heat does the like; and theſe two qualities are by turns maſter of the field, the one in winter, and the other in ſummer: they imitate thoſe victorious armies, which after gaining a deciſive battle, conſtrain their enemy to fly to his citadels, and purſuing him thither, lay ſiege to him, and reduce him to extremity. In the ſummer, cold flies to caverns and ſubterraneous cavities; and to prevent being entirely deſtroyed, redoubles the efforts of its reſiſtance, and fortifies itſelf in the beſt manner it can, by the virtue called Antiperiſtaſis: and in winter heat takes the ſame courſe. The elementary Philoſophers, who thus explain the effects of nature, tell us, that each quality ſtrives in ſuch a manner to vanquiſh the ſubjects it attacks, that, not ſatisfied with making them its vaſſals, and ordering them to wear its livery, it endeavours to tranſmute them into its own ſtate; *omne agens*, ſay they, *intendit ſibi aſſimilare paſſum - - - - every agent endeavours to aſſimilate to itſelf that which it works upon.* Can one meet with a more hoſtile, and more ambitious, animoſity than this? Empedocles was miſtaken in annexing to the four elements amity and enmity, the one for union, and the other for diſunion (64). We agree with him, that the union and diſunion of parts are highly neceſſary for the productions of nature; but it is certain, that amity has no hand in them: the ſole diſcord, the ſole antipathy of the elements aſſembles bodies in one place, and diſperſes them in another. Theſe two qualities of Empedocles can be attributed at moſt but to living bodies; but air and fire, water and earth, have no other attendant, except enmity.

Living bodies act very conformably to the order which Ovid ſhould have ſuppoſed to be given, by the author of the diſentangling of the Chaos, *viz.* that of mutual deſtruction; for it is literally true, that they ſubſiſt only by deſtruction: every thing which ſerves for the ſupport of their life, loſes its form, and changes its ſtate and ſpecies. Vegetables deſtroy the conſtitution and qualities of all the juices they can attract: and animals commit the ſame ravage upon every thing which ſerves them for food. They eat up one another, and there are ſeveral kinds of beaſts which make war upon one another, for no other end but to devour ſuch of their enemies as they ſhall happen to kill. In ſome countries men follow the ſame courſe, and every where they are great deſtroyers. I take no notice here of the ſlaughter ariſing from ambition, avarice, or cruelty, or from ſuch other paſſions as are the cauſes of war: I ſpeak only of the effects of the care taken to feed the body. In this regard, man is ſuch a ruining, deſtroying, principle, that in caſe all other animals deſtroyed as much in proportion, the earth would not be able to furniſh them with proviſions. When we ſee in the ſtreets and markets of great cities, ſuch a prodigious multitude of herbs and fruits, and of an infinite number of other things allotted for the food of the inhabitants, would not one be ready to ſay, here is proviſion for a week? would one imagine, that this ſhew is to be renewed every day? Would one believe, that ſo ſmall an opening as the human mouth, were a gulf, an abyſs, large enough to ſwallow up all that in a little time? Nothing but experience could make us believe it. In the *Saint-Evremoniana* lately publiſhed, I met with theſe Words (65): *it is ſaid, that at Paris there is four thouſand people who ſell oyſters, and that fifteen hundred large oxen, and above ſixteen thouſand ſheep, calves, or hogs, beſides a prodigious quantity of poultry, and wild fowls, are conſumed every day.* Judge what may be the caſe in thoſe countries, where they feed more upon fleſh, and are greater eaters.

Such being therefore the condition of nature, that beings are produced and preſerved by the deſtruction of one another, our Poet ſhould not have affirmed, that the war of the elements was pacified when the world began, and the Chaos ended (66). It was enough to have ſaid, that the ſituation and power of the combatants were regulated and ballanced in ſuch a manner, that their continual hoſtilities ſhould not produce the deſtruction of the work; but only the viciſſitudes that are its ornaments, *per queſto variar natura è bella, - - - - - nature is beautiful by this variety*, as the Italians ſay. Some perhaps will imagine, that the war, not ceaſing upon the regulation of theſe principles, it was not ſo much a ceſſation of the Chaos, as a rough draught of the diſentanglement; and that after this rough draught, that is, the world we live in, ſhall have continued a certain number of ages, it will be ſucceeded by a much finer world; from which diſcord will be baniſhed. And they will pretend, perhaps, that St Paul (67) confirms this opinion, in ſaying, that all creatures groan for their deliverance from fuſions and contrarieties which could poſſibly have been in the Chaos [*H*]. They muſt be

---

(59) Ib. ver. 237.

(60) Ib. ver. 244.

(61) It cannot be ſaid, in excuſe for this contradiction, that theſe ſentiments are here expreſſed in the perſon of the Philoſopher Pythagoras; for moſt of the things he makes him ſpeak, are either narrations, or opinions, agreeable to the hypotheſis of thoſe, who explained generation and corruption by the qualities of the elements.

(62) Lucret. lib. I, ver. 671.

(63) Virgil. Æneid. lib. IV, ver. 627.

(64) See Ariſtotle, book viii, of his Phyſics, chap. i, and Diogenes Laërtius, lib. viii, num. 76, *& ibi Aldobrandinus, & Menagius.*

(65) Pag. 293, of the Dutch Edit. in 1701.

(66) See in the 18th Tome of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle, pag.* 23, a remark in oppoſition to what Gregory Nazianzen ſaid in his 12th oration, that the univerſe is maintained by peace.

(67) Epiſtle to the Romans, chap. viii, ver. 19, & ſeq. This is a paſſage which puzzles the commentators very much.

from the ſtate of vanity and corruption in which they find themſelves. But let them ſay what they pleaſe, I ſhall not amuſe myſelf with the examination of their notions.

It is to be obſerved, that from the mechanical principles, by which the new Philoſophers explain the effects of nature, it is eaſier to comprehend the perpetual war of bodies, than from the Philoſophy of the four elements. For all the action of the ſix elementary qualities, being nothing elſe, according to the new Philoſophy, but local motion, it is manifeſt each body attacks every thing it meets, and that the parts of matter tend only to ſhock, break, and compreſs, one another, according to all the rigour of the laws of ſuperior powers.

[*H*] *they ought to have excepted mankind from the general rule, ſince it is ſubject to the moſt dreadful confuſions . . . which could poſſibly have been in the Chaos.*] But if we ſet aſide the arguments produced in the foregoing remark, and grant that Ovid might affirm, generally ſpeaking, that the creatures were releaſed from the Chaos, yet we might ſtill be allowed to ſay, that he could not in particular include man within that favour. I here only conſider the views we may have when deſtitute of the light of revelation. In this ſtate, who can forbear thinking that the horrors of the Chaos ſtill ſubſiſt with regard to man? For, not mentioning the perpetual conflict of the elementary qualities, which reigns ſomething more in his machine than in moſt other material beings, what war is there not between his ſoul and his body, between his reaſon and his ſenſes, between his ſenſitive and his reaſonable ſoul? reaſon ought to calm this diſorder, and pacify theſe inteſtine jars; but it is both judge and party, and its decrees are not executed; but only increaſe the miſchief (68). This is what obliged one of the moſt ſolid and moſt ſhining genius's of the XVIIth Century, to prefer the condition of ſheep before that of men. Read what follows.

Cependant nous avons la raiſon pour partage,
Et vous en ignorez l'uſage.
Innocens animaux n'en ſoiez point jaloux,
Ce n'eſt pas un grand avantage.
Cette fiere raiſon dont on fait tant de bruit
Contre les paſſions n'eſt pas un ſeur remede,
Un peu de vin la trouble, un enfant la ſeduit,
Et dechirer un cœur qui l' appelle à ſon aide,
Eſt tout l'effet qu'elle produit.
Toûjours impuiſſante & ſevere
Elle s'opoſe à tout, & ne ſurmonte rien.
Sous la garde de votre chien
Vous devez beaucoup moins redouter la colere
Des loups cruels & raviſſans,
Que ſous l'autorité d'une telle chimere
Nous ne devons craindre nos ſens (69).

Though we have reaſon's talent, which you want,
Sheep need not envy men that uſeleſs grant.
Proud reaſon, tho'. it makes ſo great a noiſe,
Is far from being paſſion's counterpoiſe.
It yields to wine, is by a child betray'd,
And only breaks the heart, which ſeeks its aid,
Reaſon for ever impotent, and ſour,
Fights every thing, yet nothing can o'erpow'r.
Againſt the wolves your dog's a ſure defence,
While our grand guard leaves us a prey to ſenſe.

This is what we meet with in the poems of Madam des Houlieres. We there likewiſe find, that the condition of inanimate creatures ſeemed to her to be preferable to ours. See what ſhe ſays, addreſſing herſelf to a brook (70).

Avec tant de bonheur d' où vient votre murmure?
Helas votre ſort eſt ſi doux!
Taiſez-vous ruiſſeau, c'eſt à nous
A nous plaindre de la nature.
De tant de paſſions que nourrit notre cœur
Aprennez qu'il n'en eſt pas une
Qui ne traine après ſoi le trouble, de douleur,
Le repentir, ou l'infortune.
Elles dechirent nuit & jour
Les cœurs dont elles ſont maîtreſſes.

. . . .

. . . .

De toutes ſortes d'unions
Que notre vie eſt éloignée!
De trahiſons, d'horreurs, & de diſſenſions
Elle eſt toûjours accompagnée.
Qu'avez-vous merité, ruiſſeau tranquill & doux,
Pour être mieux traité que nous?

. . . .

. . . .

Enfin dans cet horrible gouffre
De miſere & de vanité
Je me perds; & plus j'enviſage
La foibleſſe de l' homme & ſa malignité,
Et moins de la divinité
En lui je reconnois l'image.

O happy brook, why murmur you in vain!
Compoſe your ſtream, and let mankind complain.
The human heart a thouſand paſſions feeds,
While each to ſorrow or misfortune leads.
Both day and night in turns they tyrannize,
And ſoon deſtroy the ſpring from whence they riſe.

. . . .

. . . .

With treaſons, horrors, and diſſentions fill'd,
No drop of friendſhip does life's channel yield.
What merit, peaceful waters, can you claim,
Thus to be happier than the human frame.

. . . .

. . . .

In this dire gulph of vanity and woe,
I loſe myſelf in ev'ry ſtep I go:
And while in man, follies and crimes abound,
The Deity is no where to be found.

The verſes I am going to quote furniſh us with a freſh proof of the Chaos, in which mankind remained: the two moſt oppoſite things in the world, light and darkneſs, continue in man; in him they follow one another, and tread upon one another's heels: the leſs he knows, the more he thinks he knows: and the more he really knows, the more he is ſenſible of his own ignorance, the more he is in danger of miſtaking his right road. Now, can any thing be the ſubject, or the ſtage of a more capricious conflict?

Que l'eſprit de l'homme eſt borné!
Quelque tems qu'il donne à l'étude,
Quelque penetrant qu'il ſoit né,
Il ne ſait rien à fond, rien avec certitude:
De tenebres pour lui tout eſt environné;
La lumiere qui vient du ſavoir le plus rare
N'eſt qu'un fatal éclair, qu'n ardent qui l'égare.
Bien plus que l'ignorance elle eſt à redouter.
Longues erreurs qu'elle à fait naitre
Vous ne prouvez que trop que chercher a connoitre
Ne'ſt ſouvent qu'aprendre à douter (71).

How very narrow is the human mind?
The fineſt parts, in ſtudy long confin'd,
Can yet in ſcience boaſt no certain ground,
Such clouds and darkneſs ev'ry where abound.
Learning's beſt light, is but a fatal ray,
An ignis fatuus form'd to lead aſtray.
Better had we in ignorance remain,
Than trace her errors in an endleſs train;

Theſe

(68) Touching the complaints made againſt reaſon: ſee the New Letters againſt Maimbourg, *pag.* 755, *&* *ſeq*; and below, in the remark [*E*] of the article **PAULICIANS**, ſome paſſages of Cicero.

(69) Madam des Houlieres, Idylle on the Sheep, *pag.* 32, 33, *Edit. de Amſterdam* 1694.

(70) The ſame, in the Idylle on the Brook, *pag.* 119, 120.

(71) The ſame, in the *Réflexions diverſes, pag.* 94, 95.

Theſe prove that all we gain by the purſuit,
Is often only learning how to doubt.

I ſhould never have done, if I ſhould reſolve to collect every fine obſervation that has been made on the contrariety of ingredients in the human compoſition. The count de Buſſi Rabutin tells us, ‘ that upon this head he always remembers what Father Senault ſaid ; that the ‘ ſoul and body are very cloſely connected, and yet ‘ always at variance : and that, in a word, they are two ‘ enemies who cannot part, and two friends who ‘ cannot agree. Nothing can be expreſſed better ‘ or with greater truth (72).’ There is a greater freedom or vivacity, but not more ſtrong ſenſe, though indeed there is a great deal, in this paſſage of Balzac : *but who do you think, good reverend father, was the author of theſe words?* ‘ We are a compoſition of two ‘ enemies who never agree : the ſublime part of our ‘ ſoul is always at war with the inferior part. Let us ‘ add farther, that MAN IS MADE OF A GOD AND ‘ A BEAST, TIED TOGETHER. *If you gueſs the author ‘ of theſe four lines, I ſhall eſteem you as great a Magus, ‘ as thoſe who foretold the birth of king Sapores* (73).

There are ſome excellent things upon this ſubject, in two harangues of Gregory Palamas, archbiſhop of Theſſalonica in the XIVth century. *They are written by way of dialogue, with pleadings, and a definitive ſentence ; the ſoul accuſing the body, and the body on the other hand making it's defence, not purely by denying but colouring the fact, upon which is pronounced the ſentence of the judges.* I uſe the words of Claudius Eſpencæus, who made a French tranſlation of theſe two declamations and publiſhed it at Paris in 8vo, in 1570. Du Verdier Vau Privas quotes ſome paſſages out of it (74). I ſhall here preſent you with a long paſſage, in which there are ſome very good things and alſo ſome faults. ‘ The Philoſophers. . . . were unacquainted with the diſpoſi‘ tion of the ſprings which put the heart of man in ‘ motion, and had no knowledge, no ſuſpicion of the ‘ ſtrange change wrought upon him, by which his ‘ reaſon became a ſlave to his paſſions. . . . It is true ‘ they are excuſable for not knowing the cauſe of this ‘ change in man, but they can plead no excuſe for not ‘ perceiving the change itſelf: for, tho' ſome perſons, ‘ who live without thinking and reflexion are pardo‘ nable, for not knowing what paſſes within themſelves, ‘ it is inconceivable that the curious obſervers of na‘ ture, men who uſe their utmoſt application to ſtudy ‘ and know themſelves, ſhould not have obſerved, ‘ that man is not at preſent governed and conducted by ‘ reaſon. In effect, how can we conceive that diſcern‘ ing perſons ſhould not have diſcovered, by their ‘ knowledge and their own experience, that reaſon, ‘ with all it's power and application, is not able to de‘ ſtroy one paſſion which is rooted in the heart of man, ‘ neither by the help of any number of years, nor by ‘ the influence of any examples, nor by the fear of any ‘ evil ; and that they ſhould not have perceived what ‘ the dulleſt perſons ſee and are ſenſible of? A ſmall ‘ meaſure of attention therefore to what they experien‘ ced in themſelves, might have been ſufficient to inform ‘ them of the ſtate of reaſon, to convince them of their ‘ weakneſs, and to make them apprehend, that ‘ man who was once ſeated in the moſt elevated part of ‘ the ſoul, who inhabited that ſerene and luminous re‘ gion, from whence he ſaw and regulated himſelf ‘ within and without, is now in his preſent ſtate, plung‘ ed into ſenſe, the pleaſures of which he purſues, as ‘ if he was born for them. By the ſame means they ‘ might have perceived, that, though reaſon has loſt ‘ the power it had in man, yet it's light is not quite ‘ extinguiſhed, but ſome glimmerings are left ſufficient ‘ to point out his duty (75).’ The author who ſpeaks after this manner, is Mr Eſprit, in a piece he publiſhed in 1678. All he obſerves upon the weakneſs and ſlavery of reaſon is very true ; but he is in the wrong in charging the Philoſophers in general with the being ſtrangers to that ſervitude, and entertaining no ſuſpicion of the cauſes of it ; for undoubtedly ſeveral Heathens had a notion of this matter which he ſuppoſes they had not. I know very well, that the Stoics ſpoke too pompouſly of the empire of reaſon, and that the idea of their wiſe-man warmed their imagination to ſuch a pitch, that they let ſome things drop which might well ſeem extravagant, not in ſuppoſing, that if reſcued from paſſions, he would conſtantly and invariably obſerve the laws of order and goodneſs, but in ſuppoſing that it was poſſible for men to extirpate all vicious paſſions. This was their grand error ; it was here they betrayed their ignorance of the ſtate of mankind. The other part of their doctrine was rational, namely, that if man had once ſubdued and extirpated his paſſions, he would find no difficulty in practiſing virtue, and attaining to perfection (76). However, Mr Eſprit ſhould have confined his cenſures to them, and not have given them ſo large an extent as he has done. Who told him that the Philoſophers did not know that the ſoul of man is plunged in ſenſe? Does Cicero ſeem ignorant of this, in thoſe words of the third Book of his Republic, which St Auguſtin has preſerved to us, and which contain ſo lively a deſcription of the ſlavery of the ſoul under the empire of the paſſions. ‘ Homo non ut à matre, ſed ut à no‘ verca natura editus eſt in vitam, corpore nudo, & ‘ fragili, & infirmo, animo autem anxio ad moleſtias, ‘ humili ad timores, molli ad labores, prono ad libi‘ dines, in quo tamen ineſſet tamquam OBRUTUS ‘ quidam divinus ignis ingenii, & mentis (77). - - - ‘ *Man is brought into the world by nature, not as a ‘ mother, but as a ſtep mother, with a body naked, ‘ weak, and infirm, but with a mind ſowered by uneaſi‘ neſs, awed by fear, averſe to labour, and inclined to ‘ luſt, in which however appears, as it were,* STIFLED, ‘ *a certain divine ray of reaſon and underſtanding.*’ Had this author no *knowledge, no ſuſpicion of the ſtrange change wrought upon man, by which his reaſon became enſlaved to the paſſions?* What then is the meaning of the words preſerved to us by the ſame St Auguſtin, in which Cicero ſeems to approve of the antient Pagan, who believed, that the birth of man was a puniſhment for ſome ſin, committed in another life (78). Does he not applaud a thought which he had met with in Ariſtotle, that the union of the ſoul with the body was a puniſhment like that made uſe of by ſome antient robbers, who tied living bodies to dead corps, mouth to mouth, belly to belly, and ſo on in other parts (79)? Was not this owning, that the ſoul is, by ſin, reduced to the miſerable condition which it experiences in the body? Was not this conſidering ſin as the cauſe which had degraded the ſoul from it's natural ſtate, and primitive nobility? Let us recite this fine paſſage of Cicero. *Ex quibus humanæ vitæ erroribus, & ærumnis fit, ut interdum veteres illi ſive vates, ſive in ſacris, initiiſque tradendis divinæ mentis interpretes, qui nos ob aliqua ſcelera ſuſcepta in vita ſuperiore, pœnarum luendarum cauſſa natos eſſe dixerunt, aliquid vidiſſe videantur; verumque ſit illud, quod eſt apud Ariſtotelem, ſimili non affectos eſſe ſupplicio, atque eos, qui quondam, cum in prædonum Etruſcorum manus incidiſſent, crudelitate excogitata necabantur: quorum corpora viva cum mortuis, adverſa adverſis accommodata, quam aptiſſime colligabantur: ita noſtros animos cum corporibus copulatos, ut vivos cum mortuis eſſe conjunctos* (80). In fine, I do not conceive how Mr Eſprit comes to affirm, that the Philoſophers were ignorant that the power of reaſon is loſt, and yet it's light preſerved. Had not Euripides, the dramatic Philoſopher, ſaid, that after meditating a long time upon the corruption of men, he found that it was not owing to the frame of their underſtanding that they ſinned, but to their ſwerving from what is good, at the ſame time that they very well know it, ſome through idleneſs, others through the love of voluptuouſneſs? He puts theſe fine maxims in Phædra's mouth.

Ἤδη ποτ᾽ ἄλλως νυκτὸς ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ
Θνητῶν, ἐφρόντισ᾽, ᾗ διέφθαρται βίος.
Καί μοι δοκοῦσιν οὐ κατὰ γνώμης φύσιν
Πράσσειν κάκιον. Ἔστι γὰρ τόγ᾽ εὖ φρονεῖν
Πολλοῖσιν, ἀλλὰ τῇδ᾽ ἀθρητέον τάδε.
Τὰ χρηστ᾽ ἐπιστάμεσθα, καὶ γιγνώσκομεν,
Οὐκ ἐκπονοῦμεν δ᾽. οἱ μὲν ἀργίας ὕπο,
Οἱ δ᾽ ἡδονὴν προθέντες ἀντὶ τοῦ καλοῦ
Ἀλλήν τιν᾽.

Jam ſæpe *mecum* aliâs noctis in longo tempore
Cogitavi, quomodo corrupta ſit hominum vita.
Et mihi videntur non ſecundum animi naturam : *at*
præter eam
Deterius facere. eſt enim recta *rerum* cognitio
Multis. Sed ſic ſpectanda *ſunt* hæc.
Bona *quidem* tenemus, & novimus :
Sed non facimus : alii quidem propter ignaviam,

(72) Buſſi Rabutin, Letter xxxi, of the fourth part, pag. 53, of the Dutch edition.

(73) Balzac, Diſſertation to the reverend Father, Dom Andrew de St Denis, a Divine, of the congregation of the Feuillants, *at the end of his* Socrate Chrétien, *pag. m.* 193, 194.

(74) *See pag.* 175, *& ſeq. of the* Bibliotheque Françoiſe.

(75) Eſprit, Preface to his book of the Deceitfulneſs of human Virtues.

(76) *See the* New Letters againſt Maimbourg, *pag.* 758.

(77) See the Fragments of Cicero, collected by Andreas Patricius, *pag. m.* 70. He quotes this, as taken from St Auguſtin, *lib. iv, contra Pelagium.*

(78) See the remark [*R*] in the article TULLIA.

(79) Compare citat. (68) of the article LEO X, where I quote a paſſage from Virgil.

(80) Cicero, in Hortenſio, apud Auguſtinum, *lib. iv, contra Pelagium.* See the Fragments collected by Andreas Patricius, *pag. m.* 102, 103.

be very weak who take a certain poem *de Vetula* to be the work of Ovid [*I*]. I ſhall

Alii vero anteponentes voluptatem honeſto,
Aliam aliquam (81).

Oft have I ſpent the tedious night to know,
From whence in human life corruptions flow.
And from thoſe ſtudies, this reſult I find,
That men do ill through no defect of mind.
For we are form'd ſufficiently wiſe ;
But here the truth of this great matter lies.
Plainly we all perceive the path to good ;
But ſloth, or pleaſure, makes us ſhun the road.

Is it poſſible to give a finer deſcription than in theſe words of Ovid, of the incapacity of reaſon to make us do what ſhe makes us approve ?

Concipit interea validos Æetias ignes,
Et luctata diu, poſtquam ratione furorem
Vincere non poterat ; Fruſtra Medea repugnas,
Neſcio quis deus obſtat, ait (82).
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Excute (83) virgineo conceptas pectore flammas,
Si potes, infelix. Si poſſem, ſanior eſſem ;
Sed *trahit invitam nova vis : aliudque Cupido,*
Mens aliud ſuadet. Video meliora, proboque,
Deteriora ſequor (84).

Mean while the daughter rages with deſire,
Nor pains, nor thoughts, avail to quench the fire :
In vain, Medea, you reſiſt, ſhe cries ;
Some heavenly power all ſucceſs denies.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Extinguiſh, if you can, unhappy maid,
Theſe cruel flames which your fond heart invade.
O that I cou'd! Then might I be at reſt !
But a new tyrant lords it in my breaſt !
In ſpite of reaſon, paſſion rules my will :
I ſee, approve the good ; yet muſt purſue the ill !

Here be pleaſed to obſerve, that ſhe imputes this irreſiſtible impulſe to ſome god. That was the uſual refuge of the Heathens, in accounting for the paſſions which hurry away man in ſpite of the light of his mind, and the knowledge of his true intereſt (85). They believed this to have ſomething divine in it, and almoſt always to be a puniſhment for ſome antecedent ſin : which ſhews that they were not ſo ignorant as Mr Eſprit makes them, and that they had ſome ſort of notion of what the Divines teach us concerning the loſs of Free-will, occaſioned by ſin, and concerning the deſertion of thoſe who abuſe the grace of GOD.

I could have cited, inſtead of Ovid, ſeveral writers who were Philoſophers by profeſſion : but I thought this much more proper, to ſhew Mr Eſprit's miſtake ; for it is leſs excuſable to be ignorant of what is to be met with in ſuch a Poet, than of what is ſaid by the Greek authors. I could likewiſe have muſtered up ſeveral teſtimonies of ſufficient credit to convince us, that it was very well known that mankind grovelled ſtill in the Chaos : but the moſt nervous deſcriptions of the pagan Orators, Poets, or Philoſophers, are not able to give us ſo lively an idea of this matter, as that which St Paul has left us. We need only therefore caſt our eyes upon the picture, which that great Apoſtle, under the direction of eternal Truth, lays before us in his Epiſtle to the Romans. *That which I do*, ſays he (86), *I allow not ; for what I would, that I do not ; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I conſent unto the law that* it is *good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but ſin that dwelleth in me : for I know that in me (that is, in my fleſh) dwelleth no good thing : for to will is preſent with me, but* how *to perform that which is good, I find not : for the good that I would, I do not : but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now, if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but ſin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is preſent with me. For I delight in the law of GOD, after the inward man. But I ſee another law in my members, warring againſt the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of ſin, which is in my members. O wretched man that I am, who ſhall deliver me from the body of this death !*

Note, that I have conſidered the Chaos in man, only with reſpect to the inteſtine war which every one feels within himſelf. If I had taken into conſideration the differences between nations and nations, and even between neighour and neighbour, with all the hypocriſies, frauds, and violences, *&c.* that attend them, I ſhould have found a field very large and fertile, in confirmation of what I propoſed to prove.

[*I*] *They muſt be very weak who believe a certain Poem* de Vetula, *to be the work of Ovid.*] The ſtory goes, that Ovid deſpairing of being recalled from his exile, compoſed this piece, and ordered it to be laid in the grave by him (87). It is added (88), that this poem being found in a public burying-place in the ſuburbs of the city of Dioſcurias, was carried to Conſtantinople, by the order of the king of Colchis, and publiſhed by Leo, Protonotary of the ſacred palace, and ſecretary to the emperor Vaſtaſius (89). It is divided into three books, and is ſaid to bear the title *de Vetula*, upon account of the adventure related by the author in the ſecond. He was paſſionately in love with a young girl, who was an accompliſhed beauty ; and had, by preſents, engaged an old woman to ſerve him in his amours. The old woman had been the young lady's nurſe, and after making ſeveral repreſentations of the difficulty of the enterprize, at laſt aſſured the lover, that at ſuch an hour he ſhould find his miſtreſs in bed in ſuch a place, where he muſt enter ſoftly, and without a light. Ovid tranſported with the moſt violent love imaginable, ſlipped into the bed appointed ; but ſo ſtrange a change as he there met with, is not to be parallelled in all his Metamorphoſes ; for inſtead of all thoſe beauties which his fancy was ſo full of, he found all the deformities of old age, for the perſon in bed was the nurſe herſelf. Upon this he fretted, and ſtormed to the laſt degree. Obſerve how he expreſſes himſelf.

Heu mihi ! tanta meis regnans dulcedo medullis
Quam modicum manſit ! Reperi contraria votis.
Vertitur in luctum cytharæ ſonus, inque ſtuporem
Deliciarum ſpes, moritur fax ignis amoris.
Si quid erat, quod epar, ventoſo turbine miſſo,
Fecerat arrectum, ſubito languetque caditque :
Sopitur virtus, frigeſcunt omnia membra.
Credere quis poſſet, quod virgo, quattuor implens
Nuper Olympiades, adeò cito conſenuiſſet ?
Nunquam tam modico Roſa marcuit. In nova formas,
Corpora mutatas cecini, mirabiliorque
Non reperitur ibi mutatio, quàm fuit iſta :
Seilicet, ut fuerit, tam parvo tempore talis,
Taliter, in talem vetulam mutata puella !
Heu quàm diſſimiles ſunt, Virginis artubus, artus !
Accuſant Vetulam, membrorum turba ſenilis,
Collum nervoſum, ſcapularum cuſpis acuta,
Saxoſum pectus, laxatum pellibus uber,
Non uber, ſed tam vacuum, quâm molle ; velut ſunt
Burſæ paſtorum : Venter ſulcatus aratro,
Arentes clunes macredine, crudaque crura,
Inflatumque genu, vincens adamanta rigore.
Accuſant vetulam membrorum marcida turba.
Concitus exurgo, cæpi firmare, quod illam
Appeterem ferro : ſed mens ad ſe revocavit
Virgineam famam, quæ ſcandala ne pateretur,
Continui ; quamvis omnis ſpes ejus habendæ
Jam diſceſſiſſet. Sic dextra quievit, amorque
Extinctus, vivum potuit ſuperare dolorem (90).

The young girl married, and in about twenty years time became a widow, after many frequent lyings-in, which had very much impaired her beauty (91). Then ſhe appeared very much diſpoſed to marry Ovid ; who agreed

(81) Euripides, in Hippolyto, *ver.* 375, *pag. m.* 359. Note, that Farnaby, in Ovid. Metam. lib. vii, ver. 11, falſly quotes this from Euripides's Medea.

(82 Ovid. Metam. lib. VII, ver. 9.

(83) Id. ib. ver. 17.

(84) She owns in Euripides, that ſhe knows very well what crimes ſhe is going to commit ; but that her paſſions prevails over her knowledge. Καὶ μανθάνω μὲν οἷα τολμήσω κακὰ, Θυμὸς δὲ κρείσσων τῶν ἐμῶν βουλευμάτων. Et intelligo quidem qualia *ſint ea* mala, *quæ* ſum auſura. Sed ira eſt potentior meis conſiliis. *I plain enough perceive the ill ; But paſſion overrules my will.* Euripid. in Medea, ver. 1078, *pag.* 319.

(85) See the remark [*Y*] of the article HELENA.

(86) Epiſtle to the Romans, ch. vii, ver. 15, & ſeq.

(87) Leo Protonotarius, in Præfatione Librorum de Vetula.

(88) Gloſſator *ejuſdem Operis* de Vetula.

(89) Alias John Ducas. He was emperor from the year 1222 to 1255.

(90) Ovid. de Vetula, *lib. ii, cap. xxx, & xxxi, pag. m.* 48.

(91) Poſtquam viginti circiter annos cum ſponſo fuerat, partuque effœta frequenti & ſua jam facies diſpendia parturiendi ſenſerat. *Id. ib. cap. xxxiv, pag.* 50.

I ſhall quote ſome verſes (d) out of it, that thoſe who have not the book may judge of the author's vein.

I ſhall begin my additions with explaining what I have ſaid in contradiction to thoſe who believe he was baniſhed for having ſurprized Auguſtus in an execrable inceſt [K], and

agreed to it; but he found it after all no ſuch great favour that he had obtained, for he had only made himſelf maſter of a piece of antiquity. This occaſioned him to take a reſolution to change his courſe of life, and apply himſelf to ſolid ſtudies.

This Poem, and another, intituled, *Brunellus Vigelli*, ſeu *Speculum ſtultorum*, were printed at Wolfembuttel, in 1662. The editor affirms in his Preface, dated the thirteenth of December, 1661, that they had been printed at Cologne almoſt two hundred years before. Naudæus knew nothing of this firſt edition; for he tells us, that this pretended Poem of Ovid *had been twice printed; firſt, ſeparately, and without the name of the place, or Printer, in* 1534; *and a ſecond time*, inter Ovidii erotica & amatoria opuſcula, *publiſhed at Frankfort in* 1610, *with a Preface not at all contemptible* (92). He obſerves (93), that Robert Holcot has quoted *ſeveral verſes of this piece, in his Commentary upon the book of Wiſdom, lecture ſixty of the old Venice edition, and the ſixty-firſt of that of Baſil* (94), without affirming or denying, that Ovid was the genuine author of it. ‘An ſit liber Ovidii, Deus novit, ‘quamvis à Leone Protonotario Sacri Palatii Vaſtaſii ‘Principis, referatur liber ille extractus de ſepulchro ‘Ovidii, unde teſtamentum Ovidii nuncupatur; dicit ‘enim quod inventus fuit in cœmiterio publico, in ‘quodam ſepulchro, in ſuburbano Dioſcori Civitatis, ‘quæ eſt caput Regni Colchorum; & quia ibi non ‘erat copia Latinorum, eo quod Armenici linguam ‘Latinam non intelligunt, Rex Colchorum miſit illum ‘librum Conſtantinopolim, ubi erat copia Latinorum. ‘Refert etiam quod inter antiquorum ſepulchra unum ‘inventum eſt, in quo epigramma fuit ſcriptum litteris ‘Armenicis, cujus inſcriptio ſic ſonabat, Hic jacet ‘Ovidius, ingenioſiſſimus Poëtarum, obiit autem anno ‘Chriſti XVIII, ſicut refert Guillelmus de Euange in ‘Chronico ſuo, tertio anno, unde conſtat quod ſi veraciter ‘liber ſuus erat, fuit pulcherrima prophetia de ‘Chriſto. - - - - *Whether it be the work of Ovid, God ‘knows, tho' the book is affirmed by Leo the Protonotary ‘of the ſacred palace to the emperor Vaſtaſius, to have ‘been taken out of Ovid's tomb, from whence it is called ‘Ovid's Will; for he ſays it was found in a public ‘burying-place, in a certain tomb, in the ſuburbs of ‘Dioſcurias, the capital city of the kingdom of Colchis; ‘and becauſe there were no people there who ‘underſtood Latin, the Armenians being ſtrangers to it, ‘the king of Colchis ſent the book to Conſtantinople, where ‘that languague was very well known. He relates alſo, ‘that among ſome antient ſepulchres, one was found with ‘an inſcription in Armenian letters, to this purpoſe*; Here ‘lies Ovid, the moſt witty Poet, who died in the ‘year of CHRIST XVIII, *as William de Euange ‘has it in his Chronicon, at the third year, from whence ‘it is plain, that if it was really his book, it was a ‘very fine prophecy of CHRIST.*’ A man, without being a great conjurer, may ſafely ſwear that Ovid never compiled ſuch a barbarous poem as this, and that it is the production of ſome Chriſtian of the lower empire.

[K] *I ſhall . . . . explain what I have ſaid* (95) *in contradiction to thoſe who believe Ovid was baniſhed for having ſurpriſed Auguſtus in an execrable inceſt.*] I cited Father Briet, who ſays that there are ſome who will have it, that Ovid ſurpriſed Auguſtus in a horrid crime with his daughter Julia, and I did not refute this, as I ſhall now do, with a demonſtrative argument, which, is that our Poet was diſgraced ſeveral years after Julia was gone from Rome, and become the object of her father's indignation (96). Inſtead of alledging this undoubted proof, I oppoſed that opinion only with a probability, namely that it was not at all probable, if the cauſe of Ovid's exile was ſuch as they ſuppoſed, that he would ſo frequently have repreſented that what he had ſeen was the ſource of his misfortune. Nothing could have been more likely to aggravate Auguſtus's uneaſineſs, which the Poet would have made uſe of every turn of wit to ſooth, and to flatter: but this objection, however ſpecious it may be, is not without reply; for it cannot be denied that what Ovid had ſeen was ſomething which concerned Auguſtus ſo nearly, that the recalling this object to his mind, was renewing his ſorrow, and opening afreſh his wound. Ovid himſelf confeſſes it in his addreſs to that emperor.

Perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen & error,
Alterius facti culpa ſilenda mihi.
Nam non ſum tanti, ut RENOVEM TUA VULNERA, *Cæſar*
Quem nimio plus eſt INDOLUISSE *ſemel* (97).

Theſe are the two cauſes he aſſigns for the ruin of his fortune, the one for having compoſed love verſes, the other for having ſeen certain things accidentally. He juſtifies himſelf the beſt he can, and that very particularly and fully, as to the former (98); but he conceals the latter in ſilence, to prevent renewing Auguſtus's concern. He knew therefore that the memory of this accident muſt provoke him, and make him uneaſy; and yet he revives it at every turn in his Poems: he had not therefore the prudence I ſuppoſe him to have had; and conſequently I have made uſe of an argument that proves too much, for it proves that he muſt have avoided renewing all uneaſy ideas, and it is certain he did not avoid it.

This objection lies much harder upon Aldus Manutius, than it does upon me; for the argument I have uſed is only aimed againſt thoſe who will have it, that Ovid ſurpriſed Auguſtus, either with his daughter, or grand-daughter; but Aldus Manutius urges it in general againſt thoſe who believe that this emperor was ſurpriſed in ſome indecent action: ‘Ubique exilii cauſam ‘tum libros de Arte, tum errorem fuiſſe commemorat ‘*(Ovidius)*: quis verò ille error fuerit, nunquam ‘aperuit, ne magis Auguſtus ſibi iraſceretur, ‘verùm quia, ut ipſe ait, *Nitimur in vetitum ſemper, ‘cupimuſque negata*; quidnam id fuerit, plurimi ſcire ‘conati ſunt, & conatur ſemper aliquis; quapropter ‘ſuſpicati ſunt quidam turpe aliquod Auguſti ſecretum ‘caſu vidiſſe Ovidium, quod non placet, quia toties ‘objiciendo ſcelus, immitiorem reddidiſſet Cæſarem, ‘quem lenire & placare ſtudebat (99). - - - - *Ovid every ‘where aſſigns as the cauſes of his exile, both his book ‘of the Art of Love, and ſome unlucky diſcovery; what ‘this diſcovery was, never appeared, for fear of giving ‘a freſh offence to Auguſtus; but becauſe, as he himſelf ‘ſays,* we are always for purſuing what is forbidden, ‘and deſiring what is refuſed us, *a great many have endeavoured, ‘and ſome are always endeavouring to find ‘it out: for which reaſon ſome have ſuſpected that Ovid ‘had accidentally ſeen ſome indecency of Auguſtus, which ‘is by no means probable, becauſe by ſo often mentioning ‘his crime, he muſt have incenſed Auguſtus, whom it ‘was his ſtudy to ſoften and appeaſe.*’ I might be in the right, though Aldus Manutius were in the wrong: there are ſome indecent actions which Ovid might have ventured to remind Auguſtus of, without allowing any poſſibility of inferring that he might be ſo imprudent as to renew in his mind the idea of a horrid inceſt. This remembrance muſt be infinitely more likely to provoke and incenſe him, than that of a ſimple act of galantry, in which he might have been ſurpriſed either with the daughter or wife of ſome magiſtrate; and yet ſuch a diſcovery as this, might incur Auguſtus's diſpleaſure, and inſpire him with all that reſentment which he expreſſed againſt Ovid. His age of ſeventy years, and a great many other circumſtances, which may be ſuppoſed, might furniſh ſufficient reaſon to be angry with one who ſhould have been eye-witneſs of this myſtery of love. Ciofanius paid no regard to the ſentiment of Aldus Manutius; but, on the contrary, declared himſelf of the opinion which I have juſt now eſpouſed: ‘Ejus ‘exilii, ſive potius relegationis cauſam longè veriorem ‘eam eſſe puto, viſum à ſe fortè fortuna Auguſtum ‘Cæſarem in re quadam turpi atque obſcœna. Teſtatur ‘enim *Ariſtot. Lib.* II. De Arte dicendi, nullum ‘eſſe tam magnum, tamque vehemens odium, ‘quàm illud, quod ex eo naſcitur, cùm quis in ejuſmodi ‘re turpi deprehenditur (100). - - - - *I take it ‘to be a truer cauſe of baniſhing him, or rather of re-*

(d) In citation (90), below.

(92) Naudé, Dialogue de Maſcurat, *pag.* 226.

(93) Ibid. *pag.* 225.

(94) Note, that Naudæus cenſures Selden, who, in his treatiſe *de Diis Syris*, *pag. m.* 31, quotes for this the 21ſt lecture of Holcot, upon the book of Wiſdom.

(95) In the remark [B].

(96) See the remark of the article JULIA, the daughter of Auguſtus.

(97) Ovid. Triſt. lib. II, ver. 207.

(98) Id. ib.

(99) Aldus Manutius, in Vita Ovidii, apud Ciofanium Obſervat. in Ovidium, *pag. m.* 20.

(100) Ciofan. in Vita Ovidii, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 27.

and I ſhall demonſtrate that their conjectures are falſe with regard to Julia, the daughter of

'*legating him, that he had accidentally diſcovered Auguſtus in ſome indecent and obſcene action.* For Ariſtotle 'obſerves in book II of his Rhetoric, *That no hatred 'is ſo great, as that which ariſes from the being ſurpriſed in an indecent fact.*' Obſerve that neither of theſe two authors give the leaſt hint with regard to the inceſt; and remember that if the reaſoning I have made uſe of is liable to ſome objections, yet it muſt at leaſt be allowed that the conjecture concerning the inceſt is neceſſarily falſe with reſpect to Julia the daughter, ſhe being baniſhed a long time before Ovid offended the emperor: and it is to be obſerved, that ſhe was already baniſhed when he compoſed his *Art of Love*, and that it was eight or nine years after his writing that book before he himſelf was baniſhed. This refutes the *Abbé de Marolles*, who pretends that one of the cauſes of his diſgrace was *his Art of Love which had given offence to the emperor by ſome paſſages of it which were meant of his daughter under the name of Corinna* (101). See above (102) the arguments of Aldus Manutius againſt thoſe who hold that this Corinna was Auguſtus's daughter (103).

Let us examine theſe conjectures with regard to Julia the grand-daughter. There is no poſſible foundation for them from the paſſage of Suetonius (104); for if any handle were to be taken from the extravagance of Caligula, this at moſt could be only with regard to Julia the daughter of Auguſtus; and be pleaſed to take notice, that Suetonius in his account of this extravagance does not in the leaſt inſinuate that there were any reports of amours between Auguſtus and his daughter or grand-daughter. This however was a very fair opportunity for mentioning ſomething of it, and therefore ſince Suetonius has not ſaid one ſyllable about it (105), neither in this place, nor where he ſpeaks of the laſciviouſneſs of Auguſtus, and of his behaviour with regard to the two Julias, it is a ſign there was no ſuch report of the inceſt in queſtion; for if there had been any ſuch, that hiſtorian could not have been ignorant of it, and would certainly have mentioned it. His genius inclined him to diſcover ſuch ſecret hiſtories, and to inſert them without ſcruple in his work: for the proof of which we have a thouſand and a thouſand examples. But however it be, Chronology does not give me ſo great aſſiſtance here, as againſt the other conjecture; for the exile of Ovid, and that of Julia the grand daughter of Auguſtus happened much about the ſame time.

This Julia died in the year of Rome 781, twenty years after ſhe had been baniſhed (106). She muſt therefore be baniſhed in the year 761. Ovid was fifty years old at the time of his exile (107), which muſt therefore be in the year 761, for he was born in the year 711 (108): he ſays in an epiſtle where he mentions the death of Auguſtus, that he had then ſpent ſix years among the Getæ (109). This confirms what I have ſaid, ſince it is certain that Auguſtus died in the year 767. Now as we do not know the day on which the diſgrace of this Poet happened, tho' we find that in the month of December he paſſed the Adriatic ſea, in order to go to the country of the Getæ (110), and as we are equally ignorant of the day and month when Julia incurred the indignation of her grand-father, we are not able to refute by chronological arguments thoſe who ſhould ſay that the exile of theſe two perſons proceeded from the reſentment of Auguſtus in finding his inceſt diſcovered. Ovid, who had been the ſpectator of it was become odious, and, on the other ſide, Julia herſelf was alſo become odious; there was no enduring any longer two objects capable of renewing the ſhame of this diſcovery. They were both expelled from Rome, and to have the fairer pretence for doing it, Julia was convicted of having violated her conjugal faith (111), and Ovid was charged with preſuming to publiſh ſcandalous and pernicious verſes. Theſe are facts which we might refute perhaps invincibly, if we knew the preciſe dates of them; but ſo long as we continue ignorant of theſe, there is no refuting them by arguments borrowed from Chronology. Scaliger would be very ſerviceable on this occaſion (112), if he were not miſtaken when he ſuppoſes that Ovid in ſpeaking of Rome was full fifty-two years old. This would prove that he was not baniſhed till about the end of March 763.

But if we are at a loſs for chronological arguments, we have others with which we may oppoſe this conjecture of inceſt between that emperor and his grand-daughter.

I. The firſt is taken from the ſilence of Suetonius (113).

II. The ſecond from hence, that Ovid never fails to repreſent as one of the cauſes of his misfortune, the having ſeen we know not what thro' inadvertency. He does not deny but that he was ſenſible this diſcovery had incenſed the emperor, and that he could not mention it without opening afreſh the wound; but ſince notwithſtanding this he makes ſo frequent a mention of it, we ought to judge that what he ſaw could not be to the laſt degree infamous, nor capable of expoſing Auguſtus to the curſes of the Roman people who loved, reſpected, and adored, him in an extraordinary manner. Ovid had too much wit, and too much ſenſe, not to comprehend that with regard to ſuch a ſecret as that, thoſe who have the misfortune to be privy to it, can take no better method than to endeavour to make it believed that they have entirely forgot it. The moſt general and equivocal expreſſions would always appear too plain to a monarch intereſted in the affair, and might make him apprehend, that after having ſo frequently lamented in general the misfortune of having ſeen ſomething which muſt not be mentioned, the ſecret itſelf may at laſt come out. Such an apprehenſion as this may make him take a reſolution of diſpatching out of the way thoſe who are privy to the ſecret. There is no need of very great penetration to form theſe reflections, and to draw from them a leſſon of ſilence. But if the ſecret that is diſcovered is an affair which may become public without deſtroying a monarch's reputation, if it is one of thoſe facts he would chuſe to conceal either out of humour, or for ſome reaſon of ſtate, and not at all on account of the infamy of them, the ſame meaſures are not to be obſerved, and there is no difficulty made in complaining generally of the misfortune of having ſeen what muſt not be mentioned. We are ſenſible of the prince's being well aſſured, that at the worſt his glory has nothing to fear from our indiſcretion.

III. My third argument is taken from hence, that Ovid gives us to underſtand he would have mentioned it, and juſtified himſelf, if his ſtation had not appeared to him too inſignificant to be worth the trouble of renewing the Emperor's concern (114). Would any one ſay this, if it had been an inceſtuous affair that Julia had been diſcovered in, with her grand-father of ſeventy years of age? Is this a matter which might be mentioned upon certain occaſions, I mean by a perſon who might believe himſelf to be of importance? Is not this a crime of ſuch a nature, as ought abſolutely and without exception to be concealed in eternal ſilence.

IV. I take my fourth argument from hence, that Auguſtus did not immediately and ſecretly get Ovid diſpatched out of the way, which he might very eaſily have done. Could he have lived in quiet, if he had known, that, with regard to ſo horrid a ſecret as this, he was at the mercy of a gallant and raking Poet? If he would not have choſe to prevent his indiſcretion by making away with him, he certainly would have endeavoured it by heaping favours on him. He took neither of theſe two methods, but ſent him to Tomos, and there left him amidſt complaints and groans, without apprehending that the hardſhip of that ſituation, and the deſpair of ever being delivered from it, might at laſt induce him to reveal the ſecret. Never let it be ſaid that he ſoftened the decree of baniſhment with ſome circumſtances of favour, and that this was a ſign of his behaving towards Ovid with a view of preventing his telling tales. This thought can never appear reaſonable: for although he left this Poet the enjoyment of his fortune, and did not procure his condemnation by a decree of the Senate, and made uſe of the term *Relegation* inſtead of *Baniſhment*, yet he did not fail to inflict upon him a very heavy puniſhment.

Cujus in eventu pœnæ clementia tanta eſt,
Ut fuerit noſtro lenior ira metu.
Vita data eſt, citraque necem tua conſtitit ira,
O princeps parce viribus uſe tuis.

(101) Marolles, Life of Ovid, prefixed to the French tranſlation of the poem againſt Ibis, *pag.* 4.

(102) In the remark [*E*], num. VII.

(103) *This has been again affirmed in a book printed in* 1697. Soli Imp. Aug. inviſus (*Ovidius*) qui de ſollicitata ſub Corinnæ nomine Julia ſua ſuſpectum Tomos in exilium miſit. *Jo. Alb. Fabricius, Bibl. Latina, pag.* 35, 36.

(104) Which I have quoted in the remark [*B*].

(105) This will be mentioned afterwards, as the firſt of my reaſons.

(106) Per idem tempus Julia mortem obiit quam neptem Auguſtus convictum adulterii damnaverat projeceratque in inſulam Trimetum . . . illic viginti annis exilium toleravit. *Tacit. Ann. lib. iv, cap. lxxi.*

(107) *Ovid. Triſt. lib. iv, Eleg. ult.* But note, that by miſtake he gives five years to each Olympiad.

(108) Ibid.

(109) Ib. de Ponto, *lib. iv, Epiſt. xiii.*

(110) Ib. Triſt. *lib. i, Eleg. X.*

(111) Tacit. Annal. *lib. iv, cap. lxxi.*

(112) Scalig. Animadv. in Euſeb. *pag. m.* 182. *See Father* Noris, Cenotaph. Piſan. *pag.* 202.

(113) To be ſenſible of what weight it is, ſee the above citation (105).

(114) Alterius facti culpa ſilenda mihi.
NAM NON SUM TANTI, ut renovem tua vulnera, Cæſar
Quem nimio plus eſt indoluiſſe ſemel. *Ovid. Triſt. lib. II, ver.* 208.

of this emperor, and that with regard to Julia his grand-daughter, they are very far from being probable. I perſiſt in the opinion that Ovid's love-verſes were not ſo much the cauſe, as the pretence, of baniſhing him: and I can give a ſufficient proof of it, which is, that the Art of Love was the book principally complained of, and that this had been publiſhed ſeveral years when he was baniſhed. He compoſed it about the year of Rome 752 (*e*), and he was baniſhed in the year 761 (*f*): and indeed he has obſerved, that the puniſhment followed a long time after the offence [*L*], and that he ſuffered in his old age for the ſins of his youth. This is not altogether exact with regard to his Art of Love; for he compoſed that work at the age of forty-one. He was in the fifty-firſt year of his age (*g*), when he left Rome to go to Tomos the place of his relegation. This was the term made uſe of by Auguſtus in his decree of condemnation, and not that of exile; this favour was accompanied with another which was much more ſubſtantial ſince Ovid was permitted to enjoy his patrimony (*h*). Although he was not able to get himſelf recalled, or ſo much as removed to another place of confinement (*i*), yet he never was wanting in his reſpect to the emperor; but, on the contrary, continued invariably to praiſe him with ſuch extravagance as bordered upon idolatry, and he made an idol of him literally as ſoon as he heard of his death. He not only wrote his elogy, in a poem in the Getic tongue, but alſo invocated him, and conſecrated a chapel to him, where he went every morning to

(*e*) He ſays, *lib. i, Art. Amat. ver.* 171, that the ſhew of the naval engagement had been exhibited a little time before, and that the young Cæſar was preparing for an expedition into the Eaſt. This agrees with the year 752.

(*f*) See the remark [*K*], citation (108).

(*g*) See the ſame remark, citation (107).

(*h*) See the proof of all this in the ſame remark, citation (115).

(*i*) He contented himſelf at laſt with petitioning for this favour. See lib. i, *de Ponto*, Epiſt. II, pag. m. 220; and lib. ii, *Triſt*, at the end.

Inſuper accedunt, te non adimente, paternæ,
  Tanquam vita parum muneris eſſet, opes.
Nec mea decreto damnaſti facta Senatus,
  Nec mea ſelecto judice juſſa fuga eſt.
Triſtibus invectus verbis (ita principe dignum)
  Ultus es offenſas, ut decet, ipſe tuas.
Adde quod edictum quamvis immite, minaxque,
  Attamen in pœnæ nomine lene fuit.
Quippe relegatus, non exſul dicor in illo:
  Parcaque fortunæ ſunt ibi verba meæ (115).

Such mercy in my puniſhment appears,
That your reſentment falls below my fears.
Since to your clemency my life I owe,
O prince, you ſparingly your power ſhow.
And as if life were yet too ſmall a boon,
My fortune too you let me call my own.
Nor did my ſentence from the ſenate come:
Nor did the ſolemn judge pronounce my doom.
But as my prince I happ'ned to incenſe,
Your own harſh words beſt ſuit my dire offence.
Beſides, in the decree, tho' hard at beſt,
Yet is there ſomething tenderly expreſs'd.
While relegation ſtands in exile's place,
And ſpeaks in ſofteſt terms my ſad diſgrace.

He ſent him away into a country which, to this unfortunate man, appeared as a ſort of Hell (116); what can be met with more deplorable than the condition Ovid was in upon leaving Rome (117)?

Some may perhaps eſteem it more reaſonable to object againſt me, that ſince Auguſtus was not to be ſoftened by ſuch fawning and pathetic ſupplication as Ovid made to him, it muſt neceſſarily follow that his anger was founded upon the ſhame of having been catched in ſome very obſcene action. I anſwer, 1. That it is pretended that he was at laſt ſoftened, and that, if his death had not intervened, he would have recalled Ovid (118). 2. That as he had alledged for one cauſe of his baniſhment the ſcandalous verſes of this Poet, he found his account in not recalling him. He made a merit of this with the Senate, and with all perſons of gravity and zeal for the reformation of manners. He would have overlooked this conſideration, if Ovid had been neceſſary to him either in the cabinet, or at the head of his troops; but having no occaſion for him upon this account, he was very well pleaſed with ſhewing that he gave no encouragement to the corrupters of morality. I do not know whether Tiberius, who ſuffered Ovid to die in his exile, might not make uſe of the ſame policy. The Poet did not neglect making his court upon the deceaſe of Auguſtus, he invoked him as a new deity (119), and endeavoured to make the moſt of this worſhip with the new emperor.

It might be difficult to ſatisfy thoſe who deſire to know the reaſon why Auguſtus was ſo incenſed againſt Ovid, as to ſeek for harſh words (120), in order to expreſs in the edict of baniſhment his indignation and reſentment of the offence he thought he had received: but it would not be difficult to think of incidents, which without including any diſcovery of inceſt, or even of ſome inſtance of ſimple galantry, might throw him into a violent rage againſt a witneſs unexpected. Suppoſe that upon his having diſcovered ſome mortifying intrigue in his own family, he had choſe a place of retirement to lament, and bewail it in ſecret, or to examine his grand-daughter, to reprove her, to threaten her, and even, if occaſion were, to beat her. Suppoſe that he was taking to taſk ſome confident, and endeavouring to force her, either by threats or blows, to tell him the truth. Suppoſe that one of his freed men or ſlaves had been under the ſame circumſtances, or even that the emperor had reſolved to put him to the torture privately; here you would have three or four caſes in which Ovid could not ſurprize the emperor without irritating him to the laſt degree. Was it poſſible for a prince who had ſo long beheld himſelf ſeated on the very higheſt pinnacle of human grandeur, to avoid being extremely nice and punctilious on the head of receiving an affront? If the leaſt want of reſpect could offend him on any occaſion, it muſt certainly be on that of prying into his family concerns, and making an actual diſcovery of ſomething there which he would be deſirous of keeping private. The anger this occaſioned did not then permit him to diſtinguiſh whether chance, or deſign, and a bold and ambitious curioſity (121), were the cauſe of this diſcovery. He was too much provoked at this unlucky juncture, not to eſteem it an offence highly deſerving puniſhment.

For the reſt, our modern authors are not the only ones who pretend that the ruin of Ovid's fortune was owing to his being witneſs to an inceſtuous commerce. Cœlius Rhodiginus has quoted ſome fragments of one Cæcilius Minutianus Apuleius wherein we meet with this very fact (122).

[*L*] *He has obſerved that the puniſhment followed a long time after the offence.*] See how he deſcribes the long continuance of his impunity, in addreſſing to Auguſtus himſelf, and after having given a long liſt of the authors of laſcivious works which had not been puniſhed.

Nos quoque jam pridem ſcripto peccavimus iſto,
  Supplicium patitur non nova culpa novum.
Carminaque edideram, cum te delicta notantem
  Præterii toties irrequietus eques.
Ergo quæ juveni mihi non nocitura putavi
  Scripta parum prudens; nunc nocuere ſeni.
Sera redundavit veteris vindicta libelli,
  Diſtat & à meriti tempore pœna ſui (123).

I too have long ſince ſinn'd in amorous rhime,
New is the puniſhment, but old the crime.
Oft have I, tho' my verſe has met your frown,
Yet ſpurr'd my Pegaſus, and ſtill writ on.
When young, my pen was grown ſo very bold,
I fear'd no hurt, which now I feel when old.

(115) Ovid. Triſt. *lib. ii, ver.* 125. *See alſo* Triſt. *lib. v, Eleg. XI,* & de Ponto, *lib. i, Epiſt. vii.*

(116) Read the verſes of Ovid wrote during his exile.

(117) *See* Ovid, Triſt. *lib. i, Eleg. III.*

(118) Cæperat Auguſtus deceptæ ignoſcere culpæ
Spem noſtram terras deſeruitque ſimul.
Auguſtus now my ſad miſtake forgave,
When lo my hopes were buried in his grave.
Ovid. de Ponto, *lib. iv, Epiſt. VI, ver.* 15.

(119) See the remark [*M*], citation (125).

(120) Triſtibus invectus verbis, (ita Principe dignum)
Ultus es offenſas, ut decet ipſe tuas.
But as my prince I happ'ned to incenſe,
Your own harſh words beſt ſuit my dire offence.
Id. Triſt. *lib. ii, ver.* 133.

(121) Scire volunt ſecreta domus atque inde timeri.
They love the ſecrets of your houſe to gain,
That they may ride you with a ſtraiter rein.
Juven. Sat. III, ver. 113.

(122) Pulſum quoque in exilium (*Ovidium*) quod Auguſti inceſtum vidiſſet. - - - - *That Ovid was ſent into baniſhment for having diſcovered Auguſtus's inceſt.* Cœl. Rhod. Antiq. Lect. *lib. xiii, cap. i, pag. m.* 659.

(123) Ovid. Triſt. lib. II, ver. 539.

to offer him incenſe and worſhip [*M*]. The ſucceſſor and family of this prince had their ſhare in all this adoration, and were in all probability the real motive of it (*k*); however Ovid could find no remedy for his miſfortune, the court continued as inexorable under Tiberius as before, and he died in his exile in the fourth year of this

For an old work my torments now begin,
And I muſt ſmart for a forgotten ſin.

[M] *He not only wrote Auguſtus's elogy in a Poem in the Getic tongue, but alſo invocated him, and conſecrated a chapel to him, where he went every morning to offer him incenſe and worſhip.*] This is what he wrote to his friend Carus.

Nec te mirari, ſi ſunt vitioſa, decebit
  Carmina, quæ faciam pæne poëta Getes.
Ah pudet, & Getico ſcripſi ſermone libellum,
  Structaque ſunt noſtris barbara verba modis.
Et placui (gratare mihi) cœpique poëtæ
  Inter inhumanos nomen habere Getas.
Materiam quæris? laudes de Cæſare dixi.
  Adjuta eſt novitas numine noſtra Dei.
Nam patris Auguſti docui mortale fuiſſe
  Corpus; in æthereas numen abiſſe domos (124).

Nor need you wonder if my verſe is lame,
Since Getic poetry is all my aim.
I bluſh to own a book in this rude tongue,
And that with barbarous notes my muſe has ſung.
Am I not happy in my ſearch for fame,
By gaining among brutes a Poet's name.
The ſubject, if you aſk, was Cæſar's praiſe,
Himſelf the god inſpiring my new lays.
I taught how Rome's great ſire his clay reſign'd,
And now a god his heavenly kindred join'd.

He deſcribes in another letter his devotions to Auguſtus, and makes uſe of theſe words (125).

Nec pietas ignota mea eſt: videt hoſpita terra
  In noſtra ſacrum Cæſaris eſſe domo.
Stant pariter natuſque pius, conjuxque ſacerdos,
  Numina jam facto non leviora Deo.
Neu deſit pars ulla domus; ſtat uterque nepotum;
  Hic aviæ lateri proximus, ille patris.
His ego do toties cum thure precantia verba,
  Eoo quoties ſurgit ab orbe dies.
Tota, licet quæras, hoc me non fingere dicet,
  Officii teſtis Pontica terra mei.
Pontica me tellus quantis hac poſſumus ora,
  Natalem ludis ſcit celebrare Dei.
Nec minus hoſpitibus pietas eſt cognita talis,
  Miſit in has ſi quos longa Propontis aquas.
Is quoque, quo levior fuerat ſub Præſide Pontus,
  Audierit frater (126) forſitan iſta tuus.
Fortuna eſt impar animo, talique libenter
  Exiguas carpo munere pauper opes.
Nec veſtris damus hæc oculis, procul urbe remoti:
  Contenti tacita ſed pietate ſumus.
Et tamen hæc tangent aliquando Cæſaris aures.
  Nil illum toto quod fit in orbe latet.
Tu certe, ſcis hæc, ſuperis adſcite, videſque
  Cæſar, & eſt oculis ſubdita terra tuis.
Tu noſtras audis inter convexa locatus
  Sidera, ſollicito quas damus ore preces.
Pervenient iſtuc & carmina forſitan illa,
  Quæ de te miſi cœlite facta novo.
Auguror his igitur flecti tua numina, nec tu
  Immerito nomen mite parentis habes.

Nor is my zeal unknown; ev'n this ſtrange land
Sees in my houſe the ſacred temple ſtand.
His pious ſon too, and his holy ſpouſe,
With him are the joint object of my vows.
I add his grandſons, to compleat the choir,
This next his grand-mother, and that his ſire.
To theſe as often as the morn appears,
I offer up my incenſe and my pray'rs.
Pontus, which ſees me my devotion pay,
Will witneſs to the truth of what I ſay.
Pontus beholds me muſter all her ſtore,
To celebrate with games his natal hour.
Thoſe too who from Propontis thither ſail,
Can all ſufficiently atteſt my zeal.
Perhaps your brother alſo does me right,
Whoſe government ſtill makes this place more light.
Tho' niggard fortune does my will confine,
Yet gladly I my little mite reſign.
Unſeen by you, from Rome ſent far away,
This ſilent duty I'm content to pay.
And yet it ſoon ſhall reach to Cæſar's ear,
Cæſar to whom all things on earth appear.
O Cæſar while from Heaven you look down,
All things we mortals do to thee are known.
Seated on Heaven's convex ſtarry ſphere,
Our anxious pray'rs with kind regard you hear.
O may my verſe too be to thee convey'd,
On thy divine inſtalment lately made.
Theſe will, I truſt, at laſt my peace obtain,
Nor ſhall I call thee gentle ſire in vain.

You ſee he hoped that his ſupplications and praiſes would come to the knowledge of Auguſtus deified, and be rewarded by him; but you ſee alſo that he includes the living too in his adorations, and flatters himſelf with hopes that Tiberius would be made acquainted with them. This was his principal view, and from hence came thoſe ſoothing turns which are ſo remarkable in the paſſage where he mentions his Getic verſes. He ſuppoſes that one of the Getic inhabitants, who heard him repeat them, gave his opinion that the panegyric on Tiberius, which was contained in them, ought to have procured the author's reſtoration.

Eſſe parem virtute patri, qui fræna rogatus
  Sæpe recuſati ceperit imperii.
Eſſe pudicarum te Veſtam, Livia, matrum,
  Ambiguum nato dignior, anne viro.
Eſſe duos juvenes firma adjumenta parentis,
  Qui dederint animi pignora certa ſui.
Hæc ubi non patria perlegi ſcripta Camœna,
  Venit & ad digitos ultima charta meos;
Et caput & plenas omnes movere pharetras,
  Et longum Getico murmur in ore fuit.
Atque aliquis, Scribas hæc cum de Cæſare, dixit,
  Cæſaris imperio reſtituendus eras.
Ille quidem dixit, ſed me jam, Care, nivali
  Sexta relegatum bruma ſub axe videt.
    Carmina nil proſunt (127).

In his great ſon the father's virtues ſhine,
Who cou'd ſo oft imperial rule reſign.
In his chaſt empreſs, matrons are outdone,
Worthy of ſuch a ſpouſe, and ſuch a ſon.
In his two grandſons, who ſupport his name,
The earlieſt ſigns their native worth proclaim.
Theſe while I read, in a ſtrange tongue compos'd,
And my laſt letters bring ſad news incloſ'd;
They ſhake their heads, and quivers all around,
And Getic mouths return a murm'ring ſound.
Nay ſome wou'd ſay, ſuch loyal lines as theſe,
In Cæſar's praiſe, ſhou'd Cæſar's wrath appeaſe.

(*k*) See the remark [*M*].

(124) Ovid. de Ponto, lib. IV, Epiſt. XIII, ver. 17.

(125) Id. ib. Epiſt. IX, ad Græcinum, ver. 105.

(126) That is, Lucius Pomponius Flaccus, who was conſul in the year of Rome 770. See *Ovid. de Ponto, lib. iv, Epiſt. IX, ver.* 60.

(127) Id. ib. Epiſt. XIII, ver. 27.

this emperor, or in the year of Rome 771, about ſixty years of age [*N*]. He had compoſed his Metamorphoſes before his diſgrace, but finding himſelf condemned to baniſhment, he threw them into the fire, either out of ſpite, or becauſe he had not put the finiſhing hand to them [*O*]. Some copies, which had before been taken of this beautiful work (*l*), were the cauſe of its not being loſt. He wiſhed, that in caſe he

(*l*) Lactantius, Inſtit. Divin. *lib. i, cap. v, pag. m.* 13, *it is called* præclarum opus.

In vain, my deareſt Carus, is this ſaid,
For the ſixth winter chills my exil'd head.
Verſes avail not. - - - -

[*N*] *He died . . . . the fourth year of Tiberius, ... about ſixty years of age.*] We find his death placed under this year in Euſebius's Chronicon with the approbation of Scaliger (128). Since Ovid therefore was baniſhed when he was a little more than fifty years old, in the year of Rome 761 (129), he muſt neceſſarily have lived to about ſixty years, and his exile muſt have continued nine or ten years, if it be true that he lived till the fourth year of the emperor Tiberius: for this fourth year agrees with the year of Rome 771: and note that ſome ſay Ovid died the firſt of January (130). Aldus Manutius (131) ſuppoſes that he was baniſhed about the fifty-ſecond year of Auguſtus, and that he died in the fifth year of Tiberius, and conſequently that his exile laſted eight years and ſome months. This computation is not exact: Auguſtus was in the fifty-eighth year of his reign when he died: it muſt follow therefore that he lived above five years after Ovid's diſgrace, if that happened about the fifty-ſecond year of his reign. Since therefore according to Aldus Manutius, this Poet lived to the fifth year of Tiberius, it follows that his exile continued about ten years. Ciofanius (132) has another hypotheſis, he pretends that Ovid left Rome the tenth of December, aged fifty years, ſeven months, and twenty-one days. He died, adds he, on the firſt of January, aged fifty-ſeven years, nine months, and eleven days, having been baniſhed ſeven years and twenty-one days. If we would rectify the miſtakes in this account, we need only put eight months in the room of ſeven after the fifty years of Ovid. This was without doubt the meaning of Ciofanius, who ſuppoſed, with Manutius (133), that Ovid was born the nineteenth of March 711. He ought to have reckoned from this day to the tenth of December, eight months, and twenty-one days; but he ought to have reckoned from the nineteenth of December to the firſt of January thirteen days and not eleven. However this be, he believed that Ovid died the firſt of January 769, at which time Tiberius had reigned but a little above fourteen months. And this is an opinion very different from that I have embraced. Mr de Tillemont makes the exile of this Poet (134) to continue no longer than ſeven years, and he fixes them from the fifty-fourth year of Auguſtus to the fourth of Tiberius (135). According to this, Ovid muſt have been exiled at the age of fifty-three years, and not as he aſſures us himſelf (136), at the age of fifty, making uſe of round numbers, and omitting the redundant months. He would not thus have paſſed by two or three years, if he had ſo much exceeded fifty years. Scaliger, who charges him with this omiſſion (137), is more unreaſonable for ſo doing, than for making him die in the ninth year of his baniſhment. The computation of the Abbé de Villeloin (138) is very erroneous. He will have it, that Ovid, being baniſhed in the fifty-ſecond year of Auguſtus, and having lived in exile ſeven years and twenty-one days, and being dead in the fourth year of Tiberius, lived fifty-ſeven years, nine months, and eleven days. We muſt not forget Mr Moreri, who has ſaid that Ovid died the firſt of January in the hundred and ninety-ninth Olympiad, as if a period of four years had but one firſt of January. Calviſius ſpeaks of the death of this Poet, a little before his mentioning the hundred and ninety-ninth Olympiad. This is placing it about the latter end of the hundred and ninety-eighth Olympiad. He gives us to underſtand, that Ovid died in the beginning of the year of Rome 769, and under the conſulſhip of Cœlius Rufus, and of Pomponius Flaccus; but the reaſon he gives is of no weight at all. ‘Ovidius circa hæc tempora mortuus eſt, meminit ENIM in penultima elegia de Ponto (139) hujus Flacci futuri conſulis in Calendis Januarii (140). - - - - *Ovid died about this time,* FOR *he takes notice in the laſt elegy but one de Ponto, that this Flaccus was to become conſul on the Calends of January.*’ How! becauſe Ovid obſerves that this Flaccus was to enter upon his conſulſhip on the firſt of January following, muſt it be concluded that he died in the beginning of that conſulſhip? What ſort of reaſoning is this! I believe that Calviſius had another meaning, he intended to ſay, in my opinion, that ſince Ovid's works contained nothing of a later date than this deſignation of the conſulſhip of Pomponius Flaccus, it ought to be concluded that his death happened a little time after. This reaſoning, tho' better than the former, is yet by no means accurate; for a long diſtemper, or the vexation in finding ſo many verſes ineffectual, might have obliged Ovid to ſilence his muſe.

(128) Scalig. in Euſeb. pag. 182, ad num. 2033.

(129) See the remark [*K*], citat. (108).

(130) Ciofan. in Vit. Ovid.

(131) In Vita Ovid.

(132) Ibid.

(133) Ald. Manut. in Vita Ovidii, *pag.* 16.

(134) Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. *Tom. i, pag. m.* 111.

(135) Ib. pag. 66, & 111.

(136) See the remark [*K*], citation (107).

(137) Scaliger. in Euſeb. pag. 182, num. 2033.

(138) L'Abbé de Marolles, Vie d'Ovide.

(139) He ſhould have ſaid, *in nona Elegia, lib. iv*: it is not the laſt but one, becauſe that book contains XVI.

(140) Sethus Calviſius, *ad ann. Mundi* 3966, *pag. m.* 414.

It would be endleſs to enumerate all thoſe who affirm that he died on the ſame day with Livy, and that this was the firſt day of the year. I do not ſee where they find their authority; for it is true the Chronicle of Euſebius makes this famous Poet and Hiſtorian to die in the ſame year; but the day is not mentioned. The Cœcilius Minutianus Apuleius of Cœlius Rhodiginus, is in all probability, the original of this date we are ſpeaking of; for he ſays that Ovid died the firſt day of January, after he had been baniſhed ſeven years, and that Livy alſo died that day (141).

(141) *See* Cœlius Rhodigin. *lib. xiii,* Antiq. Lect. *cap. i, pag. m.* 659.

[*O*] *He threw his* Metamorphoſes *into the fire, either out of ſpite, or becauſe he had not put the finiſhing hand to them.*] He himſelf informs us of this particular; and the account he gives will not, I hope, be eſteemed diſagreeable in my commentary.

Carmina mutatas hominum dicentia formas:
  Infelix domini quod fuga rupit opus.
Hæc ego diſcedens, ſicut bona multa meorum,
  Ipſe mea poſui mœſtus in igne manu.
Utque cremaſſe ſuum fertur ſub ſtipite natum
  Theſtias, & melior matre fuiſſe ſoror;
Sic ego non meritos mecum peritura libellos
  Impoſui rapidis viſcera noſtra rogis.
Vel quod eram Muſas, ut crimina noſtra, peroſus:
  Vel quod adhuc creſcens, & rude carmen erat.
Quæ quoniam non ſunt penitus ſublata, ſed exſtant;
  (Pluribus exemplis ſcripta fuiſſe reor)
Nunc precor ut vivant, & non ignava legentem
  Otia delectent, admoneantque mei.
Non tamen illa legi poterunt patienter ab ullo;
  Neſciat his ſummam ſi quis abeſſe manum.
Ablatum mediis opus eſt incudibus illud:
  Defuit & ſcriptis ultima lima meis.
Et veniam pro laude peto, laudatus abunde
  Non faſtiditus ſi tibi lector ero.
Hos quoque ſex verſus, in prima fronte libelli
  Si præponendos eſſe putabis, habe:
Orba parente ſuo quicunque volumina tangis,
  His ſaltem veſtra detur in urbe locus.
Quoque magis faveas, non hæc ſunt edita ab illo,
  Sed quaſi de domini funere rapta ſui.
Quicquid in his igitur vitii rude carmen habebit,
  Emendaturus, ſi licuiſſet, erat (142).

(142) Ovid. Triſt. *lib. i, Eleg. VI, ver.* 13. *See alſo ibid. lib. iii, Eleg. xiv, ver.* 20.

My verſe which Metamorphoſes *relate,*
Share in their exil'd maſter's wretched fate.
Theſe and ſome others, which the world admire,
My ſad departing hand committed to the fire.
And as Althæa's block conſumed her ſon,
While her love was by her revenge outdone:
So tho' they merit not from me that doom,
My paper offſpring I in flames conſume.
Either becauſe I hate my guilty muſe;
Or want the time her errors to peruſe.
But ſince not wholly loſt, they ſtill remain,
While copied they in private hands have lain;

May

he died in the country of the Geta, his aſhes might be carried to Rome, and that the epitaph he compoſed for himſelf might be inſcribed on his tomb [*P*]. He not only met with humanity among thoſe Barbarians, but alſo a great deal of civility. They loved and honoured him in a ſingular manner, and teſtified their eſteem for him by public decrees. The diſmal deſcriptions he made of their country, were not at all pleaſing to them; they complained of it to him, for which he made his excuſes [*Q*]. He boaſts of one thing which will prove, that he renounced gallantry in his exile; for he pretends, that no perſon of whatſoever age, or ſex, could complain of him *(m)*: it is a ſign he no longer amuſed himſelf in making love, and that even after he had learned the Getic tongue, he did not entertain the wives and daughters of the Tomians on that ſubject; for if he had, their huſbands and fathers would have clamoured againſt him. But as to his indifference, if that was a thing diſpleaſing to them, yet it was neceſſary, at leaſt, that they ſhould ſuppreſs their complaints. This part of his conduct was ſo much the more commendable, as it was difficult to be obſerved by a perſon of his amorous diſpoſition, and who had contracted a long habit in a quite different courſe of life (*n*). There are ſome Chriſtian Poets (*o*), who reſemble him in other reſpects, but yet tho' they are baniſhed for their religion, do not ceaſe their leud courſes. He wrote an infinite number of verſes during his exile: nor is

(*m*) See the beginning of the remark [*Q*].

(*n*) Molle cupidineis nec inexpugnabile telis Cor mihi, quodque levis cauſſa moveret erat. Cum tamen hoc eſſem: minimoque accenderer igni. *Ovid. Triſt. lib. iv, Eleg. X, ver.* 65.

(*o*) Clement Marot, *for example.*

May they now live, and with the reader join,
To ſooth his leiſure, and account for mine.
Nor can they his attention yet command,
If once he knows they want the pruning hand.
Abrupt the work was from the anvil torn,
Nor had the file beſtow'd the finiſh'd form.
Excuſe is all the praiſe my lines require;
Enough commended if they do not tire.
Theſe ſix ſucceeding verſes, may have place,
If you approve, the title page to grace.
To whomſoe'er my orphan-work ſhall come,
To this your city may at leaſt give room.
Perhaps it may the greater favour gain,
Conſider'd as my poſthumous remain.
If therefore my unpoliſh'd verſe offend,
Excuſe theſe faults I wanted leave to mend.

We may alſo conſult the paſſage (143) where he intreats the emperor to read ſome pieces of this work.

(143) Id. lib. II, Triſt. ver. 555.

[*P*] *He deſired . . . . that his aſhes might be carried to Rome, and that the epitaph he compoſed for himſelf, might be inſcribed on his tomb.*] He dreaded the immortality of the ſoul, and wiſhed for its mortality; for he was not willing that his ſhade ſhould wander among thoſe of the Sarmatians: therefore at all events he was deſirous of having a tomb at Rome. We ſhall repeat what he wrote upon this ſubject to his dear wife.

Atque utinam pereant animæ cum corpore noſtræ,
  Effugiatque avidos pars mea nulla rogos!
Nam ſi morte carens vacuas volat altus in auras
  Spiritus, & Samii ſunt rata dicta ſenis;
Inter Sarmaticas Romana vagabitur umbras,
  Perque feros Manes hoſpita ſemper erit.
Oſſa tamen facito parva referantur in urna.
  Sic ego non etiam mortuus exſul ero.
Non vetat hoc quiſquam: fratrem Thebana peremptum
  Suppoſuit tumulo rege vetante ſoror.
Atque ea cum foliis & amomi pulvere miſce:
  Inque ſuburbano condita pone loco.
Quoſque legat verſus oculo properante viator,
  Grandibus in tumuli marmore cæde notis:
Hic ego qui jaceo tenerorum luſor amorum,
  Ingenio perii Naſo poëta meo.
At tibi qui tranſis, ne ſit grave, quiſquis amaſti,
  Dicere, Naſonis molliter oſſa cubant (144).

(144) Id. *lib. iii*, Triſt. Eleg. III, ver. 59.

O that my ſoul might with my body die,
And not ſurvive death's ſad ſolemnity.
For if the Samian ſage has reaſon'd right,
Immortal ſhe muſt take her airy flight;
My Roman ghoſt muſt with Sarmatians rove,
And to fierce ſhades a ſtranger always prove.
But bring my aſhes back within their urn,
I may when dead from exile ſure return.
This none forbid; the Theban ſiſter gave,
Spite of the king, her brother's corps a grave.
Let herbs and ſpices mix their ſweet perfume,
And gently lay them in ſome ſuburb tomb.
Let this inſcription on the marble ſtay
Each curious reader who ſhall paſs that way.
Here lies love's faithful ſlave beneath this ſtone,
Ovid, the Poet, by his wit undone.
Let every lover as he paſſes by,
Wiſh that his bones may unmoleſted lie.

He mentioned the opinion of Pythagoras very unſeaſonably: for it is contrary to the doctrine which ſuppoſes, that the ghoſts of the dead wander about their tombs.

[*Q*] *The Barbarians . . . loved and honoured him in a ſingular manner . . . he excuſed to them* the deſcriptions he gave of their country.] We ſhall cite a paſſage in one of his epiſtles.

Nec ſumus hic odio, nec ſcilicet eſſe meremur,
  Nec cum fortuna mens quoque verſa mea eſt.
Illa quies animi eſt, quam tu laudare ſolebas,
  Ille vetus ſolito perſtat in ore pudor.
Sic ego ſum longe, ſic hic, ubi barbarus hoſtis,
  Ut fera plus valeant legibus arma, facit.
Rem queat ut nullam tot jam Græcine per annos
  Fœmina de nobis virve puerve queri.
Hoc facit, ut miſero faveant adſintque Tomitæ,
  Hæc quoniam tellus teſtificanda mihi eſt.
Illi me, qui velle vident, diſcedere malunt:
  Reſpectu cupiunt hic tamen eſſe ſui.
Nec mihi credideris: exſtant decreta quibus nos
  Laudat, & immunes publica cera facit.
Conveniens miſeris & quanquam gloria non eſt,
  Proxima dant nobis oppida munus idem (145).

(145) Id. de Ponto, *lib. iv, Epiſt. ix, ver.* 89.

Nor hatred do I here deſerve, or find,
Nor with my fortune have I chang'd my mind.
That peace you us'd to praiſe I ſtill enjoy,
And in chaſt words my modeſt tongue employ.
Thus, live I here, far off, where war's alarms
Compel the laws to yield to brutal arms.
Hence, O Græcinus, for ſo many years,
Not one complaint from either ſex appears.
Hence, I can boaſt the Tomians generous aid,
Since my appeal muſt to this place be made.
They wiſh me gone, becauſe 'tis my deſire;
While they themſelves rather my ſtay require.
You'd ſcarce believe it: they have paſs'd decrees
Much in my praiſe, with large immunities.
And tho' they ſuit not this ſad ſtate of mine,
The neighb'ring towns in all theſe honours join.

is this to be wondered at; for the muſes are naturally tatlers, but moſt of all ſo in adverſity: and beſides this, he wanted converſation, and took no delight either in drinking, or gaming [*R*]; ſo that they muſt needs be his whole entertainment. If he had

You ſee that they granted him exemptions, and here follows another paſſage which ſhows that this, was among them an extraordinary favour, and that they crowned him publickly.

Adde quod Illyrica ſi jam pice nigrior eſſem,
Non mordenda mihi turba fidelis erat.
Molliter à vobis mea ſors excepta, Tomitæ,
Tam mites Grajos indicat eſſe viros.
Gens mea Peligni, regioque domeſtica Sulmo,
Non potuit noſtris lenior eſſe malis.
Quem vix incolumi cuiquam ſalvoque daretis,
Is datus à vobis eſt mihi nuper honor.
Solus adhuc ego ſum veſtris immunis in oris;
Exceptis, ſi qui munera legis habent.
Tempora ſacrata mea ſunt velata corona,
Publicus invito quam favor impoſuit.
Quam grata eſt igitur Latonæ Delia tellus,
Erranti tutum quæ dedit una locum;
Tam mihi cura Tomus, patria quæ ſede fugatis,
Tempus ad hoc nobis hoſpita fide manet.
Dî modo feciſſent placidæ ſpem poſſet habere
Pacis, & à gelido longius axe foret (146).

The blackeſt pitch wou'd be leſs black than I,
Should this kind people meet my calumny.
So gently Tomians my ſad fate you cheer,
That from this mildneſs you true Greeks appear.
Not even Sulmo's ſelf, my native town,
Cou'd treat me friendlier than you have done.
Such honours to a wretch you kindly ſhow,
As your own happieſt people rarely know.
To me alone immunities you give,
Which others only from the laws receive.
My ſacred temples with a crown you bind;
An honour I wou'd rather have declin'd.
As Delos then is to Latona dear,
Where firſt her flying ſteps forgot their fear;
So Tomos is to me, who exil'd find
A treatment here as faithful and as kind.
O that the gods had placed this fav'rite race,
Far from the pole, and in perpetual peace.

Theſe laſt words deſcribe the greateſt inconveniences he met with in the place of his exile: he was expoſed to the rigours of cold, and in the neighbourhood of a people who were continually making irruptions (147). This was not at all agreeable to an Italian of a delicate and thin conſtitution (148), and who had led his whole life in the pleaſures of Repoſe (149).

We ſhall ſee alſo what he anſwers to the complaints of the inhabitants of Tomos: he aſſures them that he had never ſaid any thing ill of them (150), and that he had only exclaimed againſt their climate.

In medias Syrtes, mediam mea vela Charybdin
Mittite, præſenti dum careamus humo.
Styx quoque, ſi quid ea eſt, bene commutabitur Iſtro:
Si quid & inferius, quam Styga, mundus habet.
Gramina cultus ager, frigus minus odit hirundo;
Proxima Marticolis quam loca Naſo Getis.
Talia ſuccenſent propter mihi verba Tomitæ,
Itaque carminibus publica mota meis.
Ergo ego ceſſabo nunquam per carmina lædi?
Plectar & incauto ſemper ab ingenio?
- - - - - - -
- - - - - - -
Sed nihil admiſi: nulla eſt mea culpa, Tomitæ,
Quos ego, cum loca ſim veſtra peroſus, amo.
Quilibet excutiat noſtri monumenta laboris;
Littera de vobis eſt mea queſta nihil.
Frigus & incurſus omni de parte timendos,
Et quod pulſetur murus ab hoſte, queror.
In loca, non homines, veriſſima crimina dixi.
Culpatis veſtrum vos quoque ſæpe ſolum.
- - - - - - -
- - - - - - -
At malus interpres, populi mihi concitat iram,
Inque novum crimen carmina noſtra vocat.
Tam felix utinam, quam pectore candidus eſſem.
Exſtat adhuc nemo ſaucius ore meo (151).

Charybdis gulph, or Lybia's opening ſand,
Wou'd leſs alarm me than this dreadful land.
With Styx, if real, I'd the Danube change,
Or to far lower regions gladly range.
Swallows hate cold, the plough-ſhare hates the graſs,
Much leſs than Ovid does this hoſtile place.
The Tomians take ſuch words as theſe unkind,
And my ſad lines their high diſpleaſure find.
What muſt my verſe for ever then offend?
Muſt my raſh wit ſtill in my torment end?
- - - - - - -
- - - - - - -
But I am clear: Tomians, my plea approve,
Your place I hate, but I your perſons love.
Thro' all my works, you ſtill may ſearch in vain,
There's not one title does of you complain.
But of your walls, I own I oft have told,
How much they're haraſs'd both with arms and cold.
My railing at your ſoil I frankly own;
This is no more than you yourſelves have done.
- - - - - - -
- - - - - - -
Some falſe conſtruction makes the people rage,
And charge new crimes upon my guiltleſs page.
O wou'd I were as happy, as I'm clear,
That no reflexions in my verſe appear.

[*R*] *He wrote an infinite number of verſes during his exile* (152); *nor is it to be wondred at, . . . he wanted converſation, and took no delight in drinking or gaming.*] Here are ſome cauſes aſſigned for the fruitfulneſs of his Muſe; but the principal one is not taken notice of, which is, that Ovid's Muſe was uſed to bring forth without pain, and never troubled herſelf any farther about nurſing the child; for ſhe took very little care in correcting her productions (153): her caſe therefore muſt of courſe be like that of a mother who never ſuckles, ſhe breeds the more readily. The following paſſages ſhew that Ovid was obliged for every thing to the Muſes.

Hic ego, finitimis quamvis circumſoner armis,
Triſtia, quo poſſum, carmine fata levo.
Quod quamvis nemo eſt, cujus referatur ad aures;
Sic tamen abſumo decipioque diem.
Ergo quod vivo, duriſque laboribus obſto,
Nec me ſollicitæ tedia lucis habent;
Gratia Muſa tibi. Nam tu ſolatia præbes,
Tu curæ requies, tu medicina venis:
Tu dux & comes es: tu nos abducis ab Iſtro,
In medioque mihi das Helicone locum (154).

Tho' here ſurrounded with the noiſe of arms,
My wretched fate, verſe, in ſome meaſure, charms.
And tho' no liſtning ear my works attend,
Yet thus at leaſt the tedious hours I ſpend.
My life, my patience, and diverſions too,
To you, indulgent Muſe, I ſolely owe.
In you alone, I conſolation find;
You ſooth my cares, and heal my wounded mind.
You are my guide, you're my companion,
And ſhift rude Danube's ſcene to Helicon.

---

(146) Ovid. de Ponto, *lib. iv, Epiſt. XIV, ver.* 45.

(147) See the third letter of the firſt book *de Ponto*, and elſewhere throughout.

(148) Sufficiant: graciles ſed non ſine viribus artus:
Pondere non nervis, corpora noſtra carent. *Ovid. Amor. lib. ii, Eleg. X, ver.* 23. *See, above, the paſſage in Epiſt. X, of the firſt book* de Ponto, *ver.* 21.

(149) *See* Elog. X, *lib. iv*, Triſt.

(150) This is hard to reconcile with, *Eleg. VII, and X, lib. v*, Triſt.

(151) Ovid. Epiſt. xiv, lib. iv, de Ponto, ver. 9.

(152) Beſides the five books *Triſtium*, and the four books *de Ponto*, which we now have remaining, he wrote a great many verſes which he threw into the fire. See his XIIth Elogy of the fifth book *Triſtium*.

(153) See the end of this remark.

(154) Ovid. Triſt. *lib. iv, Eleg. X, ver.* 111. *See alſo lib. v, Eleg. VII.*

had met with any perſons, to whom he could have repeated his verſes, he would have verſified with much more ſatisfaction: for he confeſſes, that walking in the dark, and

He complains of being without books and without hearers:

Non hic librorum, per quos inviter alarque,
Copia: pro libris arcus & arma ſonant.
Nullus in hac terra, recitem ſi carmina, cujus
Intellecturis auribus utar, adeſt (155).

(155) Id. ib. lib. iii, Eleg. XIV, ver. 37.

No books to entertain me here are found,
Books are ſupply'd by wars alarming ſound.
And ſhould I aim at ſome poëtic flight,
Here is not one to judge of what I write.

and he deſires this may ſerve for his excuſe, if his verſes, are not good: that his genius being diſcouraged by adverſity was not excited with the hopes of applauſe.

Contudit ingenium patientia longa laboris,
Et pars antiqui magna vigoris abeſt.
Sæpe tamen nobis, ut nunc quoque ſumta tabella eſt,
Inque ſuos volui cogere verba pedes:
Carmina ſcripta mihi ſunt nulla, aut qualia cernis,
Digna ſui domini tempore, digna loco.
Denique non parvas animo dat gloria vires,
Et fœcunda facit pectora laudis amor.
Nominis & famæ quondam fulgore trahebar,
Dum tulit antennas aura ſecunda meas.
Non adeo eſt bene nunc, ut ſit mihi gloria curæ:
Si liceat, nulli cognitus eſſe velim.
- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - -
At puto, ſi demens ſtudium fatale retentem.
Hic mihi præbebit carminis arma locus.
Non liber hic ullus, non qui mihi commodet aurem,
Verbaque ſignificent quid mea norit, adeſt.
Omnia barbariæ loca ſunt, vociſque ferinæ:
Omnia ſunt Getici plena timore ſoni (156).

(156) Ovid. Triſt. lib. v, Eleg. XII, ver. 29.

The ills I've long endur'd, my genius tire,
And only ſerve to quench my former fire.
Yet oft, as now, my pen I take in hand,
And try to make each foot in order ſtand.
But all the verſe I write like theſe you ſee,
Too plainly with their author's ſtate agree.
Glory does beſt the flagging fancy raiſe,
And wit's incentive is the love of praiſe.
Theſe in full force did once with me prevail,
While fortune favour'd with a proſp'rous gale.
But now, alas! they are no more my lot;
My ſole ambition is to be forgot.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
But ſhou'd I try this fatal gift once more,
What helps has ſuch a place as this in ſtore?
Here I can neither find a book nor friend
Whoſe learned ear may to my works attend,
Here nothing elſe but barbariſm is found,
And conſtant horror of a Getic *ſound.*

He repeats the ſame thought, and enlarges upon it in another place, where he ſays, that he is diſcouraged from making verſes, and that he would have quite given it over, if he had not been deprived of all other amuſements.

Da veniam faſſo, ſtudiis quoque frena remiſi,
Ducitur & digitis littera rara meis:
Impetus ille ſacer; qui vatum pectora nutrit,
Qui prius in nobis eſſe ſolebat, abeſt.
Vix venit ad partes, vix ſumptæ Muſa tabellæ
Imponit pigras pæne coacta manus:
Parvaque ne dicam, ſcribendi nulla voluptas,
Eſt mihi: nec numeris nectere verba juvat.
Sive quod hinc fructus adeo non cepimus ullos,
Principium noſtri res ſit ut iſta mali:
Sive quod in tenebris numeroſos ponere greſtus,
Quodque legas nulli, ſcribere carmen, idem eſt.
Excitat auditor ſtudium, laudataque virtus
Creſcit, & immenſum gloria calcar habet.
Hic mea cui recitem, niſi flavis ſcripta Corallis,
Quaſque alias gentes barbarus Iſter habet?
Sed quid ſolus agam? quaque infelicia perdam
Otia materia, ſurripiamque diem?
Nam neque me vinum, nec me tenet alea fallax,
Per quæ clam tacitum tempus abire ſolet.
Nec me, quod cuperem, ſi per fera bella liceret
Oblectat cultu terra novata ſuo.
Quid, niſi Pierides, ſolatia frigida reſtant,
Non bene de nobis quæ merure, deæ (157)?

(157) Idem, *de Ponto*, lib. iv, Epiſt. II, ver. 23. See alſo lib. i, Epiſt. V, ver. 10.

I frankly own, while I your pardon aſk,
I now grow lazy in the ſtudious taſk.
That ſacred warmth, which fires the Poet's thought,
And once was felt by me, is now forgot.
No more my Muſe with uſual freedom comes,
It ſeems a force when ſhe the pen reſumes.
No more the flowing numbers now delight,
Inſtead of pleaſure, 'tis a pain to write.
Whether becauſe ſuch ill ſucceſs I know,
That all my ills from this one fountain flow;
Or that to write what none can e'er remark,
Is juſt the ſame as ſcribbling in the dark.
An auditor gives life, and praiſe will ſtir
The Muſe, for glory is a noble ſpur.
Here only with ſuch auditors I meet,
As near the Danube find a ſavage ſeat.
But loneſome as I am, what can I do,
To make my wretched hours leſs tedious flow?
For neither wine, nor gaming ſuit my taſte,
Which others chuſe their vacant time to waſte.
Nor do I like, tho' wou'd fierce war allow,
I'd try the ruſtic pleaſures of the plough.
Your cold amuſements, therefore, O *ye Nine,*
Tho' ill you've have treated me, muſt ſtill be mine.

I ſhall cite one paſſage more, which is that, where he ſays, that his thinneſs did not proceed from any debauches, ſince his drink was chiefly water, and the circumſtances he was then in, did not expoſe him to the paſſion of love.

Is quoque, qui gracili cibus eſt in corpore, ſomnus,
Non alit officio corpus inane ſuo.
Sed vigilo, vigilantque mei ſine fine dolores,
Quorum materiam dat locus ipſe mihi.
Vix igitur poſſis viſos agnoſcere vultus,
Quoque ierit, quæras, qui fuit ante color.
Parvus in exiles ſuccus mihi pervenit artus,
Membraque ſunt cerâ pallidiora novâ.
Non hæc immodico contraxi damna Lyæo:
Scis, mihi quam ſolæ pene bibantur aquæ.
Non epulis oneror, quarum ſi tangar amore,
Eſt tamen in Geticis copia nulla locis.
Nec vires adimit Veneris damnoſa voluptas,
Non ſolet in mœſtos illa venire thoros.
Unda locuſque nocent, & cauſſa valentior iſtis
Anxietas animi, quæ mihi ſemper adeſt (158).

(158) Id. lib. i, *de Ponto*, Epiſt. X, ver. 21.

Sleep too, by which thin bodies chiefly live,
To me no nouriſhment can ever give.
Sorrows keep watch upon my weary eyes,
Which without number this ſad place ſupplies.

2

Scarce

and writing verſes which we can read to no body, is the very ſame thing (*p*). He had among other good qualities that of not being ſatirical, and yet he was very capable of compoſing ſatirical verſes, as he has ſhown in his Poem againſt Ibis [*S*]; for no piece ever

---

(*p*) See the remark [*R*], citation (151).

Scarce could my alter'd viſage now be known,
My wonted colour is ſo ſtrangely gone.
My ſhrivell'd limbs their uſual juices fail,
Not even virgin-wax appears ſo pale.
Nor do theſe ills from reeling Bacchus flow,
For water you my fav'rite liquor know.
Nor do I ſurfeit with exceſſive cheer,
There is no room for over-eating here:
Nor yet does Venus thus my health deſtroy,
The wretched bed's a ſtranger to her joy.
Hurtful the water, and the place I find,
And what is worſe than theſe, a tortur'd mind.

We ſhall juſt take notice of the manner of his correcting his works. He confeſſes his negligence and idleneſs upon this head. He agrees that he was juſtly cenſured at Rome for eternally repeating the ſame things in the poems he wrote during his exile (159). This was a fault he was very ſenſible of, and endeavoured to mend; but the vivacity which animated him in his firſt compoſition, failing him when he came to reviſe what he had written, he found the correction too troubleſome, and quite gave it over. This is only one of his excuſes. It is certain that the caſe is the ſame with a great many authors. They compoſe with pleaſure and warmth, and thence it is that they diſplay their whole force; but they flag when they come to reviſe their work: the firſt fire returns no more; there ſucceeds in their imagination a certain calm which makes their pen proceed with a thouſand difficulties. It is like a boat that can make no way but by the force of oars. If you would know what Ovid ſays upon the correction of his writings, read the following verſes.

(159) Id. *de Ponto*, lib. iii, Epiſt. IX, ver. 39.

Judicium tamen hic noſtrum non decipit error,
  Nec quicquid genui, protinus illud amo,
Cur igitur ſi me video delinquere, peccem;
  Et patiar ſcripto crimen ineſſe, rogas?
Non eadem ratio eſt, ſentire, & demere morbos.
  Senſus ineſt cunctis, tollitur arte malum.
Sæpe aliquod verbum cupiens mutare relinquo:
  Judicium vires deſtituuntque meum.
Sæpe piget (quid enim dubitem tibi vera fateri?)
  Corrigere, & longi ferre laboris onus:
Scribentem juvat ipſe favor, minuitque laborem,
  Cumque ſuo creſcens pectore fervet opus:
Corrigere at res eſt tanto magis ardua, quanto
  Magnus Ariſtarcho major Homerus erat.
Sic animum lento curarum frigore lædit,
  Ut cupidi ſi quis fræna retentat equi (160).

(160) Id. ver. 9.

Nor does my judgment yet ſo partial prove,
As ev'ry thing I write, myſelf to love.
If therefore I with open eyes offend,
Why do I not, you'll ſay, thoſe errors mend?
It differs quite to ſee, and cure the ill;
That's plain to ſenſe, this muſt be done by ſkill.
Often when to correct ſome word I try,
My flagging judgment does it's aid deny.
Often, to ſay the truth, my thoughts recoil,
And dread to undergo ſo long a toil.
The itch of writing does itſelf repay;
Each ſtep it ſets, the more it ſmooths the way.
But to correct is a more arduous taſk,
And does the talents of a Homer aſk.
This dull employment gives the mind ſuch pain,
As the briſk ſteed feels from the checking rein.

[*S*] *He had, among other good qualities, that of not being ſatirical . . . . . No piece ever diſcovered more gall than his Poem againſt Ibis.*] He prides himſelf in having never once attacked any perſon in a ſatirical way, and he repreſents this to the emperor, to ſhew him, that if his verſes had offended in other reſpects, yet they deſerved encouragement on this account, that they were always exempt from the ſpirit of ill-nature.

Non ego mordaci diſtrinxi carmine quemquam,
  Nec meus ullius crimina verſus habet,
Candidus à ſalibus ſuffuſis felle refugi:
  Nulla venenato littera miſta joco eſt.
Inter tot populi, tot ſcripti millia noſtri,
  Quem mea Calliope læſerit, unus ero (161).

(161) Ovid. Triſt. lib. ii, ver. 563.

None can with juſtice of my verſe complain,
Since they the faults of no one ſoul contain.
The wit they have is without gall expreſs'd,
No mixture of ill-nature points the jeſt.
Of all mankind, howe'er my works abound,
I am the only perſon they ſhall wound.

It is thus he expreſſes himſelf in a Poem, which he compoſed after his baniſhment: and yet I am of opinion, that his invective againſt Ibis was finiſhed before that time. For ſince he makes himſelf but fifty years old in the beginning of that work, he wrote it, without doubt, a very little time after his arrival at Tomos, and upon the firſt news he received that a certain perſon had declared himſelf his enemy.

Tempus ad hoc, luſtris mihi jam bis quinque peractis,
  Omne fuit Muſæ carmen inerme meæ:
Nullaque, quæ poſſit, ſcriptis tot millibus, exſtat,
  Littera Naſonis ſanguinolenta legi.
Nec quemquam noſtri, niſi me, læſere libelli:
  Artificis periit cum caput arte ſua.
Unus (& hoc ipſum eſt injuria magna,) perennem
  Candoris titulum non ſinit eſſe mei.
Quiſquis is eſt (nam nomen adhuc utcunque tacebo)
  Cogit inaſſuetas ſumere tela manus.
Ille relegatum gelidos Aquilonis ad ortus,
  Non ſinit exſilio delituiſſe meo:
Vulneraque immitis requiem quærentia vexat:
  Jactat & in toto nomina noſtra foro:
Perpetuoque mihi ſociatam fœdere lecti
  Non patitur miſeri funera flere viri (162).

(162) Ovid. in Ibin, *init.*

Full fifty ſuns have run their annual round,
And hitherto unarm'd my muſe have found.
Among ſo many thouſand verſe of mine,
There is not to be ſeen one cutting line.
Except myſelf, my works do hurt to none,
By my own art I only am undone.
But now, one wretch ſo much ill-nature ſhews,
I muſt, at laſt, this boaſted candor loſe.
This wretch, for ſtill his name ſhall be concealed,
Forces me now unuſual arms to wield.
His malice reaches to the northern Pole,
And even there diſturbs my baniſh'd ſoul.
Cruel he tears the wounds that want to cloſe,
And makes a public jeſt of all my woes.
My wretched conſort too muſt ſhare his hate,
Nor will he give her leave to weep my fate.

If he had been then fifty-two years of age, or more, he would certainly have told us ſo, in order to magnify his merit in not having written any thing ſatirical in ever diſcovered more gall than this, nor more ſevere maledictions or anathemas. He wrote it a little after his baniſhment.

in all that time. This one Eſſay proved a maſter-piece of the kind: Ovid there (163) *makes a collection of all the puniſhments to be met with in hiſtory or fable, in order to wiſh them by way of curſe to his perfidious adverſary, which he takes from two hundred and thirty-nine examples. A learned profeſſor in the univerſity of Paris, who lived about a hundred years ago* (164), *has digeſted them into forty-two kinds, upon which he intended to have compoſed ſo many chapters* (165); *his name was Stephanus Richardus Nivernenſis.* The beſt commentary extant upon this ſatire, is that of Mr Boiſſieu (166): it was printed at Lyons, *ſumptibus Antonii Pillehotte*, in the year 1633, in 4to (167). The Abbé de Marolles, who is the firſt tranſlator of this Poem into French, has accompanied it with very large notes, the beſt of which are borrowed from the Commentary of Mr Boiſſieu. This tranſlation was printed at Paris in the year 1661, in 8vo.

---

(167) *The Abbé* de Marolles *did not know this, for he ſays, pag.* 67, *that this work of* Meſſire Denys de Salvaing, Seigneur de Boiſſieu, *was printed at Lyons in* 1638.

(163) The Abbé *de Marolles*, in the argument of his French tranſlation of the poem againſt Ibis.

(164) This Abbé ſaid this in the year 1661.

(165) This Abbé gives the title of theſe chapters.

(166) Dionyſius Salvaginus Boeſſius.

P

PACARD (GEORGE) calls himſelf a *Seguſian* in the title of his books, which makes me believe that he was born in the Lionnois, or in the neighbouring country. He lived in the XVIth century. I think he was miniſter at la Rochefoucaut in the year 1574, when he dedicated his Natural Theology to the count of la Rochefoucaut. We find in the Bibliotheque of Du Verdier Vau-Privas, that this book, which contains *ſeveral arguments taken from the conſideration of nature againſt the Epicureans and Atheiſts*, was printed at Rochelle in the year 1579 in 8vo. There is a ſecond edition of it reviſed and enlarged by the author [*A*]. It was printed at Niort in the year 1606 in 8vo. The manuſcript of this treatiſe did very great ſervice to George Pacard [*B*].

[*A*]] *A ſecond edition reviſed and enlarged by the author.*] The author left out of it the chapter concerning Antichriſt, which was in the firſt. He had publiſhed a particular treatiſe on that ſubject at Niort two years before (1).

[*B*] *The manuſcript of that treatiſe did great ſervice to the author.*] This is what he ſays of it in the Epiſtle Dedicatory: *Being releaſed out of priſon, where I had been detained at Grenoble for about a year, I was informed by Mr de Bompar, who had procured my deliverance, that I had been exempted from death (which eight of our company had ſuffered) on account of a copy of that book, found upon me when I was taken priſoner, and which had fallen into the hands of the parliament of the ſaid place.*

(1) See the advertiſement to the reader, in the beginning of the fourth book.

PACHECO (ALVAREZ) a Spaniſh colonel and kinſman of the duke of Alba (*a*) ſerved under him in the Low-Countries, and was ſent to Fluſhing, to be commander of the place, and alſo to haſten the building of a citadel there in 1572: but before he landed, there had been an inſurrection in the city, and the Spaniſh garriſon was driven from thence. He was then in amaze, and found himſelf in the power of the enemy, who cauſed him to be hanged, without any regard to his alledging, that he ſhould be beheaded upon the account of his nobility, ſince they were not willing to ſave his life for the price he offered for it. Treſlon being incenſed againſt the duke of Alba (*b*), would abate nothing of the ſentence, but Pacheco muſt take his turn at the gallows with two other Spaniards. Meurſius relates this matter at large; but he has confounded this Pacheco with a famous Engineer (*c*) whom the duke of Alba had brought from Italy, who was called Paciotti; he ſuppoſes that he who was hanged was called Paciottus. Mr du Maurier obſerves ſome other miſtakes concerning our Spaniard [*A*], who probably was of the family of the cardinals Pacheco, mentioned by Moreri.

(*a*) Strada, *Dec. i, lib. vii, ad ann.* 1572.

(*b*) Becauſe the duke had put this Treſlon's brother to death in 1568.

(*c*) Se maxime Albanum lædere exiſtimabat, ſi munitionum artificem tam inſignem, belli egregium miniſtrum & propinquo ſanguinis nexu, tempore tam alieno eriperet. *Meurſius, Guill. Auriac. lib. vi.*

[*A*] *Mr du Maurier obſerves ſome other miſtakes concerning our Spaniard.*] Thus he expreſſes himſelf (1): 'As to this Pacheco, I cannot ſufficiently admire the 'diverſity of opinions which I have obſerved among 'the moſt famous Hiſtorians, who have written of 'the affairs of the Low-Countries; for Grotius ſays, 'that he was a Savoyard, altho' Bentivoglio, Strada, 'Meurſius, and Emanuel Meteren, agree that he was 'a Spaniard. Cardinal Bentivoglio ſays, that he was 'beheaded; and others write, that he was hanged. 'Again, Meurſius calls this executed kinſman of the 'duke of Alba, Paciotti, altho' all the others call 'him Pacheco, confounding this Pacheco and Francis 'Paciotti of Urbino, count of Montefabro, who was 'ſo ſkillful in fortifications and warlike engines (2), 'that having built the citadel of Antwerp, his name 'was given to one of the five baſtions of the fortreſs, 'by the order of the duke of Alba, that the name of 'ſo a great man might be perpetuated to poſterity. 'The four other baſtions were called the Duke, Ferdinand, Toledo, and Alba, being the ſeveral names of 'of this duke, without calling any of them by the 'name of king Philip, his maſter. In fine, to return 'to this Pacheco, Emanuel Meteren, although he be a 'very exact Hiſtorian, calls him Peter Pacheco, whom 'Famianus Strada, being better informed, calls Alvarez.' Properly ſpeaking, Grotius cannot be ranked among the Hiſtorians who ſay that Pacheco was hanged. *Secuti Hollandiæ oppidum*, ſays he (3), *Fliſſingani quos ſurgentis arcis aſpectus & præſidium adventans commoverat; Bacieco Allobroge, operum Albanicorum peritiſſimo curatore ad ſupplicium rapto, in cauſam deſcendunt.* Perhaps he called him Savoyard, becauſe he had read, that the duke of Alba had obtained him of the duke of Savoy. *Impetraverat à Duce Sabaudiæ Franciſcum Paciottum Urbinatem, Montisfabri Comitem, arcium bellicarumque machinarum peritiſſimum* (4). Thuanus furniſhes us with a new variation, for he ſays, that Peter Paciotus was killed in a popular commotion, and that his head was firſt fixed on the top of a ſpear, and afterwards upon the walls of the city (5). Who knows but he thought that it was the ſame Engineer, whom he had named Paciottus Allobrox (6), ſpeaking of the citadel of Antwerp? He informs us, that this Paciottus had, a little before, built the citadel of Turin, by order of duke Emanuel Philibert. From hence, perhaps, Grotius took the word *Allobrox*, which no ways ſuits this famous Engineer, for he was of Urbino. Another Hiſtorian gives the name of Iſidorus Paciottus to him who built the citadel of Antwerp (7); and obſerves, that he left two ſons behind him, who were excellent Engineers; one, named Vido Ubaldus, was killed at the taking of Calais in 1596; the other named Frederic, was in Amiens the next year, when the French retook that town (8).

(1) Du Maurier's Memoirs, *pag.* 48.

(2) Du Maurier took this from Strada, *Decad. i, lib. vii.*

(3) Annal. *lib. ii, pag.* 50, *Edit. in* 12*mo, ann.* 1658.

(4) Strada, *Dec. i, lib. vi.*

(5) Petro Pacioto quem Albanus arci exſtruendæ præfecerat, in tumultu occiſo, cujus caput conto præfixum & pro mœnibus ſtatutum eſt. *Thuan. lib. liv.*

(6) Thuan. *lib. xli.*

(7) Angelus Galluccius, de Bello Belg. *Part i, lib. viii.* Thuanus, *lib. cxvi, pag.* 747, *calls him alſo* Iſidorus.

(8) Galluc. ibid. *lib. ix.*

PADILLA (MARY DE) miſtreſs to Peter the Cruel, king of Caſtile, was educated at the houſe of Alfonſus d'Albuquerque, when that monarch fell in love with her, during the expedition of Aſturia. One of the king's brothers took up arms in that country; and this rebellion being ſupported by another brother in Arragon, might have been of a miſchievous conſequence; wherefore the court thought it neceſſary to put a ſtop to it very quickly, and the king marched in perſon with an army towards Aſturia (*a*). The wife of Don Alfonſo d'Albuquerque followed the court; with Mary de Padilla, one of the maids ſhe had in her ſervice, who, by her beauty, captivated that fierce monarch. She did not make him ſigh long for her, for they lay together during that journey (*b*). John de Hiniſtroſa, uncle, by the mother's ſide, to the maid, ſerved them as a procurer and confident (*c*): this was done in the year 1352. The prince was already contracted to Blanche of Bourbon the daughter of Peter the firſt of that name, duke of Bourbon (*d*), and ſiſter to the daughter-in-law (*e*) of the king of France; but altho' the perſon, to whom he was contracted, was as beautiful as his miſtreſs, and of a houſe infinitely more illuſtrious [*A*], yet he made no great haſte to conſummate the marriage; neither did he take it well of Albuquerque that he ſhould preſs him upon this point (*f*): Albuquerque, I ſay, who was afraid leſt the kindred of Padilla ſhould be promoted to the higheſt degree of favour. At laſt, the marriage was celebrated in the beginning of June 1353, without any pomp (*g*): ſome time before, the miſtreſs was brought to bed of a daughter (*h*). The king quickly conceived a very great diſguſt to his wife, for the very third day after his marriage, he prepared to go to his miſtreſs, whom he had left in a fortreſs on the banks of the Tagus. The queen, his mother, and the princeſs Eleonora, his aunt, being informed of his deſign, conjured him not to do ſo, and repreſented to him the conſequences of this conduct [*B*]. He was no ways moved with their prayers or reaſons; but only denied that he had formed any ſuch deſign, and then immediately went away with great ſecrecy. Several courtiers followed him, reſolving rather to humour his paſſion, than remonſtrate to him what he ought to do: yet there were ſome who earneſtly preſſed him to return to his wife, and at laſt prevailed with him to do it: but after he had ſpent two days with her, he was carried back again to his concubine, by the force of his paſſion (*i*). Some thought there was witchcraft in the caſe, others believed he was jealous of his wife [C], and therefore could not endure her. Every day he treated her

[*A*] *Altho' the perſon to whom he was contracted, was as beautiful, and of a birth more illuſtrious.*] The Words of Mariana are theſe: *Vix Caſtellæ Rex nuptiarum celebritate peracta, novam nuptam faſtidivit, in Padillæ amorem effuſus, ſi regiæ ſtirpi compararetur, ignobilis, neque majori formæ pulchritudine. Tanti plerumque eſt præpoſteræ animum libidini mancipari* (1). He ſays elſewhere, that ſhe was very beautiful, very virtuous (2), and that the ambaſſadors of the king made choice of her among the ſix daughters of the duke of Bourbon, as moſt worthy to be his conſort: *E ſex quas habebat, eam expetituri quam regio toro idoneam fore maximè judicarent. Blanca concedente patre delecta* (3). Note, that this duke of Bourbon had ſeven daughters, but ſince the eldeſt was already married (4), we muſt not blame Mariana for mentioning only ſix: neither muſt we cavil, becauſe the other ſiſters of Blanche were not marriageable (5), for this could never hinder the ambaſſadors from preferring one of the youngeſt before all the reſt, if ſhe had appeared to them better ſhaped, and more beautiful.

[*B*] *His mother and .... aunt ... repreſented to him the conſequences of this conduct.*] They told him, that he run the hazard of loſing not only his reputation, but alſo all his dominions; that the French would make war againſt him, to revenge the injury his wife had received; that this would give occaſion to the Caſtilians to riſe up in arms; and, that men never fear to attack ſuch people whom they fancy to be abandoned by Heaven, upon account of the crimes they have committed. This is only a rough draught of the thoughts of Mariana, and therefore I will now ſet them down in his own words: 'Regina mater, Eleonora amita regis conſilio indicato, eum remotis arbitris per omnia numina & quicquid in terris ſanctum eſt, ne ſe, regnum, fortunas, nominis exiſtimationem præcipiti temeritate perditum eat, profuſis lacrimis obteſtantur. Quid orbi ſermonem, Gallis arma injuriam non laturis, civibus diſſidiorum materiam daret? Ignorare videlicet integra probitatis fama humana imperia conſtare, quos deſtitui à numine, quibus infenſum cœlum eſſe, ſemel fuerit perſuaſum, in eos homines mala omnia quaſi facto agmine impetum dare (6). - - - *The queen, his mother, and Eleanor, his aunt, being informed of his deſign, went to him when he was all alone, and, with tears in their eyes, conjured him by all that was ſacred in heaven and earth, that he would not raſhly go to ruin himſelf, his kingdom, fortune, and reputation. They expoſtulated with him, why he would give occaſion to the world to ſpeak ill of him, put arms into the hands of the French to revenge the injury done to his wife, and furniſh his ſubjects with a handle to rebel? They told him, he did not conſider, that human government ſubſiſted by the unſpotted character of a prince's probity, and that all evils united as in a body, and fell upon thoſe, whom people believe to be forſaken of GOD, and againſt whom Heaven is incenſed.*'

[C] *Some thought there was witchcraft in the caſe, others believed he was jealous of his wife.*] A report was ſpread abroad, that Don Pedro was bewitched, and that a girdle poiſoned by the enchantment of a Jew, diſcovered to this monarch the figure of a dragon; *Non amplius biduo apud eam (Blancam) ſubſtitit, tanto impudici amoris impatientia veſaniaque ut injectam carminibus amentiam fama vulgaverit: zona Judæi cujuſdam arte medicata draconis ſpecie regiis oculis objecta* (7). Some ſuſpected that the king had not entertained an averſion for the queen without a juſt cauſe, ſince ſhe had been debauched by Frederic, Don Pedro's brother, and had by him a ſon, the founder of the family of the Henriques. Mariana rejects theſe two opinions, and looks upon the ſecond as impudent and raſh (8). 'Neutrum nobis veriſimile viſum eſt: ac credam potius ubi tetri amoris flamma pectori inſederit, non alia philtra amatoria quærenda neque alias offenſionis cauſas præpoſtere excogitandas, ut juvenis animus in furorem agi & de poteſtate mentis exiiſſe videretur (9). - - - *Neither of which appears to me probable: and I ſhould rather think, when the fire of vile luſt is once kindled in the heart of a young man, no other charm, or cauſe of diſtaſte needs be imagined, why he ſhould ſeem mad, and out of his ſenſes.*' He is in the right to ſay, that the love this monarch had conceived for Padilla, was ſufficient to diſturb his mind, and poſſeſs him with a hatred for his wife. Such an immorality as this is a fruitful ſource from whence an hundred other diſorders may ariſe. I wonder that Mariana forgot what is ſaid of this girdle. The king *offered a thouſand indignities to Blanche, by the perſuaſion of a lady whom he kept, called Padilla, who gave him to underſtand, that the queen, out of ſpite to her, had cauſed a Jewiſh inchanter to make a girdle, adorned with buttons of gold, in order to be given to him, which was ſo inchanted, that as ſoon as he ſhould tie it about him, on a ſudden he ſhould loſe all his ſtrength and underſtanding; and by this means ſhould fall under the power of his wife, who, for the future, ſhould govern him and all the kingdom entirely according to her own fancy* (10). The author of the Hiſtory of Favourites (11) has paraphraſed this fine tale wholly to his own mind: he ſays, that the next day after the marriage, the queen gave the king *a girdle of precious ſtones of great value, and of an ingenious workmanſhip* (12); that Mary Padilla *having learned of whom*

Don

(*a*) Mariana, ubi infra.

(*b*) Eo in itinere Regis animus Mariæ Padillæ quæ in Albuquerquii familia educabatur, eximia pulchritudine captus, cum ea ad S. Facundi oppidum ſtupri conſuetudinem habere cœpit, ſponſæ immemor, noviſque amoribus amens. *Mariana, de Rebus Hiſpaniæ, lib. xvi, cap. xvii, pag. m.* 80, *ad ann.* 1352.

(*c*) Internuncius, pravæque conſuetudinis conciliator. *Id. ib.*

(*d*) Father Anſelme, Hiſt. Geneal. *pag.* 260.

(*e*) She had married the ſon of king John, who was Charles V.

(*f*) Mariana, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 81.

(*g*) Id. ib.

(*h*) Id. ib. *pag.* 80.

(*i*) Id. ib. *cap. xviii.*

(1) Mariana, de Rebus Hiſpaniæ, *lib. xvi, cap. xviii, init. pag. m.* 81.

(2) Lectiſſima forma, ſanctiſſimis moribus, prudentiaque. *Id. ib. lib. xvii, cap. iv, pag.* 100.

(3) Id. ib. *lib. xvi, cap. xvii, pag.* 79.

(4) She was married in 1337, to Charles of France, who was king Charles V. See Father Anſelme's Hiſt. Genealog. *pag.* 260.

(5) Mariana, *lib. xvii, cap. iv*, ſays, that Blanche was poiſoned in 1361, at the age of 25 years. She was therefore but 16 years old when the embaſſadors of Don Pedro, king of Caſtile, made choice of her, in 1352, and conſequently ſome of her younger ſiſters were not marriageable.

(6) Mariana, *lib. xvi, cap. xviii, pag.* 81.

(7) Id. ib. *pag.* 82.

(8) Quibuſdam ſuſpicio fuit temeraria ſane & impudens regem non ſine cauſa à Blanca uxore repente alienatum: vitiumque illi à Friderico fratre illatum. *Id. ib.*

(9) Id. ib.

(10) Paulus Æmilius, book ix, in the Life of Charles V, *pag. m.* 548.

(11) Printed at Amſterdam 1697.

(12) The Hiſtory of Favourites, *pag.* 8.

her worſe and worſe, and at laſt cauſed her to be poiſoned in 1361 (*k*). Every body deplored the fate of this princeſs, thus taken away at the age of twenty five years (*l*). The miſtreſs died a little after at Seville (*m*); and was interred in a monaſtery which ſhe had built (*n*). Her funeral was ſolemnized thro' all the kingdom, as if ſhe had been a lawful queen, and her children were educated as preſumptive heirs to the crown (*o*) [*D*]. She had been ſo much in favour with the king that ſhe could do whatever ſhe pleaſed [*E*]. Diego de Padilla, her brother, was preferred to the office of great-chamberlain in 1353, and to the dignity of great-maſter of the order of Calatrava the next year (*p*): John Padilla, her other brother, was made great-maſter of the order of St James, in the room of Don Frederic, the king's brother, in 1354 (*q*). His marriage was no obſtacle to his promotion to this high poſt, altho' there was no precedent, that it had been poſſeſſed by a married man. Nevertheleſs, we muſt not think that Mary de Padilla enjoyed his favour without any mixture of trouble; for, in 1357, another miſtreſs appeared more amiable than ſhe in the eyes of Don Pedro the Cruel. This prince abandoned himſelf ſo much to the paſſion he entertained for Alfonſa Coronella (*r*), that he thought no more of our Mary (*s*), which we may eaſily conceive was very grievous to her. What ſhall we ſay then of the torture ſhe muſt have endured, whilſt Don Pedro was ſo enamoured of a lovely widow, that to enjoy her he made her believe he was not married, and that he could eſpouſe her: in effect, he did eſpouſe her [*F*]; and though he quickly forſook her, yet he muſt have given great uneaſineſs to the heart of his concubine. I ſhall not refer my reader to the Hiſtory of Favourites, printed (*t*) in 1697, for what is there ſaid of our Padilla is blended with a thouſand romantic tales: we muſt not therefore ſearch for the truth in ſuch works, but in authors like Mariana. Obſerve that he confeſſes, that this woman wanted nothing but chaſtity to merit the crown: *Fœminæ*, ſays he (*v*), *præter injuriam pellicatûs, magnis animi & corporis dotibus, dignæque imperio.*

(*k*) Id. ib. *lib. xvii, cap. iv.*

(*l*) Id. ib.

(*m*) Id. ib. *cap. v.*

(*n*) In Studilli Monaſterio. *Id. ib.*

(*o*) Id. ib.

(*p*) Mariana, *lib. xvi, cap. xviii.*

(*q*) Id. ib. *cap. xx, pag.* 86.

(*r*) Id. ib. *lib. xvii, cap. i, pag.* 94.

(*s*) In ea Urbe (*Hiſpali*) Alfonſæ Coroneliæ amoribus ita indulſit ut præ illa Padillia contemptui eſſet. *Id. ib.*

(*t*) At Amſterdam, by Paul Marret.

(*v*) Mariana, *lib. xvii, cap. v, pag.* 101.

Don Pedro had it, deſired it of him, that ſhe might imitate the workmanſhip of it; that for a fence againſt the inconſtancy of the hearts of kings, *ſhe made uſe of a Jew, a profeſſed Magician, who, by his black and abominable art, committed crimes as horrid as his ſoul. It was with this diſciple of the devil,* continues he, *that ſhe entruſted the girdle of Don Pedro; and the charm put upon it was ſuch, that when he wore it, he fancied himſelf to be girded and ſtung by a ſerpent, whereupon he made terrible outcries. There was no need of ſuch wicked arts to deſtroy a queen already ſo unhappy; Mary Padilla, and all her creatures, told the king, that this preſent of his ſpouſe was a deadly favour, which ſhe had not poiſoned in a day. This diſcourſe, and the terrible effect of the girdle, redoubled his averſion to the queen, ſo that he reſolved to ſhun her eternally* (13). I ſhould not have quoted ſo long a paſſage out of the Hiſtory of Favourites, if I had not known, that the ſame thing is related in a meer hiſtory, I mean, in ſuch a work wherein the author does only tranſcribe Hiſtorians, without taking the liberty of mixing with matters of fact the fictions of his own brain. Read the following paſſage; 'Diego de Valera writes, that among the 'many ornaments which queen Blanche brought from 'France, there was a rich girdle, which ſhe preſented 'to her ſpouſe, and that Mary Padilla getting it into 'her hands, found a Jewiſh Magician, who put ſuch 'a charm upon it, that when the king wore it, he 'thought himſelf girded with a ſerpent; and having 'complained of it to his favourites, moſt of whom 'were related to Mary Padilla, they perſuaded him, 'that it was a pernicious preſent of the young queen; 'which increaſed his averſion to her, and carried his 'contempt of her to the laſt extremity (14).'

[*D*] *And her children were educated as heirs preſumptive to the crown.*]. This is what Mariana ſays, *Filii regio cultu, & in ſpem paterni regni educati* (15). I think ſhe had but one ſon, and three daughters. The ſon was called Alphonſus, and was born at Tordeſilla in 1359: his birth occaſioned an extradinary joy to the king, which was quickly changed into great ſorrow; for he lived not very long. Garſias de Toledo, great-maſter of the order of St James, was deſigned to bring him up (16). Beatrix, the eldeſt of all the children, was born at Corduba, in 1353 (17). Conſtantia, the ſecond daughter, was born the next year: ſhe was married to the duke of Lancaſter, ſon to the king of England (18). The third daughter was named Iſabella, and was born at Tordeſilla in 1355 (19).

[*E*] *She had been ſo much in favour with the king, that ſhe could do whatever ſhe pleaſed.*] Her brothers and kinſmen were preferred to dignities, and had the greateſt intereſt at court (20). Nothing was done in the kingdom but in purſuance of their views: the grandees, and even the king's brothers, endeavoured to inſinuate themſelves into the good-liking of this favourite, and ſpared neither for preſents nor ſubmiſſions to obtain it. *Omnino ſe Rex & rempublicam Mariæ propinquis gubernandum tradiderat: eorum arbitratu belli & pacis conſilia gerebantur: proceres ipſique Regis fratres tempori ſervire, atque ad fortunæ motum ſe movere: ad Mariæ gratiam donis, officiis, aſſentatione aditum certatim captare* (21). In favour of this woman the moſt ancient cuſtoms were deſpiſed and neglected, even when they had great affinity with the principles of religion. Was it not for her ſake, that the great-maſterſhip of the order of St James was made conſiſtent with marriage (22)? It muſt be confeſſed, this was a great irregularity, and a great occaſion of ſcandal and diſcontent to the people. Thoſe who read ſuch kind of things are much leſs offended than moſt of thoſe who ſee them. But you muſt take notice, that I diſtinguiſh between thoſe who read much, and thoſe who ſcarce read any thing at all. The latter fancy to themſelves that the corruption of their own time is ſomething extraordinary; they imagine that other countries are not ſubject to the like, and that other ages have been preſerved from it. This makes them murmur the more; but thoſe who know by the reading of hiſtory, that the diſorders of their own times are common to all ages, and to all nations, more or leſs; thoſe, I ſay, are patient, prepared for hardſhips, and enured to matters of ſcandal. To ſuch the power of the concubines of princes is no cauſe of indignation, they know too many examples of it: but thoſe who read nothing are extremely offended to ſee, that an unchaſte favourite ſhould be idolized by courtiers, becauſe ſhe has the diſpoſal of all employments. See the article of Diana of *POITIERS* (23).

[*F*] *Don Pedro was ſo enamoured of a lovely widow, that .... in effect he did eſpouſe her.*] She was called Joan de Caſtro, and had been married to Don Diego de Haro (24). Her beauty and chaſtity were extraordinary (25). The king fell in love with her, and having no hopes of ſatisfying his paſſion but in the quality of a huſband, he pretended he was not married, and produced proofs of the averſion wherewith he had married Blanche of Bourbon. Two biſhops were conſulted, who declared, That this marriage was null. In purſuance of this ſentence he made haſte to eſpouſe the widow; but he was quickly diſguſted at her, and continued with her but a few days. Some ſay, that he forſook her the next day after the marriage (26). Nevertheleſs ſhe was with child, and had a ſon, who was a comfort to her, tho' he proved the ſport of fortune. *Copia faſtidium ut antea faciente, paucis apud novam nuptam diebus moratur, ſunt qui una tantum nocte dicant. . . . Joannes filius ex iis nuptiis procreatus eſt, matri ſolamen, fortunæ ludibrium futurus* (27).

(13) Ib. *pag.* 9.

(14) A Chronological Hiſtory of Spain by Madam *** *Tom. ii, pag.* 272, 273, *of the Edit. of Rotterdam* 1694.

(15) Mariana, *lib. xvii, cap. v.*

(16) Id. ib. *cap. iii.*

(17) Id. ib. *lib. xvi, cap. xvii.*

(18) Id. ib. *cap. xviii, pag.* 84.

(19) Ib. ib. *cap. xxi, pag.* 90.

(20) See Mariana, *cap. xviii, book xvi.*

(21) Id. ib. *pag.* 82, 83.

(22) Joannem Padilliam Villageræ regulum in Friderici fratris locum D. Jacobi Magiſtrum ſubſtituendum curavit, & quidem conjugem contra ſuperioris temporis exempla. Novum exemplum legibus, moribuſque validius fuit: ab eoque initium ſuſceptum ut conjuges iidem & Magiſtri eſſent. Mariæ in gratiam quæ novi Magiſtri ſoror erat majorum inſtituta violata. *Mariana, lib. xvi, cap. xx, pag.* 86.

(23) At the remark [*N*].

(24) Mariana, ubi ſupra, *lib. xvi, cap. xviii.*

(25) Vidua, cui forma comparari nulla poterat, inſigni pudicitiæ laude viduitatis incommoda ſuſtentabat. *Id. ib.*

(26) Id. ib.

(27) Id. ib.

PADILLA (JOHN DE) one of the ring-leaders of the ſedition which was raiſed in Caſtile in 1520. It is ſaid, that his wife perſuaded him to this revolt, and that ſhe herſelf engaged in it, becauſe ſhe had ſeen him in a dream great-maſter of the order of St James [*A*]. Some add, that ſhe had a maid-ſervant who practiſed witchcraft [*B*], and foretold to her ſome great advancement. However that be, this is certain, that there was not in that confederacy any lord who ſhowed more zeal than this lady, to deprive Charles V of the crown [*C*]. She robbed the churches to get money for maintaining the ſedition; but ſhe committed this ſacrilege devoutly [*D*]. The behaviour of

[*A*] *It is ſaid, that his wife perſuaded him to this revolt, becauſe ſhe had ſeen him in a dream great-maſter of the order of St James.*] Let us ſee what Antony de Guevara wrote to her. *I know very well, that the firſt aſſembly was held in your houſe, where the fire was kindled, which you have always blown and kept up: Wherefore I have many times enquired, what occaſion you had thus to diſturb the kingdom; and have been anſwered by your relations and friends, that it was becauſe you dreamed or fancied you ſaw your huſband great-maſter of the order of St James: And if this be true, it was in you great folly and madneſs; for it is poſſible, that inſtead of giving him this commandery, or the order, which is a croſs, we ſhall give him another ſort of a croſs* (1). Is it not a deplorable thing, that the dream of a woman ſhould be able to produce ſo much confuſion and devaſtation through a whole kingdom? The firſt that gave riſe to this great revolt was Don Ferdinand d'Avalos; who gained the lady we have mentioned. The lady drew in her huſband, and he having prevailed with Don Pedro Giron, put all things in ſuch a commotion, that they talked of nothing leſs than erecting every great city of Caſtile into a commonwealth (2). *Ferdinand d' Avalos was the firſt contriver of the rebellion, and I am well informed that it began in your houſe; ſo that he laid the wood, but you ſet it on fire* (3). This civil war, therefore, is one of thoſe which proceeded from frivolous cauſes.

[*B*] .... *And that ſhe had a maid-ſervant who practiſed witchcraft.*] This is what Guevara objects to her (4): By ſome in theſe parts *I have been told, That you have a woman-ſlave, a great witch, who ſaid, and aſſured you, that you ſhall ſhortly be queen, and your huſband king, and ſo you ſhall ſucceed to the kings of Spain, Don Carlos and lady Iſabel: and if it be ſo, that you give heed to ſuch follies, which I cannot believe, have a care of the Devil, and his deceits and frauds.* In another letter he ſpeaks to her after this manner (5): *It is ſaid, moreover, that you have a white woman-ſlave, or rather a fooliſh ſlave, who is a great witch: and it is ſaid, that ſhe told and aſſured you, That, notwithſtanding your mean condition, in a little time the title of Excellency ſhould be given to you as to a princeſs; and the title of highneſs to your huſband: ſo that you pretend to ſucceed to the queen our ſovereign lady, and your huſband hopes to poſſeſs the place of Charles the Fifth.*

[*C*] .... *No perſon .... ſhowed more zeal than this lady to deprive Charles the fifth of the crown.*] This is ſaying a great deal; for Don Antonio d'Acugna, biſhop of Zamora, was as violent in this revolt, at ſeventy years of age, as the youngeſt and moſt reſolute brigadier of the army could be. Don Guevara wrote him a letter, of which the reader will not be diſpleaſed to ſee ſome paſſages. *To make ſoldiers prieſts,* as he writes to him (6), *is a thing that is tolerable; but to make prieſts ſoldiers is a ſcandalous action, which we ſhall not ſay, your lordſhip hath permitted, but rather, you yourſelf have done it: ſince you have brought more than three hundred prieſts of Zamora to attack Tordeſilla: and when a good prelate ſhould have employed them in the beginning of Lent to take confeſſions, you have carried them away to begin the war. In the aſſault made by the knights and governors of the kingdom againſt your party, I ſaw, with my own eyes, a prieſt, who was behind a battlement, ſtrike to the ground eleven of our men with a harquebuſs; and which was pleaſant enough to ſee, at the ſame time he aimed to hit them, he bleſſed them with a harquebuſs, and after that diſpatched them with a bullet. I ſaw likewiſe, before the battle was ended, this jolly prieſt receive a blow with an arrow in his forehead, which killed him ſo ſuddenly, that he had no time to confeſs, nor ſo much as to croſs himſelf.* ...... (7) *I have often ſeen you with a ſpear upon your ſhoulder, but never with a book in your hand, nor a ſtole about your neck; and this I ſhall not omit to tell, viz. that to the ſoldiers who battered the fortreſs of Ampudia, and fell down from a high place, you ſaid thus: Courage, my boys, courage, get up, get up, mount, mount, and fight valiantly as brave champions, and if you die, let my ſoul be with yours, ſince you have ſo juſt a cauſe and ſo holy a pretenſion. Now you know very well, my lord biſhop, that the ſoldiers who died in that place were excommunicated by the Pope, as traitors to the king, diſturbers of the kingdom, ſacrilegious perſons, robbers, enemies to the commonwealth, and the ſource of all the ſeditions in it. Wherefore it is plain enough that a biſhop, who purſues ſuch deſigns, was not very fearful or ſcrupulous of loſing his ſoul, ſince he loved to die like a ſoldier; and I do not wonder, that a man choſe to die like a deſperate ſoldier, who never valued his profeſſion.* The lady Mary Padilla (8) therefore muſt have been very furious, if ſhe equalled the rage of this prelate. There were ſome other women engaged in this faction, *and who were moſt violent, as we have ſeen,* ſays Brantome (9), *in our civil wars of the league, for what reaſon I cannot tell, but that they were wheedled and drawn in by the ſermons and perſwaſions of ſome preachers and ſeducers.* Obſerve theſe laſt words, and note, that the biſhop of Zamora was at laſt taken and ſtrangled (10).

[*D*] .... *She committed this ſacrilege devoutly.*] It is better to hear Brantome himſelf relating this, than if I ſhould alter his ſtile. 'Such another and more 'comical exploit is related of Donna Maria Padilla, 'one of the honourable ladies of Spain, and of the 'moſt zealous for the rebellion raiſed in Spain, at the 'beginning of the reign of the emperor Charles, as 'Don Antony Guevara relates, who, wanting money 'to pay her ſoldiers, took all the gold and ſilver from 'the reliques of Toledo. But this was done with a 'holy and pleaſant ceremony, and an air of ſanctity, 'for ſhe entered the church kneeling, with her hands 'claſped together, her face covered with a black veil, 'or, to ſpeak more properly, with a wet ſack according to Rabelais, with a ſad and mournful countenance, beating her breaſt, weeping and ſighing, 'having two great lighted torches carried before her; 'and then having genteely committed the robbery, 'ſhe retired no leſs genteely with the ſame ceremony, 'thinking and believing moſt firmly, that upon the 'account of this doleful ceremony, or rather hypocriſy, God would not be diſpleaſed with her. They 'might very well laugh who could ſee her act this 'ſame myſtery: but the beſt of it was, ſays the ſtory, 'that thieves, when they rob any thing, do it with 'great joy and chearfulneſs, and when they are puniſhed, mourn; but this lady, on the contrary, 'when ſhe was robbing, wept, and conſequently, if 'ſhe had been puniſhed, muſt it ſeems have laughed, 'contrary the cuſtom of other robbers (11).' The firſt words of this paſſage ſhew that the author had been ſpeaking of ſuch another exploit: Every curious reader would be glad to know what it is; wherefore, for their ſakes who cannot preſently conſult Brantome, I will here ſet down what he had related. Antony de Leve being at the ſiege of Pavia, *and wanting money to ſatisfy and pay his ſoldiers, inſomuch that even the German foot mutinied, he invented a trick which is mentioned in hiſtories, and I need not repeat here; but the moſt pleaſant, as the Spaniards relate, was:* que tomò toda la plata conſagrada de los Templos, prometiendo todas vezes con voto ſolemne à los ſantos, que ſi quedava vencedor, coſas harto majores que las que tomava, de que hizo batir dinero groſamente. That is to ſay, *he took the conſecrated ſilver of the temples, promiſing, nevertheleſs, to the ſaints with a ſolemn vow, to give greater things than he took, if he ſhould be conqueror; and then of this ſilver he coined money, after a courſe manner. But he acted according to the proverb,* Paſſato il pericolo, gabbato il ſanto, *i. e. when the danger is over, the ſaint is bubbled, and never paid any thing of it. What a payer of debts was he! and in my younger days it was ſtill ſaid in Pavia, that he left the* debt of a prieſt towards Padilla, that deſerves to be related [*E*]. The rebellion of this man and his wife, who were both of a very illuſtrious family, prevailed moſt at Toledo (*a*). The huſband had ſcarce any merit, and the wife was little worth, tho' ſhe highly valued herſelf; for ſhe was extreamly vain (*b*). He was defeated near Villalar, and fell into the hands of the conqueror; and two days after he was beheaded (*c*). But his wife eſcaped into Portugal (*d*). She was called Mary Pacheco, and was the daughter of Tendillos de Mendoza, if we may believe Paul Jovius, who ſays alſo, that ſhe was learned (*e*).

---

(1) Golden Epiſtles, *book i, pag. m.* 186. This letter is dated March 10, 1522. The ſame thing is found in a letter of the third book, *pag. m.* 21, dated January 15, 1522.

(2) Brantome, Foreign Captains, *Tom. i, pag.* 173. He took this from the letter of Guevara, *pag. m.* 172, *book i.*

(3) Guev. *book iii, pag.* 21.

(4) Ibid. *book i, pag.* 187.

(5) Ibid. *book iii, pag.* 22.

(6) Id. ib. *book i, pag.* 170.

(7) Id. ib. *pag.* 171.

(8) Thus *Guevara* calls her: others call her Donna Maria Pedrecco, as Brantome informs us, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 174. Probably *Guevara* gave her the name of her huſband. The count *de la Roca, Hiſt. of Charles V*, calls her Mary Pacheco, and to this we muſt hold.

(9) Brantome, ibid. *pag.* 174.

(10) The count de la Roca, ibid. *pag.* 56.

(11) Brantome, Foreign Captains, *Tom. i, pag.* 127, 128. He took this from a letter which *Don Antonio Guevara* wrote to this lady. It is in the firſt book of his Golden Epiſtles, *pag. m.* 184.

(*a*) *The count* de la Roca, Hiſt. of Charles V, *pag. m.* 40. (*b*) Id. ib. (*c*) Id. ib. *pag.* 54. (*d*) Id. ib. *pag.* 56.

(*e*) Quum Maria Paceca Tendillii Mendocii filia eruditi ingenii & virilis animi mulier, Padilliæ conjugis vexillum ne concitatæ multitudini deeſſet dux gerendo bello ſuſtuliſſet. - - - - - *When Mary Pacheco, the daughter of Tendillos de Mendoza, a woman of great learning, and of an heroic ſpirit, had taken up the ſtandard of her huſband Padilla, that the ſeditious rabble might not be without a leader.* Paul Jovius, Hiſt. *lib. xix, fol. m.* 7. *verſo.*

debt to be paid, and the vow to be performed by the Emperor, becauſe it was for his intereſt that he borrowed and ſpent it (12).

(12) Brantome, ibid. *pag.* 126, 127.

[*E*] *The behaviour of a prieſt towards Padilla deſerves to be related.*] We will continue to make uſe of the words of Brantome, ‘ A prieſt of the village of ‘ Mediana . . . . was ſo well affected to Don Juan de ‘ Padilla, one of the principal ſeditious captains, that ‘ every Sunday, at his exhortation to the people, he ‘ did not fail to recommend him, and the holy ſe‘ dition of which he was the great promoter, with a ‘ *Pater-noſter* and an *Ave-maria*, and continued theſe ‘ prayers for the ſpace of a month; at the end of ‘ which it happened by chance, that the troops of ‘ the ſaid Padilla paſſed through the village of the ‘ prieſt, who eat up all his fowls and bacon, and ‘ drank up all his wine, and, what is more than that, ‘ carried away his maid. The Sunday after he made ‘ his complaint in his ſermon, and related to the ‘ people all the damage theſe troops had done him; ‘ eſpecially, the taking away of his maid Catherine, ‘ naming her openly, and admoniſhing the people, ‘ not to follow any more the party of Padilla, but the ‘ king's: after this he gave all his ſeditious partiſans ‘ to the Devil, and conjured his people to cry, *Long* ‘ *live the king, and let Padilla periſh*; which was ‘ done, and all the reſt were ſent to the Devil. Many ‘ ſuch actions have we ſeen done alſo in our wars of ‘ the League, according to the malice and diſcontent of ‘ the perſons who had been robbed, and who renounced ‘ this holy League and goodly confederacy like the ‘ Devil (13).' That it may appear whether Brantome took too much liberty either in abridging or amplifying the authors he tranſcribed, I ſhall relate, word for word, the narrative of Guevara, tranſlated by the Phyſician Guterry. ‘ A Biſcain prieſt, being a half‘ witted fellow, had ſo great an affection for John de ‘ Padilla, that every Sunday, in his ſermon he was ‘ wont to ſay thus: my brethren, I recommend to ‘ you one *Pater* and one *Ave-maria*, for the holy ſe‘ dition and popular commotion, that it may never ‘ ceaſe; and I recommend to you another *Pater* for ‘ the Majeſty of king John de Padilla, that GOD ‘ would proſper him, and as much for the queen his ‘ wife; for to tell you the truth, theſe are our true and ‘ natural ſovereigns, and all others, to this day, have ‘ been tyrants. When theſe prayers had laſted near ‘ three weeks, at the expiration of them John de Pa‘ dilla happened to paſs thro' the village with his ‘ horſe-guards, and becauſe the ſoldiers, who lodged ‘ in his houſe, carried away his maid, drunk up his ‘ wine, and forgot not to eat up his bacon and poul‘ try, and all that he had, he told them the next Sun‘ day, in his ſermon, you know, my brethren, how ‘ John Padilla paſſed thro' here this week, and I be‘ lieve you are not ignorant that the ſoldiers who ‘ lodged in my houſe, have not left me ſo much as ‘ one pullet, that they have alſo eaten up my bacon, ‘ and drunk up my four barrels of wine; and, above ‘ all, the wretches have carried away, as you know, ‘ my poor Catherine. I tell you this, my friends, ‘ to the end, that for the future you may not pray ‘ for him, but for the king Don Carlos, and the ‘ queen, Madam Joan his mother, who are our na‘ tural ſovereigns (14).'

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 175. He borrowed this from the Golden Epiſtles of Guevara, *book i*, *pag. m.* 173.

(14) Guevara, ubi ſupra, *lib. i*, *pag.* 173.

PADILLA (LOUISA DE) counteſs d'Aranda, in the XVIIth century, was extreamly commended by the Spaniards. as may be ſeen in a paſſage of Don Juan de Laſtanoſa, which I ſhall tranſcribe [*A*].

[*A*] *In a paſſage . . . . . which I ſhall tranſcribe.*] ‘ I have heard two ſorts of readers complain of the ‘ works of Balthaſar Gracian: ſome complain of the ‘ matter, others of the ſtyle; thoſe becauſe they infinite‘ ly eſteem his books, and theſe becauſe they wiſh they ‘ had been a little more to their purpoſe. The former, ‘ and among them the phenix of our age, the learned ‘ counteſs de Aranda *, whoſe name is written with ‘ ſix immortal pens, are offended becauſe matters ſo ‘ high, and which are proper only for heroes, become ‘ common by printing of them; ſo that the meaneſt ‘ citizen can have, for a crown, thoſe things, which, ‘ becauſe of their excellency, do not become ſuch ‘ hands (1). This complaint puts me in mind of thoſe who were offended with Mr du Pin for publiſhing in French a new Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Writers. See the laſt page of his preface, and the *News from the Republic of Letters* (2).

* Donna Luiſa de Padilla.

(1) Juan de Laſtanoſa, Preface to the treatiſe of Gracian, intituled, *El Diſcreto*, (*The Diſcreet*). See the Preface of Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie, upon *l'Homme de Cour* (*The Courtier*).

(2) For the month of June 1686, Art. IV, pag. 658.

PAGEAU (N) one of the moſt illuſtrious advocates of the parliament of Paris, died the month of July, 1683, *when he was not very old* (*a*). His Elogy, taken from a manuſcript, intituled, *Portraits des Avocats*, is to be found in the Mercure Galant (*b*). and in a piece of Father Bouhours (*c*).

(*a*) Mercure Galant, month of July 1683, pag. 128. (*b*) Id. ib. *pag.* 128, *& ſeq.* (*c*) *Intituled*, Maniere de bien penſer dans les Ouvrages d'Eſprit, *pag.* 395, *& ſeq. Dutch Edit.*

PAYS (RENATUS LE) paſſed for a wit: He was of Bretagne, but was ſcarce known except in the province of Dauphiné [*A*]. He was employed there in the finances.

His

[*A*] *He was ſcarce known except in the province of Dauphiné.*] For this reaſon Mr Allard has put him in the catalogue of the writers of that province: *the greateſt part of his works*, ſays he (1), *were written in Dauphiné, either at Grenoble or Valence.* This he might do according to cuſtom; for thoſe who write a Bibliotheque of a certain country, do commonly place in it the ſtrangers who ſojourned in that country, when they compoſed or publiſhed books. The following paſſage of the author of *Amitiez, Amours, & Amourettes, - - - Friendſhip and Amours*, will not be impertinent: *What probability is there that a wit ſo ſublime as that of* your highneſs, *a genius to whom all the fineſt wits of our age do daily pay their homage, and who is accounted at court a fountain of learning, could find any thing agreeable in the collection of my trifles, and in the works of a man brought up in an obſcure province: that a wit originally of Bretagne tranſplanted into Gaſcogne, and afterwards*

(1) Allard, Bibliotheque de Dauphiné, *pag.* 169.

PADILLA (John de) one of the ring-leaders of the ſedition which was raiſed in Caſtile in 1520. It is ſaid, that his wife perſuaded him to this revolt, and that ſhe herſelf engaged in it, becauſe ſhe had ſeen him in a dream great-maſter of the order of St James [*A*]. Some add, that ſhe had a maid-ſervant who practiſed witchcraft [*B*], and foretold to her ſome great advancement. However that be, this is certain, that there was not in that confederacy any lord who ſhowed more zeal than this lady, to deprive Charles V of the crown [*C*]. She robbed the churches to get money for maintaining the ſedition; but ſhe committed this ſacrilege devoutly [*D*]. The behaviour of

[*A*] *It is ſaid, that his wife perſuaded him to this revolt, becauſe ſhe had ſeen him in a dream great-maſter of the order of St James.*] Let us ſee what Antony de Guevara wrote to her. *I know very well, that the firſt aſſembly was held in your houſe, where the fire was kindled, which you have always blown and kept up: Wherefore I have many times enquired, what occaſion you had thus to diſturb the kingdom; and have been anſwered by your relations and friends, that it was becauſe you dreamed or fancied you ſaw your huſband great-maſter of the order of St James: And if this be true, it was in you great folly and madneſs; for it is poſſible, that inſtead of giving him this commandery, or the order, which is a croſs, we ſhall give him another ſort of a croſs* (1). Is it not a deplorable thing, that the dream of a woman ſhould be able to produce ſo much confuſion and devaſtation through a whole kingdom? The firſt that gave riſe to this great revolt was Don Ferdinand d'Avalos; who gained the lady we have mentioned. The lady drew in her huſband, and he having prevailed with Don Pedro Giron, put all things in ſuch a commotion, that they talked of nothing leſs than erecting every great city of Caſtile into a commonwealth (2). *Ferdinand d'Avalos was the firſt contriver of the rebellion, and I am well informed that it began in your houſe; ſo that he laid the wood, but you ſet it on fire* (3). This civil war, therefore, is one of thoſe which proceeded from frivolous cauſes.

[*B*] .... *And that ſhe had a maid-ſervant who practiſed witchcraft.*] This is what Guevara objects to her (4): By ſome in theſe parts *I have been told, That you have a woman-ſlave, a great witch, who ſaid, and aſſured you, that you ſhall ſhortly be queen, and your huſband king, and ſo you ſhall ſucceed to the kings of Spain, Don Carlos and lady Iſabel: and if it be ſo, that you give heed to ſuch follies, which I cannot believe, have a care of the Devil, and his deceits and frauds.* In another letter he ſpeaks to her after this manner (5): *It is ſaid, moreover, that you have a white woman-ſlave, or rather a fooliſh ſlave, who is a great witch: and it is ſaid, that ſhe told and aſſured you, That, notwithſtanding your mean condition, in a little time the title of Excellency ſhould be given to you as to a princeſs; and the title of highneſs to your huſband: ſo that you pretend to ſucceed to the queen our ſovereign lady, and your huſband hopes to poſſeſs the place of Charles the Fifth.*

[*C*] .... *No perſon .... ſhowed more zeal than this lady to deprive Charles the fifth of the crown.*] This is ſaying a great deal; for Don Antonio d'Acugna, biſhop of Zamora, was as violent in this revolt, at ſeventy years of age, as the youngeſt and moſt reſolute brigadier of the army could be. Don Guevara wrote him a letter, of which the reader will not be diſpleaſed to ſee ſome paſſages. *To make ſoldiers prieſts,* as he writes to him (6), *is a thing that is tolerable; but to make prieſts ſoldiers is a ſcandalous action, which we ſhall not ſay, your lordſhip hath permitted, but rather, you yourſelf have done it: ſince you have brought more than three hundred prieſts of Zamora to attack Tordeſilla: and when a good prelate ſhould have employed them in the beginning of Lent to take confeſſions, you have carried them away to begin the war. In the aſſault made by the knights and governors of the kingdom againſt your party, I ſaw, with my own eyes, a prieſt, who was behind a battlement, ſtrike to the ground eleven of our men with a harquebuſs; and which was pleaſant enough to ſee, at the ſame time he aimed to hit them, he bleſſed them with a harquebuſs, and after that diſpatched them with a bullet. I ſaw likewiſe, before the battle was ended, this jolly prieſt receive a blow with an arrow in his forehead, which killed him ſo ſuddenly, that he had no time to confeſs, nor ſo much as to croſs himſelf......* (7) *I have often ſeen you with a ſpear upon your ſhoulder, but never with a book in your hand, nor a ſtole about your neck; and this I ſhall not omit to tell, viz. that to the ſoldiers who battered the fortreſs of Ampudia, and fell down from a high place, you ſaid thus: Courage, my boys, courage, get up, get up, mount, mount, and fight valiantly as brave champions, and if you die, let my ſoul be with yours, ſince you have ſo juſt a cauſe and ſo holy a pretenſion. Now you know very well, my lord biſhop, that the ſoldiers who died in that place were excommunicated by the Pope, as traitors to the king, diſturbers of the kingdom, ſacrilegious perſons, robbers, enemies to the commonwealth, and the ſource of all the ſeditions in it. Wherefore it is plain enough that a biſhop, who purſues ſuch deſigns, was not very fearful or ſcrupulous of loſing his ſoul, ſince he loved to die like a ſoldier; and I do not wonder, that a man choſe to die like a deſperate ſoldier, who never valued his profeſſion.* The lady Mary Padilla (8) therefore muſt have been very furious, if ſhe equalled the rage of this prelate. There were ſome other women engaged in this faction, *and who were moſt violent, as we have ſeen,* ſays Brantome (9), *in our civil wars of the league, for what reaſon I cannot tell, but that they were wheedled and drawn in by the ſermons and perſwaſions of ſome preachers and ſeducers.* Obſerve theſe laſt words, and note, that the biſhop of Zamora was at laſt taken and ſtrangled (10).

[*D*] .... *She committed this ſacrilege devoutly.*] It is better to hear Brantome himſelf relating this, than if I ſhould alter his ſtile. 'Such another and more 'comical exploit is related of Donna Maria Padilla, 'one of the honourable ladies of Spain, and of the 'moſt zealous for the rebellion raiſed in Spain, at the 'beginning of the reign of the emperor Charles, as 'Don Antony Guevara relates, who, wanting money 'to pay her ſoldiers, took all the gold and ſilver from 'the reliques of Toledo. But this was done with a 'holy and pleaſant ceremony, and an air of ſanctity, 'for ſhe entered the church kneeling, with her hands 'claſped together, her face covered with a black veil, 'or, to ſpeak more properly, with a wet ſack ac'cording to Rabelais, with a ſad and mournful coun'tenance, beating her breaſt, weeping and ſighing, 'having two great lighted torches carried before her; 'and then having genteely committed the robbery, 'ſhe retired no leſs genteely with the ſame ceremony, 'thinking and believing moſt firmly, that upon the 'account of this doleful ceremony, or rather hypo'criſy, God would not be diſpleaſed with her. They 'might very well laugh who could ſee her act this 'ſame myſtery: but the beſt of it was, ſays the ſtory, 'that thieves, when they rob any thing, do it with 'great joy and chearfulneſs, and when they are pu'niſhed, mourn; but this lady, on the contrary, 'when ſhe was robbing, wept, and conſequently, if 'ſhe had been puniſhed, muſt it ſeems have laughed, 'contrary the cuſtom of other robbers (11).' The firſt words of this paſſage ſhew that the author had been ſpeaking of ſuch another exploit: Every curious reader would be glad to know what it is; wherefore, for their ſakes who cannot preſently conſult Brantome, I will here ſet down what he had related. Antony de Leve being at the ſiege of Pavia, *and wanting money to ſatiſfy and pay his ſoldiers, inſomuch that even the German foot mutinied, he invented a trick which is mentioned in hiſtories, and I need not repeat here; but the moſt pleaſant, as the Spaniards relate, was:* que tomò toda la plata conſagrada de los Templos, prometiendo todas vezes con voto ſolemne à los ſantos, que ſi quedava vencedor, coſas harto majores que las que tomava, de que hizo batir dinero groſamente. That is to ſay, *he took the conſecrated ſilver of the temples, promiſing, nevertheleſs, to the ſaints with a ſolemn vow, to give greater things than he took, if he ſhould be conqueror; and then of this ſilver he coined money, after a courſe manner. But he acted according to the proverb,* Paſſato il pericolo, gabbato il ſanto, *i. e. when the danger is over, the ſaint is bubbled, and never paid any thing of it. What a payer of debts was he! and in my younger days it was ſtill ſaid in Pavia, that he left the* debt

(1) Golden Epiſtles, *book i, pag. m.* 186. This letter is dated March 10, 1522. The ſame thing is found in a letter of the third book, *pag. m.* 21, dated January 15, 1522.

(2) Brantome, Foreign Captains, *Tom. i, pag.* 173. He took this from the letter of Guevara, *pag. m.* 172, *book i.*

(3) Guev. *book iii, pag.* 21.

(4) Ibid. *book i, pag.* 187.

(5) Ibid. *book iii, pag.* 22.

(6) Id. ib. *book i, pag.* 170.

(7) Id. ib. *pag.* 171.

(8) Thus *Guevara* calls her: others call her Donna Maria Pedrecco, as Brantome informs us, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 174. Probably *Guevara* gave her the name of her huſband. The count *de la Roca, Hiſt. of Charles V*, calls her Mary Pacheco, and to this we muſt hold.

(9) Brantome, ibid. *pag.* 174.

(10) The count de la Roca, ibid. *pag.* 56.

(11) Brantome, Foreign Captains, *Tom. i, pag.* 127, 128. He took this from a letter which *Don Antonio Guevara* wrote to this lady. It is in the firſt book of his Golden Epiſtles, *pag. m.* 184.

of a prieſt towards Padilla, that deſerves to be related [*E*]. The rebellion of this man and his wife, who were both of a very illuſtrious family, prevailed moſt at Toledo (*a*). The huſband had ſcarce any merit, and the wife was little worth, tho' ſhe highly valued herſelf; for ſhe was extreamly vain (*b*). He was defeated near Villalar, and fell into the hands of the conqueror; and two days after he was beheaded (*c*). But his wife eſcaped into Portugal (*d*). She was called Mary Pacheco, and was the daughter of Tendillos de Mendoza, if we may believe Paul Jovius, who ſays alſo, that ſhe was learned (*e*).

(*a*) *The count* de la Roca, Hiſt. of Charles V, *pag. m.* 40. (*b*) Id. ib. (*c*) Id. ib. *pag.* 54. (*d*) Id. ib. *pag.* 56.

(*e*) Quum Maria Paceca Tendillii Mendocii filia eruditi ingenii & virilis animi mulier, Padilliæ conjugis vexillum ne concitatæ multitudini deeſſet dux gerendo bello ſuſtuliſſet. - - - - - *When Mary Pacheco, the daughter of Tendillos de Mendoza, a woman of great learning, and of an heroic ſpirit, had taken up the ſtandard of her huſband Padilla, that the ſeditious rabble might not be without a leader.* Paul Jovius, Hiſt. *lib. xix, fol. m.* 7. *verſo.*

debt to be paid, and the vow to be performed by the Emperor, becauſe it was for his intereſt that he borrowed and ſpent it (12).

(12) Brantome, ibid. *pag.* 126, 127.

[*E*] *The behaviour of a prieſt towards Padilla deſerves to be related.*] We will continue to make uſe of the words of Brantome, ‘ A prieſt of the village of ‘ Mediana . . . . was ſo well affected to Don Juan de ‘ Padilla, one of the principal ſeditious captains, that ‘ every Sunday, at his exhortation to the people, he ‘ did not fail to recommend him, and the holy ſedition of which he was the great promoter, with a ‘ *Pater-noſter* and an *Ave-maria*, and continued theſe ‘ prayers for the ſpace of a month; at the end of ‘ which it happened by chance, that the troops of ‘ the ſaid Padilla paſſed through the village of the ‘ prieſt, who eat up all his fowls and bacon, and ‘ drank up all his wine, and, what is more than that, ‘ carried away his maid. The Sunday after he made ‘ his complaint in his ſermon, and related to the ‘ people all the damage theſe troops had done him; ‘ eſpecially, the taking away of his maid Catherine, ‘ naming her openly, and admoniſhing the people, ‘ not to follow any more the party of Padilla, but the ‘ king's: after this he gave all his ſeditious partiſans ‘ to the Devil, and conjured his people to cry, *Long* ‘ *live the king, and let Padilla periſh*; which was ‘ done, and all the reſt were ſent to the Devil. Many ‘ ſuch actions have we ſeen done alſo in our wars of ‘ the League, according to the malice and diſcontent of ‘ the perſons who had been robbed, and who renounced ‘ this holy League and goodly confederacy like the ‘ Devil (13).’ That it may appear whether Brantome took too much liberty either in abridging or amplifying the authors he tranſcribed, I ſhall relate, word for word, the narrative of Guevara, tranſlated by the Phyſician Guterry. ‘ A Biſcain prieſt, being a half-‘ witted fellow, had ſo great an affection for John de ‘ Padilla, that every Sunday, in his ſermon he was ‘ wont to ſay thus: my brethren, I recommend to ‘ you one *Pater* and one *Ave-maria*, for the holy ſedition and popular commotion, that it may never ‘ ceaſe; and I recommend to you another *Pater* for ‘ the Majeſty of king John de Padilla that GOD ‘ would proſper him, and as much for the queen his ‘ wife; for to tell you the truth, theſe are our true and ‘ natural ſovereigns, and all others, to this day, have ‘ been tyrants. When theſe prayers had laſted near ‘ three weeks, at the expiration of them John de Padilla happened to paſs thro' the village with his ‘ horſe-guards, and becauſe the ſoldiers, who lodged ‘ in his houſe, carried away his maid, drunk up his ‘ wine, and forgot not to eat up his bacon and poultry, and all that he had, he told them the next Sunday, in his ſermon, you know, my brethren, how ‘ John Padilla paſſed thro' here this week, and I believe you are not ignorant that the ſoldiers who ‘ lodged in my houſe, have not left me ſo much as ‘ one pullet, that they have alſo eaten up my bacon, ‘ and drunk up my four barrels of wine; and, above ‘ all, the wretches have carried away, as you know, ‘ my poor Catherine. I tell you this, my friends, ‘ to the end, that for the future you may not pray ‘ for him, but for the king Don Carlos, and the ‘ queen, Madam Joan his mother, who are our natural ſovereigns (14).’

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 175. He borrowed this from the Golden Epiſtles of Guevara, *book i, pag. m.* 173.

(14) Guevara, ubi ſupra, *lib. i, pag.* 173.

PADILLA (LOUISA DE) counteſs d'Aranda, in the XVIIth century, was extreamly commended by the Spaniards. as may be ſeen in a paſſage of Don Juan de Laſtanoſa, which I ſhall tranſcribe [*A*].

[*A*] *In a paſſage . . . . . which I ſhall tranſcribe.*] ‘ I have heard two ſorts of readers complain of the ‘ works of Balthaſar Gracian: ſome complain of the ‘ matter, others of the ſtyle; thoſe becauſe they infinite ‘ ly eſteem his books, and theſe becauſe they wiſh they ‘ had been a little more to their purpoſe. The former, ‘ and among them the phenix of our age, the learned ‘ counteſs de Aranda *, whoſe name is written with ‘ ſix immortal pens, are offended becauſe matters ſo ‘ high, and which are proper only for heroes, become ‘ common by printing of them; ſo that the meaneſt ‘ citizen can have, for a crown, thoſe things, which, ‘ becauſe of their excellency, do not become ſuch ‘ hands (1). This complaint puts me in mind of thoſe who were offended with Mr du Pin for publiſhing in French a new Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Writers. See the laſt page of his preface, and the *News from the Republic of Letters* (2).

* Donna Luiſa de Padilla.

(1) Juan de Laſtanoſa, Preface to the treatiſe of Gracian, intituled, *El Diſcreto*, (*The Diſcreet*). See the Preface of Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie, upon *l'Homme de Cour* (*The Courtier*).

(2) For the month of June 1686, Art. IV, pag. 658.

PAGEAU (N) one of the moſt illuſtrious advocates of the parliament of Paris, died the month of July, 1683, *when he was not very old* (*a*). His Elogy, taken from a manuſcript, intituled, *Portraits des Avocats*, is to be found in the Mercure Galant (*b*). and in a piece of Father Bouhours (*c*).

(*a*) Mercure Galant, month of July 1683, pag. 128. (*b*) Id. ib. *pag.* 128, & *ſeq.* (*c*) *Intituled,* Maniere de bien penſer dans les Ouvrages d'Eſprit, *pag.* 395, & *ſeq. Dutch Edit.*

PAYS (RENATUS LE) paſſed for a wit: He was of Bretagne, but was ſcarce known except in the province of Dauphiné [*A*]. He was employed there in the finances.

[*A*] *He was ſcarce known except in the province of Dauphiné.*] For this reaſon Mr Allard has put him in the catalogue of the writers of that province: *the greateſt part of his works,* ſays he (1), *were written in Dauphiné, either at Grenoble or Valence.* This he might do according to cuſtom; for thoſe who write a Bibliotheque of a certain country, do commonly place in it the ſtrangers who ſojourned in that country, when they compoſed or publiſhed books. The following paſſage of the author of *Amitiez, Amours, & Amourettes,* - - - *Friendſhip and Amours,* will not be impertinent: *What probability is there that a wit ſo ſublime as that of* your highneſs, *a genius to whom all the fineſt wits of our age do daily pay their homage, and who is accounted at court a fountain of learning, could find any thing agreeable in the collection of my trifles, and in the works of a man brought up in an obſcure province: that a wit originally of Bretagne tranſplanted into Gaſcogne, and after-*

(1) Allard, Bibliotheque de Dauphiné, *pag.* 169.

His *Amitiez*, *Amours*, *&* *Amourettes*. - - - *Friendſhip*, *Amours*, *and Love-frolicks*, printed in 1664, were the admiration of the provinces, and deſerved the applauſe even of the Metropolis [*B*]. There were ſome ladies of the firſt quality who read them with much pleaſure, and enquired of the Bookſeller what kind of perſon the author was: as ſoon as he knew that the ducheſs of Nemours had this obliging curioſity, he ſent her a deſcription of his perſon. The piece is intituled, *Portrait de l'Auteur des Amitiez*, *Amours*, *& Amourettes*. It is a miſcellany of verſe and proſe; the ſtyle is merry, like that of the book which had pleaſed that princeſs. The ſucceſs of this firſt book encouraged Mr le Pays to employ the Printers; but his Zelotide having not been approved, he abated of his ardour, and appeared in print but ſeldom. The letter which he wrote to Mr du Gué, intendant of Dauphiné, when an enquiry was made after the pretenders to nobility, was well enough eſteemed: he there proves the nobility of his Muſe to deſcend from that of Voiture [*C*]; and he collects together divers curious facts concerning the genealogy of the Poets, conſidered as Poets. He did but imitate one of the fineſt epiſodes of the Clelia of Madam de Scuderi. Some time after, he publiſhed a new Collection of Pieces. It appears by ſome of his letters, that he had been in Holland and England. The accounts he gives of theſe countries are too waggiſh and very unjuſt; and there is a mixture of reflexions in them which are ſomewhat ſerious, but very falſe [*D*]. This does a prejudice to the whole French Nation. He was of the academy

wards into the mountains of Dauphiné, could produce ſuch fruits as ſhould pleaſe ſo fine and nice a palate? No, Madam, I ought not to believe it, my preſumption would be too great, and I ſhould be afraid of injuring you (2).'

[*B*] His *Amitiez, Amours, and Amourettes, deſerved the approbation even of the Metropolis.*] The Pariſians eaſily pardon the publiſhing of a good book in a country-gentleman who has made a long ſtay in Paris, but they take it very ill that any perſon, who never went out of his province, ſhould be a good author. They look upon it as an attempt of dangerous conſequence; one would think that they imagine it to be a breaking looſe from order, and withdrawing one's ſelf from the lawful authority of one's ſuperiors, and erecting in the Republic of Letters a ſect of independants, which is ſo odious in the church: they were therefore little inclined to judge favourably of the Friendſhips and Amours of our author; for it was a book that came to them from the country of the Allobroges, it was the work of an author born in Bretagne, and from thence tranſplanted firſt into Guienne, and after that on the mountains of Dauphiné. Theſe are the ſchools in which he became the diſciple of Voiture, and wherein he formed the deſign of ſetting up for his ſucceſſor. Thus theſe prejudices were no way favourable to him, and yet his book ſold mightily in Paris, and he found many that liked it, both at court and in the city: but I do not pretend to affirm, that he was neither cenſured nor deſpiſed there by many perſons. Read theſe words of Mr Gueret, *whilſt one makes ſilly love-letters for his miſtreſs, and another writes wretched raillery to his butcher, they will attempt nothing againſt the ſtate* (3). He points to the letters of Mr le Pays, and thoſe of Mr Montreuil. In the next page he is not ſo diſobliging, but his praiſes are very ſlender: *Becauſe*, ſays he, Amours, Amitiez, & Amourettes, *paſſed for an indifferent good title, does it thence follow, that* Fleurs, Fleurettes, and Paſſetemps, *ſhould be received after the ſame manner?* Mr Boileau ſaid ſomething againſt Mr le Pays: he received the rebuke with a good grace; and he was never obſerved to be tranſported, nor to fly out into reproaches, as the greateſt part of his companions in diſgrace did; but he anſwered civilly and modeſtly (4). For the reſt, what I have ſaid of Paris, I think to be true of ancient Rome: I do not believe that in the age of Cicero or Pliny the younger, the Romans would have taken it well that the Poets and Orators, who lived beyond the Alps and the Pyrenees, ſhould have written fine pieces before they had quitted their native ſoil.

To confirm, by an authentic proof, what I have ſaid of the great ſucceſs of the firſt piece of our author, I need only cite a journaliſt, who does by no means flatter. Let us ſee the beginning of an extract which he made of another piece of the ſame writer (5). *The* Friendſhips, Amours, and Love-frolics *of Mr le Pays, were ſo well received by all polite perſons, that the public will entertain an agreeable idea of this conteſt between Wit and Judgment, as ſoon as it is known that he is the author of it. It was ſaid, that cupid had given him a feather of his wing to write his amours; and formerly he made Love and Reaſon quarrel ſo ingeniouſly, that none of the reaſons of wit will be forgotten in this work* (6).

[*C*] *He there proves the nobility of his Muſe to deſcend from that of Voiture.*] The letter which he publiſhed upon this ſubject was inſerted afterwards in the edition of his new works, it is intituled, *The Titles of the Nobility of the Amorous Muſe, to my lord Gué, counſellor in ordinary to the king*, &c (7). One who had read it when it was newly come out, aſſured me, that the intention of the author was to prove that he was noble upon the account of his Muſe, and that therefore none ought to demand of him other titles of nobility, nor pretend to tax him if he did not produce any other. But having read this work, I found nothing in it which ſhowed this intention. I cannot ſay whether this author was noble or no, for it is ſo long ſince I read his works, that I cannot remember the places where he might ſay either in expreſs words, or equivalent terms, *I am a gentleman*. I remember a place where he mentions a quarrel of his brother, whom he repreſents as a gentleman; but there is an infinite number of the meaner ſort that live nobly, who would talk as big upon the like occaſion. Here is what he writes in anſwer to a letter of conſolation (8). *The care you have taken of my brother's quarrel and your goodneſs in endeavouring to compoſe it, are ſo great obligations, that I can never acknowledge them enough. I am very ſorry that this little diſaſter ſhould have happened to him: but as he ought to be ſo prudent as not to involve himſelf in ſuch troubleſome affairs, he ought alſo, to have the courage to vindicate himſelf when any injury is done him; and I ſhould never pardon him, if he ſuffered any diſgrace to remain upon this account* (9).

[*D*] *He has made ſome reflexions . . . . . . very falſe.*] ‘It is a thing at which I am exceedingly troubled, that the Jews are tolerated at Amſterdam and not the Catholics: at Paris the Stews do not ſo much fear the conſtables, as thoſe houſes at Amſterdam do, wherein the holy maſs is celebrated. Yet I have obſerved, that policy here is the greateſt enemy of our religion. The Hollanders do not ſo much hate Rome as Madrid; and I believe they would ſooner ſubmit to Alexander VII, than Philip IV: this is ſo true, that in a certain company where I was lately, one having ſaid in jeſt, that a miniſter had obtained leave, a little while ago, to preach at Madrid, that the Inquiſition was going to be ſuppreſſed, and that the Catholic king was ready to declare himſelf a Huguenot; an old Dutchman anſwered him bluntly, and from the abundance of his heart, that if Spain turned Huguenot, Holland muſt be forced to turn Catholic. After this, you may judge, Sir, whether they be firmly fixed in their religion, or very averſe to ours. It may be affirmed, that they hate nothing ſo much as the Spaniſh government (10).’ The letter from which I take theſe words is not dated, and this is a common defect in ſuch kind of works (11), but by the circumſtances it may be known, that it was written in 1662; and hence you may judge whether our author underſtood well what he ſaid. Would not any one think, that he took this account from demy of Arles [*E*]. He was honoured with the eſteem of the duke of Savoy [*F*], who made him a knight of St Maurice. He wrote a very pretty letter upon this occaſion [G]. He complains often of fortune [*H*], and does no leſs reproach her than the Poets. Theſe are common

---

(2) Le Pays, in his Letter to the ducheſs of Nemours, wherein he deſcribes himſelf.

(3) Parnaſſus Reformed, *pag. m.* 113.

(4) See his Letter to Mr du Tiger. It is the firſt of the ſecond book of the ſecond part of his new pieces.

(5) *Intituled*, A Conteſt between Wit and Judgment, *printed at Paris* 1688.

(6) Baſnage de Beauval, Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, *Sept.* 1688, *Art. XV*, *pag.* 129.

(7) It is the 26th of the ſecond book of the ſecond part.

(8) It was written to him while he was afflicted for the loſs of a ſiſter. The manner of expreſſing his grief and tenderneſs for the deceaſed becomes a perſon of good nature and probity. *See Letter XLII, and XLIII, of the ſecond book.*

(9) Le Pays's Friendſhips, Amours, and Love-frolics, *book ii, Letter XLII, pag.* 164, *of the Holland Edit.* 1665.

(10) Le Pays, ib. Letter xxxviii, of the ſecond book, *pag.* 153, 154.

(11) This word muſt not be taken ſtrictly, for the date is ſometimes found in that ſort of writings.

ſome book, written in the time of the duke of Alba, or before the end of the truce which Henry IV concluded between Philip III, and the United Provinces? For at that time the ſcurrilous writers might pretend, that the Hollanders hated the government more than the religion of the Spaniards; and I do not doubt but they ſaid ſo in many books: but it is certain, that when Mr le Pays was in Holland, the hatred to the Spaniſh nation was quite worn out; for the hatred laſted no longer than the fear, which had been long ſince diſſipated. After the taking of Boiſleduc, Maeſtricht, and Breda, and after the war which was declared againſt Spain by Lewis XIII, the United Provinces were ſure, that they ſhould never fall again under the yoke of the Spaniards; they were more troubled with the fear that they ſhould be brought too low, and France ſhould make too great an advantage of their low eſtate, than that they ſhould recover what they had loſt. This uneaſineſs contributed as much as any other thing to the treaty which they concluded at Munſter with Philip IV, and ſince that time they have had more true and cordial affection for the Spaniards, than for the French: which was moſt natural, and agreeable to true policy. It is needleſs to refute this author, as to the complaints he makes of the ſeverity uſed towards the Catholics at Amſterdam, and as to his vile and abuſive raillery againſt the Engliſh (12) and Dutch women (13).

[*E*] *He was of the academy of Arles.*] This is an academy of fine wits, ſettled according to the model of the French academy. None is admitted into it, no more than into that of Paris, but upon requeſting it. Mr le Pays knowing that his admiſſion was wiſhed for, and that his petition, which he muſt preſent to that end, according to the ſtatues, would be favourably heard, wrote to thoſe gentlemen, and was immediately received into their ſociety. His letter is dated at Grenoble the twelfth of May 1668. It is in the ſecond part of his New Works (14), with the thanks which he wrote to the academy (15).

[*F*] *He was honoured with the eſteem of the duke of Savoy.*] If I rightly remember it, he dedicated his Zelotide to that duke, who wrote him a very obliging letter. The anſwer he made to this prince, March 5, 1666, is the nineteenth letter of the ſecond part of his New Works. He made a journey to Turin, in 1670, and thus he relates the honours he received there. 'Without vanity, or with vanity, if you pleaſe, I can aſſure you, I was received very kindly by their royal highneſſes; and in their names I have been invited to ſee the feaſt of S. Hubert at the Venerie. It will be a moſt magnificent feaſt: the ladies there hunt the ſtag with equipages all embroidered with gold and precious ſtones. After the chace, there will be for the ſpace of two days feaſting, balls, dancing, Muſic, and operas, for which preparations have been made this great while; but after all this, will you believe me when I tell you that his royal highneſs cauſed a chamber to be prepared for me in the palace, and ordered that horſes ſhould be given me out of his own ſtables for hunting (16).'

[G] *He wrote a very pretty letter upon this ſubject.*] He was made *a knight by the hand of the marquis of* St Damien: he had *for godfather*, one of this lord's ſons, and another of them, *honoured and regaled him with a feaſt* (17). It was of him he merrily aſked the revenue of ſome commandery, becauſe otherwiſe he ſhould be incapable of performing the vow of hoſpitality. Here follow ſome paſſages of his letter, but we muſt remember that he writes to the grand prior of the order of St Maurice. *Since you are my ſuperior*, ſays he to him (18), *and that I have the honour to be one of your brethren, I ought from time to time to give your excellency an exact account of my conduct. I ſhould be very unhappy if the Alps, which part us, ſhould deprive me of the light of your guidance, when at this great diſtance I have more need of it than others; and therefore I pray you, Sir, for the quiet of my conſcience, to aſſiſt me with your wholſome counſel, and to remove ſome ſcruples I have concerning the obſervation of my vows: as to chaſtity, thanks to the cruelty of the fair ſex, I preſerve it religiouſly: as to obedience, I have hitherto obſerved it very well, and my ſuperiors, who have commanded me nothing, have no reaſon to complain: as to hoſpitality, this is the point which occaſions my ſcruples, and upon which account I feel the moſt bitter remorſe; for in, ſhort, Sir, I do not keep it at all: not but that I have a great inclination to be hoſpitable; but how can it be when I have neither houſe-room to lodge my gueſts, nor money to entertain them? I think, Sir, that in making this laſt vow I did implicitly make one to be a commander, ſince I cannot obſerve it without a commandery. This ſhould make you think of procuring me one, and even one of the beſt, that my vow may be the better performed.* . . . . (19). *Beſides, by making me a commander, you will ſtop the mouths of a thouſand ridiculous people who come to aſk me impertinent queſtions about the croſs which I wear. Some are ſuch fools as to come, and aſk* how much, dear Sir, do you get every year for wearing this croſs? *I muſt confeſs to you, I do not know what to anſwer them;* . . . . *but when I have got a commandery, I ſhall have wherewith to ſatisfy all the world; I ſhall be able to perform my vow of hoſpitality, and ſhall be no more troubled with impertinent queſtions about the revenue of my croſs. Be ſo kind, Sir, as to anſwer to my reaſons, and cure my ſcruples, and you will give eaſe to the ſoul of him, who, of all your brethren, is, with the greateſt reſpect.*

REFLEXION upon the complaints of authors againſt fortune.

[*H*] *He complains often of fortune.*] This fault is almoſt an epidemical diſeaſe in the republic of letters: There are ſcarce any authors who do not complain of the ingratitude of their own time. Thoſe who are called fine wits, ſignalize themſelves above others in this kind of complaint. They think it would not be giving themſelves airs to own that fortune looked upon them with a favourable eye. One would imagine they are afraid, leſt if they ſhould appear contented with her favours, the public would take it for a confeſſion, that they have no merit; for there is a common ſaying very antient, which informs us that ſhe is blind, and makes a very bad choice of the objects of her love. Read all the letters of Balzac, and you may learn from them two things, one is, that he had a very handſome income, which allowed him to treat his friends, to give them excellent ſoops, *&c.* and to have for himſelf all the conveniences of life, in one of the pleaſanteſt places of the kingdom; the other is, that he looked upon himſelf as confined to a deſert, and ſo perſecuted by ill fortune, that one would think her ſharpeſt and moſt poiſoned darts had been reſerved for him. What can be concluded from theſe two things, but that he had too good an opinion of himſelf? for one, that is truly modeſt, how great ſoever his merit be, thinks himſelf very well rewarded, if he hath wherewithal to ſupply his neceſſities. Thus all thoſe common-places, which our fine wits, and ſo many other writers urge againſt fortune, are, in truth, a pompous commendation of the great and good qualities they fancy themſelves poſſeſſed of: there is therefore a little too much vanity in it. I will add, that oftentimes theſe kind of complaints are much more a ſign of the ingratitude of the authors towards their age, than a teſtimony of the ingratitude of the age towards authors; for commonly thoſe, who live in the greateſt plenty, are they who murmur moſt at the capriciouſneſs of fortune, and the injuſtice of the times.

I ſay this in general; I make no application to our Mr le Pays; for I am not ſo well acquainted with his hiſtory as to be able to ſay, whether he had a good fortune wherewith he ought to have been contented. But I am of opinion he ſhould not have thought it ſtrange, that other men of buſineſs ſhould raiſe themſelves more than he did; for a Financier with love-letters, ſonnets, and madrigals, ought not to pretend to merit the favour of his ſuperiors, and their recommendation to be advanced to great employments, as he might deſerve, if he would punctually follow, as others do, this precept of Mr Boileau:

Pren moi le bon parti: laiſſe là tous les livres.
Cent francs au denier cinq combien font-ils? Vingt livres.
C'eſt bien dit. Va, tu ſais tout ce qu'il faut ſavoir.
Que de biens, que d'honneurs ſur toi s'en vont pleuvoir!

Exerce-

(12) In Letter xxxvi of the ſecond book.

(13) In Letter xxxviii of the ſame book.

(14) It is Letter xxxviii of the firſt book.

(15) Dated at Grenoble, June 12, 1668. It is Letter xxxix of the ſame book.

(16) Le Pays New Works, *Part ii, book i, Letter XLI, pag.* 105, *of the Holland Edit.*

(17) Idem, Letter xliii of the ſame book, *pag.* 112, dated at Grenoble, May 20, 1671.

(18) Ibid. *pag.* 110.

(19) Ibid. *pag.* 112.

common-places, in which vanity has generally too great a ſhare. For the reſt, he was very

Exerce-toi, mon fils, dans ces hautes ſciences.
Prens au lieu d'un Platon le Guidon des Finances,
Sçache quelle Province enrichit les Traitans :
Combien le ſel au Roi peut fournir tous les ans.
Endurci-toi le cœur : Sois Arabe, Corſaire,
Injuſte, violent, ſans foi, double, fauſſaire (20).'

Chooſe you the beſt part: leave all your books.
A hundred livres at twenty per cent, how much is that? twenty livres.
That's well ſaid. Get you gone, you know as much as needs to be known.
What riches, what honours are ready to befal you!
Exerciſe yourſelf, my ſon, in this high ſcience.
Take, inſtead of Plato, the Book of Rates.
Enquire what province moſt enriches the Financiers?
How much the ſalt may bring to the king every year.
Harden your heart, be a robber, a plunderer,
Unjuſt, violent, unfaithful, double, falſe.

To ſtudy politeneſs, to employ whole days in a letter of gallantry, correct a ſonnet, or a ſong an hundred times, till it have a happy cadence, be well turned, very tender, and very paſſionate, is not the way to ſupplant a rival, or to hinder him from ſupplanting you; I mean, a rival as to employments, which depend upon the directors of the finances, or upon the farmers-general of the king's revenues. If it were a love-rival, well and good: you will learn much better to ſupplant him, by ſpending your time, in a letter of gallantry, than by ſpending it in a rule of Arithmetic. But ſtill, in this parallel, we muſt ſtop at the immediate effects; for if any one ſhould alledge to me, that by applying oneſelf to caſting up of accounts, one would be better qualified to grow rich, than by applying ones ſelf to a piece of gallantry; and that a rival who is richer, will be preferred to a fine wit, I will not diſpute any more. I have read ſomewhere, that Ludovicus Sforza ſaid, *A wit was a bad qualification for a ſoldier, and that he would not eaſily receive ſuch into his ſervice as valued themſelves upon it* (21). The marſhal de Gaſſion was alſo of this opinion; he was one day ſo offended with the reflexions of the abbot de la Riviere, who would have his royal highneſs the duke of Orleans to raiſe the ſiege of Courtray 'that being provoked into a paſſion, he told him to his face: Mr Abbot, *fine wits are but mean tools for war* (22).' Neither are they much fitter for the finances, generally ſpeaking.

But now, let us come to the point, and ſay ſomething of the complaints of our author againſt his hard fate: his peeviſh letter againſt fortune (23) is well turned, and well furniſhed with thoughts; out of which I ſhall ſet down the following paſſages: 'I was born under a certain ſtar, whoſe malignity cannot be overcome; and I am ſo perſuaded of the power of this malevolent ſtar, that I accuſe it of all my misfortunes, and I never lay the fault upon any body. And therefore, Madam, tho' you ſhould not obtain for me what you ſollicit with ſo much ardour and addreſs, I ſhall neverthelеſs reckon myſelf obliged all my life-time to your generous and active friendſhip. This is not the firſt time that endeavours to advance me have proved unſucceſsful, you may remember, *&c.* . . . In my younger days I did like others, and ſought after fortune with a reſtleſs mind; I conſidered the places which ſhe frequented moſt, and endeavoured to place myſelf in her way. Going to meet her, I thought that as ſhe was blind ſhe might puſh me forward, even without taking notice of it, but I fancy ſhe had eyes to ſee me, ſince ſhe knew ſo well how to ſhun all my approaches to her. I have done what I could to make my court to her: obſerving in the world that ſhe treated ill the men of learning, and careſſed the men of buſineſs, to pleaſe her I offered violence to my own inclination; I addicted myſelf wholly to the finances, and made the Muſes only my recreation: yet ſtill all my cares and endeavours have been fruitleſs, for to this day I could never find her favourable. Since then fortune is made a blind goddeſs, but yet ſuch a goddeſs to whom all men pay an homage, which looks ſomewhat like an act of religion, I fancy we may believe, without hereſy, that this goddeſs has, among her creatures, ſome that are elect, and ſome that are reprobate, who are happy or unhappy by her choice, and without owing any thing to their own conduct. After I underſtood that ſhe had placed me in the number of the latter, I endeavoured by all means to comfort myſelf. . . . . If my reflexions were not tedious to you, I would make many more before I concluded this letter; I would yet inveigh with greater warmth againſt the caprices of fortune: but withal you muſt know, that I do not hate her ſo much becauſe ſhe has not preferred me, as becauſe ſhe has ſo degraded our incomparable friend, whom I find to be much more unhappy than myſelf; for a man cannot fall from from ſo high a place without feeling the bruiſe of ſuch a cruel fall all his life-time. But as to me, who have always crept upon the ground, I never could fall; all the miſchief which happened to me, is ſome weakneſs that remains ſtill, from my having made ſome vain attempts to advance myſelf. Our dear friend is much more to be pitied, and I am the more ſorry for him, the leſs he deſerved his diſgrace. When I ſee a fool abandoned by fortune, I am no more ſurpriſed at it, than when I ſee a blind-man fall down, who walks without a guide. But when I ſee fortune overturn a man that is ſupported by true wiſdom, I cannot ſufficiently exclaim againſt her unjuſt cruelty. The miſchief is, that one can hardly put oneſelf into ſuch a condition as to avoid her injuſtice. She is a goddeſs that makes ſport with her adorers, as well as with her enemies; ſhe often does evil to thoſe who ſhun her: At court ſhe ſtirs up an envious perſon againſt you, who blackens your actions; a rival who does you ill offices with the prince: in the country ſhe will ſtrike off a ſtone from a rock, or cauſe an eagle to lift up a tortoiſe into the air, which ſhall cruſh you. She does almoſt equally ſlight the altars which are built to her by the courtiers, and the contempt ſhe receives from the Philoſophers. Alas! if wiſdom and virtue could ſecure us from her blows, good men would not fear her, and none but ſuch as are ſtupid or wicked would be found among the unfortunate; but men of virtue and parts ſeem to be moſt expoſed to her power. All the eyes of prudence are not ſharp enough to penetrate into the ſecret ſprings which ſet her wheel in motion. Her movements are concealed from us, and ſince we cannot know the cauſe of them, we cannot avoid the effects. This being ſo, it were folly to be grieved for it; but we ought to endure her motions, and look upon them as upon thoſe of the ſtars. If any one ſhould afflict himſelf becauſe of an eclipſe of the ſun or moon, he would be thought a madman; and he that is grieved for a change of fortune is little leſs unreaſonable.' He deſcribes in another letter (24), the trouble he underwent at Fontainebleau in ſolliciting an affair wherein he did not ſucceed: a thouſand crowns were cut off from his ſalary, and he could not get this retrenchment revoked. *Since I came to Fontainebleau*, ſays he, *I have loſt every day nine or ten hours conſtantly in a very melancholy hall, where indeed I have, for companions, many perſons more conſiderable than myſelf, who are received there with no more ceremony, nor diſpatched with greater diligence. . . . In order to allay my grief, ſometimes I fancy with myſelf that if one, who is altogether indifferent, and unconcerned about any buſineſs, ſhould come into the hall, where ſuch a multitude of people wait ſo impatiently, he would have a vaſt pleaſure in ſeeing our different poſtures; ſome are muſing, others raging; ſome are walking, others leaning againſt the wall; and when the patron's door makes the leaſt noiſe, preſently all caſt their eyes that way; and tho' none comes out but a footman, they all make low bows to him. If this footman ſays the patron is a little indiſpoſed, preſently all affairs fall ſick; and the miſchief on it is, that when he is well, mine are not much the better for it. Sometimes at laſt, he appears, like lightning, then every body follows him, importunes him, and deſires to be heard. I endeavour to ſpeak to him, among the reſt; but my weak voice is loſt in the crowd, and is not heard. Oftentimes, to eaſy my grief, I go to feed my eyes with the charms of Fontainebleau, and the beauties of the court: ſometimes I go to ſee the queen's maids of*

A DESCRIPTION of the ſollicitations of affairs at court.

---

(20) Deſpreaux, Sat. VIII, ver. 183.

(21) Silhon's Miniſter of State, *book i, chap. xiii.*

(22) The abbot de Pure, his Life of marſhal de Gaſſion, *Tom. iv, cap. iv, pag.* 36, *ad ann.* 1646.

(23) It is the firſt of the firſt book of the ſecond part of his New Works. It is written to the counteſs de . . . . and is without date.

(24) The xxxth of the ſecond book of the firſt part of his New Works. It is written from Fontainebleau, Aug. 13, to the count de Lionne, the year is not ſet down.

very willing it ſhould be known that he was a great fumbler [*I*]. The letter he wrote

of honour, and ſometimes the chambers and galleries of the caſtle: after that I walk along the canals, and there I ſink into the thickeſt of the words. But the retrenching of my thouſand crowns embitters all the pleaſure I would take, it tarniſhes the eyes and complexions of the ladies Soubize, Briſſac, St Geran, Lanois, la Mark, and Rouvroy: it defaces the beauty of the tapeſtry, the painting and gilding of the richeſt apartments; it troubles the the waters of the canals, fountains, and caſcades; it dries up the leaves and bloſſoms of the elm-trees, the linden, and orange-trees.

I have not ſeen the verſes which he made upon a decree, that ruined him, by condemning him to be accountable for a man who had imbezzled his majeſty's money (25) (§ α); but I have a good opinion of them, when I conſider that they are a part of a collection of poems, in which there was a piece which was highly eſteemed by a good judge, who is not at all prodigal of his praiſes: *to this we may add a third*, ſays he (26), *which Mr le Pays wrote in praiſe of Tobacco, which doubtleſs will contribute very much to augment the ſale of it, and the letting it out to farm. He wrote two poems upon this barren ſubject, and had the ingenuity to mingle in them ſo many pleaſant things, and to extol it's virtues ſo much, that for the future this plant will be ſeen among the flowers of Parnaſſus.* To underſtand all this paſſage, we muſt know, that the author had alledged two other reaſons, which I ſhall relate, becauſe they are ſubſervient to the hiſtory of him, who is the ſubject of this article: 'beſides the reaſons taken 'from the proceſs itſelf, there are two others, which 'one would have thought, ſhould have ſaved Mr 'le Pays from ſo terrible a condemnation; one is, that 'he was never enriched in the ſpace of thirty years, 'that he was concerned in the king's farms: the other is 'that he was too great a wit to engage in the accompts 'and calculations of the finances.' I am ſure, I may be allowed to conjecture, that a Poet who had ſucceded ſo well in writing the praiſes of Tobacco, did expreſs very well in the ſame tome, his vexation at the injuſtice of a cruel decree. The Muſes are never more eloquent, more lively, nor more fruitful in thoughts, than upon ſuch like occaſions. Theſe are not circumſtances, to which we may apply that phraſe, *Curæ leves loquuntur, ingentes ſtupent.* - - - *Light cares ſpeak, great ones are ſilent.* Nevertheleſs, I leave it to thoſe who have read thoſe pieces to determine, whether we ſhould ſay of Mr le Pays, what he wrote to a count: 'it were pity, Sir, that you ſhould not have met 'with ſome trouble, for you make ſo agreeable an 'uſe, and your letter has given me ſo good a picture 'of it, that I ſhould now be very ſorry, if you had 'gained the ſuit which gives you diſturbance. *Ne- 'que dii, neque deæ faciant ut te fortuna in deli- 'ciis habeat* - - - - - *Heaven grant you may not be for- 'tune's favourite.* If I were Seneca, you ſhould be 'my Lucilius, and I would make you the like com- 'pliment as he did. In truth, Sir, ſhould I not have 'reaſon to ſpeak after this manner, after I have read 'the melancholy and pleaſant things which your pre- 'tended misfortune has cauſed you to write. . . . 'Yes, Sir, your troubles have given me great diver- 'ſion, becauſe you expreſs them ſo well, that ſurely they 'have ſcarce done you any hurt. If you were over- 'whelmed with them, as you ſay, you would not ſpeak 'of them, with ſo much eaſe as you do (27).' Coſtar was very near of the ſame humour. *There is but one thing*, ſays he (28), *which the moſt ſevere* could blame, in the complaint that Mr Balzac made of his diſeaſes and diſgraces; *and that is, that they are two eloquent and too refined. And truly, he has ſo many pretty thoughts in them, that he brings to my mind the comedian Apelles, who, during the time that Caligula cauſed him to be laſhed, cried with ſo harmonious a voice, that this wicked prince, to prolong the pleaſure he received from it, made the puniſhment of this unhappy man to continue the longer* (29). *None but Caligula was capable of ſuch barbarity. But, I think, there are ſome people to be met with, who, without being barbarous, are ſo addicted to their pleaſure, that they would almoſt rejoice at the Sciatica and Stone of our Orator, when they read in ſome of his letters*, &c. Here he gives ſeveral extracts of them, after which he ſays (30), *the greateſt part of all theſe things are ſo pleaſantly conceived, that I ſhould be a declared enemy to the public joy, if it were true that I was offended with them, as my adverſary affirms.*

[(§ α) The Mercure Galant of March, 1689, pag. 195, 196, of the firſt part, tells us that 'Mr le Pays, 'after many proſecutions to oblige him to pay a very 'conſiderable ſum, for which a farmer pretended to 'make him accountable, was at laſt diſcharged by an 'order of council: and thereupon made the follow- 'ing verſes:

TO THE COMPTROLLER-GENERAL.

Peace is return'd to me at laſt,
After many alarms,
I ſleep a nights, I laugh a days,
Of reſt feel all the charms.

Now, from the expenſive ſuit at law,
That long my heart had teiz'd,
In which I deeply was engag'd.
I fully am releas'd

Juſt in the nick of time came help
To ſave me from ſhip-wreck,
The greater fear the ſtorm has rais'd,
More joy the calm brings back, &c.

REM. CRIT.]

[*I*] *He was very willing that it ſhould be known he was a great fumbler.*] He ought to have concealed this fault, for it is a little vulgar. Conſult the Dictionary of Furetiere, and there you will find not only the definition but alſo the condemnation of this way of acting. The definition contains theſe words (31). *It is ſaid alſo, that a woman is* fumbled, *when her arms, boſom, &c. are handled.* The condemnation contains theſe: *there are none but country-women and ſervant-maids that ſuffer themſelves to be* fumbled. Fumbling *is not uſed by the finer ſort of people. . . . The provincials are great* fumblers. Furetiere had reaſon to ſay this of the provincials; he might have added, that this fault reigns more or leſs in the provinces of France; according as they are more or leſs diſtant from Paris; and that it is much leſs common in the cities than in the country, and more uſed in the little towns than in the great ones: which proves, that this is not regulated according to the ideas of morality, but according to thoſe of politeneſs and of a genteel carriage. There is another notable proof of it, which is this, that leudneſs carried to the greateſt exceſs, is more frequent in towns than in villages, and more common in great cities than in little ones. It is quite the contrary with reſpect to fumbling. We will add, by the way, that notwithſtanding the politeneſs of the age of Auguſtus, the young maids of Rome were obliged to beware of the hands of fumblers; they made uſe of their nails, but they were all pared (32). I have elſewhere (33) quoted a paſſage, which probably concerns a Provincial, who had ſtayed a long time at Paris, and who nevertheleſs was of opinion, that to procure to himſelf the eſteem of the marchioneſſes, he muſt fumble them. We will recite this again, and add to it what follows. 'M. M. was going into Bretagne with the 'marchioneſs of Lavardin, to ſee Madam de Sevigny; 'he was in the coach of the marchioneſs, and by the 'way, *per non parer troppo coglione,* - - - *that he might not 'ſeem to want ſpirit*, he flattered her, and took her by 'the hand to kiſs it. Madam de Lavardin told him, 'ſmiling, *Sir, you ſtudy your leſſon for Madam de S . . .* 'The ſame man being in company with the counteſs 'de la Suze, handled her hands, and ſhe repeated to 'him this verſe of Scarron; *Fumblers are an intolerable 'people.* To which he anſwered immediately in the 'verſe which follows; *Even to thoſe beauties which de- 'ſerve moſt to be fumbled* (34).'

You do not prove, will ſome ſay, what muſt be proved. A little patience, ſay I, and it ſhall quickly be proved. The proof appears in ſeveral letters of Mr le Pays, and particularly in the firſt book of his Amitiez, in the twenty-fourth letter, where he ſays to his Caliſta; *I was afraid of you, tho' you was naked* (35) *and diſarmed, and tho' probably you had not that curſed bodkin, wherewith you puniſh* ſo often *my little tranſports.* What I am now to add, furniſhes a proof yet more evident, which I ſhall take from a letter which he wrote to a lady, who boaſted of having given him a

(25) See the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, *for the month of Sept.* 1688, *pag.* 132.

(26) Baſnage de Beauval, Hiſt. of the Works of the Learned, *ibid. pag.* 133.

(27) Le Pays in his New Works, *Part ii, book i, Letter IX.* It is written to the count du Bouchage, and dated June 12, 1668.

(28) Coſtar, Apolog. *pag.* 111.

(29) Suetonius *does not ſay ſo, he ſays only,* Cum aſſiſtens ſimulacro Jovis Apellem tragœdum conſuluiſſet, uter illi major videretur, cunctantem flagellis diſcidit: collaudans ſubinde vocem deprecantis, quaſi etiam in gemitu prædulcem. - - - - *Caligula ſtanding by the image of Jupiter, when he had aſked Apelles the Tragedian, which of the two ſeemed to him the greater, cauſed him to be laſhed becauſe he delayed to anſwer: now and then commending his voice, as he begged for mercy, as tho' it had been exceeding ſweet even in groans.* Sueton. in Calig. *cap.* xxxiii.

(30) Coſtar, Apolog. *pag.* 113.

(31) Furetiere's Dictionary, at the word *Patiner.*

(32) Nos convivia, nos prælia virginum
Sectis in juvenes unguibus acrium,
Cantamus vacui. *Horat. Od. VI, lib. i. Elſewhere he ſays, that they would defend themſelves ill againſt thoſe that endeavoured to kiſs them.*
Dum flagrantia detorquet ad oſcula
Cervicem, aut facili ſævitiâ negat,
Quæ poſcente magis gaudeat eripi,
Interdùm rapere occupet? *Ibid. Od. XII, lib. ii. See alſo Od. IX, lib. i.*

(33) In the article LYCURGUS, the Lawgiver, citat. (9).

(34) A continuation of the Menagiana, *p.* 378, 379. This is ſaid of Mr Menage himſelf.

(35) He ſuppoſes that he ſurprized her in the bath.

wrote to a lady, who boaſted of the box on the ear ſhe gave him, is ſpiteful enough (*a*). It may very well be that this epiſtle, which he compoſed is a fiction, and that it was wrote to no body; and this is not the only adventure which appears to be imaginary among the facts which he relates. It is very probable, that he never ſaw his miſtreſs ſtark-naked [*K*], and that he only forged it, that he might have occaſion to publiſh many conceits. He was caſt in a troubleſome ſuit a few years before his death (*b*), and died at Paris, April 30, 1690. There was a ſatire publiſhed againſt him in 1670 (*c*).

(*a*) See the remark [*I*].

(*b*) See the remark [*H*].

(*c*) Printed, if I miſtake not, either at Grenoble, or Lyons. He was very ill treated in this little piece.

box on the ear. ‘Do not miſtake, dear Madam, the glory of treating me ill is not ſo great as you think: I have had twenty miſtreſſes, more fierce than you, who knew better how to repulſe my attacks, and yet never boaſted of it. You are but a novice in the point of cruelty; and your very maid could teach you a leſſon about it. For leſſer freedoms, Kate hath treated me more cruelly; you gave me but one box on the ear, ſhe has given me more than a dozen; you tore only a ribbon, but ſhe tore off half my hair, and yet ſhe never told any body of it. You reſemble your great couſin for vanity; he never ſaw any thing of war but one wretched ſkirmiſh, which he tells to every body: you, perhaps, have never treated any body ill but me, and and you make a ſtory of it to all the world; but however, if you did not mix fable and hiſtory together, if you would tell how all things paſſed, I could endure your vanity, and not complain of your indiſcretion. Why all this buſtle, and ſo much fierceneſs? Why do you diminiſh by your diſcourſe the exceſs of the boldneſs I uſed? Why do you magnify the ſharpneſs of your reproaches, and the weight of the blow you gave me? Ah! Madam, if you remember, the reproaches were not very ſharp, and the blow was not very heavy. In juſtice I deſerved more; and if you had done all that you have ſaid, you would have done but half your duty. Nevertheleſs you know very well, that in your heart you was afraid of having been in too great a paſſion; you was afraid leſt I ſhould be more provoked than you, and at laſt you aſſumed ſuch an air as might perſuade me, that you would be no more offended with my boldneſs: but your gentleneſs did not pacify me; and when I ſaw your reſiſtance grow ſo quickly faint, I deſpiſed a victory ſo eaſy. Confeſs the truth, Madam, this was the cauſe of your rage, my contempt offended you, and you thought it neceſſary to cloak it with the appearance of yours (36).’ The letter which precedes this is no leſs unlucky; it was written to a lady who found Mr le Pays too familar; and it deſerves to be read, for it may ſerve for a leſſon to many perſons who ſtand in need of it.

(36) Le Pays in his New Works, *Part i, book ii, Letter iii, pag. m.* 107, 108.

[*K*] *It is very probable that he never ſaw his miſtreſs ſtark-naked.*] He affirms it roundly. ‘Laſtly, *Caliſta*, all your wiles were in vain. I found out the place, yeſternight, where you bathed . . . . For God's ſake, why do you take ſo much care to hide yourſelf? In truth, you did not ſhow any parts that are ſhameful; and if there were any ſuch, they were the knees, and other members of your ſiſter and couſin, which ſhould have been aſhamed to appear in the preſence of your's. But as to you, tho' you ſhewed all, you ſhewed nothing but what is very beautiful, nothing but what was very glorious to you. I perceived then that the parts which you kept concealed, were not inferior to thoſe you ſuffered to be ſeen; and I thought with myſelf, there were ſome of the fair ſex, who had more reaſon to hide their noſes, than you have to hide your buttocks (37).’ The reſt of that letter is a medley of pretty thoughts enough; which makes me believe he feigned this adventure, that he might have an opportunity to publiſh them. Whatever privilege the fair ſex may have in ſeveral provinces of France, to allow themſelves with decency ſeveral freedoms which would diſgrace them in Italy, I am certain that neither the miſtreſs of Mr le Pays, nor the ſiſter and the couſin of that Caliſta, bathed in a river without a ſhift, or linen cover, in view of one another, and that with ſo little precaution, that a man might ſurprize them in this condition, and compare, at his leiſure, the moſt ſecret parts of one with the moſt ſecret parts of the other's. I doubt whether even the country-women allow themſelves ſo much liberty: much more may we think, that thoſe young women, who, without any great miſapplication, had the title of Gentlewomen, would never ſo far violate the laws of chaſtity and decency. If they ſtripped themſelves ſtark-naked, that they might the better enjoy the cool air, doubtleſs they waited for the darkneſs of the night. There is no ſuch cuſtom in our days, as there was in the days of Diana (38). I may ſay therefore of this letter, and of many other pieces of the ſame nature, that ſome things are publiſhed in them as if they had really happened, which are only the invention of the author.

(37) Le Pays, ubi ſupra, *book i, Letter xxiv, pag. m.* 22.

(38) See Ovid's Metamorph. lib. II, ver. 461; & lib. III, ver. 179.

PALEARIUS (Aonius) one of the moſt virtuous men in the world, and one of the good writers in the XVIth century, was born at Veroli (*a*), an Epiſcopal city in the *Campania di Roma* [*A*]. He was well ſkilled both in Latin and Greek; and to this knowledge of polite learning he joined the knowledge of Philoſophy and Divinity; and to improve himſelf the more, he travelled over the greateſt part of Italy, and ſtudied under the moſt excellent Philoſophers he could find there. He ſpent ſix whole years at Rome, before this city was taken by the army of Charles the Fifth, and returned thither ſeveral times after that deſolation (*b*). He gave a public teſtimony of his proficiency, in a fine Poem which he wrote upon the immortality of the ſoul (*c*), and he was highly eſteemed by the learned and great wits of that time [*B*]. Having retired

(*a*) From hence comes his firname *Verulanus.*

(*b*) Palearius, Epiſt. IV, *lib. i, pag.* 406.

(*c*) See the remark [*F*].

[*A*] *An Epiſcopal city in the Campania di Roma.*] I do not at all underſtand theſe words of the Preface, which I ſhall quote here-under: *Natus eſt Aonius Verulis (oppidum id eſt Latii Epiſcopalis)* and I conjecture, that he who ſpoke this had before his eyes a book, wherein there was, *Urbs Latii Epiſcopalis*, and that having put *oppidum* inſtead of *Urbs*, he forgot to put *Epiſcopale* inſtead of *Epiſcopalis.*

[*B*] *He was highly eſteemed by the learned and great wits.*] The Preface prefixed to the new edition of the works of Aonius Palearius, acquaints us with the names of ſome perſons by whom he was loved and eſteemed. ‘Summo in honore fuit Palearius apud viros ætatis iſtius principes: Petrum Bembum, Jacobum Sadoletum, Franciſcum Sfondratum, Ennium Philonardum, Eccleſiæ Romanæ Cardinales; Janum Benedictum Lampridium, Marcum Antonium Flaminium, Andream Alciatum. - - - *Palearius was highly reſpected by the chief men of that age: Petrus Bembus, Jacobus Sadoletus, Franciſcus Sfondratus, Ennius Philonardus, Cardinals; Janus Benedictus Lampridus, Marcus Antonius Flamminus, Andreas Alciatus.*’ To know the names of ſeveral others of his friends, you need but caſt your eyes upon a liſt which was printed of them, at the end of his Letters in the laſt edition: there we find the names of thoſe who wrote to him, and of thoſe to whom he wrote. In the ſame edition we find, after the Preface, the excellent character which many learned men gave him; but becauſe the following verſes of Baptiſta Pigna, are not to be met with there, I thought fit to ſet them down here.

Aoni decus Aonum ſororum,
Quos mihi dedit aureos libellos,

Riccius

tired into Tuſcany, he choſe the city of Siena for his conſtant habitation; where he was made profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres*, and had a great number of ſcholars: and there he married at the age of thirty-four years, a young woman, whom he loved paſſionately all his life, and who brought him four children (*d*). His repoſe was a little diſturbed by the conteſts he had with one of his colleagues, who was troubled to ſee his own reputation obſcured by the luſtre of that of Palearius. But Peter Aretin quickly ſilenced this envious man [*C*]. After this there aroſe another ſtorm, which was much more terrible. Antony Bellantes, a nobleman of Siena, being accuſed of ſeveral miſdemeanors, got off by the excellent defence Palearius made for him. Some time after, he accuſed ſome monks of having robbed his grand-mother, and employed again the eloquence of Palearius to maintain his right. The defendants having ſworn, that they took nothing from the good woman, were acquitted by the judgment of the court; but they kept in their minds a lively reſentment againſt the advocate of the other party, and had recourſe to their common artifices to deſtroy him: they defamed him as an impious wretch, and preached againſt him as ſuch: but he made an apology for himſelf with ſo much vigour and eloquence, that the accuſation vaniſhed. Nevertheleſs, being wearied with the perſecutions to which he ſaw himſelf expoſed, he left Siena, and went to ſettle at Lucca [*D*]; from whence, after a few years, he removed to Milan. The magiſtrates called him thither, and gave him marks of their eſteem, by granting him (*e*) ſeveral privileges, beſides a good penſion. It happened unfortunately for him, that a Cardinal, who had been a Dominican, and a ſevere Inquiſitor, became Pope (*f*) after the death of Pius the IVth. He had a mind to ſignalize the beginning of his reign, by the puniſhment of ſome famous Heretics, and for that end he ordered that the cauſe of Palearius ſhould be re-heard. This learned man was ſeized at Milan, and carried to Rome, where he was eaſily convicted of having ſpoken in favour of the Lutherans, and againſt the Inquiſition [*E*]. He was condemned to be burned, and the ſentence was

Riccius tuus, aureos libellos
Qui deſiderium omnibus relinquunt,
Quo magis relegunt magis legendi,
Intentis oculis libenter hauſi.
Immortalem animam probas in ipſis.
Ipſi ſecula ſempiterna, & eſſe
Immortalem operam tuam probabunt (1).

Aonius, the glory of the Muſes,
Attentively I've read the golden books
Which thy Riccius gave me, thoſe who once read them,
Will ſtill deſire to read them more and more.
There you prove the ſoul to be immortal;
The books themſelves eternity will prove,
And that thy work ſhall never have an end.

[*C*] *Peter Aretin quickly ſilenced this envious man.*] If I be not miſtaken, his deſign was not to revenge Palearius's quarrel, but to revenge himſelf, or to ſatisfy his ſlandering humour. ‘ *Senis* primum exagitari ‘ cœpit inſanis contentionibus neſcio cujus profeſ‘ ſoris, (ipſe *Machum Blateronem* vocat) qui putabat ‘ tantum decedere de ſuo honore, quantum Aonii vir‘ tutibus & meritis dabatur. Quamquam hunc mo‘ rionem ignobilem brevi compeſcuit mordax ingenium ‘ Petri Aretini, qui ſtolidum pecus omnium ludibriis ‘ ſanniſque expoſuit in fabula quadam vulgari idiomate ‘ conſcripta, & Venetiis publico ſpectaculo exhibita (2). ‘ *He began firſt to be plagued at Siena with the fooliſh* ‘ *contentions of ſome (I do not know what) profeſſor, (he* ‘ *calls him Machus the Impertinent) who imagined his* ‘ *own reputation ſo much leſſened as the merit and vir*‘ *tues of Aonius were extolled. Tho' this ſilly fellow* ‘ *was ſoon humbled by the ſatirical wit of Peter Aretin,* ‘ *who expoſed the ſtupid wretch to the ſcoffs and deriſion* ‘ *of every body, in a comedy written in Italian; and* ‘ *publickly acted at Venice*'. Palearius complains very much of this enemy, of whom he ſpeaks as of an illiterate man, who had taught the Latin-tongue at Siena with ſo little ſkill, that his own ſcholars very much deſpiſed him. When Palearius wrote this, that man taught at Lucca, and endeavoured, by his calumnies, to hinder his adverſary from being called thither (3). We ſhall ſee in the following remark that his efforts were fruitleſs. ‘ Machus Blatero, is de ‘ quo hominibus noſtris fabula data eſt ab Aretino, le‘ pidè & feſtivè ſcripta, homo impudentiſſimus, & ‘ puræ veræque Latinitatis tàm ignarus quàm ii qui ‘ trans Taurum incolunt: Senis quam diu fuit, magnas ‘ mihi turbas fecit, veritus ne munus interpretationis ‘ ſcriptionum Latinarum mihi demandaretur: in qua ‘ cum ille infeliciter multos annos laboraſſet, apud ‘ eruditiores juvenes nihil aliud fuerat aſſequutus, quàm ‘ turpiſſimum infantiæ nomen: Is nunc lucæ eſt: ‘ utinam tàm cognitus, quàm Venetiis, ubi & fabula ‘ acta eſt, & Machus ludibrio habitus (4). - - - *The im*‘ *pertinent Machus, the perſon upon whom a witty and* ‘ *diverting play was writ by Aretin, is a moſt impudent* ‘ *fellow, and as ignorant of pure and true Latin as thoſe* ‘ *who live beyond the Taurus: whilſt he was at Siena,* ‘ *he gave me a vaſt trouble, fearing leſt the office of pro*‘ *feſſor ſhould be given to me: in which after he had la*‘ *boured unſucceſsfully for many years, among the more* ‘ *learned lads, he obtained only the ſhameful name of an* ‘ *old dotard: He is now at Lucca: I wiſh he were as* ‘ *well known there as at Venice, where the play is acted,* ‘ *and Machus expoſed to ridicule.*'

[*D*] *And went to ſettle at Lucca.*] He was called thither by the magiſtrates, to teach the *Belles Lettres*; and if he accepted this office, it was not upon the account of any pleaſure he took in teaching, but becauſe he had not a revenue ſufficient to maintain the expences of his family. ‘ Cum Lucenſes homines ‘ honeſtiſſimi propoſitis præmiis invitarent me ſin‘ gulorum dierum unius horæ uſurâ ad interpretan‘ dum, accepi conditionem duram mihi & aſperam, & ‘ vero etiam odioſam (5). - - - - *When the magiſtrates* ‘ *of Lucca invited me thither, having offered me a ſalary* ‘ *to teach an hour every day, I accepted the propoſal,* ‘ *tho' hard and grievous, and even odious to me.*' His wife loved to make a ſhew, his children were not free from vanity, and therefore, contrary to his own inclination, he muſt turn a teacher, tho' he was afraid leſt that exerciſe ſhould leſſen his wit, and blunt the vigour he felt for more ſublime ſtudies. He is not the only perſon who has been reduced to this pinch, and whom domeſtic expences have forced to groan under the burden of repetitions and leſſons. Read the words of this author, who expreſſes himſelf well: *Moriar ſi non me angunt putidiſſimæ interpretationes meæ, ſive Græcæ, ſive Latinæ, in quas veluti in piſtrinum detruſi me, non tàm imprudentiâ, quàm neceſſitate. Ego enim, ut ex meis ſtudiis noſſe potuiſti, ſemper judicavi obſcurum & ſordidum iis, quorum ingenio aliquid fieri poteſt illuſtrius, ſi interpretandis ſcriptis aliorum humiles ac demiſſi, quaſi ſervitia ancillentur. Sed cùm mihi res domi eſſet anguſta, uxor lauta, liberi ſplendidi, & propterea magnos ſumptus facerem, mancipavi propè me iis ſtudiis, à quibus ſemper abhorrui* (6.)

[*E*] *He was convicted . . . . . of having ſpoken in favour of the Lutherans, and againſt the Inquiſition.*] The monks that endeavoured to deſtroy him at Siena, decried him as an Heretic, becauſe he declared plainly enough, that he diſapproved certain ſuperſtitions, Beſides, they did not approve the book he wrote about the

(*d*) Two ſons and two daughters.

(*e*) In the year 1559.

(*f*) Under the name of Pius V.

(1) Jo. Baptiſta Pigna, Carmin. *lib. iii, pag. m.* 81.

(2) Præfat. Operum Antonii Palearii, *Edit.* 1696.

(3) Palearius, Epiſt. XVII, *lib. iii, pag.* 500.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 499.

(5) Ib. Epiſt. IV, *lib. iv, pag.* 509.

(6) Ibid.

was executed without any mercy in 1566 (g) [*F*]. We have ſeveral pieces written by him both in verſe and in proſe; the beſt edition of them is that of Mr Wetſtein at Amſterdam, 1696.

(g) Taken from the Preface which is before the works of Palearius, of the Amſterdam Edit. 1696.

the merits of the death of JESUS CHRIST (7). In the apology he was obliged to make, he did not ſcruple to ſay, that the German Doctors who followed Luther were commendable in ſome things, and that the Inquiſition was deſigned for putting learned men to death. His affair was amicably concluded, and it was agreed, that all the copies of his Apology ſhould be thrown into the fire (8). Nevertheleſs three of them were preſerved, whereof he kept one, his adverſary had another, and the third was that which Peter Victorius had (9). The copy which remained in the hands of the accuſer, ſerved for the conviction of Aonius; for the following words, in favour of the Proteſtants, are to be found in it. ‘Germanos vocas Oecolampadium, Rotherodamum, Melancthonem, Lutherum, Pomeranum, Bucerum, & cæteros, qui in ſuſpicionem vocati ſunt? Ego vero ex Theologis noſtris tam ſtupidum arbitror eſſe neminem, qui non intelligat & fateatur, permulta eſſe in his quæ ab illis ſcripta ſunt, digna prorſus omni laude: ſunt enim graviter, accuratè & ſyncerè ſcripta, repetita vel ex patribus illis primis, qui præcepta nobis ſalutaria reliquerunt: vel ex commentationibus Græcorum, & noſtrorum hominum (10). *Do you call Oecolampadius, Rotherodamus, Melancthon, Luther, Pomeranus, Bucerus, and others, who have been ſuſpected, Germans? In truth I do not think there is any of our Divines ſo ſtupid as not to know, and confeſs, that there are a great many things in their writings highly commendable; for they are writ with gravity, accuracy, and ſincerity, being taken either from the primitive Fathers, who have left us wholſome precepts; or from the Commentaries of the Greeks, and of our Divines.*’ Let us relate alſo what he ſays of the Inquiſition. ‘Quòd niſi indicto concilio ſpes bonis injecta eſſet, negotium felix & ſalutare à Pontificibus, à Cæſare, à Regibus unà ſuſceptum iri, ut magnis concurſibus omnium gentium, omnium nationum celeberrimi conventus peragantur, deſperaremus omnino tantarum perturbationum finem ullum unquam futurum: deſperaremus poſſe fieri, ut ſica iſta diſtricta in omnes ſcriptores, de manibus eorum extorqueatur, qui vel leviſſimis de cauſis crudeliſſimè ferire didicerunt: à quibus appetitus fuit aliquando vir omnium ſanctiſſimus & integerrimus, Sadoletus meus (11). - - - - *But if good men were not made to hope by the calling of a council, that a bleſſed and uſeful work is jointly undertaken by the Pope, the emperor and kings, in order to the holding of the moſt full aſſembly of all countries and nations, we might deſpair that ever an end would be put to ſuch diſturbances, that ever the dagger, which is drawn againſt all writers, ſhould be wreſted out of the hands of thoſe, who have learned to ſtrike in the moſt cruel manner, even upon the moſt frivolous occaſions; and who ſome time ago fell upon my dear Sadoletus, the moſt pious and virtuous man that ever lived.*’ He wrote this Apology but a little time after Ochinus had made his eſcape (12), and therefore we ought to believe that it was written in 1542 or 1543. Palearius was from that time a good Proteſtant, but he did not ſay all that he thought. A book written with his hand was found in 1596, intituled, *Teſtimonium ad gentes & nationes quæ invocant nomen Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti*, to which is added a longer treatiſe, intituled, *Actio ex Declaratione teſtimonii in Pontifices Romanos & eorum Aſſeclas. Ad Principes Chriſtianos, & Præfectos Concilio, in quibus habitat Spiritus Dei.* He wrote this piece a little before the opening of the Council of Trent; his deſign was to have it preſented to that aſſembly by the ambaſſadors of the Emperor. It is a plea in good form for the cauſe of the Proteſtants, which was never publiſhed till the year 1606 (13). There are two opinions in it which they do not approve of; one is, that marriage is a ſacrament; the other is, that a Chriſtian ought not to ſwear at all, no, not before the judges (14).

[*F*] *He was condemned to be burned* (§ *a*) . . *in* 1566.] He that publiſhed the *Actio in Pontifices* in 1606, informs us, that Palearius was burnt at Rome about the year 1558, and that he declared publickly what was his faith (15); but he is miſtaken as to the time. He that wrote the Preface to the new edition ſhows plainly that we muſt hold with Thuanus, who ſays, that this learned man was burnt in 1566 (16). This may ſerve to refute Simler, who ſays (17), that this martyr was beheaded in 1570, which is both an error in Chronology, and as to the kind of death. I have heard ſome ſay, that he was burnt for his book on the Immortality of the Soul, but this is falſe; for there is nothing in this fine poem which the Roman Catholics could condemn. A certain perſon wrote from Italy to Marcus Velſerus, that this piece was not Aonius Palearius's; but I know not what anſwer he made to Velſerus, who demanded immediately to what author it muſt be attributed (18). We have ſhewn above, that Pigna praiſes Palearius for writing this poem; and all the Bibliographers aſcribe it to him. I find in the Epitome of Geſner that it was printed at Lyons in 1536. James Sadoletus, biſhop of Carpentras, wrote to Gryphius (19), to perſwade him to print it. He wrote alſo a letter (20) to the author, wherein he mightily commends this piece. Palearius had ſent him a copy of an edition that was uncorrect, and prayed him to get Gryphius to reprint it (21). A book cannot be more advantageouſly recommended to a Printer than Sadoletus recommends this to Sebaſtian Gryphius. I ſhall only relate part of his Elogium. ‘Numerus porro carminis is eſt, ut videatur Lucretium velle imitari, redolet enim antiquum illud; ſed ita ſapore humanitatis conditus eſt, ut aſperitate demiſſa, vetuſtatis tamen autoritas ſalva remaneat. Atque hæc in univerſum. Illa jam partium ſingularum propria, nihil non latine dictum, nihil non accuratè, quove judicium & diligentiam adhibitam eſſe non pateat: multaque præterea ubique nitentia ingenii & venuſtatis luminibus, &, quod ego pluris quam reliqua omnia facio, Chriſtiana mens, integra, caſtaque religio, erga Deum ipſum honos, pietas, ſtudium; in eo libro vel maximè, non ſolum docere mentes errantium, ſed etiam animos incendere ad amorem puræ religionis poſſunt (22). - - - - *Beſides, the number of the verſe is ſuch, that he ſeems to have imitated Lucretius, for it reſembles that old piece: but it is ſo ſeaſoned with ſweetneſs, that the force without the harſhneſs of antiquity remains entire. And thus much in general. But now as to the particular parts, every thing is expreſſed in pure Latin, and with great accuracy, and ſhews that judgment and care have been uſed: and beſides, many things are to be found every where that ſhine with the luſtre of wit and elegance, and what I eſteem more than all the reſt, a Chriſtian mind, pure and undefiled religion, reverence, piety, and love, towards GOD: which tend very much, not only to inform the minds of thoſe that err, but likewiſe to inflame their hearts with the love of true religion.*’

[(§ *a*) He was hanged and ſtrangled before he was burnt. See the New Menagiana, Paris edit. 1715. Tom. I. pag. 217 and 218. REM. CRIT.]

(7) This work is loſt. It was in Italian. See the plan of it in the IIId Harangue of Palearius, *pag.* 90, 91.

(8) Preface to the Works of Palearius.

(9) Ibid.

(10) Palearius, Orat. III, *pag.* 83.

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 91.

(12) Ibid.

(13) Neither the year nor place of the edition appear in the title, but we learn from the Journal of Leipſic for the month of January 1696, *pag.* 44, that it was printed at Leipſic in 1606.

(14) See the advertiſement to the reader.

(15) Circiter annum Domini 1558 (ut ejus amicus quidam mihi narravit) Mediolani captus, vinctus, & Romam miſſus eſt, ubi fidei ſuæ confeſſione fortiter edita, flammis adjudicatus eſt.

(16) Thuan. Hiſtor. *lib.* *xxxix*, *pag. m.* 779.

(17) In Epitome Biblioth. Geſner.

(18) See the Letters of Velſerus, *pag.* 878.

(19) His Letter is found in the edition of Aonius Palearius, 1696, *pag.* 564.

(20) It is found, ibid. *pag.* 562.

(21) See Letter ii, of book iii, of Palearius, *pag.* 434.

(22) Sadolet. Epiſt. ad Gryph. pag. 565. Operum Palearii, Edit. 1696. *It is alſo among the Letters of Sadolet, pag.* 184, *Edit. Lugd.* 1554.

PALINGENIUS (MARCELLUS) is famous for a poem divided into twelve books, and intituled, *Zodiacus vitæ* [*A*]. He ſpent ſeveral years in compoſing it, and dedicated

[*A*] *He is famous for a poem divided into twelve books, and intituled,* Zodiacus vitæ.] *Hoc eſt de hominis vita, ſtudio, ac moribus optime inſtituendis libri* 12. Each of theſe twelve books has the name of one of the twelve ſigns of the Zodiac, and I make no doubt but this is the reaſon why this author calls himſelf *Poëta Stellatus.* Scaliger, the Father (1), has cenſured ſharply, and I think with very good reaſon, the little conformity there is between the ſubjects of each book, and the qualities of the ſign of the Zodiac, which is the title of it. I obſerve, by the by, that Barthius has written a poem (2) in imitation of this; the title of

(1) Julius Cæſar Scaliger, Poët. *lib. vi*, *pag. m.* 731, 732.

(2) Printed at Francfort in 1623, in 8vo.

dedicated it to Hercules d' Eſt, the ſecond of the name, duke of Ferrara (*a*). Some ſay he was Phyſician to this prince [*B*]. Others place him in the number of thoſe learned Lutherans, whom the ducheſs of Ferrara, Renata of France, received into her court, and honoured with her protection (*b*). It is certain, that he ſpoke againſt the monks and the abuſes of the church with very great freedom; and hence it is that he appears in the *Index Librorum prohibitorum* (*c*), among the Heretics of the firſt claſs as a Lutheran. It is ſaid alſo, that his dead body was dug up and burnt under pretence of Hereſy [*C*]. Nevertheleſs he declares himſelf a good Catholic at the end of his epiſtle dedicatory; for he ſubmits all his opinions to the cenſure of the church [*D*]. They cannot all be approved by the Proteſtants. He urged ſome objections of the libertines too far, and explained them after ſuch a manner as ſhewed he did not condemn them. Excepting this, his Zodiac is filled with good things, and contains a good Philoſophical Satire (*d*) againſt immorality and falſe prejudices. There is an infinite number of editions of this Poem [*E*]; but I find no body who knows that which Chriſtopher Wirſungus illuſtrated with a Commentary (*e*). It is ſomewhat ſtrange, that a Poet of his merit ſhould appear ſo little among the great number of Elogiums which the Italians have publiſhed on the writers of their own nation; probably his being thought a Heretic was the cauſe of it. However, the life of this perſon is ſcarce at all known. He was the favourite author of Naudæus.

A man of letters thinks, that Marcellus Palingenius is a falſe name under which Marſilius Ficinus is diſguiſed; which conjecture he confirms by a paſſage wherein Ficinus aſſigns himſelf two fathers, *ſe duos habuiſſe patres, Ficinum Medicum, & Coſmum Medicen; ex illo natum, ex iſto renatum* (*f*), - - - *that he had two fathers, Ficinus Medicus* (*a Phyſician*) *and Coſmus de Medicis; that he was begot by the former, and new-born by the later.* He might eaſily perſuade me, that the name Palingenius was not the name

(*a*) Opus noſtrum . . . in duodecim libros digeſtum, multoſque per annos elaboratum, Celſitudini tuæ donamus. *Epiſt. Dedicat.*

(*b*) *See* Seckend. Hiſt. Lutheran. *lib. ii, pag.* 122, *num.* 5, *ad ann.* 1528. *He cites the* Annals of Schultetus, *pag.* 148.

(*c*) *Pag.* 765, *Edit.* 1667, *in folio.*

(*d*) See Baillet's Judgment on the Poets, *num.* 1259.

(*e*) See the remark [*C*].

(*f*) Ficinus, Epiſt. Dedicat. ad Laurent. Medicen in lib. de Vita, Tom. i, pag. m. 482.

---

of it is, *Zodiacus vitæ Chriſtianæ, Satyricon pleraque omnia veræ ſapientiæ myſteria ſingulari ſuavitate enarrans.* He divided it into twelve books, whereof each bears the name of a ſign of the Zodiac. He does not trouble himſelf to obſerve any conformity between the matter of each book, and the virtue which is attributed to each of thoſe twelve conſtellations.

[*B*] *Some ſay that he was Phyſician to this prince.*] Scævola Sammarthanus affirms it (3); I dare not deny it: I ſhall only ſay, that this Poet was not known to the duke of Ferrara when he dedicated his book to him; for he declares in his epiſtle dedicatory, that underſtanding by a general report the learning of the duke, he had taken the boldneſs to addreſs to him, after the hopes of a good reception which Braſavolus had given him. ‘ Quid mihi cum principe qui alie‘nis oculis videt? ore loquitur alieno? illum volo ‘ qui per ſe poſſit curvum diſcernere recto: cui non ‘ auſint maligni homines dicere candida de nigris, & ‘ de candentibus atra. Talem igitur cùm te eſſe om‘nes prædicent, Dux illuſtriſſ. audacter ad te pro‘fectus ſum: eo maximè quòd Antonius Muſa Braſa‘volus, vir ſingulari doctrina integritateque conſpi‘cuus, qui excellentiam tuam fideliſſimè colit, mihi ‘ de te ſpem optimam attulit: quippe qui doctrinam, ‘ humanitatem, liberalitatemque tuam mirificè apud ‘ me commendavit. Cujus verbis tantum habeo fidei, ‘ quantum dici poſſit. Ego igitur ſuadente, &c (4). ‘ - - - *What have I to do with a prince, who only* ‘ *ſees with the eyes of others, and only ſpeaks with the* ‘ *mouth of others? I deſire to have to do with him, who* ‘ *is able of himſelf to diſtinguiſh right from wrong: and* ‘ *before whom malicious men dare not call black white,* ‘ *and white black. Since therefore, moſt illuſtrious* ‘ *prince, all the world declares you to be ſuch an one,* ‘ *I have taken the boldneſs to addreſs myſelf to you: eſpe*‘*cially as Antonius Muſa Braſavolus, a man of extraor*‘*dinary learning and integrity, and who moſt ſincerely* ‘ *reſpects your Excellency, has given me great hopes my* ‘ *addreſs would not be unacceptable to you: for he has* ‘ *mightily extolled to me your learning, humanity and ge*‘*neroſity, and upon his authority I entirely rely. I there*‘*fore,* &c.’ Note, that he is not in the catalogue of Phyſicians that have been Poets, compiled by Bartholinus.

[*C*] *It is ſaid that his dead body was dug up and burnt under pretence of hereſy.*] I have read this in Melchior Adam: ‘ Edidit præterea, *ſays he* (5), *ſpeak*‘*ing of Chriſtopher Wirſungus,* Marcelli Palingenii ſtel‘latenſis (cujus cadaver, propter pietatis doctrinam in ‘ Italia exhumatum concrematumque fuit) poëmata ‘ doctiſſimis adjectis commentariis. - - - *He publiſhed* ‘ *beſides, with very learned notes the Poems of Marcellus* ‘ *Palingenius, whoſe body was dug up and burnt in* ‘ *Italy.*’

But I have a teſtimony more authentic; for Gyraldus, who lived in that time, and in the country where the thing happened, affirms, That they dealt cruelly by the aſhes of this Poet, *poſt ejus mortem in ejus cineres ſævitum eſt, ob impietatis crimen* (6).

[*D*] *He ſubmits all his opinions to the cenſure of the church.*] He confeſſes that having related the opinions of Philoſophers, he had perhaps ſaid ſome things that were falſe, but that he was not anſwerable for them. It will be better to hear him himſelf. ‘ Si ‘ tamen in tanto opere aliquid fortè reperitur quod à ‘ noſtra religione aliquantum diſſentire videatur, mihi ‘ minimè imputandum cenſeo. Nam dum aliquando ‘ de rebus philoſophicis loquor, diverſorum philoſo‘phorum opiniones refero, præſertim Platonicorum. ‘ Quæ ſi falſæ ſunt, non ego, ſed ipſi reprehendi de‘bent: cùm mea ſit intentio, à catholica fide nun‘quam declinare. Quo circa in omnibus quæ ſcripſi, ‘ orthodoxæ Eccleſiæ me humiliter ſubjicio: ejuſque ‘ cenſuram, ut virum Chriſtianum decet, libenter ac‘cipio (7). - - - *However, if any thing be found in* ‘ *ſo large a work, that may ſeem in the leaſt to differ* ‘ *from our religion, I think it is not to be imputed to me.* ‘ *For when I ſpeak ſometimes of philoſophical matters, I* ‘ *relate the opinions of divers Philoſophers, eſpecially the* ‘ *Platoniſts: for which, if they be falſe, not I, but they* ‘ *are to be blamed: ſince my intention is, never to de*‘*part from the Catholic faith. Wherefore I humbly* ‘ *ſubmit myſelf to the orthodox Church in all that I have* ‘ *writ, and willingly receive its cenſure, as becomes a* ‘ *Chriſtian.*’ After this the Inquiſition could not in juſtice proceed againſt his perſon, nor declare him an heretic, this blemiſh could at moſt belong only to his doctrine; for it is obſtinacy, and not error, which is condemned in a man.

[*E*] *There is an infinite number of editions of this poem.*] The authors of the *Index Librorum prohibitorum* quote that of Baſil 1537, and obſerve that it followed that of Italy; but they neither ſet down the year nor the place of the later edition (8). I make uſe of that of 1569, in octavo, where there is neither the name of the Printer, nor the place of the impreſſion. The Index is very large, which was in the former edition of 1537, as Geſner obſerves (9). His abridger ſays nothing of the commentary of Wirſungus, neither under the word Palingenius, nor under that of Wirſungus. Mr Moreri affirms that this book was tranſlated into French and other languages. La Croix du Maine ſays only, that Scævola Sammarthanus promiſed an entire verſion of this author, having publiſhed one part of it. His words are theſe, *As he hath ſhewn by his fine and well-poliſhed imitations of the learned Italian Poet Marcellus Palingenius, whom he tranſlated with ſo much grace that this diverted many from ſetting about it, who before had reſolved to tran-*

(3) In the title of his French tranſlation of ſome paſſages of *Palingenius, apud Du Verdier Vau-Privas,* his French Bibliotheque, *pag.* 842.

(4) Palingenius, Epiſt. Dedicat.

(5) Melch. Adam, in Vitis Philoſophorum, *pag.* 253.

(6) Gyrald. de Poët. ſuorum temporum, Dial. ii, pag. m. 569.

(7) Palingen. Epiſt. Dedicat.

(8) The ſame thing is to be ſaid of Geſner and his Abridgers.

(9) In Biblioth. *folio* 492.

of the family of the author of *Zodiacus vitæ*, but a name turned into Greek, according to the mode of that time. Nevertheleſs, I cannot think that this piece was compoſed by Ficinus, ſince we are informed by Giraldus of the proceſs made againſt the aſhes of the author of this Poem (*g*).

(*g*) See the remark [*C*].

ſlate it into our language. He promiſed to continue till he had made an entire verſion of the Zodiac of the ſaid Palingenius; but hitherto he has printed but one part of it, with his other French poems, which he intituled, His firſt Works, *containing four books of imitations and tranſlations of ſeveral Greek and Latin Poets, printed at Paris by Frederic Morel, in the year* 1569 (10). Du Verdier agrees with this account, who ſays, *That Scævola Sammarthanus publiſhed a collection of ſeveral diſcourſes taken from the Zodiac of life, written by Marcellus Palingenius, Phyſician to the duke of Ferrara, and tranſlated* by him *into French verſe* (11). If any one ſhould have aſked of Mr Moreri, what are the other Poems of this Italian (12), he would have been puzzled to give an account of them.

(10) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Françoiſe, *pag.* 453.

(11) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibliotheque Françoiſe, *pag.* 842.

(12) He compoſed ſome poems, and among the reſt, that which is intituled *Zodiacus Vitæ*. Moreri at the word *Palingene*.

PALLAVICINO (**Ferrante**) the author of ſome ſatirical pieces, which made him loſe his head upon a ſcaffold. I have nothing to add to what Moreri has ſaid of him, but that there is an abridgment of his life prefixed to the new French tranſlation of his celeſtial divorce (*a*).

(*a*) Printed at Amſterdam 1696, and written by a man of much wit and merit (§ *α*).

[(§ *α*) Mr . . . . Brodeau d'Oyſeville, at that time counſellor in the parliament of Metz, and afterwards lieutenant-general in the bailiwick of Tours, grandſon of the commentator of Louet. He undertook this tranſlation to try his ſkill in the Italian tongue, which he had been learning for ſome months. Rem. Crit.]

PANORMITA (**Antony**) a native of Palermo in Sicily (*a*), and deſcended from the family of the Beccatelli (*b*), which had been illuſtrious a long time at Bologna (*c*), was one of the ableſt men of the XVth century. He being a perſon valuable for his virtue and learning, offered his ſervice to Philip duke of Milan, and was received by him with great kindneſs and liberality. He taught him Hiſtory, and made public lectures, for which he had a ſalary of 800 crowns a year. He was afterwards ſecretary to Alphonſus king of Naples, and his chief man of letters [*A*]. The literary diſputes he had with Laurentius Valla, occaſioned a torrent of reproaches on both ſides, wherewith their common enemies very much diverted themſelves. He waited till he was old before he married [*B*], and then eſpouſed a beautiful maid, for whom he had a particular affection; and by whom he had children who left poſterity (*d*). He was a man of a very pleaſant humour (*e*), and one who made the Portico of Naples famous [*C*], wherein many perſons of wit aſſembled to diſcourſe with him about a hundred

(*a*) Hieron. Raguſa, Elog. Siculorum, *pag.* 33.

(*b*) Jovius, Elog. *cap. xii, pag.* 33.

(*c*) Therefore he is called by ſome *Antonius Bononia.*

(*d*) Jovius, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) *Imprimis facetus.* Facius, de Rebus geſtis Alfonſi, *lib. iii, pag.* 103.

[*A*] *He was ſecretary to Alphonſus . . . . and his chief man of letters.*] This may be gathered from theſe phraſes of Paul Jovius, 'Panhormita Alphonſo 'adhæſit, ſecretioris ſcrinii magiſter, & ſtudiorum, expeditionumque omnium terra marique perpetuus comes (1). - - - *Panhormita was ſecretary to Alphonſus, 'and companion in his ſtudies, and always attended him 'in his expeditions both by ſea and land.*' See the remark [*C*] of the article of this Prince (2), and add to it, if you pleaſe, this paſſage of Jovianus Pontanus: 'Rex Alphonſus ſtatim poſt prandium, vel Antonium 'Panormitam, vel è doctis aliquem audiebat, ut qui 'dignum judicaret animum quoque cibo ſuo poſt paſtum corporis reficiendum eſſe (3). - - - *King Alphonſus preſently after dinner heard Antonius Panormita, 'or ſome learned man, for he thought his mind ſhould 'be nouriſhed likewiſe with its proper food after feeding 'of the body.*' Note, That this Prince cauſed letters of naturalization to be drawn up for Panormita, and made him a freeman of Naples; he made him alſo his counſellor, and preſident of the royal chamber (4).

[*B*] *He waited till he was old before he married.*] This is what Paul Jovius obſerves, *Senex*, ſays he (5), *uxorem duxit Arcellam ſibi magnopore dilectam, liberoſque ſuſcepit quorum honeſta ſoboles Neapoli viſitur.* The king underſtanding that Panormita was about to marry, at firſt blamed the deſign; for he thought that his ſecretary not being able for the future to mind both his ſpouſe and his books, he ſhould loſe the pleaſure of ſtudying; but when he knew that his ſpouſe was both beautiful and virtuous, he changed his opinion, believing that the pleaſures of this marriage would compenſate thoſe of ſtudying. Panormita himſelf tells us this particular: *Cum audiſſet Rex me uxorem eſſe ducturum, primo improbavit, arbitratus de cætero literis ſimul & uxori me operam dare non poſſe, ac proinde vera ſolidaque literarum voluptate cariturum. Sed cum mox audiſſet, me Leonoram Aureliam virginem probam, nobilem ac formoſam duxiſſe, approbavit, literarum commoda, & honeſti conjugii ſuavitatem in æquo ponens* (6). I believe that *Aureliam* is a fault either of the tranſcriber or the Printer, for *Arceliam*; for the epitaph of this woman in the Poems of Jovianus Pontanus, has this prefixed to it, 'Lauræ Arceliæ uxoris Antonii 'Panhormitæ (*tumulus*) (7). - - - *The tomb of Laura 'Arcelia, the wife of Antonius Panhormita.*' I know not whence Varillas took the particulars I ſhall here ſubjoin. *Antony of Palermo . . . . had been very reſerved the firſt ſeventy years of his life, but at ſeventy-one, he fell in love with a beautiful maid of Naples, called Marcilla, and began to think of marriage. He had many children by her, and died ten years after, with ſo little pain and diſtraction, that a moment before he expired, he wrote his own epitaph* (8). Mr Varillas names not right the miſtreſs of Panormita, and he ſpoils, by too bold an hyperbole, what Paul Jovius ſays concerning the time when Panormita wrote his own epitaph: *Æger vitæque diffidens in ſupremo morbo hoc carmen compoſuit* (9). Which ſignifies only, that this author compoſed it during a ſickneſs of which he never hoped to be cured, and of which he really died. If it be true, as Jovianus Pontanus ſeems to ſay (10), That Panormita and Theodore Gaza died much about the ſame time, it may be thought that Varillas was not miſtaken as to the age of Panormita, but he muſt be miſtaken as to the continuance of the marriage, ſince it is certain that Panormita married while Alphonſus was alive, and that this Prince died in the year 1458, and Theodore Gaza twenty years after.

[*C*] *He was a man . . . . who made the Portico of Naples famous.*] Jovianus Pontanus, his diſciple, in one of his dialogues, introduces a Sicilian, who aſks of an inhabitant of Naples where this Portico was, *Quænam quæſo, bone civis, Antoniana eſt Porticus* (11)? To whom anſwer was made, 'Antonium ne hoſpes 'requiris, an eam quæ ab illo Porticus Antoniana dicitur? - - - *Do you aſk, O ſtranger, for Antonius 'himſelf, or the Portico which goes by his name?*' We will ſet down the reply of the Sicilian, wherein you will find the character of the converſations of Panormita, which reſembled thoſe of Socrates. 'Et porticum ipſam noſſe, & Antonium videre cupio, audio 'enim pomeridianis horis illic conventum haberi literatorum hominum. Ipſum autem Antonium quan- 'quam

(1) Paulus Jovius, Elog. *cap. xii, pag. xxxiii.*

(2) Above, citation (24) of the article NAPLES (Alphonsus).

(3) Jov. Pontanus, de Conviv. *pag.* 143, apud Leonard. Nicodemum Addiz. alla Bibl. Napolet. *pag.* 21, 22.

(4) Nicolo Toppi, Bibl. Napoletan. *pag.* 24.

(5) Jovius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 34.

(6) Panormita, de Dictis & Factis Alphonſi, *lib. iii, num.* 27, *p.* 63, *Edit. Hanov.* 1611.

(7) Jovian. Pontan. Tumulorum, *lib. ii, fol. m.* 83, *verſo.*

(8) Varillas, Anecdotes de Flor. *pag.* 165.

(9) Jovius, ubi ſupra.

(10) See the laſt remark, num. 7.

(11) *Id.* In dialogo Antonius, init.

dred things. He was the beſt Poet of his time, and he received from the emperor Sigiſmund the Poetical crown, according to the ancient ceremonies [*D*]. Beſides, he underſtood the Civil Law; he wrote well in proſe, and was alſo a good Orator (*f*). He was employed in affairs of ſtate, as well upon account of his great capacity as of his reputation for wiſdom [*E*]. He was deputed to the Venetians in 1451, by king Alphonſus, to deſire of them the bone of the arm of Livy (*g*), which was granted him. He ſold an eſtate to purchaſe this Hiſtorian [*F*]. He wrote an epitaph for himſelf, which is a proof

quam multa dicit, plura tamen ſciſcitari quàm docere ſolitum; nec tam probare quæ dicantur, quàm Socratico quodam more irridere differentes. Auditores vero ipſos magis voluptatis cujuſdam eorum quæ à ſe dicantur plenos domum dimittere, quàm certos rerum earum quæ in quæſtione verſentur (12). - - - *I deſire both to know the Portico, and to ſee Antonius, for I hear that learned men meet there in an afternoon: that tho' Antonius himſelf ſays many things, yet he is more apt to aſk queſtions than to inſtruct others, and like Socrates, rather laughs at thoſe who talk, than approves of what is ſaid, that the hearers return home, more pleaſed with what they ſay than ſatisfied about the points in queſtion.*' I add to this a part of the reply of the Neapolitan. ‘ Hæc illa eſt Porticus in qua ſedere ſolebat ille ſenum omnium feſtiviſſimus. Conveniebant autem docti viri, nobileſque item homines ſanè multi. Ipſe quòd in proximo habitaret, primus hic conſpici, interim dum Senatus, ut ipſe uſurpabat, cogeretur, aut jocans cum prætereuntibus, aut ſecum aliquid ſuccinens, quo animum oblectaret (13). - - - *This is the Portico, where that merry old man uſed to ſit. Men of learning and likewiſe perſons of quality aſſembled here in great number. He himſelf was wont to appear firſt, becauſe he lived hard by, and till the company met, he diverted himſelf with ſinging, or joking with people that went along.*' Since Panormita was a man of witty ſayings, I believe it may be ſaid, that if the mode of making collections which end in *ana*, had prevailed in that time, as it has ſome times ſince (14), we ſhould have had a book intituled *Panormitaniana*, which would have taught us many things. The aſſemblies of this Portico may doubtleſs be compared to the Mercuriales of Mr Menage. If you deſire a proof that Panormita ſaid witty things, read the book of Pontanus *de Sermone*, and there you will ſee ſome of them, and among others, you will find there a thought which is become very common, and it is this, That to make a good agreement in a family, you ſhould join together a blind woman and a deaf huſband. ‘ Antonius Panormita ſuavis admodum vir interrogatus ad rem uxoriam jucunde concorditerque agendam, quibuſnam maximè opus eſſe duceret? ſumpto argumento à frequentia moleſtiarum ac magnitudine, quæ in vita contingerent conjugali: duobus tantum opus eſſe reſpondit, vir ut aurium ſurditate teneretur, uxor verò ut oculis eſſet capta: ne altera videlicet inſpiceret quæ à marito intemperanter fierent plurima, alter ne audiret obgannientem aſſiduò domi uxorem (15). - - - *Antonius Panormita, a very pleaſant man, having been aſked, what was moſt neceſſary in order to live quietly and agreeably in marriage: the ſubject of diſcourſe being upon the frequent and great vexations which happen in that ſtate, anſwered, that two things only were neceſſary, that the huſband ought to be deaf and the wife blind: that the latter might not ſee the pranks of her huſband, nor the former hear the ſcolding and impertinence of his wife.*'

[*D*] *He was the beſt Poet of his time, and he received . . . . the poetical crown, according to the ancient ceremonies.*] He is eſteemed the firſt reſtorer of Latin poetry (16), and here follows the compliment which Faccius made him under the perſon of Guarinus: ‘ Quod in cæteris partibus te antecedam, in eo tibi planè non aſſentior, præſertim cum tu Juris conſultus & Eques ſis: cumque plures Rhetores his temporibus inveniantur ſatis clari, poëta autem illuſtris præter te nullus, qui quidem Sigiſmundo Imperatore propter optimum de te judicium, conſenſu omnium excitatum, laurea corona more majorum donatus ſis, quæ res uſque adhuc noſtrum contigit nemini (17). - - *That I excel you in other reſpects, I do not at all agree with you; eſpecially as you are a Civilian and Knight: and tho' ſeveral Orators, famous enough, may be found in theſe times, yet there is no eminent Poet beſides yourſelf, whom the emperor Sigiſmund, becauſe of the excellent opinion all the world entertains of you, has preſented with a crown of laurel after the manner of our anceſtors, which ſince that time none of us learned men obtained.*' Voſſius did not rightly underſtand theſe words, for he thought they ſignified that no man before Panormita had received the poetic crown. This is a miſtake; if Faccius had meant this, he would have publiſhed a groſs falſity; for who is ignorant of the ſolemnity of the poetic coronation of Petrarch? But the compliment of Guarinus was this, The emperor has crowned you after the manner of our anceſtors, and ſince that time none of us learned men hath obtained that honour. This ſenſe is very different from that of Voſſius, which he thus expreſſes: ‘ Panormita hic à Bartholomæo Facio initio lib. de humanæ vitæ felicitate *poëta, atque eques præclarus* nominatur: & mox, *clarus & ſingularis poëta, & juriſconſultus.* Ac paullò poſt ait Sigiſmundo Imp. laurea donatum corona, more majorum, quæ res uſque ad id tempus contigiſſet nemini (18). - - - *This Panormita is called by Bartholomew Facius in the beginning of his book* de humanæ vitæ felicitate, an eminent Poet and Knight: *and afterwards* a famous and extraordinary Poet and Civilian. *And a little after he ſays, he was preſented by Sigiſmund the emperor, with a crown of laurel according to ancient cuſtom, which till that time no man had received.*'

[*E*] *He was employed in affairs of ſtate, as well upon the account of his capacity, as . . . . his wiſdom.*] Read theſe words of Faccius, ‘ Miſit igitur Otolinus ad Alphonſum qui peteret ad ſe mitti quempiam ex iis quibus fidelioribus uteretur qui cum de deditione ageret, & nominatim Antonium Panormitam, quem poetam non inſuavem Mediolani apud Philippum in magna gratia & dignitate cognoverat: cumque non tantum propter prudentiam, ſed multo etiam magis propter æquitatis opinionem, & quod illum ab Alphonſo apprime diligi acceperat (19). - - - - *Otolinus therefore ſent to Alphonſus deſiring that ſome faithful perſon might come to him to treat of a ſurrender, and particularly Antonius Panormita, whom he had known to be an agreeable Poet at Milan in great favour and dignity with Philip, not only upon the account of his prudence, but much more for the opinion he had of his juſtice, and becauſe he heard he was extremely beloved by Alphonſus.*' You will find in the hiſtorian whom I cite, the harangue which Panormita made to the inhabitants of Gaeta, in the name of Alphonſus, and that which he made to the Venetians, to congratulate them upon the peace.

[*F*] *He ſold an eſtate to purchaſe Livy.*] ‘ It is very well known, that Beccatelli, otherwiſe called Bologna, of Palermo, was obliged to ſell an eſtate that he might purchaſe a Livy, written with the hand of Poggius Florentinus, who employed this price of his book to purchaſe another eſtate near Florence, about the year 1455 (20).' Theſe are the words of Mr Baillet, who quotes for it the 154 page of the treatiſe of libraries, compoſed by Mr le Gallois. I have conſulted this treatiſe, and found in it a French tranſlation of the letter which was written on this ſubject to king Alphonſus, which follows: *Sir, You have acquainted me from Florence, that the books of Livy, written in a fair hand, are to be ſold, and that they aſk for them one hundred and twenty crowns. I pray your majeſty to cauſe this author to be brought to me, which we are wont to call the king of books, and I will not fail to ſend the money for it. And I intreat your prudence to let me know, whether Poggius or I does better, he who to purchaſe a farm near Florence, ſells Livy; or I who to purchaſe the book written with his own hand, ſell my land. Your goodneſs and modeſty induce me to put this familiar queſtion to you. Farewel and triumph* (21). If you would ſee the reflexions of Mr le Gallois, you need only read what follows (22): ‘ I think ſo great a king ſhould not have ſuffered ſo honeſt a man to ſell his eſtate to purchaſe Livy. He ought, like a generous prince, to have given it liberally to him. Neither do I ſee any cauſe why Pecatel (23) ſhould

‘ blame

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) See the article TITUS LIVIUS.

(12) Id. ib. *pag.* 1196.

(13) Id. ib. *pag.* 1198. *See alſo* de Sermone, *lib. vi, cap. iv, pag.* 1741.

(14) This I write in the year 1697.

(15) Jovian. Pontanus, de Sermone, *lib. iii, cap. xvii, pag.* 1645, 1646.

(16) Obliteratam nedum langueſcentem in Italia poeticam reſtituit in antiquam pene formam. *Idem,* de Sermone, *lib. vi, cap. iv, pag. m.* 1738.

(17) Barthol. Faccius, de hum. Vitæ Felicitate circa init. *pag. m.* 108.

(18) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latin. *lib. iii, pag.* 593.

(19) Faccius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 102, 103, apud Leon. Nicodemum, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 22, 23.

(20) Baillet, Jugem. des Sav. *Tom. i, ch. xiv, parag.* 1.

(21) Gallois, Traité des Bibliotheques, *pag.* 154, 155.

(22) Id. ib. *pag.* 155.

(23) It ſhould be Beccatel.

a proof of his preſumption, and of his orthodoxy at the ſame time [*G*]. He ſuffered with much conſtancy long pains by reaſon of a difficulty of urine, and reaſoned admirably well about adverſity and proſperity [*H*]. The public has ſeen ſome of his writings (*b*), but his Latin Poem, intituled *Hermaphroditus*, was never publiſhed. It is a piece ſo full of obſcenity that even Pogius diſliked it [*I*]. Mr Moreri has

‘ blame Poggius for ſelling Livy, ſince he might have two copies of it, or at leaſt he might have read it ſo many times over, that he had no further need of it.’

I have three ſhort remarks to make. I. It is not true that Panormita declares, he purchaſed this manuſcript from Poggius; on the contrary he intimates very plainly, that the Livy of Poggius was already ſold, and that the price of it was employed in purchaſing a farm; let us here ſet down his Latin letter, that the unfaithfulneſs of him who tranſlated it into French may appear. *Significaſti mihi nuper ex Florentia extare Titi Livii opera venalia, literis pulcherrimis, libro pretium eſſe cxx aureos. Quare majeſtatem tuam oro, ut Livium quem Regem librorum appellare conſuevimus, emi meo nomine, ac deferri ad nos facias. Interim ego pecuniam procurabo quam pro libri pretio tradam. Sed illud à prudentia tua ſcire deſidero, uter ego an Poggius melius fecerit; is ut villam Florentiæ emeret, Livium vendidit quem ſua manu pulcherrimè ſcripſerat: ego ut Livium emam fundum proſcripſi. Hæc ut familiariter à te peterem ſuaſit humanitas & modeſtia tua. Vale & triumpha* (24). II. It is not true that Panormita blames Poggius, he leaves it to king Alphonſus to judge, whether it be more prudent to ſell a book to purchaſe ſome land, or to ſell land to purchaſe a book, and as to himſelf he determines nothing about the matter. III. The excuſe that Poggius might have read Livy ſo often, *that he had no further need of it*, is chimerical; for a book of this nature is not got by heart, although it be read ſeveral times over, and it cannot be uſeleſs, unleſs one had it almoſt by heart.

[*G*] *He wrote for himſelf an epitaph, which is a proof of his preſumption and of his orthodoxy.*] It contained theſe four verſes.

Quærite Pierides alium qui ploret amores,
Quærite qui Regum fortia facta canat.
Me Pater ille ingens hominum ſator atque redemptor,
Evocat & ſedes donat adire pias.

That is to ſay, Muſes, ſeek out another Poet to make verſes of love, and ſing the brave actions of kings. For as to me I am going to paradiſe; the great God, creator and redeemer of mankind, calls me thither. Gyraldus conſidered this epitaph only on the wrong ſide, he perceived in it the arrogance (25), but not the faith of the author. I do not think that he found any heterodox principle in it, upon pretence that purgatory is excluded out of it.

[*H*] *He ſuffered with much conſtancy, long pains, and he reaſoned admirably well about adverſity and proſperity.*] Jovian Pontanus, his diſciple, ſhall here be my warrant, who ſpeaks as an eye-witneſs. ‘Vidimus Antonium Panhormitam multos annos tormina & urinæ difficultatem tam ſedate ferre, ut etiam diſſimulare videri poſſet ægritudinem (26). - - - *I have ſeen Antony Panhormita ſuffer the ſmart pains of the difficulty of urine many years ſo patiently, that he ſeemed even to have no illneſs.*’ He ſays in another book, that Panormita was always chearful, whether his affairs went well or ill: his principle was to refer all to God, and to ſuppoſe that the cauſes of good or ill fortune were hid from us; and that many accidents are thought unhappy, which are not really ſo; ſince they are only occaſions which providence offers us to ſhew our conſtancy. ‘Quid erat lætis in rebus Antonio jucundius? quid rurſus in turbatis atque aſperis gratius? Incredibilis quædam in ejus oratione vis inerat res humanas contemnendi, ferendique fortuitos caſus æquo animo, quippe cum omnia referret ad Deum, diceretque latêre nos & bonorum, & malorum cauſas. Pleraque autem videri quæ non eſſent mala, ut quæ objecta nobis eſſent à Deo, quo humana in iis conſtantia fortitudoqueeniteſceret. Quotum enim fortem inveniri, ſi quieta & ſecura omnia nobis forent? natos eſſe homines ad comparandam virtutem, ad excolendos animos, neminem autem ſine laboribus plurimis poſſe hoc aſſequi, ſed decipi opinione, nimiſque demiſſè, ac molliter nobiſcum nos ipſos agere: quæ fluant aquas ſalubriores eſſe, magiſque probari: quæ verò reſtagnent, noxias ac peſtilentes eſſe. . . . . Optimo itaque & fortiſſimo cuique labores ac moleſtias offerri à Deo, eamque veluti materiam præberi in qua ſeſe exerceat, cum excellentia hominum cæterorum. Tum Imperatores ipſi quos præcipuè ament, & quorum virtus eſt proſpectior, iis graviſſima & periculoſiſſima quæque demandent. Atque hanc quidem ipſam, non quæ prædam quæritaret, maximè illuſtrem militiam eſſe. Et verò ignavi eſſe, imbecillis, deſidis, odiſſe labores, fugitare moleſtias, velleque in ocio, ac ſub umbra marceſcere (27). - - - *Who could be more pleaſant than Antonius was in proſperity? or more chearful in adverſity? there was a wonderful force in his ſpeech inducing us to deſpiſe worldly affairs, and to bear misfortunes patiently, for he referred all to GOD, and ſaid we were ignorant of the cauſes of good and evil. That many things ſeem evil, which are not really ſo, but are opportunities given us by providence to ſhew our conſtancy and courage. For what man would be found ſteddy, if all things were quiet and ſecure? men are born to acquire virtue, and to improve their minds, and none can do this without much labour; but we are deceived in our notions, and deal too meanly and effeminately with ourſelves: running water is more wholeſome and agreeable: ſtanding water is noxious and peſtilent. . . . . Providence therefore offers to every brave and virtuous man troubles and afflictions, that he may exert and diſtinguiſh himſelf above others. Generals commit the moſt difficult and dangerous enterpriſes to thoſe they love beſt, and whoſe courage is moſt unqueſtionable. And indeed this kind of warfare is the moſt glorious, not that which ſeeks for booty and ſpoil. But it is the part of a weak and cowardly ſoul to hate labour, to ſhun trouble, and to languiſh in ſloth and idleneſs.*’ There is nothing finer than theſe common-places; and they are very true according to the preſent condition of men: but at the ſame time it muſt be acknowledged, that they ſuppoſe that it is a very odd condition; for what can be more aſtoniſhing and incomprehenſible, than to ſee a man reduced to ſuch a ſtate, that he muſt be unhappy to avoid greater evils? why is he not conducted from one good to another, until he arrive at perfection? why ſhould vexation, grief and miſery, be the leaſt inconvenient way that he can take? The Pagans could anſwer nothing that was good to this difficulty, and they were ſtupid enough hardly to think of it: Revelation only can ſolve it.

[*I*] *His* Hermaphroditus *is a piece ſo full of obſcenity that even Poggius diſliked it.*] It was dedicated to Coſmus de Medicis, who ordered ſeveral copies of it to be made, whereof ſome ſtill remain in the library of St Laurence (28). The reaſon why it was dedicated to that great man, was becauſe he regarded not the opinion of the vulgar, but pleaſed himſelf with reading this laſcivious piece. The author himſelf makes this remark, for thus he begins, *Hermaphroditi libellus incipit ad Coſmum Florentinum ex illuſtri progenie Medicorum virum clariſſimum. Quod ſpreto vulgo libellum æquo animo legat, quamvis laſcivum & ſecum una priſcos viros imitetur* (29). Mr Magliabecchi has a manuſcript copy of this poem (30). At that time many letters were written about this poem. Guarin of Verona (31) wrote one to John Lamola, wherein he gives great praiſe to the Hermaphroditus and its author; of which letter Mr Magliabecchi has the original. Gyraldus thought it very ſtrange, that this poem ſhould be commended. ‘Legi, *ſays he* (32), ejus ætatis quorundam epiſtolas quibus Hermaphroditus illius multis laudibus commendatur, ſed quare neſcio. Dicam ego vobis ſanè quid ſentio, nec is mihi poëta bonus, nec bonus Orator; quæ enim ſoluto & pedeſtri ſermone ejus ſcripta legi, luxuriantis magis quam bonæ frugis referta videntur, ut impudicas & proſtitutas ejus Muſas mittam. - - - *I have read the letters of ſome of that time, wherein his Hermaphroditus is highly commended, but upon what account I know not. I will tell you my opinion plainly, I think*

(*b*) There were printed at Venice in 1553, five books of his Letters, two harangues, and ſome verſes. See the laſt remark.

(24) Anton. Panormita, Epiſtol. *lib. v*, apud Naudé, Addit. à l'Hiſt. de Louïs XI, *pag.* 88.

(25) Senex diem obiit hocque ſibi moriens Epitaphium arrogantiæ plenum condidiſſe legi. *Gyraldus, de Poët. ſui tempor. Dial. I.*

(26) Jovianus Pontanus, de Fortitudine, *lib. ii, fol. m.* 51.

(27) *Idem*, in Diologo Antonius, init. *pag. m.* 1197.

(28) Leonardo Nicodemo, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 21.

(29) See Nicodemo, ibid. *pag.* 20.

(30) Ibid.

(31) So I correct *Gravino, Veroneſe*, which I find in *Nicodemo*, ibid.

(32) Lil. Gregor. Gyraldus, de Poëtis ſui tempor. Dial. I, *pag.* 385, apud Nicodemum, ibid.

has not committed many conſiderable faults [*K*]. Thoſe of Varillas are not very numerous; ſee them in the remark [*B*].

‘ *he is neither a good Poet nor a good Orator: for what I have read of him in proſe is rather luxuriant than ſolid, not to mention his unchaſte and proſtitute Muſes.*’ You ſee he does not only deteſt the obſcenity of this piece, but deſpiſes alſo the verſes themſelves. The cenſure of Poggius was not ſo extenſive, he commended the invention, the wit, and the ornaments of the work; but he condemned the obſcenity, and counſelled the author, for the future, to beſtow his pains upon ſubjects more becoming a Chriſtian. *Delectatus ſum, mehercle, varietate rerum & elegantia verſuum: ſimulque admiratus ſum res adeo impudicas, adeo ineptas tam venuſtè tam compoſitè à te dici, atque ita multa exprimi turpiuſcula, ut non enarrari ſed agi videantur: nec ficta à te jocandi cauſa, ut exiſtimo, ſed acta exiſtimari poſſint. Laudo ego doctrinam tuam, jucunditatem carminis, jocos ac ſales .... pro charitate tamen qua omnibus debitores ſumus, unum eſt quod te monere & debeo & volo, ut ſcilicet deinceps graviora quidem mediteris, hæc enim quæ adhuc edidiſti, vel ætati concedi poſſunt, vel licentiæ jocandi .... ſcis enim non licere idem nobis qui Chriſtiani ſumus, quod olim Poëtis qui Deum ignorabant* (33). Panormita anſwered Poggius, and alledged to him ſome reaſons to juſtify or excuſe himſelf (34). Poggius replied, and maintained, that a man ought to be virtuous, not only in his actions, but in his writings (35). From whence we may conclude, that he repented of having employed his pen in laſcivious writings during his youth (36). We will cloſe this remark with the words of a Dutch writer, who had read this obſcene Poem of Panormita: ‘ De Hermaphrodito quod dicit (*Gyraldus*) non eſt de nihilo: ego enim legi manu deſcriptum, (neque enim unquam eſt typis excuſus) adeo ſpurcum, adeo abominabilem, ut nihil ſupra. Verſus deinde ipſi vix ſunt tolerabiles, tantum abeſt ut laudem aliquam mereantur. Inſcribitur autem Hermaphroditus, eo quod utriuſque ſexus membra genitalia utriuſque libelli omnem materiam faciunt. Hæc qui patienter legit, næ illum oportet eſſe hominem frugi (37). - - - - *What he* (Gyraldus) *ſays of the Hermaphroditus is not without reaſon: I have read it in manuſcript (for it never was printed) and it is ſo filthy, ſo abominable, that nothing can exceed it. Then, the verſe is ſcarce tolerable, ſo far is it from meriting praiſe. It is intituled Hermaphroditus, becauſe the genital members of both ſexes make the whole ſubject of both books. He muſt be a man of great temper that can read theſe things patiently.*’

[*K*] *Mr Moreri has not committed many faults that are conſiderable.*] I. Inſtead of ſaying as he does, that Panormita was *a native of Bologna*, and originally from Sicily, he ſhould have ſaid the quite contrary. Mr Varillas alſo makes him a native of Bologna (38). II. He ſhould not have affirmed, that Philip, *Lord of Milan invited him to his houſe*, but he ſhould rather have ſaid, that Panormita made an offer of his wit to Philip duke of Milan: *Quum Philippo Mediolanenſium principi fertilis ingenii induſtriam obtuliſſet, tanta liberalitate ſuſceptus eſt ut, &c* (39). Theſe are the words of Paul Jovius, one of the authors, cited by Moreri. III. Why does he ſay, that Panormita did not attend the king of Naples till after the death of the duke of Milan? Does not Paul Jovius intimate the contrary (40)? IV. I have ſhewn elſewhere (41) the falſhood of theſe words of Moreri: *He wrote with care the hiſtory of this king*. This pretended hiſtory is nothing but a collection of the Apophthegms, and of ſome memorable actions of Alphonſus, *de dictis & factis Alfonſi Regis Aragonum libri quatuor*. That prince rewarded the author for it with 1000 crowns (42). V. He impoſes upon us when he ſays, *that we have divers editions of that hiſtory, with the Remarks and Commentaries of Æneas Sylvius*; for theſe pretended Commentaries, are nothing but a collection of the actions and ſentences of other princes like thoſe of Alphonſus. By the by, obſerve an error of Voſſius, who thought that the piece of Panormita, and that of Sylvius, had always been printed apart, until Marquardus Freherus publiſhed them as parallels (43). This miſtake he might have avoided, by conſulting the *Bibliotheca* of Geſner, where he might have ſeen, that in the Baſil edition, 1538, what Panormita had done was interwoven chapter by chapter with what Æneas Sylvius had collected (44). Paul Jovius was not ignorant of this, for ſpeaking of Panormita's book, he ſays, *Quem pius pontifex exemplis paribus* INTERTEXTIS *nobiliorem reddidiſſe videtur* (45). - - - *Which the pious pontif ſeems to have rendered more excellent by intermixing parallel examples.* I do not blame in Voſſius the word *Commentariis*, which he makes uſe of, ſpeaking of the book of Æneas Sylvius, for this word in Latin is of a larger extent than our word Commentary. VI. Since none of the three authors whom Moreri cites, ſays any ſuch thing, he had no reaſon to affirm, *that it is certain that Panormita ſurvived king Alphonſus, who died in* 1458; and that *it is probable* he did not die *till after* 1460. VII. This probability is not well proved by alledging a letter written to Panormita by Philelphus in 1458, for without doubt he received many letters the ſame year that he died. Note, that I do not mean to deny that he lived till after the year 1460; I only condemn the raſhneſs of an author, who affirms that which his witneſſes do not affirm. I believe that Panormita died after 1460, becauſe I find in the ſame Dialogue, where it is ſaid that he was lately dead (46), that Theodorus the Grecian had departed this life not long before (47): Now I fancy that this Theodorus, is not different from Theodora Gaza, who died in the year 1478 (48); therefore I do not alledge what we read in the ſame Dialogue, that it was a little more than an age (49) ſince there had happened a conflagration in the iſle Ænaria, for the calculation of Pontanus is not exact, ſince this eruption of fire happened in the year 1301 (50). VIII. He ſhould have cited *Miræus in Auctario*, and not *in Aug.* but this fault I impute to the correctors of the Preſs; but that of having cited Miræus is to be reckoned the author's. It was very needleſs to cite him, ſince that little which he ſays of Panormita is to be found in Paul Jovius. I could criticize upon the place he has aſſigned to our Panormita, for he ſpeaks of him under the word Antony, which is not his proper place.

(33) Poggius, Epiſt. *pag.* 131, 132, apud Nicodemum, ibid. *pag.* 21.

(34) Nicodem. ibid.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Dal che ſi comprende ch'eſſo ſi pentiſſe delle facezie, e dell' altre coſe meno oneſte che in gioventu ſcritte avea. *Nicodemo, ibid.*

(37) Author Anonymus notarum ad poëmata Sannazari, *pag.* 202, 203, *Edit. Amſtel.* 1689.

(38) Varillas, Anecdot. de Florence, *pag.* 165.

(39) Jovius, ubi ſupra.

(40) Verum eo (*Philippo*) graviſſimis bellis occupato, Panhormita Alphonſo adhæſit. *Ibid.*

(41) Above, in the text of the article NAPLES (ALPHONSUS KING OF).

(42) Jovian. Pontanus, de Liberalitate, *fol. m.* 97.

(43) Utrumque opus SEORSIM antea excuſum παραλλήλως atque emendatius in Germania prodiit (*Hanoviæ ann.* 1611) cura Marquardi Freheri. *Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Latinis, pag.* 593.

(44) Cum Æneæ Sylvii commentariis quæ capitatim cum Alphonſinis contendunt. *Geſn. Bibl. fol.* 62, *verſo.*

(45) Jovius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 34.

(46) Nuper paucos antequam morbo aggravaretur dies. *Pontanus, in Dialogo Antonius, pag.* 1198.

(47) Et Theodorus Græcus qui diem nuper obiit. *Id. ib. pag.* 1237.

(48) Geſner. in Biblioth. *folio* 611, *verſo.*

(49) Centum ante annis aut paulo amplius. *Pontanus, ubi ſupra, pag.* 1231.

(50) Scipio Mazzella, de Balneis Puteolanis, *pag. m.* 255.

PARACLETE, an abbey of Nuns founded by Peter Abelard. This learned man, being a monk in the abbey of St Denys, after the relations of Heloiſa, had villainouſly caſtrated him, quarrelled more than once with his brethren; and at laſt he had reaſon to fear they would deliver him over to the ſecular power, becauſe he had ſaid, that St Denys the Areopagite had not converted France. He retired into the territories of Thibaud, or Theobald, earl of Champagne, and kept near to Provins in a cell which belonged to the monks of Troies. Some time after, having obtained leave from the abbot of St Denys to retire to any hermitage he pleaſed, provided he ſhould not depend upon any community; he made choice of a very ſolitary retirement in the dioceſe of Troies [*A*]. There he built a cottage on a piece of ground that was

[*A*] *In the dioceſe of Troies.*] For the ſake of thoſe who would be more particulary informed, I add, that the Paraclete was built in the pariſh of Quincey, upon the little river Arduzon, near to Nogent upon the Seine. The letter of Pope Innocent II to Heloiſa, mentions the greateſt part of theſe particulars. *Heloiſæ Abbatiſſæ cæteriſque ſororibus in Oratorio, quod in pago Trecenſi, in Parrochia Quinceii, ſupra fluvium Arduconem ſitum eſt* (1). The Chronicle of William de Nangis ſays this of it, ‘ Conſtruxerat Monaſterium in Epiſcopatu Trecenſi juxta Nogentum ſuper Sequanam, in quodam prato ubi legere ſolitus fuerat (2). - - - *She had built a monaſtery in the dioceſe of Troies near Nogent upon the Seine, in a meadow where he uſed to read lectures.*’

(1) Du Cheſne, Not. in Hiſt. Calamitatum, *pag.* 1177.

(2) Apud eumd. ibid.

was given him, and, with the permiſſion of the biſhop, he made of that cottage an Oratory, which he conſecrated to the Trinity (*a*). His ſcholars knowing this, ran from all parts to this deſart, and there built themſelves huts, being well ſatisfied to live upon herbs and roots, and to ſubſiſt, as I may ſay, upon bread and water, provided they might enjoy the benefit of the lectures of this famous profeſſor. He could not dig the ground, and he was aſhamed to beg, and therefore he thought it convenient to get a livelihood by his tongue, and by re-aſſuming his ancient profeſſion, knowing that his ſcholars would furniſh him with what was neceſſary for his ſubſiſtence. And they did more than this, for they enlarged the Oratory, and built it of wood and ſtone : then Abelard gave it the name of Paraclete, to preſerve the memory of the conſolations he had received in this deſart. The jealouſy and envy, which a long time before had ſtirrred up againſt him Alberic of Rheims, and Ludolfus of Lombardy, was furiouſly revived, when they ſaw ſo many ſcholars flock about him, notwithſtanding the inconveniences of the place, and in contempt of the maſters they could ſo conveniently find in the cities. They ſought therefore for all occaſions to vex him, and did not forget that which the title of Paraclete afforded them. They ſaid, it was an innovation, and that it was not more lawful to conſecrate churches to the holy Ghoſt, than to GOD the Father. This made a great uproar : but the perſecution was infinitely more terrible, when the two perſons above-named had prevailed with St Bernard and St Norbert to eſpouſe their intereſt, who valued themſelves upon the account of their great zeal, and a ſpirit of reformation. He could by no means ſtand againſt ſuch adverſaries ; Abelard therefore quitted that place, and went into the lower Bretagne, where the monks of the abbey of St Gildas of Ruys had choſen him for their head. The Paraclete remained empty, until ſuch time as the abbot of St Denys drove away the nuns of Argenteuil from their convent. Heloiſa, their prioreſs, not knowing which way to turn herſelf, was very glad that her late huſband did yield her the Paraclete. Pope Innocent II, confirmed this donation in the year 1131 (*b*) ; and this was the original of the abbey of the Paraclete, whereof Heloiſa was the firſt abbeſs. Great riches were given to it in a little time (*c*). The abbeſſes who ſucceeded her, were very often of the moſt ancient families of the kingdom ; you may ſee a catalogue of them in the works of Abelard (*d*), from the firſt foundation, which happened in the year 1130, to the year 1615. But it was not judged proper to obſerve in it, that Jane Chabet, who died the twenty-fifth of June 1593, publickly profeſſed the Proteſtant religion, *yet without marrying or quitting the habit of a nun, which ſhe always retained, tho' ſhe was driven from her nunnery* (*e*). For the reſt, it is a difficulty which is looked upon as a matter of conſequence, to know whether it muſt be called Paraclete or Paraclite [*B*]. That it might not be forgot, that Heloiſa underſtood Greek, the nuns are wont to have the office read in that language on Whitſunday (*f*).

' *lectures.*' This laſt circumſtance is contrary to the narrative of Abelard (3), according to which it is certain, that he taught not in the place where he built the oratory, until after he had built it. I think three ſtations of Abelard may be reckoned in the territories of Theobald earl of Champagne ; for firſt, he retired thither with the permiſſion of the monks of St Denys, and there read lectures to a great number of ſcholars. This was interrupted by the cenſure which the council of Soiſſons paſſed upon him in 1121. Being ſent back to his cloyſter, and having there brought himſelf into trouble about Denys the Areopagite, he retired by night to Provins, and lived in a little cell until ſuch time as his difference with the monks of St Denys was ended ; after which having permiſſion to live in any ſolitude he pleaſed, he went to the place where he built the Oratory. It was known that he lived there very retired ; the ſcholars flocked to him, and he begun again his lectures. ' Oratorium quoddam in nomine Sanctæ ' Trinitatis ex calamis & culmo primum conſtruxi ' Ubi cum quodam Clerico noſtro latitans, illud vere ' Domino poteram decantare, ecce elongavi fugiens & ' manſi in ſolitudine. Quod cum cognoviſſent ſcho' lares, cœperunt undique concurrere (4.) - - - *I built at ' firſt an Oratory, in the name of the Holy Trinity, with ' ſtraw and reed. Where lying hid with one of our clergy, ' I could truly ſing that to the Lord, Lo, I have wan' dered far off, and have remained in the wilderneſs. ' Which when the ſcholars knew, they flocked from all ' parts.*' It does in no wiſe appear, that he retired to the ſame place the firſt and the third time, and it may rather be inferred from his narrative, that theſe two places of retreat, were remote from one another : Thus William de Nangis might very well be miſtaken.

[*B*] *It is a difficulty . . . whether it muſt be called Paraclete, or Paraclite.*] This queſtion had never been much diſcuſſed, if this word had not been uſed in the divine ſervice. This was the ground of the diſpute, ſome maintaining that it ſhould be pronounced *Paracletus*, while others thought it better to call it *Paraclitus* ; the latter have, with a ſtrict hand, obtained a compleat victory. Paſquier relates a curious thing. ' The ignorance of the common people called it *Para' clite* (5). So have I ſeen in my younger days, that ' in the churches, the Holy Spirit was called, *Spiritum ' Paraclytum*, not *Paracletum*, two words of quite ' contrary ſignifications, for the one ſignifies a flatte' terer, and the other a comforter. Nay, a little ' after I came to the bar, one Maſter John Sablet, a ' canon of Chartres, a learned man, having pronounced ' at the celebration of his maſs, *Paracletus*, and not ' *Paraclytus*, was for that ſuſpended, *ex officio*, by the ' biſhop, from which ſentence he appealed as a grie' vance ; and, in maintainance of his cauſe, he publiſhed ' a very learned manifeſto, which I had in my poſ' ſeſſion ſome time ; and afterwards the cauſe was com' promiſed between them by ſome friends of the biſhop, ' that he might not be laughed at by the people (6).' There are two things to be cenſured in this diſcourſe of Paſquier : I. it is falſe that thoſe who do not pronounce *Paracletus*, pretend to pronounce *Paraclytus* ; for they pretend to pronounce *Paraclitus*, and to ſay the very ſame thing with thoſe who pronounce *Paracletus*. The queſtion turns only upon this grammatical nicety, whether the *η* of the Greeks does anſwer to the *e* or *i* of the Latins. II. Παράκλυτος does not ſignify a flatterer, but in general, a man of a bad name. Garaſſe here does not ſpare Stephen Paſquier, but inſults him with his uſual pride, and maintains againſt him, that the Greek-tongue has no ſuch word as *Paraclytus*, and that if this word might be compoſed by analogy, it would not ſignify a *flatterer*, but it would ſignify either an infamous man, or one that is honoured above his merits (7). The apologiſt of Paſquier acted a very ſilly part, when he writ againſt this ; for inſtead of confeſſing that his client was miſtaken, he took upon him to defend him, and he could not even invent many falſe reaſonings ; what he replied was equally ſhort, and bad. He ſays, that

---

(*a*) Ibi à quibuſdam terra mihi donata, aſſenſu Epiſcopi terræ Oratorium quoddam in nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis ex calamis & culmo primum conſtruxi. *Abælard. Oper. pag.* 28.

(*b*) Taken from the Letter of Abelard, which contains the Hiſtory of his misfortunes.

(*c*) Plus ut arbitror uno anno in terrenis commodis ſunt multiplicatæ, quam ego per centum ſi ibi permanſiſſem. *Ib. p.* 34.

(*d*) Not. Andr. du Cheſne in Hiſtor. Calamit. Abælardi.

(*e*) Maimb. Hiſt. du Calvin. *pag.* 464.

(*f*) Aub. Miræus, in Schol. ad Henr. Gandavenſ. de Script. Eccleſ. *pag.* 165.

(3) See the Letter intituled, *Hiſtoria Calamitatum.*

(4) Abælard. Oper. *pag.* 28.

(5) He ſpeaks of the Oratory of Abelard.

(6) Paſquier, Recherches de la France *livr. vi, chap. xvii, pag. m.* 511.

(7) Enquiry of Enquiries, *book iii*, §. *xii.*

we find in the great *Etymologicon*, and in *Scapula*, that *Paraclytus* with an υ ſignifies a flatterer (8). I have a *Scapula* in folio, printed at Baſil in 1605, and there I find παράκλυτος at p. 810, and this refutes Father Garaſſe; but there I find that this word ſignifies *infamis, famoſus, infamous, diſgraced*, which refutes the defender of Stephen Paſquier. But to return to the general diſpute, I ſay, that Mr Thiers has wrote a treatiſe *de Retinenda in Eccleſiaſticis libris voce* PARACLITUS, - - - *about retaining the word* PARACLITUS *in Eccleſiaſtical books*, wherein he tells us many curious things; as that, 'In the ninth century, that diſpute was warmly debated by the biſhops of France 'and Germany, upon occaſion of a Greek who came 'to court, and who hearing, in the king's chapel, '*Paraclitus Spiritus Sanctus*, remonſtrated, that they 'ſhould ſay *Paracletus* (9).' His remonſtrances were to no purpoſe; none durſt change the pronunciation of this word, becauſe it was the cuſtom to read ſo, and there muſt be no innovation (10). Mr Thiers adds, that in 1526, the faculty of Theology in Paris having paſſed a cenſure upon Eraſmus's works condemned him, among other things, for this, that he maintained we ought to write *Paracletus*.

(8) Defence for Stephen Paſquier, *pag.* 795.

(9) See the Journal of the Learned, of the 16th of December 1669.

(10) Ibid. ex Haimone Epiſcopo Alberſtad.

PARAVICIN (VINCENT) Miniſter of the word of GOD in the country of the Griſons, lived in the XVIIth century. He tranſlated from French into Italian the treatiſe of Meſtrezat, concerning our communion with JESUS CHRIST in the ſacrament of the holy ſupper. This tranſlation was put in the Index at Rome in the year 1640. He was probably of the ſame family with PETER PAUL PARAVICIN, Phyſician at Como, author of a letter printed in the year 1545 *in* 4, *de Maſinenſium & Burmenſium Thermarum hactenus incognitarum ſitu, natura, & miraculis* (*a*).

(*a*) *See* Lindenius renovatus, *pag.* 902.

PARE′ (AMBROSE) in Latin, *Paræus*, a native of Laval in the country of Maine. I ſhall only add three things to the article that Moreri has given of him, *viz.* that he was a Proteſtant, and that he was ſaved from the maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day, by the ſpecial favour of Charles the IXth [*A*], and that he had many obſtacles to remove, when he publiſhed his books of Phyſic [*B*]. He had expreſſed himſelf too ſmuttily.

A modern writer relates two things; one is, that Ambroſe Paré, being Surgeon to Francis the IId, told admiral Coligni, as a ſecret, that the diſtemper in the ear of that monarch was extreamly dangerous (*a*). The other, that it was ſuſpected he had put poiſon in the ear of this prince *when he dreſſed him* (*b*). The author above-mentioned adds to each of theſe two things many particulars; believe them who will. I find nothing of them in good Hiſtorians; only I know that Beaucaire has mentioned the ſuſpicion concerning the poiſon. Spondanus relates it after him (*c*), and does not ſeem to believe it.

(*a*) Vie de Gaſpar de Coligni, *pag.* 220, *Edit.* 1686.

(*b*) Ib. *pag.* 221.

(*c*) Spondan. *ad ann.* 1560, *num.* 20.

[*A*] *He was ſaved from the maſſacre on St Bartholomew's-day, by . . . favour of Charles IX.*] What Brantome ſays upon this ſubject is too remarkable to be here omitted. 'The king, as ſoon as it was day, having 'put his head out of his chamber-window, whenever 'he ſaw any in the ſuburbs of St Germains removing 'and making their eſcape, took a great hunting harquebuſs which he had, and ſhot at them, but in 'vain, for the harquebuſs would not carry ſo far, and 'cried out, continually *kill, kill*; and would have none of 'them ſaved, except Mr Ambroſe Paré, his firſt Surgeon, and the beſt in Chriſtendom; he had ſent for 'him to come the night before to his own chamber and 'wardrobe, commanding him not to ſtir from thence; 'for he ſaid, that it was not reaſonable, that he who 'could do great ſervice to ſo many people, ſhould be 'thus maſſacred (1).'

[*B*] *He had many obſtacles to remove when he publiſhed his books of Phyſic.*] I change nothing in the expreſſions of the author who informs me of this: 'Ambroſe 'Paré, *ſays he* (2), Surgeon to three kings ſucceſſively, 'learned, and experienced, who hath publiſhed many 'good and curious books, which were for ſome time 'ſtopped from being printed and publiſhed by the college of learned Phyſicians in Paris; not upon the account of any error that was diſcovered in them relating to the art of which he treated; but becauſe 'in his book of Generation, through inadvertence, 'he had inſerted ſome paſſages about it which were a 'little immodeſt; and after he had corrected them, he 'met with no more oppoſition.'

(1) Brantome's Memoirs, *Tom.* iv, *Diſcourſe on Charles IX.*

(2) Louïs Guyon, diverſes Leçons, *Tom.* ii, *book* ii, *chap.* viii, *pag.* 298.

PAREUS (DAVID) a famous Reformed Divine, was born at Francoſtein in Sileſia, December 30, 1548. John Wængler, his father, ſon of a rich countryman (*a*), made him at firſt ſtudy at Francoſtein, and then bound him apprentice to an Apothecary at Breſlaw, and after that to a Shoemaker. But this young man was not born for ſuch little things; and, as the author of his life ſays, the GOD, who preſides over the Muſes, did not abandon him to the caprices of a ſtep-mother, who was the cauſe of this unworthy treatment. The good man, John Wængler, ordered him to return to his ſtudies in 1564, and ſent him to Hirſchberg in the neighbourhood, where there was a college, of which a learned man called Chriſtopher Schilling (*b*) was rector. There our young ſcholar acquired the name of *Paræus*, taken from the Greek, by alluſion to that of his family [*A*]. This was the common cuſtom of that time, and particularly of Schilling. The bad humour of the ſtep-mother, was a little pacified no

(*a*) Who lived more than 100 years, and ſaw more than 20 of his own children alive. *Philip. Pareus, in Vita Davidis Parei.*

(*b*) We ſhall ſpeak of him in its proper place.

[*A*] *The name of Pareus taken from the Greek, by alluſion to that of his family.*] His father was called Wængler. Now Wange in the German-tongue ſignifies the ſame thing with παρειὰ in Greek, *i. e.* the cheek. Παρειὸς therefore was formed ἀπὸ τῆς παρειᾶς, *quaſi dicas*, GENIUS Wængler. The ſon of Pareus, from whom I take this remark, ſays, that his father oppoſed as much as he could this change of name, but that he was forced at laſt to ſubmit to it when Zachary Urſinus had approved it (1). He adds, that moſt people write Paræus, and that they are in the wrong, *becauſe*, ſays he, τὸ ει *Græcorum tranſit, in ē longum, apud Latinos, the* ει *in Greek is turned into ē long in Latin, as* ἠλεῖοι *Elēi*, αἰνείας *Ænēas*, ἀλφειὸς *Alphēus*, λύκειον *Lycēum*, μουσεῖον *Musēum*, πρυτανεῖον *Prytanēum, & id genus alia non pauca.* As to the Chriſtian name David, it was given to his father, ſays he, becauſe he was born on the thirtieth of December, which is a day conſecrated to David; 'Penultima 'Decembris die quæ DAVIDI eſt ſacra . . . . & 'parentibus ſic placuiſſet liberis ſuis, quotquot illis 'naſcerentur, ea imponere nomina quæ præ ſe ferrent 'ſolemnes

(1) Philip. Pareus, in Vita David. Parei, *pag. m.* 5.

no doubt, becauſe David's board was not to be paid; for he maintained himſelf by means of a tutorſhip [*B*]; and by he money the received from one of the principal men of the place (*c*), every time that he preſented him with verſes. His maſter did not only take from him his paternal name, but alſo turned him from Lutheraniſm, by ſetting him right about the real preſence, as well as the reſt of his ſcholars. This was of miſchievous conſequence, both to the maſter and the ſcholar; the former was turned out of his ſchool, at the importunity of the miniſter of the place; the latter was like to be diſinherited by his father, from whom he could very hardly get leave to go to the Palatinate, altho' he made uſe of a reaſon, which is commonly moſt prevailing, to wit, that by this means he could finiſh his ſtudies, without any expence to the family. Having obtained this leave at laſt, he followed his maſter, who was invited by the elector Palatine, Frederic III, to be principal of the new ſchool of Amberg. The allowance which his father gave him for his journey was ſo ſmall, that he was forced ſometimes to beg by the way. A little after his arrival at Amberg, in 1566, he was ſent with ten of his comrades to Heidelberg, by their common maſter, who gave them ſo good recommendations, that they were all admitted into the *Collegium Sapientiæ*, whereof Zachary Urſinus, profeſſor of Divinity, was director. The univerſity of Heidelberg was then very flouriſhing in all the Faculties, and ſo Pareus wanted nothing to improve himſelf conſiderably in the languages, in Philoſophy and Divinity. He was admitted miniſter in 1571, and ſent in the month of May into a village called Schlettenbach, where he was much perplexed, becauſe the Proteſtants and Roman Catholics were there at variance with one another [*C*]. Nevertheleſs he was juſt going to marry there, before the winter came on, when he was called back to Heidelberg, to teach the third claſs. This put an end to his intended marriage, and he ſo well acquitted himſelf in his employment, that at the end of

two

'ſolemnes faſti ad ipſum nativitatis diem. - - - - *On the* '*thirtieth of December, which is conſecrated to* D A V I D ' . . . . *and the parents thought fit to give to their chil-* '*dren the names of the holy-days on which they were* '*born.*' Every body does not know that St David's-day is in the Calendar.

[*B*] *He maintained himſelf by means of a tutorſhip.*] Here the Hiſtorian is not very exact: he ſays, that David Pareus ſpent two years at Hirſchberg, three months at the expence of his father, and the reſt of the time by being tutor in the houſe of an honeſt citizen, whom he names (2). A little while after it is ſaid, that the lord of Zackenſtein was very liberal to him, that he maintained him *gratis*, upon account of the verſes wherewith the death of his eldeſt ſon was honoured by this young man (3); and that afterwards he gave him ſome money for every poem he ordered him to make. The ſame Hiſtorian mentions a letter of that lord, wherein he deſired to know, whether that Pareus, who had lodged in his houſe twenty-five years ago, *Quem ante annos XXV hoſpitem domeſticum habuiſſet* (4), was the ſame perſon by whoſe care the German Bible had been printed? Is not this to put a body in two places at the ſame time? David Pareus was ſent to Hirſchberg in 1564, he received the letter from this lord in 1589, he lodged therefore with him in the year 1564. He was not therefore preceptor twenty-one months in the houſe of James Schilder. There are every where ſuch like faults to be met with.

[*C*] *The Proteſtants and Roman-Catholics were there at variance.*] It became neceſſary to uſe force for maintaining the pretenſions of the elector Palatine againſt thoſe of the biſhop of Spires; the latter maintained, that the collation of benefices in the community of Alfeſtad belonged to his chapter: the elector granted this, but he maintained, that ſince the patronage was his, the collators were obliged, according to the peace of Paſſaw, to preſent ſuch paſtors whoſe religion was agreeable to him. By virtue of this right he ſettled the Reformed religion in that community, and ſent Pareus to the pariſh of Schlettenbach. The Catholics ſhut up the gates of the church againſt him; but they were broke open, and then the images and altars were overthrown; after which, the great trouble of Pareus was to get the church cleaned, for every one turned over to another the trouble of removing the rubbiſh (5). The rector of the univerſity of Heidelberg, alludes to all this in his Program for the obſequies of Pareus. 'Ad paſtoratum, *ſays he* (6), Schlettenba-'cenſem . . . . miſſus, ibidem cum ſtatuis & altaribus 'acri duello primus conflictatus. - - - *Being ſent to be* '*paſtor of Schlettenbach . . . at firſt he had a ſharp ſkir-*'*miſh with the images and altars.*' Pareus was alſo the firſt paſtor of Hemſbach, and found there the people more tractable: for after the elector Palatine, who, as the patron of this pariſh, reſolved to reform it, had broke open the gates of the church, Pareus removed all the images, and burnt them with the conſent of the people (7). To this the program of the rector referred in theſe words: *Hinc anno* 73, *Eccleſiæ Hemſbacenſi (& hic iconomachus futurus* L E O *non imperator ſed Paſtor) Miniſter præfectus* (8). The occaſion which induced the prince to ſettle the Reformation in this place is very ſingular. The prieſt having drunk all the night before Eaſter, ſlept the next morning, at the time of the office; at laſt being waked by the ſexton, he went to church, and after ſinging, he went up into the pulpit, begun his ſermon, fell down upon his knees, according to cuſtom, to ſay the Lord's-prayer (9), and then fell aſleep. The people thought that this long kneeling proceeded from a very great zeal, but the too long continuance of it obliged the ſexton to pull the prieſt by the gown. He roſe, being half aſleep, and cried out with an oath, that he could not preach, *Ich kan beym Sacrament nicht predigen* (10), *By the Sacrament, I cannot preach.* The biſhop of Worms being informed of this ſcandal, cauſed the prieſt to be impriſoned, and in his room ſubſtituted another who had ſeven baſtards. The marriage of Pareus being celebrated publickly in the church, was ſuch a ſight as had never been ſeen in the pariſh of Hemſbach: as for concubines and baſtards of prieſts, as many as you will, none of theſe was ſo ſtrange a ſight as the other. But the people were eaſily reconciled to the novelty, when they underſtood what St Paul orders concerning the marriage of a biſhop. 'Celebratæ ſunt nuptiæ d. 5 Januarii Hemſbaci: ubi antehac nullus Eccleſiæ Miniſter ſponſus vel maritus 'fuit. Portenti igitur ſimile habebatur matrimonium 'Paſtoris Eccleſiæ eo loci, ubi nunquam niſi ſacrificu-'lorum concubinas, coquillas, & ſcortilla viderant. 'Verum percepta in Concionibus doctrina Apoſtoli †: '*Oportet Epiſcopum eſſe unius uxoris Virum:* Et ‡ *Epiſ-*'*copus ſit unius uxoris Vir: liberos habens fideles:* & 'vernaculis Sacramentorum liturgiis auditis, matrimo-'nium & miniſterium novi Paſtoris cuncti approbave-'runt (11). - - - - *The marriage was celebrated the fifth* '*of January at Hemſbach: where no clergy-man had* '*ever before been betrothed, or married. And therefore* '*the marriage of the paſtor of the church ſeemed like a* '*prodigy in that place, where they had only ſeen the con-*'*cubines, cookmaids, and harlots of the prieſts. But* '*when they underſtood, by his ſermons, the doctrine of* '*the Apoſtle; that a biſhop muſt be the huſband of one* '*wife: And again, let a biſhop be the huſband of one* '*wife, having faithful children: And when they heard* '*the public ſervice of the ſacraments in their own tongue,* '*they all approved the marriage and miniſtry of their* '*new paſtor.*'

I

[*D*] *Winzengen*

(*c*) Albert Kindler lord of Zackenſtein, who was afterward governour of Luſatia.

(2) In ea Schola vixit biennium trimeſtri ſpatio ſumptibus parentis, reliquo tempore pædagogi officio functus apud civem honeſtum Jacobum Schilderum. *Ibid. pag.* 8, *ad ann.* 1564.

(3) Convictum, quod filio defuncto epicedio carmine parentaſſet, gratuitum facile dedit. *Ibid.*

(4) Ib. *pag.* 45.

(5) Expurgationem ruderum ab his & ab illis fruſtra quærebat novus Paſtor. *Ib. pag.* 24.

(6) Ib. *p.* 96.

(7) Nemine refragante è plebe quæ ſeſe omnimodis docilem præbuit, idola templi conſentiente populo removit & Vulcano obtulit. *Ib. pag.* 27.

(8) Ib. *p.* 96.

(9) It ſhould be the *Ave Maria.* Pareus, the ſon, might well be miſtaken in ſome other little circumſtances, becauſe he knew not the Romiſh ceremonies.

(10) Per Sacramentum (*that is the great oath of the Germans*) non poſſum concionari. *Ib. pag.* 26.

† 1 Tim. iii, 2.

‡ Tit. i, 17.

(11) P. Pareus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 32.

two years, he was promoted to the ſecond claſs, but he quitted it ſix months after, that he might re-aſſume the function of the miniſtry, which he went to diſcharge at Hemſbach in the dioceſe of Worms. Growing weary of lodging in a public houſe, he married, four months after his arrival, the ſiſter of John Stibelius, miniſter of Heppenheim (*d*). The marriage was celebrated on the fifth of January, 1574. He loſt that church in 1577, becauſe after the death of the elector Frederic III, Louïs, his ſon, being a great zealot for Lutheraniſm, ſettled Lutheran miniſters in his dominions in the room of the Reformed. Pareus retired into the territories of prince John Caſimir, brother to this elector, and was miniſter at Ogerſheim near Franckenthal, for the ſpace of three years, and then at Winzingen near Neuſtad [*D*]. This neighbourhood was ſo much the more uſeful and agreeable to him, becauſe prince Caſimir had founded a *Schola illuſtris* at Neuſtad in 1578, where he placed all the profeſſors that were driven away from Heidelberg. The elector Louïs dying in 1583, prince Caſimir had the ſole guardianſhip of Frederic IV, his nephew, and the adminiſtration of the Palatinate. Then the Reformed miniſters were reſtored and the ſecond profeſſorſhip in the college of Sapience, at Heidelberg, was given to Pareus; this was done in the month of September, 1584. He began two years after to ſet up for an author, by printing the *Methodus totius Ubiquitariæ Controverſiæ.* He printed the German Bible at Neuſtad with notes, in 1589, which occaſioned a warm diſpute between him and a Lutheran of Tubingen named James Andrew. He became the firſt profeſſor of the college of the Sapience, in the month of January 1591, and counſellor of the Eccleſiaſtical ſenate in the month of November 1592. The next year he was ſolemnly admitted Doctor in Divinity. He had already had ſeveral conteſts with the writers of the Augſburg confeſſion; but that of the year 1596, was one of the moſt conſiderable. It produced an apology for Calvin, who was accuſed of favouring Judaiſm, in the interpretation of many paſſages of ſcripture. Two years after he was honoured with the place of Divinity profeſſor of the Old Teſtament in the academy; whereby he was delivered from the dreadful fatigue he had endured for the ſpace of fourteen years, in governing the youth which was entertained in the college of Sapience (*e*); a fatigue ſo terrible, that the good Zachary Urſinus thought himſelf happy for being baniſhed by the Lutherans, ſince that baniſhment delivered him from that miſerable ſlavery [*E*]. Pareus was advanced in 1602, to be Theological profeſſor of the New Teſtament, after the death of Daniel Toſſanus. His reputation increaſed daily, after ſuch a manner, that many ſtudents came from Hungary and Poland upon his account. He publiſhed divers Commentaries on the ſcripture, and particularly one on the Epiſtle to the Romans, which was extreamly diſliked in England [*F*], becauſe it contained ſuch maxims as were a little antimonarchical. The Evangelical Jubilee, was celebrated at Heidelberg in 1617, for the ſpace of three days, with great pomp. There was nothing to be heard but harangues, diſputes, poems, and diſcourſes, about the great mercy of GOD ſhown to the church one hundred years before, in delivering it from the yoke of Popery. Pareus, for his part, wrote ſome pieces upon this ſubject, which expoſed him to the attacks of the Jeſuits of Mentz, to whom he was obliged to anſwer; but this was not the moſt troubleſome controverſy that he had been engaged in (*f*). He was deſigned to be ſent the next year to the ſynod of Dort, according to the deſire of the States-General; but he excuſed himſelf from going upon the account of the infirmities of his old age (*g*), which did not permit him to undertake a long journey, nor to uſe a new diet. He had otherwiſe been a very fit man for that aſſembly; for he was a great enemy to all innovations in point of doctrine [*G*]. After that time this venerable old man had

ſcarce

(*d*) See in the remark [*C*] of the article URSINUS (ZACHARY) a miſtake of Thuanus which concerns this Stibelius.

(*e*) Haud omnino invitus eam in ſe ſuſcepit, pertæſus ſcilicet Siſyphiarum moleſtiarum quas in annum decimum quartum ærumnabili prorſus cura in collegio volviſſet effrænem juventutem gubernando. *Philip. Pareus, in Vita David. Parei, pag.* 53, *Edit. in* 8*vo, Gen.* 1641. *cum Comm. in Matthæum.*

(*f*) See the remark [*H*].

(*g*) Idem ἐμπόδισμα ſenem emaciatum longinquioris itineris exoticæque diætæ impatientem D. Pareum in Academia domi ſervavit. *Phil. Pareus, ubi ſupra, pag.* 66.

[*D*] *Winzingen near Neuſtad.*] Paul Freherus affirms, that David Pareus was miniſter of Neuſtad (12); but Philip Pareus, who aſſigns him only a church in the neighbourhood of Neuſtad, is more to be credited than the continuator of Boiſſard cited by Freherus; I ſay he is more to be credited both as to this matter, and as to the honours of John Wængler, the father of David Pareus. According to Freherus, John Wængler was preſident of the Echevins in his country, but he was only Echevin, *aſſeſſor Scabinatus*, according to Philip Pareus.

[*E*] *Delivered him from that miſerable ſlavery.*] The words which Philip Pareus uſes, are very emphatical. 'Quamtumvis pauper & debilis ſim & non proſpiciens 'ullum peregrinationis aut exilii portum, tamen gaudebo me dimitti ex meo ergaſtulo. Non poſſum amplius δυσμεταχείριστον & ἀχάλινον illam juventutem regere. Defeſſus enim ſum & infirmus factus (13). '*Though I be poor, and weak, and ſee no reſt to my pilgrimage or baniſhment, yet I ſhall be glad to be diſmiſſed from my priſon. I am no longer able to govern that untractable and unruly youth. For I am become weary and infirm.*'

[*F*] *His Commentary on the Epiſtle of St Paul to the Romans . . . . was extremely diſliked in England.*] King James cauſed it to be burnt by the hands of the hangman; the univerſity of Oxford condemned it in the moſt diſgraceful manner. See their proceedings in a book of Grotius, intituled, *Votum pro Pace Eccleſiaſtica.* The Sieur Konig refers us to p. 754, of an Abridgment of Univerſal Hiſtory (14), wherein I find only 544 pages, altho' my edition be the third, which is that of the year 1661. I find a fault in the Index, for under the word David Pareus, we are referred to pag. 715, 745, and 755. I know not whether the Sieur Konig was not deceived by this means; however, the places where I found David Pareus, which are at pag. 509, 535, and 536, ſay nothing of the diſgracing of his Commentary upon the Epiſtle to the Romans. There was an Engliſh Divine called David Owen, who refuted him. Philip Pareus anſwered him, and endeavoured to juſtify his father. See the *Anti* of Mr Baillet (15), and the Apology of Mr Arnauld for the Catholics (16), where we find that David Pareus was juſtified, among other means, by that which the Jeſuits make uſe of, when they are accuſed of corrupting the Chriſtian Morality. They ſhew that they are neither the firſt, nor the only perſons who have taught this or that.

[G] *He was a great enemy to all innovations in point of doctrine.*] See what will be ſaid in the next remark concerning his antipathy to the Ramiſts. That tem-

(12) Paul. Freher. in Theatro, *pag.* 413.

(13) Phil. Pareus, in Vita Davidis Parei.

(14) It is that of *John Lætus.* He publiſhed it the firſt time in 1642. I found that the firſt edition contains more pages than the third.

(15) Num. 128.

(16) In chap. iv, of the firſt part.

ſcarce ever any reſt. He apprehended what afterwards happened to the elector, his maſter, for having accepted the crown of Bohemia. He fancied, I know not how many troubleſome preſages, founded upon ſeveral things he had ſeen, either when awake, or in his ſleep; for he gave credit to dreams [*H*]; and while he ſaw people working at the fortifications of Heidelberg, he ſaid that it was loſt labour. Calling to mind the books he had publiſhed againſt the Pope, he looked upon it as a dreadful misfortune to fall into the hands of the monks, and therefore he hearkened to thoſe who adviſed him to retire to a place of ſafety: and for his retirement he made choice of Anweil in the duchy of Deux-Ponts, near Landau, and arrived there in the month of October, 1621. Some months after, he went from thence to Neuſtad, and reſolved

per of mind linked him in a moſt intimate friendſhip to a certain divine of Franeker, called Sibrandus Lubbertus, who vigorouſly oppoſed the promoters of new ways of ſpeaking and teaching. Pareus called him his ſoul, and did not ſet him any bad examples (17), for he would by no means permit that any ſhould depart from the Catechiſm of his profeſſor Urſinus, as ſome Divines, I know not who, departed from it, who added no fewer than three kinds of imputations, to that which was laid down by Urſinus, as the matter of our juſtification before God, *viz.* The imputation of the death of Jeſus Chriſt, the imputation of his actual righteouſneſs, and habitual holineſs (18). There were alſo diſſenſions in the year 1604, about a queſtion of the ſame Palatine Catechiſm, *viz.* the LXXVI, which treats of the efficacy of the holy ſupper. Pareus, like a brave champion of the received doctrine, would not ſuffer it to be changed. Theſe innovations according to him, were a removing of the boundaries of truth, which ought to be ſacred and immutable (19), like thoſe which part lands of inheritance; and he thought that theſe attacks, which were made upon the Catechiſm, were the preſage of an approaching deſolation, which he expreſſed in theſe two verſes:

Aula ruit: Politia ruit: ruet & Catecheſis;
Ante fores noſtram quis jam neget eſſe ruinam (20).

The court, the government, and Catechiſm
  All three to ruin go.
None can deny but this foretels
  Our near approaching wo.

Let them ſay, if they will, that Pareus by this means introduced the principle of authority in lieu of that of enquiry, and that this was to employ, the engines of Popery againſt his brethren, after he had inveighed againſt them as abominable. Let them exclaim, if they pleaſe, that this conduct reſembles the ſtratagem of the Trojans:

Mutemus clipeos, Danaumque inſignia nobis
Aptemus. Dolus, an virtus, quis in hoſte requirat (21).

Then change we ſhields, and their devices bear,
Let fraud ſupply the want of force in war.

Let them, I ſay, declaim thus, and draw from thence a thouſand reproaches of contradiction, thoſe who know the powerful virtue of *diſtinguo*, thoſe who remember, *diſtingue tempora & conciliabis ſcripturas*, ---- *diſtinguiſh the times and you will reconcile the ſcriptures*, thoſe who conſider, that there are certain maxims which may be laid aſide at a certain time, and which muſt be taken up again at laſt, and that the abuſe does not take away the uſe, will ſuffer theſe declaimers to cry out and ſtorm on. Fancy to yourſelves a circle hanging at the entry of a houſe, whereof one half is without, and the other half within; make it turn about upon it's centre, and you will ſee that exactly, as one half goes out of the houſe, another will enter in; juſt ſo it is with certain principles of human ſociety; it is a thing that muſt be done: and after all, the greateſt perſecution is not that of the ſecular arm, but that of ſome reſtleſs men, who very prepoſterouſly ſet up for reformers. Our Pareus ſaid of ſuch people with Luther, ‘A Doctore glorioſo, & ‘Paſtore contentioſo, & inutilibus quæſtionibus liberet Eccleſiam ſuam Dominus (22). --- *From a haughty* ‘*divine, a contentious miniſter, and uſeleſs queſtions, good* ‘*Lord deliver thy church.*

[*H*] *He gave credit to dreams.*] His ſon informs us, that he found in the journal of his father, divers dreams and other augural obſervations. Take one inſtance: Pareus wrote in his journal on the twenty ſixth of December, 1617, that he dreamed a cat ſcratched his face, and that certainly this was an augural dream, *ſine dubio ominoſum* (23). Two days after having received the firſt leaf of a book that was printing at Mentz, he ſaid this was the cat that was to ſcratch him, and ſet down this expoſition in his journal. This is certain, that the Jeſuits of Mentz wrote bitterly againſt him; but what he ſuffered from Scaliger's hand, was a much heavier blow (24). It had been better for him that he had never engaged his pen againſt ſuch a Chronologer, *impar congreſſus Achilli.* --- *a very unequal match*: but he was troubled a little with the itch of meddling with too many ſubjects. His comfort was to ſee his adverſary ſuffer the *Lex talionis*; and then his Muſe awaked, and was delivered of this epigram:

Nobiliore canum jactans ſe ſtirpe Moloſſus
  Forte viatorem dum petit ore minax,
A cane degenere incautus miſer ipſe necatur:
  Hanc Nemeſim juſtam quis neget eſſe δίκην (25)?

A maſtiff dog with inſolence did boaſt
Of his high birth, and did with open mouth
Attack a traveller: mean while a dog
Of meaner kind him kill'd; a juſt revenge!

He means the inſults of the wicked Scioppius; about which let us hear alſo Philip Pareus. ‘Nactus præ‘terea fuit, *ſays he* (26), nobilem adverſarium in ſtudiis ‘Chronologicis, ſuperciliosiſſimum Criticum JOSEPHUM SCALIGERUM Julii Cæſaris à Burden filium ‘qui ſatyrica protervia erga PAREUM uſus jure ἀντιπεπονθότος eo ipſo tempore infamiæ notam pene ‘indelebilem ab Apoſtatico quodam Alaſtore coactus ‘fuit ſubire (27). --- *Moreover he met with a noted ad*‘*verſary in Chronological matters, the moſt haughty critic* ‘*Joſeph Scaliger ſon to Julius Cæſar of Burden, who ha*‘*ving uſed Pareus with a ſatirical pride, at the ſame* ‘*time, by the law of retaliation, was obliged to under*‘*go an almoſt indelible mark of infamy from an a*‘*poſtate evil ſpirit.*’ I muſt not paſs over in ſilence, that Pareus attributes to his father a great meekneſs, and a notable ſweetneſs of temper. We muſt confeſs indeed that he was not one of thoſe untractable Divines, who would ſacrifice nothing for peace-ſake: the Irenicon which he publiſhed ſhews the contrary. But to pretend that he did not write in a ſtyle full of reproaches, and violent expreſſions upon many occaſions, is certainly to be guilty of ſuch an illuſion as is very common. Every one fancies, that there are no keen reproaches, but ſuch as are ſaid to him, and thoſe of his party. Pareus was moreover an enemy to the ſmalleſt innovations, as I have ſhewn in the preceeding remark. Now altho' it be often the cauſe of very great miſchief in matters of religion, to depart in the leaſt from the common opinions, yet it can never be ſaid that thoſe who are ſo briſk againſt the leaſt alterations, are endowed with much moderation, whatever other commendations may be given to their important ſervices. Ramus was inſupportable to Pareus, for daring to remove the boundaries of our anceſtors (28), and therefore he regaled him with this epigram:

Quæ

---

(17) Animam ſuam appellavit. Amavit autem eum præcipuè ob rotundum ingenium in tuenda ὀρθοδοξίᾳ: quippe qui non paſſus fuerit à ſciolis mutari terminos doctrinæ receptos, intrepidoque animo iis ſeſe appoſuerit, qui in conſueta forma loquendi ac docendi quicquam mutare præſumerent. *Philip. Pareus, pag.* 106.

(18) Ibid. *pag.* 102.

(19) Theologos illos qui καινοδοξίαν aut καινοτομίαν in dogmatibus vel phraſibus affectarent, nec ſervarent ex præcepto Apoſtoli ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαινόντων λόγων, dicere ſolebat movere veritatis terminos qui debeant eſſe immobiles atque ſacroſancti. *Ibid. pag.* 101.

(20) Ibid. *pag.* 103.

(21) Virgil. Æneid. lib. II, ver. 389.

(22) P. Pareus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 103.

(23) Ibid. *p.* 65.

(24) Eo conflictu non ſolum optimo patri ſed omnibus paſſim viris doctis, ſi palpones & canes venaticos alios excipias, nihil unquam ægrius indigniuſve accidiſſe probe recordor. *Ibid. pag.* 107.

(25) Ibid. *pag.* 108.

(26) Ibid. *pag.* 107.

(27) See the New Letters againſt the Calviniſm of Maimbourg, *Tom.* I, *pag.* 182, 183.

(28) Novellam artem quæ à Ramo ſectario nomen jactat perpetuo rejecit. Huic nimium quantum ſuccenſuit ideò quod per eam diceret antiquos artis terminos moveri, nihil ſuo loco relinqui, ingenia juventutis ad αὐθάδειαν καὶ φιλονεικίαν traduci. *Philip. Pareus, ubi ſupra, pag.* 21.

reſolved to return from thence to Heidelberg, chuſing rather to die in his own *Pareanum* [*I*], and to be buried near the profeſſors of the univerſity, than in any other place. He had this conſolation; for, having yielded up the ghoſt in his own houſe, on the fifteenth of June 1622, at the age of near ſeventy-four years, he received ſuch an honourable burial as the unverſities of Germany beſtow upon their eminent men. His exegetical works were collected in three volumes in folio. He publiſhed ſeveral treatiſes againſt cardinal Bellarmin, and left a ſon called Philip, of whom we ſhall ſpeak hereafter, and who wrote his father's life, from which I have taken what has been ſaid. I find nothing in it concerning his diſpute with the Jeſuit John Magirus [*K*].

Quæ mutas perdis, dixit Democritus, & quæ
Servas in phyſicis ſunt, Epicure, mea.
Nonne idem Ariſtoteles in Ramum maſtiga dicat
Quæ mutas, perdis: quæ retines mea ſunt (29).

(29) Ibid. *pag.* 22.

Democritus to Epicurus ſaid,
Whate'er in Phyſics you retain is mine
And what you change you ſpoil; the ſame reproof,
Might Ariſtotle give to Ramus . . . .

In fine, Pareus had ſo many people to write againſt, that it was ſcarce poſſible but he muſt contract a habit of reproachful language. Thoſe who have exerciſed themſelves in the Republic of Letters, will underſtand what I mean.

[*I*] *In his Pareanum.*] Having bought a houſe in the ſuburbs of Heidelberg, in the year 1607, he cauſed an apartment to be built in his garden, for his library and ſtudy; and this is what he called Pareanum. This afterwards became the name of the place, and all the city called it ſo. The elector granted to this houſe certain privileges and immunities. Pareus placed upon the frontiſpiece of it two inſcriptions, one Latin, the other German (30). Now ſince his ſon hoped, after the ravage that was made by the troops of the Catholic League in the Palatinate, that this houſe would preſerve ſtill the title of Pareanum (31), it muſt have continued entire. I know not what became of it afterwards, but I believe it is ruined at this time. The poor city of Heidelberg was ſo laid waſte by the troops of France, in the years 1689, and 1693, that there is no probability that the houſe of Pareus ſhould ſtill continue. We may remark, by the by, that certain cities ſeem to be built under a malignant conſtellation, for they are equally unhappy, whatever ſide gains the day. Heidelberg ruined for oppoſing the emperor, and for being faithful to him, is an inſtance of it.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 55.

(31) Quo nomine incolis civitatis ſtatim innotuit, & à poſteris, ſi bene ominor, eam gratiam retinebit. *Ibid. He wrote the Life of his father in* 1628.

[*K*] *His diſpute with the Jeſuit Magirus.*] Pareus ſpoke an harangue at Heidelberg, the twenty-third of March 1602, *de Jeſuitarum ſtrophis circa Canonem Sacræ ſcripturæ* - - - *Of the impoſture of the Jeſuits concerning the canon of the holy Scripture.* He maintained alſo a Theſis, in 1603, on the canonical authority of the Scripture, and the infallibility of the church, and deſired the Jeſuits of Spires to be preſent at this diſpute. Not one of them appeared, but Magirus having written to Pareus Sept. 7, 1603, this occaſioned a conteſt, the pieces of which were publiſhed. The ſuperſcription and exordium of Magirus's letter were thus; 'Clariſſimo viro Domino D. Pereo Doctori & 'Profeſſori Facultatis pro tempore Decano in Academia Heydelbergenſi. Nudius tertius venit ad Collegium noſtrum adoleſcens, ingenio præſervido, moribus linguaque protervus: is ita narrabat à te 'miſſum ſe eſſe, ut & diſputationem primam de 'S. S. authoritate adverſus Jeſuitarum impoſturas 'quam examinandam propoſueras ad diem 26 Auguſti nobis redderet, ſimulque ad eam diſputationem 'nos humaniter invitaret. - - - - *To the moſt renowned Mr D. Pereus, Doctor and Profeſſor, and at this time 'dean of the faculty in the univerſity of Heidelberg. 'Three days ago a young man of a very hot temper, and 'inſolent in his behaviour, and language, came to our 'college: he ſaid he was ſent by you, to deliver to us the 'firſt diſputation about the authority of the holy Scripture 'againſt the impoſtures of the Jeſuits, which you had 'propoſed to be examined the twenty-ſixth of Auguſt, and 'at the ſame time to invite us civilly to that diſputation.*' It is ſigned, *ſalutis tuæ cupidus Johannes Magirus.* - - - - *a well-wiſher to your ſalvation John Magirus.* Pareus anſwered and uſed this ſuperſcription, 'Clariſſimo viro Domino Joanni Magiro Societatis 'Jeſu dictæ Concionatori apud Spirenſes, amico ſuo 'in Chriſto. - - - - *To the moſt renowned Mr John Magirus of the ſociety of Jeſus ſo called, preacher at Spires, 'his friend in Chriſt.* He complains that Magirus had abuſed him in his ſermons by ſeveral invectives, and makes a remark upon this Jeſuit's naming him Pereus inſtead of Pareus. 'Si amanuenſis ſphalma eſt, 'tranſeat: ſi ſtudium tuum ut pereundi verbo me pungeres, illiberale eſt, ac ſi quis pro Magiro Megærum 'diceret. - - - *If it be the fault of your amanuenſis, let it 'paſs: but if your deſign be to ſting one with alluſion to 'the word* pereo, *to periſh, it is unlike a gentleman: 'as if one ſhould call you Megærus, in alluſion to 'Megera, one of the furies.*' This piece of Pareus was printed in 1604, *typis Voegelianis,* and contains *diſceptatio epiſtolaris Johannis Magiri Jeſuitæ Concionatoris, & Davidis Parei Chriſtiani Theologi de authoritate Divina & Canonica S. S. deque abſoluta Eccleſiæ infallibilitate. De S. S. authoritate adverſus Jeſuitarum impoſturas. Exegeſis diſputationis de authoritate Divina & Canonica, &c. adverſus Jeſuitarum ſtrophas & impoſturas.* Mr Bachelier des Marets (32) furniſhed me with all that I have ſaid.

(32) Who is mentioned above, citat. (3) of the article EPPENDORF.

PAREUS (Philip) (*a*) ſon of the preceding Pareus, was born at Hemſbach in the dioceſe of Worms, May the 24th, 1576. He was one of the moſt laborious Grammarians that Germany ever produced. He begun his ſtudies at Neuſtad, and continued them at Heidelberg, and after that, at the expence of the elector Palatine, in foreign univerſities (*b*). He went to ſee that at Baſil, in 1599, and afterwards he went to Geneva, where he continued more than a year. As he travelled he ſaw ſome others by the way, and was much reſpected every where, as well upon the account of his own learning, as for the great veneration they had for his father. He converſed very much at Paris with the famous Caſaubon (*c*). He was made rector of the college of Neuſtad in 1610, and poſſeſſed that office till the Spaniards, becoming maſters of the city in July 1622, ordered him to depart the country immediately (*d*). His library was plundered. He had already publiſhed ſeveral books [*A*]; which ſhew his prodigious application, and his peculiar affection for the comedies of Plautus [*B*]. It was a thing

(*a*) In his firſt books he takes the name of *John Philip.*

(*b*) Theatr. Freheri, *pag.* 501.

(*c*) Daniel Pareus, Not. in Muſæum, *ver.* 1.

(*d*) Ipſe in Vita Davidis Parei,

[*A*] *He had already publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Beſides thoſe whoſe titles I mention in the next remark, he had in 1616, publiſhed *Calligraphia Romna, ſeu Theſaurus phraſium linguæ Latinæ*; and in 1615. *Electa Symmachiana, Lexicon Symmachianum, Calligraphia Symmachiana,* and ſome other pieces at ſeveral times.

[*B*] *His peculiar affection for the comedies of Plautus.*] He did not only publiſh them with notes in 1609, but he alſo publiſhed a *Lexicon Plautinum* in 1614. *Analecta Plautina* in 1617, a treatiſe *de imitatione Terentiana, ubi Plautum imitatus eſt,* in 1617. a ſecond edition of Plautus in 1619, and his *Electa Plautina* in 1620. I muſt explain what I have ſaid, of the firſt edition a thing of bad example, that there aroſe between him and John Gruterus, profeſſor at Heidelberg, a fierce diſpute on account of Plautus [C]. I have already ſaid (e), that our Pareus took in hand the cauſe of his deceaſed father againſt David Owen, who had publiſhed at Cambridge in 1622, an Anti-Pareus. He anſwered him a little while after with an Anti-Owenus (f). He was rector of divers colleges, and particularly of that of Hanaw, in the year 1645 [D], as appears by the epiſtle dedicatory of his *Lexicon Criticum*, printed that year at Nuremberg. It is but one thick octavo, but it coſt much pains, *ærumnabili labore congeſtus*, as the author ſays. He wrote alſo ſome Commentaries upon the Scripture, and ſome pieces of Theology. We will ſay ſomething of his ſon Daniel in the next article.

(e) In the remark [F] of the preceding article.

(f) It is wanting in the curious collection of Mr Baillet.

THE confuſion cauſed by the Bookſellers, who reprint the title pages of books.

edition of Plautus. I am not ignorant that it has in the title the year 1610. But ſince among the thanks and elogiums that were written to the author upon this work, there are ſome which are dated in the year 1609, there is no doubt but the year 1610 was one of thoſe anticipations which the Bookſellers have brought into uſe. If they did only this, they would not cauſe ſo much confuſion to thoſe who collect ſeveral editions but how often do they take the liberty to reprint the firſt page of their books, to make them paſs for new ones? Sometimes alſo they are ſo bold as to call this a new edition, and this ſtrangely multiplies in imagination, and even in the catalogue of libraries, the editions of a book. He publiſhed at Franckfort, in 1641, the third edition of his Plautus. The Prolegomena which are in it, on the life of that Poet, about the character of his verſifying, and the quality of his railleries, were prefixed entire to the edition of *Plautus in uſum Delphini.*

[C] *There aroſe between him and John Gruterus a fierce diſpute upon the account of Plautus.*] Gruterus having attacked Pareus, the latter quickly publiſhed his anſwer in 1620, under the title of *Provocatio ad Senatum Criticum pro Plauto & Electis Plautinis.* They grew hotter and hotter, neither was the conſideration of the miſeries which hung over their heads, by the ruin wherewith the Palatinate was threatned, ſufficient to inſpire them with any degree of moderation: ſo eaſily are theſe Philologers and Grammarians provoked, and ſo difficultly appeaſed. The long preface which our Pareus prefixed to his *Analecta Plautina*, printed at Franckfort in 1623, is dated in the month of October 1621, and conſequently he filled it with gall and fury, juſt before the deſolations happened, which ruined both their univerſities and their libraries, and reduced their perſons to the greateſt extremities. Their baniſhment did not abate this violent humour, for thoſe *Analecta*, printed ſince their diſperſion, are full of groſs reproaches againſt Gruterus. This was nothing but repriſals, for Gruterus had uſed him after ſo violent a manner, that they reckoned no fewer than one hundred and thirty-ſix cruel reproaches in one of his books againſt Philip Pareus. It was the Jeſuit James Gretſerus, who pleaſed himſelf in collecting this liſt (1). There you will find Pareus called an aſs, a mule, a boar, a ram, a goat, a hog, *ſtercoreus Grammaticalis cellæ inquilinus*, &c. Gruterus had been a long time before inclined to quarrel with Pareus, for thus he writes to Goldaſt, June 19, 1601. 'Miraberis carmen tui Parei, qui me 'nondum inviſit ex quo à vobis abiit, nuper autem 'factus eſt Rector ſcholæ civitatis ſic ſatis magnæ, ut 'alios regat ſcilicet qui ſe non poteſt (2). - - - *You 'will admire the verſes of your Pareus, who has not 'been to ſee me ſince he left you, but he was lately made 'maſter of the ſchool of Neuſtad that he might go'vern others forſooth, who cannot govern himſelf.*'

[D] *He was rector of the college of Hanaw in* 1645.] This ſhews that Paul Freherus is miſtaken, when he ſays that Pareus died about the year 1643 (3). Probably the Sieur Witte, in the ſecond part of his *Diarium Biographicum*, did only abridge Freherus, as to what concerns our Philip; at leaſt he agrees with him in placing his death in the year 1643. If they had but caſt their eyes upon the *Lexicon Criticum*, they had ſeen in the frontiſpiece the face of the author when he was ſeventy years old, from whence they might have concluded, that he did not die at the age of ſixty-ſeven years, as they both ſay; and if they had conſulted the end of the epiſtle dedicatory, they had ſeen that he was ſtill alive, Auguſt 24, 1645. It is a ſtrange thing that he appears leſs deformed in the figure of 1645, than in that of 1641, which is prefixed to the third edition of Plautus. Rivetus, in a book which he wrote in 1646, ſpeaks of him as of a man then alive (4). He was ſtill alive in 1647, as appears by the dedicatory epiſtles of the Exegetical works of his father, which he cauſed to be printed that year at Francfort, in three volumes in Folio.

(1) *See* Theoph. Raynaud, Erotemat. *pag.* 115.

(2) See the collection of Letters written to Goldaſt, printed at Francfort, in the year 1688, *pag.* 73.

(3) Theatr. *pag.* 501.

(4) Rivetus, Grot. Diſcuſſ. Oper. *Tom.* iii, *pag.* 1163.

PAREUS (DANIEL), ſon of the foregoing, followed his father's footſteps, and applied himſelf, earneſtly as he had done, to the ſtudy of human learning. He was a pretty good Grecian, and publiſhed ſome books [*A*]. He was unhappily killed by highway-men [*B*] in his father's life-time. Voſſius eſteemed him very much; and endeavoured to find out Bookſellers, who would print his works [*C*].

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] In the year 1627, he printed the Poem of Muſæus on the amours of Hero and Leander with notes, which are either ſtuffed with Greek citations and phraſes, or taken from the oldeſt Latin authors. He publiſhed alſo in the ſame year, a large volume in quarto, which he dedicated to the Univerſity of Oxford, and is intituled *Mellificium Atticum:* which is a collection of ſentences reduced into common-places, and taken from Greek authors. He publiſhed in 1631 another book intituled *Medulla Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ* (1), and notes, with a Lexicon, upon Lucretius; but the life of Lucretius which he added, is not of his compoſing, for it is that which Giſanius wrote, ſome things only have been left out of it. If the Dauphin's ſcholiaſt had minded this, he would not have ſtopped at Daniel Pareus as the ſource, with reſpect to the life of Lucretius, which he prefixed to his commentary upon this Poet, but would have aſcended higher even to Giſanius. We find in ſome editions of Quintilian *Fabianarum Notarum Spicilegium ſubciſivum* by Daniel Pareus, which he ſent in the year 1628 to Henry Featherſton, Bookſeller at London.

[*B*] *He was killed by highway-men.*] This I learn from William Frey, in the verſes he made upon the *Lexicon Criticum* of Philip Pareus. 'Ceſſit avus fatis; 'furum ſcelerata nepotem, trajecit mediis cuſpide turma viis. - - - *The grand-father died a natural death: 'the grand-ſon was ſtabbed on the high-way by a curſed 'gang of robbers.*' But others ſay, that he was killed at the taking of Keiſerſlauteren in the Palatinate. See Giſbert Voëtius in Tom. 3. of his *Politica Eccleſiaſtica*, pag. 164, 165.

[*C*] *Voſſius eſteemed him very much, and endeavoured to find out Bookſellers . . . . for his works.*] This appears by a letter which he wrote (2), when it was ſaid that in Holland ſeveral towns would erect Academies (3) after the example of Amſterdam. He gives him to underſtand, that in that caſe they might procure him a profeſſorſhip. He renewed the ſame offers of ſervice ſome time after; and gave him an account of the care he had already taken, and would ſtill take to find out a Printer for the Church-Hiſtory (4), which was a piece of Daniel Pareus. He confeſſes to him that le Maire had refuſed to take this work upon him, upon pretence that he did not know the bigneſs of it, and that his preſſes were already very full. *La-Merium conveni ipſe, ac poſtea idem filius fecit. Sed nihil promittere voluit, qui neſciret de magnitudine libri. Solet ille magis capi iis, quæ minoris ſunt molis: addebat jam prælum fervere multis & variis* (5). He makes him hope that if this Printer ſhould perſiſt in his refuſal, after the declaration that was made to him, that he ſhould not be required to make haſte, others would be glad to print the book. Nevertheleſs he lets him know,

(1) See the article ALTING (HENRY), remark [*F*].

(2) It is the 100th, pag. 135, London Edit. 1693.

(3) In tranſlating word for word, the terms uſed in Holland, it ſhould be ſaid *illuſtrious ſchools.*

(4) See his Letter cccxvii, pag. 307.

(5) Voſſius, ibid. *pag.* 307.

know, that there is no country in the world where it is more difficult to find Printers than in Holland, except in theſe two caſes: one is, if the author pay the whole expences of the impreſſion; the other is, if the copy be a book of controverſy, or a frivolous pamphlet, for nothing ſells better than books of that nature (6). *Quod ſi is difficilem ſe præbeat, non deerunt, ut ſpero, alii, qui lubenter id facient. Diſſimulare tamen non poſſum, nuſquam difficilius eſſe typographum reperire quam apud nos, niſi quis ſuis ſumptibus librum edat. Fit hoc ob rerum omnium ſummam caritatem, quam cauſat grave & diuturnum bellum, quod nobis eſt cum hoſte potentiſſimo. Sola excipio* εριστικὰ, *& nugalia quibus nihil vendibilius, ut ipſi non diſſimulant typographi* (7). This letter of Voſſius informs us, that Daniel Pareus would quickly be Preceptor in the houſe of the Count of Iſenburg. See the letter 31, which ſhews that our Pareus dedicated a book to Voſſius (8).

(6) Voſſius, ibid.

(7) If Voſſius had written when I write this in 1696, he would have had yet more reaſon to ſay this. The Bookſellers may be excuſed as above in the article CRATERUS, remark [*A*].

(8) He dedicated his Lucretius to him.

PARISET (Lewis) was of Reggio in Italy, and lived in the XVIth century. He is the author of three Orations, *De divina in hominum benevolentia atque beneficentia*, which are very long (*a*), and in pretty good Latin. He dedicated them to Pope Julius III. They were printed at Venice, in the year 1553 in 8vo, by the ſons of Aldus Manutius (*b*), who printed alſo ſeveral of his Latin verſes (*c*).

(*a*) They contain 239 leaves in 8vo.

(*b*) Epitome Bibliothecæ Geſneri, *pag.* 557. *The edition I uſe is of the year* 1559.

(*c*) His *Theopœia* in ſix books in 1550, and 1553; and his *Epiſtles* in ſix books, in 1553, in 8vo. *Epitome Bibliothecæ Geſneri, pag.* 557.

PARRHASIUS (Janus), born at Coſenza in the kingdom of Naples in the year 1470 (*a*), followed the cuſtom of the Philologiſts of that time, who changed their names into others much more agreeable to Paganiſm than to Chriſtianity. He cauſed himſelf to be named *Aulus Janus Parrhaſius*, inſtead of *Johannes Paulus Pariſius* (*b*). He underſtood polite literature very well, and taught it in the city of Milan, with great reputation (*c*). He had the ſatisfaction to ſee in his Auditory General Trivulcio, who was ſixty years of age. His pronunciation was exceeding agreeable [*A*]. The liberty he took to cenſure thoſe who taught the ſchools in the Milaneze, provoked them to ſuch a degree, that they entered into a horrid conſpiracy againſt his reputation: they defamed him as a man that loved his ſcholars unchaſtly. This bad report which diſpleaſed the Milaneſe extreamly, forced him to quit his poſt. He was invited to Rome by Leo X, to be public profeſſor of the *Belles Lettres* [*B*]. He carried with him thither Baſil Chalcondylas, his wife's brother, and ſon of Demetrius Chalcondylas, profeſſor of the Greek tongue at Milan. He did not long enjoy the place which the Pope had given him; but being grievouſly tormented with the Gout, he was forced to retire into his own country, where he died a little after (*d*). He left his books to Antony Seripande, his good friend (*e*), who built a tomb for him in the convent of the Auguſtine friars of Naples (*f*). Poverty was one of the cauſes which obliged him to depart from Rome (*g*). He was very much commended by Henry Stephens in an epiſtle dedicatory (*h*). He was charged with citing authors, whom he had never ſeen. You will find this accuſation in a letter of Andrew Alciatus, which was printed at Utrecht in 1697, with ſeveral others taken out of the library of Mr Gudius (*i*). The ſame Alciatus complained (*k*) that he never received again a manuſcript of Juvenal which he had lent him. We have an Oration, wherein he complains very much againſt fortune [*C*]. I ſhall relate ſome other

(*a*) Nicolo Toppi, Bibliotheca Napoletana, *pag.* 112.

(*b*) Sertorio Quattromani, dell' origine e principio della Citta di Coſenza, apud Nicodemum, Addizioni alla Biblioteca Napoletana, *pag.* 89.

(*c*) Paul. Jovius, in Elog. *cap. cxxvii, pag.* 270.

(*d*) Taken from Paul Jovius, ibid.

(*e*) Brother of Cardinal *Jerome Seripande.*

(*f*) See the *Muſæum Italicum* of Father Mabillon, *Tom. i, pag.* 110.

(*g*) See in the remark [*D*] the words of *Pierius Valerianus.*

(*h*) To Lewis Caſtelvetro, prefixed to the book of *Parrhaſius de quæſitis per Epiſtolam*, which *Henry Stephens* publiſhed in 1567.

(*i*) Gudii, Epiſt. *pag.* 91.

(*k*) Ibid. *pag.* 85.

[*A*] *His pronunciation was exceeding agreeable.*] It was in this chiefly he excelled all the other Profeſſors. *Cunctos noſtri ſeculi doctores erudito rerum omnium quæ* (1) *explicaret apparatu, ac una præſertim rotundæ pronunciationis gloria ſuperavit* (2). Pierius Valerianus obſerves, that the fine voice of Parrhaſius, did draw a great concourſe of auditors to his lectures (3).

[*B*] *A bad report . . . . . forced him to quit his poſt. He was invited to Rome . . . . . to be Profeſſor of the Belles Lettres.*] Paul Jovius, whom I have followed in this narrative, has left here a chaſm which may be filled up by conſulting an oration of Parrhaſius. It informs us, that this Profeſſor left Milan, to go to Vicenza, where a better ſalary was offered him, and that when the territories of Venice were ravaged by the troops of the League, he retired into his own country, from whence Thomas Phædrus (4) would have invited him to Rome, if Pope Julius the IId had not died. That which was but a project under Julius II, became an actual invitation under Leo X. 'Ut ex animo gaviſus eſt (*Phaedrus*) ubi certior à me factus audivit, in Gallia citeriore portum jam me tenere, Mediolanique publicè conductum profiteri. Quid? quum ſequutus uberiora ſtipendia, Veicetiam commigraſſem: Germanis, Gallis, Hiſpanis, cæteriſque barbaris nationibus, infeſtis ſignis irrumpentibus in Venetiam, dii boni, quàm de nobis erat anxius! quàm non aliter ſaluti noſtræ timebat quàm ſi ipſe vocaretur in partem diſcriminis! Extant ab eo ad me tum datæ epiſtolæ, teſtes inquietis animi, quouſque reſcivit elapſum me per medios hoſtes in patriam ſeceſſiſſe. Nec ita quidem de nobis cogitandi finem fecit, auctorque Julio ſecundo fuit ut nos huc evocaret. Sed eo maturè defuncto, Leoni decimo per Janum Laſcarim, virum ad promerendum homines natum, mihi jam conciliato, calcaria ſponte currenti (quod aiunt) admovit. In urbem reverſo quàm præſto mihi fuit? &c (5). - - - *How heartily glad was Phædrus when I informed him I was now ſafe in Lombardy, and made a public Profeſſor at Milan. But, when I removed to Vicenza in purſuit of a better ſalary: the Germans, French, Spaniards, and other barbarous nations then ravaging the territories of Venice, good GOD, how anxious was he about me! he was as much concerned as if he had ſhared in the danger himſelf. I have now ſome letters of his dated at that time, which ſhew his uneaſineſs, till he knew I was got ſafe through the enemy into my own country. Nor even then did he lay aſide his care about me, for he put Julius the IId upon calling me hither. But he dying ſoon after, he ſet ſpurs (as we ſay) to Leo the Xth, who was forward enough to run of himſelf, and who was now reconciled to me by the means of Janus Laſcaris, a man born to do good to mankind. After I returned to the city, how ſerviceable was he to me?*' He had been juſt ſaying, that being at Rome under the Pontificate of Alexander VI, he was like to be involved in the misfortunes of Bernardin Cajetan, and Silius Sabellus, with whom he had held correſpondence, and that Thomas Phædrus adviſed him to deliver himſelf from the danger, by retiring to ſome other place.

[*C*] *We have an oration wherein he complains much againſt fortune.*] It is that which has furniſhed me with the particulars in the preceding remark. He ſays, That fortune fought inceſſantly againſt him, to force him

(1) It is a ſoleciſm, I know not whether it eſcaped Paul Jovius, or the Printers.

(2) Paul. Jovius, Elog. *ch. cxxvii, pag.* 270.

(3) Ad cujus jucundam vocem undique concurrebatur. *Pier. Valerian. de Infel. Literator. pag.* 25.

(4) Profeſſor of Rhetoric, and canon of Lateran.

(5) Janus Parrhaſius, in Orat. ante prælectionem Epiſtol. Ciceronis ad Atticum: *It is in pag.* 142, *& ſeq. of the book* de quæſitis per Epiſtolam, *Edit.* 1567. *See there pag.* 145.

other particulars in criticizing upon Moreri [*D*].

him to confeſs that he was overcome; but that the miſeries which oppreſſed him, did not at all oblige him to make this confeſſion. *Continenter enim (ſi neſcitis) aſſiduumque mecum Fortuna bellum gerit, obnixéque contendit oppreſſo mihi victoriæ confeſſionem extorquere. Rurſus ego, tametſi cumulatis ſtragibus obrutus, extrema tamen experire malo quàm tantulum de jure meo remittere, nedum manus dare* (6). He ſays, that being unwilling to ſtudy the Civil Law, as his anceſtors had done, he had incurred the indignation of his father, who would no longer ſupply him with money for his ſtudies (7). He affirms that he five times loſt his library, that he was forced to abandon his country, when the French invaded the kingdom of Naples, that he loſt in a little time his mother, his father, his two brothers, and all his children. He regrets very much the loſs of Theophilus, and Baſil Chalcondylas, his two brothers-in-law, who died young and promiſed great things (8).

They have publiſhed a letter, which he wrote to Baſil Chalcondylas, a little before the affair of his invitation to Rome was determined. In that letter he mentions two domeſtic afflictions which had juſt befallen him; one was, that his brother's widow, after ſhe had refuſed all that courted her for the ſpace of three years, like another Penelope, had at laſt married clandeſtinely one Caputus, and had robbed her children of all their patrimony: *Expilata penitus hæreditate parvorum liberûm* (9). The other was, that his brother's daughter had been got with child by an advocate, who was the widower of her ſiſter. To ſhun the penalty of death, which both of them had reaſon to fear in this caſe of inceſt, they were clandeſtinely married, no-body being admitted into the ſecret of the marriage, but the mother of the maid that was got with child. This being not enough to ſecure them from danger, unleſs the Pope would grant them a diſpenſation; Parrhaſius employed all his friends to obtain this favour from Leo X, and to get the expences moderated. *Itaque cum eo deducta res eſſet, ut utrique moriendum foret, conſcia tantum παρϑένȣ matre concubitum confarreant, atque ſic honeſto nomine nefandum crimen velant. Verum ne ſic quidem, quin ferro cadant, effugient; niſi Deus aliquis eos aſpexerit, id eſt, à ſummo Pontifice veniam inceſtus inſcriptis impetraverint; ut furtivum dedecus profeſſo matrimonio diluatur. Ad hanc rem velim omnes ingenii tui nervos intendas, utariſque gratia ac auctoritate Laſcaris, Phædri, Citrariique, & omnium denique amicorum; ut exleges has nuptias, ad evitandum paratæ cædis periculum, Pontifex privilegio juſtas rataſque faciat, indicta pro copiarum facultate mulcta. Acceſſit hoc enim meis ærumnis, ut opes ne tantæ ſaltem ſint, quæ poſſint impendia ſuſtinere. Quas ob res abs te primum peto, ſuppliciterque (ſi pateris) oro, omni ſtudio ut cures impetrandam (quam dixi) veniam. Deinde ut quam minimum poteris impendas* (10). He complains that his other misfortunes are accompanied with this, that he is too poor to bear the expence of this affair. He therefore does moſt earneſtly intreat his brother-in-law Chalcondylas, to omit no means neceſſary for obtaining a diſpenſation at the loweſt rate poſſible. He was anſwered, that the diſpenſation was granted, and that he muſt haſten to Rome for the profeſſorſhip, which the Pope had given him worth two hundred ducats a year; that he muſt not forget to bring the money at which the diſpenſation was rated, and that perhaps when he comes, his friends would manage ſo as to get him exempted from ſo great an expence (11).

Perhaps it may be aſked, how Parrhaſius came to inquire how much the diſpenſation would coſt; for he might have known it by the book of rates of the Apoſtolic Chancery. But you muſt obſerve that beſides what is ſet down in that book, they muſt always compound with the Datary (12).

[*D*] *I ſhall relate ſome other particulars in critizing upon Moreri.*] I. He ſhould not have ſaid, that Parrhaſius being driven out of Milan, and troubled *with the Gout, retired to Coſenza*; for upon his going out of Milan, he went to Vicenza to teach the *Belles Lettres* there. The war made him go from thence, and then he retired to his own country, and afterwards was Profeſſor at Rome. There it was, if we believe Paul Jovius, that he was ſo afflicted with the Gout, that it forced him to go from thence to Coſenza. 'In Urbem venit; ſed tanti ſuggeſtus honore diu perfrui non potuit, articulari morbo membra omnia ſæviſſimè deformante, unde ei maturatus in patriam reditus cum vitæ exitû contigit (13). - - - *He came to Rome; but could not long enjoy the honour of that profeſſorſhip; for being grievouſly tormented with the Gout in all his limbs, he returned ſoon to his own country and there died.*' Parrhaſius in the oration which I have cited, and which he delivered at Rome, informs us, that, in the preceding year, he had been more tormented with the Gout than ever; he does not ſay, that this inſpired him with the thought of returning to his own country. 'Quum ſolito gravius articulari morbo torquerer anno ſuperiori, tuo hortatu T. Phædre, incredibiles omnium membrorum cruciatus animi vigore ſuperavi: quumque mea magis intereſſet ex hoc ergaſtulo tetroque carcere primo quoque tempore emitti, in tuam gratiam pene revixi (14). - - - *When I was more than uſually afflicted with the Gout the laſt year, I reſolutely overcame, by your exhortations, O Phædrus, incredible pains in all my limbs: and tho' it would have been more for my benefit to be releaſed from this ſlavery and horrible priſon, yet for your ſake I recovered.*' I do not mention this to call in queſtion what Paul Jovius ſays, for I know very well that the pains of the Gout, and poverty, conſtrained Parrhaſius to retire from Rome. The miſerable condition to which he was reduced is contained in theſe words of Valerianus. 'Is dum aſſiduis vigiliis, & longæ lectionis laboribus maceratur, in eam incidit articularis morbi truculentiam, ut per annos aliquot nil præter linguam in univerſo corpore haberet incolumem, ſiderato propemodum utroque crure, ut nullis pedum officiis uti poſſet, lacertiſque præ dolore, & contractione redditis inutilibus, magna inſuper inopia, & egeſtate oppreſſus, rerum demum omnium deſperatione ductus, relicta Roma in Calabriam cùm ſeceſſiſſet, in febrim ſubito incidit, qua diu vexatus, miſerabilique eo cruciatu ſuperatus expiravit (15). - - - - *Whilſt he conſumed away with continual watchings and the fatigue of long lectures, he was ſeized with ſuch a violent fit of the Gout, that for ſome years he had not one part in his whole body ſound and well, except his tongue: both his legs being almoſt blaſted, ſo that he could not ſtir a foot, and his arms with pain and contraction of the ſinews rendered uſeleſs. Moreover, being diſtreſſed with great want and poverty, and deſpairing of every thing, he left Rome and retired into Calabria, where he quickly fell ill of a Fever, with which he was long afflicted, and at laſt being ſpent with miſerable pains he died.*' Note, that Moreri was ſo far from filling up the chaſm which Paul Jovius had left that he made it greater. II. It is falſe that Parrhaſius publiſhed only two books, if we ſuppoſe, as Moreri does, that he publiſhed *ſome commentaries upon Claudian, and upon Ovid's Poem in Ibin*; for he publiſhed ſome fragments of antiquity, when he was profeſſor at Milan. This Aldus Manutius (16) relates in the fourth book of his grammar. It is a little ſtrange that we cannot know by the large additions of Nicodemo to the *Bibliotheca Napoletana* of Nicolo Toppi, what works Parrhaſius publiſhed. Nay, we do not find plainly there, that he publiſhed a commentary upon Claudian (17). All the editions which Nicodemo mentions of the works of this critic, are poſthumous. That which we find ſometimes clearly mentioned is, that one part of Parrhaſius's works, was publiſhed by the care of others. Bernardin Martiranus publiſhed the commentary on Horace's Art of Poetry: the title of the book ſet down by Nicolo Toppi, (18), informs us of this in expreſs terms, and yet this author ſays that Parrhaſius publiſhed it. Nicodemo takes notice of that fault (19). III. It is not at all probable, that Parrhaſius publiſhed a commentary upon the Ibis of Ovid; we do not ſee any body that pretends to have ſeen this commentary, and therefore Nicodemo (20) regards as a falſhood what Paul Jovius ſays, *Edidit Commentarios in . . . . Naſonis Ibin* (21). John Matthew Toſcanus (22), Gaddi, (23), Barri (24). Moreri, and ſeveral others, follow Paul Jovius in this. Another reaſon which perſuades me that they are miſtaken is this, that Mr Boiſſieu having ſearched carefully for all the authors that wrote upon this poem of Ovid, makes no mention of this commentary of Parrhaſius, although he gives a long liſt of other commentators (25). So far is he from that, that he reckons Parrhaſius to be only one of thoſe critics, who

occaſionally

---

(6) Id. ib. *pag.* 142.

(7) Indulgentis alioqui in me patris animum depravarit (*fortuna*) ne ſumptus ad otia Muſarum ſuppeditaret tanquam relicta à majoribus trita ſemita degeneri quod, ut illi, leges ediſcere neglexiſſem. *Ibid. pag.* 143.

(8) *See* Barthius, in Theb. Statii, *lib. iv, pag.* 1008.

(9) Epiſt. ad Gudium, *pag.* 137, *Edit. Ultraj.* 1697.

(10) Ib. *pag.* 137, 138.

(11) Ex Epiſtola Baſilii Chalcondylæ ad Parrhaſium, ibid. *pag.* 139.

(12) Et præterea componendum ſemper eſt cum Datario. *Taxa Cancel. pag.* 4, *Edit.* 1701.

(13) Paul. Jovius, in Elog. *cap. cxxvii, pag.* 271.

(14) Parrhaſius, ubi ſupra, citat. (5), *pag.* 145.

(15) Pierius Valerianus, de Litteratorum Infelicitate, *lib. i, pag. m.* 25.

(16) Apud Barrium, *lib. ii,* de Antiquitate & ſitu Calabriæ, *pag.* 1050, citante Nicodemo, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 88.

(17) *Conſult* Barthius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 1007.

(18) Nicolo Toppi, Bibliot. Napolet. *pag.* 112.

(19) Nicodemo, ubi ſupra, *p.* 87.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Jovius, ubi ſupra, *cap. cxxxvii, pag.* 271.

(22) In Peplo Italiæ, *lib. iii, pag.* 63, 64, apud Nicodemum, ubi ſupra, *p.* 88.

(23) De Scriptoribus non Eccleſiaſticis, *Tom. ii, pag.* 182, *apud eumd. ibid. pag.* 87.

(24) De Antiquitate & Situ Calabriæ, *apud eumd. ibid. pag.* 88.

(25) Dionyſius Salvagnius Boeſſius, Comment. in Ibin, *pag.* 2, 3.

occaſionally corrected ſome paſſages of Ovid. Note, that Parrhaſius wrote a great number of books, and that the greateſt part of them were never printed. Conſult the additions of Nicodemo.

PARTHENAI, a city of Poitou under the juriſdiction of the preſidial of Poitiers. It was often taken and retaken during the wars about religion in the XVIth century (§*a*). The Proteſtants retired thither on the day of the battel of Moncontour (*a*); but becauſe they thought they could not maintain it, they abandoned it at the approach of the troops of the duke of Anjou. They had taken it in the preceding year, and alſo cauſed Malo to be hanged who commanded in the caſtle (*b*). The reaſon of this rigour was, becauſe he had the boldneſs to defend himſelf againſt an army. The Hiſtory of the Sieur d'Aubigné informs us, that they miſcarried more than once in the deſign of ſurprizing that place in the year 1588. They have been there in great numbers ſince the edict of Nantes, as we may judge from the ill-grounded complaint of the clergy of France [*A*], and the anſwer which Mr Drelincourt made to this complaint in 1656. The lords of Parthenai are honorary ſecular canons of St Martin of Tours (*c*). We muſt not forget, that Parthenai is the capital city of the little country of Gaſtine, and of the duchy of Meilleraye (*d*).

The lordſhip of Parthenai was re-united to the crown in 1422, by the death of John l'Archevêque [*B*].

(*a*) The third of October 1569.

(*b*) The True and Compleat Hiſtory of the Troubles, *lib. iv, pag.* 131.

(*c*) Mercure Galant, *for February* 1693, *pag.* 21.

(*d*) Du Val's Treatiſe of France, *pag.* 144.

[(§*a*) This city belonged in 1487 to Francis, earl of Dunois, who adhered to the duke of Orleans. On the twenty eighth of March the ſame year, king Charles VIII, who made war againſt this duke and the people of Bretagne; took Parthenai, and demoliſhed it's walls. See Lobineau, *Hiſt. de Bretagne*, Tom. I. pag. 765, and 768. Rabelais, book i. chap. v. ſpeaks of this demolition of Parthenai. Rem. Crit.]

[*A*] *The ill-grounded complaint of the clergy of France.*] Leſt you ſhould believe that I make uſe of this epithet out of a prejudice for a party, I ſhall compare the complaint and the anſwer together. The archbiſhop of Sens, who ſpoke in the name of the whole clergy, expreſſed himſelf after this manner. 'In the 'city of Partenai, Sir, the piety of the Catholics was 'forced the laſt ſummer, to yield to the violence of 'the enemies of this holy myſtery; who, by an af'fectation altogether irreligious, took upon them to 'make a funeral paſs by at the ſame inſtant with the 'proceſſion, which is made to honour, according to 'the laws of the church, a ſacrament, which is 'the center of our religion. They diſturbed the whole 'courſe of this holy ceremony, by a rencounter ma'liciouſly concerted; and the Catholics who have a 'mind to ſignalize themſelves by their modeſty, at 'the ſame time that their wicked brethren endeavour 'to make themſelves conſiderable for their inſolence, 'were forced to give place to the multitude of theſe 'profane and impious men, and to return into the 'church with ſorrow and ſadneſs in their countenance '... Was there ever, Sir, ſuch a boldneſs, and can 'your majeſty ſuffer in your kingdom, ſo outrage'ous an injury againſt the honour of the Son of God. 'No, Sir, we cannot believe it, and we ought to be 'perſuaded that you will revenge, as we pray you 'to do, the quarrel of the living God (1). It will be ſufficient to relate the ſubſtance of the anſwer: viz. that on the ſecond ſunday of April there was brought to Partenai, from a place two leagues off, the body of a gentleman, to be buried after the ſecond ſermon: that when the whole company was going to bury the body, they perceived by ſome tapeſtry near the citadel, that a proceſſion was to paſs that way; that they ſtopped ſhort, but having no other paſſage to go to the burying-place which is near the caſtle, it was thought convenient to ſend with all poſſible reſpect to the pariſh of the Holy Croſs, from whence the proceſſion was to come, to know of the canons, whether they would have the people that attended the funeral to ſtop, until the proceſſion was gone by; or if their proceſſion was not yet ready to depart, whether they thought fit that the funeral ſhould go on; that they anſwered, that they might finiſh the burial, and that the proceſſion would not depart ſo ſoon; and that in effect it did not ſet out from the place, till half an hour after the whole funeral was paſſed; that to ſhew an entire deference, the Reformed remained in the burying-place till the whole proceſſion was finiſhed, and all the hangings were taken down; and that therefore it could not be truly ſaid, that it returned with great trouble and ſorrow, for having met the funeral, ſince it was not come forth, and did not come forth till a long time after the funeral was paſſed; that for many days after there was not a word heard of this affair, but at laſt the bailif of Partenai, being a violent man, and heated by ſome turbulent perſons, applied to Mr Filleau, the king's advocate at Poitiers, who gloried in perſecuting the Proteſtants upon all occaſions; that many of the conſiſtory of Partenai, were ſummoned to the preſidial at Poitiers, to be there fined for having diſturbed the proceſſion; but Mr de la Meilleray ſtopped the courſe of this unjuſt proſecution, and even thoſe who had commenced it were aſhamed of it, inſomuch that the thing ended there (2). I have kept to the expreſſions of the author.

Would they have anſwered with ſuch confidence, if the thing had not been certain? here is then an error in matter of fact, which falls under our cognizance. We leave to the reader, the trouble of reflecting upon the horrible ſtorms which a vehement Orator is capable of exciting for nothing (3).

[*B*] *This lordſhip was re-united to the crown by the death of John l'Archevêque.*] He had ſold this lordſhip to the duke of Berry, reſerving the profits of it while he lived. . . . . He had no children, and for this reaſon in the year of his above-mentioned deceaſe, Meſſire James de Harcourt, who had married his niece, had a mind to turn him out of the ſaid lordſhip and caſtle of Partenai, but he was hindred by the inhabitants, who defended themſelves and killed the ſaid de Harcourt (4).

(1) Remonſtrance of the Clergy of France, in 1656, *pag. m.* 20.

(2) See the Letter of an inhabitant of Paris to one of his friends in the country, upon the Remonſtrance of the Clergy, *pag.* 133, *&c. Edit. in 8vo. Mr* Drelincourt, *a miniſter of Paris is the author of this letter.*

(3) See the Critical Anſwer to Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, *Letter xxiii, pag. xciii, &c, of the third edition.*

(4) John Bouchet, Annals of Aquitain, *Part iv, ch. vii, fol. m.* 137.

PARTHENAI, a family. It continued a long time in ſplendor. The laſt male of that illuſtrious houſe, was John de Parthenai-l'Archevêque, lord of Soubiſe (*a*), who left but one daughter, *viz.* Catherine de Parthenai, mother of the duke of Rohan, general of the Huguenot armies in France under the reign of Lewis the XIIIth. I ſhall give an article below for this lady. Some think, that the lords of Parthenai took the ſirname of l'Archevêque, becauſe they were deſcended from an archbiſhop of Bourdeaux. Some think that this archbiſhop of Bourdeaux was Joſſelin de Parthenai, who died in 1086, and that William de Parthenai, who took the ſirname of l'Archevêque, about the year 1100, was his ſon. Others (*b*) refer this original to one Archambald archbiſhop of Bourdeaux, predeceſſor to Joſſelin; but as this Archambald having been depoſed, be-

(*a*) See his article under the word SOUBISE.

(*b*) Du Cheſne, Annotat. upon the works of Alain Chartier.

came lord of St Maixent, and there is not found any perſon of that name, nor any lord of St Maixent in the family of Parthenai, this opinion is not very probable. ‘ The eldeſt branch of Parthenai, with all its eſtate, fell into the houſe of Melun Tancarville, from whence is deſcended, by alliance, that of Longueville; and the lords of Soubiſe were parted from the ſtock about the year 1330, when Guy l'Archevêque, youngeſt brother of John Sire de Parthenai was lord of Soubiſe. It was always thought with great probability, that thoſe of Parthenai were of Lezignem, whoſe arms they bore, rebated, upon the account of their being the younger branch, with a band of Gules; but they muſt have been deſcended from thence before the year 1000, for ſince that time we have the ſucceſſion of them, till John l'Archevêque lord of Soubiſe (c)’, grand-father by the mother's ſide to the duke of Rohan. It is obſerved in the life of this duke, printed in 1667, that his mother was the principal heireſs of the houſe of Luſignan.

PARTHENAI (Anne de) the wife of Antony de Pons, count de Marennes, and daughter of John de Parthenai-l'Archevêque, and of Michelle de Saubonne [*A*], was a lady of great wit and learning. She was one of the principal ornaments of the court of Renata of France, the daughter of Lewis the XIIth, and ducheſs of Ferrara; and it is very well known, there were few courts in the world ſo polite as that was. Anne de Parthenai did not only ſtudy the Latin, but with ſuch application undertook the ſtudy of the Greek tongue; that ſhe could with eaſe underſtand Greek books (*a*). Nay, her curioſity prompted her to read even books of Theology: and ſhe was a great proficient in holy writ, and took a great delight in reaſoning almoſt every day upon ſuch ſubjects with Divines. The authors of that time, did not ſpare their elogies; they beſtowed a thouſand praiſes upon her, and did not forget to ſay that ſhe ſung divinely, and that ſhe underſtood all ſorts of Muſic in perfection (*b*). See the epiſtle dedicatory which I have cited (*c*). The intereſt ſhe had with the ducheſs of Ferrara, and the knowledge of Theology wherewith ſhe was furniſhed, will doubtleſs render her ſuſpected of Calviniſm to the Catholics who ſhall read this. But becauſe I would not have them to remain in bare ſuſpicions, I ſhall cite to them an author who will convince them, that ſhe was a good Huguenot [*B*], and a worthy ſiſter of Soubiſe, who was one of the pillars of the party. Her huſband was obliged to leave the court of Ferrara [*C*].

[*A*] *Of Michelle de Saubonne.*] She was a lady of Bretagne, who had been one of the ladies of honour to queen Anne of Bretagne. She was married by the favour of that queen in the year 1507 to John l'Archevêque, the fifth of the name, lord of Soubiſe, head of the houſe of Parthenai. The ſame queen choſe her for the governeſs of Renata of France her daughter, ducheſs of Ferrara (1). There is in the third letter of Rabelais ſomething that concerns that governeſs. ‘ Monſieur de Limoges, who was at Ferrara, embaſſador for the king, ſeeing that the ſaid duke (2), without giving him notice of his deſign, was retired to the emperor, is returned into France. There is danger leſt madam Renata ſhould be troubled for it. The ſaid duke has taken from her Madam de Soubiſe, her governeſs, and will have her to be ſerved by Italian women, *which is no good ſign*.’ This letter was written in the year 1536.

[*B*] *I ſhall cite an author who will convince them that ſhe was a good Huguenot.*] ‘ As to the city of Pons, the lord of the place, while the lady Anne de Parthenai his firſt wife, and ſiſter to the lord of Soubiſe, lived, was a lover of virtue and truth, and improved ſo much in the knowledge of holy Scripture, that there was hardly a man of the robe equal to him for ſo much zeal; for he himſelf took much pains to teach his poor ſubjects, of whom he edified many, as well officers as others in his city of Pons. But immediately after the diſeaſe of that good and virtuous lady, God ſo took away his underſtanding, that at his ſecond marriage, he eſpouſed one of the moſt defamed ladies of France, *viz.* Mary de Monchenu, called the lady de Maſſy; and then God deprived him of the remainder of his ſenſe and judgment, inſomuch that without any occaſion whatſoever, he became from that time, in an inſtant, an enemy and perſecutor of the truth, which he had ſo well known and ſo much promoted (3).’ To confirm what Theodore Beza ſays, concerning the aſcendant of the virtuous Anne de Parthenai over her huſband, I will quote a paſſage of Gregory Gyraldus, wherein he teſtifies that this lady, and the count de Marennes, her huſband, followed the ſame ſtudies with the ſame ſucceſs. ‘ Quid porro dicam qua charitate & amore, ac potius pietate proſequaris illuſtrem virum tuum, jure tuum, ut qui eiſdem quibus tu ſtudiis & virtutibus poſt militares artes ſit ornatiſſimus (4)? - - - *What need I tell, with what affection and love, rather piety, you behave towards your illuſtrious huſband, juſtly your's, for beſides his ſkill in war, he is adorned with the ſame ſtudies and virtues as you are?*’ This count was firſt gentleman of the chamber to the duke of Ferrara; and Gyraldus dedicated to him the fourth Dialogue of his Hiſtory of Poets.

[*C*] *Her huſband was obliged to leave the court of Ferrara.*] It is of him doubtleſs, that theſe words of one of our Hiſtorians are to be underſtood (5). ‘ If the king of France thought, that there was juſt cauſe for expelling Monſieur de Pons from Ferrara, becauſe he ſaid he was of as good a houſe as thoſe of Aeſt (6), it being unreaſonable that he who lived by the bread of the ducheſs of Ferrara, and ſubſiſted by her wages, ſhould make ſuch a compariſon, although the aforeſaid deceaſed king held the houſe of Pons, as antient as that of Aeſt; is it not as inſupportable, that thoſe of the houſe of Guiſe, who are grown great and fat only with the ſubſtance and fatneſs of the houſe of France, ſhould offer to compare themſelves with the princes of the ſaid houſe?’ It is great imprudence in thoſe who ſerve others to compare themſelves to them. If they excel them in nobleneſs of blood, they ſhould ſeem to know nothing of the matter. And this is more eſpecially neceſſary as to ſovereigns; their relations ought to forget that they are their relations.

PARTHENAI (Catharine de) the daughter and heireſs of John de Parthenai-l'Archevêque, lord of Soubiſe, niece of the above mentioned Anne, was married in the year 1568 to the baron du Pont, and afterwards in 1575 to Renatus de Rohan, the

---

(*c*) Le Laboureur, Addit. to the Memoirs of Caſtelnau, *Tom. i, pag.* 805.

(*a*) Non modo in Latinis literis quibus ab ipſis incunabilis naviter operam dediſti, ſed in Græcis quoque ita profeciſti ut Græcos autores intrepide evolvas. *Gyraldus, Epiſt. Dedicat. Dialog. ii, Hiſtor. Poët.*

(*b*) Quid nunc memorem qualis ſis in dignoſcendis & modulandis carminibus, quali venuſtate canas & gratia? Quantum denique in omni Muſica profeceris id ejus diſciplinæ periti prædicant. *Ib.*

(*c*) *See alſo* Clement Marot, *in his* Epiſtle loſt at play againſt Madam de Pons, *pag.* 206, *&c. of the Hague edition* 1700.

(1) See the Notes upon the Letters of Rabelais, *pag.* 85.

(2) That is to ſay, the duke of Ferrara.

(3) Theodorus Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *Tom. i, lib. ii, pag.* 201, (and not 199, as is ſet down in the book) at the year 1559.

(4) Gyrald. Epiſt. Dedicat. Dialog. II, Hiſtor. Poëtarum.

(5) The preſident de la Place, of the State of Religion, *lib. ii, fol.* 63.

(6) It ſhould be *Eſt.*

the ſecond of the name (*a*); whoſe widow ſhe remained in the year 1585 (*b*); and then ſhe thought of nothing but of giving a good education to her children; and her pains had all the ſucceſs ſhe could promiſe herſelf; for the eldeſt of her ſons was the famous duke of Rohan, who ſupported the Reformed party in France with ſo much vigour during the civil wars, under the reign of Lewis XIII. Her ſecond ſon was the duke of Soubiſe. She had three daughters: Henrietta, who died in 1624, and was never married. Catherine, who married a duke of Deux-ponts (*c*), and who made this fine anſwer to Henry the IVth, her admirer; *I am too poor to be your wife, and of too good a family to be your miſtreſs* (*d*); and Anne, who was never married, and ſurvived all her brothers and ſiſters, and rendered her ſelf illuſtrious for her piety and learning. It will be ſufficiently underſtood, that I mean the famous ANNE DE ROHAN (*e*), who endured with ſo much conſtancy all the inconveniences of the ſiege of Rochelle. The courage of her mother was yet more wonderful, who notwithſtanding her old age, bore with a prodigious reſolution the neceſſity to which ſhe was reduced, of living for the ſpace of three months upon horſe-fleſh, and four ounces of bread a day. And notwithſtanding this miſerable condition, ſhe wrote to her ſon, that he ſhould continue as he had begun; and that the conſideration of the extremities to which ſhe was reduced, *ſhould not make him abate any thing to the prejudice of his party whatever ſhe ſhould ſuffer* (*f*). She and her daughter refuſed to be included in the capitulation, and were made priſoners of war. They were carried to the caſtle of Niort, November 2d, 1628 (*g*). Some ſay, that Catharine de Parthenai was then ninety-one years of age [*A*], but others allow her to be but ſeventy. La Croix du Maine informs me, that ſhe underſtood Poetry very well [*B*]. I muſt not forget the troubleſome ſuit about Impotency, which her firſt huſband had upon his hands [*C*]. If what a learned man has ſaid be true, that *Madam de Parthenai, lady of Soubiſe*

(*a*) Thuan. *lib.* *lxi.*

(*b*) Father Anſelme, and Moreri, his tranſcriber, ſay 1586. I have followed the author of the Life of the duke of Rohan.

(*c*) In the year 1605. She died in the year 1607.

(*d*) See the Obſervations upon the Amours of Alcander and the Key.

(*e*) See the article of her.

(*f*) Hiſt. of the Duke of Rohan, *pag.* 99, *of the Holland Edit.* 1667.

(*g*) Mercure Françoiſe, *Tom.* *xiv*, *pag.* 716.

[*A*] *Then ninety-one years of age.*] Father Anſelme was of that opinion, for in giving us the poſterity of Peter de Rohan, called the Marſhal de Gié, he ſets in the margin over againſt our Renatus de Rohan II of that name, that Catherine de Parthenai his wife *died at Pare in Poitou, October 26, 1631, aged ninety-four years* (1). Moreri ſays the ſame thing, except that inſtead of Paré he has put Parc. But the author of the Hiſtory of the duke of Rohan (2), obſerves, ſpeaking of the ſiege of Rochelle, and of the famine ſhe endured there, that ſhe was ſeventy years old. This was not a place to leſſen the number of her years, and he that would have flattered her, ſhould rather have added to, than taken from them. Nevertheleſs it is very probable, that this author made her younger than ſhe was, for, in the year 1574, a tragedy was acting of her compoſing. It is rare to ſee women of ſixteen years of age write tragedies; and when this happens, a la Croix du Maine would not be ignorant of it, nor conceal it. I inſiſt leſs upon the Impotency, whether true or falſe of the baron du Pont, which occaſioned a law-ſuit in 1572. A young woman is more capable of bearing children at fourteen years, than of writing tragedies at ſixteen. But what Varillas obſerves would not be a proof to be rejected. He ſays (3), that in 1562, *The viſcount de Rohan led the troops of Languedoc and Dauphiné, which he had raiſed at the ſollicitation of Soubiſe, who had promiſed him in marriage his only daughter.* Can a man that is old enough to raiſe and command troops, rely upon the marriage of a girl of four years of age? But that which follows would make the argument much ſtronger. In the year 1567, this only daughter was married to the baron du Pont, for we find among the lords, who went to join the admiral after the battle of St Denys, one Soubiſe, who was no other than this baron (4). I ſay, *it would make* the argument ſtronger, and not *that it* is ſo; for I give more credit to a letter I have received, which ſays, that the heireſs of Soubiſe was married to the baron du Pont in 1568, than to the exactneſs of Hiſtorians about ſuch niceties. This is certain, that the good Father Anſelme was miſtaken; for the marriage of John de Parthenai with Antoinette Bouchard of Aubeterre, father and mother to the lady of whom we now ſpeak, was celebrated May the third, 1553. She was born therefore at the ſooneſt in 1554, and could not be above ſeventy-ſeven years of age, when ſhe died in 1631. On the other ſide, ſince ſhe was married in 1568, ſhe muſt have been more than ſeventy years old at the ſiege of Rochelle.

[*B*] *La Croix du Main informs me, ſhe underſtood Poetry very well.*] *This lady*, ſays he (5), *is much to be eſteemed for the excellency and greatneſs of her wit, of which her writings are a ſufficient proof, without any other teſtimony; for ſhe has compoſed ſeveral tragedies and comedies in French, and among the reſt, the tragedy of Holofernes, which was publickly acted at Rochelle in the year 1574, or thereabouts; it is not yet printed. She has writ ſeveral elegies or complaints upon the death of baron du Pont, her firſt huſband, and alſo upon the admiral, and other great lords and illuſtrious perſons. She has tranſlated the Precepts of Iſocrates to Demonicus, not yet printed. She is in great repute*, continues he, *this year* 1584. *I am ignorant of her other writings, becauſe I have not the happineſs to know her.*

[*C*] *I muſt not forget the troubleſome ſuit about Impotency which her firſt huſband had upon his hands.*] This ought not to be placed to the account of our Catherine de Parthenai, but to that of her mother. It was not the wife that ſued her huſband, it was the mother-in-law, who declared againſt her ſon-in-law; and therefore, tho' none can reaſonably doubt of the ſecret confidence between the daughter and the mother, yet it muſt be granted, that the reflexion of Boileau (6), does in no wiſe concern the heireſs of Soubiſe.

Jamais la Biche en rut n'a pour fait d'impuiſſance
Trainé du fond des bois un Cerf à l'audience;
Et jamais Juge entr'eux, ordonnant le congrés,
De ce burleſque mot n'a ſali ſes arrêts.

Nor any hind, for impotence at rut,
Did e'er the ſtag into the arches put,
Where a grave dean the congreſs might ordain,
And with that burleſque word his ſentence ſtain.
OZELL.

If on the one ſide it is aſhoniſhing, that when the Proteſtant ladies diſtinguiſhed themſelves by the reformation of manners, as well as of doctrines, one of the chief of the party (7) ſhould think fit to commence a ſuit, which tended ſo little to edification; on the other ſide it ought to be conſidered, that the continual reading of the Bible was then more capable of communicating certain inclinations; becauſe then they ſtudied with more zeal to imitate the temper of the holy Patriarchs, and of their wives, among whom reigned an earneſt, but very chaſt, deſire of leaving poſterity behind them. The lady of Soubiſe, beſides this, might have had a motive of zeal upon another account. The Proteſtant religion was not yet well ſettled, the utmoſt endeavours were uſed to deſtroy it; and therefore it was neceſſary to perpetuate, by all due and reaſonable ways, thoſe families, which like her's, were the pillars of it. But what ſhall we ſay of the curioſity of the ladies of the court of France, upon occaſion of this affair. Before I relate what Hiſtorians have ſaid of it, I ought to acquaint you, that the ſuit was ended by the maſſacre on St Bartholomew's-day, wherein the ſon-in-law of Soubiſe loſt his life. Let us hear now what Mr Varillas ſays (8): *The reſiſtance of the baron*

(1) Hiſtoire des grands Offic. *pag.* 153.

(2) It is thought to be Mr Fauvelet du Toc.

(3) Hiſtory of Charles IX, *lib.* *iii*, *init.*

(4) D'Aubigné, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 372. Thuanus, *lib. xlii*, *pag.* 854. Varillas, Hiſt. of Charles IX, *lib. vii.*

(5) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Françoiſe, *pag.* 478.

(6) Satire VIII. ver. 143.

(7) See in the remarks of the article SOUBISE, the great zeal of that lady.

(8) Hiſtory of Charles IX, *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 276, *of the Holland Edit.*

Soubiſe was ſpoken of, as being an author, *before Madam de Rohan was known in the world* (*b*); ſhe muſt have written ſomething when ſhe was very young [*D*]. Some have thought, that ſhe wrote an apology for Henry the IVth [*E*], which at the bottom was nothing but a ſharp ſatire.

(*b*) Baillet, Authors Diſguiſed, *Part iii, ch. iii*, *§. iii.*

du Pont-Kuellevé (9) *was ſo long, that thoſe who ſaw he did not yield till after he was pierced through like a ſieve, gave him this teſtimony, that he was more than man in a fight, if he was not man enough in the nuptial-bed. He had married the heireſs of Soubiſe, and his wife's mother had commenced a ſuit againſt him for Impotency, which was not yet determined. His body was dragged as far as the gate of the Louvre, where the pity which it ſhould have inſpired, did not hinder ſeveral of the court-ladies from viewing him narrowly, to ſee if there appeared any mark of that defect whereof he was accuſed.* Thoſe who underſtand Latin, may ſee with what noble expreſſions Thuanus relates this fact. ‘Eadem calamitas Baudineum Acierii fratrem, Pluvialium & Bernium involvit, crudeliter à militibus regiis occiſos, nec non Carolum Quellevetum Pontium Armoricæ Regulum qui Catharinam Parthenæam Joannis Subiſii filiam & hæredem in uxorem duxerat ſed à Parthenææ matre frigiditatem generi cauſſata de diſſolvendo matrimonio lite aliquanto ante tempore intentata neque dum finita. Itaque cum corpora eorum ſicuti à percuſſoribus ſinguli occidebantur ante arcem Regiſque Reginæ ac totius aulici comitatus conſpectum abjicerentur, frequentes è gynæceo Fœminæ, nequaquam crudeli ſpectaculo eas abſterrente, curioſis oculis nudorum corpora inverecunde intuebantur, & in Pontio præcipue aciem defigebant, ſi qua ratione frigiditatis illius cauſſam aut notas perrimari poſſent (10). - - - - *Baudin the brother of Acier, Pluvial and Berni were involved in the ſame calamity, and alſo Charles Quellevé du Pont, a lord of Bretagne, who had married Catherine Parthenai, the daughter and heireſs of John of Soubiſe; but ſome time before, an action had been entered againſt him for Impotency, by the mother of Parthenai, in order to obtain a divorce, which was not yet determined. And when the bodies, according as each was maſſacred, were thrown down before the caſtle in view of the king, queen, and all the court, many of the ladies came out of their apartment, not a bit ſhocked at this cruel ſpectacle, and with great curioſity, and immodeſty, looked upon the naked bodies, and particularly they fixed their eyes on du Pont, to ſee if they could by any means find out the cauſe and marks of his Impotency.*’ It ſeems at firſt ſight that d'Aubigné was guilty of a miſtake, as if he had ſaid of Soubiſe what he ſhould have ſaid only of his ſon-in-law. *Berni and Soubiſe were dragged dead, and placed before the Louvre, and expoſed to the view of the ladies, who looked upon the latter, to know whether he was incapable of marriage, becauſe he was ſued at law for it.* But when we come to know that the ſon-in-law had the ſame name with the father-in-law, this Hiſtorian can only be blamed for not inſerting ſome word of diſtinction, as others have done. Mezerai would otherwiſe be altogether inexcuſable: *Who can believe it*, ſays he, at pag. 156, of the fifth tome of his Chronological Abridgment, *of ſo many valiant men* (he had named the great lords maſſacred on St Bartholomew's-day, and had not paſſed over in ſilence Francis de Quellevé, huſband to the heireſs of Soubiſe), *not one of them died with ſword in hand but Guerchi.* He is much more in fault in his great hiſtory, for he does not only call this huſband Charles de Quellevé-Pontivy, which is to confound two perſons in one, but he attributes to the wife the proceſs for Impotency, which was commenced againſt the baron du Pont. This is, in ſome meaſure, to aſperſe her, of which Thuanus was not guilty: for he aſcribes this accuſation and proſecution only to the mother-in-law. See the article QUELLENEC.

[*D*] *She muſt have written ſomething when ſhe was very young.*] For ſhe loſt the name of Mademoiſelle de Parthenai in 1568, by her marriage with the baron du Pont, and could be then but fourteen years old, ſince the marriage of her father and mother was ſolemnized in May 1553. See the remark [*A*] towards the end.

[*E*] *Some have thought that ſhe wrote an apology for Henry the IVth.*] It was printed as a work of the ducheſs of Rohan, in the new editions of the Journal of Henry III. See how d'Aubigné ſpeaks of this piece. ‘He that would ſee this matter more learnedly debated, let him read the Apology for the king, written by Mr Cahier, then miniſter to Madam. The king ſhewed it to me, as being the ſtile of Madam de Rohan. It is a prevaricating Apology, which Roquelaure hearing read, cried out, Oh! how well the authors of that piece are informed of what we do! Some accuſe la Ruffie of it, becauſe after he had diſcourſed of the king's humour, which is to puniſh ſervices, and reward offences, he ſays to thoſe who complain of his majeſty, you ought to complain of your ſelves, and not of him, for knowing his temper, if you would have rewards, you ſhould merit them by worthy actions (11).’ Whoſoever compoſed this Apology, was a perſon of wit, and I doubt very much whether Peter Victor Cayet was capable of giving ſuch a turn to his railing. Mr Varillas did not know who was pointed at in this Satire, for ſpeaking of Antony, king of Navarre, he ſays (12), *that Catherine de Parthenai, mother of the famous duke of Rohan, reproached him, that he never did good but to thoſe whom he feared.* It was not to this prince, but to Henry the IVth, his ſon, that this reproach was made in the Satire attributed to that lady (13).

(9) It ſhould be QUELLENEC. See the article of this name.

(10) Thuan. *lib. lii, pag. m.* 1076.

(11) Confeſſ. Cathol. de Sancy, *book i, chap. v.*

(12) In the advertiſement of Tom. v, of the Hiſtory of Hereſy.

(13) See the remark [*Q*] of the article HENRY IV.

PARTHENIUS, the author of a book intituled, Περὶ ἐρωτικῶν ϖαθημάτων, *de amatoriis Affectionibus*, that is, *concerning the paſſions of love* [*A*], was of Nicea, and lived in the age of Auguſtus. It cannot be queſtioned but he lived in that time, ſince his book is dedicated to Cornelius Gallus [*B*]. Several think he ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from the Poet PARTHENIUS, who having loſt his liberty in the time of the Mithridatic war, recovered it upon the account of his learning (*a*). Suidas, who informs us of this particular, ſays this Poet lived till the time of Tiberius, and aſcribes to him divers

(*a*) *See* Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Græcis, *lib. ii, cap. i.*

[*A*] *Author of a book, intituled . . . . concerning the paſſions of love.*] It was tranſlated into Latin by Janus Cornarius. This tranſlation was printed with the Greek (1) at Baſil *in officina Frobeniana* in the year 1531, in 8vo (2). The tranſlator, who practiſed Phyſic, thought he did nothing foreign to his profeſſion in tranſlating this work; for he ſuppoſed that the narratives contained in it might ſerve for a remedy to the diſtemper of love, which ſometimes ends in madneſs, or a conſumption. ‘And I do not matter, *continues he*, the cenſure of vulgar Phyſicians, who would be thought to excel in their profeſſion, only becauſe they make a figure in the world, and have very little learning.’ *Mihi ſane ejuſmodi narrationes ac* θελκτήρια, *utiliter adhiberi poſſe videntur, quum in aliis mentium perturbationibus, tum præcipue in morbo quem* τοῦ ἔρωτος *medici vocant, qui tam graviter quibuſdam incumbit, ut in maniam, aut phthiſin & febrem* ἑκτικὴν *perducantur. Quæ cauſſa fuit cur ego medicinam profeſſus hæc edere non erubuerim, nihil veritus vulgi medicorum de me judicium, qui hoc tantum nomine boni medici videri geſtiunt, quod ſint egregie purpurati, & quam minimum literarum attigerunt* (3). This work contains only thirty-ſix chapters, all very ſhort. The adventures related in it are taken from ſome very antient authors, which are not now extant. It is not in verſe, as Moreri has aſſerted (4).

[*B*] *His book is dedicated to Cornelius Gallus.*] The tranſlator imagined that Parthenius's deſign was to comfort Cornelius Gallus, who run mad out of love for Lycoris. The new motive for tranſlating and publiſhing this work, was, that youth which are but too much

(1) Not over againſt it, but by itſelf.

(2) There is another edition of Baſil 1555, and one of Heidelberg 1601, both in 8vo.

(3) Janus Cornarius, Epiſt. Dedicat. Parthenii.

(4) Mr Le Clerc has corrected that fault.

divers works [*C*]. This Parthenius is undoubtedly the ſame who taught Virgil Greek, and we muſt not confound him with a Parthenius, who was of the iſle of Chios [*D*], and who wrote verſes on his father, Theſtor, one of Homer's poſterity (*b*).

(*b*) Suidas, *Tom. ii, pag.* 455.

much inclined to debauchery, might learn to be chaſt: but Cornarius tells us, that this ſort of remedy, in the opinion of ſome moroſe critics, is a real poiſon. *Hunc autem libellum ad Cornelium Gallum poetam ſcripſit, ut ſuſpicor, furoris ejus leniendi ac conſolandi gratia, in quem ex nimio amore Lycoridis amicæ inciderat, ut eſt apud Vigilium & Tibullum. Qua re poterant ſimili modo ſalubria exempla hinc peti juventuti ad libidinem proclivi, ut & patienter & conceſſa amare pergeret, niſi præ moroſitate aut fatuitate potius, multi etiam remedia ac ſalutaria pharmaca inſtar venenorum prohiberent* (5). I do no not know why he ventures to make conjectures, whilſt the very text of Parthenius tells him the reaſon of the dedication. This author ſays, he dedicated his collection as a piece that might furniſh out materials ſuitable to the poetry of Cornelius Gallus.

[*C*] *Suidas . . . . . aſcribes to him divers works.*] Some Elegies upon Venus, the Encomium of his wife Areta, and a Poem upon the death of Areta (6). He does not give the title of the reſt, when he ſpeaks of Parthenius; but under the word Νέστωρ, he ſays Parthenius of Nicæa wrote a book of Metamorphoſes. Plutarch and Euſtathius have made mention of that book. Stephen of Byzantium has cited ſeveral other pieces of Parthenius (7). We read in Suetonius, that Tiberius, in compoſing Greek verſes, imitated, amongſt other Poets, Parthenius, whoſe picture, and works, he ordered to be put in the public libraries. *Fecit & Græca poemata (Tiberius) imitatus Euphorionem, & Rhianum, & Parthenium: quibus poetis admodum delectatus, ſcripta eorum & imagines, publicis bibliothecis inter veteres & præcipuos auctores dedicavit* (8). Caſaubon thinks, the Parthenius ſpoken of there is the ſame whoſe book we have ſtill extant *de amatoriis affectibus* (9). Voſſius is of the ſame opinion (10): but Giraldus will have it, that a Parthenius more antient is meant, he who was deſcended from Homer. See the following remark.

[*D*] *He who taught Virgil Greek, and we muſt not confound him with a* P A R T H E N I U S, *who was of the iſle of Chios.*] That a Poet, named Parthenius, taught Virgil the Greek language, may be proved by this paſſage: *Verſus eſt Parthenii, quo Grammatico in Græcis Virgilius uſus eſt:*

Γλαύκῳ. καὶ Νηρεῖ καὶ Ἰνώῳ Μελικέρτῃ.

Glauco, & Panopeæ & Inoo Melicertæ (11).

Macrobius had taken this obſervation from Aulus Gellius (12); but he added to it the circumſtance of Virgil's having had Parthenius for his maſter to teach him Greek. A groſs fault has crept into the place, where Voſſius cites Aulus Gellius (13). There are more conſiderable faults in Giraldus. He obſerves (14) that there were two Poets of the name of Parthenius, one of Chios, and the other of Nicæa. He of Chios, adds he, was ſirnamed Chaos, and was deſcended from Homer. Virgil imitated him in certain things, as Macrobius and Aulus Gellius remark. The Grammarian Probus quotes the work of Parthenius concerning lovers. Plutarch likewiſe relates a ſtory from it. Stephen of Byzantium cites the *Iphiclus* and the *Propempticon* of the ſame Parthenius. It is to this Parthenius that Giraldus refers the paſſage of Suetonius (15). As to Parthenius of Nicæa, this is what he ſays of him. It is he who taught Virgil Greek, as Macrobius affirms. He wrote a book of Metamorphoſes: he is the elegiac Poet mentioned by Artemidorus in the IVth book of dreams; he is the author of the Archelaid quoted by Hephæſtion, and of the Hercules cited by Stephen of Byzantium, and of the book intitled ἐρωτικὰ dedicated to Cornelius Gallus, and cited by Probus the Grammarian.

One may eaſily ſee that Giraldus miſerably confounds things, and falls into contradictions. I do not blame Voſſius, either for not having criticized upon him, or for not having quoted him. The nature of his work did not neceſſarily engage him to remark the faults of another, and he had perhaps found, without the help of Giraldus, all thoſe matters which he might be ſaid to borrow of him. However it be, I ſhall obſerve that this learned Italian takes from, and gives to the ſame Parthenius the ſame books in the ſame page. He gives to Parthenius of Chios the treatiſe *de Affectionibus amatoriis*, and a little after aſcribes it to Parthenius of Nicæa. He proves by Macrobius that Virgil imitated the Parthenius of Chios, and preſently after quotes Macrobius to prove that Parthenius of Nicæa taught Virgil Greek. But it is certain, Macrobius ſpoke only of the ſame Parthenius. Beſides, Giraldus would be very much puzzled, were he urged to tell why he pretends that Parthenius author of the *Hercules* is not the ſame as Parthenius author of the *Propempticon* and of the *Iphiclus*. He did not know the title of theſe works but becauſe Stephen of Byzantium cited them as pieces of Parthenius. This citation cannot regulate each of their ſhares, and leads us rather to think that they were all done by Parthenius of Nicæa: he was better known than the other Parthenius's: and therefore we ought to aſcribe to him rather than to the others the books, which are cited barely under that name. So, we find in Stephen of Byzantium the epithet φωκαεύς, *Phocenſis*, added to the word Παρθένιος Parthenius in two places (16). This epithet implies, that every where elſe Parthenius, cited ſingly, is different from him of Phocæa, and that if he were different from the Nicæan, the ſirname of his country would have been given him. By the by, it ſeems that Parthenius the Phocean lived at the fartheſt in the fourth Century: for Stephen of Byzantium (17) quotes him under a name, which was given to a people upon the account of Decentius the brother of Magnentius (18). I ſhall alſo obſerve that Athenæus, quoting a Parthenius who was not the Nicæan, does not do it by that name alone, but adds for diſtinction's ſake ὁ τοῦ Διονύσου (19), that is, *the ſon of Dionyſius*, according to Dalechamp, or *diſciple of Dionyſius*, according to Voſſius (20). This Parthenius was author of a book intituled περὶ τῶν παρὰ τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς λέξεων ζητουμένων, *de vocabulis quæſitis apud hiſtoricos* (21). Voſſius believed him to be the diſciple of Dionyſius of Alexandria a famous Grammarian, who flouriſhed from the time of Nero to that of Trajan.

If it be aſked, who is the Parthenius cited by Lucian, in naming ſome Poets that are diffuſive in their accounts of things, I anſwer that Caſaubon thinks it is the ſame that dedicated a treatiſe to Cornelius Gallus (22), that is, Parthenius the Nicean. Ὅμηρος . . . καίτοι ποιητὴς ὢν, παραθεῖ τὸν Τάνταλον, καὶ τὸν Ἰξίονα, καὶ Τιτυὸν, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους. εἰ δὲ Παρθένιος, ἢ Εὐφορίων, ἢ Καλλίμαχος ἔλεγε, πόσοις ἂν οἴει ἔπεσι τὸ ὕδωρ ἄχει πρὸς τὸ χεῖλος τοῦ Ταντάλου ἤγαγεν; εἶτα πόσοις ἂν Ἰξίονα ἐκύλισε. - - - Homerus . . . quamquam eſt poëta, Tantalum, Ixionem, Tityum, alioſque percurrit. At ſi Parthenius, vel Euphorion, vel Callimachus eadem tractaret, quàm multis putas verſibus aquam ad labia uſque Tantali adduxiſſet, Deinde quàm multis idem Ixionem volutaſſet (23). - - - *Homer . . . tho' a Poet, runs through the ſtories of Tantalus, Ixion, Tityus, and others, in a few lines. But if Parthenius, or Euphorion, or Callimachus were to write about them, how many verſes would they employ to bring the water to the lips of Tantalus, or to turn Ixion upon the wheel.*

(5) Cornarius, ubi ſupra.

(6) Suidas, in Παρθένιος.

(7) *See* Voſſius, de Hiſt. Græc. *lib. ii, cap. i*; and Pinedo in the Index of Authors, cited by Stephen of Byzantium.

(8) Sueton. in Tiberio, *cap. lxx.*

(9) Caſaub. in Sueton. ibid.

(10) Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

(11) Macrob. Saturn. *lib. v, cap. xviii, pag. m.* 412.

(12) Aulus Gellius, *lib. xiii, cap. xxv.*

(13) Ex Parthenio hoc Verbum (*read* Verſum) à Marone expreſſum Gellius refert. *Voſſius, ubi ſupra, lib. i, pag.* 164.

(14) Gyrald. de Poetar. Hiſt. Dial. III, *pag. m.* 175.

(15) Cited in the remark [*C*].

(16) In Γότθοι & in Δεκέντιοι.

(17) Δεκέντιοι.

(18) Who was emperor for ſome time, and who killed himſelf in the year 353.

(19) Athen. *lib. xi, pag.* 467, *and* 501.

(20) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Græc. *lib. ii, cap. i.*

(21) Athen. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 467.

(22) Caſaub. in Sueton. in Tiber. *cap. lxx.*

(23) Lucianus, de Conſcrib. Hiſtoria, *Tom. i, pag. m.* 704.

PARTS (James des) in Latin *de partibus*, lived in the XVth century, and was Phyſician to the duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, and afterwards to Charles VII king of France (*a*). Some ſay he was born at Tournay, but others at Paris [*A*]. He was

(*a*) Naudæus, de Antiquitate Scholæ Medicæ Pariſienſis, *pag.* 48.

[*A*] *Some ſay he was born at Tournay, but others at Paris.*] Mr Mercklin declared for the former of theſe two opinions. See him at page 490 of the *Lindenius renovatus*. Riolanus declared for the latter, and has even made uſe of this fact to prove that James Ponceau was a Pariſian. ' James des Parts was a native of Paris, was canon of the church of Paris (b), and canon and treaſurer of the church of Tournay (c), and died in this laſt city about the year 1465 (d). He was one of the moſt learned Phyſicians of that age, and wrote ſome books which were highly eſteemed for a long time [B]. I ſhall take notice hereafter (e), that ſome other Phyſicians have been his plagiaries. He was the firſt that wrote concerning the purple Fever (f). The Bagnio-keepers of Paris intended to aſſaſſinate him, becauſe he adviſed the magiſtrate not to permit the uſe of baths in time of peſtilence [C].

(b) Id. ib.

(c) Lindenius renovatus, p. 490.

(d) Riolan, Recherches ſur les Eſcholes en Médicine de Paris & de Montpellier, *pag*. 197.

(e) In the article PRÆPOSITUS, at the remark.

(f) See the remark [C].

‘ Paris, his works (1) were printed by the care of ‘ James Ponceau, firſt Phyſician to Charles VIII, being returned from Italy, and at the king's expence. ‘ Janus Laſcaris, who dedicated the book to James ‘ Ponceau, calls him *Patriotam*, the country-man, of ‘ James des Parts, *& ejuſdem artis profeſſorem*, one of ‘ the ſame profeſſion (2).’ What might induce one to think that this Phyſician of Charles VII was not a native of Tournay is, that Swertius, and Valerius Andreas Deſſelius, Bibliographers of the Low-Countries, make no mention of him, tho' he was ſo capable of doing honour to his country.

(1) *In three large volumes.* Riolan, Recherches des Eſcholes de Médecine, *pag*. 171.

(2) Ib. *p*. 170.

[*B*] *He wrote ſome books, which were highly eſteemed for a long time.*] The chief is his commentary on Avicenna. It was printed at Lyons at the king's charge, and by the care of Janus Laſcaris (3) *apud Johannem Trechſel* in the year 1498 in four volumes *in folio* (4). It was given out, that the Phyſicians of Paris concealed this excellent work, that foreigners might not enjoy the benefit of it. ‘ Cui (*Jacobo de* ‘ *Partibus*) ſi, quemadmodum Tacitus † Cæſari con‘cedatis, ut propter magnitudinem cognitionis (5), ‘ & occupationes rerum, & ſeculi ſui fatum, minus ‘ eloquentiâ effecerit, quam divinum ejus ingenium ‘ poſtulabat, habebitis alioqui virum tam celebrem, ‘ tam eruditum, tam copioſum, ut non veritus ſit af‘firmare Johannes Agricola Medicus Germanus ‡, ‘ *majores veſtros, quibus commentum illud ingens & va‘ſtum in Avicennam primum obtigerat, centum annos per‘petuos apud ſe, clam, & ſecreto continuiſſe, nulliſque* ‘ *nationibus aliis hoc communicari ſuſtinuiſſe, priuſquam* ‘ *ſecula quædam annorum* πεειπλομένων *revoluta eſ‘ſent*. Sed quidquid ſit de hac hiſtoria, vel potius ‘ ex ſubducta temporis ratione non ineleganti fabellâ, ‘ hoc loco mihi venit in mentem, quod narratur de ‘ veteris Romæ tam catis, & cautis Juriſconſultis, qui ‘ faſtorum, dierumque ſingulorum rationem penes ſe ‘ unos eſſe voluerunt, donec inventus eſt quidam ſcriba ‘ Cneius Flavius, qui faſtos ipſos populo ediſcendos ‘ proponeret, ſuorumque magiſtrorum tam arcanam, ‘ occultamque ſapientiam compilaret, ac pervulgaret ‡: ‘ inventus eſt enim tandem Janus Laſcaris è Paleolo‘gorum familia Princeps Conſtantinopolitanus, qui ‘ hoc univerſæ Medicinæ Sacrarium, hoc, ſi Diis pla‘cet, tectum & involutum non Eleuſiniarum, ſed Pa‘riſienſis Æſculapii myſterium, ſymmiſtis omnibus, ‘ omnibus medicis reſeravit, aperuit, communicavit. ‘ - - - *Of whom* (James des Parts) *if you ſay, as Ta‘citus did of Cæſar, that by reaſon of his vaſt know‘ledge, and the affairs he was taken up with, and the* ‘ *deſtiny of the age he lived in, he effected leſs by his* ‘ *eloquence than might be expected from his divine genius,* ‘ *you will in other reſpects have a man ſo famous, ſo* ‘ *learned, and ſo copious, that John Agricola, a German* ‘ *Phyſician, made no ſcruple to affirm,* That your anceſ‘tors, who firſt poſſeſſed that large and huge com‘mentary on Avicenna, kept it privately among them‘ſelves for an hundred years together, and would not ‘ ſuffer it to be communicated to other nations, till ‘ after the revolution of ſeveral years. *But whatever* ‘ *there be in this ſtory, or rather, conſidering the cal‘culation of time, this pretty fable, it brings to my mind* ‘ *what is related of the cunning and wary Lawyers of an‘cient Rome, who would have the management of the* ‘ *Calendar lodged entirely in their hands, till at length* ‘ *a certain Notary, Cneius Flavius, who propoſed that the* ‘ *people ſhould learn the Calendar by heart, compiled and* ‘ *publiſhed this ſecret and hidden ſcience of their gover‘nors: ſo, at laſt Janus Laſcaris, a Conſtantinopolitan* ‘ *prince of the family of the Paleologi, has unlocked, laid* ‘ *open, and communicated to all Phyſicians, to all initiated* ‘ *in that profeſſion, this repoſitory of univerſal medicine,* ‘ *this hidden and dark myſtery, forſooth, not of Ceres, but* ‘ *of the Pariſian Æſculapius.*’

(3) See the preceding remark.

(4) Lindenius renovatus, *pag*. 490. *Geſner* puts the year 1496. *Riolanus* only mentions three volumes.

† Lib. de claris Oratorib.

(5) Several editions of Tacitus have *cogitationum*.

‡ Epiſt. nuncupat. comment. in Galenum de locis affectis.

‡ *See* Præf. & Epiſt. nuncupat. ejus Operibus ab eodem Laſcaris præfixa.

‘ Hoc autem Imperium, quod Jacobus de Partibus ‘ ab iis omnibus, qui illum præceſſerant legitimè de‘latum obtinuit; illud idem diverſâ ratione Joannes ‘ Fernelius omnibus, qui eum ſecuturi ſunt, ita præ‘ripuit, ut non ſolum Medicorum ſeculi decimi quin‘ti Princeps (6), &c. - - - *But this ſuperiority, which* ‘ *James des Parts obtained, and which was lawfully* ‘ *conveyed to him by all thoſe that went before him, John* ‘ *Fernelius contrariwiſe has ſo raviſhed from all thoſe* ‘ *that ſhall come after him, that he is not only the* ‘ *prince of Phyſicians of the XVth Century, &c.*’ It was neceſſary to lengthen out this citation, that it might ſerve as a proof to the text of this remark.

(6) Naudæus, de Antiq. Scholæ Medicæ Pariſ. *pag*. 48, & *ſeq*.

Among the other works of James des Parts mentioned in the *Lindenius renovatus*, I ſhall only ſet down the two following, *viz. Summa Alphabetica Morborum ac Remediorum ex Libris Meſuæ excerpta. Inventiarium ſeu Collectorium receptorum omnium Medicaminum, Confectionum, Pulverum, Pilularum, Emplaſtrorum, Unguentorum, & Oleorum, & aliorum cuivis uſui reſervandorum*. The edition of the latter neither ſhews the time nor the place of the impreſſion (7).

(7) Lindenius renovatus, *pag*. 491.

[*C*] *The Bagnio-keepers of Paris intended to aſſaſſinate him, &c.*] The whole paſſage, which I am going to cite from Riolanus is curious, and may be ſubſervient to this article, and therefore I ſhall give it entire. ‘ I cannot bear that Fracaſtorius, a Phyſician, and a ‘ very learned Italian, ſpeaking of the Purple Fever, ‘ in his treatiſe *de Morbis contagioſis*, ſhould ſay that ‘ it was not known in France in the year 1529, when ‘ Andrew Naugier, ambaſſador of the republic of ‘ Venice, died at that time of this fever at Blois. I ‘ can prove, it was deſcribed in the beginning of the ‘ XVth Century by Sebaſtianus Montuus in his *O‘puſcula*, and that at the end of the XIVth Cen‘tury (8), a Phyſician of Paris, called James de Parts, ‘ firſt wrote of it very diſtinctly and learnedly, and ‘ uſed the letting of blood for its cure. It is he who ‘ ſays, that in his time baths and ſtoves were ſo com‘mon in Paris, that having adviſed the magiſtrates to ‘ prohibit them in time of peſtilence, the Bagnio‘keepers would have aſſaſſinated him, had he not ‘ made his eſcape (9).’

(8) *It ſhould be the XVth.* Naud. de Antiq. Schol. Medic. Pariſ. *pag*. 48, *commits the ſame fault*.

(9) Riolan, ubi ſupra, *pag*. 217, 218.

Riolanus afterwards quotes ſix Latin verſes from an Italian named Brixianus, who praiſed the city of Paris for its *baths and ſtoves*, in the beginning of the XVIth Century; and you will find in Peter Matthieu (10), that when the queen made her entry into Paris in 1466, four baths were ſet up for her and the ladies at the houſe of John Dauvet the firſt preſident. He reckons this (11) amongſt the ſenſual pleaſures of Lewis XI, *uncommon and little known to the kings of France his predeceſſors.* He thinks that Prince brought *the cuſtom of them from Flanders*, and cites Philip de Comines who placed baths among *the corruptions that peace had introduced into the Low-countries.* But what I have related of James des Parts ſhews they were in uſe at Paris before Lewis XI returned from Flanders.

(10) Matthieu, Hiſtoire de Louïs XI, *at the beginning, pag. m.* 273.

(11) Ib. *lib*. *xii*, *pag*. 733.

PASCAL (BLAISE) one of the ſublimeſt genius's in the world, was born at Clermont in Auvergne the nineteenth of June, 1623. He never had any maſter but his father, who was a very learned man [*A*], an able Mathematician, and preſident of the

[*A*] *His father was a very learned man.*] His name was STEPHEN PASCHAL: He was born in the year 1588 *at Clermont in Auvergne, of one of the beſt families of that province. His father was treaſurer of France at Riome, and his mother, who bore likewiſe the ſirname of Paſcal, was the daughter of the Seneſchal of Auvergne at Clermont* (1). Stephen Paſcal *quitted the province, after he had reſigned his office of preſident to one of his brothers, and retired to Paris, as to a place favourable* to his deſign of giving a good education to his

(1) Baillet, Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. i, pag*. 332.

the court of Aids in his province, and had an extraordinary tenderneſs for this child, his only ſon (*a*). This tenderneſs induced him to quit his office, and ſettle at Paris in 1631, that he might the more uſefully ſpend his time in the inſtruction of his ſon, who from his infancy gave proofs of a very extraordinary capacity; for ‘ he deſired to ‘ know the reaſon of every thing . . . and he could not yield in any point, unleſs it ‘ appeared to him evidently true; ſo that when good reaſons were not given him, he ‘ himſelf would ſearch for better; and when he applied himſelf to any ſubject, he would ‘ never leave it till he had found out ſomething that could give him ſatisfaction (*b*).’ There was reaſon to fear, that with a genius of ſuch a caſt he would turn a free-thinker, and yet he was always very far from that fault. He diſtinguiſhed exactly all his life-time the laws of Faith from thoſe of Reaſon [*B*]. What is told of the manner how he learned the Mathematics, ſeems to be miraculous [*C*], as well as the progreſs which he made in that ſcience in a very little time [*D*]. But that which we are told of his piety and humility

(*a*) He had two daughters, whereof one was a nun at Port-Royal, the other was married to Mr Perier.

(*b*) The Life of Mr Paſcal by Madam Perier, *pag.* 5.

his ſon (2). He joined with Mr de Roberval, to anſwer the objections of Des Cartes, againſt a piece of Mr de Fermat, *de maximis & minimis* (3); but he had ſcarce any ſhare in the conſequences of this diſpute, for he removed from Paris, *and retired far from publick intercourſe, leſt his preſence ſhould provoke ſome offended powers, and move them to do ſomething to the prejudice of his liberty. The diſgrace into which he thought he was fallen, was nothing elſe but the conſequence of the diſgrace of one of his intimate friends, who had been arreſted and carried to the Baſtile, for ſome diſturbance made in the town-houſe. Mr Paſcal being perſwaded of the integrity of his friend, had obſerved, that there was more misfortune than crime in his manner of occaſioning that diſturbance. He did not only ſpeak in favour of his friend, but he was alſo ſo bold as to take upon him the defence of ſeveral perſons unjuſtly treated and oppreſſed by ſome intereſted officers. Beſides he had learned, that this affair had been related with very odious circumſtances to the chancellor Seguier; wherefore the fear of having diſpleaſed this prime magiſtrate of the kingdom, made him retire to prevent the effects of his reſentment. He continued about a year in this retirement, till cardinal de Richelieu being informed of his great merit, and of the occaſion of his retiring, by the ducheſs of Aiguillon, and by the chancellor himſelf, cauſed him to return in* 1639, *and made him in a little time after intendant of Normandy at Roan* (4). He died in 1651 (5). He was become a friend to Des Cartes.

[*B*] *He diſtinguiſhed exactly all his life-time the laws of Faith from thoſe of Reaſon.*] This we are told in his life written by Madam Perier, his ſiſter. ‘ He ‘ had been hitherto, (6) by a peculiar divine protection, ‘ preſerved from all the vices of youth, and which is ‘ yet more ſtrange in one of his genius and character, ‘ he was never inclined to Libertiniſm, as to what con‘ cerns religion, but always confined his curioſity to ‘ things natural. He told me many times, that he ‘ added this obligation to all the other he had to my ‘ father; who having himſelf a very great reverence ‘ for religion inſpired it into him in his infancy, giv‘ ing him this for a maxim, that every thing which ‘ is the object of faith cannot be the object of reaſon, ‘ and much leſs ſubject to it. This maxim which ‘ was often repeated to him by a father for whom he ‘ had a great eſteem, and in whom he ſaw great learn‘ ing, with clear and ſtrong reaſon, made ſo great an ‘ impreſſion upon his mind, that whatſoever diſcourſes ‘ he heard from free-thinkers, he was not at all mov‘ ed by them; and although he was very young, he ‘ looked upon them as a ſort of people who had this ‘ falſe principle, that human reaſon was above all ‘ things, and who knew not the nature of faith. And ‘ thus that great ſoul, ſo vaſt and ſo curious, which ‘ enquired with ſo much care into the cauſe and rea‘ ſon of every thing, was at the ſame time as ſub‘ miſſive in matters of religion, as a child, which ‘ ſimplicity prevailed in him all his life-time; inſo‘ much that even after he reſolved to ſtudy nothing ‘ but religion, he never applied himſelf to any curi‘ ous queſtions of Theology; and uſed his moſt vigo‘ rous endeavours to know and practiſe the perfection ‘ of Chriſtian morality, to which he conſecrated all ‘ the talents which GOD had given him (7).’

[*C*] *The manner how he learned the Mathematics ſeems to be miraculous.*] His father perceiving in him an extraordinary inclination (8) *to matters of reaſoning, was afraid that the knowledge of the mathematics would hinder his learning the languages. He reſolved therefore to keep him, as much as he could,* from all notions of Geometry; *he locked up all the books that treated of it, and refrained even to ſpeak of it in his preſence, with his friends.* Yet he could not refuſe this general anſwer to the importunate curioſity of his ſon: *Geometry is a ſcience which teaches the way of making exact figures, and of finding out the proportions between them; but at the ſame time he forbad him to ſpeak or think of it any more.* Upon this bare opening of the matter, the child (9) ſet himſelf *to muſe at his hours of recreation*, and to make figures upon the chamber-floor with charcoal. He ſought out the proportions of figures, he himſelf made definitions and axioms, and and then demonſtrations, *and he carried his enquiries ſo far, that he came to the thirty-ſecond propoſition of the firſt book of Euclid.* For his father having ſurprized him one day in the midſt of his figures, *and having aſked him what he was doing, he told him he was ſearching for ſuch a thing, which was juſt* that propoſition of Euclid. *He aſked him afterwards, what made him think of this, and he anſwered, that it was becauſe he had found out ſuch another thing; and ſo going backward and uſing the names of bar and round, he came at length to the definitions and axioms he had formed to himſelf.* You will find all this more at large with the conſequences of it in the authors I quote in the margin (10). I have elſewhere related a matter of fact which comes ſomething near to this, concerning father Maignan. See the remark [*E*] of his article.

[*D*] . . . *The progreſs which he made in that ſcience in a very little time.*] Mr le Pailleur knowing what has been juſt ſaid, adviſed Mr Paſcal, the father, who told him of it, no longer to conſtrain his ſon. Mr Paſcal followed this advicc, and gave Euclid's Elements to the child, who ‘ (11) underſtood it all by himſelf ‘ alone, without ever needing any explication, and he ‘ improved in it at firſt ſo far, that afterwards he was ‘ conſtantly preſent at the conferences which were ‘ held every week, where all the moſt ingenious men ‘ of Paris were aſſembled, either to bring thither their ‘ own works, or to examine thoſe of others. Young ‘ Mr Paſcal, kept his place there, as well as any o‘ ther, either for examining or writing books. He ‘ carried thither as often as any man new things, and ‘ ſometimes it happened, that he diſcovered faults in ‘ the propoſitions that were examined, which the reſt ‘ did not perceive. Yet he employed only his time ‘ of recreation in the ſtudy of Geometry, becauſe he ‘ was then learning the languages which his father ‘ taught him. But finding in thoſe ſciences the truth, ‘ which he loved in all things with an extream paſ‘ ſion, he made ſuch progreſs in the little time he ‘ ſpent upon them, that at the age of ſixteen years he ‘ wrote a treatiſe of conic ſections, which in the ‘ judgment of the moſt learned was accounted one of ‘ the greateſt efforts of genius that can be imagined. ‘ And therefore Mr Des Cartes, who had been in ‘ Holland for a long time, having read it, and hav‘ ing heard ſome ſay, that it was written by a child ‘ of ſixteen years of age, choſe rather to believe, that ‘ Mr Paſcal the father, was the true author of it, ‘ who willingly robbed himſelf of that glory which ‘ juſtly belonged to him, to transfer it to his ſon, ‘ than to be perſwaded, that a child of that age, was ‘ capable of writing a book with ſuch ſtrength of rea‘ ſon; and by this backwardneſs to believe a thing ‘ which was very true, he ſhewed that it was in ef‘ fect incredible and prodigious. At the age of nine‘ teen years he invented that admirable machine of ‘ Arithmetic (12), which was eſteemed one of the ‘ moſt extraordinary things that was ever ſeen: and afterwards humility (c), is little leſs wonderful [E]. After he had taken a great deal of pains in experiments of the New Philoſophy, he forſook that ſtudy [F], *and all other learning, to apply*

---

(2) Baillet, ibid.

(3) Ib. *pag.* 331, *ad ann.* 1638.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 339, 340.

(5) Ibid. *pag.* 832.

(6) That is, till the age of 24 years.

(7) Life of Paſcal, *pag.* 12, 13.

(8) Preface to the Æquilibrium of Fluids. See alſo Madam Perier's Life of Mr Paſcal, *pag.* 6.

(9) He was then but twelve years old. Madam Perier, ibid. and the Preface to the Æquilibrium of Fluids.

(10) Preface to the Æquilibrium of Fluids. Madam Perier, in the Life of Paſcal. Mr Baillet, Famous Children, Article LXXVII.

(11) Preface to the Æquilibrium of Fluids. See alſo Madam Perier, *pag.* 8, &c.

(12) He preſented one of them to the king, and one to the chancellor, and then he gave one to Mr Carcavi. See Baillet's Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. ii, pag.* 378.

‘afterwards at the age of twenty-three years, having ſeen the Toricellian experiment, he invented and tried a very great number of other new experiments.’ We muſt not forget an early proof he gave of his great genius. ‘When he was yet but eleven years old, at table, a certain perſon having ſtruck accidentally a fine earthen diſh with a knife, he took notice, that it made a great ſound, but as ſoon as the hand was laid upon it, the ſound ceaſed. He wanted at the ſame time to know the cauſe of it; and this experiment having led him to make many others about ſounds, he obſerved ſo many things about them, that he wrote a tract upon that ſubject, which was judged very ingenious and ſolid (13).’

What follows is a thing that deſerves to be related. A man of wit who rallied finely (14) thoſe that made the preface which I have quoted (15), introduces Des Cartes ſpeaking thus: ‘This man (16) is happy in point of reputation; for formerly he made many people believe, that he wrote from his own fund of ingenuity a book of Conic Sections at the age of ſixteen; which book was ſent to me, and before I had read one half of it, I judged †, he had learned very much from Mr des Argues; in which opinion I was preſently after confirmed by the confeſſion he made of it to me himſelf (17).’ The author who brings in Des Cartes talking after this manner, preſently makes this anſwer to him (18). *What you ſay ſurprizes me a little, for in the preface to a treatiſe of the Æquilibrium of Fluids, printed after the death of Mr P . . . your teſtimony is alledged in this point, which is not altogether agreeable to that which you now give me; for there is no mention there of the aſſiſtance he had from Mr des Argues; but it is only ſaid, that the thing appeared to you ſo incredible and prodigious, that you would not believe it; that you perſwaded your ſelf, that Mr P . . . the father was in truth the author of the book, and that he had a mind to give the honour of it to his ſon.* Mr Des Cartes replies, *I know not what they make me ſay or think in that preface; but I know very well that I ſay nothing now, but what I writ in expreſs terms to* ⸸ *Father Merſenne, as ſoon as I ſaw the book.* I may be without doubt allowed to ſay, that the author of this dialogue does not relate exactly what was written by Mr Des Cartes to Father Merſenne. The words of the letter are theſe (19), ‘I have received alſo the Eſſay concerning Conic Sections from Mr Paſcal's ſon, and before I had read over one half of it, I judged he had learned of Mr Des Argues, in which opinion I was confirmed preſently after, by the confeſſion which he himſelf makes about it.’ This plainly ſignifies, that Mr Paſcal, a little after the middle of his book, confeſſes that he received great light from Mr des Argues: but the words of the dialogue do evidently imply, that Mr Paſcal, writing to Mr Des Cartes, made him this confeſſion, which makes one apt to believe, that this young man having heard that this Philoſopher ſuſpected him of having improved by the inſtructions of Mr Des Argues, wrote to him a letter, wherein he owned the juſtice of this ſuſpicion. Such are the natural conſequences of the relation made by this dialogiſt; and therefore we muſt conclude, that he ſets the reader out of the right way, and leads him to form a falſe idea of the fact. The objection is nevertheleſs very ſtrong againſt the preface to the Æquilibrium; for after all, Mr Des Cartes did not write any thing in the leaſt to Father Merſenne, that ſhewed he admired young Paſcal, he gave him no Elogium, he does not ſay that the book of Conic Sections appeared to him to be well done, he ſays nothing of it neither good or bad. Where then is this teſtimony that he is pretended to have given, *that the thing in effect was incredible and prodigious* (20)? It is, will ſome ſay, in another letter that was never printed; it muſt be added, and which was never written to Father Merſenne; for if it had been written to him, Mr Baillet would have cited it, and not have been contented to refer us to the preface of the Æquilibrium of Fluids. Mr Baillet informs us of three things. I. That Mr Roberval and Mr le Pailleur, and other friends of Mr Paſcal, were ſorry for what Mr Des Cartes had written to Father Merſenne. *And that they complained of his opinion, which did not appear obliging enough for a lad of ſuch an extraordinary merit; wherein they were followed by the gentlemen of Port-Royal, who upon this point adviſed Mr Clercelier, after he had publiſhed this teſtimony of Des Cartes in the firſt edition of his letters* (21). II. That this great Philoſopher, going upon probability, could not be perſwaded that a boy was the author of ſo good a book. He therefore acquainted his friend *with the thing, without any artifice, as he believed it.* He choſe rather to ſeek for that book, *an author among the moſt accompliſhed Mathematicians, than to venture to loſe, on other occaſions, the credit he had obtained with thoſe who knew him to be ſincere, by his eaſineſs to believe a thing, which he could not make others believe upon his bare word. And therefore when he ſaw by ſome circumſtances that cleared up the matter, that this book could not with any probability be attributed to his friend Mr Des Argues,* ‘*He* ‡ *choſe rather to believe that Paſcal the father, was the true author of it, than to be perſwaded that a child of that age was capable of writing a book with ſuch ſtrength of reaſon.*’ III. *That Mr Des Cartes might alſo from the appearance of probability fall into an error about this fact, when he remembered the correſpondence between Mr Des Argues and the Paſcals, and when he ſaw in the treatiſe of the young author of ſixteen years of age, ſuch things as he believed he had ſeen a little while before in a piece of Mr Des Argues; for this might induce him to think that Mr Des Argues had a hand in that treatiſe, and ſo much the rather, becauſe young Mr Paſcal cited Mr Des Argues in it* (22).

One cannot well judge of this diſpute until two things be explained; one is, Whether it be true, that Mr Des Cartes, renouncing his firſt opinion, wrote that Mr Paſcal the father had transferred to his ſon the glory of his Conic Sections. This does not appear by his printed letters, nor by his manuſcript letters which Mr Baillet conſulted, nor by any other circumſtantial proof. There is nothing about this matter, but an indeterminate teſtimony of thoſe who publiſhed the Æquilibrium of Fluids. The other thing, which ought to be cleared up, is the knowing of the terms, in which Mr Des Argues is mentioned in the treatiſe of Mr Paſcal. If he be only named in it, Mr Des Cartes is much to blame, to maintain that Mr Paſcal confeſſes he had been aſſiſted by Mr Des Argues. But if Mr Paſcal makes this confeſſion in it, his and his father's friends are much to blame to complain of Mr Des Cartes.

[E] *That which we are told of his piety is wonderful.*] I ſhall ſpeak hereafter more largely of this (23): here I ſhall only mention one proof of it. *In the four laſt years of his life; becauſe he was not able to bear labour, his chief diverſion was to go and viſit the churches, where ſome reliques were expoſed, or ſome ſolemnity obſerved, and for that end, he had a ſpiritual almanack, which informed him of the places where there were particular devotions. And this he did with ſo much devotion and ſimplicity, that thoſe who ſaw him were ſurprized at it, which gave occaſion to that fine ſaying of a very virtuous and knowing perſon, that the grace of GOD diſcovers itſelf in great genius's by little things, and in common ones by great things* (24).

[F] *After he had taken pains in experiments of the New Philoſophy, he forſook that ſtudy.*] The firſt experiment he made was that of Torricellius, which he repeated many times (25), *and from it drew ſeveral conſequences, for the proof of which, he made ſeveral new experiments, in the preſence of the moſt conſiderable perſons of the city of Roan* (26), *where he then was* (27) . . . *He cauſed them to be printed in the year* 1647, *and made a little book of them, which he diſperſed through all France, and afterwards he ſent it into foreign countries. . . the ſame year he was informed of a thought that Torricellius had, that the air was heavy, and that its weight might be the cauſe of all the effects which had been till then attributed to the horror of a Vacuum. He looked upon this as a very fine thought; but ſince it was a meer conjecture of which there was not any proof, he made ſeveral experiments to diſcover whether it were true or falſe, . . . which not being ſatisfactory, at the end of the ſame year* 1647, *he meditated upon the famous experiment which was tried in* 1648. . . *The ſucceſs of that experiment, which he repeated ſeveral times, . . . confirmed him altogether in the thought of Torricellius about the*

(c) See the remark [*G*].

(13) Preface to the Æquilibrium of Fluids.

(14) *See the book intituled,* A Voyage to the World of Des Cartes, *pag.* 191, 192, *of the Holland Edit.*

(15) That of the Æquilibrium of Fluids.

(16) That is, Mr Paſcal.

† Tom. ii, Letter xxxviii.

(17) Voyage to the World of Des Cartes, *pag.* 188.

(18) Ibid. *pag.* 189.

⸸ Tom. ii, Letter xxxviii.

(19) Des Cartes, *Tom. ii, Letter xxxviii, pag. m.* 217.

(20) Preface to the Æquilibrium of Fluids.

(21) Baillet, Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. ii, pag.* 40, *ad ann.* 1639, 1640.

‡ Preface to the Æquilibrium of Fluids.

(22) Baillet, ibid. *pag.* 41.

(23) In the remark [*G*].

(24) Madam Perier, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 40.

(25) Preface to the Æquilibrium of Fluids.

(26) His father was intendant there.

(27) That is, in 1646. See Mr Baillet's Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. ii, pag.* 328.

apply himſelf only to that one thing which JESUS CHRIST calls neceſſary (*d*). He was not yet twenty-four years old, when the reading of ſome pious books, put him upon taking this holy reſolution. The patience which he ſhewed in his illneſſes, that were long and frequent, ought alſo to be matter of aſtoniſhment [*G*]. Neither ſhould we leſs

the weight of the air, and gave him occaſion afterwards to draw from thence ſeveral very fine and uſeful conſequences; and to make alſo ſeveral other experiments, which he inſerted in a large treatiſe, that he wrote at that time, wherein he fully explained all that matter, and anſwered all the objections that were made againſt him. But this treatiſe was loſt, or rather, becauſe he loved brevity, he himſelf reduced it to two little tracts, which appeared after his death, whereof one is intituled, *the Æquilibrium of Fluids*, and the other, *the Weight of the Maſs of the Air*.

Here we muſt take notice of the reproach caſt upon him, that he was not ſo grateful to Des Cartes, as he ought to have been. And in ſpeaking to this, let us uſe the dialogue of a modern author (28): ‘ Mr Des Cartes interrupted me in this place, and aſked me, what was that experiment of Mr P . . . . I anſwered him, it was that which was made in 1648, upon a mountain called *Puy de Domme*, with the tube of Torricellius, wherein the quick-ſilver did not riſe near ſo high on the top of the mountain, as in the middle, or at the foot of it, from whence he clearly inferred the weight of the air. This is called, *replied Des Cartes*, the experiment of Mr P . . . . It is then becauſe he performed it, or cauſed it to be peformed by Mr Perier; for certainly, it is neither becauſe he invented it, nor becauſe he foreſaw the ſucceſs of it. And if that experiment ought to be called by the name of it's author, it may more juſtly be called † the experiment of Des Cartes; for it was I who deſired him two years before (29) to try it, and aſſured him of ſucceſs, as being altogether agreeable to my principles, otherwiſe he had never thought of it, being of a contrary opinion.’ Mr Baillet has confirmed this reproach to be juſt, for thus he informs us under the year 1647 (30). *Mr Des Cartes being very well pleaſed with the diſcourſe of Mr Paſcal, found that all theſe experiments were very agreeable to the principles of his Philoſophy, although Mr Paſcal ⸸ ſtill oppoſed them, as being of the ſame opinion with Mr Roberval and others, who maintained a Vacuum. But to reward him for his converſation, he adviſed him ‡ to try other experiments about the maſs of the air, to the weight whereof, as we have already remarked, he attributed all that the vulgar Philoſophers had vainly imputed to the horrour of a Vacuum ‡‡. He aſſured him of the ſucceſs of theſe experiments, although he had not made them himſelf, becauſe he ſpoke of them agreeably to his own principles. Mr Paſcal, who promiſed him then ſome objections againſt his* Materia ſubtilis, *would, perhaps, have had no great regard to his advice, if he had not been acquainted, about the ſame time, with a thought of Torricellius, which was perfectly like this. The experiments he made about the weight of * the air in* 1648, *upon theſe advices, proved very ſucceſsful. But he choſe rather to be obliged for it to Mr Torricellius, than to Mr Des Cartes, who was deprived of his acknowledgment either in his letter to Mr Ribeyre **, firſt preſident of the court of Aids of Clermont Ferrand, wherein he gives an account of his experiments, or in the Preface which one of his friends wrote to his poſthumous treatiſe of the* Æquilibrum of Fluids, *and of the weight of the air*. You ſee that he does not juſtify Mr Paſcal, with reſpect to Des Cartes, as he does with reſpect to Torricellius in theſe words (31). ‘ The report of his experiments being ſpread in Paris, they were confounded with thoſe of Italy; and in this confuſion, ſome attributed the whole to Mr Paſcal, and others nothing at all to him. To inform the public of this matter, in all it's circumſtances, and to do that juſtice which was due to all thoſe who had any ſhare in that invention, Mr Paſcal reſolved, the next year, to print an exact account of the experiments he had tried in Normandy; and he prefixed a preface, wherein he related thoſe of Italy made by an author, who as yet was unknown to him, and whoſe name he could not tell, and which was not known at Paris till ſome time after, that Cavalier del Pozzo wrote from Rome, that it was the famous Torricellius, who died about that time. This ſeeming ſuppreſſion of the name of a perſon, whom Mr Paſcal otherwiſe preferred to all the Geometricians of antiquity, gave occaſion to ſome to ſuſpect, that he intended to turn plagiary of Torricellius, and to belive, tho' falſly, that he had ſtole alſo from the famous Capuchin *Valerian Magni* (32.)’

Immediately after all theſe experiments, which confirmed Mr Paſcal in the opinion of the weight of the air, he (33) applied himſelf to more ſerious ſtudies, *which ſo diſguſted him with Mathematics and Phyſics, that he abſolutely forſook them. For altho' he wrote afterwards a tract intituled*, de la Roulette, *under the name of* Ettonville, *this is no wiſe contrary to what I now ſay, becauſe he found all that is contained in it by chance, and without any application; and he wrote it only to ſerve a deſign perfectly remote from the Mathematics, and from all curious ſciences, as will perhaps be proved ſome time after* (34).

[*G*] *The patience he ſhewed in his illneſs . . . . . is matter of aſtoniſhment.*] His ſiſter relates many particulars about it, I ſhall tranſcribe but one. ‘ To this ardent charity he joined, during his ſickneſs, an admirable patience, which edified, and ſurprized all perſons that were about him; and he ſaid to thoſe who declared they were troubled to ſee him in ſuch a condition, that, for his own part, he was no wiſe troubled, and that he was even afraid of recovering; and when they aſked the reaſon, he anſwered, becauſe I know the dangers of health, and the advantages of ſickneſs. He ſaid moreover, in the height of his pain, when ſome were grieved to ſee him endure it, be not concerned for me, ſickneſs is the natural ſtate of Chriſtians, becauſe they ſhould always be in a ſuffering condition, deprived of all good things, and of all the pleaſures of ſenſe, free from all the paſſions that diſquiet us during the whole courſe of our lives, without ambition and avarice, and in a continual expectation of death. Is it not thus that Chriſtians ought to paſs their lives? And is it not a happineſs, when they are by neceſſity in ſuch a condition in which they ought to be, and when they have nothing elſe to do but to ſubmit humbly and quietly? Wherefore I only deſire ye to pray to GOD, that he would grant me this grace. This was the temper with which he endured all his afflictions (35).’ The author of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, hath made ſome reflexions upon this, and upon the advantage that may be drawn from the extraordinary devotion of ſo excellent a Mathematician, and ſo great a Philoſopher. It ſerves, ſays he, to refute the Libertines, *they cannot now tell us, that none but ſhallow wits have any piety* (36). It cannot be denied, but it is rare to ſee great devotion in perſons who have once reliſhed mathematical ſtudies, and made an extraordinary progreſs in thoſe ſciences. I do not know but we may ſay, in this caſe, what the abbot Furetiere ſaid of Attornies: ‘ There are ſome ſaints who have been Advocates, Bailiffs, nay, even Comedians (37); in fine, there is no profeſſion, how mean ſoever it be, but there have been ſaints of it, except that of an Attorney (38).’ Some talk of a prieſt who adopted a maxim like that of Mr Paſcal, but it was with reference to another, and not to himſelf. I remember this queſtion is put in the *Serées*, or Evening Entertainments, of Bouchet, *Whether a prieſt did well in refuſing to pray for the health of a pariſhioner, who had ſent for him to come and pray to GOD that he would reſtore him to health? For the prieſt having aſked him at what time he found himſelf the better Chriſtian, whether in health or in ſickneſs, the ſick man anſwered, that it was when GOD viſited him. It would be better, therefore, replied the prieſt, that you ſhould continue ſick, that you may be the better man* (39). The action of this prieſt is none of the moſt difficult; but if he had deſired, during a great ſickneſs, that others ſhould pray to GOD that it might continue, he had done an extraordinary thing.

There were in the conduct of Mr Paſcal ſome other things, which are no leſs ſingular than his maxims about health. ‘ The converſations in which he was often engaged, although they were wholly about charity, yet they ſometimes made him afraid, leſt he ſhould fall into danger by them; but ſince he could not in conſcience refuſe the relief which ſome perſons

I

(*d*) Ibid. *pag* 12.

(28) A Voyage to the World of Des Cartes, *pag*. 188.

† Letter lxxvii, of Des Cartes, Tom. iii.

(29) Mr Des Cartes miſtakes one year; he deſired Mr Paſcal at Paris in 1647, to try that experiment, and the experiment was made in 1648. See Mr Baillet's Life of Mr Des Cartes, *Tom. ii*, *pag*. 330. I ſhall cite his words immediately.

(30) Baillet's Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. ii*, *pag*. 330.

⸸ Letter MS to Merſenne of the fourth of April 1648.

‡ Tom. iii, of Letters, pag. 443, and 438.

‡‡ Mr Auzout pretends to have given the ſame advice at the ſame time to Mr Paſcal.

* See the MS. Letter of Des Cartes to Merſ. of Decem. 13, 1647, of Febr. 7, 1648, of Jan. 31, 1648, and of April 4, 1648.

** Of July 12, 1651.

(31) Baillet, ibid. *pag*. 329.

(32) The ſequel of this paſſage, wherein we find the conviction of this Capuchin, may be ſeen above, remark [*B*] of the article MAGNI.

(33) Preface to the Æquilibrium of Fluids, towards the end. See alſo Madam Perier, ubi ſupra, *pag*. 12.

(34) See Madam Perier, ubi ſupra, *pag*. 24, 25.

(35) Madam Perier, ibid. *pag*. 44.

(36) News from the Republic of Letters, December 1684, in the catalogue of new books, num. 2.

(37) Mr Chappuzeau in his *French Theatre*, obſerves, that there is a martyr who was a Comedian, and that St Geneſt, whoſe feſtival the church celebrates, Auguſt 31, ended his days by a glorious tragedy.

(38) Furetieriana, pag. 144, of the Holl. Edit.

(39) Bouchet, Serée xxxiii, pag. 224, Lyons Edit. 1618, in 8vo.

leſs admire his temper towards thoſe who offended him, and towards thoſe who failed in the obedience which was due to the king. He was inſenſible to the faults of the former, and irreconcileable to the latter [*H*]. He died at Paris, Aug. 19, 1662, aged thirty-nine years and two months (*e*). He had been a long time about a work againſt the Atheiſts, and againſt all thoſe who do not admit the truths of the goſpel. He did not live long enough to digeſt the materials he had collected. What was found, concerning that ſubject, among his papers, was made public, and was admired. He ſet in

ſons demanded of him, he found out a remedy for this. He took, upon occaſion, an iron girdle full of points, and put it round about his naked fleſh, and when any vain thought came into his mind, or he took pleaſure in the place where he was, or any ſuch like thing happened, he gave himſelf ſome blows with his elbow, to redouble the violence of the prickings ; and ſo put himſelf in mind of his duty (40).' He had always in his thoughts *theſe two great maxims, of renouncing all pleaſure, and all ſuperfluity ; and he practiſed them in the worſt of his illneſs, with a continual watchfulneſs over his ſenſes, refuſing them abſolutely every thing that was agreeable to them : and when neceſſity conſtrained him to do ſomething which might give him any ſatisfaction, he had a wonderful art of diverting his mind from it, that it might have no ſhare in it. As for inſtance, his continual ſickneſs obliging him to feed delicately, he took great care not reliſh what he eat* (41). He had no violent affection for thoſe he loved (42), and adviſed others *not to ſuffer any body to love them in a very high degree ; that this was a fault which they did not enough conſider, becauſe the greatneſs of it was not ſufficiently apprehended, ſince by entertaining and cheriſhing ſuch an ardent affection, a man poſſeſſes a heart which belongs only to* GOD ; *and that this is to rob him of the thing which in the whole world is moſt dear to him* (43). He found fault with *ſome diſcourſes* of his ſiſter, which ſhe thought very innocent. *If I ſaid ſometimes*, (ſays ſhe (44), *upon occaſion, that I had ſeen a beautiful woman, he was angry, and would tell me, that I muſt not talk ſo before footmen, and young people, becauſe I did not know what thoughts I might excite in their minds thereby*. He had ſo much humility, that the curate of St Stephen du Mont, who ſaw him in all his laſt ſickneſs, very frequently ſaid, *He is a child, he is humble, he ſubmits like a little child* (45). By the ſame virtue *he allowed a perfect freedom of telling him of his faults, and yielded to the advices which were given him without reſiſtance* (46). Having embraced a kind of life, abſtracted from the world, at the age of thirty years, he governed himſelf by this maxim, *of renouncing all pleaſures and ſuperfluities, and this he practiſed during the remainder of his life. To ſucceed in this deſign, he began from that time, as he did ever after, to diſpenſe with the ſervice of his domeſtics, as much as he could. He made his bed himſelf, he went and took his dinner in the kitchen, and carried it to his chamber ; and after he had dined, he carried back the remainder. In fine, he made uſe of nobody, but only to dreſs his meat, to go into the city, and do ſuch other things as he could by no means do himſelf* (47). Laſtly, among ſeveral maxims of Mr Paſcal, which doubtleſs appear very ſtrange to worldly people, I muſt not omit one, which is very ſingular ; he did not approve of any man's uſing theſe phraſes, *I have ſaid, I have done*, &c. See the laſt remark.

[*H*] *He was irreconcileable to rebels.*] 'He had ſo great a zeal for the glory of God, that he could not endure it ſhould be violated in any thing whatſoever ; and this rendered him ſo zealous for the ſervice of the king, that he reſiſted every body at the time of the troubles in Paris, and has ever ſince called all the reaſons that were uſed to excuſe that rebellion, meer pretences : and he ſaid, that in a ſtate ſettled in the form of a Republic, ſuch as Venice was, it was a great ſin to place a king there, and oppreſs the liberty of the people, which God had given them : but that in a ſtate where the royal power is ſettled, the reverence due to it cannot be violated, without a kind of ſacrilege ; ſince it is not only an image of the power of God, but a participation of that ſame power, which could not be oppoſed without viſibly reſiſting the ordinance of God ; and therefore that he could not ſufficiently exaggerate the greatneſs of that fault ; beſides, that it is always accompanied with a civil war, which is the greateſt ſin that can be committed againſt charity to our neighbour. And he obſerved this maxim ſo ſincerely, that he refuſed at that time very conſiderable advantages, rather than he would depart from it. He was wont commonly to ſay, that he abhorred this ſin as much as to aſſaſſinate men, or to rob on the high-way. And laſtly, that there was nothing more contrary to his temper, and by which he was leſs tempted. Theſe were his ſentiments, as to the ſervice of the king, and he was irreconcileable to all thoſe who oppoſed them ; and that this did not proceed from his temper, or being wedded to his opinions, ſufficiently appeared from his admirable mildneſs towards thoſe who offended him in particular. So that he made no difference between them and others, and ſo entirely forgot what concerned only his own perſon, that it was difficult to make him remember it, unleſs they mentioned, for that end, the circumſtances of things (48). And when ſometimes he was admired for this, he would ſay, do not wonder at it, it is not any virtue in me, it is really my forgetfulneſs, I remember nothing of it. Nevertheleſs, it certainly appears from hence, that the offences which concerned only his own perſon, did not make any great impreſſion upon him, ſince he did ſo eaſily forget them ; for he had ſo excellent a memory, that he would often ſay, he never forgot any thing he had a mind to remember (49).' If this, and the other things I have related, be true, it muſt needs be granted that Mr Paſcal was a prodigy ; and if I might be ſo bold as to uſe the expreſſion, I would call him a paradoxical individuum of human kind. He more juſtly deſerves that we ſhould doubt whether he was born of a woman, than that great Philoſopher of Sicily, whom Lucretius has regaled with that commendation.

Nil tamen hoc habuiſſe viro præclarius in ſe,
Nec ſanctum magis, & mirum, charumque videtur.
Carmina quinetiam divini pectoris ejus
Vociferantur & exponunt præclara reperta ;
Ut vix humana videatur ſtirpe creatus (50).

- - - - *This iſle hath rarely ſhown*
A thing more glorious than this ſingle one.
His verſe compos'd of nature's works, declare
His wit was ſtrong, and his invention rare :
His judgment deep, and ſound, whence ſome began,
And juſtly too, to think him more than man.

Creech.

One thing may leſſen our admiration of the hatred he had for ſeditions, which is, that in his time a war was raiſed in the kingdom, the moſt unjuſt that ever was ſeen, and moſt prejudicial to the welfare of the monarchy. Upon the view of the terrible conſequences which that ſedition had, wherein the Pariſians were engaged, in 1648, to ſet ſome magiſtrates at liberty, there is no good man but will conceive an horror againſt inſurrections, and reaſon almoſt as Balzac did, and even with leſs reſpect for the prince of Condé, the fatal head of the revolt (51). *They begin here to take courage again*, ſays he (52), *after the ſiege of Coignac has been raiſed, and we are not now ſo apprehenſive for our province. But tho' peace were made to-morrow, this ſhort war would leave behind it a long remembrance of the miſchiefs it has done. If ſtates are thus to be reformed and governed, happy are the ſtates which are left in corruption and diſorder ! The hero of Monſieur d'Ablancourt was alſo mine ; but we equally deteſt the civil war, and will not pardon even Julius Cæſar, although we tranſlate his Commentaries.* Furthermore, the friends of Mr Paſcal glory much in being the followers of the doctrine which condemns rebellion. See what Mr Arnauld (53) has cited from the ſecond tome of the Moral Eſſays.

[*I*] *A thought*

(*e*) Taken from his Life written by Madam Perier, his ſiſter. That Life is prefixed to the Thoughts of Mr Paſcal, of the Amſterdam edition 1684.

(40) Madam Perier, ibid. pag. 22.

(41) Ib. *p.* 25.

(42) Ib. *p.* 34.

(43) Ib. *p.* 35.

(44) Ib. *p.* 32.

(45) Ib. *p.* 41.

(46) Ibid.

(47) Ib. *p.* 19.

(48) What Cicero, in his oration for Ligarius towards the cloſe, ſays to Cæſar, may be applied to him, thou art wont to forget nothing but injuries, *qui obliviſci nihil ſoles præter injurias.*

(49) Madam Perier, Life of Paſcal, *pag.* 36.

(50) Lucret. lib. I, ver. 730.

(51) That is, of the war to which the Barricades in 1648, gave occaſion by degrees.

(52) Balzac, Letter xxv, to Conrart, book ii, pag. m. 148, 149. The Letter is dated November 20, 1651.

(53) Arnauld, Apology for the Catholics, *Part i, ch. xi, pag.* 136.

in a good light a thought which Arnobius made uſe of [*I*]; which is, that thoſe who believe a GOD may be eternally happy, if they be in the right, and that they loſe nothing if they are miſtaken: but an Atheiſt gains nothing if he be in the right, and renders himſelf eternally miſerable if he be miſtaken. The provincial letters of Mr Paſcal have been, and are ſtill eſteemed a maſter-piece [*K*]. Some authors have erroneouſly

---

[*I*] *A thought which Arnobius made uſe of.*] That Father confeſſes to the Pagans, that the promiſes of JESUS CHRIST cannot be proved, becauſe they concern a future happineſs; but he adds, that of two uncertain things, it is better to chuſe that which gives us hopes, than that which gives us none. The force of this reaſon will be more clearly perceived in the original words. *Sed & ipſe* (CHRISTUS) *quæ pollicetur, non probat. Ita eſt. Nulla enim, ut dixi, futurorum poteſt exiſtere comprobatio. Cum ergo hæc ſit conditio futurorum, ut teneri & comprehendi nullius poſſint anticipationis attactu; nonne purior ratio eſt, ex duobus incertis, & in ambigua expectatione pendentibus, id potius credere, quod aliquas ſpes ferat, quam omnino quod nullas? In illo enim periculi nihil eſt, ſi quod dicitur imminere, caſſum fiat & vacuum: in hoc damnum eſt maximum, id eſt, ſalutis amiſſio, ſi cum tempus advenerit, aperiatur non fuiſſe mendacium* (54). Mr Paſcal unfolds this thought very well, and does ſucceſsfully make uſe of the proportions between a wager, and the hazard of loſs and gain, which make the wager prudent. See chap. 6 of his Thoughts (55). They were printed in 1669, confirmed with many approbations, which give an elogium of them. Eight years after there appeared a book (56), wherein this reaſoning of Mr Paſcal was improved and enforced. The author had been little affected with the cenſure of Mr Paſcal's deſign, made by the defender of Father Bouhours. That apologiſt concludes his cenſure with criticiſing upon this paſſage. ‘It is certain that GOD is, or is not, there is no medium, and there is an infinite diſtance between theſe two extreams. A man plays a game at this infinite diſtance, which ſhall happen croſs or pile; what wager will you lay? by reaſon, you cannot ſay that GOD is; by reaſon, you cannot deny it. Accuſe not therefore of a falſhood, thoſe who have made a choice; for you know not whether they are in the wrong, or whether they have made an ill choice. No, will you ſay; but I will blame them for making, not this choice, but a choice; and he who takes croſs, and he who takes pile are both to blame. Yes, will I reply, but a wager muſt be laid, this is not left to your option, and not to lay that GOD is, is to lay that he is not. Which ſide will you take? Let us weigh the gain and the loſs, by chuſing to believe that GOD is. If you win, you win all; if you loſe, you loſe nothing. If you ſay, that it is uncertain whether you ſhall win, and that it is certain that you hazard the pleaſures of this life, which you lay in the wager; and that the infinite diſtance which is between the certainty which you venture, and the uncertainty of what you might gain, equals the finite good, which you certainly venture, to the infinite good which is uncertain. This is not ſo, for every gameſter hazards with certainty, to gain with uncertainty, without offending againſt reaſon (57).’ Let us now ſee how he refutes this. *Be ſilent, Paſchaſius, I loſe all patience to hear you treat thus of the ſublimeſt of all ſubjects, and ground the moſt important truth in the world, and the principle of all truths, upon a notion ſo mean and childiſh, upon a compariſon of playing at croſs and pile, which is more fit to make a man laugh than to convince him, and upon an argument ſo defective, and grounded upon ſuch a foundation as is uncertain, and perhaps altogether falſe. I will not ſay that at firſt you laid down ſomething which a wiſe man would not do, neither can I tell with what conſcience you could ſay to a libertine, that by reaſon we cannot be aſſured that there is a* GOD. *I know many people who would be ſtrangely ſcandalized, to hear you uſe this horrible language, and who would not venture a wager upon the Theology of the director who ſuffers you to uſe ſuch ways of ſpeaking. Yet this were ſomething, if your moral reaſon were good; but, to the ſhame be it ſpoken, both of his Theology and your Morality, it concludes nothing, becauſe all it's force depends upon the truth of this propoſition, that every gameſter hazards with certainty to gain with uncertainty, and yet does not offend againſt reaſon. In truth, Paſchaſius, if the exiſtence of a Deity were as problematical as that propoſition, we ſhould be in a bad condition. All the fathers and huſbands, who will not have their children or wives to play, would be rank Atheiſts, and would maintain obſtinately, that it is very unreaſonable for a man to hazard the money that he has certain in his pocket, with which he can live free from miſery, to gain what is uncertain, and venture, as it often happens, to loſe both the one and the other. But I have heard ſome ſay, that you were a great enemy to looſe Caſuiſts; whence then comes it to paſs, that you do not only allow of gaming, but that you would make religion, and the being of a Deity, to depend upon the game of Croſs and Pile* (58)? This refutation is weak, and deſerves not to be examined; it may ſuffice to refer the reader to the chapter of Mr Paſcal, which I have cited, and to the writer, who made a fine paraphraſe upon it eight years after. I ſhall only make one obſervation, which will ſhew, that Father Bouhours's friend failed either in exactneſs or equity. He conſiders as a ſcandalous concluſion, contrary to wiſdom and conſcience, and deſerving the thundering rebuke of a good director, theſe words of Mr Paſcal, *by reaſon you cannot ſay that* GOD *exiſts.* He ſuppoſes that this is to own to a libertine, *that by reaſon it cannot be affirmed that there is a* GOD. This explication is very falſe; Mr Paſcal does not acknow- the truth of the propoſition, he deſigns only not to oppoſe it, and to take advantage of it in order to reclaim the Atheiſts. It is as clear as the day, that the words of Mr Paſcal, addreſſed to the libertine, are equivalent to theſe, *you maintain that by reaſon you cannot ſay that there is a* GOD.

[*K*] *The Provincial Letters . . . . have been and are ſtill eſteemed a maſter-piece.*] See the praiſes Mr Perrault has given this book (59): they engaged the beſt French pens which are among the Jeſuits, to refute theſe letters, in a book (60) which was ſuppreſſed in France, as ſoon as it appeared in 1694, and which the Bookſellers of Holland reprinted. Of all the books which have been publiſhed againſt the Jeſuits, there is none that has done them more harm, and vexed them more, than theſe Provincial Letters. They have been tranſlated into ſeveral languages. Mr Nicolle under the name of William Wendrock, a Divine of Saltzburg, turned them into Latin, and added to them ſome notes and diſſertations (61). Others have tranſlated them into Engliſh, Italian (62), and Spaniſh (63). I have ſeen an edition in octavo in four columns, which contains the French, with the Latin, Italian, and Spaniſh verſions, having two columns in one page, and two in another; ſo that by opening the book, all the four columns are to be ſeen at once.

I ſhall here give you ſome collections, which will diſcover what is thought of the New Anſwer of the Jeſuits to the Provincial Letters, the effects which it has produced, and divers things which belong to the hiſtory of theſe two books. ‘At the end of forty years there came out of the aſhes of ſo many apologies that had been confuted, a new apology for the extravagancies of the Caſuiſts; an apology ſo much the more dangerous, becauſe the author of it has dexterouſly concealed his end and deſign, and dreſſed it up with all the ornaments and artifices which his Rhetoric could furniſh, on purpoſe to blind and ſeduce the reader. We are well informed that it was printed contrary to the advice of the R. F. de la Chaiſe, contrary to the expreſs prohibition of the late archbiſhop of Paris, and againſt all the cuſtomary laws. It was diſperſed with great profuſeneſs, and an extream zeal. It was tranſlated into Latin by one of the beſt pens of the ſociety. It was rendered into Italian by another; and by theſe means the editions of it have been multiplied, ſo that the world is filled with them. The impreſſions which they have cauſed to be made in France, Holland, Flanders, and elſewhere, and the care they took to recommend it to, and to have it bought by men and women devoted to them, give juſt cauſe to apprehend, that this book has already done much miſchief, at a time when the remiſſneſs of diſcipline is already but too much in vogue, and too much ſupported. It was hoped that the holy ſee would

(54) Arnobius, Adverſus Gentes, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 44.

(55) *It is intituled,* That it is more advantageous to believe than not to believe what the Chriſtian religion teaches.

(56) *Intituled,* A Treatiſe of Religion againſt Atheiſts, Deiſts, and the new Pyrrhonians. *Printed at Paris by Lambert Roulland* 1677, *in 12mo.*

(57) Abbot of Villars's Treatiſe of Delicacy, *Dial. v, pag.* 115, 116, *of the Dutch edition.*

(58) Ibid. *pag.* 116.

(59) In the ſecond Tome of the parallel between the Ancients and Moderns.

(60) *Intituled,* An Anſwer to the Provincial Letters of L. de Montalte, *or,* The Dialogues between Cleander and Eudoxus. *See an abſtract of it in the* Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, *Nov.* 1694, *pag.* 113, *& ſeq.*

(61) See the article NICOLLE, remark [*B*].

(62) Coſimo Brunetti, a gentleman of Florence, is the author of the Italian verſion.

(63) Gratian Cordero de Burgos is the author of the Spaniſh verſion.

neouſly denied, that there were any decrees of condemnation againſt them [*L*]. It was given

not ſuffer a work ſo dangerous to be ſpread with impunity; but the multitude of great affairs which have for ſome years been upon the carpet at Rome, muſt have referred to another time, the examination of a book filled with ſo many facts and citations, that it would require much leiſure to enquire into the truth of them (64).' Thus ſpeaks the anonymous author (65), who has refuted *the anſwer to the provincial letters, or the dialogues of Cleander and Eudoxus*; thus, I ſay, he ſpeaks in his epiſtle dedicatory. Here is a paſſage out of his preface: ‘ The *dialogues of Cleander and Eudoxus*, whereof common fame makes F. Daniel the author, are, it ſeems, the laſt reſource of the ſociety. Almoſt half an age was required to produce ſuch a maſter-piece, and to form the workman: and as ſoon as it has appeared in the world, their joyful ſhouts which have been heard every where, do plainly diſcover that this was the prophet whom they expected, and that his work was the ſalvation of the ſociety. If they flattered themſelves with the hopes of drawing the public into the ſame ſentiments of eſteem, and to force it by the ſparkling eloquence of this new defence, to declare againſt Mr Paſcal; it is not my buſineſs to ſay, whether they have been miſtaken or not. Yet I am much miſtaken myſelf, if notwithſtanding this new effort, the Provincial Letters be not ſtill the delight of men of wit, and an original almoſt inimitable. As to Wendrock, the illuſtrious defender of them, his book will be to all ages a ſovereign antidote againſt the poiſon of a corrupt morality, a book wherein the moſt important principles of all Chriſtian morality are aſſerted and defended in the moſt ſolid and agreeable manner, and an apology for the Provincial Letters, which all the efforts of the ſociety will never be able to weaken.'

I think it may be ſaid, That altho' the work of Father Daniel were more ingenious and of ſtronger reaſoning than it is, it would not bring off the admirers of the Provincial Letters from their opinion. To this purpoſe read the words which a writer, who was critical enough, and naturally much inclined to the moſt biting cenſure, has inſerted in one of his collections. *Some time ago there came out*, ſays he (66), *an anſwer to the Provincial Letters, which ruins them entirely, and yet will do them no great hurt. But how can this be? The reaſon of it is, becauſe altho' this anſwer does plainly diſcover, the horrible injuſtice, the cruel calumnies, the injurious falſities which are boldly ſpread in all theſe letters, againſt one of the moſt famous ſocieties, that maintain the intereſts of the church; yet they have ſo long, by their pleaſant and comical turns of wit, engaged all the party of laughers (great and ſmall) on their ſide, that they are in poſſeſſion of an authority and credit that cannot eaſily be taken from them. In vain will the Jeſuits endeavour to do conſiderable ſervice to the church and the public. . . . Many people will not forbear to read the Provincial Letters with an eaſy credulity, and will not ſee the anſwer to them, nor ſo much as endure any to ſpeak of it. Indeed the prejudice upon this occaſion is a very unjuſt judgment, very cruel and obſtinate, ſince (altho' theſe letters have been condemned by Popes, Biſhops, and Doctors, and burnt by the hand of the hangman, according to the decrees of parliament and of the council of ſtate) it has taken ſuch poſſeſſion of mens minds, that it reſiſts all theſe powers.* It is certain that the zeal of the Anti-Moliniſts is revived, for the Provincial Letters, ſince the anſwer of Father Daniel. They have reprinted them with a new Appendix (67), in which they have uſed great application. Read what follows: ‘ You know that the late Mr Nicole, under the name of Wendrock, had publiſhed in Latin the Provincial Letters, with very large notes of his own. This book a little while ago was tranſlated into French, and it is pretended to be done by a lady of Paris; and it was printed at Lyons in three volumes in 12mo. The court being informed of it, the king ordered that the copies ſhould be ſeized; which order was executed with great noiſe, but without ſucceſs. They went to the houſes of the partners of the Sieur Aniſſon, who were ſuſpected of having printed this edition, but, as it is ſaid, they had timely enough notice of it, to lay out of the way all the copies, ſo that none of them were found. There are now ſome here (at Paris) that are ſold at nine livres, which is double of what they were ſold for before. There is an advertiſement prefixed to the firſt volume, wherein the author ſays, that he made this tranſlation, becauſe the dialogues of F. Daniel, which were publiſhed in 1694, againſt the Provincial Letters, attacked in French an author who had written in Latin; and becauſe it is fit that every body ſhould be able to judge of this controverſy. There is afterwards an hiſtory of the Provincial Letters, which is ſcarce any thing elſe, but the four Latin prefaces of Wendrock. At the end, we have an account of the intrigue, which was carried on at Bourdeaux, to procure the condemnation of the letters of Wendrock, by the parliament (68).'

[*L*] *Some authors have erroneouſly denied, that there were any decrees of condemnation againſt* the Provincial Letters.] A miniſter having ſaid, *That the cenſure of the morality of the Jeſuits, written by the gentlemen of Port-Royal, the Provincial Letters, and the other books which cenſured thoſe deteſtable morals, had been torn in pieces, and burnt by the hand of the hangman* (69); here follows the anſwer to him: ‘ But whether do you wander Mr Jurieu? For beſides that we do not know, that any cenſure of the morals of the Jeſuits, made by the writers of Port-Royal, was burnt, and that in general it is falſe, that the other books which cenſured theſe morals, and even the Provincial Letters, were burnt and torn by the hands of the common hangman; yet tho' all this were true, it would not have been done by the authority of the church, but by an authority purely ſecular; and conſequently you ought not to reproach the church with it (70).' The author who ſpeaks after this manner, calls himſelf the abbot Richard, and is a very good friend of the Janſeniſts. How then could he be ignorant of the fate of the Provincial Letters in a point ſo important? Why did he neglect ſo much the writings of the Jeſuits againſt that? Does it become him never to have caſt his eyes upon the decree of the parliament of Aix, which they printed at the end of their anſwers to the Provincial Letters? The tenor of the decree is as follows: ‘ The court having heard the report of the commiſſioners, who have ſeen and examined the ſaid letters, and having peruſed them, declares them to be defamatory, ſlanderous and pernicious to the public; and therefore ordains, that they ſhall be delivered into the hands of the executioner, to be by him burnt upon the pillory in the place called Preachers Fields in the city of Aix; and prohibits and forbids all Printers for the future to print this book, or any other of the like nature, and all Bookſellers and others of whatſoever condition or quality they be, to keep, ſell, or publiſh, them, upon pain of corporal puniſhment; and enjoins them to ſend the books without delay to the regiſtry that they may be ſuppreſſed, under the ſame penalty; and ordains that the tranſgreſſors ſhall be informed againſt by the judge-royal, or uſher of the court, to the end that the informations being made, they may proceed againſt the guilty, upon the declaration of the above-mentioned penalties. And to the end that none may pretend ignorance, the preſent decree ſhall be read and publiſhed with ſound of trumpet in all the places and croſs-ſtreets of the city of Aix. Done at the parliament of Provence ſitting at Aix, and publiſhed at the bar, Feb. 9th, 1657 (71).' The author of the hiſtory of the five propoſitions of Janſenius, informs us (72), *That among the works of the Port-Royal, two of the moſt conſiderable are thoſe which appeared in Latin, one under the name of Paul Irenæus, to juſtify Janſenius in denying the fact; the other under the name of Wendrokius, which contained a Latin tranſlation of the Provincial Letters, with notes or diſſertations of the ſame author, who is known to be Mr Nicole. Theſe two books being given by the king's order, to be examined by thirteen doctors of the Faculty of Paris, whereof four were biſhops, and the other for the moſt part profeſſors of Divinity, were condemned to the fire by a decree of the council of ſtate, made upon the judgment of theſe thirteen cenſors; the words whereof here follow:* ‘ We whoſe names are under-written, being deputed by the king's order, to give our judgment of a book intituled, *The Provincial Letters of Lewis de Montalte, &c.*

---

(64) Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Apology for the Provincial Letters, of Lewis de Montalte, pag. 8, of the Roan edition 1697.

(65) It is believed that it is Dom Petit Didier, a Benedictin of the congregation of St Vannes.

(66) Richelet, The Fineſt French Letters upon all Sorts of Subjects, *Tom. ii, pag.* 322, 323, *of the Amſterd. Edit.* 1698. He advertiſes, that he who wrote the Letter from which this paſſage is taken, is called Mr Bordellon.

(67) See the News from the Republic of Letters, *Aug.* 1699, *pag.* 202.

(68) News from the Republic of Letters, *Jan.* 1700, *pag.* 113.

(69) Jurieu, Prejugez, *Tom. i, pag.* 387.

(70) Critique des Prejugez de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 304.

(71) Anſwer to the Provincial Letters, *pag.* 517, 518, of the Liege edition 1658.

(72) Hiſt. of the five propoſitions, *livr. iii, pag.* 175, 176.

given out, that in the laſt days of his ſickneſs he deteſted that book, and that he repented of his having been a Janſeniſt (*f*); but this was found to be falſe [*M*], altho' it cannot be denied, there was ſome miſunderſtanding between him and the gentlemen of Port-Royal [*N*]. I had almoſt forgot to tell you, it was from him that the Janſeniſts learned

(*f*) See the remark [*M*] towards the end.

‘having diligently examined the ſame, do certify, that the hereſies of Janſenius, condemned by the church, are therein maintained and defended, not only in the letters, but alſo in the *notes of William Wendrock*, and in the *diſquiſitions of Paul Irenæus*, which are joined with them. . . . . Moreover we teſtify, that calumny and inſolence are ſo natural to theſe three authors, that . . . . and that this book therefore deſerves the penalties which the laws decree againſt defamatory and heretical libels. Done at Paris, September 7, 1660.’ Now let any one judge whether the cenſurer of the miniſter be excuſable, who denied a thing ſupported by ſuch facts.

[*M*] *It was given out . . . . . that he repented of his having been a Janſeniſt, but this is found to be falſe.*] Here follows a paſſage taken out of a letter of Father Bouhours, written to a Lord of the court in 1668. ‘Is any body ignorant now, that Mr Paſcal is the author of the Provincial Letters, and that he was engaged in the party when he wrote them? If any doubt of a truth ſo manifeſt as this, it will be eaſy to convince him of it by the teſtimony of Mr Paſcal himſelf, whom we know from good hands * to have abjured Janſeniſm at his death (73).’ The Janſeniſts maintained it to be falſe, that Mr Paſcal had made this abjuration. Read the following words of the anſwer which they made to the apology of the archbiſhop of Ambrun: they refer to a writing, wherein this fact was refuted by convincing proofs. ‘Neither is it neceſſary to overthrow particularly all that has been refuted elſewhere, by treatiſes written on purpoſe, as that which he imputes to Mr Paſcal upon a pretended atteſtation of the rector of St Stephen's pariſh, that he had abjured Janſeniſm, the falſity whereof appeared by convincing proofs, which are the ſubject of a letter printed after the refutation of the book of F. Anat about the mandate of the biſhop of Alet (74).’ F. Bouhours having inſerted his letter in a collection of tracts, which he publiſhed at Paris in 1684, expunged that part which concerns the abjuration, which ſhews that he acknowledged it was falſe. Nevertheleſs he aſſerted this fact verv poſitively in the firſt edition, and referred the reader to an authentic proof. Who would not have been catched by it?

* This is atteſted by a writing ſigned by the rector of St Stephen du Mont, who aſſiſted Mr Paſcal at his death. This writing is in the hands of the archbiſhop of Paris.

(73) A Letter to a Lord at Court, *pag.* 21, 22, *Paris Edit.* 1668, *in 4to.*

(74) Pieces concerning the New Teſtament of Mons, *Tom. i, pag.* 498, *of the Cologne Edit.* 1669, *in 8vo.*

The Jeſuite Cornelius Hazart, in the anſwer to the caſe of the relations of Janſenius, affirms, *That the Provincial Letters were retracted and deteſted by the author of them, when he was to give an account to his Saviour* (75). To whom this reply was made. ‘Here is another falſhood no leſs groſs, *viz.* that Mr Paſcal retracted and deteſted the Provincial Letters before he died. It concerns the Jeſuits, who have affirmed it in their theſes, and ſpread it in the world, to prove it. It is now above twenty years ſince it was made appear in a printed piece, which yet remains unanſwered, that what Mr Paſcal ſaid to his confeſſor in his laſt ſickneſs, of a little difference between him and his friends, was miſunderſtood by the confeſſor, as he owned afterwards; but it is certain, that this did no ways concern the Provincial Letters.’ Theſe words are Mr Arnauld's, and there is reaſon to believe that they are very true, ſince a writer, a friend of the Jeſuits, has obſerved (76), that Mr Paſcal, who had changed his opinion as to the principal matters in his Provincial Letters, and who *could not doubt but he was obliged to retract thoſe things publickly, to undeceive thoſe whom his letters had engaged, or might engage for the future in his former opinion . . . .* (77) *never attempted to inform the public of it, not even at his death, though he had full time and opportunity to do it.*

(75) See the 8th volume of Practical Morality, *pag.* 465.

(76) The abbot du Mas, Hiſt. of the five propoſitions, *pag.* 202.

(77) Id. ib. *pag.* 203.

[*N*] *There was ſome miſunderſtanding between him and the gentlemen of Port-Royal.*] It appears by the hiſtory of the five propoſitions, that this difference turned upon theſe two points, *viz.* the ſubſcribing the formulary, and the variations whereof he accuſed the Janſeniſts.

I. He had ſaid in the ſeventeenth and eighteenth of his letters, that there was no (78) *diſpute about the doctrine, but only about the fact*; and that he thought himſelf obliged to acquieſce in the deciſion of the Pope, *with reſpect to the doctrine.* ‘(79) But ſome time after he went over to the oppoſite extreme, which was to believe that the ſenſe of Janſenius, which he did not diſtinguiſh from the ſenſe of grace efficacious by itſelf, had been really condemned by the conſtitutions of the Popes; that it was nevertheleſs a matter of faith, which it was not lawful to abandon; and that therefore the Popes in condemning it were miſtaken, not as to the fact, but as to the doctrine itſelf. From whence Mr Paſcal concluded that it was impoſſible on that occaſion to ſeparate the fact from the doctrine; that the ſubſcribing of the patrons of Janſenius was deceitful, unleſs they proteſted expreſly, that they would not condemn that ſenſe; and laſtly, that they could not in conſcience do otherwiſe. This is what we learn partly from a piece of Mr Paſcal, and partly from the anſwers which the Divines of Port-Royal wrote againſt it. He wrote that piece upon the ſubſcribing of the formulary of the aſſembly (80) by the Nuns of Port-Royal. In ſigning of it they had ſaid, *We embrace ſincerely, and with all our heart, all the deciſions made by his Holineſs* (Alexander the VII.) *and Pope Innocent the X, concerning the faith, and reject all the errors, which they have adjudged contrary to it:* But they did not add expreſly, that they excepted the ſenſe of Janſenius; they thought they had ſufficiently excepted it, and had not deviated from it, becauſe they excuſed themſelves in their ſubſcribing from teſtifying any thing elſe but the *purity of their faith*; whereby they tacitly intimated, that they would ſay nothing concerning the fact of Janſenius. Nevertheleſs Mr Paſcal begun *not only freely to blame that ſubſcribing, but he alſo wrote a piece wherein he pretended to prove it was not ſincere.* Theſe are the words of the Divines of Port-Royal, in the † *letter of an Eccleſiaſtic to one of his friends, upon the ſubject of the declaration of the curate of St Stephen, &c.* This letter which is dated July 15th 1666, is at the end of a piece of the Port-Royal, intituled, *A refutation of the book of F. Annat, containing reflexions upon the mandate of the biſhop of Alet, &c.* And in another piece written the next year, intituled, *A Defence of the Faith of the Nuns of P. R. Part 2d*, they repeat more diſtinctly what they had ſaid in the letter.’

(78) Id. ib. *pag.* 195.

(79) Ib. *pag.* 196. See the thing otherwiſe turned in the Hiſt. of Janſeniſm, *Tom. ii, pag.* 515, *ad ann.* 1661.

(80) That is, of the aſſembly of the clergy of France.

† *Pag.* 80.

II. (81) *He had no leſs changed his thoughts concerning the fact of the Janſeniſts, than concerning that of Janſenius. For whereas in writing the Provincial Letters, he affirmed ſpeaking of them, that their doctrine about grace was never changed, and that they never had any different from that of the ſchool of St Thomas; he afterwards publickly accuſed them of uſing a language different from what they had uſed before. Thus they themſelves relate the matter in their* Letter of an Eccleſiaſtic to one of his friends, &c. ‘‡ Nay, he believed that it was not only upon occaſion of the ſubſcription of the Nuns of Port-Royal, that they had appeared inſincere; but that the ſame fault might be found in divers pieces, which were written after that affair, which has ſo long troubled the peace of the Church; that in their writings they regarded only what might ſerve the preſent intereſt, and that becauſe it changed at ſeveral times, their writings did not appear altogether conſiſtent one with another; and therefore he thought it had been convenient to review them all, and to reduce them to a perfect agreement of expreſſions. To excite the more powerfully the gentlemen of Port-Royal to do this, he wrote another piece, wherein he pretended to ſhow the advantage they gave their enemies by this diverſity, and that they might be convicted of having ſpoken more remiſly ſince the bulls than before.’ *The anſwer of the Janſeniſts was, that Mr Paſcal was miſtaken, when he fanſied a contrariety between their works before and after the bulls, becauſe there was not really any. And to point out the cauſe of his error, they affirm that* he himſelf did not conſult the proofs of what he aſſerted, but looked only into the Memoirs which ſome of his friends furniſhed him with,

(81) Hiſt. of the five propoſitions, *pag.* 203.

‡ *Pag.* 81.

learned to denote themſelves in French by *on* [O].

with, who did not examine exactly enough the paſſages * of which they compoſed them. *From whence it happened, add they*, that he could not avoid falling into a great number of miſtakes, and that there are in his piece ſome ſtories altogether fabulous, which ſerve ** for a foundation to thoſe pretended contrarieties he imputed to them; and ſome dialogues wherein people are made to ſay on both ſides ſuch things as were never ſpoken of. *That is to ſay, according to the confeſſion of the Janſeniſts, Mr Paſcal did then againſt them the ſame thing, which he had done in their favour in the Provincial Letters, if we may believe their adverſaries and his.*

* Ibid.

** *Pag.* 82.

All this in the hiſtory of the five propoſitions is accompanied with ſeveral remarks, which perhaps would puzzle an apologiſt for Mr Paſcal.

[O] *The Janſeniſts learned of him to denote themſelves in French by* on.] *He pretended, that an honeſt man ought to ſhun the naming of himſelf, and even to make uſe of the words* I *and* me, *and he was wont to ſay upon this occaſion, that Chriſtian piety annihilates the human* me, *and that human civility conceals and ſuppreſſes it* (82). *It is not*, adds the author of the Art of Thinking (83), *that this rule ſhould be improved to a ſcruple, for there are ſome occaſions wherein a man would needleſsly torment himſelf, if he would ſhun theſe words; but it is always good to have it in view, to keep one's ſelf from the ill cuſtom of ſome perſons, who ſpeak only of themſelves, and are always quoting themſelves, when the queſtion is not about their opinion.* From whence probably it came that the Janſeniſts of France did ſo much affect to make uſe of the particle *on*. One of their adverſaries pretended to know by that mark, that the book (84) of an anonymous writer which he refuted, was to be attributed to them. Thus he talks after he has given a ſtrong proof of the affection of that anonymous author for the gentlemen of Port-Royal (85). ‘But if this be not ſufficient, and if ‘one would have a plainer proof; all the world ‘knows their *on*; it is the manner wherein they cite ‘one another, no body made uſe of it before them, ‘and there is ſcarce any but they who make uſe of ‘it now. He does not only never cite them other‘wiſe, *comme on a dit dans la Grammaire raiſonneé* ‡‡; ‘*comme on l'a remarqué dans l'Art de penſer; on a* ‘*parlé de cela dans la Grammaire generale:* but he ‘ſpeaks of himſelf, only under this term, in his Pre‘face, *en revoyant cet Ouvrage on s'eſt cru obligé; on a* ‘*cru qu'il eſtoit plus à propos.* I have heard an excel‘lent man ſay, that this way of ſpeaking of one's ſelf ‘by this term *on*, was a kind of plural equivalent to ‘*nous* (*we*), which kings and other potentates make ‘uſe of (86). Our critic does in ſome ſort own it, ‘by ſaying that inſtead of *on* they formerly wrote ‘*homs* *, which is as much as to ſay *hommes, ſo that,* ‘adds he, *on dit, is the ſame thing with* hommes *or* ‘les hommes diſent, *men ſay.* Yet this illuſtrious per‘ſon did not believe, that theſe gentlemen, uſed this ‘way of ſpeaking out of vanity, but only out of ſin‘cerity, to denote that they did nothing wherein ſe‘veral had not a ſhare, and that therefore they could ‘not put to their books one particular name of an au‘thor, without acting againſt truth, ſince there is ‘none of them that is the work of one author only. ‘And if they ſhould name all thoſe that had a hand ‘in them, this would be liable to other inconvenien‘cies; both which are equally avoided by this my‘ſterious *on*; I ſhould never have believed, if this ‘able man had not ſaid ſo, that it includes ſo many ‘things.' See the margin (87).

(82) The Art of Thinking, *Part iii, ch. xix, num.* 6, *pag. m.* 350. See alſo the Thoughts of Mr Paſcal, *cap. xxix, num.* 27.

(83) Ibid.

(84) *It is intituled*, Reflexions upon the preſent uſage of the French tongue, or new and critical remarks upon the politeneſs of language. *At Paris* 1689, *in* 12*mo*.

(85) The abbot de St Real's Diſcours de la Critique, *cap. x, pag.* 223, *of the Lyons edition* 1691.

‡‡ *Pag.* 256, 318, 523.

(86) See Mr St Evremond's Miſcellanies, *Tom. iv, pag. m.* 136, where he ſcoffs at the abuſe of *on*, *Tom. iii, pag.* 75, *Edit. of Lond.* 1728.

* *Pag.* 342.

(87) The ſecond Tome of the Miſcellanies of Vigneul Marville, which juſt now came to my hands, contains this at pag. 200, of the Rotterdam edition 1701. Mr Paſcal ſaid of theſe authors, who, ſpeaking of their own works, ſay, *my book, my commentary, my hiſtory, &c.* that they are like thoſe citizens, who having a houſe of their own, have always in their mouths *my houſe:* they had better ſay, added that excellent man, *our book, our commentary, our hiſtory, &c.* ſince commonly there is more in it that is another's, than is their own.

PASCHALI (GIULIO CÆSARE) was one of thoſe Italians, who left their country in the XVIth century for the ſake of the Proteſtant religion. He was a good Poet in his mother-tongue, and publiſhed the Pſalms in Italian verſe at Geneva in the year 1592. He was then ſixty-five years of age (*a*). He added to it a collection of *Rime Spirituali*, and the firſt canto of an epic poem intituled *Univerſo*. This poem was finiſhed, and contained in xxxii canto's the whole Hiſtory of Moſes, from the creation of the world to the entry of the Iſraelites into the land of Canaan (*b*). I do not think he ought to be diſtinguiſhed from the *Giulio Cæſare P.* who cauſed to be printed at Geneva in 1557 in 4to his Italian verſion of Calvin's Inſtitution, and dedicated it to Galeas Carracciol Marquis del Vico. The epiſtle dedicatory is dated from Geneva the fourth of Auguſt 1558.

(*a*) See the Preface to his Pſalms, at the beginning.

(*b*) See the ſame Preface towards the end.

PASOR (MATTHIAS) profeſſor of Divinity at Groningen, born at Herborn in the county of Naſſau April the 12th 1599, was the ſon of GEORGE PASOR, who after he had taught Divinity and the Hebrew tongue for the ſpace of nineteen years at Herborn, was called to Franeker in the year 1626, to be profeſſor of the Greek tongue, and died there the tenth of December, 1637. Our Matthias had already made good progreſs at Herborn, when the peſtilence occaſioned him to be ſent to Marpurg in 1614. He paſſed his time there very diſagreeably; the profeſſors ſhunned him as an infectious wretch, and ſome ſcholars frequently inſulted him, and beat him, to revenge what his father, being rector at Herborn, had done in making them pay a fine, when they committed ſome diſorders (*a*). He was forced at laſt to leave the city, and returned the next year to Herborn, where he applied himſelf very much to ſtudy. He went to Heidelberg in 1616, and meeting there with all ſorts of good profeſſors, he improved himſelf exceedingly by them. He found alſo the means of leſſening the expence of his family, for he privately taught the Mathematics and Hebrew, and was received as tutor in the houſe of an honeſt man at Heidelberg. He made himſelf ſo well known by ſeveral academic acts, that he hoped to obtain a profeſſor's place which happened to be vacant; he hoped ſo, I ſay, altho' one of his antagoniſts had many more friends than he. By an extraordinary good fortune, his hope did not deceive him, and he was declared profeſſor of the Mathematics, April 23, 1620; but he was forced a little after to fly becauſe of the invaſion of the Palatinate. The ſtorm being a little over, he went to continue his function at Heidelberg, and endured in that unhappy city, all the inconveniences and dangers that could be imagined; and did not go out of it, till the troops of Tilly had ſacked it in the year 1622. After this he went to Herborn through a thouſand difficulties, and reſolved in the year 1624 to make

(*a*) Studioſi nonnulli memores mulctæ ſibi ob petulantiam Herbonæ a patre Rectore irrogatæ, me innocentem & minime ferocem ſed meticuloſum depoſitionis in Academiis Germanicis receptæ occaſione, verberibus & contumeliis variis affecerunt. *Matthias Paſor, in Vita ſua, pag. m.* 22.

make a journey into England. He read private lectures at Oxford, as well upon the Hebrew tongue as the Mathematics, and went to make a tour in France with ſome Germans. He paſſed the winter in Paris, and heard among other lectures, thoſe of Gabriel Sionita [*A*], profeſſor in Chaldee and Arabic. Being returned into England in the ſummer-time of the year 1625, he found the univerſity of Oxford ſtrangely diſperſed, by reaſon of the peſtilence. After the plague ceaſed, he found ſome ſcholars to teach, either Divinity, or the oriental languages; and he choſe rather to ſtay there, than to go into Ireland with the learned Uſher, who offered him his board, and an honourable penſion. The requeſt that he preſented to be made profeſſor of the oriental tongues was favourably heard. So that he commenced profeſſor of them, October 25, 1626, and diſcharged that office until the year 1629, when he was called to Groningen to be profeſſor of Philoſophy, which office he entered upon Auguſt the twenty-ſeventh of the ſame year. Six years after he was made profeſſor of the Mathematics, and in 1645, of Divinity, which was the reaſon he did not go to Harderwick, where he was offered the place of profeſſor in ordinary of Divinity and Hebrew. He received the degree of Doctor of Divinity at Groningen, October the twenty-firſt 1645, and laid down the profeſſorſhip of the Mathematics, but kept that of Moral Philoſophy. He made a journey into his own country of Naſſau in the year 1653, and went as far as Heidelberg, where he received a thouſand civilities from the elector Palatine (*b*). He lived to the twenty-eighth of January 1658. He was never married [*B*], and he lived without any reproach during his celibacy (*c*). He did not publiſh many books [*C*]; the two reaſons he gives for it are admirable [*D*], and ought to ſerve for a rule to many people, and eſpecially to myſelf.

(*b*) Taken from the Journal of his Life written by himſelf, and printed at Groningen, in 1658, in 4to.

(*c*) Ex Orat. Funebri.

[*A*] *He heard the lectures of Gabriel Sionita.*] This profeſſor had for ſome years left off his lectures, becauſe no body came to hear them; and he reſumed them at the deſire of our Paſor, but he did not read them in the royal college, but in his own houſe (1). Strange! that a great kingdom, and ſuch a city as Paris, ſhould not furniſh three auditors to a profeſſor, ſo famous in foreign countries, that Bangius (2), a learned Dane would not accept the place of Hebrew profeſſor at Copenhagen, unleſs time was granted him to go and perfect himſelf at Paris under this man. And here is a profeſſor at Heidelberg, who deſires to be a diſciple of the ſame man, while there were not two ſcholars at Paris that cared to hear him. Such is the temper of men, that they go a great way off to ſeek after the ſame things, which they would neglect, if they were at their own door.

(1) Ex Vita Mathiæ Paſoris, *pag.* 41.

(2) See his article.

[*B*] *He was never married.*] It is expreſsly obſerved in his funeral oration (3), that he lived not a bachelor by reaſon of any particular vow, or from any averſion to a ſuitable match; for, on the contrary, he was an apologiſt for it, and would praiſe it, although he was very ſorry, that a condition ſo uſeful and neceſſary, which was inſtituted in the very ſtate of innocency, ſhould become liable by ſin, to ſo many difficulties. The true reaſon therefore why he did not marry was this, that in his younger years he wanted to be free from domeſtic cares, after which followed a ſtate of perſecution and baniſhment, and then he found his health a little impaired; and laſtly he had conceived great hopes of George Paſor, his brother's ſon.

(3) Abdias Widmarius, miniſter of the holy Goſpel, and profeſſor of Divinity at Groningen, is the author of that funeral oration.

[*C*] *He did not publiſh many books.*] He carefully reviſed two or three of his father's books, which are of wonderful uſe to ſcholars and ſtudents in Divinity; I mean *Lexicon Novi Teſtamenti*, *Manuale Novi Teſtamenti*, and the Greek Grammar of the New Teſtament. His father wrote ſome other books, as the Funeral Oration of Piſcator, the Analyſis of the difficult words in Heſiod, *Collegium Heſiodeum*, &c. As to Matthias Paſor, I do not think that any thing of his was publiſhed but Theſes, or general ideas of ſome ſciences. It was very ill done to publiſh the Journal he had written of his life, which ſhould have been ſuppreſſed, or at leaſt many little trifles ſhould have been ſtruck out; for to inſtance in a few things, what neceſſity was there that the publick ſhould know, that the Tavern where the profeſſors of Heidelberg in a body treated Matthias Paſor, had ſwords for its ſign (4)? What neceſſity was there, to make it publickly known, that at Hanaw, in the beginning of a great feaſt, he was forced to leave the table becauſe he found himſelf indiſpoſed, and wanted to throw up a little bile (5). But I do not wonder that they publiſh ſuch Journals, when in the funeral orations upon profeſſors, we commonly meet with an exact deſcription of all the ſymptoms of their laſt ſickneſs; that on ſuch a day they did ſweat, on another they were coſtive, troubled with a looſneſs, *&c.*

(4) Partim univerſi in prandio honorario lauto, inſtituto ad ſignum enſium, *pag.* 54.

(5) In prandio lauto nihil ventriculo arridebat, imo ſub initium menſæ ſurgere coactus ſum & bilem evomui. *Ib. pag.* 55.

[*D*] *The two reaſons he gives for it are admirable.*] The firſt is, that he would not be the cauſe of taking off youth from reading the good books already publiſhed. The ſecond is, that he would not expoſe the Bookſellers to the hazard of loſing their money, who are often at great expence in printing books, which either ſell but ſlowly, or elſe for ever remain in their warehouſes. *Nolui*, ſays he (6), *nimis multa ſcribere*; 1. *Ne juventutem abſtraherem à lectione graviorum Authorum quos per Dei gratiam habemus.* 2. *Ne miſeris typographis imponeretur, qui ſæpe magnos ſumptus impendunt libris nunquam vel tardè admodum diſtrahendis.*

(6) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 58.

PATERCULUS (CAIUS (*a*) VELLEIUS)

a Latin Hiſtorian, in the reign of Tiberius. It is very probable he was born in the year of Rome 735 (*b*). His anceſtors were illuſtrious for their merit and their offices [*A*]. He was a military tribune when Caius Cæſar, a grandſon of Auguſtus, had an interview with the king of the Parthians

(*a*) *Others call him* Publius, *or* Marcus.

(*b*) *See the* Annales Velleiani *of Mr* Dodwell, *prefixed to the Oxford edition of* Paterculus, *in* 1693, *in* 8*vo.*

[*A*] *His anceſtors were illuſtrious for their merit and offices.*] See what he ſays of them, ſpeaking of the confederate war: 'Neque ego verecundia domeſtici ſanguinis gloriæ quidquam, dum verum refero, ſubtraham, quippe multum Minatii Magii, atavi mei, Aſculanenſis, tribuendum eſt memoriæ: qui nepos Decii Magii, Campanorum principis, celeberrimi & fideliſſimi viri, tantam, hoc bello Romanis fidem præſtitit, ut cum legione, quam ipſe in Hirpinis conſcripſerat, Herculaneum ſimul cum T. Didio caperet, Pompeios cum L. Sulla oppugnaret, Coſamque occuparet: cujus de virtutibus cum alii, tum maxime dilucideque Q. Hortenſius in Annalibus ſuis retulit: cujus pietati plenam populus R. gratiam retulit; ipſum viritim civitate donando, duos filios ejus creando prætores, cum ſeni adhuc crearentur (1). --- *I ought not, through modeſty, to rob my anceſtors of any glory, provided I ſay nothing but the truth. For much is due to the memory of Minatius Magius of Aſculum, my great-grand-father's grand-father. He was grand-ſon to Decius Magius, chief among the Campaneſe, and well known for his merit and fidelity. In this war he did ſignal ſervice to the Romans; for with a legion which he had raiſed in the country of the Hirpini, he took Herculaneum jointly with Titus Didius, beſieged the Pompeii with Lucius Sylla, and ſeized on Coſa. Q. Hortenſius, amongſt others, writes fully and clearly, in his Annals, about his good qualities. The people of Rome abundantly* 'recompenſed

(1) Paterculus, *lib. ii, cap. xvi.*

thians in an iſle of the Euphrates, in the year 753 (*c*). He commanded the cavalry in Germany, under Tiberius, and accompanied that prince nine years ſucceſſively, in all his expeditions (*d*). He received honourable rewards from him (*e*). We find that he was preferred to the prætorſhip [*B*], but not to higher dignities. The praiſes he beſtows upon Sejanus [*C*] give ſome probability to the conjecture, that he was looked upon as a friend of this favourite (*f*), and conſequently that he was involved in his ruin. He wrote

‘ *recompenſed his zeal, by giving him the freedom of the city, and by making his two ſons prætors, though at that time ſix only were created yearly.*’ Here is ſomething very ſingular concerning the degrees of generation: Paterculus, born in the year of Rome 735, reckons for his great-grand-father's grand-father Minatius Magius, who, at the head of a legion, which he had raiſed, beſieged and took ſome cities, about the year 664, and who was grand-ſon to Decius Magius, whoſe fidelity to the Romans was ſo famous at Capua, in the year 538. On one ſide here are five generations in the ſpace of ſeventy-one years; and on the other, there are but two in the ſpace of one hundred and twenty-ſix years. There ſeems to me to be more difficulty in the five generations than in the two; and perhaps we muſt conjecture, that *atavus* was inſerted by the tranſcribers inſtead of *avus*; or, that *atavus* was not regularly taken, upon all occaſions, for the great-grand-father's grand-father. Mr Dodwell underſtood the great-grand-father by *atavus* (2). If the conjecture of which I ſpeak, were true, we muſt ſay, that Paterculus was not deſcended from Decius Magius but by the mother's ſide, for there is no doubt but Caius Vellejus, mentioned in chap. LXXVI of the ſecond book, was his grand-father by his father's ſide, and different from Minatius Magius. I ſhall ſet down this paſſage, to ſhew all that is to be known of his anceſtors. ‘Quod alieno teſtimonium redderem, in eo non fraudabo avum meum: quippe C. Velleius, honoratiſſimo inter illos 360 Judices loco, à Cn. Pompeio lectus, ejuſdem, Marcique Bruti ac Tironis præfectus fabrûm, vir nulli ſecundus, in Campania, digreſſu Neronis à Neapoli, cujus ob ſingularem cum eo amicitiam partium adjutor fuerat, gravis jam ætate & corpore, cum comes eſſe non poſſet, gladio ſe ipſe transfixit (3). - - - - *I will not defraud my grand-father of a teſtimony, which I would give even to a ſtranger. For C. Velleius, a man inferior to none, was choſen by Cn. Pompeius into the moſt honourable place, amongſt thoſe 360 judges, and appointed ſuper-intendant of the works in Campania to the ſame Pompeius, Marcus Brutus and Tiro. When Nero retired from Naples, whoſe party he had ſupported, becauſe of the particular friendſhip between them, being very old, and infirm, and not able to accompany him, he diſpatched himſelf wich a ſword.*’ Here a ſmall ſcruple ariſes. Paterculus had a brother who was called Magius Celer; it is therefore very probable, that by the father's ſide they deſcended from Decius Magius. The editions give the ſirname of Velleianus to this Magius Celer; but it is pretended, that this epithet is only the invention of the critics, and that it is not found in the manuſcript copy (4). Mr Dodwell obſerves (5), that if it were true that Magius Celer had the ſirname of Velleianus, this would be a plain proof that by adoption it paſſed from the family Velleia into that of the Magius's. In this caſe it might be ſaid, that he had been adopted by a kinſman on the mother's ſide, deſcended from Decius Magius, from father to ſon. The learned man, whom I juſt now cited, would not admit this hypotheſis, for he pretends that our Paterculus belonged, on the father's ſide, to the family Magia, and that he bore the name of Valleius, only by virtue of ſome adoption (6). But note, that his grand-father was called Velleius. This Hiſtorian had an uncle on the father's ſide who was called Capito; he was a ſenator, and joined with Agrippa in accuſing Caſſius, the murderer of Cæſar. (7) Let us now ſpeak of his brother: ‘Cæſar ad alteram Belli Dalmatici molem animum atque arma contulit, in qua regione quali adjutore legatoque fratre meo, Magio Celere Velleiano uſus ſit, ipſius patriſque ejus prædicatione teſtatum eſt, & ampliſſimorum honorum, quibus triumphans eum Cæſar donavit, ſignat memoria (8). - - - - - *Cæſar applied his cares and arms to the other war in Dalmatia, where I need not tell what aſſiſtance he received from my brother Magius Celer Velleianus, who was his lieutenant-general. The account he himſelf and his father gave of it, and the great favours which Cæſar at his triumph beſtowed upon him, ſufficiently ſhew it.*’ He was prætor, as may be ſeen in the beginning of the next remark. I ſhall ſay ſomething hereafter of their father (9).

[*B*] *He was preferred to the prætorſhip.*] This was in the year wherein Auguſtus died: he informs us of this himſelf, and with ſuch a turn of expreſſion, as ſhows the ſubtilty of his wit. ‘Quo tempore mihi fratrique meo, canditatis Cæſaris, proxime a nobiliſſimis ac ſacerdotibus viris, deſtinari prætoribus contigit: conſecutis, ut neque poſt nos quemquam D. Auguſtus, neque ante nos Cæſar commendaret Tiberius (10). - - - - *At which time my brother and I being preſented by Cæſar, where nominated prætors, immediately after the moſt noble, and thoſe who were honoured with the prieſthood. And we had this advantage, that neither the divine Auguſtus recommended any after us, nor Tiberius Cæſar before us.*’ We will here ſet down ſome other paſſages, which declare the progreſs of his fortune: ‘Habuit in hoc quoque bello, *ſays he* (11), *ſpeaking of the war againſt the Dalmatians and Pannonians in the year* 759, ‘mediocritas noſtra ſpecioſi miniſtri locum. Finita equeſtri militia, deſignatus quæſtor, nec dum ſenator æquatus ſenatoribus, etiam deſignatus tribunus plebis partem exercitus ab Urbe, traditi ab Auguſto, perduxi ad filium ejus: in quæſtura deinde, remiſſa ſorte provinciæ, legatus ejuſdem ad eundem miſſus. - - - *In this war likewiſe, as mean as I am, I had an honourable poſt, and did ſome ſervice. When the time of my ſervice in the cavalry was ended, I was nominated quæſtor, and tho' not a ſenator, yet being equalled to thoſe of that order, I was alſo appointed tribune of the people, and in the mean time lead a part of of the army, delivered to me by Auguſtus, from the city to his ſon: and afterwards coming out of my quæſtorſhip, I gave up my chance of a province, and was ſent to him to be his lieutenant-general.*’ He ſays elſewhere (12), ‘Hoc tempus me functum ante tribunatu caſtrorum, Ti. Cæſaris militem fecit: quippe protinus ab adoptione miſſus cum eo præfectus equitum in Germaniam, ſucceſſor officii patris mei, cœleſtiſſimorum ejus operum per annos continuos IX præfectus aut legatus, ſpectator & pro captu mediocritatis meæ adjutor fui. - - - - *At this time I ſerved under Ti. Cæſar, having before been a camp-marſhal. For immediately after his adoption I was ſent with him into Germany as colonel of horſe, which poſt my father had before me, and in this quality of colonel, or lieutenant-general, I was a ſpectator, and, according to my poor ability, an aſſiſtant of his moſt divine actions for nine years together.*’ I have already ſaid (13), that he appeared at the triumph of Tiberius with ſplendid marks of honour. Hankius places this triumph in the year of Rome 744 (14), he anticipates it twenty years or more, and he was ignorant that Paterculus made his firſt campaigne in the year 753. How then could he appear at a triumph in 744, with marks of honour, which he deſerved but by his conſtant attendance in the ſervice of Tiberius, after his firſt feats of arms (15)?

[*C*] *The praiſes he beſtows upon Sejanus.*] See chap. 127, and 128, of his ſecond book: I ſhall extract but one thing out of it: he ſhows, by great examples, that a prince may ſhare the cares of the government with a miniſter. ‘Raro eminentes viri non magnis adjutoribus ad gubernandam fortunam ſuam uſi ſunt; ut duo Scipiones duobus Læliis, quos per omnia æquaverunt ſibi; ut D. Auguſtus M. Agrippa, & maxime ab eo, Statilio Tauro: quibus novitas familiæ haud obſtitit, quo minus ad multiplices conſulatus triumphoſque, & complura eniterentur ſacerdotia; etenim magna negotia magnis adjutoribus egent (16). *Illuſtrious perſons frequently make uſe of men of merit to aſſiſt them in managing their affairs: as the two Scipio's did the two Lælius's, whom they made equal to themſelves in every thing: as the divine Auguſtus did M. Agrippa, and chiefly after him, Statilius Taurus: and tho' their family was but newly raiſed, this was no obſtacle to their being advanced to ſeveral conſulſhips*

and

(*c*) Vell. Paterculus, *lib. ii, cap. ci.*

(*d*) See the remark [*B*].

(*e*) See the ſame remark.

(*f*) Dodwell, ubi ſupra, *num.* 30.

(2) Avos ſimiliter *Vellei* fuiſſe neceſſe erat *Minatii Magii filios* ſiquidem *atavus* ipſe fuerat Minatius. *Dodwellus Ann. Velleian. num.* 7.

(3) Vell. Paterculus, *lib. ii, cap. lxxvi.*

(4) Dodwell, ubi ſupra.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Eritque adeo *gentile* auctoris noſtri nomen *Magius Velleius adſcititium* ex *adoptione* in familiam *Velleiam. Id. ib.*

(7) Quo tempore Capito patruus meus vir ordinis Senatorii Agrippæ ſubſcripſit in C. Caſſium. *Vell. Patercul. lib. ii, cap. lxix.*

(8) *Id. ib. cap. cxv. Add to this what he ſays, cap. cxxi,* Quem (*Tiberium in triumpho*) mihi fratrique meo, inter præcipuos præcipuiſque donis adornatos viros, comitari contigit.

(9) In the laſt remark, *num.* 3.

(10) Id. ib. *cap. cxxiv.*

(11) Id. ib. *cap. cxi.*

(12) Id. ib. *cap. civ*, this relates to the year 757 of Rome.

(13) In the remark [*A*], citation (8).

(14) Hankius, de Scriptor. Rerum Roman. *Tom. i, pag.* 70.

(15) See Paterculus, *lib. ii, cap. ci, civ, cxxi.*

(16) Ib. *cxxvii.*

wrote an abridgement of the Roman Hiſtory, which is very curious [*D*], and he promiſed a larger Hiſtory (*g*). The praiſes he beſtows upon the emperor Tiberius are exceſſive, and he underſtood ſo well the art of flattering this emperor, that it is thought he did not forget to ſpeak ill of Germanicus [*E*]. It is not true, that an Annaliſt of Rome was named Cneius Velleius [*F*], as Glandorpius imagines. I ſhall take notice of ſome faults of Mr Moreri [*G*].

' *and prieſthoods; for great affairs require the aſſiſtance of great perſons.*' This paſſage, and ſome others ſuch like, afforded a fine embelliſhing to the panegyriſts of cardinal de Richelieu and cardinal Mazarin. They ſung to another tune, and had different maxims after the death of the latter, as I have elſewhere obſerved (17). Here we ſhall ſet down a thought of la Mothe le Vayer: *He is blamed,* ſays he (18), *and that with great reaſon . . . . for having given ridiculous elogiums, not only to Tiberius, but alſo to his favourite Sejanus, whoſe merit he twice repreſents, as one of the principal and moſt virtuous perſons that ever were in the Roman Republic. What did he do in this, but what probably happens to all thoſe who will take pen in hand to write the hiſtory of their own time, and will publiſh it while the perſons are yet alive?* This reflexion is juſt; for it is ſcarce poſſible to be ſincere, when we ſpeak of princes that are living, or of thoſe whoſe ſons do ſtill reign.

[*D*] *He wrote an abridgment of the Roman Hiſtory, which is very curious.*] The beginning of it is loſt, which was a general ſketch of antient times. La Mothe le Vayer was not miſtaken in what I ſhall now ſubjoin (19): 'The remembrance of the countries he had ſeen, while he was military tribune, and travelling through the provinces of Thrace, Macedonia, Achaia, Aſia the leſs, and other more eaſtern countries; and eſpecially on both ſides of the Pontus Euxinus, furniſhed him with very agreeable diverſions. From hence we may judge, that if he had written that entire and large hiſtory he promiſed ſo often, we ſhould have read an infinite number of very conſiderable things, as related by him who had been an eye-witneſs of them, and aſſiſted in performing them. In that little which ſtill remains of this, wherein there is nothing repreſented but by way of abridgment, there are many particulars obſerved, which are ſo much the more valuable, becauſe it is the only place where they are to be learned, either through the ſilence of other Hiſtorians, or through the common miſfortune of loſing ſome part of their works. The ſtile of Velleius Paterculus is very worthy of the age he wrote in, which ſtill was the age of fine language: he excels chiefly when he blames, or commends thoſe he ſpeaks of, which he does in ſuch fine terms, and ſuch delicate expreſſions, as are not to be found in any other Hiſtorian or Orator (20) . . . . We have nothing more pure in any Latin author, nor more worthy of Tiberius or Auguſtus's times.' Is it not ſtrange, that a work ſo worthy to be carefully preſerved, and of which, copies might be eaſily made, by reaſon of it's brevity, ſhould be like to be loſt? It is pretended, that the manuſcript of Morbac, from which Rhenanus publiſhed the firſt edition of this author (21), was the only one that was in the world (22). Beſides, it is obſerved, that no antient author but Priſcian, makes mention of Paterculus (23). The Moderns have done him infinitely more juſtice; for they have publiſhed him with notes or commentaries. The French have tranſlated him into their language, which Mr Doujat took the pains to do for the uſe of the Dauphin in 1679; and to make his work a continued hiſtory, he ſupplied what was wanting in Paterculus: I ſay nothing in particular of the edition of Lipſius at Leyden, in 1591, in 8vo; nor of that of Sckegkius at Frankfort, 1602, in 12mo; nor of that of Gerard Voſſius at Leyden, in 1639, in 12mo; nor of that of Boëclerus at Straſburg, 1642, in 8vo; nor of the edition *Variorum* at Leyden, 1653, in 8vo; nor of ſeveral others. I ſhall only add, that the *Annales Velleiani* of Mr Dodwell, prefixed to the Oxford edition 1693, are a piece of learning which diſcovers a very great knowledge of antiquity.

Note, that Paterculus wrote this book in the ſeven hundred eighty-ſecond year of Rome (24), in the ſixteenth year of the empire of Tiberius (25).

[*E*] *It is thought he did not forget to ſpeak ill of Germanicus.*] A learned critic does not agree to this; for he maintains that this paſſage, *Quo quidem tempore ut pleraque ignave Germanicus,* is not correct, and that inſtead of *ignave* we ſhould read *gnave* (26). He founds his opinion upon ſuch reaſons as appear to me ſolid (27), for, in ſhort, it is very true, that Paterculus, in other places, has praiſed Germanicus (28). However, his unjuſt ſparing the paſſions of Tiberius, do plainly appear, by the care he takes to paſs over ſlightly the illuſtrious actions of Germanicus, and even to ſuppreſs the greateſt part of them, and to ſully the reputation of Agrippina, and other perſons whom the emperor did not love. See how Juſtus Lipſius has cenſured him. 'Ex antiquis bilem mihi etiam movet Velleius Paterculus. Ælium Sejanum omnibus virtutibus accumulat, & quaſi in theatro plena manu dilaudat. Os hiſtorici! at nos eum ſcimus natum & exſtinctum exitio generis humani. Liviam Auguſtam, poſt multas laudes, diis quam hominibus ſimiliorem fœminam concludit. Jam de Tiberio, flagitium ſit ſi uſquam aliter quàm ut de Jovo immortali loquatur. Hæc liber & ingenuus animus qui ferat? Contrà ut Germanici Cæſaris virtutes ubique callidè diſſimulat? Ut Agrippinam, & quibus aliis infenſior Tiberius credebatur, obliquè premit? Quid multa? Non aliquid quàm mancipium aulæ agit. Dices, intuta illis temporibus veritas fuit. Fateor. Sed vera ſcribere ſi non licuit, falſo non debuit. Nemo ſilentii cauſam reddit (29). - - - - *Among the antients, Velleius Paterculus likewiſe raiſes my indignation. He repreſents Ælius Sejanus as endowed with all good qualities, and applauds him as upon a theatre. The impudence of this Hiſtorian! However, we know he was born, and died to the deſtruction of mankind. After many commendations, he concludes, that Livia Auguſta was a woman that reſembled the gods more than man. And then as to Tiberius, he thinks it a crime to ſpeak of him otherwiſe than of an immortal Jove. What ſincere or honeſt mind can bear this? On the other hand, how cunningly does he conceal every where the excellent qualities of Cæſar Germanicus? How ſlily does he ruin the reputation of Agrippina, and others whom Tiberius was thought to hate? In ſhort, he is nothing but a court-proſtitute. You will ſay, perhaps, it was unſafe to ſpeak the truth in thoſe times; I own it. But if he durſt not write the truth, he ought not to have wrote lies. None is called to an account for ſilence.*'

[*F*] *It is not true, that an annaliſt of Rome was named Cneius Velleius.*] Glandorpius's words are theſe: *Cneius Velleius, hiſtoricus cujus Annales citantur apud Gellium lib. 18. cap. 12. quo tempore in repub. vixerit, non comperi* (30). In this place of Aulus Gellus, of Henry Stephens's edition, it is *Cn. Vellius in Annalibus*. Here then is a fault in Glandorpius, that he puts Velleius inſtead of Vellius. And another is this, that he ſhould have read in Aulus Gellius, Gellius and not Vellius, for without doubt he cites the ſame author here, which he had cited in chap. 13, of the eighth book, and in chap. 21, of the thirteenth book, under the name of *Cn. Gellius.* Voſſius (31) pretends that Glandorpius conjectured, that inſtead of *Cn. Vellius,* we muſt read *Cn. Gellius,* in the twelfth chapter of the eighteenth book of Aulus Gellius; but the words of Glandorpius, which we have juſt now cited, do plainly ſhow, that this is falſe. If Voſſius had ſaid, that according to the conjecture of Glandorpius, the annaliſt, Gellius, differs not from Cn. Gellius, againſt whom, Cato the cenſor pleaded (32), he had been very much in the right; for Glandorpius expreſſes himſelf thus (33). *Fors idem eſt annalium ſcriptor cujus librum* 3. *citat Gellius* 13. *capite* 21 & 15 (34). There is nothing there, that relates to the paſſage, where the edition of Henry Stephens has *Cn. Vellius.*

[*G*] *I ſhall take notice of ſome faults of Mr Moreri.*] I. The Moderns, ſays he, want to know whether his firſt name was Caius, Marcus, or Publius. This phraſe is not good, and inclines one to believe, that Paterculus was firſt known by one of theſe names, and that afterwards he quitted it to aſſume another. This cuſtom is very common among the Moderns: one of the French warriours, of the XVIIth century, was known by the name of the count de Bouteville, and after that, by that of the duke of Luxemburg. We ought

(*g*) Paterculus, *lib. ii, cap. xlviii, ciii,* & *paſſim alibi.*

(17) See the New Letters of the General Criticiſm on Maimbourg, *pag.* 81, &c.

(18) La Mothe le Vayer, ubi infra, *pag.* 194.

(19) La Mothe le Vayer, in the Treatiſe of Hiſtorians, *pag.* 193, 194, of the third Tome of the edition in 12mo. What he ſays of the Travels of Paterculus is in chap. 101, of the ſecond book.

(20) Id. ib. *pag.* 197.

(21) At Baſil in 1520.

(22) See the preface of Paterculus, printed at Oxford in 1693.

(23) Dodwell, ubi ſupra, *num.* 30.

(24) Paterculus, *lib. i, cap. viii.*

(25) Ibid. *lib. ii, cap. cxxvi.*

(26) Ibid. *cap. cxxv.*

(27) See the Notes of Boëclerus upon this paſſage of Paterculus.

(28) Paterculus, *lib. ii, cap. cxvi, cxxix.*

(29) Juſtus Lipſius, *lib v,* Epiſtol. Quæſt. Epiſt. XI, *pag. m.* 599, *Tom i.*

(30) Gland. Onomaſt. *pag.* 887.

(31) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *lib. i, cap. viii, pag.* 34.

(32) Aulus Gellius, *lib. xiv, cap. ii.*

(33) Gland. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 380.

(34) It is not known what Glandorpius meant by this 15; but whether he underſtood it of the book or the chapter he is miſtaken.

ought not to entertain any ſuch thought of our Hiſtorian, either with reſpect to the name of Caius or Publius, *&c.* for this kind of names was always kept. In a word, Mr Moreri ſhould have ſaid, the *prænomen*, or the *proper name*, and not the *firſt name*. II. He ſhould not have affirmed, that Paterculus *was originally of Naples*; where is this to be found? Paterculus ſays, that his *atavus* was of Aſculum (35), and that the grand-father of this *atavus* was chief among the Campaneſe, *Campanorum principis* (36). Elſewhere (37) he affirms, that his grand-father ſaw nothing above himſelf in Campania. Here is nothing particularly about the city of Naples; and I wonder that Mr Dodwell ſhould pretend that this city was the native place of the grand-father of Paterculus (38), for this cannot be concluded from this good old man's killing himſelf, becauſe he was not able to accompany Tiberius when he retired from Naples. Mr Doujat is fallen into theſe two faults of Mr Moreri (39), probably as being his tranſcriber; from whence we may gather, that the author of a Dictionary has ſometimes the honour to be conſulted and tranſcribed by perſons who know more than himſelf. So little do men love to gather together materials, when they can find heaps of them ready at hand. III. It is very true that Paterculus was ſucceſſor to his father in the command of the cavalry (40); but this was not before he had been *military Tribune*: he had already been tribune of the camp (41), which was an office above that of meer tribune of ſoldiers. IV. He had not his father for a colleague in any office. V. *Magius Celer Velleianus* was his brother, and not his father. VI. We find no where that he was *lieutenant-general to Tiberius in the armies of Germany and Hungary*, but in Dalmatia (42). And then his brother, who was abſent (43), could not be his colleague.

ſaid only, that his brother had the advantage of being

(35) Paterculus, *lib. ii, cap. xvi.*

(36) Ibid.

(37) Id. ib. *cap. lxxvi.* See, above, the remark [*A*], citation (1).

(38) Dodw. in Synopſi Chronolog. ad calcem Annal. Velleian.

(39) Doujat, Preface to the tranſlation of Paterculus.

(40) Miſſus cum eo (*Tiberio*) Præfectus equitum in Germaniam ſucceſſor officii patris mei. *Patercul. lib. ii, cap. civ.*

(41) Functum ante tribunatu caſtrorum. *Id.*

(42) Id. *c. cxv.*

(43) If he had been preſent would he have with Tiberius?

PATIN (Guy) profeſſor of Phyſic, in the royal college of Paris, was a man of much wit and learning. See his elogium prefixed to his Letters, which are ſo well known to all the world, that this will excuſe me from ſpeaking of his merit. It is enough for me to ſay here, that you may be informed about it in the preface I have mentioned. it would be too great a nicety, to object that the author of this elogium, has not given us the Hiſtory of Guy Patin. This is the common way of panegyriſts, they ſeldom trouble themſelves to inform us, whence a man is, nor how he raiſed himſelf; neither do they ſay any thing of his actions, unleſs they eminently relate to the virtues for which they commend him. It is therefore neceſſary I ſhould ſay, that our Patin was born at Houdan in Bray, three leagues from Beauvais (*a*) in 1602 (*b*). He does not boaſt of his being of a good family, but ſpeaks of it much after the ſame manner as Horace does of his [*A*]. Doubtleſs he was one that made his own fortune, and I know,

(*a*) Patin, Letter ccxciii, pag. 561, of Tom. iii, of the Geneva Edit. 1691.

(*b*) According to his Elogium he died ſeventy years old, in 1672.

[*A*] *He ſpeaks of his family much after the ſame manner as Horace does of his* (§ *a*).] 'I was the ſon of 'good honeſt people, *ſays he* (1), whom I would not 'have exchanged for thoſe that are more rich. I 'have here their pictures before my eyes, I call to 'mind every day their virtue, and am very glad 'that I ſaw the innocence of their lives, which was 'admirable. No ſuch thing is to be ſeen in cities, 'and particularly at Paris. I ſee nothing there but 'vanity, impoſture, and fraud. God has reſerved 'us for a knaviſh and dangerous age.' And now let us ſee what Horace ſaid of his father:

- - - - - Purus & inſons
(Ut me collaudem) ſi vivo, & charus amicis,
Cauſa fuit pater his, qui macro pauper agello,
Noluit in Flavî ludum me mittere magni,
. . . .

Nec timuit, ſibi ne vitio quis verteret, olim
Si præco parvas, aut (ut fuit ipſe) coactor
Mercedes ſequerer: neque ego eſſem queſtus. Ob hoc nunc
Laus illi debetur, & à me gratia major.
Nil me pœniteat ſanum patris hujus: eóque
Non, ut magna dolo factum negat eſſe ſuo pars,
Quòd non ingenuos habeat claroſque parentes,
Sic me defendam: longè mea diſcrepat iſtis
Et vox & ratio. Nam ſi natura juberet
A certis annis ævum remeare peractum,
Atque alios legere ad faſtum, quoſcunque parentes
Optaret ſibi quiſque: meis contentus, honeſtos
Faſcibus & ſellis nolim mihi ſumere: demens
Judicio vulgi (2).

If innocent my life, if (to commend
Myſelf) I live belov'd by every friend:
I thank my father for't, for he being poor,
His farm but ſmall, th' uſual ways forbore,
He did not ſend me to Sir Fabius' ſchool
To teach me arts and make me great by rule.
. . . .

Nor did he fear the cenſuring world ſhould blame
His high deſigns, or I be damn'd with ſhame,
If after all his coſt I ſhould be made
A common cryer or a meaner trade,
Or elſe, as he himſelf, have poorly liv'd,
A mean exciſe-man, nor ſhould I have griev'd.
I owe more thanks and more reſpect for this,
Nor ſhould I e'er, whatever fops adviſe
Repent of ſuch a father, if I'm wiſe.
Therefore as others, when the haughty ſcorn,
'Twas not our fault we were not nobly born
I do not ſay, nor mind thoſe meaner cares,
My words and thoughts are different far from theirs.
For ſhould kind nature bid my ſoul retire,
Go back to birth, and chuſe a noble ſire,
As great as thought could frame, or pride deſire.
Content with theſe I have, let others chuſe,
I would the noble, and the great refuſe;
And this is fooliſh, this a wild deſign
I'th' crowd's opinion.

Creech.

[(§ *a*) It is true that in the three volumes of the letters of Guy Patin, which were publiſhed at Geneva in 1691, we find nothing concerning his family, which does not very well anſwer to the idea that Mr Bayle here gives of it: but this learned man might have found in the Opuſcules of Anthony Loiſel a note of Claude Joly, which would have given him a more advantageous notion of the family of Patin, and informed him that this famous Phyſician was not the firſt of it that had diſtinguiſhed himſelf. Here follows the note: it explains a place of the alphabetical Index of eminent perſons, mentioned in the Dialogue of the Advocates of the Parliament of Paris by Anthony Loiſel, &c. ' Mr John Patin, after he had ſpent 'ſome years at the bar of the parliament of Paris, 'retired to his native place, the city of Beauvais, 'where he was made counſellor and advocate of the 'king in the Preſidial, exerciſing there both theſe 'offices together, by virtue of an arrêt of parliament 'given in his favour the 15th of February 1588, as 'it appears in the *Conference des Ordonnances* of the laſt 'edition of the year 1641 Tom. I. pag. 427. Liv. II. 'tit. 6. parag. 5. He exerciſed thoſe two employ'ments with much courage and reſolution, at the time 'that this city ſided with the Leaguers: and maintain'ed there the king's authority with great addreſs, and 'with all the fidelity that can be expected from an 'honeſt man, till at length being perſecuted by the 'factions of the Mayor Godin, and the Lieutenant-cri'minal, called Nicholas, who were both the 'ring-leaders of the league in Beauvais, haranguing 'according

(1) Patin, Letter ccxciii, pag. m. 561. of Tom. ii.

(2) Horat. Sat. V, lib. I, ver. 68.

I know, from a good hand, that he was corrector to a preſs (c). It is not eaſy to decide, whether it would not have been better, that the letters we have of his ſhould have been

---

(c) Monſieur DRELINCOURT, profeſſor of Phyſic at Leyden, informed me of it.

'according to the duty of his office, and exhorting the people to the ſervice of the king, he was in danger to be ſtoned, thro' the practices of thoſe two arch-leaguers: ſo that he was obliged to leave the city, and retire to the king, his maſter, where he found ſupport, by the recommendation of Mr de Freſnes-Forget, ſecretary of ſtate. But at laſt he was re-eſtabliſhed in his two offices, when the city returned to the obedience of the king; and he continued there to adminiſter juſtice with reputation, till the year 1605, wherein he died of a quinſey upon his arrival from Fountainebleau, whither he had been ſent on a commiſſion to the king in the name of the city. Such commiſſions were commonly given him, both becauſe of his office, as king's advocate, and becauſe he was eloquent and well verſed in hiſtory and politics. When he was obliged to quit Beauvais thro' the violence of the league, his houſe was pillaged and his fine books loſt, which he valued extremely, and regretted all his life. He left but one daughter, named Frances Patin: he was uncle to Francis Patin, advocate in parliament, who was father to Mr Guy Patin, Doctor Regent, and Dean of the Faculty of Medicine at Paris, who communicated to me what is above-written, and moreover an epigram in praiſe of his grand-uncle, which we find *in libello Epigrammatum variorum ad amicos pro xeniis per Petrum Gouſſainuillium, Montfortenſem, pro anno* 1574, printed at Paris, *apud Dionyſium à Prato* 1574:

'AD DOM.

JOANNEM PATIN, BELLOVACUM,

'facundiſſimum in ſupremo Pariſienſi Senatu Patronum.

'Cùm tu facundas ſolitus nunc ire per artes,
'Eloquium & mirum creſcat in ore tuo:
'Cauſidicumque bonum ſic te Polyhymnia reddit,
'Omnes ut ſuperes viribus eloquii:
'Si tua Muſa mihi quædam incrementa dediſſet,
'Ditior & Crœſo redderer arte ſua:
'Sed quia nummorum non extat plena crumena,
'Pro nummis tribuit carmina miſſa tibi (3).

(3) Opuſcules de Loiſel, *pag.* 736, 737.

To

Mr JOHN PATIN of BEAUVAIS,

a moſt eloquent advocate in the parliament of Paris.

'*Surpriſing eloquence from thy mouth does flow;*
'*This gift Polyhymnia did on you beſtow.*
'*Thy wondrous ſkill in pleading who can tell?*
'*An art in which all others you excel.*
'*Had but thy Muſe been half ſo kind to me,*
'*More rich by far than Crœſus I ſhould be.*
'*But ſince my purſe not much of gold contains,*
'*Pleaſe to accept this product of my brains.*

I ſhall add a paſſage ſtill more curious, and which Mr Bayle could have no knowledge of, ſince it is in a book that was printed ſome years after his death. It is the *New Letters of the late Mr Guy Patin, taken from the ſtudy of Mr Charles Spon*, printed at Amſterdam by Steenhouwer and Uytwerf in 1718 in two volumes in 12mo: a work publiſhed with too great negligence, and wherein proper names eſpecially are very often diſfigured. The manner in which Patin himſelf ſpeaks there of his family is as follows. 'You deſire I ſhould tell you ſomething about my family, after having informed me concerning your own: I ſhall do it very willingly and very freely for your ſake. Beſides, *abſit verbo jactantia*, --- *if I may ſay it without vanity*, you aſk me the ſame thing that twenty other perſons have done before, moſt of whom however knew me only by letters. Thinking there was no harm in it, and as I took it in good part, I gave them the account which I ſhall now give you. My native place is a village, three leagues from Beauvais in Picardy, called Houdan, the third barony of the county of Clermont in Beauvaiſis. The moſt antient of my race, that I have been able to diſcover, was one Noel Patin, who lived in the ſame pariſh, above three hundred years ago, whoſe family has continued down to me. Some of his deſcendants withdrew into cities, and have been Notaries at Beauvais, and Drapers at Paris: ſome have been ſoldiers, and others have remained in the country. My grand-father, whoſe name I bear, had a brother, counſellor in the preſidial, and the king's advocate at Beauvais, a perſon of great learning, and whoſe memory my deceaſed father honoured very much. My grand-father was a military man, as all that time was a time of war. My late father had ſtudied in order to be advocate here, where he was received in the year 1588, eight days before the barricadoes, after having ſtudied at Orleans and Bourges under the late Fournier and Cujas. He would have ſettled at Paris for his whole life, had not the death of Henry III, and the ſiege of Paris which enſued, prevented it. In the year 1590 he was taken priſoner by the leaguers, and could not be ranſomed under four hundred livres, which was to be paid in ready money, a ſum which is not conſiderable now, but was then, eſpecially in time of war and in the country. My deceaſed grand-mother told me, that to make up this ſum which was collected here and there, ſhe pawned her wedding-rings, and her ſilver girdle, to a goldſmith of Beauvais, at a high intereſt: this I have often heard her tell with tears in her eyes, and abhorring the miſery of that time. The lord of our country finding that my father, who was a young man well made, talked well, and was not vicious, might be of great ſervice to him, found means to keep him near himſelf, that he might make uſe of him in his affairs, *annuente avo meo, imo urgente*, --- *my grand-father conſenting to it, nay urging it*: and to engage him the more, and to detain him in the country, procured him the richeſt match thereabouts, and with fair promiſes which he never performed, made him marry my mother, who was called Clara Maneſſier, deſcended of a good and ancient family of Amiens. My father's name was Francis Patin, an honeſt man if ever there was any. If every body were like him, there would be no occaſion for Notaries. He came to Paris every year about the affairs of his maſter, where he had all the credit imaginable. I have found there abundance of friends, with whom I had no manner of acquaintance, who were exceeding kind to me upon his account, which has made me often regret him more and more. From this marriage there came ſeven children *adhuc ſuperſtites*, --- *ſtill alive*: two ſons, whereof I am the elder, and a brother who is in Holland: the five daughters are all married, and have had amongſt them the whole fortune of their mother, which being divided into five parts, was ſufficient to marry them: my brother and I have had the paternal eſtate, which does not bring me in as yet, when remitted hither, an hundred crowns a year: but this is not the fault of thoſe good people, who lived *moribus antiquis*, --- *like the ancients*, without avarice, and without ambition. The only misfortune of my father was to have an ungrateful and covetous maſter, and with whom he got nothing, notwithſtanding almoſt thirty years of troubleſome ſervice. His concern for having left Paris and ſettling in the country upon the fair promiſes of a lord, *qui nimium attendebat ad rem ſuam*, --- *who minded too much his own intereſt*, made him think, whilſt I was very young, of bringing me up to be an advocate here, ſaying that the country was too unfortunate a place, that one ſhould go to reſide in cities, and he frequently repeated to me the paſſage of the wiſe man, *Labor ſtultorum affliget eos qui neſciunt in urbem pergere*; --- *the labour of fools will afflict thoſe who do not go to live in towns*: wherefore he made me read aloud the lives of Plutarch, when I was a child, and taught me to pronounce well. With this deſign, he placed me in the college at Beauvais; afterwards he took me to Paris, and put me in the college of Boncourt, where I was two years a boarder, and went through my courſe of Philoſophy. Some time after, the nobility to reward him in a way that ſhould coſt been deſigned for the public by the author, than that they ſhould be written in a careleſs manner, for the particular uſe of thoſe to whom they are directed [*B*]; but however this be decided, I am ſure it will be granted, that it was very fit they ſhould be printed: not but that they much injure the city of Paris, which they repreſent as infected with an horrible corruption [*C*], and as filled with ſuch creatures who

‘ them nothing, would have given him a benefice for me, which I flatly refuſed, proteſting abſolutely I would never be a Prieſt: *(benedictus Deus, qui mihi illam mentem immiſit in tenerâ adhuc ætate.) (I thank GOD for inſtilling into me ſuch a diſpoſition in my tender age.)* My father, who obſerved in this refuſal ſomething that was good and ingenious, was not very much provoked at it: but my mother continued enraged againſt me upwards of five years, telling me that I refuſed the recompence of long ſervices which .... my father had rendered to theſe noblemen: and nothing elſe was to be had. GOD aſſiſted me: I was five years without ſeeing her or going home. During that time I was acquainted with a man, that adviſed me to improve myſelf in order to be a Phyſician at Paris: to this end I ſtudied very hard from the year 1622 to the year 1624, that I was admitted here: and then my father and mother were pacified, who aſſiſted me with what they were able to take my degrees, and to purchaſe books. Five years after *duxi uxorem*, -- *I married a wife*, by whom I ſhall have upon the death of her father and mother, who are very old, twenty thouſand crowns: and beſides there is a collateral, a ſiſter without children and very rich. GOD has bleſſed my marriage with four ſons, *viz.* Robert, Charles, Peter, and Francis. *Annum ætatis attigi* 41, --- *I am arrived at the forty firſt year of my age*, with more practice than merit in my profeſſion, and with leſs health than would be neceſſary for me, *quam potiſſimum labefactarunt Vigiliæ juges & Elucubrationes nocturnæ à quibus etiam necdum abſtineo, ſed hoc erat in fatis*; --- *which has been broken chiefly by continual watchings and night-ſtudies, from which I do not even yet refrain, but this was my fate.* This is what I think you have deſired of me, and perhaps much more. Excuſe the trouble I give you, and my prolixity *in re tam vili & exiguâ* (4), --- *in a matter of ſo little weight and conſequence.*’ He ſays in ſome other place of the ſame letters (5), that he was *pretty near related to the Preſident Miron Intendant of Languedoc*, and that his *wife was couſin to* this Preſident's *daughter*.

Mr Bayle having mentioned only the letters of Guy Patin, I ſhall ſet down here the liſt of his other works, as Mercklin has given it in his *Lindenius renovatus.* It contains the following treatiſes. *De Valetudine tuenda, per vivendi normam, uſumque legitimum rerum ad bene ſalubriterque vivendum neceſſariarum. Extat pag.* 341 *Medici Officioſi à Phil. Guiberto editi. Pariſiis, apud Vid. Th. Pepinguè*, 1649, *in 8vo. Notæ in Nicolai Ellain Tractatum de Peſte. Ibidem, pag.* 485. *Notæ in Galeni Librum de Sanguinis Miſſione. Ibid. pag.* 538. *Quæſtio de Sobrietate. Pariſiis*, 1647, *in 4to, & Medici Officioſi, pag.* 446. *An totus homo naturâ ſit Morbus. Ibid.* 1644, *in 4to. Extat etiam cum DD. Virorum Epiſtolis & Reſponſis tum Medicis, tum Philoſophicis. Roterodami, apud Rudolphum à Nuyſſel*, 1665, *in 4to, Caſpari Hoffmanni Apologiam pro Galeno edidit. Lugduni apud Laurentium Aniſſon*, 1666, *in 4to* (6). I ſhall add two articles, whereof this author makes no mention, *viz.* the Latin verſions of divers tracts of Andreas Laurentius, inſerted in the Latin edition of the works of this Phyſician, printed at Paris in 1627, in 4to, by the care of Guy Patin (7); and a treatiſe *de Elephantiaſi*, which he ſpeaks of in one of his letters to Charles Spon (8). The firſt of all theſe works had been printed ſeparately at Paris in 1632 in 12mo under this title, *A Treatiſe concerning the preſervation of health by a good regimen and lawful uſe of things requiſite in order to live well and healthfully*: I ſhall tranſcribe here the judgment, which Patin himſelf paſſed on it. *I wonder*, ſays he (9), *who told you that I was the author of the little Treatiſe concerning the preſervation of health, which follows the charitable Phyſician. It is not worthy your reading. I wrote it formerly at the entreaty of the good and charitable Phyſician himſelf Mr Guybert, who had given me the doctoral cap. He deſired me to make it as popular as I could, that he might join it to his book. It does not deſerve your ſpending any time upon it.... If I can ever have any leiſure, I will endeavour to mend this treatiſe, and make it a little better than it is: and in the mean time I beg you will be ſo good as not to tell any body that I am the author of it, for I am aſhamed of it myſelf.* REM. CRIT.]

[*B*] *Whether it would not have been better that his letters ſhould have been deſigned for the public, than for the uſe .... of thoſe to whom they were directed.*] If he had written them with a deſign to publiſh them, he would have filled them with learning and exact obſervations upon the hiſtory of learned men, and their works; for he had a very good memory, he had read much, and had an excellent Library. He would not have publiſhed things which were not well examined, and as they offered themſelves to his fancy: In a word, we ſhould find fewer falſhoods in his work; but then we ſhould not find there his natural wit and genius, we ſhould not meet there with ſo many curious matters of fact, ſo many lively and bold ſtrokes which divert us, and put us upon making ſolid reflexions. Some ſelect letters were firſt publiſhed at Geneva in 1683, and reprinted quickly after in Holland. The ſale encouraged a Bookſeller of Geneva to publiſh thoſe which had been left out of the firſt impreſſion, he added them to the former, and by that means gave a collection in three volumes, in 1691. It was reprinted in Holland a little while after; but it had been better if it had been reprinted in Germany, becauſe the German Bookſellers have a laudable cuſtom of adding good Indexes to the books they reprint; and never a book had more need of them than this. It was not difficult to perceive, that every thing in them is not true. Here follows the judgment which the author of the *News from the Republic of Letters* gave of them: ‘ It is fit the reader ſhould be advertiſed, that all the witty ſayings, or all the ſtories he relates are not true. There are ſome places wherein he ſhews a terrible malice and a prodigious boldneſs, in giving a criminal turn to every thing. We ſhould be very much to blame to believe theſe paſſages becauſe they are printed. All that can be gathered from them is, That Mr Patin wrote them to his friend, as a thing he had heard from others, and to continue the cuſtom he had a long time obſerved, of converſing with him by letters as he would have done, if they had taken a walk together. It is very well known, men in converſation talk as ſoon of a report that is current thro' the city, tho' it be not true, as of any news that is true. And when one is of a ſatirical humour, as it muſt be granted Mr Patin was, that which is publiſhed to the diſadvantage of our neighbour is much more taken notice of, than that which is ſpoken to his praiſe (10).’ Mr Menage has given the ſame opinion of them. *The letters of Guy Patin are full of falſhoods. Mr Bigot and I have obſerved a great number of them. Mr Patin was not very cautious in what he wrote, and prejudice made him believe a thouſand things which were not true* (11). See the Journal of Leipſic at the month of May 1684 (12). There are ſome hopes that we ſhall have the Latin letters of Guy Patin, which will be accompanied with an *eloquent and learned Elogium*, written by *Mr Theveneau, a Phyſician of Nevers* (13).

[*C*] *His letters .... injure the city of Paris, which they repreſent as infected with an horrible corruption.*] There would be no end in collecting together all the complaints he made upon this ſubject: let us therefore confine ourſelves to what he has obſerved about the wickedneſs of thoſe leud women who murder their infants. ‘ A great noiſe is made here about the death of Mademoiſelle de Guerchi; the midwife had been ſecured in the Châtelet, and thence ſhe is removed into the Conciergerie by order of the court. The curate of S. Euſtache has refuſed burial to the body of this lady: it is ſaid it was carried to the palace of Condé, and that it was there put into quick-lime, that it might be conſumed the ſooner, and that nothing of it may be known, if any ſhould come to ſearch for it. The midwife has well enough defended herſelf who having done all that was neceſſary to people the earth, do afterwards all that is neceſſary

---

(4) Lettres de Gui Patin à Charles Spon, Letter xviii, *Tom. I, pag.* 78, 79, 80, 81.

(5) Ibid. *pag.* 196, *and* 214.

(6) Mercklini Lindenius renovatus, *pag.* 396.

(7) See the remark [*B*] of the article LAURENS.

(8) Lettres de Patin à Spon, *Tom. ii, pag.* 115.

(9) Ibid. *Tom. i, pag. m.* 90, 91.

(10) News from the Republic of Letters, *April* 1684, *Art. I, pag. m.* 115, 116.

(11) Menagiana, pag. 279, of the firſt Holl. Edit.

(12) *Pag.* 248, *& ſeq.*

(13) See the preface to the Letters of Guy Patin, Edit. 1691.

herſelf hitherto, but *aliæ admovebuntur machinæ, aliæ artes adhibebuntur ad eruendum verum:* I believe ſhe will be put to the torture: the Vicars-general and the Penitentiaries are gone to complain to the firſt Preſident, that in a year's time ſix hundred women have confeſſed, that they had killed and ſtrangled their infants, and that they have taken particular notice of it, upon the advice that had been given them (14).' And now I have begun to ſpeak of this adventure, I muſt go on to ſhew the ſequel of it (15). *Here is a libel ſpread about of eight pages in quarto* (16), *wherein it is proved,* That the crime whereof dame Conſtantin, the midwife, was accuſed a little while ago, is nothing but a conſequence of the doctrine of the Jeſuits, and alſo to undeceive thoſe ladies, who have been perverted by this error, under pretence that theſe Fathers teach it in their books. *It is ſaid, that the midwife defends herſelf very well, ſhe confeſſes that Madam de Guerchi died at her houſe, but that ſhe gave her no potion, that ſhe came to her very ſick, where ſhe died, making terrible outcries; that ſhe has heard of a certain potion that lady had taken, but that ſhe knew not what it was, nor who made it. . . . .* (17) *Dame Conſtantin, the midwife, is ſtill in the Châtelet, in priſon, and to-morrow ſhe is to be examined; N. and le Large have received a ſummons to come there and anſwer, as to the facts of the depoſition they have given in,* an ut ibi ſatis cedat pædore carceris, & metu lethalis ſupplicii confecta? *It is ſaid ſhe defends herſelf very well, and that there is not ſufficient proof againſt her to condemn her to death; but ſome monitions are expected, which ſhortly are to be publiſhed thro' all the pariſhes of the city and ſuburbs of Paris: others ſay, that ſhe will be ſaved, and that ſhe is too much recommended by the greateſt perſons. Nevertheleſs it is thought ſhe deſerves death, and more, and that if ſhe were hanged, ſhe would not die innocent. It is ſaid, that her houſe was a public bawdy-houſe, and that abundance of whores went thither, either to be brought to bed,* vel abortum paſſuræ, - - - *or to ſuffer abortion. . . .* (18) *On Wedneſday the 14th of July Dame Conſtantin, the midwife, was condemned at the Châtelet, to be hanged and ſtrangled, after ſhe had been put to the torture; from whence ſhe has appealed: ſhe has been removed to the Conciergerie. It is thought, that the next week the ſentence will be confirmed at the Tournelle. . . .* (19) *The midwife is ſtill a priſoner; but it is ſaid, that it will be only for the next week, and that the attorney-general appeals againſt her from her ſentence* à minima; *that he will give in hard concluſions againſt her, that ſhe deſerves to be burnt alive, unleſs ſhe names all her accomplices.* In fine, he informs his friend, in a letter dated Auguſt the 16th, 1660 (20), that Conſtantin was hanged, '*damnata fuit laqueo infelix obſtetrix & ſuffocata*, in good company at la Croix du Tiroir (21).' We have now ſeen the concluſion of the tragedy, as well with reſpect to her that brought the lady to bed, as to her that was brought to bed. But let us now ſee part of the preliminaries concerning the latter. I will not warrant all that is ſaid for truth, but if any thing be falſe, the writer, whom I cite, muſt anſwer for it (22). 'The duke of Joyeuſe courted Mademoiſelle de Guerchi, a companion of Mademoiſelle de Pons (23), who ſacrificed him quickly after to the commander de Jars, of the houſe of Rochechouard. . . . (24) She forſook the commander de Jars, to deliver herſelf up to Jeannin de Caſtile, the king's treaſurer, and ſhe behaved herſelf with ſo little diſcretion, that the queen baniſhed her from court. Nevertheleſs, the duke of Vitry engaged with her, and treated her with as much reſpect as if ſhe had always been very virtuous, altho' ſhe had had four or five children by ſeveral fathers. She was got with child yet once more, and the duke would have her brought to bed before her time, to preſerve her reputation, which he thought was not ſo far loſt as it really was. It was in vain for her to tell him, that ſhe would be mightily pleaſed to have this pledge of his friendſhip; he was fully reſolved, that ſhe ſhould deſtroy this fruit of their amours, and therefore ſent to her a midwife, called Conſtantin, who deſigned to bring her to bed by force; but ſhe died in the operation, and the midwife was hanged. The duke of Vitry was inconſolable for her death, and had ſo great a reſpect for her memory, that he embarked afterwards with a proſtitute, becauſe ſhe reſembled her. This woman being enriched with his great gifts, married afterwards the marquis de Goudron, a younger brother of the houſe of Gamache.' Theſe citations do not carry me ſo far from my ſubject as ſome may imagine; for they contain proofs of the text of this remark, or at leaſt they confirm what Guy Patin has publiſhed. Beſides, I do not trouble myſelf about being cenſured for making too long citations, provided I do not diſpleaſe a good part of my readers, by inſtructing them by halves, or giving them the trouble to ſeek out the ſequel of things, by going from book to book: but however this be, here follows a citation which has a nearer relation to the narrative of Mr Patin.

Thuanus relates, That in 1557, a law was made which condemned to death, as guilty of parricide, all thoſe women that ſhould conceal either their pregnancy, or their lying-in, and that ſhould not bring in certificates concerning the ſtate in which their child was born, if there was any proof, that it was buried without ceremony, and without having received baptiſm. *Ea lege ſancitum ut quæ graviditatem partumve celaſſet, neque alterutrius teſtationem aut de edito fœtu ſeu vivo ſeu mortuo proferret, ſi eum lavacro juſtiſve exequiarum privatum probationibus conſtaret, de illa tanquam parricidii rea ultimum ſupplicium ſumeretur* (25). Since that time this crime was puniſhed more ſeverely, than any other; and to the end that no perſon ſhould pretend ignorance, the judges cauſed it to be inſerted in the decree of condemnation, that the Ordinance ſhould be publiſhed with the ſound of a trumpet, in all cities where there are tribunals of juſtice; and that the curates ſhould publiſh it in their pulpits, on the feſtival-days, in all boroughs and villages (26). Nevertheleſs, this crime continued to be more common than all the reſt; for Thuanus ſays, That there paſſed few weeks wherein the judges in criminal matters, at Paris, did not try one or more women, accuſed of this parricide: ſo great is the force of ſhame, that, in a timorous ſex, it prevails over the fear of a gibbet, and the remorſe of conſcience. *In nullum crimen ab eo tempore ſeverius vindicatum fuit. Ac ne qua ignorantiæ excuſatio prætexeretur, ſententiis judicum ſemper additum eſt, ut lex in inferioribus tribunalibus palam & per plateas urbium publica præconis voce promulgaretur, & per oppida ac pagos à curionibus coram populo diebus feſtis recitaretur. Nihilominus nullum frequentius crimen etiam hodie eſt, nec ulla fere ſeptimana abit, quin in claſſe, quæ de judiciis capitalibus cognoſcit, una pluresve tam horrendi flagitii reæ producantur; adeo malus pudor in verecundo & impotenti ſexu ſupplicii terrorem, & quod omni corporis pœna gravius eſt, conſcientiæ morſus vincit* (27). It will not be improper to relate what gave occaſion to this law: notice had been given, that ſeveral women, to ſhun the infamy, killed their children when they were brought to bed, and threw them either into a river or houſe of office, or buried them in ſome profane place, without initiating them into the Chriſtian Church by Baptiſm. Thoſe who were proſecuted in a court of juſtice for this crime, told the judges, that ſhame did not permit them to diſcover that they were with child, and that, contrary to their deſire, their children were born dead. By this means they got off, there was no proof of the contrary, and the greater part of the judges were of opinion, that they ſhould be put to the torture: if they endured it, without confeſſing they had put a child to death, they were diſcharged from all further puniſhment. It was therefore believed, that impunity made the wickedneſs increaſe; and therefore a moſt rigorous law was ſollicited, which was obtained, and ſeverely put in execution; and yet the evil was not cured. Let us hear Thuanus (28): *Altera lex in ſpeciem ſevera, ſed qua impiis & abominandis parricidiis, quæ antea impunita, nunc etiam poſt legem conditam nimis frequentia ſunt, pœna conſtituta eſt, poſtulante Senatu promulgatur V. Non. Martias. Fœminæ, quæ viros non habebant, ubi ex furtivo complexu conceperant, malo pudore territæ utero celato ad extremum partus fere enecabant, geminato ſcelere famæ conſulere ſe exiſtimantes, & enecatos aut in ſterquilinium ſeu profluentem abjiciebant, aut loco profano defoſſos perdebant, atque ita neceſſaria ſacri lavacri relligione ac ſepulturæ honore privabant. Quod ſi quando res in judicium deduceretur, pudorem, quominus culpam confeſſæ eſ-*

(14) Patin, Letter clxxxiv, dated June 22, 1660. See pag. 113, of Tom. ii.

(15) Ibid. Letter clxxxv, pag. 119, of the ſame Tome.

(16) It was burnt by the hand of the common hangman at La Croix du Tiroir, by the order of the lieutenant-civil. *Ibid. Letter cxc, pag.* 142, 143.

(17) Ibid. Letter clxxxvii, pag. 130, 131.

(18) Ibid. Letter clxxxviii, dated July 16, 1660, pag. 136.

(19) Ibid. cxc, pag. 144.

(20) The cxcivth, pag. 162, of Tom. ii.

(21) I believe it is ſhe whom the abbot de Marolles ſpeaks of in the paſſage which ſhall be cited hereafter (63). Compare with this the Memoirs of Chavagnac, *pag. m.* 210.

(22) The Galantries of the Kings of France, Tom. ii, pag. 198, of the Bruſſels Edit. 1694.

(23) That is to ſay, ſhe was maid of honour to the queen-mother, Anne of Auſtria.

(24) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 210.

(25) Thuan. *lib. xix, pag.* 395, *ad ann.* 1557.

(26) See the remark [*E*], at the end.

(27) Thuanus, ubi ſupra.

(28) Id. ib.

ſent, cauſſatæ mortuos ſe enixas dicebant, & ita deficientibus aliunde probationibus debitam inhumano ſceleri pœnam effugiebant. Nam judicum in hujuſmodi cauſſis incertæ plerumque erant & vagabantur ſententiæ, cum ad mortem alii tanti criminis reas damnarent; alii, quod ſæpius accidebat, pronioribus ad miſericordiam animis, quæſtionum violentiæ ſubjiciendas cenſerent, ut vivoſne an mortuos fœtus enixæ eſſent ex ipſarum confeſſione conſtaret; quam ſi obſtinato animo ferrent, liberæ dimittebantur (29).

A COMPARISON of the power of conſcience with that of the point of honour.

This powerfullyconfirms ſome of the doctrines of the author of the *Thoughts concerning Comets* (30); for who will dare to deny, after he has read this place of Thuanus, that the ideas of the point of honour, are the ſtrongeſt bank which ſtops the torrent of incontinence? who will dare to maintain, generally ſpeaking, that the laws of religion are the moſt effectual remedy, or as effectual as this? If religion had more power over women than the point of honour, would there be ſo many found that ſtifle their children? Is it not a murder more cruel and more barbarous, than to kill a good old man in the corner of a wood? Is there any crime more enormous, and more contrary to nature, than that of thoſe wtetched mothers? They are perſuaded, that by deſtroying the fruit of their womb, they commit a more deteſtable murder in the eyes of GOD, than thoſe who rob and murder on the high-way. Thoſe of whom Thuanus and Mr Patin ſpeak, are, beſides, for the moſt part perſuaded, that they deprive their children of eternal life, and that they throw them headlong into the *Limbo*, where they ſhall ſuffer throughout all eternity. This perſuaſion aggravates their crime to ſuch a degree of cruelty as is not to be imagined: neverthelesſ they commit it in contempt of GOD, and in ſpite of their religion, and all this becauſe they will not loſe their ſhare in human honour; and therefore this honour muſt have more power over them, than the inſtinct of conſcience and all divine laws: Nay, it has even greater power than the fear of death; for after that ſevere law mentioned by Thuanus, they expoſed themſelves to the danger of death, and it was very probable they would be puniſhed with it; and yet this law, tho' it was often put in execution, ſignified nothing, for theſe murders were ſtill as frequent as ever. What can be ſaid more convincing to prove the dominion of the point of honour, and the abſolute power it has over our ſouls? Can it be denied, that it would be alone ſufficient to confine uncleanneſs within thoſe bounds which we now ſee it to have? It is none of it's buſineſs to hinder ſecret crimes; this belongs to conſcience: but when thoſe ſecret crimes draw after them ſuch conſequences as can hardly eſcape the eyes of the public, it is of great force to prevent them. Such is the incontinence of one of the female ſex, who is unmarried. It is in vain to ſay, that the art of abortion is not far from it's perfection; and that if you except the art of curing Venereal diſtempers, there is none which an unhappy induſtry, occaſioned by the wants of an infinite number of people,has improved more than this; for it cannot be denied, but that the conſequences which I have mentioned, are very embaraſſing. How many women are there, who after a thouſand anxious thoughts, and a thouſand inconveniencies, and after they have taken many drugs, yet could not hinder but their fault ſhould be known? The murder does not always conceal it; it becomes, ſometimes, more infamous and diſmal by the puniſhment it undergoes; ſo that, if a violent paſſion, and a furious tranſport of the temper do not wholly take away the uſe of reaſon, theſe women will have a care of expoſing themſelves to ſuch inconvenient and dangerous conſequences as theſe. From whence we may conclude, that ſince Thuanus and Mr Patin declare, that a great number of perſons break thro' this barrier, the female ſex muſt be greatly tormented (31). Obſerve, that they ſpeak only of thoſe who kill the fruit of their womb. If the confeſſors would give in a liſt of thoſe who uſe precaution betimes, and before the ſoul be arrived, their number would not be confined to ſix hundred in a year, in ſuch a city as Paris, a city, as unprejudiced travellers ſay, leſs impure than the greateſt part of the capital cities in the weſt. As for the reſt, theſe untimely or anticipated abortions are really murders, according to the beſt Caſuiſts. Read the paſſage of Tertullian, which Guy Patin ſhowed to the lieutenant-criminal, when the midwife was proſecuted. 'Nobis vero homicidio ſemel interdicto, etiam conceptum utero dum adhuc ſanguis in hominem delibatur, diſſolvere non licet: homicidii feſtinatio eſt 'prohibere naſci, nec refert natam quis eripiat animam, an naſcentem diſturbet: homo eſt & qui eſt 'futurus; etiam fructus omnis jam in ſemine eſt (32). '*As murder is once forbid, it is unlawful to deſtroy the* 'fœtus *even whilſt it is yet unformed: to hinder the* '*birth, is to precipitate murder. And there is no difference* '*between taking away life already formed, and interrupting it whilſt it is forming. That which would be* '*a man, is in effect ſo: and every fruit is already in the* '*ſeed.*'

I remember I have heard this queſtion put, whether or no to ſpare ſo many crimes to ſuch women as have not the gift of continency, and to ſave ſo many ſubjects to the Republic, of which it is otherwiſe deprived, it would not be neceſſary to weaken a little the dominion of the point of honour, that is, to diminiſh conſiderably the diſgrace of a woman unmarried who has children; for it is obſerved, that in countries which are leſs nice about this affair, and where ſuch perſons may, without difficulty, be married, and appear with confidence in company, that theſe abortions are much more rare, and the judges are leſs employed in puniſhing thoſe who murder their children. A grave man anſwered, and proved by very good reaſons, that the remedy would be worſe than the diſeaſe, and that there is nothing which the Commonwealth ought to maintain with greater care, than the fear of diſgrace, when it is joined to criminal actions, as in the preſent caſe. For this reaſon, *ſaid he*, magiſtrates ought to be extreamly cautious in inflicting a note of infamy, becauſe one in diſgrace loſes the rein which reſtrained him, and infamy is leſs feared when we ſee it made uſe of every day. 'Da principio ſi hanno in grande horrore gli in'fami, mentre ſi veggono miſti tra gli altri Cittadini: 'ma con l'aſſuefarſi à tolerarli, pare, che ſi di giorno 'in giorno ſi allegeriſca la macchia, che quaſi al fine 'ſvaniſca in tutto. Così vienſi à poco à poco à porre in 'uſo nella Città il traſcurare l'infamia, errore d'ogni 'altro più grave, e più pericoloſo per il viver Civile. 'Però ſtimo io bene l'andar lento à dichiarar publica'mente infami i rei, quando la nota, con cui ſi ſegna'no, non ſia perpetua per terrore degli altri. Perche, 'ſe ben l'infamia naſce propriamente dalla operatione, 'di chi commette il misfatto; nondimeno non bene 'manifeſta da tutti ſi diſcerne, finche publica dichiara'tione non vi ſi aggiunga (33). - - - *At firſt infamous* '*perſons are greatly abhorred, whilſt they are mingled* '*with other citizens: but by uſe in tolerating them, the* '*infamy leſſens every day, and at laſt quite vaniſhes.* '*And thus by degrees it becomes cuſtomary in the city to* '*neglect infamy, which is the greateſt and moſt dangerous* '*error in civil life. However, I think caution is to be* '*uſed in inflicting public marks of infamy upon the guilty,* '*when the marks wherewith they are ſtigmatized are not* '*perpetual, to the terror of others. Becauſe, tho' infamy* '*properly ariſes from the action of him that commits the* '*crime; yet it is not evidently diſcerned by all, unleſs* '*public declaration be added to it.*' But ſince I have ſaid ſo much, I beg leave to add a word or two more. Would you plainly ſee, that the force of the point of honour is ſuperiour to that of conſcience, conſider one of the ſix hundred women who had deſtroyed their children. Religion diſſuaded them from it by ſeveral motives: it ſhowed them the murder, the eternal damnation of the infant, the injuſtice of their intention, and the good uſe they ſhould make of their ſin. They deſired to preſerve the reputation of women of honour; this deſign was unjuſt, a robbery, a meer uſurpation of a benefit which did not belong to them: nay, it was an uſurpation deſigned for a very bad uſe, for deceiving the public in general, and a huſband in particular; for they wiſhed they were in a condition to beſtow themſelves upon a man, as a chaſte and modeſt maid, and without the leaſt blemiſh. The advantage they might reap from diſcovering their fault was great, with reſpect to their ſalvation; from thence they might draw a thouſand reaſons of humility and contrition. The point of honour no ſooner appeared, but it overturned all this great number of batteries: muſt it not therefore be acknowledged, that it is a thouſand times more powerful than conſcience. The Italian author is here alſo on my ſide. 'Però ſi dovera à guidicio mio aſ'ſerire, che aſſolutamente la Religione ſia più atta à 'render gli huomini giuſti, & innocenti: ma che all' 'incontro per lo riſpetto degli intereſſi, e per la ripug'nanza degli affetti, i quali quaſi venti contrarii, tur'bano il mare della vita civile, più operi per la felicità 'Morale il zelo dell' Honore. Perche gli huomini ſono 'più facili à moverſi à bene operare per lo premio dell'

---

(29) We ſhall ſhow hereafter, remark [*D*], that the procuring of abortions is very antient. See the commentators of Minutius Felix, *in Editione Ouzeliana*, upon theſe words: *Sunt quæ in ipſis viſceribus medicaminibus Epotis, originem futuri hominis extinguant, & parricidium faciant antequam pariant.*

(30) See the articles clxii, clxiii, of the Thoughts upon Comets.

(31) *See the* Thoughts upon Comets, ubi ſupra.

(32) Tertull. in Apologet. cap. ix. Patin, Letter clxxxviii, pag. 137, cites him. What he cites pag. 144, out of the ſame *Tertullian de Anima, cap. xxv*, is not to the purpoſe.

(33) Lodovico Zuccolo, Academico Filopono di Faenza, Diſcorſo dell' Honore, *Capitolo xxiii, pag.* 122, *Edit. Venetæ* 1623.

neceſſary to people the Limbo [*D*]. This will give me occaſion to ſpeak of an ordinance of Henry II (*d*), which was ſo rigorous, that a woman might happen to ſuffer death

‘ Honore, & à guardarſi dal mal fare per la macchia della infamia, che ſi veggono innanzi à gli occhi, che per le promeſſe di premii, ô pur di caſtighi futuri, e lontani (34). - - - *Nevertheleſs, in my opinion, it muſt be owned, that religion is abſolutely the fitteſt to render men juſt and innocent: but, on the other hand, becauſe of intereſts, and the repugnance of paſſions, which, like contrary winds, diſturb the ſea of civil life, the point of honour conduces moſt to moral happineſs. Becauſe men are more eaſily perſuaded to do well from the motive of honour, and to refrain from evil through fear of diſgrace, which they ſee before their eyes, than from the promiſes of rewards or fear of puniſhments, which are future and remote.*’

[*D*] *To people the Limbo.*] There is ſcarce any need of a commentary upon this after what we have ſaid; nevertheleſs I will add a paſſage of Mr Drelincourt. *It ſeems*, ſays he (35), ſpeaking to the miſſionaries, *that ſome maſters of your ſchools have really deſcended into the bowels of the earth, and exactly diſcovered and viſited all the ſecret places there. Their moſt common opinion is,* * *that there are under the earth four different places, or one deep place divided into four parts: they ſay that the loweſt place is Hell, where all the ſouls of the damned are, and where their bodies ſhall alſo be after their reſurrection, and there alſo all the Devils are to be ſhut up. That the place next to Hell is Purgatory, or the place where ſouls are purged; but rather where they ſatisfy divine juſtice by their ſufferings. They ſay, that in theſe two places there is the ſame fire, and equal heat, and that all the difference is only in reſpect of duration. They think, that adjoining to Purgatory there is the Limbo of little children who die without the ſacrament; and that the fourth place is the Limbo of the Fathers, that is, the place where the ſouls of the juſt were gatherd together, who died before the death of our Lord JESUS CHRIST. They maintain that this place is empty at preſent; ſo that it is a houſe to let.* According this doctrine, the Limbo of little children is become the porch of Hell ſince the aſcenſion of JESUS CHRIST, for the Limbo of the Fathers muſt go for nothing after that time. Here we might put the ſame queſtion which formerly the Cynic Philoſopher aſked, when he ſaw the entry of a little houſe, *Where is the houſe belonging to this gate* (36)? becauſe the entry of it was ſo very great. The frontiers of Hell muſt needs be of larger extent than all the kingdom, which is very monſtrous. Let us put together all the infants who loſe their lives without having received baptiſm, whether they die after their birth, or periſh by a voluntary or involuntary miſcarriage, and doubtleſs you will have the two thirds of mankind. The numbers of abortives would be aſtoniſhing, if they were certainly known, tho' we ſhould only reckon the victims of the point of honour, thoſe of jealouſy (37), and thoſe of effeminacy (38). All times have been concerned in this crime, in all parts of the earth, as might be eaſily proved; but I ſhall only produce two teſtimonies. Conſider theſe words of Juvenal:

Cum tot abortivis fœcundam Julia vulvam
Solveret (39) - - - - - -

- - - - - - - - *Himſelf the while*
With impious drugs and potions did beguile
The teeming Julia's womb, and thence did wreſt
Crude births, that yet th' inceſtuous Sire confeſs'd.

DRYDEN.

And elſewhere,

Sunt quas eunuchi imbelles, ac mollia ſemper
Oſcula delectent, & deſperatio barbæ,
Et quod abortivo non eſt opus (40).

There are who in ſoft eunuchs place their bliſs,
To ſhun the ſcrubbing of a bearded kiſs,
And 'ſcape abortion - - - -

DRYDEN.

Ovid exclaimed againſt this heinous crime before Juvenal, and he alſo repreſented the danger to which they are expoſed who commit it.

Quid juvat immunes belli ceſſare puellas,
  Nec fera peltatas agmina velle ſequi;
Si ſine marte ſuis patiuntur vulnera telis,
  Et cœcas armant in ſua fata manus?
- - - - - - -
- - - - - - -
Hoc neque in Armeniis tigres fecere latebris:
  Perdere nec fœtus auſa leæna ſuos.
At teneræ faciunt, ſed non impune, puellæ.
  Sæpe ſuos utero quæ necat, ipſa perit.
Ipſa perit, ferturque toro reſoluta capillos:
  Et clamant, *Meritò*, qui modocunque vident (41).

What boots it, that the fair are free from war,
And what, that they're forbid the ſhield to bear;
Againſt themſelves, if they new arms employ,
And madly with new wounds, their lives deſtroy?
- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - -
The tygreſſes, that haunt th' Armenian wood,
Will ſpare their proper young, tho' pinch'd for food;
Nor will the Lybian lioneſſes ſlay
Their whelps; but women are more fierce than they,
More barb'rous to the tender fruit they bear,
Nor nature's call, tho' loud ſhe cries, will hear.
But righteous vengeance oft their crimes purſues,
And they are loſt themſelves, who wou'd their children loſe;
The pois'nous drugs, with mortal juices fill
Their veins, and undeſign'd, themſelves they kill.
Themſelves upon the bier are breathleſs born,
With hair ty'd up, which was in ringlets worn,
Thro' weeping crowds, that on their corps attend,
Well may they weep for their unhappy end.

DRYDEN.

You may ſee ſome other paſſages of this Poet in the remark [*F*]. This furniſhes me with new proofs of the power of the point of honour. The means which were uſed at that time to kill the infant were dangerous to the mother; they deſtroyed many times the life of both; and nevertheleſs the young women choſe rather to run the hazard of death than of defamation: and even to this day, thoſe who wait too long periſh ſometimes under the remedy; witneſs the lady de Guerchi. Note, that thoſe who preſerve the child are delivered without any crying, unleſs it be in ſuch a place where they are in no fear of being defamed by the diſcovery of the myſtery: And this is a new proof of the inconceivable power of the point of honour: for it ſuppreſſes the effects of the ſharpeſt pain in a tender ſex, which groans, mourns, and cries, for the leaſt things in the world.

It was ſaid one day to a miſſionary, You cannot ſay of the Limbo what the Poets ſay of Hell, that it is a little houſe, *Domus exilis Plutonia* (42). There needs not much place, anſwered he, for embryos. But, replied the other, how many children four or five years old, go to the Limbo? And beſides, do you not know, that embryos and all children ſhall riſe perfect men. Well, anſwered he, do not trouble yourſelf about it, the world is big enough.

As for the reſt, there are ſome people who think that Virgil, who owned a Limbo, ſhould have divided it into two parts; one for the children that die before they are born, the other for thoſe that die in the cradle. The great number of the former deſerved very well a particular claſs, ſay theſe people. Whence comes it then, that this great Poet ſays nothing of thoſe poor creatures?

Continuò auditæ voces, vagitus & ingens,
Infantumque animæ flentes in limine primo,

(*d*) See the remark [C].

(34) Id. ib. *Capitolo xx, pag.* 106.

(35) Drelincourt's Dialogue about the deſcent of Chriſt into Hell, *pag.* 309, *Edit.* 1664.

* See Cardinal Bellarmin in his Treatiſe of Purgatory.

(36) Diogenes Laërtius, *lib. vi, num.* 57, *relates it otherwiſe.* Myndum profectus (*Diogenes Cynicus*) cum videret magnificas portas & urbem modicam, Viri, inquit, Myndii portas claudite, ne urbs veſtra egrediatur.

(37) In the countries where Polygamy is allowed, the wives of one and the ſame huſband play a thouſand tricks to hinder the fruitfulneſs of one another.

(38) There are ſome married women who to preſerve their good ſhapes, or to ſave expences, deſtroy their children. It is pretended that certain Caſuiſts lend them a helping hand.

(39) Juven. Sat. II, ver. 32.

(40) Idem, Sat. VI, ver. 364. See alſo ver. 593.

(41) Ovid. Amor. lib. II, Eleg. XIV.

(42) Horat. Od. IV, lib. I.

death by virtue thereof, tho' ſhe was not guilty of murdering her child. We will produce upon this occaſion the obſervation of a famous Civilian [*E*], and relate a paſſage of Henry Stephens, which will inform us, among other things, that none but ſervant-maids were put to death upon account of that rigorous law [*F*]. The very letters of Patin ſhow in

Quos dulcis vitæ exſortes, & ab ubere raptos
Abſtulit atra dies, & funere merſit acerbo (43).

Firſt ſhrill laments and tender cries are heard,
The ghoſts of infants weeping in the door,
Whom of ſweet life abridg'd, and from the breaſt
Untimely ſnatch'd, the fatal day cut off,
And in a funeral immature involv'd.

TRAPP.

[*E*] *We will produce the obſervation of a famous Civilian.*]. He ſays, that the benefit of laws ought not to be ſuſpended upon pretence of ſome inconveniencies that they produce; and upon this occaſion he relates what Cato ſaid, that there is no law that is convenient to all private perſons. Bodin's words are theſe (44): 'I confeſs it would be better to abſolve the guilty, than to condemn the innocent, but then I ſay, that he who is convicted by ſtrong preſumptions, is not innocent; as he who was found with a bloody ſword near the murdered perſon, when there was none other by but he, and other conjectures we have remarked. Wherefore king Henry II made an edict in this kingdom that was very uſeful, which was publiſhed and regiſtred the fourth of March 1556 (45). wherein he ordains, that a woman ſhall be reputed to have killed her child, and be puniſhed with death, if ſhe concealed her pregnancy, and her delivery, and if her child died without baptiſm, and ſhe could produce no teſtimony of the one or the other; neither ſhall they be believed who ſay, that the child was ſtill-born: which has ſince been put in practice by ſeveral decrees. . . . . And, nevertheleſs, it is poſſible, that a woman, to ſave her honour, will conceal her pregnancy and her delivery, and that the infant which ſhe would willingly have educated, may die in the delivery: but foraſmuch as under pretence that the child was ſtill-born, many murders were committed, it was wiſely determined, that ſuch a preſumption is ſufficient to proceed to the puniſhment of death, to revenge the innocent blood. For we muſt not, for an inconvenience which does not often happen, ſuſpend the execution of a good law **, and for this cauſe I was of opinion, that a woman of Muret, near Soiſſons, ſhould be condemned to death, having concealed her pregnancy and her delivery, and buried her child in a garden, in the month of March 1578.' I know the author of the Dutch Gazette of Haerlem, had publiſhed, in the article from Paris, not very long ago (46), that orders were given, that this edict of Henry II, ſhould be reſtored to it's former vigour, and read on the feſtival-days in all the pariſh-churches. I know not whether any other Gazetteers made mention of it; but I do not remember that I found this news either in the *Mercure-Politique*, or in the Hiſtorical Letters. Nevertheleſs it might have furniſhed many reflexions.

[*F*] *A paſſage of Henry Stephens informs us, among other things, that none but maid-ſervants were put to death by this law.*] Becauſe thoſe other things may ſerve for a confirmation and ſupplement to the preceding remarks, I ſhall not only relate what concerns the impunity of perſons of quality, but ſhall alſo join with it facts and notes which this author ſets down, before he tells us, that reſpect of perſons took place in the execution of the ordinance of Henry II. The time wherein he wrote ſhews plainly enough, that he had in his view the puniſhments which followed this ordinance. *As to women murderers of their children*, ſays he (47), ... 'the number of them is great, as well thoſe who murder them as ſoon as they come into the world, as of thoſe who exerciſe the ſame cruelty upon them, even before they are born. And firſt, as to the latter, it is certain, their wickedneſs is very antient; for we find the Greek Poet Phocylides expreſly warning the women to take heed, that they do not commit ſuch acts. And Ovid, a pagan as well as he, upbraids a woman mightily for it, and adds many fine remonſtrances againſt it. Likewiſe we find that Hippocrates, among other things, he ſwore to obſerve, places this, that he would never give to women that whereby they might deſtroy the fruit of their womb. This wickedneſs is practiſed for two reaſons; by ſome for fear they ſhould be known to have loſt their maidenheads, or generally, leſt they ſhould be diſcovered to have done that which it was not lawful for them to do, whether they be married women or widows; by others, for fear they ſhould ſhorten the time of their youth (48), and particularly for fear of what Ovid ſays,

Scilicet ut careat rugarum crimine venter (49),
Sternetur pugnæ triſtis arena tuæ!

The belly muſt be ſmooth, no wrinkle there
To ſhock the lover's wanton glance appear.
His touch as well as ſight they fain would pleaſe
And the womb early of its burden eaſe.

DRYDEN.

And as to what I have ſaid concerning the ſhortning of the time of youth, the ſame Poet alſo teſtifies it, ſaying, *Adde quod & partus faciunt breviora juventæ Tempora*. And without his teſtimony we ſee the proof of it every day before our eyes. I have heard alſo of ſome ladies, nay, I have known ſome who made no ſcruple to wear buſks, at the expence of the child that was in their womb, and that they might not loſe the honour of having genteel ſhapes, they made no conſcience of deſtroying that which ſhould be as dear to them as their life. For I ſpeak of thoſe very perſons who were got with child in a lawful way. As for thoſe who are murderers of their children as ſoon as they are born, throwing them, or cauſing them to be thrown away, ſome years ago, the monaſteries of Nuns might have furniſhed us with a great many examples of them, (as well as of thoſe who murder them in their womb) even in the time of Pontanus, witneſs what he ſays, Quod quidem execrationis genus maximè ſacerdotes attingit, quæ Deo virginitatem quum voverint, pollutis tamen votis, rituque ſacerdotali perjuranter atque inceſtè contaminato, gravidæ factæ, ne ſcelus pateat, execrabiliori conantur ſcelere idipſum prohibere ac corrigere: dum aut medicaminibus adhibitis abortionem procurant, aut partum ſtatim ipſum exanimant, terræque aut cloacis clàm infodiunt. - - - - - *Which execrable ſort of crime chiefly regards the Nuns, who, tho' they have vowed perpetual virginity to GOD, yet breaking their vows, and perjuriouſly and inceſtuouſly profaning the ſacerdotal rite, are got with child, and to prevent a diſcovery ſtill commit a more abominable crime: ſince by taking medicines they either procure abortion, or elſe kill the child as ſoon as born, and privately bury it, or throw it into an houſe of office.* When, I ſay, that a great number of them might have been found ſome years ago, I do not mean that it would be difficult to find ſome at this very day, if any one had occaſion for them, but that the number of them was then greater than at preſent; as well becauſe the number of Nuns was then greater, as becauſe they were more afraid of being diſgraced, and even of receiving correction, if they were convicted of having played tricks, than they are at preſent, when their Father-confeſſors are not ſo very ſevere (50); but, on the contrary, they themſelves, upon occaſion, would be forward enough to have a touch. Beſides, they ſee many who were Nuns before, as they are now, married publickly (51), and well eſteemed; which makes them look a little better to their conſciences, than to attempt ſuch murders. But it muſt be confeſſed, that this wickedneſs extends far beyond the cloyſters, even to thoſe unmarried women that live with their fathers and mothers, or are under the inſpection of their relations, and even to thoſe of a good family; nay, it extends to many that are widows. This is what the aboveſaid Pontanus has not concealed concerning thoſe of his time;

(43) Virgil. Æneid. lib. VI, ver. 426.

(44) Demonomanie des Sorciers, *lib. iv, cap. v, pag. m.* 447, 448.

(45) Beginning the year after Eaſter.

** *Lib. iii, & iv, de legib. ff.* 9. Sic Cato dicebat nullam legem ſatis commodam omnibus eſſe.

(46) I believe it was in the year 1698.

(47) Henry Stephens's Apology for Herodotus, *book i, cap. xviii, pag.* 223, *&c. Antwerp edition* 1568, *in* 8*vo.*

(48) See, above, citation (38): but note, that here Henry Stephens commits a groſs fault; for he applies theſe two verſes of Ovid to mothers who murder their children for other reaſons than that of covering the crime. See in the ſequel of this remark, citation (56), that the fear *rugarum ventris* is not the fear of having convincing ſigns of a preceding pregnancy.

(49) See, below, citat. (56).

(50) Henry Stephens is miſtaken here, for in his time the corruption of the monaſteries, and the connivance of the confeſſors, were leſs than in former times; the reproaches of the Proteſtants having ſtirred them up to ſome ſort of ſhame and watchfulneſs.

(51) I do not underſtand this reaſon of Henry Stephens, for either he ſpeaks of the nuns which became Proteſtants, or of thoſe whom the Pope permitted to marry; and nothing of all this ſeems proper to move a pregnant nun to ſave her child: to declare herſelf with child is not the way to obtain of the Pope a diſpenſation of her vows.

‘ time; for he adds, to what I have alledged already from him, *Nec verò monſtroſa hac feritate ſacerdotes tantùm, verumetiam viduæ ac nubiles puellæ ſplendidiſſimæque etiam fœdantur familiæ.* Servant-maids have alſo plaid that trick very often (52), and it is of them commonly, and not of others, that the judges take notice, according to the Proverb above-mentioned out of Juvenal,

Dat veniam corvis, vexat cenſura columbas.

Yet theſe obnoxious men without remorſe
Againſt our tribe will put the laws in force,
Clip the dove's wing and give the vulture courſe.
DRYDEN.

‘ For I have very often ſeen ſervant-maids hanged at Paris for this crime, but no perſons of quality; and particularly I remember I ſaw in the Phyſic-ſchools, the anatomy of a ſervant-maid, who had been hanged for this fact, *viz.* for throwing her child into the houſe of office. . . . . (53) None can be better acquainted with ſuch ſecrets than the midwives; were it not the cuſtom, at this day, to go to their houſes to fetch them, and after they have blindfolded them, to carry them to the houſe where the woman is that wants their help, who is then maſked, or otherwiſe covered, for fear of being known by them, whoſe eyes muſt needs be then uncovered. . . . (54) It is true, that many ladies now have no need to proceed ſo far, by reaſon of the preſervatives they uſe, to hinder their conception.’ There are ſome faults in this paſſage of the apology for Herodotus, as will appear, if any one will take the pains to read my marginal obſervations: and this alone may ſerve for an excuſe for my relating it at ſo great length.

The firſt paſſage of Ovid, which Henry Stephens has cited (55), is in the fourteenth elegy of the ſecond book *de Amoribus*, and diſcovers to us, that a thing was commonly known at Rome in that age, which an old Apothecary, who had read many books of Surgery and Phyſic, confeſſed to me he did not know, before he ſaw a new book which I lent him. He told me, when he returned it, that he had, by it, learned two obſervations very curious, which he had never heard of before, and which concern the ſigns by which one may know whether a woman has had any children. Mr Lamy, a Phyſician of the faculty of Paris, is the author of the book above-mentioned; and he gives the following account (56): ‘ This woman (57) had had children, and before we opened her, and without ſuſpecting any thing of what we found, we knew it by certain ſigns. Mrs la Marche, chief-midwife of the Hôtel-Dieu was there preſent: ſhe had a ſingular capacity in her profeſſion, and much wit and judgment in all things. I aſked her opinion about many queſtions concerning the ſigns of virginity; I deſired to know how ſhe knew, at firſt, that this woman, whom we were now to open, had had children. She made me obſerve the folds of the belly: and when I replyed to her, that theſe might be occaſioned, either becauſe ſhe had been hydropical, or becauſe her belly might be ſwelled from other cauſes than her being with child, and that theſe folds might remain. To convince me, ſhe ſhowed me, and all the company, what the midwives call, among themſelves, the rending of the fourchete, which is the tearing of the entry of the external orifice towards the *anus*, which is always made at the birth of the firſt child, and conſequently is an undoubted ſign of the delivery which preceded.’ Of theſe two ſigns of delivery, the firſt is incomparably more terrible than the ſecond, to one that is betrothed to a man, and who paſſes for a maid; for ſhe has good reaſon to hope, that her ſpouſe will not know the ſecond, and to fear that he will know the other. And by this we underſtand the verſe of Ovid, much better than by the commentators; and we plainly know why the young women among the Romans expoſed themſelves to ſuch a dreadful danger, that they might ſhun *rugarum crimen*, that the wrinkles of the ſkin of their belly might not diſcover their crime. Theſe wrinkles therefore were much more to be feared, than the wrinkles of the face; and there is no doubt but the conſequences of them are commonly known in our age, as well as in that of Auguſtus; and that this does create great trouble, even to ſuch perſons as have been relieved by Lucina (58) with the greateſt ſecrecy imaginable. Their invocations conceived according to the form of prayer which was addreſſed to Laverna (59),

Labra movet, metuens audiri: Pulchra Laverna,
Da mihi fallere, da juſtum ſanctumque videri:
Noctem peccatis & fraudibus objice nubem (60).

- - - - *Whiſpering ſaid:*
Good, good Laverna, hear me, grant me aid
For ſuch a cheat, let all believe me good,
Let me ſeem juſt and honeſt to the crowd
And o'er my cheats and forgeries ſpread a cloud.
CREECH.

Their invocations, I ſay, being fully heard, according to the deſign of that form, do not free their minds from fear upon the approach of a new huſband, who does not expect to find out wrinkles or folds, and from thence it comes to paſs, that they have recourſe to drugs as ſoon as poſſible. Henry Stephens did rightly obſerve, that in his time *many ladies had ſeveral preſervatives to keep themſelves from being with child* (61). Ancient Greece and ancient Rome were but novices in this wicked art, in compariſon of the XVIth century; and it is pretended that the XVIIth century does even ſurpaſs the preceding; and yet they have practiſed the groſſeſt and moſt dangerous ways mentioned by Ovid. Read the abbot de Marolles, upon this paſſage of Ovid (62): *Veſtra quid effoditis ſubjectis viſcera telis? - - Why do you pierce your entrails with little ſhort pointed darts?* ‘ It is a ſtrange thing, ſays he (63), that ſo damnable an invention ſhould have been put in practice, ſo long ago, and that it ſhould be renewed in our time. A wicked woman being convicted of this abominable crime, after ſhe had killed the mother, thinking only to kill the child in her belly, was puniſhed exemplarily at Paris, in the ſame year that I wrote this book.’ How ingenious ſoever the paſſions be which are kept up by the point of honour, the danger is great, even at this day, for a young woman or a widow, who grants the laſt favour to a gallant; for oftentimes the preſervatives fall ſhort of their end; the ninth month comes upon their backs, and there is the Devil on it, that ſcene is more troubleſome than all the reſt. For a teſtimony to this I cite theſe verſes of Madam des Houlieres.

BALADE à Mademoiſelle D***

Ores eſt temps de vous donner conſeil
Sur les perils où beauté vous expoſe.
Fille reſſemble à ce bouton vermeil
Qu'en peu de jours on voit devenir roſe.
Tant qu'eſt bouton on voudroit en jouïr,
Nul ne le voit ſans deſirs de rapine.
Dès que Soleil l'a fait épanouïr,
On n'en tient conte, un matin le ruïne,
De roſe alors ne reſte que l' épine.
Lorſqu'un amant, l'exemple eſt tout pareil,
Fait voir deſirs à quoy pudeur s'opoſe,
Si l'on ne fuit, l'amour eſt un Soleil,
Point n'en doutez, par qui fleur eſt ècloſe.
Alors en bref on voit s' évanouïr
Tranſports & ſoins par qui fille peu fine
Préſume d'elle, & ſe laiſſe éblouïr.
Mépris ſuccede à l'amour qui décline;
De roſe alors ne reſte que l' épine.
Plus de commerce avecque le ſommeil,
Ou ſi par fois un moment on repoſe,
Songe cruel donne ſâcheux réveil;
Cent & cent fois on en maudit la cauſe.
Voir on voudroit dans la terre enfouir
Tendre ſecret duquel on s'imagine
Qu'un traiſtre ira le monde réjouïr.
Parle-t-on bas, on croit qu'on le devine,
De roſe alors ne reſte que l' épine.

ENVOI.

(52) See, above, article LAUNOI (MATTHEW DE), remark [*B*], why ſervant maids are more liable than others to corruption.

(53) Henry Stephens, Apology for Herodotus, *pag.* 225.

(54) Id. ib. *pag.* 226.

(55) Above, citation (49).

(56) G. Lamy's Diſſertation againſt the New Opinion, that all animals are engendered of an egg, *pag.* 218, *& ſeq.* This diſſertation was publiſhed with ſome other treatiſes of the ſame author at Paris in 1678, in 12mo.

(57) A woman who was diſſected.

(58) The goddeſs who preſideth over child-bearing.

(59) The goddeſs who was the patroneſs of thefts, and ſuch enterpriſes as people would have concealed.

(60) Horat. Epiſt. XVI, lib. I, ver. 60.

(61) Henry Stephens, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 226.

(62) Ovid. Eleg. XIV, lib. II, Amorum, ver. 27.

(63) Abbot de Marolles, Remarks upon the ſecond book of Ovid, *Amorum*, *pag.* 269, 270. This book was printed in 1661.

in particular, that the author's creed was very ſhort [G], and that he had a great tenderneſs for his children. This is ſufficient to refute the egregious impoſture which a German writer has publiſhed [H]. It is obſerved, that Guy Patin reſembled Cicero [I]. He died in the year 1672, and left a ſon, who became very famous [K], and who excelled

ENVOI.

Galans ſiéſez donneurs de gabatine,
J'ay beau preſcher qu'on riſque à vous ouïr,
A coqueter toute fille eſt encline.
Plûtoſt que faire approuver ma Doctrine,
On fileroit chanvre ſans le rouïr,
Mais quand tout bas faut apeller Lucine,
De roſe alors ne reſte que l' épine (64).

*A BALLAD to Mrs D***.*

Now is the time to give you advice,
As to the dangers to which beauty expoſes you.
A maid reſembles this pretty roſe-bud,
Which in a few days becomes full blown.
While it is a bud people covet to enjoy it,
And every one that ſees it deſires to ſnatch it.
But after the ſun has fully open'd it,
It is no more eſteem'd, one morning ruins it,
Then of the roſe the thorn alone remains.
Thus when a lover (for the inſtance is very parallel)
Diſcovers the deſires which modeſty oppoſes,
Unleſs they be ſhunn'd, love is the ſun
By which, no doubt, the flower is diſclos'd.
Then, in a ſhort time, all the tranſports and cares,
For which the ſimple maid was proud of herſelf,
Do vaniſh away, and no longer dazle the eyes.
Contempt ſucceeds to love, which declines.
Then, of the roſe, the thorn alone is thine.
Now ſleep is quite taken away;
And if at ſome time there's a moment's repoſe,
A terrible dream makes you wake in a fright:
Then a hundred and a hundred times the cauſe is curs'd.
You would gladly hide, in the bowels of the earth,
The tender ſecret, which you fear ſome traytor
Will ſpread abroad to make the world rejoice:
When one ſpeaks low, you think they do divine.
Then of the roſe the thorn alone is thine.

The MESSAGE.

Compleat gallants, beguilers of the fair ſex,
'Tis in vain for me to preach, that 'tis dangerous to liſten to you,
Every maid is to coquetry inclin'd,
I could ſooner ſpin unhatchel'd hemp,
Than make women approve my doctrine.
But when with a low voice thou muſt call on Lucina,
Then of the roſe the thorn alone is thine.

[G] *The author's creed was very ſhort.*] Let us ſet down theſe words of his Elogium (65): 'He expreſſed himſelf with the gravity of a Stoic, yet his words 'were biting; in this he might have inſtructed Rabelais. It was ſaid he wrote a commentary upon 'this author, and that he underſtood him perfectly; 'which was the reaſon why he was accuſed of being 'a little inclined to Libertiniſm. The truth is, he 'could not endure bigotry, ſuperſtition, and hypocriſy; 'but he had an upright ſoul, and an heart well diſpoſed: he was paſſionately affected for his friends, 'affable and courteous to all the world, and particularly towards ſtrangers and learned men.' Take notice, that in anſwer to the accuſation of Libertiniſm, the author of the Elogium does not ſay, that Mr Patin was at the bottom well perſwaded of the Chriſtian orthodoxy; but he only aſſures us, that he hated ſuperſtition, and that he was an honeſt man. See the *News from the republic of Letters* (66). This is not the anſwer that was made in behalf of the Prince of Condé; for in oppoſition to fame, they publiſhed the declaration he made at his death, *I never doubted of the myſteries of religion, tho' it has been ſaid ſo; but I doubt leſs of them now than ever* (67). It may perhaps be ſaid, that the Bookſellers of Geneva have inſerted into Patin's book all that they thought fit; but that thought would be ridiculous.

[H] *The egregious impoſture which a German writer has publiſhed.*] His name is Axtius: he publiſhed, *in a letter about Antimony, which is joined to a treatiſe* de Arboribus coniferis *at Jena in* 1679, that Dr Patin would have *poiſoned his own ſon with Antimony, which he believed to be a poiſon, but that happily, contrary to his expectation, it cured him* (68). Charles Patin having complained of this calumny to the faculty of Phyſic at Jena, obtained all the ſatisfaction he could pretend to; for the faculty ordered Axtius, the Phyſician, to make a public recantation: '*Saluberrima facultas 'illum* παλινοδίαν (69) *cantare coëgit, quam ſuppreſſa 'calumnia typis mandatam ad me tranſmiſit*, it is Charles Patin who ſpeaks (70), *his verbis:* Editioni 'tractatus hujus de arboribus, benevole lector, ſubjunxeram epiſtolam de Antimonio, cui relationem 'de illuſtriſſimo Guidone Patino inſerueram: Quia 'autem certo comperi illam falſam, & ab ipſius malevolis ſine dubio effictam eſſe, epiſtolam rurſus imprimi curavi, fabulam expunxi, & manibus celeberrimi illius viri injuriam factam eſſe aperte profiteor. '- - - *The faculty of Phyſic obliged him to make a recantation, which, when the calumny was ſuppreſſed, 'they ſent to me in print, in the following words: 'Kind reader, I had joined a letter about Antimony to 'this treatiſe concerning trees, in which I had inſerted 'a ſtory relating to the moſt illuſtrious Guy Patin: but 'as I found it to be certainly falſe, and forged without 'doubt by his ſpiteful enemies, I have cauſed the letter 'to be reprinted, have expunged that ſtory, and do publickly acknowledge the injury done to the memory of that 'renowned gentleman.*'

[I] *It is obſerved that Guy Patin reſembled Cicero.*] 'The late Mr Huguetan, advocate of Lyons, who 'knew him particularly, found that he had the air 'of Cicero, whoſe ſtatue is to be ſeen at Rome (71).' Which brings to my mind what ſome ſay, that the chancellor de le Hoſpital reſembled Ariſtotle: 'Specie 'fuit auguſta, vultu gravi & tranquillo, qui ut ex veteri numiſmate apparuit Ariſtotelis faciem plane referret (72). - - - *He had a noble air, a grave and 'compoſed countenance, which, as appeared from an ancient medal, reſembled the face of Ariſtotle.*'

[K] *He left a ſon who became very famous.*] He was called Charles Patin, and was born at Paris, February 23, 1633. He made ſuch wonderful progreſs, that he maintained Greek and Latin Theſes upon all parts of Philoſophy in 1647. His Profeſſor (73), who was an Iriſh-man, and did not underſtand the Greek tongue, was very angry at theſe Theſes, when he was deſired to examine them; but ſeeing the young man prepared to defend them without a moderator, he was forced to preſide at the diſputation, leſt he ſhould proſtitute his reputation. The Pope's Nuncio, thirty four biſhops, and many perſons of quality, of the court and city, were preſent at theſe Theſes: the reſpondent ſtood the ſhock for the ſpace of five hours, in both languages, and was with great glory admitted to his degree of Maſter of Arts. He ſtudied the Civil Law in complaiſance to his uncle by the mother's ſide, who was an advocate in the Parliament: he took his licence at Poitiers, after ſixteen months, and was admitted advocate in the parliament of Paris. He ſpent ſix years in this profeſſion, but he could not forſake the ſtudy of Phyſic, to which his inclination always led him. It was not therefore hard for him to conform to his father's will, which was, that he ſhould give over the law, and devote himſelf to the profeſſion of Phyſic. He reliſhed, without difficulty, the good reaſons that were alledged to him, which were confirmed to him by the teſtimony of Mareſcot. That famous Phyſician confeſſed himſelf indebted to his profeſſion for three things, which he could never have obtained by the prieſthood, for which his father deſigned him. He had enjoyed a perfect health until the age of eighty two years; he had gained a hundred thouſand excelled in the knowledge of medals. He had loſt his eldeſt ſon, for whom he had obtained in 1667, the reverſion of his profeſſorſhip (*e*), and who had not the gratitude that was due to the affection of ſo good a father (*f*). This was a great addition to his affliction for the diſgrace of his other ſon [*L*].

---

(64) Poems of Madam des Houlieres, *pag.* 134, 135, edition of Amſterd. 1694.

(65) Advertiſement to the reader before the Letters of Guy Patin, *fol.* * 6 *verſo*.

(66) The month of April 1684, Art. I, pag. m. 116, 117. See alſo the Journal of Leipſic 1684, pag. 251.

(67) See his funeral oration ſpoken by the biſhop of Meaux, March 10, 1687, pag. 56, 57, of the Holl. edition.

(68) Taken from the Elogium of Guy Patin, prefixed to his Letters.

(69) He ſhould have ſaid παλινῳδίαν.

(70) Carolus Patinus, in Lyceo Patavino, *pag.* 102, 103.

(71) Taken from the ſame Elogium.

(72) Sammarth. Elog. *lib. i, pag. m.* 59.

(73) He was called *Rogerius Omoloy*.

thouſand crowns; and the intimate friendſhip of ſeveral illuſtrious perſons. ‘ Artem diſceres doceresque non Magiſtratibus tantum ſed Regibus ipſis & Imperatoribus leges præſcribentem: Sapientiſſimos tandem quoſque ab ore tuo pendentes, tuoque ſubmiſſos arbitrio cerneres. Recorderis, mi Stoice (*ſic quippe ob neſcio quam* ἀπάθειαν *me compellare ſolebat*) Mareſcottum noſtrum tria ſe ſacræ arti noſtræ debere profeſſum, quibus caruiſſet, ſi propoſitum à Parentibus ſacerdotium ſuſcepiſſet, ſanitatem athleticam ætatis anno LXXXII, centum aureorum millia, atque intimam innumerorum illuſtrium amicitiam (74). - - - *You would learn and teach an art preſcribing laws not only to magiſtrates, but even to kings and emperors: You would ſee the wiſeſt men attentively liſtening to you. Remember, my dear Stoic,* (for ſo he uſed to call me upon the account of a certain indifference he obſerved in me) *that our friend Mareſcot confeſſed he was indebted to our ſacred profeſſion for three things,* &c.’ As ſoon as Charles Patin was admitted Doctor of Phyſic, he applied himſelf to practice, and had a great one. He read Lectures on Phyſic, in the room of Profeſſor Lopez, who was gone to Bourdeaux. Fearing to be impriſoned if he ſhould continue longer in France, he intended to retire into Holland: *Excedere Patria conſultius fuit, quam libertatis diſcrimen ſubire* (75). But the privateers of Oſtend, did ſo diſturb Navigation, that he returned from Havre de Grace to Paris, and afterwards took the road of the Palatinate. He ſtopped ſome time at Heidelberg, and then travelled into Germany, Holland, England, Switzerland, and Italy. He fixed at Baſil, but the war which was between the French and Germans upon thoſe frontiers, made him ſo uneaſy, that he removed with all his family into Italy. He was made Profeſſor of Phyſic at Padua in 1676; three years after he was honoured with the dignity of knight of St Mark. He underſtood, in 1681 that the king of France would receive him into his favour; and perhaps he would have returned into France, if the chief profeſſor's place in Surgery at Padua had not been given him, with an augmentation of his ſalary. I take this from a book which he publiſhed at Padua in 1682, intituled, *Lyceum Patavinum, ſive Icones & Vitæ Profeſſorum Patavii 1682, publice docentium.* He died in that city (76), in 1694 (77), leaving two daughters, who became famous for the works they publiſhed (78). His wife was alſo an author (79). Here follows a catalogue of the books which he publiſhed, from the year 1662, to the year 1682. *Itinerarium Comitis Briennæ, Pariſiis,* 1662, *in 8vo. Familiæ Romanæ ex ant. Numiſmatibus, Pariſ.* 1663, *Fol. A Treatiſe of combuſtible Turf: Paris,* 1663, *in 4to. An Introduction to the Hiſtory of Medals: Paris,* 1665, *and Amſterdam* 1667, *in 12mo. Imperatorum Romanorum Numiſmata: Argentinæ,* 1671, *Fol. Theſaurus Numiſmatum: Amſtelodami,* 1672, *in 4to. Four Hiſtorical Relations: Baſil* 1673, *and Lyons* 1674, *in 12mo. Prattica delle Medaglie: Venezia,* 1673, *in 12mo. Suetonius illuſtratus: Baſileæ,* 1675. *De numiſmate antiquo Auguſti & Platonis: Baſileæ,* 1675, *in 4to. Encomium Moriæ Eraſmi, cum fig. Holbenianis: Baſil.* 1676, *in 12mo. De optima Medicorum ſecta: Patavii,* 1676, *in 4to. De Febribus: Patavii,* 1677, *in 4to. De Avicenna: Patavii,* 1678, *in 4to. De Numiſmate ant. Horatii Coclitis:* 1678, *in 4to. De Scorbuto: Patavii* 1679, *in 4to. Judicium Paridis: Patavii,* 1679, *in 4to. Le pompoſe feſte di Vicenza: Padua,* 1680, *in 4to. Natalitia Jovis: Patavii,* 1681, *in 4to. Quòd optimus Medicus debeat eſſe chirurgus: Patavii,* 1681, *in 4to. Lyceum Patavinum, Patavii,* 1682, *in 4to.* He himſelf gave us this catalogue in his *Lyceum Patavinum.* He forgot his *Epiſtolæ ad Eggelingium de Numiſmatibus quibuſdam abſtruſis Imperatoris Neronis,* publiſhed at Bremen, in 1681, with the anſwers of *Eggelingius* (80). He wrote after this a Latin tranſlation of the introduction to the knowledge of Medals (81), which was printed in 1683 (82). *Diſſertatio Therapeutica de Peſte,* at *Augſburg,* 1683, *in 4to. Commentarius in tres Inſcriptiones Græcas Smyrna nuper allatas,* at *Padua,* 1685, *in 4to. Commentarius in antiquum monumentum Marcellinæ,* at the ſame place, 1688, *in 4to. Commentarius in antiquum Cenotaphium Marci Artorii Medici,* at the ſame place, 1689, *in 4to.* He had a hand in the edition of the *Theſaurus numiſmatum Petri Mauroceni,* done at *Venice,* 1683, and he added ſome notes to it. Perhaps I have forgot ſome of his works. I muſt add, that his hiſtorical relations were printed in Holland, in 1695, and that his *Introduction to the Knowledge of Medals* was printed at Paris the ſame year (83). This book was cenſured by Mr Sallo the firſt time it was printed (84). The author anſwered this cenſure in a piece intituled, *A letter from a friend of Mr Patin, concerning the Journal of the Learned for February* 23, 1665. Mr Sallo, ſpeaking of this letter (85), continued to treat Mr Patin with great contempt; which very much incenſed Guy Patin, as appears by theſe words of his letter 351. I ſet them down ſomewhat at length, becauſe they inform us, among other things, of the reaſon which hindered Charles Patin from continuing his apology. ‘ I do not know whether you have received a kind of Gazette, which is called the *Journal of the Learned,* the author whereof having complained in a little article againſt my ſon Charles, concerning a Medal which was made here the laſt year for the Switzers, he has anſwered him. I have ſent you his anſwer, which is wiſe and modeſt. This new Gazetter has replyed to him, and there he ſpeaks as one that is ignorant and extravagant. To which reply he ſhould doubtleſs have had a ſmart and ſtrong anſwer, if Charles had not been deſired to ſuſpend his reply, and threatened with a letter under the king's ſignet. The truth is, Mr Colbert takes into his protection the authors of this Journal, which is attributed to Mr Sallo, a counſellor in parliament; to the Abbot de Bourzé; to Mr Gomberville; to Mr Chapelain, &c. ſo that Charles is adviſed to delay his anſwer; and this is alſo the opinion of the firſt preſident, who deſired it ſhould be ſo: a particular reaſon is given for it, *viz.* That he is not in favour with Mr Colbert, ſince the ſuit of Mr Fouquet. We ſhall ſee hereafter, whether theſe pretended cenſurers, *ſine ſuffragio populi & Quiritum,* - - - *without the ſuffrage of the people and nobles,*' have power and authority to criticiſe thus all thoſe authors who do not write ſo as to pleaſe their palate. Are we in the times of Juvenal, who ſaid boldly, *Dat veniam corvis, vexat cenſura columbas?* - - - *Clips the dove's wings, and gives the vulture courſe.* Yet there is one thing that comforts us, and that is, That we are not in the wrong, and that the learned and judicious are of our opinion; but theſe gentlemen abuſe their power. The Republic of Learning is on our ſide, but Mr Colbert is againſt us; and if my ſon defends himſelf, it is ſaid he will be ſent to the Baſtille: It is better not to write (86).’

[*L*] *The diſgrace of his* . . . . *ſon.*] Charles Patin deplored it; he ſays, that calumny had been the true cauſe of it, but he draws a veil before it. ‘ Cùm ecce ἀτυχία, *ſays he* (87), veriùs διαβολὴν, & calumniam dixero, me præcipitem egit, & κακῶν ἰλιάδα intulit. Timanthum (88) imitari liceat, benigne lector, qui cûm mœſtos pinxiſſet adſtantes, & triſtitiæ omnem imaginem conſumſiſſet, ob Iphigeniam ſtantem ad aras perituram, patris vultum velavit quem ſatis mœſtum pingere deſperabat. Velum hic protendamus, ſeu dolore commoti ob fortunas perditas, ſeu charitate ob invidorum nequitiam. - - - *When behold misfortune, or more properly I may call it detraction and calumny, overwhelmed and involved me in abundance of evils. Allow me, courteous reader, to imitate Timanthes, who, after he had drawn the ſpectators with ſorrowful countenances, and expreſſed the higheſt image of grief, upon the account of Iphigenia who ſtood at the altar ready to be offered up, veiled the face of her father, whom he deſpaired to repreſent ſufficiently afflicted. Let me here draw a veil, being moved with ſorrow for the loſs of my fortune, or with concern for the wickedneſs of my ſpiteful enemies.*’ His father was not ſo myſterious; he particularly mentions certain cauſes, or rather pretences of I know not what prohibited books found in the ſtudy of his ſon. It will be better to hear him ſpeak: *Every body pities him, no body accuſes him, and he is beloved by every body,*

(*e*) See his Letter ccccLv, pag. 337, of the third Tome.

(*f*) See his Letter DXXXV, pag. 539, of the third Tome.

(74) Carolus Patinus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 83, 84.

(75) Id. ib. *pag.* 91.

(76) There was found a polypus in his heart, and in the aorta, wherewith he was choaked. I have this from Mr Drelincourt, profeſſor at Leyden, to whom a profeſſor of Padua, who was of the retinue of the Venetian ambaſſadors, told it. I mean the ambaſſadors who arrived in Holland in March 1696, to congratulate his Britannic majeſty. They went, with all their retinue, to a lecture of Mr Drelincourt, April 2, of the ſame year, and paid him many civilities, as he very well deſerved.

(77) See the Journal of Leipſic 1702, *pag.* 85.

(78) See the Journal of Leipſic, in the year 1684, pag. 587; and in 1691, pag. 337, and 547. News from the Republic of Letters, April 1685, pag. 452.

(79) News, &c. Ibid. pag. 453.

(80) See the Journal of Leipſic, 1684, pag. 35.

(81) I give the title which he uſes in his catalogue, although the true title is, *An Introduction to Hiſtory by the Knowledge of Medals.*

(82) At Amſterdam, in 12mo.

(83) See the Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned, *Dec.* 1694, *pag.* 174.

(84) See the Journal of the Learned, *Febr.* 23, 1665, *pag. m.* 150.

(85) In the Journal of Mar. 9, 1665, *pag. m.* 202.

(86) Guy Patin, Letter cccli, pag. 34, 35, of the third Tome. See alſo pag. 33, 54, 62, 64, 73, of the ſame volume.

(87) Carolus Patinus, in Lyceo Patavino, *pag.* 91.

(88) He ſhould have ſaid *Timanthem.*

except ſome knaviſh Bookſellers. And yet he is abſent, and we have obliged him to reſolve upon it in ſpite of his Stoical humour. He always hoped that the juſtice of the king would extend to him, but our enemies have had too much power. Yet to allay the ſmart of our wound, it is ſaid, 1. *That it is for contempt of the court that a proceſs was commenced againſt him, as being one that is abſent, and will not defend himſelf.* 2. *That it was by a ſovereign and particular commiſſion, without right of appeal, which is extraordinary, and denotes ſo much the more the deſign there was to ruin him.* 3. *That the greateſt part of the judges have received letters under the king's ſignet, and of recommendation to make an example of him.* . . . . 4. *It is alledged, That a man of great power, was our ſecret enemy, who promoted and managed the thing againſt us; becauſe they found among thoſe books ſome volumes of Mr Fouquet's caſe, and of the Hiſtory of the enterprize of Gigeri. . . . . Three books are named, one full of impiety, which is an Huguenot book, intituled,* The Anatomy of the Maſs, *by Peter du Moulin, a miniſter of Charenton, as if the Inquiſition were in France. It is a ſix-penny book: Paris is full of ſuch books; and there is ſcarce any Library in France where ſome of them are not to be found; nay, there are ſome of them even in the ſtudies of the Monks. . . . . The ſecond is a book, as they ſay, againſt the ſervice of the king, and that is,* The Buckler of State, *which was ſold publickly in the Parliament-houſe; and to which there are two anſwers in the preſs here. The third is,* The Gallant Hiſtory of the Court; *which are little libels that rather deſerve contempt than anger. I think that theſe three books are only a pretence, and that there is ſome ſecret enemy that acts againſt my ſon, and is the cauſe of our misfortune* (89). In all this you ſee nothing that comes up to the point, I mean the cauſe which was given out in Paris, to be the true reaſon of the diſgrace. It was ſaid, 1. That Charles Patin was ſent into Holland with an order to buy up all the copies of the Amours of the Royal Palace; and to burn them upon the place, without ſparing any. 2. That a great prince gave him this commiſſion, and promiſed to reward him for his pains. 3. That this commiſſioner having bought up all the copies, did not burn them, but ſent a great number of them into the kingdom. This is the common report, I know not whether it be well-grounded.

(89) Guy Patin, Letter ccclxviii, pag. 370, of the third Tome.

PATRICIUS (Auguſtin) a canon of Siena, and then maſter of the ceremonies of the Pope's chapel, and at laſt biſhop of Pienza in Tuſcany, flouriſhed towards the end of the XVth century. Cardinal Francis Piccolomini, archbiſhop of Siena, who was Pope, by the name of Pius the IIId, ordered him to write an abridgment of the acts of the council of Baſil. We ſhall ſee hereafter in what manner this was performed [*A*]. This is not the only work of Auguſtin Patricius; he wrote another concerning the ceremonies of the Pope's chapel (*a*) [*B*]. He was ſecretary to this cardinal Francis Piccolomini, in his legation of Germany, under the pontificate of Paul II (*b*). I ſhall examine whether Father Mabillon had reaſon to ſay, that there was another Auguſtinus Patricius different from this [*C*].

(*a*) See, above, remark [*D*] of the article GRASSIS (Paris de).

(*b*) Taken from Spondanus, ad ann. 1431, num. 9, pag. m. 805.

[*A*] *We ſhall ſee . . . . after what manner this was performed.*] Auguſtinus Patricius, among other books, made uſe of two great volumes, whereof the Cardinal of St Mark lent him a copy. He affirms, that he ſaw them at Baſil, where they are kept with a particular care, as anciently the books of the Sibyls were kept, and that John of Segovia, a Spaniard, called the Cardinal of St Calixtus by the council of Baſil, a man who continued obſtinately in the ſchiſm until death, is the author of theſe two collections. He adds, that he made uſe of an hiſtory which Dominic, Cardinal of Ferma had compoſed of the firſt part of this council: This Cardinal was preſent there until the time of the rupture between Eugenius the IV and that aſſembly. Note, that the work of Auguſtinus Patricius is not printed. Mr Rigault lent it in manuſcript (1) to Spondanus (2).

[*B*] *He compoſed a* Treatiſe *concerning the ceremonies of the Pope's chapel.*] The Latin words of Spondanus, whom I have followed, are *Librum de* Ritibus Sacelli Pontificii *conſcripſit* (3). It is, without doubt, the ſame with that which I have ſpoken of elſewhere (4) in relating a paſſage of Mr Couſin, where we ſee by whom, and how the book of Auguſtin Patricius, concerning *the Rites of the Romiſh Church*, was publiſhed, and what were the conſequences of that publication. We ſee there alſo that Auguſtin Patricius was nephew to Pius II, *who had given him the ſirname of Piccolomini*, and that he became Maſter of the Ceremonies under the ſame Pope. It is certain, that in the epiſtle dedicatory to his book *Sacrarum Ceremoniarum*, inſerted by Father Mabillon in the ſecond Tome of his *Muſæum Italicum* (5), and dated from Rome the firſt of March 1488, he calls himſelf *Auguſtinus Patricius Piccolomineus*; but for all that I dare neither affirm, that Pope Pius II gave him that ſirname, or that he was his uncle: It ſeems to me more probable, that he received it from his maſter Cardinal Francis Piccolomini; however, I affirm nothing. I know that Pius II conferred the name of Piccolomini on an able man, who was his ſecretary (6), and whom he made Cardinal.

[*C*] *I ſhall examine whether Father Mabillon had reaſon to ſay, that there was another Auguſtin Patricius different from this.*] He has inſerted in the firſt tome of the *Muſæum Italicum* (7), the life of Fabian Bencius, written by Auguſtin Patricius, biſhop of Pienza, and he ſays (8) that this biſhop, who was Maſter of the Ceremonies under the pontificate of Innocent VIII, is different from Auguſtin Patricius, who was ſecretary to Cardinal Francis Piccolomini, and who wrote an account of what paſſed in the Diet of Ratiſbon, when that Cardinal was Nuncio there. So that there are, if we believe him, two Auguſtin Patricius's, who were authors; one was Maſter of the Ceremonies, and afterwards biſhop of Pienza, in 1683; the other ſecretary to Francis Piccolomini. The firſt writ the life of Fabian Bencius, and an account of the emperor Frederic IIId's entrance into Rome (9): The ſecond drew up the acts of a Diet of Ratiſbon. It is of the latter, and not of the other, continues Father Mabillon, that Voſſius ſpeaks, in his volume of the Latin hiſtorians: You may obſerve, that Voſſius, in effect, gives no other title to his Auguſtin Patricius, than that of ſecretary to Francis Piccolomini, Cardinal of Siena; and that he attributes to him no other book than the relation of what was done at the Diet of Ratiſbon. He takes notice, that it was dedicated by the author in 1471, to James Piccolomini, Cardinal of Pavia (10); and he adds, that Campanus called this Patricius, Cicero's ape (11). I dare ſay, that Father Mabillon is miſtaken; it does not ſeem neceſſary to me to find here two authors of the ſame name, and I adhere to Spondanus, who ſays, that the ſame Auguſtin Patricius, ſecretary to Francis Piccolomini, was Maſter of the Ceremonies, and biſhop of Pienza.

(1) He took it out of the king's library.

(2) Taken from Spondanus, ad ann. 1431, num. 9, pag. m. 805.

(3) Spondan. ubi ſupra.

(4) Remark [*D*] of the article GRASSIS (Paris de).

(5) *Pag.* 524, *&c.*

(6) *James Amanatus*, commonly known by the name of Cardinal of Pavia. See the *Nomenclator Cardinalium*, *pag. m.* 96.

(7) *Pag.* 251, *&c.*

(8) Mabillon, Muſæum Italicum, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 255.

(9) It is in the *Muſ. Ital. ibid. pag.* 256, *& ſeq.*

(10) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Latinis, *pag.* 604.

(11) Auguſtinum hunc ſimiam Ciceronis ob ſtudium ornandæ Dictionis appellat Campanus epiſtola quadam inter eas Piccolominæi quas diximus. *Ibid.*

PATRICIUS (Francis) biſhop of Gaëta, a native of Siena ſhewed a great reading, in his books, *De Regno & Regis Inſtitutione*, and in thoſe, *De Reipublicæ Inſtitutione*. He flouriſhed in the XVth century. He is ſometimes miſtaken for another Francis **PATRICIUS** (*a*), a great Anti-peripatetic Philoſopher, who was born (*b*) in the territories of the Venetians, in the year 1529, or in 1530 (*c*), and who died at Rome, February the ſixth 1597 (*d*). Conſult Mr Moreri, as alſo Mr Teiſſier (*e*). They have prevented me in moſt things that I could have ſaid, and therefore I ſhall only

(*a*) See the remark [*A*].

(*b*) At Cliſſa in Iſtria, according to Thuanus, *lib. cxix*, *pag.* 817.

(*d*) Thuanus, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Additions to the Elogies taken from Thuanus.

(*c*) His effigies before his *Peripatetic Diſcuſſions*, imports, that he was in his fifty-firſt year in 1580; and he ſays in the beginning of his *Nova Philoſophia de Univerſis*, that in 1588, he was writing it in the fifty-eighth year of his age.

only collect ſome errors, and obſerve ſome things as to the editions [*A*]. I ſhall only add,

[*A*] *I ſhall only collect ſome errors, and obſerve ſome things as to the editions.*] GESNER (1) had no reaſon to believe, that Francis Patricius, the Sieneſe, did not, perhaps, differ from *Franciſcus Lucius Durantinus*, the author of a book *De optima Reipublicæ Gubernatione*, printed at Venice in the year 1522. He ſhould have ſaid, That theſe are two different writers; for the work of this Lucius is divided only into three books, whereof the laſt is partly deſigned to commend the republic of Venice; but the work of Patricius is divided into nine books, and has nothing particular that regards the Venetians. In the epitome of Geſner (2) Francis Patricius the Anti-peripatetic is miſtaken for the biſhop of Gaëta. The ſame fault is to be found in the Oxford Catalogue, for the Peripatetic Diſcuſſions, &c. and the books *de Regno*, and *de Reipublicæ Inſtitutione*, are attributed to one and the ſame author. In theEpitome of Geſner we have two other Patricius's, who are meer chimeras; for the pretended *Fredericus Patricius Venetus*, is no other than the Philoſopher who attacked Ariſtotle. This appears plainly from hence, that the ſame books are attributed to him (3), which were juſt before aſcribed to *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis*. It can hardly be conceived, that there ſhould be any compilers ſo heedleſs: they ſay in the ſame column of a page, that *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis* wrote the Peripatetic Diſcuſſions, and ten dialogues in Italian, *de legendæ ſcribendæque hiſtoriæ ratione*, and that *Fridericus Patricius Venetus*, wrote the ſame dialogues in Italian, and the Peripatetic Diſcuſſions. They tell us of one *Franciſcus Patricius*, whoſe commentaries were abridged, and printed at Paris. It is the ſame author of whom they had already given the article: It is, I ſay, *Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis*. The Sieur KONIG deſerves ſome cenſure; he did not know Patricius, the Sieneſe, and applies to the other Patricius a paſſage of Barthius, which cannot agree to him. Take notice, that according to him (4) that Patricius of whom he ſpeaks died at Rome in the year 1597, and that he characteriſes him after ſuch a manner, that none can take him for any other but the Anti-Peripatetic. It is therefore an abſurdity to pretend, that, according to Barthius, he was beheaded. This will eaſily appear, if any one does but caſt his eyes upon theſe words of Barthius (5): ‘Sed quid coacervemus plures? cum hanc rationem *æra pulſandi* (6), neque aliam potuiſſe inducere videam qui horum clangorum meminerunt, è quibus Pindarum & Steſichorum cum aliis jam olim produxit, & inde Juvenalem enarravit Franciſcus Patricius Lib. 11. de Regno & Inſt. Regia, vir omnino meliore fato dignus, quam qui in patria ſua ſecuri capite truncatus fuerit, Anno M. CCCC. XLVII. aut paucis ante, ſcribente Raphaële Volaterrano Lib. XXI. Comm. Urbanor. *But why ſhould I heap up more? ſince I ſee this method of* beating kettles, *and no other could induce thoſe who remember theſe noiſes, among whom Pindar and Steſichorus, with others, in more ancient times, and afterwards Juvenal, are related by Francis Patricius, a man worthy of a better fate than to be beheaded in his own country in the year* 1447, *or a little before, as Raphael Volaterranus writes, lib.* 21. *Comm. Urbanor.*’ Can a paſſage that ſpeaks of a man beheaded in 1447, or a little before, be applied to a man that died in the year 1597 (7), I do not think that Barthius is guilty of an error in Chronology, ſince although Volaterranus does not ſet down in what year this Patricius was puniſhed with death, yet he ſufficiently intimates, that it was about that time. Having mentioned Gregory of Tifernum, and Antonius Panormita, he adds, ‘Joannes Auriſpa Secretarius Apoſtolicus ſub Eugenio inter eruditos non admodum ignobilis ea tempeſtate. Patricii quoque Senenſis, qui in factione Civitatis ſecuri percuſſus fuit; magnopere commendatur oratio ſimul & eruditio. Petrus Candidus Nicolai V. Magiſter Brevium fuit (8). . . . *John Auriſpa, Apoſtolic ſecretary under Pope Eugenius, had a great reputation among the learned at that time. And alſo the eloquence and learning of Patricius of Siena, who was beheaded in a ſedition of the city, is highly commended. Peter Candidus was maſter of the briefs to Nicholas V.*’ This ſeems to ſhew that he ſpeaks of one Patricius, who flouriſhed under Eugenius IV, and who was not alive under Nicolas V. I confeſs this is not convincing, but however if Barthius has not hit right upon the year, he is excuſable; and this fault ought rather to be pardoned in him, than that which he has committed, in ſuppoſing that an author who was beheaded in 1447, is the ſame Francis Patricius of Siena, who wrote the books *de Regno & Inſt. Regia*. The latter lived under Sixtus IV (9), to whom he dedicated his treatiſe *de Republica, & Reipublicæ Inſtitutione*. Note, that Volaterranus, in the fifth book (10) of his work, gives us to underſtand that the Patricius, whom the Sieneſe beheaded, was puniſhed in that manner during the war they had with Picinin, who invaded one of their cities, from whence they drove him away, being aſſiſted by Pope Calixtus. But that Pope was not choſen till the year 1455. Mr MORERI is to blame for not ſaying, that Patricius, the Sieneſe, was biſhop of Gaëta. He aſſigns him the biſhopric of Carriati in Calabria; probably a fault of the Printer, which he did not perceive in the book of *Aubertus Miræus*, led him into this miſtake. He had read in that author, *Franciſcus Patritius, Senenſis, præſul Caretanus* (11), and not perceiving that it was to be read *Caietanus*, he made him to be biſhop of Cariati in Calabria. It is upon the authority of the ſame writer, that he has placed this prelate in the beginning of the XVIth century; which he had not done, if he had known that Francis Patricius, who was promoted to the biſhopric of Gaëta by Pius II (12), died in the year 1494. If Mr Moreri, who refers us to Ughelli (13), had conſulted him, he would have ſeen this. What he ſays after Miræus concerning the editions of the works of his pretended biſhop of Cariati, requires a ſmall ſupplement. The Latin edition of the nine books *de Regno*, and of the nine books *de Republica*, printed at Paris in 1519, is accompanied with the notes of John Savigni, *Cum Joannis Savigneii ſcholiis . . . cum ejuſdem annotationibus* (14). The *Scholia* relate to the books *de Regno*, and the notes to the books *de Republica*. One Nicodon of Saimmaixent publiſhed the books *de Republica* at Paris, in 1580, in 16mo, and added to them the arguments of the chapters, and the citations of authors (15). John le Blond, lord of Branville, made ſome extracts out of all theſe works of Patricius, and publiſhed them in French at Paris in 1550, as du Verdier informs us (16). Mr Joly (17) obſerves that this John le Blond turned into French *an extract, or a collection of the fineſt maxims of Eraſmus's book, de Inſtitutione Principis Chriſtiani*, and that this Extract was printed at Paris in 1546, with the Abridgment of the Republic of Francis Patricius. He obſerves alſo that this extract was compoſed by Giles d'Aurigni, called *le Pamphile*, an advocate in the parliament; and that it was printed at Paris in 1543, with an Abridgment of the Republic of Francis Patricius. We find in the Bibliotheque of du Verdier (18), that *John du Ferey, knight of Dur-Eſcu, a counſellor of the king's privy-council, tranſlated out of Latin the firſt book of the writings of Francis Patricius, a Sieneſe, biſhop of Gaëta, which treat of the reign or government of one ſingle perſon, called Monarchy, and of the inſtitution of a good king, at Paris,* 1577, in 8vo. There is a French tranſlation of the nine books *of the Republic*, printed at Paris in 1610, in 8vo. The author of that verſion, is called the Sieur de la Mouchettiere. I cannot tell, whether the notes which are found at the end of each chapter, are the work of the tranſlator, or only a verſion of the notes of John Savigni. Who would not imagine, after ſo many editions, that it is an admirable work, and yet thoſe that are good judges deſpiſe it. ‘Eodem fermè tempore (19) Franciſcus Patricius Senenſis Farraginem quandam exemplorum ſub Reipublicæ titulo, puerorum credo uſui ac chriarum in Scholis compoſitioni, evulgavit: tantum diſſimilis alteri Franciſco Patricio Romano (20), qui non nihil pariter de hac re inter opuſcula juvenilia protulit; quantum noctua Aquilæ, aut Anſer diſpar eſt olori (21). - - - *About the ſame time Francis Patricius of Siena publiſhed a certain compilation of examples, under the title of a Republic, for the uſe, I ſuppoſe, of children, and for exerciſes in ſchools: as unlike the other Francis Patricius of Rome, who alſo publiſhed ſomething of this kind amongſt his juvenile works, as the owl is unlike the eagle, or the gooſe the ſwan.*’

You will find in the treatiſe of the Origin of Printing at Paris, that the edition which John Savigni cauſed to be publiſhed, did not pleaſe him, although the impreſſion was *from a very good letter*. It was full of faults, and this vexed him ſo much the more, becauſe he had taken add, that Francis Patricius, the Philoſopher, complains very much of his fate [*B*].

---

(1) Geſner. in Bibl. *fol.* 250, & 253, *verſo*.

(2) *Pag.* 242.

(3) In the Epitome of Geſner.

(4) Konig. Bibl. *pag.* 612.

(5) Barth. *in lib.* 11, (*and not* 1, *as Konig ſays*) Thebaidos Statii, *pag.* 437.

(6) He ſpeaks there of the kettles they ſounded at the time of the eclipſes of the moon.

(7) In the *Jugemens des Sçavans ſur les Poëtes, Tom. i, num.* 1062, it is ſaid, that Francis Patricius (*viz.* the Philoſopher that oppoſed Ariſtotle) was beheaded at Rome in 1597.

(8) Volaterran. Commentar. Urbanor. *lib. xxi, pag. m.* 773.

(9) Who was advanced to the Popedom in 1471.

(10) *Pag. m.* 158.

(11) Miræus, de Scriptoribus Sæculi XVI, *pag.* 22.

(12) The 23d of March 1460. Ughelli, ubi infra.

(13) Ughelli, Italia Sacra, *Tom. i, pag.* 588.

(14) Epitome Biblioth. Geſneri.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Biblioth. Franc. *pag.* 406.

(17) Joly, Codicille Chrétien, *the preface, pag.* 35, *Edit.* 1666.

(18) *At pag.* 689, 690.

(19) That is, at the time when a book of Robortel, and the treatiſe of Jerome Vida, *de Republica*, appeared. Naudæus is miſtaken; for the book of Patricius was dedicated to Pope Sixtus IV. Robortel and Vida were alive ſtill after the middle of the XVIth century.

(20) Naudæus is miſtaken, this Patricius was not a Roman, he was born in the territories of Venice.

(21) Naudæus, Bibliogr. Polit. *pag. m.* 21.

He diſguiſed himſelf under the name of Francis Mutus (*f*) in the title page of his *Diſceptationes contra Theodori Angelutii calumnias*. This Angelutius a famous Phyſician, had undertaken againſt him a defence of Ariſtotle. There is in the laſt edition

taken a great deal of pains *to correct thoſe that were in the MS*; for you muſt know that this edition was made *from a MS, which John Prevoſt, a counſellor of the parliament, had brought from Italy* (22). From whence one might perhaps conclude, that this edition of Paris is the firſt.

[*B*] *Patricius the Philoſopher complains much of his fate.*] He regrets the ſeven years he had ſpent in the iſle of Cyprus, being removed from his ſtudies, and taken up with ſuch affairs as were profitable only to others, growing weary of a labour, which was ſo little to his own advantage, he lived with Philip Mocenigo, archbiſhop of that iſle, and after he had been ſome time in his houſe, he followed him to Venice, and then to Padua (23). Returning with great ſatisfaction to his ſtudies, he wrote the life of Ariſtotle ; but his unhappy fate took him off from this pleaſant employment, and tranſported him into Spain, tho' from nine years of age he had ſcarce done any thing but run from place to place, by ſea and by land. *Ecce me fati quædam vis, quæ me novem annorum puerum, ad hanc uſque ætatem, peregrinationibus continuis terraque marique exercuerat, in Hiſpanias abripuit* (24). He returned to Venice at the end of ſix months, and finiſhed the life of Ariſtotle. This work contained alſo a judgment upon the writings of this Philoſopher ; in a word, it is the firſt volume of his Peripatetic Diſcuſſions (25). This is what the Epiſtle Dedicatory of this volume informs us of. The dedication of the ſecond diſcovers to us, that the author found a place of refuge at the court of the duke of Ferrara, and an employ to his mind, ſince he permitted him to teach in the univerſity of Ferrara the philoſophy of Plato. ‘Cui melius labores meos dicarem,’ *thus he ſpeaks to Antony Montecatin, firſt ſecretary to Alphonſus d'Eſte, the ſecond of that name.* ‘. . . quam ei viro qui me peſſum Cyprico bello datum, peſſimorumque hominum ingratitudine, fraudibus, inſidiiſque agitatum, perque multos annos fortunæ adverſiſſimæ fluctibus actum, in portum recepit, in Sereniſſi. Principis hujus familiam interpoſuit. Platonicam philoſophiam, in ſingulare hujuſce Academiæ ornamentum publice profiteri dedit (26) ? - - - *To whom could I better dedicate my labours, than to him who, after I had been overwhelmed in the Cyprian war, harraſſed by the ingratitude, frauds, and treachery of wicked men, and toſſed up and down for many years with the waves of adverſe fortune, received me into an harbour, and placed me in the family of this moſt ſerene prince. He allowed me to teach the philoſophy of Plato, to the ſingular honour of this univerſity.*’ Theſe are the heavy complaints he makes in a few words againſt the malice of his envious enemies, and the hardneſs of his fate. He repeats the ſame thing in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the fourth Tome ; for in his addreſs to a biſhop, who had formerly been his fellow-ſtudent at Padua, he informs him of the entertainment he had found after many misfortunes in the city of Modena, and how Ferrara ſerved him at laſt for an harbour. ‘Neque enim locorum diſtantia, qua tu quidem per Italiam perque Galliam, ego verò per Dalmatiam, per Græciam, per Aſiam, ac demum per Hiſpaniam atque Galliam disjuncti poſtea ſemper fuimus, potuit eam oblivioni tradere, neque ex animis noſtris eradere fortuna diſpar, quæ te in arduis ſemper negotiis ac magnis magnorum principum habuit, donec ad eam dignitatem, qua nunc frueris, longè meritò es evectus. Ego verò pauperie preſſus, dum aliena commoda curo, mea non curo, continuis itineribus terraque marique exercitus, Cyprica clade oppreſſus, atque ingratiſſimorum peſſimorumque hominum fraudibus inſidiiſque circumventus, Mutinæ in patria tua, te abſente, apud veteres amicos, apudque Alexandrum Baranzonum equitem, ac Tarquiniam Molziam ſingularem totius ſeculi fœminam, primum reſedi, poſtea è marinis fortunæque fluctibus in hunc portum ſum devectus (27). - - - *For neither the diſtance of places whereby you and I have been ever after ſeparated from one another ; you by Italy and France, and I by Dalmatia, Greece, Aſia, and at laſt Spain and France, could make us forget it ; nor that different kind of fortune, which kept you always employed in the grand and weighty affairs of great princes, till you was deſervedly raiſed to that dignity which you now enjoy, has been able to root it out of our minds. But for my part, after I had been oppreſſed with poverty, whilſt I looked after the affairs of others, and neglected my own, continually fatigued with journies and voyages, overwhelmed with the Cyprian war, and circumvented by the fraud and treachery of the moſt wicked and ungrateful men, I reſided firſt at Modena, in your country, with my old friends, and with Alexander Baranzoni, knight, and Tarquinia Molzia, the moſt excellent woman of the whole age, and afterwards I was carried by the waves of the ſea, and of fortune, into this harbour.*’ I do not find that he was profeſſor at Padua, as Lorenzo Craſſo (28), and after him Mr Moreri, ſays. It had been better to have followed Thuanus (29), who ſays that Patricius having been profeſſor ſeventeen years at Ferrara, went from thence to Rome (30), being invited by Clement VIII.

A certain perſon told me the other day, that Patricius was born at Cliſſa in Iſtria, as Thuanus affirms, and there is a fortreſs called Cliſſa in Dalmatia ; it may be therefore that Franciſcus Patricius Dalmata, does not differ from this Patricius, although Mr Teiſſier (31) deſires us *to take heed that we do not confound FRANCIS PATRICIUS, of whom we now ſpeak, with . . . FRANCIS PATRICIUS born in Sclavonia, who is the author of a book, intituled,* Eſpoſitione delli oracoli di Leone Imperatore (32). I anſwered poſitively, that there is no diſtinction to be made between them. Thuanus, in the firſt book *de Vita ſua*, gives the epithet of Dalmata to Franciſcus Patricius, the author of the Peripatetic Diſcuſſions. I was not ſo poſitive about theſe words of the book of Mr Teiſſier, *his new Philoſophy about the Predicables* (33). He has ill tranſlated, ſaid that perſon to me, the *Nova de univerſis Philoſophia* of Thuanus. This tranſlation means that this Philoſopher propoſed new doctrines concerning the five words of Pophyry, the *genus*, *ſpecies*, *differentia*, *proprium*, & *accidens*: and it is no wiſe probable, that he would take the pains to refute the ſchoolmen about ſuch things, in all that work. I durſt not be poſitive.

Now I know what is the book which Mr Teiſſier called *new Philoſophy about the Predicables*: but he ſhould not have thus tranſlated the Latin title of this work ; for it treats not at all of the Predicables. It is a folio, and the edition of Venice, 1593, *apud Robertum Meiettum*, has this title : *Nova de Univerſis Philoſophia libris quinquaginta comprehenſa, In qua Ariſtotelica methodo non per motum, ſed per lucem & lumina ad primam cauſam aſcenditur. Deinde nova quadam ac peculiari methodo tota in contemplationem venit divinitas. Poſtremo methodo Platonica rerum univerſitas à conditore Deo deducitur. Auctore Franciſco Patricio Philoſopho eminentiſſimo, & in celeberrimo Romano Gymnaſio ſumma cum laude eandem Philoſophiam publice interpretante, quibus poſtremo ſunt adjecta Zoroaſtris oracula* CCCXX, *ex Platonicis collecta. Hermetis Triſmegiſti libelli & fragmenta quotcunque reperiuntur ordine ſcientifico diſpoſita. Aſclepii diſcipuli tres libelli. Myſtica Ægyptiorum à Platone dictata, ab Ariſtotele excepta, & perſcripta Philoſophia. Platonicorum dialogorum novus penitus à Franciſco Patricio inventus ordo ſcientificus. Capita demum multa in quibus Plato concors, Ariſtoteles vero Catholicæ fidei adverſarius oſtenditur.* You may ſee that the title promiſes only fifty books ; yet the whole work is divided into four parts, whereof the firſt contains ten books, the ſecond twenty-two, the third five, and the fourth thirty-two, which makes in all ſixty-nine books. The author intitules the firſt, *Panaugia*; the ſecond, *Panarchia*; the third, *Pampſychia*; and the fourth, *Pancoſmia*. He treats of the ſublimeſt queſtions in Phyſics and Metaphyſics, and this he does upon hypotheſes altogether extraordinary. He vents many paradoxes, but not without diſcovering an admirable and profound genius. He dedicated this work to Pope Gregory the XIVth, and the Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated at Ferrara, Auguſt the fifth, 1591. This book was cenſured, and the author was obliged to retract (34), which he did a little before his death (35).

[*C*] *Moreri*

(*f*) Naudæus, de Fato & vitæ termino, *pag. m.* 27.

(22) Chevillier, Origine de l'Imprim. de Paris, *pag.* 187.

(23) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the firſt Tome of the *Peripatetic Diſcuſſions.*

(24) Ibid.

(25) It was printed at Venice 1571, in 4to.

(26) Patricius, Epiſt. Dedicator. Tom. ii, Diſcuſſ. Peripatet. pag. 177, Edit. Baſil. 1581, in folio.

(27) Patricius, Epiſt. Dedicatoria Tom. iv, Diſcuſſ. Peripatet. ad Benedictum Manzolium Epiſcopum Regienſem, pag. 363.

(28) Lor. Craſſo, Elogii d'Huom. Letter. *Tom. i, pag.* 62.

(29) Thuanus, *lib. cxix, pag.* 817.

(30) Lor. Craſſo, ubi ſupra, and Moreri, place his profeſſorſhip at Rome, before that which it is pretended he had at Padua.

(31) Teiſſier, Elogies, *Tom. ii, pag.* 279, *Edit.* 1696.

(32) *See* Hankius, de Script. Byzantinis, *Part i, pag.* 417.

(33) Teiſſier, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 277.

(34) Thuan. *lib. cxix, pag.* 817.

(35) Ibid.

edition of Moreri's Dictionary, a new article [*C*], upon which I have a remark to make.

[*C*] *Moreri has a new article, upon which I have a remark to make.*] This new article is that of PATRICIUS (Francis), and is to be found at page 133, of the Paris edition 1699. It contains this; that this Francis Patricius, *lived in the XVIIth century*; that he *wrote in Italian a hiſtory of Poetry, divided into ten books*; that he *does only act the part of an hiſtorian in this work, without enlarging much upon the rules of the Art of Poetry*; that *his head was cut off at Rome in* 1597. Janus Nicius Erythræus is cited *in Pinacotheca I*, page 204 and 205. My firſt obſervation will be, That this Francis Patricius ought not to be the ſubject of a new Article, ſince he does not at all differ from Francis Patricius the Philoſopher, who is in page 134. The proofs of this are demonſtrative; for it is moſt evident, that Nicius Erythræus, in the place cited, ſpeaks only of Francis Patricius, the adverſary of Ariſtotle, and that he ſays two or three things of him, which Moreri attributes to Patricius at page 134. It is certain alſo, that Erythræus aſcribes to Patricius a book *de Arte Poëtica*, which is the ſame with that wherein, if we may believe Father Rapin cited by Mr Baillet (36), he contents himſelf with *acting the part of an hiſtorian, without enlarging much upon the Rules of the Art of Poetry.* I ſhall obſerve by the by, that it is very probable this Jeſuit did ſcarce know this piece of Francis Patricius. It is a work divided into two decads (37), in the firſt of which the author writes like an Hiſtorian, and in the ſecond, like a Diſputant who preſſes Ariſtotle very hard (38). My ſecond obſervation is, that ſince they intended to ſpeak only to the diſadvantage of this work, they ought not to have cited only Janus Nicius Erythræus, who ſpeaks very much to its advantage. 'Edidit de ſcribenda hiſtoria tres Dialogos, & de Arte Poëtica totidem decadas, quibus precium ſtatui pro illorum æſtimatione vix poteſt (39). - - - *He publiſhed three dialogues about writing hiſtory, and as many decads upon the Art of Poetry, which are of an infinite value.*' Neither ſhould they have obſerved, that this work is divided into ten books; for Erythræus ſuppoſes that it contained three decads. I believe he is miſtaken, but it is certain that it contains two. Laſtly, They ſhould not have ſaid, that Patricius was beheaded; for it is falſe, and is no where to be found in the author whom they cite. To place in the XVIIth century a man who is believed to have had his head cut off in 1597, is a fault that ought to be aſcribed to the Printers, but not that of ſaying that Gaëta is in Calabria (40).

(36) In the firſt Tome of the *Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, num.* 1062.

(37) Della Poëtica deca Iſtoriale. Della Poëtica deca Diſputata. *This work was printed at Ferrara in* 1586.

(38) Lorenzo Craſſo, Elogii, *Tom. i, pag.* 62.

(39) Nicius Erythræus, Pinac. I, *pag.* 204, 205.

(40) This is found in Moreri's Dictionary of the Dutch edition 1698, and in that of Paris, 1699, in the article PATRICIUS, author of the book *de Regno & Regis Inſtitutione.*

PATRICIUS (ANDREW) was one of the learned men who were born in Poland in the XVIth century. He ſtudied at Padua, and acquired the eſteem of the moſt famous profeſſors of that country, particularly of Sigonius and Paul Manutius (*a*). He publiſhed ſome books that made him famous [*A*], and obtained good benefices in his own country. He was provoſt of the church of Warſaw, archdeacon of Wilna, and at laſt biſhop of Wenden. The king of Poland, Stephen Battori, having recovered Livonia, which the Muſcovites had ſeized, erected a biſhopric in the city of Wenden, and gave it to our Patricius, who enjoyed it not very long, for he died quickly after. This was in the year 1583 (*b*).

(*a*) See the three letters which Paul Manutius wrote to Andrew Patricius. They are the 19th and 20th of the 4th book, and the 6th of the 3d.

(*b*) *Taken from* Simon Starovolſcius, in Elogiis centum Polonorum, *pag.* 27, 28.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books which made him famous.*] He had carefully cultivated the ſtudy of the *Belles Lettres*, and wrote in Latin with ſome politeneſs. Which appears by his commentaries on two orations of Cicero, and by the harangues he made to the king of Poland, Stephen Battori, to congratulate him in the name of the clergy of Warſaw, for having three times beat the army of the Muſcovites. The pains he took, and which doubtleſs were very great, to collect together the fragments of Cicero, diſcovered very good things, which a great many learned men would never have come to the knowledge of, when they lay ſcattered up and down before he had collected them. The works of Cicero which are loſt by the injury of time, were ſome of the fineſt that he wrote. Several paſſages of them which are found in St Auguſtin and elſewhere, are admirable; but how many learned men are there, who would never have ſought for them in thoſe places? It is therefore a great advantage to them that Andrew Patricius has collected together theſe fragments. He wrote alſo ſome books of controverſy, *Paralleli Eccleſiæ Orthodoxæ cum Synagoga Hæreticorum. De vera & falſa Eccleſia libri quinque* (1).

(1) *See* Starovolſcius, in Elog. centum Polonorum, *pag.* 26.

PAUL II, created Pope the thirty-firſt of Auguſt 1464 (*a*), was ſon to Nicholas Barbo, a noble Venetian, and to a ſiſter of Eugenius IV. Mr Moreri obſerves, that *the Proteſtants have ſpoken very diſadvantageouſly of this Pontif*; but ſince he ſpecifies almoſt nothing, I ſhall here give ſome account of that matter. They ſay then (*b*), that he was an accomplice in the perfidy, wherewith Ferdinand king of Naples cauſed Picinin to be maſſacred; that he was a perſecutor of learned men [*A*]: that he ſold all offices; that *he did not willingly give biſhoprics, but to ſuch as had other employments, from the ſale of which they could make him a preſent*; *that he extended the Bull of caſes reſerved to the Popes as far as poſſibly he could, having by that means ſo much the more pretence to draw money from all parts: that he purchaſed at any price what valuable jewels he could get to enrich the Papal mitre, with which he took a pleaſure to appear, his face being even painted*; *that he detained ſtrangers in the city, permitting the holy handkerchief*

(*a*) Platina, in Paulo II.

(*b*) *See* Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag. m.* 542, 543.

[*A*] *The Proteſtants . . . . ſay he was the perſecutor of learned men.*] 'He had ſuch an averſion to men of learning, that he looked on them as heretics, and deprived all the learned men of their offices, who had been promoted by his predeceſſors. *Becauſe* (ſays an hiſtorian, who was a great flatterer of Popes *) *he was very ignorant, he cruelly perſecuted all men of learning and honeſty, he uſed to call heretics all thoſe Romans who applied themſelves to the ſtudy of good literature: and he always exhorted the children of Rome not to ſtudy. He not only deprived ſeveral learned men of their eſtates, but threw them into priſon, and made them ſuffer cruel torments: amongſt others Baptiſt Platina, and Mylverton, an Engliſhman, provincial of the Carmelites* (1).' I have related in other places of this Dictionary (2) the perſecution of Platina, and what was the cauſe of it. I ſhall only ſet down here the words, in which he repreſents the taſte of this Pope for ſtudies. 'Humanitatis ſtudia ita oderat & contemnebat, ut ejus ſtudioſos uno nomine hæreticos appellaret. Hanc ob rem Romanos adhortabatur ne filios diutius in ſtudiis literarum verſari paterentur: ſatis eſſe ſi legere & ſcribere didiciſſent (3). - - - *For this reaſon he exhorted the Romans not to ſuffer their ſons any longer to apply themſelves to learning: that it was ſufficient if they learned to read and write.*' Mr du Pleſſis having tranſlated theſe words of Platina, adds that they were the reaſon that Genebrard in the ſecond part of his Chronicle calls this Pope *an enemy to virtue and learning* (4). Father Gretſer,

* Wicelius, in Epitome Rom. Pontif.

(1) Jurieu, Prejugez Légitimes contre le Papiſme, *Tom. i, pag.* 245.

(2) See the article PLATINA, remark [*B*], & *ſeq*; and the article EXPERIENS, remark [*A*].

(3) Platina, in Paulo II, *ſub fin. fol. m.* 362, *verſo.*

(4) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniq. *pag.* 543.

handkerchief to be ſhewn according to cuſtom, that there might be the more people at once to behold him: that he had a baſtard daughter [*B*]; *that he was ſtrangled in the night-time by the devil in the very act of whoredom* [*C*]; that he paſſed the days in ſleeping, and the nights in counting his money, and in viewing his jewels and pictures (*c*); that he was a great drinker, and that in the midſt of Lent he cauſed games of drunkenneſs to be celebrated, to which he invited all ſorts of people, by giving them hopes of prizes and rewards: that he abandoned himſelf to Sodomy and Magic (*d*) [*D*]. Some of

not finding that in the Chronicle of Genebrard of the Cologne edition 1581, ſuſpected the quotation to be falſe (5). I ſhall decide nothing; for tho' my edition, which is that of Lyons 1609, has not this remark in the place where Paul II is ſpoken of, yet Genebrard might poſſibly have ſo characteriſed this Pope in ſome other place. Moreover, it is not eaſy to conceive that there is an edition of Cologne 1581 of the Chronicle of Genebrard, ſince the epiſtle dedicatory of the author is dated November 1584, and takes notice that it is the firſt time the book is publiſhed. Perhaps the Printer of Father Gretſer has put M. D. LXXXI inſtead of M. D. LXXXXI. But however, ſince the edition he made uſe of is not the firſt, it would ſtill be a queſtion whether it has not been curtailed of the paſſage which Du Pleſſis might have read in the firſt edition.

[*B*] . . . *that he had a baſtard daughter.*] The proof which is given of it is taken from theſe four verſes of Janus Pannonius:

Pontificis Pauli teſtes ne Roma requiras,
  Filia quam genuit, ſat docet eſſe marem.
Sanctum non poſſum, Patrem te dicere poſſum
  Cum video natam, Paule ſecunde, tuam (6).

Rome needs not ſearch Pope Paul the ſecond's tail,
His baſtard daughter proves he is a male.
Whene'er, O Paul, I ſee thy child, I may
Thee father call, but Holy cannot ſay.

They confirm it by the following verſes of another Poet.

Quum ſit filia, Paule, ſit tibi aurum,
Quantum Pontifices habere raros
Vidit Roma prius, Pater vocari
Sanctus non potes, at potes beatus.

As you've a daughter, Paul, and wealth much more
Than Popes of Rome were wont to have before.
Of Father truly you deſerve the name,
The title rich *not* holy *you may claim.*

They add (7), that Paul II, having read theſe pieces of Poetry, fell a-crying, and lamented the hard law of Celibacy, and that he reſolved to aboliſh it. You will find elſewhere (8) upon what teſtimony this is grounded. I muſt not omit that Platina has ſaid nothing concerning that baſtard, and that his ſilence is taken by the apologiſts of Paul II for a juſtifying proof: for, ſay they (9), that hiſtorian has ſpoken ſo ill of this Pope thro' a ſpirit of reſentment and wrath, that he would not have ſpared him on the ſubject of Incontinency, had he been able to defame him as the father of a girl, known by all the Romans. They make the ſame remark as to other ſlanders not mentioned by him.

[*C*] . . . . *that he was ſtrangled in the night-time by the Devil in the very act of whoredom.*] Mr Du Pleſſis Mornai ſays this upon the teſtimony of Peucer. I have conſulted that witneſs, and found he expreſſes himſelf in this manner. ‘ Paulus ſecundus ob ſpurciſſimam libidinem maſculam & artes Dæmoniacas publice infamis & execrabilis, utpote quem tandem in concubitu à Dæmone ſtrangulatum, obtorti colli terribile ſpecie mortis genus oſtendiſſe fama eſt (10). - - - *That is,* according to the verſion of Simon Goulart, *Paul II, notoriouſly infamous and execrable, on the account of his ſodomies and magic arts, was at laſt, according to the relation of Hiſtorians, ſtrangled in his bed by the Devil, who twiſted his neck off.*’ I fancy this tranſlator imagined thro' a deception of ſight that there was in his text *cubitu*, and not *concubitu*. Perhaps too he made uſe of an edition, wherein the Printer had forgot the firſt ſyllable of *concubitu*. I cannot conceive any other reaſon, why he ſhould have weakened the narrative of Peucer, by eclipſing the circumſtance of the impure act wherein the Pontif was ſtrangled by the Devil. It is not the cuſtom of Simon Goulart to enervate ſuch things: on the contrary he takes a pleaſure in heightening them. We have here an inſtance of it, ſince he has tranſlated thoſe Latin words *fama eſt* by theſe *according to the relation of hiſtorians.* There is a good deal of difference between *they ſay, there is a report,* and *Hiſtorians relate.* Peucer only uſes the expreſſion *they ſay,* his tranſlator has made uſe of another phraſe: they are both in the wrong, for one ought never thus to defame one's enemies without good quotations: but Goulart is more to blame than Peucer. The illuſtrious author (11), who is contented here with the teſtimony of a Proteſtant, ſhould have foreſeen that he would expoſe him to reproaches. And accordingly it is come to paſs, as we ſee by the following paſſage of a Jeſuit: ‘ Illud Diabolicum mendacium eſt, *Paulum in ipſo actu venereo à Diabolo ſtrangulatum:* nam omnes apoplexia extinctum tradunt, etiam accerrimus hoſtis ejus Platina. Sed Pleſſæus dicti ſui teſtem laudat Peucerum, hominem mendaciloquentiſſimum: cui qui fidem commodandam cenſet, is neſcit adhuc, quàm in rebus referendis infidus, & fide indignus ſit Peucerus, etiam apud ipſos Sectarios, præſertim Lutheranos Ubiquiſtas, qui Peucerum ob ſcelera ſua decennali carcere macerarunt: quo forſan tempore à Diabolo hoc de Paulo mendacium accepit (12). - - - *It is a deviliſh lie to ſay, that Paul in the very act of whoredom was ſtrangled by the Devil: for all Hiſtorians, even his fierceſt enemy Platina, ſay that he died of an apoplexy. But Du Pleſſis cites Peucer for his author, the greateſt liar that ever lived: whoever thinks, that Peucer is to be believed, does not yet know how unfaithful he is in relating matters, and how unworthy of credit, even amongſt the heretics themſelves, eſpecially the Lutheran Ubiquitarians, who upon the account of his crimes kept him in jail for the ſpace of ten years: at which time perhaps he learned from the Devil this lie concerning Paul.*’ ‘ Du Pleſſis quotes in the margin Peucher (13), a notorious heretic, ſon-in-law to Melanchton, from whom we cannot expect any true teſtimony with regard to the Popes (14).’ This is the anſwer Coëffeteau made.

[*D*] . . . . *that he abandoned himſelf to Sodomy and Magic.*] The end of the chapter where Mr Du Pleſſis Mornai ſpeaks of this Pope is thus worded: *but the worſt ſtill is we find an author that imputes to him both Magic and Sodomy* (15). He does not tell who the author is, and by this ſilence expoſes himſelf to very ſevere reflexions. Gretſer challenges him to name that author, and in the mean time treats him as the forger of a calumny, which neither Platina, nor even Bale has ſaid one word about. ‘ Non vult Pleſſæus, homo religioſiſſimus, Paulum *Magiæ & præpoſteræ Libidinis* accuſare; & tamen dum non vult, impudentiſſime accuſat. At, *non deeſſe, qui illum horum criminum inſimulent.* Quinam illi? Certè non Platina, qui odio Pauli talia flagitia vix latere ſiviſſet. Non ipſe calumniatorum primipilus Balæus. Quare nulla injuria Pleſſæum gravabis, licet ex ipſius officina deteſtabile hoc commentum proceſſiſſe credas: donec unde acceperit auctorem edat, quem ſi ediderit, Pleſſæo tam ſimilem conſpicies, quam ovum ovo, & lac lacti (16). - - - *Du Pleſſis, a mighty religious man, is unwilling forſooth to accuſe Paul of Magic and unnatural luſt; and yet whilſt he is unwilling, he moſt impudently accuſes him. But, ſays he, there are not wanting ſome who accuſe him of theſe crimes. Who are they? Certainly not Platina, who from his hatred to Paul would hardly have concealed ſuch wickedneſs. Nor even Bale himſelf, the ring-leader of ſlanderers. And therefore no injuſtice will be done to Du Pleſſis, if we ſuppoſe that he forged this abominable lie in his own ſhop: until he tell us the author he had it from,*

‘ and

(*c*) Revius, in Hiſtor. Pontificum Roman. *pag.* 245.

(*d*) Id. ib.

(5) Gretſer, in Exam. Myſterii Pleſſæani, *pag.* 535.

(6) *See* Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſt. d'Iniq. *pag.* 543, & Joh. Zuinger. de Feſto Corporis Chriſti, *pag.* 132.

(7) Ibid.

(8) In the remark [*B*] of the article ORICHOVIUS.

(9) *See* Gretſer, in Exam. Myſt. Pleſſæan. *pag.* 536, & Coëffeteau, Reponſe au Myſt. d'Iniq. *pag.* 1199.

(10) Peucer, Chronicorum, *lib. v, pag. m.* 895.

(11) Du Pleſſis Mornai.

(12) Gretſer, in Exam. Myſt. Pleſſ. *pag.* 535.

(13) It ſhould have been ſaid, that Du Pleſſis ought to have writ *Peucer*, and not *Peucher*.

(14) Coëffeteau, Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniq. *pag.* 1198.

(15) Du Pleſſis, Myſt. d'Iniq. *pag.* 544.

(16) Gretſer, in Exam. Myſt. Pleſſ. *pag.* 536.

of theſe things are related by Platina, either as certain, or as reports that had been current. The reſt are not founded on very good teſtimonies. However it be, I do not think the Proteſtants have made mention of a notorious piece of injuſtice of this Pontif, which we find in the writings of a contemporary cardinal, one of the moſt illuſtrious prelates of that age. I ſhall give it in the very words of one of the writers of Port-Royal [*E*]. Paul II died of an apoplexy [*F*] the twenty-eighth of July 1471 (*e*). It was he who reduced *the Jubilee to twenty-five years in hopes of enjoying this* market in the year 1475 (*f*).

‘ *and if he does, you will find him as like Du Pleſſis, as one egg is like another, or milk to milk.*’ One would be ſurpriſed that Mr de Mornai ſcrupled to cite Peucer in that matter, ſince he had juſt cited him about a thing, which was no leſs infamous. It is Peucer, who relates alſo, as we have ſeen above (17), the two abominations contained in the text of this remark. Gretſer did not know that.

I ſhall obſerve by the way, that had Peucer quoted any author of the XVth century, he would have ſecured himſelf againſt the reproach that may be made, for having brought a very uncertain tradition and very remote from it's origin as his only proof. He wrote an hundred years after the death of this Pope: a time ſufficiently long to corrupt traditions that were not immediately fixed in ſome writing (18). There is another obſervation I would make, which is, that we ought much more to miſtruſt a tradition of ſlander, than a tradition of praiſe, when it regards perſons who have incurred the public hatred thro' the ſeverity of their extortions. There was not one ſtory which people did not believe in France, when it defamed either cardinal Richelieu, or cardinal Mazarin. A domeſtic turned away for very good reaſons, a family chaſtiſed very juſtly, needed only to ſlander their eminencies, and forge whatever they thought fit, and immediately it was believed with all the pleaſure in the world, and handed about from one to another. Would an Hiſtorian act a prudent part to pick up ſuch ſtories? To be able to do it without juſt reproach, one muſt be cotemporary: for then it might be poſſible to make inſtructive inquiries: but at the end of three or four generations there is no poſſibility almoſt of finding out the grounds of uncertain and vulgar reports, which no author thought worth their while to adopt. It is proper to remember here that Paul II was of a rough and haughty temper, covetous, &c (19). To conclude, Peucer ought by all means to have quoted ſome author, and not common fame in general.

[*E*] *I ſhall relate* a notorious piece of injuſtice of Paul II *in the very words of one of the writers of Port-Royal.*] ‘It is the cuſtom of the cardinals aſſembled to chuſe a Pope, to make amongſt themſelves certain laws which they judge uſeful to the church, and to oblige themſelves by oath to keep them, in caſe they ſhould be promoted to the ſovereign pontificate. This cuſtom was obſerved before the election of Pope Paul II, and amongſt other things it was determined, that it ſhould never be inſerted in the bulls and decrees that any ordinance had been made by the advice of the cardinals, unleſs in truth it had been examined and conſented to by them: *Nil in diplomatibus factum dicere ex fratrum conſilio, quod ad verum conſulentibus iis decretum non eſſet,* ſays the cardinal James di Pavia, *Commen.* 2. (20). Nothing could be more lawful than this decree, ſince it only obliged them not to tell a lie. So, Peter, cardinal de St Mark, a Venetian, having been choſen in this conclave, and having taken the name of Paul II, confirmed as Pope what he had ſworn as cardinal; adding that he would have obſerved theſe regulations, tho' he had not been obliged thereto by a vow and ſolemn oath. Nevertheleſs, as the mind of man is naturally bent to diſengage itſelf as much as poſſible from all manner of reſtraint, and to look upon laws as a troubleſome ſlavery, from which it is convenient to free one's ſelf, this Pope gave ear a little while after to ſome ambitious and flattering prelates, who told him he was not tied down to all thoſe regulations that limited the papal power, which ought not to be bounded by any laws: ſo that far, from obſerving what he had ſworn, he reſolved to oblige the cardinals to ſign the bulls and decrees, without giving them any information about them. This proceeding ſeemed very harſh and odious to the ſacred college, who were all perſuaded that the Pope could not diſpenſe with keeping a promiſe ſo ſolemn and ſo lawful: and therefore their inclination and opinion was, that they ſhould abſolutely refuſe the ſubſcriptions which the Pope demanded of them. But it evidently appeared on this occaſion, that the conſtancy neceſſary to oppoſe a ſuperior ſo powerful, and who has ſo many ways of doing hurt, is not a very common virtue: and that as there is nothing more eaſy and more uſual than that obedience, which complies with all the inclinations of ſuperiors, whatever they be, ſo there is nothing more difficult and more rare than that holy diſobedience, which leads one to oppoſe them in things unjuſt and unreaſonable. *The cardinals,* ſays James di Pavia, *were forced to ſign briefs which they had not read, ſome by flatteries and ſome by menaces: and the violence of Pope Paul was ſo great, that cardinal Beſſarion running out of his chamber that he might not ſign a decree which he had not ſeen, the Pope ſtopped him with his hand, and threatened to excommunicate him unleſs he ſigned it,* which he did at laſt, not having courage enough to withſtand ſo powerful an authority, tho' in a viſible piece of injuſtice. Thoſe cardinals, who had more honour and conſcience, made likewiſe more reſiſtance to this order of the Pope; and cardinal di Pavia, who had a great deal, at firſt was not contented with refuſing to obey it, but moreover wrote to the Pope a letter, wherein he took the freedom to repreſent to him the obligation he was under to keep the oath he had made, and how unjuſt the ſubſcriptions were which he would exact of them. But at length he was overcome like the reſt and carried away by the torrent of cowardice: and there was but one in the whole ſacred college, which was cardinal Carvial (21), that had reſolution enough to hold out to the end, and to remain firm in refuſing to ſubſcribe thoſe decrees. This is what cardinal James di Pavia himſelf repreſents, confeſſing his own weakneſs with much humility, and extolling on the contrary, the Chriſtian generoſity of cardinal Carvial, a Spaniard by nation. *We all ſubſcribed,* ſays he in his 182d letter, *ſome thro' the deſire of obtaining what we wiſhed for, and ſome thro' the fear of being always expoſed to the effects of his holineſs's indignation. It is true we have been cowardly and too much wedded to ourſelves. We have regarded, not the intereſts of God, but the fleſh and the good things of this life. No body however approved the proceeding of the Pope. But there was none except cardinal John Carvial, far advanced in years and illuſtrious by his merits, who acquired on this occaſion the glory of being conſtant. He excuſed himſelf from conſenting to this infamy, and could not be diverted from his reſolution by all the artful ſollicitations of the Pope, who preſſed him to it; telling, in anſwer to all the motives that were uſed with him, that it muſt not be expected he would abandon juſtice in his old-age, which he had never abandoned in his youth. I ſhall give you, ſaid he to the Pope, no trouble about thoſe laws, but allow me to have a regard to my own conſcience and honour.* Which made cardinal di Pavia conclude that this perſon was worthy, not only to ſit amongſt them as cardinal, but to preſide over them as Pope: VIR *profecto dignus, non qui nobiſcum ſedeat, ſed qui præſideat ad conſilium Sedis Romanæ* (22).’

I am ſurpriſed that ſuch a fact ſhould eſcape ſo many Proteſtant authors, who have collected together the wicked actions of Popes.

[*F*] *Paul II died of an apoplexy.*] The complaint againſt the Proteſtants, as to what they ſay concerning the cauſe of his death, is not rightly repreſented in Moreri; for there it is ſuppoſed *they ſay, that he was ſtrangled by a man who found him with his wife.* We have ſeen above (23), that they aſcribe this execution to the Devil. It is very certain, no body ſaw him die (24). Platina thinks he died of an Apoplexy, occaſioned by his having eat two large melons. ‘Bibaciſſimus quidem erat: ſed vina admodum parva & diluta bibebat. Peponum eſu, cancrorum, paſtillorum,

---

(*e*) Platina, ubi ſupra. *Others ſay the 25th.*

(*f*) Du Pleſſis, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 543.

(17) In the remark [C].

(18) See the Anſwer to the Queſtions of a Provincial, *pag.* 31.

(19) Moroſus erat & difficilis tum domeſticis tum externis; & ſæpe quod promiſerat mutata ſententia invertebat. . . . . Durus interdum & inexorabilis, ſi quid ab eo peteres habebatur, neque hoc contentus convitia & probra in te conjiciebat. *Platina, in Paulo II, in fine.*

(20) *Theſe words are in the ſecond book of* Jacobi Cardinalis Papienſis Commentarii, *pag.* 371, *of the Francfort edition* 1614.

(21) It ſhould be *Carvagial.*

(22) Les Imaginaires, *Letter IX, pag.* 180, *& ſeq. Edit. of Cologne* 1683, *in* 8*vo.* Note, *that the anonymous author,* (*I believe it is Father* Queſnel) *who publiſhed in* 1704 *a book intituled,* Sincere Advices to the Catholics of the United Provinces upon the decree of the Inquiſition of Rome againſt the Archbiſhop of Sebaſte Vicar Apoſtolic, *has recited this long paſſage of the* Imaginaires, *pag.* 95, *& ſeq.*

(23) In the remark [C].

(24) Apoplexia ſolus in cubiculo nemine vidente, ſecunda noctis hora moritur. *Genebr. Chron. lib. iv, pag. m.* 701, *& Carranza, in Summa Concilior. pag. m.* 879.

‘ rum, piſcium, ſuccidiæ admodum delectabatur, quibus ex rebus ortam crediderim apoplexiam illam, qua ‘ e vita ſublatus eſt, nam duos pepones & quidem ‘ prægrandes comederet eo die quo ſequenti nocte mortuus eſt (25). - - - - - *He was indeed a great drinker: ‘ but the wine he drank was very ſmall and mixed with ‘ water. He loved extremely to eat melons, crabs, paſtils, fiſh, and bacon, whence I ſuppoſe proceeded the ‘ Apoplexy which carried him off, for he had eat two ‘ very large melons that day, when he died the night following.*’ This Hiſtorian ſays elſewhere, that he believes the Apoplexy was cauſed by the weight of jewels, wherewith the Pope loved to load his head. ‘ Qui (*Leo IV Imperator*) adeo gemmis delectatus eſt, ut ‘ direpto ſacrario S. Sophiæ coronam magni ponderis ‘ ac precii ſibi conſtituerit, qua quidem ita frequenter ‘ utebatur, ut aut propter pondus, aut ob frigiditatem ‘ lapillorum ſubito morbo correptus ſit. Idem quoque ‘ accidiſſe noſtra ætate Paulo II putaverim, quod adeo ‘ his muliebribus delinimentis delectatus eſt, conquiſitis ‘ undique magno precio gemmis, & exhauſto pene Eccleſiæ Romanæ ærario ut quotieſcunque in publicum ‘ prodiret, Cybele quædam phrigia ac turrita, non mitrata videretur. Hinc ego ortam tum ſudore præpinguis corporis, tum gemmarum pondere apoplexiam ‘ illam puto, qua correptus ſubito morbo interiit (26). ‘ - - - *The emperor Leo IV, was ſo delighted with jewels, ‘ that having robbed the ſacriſty of St Sophia, he made ‘ himſelf a crown of great weight and value, which he ‘ wore ſo frequently, that, either becauſe of the weight ‘ or coldneſs of the gems, he was ſeized with a ſudden ‘ illneſs. The ſame I ſuppoſe happened in our time to ‘ Paul II, becauſe he was ſo pleaſed with theſe effeminate ‘ toys, having purchaſed jewels every where at a great ‘ price, and almoſt exhauſted the treaſury of the Roman ‘ church, that whenever he appeared in public, he ſeemed to be ſome Phrygian Cybele with a tower on his head, ‘ and not a mitre. And therefore I am apt to think, ‘ that the Apoplexy whereof he died ſuddenly, might proceed both from the ſweating of his exceeding fat body, ‘ and from the weight of the jewels.*’

(25) Platina, in Paulo II, *fol.* 362, *verſo.*

(26) Idem, in Adriano I, *folio* 125, *verſo.*

PAUL (FATHER) a religious Servite, and Divine of the republic of Venice. See SARPI [§ *a*].

[(§ *a*) The author had promiſed to give the article of the celebrated Father PAUL, under the name SARPI: But he could not be as good as his word for a reaſon, which he gives in the body of the article PEIRESC. REM. CRIT.]

PAULICIANS.

PAULICIANS. Thus were the Manichees in Armenia called, when one Paul became their head in the VIIth century. ‘ They arrived at ſo great a power †, either ‘ by the weakneſs of the government, or by the protection of the Saracens, or even by ‘ the favour of the emperor Nicephorus, who favoured that ſect very much, that at ‘ laſt, being perſecuted by the empreſs Theodora, the wife of Baſil ⸸, they were in a ‘ condition to build towns, and to take up arms againſt their princes. Thoſe wars were ‘ long and bloody under the empire of Baſil the Macedonian, that is, at the end of the ‘ IXth century (*a*).’ And yet there was ſo great a ſlaughter of thoſe Heretics under the empreſs Theodora [*A*], that it ſeemed they would never be able to riſe again. It is thought that the preachers whom they ſent into Bulgaria [*B*], ſettled there the Manichean Hereſy, and that *from thence it ſpread it ſelf ſoon after into the other parts of Europe* (*b*). They condemned the worſhip of ſaints, and the images of the croſs [*C*]; but this was not their principal character. Their fundamental doctrine, was that of two co-eternal principles, and independent one upon another. This doctrine at firſt hearing creates horror, and conſequently it is ſtrange, that the Manichean ſect could ſeduce ſo great a part of the world [*D*]. But on the other ſide, it is ſo difficult to anſwer

† Cedrenus, Tom. ii, pag. 480.

⸸ Ibid. *pag.* 541.

(*a*) Biſhop of Meaux, in his Hiſt. of Variations, *book xi*, *num.* 13, *pag. m.* 128.

(*b*) Ibid. *num.* 16, *pag.* 131.

[*A*] *There was ſo great a ſlaughter of theſe Heretics under the empreſs Theodora.*] There is mention made of it in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary (1). Father Maimbourg is cited there, whoſe words are theſe, ‘ Theodora . . . .reſolved effectually to bring about the ‘ converſion of thoſe Paulicians, or to rid the empire ‘ of them, if they obſtinately oppoſed their true happineſs. . . . . It is true that thoſe to whom ſhe gave a ‘ commiſſion and forces to compaſs this deſign, uſed ‘ them with too much rigour and cruelty; for inſtead ‘ of endeavouring to bring them at firſt by mild and ‘ gentle ways, and with a charitable diſpoſition, to the ‘ knowledge of the truth, they ſeized thoſe wretched ‘ people, that were ſcattered in the cities and boroughs, ‘ and, as is ſaid, they killed near a hundred thouſand ‘ of them all over Aſia, by all kinds of deaths, which ‘ obliged all the reſt to go and yield themſelves up to ‘ the Saracens, who knew very well how to make uſe ‘ of them ſome time after againſt the Greeks. But the ‘ empreſs who had no hand in this inhumanity of her ‘ lieutenants, did nevertheleſs reap this advantage from ‘ it, that the empire at leaſt was purged from this vermine, during her reign of fourteen years (2).’ Theſe ways of converting are altogether Mahometan and confirm what I have ſaid elſewhere (3), that the Chriſtians, have been infinitely more cruel than the followers of Mahomet, againſt thoſe who were not of their religion.

[*B*] *The preachers which they ſent into Bulgaria.*] Petrus (4) Siculus who was ſent by the emperor Baſil, the Macedonian ‘ to Tibrica in Armenia, one of the ‘ places of theſe Heretics, to treat with them about the ‘ exchange of priſoners. . . . (5) diſcovered during the ‘ time of his embaſſy, that it had been reſolved in the ‘ council of the Paulicians, to ſend ſome preachers of ‘ their ſect into Bulgaria, to ſeduce the people that were ‘ newly converted. Thrace bordering upon this province, had been for a long time infected with this ‘ Hereſy: and therefore there was but too much reaſon ‘ to fear for the Bulgarians, if the Paulicians, who ‘ were the moſt cunning of the Manichees, ſhould attempt to ſeduce them; and this obliged Petrus Siculus, to addreſs to their archbiſhop the book we have ‘ mentioned (6), that he might fore-arm them againſt ‘ ſuch dangerous Heretics. But in ſpite of all his care, ‘ it is certain, that the Manichean Hereſy took deep ‘ root in Bulgaria.

[*C*] *They condemned the worſhip of ſaints, and the images of the croſs.*] ‘ Petrus Siculus relates, that a Manichean woman ſeduced an ignorant layman called ‘ Sergius, by telling him the Catholics honoured ſaints ‘ as deities, and that it was for this reaſon, that the ‘ laity were hindred from reading the holy Scripture, ‘ for fear they ſhould diſcover ſeveral ſuch like errors (7). See what has been cited from Maimbourg in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary.

[*D*] *It is ſtrange that the Manichean ſect could ſeduce ſo great a part of the world.*] We have ſeen elſewhere (8) with what earneſtneſs Pope Leo admoniſhes all the biſhops, that they ſhould not ſuffer thoſe Heretics condemned to baniſhment by the Imperial laws, to find any place of refuge. Yet this Hereſy ſupported itſelf, and it became neceſſary to perſecute it with laws much more ſevere, and to condemn to death all thoſe who ſhould make profeſſion of it; nevertheleſs *it continued and ſpread. The emperor Anaſtaſius, and Theodora, the wife of Juſtinian, favoured it. The followers of it appear under the children of Heraclius, that is in the VIIth century in Armenia* (9). We have already ſpoken of the great progreſs it made there. We have ſeen that the maſſacre of 100,000 Paulicians did not hinder the

ſpreading

(1) Under the word *Paulicians.*

(2) Maimbourg's Hiſt. of the Iconoclaſts, *book vi*, *pag.* 263, *Holl. Edit. ad ann.* 845.

(3) In the article MAHOMET, remarks [*O*], and [*AA*].

(4) Biſhop of Meaux, Hiſt. of the Variations, *lib. xi*, *num.* 14.

(5) Ib. *num.* 16.

(6) It is a book whoſe title is *Hiſtoria de Manichæis*. Raderus tranſlated it out of Greek into Latin, and publiſhed it at Ingolſtad with notes, in 1604, in 4to.

(7) Hiſt. of the Variations, ibid. num. 15.

(8) In the article MANICHEES, remark [*E*].

(9) Hiſt. of the Variations, ibid. num. 13.

anſwer their objections, about the origin of evil [*E*], that we muſt not wonder that the hypotheſis

ſpreading of it in Thrace and Bulgaria. It infected afterwards great numbers of perſons in ſeveral provinces of France. Conſult the biſhop of Meaux (10). Lambert Danæus obſerves, that it made a great devaſtation in Perſia, Syria, and Meſopotamia, under the emperor Anaſtaſius, and in Sicily under Pope Gregory the Great. ‘Romam ipſam occupavit hæc hæreſis, unde tamen expulſa eſt à Leone Pontifice Romano circa annum à Chriſto paſſo 414. In Arabia tamen, Perſide, & Ægypto maximè viguit patuitque, unde poſtea Mahometiſmus tanquam ex ſerpentis viperæque uvo enatus & excluſus. Diutiſſimè etiam ſubſtitit. Nam & Anaſtaſii Imperatoris temporibus adhuc in Perſide; Meſopotamia, & Syria graſſabatur apertè: & Gregorii Magni Pontificatu in Sicilia, id eſt, annos poſt Manetem mortuum plus quàm 340 ut apparet ex Gregorii Epiſt. 6. lib. 4. & P. Diaconi lib 15. Hiſtoria, ubi Indaganam eorum Epiſcopum commemorat (11). - - - *This Hereſy infected Rome itſelf*; *however, it was expelled from thence by Pope Leo about the year* 414. *But in Arabia, Perſia, and Ægypt, it flouriſhed and ſpread mightily, from which, as from a ſerpent's or viper's egg, Mahometiſm afterwards was hatched. It likewiſe ſubſiſted a very long time. For under the emperor Anaſtaſius it yet openly prevailed in Perſia, Meſopotamia, and Syria, and in the pontificate of Gregory the Great in Sicily, that is, above* 340 *years after the death of Manes, as appears from Pope Gregory's Epiſt. and P. Diaconus's hiſtory, where he mentions Indagana their biſhop.*’ I dare not affirm, that it ſpread into the provinces of the Eaſt, where we find the doctrine of two principles among ſome Infidel nations; for they might have received it by other means than by the Manichees. I approve the thought of Lewis Thomaſſin. *The relations that are often given us of Aſia, diſcover that there are ſtill*, ſays he (12), *ſome Manichees at this day, beyond the bounds of the ancient Roman empire. I cannot very poſitively affirm, that they are the remainder, or the poſterity, of thoſe who were ſo often baniſhed from the whole Roman empire, and who retired into the neighbouring provinces. There is in this ſome probability, but not the ſame certainty, as when we ſaid the ſame thing of the Arians, Neſtorians, and Eutychians. Theſe are truly Heretics, who could not have their original but from the Catholic church in their time, whoſe bowels they tore to go out of it. But the Manichees originally came from the Eaſt, as deſcending from the ancient idolaters, who admitted alſo two firſt principles, one of good the other of evil, as you may read in Plutarch, and ſeveral other profane Hiſtorians.*

[*E*] *It is ſo difficult to anſwer the objections of the Manichees about the origin of evil.*] I have prepared my readers (13) to ſee here three obſervations which I ſhould have placed in the article of the Manichees, but that I had a mind to avoid prolixity in that place. Let us now perform our promiſe, and not fruſtrate the expectation of thoſe who have a mind to go after our reference. I ſhall place below by themſelves (14), the ſecond and third obſervation: but here follows the firſt.

The Fathers of the church, who have ſo well refuted the Marcionites, the Manichees, and in general all thoſe who admitted two principles, have not well anſwered the objections which relate to the origin of evil. They ſhould have abandoned all the reaſons *à priori*, as the outworks of a place, which may be inſulted, and cannot be maintained; they ſhould have contented themſelves with reaſons *à poſteriori*, and placed all their forces behind this entrenchment. The Old and New Teſtament are two parts of revelation, which mutually confirm one another; ſince therefore theſe Heretics acknowledged the Divine authority of the New, it was no difficult matter to prove to them the Divine authority of the Old, after which it was eaſy to deſtroy their objections by ſhewing that they are contrary to experience. According to Scripture there is but one good principle, and yet moral and phyſical evil have been introduced among mankind: it is not therefore contrary to the nature of a good principle, to permit the introduction of moral evil, and to puniſh crimes; for it is not more evident, that four and four are eight, than it is evident that if a thing come to paſs, it is poſſible. *Ab actu ad potentiam valet conſequentia.* - - - *From fact to poſſibility the conſequence is good*, is one of the cleareſt and moſt unconteſtable axioms in Metaphyſics (15). This is an impregnable rampart, and this is ſufficient to render the cauſe of the orthodox victorious, altho' their reaſons *à priori* may be refuted. But may they be ſo, will ſome ſay? I will anſwer, yes; the manner of introducing evil, under the empire of a ſovereign being, infinitely good, infinitely holy, and infinitely powerful, is not only inexplicable but incomprehenſible; and all that is objected againſt the reaſons why this being has permitted evil, is more agreeable to natural light, and the ideas we have of order, than theſe reaſons are. Let us conſider well this paſſage of Lactantius, which contains an anſwer to an objection of Epicurus. ‘Deus, inquit *Epicurus*, aut vult tollere mala, & non poteſt; aut poteſt, & non vult; aut neque vult, neque poteſt; aut & vult & poteſt. Si vult, & non poteſt, imbecillis eſt, quod in Deum non cadit. Si poteſt & non vult, invidus, quod æque alienum à Deo. Si neque vult neque poteſt, & invidus & imbecillis eſt; ideoque neque Deus. Si vult & poteſt, quod ſolum Deo convenit, unde ergo ſunt mala? aut cur illa non tollit? Scio pleroſque Philoſophorum, qui providentiam defendunt, hoc argumento perturbari ſolere, & invitos pene adigi, ut Deum nihil curare fateantur, quod maxime quærit Epicurus. Sed nos ratione perſpecta, formidoloſum hoc argumentum facile diſſolvimus. Deus enim poteſt, quicquid velit; & imbecillitas, vel invidia in Deo nulla eſt: poteſt igitur mala tollere, ſed non vult; nec ideo tamen invidus eſt. Idcirco enim non tollit, quia & ſapientiam (ſicut docui) ſimul tribuit, & plus boni, ac jucunditatis in ſapientia, quam in malis moleſtiæ. Sapientia etiam facit, ut etiam Deum cognoſcamus, & per eam cognitionem immortalitatem aſſequamur, quod eſt ſummum bonum. Itaque niſi prius malum agnoverimus, nec bonum poterimus agnoſcere. Sed hoc non vidit Epicurus, nec alius quiſquam; ſi tollantur mala, tolli pariter ſapientiam; nec ulla in homine virtutis remanere veſtigia; cujus ratio ſuſtinenda & ſuperanda malorum acerbitate conſiſtit. Itaque propter exiguum compendium ſublatorum malorum maximo, & vero, & proprio nobis bono careremus. Conſtat igitur, omnia propter hominem propoſita, tam mala, quam etiam bona (16). - - - - *God, ſays Epicurus, is either willing to remove evil, and is not able: or he is able, and not willing: or he is neither willing, nor able: or elſe he is both willing and able. If he is willing and not able, he muſt then be weak, which cannot be affirmed of God. If he is able and not willing, he muſt be envious, which is likewiſe contrary to the nature of God. If he is neither willing nor able, he muſt be both envious and weak, and conſequently not God. If he is both willing and able, which only can agree with the notion of God, whence then proceeds evil? Or, why does he not remove it? I know, that the greateſt part of Philoſophers, who aſſert a providence, are commonly embarraſſed with this argument, and almoſt forced againſt their will to acknowledge that God does not concern himſelf with the adminiſtration of the world, which is the very thing that Epicurus drives at. But we eaſily overthrow this formidable argument by clear reaſon. For God can do whatever he pleaſes, and there is no weakneſs or envy in him: conſequently, he is able to remove evil but is not willing, and yet for all that, is not envious. He does not remove evil for this reaſon, becauſe withal (as I have ſhewn) he beſtows wiſdom, and there is more good and ſatisfaction in wiſdom, than there is painfulneſs in evil. By wiſdom likewiſe we come to know God, and by that knowledge attain to immortality, which is the chief good. And therefore unleſs we firſt know evil, we ſhall not be able to know good. But neither Epicurus nor any other has obſerved this: if evil be removed, wiſdom muſt alſo be removed; no trace of virtue will remain; becauſe virtue conſiſts in bearing with and overcoming the ſharpneſs of evil. And ſo, for the ſmall advantage of the removal of evil, we ſhould be deprived of the greateſt, the moſt real, and proper good. It is evident therefore, that all things, evil as well as good, were intended for the benefit of mankind.*’

The whole ſtrength of the objection could not be more ſincerely repreſented; Epicurus himſelf could not have propoſed it with greater clearneſs and ſtrength. See the margin (17). But the anſwer of Lactantius is pitiful, and it is not only weak, but full of errors, and perhaps of Hereſies. It ſuppoſes that God muſt produce evil, becauſe otherwiſe he would not be able to communicate to us either wiſdom or virtue, or the knowledge hypotheſis of two principles, the one good and the other bad, ſhould have dazzled the

---

(10) Hiſt. of the Variat. *lib. xi.*

(11) Lambert. Danæus, Notis in Auguſtin. de Hæreſib. *cap. xlvi, fol. m.* 119, *verſo.*

(12) Thomaſſin, Of the Unity of the Church, *Tom. i, Part ii, chap. ix, pag.* 378.

(13) In the article MANICHEES, citation (61).

(14) In the remarks [*G*] and [*H*].

(15) See, above, the article MANICHEES, remark [*D*], citation (59).

(16) Lactant. de Ira Dei, *cap. xiii, pag. m.* 548.

(17) Note, that this objection of Epicurus does not concern moral evil, and if it did, it would yet be more difficult to be anſwered.

ledge of what is good. Can any thing be ſhown more monſtrous than this doctrine? Does it not overthrow all that Divines tell us about the happineſs of Paradiſe, and the ſtate of innocence? they tell us that Adam and Eve in this happy ſtate felt, without any mixture of uneaſineſs, all the pleaſures, which that delicious and charming place, the garden of Eden, where God placed them, could afford them. They add, that if they had not ſinned, they and all their poſterity ſhould have enjoyed this happineſs, without being ſubject either to diſeaſes or ſorrows, and that neither the elements nor animals, had ever done them any harm. It was their ſin that expoſed them to cold and heat, to hunger and thirſt, to pain and ſorrow, and to the miſchiefs which certain beaſts do us. So far is it from being true, that virtue and wiſdom cannot ſubſiſt in a man without phyſical evil, as Lactantius affirms, that, on the contrary, it muſt be maintained, that man has been ſubject to this evil; only becauſe he renounced virtue and wiſdom. If the doctrine of Lactantius were good, we muſt neceſſarily ſuppoſe that the good angels are ſubject to a thouſand inconveniencies, and that the ſouls of the bleſſed do alternately paſs from joy to ſorrow; ſo that in the manſions of glory, and in the boſom of the beatific viſion, none are ſecured from adverſity. Nothing is more contrary to the unanimous ſentiment of Divines, and to right reaſon, than this doctrine. It is even true in ſound Philoſophy, that it is no wiſe neceſſary, that our ſoul ſhould feel evil, to the end it may reliſh what is good, and that it ſhould paſs ſucceſſively from pleaſure to pain, and from pain to pleaſure, that it may be able to diſcern that pain is an evil, and that pleaſure is a good thing. And thus Lactantius does not leſs oppoſe the light of nature, than the opinions of Divines. We know by experience, that our ſoul cannot feel at one and the ſame time both pleaſure and pain; it muſt therefore at firſt either have felt pain before pleaſure, or pleaſure before pain. If it's firſt ſenſation was that of pleaſure it found that ſtate to be agreeable, tho' it was ignorant of pain; and if it's firſt ſenſation was that of pain, it found that ſtate to be uneaſy, although it was ignorant of pleaſure. Suppoſe then that it's firſt ſenſation laſted ſeveral years without interruption, you may conceive that during that time it was in an eaſy condition, or in one that was uneaſy. And do not alledge to me experience; do not tell me, that a pleaſure which laſts long becomes inſipid, and that pain in time becomes ſupportable; for I will anſwer you that this proceeds from a change in the organ, which makes that ſenſation which continues the ſame, as to kind, to be different as to degree. If you have had at firſt a ſenſation of ſix degrees, it will not continue of ſix to the end of two hours, or to the end of a year but only of one degree, or of one fourth part of a degree. Thus cuſtom blunts the edge of our ſenſations; their degrees correſpond to the concuſſions of the parts of the brain, and this concuſſion is weakened by frequent repetitions, from whence it comes to paſs that the degrees of ſenſation are diminiſhed. But if pain or joy were communicated to us in the ſame degree ſucceſſively for a hundred years, we ſhould be as unhappy or as happy the hundredth year as the firſt day; which plainly proves that a creature may be happy with a continued good, or unhappy with a continued evil; and that the alternative, which Lactantius ſpeaks of, is a bad ſolution of the difficulty. It is not founded upon the nature of good and evil, nor upon the nature of the ſubject which receives them, nor upon the nature of the cauſe which produces them. Pleaſure and pain are no leſs proper to be communicated the ſecond moment than the firſt, and the third moment than the ſecond, and ſo of all the reſt. Our ſoul is alſo as ſuſceptible of them after it has felt them one moment, as it was before it felt them, and God who gives them is no leſs capable of producing them the ſecond time than the firſt. This is what we learn from the natural idea's we have of theſe objects. Chriſtian Theology confirms this invincibly, ſince it teaches us, that the torments of the damned ſhall be eternal and continued, and as ſharp at the end of an hundred thouſand years as the firſt day; and that on the contrary the pleaſures of Paradiſe ſhall laſt eternally and continually, without ever abating. I would gladly know whether, ſuppoſing a thing which is very eaſy, that there were two ſuns in the world, whereof one ſhould riſe when the other ſets, we muſt not conclude that darkneſs would be unknown to mankind. According to this fine Philoſophy of Lactantius, we muſt alſo conclude, that a man could not know the light, that he would not know it is day, and that he ſees the objects before him, &c. See the margin (18).

One may feel one of the contraries without having ever felt the other.

not for the same thing

Why cuſtom blunts the ſenſation.

What I have juſt now ſaid, proves invincibly, I think, that there is no advantage to be gained againſt our Paulicians, by repreſenting to them, that God has mingled good and evil, only becauſe he foreſaw that a pure and unmixed good would ſeem to us inſipid in a little time. They will anſwer, that this property is not contained in the idea we have of a good thing, and that it is directly contrary to the common doctrine about the happineſs of Paradiſe. And as to the experience which teaches us but too much; 1. That the joys of this life are not felt, but in proportion as they deliver us from a troubleſome ſtate. 2. That they draw after them diſguſt, when they have continued a little while: they will maintain, that this phænomenon is inexplicable, unleſs we have recourſe to the hypotheſis of two principles. For if we depend, will they ſay, only upon one cauſe, Almighty, infinitely good, and infinitely free, and which diſpoſes univerſally of all beings, according to the good pleaſure of his own will, we ought not to feel any evil, all our good ought to be pure, and we ought never to have the leaſt diſguſt. The author of our being, if he is infinitely beneficent, ought to take a continual pleaſure in making us happy, and preventing every thing that may diſturb or diminiſh our joy: for it is a character eſſentially contained in the idea of ſupream goodneſs. The fibres of our brain, cannot be the cauſe that God weakens our pleaſures; for according to you, he is the only author of matter; he is Almighty, and nothing can hinder him from acting according to the full extent of his infinite goodneſs; he needs only will, that our pleaſures ſhould not depend upon the fibres of our brain; and if he wills that they ſhould depend upon them, he can preſerve theſe fibres eternally in the ſame ſtate; he needs only to will either that they ſhould not wear out at all, or that the damage they ſuffer ſhould be quickly repaired. You cannot therefore explain what we experience, but by the hypotheſis of two principles. If we feel pleaſure, it is the good principle that gives it to us; but if we do not feel it perfectly pure, and if we are quickly diſguſted with it, it is becauſe there is an ill principle that thwarts the good. The latter, to be even with him, makes our pains leſs grievous by cuſtom, and gives us always ſome hopes in the greateſt evils. This, and the good uſe that is often made of adverſity, and the bad uſe that is often made of proſperity, are phænomena which are admirably explained, according to the Manichean hypotheſis. Theſe are things which lead us to ſuppoſe, that the two principles made an agreement which reciprocally limits their operations (19). The good principle cannot do us all the good he deſires: it was neceſſary that in order to do us a great deal of good, he ſhould conſent, that his adverſary ſhould do us as much evil; for without this conſent the chaos would ſtill have remained a chaos, and no creature would ever have felt what is good. Thus ſupreme goodneſs finding it a better way for it's own ſatisfaction, to ſee the world ſometimes happy, and ſometimes miſerable, than never to ſee it happy, made an agreement which produced the mixture of good and evil we now ſee in mankind. By aſcribing to your principle an almighty power, and the glory of enjoying eternity alone, you have deprived him of an attribute which goes before all the reſt; for *optimus*, the beſt, precedes always *maximus* the greateſt, in the ſtile of the moſt learned nations, when they ſpeak of God. You ſuppoſe, that having nothing to hinder him from loading his creatures with good things, he oppreſſes them with evils; and if any of them be advanced, it is that their fall may be the greater (20). We clear him from any guilt in all this matter, we explain without impeaching his goodneſs, all that can be ſaid of the inconſtancy of fortune, the jealouſy of Nemeſis, and the continual ſport which Æſop makes the employment of God: he exalts things, ſays Æſop, that are low, and abaſes things that are high (21). He could obtain no more, ſay we, from his adverſary: his goodneſs extended as far as it could; if he does us no more good, it is becauſe he cannot; we have no reaſon therefore to complain.

(18) I ſhall cite hereafter, in remark [*G*] a paſſage of Plutarch, which may be applied againſt the anſwers of Lactantius.

(19) In the remark [*I*].

(20) Tolluntur in altum ut lapſu graviore ruant. *Claudian. in Rufinum, lib. i, circa init.*

(21) See the article ÆSOP, remark [*I*].

the eyes of ſeveral antient Philoſophers, and found ſo many followers in Chriſtendom, where

Who will not admire and deplore the fate of our reaſon ? Behold here the Manichees, who with an hypotheſis altogether abſurd and contradictory, explain what we experience, an hundred times better than the orthodox do, with a ſuppoſition ſo juſt, ſo neceſſary, and ſo ſingularly true of one firſt principle, which is infinitely good and almighty.

Let us ſhow, by another example, the little ſucceſs of the Fathers in their diſputes againſt theſe Heretics, with reſpect to the origin of evil. Here follows a paſſage of St Baſil : ‘ At neque à Deo ipſum malum profluxiſſe, pium eſt dicere : propterea quod nihil contrariorum à contrario ſuo gignitur . . . at ſi nec ingenitum, inquies, ipſum malum nec à Deo profluxit, unde naturam ſortitur ? Nam mala eſſe nemo particeps vitæ contradixerit. Quid igitur eſt dicendum : nempe malum non eſſentiam viventem animaque præditam eſſe ; ſed affectionem animæ, virtuti contrariam, deſidioſis ac inertibus, propterea quòd à bono deciderunt, inditam. Noli itaque malum forinſecus circumſpicere, atque inquirere, neque quandam naturam Principem malignitatis imaginare, ſed malitiæ quiſque ſuæ ſeipſum Autorem agnoſcat. Nam ſemper ea, quæ nobis eveniunt, partim è natura proficiſcuntur, ut ſenectus, ut infirmitas : partim ſuâ ſponte proveniunt, quales ſunt caſus inopini alienis principiis accidentes . . . . partim verò in nobis ipſis ſunt collocata, ut cupiditates ſpernere, aut voluptatibus modum non ponere, continere iram, aut manus injicere in eum qui injuriâ laceſſivit, vera dicere aut falſa, manſuetum moribus eſſe ac moderatum, aut faſtu ſuperbum arrogantiaque elatum. Quorum itaque tute Dominus es, horum principia non aliunde quærere velis, ſed quod propriè malum eſt, id ab ultronea & voluntaria electione ſumpſiſſe principium ſcito, &c (22). - - - - *But to ſay that evil proceeded not from GOD is a pious aſſertion : for no contrary can ariſe from it's contrary. . . . . But if evil be not (you will ſay) innate, nor proceed from GOD, whence has it it's origin ? For that evil does exiſt, no man living will deny. What then muſt be ſaid ? I anſwer, that evil is not a living eſſence, and endued with ſoul ; but a quality of the ſoul, contrary to virtue ; planted in the ſlothful and lazy, becauſe they have fallen from good. Do not therefore look about, and enquire abroad for evil, nor imagine a firſt principle of malignity, but let every one acknowledge himſelf the author of his own wickedneſs. For thoſe things that happen to us, partly proceed from nature, as old age, and infirmity : partly come of themſelves, as ſudden accidents from external cauſes . . . but partly we are within our own power, as to mortify our deſires, to moderate our pleaſures, to govern paſſion, or to lay hands on him that has done us an injury, to ſpeak truth or untruth, to be of a meek and even temper, or to be puffed up with pride and arrogance. Do not therefore ſeek any where elſe for the principles of thoſe things, which you are maſter of yourſelf, but know that what is properly evil, takes it's riſe from free-will and choice.*’ The German Divine (23) who relates this paſſage, had reaſon to ſay, that this Father granted to the Marcionites more than he ought ; for he will not ſo much as acknowledge, that God is the author of natural evil, ſuch as ſickneſs, and old age, and of a hundred things which proceed from external cauſes, and happen ſuddenly. Thus to diſintangle himſelf from a difficulty, he adopts errors, and perhaps even hereſies. But there is another fault in his anſwer ; he fanſies he can extricate himſelf from this difficulty, by clearing Providence ; provided he affirms, that vices have their original in the ſoul of man. How came he not to perceive, that he ſhuns the difficulty ? or that he gives for a ſolution of it the very thing wherein the principal difficulty conſiſts ? The pretence of Zoroaſter, Plato, Plutarch, the Marcionites, and Manichees, and, in general, of all thoſe who admit one principle naturally good, and another principle naturally evil, both eternal and independant, is, that without this ſuppoſition, no account can be given how evil came into the world. You anſwer, that it came into the world by man : but how can that be, ſince, according to you, man is the workmanſhip of a being infinitely holy, and infinitely powerful ? ought not the work of ſuch a cauſe to be good ? Can it be any thing elſe but good ? Is it not more impoſſible, that darkneſs ſhould proceed from light, than that the product of ſuch a principle ſhould be bad ? There lies the difficulty. St Baſil could not be ignorant of it. Why then does he ſay ſo coldly, that we muſt not ſearch for evil but in the ſoul of man ? But who put it there ? The man himſelf, by abuſing the grace of his Creator, who being ſovereign goodneſs itſelf, produced him in a ſtate of innocence. If you anſwer thus, you fall into a *Petitio Principii*, begging the queſtion. You diſpute with a Manichee, who maintains, that two contrary Creators concurred to the production of man, and that man received from the good principle, whatever good he has ; and from the bad principle, whatever he has of evil ; and you anſwer his objections, by ſuppoſing that the Creator of man is one only and infinite good being. Is not this to give your own theſis for an anſwer ? It is plain that St Baſil diſputes ill : but as this is a thing that nonpluſſes all Philoſophy, he ſhould have retired into his ſtrong hold, that is, he ſhould have proved, by the word of God, that the author of all things is but one, and that he is infinite in goodneſs and all ſorts of perfections ; and that man coming out of his hands innocent and good, has loſt his innocence and his goodneſs by his own fault (24). This is the origin of moral and phyſical evil. Let Marcion, and all the Manichees reaſon as much as they pleaſe, to ſhow, that under a Providence infinitely good and holy, this fall of an innocent man could not happen, they argue againſt matter of fact, and conſequently they make themſelves ridiculous. I ſuppoſe always, that they are ſuch people as may be reduced by arguments *ad hominem*, to acknowledge the divine authority of the Old Teſtament. For if one had to do with Zoroaſter, or Plutarch, it would be another thing.

That you may ſee it is not without reaſon I urge, that we muſt only oppoſe to theſe ſectaries, this maxim, *Ab actu ad potentiam valet conſequentia* ; - - - *From matter of fact to poſſibility, the conſequence is good :* and this ſhort enthymem, *This has come to paſs, therefore it is not repugnant to the holineſs and goodneſs of GOD* ; I obſerve that we cannot join iſſue in this diſpute, upon any other foot, without ſome diſadvantage. The reaſons for the permiſſion of ſin, which are not taken from the myſteries revealed in Scripture, have this defect (25), how good ſoever they be, that they may be oppoſed by other reaſons more ſpecious, and more agreeable to the ideas we have of order. For inſtance, if you ſay that God permitted ſin to manifeſt his wiſdom, which ſhines the more brightly by the diſorders which the wickedneſs of men produces every day, than it would have done in a ſtate of innocence ; it may be anſwered, that this is to compare the Deity to a father who ſhould ſuffer his children to break their legs on purpoſe to ſhow to all the city his great art in ſetting their broken bones ; or to a king who ſhould ſuffer ſeditions and factions to increaſe through all his kingdom, that he might purchaſe the glory of quelling them (26). The conduct of this father and monarch is ſo contrary to the clear and diſtinct ideas, according to which we judge of goodneſs and wiſdom, and in general of the whole duty of a father and a king, that our reaſon cannot conceive how God can make uſe of the ſame. But you will ſay, the ways of God are not our ways. Keep to that then, this is a text of Scripture (27), and do not reaſon any more (28). Do not any more tell us, that without the fall of the firſt man, the juſtice and mercy of God would have remained unknown ; for you will be anſwered, that there was nothing more eaſy than to make man know theſe two attributes : the ſole idea of a being infinitely perfect, clearly informs ſinful man, that God poſſeſſes all the virtues that are worthy of a nature infinite in all reſpects : how much more would it have informed an innocent man, that God is infinitely juſt ? But he had never puniſhed any body : by this very thing his juſtice would have been known, this had been a continued act, a perpetual exerciſe of that virtue. None had deſerved to be puniſhed, and conſequently the forbearing of all puniſhment had been an exerciſe of juſtice. I deſire you to anſwer me : there are two princes, whereof one ſuffers his ſubjects to fall into miſery, that he may deliver them, when they have ſufficiently languiſhed under it ; and the other preſerves them always in a proſperous ſtate. Is not the latter much better, and more merciful than the other ? Thoſe who teach the immaculate conception of the Virgin, prove demonſtratively that God poured upon her his

mercy,

---

(22) Baſilias Magnus Hexaëm. Homil. II, apud Tobiam Pfannerum, Syſtem. Theologiæ Gentilis, *cap. ix*, *pag. m.* 253.

(23) Tobias Pfanner. ibid.

(24) See the article MANICHEES, between the citations (58), and (59) ; and above, the remark [*E*] of this article.

(25) *To this may be referred what a father of the church ſaid*, Felix culpa quæ talem meruit habere redemptorem. - - - - *Happy fault that procured ſuch a redeemer.*

(26) See in the article CALLISTRATES, citations (7), and (8), the words of Seneca.

(27) Iſaiah, ch. lv, ver. 8.

(28) See, below, the remark [*M*] towards the end.

where the doctrine which teaches the capital enmity of the devils to the true God, is always

mercy, and the benefits of redemption, more than upon other men. One needs not be a Metaphyſician to know this: a plough-man clearly perceives, that it is a much greater goodneſs to hinder a man from falling into a ditch, than to let him fall in, and then take him out an hour after (29); and that it is much better to hinder an aſſaſſin from killing a man, than to break him upon the wheel after he has been permitted to commit the murder. ‘Cur omnium crudeliſſimus tam diu Cinna regnavit ? At dedit pœnas. Prohiberi melius fuit, impedirique ne tot ſummos viros interficeret, quàm ipſum aliquando pœnas dare. Summo cruciatu, ſupplicioque Varius homo importuniſſimus periit: ſed quia Druſum ferro, Metellum veneno ſuſtulerat, illos conſervari meliùs fuit, quam pœnas ſceleris Varium pendere (30). - - - - *Why did Cinna, the moſt cruel of all mankind, reign ſo long ? But he ſuffered for it. However, it had been better to prevent the murder of ſo many great men, than that he at length ſhould be puniſhed for it. Varius, a moſt odious wretch, ſuffered a moſt painful death and puniſhment. But as he had diſpatched Druſus with the ſword, and Metellus with poiſon, it had been better that thoſe had been preſerved, than that he ſhould have ſuffered for his crime.*’ All this ſerves to admoniſh us, that we muſt not engage with the Manichees, till we have before all things laid down the doctrine *of the exaltation of faith, and the abaſing of reaſon* (31).

Thoſe who ſay that God permitted ſin, becauſe he could not hinder it without deſtroying free-will, which he had given to man, and which was the beſt preſent he had made him, venture very much. The reaſon they give is ſpecious, there is in it *I know not what*, which dazzles the eyes, ſomething that appears great: but neverthereleſs it may be oppoſed by ſuch reaſons as are more ſuited to the capacity of all men, and more founded upon good ſenſe, and the ideas of order. Without having read the fine treatiſe of Seneca concerning benefits, any one knows, by the light of nature, that it is eſſential to a benefactor not to beſtow ſuch favours which he knows will be abuſed in ſuch a manner, that they will ſerve only to the ruin of him on whom they are beſtowed. There is no enemy ſo inveterate, who would not upon theſe terms load his enemy with favours. It is eſſential to a benefactor to ſpare nothing to make the perſon happy with his benefits, whom he honours with them. If he could confer on him the knowledge of making good uſe of them, and ſhould refuſe it him, he would very ill ſuſtain the character of a benefactor; neither would he better ſuſtain it, if being able to keep his client from abuſing benefits, he ſhould not hinder him by curing his bad inclinations (32). Theſe are ideas which are known as well to the common people as to the Philoſophers. I confeſs that if one could not prevent the ill uſe of a favour, but by breaking the arms and legs of one's clients, or by ſhackling their feet with irons in a dungeon, one would not be obliged to prevent it; it were better to refuſe them the benefit: but if one can prevent it by changing the heart, and by giving a man a reliſh of good things, one ought to do it: now this is what God might eaſily do, if he would. Obſerve well what Cicero ſays, in oppoſition to thoſe, who alledge that it is not the fault of God, if men do not uſe aright his favours. ‘Huic loco ſic ſoletis occurrere, Non idcirco non optimè nobis à diis eſſe proviſum, quòd multi eorum beneficio perversè uterentur: etiam patrimoniis multos malè uti: nec ob eam cauſam eos beneficium à patribus nullum habere. Quis iſtuc negat ? aut quæ eſt in collatione iſta ſimilitudo ? nec enim Herculi nocere Deianira voluit, cùm ei tunicam, ſanguine Centauri tinctam, dedit, nec prodeſſe Phæreo Jaſoni, is qui gladio vomicam ejus aperuit, quam ſanare medici non potuerant. MULTI ENIM, ETIAM CUM OBESSE VELLENT, PROFUERUNT, ET CUM PRODESSE, OBFUERUNT. Ita non fit ex eo, quod datur, ut voluntas ejus; qui dederit, appareat: nec, ſi is, qui accepit, bene utitur, idcirco is, qui dedit, amice dedit (33). - - - *To this you commonly anſwer, it does not follow that we are not very well taken care of by the gods, becauſe many abuſe their benefits: for many people make a bad uſe of their patrimonies: and yet for all that, they are not deprived of their fathers kindneſs. Who denies that ? or what reſemblance is there in that compariſon ? For neither did Dejanira intend to hurt Hercules, when ſhe gave him the coat, dipped in the Centaur's blood: nor did that man deſign to do good to Jaſon, who opened his impoſtume with a ſword, which the Phyſicians were not able to cure.* FOR MANY PEOPLE, EVEN WHEN THEY INTENDED TO HURT, HAVE DONE GOOD; AND WHEN THEY INTENDED TO DO GOOD, HAVE DONE HURT. *And therefore the deſign of him who gives, does not appear by that which is given; and tho' he who receives it, makes a right uſe of it, yet it does not from thence follow, that he who gave it, gave it as a friend.*’ There is no good mother who having given leave to her daughters to go to a ball, but would revoke that leave, if ſhe were ſure that they would yield to enticement, and leave their virginity behind them; and every mother, who knowing that this would certainly come to paſs, ſhould nevertheleſs ſuffer them to go to a ball, being contented with exhorting them to virtue, and threatening them with her diſgrace, if they ſhould not return maids, would at leaſt juſtly bring upon herſelf the blame of neither loving her daughters, nor chaſtity. It would be in vain for her to ſay, in her own juſtification, that ſhe had no mind to reſtrain the liberty of her daughters, nor to ſhow any diſtruſt of them: ſhe would be anſwered, that this management was very prepoſterous, and ſavoured more of a provoked ſtep-mother, than of a mother; and that it had been better to keep her daughters in her ſight, than to give them the privilege of liberty to ſuch bad purpoſes, and to grant them ſuch marks of her confidence. This diſcovers the raſhneſs of thoſe who aſſign for a reaſon the regard which, they ſay God ſhowed to the free will of the firſt man. They had better believe, and be ſilent, than alledge ſuch reaſons as may be refuted by the examples I have juſt now made uſe of. Cotta in Cicero brings ſo many arguments againſt thoſe who ſay, Reaſon is a gift which the Gods beſtowed upon man, that Cicero found himſelf unable to anſwer thoſe difficulties; for if he had been able, he would have refuted them; his academic ſpirit was in it's element, when he could make it appear, that one may diſpute *pro* and *con*, *in infinitum*. Since therefore he has given no anſwer to the reaſons of Cotta, we muſt believe that he could not do it. Yet Cicero was one of the greateſt genius's that ever lived. Cotta having ſhown that reaſon is an accomplice in all crimes, and therefore the gods ſhould have given it us, if they intended to do us a miſchief (34), propoſes to himſelf the common ſolution, which is, that men abuſe the favours of Heaven. *Sed urgetis identidem hominum eſſe iſtam culpam, non deorum: . . in hominum vitiis ais eſſe culpam* (35). He replies that the abuſe ſhould have been prevented, and, that men ſhould have had ſuch a reaſon, as ſhould have driven away whatever is evil; and that thoſe cannot be excuſed who give what they know will prove pernicious. He proves this by ſeveral examples. ‘Eam dediſſes hominibus rationem, quæ vitia, culpamque excluderet. Ubi igitur locus fuit errori Deorum ? nam patrimonia ſpe bene tradendi relinquimus, qua poſſumus falli: Deus falli quî potuit ? An ut Sol in currum cùm Phaethontem filium ſuſtulit ? aut ut Neptunus, cùm Theſeus Hippolytum perdidit, cùm ter optandi à Neptuno patre habuiſſet poteſtatem ? Poëtarum iſta ſunt: nos autem philoſophi eſſe volumus, rerum auctores, non fabularum. Atque ii tamen ipſi Dii poëtici ſi ſciſſent pernicioſa fore illa filiis, peccaſſe in beneficio putarentur. Et ſi verum eſt quod Ariſto Chius dicere ſolebat, Nocere audientibus Philoſophos iis qui bene dicta male interpretarentur: poſſe enim aſotos ex Ariſtippi, acerbos è Zenonis ſcholâ exire. Prorſus, ſi qui audierunt vitioſi eſſent diſceſſuri, quòd perversè philoſophorum diſputationem interpretarentur; tacere præſtare philoſophis, quàm iis qui ſe audiſſent, nocere. Sic ſi homines rationem bono conſilio à Diis immortalibus datam, in fraudem, malitiamque convertunt, non dare illam, quàm dari humano generi melius fuit, ut ſi medicus ſciat eum ægrotum, qui juſſus ſit vinum ſumere, meracius ſumpturum, ſtatimque periturum, magnâ ſit in culpâ: ſic veſtra iſta providentia reprehendenda, quæ rationem dederit iis, quos ſcierit eâ perversè & improbè uſuros. Niſi forte dicitis eam neſciviſſe. Utinam quidem! ſed non audebitis: non enim ignoro quanti ejus nomen putetis (36).

- - - *Such*

---

(29) *See* Garaſſe, Somme Theologique, *pag.* 430.

(30) Cicero, de Nat. Deorum, *lib. iii, cap. xxxii, xxxiii.*

(31) Amyraldus has wrote a book that bears that title.

(32) See concerning all this the remark [*E*] of the article ORIGEN.

(33) Cicero, de Nat. Deorum, *lib. iii, ch. xxviii.* Add to this what has been ſaid of the Eutrapelus of Horace in the article of ORIGEN, citation (43).

(34) *Becauſe it was late he feigns that Balbus did not anſwer Cotta, but put it off till another day, which never came.* Quoniam adveſperaſcit dabis diem nobis aliquam ut contra iſta dicamus. *Cotta anſwers that he wiſhes he were refuted, and hopes it.* Ego vero & opto redargui me, Balbe, & ea quæ diſputavi diſſerere malui quam judicare, & facile me à te vinci poſſe certo ſcio. *Cicero, de Nat. Deor. lib. iii, ſub fin.*

(35) Non ut patrimonium relinquitur, ſic ratio homini eſt beneficio deorum data: quid enim potius hominibus dediſſent ſi iis nocere voluiſſent. *Id. ib. lib. iii, cap. xxviii, xxxi.*

(36) Ibid. cap. xxxi.

always accompanied with the doctrine, which teaches the rebellion and fall of one part of the good angels. This hypotheſis of two principles would probably have made a greater progreſs, if the particulars of it had been given leſs groſsly, and if it had not been attended with ſeveral odious practices (*c*), or if there had been then as many diſputes about Predeſtination, as there are at this day [*F*], in which the Chriſtians accuſe one

‘ - - - *Such a reaſon ſhould have been given to men, as might exclude vice and guilt. Where then was there room for the miſtake of the gods? We leave eſtates to children in hopes of doing well, in which we may be deceived: but could GOD be deceived? Either, as Phœbus, when he took his ſon Phaëton up into his chariot? Or, as Neptune, when Theſeus deſtroyed Hippolytus, after he had obtained the liberty of three wiſhes from his father Neptune? Theſe are the fictions of Poets: but we deſire to be Philoſophers, to treat of realities and not fables. And yet theſe poëtical gods would be thought culpable in beſtowing thoſe favours, had they known they would prove pernicious to their children. And if it be true what Ariſto, the Chian, uſed to ſay, that Philoſophers did hurt to thoſe, who miſinterpreted their good ſayings: for voluptuous perſons might be educated in the ſchool of Ariſtippus, and cruel perſons in that of Zeno: undoubtedly, if the hearers were to depart vitious, becauſe they miſconſtrue the diſcourſe of Philoſophers; it would be better for Philoſophers to be ſilent, than to injure thoſe that hear them. So, if men turn the reaſon, which is given with a good intention by the immortal gods, into fraud and wickedneſs, it would be better not to give, than to give it to mankind. As a Phyſician would be much to blame to preſcribe to a patient the uſe of wine, if he knew that he would drink it unmixed and immediately die: in like manner, that providence of your's would be to blame, that ſhould give reaſon to thoſe, who, it knows, would wickedly and perverſely abuſe it. Unleſs perhaps you will ſay, it does not foreſee this. I wiſh ſo indeed: but you will not dare to ſay it; for I know what a value you put upon that name.*’ By theſe reaſons it were eaſy to ſhow, that the free-will of the firſt man, which was preſerved to him ſound and entire, in the circumſtances wherein he was to make uſe of it to his own loſs, to the ruin of mankind, to the eternal damnation of the greateſt part of his poſterity, and to the introduction of a terrible deluge of evils, of guilt and puniſhment, was not a good gift. We ſhall never underſtand, that this privilege could be preſerved to him by an effect of goodneſs, and out of love for holineſs. Thoſe who ſay, that it was neceſſary there ſhould be free Beings, to the end that God might be loved with a love of choice (37), are conſcious to themſelves, that this hypotheſis does not ſatisfy reaſon; for when it is foreſeen, that thoſe free Beings will chooſe not the love of God but ſin, one may plainly perceive, that the intended end is defeated, and that therefore it is no wiſe neceſſary, that free-will ſhould be preſerved. I ſhall examine this again in the remark [*M*]. See in the margin our rule (38).

[*F*] *If there had been then as many diſputes about Predeſtination, as there are at this day.*] If the Manichees ſhould go no further, they would renounce their principal advantages: For the moſt terrible objections are theſe following. 1. It cannot be conceived that the firſt man could receive from a good principle the faculty of doing ill. This faculty is vicious, and every thing that can produce evil is bad, ſince evil cannot proceed but from a bad cauſe; and therefore the free-will of Adam proceeded from two contrary principles: inaſmuch as he could take the right way, he depended upon a good principle; but inaſmuch as he could embrace evil, he depended upon an ill principle. 2. It is impoſſible to comprehend, that God did only permit ſin; for a bare permiſſion of ſin added nothing to free-will, and was not a means to foreſee, whether Adam would perſevere in his innocence or fall from it. Beſides according to the idea we have of a created Being, we cannot comprehend that it can be a principle of action, that it can move itſelf, and that receiving in every moment of its duration its exiſtence and the exiſtence of its faculties, wholly from another cauſe, it ſhould create in itſelf any modalities by a power peculiar to itſelf. Theſe modalities muſt be either not diſtinct from the ſubſtance of the ſoul, as the new Philoſophers will have it, or diſtinct from the ſubſtance of the ſoul, as the Peripatetics affirm. If they be not diſtinct, they cannot be produced but by the cauſe, which can produce the very ſubſtance of the ſoul; but it is manifeſt that man himſelf is not this cauſe, neither can he be. If they are diſtinct, then they are created Beings, produced out of nothing, ſince they are not compoſed of the ſoul, nor of any other pre-exiſtent nature; they cannot therefore be produced but by a cauſe that can create. Now all the ſects of Philoſophy agree, that man is not, nor can be, ſuch a cauſe. Some think that the motion which excites him proceeds from ſome other cauſe, and that nevertheleſs he can ſtop it, and fix it upon a certain object (39). This is contradictory; ſince there is no leſs power required to ſtop that which is in motion, than to move that which is at reſt. Seeing therefore a creature cannot be moved by a bare permiſſion of acting, and has not in itſelf a principle of motion, it is abſolutely neceſſary that God ſhould move it; he muſt therefore do ſomething elſe than barely permit man to ſin. 3. This may be proved by a new reaſon: *viz.* that it cannot be comprehended, that a bare permiſſion ſhould bring contingent events out of the claſs of things meerly poſſible, nor that it ſhould put the Deity in a capacity of being certainly ſure that the creature will ſin. A meer permiſſion cannot be the foundation of the Divine preſcience. This is what obliges the greateſt part of Divines to ſuppoſe, that God has made a decree, which imports that the creature will ſin, and which according to them is the foundation of preſcience. Others think that the decree imports, that the creature ſhall be placed in ſuch circumſtances, wherein God has foreſeen that it will ſin. Thus ſome think that God foreſaw the ſin by reaſon of his decree; others, that he made the decree, becauſe he foreſaw the ſin. Howſoever this be explained, it follows clearly that God was willing that man ſhould ſin, and that he preferred this to the perpetual duration of Innocence, which it was ſo eaſy for him to procure and ordain. Reconcile this if you can with the goodneſs he ought to have for his creatures, and the infinite love he ought to have for holineſs. 4. But if you ſay with thoſe that come nearer to a method that would juſtify providence, that God did not foreſee the fall of Adam, you will gain but little by it; for at leaſt he knew very certainly, that the firſt man run the hazard of loſing his innocence, and introducing into the world all the evils of puniſhment and guilt, which followed his apoſtacy. Neither his goodneſs, nor his holineſs, nor his wiſdom, could permit, that he ſhould run the hazard of theſe events; for our reaſon convinces us very evidently, that a mother who ſhould ſuffer her daughters to go to a ball, when ſhe knew moſt certainly that they would run a great hazard with reſpect to their honour, would ſhew thereby, that ſhe neither loved her daughters, nor chaſtity: and if it be ſuppoſed, that ſhe has an infallible preſervative againſt all temptations, and that ſhe gives it not to her daughters when ſhe ſends them to a ball, it is moſt evident that ſhe is guilty, and that ſhe takes but little care that her daughters ſhould preſerve their virginity. Let us carry on the compariſon a little further; if that mother ſhould go to this ball, and through a window ſhould ſee and hear, that one of her daughters defends herſelf but weakly in the corner of a cloſet againſt the ſollicitations of a young gallant; if even when ſhe ſees, that her daughter is but one ſtep from yielding to the deſires of the tempter, ſhe ſhould not go then to aſſiſt her and deliver her from the ſnare, would not every one have reaſon to ſay, that ſhe acts like a cruel ſtep-mother, and that ſhe would not ſcruple to ſell the honour of her own daughter (40)? This is a repreſentation of the conduct which the Socinians attribute to God (41). They cannot ſay, that he knew the ſin of the firſt man, but as a poſſible event; he knew all the particulars of the temptation, and he muſt needs have known a moment before Eve yielded, that ſhe was going to ruin herſelf; he muſt, I ſay, have known it with ſuch a certainty, as renders one inexcuſable if he does not prevent the evil, and allows him not to ſay, *I had reaſon to believe that this would*

not

(*c*) See the remark [*B*] of the article MANICHEES.

(37) See the treatiſe of Morality of Father Malebranche.

(38) Sancta illa & profunda fidei mysteria non pari paſſu cum cauſis naturalibus ambulant, eoque rectius illa & creduntur clauſis oculis, & intelliguntur;
I ſegreti del ciel
ſol colui vede,
Che ſerra gli occhi, e crede.
Franciſcus Redi, de Gener. Inſectorum. Note, that the two Italian verſes he cites are thoſe of count Guido Ubaldo Bonarelli, at the end of the Paſtoral, intituled, *Filli di Sciro.*

(39) Father Malebranche in the treatiſe of Nature and Grace.

(40) See, below, citation (50).

(41) I ſhall ſay more of this preſently.

one another, either of making God the author of ſin, or of depriving him of the government

not happen, I had ſtill great hopes. There are no people of ſo little experience, but without ſeeing what paſſes in the heart, and knowing the matter any otherwiſe than by ſigns, may be ſure, that a woman is ready to yield, if they ſee through a window how ſhe defends herſelf when really her fall is near. Before the moment of her conſent, there are certain indications wherein they are not deceived. How much greater reaſon have we to think, that God who knew all the thoughts of Eve, as they came into her mind, (this knowledge the Socinians do not deny him) could not doubt but ſhe was juſt ready to yield. He would therefore let her ſin, and this even at the time when he foreſaw ſhe would certainly ſin. The ſin of Adam was yet more certainly foreſeen; for the example of Eve gave ſome light the better to foreſee the fall of her huſband. If God had purpoſed to preſerve man and his innocence, and to prevent all the miſeries which were to be the infallible conſequence of ſin, would he not at leaſt have fortified the huſband after the wife had fallen? Would he not have given him another wife ſound and perfect, inſtead of that which had ſuffered herſelf to be ſeduced? Let us ſay therefore that the Socinian ſyſtem, by depriving God of Preſcience, reduces him to ſlavery, and to a pitiful form of government, and does not remove the grand difficulty which it ſhould remove, and which forces theſe heretics to deny the fore-knowledge of contingent events (42).

I refer you to a profeſſor of Divinity yet living (43), who has proved, as clear as the day, that neither the method of the Scotiſts, nor that of the Moliniſts, nor that of the Remonſtrants, nor that of the Univerſaliſts, nor that of the Pajoniſts, nor that of Father Malebranche, nor that of the Lutherans, nor that of the Socinians, can ſolve the objections of thoſe who impute to God the introduction of ſin, or who pretend, that it is not conſiſtent with his goodneſs, with his holineſs, or his juſtice (44); inſomuch that this profeſſor finding nothing better elſewhere, continues in the hypotheſis of St Auguſtin, which is the ſame with that of Luther and Calvin, and of the Thomiſts and Janſeniſts; I ſay he continues there (45), *being embarraſſed with the aſtoniſhing difficulties* he has ſet forth (46), *and oppreſſed with their weight* (47). Since Luther and Calvin appeared, I do not think that a year has paſſed wherein they have not been accuſed of making God the author of ſin. The profeſſor of whom I ſpeak, confeſſes, That with reſpect to Luther, the accuſation is juſt (48); the Lutherans at this day pretend the ſame thing as to Calvin. The Roman Catholics pretend the ſame thing as to both. The Jeſuits pretend it as to Janſenius. Thoſe who are a little equitable and moderate, do not take it to be an act of inſincerity in their adverſary, when he proteſts, that he does not at all impute to God the ſin of man, that he does not at all make him the author of it: they are willing to grant that he does not expreſsly teach it, and that all the conſequences of his doctrine are not perceived by him; but they add, that *proteſtatio facto contraria nihil valet, - - - a proteſtation contrary to fact ſignifies nothing*, and that if he will take the pains to determine preciſely, what was neceſſary for God to have done that he might be the author of the ſin of Adam, he will find that according to his doctrine, God has done all that was neceſſary in order to that end. You therefore, add they, act quite contrary to Epicurus; he denied in effect that there were any gods, and yet he ſaid that there were gods (49). You, on the contrary, deny in your words that God is the author of ſin, but in effect you teach it.

Let us come at laſt to the text of this remark. The diſputes which have ariſen in the Weſt among Chriſtians ſince the Reformation, have ſo clearly ſhown that a man does not know which ſide to take, when he would ſolve the difficulties about the origin of evil, that a Manichee at this day would be more terrible than in former times, becauſe he would refute every party by the others. You have exhauſted, would he ſay, all the forces of your wit; you have invented the *Scientia media*, which like a *Deus è Machina* (a Machine-deity) is brought in to clear your Chaos. This invention is chimerical; it cannot be conceived, that God ſhould foreſee things future otherwiſe than in his decrees, or in the neceſſity of cauſes. It is no leſs inconceivable in Metaphyſics, than it is inconceivable in Ethics, that he who is goodneſs and holineſs itſelf ſhould be the author of ſin. I refer you to the Janſeniſts: See how they run down your *Scientia media*, both by direct proofs, and by retorting your arguments. For it does not hinder that all the ſins and all the miſeries of man proceed from the free choice of God; it does not take off the force of the parallel in comparing God, (*abſit verbo blaſphemia, - - - with reverence be it ſpoken*) ſee the margin (50), to a mother who knowing certainly that her daughter would yield up her honour, if in ſuch a place and at ſuch a time ſhe were ſollicited by ſuch a man, ſhould manage the interview herſelf, carry her daughter to it, and leave her there to her own conduct. The Socinians overwhelmed with the objection, endeavour to extricate themſelves by denying preſcience, but they have the diſgrace to ſee that their hypotheſis vilifies the government of God, without clearing him of the guilt, and that it does not avoid the compariſon of this mother, more or leſs. See above citat. (41). I refer them to the Proteſtants, who overthrow and utterly confound them. As to abſolute decrees, the certain cauſe of Preſcience, ſee, I pray you, after what manner the Moliniſts and the Remonſtrants oppoſe them. There is a Divine, as reſolute as Bartolus, who confeſſes almoſt with tears in his eyes, *That there is no body more perplexed than he with the difficulties of* theſe decrees, and that he continues in this condition, only becauſe when he had a mind to go over to methods mitigated, *he found himſelf ſtill oppreſſed with the ſame weights* (51). He enlarges with great ſtrength upon all this in another work (52), and you cannot deny but he refutes invincibly all thoſe methods; and conſequently you have no recourſe left, unleſs you will adopt my ſyſtem of the two principles. By this means you will extricate your ſelf from this trouble, all the difficulties will vaniſh away; you will fully juſtify the good principle, and you only paſs from one Manicheiſm leſs reaſonable to another more reaſonable: for if you examine your ſyſtem carefully, you will acknowledge, that you as well as I admit two principles, the one of good, and the other of evil; but inſtead of placing them as I do, in two ſubjects, you join them together in one and the ſame ſubſtance, which is monſtrous and impoſſible. The one only principle which you admit, determined from all eternity, according to you, that man ſhould ſin, and that the firſt ſin ſhould be infectious (53); that it ſhould produce without end and without intermiſſion all imaginable crimes over the face of the whole earth: In conſequence whereof he prepared for mankind in this life all the miſeries that can be conceived, ſuch as peſtilence, war, famine, pain, vexation, and after this life an Hell, wherein all men almoſt ſhall be eternally tormented, after ſuch a manner as makes our hair ſtand on end, when we read the deſcriptions of it. If ſuch a principle is beſides perfectly good, and loves holineſs infinitely, muſt we not acknowledge, that the ſame God is at one and the ſame time, perfectly good and perfectly bad, and that he loves vice no leſs than he does virtue? Now is it not more reaſonable to divide theſe two oppoſite qualities, and to give all that is good to one principle, and all that is bad to another principle? Human hiſtory will prove nothing to the diſadvantage of the good principle. I do not ſay, as you do, that of his own will, and only becauſe it was his good pleaſure, he ſubjected mankind to ſin and miſery, when nothing hindered him from making them holy and happy: I ſuppoſe he did not conſent to this but to ſhun a greater evil, and that he did it as it were in his own defence. This clears him of guilt. He ſaw that the evil principle would deſtroy all; he oppoſed him as much as he could, and by agreement (54) he obtained the ſtate to which things are now reduced. He acted like a monarch, who to avoid the ruin of all his dominions, is obliged to ſacrifice one part of them to the good of the other. This is a grand inconveniency, and which at firſt frightens human reaſon, to talk of a firſt principle, and a neceſſary Being, as of a thing that does not all it has a mind to, and which is forced for want of power to ſubmit to conjunctures; but it is yet a greater imperfection to reſolve voluntarily to do evil, when one can do good (55). This is what might be ſaid by this government of the world. The Pagans could better anſwer than the Chriſtians to the objections of the Manichees [*G*]; but ſome of their Philoſophers found it a difficult thing

---

(42) See Arnauld's Reflexions upon the Syſtem of Father Malebranche, *lib. i, c. xiii, p.* 256, *&c.* where he ſhews that unleſs God combines by particular wills the wills of men, and the motions of matter, the events which are called contingent, would be ſuch even with reſpect to God.

(43) This I write in the beginning of April 1696.

(44) Jurieu's judgment concerning the mitigated and rigid methods of explaining Providence and Grace. See, above, citation (36), of the article NIHUSIUS.

(45) Id. ib. *pag.* 23.

(46) *Pag.* 19, 20, 21, *and* 22.

(47) Ibid. *pag.* 23.

(48) *After he has related the opinion of Luther, he ſays,* Hæc omnia abdicamus & horremus ut religionem omnem peſſundantia & Manichæiſmum ſpirantia. *Petrus Jurius, de Pace inter Proteſtantes ineunda, pag.* 214. See the biſhop of Meaux in the Addit. to the Variations.

(49) Epicurum verbis reliquiſſe Deos, re ſuſtuliſſe. *Cicero, de Natura Deorum, lib. i, cap. xxx.* See alſo Lactantius, *lib. de Ira Dei, cap. iv.*

(50) This compariſon has given offence to many Proteſtants: but I beg of them to conſider, that it is only to repay the Jeſuits and Arminians, who make the moſt horrible compariſons between the God of the Calviniſts, as they talk, and Tiberius, Caligula, &c: it is fit to ſhew them that they may be beat at ſuch weapons.

(51) Jurieu's Judgment on the Methods, *pag.* 23.

(52) See the remark [*I*].

(53) According to the Moliniſts, he decreed to place men in ſuch circumſtances wherein he certainly knew they would ſin, and he could either have put them in more favourable circumſtances, or not have put them in theſe.

(54) In the remark [*I*], another way different from the agreement is propoſed.

(55) See what ſhall be cited out of Plutarch and Cicero in the following remark.

this heretic. I ſhall conclude with the good uſe for which I made theſe remarks.

WHAT uſe is to be made of the diſpute related here above.

It is more uſeful than one would think, to humble the reaſon of man, by ſhowing him with what force, the moſt fooliſh hereſies, ſuch as thoſe of the Manichees are, may confound it, and embroil the moſt fundamental truths. This ſhould teach the Socinians, who make reaſon the rule of faith, that they throw themſelves into the way of error, which only tends by degrees to make them deny or doubt of all things, and that they lay themſelves open to be beaten by the moſt execrable people. What muſt be done then? Men muſt captivate their underſtandings to the obedience of faith, and never diſpute about ſome things: particularly they muſt not oppoſe the Manichees but by the Scripture, and by the principle of ſubmiſſion, as St Auguſtin does. *Their Doctors who were Philoſophers, or rather Sophiſts, profeſſing to follow nothing but reaſon, without paying any deference to authority, very eaſily entangled, by their reaſonings, and the deceitful ſubtilties of a Philoſophy meerly human, thoſe who had not knowledge enough to anſwer them, and could only oppoſe to them the ſcripture, and the authority of the church, to which it belongs to interpret ſcripture according to its true ſenſe. Thus by promiſing to their diſciples that they would diſcover the truth to them by the meer natural light of good ſenſe and reaſon, and making every thing paſs for an error which is above it, as our myſteries are, they perverted many. And this is that which made St Auguſtin *, who knew both the ſtrong and weak ſide of that ſect, write againſt them his excellent book of the Uſefulneſs of Faith, and the neceſſity there is of believing, chiefly in things ſupernatural, and which belong to religion* (56).

[G] *The Pagans could better anſwer than the Chriſtians to the Manichean objections.*] I do not ſpeak abſolutely of all the Pagans; for we have ſeen elſewhere (57), that the Philoſopher Meliſſus, who acknowledged but one principle of all things, could not have anſwered the objections of Zoroaſter, who acknowledged two principles, the one good and the other bad. If there be but one principle, and this principle is eſſentially good, how comes it that men are ſubject to ſo many miſeries? How comes it that they are ſo wicked (58)? What hath he gained, if he made the world for their ſake? 'An hæc, ut fere dicitis, 'hominum cauſa à Deo conſtituta ſunt; ſapientumne? 'propter paucos ergo tanta eſt facta rerum molitio: 'an ſtultorum? at primum cauſa non fuit cur de improbis bene mereretur: deinde quid eſt aſſecutus, 'cùm omnes ſtulti ſint ſine dubio miſerrimi, maximè 'quòd ſtulti ſunt? Miſerius enim ſtultitiâ quid poſſumus dicere? Deinde quod ita multa ſunt incommoda 'in vita, ut ea ſapientes commodorum compenſatione 'leniant: ſtulti nec vitare venientia poſſint, nec ferre 'præſentia (59). - - - *Were all theſe things made by 'GOD, as you commonly ſay, for the ſake of men; for 'thoſe that are wiſe? It was for a few then that ſuch 'a vaſt creation was made: Or was it for the unwiſe? 'But firſt, there was no reaſon why he ſhould do a kindneſs to the undeſerving? And ſecondly, What has he 'gained by it, ſince all the unwiſe are undoubtedly the 'moſt miſerable, eſpecially as they are unwiſe? For 'what can be more miſerable than want of wiſdom? 'Beſides, there are ſo many inconveniencies in life, that 'wiſe men can alleviate them by the conſideration of 'ſome conveniencies; but the unwiſe can neither avoid 'the future, nor bear the preſent.'* If this one only principle that you admit be wicked in its nature, how comes it that man enjoys ſo many pleaſures (60). And that he can receive them in crouds, thro' all his ſenſes, as through ſo many doors? Whence comes the paſſionate deſire with which he ſeeks after them? Whence comes the indefatigable induſtry, by which he multiplies them, and invents new ones? Whence comes it that he has not only the idea of honeſty, but alſo that many virtuous and charitable actions are practiſed among men? It is impoſſible, will the Manichees ſay, to give the reaſon of theſe phænomena, unleſs you ſuppoſe that two principles, the one good and the other bad, have regulated the conditions of the union between our ſoul and our body, and in general, every thing which concerns the government of the univerſe. Meliſſus and Parmenides were not the only perſons, who were diſtreſſed with theſe difficulties; the Stoics alſo were much embarraſſed with them; the Stoics, I ſay, who without denying that there were many gods, reduced them all to Jupiter as to the ſovereign diſpoſer of all events (61). To him they attributed Providence, and they acknowledged him as a Being infinitely good and infinitely wiſe. Upon this Plutarch founded the objections he made to them taken from the miſery of mankind. 'There is not a wiſe 'man, ſays he (62), nor ever was upon earth, and 'on the contrary, there are innumerable millions of 'men miſerable to the laſt extremity, under the rule 'and dominion of Jupiter, whoſe government and adminiſtration is very good. And what could be more 'contrary to common ſenſe than to ſay, that Jupiter 'governing extremely well, we ſhould be extremely 'unhappy. If therefore, which is not even lawful to 'ſay, he would be no longer a Saviour, nor a Deliverer, nor a Protector, but quite contrary to all 'theſe fine names; there can no goodneſs be added to 'the things that are, neither as to their multitude 'nor magnitude, as theſe men ſay, all men living to 'the height miſerably and wickedly, and vice neither 'receiving addition, nor unhappineſs increaſe. Nor 'is this the worſt; but they are angry with Menander for ſaying upon the ſtage,

'*The chief beginning of mens miſeries*
'*Are things exceeding good.*

'ſaying that this is againſt common ſenſe. And yet 'they make GOD, who is all good, the cauſe of all 'evils. For matter could not produce any evil of itſelf, becauſe it is without qualities, and whatever 'differences it has, it has received them all from that 'which moves and forms it, that is from the reaſon 'within, it not being capable to move and form itſelf. 'So that of neceſſity, evil muſt come either from nothing, and from what has no Being, or if from ſome 'moving principle, it muſt be from GOD. For if 'they think that Jupiter has not the command of 'theſe parts, nor uſes every one of them according 'to his own reaſon, they ſpeak againſt common ſenſe, 'and imagine an animal, many of whoſe parts are 'not ſubſervient to its will, uſing their own operations 'and actions, to which the whole gives no incitation, 'nor begins their motion. For there is nothing which 'has life, ſo ill compacted, as that againſt it's will, 'it's feet ſhould go, it's tongue ſpeak, it's horns puſh, 'or it's teeth bite; many of which things GOD muſt 'of neceſſity ſuffer, if the wicked do againſt his will, 'lie, cheat, rob, and murder one another. And if, 'as Chryſippus ſays, the leaſt part cannot poſſibly 'act otherwiſe than according to Jupiter's pleaſure, 'much more every living thing muſt reſt and move 'according as he inclines it, and as he guides, ſtays, 'and diſpoſes it: but this ſaying is more impious 'than the former. For it were more tolerable to 'ſay, that innumerable parts through weakneſs and 'want of power in Jupiter, do many abſurd things by 'force againſt his nature and will, than that there is 'not any intemperance or wickedneſs of which Jupiter is not the cauſe.' Obſerve this concluſion: if one of theſe two evils were to be choſen, either that Jupiter ſhould want power, or that he ſhould want goodneſs, Plutarch is of opinion that the firſt ſhould be choſen; and that it is better to ſay, that GOD has not all the power that is neceſſary to prevent crimes, than to aſſert that he moves men to commit them. Μυρία γὰρ ἦν ἐπιεικέστερον ἀσθένεια καὶ ἀδυναμία τοῦ Διὸς ἐκβιαζόμενα τὰ μέρη, πολλὰ δρᾶν ἄτοπα παρὰ τὴν ἐκείνου φύσιν καὶ βούλησιν, ἢ μήτε ἀκρασίαν εἶναι, μήτε κακουργίαν, ἧς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Ζεὺς αἴτιος. *Tolerabilius enim erat infinitas partes dicere Jovi ob ejus imbecillitatem vi facta agere multa improbè contra ipſius naturam & voluntatem, quàm nullam eſſe libidinem, nullum ſcelus, quod non Jovi autori imputandum eſſet* (63). Cicero took advantage of the ſame doctrine of the Stoics, concerning GOD's almighty power, to oppoſe his providence; as if the only excuſe that could be alledged for the many diſorders of this world, was to ſay that GOD cannot mind every thing. If there were no other excuſe but this, no apology could be made for the Stoics; for they pretended that the power thing *(d)*. I ſhall obſerve in what ſenſe the Orthodox ſeem to admit of two firſt principles

---

* Auguſt. de utilit. cred.

(56) Maimbourg, Hiſt. of St Leo, *lib. i, pag.* 16, 17, *of the Holland Edit.*

(57) In the article MANICHEES, remark [*D*].

(58) See the article MANICHEES.

(59) Cicero, de Nat. Deorum, *lib. i, cap. ix.*

(60) Si quidem Deus eſt, unde mala? bona vero unde, ſi non eſt? - - - *If there be a God, whence proceeds evil? If there be none, whence comes good?* Boet. de Conſol. *lib. i, Proſa iv, pag. m.* 11. See what will be cited from Cicero in the article PERICLES, remark [*K*].

(61) *See* Plutarch, adverſus Stoïcos, *pag.* 1075.

(62) Ibid.

(63) Plut. ibid. *pag.* 1076, *E.*

power of Jupiter was infinite. Here are the words of Cicero: ‘ At ſubvenire certe potuit *(Deus)*, & conſervare urbes tantas, atque tales. Vos enim ipſi dicere ſoletis, nihil eſſe quod Deus efficere non poſſit, & quidem ſine labore ullo: ut enim hominum membra nulla contentione, mente ipſa ac voluntate moveantur, ſic numine Deorum omnia fingi, moveri, mutarique poſſe. Neque id dicitis ſuperſtitioſè, atque aniliter, ſed phyſicâ, conſtantique ratione. Materiam enim rerum ex qua, & in qua omnia ſint, totam eſſe flexibilem, & commutabilem, ut nihil ſit, quod non ex ea quamvis ſubitò fingi, convertique poſſit. Ejus autem univerſæ rectricem, & moderatricem divinam eſſe Providentiam: hanc igitur, quocunque ſe moveat, efficere poſſe quicquid velit. Itaque aut neſcit quid poſſit, aut negligit res humanas, aut quid ſit optimum, non poteſt judicare (64). - - - *But undoubtedly God was able to ſuccour and preſerve ſuch great cities as thoſe were. For you uſe to ſay, that there is nothing which God cannot effect, and even without any trouble: for as the members of a man's body are moved without reſiſtance, by the mind and will, ſo all things may be framed, moved, and changed, by the power of God. And this you do not maintain from ſuperſtition and dotage, but from a phyſical and powerful reaſon: becauſe, all matter, of which and in which all things conſiſt, is flexible and changeable, ſo that there is nothing which may not, tho' ſuddenly, be framed and changed from it; but, divine providence governs and directs this whole matter, and conſequently which ever way it inclines, can effect whatever it pleaſes. Therefore providence, either knows not what it can do, or neglects human affairs, or elſe is not able to judge what is beſt.*' He had ſaid before, that the ruin of Corinth was to be aſcribed to Critolaus, and that of Carthage to Aſdrubal, and not to the anger of God; ſeeing God, according to the Stoics, is never angry; nevertheleſs he ought to have come to the aſſiſtance of thoſe two towns (65). The Stoics were ſo hard put to it, that they were forced to aſſert that vice was uſeful; for otherwiſe ſaid they, there had been no virtue (66). ‘ * * * Homines feciſſe dicatur: tantam vim eſſe ærumnarum & malorum. Adverſus ea Chryſippus quum in libro περὶ προνοίας quarto diſſereret. Nihil eſt prorſus iſtis, inquit, imperitius, nihil inſipidius, qui opinantur bona eſſe potuiſſe, ſi non eſſent ibidem mala. Nam quum bona malis contraria ſint; utraque neceſſarium eſt, oppoſita inter ſeſe & quaſi mutuo adverſo quæque fulta niſu, conſiſtere. Nullum adeò contrarium ſine contrario altero. Quo enim pacto juſtitiæ ſenſus eſſe poſſet, niſi eſſent injuriæ? aut quid aliud juſtitia eſt, quam injuſtitiæ privatio? quid item fortitudo intelligi poſſet, niſi ex ignaviæ oppoſitione? quid continentia niſi ex intemperantia? quo item modo prudentia eſſet, niſi foret contrà imprudentia? proinde, inquit, homines ſtulti cur non hoc etiam deſiderant ut veritas ſit & non ſit mendacium? namque itidem ſunt bona & mala, felicitas & infortunitas, dolor & voluptas. Alterum enim ex altero, ſicuti Plato ait, verticibus inter ſe contrariis deligatum eſt. Suſtuleris unum; abſtuleris utrumque. - - - * * * *Men may be ſaid to have done it: there is ſuch a number of evils and calamities. In anſwer to theſe things, Chryſippus diſcourſing in his fourth book concerning Providence ſays, nothing ſurely can be more ignorant, nothing more ridiculous than thoſe men, who imagine that good might have been without evil. For as good is contrary to evil, it is neceſſary that both ſhould ſubſiſt together, oppoſed to one another, and each ſupported as it were by mutual contention. And certainly there is no contrary without the other contrary. For, how could we have a notion of juſtice, if there were no injuries? Or, what elſe is juſtice but the privation of injuſtice? So likewiſe, how could fortitude be known but by the oppoſition of cowardice? How temperance, but by that of intemperance? And how could there be prudence, if there were no imprudence? Why, ſays he, do not theſe fooliſh men alſo deſire that there ſhould be truth without falſhood? For good and evil, proſperity and adverſity, pleaſure and pain, go hand in hand. The one is tied to the other, as Plato expreſſes it, back to back. Remove one, and you remove both.*'

Let us ſee how ſtrongly they have been refuted by Plutarch (67): ‘ Is there then no good among the gods, becauſe there can be no evil? And when Jupiter having reſolved all matter into himſelf, ſhall be alone, other differences being taken away, will there then be no good, becauſe there will be no evil? But is it true that there is melody in a choir, though none in it ſings faultily? And health in the body, though no member is ſick? And yet cannot virtue have it's exiſtence without vice? . . . . I wonder they do not ſay, that the Conſumption was deſigned for the ſound conſtitution of men's bodies, and the Gout for the ſwiftneſs of their feet; and that Achilles would not have had a good head of hair, if Therſites had not been bald. For what difference is there between ſuch triflers and ravers, and thoſe who ſay, that leudneſs ſerves to promote chaſtity, and injuſtice to promote juſtice? That ſo we may pray to the gods, there may be always wickedneſs,

‘ *Lies, fawning ſpeeches, and deceitful manners:*

‘ If, theſe being taken away, virtue will alſo vaniſh, and be loſt at the ſame time. But would you know the moſt polite and elegant part of his fine invention and deduction. *Juſt*, ſays he (68), *as comedies have in them ſometimes ridiculous epigrams, which though bad in themſelves, give nevertheleſs a certain grace to the whole Poem: So, tho' you may blame vice in itſelf, yet it is not uſeleſs to other things.* Firſt then to ſay that vice was made by the providence of God, as a wanton epigram by the expreſs will of the Poet, tranſcends in abſurdity and falſhood all imagination. For this being granted, how will the gods be rather givers of good than evil? How will wickedneſs be diſpleaſing to them, and hated by them? And what ſhall we have to oppoſe againſt theſe ſentences of the Poets ſo ſhocking to religious ears,

‘ - - - - *A cauſe to men GOD ſends,*
‘ *When to chaſtiſe ſome houſe his wrath intends?*

‘ And again,

‘ *Which of the gods thoſe ſeeds of ſtriſe did ſow* (69)?

‘ Moreover, a leud epigram adorns the comedy, and contributes to it's end, which is to pleaſe the ſpectators, and make them laugh. But Jupiter, who is ſirnamed Father and Fatherly, Supreme Law-giver, and as Pindar has it, *the moſt perfect Artiſt*, framing the world, not as a great interlude, full of variety and great learning, but as a city common to gods and men, living together in concord and happineſs, with juſtice and virtue: what need had he, for the attaining to this holy and adorable end, of thieves and robbers, murderers, parricides, and tyrants? For vice entered not as a morris-dance, pleaſing and delightful to God; nor was brought in amongſt the affairs of men by way of paſtime to cauſe mirth, nor by way of rallery, ſince there is not to be ſeen in it ſo much as a ſhadow of that celebrated concord and agreement with nature. Beſides, that fooliſh epigram is a very ſmall part of the Poem, and takes up but a very little place in the comedy; neither do ſuch ridiculous compoſitions abound in it, nor do they corrupt any of thoſe things, which ſeem to have been well done, or ſpoil their grace. But all human affairs are replete with vice, and the whole of human life, from the very prologue to the epilogue, being diſordered, depraved and diſturbed, and having no part of it pure, or irreprehenſible, as theſe men ſay, is the moſt wretched and diſagreeable of all farces (70).' You may read in Plutarch the remaining part of this paſſage, which contains ſome other reaſons, whereby the paradox of the Stoics concerning the uſefulneſs of vice, is ſtrongly refuted. Nevertheleſs it muſt be acknowledged that they were in the right in ſome reſpects; for, to give an inſtance of it, can any thing be more uſeful than luxury for the maintenance of many families, that would ſtarve if the great men and ladies ſpent but little? Our Paulicians might make uſe of this inſtance to prove their two principles: They might ſay that the ill principle produced luxury, and that the good one conſented to it, in exchange of ſome good thing principles [*H*], and in what ſenſe it cannot be ſaid that, according to the Manichees, God is

---

(d) See the remark [*G*].

(64) Cicero, de Nat. Deor. *lib. iii, cap. xxxviii, and xxxix.*

(65) Critolaus, inquam, evertit Corinthum, Carthaginem Aſdrubal. Hi duos illos oculos oræ maritimæ effoderunt, non iratus alicui, quem omnino iraſci poſſe negatis, Deus, &c. *Ib. cap. xxxviii.*

(66) Aul. Gel. *lib. vi, cap. i.* The aſteriſks ſignify that there is a chaſm in this place of Aulus Gellius.

(67) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 1065.

(68) Viz. Chryſippus in the ſecond book of Nature.

(69) Iliad. lib. i.

(70) See what I have ſaid before, remark [*E*] againſt Lactantius: the refutation of the doctrine of that Father is mightily ſtrengthened by this paſſage out of Plutarch.

thing which his adverſary permitted him to produce, and beſides that, he reſerved to himſelf the right of getting ſome benefit by the ill production. But if he had been alone, neither luxury nor any other vice had ever been ſeen amongſt men : Pure virtue would have been our pleaſure, our deſire, and our happineſs.

I ſhall obſerve by the by, that no body ought to wonder that Cicero and Plutarch ſhould have attacked the Stoics in that manner ; for tho' that ſect of Philoſophers admitted of two principles (71), God and matter, God as the agent, and matter as the patient, yet they did not believe that matter was an ill principle ; and herein they were more orthodox than Arnobius. ‘ Quid enim, *ſays he* (72), ſi prima materies quæ in rerum quatuor elementa digeſta eſt, miſeriarum omnium cauſas ſuis continet in rationibus involutas. - - - *What if the firſt matter which is digeſted into four elements, contained in itſelf the cauſes of all miſeries.*’

The generality of the heathens needed not fear the abovementioned objections ; for their public religion moved upon theſe two hinges ; that ſome gods were beneficent, and others miſchievous, and that in general the gods had not always the ſame paſſions ; that they grew angry, and were appeaſed ; that they changed parties ; that ſome engaged to favour a nation, and others to perſecute it ; in a word, that they oppoſed one another (73). The hiſtory of men might as well be explained by that ſuppoſition, as by that of Zoroaſter. Arnobius has very ſtrongly refuted thoſe two ſorts of gods, ſome whereof are beneficent, and others miſchievous ; but he went too far, for he made uſe of a principle which is very favourable to Manicheiſm. He ſays, without any reſtriction, that the nature of God does not allow him to make any one uneaſy : but he might have been aſked, from whence came then the plague, and the famine ? are they not called God's ſcourges, by Chriſtians ? However, let us ſet down his words (74). ‘ Quod dici à vobis accepimus, eſſe quoſdam ex Diis bonos, alios autem malos, & ad nocendi libidinem promptiores : illiſque ut proſint, his vero ne noceant, ſacrorum ſolemnia miniſtrari : quanam iſtud ratione dicitur, intelligere confitemur non poſſe. Nam Deos benigniſſimos dicere, leneſque habere naturas, & ſanctum, & religioſum & verum eſt : malos autem, & lævos nequaquam ſumendum eſt auribus ; ideò quoniam divina illa vis ab nocendi procul eſt dimota & disjuncta natura. Quidquid autem potis eſt cauſam calamitatis inferre, quid ſit primùm videndum eſt, & ab Dei nomine longiſſima debet differitate ſeponi. Itaque ut vobis commodemus aſſenſum, dextrarum, ſiniſtrarumque rerum Deos eſſe fautores, ulla nec ſic ratio eſt, cur alios alliciatis ad proſpera, alios verò, ne noceant, ſacrificiis commulceatis & præmiis. Primùm quod Dii boni male non queunt facere, etiam ſi nullo fuerint honore mactati. Quidquid enim mite eſt, placidumque natura, ab nocendi procul eſt uſu, & cogitatione diſcretum : malus vero comprimere ſuam ferociam neſcit, quamvis gregibus mille, & mille alliciatur altaribus. Neque enim in dulcedinem vertere amaritudo ſe poteſt : aut ariditas in humorem, calor ignis in frigora : aut quod rei cuicunque contrarium eſt, id quod ſibi contrarium eſt, ſumere in ſuam atque immutare naturam. Ut ſi manu viperam mulceas, venenato blandiaris aut ſcorpio, petat illa te morſu, hic contractus aculeum figat : nihilque illa proſit alluſio, cum ad nocendum res ambæ non ſtimulis exagitentur irarum, ſed quadam proprietate naturæ. Ita nihil prodeſt promereri velle per hoſtias Deos lævos, cùm ſive illud feceris, ſive contrà non feceris, agant ſuam naturam, & ad ea quæ facti ſunt ingenitis legibus, & quadam neceſſitate ducantur. Quid quod iſto modo utrique Dii deſinunt eſſe ſuis in viribus, & ſuis in qualitatibus permanere. Nam ſi bonis ut proſint, res divina conficitur, aliis autem ne noceant, iiſdem rationibus ſupplicatur ; ſequitur ut intelligi debeat, nihil dexteros profuturos, nulla ſi acceperint munera, fierique ex hoc malos : malos autem ſi acceperint, nocendi poſituros mentem, fierique ex hoc bonos. Atque ita producitur res eo, ut neque hi dexteri, neque illi ſint lævi : aut, quod fieri non poteſt, utrique ipſi ſint dexteri, & utrique iterum lævi. - - - - *As to your opinion concerning the gods, that ſome are gracious, and others hurtful, that you worſhip the former to obtain their favour, and the latter to prevent their miſchief ; for what reaſon this is maintained, I confeſs I am not able to apprehend. That the gods are moſt gracious, and kind in their natures, it is pious and religious, and agreeable to truth to affirm ; but that they are malicious, and hurtful, is monſtrouſly ſhocking to hear : becauſe the Divine Nature is abſolutely incapable of doing miſchief. Whatever is able to produce miſery, is chiefly to be conſidered, and ought by no means to be called by the name of GOD. And tho' I ſhould agree with you, that the gods were the authors of proſperity and adverſity, yet this is no reaſon why you ſhould, by ſacrifices and bribes, allure ſome to ſhew kindneſs, and ſooth others to do no hurt. Firſt, becauſe the good gods can do no ill, although they receive no honours. For whatever is mild and meek by nature, is far from the practice and even the thought of injuring : but the miſchievous cannot reſtrain his fierceneſs, tho' he were allured with a thouſand offerings, and a thouſand altars. For bitterneſs cannot change itſelf into ſweetneſs, nor drineſs into moiſtneſs, nor heat into cold : nor can any thing aſſume and change into it's own nature that which is contrary to it. If you ſhould ſtroke a viper with your hand, or careſs a poiſonous ſcorpion, the one would bite, and the other ſting you : and your ſoothing ſignifies nothing, ſince both are excited to do hurt, not by the inſtigation of wrath, but by a certain property of nature. In like manner, it avails nothing to attempt to cajole the gods by victims, ſince whether you do it or not, they follow nature, and are led to act from innate laws, and a certain neceſſity. Beſides, by that method, both ſorts of gods would be diveſted of their own properties and qualities. For if divine ſervice is performed to the good, in order to procure their favour ; and to the evil, in order to prevent their miſchief, we muſt needs imagine that the good will do no kindneſs, if they receive no honours, and thereby become evil : and that the evil, if they do receive them, will lay aſide their deſign of hurting, and and thereby become good. From whence it follows, that neither theſe are kind, nor thoſe unkind : or, which is impoſſible, that both ſorts are kind, and at the ſame time both unkind.*’ Tho' this paſſage of Arnobius favours the Manichees, it contains a remark which puzzles them, and overthrows all their worſhip ; for the reaſon why they admitted of an ill principle, was, that they believed the good principle could do no harm : they believed therefore that the other principle could do no good ; and ſo all their divine worſhip was needleſs ; the gracious god had never puniſhed them for their irreligion, and they could never expect that the miſchievous god ſhould be propitious to them. Arnobius urges this objection againſt the heathens with great force ; but they might have anſwered him, that the moſt cruel tyrants make a very great diſtinction, between thoſe who honour them, and thoſe who deſpiſe them ; and that the mildeſt kings make the ſame diſtinction between thoſe who reſpect them, and thoſe who offend them ; and that proportionably the ſame judgment ought to be made of good and miſchievous deities. I think that ſuch a reply cannot be made uſe of with regard to the ſyſtem of Zoroaſter, or that of the Manichees by a man who reaſons conſiſtently.

[*H*] *The orthodox ſeem to admit of two firſt principles.*] It has been a conſtant opinion amongſt Chriſtians from the beginning, that the Devil is the author of all falſe religions ; that he moves the Heretics to dogmatize, and inſpires men with errors, ſuperſtitions, ſchiſms, leudneſs, avarice, intemperance ; in a word, with all the crimes that are committed among men : that he deprived Adam and Eve of their innocency ; from whence it follows that he is the cauſe of moral evil, and of all the miſeries of man. He is therefore the firſt principle of evil ; but becauſe he is not eternal nor uncreated, he is not the firſt ill principle, in the ſenſe of the Manichees which afforded thoſe Heretics I know not what matter of boaſting and inſulting over the orthodox. They might have told them, your doctrine is much more injurious to the good god than ours ; for you make him the cauſe of the ill principle ; you aſſert that he produced him, and that tho' he could have ſtopped him at the firſt ſtep he made, yet he permitted him to uſurp ſo great a power in this world, that mankind having been divided into two cities, that of God and that of the Devil (75), the firſt was always very ſmall, and even ſo ſmall for many ages, that it had not two inhabitants, when the other had is the author of ſin [I]. I ſhall alſo critize a modern author, who ſays that the doctrine, which

---

(71) Diogenes Laërtius, *lib. vii, num.* 134. See the commentators on that place, and Lipſius, *Phyſic. Stoic. lib. ii, Diſſert. ii.*

(72) Arnob. lib. i, Adv. Gent. pag. 6.

(73) Sæpe premente Deo, fert Deus alter opem.
Mulciber in Trojam, pro Troja ſtabat Apollo :
Æqua Venus Teucris, Pallas iniqua fuit.
Oderat Æneam proprior Saturnia Turno :
Ille tamen Veneris numine tutus erat.
Sæpè ferox cautum petiit Neptunus Ulyſſem :
Eripuit patruo ſæpè Minerva ſuo. *Ovidius, Triſt. lib. i, Eleg. ii, ver.* 4.

(74) Arnob. *lib. vii, pag. m.* 228, 229. See the paſſage of Aulus Gellius in the article MANICHEES, citation (34).

(75) *See St* Auguſtin, de Civitate Dei.

two millions. We are not obliged to enquire into the cauſe of the wickedneſs of our ill principle; for when an uncreated being is ſo or ſo, one cannot ſay why it it is ſo; it is it's nature; one muſt neceſſarily ſtop there: but as for the qualities of a creature, one ought to inquire into the reaſon of them, and it cannot be found but in it's cauſe. You muſt therefore ſay that God is the author of the devil's malice, that he himſelf produced it ſuch as it is, or ſowed the ſeeds of it in the ſoul that he created; which is a thouſand times more diſhonourable to God, than to ſay that he is not the only neceſſary and independent being. This brings in again the abovementioned objections concerning the fall of the firſt man; it is not therefore neceſſary to inſiſt any longer upon it. We muſt humbly acknowledge that Philoſophy is here at a ſtand, and that it's weakneſs ought to lead us to the light of revelation, where we ſhall find a ſure and ſtedfaſt anchor. Note, that thoſe Heretics made an ill uſe of ſome paſſages of the holy Scripture, wherein the Devil is called the prince (76), and the god of this world (77).

[I] *In what ſenſe it cannot be ſaid that, according to the Manichees, God is the author of ſin.*] The ſtyle of the orthodox does not at all vary in this point: to be a Manichee, and to make God the author of ſin, are two expreſſions which always ſignified the ſame thing; and when one Chriſtian ſect accuſes another of making God the author of ſin, it never fails to impute Manicheiſm to it in that reſpect. It is a juſt accuſation in one ſenſe, ſeeing it is true that the followers of Manes acknowledged that an eternal being was the cauſe of ſin: but if you turn the tables, you will find another ſenſe, according to which they may ſay they do not make God to be the author of ſin; for they may maintain that none but the good principle deſerves the name of God, and that ſo great and ſo glorious a name, ought never to be beſtowed upon the ill principle, and conſequently that their hypotheſis, of all others, removes fartheſt from God any ſhare in evil. All other hypotheſes involve him in ſin, as the abovementioned miniſter acknowledges it. Provided it be ſuppoſed *ſays he* (78), 'That God drew a plan of all the events of eternity, and that according to that plan he was willing that all the evils, diſorders, and crimes, which prevail in the world, ſhould come into it, this is enough. It will be impoſſible to perſuade any one that ſo many crimes crept by chance into the project of God's providence. And if they came into it by the diſpoſition of the moſt profound wiſdom of God, whether that diſpoſition be called permiſſion or will, the minds of raſh men will never be ſatisfied, and it will never be clearly ſhewn that this agrees with the hatred God expreſſes otherwiſe for ſin. It will not be in any one's power to hinder the libertines from accuſing Chriſtianity of making God the author of ſin; for the common ſenſe of all men leads them to believe, that he who could prevent the fall of the firſt man, as eaſily as he permitted it, and who opened all the ways wherein men have wandered, when he might ſo eaſily have ſhut them, may be looked upon as the author of the evil which he ſhould have prevented, according to his principles, and his hatred for evil, and which he could without any difficulty have put a ſtop to.' Afterwards he anſwers an objection grounded upon the *Scientia media*. 'This does not at all leſſen the difficulty, *ſays he*, for I may ſtill ſay, that ſince God foreſaw that Adam being placed in ſuch circumſtances, would undo himſelf and innumerable millions of men by his free will, and yet he placed him in thoſe ſad circumſtances, it is plain that he is the firſt author of all evils. If a king knew certainly, that if he ſhould place a man in a crowd with a ſword in his hand, it would raiſe a ſedition, and occaſion a fight, in which ten thouſand men ſhould be killed, he might very well, according to ſtrict juſtice, be looked upon as the firſt author of all thoſe murders. It would be no ſatisfactory defence to ſay, I ordered not that man to ſtrike any body with his ſword, nor to raiſe a ſedition; on the contrary, I forbad him to do it. I have not moved his arm to kill, nor formed his voice to excite the people to fight. He would be anſwered, you knew certainly that that man being placed in ſuch circumſtances would be the cauſe of thoſe miſeries. It was in your power to place him in more favourable circumſtances, which might have produced all manner of happineſs. I am ſure he could reply nothing that could put a ſtop to the murmuring of the people; and if we will ſpeak ſincerely, we muſt confeſs that nothing can be anſwered for God, that can ſilence the minds of men. . . . . (79). Laſtly the very God of Socinus may be accuſed of being the author of ſin. . . . . (80). To conclude, I maintain, that there is no convenient medium between the God of St Auguſtin, and the god of Epicurus who concerned himſelf about nothing, or the god of Ariſtotle, whoſe care extended not lower than the ſphere of the moon. For as ſoon as you acknowledge a general providence, which extends to every thing, the difficulty ſprings up again, and when you think you have ſhut one door, it comes in again by another.' This is plain dealing. But if the god of the Manichees, I mean the good principle whom they called God, by Excellency, had preſented himſelf to the mind of that miniſter, I fancy he would have expreſſed himſelf ſomewhat differently, and confeſſed that their hypotheſis clears God; for it aſcribes all evil to the ill principle. It will not be needleſs to know what he anſwers to his cenſors. 'There is alſo in this traſh, *ſays Mr Jurieu* (81), an obſervation upon what I have ſaid ſomewhere, that whatever method be made uſe of, we ſhall never be able perfectly to reſolve the ſcruples, which the objections of prophane men raiſe in one's mind concerning God's providence about ſin. If thoſe gentlemen have found out the way of clearing perfectly thoſe difficulties, we ſhall be much obliged to them if they will acquaint us with it.'

Perhaps it will be ſaid you are in the wrong, when you acknowledge that the Manichean hypotheſis clears God; for if they pretend that he made an agreement with the ill principle, as you ſaid before (82) he conſented to the introduction of evil, he engaged by an agreement to ſuffer it, and was willing that all the crimes and miſeries of men ſhould be produced. This is more diſhonourable to him, than if one ſhould ſay, as the Socinians do, that he knew not whether a free creature would ſin, and that if he was willing to run the hazard of it, he was in great hopes that the knowledge wherewith his creature was endowed, and his threatnings would keep him from ſinning. I think a Manichee would not find this very difficult: for, I. He might ſay, that God only made that agreement, becauſe he could not otherwiſe have done any good to his creatures. There is therefore a great difference between Manicheiſm and Socinianiſm. The Socinians own, that though God might eaſily have hindred man from being a ſinner and unhappy, yet he let him fall into ſin and miſery; but the Manichees ſuppoſe that God conſented to that fall only out of meer neceſſity, and to avoid a greater evil. II. One might deny that God made any agreement with the ill principle, and maintain that he continually with all his might oppoſes ſin, and the miſery of his creature, to make him perfectly holy and happy; but that the ill principle acting on his part with all his power, for a quite contrary deſign, the mixture of good and evil which is to be ſeen in this world, reſults from that conflict, as the action and re-action of cold and heat produce a quality between both. You may apply to this what the ſchoolmen ſay concerning the nature of mixed bodies, which reſults from the ſtruggling of the elements. I know very well that either of thoſe two explications lies open to a world of horrible difficulties; but the only queſtion now, is to know whether that Hypotheſis acquits God; now thoſe wretched Heretics pretend, that any difficulty is inconſiderable in reſpect of that which ariſes from making him the author of ſin; and it is certain, that all Chriſtians abhor to acknowledge him to be the cauſe of it.

WHETHER the doctrine that ſhould make God the author of ſin, would lead to Atheiſm.

The Jeſuits maintain (83), *that it were better for a man to be an Atheiſt, and to acknowledge no deity, than to pay divine honours to a being,* who forbids man to do evil, and yet makes him commit it, and then puniſhes him for it. They maintain, *that the god of Epicurus is more innocent, and if one may ſay ſo, more a god* than the other; *and when the Marcionites and Manichees went about to make a ſecond god author of all evil, they worſhipped another, who was the giver of all good things;*

whereas

---

(76) John xiv, 30.

(77) 2 Cor. iv, 4.

(78) Jurieu, Judgment about rigid and mitigated Methods, *pag.* 68, 69.

(79) Ibid. *pag.* 72.

(80) Ibid. *pag.* 73.

(81) Jurieu, Apolog. II, *pag.* 30, *col.* 2, *apud* Saurin's Examination of Mr. Jurieu's Theology, *pag.* 340.

(82) Above, citation (19). See alſo the article MANICHEES, remark [D], at the fifth paragraph.

(83) Father Adam, apud Daillé's Reply to Adam and Cottibi, *Part ii, chap.* 1, *pag.* 2, 3.

which makes God the author of ſin, does not lead a man to irreligion. Nay, he ſays,

whereas yours, ſay the Jeſuits to the Reformed, *is worſe than men.* They who are upbraided with this do not reject thoſe conſequences, they only reject the principle; they maintain only that it is a baſe calumny to charge them with making God the author of ſin (84). The ſame Jeſuits pretend that the doctrine of Calvin concerning Predeſtination, is attended with conſequences *that deſtroy altogether the idea we ought to have of GOD, and lead directly to Atheiſm* (85). The miniſter who anſwered Mr Maimbourg, convicted him of having unfairly repreſented the doctrine of Calvin. He ſhould have ſtopped there; for when he adds that Mr Maimbourg drew a falſe conſequence from the doctrine which he imputes to Calvin, he reaſons pitifully: let the reader judge of it (86). *Beſides I ſay that his concluſion is wrong, and that there is nothing more abſurd, and leſs theological than the conſequence which Mr Maimbourg draws from the doctrine of thoſe Divines; viz.* that it deſtroys altogether the idea we ought to have of God and leads directly to Atheiſm. *There was never any thing ſaid more inconſiderately. Let us take things in the worſt ſenſe, if that doctrine* deſtroys the idea we ought to have of God, *it is becauſe it repreſents GOD to us as being cruel, unjuſt, and puniſhing innocent creatures with everlaſting torments; and this is preciſely what Mr Maimbourg means, when he ſays that it deſtroys the idea of GOD, becauſe the idea of GOD implies the attributes of mildneſs, juſtice, and equity. But how can a doctrine, which gives us the idea of a ſevere and tyrannical GOD, who uſes his authority with the utmoſt rigour, lead men to Atheiſm? . . . It is a fooliſh thing to ſay that an hypotheſis leads to Atheiſm, when it brings GOD into every thing* (87), *makes him the cauſe of all things, and the only aim of all his own actions, and raiſes him ſo much above his creatures as to be able to diſpoſe of them in ſuch a manner as ſeems to be unjuſt to carnal reaſon. That opinion of the Supralapſarians is ſo far from leading to Atheiſm, that on the contrary it places the Deity in the higheſt degree of elevation and grandeur that can be conceived. For it does ſo much debaſe the creatures before the Creator, that the Creator, according to this ſyſtem, is bound by no laws to his creatures, but may diſpoſe of them as he thinks fit, and make them ſubſervient to his glory in ſuch a method as he judges moſt proper, and they have no right to contradict him.*

Here is the moſt monſtrous doctrine, and the moſt abſurd paradox in Divinity that was ever heard of, and I am very much miſtaken if any famous Divine ever ſaid any ſuch thing. All imaginable methods have been tried to explain the manner how God influences the actions of ſinners: the hypotheſis of abſolute Predeſtination was held, as long as it was thought to do no wrong to the holineſs of God; but it has been laid aſide, as ſoon as it was perceived that it ſtruck at that Divine attribute. They who were not ſenſible that free-will is inconſiſtent with the phyſical predetermination, have taught that predetermination all along; but they who believed that it deſtroyed free-will, have rejected it, and admitted only of a ſimultaneous and indifferent concourſe. They who believe that any concourſe is contrary to man's liberty, ſuppoſe that he only is the cauſe of his own actions (88). The only reaſon which moves them to make ſuch a ſuppoſition, is becauſe they think that all the decrees whereby providence ſhould be concerned with our will, would make all events neceſſary, whereby our wicked actions would be no leſs an effect of God than of his creatures (89). They could not reſt ſatisfied with ſaying that ſin is not a being, that it is only a privation and a nothingneſs which has no efficient, but a *deficient* cauſe (90). Laſtly, ſome have gone ſo far as to maintain, that God cannot foreſee the free actions of his creatures. Why ſo many ſuppoſitions? what was the reaſon of ſo many ſteps? It was the deſire of clearing God; for it was plainly perceived that religion was at ſtake, and that men would be neceſſarily led to Atheiſm, if God was ſaid to be the author of ſin. Hence it is that all Chriſtian ſects, that are accuſed by their adverſaries of holding ſuch a doctrine, deny it as an horrible blaſphemy, and a deteſtible impiety, and complain that they are deviliſhly calumniated. But here is a miniſter who very gravely tell us, that it is a doctrine, *which places GOD in the higheſt degree of glory and elevation that can be conceived.* He does not ſcruple to beſtow ſuch an encomium upon a doctrine which *repreſents GOD to us as being cruel, unjuſt, and puniſhing INNOCENT creatures with everlaſting torments.* He appeals to our conſciences, to know whether the idea of a tyrannical God leads us to Atheiſm, taking *things in the worſt ſenſe,* that is, ſuppoſing Maimbourg was in the right to ſay, that, according to Calvin, *GOD created the greateſt part of mankind to damn them, not becauſe they deſerved it by reaſon of their crimes, but becauſe he will have it ſo; and that he foreſaw their damnation only becauſe he ordained it before he foreſaw their crimes* (91); ſuppoſing, I ſay, that Maimbourg does juſtly accuſe Calvin of ſaying, that they who ſuffer eternal torments are *innocent creatures* (92), and conſequently that God is the author of their ſins, Mr Jurieu cannot ſuffer that Maimbourg ſhould conclude, *therefore Calvin's doctrine deſtroys the idea we ought to have of GOD, and leads directly to Atheiſm.* He is not contented to pretend that *there was never any thing ſaid more inconſiderately* than this concluſion (93), but he alſo calls it *a fooliſh thought* (94), and *a piece of ignorance* (95), and ſays that it ſhews Maimbourg to be *a ſilly Philoſopher, and a pitiful Divine* (96), and that *there is nothing more abſurd and leſs theological* than ſuch a conſequence (97). The fault wherewith Ovid was upbraided is a great one in matters of controverſy, *Neſcire quod bene ceſſit relinquere: neſcire deſinere* (98). *Not to leave off when a thing has ſucceeded well.* That miniſter had very well juſtified the Supralapſarians, by ſhewing what is wrongfully imputed to them, and by declaring that they diſown the conſequence wherewith they are charged of making God the author of ſin (99). He ſhould have retired from the field of battle after this without being ſo raſh as to aſſert that even if they ſhould make God *a cruel and unjuſt Being, puniſhing innocent creatures with eternal torments;* that is to ſay, that tho' they ſhould make God the author of ſin, and yet a ſevere judge, who puniſhes men eternally for ſins which they are not guilty of, they would not lead men to atheiſm; but on the contrary would raiſe God to the higheſt degree of glory that can be conceived. We may therefore aſk him, How comes it that all Chriſtian ſects avoid to ſay that God is the author of ſin, as the moſt dangerous rock in Divinity? How comes it that the meer idea of ſuch a doctrine is abhorred by all men? I muſt needs ſay that ſome men are very lucky: if another miniſter had ſaid any ſuch thing, his readers had been offended at it; he would have been obliged to recant it as an impious thing, and perhaps I am the only man who has taken notice of ſo ſtrange a doctrine.

But, ſays he (100), the more you aſſert that God is concerned in every thing, the more you ſuppoſe that he exiſts and is powerful. So that it is a fooliſh thing to argue thus, *GOD is the author of ſin, therefore there is no GOD:* it is therefore falſe that this doctrine leads to Atheiſm. What a poor ſhift is this! At that rate the antient Poets who aſcribed all ſorts of crimes to Jupiter and the other gods (101), and even that of exciting men to evil (102), yet without ſaying that the ſame God who moved them to it, puniſhed them for it, advanced nothing that will deſtroy the idea of God, put an end to religion, and introduce Atheiſm. Note, that there is no difference between a man who commits a crime himſelf, or by the means of another. It is manifeſt to any one who reaſons, that God is a moſt perfect Being, and that of all perfections, none is more eſſential to him than goodneſs, holineſs, and juſtice. If you deprive him of thoſe perfections, to make him a law-giver who forbids men to ſin, and yet induces them to ſin, and then puniſhes them for it, you make him a Being in whom men cannot put their truſt, a deceitful, malicious, unjuſt, and cruel Being: he can be no longer an object of worſhip; to what purpoſe ſhould any one pray to him, and endeavour to live a ſober life? It is therefore the way to Atheiſm. The fear which religion inſpires, ought to be attended with love, hope, and a great veneration. When an object is dreaded only becauſe it has the power and will of doing harm, and exerciſes that power cruelly and unmercifully, it muſt needs be hated and deteſted: this can be no religious worſhip.

To repreſent God as a Being, who makes laws againſt ſin, which he induces men to tranſgreſs, that he may have a pretence to puniſh them (103), is to expoſe religion to the rallery of libertines. That Being will

(84) See Daillé in that whole chapter.

(85) Maimbourg, Hiſt. of Calviniſm, *book i, pag. m.* 73. *See alſo pag.* 56.

(86) Jurieu's Apology for the Reformers, *Part i, ch. xix, pag.* 245, 246, *in* 4*to.*

(87) Yet Spinoziſm which teaches that all things are God himſelf, is an execrable Atheiſm.

(88) *Durandus de Sancto Portiano,* and many other divines ſuppoſe it. See an abridgment of a treatiſe of Mr de Launoi, inſerted in Mr Papin's Eſſay of Theology, printed in the year 1687.

(89) *See the book of Louis de Dole, a Capuchin, intituled,* Diſputatio quadripartita de modo conjunctionis concurſuum Dei & creaturæ ad actus liberos ordinis naturalis, præſertim vero ad pravos, adverſus prædeterminantium & aſſertorum ſcientiæ mediæ modernorum opiniones. *That book was printed at Lyons in the year* 1634, *in* 4*to.*

(90) See Papin's Eſſay of Theology againſt this doctrine, in the treatiſe againſt Phyſical Predetermination.

(91) Jurieu, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 241.

(92) Id. ib. *pag.* 246.

(93) Ibid.

(94) Ibid.

(95) Ibid. *pag.* 247.

(96) Ibid.

(97) Ibid. *pag.* 245.

(98) Scaurus, apud Senecam Controv. xxviii, *pag. m.* 272.

(99) Jurieu, ibid. pag. 244, 245.

(100) Ibid. *pag.* 246, 247.

(101) Nec multo abſurdiora ſunt ea quæ poëtarum vocibus fuſa, ipſâ ſuavitate nocuerunt, qui & ira inflammatos, & libidine furentes induxerunt Deos, feceruntque ut eorum bella, pugnas, prælia, vulnera videremus: odia præterea, diſſidia, diſcordias, ortus, interitus, querelas, lamentationes, effuſas in omni intemperantiâ libidines, adulteria, vincula, cum humano genere concubitus, mortaleſque ex immortali procreatos. *Cicero, lib. i, de Nat. Deor. cap. xvi.*

(102) See the remark [*C*] in the article EGIALEA, and the remarks [*X*] and [*Y*] of the article HELENA.

(103) Note, that if it be ſaid, as the Reformed do, that man is the only cauſe of his ſins, their diſtinction between God as a Law-giver, and as a diſpenſer of events, is a good one, notwithſtanding what Puffendorf ſays to the contrary, pag. 290, of his *Jus feciale divinum, &c.*

ſays, that doctrine raiſes God to the higheſt degree of glory that can be conceived. The antient Fathers were not ignorant that the queſtion concerning the origin of evil, is a moſt perplexing one [*K*]. They could not reſolve it by the Platonic hypotheſis, which was at the bottom a branch of Manicheiſm [*L*], ſeeing it admitted of two principles:

will not be deprived of it's exiſtence, whilſt it is ſuppoſed to be the author of ſin; which is evident, for a cauſe muſt needs exiſt when it acts: but it will prove at laſt to be nothing elſe but the world itſelf, or the God of the Spinoziſts, a Being, which exiſts and acts neceſſarily, without knowing what it does, and is intelligent, only becauſe the thoughts of the creatures are it's modifications.

There is another thing to be blamed in the particular doctrine of this miniſter. *That opinion of the Supralapſarians*, ſays he (104), *is ſo far from leading men to Atheiſm, that, on the contrary, it places the Deity in the higheſt degree of glory and elevation that can be conceived. For it does ſo much debaſe the creature before the Creator, that the Creator, according to this ſyſtem, is bound by no laws to his creature, but may diſpoſe of it as he thinks fit, and make it ſubſervient to his glory in ſuch a method as he judges moſt proper, and it has no right to contradict him. I confeſs that this opinion is liable to a great many inconveniencies, and is ſo harſh that it cannot be eaſily reliſhed. And therefore St Auguſtin's hypotheſis is without doubt to be preferred to it.* What a ſtrange doctrine is this! How can a profeſſor of Divinity be ſo bold as to ſay, there are ſome hypotheſes which are undeniably preferable to that which *places the Deity in the higheſt degree of glory and elevation that can be conceived?* It is certain that all our thoughts and actions ought to aim not only at the glory of God, but alſo at his greateſt glory. Our actions and opinions muſt tend *ad majorem Dei gloriam*. It ought to be the motto not only of a particular ſociety, but alſo of all communities, and private men. And therefore a Divine, who owns on the one ſide, that the ſyſtem of the Supralapſarians tend to the greateſt glory of God, and attains to it better than any other ſuppoſition; and who maintains on the other ſide, that St Auguſtin's *hypotheſis is without doubt to be preferred*, is guilty of a prophane and blaſphemous thought. Nor can that prophanation be excuſed by reaſon of the *harſhneſs* of the Supralapſarian ſyſtem, *which cannot eaſily be reliſhed*; for under pretence of ſome difficulties, more or leſs, none can be allowed to prefer the leſſer glory of God to the greateſt, and *to place* the ſupreme Being in *an* inferior *degree of glory and elevation*. If St Auguſtin's ſyſtem were plain and eaſy, I ſhould not ſo much wonder at the ill taſte of the author; but he himſelf owns (105) that he finds an oppreſſing weight in it, and that he bears that burden only becauſe the mitigated methods cannot free him from it. For the ſame reaſon he ſhould be a Supralapſarian; for if the ſuppoſition of the Jeſuits does not remove the difficulties of St Auguſtin's hypotheſis, it is plain that St Auguſtin's hypotheſis does not remove the harſhneſs of the Supralapſarian ſyſtem. Every thing being duly conſidered and weighed, it appears that the Supralapſarians, and they that go by the name of Infralapſarians, maintain the ſame thing at the bottom; they cannot do one another much harm; they never fail to come off by the help of arguments *ad hominem*, and retortions. You have here the character of this Doctor in little; there is no juſtneſs in his cenſures, and no connexion in his doctrines; his writings are full of wrong conſequences, unevenneſs, contradictions, and variations. If any one would give himſelf the trouble to examine his works carefully, every page would afford him ſuch matter of critizing as this.

Let us conclude, that a Manichee obſerving how carefully the ſeveral ſects of Chriſtianity invent ſuch hypotheſes as they think will acquit God, without ever owning that they make him the author of ſin, will always boldly maintain that this is a more dangerous rock than any other. Conſider well what has been ſaid againſt Chryſippus, who maintained (106), *That it is not unprofitable there ſhould be unprofitable, hurtful, and unhappy perſons.* To which Plutarch replies, *What manner of god then is Jupiter? I mean Chryſippus's Jupiter, who puniſhes a thing that is neither done voluntarily, nor unprofitably; for vice is indeed, according to Chryſippus's diſcourſe, wholly irreprehenſible: but, on the other hand, Jupiter is to be blamed, whether he has made vice, being an unprofitable thing, or having made it not unprofitably, puniſhes it.* Ποῖός τις ὁ Ζεύς, λέγω δὲ τὸ Χρυσίππου, κολάζων πρᾶγμα, μήτε ἀφ' αὑτοῦ, μήτε ἀχρήστως γινόμενον; ἡ μὲν γὰρ κακία πάντως ἀνέγκλητός ἐστι κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Χρυσίππου λόγον, ὁ δὲ Ζεὺς ἐγκλητέος εἴτε ἄχρηστον οὖσαν τὴν κακίαν πεποίηκεν, εἴτε ποιήσας οὐκ ἀχρήστως, κολάζει. *Qualis eſt Jupiter (de Chryſippeo loquor) rem puniens neque ultro neque inutiliter factam? nam Chryſippi ratio efficit vitia omnino culpanda non eſſe, ſed Jovem; ſive is fecit vitia, quæ nihil prodeſſent: ſive punit, cùm feciſſet non inutilia* (107).

[*K*] *The . . . Fathers were not ignorant that the queſtion concerning the origin of evil is a moſt perplexing one.*] I ſhall only quote a paſſage out of Origen, which will ſupply the place of all the other citations I could make. Εἴπερ ἄλλος τις τόπος τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐξετάσεως δεόμενος, δυσθήρατός ἐστι τῇ φύσει ἡμῶν, ἐν τούτοις καὶ ἡ τῶν κακῶν ταχθείη ἂν γένεσις. Si quis alius eſt locus in rebus humanis, ſcrutatu difficilis naturæ noſtræ; inter hos meritò numerari poteſt malorum origo (108). - - - *If there is any point in human affairs difficult to be accounted for, the origin of evil, may juſtly be reckoned ſuch.*

[*L*] *The Platonic hypotheſis, which was at the bottom a branch of Manicheiſm.*] I ſhall only conſider that hypotheſis as it was explained by Maximus Tyrius in his Treatiſe concerning this queſtion, *From whence comes evil, ſeeing GOD is the author of good things* (109)? This author ſuppoſes, that in order to know the cauſe of the good things that are in the world, it is not neceſſary to conſult the Oracle, and that it is plain enough they come from God, and that evil cannot come from Heaven, where there are no envious beings, but that in order to know from whence comes evil, one muſt go to diviners, that is to ſay, conſult Jupiter, Apollo, or ſome other deity, who propheſies, and takes care of human affairs. Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μὰ Δία, οὐκ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. φθόνος γὰρ ἔξωθεν τοῦ χοροῦ ἵσταται. *Non enim è cælo me hercules, non è cælo. Exulat enim illic invidia* (110). Afterwards he makes an enumeration of the miſeries our bodies are ſubject to, and concludes from thence (111) that man is the moſt unhappy of all creatures.

Οὐδὲν ἀκιδνότερον γαῖα τρέφει ἀνθρώποιο,

Nil nutrit tellus homine infelicius uno.

And then he conſiders the innumerable evils which torment our ſoul, and pretends, that the propheſying gods being conſulted about it, anſwered, That men have no reaſon to aſcribe the cauſe of their miſeries to God, ſeeing they themſelves are the authors of their unhappineſs by their own fault. He makes uſe of two verſes of Homer to expreſs this (112): Τί ἂν οὖν πρὸς ταῦτα ἀποκρίναιτο ὁ Ζεύς, ἢ ὁ Ἀπόλλων, ἤ τις ἄλλος μαντικὸς θεός; ἀκούσωμεν τοῦ ὑποφήτου λέγοντος,

> Ἐξ ἡμέων γάρ φασι κάκ' ἔμμεναι· οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
> Σφῇσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε' ἔχουσι.

Quid quæſo ad iſta aut Jupiter, aut Apollo reſpondebit, aut alius fatidicus Deus? Audiamus quid eorum interpres dicat:

> Aſcribunt ſuperis homines mala, cum tamen ipſi
> Criminibus propriis ſibi talia damna crearint.

Pray, what would Jupiter, or Apollo, or any other fatidical god anſwer to theſe things? Let us hear what their interpreter ſays:

> *Men ſay, thoſe ills are by the gods decreed,*
> *Which wholly do from their own faults proceed.*

He goes on and ſays, that Heaven and Earth are two different places. There are no evils in Heaven; and there is a mixture of good and evil upon Earth; but good things come down from Heaven, and evils ſpring from a depravation which is natural to the Earth, and contains two kinds, one whereof conſiſts in the qualities principles : they found themſelves obliged to have recourſe to the privilege of the free-will of men ; but the more we reflect on that way of ſolving the difficulty, the more we find that the natural light of Philoſophy ties and entangles this Gordian knot [*M*]. A learned

---

(104) Jurieu, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 246.

(105) Above, citation (51).

(106) Plut. de Stoicor. Repugn. *pag.* 1051.

(107) Ibid.

(108) Origenes contra Celſum, *lib. iv, pag.* 207.

(109) Τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιοῦντος, πόθεν τὰ κακά. Cum Deus bona faciat, unde ſint mala. *This is the ſubject of the 25th Diſſertation of Maximus Tyrius.*

(110) Maxim. Tyrius, Diſſert. xxv, pag. m. 253. *See, below, citat.* (118).

(111) Ibid. *pag.* 255.

(112) Ibid.

qualities of matter, and the other in the liberty of the ſoul. Ἡ τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ ἐπίῤῥυτα ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρας· τὰ δὲ κακὰ, ἐξ αὐτοφυοῦς μοχθηρίας ἀνίσταται. διττὴ δὲ αὕτη ἡ μὲν ὕλης, πάθος, ἡ δὲ, ψυχῆς ἐξουσία. *Ita ut bona quidem, è cœlo veniant : mala vero ex innata illi* (terræ) *improbitate oriantur. Improbitas vero ea duplex eſt : aut enim corrupta materiæ affectio eſt, aut animæ licentia* (113).

As to the firſt of thoſe two ſorts of depravation, he ſays, that matter ought to be conſidered as the ſubject upon which a good artiſt works. All the beauties it acquires ought to be aſcribed to art; but if there be any works upon earth that are not as they ſhould be, thoſe irregularities ought not to be imputed to art; for the intention of the workman does not ſwerve from art, no more than that of a law-giver from juſtice ; and we muſt remember that the divine underſtanding will hit the mark much better than the art of man can do. Afterwards he uſes a compariſon, *viz.* That there are ſome things in Mechanics which are the principal object of art, tending to it's deſign, and ſome things which reſult from the work, and are not the effect of art, but depend upon the modification of matter : ſuch are the ſparkles that fly to and fro when the Smith ſtrikes a red-hot iron upon an anvil. They make no part of the deſign which the Smith propoſes to himſelf, they are only an accidental effect, which reſults from his action, without his aiming at it, and it is only annexed to the quality of the iron. We muſt ſay likewiſe, that the evils which are to be ſeen upon Earth, are not the work of the divine art ; the artificer aims primarily, and directly, at the conſtruction of the world, but it happens that thoſe evils do neceſſarily flow from his work. The author adds a remark which is not very conſiſtent with this : he ſays, that the artificer calls the evils which we complain of, the preſervation of the world ; tho' we look upon them as it's ruin and deſtruction. He pretends, that the architect of the world propoſes to himſelf, the preſervation of the whole, and that the parts muſt ſuffer for the ſake of the whole. Ταῦτα ὁ τεχνίτης καλεῖ σωτηρίαν τοῦ ὅλου. μέλει γὰρ αὐτῷ τοῦ ὅλου· τὸ δὲ μέρος ἀνάγκη κακοῦσθαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὅλου. *Ea conſummationem totius vocat opifex. Qui totum reſpicit, cujus cauſa neceſſe eſt corrumpi partes* (114). Peſtilential diſeaſes, earthquakes, inundations, and the burnings of mount Ætna, do no harm but to ſome parts of the whole, and ſerve for the production of ſome others ; for, as Heraclitus ſays, the latter live by the death of the former, and the former die by the life of the latter. The death of the earth gives life to fire ; the death of fire gives life to the air ; the death of the air gives life to water ; and the death of water gives life to the earth (115). Maximus Tyrius might have been aſked, Why did you maintain then that the phyſical evils of mankind are neither intended nor produced by God ? If they are ſo neceſſary for the preſervation of the whole, and if the artificer aims at the preſervation of the whole, he muſt needs have them in view. Notwithſtanding this objection, we may very well ſay, that according to the hypotheſis of that Philoſopher, the plague, famine, and other miſeries of mankind are involuntary with reſpect to God, and came only into the work as an unavoidable effect of the diſpoſition of matter (116). Let us now ſee what he ſays about the other ſort of depravation, *viz.* moral evil : he ſays (117), that the power of the ſoul is the mother and nurſe of it, and that the earth being to be formed, which was to produce plants, and living creatures, and to contain evils in it's boſom, evils being baniſhed from Heaven were lodged in it ; that the living creatures were divided into two kinds, *viz.* beaſts and men ; that men were to ſurpaſs all other animals, and be inferior to God ; that this inferiority does not conſiſt in their dying, for their death is only the beginning of another immortal life ; that God, in order to make them inferior, to the Divine nature (118), placed the ſoul in a mortal body, as a coachman upon a chariot, put the reins in it's hands, and gave it leave to run where it would : he gave it the power to drive that chariot according to the rules, or againſt the rules of art. It directs the chariot, and reſtrains the impetuoſity of the horſes, but they are ignorant of all the rules, and go ſome one way, and ſome another way : ſome towards intemperance, others towards raſhneſs and fury ; others are ſluggiſh, and lazy, ſo that the chariot being driven up and down confounds the coachman, who yields, and runs towards the place whither the moſt unruly horſes draw him : he drives into gluttony and leudneſs, if the ſtrongeſt horſe turns that way, and ſo of the reſt. Such is the ſolution of that Platonic Philoſopher.

It is defective in two reſpects. For 1. He acknowledges two principles, God and Matter, the one very good indeed, but who cannot mend all the depravation of the other (119). That natural and abſolutely incorrigible depravation is the cauſe of phyſical evils, and the occaſion of moral evil ; it does ſo violently incline the human body to vices and crimes, that the ſoul is carried away, as it were, by unruly horſes. 2. Maximus Tyrius does not acquit the ſupream goodneſs and holineſs of God. A good and virtuous father would never cauſe his children to ride unruly horſes, and ſend them into the army, if he did certainly foreſee, or think, with great probability, that notwithſtanding their ſkill in riding, they ſhould fall, and be killed ; and that notwithſtanding their education, the profeſſion of a ſoldier would make them the moſt infamous of all men. In a word, that hypotheſis ſets bounds to the Divine power, and leaves the other attributes of God expoſed to the objections of the Manichees ; ſo that without having the conveniencies of the Chriſtian hypotheſis concerning free-will, it has the inconveniencies of it.

[*M*] *The more we reflect . . . the more we find that the natural light . . . ties and entangles this Gordian knot.*] I found it ſo by experince, as I was reading this article again to make it ready for a ſecond edition. Some new thoughts came into my mind (120), which convince me a-new, and more ſtrongly than ever, that the beſt anſwer that can be naturally returned (121) to the queſtion, *Why did GOD permit that man ſhould ſin ?* is this, *I do not know, I only believe that he had ſome reaſons for it very worthy of his infinite wiſdom, but they are incomprehenſible to me.* You will ſtop with ſuch an anſwer the moſt obſtinate diſputers ; for if they will go on they muſt talk alone, and ſo they will ſoon hold their tongues. If you ſhould enter the liſts with them, and undertake to maintain, that the inviolable privileges of free-will have been the true reaſon which moved God to permit men to ſin, you would be forced to anſwer their objections to their ſatisfaction ; and I do not know how you could well do it, for they might object two things which ſeem moſt evident to reaſon :

I. The firſt is, That God having cauſed his creatures to exiſt by an effect of his goodneſs, he gave them alſo, under the character of a bountiful cauſe, all the perfections which are proper for every kind. We muſt therefore ſay, that he expreſſed a greater love for thoſe which received very excellent qualities from him, than for thoſe who received leſs excellent qualities. He has therefore out of a particular goodneſs beſtowed free-will upon men, ſince that quality raiſes them above all the Beings that are upon earth. But we cannot conceive, how a gracious and beneficent Being can make a conſiderable preſent, without deſigning to increaſe thereby the happineſs of thoſe who receive it, and conſequently that bountiful Being ought to put them in a condition of getting ſuch an advantage by it, and keep them, if it be poſſible, from being utterly ruined and deſtroyed by it. But if there is no other way of preventing that, than by revoking the gift, that gift ought to be revoked ; whereby the character of patron and benefactor may be much better preſerved than by any other means. This is not changing one's mind with reſpect to the donee, but retaining without any ſhadow of variation, the goodwill wherewith that preſent was made him. The ſame goodneſs which moves one to give a thing which he thinks will make happy thoſe that ſhall enjoy it, moves him likewiſe to take it away as ſoon as he obſerves that it makes them unhappy ; and if he has time enough, and a ſufficient power, he will not put off the withdrawing of his gift till it proves the cauſe of miſery, but he will take it away before it has done any harm. What has been ſaid follows from the ideas of order, and the notions whereby we may judge of

256. bid. *pag.*

(114) Ibid. *pag.* 257.

(115) See about this doctrine of Heraclitus, the Notes of Daniel Heinſius, *in Maximum Tyrium, pag.* 110, and above, citation (60) of the article OVID, where Ovid makes Pythagoras deliver the ſame doctrine.

(116) See a like thought in the remark [*T*] of the article CHRYSIPPUS.

(117) Max. Tyrius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 257.

(118) This is an abſurd and impious thing, and it does not agree with what was ſaid by the author, above, citation (110), that there are no envious beings in Heaven. Note, that according to the conjecture of Heinſius, θείου ought to be joined with χοροῦ in that paſſage.

(119) Compare with this the words of Juſtus Lipſius, related above, citation (59) of the article CHRYSIPPUS, and citation (164) of the article EPICURUS. See alſo citation (167).

(120) See alſo the new remarks of the article ORIGEN.

(121) That is, without conſulting the Revelation, but only philoſophical ideas.

learned man pretends, that the Pythagoreans gave occaſion to this difficult queſtion. They looked for ſuperlatives in every thing; that is to ſay, they aimed by their interrogations, at the knowledge of things that are in the higheſt degree, every one in its kind. They aſked, for inſtance, what is the ſtrongeſt, the moſt antient, the moſt common, the trueſt thing? It was anſwered, as to the laſt point, that men are wicked, and

the eſſence and characters of goodneſs, in whatever ſubject it is to be found, whether in the creator or in a creature, a father, maſter, or king, *&c.* from thence comes this dilemma; either God has given free-will to men by an effect of his goodneſs, or without any goodneſs: You cannot ſay he did it without any goodneſs: You ſay then that he has done it with great goodneſs; but it does neceſſarily reſult from thence that he ſhould have deprived them of it at any rate, rather than ſtay till it ſhould prove their eternal damnation by the production of ſin, which is a monſter he does eſſentially abhor: and if he has been ſo patient as to leave ſo diſmal a preſent in their hands, till the evil happened, it is a ſign either that his goodneſs was altered, even before they left the right way, which you dare not ſay; or that free-will was not given them out of goodneſs, which is againſt the ſuppoſition granted in the above-mentioned dilemma.

Regard ought to be had to a ſtrong obligation; it ſhould never be diſpenſed with but in caſes of neceſſity; but men in ſuch caſes ought to have no ſuch regard. If a ſon ſhould ſee his father ready to throw himſelf out at the window, either in a fit of frenzy, or becauſe he is troubled in his mind, he would do well to chain him, if he could not reſtrain him otherwiſe. If a queen ſhould fall into the water, any footman that ſhould get her out of it, either by embracing her, or taking her by the hair (122), tho' he ſhould pluck off above one half of it, would do a very good action; ſhe would not certainly complain of his want of reſpect to her. If any one ſhould ſuffer a lady finely dreſſed to fall down a precipice, would it not be a very fooliſh excuſe to ſay, that it had not been poſſible to ſtop her without ſpoiling her ribbons and head-dreſs? Upon ſuch an occaſion as that, reſtraint and violence are an effect of goodneſs, and if a man were to be ſnatched even againſt his will out of the jaws of death, it would be a piece of charity to do it, tho' you ſhould run the hazard of putting one of his limbs out of joint, if he could not be ſaved any other way; that man, when his paſſion is over, will not fail to thank you for it. This maxim, *viz.* that to ſave a man againſt his will, who would deſtroy himſelf, is the ſame thing as if one ſhould kill him (123), is of no uſe in this caſe; and the greateſt favourers of toleration, will tell you that the pretended command, *Compel them to come in*, ſhould be executed in a literal ſenſe, if the only ſafe and infallible way of ſaving heretics, were to make them go to the Proteſtant Church, or to Maſs, with a cudgel in one's hand, I take the Philoſophical Commentator to witneſs. *If I ſhould ſee*, ſays he (124), *before the door of a houſe a man very wet whilſt it rains very hard, and if out of pity I would deliver him from that inconveniency, I might uſe theſe two means, either to deſire him to come into the houſe, or to take him by the arm, if I were ſtronger than he, and puſh him in. Thoſe two means are equally good in order to obtain the thing I ſhould aim at,* viz. *to keep that man from being wet, it is no great matter whether he comes into the houſe willingly, or againſt his will, for whether he enters of his own accord, or ſtays until be is aſked, or is puſhed in by main force, he is equally under a ſhelter againſt the rain. If Hell could be avoided the ſame way, I grant that our converters would be well grounded; for if it were enough, in order to do it, to be under the vaults of a church, it would be no great matter whether one came into it willingly, or were dragged into it being bound hand and foot, and ſo the ſtrongeſt labourers and porters ſhould be hired to take hold of heretics as ſoon as they ſhould appear in the ſtreets, and carry them upon their ſhoulders to the neareſt church; nay, their doors ſhould be blown up with a petard, if there were occaſion for it, and they ſhould be carried with all ſpeed from their beds to church.* What I have ſaid concerning the right which men have, by virtue of the laws of charity, to thwart and uſe violence towards thoſe whom they preſerve from death by that means, is truer ſtill with reſpect to fathers. They would be altogether wanting to their duty, if they did not take away from a ſon, a knife or a ſword wherewith he is ready to wound himſelf. They ought, notwithſtanding his tears, to ſnatch away thoſe preſents from him, and if they ſee him ready to ruin himſelf for ever in a certain courſe of life, they are obliged to bring him off by force, and even to implore the aſſiſtance of the temporal power. If they neglect the welfare of their ſons, alledging for their excuſe, that they will uſe no violence, as if their ſons were ſlaves, they ſhew that they have no love, or know not how to uſe it right.

It does clearly appear from all theſe things, that they who would ſubmit to the judgment of reaſon the conduct of the divine providence, with reſpect to the permiſſion of the firſt ſin, would infallibly loſe their cauſe, if they had nothing to ſay but that the privileges of free-will ought not to be violated. They would be anſwered, how can you conceive that God is the father of men, and yet ſay that he had rather ſave them the ſhort and inconſiderable trouble of forcing them to renounce an agreeable converſation, wherein they were ready to make an ill uſe of their liberty, than prevent their eternal damnation, which they incur by the ill uſe of their free-will? Where do you find ſuch ideas of paternal goodneſs? To have a regard to the free-will of a man, and carefully to abſtain from laying any reſtraint upon his inclination, when he is going to loſe his innocence for ever, and to be eternally damned, do you call that a lawful obſervation of the privileges of liberty? You would be leſs unreaſonable, if you ſhould ſay to a man who gets a fall near you, and breaks his leg, *that which hindered us from preventing your fall, is that we were afraid to undo ſome folds of your gown; we had ſo great a reſpect for its ſymmetry, that we would not attempt to diſcompoſe it, and we thought it was much better to let you run the hazard of breaking your bones.*

I will not deny but that the permiſſion of making uſe of a thing, and of abuſing it (125), has had ſometimes the character of a moſt eſpecial favour; but then that permiſſion implies the impunity of the abuſe. This then ſignifies nothing in the preſent caſe. See the margin (126).

II. But the ſecond thing which I am to propoſe will give more trouble to the defendants than the other. I have argued hitherto upon this principle; when thoſe whom we love cannot be preſerved from death, or infamy, or ſome other great evil, unleſs we make them feel a leſſer pain, we are obliged to make them feel it. To indulge them in their capricious or bad inclinations, would be rather an act of cruelty than of goodneſs; and as they would infallibly be angry, as ſoon as they come to know the conſequences of it, ſo they would be ready to thank thoſe who did hurt them ſo much for their good. The evidence of thoſe propoſitions is obvious to every body, and it cannot be doubted that Adam and Eve would have looked upon God's reſtraint to keep them from falling, as a new favour as great as the precedent.

This is what the principles of my firſt obſervation run upon; but now I take another way: I grant to the adverſaries all their demands; let them ſay that ſeeing man had received the privilege of liberty, he was to have the entire poſſeſſion and uſe of it, and no manner of reſtraint was to be put upon him. Let them ſay it was not a proper time to ſave a man by pulling him by the arm, or by the hair, by throwing him upon the ground, and ſaying to him, *It is hard for thee to kick againſt the pricks* (127). Let them ſay that the free-will of man was a barrier altogether inviolable, and a privilege which it was not lawful to ſtrike at. I will grant it. But was there no other means of preventing the fall of man? God was not to oppoſe a corporal motion; which is a troubleſome oppoſition: A meer act of the will was the thing in queſtion. But all the Philoſophers ſay that the will cannot be forced, *Voluntas non poteſt cogi*, and it is a contradiction to ſay that a volition is forced, for every act of the will is eſſentially voluntary. Now it is infinitely more eaſy for God to imprint in the ſouls of men ſuch an act of the will as he thinks fit, than it is for us to fold a napkin, therefore, *&c.* here is another and that GOD is good; which gave occaſion to this other queſtion, How comes it that GOD being good, men are wicked [*N*]? The ſolution of this difficulty ſeemed to Simplicius to be of very great importance (*e*).

---

(122) Thus queen Chriſtina was taken out of a lake whereinto ſhe fell near Stockholm. I think St Amand has pointed out that adventure in his poem, intituled, *Moyſe Sauvé*.

(123) Invitum qui ſervat, idem facit occidenti. *Horat. de Arte Poët. ver.* 467.

(124) A philoſophical commentary upon theſe words, *Compel them to come in, Part iii, pag.* 57, *&* *ſeq.*

(125) The emperor Nerva permitted thoſe two things to the father of Herodes Atticus, who found a treaſure in his houſe. See *Triſtan's Comment. Tom. i, pag.* 357; and *Spon's Travels, Tom. ii, pag.* 164, of the Dutch edition.

(126) The right way of conferring a benefit is not to permit the abuſe of it, but to add to it the art of making good uſe of it. Otherwiſe a preſent is a body without a ſoul, as Horace intimates, Epiſt. iv, lib. i, ver. 6, *ad Tibullum: Non tu corpus eras ſine pectore: dii tibi formam, Dii tibi divitias dederant, ARTEMQUE fruendi.*

(127) Acts ix, 5.

another obſervation more forcible ſtill. All Divines own that GOD can infallibly produce a good act of the will in a human ſoul without depriving it of the uſe of liberty (128). A preventing delectation, the ſuggeſtion of an idea which weakens the impreſſion of the tempting object, and a thouſand other preliminary means of acting upon the mind and the ſenſitive ſoul, move infallibly the rational ſoul to make a good uſe of its liberty, and to follow the right way without being invincibly forced to it. Calvin would not deny it with reſpect to the ſoul of Adam, during the time of innocency, and all the Divines of the Church of Rome, without excepting the Janſeniſts (129), own it with reſpect to man conſidered as a ſinner. They acknowledge that his actions may be meritorious, though he acts only by a grace that is either efficacious by itſelf, or ſufficient in ſuch a degree that it never fails to produce it's effect. They muſt therefore acknowledge a divine help ſo ſeaſonably beſtowed upon Adam, and ſo tempered that it had infallibly prevented his fall, would have been very conſiſtent with the uſe of his liberty, and had been no reſtraint upon him, nor diſagreeable to him, and had left ſufficient room for merit (130).

Thus the defendants are driven from all their entrenchments. Perhaps their laſt anſwer will be, That GOD owes nothing to his creatures, and that he was not bound to beſtow a neceſſitating or infallible grace upon them. But why then did they ſay before, that he was to have a regard to human liberty? If he was obliged to preſerve that prerogative of men, he muſt needs owe ſomething to his own work. But not to inſiſt upon that argument *ad hominem*; one may anſwer them, That if he owes nothing to his creatures, he is altogether bound to himſelf, and can do nothing againſt his eſſence. But it is eſſential to the holineſs of GOD (131), and to his infinite and almighty goodneſs, not to ſuffer the introduction of moral and phyſical evil.

Well, will they reply at laſt, but *ſhall the thing formed ſay to him that formed it, why haſt thou made me thus* (132)? This is well ſaid: we ſhould have ſtopped there. We are come again to the beginning of the liſts; it had been better to ſtay there, for it is needleſs to engage in a diſpute, if after having run for ſome time, one muſt at laſt ſhut up one's ſelf in one's own Theſis. The doctrine which the Manichees oppoſe, ought to be looked upon by the orthodox, as a truth in fact, clearly revealed, and ſince it muſt at laſt be confeſſed, that the cauſes and reaſons of it cannot be apprehended, it is better to own it from the very beginning, and ſtop there, and look upon the objections of Philoſophers as a vain wrangling, and oppoſe nothing to them but ſilence, together with the ſhield of faith.

[*N*] *That men are wicked, and that GOD is good. Which gave occaſion to this other queſtion, how comes it that - - - - men are wicked?*] This is what I find in the learned Daniel Heinſius. ‘ (133) Antiquiſſima Pythagoricorum diſputatio, & ab iis potiſſimum quos ἀκουσματικοὺς vocabant Pythagorici, qui tria quærere ſolebant: Primo, τὸ τί ἐστι, ſecundo, τὸ τί μάλιστα, tertio, τὸ τί δεῖ πράττειν. . . . . (134) In qua quæſtione tota conſtabat ſeptem ſapientum philoſophia, qui nihil aliud quærebant quam τί μάλιστα. Nec quid bonum ſed quid optimum, nec quid difficile ſed quid difficillimum. Notum eſt illud ex Plutarch. Sympoſio ſeptem ſapientum. . . . . Sic cum quæreretur, quid veriſſime diceretur, reſpondebant, ὅτι πονηροὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ὅτι ἀγαθὸς ὁ θεός. Unde primo manavit πρόβλημα tale, Τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ὄντος πόθεν κακοὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Quod teſtantur verſiculi apud Jamblichum Hippodamantis antiqui poëtæ, qui in laudem hujus quæſtionis ſcribebat:

Ω θεῖοι πόθεν ἐστὲ, πόθεν τοῖοί δ' ἐγένεσθε;
Ἄνθρωποι πόθεν ἐστὲ; πόθεν κακοὶ ὦ δ' ἐγένεσθε;

Unde hoc dimanavit, Θεοῦ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιοῦντος, πόθεν τὰ κακά. - - - *The moſt ancient method of diſputing among the Pythagoreans, and eſpecially thoſe called Auditors, who uſed to aſk three things: firſt, what is, ſecondly, what excels in the higheſt degree, thirdly, what ought to be done. . . . . In which queſtion, the whole Philoſophy of the ſeven wiſe men conſiſted, who only aſked, what excelled in the higheſt degree, not what was good, but what was beſt, not what was difficult, but what was moſt difficult. This we find by Plutarch's ſympoſium of the ſeven wiſe men. . . . . So when it was aſked, what might be ſaid with moſt truth, it was anſwered, men are wicked, GOD is good; whence came this queſtion, how comes it, that GOD being good, men are wicked. This appears by the verſes of Hippodamas, an ancient Poet, cited by Jamblichus, who wrote in praiſe of this queſtion:*

Ye gods, whence are ye, how came ye to be ſuch?
Whence are ye, men, how came ye to be bad?

Which gave occaſion to this queſtion, as GOD is gracious, whence comes evil?’ Heinſius ſays this in his notes upon a diſſertation abovementioned (135). He adds, that Maximus Tyrius, the author of that diſſertation, examined this ſubject by reaſon of Plato's doctrine concerning three attributes of GOD (136). 1. That GOD is eſſentially good, and goodneſs itſelf. 2. That he is immutable. 3. That he is truth itſelf. The firſt attribute ſignifies not only that GOD is good, but alſo that he is the author of good, ſeeing he is the idea of good, and the idea of good is the cauſe which produces good. Now becauſe the Platonic Philoſophers affirmed, that every idea is GOD, they acknowledged no idea of evil, and conſequently no cauſe of evil; which gave occaſion to this queſtion, from whence comes evil? *Ex primo ſequitur, Deo, ſi talis ſit, convenire non tantum bonum* κατὰ δύναμιν, *ſed etiam* κατὰ ἐνέργειαν, *nec tantum ut bonus ſit, ſed etiam ut efficiat bonum: quia idea boni eſt. Idea autem boni, boni quoque cauſa eſt & exemplar. Porro cum ideam mali tollant Platonici, quia, ut Parmenides dicebat,* πᾶσα ἰδέα θεὸς ἐστι, *ſequitur ut quæratur, Unde mala proficiſcantur* (137). Laſtly, Heinſius obſerves that this queſtion was thought to be of great importance to Piety, and refers us to Simplicius's Commentary upon Epictetus. The words of that Commentator ſeemed to me to be ſo remarkable, that I thought they would be an ornament to this part of my Dictionary. Here they are (138): Περὶ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τῶν κακῶν ὁ λόγος μὴ καλῶς διορθωθεὶς, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβείας αἴτιος γέγονε, καὶ τῆς τῶν ἠθῶν εὐαγωγίας τὰς ἀρχὰς διετάραξε, καὶ πολλαῖς καὶ ἀλύτοις ἀπορίαις ἐνέβαλε τοὺς μὴ καλῶς αἰτιολογοῦντας αὐτήν. Εἴτε ἀρχήν τις λέγοι τὸ κακὸν, ὡς εἶναι δύο τῶν ὄντων ἀρχὰς, τὸ, τε ἀγαθὸν, καὶ τὸ κακὸν, πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα ἄτοπα συμβαίνει. - - - *Diſputatio de natura atque ortu malorum, non bene explicata, tum impietatis erga Deum cauſa exſtitit, tum morum honeſtæque diſciplinæ principia perturbavit: tum multis, iiſque inexplicabilibus dubitationibus involvit eos, qui cauſas illius non veras reddiderunt. Nam ſive quis malum à Deo conditum, ſive principium eſſe dicat, ut duo ſint principia rerum bonum & malum: multæ magnæque abſurditates ſequuntur.* He there mentions three great inconveniencies; for he aſſerts that the falſe explication of the origin of evil has been the cauſe of impiety, and has confounded the principles of morals, and involved in many inextricable doubts thoſe who had a wrong notion of this ſubject. He refutes with great force and ſolidity the hypotheſis of the Manichees conſidered in general: he refutes it better ſtill when he comes to the particular explications they made uſe of. But when he undertakes in his turn to clear and prove his own hypotheſis, he does not ſo fully ſatisfy his reader. He makes uſe of the ſame method which the antient fathers made uſe of, that is he gives no other cauſe of the origin of evil than the free-will of the human ſoul: it is the only thing he could do; a man muſt come to this at laſt, and then he finds himſelf in the middle of a croſs way. Which gave occaſion to a learned abbot at Paris, to ſay not long ſince, I am in the middle of four ways, that of the Calviniſts, that of the Janſeniſts, that of the Thomiſts, and that of the Moliniſts. I know very well which way I ought

---

(*e*) See the remark [*N*], citation (138).

(128) See the remark [*G*] of the article MARCIONITES.

(129) That is to ſay, conſidering that they affirm that they condemn the propoſitions of Janſenius in the ſenſe that the Pope condemned them.

(130) With reſpect to the reaſon founded on the neceſſity of leaving to man the means of meriting rewards. See, above, article ORIGEN, remark [*E*], num. 1, towards the end.

(131) That is, it ſeems ſo to our weak reaſon.

(132) Rom. ix, 20.

(133) Dan. Heinſius, Not. in Maxim. Tyr. *pag.* 106.

(134) I have left out what is here in the original, I found it confuſed, and I gueſs that the Printers ſuppreſſed ſeveral lines.

(135) In the remark [*L*], citation (109).

(136) In lib. ii, de Republica.

(137) Heinſius, ibid. *pag.* 107.

(138) *Simplicius, in hæc Enchiridii Epicteti verba, cap. xxxiv.* Ὥσπερ σκοπὸς οὐ τίθεται πρὸς τὸ ἀποτυχεῖν, οὕτως οὐδὲ κακοῦ φύσις ἐν κόσμῳ γίνεται. Quemadmodum aberrandi cauſa meta non ponitur, ſic nec mali natura in mundo exiſtit.

not to go, but I do not know which way I ought to go. *Quem fugiam habeo, quem ſequar non habeo.* The firſt way is contrary to the Council of Trent; the ſecond, to the Popes conſtitutions; the third, to reaſon; and the fourth, to St Paul. Thoſe that are not Roman Catholics may more eaſily get out of this perplexity, by preferring St Paul's authority to that of the Popes and Councils.

PAULINA (LOLLIA). See the remarks (*a*) of the article **LOLLIUS**.

(*a*) Remark [*G*].

PECKIUS (PETER) born at Ziric-zee in Zeland in the year 1529, was admitted Doctor of Civil-Law at Louvain in the year 1553, and after having been there profeſſor royal of the Paratitles, was choſen profeſſor of Canon-Law in the year 1562. The reputation he acquired by his lectures, and by his works [*A*], procured him in 1586 the office of counſellor, in the ſupreme council of Mechlen. He died there the ſixteenth of July 1589, and was carried to Louvain in order to be buried in the church of S. Michael, where his widow and children cauſed a tomb to be erected with an epitaph (*a*), which is given by Aubertus Miræus, and Melchior Adam (*b*). His ſon, PETER PECKIUS, was chancellor of Brabant, and counſellor of State, and was eſteemed for his prudence and eloquence in the deputations he was charged with to the emperor Matthias and Henry IV. He compoſed ſeveral Latin poems, and amongſt others, *Votum pro ſtudiis Humanitatis*, which was printed. He died in the year 1625 (*c*).

(*a*) *See* Valerius Andreas, *pag.* 755, *of* Biblioth. Belgic.

(*b*) *See* Melchior Adam, in Vit. Juriſc. *pag.* 302.

(*c*) Valerius Andreas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 756.

[*A*] *His works.*] His treatiſe *de Teſtamentis Conjugum*, that *de Jure ſiſtendi*, and that *de Juris Canonici Regulis* are moſt eſteemed (1). There are ſeveral editions of his writings, and one was put out compleat in the year 1647. His Commentary *ad tit. d. Nautæ &c.* printed at Louvain in the year 1556, and at the Hague in the year 1603, was reprinted with excellent notes by Arnold Vinnius in the year 1647. The two former editions were full of faults (2). Vinnius added to it *Leges navales & Jus navale Rhodiorum*, in Greek and Latin. This edition was followed by that of Amſterdam 1668 in 8vo. Summaries, and ſome other things, are joined to it: but the correctors of the preſs have not done their duty well.

(1) *See* Melchior Adam, in Vitis Juriſc. *pag.* 303.

(2) That of 1647, containing all the works of Peckius, is no leſs ſo.

PEYRAREDE (JOHN DE) a gentleman of Gaſcogne (*a*), and a Proteſtant [*A*], was a good Latin Poet, and a good Critic. He began to be known at Paris towards the beginning of the reign of Lewis XIV. He publiſhed ſome remarks upon Terence, and ſome Hemiſtichs, which filled up the imperfect verſes of the Æneid, to which he added ſome verſes. He dedicated that work to the queen of Sweden (*b*). His corrections and critical conjectures upon Florus, deſerved the approbation of la Mothe le Vayer, who followed them often, and made an honourable mention of him [*B*]. Balzac ſpeaks of him ſometimes in his letters. I ſhall ſet down a paſſage out of them which is very much to his honour [*C*]. We find in a letter which he writ from Paris the twentieth of April 1641, to Iſaac Voſſius (*c*), that he began to feel the infirmities of old age, and that for the ſpace of thirty years he had laboured under great difficulties in his fortune, or ſpent his time in improving his eſtate. It appears from that letter that he had a ſon.

(*a*) He called himſelf *nobilis Aquitanus* in his works, as the abbot de Marolles obſerves in the liſt of the authors who obliged him.

(*b*) See the abbot de Marolles, ibid.

(*c*) It is the 324th of thoſe that were written to J. Gerard Voſſius.

[*A*] *And a Proteſtant.*] He was a very zealous Proteſtant, as one may gueſs from a letter of Mr de Balzac to Mr Conrart. *But who told you*, ſays he to him (1), *that I hate the Huguenots? It cannot be Mr Conrart, nor Mr de Saumaiſe, nor Mr Daillé, whom I have ſo much praiſed and celebrated, and whom I ſo publickly profeſs to love, honour, and eſteem infinitely. I perceive that Mr de Peyrarede was not pleaſed to make a difference between jeſt and earneſt, and that in the free converſation we had together, he put an ill conſtruction upon ſome words, which I ſpoke without any ill deſign. Without inſiſting any longer upon it, I proteſt, dear Sir, that I hate the Huguenots no more than you hate the Catholics.*

[*B*] *La Mothe le Vayer made an honourable mention of him.*] 'I follow the interpretation of the learned Mr Peyrarede,' *ſays he*, in his notes upon the nineteenth chapter of the ſecond book (2). He uſes a noble epithet in another place. *Thoſe words*, ſays he (3), *are pretty obſcure, I have interpreted them according to the expoſition of the illuſtrious Mr Peyrarede.* The abbot de Marolles quotes him often in his remarks upon Statius.

[*C*] *I ſhall ſet down a paſſage .... which is very much to his honour.*] 'The poſt of Friday laſt, brought me ſome news of Mr de Peyrarede. Do you know that his name makes already a great noiſe at Paris, and that the Celtæ admire the Aquitani? Or, if you had rather I ſhould expreſs myſelf another way and ſpeak poetically of a Poet, the God of the Seine is ſurprized to hear the Muſes of the Dordogne ſing ſo well. For my part, I am charmed with their laſt compoſition, and if the ſouls of the bleſſed could be raiſed up by the charms of fine verſes, I do not doubt but that the ſoul of the duke de Brezé would come down from Heaven, at the very moment he ſhould be told:

- - - - - *Tu nube ſerena*
Stellato fulgens apice, & radiante corona,
Ad tua Sacra veni, quæ multo Regia luctu
Concelebrat, ſacrique Chori, ſanctuſque Senatus, &c.
Aſpice ut ipſa gemens, ingenti affixa feretro,
Horridaque & laceris luget Victoria pennis,
Quæ quondam tua caſtra, tuas comitata triremes,
Heſperio toties mutas dum ſanguine Pontum,
Deſeruit tua ſigna ſemel: nunc cædis acerbæ
Invidiam lenire velit, fatiſque malignis
Imputat, infandæque excuſat crimina cladis, &c.

'Did you ever ſee any thing more noble or more pathetical than that poor victory, afflicted with the death of that brave duke? What a ſpectacle to ſee her with her torn robes, and broken wings, do penance for a fault which ſhe thought ſhe had committed; to ſee her faſtened and as it were nailed to that great coffin, which ſhe waſhes with her tears? She cannot eaſe her grief for the misfortune that happened at Orbitello: She would fain impute it to a bad deſtiny: ſhe, &c. (4).' Mr de Balzac writ this the fourth of December 1646.

(1) Balzac, firſt Letter to Conrart, *book i, pag. m.* 25, 26.

(2) La Mothe le Vayer, Remarks upon Florus, *pag.* 910. See alſo *pag.* 842.

(3) Ibid. *pag.* 933.

(4) Balzac, Choice Letters, *Part ii, book iii, Letter xxxvii, pag. m.* 378.

PEYRE (JAMES D'AUZOLES (*a*) LA) a gentleman of Auvergne (*b*), one of the moſt ridiculous writers of the XVIIth century, tells us before his works, that he was ſon of Peter d'Auzoles, and of Mary Fabri of Auvergne. He deſerved not to be refuted by learned men, yet he had that honour [*A*]. He was ridiculed as he deſerved in a work of Mr Baillet (*c*), ſpeaking of a book which he intituled *Anti-Babau* (*d*). He died of an Apoplexy at Paris the nineteenth of May, 1642 (*e*). I have ſaid ſomething of him in the article of Balzac (*f*), and I ſhall give an inſtance of the meanneſs of his genius [*B*].

(*a*) What we read in Moreri's Dictionary, that his name was *d'Auzoles la Reine*, is not true.

(*b*) Nobilis Arvernas. *Ludov. Jacob, ubi infra.*

(*c*) In the Anti, Artic. 155.

(*d*) It is an anſwer to a letter of Father Bolduc.

(*e*) Ludov. Jacob, Biblioth. Pontific. *pag.* 343; but Peter de St Romuald, Chronol. Journal, *Tom. i, pag.* 619, ſays, that he died of a malignant Fever the thirtieth of June.

(*f*) Citation (43).

[*A*] *He deſerved not to be refuted by learned men, and yet he had that honour.*] His little book *Of the permanent life of Melchiſedech* printed in the year 1622, was refuted by Salian a Jeſuit. His *Job* printed the next year, was refuted by Bolduc a Capuchin, and by the Jeſuit Petavius (1). He ſhould have thanked this Jeſuit, inſtead of being ſo imprudent as to write againſt him a Cnronological book intituled *the Diſciples of Times.* It is he that is mentioned, without being named, in the preface of the ſecond part of the *Rationarium temporum - - - by Petavius*, wherein it is ſaid that of all Chronological books, that were come out till then, none was more wretched than that which was intituled *Holy Chronology*. La Peyre was the author of it, and of a ſmall Folio printed in 1629, and intituled *the Holy Geography, or an exact Deſcription of the Earth, and a true Demonſtration of the Terreſtrial Paradiſe.* I wonder that Voſſius placed not this author in his long catalogue of Chronologers.

[*B*] *I ſhall give an inſtance of the meanneſs of his genius.*] I find it in the abbot de Marolles. *Mr le Fevre Chantereau*, ſays he (2), *maintains that the common way of reckoning the years of our lord, is the beſt, and ought to be preferred to all others, againſt the opinion of Scaliger, Father Petau, and others who reckon ſome few years more, or cut off ſome; and as I ſaw that he praiſed upon that account, the late Mr de la Peyre James d'Auzoles, whom I knew alſo very well, I did a little wonder at it, becauſe the good man had no great genius for it, though he applied himſelf very much to it: which I eaſily perceived, becauſe he was of opinion that the year might be made up of three hundred and ſixty four days, inſtead of three hundred and ſixty five, and ſomewhat more, that it might always begin of a Sunday, and end with a Saturday. Certainly, he underſtood not very well that ſcience; for if his opinion was followed, January would ſoon be found in the ſeaſon of Auguſt, becauſe the years would always be too ſhort by one day and ſome hours; which being loſt upon the months, they muſt neceſſarily change the ſeaſons. But he never could underſtand it, and fell into a great paſſion about it; from whence I inferred that Mr de la Peyre was not ſo great a man as he thought himſelf to be in the ſcience which he profeſſed.* He obſerved ſometimes in his diſputes what is practiſed by thoſe that are at law; for he declared where he made his abode. He dated his *Anti-Babau, at Paris in the houſe of Mr Couturier a man of probity and honour, where he lived the fifth of Auguſt*, 1631 (3). Is not this a ſign of a weak man?

(1) See Mr Baillet's Anti, *Art.* 155.

(2) Marol. Memoirs, *pag.* 271, 272.

(3) Baillet, ubi ſupra.

PEYRERE (ISAAC LA) born at Bourdeaux, made himſelf famous by his treatiſe concerning the Pre-Adamites, which was printed in Holland in the year 1655 [*A*], and immediately refuted by a multitude of authors [*B*]. He was then a Proteſtant, and had a place in the houſe of the prince of Condé. Tho' he publiſhed his book without putting his name to it, he was known to be the author of it, and upon that account he

[*A*] *His treatiſe concerning the Pre-Adamites, which which was printed in Holland in the year* 1655 (1).] Mr Heidanus was accuſed of having had a hand in the printing of that book; but he cleared himſelf of it, and his accuſer never durſt reply to it. It is what I find in Petrus ab Andlo. ‘Ignorantiam Mareſi ſequitur ejus effrons & immane mendacium, quavis pœna digniſſimum. *Eum* ſcilicet *qui familiam ducit inter hodiernos Carteſianos, obſtetricatum fuiſſe editioni libri de Præadamitis inſcripti.* Sed cum vir ille doctiſſimus deteſtandam hanc calumniam publice à ſe ſit amolitus in parte ſecunda ſuarum conſiderationum de Sabbatho & die Dominica pag. 31. Nec ille, *qui* ut inquit Mareſius, *olim per indirectum id exprobraverat*, cujus gonorrhæam & profluvia hic lambere ac reſorbere voluit noſter, quicquam reſpondere potuerit, hoc maledicentiſſimæ linguæ ſpiculum inter ſcruta rejiceremus, niſi dudum in auctoris caput recidiſſet cum immortali ejus ignominia (2). - - - - *The ignorance of Mareſius is attended with an impudent and egregious lie, for which no puniſhment can be too ſevere: viz. that*, he, who is now at the head of the modern Carteſians, was concerned in publiſhing the book intituled the Pre-Adamites. *But ſince that very learned man has publickly cleared himſelf of this abominable calumny, in the ſecond part of his conſiderations, on the Sabbath and the Lord's day, pag.* 31. *And ſince he*, who, *as Mareſius ſays*, had indirectly charged him with it before, *whoſe filth and excrements Mareſius thought fit to lick up and ſwallow again, has not been able to make a reply, I ſhould with contempt paſs by this malice of his moſt ſlandering tongue, had it not lately recoiled upon the author's head to his eternal infamy.*’ You will find in the Supplement to Moreri the plan of the book concerning the Pre-Adamites.

[*B*] *And immediately refuted by a multitude of authors.*] The author of the Supplement to Moreri names only four perſons (3), who wrote againſt the ſyſtem of the Pre-Adamites. Here is a larger catalogue. John Conrad Dannhawerus, profeſſor of Divinity at Straſburg, publiſhed there, *Præadamita utis, ſive fabula primorum hominum ante Adamum conditorum exploſa.* John Micrælius profeſſor of Philoſophy, and rector of a college at Stetin, publiſhed a book againſt la Peyrere (4). John Henry Urſinus printed at Francfort, *Novus Prometheus Præadamitarum plaſtes ad caucaſum relegatus & religatus.* Samuel Mareſius, profeſſor of Divinity at Groningen, printed there, *Refutatio fabulæ Præadamiticæ abſoluta ſeptem prioribus quæſtionibus cum præfatione Apologetica pro* αυθεντίᾳ *ſacræ Scripturæ.* John Hilpertus profeſſor at Helmſtad, publiſhed at Amſterdam *Diſquiſitio de Præadamitis*: The *Non ens Præadamiticum*, of Antony Hulſius, was printed for John Elzevir at Leyden. Philip le Prieur publiſhed at Paris *Animadverſiones in librum Præadamitarum.* He took the name of Euſebius Romanus. All thoſe books were printed in the year 1656, as Thomas Bangius obſerves (5), who adds, that La Peyrere ſhewed him his manuſcript at Copenhagen in 1645; and then he ſays, ‘Neutiquam tamen perſuadere nobis unquam potuimus eo temeritatis dilapſurum virum alias humanum & ingenioſum ut hoc commentum publicis typis excudendum daret, niſi res ipſa noſtris oculis expoſita fuiſſet. - - - - - *However, I could never have believed that a man, who was otherwiſe learned and ingenious, would have been guilty of ſuch raſhneſs, as to print and publiſh this fiction, if I had not ſeen it with my own eyes.*’ Mr Crenius (6) obſerves that Calovius and Schotanus have warmly diſputed againſt the Pre-Adamitic hypotheſis; the former in the third volume of his Common-places and the latter in his Bibliotheque of the holy Hiſtory. He ſays alſo (7), that there are to be found in the edition of the *Prometheus Præadamitarum* of John Henry Urſinus, *doctiſſimorum quorumdam Gallorum in librum de Præadamitis notæ cenſoriæ. - - - Critical notes of ſome very learned Frenchmen on the book concerning Præ-Adamites*, and (8) that Philip le Prieur put out another edition of his work at Paris, in the year 1658, wherein he

(1) Note, that I have ſeen in the catalogue of a library which was ſold at Leyden on the firſt of October 1696, that book concerning the Pre-Adamites as printed in 8vo, in 1653, and theſe words are added, *Editio optima.*

(2) Petrus ab Andlo, Animadv. ad Vindicias Diſſertationis, *pag.* 10.

(3) Mr Morin: (Morinus the Aſtrologer) Antony Hulſius, author of the *Non ens Præadamiticum.* J. Pythius, & J. Hilpertus.

(4) It was printed at Stetin.

(5) Tho. Bangius, in cœlo Orientis Exercit. II. Quæſt. viii, pag. 134, apud Thomam Crenium, faſce ii, Exercitationum Philologico-Hiſtoricarum, *pag.* 13.

(6) Tho. Crenius, ibid.

(7) Id. ib. *pag.* 8.

(8) Id. ib. *pag.* 10.

he was impriſoned in the Spaniſh Netherlands [*C*]. He found no better way to come off, than to lay his doctrine upon the principles of the Proteſtants, and to promiſe to go to maſs. He went to Rome, where he was kindly received by Alexander VII (*a*). He publiſhed, as is uſual, the motives which induced him to change his religion. Some Catholics laughed at it [*D*]. He ſpent the laſt years of his life in retirement (*b*). He had been in Denmark, where he attended Mr de la Thuillerie ambaſſador of France, and compoſed there two relations which have been printed [*E*]. He is mentioned in the Menagiana [*F*], as you may ſee in the remarks. You will find ſome very curious circumſtances in the fragment of a letter which I ſhall ſet down [*G*].

(*a*) See the remark [*C*].

(*b*) See the remark [*F*].

praiſes his antagoniſt for having embraced the church of Rome. Bangius ſays nothing of a treatiſe printed at Leyden in 1656, with this title, *Reſponſio exetaſtica ad tractatum incerto autore nuper editum, cui titulus* Præadamitæ. *Autore J. Pythio Miniſtro Jeſu Chriſti in Swartewael.*

[*C*] *That he was impriſoned in the Spaniſh Netherlands.*] ‘In the year 1655, the biſhop of Namur publiſhed a cenſure of the book concerning the Pre-Adamites, written by the Sieur la Peyrere, but without naming him, becauſe he had not ſaid that he was the author of it, tho' it was but too well known. But he was uſed worſe upon the ſame account, being at Bruſſels in February 1656 (9). Thirty armed men ruſhed into his chamber and apprehended him; and then having carried him through ſeveral long windings of the ſtreets of Bruſſels, they clapped him up at laſt in the tower of Turemberg, with the conſent of the arch-duke Leopold. He was told, that it was by the authority of the great vicar of the arch-biſhop of Mechlin. At laſt after he had been ſome time in that tower, he was releaſed by the intereſt of the prince of Condé, his maſter, and immediately, by his advice, he went to Rome, and threw himſelf at the Pope's feet, and ſubmitted himſelf and his book wholly to his will: and ſo he became a Catholic, and had as good ſucceſs as he could wiſh. It is what he himſelf ſays in his petition to the moſt Holy Father Pope Alexander VII (10).’ See the remark [*G*].

(9) Moreri is therefore miſtaken, when he ſays that la Peyrere retracted his opinion in a book printed at Rome in the year 1655. His Printers have put 1555.

(10) Peter de St Romuald, Chronological and Hiſtorical Journal, December 25, pag. m. 675.

[*D*] *Some Catholics laughed at it.*] Read this paſſage out of a letter of Guy Patin, written the ninth of April, 1658. ‘The author of the book concerning the Pre-Adamites, whoſe name is Iſaac de la Pereire (11), a Gaſcon, is here, being returned from Rome. He has publiſhed a little book in quarto, in which he gives an account of the reaſons which moved him to change his religion, (which in ſchool terms is called, to abjure one's Hereſy) and he diſowns his book concerning the Pre-Adamites. I have ſeen the book it does not ſell well. It is ſaid that the Pope has given him a ſmall abbey, and that Mazarin has promiſed him ſome new favour from Heaven or Purgatory. He is here waiting for that favour, as greedily as you may fancy of a Gaſcon, who is afraid of ſtarving, and who hath changed his religion only to raiſe himſelf and fare better, at any body's coſt. He ſhews himſelf here as if he were a great worker of miracles, or a Publiſher of pardons. . . . . (12). A Gaſcon, who is a learned man, a courtier, and a converted Huguenot lately come from Rome, is very fit for theſe pranks, and to act ſuch a Comedy.’

(11) He ſhould have ſaid *La Peyrere.*

(12) Patin, Letter cxvii, *pag.* 454, 455, *of the firſt Tome.*

[*E*] *He compoſed two relations which have been printed.*] He made them for la Mothe le Vayer, his friend; one of them is a relation of Greenland, and the other of Iceland; they are both curious enough: I have quoted ſomething of the latter in the article JONAS (ARNGRIMUS). He dedicated it to the prince of Condé; and he intimates in the Epiſtle Dedicatory that he deſigns to write the life of that Hero. I think he is the author of the Relation of the Battle of Lens.

[*F*] *He is mentioned in the Menagiana.*] ‘Iſaac de la Peyrere (13), of Bourdeaux, is the author of a book intituled, The Pre-Adamites, wherein he pretends to ſhew that Adam was not the firſt man. The good man boarded at Noſtre Dame des Vertus, in the houſe of the Fathers of the Oratory. He was ſtill infatuated with his Pre-Adamites, and it is likely he died with that fantaſtical notion. He would have been very well pleaſed, had he known that there is a Rabbin who mentions Adam's preceptor. But that Rabbin was a Rabbin, that is to ſay, an author not to be minded. When the book concerning the Pre-Adamites came out, it was condemned to be burnt by the hangman. I deſired the author, who was my friend, to ſend it me before it came to light. He underſtood the jeſt, and ſent me a copy of it with this verſe of Ovid, changing the word *urbem* into that of *ignem*.

Parve, nec invideo, ſine me liber ibis in ignem (14).

See the Miſcellanies of Vignuel Marville, pag. 144. tom. I. (15).

(13) He ſhould have ſaid *Iſaac la Peyrere.*

(14) Continuation of the Menagiana, *pag.* 38, of the Dutch Edit.

(15) He is called there *de la Peyre.*

[*G*] *You will find ſome very curious circumſtances in the fragment of a letter.*] As I do not rely much on Peter de St Romuald, I deſired a gentleman of great merit, who lived then in the houſe of the Prince of Condé, to let me know whether that good Feuillant has given a true account of the matter. Here is the gentleman's anſwer to me, ‘I think I am able to give you an exact account of what you deſire of me, becauſe Mr de la Peyrere was my very good friend. He was arreſted at Bruſſels at the time mentioned by your author. But the ſecret hiſtory of it is, that the late prince concerned himſelf in that buſineſs by the means of his confeſſor, who was a Jeſuit, and loved Mr de la Peyrere, bating his religion, which he would have him to change. The machine of the Pre-Adamite was therefore ſet a-going: he was arreſted, and was made afraid of the conſequences of his book, unleſs he changed his religion. The good man, who was not obſtinate about what is called religion, changed it very ſoon, and his maſter gave him wherewith to go and fetch his abſolution at Rome, which he did not much value. He returned to his maſter, who loved him to the laſt, and maintained him, ſince his return into France, in the houſe of the Fathers of the Oratory of Paris. I have often ſeen him there, and found that he was far from being a true Papiſt; but he was very fond of his notion concerning the Pre-Adamites, about which he writ and ſpoke ſecretly to his friends to his dying-day. The Procurator-general of that order, who is a friend of mine, and who loved him, invited me to dine with him, and made him confeſs, that he writ books ſtill, which he told me ſoftly would be burnt after the death of the good man. La Peyrere was an extraordinary good-natured man, and calmly believed but a little.’

PEIRESC (NICOLAS CLAUDIUS FABRI, LORD OF) counſellor in the parliament of Aix, was born in Provence (*a*) the firſt of December 1580. I might add many things to what has been ſaid by Moreri; but having little room left me with reſpect to the letters of the alphabet that follow P, I am forced to ſuppreſs many articles, and to touch ſlightly upon many others. I ſhall only ſay that no man was ever more ſerviceable to the commonwealth of learning. He was, if I may ſay ſo, its Attorney-General: he encouraged authors, furniſhed them with knowledge and materials, and ſpent his revenue in buying, or getting copies of the moſt ſcarce and uſeful monuments.

(*a*) In the village of *Beugencier*, which Gaſſendus calls in Latin *Belgenſerium.*

ments. He kept correſpondence with learned men in all parts of the world [*A*]. Philoſophical experiments, curioſities of nature, productions of art, monuments of antiquity, hiſtory, and languages, were equally the objects of his care and curioſity. You will find an exact account of all thoſe things in his life, which was elegantly and learnedly written by Peter Gaſſendus [*B*]. It will not be needleſs to obſerve, that Peireſc, who was ſo famous all over Europe, and whoſe death was lamented by ſo many Poets, and in ſo many languages [*C*], and cauſed a pompous mourning among the Humouriſts of Rome (*b*), was unknown to ſeveral Frenchmen, though men of merit and learning [*D*]. He died the twenty-fourth of June 1637. The Aſtrologers had foretold, that he ſhould marry and have children; yet he never was married [*E*].

[*A*] *He kept correſpondence with learned men in all parts of the world.*] I have been informed by a letter of the abbot Nicaiſe (1), that Mr Thomaſſin Mazaugues (2), counſellor in the parliament of Aix, has ten thouſand letters *in his hands*, which were found amongſt the papers of Mr de Peireſc, and that he is making a choice collection of them; that there are a great many which that famous Senator had received from Holſtenius, Father Kircher, Cavalier del Pozzo, Salmaſius, Selden, Camden, Pignorius, Gualdo, the Puteani, Rigaltius, and ſeveral other learned men, of which he could make one volume in quarto, and intitle it, *Epiſtolæ virorum eruditorum quæ extant ad Peireſkium.* You will find ſome curious things about thoſe letters in the beginning of the *Menagiana*, ſecond edition. Here is a paſſage of Balzac, which will not be improperly produced here, 'I agree with you in all the greateſt and moſt magnificent things you ſay of your friend; and if you will allow me to make uſe of a phraſe borrowed from Greece, I add, that we have loſt in that great man, *a piece of the ſhipwrack of antiquity, and the relics of the golden age.* All the virtues of the heroical times had retired into that noble ſoul. The univerſal corruption of mankind could not affect his good conſtitution, and the evil which touched him could not defile him. His generoſity was neither confined by the ſea, nor ſhut up on this ſide of the Alps; it diffuſed its favours and kindneſſes every where, and it received thanks from the extremities of Syria, and from the very top of mount Libanus. With a moderate eſtate he had the ſoul of a potent lord, and without the friendſhip of Auguſtus, he was a Mæcenas (3).' Again, *The late Mr de Malherbe was one of his particular friends, and ſometimes ſpoke to me of him; but only as of a man extremely curious, a great lover of relations and news, a great ſearcher of medals and manuſcripts, who had abundance of acquaintance in foreign countries, and was a great admirer of all the Doctors of Leyden, &c* (4).

[*B*] *His life . . . . . . written by Gaſſendus.*] That work is very much eſteemed. Yet there is an author who pretends that many things have not been well related in it (5), I ſuppoſe he means ſome paſſages wherein Salmaſius is concerned. A Phyſician of Caſtres (6), who has collected ſome facts omitted by Gaſſendus, forgot, on the other hand, ſeveral encomiums on Mr de Peireſc, which Colomeſius has inſerted in his *Gallia Orientalis* (7).

[*C*] *His death was lamented . . in ſo many languages.*] Naudæus will afford me the whole commentary on this text. '(8) I would fain . . . . hear thee diſcourſe about that famous Academy of the Humouriſts, where, as the baron de Rians ſaid one day, the obſequies of his uncle, the abbot and counſellor Peireſc, had been celebrated in more than forty ſeveral languages...... (9) Thou mayeſt well judge how much that Academy is eſteemed at Rome, ſince Monſieur Peireſc, that ornament of France, that great favourer of learned men, that abyſs of learning, deſired to be a member of it; and ſince as he had honoured that famous Academy with his name, they did alſo in their turn honour his memory with ſuch duties as they had never before paid but to thoſe by whom they had been governed, and that upon the account of their extraordinary virtue and learning.' Naudæus quotes thereupon Gaſſendus, who ſays, that beſides the funeral operation, ſpoken in Latin by Mr Bouchard, ſeveral elogies of the deceaſed were recited in Italian, Latin, and Greek, verſes (10), and then Naudæus obſerves that the baron de Rians, *who mentions forty languages, and Gaſſendus who mentions only three, are both in the right: for*, ſays he (11), *the praiſes of Monſieur Peireſc were only celebrated in three languages in the Academy, and before the Cardinals; but afterwards they added to the collection of thoſe elogies printed at Rome, this Pangloſſia*, ſive generis humani Leſſus in funere delicii ſui Nicolai Claudii Fabricii Peireſcii, - - - *or the lamentation of mankind, upon the death of their darling Nicholas Claude Fabri Peireſc,* --- *which does effectually contain the elogies of that great man in forty idioms, and I might almoſt ſay, in as many different characters. From whence* Scipio de Grammond, *who was preſent at that ceremony, and who died ſome time after at Venice, took occaſion to compoſe theſe verſes, to ſhew how honourable that Pangloſſia was both to the ſaid Sieur Peireſc, and to the city of Rome.*

Indus, Arabs, Medus, Gallus, Germanus, Etruſcus,
Anglus, Idumæus, Sarmata, Grajus, Iber,
Et quicunque venit gelido de cardine, & uſto,
Eoiſque plagis, occiduiſque ſonus;
Omnes Fabricio concordi voce parentant,
Qui norat proprios reddere cuique ſonos.
Proh ſuperi! quanta eſt Romana potentia, quæ nunc
Tot populis, & tot gentibus ora aperit.
Romana verè nunc clauditur orbis in urbe,
Cui tam multifido competit ore loqui.

Indian, Median, Engliſh, and Greek,
Syriac, Arabic, Spaniſh, and French.
Italian, German, Poliſh, and all tongues
Between the northern and the ſouthern pole,
Between the riſing and the ſetting ſun,
Concur to celebrate with one accord
Peireſk's fun'ral, who could each language talk.
How great the power of Rome! it may be ſaid,
The world is now indeed inclos'd in Rome,
Since ſhe can ſpeak ſo many diff'rent tongues.

Balzac expreſſes ſome contempt for the Pangloſſia (12). 'What does Signor John James (13) mean by his frightful title of Pangloſſia? To go as far as forty, there muſt be three and twenty which were unknown to Scaliger, and the ſoul of Parnaſſus muſt be praiſed in Baſque, and Low-Breton: that is enough to make a mad Muſic upon your Parnaſſus. It is to introduce the Barbarians into that ſacred place, and to commit as great a crime, as thoſe who opened the gates of Italy to the predeceſſors of the king of Sweden (14).' See alſo what he ſays in two other letters to the ſame Mr Chapelain (15).

[*D*] *He was unknown to ſeveral French-men, tho' men of merit and learning.*] Balzac affords me the proof of it. 'Can you believe that Monſieur de la Rochefoucaut, had never heard of our Mr de Peireſc, and that a great many other perſons, who are neither Barbarians nor ignorant, knew him not, no more than he? You ſee thereby that his reputation was good, but that the Italian Signor undertook to make it great, and that his Pangloſſia is rather an effect of his ſollicitations, than a voluntary duty which the people thought of (16).' Here is a ſecond paſſage: *I am fully perſwaded of the merit of Monſieur de Peireſc; but I was ſpeaking of his reputation, and you know that there is a* donum famæ - - - *a gift of fame, which all learned men have not, and whereby they who are in poſſeſſion of it, are not only known to the Senate, and to the order of knights, but alſo to the common people and tradeſmen* (17).

[*E*] *The Aſtrologers had foretold that he ſhould marry and have children; and yet he never married.*] Gaſſendus, the dreadful adverſary of that ſort of men, did not fail to make this obſervation againſt them; for having ſet down the day and hour of the birth of his hero,

---

(*b*) See the remark [*B*].

(1) Dated at Dijon the 21ſt of February 1696.

(2) Mentioned before, remark [*B*], of the article MARTELLIUS. He did me the honour to write to me the 4th of Feb. 1699, a long account of it, which I would have inſerted at the end of this remark [*A*], were it not that I thought the public would ſee it in the preface to thoſe choice letters before the ſecond edition of this Dictionary be ended. Thoſe letters are printing at Geneva.

(3) Balzac, Letter to Mr l'Huillier. It is the ſecond of the ſecond book of the firſt part of the Choice Letters, pag. 48, of the Dutch edition.

(4) Ibid. Letter xiii, to Chapelain, *book ii*, *pag. m.* 73.

(5) Multa perperam neſcio quo fato, in vita Peireſkii à Gaſſendo relata, alias fortaſſe docebimus. *Clementius, in vita Salmaſii.*

(6) Peter Borel: *his* Auctarium ad Vitam Peireſkii, *was printed at the Hague in the year* 1655.

(7) *Pag.* 175, & *ſeq.*

(8) Naudæus, Dialogue de Maſcurat, *pag.* 138.

(9) Id. ib. *pag.* 139.

(10) Et carmina quidem in defuncti laudem Italicè, Latinè, Græcè recitarunt lectiſſima totius urbis ingenia: funebrem verò orationem copioſam ſanè, & elegantem pronunciavit Joannes Jacobus Buccardus delectus ad id muneris. *Gaſſend. in Vita Peireſkii, lib. vi, pag. m.* 349.

(11) Naudæus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 141.

(12) Moreri is in the wrong to call it *Pandegloſſie.* The Dutch editions of Moreri have *Leſſas* inſtead of *Leſſus.*

(13) That is to ſay, *Bouchard*, who made the funeral oration, and called himſelf *Joannes Jacobus Buccardus.*

(14) Balzac, Letter xxvi, to Chapelain, *book iv.*

(15) The 28th of the fourth book, and the firſt of the fifth.

(16) Letter i, of the fifth book to Chapelain, *pag.* 205, 206.

(17) Ibid. Letter iv, of the ſame book, *pag.* 212.

hero, he adds, ‘ Quod attingo ſolum, ne videar circa temporis circumſtantiam non fuiſſe ſatis diligens; non verò ut faciam hariolandi anſam conjectoribus quò jam poſt viri obitum, certiùs quàm antè, fata retexant. Etenim mirum dictu eſt, quàm multa mentiti Aſtrologi fuerint, ſeu annos ſpectes, quibus non vixit; ſeu uxorem, & liberos, aliaque, quibus caruerit; ſeu cætera multa, quæ eſt conſequutus (18). - - - *Which I only mention, that I may not ſeem to have been too negligent as to the circumſtance of time; and not that I may give an handle to fortune-tellers to re-caſt his nativity after his death, more certainly than they did before it. For it cannot be imagined, how many things the Aſtrologers falſely foretold, whether with reſpect to the number of years, which he did not live: or, a wife and children, and other things, which he never had: or, many other things, which he happened to have.*’ Theſe words of the *Menagiana* ought therefore to be mended: ‘ Mr Peireſc ordered, by his laſt will, that Gaſſendus might have a hundred volumes out of his library, at his choice; his ſon refuſing to execute his father's will, was compelled to it by law (19).’

(18) Gaſſend. in Vita Peireſc. *lib. i*, circa init.

(19) Menagiana, pag. 2, of the firſt Edition in Holland. That miſtake has been mended in the ſecond Edition.

PELIAS, ſon of Neptune, and of Tyro daughter of Salmoneus, was nurſed by a mare (*a*). He reigned in Theſſaly with great injuſtice; for after he had uſurped the throne, he maintained himſelf on it by putting to death, or perſecuting thoſe who had a right to it [*A*]. He durſt not make uſe of violence againſt his nephew Jaſon, who went to demand of him the crown of his father (*b*). He choſe rather to evade the juſtice of that demand, by propoſing to that young prince a pious expedition, and ſuch as would get him a great reputation [*B*]. It was the conqueſt of the golden fleece. Jaſon

(*a*) Ælian. Hiſt. *lib. xii. cap. xlii.*

(*b*) Pindar. Od. IV, Pyth.

[*A*] *After he had uſurped the throne, he maintained himſelf on it, by putting to death, or perſecuting, thoſe who had a right to it.*] The kingdom did belong to Æſon, and not to Pelias, as it appears from their genealogy. Æſon was the ſon of Cretheus (1), whoſe father was Æolus (2); but Pelias was ſon of Neptune (3), and of a daughter of Salmoneus, brother of Cretheus (4). I add, That the kingdom had been given to Æolus by Jupiter, for himſelf and his poſterity.

- - - - Τάν ποτε
Ζεὺς ὤπασε λαγέτᾳ
Αἰόλῳ, καὶ παισὶ τιμάν.

Quod (regnum) *olim Jupiter dedit populorum duci Æolo & liberis* ut eſſet illis *decus* (5). So that according to the laws of ſucceſſion, it did belong not to Pelias, who deſcended from Æolus only by his mother's ſide, but to Æſon who deſcended from him by the males. Note that Æſon and Pelias were born of the ſame mother; for Tyro, daughter of Salmoneus, after ſhe had had twins by Neptune, *viz.* Pelias and Neleus (6), married Cretheus her uncle, by whom ſhe had three boys, Æſon, Amythaon, and Pheres (7). It is plain that Pelias was an uſurper, having excluded Æſon from the throne. Æſon and his wife dreaded him ſo much, that they durſt not breed up Jaſon their ſon; but as ſoon as he was born they ſecretly conveyed him into the den of Chiron, and gave out that he was dead; and the better to deceive the tyrant they performed all the ceremonies of the funeral (8). They ſaved their child by that means, but they could not preſerve themſelves from Pelias's cruelty; for he forced Æſon to drink of the blood of a bull, and ordered that Amphinome, Æſon's wife, ſhould be put to death, and cauſed Promachus, their ſon, to be killed (9). This happened during the voyage of the Argonauts, and upon a falſe report of their death. Note that Amphinome having retired to the Penates of Pelias, and having made a thouſand imprecations againſt him, ſtabbed herſelf (10). Others ſay that ſhe hanged herſelf (11). I ſay nothing of Pelias's violence againſt Sidero, Tyro's mother-in-law (12). He killed her upon the very altar of Juno, to revenge his mother Tyro, who had been very ill uſed by that ſtep-mother. Τελειωθέντες δὲ ἀνεγνώρισαν τὴν μητέρα, καὶ τὴν μητρυιὰν ἀπέκτειναν σιδήρῳ (13). Κακουμένην γὰρ γνόντες ὑπ᾽ αὐτῆς τὴν μητέρα, ὥρμησαν ἐπ᾽ αὐτήν. Ἡ δὲ φθάσασα, εἰς τὸ τῆς Ηρας τέμενος κατέφυγεν. Πελίας δὲ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν τῶν βωμῶν αὐτὴν κατέσφαξε. Καὶ καθόλου διετέλει τὴν Ηραν ἀτιμάζων. Qui (*Pelias & Neleus*) cum ad juſtam integramque ætatem perveniſſent, agnita matre, novercam, quòd ejus opera parentem male affectam percepiſſent, facto in eam impetu occiderunt: quæ, tametſi intra Junonis templum confugere antevertiſſet, eam tamen Pelias ſuper aram ipſam jugulavit: & in omnibus rebus Junonem negligebat (14). - - - *Who* (Pelias and Neleus) *when they were grown up, having owned their mother, fell upon and killed her ſtep-mother, becauſe they had heard that their mother thro' her means had been ill uſed: and tho' ſhe had fled for refuge to Juno's temple, yet Pelias ſlew her upon the very altar, and ſhewed no manner of regard to Juno.* The author from whom I have this, adds one thing which will not be foreign to the purpoſe in this place, *viz.* that Pelias and Neleus, twins, could not agree together; and that Neleus was forced to yield, and to ſeek another habitation: Ἐστασίασαν δὲ ὕστερον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ Νηλεὺς μὲν ἐκπεσών, ἧκεν εἰς Μεσσήνην, καὶ Πύλον κτίζει. Atqui poſtea inter ſe diſcordiam exercere non deſierunt, Neleus demum regno pulſus Meſſenam commigravit, & Pylo urbe condita, &c (15). - - - *But afterwards they lived in continual diſcord. Neleus at laſt being driven out of the kingdom went to Meſſene and built Pylos, &c.* Diodorus Siculus mentions the diſcord of thoſe two brothers, and obſerves, that Pelias having obtained the city of Jolcos, and the adjacent countries, raiſed an army, and brought it into Peloponneſus (16). Pauſanias ſays that Neleus fled from Jolcos becauſe he feared Pelias (17).

[*B*] *By propoſing to that young prince a pious expedition, and ſuch as would get him great reputation.*] A great many authors agree in this, that he favoured the deſign of the Argonautæ, for no other reaſon, but becauſe he hoped by that means to get rid of his nephew Jaſon, whoſe merit he feared. I ſhall only quote Valerius Flaccus: The paſſage is ſomewhat long, but it is no matter, ſince you ſhall find another fact in it, *viz.* the extent of that tyrant's ſtates.

Hæmoniam primis Pelias frenabat ab annis:
Jam gravis, & longus populis metus: illius omnes,
Ionium quicunque petunt: ille Othryn & Hemum,
Atque imum felix verſabat vomere Olympum.
Sed non ulla quies animo, fratriſque paventi
Progeniem, divumque minas: hunc nam fore regi
Exitio vateſque canunt, pecudumque per aras
Terrifici monitus iterant: ſuper ipſius ingens
Inſtat fama viri, virtuſque haud læta tyranno.
Ergo anteire metus, juvenemque exſtinguere pergit
Æſonium: letique vias, ac tempora verſat (18).

Pelias from his youth Æmonia rul'd:
A long and grievous ſcourge; and all thoſe ſtates,
Which to Ionia reach, to him belong'd.
Controll'd by none, he till'd in peace the vales
Of Othrys, Hæmus, and Olympus high.
But yet his mind was not at reſt, he fear'd
His brother's ſon, and threatnings of the gods.
The prieſts and victims often had foretold
The king's deſtruction by his nephew's hands.
The fame and merit too of Æſon's ſon
Gave to the tyrant pain: ſo he reſolv'd
To ſlay the youth and rid himſelf of fear,
And of his death the time and way contriv'd.

Pindar, if I am not miſtaken, is the only writer who tells us, that Pelias encouraged his nephew to undertake that expedition by a motive of religion (19). Here is the ſubſtance of the diſcourſe of that great Poet,

(1) Apollod. *lib. i, pag. m.* 45.

(2) Ib. *p.* 27.

(3) Ib. *p.* 45.

(4) Id. ib. *pag.* 27, 43.

(5) Pindar. Pyth. Od. IV, *pag. m.* 341.

(6) Apollod. ubi ſupra *pag.* 43.

(7) Ib. *pag.* 45.

(8) Pindar. ubi ſupra.

(9) Diod. Sicul. *lib. iv, cap.* 51, *pag. m.* 241. See alſo Apoll. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 69.

(10) Id. ib.

(11) Apollod. ib.

(12) Diod. Sicul. *lib. iv, cap. lxx, pag.* 257, gives her that name, whereby Meziriac upon Ovid's Epiſt. *pag.* 541, has corrected ſeveral paſſages.

(13) Read Σιδηρῷ according to Meziriac's correction, which is approved by Tanaquillus Faber, in his Notes upon Apollodorus, *pag.* 268.

(14) Apollod. ibid. *pag.* 45.

(15) Id. ib.

(16) Diod. Sicul. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 258.

(17) Pauſan. *lib. iv, pag.* 112.

(18) Valer. Flac. Argon. *lib. i, ver.* 22.

(19) See Benedictus upon Pind. Od. IV, Pyth. pag. 355.

Jaſon undertook it. It was reported, that that enterpriſe had proved fatal to him, which made Pelias bolder in his cruelty (c). He was puniſhed for it by the craft of Medea; his own daughters cut his throat, in hopes that they ſhould make him grow young again, as ſhe had promiſed them (d). He wiſhed ſo ardently that ſhe might do him that ſervice, that he ſaid to her, *I give you leave to flea me alive, provided you reſtore me to the ſtate of a young boy* (e). Some ſay, that ſhe did effectually reſtore him to his former youth. Cicero is one of them. I do not believe, that he did deſignedly take one Perſon for another, as Muret fancies [C]. Jaſon treated Pelias's daughters generouſly, and

(c) See the remark [A].

(d) See Diod. Sicul. *lib. iv, cap. lii, & ſeq.*

(e) See the words of Varro in the remark [C].

Poet, I ſhall uſe the words of Meziriac. *Jaſon being two and twenty years of age, came out of the den of Chiron, and returned to the houſe of his father Æſon, where he was viſited by a great number of his relations, amongſt whom were his uncles Pheres and Amythaon, and his firſt couſins Acaſtus and Melampus. He treated them, and made merry with them five days together, and on the ſixth day he went to Pelias, with all that company, and charged him to reſtore to him the kingdom, which lawfully belonged to him. Pelias ſeeing him ſo well attended, was obliged to give him fair words, and anſwered him, that he was ready to yield him his royalty; but that he would exhort him firſt to execute a pious and glorious enterprize, which was to go to Colchos to appeaſe the manes of Phryxus, and bring back into Theſſaly the Golden-Fleece, foraſmuch as the ſhade of Phryxus had appeared to him for a long time, and warned him to ſend ſomebody into Colchos, to call his ſoul thrice upon his ſepulchre, and bring back the Golden-Fleece from thence, and that having conſulted the Oracle about it, Apollo had commanded the very ſame thing. He added, That had it not been for his old age, he himſelf would have undertaken that voyage; but that Jaſon could alledge no good excuſe againſt it, becauſe he was in the flower of his youth, and of ſuch an age wherein the deſire of acquiring glory ſhould work more upon him, than the vain ambition of reigning. Finally, he promiſed and ſwore, in a ſolemn manner, that he would reſtore the kingdom to him, at his return* (20).

[C] *Cicero was one of them. I do not believe that he did deſignedly . . . . as Muret fancies.*] Let Mr Menage perform here the office of a commentator (21) 'That fable of Æſon's being made young again by the enchantment of Medea, is to be found at large in the ſeventh book of Ovid's Metamorphoſis. But what Ovid ſays of Æſon in that book, Plautus in in his Pſeudolus (22), makes a Cook ſay of Pelias:

Quia ſorbitione faciam ego te hodie meâ,
Item ut Medea Peliam concoxit ſenem;
Quem medicamento & ſuis venenis dicitur
Feciſſe rurſus ex ſene adoleſcentulum;
Item ego te faciam.

As Pelias, with old age become quite grey
Was by Medea's charms made young and gay,
I, with my ſoop will make you ſo to-day.

'Cicero ſays the ſame thing under the name of old Cato, in his book *de Senectute:* Quo quidem me proficiſcentem haud ſanè quis facilè retraxerit; nec ſi tamquam Peliam recoxerit. - - - *Whither indeed am I going, and from whence I cannot eaſily be brought back, nor made young again, as Pelias was.* But if we believe Ovid and Apollodorus, Pelias was not made young again by Medea. He was, by the perſuaſion of Medea, killed by his daughters, who hoped to make him young again, in the ſame manner as Medea had made an old ram young again. Muret, in the tenth Chapter of the ſixth Book of his *Variæ Lectiones*, thinks, that Plautus and Cicero have deſignedly miſtaken thoſe names; Plautus, in the perſon of a Cook, who never read any Metamorphoſis; and Cicero in that of an old man, whom his memory fails often; and herein he has been followed by Camerarius, Scioppius, Freherus, and ſeveral other Critics. For my part, I am fully perſuaded, that Plautus and Cicero ſpoke in earneſt; and that what they ſay of Pelias had been ſaid by ſome antient authors, whom they followed, as Ovid followed ſome others.' Mr Menage adds, that *what Ovid ſays of Æſon, Jaſon's father, was ſaid of Jaſon himſelf, by Pherecydes and Simonides, as we may learn from the argument of Euripides's Medea:* Φερεκύδης δὲ καὶ Σιμωνίδης φασὶν, ὡς ἡ Μήδεια ἀνεψήσασα τὸν Ἰάσονα, νέον ποιήσειε . . . . *Pherecydes and Simonides ſay, that Medea renewed the youth of Jaſon. So that it is likely ſome antient author ſaid, that Pelias was made young again by Medea, as well as his brother Æſon . . . and Plautus and Cicero have followed that author, as Ovid followed the author of a poem, intituled,* Νόστοι, *that is to ſay,* the Returns; *for we learn from the abovementioned argument of the Medea, that that author ſaid of Æſon, in that poem, what Ovid ſaid of him in his Metamorphoſis.*

I cannot believe that Plautus told a lie to keep up the decorum, or the probability, no, not if I were told an hundred times, that it becomes a Cook to falſify hiſtory upon the ſtage. But it would be more difficult ſtill for me to believe what is ſaid of Cicero, that he thought decorum required of him, that the memory of Cato, an old grave man, ſhould fail him. It is better to aſcribe that miſtake to Cicero himſelf, if it be a miſtake: which is alſo one of Muret's ſhifts. 'Tale aliquid hic quoque comminiſcendum eſt: nam aut decorum id & conſentaneum Catoni credidit, quod & memoria vacillare γεροντικόν ἐστιν & interdum habet aliquid gravitatis in magnis viris minus accurata fabularum & talium rerum cognitio: aut hoc quoque inter μνημονικὰ Ciceronis ἁμαρτήματα numerandum eſt (23). - - *Something of this kind is likewiſe here to be imagined: for either he thought it ſuitable to Cato, becauſe the memory of old men fails them, and ſometimes the imperfect knowledge of fables, and ſuch things, has ſomething of gravity in great men: or this may alſo be reckoned among the defects of Cicero's memory.*' It is no eaſy thing to refute Menage, for the Antients did ſo differently relate mythological adventures, that it is not unlikely that ſome ſaid, that Pelias was actually made young again. Perhaps it will be ſaid, that if Medea had done him that good office, ſhe would have done it before ſhe and Jaſon fell out: but how unlikely is it that ſhe would have been willing before that time, to beſtow ſo great a favour upon the murderer of the father and mother of her huſband. This is a weak objection, ſince moſt authors ſuppoſe, that he did not put to death the father of Jaſon. The moſt common tradition ſays, that Æſon, Jaſon's father, was made young again by Medea; and ſome authors ſay, that he died in the quiet poſſeſſion of his kingdom, and left the tuition of his ſon to Pelias (24). We have ſeen (25), that the latter ſwore in a ſolemn manner, he would reſtore the kingdom to Jaſon, at his return. Why ſhould not we believe, that ſome authors have ſaid that he kept his word: and then it might be ſaid, without any difficulty, that Medea reſtored his former youth to him at Jaſon's deſire. What is very certain is, that there are ſtill extant ſome teſtimonies of his great deſire that ſhe would do him that favour. See Diodorus Siculus (26), where he relates how Medea acting like a Fanatic, and pretending that ſhe came from the Hyperborean country, to make Pelias and his kingdom happy, perſuaded that prince that ſhe was ordered to reſtore him to the flower of his youth. But eſpecially read theſe words of Varro: 'Peliam Medeæ permiſiſſe ut ſe vel vivum degluberet, dummodo redderet puellum (27). - - - - *Pelias gave leave to Medea, even to flea him alive, provided ſhe would reſtore him to the ſtate of a little boy.*' Let us obſerve that the funeral of Pelias was celebrated with great magnificence, and that Jaſon was one of the heroes who contended for the prize in the funeral games by that ceremony (28). Is it not a ſign that Pelias died, being reconciled with his nephew? It is ſomewhat ſtrange that authors ſhould ſay, that ſhe reſtored her huſband Jaſon to his former youth, for he was very young when he married her; and if ſome years after ſhe was uneaſy to ſee him diſpoſed for a ſecond marriage, it was becauſe ſhe began to grow old (29). Per-

(20) Meziriac upon Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 542, 543. That diſcourſe of Pindar is in the IVth Pyth. Od.

(21) Menagiana, Obſervations upon Malherbe, *pag.* 349, 350.

(22) It is the 80th verſe of the 2d ſcene of the 3d act, *pag. m.* 541.

(23) Muret. Var. Lect. *lib. vi, cap. x, pag. m.* 983.

(24) Schol. Homeri Odyſſ. *lib. xii,* he quotes Pherecydes. See Meziriac, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 535.

(25) In the abovementioned paſſage of Pindar, citat. (20).

(26) Diod. Sicul. *lib. iv, cap. lii, liii. See alſo* Hyginus, *cap. xxiv.*

(27) Varro, in Marcipore, apud Nonium Marcellum, *v.* puellos, *pag. m.* 158.

(28) Pauſan. *lib. v, pag.* 165.

(29) Diod. Sicul. ibid. *cap. lv, pag.* 244.

and even left the kingdom to the ſon of that uſurper [*D*].

haps a wrong daſh of the pen, either by an author or a copyiſt, produced at laſt this tradition, that Medea reſtored Jaſon to his youth. If inſtead of writing Αἴσων, ſomebody writ Ἰάσων, it happened that the ſon and the huſband took the place of the father, and of the father-in-law; I mean, of Æſon whom Medea made young again. Such a miſtake in writing would be only the tranſpoſition of a letter; and I grant that ſuch tranſpoſitions are more frequent in printing than in writing; yet authors and copyiſts are not ſo free from them as it were to be wiſhed. One may therefore have ſome reaſon to believe, that they who ſaid that Medea reſtored Jaſon to his youth, grounded their opinion upon a book into which the word Ἰάσων had crept, through inadvertency, inſtead of the word Αἴσων. Which cannot be ſaid of the writer quoted by by Mr Menage (30), for the ſequel of the diſcourſe ſhews, that he ſpeaks of Jaſon's being reſtored to his youth, I fancy Mr Menage would have quoted Lycophron, if he had remembered theſe words: καὶ λέβητι δαιτρυθεὶς δέμας ȣ̓κ ἀσμένως ἔμαρψεν ἐῤῥάȣ σκύτος: Et in lebete corpus excoctus non impune cepit arietis vellus (31). *And as his body was boiled in a kettle, he did not take the Golden-Fleece with impunity.* Upon which Canterus made this note, 'Jaſonem à Medea recoctum fuiſſe, notum eſt. - - - - '*It is known that Jaſon was reſtored to youth by Me*'*dea.*'

Note, that if a woman had the gift which is aſcribed to Medea, ſhe would uſe it eſpecially for her huſband. So that all things duly conſidered, I ſhould not much wonder if ſome authors had ſaid, that Medea reſtored to their youth, not only the nurſes of Bacchus, and and their huſbands (32), and Æſon her father-in-law, and Pelias, Æſon's brother, but alſo her huſband Jaſon. It is a greater wonder that ſhe forgot herſelf: why did ſhe give occaſion that it might be ſaid to her, *Medice, cura teipſum, - - - Phyſician, cure thyſelf*; ſince you make other people young, why do not you part with your old age? It would be at leaſt as uſeful to you as the reſtoration of your huſband's youth. I ſhall conclude this remark with obſerving a miſtake of Aldus Manutius the younger. He ſaid that Pelias was Jaſon's father (33).

[*D*] *He treated Pelias's daughters generouſly, and even left the kingdom to the ſon of that uſurper.*] They were three: Jaſon married them very advantageouſly. Alceſtis, the eldeſt of them all, was Admetus's wife. The name of the ſecond was Amphinome; ſhe was married to Andremon. The third had for her huſband, Canas, king of the Phocæans, and ſon of Cephalus; her name was Evadne (34). I find this in Diodorus Siculus. That Hiſtorian obſerves (35), that Jaſon placed Acaſtus, Pelias's ſon, on the throne of his father; yet he ſays, a little before, that Pelias having no ſon, was afraid of being dethroned by his brother (36): It cannot be ſaid, in order to excuſe him, that he obſerves, that the fabulous narrations do very much differ one from another; he makes that obſervation that he may not be condemned, if he does not always agree with other authors, Καθόλȣ γὰρ τȣ̀ς παλαιȣ̀ς μύθȣς ȣ̓χ ἁπλῆν ȣ̓δὲ συμπεφωνημένην ἱστορίαν ἔχειν συμβέβηκε· Διόπερ ȣ̓ χρὴ θαυμάζειν ἐάν τινα τῶν ἀρχαιολογȣμένων μὴ συμφώνως ἅπασι τοῖς ποιηταῖς καὶ συγγραφεῦσι συγκρίνωμεν. In priſcis enim fabulis nulla omninò ſimplex & per omnia ſibi conſentiens eſt hiſtoria. Haud ergò mirandum eſt, ſi in antiquitatibus illis recenſendis cum poëtis & ſcriptoribus aliis non ubique nobis conveniat (37). - - - *For with reſpect to antient fables, there is no hiſtory altogether of a piece, and in every thing conſiſtent with itſelf. Therefore it is not to be wondered at, if in relating thoſe antiquities, I do not always agree with the Poets, and other writers.* But I do not believe he pretended, that ſuch an obſervation ſhould ſerve for his juſtification, in caſe he contradicted himſelf: he were to blame if he pretended ſuch a thing. Let us therefore boldly ſay, that he deſerves a little cenſure upon this occaſion; for he ſhould not have adopted, pag. 233, the opinion of thoſe who ſaid, that Pelias had no ſon, and a quite contrary opinion, pag. 243. He ſhould, at leaſt, have told his reader, that ſome ſaid one thing, and others another. As for the reſt, he had reaſon to obſerve, that his narrations agreed not with thoſe of other writers. We have an example of it here; for we read in Apollodorus (38), that Alceſtis, during the life of Pelias, was married to Admetus, who had performed the hard conditions which Pelias required of thoſe who courted her (39). Apollodorus ſays, that Pelias had four daughters, and names them one after another (40). Hyginus (41) ſays, that he had five, and tells their names. Pauſanias ſays, that the daughters of that prince being overwhelmed with grief, becauſe they had killed their father, thinking to make him young again, left the country, and retired into Arcadia, where they died, and were buried (42). This author mentions their ſepulchre, and adds, that none of the Poets, whom he has read, told their names; but that Micon, a Painter, put upon their pictures the names Aſterope and Antinoe. He obſerves, in another place (43), that one of them was called Alceſtis, in the repreſentation of Pelias's funeral. I wonder he had not read the books from which Apollodorus and Diodorus had the names of Pelias's daughters, or that he had not read thoſe two authors. Let us obſerve, that the name of Pelias's wife was Anaxibia, and that ſhe was Bias's daughter (44). Others call her Philomache, and ſay ſhe was the daughter of Amphion (45).

(30) The author of the argument of Euripides's Medea.

(31) Lycoph. ver. 1313.

(32) Eſchylus, in Nutricibus Bacchi, apud Autorem Argumenti Medeæ Euripidis.

(33) Ald. Manut. P. F. in Cicer. de Senect. ſub fin.

(34) Taken from Diodorus Siculus, ubi ſupra, *cap. liv*, *pag.* 243.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Ibid. *cap. xli*, *pag.* 233.

(37) Diod. Sicul. *lib. iv*, *pag.* 172, *Edit. H. Stephani* 1559.

(38) Apoll. *lib. i*, *pag.* 51. Hygin. *cap. li.*

(39) He required that they ſhould bring a chariot drawn by a lion and wild boar. *Apollod. ibid.*

(40) Apoll. ibid. *pag.* 45.

(41) Hygin. *cap. xxiv.*

(42) Pauſan. *lib. viii*, *pag.* 245.

(43) Ib. *lib. v*, *pag.* 165.

(44) Apoll. ibid. Hygin. *cap. xiv*, *pag. m.* 44, & *cap. li*, *pag.* 98.

(45) Ibid.

PELIAS was the name of the lance (*a*), which Peleus was preſented with on his wedding-day (*b*) [*A*]. He uſed it in battles, and gave it to his ſon Achilles, who made it extraordinary famous (*c*). It was ſo heavy, that none but he was able to dart it (*d*). It was made of an aſh-tree, which Chiron cut down upon mount Pelion (*e*). See Pliny (*f*).

(*a*) Ovid. Met. *lib. xiii*, *& alibi.*

(*b*) Schol. Homeri in Iliad. *lib. xvi*, *ver.* 140.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Homer. ibid.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Plin. *lib. xvi*, *cap. xiii*, *pag. m.* 248.

[*A*] *It was the name of the lance which Peleus was preſented with on his wedding-day.*] In Homer it is only an epithet taken from the place where Chiron cut down the aſh-tree. Πηλιάδα μελίην: *Peliadem fraxinum* (1). Πηλιὰς μελὶν: *Pelias fraxinus* (2). The Latins changed that epithet into a proper name.

(1) Hom. Iliad. *lib. xvi*, *ver.* 143.

(2) Id. ib. *lib. xxi*, *ver.* 277.

PELLISSON (Paul) was one of the greateſt wits of the XVIIth century. The ſame reaſon which hindered me from giving a long article of Mr Menage, obliges me to be very ſhort in this article (*a*). All that I could ſay of the particular honour, which the French academy did to Mr Pelliſſon [*A*], and of the praiſes he deſerved during the perſecutions which he was expoſed to, for having been in Mr Fouquet's ſervice; all thoſe things, I ſay, and ſeveral other parts of his life, are ſtill freſh in the memory of every reader. It would be as needleſs to mention his application to the great affair, as it was called in France; for the complaints and railleries of the Proteſtants about it, are known to every body. But there is a circumſtance which, perhaps, is

(*a*) The Elogy and Abridgment of Mr Pelliſſon's Life, are to be found in ſeveral new books, which are very common, as the *Mercure Galant*, the *Journal of the Learned*, the *Hiſtorical Mercury*, the *Hiſtorical Letters*, *&c.*

[*A*] *The particular honour which the French Academy did to Mr Pelliſſon.*] 'The French Academy having 'deſired to hear, in a full aſſembly, the reading of 'that work (1), which was as yet but in manuſcript, 'ordered ſome days after, of their own accord, in fa'vour of the author, that the firſt place vacant in that

(1) That is, the Hiſtory of the French Academy. That work of Mr Pelliſſon has always been looked upon as a maſter-piece. See Mr Baillet, Judgments of the Learned, *num.* 134.

is not ſo well known: ſome perſons have aſſured me, that he wiſhed the great affair of converſions had been always carried on in the ſame method as had been uſed for many years, without having recourſe to dragooning, which will be eternally abhorred by honeſt men, whatever country or religion they be of. He had been for a long time about a book of controverſy, concerning the Euchariſt, but had not time to finiſh it. Something of it has been publiſhed ſince his death [*B*]. One may perceive in it the ſubtlety of his wit; which is all that he could put in it. The ſame ſubtlety may be obſerved in his reflexions upon diſputes about religion [*C*], wherein he forgot not what the church of Rome pretends to be the ſtumbling-block of the Proteſtants: I mean the difficulties which ariſe from the way of examination. This ſtumbling-block, if it be one, is rather that of Rome, than that of Geneva, as I have ſaid elſewhere [*D*]. I ſpeak

‘ that body ſhould be deſigned for him; and that in ‘ the mean time he ſhould have a right to aſſiſt in ‘ thoſe aſſemblies, and to give his vote as an Academi- ‘ cian: with this clauſe, That the ſame favour ſhould ‘ not be done to anybody elſe for the time to come, ‘ upon any account whatſoever.’ You will find thoſe words in the Hiſtory of the French Academy (2). They are attended with a diſcourſe which the author pronounced to thank that aſſembly, the 30th of December, 1652.

[*B*] *Something of his book concerning the Euchariſt has been publiſhed.*] See the abſtract which Mr de Beauval made of it in his Hiſtory of the Works of the Learned (3), and of Mr Couſin (4).

[*C*] *In his reflexions upon diſputes about religion.*] The firſt part of that work was printed at Paris in two volumes in 12mo, in the year 1686. See the abſtract of it in the News from the Republic of Letters (5). The next year the author reprinted it, and added a new tome to it, with this title, *An Anſwer to the objections from England and Holland*; or, *of the Authority of the greateſt number in the Chriſtian Religion.* See the Journal of the Learned (6). Some time after he added another tome to it, divided into four parts, and intituled, *Mr Jurieu's Chimeras*; or, *A general Anſwer to his Paſtoral Letters of the ſecond year, againſt the book of Reflexions, and a ſhort Examination of his Prophecies.* One may eaſily gueſs, that ſo ſubtile a man had the advantage of a chimerical interpreter of the Revelations. All thoſe works of Mr Pelliſſon have been reprinted in Holland. See the Leipſic Journal (7). They make up the three firſt parts of the Reflexions upon Diſputes about Religion. The fourth part was publiſhed at Paris 1692, and is intituled, *Of the Toleration of Religions. Some Letters of Mr de Leibnitz, with the Anſwers of Mr Pelliſſon.* There is this note upon the firſt page. *Theſe objections are Mr de Lebnitz's, who is well known by his merit. They were ſent into France by the ducheſs of Hanover * to the abbeſs of Maubuiſſon her ſiſter. The author of them was not known at that time.* They who have a thouſand proofs of the extent of Mr Leibnitz's genius, cannot too much admire the purity of his French ſtile, which appears in thoſe objections. He is one of thoſe rare men, who can find no bounds in the ſphere of human merit, and who fill it up altogether.

[*D*] *The way of examination .... is rather the* ſtumbling-block of *Rome, than that of Geneva, as I have ſaid elſewhere.*] See the article of Mr NICOLLE (8), you will find in it, that that doctor having objected ſeveral great difficulties, could not anſwer thoſe which were objected againſt him. Order required that he ſhould anſwer the objections retorted upon him, and clear the way of authority. The many incumbrances of that way required the ſpeedy work of his hands; yet he put it off till another time, and even durſt not poſitively engage his word for it. He expreſſed himſelf thus (9): *As for the reſt Mr Jurieu treating two principal queſtions in his book, one concerning the ſyſtem of the church, the other concerning the Analyſis of faith, I ſhall only apply myſelf to the firſt in this treatiſe, adding to it the conſequences which have ſome relation to it, and which Mr Jurieu treats in ſeveral places, eſpecially in his third book. We ſhall ſee afterwards whether there will be the ſame neceſſity to treat of the Analyſis of faith. But the queſtion concerning the church is important enough to be examined by itſelf, and in a ſeparate work. And this is what I deſign to do here.* Abundance of people have been of opinion, that this partition was made with artifice. One of the two pieces was taken, and the other left; becauſe the one promiſed, at leaſt, that the victory would be diſputed, whereas the other threatened with an unavoidable defeat. Which made ſome conclude, that Mr Nicolle knew very well that the way of authority is but a chimera. Some wiſer people have been contented to believe, that he doubted not but it was the way which God has ſhewn to the ſimple, tho' it is not poſſible to anſwer the objections of the Proteſtants: ſo that his ſilence ought not to be looked upon as a proof of hypocriſy; but as an effect of that prudence which does not permit that Heretics ſhould be made acquainted, that there are ſome important truths, which cannot be well defended againſt the objections of the adverſaries. I do not take upon myſelf to judge of what paſſes in another man's heart; and therefore I will not ſay, that Mr Nicolle was not perſuaded of what he ſaid in one of his books. ‘ God has not only given up ‘ the material world to the diſputes of men, according ‘ to the Scripture; but by a more terrible effect of his ‘ juſtice, he has, in a manner given up to them the ‘ Divine myſteries, and the holy truths revealed to ‘ them, by permitting that they ſhould be contradicted by them, that they ſhould become the ſubject of ‘ their conteſts, and that ſome raſh Sophiſts ſhould in- ‘ ſolently play upon them in their diſcourſes and wri- ‘ tings. It is true, we cannot ſay altogether of that ‘ ſort of diſputes, what the wiſe-man ſays of thoſe ‘ which have natural things for their object, that ‘ men can never come to know the truth of them by ‘ their inquiries: *Mundum tradidit diſputationibus eorum,* ‘ *ut nunquam inveniant opus quod operatus eſt.* On the ‘ contrary, it is certain, that it appears, and even ſhines ‘ among the clouds which men endeavour to caſt over ‘ it; and that humble, ſincere, and underſtanding men ‘ will find it out among thoſe intricate queſtions, and ‘ falſe ſubtleties which they endeavour to hide it with ‘ (10).’ Which ſignifies, that the controverſy about the way of authority and the way of examination, is not one of thoſe things which God has given up to the diſputes of men, without permitting them to diſcover at any time what he has done. But ſome fancy, that Mr Nicolle believed the contrary: he had a thouſand confounding objections againſt the way of examination: he knew that they are retorted againſt the way of authority, and that new ones are added to them, which it was impoſſible for him to reſolve. He believed therefore, that the way whereby revealed truths ought to be diſcerned, is altogether like the works of nature, about which God permits us to diſpute, but does not permit us to diſcover the myſtery thereof (11). Once more, I am not ſo raſh as to judge of another man's conſcience.

Mr Pelliſon has not been more lucky than Mr Nicolle in the defenſive part. I confeſs, he has, without much difficulty, deſtroyed the diſtinction between an examination of attention, and an examination of diſcuſſion, and ſome others; but at laſt he was at a ſtand, as well as his brethren, when he came to reſolve the objection, retorted upon him, and remove the difficulties which ariſe from the way of authority. So that we may repeat here, that it had been better for both churches, never to ſtir that queſtion (12). *Nothing can be more pernicious than Mr Nicolle's method: for if he could once perſuade men, that it is impoſſible to find out truth by the way of examination, as he does his utmoſt towards it, he would ſoon perceive that he only laboured to ſet up Pyrrhoniſm, and conſequently to ruin religion. Every one might then argue thus, it is impoſſible to find out truth by the way of examination, Mr Nicolle has convinced us of it. It is evident that it cannot be found out by the way of authority, and this is much more certain than the reſt. What can we do better therefore than to give over, once for all, the hopes of ever knowing that truth which ſo many people ſeek, and which no body can find? This is the natural effect of Mr Nicolle's method, from whence one may conclude how pernicious it is. For nothing can be more oppoſite to religion* than

(2) Pag. 369, of the Paris Edition 1672, in 12mo.

(3) Auguſt 1694, pag. 513, & ſeq.

(4) In the 20th Journal of the Learned 1694.

(5) July 1686, Artic. I. See alſo the Journal of the Learned, of the 29th of April 1686.

(6) Of the 12th of April 1688, pag. 540, of the Dutch Edition.

(7) Nov. 1689, pag. 564, and in the Supplement, *Tom. i, pag.* 609.

* Princeſs Sophia.

(8) Remark [*C*].

(9) Nicolle, Of the Unity of the Church, at the end of the preface.

(10) Well-grounded Prejudices againſt the Calviniſts, in the preface.

(11) Mundum tradidit diſputationibus eorum, ut nunquam inveniant opus quod operatus eſt. *Salomon, in Eccleſiaſte, cap. iii, ver.* 11.

(12) See the article NICOLLE, remark [*D*].

ſpeak of it below in the Commentary, and I ſhall ſay occaſionally, that ſome people think it is very likely that no body makes uſe of the way of examination, properly ſo called, tho' it be very much talked of. Beſides, I do not know but it may be ſaid,
that

than Pyrrhoniſm. It is a total extinction not only of faith, but alſo of reaſon; and there is nothing more impoſſible than to reclaim thoſe who have run themſelves to ſuch an exceſs (13). Theſe are the words of an ingenious man (14), who has thought profoundly, who is a perfect maſter of the art of reaſoning, and who has made ſeveral new objections to Mr Nicolle: for he ſhews not only that, in order to make a right uſe of the way of authority, we muſt know the church which is in poſſeſſion of the authority; but alſo that Mr Nicolle's arguments would neceſſarily lead us to the doctrine of probability, in it's whole extent. This laſt point would be very ſtrong againſt Mr Nicolle, who has ſo well refuted the doctrine of probability. The other point requires a great many diſcuſſions. We cannot know where the authority reſides, but by examining what are the marks of the church which is in poſſeſſion of it. *We muſt know the preciſe number of thoſe marks. We muſt know not only that there are ſo many but alſo that there no more* (15). We muſt know whether they who reckon a hundred are more reaſonable than thoſe who reckon fifteen, or twelve, or ten, or ſix, or only four. When we have fixed the number of the marks, we muſt examine, whether they agree with the church of Rome, rather than with the Greek church. Which requires a great deal of pains, and a long ſeries of diſcuſſions: ſo that they who will avoid the way of examination, are neceſſarily brought to it again.

It is to be feared that a third party will ſtart up and teach that men are neither led to the true religion by the way of authority, nor by the way of examination, but ſome by education, and others by grace. Education without grace and examination does only perſwade. Grace with education, and ſometimes without education and examination, or with a ſuperficial examination, perſuades to ſalvation. Every orthodox perſon ought to ſay, *Gratia Dei ſum quod ſum:* I am what I am by the grace of God. I am orthodox *by grace* (16), *not of my ſelf, it is the gift of GOD, not by my works*, by inquiries, and diſcuſſions, *that no man ſhould glory*. Let the examination be eaſy, or at leaſt poſſible; let it be difficult, or even impoſſible; this is moſt certain, that no body makes uſe of it (17). Moſt men cannot read; moſt of thoſe who can read, do never read the works of their adverſaries; they know the reaſons of the contrary party only by ſome fragments which they find in the writing of their own authors. The pretenſions of the contrary party are but imperfectly and very weakly repreſented in thoſe fragments. To know the force of objections, they ought to be conſidered as they are placed in their ſyſtem, and connected with their general principles, conſequences and dependencies. Therefore, to examine the opinions of an adverſary, is not merely to compare the anſwer of our authors with the objections alledged by them; this is to judge of the force of a wheel only by the effects it may produce, being ſeparated from it's engine. Such a thing cannot properly be called an examination. As for the doctors, who pore upon the works of their adverſaries, they uſe all their wit not to enquire whether they are in the right, but to find that they are in the wrong, and to invent ſome anſwers. All the anſwers which they invent, ſeem to to them to be good, becauſe they are always ſtrongly perſuaded that their adverſaries are Heretics. This cannot be called an examination neither, but improperly. The firſt thing that ſhould be done, in order to a right examination, ſhould be to doubt of one's religion. But the leaſt doubt about it would be looked upon as an offence againſt God, and a fatal ſuggeſtion of the Devil; ſo that when men go about to diſcern Orthodoxy from Heterodoxy, they are not diſpoſed as St Auguſtin ſays they ſhould be. He would have them to lay aſide the thoughts of being already in poſſeſſion of the truth. ' Ut autem facilius miteſcatis, & non ' inimico animo vobiſque pernicioſo mihi adverſemini, ' quovis judice me impetrare à vobis oportet, ut ex ' utraque parte omnis arrogantia deponatur. Nemo ' noſtrum dicat jam ſe inveniſſe veritatem: ſic eam ' quæramus, quaſi ab utriſque neſciatur. Ita enim diligenter & concorditer quæri poterit, ſi nullâ temerariâ præſumptione inventa & cognita eſſe credatur ' (18). - - - *But that you may become moderate and may ' not write with a mind inveterate againſt me and pernicious to yourſelves, I muſt by all means beg that we ' may on both ſides diveſt ourſelves of all prejudice. Let ' neither of us ſay, we have already found out the truth; ' let us ſo ſearch for it, as if it were unknown to us both. ' For ſo it may be diligently and amicably ſought for, if ' by raſh preſumption we believe not that it is already ' known and found out.*' They, who ſay that the corruption of the heart hinders a Heretic from diſcovering the truth, are often miſtaken, if they mean that his inclination to drunkenneſs, whoring, and other ſenſual pleaſures, or pride, avarice, *&c.* corrupt his judgment (19); but they are not miſtaken, if they mean that his prepoſſeſſion hinders him from diſcovering good proofs. He examines the reaſons of the Orthodox, being fully perſuaded that he has the truth on his ſide, and that he ſhould offend God, if he fancied that the proofs of the contrary party are ſolid. He thinks he acts like a faithful ſervant of God, if he looks upon thoſe reaſons as meer ſophiſms and employs the whole force of his mind to invent anſwers, and he cannot believe that his anſwers are not good, ſince they are directed againſt what he believes to be falſe, and intended to ſupport the truth. He is miſtaken, if he fancies he has very well examined the ſyſtem of the contrary party. But I beſeech you, tell me, whether the orthodox have not the like perſuaſion, when they examine the cauſe of Heretics. They are both like people that are at law, the reaſons of their adverſaries never appear ſolid to them; tho' they read over and over the papers which they produce, they look upon them as meer wrangling; and when they have been condemned by inferiour and ſupreme judges, they believe ſtill that they are in the right, and would appeal to another tribunal, if there were any. From whence comes this? Is it not becauſe they examine every thing with a ſtrong prepoſſeſſion that they have juſtice on their ſide? Nothing can better convince us of the uſeleſſneſs of a partial examination, than what happens every day to noveliſts, or newſmongers. They perſuade themſelves that the party which they eſpouſe has a juſt cauſe, and they paſſionately deſire that it may prevail. They would be extreamly vexed, if a bright light ſhould ſhine in their eyes, whereby they ſhould be convinced of the juſtice and good fortune of the contrary party. Here is the effect of thoſe paſſions. They read the manifeſto's and relations of the enemies as ſo many falſhoods; tho' their reaſons be never ſo probable, they reject them; they apply their minds wholly to conſider what may be anſwered. But whilſt they are attentive to the ſpecious appearances of the anſwer, without minding the fair ſide of the objection, they never acquire any knowledge but what flatters their prejudices. If there be any ill news, they do not believe it; they inventa thouſand reaſons to ſhew it is falſe; they make this their whole buſineſs. If there be any good news, there credulity has no bounds (20), the weakeſt appearances are as good to them as a ſtrong proof; they uſe their utmoſt endeavours to ſupport thoſe appearances; they remove from their fancy the contrary appearances, and ſo they ſpend the year without trouble and uneaſineſs, thanks to their induſtry which removes the unpleaſant objects, and creates every day ſome agreeable chimeras in their fancy. Nothing but an undeniable evidence can undeceive them; and if they will ſeriouſly examine themſelves, they muſt needs confeſs that they reſt ſatisfied with ſuch reaſons as they would deſpiſe, if they were alledged in favour of their enemies. Is it not true that if the reaſons *pro* and *con* in matters of religion, are not more carefully examined than thoſe which concern public news, it does not deſerve the name of examination? Is it not true alſo that the ſame ſpirit, which commonly prevails in the noveliſts, who are zealous for a party, prevails alſo in moſt men zealous for their religion? The loſs of a battle afflicts a noveliſt but he is extreamly pleaſed to hear of a victory; and therefore he exhauſts all the ſtrength of his mind to convince himſelf that the battle was won; and if the proofs of the contrary are not undeniable, if there be three probabilities for the victory, against ten or twelve probabilities for the loſs of the battel, it is enough for him to believe that
it

(13) *La Placette, A Treatiſe of Conſcience, pag.* 377. *He had ſaid, pag.* 370, that nothing is more falſe and more pernicious than that objection of Mr Nicolle; that it runs upon ſuppoſitions which are moſt certainly contrary to truth, and that it is only fit to baniſh the certainty of Faith, and Morality, and to ſet up an univerſal Pyrrhoniſm in religion.

(14) Heretofore a miniſter of Bearne, and now at Copenhagen.

(15) La Placette, ibid. *pag.* 372.

(16) Epheſ. ii, 8, 9.

(17) Note, that this is not the diſcourſe of the author of this book, but of a third party, which may be feared. The ſame thing ought to be noted in many other places.

(18) Auguſt. contra Epiſt. fundam, *cap.* iii.

(19) See the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe words, *Compel them to come in, Part* ii, *ch. x, pag.* 548, *& ſeq*; *& Part iv, pag.* 217, *& ſeq.*

REFLEXIONS upon the prejudices of the Noveliſts.

(20) Note, that there is another ſort of Noveliſts: they are induſtrious to afflict themſelves. They believe what they fear, and not what they wiſh.

that the obſtacles to a right examination do not ſo much proceed from want of knowledge, as from prejudices [*E*]. It would be unjuſt to impute to the Proteſtants what was reported, that Mr Pelliſſon refuſed to confeſs during his laſt ſickneſs [*F*]. His eldeſt brother

it is won. Men are not leſs pleaſed in a diſpute about religion, when they believe that their adverſaries are worſted; they would not be leſs afflicted if they ſhould ſee their adverſaries triumph. So that the trouble which men endeavour to avoid on both ſides, and the pleaſure which they endeavour to procure to themſelves, hinder them from examining things impartially, and make them uſe a double weight and a double meaſure.

This is what a third party might advance, affirming the right, and denying the fact; affirming that men ought to follow the way of examination, but that no body does follow it. However it be; the difference proves very great in the event; for whereas thoſe that err, would perhaps become orthodox, if they were not perſuaded that they are ſo already; the orthodox, it may be, preſerve themſelves from Hereſy, becauſe they are ſtrongly prepoſſeſſed with the notion that they are orthodox.

[E] *The obſtacles to a right examination .... proceed from prejudices.*] After what has been ſaid, I need not make a long commentary upon this. The example of men that are at law, and of noveliſts which I have made uſe of, is very fit to make us apprehend, that a man, who is a judge and a party, cannot well diſcern truth from falſhood. Men are not allowed to be judges and parties, for two very good reaſons: firſt, becauſe they would be apt to decide in their own favour, tho' they ſhould be ſenſible of their injuſtice: ſecondly, becauſe they would be apt to believe that they are in the right, even when the juſtice of the cauſe of the contrary party might eaſily be known. Every body is a judge and a party in diſputes about religion; for men do not examine the reaſons of their adverſaries with a Sceptical and Pyrrhonian ſpirit. Such a diſpoſition would be looked upon as a crime: they examine them therefore being fully perſuaded, that the religion they profeſs is the only true one. Thus they are almoſt prepoſſeſſed with the abovementioned paſſions of noveliſts. Three probabilities on the ſide of our pre-poſſeſſion prevail over ten or twelve on the other ſide: the reaſon of it is, becauſe we are infinitely more attentive to ſuch probabilities as pleaſe us, than to thoſe which make us uneaſy. Mr Nicolle confirms what I ſay. *Tho' the diſproportion there is between GOD and the creatures, and between eternal and temporal things be never ſo infinite, yet the ſmalleſt pleaſures and the leaſt worldly advantages are every day preferred before GOD and eternal happineſs; becauſe we have a quick ſenſe of thoſe pleaſures and advantages, whereas GOD and eternal things are but weakly conceived: in the ſame manner our minds are carried away by the weakeſt appearances, and the worſt reaſons. They need but apply themſelves ſtrongly to them; for ſuch an application hinders them from ſeeing any other reaſons, and they are ſo full of thoſe, that no other reaſon can find admittance. Moſt queſtions ought to be decided only by comparing reaſons one with another; and it is commonly a piece of raſhneſs to decide a queſtion by examining only the reaſons of one ſide. But how eaſy is it to miſtake in that compariſon, or to proceed in it unfairly? How many are there, who cannot comprehend ſo many things at one time? If they are intent upon the conſideration of one reaſon, they forget the reſt, and ſo do not truly compare them one with another. They are determined by their preſent application; and it is their paſſion that makes them apply, and conſequently their inclination and not their light is the principle of their perſwaſion. That which is moſt terrible, is, that as, on one hand, it is an eaſy thing for men to fall into error and illuſion, ſo, on the other, it is very difficult for them to get out of it, becauſe they know not the defects which engaged them into it, and having no other ſpiritual eyes to diſcern them, they judge both of themſelves and other perſons by thoſe very eyes which are diſtempered.* Ita fit ut animus de ſe ipſo tum judicet, cum id ipſum quo judicat ægrotet (21). Be pleaſed to obſerve, 1. That in ſome caſes the truth which diſpleaſes us, is ſo manifeſt that it cannot be miſtaken. 2. That there are ſome ſuits at law, and ſome controverſies, wherein it is ſo difficult to diſcern truth from falſhood, that the moſt diſintereſted judges, and even the moſt ſubtil Sceptics would not know which way to turn. It is therefore true that men are not always blinded by their prejudices and paſſions, and that the difficulties which they meet with in an examination are ſometimes in the things themſelves.

[F] *It would be unjuſt to impute to the Proteſtants the reports .... that he refuſed to confeſs during his laſt illneſs.*] Several perſons, having read the Rotterdam Gazette of the 16th of February 1693, believed that the whole memorial inſerted in it concerning Mr Pelliſſon, had been forged in the ſame city, and that the author of that Gazette, out of ſome prudential reaſons, could not diſpenſe with publiſhing that memorial. This opinion was not exactly true; for it is certain, ſeveral letters came from France into Holland, which ſaid that every body in Paris was offended at Mr Pelliſſon's way of refuſing to confeſs. So that theſe words of the Gazette, *Mr Pelliſſon departed this life yeſterday, having refuſed to hear any body ſpeak to him of religion, and without communion and confeſſion* (22), were not invented by the great and ſorry News-mongers who were ſuſpected of it. It was grounded upon ſeveral letters which came from France. But it will be ſaid, That thoſe letters had been written by ſome Proteſtants of Paris. I know nothing of it; I know only that the Catholics of Paris were the firſt who publiſhed this news and murmured at it. Madam de Scuderi, an intimate friend of the deceaſed, was afflicted at that report, and deſired the biſhop of Meaux to acquaint her with the truth of the matter. That Prelate writ a letter to her, which was printed. Some other pieces came out about it in France and in Holland, and a little while after there was no further talk of it. What was undeniable, was that Mr Pelliſſon died without communion and confeſſion. There were three different opinions about this matter, which happens almoſt always. Mr Pelliſſon's friends maintained, agreeably to the biſhop of Meaux's account, that he had ſent for a confeſſor; but that he was ſuffocated by his defluxion before the time appointed for his confeſſion. His enemies gave the worſt turn they could to all the circumſtances. Impartial perſons were contented to ſay that the whole buſineſs was to be left to the ſearcher of hearts, and affirmed only the matter of fact, *viz.* That Mr Pelliſſon did not confeſs. As for the reſt, they condemned thoſe who publiſhed that he died HAVING REFUSED TO HEAR ANY BODY SPEAK TO HIM OF RELIGION (23); for it ſuppoſes that ſome people came to ſpeak to him of religion, and that he refuſed to hear them; which, ſay they, is very falſe. They add, That ſeveral pious perſons have put off their confeſſion and communion in their ſickneſs; either becauſe they did not think themſelves to be ſo ill as they were, or becauſe the concerns of their family required that they ſhould not be thought to be at the point of death (24). Such delays, wherein the conſcience has no ſhare, may be the cauſe why a man dies without confeſſion. However, a Catholic Hiſtorian will doubtleſs be alledged againſt Mr Pelliſſon (25). His hiſtory was printed at Paris with the king's privilege, in the year 1694. Theſe words are to be found in it, pag. 223. of the ſecond tome: *Paul Pelliſſon's religion was variouſly ſpoken of; ſome ſaid that he had none; that he was only a time-ſerver; and that according to him the religion of the prince, and that which ſerves his ambition moſt was always the beſt: others believed that he was a Proteſtant in his heart; and others, that he was a Catholic in earneſt. What is certain is, that he profeſſed thoſe two religions at different times of his life, and appeared zealous in both. But at his dying hour he profeſſed none openly; for he would not receive the ſacraments of the Church of Rome, nor durſt own himſelf to be a Huguenot; but perſiſted to the laſt in a profound ſilence, the reaſons whereof are only known to GOD* (26). But they who know that thoſe words are not to be found in the Paris edition, will not produce this witneſs. I know, the Dutch edition contains ſeveral things, which Mr de Riencourt never thought of. Note, That the Dutch edition contains in the title theſe words, *Paris, for Claude Barbin, in the palace,* 1694, *with the king's licence.* Will they who ſhall find it forty years hence in ſome library, be able to know that it is a falſe one? Will they not ſeriouſly believe, that whatever it contains was pub-

liſhed

---

(21) Nicolle, preface to the *Préjugez légitimes,* (Well-grounded Prejudices,) pag. * 4, of the Dutch edition.

(22) Rotterdam Gazette of the 16th of February 1693, in the Paris article of the 9th of February.

(23) See, above, citation (22).

(24) Mr Paſcal having confeſſed himſelf to the prieſt during his laſt ſickneſs, frighted his friends, and therefore his Phyſicians accuſed him of fear. Whereupon he ſaid, *I would fain communicate, but ſince I perceive that my friends are ſo ſurprized at my confeſſion, I am afraid they would be more ſtill; wherefore it is better to put it off; and the prieſt having been of the ſame opinion, he did not communicate.* See his Life, pag. 43. Whilſt this ſheet is reprinting in January 1701, the Dutch Gazettes give out that Mr Roze, ſecretary of the cloſet, and Mr Stouppe, lieutenant-general, died at Paris without receiving any ſacrament, and no body infers from thence that they were not good Catholics. In the *Menagiana*, it is ſaid that ſick perſons put off making their will and confeſſion as a bad omen.

(25) Mr de Reincourt, corrector of accounts.

(26) Reincourt's Hiſtory of Lewis XIV, *pag.* 224.

brother died young, and had been an author already (*b*). That family has produced ſeveral illuſtrious perſons [*G*].

I ought not to omit, that his preface to the works of Saraſin is a maſter-piece. It ſhould be added to the three or four prefaces mentioned above (*c*). It very well deſerves the commendations Coſtar has beſtowed upon it (*d*).

(*b*) He is the author of an anonymous book, intituled, *A Miſcellany of Various Problems*, printed at Paris in the year 1647, in 12°. See the Antiquities of Caſtres by Peter Borel. (*c*) In the article CALVIN, remark [*F*] in the margin, citation (20). (*d*) Coſtar, Letter cclxviii, and cclxxviii, of the firſt part.

liſhed at Paris by a corrector of accounts? And if any one objects to them, that his edition does not mention that profound ſilence, that refuſal of the ſacraments, &c (27), and that they falſify the public Hiſtory: Will they not produce a copy wherein a thouſand witneſſes may read, PARIS, FOR CLAUDE BARBIN, &c? Will they be at the trouble of appointing ſome able perſons to examine and compare thoſe editions? Not at all: every one will follow his own prejudices, and will take for the falſe edition that which he does not like. From whence it may be known, how difficult it is for men to avoid error, in the midſt of ſo many clouds which are caſt before-hand over the time to come. Our predeceſſors took no leſs care to deceive us, than we do now to deceive our poſterity. And if men are ſo bold as to falſify the works of an author, whilſt he is alive, who can aſſure us, that the manuſcripts of the Fathers have been ſpared? Who can aſſure us that no body ſuffers perſecution, for defending the trick of a falſifyer of books in libraries?

(27) For he would not receive the ſacraments of the church of Rome. *Reincourt, ubi ſupra.*

[*G*] *That family has produced ſeveral illuſtrious perſons.*] 'From the family of the Pelliſſons came Raimond Pelliſſon, firſt preſident at Chambery: Peter Pelliſſon, ſecond preſident in the ſame place: Thomas Pelliſſon, quarter-maſter of the troop of Gend'armes of Guy de Maugiron, governor of Chambery, and high provoſt of Dauphine: Benedict Pelliſſon, the only Recorder civil and criminal of the parliament of Dauphiné, ſix ſcore years ago, which was ſo conſiderable a place, that it is now divided into nine, each whereof is worth eleven thouſand crowns: John Pelliſſon de Condrieu, principal of the college of Tournon, who made an epitome of the Latin Grammar, which Deſpauterius (28) enlarged, and who was the firſt that compoſed the Latin Grammar and it's rules, with the inſtitution of children in a college, printed at Lyons 1530 in 16*mo*, by Thibaut Payen, according to du Verdier in his French Bibliotheque. He made alſo the elogy of Cardinal de Tournon, printed at Lyons by Gryphius, in the year 1534 in 4to. I could name many other illuſtrious men, deſcended from that ancient family within theſe four hundred years, who have diſtinguiſhed themſelves both in the army and in the law, with their illuſtrious alliances; and I might ſpeak of Lewis Pelliſſon, whoſe great learning has been honourably mentioned by the preſident Faber in the treatiſe *de erroribus pragmat.* and *de conjecturis*, chap. 10. As alſo of Peter and John James Pelliſſon, counſellors in the parliament of Toulouſe, and in the chamber of the edict of Caſtres, men of great learning; the firſt was ſo good a Cheſs-player, that an Italian, who played extraordinary well at it, and wanted a match, having played with him incognito, and being beat, cryed out, *O è il Diavolo, O il Signor Pelliſſono. - - - It is either the Devil, or Mr Pelliſſon.* . . . . The family of the Pelliſſons is alſo deſcended by the women, from that of du Bourg (29), which is famous for the great Anne du Bourg, counſellor in the parliament of Paris, and Antony de Bourg, chancellor of France under Francis I, and from the family of the Cavaignes (whoſe heirs they have been) and of the preſident Manſencal. . . . I would ſay more of it, if John Poſſelius had not written a book on purpoſe which contains the praiſes of Raimond Pelliſſon, and of the city of Chambery, printed at Lyons by Gryphius (30).' The author from whom I have this long paſſage, tells us in another place (31) that Claude Pelliſſon was *knight of the Order of St John of Jeruſalem, two hundred years ago* (32), and that the Pelliſſons *came from an Engliſhman, Attorney-general to the Prince of Wales, when he was in Guienne.*

(28) This author ſo well known in the ſchools of France, is ſo far from having enlarged the work of John Pelliſſon, that the latter made an abridgment of Deſpauterius. *Vid. Epitom. Biblioth. Geſner.*

(29) See the Hiſtory of the French Academy, *pag. m.* 61.

(30) Peter Borel, Treaſure of the Gallic and French Antiquities, *pag.* 233.

(31) Ibid. *pag.* 377.

(32) This book of Peter Borel was printed in 1655.

PENELOPE, daughter of Icarius, brother of Tyndarus king of Lacedæmon, was the wife of Ulyſſes, and became ſo famous for her chaſtity, that ſhe is recommended as an example to this very day, and is grown into a proverb. It is ſaid, that Ulyſſes obtained her by the good offices of Tyndarus (*a*), as a reward of the good advice he had given him (*b*). Others ſay, that he gained her in a race, Icarius having declared to thoſe who aſked him his daughter, that the beſt runner ſhould have her (*c*). Ulyſſes won the prize. He might be therefore compared with thoſe who run after a benefice, and carry it, becauſe they have the beſt horſes. He could never reſolve to live at Lacedæmon, as his father-in-law deſired: he ſet out again for Ithaca, and his wife followed him. What ſhe did, when her father, purſuing them, overtook them in the way, deſerves our notice [*A*]. The new married couple loved one another very tenderly, ſo that Ulyſſes did whatever he could not to go to the ſiege of Troy (*d*). But all

(*a*) Apollod. Bibl. *lib. iii, pag. m.* 217, 218.

(*b*) See in the text of the article HELENA, citation (*a*), what he adviſed Tyndarus to do about the marriage of Helena.

(*c*) Pauſan. *lib. iii, pag.* 93.

(*d*) See the article ULYSSES.

[*A*] *What ſhe did, when her father, purſuing them, overtook them in the way, deſerves our notice.*] Icarius having not been able to perſwade his ſon-in-law to ſtay in Lacedæmon, endeavoured to prevail upon his daughter to continue there. But his intreaties could not move her to make ſo great a ſacrifice to him, as to prefer the houſe of her father to that of her huſband. She therefore ſet out with Ulyſſes, to go to Ithaca. Her father finding that they had made their eſcape, got into his chariot, purſued them, overtook them, and renewed his intreaties to his daughter. Ulyſſes tired with this importunity, declared to Penelope, that if ſhe would follow him willingly, he ſhould be very glad of it; but that if ſhe had rather return to Lacedæmon, he would not oppoſe it. Though Penelope returned no anſwer, but only let down her veil, yet Icarius diſcovered her thoughts, and clearly perceived that ſhe had a mind to follow her huſband. He conſented to it, and erected in that very place, a ſtatue of modeſty. Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ τέως μὲν ἠνείχετο, τέλος δὲ ἐκέλευε συνακολουθεῖν Πηνελόπην ἑκοῦσαν, ἢ τὸν πατέρα ἑλομένην ἀναχωρεῖν ἐς Λακεδαίμονα· καὶ τὴν ἀποκρίνασθαί φασιν οὐδέν· ἐγκαλυψαμένης δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἐρώτημα, Ἰκάριος τὴν μὲν, ἅτε δὴ συνιεὶς ὡς βούλεται ἀπιέναι μετὰ Ὀδυσσέως, ἀφίησιν· ἄγαλμα δὲ ἀνέθηκεν Αἰδοῦς. ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τῆς ὁδοῦ προήκουσαν ἤδη τὴν Πηνελόπην λέγουσιν ἐγκαλύψασθαι. *Ulyſſes tandem victus hominis importunitate, puellæ optionem dedit, vel ſe ut ſequeretur, ſi id mallet; vel cum patre Lacedæmonem rediret: ibi illam ajunt nihil ſanè reſpondiſſe, ſed faciem tantum velaſſe: Icarium cùm ſibi probè noſſe videretur, quid illa animi haberet, ut cum Ulyſſe abiret, permiſiſſe: ſignum vero pudoris ea in viæ parte dedicaſſe; quò Penelope, cum faciem velavit, pervenerat* (1). Here are ſome lively ſtrokes of the character of an honeſt woman. Reaſon will have a wife to follow her huſband, and nature requires it. Yet if it be left to her choice either to go with her huſband, or to ſtay with her father who paſſionately deſires it, ſhe ought to be ſilent out of modeſty, and to intimate only by ſigns what reſolution ſhe has a mind to take. The modeſty and decency of her

(1) Pauſan. *lib. iii, pag.* 104.

all devices proved unſucceſsful, and he was forced to leave his dear wife by whom he had one boy. He was twenty years without ſeeing her. During this long abſence ſhe was courted by a great many lovers [*B*], who urged her to declare her mind; but ſhe eluded their addreſſes [*C*] till the return of her huſband, who deſtroyed them all. She is juſtly praiſed for refuſing to treat Ulyſſes as her huſband, before ſhe was very well aſſured that he was Ulyſſes [*D*]. Though her virtue is celebrated by the greateſt of

her ſex do not permit her to tell her mind boldly and without bluſhing. Icarius was ſomewhat unreaſonable; he aſked a preference which does neither agree with the laws of nature, nor with the matrimonial rights. There being nothing in the word of God but what is inſtructive; it has been obſerved that the Pſalmiſt does not make uſe of many reaſons to perſwade a young woman, that ſhe ought to prefer her huſband's houſe to that of her father. It would be needleſs to uſe many arguments to perſwade ſuch a thing; and therefore the Holy Ghoſt is contented to promiſe to this young woman, that ſhe ſhould be happy in children, and that her huſband would love her (2):

(2) Pſalm xlv.

But thou O royal bride give ear,
And to my words attend,
Forget thy native country now,
And ev'ry former friend.
So ſhall thy beauty charm the king,
Nor ſhall his love decay:
For he is now become thy lord,
To him due rev'rence pay.
(3) . . . . . .
Inſtead of parents left,
(O queen, the caſe ſo ſtands,)
Thou ſhalt have ſons, whom thou mayſt ſet
As princes in all lands.

(3) There is here a promiſe that ſhe ſhould receive fine preſents, and be richly cloathed; but that promiſe contained nothing that was new to a daughter of a king of Egypt. See the whole paſſage which I omit.

This is a very fine Pſalm, even when it is conſidered without it's myſtical ſenſe, and as a meer piece of Poetry. But here is a much finer verſion:

Tuque adeo regina audi; & rem pectore conde:
Nec mea dicta nega placidas demittere in aures:
Jam nunc & patriam & patrem obliviſcere, jam nunc
Ex animo caros penitus depone propinquos:
Unum oculis ſpecta, unum animo complectere regem,
Regem oculis animoque, tuo qui pendet ab ore,
Unius & pulchris defixus vultibus hæret.
Hunc dominum agnoſce, & ſupplex venerare: nec ille
Officio, ſtudioque tibi concedet.
. . . .
Neu deſiderio nimium tangare tuorum
Virgo, tibi dulcem patriſque & matris amorem
Leniet adnaſcens ſobolis generoſa propago:
Quos regere imperio terras, totumque per orbem
Adſpicies populos ſceptris frænare ſuperbos (4).

(4) Pſalm xlv, according to Buchanan's verſion.

[*B*] *She was courted by a great many lovers.*] Here are the words of a learned commentator. *According to Homer, the number of Penelope's lovers amounted to* 108; *for he ſays Odyſſ.* 16. *that there were* 52 *of the Iſle of Dulichium,* 24 *of the Iſle of Samos,* 20 *of the Iſle of Zacinthus, and* 12 *of Itbaca, which ſeveral numbers make up in all* 108 *preciſely. Euſtathius upon the firſt of the Odyſſes increaſes the number ſtill: for he ſays according to the opinion of ſome writers, they were* 300 (5). Meziriac makes this obſervation to juſtify the verſion of theſe words of Ovid, *quid . . . . alios referam*, which he renders, *I paſs by above a hundred.* Let us ſee the whole paſſage of Ovid (6).

(5) Meziriac upon Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 101.

(6) Ovid. in Epiſt. Penelop. ad Ulyſſem.

Dulichii Samiique, & quos tulit alta Zacynthus,
Turba ruunt in me luxurioſa proci,
Inque tua regnant nullis prohibentibus aulis,
Viſcera noſtra tuæ dilacerantur opes.
Quid tibi Piſandrum, Polybumque, Medon[illegible]li-
rum (7).
Eurimachique avidas, Antinoique manus,
Atque alios referam? quos omneis turpiter al[illegible]
Ipſe tuo partis ſanguine rebus alis.
Irus egens pecoriſque Melanthius author edendi
Ultimus accedunt in tua damna pudor.

(7) Meziriac, *pag.* 100, *ſhews that it ought to be read thus,* Quid tibi Piſandrum, Polybum, Amphimedontaque dirum.

From Crete and Samos, Rhodes and Zant ſet out,
To court me come a wild unruly rout:
Who revel in your houſe without controul,
And eat and waſte your means, our blood and ſoul.
Of Medon, Polybus, Piſander fell
Eurimachus, alas! why ſhould I tell?
With many more (you ſadly out o'th' way)
Feed here and on your ſubſtance let them prey.
The begger Irus and that goat-herd clown,
Melanthius, range and rummage up and down.

Rymer.

[*C*] *She eluded their addreſſes.*] 'Homer in the ſecond and nineteenth books of the Odyſſes, ſays, that Penelope, to free herſelf from the importunity of her lovers, declared to them, that ſhe would not marry till ſhe had finiſhed a piece of linnen cloth which ſhe was weaving, to wrap up the body of Laërtes, her father-in-law, when he ſhould die: and ſo ſhe amuſed them for the ſpace of three years, without finiſhing her cloth, becauſe ſhe undid in the night what ſhe had done in the day; from whence comes the proverb, the web of Penelope, ſpeaking of a work which is never ended (8).' This is Meziriac's commentary upon theſe words of Ovid.

(8) Meziriac, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 40.

Nec mihi quærenti ſpatioſam fallere noctem,
Laſſaret viduas pendula tela manus (9).

(9) Ovid. ubi ſupra.

Nor ſhould this pains to paſs the evenings take
And work and weave, ev'n till my fingers ake.

Rymer.

[*D*] *Before ſhe was well aſſured that he was Ulyſſes.*] Meziriac having alledged a paſſage which I have ſet down in another place (10), whereby it appears that Helena was deceived by the reſemblance ſhe found between Paris and her huſband, adds the following words: Euſtathius, upon the twenty third book of the Odyſſes, *obſerves, that Penelope behaved herſelf much more prudently; for though ſhe thought that ſhe knew Ulyſſes, yet ſhe would not careſs him in the leaſt, nor lie with him, till he told her many particulars, and gave her ſeveral tokens, whereby ſhe was aſſured that he was truly her huſband, and that ſhe could not be deceived* (11). Penelope's precaution ought to ſerve for a rule on all ſuch occaſions; and if a woman ſhould commit adultery, becauſe ſhe did not take ſufficient time to be fully informed of the truth, ſhe would be juſtly blamed. This has been lately obſerved by Mr Baſnage in a fine book which he has publiſhed. *Let us ſuppoſe*, ſays he (12), *a woman, tranſported with love for her true huſband, runs eagerly to one, whom ſhe takes for him; this woman does not deſign to deceive herſelf; her ardour cannot be blamed: it is lawful, if it be expreſſed to her true huſband: in a word, her ignorance is involuntary, and only the effect of a tender and paſſionate eagerneſs. But if an adulterer has embraced this woman, can ſhe be excuſed? Will ſhe not be ſomewhat aſhamed of her ardour and raſhneſs? will ſhe not condemn them?* The author, who criticized Mr Maimbourg, is of the ſame opinion, or very near it. I add this reſtriction, becauſe he thinks if that woman does not refuſe to examine the matter out of a blameable motive, ſhe ought to be excuſed. Here are his words (13), 'I take it for granted, that 'if a woman, deceived by the reſemblance which may '[illegible] between her true huſband and another man, 'ſhould grant to this other man all the privileges of 'marriage, her chaſtity would not ſuffer by it. Tho' '[illegible] may look like a paradox, I ſay, and I repeat '[illegible]in, that ſuch a woman would do no real in-[illegible] to her huſband, and he would be the moſt unjuſt

(10) In the article HELENA, citation (59).

(11) Meziriac, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 488.

(12) Baſnage, A Treatiſe of Conſcience, *Tom. i, pag.* 85, *Amſterdam* 1696.

(13) New Letters of the author of the General Criticiſm on Maimbourg, *pag.* 277, 278.

of all the Poets, and by abundance of writers, yet it has been aſperſed by ill tongues. Some have ſaid that if her lovers were diſappointed, it was becauſe they choſe rather to fare well at the coſt of Ulyſſes, than lie with his wife [*E*]. Others ſay that they actually

‘ juſt of all men, if he ſhould accuſe her of having violated the conjugal faith; provided ſhe had not contributed to deceive herſelf. For if the impatience of recovering a huſband, made her overlook the ſuſpicions ſhe might have, at the ſight of a man which reſembles her huſband, and aſſumes that title; if ſhe neglected to examine him well, leſt ſhe ſhould not enjoy the pleaſures of marriage without remorſe: In a word, if ſhe ſhould believe that he is her true huſband, becauſe ſhe wiſhes it may be he, for the reaſons I have intimated, ſilencing, every thing that might tempt her to doubt of it, I ſhould very much abate of the good opinion I had conceived of her merit, and truly I ſhould not much blame her huſband for thinking her but half chaſt, and looking upon her virtue, as a wavering one. . . . . (14). The natural reſemblance which is to be found between two men, is never ſo perfect, but they differ in ſomething, from whence it may be concluded, that a woman who is deceived by it, acts very ſuperficially. But in this very thing ſhe wants not an excuſe; for are there any women that ſcruple to receive their huſbands after they have been abſent for ſome months unleſs they prove firſt that they are their huſbands? When they ſee them come into their chambers in the duſk of the evening, before the candles are lighted, do not they go and meet them, and are they not ready to ſhew them all manner of complaiſance; without making any enquiry? Does any body blame them for it? If they are not blamed for it, why ſhould we blame an unfortunate woman who has been deceived by an impoſtor, who was in all reſpects as like her huſband, as one may appear to be in an obſcure room? It is plain, that if ſhe be blamed, all women, who behave themſelves in that manner towards their real huſbands, are alſo to blame, for according to right reaſon, we ought not to judge of things by the event; and before God two actions which proceed from the ſame cauſe change not their ſpecies, though the one ſucceeds accidently, and the other is attended by accident with unlucky conſequences.’ To reſolve this difficulty, we muſt ſay that any one, who behaves raſhly is to blame, whether any evil reſults from it or not. Whoever will act reaſonably, ought to examine whatever he does.

I ſhall obſerve, by the by, Seneca's precaution. He affirms that a man who knows his wife, believing that ſhe is another man's wife, commits adultery, and that his wife is innocent. But he does not convert the propoſition; he does not ſay, that a man who ſhould know another man's wife, thinking that ſhe is his own wife, would commit a ſin. See, below, the words of Seneca, they prove that Jacob did not commit adultery the firſt time he knew Leah; but that Leah committed the crime; for ſhe knew very well that ſhe was not Jacob's wife. ‘ Si quis cum uxore ſua tanquam cum alienâ concumbat, adulter erit, quamvis illa adultera non ſit. Aliquis mihi venenum dedit, ſed vim ſuam remixtum cibo perdidit: venenum illud dando, ſcelere ſe obligavit, etiam ſi non nocuit. Non minus latro eſt, cujus telum oppoſitâ veſte eluſum eſt. Omnia ſcelera etiam ante effectum operis, quantum culpæ ſatis eſt, perfecta ſunt (15). - - - - *If a man lies with his own wife believing her to be another man's wife, he commits adultery, tho' ſhe be innocent. A man gives me poiſon, but being mixed with my food it loſes it's virtue: by giving that poiſon he becomes guilty, even tho' it does not hurt me. A cut-throat is not the leſs ſo, becauſe the ſtroke of his dagger is avoided by the interpoſition of my cloaths. All crimes, even before the intended effect, are compleat with reſpect to guilt.*’

I return to Penelope. They who remember a certain place of the *Hexameron Ruſtique*, will perhaps believe that her precaution ought not to b[illegible] admired, becauſe Ulyſſes made himſelf ſuſpic[illegible] by expreſſing ſo much eagerneſs to enjoy her. [illegible] *me believe that Homer deſigned to make uſe* [illegible] *artifice, is the impatience wherewith he repreſ*[illegible] *in the twenty third book, who was extreamly deſi*[illegible] *with his wife. She had ſcarce had time enough* [illegible] *him, and he had ſcarce ſpoken three words to her, but he bluntly, and in a tranſport commanded his nurſe Euriclea to get a bed ready for them* (16). This is what Mr de la Mothe le Vayer ſays in his *Haxameron Ruſtique*. Which, you will ſay, ſuggeſts to us that Penelope miſtruſted his impatience, and fancied that the reaſon why he was ſo haſty, was becauſe he was afraid that the diſcovery of his impoſture, would fruſtrate his deſires. Without examining what may be ſaid againſt this reaſoning I ſhall only make this obſervation. La Mothe le Vayer deceives us; he doth not underſtand the paſſage of Homer; if he had well examined it, he might have known that Ulyſſes did not aſk a bed to lie in it with Penelope. He only aſked a bed for himſelf, becauſe his wife vouchſafed not to come near him, and uſed him very cruelly. Here are his words:

Δαιμονίη, περὶ σοί γε γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων.
Κῆρ ἀτέραμνον ἔθηκαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες.
Οὐ μὲν κ' ἄλλη ὧδε γυνὴ τετληότι θυμῷ
Ἀνδρὸς ἀφεσταίη, ὅς οἱ κακὰ πολλὰ μογήσας
Ἔλθοι εἰκοστῷ ἔτεϊ ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.
Ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι μαῖα στόρεσον λέχος, ὄφρα καὶ αὐτὸς
Λέξομαι. ἦ γὰρ τῇγε σιδήρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός

Infelix, tibi quidem ſupra fœminas mulieres,
Cor durum poſuerunt [dii] cœleſtes domos habitantes,
Non quidem alia ſic mulier toleranti animo
A viro procul ſtaret, [ac recederet] qui ei mala multa paſſus
Veniſſet vigeſimo anno in patriam terram.
Sed age, mihi nutrix ſterne lectum; ut & ipſe
Dormiam: certè enim huic [eſt] ferreus in pectoribus animus (17).

And oh! my queen! he cries, what power above
Has ſteel'd that heart, averſe to ſponſal love?
Canſt thou, Penelope, when Heav'n reſtores
Thy loſt Ulyſſes to his native ſhores,
Canſt thou, oh cruel! unconcern'd ſurvey
Thy loſt Ulyſſes on this ſignal day?
Haſte Euryclea, and diſpatchful ſpread
For me, and me alone, th' imperial bed.
My weary nature craves the balm of reſt,
But Heav'n with adamant has arm'd her breaſt.

POPE.

Telemachus was offended at Penelope's indifferency for Ulyſſes; and cenſured his mother as freely as if ſhe had been his ſiſter: *Unhappy mother*, ſaid he to her (18), *you are unmerciful, no wife would behave herſelf towards her huſband as you do. Your heart is ſtill harder than a ſtone.* Homer cannot be accuſed of having committed a fault againſt probability; for ſuch words are common enough in the mouth of great boys. But he ſhould not have copied nature ſo faithfully; he ſhould have made Telemachus ſpeak according to the notions of reſpect.

[*E*] *If her galants were diſappointed, it was becauſe they choſe rather to fare well at the coſt of Ulyſſes, than to lie with his wife.*] Horace ſuppoſes that Tireſias gave Ulyſſes no other reaſon of Penelope's chaſtity. If your patron *loves women, do not expect that he ſhould intreat you, prevent him and offer him your Penelope with a chearful countenance.* This is what Ulyſſes is adviſed to do: here is his anſwer, *What, do you think that I could perſuade Penelope to it? Penelope, who has been ſo chaſt and ſo virtuous, that the long ſollicitations of her lovers could never work upon her.* Tireſias replies, *The* [illegible] *it is, that all thoſe young men who frequented her* [illegible] *had not much to give, and minded eating and dr*[illegible]*g more than love; that is the reaſon why your Pe*[illegible]*as been ſo chaſt, but if ſhe had once taſted of a* [illegible] *man, and divided the profit with you, ſhe would*

---

(14) Id. ib. *pag.* 285, 286.

(15) Seneca, de Conſtantia Sapientis, *cap. vii, pag. m.* 683.

(16) Hexameron Ruſtique, *pag. m.* 104, 105.

(17) Homer. Odyſſ. lib. XXIII, ver. 166.

(18) Ibid. ver. 97.

actually lay with her, and that the god Pan was the fruit of their amours [*F*]. But some

no more leave him than a hunting-dog could quit a bloody ſkin.

Scortator erit? cave te roget: ultrò
Penelopen facilis potiori trade: putaſne,
Perduci poterit tam frugi tamque pudica,
Quam nequiêre proci, recto depellere curſu?
Venit enim magnum donandi parca juventus,
Nec tantùm Veneris, quantùm ſtudioſa culinæ.
Sic tibi Penelope frugi eſt: quæ ſi ſemel uno
De ſene guſtârit, tecum partita lucellum,
Ut canis a corio nunquam abſterrebitur uncto.
- - - - - - -
Nos numerus ſumus, & fruges conſumere nati;
Sponſi Penelopes (19). - - - -

Mr Dacier, who has tranſlated thus the verſes of Horace, makes this commentary upon them. ' Tireſias gives Ulyſſes no other reaſon of his wife's chaſtity, than the avarice of her lovers. And that which makes this very pleaſant, is that it is grounded upon a complaint of Penelope herſelf, as we find it in the eighteenth book of the Odyſſey. She complains to them that *they are very unjuſt; and that when many rivals court a woman to mary her, they make ſacrifices at their own charges, and treat and give preſents to their miſtreſs's friends, inſtead of eating what belongs to her*. They were nettled at that reproach and therefore thought fit to ſend her, one a gown, another a neck-lace, another ear-rings, another a bracelet, *&c.* But till then (which was a long time after the converſation that Ulyſſes had with Tireſias) they had not the leaſt thought of preſenting her with any thing. It is therefore no wonder if they had ſuch bad ſucceſs; and I deſire no other proof to ſhew the falſity of what has been ſaid by ſome authors, that ſhe favoured them all (20).' I have (21) cited ſome verſes of Ovid, whereby it appears that the lovers of Penelope made great waſte in her houſe.

[*F*] *Others ſay that they actually lay with her, and that the god Pan was the fruit of their amours.*] Some modern authors took delight in collecting ſeveral falſe evidences upon this. Lucius John Scoppa (22) cites in the firſt place this paſſage of the Priapeia:

Ad vetulam tamen ille (23) ſuam properabat: & omnis
Mens erat in cunno Penelopeia tuo.
Quæ ſic caſta manes, ut jam convivia viſas:
Utque fututorum ſit tua plena domus.
E quibus ut ſcires quicunque valentior eſſet,
Hæc es ad arrectos verba locuta procos:
Nemo meo melius nervum tendebat Ulyſſe:
Sive illi laterum, ſeu fuit artis opus.
Qui quoniam periit, modo vos intendite: qualem
Eſſe virum ſciero, vir ſit ut ille meus.

To old Penelope in haſte he went,
And on her charms his thoughts were all intent.
His wife ſo chaſt, of ſparks maintain'd great ſtore,
And did not ſcruple both to feaſt and whore.
To know which of them all might pleaſe her beſt,
She thus to her gallants herſelf addreſt.
None better than my ſpouſe could bend a bow,
Whether by ſtrength or ſkill, I do not know.
But ſince he's dead, try now this bow to bend,
For I to wed the ableſt man intend.

And then he cites theſe words of Acron (24), ' Penelope meretrix fuit, quæ amatores ſuos ſua pulchritudine luxurioſos reddebat. - - - - *Penelope was a whore, who by her beauty debauched her lovers.*' Afterwards he adds that the Poet Lycophron ſaid (25), ' Penelopen concubitum omnium procantium paſſam, ex eorum uno genuiſſe filium nomine Pana: quod cum reditu cognoviſſet Ulyſſes ſtatim abiit ad inſulam Cortinam, & ibidem obiit. - - - *Penelope lay with all her gallants, and by one of them had a ſon named Pan: which when Ulyſſes knew at his return, he went immediately to the iſland Cortina and there died.*' He goes on and tells us, that Duris of Samos ſaid, ' Penelopen proſtituto pudore conſuetudinem cum omnibus procis habuiſſe: unde natus Pan qui caprinis pedibus *Tragoſceles* vocabatur. - - - - *Penelope proſtituted her honour and committed whoredom with all her lovers: that by them ſhe had Pan, who being born with goat's feet was called Tragoſceles.*' Franciſcus Floridus (§ α) Sabinus wrote a chapter on that ſubject (26): he wonders that Petrarch (27) ſhould believe Homer in favour of Penelope, after he had been ſo equitable as to reject the authority of Virgil in favour of Dido. He obſerves that thoſe two Poets have been equally ſucceſsful the one in making Penelope paſs for an honeſt woman, tho' ſhe was a leud woman, and the other in making people believe that Dido was a leud woman, tho' ſhe lived very chaſtly. He obſerves that Penelope was called βασσάρα κασσωρεύȣσα by Lycophron, and he does not approve that Tzetzes hath contradicted that Poet. ' Durius Samius antiquus ſcriptor cujus Plutarchus Pliniiuſque aliique non pauci egregii ſcriptores mentionem faciunt, idem aſſeruit, ut Joannes Tzetzes Lycophronis interpres ait, quamvis eum communi Græciæ cauſſæ favens mentiri dicat. Illam vocem κασσωρεύȣσαν, πορνεύȣσαν, hoc eſt ſcortantem exponens. Inquit autem: νῦν δὲ Βασσάραν λέγει τὴν Πηνελόπην, κασσωρεύȣσαν δὲ, ἀντὶ τȣ͂ πορνεύȣσαν. Δȣ͂ρις γὰρ ὁ Σάμιος ἐν τῷ περὶ Αγαθοκλέȣς, φησὶ αὐτὴν συγγένεσθαι πᾶσι τοῖς μνηστῆρσι, καὶ γεννῆσαι τὸν τραγοσκέλη Πᾶνα. ὅπερ ȣ̓κ ἀληθεύει, ὁ γὰρ Ἑρμȣ͂ καὶ ἄλλης Πενελόπης. καὶ ἕτερος δὲ Πᾶν Διὸς καὶ Ὑϐρέως. *Id eſt*, nunc *Baſſaram* dicit Penelopen, κασσωρεύȣσαν autem, hoc eſt *ſcortantem*. Duris enim Samius in libro de Agathocle ipſam cum omnibus procis coiiſſe, ac Pana hircina crura habentem genuiſſe inquit. Quod verum non eſt. Hic enim Mercurii & alterius Penelopes filius fuit: alter autem Pan Jovis & Hybreos (28). - - - - *Duris of Samos, an ancient writer, mentioned by Plutarch, Pliny, and many other famous authors, has aſſerted the ſame thing, as John Tzetzes the interpreter of Lycophron ſays, tho' in favour of the common cauſe of Greece he pretends that he tells a lie. He interprets the word* κασσωρεύȣσαν, πορνεύȣσαν, *which ſignifies whoring. Theſe are his words: he calls Penelope Baſſaram* κασσωρεύȣσαν. *that is, a whore. For Duris of Samos, in his book de Agathocle, ſays, that ſhe lay with all her lovers, and that ſhe was the mother of Pan, who had goats feet. But this is not true, for he was the ſon of Mercury and another Penelope: and there was another Pan the ſon of Jupiter and Hybris.*' He pretends that Homer, by the exerciſe of the bow, which Penelope propoſed to her lovers, denoted the amorous myſtery, and the tryal which ſhe had a mind to make of their ſtrength, ' Quid verbis opus eſt? cum & ipſe Homerus cujus præconio Penelopes laus conſtat, ex ſuis operibus id colligi poſſe voluerit? An forte ille propoſitus procis arcus aliud ſignificat quam eam, ut juvenum vires experiretur, id præcipue certamen quo ſe juvenes exercerent delegiſſe? At hoc quidem vel ex eo patet, quod his verbis νευρὴν ἐντανύσαι, id eſt *nervum intendere*, ad id quod volebat exprimendum, accommodatis admodum, frequenter utitur (29). - - - - *What occaſion is there for words? ſince Homer himſelf, on whoſe teſtimony the praiſe of Penelope depends, deſigned that this ſhould be inferred from her own actions. Could the exerciſe of the bow, which ſhe propoſed to the young men, ſignify any thing elſe than the tryal ſhe had a mind to make of their ſtrength. And this appears by his uſing frequently the expreſſion, bend the bow, which is exceeding appoſite to ſhow his meaning.*' He pretends that Ovid underſtood the true meaning of Homer, and that he tells us that Penelope put her gallants to that tryal (30): *Nam & Ovidius Homerum idem innuiſſe vult, cum ait libro primo Amorum,*

Penelope vires juvenum tentabat in arcu
Qui latus argueret, corneus arcus erat

---

(19) Horat. Sat. V, lib. II, ver. 75; & Epiſt. II, lib. I, ver. 27.

(20) Dacier upon Horace, Tom. vii, pag. 421, of the Dutch Edition.

(21) In the remark [*B*].

(22) Lucius Joannes Scoppa, Parthnopæus, Collectaneorum, *lib. i, cap. xxxii.* That book was printed in 1507.

(23) That is to ſay, Ulyſſes.

(24) Acron. in 2 Epiſt. Horat. lib. i.

(25) Lycophron does not ſay ſo.

[(§ α) It ſhould be Francis Fleuri; for thus Rabelais, *lib. v, ch. xix*, calls this author who was his cotemporary. Rem. Crit.]

(26) It is the ſecond of the third book of the *Lectionum ſubciſivarum of Franciſc. Floridus Sabinus.*

(27) In an Italian poem intituled, *I Triumfi*, which title he borrowed, as Floridus ſays, of a Greek Poet, who, as Lactantius has it, *lib. i, cap. xi, Divinarum inſtitutionum*, had written a book intituled, *Triumphus Cupidinis.*

(28) Florid. Sabin. ibid.

(29) Id. ib.

(30) Ibid. That paſſage of Ovid is in the eighth Elegy of the firſt book *Amorum.*

ſome authors think rather, that ſhe conceived Pan, when Mercury, aſſuming the form of a goat, raviſhed her [*G*]. It is a pretty general opinion, that her lovers, being diſappointed in their hopes of enjoying her, applied themſelves to her maids, and debauched them [*H*]. The inhabitants of Mantinea uſed to ſay that ſhe died in their city

Virtuous Penelope is ſaid t'have try'd
With a ſtrong bow, each luſty lover's ſide.
SIDLEY.

He has not forgot the paſſage of Horace, nor that of the Priapeia which I have recited, and he concludes with the teſtimony of Herodotus (31).

Dempſterus quotes a great many authors, but without any exactneſs. Being to prove that Pan was the ſon of Mercury and Penelope (32), and that Mercury put on the ſhape of a goat when he lay with that woman, which was the reaſon why Pan's feet were like thoſe of a goat; he quotes two epigrams of the Anthologia (33), and a paſſage of Auſonius (34), which ſay only that Pan's feet were ſo made, and not that it proceeded from the figure which his father put on, when he lay with Penelope. Is it not a ridiculous thing to alledge ſuch authorities? He ſays that an ancient Hiſtorian named Lyſander gives the ſame account of the leud life of Penelope, which Duris has given: and he adds that Tzetzes (35) ſays that Ulyſſes being not able to bear the infamy of his houſe, returned to Circe, and was killed by his ſon Telemachus; and that Pauſanias tells us that Ulyſſes divorced his wife becauſe of her adulteries, and retired to Sparta, and a little while after to Mantinea where he died. Dempſterus aſcribes to the huſband, what Pauſanias ſays only of the wife (36). Laſtly, he ſays that the leudneſs of Penelope may be known by the preſents ſhe accepted, and by the marriage which ſhe contracted with the murtherer of her huſband: beſides, to prevent her being miſtaken in her choice, ſhe found out by a very good tryal who was the ſtouteſt of her gallants, ' Probaturque impudicitia ex eo, *quod a procis munera acceperit*, quod meretricii animi certiſſimum argumentum, Homer. lib. 18. Odyſſ. & *mariti ſui Ulyſſis interfectori nupſit*, ex quo connubio natus Italus. Jul. Hygin. fab. capit. 127. Et ob id, ipſe Ulyſſes apud Sabinum poëtam in reſponſoriis Epiſtolis:

Tot juvenes inter, tot vina liquentia ſemper,
Hei mihi! quid credam? pignore caſta manes?

' . . . . . . Et procorum habito delectu, ut fortiori, valentiorique poſſet concumbere, arcu tentabat ſingulos. Auctor incertus Priapeiorum carminum (37). - - - *Her leudneſs is evidently proved* by her accepting preſents from her lovers, *which is a ſure ſign of a leud diſpoſition*, and by marrying the murderer of her huſband Ulyſſes, *from which marriage came Italus. Therefore Ulyſſes himſelf, in the Poet Sabinus, ſays,*

Amidſt ſo many youths, whilſt thus you feaſt,
What can I think? can'ſt thou continue chaſt?

' . . . . *And that ſhe might have the luſtieſt and ableſt of her galants to lie with, ſhe made a trial of their ſtrength with a bow. See the uncertain author of the* Priapeia.' You may rely better upon Meziriac's quotations. There are ſome authors (§ β), ſays he (38) *who write that Penelope diſhonoured herſelf in the abſence of Ulyſſes, and that ſhe became the mother of the god Pan: but thoſe authors are divided into two opinions. Some ſay that Pan was the ſon of Mercury and Penelope. This is the opinion of Herodotus, l. 2. Of Plutarch in the treatiſe of the Oracles that ceaſed. Of the Scholiaſt upon Pindar in the argument of the Pythics. Of Probus upon Virgil's fourth Eclogue. Of Lucian in the dialogue of Pan and Mercury: and of the Scholiaſt upon the ſeventh Idyl of Theocritus: But the two laſt add, that Pan* (39) *lay with Penelope, having put on the form of a goat, whence it is that Pan was born with horns, and goat's feet: . . . . Others ſay, that Penelope proſtituted herſelf to all her galants, and that the god Pan was born from their mixed ſeed. Thus Lycophron calls Penelope,* Βασσάραν σεμνῶς κασσωρεύουσαν, a whore whoring honourably. *Tzetzes ſays thereupon,* Δοῦρις ὁ Σάμιος, *&c* (40). . . . *Some Scholiaſts not yet printed, upon the Flute of Theocritus, mention the two opinions, ſaying that Pan, in the opinion of ſome, was ſon of Mercury and Penelope, and, in the opinion of others, of Penelope and all her ſuitors* (41). Obſerve that Claudius du Verdier (42) is angry with Lycophron; he cannot forgive him for having ſaid, that Penelope proſtituted herſelf; he refutes him by his own ſcholiaſt, and by theſe words of Ovid;

Penelope manſit, quamvis cuſtode careret,
Inter tam multos intemerata procos.

Penelope, without a guard, remain'd
Amongſt ſo many ſparks, chaſt and unſtain'd.

[*G*] *When Mercury having put on the form of a goat, took her maidenhead by force.*] You will find that ſtory in Lucian with this notable circumſtance, that Mercury had forgot he had plaid that trick to Penelope. Pan went to make himſelf known to him, and being received with a ſcornful countenance, he produced his proofs: Do you not remember, ſaid he to him, that formerly you forced a woman of quality in Arcadia? Why do you bite your fingers, and heſitate ſo long? She was Penelope, Icarius's daughter. She told me that my horns and goat's feet proceed from your putting on the ſhape of that creature to lie with her. By Jupiter, anſwered Mercury, I remember that I did ſomething of that nature. Νὴ Δία μέμνημαι ποιήσας τι τοιοῦτον. *Per Jovem memini me tale quiddam facere* (43). There is a very ſurprizing ſlip of memory. The examples of divine forgetfulneſs, which have been alledged by the defender of Voiture, are not ſo ſtrange as this is. Coſtar ſays that Jupiter's memory failed him ſometimes. *I do not remember*, ſays he (44), *the name of the god, who had much ado to make him remember that wonderful expedient which he had formerly found out, to reconcile two decrees of fate which manifeſtly contradicted one another: and, by the by, it was then that he took ſo much pains, that it made him ſweat, and cabbages ſprung out of his ſweat.* I do not know whether any authors ſay, that he forgot ſometimes his amorous exploits. They were ſo numerous, that his memory might have failed him; but I do not believe there are any examples of his forgetting things of this kind. Mercury might be alledged for it. Obſerve, by the by, that Coſtar took that ſtory from Rabelais: his adverſary upbraids him with it: *I found that ſweat very cold*, ſays he to him (45), *and Rabelais, from whom you have ſo ingenious a thought, was, perhaps, formerly looked upon as an excellent buffoon, but now the reading of his works will make very few people laugh.*

[*H*] *They applied themſelves to her maids, and debauched them.*] This we read in the Odyſſey, where we find alſo that Ulyſſes having put to death his wife's lovers, ordered that the maids who had diſhonoured his family by their leudneſs, ſhould be beaten to death with ſwords; but Telemachus being of opinion that they deſerved a more ignominious death, cauſed them to be hanged.

Θεινέμεναι ξίφεσιν ταννήκεσιν, εἰσόκε πασῶν
Ψυχὰς ἐξαφέλοισθε, καὶ ἐκλελάθοιντ' Ἀφροδίτης
Τὴν ἄρ ὑπὸ μνηστῆρσιν ἔχον, μίσγοντό τε λάθρη.
. . . .
Τοῖσι δὲ Τελέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν,
Μὴ μὲν δὴ καθαρῷ θανάτῳ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἑλοίμην.
Τάων, αἳ δὴ ἐμῇ κεφαλῇ κατ' ὀνείδεα χεῦαν,
Μητέρι θ' ἡμετέρῃ, παρά τε μνηστῆρσιν ἴαυον,
Ὣς ἄρ ἔφη, καὶ πεῖσμα νεὼς κυανοπρώροιο, &c.

Diverberate enſibus longe acutis, donec omnium
Animas auferatis, & obliviſcantur Veneris,
Quam ſub procis habebant, dum clam miſcerentur (46).
: . . . .
His vero Telemachus prudens incepit dicere,
Abſit vero jam pura morte animam ut auferam
His, quæ jam capiti opprobria offuderunt.
Matrique meæ, apudque procos dormierunt,

Sic

---

(31) Ἐκ ταύτης γὰρ, *inquit de Penelope loquens*, καὶ Ἑρμέω λέγεται γένεσθαι ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων ὁ Πᾶν, *hoc eſt*, ex hac enim & Mercurio Pan à Græcis genitus dicitur. *Idem, ibid. The paſſage of Herodotus is in the 145th chapter of the ſecond book.*

(32) Ex Adulterio eum ſuſceptum à Mercurio, matre Penelope. *Dempſterus, in Paralipomenis ad Antiquitates Romanas Roſini, lib. iii, cap. ii, pag. m.* 432.

(33) The 84th and 85th of the 12th chapter of the 4th book.

(34) Auſon. Eidill. III, Moſella, *ver.* 174. *In the Amſterdam Edit.* 1671, *it is* Edyll. X, *ver.* 172.

(35) In Lycophron.

(36) See the remark [*I*].

(37) Dempſter. ibid. *pag.* 433.

[(§ β) Meziriac has omitted to reckon among theſe authors, Cicero, *lib. iii, ch. lvi, de Nat. Deor.* REM. CRIT.]

(38) Meziriac upon Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 117.

(39) It ſhould be *Mercury*.

(40) See the remaining part of this paſſage, above, citation (28).

(41) *Add to this the words of* Barthius, in Statium, *Tom. i, pag.* 334, 335. Quam (*Penelopen*) cum omnibus procis rem habuiſſe ſcripſerunt, & inde natum *Panem*, nomine à multis Patribus ducto. Scholiaſtes Theocriti in Idyllium A. Τὸν Πᾶνα οἱ μὲν λέγουσιν υἱὸν Πηνελόπης καὶ πάντων τῶν μνηστήρων, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο λέγεσθαι καὶ Πᾶνα.

(42) Claudius Verderius, Cenſura in Auctores, *pag.* 45.

(43) Lucian. in Deor. Dialog. *Tom. i, pag.* 176.

(44) Coſtar, Defence of Voiture, *pag. m.* 116.

(45) Girac, Anſwer to the Defence of Voiture, *pag.* 92.

(46) Homer. Odyſſ. lib. XXII, ver. 443.

city [*I*]. They who ſay that the reaſon why Homer praiſed her ſo much was, becauſe he was deſcended from her, do not reaſon very well [*K*]. You may ſee in the remark where I treat of this, that Penelope out-lived Ulyſſes, and married again. I ſhall ſay ſomething in particular of the praiſes which Auſonius beſtowed upon her [*L*].

Sic dixit : & funem navis nigram proram habentis, *&c* (47).

Drive to yon court without the palace wall,
And the revenging ſword ſhall ſmite them all.
So with the ſuitors let them mix in duſt,
Stretch'd in a long oblivion of their luſt.
. . . .
Then thus the prince ; to theſe ſhall we afford
A fate ſo pure, as by the martial ſword?
To theſe, the nightly proſtitutes to ſhame,
And baſe revilers of our houſe and name, &c.
Pope.

It is obſervable that of fifty maids there were but twelve who proſtituted themſelves to their miſtreſs's lovers.

Τάων δώδεκα πᾶσαι ἀναιδείης ἐπέβησαν,
Οὔτ᾽ ἐμὲ τίουσαι οὔτ᾽ αὐτὴν Πηνελόπειαν.

Harum duodecim omnes impudentiæ ſi dederunt,
Neque me honorantes, neque ipſam Penelopen (48).

Of theſe, twice ſix purſue their wicked way,
Nor me, nor chaſt Penelope, obey. Pope.

I muſt not forget that, in the opinion of Ariſtotle, they who left off Philoſophy to apply themſelves to other ſciences, reſembled Penelope's lovers. That thought does not appear juſt to ſome others. 'Cum Ariſtoteles nimio Philoſophiam ſtudio complectebatur, 'aſſerere non dubitabat eos qui reliquas artes conſectarentur, hanc vero negligerent, eſſe Penelopes procis 'ſimiles, qui ut Homerus, cum domina potiri nequiviſſent, ad ancillas divertebant (49). - - - *As Ariſtotle applied himſelf to Philoſophy* excessively, '*he ſaid, that thoſe who followed other ſciences, and neglected this, were like Penelope's lovers, who, as Homer 'relates, becauſe they could not enjoy the miſtreſs, took up 'with the maids.*' This is a lame compariſon; for thoſe young men preferred not the maids to the miſtreſs, as they who neglect Philoſophy to apply themſelves to ſome other ſtudies; they courted the maids only becauſe they could not prevail upon the miſtreſs. Plutarch ſays, that Bion made uſe of that compariſon. Ἀστείως δὴ καὶ Βίων ἔλεγεν ὁ φιλόσοφος, ὅτι ὥσπερ οἱ μνηστῆρες τῇ Πηνελόπῃ πλησιάζειν μὴ δυνάμενοι, ταῖς ταύτης ἐμίγνυντο θεραπαίναις. οὕτω καὶ οἱ φιλοσοφίας μὴ δυνάμενοι κατατυχεῖν, ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις παιδεύμασι τοῖς οὐδενὸς ἀξίοις, ἑαυτοὺς κατασκελετεύουσι. *Urbanum eſt etiam Bionis philoſophi dictum, qui aiebat, ſicut Penelopes proci quum non poſſent cum Penelopa concumbere, rem cum ejus ancillis habuiſſent, ita qui philoſophiam nequeunt apprehendere, eos in aliis nullius pretii diſciplinis ſeſe conterere* (50).

[*I*] *The inhabitants of Mantinea uſed to ſay that ſhe died in their city.*] Pauſanias (51) affords me the proof which I want: I ſhall uſe the words of Meziriac. they are a faithful tranſlation of thoſe of Pauſanias, *Pauſanias deſcribing one of the ways that went from the city of Mantinea to that of Orchomenus, ſpeaks thus: On the right hand of the way there is to be ſeen a ſmall riſing ground, which the Arcadians will have to be the ſepulchre of Penelope: but what they ſay does not agree with what is written in the verſes called Theſprotides; for it is ſaid there, that after the return of Ulyſſes from Troy, Penelope brought a ſon to Ulyſſes, who was called Ptolyporthes; whereas the Mantinians affirm, that Ulyſſes having convicted Penelope of having drawn her galants into her houſe, turned her out, and that ſhe immediately retired to Sparta, and a little while after ſhe went to Mantinea, where ſhe ended her life* (52.)

It is affirmed, in the firſt tome of the Chevræana (53), that Pauſanias ſays *that Ulyſſes being returned from Troy, Penelope, who had been extreamly complaiſant to her lovers, was brought to bed of a ſon called Polyporthe* (54); *that her huſband did ſhamefully divorce that leud woman,* &c. It is plain that Pauſanias does not ſay ſo: of the two traditions mentioned by him, one whereof was advantageous and the other diſadvantageous to the memory of that lady; that which was advantageous, imported that Ulyſſes had that ſon by Penelope after his return from Troy. But Mr Chevreau pretends that Pauſanias ſays that ſhe had him by her lovers, and that ſhe was divorced upon the account of that infamy.

[*K*] *They who ſay the reaſon why Homer praiſed her ſo much, was becauſe he was deſcended from her, do not reaſon very well.*] Meziriac having ſet down what has been ſaid by ſome authors concerning the leudneſs of this lady, raiſes an objection, which he anſwers thus (55): *It might be objected againſt thoſe authors, that it is not likely that Homer ſhould have propoſed her to us as an eminent example of chaſtity, and ſhould have beſtowed ſo many praiſes upon a leud woman, who of all women in the world deſerved to be blamed: but that objection may be very well anſwered two ways. Firſt, it may be ſaid that Homer, who, as many believe, lived in the time of the Trojan war, grew very much in love with Penelope, and lived a long while in Ithaca upon her account, as it is affirmed by Hermeſianax in Athenæus, lib.* 13. *cap.* 8; *and therefore it is no wonder, if he appears ſo fond of ſinging the praiſes of Ulyſſes and Penelope. It may be anſwered in the ſecond place, that ſome are of opinion that Homer was deſcended from Ulyſſes, being the ſon of Telemachus and Polycaſte, or Epicaſte, Neſtor's daughter. Thus we find in a little Greek book, intituled the Diſpute of Homer and Heſiod, that the emperor Adrian having aſked the propheteſs Pythia what country Homer was of, and who was his parents, he was anſwered:*

Ἄγνωστόν μ᾽ ἔρεαι γενεὴν καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν
Ἀμβροσίου σειρῆνος, ἕδος δ᾽ Ἰθακήσιός ἐστιν.
Τηλέμαχος δὲ πατὴρ, καὶ Νεστορίη Ἐπικάστη
Μήτηρ, ἥ μιν ἔτικτε βροτῶν πολὺ πάνσοφον ἄνδρα.

Thou deſireſt to know of me the unknown extraction, and native country of that divine ſinger: Ithaca is his country, Telemachus is his father; he had for his mother, the beautiful Epicaſte, Neſtor's daughter.

Thoſe two anſwers are weak; for if Homer had been a long time in Ithaca to court Penelope, he muſt be reckoned among thoſe lovers whom he ſpoke ſo ill of; for unleſs he had joined with them, he muſt have made a very ſad figure, and even expoſed himſelf to many dangerous affronts. Thoſe young men would not have permitted that a private man ſhould have courted Penelope without concerting with them. I add, that they who are in love with a woman, will very ſeldom make her huſband the hero of their poem. Beſides, if Homer had known that Penelope had proſtituted herſelf to ſo many lovers, his love for her would have prompted him to defame her, far from being a reaſon to move him to beſtow ſo many praiſes upon her. Jealouſy, ſpite, and the ſhame of having loved a woman who diſhonoured herſelf, and would not diſtinguiſh him from a croud of baſe admirers, would have violently incited him to diſgrace her. Laſtly, I obſerve, that there is no need of having recourſe to any other reaſon but this. Ulyſſes was the hero of the poem; it was therefore neceſſary that his wife ſhould appear in it as an heroine, or at leaſt as an honeſt woman. It would be a fault againſt the moſt eſſential rules not to ſuppreſs all the ſhameful actions of the wife of one's hero. Meziriac adds, *that Ulyſſes having been killed by Telegonus, Minerva adviſed Telemachus, Penelope, and Telegonus, to carry his dead body to Circe, in the iſle of Ææa, and to bury it there, and that by the advice of the ſame goddeſs, Telegonus married Penelope, and Telemachus Circe: that of Telemachus and Circe was born Latinus, from whom the Latins were ſo called: but that Italus, who gave his name to Italy, was born of Telegonus and Penelope* (56). Theſe are fine advices indeed, and very worthy of Minerva: if Penelope had followed them, I ſhould be more inclined to believe thoſe who ſay, that ſhe was extreamly kind to her lovers, than thoſe who repreſent her ſo faithful to her huſband. It had been a fault to marry the involuntary murderer of her huſband; but it had been worſe ſtill, if we believe Hyginus, for ſhe muſt have married the ſon of Ulyſſes.

[*L*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of the praiſes which Auſonius beſtowed upon her* (57). Here is a fragment of Balzac's converſations (58). 'The kiſſes of Penelope were 'ſcarce known to her ſon Telemachus, becauſe her 'ſon was not her huſband, for whom ſhe reſerved all 'her kiſſes. The marquis of Montauzier was pleaſed

with

(47) Id. ib. ver. 461.

(48) Id. ib. ver. 424.

(49) Lucius Joannes Scoppa, Collectaneorum, *lib. i, cap. xxxii,*

(50) Plut. de Liberis educandis, *pag.* 7, *C.*

(51) *Lib. viii, pag.* 247.

(52) Meziriac, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 116, 117.

(53) Pag. 388, of the Dutch edition.

(54) He ſhould have ſaid Ptolyporthe.

(55) Meziriac, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 118.

(56) Ibid. *pag.* 119. *He quotes* Hyginus, *cap. cxxvii, and he had ſaid that as Euſtathius relates it on the 16th book of the Odyſſey,* The Colophonian who wrote the Returns, ſays, that Telemachus married at laſt Circe, and that Telegonus married Penelope.

(57) Intemerata procis, & tot ſervata per annos,
Oſcula vix ipſi cognita Telemacho. *Auſonius, Epigr. cxxxv, pag. m.* 83.

(58) Balzac, Entretien xxxix, *pag. m.* 372.

‘ with thoſe words: I thought they would pleaſe him. ‘ But you tell me, that he wants to know from whom ‘ I have them, and that he is reſolved to know it from ‘ me, without your meddling with it. . . . . Thoſe ‘ words, which pleaſe a man, whoſe pleaſures are ‘ all honeſt, are the tranſlation, or rather the paraphraſe of this verſe, which a Latin Poet (59) imitated from a Greek Poet:

Oſcula vix ipſi cognita Telemacho.

‘ I might add to the ſhort paraphraſe I made upon it, ‘ a ſhort commentary, and I have a mind to do ſo ‘ ſince you invite me to ſpeak.’ That commentary contains theſe words, *Mary de Medicis, whom we know to have been as chaſt, as the Poets make Penelope to be, was alſo like Penelope in this. Could you believe, that during the four years of her regency, ſhe never kiſſed not ſo much as once the king her ſon? I was told ſo by an old courtier of that time, who took the liberty to tell her, that thoſe outward marks of affection were neceſſary to get the love of others, eſpecially of children, becauſe they are commonly leſs moved with effects than with appearances* (60).

(59) Obſerve here the ſame policy of Balzac, which I have ſpoken of in another place, citation (45) of the article GONTAULT (CHARLES DE): he will not name Auſonius, that one may have a greater idea of his learning.

(60) Balzac, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 374.

PERAXYLUS. This is the name which Arnoldus Arlenius took, to expreſs, in Greek, his native country (*a*). He was a very ſtudious man, and a great Grecian, and he took incredible pains to find out old manuſcripts. Thuanus (*b*) ſpeaks of him under the year 1561, and declares, that tho' he has not been able to diſcover the the place and the day of his death, he thinks it happened at that time. He obſerves, that this learned man had conſecrated his labours to the public good, and that poſterity would be always beholden to him for his Greek edition of Joſephus, which he printed from the excellent manuſcript of Don Diego de Mendoza ambaſſador of Charles the Vth, at Venice. He adds, that the books againſt Appion were not to be ſeen any where elſe, and that Arlenius having left Don Diego, when that lord ſet out from Venice, retired to Baſil, and exerciſed his talents there for ſome years, and made a good uſe of Henry Stephens's aſſiſtance. We ſhall ſee what Mr Teiſſier ſays of him [*A*]. The French tranſlator of Thuanus has tranſlated this paſſage careleſly [*B*]. I have at laſt found out that the books of that author which Geſner gave hopes would be publiſhed have been miſtaken for books actually printed [*C*]. I wonder, that Swertius and Valerius Andreas knew nothing of Peraxylus. He was better known in Italy than in the Low-Countries. See how Corradus praiſes him [*D*].

For your better underſtanding how great his application was in the ſearch of manuſcripts, and in promoting learning, I ſhall relate what he did concerning Plato [*E*]. I might

(*a*) A village of the Campine, ſituated beyond a little river which runs by Boiſleduc, and is called the Deeſe.

(*b*) Sub fin. lib. xxviii.

[*A*] *What Mr Teiſſier ſays of him* (1).] He obſerves, quoting Gyraldus (2), that Arlenius *compoſed very fine Greek and Latin epigrams, and that he would have excelled in Poetry, had he not applied himſelf to more ſerious ſtudies.* He adds, without quoting any body for it, that the printed works of Arlenius are the following tranſlations: *Dionis Coccæi Romanæ Hiſtoriæ libri duodecim. Olympiodori Philoſophi Platonici & Peripatetici, Commentarii ad Ariſtotelis Commentaria. Sermones quidam ex Plutarcho de moribus à nemine antehac verſi. Plurimæ Orationes Chryſoſtomi, Theodoreti, & aliorum S. S. Patrum antea non viſæ. Lycophronis Alexandram ſive Caſſandram, & Iſaaci Tzetzis in eam Commentaria edidit & recognovit.*

[*B*] *The French tranſlator of Thuanus has tranſlated this paſſage careleſly.*] He has rendered Arnoldus Arlenius (3) by Arnaud de Lens. He ſays, that Arnaud was called Praxylus, which was a name he gave himſelf, and that the manuſcript he made uſe of for the edition of Joſephus, did belong to Diego Auſtado Mendoſſe. I. Why does he pretend that Arlenius and de Lens are the ſame name? II. Why does he ſuppreſs the reaſon of the name Peraxylus, which Thuanus had alledged? *Trans Dieſam amnem qui Silvam ſeu Boſcum-Ducis alluit vico ignobili natus, indeque nomine ingenioſo ab ipſo effecto Peraxylus nuncupatus.* III. Why does he change Peraxylus into Praxylus? IV. Who does he mean by his Diego Auſtado? Why did he not ſay Hurtado? I declare that I have nothing to ſay to him as to ſuch things as may depend upon the careleſſneſs of the correctors of the Preſs, and that I have not ſeen his verſion any where elſe but in Mr Teiſſier's book.

[*C*] *The books of that author which Geſner gave hopes would be publiſhed have been miſtaken for books actually printed.*] I have conſulted Father Labbe, Dr Cave, and Mr Du Pin, in ſuch places where they give us a liſt of the works of St Chryſoſtom; they mention many tranſlators, but never Arnoldus Arlenius. I have not found him neither in the authors, who treat of ſeveral editions and tranſlations of Dion. Whereby I was almoſt convinced that Arlenius had never printed the tranſlations mentioned by Mr Teiſſier. I enquired into the cauſe of this miſtake, and found that it ought to be imputed altogether to the abbreviators of Geſner. They ſay poſitively (4) that Arlenius tranſlated ſome moral treatiſes from Plutarch's Greek, which had never been rendered into Latin; that he tranſlated alſo twenty-two books of the Roman Hiſtory of Dion Cocceius, the commentaries of Olympiodorus upon Ariſtotle's Meteors (5), and ſome ſermons and treatiſes of Chryſoſtom, Theodoret, &c. When I go as far as Geſner, I find that thoſe tranſlations were only hoped for. ‘ Expectamus, *ſays he* (6), ‘ ab Arlenio noſtro, ſi Deus vitam extenderit, quoſ‘dam ex Plutarcho, &c. - - - *We expect from Arlenius, ‘ if GOD preſerves his life, ſome treatiſes from Plu‘tarch, &c.*’ They who abridged Geſner, indeed ſay that Arlenius tranſlated thoſe books; but they do not ſay that thoſe tranſlations were publiſhed. They only tell us that he cauſed Lycophron with the commentaries of Tzetzes to be printed at Baſil in the year 1545, and then Joſephus in the ſame city (7), with a preface, but without a tranſlation.

[*D*] *See how Corradus praiſes him.*] He ſpeaks of him thus (8): ‘ Ita quidem *(poſtulabantur interpreta‘tiones epiſtolarum Ciceronis)* ut Arnoldus Arlenius ho‘mo eruditiſſimus ex Germania ad me Regium uſque ‘ venerit, & me ſuo, Joannis Opporini, Joannis Stra‘thii, Magni Gruberi, aliorumque doctiſſimorum ho‘minum nomine ſit hortatus, eas ut primo quoque ‘ tempore foras darem. - - - *So that* (ſpeaking of the ‘ notes on Cicero's Epiſtles) *Arnoldus Arlenius a very ‘ learned man came to me out of Germany, as far as Reg‘gio, and intreated me in the name of himſelf, of John ‘ Opporinus, John Strathius, Magnus Gruberus, and ‘ other learned men, to publiſh them as ſoon as poſſible.*’

[*E*] *I ſhall relate what he did concerning Plato.*] It has been ſeen elſewhere (9), that Simon Grynæus took great pains to give a better edition of the works of this Philoſopher. This edition is that of Baſil *apud Joannem Valderum* 1534. Peraxylus compared it from the beginning to the end with ſeveral manuſcripts, and by that means corrected above a thouſand conſiderable faults in it, either in omiſſions, tranſpoſitions, alterations, or ſuperfluities of words. His labour was made uſe of in the edition of the works of Plato, which was printed at Baſil *apud Henricum Petri* in the year 1556 in folio by the care of Marcus Hopperus, who did not omit to give great praiſes to Peraxylus. ‘ Vir ille, *ſays he* (10), virtutibus & præ‘ſtanti doctrina clarus, ARNOLDUS ARLENIUS, ad ‘ eruendos, vindicandos, & reſtaurandos bonos autores ‘ diis ita volentibus, quaſi natus, nactus ------ in Italia ‘ quædam manuſcripta Platonis exemplaria, conferre ‘ cum iis Vualderianum (cui & Aldinum reſpondebat) ‘ cæpit. - - - - *That great man,* ARNOLDUS ARLE‘NIUS, *famous for his virtues and excellent learning,* ‘ *and*

(1) Teiſſier, Additions to the Eulogies taken from Thuanus, *Tom.* i, *pag.* 214.

(2) De Poët. ſui temporis, *lib.* ii.

(3) The Francfort edition 1625, ſays *Artenius.*

(4) Epit. Bibl. Geſn. *pag. m.* 80.

(5) *Read* ad Ariſtotelis Meteora, *and not* ad Ariſtotelis Commentaria.

(6) Bibl. *fol.* 92, *verſo.*

(7) Geſner ſays that Joſephus was printed in 1544.

(8) In Quæſtura, pag. 100, Lugd. Bat. 1667.

(9) In the remark [*B*] of the article GRYNÆUS (SIMON).

(10) Marcus Hopperus, Epiſt. Dedicat. Oper. Platonis.

I might have juſtly blamed (*c*) the abbreviators of Geſner, for not mentioning his edition of Polybius [*F*].

‘ *and deſtined, as it were by providence, to bring to light, recover, and reſtore, good authors, finding . . . in Italy ſome manuſcript copies of Plato, undertook to compare with them the copy of Valderus, to which that of Aldus anſwered.*’ Having inſtanced in ſome faults that had been corrected, he adds that he does not do it with a deſign to leſſen the glory of thoſe who had given the former editions; but only to ſhew the better the advantages of the new edition, and the merit of Peraxylus, ‘ Et ut magnum hoc ARLENII noſtri ſtudium, cura & diligentia innoteſcat, collaudeturque, quam bonis promovendis literis, inque lucem producendis abditis & reconditis authoribus, jam ab annis aliquot multis indeſinenter impendit, nullis vel ſumptibus vel laboribus parcens: pro quo ſane viri hujus indefatigabili ſtudio tota literatorum cohors maximas merito gratias agere, & vitam ei longævam ab omnis boni largitore Deo precari debet. - - - - *And to ſhew and commend the great pains, care, and diligence, of* ARLENIUS, *which he has continually beſtowed for many years, without ſparing either coſt or labour, in promoting good literature, and bringing to light authors that had lain in obſcurity: for which indefatigable induſtry the whole body of learned men ought in juſtice to give him the greateſt thanks, and to pray GOD, the author of all good, to grant him a long life.*’ At laſt he ſpeaks of the manuſcripts which Peraxylus had found out, and which might ſerve to give a very fine edition of the ancient commentators on Plato: ‘ Idem ille noſter ARLENIUS, pro ardenti ſuo ſtudio & amore quo erga bonas literas, earundemque cultores quaſi flagrat, præter ingentem aliorum plane novorum librorum ſarcinam, etiam aliquot Græcorum commentariorum in noſtrum hunc philoſophum tomos, nobiliores Italiæ bibliothecas ſcrutando nactus eſt, eademque ſocero meo Henrico Petri tradidit. - - - *The ſame* ARLENIUS, *out of his ardent love and affection, wherewith he, as it were, burns towards learning, and lovers of it, beſides a vaſt number of other books entirely new, has obtained, by ſearching the beſt libraries in Italy, ſome volumes of Greek commentaries upon this Philoſopher, and has delivered them to my father-in-law Henric Petri.*’

[*F*] *His edition of Polybius.*] It is that of Baſil by John Hervagius 1549 in folio. It is much better than the former one, which was printed at Haguenau in the year 1530 by John Secerius, by the care of Vincentius Opſopæus. This contained nothing but the five firſt books of Polybius with the Latin verſion of Nicholas Perrotus (11). That of Peraxylus contains alſo the ſixth book almoſt entire, and the abridgment (12) of the twelve following books, taken from the library of Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, who had cauſed it to be brought from Corfu, and from the library of Janus Moſchus (13). Beſides, it is more correct: for Peraxylus compared the Greek text of the edition of Haguenau with ſome manuſcripts, and corrected and ſupplied ſeveral paſſages. Hervagius printed the Greek by itſelf, and then the Latin verſion of Perrotus, reviſed by Muſculus, and the Latin tranſlation of the abridgment of the twelve following books, done by the ſame Muſculus.

(*c*) In the remark [*G*].

(11) It was not over-againſt the text, but by itſelf at the end of the book.

(12) They are rather extracts than an abridgment.

(13) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of Arnoldus Peraxylus Arlenius, (ſo he places his names there) to Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, before his edition of Polybius.

PEREIRA (GOMESIUS), a Spaniſh Phyſician, lived in the XVIth century. He was of a contradicting temper; for he affected to oppoſe the doctrines that were beſt eſtabliſhed, and to maintain paradoxes. The liberty of philoſophizing was a great charm to him; he made uſe of it to a great degree, and even to exceſs. The *Materia prima* which was ſo much talked of by the followers of Ariſtotle, was one of the monſters he undertook to deſtroy [*A*]. What he ſubſtituted in the room of that matter was not better than what he rejected (*a*). He uſed Galen very ill about his doctrine of Fevers. But what was more ſurprizing in his paradoxes was, his maintaining, that beaſts are meer machines, and rejecting the ſenſitive ſoul which is aſcribed to them. All thoſe things may be ſeen in his book intituled *Antoniana Margarita* [*B*]. It is pretended

(*a*) See the remark [*A*].

[*A*] *The* Materia prima . . . . *was one of the monſters he undertook to deſtroy.*] Arriaga, one of the moſt ſubtile ſchool-men of the XVIIth century, acquaints us with what was objected to our Pereira on that ſubject, and ſhews the weakneſs of ſome of thoſe objections. ‘ Recentiores nonnulli referunt quendam Gomeſium Pereiram in ſua Antoniana Margarita, negantem omnino materiam primam: contra quem plura congerunt argumenta, quæ oportet examinare, ne rem certam incertis ſuadeamus rationibus (1). . . . . Hæc argumenta non urgent Gomeſium (2)? - - *Some moderns ſay, that Gomeſius Pereira in his Antoniana Margarita utterly denies the* Materia prima: *And many arguments are brought againſt him, which ought to be well examined, leſt we ground a certainty upon uncertain reaſons. . . . . Theſe arguments do not embarraſs Gomeſius much.*’ They objected to him amongſt other things, That if his doctrine was true, it would not be lawful to venerate the bones or relics of ſaints; for after their death, there would remain no matter that had belonged to them. This is one of the five objections which he might eaſily anſwer, if we believe Arriaga, who obſerves that the opinion of that Philoſopher was not well underſtood (3). He thinks himſelf therefore obliged to ſet it down faithfully, and then he oppoſes it with ſome other reaſons. Pereira, ſays he, was not ſuch a mad-man, as to aſſert that forms are not received in a ſubject, and that man is only made up of a ſoul. He only ſaid, that the ſubject to which ſouls and other ſubſtantial forms are united, is a compound of the four elements, and not a *materia prima*, a firſt matter, and he aſcribed the ſame ſimplicity to the elements, which is aſcribed to the firſt matter in the ſchool of Ariſtotle. *Fatetur hic author libentiſſimè, in homine (& idem eſt de aliis mixtis) ultra formam ſubſtantialem dari aliquod ſubjectum recipiens illam formam: neque enim tam amens erat hic author, ut in homine & animantibus nihil aliud præter animam agnoſceret, & poſt mortem illius nihil remanere doceret quod eſſet veneratione dignum in Sanctis, & in quo manerent plura accidentia, quæ prius fuerant in homine vivo, putaretque cadavera nihil eſſe reale ſed apparens & deludens ſenſus noſtros, vel ſaltem nihil illorum antea fuiſſe, quo ſatisfacit ferè omnibus argumentis in oppoſitum. Verum in hoc recedit hic author à vera & recepta ſententia, quod illud commune ſubjectum non dicit eſſe materiam primam ſed ex quatuor elementis unitis, & inter ſe permixtis putat coaleſcere. Elementa autem ipſa omnino adſtruit ſimplicia, ſicut nos materiam primam vel formam ſubſtantialem dicimus eſſentialiter ſimplicem* (4). Arriaga was of opinion that the third objection againſt Pereira was ſomewhat ſtrong; for it proved that one of the elements produced from another, was a thing naturally made out of nothing. Pereira did not much trouble himſelf about it: he maintained that ſome creatures have a power to create, and Arriaga approves his opinion (5).

[*B*] *His book intituled* Antoniana Margarita.] That title alludes to his father's and mother's name. Don Nicolas Antonio ſpeaks of that book thus, ‘ Antoniana Margarita, opus Phyſicis, Medicis ac Theologis utile & neceſſarium, *Medinæ Campi* 1554. *fol. Francofurti deinde* 1610. . . . . *Item* novæ veteriſque Medicinæ experimentis & evidentibus rationibus comprobatæ primam partem, ſive Antonianæ Margaritæ ſecundam, quæ quidem Medica eſt poſt priorem illam Philoſophicam. *Hæc ſcilicet pars de Febribus tractat, cujus febris eſſentiam, cauſas & ſpecies eſſe uſque in hæc tempora ignota dilucide (uti Author ipſe ait) demonſtrat*, Galenumque non dolo ſed ignorantia excæcatum potiſſimum ſuis de hac re ſcriptis medicis poſteris impoſuiſſe evidenter docet (6). - - - *Antoniana Margarita is a book very uſeful and neceſſary for Philoſophers, Phyſicians, and Divines, it was printed at* Medina del Campo in 1554 fol. and afterwards at Francfort in 1610. . . . . Alſo, *the firſt part* tended by ſome, that Carteſius took from him his paradox concerning the ſouls of beaſts; and that Pereira was not the inventer of it. We ſhall ſee what is to be found about it in the News from the Republic of Letters [*C*]. And I ſhall obſerve, that the epocha

---

(1) Rod. de Arriaga, Diſput. II, Phyſica, §. i, pag. m. 217.

(2) Ibid. *pag.* 218.

(3) Hæc argumenta non urgent Gomeſium, multo aliter opinantem de entibus naturalibus quam iſti Authores cenſeant. *Ibid.*

(4) Ibid.

(5) Reſpondet Gomeſius falſum eſſe nullam creaturam poſſe creare, nec facile hanc ſolutionem redargues ut infra patebit. *Ib.*

(6) Nicol. Antonius, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. *Tom. i, pag.* 414.

part of modern and ancient medicine proved by experiments and clear reaſon, or the ſecond part of Antoniana Margarita, which indeed is medicinal as the firſt is philoſophical. For this part treats of Fevers, the nature, cauſes, and kinds of which, he clearly proves (as the author himſelf ſays) to have been hitherto unknown, and evidently ſhews that *Galen impoſed on poſterity in his writings on this ſubject, not through malice but ignorance.*' An anonymous author wrote a Spaniſh book againſt him in the year 1556 (7). Antoniana Margarita is grown very ſcarce. It was in Mr Briot's library, which was ſold at Paris in the year 1679. Mr Faure bought it, he had it for two Louis d'ors, he ſhewed it me, and told me, that he did not think he ſhould have had it ſo cheap. I think that book and the whole library of Mr Faure is now in the library of the archbiſhop of Rheims.

I find in the Bibliotheque of the writers that have been Phyſicians (8), that Pereira's name was Georgius Gomez, and that his Antoniana Margarita, *in qua omnium pene morborum diſcurſus proponuntur*, - - - *in which almoſt all diſeaſes are treated of*, was printed at Medina (9) by Antony Graſbeet in the year 1554 and 1587, and that he publiſhed in the ſame city in 1558, another book in folio, intituled, *Nova veraque Medicina Chriſtiana ratione comprobata*. Konig has committed ſeveral groſs miſtakes, ſpeaking of that author. ‘Bruta, *ſays he* (10), ſenſu prædita eſſe opere operoſo & 30 annis elaborato, cui titulus Antoniana Margarita, oſtendere conatus eſt. - - - *He endeavoured to ſhew in a work, intituled, Antoniana Margarita, that coſt him a great deal of labour, and which he was* 30 *years in compoſing, that beaſts have no ſenſitive ſouls.*' Every body will not be ſenſible that the particle *non* was omitted after the word *prædita*; and they, who do not perceive it, will think it is a riddle, or laugh at it. They will look upon Pereira as the greateſt fool that ever was, for having ſpent thirty years to prove that beaſts have ſenſitive ſouls. On the other ſide, they who are ſenſible of that omiſſion, will be apt to believe, that this Spaniſh Phyſician had no other deſign than to prove that beaſts have no feeling; whereas it is but a very ſmall part of his book. Konig goes on, and ſays, ‘Ex eo omnia Carteſium hauſiſſe quæ de brutorum anima commentatus eſt, Olaus Borrichius in Epiſtola quadam *aff.* - - - *Olaus Borrichius, in a certain epiſtle, affirms, that Des Cartes had from thence all that he wrote concerning the ſouls of brutes.*' This is falſe again. We ſhall ſee by and by that Des Cartes was of that opinion, before he heard of Pereira. It is certain at leaſt that the book of that Spaniard could only make him believe in general that beaſts have no feeling. Every thing beſides is particular to the French Philoſopher, and neither ariſes from the hypotheſis, nor from the explanations of Pereira. Nicolas Antonio ſays nothing of the anſwer to the objections of Palacios publiſhed by Pereira in the year 1555.

[*C*] *What is to be found about it in the News from the Republic of Letters.*] ‘Any body would have laid a wager that no man would ever be ſo mad as to maintain the contrary (11). Yet there was one in the laſt century, who ventured to broach that paradox in a country where no body would have ſuſpected that ſuch a new doctrine ſhould take its birth. The reader will know what I mean, if I only add, that it was a Spaniſh Phyſician who publiſhed that doctrine at *Medina del Campo* in the year 1554, in a book about which he had been thirty years, and which he intituled *Antoniana Margarita*, out of reſpect to his father's and mother's name. Who would have thought that Spain, where the freedom of the mind is leſs tolerated than that of the body in Turkey, would produce ſo raſh a Philoſopher, as to maintain that beaſts have no feeling? It is ſo extraordinary a thing that it does very well deſerve to be mentioned in this place; and we ought not to ſuppreſs the name of this fine gentleman, who is the firſt author, that we know, of that unheard of paradox. His name was Gomeſius Pereira, he lived in the laſt century, and not in the twelfth, as the abbot de Gerard, Doctor of Divinity, ſays in his conferences concerning the *Philoſophy of Courtiers*. Gomeſius Pereira was vigorouſly attacked by a divine of Salamanca, whoſe name was Michael de Palacios, and anſwered him as vigorouſly, ſticking to his opinion, *that beaſts are meer machines*. But he had no followers, his doctrine died with him. No body did him the honour to dread him, ſo that he was not better known in our age than if he had never lived; and it is very likely that Carteſius, who read not much, had never heard of him. Yet ſome pretend that he took from that Spaniſh Philoſopher his opinion concerning beaſts; for by ſaying ſo, they think to deprive him of the glory of invention, and this is ſtill ſo much gained over him (12).' Some time after the author of thoſe News publiſhed an abſtract of a letter which he had received from Paris; it contained amongſt other things, the following words, *What you ſay, pag.* 23, *is not true, that Mr Des Cartes's opinion about the ſouls of beaſts is a new one; for there has been formerly ſome diſputes about it, as it appears from this paſſage of St Auguſtin*, de quantitate animæ *chap.* 30. ‘Quod autem tibi viſum eſt non eſſe animam in corpore viventis animantis, quamquam videatur abſurdum, non tamen doctiſſimi homines quibus id placuit DEFUERUNT, neque nunc arbitror DEESSE (13). - - - *As to your opinion that there is no ſoul in the body of a beaſt, tho' it may ſeem abſurd, yet there have been ſome very learned men, who were of that opinion, and I believe there are ſome now.*' The author received another letter, wherein he was told that Des Cartes's opinion was much older than St Auguſtin. Mr du Rondel wrote that letter. An abſtract of it was inſerted in the News of October 1684. I am going to tranſcribe it, and, for the ſatisfaction of the readers, I ſhall ſhew in the margin in what books they may find the authorities cited (14). ‘There has been ſome doubts about the ſouls of beaſts, not only in St Auguſtin's time, but alſo in the time of the Cæſars, that is to ſay above three hundred years before that Father of the church. The Stoics ſpoke of nothing elſe, and went ſo far as to maintain in their ſchools, that there is but a meer reſemblance between our actions and thoſe of beaſts, and that there is a nature altogether different in men and beaſts. I would not have you think that they ſaid ſo only of certain actions of which we have but little or no perception, ſuch as digeſtion, ſanguification, conception, *&c.* They underſtood it alſo of the moſt lively, violent, and ſenſible paſſions. They believed that a lion was not angry, though he tore in pieces every body he met in the amphitheater. They ſaid that his blood fumed and boiled within him, being put into a heat by ſome objects diſagreeable to the nature of that animal. *Impetus habent feræ, rabiem, feritatem, incurſum; iram quidem non magis quàm luxuriam* (15). ---- *Wild beaſts have violence, rage, fury, and will fall upon one: but they can no more be ſaid to be capable of anger than of luxury.* Why ſo? Becauſe, Sir, it happened in Seneca's time that a lion ſaved the life of an unfortunate man, without pretending that he ſhould be obliged to him for it, and without deſigning to do a good thing, *Quia nec voluit facere, nec bene faciendi animo fecit* (16). Beſides, if beaſts were capable of being angry, they would be alſo capable of forgiving. But becauſe clemency is an effect of reaſon, and beaſts are deprived of it, thoſe Stoics concluded that beaſts are not ſuſceptible of anger, nor of any other paſſion. *Iraſci non magis ſciunt quàm ignoſcere; & quamvis rationi inimica ſit ira, nuſquam tamen naſcitur, niſi ubi rationi locus eſt. Tota ferarum ut extra, ita intra, forma humanæ diſſimilis eſt* (17). - - - *They are no more capable of being angry than of forgiving: and tho' anger be contrary to reaſon, yet it never exiſts, but where there is room for reaſon. The whole form of beaſts, within as well as without, is unlike the human form.* But, Sir, a Cynic ſaid all thoſe things above three hundred years before the Stoics of Rome. He believed and taught in expreſs words, that beaſts had neither feeling nor knowledge. It is pity that Pereira knew nothing of all this; he would not have failed to make uſe of it

againſt

---

(7) Adverſus hanc ſcripſit Anonymus Hiſpanum opuſculum ita nuncupatum, *Endecalogo contra Antoniana Margarita*, Medinæ Campi 1556, 8vo. *Ibid.*

(8) Lindenius renovatus, *pag.* 328.

(9) Metymnæ Duelli. *Ibid.*

(10) Konig. Bibl. Vetus & Nova, *pag.* 619.

(11) That is to ſay, that beaſts have no feeling.

(12) News from the Republic of Letters, March 1684, Art. II, p. 20, & ſeq. It is very likely that Furetiere took from hence what we read, pag. 27, of the *Fureteriana*, edition of Bruſſels. Read there *Antoniana* inſtead of *Antonima*.

(13) News from the Republic, Auguſt 1684, Art. i, pag. 555, 556.

(14) Ibid. October 1684, Art. xi, pag. 838, & ſeq.

(15) Seneca, *lib. i*, de Ira, *cap. iii.*

(16) Ibid. de Benef. *lib. ii*, *cap. xix.*

(17) Ibid. de Ira, *lib. i*, *cap. iii.*

against thoſe who accuſed him of publiſhing a ſtrange novelty, and would have laughed at the notable learning of his adverſaries. Here are the words of that Cynic: διὰ δὲ τὸ, he ſpeaks of beaſts, τὰ μὲν πυκνότητι, τὰ δὲ πλεονασμῷ τῆς ὑγρασίας μητὲ διανοεῖσθαι, μητὲ αἰσθάνεσθαι (18), that they can have neither knowledge nor feeling, becauſe of the groſſneſs of their conſtitution, and of their great quantity of moiſture. I do not ſay that I approve this reaſoning of Diogenes.' The recantation of the firſt abſtract is to be found in the News of April 1685. Read what follows, *He who informed us that St Auguſtin ſays, that ſome maintained in his time that beaſts have no ſouls, has lately acquainted us that having conſulted the 30th chapter of the book* de quantitate animæ, *where he had been told that this was contained, he found nothing in it that has any relation to the opinion of Gomeſius Pereira. So that my remark is true ſtill in that reſpect,* viz. that no body before Gomeſius Pereira taught that beaſts are meer machines. *It remains only to enquire, whether the paſſages quoted by Mr du Rondel in the News of October prove what he pretends* (19). Theſe laſt words put Mr du Rondel upon collecting ſeveral proofs. He deſigned to impart them to me, but he loſt them, except what follows.

‘ (20) It is certain that Diogenes could not believe that beaſts have ſouls, by reaſon of his phyſical principles, and the end of his morals. He taught that there are ſome Beings and ſome half-Beings. The firſt are what they are by their own eſſence, and the ſecond exiſt with the firſt only by participation, or imitation, as the Cynics ſpeak. The ſecond are of two ſorts. Some imitate the ſpirit, and affect a circular motion, and ſome imitate the ſoul, and move in a ſtraight line: τὰ μὲν Νοῦν μιμεῖται, καὶ κύκλῳ κινεῖται, τὰ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐπ' εὐθείας. You may eaſily gueſs by that circular motion, that he underſtood the heavenly orbs. But he meant eſpecially the Lactean circle, to which the Cynics, as well as ſome other Philoſophers, aſſigned the origin of paſſions, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ παθητὸν ἔρχεσθαι σῶμα. But if we conſider how the antients deſcribed the deſcent of ſouls through thoſe circles, it is impoſſible that beaſts ſhould have any true paſſions. For going through the ſphere of Jupiter a ſoul puts on ambition, careleſſneſs in that of Saturn, pride in that of Mars, covetouſneſs in that of Mercury, &c (21). . . . So that ſeeing the like paſſions are not obſerved in beaſts, at leaſt in the ſame manner as they are obſerved in man, it follows that they have not ſouls, which are the common ſeat of paſſions, or that their paſſions are only counterfeit, or ſomething like thoſe of men, by a fortuitous imitation. And therefore the Cynics placed beaſts amongſt the bodies which move in a ſtraight line, that is to ſay, amongſt heavy bodies which have a tendency towards the earth. Indeed the nature of beaſts is always the ſame, and keeps always it's ordinary determination. There is no difference nor variety in their occupations. They are all condemned to the ſame rule, and their capacity does not reach much farther than to look for ſhelter and food; and therefore it has been ſaid of them, that they have no inclinations but what are mean, dull, and baſe, and that nature had made them on purpoſe to ſtoop towards the earth. Prona ſunt, & ex ipſa quoque ſuſpiciendi difficultate à ſuperis receſſerunt, nec ullam divinorum corporum ſimilitudinem aliqua ſui parte meruerunt, nihil ex mente ſortita ſunt, & ideo ratione caruerunt, duo quoque tantum adepta ſunt, ſentire vel creſcere, - - - *they have only obtained two things, to feel and to grow,* ſays Macrobius (22) with this reſtriction of Virgil, Quantum non noxia corpora tardant Terrenique hebetant artus, - - - *as far as not controlled by their terreſtrial bodies, nor clogged and damped by their dull fleſh.* Becauſe, as he goes on, in animalibus hebeſcit uſus animæ DENSITATE corporis; - - - *the edge of the ſoul is blunted in animals by the* THICKNESS *of the body.* Which ſeems to be tranſlated from Diogenes, who ſays, that *beaſts can have no feeling nor knowledge, by reaſon of the* THICKNESS *and great quantity of their moiſture.* See Plutarch lib. 5. cap. 20. It ſeems, I ſay, that Macrobius tranſlated it from Diogenes, and it is likely enough ſince he made uſe of the ſame word; but I do not know very well whether Virgil, with his *noxia corpora* (23), had in view what follows in Diogenes, *That beaſts are like mad-men deprived of reaſon,* διακεῖσθαι τοῖς μεμηνόσι, παρεπταικότος τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ. For the word *noxia* implies damage and loſs, yet μεμηνόσι ſeems to ſignify ſomething more: and therefore a Cynic commentator, to make us apprehend it, explains it, by the image of men poſſeſſed with devils. He ſays, That when human ſouls go out of their bodies, and look for another habitation, if they meet with no other ſubjects but ſuch wherein reaſon never dwelt, they follow and haraſs them, and never inform them as they do organized bodies deſigned for them, ὥσπερ οἱ εἰληχότες ἡμᾶς Δαίμονες, - - - *as Devils haunt us.* But you will tell me, that theſe are Platonic thoughts, which do not very well agree with the Cynics opinion. I cannot help it. Salluſt the Cynic ſays ſo: Beſides Diogenes was not ſo far from Platoniſm as it is commonly thought. One Tiberianus tells us in his Socrates, that Diogenes poſſeſſed himſelf of the whole philoſophical patrimony of Plato: Memores Platonis ſententiæ, cujus hæreditatem Diogenes Cynicus invadens, nihil ibi plus * aureâ linguâ invenit. - - - *Remembering the ſaying of Plato, whoſe patrimony Diogenes the Cynic ſeized on, and found nothing more than a golden tongue.*'

‘ But what I ſay of Diogenes will better appear from the end of his morals. His opinion was, that if a man will live as he ought to do, he muſt be inſenſible; and tho' this ſeems a ſtrange and even impoſſible thing, yet that Philoſopher muſt needs have attained to that Philoſophical ſtate of life, for the Ancients are too poſitive about it to be deceived in it. I do not know whether, in order to it, he made uſe of Chiron's precepts mentioned by Maximus Tyrius. I do not know neither, whether he followed the rules of Antiſthenes, who is the author the Apathia: but *as he was an angel of Jupiter, ſent to men, to teach them what is good and what is evil,* as Epictetus ſays, I am apt to believe that he was directed by his own thoughts and inclinations. As he uſed to ſay, that *reaſon muſt be oppoſed to paſſion, courage to fortune, and nature to cuſtom,* he reſolved at laſt to follow the deſign of nature, and fancied that whoever will be a true ſon of that good mother, ought to be like beaſts, who are a genuine and true image thereof in the places of their birth. Diogenes embraced therefore that opinion, and put it in practice by poverty, faſting, and aſcetics, which he had the honour to invent. It is ſaid that Alexander the Great, being ready to undertake the conqueſt of India, and being ſure of his deſtiny, had ſo much courage as to wiſh to be Diogenes. He envied the ſecurity of that Philoſopher, and a Cynical life ſeemed to him to exceed nature. Diſputare cum Socrate licet, dubitare cum Carneade, cum Epicuro quieſcere, hominis naturam cum Stoicis vincere, cum CYNICIS EXCEDERE (24). - - - - *One may diſpute with Socrates, doubt with Carneades, be undiſturbed with Epicurus, overcome nature with the Stoics, and* EXCEED IT WITH THE CYNICS. Indeed ſuch an inſenſibility is a very ſtrange ſtate, and whoever attained to it, paid always very dear for it: ‘ Iſtuc nihil dolere, non ſine magnâ mercede contingit, immanitatis in animo, ſtuporis in corpore (25). - - - *That unconcernedneſs is not purchaſed but at the great price of inſenſibility of heart, and ſtupidity of body.* But it is a very convenient ſtate for the miſeries of this life. Every Heathen had been glad if what has been ſaid of certain nations not unknown to you, ſhould have been ſaid of them. Victui herba, veſtitui pelles, cubile humus. Id beatius arbitrantur, quam ingemere agris, illaborare domibus, ſuas alienaſque fortunas ſpe metuque verſare. Securi adverſus homines, ſecuri adverſus Deos, rem difficillimam aſſecuti ſunt, ut illis ne voto quidem opus ſit. - - - - *Herbs are their food, ſkins their cloathing, and the ground their bed. This they think more happy than to ſweat in ploughing the fields, to labour in building houſes, and to be diſquieted with hopes and fears about their own and other peoples wealth. Being ſecure againſt men, ſecure againſt the gods, they have attained to a very difficult point, not to ſtand in need of thoſe things, nor even to wiſh for them.*'

If I could often preſent my readers with a borrowed erudition as exquiſite and profound as this is, how great an ornament would it be to this Dictionary? I ſhall quote (26) ſome paſſages of Ariſtotle, which ſeem to prove that he took beaſts for machines.

---

(18) Plut. de Placit. Philoſ. *lib. v, cap. xx, pag. m.* 909.

(19) News from the Republic of Letters, April 1685, pag. 435.

(20) Mr du Rondel in a Memoir which he did me the favour to ſend me in March 1696. I have added the citations in the margin.

(21) *See* Macrobius, in Somnium Scipion. *lib. i, cap. xii.*

(22) Ibid. *cap. xiv, pag. m.* 55.

(23) Virgil. Æneid. lib. VI, ver. 731.

* It is the Art of Living well. That paſſage of Tiberianus is quoted upon the account of Virgil's Golden Bough.

(24) Seneca, de Brevitate Vitæ, *cap. xiv, pag. m.* 711.

(25) Cicer. Tuſc. Quæſt. *lib. iii.*

(26) In the remark [*H*].

epocha of that opinion of Carteſius is falſely ſtated in that book [*D*]. If it be a ſtrange doctrine we ought not to wonder at it; for of all phyſical objects, none is more abſtruſe and perplexing than the ſouls of beaſts. The oppoſite opinions about that ſubject are abſurd or very dangerous; and it is impoſſible to keep a medium. I hope the reader will excuſe me for publiſhing, on this occaſion, ſome collections which I have made concerning the opinions of the antients and moderns, about the nature of thoſe ſouls [*E*]. Many readers will ſay, that I am too long, but the learned will think that I do

---

[*D*] *The epocha of that opinion of Carteſius is falſly ſtated in the News from the Republic of Letters.*] ‘Gomeſius Pereira inferred not his paradox from its true principles, and did not foreſee the conſequences of it, and therefore Des Cartes may be looked upon as the firſt who found it out by a philoſophical method. Yet I think it is very probable that he found it, without looking for it. It is likely that he begun and ended his meditations, without thinking of the ſouls of beaſts, and without forſaking the opinion he had of them from his tender years: but when he came to conſider the conſequences of his principle concerning the diſtinction between thinking and extended ſubſtances, he perceived that the knowledge of beaſts deſtroyed the whole oeconomy of his ſyſtem. Nay it may be that this difficulty did not come into his mind, before it was objected to him. He was therefore neceſſitated to aſſert that beaſts have no ſenſe. Had he been able to defend his principles without it, he had never oppoſed an opinion which has not only appeared undeniable to every body, but is alſo attended with an evidence almoſt invincible (27).’ That we may know whether that author was miſtaken, let us ſee how he explained himſelf. His explication is to be found at the end of his preface, which was publiſhed together with the paſſage that wanted to be cleared. *I have ſaid in the ſecond article of theſe News*, that it is likely Mr Des Cartes begun and ended his meditations, without thinking of the ſouls of beaſts, and without forſaking the opinion he had of them from his tender years. *This would be an error in fact if I meant his ſix famous meditations, which were dedicated to the Sorbonne, and againſt which they raiſed ſo many objections; for it does plainly appear from his Method, printed in the year* 1637, *before thoſe ſix meditations, that Mr Des Cartes believed already that beaſts have no ſouls. I declare therefore that by Mr Des Cartes's Meditations I did not mean thoſe which he dedicated to the Sorbonne. My meaning is, that it is likely he built a new ſyſtem in his mind, without thinking of the ſenſitive ſouls of beaſts. I do not doubt but he finiſhed the conſtruction of his work in his mind, before he publiſhed his Method* (28). It is certain notwithſtanding this explication, that this author was miſtaken; for the hypotheſis about Automata is one of the moſt ancient ſpeculations of Des Cartes, as Mr Baillet has made it out. Here are his words (29). *Thoſe who ſuppoſe that thoſe works of Mr Des Cartes were compoſed in the year* 1619, *make his opinion about the ſouls of beaſts twenty years older than his adverſaries, and ſome learned men beſides, did. That opinion was found in the works which he writ in his youth, and therefore it cannot be ſaid, that ‘he begun and ended his Meditations without thinking of the ſouls of beaſts, and without forſaking the opinion he had of them from his tender years. Neither can it be ſaid that when he came to conſider the conſequences of his principle, concerning the diſtinction between thinking and extended ſubſtances, he perceived that the knowledge of beaſts deſtroyed the whole oeconomy of his ſyſtem.’ It will no longer be imagined, that the neceſſity he was under to anſwer the objections ſtarted upon this ſubject, ſuggeſted to him a ſentiment for which he was only beholden to the freedom of his thoughts. He was not yet neceſſitated to aſſert that beaſts have no ſenſe, ſince he could not foreſee what might happen to him twenty years after. He had then no principles to defend, for he had laid down none yet for the New Philoſophy: at leaſt he had not yet read at that age, St Auguſtin, nor Pereira, nor any author from whom he might have had that opinion concerning the ſouls of beaſts. Mr Des Cartes being returned from his* † *travels to Paris five or ſix years after, diſcovered that opinion to ſome of his friends, and gave them to underſtand, that he could not believe that beaſts are any thing elſe but machines. So that they who find it difficult to aſcribe that opinion to him ever ſince the year* 1619, *will more readily believe that it came into his mind about the year* 1625 *at fartheſt. Perhaps they will not refuſe to believe Mr Des Cartes himſelf* †, *who tells us, that it came into his mind fifteen or ſixteen years before he publiſhed his Metaphyſical Meditations. As for the reſt, that opinion concerning the ſouls of beaſts is what Mr Paſcal eſteemed moſt in Mr Des Cartes's Philoſophy.* Mr Baillet was ſo civil to the author of the News from the Republic of Letters, as to refute him without naming him; and, on the contrary, he named him when he ſpoke a thought which he approved of. This is, in a manner, an exceſs of ceremony, prejudicial to the liberty which every body ought to enjoy in the commonwealth of learning: it is to introduce into it works of ſupererogation; every body muſt be allowed to name thoſe whom he refutes; and it is enough to forbear ſharp, injurious, and uncivil, expreſſions.

Here is another paſſage of Mr Baillet, which concerns the ſame ſubject. ‘It has been thought by ſeveral, that Mr Des Cartes had his famous opinion concerning the ſouls of beaſts . . . from the book of Gomeſius Pereira . . . But one may very well doubt, whether Mr Des Cartes ever heard of Pereira, and whether his book, which has been always ſcarce, ever fell into the hands of a man who cared ſo little for books and reading as our Philoſopher did. But all uncertainty in this matter is removed, ſeeing Mr Des Cartes had not ſeen Pereira's book the year after the publication of his Metaphyſical Meditations ‡, and had made known his opinion about beaſts above fifteen or twenty years before, as has been ſaid in the firſt book of this Hiſtory. Beſides, as Mr Bayle has well obſerved ‡‡, Pereira having not inferred his paradox from it's true principles, and having not foreſeen the conſequences of it, Des Cartes may be looked upon as the firſt who found it out by a philoſophical method. Moreover, Pereira was not the inventer of that doctrine, it was debated by very learned men in St Auguſtin's time *, as a thing which might be defended well enough, notwithſtanding the apparent abſurdity which the vulgar found in it. That opinion was older ſtill than St Auguſtin, Seneca, and the firſt Cæſars **, according to Mr du Rondel's obſervation, who carries it as far as the Stoics and Cynics (30).’

[*E*] *Concerning the opinions . . . about the ſouls of beaſts.*] Moſt of the antient Philoſophers taught, that the ſouls of beaſts were rational: from whence it follows, that they believed thoſe ſouls differed but as more and leſs from thoſe of men. Anaxagoras placed that difference in this, *viz.* that men are able to explain their reaſonings, whereas beaſts cannot explain theirs. Ἀναξαγόρας πάντα ζῶα λόγον ἔχειν τὸν ἐνεργητικόν, τὸν δ᾽ οἱονεὶ νοῦν μὴ ἔχειν τὸν παθητικόν, τὸν λεγόμενον τοῦ νοῦ ἑρμηνέα. *Anaxagoras omnia animalia habere mentem agentem: non item patientem, qui eſt mentis quaſi interpres* (31). Pythagoras and Plato had the ſame thoughts; for they ſaid, that the ſouls of beaſts, tho' truly rational, act not according to reaſon, becauſe they want the uſe of ſpeech, and their organs are not well proportioned (32). It were to be wiſhed, that Plutarch who knew ſo well how to enlarge finely on ſubjects, when he had a mind to it, had not been ſo laconic on this occaſion: but tho' his language be never ſo conciſe, we can have no doubts about the doctrine of Pythagoras. We ſee clearly enough, that according to that Philoſopher, the ſoul of a beaſt does not ſubſtantially differ from the ſoul of a man; for he taught the tranſmigration of ſouls, that is to ſay, that they paſs indifferently from the body of a man into that of a beaſt, and from the body of a beaſt into that of a man. Few opinions have had more followers than that. I do not believe that any Philoſopher ſpoke more advantageouſly of the ſouls of beaſts than Porphyry; he allowed them not only reaſon, but alſo the faculty of making their reaſoning to be underſtood: he believed alſo, that their language had been underſtood by ſome men, and that men are above beaſts, only

---

(27) News from the Republic of Letters, March 1684, pag. 22.

(28) Ibid. at the end of the preface.

(29) Baillet, Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. i, pag.* 51, 52.

† See the MS Letter of Iſaac Beeckman to Father Merſennes in 1631, from whence it is inferred, that he imparted his opinion about the ſouls of beaſts to his friends a long time before.

† Compare the MS treatiſes *Thaumantis Regia*, wrote in his youth, and another which he quotes in his Method, as having been wrote a great while before, with the letters of the third Tome, pag. 63, and of the ſecond Tome, pag. 9, 37, 230.

‡ He ſent word to Father Merſennes, that he had never ſeen that book, Letter MS of the 23d of June 1641.

‡‡ News from the Republic of Letters, 1684, Tom. i, pag. 22.

* Tom. ii, pag. 12. News from the Republic of Letters, *Auguſtin. cap. xxx, de Quantitate Animæ.*

** News, ibid. *pag.* 291.

(30) Baillet, Life of Des Cartes, *Tom. ii, pag.* 537.

(31) Plut. de Placit. Philoſ. *lib. v, cap. xx, pag.* 908.

(32) Οὐ μὴν λογικῶς ἐνεργούσας παρὰ τὴν δυσκρασίαν τῶν σωμάτων καὶ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τὸ φραστικόν. Non tamen ea agere ſecundum rationem, idque fieri ob incommodum corporum temperamentum & quia loquela deſtituuntur. *Ibid. pag.* 909.

I do not ſay the fourth part of what they might ſay upon this ſubject. They will ſay the ſame only becauſe their reaſons are more refined. ‘Porphyrius, lib. 3. de abſtinentia, ſtatuit naturam omnibus animantibus, quibus ſenſum & memoriam dedit, rationem quoque, imo & orationem, tam internam quam externam, tribuiſſe: additque, Apollonium Tyanæum, Melampum, Tireſiam, & Thaletem, brutorem ſermones dijudicaſſe atque intellexiſſe: quos nihil mirum ſi non intelligamus ipſi, qui plurimarum etiam nationum linguam minimè callemus. Aſſerit itaque brutæ rationem participare, neque per eam ab illis hominem ſimpliciter diſtingui; ſed quòd homini perfectum rationis acumen inſit, illis imperfectum (33). - - - *Porphyry, concerning abſtinence, ſays, that nature, which has given to all animals ſenſe and memory, has likewiſe given them reaſon, nay, and ſpeech too, both internal and external: and adds, that Apollonius Tyanæus, Melampus, Tireſias, and Thales, knew, and underſtood the language of brutes: which it is no wonder if we do not underſtand, who do not even know the language of moſt nations. He affirms therefore that brutes partake of reaſon, and that man is diſtinguiſhed from them, only becauſe his reaſoning is more refined.*’ He proves it by ſome reaſons and authorities: he quotes Empedocles, Plato, and Ariſtotle. ‘Confirmat iſtiuſmodi dogma in primis ex mutua ſignificatione, qua inter ſe bruta utuntur, quod in avibus potiſſimùm apparet, quæ ſibi occinunt viciſſimque reſpondent. Deinde, ex admirabili ſolertia, curaque in futurum proſpiciendi, utilia conſectandi, declinandi adverſa. Præterea, teſtimonio Empedoclis & Platonis, atque etiam Ariſtotelis, quos idem cenſuiſſe, ex eorum dictis ſcriptiſque haberi ait (34). *He confirms this doctrine, firſt, from the mutual information which brute animals give to one another, and paticularly birds, which ſing to, and anſwer one another by turns. Secondly, from their admirable ſagacity and foreſight, in purſuing what is uſeful, and avoiding what is hurtful to them. And laſtly, from the teſtimony of Empedocles, Plato, and Ariſtotle, who, he ſays, were of the ſame opinion, as appears from their ſayings and writings.*’ Thoſe who alledge theſe words, pretend, that Ariſtotle is not quoted to the purpoſe (35); they ſay, that he aſcribes only to beaſts an image, or copy, of reaſon, and they laugh at that pretended language which was underſtood by Tireſias, Melampus, *&c.* whereupon they obſerve, that a Rabbin followed the error of Porphyry, and believed that Solomon underſtood the ſame language. *Quod item addebat Porphyrius, bruta inter ſe colloqui, & à quibuſdam intelligi, non ita eſt, etſi ita eſſe crediderit quidam ex Hebræis doctoribus, teſte Abulenſi ad capit.* 3. *lib.* 3. *Regum quæſt.* 11. *aſſerens, eorum voces percaluiſſe Salomonem* (36.) Perhaps it would not be an eaſy thing for them to ſhew, that their Ariſtotle acknowledged a ſubſtantial difference between the ſouls of brutes and thoſe of men: for if they ſhould ſay, that he believed not that beaſts act by reaſon, it would not be a good proof; ſince it is certain that children and mad-people have a ſoul of the ſame ſpecies with the moſt rational men, and that moſt beaſts ſhew more reaſon than children of one year of age, and diſtracted perſons. So that one would think Ariſtotle acknowledged only more or leſs difference between the ſouls of beaſts and thoſe of men, and that he believed the ſoul of man reaſoned ſubtilly and eaſily, and the ſoul of a beaſt but confuſedly, becauſe of the difference of their organs. Which might be confirmed, by the opinion of thoſe who ſay, that he believed not the immortality of the ſoul (37).

There is one thing to be obſerved, *viz.* It does not appear, that the antients, when they left the poetical or oratorian ſtyle, acknowledged a real difference between a human ſoul and matter. I do not mean thick, heavy, and palpable matter, but that which the Chymiſts call ſpirits, which is as eſſentially body and matter as dirt and fleſh can be. They could not therefore believe, that the ſouls of men and beaſts ſhould differ otherwiſe than more or leſs, and according to their ſeveral degrees of ſubtilty; and conſequently they muſt have believed, that the meer diſpoſition of the organs hindered reaſon from appearing in beaſts, as it appears in men. It was, without doubt, the opinion of Galen; for he believed not that our ſouls are incorporeal; he did not diſtinguiſh them from natural heat, and the harmony of the conſtitution (38.) I know that ſeveral have ſaid, that the ſouls of men deſcended from Heaven; but it does not prove, that they believed them to be immaterial (39). Beſides, the Stoics taught, that all ſouls, without any exception, flowed from the ſame ſource, *viz.* the *Anima Mundi. Perſuaſum iis, à Deo, id eſt Mundi animâ, animam hanc eſſe. Laërtius* †: Τῆς τῶν ὅλων ψυχῆς μέρη εἶναι τὰς ἐν τοῖς ζώοις: Animæ univerſi, partes eſſe animantium Animas. *Omniumne animantium? omnium: ſed aliæ aliis magis participant, ut ſunt corpora & inſtrumenta. Eſt Socraticum* ‡: Mundi animam, fontem animarum omnium eſſe. *Sed illam, quæ ratione uteretur, cognatam & participem, imo jam partem divinitatis eſſe. Plutarchus:* ‡ Ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ μετασχοῦσα νοῦ καὶ λογισμοῦ, οὐκ ἔργον ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέρος, οὐδ᾽ ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ αὐτοῦ γέγονεν: Anima mentis & ratiocinationis conſors, non opus ſolum Dei; ſed & Pars eſt; neque ab ipſo, ſed ex ipſo eſt facta. *Enimvero etiam aliæ (hac ratione) partes Dei, id eſt mundanæ animæ: ſed iſta ſcilicet eximiè, & quæ proximè vim naturamque ejus referret* (40). Therefore how could they believe that the ſouls of beaſts had no ſenſe? I do not think they believed it; and if Seneca ſaid the contrary in the paſſages mentioned by the learned Mr du Rondel, it is plain he has refuted himſelf in ſome others. Read his laſt letter, and you will ſee that he only deprives beaſts of reaſon, wiſdom, true goodneſs, and felicity, and not of ſenſe. ‘In quo non poteſt beata vita eſſe, nec id poteſt quo beata vita efficitur: beata autem vita bonis efficitur: in muto animali non eſt quo beata vita efficitur: ergo in muto animali bonum non eſt. Mutum animal SENSU comprehendit præſentia: præteritorum reminiſcitur, cùm id incidit, quo ſenſus admonetur: tanquam equus reminiſcitur viæ, cùm ad initium ejus admotus eſt. In ſtabulo quidem nullæ viæ, quamvis ſæpè calcatæ, memoria eſt. . . . Nec illud nego, ad ea quæ videntur ſecundùm naturam, magnos eſſe mutis animalibus impetus & concitatos, ſed inordinatos ac turbidos. Nunquam autem aut inordinatum eſt bonum, aut turbidum. Quid ergo, inquis, muta animalia perturbatè & indiſpoſitè moventur? Dicerem illa perturbatè & indiſpoſitè moveri, ſi natura illorum ordinem caperet: nunc moventur ſecundùm naturam ſuam. Perturbatum enim id eſt, quod eſſe aliquando & non perturbatum poteſt. Sollicitum eſt, quod poteſt eſſe ſecurum. Nulli vitium eſt, niſi cui virtus poteſt eſſe. Multis animalibus talis ex ſuâ naturâ motus eſt. Sed ne te diu teneam, aliquod erit bonum in muto animali, erit aliqua virtus, erit aliquid perfectum: ſed quale? nec bonum abſolutè, nec virtus, nec perfectum. Hæc enim rationalibus ſolis contingunt, quibus datum eſt ſcire, quare, quatenus, quemadmodum. Ita bonum in nullo eſt, niſi in quo ratio (41). - - - *That in which life cannot be happy, cannot do that whereby life is rendered happy: but life is rendered happy in the good: in a mute beaſt there is nothing whereby life is rendered happy; therefore in a mute beaſt there is no goodneſs. A mute beaſt by* SENSATION *comprehends the preſent, and remembers the paſt, when any thing happens to excite that ſenſation: as for inſtance, an horſe remembers a road when he is brought to the beginning of it. In the ſtable indeed he remembers nothing of a road, how often ſoever he may have gone in it. . . . Nor do I deny but that mute beaſts by nature have great and violent tranſports at thoſe things they ſee, but thoſe tranſports are inordinate and confuſed. But what is inordinate or confuſed cannot be good. What then, ſay you, are beaſts moved inordinately and confuſedly? I ſhould ſay they are moved confuſedly and inordinately, if their nature were capable of order; now they are moved according to nature. For that is confuſed, which may be ſometimes not confuſed. That is anxious, which may be unconcerned. Nothing has vice but what may have virtue. Brute animals have ſuch a motion from their own nature. But not to detain you longer, there will be ſome goodneſs, ſome virtue, ſome perfection in a beaſt: of what kind is it? It is not goodneſs, nor virtue, nor perfection in an abſolute ſenſe. Theſe only happen to rational Beings, who have a capacity to underſtand, why, how, and how far. So there is goodneſs in nothing, but what is endowed with reaſon.*’ Seneca lays down a principle whereby it will appear in what ſenſe he ſays elſewhere, That beaſts do not grow angry, and are not

(33) Conimbricenſes, in Phyſ. Ariſt. *lib. ii, cap. ix,* Quæſt. III, *Art.* i, *pag. m.* 225.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Quod autem aſſerebat Porphyrius, ex Ariſtotelis doctrina colligi, exiſtimaſſe illum bruta ratione pollere; falſum eſt: niſi rationem ſumat pro rationis imitatione quam ſolam brutis quibuſdam Ariſtoteles attribuit, tum loco citato (*that is to ſay, lib. iv,* de Hiſtor. Animal. *cap. ix.*) tum 1, Metaphyſ. cap. i. *Ibid. Art. iii, pag.* 227.

(36) Ibid.

(37) Pomponatius aſſerted it ſtrongly. See the diſcourſe of La Mothe le Vayer about the immortality of the ſoul, in the ivth Tome of his works, edition in 12mo.

(38) *See the book, intituled,* Nic. Nancelii Trachyeni Noviodunenſis de immortalitate animæ velitatio adverſus Galenum, *printed at Paris in* 1587, *in* 8*vo.*

(39) See, above, remark [*R*] of the article LUCRETIUS, the Philoſopher.

† In Zen.

‡ Apul. de Dogm. Plat.

‡ Quæſt. Platonic.

(40) Lipſius, Phyſiolog. Stoicorum, *lib. iii,* Diſſert. viii, *pag. m.* 984.

(41) Seneca, Epiſt. cxxiv, *pag. m.* 477.

ſame thing of ſome other places, wherein I am ſomewhat prolix. Afterwards I ſhall make ſome reflexions [*F*]. I ſhall obſerve, that Voſſius knew no author before Pereira, who aſſerted, that beaſts have no ſenſation [*G*]. You may ſee in the ſame remark, a pretty

not capable of conferring a benefit. He ſuppoſes, that a nature which is not ſuſceptible of the two contraries, is ſuſceptible of neither of them: From whence he concludes, that beaſts being not capable of acting according to order, and the rules of reaſon, and being unable to acquire virtue, do nothing that can be called diſorderly, unreaſonable, and a vicious action; and therefore he does not call the violence or fury of a lion, anger: for, according to the Stoics, paſſions are vices, and conſequently no Being can be liable to them, but ſuch as partake of virtue and reaſon, and are able to attain to the perfection of a wiſe man. See the remark [*I*]. He aſſerts poſitively in another letter (42), that beaſts have ſenſe, and he could not have expreſſed himſelf more clearly, if he had been of our ſcholmens opinion. He even goes farther than they, for he maintains they are conſcious of their ſenſation. ‘Qualis ad nos pervenit animi noſtri ſenſus, quamvis naturam ejus ignoremus, ac ſedem, talis ad omnia animalia conſtitutionis ſuæ SENSUS. Neceſſe eſt enim id SENTIANT, per quod alia quoque SENTIUNT: neceſſe eſt SENSUM ejus habeant, cui parent, à quo reguntur. Nemo non ex nobis intelligit eſſe aliquid, quod impetus ſuos moveat: quid ſit illud, ignorat: & conatum ſibi eſſe ſcit: quid ſit, aut unde ſit, neſcit. Sicut infantibus, ſic quoque animalibus, principalis partis ſuæ SENSUS eſt, non ſatis dilucidus, non expreſſus (43). - - - *Such a ſenſe as we have of our mind, tho' we are ignorant of it's nature and ſeat, the ſame all beaſts have of their own conſtitution. For they muſt needs* FEEL *that by which they* FEEL *other things: they muſt needs have a* SENSE *of him whom they obey, and by whom they are governed. Every one of us knows there is ſomething that moves our paſſions: what it is we know not: we know we have an inclination; but what it is, or whence it is, we cannot tell. As infants, ſo beaſts have* SENSE *of their principal part, tho' not very clear and manifeſt.*’ And herein he does but follow the principles of his ſect. It is the property of beaſts, ſaid the Stoics, to deſire their preſervation, and to know that nature recommends them to themſelves. Τὴν δὲ πρώτην ὁρμήν φασι τὸ ζῶον ἴσχειν ἐπὶ τὸ τηρεῖν ἑαυτὸ, οἰκειούσης αὐτῷ τῆς φύσεως ἀπ' ἀρχῆς· κατά φησιν ὁ Χρύσιππος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ Περὶ τελῶν, πρῶτον οἰκεῖον λέγων εἶναι παντὶ ζώῳ τὴν αὐτοῦ σύστασιν, καὶ τὴν ταύτης συνείδησιν. *Primam autem hanc animantis appetitionem fuiſſe dicunt, ſeipſum tuendi atque ſervandi, naturâ ſibi ipſum ab initio conciliante, ut Chryſippus ait in primo De finibus, primum proprium cuique animanti dicens ſui ipſius fuiſſe commendationem, hujuſque conſcientiam* (44).

As to the Cynics (45), the paſſage of Plutarch mentioned by Mr du Rondel, ſays poſitively, That in the opinion of Diogenes beaſts had no ſenſe. I would ſee the doctrine of that Philoſopher more at large, for what Plutarch ſays of it is very obſcure; the beginning and the end are very inconſiſtent with the middle part. They partake of underſtanding; there is the beginning. They are almoſt affected as madmen are; there is the end. But do not mad and furious men often feel? If they had been compared with men ill of a lethargy, or apoplexy, there had been ſome connection in his diſcourſe. However here is the whole paſſage. Διογένης, μετέχειν μὲν αὐτὰ τοῦ νοητοῦ καὶ ἀέρος, διὰ δὲ τὸ τὰ μὲν πυκνότητι, τὰ δὲ πλεονασμῷ τῆς ὑγρασίας, μήτε διανοεῖσθαι, μήτε αἰσθάνεσθαι, προσφερῶς δὲ αὐτὰ διακεῖσθαι τοῖς μεμηνόσι, παρεπταικότος τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ. *Diogenes, rationis & aëris partem ea percipere, ſed vel ob craſſitiem vel ob abundantiam humoris neque intelligere neque ſentire: ac ferè affecta eſſe eo modo quo ſunt inſanientes, qui de mentis exiverunt poteſtate* (46). Whatever the doctrine of Diogenes was, concerning that ſubject, it is certain, that the number of the ancients who oppoſed it, is much greater than of thoſe who came near it. Plutarch wrote a treatiſe on purpoſe to ſhew that beaſts do reaſon (47). It is alſo the deſign of the book, wherein he inquires, whether terreſtrial animals are more induſtrious than thoſe who live in the water (48). I ſhall draw an obſervation from it, which ſeems to be of ſome importance. The author deſigning to refute thoſe who ſay, That as there are rational animals, there muſt be ſome that are irrational, maintains that by the ſame reaſon it might be ſaid, that there are ſome animals who do not feel, as there are ſome that feel. It is to be obſerved, that he ſuppoſes that this laſt diviſion of animals had never been made before: He alledges it as an example of a doctrine which no body ever would be allowed to advance. His argument is what we call *reductionem ad abſurdum*, - - - *reducing one to an abſurdity*. Here are his words: Εἰ δέ τις ἀξιοῖ μὴ κολοβὸν εἶναι τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἔμψυχον φύσιν ἔχειν, τὸ μὲν, λογικὸν, τὸ δὲ ἄλογον· ἕτερος ἀξιώσει τὴν ἔμψυχον φύσιν ἔχειν· τὸ μὲν, φανταστικὸν, τὸ δὲ, ἀφαντασίωτον. καὶ τὸ μὲν, αἰσθητικόν. τὸ δὲ, ἀναίσθητον· ἵνα δὴ τὰς ἀντιζύγους ταύτας καὶ ἀντιθέτους ἕξεις καὶ στερήσεις περὶ ταυτὸν ἡ φύσις ἔχοι μένος οἷον ἰσορροπούσας. εἰ δὲ ἄτοπος ὁ ζητῶν τοῦ ἐμψύχου τὸ μὲν, αἰσθητικὸν, τὸ δὲ, ἀναίσθητον εἶναι. καὶ τὸ μὲν, φαντασιούμενον, τὸ δὲ, ἀφαντασίωτον. ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἔμψυχον αἰσθητικὸν εὐθὺς εἶναι καὶ φανταστικὸν πέφυκεν. οὐδὲ οὕτως ἐπιεικῶς ἀπαιτήσει τὸ μὲν λογικὸν εἶναι τοῦ ἐμψύχου, τὸ δὲ ἄλογον. Quod ſi quis poſtulet, ne natura ſit manca, debere animatorum alia rationem habere, alia eſſe bruta: invenietur qui eodem jure flagitet, animalium alia debere eſſe vi imaginandi prædita, alia ea carere: alia ſenſum habere, alia non habere: ſcilicet ut oppoſitas habitibus iſtis privationes æqualibus veluti momentis natura habeat. Quòd ſi hæc poſtulare abſurdum eſt, cum quodvis animal ſimul & ſentiendi & imaginandi vim nanciſcatur: ne hoc quidem recte poſtulabitur, eſſe animalium alia ratione prædita, alia bruta (49). - - - *But if any alledge that ſome animals ought to be rational, and ſome irrational, that nature may not be defective: others may as juſtly maintain, that ſome animals ought to have the faculty of perception, and ſome to be without it: that ſome ſhould have feeling and ſome not have feeling: that ſo nature may have at the ſame time privations contrary to thoſe faculties. But if this be abſurd, ſince every animal has both the faculty of feeling and perceiving: then it cannot be right to alledge that ſome animals ſhould be rational and ſome irrational.* A little while after he refutes the Stoics, with a remark of the ſame force. Beaſts, ſay they, have no paſſions; their deſires are no deſires, but almoſt deſires, &c. What would you anſwer therefore, ſays he to them, if any body ſhould teach that they neither ſee nor hear, but that their ſight is almoſt a ſight. Οὐκ οἶδα τί χρήσονται τοῖς λέγουσι μηδὲ βλέπειν μηδὲ ἀκούειν, ἀλλ' ὡσανεὶ βλέπειν αὐτὰ, καὶ ὡσανεὶ ἀκούειν· μεδὲ φωνεῖν. ἀλλ' ὡσανεὶ φωνεῖν· μηδὲ ὅλως ζῆν, ἀλλ' ὡσανεὶ ζῆν. *Neſcio quid reſponſuri ſint iis, qui animalia etiam non videre, non audire, non vocem emittere, ſed quaſi videre, quaſi audire, quaſi vocem edere, denique omnino non vivere, ſed duntaxat quaſi vivere dicerent* (50). Which ſhews, that Plutarch was perſuaded, that no Philoſopher had ever rejected the ſenſitive ſouls of beaſts. From whence it follows, that he underſtood the opinion of Diogenes, otherwiſe than we underſtand the opinion of Pereira.

Leſt I ſhould be too prolix, I refer to another place (51), the remaining part of this compilation.

[*F*] *Afterwards I ſhall make ſome reflexions.*] I refer them to the article of RORARIUS.

[*G*] *Voſſius knew no author before Pereira, who aſſerted that beaſts have no ſenſation.*] He obſerves that there have been ſome Philoſophers, who made no diſtinction between thought and ſenſation. From whence they ſhould have concluded, either that beaſts have reaſon (52), or that they have no ſenſation (53). He adds, that the laſt propoſition pleaſed nobody, that he knew of, among the Antients; but that it was aſſerted by Gomeſius Pereira, in the XVIth century. ‘Hoc conſtituto, conſequitur, vel beſtias non habere ſenſum, cum non habeant rationem; vel eas, cum ſenſu præditæ ſint, etiam rationales eſſe. Prior ſententia, quod ſciam, veterum placuit nulli. Sed avorum noſtrorum temporibus amplexus illam fuit Gometius Pereira, Philoſophus ac Medicus Hiſpanus, in opere triginta à ſe annis elaborato; quod ab Antonii, & Margaritæ, parentum ſuorum, nominibus, *Antonianam Margaritam* inſcripſit. Eandemque opinionem tuetur

---

(42) *It is the cxxiſt Letter, wherein he proves,* omnibus animalibus eſſe conſtitutionis ſuæ ſenſum.

(43) Ibid. Epiſt. cxxi, *pag.* 467.

(44) Diog. Laërtius, in Zenone, *l. viii*, *num.* 85, *pag. m.* 416.

(45) I ſpeak ſo, ſuppoſing this Diogenes, whoſe doctrine is mentioned by Plutarch to be the Cynic, concerning which, ſee, above, remark [*D*] of the article DIOGENES of Apollonia.

(46) Plut. de Placit. Philoſ. *lib. v*, *cap. xx*, *pag.* 909. *According to Amyot's verſion, Diogenes ſays,* that beaſts have ſome UNDERSTANDING, but by reaſon of the groſſneſs and thickneſs of their conſtitution, and becauſe of the great quantity of their moiſtneſs, they have neither reaſoning nor feeling, no more than madmen, becauſe they are crack-brained, and have not a free uſe of reaſon.

(47) Περὶ τοῦ τὰ ἄλογα λόγῳ χρῆσθαι. Bruta animalia ratione uti.

(48) Πότερα τῶν ζώων φρονιμώτερα, τὰ χερσαῖα ἢ τὰ ἔνυδρα. Terreſtriane an aquatilia animalia ſint callidiora?

(49) Plut. de Solert. Animal. circa init. *pag. m.* 960, *C.*

(50) Ibid. *pag.* 961, *E.* You will ſee Amyot's verſion below, in the remark [*I*].

(51) To the article RORARIUS.

(52) Voſſius, de Orig. & Progreſ. Idolol. *lib. iii*, *cap. xli*, *pag. m.* 939.

(53) See Francis Valeſius, *de Sacra Philoſophia*, *cap. lv*, *pag. m.* 274, where he ſays ſomething by the by, againſt Pereira, without naming him.

pretty large account of the opinion of that Spaniard. Some endeavour, in vain, to find in Ariſtotle the ſeeds of Mr Des Cartes's opinion [*H*]. We are alſo referred in vain to the

‘ tuetur in Margaritæ hujus apologia, qua objectionibus Michaëlis à Palacios, Theologi Salmanticenſis, reſpondet : Utrobique docet, (ut verbis ejus inſiſtam) *illos motus brutales, quicunque in brutis viſuntur, non fieri à brutis videntibus, aut audientibus, aut guſtantibus, ſeu per quemcumque alium ſenſum exteriorem, ſeu interiorem, vitaliter ſenſificè immutatis : ſed vel ab ſpeciebus objectorum inductis in eorum organis, noſtris ſenſitivis ſimilibus, cum præſentia ſunt ſequenda, vel fugienda : vel à phantaſmatis, cum hæc abſunt.* Nimirum cenſet ea, quæ nos facultati ſenſitivæ tribuimus, proficiſci à quadam ſympathia, & antipathia : quemadmodum enim ſuccinum trahit paleas, magnes ferrum ; ſic muta animantia trahi à ſpeciebus rerum amicarum : à natura quippe hanc vim eſſe inditam rebus, ut non omnia moveat, ſed res certas : itaque, re amica præſenti, maxillas animantis natura moveri ad illam recipiendam : re præſenti inimica, eaſdem natura refugere cibum, planeque adverſari. Quod ſi natura voluiſſet ſenſum mutis dare animantibus, daturam etiam fuiſſe mentem : at ea ſic habitura fuiſſe animas indiviſibiles, eoque à corpore ſeparabiles (54). - - - - *From hence it follows, either that beaſts have no ſenſation, ſince they have no reaſon ; or that they have reaſon, ſince they have ſenſation. The former propoſition pleaſed none, that I know of, among the Antients. But in the time of our grand-fathers it was aſſerted by Gomeſius Pereira, a Philoſopher and Phyſician of Spain, in a work which he had been thirty years about, intituled,* Antoniana Margarita, *from Antonius, and Margarita, the names of his father and mother. He defends the ſame opinion in the apology of this Margarita, where he anſwers the objections of Michael de Palacios, a Divine of Salamanca : in both theſe books he maintains (to uſe his own words)* that thoſe brutal motions, which are obſerved in beaſts, are not performed by them, either ſeeing, hearing, or taſting, nor is there any change made upon them with reſpect to life and ſenſation by any other external or internal ſenſe : but they proceed from the images of objects imprinted on their organs, which are like our ſenſitive organs, when things to be purſued, or avoided are preſent ; and from phantaſms, when theſe are abſent. *He thinks that what we impute to a ſenſitive faculty, ariſes from a certain ſympathy and antipathy : for as amber attracts ſtraws, and a load-ſtone iron, ſo beaſts are attracted by the images of things agreeable : this virtue being given by nature, not to move all, but ſome particular things ; ſo when an agreeable thing is preſent, the jaws of a beaſt are moved by nature to receive it : and when a diſagreeable thing is preſented, they, by nature, refuſe and reject food. But if nature had intended to give ſenſation to brutes, he ſays, ſhe would likewiſe have given underſtanding : and then they would have had indiviſible ſouls, and conſequently ſeparable from the body.*’ Conſider theſe two things : Firſt, That he explained not the motions of beaſts by mechanical principles, but by the occult qualities of antipathy and ſympathy. Secondly, that he rejected the ſenſitive ſouls, becauſe he believed not that material, diviſible, and mortal ſubſtance was capable of feeling ; from whence he concluded, that if beaſts had a ſenſitive ſoul, it was not corporeal. When he was put in mind of the actions of beaſts, for example, of a dog, he anſwered, that it was not neceſſary they ſhould proceed from a ſenſitive faculty ; for if it was ſo the Peripatetics would be in the wrong not to aſcribe to a rational ſoul ſo many actions of a dog which are like thoſe of a man. He had ſubtilty enough to take advantage of the weak ſide of the cauſe of his averſaries. It is the common ſhift of thoſe who undertake to maintain abſurdities (55). ‘ Ictus hoſce levi amictu exire ſe poſſe Pereira arbitratur. Putat enim, ut nos non ideo rationem tribuimus beſtiis, quia tam multa actibus faciant ſimillima humanis : ita neque iis adſcribendum eſſe ſenſum, etſi, quæ agant, ſimillima ſint actibus animæ ſenſitivæ. Nec eo movetur, quòd tam diſſimiles ſint animarum actus, imò contrarii prorſus : quia, ut ait, natura etiam pro rebus, in quas agit, contraria operetur. Unde Poëta (56) :

Limus ut hic dureſcit, & hæc ut cera liqueſcit,
Uno eodemque igni.

‘ Sed longum eſſet omnia ex opere tam operoſo hominis & acuti & docti, adferre pro ridicula ſententia, quam diximus. - - - *Pereira believes he can eaſily parry theſe thruſts. For he thinks that as we do not aſcribe reaſon to beaſts, becauſe they do many things like human actions : ſo neither ought we to aſcribe to them ſenſation, tho' they do things like the actions of a ſenſitive ſoul. Nor is he much embarraſſed with the objection, that the actions of ſouls are very unlike, nay directly contrary to one another ; becauſe, as he ſays, nature produces contrary effects according to the ſubject it works upon. And therefore the Poet ſays,*

As fire this figure hardens, made of clay,
And this of wax, with fire conſumes away.

‘ *But it would be tedoius to bring from ſuch an huge work, all that this ingenious and learned man ſays for the ridiculous opinion I have mentioned.*’ I thought the reader would be glad to find here a ſpecimen of the doctrine and genius of this Spaniard.

[*H*] *Some endeavour in vain to find in Ariſtotle the ſeeds of Mr Des Cartes's opinion.*] Father Pardies endeavoured it. *Perhaps*, ſays he (57), *it will not be needleſs to examine ſome paſſages of Ariſtotle, that we may know whether ſo great a Philoſopher will not afford us ſomething, that may authorize an opinion which ſeems now to be ſo new and ſo extraordinary.* Afterwards he quotes this paſſage taken from the ninth chapter of Ariſtotle's book *de Spiritu*. ‘ One may conceive, without any great difficulty, that heat is an effect of nature : but it is difficult to apprehend, how the nature of bodies can ſo well manage that heat, and uſe it as an inſtrument to give to every thing what it ought naturally to have, and to imprint upon each of them it's particular character with as much juſtneſs, as if thoſe bodies were endowed with knowledge and reaſon. And * certainly all thoſe things cannot be performed without knowledge and the direction of reaſon : but, on the other ſide, how can the faculty of knowing be aſcribed to material beings ? This art can, by no means, be aſcribed to the force of fire and ſpirits, or of the moſt ſubtile bodies : But if we ſhould ſay, that there is within thoſe bodies ſome principles that have the faculty of knowing ; it is a thing which exceeds all admiration. And we have as much reaſon to wonder, when we conſider the very ſouls of beaſts, ſeeing they are of the ſame nature with fire and ſpirits.’ *It appears from that paſſage*, ſays Father Pardies (58), *that Ariſtotle knew very well how difficult it is to aſcribe knowledge to bodies and beaſts. But he ſeems to have poſitively aſſerted, in another place, what he propoſes here only by way of admiration ; for, ſpeaking of beaſts, he uſes theſe expreſs words* † : Of all animals, man only has the faculty of thinking. *Homo unus ex numero animalium omnium vim obtinet cogitandi.* . . . And tho' other animals be endowed with memory, and capable of diſcipline, yet none but man is capable of reminiſcence. *It ſeems from theſe words, which Ariſtotle has repeated word for word in another place* ⸸, *that he granted that beaſts have knowledge, ſince he acknowledges they are endowed with memory ; and that if he deprives them of knowledge, it is only of that ſort of knowledge, which is attended with a particular reflexion in our deliberations, and the enquiries we make to recal things to mind. But it is certain, that Ariſtotle has diſtinguiſhed otherwiſe memory and reminiſcence ; for, in his opinion, memory conſiſts only in an* image ‡ and a repreſentation, imprinted upon the ſubſtance of that part of the body wherein common ſenſe reſides, much in the ſame manner as figures are repreſented upon wax by the impreſſion of ſeals : *ſo that to have the memory of ſome things*, is to have the figures of things thus repreſented ‡‡. *Whereas reminiſcence implies beſides a certain perception of the mind, whereby when* we re-call ſome things to mind, we know that very thing, *viz.* that we re-call ſomething to mind : *which is common to all ſorts of thoughts, ſince it is impoſſible to think, without knowing that one thinks. So that Ariſtotle ſaying, that beaſts have no reminiſcence, and that man only has that faculty, it is no wonder if he ſaid alſo, that of all animals none but man is capable of thinking. That Philoſopher believed therefore, that beaſts have no true thoughts.*

(54) Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

(55) Ibid.

(56) That is to ſay, *Virgil, Eccl. VIII, ver.* 80.

(57) Ignatius Gaſton Pardies, Of the Knowledge of Beaſts, *num.* 69, *pag. m.* 136.

* V. Interpretem Latinum hujus loci.

(58) Pardies, ubi ſupra, *num.* 71, *pag.* 140.

† Hiſt. Animal. cap. i.

⸸ De Mem. & Rem. cap. ii.

‡ Ibid. cap. i.

‡‡ Ibid.

the fourth book of Cicero's Tuſculan Queſtions, and to the teſtimony of Porphyry, Proclus, *&c.* There is no reſemblance [*I*] between the doctrine which makes them machines,

It remains only, that Ariſtotle ſhould acknowledge, that beaſts are meer Automata, *and that they move only mechanically, and by the help of ſome ſprings. But he has clearly done it; for he ſpeaks thus, explaining how the motion of animals is performed.* As thoſe machines, ſays he *, which are called *Automata*, are no ſooner moved a certain way, but they perform their motions by the force of the unbent ſprings. . . . ſo animals move in the ſame manner, having bones and nerves, as ſo many inſtruments fitted for that end by the induſtry of nature, which produce the ſame effect in them which pieces of wood and iron, with their ſprings, produce in machines. *He ſays the ſame thing elſewhere.* It may be, ſays he **, that in animals one thing moves another, and that their bodies are like thoſe wonderful *Automata:* for in effect, they are made up of members which have the faculty, even when they are at reſt, *to perform certain motions as ſoon as they are determined to them.* And as there is no need at all to touch thoſe machines, when they are moving, provided they have been touched before, *ſo the ſame may be ſaid of animals.*

Theſe paſſages do great honour to Ariſtole, and ſhew, 1. That he knew the mechanical conſtruction which nature has produced in the bodies of animals, and which it daily exerciſes. 2. That he knew how unconceivable it is that matter ſhould think. But he never advanced, either as a certain thing, or as a ſuppoſition, that beaſts have no ſenſe; he never deprived them of thought, taking that word in the ſenſe which the Carteſians put upon it, but taking it in a particular ſenſe, for what is called meditation, reflexion, deliberation. It is not at all likely that he defined memory as Father Pardies ſays he did; for by that definition there will be no difference between imagination and memory. Beſides, beaſts will never be meer machines, whilſt they are able to form the image of an object that is abſent: this is what memory implies, according to the very explication of Father Pardies. Laſtly, This Jeſuit had no reaſon to oppoſe the critical obſervation made againſt the tranſlator of Ariſtotle (59). Βουλεύεσθαι is a kind of thought, and not thought in general; ſo that tho' man only were capable of the βουλεύεσθαι, as Ariſtotle will have it, yet it would not follow from thence, that there is no other animal that thinks.

[*I*] *We are alſo referred in vain to the fourth book of Cicero's Tuſculan Queſtions. . . . There is no reſemblance between the doctrine of the Automata, and what thoſe antient authors ſay.*] A learned prelate, who wrote againſt Des Cartes, accuſes him of advancing no doctrine but what is to be found in the authors who lived before him. Here are his proofs, with reſpect to the doctrine concerning the ſouls of beaſts: 'Quid hoc eſt vero, 'quod † apud Ciceronem legimus, beſtias ſimile quiddam facere perturbationem animi, in perturbationes 'non incidere, quod hæ eveniant ſolum ex aſpernatione 'rationis, qua carent beſtiæ? Quid aliud, inquam, 'ſuadet hoc nobis, quam beſtias mera eſſe automata? 'nam ſi perturbationibus carent, neque herum diligit 'canis, neque lupum ovis reformidat: imo, nec cibum appetunt, nec dolorem fugiunt, nec mortem 'timent; ſed ex coacto cœcæ materiæ motu id facere videntur quod non faciunt. Scribit conceptis verbis ‡ Plutarchus crediſſe Diogenem brutas animantes, neque intelligere, neque ſentire: Quod & confutavit ‡ Porphyrius. Sciſcit * Proclus animalia 'tantum rationalia anima eſſe prædita; additque 'decretum eſſe à Platone animam vere eſſe eam 'quæ ratione polleat, cætera ſimulacra animarum. 'At nemo doctrinam hanc vel tradidit apertius, vel 'fuſius propugnavit, quam Gomethius Pereira (60). '- - - - *What is the meaning of that expreſſion we find 'in Cicero, that beaſts do ſomething which reſembles the 'paſſions of the mind, but that they do not fall into paſſions, becauſe theſe happen only from a contempt of reaſon, 'which beaſts have not? What, I ſay, can be the 'meaning of it, but that beaſts are meer machines? For 'if they are without paſſions, a dog cannot love his maſter, nor a ſheep fear a wolf? Nay, they cannot deſire 'food, nor avoid pain, nor dread death; but from the 'neceſſary motion of blind matter they ſeem to do what 'they really do not. Plutarch expreſly ſays, that Diogenes believed that beaſts have neither underſtanding 'nor feeling: which Porphyry likewiſe confuted. Proclus 'declares that rational animals only have a ſoul, and adds 'that Plato maintained that the ſoul endowed with reaſon was properly ſuch, and others only the images of 'ſouls. But none has more clearly taught, or more fully 'defended this doctrine than Gomeſius Pereira.'* He alledges four authorities, *viz.* of Cicero, Plutarch, Porphyry, and Proclus. Let us examine them in order: we need not ſay any thing more about Pereira, whom that learned prelate mentions in the laſt words of that paſſage: we have ſaid enough of him in the foregoing remarks.

I. The paſſage of Cicero is not a good proof; it contains nothing elſe but the diſtinction which the Stoics made uſe of, and which I have mentioned above (61). They pretended that the paſſions and reaſon were two things contrary one to another, and conſequently, that they could have but one and the ſame ſubject; they could not therefore be found in any animals but ſuch as are rational, and conſequently beaſts could not be capable of them. 'Illud animorum 'corporumque diſſimile eſt quod animi valentes 'morbo tentari non poſſunt, corpora poſſunt. Sed 'corporum offenſiones ſine culpa accidere poſſunt, 'animorum non item, quorum omnes morbi & perturbationes ex aſpernatione rationis eveniunt. Itaque in hominibus ſolum exiſtunt. Nam beſtiæ ſimile 'quiddam faciunt, ſed in perturbationes non incidunt '(62). - - - - *There is this difference between minds and 'bodies, that ſound minds cannot be ſeized with diſorders, 'but bodies may. The diſorders of the body may happen without any fault, but thoſe of the mind cannot; 'all the diſorders and paſſions of which happen from the 'contempt of reaſon, and conſequently they exiſt only in men, 'beaſts do ſomething that reſembles them, but they never 'fall into paſſions.'* Thus Cicero repreſents part of the Stoical ſubtilties about the doctrine of paſſions (63). What he ſays does not at all ſignify, that the Stoics deprived beaſts of the ſenſations which we call love, hatred, anger, *&c.* They acknowledged that beaſts do ſomething like what men do when they grow angry, and give themſelves up to pleaſure, fear, or ſome other paſſion; but they pretended, that ſuch a ſtate was not really love, or hatred, or anger, or, in general, a paſſion in beaſts; for to be ſuch, ſaid they beaſts muſt fall into it out of contempt of reaſon. But they are irrational, and conſequently reaſon is not their rule, they do nothing which tends to ſwerve from that rule, or to conform to it: ſeeing therefore paſſions ariſe in men becauſe they ſwerve from reaſon which is their rule; and ſince the nature of paſſions conſiſts in being contrary to reaſon, which men ought to follow; it muſt be concluded, that what paſſes in beaſts is not a paſſion, tho' it ſeems to be one. This is what the ſubtilties of the Stoics came to. It was, properly ſpeaking, a diſpute about words; and it is at leaſt, very certain, that they did not deny, that what the other Philoſophers called anger, or love, or fear in beaſts was a true and real ſenſation. They did not deny that a dog knew his maſter, and that a ſheep knew a wolf, as a thing it ought to avoid. I will not make a collection of proofs, whereby the truth of that point might appear with the greateſt evidence. It is enough to ſay, that thoſe who endeavoured moſt to refute what was paradoxical in the ſyſtem of the Stoics, never objected to them that they made meer machines of beaſts. Would they have ſpared them about ſuch a doctrine?

II. I have already examined the paſſage of Plutarch (64). We have already ſeen that it is obſcure, and made up of inconſiſtent parts. I add, that one may plainly obſerve in it an extream oppoſition between the doctrine of Diogenes and that of Mr Des Cartes. Diogenes ſaid, that beaſts are made up of a body and a ſoul, and that if their ſoul does not actually feel and reaſon, it is becauſe the thickneſs of it's organs, and the great quantity of humours reduce it to the condition of mad men. Whereas Des Cartes acknowledges no ſenſitive principle in beaſts; he ſays, they are only made up of matter, and have a body without a ſoul. I obſerve, that if there was any probability in the doctrine of Diogenes, it would be only about oxen,

hogs,

* De Animal. motione, cap. vii.

** 2 De Gen. Anim. cap. i, poſt med.

† Cicer. Tuſcul. lib. iv.

‡ Plut. de Placit. Philoſoph. lib. v, cap. xx.

‡ Porphy. de abſt. ab anim. lib. iii.

* Proclus, in Platon. Philoſ. lib. iii, cap. i.

---

(59) By Scaliger. See Pardies, ibid. *num.* 72, *pag.* 140.

(60) Pet. Daniel Huetius, Cenſ. Philoſ. Carteſianæ, *cap. viii, pag.* 208, *Edit. Pariſ.* 1689.

(61) Remark [*E*].

(62) Cicer. Tuſcul. *lib. iv, fol. m.* 267, C.

(63) Habes ea, quæ de perturbationibus enucleatè diſputant Stoici, quæ logica appellant, quia diſſeruntur ſubtilius. *Ibid.*

(64) Citat. (46).

machines, and what thoſe antient authors ſay.

hogs, *&c.* but it appears ridiculous when it is applied to ſwallows, flies, bees, and ants, whoſe organs are incomparably thinner and leſs moiſt than thoſe of men.

III. I ſhall inſiſt ſomewhat longer upon the paſſage of Porphyry. The learned biſhop affirms, that this Philoſopher refuted what Diogenes ſaid of beaſts, that they had neither underſtanding nor feeling; but it is certain, that Porphyry refutes no body, who had ſaid that they are inſenſible. His ſilence is a plain proof, that no body had yet vented ſuch a paradox; for there being nothing more contrary to the deſign of Porphyry in all that work, he would not have failed to refute that hypotheſis. He was about to prove, that men ſhould not eat the fleſh of beaſts; he found ſeveral inconveniencies in it, and, amongſt others, that it is an introduction to cruelty (65). He gathered together as many anſwers as he could get, to the objections of his adverſaries: but was there any objection ſo ſtrong as this, *viz.* That beaſts have no feeling? Is it not certain, that this being ſuppoſed, there would be no more cruelty in killing an ox, than in plucking up turneps (66)? Here is another obſervation which convinces me, that Porphyry had not heard of that paradox, which it is pretended he refuted. He lays down, as a principle generally approved, that beaſts feel (67), from whence he draws this conſequence, *they are therefore rational* (68), and he finds in that conſequence, the moſt ſpecious arguments he can alledge to defend his opinion. He propoſes this objection to himſelf, *ſeeing the animal nature includes ſome rational ſubjects, it muſt alſo include ſome that are irrational* (69), and he anſwers as Plutarch does, or rather he tranſcribes, word for word, three or four pages of Plutarch, without naming him. What he ſteals from him, contains, in particular, what has been ſeen above in the remark [*E*] (70). They are two paſſages which demonſtratively prove, that all the Philoſophers of that time believed, that there are no inſenſible animals. Amyot has ſo ill tranſlated the firſt, that it is impoſſible to underſtand the meaning of it: he has been more ſucceſsful in the ſecond. I ſhall ſet down his words, and I ſhall ſay, by and by, why I give them in this place. ‘As for thoſe who ‘ſpeak ſo ſtupidly and impertinently of it as to ſay, ‘that beaſts neither rejoice nor grow angry, nor fear, ‘that the ſwallow makes no proviſion, that the bee ‘has no memory, but that it ſeems only that the ‘ſwallow has ſome forecaſt, that the lion ſeems to be ‘angry, and the hind to quake with fear: I do not ‘know how they would anſwer thoſe who ſhould ſay ‘that one may as well affirm, that they neither ſee ‘nor hear, and have no voice, but that they ſeem only to ſee and hear, and have a voice, and, in ſhort, ‘that they do not live, but only ſeem to live: for ‘the one is not more againſt plain evidence than the ‘other (71).’ I have tranſcribed that paſſage, to ſtrengthen the conſequence I drew from it, *viz*, that the doctrine of *Automata*, or machines, was then looked upon, not as a doctrine which had ever been aſſerted by any body, but as a doctrine which the Stoics would not be able to refute, if any one ſhould undertake to make uſe of ſuch an objection, to beat them at their own weapons. Perhaps it will be ſaid, that Plutarch and Porphyry uſe the word λέγȣσι, which is the participle of the preſent tenſe: from whence it will follow that this objection was actually made by ſome againſt the Stoics. I anſwer that the French tranſlator of Plutarch agrees herein with Xylander (72), approved by the learned Holſtenius (73), that the word λέγȣσι ought to be taken in the future conditional tenſe. Grammar allows of it, and Hiſtory requires it in this place; for Plutarch and Porphyry, thoſe two great defenders of the reaſon of beaſts, had not failed to diſpute againſt the doctrine of meer machines, had they known that there was, or that there had been ſuch an opinion. But they ſay nothing of it.

IV. As to Proclus, it is true he ſays that, according to the doctrine of Plato, the rational ſoul is properly a ſoul, and that other ſouls are but images or repreſentations of a ſoul; but he ſays at the very ſame time that they partake of knowledge and life, and that rational animals are not the only ones which partake of underſtanding; that all other animals which are endowed with imagination, memory, and feeling, do alſo partake thereof. Whereby he plainly teaches that beaſts have a ſenſitive ſoul, and ſuch in a word as the diſciples of Ariſtotle repreſent it to us. Tho' the paſſage of Proclus is ſomewhat long, I ſhall ſet it down here, that the reader may have no doubts about the true ſenſe of it, and that he may be ſure it could not ſerve as a prelude to the Carteſian doctrine concerning beaſts. Καὶ ὅλως ϖολλαχȣ̃ δῆλός ἐςι καὶ ὁ Πλάτων ψυχὴν τὴν λογικὴν εἶναι τιθέμενος, τὰς δὲ ἄλλας, εἴδωλα ψυχῶν καθόσον εἰσὶ καὶ αὗται νοεραὶ καὶ ζωτικαὶ, μετὰ τῶν ὅλων ϖαράγȣσαι τὰς ϖερὶ τὰ σώματα ζωάς· νȣ̃ δὲ ȣ̓ μόνον τὰ λογικὰ ζῶα μετέχειν συγχωρήσομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅσα γνωςικὴν ἔχει δύναμιν· φαντασίαν λέγω, καὶ μνήμην, καὶ αἴσθησιν· ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ ἐν Φιλήβῳ Σωκράτης, ἐπὶ τὴν νοερὰν ἄγει τὰ τοιαῦτα ϖάντα σειράν. *Denique multis in locis conſtat & ipſum Platonem ſtatuere illam ratione prædictam animam,* veram eſſe *animam, alias verò, animarum* eſſe, *ſimulacra, quatenus ſunt & illæ intellectuales & vivificæ, cum ipſis univerſis producentes, illas vitas, quæ circa ipſa corpora,* & in ipſis corporibus ſunt. *Concedemus autem non ſolùm animalia ratione-prædita participare Mentem: ſed etiam alia, quæcumque cognoſcendi-facultatem habent. Phantaſiam* autem *dico, & memoriam, & ſenſum. Quoniam & ille Socrates, qui in Philebo* diſputans introducitur, *hujuſmodi omnia ad intellectualem rerum ſeriem reducit* (74). That this may be the better underſtood, I ſhall obſerve, that, according to the Platonic doctrine, there is a difference between the ſoul and the underſtanding, which is not unlike the difference which the Peripatetics acknowledge betwen Species and Genus. The Platonics ſaid, that four things anterior one to another, *viz.* eſſence, life, underſtanding, and the ſoul, had preceded bodies; that life partakes of eſſence; that the underſtanding partakes of life and eſſence; and that the ſoul partakes of underſtanding, life, and eſſence, and has reaſon beſides as it's particular nature. This would be called in the ſchools the ſpecific difference of the ſoul. Τεττάρων τοίνυν τȣ́των ὄντων ϖρὸ τῆς σωματικῆς ὑποςάσεως αἰτίων, ȣ̓σίας, ζωῆς, νȣ̃, ψυχῆς, ψυχὴ μὲν ἁπάντων μετέχει τῶν ϖρὸ αὐτῆς, τὸν μὲν λόγον, κατα την ἑαυτῆς ἰδιότητα λαχȣ̃σα, τὸν δὲ νȣ̃ν, καὶ τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸ ὂν, απὸ τῶν ϖρεσβυτερων αἰτίων. *Cum igitur hæ quatuor cauſæ ſint ante corpoream hypoſtaſin, Eſſentia, Vita, Mens, Anima, Anima quidem, particeps eſt omnium eorum, quæ ſunt ante ipſam, ipſam quidem rationem, ſecundum ſuam proprietatem ſortita, Mentem vero, & Vitam, & ipſum Ens ab antiquioribus cauſis* adepta (75). Thus the ſoul may concur four ſeveral ways in the diſpoſing of all poſterior beings. It extends it's influences as far as bodies, in as much as it exiſts; it extends them as far as plants, in as much as it lives; and as far as beaſts, in as much as it partakes of underſtanding; and as far as the firſt natures that are ſuſceptible of reaſon together with the other attributes, in as much as it is rational. As for the underſtanding which precedes the ſoul, and is the ſulneſs of life, and even of being; it influences three ſeveral ways the oeconomy of the univerſe. It illuminates by it's ſpecific virtue whatever is endowed with the faculty of knowing; and it concurs in communicating life to a greater number of things, and eſſence to every thing which being has formed. Νȣ̃ς... τριχῶς διακοσμεῖ τὰ ϖάντα, τῆς μὲν νοερᾶς ἰδιότητος ἅπᾶσι, τοῖς γνωςικοῖς ἐλλάμπων τὴν δυνάμιν. *Mens.... trifariam omnia digerit ipſius quidem intellectuales proprietatis facultatem omnibus cognoſcendi vim habentibus per ſuam illuminationem largiens* (76) Beaſts are comprehended in the claſs of creatures that receive the irradiation of it's virtue: which is manifeſt from the words that Proclus makes uſe of, ſpeaking of what the ſoul does, in as much as it partakes of underſtanding. Κατὰ μὲν τὸ ὂν τὸ ἑαυτῆς, τὰ ϖάντα (ὑφίςησι) καὶ μεχρὶ σωμάτων· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ζωὴν, ϖάντα τὰ λεγόμενα ζῆν, καὶ μεχρὶ τῶν φυτῶν. κατὰ δὲ τὸν νȣ̃ν, ϖάντα τὰ γνωςικὴν ἔχοντα δύναμιν, καὶ μεχρὶ τῶν ἀλογωτάτων. *Secundum quidem ipſum ipſius Animæ Ens, omnia* (conſtituit) *vel uſque ad ipſa corpora. Secundum vero vitam, omnia quæ vivere dicuntur, & uſque ad ipſas plantas. Secundum vero Mentem, omnia quæ cognitione præditam facultatem habent, & uſque ad ipſa maxime bruta* (77).

Nothing would be more eaſy than to heap up a great many authorities, whereby it would clearly appear, that when Plato ſays, that the ſoul of beaſts is an image of ſoul, he pretended not to deprive them of ſenſe. See Plotinus chap. 11. of the firſt book of his firſt Ennead. Conſider alſo theſe words of a modern Platonic Philoſopher (78). ‘ Irrationalem animam ‘ Platonici non tam ſubſtantiale aliquid, quam acciden‘tale quiddam eſſe putant, quaſi rationalium VESTIGIUM animarum, in quo SENSUS quidem ſint, ſed ‘ per diverſa corporis inſtrumenta diviſi atque patibiles. ‘ - - - *The Platoniſts think the irrational ſoul to be ſomething rather accidental than ſubſtantial, a* VESTIGE ‘ *as it were of rational ſouls, in which indeed are the* ‘ *ſenſes, but by the ſeveral organs of the body divided* ‘ *and paſſive.*’ I have given elſewhere (79) an analyſis of ſome paſſages of the twenty-fifth diſſertation of a Platonic Philoſopher, who very clearly ſhews what diſtinguiſhes the ſoul of a beaſt from a human ſoul; but he is contented to deprive beaſts of reaſon, without depriving them of feeling. Ἄλογον, ἄφρονα, ἀλληλοφθόρον, ἀνόητον θεοῦ ἀρετῆς ἄμοιρον ὑπ' αἰσθήσεως ἐφημέρου βοσκομένην καὶ δημαγωγουμένην ἰσχυρὰν μὲν τῷ σωματι, ἀμήχανον δὴ τῷ λογισμῷ. Sine ratione aut prudentia; ita ut alterum in perniciem alterius natum, improvidum, divinæ virtutis expers, ſoloque ſenſu in diem gauderet & duceretur: corporis viribus excelleret, intellectu autem nihil poſſet (80). - - - - *Without reaſon or prudence: ſo that being formed to the deſtruction of one another, without forecaſt, without divine virtue, they only delight in and are guided by ſenſe; they excel in ſtrength of body, but have no underſtanding.*

---

(65) Porph. de Abſtin. *lib. iii, cap. xx, pag.* 125. *Cantabr.* 1655. See alſo *cap. xix, pag.* 122.

(66) I do not ſay but men would thereby uſe themſelves to ſhed blood, and grow by degrees leſs compaſſionate, and more cruel to thoſe of their kind.

(67) Id. ib. *cap. xxi, pag.* 125.

(68) Id. ib. *cap. i, pag.* 101, & *cap. xxi, xxii, & alibi.*

(69) Id. ib. *cap. vii, pag.* 109.

(70) Citations (49) and (50).

(71) Plutarch. What animals are moſt wary, *pag. m.* 472.

(72) The Latin tranſlator of Plutarch.

(73) In his Latin tranſlation of Porphyry *de Abſtinentia.*

(74) Proclus, in Platonis Theologiam, *lib. iii, cap. i, pag.* 128, *Hamburg.* 1618, *in fol. ex verſione Æmilii Porti.*

(75) Id. ib. *pag.* 129.

(76) Ibid.

(77) Ibid.

(78) Marcil. Ficin. in Compendio in Timæum Platon. *cap. xli, pag. m.* 1038, *operum Platonis.*

(79) In the remark [*L*] of the article PAULICIANS.

(80) Maxim. Tyrius, *pag.* 258.

PEREZ (JOSEPH)

PEREZ (JOSEPH) in Latin *Perezius*, a Spaniſh Monk, and profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of Salamanca, took a great deal of pains to illuſtrate the Hiſtory of Spain, eſpecially in what concerns the order of the Benedictins. He publiſhed (*a*) ſome Eccleſiaſtical Diſſertations in the year 1688, wherein he refuted ſome things which Father Papebroch had advanced in his Prolegomena of April; he found him too rigid as to the acts of St Eleutherus, but he confeſſed it was well done to lay aſide many apocryphal writings which have been publiſhed concerning the ſaints [*A*]. It is not long (*b*) ſince he died (*c*).

(*a*) In Latin at Salamanca.

(*b*) I write this in September 1697.

(*c*) Taken from Father Papebroch's anſwer *ad exhibitionem errorum, Art. XI, num.* 232, 233.

[*A*] *Too rigid as to the acts of St Elutherus but he confeſſed it was well done to lay aſide may writings . . . concerning the ſaints.*] St Eleutherus, biſhop of Æcana (1), and St Anthia, his mother, have been very famous in the Greek church, ever ſince their relics were tranſmitted from Rome to Conſtantinople, under the empire of Arcadius. Their acts were compoſed by Leontius and Theodulus, who are ſaid to have lived at that time. But Father Papebroch is not of that opinion. he thinks they are ſuppoſititious, and proves it by many reaſons. Nevertheleſs he has publiſhed them under the eighteenth of April. His cenſure ſeemed to Father Perez to be too ſevere, and therefore he endeavoured to refute him, praiſing at the ſame time the vaſt labours of the Jeſuits who publiſh the *Acta Sanctorum*, and reject many of them. ‘ Pleraque enim (fatendum ‘ eſt) Sanctorum acta, *ſays he*, circumferebantur, par‘tim apertè falſa, partim tenebris denſiſſimis obſita, ‘ quæ ab doctiſſimis patribus admodum falce juxta & ‘ face egere videbatur (2). - - - *For (it muſt be owned)* ‘ *many acts of the ſaints were publiſhed, ſome evidently* ‘ *falſe, and others full of obſcurity, which by the learned* ‘ *Fathers were thought to want both the fire and ſword.*’ The judgment which Melchior Canus gave about the lengendary writers has been approved at laſt: he ſaid that the lives of the ancient Philoſophers had been written with more judgment than thoſe of the Chriſtian ſaints. They are now more nicely examined: the acts of the new ſaints are not filled with ſo many abſurdities; yet they are not ſo carefully examined as they ought to be. Here is the remaining part of a paſſage which I have alledged elſewhere (3): *but what is moſt diverting of all, dear goſſip, (ſaid an attorney's wife of St Germain's pariſh) is that as I was going to the church of the bare-footed Carmelites, I heard ſome body cry the life and miracles of my lady St Thereſa: I bought one to gain the indulgences. But when I came home, my huſband fell a reading, and was ſurprized to find that St Thereſa had two fathers, the firſt was king Dom Bermude, and the ſecond, Alonſe Sanchez de Cepede* (4).’ It is ſuppoſed that this diſcourſe was held upon occaſion of St Thereſa's canonization in the year 1622. The author of that book was not of the Reformed religion; he ſpeaks very ill of the Proteſtants.

(1) It was a city of Italy.

(2) Taken from Daniel Papebroch, *in Reſponſ. ad exhibitionem errorum, pag.* 303, 304.

(3) In the remark [*CC*] of the article HADRIAN VI.

(4) Caquet de l'accouché, Second Journée, *pag.* 7.

PERGA

PERGA, a city of Pamphylia. There was a temple of Diana built near it, upon a very high place (*a*). It was very antient, and very much reſpected (*b*); and tho' the Diana of Epheſus was above the Diana of Perga, yet the latter had a great ſhare in the devotion of the people. There was an aſſembly kept there every year (*c*), it was then, without doubt, that they ſung the hymns which Damophila, cotemporary of Sappho, compoſed to the honour of that goddeſs, and which were ſung ſtill in the time of Apollonius Tyanæus (*d*). The Diana of Perga, Περγαία Ἄρτεμις, is mentioned upon ſeveral medals (*e*). It is one of the cities where St Paul preached the goſpel (*f*). The famous Geometer, Apollonius Pergeus (*g*), whoſe book of conic ſections is extant, was born there. It is now in a bad condition; the archiepiſcopal ſee was transferred from thence to Attalia (*h*), one of the fourteen cities which before depended upon it. Perga ſtands eight miles from the ſea.

(*a*) Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 459.

(*b*) Pergæ fanum antiquiſſimum & ſanctiſſimum Dianæ ſcimus eſſe, id quoque à te nudatum & ſpoliatum eſſe, ex ipſa Diana quod habebat auri detractum atque ablatum eſſe dico. *Cicero, in Verrem, Orat. VI.*

(*c*) Strabo, ibid.

(*d*) Vide Philoſt. in ejus Vita, *lib. i.*

(*e*) Spanh. de præſt. & uſu Numiſm. *pag.* 782.

(*f*) Acts, chap. xiii, xiv.

(*g*) I have given his article.

(*h*) Baudrand. Geograph.

PERGAMUM

PERGAMUM, a city of Aſia in Myſia, became very famous under the kings who ſucceeded Philetærus. It's ſituation was very advantageous [*A*]. It was at firſt a fortreſs built upon a mountain (*a*). Lyſimachus, one of Alexander's ſucceſſors, ſhut up his treaſures in it, and gave the government of it to a man, who taking hold of the preſent conjunctures made himſelf maſter of it [*B*], as we ſhall ſee hereafter. The ſtately

(*a*) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 428, 429.

[*A*] *It's ſituation was very advantageous.*] Eſpecially becauſe of the conveniency of the rivers: ‘ Longeque clariſſimum Aſiæ Pergamum quod intermeat ‘ Selinus, præfluit Cetius profuſus Pindaſo monte (1). ‘ - - - - - *Cetius ariſing from mount Pindaſus, runs before* ‘ *Pergamus, which is by far the moſt famous city of Aſia,* ‘ *and Selinus runs thro' it.*’ Pliny ſays this. I wonder that he ſaid nothing of the Caicus, another river which ran near Pergamum, and the only one mentioned by Strabo in the deſcription of that city. Παραρρεῖ δ' ὁ Κάϊκος καὶ τὸ Πέργαμον διὰ τοῦ Καΐκου πεδίου προσαγορευομένου, σφόδρα εὐδαίμονα γῆν διεξιὼν, σχεδὸν δέ τοι καὶ τὴν ἀρίστην τῆς Μυσίας. Pergamum præterfluit Caicus per campum valdè opulentum, qui Caicus dicitur, ac ferè optimam partem Myſiæ (2). - - - *Caicus runs near Pergamum through a very fertile plain, which is called Caicus, and through the beſt part of Myſia.*

[*B*] *A man . . . made himſelf maſter of it.*] His name was Philetærus. He had been an eunuch ever ſince his infancy, by an accident. His nurſe, who carried him to a funeral pomp, was ſo crowded by the ſpectators,

(1) Plin. *lib. v, cap. xxx, pag. m.* 611.

(2) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 429.

ſtately library [*C*] which the kings of Pergamum ſet up, and the temple of Æſculapius [*D*], were the chief ornaments of that city. You will find in Moreri that the inhabitants

tors, that the child's teſticles were cruſhed. Συνέβη γὰρ ἔν τινι ταφῇ θέας οὔσης, καὶ πολλῶν παρόντων, ἀποληφθεῖσαν ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ τὴν κομίζουσαν ἢ τροφὸν τὸν Φιλέταιρον ἔτι νήπιον, συνθλιβῆναι μέχρι τοσοῦδε, ὥς τε πηρωθῆναι τὸν παῖδα· ἦν μὲν δὴ εὐνοῦχος. *Nam ſpectaculo quodam funebri, in magna hominum frequentia, nutrix eum geſtans etiamnum infantem in turba hominum deprehenſa, adeò fuit oppreſſa, ut pueri etiam colliderentur genitalia. Erat ergo eunuchus* (3). He was ſo well educated that he made himſelf capable of noble employments; and he had, without doubt, the reputation of an honeſt man, ſince Lyſimachus truſted him with the government of the fortreſs wherein all his treaſures were. Philetærus was very faithful to his truſt, till he found himſelf perſecuted by the calumnies of Arſinoë, Lyſimachus's wife. From that time he began to withdraw himſelf from his allegiance, and to take ſome meaſures to maintain himſelf in the independency which he had uſurped. The conjunctures proved very favourable to him. Lyſimachus being diſtreſſed with domeſtic diviſions, was forced to put his ſon Agathocles to death. Nevertheleſs he was oppreſſed by Seleucus Nicator; and at laſt killed by the treachery of Ptolemy Ceraunus. During thoſe broils Philetærus ſecured himſelf in the poſſeſſion of Pergamum: he was ſo cunning as to amuſe with words and compliments the party, which ſeemed to him to be moſt formidable, ſo that he remained maſter of the caſtle and money of Lyſimachus for the ſpace of twenty years. His nephew, Eumenes (4), was his heir, and enlarged his dominions by invading ſeveral places about Pergamum. He won a battle near Sardes againſt Antiochus, ſon of Seleucus, and died after a reign of twenty-two years (5). Attalus, his firſt couſin, who ſucceeded him, took the title of king. See the following article. Chronologers place the beginning of Philetærus's dominion in the year of Rome 468. He lived eighty years (6). Some ſay that his mother's name was Boa, and that ſhe was of Paphlagonia, a profeſſed courtezan, and a player upon inſtruments (7). He was born at Teium on the Euxine ſea (8).

[*C*] *The ſtately library.*] I begin this remark with Lomeierus's words: 'Attalus & Eumenes Pergami Reges nobilem bibliothecam conquiſitis undique ſupra ducenta millia exemplaribus, in hædinis pellibus, quæ ab hoc loco pergamenæ dictæ ſunt, deſcriptis, conſtruxiſſe feruntur (9). - - - - *Attalus and Eumenes, kings of Pergamum, are ſaid to have erected a noble library, having collected every where above two hundred thouſand books, written on kid ſkins, which from this place were called pergamenæ, or parchment.*' He quotes Pliny in the ſecond chapter of the thirty-fifth book; but we read only theſe words in that place, 'An priores cœperint Alexandriæ & Pergami Reges, qui bibliothecas magno certamine inſtituere, non facile dixerim. - - - - - *I cannot well tell, whether the kings of Alexandria and Pergamum, who vied with one another in ſetting up libraries, began firſt to do ſo.*' That quotation out of Pliny is not therefore exact. It is true that Pliny tells us in another place, that the art of dreſſing ſkins to make uſe of them in the room of paper, was found at Pergamum. *Mox æmulatione circa bibliothecas regum Ptolemæi & Eumenis, ſupprimente chartas Ptolemæo, idem Varro membranas Pergami tradidit repertas* (10). We learn from thoſe words that the king of Egypt and the king of Pergamum contended who ſhould ſet up the fineſt library; and that this was the reaſon why the king of Egypt forbad the exportation of paper, which occaſioned the invention of parchment. St Jerom ought to be quoted on this ſubject: 'Chartam, *ſays he* (11), defuiſſe non puto, Ægypto miniſtrante commercia, & ſi alicubi Ptolemæus maria clauſiſſet, tamen Rex Attalus membranas à Pergamo miſerat, ut penuria chartæ pellibus penſaretur. Unde & Pergamenarum nomen ad hanc uſque diem, tradente ſibi invicem poſteritate, ſervatum eſt. - - - - *I do not think there was any want of paper, as Egypt maintained commerce with other nations, and if Ptolemy had ſhut up the ſeas any where, yet king Attalus had ſent ſkins from Pergamum to ſupply the want of paper. Whence the name of Pergamena, i. e. parchment, is continued and preſerved to this very day.*' As to the number of books mentioned by Lomeierus, we muſt conſult Plutarch (12), who ſays, that Marc Antony preſented Cleopatra with the library of Pergamum, which contained two hundred thouſand volumes. Father Jacob, in his treatiſe of Libraries, pag. 28, of the firſt part, ſays very falſly that, according to Strabo, that library contained two hundred and eighty thouſand volumes. Mr le Gallois (13) ſays more falſly ſtill, that, according to Pliny, they amounted to a greater number. Lipſius raiſes an objection, about the words of Plutarch, which is unworthy of him. Strabo, ſays he (14), who wrote under Tiberius, aſſures us that the library of Pergamum was ſtill extant, and the ſame as it was when king Eumenes ſet it up. It had not been therefore tranſported to Alexandria to be given to Cleopatra; or it muſt be ſaid that Auguſtus, who undid moſt things which Marc Antony had done, cauſed it to be carried back to Pergamum; or that after it had been loſt under Marc Antony, there was another ſet up altogether like the firſt. This is *nodum in ſcirpo quærere*; - - - *to ſtumble on plain ground*; for Strabo does not mean that Pergamum had ſtill the library and the other embelliſhments wherewith Eumenes adorned it; he means only that it had not been enlarged ſince Eumenes. That prince, ſays he, made it ſuch as it is now. This is the ſenſe of the Greek words (15). Κατεσκεύασε δ' οὗτος τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τὸ Νικηφόριον ἄλσος κατεφύτευσε, καὶ ἀναθήματα, καὶ βιβλιοθήκας, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τοσόνδε κατοικίαν τοῦ Περγάμου τὴν νῦν οὖσαν ἐκεῖνος προσεφιλοκάλησε. *Hic urbem adornavit, & lucum Nicephorium conſevit, ac donaria & bibliothecas & habitationis locum in Pergamo tantum quantus hodieque eſt conſtituit luculenter* (16). Lipſius's objection againſt Vitruvius is better grounded. *Reges Attalici magnis Philologiæ dulcedinibus inducti cum egregiam bibliothecam Pergami ad communem delectationem inſtituiſſent, tunc item Ptolemæus,' infinito zelo cupiditatiſque incitatus ſtudio, non minoribus induſtriis ad eundem modum contenderat Alexandriæ comparare* (17). Theſe are the words of Vitruvius, which plainly ſignify that Ptolemy Philadelphus (18) adorned the city of Alexandria with a fine library, in emulation of that which the kings of Pergamum had ſet up in the chief town of their dominions. Lipſius is in the right to ſay that this is falſe: the library of Alexandria was ſet up before the kings of Pergamum, who made a collection of books, were in being. This is not inconſiſtent with what Pliny ſays of the emulation of Ptolemy and Eumenes: for without doubt the king of Egypt, who lived in the time of Eumenes, was ſorry to ſee that the king of Pergamum was able to obſcure the glory of the Alexandrian library. It is to be obſerved, that the emulation of thoſe princes occaſioned many impoſtures about books, as Galen obſerves. 'Scribit Galenus, Comment. 1. in lib. Hippocr. de natura hum. inter Alexandriæ & Pergami reges, contentionem fuiſſe, quis plura veterum volumina compararet. Tum vero multos ab hominibus pecuniæ avidis falſis auctorum nominibus libros inſcriptos eſſe, quo vetuſtatis plurimum iis & auctoritatis accederet (19). - - - - - *Galen writes that there was an emulation between the kings of Alexandria and Pergamum, who ſhould have moſt books of the Antients. And then many books were by covetous perſons put under falſe names of authors, that they might be thought of the greateſt antiquity and authority.*' I have juſt now found in a fine book (20), *that it is thought the kings of Pergamum began to* adorn their city with a library, *and that Attalus made his library twenty-two years before that of Alexandria*. I do not criticize the author of that book; for, what he ſays that it is thought ſo, is certainly true of ſeveral people: many perſons may be of that perſuaſion. I only ſay that they are miſtaken. The firſt of the kings of Pergamum, who was named Attalus, was born ſome years after the death of Ptolemy Philadelphus to whom the library of Alexandria owed it's beginning. The author adds in the ſame book (21), *that the library of the kings of Pergamum was tranſported to Rome*. I wiſh an author had been quoted for it.

[*D*] *And the temple of Æſculapius.*] That god is ſirnamed *Pergamean* by Martial (22), and a Roman Hiſtorian tells us, that when an inquiry was made at Rome inhabitants of Pergamum built a temple to the emperor Auguſtus, and to the city of Rome (*b*), and that Galen was born there. Several other illuſtrious men were born in that city. Strabo (*c*) will tell you who they were. Add to them Oribaſius, Phyſician to Julian the apoſtate (*d*).

---

(3) Ibid. *pag.* 428.

(4) Son of Eumenes, brother of Philetærus.

(5) Taken from Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 428, 429.

(6) Lucian. in Macrobiis.

(7) Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 577, *B.*

(8) Strabo, *lib. xii, pag.* 374.

(9) Lomeier. de Bibliothecis, *cap. vi, pag.* 96.

(10) Plin. *lib. xiii, cap. xi, pag. m.* 78, 79.

(11) Hieron. Ep. ad Chromat. Jovin. & Euſeb.

(12) Plut. in Vit. Marci Antonii.

(13) Gallois, Treatiſe of Libraries, *pag.* 27.

(14) Lipſ. Syntagm. de Bibl. *cap. iv.*

(15) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 429, 430.

(16) *So thoſe words ought to be rendered, and not as Lipſius has done it, chap. iv,* Eumenes urbem inſtruxit, & donariis, ac Bibliothecis, uti nunc eſt, eleganter excoluit. *Mr* le Gallois, ubi ſupra, *adopts all thoſe thoughts of Lipſius, without quoting him.*

(17) Vitruv. in Præfat. *lib. vii.*

(18) The words of Vitruvius, as they are connected, cannot be underſtood of any other but Ptolomæus Philadelphus.

(19) Harduin. in Plin. *lib. xxxv, cap. ii, pag.* 175.

(20) Jaquelot, Of the Exiſtence of God, *pag.* 126.

(21) Id. ib. *pag.* 127.

(22) Mart. Epigr. XVII, lib. ix.

(*b*) *So ſays* Tacitus, *lib. iv, cap. xxxvii.* Cum divus Auguſtus ſibi atque urbi Romæ templum apud Pergamum ſiſti non prohibuiſſet. (*c*) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 429, 430. (*d*) Eunapius, in Vita Oribaſii.

Rome into falſe aſylums, the proofs which the Pergameans produced for the aſylum of Æſculapius were found valid. ‘ Conſules ſuper eas civitates quas memoravi, apud Pergamum Æſculapii compertum aſylum retulerunt: ceteros obſcuris ob vetuſtatem initiis niti (23). - - - - *The conſuls, of thoſe cities I mentioned, reported, that an aſylum of Æſculapius was found at Pergamum: that the reſt relied on old and uncertain traditions.*’ This paſſage of Tacitus puts one in mind of the inquiry into the titles of thoſe who falſly pretend to be gentlemen, which is from time to time ſo neceſſary in France. But the inquiry made about falſe aſylums was more important. So great an abuſe had crept into the Grecian cities, that the magiſtrates could no longer exerciſe the rigour of the laws; all the criminals and debtors found places of refuge; the mob protected them, and looked upon it as a duty of religion. *Crebreſcebat enim Græcas per urbes licentia atque impunitas aſyla ſtatuendi: complebantur templa peſſimis ſervitiorum: eodem ſubſidio obærati adverſum creditores, ſuſpectique capitalium criminum receptabantur. Nec ullum ſatis validum imperium erat coërcendis ſeditionibus Populi, flagitia hominum ut cæremonias deum protegentis* (24). To remedy that diſorder, it was decreed that all the cities, which had ſome privileged temples, ſhould ſend to Rome the proofs of their aſylums (25). Some of thoſe cities being ſenſible of the uſurpation, renounced it (26). Several others depending upon ſome old traditions, or ſome ſervices done to the Roman people, ſent their deputies. The ſenate gave them audience; but being weary of the ſtories which they told, and of the factions that grew thereupon, they referred that inquiry to the conſuls. *Auditæ aliarum quoque civitatum legationes. Quorum copia feſſi patres, & quia ſtudiis certabatur, conſulibus permiſere, ut perſpecto jure, & ſi qua iniquitas involveretur, rem integram rurſum ad Senatum referrent* (27). The conſuls were not very rigid, they approved of ſeveral titles of nobility which were only grounded upon chimeras; for example, they admitted as an authentic proof what the Epheſians told them, that the olive tree, upon which Latona leaned when ſhe was delivered of Apollo, was ſtill extant. ‘ Eſſe apud ſe Cenchrium amnem, lucum Ortygiam, ubi Latonam partu gravidam & oleæ quæ tum etiam maneat adniſam, edidiſſe ea numina, deorumque monitu ſacratum nemus (28). - - - - *That near them was the river Cencrius, and the grove Ortygia, where Latona being big with child, and leaning upon an olive tree, brought forth thoſe deities, and that by the order of the gods the grove was conſecrated.*’ Judges would be not leſs indulged at preſent, if every pariſh was ſummoned to produce the proofs of it's devotions and relics. Tho' it is well known how blindly the Heathens maintained their traditions; yet people will not open their eyes and ſee the abſurdity of the ſtories, which are told in all the places, that boaſt of a privileged devotion.

(23) Tacit. Annal. *lib. iii, cap. lxiii, ad ann.* 775.

(24) Ibid. *cap. lx.*

(25) Igitur placitum ut mitterent civitates jura, atque legatos. *Ib.*

(26) Quædam quod falſo uſurpaverant ſponte omiſere: multæ vetuſtis ſuperſtitionibus, aut meritis in populum Romanum fidebat. *Ibid.*

(27) Ibid. *cap. lxiii.*

(28) Ibid. *cap. lxi.*

Polybius will afford us as good a reflexion as that. Pruſias having overcome Attalus, entred into Pergamum (29), and offered a pompous ſacrifice to Æſculapius, and then he returned to his camp. The next day he cauſed all the temples to be plundered, and laid upon his own ſhoulders the ſtatue of Æſculapius (30), to whom he had offered ſome ſacrifices, and whom he had invoked the day before. Polybius calls it the action of a man furious and mad. "Ἅμα μὲν θύειν καὶ διὰ τούτων ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τὸ θεῖον προσκυνοῦντα καὶ λιπαροῦντα τὰς τραπέζας καὶ τοὺς βωμοὺς ἐξάλλως, ὅπερ ὁ Προυσίας εἴθιστο ποιεῖν, γονυπετῶν καὶ γυναικιζόμενος· ἅμα δὲ ταῦτα καὶ λυμαίνεσθαι καὶ διὰ τῆς τούτων καταφθορᾶς τὴν εἰς τὸ θεῖον ὕβριν διατίθεσθαι, πῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴποι τις εἶναι θυμοῦ λυττῶντος ἔργα καὶ ψυχῆς ἐξεστηκυίας τῶν λογισμῶν. Etenim ſimul victimas cædere, deoſque propitios orare, omnemque aram ac lapidem exquiſito quodam genere adorare & venerari flexis genibus & muliebri ſuperſtitione, quod Pruſias facere ſolebat, atque interim eadem fana labefactare, eorumque everſione contumeliam diis facere, quis neget id eſſe rabie perciti hominiſque de ſtatu mentis deturbati (31)? - - - - *For to offer ſacrifices and implore the favour of the gods, to worſhip and adore the altar in the humbleſt poſture, and with an effeminate ſuperſtition, as Pruſias uſed to do, and yet to ruin the ſame temples, and thereby affront the gods, is undoubtedly to act like a furious mad-man.* I am ſure that Polybius would not have ſpoken ſo harſhly of thoſe who ſhould have plundered the temples without having at any time worſhipped the deities thereof. What he ſays that Pruſias entred into Pergamum, is conſiſtent with what Diodorus Siculus relates, that this prince having loſt the hopes of making himſelf maſter of the Perſon of Attalus, fell a plundering the temple of Nicephorus, which was not far from the city (32). But here is a better argument againſt Polybius, will ſome ſay. King Eumenes declares expreſsly in the ſpeech he made to the ſenate of Rome, that he was beſieged in Pergamum, and was ſo happy as to prevent the taking of the city. ‘ Quod miſerrimum eſt in bello, obſidionem paſſus ſum, Pergami incluſus cum diſcrimine ultimo ſimul vitæ regnique, liberatus deinde obſidione, cum alia parte Antiochus, alia Seleucus circa arcem regni mei caſtra haberent, relictis rebus meis tota claſſe ad Helleſpontem L. Scipioni Coſ. veſtro occurri, ut eum in trajiciendo exercitum adjuvarem (33). - - - - *I underwent a ſiege, which is the greateſt calamity that can happen in war, being ſhut up in Pergamum with the utmoſt riſque of my life and kingdom; and being afterwards freed from the ſiege, tho' Antiochus on one ſide, and Seleucus on another, were encamped round the capital of my kingdom, I left my affairs and went with my whole fleet to the Helleſpont to meet L. Scipio, your conſul, that I might aſſiſt him in tranſporting his army.*’ I anſwer that neither Polybius, nor Diodorus Siculus, ſay any thing of what happened under king Eumenes. They mention a ſiege of Pergamum, which was made afterwards, and ſuſtained by Attalus Philadelphus againſt Pruſias king of Bithynia. See Appian (34).

(29) Προυσίας μετὰ τὸ νικῆσαι τὸν Ἄτταλον, μετὰ τὸ παρελθεῖν πρὸς το Πέργαμον. Pruſias victo Attalo, Pergamum ingreſſus. *Polybius, in Excerptis à Valeſio editis, pag.* 169.

(30) An admirable piece of Phylomachus, περιττῶς ὑπὸ Φυλομάχου κατεσκευασμένον. *Ibid. Diodorus Siculus, ubi infra,* calls him *Phyromachus:* it is the name of an excellent ſtatuary who flouriſhed in the CXXth Olympiad according to *Pliny, lib. xxxiv, cap. viii.*

(31) Polyb. ubi ſupra.

(32) Diod. Sicul. in Excerpt. à Valeſio publicatis, *pag.* 336. He obſerves that Pruſias took away all the gods, and amongſt others Æſculapius.

(33) T. Liv. *lib. xxxvii, chap. liii.*

(34) Appian. in Mithridat. *circa init.*

PERGAMUM (ATTALUS KING OF)

succeeded, in the year 512 of Rome, to Eumenes, his couſin [*A*], who had been the ſucceſſor of Philetærus their uncle. He took

[*A*] *Eumenes his couſin.*] Philetærus had two brother's, the name of the elder was Eumenes; the other's name was Attalus. The ſon of the former had the ſame name with his father, and ſucceeded Philetærus. The ſon of Attalus was called Attalus, and ſucceeded Eumenes (1). If Father Labbe had read Strabo attentively, he would not have quoted him as having ſaid that Attalus was brother and ſucceſſor of Eumenes (2). Moreri has tranſcribed that fault (3). I wonder that Mr Menage did not obſerve a fault of Diogenes Laërtius which Valeſius had cenſured (4). That Hiſtorian of the Philoſophers ſays that Eumenes was Philetærus's ſon (5). He ſhould have ſaid that he was his nephew; as we find it in Strabo and Athenæus. I ſhall ſet down the words of the latter, becauſe they contain a curious fact, viz. That Eumenes died by too much drinking, ὑπὸ μέθης ἀπέθανεν Ευμένης ὁ Περγαμηνὸς ὁ Φιλεταίρου τοῦ Περγάμου βασιλεύσαντος ἀδελφιδοῦς, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Κτησικλῆς ἐν τρίτῳ χρόνων (6). *Eumenes Pergamenus Philetæri* (7) *qui Pergami regnavit ex fratre nepos, ebrietate periit, ut refert Cteſicles libro tertio de temporibus.* Note that Athenæus uſes elſewhere (8) the ſame word βασιλεύσας, ſpeaking of Philetærus.

(1) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 429.

(2) Labbe, French Chronologer, *Tom. ii, pag.* 300, *ad ann. Rom.* 512.

(3) In his article of Eumenes.

(4) Hen. Valeſ. Not. ad Excerpta Polybii, *pag.* 19.

(5) Diog. Laërt. *lib. iv,* in Arceſilao, *num.* 48.

(6) Athen. *lib. x, pag.* 445.

(7) There is *Attali* in *Dalechampius*'s tranſlation.

(8) Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 557.

took the title of king, which they had not taken [*B*], and he thought he could do it without arrogance, after the glory he had acquired in winning a battle againſt the Gauls (*a*). He made an alliance with the Romans (*b*), at a time when ſuch a friend was very neceſſary to them; for beſides that they were to oppoſe Hannibal in Italy, they were alſo obliged to make head againſt Philip king of Macedon, who had declared himſelf their enemy. Attalus took the part of the Romans with great zeal, and continued their friend as long as he lived. He undertook a journey to Athens, to prejudice the king of Macedon. The Athenians did him great honours [*C*]. He made another journey into Greece being above ſeventy years of age, to procure ſome allies to the Romans againſt the king of Macedon (*c*). He harangued the Thebans with ſo much force [*D*] to engage them in that league, that his ardour, ſomewhat too great for an old man, was the cauſe of a giddineſs, or defluxion, which hindered him from making an end of his ſpeech. He fell into a ſwoon in the middle of his diſcourſe, and having embarked ſome days after, he returned to Pergamum, where he died (*d*) in a ſhort time, after he had reigned forty-four years (*e*). He lived ſeventy-two years (*f*). He was a prince that loved Philoſophers (*g*), and made uſe of his riches like a man of honour, and a great ſoul. He was faithful to his allies, he lived very well with his wife [*E*], and took care that his four ſons ſhould have a very good education (*h*). EUMENES, the eldeſt of all, ſucceeded him. He was a man of a weak conſtitution, but he had a great ſoul which ſupplied the weakneſs of his body. He loved glory above all things, he was magnificent, and he heaped up benefits upon many Grecian cities, and private men. He very much enlarged his territories, and was only beholden to his own induſtry and prudence for it. He knew ſo well how to keep his brothers

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

(*b*) In the year 542. See Livy, *lib. xxvi, pag. m.* 451.

(*c*) Livy, *lib. xxxiii, pag.* 610.

(*d*) In the year of Rome 556.

(*e*) Livy, ibid. Polyb. in Excerptis Valeſianis, *pag.* 105.

(*f*) Polyb. ibid.

(*g*) See the article LACYDES.

(*h*) Ex eodem Polybio, ibid.

[*B*] *He took the title of king which they had not taken.*] Strabo ſays ſo in expreſs words. Ἀνηγορεύθη βασιλεὺς οὗτος πρῶτος νικήσας Γαλάτας μάχῃ μεγάλῃ. Hic primus rex ſalutatus eſt cum magna pugna Galatas viciſſet (9). - - - *He was firſt ſaluted king, when he had defeated the Gauls in a great battle.* Polybius ſaid the ſame thing before him (10): Νικήσας γὰρ μάχῃ Γαλάτας, ὃ βαρύτατον καὶ μαχιμώτατον ἔθνος ἦν τότε κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, ταύτην ἀρχὴν ἐποίησατο, καὶ τότε πρῶτον αὐτὸν ἔδειξε βασιλέα. Superatis enim prælio Gallis, quæ gens maxime terribilis ac bellicoſiſſima tum in Aſia erat, tum primum regium nomen palam ſibi adſcivit. - - - *For having overcome the Gauls in battle, who were then the moſt terrible and moſt warlike nation in Aſia, he firſt aſſumed openly the title of king.* Livy is of the ſame opinion *Victis deinde prælio uno Gallis quæ tum gens recenti adventu terribilior Aſiæ erat, regium adſcivit nomen cujus magnitudini ſemper animum æquavit* (11). Thoſe three teſtimonies are to preferred to the authority of Juſtin and Diogenes Laërtius; for 1. Juſtin has committed a miſtake, which ſhews that he did not carefully enquire into the truth of the matter. He ſays that Eumenes was king of Bithynia. This might be alledged by thoſe who ſhould deny that our Attalus was the firſt who took the title of king. They might ſay that Eumenes, his predeceſſor, is ſtiled king by Juſtin (12). But, I ſhall anſwer, Did he command in Bithynia? Did he not command in Pergamum? Can Juſtin be excuſed, unleſs he has recourſe to ſome Critics, who read Nicomedes inſtead of Eumenes in that paſſage? 2. Diogenes Laertius does not treat hiſtorically of Pergamum, and mentions Eumenes only accidentally, and therefore we have no reaſon to believe that he carefully inquired whether that prince took the title of king; it was enough for him to know that Eumenes had a ſovereign authority in Pergamum, which made him uſe an expreſſion that ſignifies royalty. He ſays (13) that Eumenes having heaped up benefits upon Arceſilaus, was the only king to whom that author dedicated ſome books. The paſſage of Athenæus, which I have quoted, ought not to be objected. We read in it that Philetærus reigned in Pergamum; but this does not ſignify that he took actually the title of king. Read the modern hiſtorians of the dukes of Savoy, the electors of Bavaria, or Brandenburg, &c. and you will often find in them the words *reign*, and *to reign*, which denote only an authority exerciſed under the name of a duke, or an elector. The medals which give the title of king to Philetærus, if we believe Goltzius (14), are a better proof againſt Strabo, if they are not falſe. Thoſe which Mr Spanheim has ſeen, do not give him that title (15). As for the reſt, the victory Attalus obtained over the Gauls happened the laſt year of the CXXXIVth Olympiad (16). It was the 512th year of Rome.

[*C*] *The Athenians did him great honours.*] The whole town, men and women, and the prieſts in their habits, went to meet him. The gods were like to be forced to do him the ſame honour. Livy affords me that thought: *Rex Piræeum, renovandæ firmandæque cum Athenienſibus ſocietatis cauſa trajecit. Civitas omnis obviam effuſa cum conjugibus ac liberis, ſacerdotes cum inſignibus ſuis intrantem urbem, ac dii propè ipſi exciti ſedibus ſuis exceperunt* (17). He obſerves that Attalus thought it became his dignity to communicate his propoſals in writing, rather than expoſe his modeſty to the neceſſity of ſetting forth his ſervices, and of receiving a vaſt number of praiſes from a flattering people. The Hiſtorian expreſſes it admirably well: *In concionem extemplo populus vocatus, ut rex quæ vellet, coràm ageret: deinde ex dignitate magis viſum, ſcribere eum, de quibus videretur, quàm præſentem aut referendis ſuis in civitatem beneficiis erubeſcere, aut ſignificationibus acclamationibuſque multitudinis, aſſentatione immodica pudorem onerantis* (18). The war was concluded againſt Philip king of Macedon. It was then propoſed to add a new tribe to the ten, and to call it Attalis, in honour to king Attalus: *Ingenti conſenſu bellum adverſus Philippum decretum. Honores regi primùm Attalo immodici, deinde & Rhodiis habiti: tum primùm mentio illata de tribu, quam Attalida appellarent, ad decem veteres tribus addenda* (19).

[*D*] *He harangued the Thebans with ſo much force.*] This is ſo ſingular, that it deſerves to be read in the very words of Plutarch (20): Καὶ μέντοι παρελθὼν ὁ Τίτος, ὡς οὐκ ἔχων τὴν πόλιν, ἔπειθεν ἑλέσθαι τὰ Ῥωμαίων, Ἀττάλου τοῦ βασιλέως συναγορεύοντος αὐτῷ καὶ συνεξορμῶντος τοὺς Θηβαίους. ἀλλ' Ἄτταλος μὲν, (ὡς ἔοικεν) τοῦ γήρως προθυμότερον ἑαυτὸν τῷ Τίτῳ ῥήτορα παρασχεῖν φιλοτιμούμενος, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λέγειν προσπεσόντος ἰλίγγου τινὸς ἢ ῥεύματος, ἄφνω τὴν αἴσθησιν ἐπιληφθεὶς ἔπεσεν, καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ ταῖς ναυσὶν εἰς Ἀσίαν ἀποκομισθεὶς ἐτηλεύτησεν. Titus (21) inde, quaſi urbe non poti-retur, affatus eos eſt, ſuadens ut in partes Romanorum diſcederent adjuvante Attalo & Thebanos incitante. Sed Attalus quidem, quum præter ætatem, (ut mihi quidem videtur) majore contentione oratorem Quintio præſtare vellet, & vertigine quadam vel pituita eſſet in media oratione correptus, collapſus eſt, nec multis diebus poſt in Aſiam navibus devectus expiravit. - - - *And then Titus, as if he had not been maſter of the city, addreſſed himſelf to them, and adviſed them to ſide with the Romans, Attalus at the ſame time endeavouring to perſuade the Thebans to agree to it. But Attalus haranguing too eagerly (in my opinion) for one of his years, was ſeized with a giddineſs, or defluxion, in the middle of his ſpeech, and dropped down, and a few days after, having ſailed into Aſia he died.* You may ſee in Livy (22) how Eumenes, the ſon of Attalus, repreſented that accident to the ſenate of Rome, after he had ſet forth, in a few words, the ſervices which his father had done to the common-wealth.

[*E*] *He lived very well with his wife.*] She was of Cyzicus, and of a mean extraction; her name was

(9) Strabo, ubi ſupra.

(10) Polyb. *lib. xviii*, in Excerptis Valeſianis, *pag.* 103.

(11) Livy, *lib. xxxii, pag. m.* 610.

(12) Rex Bithyniæ Eumenes. *Juſt. lib. xxvii, cap. iii.*

(13) Ἐχορήγει αὐτῷ πολλὰ Εὐμενὴς ὁ τοῦ Φιλεταίρου· διὸ καὶ τούτῳ μόνῳ τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων προσεφώνει. Diogen. Laërt. *lib. iv, num.* 38.

(14) Vid. Valeſ. Not. ad Excerpta Polyb. *pag.* 19.

(15) Ezech. Spanheim. de præſt. & uſu Numiſm. *pag.* 468.

(16) Valeſius, ubi ſupra.

(17) T. Liv. *lib. xxxi, pag.* 572.

(18) Ibid.

(19) Ibid. *pag.* 573.

(20) Plut. in Vit. Flaminii, *pag.* 371, *B.*

(21) That is to ſay, Titus Quinctius Flaminius who then was conſul.

(22) T. Liv. *lib. xxxvii, chap. liii.*

brothers to their duty [*F*], that they concurred with him in promoting the public good, and never entered upon any factious deſign *(i)*. He kept inviolably his alliance with the Romans,

(i) Ex eodem Polyb. ibid. *pag.* 166, *& ſeq.*

Apollonis. She had the title of queen, and kept it as long as ſhe lived, not by the addreſs of a courtezan (23), but by her modeſty, probity, prudence, and gravity. She loved her four ſons tenderly, and ſhe loved them to the laſt, tho' ſhe out-lived her huſband ſeveral years. This clauſe is not ſuperfluous; for it happens but too often, that queens dowagers raiſe cabals to the prejudice of their children. King Attalus her ſon had a great reſpect for her; it was a thing very much admired by the inhabitants of Cyzicus, when they ſaw him and his brother lead their mother by the hand to all the temples, and other places of the city. They got a thouſand praiſes and good wiſhes for it (24). No body would be much ſurprized now to ſee ſuch a thing in the weſt.

[*F*] *He knew ſo well how to keep his brothers to their duty.*] Polybius giving us the character of Eumenes obſerves, as his laſt diſtinguiſhing ſtroke, that he behaved himſelf ſo wiſely towards his brothers, that they proved the inſtruments of the ſafety of his reign. Ἀδελφοὺς ἔχων τρεῖς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ πρᾶξιν πάντας τούτους συνέσχε πειθαρχοῦντας αὐτῷ, καὶ δορυφοροῦντας, καὶ σώζοντας τὸ τῆς βασιλείας ἀξίωμα· τοῦτο δὲ σπανίως εὕροι τις ἂν γεγονός. *Fratres cum haberet tres & ætate & induſtria pollentes, eos in officio omnes continuit & morigeros cuſtodeſque regni ac dignitatis ſuæ habuit ſatellites. Quod raro admodum contigiſſe reperias* (25). He is in the right to ſay that it is a rare thing (26): Hiſtory is full of cruel wars, wherein princes have been engaged againſt their brothers or their own children. So that they, who have carefully read it, may make this aphoriſm, *That it is more difficult for a king, who has brothers and children to govern his family, than to govern his kingdom.* The preventing of civil wars requires troubleſome and continual precautions; and if a prince does not prevent them, how careful muſt he be to put an end to them? How great are the uneaſineſs and dangers he is expoſed to? The politics of the Turks are horrible, they barbarouſly ſacrifice to the reigning prince, the life or the liberty of all his brothers; but it is a neceſſary evil: for otherwiſe that vaſt empire would be expoſed to the moſt terrible deſolations. See the Hiſtorical Meditations of Camerarius, Chap. 88. of the firſt volume. However that be, let us not look upon the union, wherein king Eumenes kept his brothers, as good luck, but rather as the effect of a conſummate prudence, ſupported by a great merit. It was ſo much the more difficult to keep them to their duty, as they were ſurrounded with ill examples. Syria and Egypt were cruelly torn by diſputes about the ſucceſſion. The royal family of Macedonia was imbrued with blood by reaſon of the jealouſy of authority. It was an abominable age. There was nothing to be ſeen but horrible attempts of brothers upon brothers, and of fathers upon children, or of children upon fathers. This might very well tempt the brothers of the king of Pergamum. Their mother had great reaſon to think herſelf happy to ſee them ſo well united. Ἀπολλωνίδα οὖν τὴν Κυζικηνήν, Εὐμενοῦς δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως μητέρα, καὶ τριῶν ἄλλων Ἀττάλου, καὶ Φιλεταίρου καὶ Ἀθηναίου, λέγουσι μακαρίζειν ἑαυτὴν ἀεὶ καὶ τοῖς Θεοῖς χάριν ἔχειν, οὐ διὰ τὸν πλοῦτον, οὐδὲ διὰ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι τοὺς τρεῖς υἱοὺς ἑώρα τὸν πρεσβύτατον δορυφοροῦντας, κἀκεῖνον ἐν μέσοις αὐτοῖς δόρατα καὶ ξίφη φοροῦσιν, ἀδεῶς διαιτώμενον. Apollonidem Cyzicenam, Eumenis regis matrem ac trium præterea filiorum Attali, Philetæri, & Athenæi, prædicaſſe ſubinde ſe beatam, diiſque egiſſe ajunt gratias, non propter divitias vel imperium, ſed quòd tres filios videret natu maximi eſſe ſatellites, eumque in medio ipſorum gladios haſtaſque ferentium abſque metu verſari (27). - - - *They ſay that Apollonis of Cyzicus, the mother of king Eumenes, and of three other ſons, viz. Attalus, Philetærus, and Athenæus, would now and then call herſelf happy, and thank the gods, not upon the account of riches or empire, but becauſe ſhe ſaw her three ſons guards to the eldeſt, and becauſe he was continually in the midſt of them without fear, tho' they were armed with ſwords and ſpears.* Attalus, the eldeſt of the three brothers, who did not reign, had the greateſt ſhare in important affairs. I confeſs he expreſſed a great love to Eumenes on ſeveral occaſions. Knowing that he was very much afflicted by reaſon of what the cities of Peloponneſus had done (28), he uſed his utmoſt endeavours to perſwade them to give him ſatisfaction for it (29). He called a city Eumenia, in honour of his brother (30): In a word, he was ſirnamed Philadelphus. Nevertheleſs the king did ſuſpect him, and not without reaſon, as we find it in Livy. That Hiſtorian tells us, that after the conqueſt of Macedonia (31), Attalus, who had ſerved the Romans very well in that famous expedition, came to Rome with ſecret hopes of ſupplanting his brother, and that he would have diſcovered the whole intrigue, had not the Phyſician who attended him, diſſwaded him from it. Now this Phyſician was given him by Eumenes, and he was ordered to obſerve him. He was properly the king's ſpy; and the king's ſuſpicion was well grounded. ‘Suberat & ſecreta ſpes honorum præmiorumque ab ſenatu, quæ vix ſalva pietate ejus contingere poterant. Erant enim quidam Romanorum quoque non boni authores qui ſpe cupiditatem ejus elicerent: eam opinionem de Attalo & Eumene Romæ eſſe, tanquam de altero Romanis certo amico, altero nec Romanis, nec Perſi fido ſocio. Itaque vix ſtatui poſſe, utrum quæ pro ſe, an quæ contra fratrem petiturus eſſet, ab ſenatu magis impetrabilia forent: adeò univerſos omnia & huic tribuere, & illi verò negare. Eorum hominum (ut res docuit) Attalus erat, qui quantum ſpes ſpopondiſſet cuperent, ni unius amici prudens monitio velut frænos animo ejus geſtienti ſecundis rebus impoſuiſſet. Stratius cum eo fuit medicus, ad idipſum à non ſecuro Eumene Romam miſſus ſpeculator rerum, quæ à fratre agerentur, monitorque fidus ſi decedi fide vidiſſet. Is ad occupatas jam aures ſolicitatumque jam animum cùm veniſſet, aggreſſus tempeſtivis temporibus rem prope prolapſam reſtituit (32). - - - *He entertained ſecret hopes of honours and rewards from the ſenate, which he could not well receive with a ſafe conſcience and unſpotted honour. For there were ſome Romans about him, who gave him bad advice, and raiſed his expectations by telling him, that he was looked upon at Rome as a ſure friend to the Romans, but that Eumenes was conſidered neither as a faithful ally to the Romans nor to Perſes. And therefore it was not eaſy to ſay, whether what he ſhould aſk in his own behalf, or to the prejudice of his brother, would be more readily granted by the ſenate: all were ſo forward to give the one and refuſe the other every thing. Attalus was one of thoſe men (as experience ſhewed) who eagerly deſire to enjoy what they hope for, had not the prudent advice of a friend checked the tranſports of his mind. The Phyſician Stratius attended him, being ſent to Rome by Eumenes, who entertained ſome ſuſpicion of his brother, to be a ſpy on his actions, and to give him faithful advice if he ſhould depart from his duty: Stratius finding him already engaged in intrigues, ſeaſonably applied to him, and retrieved affairs that were almoſt ruined.*’ I do not ſet down the ſolid reaſons which that Phyſician made uſe of to keep Attalus to his duty. I ſhall only ſay that they deſerve to be read in Livy, and that it is likely this was not the leaſt moving. He repreſented to Attalus that king Eumenes was an old man and had no children, ſo that he might in a ſhort time lawfully ſucceed him (33). It is neceſſary to know that the ſon of Eumenes had not been legitimated. Some things happened three or four years before, which ſhewed that fraternal love and ambition ſtruggled together in the heart of Attalus. King Eumenes having been dangerouſly wounded with two ſtones thrown at him near Delphi, was carried to the iſle of Ægina. His wounds were dreſſed ſo ſecretly, that it was ſcarce known by any body whether or no he was alive. So that it was reported every where that he was dead. Attalus believed it more readily than a good brother ought to have done. He ſpoke like a king to his ſiſter-in-law, Eumenes's wife, and to the governour of the citadel. In a word he ſhewed himſelf too haſty to ſucceed. Eumenes was not ignorant of it, and tho' he was reſolved to bear it without expreſſing any reſentment, he could not refrain upbraiding his brother, at the very firſt converſation, with his exceſſive impatience of marrying the queen. Livy ſays no more of it; but the truth is, if we believe ſome other authors, that Attalus lay actually with the queen.

(23) Οὐχ ἑταιρικὴν προσφερομένη πιθανότητα. Non meretriciis illecebris. *Polyb. ubi infra.*

(24) Polyb. in Excerpt. Valeſian. *pag.* 113, 114.

(25) Ibid. *pag.* 169.

(26) Compare citat. (7) of the article DRUSILLA, daughter of Agrippina; with citat. (4) of the article DRUSUS, ſon of Germanicus.

(27) Plut. de fraterno Amore, *pag.* 480, *C.*

(28) They had pulled down the ſtatues of Eumenes by a public decree. *Polyb. in Excerpt. pag.* 133.

(29) Polyb. ibid.

(30) Stephan. voce Εὐμένεια.

(31) In 585.

(32) T. Liv. *lib.* *xlv*, *pag.* 877.

(33) Haud ambiguum propediem regnaturum eum infirmitate ætateque Eumenis eſſet nullam ſtirpem liberum habentis. (Nec dum enim agnoverat eum, qui poſtea regnavit.) Quid attineret vim afferre rei ſua ſponte mox ad eum adventuræ? *Ibid.*

Romans, which proved very uſeful to him. He himſelf brought a great fleet to the conſul Flaminius during the war againſt Philip king of Macedon (*k*). He ſtirred up the Romans to make war againſt Antiochus, and found by experience that the principles upon which his advice was grounded were very juſt (*l*); for he was gratified with ſeveral provinces, which were taken from Antiochus, after the battle of Magneſia (*m*) [*G*]. He excited alſo the Romans to make war againſt Perſeus king of Macedon (*n*), and in order to it, he took a journey to Rome. As he was returning to Pergamum by the way of Delphi, where he deſigned to offer a ſacrifice, he was dangerouſly wounded by ſome aſſaſſins whom Perſeus had ſuborned (*o*); he did not die of it, but the report of his death went as far as Pergamum. He did ſomewhat conceal his reſentment againſt his brother Attalus, who had appeared a little too eager to ſucceed him (*p*). He aſſiſted not at the war againſt Perſeus (*q*), and ſome ſay that he made himſelf ſuſpected by the Romans. We muſt not forget, that he loſt a battle at ſea by a ſtratagem of Hannibal [*H*], and

(*k*) T. Liv. *lib. xxxiv, pag.* 632.

(*l*) See Livy, *lib. xxxv, pag.* 651.

(*m*) It was fought in the year of Rome 563.

(*n*) Ibid. Liv. *lib. xlii, pag.* 813.

(*o*) Id. ib. *pag.* 815.

(*p*) See the remark [*F*].

(*q*) Liv. *lib. xliv, pag.* 853.

queen. (34) *Compotem jam ſui regem, amici poſtero die deferunt ad navem: inde Corinthum. à Corintho per iſthmi jugum navibus traductis* (35), *Æginam trajiciunt. Ibi adeò ſecreta ejus curatio fuit, aamittentibus neminem, ut fama mortuum in Aſiam perferret. Attalus quoque celerius quàm dignum concordia fraterna erat, credidit. Nam & cum uxore fratris, & præfecto arci, tanquam jam haud dubius regni hæres eſt locutus. Quæ poſtea non fefellere Eumenem: & quanquam diſſimulare & tacitè habere id patique ſtatuerat, tamen in primo congreſſu non temperavit, quin uxoris petendæ prœmaturam feſtinationem fratri objiceret. Romam quoque fama de morte Eumenis perlata eſt.* Plutarch has turned the whole matter into a panegyric both upon Eumenes and Attalus: it was neceſſary to give it ſuch a turn, for he was writing a treatiſe of brotherly love, wherein the royal family of Pergamum ought to appear a good example, after what he had already ſaid of the mother of the four brothers (36). For my part, I find the account, which Livy gives of it, more likely. Plutarch relates the matter thus: ‘ Having heard ‘ that he came from the ſea coaſt towards the city to ‘ conſult the oracle of Apollo, they aſſaulted him behind, and threw ſome great ſtones at him, which ‘ fell upon his head and neck, and ſo ſtunned him ‘ that he ſwooned away and fell to the ground, ſo ‘ that it was thought he was dead, and the report of ‘ it went every where, and even ſome of his ſervants ‘ and friends, made all the haſte they could to bring ‘ the news of it to Pergamum, as of a thing at which ‘ they had been preſent. Wherefore Attalus, the eldeſt of his brothers, who was an honeſt man, and ‘ had always behaved himſelf more faithfully and ‘ loyally towards his brother than any other, was not ‘ only proclaimed king, and crowned with the royal ‘ diadem, but, which is more, he married queen Stratonice his brother's wife, and lay with her. But ‘ afterwards when the news came that Eumenes was ‘ alive, and that he was a coming; he laid down his ‘ diadem, retook his javelin, which he uſed to carry ‘ to guard his brother, and went to meet him with ‘ the other guards. The king received him kindly, ‘ ſaluted and embraced the queen with great honour ‘ and great careſſes; and having lived a long time ‘ after without any complaint or ſuſpicion, he died ‘ at laſt, leaving his kingdom and his wife to his ‘ brother Attalus. But what did Attalus do after his ‘ death? He would never breed up any of his ‘ children which he had by his wife Stratonice, and ‘ they were many; but he bred up and educated the ‘ ſon of his deceaſed brother, till he came to be a man, ‘ and then he himſelf put the royal diadem on his ‘ head, and called him king (37).’

[G] *He was gratified with many provinces, which were taken from Antiochus after the battle of Magneſia.*] That prince having been forced to accept the peace upon ſuch terms as the Romans impoſed on him, all the allies of the Romans endeavoured to have a ſhare in his ſpoils, their demands were heard, and they were anſwered: ‘ Decem legatos more majorum ſenatum ‘ miſſurum ad res Aſiæ diſceptandas, componendaſque: ‘ ſummam tamen hanc fore, ut cis Taurum montem ‘ quæ intra regni Antiochi fines fuiſſent, Eumeni attribuerentur; præter Lyciam Cariamque, uſque ad ‘ Mæandrum amnem, ea civitatis Rhodiorum eſſent. ‘ Cæteræ civitates Aſiæ, quæ Attali ſtipendiariæ fuiſſent, eædem Eumeni vectigal penderent: quæ vectigales Antiochi fuiſſent, eæ liberæ atque immunes ‘ eſſent (38). - - - *That the ſenate, after the manner of ‘ their anceſtors, would ſend ten commiſſioners to examine ‘ and ſettle the affairs of Aſia: that the concluſion however would be this, that what Antiochus had poſſeſſed ‘ on this ſide mount Taurus ſhould be given to Eumenes, ‘ and what was beyond Lycia and Caria, as far as the ‘ river Mæander, ſhould belong to the Rhodians. The other ‘ cities of Aſia, which had been tributary to Attalus, ‘ ſhould pay tribute to Eumenes: and thoſe which had ‘ been tributary to Antiochus, ſhould be free and exempted ‘ from paying tribute.*’ After ſo formal a teſtimony it is not neceſſary to hear Cicero: neverthleſs I ſhall quote him to obſerve a fault which he has committed: ‘ Antiochum illum magnum, *ſays he* (39), majores ‘ noſtri magna belli contentione terra marique ſuperatum intra montem Taurum regnare juſſerunt: Aſiam ‘ qua illum multarunt, Attalo ut is regnaret in ea, ‘ condonaverunt. - - - *Our anceſtors, having ſubdued ‘ the great Antiochus in a formidable war by ſea and ‘ land, limited his territories within mount Taurus, and ‘ gave that part of Aſia, which they took from him, to ‘ king Attalus.*’ Cicero is miſtaken about the name of the king who obtained ſo noble a preſent from the Roman people. It was Eumenes and not Attalus, who received it. I know not whether any commentator has obſerved this miſtake (40); but I have juſt now conſulted two, who, inſtead of obſerving it, have committed another fault: ATTALO, ſays Manutius (41), *Eumenis fratri, qui eam poſtea populo Romano moriens teſtamento legavit.* Another ſays, ATTALO *Pergami Regi qui moriens populum Romanum fecit hæredem* (42). It is not true that Attalus, brother of Eumenes, received from the Roman people the provinces which were taken from Antiochus, and it is falſe that he reſtored them to the Roman People by his laſt will. He, who choſe ſuch an heir, was Attalus ſon of Eumenes. Father Abram has committed another fault; he thinks that Cicero ſpeaks of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that the ſame Antiochus was overcome by Lucius Scipio (43). He is miſtaken; for Antiochus Epiphanes did not reign till after Seleucus Philopator, the ſucceſſor of Antiochus the great, and it was Antiochus the great that the Romans conquered under the command of Lucius Scipio. As for the reſt, the miſtake of Manutius is but a copy of that of Valerius Maximus. ‘ Liberalis Populus Romanus magnitudine muneris, quod ‘ Attalo regi Aſiam dedit dono. Sed Attalus etiam ‘ teſtamenti æquitate gratus, qui eandem Aſiam Populo ‘ Romano legavit (44). - - - *The Roman people were ‘ very liberal in giving ſuch a noble preſent as Aſia to ‘ king Attalus. And Attalus was alſo grateful and juſt, ‘ in leaving by his laſt will the ſame Aſia to the Roman ‘ people.*’

Note, That when I writ this article, the edition of Cicero's orations, which Mr Grævius has publiſhed, was not then come out. It came out ſince (45), I have conſulted it as I was reading this again before I gave it to the Printers, and I have found that the miſtakes of Father Abram, Manutius, and Cicero, have been obſerved by Mr Grævius. See pag. 78 and 79 of the fifth volume.

[*H*] *He loſt a battle at ſea by a ſtratagem of Hannibal.*] Antiochus being not able to protect Hannibal againſt the Romans, who would have him to deliver him up to them, adviſed him to make his eſcape. Hannibal retired to the iſle of Crete, and then to the court of Pruſias king of Bithynia, and perſuaded him to break the peace which the Romans had eſtabliſhed between him and our Eumenes. The conſequences of that rupture proved at firſt prejudicial to Pruſias; he was beaten by land, and obliged to try whether a ſea-fight would be more favourable to him (46). He won

(34) Ibid. *lib. xlii, pag.* 815.

(35) Here is a thing very remarkable. There was a ſhip carried by land from one of the gulphs of Peloponneſus to the other. The ſame has been done on ſome other occaſions.

(36) See, above, remark [*E*].

(37) Plutarch, of Brotherly Love, pag. 489, of the Greek and Latin edition.

(38) T. Liv. *lib. xxxvii, pag.* 713, *cap. lv.* See the paſſage of Strabo, which I ſhall quote in the remark againſt Moreri.

(39) Cicero, in Orat. pro Sextio, *pag. m.* 92.

(40) See the laſt lines of this remark.

(41) P. Manutius, in Orat. Cic. pro Sextio, *pag.* 93.

(42) Nic. Abramus, in eamd. Orat. *pag.* 100.

(43) Antiochum Epiphanem ſive illuſtrem de quo auſpiciis Luc. Scipionis Aſiatici ſuperato Appianus in Syriacis, &c. *Ibid.*

(44) Val. Max. *lib. v, cap. ii, num.* 3, *in extern.*

(45) That is, in the year 1699.

(46) Juſtin, *lib. xxxii, cap. iv.*

and that he had like to have periſhed in it. He was then at war with Pruſias king of Bithynia. He died very old [*I*] in the year 596, leaving the tuition of his ſon, and the adminiſtration of the kingdom to his brother ATTALUS (*r*). The latter, properly ſpeaking, reigned till he died. He began his regency with a glorious action, which was to re-eſtabliſh Ariarathes in the kingdom of Cappadocia (*s*). He ſignalized himſelf by ſeveral other actions (*t*), and died in the year 566, and then ATTALUS, his pupil, reigned alone, who was ſirnamed Philometor [*K*]: he was a great lover of agriculture [*L*], and even wrote ſome books about it. He was very cruel (*u*). He ſent
very

(*r*) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 429.

(*s*) Polyb. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 168.

(*t*) See the remark upon the miſtakes of Moreri.

(*u*) See the remark [*L*].

won the battle at ſea by this means. Hannibal cauſed all manner of ſerpents to be ſhut up in earthen pots, and ordered that thoſe pots ſhould be thrown into the enemies ſhips. That order was obeyed, and the victory got by it; for Eumenes's men were frighted to ſee themſelves ſurrounded with ſo many ſerpents. *Cum Pruſias terreſtri bello ab Eumene victus eſſet, & prælium in mare tranſtuliſſet, Annibal novo commento auctor victoriæ fuit. Quippe omne ſerpentium genus in fictiles lagenas conjici juſſit, medioque prælio in naves hoſtium mittit. Id primum Ponticis ridiculum viſum, fictilibus dimicare, qui ferro nequeant. Sed ubi ſerpentibus repleri naves cœpere, ancipiti periculo circumventi, hoſti victoriam ceſſere* (47). Cornelius Nepos relates this more at large, and obſerves that the chief deſign of Hannibal was to deſtroy Eumenes, and therefore it was neceſſary to know what ſhip he was in. It was diſcovered by means of a ſloop, which was diſpatched under pretence of carrying a letter to him; afterwards Hannibal commanded the officers of the ſhips to apply themſelves chiefly to that of Eumenes: they did ſo, and would have taken her, but ſhe ſtood off, making all the ſail ſhe could. ‘ Claſſiarios convocat (Hannibal) hiſque præcipit, omnes ut in unam Eumenis regis concurrant navem, à ceteris tantum ſatis habeant ſe defendere. Id facilè illos ſerpentium multitudine conſecuturos. Rex autem quâ nave veheretur, ut ſcirent, ſe facturum: quem ſi aut cepiſſent, aut interfeciſſent, magno his pollicetur præmio fore (48). - - - - *Hannibal called the ſea-officers together, and ordered that they ſhould all at the ſame time fall upon the ſhip of king Eumenes, and ſhould only defend themſelves againſt the others. He told them this might eaſily be done by the multitude of ſerpents, and that he would let them know what ſhip the king was in: and promiſed them great rewards, if they ſhould either kill or take him priſoner.*’ The other ſhips of Pergamum fought ſtoutly, but the ſerpents thrown into them forced them to run away (49). The Romans having heard theſe things ſent ambaſſadors into Aſia, to make a peace between thoſe two princes, and to demand of Pruſias that he ſhould deliver Hannibal to them; but he prevented it by poiſoning himſelf (50). It was about the 570th year of Rome.

[*I*] *He died very old.*] He lived eighty-two years, if we may believe Lucian. Ἄτταλος δὲ, ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Φιλάδελφος, τῶν Περγαμηνῶν καὶ οὗτος βασιλεύων, πρὸς ὃν καὶ Σκηπίων ὁ τῶν Ρωμαίων στρατηγὸς ἀφίκετο, δύο καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτῶν ἐξέλιπε τὸν βίον. Attalus, cognomento Philadelphus, rex etiam Pergamenorum, ad quem etiam Scipio Romanorum imperator venit, duos & octoginta annos natus è vita migravit (51). - - - *Attalus, ſirnamed Philadelphus, king of Pergamum, to whoſe aſſiſtance Scipio the Roman general came, was eighty-two years of age when he died.*’ I do not doubt but Lucian has committed a fault in this place. The Roman general he ſpeaks of, is, without doubt, Lucius Scipio Aſiaticus, who defeated Antiochus. But Attalus reigned not at that time.

[*K*] *He was ſirnamed Philometor.*] ‘ By reaſon of his love for his mother, which was the cauſe of his death; for as he was digging up a ſepulchre for her, the heat of the ſun made him ſick; and he died in ſeven days (52).’ That the reader may know from whence Mr Dacier had that circumſtance, I ſhall ſet down theſe words of Juſtin: *Matri deinde ſepulchrum facere inſtituit, cui operi intentus morbum ex ſolis fervore contraxit, & ſeptima die deceſſit* (53). His mother's name was Stratonice (54), ſhe was daughter of Ariarathes king of Cappadocia: ſhe was married to Eumenes a little while after the victory which the Romans got over Antiochus at Magneſia (55). Since Strabo (56), Appianus (57), and ſeveral others, give him the ſirname of Philometor; I fancy that Plutarch gives him that of Philopator (58) through a ſlip of memory. It is in the life of the Gracchi. In other places he calls him Philometor. See the paſſage quoted by me in the following remark. Volaterranus had related well enough what concerns the kings of Pergamum, but he ſpoils all as to the laſt. He pretends that he was called Philometor by way of irony: ‘ Is Philometor ex ſcelere per antiphraſin cognominatus eſt, quod matrem interfecerit (59). - - - *He was ironically ſirnamed Philometor from his wickedneſs, becauſe he killed his mother.*’ Nay, which is worſe, he quotes Juſtin, as ſaying that that prince having ſecretly put his mother, and his wife to death, let his hair and beard grow to conceal his crime. Juſtin ſays quite another thing.

[*L*] *He was a great lover of agriculture.*] It was not his firſt inclination, and it ſeems that it was an effect of his melancholy. He put to death ſeveral illuſtrious perſons (60), and then he grew extreamly melancholy; he put on, as it were, ſack-cloth and aſhes, and minded nothing elſe but the culture of his garden. But he did not lay aſide his cruelty, for his chief delight was to cultivate the moſt venomous herbs; he diſtilled the juices thereof, which he mixed afterwards with good remedies, and ſent that ſort of compoſition as a preſent to his friends. Here is my author (61). ‘ In Aſia Rex Attalus florentiſſimus ab Eumene (62) patruo acceptum regnum, cædibus amicorum, & cognatorum ſuppliciis, fœdabat, nunc matrem anum, nunc Berenicem ſponſam, maleficiis eorum necatas confingens. Poſt hanc ſceleſtam violentiæ rabiem, ſqualidam veſtem ſumit: barbam capillumque in modum reorum ſummittit: non in publicum prodire, non populo ſe oſtendere, non domi lætiora convivia inire, aut aliquod ſignum ſani hominis habere, prorſus ut pœnas pendere manibus interfectorum videretur. Omiſſâ deinde regni adminiſtratione, hortos fodiebat, gramina ſeminabat, & noxia innoxiis permiſcebat, eaque omnia veneni ſucco infecta, velut peculiare munus, amicis mittebat. - - - - *Attalus, a moſt flouriſhing king in Aſia, polluted the kingdom he had received from his uncle Eumenes*, with the ſlaughter of his friends, and murder of his relations, pretending ſometimes, that his mother, an old woman, and ſometimes that Berenice, his wife, were killed by their treaſonable practices. After this violence and wickedneſs, he cloathed himſelf in rags, he let his hair and beard grow after the manner of criminals: he would not appear in public, nor ſhew himſelf to the people, nor live ſplendidly at home, nor give any indication of a ſound mind, that ſo he might ſeem to do penance to the ghoſts of thoſe he had ſlain. Then laying aſide the adminiſtration of his kingdom, he employed himſelf in digging and ſowing in his gardens; he mingled poiſon with wholſome herbs, and ſent them as a particular preſent to his friends.*’ Let us add theſe words of Plutarch: Ἄτταλος ὁ Φιλομήτωρ ἐκήπευε τὰς φαρμακάδεις βοτάνας, οὐ μόνον ὑοσκύαμον καὶ ἐλλέβορον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κώνειον καὶ ἀκόνιτον καὶ δορύκνιον αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς κηποῖς βασιλικοῖς σπείρων καὶ φυτεύων ὀπούς τε καὶ καρπὸν αὐτων ἔργον πεποιημένος εἰδέναι καὶ κομίζεσθαι καθ' ὥραν. Attalus Philometor herbas venenoſas colebat, non tantùm hyoſcyamum & helleborum, ſed & cicutam, aconitum, dorycnion, ipſe in hortis regiis ſeminans & plantans: liquoreſque & ſemina & fructus horum elaborabat cognoſcere, ac ſuo quæque tempore colligere (63). - - - - *Attalus Philometor diverted himſelf in cultivating henbane, hellebore, hemloc, aconite, dorychnium, and other noxious plants, which he uſed to ſow himſelf in the royal gardens, and with great diligence to gather their ſeeds in their ſeaſon, their fruits and juices, and to try experiments of their natures, qualities, and virtues.* Attalus left that occupation, and applied himſelf to the melting of metals. ‘ Ab hoc ſtudio ærariæ artis fabricæ ſe tradit ceriſque fingendis, & ære fundendo procudendoque oblectabatur (64). - - - - *Leaving that ſort of ſtudy, applied himſelf to working in braſs, to the making of images*

‘ *in*

(47) Ibid.

(48) Cornel. Nepos, in Vita Hannibalis, *pag. m.* 369.

(49) Ibid.

(50) Juſtin. & Corn. Nepos, ubi ſupra.

(51) Lucian. in Macrob. *pag.* 637, *Tom. ii, Edit. Salmur.*

(52) Dacier, Remarks upon the firſt Ode of the firſt book of Horace, *pag. m.* 14.

(53) Juſt. *lib. xxxvi, cap. iv, pag. m.* 537.

(54) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 429.

(55) Liv. *lib. xxxviii. pag.* 733.

(56) Strabo, ibid.

(57) Appian. in Mithrid.

(58) Plut. in Vit. Gracchor. *pag.* 830.

(59) Volater. *lib. xiii, pag. m.* 497.

(60) Vid. Excerpta Didor. Siculi à Valeſio collecta, *pag.* 370.

(61) Juſtin. ubi ſupra.

(62) Juſtin is miſtaken, he ſhould have ſaid *ab Attalo.*

* It ſhould be *Attalus.*

(63) Plut. in Demetrio, *pag.* 897, *D.*

(64) Juſtin. ubi ſupra.

very rich preſents to Scipio before Numantia [*M*], and died a little while after about the year 621, and having no children, he made the Roman people his heir (*x*). Ariſtonicus, baſtard of Eumenes, deſpiſed that will, and declared himſelf to be the lawful ſucceſſor; he won ſome battles (*y*) but he was overcome and taken in the year of Rome 623 (*z*). Thus ended the kingdom of Pergamum which grew very powerful in a ſhort time, and there was ſo much magnificence in it, that it became a proverb (*N*). I ſhall obſerve ſome faults of Moreri [*O*].

‘ *in wax, and to melting and forging of metals.*’ His books concerning huſbandry were not unknown to Varro (65), Pliny (66), and Columella (67). Father Hardouin obſerves, that according to the teſtimony of Galen, that prince underſtood all ſorts of remedies, and compoſed ſome books about them. ‘ Haud diverſum ab eo puto Attalum eſſe eum, quem Medicum ‘ appellat Plinius in indice l. 32. & 33. cum hunc ‘ ipſum Pergamenorum regem, omnis generis medicamentorum perquam ſtudioſum fuiſſe Galenus affirmet, ‘ l. 1. κατὰ γένη, c. 13. p. 657. & l. 1. de antidotis ‘ c. 1. p. 865. De medicinis ex animalibus ſcripſiſſe, ‘ l. 10. de facult. ſimp. medic. c. 1. p. 275. (68). - - - ‘ *I do not think this Attalus is different from him whom* ‘ *Pliny calls a Phyſician, ſince Galen affirms that this* ‘ *king of Pergamum was very ſkillful in all ſorts of remedies.*’ Mr Menage aſcribes to another what concerns the gardens of this Attalus (69).

[*M*] *He ſent ſome rich preſents to Scipio before Numantia.*] I have read this no where but in Cicero. ‘ Quo in loco Dejotarum talem erga te cognoviſti, ‘ qualis rex Attalus in Africanum fuit, cui magnificentiſſima dona, ut ſcriptum legimus, uſque ad Numantiam miſit ex Aſia, quæ Africanus inſpectante ‘ exercitu accepit (70). - - - *In which reſpect you have* ‘ *found Dejotarus the ſame to you, as king Attalus was to* ‘ *Scipio Africanus, to whom, as we find it written, he* ‘ *ſent very rich preſents out of Aſia as far as Numantia,* ‘ *which Africanus received in the ſight of the army.*’ What did Father Abram think of when he ſaid that Livy does not agree with Cicero (71)? Thereupon he quotes a paſſage of the fifty-eighth book of Livy (72), which ſays that Scipio having received great preſents from Antiochus ſhewed them to the whole army, and ordered the quæſtor to enter them into his book of accounts. Cicero meant not that Scipio, who overcame Antiochus.

[*N*] *The magnificence of Pergamum, ... became a proverb.*] See the commentators upon theſe words of Horace:

- - - - - - - Attalicis conditionibus
Nunquam dimoveas ut trabe Cypria
Myrtoum pavidus nauta ſecet mare (73).

And hopes of wealth, and worlds of gain
Shall never tempt him from the plain;
Nor draw his fearful ſoul to ride
In feeble ſhips, and ſtem the tide.

Conſider alſo theſe verſes of Propertius.

Nec mihi tunc fulchro ſternatur lectus eberno,
  Nec ſit in Attalico mors mea nixa toro (74).

Let not the bedſtead be of iv'ry made,
Nor lay my corps upon a ſtately bed.

Attalicas ſupera veſtes, atque omnia magnis,
  Gemmea ſint ludis, ignibus iſta dabis (75).

Tho' in attire more rich than one can tell,
And vaſt magnificence you ſhould excel.

It is pretended that hangings were not known at Rome before thoſe of Attalus were carried thither, who made the Roman people his heir (76). Servius ſays (77) that they were invented at the court of the kings of Pergamus, and called *aulæa, ab aula Attali* (78). He is miſtaken as to the laſt point, for the Romans called them ſo, becauſe they were called αὐλαίαι in Greek (79). However it be, the Attalic hangings were very famous. ‘ Quid illa attalica, tota Sicilia nominata, ab eodem Heio peripetaſmata emere oblitus ‘ es (80)? - - - - *Why did you forget to buy of the ſame* ‘ *Heius thoſe hangings, which are called Attalic throughout all Sicily?*’ King Attalus invented the gold embroidery: *Aurum intexere in eadem Aſia invenit Attalus Rex* (81). Read this paſſage of Silius Italicus:

Quæ radio jactat Babylon, vel murice picto
Læta Tyros, quæque Attalicis variata per artem
Aulæis ſcribuntur acu (82).

What, Babylon, in cloth, Tyre in purple die,
Or Attalus in gold embroidery,
Does boaſt.

Pliny does often mention the exceſſive price which king Attalus paid for good pictures (83)

[*O*] *I ſhall obſerve ſome faults of Moreri.*] What I ſay here concerns the Dutch edition. I. It is not true that Attalus the firſt of that name, *extended his conqueſts in Aſia, as far as mount Taurus*; for the kingdom of Pergamum had that extent under king Eumenes; and it was by the liberality of the Romans. Before that time it was but a ſmall ſtate, as I am going to prove. Συνεπολέμησε δὲ καὶ οὗτος (Ἐυμένες) Ῥωμαίοις πρός τε Ἀντίοχον τὸν μέγαν, καὶ πρὸς Περσέα. καὶ ἔλαβεν ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἅπασαν τὴν ὑπ' Ἀντιόχῳ τῆς ἐντὸς τοῦ Ταύρου. Πρότερον δ' ἦν τὰ περὶ Πέργαμον οὐ πολλὰ χωρία μέχει τῆς θαλάττης τῆν κατὰ τὸν Ἐλαΐτην κόλπον, καὶ τὸν Ἀδραμυττηνόν. Hic quoque (*Eumenes*) Romanorum ſocius fuit in bellis adverſus Antiochum Magnum, & Perſeum: accepitque à Romanis quidquid Aſiæ intra Taurum Antiochus poſſederat, cùm antè ſub Pergami ditione fuiſſent pauca quædam loca uſque ad mare, juxta ſinum Elaiticum & Adramyttenum (84). - - - - *Eumenes alſo was an ally of the Romans in the wars againſt Antiochus the Great, and Perſeus: and he received from the Romans whatever Antiochus had poſſeſſed of Aſia on this ſide Taurus: before that time, there were but ſome few places under the dominion of Pergamum towards the ſea, near the bay of Elæa and Adramyttium.* Father Labbe has been the occaſion of that fault of Moreri, for here are his citations about Attalus. ‘ *Juſtin.* 27. *Tit. Liv.* 34. ‘ *Polyb.* 5. where he ſays that he extended his con- ‘ queſts in Aſia, as far as mount Taurus (85).’ I have not found this in the fifth book of Polybius, but only that Attalus, during the war againſt Achæus, forced the inhabitants of ſeveral cities to declare for him. This does not go by the name of conqueſt, and it does not appear that after his return to Pergamum thoſe cities were ſubject to him. II. He ſhould not have been contented with Father Labbe's quotation of thoſe three authors, ſince they ſay nothing of the love of the four brothers which is *commonly propoſed as a model of the union which ought to be between brothers.* He ſhould have quoted Plutarch for it, as Father Labbe did (86). III. The wife of Attalus, mother of thoſe four brothers, was called Ἀπολλωνὶς (87). He ſhould not therefore ſay that her name was *Apollonia*, but *Apollonis*, or *Apollonida*. IV. The article of Attalus the ſecond is a pitiful one. He begins with ſaying that he *was firſt ſent to Rome by his brother Eumenes, in the year 596, where he obained whatever he deſired of the ſenate.* This is a meer tranſcript of Father Labbe (88). Attalus was above ſixty years old at that time; his Hiſtory ſhould not therefore begin there, conſidering the memorable things he had done before. V. I do not think that he was his brother's ambaſſador at Rome in the year 596, and I fancy that the times have been confounded: the journey he made to Rome about the year 584, after the laſt king of Macedon had been taken, has been transferred to the year 596. VI. It is an abſurd thing to quote Polybius, l. 5. and Juſtin, lib. 36. ſeeing they ſay nothing of that Attalus. Note, that the Hiſtory of Polybius did not reach the year of Rome 596. VII. Attalus the third, was ſirnamed Philometor, and not Philopator. That fault is alſo to be found in Father Labbe (89). But Moreri is moſt to blame for having inſerted among theſe three

---

(*x*) Flor. *lib. ii, cap. xx,* & *multi alii.*

(*y*) Juſtin. *lib. xxxvi, cap. iv.*

(*z*) Ibid.

(65) He mentions them in the firſt chapter of the firſt book *de re Ruſtica.*

(66) Plin. *lib. xviii, cap. iii.*

(67) Colum. *l. i, cap. i, but inſtead of* Attalus & Philometor, *read* Attalus Philometor. *See Father* Hardouin, in Indice Pliniano, *pag.* 100.

(68) Harduin, ibid.

(69) See the remark [*B*] of the article LACYDES.

(70) Cicero, in Orat. pro Rege Dejotaro, *pag. m.* 647.

(71) Abramus, Com. in Orat. Cic. pro Dejotaro, *pag.* 441.

(72) What remains of Livy goes no further than the 45th book.

(73) Horat. Od. I, lib. i. ver. 12.

(74) Propert. Eleg. XIII, *lib. ii.* See alſo Eleg. XXXII, *ejuſdem libri.*

(75) Ibid. Eleg. XVII, lib. iii. See alſo Eleg. V, lib. iv.

(76) See the notes *Variorum* upon Virgil, Georg. lib. iii, ver. 20.

(77) Ideo *aulæa* dicta ſunt quod primum in aula Attali, Regis Aſiæ, qui populum Romanum ſcripſit hæredem, inventa ſunt. *Servius, in Æn. lib. i, ver.* 697.

(78) *Servius, in hæc Verba Georg. lib. iii, ver.* 25. Purpurea intexti tollun taulæa Britanni.

(79) *See* Plut. in Vit. Themiſtoclis.

(80) Cicero, in Verrem, *lib. vi, fol. m.* 70, *B.*

(81) Plin. *lib. viii, cap. xlviii, pag. m.* 232. *He ſays, chap. iii, of the thirty-third book* Attalicis jampridem aurum intexitur invento regum Aſiæ.

(82) Sil. Ital. *lib. xiv, pag. m.* 636.

(83) Plin. *lib. vii, cap. xxxviii, and lib. xxxiv, and xxxv.*

(84) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 429.

(85) Labbe, Chron. Franc. *Tom. ii, pag.* 300, *ad ann. Romæ* 512.

(86) Labbe, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 336, *ad ann.* 556.

(87) Strabo, *lib. xiii, pag.* 429.

(88) Labbe, *pag.* 365, *ad ann.* 596.

(89) Labbe, ibid. *pag.* 391, *ad ann.* 621.

Attalus's an Attalus Philadelphus, without ſaying that it is not a new Attalus; for the reader would think, by the omiſſion of that caution, that that Attalus Philadelphus is different from the other three, and yet he is the ſame with Attalus the ſecond. Let us ſee whether his article be right. VIII. What he did before he was a king is not diſtinguiſhed from what he did under the reign of his brother: every reader has all the reaſon in the world to fancy that whatever is ſaid of this Attalus, was done by him, after he was made his nephew's guardian, *with the title of king*. But this is falſe. IX. It was not he who *ſuſtained the ſiege of Pergamum againſt Antiochus*. We have ſeen (90) that king Eumenes himſelf was in Pergamum during that ſiege. X. He did not make war againſt Perſeus king of Macedon: Moreri ſhould have ſaid that he was concerned in that war as an ally of the Romans. XI. Strabo and Appianus, quoted by Moreri, do not ſay that Attalus made Pruſias a priſoner. XII. Nor that he ſent preſents to Scipio Æmilianus before Numantia. XIII. Nor that he periſhed by the ambuſh of his nephew Attalus. He died before that Scipio went to Numantia.

PERIANDER, tyrant of Corinth. He was reckoned one of the ſeven wiſe men of Greece; but there was more reaſon to rank him among the moſt wicked men that ever lived: for he changed the government of his country [*A*], and oppreſſed its liberty, and ſettled the monarchical power upon himſelf (*a*); and to maintain himſelf in his uſurpation, he cauſed the principal men of the city to be put to death, thinking they would be able to reſtore things to their firſt ſtate (*b*). On the day of a ſolemn feaſt he took from the women all their ornaments, and made of them a golden ſtatue which he had vowed (*c*) [*B*]. He committed inceſt with his mother [*C*]; he kicked his wife to death whilſt ſhe was big with child; he cauſed his concubines to be burnt, becauſe their calumnies had exaſperated him againſt his wife. He was ſo angry with his ſecond ſon (*d*), becauſe he lamented the death of his mother, that he turned him out, and diſinherited him. He formed a villainous plan of revenge againſt the inhabitants of Corcyra: which was to ſend their young boys (*e*) to king Alyattes to be gelded: and when he heard that the ſhip which carried thoſe innocent victims, had put into Samos, and that thoſe youths had been preſerved from the miſery to which they were deſtined, he

[*A*] *He changed the government of his country.*] Diogenes Laërtius ſays ſo poſitively. Οὗτος πρῶτος, ſays he (1), δορυφόρους ἔσχε, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰς τυραννίδα μετέστησε. Primus hic armatis circumſeptus inceſſit, magiſtratumque ad tyrannidem tranſtulit. - - - *He was the firſt that went guarded with armed men, and turned the government into tyranny.* Aldobrandinus obſerves upon thoſe words, That if we believe Ariſtotle, Periander muſt be looked upon as the inventer of the great number of ways whereby tyranny is eſtabliſhed and kept up (2). *Omnium autem earum rerum quæ ad tyrannidem faciunt conſtituendam & conſervandam, auctorem fuiſſe Periandrum Cypſeli filium, tum aliis locis, tum præcipue eodem lib.* 5. *polit. ait cap.* 11. Τούτων, inquit, τὰ (3) πολλά φασι καταστῆσαι Περίανδρον. Mr Menage upon the ſame words of Laërtius, quotes Suidas, who ſays, That Periander had three hundred guards, and that he forbad the Corinthians to keep any ſervants, and to live in idleneſs. He invented every day ſomething to keep them buſy, and fined thoſe whom he found ſitting in the public places: he was afraid they ſhould contrive ſomething againſt him. Herodotus however does not aſcribe to him the firſt inſtitution of tyranny, but to Cypſelus, who reigned thirty years in Corinth very cruelly, and left all his authority to his ſon Periander. Τυραννεύσας δὲ ὁ Κύψελος, τοιοῦτος δή τις ἀνὴρ ἐγένετο· πολλοὺς μὲν Κορινθίων ἐδίωξε, πολλοὺς δὲ χρημάτων ἀπεστέρησε, πολλῷ δ' ἔτι πλείστους τῆς ψυχῆς. Cypſelus vero tyrannide potitus, talis extitit ut Corinthiorum multos inſequutus ſit, multos pecunia, longe plurimos anima privaverit (4). - - - *But Cypſelus during his tyranny perſecuted and fined many Corinthians, and put vaſt numbers of them to death.* Periander was not at firſt ſo hard a Prince as his father, but afterwards he became much more cruel than he.

[*B*] *The golden ſtatue which he had vowed.*] Obſerve here a very ſenſible proof of the diſorder wherein falſe religions leave the hearts and minds of men. They do not correct mens inclinations to ſin. Here we ſee Periander makes a vow, and dares not diſpenſe with accompliſhing it, even when he has no money. Ἔφορος ἱστορεῖ ὡς εὔξαιτο, εἰ νικήσειεν Ὀλύμπια τεθρίππῳ, χρυσοῦν ἀνδριάντα ἀναθεῖναι. νικήσας δὲ καὶ ἀπορῶν χρυσίου, &c. Ephorus in hiſtoria, voviſſe illum tradit, ſi Olympia quadriga viciſſet, auream ſtatuam deo ſacraturum, victoria verò potitum, & auro egentem, &c (5). - - - *Ephorus in his hiſtory writes that Periander made a vow, if he ſhould gain the victory with his chariot and four, in the Olympic games, to conſecrate a golden ſtatue to the god, but having obtained the victory, and wanting money, &c.* He therefore believes there are gods; he believes a providence: and yet he pollutes himſelf with inceſt, he ſheds innocent blood, he kills his wife, *&c.* Let us proceed to the diſorders of the mind. The ſame tyrant is not afraid of being puniſhed for his inceſts and murders; but he fears, that if he ſhould not offer to the gods a lump of gold, which he promiſed them, they will oppreſs him with miſeries, and ſeverely puniſh him. Nay, he perſuades himſelf, that tho' he fulfils his vow with a moſt unjuſt robbery, which extremely vexes all the women of Corinth, yet the golden ſtatue which he conſecrates will be acceptable to the gods, and preſerve him from the misfortunes they would have inflicted upon him, if he had not offered the ſtatue he promiſed them. Next to the violence done to the honour and virtue of chaſt women, there is none they are more ſenſible of, than to ſee themſelves ſtript of their ornaments. The deſire of being well dreſſed, and wearing fine things, has always prevailed in that ſex. ‘ Φιλόκοσμον genus femineum ‘ eſt: multaſque etiam inſignis pudicitiæ, quamvis ‘ nulli virorum, tamen ſibi ſcimus libenter ornari (6). ‘ . . . Ut taceam de inaurium pretiis, candore margaritarum, rubri maris profunda teſtantium, ſmaragdorum virore, cerauniorum flammis, hiacynthorum ‘ pelago, ad quæ ardent & inſaniunt ſtudia matronarum (7). - - - *Women are fond of ornaments, and we ‘ know many of them that are even noted for their modeſty, who love to dreſs to pleaſe themſelves tho' not the ‘ men. . . . To ſay nothing of the value of ear-rings, ‘ the whiteneſs of pearls brought from the bottom of the ‘ red-ſea, the greenneſs of emeralds, the redneſs of carbuncles, and the blueneſs of jacinth, which women eagerly deſire to have.*' I obſerve this only, to make the tyrannical ſpirit of that pretended wiſe-man of Greece more odious. See the remark [*D*].

[*C*] *He committed inceſt with his mother.*] Her name was Cratea (8): ſome ſay (9), that being not able to reſtrain the impetuoſity of her paſſion, ſhe propoſed to her ſon to lie ſecretly with a woman, who was extreamly in love with him, and who would not be known. He conſented to it, and ſo he lay with his mother without knowing it; for Cratea was in the bed where the pretended woman, whom ſhe mentioned to her ſon, was to lie. This ſecret intrigue laſted a long time; but at laſt Periander would know who was the woman whom he had ſo often been with: He ordered ſomebody to hide himſelf in the chamber, and as his mother was going to bed, he came to her with a flambeau. He had killed her upon the ſpot, had not a genius, who appeared to him, prevented it. Ever after that time he lived like a mad-man, he was cruel, and put ſeveral people to death. As for Cratea ſhe complained mightily of her deſtiny, and killed herſelf. Others relate this adventure differently: They ſay indeed (10) that the intrigue of Periander and he died with grief for it. He was then about eighty years old (*f*). Some ſay, that he lay with his wife after her death [*D*]; a brutality almoſt as horrible as that of the Lydian monarch who eat his wife [*E*]. Some authors are (*g*) ſo ſimple as to reckon that action of Periander among the great examples of conjugal love. He reigned forty-four years, according to Ariſtotle (*h*), or forty according to Diogenes Laërtius (*i*). He flouriſhed about the XXXVIIIth Olympiad (*k*). Mr Moreri has committed ſome faults [*F*].

---

(90) In the laſt remark of the foregoing article at the end.

(*a*) Diog. Laërt. *lib. i, num.* 98.

(*b*) Herodot. *lib. v, cap. xcii, pag. m.* 324.

(*c*) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 96.

(*d*) His name was Lycophron. See his article wherein I have ſet down what Herodotus ſays of him.

(*e*) Diog. Laërt. does not limit the number of them. *Herodotus, lib. iii, cap. xlviii,* ſays, they were three hundred of the beſt families of that iſland.

(1) Diog. Laërt. in Periandro, *num.* 98, *lib. i.*

(2) Aldobrandin. in Diog. Laërt. ibid.

(3) Aldobrandinus ſhould not therefore uſe the word *omnium*. What he quotes of Ariſtotle is againſt him.

(4) Herod. *lib. v, cap. xcii, pag.* 324.

(5) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 96, *pag.* 60.

(6) Hieron. Epiſt. ad Gaudentium de Pacatulæ Inſtitut. *pag. m.* 268.

(7) Ibid. Epiſt. ad Demetriadem de ſervanda virginitate, *pag.* 291.

(8) Diog. Laërt. *lib. i, num.* 96.

(9) Parthenius, in Eroticis, *cap. xvii.*

(10) Ariſtippus, apud Diog. Laërtium, ubi ſupra.

There

and his mother was covered with a veil of great ſecrecy, but that he was not ignorant that he lay with his mother. They affirm, that he was very well pleaſed with the ſport, and that he grew angry only becauſe his inceſt was diſcovered. He vented his anger upon his ſubjects, and ever after behaved himſelf tyrannically.

After his mother had killed herſelf he ceaſed to honour the goddeſs Venus, and to offer ſacrifices to her; but he began again to practiſe that worſhip, by reaſon of ſome dreams of his wife Meliſſa. It is what Plutarch obſerves in the beginning of the feaſt of the ſeven wiſe men; and he ſuppoſes that Periander began again to ſacrifice to that goddeſs on the day of that feaſt.

[*D*] *Some ſay that he lay with his wife after her death.*] Here is one of Herodotus's ſtories, which he tells upon occaſion of the injuſtice which the women of Corinth ſuffered under Periander. That tyrant ſent to conſult the oracle of the dead, deſiring to know what was become of a certain *depoſitum*. His wife Meliſſa appeared, and declared, that ſhe would by no means reveal that ſecret; for I am very cold, ſaid ſhe, I am ſtark naked, the cloaths wherewith I was buried are of no uſe to me, becauſe they have not been burnt. To prove the truth of what I ſay, continued ſhe, it is enough for me to obſerve, that Periander has put his bread in a cold oven. When Periander was told of it, that diſcourſe ſeemed to him to be very true, becauſe he remembered that he had lain with Meliſſa, even after ſhe had given up the ghoſt (11). Ταῦτα δὲ ὡς ὀπίσω ἀπηγγέλθη τῷ Περιάνδρῳ, πιστὸν γάρ οἱ ἦν τὸ συμβόλαιον, ὃς νεκρᾷ ἐούσῃ Μελίσσῃ ἐμίγη. *Hæc Periandro renunciata, ob illud argumentum fidem fecere, quod ipſe cum Meliſſa quamvis defuncta coierat* (12). He therefore ordered by a proclamation, that all the women of Corinth ſhould repair to the temple of Juno. They obeyed, and put on the fineſt things they had, as on a feſtival-day; but the guards who lay hid in the temple ſtript them all, without exception; the miſtreſſes and their maids were treated alike. All their cloaths were burnt upon the grave of Meliſſa. She was daughter of Procles, tyrant of Epidaurus; and ſhe was related, by her mother's ſide, to ſome great lords who reigned almoſt all over Arcadia (13). Another author in Athenæus does not ſpeak ſo advantageouſly of Meliſſa's quality: he ſays, That Periander grew very much in love with her (14), having ſeen her fill ſome drink to ſome workmen (15).

[*E*] *The Lydian monarch who eat his wife.*] The Sieur de Rampalle deſigning to prove that our age doth not exceed paſt ages in vices, brings in, amongſt other examples of intemperance, the voracity of Maximinus, Albinus, Phagon, and Aſtidamas; and then he ſays, that *Cambyſes king of Lydia ſupped one night upon his wife* (16). He is miſtaken as to the name; I do not think that any king of Lydia was called Cambyſes; however, he who eat up his wife had not that name. His name was Cambles. He was a great eater and a great drinker. The Hiſtorian, who ſpeaks of him, intimates, that he committed that crime without knowing what he did, and that he knew not his barbarity, but when he felt his wife's hand in his mouth as he waked, he killed himſelf when he knew that this action was diſcovered. Ξάνθος δὲ ἐν τοῖς Λυδιακοῖς, Κάμβλητα φησὶ τὸν βασιλεύσαντα Λυδῶν πολυφάγον γενέσθαι καὶ πολυπότην, ἔτι δὲ γαστρίμαργον. τοῦτον οὖν ποτε νυκτὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα κατακρεουργήσαντα καταφαγεῖν· ἔπειτα πρωῒ εὑρόντα τὴν χεῖρα τῆς γυναικὸς ἐνοῦσαν ἐν τῷ στόματι, ἑαυτὸν ἀποσφάξαι περιβοήτου τῆς πράξεως γενομένης. Xanthus in Lydiacis narrat Cambleta Lydorum olim regem, edacem, bibacem, guloſum fuiſſe, noctuque uxorem ſuam in fruſta diſſectam voraſſe: deinde craſtino manè, repertâ conjugis manu, quæ ad ejus os hæſerat, re cognitâ, & in vulgus ſparſa, ſeipſum jugulaſſe (17). - - - *Xanthus in his Lydian hiſtory tells us, that Cambleta, formerly king of the Lydians, was a great eater and drinker, and that one night he cut his wife into pieces and eat her: next morning he felt her hand in his mouth, and the matter being known and blazed abroad, he killed himſelf.* I can ſcarce believe but this ſtory is like old wives tales, full of giants, man-eaters.

[*F*] *Moreri has committed ſome faults.*] I ſhall ſay nothing of his faults of omiſſion; every body may know them by comparing his Periander with mine. I. He does not reckon well, when he ſays, that Periander began his reign in the XXXVIIIth Olympiad, and died in the XLVIIIth, after he had reigned forty-four years. He might have ſaid ſo, if Periander having ſucceeded his father in the beginning of the XXXVIIIth Olympiad, had died towards the end of the XLVIIIth Olympiad: But then he ſhould have ſaid ſo preciſely. II. He ſhould not have quoted Euſebius; for he does not ſay, that the reign of Periander laſted forty-four years. He places the beginning of it in the firſt year of the XXXVIIIth Olympiad, and the end (18) in the firſt year of the XLVIIIth Olympiad. I find a great miſtake in theſe words of Scaliger: ‘ Obiit (*Periander*) anno ultimo Olympiadis XLVIII. Tyrannidem obtinuit, an. XL. auctore Laërtio. Ergo ejus initium an. primo Olympiadis XXXVIII ut hic recte aſſignatum (19). - - - - *Periander died the laſt year of the XLVIIIth Olympiad. He reigned forty years according to Laërtius. Therefore the beginning of his reign is rightly placed as it is here in the firſt year of the XXXVIIIth Olympiad.*’ It is not true, according to Euſebius, that Periander died the laſt year of the XLVIIIth Olympiad. But if Euſebius had placed the death of that prince in that year, he would not agree with Diogenes Laërtius, who ſays, that he reigned only forty years. Scaliger expreſſes himſelf better five pages after (20). III. Periander *anſwered* not *thoſe, who aſked him why he kept the government, that it was as dangerons to quit it as to loſe it.* This is an equivocal and perplexed anſwer: it is falſe, whenever a man loſes his power together with his life; for they who loſe it in that manner, run no longer any hazard. Moreri ſhould have ſaid that he anſwered, It is as dangerous to part willingly with tyranny, as to be deprived of it by one's enemies. We have not the privilege of ſpeaking obſcurely in French; we are obliged to uſe more precautions than the ancients, to avoid being criticized. I ſay ſo, becauſe I ſet down in this place the words of the original. Πότε ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τί τυραννεῖ, ἔφη, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἑκουσίως ἀποστῆναι, τὸ καὶ ἀφαιρεθῆναι κίνδυνον φέρει. *Rogatus aliquando cur in tyrannide perſiſteret; quia, inquit, & ſponte & invitum cedere æque periculoſum eſt* (21). IV. To what purpoſe does Moreri cite Soſicrates (22), who has nothing of what he ſays in the article of Periander, and who is of a contrary opinion to that which he adopts concerning the age of that tyrant? He ſays, that he died forty-one years before the XLIXth Olympiad (23). I know that by altering the punctuation his opinion might come nearer that of Euſebius (24). But did Mr Moreri know this? And muſt an author be quoted upon dubious readings? This cannot be permitted to any body, but to thoſe who have given notice that they adopt the correction of ſuch or ſuch a critic.

Of the danger tyrants expoſe themſelves to, when they abdicate.

Here are ſome words of Balzac, which relate to Periander's anſwer. *It is no leſs dangerous to part with tyranny, than to ſet it up. Phalaris * was ready to leave it; but he would have a god to be ſecurity for his life, if he ſhould deprive himſelf of his authority; and it has been always a common opinion, that they who took up arms againſt their country or their prince, are in a manner reduced to the neceſſity of doing miſchief, becauſe it is not very ſafe for them to do good. They dare not become innocent, leſt they ſhould be at the mercy of the laws which they have violated, and they go on in their faults*

becauſe

(*f*) *Taken from* Diog. Laërt. in Vita Periandri, *lib. i.*

(*g*) Raviſius Textor, in Officina, *lib. v, cap. iii,* in the title *de amore conjugali, pag. m.* 553, and ſeveral others after him.

(*h*) Ariſt. Polit. *lib. v, cap. xii.*

(*i*) Ubi ſupra, *num.* 98.

(*k*) Ibid.

(11) Herod. *lib. v, cap. xcii.*

(12) Ibid. *pag. m.* 325.

(13) Diog. Laërt. *lib. i, num.* 94.

(14) Pythænetus, *lib. iii,* de Ægina apud Ath. *lib. xiii, pag.* 589.

(15) Ὠνοχόει τοῖς ἐργαζομένοις. Operariis vinum miniſtrantem. *Ibid.*

(16) Rampalle, that the world does not grow worſe and worſe, *pag.* 94.

(17) Athen. *lib. x, cap. iii, pag.* 415.

(18) He only mentions the end of the monarchical government of Corinth: but it is the ſame thing with Periander's death.

(19) Scalig. Animadv. in Euſeb. *num.* 889, *pag. m.* 84, *col.* 1.

(20) Ibid. *num.* 929, *pag.* 89.

(21) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 97.

(22) In the 2d Dutch edition there is Socrates.

(23) Apud Diog. Laërt. ibid. *num.* 95.

(24) Vid. Menag. in Diog. Laërt. *lib. i, num.* 95, *pag.* 55.

* *Phalar. in Epiſt.*

There are ſeveral things to be found in a work of Heraclides, which are not diſadvantageous to Periander. If he forbad the inhabitants of Corinth to keep any ſervants, he forbad them alſo to live voluptuouſly, which is no ill law. He laid no taxes upon any body, and was contented with the cuſtoms which accrued to him from the ſale, and the importation, and exportation of commodities. He hated wicked men, and cauſed all pimps and bawds to be drowned (*l*). In fine, he eſtabliſhed a ſenate, and regulated the expence of its members *(m)*.

(*l*) So I render τὰς προαγωγοὺς πάσας κατεπόντισε. Cragius underſtands by it proſtituted women.

(*m*) *Taken from* Heraclides de Politiis, *pag.* 17, *Ed. Cragii* 1593, *in* 4*to*.

becauſe they do not believe that people would be ſatisfied with their repentance (25). This was one of the maxims which Mæcenas made uſe of when Auguſtus was deliberating with him and Agrippa, whether he ſhould reſtore the Roman people to their liberty. Agrippa adviſed him to do it, and Mæcenas diſſuaded him from it. Let us ſet down here what the learned Meibomius has collected about it ‘ Tangit Xiphilinus, *ſays he* (26), ex parte cauſſam, ‘ qua motus Mæcenas, Auguſto ſuaſerit, ut imperium ‘ retineret. *Regnum nempe juſtum & legitime comparatum imprimis conducere rerum magnitudini* gubernandæ: ‘ *nec aliud diſcordantis patriæ remedium eſſe, quam ut ab uno*, ut loquitur Tacitus Ann. lib. iv. cap. ix. ‘ unumque Reip. corpus *unius præſidis nutu, quaſi anima & mente regatur*, ut monet Florus lib. iv. ‘ cap. iii. Potior tamen, & altera cauſſa fuit, quam ‘ Suetonius adducit, loco quem dixi (27) quod Auguſtum, *ſi privatus viveret non ſine periculo fore* cenſeret. Eam etiam inculcat Zonaras; quod qui ſemel ‘ imperitarint, tuto privatam vitam agere nullo modo ‘ poſſint. Quo ſenſu jam olim Periander interrogatus, ‘ cur non deponeret imperium, reſpondit: *Quoniam per vim imperanti, etiam ultro imperio abire periculoſum*, ut ex Xenophontis lib. de Memorabil. Socrat. ‘ refert Stobæus Serm. xli. Quin & Mæcenas ipſe in ‘ Orat. apud Dionem, non alia ratione depoſitionem ‘ imperii Auguſto diſſuadet, quam quod oſtendat *neminem Senatui populoque reddita Rep. ipſi parciturum,* ‘ *qui multos offenderit. Hos enim rerum ſummam ad ſe trahendo, id acturos, ut ſe vel ulciſcantur, vel ipſum ſibi adverſantem è medio tollant.* Docet id exemplis Pompeji, Julii Cæſaris, Marii ac Sullæ: ‘ Quos abdicata poteſtas vel peſſum dederit, vel peſſum datura fuiſſet, ſi diutius vixiſſent. - - - - - *Xiphilinus partly touches on the reaſon that induced Mæcenas to perſuade Auguſtus, to keep the empire in his own hands: viz.* that dominion, juſtly and lawfully acquired, was of the greateſt ſervice in governing affairs: and that there is no other remedy for ‘ the diviſions of a country, than that it be governed, *as Tacitus ſays*, by one ſingle perſon, and that ‘ one body of a commonwealth, *as Florus expreſſes himſelf*, be ſwayed and directed by the will of one ‘ man, like one ſoul and mind. *But the other and better reaſon, alledged by Suetonius in the place I mentioned, was, that he did not think* it ſafe for Auguſtus ‘ to live in a private capacity. *Zonoras likewiſe inculcates it; that thoſe who have once exerciſed tyranny can by no means lead a private life in ſafety. And upon that account, Periander being formerly aſked, why he would not reſign his dominion, anſwered:* becauſe it ‘ is dangerous for one, that reigns by force, even voluntarily to abdicate power, as Stobæus relates it. ‘ *But even Mæcenas himſelf diſſuades Auguſtus from reſigning the empire, meerly for this reaſon*, becauſe if ‘ the commonwealth be reſtored to the ſenate and people, no body would ſpare him who had diſobliged ſo ‘ many. For by taking the government into their own ‘ hands they would either revenge themſelves or kill ‘ him if he made oppoſition. *This he proves by the examples of Pompey, Julius Cæſar, Marius, and Sylla;* ‘ *who by laying down their power were either ruined,* ‘ *or would have been ruined had they lived longer.*’ To which Solon's anſwer may be added: his friends wondered that the name of monarchy ſhould fright him, and that he durſt not take advantage of the preſent conjuncture to acquire the ſupream authority. He anſwered them (28), *Dominion and Tyranny are indeed a fine place, but there is no way to come out of it when one is once got into it.* It ſeems to me that Xenophon has illuſtrated that thought better than any body elſe. He introduces a tyrant, who gives a lively deſcription of the miſerable condition he is in; and then Simonides aſks him, why do you remain in it? why do not you leave it? mind well the anſwer: the greateſt unhappineſs of tyranny is, that there is no way to renounce it. How can a tyrant, who abdicates, repay the great ſums he has extorted; indemnify thoſe whom he has impriſoned; reſtore life to thoſe whom he has put to death? If ever a man has juſt cauſe to hang himſelf, it is when he exerciſes tyranny, they who underſtand Greek will be charmed with the Greek words: I ſhall therefore ſet them down to pleaſe them. Καὶ ϖῶς (ἔφη) ὦ Ἱέρων, εἰ οὕτω ϖονηρόν ἐστι τὸ τυραννεῖν, καὶ τοῦτο σὺ ἔγνωκας, οὐκ ἀπαλλάττῃ οὕτω μεγάλου κακοῦ; οὔτε σὺ οὔτε ἄλλος μὲν δὴ οὐδεὶς ϖώποτε ἑκὼν εἶναι τυραννίδος ἀφεῖτο, ὅσπερ ἂν ἅπαξ κτήσαιτο; Ὅτι (ἔφη) ὦ Σιμωνίδη, ταύτῃ ἀθλιώτατόν ἐστιν ἡ τυραννίς· οὐδὴ γὰρ ἀπαλλαγῆναι δυνατὸν αὐτῆς ἐστί. ϖῶς γὰρ ἄν τις ϖοτὲ ἐξαρκέσειε τύραννος ἢ χρήματα ἐκ τίνων ὅσους ἀφείλετο, ἢ δεσμοὺς ἀντιπαράσχοι ὅσους δὴ ἐδέσμευσεν, ἢ ὅσους κατέκτανε, ϖῶς ἂν ἱκανὰς ψυχὰς ἀντιπαράσχοιτο ἀποθανομένας; ἀλλ' εἴ ϖερ τῷ ἄλλῳ, ὦ Σιμωνίδη, λυσιτελεῖ ἀπάγξασθαι, ἴσθαι (ἔφη) ὅτι τυράννῳ ἔγωγε εὑρίσκω μάλιστα τοῦτο λυσιτελοῦν ποιῆσαι. μόνῳ γὰρ αὐτῷ οὔτε ἔχειν οὔτε καταθέσθαι τὰ κακὰ λυσιτελεῖ. *Et qui fit, inquit Hieron, ut ſi adeo miſera res eſt tyrannidem gerere, idque te non fugit, non abjicias tam ingens malum? Neque tu neque alius quiſquam unquam lubens tyrannidem depoſuit, ubi ſemel nactus eſt. Quoniam, inquit, ô Simonides, iſto nomine miſerrima eſt tyrannis, quod ab ea non licet diſcedere. Quomodo enim quiſquam tyrannus unquam ſuffecerit ad pecuniam rependendam iis quos ſpoliavit? aut quomodo vincula repenſet iis quos detruſit in vincula? aut quomodo reſtituet tot animas extinctas iis quos occidit? Sed ſi cuiquam alteri, ô Simonides, expedit laqueo finire vitam, ſcito, inquit, me compertum habere, ut id faciat nulli magis expedire quàm tyranno, quandoquidam huic uni mala nec retinere nec deponere expedit* (29). Dionyſius the tyrant ſaid, that inſtead of returning to a private man's condition on horſeback, one muſt be dragged to it by the feet. Livy relates this but he adds another thought to it which enervates the firſt, *ultima primis obſtant*, and deſtroys the commonplace which I am about. The reader may judge of it for I ſet down the whole paſſage. ‘ Sed evocatum ‘ eum (30) ab legatis Demarata uxor, filia Hieronis, ‘ inflata adhuc regiis animis, ac muliebri ſpiritu, admonet ſæpe uſurpatæ Dionyſii tyranni vocis: Qua ‘ pedibus tractum, non inſidentem equo relinquere tyrannidem dixerit debere. Facile eſſe momento quo ‘ quis velit, cedere poſſeſſione magnæ fortunæ: facere ‘ & parare eam, difficile atque arduum eſſe. Paululum ſumeret ſpacii ad conſultandum ab legatis; eo uteretur ad accerſendos ex Leontinis milites, quibus ‘ ſi pecuniam regiam pollicitus eſſet, omnia in poteſtate ejus futura. Hæc muliebria conſilia Andronodorus neque tota aſpernatus eſt, neque extemplo accepit (31). - - - - *But the embaſſadors having demanded* ‘ *an audience, his wife Demerata, the daughter of Hiero, full of ambition and a womaniſh ſpirit, put him in* ‘ *mind of a ſaying frequently uſed by Dionyſius the tyrant: that inſtead of returning to a private ſtation on horſeback, one muſt be dragged to it by the feet. That it was* ‘ *an eaſy matter, whenever one pleaſed, to yield up the poſſeſſion of a great fortune, but very hard and difficult to make and acquire it. That he ſhould have ſome* ‘ *time allowed by the embaſſadors to conſider of it; and in* ‘ *the mean while ſhould ſend for ſoldiers from Leontini, to* ‘ *whom if he promiſed a good deal of mony, he might have* ‘ *every thing in his own power. Theſe womaniſh counſels Andronodorus did not wholly deſpiſe, nor immediately comply with.*’ It is not neceſſary to ſuppoſe that the ſecond maxim is of Dionyſius; for in all likelihood it is the maxim of that ambitious woman whom Livy introduces ſpeaking, Cicero obſerves, that Dionyſius could not have renounced the condition he was in, and his wicked life, without undoing himſelf. ‘ Atque ei ne integrum quidem erat ut ad juſtitiam remigraret civibuſque libertatem & jura redderet. His ‘ enim ſe adoleſcens improvida ætate irretierat erratis, ‘ eaque commiſerat ut ſalvus eſſe non poſſet ſi ſanus ‘ eſſe cœpiſſet (32). - - - - *And indeed it was not ſafe* ‘ *for*

(25) Balzac, chap. xlv, of the Prince, *pag. m.* 33, 34.

(26) Joan. Henr. Meibom. in Vita Mæcenatis, *pag.* 87, 88.

(27) That is in Octavio, *cap. xxviii.* Meibomius quotes the 29th chapter.

(28) Καλὸν μὲν εἶναι τὴν τυραννίδα χωρίον, οὐκ ἔχειν δὲ ἀπόβασιν. Præclarum fundum tyrannidem eſſe, ſed non habere exitum. *Plut. in Solone, pag.* 85.

(29) Xenoph. in Hierone, ſive Tyrannico, *pag.* 533, *Edit. H. Steph.* 1581.

(30) That is to ſay Andronodorus, who was exhorted in Syracuſe to give over the too great power he had uſurped.

(31) T. Liv. *lib. xxiv, cap. xxii.*

(32) Cicero, Tuſcul V, *cap. xxi.*

‘ for him to return to juſtice, and to reſtore to the ‘ people their rights and liberties. For in his unwary ‘ youth he had ſo entangled himſelf by theſe errors, and ‘ had committed ſuch faults, that he could not be ſecure ‘ tho’ he had a mind to be wiſe and juſt.’

PERIBOEA, daughter of Alcathous king of Megara, wife of Telamon king of Salamis, and mother of Ajax. See the remark [*C*] of the article **TELAMON**.

PERICLES was one of the greateſt men that ever lived in Ancient Greece. His anceſtors by his father's and mother's ſide were very illuſtrious. He was educated with all imaginable care; and he had, amongſt other maſters, Zeno Eleates, and Anaxagoras, two of the moſt illuſtrious Philoſophers who taught in Athens. He learned of the latter, amongſt other things, to fear the gods without ſuperſtition [*A*], and to give an account of eclipſes, which proved once very beneficial to the Athenians [*B*]. They were

[*A*] *He learned of Anaxagoras to fear the gods without ſuperſtition.*] The Athenians were alarmed without any reaſon, as ſoon as any uncommon phænomenon appeared in the air: they looked upon them as ſigns of the anger of the gods. The Philoſopher Anaxagoras freed Pericles from that fear, explaining to him, by natural reaſons the apparition of thoſe meteors. And ſo he inſpired him with a more rational religion, and he was not diſturbed with ſuperſtitious fears, but he expected heavenly favours with a quiet mind. Οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα τῆς Ἀναξαγόρου συνουσίας ἀπέλαυσε Περικλῆς. ἀλλὰ καὶ δαισιδαιμονίας δοκεῖ γενέσθαι καθυπέρτερος, ὅση πρὸς τὰ μετέωρα θάμβος ἐργάζεται τοῖς αὐτῶν τε τούτων τὰς αἰτίας ἀγνοοῦσι, καὶ περὶ τὰ θεῖα δαιμονῶσι καὶ ταραττομένοις δι ἀπειρίαν αὐτῶν. ἣν ὁ φυσικὸς λόγος ἀπαλλάττων, ἀντὶ τῆς φοβερᾶς καὶ φλεγμαινούσης δεισιδαιμονίας, τὴν ἀσφαλῆ μετ’ ἐλπίδων ἀγαθῶν εὐσέβειαν ἐνεργάζηται. *Nec verò hunc ſolum fructum tulit Pericli Anaxagoræ uſus, verùm omni etiam liberavit eum ſuperſtitione, quæ terrorem ex rebus æthereis imprimit ignorantibus earum cauſas, & iis qui rerum divinarum metu pavent, percelluntur que rudes earum: quem eximens naturalis ratio, pro terrifica & æſtuante ſuperſtitione, ſecuram inſerit cum bona ſpe religionem* (1).

A REFLEXION upon the doctrine of preſages.

What follows in Plutarch deſerves to be taken notice of. It happened one day that a ram's head, had but one horn which was brought to Pericles. That ram was yeaned in a country houſe of Pericles. Lampon, the diviner, declared that it was a ſign that the power of the two factions, which were then in Athens (2), would fall into the hands of the perſon in whoſe houſe that prodigy happened. Anaxagoras went another way to work. He diſſected that monſter, and finding the ſcull ſmaller than it ſhould be, and of an oval figure, he explained the reaſon why that ram had but one horn, and why it came out in the middle of the forehead. That method of giving an account of prodigies was admired; but ſome time after Lampon was admired, when they ſaw the faction of Thucydides overthrown, and all the authority in the hands of Pericles. The Hiſtorian ſays thereupon, that the diviner and the Philoſopher might be both in the right, the one in gueſſing at the effect, and the other in gueſſing at the cauſe. It was the Philoſopher's buſineſs, adds he, to explain from whence and how that ſingle horn was formed; but it was the diviner's office to declare why it was formed, and what it portended. For they, who ſay that as ſoon as a natural reaſon is found out, the prodigy vaniſhes away, are not aware that they deſtroy artificial as well as celeſtial ſigns. Watch-lights upon towers, ſun-dials, &c. depend upon certain cauſes, which act according to certain rules; yet they are appointed to ſignify certain things. This is the moſt ſpecious and ſtrongeſt reaſon that can be alledged for the vulgar opinion which Anaxagoras oppoſed. That a natural phænomenon may be a prodigy, or a ſign of a future evil, it is not at all neceſſary that Philoſophers ſhould not be able to give any account of it; for tho’ they may explain it by the natural virtues of ſecond cauſes, yet it may very well be appointed to preſage ſomething. Watch-lights are explained by natural reaſons, nevertheleſs they are a ſign of the courſe which pilots ought to ſteer. It muſt be therefore confeſſed that Plutarch has defended the common opinion as learnedly as it can be maintained. The efficient cauſe, when found out, does not exclude the final cauſe, and even neceſſarily ſuppoſes it in every action directed by an intelligent being. What grounds therefore do Philoſophers go upon, when they maintain that eclipſes being a natural conſequence of the motion of the planets, cannot be a preſage of the death of a king, and that the overflowing of rivers being a natural effect of rains, or melted ſnows, cannot portend a ſedition, the dethroning of a prince, or ſuch like public calamities? I anſwer, that they go upon this ground, that the effects of nature cannot be preſages of future contingents, unleſs they be appointed for that end by a particular intelligent being. It is evident that the laws of nature being left in their general courſe, would never raiſe any towers, nor ſet up watch-lights upon them for the uſe of pilots. It muſt be the work of men; it is neceſſary that their particular wills ſhould apply the virtue of bodies in ſuch a manner as may relate to the end which they propoſe to themſelves. On the other hand, it is manifeſt that the laws of nature being left in their general courſe cannot produce any meteors, or the overflowing of a river whereby the inhabitants of a kingdom may know that there will ariſe a ſedition in two or three years time, which will overthrow the monarchy. It is manifeſt that a particular intelligent being muſt needs form thoſe meteors, or thoſe great inundations, that they may be the ſigns of a change of government. But then it will be impoſſible to explain them by phyſical reaſons; for that which depends upon the particular will of a man or an angel, is not the object of a ſcience: the cauſes thereof cannot be founded out by Philoſophy. From whence it follows, 1. that an event which may be explained by phyſical reaſons, is not a preſage of a future contingent, and that ſuch a preſage cannot be explained by the laws of nature. So that when Plutarch ſays, that the diviner found out the final cauſe, and the Philoſopher the efficient cauſe, he muſt ſuppoſe that a particular ſpirit ſo diſpoſed the ſcull of that ram, that his brains being ſtraitned, and ended ſharping over againſt the middle of the forehead, produced but one horn which came out in that very place. He muſt alſo ſuppoſe that this ſpirit modified the brains of that ram in ſuch a manner, to the end that the Athenians might know that the faction of Pericles would overthrow that of Thucydides, and have all the power in it's hands. But that ſuppoſition being contrary to the notions whereby we know that none but God can foreſee future contingents, cannot be admitted; and ſo the vulgar opinion about preſages cannot be adopted without acknowledging that God produces miraculouſly, and by a particular will all the natural effects which are looked upon as prognoſtics. According to that ſuppoſition, miracles, properly ſo called, would be almoſt as frequent as natural effects; which is a prodigious abſurdity. Obſerve, that if God had been willing to work a miracle, to inform the Athenians that one of their factions would be deſtroyed, he needed not ſtraiten the brains of that ram. He would have produced an horn in the middle of the forehead without making any alteration in the brains, which would have been a ſtronger proof of the prodigy. However, I hope the reader will find no fault with me, for having made a reflexion upon a thought of Plutarch, which is ſo ſpecious that it might ſeem to moſt readers to be a ſolid one.

[*B*] . . . *and to give an account of eclipſes, which proved once very beneficial to the Athenians.*] I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Plutarch, which concerns a naval expedition in the beginning of the Peloponneſian war. ‘ And now the veſſels having their complement of ‘ men, and Pericles being gone aboard his ſhip, it hap‘pened that the ſun was in an eclipſe, and it grew ‘ dark on a ſudden, to the extream affrightment of them

(1) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 154, *E.*

(2) That of Pericles, and that of Thucydides, ſon of Myleſius.

were ſo unjuſt as to ſuſpect him of Atheiſm, becauſe he had thoroughly learned the doctrine of the Philoſoper [*C*]. He ſignalized himſelf by an undaunted courage, and an extraordinary force of eloquence (*a*), which was increaſed and ſtrengthned by the knowledge of nature; and he knew ſo well how to accommodate himſelf to the humour of the people according to the times, that, under a republican government, he acquired almoſt as great authority as if he had been a monarch. [*D*]. It is true that he was not free

‘ them all, looking upon it as a diſmal, and unlucky, omen. Wherefore Pericles perceiving the pilot, or ſteerſman, ſeized with a great fear, and at a ſtand what to do, he took his cloak and put it before the man's face, and muffling him up in it that he could not ſee, he aſked him whether he did imagine there was any dreadful thing or great hurt in this that he had done to him, or whether he thought it was the ſign of any hurt: he anſwering, no; then ſaid he, there is no other difference between this and that, except that the body which cauſes the darkneſs is bigger than my cloak which covers your eyes (3).’ Quintilian obſerves that Pericles freed the Athenians from a great fear at that time. ‘ An verò cum Pericles Athenienſes Solis obſcuratione territos, redditis ejus rei cauſis, metu liberavit: aut cùm Sulpitius ille Gallus in exercitu L. Pauli de Lunæ defectione diſſeruit, ne velut prodigio divinitus facto militum animi terrerentur, non videtur eſſe uſus oratoris officio (4)? - - - *But does not Pericles, when he freed the Athenians from the great fear they were in about an eclipſe of the ſun, by aſſigning the natural cauſe of it: or Sulpitius Gallus, when he diſcourſed in the army of L. Paulus about an eclipſe of the moon, that the minds of the ſoldiers might not be frightened as at a prodigy ſent by the gods, I ſay, do they not ſeem to have acted the part of Orators?*’ Valerius Maximus does not ſay as Plutarch does, that Pericles was in the fleet; he pretends that this Aſtronomical lecture was given in the middle of Athens. ‘ Cùm obſcurato repentè ſole inuſitatis perfuſæ tenebris Athenæ ſolicitudine agerentur, interitum ſibi cœleſti denuntiatione portendi credentes; Pericles proceſſit in medium, & quæ à præceptore ſuo Anaxagora pertinentia ad ſolis & lunæ curſum acceperat, diſſeruit: nec ulterius trepidare cives ſuos vano metu paſſus eſt (5). - - - - *Whilſt Athens was in a great fright at the unuſual darkneſs occaſioned by a ſudden eclipſe of the ſun, believing their deſtruction was portended by a declaration from Heaven: Pericles went out amongſt the people, and told them what he had learned of his maſter Anaxagoras, concerning the courſe of the ſun and moon; and by that means delivered his countrymen from their vain fear.*’ Frontinus mentions the explication of the lightning, and not of an eclipſe. ‘ Pericles, *ſays he* (6), cum in caſtra ejus fulmen decidiſſet, terruiſſetque milites, advocata concione, lapidibus in conſpectu omnium colliſis, ignem excuſſit, ſedavitque turbationem, cum docuiſſet ſimiliter nubium attritu excuti fulmen. - - - *Pericles, when the lightning fell upon his camp and terrified the ſoldiers, called them together, and by knocking ſtones againſt one another, ſtruck fire in the ſight of them all, and ſo calmed their minds, telling them that in like manner lightning was produced by the colliſion of clouds.*’

If all the Athenian generals had had the Philoſopher Anaxagoras for their maſter, the misfortune, which befel to the Athenian fleet before Syracuſe, had not happened. It was ready to ſet ſail in order to return to Athens, but the moon being eclipſed, the general, Nicias, put off the departure, which occaſioned the ruin of the fleet. Let us hear Plutarch. ‘ The moon became eclipſed in the night, to the great fright of Nicias, and others, who, for want of experience, or out of ſuperſtition, are ſcared with theſe appearances. That the ſun would be darkened about the thirtieth day of the month by the moon going between, this even the ordinary people now well enough underſtood; but the moon itſelf to be darkened, how that could come about, and how on the ſudden a broad full moon ſhould loſe all her light, and ſhew ſuch various colours, that was not eaſy to be comprehended; but they concluded it to be ominous, and a ſign from God of heavy calamities to enſue. For he, who the firſt and the moſt plainly of any, and with the greateſt aſſurance, committed to writing, how the moon is enlightned, and overſhadowed, was Anaxagoras; yet neither was he ancient, nor his notion much taken notice of, but was looked upon as heterodox, and kept ſecret, paſſing only among a few, under ſome kind of caution and confidence, becauſe the people could not endure Naturaliſts and μετεωρολέσχας, as they then called them, that is, ſuch who diſpute of things that happen in the air; looking upon it as leſſening the Divine Power, by deducing things from natural ſenſeleſs cauſes, and a long chain of neceſſity, without any thing of providence, or a free agent. Hence it was that Protagoras was baniſhed Athens, and Anaxagoras caſt in priſon, and Pericles had much ado to procure his liberty (7).’ Theſe words of Plutarch may afford matter enough for ſeveral reflexions.

[*C*] *They were ſo unjuſt as to ſuſpect him of Atheiſm, becauſe he had learned the doctrine of Anaxagoras.*] I ſhall quote a grave author for it. Ἤκουσε δὲ διδασκάλων, Ἀναξαγόρου μὲν ἐν φιλοσόφοις, ὅθεν, φησὶν Ἄντυλλος, καὶ ἄθεος ἠρέμα ἐνομίσθη, τῆς ἐκεῖθεν θεωρίας ἐμφορηθείς. *Doctores autem audivit in Philoſophia quidem, Anaxagoram: unde etiam, Antyllo teſte, atheus paulatim haberi cæpit, quòd illius philoſophiæ diſciplinam avidius hauſiſſet* (8). See a paſſage of Plutarch at the end of the remark [*O*]. Here is another paſſage out of Diodorus Siculus. Διόπερ ἐκκλησίας συνελθούσης περὶ τούτων, οἱ μὲν ἐχθροὶ τοῦ Περικλέους ἔπεισαν τὸν δῆμον συλλαβεῖν τὸν Φειδίαν, καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Περικλέους κατηγόρουν ἱεροσυλίαν. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Ἀναξαγόραν τὸν σοφιστὴν διδάσκαλον ὄντα Περικλέους, ὡς ἀσεβοῦντα εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς ἐσυκοφάντουν. συνέπλεκον δ᾽ ἐν ταῖς κατηγορίαις καὶ διαβολαῖς τὸν Περικλέα, διὰ τὸν φθόνον, σπεύδοντες διαβαλεῖν τὴν τἀνδρὸς ὑπεροχήν τε καὶ δόξαν. Advocatâ igitur ob hoc concione, malevoli Periclis ſuaſores populo exiſtunt, ut Phidiam comprehendant, ipſumque Periclem ſacrilegii requirant. Anaxagoram præterea ſophiſtam, qui præceptor Periclis erat, quod impiè de diis ſentiat, criminantur. Eiſdem interim criminibus & calumniis etiam Periclem involvunt, hoc unicè agentes, ut excellentem viri auctoritatem & gloriam calumniis ſuis convellerent ac labefactarent (9). - - - *An aſſembly being for this reaſon called, the enemies of Pericles perſwaded the people to ſeize on Phidias, and to impeach Pericles himſelf of ſacrilege. They moreover accuſed the Philoſopher Anaxagoras, who was maſter to Pericles, becauſe he entertained impious notions of the gods. In the mean time they involved Pericles in the ſame calumnies and accuſations, intending thereby to weaken his power and to ſully his glory.* That author adds, that Pericles found no better way to calm that ſtorm, than to engage the republic in an important war. He knew the genius and humour of the people (10). They eſteem a great man, when they are involved in a great war; but the ſweetneſs of peace plunging them into idleneſs, they diſcover their jealouſies, and proſecute him as a criminal.

[*D*] *He acquired almoſt as great an authority, as if he had been a monarch.*] It has been ſaid that he got that authority by his eloquence. ‘ Pericles feliciſſimis naturæ incrementis, ſub Anaxagora præceptore ſummo ſtudio perpolitus & inſtructus, liberis Athenarum cervicibus jugum ſervitutis impoſuit: egit enim ille urbem, & verſavit arbitrio ſuo. Cumque adverſus voluntatem populi loqueretur, jucunda nihilominus & popularis ejus vox erat. Itaque veteris comœdiæ maledica lingua, quamvis potentiam viri perſtringere cupiebat, tamen in labris ejus hominis melle dulciorem leporem fatebatur habitare: inque animis eorum, qui illum audierant, quaſi aculeos quoſdam relinqui prædicabat (11). - - - *Pericles, endowed with an extraordinary genius, educated and inſtructed with great care under his maſter Anaxagoras, laid a yoke of ſervitude upon the free necks of the Athenians: for he managed and governed their city at his pleaſure. And whenever he ſpoke, tho' contrary to the inclinations of the people, yet his ſpeech was always agreeable to them. Therefore the ancient comic Poets, inveighing againſt his power, acknowledged notwithſtanding, that eloquence ſweeter than honey ſat upon his lips, and left a ſting in the hearts of his hearers.*’ Valerius Maximus

(*a*) See the remark [*D*].

(3) Plut. in Vit. Pericl.

(4) Quintil. Inſtitut. Orat. *lib. i, cap. x, pag. m.* 55.

(5) Val. Max. *lib. viii, cap. xi, num.* 1. *ext.*

(6) Front. Strатag. *lib. i, cap. xii.*

(7) Plut. in Nicia.

(8) Marcell. in Vit. Thucyd.

(9) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xii, cap. xxxix, pag. m.* 433.

(10) Ibid.

(11) Val. Max. *lib. viii, cap. ix, pag. m.* 699, 700.

mus adds, that the only difference between Piſiſtratus and Pericles was, that the one exerciſed tyranny with arms, and the other without arms. *Quid enim inter Piſiſtratum & Periclem interfuit, niſi quod ille armatus, hic ſine armis tyrannidem geſſit?* To give a greater weight to that teſtimony of Valerius Maximus, I ſhall obſerve that he had it from Cicero: *Quid Pericles? de cujus dicendi copia ſic accepimus, ut quum contra voluntatem Athenienſium loqueretur pro ſalute patriæ, ſeverius tamen id ipſum, quod ille contra populares homines diceret, populare omnibus, & jucundum videretur, cujus in labris veteres comici etiam quum illi maledicerent, quod tum Athenis fieri licebat, leporem habitaſſe dixerunt, tantamque in eo vim fuiſſe, ut in eorum mentibus qui audiſſent, quaſi aculeos quoſdam relinqueret. At hunc non declamator aliquis ad clepſydram latrare docuerat, ſed, ut accepimus, Clazomenius ille Anaxagoras vir ſummus in maximarum rerum ſcientia. Itaque hic doctrina, conſilio, eloquentia excellens, quadraginta annos præfuit Athenis, & urbanis eodem tempore, & bellicis rebus* (12). We have here a proof of what I ſhall ſay, concerning the liberty which the comic Poets took againſt Pericles. Their ſatirical ſtrokes ſet off the praiſes they could not refuſe him, upon the account of his eloquence. If any body deſires to know the names of the Poets who praiſed it, he needs only conſult Cicero, who tells us that Eupolis ſaid that the goddeſs of perſwaſion had her ſeat upon Pericles's lips (13), and that the eloquence of that man left a pleaſant ſting in the hearts of his hearers. *Non quemadmodum de Pericle ſcripſit Eupolis, cum delectatione aculeos etiam relinqueret in animis eorum à quibus eſſet auditus* (14). Diodorus Siculus (15), and Pliny the younger, have preſerved to us the very words of that comic Poet. *Nec me præterit ſummum oratorem Periclem ſic à comico Eupolide laudari,*

- - - Πρὸς δέ γ' αὖ τούτῳ τάχ' ἡ
Πειθώ τις ἐπεκάθητο τοῖσι χείλεσιν.
Οὕτως ἐκήλει, καὶ μόνος τῶν ῥητόρων,
Τὸ κέντρον ἐγκατέλιπε τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις (16).

You will find in the Scholiaſt upon Ariſtophanes the ſame verſes of Eupolis with ſome others that go before, and contain an Encomium upon the eloquence of Pericles, which pleaſed, was admired and feared: *Hujus ſuavitate maxime hilaratæ ſunt Athenæ, hujus ubertatem & copiam admiratæ, ejuſdem vim dicendi terroremque timuerunt* (17). It charmed by it's ſweetneſs, it was admired by reaſon of it's copiouſneſs, and feared by reaſon of it's force. Do not think it therefore an incredible thing that it made Pericles reign in the middle of a republic. His words have been compared with the thunder. *Qui* (Pericles) *ſi tenui genere uteretur, nunquam ab Ariſtophane poëta fulgurare, tonare, permiſcere Græciam dictus eſſet* (18). That paſſage of Cicero was paraphraſed by Pliny the younger. 'Adde, quæ de eodem Pericle comicus alter, ἤστραπτ', ἐβρόντα, ξυνεκύκα τὴν Ἑλλάδα. Non enim amputata oratio & abſciſſa, ſed lata, & magnifica, & excelſa tonat, fulgurat, omnia denique perturbat ac miſcet (19). - - - *For his ſtile was not looſe and broken, but copious and ſublime; it lightned, thundered, and confounded all things.*' The firſt time Cicero publiſhed his book, he aſcribed thoſe words to Eupolis; but he acknowledged his miſtake in another work. 'Mihi quidem gratum, & erit gratius ſi non modo in libris tuis, ſed etiam in aliorum per librarios tuos Ariſtophanem repoſueris pro Eupoli (20). --- *You will oblige me by putting Ariſtophanes inſtead of Eupolis in your own books, and the obligation will be ſtill greater if you cauſe the ſame alteration to be made in the books of others by your amanuenſes.*' Ariſtophanes mentions only the lightning and the thunder; but Plutarch mentions the thunder-bolt. *The comedies,* ſays he, *of the then maſters of the ſtage, who both in good earneſt, and out of merriment too, let fly many ſhrewd words at him, do plainly ſhew that he got that appellation* of Olympian, *eſpecially upon the account of his being an able ſpeaker, by ſaying that he thundered and lightened when he harangued the people, and that he carried a dreadful thunder-bolt on his tongue.* Αἱ μέντοι κωμῳδίαι τῶν τότε διδασκάλων σπουδῇ τε πολλὰς καὶ μετὰ γέλωτος ἀφεικότων φωνὰς εἰς αὐτὸν, ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ μάλιστα τὴν προσωνυμίαν γενέσθαι δηλοῦσι, βροντᾶν μὲν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀστράπτειν ὅτε δημηγοροίη, δεινὸν δὲ κεραυνὸν ἐν γλώσσῃ φέρειν λεγόντων. *At comœdiæ, quod qui ea tempeſtate docebant eas, & ſerias & ridiculas voces in eum multas ejacularentur, traxiſſe ex vi dicendi eum oſtendunt hoc cognomen:* (Olympii) *Tonare enim & fulminare concionantem, & vehemens eum in lingua fulmen dicebant gerere* (21). The author adds an anſwer of Thucydides which confirms this. *When Archidamus, king of the Lacedæmonians, aſked him, whether he or Pericles were the better wreſtler? he made this anſwer; when I, ſaid he, have thrown him and given him a fair fall, he by ſtanding out in the denial, ſaying that he had no fall, gets the better of me, and perſwades people into a belief of what he ſays whether they will or no, though they ſaw the quite contrary.*

I have not done yet with the eloquence of Pericles. Some ſay he was the firſt that wrote his harangues before he recited them. Πρῶτος γραπτὸν λόγον ἐν δικαστηρίῳ εἶπε, τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ σχεδιαζόντων. *Primus ſcriptam orationem habuit in judicio, cum illi qui ipſum anteceſſerant ex tempore dicerent* (22). Corradus methinks is in the wrong when he fancies this meant that Pericles read his manuſcript (23); for an harangue, when read, is not very fit to produce the effects which are aſcribed to the eloquence of that Orator. Some harangues of Pericles were ſtill extant in Quintilian's time; but that learned Rhetorician finding them diſproportioned to the high reputation of this great man, approved the opinion of thoſe who looked upon them as a ſuppoſititious work (24). *Cicero in Bruto negat ante Periclem ſcriptum quicquam quod ornatum oratorium habeat: ejus aliqua ferri. Equidem non reperio quicquam tanta eloquentiæ fama dignum: ideoque minus miror eſſe qui nihil ab eo ſcriptum putent: hæc autem quæ feruntur, ab aliis eſſe compoſita* (25). But an indifferent harangue being recited by an excellent Orator, may charm the hearers. Action is almoſt all. See the remark [*C*] of the article NARNI. I ſhall conclude with a paſſage of Thucydides, who tells us that Pericles having the gift of reſtraining the Athenians when they were too bold, and of animating them when they wanted courage, was, in reality, the king of a titular republic. Ὁπότε γοῦν αἴσθοιτό τι αὐτοὺς παρὰ καιρὸν ὕβρει θαρσοῦντας, λέγων κατέπλησσεν ἐπὶ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι. καὶ δεδιότας, αὖ ἀλόγως, ἀντικαθίστη πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ θαρσεῖν, ἐγίγνετό τε λόγῳ μὲν, δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή. *Quoties itaque intelligebat eos quippiam intempeſtivè ferociterque conantes, orationis acrimonia deterrebat: quoties ab re formidantes, rurſus ad fiduciam erigebat. Denique verbo quidem, popularis ſtatus, re autem ipſa, penes primarium virum principatus erat* (26). Plutarch has wonderfully paraphraſed that paſſage of Thucydides (27); to which he adds very much to the purpoſe what Plato ſays concerning the force of eloquence: he obſerves alſo, that the Poets laughed at the republic for granting ſo much power to one man, and that they exhorted Pericles to promiſe upon his oath, that he would not be a tyrant. Αὐτὸν δ' ἀπομόσαι μὴ τυραννήσειν κελεύοντες, ὡς ἀσυμμέτρου πρὸς δημοκρατίαν καὶ βαρυτέρας περὶ αὐτὸν οὔσης ὑπεροχῆς. ὁ δὲ Τηλεκλείδης παραδεδωκέναι φησὶν αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους πόλεών τε φόρους, αὐτάς τε τὰς πόλεις, τὰς μὲν δεῖν, τὰς δ' ἀναλύειν· λάϊνα τείχη, τὰ μὲν οἰκοδομεῖν, τὰ δὲ αὖτα πάλιν καταβάλλειν, σπονδὰς, δύναμιν, κράτος, εἰρήνην, πλοῦτόν τ' εὐδαιμονίαν τε. Ipſumque jubent, ut cujus ſint immodicæ opes & intolerabiles liberæ civitati, tyrannidem ſe uſurpaturum abjurare. Teleclides permiſiſſe ei refert Athenienſes urbium tributa, ipſaſque adeo urbes has ligare, illas ſolvere, muros lapideos nunc extruere, nunc eoſdem demoliri, fœdera, opes, vires, pacem, opulentiam, fortunaſque omnes (28). - - - *And they require of him to ſwear that he will not be a tyrant, becauſe his power was too great and intolerable to a free ſtate. Teleclides ſays, that the Athenians gave him the tribute of the cities, and conſequently a power to bind ſome and exempt others, to build or demoliſh ſtone-walls, and left to his management their alliances, riches, forces, peace, and all their fortunes.*

I muſt not forget to obſerve that, with the extraordinary force of his genius, he made a very good uſe of his philoſophical knowledge, the better to ſet off his eloquence. The ſublime ſpeculations, and the phyſical and metaphyſical depths wherewith Anaxagoras had ſtored his mind, would have proved an obſtacle to ſeveral others, who had been deſirous of acquiring the glory of being great Orators. But as for him, he found in them wherewith to give a wonderful force to his harangues. We learn this fine particular of Plato: his expreſſions are noble, and will

charm

---

(12) Cicero, de Oratore, *lib. iii, fol. m.* 95, *B.*

(13) Πειθὼ quam vocant Græci, cujus effector eſt orator, hanc Suadam appellavit Ennius. Ejus autem Cethegum medullam fuiſſe vult, ut quam deam in Periclis labris ſcripſit Eupolis ſeſſitaviſſe, hujus hic medullam noſtrum oratorem fuiſſe dixerit. *Idem, in Bruto, pag. m.* 104.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 62.

(15) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xii, cap. xl, pag. m.* 434.

(16) Plin. Epiſt. XX, *lib. i, pag. m.* 60.

(17) Cicero, in Bruto, *pag.* 91.

(18) Ibid. in Oratore, *fol. m.* 118, *B.*

(19) Plin. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 61.

(20) Cicero. ad Attic. Epiſt. VI, *lib. xii, pag. m.* 301, 302.

(21) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 156, *B.*

(22) Suidas, in Περικλῆς.

(23) Corrad. in Brutum Cicer. *pag.* 77.

(24) *Plutarch, ubi ſupra*, ſays, that Pericles left no other writings but ſome decrees.

(25) Quint. Inſtit. Orat. *lib. iii, cap. i, pag. m.* 115.

(26) Thucyd. *lib. ii, pag.* 141, *Francof.* 1614, *fol.*

(27) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 161.

(28) Ibid.

free from the ſatirical railleries of the Comic Poets [*E*]. He was defamed by them upon

charm thoſe who underſtand Greek. Πᾶσαι ὅσαι μεγάλαι τῶν τεχνῶν προσδέονται ἀδολεσχίας καὶ μετεωρολογίας φύσεως πέρι. τὸ γὰρ ὑψηλόνουν τοῦτο καὶ τὸ πάντη τελεσιουργικὸν ἔοικεν ἐντεῦθεν ποθὲν εἰσιέναι. ὃ καὶ Περικλῆς πρὸς τῷ εὐφυὴς εἶναι ἐκτήσατο. προσπεσὼν γάρ, οἶμαι, τοιούτῳ ὄντι Ἀναξαγόρα, μετεωρολογίας ἐμπλησθεὶς, καὶ ἐπὶ φύσιν νοῦ τε καὶ ἀνοίας ἀφικόμενος (ὧν δὴ πέρι τὸν πολὺν λόγον ἐποιεῖτο Ἀναξαγόρας) ἐντεῦθεν εἵλκυσεν ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν λόγων τέχνην τὸ πρόσφορον αὐτῇ. Magnæ quælibet artes exercitatione dialectica, contemplationeque ſublimium in natura rerum indigent. Ipſa enim mentis ſublimitas, & vis efficax in quavis re perficienda, hinc quodammodo proficiſci videntur: quod Pericles ad ingenii acumen adjunxit. Anaxagoræ namque hujuſmodi rerum indagatoris familiaritate fretus contemplationi ſe tradidit mentiſque & dementiæ naturam illam comprehendit, de qua Anaxagoras diffusè diſſeruit. Unde ad dicendi artem quod ipſi conducere videbatur, traduxit (29). - - - *The practice of Logic, ſays he, and ſublime contemplations are neceſſary to every noble profeſſion. For an exalted capacity of mind, and an admirable addreſs in bringing about any thing, ſeem in ſome meaſure to proceed from thence: which Pericles, &c.* Cicero, who, as I think, had that paſſage of Plato in his view, does not expreſs all the ſublimity of it. *Pericles*, ſays he (30), *primus adhibuit doctrinam, quamquam tum nulla erat dicendi, tamen ab Anaxagora phyſico eruditus exercitationem mentis à reconditis abſtruſiſque rebus ad cauſas forenſes populareſque facile traduxerat, hujus ſuavitate, &c* (31).

[*E*] *He was not free from the ſatirical railleries of the comic Poets.*] He was ridiculed by Cratinus, Teleclides, Eupolis, Plato the comic Poet, and Dexippus. Plutarch does not only ſay ſo, but even ſets down their very words (32). Tanaquillus Faber obſerves (33) that *Cratinus was reſolute and bold in his compoſitions*, and that *his pen ſpared not the principal officers of the republic, and the great and Olympian Pericles.* Let us ſee what he ſays in another place. ‘ Hermippus did a thing which St Auguſtin was doubtleſs ignorant of: for that great doctor, who underſtood not Greek ſo well as ſome might think, and ſtudied more carefully the *doctrine of grace*, than the Greek hiſtory or the comic Poets, ſays ſomewhere in his book *de Civitate Dei*, that the licentiouſneſs of the ſtage was never ſo impudent as to offend Pericles: whereas Terence made no ſcruple to offend Jupiter himſelf, (that paſſage is to be found in the Eunuch.) He was therefore miſtaken, for Hermippus made ſome verſes againſt Pericles (34).’ There was never a more unjuſt cenſure than this is; for St Auguſtin does not ſay what the Salmurian critic imputes to him. That Father has quoted a long paſſage, wherein ſome body deplores the caſe of the great Pericles, becauſe he was not ſpared by the ſtage Poets. ‘ Quid autem hic ſenſerint Romani veteres, Cicero teſtatur in libris, quos de Republica ſcripſit, ubi Scipio diſputans ait, Nunquam comœdiæ niſi conſuetudo vitæ pateretur, probare ſua theatris flagitia potuiſſent. Et Græci quidam antiquiores vitioſæ ſuæ opinionis quandam convenientiam ſervaverunt, apud quos fuit etiam lege conceſſum, ut quod vellet comœdia nominatim, vel de quo vellet, diceret. Itaque ſicut in eiſdem libris loquitur Africanus, quem illa non attigit, vel potius quem non vexavit, cui pepercit? Eſto: populares homines improbos, in repub. ſeditioſos, Cleonem, Cleophontem, Hyperbolum læſit. Patiamur, inquit, etſi hujuſmodi cives, à cenſore melius eſt quàm à poëta notari: ſed Periclem, cùm jam ſuæ civitati maxima autoritate plurimos annos domi & bello præfuiſſet, violari verſibus, & eos agi in ſcena non plus decuit, quàm ſi Plautus, inquit, noſter voluiſſet, aut Nævius, Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius Marco Catoni maledicere. Deinde paulò poſt noſtræ, inquit, contrà duodecim tabulæ cum perpaucas res capite ſanxiſſent, in his hanc quoque ſanciendam putaverunt, ſi quis actitaviſſet, ſive carmen condidiſſet, quod infamiam faceret, flagitiumve alteri. Præclarè. Judiciis enim ac Magiſtratuum diſceptationibus legitimis propoſitam vitam, non poëtarum ingeniis habere debemus, nec probrum audire, niſi ea lege ut reſpondere liceat, & judicio defendere. Hæc ex Ciceronis quarto de Republica libro ad verbum excerpenda arbitratus ſum, nonnullis propter faciliorem intellectum vel prætermiſſis, vel paululum commutatis (35). - - - *But what the opinion of the ancient Romans was in this caſe, Cicero ſhews in his books* de Republica, *wherein Scipio is introduced ſaying, that Poets could never have vented their ſcandal upon the ſtage, if common uſage had not permitted it. And ſome of the more ancient Greeks, ſuitably to their bad notions, granted a liberty even by law to the comic Poets, to name expreſsly what and whom they pleaſed. Therefore as Africanus ſpeaks in the ſame books, they attacked every body, they laſhed every body, and ſpared none. But, may one ſay, they expoſed thoſe who were factious and ſeditious in the common-wealth, as Cleon, Cleophon, and Hyperbolus. This I could bear with, replies he, tho' ſuch perſons ought rather to be diſgraced by the Magiſtrate than the Poet: but that Pericles, who had governed his country for many years with great authority, both in peace and war, ſhould be abuſed in Poems, even upon the ſtage, was no more to be ſuffered than that Publius and Cneus Scipio ſhould be defamed by Plautus, or Marcus Cato by Cæcilius. And then a little after he adds, on the contrary, ſays he, the twelve tables amongſt other very few things have made this a capital crime, either to act any thing or write verſes, which may, injure the reputation of another. Excellently well. For a man's life ought to be ſet forth by the deciſion of the Magiſtrate and not the wit of the Poet, nor ought one to ſuffer ignominy, who has not an opportunity to defend and anſwer for himſelf. I thought proper to tranſcribe this from the fourth book of Cicero* de Republica, *having omitted or a little altered ſome things to be better underſtood.*’ All authors ought to learn from this miſtake of Tanaquillus Faber to miſtruſt their memory, and never to alledge any thing, without conſulting over again the books wherein they remember they have read it. He had read in St Auguſtin, that the Romans would not have permitted that their players ſhould offend Scipio, tho' they permitted that Terence ſhould offend Jupiter: his notions were confounded; he miſtook Pericles for Scipio, and then he thought he had a good reaſon to rail at St Auguſtin. Let us ſee the words of that Father, they are fine and judicious, they upbraid the Roman legiſlators with a very great fault; they forbad the Poets to abuſe their magiſtrates, and permitted them to ridicule their gods. ‘ At Romani, ſicut in illa de Repub. diſputatione gloriatur Scipio, probris & injuriis poëtarum ſubjectam vitam famamque habere noluerunt, capite etiam punire ſancientes tale carmen condere ſi quis auderet. Quod erga ſe quidem ſatis honeſtè conſtituerunt, ſed erga Deos ſuos ſuperbè & irreligiosè. Quos cùm ſcirent non ſolùm patienter, ſed etiam libenter poëtarum probris maledictiſque lacerari, ſe potius hujuſcemodi injuriis indignos eſſe duxerunt, ſeque ab eis etiam lege munierunt, illorum autem iſta etiam ſacris ſolennitatibus miſcuerunt. Itane tandem Scipio laudas, hanc poëtis Romanis negatam eſſe licentiam, ut cuiquam opprobrium infligerent Romanorum, cum videas, eos nulli Deorum pepercisse veſtrorum? Itane pluris tibi habenda eſt exiſtimatio veſtræ curiæ, quàm Capitolii, imò Romæ unius quàm cœli totius: ut linguam maledicam in cives tuos exercere poëtæ etiam lege prohiberentur, & in Deos tuos ſecuri, tanta convitia nullo Senatore, nullo Cenſore, nullo Principe, nullo Pontifice prohibente jacularentur? Indignum videlicet fuit, ut Plautus aut Nævius Publio & Cneo Scipioni, aut Cæcilius M. Catoni malediceret: & dignum fuit, ut Terentius veſter flagitio Jovis optimi maximi adoleſcentium nequitiam concitaret (36). - - - *But the Romans, as Scipio boaſts in that diſſertation concerning the common-wealth, would not ſuffer the life and reputation of a man to be expoſed by the ſlanders and railleries of Poets, making it even a capital crime to write verſes of that kind. Which regulation was indeed decent enough with regard to themſelves, but arrogant and impious with reſpect to the gods. For whilſt they ſaw, not only with patience, but alſo with pleaſure, that the gods were reviled by the Poets, and ridiculed even at ſacred ſolemnities, they thought themſelves more undeſerving of ſuch injuries, and provided againſt them by law. Do you indeed think it worthy of commendation, O Scipio, that the Roman Poets are prohibited to offer the leaſt indignity to a Roman, when at the ſame time you find they ſpare none of your gods?*

---

(29) Plato, in Phædro, *pag. m.* 1237, *A*, *B*.

(30) Cicero, in Bruto, *pag. m.* 72, 73.

(31) You will find the reſt above, citation (17).

(32) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 153, 154, 160, 165, 170.

(33) The Lives of the Greek Poets, *pag. m.* 90.

(34) Ibid. *pag.* 81, 82.

(35) Auguſt. de Civ. Dei, *lib.* ii, *cap. ix*, *pag. m.* 166.

(36) Aug. ibid, *cap. xii*, *pag.* 180, 181.

upon ſeveral accounts, but eſpecially by reaſon of his love to Aſpaſia. His immoderate love of women was one of the vices he was moſt upbraided with (*b*). He bore patiently thoſe railleries [*F*], and he might have been looked upon as a happy man, had he not been expoſed to ſome other evils; but he felt the malignity of fortune in ſeveral reſpects, eſpecially in his family (*c*) [*G*]; for his wife and children gave him a great deal of trouble.

(*b*) See the remark [*G*].

(*c*) Taken from Plutarch's Life of Pericles.

Have you ſo much an higher regard for your court, than for the capitol, for Rome alone than for all Heaven; that a Poet ſhall be reſtrained by law from railing at your citizens, and yet may ſecurely inveigh againſt your gods, without the leaſt check from ſenator, cenſor, prince, or prieſt? It would have been an heinous crime, forſooth, if Publius and Cneus Scipio had been defamed by Plautus or Nævius, or M. Cato by Cæcilius: but it was decent enough for Terence to ſtir up youth to wickedneſs, from the vicious example of almighty Jove.’ Arnobius had already upbraided the Heathens with the ſame thing. Here are his words which very well deſerve to be read, *Nec à vobis ſaltem iſtum meruerunt honorem, ut quibus expellitis à vobis, eiſdem ab his legibus propulſaretis injurias. Majeſtatis ſunt apud vos rei, qui de veſtris ſequius obmurmuraverint aliquid regibus. Magiſtratum in ordinem redigere, Senatorem aut convitio proſequi, ſuis eſſe decreſtis periculoſiſſimum pœnis. Carmen malum conſcribere, quo fama alterius coinquinetur & vita, decemviralibus ſcitis evadere noluiſtis impune: ac ne veſtras aures convitio aliquis petulantiore pulſaret, de atrocibus formulas conſtituiſtis injuriis. Soli Dii ſunt apud vos ſuperi inhonorati, contemptibiles, viles: in quos jus eſt à vobis datum, quæ quiſque voluerit dicere: turpitudinum jacere, quas libido confinxerit atque excogitaverit, formas* (37).

[*F*] *He bore patiently thoſe railleries.*] We do not find that any of the Poets who abuſed him, were puniſhed for it. Yet it was very likely, that a man of ſo great an authority, might have eaſily puniſhed the boldneſs of thoſe men. They touched him in his moſt ſenſible part; for they called Aſpaſia an impudent and leacherous concubine, they called her ſo, I ſay, upon the ſtage. Ἐν δὲ ταῖς κωμῳδίαις Ὀμφάλη τε νέα καὶ Δηϊάνειρα καὶ πάλιν Ἥρα προσαγορεύεται. Κρατῖνος δ' ἄντικρυς παλλακὴν αὐτὴν εἴρηκεν ἐν τούτοις, Ἥραν τε οἱ Ἀσπασίαν τίκτει, καὶ καταπυγοσύνεν παλλακὴν κυνώπιδα. In comœdiis nova Omphale & Deianira, alias Juno nominatur. Cratinus diſerte pellicem appellavit hiſce verſibus:

Junonem Aſpaſiam parit,
Et impudicam & pellicem, inverecundamque (38).

She was called in plays a new Omphale and Deianira, and in other places Juno. Cratinus expreſly calls her a concubine impudently leud. His indolence proceeded partly from policy; for if Pericles had endeavoured to ſtop the mouth of the Poets, he would have made the Athenians ſenſible of a thing which it was not his intereſt they ſhould ſee: they would have perceived that they had only the name of a Republic, and that all the power was in reality re-united in one man. Nothing will more effectually hinder the people from perceiving the extinction of their liberty, than to be permitted to abuſe, without being puniſhed for it, thoſe who enjoy the reality of a monarchical power, under ſuch names as have nothing that is odious. It was therefore neceſſary that Pericles ſhould deſpiſe the licentiouſneſs of the ſtage: but we muſt not aſcribe his patience to meer art and policy: it was alſo an effect of his great ſoul; for a man of ſuch courage and ſpirit as he was, had never endured ſuch ill uſage with ſo much patience, had he not had an extraordinary great ſoul. Read this paſſage of his life. *One time being reviled and ill ſpoken of all day long, in his own hearing, by a villainous and ill-tongued raſcal, that cared not what he ſaid, he bore it patiently all along without returning him one word; all this in the open court, or the aſſembly of the people, where he was at the ſame time engaged in the proſecution and diſpatch of ſome weighty urgent affair. In the evening he went home in very good order, as one unconcerned, this fellow dogging him at the heels, and pelting him all the way he went with all the hard words and foul language he could take up. As he was entring his houſe, it being by this time dark, he ordered one of his ſervants to take a light, and to go along with the man and ſee him ſafe home* (39). He ſhewed the force of his courage and his great patience in the beginning of the Peleponneſian war. Whilſt the enemies were ravaging Attica, Pericles being not able to repulſe them, was contented to provide for the ſecurity of Athens. The Athenians murmured at his conduct, made ſharp verſes againſt him, and reviled, and threatened him. He deſpiſed their railing, and followed his own judgment with the greateſt tranquillity. Ἐχρῆτο τοῖς αὑτοῦ λογισμοῖς, βραχέα φροντίζων τῶν καταβοώντων καὶ δυσχεραινόντων. καί τοι πολλοὶ μὲν αὐτοῦ τῶν φίλων δεόμενοι προσέκειντο, πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀπειλοῦντες καὶ κατηγοροῦντες. πολλοὶ δ' ᾖδον ᾄσματα καὶ σκώμματα πρὸς αἰσχύνην, ἐφυβρίζοντες αὐτοῦ τὴν στρατηγίαν, ὡς ἄνανδρον καὶ προϊεμένην τὰ πράγματα τοῖς πολεμίοις. ἐπεφύετο δὲ καὶ Κλέων ἤδη διὰ τῆς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὀργῆς τῶν πολιτῶν πορευόμενος ἐπὶ τὴν δημαγωγίαν . . . . πλὴν ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἐκινήθη τῶν τοιούτων ὁ Περικλῆς, ἀλλὰ πράως καὶ σιωπῇ τὴν ἀδοξίαν καὶ τὴν ἀπέχθειαν ὑφιστάμενος. *Sua ſequens conſilia, contempſit obſtrepentes & ſtomachantes: quamvis multi eum amici obtunderent precibus, multi minitarentur adverſarii inſectarenturque, multi carmina canerent & dicteria probroſa, convitiiſque inceſſerent ejus imperium ut molle & prodens hoſtibus rempubl. Et verò etiam Cleon, incenſam conſpiciens in illum civitatem, mordebat eum, auram popularem captans. . . . . Verum iſtorum movit Periclem nihil: ſed comiter & tacitè tulit ignominiam & invidiam* (40). What courage! what conſtancy! what force of mind is this!

[*G*] *He felt the malignity of fortune . . . . in his family.*] The woman he married was related to him, and had been already married to Hipponicus, by whom ſhe had a boy. Pericles had two ſons by her, and grew weary of her. She was not pleaſed with him neither, and ſhe conſented, without any reluctancy, to marry the man he propoſed to her (41). I believe ſhe was not altogether in the wrong; for Pericles behaved himſelf ſo, as to give his wife juſt cauſe of being angry with him. He loved ſome other women; for to ſay nothing of Chryſilla (42), with whom he was in love whilſt he was a huſband, it is certain that he kept Aſpaſia. He was ſo fond of her that he married her, tho' ſhe had an ill reputation. The ill-tongued Athenians ſpread abroad a thouſand ſtories, which could not but exaſperate his wife againſt him, and perhaps there was ſome truth in the matter. They ſaid that Phidias, the moſt excellent ſculptor in the world, and ſurveyor-general of all the works which Pericles ordered to be made for the ornament of the city, drew in the ladies, under pretence of ſhewing them the works of the greateſt maſters; but, in truth, to debauch and deliver them to Pericles. Πάντα δ' ἦν σχεδὸν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐπιστάτει τοῖς τεχνίταις διὰ φιλίαν Περικλέους. καὶ τοῦτο τῷ μὲν φθόνον, τῷ δὲ βλασφημίαν ἤνεγκεν, ὡς ἐλευθέρας τῷ Περικλεῖ γυναῖκας εἰς τὰ ἔργα φοιτώσας ὑποδεχομένου τοῦ Φειδίου. δεξάμενοι δὲ τὸν λόγον οἱ κωμικοὶ, πολλὴν ἀσέλγειαν αὐτοῦ κατεσκέδασαν, εἴς τε τὴν Μενίππου γυναῖκα διαβάλλοντες, ἀνδρὸς φίλου καὶ ὑποστρατηγοῦντος. εἴς τε τὰς Πυριλάμπους ὀρνιθοτροφίας, ὃς ἑταῖρος ὢν Περικλέους, αἰτίαν εἶχε ταῶνας ὑφιέναι ταῖς γυναιξὶν αἷς ὁ Περικλῆς ἐπλησίαζε. *Omnia ferè hic ob Periclis neceſſitudinem curabat, artificibuſque præerat omnibus: id quod huic convitia, illi conflavit invidiam, quaſi ingenuas matronas, ad ſpectanda opera commeantes, in gratiam Phidias Periclis reciperet. Eos rumores excipientes comici, inſolentem laſciviam ei impegere, ac Menippi uxorem amici atque in bello legati improperavere, Pyrilampiſque avium vivaria, cui quum familiaris Periclis eſſet, infligebatur, ipſum mulieribus quibus conſueſceret Pericles, ſubjicere pavones* (43). ‘The comic wits of the town, taking occaſion from that ſtory, beſpattered him with all the ribaldry they could invent, as if he had been the erranteſt whoremaſter that ever lived; charging him falſly with the wife of Menippus, one who was his friend, and had been a lieutenant-general under him in the wars; and reproaching him with Pyrilampes's places for breeding and keeping birds, who being an acquaintance of Pericles, they pretended was wont privately to preſent peacocks (44) ‘and

(37) Arnob. *lib. iv, pag.* 150, 151.

(38) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 165, *D.*

(39) Idem, in Pericle.

(40) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 170, *D*, & *E.*

(41) Ibid. *pag.* 165.

(42) Αὐτὸς δὲ (Ιων) ἐν τοῖς ἐλεγείοις ἐρᾷν μὲν ὁμολογεῖ Χρυσίλλης τῆς Κορινθίας, Τελέου δὲ θυγατρὸς, ἧς καὶ Περικλέα τὸν Ολύμπιον ἐρᾷν φησὶ Τηλεκλείδης ἐν Ἡσιόδοις. Fatetur ille (*Ion*) ſanè in elegis ſuis dilectam à ſe fuiſſe Chryſillam Corinthiam, Telei filiam, cujus amore captum quoque fuiſſe Periclem Olympium ait Teleclides in Heſiodis. *Athen. lib. x, pag.* 436, *F.*

(43) Plut. ibid. *pag.* 160, *C.*

(44) Thoſe birds were at that time extreamly valued. See *Athen. lib. xiv, cap. xx, pag.* 654, 655.

trouble. An obſervation ought to be made upon the ſcandalous ſtories, which were ſpread againſt him [*H*]. He died in the third year of the Peloponneſian war (*d*), after a long

‘ and ſuch fine birds, to Pericles's miſſes, the women ‘ whom he galanted and kept company with (45).’ If Pericles was not pleaſed with his wife, he was leſs pleaſed ſtill with his eldeſt ſon. He was a very ill-natured and prodigal young man; he was continually finding fault with his father's œconomy, eſpecially when he married a very extravagant woman. He borrowed ſome money in his father's name, and when he ſaw that his father, inſtead of repaying that ſum, entered an action againſt the man who had lent it, he horribly inveighed againſt him. ‘ The young man ‘ Xanthippus thought himſelf ſo heinouſly uſed and ‘ highly diſobliged, that he openly reviled his father; ‘ and firſt by way of droll raillery, and he ridiculed him ‘ by telling ſtories, what his carriage and converſation ‘ were at home, and what kind of diſcourſes he had ‘ with the ſophiſters and ſcholars that came to his ‘ houſe. As for inſtance, how Epitimius the Theſſa‘lian, (one who was a practicer of all the five games ‘ of ſkill) having, with a dart or javelin, unawares ‘ againſt his will, ſtruck, and killed a horſe that ‘ ſtood in the way, his father ſpent a whole day with ‘ Protagoras in ſerious and learned diſpute, whether ‘ the javelin, or the man that threw it, or the maſters ‘ of the game, who appointed theſe ſports, were, ‘ according to the ſtricteſt and beſt reaſon, to be ac‘counted the cauſe of this murder; whereas, and ‘ make the worſt of it, it was but chance-medley. ‘ Further, beſides this Steſimbrotus tells us, that it ‘ was Xanthippus himſelf, who ſpread abroad among ‘ the people that infamous ſtory concerning his own ‘ wife, how his father would make him a cuckold, ‘ and that this untoward grudge of the young man ‘ againſt his father, and unnatural breach betwixt ‘ them, which was never to be healed or made up, ‘ continued with him to his very dying-day (46).’ Xanthippus gave out that his wife had been debauched by Pericles. This is Plutarch's meaning; but it cannot be known neither by the Greek words nor by the Latin tranſlation; it muſt be gueſſed at by another paſſage out of the ſame Hiſtorian. He ſays, pag. 160, that Pericles was accuſed by Steſimbrotus, as having lain with his ſon's wife. Στησίμβροτος ὁ Θάσιος δεινὸν ἀσέβημα καὶ μυθῶδες ἐξενεγκεῖν ἐτόλμησεν εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ υἱοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Περικλέους. *Quum Steſimbrotus quoque Thaſius atroci ſcelere & fabuloſo Periclem aſperſerit in filii conjugem admiſſo* (47). By the help of that paſſage one may underſtand this, which otherwiſe would be a riddle. Πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, καὶ τὴν περὶ τῆς γυναικὸς διαβολὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ξανθίππου φησὶν ὁ Στησίμβροτος εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς διασπαρῆναι. Infamiam etiam à ſua ipſius uxore Steſimbrotus per Xanthippum memoriæ prodidit vulgatam (48). *Steſimbrotus ſays that Xanthippus ſpread the infamous ſtory concerning his wife.* I am going to ſpeak of another domeſtic trouble, which is not very great if compared with the former; but it is no ſmall one, if it be conſidered without any compariſon. Pericles had a ſteward, who regulated the expences of his houſe with ſuch frugality (49), that the meaneſt citizens could not be more careful to avoid unneceſſary charges. The ſon of Pericles, and all the women in the houſe grumbled at it. This was ſufficient to check his joy. One may reaſonably believe that Pericles did not think himſelf happy, when he loſt his eldeſt ſon, who gave him ſo much trouble; for we are naturally inclined to wiſh that a ſon ſhould live rather than die, tho' he be undutiful. But one may be ſure that this great man was not unconcerned, when his ſecond ſon, the only lawful begotten ſon that was left, died of the plague. He bore the death of his eldeſt ſon, and of his ſiſter, and of moſt of his friends and relations, with great conſtancy: but he could not forbear ſhedding tears when he was ſtruck with this laſt blow (50). *However he did not ſhrink upon theſe occaſions, nor betray or lower his high ſpirit, and the greatneſs of his mind under all his miſfortunes, and thoſe calamities which befel him. Nay, ſo unconcerned, and ſo great a maſter of his paſſions he was, at leaſt ſeemed to be, that he was never known to weep or mourn, at the funerals of any of his dead friends, nor was ſo much as ſeen at the burial of any of his relations, till at laſt he loſt the only ſon which was left of thoſe who were lawfully begotten, his ſon Paralus. This touched him home, and made him bow, and relent, and yet he ſtrove what he could to maintain his principle of gravity, and to preſerve and keep the greatneſs of his ſoul: but all would not do, for when he came to perform the ceremony of putting a garland of flowers upon the head of the corps, he was vanquiſhed by his grief at that ſight, ſo that he burſt out a crying, and poured forth abundance of tears, having never done any ſuch thing before* (51). This puts me in mind of a king of Egypt mentioned by Herodotus (52), and of an omiſſion of Valerius Maximus. ‘ Pericles intra quatriduum duobus mirificis adoloſcen‘tibus filiis ſpoliatus; iis ipſis diebus & vultu priſti‘num habitum retinente, & oratione nulla ex parte ‘ infractiore concionatus eſt. Ille vero caput quoque ‘ ſolito more coronatum gerere ſuſtinuit, ut nihil ex ‘ vetere ritu propter domeſticum vulnus detrahe‘ret (53). - - - - *Pericles in four days time loſt two ‘ ſons, admirable young men: and yet on thoſe days ha‘rangued with his uſual energy, and without the leaſt ‘ alteration in his countenance. He likewiſe performed, ‘ according to cuſtom, the ceremony of putting a garland of ‘ flowers on the head of the corps.*’ I look upon the ſteps which Pericles made in favour of his baſtard, to be very diſadvantageous to him. He cauſed a law to be enacted, which proved the ruin of many people; and then he deſired that it ſhould be repealed in favour of his baſtard; which was granted him meerly out of compaſſion for his misfortunes. Ὄντος οὖν δεινοῦ τὸν κατὰ τοσοῦτον ἰσχύσαντα τὸν νόμον, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πάλιν διαλυθῆναι τοῦ γράψαντος, ἡ παροῦσα δυστυχία τῷ Περικλεῖ περὶ τὸν οἶκον, ὡς δίκην τινὰ δεδωκότι τῆς ὑπεροψίας καὶ τῆς μεγαλαυχίας ἐκείνης, ἐπέκλασε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους· καὶ δόξαντες αὐτὸν νεμεσητά τε παθεῖν, ἀνθρωπίνως τε δεῖσθαι, συνεχώρησαν ἀπογράψασθαι τὸν νόθον εἰς τοὺς φράτορας, ὄνομα θέμενον τὸ αὐτοῦ. *Quum eſſet igitur res indigna, ut quæ contra tam multos vim habuerat, ab eodem lex qui tulerat eam, rurſus abrogaretur: præſens Periclis clades domeſtica (ut qui pœnam luiſſe jam faſtus & arrogantiæ illius ſuæ videretur) infregit populum Athenienſem, putavitque eum, Deorum oppreſſum invidia, eſſe humanitate allevandum, quare indulſit ei ut in curia ſua nothus cenſeretur nomine paterno* (54). A favour muſt be very grating which is purchaſed at that rate. It was without doubt a great trouble to him to think that the whole town would reflect upon the conduct of a man, who having made a law, whereby part of the inhabitants were to be ſacrificed, I mean, reduced to ſlavery, demands afterwards that it be repealed for his particular intereſt. It was ordered by the law I ſpeak of, that all thoſe who were not born of Athenian parents, ſhould be reputed baſtards, and accordingly near five thouſand citizens were ſold off.

[*H*] *An obſervation ought to be made upon the ſcandalous ſtories, which were ſpread againſt him.*] It is Plutarch's reflexion, and it tends to ſhew the uncertainty of Hiſtory: it is one of the reaſons for doubting in the ſyſtem of hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm. Plutarch having related how Pericles was abuſed by the Poets, and ſhamefully calumniated by Steſimbrotus, cries out, that it is a difficult thing to find out truth. The cotemporary authors ſuppreſs, or pervert it, ſome out of hatred and jealouſy, others out of love and flattery. Thoſe that come after them meet with the time paſt, which proves a kind of a barrier, whereby they are excluded from the true knowledge of things. Οὕτως ἔοικε πάντη χαλεπὸν εἶναι καὶ δυσθήρατον ἱστορίᾳ τἀληθές, ὅταν οἱ μὲν ὕστερον γεγονότες τὸν χρόνον ἔχωσιν ἐπίπροσθεν ὄντα τῇ γνώσει τῶν πραγμάτων. ἡ δε τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν βίων ἡλικιῶτις ἱστορία, τὰ μὲν φθόνοις καὶ δυσμενείαις, τὰ δὲ χαριζομένη καὶ κολακεύουσα, λυμαίνηται καὶ διαστρέφῃ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. *Tantæ molis eſt & difficultatis aſſequi ex hiſtoria veritatem, quam poſteriores, antequam cognoſcant res, præveniantur tempore: æqualis rerum geſtarum & hominum hiſtoria partim invidia & odio, partim gratia & adulatione opprimat & pervertat veritatem* (55). Plutarch knew thoſe difficulties by experience. He was obliged to ſay, that the cauſe of the Peleponneſian war was not well known (56). What is there then that will be known? The reaſon why the cauſe of that war was obſcure takes place on a thouſand occaſions. The glory and power of Pericles made him odious; hence it is that his enemies invented an hundred falſe ſtories againſt him. They were reſolved by all means to impute to him the misfortunes

---

(*d*) Thucyd. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 118; it was the third year of the LXXXVIIth Olympiad.

(45) Plut. in Pericle.

(46) Ibid.

(47) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 160, *E.*

(48) Ibid. *pag.* 172, *B.*

(49) Ibid. *pag.* 162.

(50) Ibid.

(51) This does not agree with the tears he is reported to have ſhed at the trial of Aſpaſia. See the remark [*O*], citation (171), and (172).

(52) *Lib. iii, cap. xiv:* he ſays that Pſammenitus wept not for the miſfortune of his daughter and ſon, and that he wept when he ſaw the misfortune of one of his friends. See in the ſame place what he anſwered, being aſked what was the reaſon of ſuch a behaviour. See alſo *Montagne*'s Eſſays, *ch. ii, book i.*

(53) Val. Max. *lib. v, cap. x.* *See alſo* Ælian, Var. Hiſt. *lib. ix, cap.* 6. *Note, that* Protagoras apud Plutarch. de Conſol. ad Apollon. *pag.* 118, *relates the thing as Valerius Maximus does, only he reckons eight days between the death of the two ſons.*

(54) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 172, *E.*

(55) Ibid. *pag.* 160, *E.*

(56) Ibid. *pag.* 169, *A.*

long ſickneſs which had weakened his judgment [*I*]. Yet a little before he died, he ſaid a very judicious thing, which has given Plutarch occaſion to make a ſolid reflexion upon the nature of God [*K*]; but that author went too far; he over-ſtrained the idea of

misfortunes of that war: ſome invented one thing, ſome another. Which ſide can a reader take in the midſt of ſo many malicious ſtories? He was no ſooner expoſed to the hatred of the multitude, but ſeveral ſatirical wits ſtarted up, who ſacrificed to that hatred, as to an ill genius, ſuch victims as they judged moſt proper for it. Καὶ τί ἂν τις ἀνθρώπȣς σατυρικὺς τοῖς βίοις καὶ τὰς κατὰ τῶν κρειττόνων βλασφημίας ὥσπερ δαίμονι κακῷ τῷ φθόνῳ τῶν πολλῶν ἀποθύοντας ἑκάστοτε, θαυμάσειεν. *Et quidem quis miretur, peculanti homines lingua, ſi maledicta in principes invidiæ multitudinis, tanquam malo dæmonio, aſſiduè conſecraverint* (57). But they found none more proper than the ſlanders whereby he was defamed. Plutarch is to be praiſed for having had little regard to the pretenſions of the Megarians (58), tho' they were grounded upon the teſtimony of Ariſtophenes. They were parties in that affair againſt Pericles, and what has been lately ſaid of a modern author (59), may be ſaid of Ariſtophanes and all the comic Poets of that time, *that they are only good to make one doubt of the cleareſt truths, when they are advanced by them.* If Plutarch were now alive, he would ſay that our poſterity will have very great difficulties to diſcover the true Hiſtories of our time; for there are ſo many falſities ſpread abroad, and ſo many victims offered to the ill genius of the hatred and envy of the people, that if the Athenian ſatiriſts ſhould come again into the world, they would think themſelves to be meer novices. Beſides, there are ſo many encomiums publiſhed every day, that if the flatterers of that country ſhould riſe again from the dead, they would be convinced that they were meer ſchool-boys.

I remember a very fine paſſage of Plutarch, wherein Pericles is concerned (60). When a fact is certain, and the intention of the author not well known, it is a wicked and malicious thing to aſcribe it to an ill motive. This was practiſed by the comic Poets: they ſaid poſitively, that Pericles kindled the Peloponneſian war for the ſake of his courtezan Aſpaſia, and Phidias, and not at all out of a noble and courageous ambition of bringing down the pride of the Peloponneſians, and from a reſolution to yield nothing to the Lacedemonians. They, who being forced to acknowledge that an action is worthy of praiſe, ſearch the intention of the heart, and ſuppoſe that it was not good, are come to the higheſt pitch of envy and malignity. Ἐν μὲν γὰρ τοῖς εὐδοκιμȣ̃σιν ἔργοις καὶ πράγμασιν ἐπαινȣμένοις αἰτίαν φαύλην ὑποτίθησι, καὶ κατάγεται ταῖς διαβολαῖς εἰς ὑποψίας ἀτόπȣς περὶ τῆς ἐν ἀφανεῖ προαιρέσεως τȣ̃ πράξαντ@ αὐτȣ̃ τὸ πεπραγμένον ἐμφανῶς ȣ̓ δυνάμενος ψέγειν .... εὔδηλον ὅτι φθόνȣ καὶ κακοηθείας ὑπερβολὴν ȣ̓ λέλοιπε. *Præclaris enim & laudatis factis atque rebus maligni cauſam qui ſubjiciunt vitioſam, calumniandoque in ſiniſtras abducunt ſuſpiciones de latente ejus qui rem geſſit conſilio, quando ipſum factum palam vituperare non poſſunt .... hos liquet ad ſummam invidentiam & nequitiam nihil ſibi feciſſe reliquum* (61). I would fain know whether Duris of Samos and Theophraſtus aſcribed to Aſpaſia the two wars, which the Poets imputed to her. Harpocration quotes them in the ſame manner as he alledges Ariſtophanes. Δοκεῖ δὲ δυοῖν πολέμων αἰτία γεγονέναι, τȣ̃ τε Σαμιακȣ̃, καὶ τȣ̃ Πελοποννησιακȣ̃ ὡς ἔςι μαθεῖν παρά τε Δȣ́ριδος τȣ̃ Σαμίȣ. καὶ Θεοφράςȣ ἐκ τȣ̃ τετάρτȣ τῶν πολιτικῶν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριςοφάνȣς Ἀχαρνέων. *Duorum bellorum, Samiaci & Peloponneſiaci cauſſa cenſetur: ut è Duride Samio, Theophraſti libro quarto Politicorum, & ex Ariſtophanis Acharnenſibus cognoſcere licet* (62). But who knows whether they ſaid ſo of their own head, or whether they related it as being the opinion of Pericles's enemies, and the Poets.

[*I*] *He died ... after a long ſickneſs, which weakened his judgment.*] 'The plague ſeized Pericles, not 'with ſharp and violent fits, as it did others that had 'it; but a dull and lingering diſtemper, through va'rious changes and alterations, leiſurely by little and 'little waſting the ſtrength of his body, and under'mining the noble faculties of his ſoul. So that 'Theophraſtus, in his morals, having made a que'ſtion, whether mens manners do change with their 'fortunes, and their ſouls being jogged and diſturbed 'by the ailings of their bodies, do ſtart aſide from 'the rules of virtue, hath left it upon record, that 'Pericles, when he was ſick, ſhewed one of his friends 'that came to viſit him, an amulet, or charm, that 'the women had hung about his neck; as much as 'to ſay, that he was very ſick indeed, when he 'would admit of, or endure, ſuch a foolery as that 'was (63).' I have ſet down the Greek words of Plutarch in the article DESBARREAUX (64). There is without doubt a fault in the chapter wherein Ælian ſays, that Pericles, Callias, and Nicias, having ſpent all that they had, drank off a great glaſs of hemlock. It was the laſt health they drank, being reſolved to live no longer, ſince they could no longer make merry. Κώνειον τελευταίαν πρόποσιν ἀλλήλοις πεϱπιȣ́ντες ὥσπερȣ̃ν ἐκ συμποσίȣ ἀνέλυσαν. *Cicutam invicem propinantes extremam potionem quaſi è convivio ad inferos migrarunt* (65). If Ælian's memory failed him not, we muſt ſay that his tranſcribers wrote Pericles inſtead of Epicles: for we read in Athenæus, that Antocles and Epicles having reſolved to live together, and to ſacrifice every thing to voluptuouſneſs, poiſoned themſelves with a glaſs of hemlock, when they ſaw they had ſpent all their money (66).

[*K*] *Plutarch makes a ſolid reflexion upon the nature of God.*] What follows is to be found immediately after the words which I have ſet down in the foregoing remark (67). 'When he was drawing on, 'and near his time, the beſt of the citizens, and 'thoſe of his friends who were left alive, ſitting a'bout him, were diſcourſing of his virtue and autho'rity, how great it was, and were reckoning up his 'famous actions and atchievements, and the number 'of his victories; for he had gained nine battles, and 'there were no leſs than nine trophies, which he, as 'their chief commander and conqueror of their ene'mies had ſet up for the honour of the city and 'ſtate. Theſe things they talked of together among 'themſelves: as though he did not underſtand, 'or mind what they ſaid, but had been utterly de'prived of his ſenſes. But he had liſtened all the 'while, and given good heed to all the paſſages of 'their diſcourſes, and ſpeaking out among them ſaid, 'that he wondered they ſhould commend and take 'notice of thoſe things in him, which were as much 'owing to fortune as to any thing elſe, and had hap'pened to many other captains in former times, as 'well as to him, and that at the ſame time they 'ſhould not ſpeak or make mention of that which 'was the moſt excellent and greateſt thing of all: 'For, ſaid he, there was never any of all my fellow'citizens that ever wore black, or put on mourning 'upon my account.' Here is Plutarch's reflexion (68). 'And to me it appears, that this one thing of him, 'did make that otherwiſe childiſh and arrogant title 'they gave him, in nicknaming him Olympian, (that 'is, the Heavenly, or Godlike) to be without envy, 'and truly becoming him: I mean his kind and 'courteous carriage, and a pure and unblemiſhed con'verſation in the height of power and place: accord'ing to thoſe notions that we have of the gods them'ſelves, in their kind; whom, upon this account, 'that they are naturally the authors of all good 'things, and are not the authors of any evil, we do 'think worthy to rule and govern the world. Not 'as the Poets rudely fancy, who, confounding us 'with their fooliſh unmannerly conceits and opinions, 'contradict themſelves in their own poems and ficti'tious ſtories, when they call the place indeed where'in they ſay the gods make their abode, a ſecure 'and quiet ſeat, free from all hazards and commo'tions, not troubled with winds, nor darkened with 'clouds, but at all times alike, ſhining round about 'with a ſoft ſerenity, and a pure light; in as much 'as ſuch a tempered ſtation is moſt agreeable and 'ſuitable for a bleſſed and immortal nature to live 'in: and yet in the mean while do affirm, that the 'gods themſelves are full of trouble, and enmity, and 'anger, and other paſſions, which no way become 'or belong even to men that have any underſtanding.' Καθάπερ τὸ τῶν θεῶν γέν@ ἀξιȣ̃μεν, αἴτιον μὲν ἀγαθῶν,

(57) Ibid. pag. 160, D.

(58) They ſaid that the rape of two whores of Aſpaſia had engaged Pericles in that war. See, below, remark [*O*].

(59) The author of *l'Eſprit de Mr Arnauld*. See the article ARNAULD (ANTONY) Doctor of the Sorbonne, citation (64).

(60) Plut. de Herodoti malignitate, *pag.* 855, *F.*

(61) Ibid. *pag.* 856, *A.*

(62) Harpocrat. in Ἀσπασία, *pag. m.* 79.

(63) Plut. in Pericle.

(64) Citat. (22).

(65) Ælian. Variæ Hiſt. *lib. iv, cap. xxiii.*

(66) Athen. *lib. xii, pag.* 537.

(67) Plut. in Pericle.

(68) Ibid.

of the infinite goodneſs, he affirmed that it could do no harm, and he would rather impute

ἀγαθῶν, ἀναίτιον δὲ κακῶν πεφυκὸς, ἄρχειν καὶ βασιλεύειν τῶν ὄντων. οὐχ ὥσπερ οἱ ποιηταὶ, &c. *Sicut dignam arbitramur deorum gentem, quæ per ſe eſt propitia, & nullius autor mali, ut rebus præſit & moderetur, non ut Poëtæ, &c* (69). What Plutarch ſays here againſt the Poets is very fine and ſolid: the reſt is a deceitful beauty, and may be compared with poiſoned flowers, that cover a ſerpent, *latet anguis in herba*. Perhaps it will be thought that I mean that there are in thoſe words ſome ſeeds of the falſe doctrine of Epicurus, concerning the tranquillity of the gods, free from hatred and anger; but it is not that: Plutarch does not preſent us the poiſon of Epicurus, but that of Manicheiſm. We have ſeen elſewhere (70) that he poſitively declared for the doctrine of two principles. He mentions it again in this reflexion upon Pericles's anſwer. He does not believe, as Epicurus did, that God enjoys an idle reſt; he aſcribes to him action and providence; but it is only a bountiful providence, which diſtributes favours and happineſs. It is not a providence which grows angry ſometimes, which puniſhes and corrects, and oppreſſes mankind with miſeries. He does not approve that Pericles ſhould have had the ſirname of Olympian, that is to ſay, divine and heavenly, becauſe his eloquence lightened, thundered, and fulminated, but becauſe he never made uſe of his authority to revenge himſelf, and not one family did ever put on mourning upon his account. Plutarch's opinion was not the moſt common: moſt people knew better the divinity of Jupiter by thunder and lightening (71), than by the diſtribution of benefits: the religious ceremonies of the Heathens were rather appointed to avert the anger of the gods, than to obtain favours from them. Yet there was a general notion which prevailed every where, that nothing is more agreeable to the divine nature than to do good. The epithet of *optimus* (*beſt*) went before that of *maximus* (*greateſt*), when they praiſed Jupiter. 'Sed ipſe Jupiter, id eſt juvans pater, quem converſis caſibus appellamus à juvando Jovem, à poëtis pater Divumque, hominumque dicitur; à Majoribus autem noſtris *Optimus*, *Maximus*, & quidem ante Optimus, id eſt beneficentiſſimus, quàm Maximus: quia majus eſt, certeque gratius prodeſſe omnibus, quàm opes magnas habere (72). - - - - - *But Jupiter, that is, helping father, whom we call ſo, becauſe he relieves us in our afflictions, is called by the Poets the father of gods and men: but by our anceſtors he was ſtiled* Optimus, Maximus; *the epithet* Optimus, *which ſignifies moſt gracious, being put firſt: becauſe it is better to be good than great*.' See the remark [G] of the article JUPITER. Plutarch ſays, that king Amaſis having ſeveral queſtions to reſolve, wherein the ſuperlative was looked for, I mean the ſupreme degree of things; for example, what is moſt antient, moſt great, moſt wiſe, moſt beautiful, moſt common, moſt beneficial, moſt pernicious (73)? anſwered as to the two laſt articles, *God and the Dæmon*. Τί ὠφελιμώτατον; θεός· Τί βλαβερώτατον; δαίμων. *Quid utiliſſimum? Deus. Quid damnoſiſſimum? Genius* (74). Here is the doctrine of the two principles, and even what the Chriſtians ſay concerning the Devil. I do not know whether theſe words, or this notion of the δαίμων of the ancients have been taken notice of. I reſume the thread of my diſcourſe. The Philoſopher Antipater defined God an animal, happy, immortal, and good to all men (75). The Heathens were moſt inclined to deify thoſe, who had been the inventers of uſeful things. 'Perſæus ejuſdem Zenonis auditor, eos dicit eſſe habitos Deos, à quibus magna utilitas ad vitæ cultum eſſet inventa, ipſaſque res utiles & ſalutares Deorum eſſe vocabulis nuncupatas: ut ne hoc quidem diceret, illa inventa eſſe Deorum, ſed ipſa divina (76). - - - - *Perſæus the diſciple of Zeno ſays, that thoſe were accounted gods, who were the authors of uſeful inventions, and that the inventions were called by the names of gods: he does not ſtile them the inventions of gods, but divine inventions*.' It was the way of obtaining the Apotheoſis, if we believe Pliny. 'Deus eſt mortali juvare mortalem, & hæc ad æternam gloriam via. Hac proceres iere Romani: hac nunc cœleſti paſſu cum liberis ſuis vadit maximus omnis ævi rector Veſpaſianus Auguſtus, feſſis rebus ſubveniens. Hic eſt vetuſtiſſimus referendi bene merentibus gratiam mos, ut tales numinibus adſcribantur. Quippe & omnium aliorum nomina Deorum, & quæ ſupra retuli ſiderum, ex hominum nata ſunt meritis (77). - - - *It is god-like, for one man to help another, it is the road that leads to eternal glory. In this way the Roman heroes travelled, and in this heavenly path the moſt excellent prince Veſpaſian, with his children, now walk, relieving thoſe that are in miſery. It was the cuſtom of the Antients to ſhew their gratitude, by deifying thoſe who had done great and good actions. For the names of all the other gods, and of the conſtellations I have above recited, take their riſe from the good offices performed by men*.' Others giving a more reaſonable turn to it, ſaid that the gods had inſpired men with the invention of arts.

> Κεῖνοι γὰρ τέχνας πολυκερδέας ἀνθρώποισι
> Δῶκαν ἔχειν, καὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιφροσύνην ἐδίδαξαν.

> *Illi etiam artes multum lucroſas hominibus*
> *Dederunt habere, & omnem ſolertiam docuerunt* (78).

Laſtly, they ſaid that the beſt way of imitating God was to do good (79), and that man never came nearer to the divine nature than when he ſaved a man. 'Homines ad Deos nulla re propius accedunt, *ſaid Cicero to Julius Cæſar towards the end of his oration for Ligarius*, quam ſalutem hominibus dando. Nihil habet nec fortuna tua majus, quàm ut poſſis, nec natura tua melius, quàm ut velis conſervare quamplurimos. - - - - - *Men reſemble the gods in nothing ſo much as in ſaving men. The greateſt advantage of your fortune is, that it makes you able, and the beſt excellency of your nature is, that it makes you willing, to preſerve men*.' The Scythians told Alexander: if thou art a god, thou muſt do good to men, and not take from them what is their own; *ſi Deus es, tribuere mortalibus beneficia debes, non ſua eripere* (80). Sound Theology agrees with all theſe notions of the ancient Heathens. There are innumerable paſſages in the Scripture, whereby it appears, that God is infinitely more inclined to uſe mercy than ſeverity. To which may be added theſe fine words of Gregory Nazianzen, who ſays, that man becomes a god to his miſerable neighbour, when he helps him. Γένου τῷ ἀτυχοῦντι θεὸς τὸν ἔλεον θεοῦ μιμησάμενος οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως ὡς τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν, ἄνθρωπος ἔχει θεοῦ. *Eſto miſero Deus Dei miſericordiam imitando. Nihil enim tam ex Deo habet mortalis quàm ut beneficia largiatur* (81).

Strabo has limited that thought: he ſays that a happy life, which is ſpent in feſtivals, in mirth, in philoſophizing and ſinging, is a better imitation of the divine nature, than to confer benefits. His words deſerve to be ſet down. Εὖ μὲν γὰρ εἴρηται καὶ τοῦτο, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τότε μάλιστα μιμεῖσθαι τοὺς θεοὺς, ὅταν εὐεργετῶσιν· ἄμεινον δ' ἂν λέγοι τὶς ὅταν εὐδαιμονῶσι· τοιοῦτον δὲ τὸ χαίρειν, καὶ τὸ ἑορτάζειν, καὶ τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν, καὶ μουσικῆς ἅπτεσθαι. *Bene quidem dictum eſt, homines tum maximè Deum imitari, cùm beneficia conferunt: rectius autem diceretur, cum fæliciter vivunt: id autem fit gaudendo, dies feſtos agitando, philoſophando, muſicam tractando* (82).

I have read in the voyage of Sir Francis Drake, that the inhabitants of New-Albion took the Engliſh for gods, and paid divine honours to them, becauſe *when they ſhewed their wounds to them, they received plaiſters and ſalves which cured them*. On the contrary, the Spaniards were looked upon as gods in America, becauſe they did a great deal of miſchief with their cannons. Their ſhip was taken for a bird that brought them down from Heaven (83). Which ſhews that two oppoſite things lead men to the knowledge of God; *viz*. the power to do ill, which he exerciſes ſo ſeverely, and the goodneſs wherewith he beſtows a thouſand benefits upon mankind. It may be a queſtion, whether one of thoſe two attributes is more knowable than the other. Tacitus pretends, that the gods are more inclined to puniſh men, than to let them be quiet. 'Nec enim unquam, *ſays he* (84), atrocioribus populi Romani cladibus magiſve juſtis judiciis approbatum eſt, non eſſe curæ deis ſecuritatem

---

(69) Plut. ibid. *pag*. 173, *C*.

(70) In the article MANICHEES, remark [C]. See alſo the remark [G] of the article PAULICIANS.

(71) Cœlo tonantem credidimus Jovem regnare. *Horat. Od. V, lib. iii.* Namque Dieſpiter Igni coruſco nubila dividens, &c. *Idem, Od. xxxiv, lib. i.*

(72) Cicero, de Nat. Deor. *lib. ii, cap. xxv.*

(73) Compare the text of the article PAULICIANS towards the end, and citation (133).

(74) Plut. in ſeptem Sapientium Convivio, *pag*. 153, *A*.

(75) Ζῶον μακάριον καὶ ἄφθαρτον καὶ εὐποιητικὸν ἀνθρώπων. Plut. de Repug. Stoic. *pag*. 1051.

(76) Cicero, ubi ſupra, *lib. i*, *pag*. 60. Virgil. Æneid. *lib. vi, ver*. 663, *was contented to place them in the Elyſian fields.* Inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artes, Quique ſui memores alios fecere merendo.

(77) Plin. *lib. ii, cap. vii, pag. m.* 143, 144.

(78) Oppian. *lib. ii*, Ἁλιευτικῶν.

(79) Strabo, *lib. x, pag. m.* 322. See his words below, citation (82).

(80) Q. Curtius, *lib. vii, cap. viii, num.* 26. See Freinſhemius, ibid. who alledges ſeveral ſuch ſentences.

(81) Nazianz. Orat. de Amore Pauperum.

(82) Strabo, *lib. x, pag.* 322.

(83) See La Mothe le Vayer, Diſcourſe concerning Hiſtory.

(84) Tacit. Hiſt. *lib. i, cap. iii.*

impute evil to another cauſe. We ſhall ſee upon this occaſion, one of his proofs of the malignity

'noſtram, eſſe ultionem. - - - - *The dreadful calamities of the Roman people evidently prove, that the gods deſire not our quiet, but our miſery.*' A Journaliſt maintains that the effects of goodneſs are more extended than the effects of puniſhment. Here are his words: 'Of all the perfections of God, goodneſs would be moſt viſible, if men would conſider it. Is it not great goodneſs to have ſo ordered things, that all our neceſſary actions are attended with pleaſure, and to have made us ſuſceptible of pleaſure a thouſand ways. It is in vain to ſay that we are more ſuſceptible of ſorrow and pain; this is not true, and if it were true, we ſhould not for all that forget the great goodneſs of God, ſince we might eaſily ſee that the pleaſures we enjoy, come from the laws he has eſtabliſhed in nature, and that, on the contrary, moſt of our ſorrows proceed from the ill uſe we make of our reaſon. But it is not true that men are more unhappy than happy; our ingratitude, pride, and inſatiable deſires, make us ſay ſo. *Falſo queritur de naturâ ſuâ genus humanum.* - - - *It is a groundleſs complaint which men have made concerning the condition of their nature.* This is a true ſaying of a famous Hiſtorian in the preface to the war of Jugurtha. Mankind are more happy than they deſerve, and it is true in a literal ſenſe, that for one pain men feel a thouſand pleaſures, except perhaps a ſmall number of unhappy ſouls, which a Heathen would aſſert to have been produced by deſtiny in a ſpiteful moment (85).' Note, by the by, that the difference he ſpeaks of, and which he grounds upon the conſequences of the ill uſe we make of liberty, could not ſatisfy a difficult adverſary, who would ſay that this very thing, *viz.* the ill uſe a man makes of his reaſon, to vex himſelf to no purpoſe, is a great unhappineſs, and ought neceſſarily to be placed amongſt afflictions; ſo that if we make a parallel between the good and evil which providence imparts to men, we muſt reckon the evils which proceed from the weakneſs of our reaſon, as well as ſickneſſes, hunger, thirſt, &c.

Ovid obſerves, that there are more fine days than cloudy ones in the year (86): it may be ſaid likewiſe, that the days wherein men enjoy their health, are in greater number than thoſe wherein they are ſick. But there is perhaps as much miſery in fifteen days ſickneſs, as there is pleaſure in fifteen months health: for pleaſure is ſuch in as much as it is felt: but men do not much feel their health when they enjoy it without any interruption. Obſerve that I conſider health, as being ſeparated from the other pleaſures, which may be enjoyed with it. The Journaliſt I have quoted, might have alledged a fine paſſage of Cicero, wherein, after an exact enumeration of the advantages which men receive from plants and animals, he ſays, that one would think that providence laboured to procure pleaſures to mankind, as if it had been Epicurean. *Ex quibus tanta percipitur voluptas ut interdum Pronœa noſtra Epicurea fuiſſe videatur* (87). However it be, men are more apt to perceive the character of the divine nature in the effects of goodneſs, than in the diſtribution of puniſhments and miſeries. The goodneſs of providence has been perceived in the ſervice which great men have done to their country. 'Multos præterea & noſtra civitas & Græcia tulit ſingulares viros, quorum neminem niſi juvante Deo talem fuiſſe credendum eſt . . . nemo igitur vir magnus ſine aliquo afflatu divino unquam fuit (88). - - - *Both our own country and Greece have produced many excellent men, none of whom could have been ſuch without the aſſiſtance of God . . . . and therefore no man was ever great without ſome divine influence.*' And Seneca ſays in general, that none can be a good man, and a great man, without the aſſiſtance of God. 'Bonus vir ſine Deo nemo eſt. An poteſt aliquis ſupra fortunam, niſi ab illo adjutus, exſurgere? ille dat conſilia magnifica, & erecta. In unoquoque virorum bonorum, (*Quis Deus incertum eſt*) *habitat Deus.* . . . . Si hominem videris interritum periculis, intactum cupiditatibus, inter adverſa felicem, in mediis tempeſtatibus placidum, ex ſuperiore loco homines videntem, ex æquo deos: non ſubibit te veneratio ejus? non dices, iſta res major eſt altiorque, quàm ut credi ſimilis huic, in quo eſt, corpuſculo poſſit? Vis iſtuc divina deſcendit: animum excellentem, moderatum, omnia tanquam minora tranſeuntem, quidquid timemus optamuſque ridentem, cœleſtis potentia agitat. Non poteſt res tanta ſine adminiculo numinis ſtare. Itaque majore ſui parte illic eſt, unde deſcendit (89). - - - - - *None can be good without the help of God; none can be great without his aſſiſtance. It is he that inſpires men with noble reſolutions.* A God dwells (what God we know not) in every good man. . . . . *If you ſhould ſee a man undaunted in dangers, uncorrupted with pleaſures, happy in adverſity, calm in the midſt of ſtorms, would you not have a high veneration for him? Would you not think ſuch perfection inconſiſtent with a mortal ſtate? That divine virtue is from above; an excellent mind, endowed with moderation, deſpiſing earthly things, laughing at our hopes and fears, is actuated by an heavenly power. Such extraordinary qualities cannot ſubſiſt without the influence of a deity.*' As to evils, they made uſe of a thouſand ſhifts not to aſcribe them to God; they formed to themſelves a phantaſm, which they called Fortune, and to which they imputed their misfortunes: they repreſented to themſelves I know not what beings miſchievous by their nature; and Plutarch tells us here that the gods can do nothing but what is good. In another place he laughs at Chryſippus, who aſcribed evil to the negligence and malice of the genii, whom Jupiter ſet over certain things. Τὸ δὲ φαύλους δαίμονας ἐκ προνοίας ἐπὶ τὰς τοιαύτας ἐπιστασίας καθίστασθαι· πῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἔγκλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, καθάπερ βασιλέως κακοῖς καὶ ἐμπλήκτοις σατράπαις καὶ στρατηγοῖς διοικήσεις ἐπιτρέποντος, καὶ περιορῶντος ὑπὸ τούτων ἀμελουμένους καὶ παροινουμένους τοὺς ἀρίστους; καὶ μὴν εἰ πολὺ τὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης μέμικται τοῖς πράγμασιν, οὔτε κρατεῖ πάντων ὁ θεὸς, οὔτε παντα κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνου λόγον διοικεῖται. Malos autem genios à providentia his præfici muneribus, qui non ſit vitio vertendum Deo, qui tanquam rex malis & vecordibus ſatrapis ac præfectis provincias mandaverit, patiaturque ab his deſpici & contumelioſe tractari optimos? Et quidem, ſi multum, neceſſitatis admixtum rebus eſt: neque omnia Deus habebit in ſua poteſtate, neque omnia ſecundum ejus rationem gubernabuntur (90). - - - *But to ſuppoſe that evil genii are appointed by providence for ſuch offices, is a reflexion upon God, as if he were like a prince, who commits provinces to the care of wicked and fooliſh governors, and ſuffers good men to be deſpiſed and harraſſed by them. And to imagine that events happen by a fatal neceſſity, is to deprive God both of his power and providence.* Again in another place he accuſes an Hiſtorian (91) of a malicious impiety, for having made Solon ſpeak thus: *Why ſhould I be aſked whether man is happy, ſeeing I know that all the gods are envious and turbulent.* Τοῖς δὲ θεοῖς λοιδορουμένος ἐν τῷ Σόλωνος προσωπείῳ ταῦτα εἴρηκεν, ὦ Κροῖσε, ἐπισάμενόν με τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἐὸν φθονερόν τε καὶ ταραχῶδες ἐπαιρωτας ἀνθρωπηΐων περὶ πραγμάτων, ἃ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐφρόνει περὶ τῶν θεῶν τῷ Σόλωνι προστριβόμενος, κακοήθειαν τῆ Βλασφημία προστίθησι. *Diis autem maledicens ſub perſona Solonis: Me, inquit, gnarum omne numen invidum eſſe ac tumultuoſum, de rebus humanis interrogas. Suam enim de diis Soloni tribuens ſententiam, malignitatem impio ſermoni adjunxit* (92). I am ſure he would have laughed at the mitigated gloſs of the ancient prieſts of Etruria. They aſcribed two ſorts of thunderbolts to Jupiter, a favourable one and a fatal one; and they pretended he never threw the ſecond but with the advice of the gods; whereas he threw the other of his own accord, and without any one's advice. This would not have ſatiſfied Plutarch: he believed not that ſuch a goodneſs as that of mild princes was ſufficient for God. Good princes take pleaſure in diſtributing their favours to men, and intruſt their miniſters with the care of puniſhing them; they are ready to reward, and ſlow to puniſh (93). They rejoice when they do good, and are ſorry when they inflict any puniſhment. Herein they reſemble fathers. But once more, Plutarch would have been very much diſpleaſed with the gloſs of the Etrurians; he would perhaps have ſaid of their Jupiter, what others ſay of an emperor (94) who perſecuted the Chriſtians very much, and would not begin the perſecution without conſulting his friends. 'Placuit ergo amicorum ſententiam experiri. Nam erat hujus malitiæ. Cùm malignity of Herodotus, and what has been anſwered to it. That proof is grounded upon the jealouſy and envy which that Hiſtorian pretends the Divine Nature is ſubject to [*L*]. Valerius Maximus has committed a miſtake, which I ſhall take notice of: it will

---

(85) News from the Republic of Letters, *Auguſt* 1684, *Art. VI*, *pag. m.* 603, 604.

(86) Si numeres anno ſoles & nubila toto, Invenies nitidum ſæpius eſſe diem, *Ovid. Triſt. lib. v*, *Eleg. viii*, *ver.* 31. See the remark [*F*] of the article XENOPHANES.

(87) Cicero, de Nat. Deor. *lib. ii*, *cap. lxiv.* Compare what David, Pſalm viii, obſerves concerning the goodneſs of God in giving beaſts for the uſe of men, and what Seneca ſays, *de Ben. lib. iv*, *cap. v*, *vi*, *& vii*, *uſque in delicias amamur*, which may be ſeen more at large in the remark [*F*] of the article XENOPHANES.

(88) Cicero, ibid. *cap. lxvi.*

(89) Seneca, Epiſt. XLI, *pag. m.* 236. *See alſo Epiſt.* LXXIII, *pag.* 305.

(90) Plut. de Stoic. Repug. *pag.* 1051, *D.*

(91) Herodotus.

(92) Plut. de malignit. Herodoti, *pag.* 857, 858.

(93) Sed piger ad pœnas princeps, ad præmia velox, Quique dolet quoties cogitur eſſe ferox. *Ovid. de Ponto, lib. i*, *Eleg. ii*, *ver.* 123.

(94) Diocleſian.

‘bonum quid facere decreviſſet, ſine conſilio faciebat, ut ipſa laudaretur. Cum autem malum, quoniam id reprehendendum ſciebat, in conſilium multos advocabat, ut aliorum culpæ adſcriberetur quidquid ipſe deliquerat (95). - - - *And therefore he thought fit to adviſe with his friends. For, he was a man of ſuch a malicious turn, that when he deſigned to do any good, he did it without advice, that all the praiſe might redound to himſelf. But when he intended evil, he conſulted others about it, that his own faults might be laid upon them.*’ It is a cunning trick of an old politician, witneſs Pius IV, beeing urged to terminate the diſputes about precedency, between the embaſſadors of the moſt Chriſtian King, and thoſe of the Catholic King; he put it off for ſome time, and at laſt he adviſed them to leave the thing to the deciſion of the ſacred college. He would not be the only man expoſed to the ill conſequences of that judgment; and he ſaid in jeſt, that he conformed himſelf to the conduct of Jupiter. ‘Ad extremum utrique occultè ſuadere ut ad ſacrum Cardinalium Collegium cauſam integram remitterent: interea à publicis in Pontificio ſacello cæremoniis abſtinerent. Ratus eâ ratione ob diverſa Cardinalium ſtudia producendum infinitè judicium, ſe certè à ferendæ ſententiæ neceſſitate, atque adèo ab invidiâ ſubtrahendum. Nempe imitandum Principi Jovem facetè dicebat: qui (ut eſt vetus Etruſcorum diſciplinæ commentum) ex duplici fulminum genere, proſperum ipſe per ſe, at infauſtum adhibito Deorum conſilio contorquere ſolitus ſit (96). - - - - - *At laſt he adviſed them both in ſecret, to refer the whole matter to the ſacred college of cardinals: and that in the mean time they ſhould forbear aſſiſting at the public ceremonies in the Pope's chapel. He thought by this means the determination of the affair would be very much prolonged, becauſe of the various factions amongſt the cardinals, and that he himſelf would be freed from the neceſſity of giving judgment, and conſequently not expoſed to ill-will. For he ſaid, wittily, that a prince ought to imitate Jupiter: who (according to the notion of the ancient prieſts of Etruria) threw favourable thunderbolts of his own accord, but never threw fatal ones without conſulting the other gods.*’

Thus the mind of man, being too narrow to comprehend clearly, how the miſeries and crimes which cover the whole earth, can be conſiſtent with an infinitely good Being, has run itſelf into the hypotheſis of two principles. This is what I had to ſay concerning Plutarch's obſervation.

I ſhall only add that the Greek proverb (97), *Every thing that nouriſhes me, is a god to me*, is more deceitful than people think. See the anſwer which was made to Philip de Comines (98), and that of a Surgeon to a monk of St Denis. ‘It is certain, that the pox was unknown in France before the reign of Charles VIII; the greateſt part of that prince's army died of it; becauſe that diſeaſe being not yet known, they knew no remedy for it; which ſhews, that it was not the leproſy. Neceſſity put men upon finding ſome remedies to cure it, whereby many Surgeons grew very rich. One of them, very thankful for his happineſs, went one day to St Denis, and kneeled down before the ſtatue of Charles VIII, to thank him for it: but a monk having told him that he was miſtaken, and that it was not the image of a ſaint: hold your tongue, father, ſaid he, I know very well what I do, he is a true ſaint to me, ſince I have got by his means thirty thouſand livres a year, ſo that it is a piece of juſtice for me to thank him for it (99).’ The author of *Moyen de Parvenir* makes the ſum leſs, and names the Surgeon. Here are his words *You put me in mind of that monk of St Denis in France, who was an aſſuming fellow. When he ſaw Thierre de Hery, upon his knees before the ſtatue of Charles VIII, he told him my friend, you are miſtaken, that is not the image of a ſaint. I know it very well, ſaid the Surgeon, I am not ſo great a fool as you are, I know it is the ſtatue of king Charles VIII, for whoſe ſoul I pray, becauſe he brought the pox into France, whereby I have got ſix or ſeven thouſand livres a year* (100). I will not conclude without quoting Virgil. He was very much diſpoſed to deify his benefactors: his lands having been ſpared by a particular favour of Octavius, he ſtyled him a God.

O Melibœe, DEUS *nobis hæc otia fecit:*
Namque erit ille mihi ſemper Deus: illius aram
Sæpè tener noſtris ab ovilibus imbuet agnus (101).

O Melibœus, 'twas a god to us
Iudulg'd this freedom: for to me a god
He ſhall be ever; from my fold full oft
A tender a lamb his altar ſhall imbrue.

TRAPP.

Good Maturinus Corderius (102) out of a pious fraud, which may be well excuſed, made ſchool-boys believe that thoſe words were very pious. He tranſlated them, thus, Melibœus, *that favour comes to us from the only wiſe God.* Virgil had no ſuch thought, he only meant Auguſtus. Compare the nineteenth verſe with the forty-third, and following.

Sed tamen ille Deus qui ſit, da, Tityre, nobis,
- - - - - -
Hic illum vidi juvenem, Melibœe, quotannis
Bis ſenos cui noſtra dies altaria fumant.
Hic mihi reſponſum primus dedit ille petenti:
Paſcite, ut ante, boves, pueri, ſubmittite tauros (103).

- - - but who that god ſhould be
You mention'd, give me, Tityrus to know
- - - - - -
There, Melibœus, that ſweet youth I ſaw,
To whom, twelve days each year, our altars ſmoke,
There to my ſuit this anſwer firſt he gave,
Swains, feed as erſt your heifers, yoke your ſteers.

TRAPP.

[*L*] *One of his proofs of the malignity of Herodotus, and what has been anſwered to it. That proof is grounded upon the jealouſy which that Hiſtorian pretends the Divine Nature is ſubject to.*] See the words of Plutarch, which I have ſet down before (104). I wonder that he confined himſelf to the anſwer which Solon gave to king Crœſus, and that he did not at leaſt intimate, that many ſuch paſſages are found in Herodotus. He might thereby have ſtrengthened his accuſation, and ſhewed that Herodotus cannot be juſtified, by ſaying that he let fall that raillery againſt the gods out of inadvertency: he would have ſhowed that a man who makes often the ſame reflexion is throughly penetrated with the venom it contains, and with the deſire of ſpreading it, and infecting his readers with it. It is certain, that Herodotus has often repeated the ſame maxim which he made Solon utter. See above (105) what he put in the mouth of Artabanus; and here is what he ſuppoſes that a king of Egypt wrote to Polycrates tyrant of Samos; *I am glad to hear that a man, who is my friend, is happy. But your great proſperity does not pleaſe me, for I know how envious the deity is.* Ἐμοὶ αἱ σαὶ μεγάλαι εὐτυχίαι οὐκ ἀρέσκουσι, τὸ θεῖον ἐπισταμένῳ ὡς ἔστι φθονερόν. *Tuæ magnæ proſperitates mihi non placent, qui intelligo* QUAM INVIDUM NUMEN SIT (106). Henry Stephens, who juſtifies that Hiſtorian as well as he can in ſeveral others reſpects, takes no notice of this accuſation of Plutarch. I do not find that he intimates any where that he knew it. He has carefully collected many maxims and obſervations of Herodotus, which may prove his pious Orthodoxy about providence; nay, he has placed amongſt them a paſſage of the ſeventh book, wherein Artabanus does very much inſiſt upon the envious nature of GOD. Artabanus ſays, that GOD throws his thunder-bolts only at great bodies (107), becauſe he takes delight in oppreſſing whatever is eminent. Φιλέει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολούειν. *Gaudet enim Deus eminentiſſima quæque deprimere* (108). Hence it is that a great army is beaten by a ſmall one, when God out of envy (109) terrifies them, or throws his thunderbolt. Thus ſome have been precipitated into miſery

(95) Lactant. de Mortib. perſecut. *cap. xi, pag.* 99, 100, of the noble edition of Mr Bauldri. See his notes, and thoſe of Columbus, ibid. *Part ii, pag.* 287.

(96) Famian. Strada, Dec. I, *lib. iv, pag. m.* 175. *See* Seneca, Nat. Quæſt. *lib. ii, cap. xli, & ſeq.* Compare citations (96) and (97), of the article **NESTORIUS.**

(97) Τὸ γὰρ τρέφον με τοῦτ' ἐγὼ κρίνω θεόν.

(98) See the article GREGORY I, citation (54).

(99) Fureteriana, pag. 113, of the Dutch Edit.

(100) Moyen de Parvenir, *pag. m.* 578, 579.

(101) Virgil. Eclog. I, ver. 6.

(102) See his Colloquies.

(103) Virgil. Eclog. I, ver. 19, 43, 44, 45, 46.

(104) Citation (92).

(105) Citation (7) of the article ARTABANUS, ſon of Hyſtaſpes.

(106) Herod. *lib. iii, cap. xl, pag. m.* 178.

(107) Ibid.

(108) Ibid. *lib. vii, cap. x, pag.* 388. Valeſius, in Amm. Marcel. *lib. xiv, cap. xi, pag.* 59, quotes this as being taken from the ſixth book of Herodotus.

(109) Ἐπεάν σφι ὁ θεὸς φθονήσας. Quoties Deus iis quibus invidet. *Ibid.*

ry otherwiſe than their dignity required; for God will by no means endure, that any one beſides him ſhould have a great opinion of himſelf. Δὶ ὧν ἐσφάλησαν ἀναξίως ἑωϋτῶν· ȣ̓ γὰρ ἐᾷ φρονέειν ἄλλον μέγα ὁ θεὸς ἢ ἑωϋτόν. *Propterea quidam ſecus ac dignitas ſua poſtulabat in calamitatem inciderunt, quia Deus neminem alium quam ſeipſum ſinit magnifice de ſe ſentire* (110). This is one of the examples which Henry Stephens gives of the piety of Herodotus, a piety, ſays he, as great as it could be in a man deſtitute of the light of the goſpel. Nay, he affirms, that this opinion of Herodotus about the power and providence of God, is the ſame which Chriſtians ought to have: he pretends that it is impoſſible to ſay any thing more divine upon this ſubject, than what has been ſaid by that Hiſtorian (111) *Multæ ſententiæ ſive* γνῶμαι *tum quas aliis locis adhibuit, tum quas narrationibus vel præfixit, vel tanquam corollaria adjunxit, tanta illum pietate præditum fuiſſe teſtantur, quanta in hominem Chriſtianæ religionis ignarum cadere poteſt: imo vero ea de divina potentia providentiaque ſenſiſſe quæ Chriſtianum ſentire & deceat & oporteat. Hujuſmodi ſunt hæc in Thalia,* SED *profecto. . . . . Conſideremus & hæc ex Polymnia,* VIDEN' *ut Deus* (112) . . . . . *quid, obſecro, de divina potentia divinius iſtis dici potuit?* Afterwards he alledges four Greek verſes (113), much the ſame with ſome words of Horace (114), which he does alſo alledge, and which ſignify that God can make low what is high, and that he depreſſes great men, and raiſes mean perſons, and he concludes, that the praiſes beſtowed upon that ſentence are very juſt; but that Herodotus goes much further, *& meritò quidem certè illam veteris poëtæ ſententiam laudibus extollant: ſed quanto tamen ulterius progreditur hic noſter hiſtoricus?* I cannot apprehend by what miſtake Henry Stephens could take this the wrong way. He ſees only the fair ſide of it, and does not at all perceive the moſt viſible defect. He is charmed with the great idea which Herodotus gives of the divine Power; but he is not aware that a power directed by jealouſy of the proſperity of others, is an odious and ill quality. There lies the ſtreſs of Plutarch's objection.

Camerarius, who before Henry Stephens undertook to juſtify Herodotus knew very well where the evil lay; but he found no better remedy than to change the ſtate of the queſtion, and to call the main point of the objection a meer cavil. Here are his words. ‘Nam quod exagitat (*Plutarchus*) præclaram ſententiam de inſtabili & incerta fortuna rerum humanarum, quam Herodotus † Soloni attribuerit (cui quidem ſimiles & alibi leguntur) nimiæ ſapientiæ & pietati hominis concedatur: qui veritus ſit, ne ſi ita de Deo loquamur, ut humanus intellectus quæ dicuntur percipere poſſit, parum pii eſſe videamur. Cur ergo Deo oculos, manus, pedes, aures attribuimus? cur dicimus Deum iraſci? cur ulciſci? etiam vereri profectò, tentare, pœnitere, lætari, dolere. πόῤῥω γὰρ λύπης καὶ χαρᾶς ἵδρυται τὸ θεῖον. ſine quibus illa ne intelligi quidem poſſunt. Quid Xenophon? (quo nemo fuit numinis colentior, nemo obſervantior, nemo impietatis erga Deum acrior hoſtis) nonne eandem ſententiam ponere non dubitavit in præclaro illo opere ſuo hiſtoriæ rerum Græcarum? ſic enim ait ‡, καὶ ὁ θεός δὲ, ὡς ἔοικε, πολλάκις χαίρει τȣ̀ς μὲν μικρȣς μεγάγȣς ποιῶν, τȣ̀ς δὲ μεγάλȣς μικρȣ́ς. Hæc igitur ſacrilega eſt in Herodoto ſententia, quia ſecundum hominum intelligentiam φθονερόν dixit eſſe τό θεῖον. Sed hæc quàm ſint futilia quis non videt (115). - - - - *For as to Plutarch's cavilling at that noble ſentence, concerning the inconſtant condition of human affairs, which Herodotus makes Solon ſpeak, (and we find many ſuch paſſages in this Hiſtorian) we may impute it to an over-tenderneſs of conſcience: he was afraid, it might be impious to ſpeak of God in a manner adapted to our capacities. But why then is God ſaid to have eyes, hands, feet, and ears? why do we aſcribe to him anger, revenge, and even fear, temptation, repentance, joy, and ſorrow? without which thoſe things could not be apprehended. Why did Xenophon (who had the greateſt reverence for the deity, and was the fierceſt enemy to impiety) ſay the ſame thing in his excellent Hiſtory of Greece: for,* God as it ſeems good to him, *ſays he,* often delights to make the little great, and the great little. *This paſſage then in Herodotus ſeems profane, becauſe he ſaid God was jealous according to our manner of apprehending things. But how ridiculous is this?* It is manifeſt that he changes the ſtate of the queſtion; for Herodotus was not blamed for ſaying that the condition of human things is very inconſtant; but he was blamed for ſaying, that the jealouſy of God is the cauſe of that great inconſtancy: and it is not at all neceſſary, in order to repreſent to us the inconſtancy of fortune, to have recourſe to an image, whereby we may concieve the deity as a being that envies the happineſs of men. Beſides, there is a very great difference between the things which ſome other authors, and even the holy Scriptures, have aſcribed to God, and the jealouſy which Herodotus imputes to him. An eye, hands, anger, repenting, joy and fear, may ſerve as images to repreſent to men the conduct of providence; for thoſe weakneſſes do not ſeem to us to be inconſiſtent with an honeſt man, and an excellent prince. To be jealous of one's glory, and not to ſuffer that it ſhould be uſurped, is not looked upon as a fault among men; nay, they believe it is a quality worthy of great kings and heroes. Wherefore the Scriptue does not ſcruple to aſcribe ſuch a jealouſy to God. But to be jealous of the happineſs of other men, and to ruin them, becauſe their proſperity makes us feel the bitings of envy, is one of the moſt ſhameful qualities that can be conceived; the baſeſt tradeſmen could not bear to be accuſed of it. It is a diſeaſe that few people can avoid, but no body dares own that he is affected with it. We are ready to own, that a noble emulation of equalling or ſurpaſſing the merit and glory of great men, excites us to form glorious projects; but not that the envy of the proſperity of our neighbours prompts us to ruin them. Camerarius cannot be therefore well excuſed for having made ſuch compariſons. The expreſſions of Xenophon cannot very well ſerve to juſtify Herodotus; for if they ſignify, that God does often delight in overturning the diſpoſition of things, by reducing the great ones to the condition of the little ones, and by raiſing the little ones to the condition of the great ones; if they ſignify that God does ſo in his hours of recreation, and that it is his tennis, as princes take pleaſure in ſetting great beaſts one againſt another at a bull-feaſt, whilſt they make much of a little dog; they are as impious as the expreſſions of Herodotus, and ſo one impiety would ſerve to juſtify another impiety. But nothing requires that ſuch a ſenſe ſhould be put upon the words of Xenophon. They are capable of a reaſonable ſenſe, by ſuppoſing he meant that God is pleaſed with that frequent viciſſitude of conditions, becauſe his quality of judge, and common father of mankind requires it from him (116). Great men abuſe their power; it is therefore neceſſary that the fall of ſome ſhould be a warning to others, and ſhould preyent the miſchief they might have done, and comfort thoſe who were vexed by them. And ſince the condition of human affairs does not permit that all men ſhould be in great poſts at the ſame time, every body muſt be raiſed in his turn, and the common father of mankind muſt diſpoſe of them ſometimes in favour of one, ſometimes in favour of another. The little ones muſt riſe, and the great ones go down in their turn. It is likely that Xenophon underſtood it ſo, and that he inſiſted not upon the meer idea of the ſupreme authority which God has over the goods of fortune. It would be a thing unworthy of the moſt perfect Being, to overthrow great men, and to raiſe little ones only to ſhew his power. Any prince would be juſtly blamed, if out of a meer oſtentation of his power, he ſpent his time in levelling mountains, filling up vallies, drying up marſhes, and overflowing ſandy plains. He muſt propoſe the public good to himſelf, or elſe it is meer tyrannical pomp and luxury, and a ſubject of ſcandal or juſt complaints. Read theſe words of Salluſt. ‘Nam quid ea memorem, quæ niſi iis, qui videre, nemini credibilia ſunt, à privatis compluribus ſubverſos montes, maria conſtructa eſſe? quibus mihi ludibrio videntur fuiſſe divitiæ, quippe quas honeſte habere licebat, per turpitudinem abuti properabant (117). - - *What need I mention other things, that will hardly meet with credit from thoſe, who have not been eye witneſſes of their truth? Such as levelling of hills and mountains, and raiſing palaces in the ſea itſelf by private men for the purpoſes of pleaſure: to whom their riches, in my opinion, prove the greateſt ſcandal in the world, by the prodigal uſe they make of that which they might as eaſily employ with honour.*’ Read alſo theſe words of Suetonius concerning the emperor Caligula: ‘In extructionibus prætoriorum atque villarum omni ratione poſthabita, nihil tam efficere concupiſcebat quam quod poſſe effici negaretur. Et jactæ itaque moles

---

(110) Ibid.

(111) H. Steph. in Apolog. pro Herodoto, *præfixa Editioni Latinæ Herodoti Francof.* 1595, *in* 8vo, *pag.* 24, 25.

(112) He ſets down here the words which I have quoted out of book vii, cap. x, of Herodotus.

(113) Of Heſiod.

(114) Valet ima ſummis
Mutare & inſignem attenuat Deus,
Obſcura promens. *Horat. Od. XXXIV, lib. i.*

† Clione, cap. xxxii.

‡ Helenican. lib. v.

(115) Joach. Camerarius, Procemio in Herodot. *pag.* 5, *Genev.* 1618, *in folio.*

(116) Compare this with the remark [*F*] of the article **LUCRETIUS.**

(117) Salluſt. de Bello Catil. *pag. m.* 28. *See alſo pag.* 53, *in the harangue of Catiline,* Quis mortalium, cui virile ingenium eſt, tolerare poteſt illis divitias ſuperare, quas profundant in extruendo mari, & montibus coæquandis, nobis rem familiarem etiam ad neceſſaria deeſſe?

moles infeſto ac profundo mari, exciſæ rupes duriſſimi ſilicis, & campi montibus aggere æquati, & complanata foſſuris montium juga, incredibili quidem celeritate, cum moræ culpa capite lueretur (118). - - - *He utterly deſpiſed the building of country-ſeats and palaces, and coveted nothing ſo much as what ſeemed impoſſible to be attained. Therefore huge ſtructures were raiſed in the deep and dangerous ſea, the hardeſt rocks cut through, the higheſt mountains levelled, the deepeſt vallies raiſed, and that with incredible diſpatch, becauſe the ſmalleſt delay was puniſhed with death.*' And to add a modern example to the ancient, read alſo a paſſage which concerns Mr Fouquet: ‘ Fouquetus . . . . . Lucillianis ſumptibus naturam poſſeſſor domuit, & contumaciam ſitus repugnantem in delicias ſuas manſueſcere coëgit nullo læſo, niſi ſe & arca Regia (119). - - - *Fouquet . . . . . at an infinite charge ſubdued nature, and compelled the reſiſtance of ſituation to yield to his delight, without injuring any but himſelf and the king's coffers.*' I do not doubt but Xenophon underſtood in an orthodox ſenſe the maxim he advanced. Having ſo much improved under his profeſſor (120), he could not ſay that if GOD is pleaſed to raiſe the little ones, and to overthrow the great ones, it is to divert himſelf, or to make a ſhew of his power. He believed without doubt, that GOD did ſo only for the public good of mankind, and conſequently Camerarius has alledged him without reaſon in favour of Herodotus, who was cenſured for having attributed to GOD a jealous humour, which is the cauſe of the overthrow of human proſperity. Obſerve that it ſignifies nothing to the earth or rocks to be in a valley or in a high place. They are inſenſible bodies, any ſituation is equally good and indifferent to them. Water is neither more nor leſs unhappy, when it runs in the channel of a river, than when it is forced out of a pipe into the clouds; but the fall of a monarch, the diſgrace of a prime miniſter, and other ſuch overthrows of worldly proſperities, overwhelm a great many people with ſorrow. It would be therefore a leſs diſorder to overturn the ſituation of ſome parts of the earth, meerly to ſatisfy one's fancy, and make a ſhew of one's riches, than to precipitate the high fortune of men, meerly to divert one's ſelf, and make a ſhew of one's power. From whence you may conclude, that all thoſe who have had a right notion of providence, have underſtood the maxim of Xenophon in the ſenſe I have mentioned. They believed without doubt, that the ruin of great men was an act of juſtice, whereby the misfortunes of ſome private men were compenſated by a greater advantage of the public.

Valeſius's way of juſtifying Herodotus is ſomewhat more ingenious than that of the other apologiſts. See his commentary upon a place, wherein Ammianus Marcellinus gives us the deſcription of the goddeſs Nemeſis. That Hiſtorian having mentioned the tragical end of ſome great criminals, adds: ‘ Hæc & hujuſmodi quædam innumerabilia ultrix facinorum impiorum, bonorumque præmiatrix aliquoties operatur Adraſtia, (atque utinam ſemper) quam vocabulo duplici etiam Nemeſim appellamus: . . . . Hæc ut regina cauſarum, & arbitra rerum ac diſceptatrix, urnam ſortium temperat, accidentium vices alternans: voluntatumque noſtrarum exorſa interdum alio, quàm quò contendebant, exitu terminans, multiplices actus permutando convolvit. Eademque neceſſitatis inſolubili retinaculo mortalitatis vinciens faſtus tumentes incaſſum, & incrementorum detrimentorumque momenta verſans, ut novit, nunc erectas mentium cervices opprimit & enervat: nunc bonos ab imo ſuſcitans, ad bene vivendum extollit (121). - - - *Adraſtia, who is likewiſe called Nemeſis, the revenger of impious deeds, and the rewarder of good ones, ſometimes (I wiſh I could ſay always) does theſe and a thouſand other things of the ſame kind: . . . . She governs cauſes and regulates events, ſhe manages the urn of lots, and diſpenſes the viciſſitudes of fortune: ſhe turns and winds the various acts of our wills, and makes us ſometimes conclude contrary to what we firſt propoſed. She faſtens the vain pride of mortality with the indiſſoluble chain of neceſſity, and by turning the ſcales of proſperity and adverſity, ſhe ſometimes depreſſes the haughty, and ſometimes exalts the humble.*' You may plainly ſee, he ſuppoſes that the goddeſs Nemeſis preſides over the viciſſitudes of elevation and overthrow, which are to be ſeen in the courſe of human things, and that ſhe directs the play of the ſwipe, which I have mentioned in another place (122), upon occaſion of an anſwer of Æſop, which is altogether like the maxim of Xenophon; but we muſt not forget, that he ſuppoſes at the ſame time, that ſhe diſpenſes this alternative with a ſupreme equity. ‘ Jus quoddam ſublime numinis efficacis . . . . ſubſtantialis tutela . . . . quam Theologi veteres fingentes juſtitiæ filiam ex abdita quadam æternitate tradunt omnia deſpectare terrena (123). - - - *A certain ſublime equity of a powerful deity . . . . a powerful protectreſs . . . . the ancient Theologers feigning her to be the daughter of Juſtice, ſay that from ſome hidden eternity, ſhe looks down upon all earthly affairs.*' Valeſius obſerves, 1. That ſhe is called Nemeſis, becauſe ſhe renders to every one his due. 2. That Plato in the fourth book *de Republica*, calls her the meſſenger of Juſtice. 3. That Dion Chryſoſtom obſerves in his ſixty-fourth oration, that fortune, as it is equitable, went by the name of Nemeſis, τὸ ἴσον αὐτῆς Νέμεσις. *Æquitas ejus* (Fortunæ) *Nemeſis dicta eſt.* 4. That the ancients aſcribed to GOD a certain power which mortified proud men, and deſtroyed all ſublime things. 5. That that power was called either envy φθόνος, or indignation νέμεσις. 6. That indignation, or Nemeſis, has a great affinity with envy, and that in the ſecond book of Ariſtotle's morals, it holds the middle place between envy and the vice which makes one rejoice at other mens misfortunes (124). 7. That Herodotus upon this account makes Solon ſay, that all the deities are envious, and Artabanus, that GOD was envious. ‘ Artabanus apud eumdem Herodotum in lib. 7. iiſdem verbis alloquitur Xerxem: ὁ δὲ θεὸς γλυκὺν γεύσας τὸν αἰῶνα, φθονερὸς ἐν αὐτῷ εὑρίσκεται ἐών. At Deus qui ſuavi perfruitur ævo, invidus ipſe eſſe deprehenditur. Quæ quidem Herodoti verba immeritò reprehendit Plutarchus (125). - - *Artabanus, in the ſame Herodotus, ſpeaking to Xerxes uſes theſe words. But GOD himſelf, who enjoys a bleſſed eternity, is envious. Which words of Herodotus Plutarch cenſures undeſervedly.*' 8. That Plutarch had no reaſon to cenſure thoſe words of Herodotus (126), for if Nemeſis is juſtly attributed to GOD, why ſhould not envy φθόνος be aſcribed to him? one of thoſe vices is not leſs than the other among men: but when ſuch things are ſpoken of GOD, they are diveſted of all imperfection, and ought to be underſtood in a favourable ſenſe; or elſe Plutarch himſelf would be convicted of the ſame fault, ſince he ſaid in the life of Paul Æmilius (127), Οὐδενὶ γὰρ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐπίφθονον, πλὴν εἴ τι δαιμόνιον. . . . . &c (128), that is to ſay, ‘ Æmilius was admired and accounted happy by all men, and unenvied by every one that was good: only that it ſeems the province of ſome GOD, to leſſen the happineſs which is too great and inordinate, and ſo to mingle the affairs of human life, that no one ſhould be entirely free and exempt from calamities; but, as it is in Homer, that thoſe ſhould think themſelves truly bleſſed, to whom fortune has given an equal ſhare of good and evil. Æmilius had four ſons, &c.' You will ſee hereafter (129) what follows in Plutarch.

I ſhall make ſome ſhort obſervations upon this apology of Valeſius. I ſay, 1. That all the Heathen authors, who aſcribe the functions of Nemeſis to the deity, are not to blame; for they who aſcribe them to GOD, according to the above-mentioned notions of Ammianus Marcellinus, or according to that equality and equity which Dion Chryſoſtom ſpeaks of, attribute nothing to him that is unworthy of him, or that includes a moral imperfection. But there have been I do not know how many Poets, Orators, and other people, who underſtood by Nemeſis a moroſe Being, whoſe greateſt delight was to overturn human proſperity, and to poiſon with ſome misfortunes ſuch events as were able to give moſt joy to illuſtrious men. In that ſenſe it is as impious a thing to uſe the word νέμεσις as that of φθόνος, with reſpect to GOD; and therefore Valeſius had no reaſon to ſay that the laſt may be excuſed by the firſt. I ſay, 2. That the chapter of Ariſtotle's morals, which he refers us to, is not favourable to him. It is true, that we read there, that there are three ſorts of envy, two at the extreams, and one in the middle. That which is in the middle, is called νέμεσις, Nemeſis, and conſiſts in being ſorry that a man, who deſerves not to be happy, ſhould be happy notwithſtanding. The exceſſive extream is called φθόνος, and conſiſts in being ſorry that there are any men happy. The defective extream is called will give me occaſion to mention a Political aphoriſm [*M*]. Cimon's ſiſter undertook one day to criticize the conduct of Pericles, for which ſhe received a mortifying anſwer.

---

(118) Suet. in Calig. *cap. xxxvii.*

(119) Priolus, de Rebus Gallicis, *lib. ix, cap. ii, pag. m.* 320, 321.

(120) Socrates.

(121) Amm. Marcel. *lib. xiv, cap. xi, pag. m.* 59, 60.

(122) Above, remark [I], of the article ÆSOP.

(123) Ammian. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 59.

(124) Ex Henr. Valeſ. in Marcel. *pag.* 59.

(125) Valeſ. ibid. *pag.* 60, you will ſee at the end of this remark, why I quote this paſſage.

(126) Note that Valeſius has not well ordered this diſcourſe; for Plutarch does not cenſure the words of Artabanus, but thoſe of Solon, which Valeſius had quoted before he alledged thoſe of Artabanus.

(127) Plut. in Paulo Æmilio, *pag.* 273, *F.*

(128) Ex Valeſio, ibid.

(129) After citation (132).

ἐπιχαιρεκακία, and conſiſts in rejoicing at the miſfortune of others (130). This doctrine is not very exact, and has been very well refuted by the commentator Euſtratius. He ſhews that a man who rejoices at the miſery of others, is vexed at the happineſs of others, and conſequently that the paſſion called φθόνος, and the paſſion called ἐπιχαιρεκακία belong to the ſame perſons, and not one to this and the other to that man. They are not therefore two extreams, between which the paſſion called νέμεσις may be placed. But I leave that diſpute, and I ſhall only obſerve, that the popular ſtyle, which men conformed themſelves to in matters of religion, admitted not of thoſe ſcrupulous diſtinctions, which Ariſtotle made uſe of in his morals, and which are moſt times meer logical abſtractions. We muſt not therefore fancy, that they, who feared Nemeſis, and ſpoke of her conduct, had in their minds, as the rule of the nature or character of that goddeſs, the difference which that Philoſopher obſerves between νέμεσις indignation, and φθόνος envy. I ſay, 3. That nothing can be more prejudicial to the deſign of the apologiſt, than his having recourſe to Ariſtotle's morals; for, according to that Philoſopher, the word φθόνος ſignifies the uneaſineſs and vexation occaſioned by the happineſs of others in general, whether the perſon that is happy deſerves it or not. He that is ſubject to that paſſion is called φθονερὸς (131). He exceeds the perſon called νεμεσητικὸς, who feels what goes by the name of νέμεσις, being ſorry for the proſperity of thoſe who are unworthy of it. Now, it is certain that Herodotus has given the epithet of φθονερὸς to God; therefore, by Ariſtotle's doctrine, he is more to blame than if he had uſed only the word Nemeſis or Nemeſiticus. Therefore to alledge the ſecond book of Ariſtotle's morals, is to furniſh the accuſers of Herodotus with proofs againſt him, and not his apologiſts with proofs for him. What did therefore Valeſius think of? Had he not forgot his uſual exactneſs, when deſigning to prove that φθόνος and νέμεσις are as vicious the one as the other among men, he confirmed his opinion by the doctrine of that Philoſopher? I ſay, 4. That he is in the wrong to aſſert, that when envy, or ſuch like imperfections, are aſcribed to God, they loſe what is vicious in them, and that they muſt be favourably underſtood. This cannot reach ſo far as moral imperfections, or that ſort of faults we think to be inconſiſtent with an honeſt man. Such are fraud, cruelty, treaſon, and that ſort of baſe envy which cannot bear any one's proſperity, and prompts one to perſecute all thoſe that excel. All the blaſphemies of the Poets, and all the impious doctrines upon which the religious worſhip of the Heathens was grounded, and which have been very ſolidly refuted by the Fathers of the Church, would be excuſable, if the maxim of Valeſius was admitted. Let us therefore reject it, and not trifle in putting a figurative ſenſe upon Herodotus's words. Let us rather ſay, that he took the word *envy* in an odious ſenſe. We may judge of it as we judge of the complaints, which the Pagans made of their gods in their calamities. Their reviling of fortune, and the cruelty whereof they accuſed the gods, were underſtood not in an allegorical ſenſe, but in a literal one: they deſigned to offend them by their words, as they deſigned to offend them by their actions, when they threw ſtones at their temples. Did the Roman people purifie the idea of cruelty, did they diveſt it of ſomething that was vicious, when they murmured at fortune during the triumph of Paulus Æmilius? Let us make uſe of Plutarch's words, which immediately follow thoſe which we have ſeen above (132). They properly concern the goddeſs Nemeſis, or that pretended divine virtue which Herodotus called Envy. ' Æmilius had four ſons, of which Scipio and Fabius ' were adopted into other families . . . . the other two ' which he had by a ſecond wife, and were yet but ' young, he brought up in his own houſe. One of ' theſe died at fourteen years of age, five days before ' his father's triumph, the other at twelve, three days ' after. So that there was no Roman without a deep ' ſenſe of his ſuffering, and every one dreaded the ' cruelty of fortune, that did not ſcruple to bring ſo ' much ſorrow into a houſe repleniſhed with happineſs, rejoicing and ſacrifices, and to intermingle ' tears and complaints with ſongs of victory and ' triumph.' It is ſo true that the word *envy* was taken in the moſt odious literal ſenſe, that ſome wiſe men oppoſed that impiety, and ſaid in expreſs words, that the gods were not ſubject to that paſſion. We have ſeen above (133) the remark of a famous Platoniſt, and we find in Stobœus four Greek verſes of Phocylides, which ſay, that there is no envy among the gods, ἄφθονοι ἐρανίδαι, &c. 5. Laſtly, I ſay that Plutarch cannot be guilty of Herodotus's fault, becauſe he ſpeaks only in a doubtful way, he makes uſe of an *if*, he confines himſelf to a certain god, whoſe particular commiſſion or lot ſhould be to croſs the happineſs of men. Whereas Herodotus affirms, that all the gods are envious and turbulent. Let us conclude, that Henricus Valeſius has not been very happy in undertaking to juſtify Herodotus, and to refute Plutarch's cenſure.

He has put (134) quite a different ſenſe from mine, upon a paſſage of Herodotus. I give the reader notice of it, and I confeſs that his tranſlation is more literal than that of Laurentius Valla, which I have followed (135). I did ſomewhat ſcruple to make uſe of it, but conſidering on the one ſide, that Henry Stephens did not criticize it, and on the other ſide, that according to that tranſlation, Herodotus reaſons more nicely and more clearly, I preferred it to that of the learned Henricus Valeſius: perhaps I am in the wrong.

[*M*] *The miſtake of* Valerius Maximus *will give me occaſion to mention a Political aphoriſm.*] He ſays that Ariſtophanes in one of his comedies, introduces Pericles returning from Hell, and declaring that a lion ought not to be brought up, and that if he be brought up and ſuffered to grow, he muſt be obeyed. *Ariſtophanis quoque altioris eſt prudentiæ præceptum, qui in comœdia introduxit remiſſum ab inferis Athenienſem Periclem, vaticinantem, non oportere in urbe nutriri leonem; ſin autem ſit alitus, obſequi ei convenire. Monet enim, ut præcipuæ nobilitatis & concitati ingenii juvenes refrenentur. Nimio verò favore ac profuſa indulgentia paſti, quò minus potentiam obtineant, ne impediantur: quòd ſtultum ſit, & inutile, eas obtrectare vires, quas ipſe foveris* (136). It is Æſchylus, and not Pericles that ſays ſo in Ariſtophanes. Here are the words of that Poet:

Οὐ χρῆ λέοντος σκύμνον ἐν πόλει τρέφειν,
Μάλιστα δὲ λέοντα μὴ 'ν πόλει τρέφειν.
Ἢν δ' ἐκτραφῇ τις, τοῖς τρόποις ὑπερετεῖν.

Catulum ne alas leonis in republica,
Ac maxime ipſum leonem ne alas ibi.
Quod ſi quis alitus; obſequendum moribus (137).

They were thus tranſlated by Eraſmus, who obſerves that Valerius Maximus quotes that paſſage (138), but he does not cenſure him for having taken Pericles for Æſchylus (139). He underſtood that ſentence better than Valerius Maximus: the latter reaſons thus; ſince you have bred up a man, you ought to conſider his power as your own work; it would be therefore a piece of folly to go about to deſtroy it, nay, you would not be able to ſucceed in it. This is pitiful reaſoning. The Greek Poet meant no ſuch thing. His meaning was without doubt, that the beſt way to avoid the miſeries which ariſe from oppoſing a power, which was ſuffered to grow too great, is to yield to the ſtream. ' Admonet ænigma, *they are the words of* ' *Eraſmus* (140), non eſſe fovendam potentiam quæ ' leges poſſet opprimere: quod ſi forte talis quiſpiam ' extiterit, non eſſe è rep. decertare cum illo, quem ' nequeas niſi magno reip. malo devincere. Tyran' nus aut ferendus eſt, aut non recipiendus. - - - *The* ' *meaning of the parable is, that a power is not to be* ' *nouriſhed which may be able to oppreſs the laws: but* ' *if there ſhould happen to be any ſuch, it is not for the* ' *intereſt of a ſtate to contend with him, whom you can*' *not conquer without great detriment to the common*' *wealth. A tyrant is either to be born with, or not to* ' *be received.*' It is a great fault in a republic, when

(130) *See* Ariſtotle's Morals, *lib. ii, cap. vii, pag. m.* 19, and the paraphraſe of Andronichus, *pag. m.* 110.

(131) Ὁ μὲν γὰρ νεμεσητικὸς, λυπεῖται ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναξίως εὖ πράττουσιν· ὁ δὲ φθονερὸς ὑπερβάλλων τοῦτον ἐπὶ πᾶσι λυπεῖται. Nam qui ad indignandum propenſus eſt is dolet eorum rebus ſecundis qui eis indigni ſunt. Invidus hunc ſuperans, rebus omnibus ſecundis contabeſcit. *Ariſt. ubi ſupra.*

(132) After citation (128).

(133) Citation (110) of the article **PAULICIANS.**

(134) Above, citation (125).

(135) In the article ARTABANUS, ſon of Hyſtaſpes, citation (7).

(136) Val. Max. *lib. vii, cap. ii, num.* 7, *in Exter.*

(137) Ariſtoph. in Ranis, *Act. v, Sc. iv, pag. m.* 264.

(138) Eraſmus, Adag. lxxvii, Chil. ii, Cent. III, pag. m. 451.

(139) Leopardus, Emendat. *lib. viii, cap. xii,* & Pighius, Comment. in hunc locum Val. Maximi, *cenſure Valerius Maximus for it.*

(140) Eraſmus, ubi ſupra.

anſwer. That anſwer ſhews that Pericles had a ready wit [N]. I promiſed to give here the Hiſtory of the famous ASPASIA [O], and I will be as good as

they ſuffer a factious and bold ſubject to get too great an authority. But it is a greater fault ſtill to oppoſe that man, when they have ſuffered him to become maſter of a republic. There are a thouſand abuſes which ought to be prevented; but when they are grown ſtrong, it is very often a leſſer evil to tolerate them, than to undertake to reform them. Thoſe who undertake it, do moſt times as Sylla did, they make uſe of a remedy worſe than the diſeaſe (141). An Hiſtorian ſaid very judiciouſly, that it had been better to let the ſick and wounded republic lie quiet, than to ſtir it up, in order to give it ſome remedies, and dreſs its wounds. *Expediebat quaſi ægræ ſauciæque reipublicæ requieſcere quomodocunque, ne vulnera curatione ipſa reſcinderentur* (142). I might alledge a great many things concerning the inconveniencies of certain remedies, which are made uſe of to cure public evils; but it would look too much like an affectation of common-places.

[N] *The anſwer of Pericles to Cimon's ſiſter, ſhews that he had a ready wit.*] Cimon and Pericles had very different intereſts, and were of two contrary parties. The latter became ſuperior to the other, and cauſed him to be baniſhed (143) It was not the only advantage he had over him; for he contributed to his recalling. That mark of credit to do and undo things, did but increaſe the jealouſy of Cimon's family: the victories of Pericles increaſed alſo that paſſion. Wherefore Elpinice, Cimon's ſiſter, being diſpleaſed with the praiſes beſtowed upon Pericles's victories, could not forbear reflecting upon them out of ſpite: Pericles paid her off with this ſmart anſwer contained in a Greek verſe: You ſhould uſe no paint, you are too old for that. Let us ſee the words of Plutarch (144). *Pericles after the overthrow of Samos, as ſoon as he returned back to Athens, took care that thoſe who died in the war, ſhould be honourably buried, and made ſuch a funeral harangue, as the cuſtom is, in their commendation at their graves and monuments, that he was highly admired and eſteemed for it. As he came down from the pulpit (or place where they delivered their ſpeeches) the reſt of the ladies came and complimented him, taking him by the hand, and crowning him with garlands and ribbons, as they uſed to do to gameſters that won the public prizes; only Elpinice coming near to him, ſaith ſhe, Theſe are brave things, Pericles, that you have done, and ſuch as deſerve our chaplets, who have loſt us ſo many brave worthy citizens, not in a war with Phœnicians or Medes, (enemies and foreigners) as my brother Cimon was wont to do, but for the overthrow of a city that was in alliance, and of the ſame country and kindred with us. As Elpinice ſpoke theſe words, he gently ſmiling, as it is ſaid, returned her this verſe of Archilochus for anſwer.*

Old woman as you are,
You ſhould not powder hair,
Nor, as you walk, perfume the air,
Leave theſe things to the young and fair (145).

Could any thing be ſaid more to the purpoſe to mortify that lady? We are told of another anſwer, which is not ſo glorious to Pericles. He was one of Cimon's accuſers in a capital affair. Elpinice went and humbly beſought him to be favourable to her brother: *You are too old*, ſaid he to her, *to ſucceed in ſuch a requeſt*. Ἐλθούσης δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν τῆς Ἐλπινίκης καὶ δεομένης, μειδιάσας εἶπεν, Ὦ Ἐλπινίκη γραῦς εἶ, ὡς πράγματα τηλικαῦτα δράσειν. *Quum adiſſet autem eum ſupplex Elpinice, ridens, at enim anus es, inquit, Elpinice: anus es nimium, quàm ut res tantas tranſigas* (146). The meaning of thoſe words ſeem to be this; if your youth could perſuade me, that by granting me the poſſeſſion of your body, you would pay the ſervice I ſhould do to your brother, I would ſerve him; but you are too old to make me wiſh for this mark of gratitude; you ſhall therefore obtain nothing from me. Two things might be ſaid for Pericles: Firſt, that he ſpoke in jeſt: Secondly, that he meant only, that the other perſons whom ſhe would endeavour to prevail with, would deſpiſe her old age. A young and beautiful ſollicitreſs may obtain a thouſand things, which an old woman will never obtain. Plutarch obſerves, that notwithſtanding that anſwer, Pericles did but weakly purſue his accuſation, and only for faſhion-ſake. Others ſay, that he liked Elpinice very well, and lay with her as a reward of the good offices he had done Cimon. It was no very difficult thing to gain her, for ſhe lay with her brother. Καὶ Κίμωνος δ' Ελπινίκῃ τῇ ἀδελφῇ παρανόμως συνόντος, εἶθ' ὕστερον ἐκδοθείσης Καλλίᾳ, καὶ φυγαδευθέντος, μισθὸν ἔλαβε τῆς καθόδου αὐτοῦ ὁ Περικλῆς τὸ τῇ Ελπινίκῃ μιχθῆναι. *Cum Cimon Elpinice ſorore, quam poſt nuptum Calliæ dedit, contra leges abuteretur, exilioque damnatus fuiſſet, ejus reditus mercedem Pericles accepit Elpinices concubitum* (147). Beſides, ſhe proſtituted herſelf to a Painter (148). Obſerve, 1. That Athenæus from the teſtimony of Antiſthenes, ſuppoſes ſhe obtained Pericles's vote for the recalling of her brother, by granting him the enjoyment of herſelf (149). 2. That according to Plutarch, ſhe received Pericles's denying anſwer becauſe of her old age, as ſhe was ſolliciting him in a criminal proceſs which concerned Cimon, and which happened before the time mentioned by Athenæus (150). It is neceſſary to obſerve this; for if Plutarch had ſpoken of a ſollicitation that was poſterior to the recalling of Cimon, we might believe that the only reaſon why Pericles favoured that exile, was his engagement to Elpinice. The anſwer mentioned by Plutarch would make me believe, that Elpinice remembring that the laſt favours ſhe granted to Pericles, made him conſent that Cimon ſhould be recalled, applied herſelf to him again, to deſire him not to be againſt her brother, who was concerned in a criminal proceſs, and that Pericles anſwered her in words to this effect: *Do not expect to obtain any thing from me by your ſollicitations, you are no more what you was, when the amorous ſport you granted me, moved me to do your brother a good ſervice; you are now too old, to deſerve that I ſhould make ſuch an exchange of courteſy with you*: but, as I have already ſaid, Plutarch ſuppoſes that anſwer was made before Cimon's oſtraciſm. However it be, Athenæus tells us that Pericles was very much given to women. Ἦν δ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ πρὸς ἀφροδίσια πάνυ καταφερής. *Fuit quidem ille ad venerem multum propenſus* (151).

[O] *I promiſed to give here the hiſtory of Aſpaſia.*] She was born at Miletus: ſhe followed the ſteps of Thargalia, who gained the affection of the principal Grecians of Ionia by her wit and beauty, and engaged them to favour the king of Perſia (152). Aſpaſia was a woman of ſo great parts, that Socrates went to ſee her, and carried his friends with him (153); and to ſpeak more clearly, ſhe taught him Rhetoric and Politics. Ἀσπασία μὲν τοι ἡ σοφὴ τοῦ Σωκράτους διδάσκαλος τῶν ῥητορικῶν λόγων. *Aſpaſia ſapiens fœmina Socratis in eloquentiæ ſtudiis magiſtra* (154). Πλάτων ἐν τῷ Μενεξένῳ τὸν Σωκράτην παρ' αὐτῆς φησι μαθεῖν τὰ πολιτικά. *Plato in Menexeno teſtatur, Socratem ab ea didiciſſe politica* (155). That which is moſt ſtrange, is, that they who frequented her, carried their wives to her houſe, that they might hear her diſcourſes and lectures, though ſhe kept ſeveral courtezans at home. Τὰς γυναῖκας ἀκροασομένας οἱ συνήθεις ἦγον εἰς αὐτὴν, καίπερ οὐ κοσμίου προεστῶσαν ἐργασίας οὐδὲ σεμνῆς, ἀλλὰ παιδίσκας ἑταιρούσας τρέφουσαν. *Fœminaſque ad audiendam eam duxerunt familiares: licet officinam tractaret parum decoram & honeſtam, quæ puellas ad quæſtum corpore faciendum aleret* (156). She underſtood Politics very well, and it was ſaid that Pericles kept company with her, becauſe ſhe had a great knowledge of the maxims of government; but their great acquaintance proceeded from ſome other cauſes. Love had a ſhare in it: Pericles loved not his wife, and parted with her with all his heart to give her to another, and then he married Aſpaſia, and loved her paſſionately. The Hiſtorian (157) who relates all theſe things, alledges as a very ſingular proof of his love, a thing which would be looked upon now as moſt ridiculous. Pericles, ſays he, never went to, or came from the ſenate without kiſſing Aſpaſia. Αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν Ἀσπασίαν λαβὼν, ἔστερξε διαφερόντως· καὶ γὰρ ἐξιὼν ὥς φασι, καὶ εἰσιὼν ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, ἠσπάζετο καθ' ἡμέραν αὐτὴν μετὰ τοῦ καταφιλεῖν. *Aſpaſiam uxorem duxit*

(141) Ingratus L. Sylla, qui patriam durioribus remediis quam pericula erant, ſanavit. *Seneca, de Benef. lib. v, cap. xvi.*

(142) Flor. *lib. iii, cap. xxiii.* See Balzac's Letters to Chapelain, *pag.* 107.

(143) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 157.

(144) Ibid. in Pericle.

(145) Ταῦτα τῆς Ἐλπινίκης λεγούσης, Περικλῆς μειδιάσας ἀτρέμα, λέγεται τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου πρὸς αὐτὴν εἰπεῖν, Οὐκ ἂν μύροισι, γραῦς ἐοῦσ' ἠλείφεο. Sic fata Elpinice, ſubriſit Pericles, & ſubmiſſe hoc ei reſpondit Archilochi, *Quando anus es, ungi minus tibi convenit.* Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 167.

(146) Ibid. *pag.* 157, *E.*

(147) Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 589, *F.*

(148) *To* Polygnotus. *See* Plut. in Cimone, *pag.* 480.

(149) Athen. ubi ſupra.

(150) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 157, *E. See alſo* in Vita Cimonis, *pag.* 487, *E, where he quotes Steſimbrotus, a cotemporary Hiſtorian.*

(151) Athen. ubi ſupra.

(152) Plut. in Pericle, *pag.* 165.

(153) Ibid.

(154) Athen. *lib. v, pag.* 210. *See alſo* Lucian, de Saltatione, *pag. m.* 923, *Tom. i.*

(155) Harpocration, Voce Ἀσπασία.

(156) Plut. ubi ſupra, *C.*

(157) Ibid.

as my word. See the remark [*O*]. I will make alſo a ſmall collection of ſome miſtakes,

---

duxit, quam mire dilexit, nam ſive exiret, ſive rediret à foro, ſalutabat ſemper eam oſculo (158). Perhaps this author underſtood not well what he read upon that ſubject. I had rather ſay, as an author intimates in Athenæus, that Pericles went to ſee Aſpaſia twice a day, and kiſſed her when he went in, and when he came out; which was before he married her. Ἀντισθένης δὲ ὁ Σωκρατικὸς ἐρασθέντα φησὶν αὐτὸν Ἀσπασίας, δὶς τῆς ἡμέρας εἰσιόντα καὶ ἐξιόντα ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς ἀσπάζεσθαι τὴν ἄνθρωπον. *Antiſthenes Socraticus narrat amatorem illum Aſpaſiæ, bis quotidie ſalutaturum ad eam introire, exireque inde ſolitum* (159). It has been reported, that he turned out his wife, and lodged with Aſpaſia, a Magarian whore, and plunged himſelf into leudneſs, and ſpent a great part of his eſtate upon her (160). Περικλέα δὲ τὸν Ὀλύμπιον φησὶν Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ποντικὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἡδονῆς, ὡς ἀπήλλαξεν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ τὸν μεθ᾽ ἡδονῆς βίον προείλετο, ᾤκει τε μετὰ Ἀσπασίας τῆς ἐκ Μεγάρων ἑταίρας, καὶ τὸ πολὺ μέρος τῆς οὐσίας εἰς ταύτην κατανάλωσε. *Periclem Olympium Heraclides Ponticus ſcribit, libro de voluptate, exactâ domo uxore voluptati ſe tradidiſſe, cum Aſpaſia ſcorto Megarico* (161) *habitaſſe, & magnam rei familiaris partem in eam dilapidaſſe.* Aſpaſia, after the death of Pericles, became acquainted with a man of mean extraction, whom ſhe raiſed to the principal dignities of the Republic (162). Which ſhews that nothing was impoſſible to her wit and eloquence. She muſt needs have well underſtood the art of ſpeaking, ſince ſeveral Athenians learned Rhetoric of her. She acquired ſo great a reputation, that young Cyrus gave the name of Aſpaſia to a miſtreſs whom he loved and eſteemed above all things (163). Our Aſpaſia was the cauſe of the war, which the Republic of Athens declared againſt the Samians. They were at war with the Mileſians for the city of Priene, which the two parties laid claim to. The Samians got the victory. Aſpaſia, out of love for her countrymen, deſired Pericles to make the Athenians declare war againſt the Samians (164). It is ſaid alſo that ſhe was the cauſe of the Megarian war, which was the beginning of that of Peloponneſus, and that the motive which induced her to it was a very ſhameful one. Some young Athenians having drunk too much, went to Megara, and carried away a famous whore. The Megarians carried away, by way of reprizals, two whores belonging to Aſpaſia. This was the ſubject of her anger, which moved her, as it is ſaid, to make uſe of all her credit to have the Megarians attacked, to which Pericles was well enough diſpoſed. Μεγαρεῖς δὲ . . . . . τὰς αἰτίας εἰς Ἀσπασίαν καὶ Περικλέα τρέπουσι, χρώμενοι τοῖς περιβοήτοις καὶ δημώδεσι τούτοις ἐκ τῶν Ἀχαρνέων στιχιδίοις, Πόρνην δὲ Σίμαιθαν, ἰόντες Μεγάραδε νεανίαι κλέπτουσι μεθυσοκότταβοι· κᾆθ᾽ οἱ Μεγαρεῖς ὀδύναις πεφυσιγγωμένοι, ἀντεξέκλεψαν Ἀσπασίᾳ πόρνα δύο. *Megarenſes verò . . . . cauſam omnem in Aſpaſiam detorquent & Periclem, allegantque celebratos & vulgatos hoſce verſus Ariſtophenis ex Acharnibus,*

Juvenes profecti Megaram ebrii auferunt
Simætham ex ſcortatione nobilem:
Megarenſis hinc populus dolore percitus,
Furatur Aſpaſiæ duo ſcorta haud impiger (165).

Plutarch had done well to ſet down the two following verſes; for they contain the concluſion which the Poet draws from that narrative, *viz.* that three whores were the cauſe of a general war in Greece (166).

Κἀντεῦθεν ἀρχὴ τοῦ πολέμου κατερράγη
Ἕλλησι πᾶσιν, ἐκ τριῶν λαικαστριῶν.

Hinc initium belli prorupit
Univerſis Græcis, ob tres meretriculas.

Athenæus, who alledges the ſix verſes of Ariſtophanes, ſays juſt before, that the ſchool of Aſpaſia filled the whole country with courtezans (167). Καὶ Ἀσπασία δὲ ἡ Σωκρατικὴ ἐνεπορεύετο πλήθη καλῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν ἀπὸ τῶν ταύτης ἑταιρίδων ἡ Ἑλλάς, ὡς καὶ ὁ χαρίεις Ἀριστοφάνης παρασημαίνεται λέγων τὸν Πελοποννησιακὸν πόλεμον, ὅτι Περικλῆς διὰ τὸν Ἀσπασίας ἔρωτα, καὶ τὰς ἁρπασθείσας ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς θεραπαίνας ὑπὸ Μεγαρέων, ἀνερρίπισε τὸ κατὰ Μεγαρέων ψήφισμα τὸ δεινὸν (168). Dalechampius renders thoſe Greek words thus: Aſpaſia Socratica formoſas mulieres, & eas quidem multas, Athenis præbuit. Jam inde ſcortis abundavit Græcia, ut indicat facetus Ariſtophanes, Peloponneſiaci belli cauſam explicans, nempe ob amorem Aſpaſiæ, & raptas à Megarenſibus ejus ancillas, Periclem decretum luctuoſum illud de bello Megarenſibus indicendo, velut ignem flabello, excitaſſe, accendiſſe. - - - *The Aſpaſia of Socrates ſupplied Athens with many beautiful women. And from thence all Greece ſwarmed with whores, as the witty Ariſtophanes ſays, explaining the cauſe of the Peloponneſian war,* viz. *that Pericles, becauſe of his love for Aſpaſia, and becauſe her whores were carried away by the Megarians, declared war againſt the Megarians, and ſo kindled, and blowed a fire as with a pair of bellows.* I muſt not forget that Aſpaſia was accuſed of two crimes by the comedian Hermippus. They were not the ſlanders of the ſtage, or of comedy. He made himſelf a party againſt her in due form, and accuſed her before the judges of impiety, and of drawing women into her houſe to ſatisfy the luſt of Pericles. Ἀσπασία δίκην ἔφευγεν ἀσεβείας, Ἑρμίππου τοῦ κωμῳδοποιοῦ διώκοντος, καὶ προσκατηγοροῦντος ὡς Περικλεῖ γυναῖκας ἐλευθέρας εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ φοιτώσας ὑποδέχοιτο. *Aſpaſia violatæ religionis eſt rea facta, accuſatore comœdiarum ſcriptore Hermippo: objecit præterea eam liberas fœminas, quibus illudebat Pericles, recipere* (169). I do not know very well whether he pretended that ſhe had carried on the trade after he had married her: in ſuch a caſe, the ſecond crime had been as extraordinary as the firſt; for it is almoſt as rare a thing, that a woman ſhould be her huſband's bawd, as it is a rare thing that ſhe ſhould have no religion. During the trial of Aſpaſia, Pericles uſed ſo many intreaties with the judges, and ſhed ſo many tears, that he obtained her abſolution. He expected not the ſame favour for Anaxagoras, who had been accuſed of irreligion at the ſame time, under pretence that he explained meteors by philoſophical reaſons (170), he ſent him out of Athens to ſave him. Ἀσπασίαν μὲν οὖν ἐξῃτήσατο πολλὰ πάνυ παρὰ τὴν δίκην, ὡς Αἰσχίνης φησίν, ἀφεὶς ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς δάκρυα, καὶ δεηθεὶς τῶν δικαστῶν· Ἀναξαγόραν δὲ, φοβηθεὶς, ἐξέπεμψε καὶ προὔπεμψεν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως. *Ac Aſpaſiam quidem eripuit Pericles precibus, pro qua vim lacrymarum in cauſa dicenda (ut ſcribit Æſchines) profudit, obſecravitque judices: Anaxagoram trepidans ablegavit, atque ex urbe deduxit* (171). Athenæus mentions another author who relates the ſame fact, and who obſerves, that when Pericles was in danger of loſing his life, he ſhed not ſo many tears as he did upon the account of Aſpaſia. Καὶ φευγούσης ποτὲ αὐτῆς γραφὴν ἀσεβείας, λέγων ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, πλείονα ἐδάκρυσεν ἢ ὅτε ὑπὲρ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἐκινδύνευσεν. *Et cùm impietatis accuſata fuiſſet, orationem pro illa habuiſſe, effuſiùs lacrymantem, quàm cùm vitæ ac fortunarum periculum adiiſſet* (172). Tanaquillus Faber, in the lives of the Greek Poets, pag. 81, wraps up this accuſation of Aſpaſia in words which every one does not underſtand. *Aſpaſia,* ſays he, *deſerves that honour, ſince ſhe was the miſtreſs of a man who was maſter of Attica, and of the iſlands of the Ægean ſea; ſince ſhe was the Juno of the Olympian Pericles; ſince ſhe made verſes and harangues; and laſtly, ſince ſhe knew as much Rhetoric as Prodicus and Gorgias the great Cymbaliſt of Greece. But ſhe knew ſomething elſe, which I would never tell you, were it not that I am reſolved to ſpeak of* HERMIPPUS, *a comic Poet, who lived at the ſame time. Hermippus . . . . made ſome verſes againſt Pericles, and even accuſed Aſpaſia of driving a certain trade which Pericles hated not. That trade is a thing which I do not know how to expreſs. However, let us ſee whether ſo naſty a ſubject may not be explained with honeſt words. She did, Sir, for Pericles what Livia did for Auguſtus, when he was diſguſted, and the nights ſeemed to him to be too long,* &c. What Tanaquillus Faber ſays of Livia, is to be found in Suetonius, Chap. LXXI of the Life of Auguſtus. ‘Circa libidines hæſit, poſtea ‘quoque, ut ferunt, ad vitiandas virgines promptior, ‘quæ ſibi undique ETIAM AB UXORE conquireren‘tur.

---

(158) Ibid. *D.*

(159) Athen. *lib.* xiii, *pag.* 589, *E.*

(160) Ibid. *lib.* x, *pag.* 533.

(161) She was born at Miletus according to Plutarch. Perhaps Heraclides gives her the firname of Megarian, becauſe ſhe kept a bawdy-houſe at Megara before ſhe came to Athens.

(162) Plut. ubi ſupra. *See alſo* Harpocration, *voce* Ἀσπασία, *and the Notes of Valeſius.*

(163) See the remark [*C*] of the article CYRUS.

(164) Plut. ibid. *pag.* 165, 166.

(165) Ibid. *pag.* 168, *E.*

(166) Note, that Plutarch does not adopt this fact. See the remark [*H*].

(167) Athen. *lib.* xiii, *pag.* 570.

(168) Ibid. *pag.* 569, 570.

(169) Plutarch. *pag.* 169, *D.*

(170) Ψήφισμα Διοπείθης ἔγραψεν εἰσαγγέλλεσθαι τοὺς τὰ θεῖα μὴ νομίζοντας, ἢ λόγους περὶ τῶν μεταρσίων διδάσκοντας ἀπερειδόμενος εἰς Περικλέα δι᾽ Ἀναξαγόρου τὴν ὑπόνοιαν. Rogationem tulit Diopithes, nomina ut deferrentur eorum qui eſſe deos negarent, aut qui ſermones de rebus æthereis ſererent, ea ſuſpicione perſtringens Anaxagoræ cauſa Periclem. *Ibid.*

(171) Ibid. *E.*

(172) Athenæus, *lib.* xiii, *pag.* 589, ex Antiſthene Socratico.

miſtakes, which concern that woman [*P*]. I ſhall not forget the faults of Mr Moreri [*Q*], nor thoſe of his continuator, nor thoſe of another French writer concerning Pericles

‘ tur. - - - *He was very much given to women, and,* ‘ *as it is reported, maids were procured for him even* ‘ *by his own wife.*’ I ſhall ſet down Plutarch's words, that one may ſee the whole extent of the crime which Aſpaſia was accuſed of: it will appear that ſhe debauched not ſlaves and outlandiſh women, but the noble ladies of Athens. *About this time Aſpaſia was charged with impiety or irreligion, upon the complaint of Hermippus, a writer of comedies, who alſo laid further to her charge, that ſhe was bawd to Pericles, and entertained citizens wives and daughters for his uſe; and Diopithes propoſed a decree, that information ſhould be given in againſt ſuch perſons as deny a Deity, and thoſe who teach certain new doctrines concerning meteors, and other appearances in the ſky; by theſe laſt words aiming in ſhew at Anaxagoras, but really ſtriking at Pericles* (173). See above remark [*C*].

[*P*] *Some miſtakes which concern Aſpaſia.*] Quintilian has committed a miſtake in the account he gives of the queſtions which were put to Xenophon's wife. She was aſked: *If the gold of your neighbour were better than your's; which had you rather have, your's or her's?* Her's, anſwered ſhe. *If her cloaths and ornaments were finer than your's, had you rather have her's than your's?* Yes, anſwered ſhe. *But if her huſband were better than your's, had you rather have him than your's?* She was aſhamed of that queſtion, and anſwered nothing. Cicero relates this (174), and plainly ſays, thoſe queſtions were put to Xenophon's wife by Aſpaſia. But Quintilian ſays, that they were put to Aſpaſia by Xenophon's wife: *Ut apud Æſchinem Socraticum male reſpondit Aſpaſia Xenophontis uxor: quod Cicero his verbis transfert* (175). Voſſius cenſured that miſtake, but he was miſtaken in his turn (176); for he believed that Quintilian had admitted of two Aſpaſias (177). The miſtake does not conſiſt in that; but in believing that Aſpaſia mentioned by Cicero, was Xenophon's wife. Colomeſius cenſures that fault of Quintilian (178), and obſerves that Bruſonius follows it (179). I believe that over-ſight comes from the tranſcribers, and that Quintilian ſaid, *Apud Æſchinem Socraticum male reſpondit Aſpaſiæ Xenophontis uxor.* A half learned copier may have fancied it ſhould be Aſpaſia inſtead of Aſpaſiæ, and that it was the name of Xenophon's wife. Note, that Aſpaſia having, by her captious queſtions, reduced the wife to ſilence, applied herſelf immediately to the huſband, aſked him the ſame queſtions, and made him bluſh at the third, and reduced him to the ſame ſilence; and then ſhe made a very judicious diſcourſe to both of them (180). The learned Leopardus knew not that Quintilian, as we have him now, was the cauſe of Bruſonius's miſtake; he was contented to cenſure the modern author. ‘ Idem Bruſonius, *ſays* ‘ *he* (181), eodem capite: Aſpaſia, inquit, Xenophon- ‘ tis uxor quum eſſet (ut muliebre ingenium eſt) ‘ rerum alienarum appetens atque invida, interrogata, ‘ ſi vicina tua, *&c.* - - - *Bruſonius, in the ſame chap-* ‘ *ter, ſays, that Aſpaſia, the wife of Xenophon, envious,* ‘ *and covetous, (as it is the nature of women to be ſo)* ‘ *of other peoples goods, being aſked, if your neighbour,* ‘ &c.’ Here is a fault which Leopardus took no notice of. Bruſonius ſuppoſes, of his own authority, that Aſpaſia, Xenophon's wife, was a covetous and envious woman. Where did he find ſuch a thing? Is it lawful to forge things of this nature? To what purpoſe is his parentheſis? As for the reſt, having ſhewed my ſmall correction of Quintilian to a learned Humaniſt, he approved of it, and ſome days after, he ſhewed me his edition of *Quintilian Variorum*, whereby it appears that Turnebus had already corrected that paſſage.

Suidas ſays falſly, that Pericles had two ſons by Aſpaſia, *viz.* Xanthippus and Paralus, for he had them by his other wife.

Lloyd has robbed our Aſpaſia of a paſſage of Xenophon, which might have made her very glorious: he underſtands it of another Aſpaſia, wife of Cleobulus. But it is plain he is miſtaken, for, 1. The name of Xenophon's interlocutor is not Cleobulus, but Critobulus. 2. Socrates, who is the other interlocutor, does not ſpeak of Critobulus's wife; he ſpeaks of the Rhetorician and learned Aſpaſia; he ſays that ſhe will give Critobulus better precepts than he (Socrates) can give him. Συστήσω δὲ σοι ἐγὼ καὶ Ἀσπασίαν ἣ ἐπιστημονέστερον ἐμοῦ σοὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἐπιδείξει. *Ego tibi exempli cauſa Aſpaſiam conſtituam, quæ doctius hæc omnia quam ego tibi monſtrabit* (182).

Theſe words of a commentator upon Minutius Felix are not very exact: ‘ De Pythagora referunt Diogenes ‘ Laërtius lib. 8. & Lucianus in Gallo eum dixiſſe ‘ ſe primum fuiſſe Æthalidem Mercurii filium, inde ‘ Euphorbum Panthi filium, mox Aſpaſiam nobile Pe- ‘ riclis ſcortum, deinde Cratem Cynicum (183). - - - ‘ *Diogenes Laërtius, and Lucian relate that Py-* ‘ *thagoras ſaid, he had been firſt Æthalides the ſon of* ‘ *Mercury, and then Euphorbus the ſon of Panthus, after-* ‘ *wards Aſpaſia, a noble whore of Pericles, and laſtly, Crates the Cynic.*’ We have in thoſe words three removes of Pythagoras one after another: from the body of Æthalides he went into that of Euphorbus, and then into that of Aſpaſia, and laſtly into that of Crates. If the commentator was exact, that liſt would be found entire both in Diogenes Laërtius and Lucian; but there is only part of it in the one, and part of it in the other. This is no good way of quoting authors. This is the firſt miſtake of that author. The ſecond conſiſts in giving a wrong account of the narrative of Diogenes Laërtius, who ſays that Pythagoras boaſted to have been ſucceſſively Æthalides, Euphorbus, Hermotimus, Pyrrhus, and Pythagoras. 3. He does not give a better account of Lucian's narrative; for had he tranſcribed him well, he would have ſaid that the ſoul of Pythagoras was firſt in the body of Euphorbus; and then in that of Pythagoras; and then in that of Aſpaſia; and then in that of Crates; afterwards in that of a king, &c. and laſtly in that of a cock. IV. He ſhould not have quoted upon this ſubject, a man who does nothing but banter, and who takes an age poſterior to Pythagoras. He ſhould have quoted thoſe authors only, who relate what Pythagoras himſelf ſaid, ſpeaking of the ſhare he had in the tranſmigrations of the ſoul.

Moreri has not committed very many miſtakes. I find fault with him only for having ſaid, that Aſpaſia was *very learned in Philoſophy and Eloquence, but eſpecially in Poetry.* I do not blame Moreri for ſaying that ſhe underſtood Philoſophy, and the art of ſpeaking. I only ſay, that he was in the wrong to affirm, that Poetry was the ſcience that ſhe excelled moſt in. This is ſo falſe, that one may very well doubt, whether ſhe ever made any verſes. I think Athenæus is the only author who might be alledged for her underſtanding Poetry, but his teſtimony is very weak; for he only ſays, that there were ſome verſes aſcribed to Aſpaſia (184), which had been publiſhed by Herodicus. To ſpeak exactly of what ſhe excelled in, we muſt ſay that it was Rhetoric. Pericles was not aſhamed to recite the harangues which ſhe compoſed (185). She underſtood Politics better than Philoſophy, and ſeeing Pericles conſulted her about the art of governing, it ſhould not ſeem ſtrange, that ſome other great Politicians hould very much eſteem the counſels of that woman. I ſaid before, that the great Socrates learned that ſcience of her.

[*Q*] *The faults of Mr Moreri.*] I. I doubt whether the maſters, who taught Pericles Philoſophy, were *jealous* of the *univerſal knowledge he acquired* of it. The three authors quoted by Moreri (186) ſay no ſuch thing. I do not find that circumſtance in any ancient author: yet I dare not ſay that Moreri invented it, or that the modern author, from whom he might have it, was the inventer thereof; I only ſay, that his way of quoting authors, in a general indeterminate manner, hinders me from pointing out ſeveral falſities, and makes me ſpeak doubtfully. II. Seeing Plutarch ſays only that Pericles got a victory over the Sicyonians at Nemea (187), why does Moreri affirm, that this battle was fought *near the . . . river Nemea?* III. If it be a river, it is not conſiderable enough to be called a great river. The following miſtakes are to be found in the Supplement. IV. *Pericles did* not *fortify the Iſthmus of Corinth with a good wall.* Two things extremely different one from another have been confounded together. He cauſed to be built at Athens what went by the name of *the long wall* (188). It was rather the buſineſs of the Peloponneſians to fortify the Iſthmus of Corinth, than that of the Athenians.

(173) Plut. in Pericle.

(174) Cic. de Invent. *lib. i, fol. m.* 30, *A.*

(175) Quintil. *lib. v, cap. xi, pag. m.* 243.

(176) Voſſ. Inſt. Orat. *lib. iii, cap. v, pag. m.* 406.

(177) Quintiliani lapſus in duabus Aſpaſiis. *Ibid. in Indice rerum & verborum.*

(178) Falſus eſt Fabius, quique eum ſecutus eſt Bruſonius in Apophthegm. *Colomeſ. Not. ad Quintil. pag. m.* 224, *Opuſculor.*

(179) Here are all the titles of that author: *L. Domitius Bruſonius, Contorſinus, Lucanus.* He made a collection of apophthegms, intituled *Septem facetiarum libri.*

(180) *See* Cicero, ubi ſupra.

(181) Leopard. Emendat. *lib. xii, cap. xiii.*

(182) Xenoph. in Oeconom. *pag. m.* 482.

(183) Ouzelius, in Minut. Felic. *pag.* 325, *Edit.* 1672, *in* 8*vo.*

(184) Ἐν τοῖς φερομένοις ὡς αὐτῆς ἔπεσιν ἅπερ Ἡρόδικος ὁ Κρατήτιος παρέθετο. In carminibus ipſi attributis, & ab Herodico Cratetio publicatis. *Athen. lib. v, pag.* 219. *Gyraldus, de Poëtis Græcis, pag.* 170, *Edit.* 1696, ſays that Athenæus mentions Aſpaſia's verſes in ſome other places which he (Gyraldus) does not quote. I have not had time enough to verify it.

(185) Plato, in Menexeno, *pag. m.* 517.

(186) Plut. in his Life: *Diod. Sic. lib. xii. Thucyd. lib. ii, iii, & ſeq.*

(187) Ἐν δὲ Νεμέᾳ, apud Nemeam. *Plutarch. in Pericle, pag.* 163, *D.*

(188) Μακρὸν τεῖχος, longum murum. *Ibid. pag.* 160, *init.*

Pericles [*R*]. Which will give me occaſion to obſerve the unjuſt acts and diſorders which

V. Plutarch and Herodotus are not well quoted; the latter ſays nothing of the apophthegms or actions of Pericles; and the other mentions only part of the things related in the Supplement. The fine ſaying *Amicus uſque ad aras*, - - - *to be-friend one as far as religion gives leave*, being not in the life of Pericles, the book of Plutarch wherein it is mentioned, ſhould have been quoted (189). VI. The article of Pericles's ſon is very bad: any reader would think that he commanded in chief the Athenian fleet, which defeated that of Lacedæmon near the iſlands called Arginuſæ; for we are told, that *he did wonders in that expedition, and burnt the fleet of the enemies.* This author ſhould have expreſſed himſelf ſo, if he had meant a man who had the whole command. He ſaid juſt before, that *the Athenians choſe him to ſucceed Alcibiades:* Which will deceive more and more thoſe who are not ignorant that Alcibiades had been captain-general of the Athenians (190). The truth is, that ten generals were choſen in the room of Alcibiades, and that Pericles's ſon was one of the ten (191). Xenophon ſays ſo poſitively, and does not ſay that the Lacedæmonian fleet was burnt; he only ſays, that it was beaten, and went off, having loſt ſeventy ſhips (192). Note, That the commander on the day of the battle, was not Pericles, but Thraſybulus (193). If it be objected that the colleagues of Pericles are mentioned in the Supplement, for it ſays that *he was condemned with the other ſeven captains of the army, to loſe his head*; I anſwer that my cenſure is well grounded notwithſtanding. An author, who contradicts himſelf by uſing ſome expreſſions which deſtroy one another, gives an ill account of a fact, and confounds and deceives his reader. Here is another deceit; for a reader being undeceived by this laſt phraſe, as to Pericles his commanding in chief, will be apt to believe that there was but eight commanders on board that fleet. He will be therefore miſtaken, for there were ten: it is true, there was but eight of them condemned to loſe their lives. The author of the Supplement ought to have expreſſed himſelf thus, *he was condemned with ſeven others.* Xenophon obſerves that ſix only were put to death, and that the other two were abſent (194). He or Diodorus Siculus ſhould have been quoted in the Supplement, and not Plutarch, who mentioned only the ſon of Pericles by the by (195), and without telling the circumſtances of the cauſes of his death. They were ſo unjuſt, that a more enormous thing was perhaps never ſeen under the moſt deſpotic monarchy. The Athenians put to death ſix generals, who had lately obtained the moſt glorious victory, that Grecians ever obtained over Grecians, and who had ſignalized themſelves on many other occaſions; they were put to death, I ſay, becauſe they had not buried thoſe who died in the battle; no regard was had to the reaſon that juſtified them. What they alledged in their defence was not at all minded, *viz.* that thoſe whom they had intruſted with that care, met with a ſtorm, which hindered them from executing that commiſſion (196). Socrates, one of their judges, oppoſed vigorouſly that injuſtice; but his reaſons were not minded (197). Theſe brave men ſuffered death after ſuch a manner as rendered that iniquity moſt execrable. Diomedon ſpoke for all, and inſtead of imprecations and complaints, inſtead of ſetting forth their ſervices paid with ungratefulneſs, he was contented to wiſh, that their death might prove happy to their country, and to deſire the aſſembly to perform the vows which they had made in order to obtain the victory. Τὰ μὲν περὶ ἡμῶν κυρωθέντα συνενέγκαι τῇ πόλει· τὰς δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς νίκης εὐχὰς ἐπειδήπερ ἡ τύχη κεκώλυκεν ἡμᾶς ἀποδοῦναι, καλῶς ἔχον ὑμᾶς φροντίσαι, καὶ τῷ Διῒ τῷ σωτῆρι καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ ταῖς σεμναῖς θεαῖς ἀπόδοτε. τούτοις γὰρ εὐξάμενοι, τοὺς πολεμίους κατεναυμαχήσαμεν. *Quod in capita noſtra jam decretum eſt, id fauſtum ac felix civitati huic eveniat. At vota pro victoriâ Diis nuncupata, quia fortuna reddere nos prohibuit, vos accurare pium & honeſtum eſt. Jovi igitur ſervatori & Apollini & venerandis Deabus illa perſolvitote. Horum enim numine invocato hoſtes profligavimus* (198). The Hiſtorian who relates this, adds a reflexion upon the fury which moved the people to ſuch an injuſtice, the people, I ſay, incenſed by their Orators. Οὕτω δὲ ὁ δῆμος τότε παρεφρόνησε, καὶ παροξυνθεὶς ἀδίκως ὑπὲρ τῶν δημαγωγῶν, τὴν ὀργὴν ἀπέσκηψεν εἰς ἄνδρας οὐ τιμωρίας ἀλλὰ πολλῶν ἐπαίνων καὶ στεφάνων ἀξίους. Tam perditè tunc populus inſanivit, ut ab Oratoribus præter jus & fas exacerbatus, iram ſuam in viros, non modo nullâ pœnâ, ſed magnis inſuper laudibus & coronis dignos, exonerarit (199). - - - *The people were ſo exceſſively enraged, being incenſed by their Orators, contrary to all juſtice and equity, that they vented their fury upon men, who not only deſerved no puniſhment, but even merited the greateſt commendations and marks of honour.* But why ſhould this ſort of men go by ſuch a name? An Orator is defined, *an honeſt man who underſtands the art of ſpeaking, vir bonus dicendi peritus* (200). The name of Orator, or Preacher, ought not therefore to be given to a turbulent, factious, and wicked man, who uſes his eloquence and the ſtrength of his lungs, to move the people to violence. I have ſaid elſewhere (201), That Thomas Hobbes undertook the tranſlation of Thucydides, to put the Engliſh out of conceit with the republican ſpirit. It was well enough thought of; but it had been better ſtill, if he had written a book concerning the internal ſtate of Athens. The hiſtory we have of that people is only fit to impoſe upon us; we are charmed with the fair ſide of it; we are dazzled with the battles of Marathon and Salamis; with their land and ſea-forces, their conqueſts, the wealth of the inhabitants, the pomp of their public ſhews, and the magnificence of their public buildings. All thoſe things induce us to think, that to live under another form of government, is to be a ſlave. But if we had a Hiſtory which ſhould but touch upon thoſe things, and ſet forth at large the tumults of their aſſemblies, the factions which divided that city, the ſeditions wherewith it was agitated, the moſt illuſtrious ſubjects perſecuted, baniſhed (202), puniſhed with death at the will of a violent harangue-maker, we ſhould be convinced, that the Athenians who boaſted ſo much of their liberty, were in truth but ſlaves to a few factious perſons, whom they called Demagogues, and who made them turn ſometimes one way, ſometimes another, according as their paſſions changed: as the ſea drives the waves ſometimes one way, ſometimes another, according as it is toſſed with the winds (203). If you inquire into the hiſtory of Macedonia, which was a monarchy, it will not afford you ſo many examples of tyranny, as the hiſtory of the Athenians will. But this is too long a digreſſion. See the remark [*S*].

[*R*] The faults *of another French writer concerning Pericles.*] He did not put his name to his book, which was printed at Paris in two volumes in 12mo in the year 1669, and is intituled, *A general hiſtory of Greece.* He ſays, That Phidias was accuſed *of having in his hands a great deal of ſacred money, which was given him by Pericles* (204). . . . . That the Athenians *charged Pericles with that ſacrilege, and accuſed Anaxagoras the Philoſopher, his preceptor, of being an accomplice of it, and of having given him ſuch inſtructions* (205). This author has not well underſtood the Hiſtorian whom he tranſcribes; for we read in Diodorus Siculus, that Phidias was accuſed of having converted to his own uſe a great ſum of money, not without the knowledge of Pericles, who ordered him to make the ſtatue of Minerva. Whereupon the enemies of Pericles moved the people to impriſon Phidias, and to bring an action of ſacrilege againſt Pericles. They alſo accuſed Anaxagoras of impious doctrines, and involved Pericles in the ſame accuſation (206). It muſt be confeſſed that an Hiſtorian, who repreſents that fact as the modern author has repreſented it, does falſify, and conſiderably diſguiſe it. Some pages after he ſays, That Pericles having made the funeral oration which is *in the ſecond book of Thucydides . . . . was ſo much careſſed and courted by the Athenian ladies, that as he came down from the pulpit, they embraced him, kiſſed his hands, and crowned his head with flowers, as if he had returned victorious from the Olympic games* (207). This author confounds the times: the harangue of Pericles, mentioned by Thucydides, was pronounced in commendation of thoſe who had been killed in the beginning of the Peloponneſian war. But the Orator was not careſſed by the ladies at that time. If our modern author had carefully examined Plutarch whom he quotes, he might have known that Pericles received

(189) It is the treatiſe *de vitioſo Pudore, pag. m.* 531. See alſo Aulus Gellius, *lib. i, cap. iii.*

(190) See Plutarch in the Life of Alcibiades, *pag.* 210.

(191) *See* Xenophon, *lib. i,* de Geſtis Græcor. *pag. m.* 259. *See alſo* Diod. Sicul. *lib. xiii, cap. C.*

(192) Xenoph. ibid. *pag.* 262.

(193) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xiii, cap. xcvii.*

(194) Xenoph. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 265.

(195) Plut. in Vit. Periclis, *ſub fin. pag.* 172.

(196) *See* Xenoph. ibid. *pag.* 263.

(197) See the Life of Socrates, written by Mr Charpentier, *pag. m.* 168, *& ſeq.*

(198) Diod. Sic. *lib. xiii, cap. cii, pag. m.* 553. It is the 221ſt page of the Greek and Latin Edit. 1604, *in fol.*

(199) Ibid.

(200) *See* Quintil. *lib. xii, cap. i, pag. m.* 552.

(201) Above, in the text of the article HOBBES, at the beginning.

(202) Hos libros tum ſcripſiſſe dicitur (*Thucidydes*) quum à Rep. remotus, atque id quod optimo cuique Athenis accidere ſolitum eſt, in exilium pulſus eſſet. - - - *Thucydides is ſaid to have written thoſe books, when he was removed from the government and baniſhed, which commonly happened to the moſt illuſtrious perſons.* Cicero, de Oratore, *lib. ii, fol.* 73, *D.*

(203) Compare this with citation (75) of the article EDWARD IV.

(204) A General Hiſtory of Greece, *Tom. ii, pag.* 390.

(205) Ibid. *pag.* 391.

(206) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xii, cap. xxxix.*

(207) General Hiſt. of Greece, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 409.

which often prevailed under the republican ſtate of Athens [*S*].

Of all the actions of Pericles, his expedition to Samos, the motives whereof I have mentioned in one of my remarks (*e*), was miſrepreſented with the greateſt malignity (*f*). You will find it in Plutarch, but he has omitted an odious circumſtance, which he might have found in Alexis the Samian, in the ſecond book of the confines of Samos. That author obſerved that the whores who followed Pericles in that expedition, got ſo much money, that they built the temple of Venus, ſirnamed of the reeds, or of the marſhes in Samos [*T*]. Which was a reflexion upon that General, as if he had not well obſerved Military diſcipline.

thoſe careſſes after the funeral oration he made for thoſe who had loſt their lives in the Samian war (208). There was a ſpace of ten years between thoſe two harangues (209). Here is another miſtake of that author. Having related what happened in the two firſt campaigns of the Peloponneſian war, he ſays, that Pericles being diſpleaſed with the reproaches of the people, harangued the council of Athens, and repreſented ſeveral things, which made no great impreſſion upon them (210), ſince *that great man was fined* (211). *But*, (the Hiſtorian goes on) (212), *he was elected again general of the Athenian army, an honour he enjoyed not long, for he died two years and a half after.* He muſt then have lived till the fifth year of the Peloponneſian war; but Thucydides who knew it very well (213), ſays he died two years and a half after the beginning of that war. If that general Hiſtory of Greece was thus carefully examined, I believe we ſhould find it abounding in ſuch miſtakes.

[*S*] *The unjuſt acts and diſorders which often prevailed* among *the Athenians.*] See in the remark [*Q*] what I have ſaid upon this ſubject by way of digreſſion. I would add nothing to it, were it not that I know ſome perſons have been diſpleaſed with that digreſſion, and even affirmed that I am the only man who ever made a remark of that nature. I will ſhew them that they have not read much, and that the authorities which might be alledged againſt them, will not be more favourable to them than reaſon: Reaſon, I ſay; for can any one have a good opinion of a government, wherein the oppoſite factions of declaimers were a neceſſary evil. Ὁ μὲν οὖν Μελάνθιος εἴτε παίζων εἴτε σπουδάζων, ἔλεγε διασώζεσθαι τὴν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ῥητόρων διχοστασίας καὶ ταραχῆς. οὐ γὰρ ἀποκλίνειν ἅπαντας εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν τοῖχον, ἀλλὰ γίνεσθαι τινα τοῦ βλάπτοντος ἀνθολκὴν ἐν τῇ διαφορᾷ τῶν πολιτευομένων. Sanè Melanthius, ſive ſerio id, ſive joco, Athenienſium civitatem conſervatam fuiſſe dixit oratorum diſſidiis atque turbis. Ita enim non in unum univerſos parietem inclinaſſe, ſed eorum qui rempublicam tractabant in diſſidio quippiam fuiſſe quod repelleret à damnoſa parte urbem (214). - - - *Melanthius ſaid, whether in jeſt or earneſt, I cannot tell, that Athens was preſerved by the parties and factions of the declaimers. For they were not all inclined the ſame way, but the diviſions amongſt thoſe in the adminiſtration ſaved the city from deſtruction.* I deſire you to compare two paſſages of Ariſtotle together, that wherein he deſcribes the diſorders of Democracies, and another wherein he obſerves how the city of Athens came to a democratical government. You will find by conferring thoſe two paſſages one with another, that he muſt needs have looked upon the government, which was eſtabliſhed at Athens, after the victories obtained over the Perſians, as a perfect tyranny. He ſays, that after Solon intruſted ſome judges, elected by the people, with the ſupreme authority, the people were flattered as tyrants uſe to be; that Ephialtes and Pericles leſſened the authority of the Areopagus; that Pericles rendered magiſtracy mercenary, and that the other Demagogues following thoſe examples, introduced Democracy at laſt. He pretends that they acted not therein according to Solon's intentions; and that the pride of the inhabitants, after the glory they acquired in the war againſt the Perſians, and the ill qualities of the Demagogues, produced that effect (215). Thus he acknowledges that Democracy reigned in Athens, that is, according to the deſcription he made of that form of government in another place of the ſame book (216), a ſtate wherein all things, even the laws themſelves, depend upon the multitude made a tyrant, and governed by the flatteries of ſome declaimers. Boëtius brings in Philoſophy ſpeaking theſe words, which are not advantageous to the Athenians: ' Si cujus oriundus ſis ' patriæ reminiſceris, non uti Athenienſium quondam, ' multitudinis imperio regitur: ſed εἷς κοίρανός ἐστιν, ' εἷς βασιλεύς: qui frequentia civium non DEPULSIONE lætatur (217). - - - *Your native country is ' not like Athens, governed by the multitude: but it has ' one prince, one king, who rejoices in the great number ' of his ſubjects and not in their* BANISHMENT.' There is ſcarce any thing more ſatirical againſt the Athenians, than the verſes of Julius Cæſar Scaliger, wherewith a learned Profeſſor of Hiſtory, in the univerſity of an imperial city, was extraordinary well pleaſed. I obſerve this, that one may ſee that a Profeſſor who received his ſalary from a republic, did not think himſelf obliged to have any regard for the government of Athens. He is not contented to ſet down the invective of Scaliger, the Father, and to praiſe it; but he ſtrengthens it with examples, and with an apoſtrophe of Demoſthenes to Minerva, O goddeſs, ſaid that Orator, being ready to go into baniſhment, how come you to be ſo fond of three very troubleſome beaſts, the owl, the dragon, and the people? ' Cùm nulla cœna tam parca ſit, in qua non ' hilaritatis poculum circumeat; propinabo ejus loco ' lepidiſſimos hoſce verſus *Julii Scaligeri* de inſaniente ' *Athenienſium* vulgo:

Nulla eſt, puto Reſpublica nativè vera,
Commentitia, fictavè cogitatione,
Aut ſtultitiâ aut nequitiâ Atticâ priores.
Ita conſiliis flagitiiſque Demagogos
Tetris nugivoram excruciaſſe cerno plebem:
Fecem pelagi turbine turbulentiorem.
Juſtos opibus, patria & exuiſſe vita.

' Nihil ſolemnius hoc poſtremo; & exemplo eſt *Diomedon* apud *Valerium noſtrum*, qui *ad non meritum ' ſupplicium ductus nihil aliud locutus eſt, quam ut vota ' pro incolumitate exercitus ab ipſo nuncupata ſolverentur.* Fertur, cum *Demoſthenes* jam exulaturus urbe ' cederet, extenſis verſus arcem manibus exclamaſſe: ' *O Domina Polias* (ita Minervam cognominabant) ' *quid ita gaudes tribus moleſtiſſimis beſtiis, Noctua, Dracone & Populo* (218). - - - *As there is no entertainment, ' however ſcanty, without a chirping cup; I ſhall give ' in the room of it theſe pretty verſes of Julius Scaliger, ' concerning the mad people of Athens:*

The ſtrongeſt fancy cannot well conceive,
How any ſtate or nation ſhould ſurpaſs
Athens in folly, or in wicked deeds.
Factious leaders us'd ſo to ſet on flame,
By horrid counſels and ſland'ring moſt vile;
The giddy mob, more boiſterous than the ſea;
They plunder'd, baniſh'd and put to death the juſt.

' *Nothing can be more ſolemn than the laſt verſe: and* ' Diomedon *in our Valerius is a proof of the truth of ' it, who being brought to an undeſerved puniſhment ' made no complaint, only deſired that the vows he had ' made for the ſafety of the army might be performed. ' Demoſthenes being ready to go into exile, &c.*'

[*T*] *The whores . . . got ſo much money that they built the temple of Venus . . . . of the marſhes.*] We find this particular in Athenæus. Ἀλέξις δ' ὁ Σάμιος, ſays he, ἐν δευτέρῳ ὅρων Σαμιακῶν τὴν ἐν Σάμῳ Ἀφροδίτην, ἣν οἱ μὲν ἐν Καλάμοις καλοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐν Ελειατικαῖς φησὶν, ἑταῖραι ἱδρύσαντο αἱ συνακολουθήσαται Περικλεῖ, ὅτε ἐπολιόρκει τὴν Σάμον, ἐργασάμεναι ἱκανῶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας. *Alexis Samius libro ſecundo de Samiorum finibus, ſcribit, ædem Veneris in Samo, quam in arundinibus quidam vocant, alii in paluſtribus, meretrices Periclem ſecutas, cùm obſideret Samum, ædificaſſe, ingenti quæſtu proſtituta forma ditatas* (219). Let us wonder at the blindneſs of the human mind; here are ſome conſcientious proſtitutes,

---

(*e*) Above, citation (164).

(*f*) See Plutarch in the Life of Pericles, *pag.* 166, & *ſeq.*

(208) See the remark [*N*], citation (144).

(209) The war of Samos happened in the LXXXIVth Olympiad, and that of Peloponneſus in the LXXXVIIth.

(210) General Hiſtory of Greece, *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 413.

(211) Ibid. *pag.* 415.

(212) Ibid. *pag.* 416.

(213) Thucydides, *lib. ii*, *pag. m.* 118.

(214) Plut. de audiendis Poëtis, *pag.* 20, *C.*

(215) Ariſt. Politic. *lib. ii*, *cap. xii*, *pag. m.* 252.

(216) Ibid. *lib. iv*, *cap. iv*, *pag.* 278.

(217) Boët. de Conſol. Philoſ. *lib. i*, *pag. m.* 16. See the notes of Renatus Vallinus upon that place of Boëtius.

(218) Chriſtophorus Adamus Rupertus, Diſſert. in Val. Max. *lib. i*, *cap. i*, *pag.* 33, 34, *Edit. Noriberg* 1663. What he ſays of Demoſthenes is in Plutarch, in the Life of Demoſthenes, *pag.* 858, *B.*

(219) Athen. *lib. xiii*, *cap. iv*, *pag.* 572.

rutes, who conſecrate to religion a conſiderable part of the money they have got by their infamous debaucheries. They cannot be better compared than with thoſe Financiers, who being grown rich with the blood and ſweat of the people, build a magnificent chapel, and adorn the great altar of a cathedral with their offerings.

Si l'on vient à chercher pour quel ſecret myſtere
Alidor à ſes frais bâtit un monaſtere.
Alidor, dit un fourbe, il eſt de mes amis,
Je l'ai conu laquais, avant qu'il fût Commis:
C'eſt un homme d'honneur, de pieté profonde,
Et qui veut rendre à Dieu ce qu'il a pris au monde (220).

(220) Boileau, Sat. IX, ver. 159.

Theſe ſoft-mouth'd ſatiriſts would thus declaim
At M - - - - r, whoſe charity records his name;
The knight had known how needy wretches fare,
His parents were, it ſeems, the pariſh care;
A ſaint profound . . . to make his reck'ning ev'n,
The wealth he ſtole from man, he gave to Heav'n.

Some Heathens have been more diſcerning men than the Samians. Do you think the emperor Alexander would have permitted that the courtezans of Rome ſhould ſpend part of their gain in the building of a temple? He would not ſo much as permit that the tribute paid by public whores and pimps, ſhould be brought into his treaſury; he ordered that it ſhould ſerve for the repairing of the amphitheatre, &c. *Leonum vectigal & meretricum, & exoletorum in ſacrum ærarium inferri vetuit, ſed ſumptibus publicis ad inſtaurationem theatri, circi, amphitheatri, & ſtadii, deputavit* (221).

(221) Lamprid. in Alexandro Severo, *cap. xxiv*, *pag. m.* 917, 918, *Tom. i*, Hiſt. Auguſt. Scriptor.

PERIERS (BONAVANTURE DES) born at Bar upon the river Aube in Burgundy, was Valet de Chambre to Margaret de Valois, queen of Navarre, and ſiſter of Francis I (*a*). He wrote ſeveral pieces of French Poetry, which were printed after his death at Lyons, by John de Tournes, in the year 1544, in 8vo; tranſlated (*b*) the *Andria* of Terence (*c*), and wrote ſeveral tales in proſe, intituled *New Recreations* (*d*) [*A*]. I never ſaw his *Cymbalum mundi*: which is ſaid to be a moſt impious book [*B*]. He came to an

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 36.

(*b*) Into French verſe.

(*c*) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 131.

(*d*) La Croix du Maine, ibid.

[*A*] *He wrote ſeveral tales in proſe, intituled,* New Recreations.] La Croix du Maine ſays, that *the two firſt authors of that work are James Peletier of Mans, a Phyſician, and a Philoſopher, and Nicolas Deniſot, ſirnamed the count de Alſenois* (1). Stephen Paſquier ſpeaks otherwiſe of it in a letter which he writ to Tarbourot, Sieur des Accords, the author of a book, intituled, *Les Bigarrures*. 'I find, ſays he (2), that in this ſecond edition, you aſcribe the recreations of Bonaventure du Perier to James Pelletier. Give me leave to tell you that I think you are not well informed. I was one of Pelletier's greateſt friends, and he imparted his moſt ſecret thoughts to me. I know what books he told me he had compoſed. He never mentioned this to me. He was a true Poet, and very jealous of his name, and I can aſſure you he would not have concealed it from me, the book being ſo valuable for it's ſubject, that it does not deſerve to be diſowned by it's author, no more than the *Facetiæ* of Poggius Florentinus. Du Perier is the author of them, and of another book, intituled, *Cymbalum Mundi*, which is a Lucianiſm, that deſerves to be burnt, together with the author, if he were alive.' What is certain, is, that Des Periers is not the author of all the tales which are in his New Recreations. He cannot be the author of that which is the firſt in the edition mentioned by Voëtius. It is that of Rouen in 1606, for Raphaël du Petit-Val. It is ſaid in the firſt tale, that this book comes out very ſeaſonably, to afford the ladies ſome diverſion during the civil wars, which cauſed ſo many public misfortunes. Des Periers could not ſay that, for he died a great while before the firſt civil wars of France. Let us ſee what that famous Divine thought of that book. 'Eum (*librum*) carptim percurrens, offendi nihil aliud eſſe quam *colloquia prava*; hoc eſt, narrationes & diſſertationes, meris morologiis, vanitatibus, obſcœnitatibus, nominis divini abuſibus refertas, quo quidem nemini niſi Epicureis (quibus voluptas ſummum bonum) placere poteſt. Et tamen librum cum auctore in cœlum tollit, quiſquis præfationem præfixit . . . ſuffecerit ex primâ novella quæ inſtar præambuli eſt, annotaſſe, quod dicat ſe libellum illum opportunè tunc edere, ut in mediis bellis civilibus & publicis calamitatibus habeant unde ſe oblectent imprimis matronæ & virgines, quas ad lectionem nominatim ſcurrilium quæ ibi occurrunt, contentioſe invitat. Summam autem & maximè convenientem huic vitæ noſtræ doctrinam eſſe. *Bene vivere & lætari*; quod poſtea interpretatur ridere (3). --- *I ran over that book ſlightly, and found it contained nothing but wicked dialogues; that is, narratives and diſſertations ſtuffed with buffoonry, vanity, obſcenity, and the profanation of* GOD'*s name, ſo that none can be pleaſed with it but Epicureans, whoſe chief good is pleaſure. And yet the writer of the preface extols the book and the author to Heaven . . . let it ſuffice to obſerve from the firſt ſtory, which ſerves by way of introduction, that the book is ſaid to come out very ſeaſonably at that time, to afford diverſion during the civil wars and public calamities to the ladies and young women, who are earneſtly invited to read it, and eſpecially the ſcurrilous things contained in it. That the chief and moſt proper rule of life, is* to be merry and rejoice, or laugh.' Des Periers is not the only author who publiſhed ſuch tales. The nine Matinées of the lord de Cholieres are of the ſame ſtamp, *merry and recreative*, and very full of obſcenities. I think the firſt edition is that of the year 1585, Paris, for John Richer, in 8vo, with the king's licence.

(1) Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 36. See alſo *pag.* 193.

(2) Paſquier, Letters, *book viii*, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 493, *Edit. Pariſ.* 1619, *in* 8*vo*.

(3) Giſb. Voët. Diſp. Theol. *Vol. i*, *pag.* 200.

[*B*] *His* Cymbalum Mundi: *it is ſaid to be a moſt impious book.*] He wrote it *firſt in Latin*, and then he tranſlated it *into French under the name of Thomas du Clevier, printed at Paris in the year* 1537. La Croix du Maine, who expreſſes himſelf thus (4), ſays that it is a *deteſtable book, and full of impieties*. We have already ſeen that Stephen Paſquier had the ſame opinion of it. I have found a kind of analyſis of the *Cymbalum Mundi* in the French Bibliotheque of du Verdier Vauprivas, and becauſe moſt of my readers cannot conveniently have recourſe to that Bibliotheque, I thought they would be glad to find an abſtract of it here. 'Thomas du Clevier tranſlated out of Latin into French, a treatiſe, intituled, *Cymbalum Mundi*, containing four poetical dialogues very antique, merry, and pleaſant, printed at Lyons, in 16mo, by Benoit Bonnyn, 1538. I have found nothing in that book that deſerves a greater cenſure than Ovid's Metamorphoſis, the Dialogues of Lucian, and the books of wanton ſubjects and fabulous fictions. In the firſt dialogue the author introduces Mercury, Bryphanes, and Curtalius, who being in an inn at Athens, at the ſign of the White Coal, whether Mercury happened to come, being deſcended from Heaven by Jupiter's order, who ſent him to get a book bound; thoſe two rogues, whilſt he went to divert himſelf, take this book out of a packet he had left upon the bed, ſteal it, and put another in the room of it, containing all the amorous tricks and follies of Jupiter, as when he turned himſelf into a bull to raviſh Europa; when he put on the ſhape of a ſwan to go to Leda; when he took the form of Amphytrion, &c. In the ſecond dialogue he brings in ſome Philoſophers, looking for pieces of the Philoſophers ſtone in the ſand of the theatre, where, as they were formerly diſputing about it, Mercury ſhewed it to them, and thoſe fools importuned him ſo much with their entreaties, that not knowing to whom he ſhould give it entire, he reduced it to powder, and threw it into the ſand, that every one might have ſomething of it, bidding them look well for it, and that if they could find a little piece of it, they would do wonders, tranſmute metals, break the bars of doors that are open, cure people that are not ſick, and obtain any thing from the gods that was lawful, and would neceſſarily happen, as rain after fair weather, flowers in the ſpring, duſt and heat in the ſummer, fruits in autumn, cold and dirt in winter: whereby the author laughs at the vain labours of Alchymiſts (5). . . . In the third dialogue

(4) Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 36, 37.

(5) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 1177.

an unhappy end, for *he killed himſelf with a ſword, which he thruſt into his belly, being grown mad* (e). Several authors ſpeak of his deſpair [C]. Mr Allard ſays, that the name of our Bonaventure was Perier, and that he was born in the *Ambrunois*, and that *he wrote an apology in verſe for Marot abſent, againſt Sagon in the year* 1580 (f). It is certain that he made that apology, but not in that year: for he died before the year 1544.

dialogue he reſumes the diſcourſe of the firſt dialogue, about the book ſtolen from the author, of all thefts, intituled, Quæ in hoc libro continentur: Chronica rerum memorabilum quas Jupiter geſſit antequam eſſet ipſe. Fatorum præſcriptum: Sive, eorum quæ futura ſunt, certæ diſpoſitiones. Catalogus Heroum immortalium, qui cum Jove vitam victuri ſunt ſempiternam. - - - *The contents of this book are; Chronicles of the memorable things which Jupiter performed before he exiſted. The Decree of Fate, or certain Diſpoſitions of thoſe things that are to happen. A catalogue of immortal Heroes, who are to live eternally with Jupiter.* Wherein the author ridicules firſt the idolatrous Heathens, and their falſe god Jupiter, meaning that he never exiſted; or that if he did ever exiſt, he was a man, and never did any wonderful actions, nor ſuch as have been fabulouſly written of him. By the ſecond head of the title of the book, he laughs at deſtiny, and fatal neceſſity, and tacitly at judicial Aſtrology. And by the third, he laughs at thoſe who look upon themſelves as gods, by reaſon of their grandeur. Afterwards he brings in Mercury diſcourſing of the ſeveral commiſſions which the gods and goddeſſes have intruſted him with; and the ſame Mercury, by virtue of ſome words which he mutters, makes a horſe, called Phlegon, ſpeak, and reaſon with his groom. In the fourth and laſt dialogue, two dogs . . . diſcourſe together of ſeveral pleaſant things (6).’ It does not appear that du Verdier Vau-Privas found any thing dangerous in that book, but only the ridiculouſneſs of the Pagan religion, *&c.* Moſt other readers are of opinion, that Bonaventure des Periers wrote againſt the true religion, under pretence of ridiculing Paganiſm. It was the opinion of Father Merſenne. That man, ſays he, brings in the fables of Jupiter and Mercury, *&c.* and deſigns by ſuch means to open the way to redicule the Catholic faith, and reject the greateſt truths that we teach and believe concerning GOD. ‘*Per quas* (fabulas) *fidem Catholicam irridere, & ea quæ de Deo veriſſima eſſe dicimus & credimus, rejicere velle videtur* (7). He ſays that Bonaventure des Periers was only the tranſlator of the *Cymbalum Mundi*, and that he was a moſt impious knave, *impiiſſimum nebulonem*, and looked upon as an Atheiſt by a great many people. Voëtius, who had not ſeen that book, does not ſay that the author was an Atheiſt, nay, he acquits him of Atheiſm, ſuppoſing the *Cymbalum Mundi* to be only a ſatire againſt Purgatory, and many other inventions of Chriſtians. He adds, that a man may inſinuate Atheiſm, or Epicureiſm, in a trifling and fabulous book, and make uſe of that artifice to come off, if he is proſecuted for it. He adds alſo, that in a ſtage-play, intituled *Iphigenia*, one may laugh at Hecate, who had three ſeveral ſhapes, and ridicule the gods who will have human victims, and run down the prieſts who adviſe to offer ſuch ſacrifices. A man may deſign to ridicule the Trinity, and the Paſſion of the Son of GOD, and to open a door to Deiſm and Turkiſh Socinianiſm; but he may alſo maintain, if there is any neceſſity for it, that they who underſtand it ſo, are calumniators, and that he only deſigned to turn the fables of Paganiſm into ridicule. I ſhall ſet down the words of Voëtius, they intimate that ſome ſuch thing had happened upon the ſtage in a town of Holland. *Quibus reponi poteſt: nihil vetare, quin Lucianum omneſque prophanos & impios poetas atque antiquos literiones imitando quis ſubdolè Atheiſmum, Epicureiſmum, Gentiliſmum hominum animis inſtillet; quamvis ſtylum ludicris ambiguitatibus, & jocis, item mimeſibus, proſopopæis,* &c. *ita moderetur, ut ſi quis hæc ad examen revocet, colore aliquo eludere & elabi poſſit. Quomodo meminimus à Sceptico-Libertinis & Epicureis nebulonibus alicubi in Belgio omnem pietatem & fidem Chriſtianam dicteriis quibuſque apud homines traductam eſſe: exempli gratia, Tragœdia ſcribitur, & in theatro exhibetur tit.* Iphigenia: *in quâ Ethnica illa, de Hecate triformi, de diis ſanguine humano, idque ex conſilio ſacerdotum, placandis perſtringuntur. Si quis pius metuat (ut quidem autores illos novit) eos myſterium Trinitatis, & redemptionis noſtræ per ſanguinem Chriſti velle deridendum proponere & ſic Epicureiſmo, Deiſmo, aut Turco-Sociniſmi viam munire: quomodo hoc evincet; cum promptum ſemper ſit effugium; rideri tantum fabulas Gentilium* (8).

The reflexions of that profeſſor of Divinity are very judicious: there are two ways of ridiculing ſuperſtition, the one very good, the other very bad. The Fathers of the church, who have expoſed the ridiculouſneſs of falſe deities, are very much to be praiſed, for they propoſed thereby to open the eyes of the Pagans, and to confirm the Faithful. They knew that by inſpiring the Chriſtians with contempt and averſion for Paganiſm, they ſtrengthened their faith, and gave them ſome arms to reſiſt perſecution. But Lucian, who did ſo much ridicule the falſe gods of the Heathens, and made a moſt lively and agreeable deſcription of the follies and impoſtures of the religion of the Grecians, deſerves notwithſtanding to be deteſted, ſince inſtead of doing it out of a good motive, he had no other deſign than to ſatisfy his ſcoffing ſatirical humour, and was no leſs indifferent or averſe to truth than to lies. Thoſe two models, that of the Fathers of the church, and that of Lucian, may ſerve to make one judge rightly of ſeveral ſatires, which have been made in theſe latter times, againſt abuſes in matters of religion. Rabelais ought to be looked upon as a copier of Lucian, and I think the ſame ought to be ſaid of *Bonaventure des Periers*; for I find that the Proteſtants (9) are not leſs angry with the *Cymbalum Mundi* than the Catholics. Only we muſt obſerve that a great many abuſes have crept into Chriſtianity, which are ſo like thoſe of the Heathens, that one cannot write againſt the Pagans, without affording many devout men a pretence to ſay, that the Chriſtian religion is wounded through the ſides of the Pagan religion. It is the duty of thoſe, who give occaſion for ſuch reproaches, to examine ſeriouſly what was their intention, and whether they did actually deſign, that their deſcriptions of the faults of the Heathens ſhould be looked upon as a picture of modern abuſes. Some diſſenting Proteſtants in England, are accuſed of having made a lively deſcription of the corruption of the antient Romiſh clergy, only to draw a picture which might caſt an odium upon the preſent ſtate of the Epiſcopalians. We find in Milton’s life (10), that his Hiſtory of England, as far as William the Conqueror, was printed in the year 1670, but not ſuch as he wrote it, for the licenſer ſtruck out ſeveral paſſages, which contained a deſcription of the ſuperſtition, luxury, and craft of the eccleſiaſtics, who lived under the Saxon kings. The reviſors of the manuſcript fancied, that it was a reflexion upon the clergy under the reign of Charles II. The author of that life adds (11), that Sir Robert Howard having heard, that he was accuſed of having whipped, in a certain book, the clergy of England, upon the back of the Pagan and Popiſh prieſts, anſwered maliciouſly and ſubtilly, *what had they to do there* (12)?

[C] *Several authors ſpeak of his deſpair.*] I ſhall only ſet down the words of Henry Stephens (13). ‘I will not forget Bonaventure des Periers, the author of a deteſtable book, intituled *Cymbalum Mundi*, who, notwithſtanding the care that was taken to obſerve him, (becauſe it was known that he deſigned to make away with himſelf) was found run through with his ſword, upon which he threw himſelf, having faſtened the pommel againſt the ground, ſo that the point run through his ſtomach to his back.’ See alſo John Chaſſanæus, chap. 24, of the firſt book of the memorable Hiſtories of the great and wonderful Judgments and Puniſhments of GOD (14.)

(e) Ibid. *pag.* 37.

(f) Allard. Bibl. of Dauphiné, *pag.* 172.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 1178.

(7) Merſen. in Geneſim, *pag.* 669, apud Voët. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 199.

(8) Voët. ubi ſupra.

(9) La Croix du Maine, whom I have already quoted, and Henry Stephens, whoſe words you will ſee in the next remark.

(10) Toland, the Life of Milton, *pag.* 138.

(11) Ibid.

(12) The reader will perhaps remember the comedy intituled, *The Cheats of Scapin*, where, when the father is told of his ſon’s ranſom, he aſks ſo often, *what the devil had he to do in that ſhip?*

(13) Henry Stephens, Apology for Herodotus, *cap. xviii, ſub fin. pag. m.* 231. See alſo *cap. xxvi, pag.* 309.

(14) *Pag.* 170, *Genev. Edit.* 1586, *in* 8*vo.*

PERIMEDE, a famous witch, whom Theocritus equals to Medea and Circe (*a*), and who according to the ſcholiaſt on that Poet was the ſame with Agamede mentioned in the Iliad. This Agamede was the eldeſt daughter of Augeas king of Elis (*b*), and wife of Mulius, a brave man, killed by Neſtor (*c*), who was then very young (*d*). I make this remark in order to ſhew the time wherein Perimede lived, if ſhe was not different from Agamede. It is thought, Propertius ſpoke of Perimede [*A*].

(*a*) Theocr. Idyll. II, ver. 16.

(*b*) Homer. Iliad. lib. XI, ver. 739.

(*c*) Id. ib. ver. 737, & ſeq.

(*d*) Id. ib. ver. 683, 718.

[*A*] *It is thought, Propertius ſpoke of Perimede.*] The manuſcripts vary much in the paſſage relating to that; and therefore ſeveral editions give it in this manner:

Non hic herba valet, non hic nocturna Citeis
Non per Medeæ gramina cocta manus (1).

All the charms of Citeis here will fail,
Herbs by Medea boil'd will not avail.

Muretus, having conſidered that *Citeis* ſignifies Medea, did not believe that ſhe was ſpoken of in the following verſe; and therefore he ſays it ought to be read thus:

Non Perimedeæ gramina cocta manu,

And Perimede's herbs will not avail,

and he obſerves that Beroaldus found this reading in ſome old manuſcripts (2). Grævius has followed it in his edition of Propertius. Brockhuſius has alſo followed it, and approved the reaſoning of Muretus. I ſhall obſerve by the way, that inſtead of *cocta, boiled*, he would put *lecta, gathered*, and confirms his conjecture in a very learned manner (3).

(1) Propert. lib. II, Eleg. IV.

(2) Muret. Notis in Propertium, Eleg. IV, lib. ii.

(3) See his excellent edition of Propertius.

PEROT (NICOLAS) in Latin *Perottus*, born at Saſſoferrato in Italy, was one of the moſt learned men of the XVth century. He was of a family which had been formerly illuſtrious in his country [*A*], but it fell into an obſcure condition, as it may be gathered from the ſmall eſtate he had, and from his firſt profeſſion, which was to teach the Latin tongue (*a*). He acquitted himſelf very well in it, and got a great number of ſcholars. He put the rudiments of the Latin tongue into a better order, and a ſhorter method, and publiſhed them to the great advantage of his ſcholars. Afterwards he went to Rome, where he ſtudied the Greek tongue with great application. To let the public know what progreſs he had made in it, he undertook to tranſlate Polybius into Latin. That tranſlation was very much eſteemed [*B*]. He engaged in another work,

(*a*) Huic quum deeſſent opes, corporis vires municipali frugalitate, atque duritia conſtitutæ, perpetuis lucubrationum vigiliis minimè defuerunt. Juvenis in ludo pueros honeſtos docuit, &c. *Jovius, Elog. cap. xviii, pag. m.* 45.

[*A*] *He was of a family, which had been formerly illuſtrious in that country.*] The inſcription of a monument ſet up for him in the year 1624, ſays, that the town of Saſſoferrato was delivered from tyranny by his anceſtors, and was beholden to them for it's liberty and happineſs (1). James Philip Tomaſini explains that fact. He ſays (2), that whilſt Innocent VI kept his ſee at Avignon, the towns of Italy, which did belong to St Peter's patrimony, were expoſed to a thouſand miſeries. Seditions were frequent there, every place had it's tyrant. Innocent VI, to remedy thoſe diſorders, gave the government of that province to cardinal Giles Albornoti, a man well ſkilled in military affairs, and very well qualified for ſuch an employment. He made war againſt all thoſe petty tyrants, who oppreſſed the country, and was very well ſerved therein by ANDREW PEROT, and amongſt other things in the conſtruction of the fortreſſes, which are to be ſeen ſtill at Saſſoferrato, whereby that place was ſo well ſecured, that they who had tyrannized over it for a long time, loſt the hopes of getting it again. That Perot was the father of JUSTINA PEROT, a young lady, illuſtrious for her wit, and application to learning. Petrarch had a great eſteem for her, and anſwered a ſonnet which ſhe addreſſed to him: it is to be found in the *Petrarcha redivivus* of Tomaſini (3). See alſo the *Meſcolanze* of Menagius (4). Note, that Tomaſini calls that lady JUSTINA DE LEVIS PEROTTA, and ſays (5), that Andrew de Levis Perot, her father, was of the houſe of Levis, one of the moſt noble and illuſtrious houſes of France, and that this extraction is proved not only by old records, but alſo by ſome letters, which the lords of that houſe wrote from France to Rome, to Torquato Perot, chamberlain to Pope Urban VIII. They acknowledged in thoſe letters, that he was iſſued from the ſame ſtock with them: *quibus* (litteris) *illum unius ſecum ejuſdemque radicis & familiæ ingenuè agnoſcunt* (6). If this be true, it muſt be confeſſed that our archbiſhop of Siponto was of a good extraction, for the houſe of Levi is one of the nobleſt in France. I have read in a book (7), printed at Paris in 1657, that it *comes from Levi*, one *of the twelve tribes of Iſrael, out of which the Virgin Mary iſſued, whom Meſſieurs de Vantadour* (8) *call their couſin.*

[*B*] *His tranſlation of Polybius was very much eſteemed.*] He made it by order of Pope Nicolas V. It was looked upon as a better tranſlation than thoſe of Thucydides, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, and Appian, and ſome envious people fanſied it was the work of an ancient author, and that Perot ſtole it. *Non defuére tamen ex æmulis, qui ejus auctoris traductionem antiquiſſimam fuiſſè, furtoque ſurreptam exiſtimarint, quod Thucydidem, Diodorum, Plutarchum, & Appianum, clariſſima ingeniorum certamine converſos, unus Polybius egregia fide Latinus, æquabili, & prædulci Romani ſermonis puritate prorſus antecedat* (9). It may be, that our Perot exceeded the tranſlators who appeared ſome time before, and that he made a maſter-piece, conſidering that he lived when the ſtudy of learning was but lately revived; but abſolutely ſpeaking, and even if he be compared with the tranſlators of the XVIth century, his tranſlation cannot be accounted a tolerable one, and conſequently Mr Varillas could not give a better proof of his ignorance of the Belles Lettres, than by paraphraſing, as he has done, the abovementioned words of Paul Jovius. ‘ His firſt eſſay was the tranſlation of Polybius, wherein he did ſo admirably ſucceed, that it was queſtioned whether he had made it, and whether he had not found an ancient tranſlation of Polybius, which he printed under his own name (10). . . . . He that made his epitaph, was in the right to uſe no other words but this, *Here lies the tranſlator of Polybius*; for if Peroty be the author of it, none of thoſe who have tranſlated Greek . . . . . . into Latin, can be compared with, or ſo much as come near, him (11). What a ſhame had it been for Varillas, if any body had ſhewed him what Caſaubon ſays of Perot's tranſlation? He does not deny, but he was learned in Latin and Greek according to the ability of the time wherein he lived (12), and that he may be looked upon as a man that has but one eye, in the kingdom of blindmen; but he accuſes him of having very ill performed the commiſſion of Nicolas V. *Jam ille eruditus Italus, quo ipſe* (Nicolaus Quintus) *uſus eſt interprete, partim ſæculi vitio, partim propria culpa, provinciam ſibi demandatam, ita geſſit male, facile ut appareat, non ob ſingularem aliquam eruditionem, in Græcis præſertim literis, Polybium interpretari fuiſſe juſſum; ſed quia nemo erat qui amplius ſciret, velut coclitem inter cæcos captum, qui in vacuam ſtationem pro tempore ſubſtitueretur* (13). It would be an abſurd thing to ſuſpect that Caſaubon ſaid ſo out of envy; for what advantage could it be to him to leſſen the glory of a man, who had been dead above a hundred years? Beſides, he owns that ſuch places of Polybius as Perot had well underſtood, were ſo excellently tranſlated, that they looked like an original. ‘ Nicolaus Perottus, *ſays he* (14), Literarum Latinarum, quas perdiu docuit, exquiſitè, ut illa erant tempora fuit peritus, & cumprimis curioſus. . . . Erat prætereà in hoc viro non vulgaris induſtria in *Græcis* ita ‘ vertendis

(1) *See* Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. *Tom. vii, pag.* 1169.

(2) Jac. Phil. Tomaſinus, in Petrarcha redivivo, *pag.* 111.

(3) *Pag.* 111, 112.

(4) Pag. 279, & ſeq. of the Rotterdam Edit. 1692.

(5) Tomaſin. ibid. *pag.* 110.

(6) Ibid.

(7) *Intituled*, The Preſent State of France. *See the* 439*th page of that book.*

(8) It is a branch of the houſe of Levi.

(9) Jovius, Elog. *cap. xviii, pag. m.* 45, 46.

(10) Varillas, The Secret Hiſt. of Florence, *pag.* 170.

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 171.

(12) Partem illius (*Polybii*) librorum aliquam nactus (*Nicolaus Quintus*) ejus in Latinum ſermonem transferendæ, viro Græcæ & Romanæ linguæ ut erat captus ejus ætatis non ignaro, munus delegavit. *Caſaub. Epiſt. Dedicat. Polybii.*

(13) Caſaubon. ibid.

(14) Idem, in Præfat. ad Lectorem.

work, in which he exhauſted his learning. It was a commentary upon Martial [C], but finding himſelf inveſted with a conſiderable employment, and a very eminent Eccleſiaſtical dignity, he did not think fit to publiſh that commentary. He thought it was beneath him, and not ſuitable to the decorum of an archbiſhop's dignity, by reaſon of the obſcenities which are in Martial (*b*). That commentary was publiſhed after his death. The author had a great ſhare in the benefits and eſteem of cardinal Beſſarion; but it is ſaid

‘ vertendis (quæ quidem intelligeret) ut nullum perſæpè *Græci Idiomatis* in *Latina* ejus Verſione veſtigium appareret: quam interdum eſſe opus αὐτοφυὲς dicas, non alieni *Interpretationem*. Quòd ſi par fides reſponderet, inter excellentiſſimos *Interpretes* poterat ſine dubio *Perottus* recenſeri. Nemo enim illis temporibus *Italorum* erat, qui amplius *Græce* ſciret, quàm hic *Interpres*: pauci qui tantum, quantum ille. - - - - *Nicholas Perot was (conſidering the age he lived in) very ſkillful in, and a great lover of, the Latin tongue, which he had taught for a long time. . . . . . He had likewiſe ſuch an uncommon talent in tranſlating Greek (where he underſtood it) that very often you could not diſcern any veſtige of the Greek idiom in his Latin verſion: and ſometimes you would take it for an original, and not a tranſlation. If his fidelity had been proportionable, he might undoubtedly have been reckoned among the moſt excellent tranſlators. For there was no Italian at that time, who underſtood Greek better than he, and very few came up to him.*' One may therefore believe him as to what he cenſures in the work of that tranſlator. He pretends that it is a copy ſo unlike the original, that Polybius is altogether disfigured. ‘ *Nos* vero affirmamus, *Perottum* à fidelis *Interpretis* laude tantum abeſſe, quantum qui longiſſimè. Nullo enim pacto ferendus aut excuſandus eſt hic *Interpres*, homo *Bellicarum rerum* & *totius Tacticæ* adeo rudis & imperitus, ut qui in cæteris partibus *Hiſtoriæ Polybianæ* multa neſciret, in deſcriptionibus *Præliorum* omnia ignoraret, omnia peccaret; atque eâdem operâ tanto *Scriptori*, quod erat ferè præcipuum ejus decus, adimeret. Omninò prælium nullum, facinus militare nullum, à *Polybio* fuerat paulo diligentiùs narratum, in quo graviſſima & momenti maximi peccata ab hoc *Interprete* non ſint admiſſa (15). - - - - *But I affirm he does not deſerve in the leaſt the commendation of a faithful interpreter. In many places of Polybius's hiſtory he ſhews his want of knowledge; but his ignorance of military affairs is ſo great, that in the deſcriptions of battles, every thing he ſays is a blunder, which deſtroys the merit of his ſtile, that was almoſt his chief glory. There is not one battle, not one military exploit, accurately related by Polybius, in which he has not committed the moſt grievous miſtakes.*' He blames him in another place, for having inſerted in his tranſlation, many words of Livy in the room of Polybius's thoughts, and for having ſcarce tranſlated any one period without being guilty of ſome faults (16). ‘ Non neſcimus fuiſſe olim, & nunc quoque eſſe quibus Perotti verſio, propter aliquam Latinitatis ſpeciem, mire arrideat. Sed quo iſta Latinitas ſi deeſt fides, abeſt veritas? Nihil dicam de locis infinitis quos propterea aut tranſiit, aut malè interpretatus eſt Perottus, quia vel codices erant corrupti, vel occurrebat dictio aut phraſis aliqua minus vulgaris: cujuſmodi multas ſanè habet Polybius. Verum ubi nihil erat ejuſmodi, quis ferat longè adeo ab auctoris ſui verbis diſcedentem? aut quis neget flagitium eſſe inſigne, tot locis verba, periodos, atque adeo pericopas integras è Livio deſumpſiſſe, & lectoribus Græcæ linguæ imperitis obtruſiſſe pro Polybianis? ubi fides? ubi pudor? in tanta igitur errorum omnis generis copia, ſingula velle perſequi, quod petiverunt à nobis nonnulli, ejus ſit hominis, qui vetus dictum velit tollere in lente unguentum (17). - - - *I know there have been and ſtill are, ſome, who are, mightily delighted with Perot's verſion, becauſe it ſeems to be a fine Latin ſtile. But what ſignifies the Latin ſtile, if there be no fidelity, no truth in it? I ſhall ſay nothing of a multitude of places, which he has ſkipped over or miſinterpreted, either becauſe the copies were corrupted, or becauſe there occurred ſome uncommon phraſe or diction: in which Polybius indeed abounds. But when the caſe was otherwiſe, who can bear that he ſhould depart ſo far from the words of his author? Is it not an egregious crime, to have taken ſo frequently words, periods, and whole paragraphs, from Livy, and obtruded them on his readers, that are ignorant of the Greek, for thoſe of Polybius? where is the honeſty? where is the modeſty of this? Since therefore he abounds in faults of all ſorts, to go about to ſhew them particularly, as ſome have deſired of me, would be an endleſs piece of work.*' What would Varillas have ſaid, if his friends had ſhewed him how contrary his opinion was to that of ſo good a judge, and ſo excellent a critic as Caſaubon? If the very firſt time he made bold to paſs ſuch raſh judgments, he had been corrected by ſuch means, it had been a good ſervice done to him. Note, that Perot did not tranſlate all that we have of Polybius. The firſt five books of his hiſtory were only found out at that time, which Perot tranſlated. The abridgment of the twelve following books, and the *Excerpa Legationum* were found out ſince. Perot has alſo publiſhed a tranſlation of Hippocrates's oath.

[*C*] *A commentary upon martial* (18).] He intituled it *Cornucopiæ*. I have already told you (19), why he did not publiſh it. His nephew PYRRHUS PEROT gave it to the public after the death of the author. He ſaid, in his preface, that he had added very few things to it, except that he had explained more at large ſome obſcene places, which his uncle had but ſlightly touched upon. *Nihil fere de meo addidi, præterquam quod loca quædam, quæ ille, quoniam impuritate quadam atque obſcænitate verborum caſtis ac pudicis auribus execrabilia viderentur, curſim breviterque tetigerit, ipſe latius expoſui* (20). From whence it appears, that Mr du Cange was miſtaken, when he ſaid, that Nicolas Perot, biſhop of Siponto, publiſhed in the year 1470, a great volume of Commentaries upon the Latin tongue, *cui Cornucopiæ nomen indidit cum duobus ſingularum dictionum indicibus, Græco altero, altero Latino, qui juſti Dictionarii vicem præſtant* (21). We muſt remember that our Perot lived till the year 1480. Geſner obſerves that the *Cornucopiæ* was printed at Venice by Aldus, and at Baſil by Curio and Valderus more than once in folio. He forgets the main thing, he does not ſet down the year of the firſt edition. I cannot tell it neither, I can only ſay that the Straſburg edition 1506, was better than the preceding or thoſe that went before; and that of Venice 1513, was more correct than that of Straſburg (22). Geſner adds, that this is a very learned work: ‘ Plena Philologiæ & eruditionis variæ, ex optimis quibuſque veterum denſiſſima teſtimonia citans, multiplici cum ad rerum, tum ad vocabulorum cognitionem uſu (23). - - - - - - *Full of various ſorts of learning, abounding with quotations from the beſt of the Ancients, and extremly uſeful for acquiring the knowledge both of things and words.*' Perot is accuſed of having tranſcribed what others had ſaid, without naming them. Martinius upbraids him with it, having convicted him of having ſtollen a paſſage of Laurentius Valla, and he makes this obſervation in his preface: ‘ Ambroſius Calepinus. . . . judicio uſus barbara à Latinis ſegregavit, & auctoritate veterum verba ſua firmavit: rectius, quàm Perottus qui ſuum copiæ cornu diligenter quidem, at latenter, contexuit, ut eorum nomina à quibus ſua ſumpſerat, ferè ſubticeret (24). - - - - *Ambroſius Calepinus. . . . judiciouſly diſtinguiſhed the barbarous words from the Latin, and confirmed his opinion by the authority of the Ancients; in this he acted more ſincerely than Perot, who indeed compoſed his* Cornucopiæ *diligently, but ſecretly, concealing the names of the authors from whom he had his materials.*' Several people will wonder to find in this paſſage the ſincerity of Calepinus preferred to that of Nicolas Perot; for great complaints have been made of Calepinus, as being an impudent plagiary of Nicholas Perot. ‘ (25) To ſay ſomething more particular about the conduct of Calepinus, I ſhall obſerve, that being not a literate man, he had no thoughts of ſetting up for an author, till he ſaw the *Cornucopiæ* of Nicolas Perot; and having heard that Perot ſeemed to be reſolved to diſown and give over that fruit of his ſecular and prophane ſtudies, and to renounce the quality of father, as if that of archbiſhop would be diſhonoured by it, he thought he could take advantage of his diſlike, and reſolved to inſert that work in his Dictionary, as if he had ‘ been

(*b*) Taken from Paul Jovius, ubi ſupra.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Multa quidem in ſingulis fere periodis Perottus perperam interpretatur. *Idem. in Comment. ad Polyb. pag.* 112.

(17) Ibid. *pag.* 60.

(18) It is only a commentary upon Martial's *Spectacula*, and the firſt book of his epigrams.

(19) In the text.

(20) Pyrrhus Perottus, in Præfat. Cornucop. apud Geſnerum Bibl. *fol.* 523.

(21) Du Cange, Præf. Gloſſarii Latin. *pag.* 41.

(22) *See* Borrichius, in Analectis ad Cogitata de Lingua Latina, in Appendice, *pag.* 42.

(23) Geſner. ubi ſupra.

(24) Matthias Martinius, in Lexico Philolog. *voce* ſarcina.

(25) Baillet, the Judgment of Learned Men, *n.* 630, of the Latin Gram. *See alſo num.* 303, of the Crit. Gram. & Borrichius, *ubi ſupra, citation* (22).

ſaid that he hindered him from being made Pope by a very great imprudence [*D*]. The emperor Frederic III gave him the poetical crown in the city of Bologna (*c*), and honoured him with the title of his counſellor. That dignity was leſs real than the government of Perugia and Ombria, which was given to Perot (*d*), and the archbiſhopric of Siponto (*e*) to which he was promoted the ſeventeenth of October 1458 (*f*). He built a houſe of pleaſure near Saſſoferrato, and called it *Fugicura* [*E*], meaning that it was a place of retirement, where he recreated himſelf after the fatigue of affairs, and where he lived without any cares. He died in that place (*g*) in the year 1480. He fell out with Domitius Calderinus [*F*]. Nature gave him a quality that goes a great way;

(*c*) Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. *Tom. vii, pag.* 1168.

(*d*) Jovius, ibid.

(*e*) The modern name of that archbiſhopric is Manfredonia; but they ſay always in Latin *Archiepiſcopus Sipontinus.*

(*f*) Jovius, ubi ſupra.

(*g*) Jovius, ubi ſupra.

‘ been the author of it. Floridus Sabinus † ſays that he did it moſt wretchedly, becauſe he mixed the *Cornucopiæ* with a world of filthy ſtuff, which he gathered together out of the worſt authors of the barbarous and ignorant ages. He adds, that it contributed on the one ſide to celebrate the merit of Perot, and to make people look for his original book, and on the other ſide to ſhew the impertinence of Calepinus, and the impurity of his Dictionary. This is alſo the opinion of the anonymous author of the apology for the Latin Poets ⸸, of the German author of the *Bibliographia curioſa* ‡, and of Leonardo Nicodemo in his additions to Toppi *.’

[*D*] *He hindered Cardinal Beſſarion from being made a Pope by a very great imprudence.*] Varillas relates that adventure thus: ‘ That cardinal, *ſays he* (26), would have been made a Pope, after the death of Paul II, had it not been for the imprudence of Nicolas Perroty . . . . who ſerved him as a conclaviſt. One evening, as Beſſarion was at his ſtudy according to his cuſtom, without much caring for the intrigues of his colleagues; three cardinals, heads of ſo many factions in the conclave, who agreed at laſt upon his election, went to his cell, and deſired to ſpeak with him. Perroty fancied, that they came only to beg his patron's vote, and becauſe he knew him well enough, to be perſuaded that the ſollicitations of thoſe cardinals would be to no purpoſe, he thought there was no need of interrupting Beſſarion's ſtudies. He therefore obſtinately refuſed to introduce them, and to acquaint his patron that they wanted to ſpeak with him; and what is moſt ſtrange is, that the more Perroty was careſſed, intreated, conjured, and threatened, the more he reſolved to keep the door ſhut, becauſe he confirmed himſelf ſo much the more in his chimerical ſuppoſition, that they were ſo earneſt to come in, only to beg the ſingle vote they wanted for the cardinal upon whom they were agreed. The conteſt laſted ſo long, that the three cardinals being weary of it, ſaid amongſt themſelves, that it was not proper to raiſe to the holy ſee a man, who not only would not be beholden to them for his election, but alſo would make them depend upon the caprice of his domeſtics, whenever they wanted to ſpeak with him. Then they took ſome other meaſures out of ſpite and indignation: and becauſe cardinal Riairo flattered their fancy moſt in that inſtant, they made him Pope, tho' they had agreed before not to give their votes to any monk, and tho' Riairo had been a Franciſcan. They thought that the trouble cardinal Beſſarion would be in, for having loſt the papacy by the fault of his conclaviſt, would afford them ſome pleaſure, and therefore they acquainted him with what had paſſed. But Beſſarion changed neither his countenance nor behaviour towards them, and was contented to tell Perotty that he had hindred him from making him a cardinal.’ There are few paſſages in Varillas, whereby we may better know the liberty he took to join his fancies and conjectures to the hiſtories he found in other authors. All that long narrative is only a paraphraſe of theſe Latin words of Paul Jovius. ‘ Paulo morte ſublato, in comitiis fatilis caſus tantæ ſpei Fortunam avertit. Ferunt enim tres ſummæ auctoritatis Cardinales, quum eo decreto, ut Pontificem ſalutarent, abditum in cella Conclavis adiſſent, nec admitterentur à Nicolao Perotto janitore, quòd tum vir ineptus lucubranti parcendum diceret, uſque adeò ſtomachatos, ut ſeſe indignanter avertentes reſponderent, Ergo nec prenſanti, nec roganti quidem, ſumma dignitas erit inculcanda: ut quum è cœlo ſuffragia expectet, ſuperbis demum ac ſtolidis janitoribus pareamus? ſtatimque ſuffragia Xyſto detuliſſe, quo repentè renunciato, adoratoque Beſſarion dixiſſe fertur: Hæc tua, Nicolae, intempeſtiva ſedulitas, & tiaram mihi, & tibi galerum eripuit (27). - - - - *Paul being dead, a fatal accident at the election deprived him of the papal dignity. For it is ſaid, that three cardinals of the greateſt authority, having determined to make him Pope, went to him when he was ſhut up in his cell, but were not admitted by Nicholas Perot, the Porter, who like a fool told them that they ſhould not interrupt his ſtudies, which they reſenting, and turning away with indignation ſaid, what, ſhall we urge one to accept the ſupreme dignity, who neither courts nor deſires it; that when he expects ſuffrages from Heaven, we may be ſubject to haughty and fooliſh Porters? and forthwith gave their votes for Xyſtus, who being quickly declared Pope, and adored, Beſſarion is reported to have ſaid: O Nicholas, your unſeaſonable officiouſneſs has deprived me of a mitre and you of a cardinal's cap.*’ I have ſet down that Latin narration, that by comparing it with that of a French author, one may ſee the circumſtances he has added to the text, which was his original. He has forged them, as he thought fit; which is an intolerable thing. The latter Hiſtorians ought not to adorn a fact; they muſt publiſh it ſuch as they find it. Note, by the by, that if that French writer had read all the manuſcripts he quotes, which is very much doubted of, yet one might very well believe that he ſays a thouſand things of his own invention; for ſince he was ſo bold as to flouriſh on Paul Jovius, who is a printed author, much more did he think he might be allowed to romance on the manuſcript relations which he has only quoted in a very general way. Gyraldus aſcribes Beſſarion's ill luck to another cauſe (28), but he does alſo mention what is ſaid of Perot the conclaviſt, and he is much ſhorter than Paul Jovius about that incident. Menagius ſuppoſes that Perot committed that fault in the conclave wherein Paul II, was elected (29). I think he is leſs to be credited as to this circumſtance of the time, than the two Italian authors whom I have alledged (30).

[*E*] *He built an houſe of pleaſure . . . . and called it* Fugicura.] Moreri did not at all underſtand this, and has ſo much falſified it, that there is neither rhime nor reaſon in it. Yet nothing can be clearer than theſe words of Paul Jovius: ‘ Exceſſit è vita ſenex apud Sentinum in villa viridariis & fontibus peramœna, quam à pingui ocio Fugicuram appellavit. (31). - - - *He died an old man, at a country-ſeat near Saſſoferrato, a very delightful place for it's fountains and groves, which from the great eaſe and pleaſure he enjoyed there he called* Fugicura.’ Moreri has Figurica inſtead of Fugicura, in the very verſes of Myrteus, which he quotes, and which run upon the alluſion to the avoiding of cares.

[*F*] *He fell out with Domitius Calderinus.*] I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Alexander ab Alexandro, which contains a thing that Paul Jovius has not mentioned, and which he ſhould have mentioned, *viz.* that Nicolas Perot read public lectures to the youth of Rome. He and Calderinus explained ſome paſſages of Martial at the ſame time; and were more earneſt in contradicting one another, than in explaining that Poet; which occaſioned a world of injurious and empty words, and, after all, the ſenſe of Martial was leſs underſtood than if they had been ſilent. ‘ Nicolaus Perottus Sipontinus præſul, homo fuit accurato ingenio, & lectione multa exercitus: eum Domitius Calderinus, vir, ut in ea tempeſtate, doctus, & æmulatione doctrinæ, & morum diſſimilitudine oſum habebat, jurgiiſque & conviciis apud ſuos ſectatores plerunque inceſſebat, ſæpiuſque apud ſtudioſos in invidiam illum crimenque vocabat: & ut ſunt fere ingenia, in explicandis auctoribus ſi quid in controverſiam veniret, uterque potius, quo pacto diverſus ab altero diſſentiret, quam quid veræ lectionis eſſet, rimabatur. Cum autem in ſcholis Romæ eodem

‘ tempore

† *Franc. Florid. Sab. Apol. lib. i, pag.* 111.

⸸ *Ap. Obert. Giffan. pag.* 505, *item ap. G. M. Konig. Biblioth. V. & N. pag.* 153.

‡ *Bibliogr. cur. Philologic. Hiſt. pag.* 28.

* *In additionib. ad Biblioth. Neapolit. Nic. Topp. pag.* 184.

(26) Varillas, The Secret Hiſt. of Florence, *pag.* 174, 175.

(27) Jovius, in Elog. *cap. xxiv, pag.* 57, 58.

(28) Gyrald. de Poët. ſuor. tempor. *Dialog. i, pag. m.* 551.

(29) Menagiana Meſcolanze, *pag.* 280.

(30) Paul. Jovius, & Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus.

(31) Jovius, Elog. *cap. xviii, pag.* 46.

way; for when he heard of any thing that was unknown to him, he applied himſelf altogether to it (*b*), and laid aſide all other buſineſs, and left off ſleeping, the better to mind it. TORQUATO PEROT, who was of the ſame family, and chamberlain to Pope Urban VIII, and biſhop of Ameria, cauſed a monument to be erected for him in the great church of Saſſoferrato, in the year 1624 (*i*), with a fine inſcription (*k*), whereby it appears amongſt other things, that the Popes Eugenius IV, Nicolas V, Calixtus III, and Pius II, had a great kindneſs for him, eſpecially becauſe he applied himſelf very much to re-unite the Greek church during the council of Ferrara. The ſame Torquato deſigned to put out a new edition of Nicolas Perot's works (*l*), conſiſting of tranſlations, letters, harangues, commentaries upon Statius, Martial, &c. He deſigned alſo to publiſh the elogies of the illuſtrious men of Saſſoferrato, which he had compoſed. He is the author of ſome Italian verſes, printed with thoſe of Antony Brunus (*m*).

(*b*) Volaterr. *lib. xxi, pag. m.* 776.

(*i*) Jovius, ibid.

(*k*) *It is to be found entire in* Ughelli, Ital. Sacr. *Tom. vii, pag.* 1168.

(*l*) Allatius, in Apibus Urbanis.

(*m*) Ibid.

‘tempore Martialis apophoreta publice lectitarent, cujus hoc diſtichon fuit:

In precio ſcopas teſtatur palma fuiſſe,
Ocia ſed ſcopis nunc analecta dabunt.

‘Ita iſtos verſus uterque interpretatus eſt (32), ut poſt multa deblatterata verba, vix aliquem ſenſum illorum ex dictis elicere queas, cum modo mendum in verſu poſtremo fuiſſe alter aſſeveret, & pro ocia, precium poni oportere, modo aſarota, non ab à privativa, ſed intenſiva dicta eſſe affirmet: alter ita pleraque nugalia jurgiis & maledictis plena effundat, ut equidem ſingula enarrare & referre pigeat (33). - - - *Nicholas Perot, archbiſhop of Siponto, was a man of a fine genius, and much reading: Domitius Calderinus, a learned man, conſidering the time he lived in, had an averſion to him, which proceeded from an emulation in learning and unlikeneſs of manners; he frequently railed at and abuſed him amongſt his followers, and procured him the hatred and ill-will of his ſcholars: and as it commonly happens, if there was any point of controverſy in explaining authors, they both ſtudied rather to oppoſe each other, than to find out what might be the true reading. As Martial's Apophoreta were then publickly read by them in the ſchools of Rome, one diſtich of which was this:*

In precio ſcopas, &c.

‘*they both interpreted thoſe verſes in ſuch a manner, that after a deal of prating, you could hardly find any ſenſe in what they ſaid: one of them ſometimes alledged there was an error in the laſt line, and that* precium *inſtead of* ocia *ought to be put, and ſometimes affirmed that* aſarota *was derived, not from à privative, but intenſive: the other vented abundance of impertinent and abuſive language, ſo that it would be tedious to relate every particular.*' Here is another paſſage whereby it appears, that Perot examined and criticized in his letters, the notes of Calderinus upon Martial's epigrams, and that Calderinus was accuſed of being Perot's plagiary. ‘Domitii Calderini in Martialem commentarios notans, quamvis ſuppreſſo nomine, & furta ex ſcriptis patrui ſui, ſubdit: Recognoſci autem furta facillime poterant ex errorum multitudine, cujus commentarii ejus undique ſcatent, quorum bonam partem patruus meus duob. epiſtolarum, Romanarum ſcilicet ac Peruſinarum, præclaris voluminibus oſtendit (34). - - - *Taking notice of the commentaries of Domitius Calderinus on Martial, without mentioning his name, and of his pilfering from his uncle's writings, he ſaid: But his thefts might eaſily be known from the multitude of errors which his commentaries are ſtuffed with; my uncle ſhewed a good part of them in his two excellent volumes of Roman and Peruſian letters.*' Angelus Sabinus having a quarrel with Calderinus about learning, was aſſiſted by Perot. The latter had the name of Fidentinus given him in the writings of Calderinus, and the other that of Brotheus. See Gyraldus in the firſt dialogue *de poëtis ſuorum temporum* (35).

(32) *Tiraquellus makes this note upon it:* Perottus in Cornucopia ſecus interpretatur, quam hic accuſatur. - - - *Perot in his Cornucopiæ interprets them otherwiſe than it is here pretended.*

(33) Alexander ab Alexandro, Genial. Dier. *lib. iv, cap. xxi, pag.* 1157, *Edit. Lugd. Bat.* 1673.

(34) Geſner. ubi ſupra.

(35) *Pag.* 532, *Oper. Gyraldi. Lugd. Bat.* 1696.

PERROT (FRANCIS) author of an Italian book, which Bellarmin refuted. See the remark [*A*] of the following article, towards the end.

PERROT (NICOLAS) Sieur d'Ablancourt, one of the great wits of his age, was born at Châlons upon Marne (*a*), the fifth of April 1606 (*b*). He was of a family very much diſtinguiſhed among thoſe of the Long Robe [*A*], and he was educated with a particular care. He *was ſent to the college of Sedan to ſtudy there* (*c*), and he made ſuch a progreſs in his ſtudies, that *being thirteen years of age, he had gone through a courſe of claſſic learning* [*B*]. *Then his father ſent for him home, and gave him a learned man, not only to run over all his ſtudies, but alſo to give him a tincture of Philoſophy. Thoſe exerciſes laſted about three years, and then he was carried to Paris, where he ſtudied the Civil-Law, for five or ſix months. Being eighteen years of age, he was made an advocate in the parliament, and frequented the bar* (*d*). He ſoon took a diſguſt to it, and plainly ſhewed his repugnancy for the law. His uncle *Cyprian Perrot, counſellor of the Great Chamber* (*e*), was diſpleaſed

(*a*) And not at *Vitry le Françoiſe*, as it is ſaid in the *Menagiana, pag.* 324, of the firſt Dutch Edit.

(*b*) The Life of Mr d'Ablancourt, in the ſecond Tome of Mr Patru's works, pag. 334. of the Dutch Edit. 1692.

(*c*) Ib. p. 335.

(*d*) Ib. p. 339.

(*e*) Ib. p. 336.

[*A*] *He was of a family very much diſtinguiſhed amongſt thoſe of the Long Robe.*] PAUL PERROT de la Salle, his father, *famous for his works in verſe and proſe*, and who *had a hand in the compoſition of the Catholicon*, was grandſon of ÆMILIUS PERROT, counſellor in the parliament, and ſon of NICOLAS PERROT, counſellor of the Grand Chamber. *He ſtudied at Oxford, where he embraced the Proteſtant religion, and returning into France,* he retired to Chaalons, *where part of the parliament of Paris was then:* CYPRIAN PERROT, *his eldeſt brother, was a counſellor in that parliament.* He married at Chaalons, Anne des Forges, a noble lady, by whom he had our Nicolas Perrot, Sieur d'Ablancourt, and two daughters, the eldeſt whereof was mother of Mr Fremont d'Ablancourt (1) of whom I ſhall ſpeak below (2). CYPRIAN PERROT, uncle of him who is the ſubject of this article, was father of JOHN PERROT, Preſident of the Inqueſts, who left a ſon, CYPRIAN PERROT, who was maſter of the Requeſts. The Perrots of Geneva, the good Perrotto of Fra Paolo, my lord Perrot, who was for ſome time in queen Elizabeth's favour, *the Perrots of the Malmaiſon, one whereof was provoſt of the merchants, and the beautiful Perrot of the princeſs of Conti, are all iſſued from the ſame ſtock.* Chriſtophorus Thuanus firſt preſident of the parliament of Paris married one Perrot. The chancellor Boucherat was grand-ſon of another Perrot, *not to mention many other alliances in the Long Robe* (3). This is what I have taken out of a manuſcript letter. The life of Mr d'Ablancourt, written by Mr Patru, may ſerve as a printed proof. It begins thus: ‘The family of the Perrots is ancient in the parliament, and related to the moſt illuſtrious perſons of the Long Robe (4).'

Thuanus (5) reckons amongſt thoſe who were killed in the maſſacre of Paris, DENYS PERROT, moſt worthy ſon of ÆMILIUS PERROT, counſellor in

(1) Taken from a letter which Mr Fremont d'Ablancourt wrote to me the 14th of April 1693.

(2) In the remark [*D*].

(3) Taken from the ſame letter.

(4) Patru's works, Tom. ii, pag. 334, of the Dutch Edit. 1692.

(5) Thuan. *lib. lii, pag. m.* 1077.

diſpleaſed with it, but he eaſed his grief by forſaking the Proteſtant religion, in which he was born. He abjured it at twenty years of age; yet he would not follow the intentions of his uncle, who deſigned *to make him a churchman, hoping that he would prove a great preacher in time* (*f*). *He ſpent five or ſix years in ſuch diverſions as are ſuitable to thoſe of his age* (*g*), yet without neglecting *learning altogether* (*h*). *It was then that he wrote the preface to the book intituled* L'honneſte femme, *to pleaſe his friend Father du Boſc.* That preface, *one of the maſter-pieces of our tongue*, was ſcarce publiſhed, *when being about five or ſix and twenty years of age he thought fit to return to the religion he had left* [*C*], *the impreſſions whereof were never quite blotted out of his mind* (*i*). 'To do nothing raſhly, he 'betook himſelf firſt to the ſtudy of Philoſophy, and then to the ſtudy of Divinity, and 'had for his maſter Mr Stuart, a Scotchman and a Lutheran, but a very learned 'man. He laboured with ſo much eagerneſs and ardour, that he ſpent twelve and 'fifteen hours every day in his ſtudies, without acquainting any body with his deſign, 'and he did ſo very near three years. . . . . . He ſet out. . . . . . from Paris to go 'into Champagne, where he made his ſecond abjuration in the temple of a village called 'Helme near Vitry, and almoſt at the ſame time he went into Holland, to let the 'rumour of his new change drop. He was near a year at Leyden, where he learned 'the Hebrew tongue, and got acquainted with Salmaſius. From Holland he went over 'into England (*k*).' He returned to Paris, and after he had been five or ſix weeks in Mr Patru's houſe, he *took lodgings near the Luxembourg, and ſent for two of his nephews to live with him* (*l*) [*D*]. 'He lived a very pleaſant life, and though he ſpent moſt of his 'leiſure hours in reading, yet he ſaw the world, he converſed with the ladies, and the 'moſt eminent men of Paris for learning. He went almoſt every day to Meſſieurs 'Dupuy, to that famous place whither all curious and learned men reſorted (*m*). . . . 'In September 1637, he was admitted into the French academy with a general ap'plauſe. He undertook almoſt at the ſame time the tranſlation of Tacitus. . . . . . 'But whilſt he was about that laborious tranſlation, he was forced to leave Paris, and 'to go into his province, to take care of his eſtate, which was not conſiderable, and 'which the war leſſened every day. He therefore left off houſe-keeping, and retired with 'his ſiſter to his country ſeat called Ablancourt, where he reſided tell he died. When 'he firſt retired into the country, he came pretty often to Paris, where he paſſed all the 'winter. . . . . But at laſt he quite left Paris, and never went thither but to get his 'works printed (*n*). . . . . He had been troubled with the gravel all his lifetime: nay, 'there was a time that he could neither ride on horſeback, nor in a coach, and ſtood in 'need of a ſtick to walk. But he fell a digging his garden to uſe ſome exerciſe, whereby 'his pain was much abated, and he recovered his ſtrength in ſome meaſure. So that he

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) Ibid.

(*h*) Ibid. *pag.* 337.

(*i*) Ibid.

(*k*) Ibid. *pag.* 338.

(*l*) Ibid. *pag.* 339.

(*m*) Ibid.

(*n*) Ibid. *pag.* 340.

in the parliament of Paris, and as illuſtrious for his probity as for his learning. I have ſaid elſewhere (6), that I do not believe this Æmilius Perrot to be a different perſon from him, who makes a very great figure in Bunel's letters.

The good Perrotto of Fra Paolo, mentioned in the manuſcript letter, is without doubt the ſame FRANCIS PERROT mentioned in the eighty-ſecond book of Thuanus's hiſtory (7), as the author of a piece which contained a refutation of Pope Sixtus's bull againſt the king of Navarre. That piece was intituled *Aviſo piacevole dato alla bella Italia*. '(8) That 'book (which was refuted by Bellarmin) is a cenſure 'of the court of Rome; the ſtyle whereof is ſo fine, 'that the Italians themſelves admired it. The author 'is a Frenchman, named Perrot, who, as Thuanus 'ſays in his hiſtory upon the year 1585, accompanied 'in his youth Gabriel Aramont, ambaſſador of his 'majeſty to Solyman. Afterwards, being come into 'Italy, he got ſome conſiderable acquaintances there. 'He knew, amongſt other great men, Father Paul, a 'Divine of the republic of Venice, to whom he vowed 'ſo great an affection, that he continued it to him 'till he died. The Italians on their part had a par'ticular eſteem for him, ſtiling him commonly a true 'Iſraelite, by reaſon of his candor and meekneſs. 'We have alſo an Italian tranſlation by the ſame Per'rot, of the truth of the Chriſtian religion, written 'by Mr du Pleſſis-Mornay, and printed at Samur in 'the year 1612. Amongſt our French authors, Lewis 'des Maſures in his Latin Poems, Hubert Languet in 'his letters to Sir Philip Sidney, and Mr de Liques in 'the life of Mr du Pleſſis (9), ſpeak honourably of 'him.'

[*B*] *Being thirteen years of age, he had gone thro' a courſe of claſſic learning.*] I would make no obſervation upon this, were it not that I muſt take notice of a fault very common among the makers of elogies. They love to exceed one another, and by this means they ſpoil the truth. Richelet (10) not thinking it to be ſo admirable a thing that d'Ablancourt ſhould have made an end of his claſſic ſtudies at thirteen years of age, adds Philoſophy to the claſſic ſtudies. We may rectify that miſtake, ſeeing we have the life of that illuſtrious man written by Mr Patru: but if we had no other author but Richelet, we ſhould believe what he ſays, and mention it as a kind of prodigy; for there were ſix claſſes in the college of Sedan, the promotions of the ſcholars were made but once a year, and the courſe of Philoſophy laſted two years at leaſt.

[*C*] *Being about five or ſix and twenty years of age, he thought fit to return to the religion he had left.*] The continuator of Moreri, who took the article Ablancourt from Mr Patru ſtumbled in this place. He did not perceive that Mr Patru reckons three years between the beginning of d'Ablancourt's deſign, and the execution thereof: He ſays that d'Ablancourt left the Catholic Church being twenty-five years of age, and went into Holland, and was near a year at Leyden, and got acquainted with Salmaſius. His firſt miſtake was the occaſion of another; for he ſuppoſes that d'Ablancourt left Leyden before he was quite twenty-ſix years old, that is, before the fifth of April 1632. But Salmaſius was not then at Leyden, he came thither only towards the end of the ſame year (11). It is almoſt impoſſible to miſplace a fact, without committing ſome other anachroniſms one after another.

[*D*] *And he ſent for two of his nephews to live with him.*] They were his eldeſt ſiſter's ſons, and their name was Fremont. 'Never any children had a bet'ter education. The ſecond is dead; but Mr Fre'mont d'Ablancourt, who was the eldeſt of the two, 'has ſhewed that they did not cultivate a barren ſoil. 'He is the author of the dialogue of the letters of 'the alphabet, and of the ſupplement to the true 'hiſtory, which are to be found at the end of his 'uncle's Lucian, and were ſo well received by the 'public. One of the great princes of Europe deſired 'to have him to be his ſon's governor; and the im'portant employments which he has ſo well diſcharg'ed, are ſufficient proofs of his capacity and parts (12).

(6) Above, the remark [*A*], of the article FERRET.

(7) *Pag. m.* 33, *ad ann.* 1585.

(8) Colomiés, Bibliotheque Choiſie, *pag.* 20, 21.

(9) Pag. 13, where he is called *lord of Mezieres Pariſian.*

(10) Richelet, The Lives of the French authors, *pag.* 34, *of the Dutch Edit.* 1699.

(11) Anton. Clement. in Vita Salmaſ. *pag.* 42.

(12) Patru's works, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 339.

‘ could bear all ſorts of carriages, and even lay aſide his ſtick, but he retook it ſoon ‘ after. . . . . . In the year 1664, in the beginning of October, he was ſo violently ‘ tormented with the gravel, that it was expected every moment he would die of it. ‘ But at the end of three or four days his pain began to abate (*o*).’ It returned upon him ſoon after, *and laſted till he died. He bore his long and violent pains with great conſtancy* [*E*]. *He was attended all the time of his ſickneſs by the miniſter of Vitry, and by Mr du Boſc, a famous miniſter of Caen, who was then baniſhed to Châlons. At laſt he died in the arms of his ſiſter and his nephew d'Ablancourt, the twenty-ſeventh of November, being eight and fifty years, eight* (*p*) *months and twelve days old* (*q*). The catalogue of his works, moſt of which are tranſlations, may be ſeen in Moreri. The reaſon, why he choſe rather to be a tranſlator than an author, deſerves to be mentioned [*F*], as alſo the reaſon why he that princes ſhould underſtand Latin [*G*]. He never was married; *he was not of a very amorous complexion, and had a blunt way with him which did not very well ſuit with love* (*r*). ‘ He uſed to ſleep, to eat, and to work, indifferently at ‘ any hour of the day or of the night. But after he had been about two hours at work, ‘ he refreſhed himſelf either by walking, or by reading a pleaſant book, and after half ‘ an hour's relaxation he returned to his work. He wrote a very ill hand, ſo that being ‘ in his declining age, he could not very often read it himſelf. He drank but little ‘ wine at his uſual meals, but he had a ſtrong head, and bore it well, ſo that he never ‘ was injured by it (*s*). . . . . . He was the ſon of a man who made in his life-time an ‘ hundred thouſand verſes; yet he could never make two verſes together (*t*).’ His converſation

(*o*) Ibid.

(*p*) It ſhould be ſeven.

(*q*) Ibid. *pag.* 342.

(*r*) Ibid. *pag.* 349.

(*s*) Ibid. *p.* 347.

(*t*) Ibid.

Mr Patru might have added to it the eſteem which Marſhal de Turenne had for Mr Fremont d'Ablancourt. That Marſhal procured him to be ſent as envoy of France to the court of Portugal in the year 1663 (13), and to be reſident of France in the city of Straſburg in the year 1675. That reſident returned into France after the death of his patron, and lived retired, reading good books, and enjoying the company of ingenious men, till the laſt blow of the perſecutors obliged him to look for liberty of conſcience in foreign countries. He made ſome ſtay at Groningen, and then he came to the Hague, where he ſettled, and was very much eſteemed by the prince and princeſs of Orange. He was even gratified with a penſion, together with the title of Hiſtoriographer. He died at the Hague, about ſix or ſeven years ago (14). He was a man of merit, very zealous for the Proteſtant religion, and who did not think it beneath him to write a French catechiſm. He knew a world of thoſe things which are proper to be ſaid in converſation, and told them with a good grace. The ſweetneſs which appeared in his behaviour, occaſioned the ſurprize of thoſe who read a little book he publiſhed againſt Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie, in the year 1686 (15). He expreſſed much more anger and paſſion than could be expected from a man of his gravity and age, and who had left his country for his religion. Several people endeavoured to excuſe him, upon the account of the tenderneſs he had ſtill for his dear uncle Mr d'Ablancourt; but as the queſtion was not whether his uncle had been an honeſt man, but only whether his tranſlation of Tacitus deſerved to be blamed, inſtead of enjoying the great reputation it was in, I think his apology might have been made with a more ſedate mind. He publiſhed ſome dialogues in the year 1684. They were mentioned in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (16). His memoirs, containing the hiſtory of Portugal from the Pyrenean treaty in 1659 to 1668, have been publiſhed within theſe few days (17). They are worth reading.

[*E*] *He bore his long . . . . pains with great conſtancy.*] Mr Patru does not mention what I am going to relate out of the Menagiana (18). ‘ Mr d'Ablancourt . . . . ſtudied in the winter over an oven at a ‘ Paſtry-Cook's (19). Being about threeſcore and three ‘ years old (20), he was tormented with the ſtone, ‘ whereof his father died, and had a-mind to go to ‘ Paris to be cut; but conſidering that it being then ‘ the month of November, he ſhould be obliged to ‘ ſtay for the ſpring, and that he ſhould be at great ‘ charges; he reſolved to forbear eating, to ſee an ‘ end of his pain the ſooner, which he accordingly ‘ forbore. However, being urged to eat ſomething, ‘ he was perſuaded to it, but it was too late, and he ‘ died.’ It is likely that Mr Patru would have ſuppreſſed this circumſtance, even if he had known that it was true.

There are ſome things, the remembrance of which we rather chuſe entirely to ſuppreſs, than to ſhew the falſity of them. We often believe, that it is more advantageous to the memory of our friends, that no body ſhould know that they were calumniated, than to diſcover the falſity of thoſe ſlanders. But there are ſome occaſions in which we think ourſelves obliged to let the public know how cruelly innocence has been abuſed. It is what Mr le Gendre did with reſpect to d'Ablancourt. ‘ God permitted that Mr du ‘ Boſc ſhould attend him at his latter-end, to undeceive ‘ the world, as to the falſe reports that were ſpread ‘ abroad, and which even reached the king's ears, as ‘ if he had died in deſpair. It was a horrid calum‘ ny, as Mr du Boſc made it appear in his letter to ‘ Mr Conrart, who was ſo much the more afflicted ‘ at the injury done to his friend's memory, becauſe ‘ it concerned all thoſe of the Reformed religion; for ‘ the king was further told, that it was the diſpoſition ‘ in which all the Huguenots died (21).’

[*F*] *The reaſon, why he choſe rather to be a tranſlator than an author, deſerves to be ſet down.*] ‘ His ge‘ nius was much like that of Montagne; and if he ‘ had been willing to work out of his own ſtock, he ‘ wanted nothing that was neceſſary for it. He had ‘ a very fruitful imagination, and his mind was full ‘ of good learning. But when he was told of it, he ‘ ſaid that he was neither a preacher nor an advocate, ‘ to make pleas or ſermons; that the world was full ‘ of political books; that all moral diſcourſes were ‘ but repetitions of Plutarch and Seneca; and that to ‘ ſerve his country, it was better to tranſlate good ‘ books, than to write new ones, which moſt times ‘ contain nothing that is new (22)’.

[*G*] *Why he thought that princes ſhould underſtand Latin.*] He ſaid, that it was fit they ſhould learn that tongue, *becauſe they might learn thereby ſeveral things of the ancients, which they cannot be told of, and ſee the honeſt men of antiquity condemn princes who are wanting in their duty* (23). There is ſome wit in that thought, and I know not what, that may dazzle and charm thoſe who do not examine things to the bottom. A ſtroke of cenſure that is well drawn, does very much ſet off a moral picture, eſpecially when human grandeur is the object of that cenſure. This is our caſe. Mr d'Ablancourt's thought impoſes upon us for that reaſon, it takes it's greateſt beauty from thence, but it is only an outward beauty. Examine what he ſays, ſound it well, and you will find it is like gilt-wood. It is but an appearance and a ſuperficial ornament. All learned nations tell princes of their faults in their mother-tongue, and may inſtruct them in their duties as well as Latin books. How can the books of ancient Rome teach modern princes? It is not by telling them, *You have committed an injuſtice, and a very great fault in this or in that:* It is only by the cenſure of the injuſtices and faults committed in ancient times. But do we now want books written in vulgar tongues, that repreſent the duties of princes with great force, and defame the memory of thoſe who have reigned ill, either lately in ſome other countries, or formerly in the very country where thoſe books are written? To ſay nothing of ſermons or political writings,

(13) See Mr d'Ablancourt's Memoirs, *pag.* 127, *&c.*

(14) I write this in January 1701.

(15) See the News from the Republic of Letters, *December* 1686, *pag.* 1460, *& ſeq.*

(16) March, in the catalogue of new books, *num.* 4, *pag.* 90, *& ſeq.*

(17) I write this in January 1701.

(18) Menagiana, pag. 324, 325, of the firſt Dutch Edit.

(19) See the Menagiana, *pag.* 397.

(20) There is a miſtake here, for d'Ablancourt lived not full 59 years.

(21) Le Gendre's Life of Mr du Boſc, *pag.* 37.

(22) Patru, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 345, 346.

(23) Menagiana, *pag.* 389, 390.

verſation was admirable [*H*]. He made good uſe of the advices of his friends, for the correction of his works; but he might have made a better uſe of them [*I*], had he not been ſo much in haſte to return into the country when he was at Paris to get his books printed. *His way of tranſlating was not approved by every body, though it was admired by all the illuſtrious men of our age. It is true, that ſometimes he takes ſome liberty* (*u*). He made an apology for it in his *prefaces*, wherein he ſhewed, *that he propoſed to himſelf the true notion of a good tranſlator, who ought to render the ſenſe of the original, without taking any thing from its force, or beauty. This is.* . . . . . what he has *ſo happily performed; and his lively and bold expreſſions are ſo far from any ſervileneſs, what whoever reads his tranſlations, would think he reads originals and not tranſlations* (*x*). So ſays the author of his elogy; but every body does not agree, that he took no other liberty but ſuch as he might take (*y*). He had a large extent of Learning, and applied himſelf more particularly to the ſtudy of the Bible [*K*]. We ſhall ſee what he thought concerning the immortality of the ſoul [*L*]. See his elogy written by Mr Patru, from which I have taken

moſt

(*u*) Ibid. *pag.* 345.

(*x*) Ibid.

(*y*) *See Mr* Baillet's Jugement des Sçavans, *on the French tranſlators, num.* 950. *Menagius uſed to call d'Ablancourt's tranſlation of Tacitus, the fair unfaithful.* Menagiana, *pag.* 324, *of the firſt Dutch Edit.*

---

writings, let us only inſiſt upon hiſtorians, Mezerai, for inſtance, who lived in the time of d'Ablancourt. I confeſs he has not written the hiſtory of his own time, but he comes infinitely nearer it than Livy, or Tacitus, or any of the ancient Latin authors, and cenſures, with great liberty and force, the ill adminiſtration of the kings of France that come under his conſideration. He laſhes them and their miniſters as meer ſchool-boys, when truth requires it. Varillas uſes the ſame freedom, tho' he was ſo great a flatterer of his cotemporaries; and the greateſt flatterers of the preſent times do commonly cenſure the faults of paſt times with the greateſt freedom (24). So that the reaſon why Mr d'Ablancourt pretends, that princes ſhould underſtand Latin, is falſe. It is ſo much the worſe, becauſe he could not be ignorant that the writings of ancient Rome have been tranſlating for above theſe hundred years; and if he thought it ſo uſeful a thing for princes to underſtand that language, why did he afford them ſo fair a pretence not to ſtudy it? They needed but ſay, that his tranſlations excuſed them from it. He deſtroyed therefore his own theſis by his conduct.

[*H*] *His converſation was admirable.* '(25) He was, in his youth, as gay as any one can be; he was full of vivacity and wit, which was attended with a certain turn, which none but the genteel part of the world can give . . . . his gay humour laſted till he died. The ſuburbs of St Germain afforded him the acquaintance of all thoſe lords who made up the court of the prince of Condé, and went, at that time, by the name of *Petits-Maîtres* (26). But Mr de Colligny and Mr de la Mouſſaye were extremely fond of him. When any of them went through Vitry or Châlons, or through ſome other place, not very far diſtant from his houſe, they would have him; and a dinner had not been good if Mr d'Ablancourt had not been at it. He had always ſomething to ſay at table, and in converſation. He ſpoke a great deal, but he was never tedious; what he ſaid was always new and agreeable. One would have thought he had ſtudied every thing he ſaid, ſo proper and pertinent were his railleries, but he uſed them to defend himſelf, and not to offend any body.' I ſhall confirm this by a paſſage of the Menagiana. *Mr d'Ablancourt . . . . uſed to ſay ſo many good and agreeable things in converſation, that Mr Pelliſſon ſaid, it were to be wiſhed that he had had always a regiſter by him, to write down every thing he ſaid* (27).

[*I*] *He made good uſe of the advices of his friends . . . but he might have made a better uſe of them.*] What I am going to ſay, is not only a conſiderable part of the character and hiſtory of the ſtudies of our Perrot; but alſo an inſtruction which may ſerve ſome other authors, if they avoid what is wrong in this example. *At firſt he conſulted no body but Mr Patru. But ſince he became acquainted with Mr Conrart and Mr Chapelain, he alſo took their advice, eſpecially Mr Conrart's, with whom he reviſed all his works, and ſo much the more willingly, becauſe underſtanding neither Greek nor Latin he gave him leſs trouble: For when he came to Paris to print his works, he was always in haſte to return into the country; and for that reaſon, when any thing was objected to him, he anſwered it with great warmth, and, as it were, in anger; becauſe thoſe difficulties put him to work, and conſequently retarded his return. And that humour did ſo far prevail upon him, that towards the end of his life, and in his laſt tranſlations, he conſulted, or at leaſt believed no body: Which was neither out of preſumption or vanity, but only out of haſtineſs, and a precipitate deſire of eaſing himſelf of his burden: For when his book was printed, he willingly received all the advices that were given him; and even preſſed his friends to give him their opinion about it, that he might make uſe of their remarks in a ſecond edition, and therefore it will not be improper to mention a notable particular. He had, till then, reviſed all his works with Mr Patru; but ever ſince his Arrianus, which they examined together, from the beginning to the end, in eight or ten afternoons, he printed all his books, for the firſt time, without acquainting him with it in the leaſt, becauſe he vexed him too much. He did the ſame as to his Lucian, but when it was printed and publiſhed, he deſired that dear friend to reviſe it. That dear friend reviſed it, and ſent him his remarks: he approved moſt of them; and as for thoſe which he approved not, he referred them to Mr Conrart or Mr Chapelain. Mr Patru joined with them, and they reſolved thoſe difficulties together: So that the ſecond edition, which was made upon thoſe obſervations, is much more correct than the firſt* (28).

[*K*] *He had a large extent of learning, and he applied himſelf . . . . to the ſtudy of the Bible.*] 'He had a quick and penetrating wit: When he undertook to examine any difficulty, he preſently ſaw into the very bottom of it; he underſtood Philoſophy, Theology, Hiſtory, and all the Belles Lettres. He underſtood Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, and Spaniſh; he was very well inſtructed in his religion, and more than was required for his ſalvation. But ſo great a variety of knowledge, ſo deep a learning, neither dulled his wit, nor confounded or impaired his judgment; he clearly underſtood every thing, the ancient authors as well as the modern. In his declining age he ſcarce read any books beſides the holy ſcripture, and the relations and hiſtories of the new world; but eſpecially the holy ſcripture, which may be ſaid to have been his moſt tender and laſt love. He had all the good commentators on the Bible, either general or particular ones. There was not any one difficulty in the Bible, but what he was throughly acquainted with (29).'

[*L*] *We ſhall ſee what he thought concerning the immortality of the ſoul.*] Having aſſerted in a converſation, *That religion, and not reaſon, teaches us the immortality of the ſoul* (30), he writ a diſcourſe, which he ſent to Mr Patru, to juſtify his opinion (31). He ſays in that diſcourſe, 'That the perfect knowledge of our ſouls is above the ordinary ſtrength of our minds, and that there are no reaſons that can prove their immortality (32). He alledges the chief of thoſe reaſons, and adds, *That they are good indeed to confirm in that belief a ſoul that is already enlightened with grace, but that they are not ſufficient to ſatisfy a man who has no other light than that of nature.* He ſpeaks (33) of the blindneſs of Philoſophers, and of the confuſion of Ariſtotle's doctrine concerning this ſubject, and he pretends that we ſhould not wonder at it: *The light of the Goſpel had not yet enlightened the world; and that truth being above human reaſon, ſtood in need of a ſupernatural help to be known* (34). . . . *You muſt confeſs*, ſays he (35), to Mr Patru, his friend, *that we are made Chriſtians by faith, and not by natural reaſon; and that I may be allowed to ſay, ſpeaking as a natural Philoſopher, that the reſurrection is impoſſible, provided I believe that* GOD *by his infinite power can do things that are impoſſible to nature. So that I ſaid nothing but what*

I might

(24) See, above, citation (17) of the article marſhal de MARILLAC.

(25) Patru, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 349.

(26) Vigneul Marville is therefore in the right, when he ſays in his Miſcellanies, pag. 324, of the firſt Tome, that *the prince of Condé had ſome of thoſe Petits-Maîtres.* What he ſays concerning the origin and character of thoſe men is curious. To which you may add what the continuation of la Bruyere, or the *Modern Theophraſtus* ſays of them, pag. 322, and following, of his *New Characters of Manners*, of the Dutch Edit. See alſo the *Diverſitez Curieuſes* of Mr Bordellon, *Part* x, *pag.* 359, of the Dutch Edit.

(27) Menagiana, pag. 325, of the firſt Dutch Edit.

(28) Patru, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 346, 347.

(29) Ibid. *pag.* 348, 349.

(30) Patru, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 355.

(31) It is to be found in the ſecond Tome of Patru's works, *pag.* 354, & *ſeq.*

(32) Ibid. *pag.* 356.

(33) Ibid. *pag.* 357.

(34) Ibid. *pag.* 358.

(35) Ibid.

moſt of what has been ſaid: It contains ſeveral other things, which will not be unacceptable to thoſe who are pleaſed with a particular account of the lives of illuſtrious men.

Note,

I might ſay, when I affirmed, that human reaſon cannot make me comprehend, that our ſouls are immortal; and that the holy Scripture, and the revelations of GOD to his church have taught me that truth, which is the foundation of our religion. Afterwards he maintains, that his opinion is much better than it would be, if it was grounded upon ſome philoſophical proofs (36). 'You believe the immortality of the ſoul, becauſe your reaſon tells you ſo; as for me, I believe it againſt my reaſon: I believe that our ſouls are immortal, becauſe our religion commands me to believe it. Conſider thoſe two opinions, and you will certainly confeſs, that mine is much better: yours is not ſo much as Catholic . . . (37). As . . . it is not ſufficient to do good works in order to be a virtuous man; but, beſides, our intentions ought to be innocent, and our actions to proceed from a good motive: ſo it is not ſufficient, in order to be a Catholic, not to doubt of any thing which the church will have us to believe, we muſt, beſides, believe like Chriſtians, and humility, and not preſumption, ought to be the cauſe of our faith . . . . (38) We have not a perfect truſt in GOD, if we rely upon our reaſon in things which he will have us to believe. If our reaſon never deceived us, and if we had a perfect knowledge of ſuch things as fall under our ſenſes, perhaps our raſhneſs would be excuſable; and it would be no wonder, if finding nothing upon earth that could puzzle us, we enquired after ſuch things as are above us. But you know better than I do, what the knowledge of man is; and that there are ſtill ſo many things in nature that are above philoſophical enquiries, that we may very well miſtruſt our ſtrength and our reaſon. None but a novice in Philoſophy will think that all manner of queſtions may be eaſily reſolved. They who go farther into the knowledge of things, meet with greater difficulties: two contrary opinions are often equally probable; and if they embrace one of them, it is rather out of inclination than out of reaſon. Man cannot judge certainly of any thing whatſoever; his reaſon deceives him as well as his ſenſes; we live among errors and doubts, and we have no certain truths here below, but thoſe which GOD has revealed to his church. Take a view of all the ſchools of Philoſophy, conſider what they do, and teach there; you will find preſumption in ſome, obſtinacy in others, and ignorance, error, and weakneſs, in all of them. Certainly we ſtand in need of our imbecillity to keep to our duty . . . (39) ſince our reaſon is ſo weak that the leaſt difficulties puzzle it, and that it is deceived, and miſtaken at every turn, let us be ſure not to truſt ſuch a blind guide, and not to ground our belief upon ſo weak a foundation. We muſt not rely upon our arguments, but upon him who made Heaven and Earth . . . . (40) Let us always remember that we muſt believe in GOD, and not in ourſelves, and that if we ſhould uſe our reaſon in what concerns divine things, we ſhould imitate the Cynic, who not contented with the light of the ſun, looked for a good man with a candle at noon-day.'

Des Cartes and his moſt faithful followers might find fault with ſome of thoſe thoughts, but it would be only as meer Philoſophers; for as ſoon as they conſider themſelves as Chriſtians, they muſt entirely approve d'Albancourt's opinion. They are perſuaded, that their proofs of the immortality of the ſoul are demonſtrative; they would therefore take it ill that he ſhould ſay, that the light of reaſon affords no good proofs of that immortality: but, after all, he would be only looked upon as heterodox in Philoſophy; and they would confeſs, that as a Chriſtian he had the fulneſs of orthodoxy (41). A perſuaſion grounded upon the light of nature ought to be conſidered in a Chriſtian as eloquence in a Philoſopher, or as agreeableneſs in a Hiſtory, or as beauty in a Wreſtler (42). They are things the privation whereof can be no great prejudice, tho' it be no diſadvantage to enjoy them. *A Philoſopho ſi afferat eloquentiam, non aſperner: Si non habeat, non admodum flagitem* (43). It is an advantage to be able to reconcile the truths of the Chriſtian religion with the principles of Philoſophy; it is a benefit not to be neglected, but rather improved as much as it can be: but one muſt be always ready to loſe it without regret, when it cannot be extended to the doctrines that are above it's reach, and which, by the nature of the myſtery, are above the capacity of our reaſon. One muſt be affected with reſpect to that advantage, as wiſe men are affected with reſpect to fortune: if ſhe is conſtant in her favours to them, they are glad of it; if ſhe runs away they are not much troubled at it: *I praiſe her,* ſaid Horace, *when ſhe ſtays with me; but as ſoon as I perceive that ſhe is ready to forſake me, I return her her gifts, and wrap up my ſelf in my virtue* (44). True Chriſtians do the ſame, with reſpect to Philoſophical knowledge: if after they have proved ſome tenets of religion, it ſeems to be againſt them, and to ſerve the contrary tenets, we let it go, ſay they, and we wrap up ourſelves in our faith. It is a thick and impenetrable vail againſt the injuries of the air, that is to ſay, againſt all the aſſaults of human reaſon. Mr d'Albancourt did the ſame. There is nothing more judicious and ſolid than his reflexions upon the nature of faith, and upon the good uſe which ought to be made of the uncertainty of reaſon: the certainty of divine faith is above that of ſcience. It would be therefore a very unjuſt thing to pretend, that a Chriſtian wants ſome Philoſophical proofs to be ſure that his ſoul is immortal. Is it not enough for him to be certain of it by his ſubmiſſion to the divine authority, and by a firm perſuaſion, that there is no foundation ſo immutable and ſo immoveable as the word of GOD? and muſt not a Chriſtian, if he will act as a Chriſtian, believe the immortality of the ſoul, becauſe GOD has promiſed us an eternal felicity? If he believed the immortality of the ſoul for ſome Philoſophical reaſons, it would be no act of faith, which yet he ought to perform, if he deſires to fulfil the duties of religion, and to be acceptable to GOD. Chriſtians have no regard to the light of reaſon in an act of faith, they lay it aſide, and rely only upon GOD's veracity. See what the ſchoolmen ſay when they enquire, whether opinion, ſcience, and faith, can be in our minds at the ſame time, with reſpect to the ſame object.

I have now a very fair opportunity to ſet down a paſſage which I have promiſed in another place (45). Mr Locke found himſelf almoſt in the ſame caſe with Mr d'Albancourt: he was blamed for having ſaid, that natural reaſon does not clearly prove the immortality of the ſoul. Let us ſee his anſwer (46). 'This your accuſation of my leſſening the credibility of theſe articles of faith, [the immortality of the ſoul, and the reſurrection of the body] is founded on this, that the article of the immortality of the ſoul abates of it's credibility, if it be allowed, that it's immateriality (which is the ſuppoſed proof from reaſon and philoſophy of it's immortality) cannot be demonſtrated from natural reaſon: which argument of your lordſhip's, bottoms, as I humbly conceive, on this, that divine revelation abates of it's credibility in all thoſe articles it propoſes, proportionably, as human reaſon fails, to ſupport the teſtimony of GOD. And all that your lordſhip in thoſe paſſages has ſaid, when examined, will, I ſuppoſe, be found to import thus much, *viz.* Does GOD promiſe any thing to mankind to be believed? It is very fit and credible to be believed, if reaſon can demonſtrate it to be true. But if human reaſon comes ſhort in the caſe, and cannot make it out, it's credibility is thereby leſſened; which is, in effect, to ſay, that the veracity of GOD is not a firm and ſure foundation of faith to rely upon, without the concurring teſtimony of reaſon, *i. e.* with reverence be it ſpoken, GOD is not to be believed on his own word, unleſs what he reveals be in itſelf credible, and might be believed without him. I could not have imagined to find this in a book, written in defence of the Myſtery of the Holy Trinity. Your lordſhip ſays, *You do not queſtion whether GOD can give immortality to a material ſubſtance; but you ſay it* takes off very much *from the evidence of immortality, if it depends wholly upon GOD's giving that which, of it's own nature, it is not capable of.* To which I reply, any one's not being able to demonſtrate the ſoul to be immaterial, *takes off* not *very much,* nor at all from the *evidence of it's immortality,* if GOD has revealed that it ſhall be immortal, becauſe the veracity of GOD is a demonſtration

(36) Ibid. *pag.* 361.

(37) Ibid. *pag.* 362.

(38) Ibid. *pag.* 363.

(39) Ibid. *pag.* 364.

(40) Patru, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 365.

(41) Compare this with remark [*M*] of the article DICÆARCHUS.

(42) Lucianus in libello de hac re, unum ait eſſe opus Hiſtoriæ, unumque finem, utilitatem: jucundum verò ſi & ipſum ſequatur, melius hoc eſſe: perinde atque in athleta vires requiruntur, forma ac venuſtas laudantur. *Famian. Strada, Proluſ. ii, lib. ii, pag. m.* 223.

(43) Cicero, de Finib. *lib. i, cap. v.*

(44) Laudo manentem: ſi celeres quatit Pennas, reſigno quæ dedit, & mea Virtute me involvo. *Horat. Od. xxix, lib. iii.*

(45) Citat. (63) of the article DICÆARCHUS.

(46) Mr Locke's Reply to the biſhop of Worceſter, Anſwer to his ſecond Letter, *pag.* 418, 419. See alſo the *Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, Nov.* 1699, *pag.* 510.

Note, that Mr Patru aſcribes to Perrot the moſt excellent moral qualities that can be wiſhed for.

demonſtration of the truth of what he has revealed, and the want of another demonſtration of a propoſition, that is demonſtratively true, takes not off from the evidence of it. For where there is a clear demonſtration, there is as much evidence as any truth can have, that is not ſelf-evident (47). . . . Can any one who admits of divine revelation . . . think this propoſition leſs credible, the bodies of men, after the reſurrection, ſhall live for ever; than this, the ſouls of men ſhall, after the reſurrection, live for ever? For that he muſt do, if he thinks either of them is leſs credible than the other. If this be ſo, reaſon is to be conſulted, how far GOD is to believed, and the credit of divine teſtimony muſt receive it's force from the evidence of reaſon, which is evidently to take away the credibility of divine revelation, in all ſupernatural truths, wherein the evidence of reaſon fails.'

(47) Mr Locke, Ibid. *pag.* 420, 421.

The reader may find ſeveral things in the article of Pomponatius, which concern this matter; but it is to be obſerved here, that many ſchool-men have aſſerted, that the natural reaſons of the immortality of the ſoul are not convincing. *Naturæ rationes Henricus atque Scotus probabiliter ſuadere aiunt, non neceſſario demonſtrare* (48). Cajetanus, who had openly and haughtily rejected that opinion (49), embraced it at laſt; I believe, ſays he, that our ſouls are immortal, but I do not know it: *Se credere quidem animam rationalem incorruptibilem eſſe, at neſcire tamen* (50). He and Scotus, and Joannes de Janduno, having examined all the arguments alledged by Thomas Aquinas declared that they were not demonſtrative, *pronunciarunt tandem rem non eſſe demonſtratam ſed creditam* (51). Scotus anſwered all the arguments of Thomas Aquinas. The latter propoſed twenty-one probable reaſons for the immortalityof the ſoul, to which Joannes de Janduno added many more (52).

(48) Melch. Canus, Loc. Commun. *lib. xii, cap. ult. pag. m.* 724.

(49) Ibid.

(50) Ibid.

(51) Ibid. *pag.* 725.

(52) Ibid. *pag.* 727.

PERSIUS (CAIUS) (*a*) was one of the moſt learned men of his time [*A*]. He was Quæſtor in the year of Rome 608, and Prætor two years after (*b*). The poet Lucilius dreaded him, and ingenuouſly confeſſed that he did not write for ſuch men, and that he deſired not his readers ſhould be ſo learned as he was. It was thought by ſome, that Perſius made the harangue which was pronounced by the conſul Caius Fannius againſt Caius Gracchus (*c*), in the year of Rome 631. The reaſon of it was that Fannius was but an indifferent Orator, and that his harangue was ſo fine (*d*), that others believed ſeveral great men had contributed to it every one according to his capacity. It was not at that time a thing without example, that a man ſhould make a diſcourſe, and another recite it. Nevertheleſs Cicero refutes thoſe who aſcribed not that harangue to Fannius. Some by a ſtrange error in Chronolgy have confounded our Perſius with the Poet I ſpeak of in the next article [*B*].

(*a*) Pliny calls him *Manius* in Harduin's edition. See the remark [*A*].

(*b*) *According to* Voſſius, de Poët. Lat. *pag.* 41.

(*c*) Alii à C. Perſio literato homine ſcriptam eſſe ajebant, illo quem ſignificat valde doctum eſſe Lucilius; alii multos nobiles quod quiſque potuiſſet in illam orationem contuliſſe. *Cicero, in Bruto.*

(*d*) Eam ſuſpicionem propter hanc cauſam credo fuiſſe, quod Fannius in mediocribus Oratoribus habitus eſſet, oratio autem vel optima eſſet illo quidem tempore orationum omnium. *Ibid.*

[*A*] *He was one of the moſt learned men of his time.*] Cicero mentions him in two or three places. He brings in the Orator Craſſus, who declares, that, in imitation of the Poet Lucilius, he does not deſire that his readers ſhould be altogether ignorant, or very learned men: and upon this occaſion he tells us that Perſius, one of thoſe whom that Poet would not have to be his reader, was, in a manner, the moſt learned man that was ſeen at Rome (1). 'Nam ut Cajus Lucilius homo doctus & perurbanus dicere ſolebat ea quæ ſcriberet neque ab indoctiſſimis neque ab doctiſſimis legi velle, quod alteri nihil intelligerent, alteri plus fortaſſe quàm ipſe de ſe; quo etiam ſcripſit; Perſium non curo legere, hic enim fuit, ut noramus, omnium fere noſtrorum hominum doctiſſimus; Lælium Decimum volo, quem cognovimus virum bonum & non illiteratum, ſed nihil ad Perſium; ſic ego ſi jam mihi diſputandum ſit de his noſtris ſtudiis, nolim equidem apud ruſticos, ſed multo minus apud vos, malo enim non intelligi orationem meam, quàm reprehendi. - - - - *For as Caius Lucilius, a learned and very polite man, uſed to ſay, that he did not deſire his writings ſhould be read either by the moſt ignorant, or moſt learned men: because the former knew nothing, and the latter, perhaps, more than himſelf; he likewiſe ſaid, he would not have ſuch as Perſius to read them, who was known to be the moſt learned of all the Romans; but ſuch as Lælius Decimus, a good man, and not illiterate, but nothing in compariſon to Perſius: ſo, were I to reaſon concerning theſe my ſtudies, I ſhould not like to do it before thoſe that are altogether ignorant, and much leſs before you; for I would rather my oration were not underſtood than cenſured.*' Cicero declares in another place (2) that he is not of Lucilius's mind; he wiſhed that Perſius might have read his works. 'Nec enim ut noſter Lucilius recuſabo quo minus omnes mea legant. Utinam eſſet ille Perſius; Scipio vero & Rutilius multo etiam magis, quorum ille judicium reformidans Tarentinis ait ſe & Conſentinis & Siculis ſcribere. *Nor will I, like Lucilius, be againſt every body's reading my works. I could wiſh they were read by ſuch as Perſius, but much more by Scipio and Rutilius, whoſe judgment he feared, and therefore he ſays he wrote to the people of Tarentum, Conſentia, and Sicily.*' Pliny deſigning to make uſe of Lucilius's thought, choſe rather to take it from Cicero than from it's author; and it appears that he had in view a paſſage of Cicero, wherein the thing was related with ſome different explications from thoſe we have ſeen. 'Præterea, *ſays Pliny* (3), eſt quædam publica etiam eruditorum rejectio. Utitur illa & M. Tullius extra omnem ingenii aleam poſitus, & (quod miremur) per advocatum defenditur. *Nec doctiſſimis: Manium Perſium hæc legere nolo, Junium Congum volo* (4.) Quod ſi hoc Lucilius qui primus condidit ſtyli naſum dicendum ſibi putavit: ſi Cicero mutuandum, præſertim cum de Republica ſcriberet, quanto nos cauſatius ab aliquo judice defendimus. - - - - *Beſides, one may in ſome meaſure reject the judgment of learned men. Cicero, who has nothing to apprehend, does ſo, and (which is ſtrange) is defended by an advocate.* Neither do I deſire that the moſt learned men, ſuch as Manius Perſius, but ſuch as Junius Congus, ſhould read theſe my writings. *If Lucilius, who firſt wrote ſatire, thought fit to ſay ſo; if Cicero thought fit to imitate him, eſpecially when he wrote concerning the Republic, how much more reaſon have I to except againſt a judge?*' That paſſage of Cicero was, without doubt, in the preface to his books *de Republica*; he had not then the ſame thought that he had in the firſt book *de Finibus*, but the ſame that he had in the ſecond book *de Oratore*. We ought not to wonder at thoſe variations, for the ſubjects are different. It is a more ſurprizing thing, that every time he mentioned that thought of Lucilius, he brought in ſeveral perſons oppoſite to Perſius, ſometimes Lælius, ſometimes the Sicilians and Tarentines, ſometimes Junius Congus. The reaſon of it may be, either becauſe Lucilius mentioned ſeveral perſons in the ſame place, whoſe penetration he did not much fear; or becauſe he made uſe of the ſame thought in ſeveral places, ſometimes againſt one, ſometimes againſt another: for when an author declares that he is afraid of being criticized by a man by reaſon of his great learning, it may preſently afford him a ſatirical ſtroke againſt thoſe whom he deſigns to expoſe, as ignorant or half-learned men, by oppoſing them to the perſon whoſe judgment he fears. Lucilius's deſign was not ſo much to praiſe the learning of Perſius, as to exerciſe his ſatirical wit. He might, in both caſes, give occaſion to Cicero to diverſify the perſons oppoſed to Perſius: and therefore Father Harduin did very well to expunge Lælius Decimus out of Pliny, and in the room of it to inſert Junius Congus, by virtue of the beſt and moſt antient manuſcripts. See the remark [*F*] of the article LUCILIUS.

(1) Cicero, de Orat. *lib. ii.*

(2) De Finib. *lib. i, cap. iii.*

(3) In Præf.

(4) *So Father Hardouin reads. In the other editions it is* Hæc doctiſſimum Perſium legere nolo, Lælium Decimum volo.

[*B*] *Some have confounded him with the Poet I ſpeak of in the next article.*] Fungerus (5) taking, without any reaſon for it, theſe words of Cicero, *nihil ad*

(5) In nova Proverbior. Farragine, apud Voſſium, Inſt. Orat. *lib. iv. cap. xi,* & de Poët. Lat. *pag.* 41.

Perſium, for a proverbial expreſſion, fancied, ſtill more unreaſonably, they were meant of Perſius, the ſatirical Poet, born towards the end of the Empire of Tiberius. Thoſe two faults have been obſerved by Voſſius. He complains of a great number of ſuch over-ſights, which he found in antient and modern authors. *Vellem*, ſays he (6), *ut juventus hinc videat quàm neceſſaria ſit doctrina temporum, cujus neglectu ſpiſſe fœdeque peccatur à viris alioqui non ineruditis. Quamquam nec tanti id foret, ſi unus ille* (Fungerus) *ſic exorbitaret. Sexcenta id genus poteram ex aliis adferre, pluſcula etiam ex veteribus ipſis.*

(6) De Poët. Lat. ibid.

PERSIUS (AULUS PERSIUS FLACCUS) [*A*], a ſatirical Poet under the empire of Nero, was born at Volterra in Tuſcany [*B*]. He was a Roman knight, and related and allied to perſons of the firſt rank. He ſtudied at Volterra till he was twelve years of age, and then he continued his ſtudies at Rome, under the Grammarian Palæmon, the Rhetor Verginius, and Cornutus a Stoic Philoſopher, who entertained ſo great a love for him, that there was ever after a moſt intimate friendſhip between them. Perſius has immortalized in his works that friendſhip, and his thankfulneſs for the good offices of this friend (*a*). Which he expreſſed more fully by a codicil. ſor he left him his library and a great deal of money (*b*): but Cornutus kept only the books, and leſt the money to the heirs (*c*). He adviſed the mother of his friend to ſuppreſs ſome pieces of poetry, which her ſon made in the beginning of his youth. He thought, without doubt, they would not anſwer the great reputation of thoſe which had been publiſhed, and received by the public with ſo great an admiration, that all the copies were preſently ſold off. This is a model to be propoſed to thoſe who publiſh ſo many ſorry poſthumous books, in hopes that the glory of the deceaſed will be a ſafeguard to them. They ſuppreſſed, amongſt other works of Perſius, ſome verſes which he had made upon Arria, that illuſtrious Roman lady, who killed herſelf to give an example to her dear huſband. Moreri fancied that it was a ſatire againſt Arria [*C*], which is falſe; it was rather

(*a*) Perſius, Sat. V, paſſim.

(*b*) Five and twenty thouſand crowns acording to the ſupputation of ſome. See the preface of Perſius's tranſlation by the Jeſuit Tarteron.

(*c*) That is, to Perſius's ſiſters.

[*A*] *Aulus Perſius Flaccus.*] Thoſe who ſaid that the ſirname of Flaccus was given him, becauſe he imitated Horace, did not obſerve that his father had the ſame ſirname (1), and have not been more lucky in their gueſs, than when they ſaid that he was called Severus, becauſe he profeſſed the Stoic Philoſophy. Caſaubon (2) affords me thoſe two remarks. He believes, as to the ſecond, that an inſcription found at Volterra occaſioned that error. Here is the inſcription *A. Perſius A. F. Severus V. an.* VIII. M. III. D. XIX. Which ſuppoſes that thoſe whom that great Critic cenſures, pretended that the title of Severus was given to Perſius as a ſirname of a family, and if it be ſo, they might be cenſured for it; but if they conſidered that title only as an epithet, like that of *Ardens*, which Juvenal beſtowed upon Lucilius (3), they could not be blamed, in my opinion, for having taken notice of that Poet's application to the Stoic Philoſophy, nor could it be pretended that they had any regard to the inſcription of Volterra. No man ever better deſerved the title of *Severe* than that Poet, conſidering the imperious tone of his invectives and cenſures; which is the reaſon Barthius gives of that title. It was therefore an unreaſonable thing to apply to him the ſevere reprimand of Caſaubon. What I ſay concerns Magirus (4) for having ſet down theſe words of Barthius (5); ‘Severum veteres libri ab auctoritate caſtigandi & invectione in malos mores nominant, *he adds*, ſed videtur huic vaniſſimo commento occaſionem præbuiſſe inſcriptio illa memoria avorum Volaterris inventa, ubi *Aul.* *PERSII* cujuſdam octennis pueri fit mentio, cui cognomen fuit Severo. Caſaub. not. ad Perſii vitam. - - - - *Antient books call him Severus, from the keenneſs of his cenſures, and invectives againſt vice; but this idle fiction ſeems to have been occaſioned by that inſcription found at Volterra, in the memory of our fore-fathers, wherein mention is made of one* Aul. PERSIUS, *a boy of eight years old, whoſe ſirname was Severus.*’ This application does not ſeem to be judicious.

(1) Sueton. in Vita Perſii.

(2) Notis in Vitam Perſii.

(3) Sat. I. So Perſius calls Horace, *Vafer*, and Ovid gives the epithet of *Doctus* to Catullus.

(4) Eponymolog. Critic. *pag.* 648.

(5) VI. Adverſar. I.

[*B*] *Born at Volterra in Tuſcany.*] All authors do not agree herein; Etruria and Liguria contended for it. Perſius might boaſt of having a good ſhare in Homer's deſtiny, two great provinces ſtrive which ſhall have him. The Etrurians ground their pretenſion upon the teſtimony of ſome ancient authors, who ſay that Perſius was of Volterra (6). The Ligurians ground theirs upon theſe words;

- - - - Mihi nunc Ligus ora
Intepet, hibernatque meum mare, qua latus ingens
Dant ſcopuli, & multa littus ſe valle receptat
Lunai portum eſt operæ cognoſcere cives (7).

For me, my warmer conſtitution wants
More cold than our Ligurian winter grants.
And therefore to my native ſhores retir'd,
I view the coaſt old Ennius once admir'd;
Where cliffs on either ſide their points diſplay,
And after opening in an ample way.
'Tis worth your while, O Romans, to regard
The port of Luna, ſays our learned Bard.
DRYDEN.

(6) The author of Perſius's Life. *Euſeb. in Chronic. Caſſiodor. in Faſtis.*

(7) Perſius, Sat. VI, ver. 6.

They pretend that the Poet ſpeaks of his native country, and conſequently that he was born at Portus Lunæ, which is called now the gulph della Spezzia. Don Gaſparo Maſſa has treated that matter learnedly, in a diſſertation printed at Genoa in 1667, *della vita, Origine, è patria di Aulo Perſio Flacco.* He believes that the town formerly called Luna was ſituated in Tuſcany (8), and therefore he is far from granting that it was the native country of our Poet; for his not being born at Volterra would ſignify nothing to him, if he could not deprive Tuſcany of him, and prove that he was born in the ſtate of Genoa. He therefore ſays, that the place of his birth was Tigulia, near Portus Lunæ, ſituated in Liguria, eighty ſtadia diſtant from Luna (9). You muſt obſerve that the town of Luna and the port of Luna are diſtinguiſhed one from the other. Lewis Aproſio is of the ſame opinion with Gaſparo Maſſa, as it appears from his diſſertation *della Patria d'A. Perſio*, printed at Genoa in the year 1664. See how little one can rely upon Moreri, he pretends that Aproſio *maintains that Perſius was of Volterra, and that Gaſpar Maſſa ſays he was born at Luna or la Spezzia.* Which is very falſe with reſpect to Aproſio, and far from being exact with reſpect to Maſſa. For the reſt, tho' the arguments of thoſe two gentlemen are none of thoſe which cannot be anſwered, yet they are probable enough, and if I was to chooſe, I had rather follow their opinion (10) than that of Euſebius. I ſhall acquaint my reader, that Soprani being not contented to place Perſius in his catalogue of the writers of Liguria (11), and to give ſome reaſons for it, cauſed thoſe two diſcourſes to be printed at the end of his work.

(8) Pag. 40.

(9) Aproſio della Patria d'A. Perſio, *pag.* 14.

(10) It is alſo the opinion of Bartholomew Fontius, in his commentary upon Perſius, printed at Venice in 1491, and of Hippolytus Landinelli, *Nell' origine di Luni, cap. xi*, apud Michael. Juſtiniani, Scritt. Liguri, *pag.* 108.

(11) Printed at Genoa in 4to, in the year 1667.

[*C*] *Moreri fancied that it was a ſatire againſt Arria, which is falſe.*] I think the true reaſon of his miſtake proceeds from theſe words: *Scripſerat in pueritia Flaccus . . . . paucos in ſororem Thraſeæ & in Arriæ matrem verſus quæ ſe ante virum occiderat* (12). The Critics (13) have corrected theſe words thus, *in ſocrum Thraſeæ Arriæ matrem*, or *Arriam* (14) *matrem.* The Præpoſition *in* is equivocal (15); it ſignifies ſometimes *againſt*, and ſometimes *upon*. One may eaſily perceive that it ought to be taken here in the ſecond ſenſe; for is it likely that Perſius ſhould have written verſes againſt a lady who was his kinſwoman, and mother of his beſt friend's wife, and famous for having died in a moſt heroical manner, according to the

(12) Suet. in Vita Perſii.

(13) Caſaub. Not. in Vitam Perſii.

(14) Gronovius, in eamd. Vitam in Edit. Sueton. Græviana.

(15) Vid. Caſaub. in Perſ. Sat. I, *pag.* 110.

rather an elogy, and it cannot be reaſonably doubted of conſidering the great love of the author for Thraſeas, ſon-in-law to Arria, his kinſwoman (*d*). He ſtudied with Lucan, under Cornutus, and was ſo much admired by his ſchool-fellow, that when Perſius recited his verſes, Lucan could ſcarce forbear breaking out into acclamations: which is a rare thing among Poets of the ſame rank, but ſometimes too common out of cunning and vanity [*D*]. Perſius became acquainted with Seneca very late, and could never like his temper. He was a good friend, a better ſon ſtill, a better brother, and a better kinſman [*E*]. He was very chaſte, though a beautiful young man: he was ſober, as meek as a lamb, and as modeſt as a young virgin: ſo true it is, that we muſt not judge of a man's morals by his writings; for the ſatires of Perſius are licentious: beſides, they are ſharp and full of bitterneſs. Nay, it is believed that he ſpared not the cruel Nero, and that he did ſo plainly hint at him, that Cornutus thought

the notions of the ſect wherein our Poet was bred up? The friendſhip of Perſius and Thraſeas, ſon-in-law of that lady, laſted near ten years, which ſignifies, as Caſaubon obſerves, that Perſius did not live above ten years from the time he contracted an intimate friendſhip with Thraſeas. Now becauſe he lived but twenty-eight years, any one may ſee that their friendſhip began whilſt Perſius ſtudied Philoſophy under Cornutus: and it is likely that he made the verſes in queſtion after he had got ſuch a friend.

Cum primum pavido cuſtos mihi purpura ceſſit,
Bullaque ſuccinctis laribus donata pependit,
Me tibi ſuppoſui (16). - - -

When firſt my childiſh robe reſign'd the charge
And left me unconfin'd to live at large.
When now my golden bulla (hung on high
To houſhold gods) declare me paſt a boy.
And my white ſhield proclaim my liberty,
Under thy care I put myſelf. - - -

The word Pueritia is uſed by the beſt Latin authors for young men of eighteen or twenty years of age. I ſhall place here in order the other miſtakes of Moreri. He ſays *that Perſius wrote a book againſt Arria, which his maſter, Cornutius, made him burn.* Suppoſe this to be true, it was not a book, but ſome few verſes, *paucos verſus.* His maſter's name was not Cornutius, but Cornutus; and it was only after the death of the author, that he adviſed his mother to ſuppreſs thoſe verſes, and all thoſe he had made in his youth. *Omnia autem Cornutus auctor fuit* MATRI *ejus ut aboleret* (17). Whereby the author of the Epiſtle, which ſerves inſtead of a preface to the new tranſlation of Perſius, may be convinced of a miſtake. His words run thus (18): 'He compoſed ſome verſes upon that ſubject (19), which were no commendation of that generous and faithful wife (20): but he followed the advice that was given him, he ſuppreſſed thoſe verſes, and he did well.' Moreri calls the Rhetorician, under whom Perſius ſtudied, Virginius Fulvius; he ſhould have called him Verginius Flaccus. He ſays that this pretended Virginius Fulvius and Rhemnius Palæmon *took care of Lucan's education.* To what purpoſe does he make ſuch a remark, ſince he was to ſay nothing of Lucan's love for Perſius? But beſides, none of the authors quoted by him, mention that pretended education. It is with reſpect to Cornutus, that the author of the life of Perſius obſerves, that he taught Lucan and Perſius at the ſame time. We ſhall ſee hereafter (21) a Chronological error of Moreri.

Mr Marais was pleaſed to acquaint me, that Moreri might have taken from Mr Geffrier (22) what he ſays of Arria,; for the reputation of that lady was ſo dear to Mr Geffrier, *that to make amends for the wrong* which he pretends Perſius had done her, he cauſed a ſonnet to be printed before his tranſlation, which Father le Moine compoſed to the praiſe of Arria, and which is to be found in his *Galerie des Femmes fortes.*

[*D*] *A thing . . . ſometimes too common out of cunning and vanity.*] This is finely explained by a modern author, who does not pretend that Lucan was free from that fault. 'Perſius, (ſays he) (23), was much better pleaſed with Lucan, who perhaps inſinuated himſelf into his favour with much exclaiming at the fineſt paſſages of his ſatires, and often repeating theſe words with great admiration (24), *theſe are excellent pieces indeed!* for tho' an author be never ſo modeſt, he will be eaſily allured by the charms of flattering applauſes, which he receives from a good judge in a full aſſembly. But, Sir, had not Lucan a view in it? Did not he expect the like from Perſius? Poets and authors, you know, do ſeldom give any thing for nothing; and when they come to engage one another with praiſes and compliments, they do not ſpare themſelves; they make paſſes at one another with great force. You know ſome at preſent, as well as I, who are accounted for bravery of wit, if I may ſay ſo, the Boutevilles of this time: they challenge thoſe that have moſt ſkill, and whether it be in a rencounter, or in formal duels, which were never prohibited by the king, they ſtrive to conquer one another, and are on both ſides extremely free of the moſt obliging and civil expreſſions, even in writing and in print, that poſterity may not doubt of it. In this ſort of duels the weakeſt man is always the aggreſſor; it is he who ſends or even carries the challenge. This is, Horace's metaphor, and it will appear to you, at leaſt, as pleaſant as it is bold; you may find it in his epiſtle to Florus. As for me, if the title of writer made me greedy of praiſes, I had rather be commended by a good author, whom I ſhould neither know by his name, nor by ſight, and who could have no intereſt in praiſing me; for ſuch praiſes could not be ſuſpected.'

[*E*] *He was a good friend, a better ſon ſtill, a better brother, and a better kinſman.*] The author who affords me theſe words, will afford me alſo a Commentary upon them. *You wonder at it*, ſays he (25) *and perhaps you have your reaſons for it: Nevertheleſs, there is nothing truer than this; and they who knew him beſt, ſay, that he might be propoſed as an example in that reſpect* (26). *In effect, he had a ſolid and true love for his ſiſters, and a reſpectful tenderneſs for his mother Fulvia, tho' ſhe was married again: and if he was but a child when his father died, if he was but ſeven or eight years of age when ſhe did that . . . . I had almoſt let fall the word folly, but we muſt be ſomewhat circumſpect in favour of thoſe women; he was already clearſighted enough to perceive that it was not an agreable thing, for reaſon diſplays itſelf much in ſuch junctures, it grows ſtrong and lively, and does not always wait for the time appointed to make it's reflexions, eſpecially when it happens to be in a ſubject that has a diſpoſition to be ſatirical. But, Sir, we muſt have the whole truth, the ſecond huſband died in a ſhort time, and left Perſius in a condition of reſpecting and loving his mother, as ſincerely as he did, when he was but a child.* 'Pater ejus Flaccus pupillum reliquit moriens, annorum fere ſex. Fulvia Siſennia mater nupſit poſtea Fuſio, Equiti Romano: & eum quoque extulit intra paucos annos (27). - - - - *He was but young when his father Flaccus died, being about ſix years of age: his mother Fulvia Siſennia afterwards was married to Fuſius a Roman knight: and ſhe buried him too within a few years.*' *I do not know whether Fulvia took great care of her ſon's education, and whether ſhe loved not herſelf too much to mind an affair of ſo great importance: this I cannot be ſure of, for a ſecond wedding, and even the condition of a young widow, is a great hindrance to it; but that which I am ſure of, is, that the Roman knight, though never ſo young, neglected nothing to make himſelf as accompliſhed a man as I have repreſented him to you.* I ſhall add theſe words of Suetonius to that pretty commentary; 'Reliquit circa H. . .SXX matri & ſorori. . . . . Cornutus, ſublatis libris, pecuniam ſororibus, quas frater hæredes fecerat, reliquit. - - - - *He left to his mother and ſiſter about twenty five thouſand crown . . . Cornutus kept the books, but gave the money to his ſiſters, whom their brother had made his heirs.*' What ſhall we ſay of an Hiſtorian, who in the ſame page, where he ſays twice, that Perſius had but one ſiſter, obſerves that Perſius left his eſtate to his

---

(*d*) Ipſe etiam decem fere annis ſumme dilectus apud Thraſeam eſt, ita ut peregrinaretur quoque cum eo aliquando, cognatam ejus Arriam (*the daughter of that Arria who killed her ſelf*) uxorem habente. *Suet. in Vit. Perſii. Inſtead of* dilectus apud Thraſeam, *Lipſius, in Ann. Tacit. lib. xvi, reads* dilectus à Pæto Thraſea.

(16) Perſ. ad Cornutum, Sat. V.

(17) Suet. ubi ſupra.

(18) Epiſtle prefixed to the tranſlation of Perſius by Father Tarteron.

(19) That is, upon the action of Arria.

(20) It is a miſtake, which I refute.

(21) In the remark [*G*].

(22) *De quo infra.* remark [*F*], at the end.

(23) Epiſtle prefixed to the tranſlation of Perſius by the Jeſuit Tarteron.

(24) Lucanus adeo mirabatur ſcripta Flacci, ut vix retineret ſe illo recitante à clamore quin illa eſſe vera poemata diceret. - - - - *Lucan ſo much admired the writings of Perſius, that when he read them to him, he could not forbear crying out, that they were excellent poems indeed.* Sueton. in Vit. Perſii.

(25) Epiſtle prefixed to the new tranſlation of Perſius and Juvenal, by Father Tarteron.

(26) Pietatis erga matrem & ſororem & amitam exemplo ſufficientis. *Sueton. in Vita Perſii.*

(27) Ibid.

thought fit to alter ſome of his words (*e*) [*F*]. He died when he was twenty-eight years

his mother and ſiſter, and made his ſiſters his heirs?

[*F*] *It is believed that he did ſo plainly hint at Nero, that Cornutus thought fit to alter ſome of his words.*] He made uſe of theſe words in his firſt ſatire;

> Auriculas aſini Mida rex habet.
>
> *An aſs's ears king Midas has.*

Cornutus adviſed them to change them into theſe:

> Auriculas aſini quis non habet (28)?
>
> *An aſs's ears who has not got?*

If Cornutus thought that Nero was too plainly hinted at by theſe words, he did wiſely to uſe that precaution, tho' perhaps, that emperor was ſtill in his happy days, which continued the firſt five or ſix years of his reign, but how comes it that Cornutus made no alteration in the four verſes inſerted in the ſame ſatire, and taken from a tragedy of Nero? Was it a dangerous thing to ſay *king Midas has aſſes ears*, whilſt his verſes might be propoſed as a model of ridiculous poetry without any danger? I find ſome difficulty in it, and perhaps theſe four verſes,

> Torva Mimalloneis implerunt cornua bombis,
> Et raptum vitulo caput allatura ſuperbo
> Baſſaris, & Lyncem Mænas flexura corymbis
> Evion ingeminat: reparabilis adſonat Echo (29).
>
> *Their crooked horns, the Mimallonian crew*
> *With blaſts inſpir'd; and Baſſaris, who ſlew*
> *The ſcornful calf, with ſword advanc'd on high*
> *Made from his neck his haughty head to fly,*
> *And, Mænas, when with ivy bridles bound,*
> *She led the ſpotted lynx, then Evion rung around,*
> *Evion from woods and floods repairing echo's ſound.*

Theſe verſes, I ſay, perhaps were at moſt but an indirect and obſcure raillery; for if Nero had been the author of thoſe verſes, how could any body be ſo bold, as to ſet them down word for word to laugh at them, ſince it was thought neceſſary to mend thoſe other words, *Auriculas aſini Mida rex habet?* This is a very ſtrange diſparity; a great cowardice on the one hand, and a great raſhneſs on the other. But I have more ſcruples ſtill about it. Methinks Cornutus ſpoils the thought of his friend without any neceſſity, his fear ſeems to me to be ill grounded. Perſius being told that it was dangerous to cenſure the faults of other men, and that he ſhould not ſo much as ſpeak of them to a pit, anſwers, that he will at leaſt tell his book buried in the ground what he has ſeen, *viz.* that king Midas had aſſes ears?

> Men' mutire nefas, nec clam nec cum ſcrobe? nuſquam.
> Heic tamen infodiam. Vidi, vidi ipſe, libelle,
> Auriculas Aſini Mida rex habet.
>
> *Like the fam'd Barber I ſhall dig a hole,*
> *And there diſcharge the burthen of my ſoul,*
> *And whiſper to the reeds that Midas wears,*
> *Beneath the royal crown, an aſs's ears.*

It is a manifeſt alluſion to the hiſtory of Midas's Barber, which was very well known to Nero.

> \- - - Secedit humumque
> Effodit, & domini quales aſpexerit aures
> Voce refert parva terræque immurmurat hauſtæ (30)
>
> *Reſtleſs, at laſt, a private place he found,*
> *Then dug a hole, and told it to the ground;*
> *In a low whiſper he reveal'd the caſe,*
> *And cover'd in the earth, and ſilent left the place.*
>
> CROXALL.

It was not therefore very likely that he ſhould take it ill, that any one ſhould faithfully relate the beſt paſſage of that hiſtory, *Auriculas aſini Mida rex habet.* If you change thoſe words into theſe, *Auriculas aſini quis non habet*; it is no more the Barber's text, but a looſe imitation of it. If I ſhould be told, that it is better to leſſen the beauty of a thought, than to exaſperate a tyrant, I would anſwer as I did before, *Why do not you take off the four verſes; you ought to force the author to blot them out, not only if they are borrowed from a poem of Nero, but alſo if they only contain ſome of his phraſes.* In effect, it cannot be doubted but that Malherbe would have been offended at theſe verſes of Mr Boileau, even if he had not been named in them:

> *Irai-je dans une ode en phraſes de Malherbe,*
> Troubler dans ſes roſeaux le Danube ſuperbe,
> Delivrer de Sion le peuple gemiſſant,
> Faire trembler Memphis & pâlir le Croiſſant,
> Et paſſant du Jourdain les ondes allarmées
> Cueillir *mal à propos* les palmes Idumées (31)?

Mr Boileau names no body when he ſays:

> *Tout chantre ne peut pas ſur le ton d'un Orphée,*
> *Entonner en grands vers* la Diſcorde étouffée:
> *Peindre* Bellone en feu tonnant de toutes parts,
> Et le Belge effrayé fuyant ſur ſes remparts. (32).

Yet can any body doubt but that it muſt raiſe the indignation of the author of thoſe lines? Therefore it ſeems to me that the *torva Mimalloneis*, &c. can neither be a fragment of Nero's Poems, nor a parody or an imitation of his verſes: for once more if he would have been diſpleaſed with the *Auriculas aſini Mida rex habet*, which was an old ſtory, how could it be expected that he ſhould patiently bear ridiculous cento's made up of his own expreſſions? Wherefore, with the old ſcholiaſt's leave, I will not ſubſcribe to theſe words of Mr Boileau till my ſcruples be removed: *Let us examine Perſius, ſays he* (33), *who wrote under Nero's reign. He does not only rail at the Poets of his time, but alſo ridicules the verſes of Nero himſelf. For every body knows, and the whole court of Nero knew it, that thoſe four verſes,* torva Mimalloneis, *&c. which Perſius does ſo ſharply reflect upon in his firſt ſatire, were Nero's verſes. Yet we do not find that Nero, as cruel as he was, cauſed Perſius to be puniſhed for it; and that tyrant, though an enemy to reaſon, and very fond of his works, as it is well known, was ſo reaſonable as not to be offended at it, and did not think that upon ſuch an occaſion the emperor ſhould concern himſelf for the Poet.* I have done with that ſcruple. Caſaubon pretends, that the four verſes in queſtion, were part of a tragedy (34) intituled Bacchæ (35), and to prove that Nero had compoſed ſuch a piece, he quotes Dion Caſſius, who only ſays, that Nero acted the part of a Muſician when that tragedy was acted. But is this a proof that he was the author of it? Beſides, Hexameter verſes, I think, were not uſed in tragedies; but the four verſes in queſtion are Hexameter. If that learned commentator had compared his opinion about *torva Mimalloneis* with his preface on the fourth ſatire, I doubt he would not have perſiſted in that opinion. In effect, he ſays in that preface, that the chief deſign of Perſius in his fourth ſatire was to cenſure the conduct of Nero; and that to avoid bringing himſelf into trouble, he ſo diſguiſed his deſign, that he made uſe of no ſtroke hinting at that prince, and contrived the matter ſo as to be able to come off, in caſe he ſhould be accuſed of aiming at the government. Caſaubon obſerves alſo, that this ſatire was compoſed before Nero had ſhewn all his ill-nature. 'Cujus (*ſatiræ quartæ*) etſi præ'cipuus erat Scopus in Neronem invehi, atque ipſum 'ſatirico ſale defricare .... ſic tamen poëta in hoc 'argumento indignationi ſuæ habenas laxavit, ut ne'que palam neque plenis velis in flagitioſiſſimum prin'cipem inveheretur, verum tectè & longè mollius 'quam vel natura ipſius ferebat, vel Neronis flagitia 'ac ſcelera merebantur. Nos autem putamus tum 'ſcriptam eſſe hanc ſatiram cum nondum totus inno'tuerat Nero, cujus principium laude digna habuit

'multa

(*e*) Taken from his Life written by Suetonius, as it is thought.

(28) Sueton. in Vita Perſii.

(29) Perſ. Sat. I, ver. 99.

(30) Ovid. Met. lib. xi, ver. 186.

(31) Boileau, Sat. IX, ver. 251.

(32) Ibid. ver. 39.

(33) *Idem*, Diſcours ſur la Satire.

(34) Hinc intelligimus Bacchas Neronis ejuſdem argumenti fuiſſe cum Bacchis Euripidis. - - - - *Hence we find that the Bacchæ of Nero were on the ſame ſubject as the Bacchæ of Euripides.* Caſaub. in 1. Sat. Perſii, *pag.* 142.

(35) Sunt autem Neronis verſus ex ejus Bacchis, cujus carminis etiam Dio nominatim facit mentionem. - - - - *They are verſes from the Bacchæ of Nero, which poem Dion expreſſly mentions.* Ibid. pag. 140. Vide etiam, *pag.* 134.

years of age [G]. His panegyriſts may ſay what they pleaſe, it is certain that he wrote harſhly and obſcurely [H]. He might almoſt be called the Lycophron of the Latins

‘ multa. . . . . Probè verò norat Perſius cum ad hanc ſatiram ſcribendam ſe accingeret, quantam rem & quâm periculoſam moliretur. Quamobrem conſilio prudentiſſimo hoc argumentum Platonis imitatione ſibi tractandum cenſuit, non ſolum nominibus inde petitis, ſed etiam ſententia propemodum univerſa; ut ſi quis forte Corycæus aut Cercops nomen ipſius deferret, probabili excuſatione poſſet factum ſuum defendere quaſi exercendi tantum ſtili cauſa petitum è libris ſummi philoſophi argumentum latinis verſibus tentaſſet complecti. Quare etiam ab omnibus illum videmus abſtinuiſſe, quæ Neronis perſonam propriè erant denotatura. - - - *Tho' the fourth ſatire was chiefly intended as a cenſure and invective againſt Nero . . . yet the Poet ſo managed the matter, that he did not openly and directly reflect on that wicked prince, but covertly and much more gently than either his own temper was inclined to, or Nero's crimes deſerved. But in my opinion this ſatire was written, when Nero's diſpoſition was not perfectly known; for in the beginning of his reign he did many commendable things. . . . Perſius knew very well when he ſet himſelf to compoſe this ſatire, how great and dangerous an attempt it was. And therefore he very prudently reſolved to handle this ſubject in imitation of Plato, not only by borrowing names from him, but even almoſt all his thoughts: that ſo, if any envious perſon ſhould inform againſt him, he might give this plauſible excuſe in his own defence, that only to exerciſe his pen he had attempted to turn the argument of that great Philoſopher into Latin verſe. Wherefore we ſee he abſtained from every thing that could properly deſcribe the perſon of Nero.*' Is it not a ſtrange thing, that a man who was of that opinion, ſhould believe that Perſius made bold to ridicule Nero's verſes, and quoted them word for word without any diſguiſe? Perhaps it will be ſaid, that Nero was not much concerned for his quality of Poet: but one muſt give good proofs of it or not ſay ſo; for every body is commonly fond of his own poetry (36). The crown and ſcepter cure not a man of that fault; and we particularly know that Nero was more ſenſibly affected with the cenſure of his Muſic, than with that of his crimes (37). Which is a reaſon to make one believe, that as a Poet he could not bear to be reflected upon. Did he not baniſh Cornutus, and had he not like to have put him to death, for having had the boldneſs to ſay, that Nero would make too many verſes, if he compoſed four hundred books of them, and that the example of Chryſippus ſhould not be alledged in the caſe, ſeeing the books of that Philoſopher were uſeful to human life (38)? Did not he grow jealous of the Poet Lucan, and did not he forbid him to make any verſes (39)? ‘ Lucanum propriæ cauſſæ accendebant, quod famam carminum ejus premebat Nero, prohibueratque oſtentare, vanus adſimulatione (40). - - - *Lucan was induced from private motives, becauſe Nero ſtifled the reputation of his Poems, and forbad him to make any more.*' Lucan was ſo exaſperated at it, that he joined with the conſpirators who endeavoured to kill that prince.

It would be an endleſs thing to quote all the authors (41) who believe that the four verſes ſo cruelly ridiculed by Perſius, were Nero's. I ſhall only cite the notes which have been added to the new tranſlation of Petronius (42): *It has been lawful at all times to critize ſorry books, when they are publiſhed. The defects of the mind may be cenſured every where, and that liberty is as ancient as the world. The Torva, &c. which we read in Juvenal (43), ſhews, that Nero himſelf, as cruel as he was, was not offended at it, and never thought of treating as enemies to the ſtate, thoſe who critized his works: he was only out of humour with thoſe who made verſes better than he.*

Note, That the life of Perſius written by Suetonius (44), as it is thought, does not tell us that the *torva Mimalloneis* had any relation to Nero. It alledges no other example of the liberty that Poet took to critize him, than the verſe wherein *Mida Rex* was to be found, which Cornutus adviſed him to alter. We have therefore but one witneſs for the *torva Mimalloneis*, viz. The ſcholiaſt upon Perſius. An Engliſh author, who made good notes upon the ſatires of that Poet, does not ſay poſitively, as ſo many others do, that Nero was the author of the four verſes in queſtion: ‘ Sive à Nerone, *ſays he* (45), ſive ab alio quopiam nobili Romano compoſita. - - - *Whether they were compoſed by Nero, or any other noble Roman.*' Mr Marais has acquainted me that there is ſuch a paſſage in the Engliſh commentator, and that Mr Geffrier, who publiſhed a French tranſlation or a paraphraſe of Perſius at Paris in 1658, ſays thoſe four verſes were Nero's.

[G] *He died when he was twenty-eight years of age.*] This appears from the conſulſhips of his death and birth. He was born *Fabio Perſico, L. Vitellio Coſſ.* the fourth of December, and he died *Rubrio Mario, Aſinio Gallo Coſſ.* the twenty-fourth of November. Now there being but twenty-eight years between theſe two conſulſhips, it follows that Perſius lived twenty-eight years, within ſome days. Therefore the author of his life made a very wrong reckoning, when after he had fixed the day and year of his death and birth with ſo much exactneſs, he placed his death in the thirtieth year of his age. St Jerome's miſtake is not ſo great, but he has not been exact enough. He ſays that Perſius was born in the ſecond year of the CCIIId Olympiad, and died in the twenty-ninth year of his life, and the ſecond of the CCXth Olympiad. Which cannot be true, but by ſaying that he was born in the firſt months of the year, and died ſome months later: but beſides that St Jerome makes no ſuch diſtinction, we have ſeen that Perſius was born in December, and died in November. I am more ſurprized at Scaliger's approving St Jerome's ſupputation, than at St Jerome's miſtake. Scaliger ſays, that Father was in the right to reckon twenty-nine years from the number 2050 to the number 2078. He finds alſo twenty-nine years between the two above-mentioned conſulſhips, but he had done better to find but twenty-eight. The firſt of thoſe conſulſhips falls upon the year of Chriſt 34, the twentieth of Tiberius, and the 786th of Rome; the other falls upon the year of Chriſt 62, the eighth of Nero, and the 814th of Rome, according to Calviſius's Chronology. Moreri is not at all exact in this point. He places the birth of Perſius at the end of the thirty-ſecond year of Chriſt, and his death *when he was twenty-nine years of age, in the ninth of Nero's reign, and the 62d of Chriſt.* To ſay this with any ſhew of reaſon, he ſhould have added, that he died in the beginning of the ſixty-ſecond year of the Chriſtian Æra; but then it had been falſe, ſince he died on the twenty-fourth of November. It is therefore certain, according to Moreri's ſupputation, that when Perſius died he was near thirty years old. Beſides, according to Moreri, the 32d year of Chriſt anſwers the 18th of Tiberius (46); but it is certain that there are thirty-one years from the 18th of Tiberius to the ninth of Nero: ſo that it would follow that Perſius died being thirty-one years of age. The Dutch edition places his death in the year of Chriſt 26. That miſtake comes from a tranſpoſition of numbers, which is but too common among Printers. Auguſtin Oldoini has committed ſome childiſh faults in his ſupputation about the life of Perſius. He ſays he was born in the year of Rome 795, and died being thirty-three years of age, in the ninth year of Nero's empire. He pretends that the time of his birth anſwers the CCIIId Olympiad, and the twenty-ſecond year of Tiberius's reign (47). Conſult Calviſius, and you will ſee that the firſt year of the CCIIId Olympiad is the 785th year of Rome, and that the ninth year of Nero is the 815th of Rome, and that there are but twenty-eight years between the twenty-ſecond of Tiberius and the ninth of Nero.

Mr Marais has acquainted me in a letter, that Mr Geffrier places the death of Perſius in the CCIIId Olympiad, in the year 785 of Rome, and in the twenty-ſecond of Tiberius's reign.

[H] *His Panegyriſts may ſay what they pleaſe . . . he wrote obſcurely.*] I reckon Iſaac Caſaubon amongſt them (48). I grant that the praiſes he beſtows upon Perſius, are not ſo great as thoſe of Quintilian and Martial, for he intermixes them with ſome cenſures; but after all he acknowledges that Perſius was a man of great merit and parts, and makes himſelf his champion againſt the great Julius Scaliger, tho' at the ſame time he humbles himſelf with great reſpect at the foot of

---

(36) Scripſit ſummo vir ingenio & ſcientia ſingulari Philoſophus artifices omnes opus ſuum adamare, Poetas tamen præcipue. - - - - *A Philoſopher, who was a man of a great genius and extraordinary learning, ſaid that all artiſts were fond of their own works, and eſpecially Poets.* Menag. Ep. Dedic. Carmin.

(37) Nihil æque doluit, quam ut malum ſe citharædum increpitum. *Sueton. in Nerone, cap. xli.*

(38) Xiphil. in Nerone.

(39) Id. ib. & Tacit. Ann. *lib. xv, cap. xlix.*

(40) Tacit. ibid.

(41) You will find one mentioned in the remark [K].

(42) Pag. 24, Tom. i, of the Dutch Edit. 1694.

(43) He ſhould have ſaid Perſius.

(44) It is at the end of Suetonius's treatiſe *de Claris Rhetoribus.*

(45) Joan. Bond in Perſ. Sat. I, pag. m. 24.

(46) He ſays in the article of Tiberius, that this emperor died in the 23d year of his reign, and the 37th of Chriſt.

(47) Athen. Liguſt. *pag.* 80, 81.

(48) In the Prolegomena of the commentary he publiſhed upon that author at Paris in 8vo, in the year 1605. It was inſerted in the edition of Juvenal and Perſius in Holland 1696, in 4to.

Latins [*I*]. Scaliger the father, and ſeveral other excellent Critics ſpeak very ill of him (*f*). Perhaps they run into an extreme, which is leſs tolerable than if they had a great eſteem for that Poet. Note, that the rigour of the time wherein he lived can be no excuſe for the obſcurity of his ſtile [*K*], as ſome pretend. Some Italian Genealogiſts will

of the throne of that terrible antagoniſt. I ſhall only mention that part of the diſpute, which concerns the obſcurity of our Poet. Caſaubon wonders that Scaliger ſpoke of it more than once, conſidering that nothing was obſcure to him; but it ſeems to me that he falls into the Sophiſm, which Logicians call *ignorationem Elenchi*, miſtaking the queſtion, and which is not leſs common among Critics than among Philoſophers. Scaliger pretended not that Perſius was obſcure to him; on the contrary he declares, that he underſtood him from the beginning to the end (49); he only ſays, that Poet was formerly placed in the number of things that were unknown, and charges him with impertinency, for having written to be read, and not to be underſtood. He ſeems to inſult over him, becauſe the interpreters have fruſtrated his expectation, by removing the darkneſs he had deſignedly ſpread over all his writings, to be eternally buried in it, and eternally admired by fools.

Omnia enim ſtolidi magis admirantur amantque
Inverſis quæ ſub verbis latitantia cernunt (50).

- - - - For only fools regard,
What ſeems obſcure, and intricate, and hard.

The encomiums which Quintilian and Martial beſtow upon him, put me in mind of thoſe which are beſtowed upon two of our French Poets. *It is not the quantity of a man's works that makes him immortal. Two ſheets of paper have tranſmitted Perſius to us: The abbot de Ceriſi will live longer only by his Metamorphoſis of Phillis's eyes into ſtars, than many authors who take up a great deal of room in our libraries, and the temple of death* (51) *will more eaſily break thro' the rigour of time, than the ſix hundred volumes of the biſhop du Bellay* (52). Which does pretty well agree with theſe two Latin verſes:

Sæpius in libro memoratur Perſius uno,
Quam levis in tota Marſus Amazonide (53).

More fam'd is Perſius by one ſingle book,
Than Marſus by the whole Amazonid.

And with theſe words of Quintilian, ‘Multum & veræ ‘gloriæ quamvis uno libro Perſius meruit (54). - - - ‘*Perſius deſerved much glory tho' he wrote but one* ‘*book.*’

[*I*] *He might almoſt be called the Lycophron of the Latins.*] I have read ſomewhere (55), that the ſenſe of the troubleſome volumes of the Talmudiſts *is ſo unknown to us, out of envy to their ſucceſſors, that their books might be cut and tore with better reaſon than the ſatires of Perſius were by a Father of the church, who ſaid, that ſince he could not be underſtood by the outſide, as other writers are, he would ſee whether he was more intelligible in the inſide.* Here is another paſſage wherein Lycophron and Perſius are coupled together (56). *For my part I think that Trithemius's book ſhould be ſawn in two, as ſome body ſawed formerly Lycophron's Caſſandra, to ſee what there was in the inſide, ſince nothing could be known of it by the out-ſide. Or, as it is alſo reported of St Jerome, that he did the like with the ſatires of Perſius, whoſe riddles and obſcurities being not able to underſtand,* intellecturis ignibus ille dedit (57). - - - *He committed them to the fire to be unfolded.* I would have this laſt ſtory, and the others alſo, to be well warranted; for I ſee that Caſaubon relies upon St Jerome's teſtimony, to refute thoſe who cenſure Perſius (58).

Here is another obſervation which Mr Marais has imparted to me. The elogy of John Bond's commentary is to be found in a place where no body would look for it; *viz.* in the preface to the *Aloiſiæ Sigeæ Toletanæ Satyra Sotadica* (59). The words which contain that elogy, contain alſo a deſcription of Perſius's obſcurity: ‘Gratuleris tibi, Aule Perſi. Ob‘volviſti te ipſe cœca nocte, videri nolebas, altam ver‘ſibus & verſuum ſenſibus profudiſti caliginem. No‘lebas intelligi: forte & tu te non intelligebas. Non ‘fecerunt ad te nox & caligo ut exerraret, Joannes ‘Bond, venit, vidit, diſcuſſit noctem & caliginem. ‘Perſpectum id omne habet, ut tute loqueris, *quod* ‘*latet arcanâ non enarrabile fibrâ.* Eripuit tibi te ne‘ganti conſpectum. Latebas intra te, ne te curioſa ‘& erudita inveniret ſagacitas. Eras ipſe involucrum ‘tibi. Quis vero fuit furor ille tuus? - - - *You may* ‘*pleaſe yourſelf, O Perſius, with the thoughts of it. You* ‘*have involved yourſelf in thick darkneſs, you deſired not* ‘*to be ſeen, and have ſpread a miſt upon your verſes* ‘*and the ſenſe of them. But yet your obſcurity could* ‘*not miſlead John Bond: he came, he ſaw, he diſpelled* ‘*night and darkneſs. He diſcovered all that which, as* ‘*you ſay,* lay hid in a ſecret nerve. *He got a ſight of* ‘*you, againſt your will. You lay lurking within your* ‘*ſelf, that no learning or penetration might find you out.* ‘*What madneſs was this?*’ As for the reſt, that commentary of John Bond upon Perſius was printed a year after the death of the author, by the care of Roger Prowſe his ſon-in-law. I have the London edition of 1614. If it be the firſt, as I think it is, we may know that John Bond died in the year 1613. The *Diarium* of Mr Witte ſays nothing of it.

[*K*] *The rigour of the time wherein he lived can be no excuſe for the obſcurity of his ſtile.*] I am ſorry I cannot be of the opinion of the author of the preface, who has afforded me two paſſages, the reading whereof is ſo agreeable. *I know very well,* ſays he (60), *that Perſius is not at firſt very intelligible, and that he might have expreſſed himſelf more clearly; but how could he do it under Nero's reign? He was a terrible man, and could not bear a jeſt; and becauſe he had more reaſon than any body elſe to think he was concerned in the ſharpeſt and moſt ingenious part of a ſatire, if there had been the leaſt colour for it, I am not ſurprized to ſee that Perſius affected to be enigmatical and myſterious. Therefore when Julius Scaliger called him a feveriſh learned man, it is likely he did not mind what he ſaid; and I am ſure this proud and terrible Critic would have been ſeized with a violent ſhivering, at the meer ſight of Nero. Nay, I admire the boldneſs of Perſius in venturing once to ridicule that emperor; for theſe words* Auriculas Aſini Mida Rex habet, *were put in on purpoſe for him. Perſius had been undone, if the wiſe and diſcreet Cornutus had not ſuppreſſed the proper name, and ſubſtituted in the room of it a word which concerns all mankind. Nay, I cannot apprehend how that Philoſopher, who was baniſhed afterwards by the tyrant, becauſe he could not in conſcience approve the deſign of his Poem, ſuffered his diſciple to expoſe himſelf, by producing with a malicious deſign, the* Torva Mimalloneis, *&c. as a model of moſt excellent verſes.* Here are two obſervations upon that paſſage.

I. It is evident to any one who reads Perſius attentively, that he is obſcure, not out of policy, but becauſe he had ſuch a taſte, and had given ſuch a turn to his genius; for if the fear of bringing himſelf into trouble at court had moved him to cover his conceptions with a thick cloud, he would have done it only in ſuch matters as had ſome relation to the life of the tyrant. But we ſee that he twiſts his words, and has recourſe to alluſions and enigmatical figures, even when he is about to inſinuate only a moral maxim, the cleareſt explication whereof could not have afforded Nero the leaſt pretence of being angry with him. I ſhall give no examples of it, and I refer my readers to the very ſatires of that Poet; they make but a little book; every body will be able to know in a little time whether I am in the right, or whether I am miſtaken. But if any one had rather not be at that trouble, and refer himſelf to the judgment of a learned Critic, he needs go no farther. Here is the ſentence. ‘Obſcuritatis hujus diverſas afferre cauſſas poſſumus, ‘eaſque certiſſimas: in auctore ſunt aliquæ, aliæ extra ‘illum, quædam in interpretibus. Non negabo per‘obſcura quædam eſſe in quarta, prima quoque: ſed ‘poëtæ facilè ignoſco, cum cogito crudeliſſimi & φο‘νικωτάτȣ tyranni, in quem illa erant, metu, de in‘duſtria atramenti ſepiarum aliquid eſſe affuſum: ne‘que dubito ſapientiſſimum præceptorum Cornutum

‘ſcribenti

(*f*) See the Poets of Mr Baillet, *num.* 1158.

(49) Perſii ſtilus moroſus, & ille ineptus qui cum legi vellet quæ ſcripſiſſet, intelligi noluit quæ legerentur, quamquam nunc à nobis omnia intelliguntur. At fuit tempus cum inter ignota haberetur. *Jul. Cæſar Scaliger, Poëtic. lib. vi, cap. vi, pag. m.* 773. *See alſo cap. xcvii, of the third book, pag.* 343.

(50) Lucret. lib. I, ver. 642.

(51) Mr Habert, of the French academy, is the author of it.

(52) Guerre des Auteurs, pag. 139.

(53) Martial. Epigr. XXIX, lib. IV.

(54) Quintil. *lib. x, cap. i.*

(55) In the firſt Tome of the *Conférences du Bureau d'Adreſſe.*

(56) Vigenaire, Traité des Chifres, *pag.* 12.

(57) Ex Ovidio Triſt. lib. IV, Eleg. X.

(58) Certe aliud Quintilianus judicabat cum vera laude dignum pronunciaret, aliud Hieronymus cum diſertiſſimum ſatiricum vocaret. - - - - *Certainly Quintilian thought otherwiſe when he pronounced him worthy of true glory, and St Jerome, when he called him a moſt eloquent ſatiriſt.* Caſaub. ubi ſupra.

(59) The preface of my Edit. of *Aloiſiæ,* &c. *Satyra Sotadica* does not contain what Mr Marais found in his.

(60) Epiſtle prefixed to the tranſlation of Father Tarteron.

will have it that the Falconcini of Volterra draw their original from his father [*L*].

‘ ſcribenti adfuiſſe, qui vetus verbum crebrò illi inſuſurraret, Σκότισον. . . . . Cùm ſcribit idem βιογράφος, verecundiæ virginalis Partheniam noſtrum fuiſſe, aliud agens cauſſam nos docet cur ille locus tenebricosè fuerit tractatus, cui vix alius toto libro obſcuritate par, obſcœnitate ſimilis nullus, περικοπὴν illam dico è quarta. *At ſi unctus ceſſes.* Etiam illud ultrò concedimus, nonnulla Perſii loca tropis parum uſitatis & audacioribus eſſe offuſcata, hujus quoque non culpam, ſed cauſſam, ita enim dicere æquius, ingenio poëtæ aſſignamus: quod cùm eſſet magnum, magna ſectabatur (61). . . . . Fuit præterea Flaccus noſter οὐ φιλόμυθός πως. ſed amans brevitatis: quæ res obſcuriorem eſt ubi illum reddit (62). - - - *Various reaſons, and thoſe very certain ones, may be aſſigned for this obſcurity: ſome relate to the author, ſome to outward circumſtances, and ſome to his interpreters. I will not deny but there are very obſcure paſſages in the fourth ſatire and in the firſt too: but I can eaſily forgive the Poet, when I conſider that he ſtudied to be intricate, from the fear of that moſt cruel and murdering tyrant, and I do not queſtion but his prudent maſter, Cornutus, aſſiſted him when he wrote, and frequently inculcated that ſaying, be obſcure. . . . . Since the ſame Biographer tells us, that our Poet had the modeſty of a virgin; he gives this as another reaſon why that place was handled ſo obſcurely, to which hardly any other in the whole book is equal for difficulty, and none like it for obſcenity. I mean that paſſage of the fourth ſatire,* At ſi unctus ceſſes. *I muſt likewiſe grant that ſome places of Perſius are obſcured by unuſual and bold figures, but this cauſe, for it is not juſt to call it a fault, is to be aſcribed to the genius of the Poet; which, as it was great, loved great things. . . . . Beſides, our Perſius was not given to talk much, but affected brevity, which rendered him the more obſcure.*’ Caſaubon aſcribes the obſcurity of Perſius to four cauſes. 1. He was afraid of Nero. 2. He was modeſt. 3. He had a great genius. 4. He loved brevity. Why ſhould theſe four cauſes be reduced to the firſt, in the preface of the new tranſlation?

(61) Caſaub. in Prolegomenis ad Perſ. *fol. m.* eij.

(62) Ibid. *fol.* eiij.

II. This author having ſaid, that Perſius expreſſed himſelf obſcurely, becauſe he was afraid of Nero, ſhould not ſuppoſe that the *Torva Mimalloneis, &c.* were that prince's verſes. It is not enough to ſay, that one cannot apprehend how Cornutus permitted it; we muſt ſay poſitively that he would not have conſented to it, and that Perſius wanted no corrector. Otherwiſe this will be a monſtrous diſparity, which ſeems to ſurpaſs all the caprices and extravagances of the minds of men.

[*L*] *Some Italian Genealogiſts will have it that the Falconcini of Volterra draw their original from his father.*] Francis Stelluti (63) makes uſe of this reaſon to prove that Perſius was born at Volterra. They believe, ſays he, by tradition, that the Falconcini came from Flaccus, a Roman knight, who was Perſius's father; which is ſo much the more likely, becauſe the name of Perſius was preſerved in that family, and conſtantly appeared in it for above theſe three hundred years. But it is anſwered, that Perſius had no brother, nor children; that the ſirname of Flaccus was to be found in ſeveral cities of Italy, and that the noble and illuſtrious family of Perſius has been in Genoa above four hundred years. See the above-mentioned diſſertation of Gaſparo Maſſa. Hippolitus Landinelli (64), ſays, that they ſhew at Volterra a houſe which is ſuppoſed to be that of Perſius.

(63) In the Life of Perſius before the Italian paraphraſe on the ſame Poet.

(64) Nell' Origine di Luni, *cap. xi*, apud Mich. Juſtiniani, Scritt. Liguri, *pag.* 108.

PERSONA (CHRISTOPHER) a Roman by birth, and prior of the convent (*a*) of Santa Balbina (*b*), of the order of the Guillelmites (*c*), upon mount Aventinus, was a conſiderable man in the XVth century, for his ſkill in the Greek tongue. It is ſaid that he went into Greece to learn it (*d*). He tranſlated Agathias and ſome other authors into Latin [*A*]. We are told that he died of the Plague in the year 1486 (*e*). Voſſius ſpeaks of him with the greateſt contempt [*B*]. Yet ſome ſtrive who ſhall have him; the

(*a*) Jovius, Elog. *cap. cxvi.*

(*b*) Geſner, *in his* Bibliotheca, *ſays* Sancta Albina.

(*c*) Jovius, ibid.

(*d*) Konig. Bibl. Vet. & Nova.

(*e*) Ibid. Baillet, Jugemens des Traduct. Lat. *Tom. iii, num.* 812.

[*A*] *He tranſlated Agathias, and ſome other authors, into Latin.*] He tranſlated into Latin the Hiſtory of the Goths, written by Procopius; but thoſe who ſay, as well as Paul Jovius (1), that he did alſo tranſlate the Hiſtory which the ſame Procopius wrote concerning the war of the Perſians, and that of the Vandals, are miſtaken. What he publiſhed of Procopius ſhewed the impoſtor of Leonard Aretinus (2), which I have mentioned in another place (3). He made ſeveral other tranſlations, he tranſlated Origen's books againſt Celſus, twenty-five homilies of St Chryſoſtom, ſome treatiſes of Athanaſius, and ſome treatiſes of Theophylactus (4). Thoſe tranſlations are not very good; but Paul Jovius, and ſo many other authors, who ſpeak of him, cannot be excuſed for ſaying nothing of them. Mr du Pin, I preſume, will not take it ill that I ſhould ſay, there is ſome obſcurity in theſe words of his firſt volume. *The treatiſe of Origen againſt Celſus is divided into eight books, which were publiſhed in Greek a great while ago, with the tranſlation of Gelenius, and ſome notes of Eſchelius, and of one Chriſtopher Perſona, printed at Rome in* 1471, *and ſince very correctly in England in the year* 1658 (5). I obſerve, 1. That the change of Hoeſchelius into Eſchelius may deceive a reader; he would be apt to believe that there was a writer named Eſchelius, different from the learned man of Auſburg, to whom the public is beholden for the edition of ſeveral Greek books. 2. Mr du Pin gives us clearly to underſtand that Perſona made no tranſlation of that book of Origen, but only ſome notes to explain it. But Geſner tells us (6), that Perſona dedicated to Sixtus IV his Latin verſion of the eight books of Origen againſt Celſus. 3. The meaning of Mr du Pin's words is, that thoſe eight books were printed at Rome in 1471, in Greek, with Gelenius's tranſlation, and ſome notes of Eſchelius and Perſona. Which ought not to be ſaid, for Gelenius lived in the XVIth century, and the Greek edition with Gelenius's tranſlation came out in 1605. It was a preſent of Hoeſchelius.

(1) Jovius, Elog. *cap. ix.*

(2) Id. ib. & cap. cxvi.

(3) Above, remark [*F*] of the article ARETINUS (LEONARD).

(4) Geſn. Bibl.

(5) Du Pin, Bibl. of Eccleſ. Writers, Tom. i, pag. 133, of the Dutch Edit.

(6) Geſner, Bibl. *fol.* 167, *verſo.*

I ſhall ſet down here a good ſupplement which Mr Simon affords me. The Printers have committed two great miſtakes in it, by putting the year 1581 inſtead of the year 1481 (7), and Suſchelius inſtead of Hoeſchelius. ‘We learn from Theodore Gaza *, that Pope Nicolas V ſent a man on purpoſe to Conſtantinople, to fetch the books which he wrote againſt Celſus, and that as ſoon as he received them, he promiſed a good reward to any one that would tranſlate them into Latin. But this Pope being dead, they were not printed at Rome in Latin only, till the year 1581, under Sixtus IV. Gaza, who expected not the ſame reward from Sixtus, as from his predeceſſor, engaged Chriſtopher Perſona, prior of St Balbina, to tranſlate them into Latin, and we have had no other tranſlation of them till Suſchelius publiſhed them in Greek and Latin at Auſburg from ſome Greek MSS which he found in the libraries of Germany. Laſtly, Spencer, an Engliſh Proteſtant, publiſhed a very fine edition of them at Cambridge 1658, which does not differ from that of Auſburg, becauſe he had no Greek MSS. He was contented to correct the tranſlation in ſome places, and to add ſome new notes to it (8).’

(7) I ſuppoſe Mr Simon had written 1481, and not as Mr du Pin did 1471.

* Theod. Gaza, Epiſt. ad Chriſtoph. Perſon.

(8) Simon, Choice Letters, *pag.* 94, *Edit.* 1700.

[*B*] *Voſſius ſpeaks of him with the greateſt contempt.*] The publication of Procopius's Greek, ſays he, was a preſent ſo much the more conſiderable, becauſe they had at that time but ſorry tranſlations of it. He adds, that the moſt impertinent Chriſtopher Perſona omitted many things, and publiſhed his dreams, rather than the thoughts of that Hiſtorian. ‘Eſtque hoc egregii viri *(Davidis Hœſchelii)* beneficium eo majus, quòd Latini interpretes toties abeant à Græcis: imprimis ineptiſſimus ille Chriſtophorus Perſona quatuor rerum Gothicarum libros vertit; ſi vertiſſe, & non pervertiſſe dici is debet, qui multa adeo omittit, & in iis, quæ refert, toties nobis ſua narrat ſomnia (9). - - - - *The preſent of that excellent man, David Hoeſchelius, is ſo much the greater, as the Latin tranſlators ſo much vary from the Greek, eſpecially that moſt*

‘ *impertinent*

(9) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Græc. *pag.* 269, 270. *See alſo* de Arte Hiſt. *pag.* 94.

the Auguſtins will have him to be one of their order; but the Servites claim him, and place him in the catalogue of their authors (*f*).

(*f*) Proſper Mandoſius, Bibl. Romana, *Cent. I, num.* 82, *p.* 59.

‘ *impertinent Chriſtopher Perſona, who has tranſlated four books of the Hiſtory of the Goths: if that work may be called a verſion, and not a perverſion, ſince he has omitted many things, and inſerted many of his own dreams.*’ I have obſerved in another place (10), a miſtake of Voſſius, which Sandius's Critic took no notice of. Voſſius ſays, that Leonard Aretinus having aſcribed to himſelf a book of Procopius, it moved Perſona to tranſlate Agathias (11). He ſhould have ſaid, that it moved him to tranſlate that book of Procopius into Latin. ‘ Procopium Latine loquentem fecit, non dubia in Leonardum Aretinum conflata invidia, qui ſuppreſſo Græci authoris nomine Gothicam hiſtoriam tanquam è variis ſcriptoribus decerptam pro ſua Juliano Cæſarino Cardinali qui ad Varnam ab Amurathe cæſus periit, nullo pudore nuncuparat (12). *He tranſlated Procopius into Latin, from a manifeſt reſentment to Leonardus Aretinus, who ſuppreſſing the name of the Greek author had impudently dedicated the Hiſtory of the Goths as his own work, as if he had collected it from ſeveral authors, to Cardinal Julianus Cæſarinus, who was ſlain at Verna, by Amurath.*’ Voſſius, who quotes that paſſage, has thereby given himſelf up to his Critics.

(10) See the remark [*F*] of the article ARETINUS (LEONARD).

(11) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 558.

(12) Jovius, Elog. *cap. cxvii, pag.* 258.

PETAVIUS (DIONYSIUS), in French, *Petau*, born at Orleans in the year 1583, entered into the ſociety of the Jeſuits in the year 1605. He taught Rhetoric in their college at Paris, and then Divinity, with an extraordinary capacity (*a*). He was one of the moſt learned men in Europe. I ſhall not give the character of his vaſt and deep learning, for it may be found in a new book (*b*) ſold by all the Bookſellers. One may conſult alſo the funeral oration of that Jeſuit, written in Latin by Henricus Valeſius (*c*), and read in the *Gallia Orientalis* (*d*) a large collection of ſeveral things which have been ſaid of him, with the titles of moſt of his works, and the time wherein they were printed. The titles and dates of moſt of them are alſo to be found in Moreri's Dictionary. Mr Baillet has collected abundance of things which concern that great author. See his Jugemens des Savans, on the Grammarian Critiques chapter DXIII; on the Latin Tranſlators, chapter CMXXI; and on the Poets, chapter MCDLXXIV. It is enough for me to have directed the reader to thoſe books. I ſhall only add, firſt, that Petavius died at Paris (*e*), on the eleventh of December (*f*) 1652, thirteen weeks after Salmaſius, his antagoniſt [*A*]. 2. That without deſigning it, and even againſt his intention,

(*a*) Alegambe, Bibl. Script. Societ. *pag.* 96.

(*b*) The Elogies of Illuſtrious Men, by Mr Perrault, *Tom. i, pag.* 63, *& ſeq. of the Dutch Edit.* 1698.

(*c*) It is in the Lives of Illuſtrious Men, collected by William Bates, and printed at London 1681.

(*d*) *Pag.* 217, *& ſeq.*

(*e*) The Paris Gazette, Decemb. 14, 1652, where it is obſerved, amongſt other Elogies, that he was invited by ſeveral princes, eſpecially by Urban VIII, but that he refuſed that honour as much out of modeſty, as out of obedience to Lewis XIII, *who thought it was for the good and glory of his kingdom to keep ſo great a man in it.*

(*f*) And not of November, as Father Labbe ſays, *Chronol. Franç. Tom. v, pag.* 894.

[*A*] *Salmaſius, his antagoniſt.*] They had a very long and very violent diſpute: it was not poſſible to match two better wreſtlers together. It is pity they did not write with more moderation. Their firſt quarrel began, if I am not miſtaken, a little after Salmaſius had publiſhed his commentary upon Tertullian's treatiſe *de Pallio*, in the year 1622. Petavius criticized (1) that commentary under the falſe name of Antonius Kercoëtius Aremoricus. He was anſwered in a book printed (2) in the year 1623, and intituled, *Confutatio animadverſorum Antonii Cercoëtii ad Claudii Salmaſii notas in Tertullianum de pallio. Auctore Franciſco Franco J. C.* He replied, in a book divided into three parts, the firſt whereof was printed at Paris in the year 1622, and the other two one after another the next year in the ſame city. The firſt is intituled, *Antonii Kerkoëtii Aremorici Maſtigophorus primus, ſive elenchus confutationis quam Claudius Salmaſius ſub ementito nomine animadverſis Kerkoëtianis oppoſuit.* The ſecond, *Antonii Kerkoëtii Aremorici Maſtigophorus ſecundus, ſivi elenchi confutationis. . . . pars ſecunda*; and the third, *Antonii Kerkoëtii Aremorici Maſtigophorus tertius, ſive elenchi confutationis . . . pars tertia.* I do not know whether his Reply was refuted, but I know that ever ſince that firſt attack, he never ceaſed to look for his adverſary, and to fight him wherever he found him. Thoſe who know Salmaſius's temper, may eaſily imagine that he defended himſelf, and attacked his adverſary in his turn. He made ſome very fine Latin verſes, which Menagius inſerted in one of his books, as I have obſerved in another place (3), and which run upon a thing which has been ſaid of apes. Scaliger had uſed the ſame compariſon, not only againſt Lydiat (4), but alſo againſt Scioppius. Scioppius, ſays he (5), *ſcripſit adverſus Jeſuitas, - - - wrote againſt the Jeſuits: he goes up too high, and makes himſelf as ridiculous as an ape, who the higher he goes, the more he ſhews his back-ſide.* The author of the Apology for Stephen Paſquier againſt Garaſſe, made uſe of the Latin verſes of Salmaſius without naming him; he made a kind of a paraphraſe upon them, and cited ſome of them as they are. Here is the paſſage (6): ‘ They tell a pleaſant ſtory of a monkey, which I may very well apply to Garaſſe's humour and actions, which are meer monkey tricks. One day an old monkey without hair, but ſtuffed with malice in the in-ſide, poſted up bills in all the croſs-ſtreets of the common-wealth of apes and baboons, to give notice, that whoever deſired to ſee a fine ſhow, ſhould come to a certain place, at a certain hour, and that he would afford them good ſport. The day being come, every one makes himſelf ready, great and little monkies, apes, and baboons, come from all parts in crowds to the appointed place, expecting to ſee wonderful performances. Such a concourſe was never ſeen before.

Conveniunt omnes, Cercopitheci, Simiæ,
Clurinæ pecudes, omne genus Cercopium:
Quæ ſunt caudatæ, quæ ſine caudis ambulant,
Similes hominibus beſtiæ turpiſſimæ.
Erat inter illos ingens expectatio:
Quidnam editurus, & miri novi foret,
Tam grandium Minator ille SIMIUS.

‘ Every one takes his place, and they ſtaid a great while for the farce-player; at laſt, after he had kept them waiting a matter of four or five hours, he comes, and gets up a tree, which was to ſerve him inſtead of a ſtage, he ſkips from bough to bough, comes down, goes up again, gets up to the top of the tree, comes down again; and laſtly, after ſo many turns, he ſtops and ſhews his back-ſide to the aſſembly, to ridicule, by ſuch an action, thoſe who truſted the promiſes of a monkey. Poggius ſays, that a certain Jack-pudding plaid the ſame trick in the city of Bologna, but Garaſſe affords us a new example of it.’ The ſtory mentioned by Poggius was applied to Laurentius Valla, and perhaps Menagius would have cited it, if he had remembered it. Here is the ſtory with it's application: ‘ Perſimilis eſt Valla noſter homini ridiculo: qui cum aliquando ſe ex quadam turri volaturum certo die profiteretur: & populos ad id ſpectaculum conveniſſet: homines Suſpenſos variis alarum oſtentationibus ad noctem uſque detinuit. Deinde omnibus volatum cupide exſpectantibus: populo culum oſtendit. Ita Laurentius noſter poſt multas atque ingentes verborum pollicitationes; poſt tantam expectationem promiſſorum: tandem non quidem culum, ut ille, ſed volantis cerebri inſaniam, & pergrandem ignorantiæ ſupellectilem oſtendit (7). - - - - *Valla is like a ridiculous fellow, who gave out that he was to fly from a tower on a certain day: and when the people were all met to ſee this ſight, kept them in ſuſpence till evening by ſhewing them*
‘ *his*

(1) That criticiſm intituled, *Animadverſorum Liber*, was printed at Rhemes in the year 1622, in 8vo.

(2) At Paris, and not at Middelburg as the title ſays.

(3) Citat. (111) of the article HOSPITAL (MICHAEL DE L').

(4) Citat. (112), ibid.

(5) Scaligerana, voce Scioppius, *pag. m.* 222.

(6) Apology for Stephen Paſquier, *book i*, §. *vii, pag.* 93, *& ſeq.*

(7) Poggius' Invect. *lib. i.*

tention, he did a great ſervice to the Socinians [*B*]. 3. That it has been ſaid the Jeſuits were

‘*his wings: and at laſt, whilſt they are eagerly expecting the performance, turns up his back-ſide to them. In like manner Valla, after many and vaſt promiſes, after much expectation to ſee them fulfilled, at length ſhews, not his back-ſide indeed, as the other, but the madneſs of his ſoaring brain, and a great deal of ignorant ſtuff.*’

It cannot be denied but that the Jeſuit Petavius ſhewed too much paſſion and haughtineſs, not only againſt Salmaſius, but alſo againſt Scaliger, and many others. It was well done to inſert a parentheſis upon that ſubject, in the article of that Jeſuit, in the Dutch edition of Moreri. I wonder Mr Perrault choſe rather to paraphraſe a paſſage out of Henry Valeſius's harangue, than ſuppreſs it entirely. *Tanta ejus viri* (Scaligeri) *auctoritas omnium prope præjudicio roborata Petavium noſtrum à ſcribendo minime deterruit. Immo vero ipſum eo magis impulit, ut quæ ab illo emendatore temporum peccata fuerant, ipſe in ſuis de doctrina temporum libris emendaret. Non quod illius viri gloriæ obtrectaret; ſed ne plerique forte auctoritate Scaligeri inducti, minime diſcuſſa rei veritate, in errorem præcipites laberentur* (8). This is what Henry Valeſius ſays, and here are Mr Perrault's words: *That work of Scaliger was looked upon as a rule to which every body was to conform. Which hindred not Petavius from undertaking the ſame work, and correcting in his book* de Doctrina temporum *many faults which are to be found in Scaliger's book* de Emendatione temporum; *which he did, obſerving all the rules of civility which ſcholars ought to obſerve one towards another; ſo that without obſcuring the glory of his predeceſſor, he acquired a very great one in the ſame ſcience* (9). If you read a paſſage of Mr Morus, and another of Guy Patin (10), you will not have ſo good an opinion of the civil behaviour of Scaliger's adverſary.

[*B*] *Without deſigning it . . . he did a great ſervice to the Socinians.*] I ſhall tranſcribe a long paſſage of Mr Simon, which concerns that ſubject, and contains ſome other things relating to Petavius. ‘Mr Hardy told me that Mr de l'Aubeſpine had alſo ſome difference with Petavius, and threatened him to cauſe ſome of his notes upon St Epiphanius to be condemned; but I am perſuaded, that this learned Jeſuit would have made a very good apology for himſelf. If there be any thing to blame in Petavius's works, it is eſpecially in the ſecond volume of his *Dogmata Theologica*, wherein he ſeems to favour the Arians: It is true, that he has ſoftened thoſe paſſages in his preface; but becauſe the body of the book remains entire, and the preface, which is an excellent piece, came too late, he has not altogether remedied the harm which that book may do at this time, wherein the new Unitarians boaſt, that Petavius has given up tradition to them. I have ſeen ſome perſons here, who believe that Grotius, who kept correſpondence with Crellius, and ſome other Socinians, impoſed upon that learned Jeſuit; but it is not at all likely that ſo underſtanding a man as Petavius ſhould have been deceived by Grotius who was his friend. It is more likely that he ingenuouſly wrote his own thoughts. It would be for the honour of the ſociety to continue the *Dogmata Theologica* of their brother, and to follow his method, which is an excellent one. It is certain, that he himſelf had ſuch a deſign; for I have ſeen the plan he performed of it, whereby I knew the courſe he followed in his ſtudies, wherewith I ſhall perhaps acquaint you in another letter. A friend of mine aſſured me, that he was not accounted a great Divine among the Jeſuits, and that he was often obliged to have recourſe to ſome other Fathers of his ſociety, when the queſtion was about theological matters. Many of ours (11) ſay the ſame of Father Morin, who is really a poor man for the reaſoning part. But whatever may be ſaid of Petavius in his ſociety, I admire him in all reſpects. Can any thing be more charming than his fine Latin ſtile in ſuch thorny ſubjects? I only wiſh he had not been ſo diffuſe in his expreſſions. An author can never be too conciſe when he treats of doctrines; he ought to avoid long phraſes as much as he can: this is what Father Sirmond excelled moſt in, who found out the ſecret of explaining himſelf in few words, and with great clearneſs. Yet he was very much inferior to Petavius as to learning (12).’ Mr Simon is in the right to ſay, that the preface of Petavius was not a good remedy; for the Socinians and new Arians have, notwithſtanding, taken advantage of the collections of that Jeſuit, about the tradition of the three firſt centuries. Thoſe collections encouraged Sandius to write a book, which vexed the orthodox and gave them a great deal of exerciſe. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, in the abſtract of one of Dr Bull's book (13). See alſo Mr Jurieu's *Tableau du Socinianiſme, pag.* 224, *and* 363. But obſerve that this miniſter deſigning to take advantage of Petavius's teſtimony, falſified it, and that the biſhop of Meaux took him up for it. This I am going to prove.

Laſtly the Theology of the ancient Fathers, ſays Mr Jurieu (14) *was ſo imperfect* about the doctrine of the Trinity, *that the Jeſuit Petavius was forced to own in expreſs words, that they gave us* only the firſt lineaments of it *. Here is the biſhop of Meaux's anſwer (15). ‘Now how can you truſt your miniſter when he quotes ſome paſſages? No, my brethren, he does not read them, or he reads them curſorily; he looks for difficulties in them, and not for ſolutions, that he may thereby perplex your minds, inſtead of inſtructing you, and he omits nothing to impoſe upon you, as when to make you believe †, *that the Theology of the Fathers was imperfect* about the myſtery of the Trinity, he makes Petavius ſay *in expreſs words, that they gave us only the firſt lineaments of it.* But that learned author ſays the contrary in the place quoted by the miniſter, which is the preface to the ſecond volume of his *Dogmata Theologica*. For he ⸸ undertakes to prove, that the Catholic doctrine was always the ſame on that ſubject. and in the very firſt chapter of that preface he ſhews, that the *main and ſubſtance of that myſtery* was always very well known by tradition; that the Fathers of the firſt centuries *agree with us in the main, in the ſubſtance, and in the thing itſelf, tho' not always in the manner of expreſſing it*: which he further proves in the ſecond ‡ chapter by the teſtimony of St Ignatius, St Polycarp, and all the ancient doctors: laſtly, in the third ‡‡ chapter which the miniſter objects to us ſpeaking of St Juſtin, who of all the ancients is moſt ſuſpected by Mr Jurieu, that learned Jeſuit ſays poſitively, that this holy martyr *has excellently and clearly propoſed the main and ſubſtance of that myſtery*: which he proves alſo ** with reſpect to Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus, and others, *who all believed*, as he ſays, *the main and ſubſtance of that doctrine without any ſpot*; from whence he concludes, that if there are ſome paſſages more obſcure in the writings of thoſe holy men, it is becauſe having to do *with Heathens and Philoſophers, they declared not with the greateſt ſubtilty and preciſion the ſecret of that myſtery in the books which they publiſhed; and in order to gain thoſe Philoſophers, they explained it in a manner more agreeable to Platoniſm, which they had learned; as it was likewiſe practiſed for a long time after in the catechiſms that were made to inſtruct thoſe whom they had a mind to bring over to Chriſtianity, to whom they gave only in the beginning the firſt ſtrokes*, or as the miniſter renders it, *the firſt lineaments of the myſteries*: Not that they were not well known, but becauſe it was believed thoſe weak ſouls could not bear the whole weight of them; ſo that it was thought fit to introduce them into ſo great a ſecret with a caution ſuitable to their weakneſs: this is what that Father ſays *in expreſs words*. Your miniſter makes him ſay the quite contrary *in expreſs words*. He makes him ſay that *their Theology was imperfect*, becauſe he ſays that it was tempered and accommodated to the capacity of the ignorant, and he takes for ignorance in the maſters, the wiſe temperament which they made uſe of towards their diſciples.’ The biſhop of Meaux had ſaid before, that *the learned preface of Petavius is the unravelling of all his doctrine about that ſubject* (16). I think it is as good an unravelling as a moſt learned man could give; but notwithſtanding this, it appears that this Jeſuit contradicted himſelf, or fell into thoſe perplexing variations, which all writers are ſubject to, when they come to have a different intereſt and different motives during the courſe of their writings. He deſigned at firſt, ingenuouſly to repreſent the doctrine of the three firſt centuries. He did were very much diſpleaſed with his way of ſpeaking of St Auguſtin's hypotheſis concerning Grace [*C*]. 4. That his *Dogmata Theologica*, which were very dear and ſcarce, have been lately reprinted at Amſterdam (g), with ſeveral treatiſes added to them.

---

(8) Henr. Valeſ. in Orat. Funebri Dionyſ. Petav. pag. 682, collect. Bateſianæ.

(9) Perrault, Illuſtrious Men, *Tom. i, pag. m.* 65, 66.

(10) See the New Letters againſt Maimbourg, *pag.* 182.

(11) That is, the Fathers of the Oratory; for Mr Simon was amongſt them when he wrote this.

(12) Simon, Choice Letters, *pag.* 12, *&* 13.

(13) Sept. 1685, in the Catalogue of New Books, num. 4. See alſo June 1685, Artic. II, pag. 611, & June 1684, Artic. VIII, pag. 399, of the ſecond Edit.

(14) Jurieu's ſixth Paſtoral Letter of the 3d year, pag. 134, in 12mo.

* *Theol. Dogm. Tom. ii, Præf. cap. iii.*

(15) Boſſuet, firſt advertiſement to the Proteſtants, *num.* 27, *&* 28, *pag.* 28, of the Dutch Edit.

† *Lett. VI, pag.* 45.

⸸ *Theol. Dogm. Tom. ii, Præf. cap. i, num.* 10, 12.

‡ *Ibid. cap. ii.*

‡‡ *Ibid. cap. iii.*

** *Ibid. num.* 3.

(16) Boſſuet, ubi ſupra, *num.* 25, *pag.* 25.

did not diſguiſe the opinion of the Fathers, who had falſe notions of the myſtery of the three perſons. He was contented to ſet down things as they were, and to add to them the moſt natural explications which the words were capable of. Whereby he acquainted the public, that ſeveral Fathers of the primitive church had publiſhed very abſurd falſities about the generation of the word, and the myſteries that are annexed to it. Which ſtrikes much at the authority of the canons of the council of Nice; for it might be concluded from thence, that the article of the Trinity is not a fundamental doctrine, ſince thoſe who erred in that point were ſaved notwithſtanding. The new Anti-Trinitarians could draw many conſequences from it. Petavius was told of it, and found himſelf obliged to remedy that evil as well as he could. He therefore made his preface with ſuch a deſign, having now a quite different aim, and quite different motives; he made it now his buſineſs to aſſert the orthodoxy of the Fathers, he was obliged to give them ſatisfaction; in a word, he was forced to contradict himſelf. Mr Jurieu has undergone the ſame trial. He wrote a Paſtoral Letter (17), wherein he uſed his utmoſt endeavours to ruin the foundation of the *Hiſtory of the variations*. It was then neceſſary for him that the Fathers ſhould have erred in the moſt important doctrines of the Chriſtian faith. He therefore depreſſed them as much as he could, and enlarged upon the abſurd notions they had of the Trinity. He minded only his preſent intereſt, and was not able to contain himſelf. But ſome time after (18) he had occaſion to oppoſe thoſe who ſay, that the doctrine of the Trinity is not neceſſary to ſalvation, and conſequently that the Socinians ought to be tolerated. It was then neceſſary for him that the Fathers ſhould have been orthodox; he therefore aſſerted their orthodoxy, and made them whiter than ſnow; he ſet up for their apologiſt, and panegyriſt, and laſtly, for the accuſer of thoſe who deſpiſed them, and relied upon his example (19). This is to banter the public, and to expoſe one's ſelf to ſhame: notwithſtanding his variations, it has been proved to him that he had ſaved the Socinians againſt his will (20). Compare with this the remark [C] of the article RODON.

[C] *The Jeſuits were very much diſpleaſed with his way of ſpeaking . . . . of Grace.*] It has been ſaid, that they vexed him ſo much, that he was ready to leave their houſe: but they maintain that it is a meer ſtory. Let us quote a printed book. Dom Denys de Sainte Marthe, a Benedictin, obſerves (21), that it is pretended that Petavius retracted in the tenth book of his firſt volume what he had ſaid in the ninth book, in favour of St Auguſtin's doctrine. But it has been anſwered (22), that it is falſe, and that 'The ſociety never gave any trouble to that learned old man upon that account, and that had they had any ſuch deſign, they would have taken another courſe; for inſtead of obliging him to retract himſelf in the tenth book, they would have made him correct the ninth, ſince thoſe books made part of the ſame volume.' From whence it is concluded (23). *That Petavius never thought of removing, and that it is but a poor ſtory contrived by the Janſeniſts, Father de Sainte Marthe being only their eccho.* What is certain is, that ſome paſſages of Petavius, which favour the hypotheſis of the Auguſtinians, have been cited in the writings of the Janſeniſts (24), and it has been ſaid, that when he wrote againſt Janſenius's friends, he renounced his firſt opinion. Read this paſſage of the Hiſtory of Janſeniſm: 'Petavius . . . . could not refuſe to come to the aſſiſtance of his brethren, to defend the honour and doctrine of his ſociety, againſt his own opinion, and at the coſt of his reputation. He publiſhed at firſt a treatiſe *de Lege & Gratia*, againſt Janſenius, which came out in that year; and then he endeavoured to refute what Mr Fromond had written againſt his diſſertation concerning liberty. And that book came out towards the end of the ſame year, with this title: *Elenchus Theriacæ Vincentii Lenis, ſive Liberti Fromondi, Doctoris Lovanienſis. Pariſiis* 1648 (25).' This happened in the year 1648, but the following paſſage concerns the year 1651. *Petavius, a Jeſuit, who, after he had taught in his* Dogmata Theologica *the doctrine of St Auguſtin, as that of the church, which every body ought to follow, renounced it to defend the intereſt and opinions of his ſociety, undertook to explain, according to Molina, St Auguſtin's diſtinction between that grace, whereby a man is enabled to do ſomething*, auxilium quo, *which is an efficacious grace; and that grace, without which a man can do nothing*, auxilium ſine quo non, *which is a ſufficient grace. He intituled that book*, Diſſertatio brevis de Adjutorio SINE QUO NON & de Adjutorio QUO; ad mentem B. Auguſtini (26).

That my readers may ſee more amply and clearly what the Anti-Moliniſts have publiſhed on this head. I ſhall copy one paſſage more. 'Father Petavius had almoſt a general knowledge, and his name is famous among the learned. If his judgment had been anſwerable to his reading, thoſe who ſet a greater value on that part of a man than upon a vaſt reading and believe that an excellent man is ſuch an one who can judge well of things with an indifferent learning, would be more ſatisfied with his works than they are. It is ſomewhat ſurprizing and incomprehenſible to ſee, how in his *Dogmata Theologica*, he has delivered up the Fathers of the three firſt centuries to the Arians, and how he makes them all favourers of that Hereſy. I am far from thinking that he was not a good Catholic, nor will I draw from this all the other extravagant conſequences which the Calviniſts, the other Proteſtants, and the Socinians, have drawn. I only find fault with his judgment. It is true, that he thought to mend his fault in ſome meaſure, by a preface, which the doctors of the Sorbonne obliged him to write; but this was only to place the remedy near the ſore, and not to heal it: he ſhould have burnt that unfortunate work, and by that means he would have avoided a great deal of ſhame. His judgment appeared no better in what he wrote about Grace. For being obliged by order of his ſuperiours to retract the Auguſtinian doctrine of Grace and Predeſtination, which he had embraced and maintained as the doctrine of the church in the ninth book of his firſt tome; he declared againſt that doctrine in the tenth, for fear he ſhould be conformable to the adverſaries of his ſociety: but it was without removing the foundation which he had laid in the preceding book. . . . I do not ſay this to inſult the author, who was certainly a man of merit, nor for the ill-natured pleaſure of ſpeaking ſlightingly of a Jeſuit; but to ſhew that it is fit to beware of great Bookmakers and compilers and to take good heed not to rely on them, without conſidering, 1. Whether they write with judgment, and give themſelves time to conſider of what they write. 2. Whether they write freely and without intereſt; that is to ſay, whether they are not of a body which profeſſes not to ſuffer certain opinions, and to embrace others, and which obliges every member blindly to follow the engagements of the ſociety, under the pain of removing, as Father Petavius told one of his friends, giving him the reaſon of his change. *I am too old to remove*, ſaid he to Mr de Marolles, abbot of Villeloin (27).'

(g) In the year 1700. See what Mr Bernard ſays of it in his *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lett. Aug.* 1700, *p.* 180, *& ſeq.*

(17) The ſixth of the third year, dated the 15th of November 1688.

(18) See his 6th and 7th Letters of the *Tableau du Socinianiſme*, printed in the year 1690.

(19) See Mr Saurin's Examination of Mr Jurieu's Theology, *pag.* 670, *& ſeq.*

(20) *See the book intituled*, Janua Cœlorum reſerata, *pag.* 126, *& ſeq.*

(21) *See the book intituled*, How the Benedictin Fathers behaved themſelves ſince their edition of St Auguſtin was cenſured, *p.* 56.

(22) Ib. *pag.* 57, *& ſeq.*

(23) Ib. *pag.* 58, 59.

(24) See, above, citat. (24), of the article St AUGUSTIN; and the abridged Hiſtory of the Congregation *de auxiliis*, *pag.* 73, *& ſeq. Edit.* 1687.

(25) Hiſtory of Janſeniſm, *Tom.* i, *pag.* 247, *ad ann.* 1648. *See alſo pag.* 377, 378, *ad ann.* 1650.

(26) Ib. *pag.* 505, *ad ann.* 1651.

(27) Notes on the third Anſwer of the prince of Conti to Father des Champs, *pag.* 74, *&c.*

PETIT (JOHN) profeſſor of Divinity in the univerſity of Paris, in the beginning of the XVth century, acquired a great reputation by his eloquence and learning; but he made ſometimes an ill uſe of his talents, to defend bad cauſes. He ſpoke for the univerſity of Paris before the king's council in the year 1460 *(a)*, to ſhew that cardinal de Chalant, Pope Benedict's Legate, complained without reaſon of thoſe who had forſaken their obedience to that Pope. *His concluſion was, that* their withdrawing *ſhould be obſerved and executed for the time to come . . . . . and the Gallican church delivered from*

(a) Hiſtory of Charles VI by a monk of St Denys, tranſlated into French by Mr le Laboureur, *book* xxvi, *cap.* ii, *pag.* 543.

from the exactions unjuſtly introduced by the court of Rome. The king's council referred that cauſe to the parliament. It was pleaded in the great chamber the ſeventh of June in the ſame year (*b*). John Petit made a long diſcourſe, and as ſtrong as could be wiſhed. The parliament gave no ſentence, but were forced ſome time after to give one which favoured the demands of the univerſity (*c*). John Petit was in the famous embaſſy which France ſent into Italy, for the pacification of the ſchiſm, and he made an harangue in Rome the twentieth of July 1407 (*d*). Every thing goes well hitherto, he makes uſe of his eloquence in lawful things; but we ſhall ſee by and by that he made an ill uſe of it. The duke of Burgundy having cauſed the duke of Orleans, the king's only brother, to be aſſaſſinated, was ſo bold as to own that action, which was an enormous crime in all its circumſtances [*A*]. He returned to Paris as it were in triumph, and demanded audience to ſhew that he had good reaſons to cauſe the duke of Orleans to be killed (*e*). He choſe John Petit to be his Orator, a mercenary ſoul and ſold to iniquity [*B*], who maintained, in the great hall of the royal Hôtel of St Paul, on the eighth of March 1408, that the murder of that duke was lawful (*f*). His plea was printed (*g*): the honour of the duke of Orleans was torn with greater rage by it, than his body had been by the aſſaſſines. The duke's widow cauſed it to be refuted by the abbot of St Denys who pleaded for her, and for the memory of the deceaſed before the king's council, with great eloquence, on the eleventh of September 1408 (*h*). The doctrine of the duke of Burgundy's Orator was ſo enormous, and ſo proper

[*A*] *An enormous crime in all it's circumſtances.*] I have ſpoken of it in the article of that duke (1), but without mentioning a fact which does very much aggravate the enormity of that murder. The monk of St Denys, who wrote the hiſtory of Charles VI, which Mr le Laboureur tranſlated into French, ſays, that the princes of the royal family no ſooner heard that the Burgundian had cauſed the duke of Orleans to be aſſaſſinated, *but they deteſted ſo execrable a treaſon, and wiſhed, that the author of it were already in the everlaſting torments which the enormity of his crime deſerved. That which ſhewed them better ſtill the blackneſs of the Burgundian's ſoul, is, that he had very lately, not only reconciled himſelf, but alſo made an alliance of brotherly friendſhip with the duke of Orleans. Beſides, they had newly confirmed it both by letters and oaths, even ſo as to take God to witneſs, and communicate together. They ſeemed to be perfectly united in the management of the war, which they took upon themſelves; they had defended one another's honour in the ill ſucceſs they had: it ſeemed as if they had but one and the ſame intereſt, and for a greater ſign of union and love the duke of Burgundy knowing that the duke of Orleans, his couſin, was indiſpoſed, viſited him with all the marks, I will not ſay of civility, but of tenderneſs, and even was perſuaded to come and dine with him the next day, which was a Sunday. The other princes of the blood, who knew that, could not but conceive an extreme indignation for ſo horrible a proceeding, and therefore they refuſed to hear his excuſes, they retired with tears in their eyes from the king's council, and the next day, as he was coming to the parliament, they ſent him word to retire* (2). The widow's Orator did very much inſiſt upon theſe circumſtances (3). Obſerve here how human nature can join in the ſame ſoul the baſeneſs of hypocriſy with the moſt inſolent boldneſs. There was never a prince more haughty nor more courageous than John duke of Burgundy; he was ſirnamed *Without Fear*. Nevertheleſs, what deceit and diſſimulation do not we find in his conduct? Here is one inſtance of it. He repaired to the church whither the body of the duke of Orleans was brought. *He pretended to be as much afflicted as any body elſe, he put on mourning afterwards, as all the princes did, and was not aſhamed to aſſiſt with them at the funeral pomp in the church of the Celeſtins, where that duke, when alive, deſired to be buried* (4). He pulled off his maſk only when he ſaw that the king's council was upon the point of ordering that Robert de Canni (5), ſuſpected of the murder (6), ſhould be impriſoned.

[*B*] *A mercenary ſoul, and ſold to iniquity.*] The greateſt blot in the reign of Charles VI, is the triumphant impunity of the duke of Orleans's aſſaſſin: but it is not ſo much a blot in the king, as in his kingdom; for moſt times that unhappy prince had not the uſe of his reaſon, he was not therefore anſwerable for the diſorders of the ſtate. The French nation is to blame: the French did not ſupport, and join with the princes who deſired to take vengeance of that crime; they were ſo divided, as to make the party of the aſſaſſin more formidable than the other. The city of Paris, where the king's only brother was maſſacred, is moſt of all to blame, for not endeavouring to have that crime puniſhed; the Burgundian would have been treated according to the exigency of the caſe, if that city had deſired it. It would be a piece of injuſtice to tax the univerſity of Paris, becauſe one of their profeſſors of Divinity was ſo wicked, as to undertake to make an apology for that murder; for they approved not the wicked principles of that furious declaimer, and ſeconded the biſhop who condemned them authentically, as ſoon as he could do it ſafely. It is what we ſhall ſee in the next remark. Before I make an end of this, I muſt obſerve, that John Petit was very ſure of the peoples approbation, when he engaged in the defence of ſo deteſtable a cauſe; beſides, he knew that he ſhould ſpeak for a prince whom the king himſelf dreaded. It is certain that Charles VI ſent the count de St Paul to the Burgundian, *to offer him a public audience, with impunity as to himſelf, and the only thing that was demanded of him, was, that he ſhould deliver up the aſſaſſins, that they might be tried according to law; but he ſent him back very much diſappointed, ſeeing the king was obliged to treat with honour about the reparation of an action that was more than wicked, and to ſend to him the duke of Berry, and the king of Sicily at Amiens. The noble duke of Bourbon was named to be one of that embaſſy, but he generouſly excuſed himſelf, he would not ſo much as ſtay at court, he deſired leave to retire to his houſe, and choſe rather to part with the ſhare he had in the government, than to give his conſent to compound with the ſtate, for the murder of his nephew; and therefore he ſaid openly, and at ſeveral times, as I have been informed, that he would never ſee with a favourable eye the author of ſo baſe and villainous a treachery* (7). Thoſe two conſiderations, I mean the peoples favour, and the credit of the duke of Burgundy, cannot excuſe the advocate. For the reſt, the reaſon why the people did not much care that the aſſaſſin ſhould be puniſhed, was the hatred they had conceived againſt the duke of Orleans, who was the author of ſeveral taxes. Hence it is, that they rejoiced at his death, and applauded the duke of Burgundy; ſo true it is, that men are more tender of their private and domeſtic intereſt, than of the fundamental laws of the ſtate. *Tantum nimirum ex publicis malis ſentimus quantum ad privatas res pertinet: nec in eis quicquam acrius quam pecuniæ damnum ſtimulat* (8). Montagne knew very well that fault: *They are not concerned*, ſays he (9), *for the cauſe in common, and in as much as it is prejudicial to the intereſt of all perſons, and of the ſtate; but they are only concerned, becauſe it touches them perſonally. Hence it is that they are ſo earneſt about it, and even beyond juſtice and public reaſon.* Non tam omnia univerſi, quam ea, quæ ad quemque pertinent, ſinguli carpebant. The impunity of the duke of Burgundy was a mortal wound given to the juſtice, authority, and the majeſty of the ſtate. What then? Private men did not feel it, they ſaw but afar off the pernicious conſequences of it; and every body hoped to avoid them. But the taxes of the duke of Orleans fell upon every citizen. This is the reaſon why

---

(*b*) Id. ib. *pag.* 544.

(*c*) Id. ib. *cap.* iii, *pag.* 547.

(*d*) Id. ib. *book xxvii, cap. xvi, pag.* 606.

(*e*) Id. ib. *book xxvii, cap. xxvii, pag.* 631.

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) You will find the ſubſtance of it in the monk of St Denys, *book xxvii, cap. xxvii*, and you may ſee it entire in Monſtrelet, *book i, cap. xxxviii, xxxix.*

(*h*) Hiſtory of Charles VI, *book xxviii, cap. x, pag.* 660, 661.

(1) Of BURGUNDY (JOHN), remark [*B*].

(2) Hiſtory of Charles VI, tranſlated into French by Mr le Laboureur, *book xxvii, cap. xxiii, pag.* 627.

(3) Ibid. *book xxviii, cap. x, pag.* 666.

(4) Id. ib. *book xxvii, cap. xxii, pag.* 625.

(5) Id. ib. *cap. xxiii, pag.* 626.

(6) He hated the duke of Orleans, becauſe that duke loved his wife for a long time. *Ibid.*

(7) Id. ib. *pag.* 627.

(8) Annibal ad Carthaginienſes, apud Livium, *lib. xxx, ſub fin. pag. m.* 566.

(9) Montagne's Eſſays, *book iii, cap. x, pag. m.* 410, 411.

proper to introduce all manner of confuſion into the ſtate, that it was condemned by the biſhop of Paris [C], as ſoon as the duke's faction proved leſs powerful. The proxies of that prince appealed to the Pope, and he himſelf wrote to the council of Conſtance, to recommend the cauſe of John Petit (i): his ambaſſadors and partizans maintained, that the propoſitions that were condemned, were not to be found in the book of that doctor; the commiſſioners of the council annulled the ſentence of the biſhop of Paris [D]. Gerſon

(i) See the remark [D].

---

why they did not much care to revenge his death. We ſhall ſee by and by that the populace of Paris changed their mind, when the biſhop had condemned the apology for the duke of Burgundy (§ α).

[(§ α) Two reaſons, which John Petit ingenuouſly and impudently alledged in the king's council, to excuſe himſelf for aſſiſting the duke of Burgundy in ſuch an odious affair, deſerve to be known. The firſt is, becauſe he was obliged to ſerve this duke, to whom he had taken an oath of fidelity three years before. And the ſecond, that it was the leaſt thing he could do out of gratitude to this prince, who for a long time had granted him a ſmall annual penſion, conſidering he had but a poor benefice. Monſtrelet has preſerved the memory of this fact, and Innocent Gentillet has inſerted it with the very plea of John Petit, l. 3. Max. 8. of his *Antimachiavel*. REM. CRIT.]

[C] *The doctrine of John Petit was ſo enormous . . . . that it was condemned by the biſhop of Paris.*] Before the condemnation many learned and virtuous men were offended at the propoſitions of that profeſſor of Divinity, and were afraid that they would have *very dangerous conſequences, if they were not cenſured. For my part*, ſays a Monk of St Denys (10), *I did often very much wonder that the biſhop of Paris, and the inquiſitor of the Faith, neglected a cauſe that was ſo prejudicial to good manners, and the ſervice of* G O D; *but I was always anſwered, that the formidable authority of the duke of Burgundy was the reaſon of it, and that it was prudently done of them to let that plague lie as it were buried in a deep ſilence, rather than venture to ſee it authorized by the credit of that prince. Which proved but too true in it's time, for that ſafety ſo much deſired, did no ſooner appear, than they ordered the members of the venerable univerſity of Paris, under the penalty of the law, to bring and repreſent without delay whatever they had in their ſheets and collections relating to the propoſition of the ſaid John Petit, which ſerved to the pretended juſtification of the duke of Burgundy. They called together in the great hall of the biſhopric, the famous Doctors and Bachelors of Divinity, and the Doctors of the Canon and Civil Law, that by their advice, what was erroneous in them might be examined; and after they had applied themſelves to it for ſeveral days with all the diligence which the intereſt of faith required, on the ſixteenth of January they elected out of that numerous company ſixteen doctors, choſen in the colleges of Paris, who made an abſtract of the aſſertions and propoſitions advanced by that Doctor, which they judged to be condemnable as follows.* That Hiſtorian ſets down afterwards nine propoſitions of John Petit, with the cenſure paſſed upon them, and then he adds (11), ‘ Such was the advice of all the doctors and regents ‘ there met, and that the whole piece of John Petit was ‘ unworthy of a man of parts, and even deſerved not ‘ to be mentioned: wherefore, on the twenty-third of ‘ February (12), the ſaid biſhop and inquiſitor of the ‘ faith, being met in the hall of the biſhopric, in preſence of ſeveral prelates and eminent doctors, and ‘ a great croud of people, thought fit to cenſure it, as ‘ being erroneous as to faith and good manners, and ‘ to condemn it, as being ſcandalous in ſeveral reſpects, to be burnt before the porch of Noſtre-Dame. ‘ two days after, the execution was made in their ‘ preſence upon a ſcaffold ſet up for that purpoſe, before a great multitude of people, after Benedict Jencien, ‘ a famous Doctor, had loudly and very learnedly ſhewed ‘ the enormity of thoſe opinions.’ You ſhall ſee now an example of the people's inconſtancy: *It was a ſenſible affront to the duke of Burgundy, who learned by an experience neceſſary to give an example, how ſhameful it is for great men to degenerate from the glory of their birth; but his greateſt vexation was to hear, that that fooliſh juſtification had made him odious to the wiſeſt and moſt moderate men, that he was laughed at and deſpiſed by them, that the people and the mob derided him, and that he was the public talk, and the ſubject of a thouſand ſatirical ſongs, wherein he was publickly called a traytor and an aſſaſſin* (13).

Note, that Gerſon, chancellor of the univerſity, did very much contribute to that cenſure (14). He preached often againſt the propoſitions of John Petit, and refuted *in the name of the univerſity, before the king, all the parts of the diſcourſe and book* of that profeſſor (15). Note alſo, that the nine propoſitions that were cenſured, may be reduced to this: ‘ That it is ‘ lawful for any body, and even a commendable and ‘ meritorious thing, to kill a tyrant by one's private ‘ authority; and that, in order to it, all manner of ‘ ways may be made uſe of, and even treaſons and ‘ flatteries, to make him fall into the ſnare that is prepared for him, notwithſtanding any alliances and ‘ oaths whatſoever (16).’

[D] . . . . *his partizans maintained, that the propoſitions, that were condemned, were not to be found in the book of that Doctor; the commiſſioners of the council annulled the ſentence of the biſhop of Paris.*] It was the only way they could take, for unleſs they had renounced all ſhame, they could not deny that the cenſure of thoſe nine propoſitions was a lawful one. They were therefore obliged to do what the Janſeniſts did a long time after, to have recourſe to the diſtinction *de facto & de jure*, and to maintain that the nine propoſitions were not to be found in the book of John Petit. They failed not to do it. Read what follows. I go ſomewhat higher, that my reader may be more fully informed of that affair.

(17) ‘ That ſentence (18) being extreamly ſhameful ‘ to the duke of Burgundy, whoſe juſtification was ‘ burnt in that book, with an eternal reproach to his ‘ name; his proxies appealed to the holy ſee †. The ‘ duke undertook to protect the Pope, to make a friend ‘ of him. . . . ⸸ But when he heard that he had been ‘ arreſted at Friburg, before he could get into the ‘ county of Burgundy, he wrote again to the council, ‘ in anſwer to the advice the council had given him of ‘ the Pope's flight, that having promiſed to protect ‘ him only upon condition that he would keep his ‘ word ‡, he was now reſolved to forſake him, ſeeing ‘ they approved not of his conduct, and to adhere entirely to the council. Having thus artfully diſpoſed ‘ their minds, he added, that he was informed his ‘ enemies had undertaken to defame him, under pretence of cauſing certain heretical propoſitions to be ‘ condemned by the council, which they aſcribed to the ‘ late Dr John Petit, who had defended his cauſe like an ‘ honeſt man; that foraſmuch as his honour was concerned in it, he entreated the Fathers, that before ‘ they ſhould decide a point of that importance, and ‘ condemn the book of that Doctor, they would examine in the preſence of his ambaſſadors, whether ‘ thoſe propoſitions were truly his, or whether they ‘ were not maliciouſly contrived by others, who endeavoured to cauſe them to be condemned under the ‘ name of that famous profeſſor, and even under his ‘ own name ‡‡. The council thereupon appointed ſome ‘ commiſſioners, *viz.* the cardinals of Albano, Aquileia, Florence, and d'Ailli. The ambaſſadors of the ‘ duke of Burgundy, who had made a powerful party ‘ by their intrigues, and had at their head Martin ‘ Porrée, biſhop of Arras, and Doctor of Divinity, ‘ excepted againſt cardinal Peter d'Ailli, as having ‘ been John Gerſon's maſter, whom they took for ‘ their chief adverſary, and maintained boldly, that ‘ the propoſitions which the biſhop of Paris had ‘ condemned, as being in the book of Dr John Petit, ‘ intituled, *The Juſtification of the Duke of Burgundy*, ‘ were not to be found in it in ſuch terms as they ‘ were produced; that John Gerſon being jealous of ‘ the glory Dr Petit had acquired in the univerſity, ‘ framed them according to his fancy, to give them an ‘ heretical ſenſe, which they themſelves would readily ‘ condemn; but that as they were worded in the doctor's book, they were ready to prove that they were ‘ very orthodox *. On the other hand, cardinal ‘ d'Ailli, who had been excepted againſt, joined with ‘ Dr John Gerſon, and Dr Jordan Morin, and theſe ‘ three proteſted, that nothing could be more falſe ** ‘ than what the ambaſſadors of Burgundy durſt advance, that any one who had eyes, and could read,

‘ and

(10) Hiſtory of Charles VI, *book xxxiii, cap. xxviii, pag.* 931, 932.

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 933.

(12) It was in 1414, reckoning the beginning of the year from January.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Cancellarius contra Joannis Parvi aſſertiones concionatur ſæpius, has accurato & diligenti ſtudio expendit, & detectos in iis contra fidem errores configit. Tum curante potiſſimum Gerſone errorum cenſura à Theologiæ facultate & Pariſienſi Epiſcopo confecta eſt. *Joh. Launoius, Hiſt. Gymn. Navarr. pag.* 482.

(15) Maimbourg, Hiſt. of the Great Schiſm, *book v, pag. m.* 236.

(16) Ibid.

(17) Ib. p. 237.

(18) That is, the ſentence of the biſhop of Paris.

† *J. Juvenal.*

⸸ *Cod. Victor. ap. Spond.*

‡ *Act. Victor. ap. Spond.*

‡‡ *Tom. v, Hiſt. Univ. pag.* 299, *ex Monſtrel. J. Juvenal. Cod. Victor.*

* *J. Juvenal.*

** *Cod. Victor.*

Gerſon appealed from their judgment to the council, and obtained not all the ſatisfaction he might reaſonably expect [*E*]. That aſſembly ſhewed, that a prince who has an army is a very good protector of an Heretic. The council made only a general deciſion, which prejudiced neither the book of John Petit, nor the Burgundian. The king of France, on the contrary, cauſed that libel to be condemned with the greateſt ſeverity, and expelled ſeveral doctors from Paris, who oppoſed the good deſign the others had of engaging the univerſity in the cauſe of the biſhop [*F*]. But, two years after, that prelate was obliged to cauſe his ſentence to be revoked out of complaiſance to the duke of Burgundy [*G*]. John Petit died in the year 1411, at Hedin, a town belonging to that duke (*k*). He fled thither for refuge, fearing the ſons of the duke of Orleans, who deſigned to proſecute him as a Heretic. He was not a Cordelier, as ſome have ſaid, but a ſecular prieſt (*l*).

(*k*) Monſtrelet, *lib. i, cap. xxxix*, apud Spond. *ad ann.* 1408, *num.* 1, *pag.* 704.

(*l*) Spond. ibid. *pag.* 703.

and underſtand French, would plainly ſee that the propoſitions which had been condemned, but eſpecially that which all the reſt had been reduced to, were not only advanced by John Petit, but contained alſo the ſubſtance and ſummary of his libel, wherein he makes it his buſineſs to eſtabliſh them by his pretended proofs and falſe reaſonings. At laſt, after long debates about that point, the queſtion being only a plain matter of fact which the Burgundians denied obſtinately, the three cardinals commiſſioners, who were for them, made uſe of a very ill expedient. For, on the one hand, not approving thoſe wicked propoſitions, and, on the other hand, being not willing to condemn the advocate of the duke of Burgundy ††, they declared that the biſhop of Paris was an incompetent judge in that cauſe, which did belong to the holy ſee; and thereupon annulled his ſentence.’ Their judgment was proclaimed by ſound of trumpet before the porch of the cathedral church of Paris (19). You may ſee in a book of Gerſon by what intrigues the faction of Burgundy compaſſed the whole matter. ‘Inſtituit inter Volucrem & Monimum, id inter ſe & fratrem ſuum dialogum, ubi καθ᾽ ἕκαϛα & ſingillatim exponit, quibus molitionibus Burgundiones uſi ſunt ut Pariſienſis cenſura caſſa & irrita declarareture (20). - - - - *He made a dialogue between Volucer and Monimus, that is, between himſelf and his brother, wherein he particularly ſets forth the intrigues which the Burgundians uſed to get the cenſure of the biſhop of Paris annulled.*’

[*E*] *Gerſon appealed from their judgment to the council, and obtained not all the ſatisfaction he might reaſonably expect.*] He deſired, without doubt, that the council ſhould confirm the ſentence of the biſhop of Paris, by condemning expreſsly the book which contained the duke of Burgundy's apology; but the council did it not. ‘Whether it be that they had not the libel of John Petit at Conſtance, but only an abſtract which contained his propoſitions; or whether they would not examine it, to diſoblige nobody, as * the emperor adviſed them; they were contented according to his advice, to apply themſelves to the doctrine in general, and to condemn the fundamental propoſition which contained the ſubſtance of all the reſt; which they did in theſe words: *It has been remonſtrated to this holy council, that ſome propoſitions have been taught, which are erroneous and moſt ſcandalous, and tending to the ſubverſion of the ſtate of the whole commonwealth, amongſt which this has been preſented to the council* †. *Any tyrant may, and ought lawfully and meritoriouſly to be killed by any of his vaſſals or ſubjects, and even they may uſe, in order to it, ſnares, flatteries, and feigned careſſes, notwithſtanding any oath or alliance made with him, without waiting for the ſentence or command of any judge whatſoever. The holy council, in order to exterminate that error, declares, and defines, upon mature deliberation, that ſuch a doctrine is againſt faith and good manners, and reproves and condemns it as heretical and ſcandalous, and giving occaſion to frauds, cheats, lies, treaſons, and perjuries. Further, it defines, and declares, that they who obſtinately maintain that moſt pernicious doctrine, are Heretics, and, as ſuch, ought to be puniſhed according to the ordinance of the holy canons.* Such was the decree of the council, which, for certain conſiderations, and eſpecially for fear of diſobliging the duke of Burgundy, would not join the fact with the right, in this cauſe (21).’

That conduct did ſo much the more vex John Gerſon, becauſe he had been accuſed of acting not out of love for truth, but upon the account of ſome differences he had had with John Petit (22). They reproached him alſo, that he had reduced all the doctrine of that man to one propoſition, and then that he had made nine propoſitions, when he knew that the examinators were not ignorant that he had mutilated the opinion of his adverſary (23). He expoſed himſelf ſo much to the hatred of the houſe of Burgundy, that he ran a great many dangers after the ſitting of the council. He had not the liberty to go to Paris, to re-aſſume his place of chancellor. He was forced to retire thro' ſome by-ways; he went to hide himſelf for ſome time in the mountains of Bavaria, and then he croſſed Swiſſerland, and arrived at Lyons, where he ſtaid till he died (24).

[*F*] *The king of France . . . . cauſed that libel to be condemned with the greateſt ſeverity, and expelled ſeveral doctors from Paris, who oppoſed the good deſign . . . . of the biſhop.*] The following account begins with the laſt of thoſe two facts. ‘Our doctors who were at Conſtance, ⸸ fearing what came to paſs, that the cardinals commiſſioners would favour the Burgundians, had written to their brethren at Paris, that they ſhould endeavour to get the univerſity to ſide with the biſhop, that his ſentence againſt the doctrine of John Petit might be confirmed: But it happened that ſeveral members of that great body, having been gained by the party of the doctor, and of the duke of Burgundy, raiſed ſo great a cabal againſt them, that they prevented them from obtaining what they demanded. The honeſt doctors, eſpecially thoſe of the illuſtrious Sorbonne and of Navarre, ſticking cloſe to the good party, which Gerſon defended with great zeal and force, having made their complaints to the king; his majeſty, to clear the univerſity from thoſe turbulent ſpirits, who diſturbed the church and ſtate, ordered above forty of the moſt factious to depart from Paris that very day upon pain of death. . . . . Afterwards, leſt ſo abominable a doctrine ſhould be revived, if the book which contained it, ſhould remain; his majeſty ſent his declaration to the parliament, againſt the errors contained in the libel of ‡ John Petit, intituled, *The juſtification of the duke of Burgundy*, ordering them to tear, in a full court, as many copies of it as could be found, forbidding every body to keep any of them upon pain of forfeiting their lives and goods; ordering further, that this declaration be regiſtred with the ſentence of the biſhop of Paris, containing the right and the fact joined together, in the condemnation of the moſt pernicious errors of the libel of Dr John Petit, intituled, *The duke of Burgundy's juſtification*, which begins with theſe words, *Before the moſt noble and moſt high royal majeſty*, and was publickly ‡‡ ſold in Paris and other places. The whole was regiſtred in the parliament, on the fourth of June 1416; and on the ſixteenth of September in the ſame year, the parliament at the requeſt of the univerſity, publiſhed a ſevere decree againſt all thoſe who ſhould be ſo bold as to maintain ſtill the doctrine of that deteſtable libel, declaring them liable to all the puniſhments which they that are guilty of high treaſon deſerve (25).’

One may eaſily perceive that Mr Maimbourg gives a touch to the Janſeniſts.

[*G*] *That prelate was obliged to cauſe his ſentence to be revoked out of complaiſance to the duke of Burgundy.*] What has been ſeen at all times was ſeen in the cauſe of John Petit: Toleration, condemnation, abſolution, &c. as the prince, his protector, grew ſtronger or weaker. His credit was loſt at Paris in the year 1414. Then they proceeded rigorouſly againſt his apologiſt. He could do any thing in that city in the year 1418, then the cenſure was annulled. I ſhall quote for this an author of the ſame century. *At this time*, ſays he (26), *a general proceſſion was made at Paris, wherein the univerſity appeared, and eſpecially the vicars of the biſhop*

---

†† *J. Juvenal.*

(19) Dati ſunt à Concilio & ſelecti judices, qui repugnante Gerſone, & aliis qui ab ejus ſtabant partibus, Pariſienſem cenſuram abrogarunt, politicis potius quam Theologicis rationibus ducti. Cenſuræ abrogatio & lecta & publicata eſt buccis concrepantibus in propylæo Ædis beatæ Mariæ Pariſ. Hæc Juvenalis Urſinus ut vidit, ita & retulit in Hiſtoria Caroli VI. *Jo. Launoius, ubi ſupra, pag.* 489.

(20) Ibid.

* *Cod. Victor.*

† *Act. Concil. Conſt. Seſſ. XV.*

(21) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 240.

(22) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1415, *num.* 51, *pag.* 752.

(23) Sentiens nihilominus Gerſonius Theologos illos agnoviſſe fraudem in truncatione propoſitionum Parvi illas alias novem concluſiones propoſuerit. *Ibid.*

(24) Launoius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 490.

⸸ *John. Juvenal, pag.* 328, *printed at the Louvre.*

‡ *Hiſt. Univ. Tom. v, pag.* 300. Quam M. Joannes Parvi nuncupatus juſtificationem Ducis Burgundiæ fecit appellari, ejus quaternos & particulas apud quemcumque inveniri poterunt, &c. Prædicta Propoſitio M. J. Parvi in ſeſe, & in ſuis aſſertionibus principaliter intentis & in ea contentis eſt abolenda atque damnanda tanquam in fide erronea, &c. & eam ſic abolemus & damnamus, &c. Quam juſtificationem D. Ducis Burgundiæ appellavit complures in ſe errores peſtiferos continentem, & quæ in tantum in dictis villa & Diocæſi Pariſienſi publicata extitit, quod venditioni publicè expoſita & à pluribus empta fuerit. *Pag.* 301.

‡‡ Publicæ venditioni expoſita, quæ ſic incipit. *Before, &c. pag.* 302.

(25) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 242, 243.

(26) John le Fevre, lord of St Remi, Hiſt. of Charles VI, *cap. lxxxviii, pag.* 124.

biſhop of Paris, who was then ſick at St Omer. Which vicars revoked there, in a ſermon before the whole aſſembly, the condemnation which the ſaid biſhop had paſſed heretofore againſt the propoſition of Dr John Petit, and againſt the honour of the duke of Burgundy, repairing, in that reſpect, his honour and fealty, as of a true champion of the crown of France, and they made appear the power they had received from the biſhop to that effect, ſo that the duke of Burgundy was ſatisfied.

PEZELIUS (CHRISTOPHER) a Proteſtant Divine, was born the fifth of March 1539 at Plawen a city of Germany, in Voitland (*a*). He taught for the ſpace of five years in the college of his own country, and was afterwards profeſſor of Theology and miniſter at Wittemberg (*b*): but as he was one of thoſe doctors, who under-hand oppoſed Lutheraniſm, and wanted to introduce Calviniſm, he was deprived of his offices, and put in priſon in the year 1574, with ſeveral others of his colleagues; and they were ſet at liberty only upon condition that they ſhould depart the country of Saxony, and not write any thing either againſt the elector, or his academies and churches (*c*) [*A*]. He retired to Egra, and after he had reſided there a little while, he was called to teach the ſchool at Sigen by Count John of Naſſau, brother to William of Naſſau prince of Orange. Some time after that, he had a call to be miniſter at Herborn (*d*): and from thence he dated the epiſtle dedicatory of one of his books (*e*) in the month of September 1580. He was profeſſor of Divinity at Bremen in the year 1588, and likewiſe ſuperintendant of the churches there till his death, which happened the twenty-fifth of February 1604 (*f*). He publiſhed many books [*B*]. He was at Heidelberg in the year 1599, and aſſiſted at the aſſembly of the faculty of Theology, before whom Conrad Vorſtius gave an account of his faith (*g*). It is very ſtrange, that neither Melchior Adam, nor Paul Freher have written his life.

[*A*] *Pezelius, and his colleagues, were ſet at liberty only upon condition . . . . that they ſhould not write any thing either againſt the elector, or his academies and churches.*] However, they reſerved to themſelves the liberty of declaring their ſentiments. *Sic autem Deus Opt. Max. eventus poſtea rexit, ut à triſti ſervitute atque obligatione prius nobis impoſitâ unà cum collegis liberatus, duris quidem conditionibus (ut patria tota excederemus, nec adverſus illuſtriſſ. Electorem Saxoniæ ejuſque Scholas & Eccleſias ſtylum ſtringeremus, confeſſione tamen veritatis & conſcientiæ noſtra ratione integrâ & liberâ nobis, ut verbi miniſtris, relicta) in exilium ire juberemur* (1). How he reconciled his promiſe with the writings he publiſhed againſt the doctrine of the Lutherans about the Euchariſt, I cannot tell. I only know that he maintained a paper-war with the moſt violent doctors of the other ſide, ſuch as Nicolas Selneccerus, Daniel Hoffman, Giles Hunnius, and Philip Marbachius. The very title of a book, which he printed at Bremen in the year 1591, ſhews that he wrote with heat: The title is as follows, ‘ Defenſio ‘ contra vaniſſimas calumnias quas N. Selneccerus evo‘ muit in Reſponſione Chriſtophori Pezelii Confuta‘ tionis quatuordecim cauſarum Selnecceriarum de con‘ demnationibus Calviniſtarum (2). - - - *A defence* ‘ *againſt the ſilly calumnies, which N. Selneccerus has* ‘ *vented in his anſwer to*, &c.’ The title of another book which he publiſhed in the year 1593, contains this amongſt other things, *quam* (Pezelii explicationem) *Hermannus Hamelmannus libello, cui titulum fecit*, de depravatione, fraudulentia, impoſtura, & falſitate D. Chriſtophori Pezelii & omnium Sacramentariorum, *temerario ac ſtolido conatu oppugnare auſus fuit* (3). Hoſpinian mentions ſome other works of Pezelius, publiſhed during the Sacramentarian war, and he gives (4) the analyſis of that which was publiſhed at Bremen in the year 1589: *Tractatus Chriſtophori Pezelii propoſitus in Gymnaſio Bremenſi, in explicatione Examinis Philippi Melanchthonis de Cœna Domini, &c.*

[*B*] *He publiſhed many books.*] For beſides thoſe I have juſt mentioned, he printed at Wittemberg in 1565 an harangue *de generatione hominis*, and in 1571 *Apologia veræ doctrinæ de definitione Evangelii oppoſita Thraſonicis præſtigiis Joan. Wigardi* (5). His commentary on Geneſis was printed at Neuſtat in the year 1599 in 8vo, and his expoſition of the firſt chapters of the Goſpel of St John in the year 1586 in 8vo. It would be too tedious to enumerate all the others. I ſhall only ſay that his *Mellificium Hiſtoricum* is a large commentary on John Sleidan's treatiſe *de quatuor Monarchiis*, which comes to the empire of Heraclius, that it was printed at Marpurg in two parts in 4to in the year 1610, and that in the year following Lampadius added to it a third part, which reached to his own time. I ſhall alſo obſerve, that Pezelius publiſhed ſome extracts of Melanchthon's works, in which he put the objections and anſwers concerning theological matters in a very good method, and that he interlarded ſome ſhort obſervations. This work contains ſeven or eight volumes in 8vo, which have been printed ſeveral times at Neuſtat. The firſt tome was publiſhed in the year 1578.

(*a*) Chriſtoph. Pezelius, Epiſt. Dedicat. Part vii, Argumentor. Melanchth.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Idem, Epiſt. Dedicat. Part ii, Argumentor. Melanchth.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) *Secundæ Partis* Argumentor. Melanchth.

(*f*) Witte, in Diario Biograph.

(*g*) See the Life of David Pareus, *pag. m.* 56, 58. See alſo the remark [*C*] of the article VORSTIUS (CONRAD).

(1) Chriſtoph. Pezelius, Epiſt. Dedicat. Part ii, Argument. Melanchth. *folio* 65.

(2) See the *Hiſtoria Sacram.* by Hoſpinian, *Tom. ii, pag.* 670.

(3) Hoſpin. ibid. *pag.* 80.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 662.

(5) Epit. Biblioth. Geſneri, *pag.* 146.

PHAON, of Mitylene in the iſle of Leſbos, was a handſome man, extraordinarily beloved by the fair ſex. The poor Sappho fell in love with him, as well as many others; but ſhe found him ſo unkind that ſhe fell into deſpair, as I ſhall ſay in her article. The Poets, who have recourſe to miracles at every turn, ſay, that his beauty, ſo powerful upon the hearts of the ladies, was given him by the goddeſs Venus, as the reward of the ſervices ſhe had received from him, when he was maſter of a ſhip. One day he took her on board his ſhip, without enquiring who ſhe was, and conveyed her with all ſpeed to the place ſhe was to go to (*a*) [*A*]. He aſked nothing for his trouble (*b*), but he was very well paid notwithſtanding. Venus preſented him with a veſſel of alabaſter full of an ointment, wherewith he had no ſooner rubbed himſelf, but he became the moſt beautiful of all men (*c*). He inflamed the women of Mitylene with love. His youth

[*A*] *He conveyed . . . . Venus to the place ſhe was to go to.*] There is a paſſage of Lucian from whence we learn, not whether ſhe was conveyed, but where ſhe took ſhipping. Μῶν καὶ σύ τινα ὥσπερ ὁ Φάων τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἐκ Χίου διεπορθμεύσας εἶτά σοι εὐξαμένῳ ἔδωκε νέον εἶναι καὶ καλὸν ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς καὶ ἀξιέραστον. Num tu quoque, *ſays Simylus to Polyſtratus*, ut & Phaon ille venerem è Chio tranſvexiſti, ut optanti tibi illa dederit juveneſcere, ac denuo formoſum atque amabilem fieri (1)? - - - *Did you, like Phaon, tranſport Venus from Chios, that ſhe granted your requeſt to grow young again, and to become beautiful and lovely.* It might be inferred from theſe words, that Phaon demanded as his reward, that his youth and beauty ſhould be reſtored to him; but Palæphatus ſays nothing like it: he ſays that Phaon had been a ſeaman all his life-time, and never abuſed any body, nor made poor people pay for their paſſage; that upon this account he was admired in the iſle of Leſbos; that Venus having put on the ſhape of an old woman, went on

(*a*) Ælian, Hiſt. div. *lib. xii, ch. xvii.*

(*b*) Palæphatus de Fabulis.

(*c*) Ælian. ubi ſupra.

(1) Lucian. Dial. Mort. *Tom. i, pag.* 234.

youth returned to him, and what follows (*d*). He made an ill uſe of it, and at laſt it coſt him his life; for he was killed in the fact, I mean, being ſurprized in adultery (*e*). Some ſaid that the virtue of a certain herb was the cauſe of Sappho's love for him [*B*].

(*d*) Palæph. ibid. Lucian. Dialog. Mort. *Tom. i*, *pag.* 234.

(*e*) Ælian. ubi ſupra.

on board his ſhip; that he carried her over with all ſpeed, and aſked nothing for it; but that of an old man as he was, ſhe made him a beautiful young man. Servius touches upon that ſtory (2), and adds a particular to it which he borrows from two comic Poets (3), *viz.* That Phaon built a temple to Venus upon mount Leucate, from whence a woman, who was very much in love with him, threw herſelf into the ſea. For the reſt, Lucian thought that Phaon was of the iſle of Chio (4), but I think he was miſtaken.

[*B*] *Some have ſaid that the virtue of a certain herb was the cauſe of Sappho's love for him.*] It is a ſtrange thing, that the paſſionate love of Sappho ſhould not be aſcribed meerly to her conſtitution. Pliny aſcribes it to a cauſe which is as fabulous as the ointment of Venus; he is in the right to ſay, that the virtue of that herb is a monſtrous thing (5). ‘ Portentoſum eſt ‘ quod de ea traditur, radicem ejus alterutrius ſexus ‘ ſimilitudinem referre, raram inventu: ſed ſi viris ‘ contigerit mas, amabiles fieri. Ob hoc & Phaonem ‘ Leſbium dilectum à Sappho. Multæ circa hoc non ‘ Magorum ſolum vanitates, ſed etiam Pythagoricorum (6). - - - *It is monſtrous what is related of it;* ‘ *that it's root reſembles either the one or the other ſex,* ‘ *and is very rare to be found: but if men happen to* ‘ *have the male kind, they become lovely. For this rea-* ‘ *ſon Phaon was beloved by Sappho. Many ſilly things* ‘ *are told about it, not only by the Magi, but alſo by the* ‘ *Pythagoreans.*’ He ſpeaks of the white Eryngo, which the Latins call *centum capita*.

(2) Servius, in Æn. III, *ver.* 279. *Read in the Leyden edition of* 1680, in anus formam, *inſtead of*, in navis formam.

(3) Menander & Turpilius.

(4) Lucian. in Navigio, *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 696.

(5) Plin. *lib. xxii*, *cap. viii*.

(6) Father Harduin refers us hereupon to a book falſly intituled, *Kiranidum Kirani*, *pag.* 37.

PHASELIS, a ſea-town in Lycia upon the borders of Pamphylia (*a*). It was one of the towns that grew rich by the piracies of the Cilicians; which was the reaſon why Publius Servilius ruined it (*b*), after the victories he obtained over thoſe pirates. It was in a miſerable condition when Pompey landed there after the battle of Pharſalia [*A*]. It it ſaid that it was built by Mopſus (*c*). That town has been very much ſpoken of, upon the account of the miraculous favour which Alexander was ſaid to have received from the gods in that place [*B*]. I ſhall

(*a*) Strabo, *lib. xiv*, *pag.* 458. *See alſo* Livy, *lib. xxxvii*, *cap. xxiii*.

(*b*) Nec mari ſubmoviſſe contentus, validiſſimas urbes eorum & diutina præda abundantes, Phaſelin & Olympon evertit, Iſaurumque ipſam arcem Ciliciæ. *Flor. lib. iii*, *cap. vi*.

(*c*) Pomponius Mela, *lib. i*, *cap. xiv*.

[*A*] *It was in a miſerable condition when Pompey landed there after the battle of Pharſalia.*] If we believe Lucan, there was more people in Pompey's ſhip than in that town.

> - - - - Te primum parva Phaſeli
> Magnus adit. . Nam te metui vetat incola rarus,
> Exhauſtæque domus populis, majorque carinæ
> Quam tua turba fuit (1).

> - - - - *But Pompey durſt,*
> *Commit his perſon to no town but thee,*
> *Little Phaſelis; thy ſmall company,*
> *And few inhabitants could cauſe no fear,*
> *More in his ſhip than in thy walls there were.*

(1) Lucan, *lib. viii*.

Yet Strabo, who lived after Pompey, ſpeaks of Phaſelis as of a conſiderable town, which had three ports. It is likely he repreſents it as it had been (2), but he ſhould not have expreſſed himſelf in the preſent tenſe. Εἶτα φασηλὶς, τρεῖς ἔχουσα λιμένας, πόλις ἀξιόλογος. *Ac deinde Phaſelis, tres habens portus, urbs memorabilis* (3).

(2) Note, that it is not at all likely that town was re-peopled from the battle of Pharſalia, to the time of Strabo.

(3) Strabo, *lib. xiv*, *pag.* 458.

[*B*] *A miraculous favour which Alexander was ſaid to have received from the gods.*] Let us firſt cite Joſephus who having deſcribed the paſſage thro' the Red-ſea, makes this obſervation upon it. *No body ought to look upon it as an impoſſible thing, that men who lived an innocent and ſimple life in thoſe firſt times, ſhould have found a paſſage through the ſea to make their eſcape, whether it opened of itſelf, or whether is was by the will of* GOD, *ſince the ſame thing happened a long time after to the Macedonians, when they went thro' the ſea of Pamphylia under the conduct of Alexander,* GOD *being willing to make uſe of that nation to deſtroy the Perſian empire, as it is reported by all the Hiſtorians who wrote the life of that Prince. However, I leave to every body the liberty of judging of it as he thinks fit* (4). It is not true that all the Hiſtorians of Alexander repreſented as a miracle, his paſſage through the ſtreights of Pamphylia near Phaſelis. I ſhall quote a great author, who clearly ſhews that there was nothing miraculous on that occaſion. *Alexander paſſed his army along the ſea-coaſts of Pamphylia with ſuch expedition, that ſeveral Hiſtorians have deſcribed and extolled it with that height of admiration, as if it were no leſs than a miracle, and an extraordinary effect of divine favour, that the waves which were wont to come rolling in from the main, and hardly ever leave ſo much as the beach under the ſteep broken cliffs at any time uncovered, ſhould on a ſudden retire to afford him paſſage. Menander, in one of his comedies, alludes to this wonderful event, when he ſays,*

(4) Joſeph. Ant. Jud. *lib. ii*, *ſub fin.*

> *How this reſembles Alexander's high*
> *Exploits? This fellow of his own accord is here.*
> *Aſk him to wade the ſea, and he'll reply,*
> *Ev'n that to him does paſſable appear.*

Alexander himſelf in his epiſtles, mentions nothing unuſual in this at all, but ſays, he went from Phaſelis, and paſſed through the ſtreights which they call the Ladders (5). We are beholden to Plutarch for having mentioned the letters of that conqueror; for they reſolve the difficulty, and ſhew the impoſture of thoſe who deſcribed that paſſage as ſomething ſupernatural and a ſignal miracle. If there had been any prodigy in it, and an extraordinary favour from Heaven, Alexander had certainly mentioned it in the letters he wrote concerning that march of his army. He could have no political reaſon to be ſilent about ſo wonderful an event; on the contrary, ſeveral important motives might have induced him to ſpeak of it. It was a thing of the greateſt conſequence, to convince all the world, that the gods had viſibly declared for him, that the moſt untractable elements were ſubjected to him, and that nature left it's uſual courſe to haſten the ruin of the king of Perſia. He ſhould have therefore acquainted his mother, and Antipater, and all the nations of Greece with that great miracle; he ſhould have ſent the news of it where-ever he deſired it ſhould be known. He ſhould have taken care to make his letters as authentic as they could be; yet nothing could be plainer than what he wrote upon that occaſion. Let no body ſay that he would be beholden to his valour only; it is not true: We have ſhewed in his article (6) that the extravagant ambition he expreſſed of being accounted a god, was in a great meaſure the effect of policy. His whole conduct ſhewed, that he deſired nothing ſo eagerly as to ſee the nations perſuaded of the aſcendant of his fortune, and of the immutable happineſs of his deſtiny. A man may go a thouſand times farther with ſuch a reputation, than with the fame of a moſt valiant and ſkillful captain: for every body knows that the valour and prudence of a general have their bounds; whereas people are apt to think that nothing can ſtop a conqueror for whom fortune openly declares, and who has heaven and earth, the ſea and the winds, at his diſpoſal, *Cui militat æther, Et conjurati veniunt ad claſſica venti* (7). So that the greateſt and moſt eſſential intereſt of conquerors, is to be looked upon as men, whom GOD has appointed for great revolutions, and

(5) Plut. in Vit. Alexand. *pag.* 673, 674, *of the Greek and Latin edition.*

WHETHER Alexander could have any reaſons to ſuppreſs a miracle wrought in his behalf.

(6) See the article MACEDON, remark [*H*], and that of OLYMPIAS, remark [*F*].

(7) They are Claudian's words, *in III Conſul. Honorii Auguſti*, *ver.* 95. This concerns a prodigy whereby Theodoſius obtained a victory over Eugenius in the year 394. See Flechier's Life of Theodoſius, *lib. iv*, *pag.* 479, *Edit. in* 12*mo*, & Barth. *in* Claudian. *pag.* 509, & *ſeq.* Here is the whole paſſage of Claudian: *O nimium dilecte Deo, cui fundit ab antris Æolus armatas hiemes, cui militat æther, Et conjurati veniunt ad claſſica venti.*

ſhall make a remark upon that ſubject, as I have promiſed (*d*)

(*d*) Article MACEDONIA, in the text, citation (*d*).

and favours with miracles. If it abates ſomething of their glory, with reſpect to their courage or genius, that loſs is plentifully made up in ſome other reſpects. The extent of their conqueſts, the number of their victories, the rapidity wherewith great exploits are performed when fortune directs them, and when ſhe takes almoſt all upon herſelf, without caring for the help of prudence, all thoſe things, I ſay, are an object of admiration, a thouſand times more dazzling, than thoſe limited and mean conqueſts, which are only owing to the moſt conſummate prudence and intrepidity. Are there any human virtues that can inſpire us with the ſame reſpect, veneration, and eſteem, which we do naturally conceive for thoſe whom we look upon as choſen veſſels, men appointed by God for the founding of empires, and his favourites and darlings? Men are much more admired on that account, than if they were only commendable for their prudence and courage. Laſtly, we muſt obſerve, that there are ſome things independent upon the valour and wiſdom of a conqueror. Thoſe qualities can never open a way through the ſea and rivers for the paſſage of an army. When therefore it is ſaid that the ſea and rivers opened in his behalf, and miraculouſly gave way to his troops, he is not deprived of his due praiſes, that they may be beſtowed upon fortune; for every body knows that the courage and ſkill of a great captain can never produce theſe effects: he would be looked upon by every body as a fool, and laughed at, if he ſhould venture to ſay, that he had found out the invention of paſſing a great army through an arm of the ſea, without pontons and ſhips. No good reaſons then can be given, why Alexander ſhould have ſuppreſſed the miracle in queſtion: We muſt therefore conclude, that he made no mention of it in the letters he wrote concerning his march, becauſe there had been nothing extraordinary in it.

I will ſtrengthen this reaſoning with a very good obſervation. The moſt ambitious princes, the warriors that are moſt greedy of praiſes, are not ſo inventive as their flatterers, nor ſo ingenious as a panegyriſt (8), in things that may ſet off the glory of a conqueror. Since therefore the flatterers of Alexander, the Orators and the Poets, who beſtowed praiſes upon him, ſaid that the ſea of Pamphylia withdrew its waves, to facilitate the paſſage of his army, and that this happened by a great miracle, we may very well believe they were perſuaded, that by taking ſuch a turn, they might more eaſily immortalize his glory, and make it more admirable. He himſelf did not think of ſuch an invention; he did not equal in that ſort of devices the fecundity of the wits, of the flatterers and rhetoricians, and therefore he plainly and ingenuouſly related how he got over that place. If there had been any policy in the matter, if he had been ſilent about that prodigy, for fear of leſſening his glory, by confeſſing that the gods had ſeconded him; the flatterers would have known his judgment about it, they would have accommodated themſelves to it, and had never ſpoken a word of the miracle. If we had all the verſes and looſe ſheets which came out about this ſubject, during the life of that prince, we ſhould find a great many idle fancies in them; but becauſe it is the fate of thoſe little books to die as ſoon as, or ſooner, than their authors, poſterity has not been troubled with them. We have only the reduction of them made by ſome more grave writers; and it is no difficult matter to have a juſt notion of that adventure, by conſulting a learned Geographer. Strabo tells us, that mount Climax lies ſo near the ſea of Pamphylia, that it is only parted from it by a narrow way, which one may walk when that ſea is calm; but it is covered with water when that ſea is rough. Alexander truſting his good fortune, ordered his army to go thro' that place, without waiting for the time of the year when the waters go off. The ſoldiers went over, being up to their bellies in the water: this is all the miracle: Περὶ Φασηλίδα δ᾽ ἐστὶ τὰ κατὰ θάλατταν στενὰ, δι᾽ ὧν Ἀλέξανδρος παρήγαγε τὴν στρατείαν· ἔστι δ᾽ ὄρος Κλίμαξ καλούμενον· ἐπίκειται δὲ τῷ Παμφυλίῳ πελάγει, στενὴν ἀπολείπων πάροδον ἐπὶ τῷ αἰγιαλῷ, ταῖς μὲν νηνεμίαις γυμνουμένην, ὥς τε εἶναι βάσιμον τοῖς ὁδεύουσι πλημμύροντος δὲ τοῦ πελάγους, ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων καλυπτομένην ἐπιπολύ. ἡ μὲν οὖν διὰ τοῦ ὄρους ὑπέρβασις, περίοδον ἔχει καὶ προσάντης ἐστὶ, τῷ δ᾽ αἰγιαλῷ χρῶνται κατὰ τὰς εὐδίας. Ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος εἰς χειμέριον ἐμπεσὼν καιρὸν, καὶ τὸ πλέον ἐπιτρέπων τῆ τύχη πρὶν ἀνεῖναι τὸ κῦμα ὥρμησε, καὶ ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ὕδασι γενέσθαι τὴν πορείαν συνέβη, μέχει ὀμφαλοῦ βαπτιζομένων. *Apud Phaſelidem ſunt ad mare anguſtiæ, per quas exercitum traduxit Alexander. Eſt enim ibi mons Climax, Pamphylio incumbens mari, & propter litus arctum relinquens tranſitum: qui tranquillo mari nudatur, & à viatoribus perambulari poteſt: mari exundante, fluctibus admodum obtegitur. Alexander autem hybernam incidit in tempeſtatem, cumque fortunæ maximam eventus partem crederet, antequam defluerent undæ profectus eſt: itaque contigit, ut totum diem milites per aquam iter facerent uſque ad umbilicum in eam demerſi* (9). Others ſay, that the ſoutherly winds, which had blown for ſeveral days, and overflowed all the way to the foot of the mountain, ceaſed as ſoon as Alexander appeared, and that a north wind aroſe, which drove the waters toward the ſea. Freinſhemius (10) quotes the authors who mention this, I ſhall tranſcribe his words and quotations. '*Parte exercitus ad Pergenſium urbem per montes præ'miſſa; cæteros ipſe per litus ducebat, qua Climax 'mons Pamphylio mari imminens anguſtam ſubinde 'ſemitam relinquit, quoties mare tranquillum eſt; at 'quum æſtus incubuit, fluctibus operitur. Idque hye'me frequens & prope perpetuum eſt. At Alexander 'nihil æque ac moram metuens, exercitum per æqua, 'per iniqua, eodem ardore atque impetu rapiebat. 'Continui per eos dies Auſtri flaverant, qui mare in 'litus propellentes, omnia itineris veſtigia altis palu'dibus opplent: adſiduæ etiam magnæque pluviæ, ut 'ventis iſtis ſpirantibus ſolet, ruebant. Sed adven'tante Alexandro ſubito exortus Aquilo cœlum purga'vit imbribus, undas rejecit in mare, & Macedonibus 'tranſitum aperuit. Sic quoque unius ** diei itinere 'per incerta vada emergendum fuit; aqua ad umbi'licum ferme pertingente. Tantam in periculis A'lexandri fiduciam, ut ab ipſius ingenio profectam 'non dubito; ita frequentibus prodigiis & ominibus 'auctam confirmatamque fuiſſe crediderim: poſtquam 'decreto numinis, clariſſimis maximiſque rebus ſe de'ſtinari conjecit. - - - *Having ſent part of the army 'before, over the mountains to the city of Perga; he led 'the reſt himſelf along the ſhoar, where mount Climax, 'adjoining to the Pamphylian ſea, leaves a narrow path 'for travellers, when the ſea is calm; but when it is 'rough, the way is covered with water. This frequent'ly and almoſt always happens in the winter-time. But, 'Alexander fearing nothing ſo much as delay, carried 'his army, thro' the moſt difficult places with the ſame 'eagerneſs as thro' the moſt eaſy. Continual ſoutherly 'winds had blown for ſeveral days before, which drove 'the waves upon the ſhoar, and thereby the path was 'overflown with deep water: there had likewiſe fallen 'great and conſtant rains, as commonly happens with 'thoſe winds. But upon Alexander's approach, a north'wind ſuddenly aroſe, which kept off the rain, and 'drove back the waters towards the ſea, and ſo opened 'a paſſage for the Macedonians. Thus the army went 'over in one day, the water reaching up to their bellies. 'As I do not queſtion but this boldneſs of Alexander in 'the midſt of dangers proceeded from his natural diſpoſition, ſo I believe it was increaſed and confirmed by 'frequent prodigies and omens, after that he imagined he 'was deſtined by the gods to great and glorious exploits.'* Joſephus ſhews no great judgment, when he compares the paſſage thro' the Red-ſea, with the paſſage thro' the ſea of Pamphylia. He hoped that the miracle of Alexander would make the Greeks believe that of Moſes; but he ſhould have feared that the paſſage thro' the Red-ſea would be aſcribed to ſome natural cauſes, as that of the ſea of Pamphylia was aſcribed to the north-wind. If Genebrard had not made uſe of ſo ſevere a cenſure, one could not blame the remark he made upon theſe words of Joſephus: *The Egyptians were miſtaken, they knew not that GOD had opened that way only for his people, and not for their perſecutors, who followed them only to deſtroy them* (11). Here is his note. 'From hence thou mayſt know how execrable 'is the impiety of Joachim Vadianus, who was ſo 'bold as to ſay in his commentary upon Pomponius 'Mela

(8) *To this may be applied the words of Pliny the younger*, in Paneg. Traj. *cap. lv.* Ingenioſior eſt ad excogitandum ſimulatio veritate, ſervitus libertate, metus amore.

(9) Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 458.

(10) Supplem. in Q. Curt. *lib. ii, cap. xi, num.* 18. *See alſo his index upon* Q. Curtius, *at the word* Pamphylia.

* *Strab. l. xiv, Curt.* 5. 3. 22. 6. 3. 16. *Artemon. in Senecæ ſuaſor* 1. *Arrian.* 1, 8, 8. *Euſtath. in Dionyſ. v.* 855, & 865. *Appian. lib. ii. de bell. civ. Joſeph. Antiq. lib. ii. extremo. Plut. c.* 27, & 28.

** *Strabo, lib. xiv.*

(11) Joſeph. ubi ſupra.

‘ Mela, that Moſes waited for the time when the Red-ſea was to retire into the ocean, and leave the bottom dry, as it happens twice in a day at mount St Michael in Normandy. For, beſides that God deſigned to ſhew his power by it, the Red-ſea never leaves it's channel by a flux and re-flux, being always full, as it is certain by Geography and Sea-charts (12).’ Joſephus ſhould have ſo much the more abſtained from ſuch a paraliel, becauſe there was ſome reaſon to fear, that the Greek Philoſophers would take advantage of what is obſerved by the ſacred Hiſtorian, that God *cauſed the ſea to go back by a ſtrong wind all that night* (13). They might have ſaid, that thoſe two miracles were like one another, and both the effect of the wind. There aroſe a north-wind for Alexander, which drove back the waters of the ſea; another wind did the ſame for Moſes. Several Hiſtorians, to make the conqueſts of the Macedonian army wonderful, took for a miracle a north-wind which proved uſeful to him by chance. The Hiſtorian of the Hebrews did the like (14). Therefore to prevent thoſe objections, Joſephus ſhould have avoided the parallel which he made uſe of very improperly. A Commentator for the uſe of the Dauphin cenſures him ſeverely for it. ‘ Ut imperite, ne dicam impie, feciſſe Joſephus videatur, qui narrato Iſraëlitarum tranſitu per rubrum mare, quo credibile probaret eſſe miraculum, ſimile quiddam Alexandro contigiſſe agnoſcit, & ab omnibus affirmari tradit qui res ejus geſtas literis mandarunt (15). - - *Joſephus, having given an account of the paſſage of the Iſraelites through the Red-ſea, to prove the credibility of that miracle acknowledges that ſomething like it happened to Alexander the great, and ſays that the ſame is aſſerted by all thoſe who wrote his Hiſtory; whereby he ſhews his want of judgment, if not the want of piety.*’

Note, That it is a very eaſy thing to obſerve a vaſt difference between what paſſed near Phaſelis, and what happened in Egypt. The wind which drove the Red-ſea back, was preceded by an human action, which ſhews that God interpoſed therein after a ſpecial manner: *Moſes ſtretched out his hand over the ſea* (16). Beſides, there happened a thing which cannot be aſcribed to the wind; the ſea opened, and the Iſraelites went upon the dry ground, *and the waters were as a wall unto them on the right hand and on the left.* If it be ſaid that the wind was the cauſe of that opening, it muſt be confeſſed that it was not natural, I mean, that it blew only upon a very ſmall part of the ſea, and that leaving the waters at reſt on the right, and on the left, it made a way in the middle; it drove only the waters that were in that intermediate ſpace, and kept up the reſt on each ſide. If any one ſhould aſk me why it was neceſſary that the wind ſhould blow all night, ſeeing God does not at all want the help of ſecond cauſes to dry up an arm of the ſea in a moment: I would anſwer, that creatures are not to preſcribe to their Creator the manner of his conduct. Beſides, thoſe who ſay, that the miracles of the ancient law were produced upon occaſion of the will of a creature, are not perhaps miſtaken. See what Father Mallebranche and Mr Arnauld think of it (17). If the angel, who was entruſted with the conduct of the Iſraelites, had been the occaſional cauſe of all the miracles of Moſes; it would be no wonder that the action of bodies, the violence of the winds, &c. ſhould have been made uſe of. Several difficulties may be ſolved by that principle. Perhaps, a Heathen would ſay, according to the language of thoſe who ſpoke ſo much of the *Genii* of the emperors, that the genius of Alexander ſtopped the ſouth-wind, and formed a north-wind the very ſame day that conqueror deſigned to go along the ſhoar of Phaſelis. But to perſuade us of it, it would be neceſſary to ſhew, that ſuppoſing Alexander had been quiet in Macedonia, a north-wind had not ſucceeded a ſouth-wind the ſame day that he marched his army along that coaſt: which is a thing that can neither be proved nor known. One may apprehend that the *Genii* of the emperors might, by uſing their Phyſics, *applicando activa paſſivis, - - - by applying actives to paſſives*, ſtop one wind, and raiſe another; but it cannot be known whether they do it in ſuch a place, or at ſuch a time.

PHASIS, a river that runs through Colchis and diſcharges itſelf in the Euxine ſea, had that name after a young man had thrown himſelf into it. Before, it was called Arcturus. That young man was the ſon of Apollo and Ocyroë (*a*), and killed his mother whom he had taken in the very fact [*A*], I mean in the arms of a galant. The furies appeared to him, and tormented him to ſuch a degree that he threw himſelf into the Arcturus. In this river there was found a plant named *Leucophyllus*, which was endowed with an admirable virtue; for it hindered women from committing adultery. Certain

[*A*] *He killed his mother whom he had ſurprized in the fact.*] Thoſe who have read Pontus de Tyard will perhaps wonder, that I ſpeak of the young Phaſis without beſtowing on him the encomiums which he has. *Phaſis*, ſays he (1), *being then grown up, and a ſtrict obſerver of chaſtity, ſurprized his mother in adultery. Vexed, and provoked at her crime, and not able to command his paſſion, he ſlew her.* If you want to know how he expreſſes this poetically, read what follows.

Leur fils Phaſis ja grand, mais de chaſte nature,
D'un adultere bras voit ſa mere embraſſée,
Dont d'un glavie vangeur l'ayant morte laiſſée,
Il choiſit en Arcture & mort & ſepulture (2).

But to account for my conduct, it is ſufficient to obſerve that the author from whom Pontus de Tyard had this ſtory, does not ſay that Phaſis was chaſt: and therefore I thought nothing ſhould be added to the original. It is a bad method which a world of tranſcribers take: they confound a fact with their own conjectures, or with the conſequences they draw from it: for they inſert them in the body of the narrative, as if the author, who furniſhed them with the fact, had alſo vented them. It would be proper to diſtinguiſh what is added from what is copied, and eſpecially when the facts that are added do not neceſſarily reſult from the others. Pontus de Tyard did not follow this rule, he fanſied Phaſis was a rigid obſerver of continency, ſince the adultery of Ocyroe had induced him to kill her. He has affirmed thoſe two things as if Plutarch had equally related them. He has confounded his conſequences with the narrative of that antient author. Now, they are conſequences which at moſt amount but to a probability: for, without being very chaſt one might conceive ſuch an horror at ſeeing one's mother in the arms of a galant, as to be thereby induced to kill her. All thoſe who puniſh leudneſs in their families are not chaſt themſelves. There is ſuch a one, that debauches as many women as he can, that yet would cruelly uſe his ſiſters and ſiſters-in-law, and even his mother, if they ſuffered themſelves to be debauched, and eſpecially if he catched them in the act of adultery (3). I ſhould not enlarge ſo much on this fault of Pontus de Tyard, did I not ſee that even now-adays very great authors are guilty of it.

I do not alledge the teſtimony of Valerius Flaccus to prove that Phaſis was not continent; for when that Poet tells that Phaſis, deſperately in love with a beautiful nymph, violently purſued her, he means only the god of the river.

Barbarus in patriis ſectatur montibus Aëan
Phaſis, amore furens: pavidas jacit illa pharetras
Virgineo turbata metu; diſcurſibus & jam
Deficit: ac volucri victam deus adligat unda (4).

Cruel Phaſis the beauteous Æa views
With luſtful eyes, her eagerly purſues
O'er their native hills; then with trembling heart
The fearful virgin at him throws a dart.
But faint, and tir'd with running, yields at laſt,
The god then hugs her in the river faſt.

---

(12) Genebrard, in the margin of his tranſlation of Joſephus, *ſub fin. lib. ii, Ant. J. fol.* 53, *Pariſ.* 1604, *in* 8vo.

(13) Exod. xiv, 21.

(14) Let all this be aſcribed to thoſe Greek Philoſophers, whom I mentioned before.

(15) Michael le Tellier, Not. in Q. Curt. *lib. v, capite ipſi undecimo, pag.* 193.

(16) Exod. ubi ſupra. See Mr le Clerc's Diſſertation mentioned in the *Hiſt. des Ouvrages de, Sçavans, Octob.* 1695, *pag.* 59, 60.

(17) Mr Arnauld publiſhed in the year 1685, a Diſſertation concerning the manner how God wrought the miracles of the old law by the miniſtry of angels. He refutes Father Mallebranche.

(*a*) Who was the daughter of Oceanus.

(1) Pontus de Tyard, *in the* Douze Fables de Fleuves, ou Fontaines, *fol. m.* 11.

(2) Ib. *fol.* 12.

(3) ᾽Επαυτοφώρω, in flagranti crimine. *Plut. de Fluviis, pag. m.* 16. See the notes of Mauſſac, *pag.* 234, on that expreſſion of Plutarch.

(4) Valer. Flac. Argonaut. *lib. v, ver.* 425, *pag. m.* 304.

Certain precautions were to be uſed in gathering it (*b*) [*B*]. Nothing ever made the Phaſis ſo much talked of as the expedition of the Argonauts, ſince all the Poets who have ſung it were obliged to mention this great river, which the Argonauts were forced to ſail up, before they could ſeize on the Golden Fleece. As to that, and ſeveral other things, I refer you to Lloyd's Dictionary: but, as to the preſent ſtate of the Phaſis, you had better conſult Moreri.

[*B*] *There was found . . . a plant . . . which was endowed with an admirable virtue. . . . . Certain precautions were to be uſed in gathering it.*] It was found at break of day in the beginning of the ſpring, when the myſteries of Hecate were celebrated: the god Pan was very neceſſary in that affair (5). See the margin (6). Jealous huſbands having gathered it, uſed to throw it round about their beds, in order to preſerve them pure and undefiled: ἣν οἱ ζηλότυποι τῶν ἀνδρῶν δρεπόμενοι, ῥίπτουσι περὶ τὴν παρθένιον θάλαμον, καὶ ἀνόθευτον τηροῦσιν τὴν γάμον. *Quam poſtquam hominum zelotypi collegerunt, circa thalamum virginalem jaciunt, ut puras conſervent nuptias* (7). We find the ſame words in a book of Ariſtotle (8): but they have been foiſted in there, and Mr de Mauſſac does not queſtion (9) but that they were taken from the treatiſe *de Fluviis*, which I have juſt quoted. Furthermore, if any impure drunken perſon (10) approached the place where this plant grew, he loſt his underſtanding, and confeſſed all the crimes he had committed, or intended to commit. He was ſeized, and wrapped up in a ſkin, and thrown into a round hole, which was called The Little Mouth of the Impious, and reſembled a well. The body of this man appeared in the lake Mœotis thirty days after, full of worms, and was immediately torn in pices by vultures that had not been ſeen before (11).

I do not know whether the Hiſtory of this plant has not been corrupted by thoſe, who abridged the authors that ſpoke of it firſt, and by thoſe who have quoted ſome part of the abridgments. Theſe are two grand ſources of falſification, becauſe there are ſome people who frame a new ſtory, by taking ſomething from abbreviators, and ſomething from thoſe who have applied to their own particular deſigns what fitted them, leaving and abandoning the reſt of the circumſtances, and even extending ſuch as might ſerve their purpoſe. However, it is probable the firſt foundation of this ſtory was, that the men, being obliged to contain themſelves during the celebration of the ſolemn rites of Hecate, uſed to put in their wives bed a ſort of herb which cooled nature. We have ſeen below (12) that ſuch a thing was ſaid to be practiſed among the Athenians, at the time of their Theſmophoria, or the myſtical Rites of Ceres. But it muſt be owned, the plant of the Phaſis was much more remarkable than the *Agnus Caſtus* of the Athenians, ſince it's virtue was not confined to the duration of a feſtival, but could calm the anxiety of jealous huſbands for their whole life. Here are ſome more verſes of Pontus de Tyard:

Depuis du nom Phaſis eſt appellé ce fleuve,
Où le chaſte arbriſſeau Leucophile ſe treuve,
Remede à jalouſie en un froid cueur tombée.
Car quinconque au Printemps en ſon lit cachera
Ceſte plante trempée en Phaſis: treuvera
Que jamais ſa Venus ne ſera deſrobée (13).

The modeſt plant, called Leucophyllus, grows
(A cure for jealous love) where Phaſis flows.
Whoe'er this ſhrub, there ſteep'd, will in his bed
In ſpring-time hide, from horns ſecures his head.

PHŒBADIUS, biſhop of Agen in the IVth century, expreſſed a very great zeal for Orthodoxy, and againſt Arianiſm. He wrote a book againſt the ſecond form of faith [*A*], which Oſius and Potamius had drawn up at Sirmium in the year 357 (*a*). He aſſiſted at the ſynod of Ariminum in the year 359, and maintained the Nicene form of faith to the end of that council, and refuſed to ſubſcribe to that which was propoſed there. ‘Neither fear nor threatnings could make him change his reſolution; but ‘Taurus, the governor, perceiving that he could not overcome his conſtancy by that ‘means, betook himſelf to intreaties, and beſought him with tears to take the mildeſt ‘courſe, to deliver a great number of biſhops who had been ſhut up in a town ſeven ‘months, and were very much incommoded, by reaſon of the ſharpneſs of the winter, ‘and the ſcarcity of all things . . . . . Phœbadius anſwered, that he was ready to go ‘into baniſhment, and ſuffer all ſorts of torments rather than do what was required of ‘him, and that he would never approve of a form of faith made by the Arians. Some ‘days were ſpent in that conteſt; but at laſt, ſeeing there was no hopes of a peace, he ‘abated of his conſtancy, when Urſacius and Valens had declared, that the profeſſion ‘of faith they propoſed was Catholic, and that thoſe to whom it ſhould not appear to ‘be ſufficient, might add to it what they ſhould think fit (*b*).’ Some orthodox propoſitions were added to it, namely this, that the Son of GOD was not a creature; but Urſacius and Valens did cunningly add to it, that he was not a creature as others are; and by ſuch a fraud they obtained the ſubſcriptions they deſired (*c*). *Phœbadius being returned into his country, was one of the biſhops who expreſſed the greateſt ſorrow for their fault, and made amends for it by their declarations and proteſtations againſt what they had done by ſurprize. He aſſiſted at the council of Valence in the year 374. We have a letter of St Ambroſe directed to him and Delphinius biſhop of Bourdeaux. St Jerom aſſures us in his book concerning illuſtrious men, that Phœbadius was ſtill alive in his time (d), and that he was very old. He adds, that he had compoſed ſome other works, beſides that which we have mentioned. The memory of that ſaint is particularly honoured at Agen, where he is commonly*

[*A*] *He writ a book againſt the ſecond form of faith.*] That work is extant. You will find the ſubſtance of it in Mr du Pin's *Bibliotheque* (1). Father Labbe ſays, that Petrus Pithœus was the firſt who publiſhed it. *Primum prodiit ſtudio Petri Pithœi cum aliquot aliorum Veterum Galliæ Theologorum ſcriptis, Pariſiis apud Nivellium* 1586, *in 4to hoc titulo: Liber contra Epiſtolam ſive edictum ſub nomine Conſtantii Imp. emiſſum in Synodo Mediolanenſi* (2). He adds, that it was inſerted ſince in the editions of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and that Barthius made ſome notes upon it. Mr du Pin ſays alſo, that the firſt edition is that which was publiſhed by Petrus Pithœus, but he places it in the year 1589. John Darnalt in his Antiquities of Agen, chap. 5, mentions a preceding edition. *That epiſtle of Phœbadius*, ſays he (3), *was found in our time, and immediately publiſhed by Robert Stephens, and ſince by Nivelle, in* 1586. Let them that have libraries enquire whether it be ſo.

---

(5) Πρὸς πανισμὸν ἔνθεον, ad divinum panis Dei afflatum. *Plut. ibid. pag.* 17.

(6) This puts me in mind of a popular tradition of ſome provinces in France: which is, that the ſeed of fern cannot be gathered but on Midſummer Eve, preciſely at mid-night, and in order to ſucceed in it, one muſt be aſſiſted by a ſorcerer: that it has admirable virtues, &c.

(7) Id. ib. *pag.* 16.

(8) Περὶ θαυμασ. ἀκουσμ. De Mirabili Auſcultatione, *ſub fin.*

(9) Mauſſac. in Plutarchum de Fluviis, *pag.* 235.

(10) Ἐὰν τις τῶν ἀσεβεστέρων διὰ μέθην. Si quis impurus ob ebrietatem. *Plut. ibid. pag.* 16.

(11) *Taken from* Plutarch. ibid. ex Cteſippo, *lib. ii*, Rerum Scythicarum.

(*b*) Taken from Plutarch in the treatiſe *de Fluviis, pag. m.* 16, 17.

(12) In remark [*B*] of the article THESMOPHORIA.

(13) Pontus de Tyard, ubi ſupra, *folio* 12.

(*a*) Du Pin's Biblioth. *Tom. ii, pag.* 107, *of the Dutch Edit.*

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) *That is, in the year* 392, *when St Jerom wrote that book. See Father* Labbe, Diſſert. de Scriptor. Eccleſ. *Tom. ii, pag.* 221.

(1) *Pag.* 107, & 108, *of the ſecond Tom. Dutch Edit.*

(2) Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. ii, pag.* 221.

(3) Darnalt the King's artorney in the preſidial of Agen, *Antiq. of Agen, fol.* 32, *verſo, Pariſ.* 1606, *in* 8*vo.*

commonly called St Fiari [*B*].

[*B*] *His memory is particularly honoured at Agen, where he is commonly called St Fiari.*] The name of that illuſtrious prelate has undergone ſeveral ſtrange metamorphoſes. *Sulpicius Severus calls him Fegadius. He is called Sœbadius in St Jerom, and in the Greek tranſlator of his book. . . . . We read Fygadius in St Ambroſe* (4). Arnalt bewails thoſe alterations, and the deſtruction of the church conſecrated to that biſhop. *I ſhall ſay by the by, that the name of that holy biſhop has been ſo unfortunate, that it is at this day ſo changed and altered, not only amongſt the vulgar, but alſo in the books of his own church, that ſome call him Fœdarium, others Phœbadium and Feudarium, Ephionius calls him Sebaudium, he is commonly called St Fiari. I ſhall add to the alteration of his name, that the injuries of time, and of the age, have been ſo great, and ſo deplorable, that his church was firſt pulled down, and levelled to the ground in this city, and the place where it ſtood was converted to a profane uſe* (5). Beza mentions a thing that is ſomewhat curious, which belongs to the year 1561. ‘ At that time John Barrelles, a miniſter at Toulouſe, ‘ being left at Agen by reaſon of his illneſs, where he ‘ went through a courſe of Phyſic, preached in the ‘ day-time in the houſe of Rouſſanes a counſellor, and ‘ the aſſembly grew ſo numerous every day, that at ‘ laſt, on the ſixteenth of March, he preached in a ‘ little church called St Fiari, who was formerly biſhop ‘ of Agen, and a very learned man, having written ‘ againſt the Arians in St Jerom's time, as he himſelf ‘ ſays in his treatiſe concerning eccleſiaſtical writers, ‘ where his name is ill written Sebadius inſtead of ‘ Fedarius. There was in that church a marble ſe‘ pulchre, which was ſaid to be that biſhop's ; the ‘ nurſes were wont to ſcrape it, and to ſwallow the ‘ ſcrapings with their porridge, that they might have ‘ abundance of milk. Yet there is a little town near ‘ Toulouſe called Benerque, upon the river Rege (6), ‘ where, on the twenty-fifth of April, which is the ‘ feſtival of the ſaid St Fiari, the neighbours uſe to ‘ meet in arms, which is an antient cuſtom among ‘ them, for fear, as they ſay, that the inhabitants of ‘ Agen ſhould come and carry away the body of that ‘ ſaint, which they maintain to have been ſtollen from ‘ them. Let them debate the matter amongſt them‘ ſelves ; but the ſepulchre having been opened at laſt ‘ at Agen, there was nothing found in it but a ſcull ‘ with the teeth very well preſerved, conſidering the ‘ ſaid biſhop had been buried there above twelve hun‘ dred years (7).’

(4) Du Pin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 109.

(5) Arnalt, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 33.

(6) He ſhould have ſaid Ariege.

(7) Beza, Hiſt. Ecleſ. *lib. v*, *pag.* 790, 791.

PHÆDRUS, the author of the five books of fables in Latin Iambic verſes, was a Thracian by birth (*a*). He was made free by Auguſtus [*A*], and lived till after the death of Sejanus (*b*). He had been oppreſſed by that favourite of Tiberius (*c*). He ſpeaks of himſelf as of a man who did not care to grow rich [*B*]. All the Critics do not agree that he is the ſame Phædrus mentioned in one of Martial's epigrams [*C*]. It is to be obſerved, that Caſaubon, who was ſo learned a man, knew not that there was

(*a*) Phædrus, in Præf. *lib. iii*.

(*b*) Vid. Scheffer. in Vit. Phædri.

(*c*) See the ſame author, ibid.

[*A*] *He was made free by Auguſtus.*] He is called *Auguſti Libertus* in the title of his fables. Lipſius, Andreas Scotus, Dempſterus, Borrichius, and ſeveral other Critics, underſtand by it that he was made free by Tiberius (1). But Florens Chriſtianus, Voſſius, Schefferus, *&c.* had rather underſtand it of Auguſtus. I follow the laſt opinion, though I confeſs that the proofs that can be given for it, are not demonſtrative. That which is certain, is, that our Phædrus relates, as an eye-witneſs, ſome things that happened under the empire of Auguſtus. See the XIth Fable of the IIId Book, but not the VIIIth of the Vth Book, wherein Bathyllus is mentioned ; for Voſſius (2) is in the wrong to ſay that Phædrus ſpeaks of that as having ſeen it.

[*B*] *He ſpeaks of himſelf as of a man who did not care to grow rich.*] See the preface of his third book : he mentions this amongſt the things which ſhould facilitate his promotion to the rank of Poets :

Quamvis in ipſa natus ſim pene ſchola,
Curamque habendi penitus corde eraſerim,
Et laude invita in hanc vitam incubuerim,
Faſtidioſe tamen in cœtum recipior.

Tho' in the very ſchool almoſt
I had my birth : and from my heart
All thoughts of growing rich are fled ;
Tho' this way I have bent my mind,
Yet with diſdain I am receiv'd.

See alſo the fifth fable of the fifth book (3).

[*C*] *All the Critics do not agree that he is the ſame Phædrus that is mentioned in one of Martial's epigrams.*] Here are the words of this Poet :

Dic Muſa quid agat Canius meus Rufus ?
Utrumne chartis tradit ille victuris
Legenda temporum acta Claudianorum ?
An quæ Neroni falſus adſtruit ſcriptor ?
An æmulatur improbi jocos Phædri (4) ?

Acquaint me, Muſe, with what my Rufus does.
If laſting annals of the Claudian age,
Or ſomething under Nero's name, he writes,
Or imitates the ſaucy Phædrus' jokes.

The note of Scriverius upon the laſt of thoſe five verſes is extremely injurious to thoſe, who think that Martial ſpeaks of our Phædrus : ‘ Poſſunt ne magis ‘ decoquere de judicio, ac magis ludere de otio ſuo ‘ viri docti, qui exiſtimant Fabulatorem Phædrum à ‘ Clariſſimo Pithœo editum, & cujus Avienus quidam, ‘ ſive Avianus, in præfatione Fabularum ſuarum Æſo‘ piarum ad Theodoſium meminit, hunc eundem eſſe, ‘ de quo loquitur Martialis ? Volunt nos credere ſcili‘ cet, Libertum illum Auguſti Cæſaris fuiſſe, ſtilo at‘ que tempore parem proximumve Laberio vel Publio ‘ Mimo, & quidem, quantum conjiciunt, ſub Tiberio ‘ vixiſſe, atque adeo poſt Sejanum damnatum : Nugæ. ‘ Certè niſi vehementer fallor, ævo illo dignus cenſeri ‘ minime poteſt ſcriptor iſte, cuicui tandem ille ala‘ pas & libertatem debeat (5). - - - *Thoſe learned men* ‘ *cannot miſapply their time and parts worſe, who think* ‘ *that Phædrus the fable writer, publiſhed by the learn*‘ *ed Pithœus, and mentioned by one Avienus, or Avia*‘ *nus, in the preface of his Æſop's Fables to Theodoſius,* ‘ *is the ſame that is ſpoken of by Martial. For they* ‘ *would have us believe that he was the freed man of* ‘ *Auguſtus Cæſar, equal, or next, to Laberius, or Publius* ‘ *Mimus, in ſtile and time, and that he lived, as they* ‘ *imagine, under Tiberius, and therefore after Sejanus* ‘ *was condemned : meer ſtuff. Certainly, if I am not* ‘ *exceedingly miſtaken, that writer cannot be thought* ‘ *worthy of that age, whoever he was indebted to for* ‘ *his freedom.*’ Scriverius boaſts that he can prove his opinion by ſeveral reaſons, and obſerves, amongſt other things, that Perot, archbiſhop of Siponto, is the author of one of the fables publiſhed under the name of Phædrus (6). It is certain, that the fable which Perot ſays he took from Avienus, and publiſhed in Iambic verſes, differs very little from the other. *Alluſit ad fabulam*, ſays he in his commentary on the 77th epigram of the firſt book of Martial (7), *quam nos ex Avieno in Fabellas noſtras adoleſcentes Iambico carmine tranſtulimus :*

Olim quas vellent eſſe in tutela ſua
Divi legerunt arbores, &c (8).

But the critics did not fail to ſay, that prelate aſcribed it unjuſtly to himſelf. However, one may very well wonder, that ſo pleaſant a book as that of Phædrus ſhould have been almoſt unknown for many ages. Suppoſing that Martial ſpeaks of it, we have but two authors that ſpoke of it (9). I have ſaid in another place (10), that Seneca knew nothing of it, and I ‘ am

(1) See the notes of Schefferus, *in Phædrum, init.*

(2) Voſſ. de Poët. Lat. *pag.* 58.

(3) *He ſays* Hujus reſpectu fabulæ deterritus, periculoſum ſemper vitavi lucrum.

(4) Mart. Epigr. XX, lib. III.

(5) Scriverius, in Mart. Epigr. XX, *lib. iii*, *pag. m.* 88.

(6) It is the 18th of the 3d book in my Hamburg Edit. 1673.

(7) And not the 20th of the 3d book as Menagius ſays in his *Meſcolanze, pag.* 280.

(8) You may ſee what follows in Menagius, ibid.

(9) Avienus mentions it, as Scriverius obſerves in the above-cited words.

(10) In the article ÆSOP, remark [*M*]. See the words of the Jeſuit Vaſſeur in the next remark.

was one Phædrus among the ancient authors, until Petrus Pithœus publiſhed Phædrus’s Fables [*D*]. Since that firſt edition which came out in 1596, there has been many others with the notes of the greateſt Critics. See the Catalogue of them in the preface of John Schefferus upon that author, to which you may add the edition (*d*) of the year 1698, publiſhed by Mr Burman, which contains the notes of Gudius, never before publiſhed, the intire Commentaries of Conradus Ritterſhuſius, Nicolas Rigaltius, Nicolas Heinſius, John Schefferus, and John Lewis Praſchius, with abſtracts of ſome other commentaries. The edition which came out ſince that (*e*), by the care, and with the notes of Mr Hoogſtraten, is the fineſt that has been ſeen as yet, both with reſpect to the character and figures. It is for the uſe of the young prince of Naſſau, Governor of Frieſland and Groningen. The French tranſlation, which Moreri commends, comes

am going to ſay that Caſaubon was for a long time in the ſame caſe. Which ought to make us leſs wonder at the obſcurity wherewith the name and glory of Quintus Curtius has been covered during ſo many years. To which I add that Paterculus had the ſame fate. See above the article PATERCULUS, remark [*D*], citation 23.

[*D*] *Caſaubon . . . . knew not there was one Phædrus, until Petrus Pithæus publiſhed Phædrus’s fables.*] He wrote the following words to Petrus Pithœus : ‘ Ex epiſtola tua primum de Phædro Auguſti liberto cognovi : nam plane mihi ante id nomen incognitum, prorſuſque de eo qua ſcriptore qua ſcripto vel legi nihil, vel ſi eſt aliter non memini. - - - *The firſt time I knew any thing of Phædrus the freed man of Auguſtus was when I read your epiſtle : before that, the name was quite unknown to me : I never read of him either as a writer, or as written of, that I remember.*’ That letter of Caſaubon was written in the year 1596, and Petrus Pithœus publiſhed Phædrus’s fables in the ſame year at Troyes. He ſent a copy of it to Father Sirmond who was then at Rome. That Jeſuit ſhewed it to the learned men of Rome, who thought at firſt that it was a ſuppoſititious book ; but having more carefully examined it, they changed their opinion, and found ſome characters of the age of Auguſtus in it. ‘ Memini equidem Jacobum Sirmundum narrare mihi ſolitum, cum Petrus Pithœus hos Phædri Æſopiarum fabularum quinque libros Lutetiæ (11) edidiſſet primum, & ad ſe Romam pro veteri amicitia muneri miſiſſet ; percuſſos illico Romanos novitate voluminis, atque ut gens eſt *emunctæ naris, natura nunquam verba cui potuit dare,* ſuſpicari cœpiſſe num quidnam partus iſte recens ac ſuppoſititius eſſet, qui tanto intervallo appareret, tamque delituiſſet diu : veruntamen libro perlecto toto, neminem dubitaſſe, quin ætatem redoleret Auguſti, ac ſummam illam facilitatem ſtili & ſcripturæ, & beatam copiam repræſentaret ; tuncque vixiſſet auctor, cum laus bene loquendi temporum potius, quam hominum fuit ; ibique etiam apud Cæſarem ſerviſſet, ubi ſedem ac domicilium eruditio collocaſſe videretur ; qua in domo filiæ & neptes, intimi & familiares, ſervi & liberti literas egregie didiciſſent (12). - - - *I remember indeed Father James Sirmond uſed to tell me, when Petrus Pithæus firſt publiſhed at Paris Phædrus’s five books of Æſop’s fables, and ſent them to Rome as a preſent to him upon the account of their old friendſhip, that the Romans were at firſt ſurpriſed at the novelty of the book, and like cunning people that are not eaſily impoſed upon, began to ſuſpect whether it might not be a ſpurious and modern piece, ſince it appeared at ſuch a diſtance of time, and had been ſo long concealed : but having read it quite through, no body queſtioned but that it ſavoured of the age of Auguſtus, and reſembled the copious and eaſy way of writing uſed at that time ; and that the author lived, when the praiſe of ſpeaking well was due to the times more than to perſons : and that he had ſerved the emperor in the place, where learning ſeemed to have taken up it’s reſidence : in the houſe where his daughters and nieces, his intimate and familiar friends, his ſlaves and freed-men had received a learned education.*’ Theſe are the words of a Jeſuit, who immediately after makes ſome reflexions upon this paſſage of Seneca, *Æſopeos logos intentatum Romanis ingeniis opus. - - - Æſop’s fables, a work unattempted by Roman wits.* He pretends, that Seneca does not ground what he ſays upon Phædrus’s being not a Roman, but a Thracian ; he does ſolidly refute thoſe who have recourſe to ſuch an explication, and believes either that Seneca’s memory failed him, or that the ſucceſſors of Tiberius cauſedPhædrus’s book to be immediately ſuppreſſed,becauſe their tyranny was repreſented in it, and ſo Seneca knew not that book. I ſhould not like the laſt conjecture ; for if that work had been ſuppreſſed for that reaſon,Seneca would have more eaſily remembered it. Let us hear the Jeſuit (13) : ‘ Miror vehementer, cur affirmarit Seneca, Æſopios logos eſſe intentatum Romanis ingeniis opus : cum Phædrum hunc haberet, quem opponere poſſet toti Græciæ. Nam quod, clariſſima lumina ſuperioris ſæculi duo, Petrus Pithœus & Juſtus Lipſius prodiderunt, vere id à Seneca dictum ; quia Phædrus non genere aut ortu Romanus, ſed Thrax, ſicut ipſe teſtatum reliquit, eſſet : minus ea probabilis videtur expoſitio Senecæ. Quaſi vero Romanis ingeniis opus intentatum, ſit quidquam aliud, quam Latinis literis nondum illuſtratum nec elaboratum opus : aut comœdia fuerit carmen intactum Romanis, quamvis id ſolus natione Afer Terentius tractaſſet : aut ſi percenſeret Seneca, qui philoſophiam ſcriptores Latine explicaſſent ; de eo ſe numero eximeret ipſe ; propterea quod natione foret Hiſpanus, patria Cordubenſis. At non exemit Quintilianus, qui quo loco de Philoſophis egit Latinis, his illum potiſſimum annumeravit ; cum inter oratores, & poëtas, & alios diverſi generis ſcriptores potuiſſet referre. Citius dixerim Senecam vel parum hic attendiſſe, quid ſcriberet : vel iſtud, ut alia, oblitum prorſus, memoriæ vitio peccaſſe. . . . . (14) Illud veriſimilius, iniquiſſimis Tiberii, Caligulæ, Claudii, Neronis temporibus, cum ſcripta edictis abolerentur & ſenatuſconſultis, ſi cui poëtæ aut hiſtorico verbum excidiſſet opportunum delationi & calumniæ ; cum ne liberæ quidem relictæ cogitationes ; & opinio tacita de principe, ſicunde vel ex vultu argui poſſet, majeſtatis rea fieret : libellum fabularem, cujus in apologis pleriſque mera illius ſæculi tyrannis notaretur, ſuppreſſum fuiſſe continuo, ac evanuiſſe tandem, & ignoratum a Seneca, & reliquæ poſteritatis oculis ſubductum. - - - *I am very much aſtoniſhed that Seneca ſhould ſay, Æſop’s fables are a work unattempted by Roman wits : ſince he had this Phædrus, whom he might oppoſe to all Greece. For as to the opinion of thoſe two bright luminaries of the former age, Petrus Pithæus and Juſtus Lipſius, that Seneca ſpoke the truth, becauſe Phædrus was not by birth or family a Roman, but a Thracian, as he himſelf teſtified : that explication of Seneca does not ſeem reaſonable. A work unattempted by Roman wits, can ſignify nothing elſe but a work not yet written or performed in the Latin tongue : Comedy could not be ſaid to have been untouched by the Romans, tho’ Terence only, an African by birth, had writ it : and were Seneca to reckon up the Latin writers on Philoſophy, he would not exclude himſelf from the number, becauſe he was a Spaniard by nation, and born at Corduba. Quintilian has not excluded him, for in the place where he treated of Latin Philoſophers, he has reckoned him particularly among them : tho’ he might have ranked him amongſt Orators and Poets, and other writers of various kinds. I ſhould rather ſay, that Seneca either did not attend to what he wrote, or that his memory failed him in this as well as other things. . . . . It is very probable, that in the cruel times of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, when writings were aboliſhed by edicts and decrees of ſenate, if any Poet or Hiſtorian happened to drop a word liable to accuſation or ſlander, when even thoughts were not left free, and when a ſecret opinion concerning the prince, if it could be diſcovered even by the countenance, was made high treaſon : I ſay, it is very probable that this book of fables, which frequently repreſents the tyranny of that age, was then ſuppreſſed, and at laſt forgot ; that it was unknown to Seneca, and concealed from poſterity.*’

(*d*) At Amſterdam by Henry Wetſtein.

(*e*) At Amſterdam for Francis Halma 1701, in 4to.

(11) He publiſhed Phædrus at Troyes in Champagne.

(12) Franc. Vavaſſor, de Ludicra dictione, *pag.* 206, 207.

(13) Ib. *p.* 207.

(14) Ib. *p.* 208.

comes from Port-Royal. However good it may be Tanaquillus Faber found many faults in it [*E*].

‘ *poſterity*.’ We muſt not forget that Gabriel Faërnus dealt unfairly with the public, if we believe Thuanus (15). He had a manuſcript of Phædrus, but he took care not to boaſt of it, or to impart it to the public. He was afraid of leſſening the value of the fables he had made in Latin verſes, in imitation of Æſop, if the world ſhould know that a little book of Phædrus, Auguſtus's freed-man, was ſtill extant. We muſt not forget neither Mr Perrault's remark upon that paſſage of Thuanus. It is to be found in the preface of his tranſlation of Faërnus's fables into French verſe, which was publiſhed at Paris in the year 1699. Theſe are his words: ‘ Faërnus has been called a ſecond Phædrus, ‘ by reaſon of the excellent ſtyle of his fables, tho' he ‘ never ſaw Phædrus, who did not come to our know‘ ledge, till above thirty years after his death; for ‘ Pithœus having found that manuſcript in the duſt of ‘ an old library, publiſhed it in the beginning of this ‘ century. Thuanus, who makes a very honourable ‘ mention of our author in his Hiſtory, pretends, that ‘ Phædrus was not unknown to him, and even blames ‘ him for having ſuppreſſed that author, to conceal ‘ what he had ſtolen from him: but there is no ‘ ground for what he ſays, and it is only the effect of ‘ the ſtrong perſuaſion of all thoſe who are ſo great ‘ admirers of antiquity, as to think that a modern ‘ author can do nothing that is excellent, unleſs he ‘ has an ancient author for his model. Out of the ‘ hundred fables which Faërnus publiſhed in Latin ‘ verſes, there are but five that have been treated on ‘ by Phædrus, and out of thoſe five there is but one or ‘ two that have been treated on almoſt in the ſame man‘ ner: which happened only, becauſe it is impoſſible ‘ that two men, who treat on the ſame ſubject, ‘ ſhould not agree ſometimes in the ſame thoughts, or ‘ in the ſame expreſſions.’ The latter part of this paſſage is as full a vindication of Faërnus as he could have wiſhed.

[*E*] *Tanaquillus Faber found many faults in it.*] He publiſhed very good notes upon Phædrus, in the year 1657, and he was already very famous for his learning; yet the learned Schefferus had not heard of him in the year 1660. He knew then the name of that author, and the worth of his Phædrus, by a letter which he received from Gronovius (16). ‘ Mihi ſane, ‘ *ſays he* (17), adeo ad Diem illum Faber fuit ignora‘ tus, ut illius nihil ante, ac ne notas quidem in ſcrip‘ torem noſtrum niſi ſero, ut prædixi, viderim vel ‘ legerim. - - - *Indeed Faber was ſo unknown to me be‘ fore that time, that I had never ſeen or read any thing ‘ of him, and not even his notes upon our author till late‘ ly, as I have ſaid above.*’ This I obſerve, that one may ſee that the moſt learned men are ſometimes unknown to one another, though they flouriſh at the ſame time.

(15) Thuan. *lib. xxviii, ſub fin. pag. m.* 578, *ad ann.* 1561. Si Phædri cujus ſive imitatione ſive æmulatione luſerat, nomen non diſſimulaſſet.

(16) *Scheffer. Præf in* 2 *Edit. Phædri.*

(17) Ibid.

PHÆDRUS (THOMAS) profeſſor of Eloquence at Rome, towards the end of the XVth century, and in the beginning of the XVIth, was accounted the Cicero of his time [*A*]. He was Canon of Lateran, and keeper of the Vatican library (*a*). He was beholden for the beginning of his fortune to the acting of Seneca's Hippolytus, wherein he acted the part of Phædra (*b*). Hence it is that he was called Phædrus. The cauſe of his death was very ſingular [*B*]. One day as he was riding upon a mule in the city, he met ſome oxen which drew an huge cart. His mule ſtartled and threw him. He was ſo lucky, that the cart went over him without hurting him: he happened to be juſt between the wheels; but his fright and his fall did ſo ſpoil the maſs of his blood, that he contracted a ſickneſs, of which he never was cured. Had he lived longer, it is likely he would have publiſhed ſome books [*C*], which would perhaps have confirmed what was ſaid of him, that his tongue was better than his pen (*c*). Parrhaſius's colleage,

(*a*) Parrhaſ. de Quæſitis per Epiſt. *pag.* 34.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*].

(*c*) See the remark [*A*].

[*A*] *Was accounted the Cicero of his time.*] I ſhall quote Eraſmus, who tells us ſome curious things concerning this Phædrus. ‘ Romæ . . . cognovi & amavi ‘ Petrum (1) Phædrum, linguâ veriùs quàm calamo ‘ celebrem: mira erat in dicendo tum copia, tum au‘ toritas. Magna felicitatis pars eſt Romæ innotuiſſe: ‘ ille primùm innotuit ex Senecæ Tragœdia, cui titulus ‘ Hippolytus, in qua repræſentavit perſonam Phædræ, ‘ in area, quæ eſt ante Palatium Cardinalis Raphaelis ‘ Georgiani. Sic ex ipſo Cardinale didici, unde & ‘ Phædro cognomen additum. Is obiit minor annis, ‘ ni fallor, quinquaginta, dictus ſui ſeculi Cicero (2). ‘ - - - *At Rome . . . . I knew and loved Petrus Phædrus, ‘ more famous for his tongue than his pen. There was a ‘ wonderful copiouſneſs and majeſty in his way of ſpeak‘ ing. It is a great happineſs to be known at Rome: ‘ he became famous at firſt by the tragedy of Seneca, in‘ tituled Hippolytus, wherein he acted the part of Phæ‘ dra, in the court before the palace of Cardinal Raphael ‘ Georgianus. This I had from the Cardinal himſelf, ‘ and he was from thence ſirnamed Phædrus. He was ‘ not fifty years of age when he died, if I am not mi‘ ſtaken, and was called the Cicero of his time.*’ Pierius Valerianus commends our Phædrus for his eloquence: ‘ Neque diu felix fuit Thomas Phædrus af‘ fluentiſſimum eloquentiæ flumen, quo non alius eo ‘ tempore orando clarior, neque vehementior fuit, Ro‘ manæ ipſe quoque cathedræ decus, & ornamentum ‘ (3). - - - *Thomas Phædrus, that moſt copious torrent ‘ of eloquence, was not long fortunate. He was the moſt ‘ famous and powerful Orator of that time, the glory ‘ and ornament of the Roman chair.*’ To which you may add what I have quoted out of Parrhaſius in the remark [*C*], and the teſtimony of Petrus Bembus: he was a good judge of eloquence; he praiſes very much our Thomas for it, in the third letter of the fourth book, dated at Venice the 13th of January 1505, out of which I ſhall obſerve this particular. Some body writ to him, that Phædrus grew big: All the better, ſaid he, for then we may treat him after the manner of the ancient heroes, *illum certe poſſumus heroum more* ἠύντε μέγαντε dicere, - - - *and call him good and great.*

[*B*] *The cauſe of his death was very ſingular.*] This is very well expreſſed by Pierius Valerianus. *Quàm verò miſerabiliter, quàmque inopino mortis genere ſurreptus interiit, dum ſcilicet mula media urbe vehitur junctis factus obviam bubalis, qui viſendæ magnitudinis carrucam trahebant: Conſternata ſiquidem mula, bubaliſque identidem perterrefactis ſimul ab ea calcitroſa excuſſus eſt tam magnæ corporaturæ vir, quantum hominem noſtis, ſimul à plauſtro ſuperatus, quamvis in rotarum medium intervallum incidens eliſionem evitarit, corrupto tamen præ timore, & gravi caſu intra viſcera ſanguine, multa inde longæ, & occultæ valetudinis incommoda perpeſſus, in ejuſmodi ærumna vita functus eſt* (4).

[*C*] *It is likely he would have publiſhed ſome books.*] The reader would be glad to know the titles of them, which Parrhaſius has preſerved, and therefore I ſhall tranſcribe the following words. It is a great encomium upon Phædrus; but we muſt remember, that the author of it is an Orator, who had received many favours from him. ‘ Quis eſt in hoc orbis terrarum domici‘ lio, (cujus antiquum ſcenæ decus inſtauravit) quis ‘ in hac excultiſſima academia, (quæ Phædro rhetore ‘ cœlum vertice contingebat) quis adeo barbarus à ‘ Muſis abeſt & Gratiis, qui ad extincti Phædri no‘ men ubertim non fleat? O deteſtandam fati importu‘ nitatem. Silet, heu, T. Phædre, vox illa tua jucundè ‘ ſonora: illa argutæ linguæ ſuadela, quæ mentes ho‘ minum in omnes affectus impellebat, quæ Romanam ‘ facundiam à Goticis uſque temporibus amiſſam reſti‘ tuit. Ubi nunc eſt ille geſtus cum ſententiis congru‘ ens? Ubi illa incorrupti Latini ſermonis integritas? ‘ Quis ultimam manum tot inchoatis operibus impo‘ net? Quæ (non ſecus ac Apellis illa decantatiſſima ‘ Venus)

(1) Parrhaſius *and* Pierius Valerianus *call him* Thomas.

(2) Eraſm. Ep. V, *lib. xxiii, pag.* 1210.

(3) Pierius Valerian. de Litter. Infelicit. *lib. i, pag.* 25.

(4) Ibid.

colleague, who was very much obliged to him (*d*), regretted mightily the loſs of that friend. I do not know whether Phædrus made the ſermon which Eraſmus criticized with great reaſon [*D*]. Voſſius thought that our Roman profeſſor was the author of the Antiquities of Hetruria [*E*], which were publiſhed under the falſe name of Proſper.

Venus) interrupta pendent: luculentiſſimæ ſcilicet orationes, Apologia Ciceronis in obtrectatores, quam mihi paucis ante diebus quam cœpiſſet æſtuare, domi ſuæ per ſummam voluptatem legit: Annalium breviarium, quo res omnes à populo Romano geſtas complexus eſt: in Horatii poëticam vigilantiſſima commentaria: in Plauti comœdias ſcrupuloſiſſimæ quæſtiones (5). - - - - *Who is there in this part of the world (whoſe antient glory of the ſtage he revived), who is there in this polite academy (whoſe reputation by the Orator Phædrus was raiſed to Heaven), who is there ſuch a barbarous enemy to the Muſes and Graces, as not to ſhed a flood of tears at the name of the deceaſed Phædrus? Horrid cruelty of fate! Alas! O Phædrus, that ſweet and harmonious voice of thine, that powerful perſuaſion of thy lips, which commanded all the paſſions of the ſoul, and which reſtored the Roman eloquence that had been loſt ever ſince the Gothic times, is now heard no more. Where is now that graceful action which was ſuited to thy expreſſions? Where is that purity of ſtile and diction in the Latin tongue? Who is there to put the laſt hand to the works thou haſt begun? which, like the celebrated Venus of Apelles, remain unfiniſhed*, viz. *Moſt elegant orations, the apology of Cicero againſt ſlanderers, which he read to me with great pleaſure at his own houſe, a few days before he began to be feveriſh: An abridgment of annals, containing the Hiſtory of the Roman people; moſt excellent commentaries on Horace's Art of Poetry: and moſt curious queſtions on the comedies of Plautus.*’ If we knew the date of that oration, we might know the year of Phædrus's his death. Note, that Volterranus, having ſhewed the ſeries of antient wars, expreſſes himſelf thus: ‘ Bellorum igitur hujuſmodi excurſum T. Phædri noſtri ex magna parte diligentia collectum, non ab re fuerit ſimul ordine repetiiſſe (6). - - *It will not be foreign to the purpoſe to repeat in order the irruptions of thoſe wars, as they are carefully collected by T. Phædrus.*’

[*D*] *The ſermon which Eraſmus criticized with great reaſon* (7).] That ſermon was preached before Pope Julius II, upon a Good-Friday. Eraſmus heard it, and was not pleaſed with it; the preacher made it his only buſineſs to appear Ciceronian. Eraſmus does not name him (8), but one may believe that he denotes one of the profeſſors of Eloquence, of whom he had ſaid: ‘ Florebant id temporis Romæ præter cæteros dicendi laude Petrus Phædrus & Camillus hoc ætate minor, ſed eloquendi viribus major, niſi quod ille jam hujus laudis arcem occuparat (9). - - - - *Petrus Phædrus and Camillus flouriſhed at that time in Rome, and excelled all others in Rhetoric: the latter was indeed inferior to the former in age, but ſuperior in force of eloquence, only the other had engroſſed the reputation of that art.*’

[*E*] *Voſſius thought that Phædrus was the author of the antiquities of Hetruria.*] Here are his words: ‘ Fuere qui fœtum crederent Guilielmi Poſtelli. Sed verus auctor eſt Thomas Phædrus qui vixit anno CIↃ CCCC XC. (10). - - - *Some have thought they were writ by Gulielmus Poſtellus. But the true author is Thomas Phædrus who lived in the year* 1490.’ A great deal of wrong has been done to Voſſius, in the treatiſe of Placcius *de Scriptis Anonymis*; for next to the words, which I have juſt now ſet down, and thoſe that go before, we read theſe following words. ‘ Cujus Thomæ ulteriorem nullam nec apud ipſum, nec apud Geſnerum, alioſve illius generis auctores invenio mentionem. Verum enim vero non opus eſt ut de eo multum hic ſolliciti ſimus, cum non illum, ſed ipſum CURTIUM INGHIRAMIUM, qui fragmenta illa primus ac ſi Scornelli prope Vulterram ea ſub terra inveniſſet, Florentiæ publicavit, parentum hujuſce ſuppoſititii figmenti fuiſſe prolixè docuerit *Leo Allatius* in ſuis ad dictas antiquitates annotationibus, Pariſiis 1640, & biennio poſt Romæ iterum excuſis (11). - - - *Of which Thomas Fædrus I find no further mention, either in him, or Geſner, or other authors of that ſort. But we need not be very ſollicitous about it, ſince Leo Allatius in his notes upon the ſaid antiquities, printed at Paris in* 1640, *and reprinted two years after at Rome, has fully ſhewn that he was not the father of this ſuppoſititious work, but* CURTIUS INGHIRAMIUS, *who firſt publiſhed thoſe fragments at Florence, as if he had found them at Scornelli near Volterra under ground.*’ This whole paſſage is printed in Italic, as well as the words that are cited out of Voſſius, and there is nothing whereby one may diſtinguiſh the firſt part of the paſſage from the laſt; ſo that any reader may very well fancy that Voſſius is the author of all thoſe words, and conſequently that he knew not what Parrhaſius, Eraſmus and Pierius Valerianus ſaid of Phædrus. But the worſt of all is, that one may think he did ſo far blunder as to ſay in the ſame page, that Thomas Phædrus is the true author of a book which Curtius Inghiramius compoſed. For the reſt, the falſe ſpelling of Voſſius has been the occaſion of Konig's (12) multiplying one author into two: he gives us Thomas Fœdrus as a different author from Thomas Phædrus, and refers us to Hallervord.

PHERON, king of Egypt, the ſon and ſucceſſor of Seſoſtris, undertook no war, and became blind, as a puniſhment of his boldneſs in throwing a dart upon the waters of the Nile. They were upwards of eighteen cubits high above the fields, and very much agitated by the wind. When the king ſaw this, he threw a dart, and loſt his ſight immediately. He was ten years in that condition, and then he was told by an Oracle, that the time of his misfortune was almoſt ended, and that he ſhould recover his ſight, if he waſhed his eyes with the urine of a woman that never lay with any man but her huſband. He began to make uſe of his wife's urine, but got no benefit by it. Afterwards he uſed the water of other women, and at laſt he recovered his ſight. He cauſed all the women, whoſe water had not been beneficial to him, to be carried into a certain town, and to be all burnt together with the town, and then he married the woman to whom he was beholden for the recovery of his ſight, and conſecrated in the temples ſeveral monuments of his thankfulneſs to the gods, and particularly two obeliſks, an hundred cubits high, and eight cubits broad, in the temple of the Sun [*A*]. A man of Memphis, whom the Greeks called Proteus, reigned after him (*a*). This Article

[*A*] *And particularly, two obeliſks in the temple of the ſun.*] Sir John Marſham (1) thinks they are both at Rome, and that one of them is that which Sixtus V, cauſed to be ſet up before St Peter's church. He thinks alſo that Caligula cauſed one of thoſe obeliſks to be carried to Rome. He grounds his opinion upon ſome paſſages of Pliny, which import no ſuch thing. Here are the words of Pliny, according to Father Hardouin's edition, wherein the wrong reading, which Sir John Marſham followed, has been corrected. ‘ Tertius (*obeliſcus*) Romæ in Vaticano Caii & Neronis principum Circo, ex omnibus unus omnino factus eſt imitatione ejus, quem fecerat Seſoſtridis filius Nuncoreus. Ejuſdem remanet & alius centum cubitorum, quem poſt cæcitatem viſu reddito, ex oraculo Soli ſacravit (2). - - - - *The third obeliſk at Rome in the*

‘ *Vatican*

(*d*) See the remark [*B*], of the article PARRHASIUS.

(5) Janus Parrhaſius, in Orat. ante Prælectionem Epiſt. Cicer. ad Atticum, *pag.* 145, 146.

(6) Volaterr. Comm. Urban. *lib. xxxviii*, *pag. m.* 1459.

(7) *See his* Ciceronianus, *pag. m.* 39, *& ſeq.*

(8) Nomen Oratoris non edam ne cui videar hominis probi & eruditi famam arrodere voluiſſe. *Eraſm. in Ciceroniano, pag.* 39.

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 38.

(10) Voſſ. de Hiſt. Lat. *lib. i*, *cap. ix*, *in fine*, *pag.* 41.

(11) Placcius, de Scriptis Anonymis, *in Appendice, pag.* 30.

(12) *See his* Biblioth. Vetus & Nova, *pag.* 310, *&* 628.

(*a*) Taken from Herodotus, *lib. ii, cap. cxi, cxii, pag. m.* 129, 130. *See alſo* Diodorus Sicul. *lib. i, cap. lix.*

(1) Marſham. Chron. Can. *Seculo xv*, *pag. m.* 413, 414.

(2) Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. xi, pag. m. 299.

ticle being to be found in Moreri's Dictionary, I was reſolved to paſs it by; but I changed my mind, having obſerved that ſome have taken the liberty to falſify that fact. As I deſigned to cenſure that licentiouſneſs, it was requiſite that I ſhould ſet before the eyes of the reader, a faithful expoſition of that old ſtory, that he may compare it with the falſe copy of ſome modern writers [*B*].

' *Vatican Circus of the emperors Caius and Nero, was* ' *the only one made in imitation of that, which Nuncoreus, the ſon of Seſoſtris, had cauſed to be made. There* ' *remains alſo another of the ſame Nuncoreus, an* ' *hundred cubits high, which he dedicated to the* ' *ſun, upon the recovery of his ſight, by order of the Oracle.*' See how Sir John Marſham quotes that paſſage. Plinio appellatur *Nuncoreus Seſoſtridis filius* ille, qui Obeliſcum *centum cubitorum poſt cæcitatem (viſu reddito ex oraculo) Soli ſacravit. Ejuſdem remanet & alius Romæ (in Vaticano Caii & Neronis principum Circo) ex omnibus unus omnino fractus eſt in molitione* (3). And obſerve that Pliny (4) does not ſay that the obeliſk which was brought to Rome under the empire of Caligula, was one of the two obeliſks of the ſon of Seſoſtris.

[*B*] *I have ſet . . . a faithful expoſition of that old ſtory, that he may compare it with the falſe copy of ſome modern writers.*] I have nothing to ſay againſt Mr Chevreau, for he has not falſified the narrative of Herodotus (5). It is true, that he adds a circumſtance to it, *viz.* That the woman who reſtored Pheron's ſight was a Gardener's wife; the Greek Hiſtorian whom he cites does not mention it, but that addition is of no conſequence: and indeed, an ancient Hiſtorian (6) whom he does not quote, ſays that ſhe was a Gardener's wife. I do not blame the reflexion which follows that hiſtory in the *Chevræana*. Any author, who relates what he has read, may add ſome moral reflexions to it: he muſt only take care that the reader be not at a loſs to know whether thoſe reflexions are his, or whether they are to be aſcribed to the author that has been quoted. Mr Chevreau does not keep us in ſuſpence; we eaſily apprehend that theſe following words are his, and not Herodotus's: ' If there was a Pheron at this day, ' if the remedy which cured him was in uſe, and the ' ſame puniſhment renewed, many women would not ' be afraid of ſtarving with cold (7).' This is a gloſs which ſuits the text; for there is no doubt but this is a meer ſtory, or ſatirical invention againſt women. I need not tell my readers, I. That there was no Oracle that foretold, that a king having been blind for the ſpace of ten years, ſhould recover his ſight ſoon after. II. That it is not true that the urine of a chaſte woman did ever reſtore any one's ſight. Chriſtians are perſuaded that this whole relation of Herodotus is a meer fable, and a ſtory forged in the times of ignorance, for the ſame end as the apologues, or the fictions of Æſop, I mean, to inſpire men with the fear of the gods, and to cenſure vice. They were ſometimes attended with railleries and ſorry jeſts againſt women. This was not forgotten in the ſtory of Pheron: but ſome modern authors finding it too plain, and too careleſly dreſſed, have been at the charges of embelliſhing it. It is to be found in the Saint-Evremoniana dreſſed in this manner: ' That a king called Pheron having loſt his ſight, and ' aſking the Oracle how he ſhould recover it, was ordered to uſe the urine of a woman faithful to her huſband; that his own wife, and all the other wives ' of his kingdom wanting that virtue, he was obliged ' to diſpatch ſome embaſſadors to look for one in the ' neighbouring kingdoms; that after a long ſearch, ' there was one found by chance who cured him; ' that he cauſed his wife to be burnt firſt, and then ' married the woman who had reſtored his ſight, that ' ſhe proved not ſo chaſte afterwards, and the king having aſked her, why ſhe had been faithful to her firſt ' huſband, ſhe ingenuouſly anſwered him, that *ſhe was* ' *never aſked before* (8). Let Boccacio and Douville make a ſtory as pleaſant as ever they can, no body ought to find fault with them for it. The ground they work upon is altogether their own, and conſequently they may flouriſh it as they pleaſe; but when an author relates a ſtory which is to be found in the beſt ancient writers that are extant, he is not allowed to adorn it with a new dreſs, by adding to it ſome circumſtances juſt invented. Yet this has been done in the Saint-Evremoniana. We are told that Mr de St Evremont is not the author of that book, and that he diſowns it from the beginning to the end (9). Yet there are very good things in that work, and they ſeem to have been expreſſed upon his model; but whoever is the author of it, Mr de Vigneul Marville would freely give him this advice: *The more particulars, like thoſe that are to be found in Brantome, a writer publiſhes, the more he raiſes himſelf above common writers, and makes himſelf uſeful to the public. Thoſe who publiſh them, muſt only take care that they be true and well grounded:* FOR *a writer is not allowed to invent chimeras to adorn his hiſtory* (10).

I ſhall obſerve by the by that this is not the firſt time that Authors and Bookſellers have publiſhed ſome works under the name of Mr de St Evremond. That trick begins to be thread-bare, and one cannot think of it without comparing this illuſtrious author with that man to whom ſeven women ſhould ſay, *We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach* (11).

(3) Marſham, ubi ſupra.

(4) Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. ix, pag. 296, 297.

(5) See the 2d part of the *Chevræana*, pag. 395, of the Dutch Edit.

(6) Diodor. Sicul. *lib. i, cap. lix.*

(7) Chevræana, ibid. *pag.* 396.

(8) St Evremoniana, pag. 132, 133, of the Dutch Edit.

(9) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *Feb.* 1701, *pag.* 145.

(10) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges d'Hiſt. & de Littérat. *Tom, ii, pag.* 159, *of the Dutch Edit.*

(11) Iſaiah iv, 1.

PHILELPHUS . . . .

. . . .

The book, which he intituled *Florentinarum de exilio Commentationum, pro exulibus Florentinis à Coſmo Medicæo atque ejus factione ejectis, conſcriptarum Libri tres*, and which he dedicated to Vitalian Borrhomæus, is not in the catalogue of his works that is publiſhed with his life. It is probable it was never printed. The author mentions it in a letter to Anthony Metallus, and in another letter to John Olzina (*a*). This I read in a piece of Don Nicolas Antonio (*b*), to whom Martin Vaſques Sirvela (*c*) had lent that manuſcript.

(*a*) See the 16th book of the Letters of Philelphus.

(*b*) Nicol. Antonius, de Exilio, *lib. i, cap. i, pag.* 4.

(*c*) He had a fine library at Seville.

PHILETAS, a Grammarian, a Critic, and a Poet, was born in the iſle of Cos, and lived in the time of Alexander the Great, and of Ptolemy, firſt of that name, king of Egypt, who made him preceptor of his ſon Ptolemy Philadelphus (*a*). He publiſhed ſeveral pieces of Poetry, whereof we have only ſome fragments in Athenæus, and in ſome other ancient authors who quoted him [*A*]. He did ſo well ſucceed in elegy, that ſeveral authors gave him the ſecond rank in that ſort of Poetry. It is not certain that Propertius, a good Judge of ſuch things, was contented to give him the ſecond

(*a*) Suidas. *See alſo* Strabo, *lib. xiv, pag.* 452.

[*A*] *Some ancient authors quoted him.*] Parthenius borrows from him the ſecond of his amorous adventures (1). Stephanus Byzantinus quotes him in the words ἴχναι & φλιῆς. He is quoted three or four times in the great *Etymologicum*. Stobæus mentions ſomething of his *Pægnia* in the diſcourſe, which contains the ſubjects of conſolation παρηγορικά. I ſuppoſe that the Philetas quoted by them is that of Cos; for it does not appear that Philetus of Epheſus, mentioned only by Suidas, wrote any book. I will not ſay, as many do, that Claudian mentions Philetas in this verſe,

Fors juvat audentes, Coi ſententia vatis:

Fortune does help the bold, the bard of Coos ſaid:

(1) Parthenius is quoted wrong in Moreri's Dictionary, in the article of Philetas. Inſtead of *in Erat.* read *in Erot.* that is *in Eroticis.*

ſecond rank [B]. If we conſider that elegies were chiefly made uſe of on ſorrowful occaſions, and about the diſgraces of lovers, it cannot be denied that Philetas had a peculiar talent to keep up by his mien, and by his out-ſide, the character of the Poems wherein he excelled, and to prevent the want of occaſions which makes the Muſes faint and languid. He was ſo little and ſo thin, that he was obliged to put ſome lead to his ſhoes, leſt the wind ſhould carry him away [C]. He was not therefore liable to the reproaches which Lent-Preachers are ſo often expoſed to, when with a freſh ruddy complexion they bewail the corruption of the world, and the contempt of the laws of mortification. It would become them better, if they were as lean as our Philetas. Beſides, one may eaſily apprehend, that he had very often reaſon to ſigh for the cruelty of his Battis (b); for ſuch an air as his was, and a body ſo waſted and ſo lean, that the leaſt wind could throw him down, was no very great charm in point of love. Perhaps this was the reaſon of his great ſkill in elegies. It is very likely he was ſeldom fortunate in his amorous attempts, and that he ſuffered continual repulſes. However, the hectic and waſting condition he was in, of which he died at laſt, was not aſcribed in his epitaph to his good or ill luck in point of love, but to his watchings and intent ſtudies [D]: which would be much more advantageous to his memory than it is, if he had ſpent his time in things of great moment; but the poor man wore out his ſtrength and his health in running after the captious and intricate ſophiſms of the Logicians (c), particularly after that which was called the Liar which was a meer childiſh ſubtilty [E]. It is thought that he intituled one of his Poems *Telephus*, becauſe it was his father's name. The Scholiaſt upon Apollonius mentions it under that title (d), but according to Voſſius pag. 401 of his Greek Hiſtorians, that Scholiaſt ſpeaks of a Poem intituled *Templum*.

For it is not certain whether we ought to read Coi rather than Cei, or Chii, or Priſci (2).

[B] *Several authors gave him the ſecond rank . . . It is not certain that Propertius. . . . was contented to give him the ſecond rank.*] I refer it to the judgment of any one who conſiders theſe three paſſages of Propertius:

Tu ſatius memorem muſis imitere Philetam,
Et non inflati ſomnia Callimachi (3).

Inter Callimachi ſat erit placuiſſe libellos,
Et ceciniſſe modis Coe poëta tuis (4).

Callimachi manes & Coi ſacra Philetæ
In veſtrum quæſo me ſinite ire nemus (5).

Philetas imitate the Muſes friend,
And, not high-flown, Callimachus's ſtrain.
If like Callimachus you pleaſe, or ſing
As did the Bard of Cos, it will ſuffice.
Of Callimachus and Philetas both
Ye ſhades, permit me in your grove to go.

I do not deſire that theſe paſſages ſhould be underſtood in the ſenſe which Joſeph Scaliger put upon them; for I think he is miſtaken when he ſays that Propertius adviſes not to imitate the ſwoln Callimachus, and when inſtead of *Coe poëta tuis*, he reads *pure poëta tuis*, to conclude from thence that Propertius looks upon Philetas as a Poet whoſe verſes are the ſweeteſt. I deſire no ſuch thing; I am ſure that without ſuch a help one may perceive that, all things duly conſidered, Propertius does not place Philetas beneath Callimachus. I do not know why Ælian reckons Philetas among the heroic Poets (6), nor why Lorenzo Craſſo (7) makes Callimachus ſay, that Philetas obtains the ſecond rank in point of elegy. He ſhould have quoted Quintilian; *Elegiæ princeps habetur Callimachus*, ſays he chap. i. of the tenth book of his Inſtitutions, *ſecundus confeſſione plurimorum Philetas occupavit. - - - Callimachus is reckoned the chief in elegy, and, by the confeſſion of moſt, Philetas has obtained the ſecond rank.* See alſo Proclus in the abſtracts of his *Chræſtomathia* to be found in Photius (8).

[C] *He was obliged to put ſome lead to his ſhoes, leſt the wind ſhould carry him away.*] He tied ſome leaden balls to his feet, if we believe Athenæus (9), or ſoled his ſhoes with lead, if we believe the authors tranſcribed by Ælian, tho' he looks upon it as a meer ſtory (10). The reaſon of his not believing it, is, that a man who was not ſtrong enough to reſiſt the wind, could by no means wear ſo heavy ſhoes.

[D] *It was to his watchings and ſtudies, they aſcribed his waſting condition, in his epitaph.*] Athenæus has preſerved that particular fact. Κινδυνεύεις οὖν ποτε διὰ ταύτας τὰς φροντίδας ὥσπερ ὁ Κῷος Φιλητᾶς ζητῶν τὸν καλούμενον ψευδολόγον τῶν λόγων, ὁμοίως ἐκείνῳ διαλυθῆναι· ἰσχνὸς γὰρ πάνυ τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὰς ζητήσεις γενόμενος ἀπέθανεν· ὡς τὸ πρὸ τοῦ μνημείου αὐτοῦ ἐπίγραμμα δηλοῖ, Ξεῖνε, Φιλητᾶς εἰμί, λόγων ὁ ψευδόμενός με Ὤλεσε, καὶ νυκτῶν φροντίδες ἑσπέριοι. Eſt itaque periculum ne ob has curas aliquando ut Philetas Cous perveſtigans rationem mentientem dictam exolutus pereas: Nam corpore ob id ſtudium valde attenuato is obiit, quod inſculptum ejus monumento declarat hoc epigramma, Hoſpes Philetas ſum mendax & captioſa ratio Me perdidit, veſpertinæque ac nocturnæ ſtudiorum curæ (11). - - - - *You run the hazard*, ſays he, (ſpeaking to a curious man, who never touched any meat, without inquiring how long ſince it had the name it went by) *of wearing out your life by ſuch inquiries, as Philetas wore out his in examining a ſophiſm; for that ſtudy did ſo waſte his body, that he died of it. As it appears from this inſcription of his ſepulchre,* Ὤλεσε, &c. Muretus, in his notes upon the firſt elegy of the third book of Propertius, ſtretches out the teſtimony of Athenæus a little more than he ſhould have done; for he makes that author ſay, that Philetas loſt his life, with over much ſtudying, and becauſe he was vexed that he was not able to find out the ſolution of a ſophiſm. Athenæus ſays nothing of that vexation. If Muretus had ſaid ſo out of conjecture, I ſhould not blame him for it; but one muſt always ſcruple to impute to people what they have not ſaid. The reader does not deſire to confound our paraphraſes, and, our gloſſes and conjectures, with the text of the ancient authors quoted by us (12).

[E] *The* Liar *was a meer childiſh ſubtilty.* The ſophiſm which the Greeks called ψευδόμενον, is called *Mentiens, (the Liar)* by Cicero in the ſecond book *de Divinatione*. It was one of the moſt renowned ſophiſms that Eubulides, ſucceſſor of Euclid, produced (13). It conſiſted in certain terms which ſeem to deſtroy one another, or, as Africanus the Civilian ſays (14), it is a way of a reaſoning, *Qua quicquid verum eſſe conſtitueris falſum eſſe reperietur. - - - Whereby whatever you eſtabliſh for truth, is found to be falſe.* Here is an example of it (15): *If you ſay that you lie, and if by ſaying ſo you ſpeak truth, you lie: but you ſay that you lie, and herein you ſpeak the truth; therefore you lie when you ſpeak truth.* It is a ſyllogiſm whereby you prove that a man does not ſpeak truth, for that very reaſon that he ſpeaks it. One may make the ſame ſophiſm by ſuppoſing that a man who perjures himſelf, ſwears that he perjures himſelf; for at one and the ſame time he ſwears truth, and conſequently he does not perjure himſelf; and he ſwears a falſity, and conſequently he perjures himſelf. They drew the ſame contradictory conſequences from what was ſaid by Epimenides, a Cretan Poet, that all Cretans were liars. The Stoics fell headlong into thoſe falſe ſubtilties of the ſect of Megara. Our modern Logicians uſe ſometimes the propoſitions which they call *ſeipſas falſificantes*;

ſuch

(b) Nec tantum Coo Battis amata viro. *Ovid. Triſt. lib. i, Eleg. VI, ver.* 2.

(c) Athen. *lib. ix.* Suidas.

(d) *In lib. iv, apud* Andr. Schottum, in Procli Chreſtom.

(2) *See* Barthius, in Claud. Epiſt. ad Probin. *pag.* 967.

(3) Propert. lib. II, Eleg. xxxiv.

(4) Idem, lib. III, Eleg. viii.

(5) Idem, lib. III, Eleg. i. There is another paſſage, Eleg. vi, lib. iv, where he hints at thoſe two Poets, and firſt at Philetas. *Statius, Silv. II, lib. I*, names Philetas before Callimachus.

(6) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. x, cap. vi.*

(7) Iſtor. de Poët. Græc. *pag.* 231.

(8) Phot. *cap. ccxxxix.*

(9) Athen. *lib. xii, cap. xiii, pag.* 552.

(10) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. ix, cap. xiv.* See alſo *lib. x, cap. vi.*

(11) Athen. *lib. ix, pag.* 401.

(12) See the remark [*B*], of the article PHERON.

(13) Diog. Laërt. *lib. ii.*

(14) *L. qui quadring.* 88 *ad leg. Falc.*

(15) *See* Cicero, Academ. IV.

ſuch as this is, *ſemper mentior, I lie always*. A little judgment is ſufficient to know the illuſion of that ſort of ſophiſms; yet Ariſtotle (16) declares very ſeriouſly, that the ſophiſm called the Liar is a very perplexing one. I am not ſo well pleaſed to hear him ſay ſo, as to ſee Seneca laugh at the great number of books that were made upon that ſophiſm (17). 'Quid me detines in eo quem tu ipſe pſeudomenon appellas, de quo tantum librorum compoſitum eſt (18)? ecce tota mihi vita mentitur, hanc coargue, hanc ad verum, ſi acutus es, dirige. ---- *Why do you detain me in what you call the Liar, about which ſo many books have been writ? Lo, my whole life is made up of lies; diſprove this, and direct it to truth, if you are ingenious.*' See the remark [D] of the article EUCLID.

PHILYRA, daughter of Oceanus, was ſo ſenſible of the declaration of love which Saturn made her, that ſhe granted him the laſt favours. Rhea, Saturn's wife, knew nothing of it for ſome time; but at laſt ſuſpecting ſomething, ſhe had a watchful eye over theſe two lovers, and ſurpriſed them in the fact. Saturn put on the ſhape of a horſe to conceal himſelf [*A*], but Philyra was ſo confounded that ſhe left the country [*B*], and wandered thro' the mountains of the Pelaſgi, where ſhe was delivered of the centaur Chiron (*a*). She was ſo afflicted at her bringing forth ſuch a child, made up of the nature of a horſe, and of a man, that ſhe beſought the gods to change her into ſomething elſe [*C*]. They heard her prayers, and transformed her into a tree (*b*).

[*A*] *Saturn .... put on the ſhape of a horſe.*] Virgil adds, that he run away as faſt as ever he could, and that mount Pelion rung all over with his neighing (1):

Talis & ipſe jubam cervice effundit equina
Conjugis adventu pernix Saturnus, & altum
Peliona hinnitu fugiens implevit acuto (2).

In ſuch a ſhape grim Saturn did reſtrain
His heav'nly limbs, and flow'd with ſuch a mane.
When half ſurpriz'd, and fearing to be ſeen,
The leacher gallopp'd from his jealous queen,
Ran up the ridges of the rocks amain,
And with ſhrill neighings fill'd the neighb'ring plain.

This is not unlikely, for a huſband ſurprized by his wife in the fact, is expoſed to ſuch a ſtorm of hard words, and to ſuch ſcoldings, that the beſt thing he can do is to run away. Some ſay (3) that Saturn put on the ſhape of a horſe to enjoy Philyra. The preſence of his wife was not therefore the reaſon of it. Perhaps he uſed that trick out of precaution: he was afraid of the vigilance of Rhea, and ſo he was reſolved before-hand to deceive her.

[*B*] *Philyra was ſo confounded that ſhe left the country.*] Authors do not agree about the ſcene of this act. Some place it in Thrace (4), others in Theſſaly (5), others in an iſland of the Euxine ſea. Apollonius (6) follows the laſt opinion; he ſays Philyra run away as far as Theſſaly, from whence you may judge how much aſhamed ſhe was.

Ἡ δ' αἰδοῖ χῶρόν τε καὶ ἤθεα κεῖνα λιποῦσα.
Ὠκεανὶς Φιλύρη, εἰς οὔρεα μακρὰ Πελασγῶν
Ἦλθ'.

Sed loco & ſedibus illis relictis pudore
Philyra Oceani filia in celſos Pelaſgorum montes
Migravit (7).

Confounded at the thoughts of her diſgrace,
Ocean's daughter, Philyra, left that place,
And to the mountains of Theſſalia fled
With ſpeed.

Some pretend that Saturn changed her into a mare (8), to ſave her the ſhame of her fault. Note, that he was then in proſperity: he enjoyed his kingdom (9), his ſon, Jupiter, was ſtill at nurſe; but ſome will have it, that, even after he was dethroned, and after he retired into Italy, he plunged himſelf into his former debauchery.

Advena quos profugus gignens, & equina libido
Intulit Italiæ: Tuſcis namque ille puellis
Primus adhinnivit ſimulato numine mœchus.
Mox patre deterior ſilvoſi habitator Olympi
Juppiter, inceſta ſpurcavit labe Lacænas (10).

Which exil'd Saturn, in a courſer's ſhape
Aſſum'd on purpoſe to commit a rape,
To Italy did bring. He, by ſurprize,
Firſt Tuſcan maids debauch'd in this diſguiſe.
But Jove, his ſon, ſtill more than he prov'd vile,
And Spartan dames with inceſt did defile.

This is likely enough; for as I have obſerved in another place (11), the baniſhment of leud kings is not a remedy for love. For the reſt, that paſſage of Prudentius does not agree with theſe following verſes:

Credo pudicitiam Saturno Rege moratam
In terris viſamque diu: cum frigida parvas
Præberet ſpelunca domos, ignemque laremque
Et pecus & dominos communi clauderet umbra (12).

In Saturn's reign, at nature's early birth,
There was that thing call'd chaſtity on earth,
When in a narrow cave, their common ſhade,
The ſheep, the ſhepherds, and their gods, were laid.
When reeds, and leaves, and hides of beaſts were ſpread
By mountain-houſewives for their homely bed,
And moſſy-pillows rais'd for their rude huſbands head.

[*C*] *She was ſo afflicted ..... that ſhe beſought the gods to change her into ſomething elſe.*] Hyginus pretends that ſhe addreſſed herſelf to Jupiter: but becauſe Apollonius obſerves that Chiron was born during the infancy of Jupiter, it is better to ſay that Philyra had not recourſe to him; for it is not at all likely that ſhe ſtaid till he became maſter of Heaven, after he had expelled Saturn from it. 'Philyra poſtquam inuſitatam ſpeciem ſe peperiſſe vidit, petit ab Jove ut ſe in aliam ſpeciem commutaret, quæ in arborem Philyram hoc eſt tiliam commutata eſt (13). ---- *When Philyra ſaw ſhe had brought forth a monſter, ſhe begged of Jupiter to change her into ſomething elſe; and ſo ſhe was turned into a lime-tree.*'

PHILISTUS, a Greek Hiſtorian, born at Syracuſa, had a great ſhare in the friendſhip of Dionyſius the tyrant, and did very much help him to eſtabliſh his power (*a*). He obtained of him the government of the citadel of Syracuſa. Nay, it is thought that he lay with the mother of that tyrant, with her ſon's knowledge. He loſt his favour after he had married, without acquainting that prince with it, the daughter of Leptines, his brother (*b*), and being baniſhed, he pitched upon the town of Adria for his retirement. He was recalled after the death of that tyrant: thoſe who perſuaded young Dionyſius to ſend for him, were contrary to Dion (*c*), and feared that Plato would change the mind of the tyrant, and thought that none could be fitter than Philiſtus to croſs that Philoſopher. They were not miſtaken; for as ſoon as Philiſtus was reſtored, he made it his buſineſs to oppoſe Plato, and induced the tyrant to expel Dion (*d*). The latter found himſelf quickly in a capacity of making war againſt Dionyſius, he beſieged him in the fortreſs of Syracuſe, and beat the fleet which Philiſtus brought to the aſſiſtance of the beſieged (*e*), the firſt year of the CVIIth Olympiad (*f*). Some ſay that Philiſtus having loſt the battle, killed himſelf; others ſay, that he fell into the hands of his enemies, who cauſed him to be cruelly put to death [*A*]. He was a man of merit, if we conſider only his wit, his learning, and his writings, and even his bravery (*g*): but his moral qualities are not to be praiſed, ſince he made uſe of his talents to hide under fair pretences the injuſtice of tyranny (*h*). There would be ſome generoſity in his conduct, if it had not been mixed with ſelf-love [*B*]. Of all the books he wrote [*C*], his Hiſtory of Sicily was moſt eſteemed [*D*]. He imitated the conciſe ſtyle of

---

(16) Ethic. Nicom. *lib. vii, cap. iii.* See the remark [*D*] of the article EUCLID.

(17) Seneca, Epiſt. XLV.

(18) Chryſippus wrote eleven books on that ſubject. *Diog. Laërt. in ejus Vita.*

(*a*) *Taken from* Apollonius, Argon. *lib. ii, ver.* 1235, *& ſeq.*

(*b*) Viz. a lime-tree. See the remark [*C*].

(1) A mountain in Theſſaly.

(2) Virgil. Georg. lib. III, ver. 92.

(3) Pherecydes, ap. Scholiaſt. Apollonii, *in lib. ii, ver.* 1237.

(4) Hygin. *cap. cxxxviii.*

(5) Philargyrius, in Virgil. Georg. *lib. iii, ver.* 93.

(6) Apollon. *lib. ii, ver.* 1236.

(7) Id. ib. *ver.* 1242.

(8) Adventante uxore ſe in equum, illam in equam convertit, atque ita uterque effugerunt. *Philargyr. ubi ſupra.*

(9) Apollon. ibid. *ver.* 1237.

(10) Prudent. in Symmach. *lib. i, ver.* 56.

(11) In the text of the article BASINE, after citation (*a*).

(12) Juven. Sat. VI, init.

(13) Hygin. ubi ſupra.

(*a*) Plut. in Dion. *pag.* 962.

(*b*) That is to ſay, brother of Dionyſius.

(*c*) He was brother of the ſecond wife of old Dionyſius.

[*A*] *Some ſay that Philiſtus killed himſelf; others ſay* that his enemies *cauſed him cruelly to be put to death.*] The beſt thing I can do is to ſet down the account which Plutarch gives of it (1). *Thoſe who took Philiſtus priſoner, uſed him in a moſt cruel and barbarous manner. Ephorus relates, that when he ſaw that his ſhip was taken, he ſlew himſelf. But Timonides, who from the beginning of the war was with Dion in all the conſiderable actions, writing to Speuſippus the Philoſopher, relates the ſtory, That Philiſtus's galley running a-ground, he was taken priſoner alive, and firſt diſarmed, then ſtripped, and expoſed ſtark-naked, tho' an old man, to all ſorts of ſcorn and contumely; afterwards they cut off his head, and gave the rabble his body, who dragged it along the Acradina, and then threw it into a common-ſhore. Timæus upbraiding him, adds further, that the boys tied him by his lame leg, and ſo drew him thro' the ſtreets of the city, while the Syracuſans inſulted over his carcaſe, to ſee him tied by the leg, who ſaid, it would not become Dionyſius to be beholden to the ſwiftneſs of his horſe to fly from his throne* (2), *but rather to be dragged from thence by the heels; tho' Philiſtus relates, that this was ſaid to Dionyſius by another, and not by himſelf* (3). Diodorus Siculus is one of thoſe who ſay, that Philiſtus killed himſelf for fear of falling into the hands of the enemies, and to avoid the torments and the ignominy they would have expoſed him to (4). Note, That the fight was obſtinate, and that Philiſtus had the advantage in the beginning, by reaſon of his great bravery: but at laſt he was ſurrounded with many ſhips of the enemies, who uſed their utmoſt endeavours to take him (5). The ſame Hiſtorian relates, that his dead body was moſt ignominiouſly uſed, and left unburied (6). He obſerves, 1. That Philiſtus did very great ſervices to the two Dionyſius's, and with a much greater fidelity than all the reſt of their friends. 2. That the tyrant finding nobody that was worthy to fill up the place vacant by the death of Philiſtus, the moſt valiant of his friends, began to deſpond, and offered firſt one half of his kingdom, and then his whole crown to Dion. 3. That Philiſtus ſhewed great courage in a land-expedition, and that young Dionyſius gave him the command of all his naval-forces, as ſoon as he heard that the Syracuſians had promoted Heraclides, a great friend of Dion, to the ſame employment (7).

[*B*] *There would be ſome generoſity in his conduct, if it had not been mixed with ſelf-love.*] Dionyſius the tyrant loved, and beſtowed ſeveral benefits upon him, and afterwards baniſhed him. It is a common thing for an Hiſtorian to follow the reſentment of a preſent injury, rather than the remembrance of paſt favours; I mean, that if he writes his Hiſtory during the baniſhment which his patron and benefactor condemned him to, he ſpeaks more ill of him than good. Philiſtus did quite otherwiſe; he wrote a Hiſtory during his diſgrace, and ſaid nothing in it whereby it appeared that his reſpect was changed towards Dionyſius; on the contrary, he had a great regard for him, and excuſed, and praiſed him. One would have thought that he wrote in Syracuſe, under that prince's favour, and enjoying the noble employments he had obtained of him. If the good offices which princes receive from the pen of an Hiſtorian, to the prejudice of truth, were ſometimes to be commended, none could better deſerve it, than thoſe that are done by an Hiſtorian to a prince who has baniſhed him. It is a ſign of a great ſoul to preſerve more carefully the remembrance of a favour, than the remembrance of an injury; but becauſe Philiſtus flattered Dionyſius in hopes of being recalled to Syracuſe, that perſonal intereſt, that mixture of ſelf-love, ſpoils his action, and we muſt by no means excuſe him, as Pauſanius does. Εἰ δὲ καὶ Φίλιςος αἰτίαν δικαίαν εἴληφεν, ἐπελπίζων τὴν ἐν Συρακȣ́σαις κάθοδον ἀποκρύψασθαι τῶν Διονυσίȣ τὰ ἀνοσιώτατα. Nam ſi Philiſtius venia dignus habetur, qui cum Syracuſas ſe reſtitutum iri ſperaret multa Dionyſii flagitia diſſimulavit (8). - - - *For if Philiſtus be thought to deſerve favour, becauſe he concealed many crimes of Dionyſius, in hopes of being re-called to Syracuſe.*

[*C*] *Of all the Books he wrote* ...] Suidas (9) aſcribes to him a treatiſe concerning Oratory; *Ægyptiaca* in twelve books; *Res Siculæ* in eleven books; ſome orations, and one amongſt others concerning the city of Naucratis; the hiſtory of Dionyſius the tyrant; three books about the Theology of the Egyptians; a treatiſe concerning Libya and Syria. He obſerves firſt of all, that Philiſtus was born at Naucratis, or at Syracuſe; which makes me ſuſpect that he makes but one author of two. There are many works in his catalogue, which do not ſeem to have been written by our Philiſtus, and I ſhould willingly aſcribe them to another Philiſtus born at Naucratis. The Jeſuit Raguſa (10), who quotes Conſtantin Laſcaris, admits of two Philiſtus's, the one of Syracuſe or Naucratis, and the other of Syracuſe. The firſt, ſays he, was related to Dionyſius the tyrant, and died in a war againſt the Carthaginians: He wrote ſeveral things concerning Sicily. The ſecond was baniſhed by old Dionyſius, and compoſed in his baniſhment a good part of his hiſtory. *Plura ſcripſit de rebus Ægyptiacis, lib.* 12. *de Sicanicis lib.* 11. *item de Baccho: de Theologia Ægyptiorum lib.* 6. *de Syria & Libya.* This author confounds the matter; for admitting of two Philiſtus's, he divides what he ſhould have left entire for the one or for the other of them, he changes the circumſtances (11), and aſcribes to the Syracuſan, what it had been better to aſcribe to him, whoſe native country is doubtful.

[*D*] ...... *His hiſtory of Sicily was moſt eſteemed.*] It was divided into two parts: the firſt contained in ſeven books, the hiſtory of above 800 years, and ended with the taking of Agrigentum, that is, in the third year of the XCIIId Olympiad; for that city was then taken by the Carthaginians (12). The ſecond part, which contained four books, began with the reign of old Dionyſius, that is, where the firſt ended; for that Dionyſius made himſelf maſter of Syracuſe the year after the taking of Agrigentum (13). Theſe are the eleven books *Rerum Sicularum* which Suidas aſcribes to Philiſtus; but beſides, he aſcribes to him the particular hiſtory of the tyrant Dionyſius in ſix books. Voſſius pretends, that Cicero in the paſſage which I am going to quote, has regard only to the above-mentioned diviſion, *viz.* That of the hiſtory of Sicily into two parts; one whereof contained ſeven books, and the other four: ' Siculus ille (Philiſtus) capitalis, ' creber, acutus, brevis, pene puſillus Thucydides: ſed ' utros ejus habueris libros (duo enim ſunt corpora) ' an utroſque, neſcio. Me magis de Dionyſio delectat: ipſe eſt enim veterator magnus & perfamiliaris ' Philiſto Dionyſius (14). - - - *The Sicilian Philiſtus is ' compendious, cloſe, acute, conciſe, and almoſt a little ' Thucydides; but which of his books you would have ' (for there are two) or both, I know not: I am beſt ' pleaſed with that concerning Dionyſius; for Dionyſius ' was a cunning fox, and very familiar with Philiſtus.'* The opinion of Voſſius is perhaps very reaſonable: but it may be alſo that Cicero placed, on the one hand, the two parts of the general hiſtory of Sicily, and on the other, the particular hiſtory of the tyrant Dionyſius, mentioned by Suidas. Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus ſeems to be a little more favourable to thoſe, who ſhould ſay, that the hiſtory of the tyrant does not differ from the ſecond part of the hiſtory of Sicily, than to thoſe who ſhould ſay the contrary (15). However, Cicero was pleaſed with our Philiſtus, conſidered

---

(*d*) *Taken from* Plutarch. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 962, 963.

(*e*) Id. ib. *pag.* 970, 973.

(*f*) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xvi, cap. xvi.*

(*g*) See the remark [*A*], towards the end.

(*h*) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 974, C. See the remark [*B*].

(1) Plutarch. in Dion. *pag.* 973.

(2) Compare with this citation (31), of the article PERIANDER.

(3) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xiv, cap. viii, pag.* 571, ſuppoſes that Philiſtus ſaid ſo.

(4) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xvi, cap. xvi, pag. m.* 748.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Id. ib. *pag.* 747.

(8) Pauſanias, *lib. i, pag.* 13.

(9) Suidas, in Φίλιςος.

(10) Hieron. Raguſa, in Elogiis Siculorum, *pag.* 232, 233.

(11) Philiſtus who died in the war, did not fight with the Carthaginians, but againſt the troops of Dion of Syracuſe.

(12) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xiii, cap. ciii, pag. m.* 554.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Cicer. ad Quint. Frat. Ep. XII, *lib. ii.*

(15) *See* Dionyſ. Halicarn. Epiſt. ad Pompeium, *pag. m.* 261.

of Thucydides, and avoided digreſſions to an exceſs [*E*]. The Hiſtorian Timæus uſed him

as an Hiſtorian, and conſequently they who deſpiſed him may be looked upon as men who had a depraved taſte, or were too nice. ‘ Dionyſii mater ejus qui Syracuſanorum tyrannus fuit ut ſcriptum apud Philiſtum eſt, & doctum hominem & diligentem & æqualem temporum illorum, quam prægnans hunc ipſum Dionyſium alvo contineret, ſomniavit ſe peperiſſe Satyriſcum (16). - - - *The mother of Dionyſius, tyrant of Syracuſe, as we find it in Philiſtus, a learned, careful, and contemporary author, being with child of him, dreamed that ſhe brought forth a hairy monſter.*’ Thoſe who will weigh the praiſes which Cicero beſtowed upon Thucydides, will lay great ſtreſs upon his declaring immediately after, that Philiſtus has very well imitated Thucydides: ‘ Hunc conſecutus eſt Syracuſius Philiſtus, qui quum Dionyſii tyranni familiariſſimus eſſet ocium ſuum conſumpſit in hiſtoria ſcribenda, MAXIMEQUE Thucydidem eſt, ſicut mihi videtur, IMITATUS (17). - - - *Philiſtus of Syracuſe followed him, who, being very intimate with Dionyſius the tyrant, ſpent his leiſure time in writing hiſtory, and in my opinion,* VERY MUCH IMITATED *Thucydides.*’ Quintilian ſays, that Philiſtus is clearer than Thucydides (18); which is a fine encomium; for obſcurity is a great fault, and it may very well balance the advantage which ſome think Thucydides has over Philiſtus. Perhaps, if we could compare their writings together, we ſhould find that Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus placed Thucydides a little too much above Philiſtus (19). However, this may be ſaid for the honour of Philiſtus, that he was called *the little Thucydides* by Cicero. Thoſe who ſtiled a comedian of Paris, the little Moliere, deſigned to beſtow no ſmall encomium upon him.

I ſhall obſerve two faults, which have been committed upon the *pene puſillus Thucydides*, of Cicero. One of them was criticized by Voſſius, and the other by a Jeſuit. A learned commentator was of opinion, that Philiſtus was ſo called by Cicero, becauſe he wrote but little in compariſon of Thucydides. It is a miſtake. ‘ Id referri eo minime debet quod præ Thucydide pauca admodum ſcripſerit, quæ † Pauli Manutii ſententia eſt, (nam longe aliud apparet ex iis quæ ex Suida & Diodoro adduximus) ſed quia non paullo quidem infirmior ſit Thucydide, ut Fabius ‡ quoque cenſet, attamen imitetur eum non infeliciter (20). - - - *The reaſon is not becauſe he wrote very little in compariſon of Thucydides, as Paulus Manutius thinks, (for it appears quite otherwiſe from what I have alledged out of Suidas and Diodorus) but becauſe he was, indeed weaker than Thucydides, as Fabius alſo imagines, but yet a ſucceſsful imitator of him.*’ An author, who made a collection of the miſtakes of great men, fancied that Cicero ſpoke of Thucydides with great contempt, and called him *little Thucydides*. Here is the refutation of that over-ſight. ‘ Iſto fere pacto hullucinatum fuiſſe virum doctum, qui de erroribus magnorum virorum ſcripſit, illico ſenſi, ut hic iſtius liber in manus meas incidit. Is pagina nonageſima extrema ait, Thucydidem hiſtoricum videri ne enarratorem quidem interdum, ideoque *pæne puſillum Ciceroni dictum*. Non animadvertit ſcriptor, tum profecto aliud agens, neque quemquam ab ullo vocari ſolere pæne parvum, aut pæne magnum, ſed omnino parvum, aut magnum; neque ibi apud Tullium, ubi pæne puſillus Thucydides dicitur, uſurpari hoc de Thucydide (21). - - - *And thereby I perceived immediately that the learned author, who wrote of the miſtakes of great men, was deceived, as ſoon as his book fell into my hands. In page* 90, *towards the end,* he ſays *the Hiſtorian Thucydides ſometimes deſerves not the name even of a relator, and therefore* is called by Cicero, pene puſillus. *He did not obſerve, his mind being employed upon ſomething elſe, that one is not called* pene parvus, *or* pene magnus, *but abſolutely* parvus *or* magnus; *and that in Tully, the expreſſion* pene puſillus Thucydides, *is not meant of Thucydides.*’ Father Vavaſſeur ſhews afterwards that Cicero means our Philiſtus.

I muſt make another obſervation. Cicero ſays, that he was better pleaſed with the hiſtory of Dionyſius, than with the other work of Philiſtus, becauſe Dionyſius was a very crafty man, and lived familiarly with that Hiſtorian. Voſſius being afraid that it would give occaſion to ſpeak ill of Cicero, takes care to clear the matter. Cicero, ſays he, does not praiſe Philiſtus's diſpoſition of mind, he only regards in that hiſtory the uſe that can be made of the knowledge of the craft of that tyrant. *Non animum Philiſti laudavit Tullius, ſed utilitatatem libri prædicavit: atque id imprimis quidem propter prudentiam quam ex vafri adeo tyranni vita capere eſſet: ſed & propter dictionem quam Thucydidæ æmulam fuiſſe etiam ex ſecundo de oratore cognoſcimus, ac propterea idem in Bruto,* &c. (22). Theſe laſt words are altogether needleſs, not to ſay worſe; for the queſtion was not to excuſe Cicero, becauſe he took pleaſure in the reading of Philiſtus; but becauſe he was better pleaſed with the hiſtory of the tyrant Dionyſius. It is nothing to the purpoſe to ſay, that Philiſtus wrote well. We do not know whether that talent was more conſpicuous in his hiſtory of Dionyſius, than in the other. We may therefore ſay, that Voſſius had rather make way for a tranſition, than argue as he ſhould have done. Thoſe who know how difficult it is to write in a coherent manner, I mean ſo as to manage tranſitions well, and yet to obſerve very exactly the diſtinctions of Logic, will leſs wonder, that faults, like that of Voſſius, ſhould be ſo frequent in authors.

For the reſt, Voſſius's apology for Cicero is very ſolid. Any curious man, eſpecially if he meddles with the affairs of the common-wealth, will be of that illuſtrious Roman's mind, without acting againſt probity. He will rather chuſe to read the particular hiſtory of a cunning Politician, who is a very wicked man, and a bold and crafty uſurper, than general hiſtories, eſpecially when the writers of it were familiarly acquainted with the tyrant. If it be ſaid that they will miſrepreſent things, and give a good turn to the crimes of their hero, as Philiſtus did: I anſwer, that a judicious reader will diſcover thoſe artifices, and make a good uſe of them. I do not queſtion but ſeveral perſons would part with four or five ancient authors that are extant, in order to recover that ſingle book of Philiſtus. We ſhould find a great many things in it, that are unknown to us. We know very little of Dionyſius the tyrant, beſides his cruel actions, and his diffidence; which is but a very ſmall part of his character. A man who makes himſelf maſter of a potent republic, and maintains himſelf many years in his uſurpation, notwithſtanding a thouſand obſtacles, is commonly a man that has many good natural qualities. We are ignorant of that mixture with reſpect to this Dionyſius, we have no particular account of his conduct, and of ſeveral defects of the Syracuſans. It would be an uſeful thing to ſee how Philiſtus deſcribed all thoſe things: the maxim, *Intereſt reipublicæ cognoſci malos,* - - - *It is for the good of the ſtate that wicked men be known,* ought to reach as far as that. Who hears but one party, knows nothing, or cannot judge right; and if he ſhould judge right, it would be only by chance.

[*E*] *He avoided digreſſions to an exceſs.*] It is a fault to delight in rambling from one's ſubject; the hiſtorian Theopompus was juſtly blamed for it (23), but it does not follow that it is a virtue never to leave the main ſubject; on the contrary it is to over-do a good thing, and to ſpoil it.

Inſani ſapiens nomen ferat, æquus iniqui,
Ultra quam ſatis eſt virtutem ſi petat ipſam (24).

The juſt will be unjuſt, th' wiſe void of wit,
That ſeek e'en virtue more than what is fit.

There is a medium between thoſe two extremes, as Theon judiciouſly obſerves. Οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῶς χρὴ (παρέκβασιν) πᾶσαν παραιτεῖσθαι, καθάπερ ὁ Φίλιστος, ἀναπαύει γὰρ τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ἀκροάτων· ἀλλὰ τὴν τηλικαύτην τὸ μῆκος, ἥτις ἀπαλλοτριοῖ τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ἀκροωμένων, ὥστε δεῖσθαι πάλιν ὑπομνήσεως τῶν προειρημένων, ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν ταῖς Φιλιππικαῖς. Neque enim oportet ſimpliciter fugere digreſſiones, quod Philiſtus fecit: quia in hâc animus audientium acquieſcit. Verùm illas, quæ adeò ſunt prolixæ, ut abducant auditorum animos, ut neceſſe ſit ea, quæ antè dicta ſunt, in memoriam revocari: cujuſmodi digreſſionibus utitur Theopompus in Philippicis (25). - - - *We ought not abſolutely to avoid digreſſions, as Philiſtus did: becauſe the mind might may be thereby relieved. But only ſuch as are too long, to bewilder the minds of hearers, and make it neceſſary to repeat what has been ſaid before: Such digreſſions Theopompus uſes in his Philippics.* You ſee him very ill. Plutarch cenſures him for it, though on the other hand he blames Ephorus for having beſtowed ſome praiſes upon Philiſtus [*F*].

---

(16) Cicero, *lib. i*, de Divin. *cap. xx.*

(17) Idem, *lib. ii*, de Oratore, *fol.* 73, *D.*

(18) Philiſtus quoque meretur qui turbæ quamvis bonorum poſt hos authorum eximatur, imitator Thucydidis, & ut multo infirmior ita aliquatenus lucidior. *Quintil. lib. x, cap. i, pag. m.* 469.

(19) Dionyſ. Halic. Ep. ad Pomp. *pag.* 261, & 262. *See alſo pag.* 190.

† *Notis ad eum Ciceronis locum.*

‡ *Lib. x, cap. i.*

(20) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Græcis, *lib. i, cap. vi, pag.* 27.

(21) Franc. Vavaſſor, de ludicra Dictione, *pag.* 166, 167.

(22) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 27.

(23) See the article THEOPOMPUS, in the remarks [*E*] and [*F*].

(24) Horat. Epiſt. VI, lib. I, ver. 15.

(25) Theon in Progymnaſm. *cap. iv, pag.* 44.

ſee that he blames Philiſtus for making no digreſſions, and ſays that they are ſometimes neceſſary, and ſerve as ſo many reſting-places. He is in the right, a little variety is neceſſary in all ingenious works, and it is obſerved, that the moſt regular writers are not read with the greateſt pleaſure. I could mention ſome hiſtories, which make the reader gape, and even ſleep, tho' they are written with an exact obſervation of all the rules of art; a grave ſtyle, conciſe, correct, and ſententious; a narrative free from incidents and trifling niceties; no particulars, no excurſions; and always upon the ſtrait line, becauſe it is the ſhorteſt (26). Other writers, who ſometimes lay aſide their gravity, either with reſpect to the language, or to the ſubject, and make no ſcruple to go out of the way to take in an epiſode, write a hiſtory that continually draws the attention of the reader. He goes thro' it before he is weary of it. I ſhall not examine whether it be a proof of the one of theſe things, rather than of the other, either that the rules, or the judgment of the reader, are falſe. I inſiſt upon the fact, and refer myſelf to the obſervation of a man of a very good taſte. *What a prodigious diſtance*, ſays he (27), *there is between a fine work, and a perfect or regular work! I do not know whether there has been any yet of the latter ſort. It is, perhaps, leſs difficult for a rare genius to attain to greatneſs and ſublimity, than to avoid all manner of faults. The Cid had but one voice at its birth,* viz. *that of admiration; it prevailed over authority and policy, which endeavoured in vain to deſtroy it; it reunited in its favour thoſe that are always divided in their opinions and ſentiments, great men, and the common people; they all agree in learning it by heart, and in preventing the actors upon the ſtage when they recite it. In ſhort, the Cid is one of the fineſt poems that can be made; and one of the fineſt criticiſms that ever was made of any ſubject, is that of the Cid* This is the fineſt example that can be alledged of the inſufficiency of the rules. The author of the Cid obſerved almoſt none of them. The French academy declared him an infringer of them; yet he charmed, and ſtill charms the public. He loſt his cauſe before the maſters, but he carried it every where elſe: he appealed to the people, as that Horatius who killed his ſiſter, and cauſed the ſentence of the judges to be revoked by that tribunal. Montagne's eſſays are another example of a happy irregularity. Whoever ſhould undertake to make that book very methodical, would deprive it of its chief beauties.

(26) A puncto ad punctum linea recta eſt omnium breviſſima.

(27) La Bruyere, The Characters of this Age, in the chapter concerning ingenious works, *pag. m.* 76, 77.

For the reſt, I am not ſo much concerned in vindicating digreſſions, as one might think; for the hiſtorical part of this work is a thouſand times more agreeable to the manner of Philiſtus than to that of Theopompus; and as for my commentary, I need not make an apology if it contains ſeveral digreſſions. It is a ſort of work which requires or naturally bears them. It is a compilation, it is what we call miſcellanies. Variety is eſſential to that ſort of compoſitions, and it ought chiefly to be allowed to thoſe who cannot hope to prevent any other way the wearineſs of the reader (28). Note, that a digreſſion cannot be ſaid to be too long, only becauſe it fills up ſeveral pages, but when every part of it takes up too much room; for though you be never ſo ſhort upon every one of them, the conjunction of many will make you prolix. *Solet enim eſſe quædam partium brevitas quæ longam tamen efficit ſummam* (29). I make uſe of that thought of Quintilian in another ſenſe than he.

(28) Liber fuit & opuſculis varius & metris: ita ſolemus qui ingenio parum fidimus ſatietatis periculum fugere. *Plin. Ep. XXI, lib. viii.*

(29) Quint. *lib. iv, cap. ii, pag. m.* 183.

[*F*] *Plutarch cenſures Timæus, though on the other hand he blames Ephorus, for having beſtowed praiſes upon Philiſtus.*] ' But Timæus takes this occaſion, ' and truly a juſt one, of his zealous and conſtant adherence to the tyranny, to vent his own ſpleen and ' malice againſt him. Thoſe indeed who were injured ' by him are the more excuſable, if they expreſſed their ' reſentment to his dead body; but thoſe who write ' his hiſtory after his death, and were no way wronged ' by him in his life-time, but have had the advantage ' of his learned writings, in honour ought not, with ' opprobrious and ſcurrilous language, upbraid him for ' thoſe misfortunes, which many times by unhappy ' accidents have befallen even the beſt of men. On ' the other ſide, Ephorus is as much out of the way ' in the laviſh encomiums he beſtows on Philiſtus; ' for tho' he is very good at diſguiſing baſe and unworthy actions, with fair and colourable pretences, ' and in his expreſſions is very florid and rhetorical, ' yet when he has done his beſt, he can never acquit ' him of the imputation he lies under, of being of all ' mankind the moſt zealous aſſertor of arbitrary government, and that no man ever more induſtriouſly ' promoted, or fondly admired the luxury, power, ' riches, and alliances of tyrants. But between both ' theſe extreams, he that neither praiſes Philiſtus for ' his faults, nor inſults over his misfortunes, ſeems to ' me beſt to conſult his own credit, and perform the ' part of an Hiſtorian (30).' What Plutarch ſays of thoſe alliances of tyrants may be confirmed by theſe words of Cornelius Nepos: ' Philiſtum Hiſtoricum ' Syracuſas reduxit hominem amicum non magis tyranno quam tyrannidi (31). - - - *He recalled the ' Hiſtorian Philiſtus to Syracuſe, who was as great a ' friend to tyranny as to the tyrant*,' and by theſe words of Dyoniſius Halicarnaſſeus: ' Philiſtus Thucydidem ' ſequitur moribus exceptis: hic enim liber eſt & animi ' magnitudinis ac gravitatis plenius: ille tyrannorum ' & aliorum cupiditati plus nimio ſubſervit (32). - - - ' *Philiſtus imitated Thucydides, except in his morals: for ' the latter was a man of great gravity, and of a noble ' ſoul: but the former was too obſequious to tyrants and ' others.*'

(30) Plut. in Dione, *p.* 974.

(31) Corn. Nep. in Vit. Dionyſ. *cap. iii.*

(32) Dionyſ. Halic. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 190.

PHILLA, one of the moſt illuſtrious ladies of antiquity, was daughter of Antipater, governor of Macedon, during the abſence of Alexander. She was a very witty woman, and very fit to manage great affairs (*a*). She did ſo dexterouſly behave herſelf, according to the ſeveral humours of thoſe whom ſhe was to bring or keep to their duty, that ſhe hindered an army full of factious and turbulent ſpirits from making an inſurrection: ſhe married poor maids at her own charges, and oppoſed the oppreſſors of innocency with ſo much vigour, that ſhe ſecured many perſons who were upon the point of being overwhelmed by their calumniators. Her capacity was not the fruit of experience; for being but a young woman, ſhe was conſulted about affairs of the greateſt moment by her father Antipater, one of the wiſeſt Politicians of that time (*b*). We might know the particulars of this princeſs's capacity (*c*), if we had all the books of Diodorus Siculus; but we have loſt that part of his Hiſtory which contained them. Philla married firſt (*d*) Craterus (*e*), who of all the captains of Alexander was moſt beloved by the Macedonians. After the death of Craterus ſhe married Demetrius (*f*), and was the chief of her ſecond huſband's wives [*A*], but ſhe had no great ſhare in his love: he

(*a*) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xix, cap. lix, pag. m.* 1013.

(*b*) Ib. *p.* 1014.

(*c*) *See* Diod. Sic. ibid.

(*d*) Ib. *p.* 1013.

(*e*) Plut. in Demetrio, *pag.* 895, *A.*

(*f*) Diod. Sic. & Plut. ibid.

[*A*] *She was the chief of Demetrius's wives.*] He had ſeveral at the ſame time: our Phylla: Eurydice iſſued from Miltiades, and widow of Opheltes king of Cyrene (1). Deidamia, daughter of Æacides king of Epirus, and ſiſter of Pyrrhus (2). Phylla was moſt eſteemed, and moſt in credit. I wiſh the author who ſays ſo, had imputed that preference to the great merit of this lady; but he aſcribes it only to the glory of Antipater, and to that of Craterus. Πολλαῖς ἅμα συνῆν γυναιξὶν ὧν ἀξίωμα μέγιστον εἶχε καὶ τιμὴν Φίλλα, διὰ Ἀντίπατρον τὸν πατέρα, καὶ διὰ τὸ προσυνῳκηκέναι Κρατερῷ. *Multas uno tempore conjuges*

(1) Plut. in Demetrio, *pag.* 894, *E.*

(2) Id. ib. *pag.* 900, *B.*

he was a voluptuous prince (*g*), who kept ſeveral miſtreſſes at the ſame time, ſome of whom had been common whores. He grew weary of Philla under pretence that he was younger than ſhe (*h*); yet he was extremely fond of the courtezan Lamia, though ſhe was upon the decline (*i*). Philla died after a tragical manner; for when ſhe heard that Demetrius had loſt his dominions, ſhe had not the courage to ſee him as a miſerable fugitive, but ſhe poiſoned herſelf, curſing the fortune of her huſband (*k*), who had been leſs conſtant in her favours to him, than in her ill uſage (*l*). She had by him a ſon (*m*), and the famous Stratonice (*n*), who was Seleucus's wife, and whom Seleucus yielded to his ſon Antiochus (*o*). A niece of the deceaſed quickly ſupplied her place [*B*].

(*g*) Plut. ibid.

(*h*) Id. ib. *pag.* 902, *C.*

(*i*) See the article LAMIA, (Courtezan) remark [*C*].

(*k*) Plut. ib. *pag.* 911.

(*m*) Id. ib. *pag.* 906, *E.* His name was Antigonus. *Id. ib. pag.* 915.

(*n*) Id. ib. *pag.* 903, *D.*

(*o*) Id. ib. *pag.* 907.

(*l*) Μισήσασα τὴν τόχην αὐτοῦ βεβαιοτέραν ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς οὖσαν ἢ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, πιοῦσα φάρμακον ἀπέθανε. Fortunam ejus execrata quæ in adverſitatibus eſſet quam ſecundis rebus ſtabilior, atque hauſto veneno extincta eſt. *Plut. Ibid.*

---

conjuges habebat (*Demetrius*) *quarum erat maxima in dignatione & honore Philla, tum propter patrem Antipatrum, tum quod etiam matrimonio juncta fuiſſet Cratero* (3). I believe that Antigonus pitched upon her to be his daughter-in-law, conſidering that ſhe was a good match for thoſe two reaſons. Demetrius was very much diſpleaſed with it, by reaſon of the diſproportion of their age; but his father whiſpered to him in the ear a paſſage of Euripides, wherein he made ſome alteration. The meaning of it was, that a man ought to marry a woman in ſpite of nature, when ſhe brings a good portion. Ἀπροθύμως δ' ἔχοντι, λέγεται πρὸς τὸ οὖς Εὐριπίδειον εἰπεῖν, Ὅπου τὸ κέρδος, παρὰ φύσιν γαμητέον· ὁμοιόπτωτόν τι τῷ δουλευτέον εὐθυρρημονήσας. *Abhorrenti vero dicitur in aurem hoc Euripideum inſuſurraſſe.*

Ubi lucrum ſuadet, reluctetur licet
Natura, ducas conjugem.

Ubi Ducas conjugem, pro Servias, ſcite ſubjecit (4). It is likely that Demetrius eſteemed Philla, and took care to give her ſome outward marks of his regard, but that he kept her not for his pleaſure. Note, that he deputed her to Caſſander to juſtify his conduct towards Pliſtarchus, who complained very much of him (5). It is a ſign that he thought his wife was fit for a negociation. Note alſo, that he highly reſented the Rhodians giving the king of Egypt a ſhip which they had taken, wherein was the letter which Philla writ to him, and the fine goods ſhe ſent him (6).

[*B*] *A niece of the deceaſed quickly ſupplied her place.*] She was daughter of Ptolemy and Eurydice, ſiſter of Philla, and her name was Ptolemais (7). She had been betrothed to Demetrius during the life of Philla (8). He had a ſon by her called Demetrius, who was afterwards king of Cyrene (9). It is without doubt the ſame whom I have mentioned in the article of ARSINOE.

(3) Id. ib. *pag.* 894, 895.

(4) Id. ib. *pag.* 895.

(5) Id. ib. *pag.* 904, *A.*

(6) Id. ib. *pag.* 898. *See alſo* Diod. Sicul. *lib. xx, cap. xciv.*

(7) Id. ib. *pag.* 911, *F.*

(8) Id. ib. *pag.* 904.

(9) Id. ib. *pag.* 915.

PHILOMELUS,

PHILOMELUS, general of the Phoceans, in the beginning of the war that was called Sacred, found no better expedient to reſiſt the enemies of his country [*A*], than to ſeize upon the temple of Delphos. He took a journey to Lacedæmon to impart his deſign to Archidamus (*a*), who anſwered him, that he could not openly aſſiſt him in this undertaking, but that he would ſecretly furniſh him with men and money. With ſuch a ſuccour, Philomelus made himſelf maſter of the temple, and put to the ſword thoſe who oppoſed him. He was attacked ſoon after by the Locrians, and he beat them. He was ſo fluſhed with that victory, that he took the decrees of the Amphictyones out of the temple of Delphos, and forced the prieſteſs to give him an Oracle. The anſwer he received could not but be acceptable to him, for the tenor of it was, that it was lawful for him to do any thing he had a mind to. He procured an anthentic inſtrument of that revelation, and cauſed it to be read publickly, that every body might know he ſhould act for the time to come under the authority, and with the approbation of the god, whatever he ſhould undertake. He ſent ambaſſadors to all the nations of Greece. The Athenians and Lacedemonians made an alliance with him [*B*]; but the Thebans and

(*a*) He was king of Lacedæmon.

[*A*] *The enemies of his country.*] *Viz.* the Thebans: for they cauſed the ſenate of the Amphictyones to lay an exorbitant fine upon the Phoceans, and they were upon the point of ordering, that if it were not paid, the lands of the Phoceans ſhould be forfeited to the benefit of Apollo (1).

[*B*] *The Athenians and Lacedemonians made an alliance with him.*] We learn from this Hiſtory one of the political cuſtoms of ſtates. We have already ſeen (2) that the king of Lacedemon, inſtead of diſſuading Philomelus from invading the temple of Delphos, encouraged him to it, and furniſhed him with the means of doing it. Only he ſo managed the buſineſs, that it could not be proved that he had openly eſpouſed the party of Philomelus. He took care that the public authority ſhould not appear in the ſuccours of men and money wherewith he ſupplied the Phocean general. The ſucceſs of that enterprize being doubtful, it was certainly a piece of prudence not to expoſe the glory of Lacedemon by ſome public ſteps againſt the intereſt of religion: but becauſe the invaſion of that temple was like to prejudice a nation (3), which was then the moſt dreaded by all it's neighbours, it was political to favour the impious deſign of thoſe who had a mind to ſubdue the Oracle of Delphos. Such was the cauſe of the conduct of the king of Lacedemon. When that deſign was executed, he pulled off the maſk, and joined openly in a league with Philomelus, tho' he was to have for his enemies, thoſe who declared that they took up arms to ſet the Oracle of Delphos at liberty, and to puniſh the impiety and ſacrilege of the Phoceans. The Athenians and Lacedemonians ſhewed themſelves the moſt ready and zealous to maintain the uſurpers of the temple, either during the life of Philomelus, who began to plunder it, or during the adminiſtration of his ſucceſſors, who profaned all it's treaſures, thoſe ancient and rich monuments of the piety of ſo many nations and princes. Nevertheleſs, the cities of Athens and Lacedemon pretended to be very religious. Feaſts, vows, and ſacrifices, were great things amongſt them. Wo to any one that ſhould have had the boldneſs to ſay any thing againſt the worſhip of the gods: the greateſt Philoſopher in the world would have run the hazard of his life, if he had been ſo bold. How comes it therefore to paſs, that thoſe two cities ſupported and made a league with the Phoceans, who were guilty of an impious action, and had prophaned and deſtroyed the greateſt object of the devotion of all Greece, and even of the Barbarians? The reaſon of it is this: the Phoceans could not have been puniſhed for their impiety, without letting the glory and power of the Thebans grow more formidable than before. But the political intereſt of the Athenians and Lacedemonians required that the Thebans ſhould be weakened: therefore, tho' the intereſt of religion required that the Phoceans ſhould be puniſhed, it was thought more expedient to ſupport and enter into a confederacy with them againſt the Thebans, who were the heads of a kind of Cruſade for the liberty of Apollo. The temporal good of the ſtate has been in all times preferred to religion.

Diodorus Siculus obſerves, that the Phoceans furniſhed the Athenians and Lacedemonians with more ſubſidies than was neceſſary for the payment of the troops (4). It was not therefore a chargeable alliance, but

(1) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xvi, cap. xxiii.*

(2) In the text of this article.

(3) The Thebans.

An example ſhewing that the temporal good of the ſtate is preferred to religion.

(4) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xvi, cap. xxiii.*

and ſome others joined in a league againſt him. Which occaſioned the Sacred War. Philomelus left the treaſures of the temple untouched; he was contented to lay great taxes upon the inhabitants of Delphos, who were grown rich with the ſpoils of the devotion of other nations. He took the field with a great army, and beat the Locrians. That victory ſwelled his courage, and abated that of the vanquiſhed, but it increaſed the number of his enemies. Therefore finding himſelf obliged to oppoſe greater forces to them, he laid aſide the thoughts of reſpecting the temple [C], and took great treaſures from it. Having promiſed great pay to all ſtrangers that ſhould liſt themſelves under him, he eaſily raiſed many troops, though conſcientious men refuſed to ſerve under him [D]. He entred into the country of the enemies, and had the advantage in the firſt rencounters: but ſoon after there happened an occaſion which forced him to maintain a running fight thro' very bad ways: ſo that being unwilling to be taken, and ſeeing no way to avoid it, but by killing himſelf, he threw himſelf headlong from a rock. Onomarchus, his brother, ſucceeded him. His other brother, Phayllus, ſucceeded Onomarchus. The latter compleated the plundering of the treaſures of the temple. They uſed ſome caution at firſt; but at laſt they totally plundered it, and yet the Athenians and Lacedæmonians departed not from their alliance (*b*). Theſe things happened in the time of Philip of Macedon, father of Alexander the Great. The Hiſtorian who relates them, does not forget the tragical end of thoſe who committed theſe ſacrileges [*E*].

Nay,

but it was a very odious one; for every body knew that the Athenians and Lacedemonians had a ſhare in the profit of the ſacrilege. They furniſhed the Phoceans with troops, and received from them a ſubſidy more than ſufficient for the pay of thoſe troops. There happened another thing which gave occaſion to talk againſt the Athenians. Dionyſius, tyrant of Sicily, was ſending into Greece ſome gold and ivory ſtatues, which he deſigned to conſecrate in the temples of Delphos and Jupiter Olympian. Iphicrates commanded then an Athenian fleet near Corcyra. He took among other ſhips thoſe which carried the ſtatues, and aſked his maſters what he ſhould do with them. The people being aſſembled about it, made a decree whereby Iphicrates was ordered not to examine ſo narrowly what concerns the gods, but to take a ſpecial care of the ſubſiſtence of the troops. *Περιτυχῶν ταῖς κομιζούσαις αὐτὰ ναυσὶν ὁ Ἰφικράτης καὶ κρατήσας αὐτῶν, διεπέμψατο πρὸς τὸν δῆμον, ἐπερωτῶν τί χρὴ πράττειν. οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι προσέταξαν αὐτῷ μὴ τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἐξετάζειν, ἀλλὰ σκοπεῖν ὅπως στρατιώτας διατρέψῃ* (5). *Iphicrates in naves, quæ dona votiva portabant, fortè fortuna incidens, in poteſtatem redactas Athenas mitteret, cum hac ſciſcitatione, quid facto nunc opus eſſet? populuſque contra, non ſcrupuloſè Deorum res examinare, ſed quomodo militem alat, providere, ipſum juberet.* He underſtood ſo well the meaning of that decree, that he cauſed all the ſtatues to be ſold, as well as the other goods taken by his privateers. The Athenians were ſeverely upbraided with it (6), and Diodorus obſerves, that they plundered Apollo by ſea and land, tho' they acknowledged him to be their founder. He obſerves likewiſe the fantaſtical humour of the Lacedemonians, who pretended to be beholden to the Oracles of Apollo for their glory and proſperity, and yet joined in a confederacy with thoſe impious men who plundered the temple of Delphos. So the world goes, and ſo it will go. *Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸ θεῖον τοιαῦτα ἔπραξαν, καὶ ταῦτ' εὐχόμενοι τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα πατρῷον αὐτῶν εἶναι καὶ πρόγονον. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ τῷ περὶ Δελφοὺς μαντείῳ χρησάμενοι, καὶ τὴν θαυμαζομένην παρὰ πᾶσι πολιτείαν διὰ τούτου κτησάμενοι, καὶ περὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἔτι καὶ νῦν τὸν θεὸν ἐπερωτῶντες, ἐτόλμησαν τοῖς τὸ ἱερὸν συλήσασι κοινωνῆσαι τῆς παρανομίας. Hæc tum Athenienſes in Numen committere non verebantur, qui tamen Apollinem Deum patrium & progenitorem ſuum eſſe gloriari ſolebant. Lacedæmonii etiam, quamvis Rempublicam ſuam cunctis gentibus admirabilem Delphici oraculi conſilio inſtituiſſent, deque rebus maximis (ut ad hanc uſque tempeſtatem factitant) Dei voluntatem exquirerent, cum profligatiſſimis tamen ſani expilatoribus ſacrilegæ impietatis ſocietatem inire non dubitant* (7).

[*C*] *He laid aſide the thoughts of reſpecting the temple.*] I ſhall quote Diodorus Siculus. *Ὁ Φιλόμηλος ἐκείνου μισθοφόρων ἀθροίζειν πλῆθος, προσδεομένου δὲ τοῦ πολέμου χρημάτων πλειόνων, ἠνεγκάζετο τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀναθήμασιν ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ συλᾶν τὸ μαντεῖον* (8). Philomelus majore conductitii militis robore ſe confirmare ſtatuit. At quia majores bellum ſumptus flagitabat, donariis ſacris manus injicere coactus, templum deprædatur (9). - - - *Philomelus reſolved to ſtrengthen himſelf with a greater number of mercenary troops. But as he wanted more money to carry on the war, he plundered the temple, and ſeized on its gifts and treaſures.* It does plainly appear from theſe words, that Philomelus ſpared not the treaſures, or the *ex votos* and other gifts of the temple of Delphos. Nevertheleſs, Diodorus Siculus affirms the contrary in the ſame book. I do not know whether this contradiction was ever taken notice of. *Τῶν δὲ προγεγενημένων στρατηγῶν ὁ μὲν πρῶτος ἄρξας Φιλόμηλος ἀπέσχετο τῶν ἀναθημάτων, ὁ δὲ δεύτερος προσαγορευόμενος μὲν Ὀνόμαρχος ἀδελφὸς δ' ὢν φιλομήλου πλεῖστα τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χρημάτων κατεδαπάνησε, τρίτος δὲ Φάϋλλος ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ὀνομάρχου στρατηγήσας ἐκ ὀλίγα τῶν ἀναθημάτων κατέκοψεν εἰς τὰς τῶν ξένων μισθοφοράς* (10). Priorum ſanè ducum, qui primus imperium geſſerat, Philomelus à ſacris templi donariis ſe continuerat, ſucceſſor verò ejus & frater Onomarchus plurimum de conſecratis Deo ad belli ſumptus convertit. Tertius inde Phayllus Onomarchi frater, dum Prætoris munere fungitur, non pauca de repoſitis in templo, ad perſolvendum conductitiis ſtipendia, concidit (11). - - - *Philomelus the firſt general abſtained from the ſacred gifts of the temple, but Onomarchus, his brother and ſucceſſor, applied many of them to defray the charges of the war. Phayllus, brother to Onomarchus, the third general, converted moſt of the treaſure to the payment of the mercenary ſoldiers.*

[*D*] *Conſcientious men refuſed to ſerve under him.*] *Τῶν μὲν οὖν ἐπιεικῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐδεὶς ἀπεγράψατο πρὸς τὴν στρατείαν διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν· οἱ δὲ πονηρότατοι καὶ θεῶν διὰ τὴν πλεονεξίαν καταφρονοῦντες, προθύμως συνέτρεχον πρὸς τὺν φιλόμελον.* Modeſtorum tamen virorum nullus eam in militiam nomen ſuum eſt profeſſus, quòd pietas erga deum aliud ſuadebat. Interim deterrimus quiſque, deoſque lucri ſui gratiâ nauci habens, cupidè Philomelo ſeſe aggregat (12). - - - *No pious man would liſt himſelf in that war, becauſe religion diſſuaded him from it. But every profligate fellow, for the ſake of gain deſpiſing the gods, willingly offered their ſervice to Philomelus.*

[*E*] *Diodorus Siculus does not forget the tragical end of thoſe who committed theſe ſacrileges.*] This obſervation of the Hiſtorian (13) ought not to be looked upon as a ſuperſtitious one; for tho' the temple of Delphos was conſecrated to a falſe god, yet it was an impious thing, and a ſacrilege to plunder it, when they believed that Apollo was a true god. I own, that none but the true God can change the nature of prophane things, they cannot become ſacred but by his inſtitution. Thus all the gifts conſecrated in the temple of Delphos remained in their former ſtate. The golden tiles which king Crœſus had conſecrated in it (14), were nothing but gold; it was as lawful to coin it, as it is to coin an ingot that comes from the mine; it was, I ſay, lawful for thoſe who profeſſed not the religion of the Heathens; but they who believed that the gifts of the temple of Delphos were conſecrated to God, could not invade them without committing a downright ſacrilege, which the true God, who is the only

---

(*b*) *Taken from* Diodorus Siculus, *lib. xvi, cap. xxiii, & ſeq. ad Olympiadem CVI.*

(5) *Id. ib. pag.* 453. The Latin tranſlation of thoſe words in the edition in 8vo, is in the 781ſt page.

(6) See in *Diodorus Siculus, ibid.* the letter which Dionyſius the tyrant writ to them.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xvi, pag.* 430, 431, *Edit. Hanov.* 1604.

(9) They who have no other edition but the Latin one in 8°, 1611, will find this in the 30th chapter of the 16th book, *pag.* 759.

(10) Diodor. ibid. *pag.* 452.

(11) Pag. 780, of the Edit. in 8vo.

(12) Diod. Sicul. *lib. xvi, cap. xxx, pag.* 759, *Edit. Lat. in 8vo.*

(13) Ubi ſupra, *cap. lvii, pag.* 779, 780.

(14) Id. ib. *pag.* 780.

Nay, he obſerves that the divine juſtice did ſeverely purſue the women who made bold to adorn themſelves with the ornaments taken by their huſbands from the temple of Delphos (*c*), but he does not mention a woman dancer, to whom ſuch a preſent proved very fatal [*F*]. Juſtin obſerves, that tho' the action of the Phoceans was abhorred by every body, yet they were leſs hated for it, than thoſe (*d*) who reduced them to that neceſſity (*e*). The envy or hatred of an infamous action is commonly divided in ſuch a manner, and that diſtribution is not altogether unjuſt; for they who force a man to do a deſperate thing, act more freely than he. Pauſanias makes an obſervation which will not be improperly ſet down in this place. Philomelus, ſays he, having adviſed the Phoceans to plunder the temple of Delphos, and having made uſe of ſeveral plauſible reaſons, perſuaded them to do it, whether God had blinded them, or whether they naturally preferred gain to religion (*f*). He tells us (*g*), that Philomelus was a native of Ledon, a town of Phocis, and that the temple was plundered the fourth year of the CVth Olympiad.

(*c*) See the remark [*A*] of the article CALLIRHOE, at the end, and the remark [*S*] of the article HELENA.

(*d*) Viz. the Thebans.

(*e*) Juſtin. *lib. viii, cap. i.*

(*f*) Εἴτε τὴν γνώμην σφίσι τοῦ θεοῦ βλάπτοντος, εἴτε καὶ αὐτοῖς πεφυκόσιν ἐπίπροσθεν εὐσεβείας τὰ κέρδη ποιεῖσθαι. Sive quod mentem Deus à rectis conſiliis avertiſſet, ſeu quod is populus ſuapte natura religioni ſolitus eſſet quæſtum anteponere. *Pauſan. lib. x, pag.* 318.

(*g*) Id. ib. *pag.* 317.

only infallible judge of the quality of human actions, and the only diſpenſer of rewards and puniſhments, thought fit to puniſh; I ſpeak of the puniſhments which the Jews had deſerved if they had plundered the temple of Solomon (15).

That the reader may know how great was the devotion of the Heathens towards their falſe gods, I ſhall obſerve by the by, that the gold and ſilver taken out of the temple of Delphos on that occaſion, and turned into current money, amounted to ten (16) thouſand talents (17). Some ſay that the wealth which the Phoceans took out of it, equals what Alexander found ſince in the treaſures of king Darius (18).

[*F*] *He does not mention a woman dancer to whom ſuch a preſent proved very fatal.*] That is, a preſent taken out of the ſpoils of the temple of Delphos. Our Philomelus gave the golden crown of the Cnidians to Pharſalia, a woman-dancer. A fine deſtination this, and how agreeable to the intention of the Cnidians! *Non hos quæſitum munus in uſus.* What a leap from the arch of a temple, to the head of ſuch a woman! However, ſhe had an ill bargain of it: She went over from Greece into Italy, and one day, as ſhe was dancing at Metapontum, in the temple of Apollo, ſome young men ruſhed upon her crown, and ſtrove ſo hard to take away the booty from one another, that they tore in pieces the body of Pharſalia, as we read in Plutarch (19).

(16) It is about one million nine hundred and thirty eight thouſand pounds.

(17) Diod. ubi ſupra.

(18) Ibid.

(19) Plut. de Pytheæ Oracul. *pag.* 397, 398.

---

(15) *See the* Penſées ſur les Cometes, *num.* 118. *See alſo theſe words of Seneca, lib. vii, cap. vii, de Benef.* Injuriam ſcrilegus Deo quidem non poteſt facere, quem extra ictum ſua divinitas poſuit: ſed punitur, quia tanquam Deo fecit. Opinio illum noſtra, ac ſua, obligat pœnæ. - - - *A ſacrilegious perſon cannot properly do an injury to God, becauſe by his divine nature he is placed above our reach; but he is puniſhed, becauſe he did it with that wicked intention. Our own opinion, as well as his, ſubjects us to puniſhment.*

PHILO. Peter Bellier, Doctor of the Civil Law, tranſlated into French a part of Philo's works, and dedicated it to Mr de Chiverni, Chancellor of France. The verſion was reviſed, corrected, and augmented with three books, tranſlated from the Greek original by Frederic Morel, Dean of the Lecturers and Interpreters of the king, and in that ſtate it was reprinted at Paris in the year 1612 in 8vo, and dedicated by the ſame Morel to Philip Huraut biſhop of Chartres, ſon to the Chancellor de Chiverni.

PHLEGON, ſurnamed *Trallianus* (*a*), compoſed ſeveral books, of which there is but little extant [*A*]. He was a freed-man of the emperor Hadrian. Thoſe who were of opinion that he was Auguſtus's freed-man (*b*), had never read his books. He lived, at leaſt 'till the eighteenth year of the empire of Antoninus Pius (*c*), for he mentions

(*a*) That is, born at Trallis, (a city of Lydia).

(*b*) Suidas, in Φλέγων, mentions that opinion.

(*c*) The year of CHRIST 156.

[*A*] *He compoſed ſeveral books, of which there is but little extant.*] He writ a Hiſtory of the Olympiads, divided into ſixteen books (1). It was an univerſal Hiſtory (2), which reached from the firſt Olympiad (3), to the CCXXIXth (4). It is ſometimes quoted under the name of Olympiads, and ſometimes under the name of Chronicles. Photius joins thoſe two titles together, ἀναγνώσθη, ſays he (5), Φλέγοντος Τραλλιανοῦ . . . ὀλυμπιονικῶν καὶ χρονικῶν συναγωγή. *Lecta mihi Phlegontis Tralliani . . . . Olympicorum & Chronicorum collectio.* Origen (6) and Maximus (7) have quoted it under the title of Chronicles; Stephanus Byzantinus did the ſame (8), but he quoted it oftner under the name of Olympiads. Salmaſius was of opinion, that Phlegon's Chronicles were, perhaps, a diſtinct work, and divided into eight books (9). But would he have ſaid ſo, if he had taken notice of the title mentioned by Photius, and of the citations to be found in Origen and Maximus. The former quotes the thirteenth or fourteenth book of the Chronicles, and the latter the fourteenth, to prove, by the teſtimony of a Heathen, the ſame matters of fact which Euſebius relates (10) as being contained in the thirteenth book of Phlegon's Olympiads. I do not think that theſe words of Suidas, τὰ πραχθέντα πανταχοῦ *res ubique geſtæ*, - - - *an univerſal Hiſtory*, ought to be ſeparated from what goes before, and only referred to what follows; for they do exactly ſuit with the Hiſtory of the Olympiads which he mentions juſt before. But if I do not follow the opinion of Salmaſius herein (11), I do not reject it as to this, *viz.* that Suidas meant that Phlegon compoſed another work, divided into eight books, which contained alſo τὰ πραχθέντα πανταχοῦ, *res ubique geſtas.* It happens pretty often, that a general Hiſtory is compoſed according to different methods, by the ſame author. Photius, who had read the five firſt books of Phlegon's Olympiads (12), gives a ſummary of the CLXXVIIth Olympiad, where they ended. One may judge of the whole piece by that ſpecimen, and it muſt be acknowledged, as Voſſius ſays, that if we had that Chronicle, it would be very uſeful to clear up a great many things; but this does not prove, that Photius had no reaſon to blame the trifling niceties upon which Phlegon enlarged, and which tired the readers, and covered the moſt memorable facts with their ſhadow (13). And therefore there is ſomething in the following words of Voſſius, which may be diſapproved: 'Non penitus probare poſſum quod idem (*Photius*) 'reprehendit anxiam illam curam in Olympiadibus 'recenſendis, atque iis annotandis quæ ſingularum 'tempore contigerunt. Imo vero utinam totum 'Chronicon extaret. Multum enim lucis abſque dubio priſcæ inde Eccleſiæ temporibus accederet (14). '- - - *I cannot altogether commend Photius, for blaming that ſcrupulous care in relating the Olympiads, and obſerving thoſe things which happened under each of them. I wiſh the whole Chronicle were extant. It would undoubtedly afford great light to the Hiſtory of the primitive church.*' It will appear from the words of Photius, which I ſhall quote in the remark [*E*], that what he cenſures has been miſrepreſented by Voſſius. There is nothing extant of that work of Phlegon, beſides a fragment, which does not take up ſix pages in the Leyden edition 1622, in 4to. His treatiſe περὶ μακροβίων, *de longævis*, - - - *of thoſe who have lived to a great age*, is ſhort enough, and it is likely we have it not entire (15), for there is nothing

(1) Suidas, in Φλέγων.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Phot. Bibl. *n.* 97, *p.* 265.

(4) Suidas, ibid. Anonymus in Deſcriptione Olymp.

(5) Phot. ibid.

(6) Orig. *lib. ii*, contra Celſum.

(7) Maxim. in Schol. ad Dionyſii Areopag. Ep. VII, apud Meurſium, Not. ad Phlegontem, *pag.* 170.

(8) Vid. Meurſ. ibid. *pag.* 169.

(9) Salmaſ. in Spartian. Hiſtor. Adriani, *cap. xvi, pag. m.* 151, *Tom. i.*

(10) See the remark [*D*].

(11) Salmaſ. ubi ſupra.

(12) Phot. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 268.

(13) I have ſet down the words of Photius in the remark [*E*].

(14) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Græc. *lib. ii, cap. xi, pag. m.* 219.

(15) Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

tions the conſuls of that year (*d*), which is 142 years after the death of Auguſtus. He had a freed-man, who was an author [*B*]. It was thought that the Hiſtory of Hadrian, which was publiſhed under the name of Phlegon, was written by Hadrian himſelf [*C*]. Phlegon ſpeaks of the reſurrection of a young woman as an ocular witneſs (*e*). See Mr de Tillemont (*f*). It is pretended that he ſpoke of the darkneſs which hapenned during our Saviour's paſſion [*D*]. Photius blames him for enlarging too much upon inſignificant

(*d*) Phleg. de Rebus mirabilib. *cap. x.*

(*e*) Phleg. ibid. *cap. i.*

(*f*) Tillemont, Hiſt. of the Emperors, *Tom. ii, pag.* 467, *Edit. of Bruſſels.*

thing in it concerning ſome illuſtrious perſons, who lived to a very great age. As for his treatiſe περὶ θαυμασίων, *de rebus mirabilibus, - - - of things wonderful*, it contains one hundred and thirty five chapters, moſt of them very ſhort, and there is ſomething wanting in the beginning. Theſe are the broken remnants of Phlegon's works. Xylander rendered them into Latin, and publiſhed them at Baſil, together with the Greek, and ſome notes, in the year 1568. Meurſius put out a new edition of them at Leyden, with his own remarks, in the year 1622. You will find in Suidas the title of part of the other writings of Phlegon.

[*B*] *He had a freed-man who was an author.*] This appears from theſe words of Spartianus: 'Legiſſe me apud Ælium Maurum Phlegontis Tralliani 'libertum memini, Septimium Severum immoderatiſſime cum moreretur lætatum quod duos Antoninos pari 'imperio reipublicæ relinqueret (16). - - - *I remember 'I have read in Ælius Maurus, the freed-man of Phlegon 'Trallianus, that Septimius Severus, when he died, was 'extremely glad that he left two Antonini equal ſharers 'in the government of the empire.*' Andreas Schottus pretends, without any good reaſon for it, that there is a fault in theſe words, and that they ought to be read thus: *apud Ælii Hadriani libertum Phlegontem Trallianum* (17.) He wonders the critics had not yet made that correction: *Quod mendum magnos ævi noſtri criticos fugiſſe quos nihil pæne fugit, equidem miror: ſed & poſteris ſpicas relinquunt non inviti* (18). He had no reaſon to wonder at it, for it is not at all likely that Spartianus quoted Phlegon in that place. How can any one fancy that this freed-man of Hadrian outlived Severus, who died 74 years after Hadrian? See Voſſius, who made uſe of this chronological reaſon againſt Andreas Schottus (19). The Printers have been very faulty in that place (20).

[*C*] *It is thought the hiſtory of Hadrian, which was publiſhed under the name of Phlegon, was written by Hadrian himſelf.*] I have already made that obſervation in another place (21), but I repeat it here, and I ſhall add to it the very words of Spartianus; 'Famæ celebris 'Adrianus tam cupidus fuit, ut libros vitæ ſuæ ſcriptos 'à ſe libertis ſuis literatis dederit, jubens ut eos ſuis 'nominibus publicarent: nam Phlegontis libri Adriani eſſe dicuntur (22). - - - *Adrian was ſo greedy of 'fame, that he gave the books of his own life, written by himſelf, to his freed-men, ordering them to publiſh them under their names: for Phlegon's books are 'ſaid to be writ by Adrian.* Thoſe words have been taken in a wrong ſenſe by a German author, who ſays, 'Eos (*libros de mirabilibus, Olympiadibus, & longævis*) tanti æſtimavit Hadrianus, famæ percelebris 'cupidus, ut pro ſuis venditarit, ut collegere licet ex 'Ælio Spartiano *in vita Hadriani* (23). - - - *Adrian 'ſo much eſteemed thoſe books concerning wonderful things, 'the Olympiads, and long-lived perſons, and was ſo greedy 'of fame, that he gave out they were done by himſelf, 'as we may gather from Ælius Spartianus in the life 'of Adrian.*' How ſtrangely are the words of Spartianus perverted! This German author pretends, that Hadrian put his name to Phlegon's writings; and, in order to prove it, he quotes an author who ſays, that Hadrian cauſed the name of Phlegon to be put to his own work. Before I leave off I muſt obſerve a miſtake of Moreri: He has committed few faults that deſerve more than this to be mended. *Phlegon*, ſays he, *the emperor Adrian's freed-man, had a great ſhare in that prince's friendſhip, who publiſhed a hiſtory of his life under his name. He relates in his 14th book, that the fourth year of the* CCII*d Olympiad*, &c. The conſtruction of theſe words is ſo odd, that it is a very hard matter to underſtand them: they ſignify, according to the laws of our Grammarians, that Hadrian ſet his name to the hiſtory of his life which he publiſhed; but this is falſe and againſt Moreri's intention: Now thoſe words being contrary to the rules of Grammar, they may be underſtood as if that emperor had publiſhed Phlegon's hiſtory under Phlegon's name; or, as if he had publiſhed it under his own name. Here is another fault. The conſtruction of thoſe words is ſuch, that every reader will think, the event of that fourth year of the CCIId Olympiad, is to be found in the fourteenth book of the hiſtory publiſhed by Hadrian. The reader will be therefore deceived; for if he gets out of that ſnare, he will fall into another, he will think that Phlegon compoſed but one work.

[*D*] *It is pretended that he ſpoke of the darkneſs which happened during our Saviour's paſſion.*] As the book, which contained the words on which this pretenſion is grounded, is not extant, the beſt thing I can do is to ſet down the words of Euſebius: That author does not affirm, in a general way, that Phlegon ſaid this or that; he quotes his very words, Γράφει δὲ καὶ λέγει ὁ τὰς Ὀλυμπιάδας .... περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ιγ, ῥήμασιν αὐτοῖς τάδε. τῷ δ' ἔτει τῆς σβ Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐγένετο ἔκλειψις ἡλίου μεγίστη τῶν γνωρισμένων πρότερον. καὶ νὺξ ὥρα ς τῆς ἡμέρας ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἀστέρας ἐν οὐρανῷ φανῆναι. σεισμός τε μέγας κατὰ Βιθυνίαν γενόμενος τὰ πολλὰ Νικαίας κατεστρέψατο, καὶ ταῦτα ὁ δηλωθεὶς ἀνήρ (24). That is according to St. Jerom's tranſlation; 'Scribit vero ſuper his & Phlego qui Olympiadum egregius ſupputator eſt, in tertio decimo 'libro ita dicens: *quarto autem anno* CCII *olympiadis 'magna & excellens inter omnes quæ ante eam acciderant, defectio ſolis facta: dies hora ſexta in tenebroſam noctem verſus, ut ſtellæ in cœlo viſæ ſint, terræque motus in Bithynia Nicææ urbis multas ædes ſubverterit.* Hæc ſupradictus vir (25). - - - Phlegon 'likewiſe writes of theſe things, who was an excellent 'calculator of Olympiads: in the thirteenth book he 'thus ſpeaks: *But in the fourth year of the* CCII*d Olympiad there was a great eclipſe of the ſun, greater than 'any that had happened before: noon-day was turned into obſcure night, ſo that the ſtars were ſeen in the 'heavens, and an earthquake in Bithynia overthrew 'many houſes in the city of Nicæa.* Thus far the above-'mentioned writer.' You ſee that Euſebius pretends, that thoſe words of Phlegon relate to the prodigies which attended the crucifixion of Chriſt. Several other Fathers pretended the ſame thing; but it is a pretenſion liable to ſome difficulties, the greateſt whereof in my judgment, lies in this. No man was more fond than Phlegon to compile wonderful events, and to obſerve the ſupernatural circumſtances thereof (26.) How comes it then, that a man of ſuch a character did not obſerve what was moſt prodigious in the eclipſe, which, it is ſaid, he ſpeaks of, I mean, that it happened when the moon was in the full? This objection was, without doubt, propoſed; and, it is likely, that ſome found the beſt way to anſwer it was to aſſert, That Phlegon had ſet down that circumſtance. Φλέγων ἱστορεῖ ἐπὶ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ἐν πανσελήνῳ ἔκλειψιν ἡλίου γεγονέναι: *Narrat Phlegon imperante Tiberio Cæſare ſolis eclipſin plenilunio contigiſſe* (27). Thoſe words of Africanus are quoted by Syncellus, wherein it is poſitively ſaid, that Phlegon mentions an eclipſe of the ſun which happened under the empire of Tiberius at a full moon. But Phlegon ſaid no ſuch thing: if he had, Euſebius had not failed to mention it; and Origen would not have ſaid, that Phlegon omitted that circumſtance. *Et Phlegon quidam in Chronicis ſuis ſcripſit in principatu Tiberii Cæſaris factum: ſed non ſignificavit in luna plena factum* (28). If it be objected, that he does not ſay neither, that the eclipſe in queſtion happened at the new moon (29). I anſwer, that there was no need for him to ſay ſo, it being a thing to be ſuppoſed. The obſervation of Philoponus is of no uſe; it is a falſe gloſs: He pretends that Phlegon having mentioned an eclipſe not like thoſe that were obſerved till then, intimated the darkneſs which happened at the time of our Saviour's paſſion. Ἐγένετο ἡλίου ἔκλειψις οὐκ ἐγνωσμένων πρότερον ..... μὴ ἐγνῶσθαι τὴν τοιαύτην ἔκλειψιν τοῖς πρότερον χρόνοις. *Contigit eclipſis ſolis cujuſmodi nulla ante cognita eſt .... ſuperioribus non eſſe cognitam eclipſim hujuſmodi ....* (30.) That author ſhews too great an inclination

(16) Spartian. in Vita Severi, *cap. xx, pag. m.* 632, *Tom. i.*

(17) Andreas Schott. Obſervat. humanar. lib. ii, cap. xix, pag. 57.

(18) Ibid.

(19) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *lib. ii, cap. ii, pag.* 176.

(20) They have put in *Trullanus* twice, inſtead of *Trallianus*, and *anno* inſtead of *uno*. They have alſo left out ſeveral words.

(21) Above, citation (49), of the article ADRIAN.

(22) Spartian. in Adriano, *cap. xvi, pag. m.* 150.

(23) Tobias Magirus, Eponymolog. Critic. *pag.* 659, *Edit.* 1687.

(24) Euſeb. in Chron. ad Olymp. σβ, *pag.* 202, *Edit. Scaligeri Amſtel.* 1658.

(25) *See the ſame Edit. of Scalig. pag.* 158.

(26) Ex quo loco apparet quale fuerit argumentum librorum Olympiadum Phlegontis. Nam ſub quaque Olympiade, quid toto orbe geſtum eſſet recenſebat, prodigia præcipue & monſtra, reſque alias mirabiles memorabileſque. *Salmaſ. in Spart. pag.* 152, *Tom. i.*

(27) Africanus, apud Georgium Syncellum in Chronographia, citante Huetio, Demonſtr. Evangel. *Propoſ. III, pag. m.* 49.

(28) Orig. in Matthæum, *Tract. XXXV.*

(29) Atque neque interlunio factum id adnotavit. Quare rem in medio reliquit. *Huet. ibid.*

(30) Philoponus, de Mundi Creatione, *lib. ii, apud Huet. ibid.*

inſignificant things, and for having collected too many anſwers of the Oracles. That cenſure is ſo judicious, that it deſerves to be recited here [*E*].

clination to make people ſpeak according to the intereſt of his party, and at the coſt of ſincerity. Phlegon did not ſay in general, that the eclipſe we ſpeak of was of another nature than all thoſe that were ſeen before. Such a general way of ſpeaking would bear ſeveral interpretations, and might favour the cauſe of Philoponus. But Phlegon made uſe of a limited expreſſion; he ſaid, that eclipſe was greater than thoſe that were obſerved before. That expreſſion may be fully underſtood, by ſuppoſing that he mentions an eclipſe which happened during the Perigæum of the moon, and was a central one. Such an eclipſe happens ſo ſeldom, that an Hiſtorian who relates ſuch things according to the impreſſion they make upon the minds of men, and not according to the exact obſervations of an Aſtronomer, who has conſulted the ephemerides of all ages, might very well make the obſervation which Phlegon made. See what the French Hiſtorians obſerve about the eclipſe of the ſecond of October 1605.

Note it is not certain that Phlegon ſaid, that the earthquake which overthrew ſeveral houſes in the city of Nicea, happened at the time of the eclipſe. Perhaps he meant only, that thoſe two events were obſerved in the ſame year. If you will have it by any means that Phlegon denoted the ſame day, you lie open to another difficulty; for you muſt ſuppoſe that the light of the ſun diſappeared at noon in Bithynia, and conſequently that the darkneſs at the time of our Saviour's paſſion, was general over all the earth. That opinion was always oppoſed by ſome perſons who had no deſign to prejudice orthodoxy (31), and it is liable to a difficulty, the weight whereof is not eaſily born; for how can it be apprehended, that if that darkneſs had happened all over the world (32), Phlegon ſhould be the only man, or almoſt the only one (33) that mentioned it? We muſt not forget that Mr Huet (34) blames Kepler for aſſerting that Phlegon's eclipſe ought to be placed under the 24th of November, of the ſecond year of the CCIId Olympiad.

I come now to a critical obſervation of another kind. Euſebius pretends, that Phlegon writ this in the 13th book of his hiſtory. Origen ſays, that it was in the 13th or 14th (35). Maximus quotes only the 14th (36). Meurſius is of opinion, that the quotation of Maximus is the right one; for which he gives this reaſon: Phlegon, ſays he (37), had a mind that each book of his hiſtory ſhould contain fifteen Olympiads: but having not lived long enough to make an end of the laſt book, it contain'd only four Olympiads. It appears, by ſupputation, that he was to treat of the CCIId Olympiad in the fourteenth book, and therefore he mentioned the eclipſe in that book. The ſupputation of Meurſius is right, but his ſuppoſition is falſe; for that diſtribution of fifteen Olympiads for each book is a meer fancy, ſince Photius affirms (38), that the firſt five books of Phlegon reached to the CLXXVIIth Olympiad. It had been as neceſſary for Salmaſius, as for Meurſius, to remember that paſſage of Photius; he fancied, for want of knowing it, that Phlegon did ſo divide his work, that the eleven firſt books contained each fourteen Olympiads, and the five laſt contained each fifteen (39). This is all falſe; but here is a reaſonable conjecture. Phlegon divided that hiſtory into ſixteen parts, almoſt equal: he found materials for it more and more, as he came nearer his own time; and therefore every one of his laſt books contained but a ſmall number of Olympiads, whereas the five firſt contained 177. Thus Mezerai's chronological abridgment contains in the firſt volume the reigns of 31 kings, and the ſpace of 518 years, and only the reign of Henry IV in the laſt volume (40). The like obſervation may be made about all the hiſtories of a nation divided into books (41). The firſt contain more years than the laſt. If Salmaſius had conſidered this, he had not undertaken to correct a paſſage of Stephanus Byzantinus. ‘In voce Ὀλύμπιον, (42), ſays he (43), citat (Stephanus) Phlegontem *ἐν πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ* Ὀλυμπιάδων: in quo niſi fallor mendoſæ ſunt editiones, legendum enim *ἐν ἕκτῳ καὶ δεκάτῳ* Ὀλυμπιάδων. Cujus emendationis hæc ratio eſt. Meminerat eo libro Phlegon olympii ab Hadriano vel potius ſumptibus Hadriani ab Athenienſibus ædificati. Atqui ejus rei mentionem non niſi ultimo libro, id eſt decimo ſexto facere poterat Phlegon. Nec enim ultra tempora Hadriani olympiadas ſuas contexuit. - - - *Under the word Olympion, Stephanus cites Phlegon in the fifteenth book of his Olympiads: wherein, if I miſtake not, the editions are faulty, for it ſhould be read the ſixteenth book. The reaſon of which amendment is this. Phlegon had mentioned in that book that Olympeium was built by Hadrian, or rather by the Athenians, at the expence of Hadrian. But Phlegon could mention it only in the laſt book, viz. the ſixteenth. For his Olympiads go no further than the time of Adrian.*’ This critical obſervation is grounded upon two inſignificant reaſons; the firſt is, that Phlegon could not ſpeak of a building erected at the charges of the emperor Hadrian, but in the book which contained the Olympiads belonging to the reign of that emperor. The ſecond is, that he writ the hiſtory of thoſe Olympiads only in his laſt book. If you deſire to know the falſity of the firſt reaſon, you need only conſider, that the beſt annaliſts are apt to make ſome incidental obſervations, wherein they relate both what happened before, and what came to paſs ſince. If they mention the burning of a town, they do not ſcruple to obſerve, that it was founded by ſuch a one, who flouriſhed at ſuch a time, and to ſay, by way of anticipation, that it was rebuilt thirty years after. They are pleaſed with thoſe anticipations, eſpecially when they ſerve to praiſe the reigning prince. It may very well be, therefore, that Phlegon ſpoke of an Olympeium under an Olympiad prior to the empire of Hadrian, his maſter and benefactor; for treating of a thing which happened in the iſle of Delos, before the reign of that prince, he might ſay, that the place where it happened, received afterwards a great honour, ſeeing the Athenians built there an edifice, which they called Hadrian's new Athens (44), becauſe that emperor furniſhed them with the money they wanted. It is very likely, that he took hold of every occaſion that offered to praiſe that prince, and ſpoke of him *in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon*; and therefore the reaſon alledged by Salmaſius is not good. Nevertheleſs I will not deny that Phlegon mentioned the conſtruction of that building, under the very ſame year that it was built; but this does not prove, that he ſpoke of it in his laſt book. In all likelihood he enlarged more upon the reign of Hadrian, than upon the time that went before. It is the conſtant practice of all hiſtorians. It is therefore likely, that his fifteenth and ſixteenth books contained only the Olympiads of Adrian's reign; and ſo the ſecond reaſon of Salmaſius is not better than the other. He might be further criticiſed, becauſe he affirms, that Phlegon's hiſtory did not reach farther than the reign of that emperor; yet Father Pagi (45), and ſome other learned men maintain, that the whole CCXXIXth Olympiad was in it; from whence it follows, that it contained alſo the firſt four years of the empire of Antoninus.

[*E*] *That cenſure of Photius is ſo judicious, that it deſerves to be recited here.*] Here it is intire. Ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν οὔτε λίαν χαμαιπετὴς, οὔτε τὸν ἀττικὸν ἐς τὸ ἀκριβὲς διασώζων χαρακτῆρα· ἄλλως τε δὲ καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰς Ὀλυμπιάδας, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς τῶν ἀγωνισμάτων ὀνόματα, καὶ τὰς πράξεις, καὶ ἡ περὶ τοὺς χρεσμοὺς ἄκαιρος φιλοπονία τε καὶ φιλοτιμία, εἰς κόρον ἀπάγουσα τὸν ἀκροατὴν, καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο τῶν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ προκύπτειν συγχωροῦσα, ἀηδῆ τε σχεδὸν τὸν λόγον δεικνύει, καὶ χάριτος οὐδὲν ἔχειν παρατίθησι. χρησμοῖς δὲ παντοίοις ἐς ὑπερβολὴν ἐστὶ κεχρημένος. Auctoris ſtylus neque omnino humi ſerpit, neque Atticum uſquequaque characterem ſervat. Alioquin illa nimis putida ipſius accuratio atque diligentia in Olympiadibus percenſendis ſingulorumque certaminum nominibus, & rebus geſtis, atque ipſis etiam oraculis referendis, non tædium modo lectori adfert, dum per eam reliqua omnia in hoc libro obteguntur, neque apparere ſinuntur: verumetiam injucundum propemodum reddit ſermonem, quique gratiæ nihil habere judicetur. Et vero omnis generis Deorum reſponſa ſine modo inculcat (46). - - - *The author, in his ſtile, is neither altogether mean, nor does he every where keep up to the Attic way of writing. But otherwiſe, his too much affected accuracy and care in reckoning the Olympiads, and in relating names, facts, and even the very oracles themſelves, is not only tedious*

(31) Vid. Anton. Bynæum, de morte Chriſti, lib. v, pag. 405, & ſeq.

(32) Vid. Voſſ. Harm. Evang. lib. ii, cap. x, pag. 322.

(33) I uſe that reſtriction becauſe Mr Huet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 51, ſays, that it was mentioned likewiſe by the Hiſtorian Tallus, to which he adds the teſtimony of the Chineſe as it is to be found in the Hiſtory of China, written by Hadrian Greſſon.

(34) Huet. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 49.

(35) Orig. cont. Celſ. *lib. ii.*

(36) Max. Schol. ad Epiſt. VII, Dionyſ. Areopag.

(37) Meurſ. Not. ad Phlegont. pag. 170.

(38) Phot. ubi ſupra.

(39) Salmaſ. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 151.

(40) Of the Dutch edition divided into ſix volumes in 12mo.

(41) See the Hiſt. of France, written by Gaguin, Paul Æmilius, &c.

(42) It ſhould be Ὀλυμπίειον.

(43) Salmaſ. ubi ſupra.

(44) Steph. Byzant. voc. Ὀλυμπίειον.

(45) Pagi againſt Baronius, *ad ann.* 136, *num.* 4.

(46) Phot. Bibl. num. 97, pag. 268.

to the reader, whilſt all other things in the book are covered, and not ſuffered to appear; but alſo the language is thereby rendered unpleaſant and ungraceful. And indeed he inculcates without meaſure the anſwers of the gods of every kind.

PHLEGYAS, ſon of the god Mars and Chryſe [*A*], reigned in a diſtrict of Bœotia after the death of Eteocles. This diſtrict which was called *Andreis*, was from him named *Phlegyantis*. He built there a city, to which he gave his own name. He drew thither the braveſt and moſt intrepid warriors of all Greece (*a*): and as he was the moſt valiant man of his time, wherever he went to make incurſions, he never returned without carrying off the corn, cattle, and every thing elſe (*b*). He took his meaſures exceeding well: for, having had a deſign, for inſtance, to ravage Peloponneſus, he went firſt as a traveller to view the ſituation of the country, and to know what number of men could be raiſed to ſerve in that expedition. It is ſaid that his daughter Coronis, who accompanied him, was at that time delivered of Æſculapius near Epidaurus (*c*). The inhabitants of the country where he reigned were called Phlegyans, and continued the way of life which he had led [*B*]. As he left no children, one of his couſins ſucceeded him (*d*) [*C*]. The Poets feigned, that having burnt the temple of Delphos to be revenged on Apollo for getting his daughter Coronis with child, he was caſt down to hell, and expoſed to a very grievous torment [*D*], after Apollo had ſhot him dead with arrows (*e*). Some ſay that Ixion was his ſon (*f*), and others that he was his brother (*g*). I do not find in any ancient author that Phlegyas was king of the Lapithæ in Theſſaly, as Charles Stephens, Lloyd, Hofman, and Moreri, affirm.

[*A*] *He was the ſon of Mars and Chryſe.*] Andreus the ſon of the River Peneus was the firſt that ſettled in a province of Bœotia, which upon his account was called Andreis. He married a daughter of Leucon, the ſon of Athamas, and by her had a ſon named Eteocles who ſucceeded him, and who granted a part of the country to Halmus the ſon of Siſyphus (1). This Eteocles leaving no children, Phlegyas, the ſon of Chryſe, daughter to Halmus, ſucceeded him (2).

[*B*] *The Phlegyans continued the way of life which he had led.*] Homer has mentioned them as a people extremely courageous (3), inſolent, outrageous, and impious (4). They uſed to make incurſions into the neighbouring countries, and carry off whatever they were able, and even undertook to pillage the temple of Delphos (5). Philammon marched againſt them with a choice body of the Argians, and was killed in the engagement, both he and the braveſt of his troops. The impiety and violence of the Phlegyans did not go unpuniſhed: many of them periſhed by lightning and earthquakes, and the reſt were taken off by the plague, excepting a few who retired into Phocis (6). Servius, upon the teſtimony of Euphorion, affirms, that the Phlegyans inhabited an iſland which Neptune, provoked at their ſacrileges, ſtruck with his trident and deſtroyed (7). The ſcholiaſt on Homer relates upon the authority of Pherecydes, that the Phlegyans, otherwiſe called Gortynians (8), an atheiſtical people in Phocis, practiſed a thouſand violences againſt their neighbours, that they burnt the temple of Delphos; that after the death of Amphion and Zethus, who had hindered them from inſulting the city of Thebes, they took it; and that preparing to commit new acts of injuſtice, they were exterminated by Apollo (9). We muſt not forget what Ovid ſays, that Ceyx intending to conſult the Oracle was forced to go to Claros, becauſe the impious Phorbas with the Phlegyans hindered him from going to that of Delphos.

> Ad Clarium parat ire Deum: nam templa profanus
> Invia cum Phlegyis faciebat Delphica Phorbas (10).

> *He purpoſes to ſeek the Clarian god,*
> *Avoiding Delphi, his more fam'd abode,*
> *Since Phlegyan robbers made unſafe the road.*

According to Philoſtratus (11), the Phlegyans had choſen Phorbas to be their king, both upon the account of his high ſtature, and becauſe he ſurpaſſed all in cruelty. He ſtopped all thoſe that were going to Delphos, and ſent to the Phlegyans the old men and children; he fought with the young men and beat them, and then cut off their heads: but he was conquered and killed by Apollo.

It is difficult to diſtinguiſh this Phorbas amongſt all thoſe, that have had that name. Farnaby (12) will have it, that he is the Phorbas, ſon of Lapitha, mentioned by Pauſanias (13): but produces no proof Vigenere is very much embaraſſed on this head (14). I do not wonder at it, the ſubject is too intricate. We find in Pauſanias a Phorbas, who commanded in Athens before the Olympiads (15): a Phorbas, ſon of Argus and father of Triopus (16): a Phorbas, ſon of Triopus and father of Pellen (17): and the Phorbas, who, according to Farnaby' was king of the Phlegyans. There was a Phorbas, ſon of Triopus, that deſtroyed the ſerpents which the iſle of Rhodes abounded with (18). Homer mentions a Phorbas ſon of Triopus (19).

[*C*] *One of his couſins ſucceeded him.*] *viz.* Chryſes the ſon of Neptune and Chryſogenea, daughter to Halmus and ſiſter to Phlegyas's mother. The ſon and ſucceſſor of this Chryſes was named Minyas, and therefore his ſubjects were called Minyans, and they were ſtill called ſo in the time of Pauſanias. It is true that under the reign of Orchomenus, the ſon of Chryſes, they were named Orchomenians: but they kept the ſirname of Minyans, and were thereby diſtinguiſhed from the Orchomenians in Arcadia (20). Note that the Argonauts were commonly ſirnamed Minyans, becauſe ſeveral of them were deſcended from Minyas on the mother's ſide (21): other reaſons are given for it. See Lloyd upon the word *Minyæ*, and Munckerus in his notes upon Hyginus (22).

[*D*] *He was caſt down into Hell, and expoſed to a very grievous torment*] Theſe words of Virgil are ambiguous,

> - - - Sedet, æternumque ſedebit
> Infelix Theſeus, Phlegyaſque miſerrimus omnes
> Admonet & magna teſtatur voce per umbras
> Diſcite juſtitiam moniti & non temnere divos (23).

> *Unhappy Theſeus, damn'd for ever there,*
> *Is fix'd by fate on his eternal chair.*
> *There wretched Phlegyas warns the world with cries*
> *Could warning make the world more juſt and wiſe,*
> *Learn righteouſneſs and dread th' avenging deities.*
> DRYDEN.

It is not certain whether Phlegyas be the nominative ſingular, or the accuſative plural (24). In the latter caſe, the paſſage of Virgil is no proof of my text: but here are other paſſages without any ambiguity.

> - - - - Diſcumbitur altis
> Porticibus: ſua cuique furens feſtinaque conjunx
> Adjacet. Inferni qualis ſub nocte barathri
> Adcubat attonitum Phlegyan & Theſea juxta
> Tiſiphone, ſævaſque dapes & pocula libat,
> (Tormenti genus) & nigris amplectitur hydris (25).

You ſee there that the fury Tiſiphone ſat by the victuals, which was preſented to Theſeus and Phlegyas, and that ſhe firſt taſted of it, to inſpire them with an horror and averſion to it, however hungry they might be. Statius has expreſſed it ſtill more clearly:

> - - - Ultrix

(*a*) Ex Pauſania, *lib. ix, cap. xxxvi.*

(*b*) Idem, *lib. ii, cap. xxvi, pag. m.* 170.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Idem, *lib. ix, cap. xxxvi.*

(*e*) Servius, in Æneid. lib. vi, ver. 618.

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) Strabo, lib. ix, pag. 304.

(1) Pauſan. lib. ix, cap. xxxiv.

(2) Ibid. cap. xxxvi.

(3) Homer. Iliad. lib. xiii, ver. 302.

(4) Idem, Hymno in Apoll. pag. m. 786.

(5) Pauſan. lib. ix, cap. xxxvi.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Servius, in Æneid. lib. vi, ver. 618.

(8) Strabo, *lib. ix, pag.* 304, obſerves, that the Gyrtonians lived about Peneus and Peleus, and that antiently they had been called Phlegyans. *Stephanus Byzantinus, voce* Γύρτων, ſays, that Gyrton, a town in Theſſaly, was ſo named from Gyrton the brother of Phlegyas.

(9) Schol. Homeri, in Iliad. lib. xiii, ver. 302.

(10) Ovid. Metam. lib. xi, ver. 413.

(11) Philoſtr. in the picture of the Phlegyans.

(12) In Ovid. Metam. lib. xi, ver. 413.

(13) *Lib. v, cap. i, pag. m.* 377.

(14) Vigener. on Philiſtr. in the picture of the Phlegyans, *pag. m.* 815.

(15) Pauſan. *lib. vi, cap. xix.*

(16) Idem, lib. ii, cap. xvi.

(17) Id. lib. vii, cap. xxvi, pag. 593.

(18) Hygin. in Aſtronom. *lib. i, cap. xiv. See* Meurſius, in Rhodo, *lib. i, cap. v, pag.* 12, *&* 13.

(19) Homer. Hymno in Apollin. *pag. m.* 782.

(20) Ex Pauſan. lib. ix, cap. xxxvi.

(21) *See* Apollonius, *and his* Scholiaſt, Argonaut. *lib. i, ver.* 229.

(22) Cap. xiv, pag. 44.

(23) Virgil. Æneid. lib. vi, ver. 617.

(24) *See* Servius, in Æneid. *lib. vi, ver.* 618.

(25) Valerius Flaccus, Argonaut. *lib. ii, ver.* 190.

- - - Ultrix tibi torva Megæræ
Jejunum Phlegyam ſubter cava ſaxa jacentem
Æterno premit accubitu, dapibuſque profanis
Inſtimulat: ſed miſta famem faſtidia vincunt.
Adſis ô memor hoſpitii, Junoniaque Arva (26).

Wrinkled Megæra is thy miniſter
Tormenting hungry Phlegyas, who does fear
The ever falling ſtone; ſhe proffers meat
To's empty ſtomach, but he loaths to eat.
Great GOD be preſent, think upon the place
That entertain'd thee; ſhew a ſmiling face
To Juno's land. STEPHENS.

Virgil has finely deſcribed this kind of puniſhment; but he does not expreſsly ſay, that it was inflicted on Phlegyas: he only names Ixion and Pirithous (27).

PHRÆA (*a*) (JOHN) a learned Engliſhman, taught the *Belles Lettres* in Italy with great reputation [*A*]. He tranſlated out of Greek into Latin ſome treatiſes of Xenophon, and ſome books of Diodorus Siculus (*b*). He had tranſlated before that a diſcourſe of Syneſius (*c*). It was his firſt eſſay [*B*]. Pope Paul II was ſo well pleaſed with the tranſlation which that learned Engliſhman dedicated to him, that he intended to make him biſhop of Bath (*d*), but death permitted not John Phræa to enjoy that favour. He died in the year 1465 [*C*], before he was inſtalled (*e*). It was thought that he was poiſoned by his competitor (*f*).

Phræa was Fellow of Baliol-College in Oxford (*g*). It is ſaid that Poggius appropriated to himſelf Phræa's tranſlation of Diodorus Siculus [*D*].

[*A*] *He taught the Belles Lettres in Italy with great reputation.*] This I find in a dedicatory epiſtle of Beatus Rhenanus (1): 'Is Joannes Phræa, *ſays he,* 'quod non ſine publico Britanniæ, quam nunc Angliam vocant, honore dixerim, utramque linguam 'egregie percalluit, bonas literas ſumma cum laude 'non paucos annos, idque in Italia profeſſus. - - - - '*This John Phræa perfectly underſtood both languages,* '*which I mention to the public honour of Britain, now* '*called England, and for many years he taught the Belles* '*Lettres in Italy with great reputation.*' Obſerve that he calls him Phræa, and not Phreas, or Phreus, as Voſſius calls him (2). He calls himſelf Joannes Phræa, in the title of a book which I am going to ſpeak of.

[*B*] *The tranſlation of a diſcourſe of Syneſius, was his firſt eſſay.*] He ſays, in his epiſtle dedicatory, that he would not follow the method of other tranſlators. They begin with ſome authors that are not difficult; and when time and labour have increaſed their ſtrength, they undertake more difficult tranſlations. He does not blame them for it; but he declares, that he thought he ſhould do well to take quite another way, and to begin with Syneſius, one of the moſt obſcure writers that is. Every body, ſays he, ought to know what is proper for him: and Syneſius muſt needs be a difficult author, ſince none of the learned men, who have tranſlated out of Greek into Latin, undertook to tranſlate him. Here are his words. 'Nos vero 'etſi nonnullis perſuaſi rationibus, quas nunc conſulto 'præterire libet, converſum ordinem magis ad doctrinam conducere arbitramur: ea tamen modeſtia hanc 'noſtram defenſamus opinionem, ut neque mihi ipſi 'arrogare, neque quod ſecus alii ſenſerint, id vitio 'illis dare velim. Suis enim quiſque in rebus, quid 'magis, quidve minus ſibi conducat, explorator eſt, '& judex optimus. Itaque mihi in hoc à reliquis 'diſſentienti, à Syneſio ſummo Philoſopho, autoreque 'graviſſimo, interpretationis initium auſpicari placuit. 'quos autem hic ſcripſit libros, tot ac tantis obſtructi 'ſunt difficultatibus, ut haud ſciam ſi qua alia apud 'Græcos extent volumina, quæ cum his aut ſententiarum perplexitate, aut obſcuritate verborum auſim 'conferre. Cujus profecto rei argumentum eſt non 'mediocre, quod in tanto numero interpretum, quos 'noſtra, quoſve prior ætas vidit, nemo unquam inventus ſit, quod ſciam, qui hujus autoris opus aliquod attigerit (3). - - - - *But tho' I think it con*'*duces more to learning to invert the common method,* '*being perſuaded thereto by ſeveral reaſons, which I now* '*purpoſely omit: yet I would defend this my opinion with* '*ſuch modeſty, as neither to take too much upon myſelf,* '*nor to blame others for their different ſentiments. Every* '*one is the beſt judge, in his own affairs, of what is* '*proper, or not proper for him to do. And therefore I* '*thought fit, though in this I differ from others, to* '*begin the work of tranſlating with Syneſius, a very* '*great Philoſopher, and a very grave author. The books* '*he wrote abound with ſo many, and ſo great difficulties,* '*that I do not know whether there be any Greek writings* '*to be compared with them, either for intricacy of* '*thoughts, or obſcurity of words. This evidently appears* '*by conſidering, that amongſt ſuch a vaſt number of* '*tranſlators, in our own, or the former age, there is not* '*one, that I know of, who undertook any of this author's* '*works.*' Amongſt the writings of Syneſius, Phræa pitched upon his encomium of baldneſs to tranſlate it. Beatus Rhenanus publiſhed that tranſlation at Baſil in the year 1515, to which he added a commentary. It is not mentioned by Father Labbe, nor by Mr du Pin.

[*C*] *He died in the year* 1465.] It is ſtrange that Moreri having faithfully ſet down that date (4), ſhould ſay, notwithſtanding that Phræas *lived in the XIVth century.*

[*D*] *It is ſaid that Poggius appropriated to himſelf Phræa's tranſlation of Diodorus Siculus.*] Read theſe words: '*Burton hiſt. linguæ Gr. p.* 55. ait Johannem 'Phræam Anglum Colleg. Baliolenſis Socium Diodori '6, libros vertiſſe, illamque verſionem Poggium nactum fuiſſe, & pro ſuo in publicum extruſiſſe, idque 'teſtari quoque *Brian Twyn. Antiq. Oxon.* l. 3. (5). '*Burton, in his hiſtory of the Greek tongue, ſays, that* '*John Phræa, an Engliſhman, fellow of Baliol-college,* '*tranſlated ſix books of Diodorus Siculus, and that Pog*'*gius having got that tranſlation, publiſhed it under his* '*own name, and that this is atteſted likewiſe by* Brian 'Twin. Antiq. Oxon. l. 3.'

PIASECKI (PAUL) in Latin, *Piaſecius*, biſhop of Premiſlia in Poland, lived in the XVIIth century. He publiſhed in 1646 *a fine Hiſtory of what paſſed in the kingdom* of Poland *from Stephen Batthory to that year* (*a*). He *accidentally inſerted, in it the principal affairs of Chriſtendom.* Mr le Laboureur, of whom I have borrowed thoſe words, will tell us what he thought of that work [*A*].

[*A*] *Mr le Leboureur . . . . will tell us . . . what he thought of that work.*] He ſays that prelate was not ſufficiently informed of ſome affairs of France: *Abating that*, ſays he (1), *it is a piece worthy of the labour of a man of his rank; for he is very impartial, and has ſo generous an abhorrence of flattery, that he does no more ſpare the faults of the late king* (2), *than thoſe of his ſon who reigns at preſent, whom he never praiſes without having a good reaſon for it. He cenſures the ambition of the houſe of Auſtria; he blames the injuſtice of their proceedings, and praiſes, with great ingenuity, the reaſon of our taking up arms, and the alliances we made, to oppoſe the deſign they had upon all the ſtates of Europe.* Here is the judgment which a German author gives on that Hiſtory: 'Quæ noſtram ætatem ſpectant, ea 'Paulus PIASECIUS in *Chronicis geſtorum in* '*Europa ſingularium* luculentiùs ſubminiſtrat; negant 'tamen PIASCECIO in omnibus ſecurè fidem 'adhiberi aliqui, & certum eſt, non eſſe ipſum ab 'omni in hiſtoria errore immunem (3). - - - *What re*'*lates to our own age is excellently well written by Paul* '*PIASECKI, in his chronicle of the Affairs of* '*Europe:*

---

(26) Stat. Theb. *lib.* i, *ſub fin. ver.* 712, *pag. m.* 141. See Barthius on this paſſage.

(27) Quid memorem Lapithas Ixiona Pirithoumque, &c. *Virgil. Æneid. lib. vi, ver.* 601.

(*a*) See remark [*A*].

(*b*) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 634.

(*c*) The encomium of baldneſs.

(*d*) In England.

(*e*) Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Veneno à competitore extinctum fuiſſe ſuſpicio erat. *Ibid.*

(*g*) See the remark [*D*].

(1) *Prefixed to the tranſlation of the* Encomium Calvitiei. *See remark* [*B*].

(2) Voſſ. de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 634.

(3) Jo. Phræa, in Epiſt. Dedicat. Encomii Calvitiei.

(4) There is a tranſpoſition of numbers in the Dutch edition. It ſhould be 1465, inſtead of 1456.

(5) Henr. à Sypeſtein, in Epiſtola de Plagiariis, *pag.* 70, *at the end of Almeloveen's* Amœnitates Theologico-Philologicæ.

(*a*) Le Laboureur, A Relation of the Queen of Poland's Journey, *Part ii, pag.* 117.

(1) Le Laboureur, *ubi ſupra.* That relation was written in the year 1646.

(2) That is, of the king of Poland.

(3) Maurit. de Princip. Jur. Publ. c. ii, n. 25, apud Magirum, Eponymolog. *pag. m.* 661.

'*Europe: but ſome ſay he is not entirely to be relied on 'in all things, and it is certain he is not without faults 'in his hiſtory.*' Piaſecki's hiſtory has been re-printed at Amſterdam from the Poliſh edition. Mr Amelot de la Houſſaie quotes it, in his notes upon cardinal d'Oſſat's letters, and elſe-where, which is a proof that he eſteems it.

PICARDS. That name was given to the followers of a certain man, who, about the beginning of the XVth century, over-ſtretched the error of the Adamites, with reſpect to nakedneſs. His name was Picard: he went from Flanders into Germany, and as far as Bohemia. It has been ſaid that he deceived the people with juggling tricks. However it be, he had in a little time a great number of followers, both men and women. He commanded them to go always naked: which was more than was practiſed by the Adamites mentioned by St Epiphanius, who were contented to ſtrip themſelves naked in their aſſemblies. He ſtyled himſelf the Son of God, and pretended that he was ſent into the world by his father, as a new Adam, to reſtore the law of nature, which he ſaid did chiefly conſiſt in two things, viz. the community of women, and the nakedneſs of all the parts of the body (a). He fortified himſelf in an iſland of the river Luſmik, ſeven leagues from Thabor, the place of arms of the famous Ziſca. It happened unluckily for him, that forty of his followers having committed great diſorders, drew the forces of that famous General upon the whole crew. Thoſe forty Adamites being gone upon a party, plundered ſome country-houſes, and killed above 200 people. Whereupon Ziſca (b) cauſed the iſland to be attacked, made himſelf maſter of it, and put all the Picards to the ſword, except two [*A*], whoſe lives he ſaved, that he might know from them what was their religion. It is ſaid, that though there was no marriages amongſt them, yet no man lay with a woman without the permiſſion of the head of the ſect. Any one, who had an inclination for a woman, was obliged to take her by the hand, and to bring her before Picard, to whom he ſaid, *my ſpirit is grown hot for this woman* (c). Picard anſwered him, *go increaſe and multiply*. One of the great principles of that ſect was, that they were the only free perſons in the world: all other men being ſlaves, eſpecially when they hid their privy-parts. This is what ſome women of that ſect meant, whom a Bohemian lord kept priſoners for ſome time. They ſaid that thoſe who wore cloaths, eſpecially thoſe who wore breeches, ought not to be accounted free. They were brought to bed in priſon; and having been condemned to be burnt with their huſbands, they ſuffered that puniſhment laughing and ſinging (d). There have been ſome extravagant men among the Anabaptiſts, who had a mind to renew the hereſy of the Picards, with reſpect to nakedneſs [*B*]. That ſort of men have been as much abhorred by the Proteſtants, as by the Catholics, as it is acknowledged by cardinal Hoſius (e). Nevertheleſs, the brethren of Bohemia were called *Picards* [*C*], though they had nothing common

(a) Varillas, the Hiſt. of Wicklefianiſm, *Part ii, pag.* 43, *and* Hiſt. of Hereſy, *lib. ii, ad ann.* 1420.

(b) John Slechta, in a letter to Eraſmus in the year 1519 (it is the 20th of the 14th book of Eraſmus's Letters) ſays, that Picard communicated his errors to Ziſca, and his whole army.

(c) In hanc ſpiritus meus concaluit.

(d) Ex Ænea Silvio, de Origine Bohemor. cap. xli.

(e) Lib. de utriuſque ſpeciei commun. apud Prateol. *voce* Pikardi.

[*A*] *Except two.*] Mr Varillas pretends, that there was not one man ſaved; but that the *women who proved to be big with child* were ſaved (1). He adds, *that after they were delivered, they refuſed to renounce the licentiouſneſs of their ſect, and ſo they were condemned to be burnt, and threw themſelves into the fire laughing*. I do not know why he does not keep to the account which Æneas Silvius gives, who ſays that Ziſca gave quarter only to two men, 'Adamitas 'omnes gladio delevit, duobus tantum reſervatis, ex 'quibus gentis ſuperſtitionem cognoſceret. - - - - *He 'put all the Adamites to the ſword except two, by whom 'he might be informed of the ſuperſtition of the ſect.*' Perhaps he had a mind to rectify that narrative by another paſſage of the ſame Hiſtorian, who ſpeaks of ſome women of that ſect, who lay-in in priſon, and then endured the puniſhment of fire with joy. But that paſſage cannot juſtify Mr Varillas, for we ſee that thoſe women were in priſon with their huſbands, and condemned to be burnt with them. To adjuſt all the parts of that piece, we muſt ſuppoſe either that all the Adamites were not in the iſland that was forced by Ziſca, or that ſome of them were impriſoned before the ſlaughter. If thoſe two ſuppoſitions be denied, it is not true that he ſaved only two Adamites. For the reſt, the Proteſtants have praiſed Ziſca very much for that action (2).

[*B*] *There have been ſome extravagant men amongſt the Anabaptiſts, who had a mind to renew . . . nakedneſs.*] I have touched upon this in the article of the ADAMITES, and quoted Lindanus, an author of no great authority. But here is a much more credible author, *viz.* Lambertus Hortenſius (3) in his relation of the tumults of the Anabaptiſts, dedicated to the magiſtrates of Amſterdam, whilſt the memory of thoſe things were ſtill freſh. He ſays, that on the thirteenth of February, 1535, ſeven men and five women met at Amſterdam, in the houſe of John Sibert. One of thoſe men, whoſe name was Theodoret Sartor, pretended to be a prophet; he lay upon the ground to pray to God, and having made an end of his prayer, he told one of his brethren, that he had ſeen God in his majeſty; that he had ſpoken to him; that he had deſcended from Heaven into Hell, and that he knew the day of judgment was near at hand. They met again the ſame day, and after they had ſpent four hours in prayer and explications, the Prophet, all of a ſudden, pulls off his helmet and his armour, and throws them into the fire with the reſt of his arms, and ſhews himſelf naked to all the company. He bids them all to do the like: every one obeys ſo exactly, that they did not ſo much as leave a ribbon upon their heads to keep their hair tied. They throw every thing into the fire, as a burnt-offering unto the Lord. Then the prophet bids them follow him, and do as he does. They go out all of them, and run into the ſtreets with moſt horrid cries, *Væ, væ, væ, divina vindicta, divina vindicta, divina vindicta!* Wo, wo, wo, divine vengeance, divine vengeance, divine vengeance! The people being frightened with ſuch howlings, think that the town is taken by the enemy, and take up their arms. The naked crew are apprehended, and brought before the judges: they ſcorn to put on the cloaths that are offered them. In the mean time the houſe, from which that infamous proceſſion ſet out, was burning, and they had much ado to put out the fire. On the twenty-eighth of March the ſeven men were put to death; and nine of their accomplices were puniſhed in the ſame manner ſome few days after. *Gui de Bres*, a miniſter, relates that hiſtory in a book againſt the Anabaptiſts, printed in 1565 (4). He did not underſtand well the Roman way of dating, *tertio Id. Februarii, quinto Kal. Mart.* which Hortenſius makes uſe of; for he renders it *the third of February*, and *the fifth of March*. He gives a faithful account of the reſt, only he ſays that thoſe men were put to the rack, and beaten. The Latin original does not mention the rack, and the word *percutiuntur* ſignifies a capital puniſhment.

[*C*] *The brethren of Bohemia were called Picards.*] Such they called all thoſe who oppoſed Popery with the greateſt vigour in Bohemia: for Sleidan divides the

(1) Varillas, ubi ſupra.

(2) See du Pleſſis Mornai, in his Myſtery of Iniquity, *pag.* 512, and Rivetus, Remarks on the Anſwer to the Myſtery of Iniquity, *Part ii, pag.* 594.

(3) He was rector of the college of Naërden, his book was printed at Baſil in 1548.

(4) *Intituled*, The Root, Spring, and Foundation, of the Anabaptiſts of our time. *See alſo the Hiſt. of the Anabaptiſts, printed at Amſterdam in the year* 1695, *pag.* 96, *& ſeq. There is a tranſpoſition of numbers, pag.* 95, *viz. the year* 1553, *inſtead of* 1535.

common with thoſe that were exterminated by Ziſca. Thoſe who pretend that Tandemus revived the hereſy of the Adamites in the XIIth century, as Picard revived it in the XVth (*f*), are not exact; for it is not true that Tandemus (*g*) commanded his followers to wear no cloaths. They have more reaſon to ſay ſo of the Turlupins, as I ſhall ſhew in its proper place.

(*f*) Moreri in the article of the Adamites.

(*g*) See his article.

the Bohemians in this manner: ‘Ad Bohemos quod attinet, ſic habet. A morte Joannis Huſſi in tres potiſſimum ſectas diviſus eſt populus. Una eſt eorum, qui Pontificem Romanum ut Eccleſiæ Principem, & Chriſti Vicarium agnoſcunt, altera eorum qui cœnam Domini percipiunt integram, & in Miſſis nonnulla recitant lingua populari; cæteris autem in rebus à Pontificiis nihil differunt: tertia eſt eorum qui dicuntur Picardi; Pontificem hi Romanum & clientelam ejus omnem appellant Antichriſtum, & meretricem illam in Apocalypſi depictam; præter biblica ſcripta nihil recipiunt; Sacerdotes & Epiſcopos ſibi deligunt ipſi; matrimonio nemini interdicunt; mortuis nullas faciunt exequias; dies feſtos & ceremonias habent perpaucas (5). - - - *What concerns the Bohemians is as follows. After the death of John Huſs they were divided chiefly into three ſects. One of them acknowledges the Pope of Rome, as head of the church, and vicar of* CHRIST. *Another partakes of the Lord's-Supper in both kinds, and in that ſervice they recite ſome things in the vulgar-tongue: but in other reſpects they do not differ from the Papiſts: the third ſect is named Picards; they call the Pope, and all that adhere to him Antichriſt, and the Whore, deſcribed in the Revelation: they receive nothing beſides the ſcriptures: they chuſe their own biſhops and prieſts, they forbid none to marry, they perform no funeral rites, and have very few feſtivals and ceremonies.*’ But Rudigerus, in his hiſtory of the brethren of Bohemia, rejects (6) the name of Picards that was impoſed upon them, and conjectures that it was given them by their enemies, *to diſhonour them by ſo infamous a title, as if we had been only*, ſays he, *the wretched remains of the leud Picard, who renewing the ancient hereſy of the Adamites, introduced nakedneſs and infamous actions*. This conjecture is probable enough.

(5) Sleid. *lib. iii. See alſo* Thuan. *lib. vi, and the letter of John Slechta among thoſe of Eraſmus, lib. xiv, pag.* 675.

(6) *Pag.* 148.

PICCOLOMINI (ALEXANDER) archbiſhop of Patras, coadjutor of Siena, deſerves to be reckoned among the illuſtrious men of the XVIth century. He was born at Siena, and of the ſame family with Pope Pius II (*a*). He had a great extent of learning, as he ſhewed by the books he compoſed upon ſeveral ſubjects [*A*]. Yet I would not have every body believe all that is ſaid of him by his Panegyriſts [*B*]. He wrote ſome Philoſophical books in his mother tongue, and is accounted the firſt who did ſo [*C*]. The treatiſe he publiſhed by order of Francis de Medicis, Great Duke of Tuſcany, concerning the reformation of the calendar, had the approbation of the moſt learned (*b*). He is very much to be praiſed for having joined good manners and a moſt exemplary life with the theory of the Mathematics and Phyſics (*c*). As for the reſt he was a ſtrict follower of Ariſtotle's opinions (*d*), and a member of the academy of the *Infiammati* at Padua (*e*). Notwithſtanding his gravity, and his great application to Philoſophical works, he compoſed ſome plays, which were very much eſteemed

(*a*) Thuan. Hiſt. *lib. lxv, pag.* 233.

(*b*) Joh. Imperial. in Muſ. Hiſt. *pag.* 82, 83.

(*c*) Ibid. *pag.* 82.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Ghilini, Teatr. *Part i, pag.* 8.

[*A*] *The books he compoſed on ſeveral ſubjects.*] Ghilini mentions theſe that follow: *La Filoſophia morale: la Theorica de' pianetti: l' inſtituzione dell' humo: l' Inſtituzione del Prencipe Chriſtiano: della Grandezza dell' acqua e della terra: Parafraſi sù la Rettorica d' Ariſtotile: della creanza delle Donne: delle Stelle fiſſe: due Comedie cioè l' Aleſſandra e l' Amor Conſtante: la Sfera: i Sonetti: Traduzione della Poëtica d' Ariſtotile: Annotazione ſopra la medeſima Poëtica d' Ariſtotile: Teſoro dell' huomo in tre parti diviſo tratta del buon nome, e nella terza fa menzione dell' amor ſopra-naturale* (1). Voſſius obſerves that our Piccolomini publiſhed at Venice, in 1565, a Latin commentary upon Ariſtotle's Mechanical Queſtions (2). He praiſes that author very much: ‘Philoſophus planè eximius fuit; tum ob ingenium, & induſtriam; tum quia feliciter adeò Matheſin & Philoſophiam conjunxit. Utrâque ſanè excelluit; ut præclara tot ejus opera oſtendunt (3). - - - *He was certainly a great Philoſopher; both with reſpect to his genius and application, and becauſe he ſo happily united Mathematics and Philoſophy together. He was eminent in both, as his excellent works ſhew.*’

[*B*] *All this is ſaid of him by his panegyriſts.*] I believe there is an hyperbole in this paſſage of Thevet (4). ‘Certainly he was a man who ſhewed a divine eloquence in his writings, and his graceful way of ſpeaking was ſo admirable, that he ſeemed rather to charm the ears of his hearers, than perſuade them by the artifice of his eloquence. He was inferior to none in his time as to languages, either for the antiquity and propriety of the Hebrew tongue, or for the elegancy and ſweetneſs of the Latin ſtile, which he underſtood ſo well, that Cicero, and the other excellent Orators, could not have expreſſed their thoughts better than our learned Alexander did. He made ſuch a progreſs in Divinity, the Civil Law, Phyſic, Mathematics, and Philoſophy, that there is no ſecret, or receſs, but what he carefully looked into, as may be atteſted by thoſe who had the happineſs to frequent and converſe with him, and to caſt their eyes upon his learned and excellent works. The facility wherewith he explained and made the moſt difficult authors intelligible, is particularly praiſed. Let any one take his commentaries upon Ariſtotle's Meteors, and ſome other books of that antient Philoſopher (5), and it will be found that he has ſo dexterouſly dived into the ſenſe of his author, that Ariſtotle himſelf could ſcarce have explained his opinions better than our Piccolomini did.’

[*C*] *He is accounted the firſt who did ſo.*] Imperialis blames him for it, as being a thing which makes learning contemptible, and does not agree with the reſpect due to the language of ancient Rome. ‘Efferbuit mire, *ſays he* (6), ingenium Alexandri Piccolominei Senenſis in cogendo ſub Etruſcis vexillis agmine ſcientiarum omnium, quo intentato alias facinore immortalem ſibi pararet in Italica celebritate triumphum. Memorabilis profecto induſtria niſi trito proteri ſermone rerum apices præclariſſimarum eſſet, contemptum ipſarum quendam apud viliores inducere, & quod magis intereſt, eſſet Latinæ locutionis majeſtatem ac ſtudium abdicare qua ultro utiliſſima quæque comprehenſa & conſignata eſſe palam eſt. - - - - *Alexander Piccolomini of Siena was wonderfully zealous in liſting the whole troop of ſciences under Tuſcan banners, by which enterpriſe, unattempted before, he might obtain an immortal triumph amongſt the crowd of Italians. His induſtry indeed would be very commendable, did it not tend to bring the moſt excellent things into contempt, and to extinguiſh the majeſty and ſtudy of the Latin tongue, in which the moſt uſeful things are always written.*’ See what Boccalini makes our Alexander ſay upon Parnaſſus (7). Some men would be glad that the key of learning ſhould not be imparted to the people. They would have all Philoſophical and learned books to be publiſhed in Latin, and the commonwealth of learning to deal with ancient books, as the church of Rome deals with the Scripture. She does not allow the reading of it in a vulgar tongue, but with a thouſand precautions. It is a ſanctuary where prophane men are not permitted to enter. See the complaint (8), which Mr du Pin has refuted in the preface of his *New Bibliotheque of Eccleſiaſtical Writers.*

(1) Ghilini, Teatro d'Huomini Letterati, *Tom. i, pag.* 8.

(2) Voſſius, de Scient. Mathem. *pag.* 302.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Thevet, Elogies of Illuſtrious Men, *Tom. viii, cap. iii, pag.* 32, 33, *Edit. in* 12*mo*, 1671.

(5) The abbreviators of Geſner ſay only that he tranſlated the commentaries of Alexander Aphrodiſienſis upon the four books of Ariſtotle's Meteors.

(6) Imper. in Muſæo, Hiſt. *pag.* 82.

(7) Boccal. Raguagli, di Parnaſo, *cent. i, cap. lxxiii, pag. m.* 221, 222.

(8) *It is mentioned in the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *June* 1686, *Art. IV, pag.* 653. *See a paſſage of Cicero,* in Orat. pro Muræna, *alledged by Eraſmus under the adage* Cornicum oculos configere. *It is the* 75*th of the IIId century of the firſt Chiliad, pag. m.* 123.

eſteemed [D]. He died at Siena the twelfth of March 1578 (f), being threeſcore and ten years old, and was buried in the cathedral church (g). What Thuanus ſays of him [E] is pretty curious, and a good example for thoſe who ſtudy: he ſpeaks of it as an ocular witneſs. I muſt criticize his tranſlator [F].

[D] *He compoſed ſome plays, which were very much eſteemed.*] I ſhall quote John Imperialis for it: ‘Neque tamen his dicatus gravioribus muniis abſtinuit interdum à luſibus poetarum comicas concinnando fabulas, quarum inſigniores duæ amoris cenſtantis, & Alexandri titulo feruntur impreſſæ, in quibus ſic excelluit, ut ideo comicorum Italicorum princeps Trajani Boccalini judicio cenſeatur (9). - - - *But notwithſtanding his application to theſe graver ſtudies, he ſometimes amuſed himſelf in writing Plays; two of the moſt remarkable of them are ſaid to be printed with the title of* Conſtant Love, *and* Alexander, *in which he ſo excelled, that Boccalini thinks him the prince of Italian Comic Poets.*’ I think that by virtue of theſe words Menage might have placed our Piccolomini among the Eccleſiaſtics, who wrote amorous verſes (10).

[E] *What Thuanus ſays of him.*] He followed Paul de Foix, whom Charles IX, ſent embaſſador into Italy in the year 1573. That embaſſador being come to Siena, went to ſee our Piccolomini, and found him reviſing his commentaries upon Ariſtotle. All the ſervants of the good old man were gone out, ſo that having had no notice of the embaſſador's viſit, he was ſurprized by him as he lay upon a couch. I ſhall ſet down in Latin what he told him about the comfort he found in reading in the midſt of the infirmities of old age. ‘Dum in urbe eſſet Foxius, Alexandrum Picolomineum veneranda canicie ſenem in ædibus ſuis inviſit, quem culcitræ incumbentem, & Ariſtoteli ſuo, hoc eſt à ſe diverſis explicationibus illuſtrato, recognoſcendo vacantem improviſus invenit. Nam ſolus erat, & famuli huc illuc per feſtum diem diverſi abierant. Quod ille anxietate ſumma excuſavit, & gratias Foxio pro tam honorifica ſalutatione egit, tum ſedere juſſis qui cum Foxio aderant, in iiſque Thuano. Multa de ſtudiis ſuis diſſeruit, eorumque ſe demum in ea ætate dulciſſimum fructum capere dixit, aliis oblectamentis deficientibus quibus aliæ ætates innocenter & citra offenſam gaudere poſſunt. Quod cum dicebat, non tam ſenectuti ſolatium quærere dicebatur, quam adoleſcentes qui aderant, qua humanitate erat, ad deſidiam vitandam & Philoſophiæ ſtudia capeſſenda exemplo ſuo cohortari (11). - - - *He earneſtly begged to be excuſed becauſe he was alone and without his ſervants. He thanked de Foix for the honour of his viſit, and then having deſired thoſe who accompanied him, and amongſt them Thuanus, to ſit down, he talked much concerning his ſtudies, which he ſaid afforded him great ſatisfaction in his old age; ſince he was not capable of other pleaſures, which might be innocently and without offence enjoyed in other parts of life. This he ſpoke, not ſo much to intimate that he wanted comfort in his old age, as courteouſly to exhort the young men that were preſent to follow his example in avoiding idleneſs and ſtudying Philoſophy.*’

[F] *I muſt criticiſe Thuanus's tranſlator.*] Let us compare his tranſlation with the Latin words of Thuanus. *Alexander Piccolomini*, ſays he (12), *would make people believe that he was of Æneas Silvius's family, who being raiſed to the papal dignity, took the name of Pius II.* Here are Thuanus's words: *Alexan. Piccolominæus Æneæ Silvii, qui Pontifex Pius II. dici voluit, Gentilis*, &c. (13). It is evident that Thuanus affirms, that our Alexander was related to Pius II, but the tranſlator makes him ſay a thing very injurious to the memory of that learned man, as if he had falſly pretended to be related to that Pope. If it be an enormous overſight, becauſe it wrongs an illuſtrious man, it is no leſs enormous if it be conſidered how eaſy it was to underſtand the words of the original. The tranſlator adds, that John Baptiſt Sacriſtan, Deiphobus Archprieſt, *and his other brothers beſtowed upon him* (14) *an honourable elogy.* I think theſe words of Thuanus are not well rendered, *in majore patriæ urbis templo ſepultus, & honorifico à Jo. Baptiſta æditno, Deiphobo Archipreſbytero aliiſque fratribus elogio ornatus.* I fancy that theſe words, *aliis fratribus* ſignify the other canons of the cathedral of Siena, and not the brothers of Alexander Piccolomini.

(f) He was not therefore alive in 1600, as Moreri affirms.

(g) Imper. ubi ſupra.

(9) Imper. in Muſ. Hiſt. *pag.* 83.

(10) Menage mentions thoſe Eccleſiaſtics in the cxlvth chapter of his *Anti-Baillet*, *Tom. ii.*

(11) Thuan. de Vit. ſua, *lib. i*, *pag. m.* 1170, *col.* 1.

(12) Apud Teiſſier, Elogies taken from Thuanus, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 484, 485.

(13) Thuan. Hiſt. *lib. lxv*, *pag.* 233, *ad ann.* 1578.

(14) That is, upon Alexander Piccolomini.

PICCOLOMINI (FRANCIS) was born at Siena, being of the ſame family with the foregoing. He was a very famous Philoſopher in the XVIth century. Though he was very young when he taught Logic in the univerſity of Siena, yet the whole town admired him upon the account of his lectures. Afterwards he taught Philoſophy in the univerſity of Macerata, and then for the ſpace of ten years in that of Perugia [A]. His reputation increaſed to ſuch a degree, that the city of Padua reſolved to have him for the ſame employment. He was made extraordinary profeſſor of Philoſophy there in the year 1560, and about four years after ordinary profeſſor in the ſame faculty. He publiſhed ſeveral commentaries upon Ariſtotle, which were very much eſteemed, by reaſon of their clearneſs and ſubtilty. He endeavoured to revive the Platonic Philoſophy

[A] *He taught Philoſophy in the univerſity of Macerata, and then . . . . of Perugia.*] He was twenty-five years of age when he left Siena to go to Macerata, and his deſign was rather to ſit down amongſt the ſcholars, than to get into the pulpit as a profeſſor; but as ſoon as he appeared at Macerata he was made firſt profeſſor of Philoſophy. So ſays Imperialis (1). He does not intimate in the leaſt what is affirmed by Tomaſini, *viz.* that Piccolomini was profeſſor of Logic at Siena before he went to Macerata. Imperialis adds, that he ſtaid no longer than one year in this laſt town, and that being called to Perugia, he took hold of that opportunity of ſhewing his capacity upon a nobler ſtage. He taught Philoſophy there for the ſpace of ten years, and publiſhed a volume *de Morali Philoſophia*, which was admired: ‘Tantis omnium cœtuum laudibus exceptum, cum nihil eo, vel ad efformandos mores utilius, vel ad rempublicam recte gerendam accommodatius, vel ad omnem bonorum malorumque notitiam ſuavius excogitari poſſit (2). - - - - *It was ſo much extolled by all, becauſe nothing could be imagined more uſeful for forming the manners, or more adapted to the well governing of the ſtate, or more acceptable for the univerſal knowledge of good and evil.*’ Father le Moine (3) ſpeaks well of that book, and criticizes ſome paſſages in it. Take notice of this title, *Franciſci Piccolominei Senenſis univerſa philoſophia de moribus* nunc primum *in decem gradus redacta & explicata. Venetiis in fol.* 1583. It ſeems to intimate that the firſt edition came out in the year 1583. If it be ſo, Imperialis is miſtaken when he ſays, that Piccolomini publiſhed that book being profeſſor at Perugia, and deſerved, by reaſon of ſo fine a work, to be called to Padua (4), for according to Imperialis's reckoning, he began to teach Philoſophy at Padua being about thirty-ſeven years of age, that is to ſay, in the year 1557. That Hiſtorian cannot be excuſed, but by ſaying that Piccolomini publiſhed his Moral Philoſophy before the year 1557, and put it afterwards in a new order, and ſo the abovementioned title will denote a ſecond edition. Note, that he inſerted in his morals printed in the year 1583, a treatiſe *de Methodo*, wherein he refuted Zabarella, his colleague and rival: the latter anſwered him, but Piccolomini made a reply intituled *Comes politicus adverſus Jacobum Zabarellam.*

[B] *He*

---

(1) Jo. Imper. in Muſ. Hiſt. *pag.* 114.

(2) Ibid.

(3) *In his* Peintures morales.

(4) Hoc unum effecit poſtea ut graviſſimo Venetorum judicio ad Patavinum Gymnaſium fuerit convocatus. *Imper. ubi ſupra.*

ſophy [*B*], and to ſhew that at the bottom it agreed with that of Ariſtotle (*a*). The famous James Zabarella was the antagoniſt, againſt whom he publiſhed ſomething. I ſhall ſay in another place wherein he exceeded him [*C*]. Having obſerved that the diſputations which the profeſſors had appointed in the afternoon, were the cauſe of many diviſions and quarrels, he wiſely ſuppreſſed them (*b*); which he was the more willing to do, becauſe he enjoyed a penſion of 1400 florins (*c*). He would have been a happy man, had he been able to put an end to the quarrels of his family, as he did to thoſe of his ſcholars: but his ſons hated one another ſo violently, and were ſo wicked, that they made him extreamly uneaſy in his old age. He gave over the function of a profeſſor, after he had glorioully exerciſed it for the ſpace of fifty-three years [*D*], and retired to Siena, where he died very old [*E*]: he left a great eſtate to his heirs (*d*). It appeared by his funeral how much he was eſteemed by the inhabitants of Siena; for every body went in mourning, and all the courts of judicature were ſhut up (*e*). He had been a diſciple of the famous Zimara, and ſchoolfellow of Felix Perrette, who was Pope by the name of Sixtus V, and boaſted, as long as he lived, that he had been able to anſwer his objections at a publick diſputation (*f*) [*F*]

(*a*) *Taken from* James Philip Tomaſini, Elog. *Part i, pag.* 208, & *ſeq.*

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) This ſhews that the profeſſors got ſomething by thoſe diſputes.

(*d*) Ex eodem, ibid.

(*e*) Fœlix etiam quod inſolito civium ſqualore, juſtitio, Lacrymis ejus in patria funus elatum. *Imper. in Muſæo Hiſt. pag.* 115.

(*f*) Ibid. *pag.* 114.

[*B*] *He endeavoured to revive the Platonic Philoſophy.*] Imperialis ſays, that he began to apply himſelf to that ſtudy, after he had given over the function of a profeſſor; but Tomaſini ſays, that he read lectures, and wrote ſomething about it even at Padua. Here are the words of Imperialis (5): ‘Hac igitur egregie navata Venetis opera per annos duos & viginti patriam ſibi tandem viſendam cenſuit, in qua extremos etiam ſpiritus hauſit. Ac interim pluribus ad magnum Etruriæ Ducem legationibus (6) perfunctus plurimiſque honoribus auctus amœniſſimæ Platonis philoſophiæ vacare cœpit, quam etiam commentariis exornandam ſuſceperat, ipſum namque dicere ſolitum accepimus, Platonis & Ariſtotelis philoſophiam duos quaſi oculos humani aciem intellectus dirigere, quorum alterutro ſi quis careat Cyclopis inſtar in hac rerum univerſitate labatur neceſſe eſt: ſed communia fata præclaros hoſce illius conatus interciderunt. - - - *Having thus laboured for the Venetians twice twenty years, he reſolved at laſt to viſit his native country, in which likewiſe he died. And in the mean time, after he had executed ſeveral deputations to the Great Duke of Tuſcany, and received many honours, he began to apply himſelf to the agreeable Philoſophy of Plato, upon which alſo he had undertaken to write commentaries, for I have heard he was wont to ſay, that the Philoſophy of Plato and Ariſtotle, like two eyes directed the ſight of human underſtanding, and whoever had but one as a Cyclops, muſt need tumble down in the world: but the common lot of all mankind put an end to theſe his glorious undertakings.*’ Here are alſo the words of Tomaſini, with which make the neceſſary compariſons. ‘Platonicam diſciplinam fere collapſam & legendo & ſcribendo in integrum reſtituere conatus eſt, illud in primis enitens ut Platonem cum Ariſtotle in pluribus conciliaret (7). - - - *He attempted to revive the Platonic Philoſophy both by his lectures and writings; endeavouring eſpecially to reconcile Plato with Ariſtotle in many points.*’

[*C*] *I ſhall ſay in another place* (8) *wherein he exceeded Zabarella.*] But I muſt obſerve here that he was inferior to him in ſome reſpects. He did not dive into the bottom of his ſubject, as Zabarella did, he rambled from one ſubject to another, and preſented them rather as a wine to be taſted, than to be drank off. This ſeems to be the meaning of Imperialis. ‘Piccolomineus, *ſays he* (9), oratione quidem utitur expedita, gravi, & illaborata, cæterum ſententiarum nexu frequentior quam forte conveniat, excurrit enimvero, nec in concluſionibus hæret, novis at ſubinde doctrinæ cumulis urget, ut libanda potius quàm guſtanda propoſitorum veritas offerri videatur, propterea bene ſentientium calculis ſancitum, hujus ſcripta magis provectiorum auribus inſervire, illius autem juniorum. - - - *Piccolomini indeed uſes a ſhort, grave and eaſy ſtile, but is guilty of too many excurſions. He does not examine matters thoroughly, but introduces new ſubjects every now and then, ſo that the truth of his propoſitions is preſented, to be touched with the lips rather than taſted with the tongue, and therefore in the opinion of good judges his writings are fitter for thoſe that are more advanced in years, and thoſe of the other for ſuch as are younger.*’

[*D*] *He gave over the function of a profeſſor after he had exerciſed it for the ſpace of fifty-three years.*] So ſays Tomaſini: but the account he gives of it cannot be reconciled with the words of Imperialis, who ſays that Piccolomini was one year at Macerata, ten years at Perugia, and two and twenty at Padua, which makes up but thirty three years. It would be in vain to ſay that he forgot his profeſſing of Logic at Siena; for it could not laſt twenty years, ſeeing Piccolomini was but twenty-five years old, when he was made profeſſor of Philoſophy at Macerata. Ghilini adopts the fifty three years of Tomaſini (10), and he is more excuſable than Paul Freherus (11), who admits of them after he had ſaid that Francis Piccolomini was made profeſſor at Macerata, being twenty-five years of age, that he kept that profeſſorſhip but one year, that he exerciſed that of Perugia only ten years, and that of Padua twenty-two years. Such are the miſtakes, which an author will be guilty of when he joins together ſeveral oppoſite relations.

[*E*] *He died very old.*] Tomaſini and Imperialis agree in making him live eighty-four years: they have forgot to ſet down the year of his death; but we know from the date of his epitaph as it is in Ghilini (12), that it was the year 1604. Imperialis obſerves that this venerable old man was ſo happy as never to ſtand in need of ſpectacles (13).

[*F*] *Sixtus V, boaſted as long as he lived, that he had been able to anſwer his objections at a public diſputation.*] I ſhall ſet down this particular, as it is related by Imperialis. ‘Et quidem Fœlix adhuc Minorita quod ſemel propoſitarum in Templo Theſium ex utraque philoſophia publicum impugnatorem ſortitus erat Franciſcum, ſæpius porro pontifex ejus diei memoriam recolebat, ſibi digniſſimum reputans cum acerrimo, ut ipſe ajebat, ingenio in celebri conſeſſu, haud ſegniter doctrinæ atque ingenii gloriam ſuſtinuiſſe (14). - - - *Fœlix, after he was made Pope, often remembered the day, when being as yet a Minorite, he publickly defended ſome theſes in both kinds of Philoſophy, and happened to have Francis for his opponent, thinking it the greateſt honour, that he was able, before a renowned aſſembly, to contend in point of learning and parts with the moſt acute genius, as he uſed to ſay.*’

(5) Ibid. *pag.* 115.

(6) He mentions one of thoſe deputations in the Dedicatory Epiſtle of his book *de rerum definitionibus*, dated from Siena in 1600.

(7) Tomaſin. Elog. *Part i, pag.* 209.

(8) In the remark [*A*], of the article ZABARELLA.

(9) Imp. ubi ſupra.

(10) Ghilini, Teatro, *Tom. i, pag.* 62. Witte in Diario Biogr. *ad ann.* 1604, *mentions only* 52 *years.*

(11) Freher. in Theatro, *pag.* 1498.

(12) Ibid. *Part i, pag.* 62.

(13) Ex eo fœlix in tanto ſenio quod oculorum vim nullo unquam chryſtalli ſubſidio juvit. *Imper. ubi ſupra.*

(14) Imper. ibid. *pag.* 114.

PIENNE (JOAN DE HALLUIN) maid of honour to Catherine de Medicis, was paſſionately beloved by Francis de Montmorenci (*a*), eldeſt ſon to the Conſtable Ann de Montmorenci. He promiſed her to marry her, but did not acquaint his father or his mother with it [*A*], ſo much he feared leſt they ſhould oppoſe his deſign. It

(*a*) Who was made Mareſchal of France in the year 1559.

[*A*] *He promiſed her to marry her, without acquainting his father or mother with it.*] Mr le Laboureur who had *the originals of all the proceedings*, ſays (1), they *began with the interrogatory of the two lovers made in the Louvre* on the fifth of October 1556, that *Jane de Halluyn was called firſt, and ſaid ſhe was about nineteen or twenty years old*, and that five or ſix years before Meſſire Francis de Montmorenci ‘had ſpoken to her

(1) Le Laboureur, Addit. to the Memoirs of Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 419.

It is not likely they would have conſented to it, though that lady was very illuſtrious by her birth, and commendable for her beauty and virtue; but there was a particular reaſon which moved them to oppoſe that engagement openly, viz. becauſe Henry II was deſirous that his natural daughter, widow of the duke of Caſtro, ſhould marry the lover of the lady de Pienne. The conſtable's ambition was too much favoured by ſuch an alliance, to ſuffer that his eldeſt ſon's engagement ſhould paſs for a good one. Therefore he omitted nothing to get it broke, and being in the greateſt favour with Henry II that ever a ſubject was in with his king, he perſwaded that prince to uſe all imaginable means to get the promiſe, which might be alledged by the lady de Pienne, declared null. *That affair became the greateſt in Chriſtendom, becauſe of the deſigns of Pope* Paul IV, *who had a mind to marry* that daughter of Henry II (*who was already the widow of an Italian, and a Pope's grand-ſon) to another Italian his nephew. . . . . The Pope's intereſt was the only obſtacle to the diſpenſation which was demanded of him, and which* Francis de Montmorenci went to ſollicit in perſon (*b*). The king did not believe *that the Pope would deny him any thing, in ſo favourable a time as that of the League which they were then treating of againſt Spain.* Nevertheleſs, Paul IV appeared ſo averſe to it, that the king was obliged to have recourſe to ſome other expedients [*B*]. He publiſhed an edict,

‘ her of marriage, in the palace of Paris, or at St Germains, where *he ſaid that he took her for his wife, and ſhe anſwered, that ſhe took him for her huſband: that he had ſpoken to her about it ſeveral times before, but ſhe would not have him, becauſe he was too young, and beſides, ſhe was afraid that the conſtable would take it ill; to which he anſwered, that he would ſtay ſo long, and be ſo obedient to him, that he would make him approve of it: and ſhe would not have declared it, if the ſaid Montmorenci had not ſpoken of it, becauſe of the marriage of the ducheſs of Caſtro.* She ſaid further, that ſhe had received no gift nor any preſent upon account of marriage, and that every thing was done by word of mouth, without witneſſes, and without acquainting any of her relations with it. That he wrote to her about it whilſt he was in priſon, but that ſhe burnt his letters, *that he continued to ſpeak of it ſince his return, namely, in the abbey of Vauluiſant where he was lately, and even yeſterday in the conſtable's houſe, he repeated the ſame things to her, and deſired her not to be uneaſy. She added that ſhe knew not that the ſaid marriage was clandeſtine and prohibited, and that ſhe thought he might marry of himſelf, tho' he had a father and a mother, becauſe marriage belongs to GOD, and ceremonies to the church.* For the reſt, ſhe referred it to the Sieur de Montmorenci, and ſhe put her hand to her anſwer. That lord made a like anſwer, and after he had ſaid that he was twenty-ſix years of age, he confeſſed every thing, even that the day before in the evening, he had made a new promiſe of marriage to her, as he was ſpeaking of the trouble he was in; only being aſked, whether having a father and a mother, he knew not that it was not in his power to contract a marriage without their conſent, he ſaid, *that when he did that folly, he conſidered not all thoſe things, and that his age, it ſuited not, and that if he was to do the ſame again, he would think more of it. . . . .* (2) Thoſe depoſitions were ſent to Rome, with all the paſſages they could collect out of the Scripture and the Fathers, againſt marriages contracted without the conſent of parents, and the Pope received the whole graciouſly enough at firſt, gave a kind reception to the Sieur de Montmorency, and promiſed him all manner of ſatiſfaction: but either he diſſembled, or had not yet thought of this opportunity of allying his family with the houſe of France, which made him put off that buſineſs, that he might have time to conſider by what means he might effect his deſign.’ In an act of proteſtation which Mr de Montmorenci cauſed to be drawn up in the houſe of Cardinal du Bellai at Rome, the 23d of March 1557, he declared: *That five years ago and above, being in the heat of his youth, he fell in love with the lady Jane de Halluin de Pienne, and contracted a marriage with her by word of mouth, without the conſent of the king, and of his father and mother; that ſince that time the king and his father being reſolved to marry him to Diana of France, he came to Rome by their order to have the Pope's abſolution and diſpenſation; that for the ſpace of four months he had not ceaſed to ſollicit His Holineſs about it, and even juſtified the lawfulneſs of his demand by a diſpenſation granted by him in a like caſe. Whereupon he had been amuſed with hopes, and referred to a congregation of Divines and Canoniſts, ſummoned to meet on the twenty-third of this month, with the cardinals, archbiſhops, and biſhops, under pretence of making the thing more legal; but in effect, as he had it from very good hands, to prejudice his deſign, notwithſtanding the promiſes of the Pope, who favoured the opinions of his adverſe party, tho' without any ſollicitation, and was diſpleaſed with, and uſed very ill, thoſe who were for his abſolution, and appeared evidently to be contrary to him. Wherefore having had notice of the renunciation of the lady de Pienne, he proteſts againſt whatſoever the Pope may order for the future, againſt the liberty which he pretends to have of marrying, and demands that the petitions preſented by him to His Holineſs, and the diſpenſation granted by the Pope in a like caſe, be recorded* (3). We ſhall ſee below the reaſons of his complaints againſt the Pope's conduct (4).

[*B*] *Paul IV appeared ſo averſe to it that the king was obliged to have recourſe to ſome other expedients.*] Mr le Laboureur goes on (5). The Pope *kept a great while Francis de Montmorenci in Rome, putting him off from congregation to congregation; till at laſt his game was found out, and the king and conſtable being diſappointed in their hopes of the Pope, reſolved to bring to a concluſion that buſineſs, which had made ſo great a noiſe to their diſadvantage, and in order to it they cauſed an edict to be drawn up, which was made on purpoſe, publiſhed and verified, whereby clandeſtine marriages were declared to be null: on the other hand, the poor lady was forced to deſiſt; for ſhe was ſhut up in the convent of the Filles Dieu at Paris, where deſpairing to ſucceed in her hopes, and afraid of being treated worſe, ſhe was at laſt perſuaded that the Sieur de Montmorency had obtained the Pope's diſpenſation.*

That we may well underſtand how much the intereſt of the Pope's family did work upon him, we muſt not loſe the ſight of this capital point, *viz.* That Paul IV deſired to marry his nephew with the natural daughter of Henry II, and that he could not ſucceed in it, if he declared the promiſe made to the lady de Pienne to be null. We ſhall ſee that he wiſhed on this occaſion that the Papal authority were leſſened, and that he was deprived of a right, of which he would have been very jealous in another caſe. The particular advantage of his family was more dear to him than the privileges of the Papacy, whether it be that he believed his ſucceſſors could eaſily remedy the prejudice he deſigned to do them, or that he abſolutely preferred perſonal advantages to thoſe of the Holy See. This affair was purſued with great heat by the court of France; they omitted nothing to make it ſucceed. They preſented the act whereby the lady de Pienne renounced her pretenſions, and the edict againſt clandeſtine marriages (6). They obtained (7) *a copy of a diſpenſation* which the Pope *had granted in a like caſe.* Here is a paſſage of the relation which Doctor de la Haye ſent to the conſtable (8): it is curious: Paul IV ſent (9) *immediately for the datary to know how that diſpenſation had been granted, wondering at it, and much more how it came into our hands: to which the datary anſwered, that it had been granted in a full ſignature, and by His Holineſs himſelf; which he might remember, being deſirous to know and underſtand, more than any of his predeceſſors did, what paſſes in his ſignature. His Holineſs was amazed at it, and aſked*

(*b*) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 419.

(2) *Id. ib. pag.* 420. *Obſerve theſe words of Brantome in his encomium on the Conſtable of Montmorenci, Tom. ii, of his Memoirs, pag.* 137. As the Conſtable had procured a match between him and the natural daughter of king Henry . . . . . when his father told him of it, and of the day appointed for the wedding, M. de Montmorenci anſwered him that he could not hearken to it, becauſe he was engaged to marry the lady de Pienne. The old man was ſtrangely ſurprized, and had more recourſe to tears, &c.

(3) Le Laboureur, ibid. *pag.* 432.

(4) See the remark [*B*].

(5) Ib. *p.* 420.

(6) Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 424.

(7) Ib. *p.* 425.

(8) Ib. *p.* 424.

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 426. See alſo the remark [*D*].

edict, whereby clandeſtine marriages were declared null, and ordered that the lady de Pienne ſhould be ſhut up in a nunnery, and a declaration of her deſiſting was extorted from her; and at laſt the Pope was not regarded; for the marriage of Mr de Montmorenci and the daughter of Henry II, was celebrated with pomp, although the diſpenſation had not been granted [*C*]. The Pope made an acknowledgment which deſerves to be here related [*D*]. There was a great deal of unfair dealing in thoſe proceedings

aſked the Datary, by what means the ſaid diſpenſation might be retracted, a thing which the Datary ſaid could not be done, becauſe it was already in the hands of the parties, and that they were married by virtue of the ſame. I ſhall alſo give ſome abſtracts of the reſult of the firſt congregation held for the diſpenſation of that marriage. The Pope preſided in it (10): *many Divines and Canoniſts* were called to it . . . . . *the Pope began*, and having propoſed the matter of fact, he ſaid (11): 'We aſk whether a marriage contracted by word of mouth, which is a true marriage and a true ſacrament, according to the opinion of the moſt holy divines, may be diſſolved and broke by us, I mean when carnal copulation has not intervened. And then he added, Do not inſiſt, I deſire you, on the examples and facts of our predeceſſors, which I proteſt I will not follow, but in as much as the authority of the ſcripture, and the reaſons of the divines will induce you to it. He went on and ſaid, I do not doubt but that my predeceſſors and I may have erred ſometimes, not only in this fact, but alſo in many others; nevertheleſs, we ought not to be condemned for it; for GOD does ſo direct his church as to conceal many things from her for a time, which he reveals afterwards: this Chriſt himſelf has clearly enough intimated to us, as when he ſaid to St Peter, *What I do now thou doſt not underſtand, but thou ſhalt underſtand it hereafter.* And in another place he ſaid, *I have many things to ſay, which you cannot comprehend now, but the ſpirit, which my father ſhall ſend in my name, will teach you all things.* Who knows therefore but that GOD will now declare by us what he permitted to be formerly unknown to others, concerning the indiſſolubility of holy marriage? Therefore, my brethren and children, uſe your endeavours to help me in this affair; and without regarding what ſuch and ſuch a one of my predeceſſors did, as I have already ſaid, ſee whether it be not true, that they have not well underſtood what we are now examining, concerning the indiſſolubility of marriage. Having thus ſpoken, he addreſſed himſelf to archbiſhop Couſance, heretofore the Pope's nuncio at the court of the emperor, and commanded him to give his opinion. Couſance did his utmoſt to ſhew, that ſuch a marriage could not be diſſolved by any means, and the Pope appeared to be very well pleaſed with his opinion; which moved the ſaid archbiſhop to ſay a great deal more than he deſigned, as it appears from his writings and former conferences about this matter, from ſo many ſmiles, winkings, nods, and clappings of hands. The Pope ſaid further, with a loud voice, That the ſaid archbiſhop had very well explained that affair. Biſhop Antoniellus ſpoke next to him, a very old and venerable man, who was of a contrary opinion; and in a few words gave and made out this concluſion, That the Pope might do the thing which was in queſtion. Whom the Pope anſwered, That he would not thank him for giving him ſo great a power on this occaſion. And becauſe the ſaid biſhop had made uſe of ſome paſſages out of St Thomas, the Pope added, That St Thomas might have ſaid many things when young, which he afterwards retracted, having acquired a greater degree of knowledge; adding theſe words of St Paul, *When I was a child I ſpoke like a child, but when I grew a man I left childiſh things.* Afterwards he went on and ſaid, It is not without reaſon that I give you this warning; I do it that none of thoſe who are to deliberate concerning this matter, may rely upon ſuch paſſages of St Thomas, which he may have writ in his youth. The ſacriſt ſpoke next, and was of the ſame opinion with biſhop Antoniellus, *viz.* That the Pope might and ought to diſſolve ſuch marriages, when there is a reaſonable cauſe for it. And becauſe in his proofs, which were very long and learned, he happened to mention a paſſage of Durandus, concerning marriage, which we do not approve of, and which he alledged only as that doctor's opinion, and not to defend it; the Pope being already offended at his determination, grew very angry with him, as if he had been the author or defender of Durandus's error. And the ſaid ſacriſt excuſing himſelf to His Holineſs, he ſtopped his mouth with hard words and great threatnings, often repeating, that he deſerved to be turned out of his place, and that he would ſpeak to him further about it in private. Which ſo diſcouraged the reſt, that many of them reſolved to alter their reſolutions.'

There were ſeven perſons only who gave their opinions in this congregation; *the others* were reſerved *to be heard another time* (12). The cardinals went out very much diſſatisfied, and one might perceive, *without any further intelligence of what paſſed in it . . . . that there had been as much confuſion and diſorder in it as there is amongſt ſheep, when their ſhepherd is wounded: for every body went home, one one way, another another way, in a great conſternation, and almoſt with tears in their eyes, without being able to tell any friend or ſervant how the thing went, and what reſolution had been taken* (13). Cardinal du Bellay, and Mr de Montmorenci having informed the conſervator of Naples, that the king's edict might be ſufficient without the Pope's diſpenſation; and that he ſhould remember, *that a leſſer thing than that occaſioned the withdrawing of Germany and England from their obedience to the Holy See* (14), the conſervator ſent the datary to tell cardinal Caraffa, and cardinal de Piſa, 'That he very much wondered at the manner of proceeding of His Holineſs, and that he could never believe he would be judge and party in this affair, and think that the Holy Ghoſt was in his head, and in no body's elſe, deſpiſing every one's opinion, with little reſpect for himſelf, and for thoſe whom he had appointed and commanded to ſpeak their thoughts freely and impartially; and that for a leſs thing than this, by reaſon of cardinal Cajetan's obſtinacy, Germany was in ſuch a condition as every body knew, without any great hopes of amendment, except by the meer grace of GOD. And that they ſhould well conſider the tenor of the ſaid edict; by virtue whereof, together with the cenſure of the Sorbonne, and the authority of the ordinary, without any other diſpenſation of His Holineſs, the ſaid Mr de Montmorency might ſet himſelf at liberty, and take ſuch a wife as he thinks fit (15).' This was repreſented to the Pope, but made him not change his conduct. From whence it may be concluded, that the court of France looked upon this negotiation as a thing of the greateſt moment; but the Pope thought it not leſs important for his intereſt to come to no concluſion thereupon. If we had two or three volumes in folio of ſuch relations, like that of Dr de la Haye, and that of cardinal du Bellay (16), it would be one of the moſt curious works that could be put into a library.

[*C*] *The Pope was not regarded; for the marriage . . . . . was celebrated . . . . . although the diſpenſation had not been granted.*] 'The king and the conſtable thought that they could not better revenge themſelves upon the Pope, for the little regard he had ſhewn to their recommendation, than by paſſing on to the marriage, by virtue of the edict againſt clandeſtine marriages; and it was kept with the greater magnificence at the arrival of Mr de Montmorency in the month of May 1557, the court being at Villiers-Cotretz (17).'

[*D*] *The Pope made an acknowledgment which deſerves to be related.*] This was done in the congregation abovementioned. *I am not ignorant*, ſaid he (18), *that the Popes, my predeceſſors, have granted ſeveral diſpenſations in this caſe; they are, in the preſence of GOD, to give him an account of it. If they have been miſtaken I have no mind to follow them; perhaps they may have done it through ignorance, and that age might not then know certainly, what the other ages clearly perceive, ac-*

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 427.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 429.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 430, 431.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Mr le Laboureur ſets it down at full length, *ubi ſupra*, *pag.* 432, *&c.*

(17) Ibid. *pag.* 437.

(18) Ibid. *pag.* 433.

proceedings [*E*], and the conſtable's ſon felt ſome remorſe of conſcience, which obliged him

cording to the words of JESUS CHRIST: 'Scietis autem poſtea, &c. non poteſtis omnia portare modo, &c. veniet paracletus, &c. - - - *But ye ſhall know afterwards, &c. ye cannot bear all things now, &c. the comforter will come, &c.' And as to what is ſaid, That I have granted a diſpenſation in a like caſe, I would not have this to cauſe any prejudice to this matter; for GOD knows that I never underſtood it. In the ſignet-office there is a multitude of people, prelates, referendaries, and others, who make a great noiſe; ſo that an old decrepit Pope cannot mind every particular thing. As to myſelf I proteſt that I never underſtood it: and moreover, that though I ſhould have erred in one thing or another, yet I would not continue in my error.* This is a paſſage taken out of a relation of cardinal du Bellay, which Mr le Laboureur has inſerted in his Additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs. And here you may ſee a man who built upon a very weak diſpenſation; for the Pope himſelf, who granted it, declared to the ſacred college, that he never underſtood that queſtion, and that a perſon of his great age could not give ear to all the particular matters, amidſt the great noiſe that is raiſed in the place where the diſpatches are ſigned. And yet the man who had obtained this diſpenſation thought himſelf well married; but if it was null he committed adultery every time that he had to do with his wife. Nothing appeared ſhameful to Paul IV, provided he might find pretences not to annul the marriage of Mr de Montmorency.

[*E*] *There was a great deal of unfair dealing in thoſe proceedings.*] Nothing could be more proper for the Pope's deſign, than to be able to ſay, that the Lady de Pienne demanded the accompliſhment of the marriage. Therefore to take that weapon out of his hands, they provided themſelves with an act in due form, whereby it appeared, that ſhe had no pretenſions to Mr de Montmorenci. But to obtain ſuch a declaration from her, they were forced to make her believe, that the Pope had already granted the diſpenſation. Wherefore her lover made no ſcruple to write ſuch an untruth to her. Here is his letter, it is as dry as thoſe which he wrote to her before, were ſweet and paſſionate. 'MADEMOISELLE DE PIENNES, Being ſenſible of the error into which I fell unawares, and being ſorry that I have offended GOD, the king, my lord, and the conſtable, and his lady, I have acquainted our holy father, the Pope, how things paſſed between us, and begged his Holineſs's pardon, which he, out of his bounty and clemency, has granted me; and, inaſmuch as it was neceſſary, he has given me a diſpenſation, to be reſtored to my former liberty, which I thought fit to give you notice of: and in order to free ourſelves from the miſeries and trouble we are in, I revoke and deſiſt from all the words and promiſes of marriage which paſſed between us, from which, by virtue of the ſaid diſpenſation, we remain diſcharged; and I declare you to be ſo, beſeeching you to do the like towards me, and to take ſuch other match as you will like beſt; for I am reſolved to keep no longer any correſpondence with you; not but I look upon you to be a ſober and virtuous lady, and of a good family, but to do my duty, and avoid the miſchiefs and inconveniencies which might enſue from it; but eſpecially to give thereby an occaſion to his majeſty, and my ſaid lord and lady to forget the offence I have committed againſt them, that I may be able, not only to repair it, and endeavour to make myſelf worthy of their favour, but alſo to perform what I owe them, according to the command of GOD, whom I beſeech to keep you, Mademoiſelle de Pienes, under his holy protection. Rome, the fifth of February. He, whom you will find ready to ſerve you, MONTMORENCY (19).' Francis de la Porte, gentleman to Mr de Montmorenci, a maſter of the requeſts, and one of the king's ſecretaries, *attended* with two Notaries of the Chaſtelet, went to the nunnery, where the lady had been ſhut up. They were admitted (20) *by virtue of a letter ſigned with the king's own hand. They called for the lady,* and when ſhe had read aloud Mr de Montmorenci's letter, the Sieur de la Porte told her, *Madam, all that I have to ſay comes from Mr de Montmorency, and I ſhall tell it you, if you pleaſe, becauſe he has ordered me ſo to do. You have ſeen by his letter, which you have juſt now read, how greatly he thinks he has offended GOD. . . . .* (21), *and he has moſt humbly ſupplicated his Holineſs to pardon him the offence he had committed, by promiſing to marry you, and to grant a diſpenſation both to him and you, that you might marry to another whenever you ſhall think fit. This our holy Father has done, and by this means reſtored Mr de Montmorency and you to your former liberty, as he has mentioned to you in his letter, which I have now delivered to you for that purpoſe. And he being diſpenſed with, and by that diſpenſation made free as he was before, to marry another whenever he ſhall think fit, I declare to you, by his command, that he acquits you from all promiſes, which may have been in any manner between you two before this time; and I pray, and require you, in his name, that you likewiſe declare to me, whether you do not alſo acquit him from them on your part. To which the ſaid Lady de Pienne, with tears in her eyes, mournfully anſwered in theſe words: Mr de la Porte, I had much rather that the breach of the promiſes of Mr de Montmorency, and of mine, ſhould come from him than from me. He ſhows plainly, by the words you have ſpoke to me in his name, that he has a meaner ſoul than a woman, and is not ſuch a man as he pretended to be, when he told me ſo often, that he would loſe his life rather than change his reſolution. He has very much injured me; and I ſee plainly, that he had rather be rich than an honeſt man.* This anſwer containing nothing poſitive, Mr de la Porte returned to the charge, and inſiſted chiefly upon the Papal diſpenſation, and deſired her to declare her mind plainly: 'Whereupon the ſaid lady, weeping, as before, ſpoke theſe words: Alas, Mr de la Porte, what anſwer would you have me to make? Had Mr de Montmorency the heart to write me ſuch a letter?' This ſecond anſwer being as indefinite as the former, a third queſtion was put ſo preciſely, that the lady muſt needs needs anſwer to the matter in hand. *Mr de la Porte* ſaid ſhe (22), *ſince the deſire of Mr de Montmorenci is, that I ſhould acquit him from the promiſes of marriage between us, and that now he leaves me, I neither will, nor can hinder him from doing what he pleaſes; and I cannot have a will contrary to his.* Mr de la Porte was not ſufficiently ſatisfied with this third anſwer, but he urged her ſtill, and at laſt obtained that which follows: 'Mr de la Porte, ſince Mr de Montmorency does now acquit me from the promiſes of Marriage which were made betwixt him and me, if he were the ſon of a king, or a prince, having written to me as has done in his letter which you juſt now delivered, I would not marry him, and ſo I acquit him. Nevertheleſs I wonder at his way of writing in that letter, and I cannot well believe that he writ it, ſince he was wont to write to me in another way and ſtile (23)'. To this it was replied, That Mr de Montmorency had been ſeen to write this whole letter with his own hand. As the lady retired ſhe made ſome efforts of courage to excuſe the tears ſhe had been ſeen to ſhed; but it was impoſſible for her to appear unconcerned; every thing ſhe ſaid ſavoured of humiliation, grief, and trouble, for not marrying this fickle lover. It is commonly ſaid in jeſt, or by way of gallantry, that a miſtreſs has much ado to ſpeak the terrible *Yes*, when ſhe is to anſwer to the queſtion, *Do you conſent to be the wife of ſuch a man?* But it is very probable, that there never was a *yes* of that nature more grievous than that, which the lady de Pienne anſwered to the queſtion, *Do you conſent that Mr de Montmorency ſhould not marry you?*

There happened another thing, wherein, according to all appearance, he was perjured; which was this: *Being returned from Rome he gave a declaration in writing, before the chief perſons of the king's council, importing, that there had been no marriage between him and the lady de Pienne, really contracted in words; but only an agreement between them to make it believed, that by this means they might endeavour to induce the conſtable, his father, to agree to it* (24). He affirmed upon oath, that this declaration, written with his own hand, *contained the truth* (25), and that if he had deſired a diſpenſation of the Pope, by confeſſing to him more than he ſhould, he did it in hopes to obtain it eaſily, by means whereof it would not have appeared that he had impoſed a falſity; but that finding at Rome many difficulties, he, at laſt, reſolved to declare to his majeſty and the conſtable, the truth of the matter him to aſk the abſolution of Pope Pius IV [*F*]. The lady was married, ſome time after, to a man who was very much inferior to the galant ſhe had loſt [*G*]. We have here

---

(19) Ibid. *pag.* 421.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Ibid. *pag.* 422.

(22) Ibid.

(23) Ibid. *pag.* 423.

(24) Ibid. *pag.* 437.

(25) Ibid. *pag.* 439.

matter. This is as if he had ſaid, I never promiſed marriage to the lady de Pienne, but only agreed with her to ſay, that we had mutually given our promiſe to one another, and we had no other deſign but to induce by this lie, my father and mother to conſent to this marriage. Having many times uttered this falſhood, I was ſorry to unſay it again; and that I might not be forced to contradict myſelf, I choſe rather to deſire of the Pope a diſpenſation, and I perſiſted in my lie to the holy Father: but not being able to avoid contradictions this way, I acknowledge, at laſt, that my diſcourſes were falſe, and I ſwear before the principal members of the king's council, and atteſt in writing, that I have lold a lie for a long time, on purpoſe to deceive my father and mother, the Pope, &c. Muſt not ambition have a very tyrannical power to engage people to make ſuch confeſſions? And is there any probability that this lover had only ſo ſlight an engagement with ſo young and ſo beautiful a miſtreſs? The ſcruples wherewith he was tormented, as I ſhall now ſhow, juſtify my opinion (26).

Here I intend to examine an anſwer which appears to me very ſophiſtical: the cardinal of Lorrain, after the inſult which I have mentioned in another place (27), cauſed a letter to be publiſhed, wherein are found theſe words: *I have heard ſome others aſcribe the bad diſpoſition of the ſaid marſhal de Montmorency to a more antient cauſe, from the very time when he was perplexed and embarraſſed about his marriage with the lady de Pienne, which he confeſſed, and declared before the ſaid lord Cardinal, and other lords deputed in this caſe by the late king Henry, and quickly after denied, and ſwore to the Pope, that he had never made any promiſe to the ſaid lady; inſomuch that the ſaid Mr de Montmorency was aſhamed to be known by the ſaid lord Cardinal to be a perjured man, and one that might be excepted againſt in courts of judicature, and degraded from all honour* (28). See here what the Proteſtant anſwered who refuted this letter: ' The ſecond cauſe of the hatred of Mr de Montmorency proceeds from hence, as you ſay, becauſe you take him to be a perjured man, upon the account of the marriage of the lady de Pienne. Before I purge him from this calumny, by true teſtimonies and authorities, I humbly pray the king's majeſty to conſider your boldneſs, whereby you have exceeded the bounds of reaſon, in daring to publiſh, that the marriage of his ſiſter is unlawful. Is it poſſible to draw any other conſequence from your diſcourſe? I ſhould willingly pardon your ignorance, if it were not attended with malice. Can the promiſe of the children of diſtinction (although your accuſation were as true as it is falſe) be of any validity to fullfil their marriage, unleſs it be approved by the conſent of their parents, under whoſe authority they live? the examples of Abraham and Iſaac ſhow us ſufficiently that it belongs to fathers to marry their children as they pleaſe. And if a vow (which is a promiſe we make to God) made by a daughter without the conſent of her father, is null by the law of Moſes; much more a promiſe of marriage, made by one perſon to another, will be null if the father conſent not to it. And although the Greeks were too indeterminate and uncertain in theſe marriages, yet they were not ſo far deprived of the light of nature, but a maid made anſwer, to one who courted her, in theſe verſes of Euripides,

I cannot marry a man
Without the will of my father,
To whom I ſubject am.

' If any one alledges, that the authority of fathers is not ſo great over their ſons as over their daughters, all the laws are againſt him; by which the fathers can even ſell them in their neceſſity (29).' After this the author alledges the Scripture, the Councils, the Fathers, and the Civilians, to prove that the marriage of children ought to be ſubject to the will of thoſe from whom they received life. But all this long diſcourſe is nothing but a ſly evaſion; for this is to ſhift the ſtate of the queſtion, and to paſs *de genere in genus*. The queſtion was not whether the marriage of Mr de Montmorency with the natural daughter of Henry II was lawful: the author of the letter had not touched upon that ſtring; but he had only ſaid, that the marſhal was perjured for confeſſing and denying ſolemnly, that he had promiſed marriage to the lady de Pienne. Theſe two facts are a plain proof of perjury, whether the promiſe was obligatory or not: for if a man ſhould promiſe to commit a crime, he would eaſily obtain, before all the courts of juſtice, a releaſe from his promiſe; but if he ſhould ſwear before one court, that he did promiſe it; and before another, that he did never promiſe it, he would be found guilty of perjury. This was the caſe of Mr de Montmorency, as was pretended; this was the ſubject of the accuſation. The enquiry was not whether he ought to keep his promiſe of marriage, nor whether it was lawful or unlawful: and yet the Proteſtant who anſwered the letter of the cardinal of Lorrain ſuppoſes, that all the accuſation was grounded upon this, that lawful promiſe had not been kept, having made this falſe ſuppoſition, he rambles about, he alledges the divine laws, and the law of nature, he handles the common-place of paternal right, he ſays an hundred needleſs things, and ſays nothing at all to the purpoſe. This is the common practice of thoſe who cannot make a good anſwer, and are afraid leſt they ſhould do a prejudice to their cauſe by being ſilent. They change the ſtate of the queſtion, that they may open a way for excurſions. I believe many readers thought, that the apologiſt for Mr de Montmorency had obtained a full victory, and were very much pleaſed to ſee that he brought Henry the ſecond's daughter into his cauſe: a ſtratagem too frequent in Polemical writings, and which, at the bottom, is a meer impoſition.

[*F*] *Some remorſe of conſcience, which obliged him to aſk the abſolution of Pope Pius IV.*] ' Thus things ſtood while the Pope and the king lived; but either becauſe Mr de Montmorency had afterwards ſome ſcruple about it, and attributed to it the bad ſucceſs of the many pregnancies of his wife, who had but one live child of the many ſhe had conceived, which died immediately after, or for ſome other reaſons, he had recourſe once more to the holy See, and ſent a ſupplication to Pope Pius IV, after the death of Paul, whereof I have the original memomorial; wherein he declares, how by a ſurprize of love he had formerly made a promiſe of marriage to the lady *de Piennes*, on condition, nevertheleſs, that he ſhould obtain the conſent of his father, and not otherwiſe; which he being not able to obtain, the ſaid lady did freely acquit him from his promiſe, as well by word of mouth, as by a declaration ſigned by her, in the preſence of witneſſes, wherein ſhe perſiſts to this day: and he was married; and nevertheleſs, upon account of ſome aſſertions made by him, he deſires abſolution, by way of caution, and that the commiſſion ſhould be addreſſed to the biſhop of Paris. Pope Pius IV, who had not the ſame intereſt with his predeceſſor, made not ſo much ado about it, and ſent him a good and ample diſpenſation (30). . . . This diſpenſation quieted his conſcience, but did not change the condition of his marriage, which continued ſtill to be barren (31).' Mr le Laboureur was very much inclined, for ſome domeſtic reaſons, to juſtify, as much as poſſible, thoſe of the houſe of Montmorency; nevertheleſs, he ſeems to believe that it was not true, that the promiſe I ſpeak of was not made but upon condition: *If this marriage of Diana of France with the marſhal duke of Montmorency*, ſays he, *was both advantageous and glorious in the eyes of the world, yet it is juſtly doubted whether it was pleaſing to* GOD, *becauſe it was contracted with more violence than juſtice, to the prejudice of an engagement, of affection and promiſe on the part of the marſhal with Jane de Halluin* (32).

[*G*] *The lady married, ſome time after, a man who was very much inferior to the galant ſhe had loſt.*] It is Brantome who informs me of this, in a parentheſis which he has inſerted in a narrative he has given us of the reſtitution of the places of the duke of Savoy. What he ſays is a proof that love creeps in every where, and ſerves as a ſpring to the moſt important affairs of ſtate. There were ſome wiſe heads in the king's council, who were of opinion, that all the

(26) Add to this the diſcourſes which the lady de Pienne held with the Sieur de la Porte, which may be ſeen above.

(27) Remark [*L*] of the article LORRAIN (CHARLES).

(28) A letter of a lord of the country of Haynault, ſent to his neighbour and friend who followed the court of Spain, *pag. m.* 5, 6.

(29) An Anſwer to the Epiſtle of Charles de Vaudemont, Cardinal of Lorrain, *fol.* E iij, *verſo*.

(30) Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 439.

(31) Ibid. *pag.* 440.

(32) Ibid. *pag.* 419.

here a very remarkable inſtance, whereby it appears that the paſſions of a prince, which frequently occaſion ſeveral abuſes, prove ſometimes a remedy for the diſorders of the ſtate. The edict whereby all clandeſtine marriages were declared void, occaſioned the enacting of a very good and beneficial law [*H*], but it was not out of zeal for the public

towns which the duke of Savoy demanded back again ſhould not be reſtored to him. The king of Navarre (33) argued, *That this reſtitution ſhould be made abſolutely, otherwiſe he ſhould not have the kingdom of Sardinia, which was in diſpute, and that the duke of Savoy had acquainted, and promiſed him, he would uſe his intereſt for him with the king of Spain. . . . . In concluſion, after many debates, the weaker party carried the cauſe againſt the ſtronger; and therefore they diſpatched into Piedmont, from the Bois de Vincennes, after the taking of Bourges, the lord d'Alluye (Florimond Robertet) one of the four ſecretaries to the king, who was then very much in love with the lady de Pienne* (34). . . . . .

. . . .

. . . .

. . . .

. . . .

whom he deſired very much to marry. The king of Navarre promiſed him, that if he managed the buſineſs to his content, he ſhould marry her, of which there was no probability, but by his favour; foraſmuch as this lady was of one of the beſt and moſt honourable houſes of France, and one who had refuſed, in her time, ſo high and ſo great matches, that there was no reaſon to think a meer ſecretary ſhould marry her; who, nevertheleſs, married her afterwards, more out of humour, and a capricious fancy in the lady, than upon any reaſonable motive. This I have heard many of our courtiers ſay, and not that the thing had been done by the favour of the king of Navarre, for he had been dead above a year; nevertheleſs it was he who firſt countenanced his love, and encouraged and aſſiſted him in it as much as he could: thus, in theſe matters, the grandees at court can do very much, and be very ſerviceable, and even their companions and particular friends.' The king of Navarre knew very well how to make choice of his tools, ſince he made uſe of a man who was very much in love, whom he filled with hopes of poſſeſſing the beloved object.

[*H*] *The edict whereby clandeſtine marriages were declared void, occaſioned the enacting of a very good and beneficial law*] One of the ableſt advocates of the parliament of Paris argues very well upon this ſubject, in his letter to Robert and Fournier, profeſſors of the Civil Law at Orleans, and he is troubled that the law was not ſevere enough. He would not have had things done by halves, but that abſolutely all marriages contracted without the knowledge, or againſt the will of the fathers, ſhould have been annulled. Here follows the beginning of his letter: 'The EDICT concerning 'marriages has been publiſhed in our court of parliament, which is indeed great and magnificent, 'but greater ſtill, if you underſtood the motive of it; 'becauſe ſome of thoſe who hold the chief places of 'France, were the cauſe of it. It is ſaid, that the 'greateſt part of bad examples, proceed commonly 'from ſuch things, as were formerly wiſely and holily ordained, but turn into abuſes in proceſs of time. 'On the contrary, never was there a good law which 'did not proceed from ſome ſcandalous practice; the 'diſeaſe muſt firſt come, before the remedy be found 'out. As to this edict, every one rejoices at it, as 'being excellent and worthy of a king: I alone, 'like another Timon, or man hater, mourn, ſigh, and 'lament, not but that I am glad of the authority that 'is given to fathers over their children; but becauſe 'I am ſorry it is not granted more fully, and that as 'Alexander the Great being arrived in Aſia, did not 'amuſe himſelf with untying the twiſtings of the Gordian knot, like the other princes who had gone that 'way before him, but for a greater diſpatch, cut it 'quite aſunder; ſo I wiſh this matter had been fully 'ſettled, and that by an ordinance made with the common conſent of the Gallican church, all marriages 'of children had been declared null, for which there 'are only promiſes, without the authority and conſent of the fathers and mothers. Upon this account 'I pity France, which tho' it was never weary of 'bringing all eccleſiaſtical matters under a good and 'laudable diſcipline, dares not put the laſt hand to this 'work (35).' What he adds, contains ſeveral judicious remarks; but his concluſion is too ſevere, for he would have thoſe who allure any body with fair words into the ſnare of marriage, to be puniſhed with death. *Our anceſtors*, ſays he (36), *being ſenſible, that it was a thing of a very ill example, that any one under five and twenty years of age, ſhould be thought to be lawfully married by verbal engagements, to the prejudice of the paternal authory, introduced the action of Rape, (which we commonly call* Raptum in parentes) *which is unknown to all other nations. Whereby fathers and mothers, and even guardians, were permitted to bring an accuſation before the royal judge, againſt a man or a woman, who with ſuch fair and affected words, ſhould entice and draw any of their children into the ſnare of marriage: and ſuch is the power and effect of this proſecution, that whilſt it laſts, it ſuſpends and ſtops all the proceeedings which might be made before an official, or an eccleſiaſtical judge, for the validity of the marriage. But what advantage did you ever get by ſuch an accuſation? None at all; only like true Frenchmen, we are in the beginning ſtronger than men, but we prove at laſt weaker than women. Every body ſtirs himſelf in the beginning of the proſecution, the very judges ſeem mightily to favour the plaintiffs. But when all is done, you never ſaw an exemplary puniſhment made upon ſuch an account, and at laſt he, who committed the rape, triumphs over the law and the afflicted family, remaining in full poſſeſſion of the perſon raviſhed. For my part, I am of opinion, either that ſuch an accuſation ſhould not have been introduced amongſt us, or that it ſhould terminate with the death of the guilty; that the diſſolution of his life might alſo produce the diſſolution of his marriage.* Perhaps he did not ſpeak his whole mind, he meant perhaps thoſe, who, not contented to ſeduce a young woman, perſuade her to conſent to her being ſtolen. Suppoſing that out of inadvertency he omitted this part of the definition of a rape, and that he had it in his mind, his concluſion cannot be looked upon as too ſevere in France, for the French puniſh with death all thoſe who ſteal a maid, whether ſhe conſents to it or not. I think that law was not eſtabliſhed, when Paſquier wrote his letter to the two profeſſors of Orleans. I fancy it was eſtabliſhed ſince, becauſe they perceived that the law which puniſhed only the ſtealers of a maid not conſenting, was almoſt of no uſe. It was eaſily eluded, for it was no difficult thing to perſuade a young woman to confeſs that ſhe had conſented to it: ſuch a confeſſion ſaved a man's life, and the maid was not unwilling to ſave the life of a man, who profeſſed that love had forced him to ſteal her: beſides, ſhe found herſelf diſhonoured, very much ſuſpected, and in danger of meeting with no good match, and of being looked upon as the remains of another, having been for ſome time in the power of a ſtealer (37); and all thoſe things being duly conſidered by the daughter and her parents, they reſolved to ſave the man, and in order to it, the ſtolen maid was only to confeſs that ſhe had conſented to it: ſo that ſuch an affair ended as thoſe mentioned by Paſquier (38), and therefore rapes became very common; the old law proved uſeleſs, and it was thought neceſſary to make another more ſevere, that ſhould have no regard to the declaration which maids ſhould make of having conſented to their being ſtolen. It was thought fit to puniſh their conſent; for impunity tends very much to the multiplying of ſuch ill examples: thoſe who ſucceed firſt, are an encouragemt to others, and then no body is aſhamed of treading in a way that ſeveral others have ſafely gone in. See the remark of the article ARIOSTO.

Our advocate examines the permiſſion which the edict gave *to fathers and mothers to diſinherit their children, who have been ſo imprudent as to enter into the bond of marriage without their conſent* (39). He ſhews that it is neither a remedy, nor a conſolation, but a new calamity (40), and maintains that the only remedy is, that *ſuch marriages ſhould be declared null* by an ordinance of a council (41). He alledges the Scripture, the Fathers, the Roman law, the French law under king Charles the Bald, and he ſays that *he does not find that there has been any council ſince, that took away that noble juriſdiction from parents with reſpect to their children.*

(33) Brantome, Memoir. apud Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra, *Tom. i, pag.* 848.

(34) All this chaſm contains a parentheſis in the text of Mr le Laboureur, which would ſerve to no purpoſe here.

(35) Paſquier, Letters, *book iii, pag.* 111, *of Tom. i.*

(36) Ibid. *pag.* 112, 113.

(37) Compare this with the remark [*E*] of the article HELENA.

(38) When there has been a rape there is at firſt a great ſtir about it, the raviſher is ſued and threatened with puniſhment; but that eagerneſs cools by degrees, the raviſher remains maſter of his prey, and it is declared to be a lawful prize. The worſt is, and it happens pretty often, that he makes himſelf feared. They are afraid that when he has had ſport enough with his miſtreſs, he will leave her in the lurch. He muſt be intreated, and ſo he becomes maſter of the terms of the contract.

(39) Paſquier, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 113.

(40) Is it not to make my old age miſerable, that I muſt ſee that fool unhappy in a great meaſure for having fooliſhly bound himſelf, and that I can have no comfort but by making him altogether miſerable, by diſinheriting him as the law impowers me to do? *Ibid. pag.* 114.

(41) Ibid.

public good that Henry II enacted ſo juſt a law, it was to promote the private intereſt of his favourite, and to avoid the ſhame of yielding to the artful intrigues of the Pope (*c*). The houſe of Guiſe did mightily contribute to the oppoſition which Francis de Montmorenci met with at the court of Rome [*I*].

children. He goes on and ſays, ‘ This indeed I know, ‘ that ſome hundred years ſince, ſome monks, patchers ‘ of old gloſſes, have inſinuated to us this barbarous ‘ and bruitiſh opinion, that by the canon law the ‘ conſent of fathers and mothers was requiſite for the ‘ marriage of their children, only out of honour, and ‘ not out of neceſſity. Thoſe monks made a perpe‘tual profeſſion of celibacy, and would to God, that ‘ as that wiſe king of Sparta, Ageſilaus, being ſurpriſ‘ed by a friend, as he was playing with his children, ‘ deſired him to ſuſpend his judgment about it till he ‘ was a father; ſo thoſe monks had not been ſo buſy ‘ as to interpoſe their opinion concerning marriage, ‘ ſince their vow and their rule exempted them from ‘ being fathers. Hence it is that they meaſure pater‘nal affection by their own, I mean by a common ‘ and trivial affection (42).’ I wonder how he forgot to ſay, that the permiſſion of diſinheriting is not a ſufficient terror to young lovers; for there are ſo many fathers, who have eaſily forgiven the fault of marrying againſt their will, and we have ſo few examples, of fathers who have kept their reſentment as long as they lived, and expreſſed it by their laſt will and teſtament, that children flatter themſelves with the hopes of being ſoon reconciled. They relie much upon the natural force of paternal love (43), and they know very well, that a ſhort mortification will expiate great faults with a father, *pro peccato magno paulum ſupplicii ſatis eſt patri* (44).

Paſquier's cenſure is at the bottom a great encomium upon the edict of Henry II. For ſince that learned Civilian would have the rebellion of children under age, to be more ſeverely puniſhed, he praiſes and approves the new degrees of puniſhment, which it was made liable to. Beſides, it is to be obſerved, that he declares that what is wanting therein ought to proceed from the eccleſiaſtical, and not the royal authority.

A Refutation of thoſe, who endeavour to juſtify clandeſtine marriages and rapes.

Let no body ſay, that ſuch an edict is prejudicial to thoſe perſons, whoſe fathers are ſo covetous or capricious, that they will never conſent to the marriages of their children. This is no reaſonable objection, there is no law abſolutely convenient to every body (45), we muſt be therefore contented with ſuch laws as remedy the greateſt evils. Now there are infinitely more children, who, in the heat and folly of youth, will marry improperly, than there are fathers who will oppoſe reaſonable matches. It is therefore better that the laws ſhould reſtrain the liberty of children, than that they ſhould leſſen the paternal authority. Beſides, children after a certain age were no longer reſtrained by the edict of Henry II. Let no body ſay neither, that the liberty of marrying without the conſent of the fathers, gives honeſt people, who have no eſtates, an opportunity of making their fortune. This I have heard ſome Engliſhmen ſay, who endeavoured to make an apology for the privileges of ſome churches in London, where a prieſt may give the nuptial benediction without the obſervation of any preliminary formalities, and hereby legitimate the moſt clandeſtine marriages. It has been ſeen by ſuch means, ſaid they to me, that the patrimony of a very rich heireſs dropped into a poor family, which flouriſhed afterwards, and was the glory of the country. The very ſame argument might ſerve to juſtify the impunity of rapes. But this is a weak apology; for the greateſt abuſes will ſometimes prove convenient to ſome private perſons: but that is not a reaſon to keep them up. Can any one be a true honeſt man, a man of true merit, who endeavours to enrich himſelf by depriving a father of the power which divine and human laws give him over his children? If we reckon right, we ſhall find, that for one man of merit, who raiſed himſelf that way, there are twenty who have only the art of wheedling a young woman, who is either very ſimple, or diſcontented with the ſeverity of a mother, or a guardian, &c. and the falſity of the apology for the privileges of thoſe churches has been plainly perceived; for we have read not long ſince in the Gazettes, that the parliament of England was about to take them away.

[*I*] *The houſe of Guiſe did powerfully contribute to the oppoſitions of the court of Rome.*] ‘ The preſence of the ‘ duke of Guiſe at Rome, and the mutual jealouſy, ‘ with regard to power, between him and the con‘ſtable, gave ſo much the more occaſion to ſuſpect ‘ that he croſſed that diſpenſation, becauſe the in‘tended marriage was very advantageous to the houſe ‘ of Montmorency. He and the cardinal his brother, ‘ were ſtrictly allied to Pope Paul IV, and all the ‘ houſe of the Caraffa's, they had been the chief au‘authors of the rupture of the truce with Spain in ‘ their behalf, and the conſtable had oppoſed it; and ‘ therefore it was likely that they ſet the Pope at ‘ work, and that if they did not propoſe to him to ‘ aſk Diana of France for one of his nephews, they ‘ made him hope, however, that he might obtain ‘ her by ſtarting ſome difficulties againſt the diſpen‘ſation, and made him ſenſible of the advantages ‘ which would accrue to his relations by it. So that ‘ they would not only have broke off a marriage of ‘ great importance to the houſe of Montmorency, ‘ but alſo made another with a moſt noble houſe in‘deed, but unequal in riches and grandeur (46).’ The Guiſes found ſo many advantages in the marriage of Francis de Montmorency with the lady de Pienne, as Mr le Laboureur ſhews, that there can be no doubt but that they played the game which he ſpeaks of; and if they had not prepoſſeſſed the Pope, and ſollicited him, it is not likely that ſo cunning and crafty a Pope would have had ſo little power over his paſſions. You have ſeen (47) how he expreſſed his partiality by his rough proceeding, and inveighing againſt thoſe who gave not their opinion according to his deſire. Had he left to every one the liberty of giving their votes, he could not have compaſſed his deſign, that is to ſay, the execution of the projects which the Guiſes put him upon. Had it not been for that, he had commanded his paſſion, concealed his game, and perſuaded many people that his zeal for diſcipline obliged him not to violate the holy canons in the leaſt, though he might thereby pleaſe the moſt Chriſtian king, and only exerciſe the Papal authority in the ſame latitude as his predeceſſors had done, more than once. Had the Pope's conduct been ſuch, it might have afforded Mr Eſprit an example *of the deceitfulneſs of human virtues.*

PIGHIUS (Albertus) was born at Campen, in the province of Over-Yſſel, and is reckoned among the learned men of the XVIth century. Moreri ſpeaks of him at large, but he has not obſerved a groſs miſtake of Lewis Guicciardin [*A*], which I ſhall

[*A*] *A groſs miſtake of Lewis Guicciardin.*] He ſays that Albertus Pighius, a great Divine, and a great Mathematician, left Italy, where Hadrian VI, Clement VII, and Paul III, had heaped up honours and riches on him, and returned into his country, and died in it glorioully ſome years after; and then he adds, that nevertheleſs ſome authors have ſaid that he died in the year 1530, at Bologna, by the fall of a bridge. He obſerves, that Paul Jovius is the firſt who told that ſtory, and that Surius, and ſome others, did blindly tranſcribe him: and from thence he takes occaſion to cenſure the raſhneſs of ſome copiers. *Paulus tamen Jovius, quem ſecuti ſunt poſtmodùm Frater Laurentius Surius, & alii quidam Scriptores, qui non inſtituta priùs collatione, neque adhibitâ ullâ conſimili diligentiâ, (digni ſanè hoc nomine qui reprehendantur) alienâ fide ſubnixi ad alios ſeſe perpetuò referunt: Paullus (inquam) Jovius, libro hiſtoriarum ſuarum vigeſimo ſexto, Albertum hunc, multò anteà tempore, anno ſcilicet Chriſti* 1530, *& in ipſa Caroli Quinti Cæſaris inauguratione, fortuita pontis ruinâ Bononiæ mortuum perhibet* (1). Here is a cenſure very ill placed! Guicciardin does ſharply condemn the authors, who admit of any relations, without examining whether they be true or not, he ſpeaks of them,

---

(*c*) See the remark [*C*].

(42) Id. ib. *pag.* 117.

(43) O nimium potens
Quanto parentes ſanguinis vinclo tenes
Natura! quàm te colimus inviti quoque!
Oh powerful Nature, with how ſtrong a chain doſt thou bind parents! How unwilling do we reverence thee! Seneca, in Hippolyto, *Act. IV, ver.* 1114.

(44) Terent. in Andria, *Act. V, Sc. III, in fine.*

(45) See, above, remark [*E*], of the article PATIN, citation **.

(46) Le Laboureur, ubi ſupra, *Tom. ii, pag.* 437.

(47) In the remark [*B*].

(1) Ludovicus Guicciardinus, in Deſcriptione Belgii Provinciarum, *pag. m.* 237.

ſhall cenſure, nor the extream uglineſs, and the bad pronunciation of Albertus Pighius [*B*]. Moreri has committed ſome conſiderable faults [*C*]. Beza ſays, that Pighius wrote a book againſt Calvin, to be promoted to the dignity of a cardinal [*D*]. Others affirm that the reading of Calvin's works made Pighius heterodox [*E*], with reſpect to the merit

I ſay with great contempt, and yet for all that he moſt egregiouſly commits the ſame fault for which he blames them. For if he had been at the pains to conſult Paul Jovius, and Brother Laurentius Surius, he might have ſeen that they do not ſay Pighius loſt his life in the year 1530. He muſt therefore have blindly tranſcribed ſome writers, who imputed that falſhood to thoſe two authors. I have conſulted Paul Jovius in the place quoted by Guicciardin, and I found nothing in it relating to the matter in hand: I looked for the place where he deſcribes the coronation of Charles V, and I found only that Pighius was one of thoſe who fell, when the bridge tumbled down. ‘ Ibi plerique militibus immixti, fœdo caſu procidentes, ſeſe pilis atque ſecuribus induerunt; inter quos fuit Albertus Pighius Belga theologus Lutheromaſtix, minima tamen pro tumultu clades incidit (2). - - - - *Many being mingled amongſt the ſoldiers fell under halberts and battle-axes, amongſt whom was Albertus Pighius, a Dutch Divine, a great ſcourge to the Lutherans, but yet there was more noiſe than hurt.*’ A man who ſays that the fall of the bridge made more noiſe than it did hurt, and doth not ſay that Pighius, the only perſon he names amongſt thoſe that fell, was killed by it, intimates plainly enough, that he recovered of it. Note, that he calls him Lutheromaſtix, the ſcourge of the Lutherans, whereby Guicciardin may be convicted of a new over-ſight, for he accuſes Paul Jovius of having charged Pighius with Lutheraniſm (3). His charge againſt Surius is very ill grounded, for that Carthuſian doth faithfully tranſcribe Paul Jovius (4), and beſides, he ſays in another place, that Pighius died only in the year 1543 (5). To which I ſhall add, that Paul Jovius obſerves, that the piety of Pighius preſerved him from the diſmal conſequences of the fall of the bridge. ‘ Quum id volumen (*de hierarchia*) commentaretur . . . . eum è ſummo vitæ periculo certiſſimum Dei maximi numen eripuit. Bononiæ enim in celeberrima pompa, quum tranſeunte coronato Cæſare Carolo Quinto, pars lignei pontis juxta Cæſarem turbæ pondere corruiſſet, Albertus tignorum atque hominum ruina ita oppreſſus eſt, ut probitatis, ac inſtituti operis merito ſervaretur. Obiit nondum ſenex in patrio ſolo, ſacerdotiis à Clemente & Paulo liberaliter honeſtatus (6). - - - *Whilſt he was compoſing that book concerning the hierarchy . . . . he was reſcued from imminent danger by the ſignal providence of GOD. For during the grand proceſſion at the coronation of the emperor Charles V at Bologna, when part of the wooden bridge tumbled down by the weight of the crowd, he was almoſt cruſhed to death with the pieces of timber and numbers of people that fell upon him, but was preſerved upon the account of his piety, and the merit of the work he was about. He died before he was old in his native country, having received great honours and benefices from Clement and Paul.*’ Hoſpinian, in anſwer to thoſe who alledged, as an argument againſt the doctrine of Zuinglius, that he died a violent death, retorts this argument upon them amongſt other reaſons. He names ſome perſons, zealous for Popery, who ended their days after a tragical manner, and reckons Pighius amongſt them. ‘ De Pighio aliqui ſcribunt, *ſays he* (7), fuiſſe illum in tumultu oppreſſum in magna hominum frequentia una cum pecunia illa quam à Papa & Cardinalibus propter operam ſuam in cauſa pontificia defendenda collocatam, acceperat. - - - *Some write that Pighius periſhed in a great crowd of people, with all the riches he had received from the Pope and Cardinals, upon the account of his ſervice in defending the Papal cauſe.*’ We find in all Chriſtian ſocieties, ſome Hiſtorians who take advantage of a falſe report: The orthodox themſelves are not free from that fault. See in the remark [*F*] a Divine of the confeſſion of Augſburg, who advances the ſame falſity with Hoſpinian.

[*B*] *The extreme uglineſs and the bad pronunciation of Pighius.*] Paul Jovius pretends, that nature inſulted Pighius with a kind of impudence, by covering his great learning and Chriſtian eloquence with a hideous face. *Magna hercle naturæ illudentis inverecundia, excellentem doctrinam cum illuſtri eloquentia conjunctam ſi Chriſtiani ſcriptoris decus ſpectetur, multa infaceti oris truculentia opertam, in Alberto Pighio conſpeximus. . . . In differendo vultus Scythico more contuſus & enormis, & aſpero gutture vox educta, & graviter reſonantis naſi tumultus, totam ferè ſapientiæ gloriam deformabant* (8).

[*C*] *Moreri has committed ſome conſiderable faults.*] I. I will not be poſitive about this queſtion, whether Pighius's father was a gentleman; but I dare ſay that Moreri aſſures it ſomewhat raſhly. The word *Patricius*, upon which he relies, is an equivocal word; it does commonly ſignify, when it is uſed for modern families, a man, whoſe anceſtors have been ſenators, burgo-maſters, &c. The Patrician families in ſome imperial towns, and in ſome other places, are ſometimes noble; but whether they be ſo or not, they are called Patrician families, provided they have been for ſome time in poſſeſſion of the magiſtracy from father to ſon. Perhaps this was all the *Gentility* of Pighius's father (9). I am not ignorant that Pighius had ſeveral fine lordſhips (10), and that it is commonly a ſign of a noble extraction; but becauſe it is not a demonſtrative proof of it, I will not decide poſitively about it. It is enough for me that I have obſerved the ambiguous ſenſe of the word, which gave occaſion to Moreri's obſervation. II. This expreſſion is wrong, *Mark of Benevento had miſrepreſented the opinion of Alphonſus, concerning the ſituation of the eighth circle.* There are two blunders in thoſe words, for Moreri ſhould have ſaid, that that man had miſrepreſented the hypotheſis of Alphonſus concerning the motion of the eighth Heaven (11). III. Theſe words, *he wrote in* 1538 *an apology for the general council, which Pope* Paul III *had publiſhed*, are abſurd; for that Pope did not publiſh an apology for the council, but a bull for the celebration of a council. IV. That apology of Pighius was not rewarded with a *preſent of two thouſand ducats*, and with the *provoſtſhip of St John at Utrecht*; for Pighius received thoſe two gratifications in the year 1535 (12), three years before the publication of the apology. V. When Moreri ſays that he died at Utrecht the 24th of December 1543, he miſtakes the ſenſe of Valerias Andreas, who ſaid *obiit*, VII. *Kalend. Januarii, anni ineuntis* CIↃ IↃ XLIII. The meaning of it is, that Pighius departed this life the 26th of December 1542: Valerius Andreas is not miſtaken, and ſo Spondanus committed a fault when he ſaid that Pighius and Eckius died in the year 1543, within the ſpace of one month. He places Eckius's death on the 10th of February (13). Swertius places that of Pighius on the 29th of December 1543 (14), in which Bullart copies him (15). They are miſtaken, for cardinal Sadoletus mentions the death of Pighius in a letter bearing date June 17th, 1543 (16). See the remark [*F*].

[*D*] *Beza ſays that Pighius wrote a book againſt Calvin, to be promoted to the dignity of a cardinal.*] That book of Pighius, ſays Beza, was deſpiſed by honeſt men, and the author was deceived by Satan. Such was his reward. ‘ Adverſus Albertum Pighium Campenſem, ſophiſtam illius ætatis facile principem, à quo etiam fuerat pro Antagoniſta delectus, ex quo videlicet reportata inſigni victoria, galerum mox, à Pontifice conſequeretur. At ille hoc ſuo labore fruſtratus, id unum aſſequutus eſt quod merentur veritatis hoſtes, nempe ut & doctis ſaniſque hominibus fœteret, & ab ipſo Satana deciperetur (17). - - - *Albertus Pighius born at Campen, the greateſt ſophiſt of that time, had choſen Calvin for his antagoniſt, that by gaining a notable victory over him, he might get a cardinal's cap from the Pope. But he was diſappointed in his expectation, and only obtained the reward which the enemies of truth deſerve, viz. to be deſpiſed by learned and wiſe men, and deceived by Satan himſelf.*’

[*E*] *The reading of Calvin's works made Pighius heterodox.*] Theophilus Raynaud having ſaid, that there are ſome heretics, who cannot be read without danger by one that has not a deep learning, but that there are ſome other heretics, who vent their errors in ſo groſs a manner, that a reader, though not very learned, needs not be afraid of reading them; that author, merit of good works, and the juſtification of ſinners. It is pretended by others, that Pighius examined Calvin's works with ſo great a deſire of refuting them, that his averſion for the opinions of that adverſary made him run into another extream. They ſay, that he followed the ſteps of the Pelagians, and therefore cardinal Bona adviſes the reader to read Pighius's works with caution (*a*). His treatiſes concerning Free-will againſt Calvin, and concerning Original Sin, have been placed among the prohibited books by the Spaniſh Inquiſition. Poſſevinus acquaints his reader, that Pighius's doctrine concerning Original Sin, and Grace, are not approved by the Divines, becauſe he ſeems to have departed from the doctrine of St Auguſtin, which the church approves of (*b*). The Janſeniſt, who publiſhed ſome letters of the prince of Conti, has expreſſed himſelf more ſtrongly. He ſays, that Pighius muſt needs be looked upon (*c*) *as a wretched Divine*, ſince he is *a man who ſuſpects the doctrine of St Auguſtin, a man who adviſes thoſe who are deſirous to underſtand the true doctrine of Free-will, rather to read the other works of St Auguſtin, than thoſe which he writ againſt the Pelagians, &c* (*d*). I ſhall ſet down ſome remarks that have been made againſt John Gerhard, which contain ſome particulars, not unfit to be inſerted in this article [*F*], and I ſhall not forget to obſerve that

---

(2) Paulus Jovius, Hiſt. *lib. xxvii, fol. m.* 111, *verſo.*

(3) Lutheraniſmi inſuper, etſi injuſtiſſimè quidem, eum inſimulans: cùm (ut diximus) à doctrinâ Lutheri fuerit alieniſſimus, adeoque ſummus illius hoſtis & antagoniſta. *Ludov. Guicciardin. ubi ſupra.*

(4) Surius, Commentar. *pag. m.* 239, *ad ann.* 1530.

(5) Ibid. *pag.* 491, *ad ann.* 1543.

(6) Jovius, in Elogiis, *cap. cv, pag.* 246.

(7) Hoſpinian. Hiſt. Sacrament. *Tom. ii, pag.* 210.

(8) Jov. in Elog. *pag.* 245.

(9) Albertus Pighius campenſis Tranſiſalanus patricio ſanguine natus. *Valer. Andreas, Bibl. Belg. pag.* 38.

(10) See the remark [*F*].

(11) *The words of* Valerius Andreas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 39, *which Moreri has not well tranſlated, are,* poſitionem Alphonſinam de motu octavi orbis depravantem.

(12) Valer. Andreas. ibid.

(13) Spond. Ann. Eccleſ. *ad ann.* 1543, *num.* 12, *pag. m.* 479. *He took this from Surius, except the day of Eckius's death, which is not to be found in Surius.*

(14) Swert. Ath. Belg. *pag.* 115.

(15) Bullart, Academ. des Sciences, *Tom. ii, pag.* 14.

(16) See page 686, of Sadoletus's Letters, Lyons 1554.

(17) Beza, in Vita Calvini, *ad ann.* 1543.

(*a*) Albertus Pighius ita preſſè Pelagianorum ſectabatur veſtigia ut opera ejus cautè legenda merito cenſuerit Cardinalis Bona. *Narratio Chronol. Cauſæ Michaëlis Baji, pag.* 192, *Tom. II, Oper. Baji Edit.* 1696. See remark [*G*], citat. (32), (33).

(*b*) Poſſevin. in Apparatu.

(*c*) See at the end of the prince of Conti's Letters to Father des Champs, printed in 1689, the treatiſe which is intituled, *St Auguſtin juſtified from Calviniſm, pag.* 181, 182.

(*d*) You will ſee the ſequel of this paſſage towards the end of the remark [*G*].

author, I ſay, having once laid down that foundation, brings in Luther and Calvin. He reckons Calvin amongſt the heretics of the firſt claſs, and Luther amongſt thoſe of the ſecond, and alledges Pighius as a pregnant example of what he ſays. 'Qua ratione Lutherus, qui ubique ſtercora, & cœnum crepat, ſuamque animi impotentiam ubique prodit, minorem legentis peritiam expoſcit, quàm Calvinus, cujus in ſcribendo vafrities, etiam mediocriter doctis fraudi eſſe queat, ut in Alberto Pighio eſt deprehenſum, quem conſtat ex lectione librorum Calvini impactum non raro eſſe in ſcopulos: tametſi homo erat non ineruditus, quod edita ab eo volumina teſtatum faciunt (18). - - - *Wherefore Luther, who every where throws about his dung and naſtineſs, and ſhews the impotency of his mind, requires leſs learning in his reader than Calvin, whoſe ſubtile way of writing may impoſe even upon them that are tolerably learned; as we find by Albertus Pighius, who by reading Calvin's books frequently ſplit againſt rocks: though he was a learned man, as the works he publiſhed teſtify.*' An Engliſh Proteſtant aſſures us that Pighius is altogether orthodox in his belief concerning Juſtification (19). Another Proteſtant of the ſame country ſays, that the Papiſts accuſe Pighius of having been ſeduced by reading Calvin, but that Pighius maintained he took his doctrine only from the Scripture. 'Dicunt Pontificii Pighium, alioqui Catholicum Doctorem, ſeductum ex Lectione librorum Calvini. At Pighius, ipſe teſtatur, ſententiam ſuam ſe è lectione Scripturarum hauſiſſe: O Calvinum vel Adverſariorum teſtimonio beatum, cujus Scripta tantum cum Sacris Scripturis conſenſum retinent, ſi quod Pontificius Doctor celeberrimus fatetur ſe ex Sacræ Scripturæ lectione habuiſſe, id alii Pontificii lectioni librorum Calvini tribuant. Profectò niſi Scholaſticorum ſententia cum manifeſtis Scripturis pugnaſſet, nunquam illam deſeruiſſet Pighius (20). - - - *The Papiſts ſay that Pighius, otherwiſe a Catholic doctor, was led away by reading Calvin's works. But Pighius himſelf affirms, he had his doctrine only from the ſcriptures. O Calvin, happy even by the teſtimony of thy adverſaries, ſince thy writings are ſo conformable to the holy ſcriptures, that what a very famous Popiſh doctor confeſſes he took from the ſcriptures, other Papiſts impute to the reading of thy books. Certainly, had not the opinion of ſcholaſtic divines evidently claſhed with the ſcriptures, Pighius would never have forſaken it.*' I ſhall add a French miniſter to theſe two Engliſhmen: 'Cardinal Roffenſis and Pighius who wrote alſo againſt Luther, maintained the doctrine of Grace; nay, the latter affirmed, that we are not juſtified *by an inherent righteouſneſs that is within us*: but he was ſharply cenſured by the * dean of the univerſity of Louvain, who upbraided him with having ſhamefully departed from the doctrine which they had received together in the ſchool of Adrian VI, and that he was corrupted by the reading of Calvin's Inſtitution (21).' I have juſt now peruſed the treatiſe *de Fide & Juſtificatione*, which is the ſecond of the nine controverſies which Pighius publiſhed at Cologne in the year 1542, with this title, *Controverſiarum præcipuarum in comitiis Ratiſponenſibus tractatarum, & quibus nunc potiſſimum exagitatur Chriſti fides & religio, diligens & luculenta explicatio*, and I have found ſome things in it which make me wonder, how any body could ſay with any ſhew of reaſon, that his opinion about Juſtification was altogether the ſame with the opinion of the Proteſtants. He refutes them with all his might, and ſays in expreſs words, that when God juſtifies and ſaves a ſinner, he has a ſpecial regard to his good works. 'Ad amorem noſtrum atque opera præcipuum à Deo & majorem quam fidei reſpectum haberi in donando nobis juſtificationis & ſalutis gratiam. - - - *In beſtowing upon us juſtifying and ſaving grace, GOD has a ſpecial regard to our love and good works, and even more than to our faith.*' This is the ſummary which he put in the margin, folio 63 *verſo*, and in the next folio, *opera noſtra coram Deo eſſe meritoria*, - - - *our good works in the ſight of GOD, are meritorious.* I find that the doctrine of the text does perfectly agree with the ſummary of the margin. We ſhall ſee hereafter (22), that Calvin and the Janſeniſts charge him with being a downright Pelagian.

[*F*] *I ſhall ſet down ſome remarks, that have been made againſt John Gerhard, which contain ſome particulars not unfit to be inſerted in this article.*] The author of thoſe remarks was of Utrecht, and a Lawyer by profeſſion: his name was Giſbertus Lappius à Waveren. He ſent them to Nihuſius, who inſerted them in his Hypodigma, printed in the year 1648. They contain a ſharp cenſure of a paſſage of John Gerhard, profeſſor of Divinity at Iëna. That paſſage is to be found in the 5th tome of the *loci communes* of that Profeſſor, ſect. 14. where he refutes the fourteenth mark which Bellarmin has given of the true church, viz. that her oppoſers die a miſerable death. John Gerhard retorts this argument againſt Bellarmin, and ſpeaks of the unfortunate death of the perſecutors of the Proteſtant religion, and reckons Pighius amongſt them. 'Eodem anno Chriſti CIↃ IↃ XLIII, *ſays he*, mortuus eſt Albertus Pighius, Papatûs defenſor non poſtremus; de quo ſcribunt, fuiſſe illum in tumultu oppreſſum, in magna hominum frequentia, unà cum pecunia, quam à Papa, & Cardinalibus propter operam ſuam, in cauſa Pontificia defendenda collatam, acceperat. - - - *In the ſame year of Chriſt 1543 died Albertus Pighius, a ſtrenuous defender of the Papacy: who is ſaid to have periſhed in a tumult in a great croud of people, together with the money he had received from the Pope and Cardinals for the ſervice he had done in defending the Popiſh cauſe.*' The Critic proves by the words of Paul Jovius which I have quoted (23), that the fall of the bridge happened in the year 1530, and that Albertus Pighius was not killed by it. He adds, that the Pope's liberality towards him happened after the year 1530. So that at the worſt, he could not have been cruſhed by the fall of the bridge with his money, as the Profeſſor of Iëna ſuppoſes. Afterwards he ſhews that Albertus Pighius *Præpoſitus & Archidiaconus Eccleſiæ Divi Johannis, liber Dominus in Midrecht, Wilnes, Cudelſteert, Zevenhoven, Tamen; Dominus in Achtienhoven, Blocklant, Nuythoorn* (24), died having duly received the ſacraments of the Church, and with a great preſence of mind on the 26th of December 1542, in a magnificent houſe which he had at Utrecht. *Ultrajecti in ædibus clauſtralibus, quas in immunitate collegiatæ Eccleſiæ Divi Johannis magnificas poſſidebat* (25). This date of the day and year of his death is to be found in a letter which John Vorſtius de Lombeca, dean of the cathedral church of Utrecht, and one of the executors of the laſt will of Albertus

(18) Theoph. Raynaudus, de malis ac bonis Libris, *num.* 453, *pag. m.* 263.

(19) Mortonus, Antidot. contra merita, *cap. vii*, §. *i*, apud Pope Blount, Cenſ. Author. *pag.* 418.

(20) Epiſc. Carleton. Conſenſ. Eccleſ. Cathol. contra Tridentin. *cap. iii*, apud Pope Blount, ubi ſupra.

* Tapperus.

(21) Baſnage, Hiſtoire de la Religion des Egliſes Réformées, *Tom. ii, pag.* 39, *Edit.* 1690, *in* 12*mo*.

(22) In the remark [*G*], towards the end.

(23) See the remark [*A*].

(24) Giſbertus Lappius à Waveren, apud Nihuſium in Hypodigmate, *pag.* 339, 340.

(25) Ibid.

that Pighius is accuſed of being a plagiary [*G*], and that thoſe who wrote againſt him (*e*) own that he was an eloquent and ingenious man, and that he had all the qualities of a good

Albertus Pighius, wrote the 29th of December 1542, to Gerard Hamont, prior of the charter-houſe of Cologne. The Critic gives an abſtract of that letter: There is a remarkable thing in it. Pighius was ſo provoked at a book which Bucer wrote againſt him, that notwithſtanding his illneſs, he was employed every day in writing his apology, and no body was able to perſuade him to have ſome regard to the ill ſtate of his health. He would never leave off writing an anſwer to Bucer's book, and this haſtened his death. This anſwer remained imperfect, and was printed notwithſtanding (26). Here are the very words of the dean's letter (27): *Hoc adjiciam, præfatum Præpoſitum, D. Pighium, libello quodam, nomine Buceri emiſſo, quo eum acrius punxit, ita, durante ſua ægritudine, fuiſſe commotum, ut nullâ perſuaſione induci potuerit, ut aliqua ſuæ valetudinis habita ratione, Apologiam quandam reſponſivam edere, & indies ſcribere, voluerit omittere. Quam quidem, inchoatam tantum, morte præventus, reliquit: quæ certe indubitata fuit cauſa celerioris ejus deceſſus. Eandem Apologiam, ſic inchoatam, curabo viſitari, ac deinde typis excudi.* As to what Gerhard ſays, that the cardinals gave a great deal of money to Pighius; the dean anſwers, that it is very likely they expreſſed only in words the eſteem and affection they had for him. He quotes two letters, one of cardinal Sadoletus, written in the year 1539, and the other of cardinal Marcellus Cervinus, written from Rome the 27th of October 1542. Sadoletus aſſures Albertus Pighius that he will recommend him to the Pope and to the Cardinals. Cervinus promiſes him to repreſent his ſervices and his want to the Pope, and proteſts that if he could afford him wherewith to ſatisfy his creditors, he would do it with all his heart: ‘Quantum verò attinet ad æs alienum tuum, ſi ejus diſſolvendi facultas in mea poteſtate eſſet poſita, non laborares. Et tamen, quamvis S. S. D. N. multis magniſque hoc tempore impenſis ſimul gravetur, non deëro tua merita atque neceſſitates commemorare, & juvare rem tuam familiarem, quantum potero (28). - - - *As to your debts, were it in my power to pay them, you ſhould be in no diſtreſs. And though his Holineſs at preſent is put to vaſt charges on many accounts, I will not fail to repreſent your ſervices and wants, and to aſſiſt you as much as I can.*’ Laſtly, he obſerves that Pighius grew poor by reaſon of ſeveral ſuits at law, the chief whereof was that which he ſtoutly maintained againſt the emperor, and againſt the court of the province, who called the high juriſdiction of the provoſtſhip of St John into queſtion.

It cannot be denied by one who narrowly obſerves all his ſteps, that he was an intriguing man, and a great *Faciendaire* (§ *a*). I uſe this old French word, which ſeems to me to be very expreſſive, and which I found in ſome good authors, who lived in the beginning of the XVIIth century (29). I wiſh it had been kept up, and I wonder it is not to be found in Nicot, nor in Monet, nor in Furetiere. But there are many other words as remarkable as that, which they knew nothing of.

[(§ *a*) This word comes from the Italian *facenda*, from whence is derived *facendaro*, another Italian word anſwering to the French *faciendaire*. Therefore tho' this word is not in Nicot, nor Monet, nor Furetiere, yet we find *facende* in Oudin, later than the two firſt. *Facienda* in the Spaniſh, French, and Italian Dictionary, printed in 4to, at Geneva 1671. For the reſt, the word *faciendaire* itſelf is found in Paſquier, l. 6. ch. 12. of his Recherches. REM. CRIT.]

[*G*] *Pighius is accuſed of being a Plagiary.*] Calvin accuſes him of it. The catalogues of Plagiaries, which we have ſeen hitherto, ſay nothing of it. Pighius began his book concerning Free-will, with the connexion that is between the knowledge of GOD and the knowledge of man. He found that method in Calvin's Inſtitution, and made uſe of it, without acknowleding from whence he had it. Calvin blames him for it, and cannot apprehend what ground there is for ſo great a familiarity. He can find no other reaſon for it but the right of preſcription, becauſe Pighius had been uſed for a long time to this ſort of plundering. ‘Miror qua fronte auſus fuerit, nulla mei mentione facta, tam familiariter ſumere de meo libro, quod in ſuum tranſcriberet. Neque enim quo jure id faciat, video: niſi fortè preſcriptionem obtendat, quia ſic facere pridem ſolitus ſit. Nam in magno illo libro, quem adverſus noſtram confeſſionem edidit, integras ſæpe ex inſtitutione mea paginas, ubi viſum eſt, infercit, ac ſuo commodo ſic adaptat, quaſi aliunde non ſumpſiſſet. Velim nunc ſcire quo jure aut titulo mea ſic pro ſuis uſurpet. Si qua magna eſſet inter nos neceſſitudo, ego hanc confidentiam amicitiæ non difficulter concederem. Sed nunc huic veniæ non eſt locus. An quia hoſtis ſum, ſe jus direptionis in omnia mea habere putat? At hoc prædæ genus nullo, nec jure, nec more, defendi poteſt. Unus ergo prætextus reſtat, homini docto potuiſſe non minus venire in mentem quæ dixeram, quàm mihi prius venerant. Sed lectores obſecro, ſi tantum habeant ocii, ut caput primum libri Pighiani cum primo Inſtitutionis meæ capite conferant. Nihil dico: niſi quod non ſine riſu ac ſtomacho perſpicient nimis perditam hominis impudentiam. Quod ſi ulterius pergere libeat, percurrant quæ de Juſtificatione tractat in altero illo opere, & ad ſextum Inſtitutionis meæ caput exigant: mirum ſi bilem continere queant. Neque enim clanculum furatur aut carptim: neque artificio tegere ita ſtudet ſuas rapinas, ut apud ſe natum videatur, quod apud me legit, ſed ita palam mea ad verbum recitat, ut videatur paginas ipſas totas pigritia aſſuiſſe, quò deſcribendi laborem fugeret. Si fateretur authorem, eum dicerem mutuari: nunc quid cauſari poteſt, quo minus plagiarius palam vocetur (30).’ - - - - *I am ſurprized at his aſſurance in taking the liberty to tranſcribe from my book, without making the leaſt mention of me. Nor do I ſee what he can alledge for himſelf, unleſs it be the right of preſcription, becauſe he had been uſed to this way for a long time. For in that great book, which he put out againſt my Confeſſion, he has frequently inſerted whole pages, taken from my Inſtitution, and ſo adapted them to his own purpoſe, as if he had not had them elſewhere. Now I would fain know, what right or title he has to make uſe of what belongs to me, as if it were his own. Were there any great acquaintance between us, I could readily forgive his confidence upon the ſcore of friendſhip. But now there is no room for ſuch an indulgence. Does he think that he may lawfully plunder my goods, becauſe I am his enemy? This kind of plunder can be juſtified by no law or cuſtom. The only pretence then is, that the ſame thoughts might have occurred to this learned man, as had occurred to me. But I would entreat my readers, if they have ſo much time, to compare the firſt chapter of Pighius's book with the firſt chapter of my Inſtitution: and then they will ſee his intolerable impudence, not without contempt and indignation. And if they will pleaſe to go further, and run over his treatiſe on Juſtification, and examine it by the ſixth chapter of my Inſtitution, I believe they will hardly be able to govern their paſſion. For he does not ſteal in ſecret, and by picking out here and there; nor does he artfully endeavour to hide his theft, that what he has from me might appear to be his own; but he repeats verbatim what I ſay, in ſuch a bare-faced manner, that he ſeems to have ſtitched entire pages to his book, on purpoſe to avoid the trouble of tranſcribing them. Had he named his author, I ſhould call him a borrower: but as he has not, he deſerves the name of a Plagiary.*’ You ſee that he is accuſed of having ſtollen ſeveral pages, word for word, out of Calvin's Inſtitution, to make them his own, without any alteration or diguiſe. It is a ſurprizing ſecurity; but Calvin adds, to excuſe him, that he was contented to pleaſe thoſe who never conſulted the writings of the other party, and approved of every thing that was publiſhed againſt the Proteſtants. ‘Mirabitur quicunque leget, unde tantus homini ſtupor: qui nihil veritus ſit, in ipſo ſtatim veſtigio deprehendi. Ego verò dum omnia benè reputo, habeo quod pro hominis excuſatione dicam: eum ſecuritate magis quàm ſocordia id feciſſe. Satis enim habuit, ſi modò iis placeret, qui non minori religione à noſtris abſtinent, quàm facilitate omnia laudant ac mirantur, quæ nos quovis modo impugnant (31). - - - - *The reader will wonder how he came to be ſo ſtupid, as not to apprehend he would be found out immediately. But when I conſider it, there is one thing may be ſaid in his excuſe,* viz. *that he did ſo more out of ſecurity*

‘ *than*

(*e*) Calvin, Bucer, &c.

(26) *See* Cochlæus, in Actis Lutheri, *ad ann.* 1542, *fol. m.* 322.

(27) Apud Nihuſium, ibid. *pag.* 340.

(28) Ibid. *pag.* 342, 343.

(29) Du Pleſſis Mornai makes uſe of it ſometimes.

(30) Calvin. Reſponſ. contra Pighium de libero arbitrio, *pag.* 140, Opuſcul. Theolog.

(31) Ibid.

good ſophiſt, and of a good defender of a bad cauſe; that he knew how to give an odious turn to the doctrines of his adverſaries, and how to declame, when he found an occaſion of ſtirring up the indignation of the reader againſt them, by the help of certain principles which the common people will eaſily reliſh; that he knew very well how to hide the weak ſide of his cauſe, to put on an aſſurance, and ſo to perplex the matter, as to make one loſe the ſight of the main difficulty; and that in general he treated his ſubject very methodically. He took care to inſert in a preface, what his adverſaries owned concerning his great parts (*f*).

(*f*) *See* Cochlæus, in Actis & Scriptis Lutheri, *ad ann.* 1542, *sub fin. fol. m.* 322.

'*than imprudence. For he was contented, if he could* '*pleaſe thoſe, who as conſcientiouſly forbear to read our* '*writings, as they readily commend and admire every* '*thing that is writ againſt us.*' Note, that Calvin does not acknowledge that his works had made Pighius orthodox in the leaſt: on the contrary, he calls him a Pelagian. 'Hoc totum non modo Pelagii 'ſcholam redolet, ſed mera eſt Pelagianæ impietatis 'magna ex parte profeſſio (32). . . . . Quòd autem 'toties cum Pelagianis nihil ſe habere commune ja-'ctat, neſcio quos hic Pelagianos comminiſcatur. Ne-'que enim tantùm cum iis, quos deſcribit Auguſtinus, 'multa habet ſimilia, ſed eorum quibuſdam multo eſt 'deterior . . . . (33). Ergo, ut aliquando claudatur 'hic liber, fruſtra, aut ſe à Pelagio disjungere cona-'tur Pighius, cujus ſocietate eum teneri implicitum 'tam apertè demonſtravimus: aut nos Manichæo, 'aliiſque hæreticis adjungere, à quibus non minus 'diſſidemus, quàm ipſe ab orthodoxo Eccleſiæ ſenſu '(34).' - - - - *All this not only ſavours of the ſchool of* '*Pelagius, but in a great meaſure is an open profeſſion* '*of the Pelagian impiety. . . . As to his bragging ſo often* '*that he has nothing in common with the Pelagians, I* '*do not know who he means here by Pelegians. For he* '*not only maintains many things as thoſe did, whom* '*Auguſtin deſcribes, but he is much worſe than ſome of* '*them were. . . . . And therefore, to conclude, Pighius* '*in vain attempts either to disjoin himſelf from Pelagius,* '*with whom I have evidently proved he agrees: or to* '*join us to the Manichees, and other Heretics, from whom* '*we differ no leſs, than he does from the orthodox ſenſe of* '*the church.*'

(32) Ibid. *pag.* 163, 164.

(33) Ibid. *pag.* 188, *col.* 1.

(34) Ibid. *pag.* 191, *col.* 1.

The Janſeniſt, ſome of whoſe words I have ſet down (35), calls him alſo a Pelagian. *He is a man,* ſays he (36), *who could not apprehend the doctrine of St Auguſtin, nor that of the church, having but an imperfect knowledge of the corruption of nature, and original ſin, which is the key of that doctrine. He is a man full of Pelagian errors about that matter; he ſpeaks againſt divine Predeſtination, and the doctrine of efficacious and free Grace, with great indiſcretion and ignorance, to ſay no more, tho' he acknowledges it is the opinion of St Auguſtin. He takes the writings of Gennadius, a Semi-Pelagian, for a rule of faith, and the confeſſion of faith made by Pelagius for a work of St Auguſtin. Laſtly, having thus abuſed his doctrine, he throws out perſonal reflexions, and repreſents him as a caviller*; declinat, fugit, diſſimulat; aliquid quærit quod cavilletur; *as a dangerous writer on the ſubject of Free-will, and an open enemy to it*; ſtudio iniquiſſimus libero arbitrio: *He aſcribes to him as little as he can, deprives him of all his ſtrength, and uſes diſſimulation and craft to depreſs and weaken him.* This Janſeniſt concludes (37), 'That it is no 'wonder if the whole faculty of Louvain in the fa-'mous cenſure of the year 1587, calls . . . . Pighius 'a favourer and a colleague of the Semi-Pelagians; if 'the faculty of Douay likewiſe in their cenſure, 'reckons him among the diſciples of Fauſtus Rejenſis; 'if the learned Eſtius . . . . ſpoke of him much in 'the ſame manner; and if Dr John Molanus ſays, 'that *the moſt learned Divines blame him for having* '*departed from the doctrine of St Auguſtin,* WHICH IS 'THAT OF THE CHURCH, *concerning Original Sin,* '*Predeſtination, and Grace:* to which Aubertus Miræus 'ſubſcribes.'

(35) In the text of this article.

(36) St Auguſtin juſtifié de Calviniſme, *pag.* 182.

(37) Ibid. *pag.* 183.

PYGMALION,

PYGMALION, king of Cyprus, lived before the Trojan war, if we may believe thoſe who ſay that he was the father of Metharme wife of Cinyras, by whom ſhe had Adonis (*a*); for Cinyras reigned in Cyprus when the Grecians made war againſt Troy (*b*). Some affirm that Pygmalion ſucceeded his father Delus (*c*), and that he was born in Phœnicia (*d*). A prieſt who had eat of the fleſh of a ſacrifice, and his wife whom he had made to eat of it too, were both thrown headlong from a precipice (*e*), by the order of this prince, who otherwiſe did not ſhew himſelf very religious; ſince he entertained a criminal love for a ſtatue of Venus [*A*], and cauſed it to be put into his bed in order to gratify his brutality. According to Ovid, who does not make him king of Cyprus [*B*], he was ſo ſcandalized to ſee in that iſland the proſtitution of ſome women, and beſides conceived ſuch a diſlike to that ſex, upon the account of their natural imperfections, that he determined to lead a ſingle life [*C*]: but he made a ſtatue of ivory, with

(*a*) Apollodor. *lib. iii, pag. m.* 239.

(*b*) See the remark [*B*] of the article CINYRAS.

(*c*) Porphyr. de Abſtin. *lib. iv.* Hieronym. in Jovinian. *lib. ii, cap. ix,* apud Bochart. Geogr. Sacræ, *Part ii, lib. i, cap. iii, pag. m.* 370.

(*d*) Porphyr. ibid. apud Meurſium, in Cypro, *pag.* 124.

(*e*) Porphyr. ibid. *pag.* 126.

[*A*] *He entertained a criminal love for a ſtatue of Venus.*] Clemens Alexandrinus alledges that, to ſhew the Pagans the vanity of Idols. Ὁ Κύπριος, ὁ Πυγμαλίων ἐκεῖνος, ἐλεφαντίνου ἠράσθη ἀγάλματος· τὸ ἄγαλμα Ἀφροδίτης ἦν, καὶ γυμνή ἦν. νικᾶται ὁ Κύπριος τῷ σχήματι, καὶ συνέρχεται τῷ ἀγάλματι. καὶ τοῦτο Φιλοστέφανος ἱστορεῖ. Pygmalion ille Cyprius eburneam amavit ſtatuam: erat ea ſimulachrum Veneris, & erat nudum. Movetur figura Cyprius, & coït cum imagine quod quidem Philoſtephanus teſtatur (1). - - - - *Pygmalion the Cyprian fell in love with an ivory ſtatue, which was a naked image of Venus. His luſt was inflamed by the figure, and he lay with the ſtatue, as Philoſtephanus atteſts.* Arnobius makes a like uſe of this adventure. *Perdocent* (Dii) *aſpernari ſe illa* (ſimulacra) *in quibus ſpretos ſe ultione in aliqua ſignificare non curant. Philoſtephanus in Cypriacis auctor eſt, Pygmaleonem regem Cypri ſimulachrum Veneris, quod ſanctitatis apud Cyprios & religionis habebatur antiquæ, adamaſſe ut fœminam, mente, animo, lumine rationis judiciique cæcatis: ſolitumque dementem, tanquam ſi uxoria res eſſet, ſublevato in lectulum numine copularier amplexibus atque ore, reſque alias gerere, libidinis vacua imaginatione fruſtrabiles* (2).

[*B*] *Ovid . . . does not make him king of Cyprus.*] I am ſurpriſed he was not more careful to prevent his readers from taking Pygmalion for a meer ſtatuary, that got his livelihood by that trade. It is true that by calling him *Paphius heros* (3) he intimates that he was not an ordinary perſon, and it is certain there are ſome princes that can paint and make ſtatues: but however it had been better to leave no room to doubt concerning the ſovereignty of Pygmalion. It has been atteſted by Apollodorus and ſeveral other authors (4). Add to this that he founded the city Carpaſia in the iſle of Cyprus (5).

[*C*] *He was ſo ſcandalized at . . . . the proſtitution of ſome women, and . . . . conceived ſuch a diſlike to that ſex, upon the account of their natural imperfections, that he determined to lead a ſingle life.*] Here I have only copied the text of Ovid:

Quas quia Pygmalion ævum per crimina agentes
Viderat, offenſus vitiis, quæ plurima menti
Fœmineæ natura dedit, ſine conjuge cœlebs
Vivebat, thalamique diu conſorte carebat (6).

Pygmalion, who their proſtitutions view'd,
And ſcar'd, that women could be form'd ſo lewd,

(1) Clemens Alexandrin. Admonit. ad Gentes, *pag.* 38, C.

(2) Arnobius, *lib. vi, pag.* 206.

(3) Ovid. Met. *lib. x, ver.* 290.

(4) See the citations of the text of this article.

(5) Steph. Bezant. in Καρπασία.

(6) Ovid. Metamorph. *lib. x, ver.* 243, *pag. m.* 240.

with which he was ſo ſmitten, that he behaved himſelf towards it in the ſame manner as is commonly practiſed to gain the affections of young women. He careſſed it, commended it, gave preſents to it, and loaded it with jewels. Nay, he went much further, he fumbled it, kiſſed it, and lay with it. The great feſtival of Venus being come, he proſtrated himſelf before the altar of that goddeſs, and humbly beſought her with a trembling voice, to grant him a wife that might reſemble the ſtatue he loved. His intent was to beg that this ſtatue might become his wife, but he durſt not expreſs his meaning. Venus gueſſed it, and he was heard according to the deſire of his heart. He was no ſooner returned home but, renewing his careſſes to this ivory maid, he found by degrees ſhe grew ſenſible, and at laſt became a living woman, who ſaw her lover in her arms as ſoon as ſhe beheld the light of the day. At the end of nine months, ſhe was delivered of a boy whom they named Paphus, and who was the father of that Cinyras, which lay with his own daughter without knowing it, and had by her the beautiful Adonis (*f*), as I have related it elſewhere (*g*). Some confound this Pygmalion with him I am going to ſpeak of [*D*].

(*f*) Taken from Ovid, *book x*, (and not *iii*, as in Charles Stephens and Lloyd) of the Metamorphoſes, *ver.* 243, *& ſeq.*

(*g*) In the articles CINYRAS and MYRRHA.

Shunning the ſex, preferr'd a ſingle life,
And long forbore the dangerous bliſs a wife.

This Poet had juſt been ſpeaking of the Propætides, whom Venus had inſtigated to proſtitute themſelves, becauſe they would not own her to be a goddeſs (7).

[*D*] *Some confound this Pygmalion with him I am going to ſpeak of.*] Lloyd, Hoffman, and Moreri, are of that number, and Meurſius too: for he applies to Pygmalion king of Cyprus ſeveral things, which agree only to Pygmalion king of Tyre and brother of Dido. He quotes (8) Lutatius, who in his abridgment of Ovid's Metamorphoſes ſays, that Pygmalion king of Tyre, ſhocked at the impudence of the Propætides, reſolved never to marry. Pygmalion, continues he, killed Sichæus Dido's huſband, and being afterwards king of Cyprus, he fixed his royal ſeat at Paphos; for which reaſon Ovid calls him *Paphius heros*. He became enamoured of Venus's image, or according to others, of a ſtatue that he had made; he had a daughter who was wife to Cinyras; he puniſhed a prieſt who had eat of the fleſh of a ſacrifice; he reigned forty-ſeven years, and lived fifty-ſix as Joſephus aſſures us: it was therefore with regard to his reign rather than his life that Venus preſerved him a long time. All this ſhews that Meurſius knew of but one Pygmalion (9), and that he did not attend to the difference of times: for if he had, he muſt have ſeen that it is impoſſible the brother of Dido could have been father-in-law to Cynyras, or him to whom he applied theſe verſes of Nonnus.

Οὐκ ἀπὸ Πυγμαλίωνος ἔχεις γενος, ᾧ πόρε Κύπρος
Μηλεδαντὴν βιότοιο πολυχρονίοιο πορείτην.

Non à Pygmalione habes genus, cui dedit Venus
Longum vitæ diuturnæ tranſitum (10).

Not from Pygmalion is thy race deriv'd,
Who was a prince, by Venus' gift, long liv'd.

Nonnus ſpeaks there of Pygmalion, who was not poſterior to the expedition of Bacchus.

I ſhall obſerve by the way that the ſame Meurſius applies to king Cinyras the *Paphius heros* (11), which in Ovid concerns only the Pygmalion that was in love with a ſtatue, grandfather to Cinyras by the father's ſide. He ſays likewiſe, it was he that had been in love with a ſtatue, which being turned into a young woman brought him a ſon called Paphus (12).

(7) See the Continuation of *my* Miſcellaneous Thoughts on Comets, *pag.* 748.

(8) Meurſius, de Cypro, *pag.* 124.

(9) Unleſs he ſpeaks of a PYGMALION, one of the kings of Cyprus whom Ptolomy put to death, as we are told by Diodorus Siculus, when he treats of the wars of Alexander's ſucceſſors.

(10) Nonnus, Dionyſ. *lib. xxxii*, *pag. m.* 813.

(11) Meurſ. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 106.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 107.

PYGMALION, king of Tyre, ſhould have reigned jointly with his ſiſter by his father's laſt will; but the people conferred the ſupream power upon him alone. His ſiſter, who was very handſome, and was called Eliza, is infinitely better known by the name of Dido. She was married to Sicharbas (*a*), her uncle by the mother's ſide, who poſſeſſed the ſecond dignity of the ſtate, (which was the prieſthood of the temple of Hercules) and was vaſtly rich. Pygmalion, eager to ſeize on his treaſures, put him to death [*A*], but yet did not obtain the booty he longed for: the wealth of his brother-in-law was buried in the ground, his widow found means to eſcape with thoſe riches, and to go and build Carthage. Her brother intended to purſue her, but was diſſuaded from it by the intreaties of his mother, and the threatnings of the gods (*b*). He was then in the ſeventh year of his reign. He died at the age of fifty-ſix years, whereof he had reigned forty-ſeven (*c*). Thoſe who deſire to know what time he lived in, need only obſerve that according to Joſephus the city of Carthage was built an hundred and twenty ſix years after the temple of Solomon (*d*). We muſt not forget that he is ſaid to have had another ſiſter named Anne, and to have perſecuted her after the death of Dido [*B*]. A diſpute aroſe becauſe the famous author of the Adventures of Telemachus was cenſured, for

(*a*) Virgil *calls him* Sichæus.

(*b*) Ex Juſtino, *lib. xviii*, *cap. iv*, *& v.*

(*c*) Joſephus, contra Apion. *lib. i*, *pag.* 1043.

(*d*) Joſeph. ibid. But note, that in his text, followed by the Latin tranſlator, and by Genebrard in his French tranſlation, there are 143 years and eight months, which by no means reſult from the particular numbers he aſſigns to each king's reign.

[*A*] *Pygmalion . . . . put him to death.*] At the foot of the altar according to Virgil (1), and Ovid (2): *but Euſtathius, on Dionyſius the Geographer, and Cedrenus* do not ſay ſo: *for Euſtathius affirms, that Sichæus going into the fields with Pygmalion was there killed by him, and Cedrenus relates that being gone a hunting, as Sichæus purſued a wild boar, Pygmalion ſtruck him behind with a javelin, and threw his body down a precipice, and then being returned to his palace, gave out that Sichæus purſuing the boar too eagerly, fell from that precipice* (3).

[*B*] *He is ſaid to have had another ſiſter named Anne, and to have perſecuted her after the death of Dido.*] ‘ Few authors mention this ſiſter of Dido. Virgil in the 4th of the Æneid tells us it was ſhe, that ſeeing Dido in a doubt whether ſhe ſhould accept of the love of Æneas, adviſed her to make no difficulty about it, for ſeveral reaſons which ſhe alledged, and afterwards ſhe ſerved frequently as a faithful meſſenger between thoſe two lovers. . . . . . Servius ſays, that according to Varro, ... *it was not Dido but Anne that being in love with Æneas, burnt herſelf on the pile, which ſhe had cauſed to be built.*’ Ovid, lib. 3, Faſtor. relates *that after Dido had killed herſelf through deſpair, becauſe Æneas had forſaken her, Jarbas king of Mauritania ſeized on the city of Carthage by force. Anne with a good number of Tyrians fled by ſea, and retired at firſt to the iſle of Malta, where king Battus, who was her hoſt, received her very courteouſly, and promiſed her his aſſiſtance. But afterwards dreading the power of Pygmalion, who threatened to make war upon him, unleſs he ſent back his ſiſter to him, he begged of his gueſt to ſeek out another retreat, if ſhe had not a mind to be the ruin of him. Anne therefore put to ſea again, fearing above all things the fury of her brother, and extremely apprehenſive of falling into his hands. Her veſſel was driven by a great tempeſt upon the coaſt of Italy* (4) where Æneas very kindly received her. See the ſequel of the narrative in Ovid himſelf: it is curious, but probably a fiction

(1) See, below, citation (31).

(2) *Occidit in terras conjux mactatus ad aras.* Ovid. Epiſt. Dido. *Some Critics will have it, that inſtead of* in terras, *it ſhould be read* Herculeas, *others* internas, *and others* infernas. *See* Meziriac on Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 743, 744.

(3) Meziriac, ibid. *pag.* 745.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 760.

for repreſenting Pygmalion as a profligate wretch, plunged in all ſorts of crimes, and particularly exceſſive incontinency [*C*]. It has been alleged that this was departing too

a fiction of that Poet. His authority however is not ſufficient to induce us to believe, that Pygmalion deſigned to perſecute his ſiſter Anne.

[*C*] *The famous author of the Adventures of Telemachus was cenſured, for repreſenting Pygmalion as a profligate wretch, plunged into all crimes, and eſpecially exceſſive incontinency.*] 'He deſcribes him as a man paſſionately fond of women, as an idolizer of Aſtarbe's beauty, as the greateſt debauchee, as the moſt addicted of all men to ſenſual pleaſures, and as a monſter of incontinency. But this prince was very far from being ſo. He had an averſion to women. He could not endure them. He never would marry and divide his crown with a lawful ſpouſe, and much leſs with one unlawful, and a concubine. Venus and her ſon Cupid were both vexed, that they were not able to bring him under their ſubjection. The love of gold and ſilver was his predominant vice. Avarice ſtifled in him all other paſſions, and rendered him inſenſible to the attractive beauties of his court. Hiſtorians pretend, that it was meerly to puniſh his contempt and inſenſibility towards the women, that the gods deſtroyed him. The Poets on their ſide affirm, that Venus and Cupid, out of revenge for not being able to reduce him under their empire, made him to fall in love with a ſtatue, and in order to puniſh him for the hatred he bore to the living and animated idols of fleſh, they inſpired them with a mad fondneſs to an idol of ſtone. One may conſult upon this ſubject, and all the other particulars of the life and qualities of Pygmalion the following authors, Trogus Pompeius, or Juſtin, his abbreviator, *l.* 18. *c.* 5. Velleius Paterculus *l.* 1. *c.* 2. Silius Italicus in the firſt and third book of the *Punic War*. Ariſtotle in his treatiſe of *Marvellous things*: Joſeph. *againſt Appion*. *l.* 1. Samuel Bochartus in his *Canaan l.* 1. *c.* 3. Theophilus Antiochenus in his third book againſt Antilochus, the Servius of Daniel on the firſt book of the Æneid, and laſtly the *parallel of the Hiſtory of Spain by John biſhop of Gyronne*. We ſhall ſee by all thoſe authors, that the Pygmalion of the romance of Telemachus is no more like the Pygmalion of the ancient Hiſtorians and Poets, than it is like a wind-mill and a crocodile. The author of a romance repreſents him to us, as a tyrant frighted by the horror of his crimes, and fearing every moment to be aſſaſſinated, as a man whom *every thing ſtartles, diſquiets, and frets, who is afraid of his own ſhadow, and who ſleeps neither day nor night*: as an owl that ſhuns the light. . . . . The ancient Hiſtorians on the contrary repreſent him as an eaſy, peaceable, and quiet man. His very name intimates ſo much: for as the learned Bochartus obſerves, the word *Pygmalion*, in the Phœnician tongue, ſignifies, *the reſt of God*. He was the beſt brother that ever lived. He deſired to ſhare his crown with Eliza, or Dido, his ſiſter, and uſed his utmoſt endeavours, as he had no wife, to get her declared and acknowledged queen. After the death of the king their father, he wanted to put the government in her hands, but the people not willing to be governed by a woman oppoſed it, and gave the crown to Pygmalion alone, tho' he was extremely young, and tho' Dido had been appointed heir to the kingdom jointly with him by their father, whom ſome call Murgon, and others Agenor the ſon of Belus: whereas the author of the romance ſuppoſes that Pygmalion had always been abhorred and deteſted by the people, on the contrary he was their darling and delight. The people made him ſole ſovereign by force, contrary to the laſt will of his father, contrary to the laws of the land, and before he was of an age to reign. *Interim rex Tyri decedit, filio Pygmalione & Eliſſâ filiâ inſignis formæ virgine hæredibus inſtitutis. Sed populos Pygmalioni admodum puero regnum tradidit*, ſays Juſtin *. He behaved always like a father to his ſiſter Dido, and having married her to Acerbas, or Sicharbas, or Sichæus, ſovereign Pontiff of the Phœnicians, and high-prieſt of the god Hercules of the Tyrians, which was the ſecond dignity of the kingdom, and the firſt perſon after the king, he never called him otherwiſe than his ſon-in-law, whereas he was but his brother-in-law, and at the ſame time his uncle, his mother's brother, *Avunculum ſuum, eundemque generum*, ſays Juſtin † (5).'

The Critic thinks it ſtrange in particular, that it ſhould be ſaid Pygmalion was an impious wretch. *On the contrary*, replies he (6), he was *a very religious prince, and ſo devout toward the gods, that how great reaſon ſoever he had to be incenſed againſt his ſiſter, who had ſtolen from him all his treaſures, and fled into Africa, and how eaſily ſoever he might have overtaken her, or cauſed her to be apprehended in the iſle of Cyprus, where ſhe landed firſt before ſhe went into Africa, he would not make the leaſt attempt againſt her, becauſe having conſulted the gods in a ſacrifice which he offered up to them, before he undertook any thing, the Diviners aſſured him it was the will of the gods, that Dido ſhould not be in the leaſt obſtructed in the execution of her deſigns, and that ſhe was to found a city in which they ſhould be greatly intereſted*: Victus minis Deorum quievit, cui cum inſpirati vates canerent, non impune laturum, ſi incrementum urbis toto orbe auſpicatiſſimæ, interpellaſſet; *ſays Juſtin* ⸸. *So we find that all the reproaches, which the Poets and Hiſtorians have uttered againſt Pygmalion, amount only to this, to ſay that he was covetous.*

- - - - - Portantur avari
Pygmalionis opes pelago: dux fœmina facti ‡.

The covetous Pygmalion's wealth to ſea
In ſhips is ſent: a woman leads the way.

That was his only vice, which ſurely is a ſlight foundation for the author of the Romance to paint him in ſuch black colours as he has done.

Here follows the reply of an anonymous writer to this charge. 'The author of the cenſure pretends here to prove, that Pygmalion king of Tyre was not debauched, becauſe there was about four hundred years before him a famous ſculptor in the iſle of Cyprus, who had the ſame name, and who was very chaſt. In effect, this Pygmalion he ſpeaks of and whom he confounds with the king of Tyre, was a noted Statuary of the iſle of Cyprus, who had made himſelf the ſtatue wherewith he fell in love. Venus, moved at his paſſion, changed the marble into a woman, as beautiful as was the work of Pygmalion. It was by this woman he had Paphos, who gave his name to his native country. Paphos was father to Cinyras, and Cinyras had by Myrra, his own daughther, Adonis the favourite of Venus. That whole fable is ſo well known, that one cannot enough admire the ignorance of the author, who values himſelf upon his great learning, in confounding matters that are ſo clear. This error is not the only one into which he is fallen, on the ſubject of Pygmalion: he pretends that this prince, whom the archbiſhop of Cambray repreſents as an impious wretch, was a very religious man, and that his inſatiable avarice, and the murder committed on the perſon of Sichæus, his ſiſter Dido's huſband, were but a trifle, and that notwithſtanding that, he was an honeſt man, and the darling of his people. Fine ſentiments indeed, for a man that would make it a crime to write a romance which inſpires nothing but virtue (7).'

Let us now ſee the reply of the Critic (8). *The anonymous apologiſt of the romance of Telemachus, in his preface to the new edition of Moetjen's, accuſes me of having taken Pygmalion, king of Tyre, and brother to Dido, whom Virgil ſpeaks of* †, *for Pygmalion the Sculptor and maker of ivory ſtatues, who became enamoured with one of his figures, and of an ivory woman which he himſelf had made, and is mentioned by Ovid* ⸸. *And for having committed this pretended blunder in point of learning, that fine gentleman, as well as he that compoſed the new book, intituled* ‡, The Characters of Antient and Modern Authors, *are of opinion that I ſhould be ſhamefully driven out of Athens and Delphos, and ſhut up in little houſes. . . . All I can ſay, is, that their Apollo is a lying, ignorant fellow. I never committed the blunder they impute to me. I know the two Pygmalions better than they do. But I made them only one in temper and diſpoſition. I ſaid, with all the Antients, that the vice of the Pygmalions was ſo far from conſiſting in laſciviouſneſs and debauchery*

* Juſtin. *lib.* xviii, *cap. xv.*

† Ibid.

(5) The abbot Faydit, *Telemacomanie, pag. m.* 126, *& ſeq.* I uſe an edition of 1700, in which the place where it is was printed is named *Eleuterople.*

(6) Telemacomanie, *pag.* 129, 130.

⸸ *Lib. xviii, cap. v.*

‡ Virgil. Æneid. I.

(7) Preface to the Adventures of Telemachus, in the laſt edition of the Hague, *pag. m.* 24.

(8) *The Abbot* Faydit, Supplemens aux Eſſais de Litterature, *Part v, pag.* 124, *& ſeq.*

† *Æneid I.*

⸸ *Metam. lib. x.*

‡ *Pag.* 161.

too far from the truth of Hiſtory. I ſhall give an account of that diſpute (*e*), and ſubjoin a few notes [*D*].

bauchery with women, and there was ſo little reaſon to make them ſerve as patterns of the diſorders produced by leudneſs, (as the author of Telemachus makes them) that, on the contrary, they both had an extream averſion and antipathy to all women whatſoever, and both of them led a ſingle life : and conſequently no example in all antiquity could have been picked out leſs proper to repreſent a king, proſtitute and abandoned to the love of women, than that of Tyre, who never was ſo, no more than Pygmalion the Sculptor, or Turner, and whoſe only pleaſure on the contrary was to inveigh againſt the female ſex (9).

[*D*] *I ſhall ſubjoin ſome notes.*] Probably I ſhall make fewer than might be made : no matter ; he, that has a mind to glean after me is welcome.

I. I aſk who thoſe antient authors are, that have ſaid that Pygmalion, the brother of Dido, could not endure women, and that this was the only reaſon why the gods deſtroyed him, or made him fall in love with a ſtatue. I conſult the writers that are referred to, and can find nothing of what I was made to expect. Juſtin, who is the firſt, ſays not one word about it ; and yet he ſpeaks the moſt largely of any concerning Pygmalion. Nothing relating to this prince is to be found in Velleius Paterculus, who only tells us in a few words, that the Tyrians built Utica (10), and that Dido built Carthage (11). Silius Italicus (12) mentions the unfortunate Dido more than once, but without acquainting us with any of the particulars that are here in queſtion. The paſſage of Ariſtotle (13) concerns only the building of Utica. Joſephus informs us only of what we have ſeen above (14). The remarks of Bochartus amount only to the etymological obſervation which the Critic has related. Theophilus Antiochenus is contented to name the father of Pygmalion, and to take notice of the time in which Pygmalion lived and reigned (15). The Servius of Daniel is no more capable of ſatisfying my curioſity ; and as to the pretended *parallel of the hiſtory of Spain by John biſhop of Gironne* (16), what end would it anſwer to find any particulars in it ? That biſhop having lived in the XVth century could deſerve no credit but in proportion as he quoted the Antients.

We find there no teſtimony, either as to the chaſtity of Pygmalion, or the puniſhments he ſuffered on that account. Let us ſee whether the other good qualities aſcribed to this prince are better founded.

II. It is ſaid, he was *an eaſy, peaceable, and quiet man* ; and that ſo *the antient Hiſtorians repreſent him.* His very name intimates it, as the learned Bochartus obſerves ; but unluckily for the Critic of Telemachus, it happens that the Pygmalion of Bochartus was the ſon of one Belus, who conquered the iſle of Cyprus in the time of the Trojan war (17) : and conſequently he was not the brother of the founder of Carthage. Beſides, it is well known that the ſame name is given ſucceſſively to ſeveral perſons, who do not at all reſemble the firſt that had it, to whom, perhaps, it had been given to deſcribe his manners. In a word, I cannot find thoſe antient Hiſtorians who have drawn this fine picture of our Pygmalion. That tender love, which he is ſaid to have had for his ſiſter, thoſe mighty endeavours to get her declared queen, are only a paraphraſe on two or three words of Juſtin, which inform us that the people created Pygmalion king, tho' Dido had been declared heir to the crown, as well as he, by the laſt will of their father. By what alembic can one draw off, by what preſs can one ſqueeze out, from this paſſage (18), the ſenſe which our Critic pretended to find in it ? May not one believe, with great probability, either that Pygmalion's faction laboured underhand to get the princeſs excluded, or that the people were induced to exclude her becauſe they thought it would pleaſe the prince, and be a good method to prevent the bad effects of a partition, ſince Dido was married to the ſecond perſon of the kingdom (19), ſince ſhe was handſome, and, undoubtedly, was known to be capable of great deſigns (20). In fine, there never was a gloſs worſe founded than that which makes the text of Juſtin ſay, that Pygmalion *deſired to put the government into the hands of his ſiſter, ... but that the people oppoſed it . . . . and made him ſole ſovereign by force.*

III. As Pygmalion was then but nine years of age, it cannot well be imagined that the crown was conferred upon him, and his ſiſter excluded, only becauſe he was *the darling and delight* of the Tyrians : and it is evident he had not had time to become ſo by his actions, but at moſt by the fair hopes of what he would be one day or other : a deceitful matter, upon which it cannot be affirmed that he reigned juſtly ; for how many very lovely and promiſing children are ſpoiled and corrupted ſo as to become profligate wretches ?

IV. It was not very neceſſary to remark, that Pygmalion *having no wife uſed his utmoſt endeavours to get* his ſiſter Dido *declared queen.* One ought almoſt always to ſuppoſe (21) that a child of nine years of age is not married ; and one ought never to ſuppoſe that he conforms his conduct to the reſolution of never having a wife : after all, it is not upon his celibacy that Juſtin grounds himſelf, when he ſays that the princeſs was deprived of the right, which, by her father's laſt will, ſhe had acquired.

V. Neither Juſtin, nor any other antient writer, tells us, that Pygmalion always *acted like a father to his ſiſter Dido*, nor that he married her to Sicharbas (22), nor that he never called *the latter otherwiſe than his ſon-in-law.* The words of Juſtin, quoted by the Critic, *Avunculum ſuum eundemque generum*, are intended only to exaggerate the crime of Pygmalion ; for they ſhew that he killed Sicharbas, his uncle by the mother's ſide, and his brother-in-law (23). The term *gener* is taken indifferently, in antient writers, for father in-law, brother-in-law, and ſon-in-law, though, ſtrictly ſpeaking, it has been . . . . appropriated to the laſt ſignification (24).

VI. What the cenſor of Telemachus affirms (25), that Pygmalion ſeized on the riches of Sicharbas, and that Dido ſtole from him all his treaſures (26), is not exact. Pygmalion could not ſeize on the riches of his brother-in-law, who had buried them under-ground : he hoped to be maſter of them, when Dido ſhould come and live with him : but inſtead of chuſing that retreat, ſhe removed from Tyre, as far as ſhe could, with her huſband's treaſures. Juſtin relates this in the cleareſt manner imaginable. The words of Virgil cited by the cenſor (27), *Portantur avari Pygmalionis opes pelago, dux fæmina facti* (28), ſhould not have perſuaded him that Pygmalion's riches were carried away by his ſiſter. What goes before evidently ſhews that ſhe only took her huſband's treaſures, which Virgil calls *Pygmalionis opes*, becauſe Pygmalion had entertained hopes of making himſelf maſter of them. Commentators expreſsly take notice of it, and the matter is beyond all diſpute.

VII. The proof alledged for the piety of Pygmalion is very ambiguous : the wrath of the gods denounced by the diviners hindered him from purſuing Dido. It is neither a certain mark of love, nor of filial fear for the deity : irreligious perſons, terrified by prodigies, have ſometimes altered their reſolutions.

I ſhall make only two remarks on the reaſoning of the apologiſt.

VIII. The firſt is, that he paſſes over a multitude of faults (29) which he might have obſerved in the reaſoning of the Critic.

IX. The ſecond is, that he has neglected to improve an advantage which Virgil and Juſtin might have furniſhed him with. He very well juſtifies the archbiſhop of Cambray, with regard to the anachroniſm, in ſuppoſing that Pygmalion, king of Tyre, and brother of Dido, lived at the time of the ſiege of Troy : he juſtifies him in it, I ſay, very well ; for he ſhews that therein he was to conform himſelf *to the method of Virgil* (30) : but for the ſame reaſon, one had a right to ſuppoſe that this king of Tyre was a monſter of tyranny. That great Poet makes him the moſt profligate of all men :

> - - - - - Regna Tyri germanus habebat
> Pygmalion, ſcelere ante alios immanior omnes.
> Quos inter medius venit furor. Ille Sichæum
> Impius ante aras, atque auri cæcus amore,
> Clam ferro incautum ſuperat, ſecurus amorum
> Germanæ : factumque diu celavit, & ægram,
> Multa malus ſimulans, vana ſpe luſit amantem (31).

(*e*) See the remark [*C*].

(9) The author relates here theſe words of the 16th book of Ovid's *Metam. Quas quia, &c*, which may be read above, in the remark [*C*] of the preceeding article.

(10) Vel. Patercul. *lib. i, cap. ii.*

(11) Ibid. *cap. vi.*

(12) *See lib. i, pag. m.* 8, 11 ; *lib. ii, pag.* 8[illegible]

(13) You will find it in *Juſtin Variorum, pag.* 370, *Edit. of Grævius* 1683.

(14) In the text of this article.

(15) *See* Meurſius in Cypro, *pag.* 126.

(16) *The Latin title is* Paralipomena Hiſtoriæ Hiſpanicæ.

(17) *See* Bochart. in Geogr. Sacra, *Part ii, lib. i, cap. iii, pag. m.* 369, 370.

(18) Note, that Faydit cites it as we have ſeen above.

(19) Huic conjux Sichæus erat. . . Cui PATER intactam dederat, primiſque jugarat Ominibus. *Virgil. Æneid. lib. i, ver.* 343.

(20) She ſhewed it by the building of Carthage.

(21) I uſe this reſtriction, becauſe princes ſometimes marry their children before they are of ripe age.

(22) We have ſeen, above, citation (18), that Dido was married by her father.

(23) Pygmalion oblitus juris humani avunculum ſuum eundemque generum ſine reſpectu pietatis occidit. *Juſtin. lib. xviii, cap. iv, pag. m.* 372.

(24) See the Note of Berneggerus on this paſſage of Juſtin.

(25) *Pag.* 128.

(26) *Pag.* 129.

(27) *Pag.* 130.

(28) Virgil. Æneid. lib. I, ver. 363.

(29) Thoſe I have juſt enumerated.

(30) Preface to the Adventures of Telemachus, *pag.* 22.

(31) Virgil. Æneid. lib. i, ver. 346.

- - - - - - - - - - -
Pygmalion then the Tyrian ſcepter ſway'd
One who contemn'd divine and human laws,
Thence ſtriſe enſu'd, and curſed gold the cauſe.
The monarch blinded with deſire of wealth,
With ſteel invades his brother's life by ſtealth.
Before the ſacred altar made him bleed,
And long from her conceal'd the cruel deed.
Some tale, ſome new pretence, he daily coin'd
To ſooth his ſiſter, and delude her mind.

DRYDEN.

A little after, he obſerves that Dido was accompanied in her flight by perſons that hated or feared this cruel tyrant (32). Juſtin affirms the ſame thing, with this particular circumſtance, that thoſe fugitives were very conſiderable for their quality: he even calls them ſenators. ‘ Eliſſa diu fratrem propter ſcelus averſata, ‘ ad poſtremum diſſimulato odio, mitigatoque interim ‘ vultu, fugam tacitè molitur: aſſumptiſque quibuſdam principibus in ſocietatem, quibus par odium in ‘ regem eſſe, eandemque fugiendi cupiditatem arbitri‘ batur . . . . Junguntur & Senatorum in eam noctem ‘ præparata agmina (33). - - - *Eliza had long deteſted* ‘ *her brother upon the account of his crimes: but at laſt,* ‘ *diſſembling her hatred, and putting on a pleaſant countenance, ſhe ſecretly contrives her flight. Several of the* ‘ *chief men were let into the deſign, whom ſhe imagined* ‘ *to have the ſame hatred towards the king, and the* ‘ *ſame deſire of leaving the kingdom. . . . . Many of the* ‘ *ſenators were likewiſe got ready to accompany her that* ‘ *night.*’

Here a ſmall difficulty occurs. Pygmalion reigned forty-ſeven years, and lived fifty-ſix, and it was in the ſeventh year of his reign that Dido fled, and founded Carthage. This we are told by the Tyrian Hiſtorians whom Joſephus quotes. What he did during the laſt forty years of his reign we know nothing of: the writers we have extant ſay neither good nor bad of it: and what we find in Ovid is only a fiction (34). All that Virgil and Juſtin tell us concerning his cruelties, relate to the time which preceded Dido's flight. Now, he was but ſixteen years of age at the time of that flight. Is it likely that he had already exerciſed ſuch a barbarous tyranny? Ought we not to impute to ſome miniſter of ſtate rather than to this young prince ſo many diſorders? The Cenſor of Telemachus has touched on part of this objection: *The murder of Sichæus*, ſays he (35), *happened when Pygmalion was but fifteen years old, ſince it was committed a year before Dido's flight, and conſequently it happened not ſo much by his orders, and by his own inclination, as that of his council.* I add, that it would be a prodigy, if his whole reign had reſembled the idea Virgil gives of it, and yet that it ſhould have laſted till forty years after the flight of Dido, and nobody informs us that it ended otherwiſe than by a natural death. The ſaying of Juvenal is well known (36).

As to the reply of this Critic, I have the following objections to offer.

X. Let one examine never ſo little what he had ſaid (37), it will evidently appear that he ſpoke only of Pygmalion, the brother of Dido, and that he did not make uſe of one word which could give room to ſuſpect that he had in his eye the Pygmalion of Cyprus. I cannot therefore conceive, why he affirms in his reply, *that he ſaid, with all the Antients, that the vice of the Pygmalions was ſo far from conſiſting in laſciviouſneſs. . . that, on the contrary, they had both of them a mortal averſion to all women.* The falſity of that propoſition is plain to every one that can read.

XI. It is ſo falſe that all the Antients tell us, that Pygmalion, brother of Dido, hated women, and that his only pleaſure was, to inveigh againſt the ſex, that we defy the Cenſor of Telemachus to cite one antient author who has affirmed it, or who has ſaid it without ſuppoſing, that Pygmalion, king of Tyre, and Pygmalion, in love with a ſtatue, were the ſame perſon.

XII. It is not true that either the one or the other of the Pygmalions lived a ſingle life: he of the iſle of Cyprus was married to the young woman, into which Venus turned the ſtatue he was in love with, and he left a ſon by her (38.) I confeſs, Joſephus does not ſay that Pygmalion, king of Tyre, had had children: but as his deſign was only to bring the ſucceſſion of the kings of Tyre down to that prince, it cannot be inferred from his ſtopping there, that Pygmalion was never married, and that he left not the kingdom to one of his ſons. One cannot therefore by the ſilence of Joſephus confute (39) the fiction of the archbiſhop of Cambray, that one of Pygmalion's ſons, in ſpite of his father, ſucceeded to the crown. The following words of the Critic are fallacious: *After Pygmalion we find no more kings amongſt the Tyrians till Ithobalus, under whom Tyre, upon the continent, was taken by Nebuchadnezzar. . . . . Therefore it is probable, that after the death of Pygmalion, Tyre ceaſed to have kings, and that perpetual judges were ſubſtituted in their place, like the conſuls at Rome, and that it happened to old Tyre, after the death of Pygmalion, as it happened to new Tyre in the iſland after Ithobalus was depoſed. They put judges in his place, who were changed from time to time, to govern the people with a ſovereign authority. After which the Tyrians went to Babylon to demand a king, and Merbal was given them, who reigned four years; and after his death, the Babylonians nominated Iromus, his brother, to ſucceed him, who reigned long over the Tyrians at the time that Cyrus reigned in Perſia* *. *All this is taken verbatim from Joſephus, or rather from Menander and Dius, whoſe very words Joſephus recites* (40). Very well! but it ſhould have been obſerved that Joſephus only relates ſcraps of thoſe authors, which he thought neceſſary in order to confirm by the teſtimony of ſtrangers, what the Jews aſſerted concerning the antiquity and the deſtruction of their temple, *&c.* he proves from the Phenician hiſtory the correſpondence between Solomon and Hiram king of Tyre: and to ſhew that the temple of Solomon was an ancient building, he computes how many years the foundation of Carthage was poſterior to the reign of Hiram. He therefore gives a ſucceſſion of the kings of Tyre from Hiram down to Pygmalion, in whoſe time Carthage was built: but as it was nothing to his purpoſe to enumerate the following kings of Tyre, he ſays nothing of them; can it be concluded from his ſilence that the ſucceſſion was interrupted after the death of Pygmalion, that Pygmalion lived in celibacy, *&c*? It was neceſſary for him to confirm in another place, by the teſtimony of the Phenician Hiſtorians, what concerns the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and the liberty granted to the Jews of returning into their own country. It would have been needleſs for him to go back to the time that followed the death of Pygmalion, and therefore he goes no higher than the reign of Ithobalus, under whom the city of Tyre was ſubdued by Nebuchadnezzar; and is contented to give the ſucceſſion of the government of Tyre from this Ithobalus down to Irom, who reigned there in the time of Cyrus.

XIII. Note, that the judges did not immediately ſucceed Ithobalus, as our Critic will have it: they were not eſtabliſhed till after the death of Baal, who ſucceeded Ithobalus, and whoſe reign laſted ten years (41).

However it be, Joſephus can by no means hinder us from thinking, that a ſon of Pygmalion ſucceeded to the crown of Tyre, and that this city was governed by kings, and not by judges, from the ſucceſſor of Pygmalion, down to that Ithobalus, who was cotemporary with Nebuchadnezzar.

XIV. Since the Cenſor refers us to Ovid, with regard to Pygmalion the Sculptor, he ought to retract his aſſertion, that Venus made him fall in love with a ſtatue, to puniſh him for his contempt of the women: for, it is certain Ovid did not ſay ſo; on the contrary, he has repreſented this goddeſs as being ſo gracious, that ſhe readily heard the Prayers of Pygmalion, by giving life to the ſtatue, which was the object of his paſſion (42).

XV. The beſt reply the Cenſor could have made, is, that which never entered into his thoughts: he ſhould have made uſe of the teſtimony of ſome authors, who put no difference between the Pygmalion of Tyre, and him of the iſle of Cyprus. This may be ſeen above (43).

(32) Conveniunt quibus aut odium crudele tyranni Aut metus acer erat. *Virgil. ibid. ver.* 361.

(33) Juſtin, *lib. xviii, cap. iv.*

(34) See the remark [*B*].

(35) *Pag.* 130, 131.

(36) Ad generum Cereris ſine cæde & vulnere pauci Deſcendunt reges & ſicca morte tyranni. *For rarely tyrants to the ſhades deſcend, By a dry death, or with a quiet end.* Juv. Sat. X, ver. 112.

(37) See, above, remark [*C*], citation (5).

(38) See Ovid's Metamorphoſes, *lib. x.*

(39) As is done in pag. 130, of the *Telemacomanie.*

* *Joſeph. contr. Appion. pag.* 1046.

(40) Telemacomanie, *pag.* 131.

(41) Joſeph. contr. Appion. *lib. i, pag.* 1043.

(42) See the 10th book of the Metamorphoſes, *ver.* 277, *& ſeq.*

(43) In the remark [*D*], of the preceding article.

PYLADES.

PYLADES, born in Cilicia [*A*], was a very famous Pantomime at Rome, under the empire of Auguſtus. He perfected, by ſome new inventions, the art of dancing a whole play [*B*], as I have already ſaid in the article of **BATHYLLUS**. He wrote a book concerning that ſubject (*a*). One may judge of the ſkill wherewith he performed his art, if it be conſidered that Auguſtus having recalled him to Rome (*b*), from whence he had been expelled by a faction, did ſo pleaſe the people, that it was one of the reaſons for which they ceaſed to be diſcontented with ſome inconvenient laws which that emperor had made. Others do not aſcribe the baniſhment of Pylades to the credit of a contrary faction (*c*), and ſay, that it was a puniſhment which Auguſtus inflicted upon him, becauſe he had pointed with his finger at one of the ſpectators [*C*]. But it may be that Mæcenas, who favoured Bathyllus the rival of Pylades, took hold of this opportunity to remove the latter. Pylades had another competitor, whoſe name was Hylas [*D*], who had been his diſciple. We find ſeveral particulars concerning it in Macrobius (*d*), as that there was a popular inſurrection upon the account of this competition (*e*); and that Hylas dancing one day a ſong, which ended thus *Great Agamemnon*, expreſſed the thing by the poſture of a man who ſhould meaſure an high ſtatue. Pylades, to find fault with him, cried out, *you make him a tall man, and not a great man*, and was forced by the aſſembly to dance the ſame ſong. He did it, and when he came to *Great Agamemnon*, he aſſumed the poſture of a meditating man (*f*). One day as he was dancing the tragedy of *Hercules Furens*, ſome people found fault with his ſteps; he pulled off his maſk, and told the laughers, *O ye fools, do not you ſee that I act a fool?* That very day he threw ſome arrows among the ſpectators; he threw ſome alſo, when he acted the ſame play in the chamber of Auguſtus. That prince expreſſed no reſentment for being treated as the Roman people were. All theſe things are a great deal more graceful in the original (*g*): the curious will do very well to have recourſe to it. There are ſome epigrams in the Anthologia, to the honour of our Pylades

(*a*) Athen. *lib. i, cap. xvii.* Suidas, in Πυλάδης.

(*b*) Dio, *lib. liv.*

(*c*) Sueton. in Auguſto, *cap. xlv.*

(*d*) Macrob. Saturnal. *lib. ii, cap. vii.*

(*e*) See the remark [*E*], in the article BATHYLLUS.

(*f*) Nihil magis ratus magno duci convenire quam pro omnibus cogitare. - - - - *Thinking nothing more ſuitable to a great general than to be thoughtful.* Macrob. ibid.

(*g*) Ap. Macrob. ibid.

[*A*] *Born in Cilicia.*] This appears clearly from Suidas: what follows, wherein he had perhaps ſet down the name of his native country, is ſo dark, that the Critics have not been able yet to clear it. Bulengerus (1), fancied without any reaſon for it, that there was an oppoſition between thoſe who make Pylades a Cilician, and the Anthologia which ſays, as Bulengerus underſtands it, that he came from Thebes in Egypt; whereupon he quotes theſe words:

- - - - - - Βάκχας
Ἐκ Θηβῶν Ἰταλὴν ἤγαγε πρὸς θυμέλην
Ἀνθρώποις Πυλάδης.

Id eſt quando Bacchas ex Thebis ad pulpitum Italicum hominibus Pylades adduxit. The meaning of them is only that Pylades ſhewed to the Romans the repreſentation of a thing which happened at Thebes, and not that he was born at Thebes, or had lived there before he came into Italy: beſides, it is plain that no other town can be meant here but Thebes in Bœotia, where Bacchus and his feaſts had their principal ſtations. For the reſt Ἰταλὴν πρὸς θυμέλην is very well rendered *ad pulpitum Italicum, upon the Italian ſtage*; but thoſe who have rendered it *Italicum ad ſacrificium* (2), have committed a very groſs miſtake.

[*B*] *He perfected, by ſome new inventions, the art of dancing a whole play.*] I obſerved in general in the article of Bathyllus what alterations were made under Auguſtus in the dances of the Pantomimes. But to be more particular, I ſhall ſay now that Pylades, if we believe St Jerome, is the firſt who danced at Rome, whilſt others played upon flageolets, and whilſt the chorus ſung, and that before him the Pantomimes danced and ſung themſelves at the ſame time (3). Salmaſius does not grant all this (4): He ſhews that from the time of Livius, a Poet and a Comedian, the dancer was excuſed from the fatigue of ſinging, and that they gave him a boy, who ſung, whilſt another was playing on the flute (5); but he owns that Pylades is the firſt who danced whilſt the chorus ſung, and others played upon flageolets, *fiſtulas & chorum ſibi ſaltanti ut præcineret curaviſſe.* This agrees with the anſwer he returned to Auguſtus, who aſked him what he had joined to dancing, Αὐλῶν συρίγγων τ' ἐνοπὴν, ὁμαδόν τ' ἀνθρώπων, *the ſound of flageolets and flutes, and the ſymphony of men* (6); becauſe before him there was but one flute appointed for the uſe of the Pantomimes, whereas ſeveral were appointed for him. We read in Lucian that ſeveral other inſtruments, *citharæ, cimbala, - - - lutes, cymbals,* were uſed when the Pantomimes danced, as well as certain ſtampings of the feet, which, as Salmaſius thinks, were of the ſame uſe as the motion of the hands, which we call now *to beat time.* The ſame author has obſerved, that it was chiefly under Auguſtus that dancing came to its perfection (7). Pylades is to be praiſed for it, ‘ qui ferebatur mutaſſe rudis illius ſaltationis ritum ‘ quæ apud majores viguit, & venuſtam induxiſſe no‘ vitatem (8). - - - *who was ſaid to have altered the* ‘ *ancient unpolite method of dancing, and to have intro*‘ *duced a new and genteel way.*’

[*C*] *He had been expelled . . . becauſe he pointed with his finger at one of the ſpectators.*] Auguſtus muſt needs have been very indulgent to thoſe who hiſſed in a play, for that ſpectator hiſſed at Pylades. *Pyladem urbe atque Italia ſummoverit quod ſpectatorem à quo exſibilabatur demonſtraſſet digito, conſpicuumque feciſſet* (9). If an actor at Paris ſhould now revenge himſelf in ſuch a manner, he would not be blamed for it (10). We have ſeen in the public news, that a ſevere regulation has been made in France againſt thoſe who hiſs, whoſe boldneſs was arrived to the higheſt degree. The petition which a Poet preſented to the king, in order to get their fury reſtrained, is a very pretty piece of Poetry. It has been printed in the Mercure Galant, and again in the collection which comes out every month at the Hague. An epigram about the origin of Hiſſing has been inſerted in the *Furetieriana*. It is aſcribed to an author very illuſtrious for his tragedies; but the reputation of the ingenious man, who is abuſed in it, is ſo well eſtabliſhed, that it can do him no hurt (11). There is a fault in the Dutch edition, *Hiſtorien* inſtead of *Hiſtrion* (12).

[*D*] *He had another competitor, whoſe name was Hylas.*] So ſays Macrobius: ‘ Hylam diſcipulum uſ‘ que ad æqualitatis contentionem eruditione provexit: ‘ populus deinde inter utriuſque ſuffragia diviſus eſt ‘ (13). - - - *His ſcholar Hylas was ſo learned as even* ‘ *to rival him: and the people were divided in their* ‘ *ſuffrages between them.*’ Some learned men take Hylas and Bathyllus to be one and the ſame perſon (14): they ſay he had that name given him, becauſe he had the ſame ſhare in the love of Pylades, his maſter, which Hylas had in the love of Hercules. In a word, they fancy that there was a commerce of Pæderaſty between them. But this ſeems to me farfetched, ſilly, and ſtrained. No body ſays that Bathyllus had been Pylades's ſcholar, as Macrobius ſays Hylas was. We muſt therefore be contented to ſay, that it is likely they have been miſtaken the one for another, as to the reaſon which moved Auguſtus to be angry with Pylades; and let us believe that Hylas and Bathyllus have been two different Pantomimes. See the remark [*E*] of the article BATHYLLUS.

[*E*] *There*

---

(1) Jul. Cæſ. Bulengerus, de Theat. *lib. i, cap. xliii, fol. m.* 115, *&* 117, *verſo.* You will ſee in the remark [*E*], citation (15), where thoſe Greek verſes are to be found.

(2) *That fault is in the* Anthologia, of Lubin's Edit. in 4to, pag. 760.

(3) Pylades Cilix Pantomimus, quum veteres ipſi canerent & ſaltarent, primus Romæ chorum ſibi & fiſtulas præcinere fecit. *Hieronymus, in Chron. Euſeb. ad ann.* 1995.

(4) Salmaſ. in Vopiſc. *pag.* 836, *Edit. Lugd. Batav. in* 8*vo.*

(5) Valer. Max. *lib. ii, cap. iv, pag. m.* 161. *See alſo* Lucian, de Saltatione, *pag. m.* 925, *Tom. i.*

(6) It is the 13th verſe of the 10th book of the Iliad.

(7) Οὐ πάλαι ἀρξαμένη ἐς τοσοῦτον κάλλος ἐπιδιδόναι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν Σεβαστὸν μάλιστα. Lucian. ubi ſupra, apud Salmaſium, ibid. *pag.* 836.

(8) Macrob. Saturn. *lib. ii, cap. vii.*

(9) Sueton. in Auguſto, *cap. xlv.*

(10) I write this in the year 1696.

(11) See the Hiſtorical Letters of March 1696, *pag.* 288, 289.

(12) Furetieriana, *pag.* 72.

(13) Macrob. ubi ſupra.

(14) Iſaacus Pontanus, in illum locum Macrobii.

Pylades [*E*]. He left ſome diſciples who went ſucceſſively by his name. We find under the empire of Trajan, a dancer whoſe name was Pylades, particularly beloved by that prince (*b*). We read of another, whom Didius Julianus cauſed to dance in the palace where Pertinax had been murthered juſt before (*i*). Galen ſpeaks of a Pantomime named Pylades, and diſcovers that a woman was paſſionately in love with him (*k*): he is without doubt one of them. The inſcriptions of Gruterus mention ſome Pantomimes who had the ſame name (*l*).

(*b*) Xiphilin. in Trajan.

(*i*) Id. in Did. Juliano.

(*k*) *See* Voſſius, Inſt. Poët. *lib.* ii, *pag.* 184. *He refutes Brodæus, who ſays in his Notes upon the* Anthologia, *that there have been only two Pantomimes, named Pylades.*

(*l*) *See* Scaliger, in Euſeb. *pag.* 169. Salmaſ. in Vopiſc. *p.* 834, *Edit. in 8vo.*

[*E*] *There are ſome epigrams in the Anthologia to the honour of our Pylades.*] That which Bulengerus and Lubinus have miſinterpreted, aſcribes to Pylades hands that ſpeak every thing, παμφώνες (15). If any one undertook to collect all the paſſages, wherein the ancients have happily repreſented the manual language of the Pantomimes, it would make a large volume: I ſhall only ſet down one out of Caſſiodorus (16): ‘ His ‘ ſunt additæ Orcheſtarum loquaciſſimæ manus, linguoſi digiti, ſilentium clamoſum, expoſitio tacita, ‘ - - - *To theſe are added the talking hands, the ſpeaking* ‘ *fingers, the noiſy ſilence, and the ſilent declaration of* ‘ *the Pantomimes.*’ And another out of Nonnus (17), Νεύματα μῦθον ἔχων, παλάμην ςόμα, δάκτυλα φωνήν. *Nutus ſermonem habens, manum os, digitos vocem.* Let this ſuffice; I paſs by St Cyprian, who ſays, *cui ars ſit verba manibus expedire* (18).

(15) Anthol. *lib.* iv, *cap. xxv, num.* 8, *pag. m.* 760.

(16) Lib. iv, Variorum.

(17) Dionyſ. *lib.* vii, *ver.* 18.

(18) Lib. de Spectac.

PIN (JOHN DU) in Latin *Pinus*, biſhop of Rieux in the XVIth century, was born at Toulouſe. He went into Italy to cultivate his mind, he ſtudied Eloquence and the Civil Law at Bologna, and publiſhed there ſome books for which he was eſteemed. Thoſe which he publiſhed ſince, confirmed and increaſed his reputation [*A*]. He ſtudied the politeneſs of the Latin ſtyle [*B*]. He was counſellor in the parliament of Toulouſe, and ambaſſador of France, I know not where, but I think it was in Italy. I would not expreſs myſelf in ſuch general terms, but ſhould be more particular, if I had his books, or if the authors who ſpeak of him, and whom I have been able to conſult, had ſaid ſomething relating to his Hiſtory; but they know nothing of it. Catel, his countryman, knew him ſo little, that he made a pitiful Anachroniſm in ſpeaking of him [*C*]. I cannot tell at what time Du Pin was made biſhop of Rieux, nor when he died, I know only that he was in poſſeſſion of that biſhopric in 1530, and that he did not live after the year 1538 [*D*].

[*A*] *He .... publiſhed ſome books, for which he was eſteemed. Thoſe he publiſhed ſince confirmed and increaſed his reputation.*] He wrote the life of Philip (1) Beroaldus the father, and that of Catherine of Siena: they were printed at Bologna in the year 1505. A letter and ſome epigrams to the praiſe of Codrus Urceus were printed with the works of that author. He wrote alſo a treatiſe *de vita aulica:* His book *de claris fœminis*, of illuſtrious women, was printed at Paris in the year 1521 in folio (2). His Life of St Roch was printed at Paris in 4to, *apud Joannem Parvum.* He was then *Senator Toloſanus & Orator Regius* (3). The *Allobrogicæ narrationis liber* was printed at Venice in 4to in the year 1516, and after at Paris by Badius in the ſame year (4).

[*B*] *He ſtudied the politeneſs of the Latin ſtyle.*] I ſhall prove this by a paſſage of Eraſmus. ‘ Poſſet inter hujus laudis (*Tullianæ dictionis*) competitores numerari, (*Joannes Pinus*) niſi & hunc negotiorum tumultus & eccleſiaſtica dignitas à ſtudiis avulſiſſent. ‘ Olim certè præclarum ſui ſpecimen dedit, quùm ‘ Bononiæ Muſarum ſacra coleret. Nunc epiſcopum ‘ audio factum, quid acceſſerit eloquentiæ neſcio. Fieri poteſt ut plus acceſſerit eruditionis quàm dignitatis (5). - - - *Amongſt thoſe that excel in this accompliſhment (of the Ciceronian ſtile) I might reckon John* ‘ *du Pin, had not hurry of buſineſs and eccleſiaſtical* ‘ *dignities diverted him from his ſtudies. He eminently* ‘ *diſtinguiſhed himſelf formerly at Bologna, when he ſpent* ‘ *his time in the ſervice of the Muſes. Now I hear he* ‘ *is made a biſhop. What improvement he has made in* ‘ *Eloquence, I know not. Perhaps he has acquired more* ‘ *learning than dignity.*’

[*C*] *Catel .... made a pitiful Anachroniſm in ſpeaking of him.*] See in his Memoirs concerning the Higory of Languedoc (6), the catalogue of the biſhops of Rieux, and you will find John du Pin two degrees higher than *Peter Lewis de Voltan biſhop of Rieux in the year* 1515.

[*D*] *He was in poſſeſſion of that biſhopric in* 1530 *.... he did not live after the year* 1538.] The firſt of theſe two facts may be proved by a letter which Sadoletus wrote *Pino Rivenſi Epiſcopo* the firſt of March 1530 (7). It contains ſeveral great encomiums upon our du Pin, to whom the author ſent a copy of his firſt production, which was a commentary on the XCth Pſalm. The ſecond fact is proved by ſome verſes of Hubert Suſſanneau *in obitum Pini Rivorum Epiſc. cum interfuiſſet ejus funeri.* They are in folio forty-one *verſo* of the four books *Ludorum* of that author, of the Paris edition, *apud Simonem Colinæum* 1538 *in 8vo.* There we find that this prelate was buried at Toulouſe with great pomp.

(1) And not *Peter* as Moreri has it.

(2) Ex Epit. Bibl. Geſneri, *pag.* 485, vel ex Voſſio de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 662.

(3) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, in Supplem. Epit. Bibl. Geſner. *pag.* 53.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Eraſmus, in Ciceroniano, *pag. m.* 74.

(6) *Pag.* 1035.

(7) In the fourth book of Sadolet's Letters, *pag.* 150, *Edit. Lugd.* 1554, *in 8vo.*

PINCIER (JOHN) was born at Wetteraw in the country of Heſſe, in the year 1521. He ſtudied at Marpourg, and then at Louvain, and afterwards at Paris, Zurich, and Straſbourg, and was miniſter of the Proteſtant church in his own country for above thirty years. After which he exerciſed the ſame function in another place (*a*), till the infirmities of old age obliged him to demand his diſcharge. Having obtained this favour, he retired to Francberg where his wife had a houſe. He died there the twenty-ſixth of January 1591 (*b*). He publiſhed ſome books, and deſerves a place amongſt pſeudonymous authors [*A*]. He oppoſed the Lutherans as to the doctrine of Ubiquity, and the real preſence. I have ſaid elſewhere (*c*), that he was brother-in-law to Hyperius.

(*a*) In Cœnobio Heneienſi.

(*b*) Taken from the epitaph which his daughter, and James Altſteten, his ſon-in-law, miniſter of the goſpel, drew up for him. It is in the *Deliciæ Itinerum* of *Nathan. Chytræus, pag. m.* 651.

(*c*) In the article KUCHLIN, in the margin, citation (*a*).

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books, and deſerves a place amongſt pſeudonymous authors.*] He publiſhed two books under the name of Helias Palingenius, one is intituled *Dipnoſophiſticæ Tragœdiæ procataſtrophe tractans & explicans controverſiam de Cœna Domini*, at Geneva 1569 in 8vo; the other is intituled, *Elenchus ſanæ de Euchariſtia doctrinæ atque fidei ab incommutabili tam ſententiarum quam connexionum veritate inſtructus ad Auguſtini præſcriptum*, at Heidelberg 1575 in 8vo (1). This I find in epitome Biblioth. Geſn. where it is conjectured that Elias Palingenius is a falſe name, but it is not ſaid what the true name was. In another place it is obſerved (2) that John Pincier wrote a learned and pious book *de Cœna Domini*, which was printed at Baſil in 8vo: it was in the year 1561, according to Hoſpinianus (3). The epitaph of the author informs us, that the two books he publiſhed under the falſe name of Helias Palingenius were printed at Heidelberg, and that

(1) Ex Epit. Bibl. Geſn. pag. 212.

(2) Ib. p. 485.

(3) Hoſp. Hiſt. Sacram. *Tom. ii, pag.* 480.

that his *Antidotus* was printed at Geneva firſt with the name of Johannes Pincierus, and afterwards without any name (4). Mr Placcius has ſaid nothing of this pſeudonymous author, and Mr Baillet has not put him in his catalogue. I fancy that *Antidotus* is the ſame book, whereof we find the ſummary in Hoſpinian (5), who ſays it was reprinted at Heidelberg in the year 1575. He obſerves (6) that the *Elenchus* was printed the firſt time at Neuſtad in the year 1575, and afterwards at Heidelberg in 1583.

(4) See the epitaph of Pincier, in *Nathan. Chytræus, Delic. Itinerum, pag.* 651, 652.

(5) Hoſp. ubi ſupra, pag. 602.

(6) Ib. p. 604.

PINEAU (Severin) in Latin *Pinæus*, born at Chartres (*a*), publiſhed at Paris, where he practiſed Surgery, a Latin book in 1598, which has been reprinted ſeveral times (*b*). He treats of the ſigns of a maid's virginity, which in all appearance has been the chief cauſe of the ſale of that book. It is affirmed, that the German tranſlation of it, publiſhed at Francfort about the beginning of the XVIIth century, was prohibited by the magiſtrates [*A*]: they did not approve that ſuch a ſubject ſhould be treated in a vulgar tongue. The author wrote his book in French at firſt, and deſigned to publiſh it in that language; but when he ſaw that the ſpecimen, which he ſhewed to ſome perſons, gave occaſion to ſeveral obſcene diſcourſes, or ſorry jeſts, he reſolved to write only for learned men [*B*], and he put, at the end of his preface, theſe verſes of an ancient Poet (*c*).

(*a*) Carnutenſis, *and not* Cornutenſis, *as in* Draudius, *or* Camutenſis, *as in* Lindenius renovatus.

(*b*) Lindenius renovatus mentions eight editions of it.

(*c*) Horace, Ode I, lib. iii.

Odi profanum vulgus, & arceo:
Favete linguis: carmina non prius
Audita, Muſarum ſacerdos
Virginibus pueriſque canto.

Be gone, Be gone, I hate you all,
Both you great vulgar, and you ſmall,
Nor myſteries, prophane behold:
To boys and maids unſtain'd with crimes,
The Muſe's prieſt in ſacred rhimes
Doth unknown ſongs and wond'rous truths unfold.

[*A*] *It is affirmed that the German tranſlation of his book was prohibited by the magiſtrates.*] I have found this particular in a letter written to Goldaſtus, which is the CLXXIId of the collection printed at Francfort in 1688. One of his friends, whoſe name was Segeth, writing to him from Hanaw the fifth of Auguſt 1607, deſires him to buy that tranſlation for him at any rate, and he is ſo much the more deſirous to have it, becauſe he heard that it was prohibited. *Si in libellum quendam Severini Pevini* (1) *de dignoſcendis virginibus è Gallica in Germanicam linguam verſum incidas, eum mihi quocunque pretio compares, quod cum gratiarum actione reddetur. Audio iſthic apud Spieſſium excuſum, & interdictum ejus venditione, quod fateor mihi calcar addidit ad poſcendum.*

(1) *Read* Pinæi.

[*B*] *He wrote his book in French . . . . and deſigned to publiſh it in that language, but when he ſaw . . . . he reſolved to write only for learned men.*] He had a good intention: he deſigned to do ſervice to the judges, who found themſelves very often perplexed in ſome cauſes, where women were plaintiffs, ſometimes becauſe they had their virginity ſtill, ſometimes becauſe they had loſt it. In the firſt caſe, a woman complained of being married to an impotent man, and in the ſecond caſe, of having been raviſhed. Perhaps there was ſome abuſe in thoſe two ſorts of complaints, as well as in the information of the fact; for either the matrons and other perſons appointed to ſearch and inſpect their parts, were ignorant of nature, or unfair in their proceedings: and therefore Pineau thought himſelf obliged to impart his diſcoveries to the public, and to make them intelligible to thoſe who underſtood not Latin; but he changed his mind for other reaſons. Here are his words (2): *Te autem monitum volumus (amice lector) hoc opuſculum primum nos Gallicum feciſſe, ſicque in publicum proditurum decreviſſe ad eorum ſublevationem, qui judicibus & parentibus referre debent de conformatione naturali, aut vitiata pudendorum virginum nuptarum aut innuptarum, quarum hæ maximam vim à procis integritati ſuæ: illæ vero nullam à maritis aut ſaltem ſponſis imbecillioribus & fatuis illatam fuiſſe conqueruntur. Sed cum primas delineationes quibuſdam expoſuiſſemus, cognoviſſemuſque horum alios ad laſciviam, alios ad vaniloquium & procacitatem potius quam ad fructum aliquem ex eo ſibi & reipublicæ utilem colligendum expetere, inſtituti noſtri rationem mutavimus, atque in ſermonem Latinum convertimus, philiatriſque ſolis & literatis hominibus devovimus Horatii exemplo impulſi* (3). Note, that his book is divided into two parts. He examines in the firſt part, the ſigns of virginity, and he maintains in the ſecond, that there are two bones (4) which part aſunder, when women bring forth children. He exhorts the Phyſicians and Surgeons to remember his hypotheſis; either to facilitate the diſjunction of thoſe two bones, or to rejoin them when the child is born. 'Propterea mulieres in utero habentes, & pueros adhuc in eo degentes ac ſtabulantes non ſic negligendos eſſe hortamur, ſed omni auxilio & arte juvandos, ut non minus ſaltem diligentes ſe præbuiſſe videantur Medici & Chirurgi in partibus dilatandis, per quas exit fœtus de utero matris, quam quum editus eſt, in iiſdem conſtringendis ſolliciti ſunt. Quod fit apte & convenienter, ſi medicamenta emollientia qua voles forma parata ſymphyſibus prædictorum oſſium pubis & ilium adhibita fuerint, ut natura docet, atque ipſamet quantum poteſt, præſtat. Quæ oſſa his in ſymphyſibus adeo vehementer conſtricta ſunt reliquo vitæ tempore, ut citius alibi, puta, in medio ſui frangerentur, quam à cauſa quadam procatarctica ab invicem diducerentur, quæ tamen tempore partus diſtrahuntur (5). - - - *This he ſays may be conveniently done, by applying emollient medicines to the place where the* Os pubis *and the* Os ilium *join, as nature itſelf directs, and even aſſiſts as much as poſſible. He adds, that the ſaid bones are ſo ſtrongly compacted at other times, that they would ſooner break any where elſe, than be parted aſunder by any procatarctic cauſe, and yet at the time of birth they are ſeparated.*'

(2) Severin. Pinæus, in Præfat. ad Lector. *pag.* 22.

(3) He places here the verſes of Horace, which I have alledged at the end of the text of this article. The application of thoſe verſes is agreeable to the title of a book *de Organis Generationis.* It has been intituled *Sacra Eleuſinia patefacta.* See the *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lett. July* 1684, *pag.* 535. But obſerve, that Reunerus Rolfincius, the author of that book, did not intitle it ſo. It was by a Bookſeller's trick, that his book came out as new under that title, in the year 1684, and without the name of the author.

(4) Os Pubis, *and* Os Ilium.

(5) Pinæus, ubi ſupra, pag. 21, 22.

PINEAU (Gabriel du), in Latin *Pinellus*, counſellor in the preſidial of Angers, was a famous man. He died at Angers in the year 1644, being in his ſeventy-third year (*a*).

(*a*) See Mr Menage, Remarks on the Life of William Menage, pag. 333, where he gives a catalogue of Pineau's books that are publiſhed, or not publiſhed.

PINET (Antony du) lord of Noroy, was born in the XVIth century, in the Franche Comté, at Bezançon according to la Croix du Maine (*a*), or at Baume les Nonnes, according to Lewis Gollut (*b*). He publiſhed ſeveral books [*A*], ſome of which ſhew, that he was zealous for the Proteſtant religion. Which does chiefly appear from the notes which he added to the French tranſlation of the tax of the Chancery of Rome [*B*]. He vented ſome extravagant notions concerning the genealogy of ſome families

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] The moſt conſiderable are only French tranſlations. I ſhall ſpeak of the beſt of them in the laſt remark of this article. His other tranſlations are that of the third part of the letters of Don Antonio de Guevara, and that of a *treatiſe* of the ſame Guevara, *concerning the work and privileges of gallies* (1). That of the *commentaries of P. Andreas Matthiolus of Siena, upon the Hiſtory of plants of Pedacius Dioſcorides Anazarbeus*, Lyons in folio (2) 1566 (3). That *of the ſecret wonders of nature, of Levinus Lemnius, a Phyſician of Zirizee*, Lyons 1567 (4). That of the *common places of the Holy Scripture, collected by Wolfgangus Muſculus in ſixty-ſix titles*, at Geneva, by Euſtace Vignon, in folio 1577 (5). That of the *tax of the caſual forfeitures, &c.* I ſhall ſpeak of it in the following remark. Amongſt the books of his own compoſing, there are ſome which treat of controverſy, *the conformity of the Reformed Churches of France, and of the Primitive Church in policy and ceremonies*, Lyons 1564 in 8vo (6). *Sermons upon the Revelation* (7). Here is a book of another kind. *Plans, draughts, and deſcriptions, of ſeveral towns and fortreſſes, as well in Europe, Aſia, and Africa, as in the Indies and America, their foundations, antiquities, and manner of living: with ſeveral general and particular maps,* &c. Lyons, by John d'Ogerolles in the year 1564 in folio (8). See in the remark [*C*], a critical obſervation againſt that compilation.

[*B*] *The notes which he added to the French tranſlation of the tax of the Chancery of Rome.*] Here is the title of the book: *The tax of the caſual forfeitures of the Pope's ſhop, in Latin and French, with ſome annotations taken from decrees, councils, and canons, either ancient or modern, for the verification of the diſcipline anciently obſerved in the Church, the whole enlarged and reviſed.* By A. D. P. The epiſtle, dedicated *to all faithful Chriſtians*, is dated from Lyons the 26th of March 1564. I ſhall tranſcribe a paſſage out of it, that the reader may judge of this author's freedom in ſpeaking. It was the cuſtom of that time. *Which is the reaſon I have only ſet before them the aſſeſſment of their ſouls, according to the rates which their terreſtrial GOD has ſet upon them: To the end, that ſeeing the trade they make of them, and of their conſciences, and the tyranny they are reduced to, and how dangerous it is, they may lift up their eyes towards Heaven, and know at laſt how great is the grace of GOD to thoſe whom he delivers from ſuch a ſlavery. And leſt any dataries, auditors, bulliſts, copiſts, expeditionary bankers, and ſuch like, ſhould fancy that this is a* quid pro quo, - - - one thing for another, *I have truly ſet down the Latin text of the tax of the Papal chamber, with the French tranſlation, adding ſome annotations to it for the good of the church. For the contents of the text are ſo ſhameful and deteſtable, that I muſt intreat you, my brethren, to forgive me for having dedicated it to ſo holy a company as yours, amongſt whom nothing is to be heard but holy ſongs, pſalms, and praiſes to the LORD our GOD. But it behoves us to ſhew a villain his villany, and a fool his folly, leſt we ſhould be thought to be like him* (9). One may eaſily conjecture, that a man who ſpeaks ſo in his preliminary epiſtle, has expreſſed himſelf very bluntly in his gloſs upon a text ſo liable to invectives as that of the tax of the Roman Chancery. I wiſh that all the notes of du Pinet did not ſavour of controverſy, and that he had explained certain ways of ſpeaking, which come in very often. But I fancy he was not verſed enough in the Canon Law, nor in the ſtile of the court of Rome, to be able to clear ſuch obſcurities. He undertook in the beginning of his commentary, to ſhew the price of every tax, but he was forced to confeſs, that it was above his capacity. No reader can remain ſatiſfied with what he ſays on that ſubject. I ſhall convince you of it. The three ſorts of money mentioned in that apoſtolical Tarif of Rome, are *turonenſes, ducatus,* and *carlinus*. Du Pinet has rendered thoſe words *tournois d'or, ducat de chambre,* and *carlin*; upon which he makes this obſervation: 'As to the *gold tournois*, ſome take it for a *livre Pariſis*; others ſay that it is an old crown; others are of opinion, that it is worth a *Philippus*. In ſhort, I have not hitherto found out any thing certain concerning that money, though the *Tournois de Chambre* is commonly worth a *Real*: a Ducat is worth a Piſtolet and four pence *Tournois*: and a Carlin is worth four pence (10).' Thoſe who love to underſtand every thing they read, want an explication much better than that; and it is certain that this was one of the paſſages which the author of the notes ſhould have explained with the greateſt clearneſs, if he could have done it. His work was reprinted at Leyden in the year 1607 (11). It was reprinted at Amſterdam, with a new preface, in the year 1700. The author of that preface tells us, that all poſſible care has been taken to reduce to our money the Tournois, Ducats, and Carlins, mentioned in the tax of the Pope's Chancery; but that nothing could be found out to clear that matter, and that if any diſcovery be made about it hereafter, it ſhall be inſerted in a new edition. He alledges what du Pinet has obſerved concerning the value of thoſe three ſorts of coins, and he adds, that the author of the notes upon the *Confeſſion of Sanci* aſſures, that there is at the end of the book of the taxes of the Roman Chancery, *a Tarif which reduces the Groſs to four pence Tournois, the Ducat to forty pence, and the Carolus to eight blanks* (12). The author of thoſe notes makes that obſervation in his commentary, upon a part of this paſſage of d'Aubigné. 'There is another book which thoſe whom I mentioned before, were very deſirous to deſtroy; but the Holy See will never permit it. . . . . It is the book of taxes, wherein a good Catholic ſees a low price ſet upon ſins, and knows in a moment what he is to pay for them. He, who has defloured a virgin, ſhall pay ſix groſſes for it. Whoſoever has carnally known (but with a mutual conſent) his own mother, ſiſter, couſin-german, or god-mother, let him pay five groſſes. But if it be known in the church, he muſt pay ſix. For having killed one's father or mother, one ducat, and five carlins (13).' Upon theſe words *five groſſes*, the commentator ſays, that this is to be found in the 36th folio *verſo*. He means without doubt, the edition mentioned by d'Aubigné, which is that of Paris 1570 (14), by Touſſaint Denis, in St James-Street, at the Wooden-Croſs, with this title, *Cancellaria Apoſtolica*; for here is his note upon theſe words, *it is the book of Taxes*. '*Taxæ Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ, & Taxæ Pœnitentiariæ itidem Apoſtolicæ*, printed at Paris with the king's licence for three years in 1520, by Touſſaint Denis, in St James-Street, at the Wooden-Croſs, having in the frontiſpiece the arms or the eſcutcheon of France, and thoſe of the houſe of Medicis, of which Leo X was (15).' He pretends that *that ſame book tranſlated into French in the year 1564, by Antony du Pinet, reprinted in the ſame year in 8vo at Lyons, by John Saugrain, and reprinted with the Latin* (16) *at Leyden in 1607, with this title,* Taxe des Parties Caſuelles de la Boutique du Pape, *is to be found among the condemned anonymous authors of the letter A, in the catalogue of prohibited books in 1685, by an order of the archbiſhop of Paris: and the authors of that catalogue did not think it neceſſary to mention the Latin Gothic original; becauſe the book of du Pinet is written in French, and full of annotations, wherein the author pretends to ſhew a great deal of turpitude in the old book of taxes; whereas, it may be thoſe gentlemen believed that the original was no more to be found; and beſides, they durſt not, without doubt, ſuppreſs it, by reaſon of the two great authorities wherewith it is attended. For the reſt,* the tax of the Chancery, &c. *was reprinted in 1613 with the pragmatic ſanction.* He will give me leave, I am ſure, to tell him, that the book which du Pinet tranſlated, is not the ſame with the book quoted by d'Aubigné. There is no money called a Groſs in the tax which du Pinet tranſlated and explained with notes. The chapter of *perpetual Diſpenſations* mentioned by d'Aubigné, is not to be found in it, nor any thing concerning

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 19.

(*b*) Gollut, Mémoires de la Franche Comté, *pag.* 6.

(1) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 76, who ſays, that thoſe two tranſlations were printed together at Lyons in 4to, in the year 1560.

(2) Ib. p. 78.

(3) La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 19.

(4) Ib. p. 20.

(5) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 78.

(6) Ib. p. 75.

(7) Ib. p. 76.

(8) Ib. p. 75.

(9) Pinet, Epiſt. Dedicat. *of the* Taxe des Parties Caſuelles, &c.

(10) Du Pinet, Taxe des Parties Caſuelles, &c. *pag.* 7.

(11) Note, that the Leyden edition is not the ſame in every thing with the Lyons edition 1564.

(12) Notes upon the Confeſſion of Sanci, *pag.* 101, *Edit.* 1699.

(13) Confeſſion of Sanci, *lib.* i, *cap.* ii, *pag.* 66.

(14) It ſeems to be a fault of the print inſtead of 1520.

(15) Notes upon the Confeſſion of Sanci, *pag.* 100, 101.

(16) The meaning of it is, that the edition of 1564 did not contain the Latin; but it is certain that it did.

families [*C*]. Of all his works, the tranſlation of Pliny was moſt eſteemed [*D*].

cerning the tax of thoſe who have committed inceſt with their mothers, ſiſters, *&c.* but ſince the author of the notes affirms, that thoſe men are only taxed five Groſſes, folio 36 *verſo*, we have reaſon to believe that d'Aubigné does not tell a lie. How comes it therefore to paſs, that neither du Pinet, nor thoſe who reprinted his tranſlation and his commentary, knew that other tax which is much more infamous than that which they took care to print? I very much wonder at it, and he is to blame for not ſaying what edition he made uſe of. The commentator of d'Aubigné gives us for the firſt edition, that of Paris 1520. But I know that in 1664, Stephen du Mont, Bookſeller of Boiſleduc, put out in Latin and Dutch from an edition of Rome 1514, a book intituled, *Taxæ Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ, & Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apoſtolicæ*, which he had compared word for word with the edition of Rome; whereof a ſecretary of the town of Boiſleduc gave a certificate, which is printed page 131. It is ſaid in the preface, that this book was printed at Cologne in 1515, *apud Goſuinum Colinium* (17). I know alſo, that a Profeſſor of the Civil Law in the univerſity of Franeker (18), publiſhed in 1651, with ſome notes, *Taxa Cameræ Apoſtolicæ*, which differs from the book printed at Boiſleduc.

If what d'Aubigné alledges, is really to be found in the book of taxes quoted by him, one may very well wonder how ſuch a book came out, and how it came to be authentically reprinted, even after it had afforded the Proteſtants the matter of ſo many triumphs. I ſhall ſet down the reproachful words of a miniſter of Paris upon that head to the biſhop of Belley. ‘I dare not ſay of this book all that Dr Deſpenſe † ſaid of it, even ſo as to apply theſe words to it;

> Proſtat & in quæſtu pro meretrice ſedet.
>
> *And like a common whore let out for hire.*

Thoſe of your communion are ſo far from being aſhamed of that book, which invites cuſtomers with ſound of trumpet, that they ceaſe not to publiſh and expoſe it to ſale. I have ſeen three Paris editions of it. The firſt came out in the year 1520, and it has been often quoted by our authors. The ſecond in the year 1545 ⸸. And the third in the year 1625, by that very man who prints your books ‡. I have among my books the edition of 1520, and that which was publiſhed in our time, in the year 1625. I have compared them, and found them the ſame. But eſpecially theſe words, which cry for vengeance before God. ‘*Et nota diligenter quod hujuſmodi gratiæ & diſpenſationes non conceduntur pauperibus, quia non ſunt, ideo non poſſunt conſolari.* That is to ſay, *and be ſure to obſerve* (and indeed the thing deſerves it) *that ſuch graces and diſpenſations are not granted to the poor: for, becauſe they have not wherewithal to pay, they cannot be comforted.* Thoſe words, I ſay, which are in folio 23 of the old edition 1520, are alſo to be found pag. 208, of the new edition of 1625, and thoſe who have the edition of the year 1545, will find them folio 130 (19).’

If any one had aſked d'Aubigné how it came to paſs that the court of Rome, ſo much cried down for her covetouſneſs, taxed but twenty pence Tournois the worſt of inceſts, he had without doubt, anſwered, that the ſeller who has wares which coſt him nothing, gets more by ſelling them at low rates, becauſe he ſells a greater quantity of them upon that account, and ſo he indemnifies himſelf by reaſon of the great number of buyers who flock to him, moſt of whom could eaſily be without thoſe wares, if they were exceſſively dear. But let no body miſtake the matter: the tax ſet down in that book is not all that muſt be paid: one muſt beſides treat with a datary, and compound with him according to one's ability (20).

[*C*] *He vented ſome extravagant notions concerning the genealogy of ſome families.*] One of our beſt Hiſtoriographers ſpeaking of Francis d'Agoult, count de Sault (21), *the greateſt lord of Provence, and one of the greateſt captains in his time*, and very much attached to the party of the Huguenots, *for which he was killed with John d'Agoult, his brother, in the battle of St Denys*, in the year 1567. This Hiſtoriographer, I ſay, giving that lord's encomium, expreſſes himſelf thus (22). ‘He was brave, generous, magnificent, and a man of great parts, he loved learning, and it was out of reſpect to him (23), that Antony du Pinet Sieur de Noroy collected in his treatiſe of the cities and forteſſes of the world, ſome trifling traditions concerning the origin of the houſe of Sault; to make a romance of it leſs credible than the apologues and the converſations of men with beaſts, and by which the reputation of that author had been ruined, had he not maintained it by his tranſlation of Pliny's works. I do not believe that Poetry would allow of ſuch fictions, ſo wonderful and incredible this ſeems to be, as well as the fable of Berold of Saxony, the pretended anceſtor of the dukes of Savoy, and Ferry Borſtelſtickel, whom Thevet the romancer makes the head of the illuſtrious houſe of Chabots: and it is a ſtrange thing that ſome daughter of a king or emperor, muſt loſe her honour to lay the foundation of a falſe tranſmigration. All that can be ſaid to excuſe du Pinet, is, that he wrote in a time when phantaſms were given for anceſtors to ſuch, as having loſt the memory of thoſe from whom they iſſued, afforded, in order to dreſs them up, ſome traditions, and old wives tales, whereof flatterers made myſteries with the alluſions they looked for in the names and arms of thoſe families; not knowing that arms and ſirnames have their limited time, and not ſuſpecting that a knowing age, ſuch as ours is, ſhould ſucceed an ignorant one, ſo as to penetrate into the foreign countries, whither they went to look for the firſt heroes of every race. He, whom du Pinet choſe for the houſe of Agoult, is one Hugh prince of Tric, an imaginary ſtate in Pomerania, whom his bravery and beauty made worthy of the love of the Infanta Valdugue, daughter of king Valdugue of Pomerania. He had a ſon by her, whom that princeſs, who was a priſoner, letting down from a window, to deliver him into the hands of a country-man, who was to carry him to his nurſe, a ſhe-wolf came in of a ſudden, and ſnatched him out of his hands, and carried him to her den to her young ones. She ſuckled him till the next day, when the king finding her as he was a hunting, purſued and killed her with her young ones, and found the child wrapped up in a rich cloth, whom he cauſed to be baptized; and having heard the hiſtory of his birth, he legitimated him by marrying his daughter to prince Hugh. She died a little while after, and the prince went to make war againſt the Grecians, and married the daughter of the emperor of Conſtantinople, where he ſettled, and had many children by her. Wolf of Tric, his ſon by his firſt marriage, ſo named in memory of ſo wonderful an accident, married Sidrac, daughter of the king of Ruſſia; and his eldeſt ſon of the ſame name having married a princeſs of Saxony, came with Berold of Saxony to the ſervice of the king of Arles (of Burgundy) and conquered the territory and valley of Sault in Provence, where he built the caſtle of Agoult, and his poſterity took their ſirname from it, and quitted that of Tric. He adds, that the country of Sault was infeoffed to him in the year 1200. Here is a fine hotch-potch of Hiſtory, Chronology and Coſmography, and the whole is grounded upon this, that the arms of Agoult are, not a ſhe-wolf, as they ſhould have been, but a he, and that ſome of that houſe took in the Latin titles, the ſeveral ſirnames de Agouto and de Tritis, becauſe of the manor of Trez, an ancient lot of the viſcounts of Marſeilles, which fell to them by marriage.’

This is not the only place, where le Laboureur inveighs with great reaſon againſt the abſurd impertinencies of the Genealogiſts. See pag. 801. of the 1. Tom. of his Additions to Caſtelnau's Memoirs, and you will ſee that du Cheſne has undeceived the houſe of Rochefoucaut, *(with honour to that houſe as well as to himſelf) as to the ſilly and fooliſh impoſtures of Brother Stephen de Luſignan, who derives more tribes from his Melluſine* (24), *than God promiſed Abraham.* See alſo pag. 559 of the ſecond tome, where he ſays, that, in 1560, Renatus de Sanzay *compiled with John le Feron, king at arms of France, that Genealogy of the houſe of Sanzay, made up of near fifty degrees of generation, moſt of them given year by year, with the names, ſirnames, and arms of the women, and all thoſe names, families, and arms are mere phantaſms. . . . . Brother Stephen de Luſignan, a friar, having had that fine piece of work imparted to him, made uſe of it to build his Romance of the ſixty ſeven illuſtrious houſes ſprung from that of Luſignan, more incredible ſtill than*

(17) See the article BANCK.

(18) Laurentius Banckius.

† In Epiſt. ad Titum, cap. i, Digreſ. II. *You will find this in pag.* 479, *of the Paris Edit.* 1619.

⸸ Apud Galeanum à Prato.

‡ Apud Gervaſium Alliot.

(19) Drelincourt, Reply to the Anſwer of the biſhop of Belley, *pag. m.* 370, 371.

(20) See the remark [*C*], in the article PARRHASIUS.

(21) Le Laboureur, Addit. to the Memoirs of Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 511.

(22) Ibid.

(23) *I fancy that this count de Sault was one of thoſe whom du Pinet means in his preface to Pliny's tranſlation, when he ſays*, for fifteen months that I have been labouring hard *at this tranſlation*, I have been often ſick, and charged with ſome affairs for the ſervice of ſome great lords to whom I am devoted.

(24) See what he ſays of Melluſine, pag. 702, 703, of the firſt Tome of his Addit. to Caſtelnau.

than that of Melluſine; out of whoſe tub, as out of a public fountain, he let out the nobility and blood of Luſignan to any that was ambitious of it. See the margin (25).

[*D*] *The tranſlation of Pliny.*] I believe that the firſt edition of it is of the year 1562, at Lyons, in two volumes in folio. Du Verdier Vau-Privas mentions none but that of the year 1566, at Lyons, by Claudius Senneton. I make uſe of the fourth, printed at Paris 1608, by John Houzé. It may be ſaid without flattering du Pinet, that he deſerved great praiſes on account of that tranſlation. He took great pains about it, he conſulted the ancient MSS. and the old editions of Pliny; he corrected and compared with them, what he wrote; he made a great many marginal annotations; he drew up two large indexes; he compoſed *a treatiſe of ancient weights and meaſures, reduced to the French,* and prefixed it to his tranſlation: which required abundance of time. I know he has committed a great many faults, ſome whereof are very abſurd. ‘He made two Roman gentlemen of two ſorts of marble, the one called *Lapis Numidicus*, and the other *Sinandicus*: it is in the firſt chapter of the thirty-fifth book. (26).’ He who has afforded me that remark, adds, *that he has obſerved a great number of other faults in that author, whoſe work is notwithſtanding very uſeful.* Any one that has never ſo little equity, and knows the difficulty of the undertaking, will be much more diſpoſed to value this author, by reaſon of ſo many paſſages which he has happily tranſlated, than to deſpiſe him by reaſon of his over-ſights. Read his preface, and you will ſee that he knew very well where the difficulty lay, and what helps were neceſſary for ſuch an undertaking.

(26) La Mothe le Vayer, Hexamer. Ruſtiq. *pag. m.* 30.

---

(25) At that time, ſays le Laboureur, pag. 320, of the ſecond Tome, they had not the method of drawing up genealogies upon deeds and records, they were contented with traditions, and old womens ſtories, to ſupply the defect of memory: they ſcarce knew their grand-fathers by rules, and above that they received for true whatever was vented by certain falſe antiquarians, and downright viſionaries, ſuch as John le Maire de Belges, author of the romance intituled, *Le Chevalier du Cygne*, compoſed in the behalf of the houſe of Cleves; Forcatel, a Civilian, author of the *Montmorency Gaulois*, Brother Stephen de Luſignan, a great impoſtor, and John le Feron, whom I ſhall only charge with credulity, who, as a king at arms, ſuffered his name to be put to ſeveral falſe genealogies, as did, after his example, Bernard de Girart Sieur du Haillan, a Genealogiſt of the order of the Holy Ghoſt.

PINON (JAMES) Abbot of Condé, canon of the church of Paris, and ſon to **JAMES PINON**, dean of the parliament of the ſame city (*a*), lived in the XVIIth century. He was eſteemed upon the account of his Latin Poetry (*b*), though *it was very late before he applied himſelf to it* [*A*]. Mr de Marolles, Abbot of Villeloin dedicated to him in 1661 his French verſion of Ovid's Poem *in Ibin*, and put at the end of the volume a letter he had writ to him. He commends him much in thoſe two places, and aſcribes to him excellent qualities. He inſerted at the end of the ſame tome ſeveral pieces of Poetry of *James Pinon*. We are beholden to the latter for an edition of Plutarch by Amiot in four volmues *in folio* (*c*). His father likewiſe publiſhed ſome Latin Poems: that *de Anno Romano* is ſtiled famous by the Abbot of Villeloin: that which he compoſed *de Crucifixo* was exceedingly praiſed by a good Poet, I mean by Nicholas Bourbon (*d*).

(*a*) *The Abbot* de Marolles, Dénombremont des Autheurs, *pag.* 431.

(*b*) Id. Epiſtle Dedicatory of the French tranſlation of Ovid *in Ibin.*

(*c*) Marolles, ubi ſupra.

(*d*) Nicolai Borbonii Poëmatia, *pag.* 144, *Edit.* 1630.

[*A*] *He was eſteemed upon the account of his Latin poetry, tho' it was very late before he applied himſelf to it.*] ‘I have been told, ſays the abbot de Villeloin (1), that you was at leaſt thirty years of age, when you firſt tried this fine talent: which you did in a time of Piety, on the ſubject of David's penitential Pſalms: and I know, that your father, who likewiſe made very good Latin verſes, having ſeen this noble production of your genius (he was an excellent judge in every thing) was ſurprized at it, as well as Mr Bourbon of the Oratory, your dear friend, who was no leſs a judge in it: ſo that you would have excited a jealouſy in the one and in the other, whatever powerful relation and great friendſhip there was between you, had they not at leaſt been as much concerned for your glory, as yourſelf. And the latter adviſed you to publiſh that excellent work; but not without accompanying it with a very ſingular mark of his eſteem, by the Hendecaſyllaba, worthy of himſelf, which he put at the beginning.’ *In his fine Epiſtles, he ſays of you, alluding to the name you bear,*

(1) Marolles, *Abbot* de Villeloin, Epitre à Mr l'Abbé de Condé, *at the end of the French tranſlation of Ovid* in Ibin.

- - - - Uni condere carmen
Condæo latius atque exercere camœnas.

And elſe where, after having ſpoken of your extraordinary knowledge in ſacred and prophane learning, he adds with his uſual eloquence; that being poſſeſſed of all thoſe riches, neither the graces of Poetry, nor the Latin Muſes have any ſecrets or myſteries, which are not revealed to you.

Inſtructo tantis opibus, veteriſque Latinæ,
Arcana, & Muſarum adyta haud adeunda prophanis,
Tota patent,

. . . . *You acquired immediately* by your verſes *an extraordinary reputation, and ſome learned men of Germany, who ſaw a Panegyric you had compoſed for the late king, ſpoke of it to Mr Davaux, embaſſador for the peace at Munſter, as one of the fineſt pieces they had ever ſeen. This did not ſurpriſe that excellent man, who was acquainted with your merit; and who knew very well the eſteem that the Bélièvres and the Dépeſſes had for you, as well as Father Gondran, general of the Oratory, who ſaid of your verſes, that it was not a mortal who had dictated them. . . . . Make a collection of all your excellent works, which are in looſe ſheets, ſome printed, and others not printed: it will be a valuable one, and I am perſuaded it will maintain it's place with honour in the beſt choſen libraries. The variety of it will be wonderful, for beſides the ſubjects which are very different from one another, you have very aptly employed all ſorts of ſtiles and characters of the beſt authors of antiquity, without taking however their verſes or periods entire, tho' the terms be the ſame, or their thoughts either, having enough to ſpare out of your own fund, which is not eaſily exhauſted. And as to your Elegiac Poetry, the verſification of Tibullus and Propertius is not more polite than yours: there appears no leſs wit in it than in the works of Ovid: your Hendecaſyllaba are in the manner of thoſe of Catullus. Your Epiſtles and Satires very much reſemble thoſe of Horace: and your Epigrams contain a ſpirit which equals that of Martial. I ſhall ſay nothing of your heroic Poetry, which you have ſufficiently ſhewn in your Panegyric on the late king, and in ſeveral works of piety that you dedicated to cardinal Richelieu, the year in which the king was born* (2). Mr de Marolles tells us elſewhere (3) that he keeps amongſt the pieces he compoſed an ‘Epiſtle to the abbot Pinon, who delights ſo much in Latin Poetry, that there is not one perſon now-a-days who has done more than he in every kind, wherein all judges allow he has perfectly ſucceeded: and were there nothing but his foreſt of Pines, called *Pinea Sylva*, which is ſo finiſhed a piece, it might be queſtioned whether any of the Antients ever had more wit, genius, and invention, than he, to expreſs always his thoughts agreeably and clearly in that kind, wherein is conſidered the vaſt number of thoſe of all conditions who have been employed in it, to whom likewiſe great commendations could not be refuſed, were particulars to be examined of which we have ſpoken largely in another place. But certainly the abbot Pinon could not be out-done.’

(2) Epiſt. Dedicat. of the tranſlation of Ovid *in Ibin.*

(3) Idem, in the catalogue of his works, *pag.* 22.

It will ſeem ſurprizing, without doubt, that Poems, which have been honoured with ſo much public applauſe, ſhould be entirely unknown in foreign countries, and that even in France they ſhould be ſo little talked of, that Mr Baillet has not mentioned them in his vaſt collection of Poets: but two things ought to be conſidered; firſt, that a great abatement ſhould always be made with regard to public encomiums beſtowed by friends: ſecondly, that the abbot de Condé probably did not follow the advice of his friend

friend in collecting the looſe ſheets of his Poems. This was the only method almoſt to preſerve the memory of them: for ſmall pamphlets, however good they be, are eaſily diſſipated (4): thirty years time will make an end of them, unleſs they are bound up; and therefore they ſhould be joined together again by a new edition. Bookſellers are ready enough to take that trouble with reſpect to French poems, which have had the good fortune to pleaſe ſeparately: but they muſt be ſollicited and encouraged to it, with reſpect to Latin Poems.

(4) One might, by a ſenſe of accommodation, apply to Poets theſe words of *Virgil. Æn. lib. vi, ver.* 74. Foliis tantum ne carmina manda; Ne turbata volent rapidiſ ludibria ventis. *See the* Nouv. de la Rep. des Lett. *Feb.* 1687, *at the end of the firſt article.*

PINSSON (Francis) profeſſor of the Civil Law at Bourges, was inſtalled in that employment on the eighth of February 1611. He had already taught, for ſome time, the Inſtitutes in that city. He was ſo exact in the exerciſe of his profeſſion, that he never failed to make his lectures, and rather than miſs any of them, he often came from his country houſe, which was five leagues off, to be in the ſchool at the hour he was expected there. He taught the Canon-Law for a long time, and he had always five or ſix hundred ſcholars. He died at Bourges in the year 1643, being ſixty-three years of age. His firſt wife was Mary Bengy, daughter of Antony Bengy, of whom I ſhall ſpeak below [*A*], and his ſecond wife was N. d'Amours: he had no children but by his firſt wife. We are promiſed the publication (*a*) of what he dictated in the ſchools of Bourges in the year 1625, *ad Philippi Imperatoris reſcripta*, and his commentary on the epiſtles of Pope Honorius III, and his funeral oration pronounced at the opening of the ſchools of Bourges in the year 1643, by Mr de Roye, who was afterwards profeſſor of law at Angers (*b*).

(*a*) Mr Pinſſon des Riolles, his grand-ſon deſigns to publiſh it.

(*b*) Taken from a MS Memoir.

[*A*] *Daughter of Antony Bengy, of whom I ſhall ſpeak below.*] Antony Bengy, Eſq; Sieur de Puy-Vallée, was called from the bar, being twenty-ſix years of age, to ſucceed Cujas in the profeſſion of the Law at Bourges, in the year 1595. He exerciſed it with great diligence till the year 1616, wherein he died. He had ſometimes two thouſand ſcholars. He dictated, among other things, the treatiſe concerning Benefices, as far as the fourth chapter *de oneribus & immunitatibus Eccleſiarum*. I ſhall ſpeak of it afterwards (1). He was made echevin of Bourges in the years 1603 and 1604. The diſcourſe he made, when he began his lectures, in the year 1600, was printed in the ſame year at Bourges, with this title, *Concio funebris in memoriam defuncti Joannis Mercerii Juris utriuſque Doctoris in Schola Biturigum* (2). He is the author of an epitaph of Cujas, which is to be found only in the collection of the *privileges and antiquities of* Bourges, by John Chenu, but not in the laſt collection of the works of *Cujas* in ten volumes, made by Mr Fabrot. In the year 1614, he made an epitaph for the marſhal de la Châtre, which was never printed. Note, that he had been a counſellor in the provoſtſhip of Bourges. He left, among other children, a ſon, who was counſellor and the king's advocate in the preſidial of Bourges, and then the king's advocate in the court of finances, and who married in the year 1618 Frances Chenu, daughter of John Chenu, a famous advocate, who has wrote many books (3.)

(1) In the remark [*A*] of the following article, in the title of the firſt book publiſhed by Francis Pinſſon the advocate.

(2) *That funeral oration was printed with* honeſtorum virorum lamenta Latinis Græcis & Gallicis verſibus ſcripta: *which makes in all* 38 *pages in* 4*to*.

(3) Taken from a MS Memoir.

PINSSON (Francis) ſon of the foregoing, was born at Bourges, the fifth of April 1612, and having finiſhed his ſtudies there, and taken his degree, he came to Paris, where he was admitted an advocate the fifth of November 1633. He applied himſelf to the Châtelet at firſt, and afterwards to the courts of parliament, where he had a great deal of practice, eſpecially in what relates to benefices. He publiſhed ſeveral books on that ſubject. You will find below the catalogue of all the books he printed [*A*], from which you may rightly conclude that he was a man of great capacity, and reputation.

[*A*] *The catalogue of all the books he printed.*] It apappears to me to be ſo well done, that I ſhall give it as I have received it. ‘The firſt book which Francis Pinſſon publiſhed, is his treatiſe of Eccleſiaſtical Benefices in Latin, which he finiſhed after the death of Mr Bengy his grand-father by the mother's ſide; which is the reaſon why the title of that book runs thus: *Antonii Bengii in Alma Biturigum Academia Anteceſſoris primicerii, & Franciſci Pinſſoni Pariſienſis Advocati ejuſdem ex filia Nepotis Tractatus de Beneficiis Eccleſiaſticis ex definitione deſumptus ad uſum fori Gallici & libertatum Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ accommodatus, Pariſiis ſumptibus Antonii de Sommaville* 1654, in folio, dedicated to the firſt preſident de Bellievre. He has reviſed, corrected, and conſiderably enlarged that work, which is ready to be printed, having obtained a licence for it from the chancellor. He cauſed to be printed in 1663, by Francis Muguet, in 4to, *Sancti Ludovici Francorum Regis Pragmatica Sanctio, & in eam hiſtorica præfatio & Commentarius*, dedicated to the king. In 1666, he publiſhed the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles VII, with this title: *Caroli Septimi Francorum Regis Pragmatica Sanctio cum gloſſis Domini Coſmæ Guymier Pariſini ſupremæ Galliarum curiæ Senatoris, & Inquiſitionum præſidis, & additionibus Philippi Probi Biturici ad Pragmaticæ Sanctionis & Concordatorum diſſidia componenda; accedunt hiſtoria Pragmaticæ Sanctionis & Concordatorum, annotationes marginales, & veterum inſtrumentorum ſupplementa, opera & ſtudio Franciſci Pinſſonii Biturici Advocati Pariſienſis, Pariſiis apud Franciſcum Clouzier* 1666, in folio, dedicacated to the king. He anſwered, in 1674, ſome treatiſes, which came out at that time under the title of *L'Abbé Commendataire*, a work in two little volumes, in 12mo, printed at Cologne, by Nicolas Schouten in 1673, one under the name of the Sieur des Bois, Doctor of Law, who is thought to be Dom Gabriel Gerberon, a Benedictin Monk; and the ſecond part in 1674, under the name of the Sieur Fromont, done, as is ſaid, by Dom . . . . Delfau, another Benedictin. That anſwer was never printed: it will be inſerted in the new edition of his treatiſe concerning Benefices. In 1668, on the eighteenth of December, he wrote a Conſultation, printed ſince in his ſecond volume of his treatiſe concerning the Regale, to ſhew that the king, by virtue of the treaty of peace of Aix la Chapelle, containing the ceſſion of the city of Ath, has a good claim to the ſtrong place of Condé, as being a dependency of the Chatellaney of Ath. He wrote another ſince, on the ſeventeenth of June 1669, printed in the ſame place, which is a continuation of the foregoing, wherein he ſhews, that the additions made to the town of Condé ought to belong to the king, as well as the body of the place. In the year 1673, he publiſhed ſome ſummary notes upon the indults granted to the king, printed in two volumes in 12mo, by Charles de Sercy, and dedicated to the king. In the year 1681, he printed his notes on the body of the Canon-Law, which are to be found among the works of Charles du Moulin, in the fourth volume of his laſt edition, with this title, *Franciſci Pinſſonii Biturici Pariſienſis Advocati Manuale juris Pontificii Cæſarei & Gallici, compactum ex annotationibus Caroli Molinæi* tation. He was Bâtonnier of the ſociety of Advocates and Attornies of the Parliament in 1682 [*B*], and was made one of the twenty-four honorary doctors of the faculty of Law at Paris, in the room of Mr Boſcager, the twenty-fifth of February 1688. He died ſub-dean of the ſociety of the advocates, the tenth of October 1691, being above ſeventy-nine years old, and was buried at St Stephen du Mont. He left ſeveral children (*a*), and, amongſt others, Mr PINSSON des Riolles, an advocate in the parliament of Paris, a man of merit, and very well known to the learned, and one of the moſt obliging friends that ever were. He is writing, amongſt other things, the lives of the profeſſors of Bourges.

(*a*) Taken from a MS Memoir.

‘ *Molinæi ad jus Pontificium ſive Canonicum ; adverſariis Gabrielis du Pineau* (1) *Senatoris Andegavenſis ad Molinæanas annotationes, animadverſionibuſque ejuſdem Pinſſonii ad utrumque ; in quibus jus quotidianum & forenſe exhibetur ex libertatum Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ uberiori penu : Conſtitutionum Regiarum tùm antiquiorum, tùm recentiorum inexhauſto fonte, & ſuperiorum Galliæ tribunalium decretorio ſtylo.* Thoſe notes are dedicated to Mr Colbert, in folio, Paris, for Guignard, *&c.* Finally, in the year 1688, his ſingular treatiſe concerning the *Regale*, or the King's Rights over Eccleſiaſtical Benefices, and dedicated to the king, was printed for John Guignard and Antony Dezallier, in two volumes in 4to (2). He added to that work the Conference about the Edict of the *Controll*, and the Declaration of Eccleſiaſtical Inſinuations (3), with ſeveral other Inſtructions concerning Beneficiary Matters, dedicated to the advocate-general de Lamoignon, and to Mr de Lamoignon de Baſville, intendant of Languedoc. He alſo had a hand in the edition of the works of Antony Mornac, printed in four volumes in folio, for Antoni de Sommaville, in the year 1654, and in the two laſt editions of Charles du Moulin's works. He made alſo ſome remarks upon a book of Mr du Bois, advocate in Parliament, intituled Maxims of the Canon-Law, which have been publiſhed with that book ſeveral times, for John Guignard, in two volumes in 12mo, in 1678, 1684, *&c.* by Denis Simond, counſellor in the Preſidial, and aſſeſſor in the Marſhalſey of Beauvois (4).’

[*C*] *He was* Bâtonnier *of the ſociety of the Advocates and Attornies of the parliament in* 1682.] I ſhall ſet down here the explication of the word *Bâtonnier*, for the ſake of thoſe who ſhall read this without having Furetiere's Dictionary. ‘ *Baſtonnier* is a Law-term, and ſignifies an ancient Advocate, who is choſen every year, according to ſeniority, to be the head of the ſociety of Advocates and Attornies, to be maſter of their chapel and fraternity, and to preſide, when they meet, for the maintaining of the diſcipline of the court of juſtice, and of the regulations. To him alſo belongs the commiſſion of the places of inferior judges when they are interdicted (5).’

(3) *The Journaliſts of Leipſic excuſe themſelves for not giving an abſtract of that part of the work, and give a very good reaſon for it :* Quia, *ſay they, ibid. pag.* 574, nec res nec verba facile intelligi poſſunt ab iis qui extra Galliam vivunt, & tabem illam fori Eccleſiaſtici, liteſque innumeras, ut & diſſenſiones ignorant quæ non ſolum inter partes fervent, ſed & ſæpe inter Parlamentum & Tribunal regium. - - - - *Becauſe neither the things nor the words can be underſtood by thoſe who live out of France, and are unacquainted with the querks of the eccleſiaſtical courts, and the innumerable law-ſuits, and alſo the warm debates that happen not only between parties, but often between the parliament and the king's council.*

(1) It is he whom I have mentioned before, article PINEAU (GABRIEL DU).

(2) See an abſtract of it in the Journal of Leipſic, in the firſt Tome of the *Supplem. pag.* 570, *& ſeq.*

(4) Taken from the MS Memoir.

(5) *See the word* Baſtonnier *in Furetiere's Dictionary.*

PYRRHO, a Greek Philoſopher, born at Elis in Peloponneſus, was a diſciple of Anaxarchus, and accompanied him as far as India (*a*). Without doubt, he then followed Alexander the Great, from whence one may know in what time he flouriſhed. He had been a Painter (*b*) before he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Philoſophy. His opinions did not differ much from thoſe of Arceſilaus [*A*]; for he did almoſt teach, as well as he, the incomprehenſibility of all things. He found in all things reaſons to affirm and to deny ; and therefore he ſuſpended his aſſent after he had well examined the arguments *pro* and *con*, and reduced all his concluſions to a *non liquet*, *let the matter be further enquired into.* Hence it is that he ſought truth as long as he lived, but he ſo contrived the matter, as never to grant that he had found it. Though he is not the inventer of that method of philoſophizing, yet it goes by his name: the art of diſputing about every thing, without doing any thing elſe but ſuſpending one's judgment, is called *Pyrrhoniſm* (or Scepticiſm) : this is its moſt common name. It is juſtly deteſted in the ſchools of Divinity [*B*], where it endeavours to get a new, though a chimerical, ſtrength ; but

(*a*) Diog. Laërt. in Pyrrhone, *lib. ix, init. num.* 61.

(*b*) Ibid.

[*A*] *His opinions did not differ much from thoſe of Arceſilaus.*] Did I follow punctually Aſcanius Abderita, I ſhould ſay that there was no difference between thoſe two Philoſophers. Γενναιότατα δοκεῖ φιλοσοφῆσαι τὸ τῆς ἀκαταληψίας καὶ ἐποχῆς εἶδος εἰσαγαγών. ὡς Ἀσκάνιος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης φησί. *Nobiliſſimè philoſophiam tractaſſe videtur, commentus modum quo de omnibus nihil decerneret, neque quicquam comprehendi poſſe diceret, ut Aſcanius Abderites auctor eſt* (1). This is poſitively to affirm, that, according to Pyrrho, the nature of things is incomprehenſible : now this was the doctrine of Arceſilaus. Nevertheleſs, I had rather acknowledge that there was ſome difference between them, becauſe Pyrrhoniſm does not formally ſuppoſe incomprehenſibility. They were called, Sceptics, Zetetics, Ephectics, Aporetics (2), that is to ſay, *examiners, inquirers, ſuſpending, and doubting men.* Which ſhews, that they ſuppoſed it was poſſible to find out truth, and that they did not poſitively affirm that it was incomprehenſible. We find in Aulus Gellius, that they condemned thoſe who affirm that it is incomprehenſible ; and therein, according to that author, lies the difference between the Pyrrhoniſts and Academics (3) : in every thing elſe they were perfectly alike, and they gave one another the above-mentioned names (4). *Cum hæc autem conſimiliter tam Pyrrhoni dicant quàm Academici ; differre tamen inter ſeſe & propter alia quædam, & vel maximè propterea exiſtimati ſunt, quòd Academici quidem ipſum illud nihil poſſe comprehendi, quaſi comprehendunt ; & nihil poſſe diſcerni, quaſi diſcernunt : Pyrrhonii ne id quidem ullo pacto videri verum dicunt, quòd nihil eſſe verum videtur* (5). Sextus Empiricus found another difference between them (6). Arceſilaus pretended, that the ſuſpenſion of the mind was naturally good, and affirmation naturally bad ; but, according to Pyrrho, they were only ſo in appearance, ȣ κατὰ φύσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ φαινόμενον, *non ſecundum naturam, ſed ſecundum id quod apparet.* After all, the one was not more for doubting than the other, and there was nothing more eaſy than to reconcile them. They ſhould only have been deſired to expreſs themſelves more clearly and ſincerely (7).

[*B*] *Pyrrhoniſm is juſtly deteſted in the ſchools of Divinity.*] Pyrrhoniſm is dangerous with reſpect to that divine ſcience ; but it is not very dangerous with reſpect to Natural Philoſophy or the ſtate. There is no harm in ſaying, that the ſouls of men are too narrow to diſcover any thing in natural truths, in the cauſes which produce heat, cold, the flux of the ſea, *&c.* It is enough for us to endeavour to find out ſome probable hypotheſes, and to make a collection of experiments ; and I am ſure that there are very few good Natural Philoſophers in our age, but are convinced, that nature is an impenetrable abyſs, and that it's ſprings are known to none, but to the maker and director of them. So that all thoſe Philoſophers are, in that reſpect, Academics and Pyrrhoniſts. The civil life needs not be afraid of them ; for the Sceptics did not

(1) Diog. Laërt. *lib. ix, num.* 61.

(2) *See* Gaſſendus, in Libro Procemiali de Philoſophia Univerſè, *cap. viii, pag. m.* 24. *See alſo* Aulus Gellius, ubi infra.

(3) *Viz. thoſe of the ſecond academy founded by Arceſilaus.*

(4) Aulus Gellius, *lib. xi, cap. v.*

(5) Ibid.

(6) *See* Voſſius, de Philoſophorum Sectis, *pag.* 107.

(7) *See the paſſage of* Ariſtocles, apud Euſebium Præpar. Evangelic. *lib. xiv, quoted by Voſſius, ibid. pag.* 106.

but it may be of uſe to oblige man out of a ſenſe of his ignorance, to call for the help of God,

not deny, but that men ought to conform to the cuſtoms of their country, and practiſe moral duties, and reſolve upon thoſe things from a probable reaſon, without ſtaying for certainty (8). They might ſuſpend their judgment upon this queſtion, Whether ſuch a duty was naturally and abſolutely lawful ; but they did not ſuſpend it upon this queſtion, Whether it was to be practiſed on ſuch and ſuch an occaſion. From whence it follows, that Pyrrhoniſm is only dangerous to religion ; for it ought to be grounded upon certainty : the deſign, the effects, and uſe of religion, vaniſh, as ſoon as the firm perſuaſion of it's truth is blotted out of the mind. But, on the other ſide, we need not be uneaſy at it ; there never was, and there never will be, but a ſmall number of men capable of being deceived by the arguments of the Sceptics. The grace which God beſtows upon the Faithful, the force of education in other men, and, if you will, ignorance (9), and the natural inclination men have to be peremptory, are an impenetrable ſhield againſt the darts of the Pyrrhoniſts, though that ſect fancies it is now more formidable than it was anciently. Let us ſee upon what grounds they build ſuch a ſtrange pretenſion.

About two months ago a learned man gave me a full account of a conference at which he had been preſent. Two abbots, one whereof had but common learning, the other was a good Philoſopher, grew ſo hot by degrees in their diſpute, that they were like to fall out in earneſt. The firſt had ſaid, ſomewhat coldly, that he forgave the Heathen Philoſophers, their floating in the uncertainty of their opinions ; but that he could not apprehend how there could be any Pyrrhoniſts under the light of the Goſpel. To which the other anſwered, You are in the wrong to reaſon in ſuch a manner. If Arceſilaus ſhould return into the world, and was to diſpute with our Divines, he would be a thouſand times more formidable than he was to the Dogmatiſts of old Greece ; the Chriſtian Theology would afford him unanſwerable arguments. All the company heard this with great ſurprize, and deſired the abbot to explain himſelf, and doubted not but he had vented a paradox which would turn to his confuſion. He anſwered thus, applying himſelf to the firſt abbot. I will not make uſe of the advantages which the new Philoſophy gives to the Pyrrhoniſts. The name of Sextus Empiricus was ſcarce known in our ſchools ; what he propoſed with ſo great ſubtilty concerning ſupending one's judgment, was not leſs unknown there, than the Terra Auſtralis, when Gaſſendus (10) gave an abridgment of it, which opened our eyes. Carteſianiſm has put the laſt hand to the work, and none among good Philoſophers doubt now but the Sceptics are in the right to maintain, that the qualities of bodies which ſtrike our ſenſes, are only meer appearances. Every one of us may ſay, *I feel heat before a fire*, but not *I know that fire is ſuch in itſelf as it appears to me*. Such was the ſtyle of the ancient Pyrrhoniſts. But now the new Philoſophy ſpeaks more poſitively : heat, ſmell, colours, *&c.* are not in the objects of our ſenſes ; they are only ſome modifications of my ſoul ; I know that bodies are not ſuch as they appear to me. They were very willing to except extenſion and motion, but they could not do it ; for if the objects of our ſenſes appear to us coloured, hot, cold, ſmelling, tho' they are not ſo, why ſhould they not appear extended and figured, at reſt, and in motion, though they had no ſuch thing (11). Nay, the objects of my ſenſes cannot be the cauſe of my ſenſations : I might therefore feel cold and heat, ſee colours, figures, extenſion, and motion, tho' there was not one body in the world. I have not therefore one good proof of the exiſtence of bodies (12). The only proof they can give me for it, is, that God would deceive me, if he imprinted in my ſoul the ideas I have of body, if there were no bodies (13), but that proof is very weak ; it proves too much. Ever ſince the beginning of the world all men, except, perhaps, one in two hundred millions, do firmly believe that bodies are coloured, and yet it is a miſtake. I aſk, whether God deceives men with reſpect to thoſe colours ? If he deceives them in that reſpect, what hinders but he may deceive them with reſpect to extenſion. This latter illuſion will not be leſs innocent, nor leſs conſiſtent, than the former, with the moſt perfect being. If he does not deceive them, with reſpect to colours, it is without doubt, becauſe he forces them not to ſay, *thoſe colours exiſt out of my ſoul*, but only *it appears to me there are ſome colours there.* The ſame may be ſaid with reſpect to extenſion. God does not force you to ſay, that *it does exiſt*, but only to judge that you feel it, and that it appears to you to exiſt. A Carteſian can as readily ſuſpend his judgment about the exiſtence of extenſion, as a peaſant affirm that the ſun ſhines, that the ſnow is white, *&c.* And therefore if we are miſtaken in affirming the exiſtence of extenſion, God will not be the cauſe of it, ſince you acknowledge that he is not the cauſe of that peaſant's error. Such are the advantages which the new Philoſophers would procure to the Pyrrhoniſts, but I will not take advantage of them.

Immediately the ſame abbot, who was a Philoſopher, declared to the other, that if he would have the better of a Sceptic, he muſt, before all things, prove, that truth may certainly be known by ſome marks. They are commonly called *Criterium veritatis*. You will juſtly maintain againſt him, that evidence is a certain character of truth, for if evidence was not that character, we ſhould have none. Let it be ſo, will he ſay, it is what I would have you be at : I will ſhew you ſeveral things of the greateſt evidence, which you reject as falſe. I. It is evident, that things which do not differ from a third, do not differ from each other (14), it is the baſis of all our reaſonings, all our ſyllogiſms are grounded upon it ; nevertheleſs we are aſſured by the revelation of the myſtery of the Trinity, that this is a falſe axiom. You may invent as many diſtinctions as you pleaſe, but you will never be able to ſhew, that that maxim is not contradicted by this great myſtery. II. It is evident, that there is no difference between *individuum, nature*, and *perſon* : nevertheleſs, the ſame myſtery has convinced us, that perſons may be multiplied and that individuums and natures will not ceaſe for all that to be one. III. It is evident, that for a man to be really and perfectly a perſon, it is enough to unite together a human body and a reaſonable ſoul. But the myſtery of the Incarnation has taught us, that this is not ſufficient. From whence it follows that neither you nor I can be ſure whether we are perſons : for if it was eſſential to a human body and a reaſonable ſoul, united together, to conſtitute a perſon, God could never cauſe that thus united they ſhould not conſtitute a perſon : we muſt therefore ſay, that perſonality is meerly accidental to them. But every accident may be ſeparated from it's ſubject ſeveral ways : God therefore may hinder us ſeveral ways from being perſons, tho' we are made up of a body and a ſoul : and can any one aſſure us, that he does not make uſe of ſome ſuch means to ſtrip us of our perſonality ? Is he obliged to reveal to us the ſeveral ways he diſpoſes of us ? IV. It is evident, that a human body cannot be in ſeveral places at one time, and that it's head cannot be penetrated, with all it's other parts, under an indiviſible point : nevertheleſs the myſtery of the Euchariſt teaches us, that thoſe two things happen every day (15), from whence it follows, that neither you nor I can be ſure whether we are diſtinguiſhed from other men, and whether we are not at this very moment in the ſeraglio of Conſtantinople, in Canada, and in Japan, and in every town of the world, under ſeveral circumſtances in each place. Would God, who does nothing in vain, create ſeveral men, when one man only created in ſeveral places, and cloathed with ſeveral qualities, may ſuffice ? This doctrine deprives us of the truth, we find in numbers ; for we know no longer what two or three are ; we know not what identity and diverſity are. If we judge that John and Peter are two men, it is only becauſe we ſee them in diſtinct places, and becauſe the one has not the accidents of the other. But that ground of diſtinction becomes null from the doctrine of the Euchariſt. It may be that there is but one creature in the world multiplied in ſeveral places by production, and by the diverſity of qualities : we caſt up long accounts in Arithmetic, as if there were many things diſtinct (16) ; but this is only a vain imagination. We are not only ignorant whether there are two bodies in the world ; but we do not ſo much as know whether there is a body and a ſpirit : for if matter is penetrable, it is plain that extenſion is only an accident of the body, and ſo the body, according to it's eſſence, is a ſubſtance not extended : it is therefore capable of all the attributes which we conceive in a ſpirit, as the underſtanding, the will, the paſſions, and the ſenſations : ſo that we are left without any rule whereby we may diſcern whether a ſub-

---

(8) See Diogenes Laërtius, at the end of Pyrrho's Life.

(9) It is a ſaying of Simonides, thoſe men are not ſubtle enough to be deceived by ſuch a one as I am. Balzac ſaid the ſame thing of the maids of his village. Ageſilaus complained that he had to do with enemies who underſtood not the war, his ſtratagems were uſeleſs, he could not deceive unexperienced troops. See Plutarch in his Life, towards the end.

(10) *In his book* de fine Logicæ, *cap. iii, pag. 72, & ſeq. of the firſt volume of his works, Lyons* 1658.

(11) The Abbot Foucher propoſed this objection in his *Critique on the Search of Truth.* Father Mallebranche made no anſwer to it. He was ſenſible of the ſtrength of this objection. See the following citation.

(12) Father Mallebranche ſhews in one of his explications of ſome paſſages of the *Search after Truth, That it is very difficult to prove the exiſtence of bodies, and that nothing but faith can convince us that bodies do really exiſt.*

(13) See the 28th chapter of Mr Arnauld's treatiſe *Concerning True and Falſe Ideas*, where he refutes the above-mentioned explication of Father Mallebranche, by ſome reaſons taken from this principle.

(14) *Quæ ſunt idem uni tertio ſunt idem inter ſe.*

(15) Note, that this is the diſcourſe of an Abbot. I am obliged to give the reader notice of this in this ſecond edition, becauſe I know that ſeveral perſons of the Proteſtant religion have been offended to ſee the myſteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, parallelled with the doctrines of the Real Preſence and Tranſubſtantiation.

(16) Note, that if a body may be produced in ſeveral places, any other being, ſpirit, place, accident, &c. may be multiplied the ſame way ; and ſo there will not be a multitude of beings, but all things will be reduced to one only created being.

God, and to ſubmit to the authority of faith [C]. Now becauſe what I have related (c) concerning

ſtance is ſpiritual by it's nature, or whether it be corporeal. V. It is evident, that the modes of a ſubſtance cannot ſubſiſt without the ſubſtance, which they modify; but the myſtery of Tranſubſtantiation has taught us that this is falſe (17). All our ideas are confounded by it; we can no longer define a ſubſtance: for if an accident can ſubſiſt without any ſubject, a ſubſtance may in it's turn ſubſiſt dependently upon another ſubſtance, as accidents do: a ſpirit may ſubſiſt after the manner of bodies, as in the Euchariſt, matter exiſts after the manner of ſpirits: the latter may be impenetrable, as matter is penetrable in the Euchariſt. Now if by coming from the darkneſs of Paganiſm to the light of the Goſpel, we have learned the falſity of ſo many evident notions, and of ſo many certain definitions (18), what will it be when we ſhall come from the darkneſs of this life to the glory of heaven? Is it not very likely that we ſhall then learn the falſity of a thouſand things which appear to us undeniable? Let us make a good uſe of the raſhneſs of thoſe who lived before the Goſpel, and who affirmed that ſome evident doctrines were true, the falſity whereof has been revealed to us by the myſteries of our Theology.

I come now to morals. I. It is evident, that evil ought to be prevented, if it be poſſible, and that it is a ſinful thing to permit it when it can be prevented. Nevertheleſs, our Theology ſhews us, that this is falſe: it teaches us that God does nothing but what becomes his perfections, when he permits all the diſorders that are in the world, and which he might eaſily have prevented. II. It is evident, that a creature which does not exiſt, cannot be an accomplice of an ill action. III. And that it is unjuſt to puniſh that creature as an accomplice of that action. Nevertheleſs, our doctrine concerning original ſin ſhews us the falſity of thoſe evidences. IV. It is evident, that what is honeſt ought to be preferred before what is profitable, and that the more holy a Being is, the leſs freedom he has to prefer what is profitable to what is honeſt. Nevertheleſs, our Divines tell us, that it being in God's choice to make a world perfectly well regulated, and adorned with all virtues, and a world like ours, wherein ſin and diſorder prevail, preferred the latter to the former, as being more conſiſtent with the intereſt of his glory. If you ſhould tell me, that the duties of the creator ought not to be meaſured by ours, you will fall into the net of your adverſaries. They would have you there; the main thing they aim at is, to prove that the abſolute nature of things is unknown to us, and that we know only ſome relations they have one to another (19). We know not, ſay they, whether ſugar be ſweet in itſelf, we only know that it ſeems to us to be ſweet, when we taſte it. We know not whether a certain action is honeſt in itſelf and by its nature, we only believe that with reſpect to ſuch an one, and by reaſon of certain circumſtances, it has the appearance of honeſty. But it is another thing in other reſpects, and under other relations. See therefore how you expoſe yourſelf, by telling them that the ideas we have of juſtice and honeſty are liable to exception, and are relative. Beſides, I would have you to obſerve, that the more you raiſe the rights of God to the privilege of acting contrary to our ideas, the more you deſtroy the only means left you to prove that there are bodies, *viz.* that God does not deceive us, and that he would do it if the corporeal world did not exiſt. To ſhew a people a thing which does not exiſt out of their minds, would be a deceit: but they will anſwer you, *diſtinguo*, - - - *I diſtinguiſh*; if a prince did ſo, *concedo*, - - - *I grant it*: if God did it, *nego*, - - - *I deny it*: for the rights of God are quite different from thoſe of kings. Beſides, if the exceptions you make to the principles of morality are grounded upon the incomprehenſible infinity of God, I can never be ſure of any thing; for I ſhall never be able to comprehend the whole extent of the rights of God. I conclude therefore, that if truth was to be known by any mark, it would be by evidence: but evidence is no ſuch mark, becauſe it ſuits with falſities; therefore, &c.

The abbot, to whom this long diſcourſe was directed, had much ado to forbear interrupting him: he heard him with great uneaſineſs, and when he perceived that every body was ſilent, he fell into a great paſſion againſt the Pyrrhoniſts (20), and ſpared not the abbot for having mentioned the objections which they take from the ſyſtems of Divinity. This abbot replied modeſtly, that he knew very well thoſe objections were very inconſiderable and meer Sophiſms; but that it is reaſonable, that thoſe who ſo much deſpiſe the Pyrrhoniſts, ſhould not be ignorant of the ſtate of things. He went on, and ſaid, you did believe hitherto that a Pyrrhoniſt could not puzzle you, anſwer me therefore: you are forty-five years of age, you do not doubt of it, and if there be any thing that you are ſure of, it is that you are the ſame perſon to whom the abbey of . . . . was given two years ago. I am going to ſhew you, that you have no good reaſon to be ſure of it: I argue from the principles of our Theology. Your ſoul has been created; God muſt therefore at every moment renew it's exiſtence; for the conſervation of creatures is a continued creation. How do ye know but that God permitted this morning your ſoul to relapſe into nothing, which he had continued to create till then, ever ſince the firſt moment of your life? How do ye know but that he has created another ſoul modified as your's was (21)? That new ſoul is that which you have now. Shew me the contrary; let the company judge of my objection. A learned Divine who was there, anſwered, and acknowledged, that the creation being once ſuppoſed, it was as eaſy for God to create a new ſoul at every moment, as to reproduce the ſame; but that the ideas we have of his wiſdom, and eſpecially the light which his word affords us, are ſufficient to aſſure us, that we have the ſame numerical ſoul to day, which we had yeſterday, the day before, &c. and he concluded that it was needleſs to diſpute with the Pyrrhoniſts, and that their Sophiſms could not eaſily be eluded by the meer force of reaſon; that before all things they ſhould be made ſenſible of the weakneſs of reaſon, that they may have recourſe to a better guide, *viz.* Faith. This is the ſubject of the following remark.

[C] *It may . . . . oblige men . . . . to call for the help of GOD, and to ſubmit to the authority of faith.*] A modern author, who made a more particular ſtudy of Pyrrhoniſm than of any other ſect, looks upon it as a party the leaſt contrary to Chriſtianity, and that *will receive the myſteries of our religion with the greateſt docility* (22). He confirms his opinion by ſome reaſons, and then he ſpeaks thus (23): *It is not without reaſon that we believe the ſyſtem of the Sceptics, which is grounded upon an ingenious acknowledgment of human ignorance, to be leſs contrary to our belief than any other, and the fitteſt to make one receive the ſupernatural light of faith. We ſay nothing herein but what is agreeable to the beſt Theology, seeing that of* † *St Dionyſius teaches nothing in more expreſs terms, than the weakneſs of our minds, and their ignorance, eſpecially with reſpect to divine things. Thus that great Doctor explains what GOD himſelf ſaid by the mouth of his prophets,* ⊥ *that he made his retreat in darkneſs. For this being ſo, we cannot come near him, without entering into that myſterious obſcurity: from whence we draw this important inſtruction, that he cannot be known but obſcurely, covered with enigmas or clouds, and as the ſchools ſay, by being ignorant of him. But as thoſe, who have always profeſſed humility and ignorance, will be better pleaſed than others with that ſpiritual obſcurity; the Dogmatiſts, on the contrary, who never feared any thing ſo much as to appear ignorant, are preſently loſt in it: and being ſo preſumptuous as to believe, that they are clear-ſighted enough to overcome all manner of obſcurity, their blindneſs increaſes ſo much the more, as they fancy that they move forward in a darkneſs, into which human nature cannot penetrate. However, I am of opinion, that Scepticiſm is of no little uſe to a Chriſtian ſoul, when it loſes by ſuch means all thoſe magiſterial opinions which St Paul does ſo much deteſt.* He enlarges more exactly and more ſtrongly upon that ſubject in another book (24).

When a man is able to apprehend all the ways of ſuſpending his judgment, which have been laid open by Sextus Empiricus, he may then perceive that that Logic is the greateſt effort of ſubtilty that the mind of man is capable of; but he will ſee at the very ſame time, that ſuch a ſubtilty will afford him no ſatisfaction: it confounds itſelf; for if it were ſolid, it would prove that it is certain that we muſt doubt. Therefore there would be ſome certainty, there would be a certain

(c) In the remark [B].

(17) See the marginal note (15).

(18) Thoſe who hold Tranſubſtantiation place the eſſence of matter in the faculty of receiving extenſion, and ſo with the eſſence of every thing: nothing is actual; every thing is a paſſive capacity: but that capacity may conſiſt with a ſpirit, &c. which confounds all definitions.

(19) *The ſtrongeſt part of their Logic or Topics conſiſted in one common place, viz.* in that of relation, which was the eighth out of ten, whereby thoſe of that ſect ſhew that we judge of things only by compariſon, which they expreſs thus, πάντα πρός τί, *omnia ſunt ad aliquid.* La Mothe le Vayer de la Vertu des Payens, *Tom. v, pag.* 217.

(20) Compare this with what la Mothe le Vayer relates in the ſecond part of his *Proſe chagrine*, in the 9th Tome of his works.

(21) That is to ſay, with the reminiſcence which he would have re-produced, if he had continued to create the ſoul of the Abbot.

(22) La Mothe le Vayer, de la Vertu des Payens, *Tom. v, of his works, pag.* 229. *See alſo the diſſertations of the Abbot Foucher concerning the Philoſophy of the Academics.*

(23) La Mothe le Vayer, ibid. *pag.* 231.

† *Lib. i, de Myſt. Ph. cap. i, & ii.*

⊥ *Poſuit tenebras latibulum ſuum.*

(24) In the ſecond part of the *Proſe chagrine*, in the 9th Tom. of his works.

concerning a conference wherein two abbots diſputed about Pyrrhoniſm, might perplex many readers, I deſign to clear that matter in a diſſertation at the end of this work. The ſtories of Antigonus Caryſtius (*d*), concerning Pyrrho, ought to be looked upon as ſorry jeſts, or rather as impoſtures, viz. that Pyrrho did not prefer any thing to any thing, and that a cart and a precipice never made him go a ſtep backwards or aſide, and that his friends who followed him, ſaved his life very often. It is not at all likely, that he ſhould have been mad to that degree [*D*]: but there is no doubt that he taught

(*d*) Apud Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 62.

---

tain rule of truth. That ſyſtem would be deſtroyed by it; but you need not fear that things would come to that: the reaſons for doubting are doubtful themſelves: one muſt therefore doubt whether he ought to doubt. What chaos! what torment for the mind! it ſeems therefore, that this unhappy ſtate is the fitteſt of all to convince us, that our reaſon is the way to wander, ſince when it diſplays itſelf with the greateſt ſubtilty, it throws us into ſuch an abyſs. What naturally follows from thence, is to renounce that guide, and beſeech the cauſe of all things to give us a better. It is a great ſtep towards the Chriſtian religion, which requires of us, that we ſhould expect from God the knowledge of what we are to believe, and do, and that we ſhould captivate our underſtanding to the obedience of faith. If a man is once convinced, that he can expect no ſatisfaction from his philoſophical enquiries, he will find himſelf better diſpoſed to pray to God, to aſk him the perſuaſion of the truths which he ought to believe, than if he ſhould flatter himſelf with a good ſucceſs in reaſoning and diſputing. It is therefore a happy diſpoſition to faith, to know the defects of reaſon: hence it is that Paſcal and ſome others have ſaid, that to convert Libertines, they muſt be made ſenſible of the weakneſs of reaſon, and taught to miſtruſt it. Calvin is admirable on this ſubject, for thus he ſpeaks in the liturgy for baptiſm (25), that is to ſay, thus he begins his inſtructions for thoſe that want to be initiated in the Chriſtian religion. *Herein* (26) *therefore GOD admoniſhes us to humble and be diſpleaſed with our ſelves; and by that means he prepares us to deſire and require his grace, whereby all the perverſity and malediction of our firſt nature may be removed. For we are not capable of receiving it, before we are void of all manner of confidence in our virtue, wiſdom, and juſtice, even ſo as to condemn every thing that is in us. But after he has repreſented to us our miſery, he does likewiſe comfort us by his mercy, promiſing us to regenerate us by his Holy Spirit into a new life, which may be to us as an entrance into his kingdom. This regeneration conſiſts of two things,* viz. *That we deny ourſelves, following not* OUR OWN REASON, *our pleaſure and will; but that* CAPTIVATING OUR UNDERSTANDINGS, *and our hearts to the wiſdom and juſtice of GOD, we mortify whatever belongs to us and to our fleſh. And then that we* FOLLOW THE LIGHT OF GOD, *to comply with and obey his good-will, as he teaches us by his word, and we are directed to it by his Holy Spirit.* However, there are ſome learned men who maintain, that there can be nothing more oppoſite to religion than Pyrrhoniſm. ‘ (27) It is the ‘ total extinction not only of faith, but alſo of reaſon, and there is nothing more impoſſible than to ‘ reclaim thoſe who run themſelves into ſuch an exceſs. The moſt ignorant men may be inſtructed, ‘ the moſt conceited may be convinced, and the moſt ‘ incredulous may be perſuaded. But it is impoſſible, ‘ I will not ſay to convince a Sceptic, but to reaſon ‘ cloſe with him; for it is not poſſible to urge him ‘ with any argument, but what is a Sophiſm, and ‘ even the groſſeſt of all Sophiſms, I mean a begging ‘ the queſtion. In effect, there is no argument that ‘ can be concluſive, but by ſuppoſing, that whatever ‘ is evident is true, that is to ſay, by ſuppoſing what ‘ is in queſtion. For Pyrrhoniſm, properly ſpeaking, ‘ conſiſts only in not admitting that fundamental ‘ maxim of the Dogmatiſts (28).’ See Voſſius, who having ſaid that Pyrrhoniſm and Epicureiſm are very contrary to the Chriſtian religion, confirms his opinion by a paſſage out of Clemens Romanus (29). ‘ Hinc Nicetas de ſe, & fratre Aquila in epitome Clementis Romani, de geſtis B. Petri pag. 56. ed. Adr. ‘ Turnebi, in Latinâ Perionii tralatione ex Pariſienſi ‘ editione Sonnii folio 596. Ἠκειβώσαμεν δὲ καὶ ‘ τα φιλοσόρων, ἐξαιρέτως τὰ ἀθεώτατα. λέγω ‘ δὴ τὰ Ἐπικȣ́ρȣ καὶ Πύῤῥωνος, ἵνα καὶ μᾶλλον ‘ ἀνασκευάζειν δυνάμεθα. *Accuratè etiam ea inquiſivimus, quæ à philoſophis traduntur: præcipuè illa,* ‘ *quæ maximè repugnant pietati erga Deum: Illa, inquam, Epicuri ac Pyrrhonis, quò magis ea refellere* ‘ *poſſemus.* Nempe Nicetas quidem fuerat Epicureus: ‘ Aquila verò Pyrrhonios erat ſecutus, ut apud ipſum ‘ eſt Clementem in octavo Recognitionum libro ‡, ‘ quod opus Græcè non exſtat, ſed Latinè ex tralatione Rufini Aquilejenſis (30). - - - *Hence Nicetas ſays* ‘ *concerning himſelf and his brother Aquila*; we have ‘ carefully examined thoſe things that are laid down ‘ by Philoſophers, eſpecially ſuch things as are repugnant to religion: I mean, what is advanced by Epicurus and Pyrrho, that we might the more eaſily refute them. *For Nicetas had been an Epicurean, and* ‘ *Aquila a Pyrrhoniſt, as we find in Clemens in his eighth* ‘ *book of recognitions, which work is not extant in Greek,* ‘ *but tranſlated into Latin by Rufinus.*’

Obſerve that la Mothe le Vayer excludes the Pyrrhoniſts from the favour he beſtowed upon ſeveral ancient Philoſophers: what he ſays thereupon, contains ſome facts which belong to this article. ‘ I deſpair of ‘ the ſalvation of Pyrrho, and of all his diſciples, ‘ who entertained the ſame opinions concerning the ‘ Deity as he. Not that they profeſſed themſelves to ‘ be Atheiſts, as ſome have believed. One may ſee ‘ in * Sextus Empiricus that they admitted the exiſtence of the gods, as the other Philoſophers did, ‘ that they paid the common worſhip to them, and ‘ denied not their providence. But beſides that they ‘ never acknowledged a firſt cauſe, whereby they ‘ would have deſpiſed the idolatry of their time; it ‘ is certain, that they believed nothing concerning the ‘ divine nature, but with a ſuſpenſion of mind, and confeſſed nothing of what we have ſaid but in a doubting way, and only to accommodate themſelves to ‘ the laws and cuſtoms of their age, and of the country where they lived. And conſequently ſeeing they ‘ have not had the leaſt light of that implicit faith, ‘ on which we have grounded the hopes of the ſalvation of ſome heathens, who enjoyed it together with ‘ an extraordinary grace of God, I cannot ſee how ‘ any Sceptic, or Pyrrhoniſt of that kind, could avoid ‘ going to Hell (31).’

[*D*] *That he ſhould have been mad to that degree.*] I ſhall ſet down another paſſage out of la Mothe le Vayer (32). *I know that Antigonus Caryſtius ſaid, that Pyrrho would not go out of his way for a cart, nor for a precipice, or a mad dog, and that his friends only preſerved him from all thoſe dangers. But why ſhould we rather believe Antigonus, than Æneſidemus, who wrote eight books concerning the ſect ** of the Pyrrhoniſts, and aſſures, that their leader never committed any ſuch extravagancies? Indeed they are ſo unlikely, and it is ſo difficult to imagine how ſo many Philoſophers ſhould have approved of them, that I ſhould ſcruple to believe them, even though they had not been contradicted by any body, and though the remaining part of Pyrrho's life did not ſhew the falſity thereof. In effect, it is agreed that he lived near fourſcore and ten years, and ſpent the greateſt part of that time in travelling, for he went to ſee the Magi of Perſia, and the Gymnoſophiſts of India. Is it likely that a man, who had expoſed himſelf to all manner of dangers, ſhould have attained to ſo great an age? And how could he have friends enough every where to deliver him from ſo many perils, which can ſcarce be avoided by thoſe who travel with the greateſt care and prudence? However it be, he is to be looked upon as the founder of a great ſect, and which conſequently was, without doubt, conſiderable in many reſpects. If we had nothing to alledge but what we read in his life, that he was made high-prieſt by his countrymen, it would be ſufficient to ſhew the calumny of his enemies; for it is not at all likely, that ſo important a charge ſhould have been beſtowed upon a man ſubject to ſo great caprices. . . . .* (33) *He never wrote any thing; ſo that one cannot judge of his capacity by his works. But beſides what we may preſume from his great reputation; the mere privilege of immunity which the city of Elis, the place of his birth, granted to all Philoſophers upon his account, and the* honour taught that the honour and infamy of actions, and their juſtice and injuſtice depended only upon human laws and cuſtom (*e*). That doctrine, though never ſo abominable, does naturally ariſe from that Pyrrhonian principle, that the abſolute and internal nature of objects is unknown to us, and that we can be ſure only of what they appear to us in ſome reſpects. The indifference of Pyrrho was ſurpriſing [*E*]: he loved nothing, and was never angry at any thing (*f*); and no man was ever more perſuaded of the vanity of things [*F*]. When he ſpoke, he did not care much whether any body gave ear to what he ſaid or not, and he went on ſtill, though his hearers retired (*g*). He kept houſe with his ſiſter, and had an equal ſhare in the ſmalleſt domeſtic concerns [*G*]. Thoſe

---

(25) Obſerve that this Liturgy is uſed by all the churches of the Confeſſion of Geneva, and ſo the maxims contained in it ought to be looked upon as the general opinion of thoſe churches, and not as a particular opinion of John Calvin.

(26) That is, by telling us we muſt be born again.

(27) La Placette, Traité de la Conſcience, *pag.* 377.

(28) That maxim was formerly more invincible, for example, in the hands of the Stoics than it is now, that one may maintain to divines *ad hominem*, that ſome evident propoſitions are falſe. See, above, the diſpute of the two abbots, remark [*B*].

(29) Voſſius, de Philoſoph. Sectis, *pag.* 107, 108.

‡ *Fol.* 81, 6.

(30) Ib. p. 108.

* *Lib. iii, Pyr. Hyp. cap.* i.

(31) La Mothe le Vayer, de la Vertu des Payens, *pag.* 226.

(32) Ibid. *pag.* 213, 214.

** *Diog. Laërt. Photius, in Bibl.*

(33) La Mothe le Vayer, ibid. *pag.* 227.

honour which the Athenians did him by making him one of their citizens (34), *which they granted to few perſons, are ſufficient to perſuade us that he was a man of great merit.*

[*E*] *The indifference of Pyrrho was ſurpriſing.*] I ſhall alledge but one example of it. Anaxarchus being fallen into a ditch, was ſeen by Pyrrho, but received no help from him. Pyrrho went his way, without vouchſafing to reach his hand to him. He was juſtly blamed for it, for he ſhould have helped in ſuch a caſe, a man unknown to him, but much more his profeſſor. The maſter knew more than the diſciple about that point, for Anaxarchus did not ſo much as complain of Pyrrho, and approved not that he ſhould be cenſured; but beſides, he praiſed him for his indifferency, and for loving nothing. Could any one do a thing more ſurpriſing under the diſcipline of the monks of la Trape? Καὶ ποτε Ἀναξάρχου ἐς τέλμα ἐμπεσόντος, παρῆλθεν οὐ βοηθήσας. τινῶν δὲ αἰτιωμένων, αὐτὸς Ἀνάξαρχος ἐπῄνει τὸ ἀδιάφορον καὶ ἄστοργον αὐτοῦ. *Et cùm aliquando Anaxarchus in ſcrobem incidiſſet, ille pertranſiit nihil ei opem ferens. Idque cùm plerique culparent, Anaxarchus ipſe laudabat, ut indifferenter & ſine affectu ſe habentem* (35). This puts me in mind of a repartee to be found in a book of the abbot de St Real. *I might*, ſays he (36), *anſwer you as an ancient did, who being told in a reproachful manner, that for a Philoſopher he had no great value for Philoſophy:* it is that very thing, *replied he*, which I call to be a Philoſopher. This is worthy of Pyrrho and Anaxarchus.

I add that Pyrrho maintained, that to live and to die were indifferent. Why do not you die then, ſaid one to him; becauſe, anſwered he, death and life are indifferent. Diogenes Laërtius does not mention this, but Stobæus has preſerved it. Πύῤῥων ἔλεγε μηδὲν διαφέρειν ζῆν, ἢ τεθνάναι· καί τις ἔφη πρὸς αὐτόν, τί οὖν σὺ οὐκ ἀποθνήσκεις, ὁ δὲ, Ὅτι, εἶπεν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει. *Pyrrhon ajebat, nihil intereſſe inter vitam & mortem Et cùm quidam ad eum diceret, cur igitur ipſe non moreris? Quia nihil intereſt, reſpondit* (37). Let no body ſay that he would have forgotten his maxims, if the danger of death had been preſent. Let no body ſay.

Era fuor de perigli un ſacripante,
Ma ne perigli havea cara la vita.

He was, when out of danger, brave,
But glad, in danger, his life to ſave.

He ſhewed the contrary when he was in great danger of ſuffering ſhipwrack. He was the only one that was not afraid of the ſtorm; and when he ſaw every body ſtruck with fear and ſorrow, he deſired them with a great ſedateneſs of mind, to look upon a hog that was there, and eat as he uſed to do: Such ought to be, ſaid he, the inſenſibility of a wiſe man (38). Τῶν γὰρ ἐμπλεόντων ἐσκυθρωπακότων ὑπὸ χειμῶνος, αὐτὸς γαληνὸς ὢν ἀνέῤῥωσε τὴν ψυχήν, δείξας ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ χοιρίδιον ἐσθίον, καὶ εἰπών, ὡς χρὴ τὸν σοφὸν ἐν τοιαύτη καθεστάναι ἀταραξία. *Navi aliquando vehebatur, & cum ſocii tempeſtate acti mæſtiores eſſent, ipſe tranquillo animo porcellum in navi edentem oſtendebat, dicens*, oportere ſapientem tali animi tranquillitate eſſe (39).

[*F*] *No man was ever more perſwaded of the vanity of things.*] He deſpiſed above all things human nature, and he was never weary to repeat the words wherein Homer compares men with the leaves of trees. Θαυμάζων αὐτόν, καὶ συνεχὲς λέγων (40).

Οἵηπερ φύλλων γενεή, τοίηδε καὶ ἀνδρῶν (41).

Miratum eum (Homerum) aſſidueque pronuntiare ſolitum ejus verſiculum, tale quidem genus eſt hominum quale eſt foliorum. Gaſſendus is of opinion, that he was pleaſed with that parallel (42), becauſe he found in it the mortality of men, and the inconſtancy of their opinions, which makes them turn like leaves with the wind. He uſed to praiſe very much ſome other paſſages of Homer, wherein men are compared to birds and flies, and wherein their infirmity and childiſhneſs are deſcribed (43). Καὶ ὅσα συντείνει εἰς τὸ ἀβέβαιον, καὶ κενόσπουδον ἅμα καὶ παιδαριῶδες τῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Sicut & cætera illius, quibus infirmitas & inania ſtudia atque pueriles hominum motus indicantur* (44). I wonder they do not ſay that he was a great admirer of this ſaying of Homer:

Τοῖος γὰρ νόος ἐστὶν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων,
Οἷον ἐπ᾽ ἦμαρ ἄγησι πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

Talis enim ipſorum eſt hominum mens terricolarum,
Qualem ipſis hominum & divum pater indit in horas (45).

For, frail man's reaſon daily ebbs and flows,
Juſt as almighty God his grace beſtows.

It ſignifies, that the mind of man is unſtable, and that God gives them their proviſion of reaſon as a kind of daily bread, which he renews every day. Which ſuits admirably well with the Pyrrhonian hypotheſis; they were always ſeeking, and always unſteady, and ready at all times to reaſon after a new manner, according to the various occurrences they met with. A certain Doctor of Divinity does the ſame, if we believe his adverſary: but above all things he does not forgive him his variations, and perpetual contradictions (46). He ſhews him that he lays down principles, according as he ſtands in need of them; and that as ſoon as they begin to incommode him, he ſubſtitutes others in the room of them: and to uſe his expreſſions, he upbraids him with *reaſoning, if one may ſay ſo, from hand to mouth*, and according to the paſſion, *whoſe turn it is* to command in his ſoul: and yet that doctor is very peremptory; he magiſterially and readily affirms and denies. He is as bold as the Sceptics were reſerved. He ſhould not encroach upon their rights, but leave them the privilege of reaſoning from hand to mouth, which they aſcribe to themſelves in Tully (47). For the reſt, the inconſtancy of human opinions and paſſions is ſo great, that one would think man is a little republic which often changes its magiſtrates.

[G] *He had an equal ſhare in the ſmalleſt domeſtic concerns.*] He carried chickens, pigs, *&c.* to ſell in the market, and ſwept the houſe, and cleaned the goods, juſt as if he had been the maid of the houſe (48). Every thing was indifferent to him; he believed not that one thing was better than another. Τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας καθαίρειν ἀδιαφόρως, *domique indifferenter munditiem curabat* (49). He was not always the ſame man, for he happened one day to be angry with his ſiſter; and being told that his anger was not conſiſtent with the indolence he profeſſed, he anſwered. Do ye think that I will practiſe that virtue for a woman? Χολήσας τι περὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς πρὸς τὸν λαβόμενον εἰπεῖν, ὡς οὐκ ἐν γυναίῳ ἡ ἐπίδειξις τῆς ἀδιαφορίας. *Cum ſorori quandoque ſuccenſuiſſet, argueretque illum quiſpiam ut immemorem inſtituti ſui, non, inquit, muliercula documentum erit noſtræ indifferentiæ.* Do not fancy his meaning was, that he did not renounce love; it was none of his thoughts; he meant, that every ſubject does not deſerve that a man ſhould exerciſe his doctrine againſt anger. The cauſe of his anger was very unworthy of a Philoſopher, and eſpecially of ſuch a Philoſopher as he was; he grew angry with his ſiſter becauſe he had been forced to buy the things which

---

(*e*) Ibid. *num.* 61.

(*f*) Do not take this in a ſtrict ſenſe; there is no doubt but that he had rather enjoy his health than be ſick, &c.

(*g*) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 62.

(34) I will ſhew in the remark [*H*] that this is falſe.

(35) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 63.

(36) Ceſarion, ou Entretiens divers, *pag.* 31, 32, *of the Hague edition.*

(37) Stobæus, Sermone 118.

(38) Compare with this the doctrine of Diogenes the Cynic, mentioned by Mr du Rondel in the article PEREIRA, remark [C], at 2 and 3 *à lineà.*

(39) Diog. Laërt. ibid. *num.* 68.

(40) Ibid. num. 67.

(41) It is the 146th verſe of the 6th book of the Iliad.

(42) Quaſi exinde ſignificetur non hominum modo, perinde ac foliorum natura caduca, ſed opinio quoque inconſtans & perinde mutabilis ac minimo vento ſunt arborum folia mobilia. *Gaſſend. de Logicæ fine, cap. ii, pag. m.* 70.

(43) Diog. Laërt. ibid. *num.* 68.

(44) Ibid.

(45) Homer's Odyſſes, *lib. xviii, ver.* 135. *See St Auguſtin*, de Civitate Dei, *lib. v, cap. viii.*

(46) Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *Octob.* 1694, *pag.* 72, *in the extract of Mr Saurin's book, intituled*, Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu.

(47) Tuſcul. *lib. vi, fol.* 273, *D.*

(48) Diog. Laërt. ibid. *num.* 66.

(49) Ibid.

Thoſe who ſay that he was made citizen of Athens for having killed a king of Thrace, are groſsly miſtaken [*H*]. I cannot charge Moreri with being guilty of many faults [*I*].

The equality he put between life and death (*b*) was commended by Epictetus, who otherwiſe had the greateſt contempt for Pyrrhoniſm [*K*].

which ſhe wanted to offer for a ſacrifice; a friend who had promiſed to provide them, kept not his word. This we learn from Euſebius. Φιλίστης δὲ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ θυούσης, ἔπειτα τῶν φίλων τινὸς ὑποσχομένου τὰ πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν, καὶ μὴ παρασχομένου. τοῦ μέντοι Πύῤῥωνος πειαμένου, καὶ ἀγανακτοῦντος, ἐπειδή περ ὁ φίλος ἔλεγεν, ὡς οὐ ποιήσαιτο σύμφωνα τοῖς λόγοις, οὐδ᾽ ἀξία τῆς ἀπαθείας· εἰπεῖν αὐτὸν, ἐν γοῦν γυναικὶ οὐ δεῖ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν αὐτῆς ποιεῖσθαι. καίτοι δικαίως ἂν εἶπεν ὁ φίλος, ὅτι ματαία καὶ ἐν γυναικὶ, καὶ κυνὶ, καὶ πᾶσιν. Cum Philiſta ejus ſoror ſacrificium adornaret, quendam ex amicis, qui res ad illud neceſſarias pollicitus fuerat, promiſſis non ſtetiſſe. Pyrrhonem igitur eos ſumptus facere coactum, graviter id acerbeque cum ferret, ex ſuo illo amico audiiſſe, parum ſe omnino ſuorum ex decretorum præſcripto facere, atque ab omni perturbatione vacuum oſtendere. Tum enimvero Pyrrhonem homini repoſuiſſe, hujus rei fidem in mulierculæ cauſa fieri non debere. Cui ſane amicus ille ſuus merito reſponderet, in muliere, in cane, in reliquis omnibus inane totum hoc diſputandi genus futurum (50). - - - *When his ſiſter Philiſta was preparing to offer up a ſacrifice, one of his friends promiſed to provide what was neceſſary for that purpoſe, but kept not his word. Pyrrho was therefore obliged to be at the charge of buying thoſe things, and being upon that account very angry, his friend told him, he did not act agreeably to his profeſſion, nor ſhew himſelf altogether free from paſſion. Pyrrho anſwered, that a woman was to be excepted out of the caſe. Upon which his friend juſtly replied, that all this ſort of philoſophy, with regard to women, dogs, and every thing elſe, would ſignify nothing.* In theſe laſt words the author alludes to the anſwer which Pyrrho returned, when he was jeſted upon for having fled from a dog which purſued him: It is a difficult thing, ſaid he, to put off the man. Ἀντίγονος ὁ Καρύστιος κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς γενόμενος χρόνους, καὶ ἀναγράψας αὐτῶν τὸν βίον, φησὶ τὸν Πύῤῥωνα διωκόμενον ὑπὸ κυνὸς, ἀναφυγεῖν ἐπί τι δένδρον· σκωπτόμενον δ᾽ ὑπὸ τῶν παρόντων, εἰπεῖν ὡς χαλεπὸν εἴη τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκδῦναι. Antigonus Caryſtius, qui ſub eadem vivebat tempora, quique illorum vitam conſcripſit, Pyrrhonem commemorat, ut ſeſe inſequenti cani eriperet, quandam ad arborem confugiſſe: qua de cauſa cum ab iis, qui aderant, rideretur, ægre admodum hominem exui reſpondiſſe (51). - - - *Antigonus Caryſtius, who lived at that time, and who wrote their lives, ſays that Pyrrho fled to a tree to ſave himſelf from a dog which purſued him: and being laughed at by thoſe that were preſent, he anſwered, it was very hard to put off the man.*

[*H*] *Thoſe who ſay that he was made a citizen of Athens, for having killed a king of Thrace, are groſsly miſtaken.*] The conformtty of the name has occaſioned that falſity. A certain Pytho, diſciple of Plato, was (52), made citizen of Athens for having killed Cotys king of Thrace (53). From thence comes the miſtake of thoſe who ſay, that our Pyrrho committed this murther, and obtained that reward for it (54).

[*I*] *I cannot charge Moreri with being guilty of many faults.*] Five only. I. Theſe words, Pyrrho *pretended that men do every thing out of cuſtom*, are abſurd. He was not ſo great a fool as to ſay ſo; he knew very well, that ſome Philoſophers maintained, that there is an eſſential difference between virtue and vice, and that abundance of people do a thouſand things in compliance with the laws. He ſhould have expreſſed himſelf thus. Pyrrho maintained that there was not really any one thing that was this or that, and that the nature of things depended upon laws and cuſtoms; that is to ſay, that men by their laws and cuſtoms made ſome things to be good, laudable, ill, blameable, &c. Such was his doctrine. If Diogenes Laërtius underſtood it otherwiſe, he is to be blamed. I ſay ſo, becauſe his words are not clear enough to make one believe that their meaning is, that *men by their laws and cuſtoms make every thing to be ſo or ſo.* Καὶ ὁμοίως ἐπὶ πάντων, μηδὲν εἶναι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, νόμῳ δὲ καὶ ἔθει πάντα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους πράττειν· οὐ γὰρ μᾶλλον τόδε ἢ τόδε εἶναι ἕκαστον. *Eadem ratione & de omnibus, nihil verè eſſe: cæterum lege atque conſuetudine cuncta homines facere. Neque enim eſſe quicquam iſtud potius quam illud* (55). II. I do not know where he found *that Pyrrho loved not to be interrupted in his Philoſophical meditations.* Diogenes Laërtius does not ſay ſo, though he makes him a lover of ſolitude; nay, he ſays, that thoſe who asked him queſtions, were never diſſatisfied with his anſwers (56.) III. That is but a ſmall fault if compared with this. *Yet it is confeſſed that he lived fourſcore and ten years.* As if a man, who loves to be alone, and not to be interrupted in his meditations, could not live long. Moſt men, who love meditation, are extreamly deſirous to go on with it; for the leaſt interruption breaks the ſeries of their thoughts, and makes them loſe time: and if a man deſires to be alone, and is weary of company, the beſt way to prolong his life, is to permit him to be alone as long as he will. I conclude therefore that Moreri made uſe of a *yet* very ill placed. IV. I do not find that Pyrrho was made citizen of Athens. That fault has been tranſcribed out of la Mothe le Vayer (57). V. If that author had been faithfully tranſcribed by Moreri in another thing, theſe remarks would be ended already. La Mothe le Vayer ſays, that by the eighth manner of doubting, which is that of relation, the Pyrrhoniſts *ſhew, that we judge of things only by compariſon* (58). Moreri adds to it, the word prejudices; *The Sceptics*, ſays he, *pretend that we judge only by prejudices or by compariſon.* It is no good disjunction; for the manner ſpoken of there does not concern prejudices; but only the judgments we make of relative qualities, ſuch as heavineſs, hardneſs, bigneſs, ſmallneſs, &c.

[*K*] *The equality he put between life and death was commended by Epictetus, who otherwiſe had the greateſt contempt for Pyrrhoniſm.*] ‘Epictetus held Pyrrho in particular veneration, becauſe he put no difference between life and death. He admired eſpecially the reply he made (59), &c. (60). - - - - - - Though he very much eſteemed Pyrrho, yet he deſpiſed the Pyrrhoniſts to ſuch a degree, that he could not endure them. One day he told a Pyrrhoniſt, who endeavoured to prove that the ſenſes were always deceitful; which of you, ſays he, ever went to a mill when you deſigned to go to a bagnio? He uſed likewiſe to ſay *, were I a ſervant to thoſe Pyrrhoniſts, I ſhould take a pleaſure in teazing them. If they ſhould bid me pour ſome oil into the bathing tub, I would throw ſome brine upon their head. If they ſhould ask me to give them ptiſan, I would bring them vinegar. And if they offered to complain, I would tell them they were miſtaken, or perſwade them that the vinegar was ptiſan, or elſe make them renounce their notions (61).

PYRRHUS, ſon of Achilles, and Deidamia, daughter of Lycomedes, king of the iſle of Scyros, was born in that iſland a little while before the Trojan war. He was educated there till Ulyſſes and Phœnix came to fetch him (*a*) thence, and to lead him to that famous ſiege after his father's death. He went to it notwithſtanding the tears of his grand-father by his mother's ſide [*A*]. The Grecians had been told, that they ſhould never

[*A*] ***Notwithſtanding the tears of his grand-father by his mother's ſide.***] We find this particular in Cicero, chap. xx. of his book *de Amicitia*, pag. 515, of Grævius's edition. ‘Recte etiam, *ſays he*, præcipi poteſt in amicitiis, ne intemperata quædam violentia (quòd perſæpe fit) impediat magnas utilitates amicorum, nec enim (ut ad fabulas redeam) Trojam Neoptolemus capere potuiſſet, ſi Lycomedem, apud quem ‘erat

---

(*b*) See the remark [*E*].

(50) Ariſtocles, apud Euſeb. Præp. Evang. *lib. xiv, cap. xviii, pag. m.* 763.

(51) Ibid.

(52) Plut. Adverſ. Colotem, *circa fin. pag.* 1126. *See alſo* de laudando ſeipſo, *pag.* 542; & de gerenda Republica. *pag.* 816.

(53) Demoſthenes adverſus Ariſtocratem, *pag. m.* 445.

(54) Diocles *ſays ſo*, apud Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 65.

(55) Diog. Laërt, ubi ſupra, *num.* 61, *pag.* 581.

(56) Ibid. *num.* 64.

(57) See the remark [*D*].

(58) La Mothe le Vayer, de la Vertu des Payens, *Tom. v, pag.* 217.

(59) You will find it in the remark [*E*], citation (38).

(60) Giles Boileau, in the Life of Epictetus, *pag. m.* 43.

* *Arrian. lib. ii, Diſſ. cap. xx.*

(61) Giles Boileau, ibid. *pag.* 49, 50.

(*a*) Sophocl. in Philoct. *See alſo* Homer, Odyſſ. lib. xi.

never take Troy without the ſon of Achilles. He was called Neoptolemus, by reaſon of his youth (b) [B], and Pyrrhus, by reaſon of the colour of his hair (c) [C]. He ſhewed himſelf worthy of the blood from which he ſprung; for he was a valiant, brutiſh, and fierce man. His warlike exploits and good counſels have been as admirable as Homer a long while after, and other Poets were pleaſed to make them (d). One of his nobleſt combats was againſt Eurypylus, ſon of Telephus (e). He killed him, and he was ſo pleaſed with this victory, that upon this occaſion he inſtituted the dance which was called Pyrrhic from him (f). The dancers were to be armed from top to toe. He appeared bolder than any of the reſt, when the Grecians were to get into the wooden horſe (g): and his great intrepidity freed them from the fear they were ſtruck with. The night that the town was taken he made an horrible ſlaughter (h), and even barbarouſly murthered king Priamus [D], without any regard to his old age, or the holineſs of the place where he had taken ſanctuary. With the ſame barbarity he threw head-long from the top of a tower young Aſtyanax, Hector's ſon (i); and it was he who ſacrificed, with his own hands, Polyxena upon the grave of Achilles (k). He proved not ſo hard-hearted to Andromache, widow of the valiant Hector; he contented himſelf with ſome remains of beauty he found in her, and made her his wife, or concubine (l). Authors do not agree about the country that he went to after the ſacking of Troy; ſome ſay that he went to take poſſeſſion of his father's kingdom, which was Phthia in Theſſaly (m), others maintain that he went directly to Epirus, and that he ſettled and founded a ſtate there (n). It is ſaid that Helenus, Priamus's ſon, and a good diviner, one of the priſoners that fell to him by lot, adviſed him to return into his country by land, becauſe of the great ſtorms which he foreſaw the Grecian fleet would meet with (o). It is likely enough that Pyrrhus followed his advice, for we read, that in his way he made war againſt Harpalicus in Thrace (p). He married the beautiful Hermione, daughter of Menelaus and Helena (q); but it proved not a happy marriage. Hermione had no children by him, and grew jealous of Andromache, by whom Pyrrhus had a ſon (r). Her jealouſy made her reſolve to kill her rival (s), together with her ſon: but ſhe met with ſome obſtacles; and her deſign being known, ſhe feared her huſband's reſentment, which made her hearken to Oreſtes, who propoſed to ſteal her away, to bring her back to her father, and to marry her. She had been promiſed to him before ſhe was promiſed to Pyrrhus [E]. Others ſay, that

Oreſtes

(b) Euſtath. in Iliad. XIX.

(c) Servius, in Æn. II, ver. 469.

(d) Odyſſ. lib. xi. Quint. Calab. lib. vii, viii.

(e) Q. Calab. ib.

(f) Heſychius, & Scholiaſtes Pindari in Pyth. Od. II.

(g) Hom. Odyſſ. xi.

(h) Virgil. Æn. l. ii, v. 500, 550. Quint. Calab. *lib. xiii.* Vid. etiam Pauſan. *lib. x, pag.* 343.

(i) Pauſan. *lib. x, pag.* 342.

(k) Euripid. in Hecub. Lycophr. Ovid. Met. *lib. xiii.* Seneca, in Troad. Hygin. *cap. cx.*

(l) Virgil. Æn. *lib. iii, ver.* 319, *& ibi* Servius.

(m) Euripid. in Troad. Dictys, *lib. vi.* Homer. Odyſſ. *lib. iv.*

(n) Pauſan. *lib. i, pag.* 10. Pindar. Nem. VII, Juſtin. *lib. xvii.*

(o) Servius, ibid.

(p) See the ſucceſs of that war in the article HARPALICUS, *& apud Hyg. cap. cxciii.*

(q) Hygin. *cap. cxxiii.*

(r) Pherecydes, ap. Schol. Eurip. in Oreſte. Pauſan. *lib. i, p.* 10.

(s) Eurip. in Androm.

'erat educatus, multis cum lacrymis iter ſuum 'impedientem, audire voluiſſet. - - - - *It may like-'wiſe be a good rule in friendſhips, not to hinder the 'great advantages of friends through violence, as very 'frequently happens: for (to return to fables) Neopto-'lemus had never taken Troy, if he had complied with 'Lycomedes, with whom he had been educated, and 'who oppoſed his going to the Trojan war with many 'tears.*' Langius pretends that there is a voluntary or involuntary miſtake in thoſe words; but he is miſtaken. Here are his words, pag. 515 of Grævius's edition. 'Quod de Neoptolemo Lælius ait, 'omnes de Achille narrant. Itaque vel errat per me-'moriam Cicero: vel, quod potius credo, de indu-'ſtria Lælio, ut illa ætate, Græcanicarum fabularum 'ignorationem concedit: quod etiam in Catone ma-'jore factum videmus; tametſi iſte jam ſenex Græ-'cis litteris ſedulam operam navaverit. - - - *What 'Lælius ſays of Neoptolemus, all authors aſcribe to Achil-'les. And therefore Cicero either miſtakes through a 'ſlip of memory: or rather, conſidering that age, he de-'ſignedly connives at Lælius's ignorance of the Greek 'fables: which we find likewiſe in Cato the elder, 'though being old, he applied himſelf vigorouſly to the 'Greek language.*'

[*B*] *He was called Neoptolemus by reaſon of his youth.*] Pauſanias (1) gives another reaſon for it, but it is a pitiful one, *viz.* that Phœnix gave him that name becauſe his father Achilles was very young when he began to bear arms.

[*C*] *He was called Pyrrhus by reaſon of the colour of his hair.*] Some authors ſay that he was named Pyrrhus for another reaſon (2), *viz.* becauſe his father was called Pyrrha, whilſt he wore woman's cloaths in the court of Lycomedes (3). That fact was not very well known to the Grammarians, ſince Tiberius having a mind to puzzle them with ſome hard queſtions, asked them amongſt other things, what name Achilles went by when he was in a woman's dreſs (4).

[*D*] *And even barbarouſly murdered king Priamus.*] This is elegantly deſcribed by Virgil:

- - - Hoc dicens, altaria ad ipſa trementem
Traxit, & in multo lapſantem ſanguine nati
Implicuit comam læva, dextraque coruſcum
Extulit, ac lateri capulo tenus abdidit enſem.
Hæ finis Priami fatorum: hic exitus illum
Sorte tulit (5).

- - - *With that he dragg'd the trembling ſire*
Slidd'ring thro' clotter'd blood and holy mire,
(The mingled paſte his murder'd ſon had made)
Haul'd from beneath the violated ſhade
And on the ſacred pile the royal victim laid.
His right-hand held the bloody fauchion bare,
His left he twiſted in his hoary hair.
Then with a ſpeeding thruſt his heart he found,
The lukewarm blood came ruſhing thro' the wound,
And ſanguine ſtreams diſtain'd the ſacred ground.
Thus Priam fell. DRYDEN.

The altar mentioned in this place, is that of Jupiter Herceus (6). It is true, that all authors did not agree that Priamus was killed there: Some (7) ſay that he was taken out of his palace by Neoptolemus, and that having been dragged to the grave of Achilles, he was beheaded, and that his head was carried upon a pike all over the town. Others (8) affirm, that he was taken by force out of the temple of Jupiter, and that afterwards Pyrrhus having met with him at the gate of his palace, killed him. It ſeems that others have ſaid, that Pyrrhus killed him near an altar of Mercury (9). Thus the learned Meziriac (10) underſtands theſe words of Quintus Calaber, Ἑρμείȣ ποτὶ βωμόν. Rhodomannus renders them *ad aram Jovis Hermæi*; but it is very likely that we muſt read Ἑρκείȣ, *Hercæi*, inſtead of Ἑρμείȣ. See the notes of Dauſquejus on that Poet, pag. 35.

[*E*] *Hermione had been promiſed to him before ſhe was was promiſed to Pyrrhus.*] Ovid ſays (11), that Tyndarus, her grandfather by the mother's ſide, had promiſed her to Oreſtes, during the war of Troy, in the abſence of Menelaus, who, during the ſame time, promiſed her to Pyrrhus (12). Sophocles, as he is cited by Euſtathius (13), ſaid ſo in a tragedy which is not now extant. On the contrary, Euripides (14) ſays that Hermione was promiſed to Oreſtes by Menelaus, to prevent her being killed by Oreſtes, as he had killed Clytemneſtra, his own mother. Therefore that promiſe was made eight years after the taking of Troy. Sophocles relates the thing differently in another tragedy (15); he ſays, that Menelaus promiſed Hermione

1 to

(1) *Lib. x, pag.* 343.

(2) Hygin. *cap. xcvii.*

(3) Hygin. *cap. xcvi.* Sidonius Apollin. Carm. IX, ver. 137.

(4) Sueton. in Tiber. *cap. lxxi. See ſome like queſtions in* Juvenal, Sat. VII.

(5) Æn. l. II, ver. 550.

(6) Eurip. in Troad. Senec. Agamemn. Pauſan. *lib. iv, pag.* 127.

(7) Apud Servium, in Æn. *lib. ii, ver.* 506.

(8) Leſches apud Pauſan. *lib. x.*

(9) Quint. Calab. *l. xiii, v.* 222.

(10) Upon Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 847.

(11) Epiſt. Hermion. ad Oreſt.

(12) Homer. Odyſſ. IV.

(13) In Odyſſ. *lib. iv.*

(14) In Oreſte.

(15) In Androm.

Oreſtes being reſolved to revenge himſelf upon his rival, had recourſe to a more fatal expedient, than that of taking away his wife, with whom he lived not very well (*t*), and that he killed him, or cauſed him to be killed, in the very temple of Delphos [*F*]. It is certain enough that Pyrrhus was killed in it; but it is not ſo certain, whether he was buried there [*G*]. He had had three wives, Hermione, by whom he had no children, Lanaſſa, and Andromache: he had ſome by the two laſt. But it is not known whether the kings who have been in poſſeſſion of Epirus, to the time of him who is the ſubject of the following article, deſcended from the ſons of Lanaſſa, or from thoſe of Andromache [*H*]. Authors are divided about it. They agree only in this, that they deſcended from our Pyrrhus.

(*t*) Ovid. Epiſt. Herm. ad Oreſtem.

to Oreſtes, before the expedition of Troy; and that he promiſed her to Pyrrhus during the ſiege. Hyginus (16) follows a particular opinion, *viz.* that Menelaus, notwithſtanding the promiſe he had made to Pyrrhus before Troy, gave his daughter to Oreſtes, and then took her away from him to keep his firſt promiſe, when Pyrrhus went to Lacedæmon to require the performance of it. Here are many different opinions; but it is a common thing, and we ought not to wonder at it. We ſhould rather wonder how authors came to place among facts, the intrigues of a tragedy, and relate, as the Hiſtory of Hermione and Oreſtes, what a Poet was pleaſed to fancy, in order to fill up his play with ſurpriſing things and incidents. A man muſt have a great deal of leiſure, a thouſand years hence, if he thought himſelf obliged not to omit in the Hiſtory of Cæſar and Pompey, what we read in Scuderi's and Corneille's tragedies concerning the circumſtances of the death of thoſe two illuſtrious Romans.

[*F*] *Some ſay that he killed him in the temple of Delphos.*] Here is a fact attended with the fictions of tragic Poets: For thoſe who relate the various accounts of writers concerning the unhappy death of Pyrrhus, do not forget what Euripides ſays (17), *viz.* That Pyrrhus, who was gone to Delphos to upbraid Apollo with the death of Achilles, and to aſk him ſatisfaction for it, returned thither to beg his pardon for that inſult, and to appeaſe his anger. Authors have given ſome other reaſons of that journey: 1. That Pyrrhus went to Delphos to offer up the ſpoils of the Trojans (18). 2. That he went to know of the Oracle by what means he might get children by Hermione his wife (19). 3. That he deſigned to plunder the temple (20). However, he was killed in that temple by the command of Apollo (21), and by a Prieſt, whoſe name was Machæreus, Μαχαιρεύς. For ſo we ought to read in the ſcholiaſt upon Euripides (22), in that place where the death of Pyrrhus is mentioned: here is the paſſage according to the vulgar editions: καὶ ὁρᾷ κατὰ τὸ χρηστήριον κρέα διαρπάζοντας τοὺς Δελφοὺς ἀφαιρεῖται τὰ κρέα αὐτοὺς. ἑαυτὸν δὲ κτείνει μαχαίρᾳ. Meziriac (23) reads in the beginning ὁρῶν, and at the end, αὐτὸν δὲ κτείνει Μαχαιρεύς: So that inſtead of ſaying, that Pyrrhus killed himſelf with his own hand, we muſt ſay, *That perceiving that the Delphians, near the place of the Oracle, took away the fleſh of his ſacrifice, he took it away from them, and was killed by Machæreus.* The ſcholiaſt upon Pindar, and Pindar himſelf, mention the occaſion of that quarrel (24). But the moſt common opinion is, That Oreſtes was the chief author of Pyrrhus's death (25); whether he put himſelf at the head of the Delphians to attack him, having made them believe, that they were to prevent the plundering of the temple; or whether he ſuborned ſome aſſaſſins, without being preſent at it (26). Virgil ſays, that Pyrrhus was killed by him:

Aſt illum ereptæ magno inflammatus amore
Conjugis, & ſcelerum furiis agitatus Oreſtes,
Excipit incautum patriaſque obtruncat ad aras (27).

Till young Oreſtes pierc'd with deep deſpair,
And longing to redeem the promis'd fair,
Before Apollo's altar ſlew the raviſher.

DRYDEN.

Velleius Paterculus (28), and Hyginus (29) affirm the ſame thing.

[*G*] *It is not ſo certain whether he was buried there.*] For ſome authors maintain, that his bones were ſcattered upon the frontiers of Ambracia. *Cujus oſſa per fines Ambraciæ ſparſa ſunt quæ eſt in Epiri regionibus* (30). Ovid is of the ſame opinion:

Nec tua quam Pyrrhi felicius oſſa quieſcant,
Jacta per Ambracias quæ jacuere vias (31).

Mr de Boiſſieu in his commentary on theſe two verſes, juſtly cenſures Caſaubon and Corradus, for having underſtood them of that Pyrrhus, who made war againſt the Romans; for it is certain, from the teſtimony of three authors (32), that this Pyrrhus had an honourable burial. He alſo cenſures Reineccius for applying the ſame words to another Pyrrhus than the ſon of Achilles. Beſides, it is moſt certain, that we find very great authorities to prove that our Neoptolemus was interred at Delphos. Some ſay, that his ſepulchre was to be ſeen in the grove conſecrated to Apollo (33). Others obſerve, that he was buried under the door of the temple, and that Menelaus cauſed him to be removed into the ſacred grove (34). Pauſanias, not contented to ſay, that his ſepulchre was to be ſeen on the left hand as one goes out of the temple, adds, That the Delphians made every day ſome funeral expiation to his honour (35). It is true, that they uſed him for a long time as an enemy, without paying any honour to his memory; for they did not honour him before he appeared in the heat of the battle, fighting for them againſt the Gauls, who endeavoured to take the town, and plunder the temple (36). Dictys of Crete (37) and ſome others likewiſe teſtify that he was buried in that place.

[*H*] *It is not known whether the kings .... of Epirus deſcended from the ſons of Lanaſſa, or from thoſe of Andromache.*] Juſtin tells us, that this Lanaſſa, granddaughter of Hercules, was ſtolen away by Pyrrhus, who met her in the temple of Jupiter Dodonaus (38). He adds, That Pyrrhus had eight children by her, and that his ſon Pialis was his ſucceſſor. Meziriac (39) maintains againſt him, from the teſtimony of Plutarch, that Lanaſſa was grand-daughter of Hyllus; but Hyllus was the ſon of Hercules. On the other ſide, he obſerves, that, according to Pauſanias (40), he who ſucceeded Pyrrhus was called Pielus, and was Andromache's ſon.

(16) *Cap. cxxiii.*

(17) In Androm. Schol. Pind. in Nem. Od. VII. Strabo. *lib. ix.*

(18) Pind. Nem. Od. VII.

(19) Pherecydes, apud Schol. Euripid. in Oreſte.

(20) Schol. Pind. & Strabo, ubi ſupra, Vid. etiam Pauſan. *lib. x.*

(21) Pauſan. *lib. i, pag.* 13.

(22) In Oreſt.

(23) Upon Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 855.

(24) Od. VII, Nem.

(25) Eurip. in Andr.

(26) Dictys, *lib. vi.* Juſtin. *lib. xvii, cap. iii.* Pauſan. *lib. ii, pag.* 72.

(27) Virgil. Æn. *lib. iii, v.* 330.

(28) Patercul. *lib. i, cap. i.*

(29) Hygin. *cap. cxxiii.*

(30) Ibid.

(31) Ovid. in Ibin, *ver.* 305.

(32) Valer. Max. *lib. v, cap. i.* Plut. in Pyrrho. Auctor. de Viris illuſtrib.

(33) Strabo, *lib. ix.*

(34) Schol. Pindar. in Od. VII, Nem.

(35) Pauſan. *lib. x, pag.* 341.

(36) Ib. *lib. i, pag.* 4.

(37) *Lib. vi.*

(38) Juſtin. *lib. xvii, cap. iii.*

(39) Upon Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 861.

(40) *Lib. i.*

PYRRHUS, king of the Epirotes, ſprung from the preceding [*A*], and famous by reaſon of his wars with the Romans, was one of the greateſt captains of all antiquity [*B*]. He was ſon of Æacides and Phthia, daughter of Menon the Theſſalian. He

[*A*] *Sprung from the preceding.*] See the laſt remark of the foregoing article, and the remark [*E*] of the article of ANDROMACHE. Lloyd and Hofman have adopted, for want of attention, this miſtake of Charles Stephens, *viz.* That Pyrrhus deſcended from Achilles, by his mother's ſide, and from Hercules, by his father's ſide: This was ſaid of Alexander the Great, not of Pyrrhus. They ſhould have ſaid quite the contrary, as Aurelius Victor did (1).

[*B*] *He was one of the greateſt captains of all antiquity.*] He was ſo valiant, that thoſe who ſaw him fight with ſo much bravery, ſaid, That Alexander was revived in him; and that whereas other kings were the picture of that conqueror, only by their purple,

(1) Pyrrhus rex Epeirotarum paterno genere ab Achille, materno ab Hercule oriundus.

He was expoſed to a violent perſecution in the beginning of his life; for the Moloſſians who had dethroned Æacides, and killed as many of his friends as they could apprehend, endeavoured to ſeize on his ſon, who was ſtill at nurſe: but ſo much diligence was uſed to ſave him, that, notwithſtanding their purſuits, he was carried into Illyricum to king Glaucias, who took great care of his education, and reſtored him to his kingdom, being twelve years of age. Five years after there happened a new inſurrection, whereby Pyrrhus loſt his kingdom. He retired to his brother-in-law Demetrius (*a*). He was with him at the memorable battle of Ipſus (*b*) [*C*], where he gave great proofs of his courage. The peace being made between Demetrius, and Ptolemy, king of Egypt, Pyrrhus was ſent an hoſtage to the court of the latter, where he became ſo conſiderable, that he married Antigone, whom Berenice had by her firſt huſband, before ſhe married Ptolemy. By that marriage, he got the troops and money he wanted, to recover his kingdom. He divided it with the uſurper (*c*), but that partition did not laſt long. Pyrrhus having diſcovered that this man deſigned to poiſon him, prevented him; for, having invited him to dinner, he killed him in cold blood. Not long after he began to think of ſatisfying his ambition, by the conqueſt of Macedonia. The miſunderſtanding between the ſons of Caſſander afforded him an occaſion for it. Alexander demanded ſome ſuccours of him againſt Antipater, his eldeſt brother. He obtained them; but he paid ſeveral provinces for it. Demetrius, of whom Alexander had alſo demanded ſome ſuccours, came to him very late, and yet too ſoon; for he killed Alexander to prevent him, and got himſelf proclaimed king of Macedonia. This occaſioned a war between him and Pyrrhus, in which there was a battle fought, and Pyrrhus, who behaved himſelf with a wonderful bravery, got the victory. The irruption he made afterwards

(*a*) He had married Deidamia, Pyrrhus's ſiſter.

(*b*) In the year of Rome 452, according to Calviſius.

(*c*) His name was Neoptolemus.

purple, their life-guards, their wry necks, and the loud tone of their voice, Pyrrhus repreſented him by his valour and noble exploits. He had compoſed ſome books concerning the art of war (2), which were an undeniable proof of his ability in encamping, and drawing up an army in order of battle, *&c.* and he invented the art of teaching that diſcipline, by a kind of game at Cheſs (3). Therefore he was early looked upon as one who would prove the greateſt captain of his age, if he lived (4). Hannibal gave him the upperhand of all the greateſt captains, when he told Scipio, that Pyrrhus was the firſt of all, he (Scipio) the ſecond, and himſelf the third (5) But it muſt be confeſſed, that Livy relates the matter quite otherwiſe: He ſays, That Hannibal having given the firſt place to Alexander, and the ſecond to Pyrrhus, aſcribed the third to himſelf. *What would you ſay*, ſaid Scipio to him, *if you had overcome me? If I had*, anſwered Hannibal, *I ſhould think myſelf to be above Alexander, above Pyrrhus, and above all the captains of the world.* I ſhall ſet down the words of Livy, that one may know from whence he had this. ‘ Claudius ſecutus Græcos Acilianos libros, P. Africanum in ea fuiſſe legatione tradit: eumque Epheſi collocutum cum Annibale. Et ſermonem etiam unum refert, quo quærenti Africano, *quem fuiſſe maximum imperatorem Annibal crederet*, reſpondiſſe, *Alexandrum Macedonum regem; quod parvâ manu innumerabiles exercitus fudiſſet, quodque ultimas oras, quas viſere ſupra ſpem humanam eſſet, peragraſſet.* Quærenti deinde, *quem ſecundum poneret; Pyrrhum* dixiſſe. . . . . Exſequenti, *quem tertium duceret; haud dubiè ſemetipſum* dixiſſe. Tum riſum obortum Scipioni & ſubjeciſſe. *Quidnam tu diceres, ſi me viciſſes? Tum me verò*, inquit, *& ante Alexandrum, & ante Pyrrhum, & ante omnes alios imperatores eſſe.* Et perplexum Punico aſtu reſponſum, & improviſum aſſentationis genus Scipionem moviſſe: quod è grege ſe imperatorum velut ineſtimabilem ſecreviſſet (6). - - - *Claudius, following the Greek books of Acilius, ſays that P. Africanus was employed in that embaſſy: and that he happened to be in company with Hannibal at Epheſus. He likewiſe tells a paſſage of their converſation:* Africanus aſking, who he thought to be the greateſt general that ever was, *Hannibal anſwered*, Alexander king of Macedon; becauſe with a handful of men he had routed vaſt armies, and had extended his conqueſts, beyond all human expectation, to the remoteſt parts of the earth. *Then being aſked*, whom he took to be the ſecond, *he replied*, Pyrrhus. . . . . *And to the next queſtion*, whom he reckoned to be the third, *he made anſwer*, himſelf. At which Scipio ſmiling, *added*, and what would you have ſaid, if you had had the good fortune to beat me? Then indeed, *replied Hannibal*, I would have put myſelf before Alexander, before Pyrrhus, and before all other generals. *Scipio was ſurprized at this ſubtile anſwer, and unexpected complement of the Carthaginian, in excluding him from the number of generals as being infinitely above them.*’ Here follow the reaſons for which Hannibal eſteemed Pyrrhus: ‘ Caſtra metari primum docuiſſe, ad hoc neminem elegantius loca cepiſſe, præſidia diſpoſuiſſe, artem etiam conciliandi ſibi homines eum habuiſſe, ut Italicæ gentes regis externi, quam populi Romani tamdiu principis in ea terra, imperium eſſe mallent (7). - - - *He firſt taught the art of encamping: none knew better how to chuſe the ground than he, to place garriſons, and to gain the affections of people: ſo that the nations of Italy choſe rather to be under the government of him though a foreign prince, than of the Roman people who had reigned ſo long in that country.*’ Add to this that Juſtin ſays, That beſides his military virtues he was a man of great probity, and lived a very holy life. ‘ Satis conſtans inter omnes auctores fama eſt, nullum nec ejus, nec ſuperioris ætatis regem comparandum Pyrrho fuiſſe; raroque non inter reges tantum, verum etiam inter illuſtres viros, aut vitæ ſanctioris, aut juſtitiæ probatioris viſum fuiſſe: ſcientiam certe rei militaris in illo viro tantam fuiſſe, ut cum Lyſimacho, Demetrio, Antigono, tantis regibus, bella gerens, invictus ſemper fuerit. Illyriorum quoque, Siculorum, Romanorumque, & Carthaginienſium bellis, nunquam inferior, plerumque etiam victor extiterit, qui patriam certe ſuam anguſtam, ignobilemque, fama rerum geſtarum, & claritate nominis ſui, toto orbe illuſtrem reddiderit (8). - - - *All authors agree, that no king, either of that or the former age, was to be compared with Pyrrhus; and that one rarely ſees a king, or any illuſtrious perſon, endowed with ſo much piety and probity as he was: and that he was ſo ſkillful in military affairs, that in his wars with thoſe great kings, Lyſimachus, Demetrius, and Antigonus, he always came off conqueror. In the Illyrian, Sicilian, Roman, and Carthaginian wars he was never worſted, but moſt commonly had the better. His kingdom, which was but ſmall and obſcure, he rendered famous all over the world by his name and exploits.*’ Cicero praiſes him alſo for his great probity. ‘ Cum duobus ducibus de imperio in Italia decertatum, Pyrrho & Annibale. Ab altero, propter probitatem ejus non nimis alienos animos habemus, alterum propter crudelitatem ſemper hæc civitas oderit (9). - - - *The Roman people contended for empire in Italy with two generals, Pyrrhus and Hannibal. The former we loved for his probity, and the latter we always hated for his cruelty.*’ We ſhall ſee in the remark [*L*], that he knew very well how to make uſe of thoſe intrigues, the art whereof is one of the beſt parts of a great captain.

[*C*] *He was with Demetrius at the battle of Ipſus.*] Moreri ſays, That at the battle of Ipſus, *Victory favoured the party of Pyrrhus, againſt Antigonus and Demetrius.* There is nothing of truth in all this; for the party of Pyrrhus was, at that time, the ſame with that of Antigonus and Demetrius; or, to ſpeak more afterwards into Macedonia, might have been very happy, had he not been obliged to retire with great precipitation, and the loſs of part of his army. Notwithſtanding the peace which was made ſoon after, he favoured the ſucceſſors of Alexander, who deſigned to attack Demetrius [*D*]. The Macedonians forſook Demetrius, and gave up themſelves to Pyrrhus. who finding himſelf by that means maſter of Macedonia, did, notwithſtanding, divide it with Lyſimachus. He loſt his half in the ſame maner he had got the whole; for the Macedonians forſook him to join with Lyſimachus, who was their country-man. Thus Pyrrhus was reduced to his patrimony. He ſtaid not long in it; for he was of a reſtleſs ſpirit, and knew not how to ſpend his time, without attacking his neighbours, or being attacked by them [*E*]: ſo he willingly hearkened to the propoſals of the Tarentines [*F*], who deſired him to come over into Italy, to be their general againſt the Romans. Cineas of Theſſaly, a diſciple of Demoſthenes, endeavoured to diſſuade Pyrrhus from that expedition; but it was to no purpoſe, *Sic erat in fatis:* It was ſo decreed. That prince went over therefore into Italy, with very good troops (*d*), and becauſe the Romans ſaved him part of the way, he advanced as far as Heraclea towards the river Siris [*G*], without ſtaying for all the troops of the allies, and offered his mediation to the conſul Lævinus, who anſwered him, *that the Romans would have none of his arbitration, and were not afraid of having him for their enemy.* He went to take a view of the Roman army, and ſaid, that thoſe Barbarians had nothing barbarous in their manner

---

(2) *Cicero mentions them*, Ep. Fam. XXV, *lib. ix.*

(3) Pyrrhus peritiſſimus ſtratagematon fuit, primuſque quemadmodum ea diſciplina per calculos in tabula traderetur oſtendit. *Donat. in Terent. Eun. Act. IV, Sc. VII.*

(4) Antigonus foreſaw it. *Plut. in Vit. Pyrrhi, pag.* 387.

(5) Plut. ibid.

(6) Tit. Liv. *lib. xxxv, pag. m.* 652.

(7) Id. ib. *See alſo* Ammian. Marcel. *lib. xxiv, init.*

(8) Juſtin. *lib. xxv, ſub fin. pag. m.* 452, 453.

(9) Cicero, de Amicitia, *cap. viii.*

exactly, Pyrrhus was in that battle only in the quality of an adventurer, or a volunteer of Demetrius's party. Hofman has committed the ſame fault.

[*D*] *He favoured the ſucceſſors of Alexander, who deſigned to attack Demetrius.*] Pyrrhus did eaſily yield to the temptation (10), when the heads of the confederacy repreſented to him, that he took not a prudent courſe. He had a mind to obſerve the treaty of peace whilſt Demetrius would be engaged in a great war; whereby he would have loſt the occaſion of ſucceeding in his deſign, and his neighbour might have had time enough to expect a favourable opportunity for himſelf. Why, ſaid they to Pyrrhus, had you not rather take Macedonia from a prince who cannot defend it, by reaſon of the great number of enemies who will attack him, than expoſe yourſelf to the trouble of defending your own country againſt him, when he has made a treaty of peace? They alſo repreſented to him, how he had been wronged by Demetrius, who had raviſhed his wife, and taken the iſle of Corcyra from him. In order to underſtand this, we muſt know that Lanaſſa, daughter of Agathocles tyrant of Syracuſe, brought that iſland to Pyrrhus for her portion; but perceiving that her huſband ſhewed more kindneſs to his other wives than to herſelf, ſhe looked out for another huſband: and becauſe Demetrius was accounted a prince more eaſily to be induced to a new marriage than any other, ſhe propoſed to him to come and meet her in the iſle of Corcyra, whither ſhe had retired. He did it, and married her, and left a garriſon in the iſland (11). Thoſe reaſons were more than ſufficient to move ſo ambitious a prince as Pyrrhus was, not to obſerve a treaty of peace. I ſhall add, by the by, that he had by Antigone, a ſon called Ptolemy, who was killed by the Lacedæmonians (12), and by Lanaſſa he had Alexander, who ſucceeded him, and by Bircenna, Helenus (13) of whom I ſhall ſpeak in the remark [*P*]. I ſhall ſpeak of his daughters in the next article.

[*E*] *He knew not how to ſpend his time without attacking his neighbours, or being attacked by them.*] Pyrrhus was a man of an exorbitant ambition, and of a ſtirring and reſtleſs ſpirit. Plutarch (14) compares him with Achilles,

- - - - φθινύθεσκε φίλον κῆρ
Αὖθι μένων, ποθέεσκε δ' ἀϋτήν τε πτόλεμόν τε.

- - - - macerabat ſuum cor
Illic manens, deſiderabat autem clamoremque pugnamque (15).

- - - - - *Who languiſh'd there,*
When left alone, deſiring noiſe and war.

He underſtood war to admiration (16), he executed his deſigns with an incomparable courage and reſolution: but he was much fitter to conquer than to preſerve what he had conquered; becauſe, at the very ſame time he made new conqueſts, he framed vaſt deſigns, and filled his mind with new hopes, which kept him from thinking by what means he might preſerve what he had acquired. *Ut ad devincenda regna invictus habebatur, ita devictis acquiſitiſque celeriter carebat. Tanto melius ſtudebat acquirere imperia quam retinere* (17). Antigonus compared him with a gameſter, who throws well, but knows not how to make an advantage of it. The ſame thing was ſaid of Hannibal; ‘Non omnia nimirum eidem Dii dederunt; vincere ſcis Annibal, victoria uti neſcis (18). - - - *The gods do not beſtow all on one man: O Hannibal, you know how to vanquiſh, but not how to uſe a victory.*’ It is not an unuſual fault: our age affords us ſeveral examples of generals, who knew not how to make an advantage of their victories. Things are directed by God in that manner, leſt a nation be too much oppreſſed at one time. One might quote a thouſand ſayings like theſe two.

Non minor eſt virtus quàm quærere parta tueri (19).

No leſs a virtue it is to keep than get.

‘Parari ſingula acquirendo facilius poſſunt, quàm univerſa teneri (20). - - - - *It is more eaſy to get by degrees, than to keep all when got.*’

[*F*] *He willingly hearkened to the propoſal of the Tarentines.*] That people fell out with the Romans without a cauſe, and afterwards, tho' they were inferior to them, they could never reſolve to make a peace with them. Μήτε φέρειν τὸν πόλεμον δυνάμενοι, μήτε θέσθαι θρασύτητι καὶ μοχθηρίᾳ δημαγωγῶν. *Pares cum eis armis non eſſent, neque poſſent ea ob ferociam & pravitatem concionatorum ſuorum deponere* (21). A certain ſort of men called Demagogues, put all things in a combuſtion by their harangues, and ſtirred up every body to take up arms, ſo far as to move the people to call in a foreign prince, rather than make a peace. What was the conſequence of all this? They were forced to ſubmit to the Roman yoke ſooner than they would otherwiſe have done.

I ſhall obſerve, that the deputies of the Tarentines repreſented to Pyrrhus the ſervice they had done him in the war againſt the Corcyreans, and added, that Italy was a finer country than Greece. But obſerve eſpecially, that that prince flattered himſelf with good ſucceſs, conſidering that he was ſprung from Achilles, and that the Romans were a Trojan colony (22). We can never too much reflect on the weakneſs and fooliſh ſuperſtition of great men.

[*G*] *Near Heraclea towards the river Siris.*] Florus committed a fault in Geography, ſaying: ‘Apud Heracleam & Campaniæ fluvium Lirim, Lævino Conſule, prima pugna (23). - - - - *The firſt battle was at Haraclea in Campania, by the river Liris, under Lævinus the conſul.*’ Salmaſius, in his notes upon that author, ſhews very well, that Heraclea was not in Campania, and that Florus has confounded the river Liris with the river Siris. The former is in Campania, and not the latter: but becauſe it was certain that the firſt battle was fought near Hereclea, they who confounded thoſe two rivers, placed Heraclea in Campania. See Cluverius, chap. xiv. of the fourth book

---

(*d*) In the year of Rome 473, the laſt of the CXXIVth Olympiad.

(10) *See* Plutarch. ubi infra.

(11) *Taken from* Plutarch, in Vit. Pyrrhi, *pag.* 388, 389.

(12) See the remark [*B*], in the article CLEONYMUS.

(13) Plut. in Vit. Pyrrhi: *but* Juſtin. *lib. xxiii, cap. iii, ſays, that Helenus was ſon of the daughter of Agathocles.*

(14) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 390.

(15) Hom. Iliad. *lib. i, ver.* 491.

(16) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 400.

(17) Juſtin. *lib. xxv, cap. iv.*

(18) Liv. *lib. xxiii. See alſo* Florus, *lib. ii, cap. vi; and the remark* [*B*] *of the article* CÆSAR, *towards the end.*

(19) Ovid. de Arte Amandi, *lib. ii, ver.* 13.

(20) Liv. *lib. xxxvii. See* Florus, *lib. ii, cap. xvii.*

(21) Plut. in Pyrrho, *pag.* 390.

(22) Pauſan. *lib. i, cap. xii.*

(23) Flor. *lib. i, cap. xviii.*

manner of encamping [*H*]. There was a battle fought not long after, in which Pyrrhus was in great danger of being killed, and the event was extremely doubtful; for they gave ground ſeven times on both ſides, but at laſt the Epirotes got the victory, by means of the Elephants [*I*], whoſe ſmell frighted the Roman horſes. The conſequences of this victory proved very conſiderable, though Pyrrhus had loſt a great many brave men, and many good officers. He remained maſter of the field, and advanced within thirty-ſix miles of Rome (*e*); which did not alter in the leaſt the conſtancy and reſolution of the Romans, nor ſo much as move them to take the command from Lævinus, though many people complained of his conduct [*K*]. Pyrrhus being deſirous to make a peace, ſent Cineas to Rome (*f*) [*L*]. The eloquence and inſinuating ways of that ambaſſador had in ſome meaſure prevailed upon the ſenate. But Appius Claudius, who, by reaſon of his great age and want of ſight, had quite laid aſide the care of public affairs, was carried to the aſſembly, and made a ſpeech, which induced the ſenate to declare to Cineas, that if Pyrrhus deſired the friendſhip of the Roman people, he muſt firſt draw his forces out of Italy, and then they would treat with him. The conſul Fabricius was leſs unfortunate than Lævinus, and did an action which was as good as a victory, with reſpect to the true glory of a nation; for he let Pyrrhus know that his Phyſician offered to poiſon him (*g*). The battle fought (*h*) near Aſculum, was very bloody. Some Hiſtorians ſay that the Epirotes plainly won it; others maintain, that it was doubtful [*M*], and that the retreat was ſounded on both ſides. Pyrrhus's army was

(*e*) *Eutropius reckons but* 18 *miles.* Florus 20, Victor primo prælio Pyrrhus, *ſays he*, *lib. i, cap. xviii*, totam trementem Campaniam, Lirim Fregellaſque populatus, prope captam urbem à Præneſtina arce proſpexit, & viceſimo lapide oculos trepidæ civitatis fumo ac pulvere implevit.

(*f*) In the year of Rome 474.

(*g*) See the remark [*D*] of the article **FABRICIUS.**

(*h*) In the year of Rome 475.

---

book of his *Italia antiqua*. He reads in Florus, *Apud Heracleam & Lucaniæ fluvium Sirim*, &c. - - - *At Heraclea by Siris a river of Lucania.*

[*H*] *He ſaid that thoſe Barbarians had nothing barbarous in their manner of encamping.*] Aurelius Victor makes him ſay a thing on this occaſion, in which there is no ſenſe, becauſe it has been removed out of it's place. ‘ Viſo, *ſays he*, Lævini exercitu eandem ſibi ‘ ait adverſus Romanos, quam Herculi adverſus hy- ‘ dram, fuiſſe fortunam - - - - *Having ſeen the army* ‘ *of Lævinus, he ſaid he had the ſame fortune with re-* ‘ *ſpect to the Romans, as Hercules with reſpect to the* ‘ *Hydra.*’ According to Plutarch (24), Cineas made uſe of that compariſon, when he ſaw how eaſily the Romans had encamped their army after the firſt battle, and what a multitude of inhabitants remained in Rome, after all thoſe new levies. It was then very proper to remember the heads of the Hydra; but it had been an abſurd thing to think of it before the firſt battle. Now becauſe authors ſeem to have ſworn never to agree in their relations, Florus aſcribes that very thought to Pyrrhus himſelf. ‘ Video me planè Herculis ſide- ‘ re procreatum, cui quaſi ab angue Lernæo tot cæſa ‘ hoſtium capita de ſanguine ſuo renaſcantur (25). - - - ‘ *I perceive I am born under the very ſame ſtar with* ‘ *Hercules; for this people, like the Hydra's heads, grow* ‘ *out of their own blood.*

[*I*] *Becauſe of the elephants.*] The Romans called them *Boves Lucas*, becauſe, as it is reported, the Romans ſaw them for the firſt time in Lucania, in the time of Pyrrhus's war (26). Pliny ſays that this happened in the year 472, and he obſerves that ſome were ſeen at Rome ſeven years after at a triumph. He ſeems thereby to ſuppoſe, that that war laſted ſeven years, and according to Pliny it ended in the year 479. Plutarch ſays, that Pyrrhus returned into his country ſix years after his departure. According to the ſupputation of Calviſius, as you may ſee in the margin, that war began in the year 473, and ended in the year 478. But Father Labbe places the beginning of it in the year 474, and the end in the year 480. Is it not a ſad thing, that authors ſhould not agree about matters of that importance! As for the reſt, the elephants proved both uſeful and miſchievous to Pyrrhus, they did him good ſervice in the firſt battle: but they were not much feared in the ſecond; one of them was wounded, whereby it appeared they were not immortal (27): in the third fight they cauſed a great diſorder among Pyrrhus's troops. ‘ Eædem feræ, *ſays Florus*, quæ pri- ‘ mam victoriam abſtulerant, ſecundam parem fece- ‘ rant, tertiam ſine controverſia tradidere. - - - *The* ‘ *ſame beaſts who got the firſt victory, and made the ſe-* ‘ *cond battle a drawn match, did our work for us this* ‘ *third time, and left us conquerors.*’ That Hiſtorian knew not that ſome few lines before he had ſaid, Pyrrhus was quite overcome in the ſecond battle, which he confirms before he ends his chapter. He had ſaid juſt before, that the Romans did not leave off killing till the night put a ſtop to it, and that Pyrrhus was the laſt of thoſe who fled; and then he affirms, in the recapitulation of his narrative, that the king's camp was plundered twice, *bis exuto caſtris*, he muſt needs mean that the firſt plundering happened in the ſecond battle. What was therefore his meaning, when he ſaid *ſecundam parem fecerant?* - - - *They had made the ſecond battle a drawn match.*

[*K*] *Tho' many people complained of the conduct of Lævinus.*] Fabricius ſaid, that the loſs was not to be aſcribed to the Roman ſoldiers, but to their general and that the Epirotes had not overcome the Romans, but that Pyrrhus had overcome the conſul Lævinus (28). Pyrrhus had already beſtowed this encomium upon himſelf; for he cried out, oh how eaſy it would be for Pyrrhus to conquer the world, if the Romans were his ſoldiers, or for the Romans, if Pyrrhus was their king! *O quam facile erat orbis imperium occupare aut mihi Romanis militibus, aut me rege Romanis* (29)?

[*L*] *He ſent Cineas to Rome.*] Pyrrhus's courage and bravery were ſo great, that one would think he ſcorned to be beholden to any thing beſides his ſword: but he had too much experience to have ſuch thoughts; for the greateſt warriours have moſt times made uſe of intrigues and negotiations (30). Pyrrhus uſed to ſend Cineas before him, that he might prepare his way, and remove difficulties. Cineas made out by his eloquence the truth of Euripides's ſaying that any thing that may be done with the ſword, may be done likewiſe with words. Ὅτι πᾶν ἐξαιρεῖ λόγος ὃ καὶ σίδηρος πολεμίων δράσειεν ἄν. *Omne id expugnare verba compta ferrum quod minax poſſit* (31). Pyrrhus confeſſed, that he had got more towns by the fine ſpeeches of Cineas (32), than by his arms. Methinks Cicero is not juſt enough to Pyrrhus, becauſe he does not except him from thoſe who were involved (33) under this hard ſentence of the Poet Ennius, ‘ Semper fuit ſtolidum genus Æacidarum, belli po- ‘ tentes ſunt magis quam ſapientipotentes: - - - *The* ‘ *race of the Æacidæ were always fooliſh: and are more* ‘ *powerful in war than in wiſdom.*’ He only believes that that prince underſtood the ambiguity of this oracle,

Aio te Æacida Romanos vincere poſſe.

This only, Pyrrhus, I ſhall ſay,
That you the Romans vanquiſh may.

I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that Cicero alledges four reaſons to prove that this oracle was invented by Ennius: 1. The Grecians never ſaid any thing of it: 2. Apollo never anſwered in Latin: 3. He had ceaſed to anſwer in verſe in the time of Pyrrhus: 4. That prince was too ſharp-ſighted not to perceive the illuſion of it. But if he ſhould be anſwered, that Ennius rendred in a Latin verſe, an anſwer which was given in Greek proſe, it would very much weaken his arguments.

[*M*] *That it was doubtful.*] It is not an invention of our age for thoſe that are worſted to have recourſe to this ſhift out of vanity, ſhame, or policy; tho' perhaps that ſort of inſincerity is now more in vogue than formerly (34). The Romans did not deny that Pyrrhus

(24) Plut. in Pyrrho, *pag.* 395.

(25) Florus, ubi ſupra.

(26) Plin. *lib. viii, cap. vi.* Varro, de Ling. Lat. *lib. vi.*

(27) Cajus Minucius quartæ legionis haſtatus unius proboſcide abſciſſa, mori poſſe belluas oſtenderat. *Florus, lib. i, cap. xviii.*

(28) Plut. in Pyrrho, *pag.* 394.

(29) Florus, ubi ſupra.

(30) See the remark [*B*] in the article **ATTILA.**

(31) Plut. in Pyrrho, *pag.* 391, *B.*

(32) Ibid.

(33) Cicero, de Divinat. *lib. ii.*

(34) See the remark [*F*] of the article **FABRICIUS.**

was ſo much leſſened, that he anſwered thoſe who came to congratulate him, *we are undone, if we get another victory*. He was therefore very well pleaſed to have a pretence to carry his arms alſewhere, that is to ſay, to go over into Sicily (*i*), from whence ambaſſadors had been ſent to him to come to their aſſiſtance, and to free that iſland from the yoke of the Carthaginians, and ſeveral other petty tyrants. That expedition was attended with a very good ſucceſs; but thoſe iſlanders, whoſe republican ſpirit did not ſuit with Pyrrhus's humour, could not endure that he ſhould not treat them as kindly and civilly as he did in the beginning: ſo that the ſame ſpirit, which moved them to have recourſe to his protection, made them ſoon look out for other maſters. In this difficult juncture, he very ſeaſonably received letters from the Tarentines, who acquainted him that they ſtood in great need of his aſſiſtance, ſo that he had a fair pretence of boaſting, that he was not forced to leave Sicily, but that he went to ſuccour ſome other allies. He had much ado to get into Italy, the Carthaginians deſtroyed his fleet, and the Mamertines did very much annoy his troops after their landing. It was then (*k*) that Pyrrhus, though wounded in the head, fell with ſuch a fury upon a Barbarian, who had challenged him, that he cut his body aſunder with a blow he ſtruck on his head with a hanger [*N*]. As ſoon as he came to Tarentum, he haſtened his march againſt the Romans and loſt a battle near Beneventum (*l*): after which he reſolved to return into his country, where ſo many viciſſitudes of fortune that he had gone through, could not teach him to be quiet. He for ever engaged in new expeditions. He ſucceeded in that of Macedonia; he beat the army of Antigonus, ſon of Demetrius, and took from him the beſt part of his kingdom. Afterwards he made war againſt the Lacedemonians (*m*), at the ſollicitatiton of Cleonymus (*n*), who was diſcontented becauſe he reigned not in Sparta: but he was ſo vigorouſly repulſed by them, that he was forced to reſt contented with waſting the country, and taking winter quarters in it. In the mean while Ariſtias perſuaded him to go to Argos, where a faction had lately broke out between the ſame Ariſtias and Ariſtippus. Antigonus came to the aſſiſtance of the latter. Though Pyrrhus was introduced into the city by Ariſtias, he could not make himſelf maſter of it; he was obliged to fight in the ſtreets with the inhabitants and the troops of Antigonus, and there he died (*o*), being wounded in the head with a tile [*O*]. Antigonus treated him very generouſly after his death [*P*]. Very ſtange things have been reported of Pyrrhus [*Q*], as for example, that he cured the ſpleen with the touch of his right foot, and that his great toe had a divine virtue in it (*p*).

(*i*) In the year of Rome 475.

(*k*) In the year of Rome 478.

(*l*) In 478.

(*m*) In 480.

(*n*) See the article **CLEONYMUS.**

(*o*) In 480 according to Calviſius, or 482 according to Father Labbe.

(*p*) Taken from Plutarch in the Life of Pyrrhus.

Pyrrhus won the firſt battle, but ſome of their Hiſtorians have ſaid, that the advantage was equal in the ſecond, and others, that Pyrrhus was defeated (35). Plutarch quotes two authors, one of whom ſays that the Romans loſt about 15000 men in the firſt battle, and Pyrrhus 13000; the other ſays, that the Romans loſt ſeven thouſand men, and Pyrrhus near four thouſand. As to the ſecond battle, the one ſays that the Romans loſt ſix thouſand men, and Pyrrhus 3505, as it appeared from the records of that prince; the other ſays in general, that fifteen thouſand men fell on both ſides. From whence it appears that Moreri ſhould not have ſaid, that the loſs of the Romans in the two firſt battles, was leſs than that of the Epirotes. He is miſtaken alſo as to the time to which he applies that reflexion of Pyrrhus, *we are undone, if we get another victory*: that reflexion was made after the ſecond battle. As for the reſt, the two authors mentioned by Plutarch do very much differ from Eutropius, who ſays that the Romans had all the advantge of that day. ‘ Pyrrhus, ‘ *ſays he*, vulneratus eſt, elephanti interfecti, viginti ‘ millia cæſa hoſtium, & ex Romanis tantum quinque ‘ millia. Pyrrhus Tarentum fugatus. - - - - *Pyrrhus* ‘ *was wounded, the elephants ſlain, and twenty thouſand* ‘ *of the enemy, and only five thouſand of the Romans kil-* ‘ *led. Pyrrhus was forced to fly to Tarentum.*’ Frontinus (36) makes the loſs amount to the ſame number of men.

[*N*] *He cut his body aſunder.*] This is one of the feats of our ancient knight-errants, who cut aſunder the moſt daring giants to the very ſaddle-bow. It is certain that Plutarch has related ſome actions of Pyrrhus, which looked rather like the actions of a knight-errant, than of a real hero: he did well to fortify himſelf with the authority of Homer, who has obſerved ſomewhere, that of all virtues, bravery is only ſubject to fanatical tranſports, and fits of frenzy. *Τῶν ἀρετῶν μόνην τὴν ἀνδρείαν φορὰς πόλλακις ἐνθουσιώδεις καὶ μανικὰς φερομένην. Fortitudinem unam identidem lymphatico & phanatico motu ferri* (37). The northern nations in the time of Paganiſm, believed that the god Odinus, who preſided over the war, inſpired men with ſo great a fury, that one of the weakeſt was able to fight ten men. *Horum primarius Deus erat Odinus, qui res bellicas dirigere credebatur, furoremque hominibus, quem* Berſerkicum *vocabant, immittere, quo qui correptus erat, vel decem aliis poterat obſiſtere, utut infirmus extra raptum ac debilis* (38). There is in Plutarch another paſſage, which it will not be improper to ſet down here (39): ‘ Not ‘ only in Poetry, (as Plato very well obſerves) he that ‘ is inſpired by the Muſes, and as it were poſſeſſed by ‘ a Poetical fury, will make him, who is otherwiſe a ‘ maſter of his trade, and an exact Critic in Poetry, ‘ appear ridiculous (40): but alſo in fighting, ‘ thoſe who are elevated and inſpired with a noble ‘ rage, and a reſolution and courage above the common pitch, become invincible, and are not to be ‘ withſtood, and this is that war-like fury which the ‘ Gods, as Homer will have it, infuſe into men of ‘ honour.’

He ſpoke . . . . and every word new ſtrength inſpir'd.

And again,

This more than human rage is from the gods.

[*O*] *With a tile.*] It was a woman, who from her windows threw that tile at the king's head. The Argivi, to make a miracle of that accident, or to keep up the credulity of the people, publiſhed, that Ceres, diſguiſed like a woman, had done it. The Poet Leuceas failed not to inſert that tradition in his hiſtory of the Argivi (41).

[*P*] *Antigonus treated him generouſly*]. Pyrrhus's head being cut off, came into the hands of Alcyoneus, who carried it to his father Antigonus. The latter having known it, cudgelled his ſon for it, called him cruel and barbarous, covered his face, and wept. Afterwards he cauſed the head, and the reſt of Pyrrhus's body to be honourably interred. Alcyoneus afterwards behaved better, for having found Helenus, ſon of Pyrrhus, he treated him very kindly, and carried him to Antigonus. That prince praiſed that action, and told his ſon, that it had been more acceptable to him, if he had taken from Helenus the ſorry cloak he had on. Afterwards he ſhewed a great deal of friendſhip to Helenus, and ſent him well equipped into Epirus (42).

[*Q*] *Very ſtrange things have been reported Pyrrhus.*] When he was to cure any body of the ſpleen, he prepared himſelf for it by ſacrificing a white cock; and then

2

(35) See Florus's contradiction in the remark [*I*].

(36) Stratagemata, *l. ii, cap. iii.*

(37) In Vit. Pyrrhi, *pag.* 398.

(38) See the Journal of Leipſic, 1690, *pag.* 30, *in the abſtract of a book of Thomas Bartholinus, intituled,* Antiquitatum Danicarum de cauſis contemtæ à Danis adhuc Gentilibus mortis.

(39) Plut. de Virtute morali, *ſub fin. pag.* 452.

(40) Περὶ τὰς μάχας τὸ παθητικὸν καὶ τὸ ἐνθουσιῶδες ἀνυπόστατον ἐστι καὶ ἀήττητον. ὃ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς Ὅμηρος ἐμποιεῖν φησι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὡς εἰπὼν, ἐμπνευσε μένος μέγα ποιμένι λαῶν. καὶ Οὐχ᾽ ὅγ᾽ ἄνευθε θεοῦ τάδε μαίνεται.) In præliis etiam animo concitati ac furore correpti ſubſiſti ſuperarique nequeunt: qualem inſtinctum Homerus ait à diis homini inſeri. *Sic ait atque duci per magnas ſlamine vires Inſeruit*: & rurſum *non abſque inſtinctu furit hic ita numinis.*

(41) Pauſan. *lib. i, pag.* 12, 13.

(42) Ex Plutarcho, *ſub fin.* Vit. Pyrrhi. *See alſo* Juſtin. *lib. xxv, cap. iv.* Val. Max. *lib. v, cap. i.*

then the ſick perſon lay upon the ground, and Pyrrhus preſſed the ſpleen gently with his right foot. He was always ready to cure thus the pooreſt ſort of people. He was preſented with a cock after he had performed his ſacrifice, and that preſent was very acceptable to him. His upper gum was an entire bone, with ſome lines in it, which marked the number of his teeth. The divine virtue of the great toe of his right foot appeared when his corpſe was burnt, for that toe was found entire. This is what we find in Plutarch (43). We read in Pliny (44), that the ſame toe had the gift of healing, and that having not been damaged by the flames, it was buried by itſelf in a temple. Who doubts but it was honoured as a holy relic: and can we now object againſt the Heathens, that they had no kings like our Chriſtian princes, who cure the jaundice and king's evil? Now becauſe I have promiſed elſewhere (45), to ſpeak in this place of a falſity which concerns Achilles, I ſhall ſet it down here. Camerarius (46) having ſaid that Pyrrhus's great toe had a divine virtue, and that it was found entire in the midſt of the fire, which had conſumed the reſt of the body, adds immediately after, that Homer affirms the ſame thing concerning Achilles. Caſpar à Reies ſays more than once, but always in general (47), that Pyrrhus's finger cured thoſe that were ſick of the ſpleen; to which he adds, in one place, that *Homer writes almoſt the ſame thing of Achilles* (48). He was deceived by Camerarius. I would fain know who deceived Camerarius. Homer ſays no ſuch thing, and I can ſcarce believe that any of the Ancients mentioned it. That toe of Pyrrhus puts me in mind of a ſtory of the Rabbins. It is mentioned by Agrippa. They ſay that there is in the body of a man a little bone called *Luz*, which cannot be broken nor burnt, out of which our bodies ſhall grow up again at the time of the reſurrection, as a plant grows up again out of it's ſeed. *Eſt in humano corpore os quoddam minimum, quod Hebræi Luz appellant, magnitudine Ciceris mundati, quod nulli ruptioni obnoxium, nec igne quidem vincitur, ſed ſemper conſervatur illæſum: ex quo (ut dicunt) velut planta ex ſemine, in reſurrectione mortuorum corpus noſtrum animale repullulaſcet* (49). I am beholden for this paſſage to Dr Drelincourt, profeſſor of Phyſic; and it is a great ſatisfaction to me to make this public acknowledgment of it.

(43) Pyrrho, *pag.* 384.

(44) *Lib. vii, cap. ii.*

(45) Remark [*H*] of the article ACHILLEA, *ſub fin.*

(46) Horar. Succiſivar. *cent. iii, cap. xlii.*

(47) He never obſerves that it was the great toe of the right foot. See his *Elyſius Campus, Quæſt. XXIV, num.* 4, & 31, & *Quæſt. XXVIII, num.* 24, & 26.

(48) Quæſt. XXVIII, *num.* 26.

(49) Agrippa, de Occulta Philoſophia, *lib. i, cap. xx, pag. m.* 32. *See the remark* [*K*] *of the article* BARCOCHEBAS; *and citat.* (42), *of the article* NIHUSIUS.

PYRRHUS, king of Epirus, grand-ſon to the former, ſucceeded his father Alexander, and was at firſt under the tuition of his mother Olympias. During his minority, the Ætolians were ſo unjuſt as to undertake to deprive him of that part of Acarnania, which fell to the ſhare of his father, in the partition of a conqueſt which he had made with them. Olympias had recourſe to Demetrius king of Macedonia; and the better to engage him to ſuccour her, ſhe gave him in marriage her daughter Phthia. The Hiſtorian (*a*) ſtops here, without acquainting us with any other conſequences of the deſign of the Ætolians, except the irruption which they made into the frontiers of Epirus in the time of Ptolemy, brother and ſucceſſor of our Pyrrhus. There muſt be a chaſm there, for undoubtedly ſome years paſſed between the minority and death of Pyrrhus. However, the princeſs Olympias made uſe of too violent a remedy, to cure her ſon of his amours; for ſhe cauſed his miſtreſs to be poiſoned (*b*) [*A*]. Ptolemy, who ſucceeded his brother Pyrrhus, did not out-live him long. Their mother followed them ſoon after, being overwhelmed with grief for the loſs of her two ſons. There remained but two princeſſes of the royal family, Nereis and Deidamia, Olympias's ſiſters (*c*), and daughters of Pyrrhus, grand-father of this. Nereis was the wife of Gelon, king of Sicily. Deidamia was killed near the altar of Diana in a ſedition. The gods, to puniſh that crime, afflicted the Epirotes ſo many ways, that they were almoſt deſtroyed by famine, and by Civil and foreign wars (*d*).

(*a*) Juſtin. *lib. xxviii, cap. i, & ſeq.*

(*b*) Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 589.

(*c*) She had married her brother Alexander. *Vid. Juſt. ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) Ibid.

[*A*] *His mother cauſed his miſtreſs to be poiſoned.*] She was of Leucas, and her name was Tygris (1). Mr Boiſſieu (2) rejects all the explications that have been given of theſe two verſes of Ovid:

Utque nepos dicti, noſtro modo carmine, regis
Cantharidum ſuccos dante parente bibas.

And like the grand-ſon of the king juſt nam'd,
By parent's hand rank poiſon mayſt thou drink.

and is of opinion that they are meant of our Pyrrhus, and that his mother Olympias gave him no quarter no more than to his concubine Tigris. If it be ſo, Juſtin ſhould not have aſcribed the death of that princeſs to her grief for the loſs of her two ſons. An honourable name ought not to be given to the deſpair of a mother tormented with the remorſes of conſcience, for having put her ſon to death.

(1) Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 589.

(2) In Ibin, *pag.* 65.

PISTORIUS (John) ſirnamed *Niddanus*, becauſe he was born at Nidda in the country of Heſſe, acquired great reputation by his learning and by his works. **JOHN PISTORIUS**, his father, had been knight of Malta; but he very early embraced the reformation of Luther, and was one of the miniſters who aſſiſted at the reading of the Augſburg confeſſion in the emperor's chamber, the twenty-fifth of July 1530. He was the firſt ſuperintendant of the churches of the county of Nidda, and died the twenty-fifth of January 1583, being eighty-one years of age (*a*). His ſon, who is the ſubject of this article, was born the fourth of February 1546. He intended to practiſe Phyſic, and received his degree of Doctor: but afterwards he applied himſelf to the Law.

(*a*) Ex Frehero in Theatro, *pag.* 348.

PYTHAGORAS, is the firſt of the ancient ſages who took the name of Philoſopher [*A*]. He flouriſhed in the time of Tarquin, the laſt king of Rome, not in Numa's

[*A*] *He is the firſt . . . . who took the name of Philoſopher.*] Before him, thoſe who excelled in the knowledge of nature, and made themſelves conſpicuous by an exemplary life, were called *Sages*, σοφοί. That title appearing to him too aſſuming, he took another, which ſhewed that he aſcribed not to himſelf the poſſeſſion of wiſdom, but only the deſire of poſſeſſing it. He therefore called himſelf Philoſopher that is to ſay, a Lover of Wiſdom. The profeſſors of the ſcience of nature, and of morals, have retained that name ever ſince. Cicero tells us the native country of that new title, what gave occaſion to it, and it's ſignification. ‘ A quibus ducti deinceps omnes, ‘ qui in rerum contemplatione ſtudia ponebant, ſapi‘ entes & habebantur, & nominabantur: idque eorum ‘ nomen uſque ad Pythagoræ manavit ætatem: quem, Numa's time [*B*], as many authors ſay. He made himſelf very illuſtrious by his learning and virtue, and proved a very uſeful man in reforming and inſtructing the world. His

‘ ut ſcribit auditor Platonis Ponticus Heraclides, vir doctus in primis, Phliuntem ferunt veniſſe, eumque cum Leonte, Principe Phliaſiorum, doctè, & copioſè diſſeruiſſe quædam : cujus ingenium, & eloquentiam cùm admiratus eſſet Leon, quæſiviſſe ex eo, qua maximè arte conſideret : at *illum* artem *quidem ſe ſcire nullam, ſed eſſe philoſophum :* admiratum Leontem novitatem nominis, quæſiſſe, *quinam eſſent Philoſophi, & quid inter eos, & reliquos intereſſet,* Pythagoram autem reſpondiſſe, SIMILEM ſibi videri vitam hominum, & mercatum eum, qui haberetur maximo ludorum apparatu totius Græciæ celebritate : nam ut illic alii corporibus exercitatis gloriam, & nobilitatem corona peterent : alii emendi, aut vendendi quæſtu, & lucro ducerentur : eſſet autem quoddam genus eorum, idque vel maximè ingenuum, qui nec plauſum, nec lucrum quærerent, ſed viſendi cauſa venirent, ſtudioſeque perſpicerent, quid ageretur, & quo modo : item nos quaſi in mercatus quandam celebritatem ex urbe aliqua, ſic in hanc vitam ex alia vita, & natura profectos ; alios gloriæ ſervire, alios pecuniæ : raros eſſe quoſdam, qui, cæteris omnibus pro nihilo habitis, rerum naturam ſtudioſè intuerentur : hos ſe appellare ſapientiæ ſtudioſos, id eſt philoſophos : & ut illic liberaliſſimum eſſet, ſpectare, nihil ſibi acquirentem, ſic in vita longè omnibus ſtudiis contemplationem rerum, cognitionemque præſtare. Nec verò Pythagoras nominis ſolum inventor, ſed rerum etiam ipſarum amplificator fuit (1). - - - - *From whom all afterwards who ſtudied nature were accounted, and called wiſe men : and that name continued till the time of Pythagoras, who, according to Ponticus Heraclides, the diſciple of Plato, and a very learned man, is ſaid to come to Phlius, and to have diſputed on ſome points with Leon, the prince of that place, in a learned and copious manner. Leon admired his parts and eloquence, and aſked what art he chiefly excelled in : to which Pythagoras made anſwer,* that he knew no art, but was a Philoſopher : *Leon, wondring at the novelty of the name, enquired who Philoſophers were, and what difference there was between them and others. Pythagoras replied, that the life of man ſeemed to him to reſemble that fair, which was kept by all Greece with the celebration of games. For as there, ſome ſought for glory by the exerciſe of the body, and nobility by obtaining a crown : and others aimed at profit and gain in buying and ſelling : but a third ſort, who were people of the beſt faſhion, neither wanted applauſe nor gain, but came only to ſee and conſider what was a-doing, and in what manner : ſo likewiſe we are come from another life and nature into this life, as from ſome city to the celebration of a fair ; and ſome hunt after glory, and others money : and ſome few, deſpiſing every thing elſe, diligently ſtudy nature : theſe are called lovers of wiſdom, that is Philoſophers : and as in the other caſe, it is more noble to look on, than to acquire any thing, ſo in life, the knowledge and contemplation of nature is preferable to all other ſtudies. Pythagoras not only invented the name, but improved the ſcience itſelf.*’

[*B*] *He flouriſhed in the time of Tarquin,. . . and not in Numa's time.*] I cannot ſet down the birth-day of the word Philoſopher, the very year of it's birth is unknown. We only know that Pythagoras made that diſcourſe before he came over into Italy (2), and we are only told in general, that it was under the reign of Tarquinius (3). ‘ Hanc opinionem (*de immortalitate animæ*) diſcipulus ejus (4) Pythagoras maxime confirmavit, qui cum regnante Tarquinio ſuperbo in Italiam veniſſet, tenuit magnam illam Græciam cum honore & diſciplina, tum etiam authoritate (5). Pythagoras fuit in Italia temporibus iiſdem quibus L. Brutus patriam liberavit. - - - *This opinion concerning the immortality of the ſoul, was confirmed by Pythagoras, his diſciple, who, when he came into Italy in the reign of Tarquinius Superbus, maintained great Greece, as they called it, in honour, diſcipline, and authority. Pythagoras was in Italy at the time, when Brutus delivered his country.*’ The miſtake of thoſe who ſaid that he came over into Italy in the time of Numa (6), is glorious to him ; for the only reaſon which made them fancy ſo, is, that they could not believe that Numa ſhould have been ſo able a man, and ſo great a Philoſopher, had he not been a diſciple of Pythagoras. ‘ Quinetiam arbitror, *ſays Cicero,* propter Pythagoreorum admirationem, Numam quoque regem, Pythagoreum à poſterioribus exiſtimatum : nam cùm Pythagoræ diſciplinam, & inſtituta cognoſcerent, regiſque ejus æquitatem & ſapientiam à majoribus ſuis accepiſſent, ætates autem & tempora ignorarent, propter vetuſtatem, eum qui ſapientia excelleret, Pythagoræ auditorem fuiſſe crediderunt (7). - - - - *I believe alſo that Numa was thought to be a Pythagorean by poſterity, becauſe that ſect was held in great admiration : for as they were acquainted with the doctrines and inſtitutions of Pythagoras, and had been informed by their anceſtors of that king's equity and wiſdom, but were ignorant of thoſe very ancient times, they imagined that as he excelled in wiſdom, he muſt have been the diſciple of Pythagoras.*’ Note, that Cicero alledges only ſome ſlight conjectures, to ſhew that the Romans were acquainted with the doctrine and reputation of Pythagoras (8). He had not ſaid ſo, if that Philoſopher had been a citizen of Rome, as Epicharmus publiſhed it (9). I ſhall ſay, by the by, that an oracle having ordered that the Romans ſhould erect a ſtatue to the braveſt and wiſeſt of the Grecians, they erected one to the honour of Alcibiades, and another to the honour of Pythagoras (10). Pliny tells us in what time this happened. ‘ Invenio, *ſays he* (11), & Pythagoræ & Alcibiadi, in cornibus Comitii poſitas, cum bello (12) Samniti Apollo Pythius fortiſſimo Graïæ gentis juſſiſſet & alteri ſapientiſſimo, ſimulacra celebri loco dicari : ea ſtetere donec Sylla Dictator ibi Curiam faceret. Mirumque eſt, illos patres Socrati cunctis ab eodem Deo ſapientia prælato Pythagoram prætuliſſe, aut tot aliis virtute Alcibiadem aut quenquam utroque Themiſtocli. - - - - *I find that ſtatues were erected to Pythagoras and Alcibiades in the corners of the* Comitium, *when Pythian Apollo, during the Samnitian war had ordered images to be dedicated, in a noted place, to the braveſt, and wiſeſt of the Grecians : they continued till Sylla, the dictator, builded a palace there. It is ſurprizing, that thoſe Fathers ſhould prefer Pythagoras to Socrates for wiſdom, when the ſame God preferred the latter to all others, or Alcibiades to ſo many others for bravery, or any to Themiſtocles for both.*’ Pliny wonders how the Romans came to chuſe Pythagoras rather than Socrates. But how did he know, that they had heard of the Oracle which concerned Socrates. All things conſidered, it will be found they choſe beſt. Beſides, they may be juſtified by theſe two reaſons (13). They knew not Socrates ſo well as they knew Pythagoras, for the latter had taught for a long time in Italy with great reputation ; and their minds were prepoſſeſſed in behalf of Pythagoras, becauſe they fancied that Numa had been his diſciple. It was the common opinion, and though it was never ſo falſe, the magiſtrates took care to keep it up. Which appeared, when it was reported, that Numa's ſepulchre and books had been found out (14), for it was publiſhed abroad, that they concerned the Pythagorean Philoſophy. and ſome Hiſtorians followed that opinion. ‘ Adjicit Valerius Antias libros Pythagoricos fuiſſe : vulgatæ opinioni qua creditur Pythagoræ auditorem fuiſſe Numam, mendacio probabili accommodata fide (15). - - - - *Valerius Antias adds, that thoſe books were Pythagorean, in order to ſupport the vulgar opinion, that Numa was a diſciple of Pythagoras.*’ Caſſius Hemina and Lucius Piſo followed that popular opinion in their writings (16). If I ſhould be aſked, why the Romans had rather believe that Numa had been a diſciple of Pythagoras, than aſcribe to Italy the glory of having produced ſo wiſe a king, who was not beholden for his Philoſophy to the inſtructions of any foreigner. I ſhould anſwer, 1. That in all likelihood they did not think of that intereſt of their country, when they began to propagate that opinion. 2. That perhaps they fancied the merit of that prince would be more eaſily believed, by giving him ſo famous a tutor. Was it an eaſy thing to believe, that a Barbarian ſhould have attained to ſuch a degree of capacity without the help of the Grecians? St Auguſtin would have eaſily believed that Numa was one of Pythagoras's diſciples, for he ſays that Thales lived during the reign of Romulus (17). But we know that Thales and Pherecydes were cotemporary ; and that

---

(1) Cicer. Tuſcul. Quæſt. *lib. v, cap. iii. Diogenes Laërtius relates much the ſame thing. See his* Proœm. *num.* 12, *where he quotes* Heraclides Ponticus ἐν τῇ περὶ τῆς ἄπνȣ, in libro de femina ſeptem diebus exanimi. *He ſays that this diſcourſe was made in Sicyon. See alſo what he ſays in the life of Pythagoras, where he quotes* Soſicrates in Succeſſionibus.

(2) Qui quum poſt hunc Phliaſium ſermonem in Italiam veniſſet, exornavit eam Græciam quæ magna dicta eſt, & privatim & publice, præſtantiſſimis & inſtitutis & artibus. *Cicero, ibid. cap. iv.*

(3) Ibid. *cap. xvi.*

(4) That is, of Pherecydes.

(5) Cicero, ubi ſupra, *lib. iv, cap. i.*

(6) Ovid follows that falſe tradition, in the 15th book of his Metamorphoſes.

(7) Cicero, ibid.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Plut. in Numa, *pag.* 65.

(10) Ibid.

(11) Plin. *lib. xxxiv, cap. vi, pag. m.* 99.

(12) It was a long war: it began in the year 411 of Rome.

(13) Voſſius, de Philoſoph. Sect. *pag. m.* 39, *alledges them.*

(14) 555 Years ſince the beginning of his reign. *Plin. lib. xiii, cap. xiii* ; and not about 400 years after his death, as Plutarch ſays in Numa, *pag.* 74.

(15) Liv. *lib. xl, pag. m.* 783.

(16) Vid. Plin. *lib. xiii, cap. xiii.*

(17) Eodem Romulo regnante Thales Mileſius fuiſſe perhibetur unus è ſeptem ſapientibus. *Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, lib. xviii, cap. xxiv.*

His eloquence muſt needs have been very powerful, ſeeing his exhortations moved the inhabitants of a great city, plunged in debauchery, to avoid luxury and good cheer, and to live according to the rules of virtue (*a*). Nay, he prevailed upon the ladies to part with their fine cloaths, and all their ornaments [*C*], and to make a ſacrifice of them to the chief deity of the place. He engaged his diſciples to practiſe the moſt difficult things:

(*a*) Juſtin. *lib. xx, cap. iv.* See the remark [*C*].

that Pythagoras was diſciple of Pherecydes. Some pretend that Thales himſelf was alſo his diſciple (18). However, it is certain that Anaximander, a diſciple of Thales, and Pythagoras, lived at the ſame time (19). None of the commentators of Diogenes Laërtius tell us that theſe words are not well rendered, *Φιλοσοφίας δὲ δύο γεγόνασι διαδοχαὶ ἥ τε ἀπὸ Ἀναξιμάνδρου, καὶ ἡ ἀπὸ Πυθαγόρου. τοῦ μὲν, Θαλοῦ διακηκοότος.* Ceterum Philoſophiæ duæ fuere ſucceſſiones: quarum altera ab Anaximandro; altera à Pythagora fluxit. Anaxamandri Thales auditor fuit (20). - - - *But there were two ſucceſſions of Philoſophy, one flowed from Anaximander, and the other from Pythagoras: Thales was diſciple to Anaximander.* It is plain they ſignify not that Thales was diſciple of Anaximander; on the contrary, that Anaximander was diſciple of Thales.

I ſhall conclude with a paſſage of Pliny (21), who ſays, that Pythagoras was in Egypt in the reign of Semneſerteus. Which can ſcarce be reconciled with what we read in Laërtius, that Pythagoras went into Egypt with letters of recommendation from Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, to Amaſis, king of Egypt, of this Laërtius aſſures us (22). Father Hardouin (23) thought he could clear the difficulty, by ſuppoſing, that Pythagoras went into Egypt under the reign of Amaſis, and ſtaid there long enough to ſee the death of that prince, and the reign of Semneſerteus, his ſucceſſor. But that ſuppoſition is inconſiſtent with the account given us by Herodotus, who ſays, that Cambyſes ſubdued Egypt half a year after the death of Amaſis, whom Pſammenitus, his ſon, ſucceeded (24). Perhaps it might be ſaid, that the name of Pſammenitus, was by degrees changed into that of Semneſerteus; and we muſt not forget, that it ſeems that Pythagoras was in Egypt when Cambyſes took poſſeſſion of it; for it appears that he was one of the ſlaves which that monarch tranſported into Perſia. This cannot be better proved, than by a paſſage of Apuleius, but it muſt be corrected by changing *Ægyptum* into *Ægypto*. Which would too much confound the ſenſe of the author. It is better to ſay, that this paſſage only proves that Pythagoras was in Egypt in Cambyſes's time. See the remark [*B*] of the article ZOROASTER, towards the end. Theſe are Apuleius's words. 'Sunt qui Pythagoram aiunt eo temporis inter captivos Cambyſæ Regis Ægyptum cum adveheretur, doctores habuiſſe Perſarum Magos, ac præcipue Zoroaſtrem, omnis divini arcani antiſtitem: poſt eaque à quodam Gaſſo Crotonienſum principe recuperatum. Verum enim vero celebrior fama obtinet ſponte eum petiſſe Ægyptias diſciplinas, atque ibi à ſacerdotibus cerimoniarum incredendas potentias, numerorum admirandas vires, Geometriæ ſolertiſſimus formulus didiciſſe (25). - - - - *Some ſay that Pythagoras, who was amongſt the priſoners of king Cambyſes, when he went to Egypt, had the Magi of Perſia for his teachers, and eſpecially Zoroaſter, the chief in all divine myſteries: and that afterwards he was redeemed by one Gallus, prince of the Crotonians. But the moſt common opinion is, that he went of his own accord to acquire the Egyptian learning, and that he was taught there by the prieſts the incredible force of ceremonies, the wonderful power of numbers, and the ingenious rules of Geometry.*' John Bernartius did not ſucceed in criticizing Pliny; for he alledges Euſebius againſt him, as ſaying, that the reign of Semneſerteus began in the XLIIId Olympiad, and ended in the XLVth, that is to ſay, that king Amaſis came to the throne about thirty years after the death of Semneſerteus (26). If it were ſo, it would be impoſſible to juſtify Pliny, or to reconcile him with Diogenes Laërtius. But we need not be concerned for him; for John Bernartius is miſtaken; Euſebius does not ſpeak of a king of Egypt, whoſe name was Semneſerteus.

[*C*] *He prevailed upon the ladies to part with their fine cloaths, and all their ornaments.*] All that Juſtin tells us concerning the reformation introduced by Pythagoras into the city of Crotona, is ſo remarkable, that I ſhall ſet down the whole paſſage. 'Crotonam venit, populumque in luxuriam lapſum, auctoritate ſua ad uſum frugalitatis revocavit. Laudabat quotidie virtutem; & vitia luxuriæ, caſuſque civitatum ea peſte perditarum enumerabat; tantumque ſtudium ad frugalitatem multitudinis provocavit, ut aliquos ex his luxuriatos incredibile videretur. Matronarum quoque ſeparatam à viris doctrinam, & puerorum à parentibus frequenter habuit. Docebat nunc has pudicitiam, & obſequia in viros; nunc illos modeſtiam, & literarum ſtudium. Inter hæc velut genitricem virtutum frugalitatem omnibus ingerebat, conſecutuſque diſputationum aſſiduitate erat, ut matronæ auratas veſtes, ceteraque dignitatis ſuæ ornamenta, velut inſtrumenta luxuriæ deponerent, eaque omnia delata in Junonis ædem ipſi Deæ conſecrarent, præ ſe ferentes, vera ornamenta matronarum pudicitiam, non veſtes eſſe. In juventute quoque quantum profligatum fit, victi feminarum contumaces animi manifeſtant (27). - - - - *He came to Crotona, and, by his authority, reclaimed the people, who were ſunk in luxury, and brought them to a frugal way of living. He daily recommended virtue, and laid open the vice of luxury, and ſhewed the miſery of thoſe cities that were infected with it: he inſpired the multitude with ſuch a love to frugality, that it was extremely rare to ſee any of them extravagant. He frequently inſtructed the married women, ſeparately from their huſbands, and children from their parents. The former he taught chaſtity and obedience to their huſbands: and the latter modeſty, and the love of learning. In the mean time he inculcated frugality on all, as the parent of virtues, and by continual exhortations prevailed on the ladies to part with their fine cloaths, and all their other ornaments, as inſtruments of luxury, to bring them to the temple of Juno, and dedicate them to that goddeſs, declaring that they looked on chaſtity, and not on cloaths, as the true ornaments of women. What reformation was wrought amongſt the young men, evidently appears from the conquered obſtinacy of the women.*' The laſt words of this author are ſomewhat ſatirical; for he reaſons thus: If Pythagoras was able to overcome the obſtinacy of women, you may judge of the progreſs he made in the reformation of young men. It is certain, that the love of fine cloaths is a piece of ſo great reſiſtance (28), that nothing will ſo much reflect back the darts of a preacher. See the efficacy of Capiſtran's ſermons againſt gameſters (29). It is not ſaid that he had the ſame ſucceſs againſt jewels. Conecte made more conqueſts over head-dreſſes with ſtones thrown by children, than with rhetorical figures (30). Theſe Chriſtian preachers could not do what an heathen Philoſopher did. But let us not forget the action of the Roman ladies in the time of Camillus (31).

A modern author has given us, in a few words, the fineſt ſtrokes that may ſerve for the picture of Pythagoras's eloquence, 'According to the ſame Porphyrius, when he came into Italy, he altered the policy of a great many cities, and reſtored their liberty; by one exhortation he gained and brought over above two thouſand men to his Philoſophy. He taught them to overcome their paſſions, to ſuppreſs all the motions of avarice and ambition, to have all their wealth in common, and to love ſilence, retreat, and contemplation (32).' Let no body object to me that I repreſent that Philoſopher under the notion of a Rhetorician; it is not my intention: I am fully perſuaded that he aſſaulted not vice with harangues ſet with flouriſhes, and compoſed according to the rules, and the ſhining ſubtilties which the ſophiſts of the following ages made uſe of. But notwithſtanding, we may very well aſcribe a wonderful eloquence to him, ſeeing his diſcourſes were ſo perſuaſive. The force of his eloquence conſiſted, without doubt, in the grave expoſition of his reaſons, and in the authority which the wiſdom of his conduct gave to his words. He preached by his life: his very ſilence was eloquent, and contributed as much as his voice to the reformation, as an ancient Poet has very well obſerved:

Annon Pythagoræ monitus annique ſilentes
Famoſum Oebalii luxum preſſere Tarenti (33)?

(18) *Tzetzes affirms it. See his words*, ap. Menag. in Laërt. *cap. i, num.* 119.

(19) Diog. Laërt. *lib. ii*, ſays, that Anaximander flouriſhed chiefly in the time of Polycrates tyrant of Samos.

(20) Laërt. in Prooem. *num.* 13.

(21) Is obeliſcus quem Divus Auguſtus in circo magno ſtatuit, exciſus eſt à rege Semneſerteo, quo regnante Pythagoras in Ægypto fuit. *Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. ix, pag. m.* 297.

(22) Diog. Laërt. *lib. viii, num.* 3.

(23) In hunc loc. Plinii.

(24) Herodot. *lib. iii, cap. xiv.*

(25) Apul. Florid. *lib. ii, pag. m.* 351.

(26) Joann. Bernartius, in Boëtium de Conſol. Philoſoph. *lib. i, pag.* 169.

(27) Juſtin. *lib. xx, cap. iv, pag. m.* 395.

(28) See the article PERIANDER, citations (6) and (7).

(29) Remark [*E*] of the article CAPISTRAN.

(30) See the article CONECTE, remark [*D*].

(31) See the article CAMILLUS, remark [*C*].

(32) Thomaſſin, Méthode d'étudier & d'enſeigner la Philoſophie, *livr. i, ch. xv, pag.* 153.

(33) Claudian. de Mallii Theodori Conſulatu, *ver.* 156. *Read* annon, *and not* non *without an interrogation, as in the edition of Barthius: and obſerve that Barthius, who is too prolix every where elſe, ſays almoſt nothing on this paſſage. Claudian, a little before, ſays,* Quicquid Democritus riſit, dixitque tacendo Pythagoras. *Ibid. ver.* 90.

things: for he made them undergo a noviciate of ſilence [*D*], which laſted two years at leaſt; but he made it laſt five years for thoſe whom he knew to be moſt inclined to ſpeak (*b*). What I have ſaid in another place (*c*), perſuades me of the force of his cenſures. He made them live all in common (*d*); they renounced their property to their patrimony, and brought all they had to the feet of their maſter. An ill conſtruction was put upon their union, and it proved very fatal to them [*E*]. One of his greateſt cares was to correct the abuſes committed by married perſons [*F*]; he did not believe that

By words and ſilence Pythagoras reclaim'd,
Tarentum, which for luxury was fam'd.

[*D*] *A novicate of ſilence.*] It was a hard diſcipline. Ἔστι δὲ πάντων χαλεπώτατον ἐγκρατευμάτων τὸ γλώττης κρατεῖν (34), that is, the moſt difficult victory that can be gotten, is to have the maſtery of one s tongue. See among Cato's diſtichs, the encomium that is beſtowed on thoſe who know how to be ſilent when it is fit they ſhould (35). Servius mentions the noviciate of five years (36), and here is what Apuleius obſerves concerning that which was impoſed for about the ſpace of five years on ſuch diſciples as were not ſo cautious and diſcreet as others. 'Non in totum tamen (Pythagorici) vocem deſueſcebant, nec omnes pari tempore elingues magiſtrum ſectabantur; ſed gravioribus viris brevi ſpatio ſatis videbatur taciturnitas modificata. Loquaciores enim vero ferme in quinquennium, velut in exilium vocis mittebantur (37). - - - *But the Pythagoreans were not entirely to forbear ſpeaking, nor were all to be ſilent for the ſame ſpace of time. A ſhort time was thought ſufficient for thoſe that were reſerved. But the ſpace of five years was impoſed on them, who were more inclined to talk.*'

[*E*] *An ill conſtruction was put upon that union, and it proved very fatal to them.*] That ſociety of ſtudents was looked upon as a faction which conſpired againſt the ſtate; ſixty of them were deſtroyed, the reſt run away. 'Sed tercenti ex juvenibus cum ſodalitii juris ſacramento quodam nexi ſeparatam à ceteris civibus vitam exercerent, quaſi cœtum clandeſtinæ conjurationis haberent, civitatem in ſe converterunt, quæ eos, cum in unam domum conveniſſent, cremare voluit. In quo tumultu ſexaginta ferme periere, ceteri in exilium profecti (38). - - - - - *But three hundred young men, formed into a ſociety by a kind of oath, lived together by themſelves, and were looked upon as a private faction by the ſtate, who intended to burn them as they were aſſembled in one houſe. Almoſt ſixty of them periſhed in the tumult, and the reſt went into baniſhment.*' We can neither learn from that paſſage of Juſtin, nor from what follows, whether that ſtorm was excited during the life of Pythagoras. It ſeems more reaſonable to believe, that this Philoſopher was not involved in that perſecution, than to believe he was. One would think therefore that Juſtin relates the ſame fact which Polybius ſpeaks of. Now according to Polybius, the Pythagoreans were burnt in Great Greece, ſome time before the war, which Dionyſius, tyrant of Syracuſe, made againſt the Crotoniates (39): it ſeems therefore that they were not burnt during their maſter's life; for there are one hundred and twenty years between the expulſion of Tarquinius, and that war of Dionyſius againſt Crotona (40). But Pythagoras came into Italy under the reign of Tarquinius, and died at Metapontum, after he had been twenty years in Crotona (41). Voſſius obſerves, that Juſtin, Polybius, Porphyrius, Jamblichus, mention the ſame accident (42), but the two latter obſerve that none but two men, viz. Archippus and Lyſis, eſcaped the fire: it will be ſaid therefore, that it was not a cruelty exerciſed on the ſchool of Pythagoras during his life. For Lyſis having retired to Thebes, was there preceptor to Epaminondas (43) who died one hundred and forty five years after the expulſion of Tarquinius. Theſe are doubts, I grant it, but no ſtrong proofs againſt thoſe who ſhould maintain, that the fire from which Lyſis was preſerved, happened during the life of Pythagoras. Note, that according to Plutarch the two Pythagoreans who made their eſcape, were Philolaus and Lyſis. He ſays ſo in his treatiſe concerning the genius of Socrates (44), and calls Cyclonians thoſe who ſet Pythagoras's college on fire in Metapontum. He calls them Cylonians in another place, and obſerves that they burnt Pythagoras alive. Καὶ ὁ Πυθαγόρου ζῶντος ἐμπρησμὸς ὑπὸ τῶν Κυλωνείων. *Quod Pythagoræ vivo à Cyloneis illatum eſt incendium* (45).

If you deſire to know the name of the author, who tells us, that the diſciples of that Philoſopher deprived themſelves of the property to their eſtates, I ſhall refer you to theſe words of Aulus Gellius: 'Omnes ſimul qui à Pythagora in cohortem illam diſciplinarum recepti erant, quod quiſque familiæ pecuniæque habebat, in medium dabant, & coibatur ſocietas inſeparabilis, tamquam illud fuerit antiquum conſortium, quod re atque verbo appellabatur κοινόβιον (46). - - - - *All the diſciples of Pythagoras brought what money and ſubſtance they had into a common ſtock, and were formed into a ſociety, like that ancient community, which was properly called Cœnobium.*'

[*F*] *One of his greateſt cares was to correct the abuſes committed by married perſons.*] He repreſented to them, that the thing which is to be aimed at in the joining of the ſexes, is to produce in a lawful way another perſon like one's ſelf; that one muſt endeavour to get well made, ſound, and luſty children; that they muſt be uſed to labour and ſobriety, and removed from venereal pleaſures till they come to be twenty years of age, and then they muſt be told not to enjoy them too often. 'Neceſſum eſſe ut pueri & virgines in laboribus & exercitationibus omnibuſque tolerantiæ ac temperantiæ generibus congruentibus educentur; ut conveniens victus ipſis adhibeatur, & laborum amans, temperans & continens eorum vita ſit: ut de uſu rei venereæ ſero erudiantur; ac pueros ſic inſtitui & educari oportеat, ut intra viceſimum ætatis annum talem congreſſum nullo modo quærant. Cum autem ad ætatem veneri maturam pervenerint, hac raro utendum eſſe; incontinentiam enim, bonamque corporis habitudinem, rarius conjunctas eſſe (47). - - - *That it was neceſſary, that young men and women ſhould be enured to labour and exerciſe, patience and temperance, that a proper kind of food ſhould be given them, and that they ſhould lead an induſtrious and ſober life: that they ſhould not be early inſtructed about the uſe of venery, and that youth ſhould be told to abſtain from it, till they are at leaſt twenty years of age; and that when they are ripe for it, they ſhould uſe it rarely, becauſe incontinency and a ſound conſtitution ſeldom go together.*' He altogether condemned thoſe who perform that act after they have eaten too much, but much more thoſe who perform it whilſt they are drunk (48). He would have huſbands not only to leave off concubinage, but alſo to obſerve the laws of chaſtity and modeſty towards their wives. Before that time they neither did the one nor the other: but it is ſaid that they were ſo ſenſibly moved with his remonſtrances, that they ſhewed a great zeal in reforming themſelves. *Fertur & Pythagoras Crotoniatas à pellicum & illegitimarum feminarum conſuetudine abduxiſſe; maritos etiam monuiſſe, ut erga uxores ſuas caſti & pudici forent: quo factum, ut Crotoniatæ omnem incontinentiam & luxuriam, quæ tum temporis in urbe, ceu peſtis, graſſabantur, è medio tollere laborarint* (49). The inhabitants of Crotona lived a very looſe and diſſolute life. They married only for form's ſake, they took a wife *ad honores*, they neglected and deſpiſed her, and minded only their concubines. They gave a very ill example; their conduct was contagious; they did not conſider that it was to be feared they might be imitated, and perhaps they had not much care about it. The maxim *frangenti fidem frangatur eidem - - to pay one in his own coin*, is but too common with reſpect to conjugal fidelity. Pythagoras undertook to correct ſuch a diſorder. If we may believe Juſtin, the force of his inſtructions proved ſufficient for it; but ſome authors intimate, that they proved not effectual enough, and that he was obliged to have recourſe to a more powerful machine. He pretended therefore that he had deſcended into hell, and had ſeen in great torments ſuch huſbands as do not pay the matrimonial duty to their wives. He became very conſiderable upon that account. Φησὶ δὲ Ἱερώνυμος κατελθόντα αὐτὸν εἰς ᾅδου τὴν μὲν Ἡσιόδου ψυχὴν ἰδεῖν πρὸς κίονι χαλκῷ δεδεμένην καὶ τρίζουσαν· τὴν

δὲ

(*b*) Aulus Gellius, *lib. i, cap. ix.*

(*c*) Citation (27), of the article HIPPONAX.

(*d*) See the remark [*E*], at the end.

(34) Jamblichus, *lib. i, cap. xxxi.*

(35) Proximus ille Deo eſt qui ſcit ratione tacere.

(36) Servius. *in illud* Æneid. X, *ver.* 564, tacitis regnavit Amyclis.

(37) Apul. in Florid.

(38) Juſtin. *lib. xx, cap. iv. See the remark* [*O*].

(39) Polyb. *lib. ii.*

(40) See Calviſius, *pag. m.* 95, 165.

(41) Juſtin. ubi ſupra.

(42) Voſſius, de Philoſoph. Sectis, *cap. vi, num.* 26, *pag. m.* 38.

(43) Diog. Laërt. ibid. *num.* 7. Corn. Nepos, in Epaminonda. Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. iii, cap. xvii.*

(44) Plut. in Socrat. Genio, *pag.* 583.

(45) *Idem*, de Stoicor. Repugn. *pag.* 1051.

(46) A. Gellius, *lib. i, cap. ix. See alſo* Laërt. *lib. viii, num. x.*

(47) Omeiſius, in Ethica Pythag. *pag.* 38, ex Jamblicho in Vita Pythag. lib. i, cap. xxxi.

(48) Idem, pag. 39, ex eodem, ibid.

(49) Jamblich. ibid. cap. xxvii, ap. Omeiſium, ibid. pag. 40.

that without this the public peace, and liberty, a good form of government, and other ſuch things, about which he was very zealous [G], would be able to make private men happy.

δὲ Ὁμήρου, κρεμαμένην ὑπὸ δένδρου, καὶ ὄφεις περὶ αὐτὴν, ἀνθ᾽ ὧν εἶπε περὶ θεῶν. κολαζομένους δὲ καὶ τοὺς μὴ θέλοντας συνεῖναι ταῖς αὐτῶν γυναιξί. καὶ δὴ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τιμεθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Κρότωνι. Hieronymus vero ait deſcendiſſe ad inferos atque Heſiodi quidem animam columnæ æreæ vinculis adſtrictam, ſtridentemque vidiſſe; Homeri autem, ex arbore pendentem, ſerpenteſque illam circumdantes, propter ea quæ de diis ſinxerat. Eos item cruciari qui ſuis uxoribus congredi nollent: ejuſque rei gratia à Crotoniatis honoratum (50). - - - - *Jerom ſays he went down to hell, and there ſaw the ſoul of Heſiod tied to a pillar of braſs, and making an hideous noiſe: and alſo the ſoul of Homer, hanging on a tree, and ſurrounded with ſerpents, becauſe of his fictions about the gods. And likewiſe that thoſe were tormented that would not pay matrimonial duty to their wives: and upon that account was honoured by the people of Crotona.* That ſtory is without doubt the ſame which Hermippus relates. He ſays (51), that this Philoſopher being arrived in Italy, ſhut himſelf up in a ſubterranean place, having deſired his mother to keep an account of what ſhould happen. When he had been in that place as long as he thought fit, his mother delivered her table-book to him, as it had been agreed between them. He found in it the dates, and other circumſtances of what paſſed: he came out of that place with a pale and lean face; he called the people together, and aſſured them that he came from hell, and to perſuade them of the truth of it, he told them what had paſſed in the city. All his hearers were ſo moved with what he ſaid, that the whole aſſembly fell a groaning and crying; and they doubted no longer but he was a divine perſon, and they gave him their wives to inſtruct them. It was without doubt on that occaſion that he frighted ill huſbands by telling them that thoſe who refuſe to pay the matrimonial duties to their wives, are tormented in hell with great ſeverity. In all likelihood he ſpoke alſo of the puniſhments that are inflicted upon intriguing women, and we ought to believe it was one of the reaſons which moved the Crotoniates to ſend their wives to his ſchool. Obſerve the contradiction of that great maſter. He taught the Metempſychoſis on the one hand, without confining himſelf to the three removings mentioned by Pindar (52): and on the other hand, he was ſo bold as to ſay, that he had ſeen in hell the ſouls of Homer, Heſiod, &c. very much tormented. The Metempſychoſis deſtroyed hell, as he declares it in Ovid.

O genus attonitum gelidæ formidine mortis,
Quid Styga, quid tenebras, & nomina vana timetis,
Materiem vatum, falſique pericula mundi?
Corpora ſive rogus flamma, ſeu tabe vetuſtas
Abſtulerit, mala poſſe pati non ulla putetis (53).

Why thus frighted at an empty name,
A dream of darkneſs, and fictitious flame?
Vain themes of wit! which but in poems paſs,
And fables of the world that never was.
What feels the body when the ſoul expires,
By time corrupted or conſum'd by fires.

DRYDEN.

But he rather choſe to acquire authority, and make him ſelf fit to extirpate debauchery by contradicting himſelf, than to follow a coherent method of teaching, which would not have proved ſo uſeful.

I ſaid that he confined not himſelf to the three removings mentioned by Pindar, and I ſhall give an evident proof of it by the verſes of Ovid, which I ſhall quote below (54). Therefore Forcatulus doth not ſpeak the truth when he ſays the contrary. 'Conſtat, *ſays he* '(55), Druidum imitatorem Pythagoram, deſultoriam 'animarum migrationem nonniſi tertiam aſſeruiſſe. 'Nam ſi perenni ſerie animas in alia atque alia cor'pora tranſcripſiſſet, quis quæſo locus fuiſſet Elyſiis 'campis, aut cœli ſedibus? quod miror ſatyricis ſcrip'toribus falſis admodum inſulſe derelictum. Quicun'que, inquit Pindarus, ter in utraque vita à vitiis 'alieni fuerunt, viam ſibi à Jove deſtinatam adiere ad 'Saturni urbem. Ἔνθα μακάρων νᾶσον Ὠκεανί'δες αὖραι περιπνέουσιν, ἄνθεμα δὲ χρυσοῦ φλέ'γει, id eſt, Ubi beatorum inſulam Oceanides auræ 'circumſtant, & flores aurei fulgent. - - - *It is certain 'Pythagoras imitated the Druids, in maintaining that the 'tranſmigration of ſouls extended only to the third re'move. For if ſouls were for ever ſhifting bodies, what 'occaſion would there be for Elyſian fields, and heavenly 'habitations. Which I am ſurpiſed that ſatirical wri'ters ſhould fooliſhly ſuppoſe to be abandoned. Whoever, 'ſays Pindar, have been free from vice in tranſmigra'tions, they go to the city of Saturn, according to the de'cree of Jupiter, that is, where ſea-breezes fan the 'iſland of the bleſſed, and golden flowers caſt a luſtre.'*

[G] *About which he was very zealous.*] His affection for the public good moved him to carry his inſtructions to the palaces of great men (56): he eaſily perceived that if he could work upon the minds of princes, and of the chief magiſtrates, other men would plentifully reap the fruits of his Philoſophy. He had the happineſs and the glory of teaching ſome diſciples, who proved excellent law-givers, ſuch as Zaleucus, Charondas, and ſome others (57). A law-maker ought to be looked upon as the beſt preſent that can be given a ſociety. Thoſe who made laws are more worthy of admiration, and of an immortal glory, than the greateſt conquerors. Yet their memory is not come to us with the ſame noiſe as that of Cyrus and Alexander. The reaſon of it is, that our minds being not very capable of knowing true grandeur, do falſly join the idea of it with ſuch actions as make a noiſe. They cannot diſtinguiſh what is great from what is ſhining (58); and ſo the life of a man who makes it his buſineſs to cure the internal diſtempers of a ſtate with good laws, is an object that makes no great impreſſion, becauſe ſuch a work goes on ſlowly. But if a man ſubdues cities and provinces, and deſtroys millions of men, and reduces ten times as many to beggary, he acquires ſo much glory, that the remoteſt poſterity will ſpeak of him with tranſports of admiration. However, it will be an eternal glory for Pythagoras, in the opinion of thoſe who know how to judge of things, to have furniſhed the world with ſome good law-givers. It is a glory which redounds upon the whole Philoſophy, as Seneca has well obſerved. 'Poſt'quam, ſurrepentibus vitiis, in tyrannidem regna ver'ſa ſunt, opus eſſe cœpit legibus, quas & ipſas inter 'initia tulere ſapientes. Solon, ... Lycurgus '. . . . . . Zaleuci leges Charondæque laudantur: hi 'non in foro, nec in conſultorum atrio, ſed in Pytha'goræ tacito illo ſanctoque ſeceſſu didicerunt jura, quæ 'florenti tunc Siciliæ, & per Italiam Græciæ ponerent '(59). - - - *After governments, by the growth of vice, 'were turned into tyranny, laws became neceſſary, which 'at firſt were made by wiſe men. Solon, ... Ly'curgus . . . . . . The laws of Zaleucus and Charondas 'are eſteemed: thoſe they enacted in Sicily, then in a flou'riſhing condition, and in Greece, they did not learn at 'the forum or in courts of law, but privately of Pytha'goras.'* Beſides, he took a particular care to pacify the wars which aroſe in Italy, and the inteſtine factions of the cities (60). He uſed to ſay, that war ſhould be made only againſt theſe five things, the diſeaſes of the body, the ignorance of the mind, the paſſions of the heart, the ſeditions of cities, and the diſcord of families. They are five monſters which ought to be proſecuted to the utmoſt with fire and ſword. 'Suſtu'liſſe penitus omnes diſcordias, non à notis ſolùm & 'familiaribus, eorumque poſteris ad aliquot ſecula, 'ſed ab omnibus omnino Italiæ atque Siciliæ civitati'bus, tam inteſtinas quam externas, auctor eſt Por'phyrius in ejus Vita: qui addit, hoc apophthegma 'crebrò ei in ore fuiſſe, Fugandum omni conatu, & 'igni atque ferro, & quibuſcumque denique machinis 'præcidendum, à corpore quidem morbum; ab ani'ma, ignorantiam; à ventre, luxuriam; à civitate, 'ſeditionem; à familia, diſcordiam (61). - - - *Porphy'rius in his life relates, that he not only removed all 'differences between friends and acquaintances, and their 'poſterities for ſeveral ages, but likewiſe put an end to 'thoſe wars that aroſe in Italy and Sicily, both inteſtine 'and foreign: he adds, that he frequently uſed this a'pophthegm, that we ought by fire and ſword and all o'ther means whatever to drive diſeaſes from the body, 'ignorance from the mind, ſenſuality from the heart, ſe'dition from cities, and diſcord from families.'* It is happy. I wonder that a Philoſopher, ſo learned in Aſtronomy, Geometry, and the other parts of Mathematics, ſhould take delight in delivering his fineſt precepts under the veil of enigmas. That veil was ſo thick that it has afforded the interpreters a large field of conjectures [*H*], and as many myſtical ſenſes as they pleaſed. Some take in a literal ſenſe the order he gave to abſtain from eating of beans [*I*]. Few men, in thoſe times, travelled

---

(50) Diog. Laërt. *lib. viii, num.* 21, *pag.* 505.

(51) Apud Diog. Laërt. ibid. *num.* 41, *pag.* 521, 522. See alſo the Scholiaſt upon Sophocles. *Menagius in* hunc locum Laërtii, *pag.* 372, 373, *quotes his words.*

(52) Olymp. Od. II.

(53) Ovid. Met. *lib. xv, ver.* 153.

(54) In the remark [*M*].

(55) Forcat. de Gallor. imperio & Philoſophia, *lib. i, pag. m.* 90.

(56) Πυθαγόρας τοῖς πρωτεύουσιν Ἰταλιωτῶν. Ac Pythagora principes Italorum. *Plutarchus, cum principibus viris Philoſopho eſſe diſputandum, pag.* 777, *A.*

(57) Vid. Jambl. in Vit. Pythag. lib. i, cap. xxx.

(58) Vid. Plin. Epiſt. XVI, lib. iii, *where he ſhews* alia eſſe clariora, alia majora.

(59) Seneca, Epiſt. XC, *pag. m.* 369. *Vid.* Miſcellaneæ obſervationes *of* Petrus Petitus, *pag.* 265.

(60) See the letter which they ſay he wrote to Anaximenes, *ap. Laërt. lib. viii, num.* 49.

(61) Menag. in Laërt. *lib. viii, num.* 50.

no wonder if the inhabitants of Crotona deſired, that their ſenate ſhould be directed by the counſels of ſo excellent a man. Valerius Maximus ſays ſo, to ſhew that the authority of Pythagoras was acknowledged out of his college. ‘ Pythagoræ tanta veneratio ab auditoribus tributa eſt, ut quæ ab eo acceperant, in diſputationem deducere nefas exiſtimarent: Quin etiam interpellati ad reddendam cauſſam, hoc ſolum reſpondebant, ipſum dixiſſe: Magnus honos, ſed ſchola tenus. Illa urbium ſuffragiis tributa eſt. Enixo Crotoniatæ ſtudio ab eo petierunt ut ſenatum ipſorum, qui mille hominum numero conſtabat, conſiliis ſuis uti pateretur (62). - - - *Pythagoras was held in ſuch veneration by his diſciples in his ſchool, that they thought it a crime to call in queſtion what he ſaid; and when they were deſired to give a reaſon for any thing, they only anſwered, he ſaid ſo. He was alſo greatly reſpected by the inhabitants of Crotona, who earneſtly intreated him to aſſiſt their ſenate, which conſiſted of a thouſand men, with his counſels.*’ The ſame author tells us, that ſeveral cities of Italy felt the good effects of that Philoſopher's ſtudies (63).

[*H*] *It has afforded interpreters a large field of conjectures.*] See, for example, what they have ſaid upon this precept of Pythagoras, *Do not ſit upon a Chœnix, Chœnici ne inſideas*; ſee it, I ſay, in the learned diſſertation which I have mentioned in another place (64). Mr du Rondel is the author of it. That ſymbolical way of teaching was very much in uſe in the eaſtern countries and Egypt. Pythagoras had it, without doubt, from thence. He came from his travels loaded with the learning he had got in all the countries he went through. It is thought that he made a plentiful harveſt among the Jews, and that he learned a great many things of Ezekiel and Daniel. Nay, it is pretended that his *Tetractys* is the ſame thing with the name *Tetragrammaton*, a name not to be pronounced, and full of myſteries, as the Rabbins ſay. See the learned Huetius, *Adde*, ſays he (65), *& veri perſimilem conjecturam Seldeni, & Wendelini, qua mirificam illam Pythagoræ* τετρακτὸν *ipſum eſſe ſuſpicantur Dei nomen* τετραγράμματον, יהוה, *atque ejus notitiam à Daniele jam ſene Pythagoram, cum in Babylonia degeret, accepiſſe. Danieli adjungi poterat & Ezekiel, ut oſtendam infra.* Others ſay, That the *Tetractys*, that great object of veneration, and by which they uſed to ſwear, was only a myſterious way of teaching by numbers. Διὸ καὶ ἐφθέγγοντο οἱ Πυθαγορικοί, ὡς μεγίστου ὅρκου ὄντος τῆς τετράδος, Οὐ μὰ τὸν ἁμετέρᾳ ψυχᾷ παραδόντα τετρακτὸν. Παγὰν ἀενάου φύσεως ῥιζώματ' ἔχουσαν. Itaque ſanctiſſimum jusjurandum Pythagorei quaternario ſunt complexi, quam tetractyn vocant. *Per tibi noſtræ animæ præbentem tetrada juro Naturæ fontemque & firmamenta perennis* (66). Conſider theſe words of the Leipſic Journal, page 204 of the year 1685, in the abſtract of an Engliſh book of John Turner. *Ex hac ipſa tamen gentilium notitia inſcite à quibuſdam colligi ait, Pythagoræorum Tetractyn, quam tam reverenter habuerunt, & per quam jurare etiam ſoliti leguntur, eſſe unum idemque cum nomine tetragrammato, quod à Judæis ipſi acceperint. . . . . Aliam proinde viam demonſtrat Autor tetractyn iſtam explicandi, deſumptam puta à methodo Pythagoræorum myſtica, qua dogmata ſua fere per numeros certos indicare & explanare fuerint ſoliti.* But we muſt not forget to ſay, that Pythagoras and his ſucceſſors had two ways of teaching, the one for thoſe that were initiated, and the other for ſtrangers and profane men. The firſt was clear and perſpicuous, the ſecond was ſymbolical and enigmatical. See the XIIIth chapter of a book of John Schefferus, Profeſſor at Upſal, intituled, *De natura & conſtitutione Philoſophiæ Italicæ*, printed at Upſal in the year 1664, in 8vo.

[*I*] *The order he gave to abſtain from eating of beans.*] They who explain that prohibition in a literal ſenſe, alledge, amongſt other reaſons, that Pythagoras was inſtructed by the Egyptians, and even ſuffered himſelf to be circumciſed, that he might be admitted to their moſt ſecret myſteries. Δι' οὓς καὶ περιετέμετο, ἵνα δὴ καὶ εἰς τὰ ἄδυτα κατελθὼν, τὴν μυστικὴν παρ' Αἰγυπτίων ἐκμάθοι φιλοσοφίαν. *Propter quos* (Prophetas Ægyptios) *etiam fuit circumciſus, ut adyta ingrediens Ægyptiorum myſticam diſceret philoſophiam* (67). Now the Egyptians abſtained from beans: they ſowed none, and if they found any that had grown up without being ſown, they would not touch them (68). Their prieſts carried the ſuperſtition farther, they durſt not ſo much as look upon them, they accounted them unclean, and had rather choſen to eat the fleſh of their fathers. Θᾶττον ἂν τὰς κεφαλὰς φαγεῖν φασι τῶν πατέρων ἢ κυάμους. *Dicunt ſe parentum capita citius eſuros quam fabas* (69). From whence they conclude, that Pythagoras, who had been their diſciple, forbad the eating of beans in a literal ſenſe. Several grave authors among the ancients underſtood that prohibition ſo. Some ſay he choſe rather to be killed by thoſe that purſued him, than to make his eſcape thro' a field of beans (70), ſo great was his reſpect or abhorrence for that plant! I think Ariſtoxenus is the only author who ſays, that Pythagoras would eat them often. ‘ Ariſtoxenus muſicus vir litterarum veterum diligentiſſimus, Ariſtotelis philoſophi auditor, in libro, quem de Pythagora reliquit, nullo ſæpius legumento Pythagoram dicit uſum quàm fabis: quoniam is cibus & ſubduceret ſenſim alvum & lævigaret. Verba iſta Ariſtoxeni ſubſcripſi: Πυθαγόρας δὲ τῶν ὀσπρίων μάλιστα τὸν κύαμον ἐδοκίμασε λίαν κινητικόν τε γὰρ εἶναι, καὶ διαφορητικόν. διὸ καὶ μάλιστα κέχρηται αὐτῷ (71). - - - *The Muſician Ariſtoxenus, a great lover of ancient learning, and a diſciple of Ariſtotle, ſays in a book which he left concerning Pythagoras, that Pythagoras uſed to eat beans more often than any other kind of pulſe: becauſe that food gently purged and cleanſed the body. I am of the ſame opinion with Ariſtoxenus: for Pythagoras thought beans very proper to diſſolve and diſcuſs humours: and therefore uſed them moſt.*’ Our learned men do not much value the teſtimony of Ariſtoxenus; they believe he was miſtaken, and look upon that Pythagorean abſtinence as a certain matter of fact, and enquire into the reaſons of it. Ariſtotle gives four or five reaſons for it. He pretends that Pythagoras prohibited the eating of beans, either becauſe they are like certain parts, which I will not name, or becauſe they are like the gates of Hell, or becauſe they provoke luſt, or becauſe they reſemble the nature of the univerſe, or becauſe they were made uſe of in the election of magiſtrates (72). Thoſe who pretend that that prohibition was a moral precept, and that Pythagoras underſtood it only in an allegorical ſenſe, fancy that he forbad thereby his diſciples to meddle with the government. This is grounded upon the cuſtom of ſome cities, wherein every body gave his vote with beans, when they proceeded to the election of magiſtrates. Others think that he forbad the venereal pleaſure. Here is a paſſage of Aulus Gellius, taken from the chapter wherein the author alledges and approves the teſtimony of Ariſtoxenus. ‘ Videtur autem de κυάμῳ non eſitato cauſam erroris fuiſſe, quia in Empedocli carmine quo diſciplinas Pythagoræ ſecutus eſt, verſus hic invenitur:

Δειλοὶ, πάνδειλοι, κυάμων ἄπο χεῖρας ἔχεσθαι.

opinati enim ſunt plerique κύαμον legumentum vulgo dici. Sed qui diligentius anquiſitiuſque carmina Empedocli arbitrati ſunt, κυάμους hoc in loco teſticulos ſignificare dicunt; eoſque more Pythagoræ opertè atque ſymbolicè κυάμους appellatos, quia ſint εἰς τὸ κυεῖν δεινοὶ καὶ αἴτιοι τοῦ κυεῖν; & genituræ humanæ vim præbeant, iccircoque in Empedocli verſu iſto non à fabulo edendo, ſed à rei venereæ proluvio voluiſſe homines deducere (73). - - - *The precept about not eating the* κύαμος *ſeems to have been the foundation of an error, becauſe in a verſe of Empedocles, who followed the doctrines of Pythagoras, the word* κύαμοι *is taken by many for beans. But thoſe, who have more carefully examined the Poem of Empedocles, ſay that it ſignifies the teſticles in that place: which after the manner of Pythagoras are figuratively* travelled in ſo many places as he did (*e*). He is looked upon, by ſome, as a great Magician [*K*]: we ſhall ſee upon what grounds. I ſhall alſo obſerve that Naudæus clears

---

(62) Val. Max. *lib. viii, cap. xv, num.* 1, *in extern.*

(63) Plurimis & opulentiſſimis urbibus effectus ſuorum ſtudiorum approbavit. *Ibid. cap. vii, num.* 2, *extern.*

(64) In the article EPICURUS, remark [*L*].

(65) Dem. Evangel. Prop. IV, *cap. ii, num.* 8, *pag.* 89, *Edit. Lipſ.* 1694. *See alſo Marſham's* Chron. Can. Ægyptiac. Sæc. XI, *pag. m.* 277, 278.

(66) Plut. de Placit. *lib. i, cap. iii, pag.* 877, *A.*

(67) Clem. Alexandr. Strom. *lib. i, pag.* 302.

(68) Herod. lib. ii, cap. xxxvii.

(69) Sextus Empiricus, Pyrrhonic. Hypotypoſ. *lib. iii, pag.* 156. *See alſo St Chryſoſtom.* Hom. II, in Joann.

(70) See the remark [*P*], citation (128).

(71) Aul. Gell. *lib. iv, cap. xi, pag. m.* 131.

(72) Ariſt. in Libro de Fabis, ap. Diog. Laërt. in Pythagora, *lib. viii, num.* 34.

(73) Aul. Gell. ubi ſupra.

‘ *guratively ſo called, from* κυεῖν, *becauſe they produce conception, and give a force in generation; and therefore in that verſe of Empedocles, men are not forbid the eating of beans, but the immoderate uſe of venery.*’ Mauro in a Poem, wherein under the name *della Fava* he denotes ſomething that is laſcivious (74), joins together the opinion of Ariſtoxenus, and that which is contrary to it. He pretends that Pythagoras prohibited the uſe of beans, that is to ſay, venereal pleaſures; and nevertheleſs that there was no food which he uſed more frequently than that: he forbad others what he himſelf practiſed; and if we believe Mauro ſuch a conduct is very common.

Non fè Natura mai coſa sì ghiotta,
Che ſenza quaſi romperla co i denti
Pare, ch'ogni perſona ſe la inghiotta.
Furon certi Filoſofi prudenti,
De' quali fu Pitagora il maeſtro,
Che vietava la Fava a quelle genti.
Eran ribaldi, e ladri da capeſtro.
Che ingannavan con arte gli ignoranti.
E poi ſe ne mangiavano un caneſtro.
Così fanno hoggi certi mormoranti,
Che ogni perſona ſepeliſcon viva,
Chiamando Amore, Venere i furfanti.
Riprendono in altrui la vita attiva,
Et eſſi ogn'hor di veſpro, e di mattino
Hanno in uſo l'attiva, e la paſſiva.
Così Maometto già per torre il vino,
Seppe perſuader provincie, e regni
Co'l ſuo ſottile ingegno, e diavolino.
Gli parue, che i plebei non foſſer degni
Di quel liquore, e così ſempre al mondo
Sovra la forza ſon ſtati gl'ingegni.
Pitagora, c'havea peſcato al fondo,
E de le coſe la ragion ſapea,
Ogni gran ſavio fea parer ſecondo.
E de le Fave nemico parea,
Ma ſe ne confortava il guſto, e'l tatto,
E d'altra coſa quaſi non vivea (75).

Cicero intimates, that the prohibition of beans was grounded upon their hindering men from dreaming divinatory dreams; for they heat too much, and by that irritation of the ſpirits they ſuffer not the ſoul to enjoy that quietneſs which is neceſſary for the ſearch of truth. ‘ Ex eadem item opinione M. Cicero in libro de divinatione primo, hæc verba poſuit; *Jubet igitur Plato ſic ad ſomnum proficiſci corporibus affectis, ut nihil ſit quod errorem animis perturbationemque afferat. Ex quo etiam Pythagoreis interdictum putatur, ne faba veſcerentur; quod habet inflationem magnam is cibus tranquillitatem mentis quærentibus contrariam* (76). Hæc quidem M. Cicero (77). - - - *According to the ſame opinion, Cicero in the firſt book of Divination has theſe words:* Therefore Plato adviſes that one ſhould go to ſleep in ſuch a diſpoſition of body, that nothing may occaſion error or diſturbance to the mind. And for the ſame reaſon, it is thought the Pythagoreans were forbid to eat beans, becauſe that ſort of food is extremely apt to breed wind, and to diſcompoſe the ſpirits.’ The learned Windet has inquired more learnedly than any body elſe into the reaſons of that abſtinence: he lays the greateſt ſtreſs upon the gates of Hell. We have ſeen that one of Pythagoras's reaſons was taken from the reſemblance between beans and thoſe gates. Windet does not approve the opinion of thoſe who ſay, that by κύαμος, Pythagoras underſtood a woman's breaſt, or the teſticles (78). He ſticks to the literal ſenſe, but he owns that beans were forbidden out of a principle of chaſtity. What he ſays is full of exquiſite learning: he ſhews, that in the opinion of Pythagoras, to deſcend into Hell, ſignified to be begotten, and denoted only the change which a ſoul undergoes when it comes out of the upper regions, to be united with an organized body upon earth. *Cum autem* ᾅδης (localiter) ſit regio naturæ corruptibilis, *hinc* Pythagoricis *animæ cæleſte ſolum vertentes atque* ἰοῦσαι εἰς γένεσιν *dicuntur etiam* κατελθεῖν εἰς ᾅδου (79). He ſhews, that beans having no knots in their ſtalks, reſemble the gates of Hell, through which the ſouls have always a free entrance, in order to generation. He adds, that Pythagoras conſidering this life as a kind of death or baniſhment, endeavoured to perſuade men not to beget children, but to return to the heavenly places (80). *Atque in eo* Portæ Inferni *ſimilis eſt* Faba, διὰ τὸ ἀγόνατον εἶναι, quod genuum expers ſit, *ut loquitur* Ariſtoteles (81), *vel* διὰ τὸ δι᾽ ὅλου τετρῆσθαι, καὶ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι, ταῖς μεταξὺ τῶν γονάτων ἐμφράξεσιν, *id eſt*, propterea quod penitus perforetur, nec articulorum ſive geniculorum obicibus intercipiatur: *perinde* ac porta inferni nunquam oppeſſulata animabus εἰς γένεσιν κατιούσαις in generationem deſcendentibus perpetuo patet. Pythagoras *ergo* Fabas vetando, cavit à generatione continua ac perpetua; *inſinuans ſuis, ſatiùs fuiſſe pollutum corruptibilis hujuſce regionis hoſpitium nunquam intrâſſe, ſed quando id integrum jam non fuerit, ſaltem ut admiſſi quàm primùm* generationem ſiſtant, *atque ad ſuperiora redire nitantur.* He refutes thoſe, who believe that the diſciples of Pythagoras were forbidden to eat beans, becauſe they are unclean food; and he ſays that it was for ſome holy and myſterious reaſons, which they kept to themſelves. *Nimis autem populariter dictum eſt* Ægyptios & Pheneatas *ipſumque* Pythagoram Fabas *utpote* immundas *adſpernatos: cùm revera non ob* immunditiem *ſed* ob ſacras rationes *abſtinuerint* (82). Some of them choſe to die rather than to reveal ſo great a ſecret. A Pythagorean woman cut out her tongue, leſt the ſeverity of the torments ſhould force her to ſpeak (83). ‘ Ipſum autem *Pythagoram* ferunt ſe vita potiùs ſpoliandum perſequentibus ultrò ſtitiſſe, quam per *Fabetum* fuga ſibi conſulere voluiſſe. *Jamblichus* decem, *Suidas* quinquaginta *Pythagoreis* itidem factum memorat. *Millias Crotoniata* mori maluit, quàm *Dionyſio* cauſas exponere propter quas *Pythagorei Fabis* abſtinerent. Perinde etiam eſt quod de ipſo *Pythagora* refert *Suidas*. *Milliæ* uxor *Timycha*, in ſimilem quæſtionem veniens, ſuam ſibi linguam præmordit, ne, tormentis victa, cogeretur τῶν ἐχεμυθουμένων τι ἀνακαλύψαι, *arcanorum quidpiam detegere*, referente *Jamblicho* (84). - - - *They ſay that Pythagoras himſelf choſe rather to be killed by thoſe that purſued him, than to make his eſcape through a field of beans. Jamblichus tells that ten, and Suidas that fifty Pythagoreans did the ſame thing: Millias of Crotona would rather die than declare to Dionyſius the reaſons, why the Pythagoreans abſtained from beans: This Suidas relates of Pythagoras himſelf. Timycha, the wife of Millias, being put to the ſame trial, bit off her tongue, leſt the ſeverity of the torments ſhould force her to diſcover any ſecret, as Jamblichus relates it.*’ Menagius quotes a paſſage taken from the life of St Artemius, which ſays that Theano, a ſcholar and wife of Pythagoras, refuſing to tell the reaſon why they abſtained from beans, was put to death; but her tongue was cut off, before ſhe was put to death. Θεανὼ δὲ, ἡ τούτου γαμετὴ καὶ μαθήτεια, μὴ θέλουσα τὴν αἰτίαν κατειπεῖν, δι᾽ ἣν τὸν κύαμον οὐκ ἐσθίουσι, τὴν γλῶτταν ἐκτμηθεῖσα πρότερον, καὶ αὐτὴ προαπόλλυται, &c (85).

I ſhall obſerve by the by, that the *Schola Salernitana* in the edition of Renatus Moreau, forbids to eat beans; ‘ Manducare fabam caveas, facit illa podagram. - - - ‘ *See that you abſtain from beans: they breed the gout.*’ The learned and large collections which that Phyſician has publiſhed on that precept, deſerve to be conſulted. They contain a great many remarks which concern Pythagoras.

[*K*] *He is looked upon as a great Magician.*] I ſhall quote a paſſage out of the apology for great men accuſed of Magic. *He was looked upon as a ſorcerer and an enchanter, becauſe, firſt, he made a long ſtay in Egypt, and read the books of Zoroaſter, wherein he learned, as one may imagine, the properties of certain herbs, which he called* Coraceſia, Callicia, Menais, Corinthas, *and* Aproxis, *the two firſt whereof turned water into ice, when they were put into it, the two next were an excellent remedy againſt the biting of ſerpents, and the laſt would*

(*e*) *See* Apul. in Florid.

(74) See the article MOLZA, remark [*D*].

(75) Mauro, Capitolo in lode della Fava, *fol.* 76, *verſo, in a collection of* Rime Piaccevoli, *printed at Vicenza* 1603.

(76) *There is in Tully*, inflationem magnam is cibus tranquillitati mentis quærenti vera contrariam. *Aul. Gellius muſt needs have quoted thoſe words without book. See* Philip. Caroli, Animadverſ. in A. Gell. *pag. m.* 266, 267.

(77) Aul. Gell. ubi ſupra.

(78) Eſt qui nixus parum firmo tibicine de papillis muliebribus intellexit; alii teſtes operte ſignificari volunt, alii, alia quæ parumper attinet deſpicere. *Ja. Windet, de Vita functorum ſtatu, pag.* 79, *Edit. Lond.* 1677.

(79) Ib. p. 106.

(80) Ibid. *pag.* 110, 111.

(81) Apud Diog. Laërt. *lib. viii, num.* 34. Ἢ ὅτι ᾅδου πύλαις· ἀγόνατον γὰρ μόνον. Sive quod inferni januis (*ſimiles ſunt fabæ*) ſolæ enim geniculatæ non ſunt.

(82) Windet, ibid. *pag.* 81.

(83) Compare with this what the courtezan Leæna did at Athens. *Plin. lib. xxxiv, cap. viii, pag. m.* 122. Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 596. Pauſan. *lib. i, pag.* 41, *and* Polyen. *lib. viii, ſpeak of it. See Father* Bouhours, Entretien du Secret, *pag. m.* 197, 198.

(84) Id. Windet. ibid. *pag.* 84.

(85) Vita Sancti Artemii in codice MS Bibliothecæ Colbertinæ, *num.* 82, *pag.* 48, apud Menagium notis in Diogen. Laërt. *lib. viii, num.* 50, *pag.* 378.

clears him from that accuſation [*L*]. I might obſerve a great many other things; but I muſt

*would be kindled of a ſudden at any diſtance from the fire. Likewiſe in one of his ſymbols he expreſly forbad the uſe of beans, which according to the ſame ſuperſtition he boiled and expoſed to the moon for ſome nights, till by a great power of Magic they turned into blood; which perhaps ſerved him to do that other trick mentioned by Cœlius Rhodiginus * after Suidas and the interpreter of Ariſtophanes in the comedy of the Clouds, who ſay, that that Philoſopher uſed to write with blood upon a looking-glaſs, any thing that he had a mind to, and holding thoſe letters againſt the face of the moon when it was at full, he ſaw in that planet every thing he had written upon his looking-glaſs. To which may be added, that he appeared at the Olympic games with a golden thigh, that he was ſaluted by the river Neſſus, that he ſtopped an eagle that was flying, tamed a ſhe-bear, killed a ſerpent, and drove away an ox which ſpoiled a field of beans, only by the virtue of ſome words. Beſides, he was ſeen the very ſame day, and at the ſame hour in the cities of Crotona and Metapontum, and uſed to foretel things to come with ſo great a confidence, that many are of opinion he was named Pythagoras, becauſe the anſwers he gave were not leſs certain and true than thoſe of Apollo Pythius.* Thus far Naudæus in the xvth chap. page 215 of his apology for great men. He tells us, page 214, that what he has ſaid may be collected out of *Jamblichus, Pliny, Tertullian, Origen, St Auguſtin, Ammianus Marcellinus*, the Jeſuit *Delrio*, and *Boiſſardus*.

[*L*] *Naudeus clears him from this accuſation.*] See his Apology for great Men: I ſhall only tranſcribe the following words. ‘The proofs which are grounded upon that Philoſopher's prohibiting the uſe of beans, and his way of turning their juice into blood, may be as eaſily refuted as the foregoing, ſince Reuchlin deſpiſes, with great reaſon, all the fooleries which many crack-brained and fantaſtical men have invented about that prohibition, ſuch as that of Hermippus in Diogenes, who believed that Pythagoras choſe to be killed near a field of beans, rather than go through it to eſcape from his enemies; and if it be true that he forbad them, he did it for no other reaſon than the firſt out of the five, which Mr Moreau ** gives for it in the above-mentioned place of his commentary on the *Schola Salernitana* (86). . . . In like manner it may be ſaid, that there was nothing extraordinary in his converting beans into blood; for Mr Moreau very clearly ſhews in the ſaid commentary, that, according to the principle of Chymiſts, who reckon ſimilitude and reſemblance as cauſes of actions, it is a thing that may be done and explained by natural principles: but there is no need to believe that Pythagoras made uſe of that elixir of beans, or human blood, to write upon his looking-glaſs: for beſides that, he could have no reaſon to uſe blood rather than any other liquor, Campanella † proves, with very ſolid reaſons, that ſuch an operation is altogether impoſſible; and when Agrippa ⸸ boaſted that he had that ſecret, and Natalis Comes ‡ wrote that in the time of Francis I, and Charles V, they knew at Paris, in the night, every thing that paſſed at Milan in the day; the former ſaid ſo only to commend himſelf, and to be cried up, as we ſhall ſhew more fully in his chapter, and what the latter ſays is a meer fable and lie, contrived by thoſe who had a mind to add Magic to the arms of thoſe two great princes (87), as we are told that Ninus and Zoroaſter, Pyrrhus and Crœſus, Nectanebus and Philip of Macedon formerly did. From whence we may judge, that all that is ſaid of Pythagoras's looking-glaſs is as falſly aſcribed to him, as the ſuperſtitious Arithmetic, and the wheel of Onomancy, or that if he practiſed it any time, it was doubtleſs ſome trick, preſtige, and ſubtilty; and to conclude with Suidas, παίγνιον διὰ κατόπτρου (88), *a trick with a looking-glaſs*. It would be needleſs to inſiſt any longer upon his killing, with the muttering of ſome words, a ſerpent which waſted the country of Italy, becauſe Boiſſardus, who alledges Ariſtotle for it, does not quote the book out of which he had it, and if any one will more narrowly enquire into the truth of that ſtory, it will be found to be altogether falſe, being founded only upon the ignorance of thoſe who change Socrates into Pythagoras, and take, as a true hiſtory, the fable concerning the former, which may be read in a book of the Cauſes and Properties of the Elements, which Patricius ſhews †† to have been falſly aſcribed to Ariſtotle. But that inadvertency of Boiſſardus might be eaſily excuſed, had he not committed another much worſe, and more remarkable, when he quotes Plutarch in the life of Numa, to give credit to the hiſtory of the ox, which Pythagoras ⸸⸸ drove out of a field of beans, after he had whiſpered ſomething in his ear. He had better have confeſſed that he had it from Cœlius Rhodiginus, who does indeed quote Plutarch in the beginning of his chapter, but upon a ſubject different from that ſtory, of which he never made any mention (89).’

I believe the reader will be glad to find here the Greek words of Ariſtophanes's Scholiaſt, corrected by the learned Meziriac. *I ſhall conclude this diſcourſe*, ſays he (90), *with a pretty remark which is made by the Scholiaſt on Ariſtophanes's comedy of the Clouds, and by Suidas, upon theſe words*, Θετταλὴ γυνὴ *concerning a Magical operation relating to the Moon. Theſe are the words of the ſcholiaſt.* Ἔϛι δὲ καὶ Πυθαγόρου παίγνιον διὰ τοῦ κατόπτρου ποιοῦτο. πληροσελήνου τῆς σελήνης οὔσης, εἴτις ἔσοπτρον ἐπιγράψειεν αἵματι ὅσα βούλεται, καὶ προειπὼν ἑτέρῳ, ϛαίη κατόπιν αὐτοῦ, δεικνὺς πρὸς τὴν σελήνην τὰ γράμματα, κἀκεῖνος ἀτενίσειεν ὁ πλησίον εἰς τὸν τῆς σελήνης κύκλον, ἀναγνοίη πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ κατόπτρῳ γεγραμμένα, ὡς ἐπὶ τῆς σελήνης γεγραμμένα. There is a trick of Pythagoras's invention, which is performed with a looking-glas in this manner. The moon being at full, ſome body writes on a looking-glaſs any thing that he has a mind to with blood, and having given notice of it to another perſon, he ſtands behind him, and turns towards the moon the letters written in the looking-glaſs, and the other looking fixedly on the orb of the moon, reads in it all that is written on the looking-glaſs, as if it were written on the moon. *I have corrected two faults in that paſſage, reading* πληροσελήνου *inſtead of* προσελήνου, *according to the opinion of the learned Meurſius, in his book concerning the Grecian games, who had this correction from Suidas; and reading alſo* ἀτενίσειεν *inſtead of* ἀτενίσαι. *As for Suidas, it ſeems that he only tranſcribed that paſſage word for word; but there are many faults in all the printed books of that author.* You will find the correction of thoſe faults in Meziriac. Conſult the remarks on the *Berger Extravagant* (91). The impertinent ſtory of *Natalis Comes* (92) has crept into many books: ſo true it is, that any one who prints hearſays, does the public wrong. There are but too many authors who will adopt it one after another. Becauſe the fryar, St Romauld, inſerted that ſtory in his Chronological Treaſure, Father l'Enfant has inſerted it in his general hiſtory of all the centuries of the new law. *The manner*, ſays he (93), *how to know what paſſes abroad, without magic: write thoſe things in large letters upon a looking-glaſs, and hold it againſt the moon, and the ſame things will be read in another looking-glaſs wherein the moon is to be ſeen. Thus Francis I, being at war with Charles V for the duchy of Milan, it was known the next night at Paris* (94). If ſuch things were related to be laughed at, one might avoid being cenſured for it. Thus John Leo relates a fable, which was current in Egypt. *Among the Ptolemies*, ſays he (95), *there was one formerly king of Alexandria, who, for the ſecurity of the city, and to make it impregnable, and put it in a condition of avoiding, without any danger, the aſſaults of the enemy, cauſed a column to be erected, and a ſteel looking-glaſs to be ſet on the top of it, which had ſuch a virtue, that all the ſhips of the enemies that ſailed by that column (the looking-glaſs being uncovered) were miraculouſly ſet on fire, which is the only reaſon why he cauſed it to be erected in that manner, in the mouth of the port. But it is ſaid that the Mahometans ſpoiled the looking-glaſs at their arrival, whereby it loſt that virtue, no leſs admirable than unuſual, and then they carried the column away. But this is a ridiculous ſtory, and only fit for children, and not for thoſe who have any judgment.* Add to this what I have ſaid in the remark [*L*], of the article HERCULES, and theſe words of William Bouchet: *That woman's looking-glaſs muſt needs have been enchanted, and full of diabolical magic of Toledo, ſince the inhabitants of Rhodes could* muſt be ſhort, and I avoid every thing that may be found in Moreri. Nevertheleſs, though he ſpeaks of the Metempſychoſis, I ſhall ſay ſomething of it [*M*]. I think it was

---

* *Lib. ix, cap. xxiii.*

** *Cap. xix.*

(86) Naudæus, Apology for Great Men accuſed of Magic, *pag.* 225, 226.

† *Lib iv, de ſenſu, cap. xvi.*

⸸ *Lib. i, de occult. Philoſoph. cap. vi.*

‡ *Lib. iii, cap. xvii, Mytholog.*

(87) See the article FRANCIS I, remark [*X*].

(88) Naud. ibid. *pag.* 226, 227.

†† *Diſcuſſion Peripat. Tom. i, lib. iii.*

⸸⸸ *Lib. xix, cap. vii.*

(89) Naudæus, ibid. *pag.* 237.

FABULOUS ſtories about looking-glaſſes.

(90) Meziriac, upon Ovid's Epiſtles, *pag.* 607, 608.

(91) Upon the 7th book, *pag.* 321.

(92) See his Mythologie, *lib. iii, ch. xvii, pag. m.* 253.

(93) David l'Enfant, a Dominican, Hiſt. Générale de tous les Siecles, *on the* 21*ſt of June, pag.* 347. *He quotes* Treſor, Chronol. *pag.* 519, *Tom. i.*

(94) See, below, remark [*Q*].

(95) Deſcript. of Africa, *fol.* 358, *Antwerp* 1556.

ſee the ſhips that ſailed into Syria or Eygpt in a looking-glaſs, which hung at the ſun's neck upon their Coloſſus (96).

The ſtory of Noſtradamus's looking-glaſſes is not better than the foregoing. It is ſaid that he ſaw in ſome Taliſmanic looking-glaſſes, things to come, which he ſo happily foretold, as it is pretended. ‘Fuit, qui narravit, ſpeculis quibuſdam Aſtrologicis Noſtradamum ad has prædictiones uſum. Nam qui arcaniora Phyſica & Aſtrologica cognita habent, ajunt è metallis, tanquam Planetis terreſtribus, eâdem configuratione, qua Planetæ in Thematibus Natalitiis ponuntur, ſub certis conſtellationibus ſpecula fieri poſſe, in quibus futura cernantur. Talia ſpecula non pro hominibus tantum, ſed & nationibus, urbibus, ſeculis, ut illi ajunt, fabricari poſſunt (97). ---- *It was ſaid that Noſtradamus made uſe of certain Aſtrological looking-glaſſes in foretelling thoſe things. For ſuch as underſtand the greateſt Phyſical and Aſtrological ſecrets, ſay, that future things may be diſcerned in looking-glaſſes, which may be made of metals under certain conſtellations, like terreſtrial planets, with the ſame configuration as planets in erecting nativities. Such looking-glaſſes, they ſay, may be made not only for particular perſons, but for nations, cities, and ages*’ (§ α).

[(§ α) In a ſatire againſt the Jeſuits, intituled, *De ſtudiis abſtruſioribus Jeſuitarum*, it is reported, ‘That Father Cotton ſhewed the king (Henry the Great) in an Aſtrological looking-glaſs, whatever paſſed in the courts and cabinets of all the princes of the world *’: and the Jeſuit who informs me of this, takes too much pains in refuting that ſtory. Nicholas Paſquier relates juſt ſuch another: and note, that he does not do it by way of ridicule, but tells it in the moſt ſerious manner that can be, in a letter full of *prognoſtications, which preceded the death of Henry the Great*. I ſhall ſubſcribe it here ſo much the more willingly, as it is one of the moſt circumſtantiated of that kind, and conſequently the moſt proper to ſhew the ridiculouſneſs of them. ‘The late queen dowager (Catherine de Medicis) *(ſays Paſquier)* † deſirous to know whether all her children ſhould be kings, a Magician in the caſtle of Chaulmont, which is ſituated on the bank of the river Loire between Blois and Amboiſe, ſhewed her in a hall, round a circle which he had drawn, all that had been, or ſhould be, kings of France, who took ſo many turns round the circle, according to the number of years they had reigned, or ſhould reign: and as ſoon as Henry the third had walked fifteen rounds, the late king begins the race, briſk and nimble; he took twenty turns entire, and going to finiſh the twenty-firſt, he ſuddenly diſappeared. After him came a young prince, between eight and nine years of age, who went thirty-ſeven, or thirty-eight, times round; and then all things became inviſible, becauſe the late queen dowager would ſee no more of it.’ Obſerve, that his pretended enchantment grows lame as ſoon as it enters upon the future. He ſays very well, that Henry the third took fifteen turns, and that Henry the fourth took twenty, and diſappeared in the twenty-firſt, becauſe he wrote after the event happened ‡; but when he ſpeaks of the reign of Lewis XIII, he loſes his way. He makes him go thirty-ſeven or thirty-eight rounds; which ſhould have brought him down to the year 1647, or 1648: whereas every body knows he went no farther than the year 1643. The author of a ſmall libel, intituled, *Remarks upon the Government of the kingdom during the reigns of Henry IV, Lewis XIII, and Lewis XIV*, printed at Cologn, for Peter Marteau, in 1688, in 12mo, has turned that ſtory in this manner. *It is ſaid, that Catherine de Medicis likewiſe made uſe of the enchantments of her diviners, to know the ſucceſſors of her ſon: and that by means of a looking-glaſs they made thoſe to appear to her, who were to reign after the extinction of the houſe of Valois. The firſt that appeared was Henry IV, but ſhe conceived an implacable hatred and averſion to this prince, conſtantly endeavouring, after this ſight, to deſtroy him by all the artifices imaginable.* Notumque furens quid fœmina poſſit. *It is well known what a woman's rage can do; and that there is nothing ſhe will ſtick at to attain her ends. But GOD delivered this monarch from all her ſnares. After Henry IV, the looking-glaſs preſented to her Lewis XIII, and Lewis XIV, with a majeſtic ſtature and gate. And then there appeared in the looking-glaſs a company of Jeſuits, who were in their turn, to be maſters of France. She refuſed to ſee any more, and was even upon the point of breaking the looking-glaſs: but however, it was preſerved, and many affirm that it is ſtill in the Louvre* ‡. It is very evident, this account is only a copy reviſed and enlarged, from that of Nicolas Paſquier; but ſee with what impudence they have falſified it. I. Henry IV is made to appear the firſt, whereas Paſquier makes all his predeceſſors to appear before him. II. They bring down to Lewis XIV, and further, what he had carried only to Lewis XIII. III. They inſinuate, that it happened at the Louvre, but he ſays that it was at Chaumont upon the Loire. IV. They talk of a looking-glaſs, and he ſpeaks only of a circle. V. They ſay this looking-glaſs is preſerved, and that it is affirmed to be ſtill in the Louvre. VI. They pretend that Catherine de Medicis would have broke the glaſs; but Paſquier ſays, ſhe only refuſed to ſee any thing more. I ſhall ſay nothing of that reflexion, ſo ingeniouſly placed, and which is contradicted in the ſame breath: nor of that fine prediction in favour of the Jeſuits, the falſity of which we now ſee ſo plainly; nor of that which is ſo ridiculouſly aſſerted, touching the cauſe of the hatred of Catherine de Medicis to Henry IV: it is well known ſhe had other reaſons not to love him. It will be thought, perhaps, that I have inſiſted too long on ſuch trifles: but it is not ſo needleſs as ſome may imagine to refute thoſe kinds of traditions, and to ſhew the progreſs of them; ſince we ſee every day perſons credulous enough to admit them, and to publiſh them without ſhame. How many people are there, for inſtance, who have read the laſt of theſe accounts without knowing, and without ſuſpecting that it was only an embelliſhment of that of Paſquier? Such is the deſtiny of that ſort of traditions: they increaſe with time: one may very well apply to them the *Vires acquirit eundo*. --- *A tale loſes nothing by the telling.* REM. CRIT.]

[*M*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of the Metempſychoſis.*] They ſay that Pythagoras bragged of a ſpecial privilege about it; for he boaſted that he could remember in what bodies he had been before he was Pythagoras. But he went no farther back than the age of the city of Troy, he had been firſt Æthalides, who was reputed the ſon of Mercury, and it being in his choice to demand of that god whatever he would, he begged of him that he might remember every thing after his death. Some time after he was Euphorbus, and was wounded by Menelaus at the ſiege of Troy. After the death of Euphorbus, he was Hermotimus, and then a Fiſherman at Delos named Pyrrhus, and at laſt Pythagoras, a man who remembred all thoſe tranſmigrations, and what he had ſuffered in Hell, and what other ſouls ſuffer there (98). Here is a litttle contradiction (99); for if the ſouls of men go from one body into another, they do not go to Hell. Our Philoſopher, according to Ovid, goes no higher than Euphorbus:

Morte carent animæ, ſemperque priore relictâ
Sede, novis domibus vivunt, habitantque receptæ.
Ipſe ego (nam memini) Trojani tempore belli
Panthoïdes Euphorbus eram: cui pectore quondam
Hæſit in adverſo gravis haſta minoris Atridæ.
Cognovi clypeum lævæ geſtamina noſtræ
Nuper Abantæis, templo Junonis, in Argis (100).

Nor dies the ſpirit, but new life repeats
In other forms and only changes ſeats.
In Trojan wars, (for I the fact retain).
Euphorbus, I, Panthous' ſon, was ſlain
By Menelaus . . . . at Argos I beheld
In Juno's Fane and knew my former ſhield.

O happy memory, ſays Lactantius very pleaſantly. ‘O miram, & ſingularem Pythagoræ memoriam. O miſeram oblivionem noſtrum omnium, qui neſciamus, qui ante fuerimus; ſed fortaſſe vel errore aliquo, vel gratia ſit effectum, ut ille ſolus lethæum gurgi- tem

---

(96) Will. Bouchet, Serée XIX, *pag. m.* 171, 172.

(97) Morhofius, Polyhiſt. *lib. i, cap. x, pag.* 96.

* Reſponſ. Apologet. à l'Anti-Coton, *pag.* 141.

† Lettres de Nicolas Paſquier, *pag.* 10.

‡ His book was publiſhed in 1623. His letter is without date. But it appears, it was writ a few days after the death of Henry IV.

‡ Remarques ſur le Gouvernment du Roiaume, &c. *pag.* 15, 16.

(98) Ex Heraclide Pontico, ap. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 4, & 5.

(99) Compare this with what has been ſaid above, towards the end of the remark [*F*].

(100) Ovid. Metam. lib. xv, ver. 158.

was by reaſon of this opinion that he diſapproved the ſacrificing of beaſts, and it is obſerved that he adored an altar on which no ſacrifice had ever been offered, that he adored it, I ſay, as a place which had never been profaned or polluted [*N*]. I have not mentioned the native country of Pythagoras, becauſe there are ſeveral opinions about it; ſome ſay he was a Tyrrhenian, others a Syrian, others affirm that he was born in the iſle of Samos, others, in the iſle of Cephalonia (*f*), &c (*g*). The Heathen Philoſophers never ſaid any thing finer, than what he ſaid concerning God, and the end of all our actions [*O*]; and it is likely that he had carried his Orthodoxy much farther, had

tem non attigerit, nec oblivionis aquam guſtaverit. Videlicet ſenex vanus (ſicut ocioſæ aniculæ ſolent) fabulas tanquam infantibus credulis finxit. Quòd ſi benè ſenſiſſet de iis, quibus hæc locutus eſt, ſi homines eos exiſtimaſſet, nunquam ſibi tam petulanter mentiendi licentiam vendicaſſet. Sed deridenda hominis leviſſimi vanitas (101). - - - - *O rare memory of Pythagoras. O our wretched forgetfulneſs, who know nothing of our pre-exiſtence: but perhaps it happened by ſome particular miſtake, or favour, that he only never touched the river of Lethe, nor taſted the waters of oblivion. The vain old man forſooth (as idle old women uſe to do) invented thoſe ſtories as if he were talking to credulous children. Had he judged rightly of thoſe to whom he told them, had he looked upon them as men, he would never have been ſo bold as to forge ſuch lies. But his ridiculous vanity deſerves contempt.*’ Lactantius ſhould have known that Pythagoras aſcribed his memory to the favour of the gods; he might have read it in Heraclides; and it will be ſaid, that without this one might eaſily fancy, that Pythagoras prevented the objection which other men would raiſe againſt him, becauſe they did not remember any pre-exiſtence. I anſwer to that objection, that in ſome reſpects it is not likely he would have been ſo bold as to boaſt of ſuch a thing: otherwiſe his contempt of other men, as Lactantius obſerves, had been very great; but if we conſider the thing another way, we ſhall find nothing in it that is againſt likelihood. He had acquired ſo great a reputation and made ſo many experiments of the blind docility and great credulity of his hearers, that he might eaſily flatter himſelf, that what he ſhould ſay concerning his memory would not be diſbelieved. If you deſire to know his ſeveral tranſmigrations ſince the death of Pythagoras, you need but read the following words, and you will ſee that he was a courtezan at the third change. ‘Pythagoram verò ipſum ſicuti celebre eſt Euphorbum primo ſe fuiſſe dictitaſſe; ita hæc remotiora ſunt his, quæ Clearchus & Dicæarchus memoriæ tradiderunt, fuiſſe eum poſtea Pyrandrum, deinde Callicleam, deinde feminam pulchra facie meretricem, cui nomen fuerat Alce (102). - - - - *But as it is well known that Pythagoras himſelf ſaid he was at firſt Euphorbus: ſo afterwarwards, according to Clearchus and Dicæarchus, he became Pyrander, then Callicleas, and after that a beautiful whore called Alce.*’ As for the reſt, he invented not the Metempſychoſis: he learned it of the Egyptians (103), which made him ſpoil the fine doctrine he had heard of Pherecydes, about the immortality of the ſoul, wherewith he had been ſo moved, that he gave over the trade of an Athlete, or wreſtler, all of a ſudden, to ſtudy Philoſophy. ‘Quis nunc extremus idiota, vel quæ abjecta muliercula non credit animæ immortalitatem, vitamque poſt mortem futuram? Quod apud Græcos olim primus Pherecydes Aſſyrius cum diſputaſſet, Pythagoram Samium illius diſputationis novitate permotum ex athleta in Philoſophum vertit (104). - - - *What man is now ſo ſtupid, or what woman ſo ſilly, as not to believe the immortality of the ſoul, and a future ſtate? When Pherecydes, the Aſſyrian, firſt diſcourſed on this ſubject among the Grecians, Pythagoras, the Samian, was ſo moved with it, that of an Athlete he turned Philoſopher.*’

[*N*] *It is obſerved that he adored an altar . . . as a place which had never been profaned or polluted.*] It was an altar conſecrated to Apollo in the iſle of Delos. Read theſe words of Macrobius (105). ‘Conſtat, ſicut Cloatius Verus ordinatorum libro ſecundo docet, eſſe Deli aram; apud quam hoſtia non cæditur, ſed tantum ſolemni deum prece venerantur: verba Cloatii hæc ſunt. *Deli ara eſt Apollinis* Γενήτορος *in qua nullum animal ſacrificatur, quam Pythagoram quaſi inviolatam adoraviſſe produnt* . . . . Meminit hujus aræ & Cato de liberis educandis in hæc verba: *Nutrix hæc omnia faciebat, in verbenis & tubis ſine hoſtia, ut Deli ad Apollinis Genitivi Aram.* - - - - - - *It is certain, according to Cloatius Verus, that there is an altar at Delos where no victim is ſlain, but the god is worſhipped only by ſolemn prayer: the words of Cloatius are theſe.* At Delos is the altar of Apollo, upon which no animal is ſacrificed, which Pythagoras is ſaid to have adored as being unpolluted. . . . *Cato, in his treatiſe on education, thus ſpeaks of that altar:* The nurſe did all theſe things, with vervain and pipes, without *ſacrifice*, as at the altar of Apollo in Delos.’

[*O*] *The Heathen Philoſophers never ſaid any thing finer than what he ſaid concerning God, and the end of all our actions.*] He acknowledged the unity of God; for he ſaid that unity was the principle of all things, and that out of it came the ſubject it made uſe of as it's matter, and that out of it's action upon that matter came out numbers, figures, elements, the viſible world, *&c.* Ἀρχὴν μὲν τῶν ἁπάντων, μονάδα· ἐκ δὲ τῆς μονάδος ἀόριστον δυάδα, ὡς ἂν ὕλην τῇ μονάδι αἰτίῳ ὄντι ὑποστῆναι, &c. (106). *Omnium rerum id quod unum eſt, eſſe initium; ex eo geminum quod infinitum eſt, profectum tanquam materiem illi ipſi uni, quod cauſa eſt, ſubjectum eſſe, &c* (107). He ſaid, that that unity was God, the good, the underſtanding, the mind. Τὴν μὲν μονάδα θεὸν, καὶ τἀγαθὸν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ ἑνὸς φύσις, αὐτὸς ὁ νοῦς. *Unitatem Deum ac bonum quæ ſit Unius natura, ipſa mens* (108). Caſaubon, the ſon (109), alledges a paſſage out of Stobæus which ought to be mended. Πυθαγόρας τῶν ἀρχῶν τὴν μὲν μονάδα θεὸν καὶ τ᾽ ἀγαθον. ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ νοὸς φύσις· ὁ αὐτὸς ὁ νοῦς. καὶ τὴν ἀόριστον δυάδα, καὶ τὸ κακὸν περὶ ἣν ἐστὶν τό ὑλικὸν πλῆθος. Stobæus had it from Plutarch (110), we muſt therefore read τοῦ ἑνὸς inſtead of τοῦ νοός. The doctrine of Pythagoras is not ſo orthodox in that paſſage, as in that of Diogenes Laërtius; for, according to Plutarch, he admitted of two independent principles, Unity and Binary, and aſcribed to the firſt the Divine Eſſence, Goodneſs, and Underſtanding; and to the ſecond, the nature of a Dæmon, evil, and matter. We ſhall judge more advantageouſly of his doctrine, if we take it out of Clemens Alexandrinus. Οὐκ ἀποκρυπτέον οὐδὲ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Πυθαγόραν, οἵ φασιν, Ὁ μὲν Θεὸς, εἷς. χ᾽ οὗτος δὲ οὐκ ὥς τινες ὑπονοοῦσιν, ἐκτὸς τᾶς διακοσμήσιος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν αὐτᾷ ὅλος, ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κύκλῳ, ἐπίσκοπος πάσας γενέσιος, κρᾶσις τῶν ὅλων· ἀεὶ ὢν, καὶ ἐργάτας τῶν αὐτοῦ δυναμίων καὶ ἔργων ἁπάντων, ἐν οὐρανῷ φωστὴρ, καὶ πάντων πατὴρ, νοῦς καὶ ψύχωσις τῷ ὅλῳ κύκλῳ, πάντων κίνασις. Nec verò prætermittendi ſunt Pythagoræ ſectatores, quippe qui dicant, Deum quidem unum eſſe, non ita tamen, ut quidam opinantur, quaſi ſit extra mundi adminiſtrationem, ſed eſt totus in ipſa, in toto circulo, ſpeculator totius generationis, univerſorum contemperatio, qui ſemper eſt, & ſuas facultates deducit ad opus, omnium operum in cœlo illuſtrator, pater omnium, mens & animatio totius circuli, omnium motus (111). - - - *But we muſt not forget the Pythagoreans, for they maintain there is only one* GOD, *not ſuch an one as ſome imagine, as if he did not concern himſelf with the adminiſtration of the world, but that his providence reaches all things, that he obſerves and regulates every part of the univerſe, that he is eternal and omnipotent, the father, the mover, and ſoul, of the world.* The worſt of it is, that Pythagoras, conſidering God as the mover of the univerſe, and the ſoul of the world, affirmed that our ſouls are portions of God. There is an objection againſt this doctrine of Pythagoras to be found in Tully, which cannot be anſwered. ‘Nam Pythagoras, qui cenſuit (*Deum*) animum eſſe per naturam rerum omnem intentum & commeantem, ex quo noſtri animi caperentur, non vidit diſtractione humanorum animorum diſcerpi & dilacerari Deum: & cùm miſeri animi eſſent, quod pleriſque contingeret, tum Dei partem eſſe miſeram:

quod

(*f*) At Samos a town of that iſland.

(*g*) Vid. Farnab. in Ovid. Met. lib. xv, ver. 60.

(101) Lactant. Div. Inſt. *lib. iii, cap. xviii, pag. m.* 196.

(102) Aul. Gell. *lib. iv, cap. xi.* See the article PERICLES, citation (186).

(103) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. cxxiii.* It is true he does not mention the name of Pythagoras. But Diodorus Siculus, *lib. i, ſub fin.* mentions him.

(104) Auguſt. Ep. III, *pag. m.* 9.

(105) Macrob. Saturn. *lib. iii, cap. vi, pag. m.* 316.

(106) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 25.

(107) So Aldobrandinus renders it in the beginning of his notes upon thoſe words of Laërtius. See alſo Meric. Caſaubon on Laërt. ibid. *num.* 83.

(108) Plut. de Placit. Philoſ. *lib. i, cap. vii, pag.* 881.

(109) Not. in Diog. Laërt. in Alcmæone, *lib. viii, num.* 83.

(110) *The next words of Plutarch are,* Τὴν δ᾽ ἀόριστον δυάδα δαίμονα καὶ τὸ κακὸν, περὶ ἥν ἐστὶ τὸ ὑλικὸν πλῆθος· ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ὁρατὸς ὁ κόσμος. Infinitam autem binarii naturam, genium & malum unde eſt multitudo materiæ, & viſui expoſitus mundus.

(111) Clem. Alexandr. in Admonit. ad Gentes, *pag.* 47, C. *See alſo* Juſt. Mart. Oratione ad Gentes, *pag.* 58.

had he had courage enough to expoſe himſelf to martyrdom. The circumſtances of his death are variouſly related [*P*]. I ſhall name ſome authors who have treated of his doctrine

‘ quod fieri non poteſt. Cur autem quicquam ignoraret animus hominis, ſi eſſet Deus? quomodo porrò Deus iſte, ſi nihil eſſet niſi animus, aut infixus, aut infuſus eſſet in mundo (112). - - - *For Pythagoras, who thought GOD to be an active ſoul, pervading the whole univerſe, and that our minds were parts of him, did not conſider that by the diſtinction of human minds, GOD was divided and ſeparated: and that as many of them were miſerable, ſo a part of GOD was miſerable, which is impoſſible. But why ſhould the mind of man be ignorant of any thing, if it were GOD? And how could GOD, were he only a ſpirit, be fixed or infuſed in the world?*’ St Epiphanius aſcribes to that Philoſopher a wild opinion, *viz.* that God has a corporeal and organized nature, being nothing elſe but Heaven, and making uſe of the ſun and moon as two eyes, and ſo of the other parts of the firmament (113). But here is a thought which is abſolutely true: Clemens Alexandrinus compares it with St Paul's words. None but God is wiſe, ſaid Pythagoras (114). The author of the Jewiſh antiquities ſeems to be very well ſatisfied with the doctrines of ſeveral Philoſophers, eſpecially of Pythagoras concerning the nature of God, and he doubts not but they had ſpoken more ſoundly ſtill, had they not been afraid of perſecution; for as Plato ſays, it is not ſafe to tell ignorant men the truth concerning the divine nature. Καὶ γὰρ Πυθαγόρας καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας καὶ Πλάτων, καὶ οἱ μετ᾽ ἐκείνους ἀπὸ τῆς στοᾶς φιλόσοφοι, καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν ἅπαντες οὕτω φαίνονται, περὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ φύσεως πεφρονηκότες. ἀλλ᾽ οἱ μὲν πρὸς ὀλίγον φιλοσοφοῦντες εἰς πλῆθος δόξαις προκατειλημμένον τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ δόγματος ἐξενεγκεῖν οὐκ ἐτόλμησαν. . . . . . Αὐτὸς δὲ Πλάτων ὡμολόγησεν, ὅτι τὴν ἀληθῆ περὶ θεοῦ δόξαν εἰς τὴν τῶν ὄχλων ἄγνοιαν οὐκ ἦν ἀσφαλὲς ἐξενεγκεῖν. Pythagoras enim, & Anaxagoras, & Plato, & poſt illos philoſophi Stoici, & pene cuncti, videntur de divina ſapuiſſe natura. Sed hi quidem ad breve philoſophantes, populo ſuperſtitionum opinionibus jam præoccupato veritatem dogmatis proferre timuere (115). . . . . Ipſe ſiquidem Plato confeſſus eſt, quia veram de Deo opinionem propter ignorantiam plebis proferre ſecurum non eſt (116). - - *Pythagoras, Anaxagoras, Plato, and after them the Stoic Philoſophers, and almoſt all, ſeem to have underſtood the divine nature. But they delivered their doctrines obſcurely, and were afraid to declare openly the truth, becauſe the people were prepoſſeſſed with ſuperſtitious notions. . . . . Plato himſelf confeſſed it was not ſafe*, &c. The ſame Joſephus affirms, that Pythagoras exceeded all the ancient Philoſophers in piety and wiſdom. Σοφίᾳ καὶ τῇ περὶ τὸ θεῖον εὐσεβείᾳ πάντων ὑπειλημμένος διενεγκεῖν τῶν φιλοσοφησάντων. *Sapientia & divina pietate Philoſophos omnes excellens* (117). We muſt not forget an obſervation of Plutarch: when he ſhews the conformity there was between the thoughts of Numa and thoſe of Pythagoras, he ſays, that Numa would not have the Deity to be repreſented by any images, and that God, according to Pythagoras, is an impaſſible nature, which does not fall under our ſenſes, and can only be the object of the underſtanding (118). Οὔτε γὰρ ἐκεῖνος αἰσθητὸν ἢ παθητὸν, ἀόρατον δὲ καὶ ἀκήρατον καὶ νοητὸν ὑπελάμβανεν εἶναι τὸ πρῶτον. *Neque enim ille ſenſui aut ulli dolori expoſitum rerum principium eſſe, ſed inviſibile, incorruptum, ſola mente exiſtimavit apprehenſibile* (119).

As for the end of our actions and ſtudies, nothing can be more admirable, nor more Chriſtian, than what Pythagoras ſaid about it; for he taught that the ſtudy of Philoſophy ſhould tend to make men like God. Πρὸς τὴν θείαν ὁμοίωσιν ἀνάγει, καὶ τῆς Πυθαγορικῆς φιλοσοφίας τὸν τελειότατον σκοπὸν ἐκκαλύπτει: *ad divinam ſimilitudinem ducunt, Pythagoricæque philoſophiæ finem perfectiſſimum oſtendunt* (120). This is an encomium beſtowed on a piece of Poetry, which contains the doctrines of that Philoſopher. They conſiſt of two parts, which may be very well compared to the purgative and unitive ways ſo much talked of by our Myſtics. ‘ Hierocles, qui commentarios eruditiſſimos in Carmen Aureum Pythagoræ reliquit, ſtatim ab initio de Pythagorica philoſophia differens, appellat eam κάθαρσιν καὶ τελειότητα, *purgationem, & perfectionem.* Quæ duo cum ſubindicent officium ipſius duplex ac propoſitum, ut loco alio monſtravi, duplicem videri poſſunt Pythagoras & Pythagorici habuiſſe philoſophiam, quarum illa ſit καθαρτική, hæc vero τελική, illa, quæ purgat à malis, ſeparat à materia & corpore, liberat à vinculis & carcere; hæc, quæ perficiat, evehat & reportet ſurſum, & εἰς τὸ εἶδος τῆς προτέρας ἕξεως, ut loquitur Hierocles, id eſt habitus prioris formam inducat, ſimileſque faciat Deo. . . . . Id quod ipſe indicat Hierocles in ſequentibus, quando dicit, περιέχει (carmen aureum) πάσης φιλοσοφίας πρακτικῆς καὶ θεωρητικῆς τὰ καθόλου δόγματα, δι᾽ ὧν ἄν τις ἑαυτὸν καθαρὸν ἀπολαύοι καὶ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν ὁμοίωσιν ἐντυχήσειε. *Continet philoſophiæ omnis practicæ ac theoreticæ decreta ſumma quibus quis & purgare ſe, & ſimilem Deo facere valeat* (121). - - - *Hierocles, who left moſt learned commentaries upon the golden verſes of Pythagoras, in the beginning of his diſcourſe concerning the Pythagorean Philoſophy, calls it* purgation *and* perfection. *Which two intimating a twofold uſe and purpoſe of it, as I have ſhewn in another place, Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans ſeem to have had two kinds of Philoſophy, the one* purgative, *the other* perfective; *the former, to cleanſe from evils, to ſeparate from matter and body, and to free from bonds and priſon: the latter to perfect, raiſe, and exalt, and as Hierocles ſpeaks, to introduce the form of the firſt ſtate, and to render one like GOD. . . . . This Hierocles himſelf declares in the following words,* The golden verſes contain the chief doctrines of all ſpeculative and practical Philoſophy, whereby one may purify and make himſelf like God.’ The author whom I have quoted, alledges (122) ſeveral paſſages, whereby it appears, that according to that Philoſopher, the acquiſition of truth was the only way to attain to the likeneſs of God; but that truth cannot be known, unleſs it be enquired after with a purified ſoul, and ſuch as has overcome the paſſions of the body; from whence he concludes thus: *Ex iis, quæ ſuperiori capite attulimus, manifeſtum eſt, philoſophiam Pythagoricam id habere ſibi maxime propoſitum, ut ad quandam ſimilitudinem cum Deo ſectatores ſuos ducat; id vero fieri aliter non poſſe, quam ſi veritati atque ſapientiæ pura integraque mente incumbatur* (123). I add to this the teſtimony of the anonymous author, who wrote the life of Pythagoras. He ſays (124), that the followers of that Philoſopher taught, that men make themſelves perfect three ways. 1. By converſing with the gods; for during that commerce, they abſtain from every evil action, and become like the gods, as much as ſuch a thing is poſſible. 2. By doing good to others; for it is God's property, it is an imitation of God (125). 3. By going out of this life. The beſt preſents which Heaven gave to men, according to Pythagoras, are to ſpeak truth, and do good offices: thoſe two things, ſaid he, reſemble the works of God (126).

[*P*] *The circumſtances of his death are variouſly reported.*] He lived at Crotona, in Milo's houſe with his diſciples, and was burnt in it. A Man whom he refuſed to admit into his ſociety, ſet the houſe on fire (127). It is likely that he had not a good phyſiognomy; for Pythagoras received none for his diſciples, but thoſe whoſe look he liked, after he had examined it according to the rules of art. It was his firſt ſtep. ‘ Jam à principio adoleſcentes qui ſeſe ad diſcendum obtulerant, ἐφυσιογνωμόνει. Id verbum ſignificat, mores naturaſque hominum, conjectatione quadam de oris & vultus ingenio, deque totius corporis filo atque habitu, ſciſcitari. Eum, qui exploratus ab eo idoneuſque fuerat, recipi in diſciplinam ſtatim jubebat (128). - - - *He firſt conſidered the phyſiognomy of young men, who offered themſelves to be his diſciples. That is, he examined their manners and diſpoſitions, by the features of their countenance, and the habit of their body. And ſuch as were tried and approved by him, were immediately admitted into the ſociety.*’ Some ſay (129) that he was ſuſpected of endeavouring to uſurp the ſovereignty; and that to prevent his deſign, the Crotoniates ſet his houſe on fire. He made his eſcape through the flames, and went out of the city; but as he was going into a field of beans, he ſtopped, and choſe rather to be killed, than to open his mouth and ſpoil the beans (130). According to Dicæarchus (131) he fled to the temple of doctrine [*Q*]. One may ſee in the Hiſtory of Phyſic, what concerns him as a Phyſician (*b*).

---

(112) Cicero, de Nat. Deor. *lib. i, cap. xi. See Minutius Felix, who ſays, pag. m.* 151. Pythagoræ Deus eſt animus per univerſam rerum naturam commeans, & intentus: ex quo etiam animalium omnium vita capiatur. *Lactantius ſays the ſame, lib. i, cap. v, pag. m.* 14.

(113) Epiph. Hær. XV, *pag.* 14.

(114) Apud Clem. Alexand. Strom. lib. iv, pag. 477.

(115) Joſeph. cont. Appion. *lib. ii, pag.* 1071.

(116) Ibid. *pag.* 1076.

(117) Ibid. *lib. i, pag.* 1046.

(118) Plut. in Numa, *pag.* 65.

(119) Ibid. *B.*

(120) Hierocles, in Præfat. ad Carmina aurea circa fin. *See alſo* Stobæus, Eclog. XI, *cap. iii, where he ſays,* Σωκράτης, Πλάτων ταῦτα τῷ Πυθαγόρᾳ, τέλος ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ. Socrates & Plato quemadmodum Pythagoras finem dixerunt, dei ſimilitudinem.

(121) Joann. Scheffer. de natura & conſtitutione Philoſophiæ Italicæ, *cap. x, pag.* 78.

(122) Ibid. *cap. vii.*

(123) Ibid. cap. viii, pag. 56.

(124) Apud Photium, Cod. ccxlix, pag. 1313.

(125) Δεύτερον ἐν τῷ εὖ ποιεῖν· θεοῦ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ θείας μιμήσεως. Deinde bene de aliis merendo: Dei enim hoc proprium eſt, in eoque Deum imitatur. *Phot. ibid.*

(126) Ælian. Var. Hiſt. lib. xii, cap. lix.

(127) Diog. Laërt. ubi ſupra, *num.* 39.

(128) Aul. Gell. lib. i, cap. ix.

(129) Laërt. ibid.

(130) Ἀλῶναι μᾶλλον ἢ πατῆσαι· ἀναιρεθῆναι δὲ κρεῖττον ἢ λαλῆσαι. Capi præſtat quam has dare peſſum, cædique ſatius eſt quam quicquam loqui. *Ibid.* Meric. Caſaubon *thinks that it is better to read* ἀλύσαι, vagari, *to wander miſerably, inſtead of* λαλῆσαι.

(131) Ibid. *num.* 40.

I ſhall add to what I have ſaid concerning the fable of his looking-glaſſes (*i*) a ſtory, which I have juſt read in a news-writer [*R*].

(*b*) Printed at Geneva in the year 1696, and written by D. L. C. D. M. that is to ſay, *David le Clerc Doctor of Phyſic.* He is brother of Mr le Clerc profeſſor at Amſterdam.

(*i*) In the remark [*L*].

of the Muſes at Metapontum, and died there with hunger, after he had faſted forty days. Others ſay (132), that at his return from the iſle of Delos, whither he went to ſhut the eyes of his maſter Pherecydes, and to bury him, he himſelf put a ſtop to his life, by abſtaining from food. According to ſome other writers (133), he brought all his diſciples to the aſſiſtance of the Agrigentines againſt the Syracuſans; and having been worſted, he was killed whilſt he was running about a field of beans. Which does not very well agree neither with the eighty years which they ſay (134) he lived, nor with the ninety (135), much leſs ſtill with the ninety nine (136), or one hundred and four (137) years mentioned by others. See upon this the learned collections of Menagius (138). He has not forgot to quote Arnobius, who affirms, that Pythagoras was burnt alive in a temple. ‘ Pythagoras Samius ſuſpicione dominationis injuſta vivus concrematus in fano eſt: numquid ea, quæ docuit vim propriam perdiderunt, quia non ſpiritum ſponte, ſed crudelitate appetitus effudit (139)? - - - *Pythagoras of Samos, unjuſtly ſuſpected of aſpiring to ſovereignty, was burnt alive in a temple. Could his doctrines loſe their proper force, becauſe he died, not a natural, but a violent death.*’ Juſtin intimates that he died without any violence at Metapontum, whither he retired after he had been twenty years at Crotona, and that he died there, being ſo much admired, that his houſe was converted into a temple, and that he was honoured as a god. *Cum annos viginti Crotonæ egiſſet, Metapontum migravit, ibique deceſſit, cujus tanta admiratio fuit, ut ex domo ejus templum facerent, eumque pro Deo colerent* (140). Valerius Maximus does not ſay ſo much of him; but he is none of thoſe who ſay he was ill uſed. ‘ Cujus ardentem rogum plenis venerationis oculis Metapontus aſpexit: oppidum Pythagoræ quam ſuorum cinerum nobilius clariuſve monumento (141). - - - *Whoſe funeral pile Metapontus beheld with eyes full of veneration: the city was more noted and famous for the aſhes of Pythagoras than their own.*’

St Epiphanius was groſsly miſtaken when he ſaid that Pythagoras died in the country of the Medians (142).

[*Q*] *I ſhall name ſome authors who have treated of his doctrine.*] I ſhall confine myſelf to modern authors. William Canterus tranſlated into Latin the fragments of Pythagoras, collected by Stobæus. Eraſmus (143), Philip Beroaldus, Gyraldus, Claudius Minos, Francis Berni, Nicolas Scutelli, and ſome others, made notes upon the ſymbols of that Philoſopher. See alſo Lipſius (144), the commentaries of Ritterſhuſius upon Malchus; the diſſertation of Holſtenius, *De vita & ſcriptis Pythagoræ*; Rodericus à Caſtro's Pythagoras; Paganinus Gaudentius *de Pythagorea animarum tranſmigratione*; the dialogue of Ambroſius Rhodius *de tranſmigratione*; the diſſertation of Claudius Lignier *de ſecta Pythagorica*; the theſis of Marc Mappus *de Ethica Pythagoræ*, maintained at Straſburg under the Profeſſor Schallerus; Schilterus's diſſertation *de Diſciplina Pythagorica*; the above-mentioned book of John Schefferus; the book intituled *Ethica Pythagorica* (145) written by Magnus Daniel Omeis, Profeſſor at Altdorf. See alſo la Mothe le Vayer in his book *de la Vertu des Payens*. It is thought that the golden verſes of Pythagoras, are the work of his diſciple Lyſis. An ancient Philoſopher of Alexandria, named Hierocles, wrote a commentary on them, which has been illuſtrated with notes by Caſaubon's ſon. We have alſo ſome commentaries made upon the ſame verſes by Vitus Amerbachius, Theodorus Marcilius, Henry Brem, Michael Neander, John Straſelius, William Diezius, and Magnus Daniel Omeis. I had almoſt forgot Joachim Zehnerus's book (146).

[*R*] *A ſtory which I have juſt read in a news-writer.*] ‘ A modern author has aſſerted that the late Marſhal de Schomberg, commander of the French troops in Portugal, when that kingdom ſhook off the Spaniſh yoke, wrote whatever paſſed in that country upon a glaſs, and holding it againſt the moon, Cardinal Mazarin, who was at Paris, read in that Planet, with the help of a Teleſcope, whatever the Marſhal wanted to inform him of: if this ſecret were as true as it is fabulous, &c (147). Since the news-writer judges rightly of this pretended ſecret, I ſhall only obſerve the anachroniſms of his narrative. Mr de Schomberg did not arrive in Portugal till the month of November 1661 (148). Cardinal Mazarin had been dead eight months before: and Portugal had ſhaken off the Spaniſh yoke above ten years.

(132) Ibid.

(133) Ibid.

(134) Ibid. *num.* 44.

(135) Ibid.

(136) Tzetzes, Chil. XI, ver. 366.

(137) Anonymus apud Photium, *pag.* 1313.

(138) Menag. in Diog. Laërt. *pag.* 371, & *ſeq.*

(139) Arnob. lib. i, pag. 23.

(140) Juſtin. lib. xx, cap. iv, pag. m. 396.

(141) Val. Max. lib. viii, cap. vii, num. 2, in ext.

(142) Epiph. Hær. XV, pag. 14.

(143) In the beginning of his Chiliads of Proverbs.

(144) Manuduct. ad Philoſoph. Stoic. lib. i, Diſſert. VI.

(145) Printed at Altdorf 1693.

(146) Paſtor ac Superintendens Schleugenſis. *He publiſhed at Leipſic in* 1603, Vitam & Fragmenta Pythagoræ.

(147) Taken from the 68th page of a ſmall book intituled, *The Key of the Cabinet of the Princes of Europe, or, An Hiſtorical and Political Collection upon the Affairs of the Preſent Times, July* 1704. It is believed this book was printed at Luxemburg: there is in the title, printed for James Sincere at the ſign of Truth 1704.

(148) See the Memoirs of Fremont d'Ablancourt, *pag.* 12.

PYTHEAS, was born at Marſeilles. I think that the moſt certain thing that can be ſaid concerning the time wherein he lived, is, that he lived in the age of Alexander the Great [*A*]. He wrote ſome Geographical books [*B*], which in all likelihood were

[*A*] *The moſt certain thing . . . . is that he lived in the time of Alexander the Great.*] Voſſius is ſomewhat more preciſe: he ſays that Pytheas lived under Ptolemy Philadelphus (1). Father Hardouín follows him (2). Moreri reckons it was in the 440th or 445th year of Rome; but he ſhould have known, that the firſt year of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus falls, according to Calviſius, in the year of Rome 468. We have ſome reaſons to believe that Pytheas flouriſhed before that time. Voſſius ſhews, that Eratoſthenes wrote after Pytheas (3); but he did not make uſe of the cleareſt proof of it: he was contented to alledge this reaſon, that Polybius having pitched amongſt other Geographers upon Dicæarchus, Eratoſthenes, and Pytheas, to cenſure them, ſays (4) that Eratoſthenes wrote the laſt of all. There is a proof more poſitive than that in the ſame page, ſeeing Strabo ſays in that place, that Polybius wondered that Eratoſthenes believed what Pytheas had written. Polybius wondered ſo much the more at it, becauſe he obſerved that Eratoſthenes believed ſeveral things which Dicæarchus did not believe. It is manifeſt therefore that Pytheas was an author before Eratoſthenes and Dicæarchus wrote their Geographical books (5). We ſhall hereafter draw ſome conſequences from it. But I ſhall firſt give my opinion concerning the words wherein Strabo thinks that Polybius's way of reaſoning is ridiculous. Perhaps he underſtood not well what Polybius meant. I am apt to think that great man argued thus: Dicæarchus is a very credulous author, and has committed abundance of miſtakes; yet he would not believe ſeveral things related by Pytheas; one may therefore wonder how Eratoſthenes, who lived after him, could believe thoſe very things which he knew were rejected by Dicæarchus. But Strabo pretends that Polybius argued thus: Dicæarchus is a very judicious author, and to be looked upon as a model; it is therefore very ſtrange that Eratoſthenes believed Pytheas in ſeveral things, which Dicæarchus did not believe. Suppoſing that Polybius reaſons after this manner, Strabo might very well laugh at him, conſidering the great number of faults which Polybius had criticized in Dicæarchus's writings. But once more, I would not ſwear that he underſtood well Polybius's meaning. I wiſh we could verify it; we might then learn many other facts, which we are ignorant of, by reaſon of the loſs of ſo many books of that author. I ſhall obſerve, by the by, a fault in the Latin tranſlation of Strabo. The whole ſtrength of this repetition, μήτε Δικαιάρχου πιστεύσαντος, is altogether enervated: to render that place well, the ſame repetition which is in the original, ſhould have been made uſe of. The reader may judge of it, if he will give himſelf the trouble to examine this citation. Ἐρατοσθένη δὲ τὸν

μὲν

(1) Voſſ. de Philologia, *pag.* 55, *in his treatiſe* de Hiſt. Græc. *pag.* 467. *He adds* Vel certè proximus huic tempori fuit.

(2) In Indice Plin.

(3) Voſſ. de Hiſt. Græc. pag. 110.

(4) Ap. Strab. lib. i, pag. 71.

(5) See, below, remark [*F*].

were nothing elſe but a relation of his voyages. He ſtrangely abuſed this maxim, *a traveller may lie by authority*; for he filled his books with all manner of fables concerning the northern countries, where he pretended to have been. He knew that few ocular witneſſes could convict him of his lies; but poſterity left not his boldneſs unpuniſhed. Polybius was very hard upon him; Strabo falls upon him on ſeveral occaſions with the greateſt ſeverity *(a)*. Thoſe two authors could not endure that he ſhould ſay, with impunity, that in the iſle of Thule [*C*], ſix days journey from Great Britain towards the north, and in all thoſe parts, there was neither land, nor ſea, nor air, but a compound of thoſe three things, like the Pulmo Marinus [*D*], over which the ſea and land hung up, and which was a kind of a tie to all the parts of the world, and that it was impoſſible to go thither on foot, or in a ſhip. He boaſted that he had ſeen that ſubſtance which reſembled the Pulmo Marinus: as for the reſt, he confeſſed he knew nothing of it but by hear-ſay. He boaſted alſo, that he had travelled in all the countries of Europe which lie on the ocean, from Cadiz to the river Tanais; which Polybius could not believe of a private-man, and not well provided with money *(b)*. However, it is confeſſed, he underſtood well enough the properties of the northern countries, for what concerns the aſpects of the ſun *(c)*; and what he ſaid *(d)*, that the Barbarians ſhewed him the place where the ſun went to ſleep, and that in ſome of thoſe countries the night laſted not above three hours, and in others not above two, does not at all look like a fable,

(*a*) Πυθέας ἀνὴρ ψευδίστατος ἐξήτασται. Pytheas homo mendaciſſimus inventus eſt. *Strabo, lib. i, pag.* 43. *Vid. etiam, pag.* 44, *& lib. ii, pag.* 71, 79; *lib. iv, pag.* 139.

(*c*) Ib. *lib. iv, pag.* 139.

(*d*) Apud Geminum Iſagog. ad Phœnom.

(*b*) Φησὶ δ' οὖν ὁ Πολύβιος ἄπιστον καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο πῶς ἰδιώτῃ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ πένητι τοσαῦτα διαστήματα πλωτὰ καὶ πορευτὰ γένοιτο. Polybius autem id quoque incredibile ait eſſe, privatum hominem, eumque pauperem tantum ſpacii mari terraque obviſſe. *Strabo, lib. ii, pag.* 71.

μὲν Εὐήμερον Βεργαῖον καλεῖν, Πυθέα δὲ πιστεύειν· καὶ ταῦτα δὲ μή τε Δικαιάρχου πιστεύσαντος. Τὸ μὲν οὖν μή τε Δικαιάρχου πιστεύσαντος, γελοῖον ὥσπερ ἐκείνῳ χρήσασθαι κάνονι προσῆκον καθ' οὗ τοσούτους ἐλέγχους αὐτὸς προφέρεται. *Interim Eratoſthenem qui Euemerum Bergæum appellet, Pytheæ credere, atque hoc ne Dicæarcho quidem credente. Id quidem ridiculum eſt quod Dicæarchum profert, quaſi verò conveniat eum veluti normam ſequi quem ipſe Polybius tot reprehenſionibus inceſſit* (6). However we learn from all this that Pytheas's books were written not only before thoſe of Eratoſthenes, but alſo before thoſe of Dicæarchus. We know that the laſt was diſciple of Ariſtotle, and dedicated a book to Theophraſtus, Ariſtotle's beloved diſciple. It is therefore very likely that Pytheas lived before the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, ſince his writings came out before thoſe of Dicæarchus, who muſt needs have been an old man under the reign of that prince. Indeed, the beginning of that reign falls in the laſt year of the CXXIIId Olympiad; Ariſtotle gave over teaching before the end of the CXIVth Olympiad (7), and his ſcholars were moſt of them grown men. We learn from Pliny that Pytheas publiſhed his works before Timæus publiſhed his (8); for the latter affirms, upon the other's word, what I have ſaid concerning Amber (9). But neither Timæus nor Eratoſthenes, who wrote after Pytheas, can prove any thing againſt Voſſius, becauſe they lived ſo long (10), that they might have ſeen the relations of Pytheas, though they had not been publiſhed before the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus; and it is well known that an author who relates what he has read in another, may be older than he, and even die before him; ſo that though Timæus and Eratoſthenes wrote after Pytheas, we can infer from it nothing that is certain concerning the age of Pytheas. The beſt proof we can have to place him before the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, is, becauſe he was cited by Dicæarchus. Voſſius did not remember it, when he placed Dicæarchus before Pytheas (11). If Sanſon, one of the beſt Geographers of the XVIIth century, had conſidered this little point of Chronology, he had not ſaid, that Pytheas mentioned the converſations which the father of Scipio Africanus had with the deputies of Marſeilles in the year of Rome 532 (12). One of Pytheas's lies in the opinion of Polybius (13), was, that none of the inhabitants of Marſeilles could tell Scipio any remarkable thing concerning Britain. I have obſerved in the article ABBEVILLE the other miſtakes of Sanſon about that matter. It remains to ſay, that he ſhould not have taken that Scipio for him, who landed at the mouth of the Rhone, to obſerve the motions of Hannibal, ſince it is impoſſible that Pytheas ſhould have writ any thing after that voyage of Scipio, his works having been read by Dicæarchus, Ariſtotle's diſciple; for there was an hundred years at leaſt between the time when Ariſtotle left off teaching ſchool, and the beginning of the ſecond Punic war. It would be a difficult thing to know who that Scipio was, who, as Pytheas relates it, enquired about Britain of the inhabitants of Marſeilles, Narbonne, and Corbilon; but it is certain he was not the father of that Scipio who conquered Carthage. I wonder that Father Labbe did not obſerve that miſtake of Sanſon, and I do not believe that he was willing to ſpare him. He might alſo have been cenſured for reckoning near an hundred years between Pytheas and Polybius (14). Which does not agree with his hypotheſis, *viz.* that Pytheas wrote his relations after the year of Rome 532, which was but ſixteen years before the birth of Polybius (15). Nay, according to that ſuppoſition, Pytheas was not returned from his travels in 532, for if he was returned then, the deputies of Marſeilles might have anſwered the queſtions of the Roman conſul.

(6) Strabo, *lib.* i, *pag.* 71.

(7) Apollod. apud Diog. Laërt. in Ariſt.

(8) Plin. lib. xxxvii, cap. ii.

(9) See the text of this article, citation *(e)*.

(10) Eratoſthenes lived 80 years. He was born in the CXXVIth Olympiad, and died in the CXLVIth. See Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc. pag.* 108. Lucian ſays he lived 82 years, and that Timæus lived 96 years. But Timæus wrote the war of Pyrrhus againſt the Romans, and therefore lived under Ptolemy Philadelphus.

(11) De Philolog. *cap. xi, num.* 7. Moreri hath quoted wrong, *de Philoſ. cap. xi, n.* 6.

(12) Nicol. Sanſon, An Enquiry into the Antiquities of Abbeville.

(13) Ap. Strab. lib. iv, pag. 131.

(14) Sanſon, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 85.

(15) He was born in the year of Rome 548. See Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc. pag.* 122.

I ſhall here acquaint the reader that Mr Sanſon, the worthy ſon of the great Geographer, who publiſhed the Antiquities of Abbeville, has done me the favour to ſend me the copy of an anſwer to the Jeſuit Labbe, which his father deſigned to print concerning thoſe antiquities. It is a learned and ingenious piece. I hope I ſhall find an occaſion to publiſh ſome fragments thereof.

[*B*] *He wrote ſome Geographical books.*] The ſcholiaſt upon Apollonius (16) mentions a book of Pytheas, intituled γῆς περίοδος, *the circuit of the earth.* The abridgment of Artemidorus the Epheſian, printed with the ancient Geographers, names Pytheas among thoſe who wrote the circuit of the world, *periplum Orbis* (17). The deſcription of the iſle of Thule was, in all likelihood, part of that work. His book *de Oceano* is quoted by Geminus. Nicolas Sanſon (18) is not the only one who entered the liſts with Strabo, in favour of Pytheas. We ſhall ſee by and by that Gaſſendus undertook very zealouſly the defence of that ancient Marſeillois.

[*C*] *That in the iſle of Thule.*] Having proved with ſolid reaſons, that Pytheas publiſhed his books about the time of Alexander, I may reject one of the arguments which Father Vavaſſeur made uſe of againſt Photius. I have refuted another in the article ANTONY (19). Photius thinks that Antonius Diogenes lived near the reign of Alexander the Great. Father Vavaſſeur anſwers to it among other things, that he does not believe that the iſle of Thule was very well known at that time (20). Antonius Diogenes was the author of a Romance, intituled, *Incredibilia de Inſula Thule.* It matters not whether that iſland was not known to the common people, or whether it was not very well known in general; for if a traveller, ſuch as Pytheas, publiſhed a relation of it, a romantic writer might eaſily pitch upon that iſland to make it the ſcene of his chimerical narrations. I will not examine whether Photius is in the right or not, it is enough for me to prove that he has not been well refuted.

[*D*] *Like the Pulmo Marinus.*] La Mothe le Vayer (21) obſerves, that it is a ſpongious zoophyte, upon which the Italians have beſtowed a very obſcene name; and

(16) In lib. iv.

(17) *See* Voſſius, ibid. *pag.* 110.

(18) Ubi ſupra.

(19) A Roman family. See the remark [*B*].

(20) Suſpicio quoque eſt nondum cognitam vulgo Thulen inſulam de qua illi feruntur inſcripti libri. *Vavaſſor, de Lud. Dict. pag* 148, 149.

(21) Lett. lxxxix, Tom. xi, of his works in 12mo, *pag.* 255.

fable, and does him a great deal more honour than another thing which Pliny relates after him, viz. that there was an iſland, a day's journey from the country of the Guttones, a people of Germany, wherein they uſed amber inſtead of wood for their fuel (*e*). The reader may conſult the apology which Peter Gaſſendus wrote for Pytheas [*E*] at the deſire of Peireſkius. Thoſe two illuſtrious men born in Provence, were very willing to raiſe the glory of their country, by defending the reputation of a writer who was born in Marſeilles. Gaſſendus, though a learned man, was miſtaken in his conjectures concerning this author [*F*]; nevertheleſs, the reading of his apology may be of ſome uſe. Our Pytheas ought not to be confounded with the Athenian Orator of the ſame name, who lived in the time of Demoſthenes [*G*].

(*e*) Incolas pro ligno ad ignem uti eo, proximiſque Teutonis vendere. *Plin. lib. xxxvii, cap. ii.*

and having ſaid that Pytheas maintained *that this matter was the tie of the univerſe*, and that he was *ſo impudent, as to ſpeak of it as of a thing which he had ſeen*, he ſpeaks of *an Anachoret, who boaſted that he had been at the very end of the world*, and who ſaid, *that being there, he was obliged to bend his ſhoulders, becauſe the Heaven and Earth touched one another at that extremity.*

[*E*] *The apology which Peter Gaſſendus wrote for Pytheas.*] This was the occaſion of it. When Peireſkius cauſed the ſolſtitial elevation of the ſun to be obſerved at Marſeilles in 1636, the proportion between the ſhadow and the ſtyle of the dial was compared with what Hipparchus ſays (22) that Pytheas found out. Gaſſendus was deſired to write about that Aſtronomical operation, and at the ſame time to juſtify Pytheas againſt Strabo's invectives. 'Voluit rurſus '(Peireſkius) ut quoniam Strabo multa congeſſit adverſus Pytheam, ipſe in gratiam comprovincialis apologiam conſcriberem, purgaremque virum qui primus 'Thulen inſulam demonſtravit, & quo non habet Occidens totus quem antiquiorem in doctis habeat (23). '- - - *As Strabo had inveighed much againſt Pytheas, 'Peireſkius deſired me to write an apology for our countryman, and to vindicate him, who firſt diſcovered 'the iſland Thule, and who is the moſt ancient of all the 'learned men in the Weſt.*' What he wrote thereupon is to be found in the fourth volume of his works (24). He did not forget that Cleomedes ſtiles Pytheas a Philoſopher; and that Hipparchus having cenſured Eudoxus, for ſaying, that there is a certain ſtar which never goes out of its place, and is the pole of the world, praiſes Pytheas for having taught that the pole is a place void of ſtars, which makes a kind of a ſquare with the three neighbouring ſtars. Hipparchus, in imitation of Eratoſthenes, improved his Geography with Pytheas's diſcoveries; and it is no wonder if the latter was miſtaken concerning the Tanais, conſidering the ignorance of thoſe times about the ſituation of the Pontus Euxinus, the Caſpian ſea, and the Palus Mœotis. When Alexander came to the banks of the Caſpian ſea, it was taken for the Pontus Euxinus. Gaſſendus adds ſeveral other remarks in Pytheas's behalf. The reader may have ſeen in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (25), that Olaus Rudbeckius took warmly the part of that traveller.

[*F*] *Gaſſendus was miſtaken in his conjectures about this author.*] He believed that the Marſeillois being aſhamed becauſe they could not anſwer Scipio's queſtions about Britain, and beſides, being ſtirred up by his advices, reſolved to ſend ſome body to take a view of that country, and, in order to it, pitched upon Pytheas, who was a good Mathematician. The republic of Marſeilles was already powerful by ſea, and very much addicted to trade; they might therefore be deſirous to know whether their trade might be improved by the diſcovery of thoſe unknown countries. Polybius's objection may be ſolved thereby; it would be no wonder how Pytheas, a poor private man, could be at the charges of ſo long a journey. Beſides, it may be anſwered, that a company of merchants, or a rich citizen, might have pitched upon Pytheas to make that diſcovery, and furniſh him with all neceſſaries. If Gaſſendus had ſaid no more, I ſhould not find fault with him; but he ſays, that he who enquired about Britain of the Marſeillois, in the time of the ſecond Punic war, which began in the CXLth Olympiad, was either Scipio Africanus, or the father or uncle of that Scipio. Which cannot be true, ſince Dicæarchus had read Pytheas's voyages. Gaſſendus ſays, to elude that proof, that the words of Strabo may bear this ſenſe, *viz.* that Pytheas's relations might have diſpleaſed Dicæarchus. But it is certain that this is not Strabo's meaning: his participle πιϛεύσας (26), and the whole force of his argument are againſt this explication. Godefridus Wendelinus, to whom Gaſſendus wrote thoſe things, anſwered his queſtion, *viz. In what time Pytheas lived*, thus, that it was in the time of Alexander the Great: which he proved, 1. by Dicæarchus's railing at Pytheas: 2. Becauſe Timæus, an enemy of Agathocles, was familiarly acquainted with Pytheas at Marſeilles during his exile; from whence Wendelinus concludes, that Pytheas lived before Agathocles (27). But it is a wrong conſequence; for it does not follow becauſe a traveller grows familiarly acquainted with a baniſhed perſon, that he is therefore older than he who baniſhed that perſon. Beſides, Wendelinus makes his author ſay more than he ſaid; for he refers us to Pliny (28), who only ſays that Timæus believed what Pytheas related about Amber.

[*G*] *He ought not to be miſtaken for him .... who lived in the time of Demoſthenes.*] Father Hardouïn (29) applies to Pytheas of Marſeilles, what Plutarch ſays of one Pytheas in the life of Demoſthenes, p. 855; but there is no doubt that Pytheas mentioned by Plutarch in that place, is the ſame Athenian Orator whom he ſpeaks of, page 849, where he ſays, that Pytheas told Demoſthenes in jeſt, that his Orations ſmelt of oil (30). He ſpeaks of the ſame Pytheas in the life of Phocion (31), as of a talkative and inſolent Orator, whom Phocion was forced to cenſure. Suidas, who gives us the ſame notion of him, tells us, that he made his eſcape from the priſon wherein his creditors had put him, and retired into Macedonia. Plutarch ſays, that Pytheas having fled from Athens, went to Antipater, and ſerved him as much as he was able with his harangues. He had then a quarrel with Demoſthenes in Arcadia, who, though a baniſhed man, joined with the Athenian ambaſſadors, to oblige the Grecian towns to make a confederacy againſt Antipater, whoſe cauſe was defended by Pytheas (32).

Plutarch relates, in his precepts concerning government, a quick repartee of Pytheas. *And Pytheas the Orator*, ſays he (33), *when he oppoſed the honours decreed to Alexander, anſwered one who aſked him, How dareſt thou ſpeak of ſo great things, being ſo young? Alexander, whom you make a god by your decrees, is younger ſtill than I am.*

(22) Apud Strab. *lib. ii, pag.* 78.

(23) Gaſſendus, in Vit. Peireſk. *lib. v*, Oper. *Tom. v, pag.* 327.

(24) *Pag.* 524, *& ſeq.*

(25) February 1685, *pag.* 133.

(26) See the remark [*A*].

(27) Vid Gaſſend. *Tom. vi, pag.* 483.

(28) *Lib. xxxvii, cap. ii.*

(29) In Indice Plinii.

(30) *See* Ælian. Hiſt. div. *lib. vii, cap. vii.* He mentions him alſo *lib. xiv, cap. xxviii.*

(31) *Pag.* 751.

(32) Plut. in Demoſt. *pag.* 858.

(33) Plut. de Gerenda Repub. *pag.* 804. *See alſo* Plut. in Apophth. *pag.* 187.

PYTHIAS, Ariſtotle's daughter, was married three times, firſt to Nicanor, according to her father's laſt will [*A*], afterwards to Proclus, who deſcended from Demaratus king of Sparta, and laſtly to Metrodorus the Phyſician, diſciple of Chryſippus a Cnidian, and maſter of Eraſiſtratus. The two ſons (*a*) ſhe had by her ſecond huſband, ſtudied Philoſophy under Theophraſtus. The ſon ſhe had by Metrodorus was called Ariſtotle

(*a*) The one was called Procles, and the other Demaratus.

[*A*] *She was married .... to Nicanor, according to her father's laſt will.*] We do not find that circumſtance in Sextus Empiricus; but he ſays, that Ariſtotle, after the death of his father and mother, was bred up in the houſe of Proxenus, a native of Atarna, and to requite that good ſervice, he educated Nicanor, ſon of Proxenus, and took care that he ſhould learn all manner of good things, and adopted him, and even

Ariſtotle *(b)* [*B*]. It appears by ſome ſentences which are aſcribed to her [*C*], that her father beſtowed a good education upon her. Note, that her mother's name was PYTHIAS.

(b) Taken from Sextus Empiricus, Adv. Math. cap. xii, pag. 51.

even ordered by his laſt will that he ſhould marry his daughter Pythias (1).

[*B*] *The ſon ſhe had by Metrodorus was named Ariſtotle.*] Pliny has confounded that genealogy; for he thought that Ariſtotle's daughter had a ſon, who was Eraſiſtratus the Phyſician. 'Horum placita, *ſays he* '(2), Chryſippus ingenti garrulitate mutavit, plurimumque & ex Chryſippo diſcipulus ejus Eraſiſtratus 'Ariſtotelis filia genitus. - - - *Chryſippus by his prating, 'and after him Eraſiſtratus the ſon of Ariſtotle's daughter very much altered their decrees.*' Let us conſider the Greek words of Sextus Empiricus. Τρίτῳ δὲ Μητροδώρῳ ἰατρῷ, Χρυσίππου μὲν τοῦ Κνιδίου μαθητῇ, Ἐρασιστράτου δὲ ὑφηγητῇ· ᾧ γίνεται παῖς Ἀριστοτέλης. *Tertio autem Metrodoro Medico*, (Pythias filia Ariſtotelis nupſit) *Chryſippi quidem Cnidii diſcipulo, præceptori autem Eraſiſtrati, cui natus eſt filius Ariſtoteles* (3). It is not very difficult to underſtand thoſe words; they ſignify that Ariſtotle was the ſon of Metrodorus the Phyſician, and of Pythias; but one may conjecture, that all the authors who ſpoke of the ſeveral marriages of Ariſtotle's daughter, placed not their words right, and that a reader who was not attentive enough, might think that their meaning was that Eraſiſtratus was born of the marriage of Metrodorus and Pythias. Let us ſuppoſe that thoſe authors ſaid: Τρίτῳ δὲ Μετροδώρῳ ἰατρῷ Χρυσίππου τοῦ Κνιδίου μαθητῇ, οὗ Ἐρασίστρατος, γίνεται παῖς Ἀριστοτέλης. *Tertio autem Metrodoro Medico* (Pythias filia Ariſtotelis nupſit) *Chryſippi Cnidii diſcipulo, cujus Eraſiſtratus* diſcipulus (4), *natus eſt filius Ariſtoteles.* We may eaſily apprehend, that a reader might believe, for want of attention, that Eraſiſtratus was the ſon of Pythias. How do we know but that Pliny made uſe of an author, who had placed his words ſo, or in a more deceitful manner? Obſerve the Latin tranſlation of Sextus Empiricus, which I have ſet down: one would think by it that Eraſiſtratus was Ariſtotle's father. However it be, I ſhould prefer thoſe conjectures before that of Father Hardouïn (5). He believes that Eraſiſtratus had been adopted by Pythias, as the emperor Galba was adopted by his ſtep-mother. He muſt therefore ſuppoſe, that Eraſiſtratus was Metrodorus's ſon, but Sextus Empiricus ſays only that he was his diſciple.

[*C*] *By ſome ſentences which are aſcribed to her.*] She ſaid, amongſt other things, that the beſt colour that can be ſeen in a man's face, is that of modeſty. 'Celebrantur quidem multa dicta Pythiados filiæ Ariſtotelis graviſſima, ut appareat eandem ipſam non 'tam in gremio educatam quam in ſermone patris, 'quo nemo unquam fuit vel acumine præſtantior, vel 'feſtivitate & lepore politior, vel ſuavitate conditior. 'Ex illis autem id etiam accepimus, nullum eſſe pulchrius coloris genus in facie hominis ingenui quam 'id quod ob verecundiam ſuperveniret (6). - - - *The 'many noted and excellent ſayings of Pythias, Ariſtotle's 'daughter, ſhew that ſhe was bred up, not ſo much in 'the lap as in the converſation of her father, who never was ſurpaſſed by any, in ingenuity, wit, or agreeableneſs. Amongſt other ſayings this is one, that the 'beſt colour that can be ſeen in a man's face, is that 'which is the effect of modeſty.*' See Eraſmus in the eighth book of the Apophthegms (7).

(1) *Taken from* Ammonius, in Vit. Ariſtotel. init. *See alſo the laſt will of Ariſtotle*, in Diog. Laërt. *lib. v, num.* 12; and the note of Caſaubon.

(2) Plin. *lib. xxix, cap. i, pag. m.* 663.

(3) Sext. Empir. adv. Mathem. *pag.* 51.

(4) That word is very often underſtood when the Greeks ſpeak of the ſucceſſion of Philoſophers.

(5) Harduin. in Plin. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 664.

(6) Pet. Alcyonius, in Medice Legato poſteriore, *fol. b* 1.

(7) *Pag. m.* 621.

PITHOM, a city of Egypt. It was one of the two towns which Pharaoh cauſed to be built by the poſterity of Jacob *(a)*. It is the ſame with that which was called Peluſium, and with that which Manetho calls Abaris, if we believe Sir John Marſham *(b)*. The city of Abaris was ſo called according to the ancient Theology *(c)*. It was in the Saites Nomos, eaſtward of the river Bubaſtus *(d)*. The beauty of its ſituation engaged Saltis, king of certain nations who ſubdued Egypt, to enlarge and fortify it. He kept in it a garriſon of 240 thouſand men. The ſame people entrenched themſelves there after they had loſt the reſt of Egypt. They defended themſelves for a long time, but at laſt they capitulated, and obtained the liberty of going whither they pleaſed. They retired into Syria, and ſettled in Judea *(e)*. One may eaſily perceive by this diſcourſe of Manetho, that he means the Iſraelites. He adds *(f)* that Amenophis, who reigned over the Egyptians about five ages after, deſired to ſee the gods, and that a great prophet entertained him in the hopes of ſuch an advantage, provided Egypt were purged from all manner of people infected with leproſy, or other like infirmities. That ſort of people were gathered together, and amounted to eighty thouſand men: they were employed in drawing and cutting ſtones all along the Nile. After they had undergone that painful fatigue for ſome years, they beſought the king to aſſign a city to them for their ſecurity and quiet. He granted them Abaris, which was then deſerted, and did before belong to the ſhepherds *(g)*, and was called the city of Typhon, according to the ancient Theology. They no ſooner came into it, but they began to think of taking advantage of that place to revolt: they took care to fortify it, and choſe for their head a prieſt of Heliopolis, who changed his name of Oſarſiphus into that of Moſes, they were aſſiſted by the inhabitants of Jeruſalem, whoſe anceſtors had been in poſſeſſion of Abaris, &c. Their victories were great and cruel, but at laſt the king of Egypt overcame them, and drove them out of the country *(h)*. You will find in Joſephus the refutation of thoſe ſtories, and ſome learned obſervations of Sir John Marſham in my remark [*A*].

(a) Exod. i, 8.

(b) Marſham. Chron. Can. Ægypt. Sæc. VIII, *pag. m.* 107.

(c) Manetho, apud Joſeph. *lib. i*, cont. Appion. *pag.* 1040.

(d) Id. ap. eumd. ibid. *pag.* 1039.

(e) Ex eodem ap. eumd. *pag.* 1040.

(f) Id. ap. eumd. ibid. *pag.* 1052.

(g) That is to ſay, to the Iſraëlites, who, as Manetho ſays, had ſubdued Egypt, and whoſe king Saltis had enlarged and fortified the city of Abaris.

(h) Ex eod. ibid. *pag.* 1052, & *ſeq.*

[*A*] *You will find . . . . ſome learned obſervations of Sir John Marſham in my remark.*] He ſays (1) that the city of the ſhepherds called Abaris by Manetho, is called Peluſium by another Hiſtorian of Egypt (2). Sir John Marſham is not exact in this: that Hiſtorian ſaid only, that the maimed and ſickly people, that were turned out of Egypt, retired to Peluſium, and joined with 380 thouſand men whom Amenophis had left there. Note, that Joſephus (3) took advantage of the difference that is between Manetho and Chæremon, as to the place to which thoſe maimed and leprous people were ſent. Sir John Marſham adds, that Ptolomæus Mendeſius (4) made mention of the city of Abaris (5), and that the fables about Typhon belong to that city. The lake Serbonis, as he goes on, where Typhon hid himſelf (6), and the city of Heropolis, where he was thunder-ſtruck, were not far from thoſe parts (7). The name ϖειθὼ, or πιθωμ, given to one of the towns built by the children of Iſrael, alluded to that of Typhon. The Egyptians uſed to call Typhon by the name of Seth (8), hence it is that they called the city of Typhon, Sethron. The Sethroites Nomos took it's name from that city. What Joſephus ſays is not therefore true, that the city of Abaris was built in the Saites Nomos, for it was ſituated on the eaſtern banks of the river Bubaſtus, and that Nomos was ſituated in the weſtern part of the Delta. It is therefore better to follow Africanus's

Manetho

(1) Marſh. Chron. Can. Ægypt. Sæc. VIII, *pag.* 107.

(2) *Named* Chæremon. Joſeph. *lib. i*, cont. Appion. *pag.* 1057, *alledges his words.*

(3) Joſeph. ibid.

(4) Ptol. Mendeſius, ap. Euſeb. Præp. Evang. *lib. x, cap. xii, pag.* 497, *A.*

(5) He calls it Αὔαρις.

(6) Herodot. *lib. iii, cap. v.*

(7) Steph. Byzant. in Ἡρώ.

(8) Plut. de Iſide, *pag.* 357, *D.*

Manetho (9), quoted by Syncellus; for according to that citation, that people took Memphis, and built a town in the Sethroites Nomos. Let us conclude, that the city of Abaris, that of Typhon, that of Sethron, and hat of Pithom, which is mentioned in Exodus, are the ſame with that which the Grecians call Peluſium. This is Sir John Marſham's determination.

---

(9) Rectius ex Manethone Africanus. *Marſh. ubi ſupra, pag.* 108. *He quotes* Syncellus, *pag.* 61, *a.*

PITISCUS (**Bartholomew**) preacher to the Elector Palatine, was born the twenty-fourth of Auguſt 1561, at Schlauna, a village of Sileſia near Grunberg. The poverty of his family engaged the miniſter of that place, to recommend him to the lord of that village, as a child who was fit to ſtudy, and who deſerved to be put in the way of improving himſelf. That gentleman undertook to be at the charges of it, and ſent him to the college of Grunberg. He exceeded all his ſchool-fellows in a ſhort time. He was ſent to Breſlaw, being eighteen years of age, and was there a preceptor in the houſe of a worthy man, who had a very fine library. He often ſhut up himſelf in it with Amandus Polanus, which proved very uſeful to both of them. Having loſt his Mæcenas, when it was time to go to the univerſities, he was ſo happy as to be aſſiſted by the liberality of a Proteſtant lady (*a*), who maintained, at her own charges, a certain number of young men, who ſtudied Divinity. He pitched upon the academy of Zerbſt, by reaſon of the great reputation of Wolfgang Amlingus, and was there all the year 1583. The next year he went into the Palatinate, and having given ſeveral proofs of his merit there, he was made (*b*) one of the preceptors of prince Frederic IV (*c*). He acquitted himſelf ſo well in his employment, that prince Caſimir, adminiſtrator of the Palatinate, appointed him the ſecond preacher to his pupil, who, when he came of age, was ſo well pleaſed with his preceptor's ſermons, that he made him his firſt preacher. Pitiſcus goriouſly exerciſed that employment till he died, which happened the ſeventeenth of July 1613 (*d*). I muſt not forget that he became a very great Mathematician [*A*], and publiſhed a book, wherein he ſhewed that it would be very neceſſary that Proteſtants ſhould leave off writing controverſial books againſt one another [*B*]. He publiſhed it by order. I mean there was a conſultation upon that ſubject, after which he was charged

(*a*) The wife of Joachim de Berge.

(*b*) *In the year* 1588. Schultetus, in Narrat. Apologet. *pag.* 21.

(*c*) He was Elector ſince.

(*d*) *Taken from* Melch. Adam, in Vit. Theolog. Germ. *pag.* 833, & *ſeq.*

[*A*] *He became a very great Mathematician.*] He publiſhed in Latin five books of Trigonomety, in 1599, which were reprinted with ſome additions in 1612. That work contains ſix books of Aſtronomical problems: a book *Problematum Geodæticorum ſive de agro plane metiendo ac dividendo: Problemata Geographica:* a book *Problematum Gnomonicorum ac Architectonicorum, in quo ſe ait præcipua Architecturæ militaris myſteria reſeraſſe* (1). Tycho Brahe very much eſteemed Pitiſcus's capacity in the Mathematics, and wiſhed that the number of Mathematician preachers was greater, for he believed that it would give them a more ſolid judgment, and put an end to ſeveral diſputes. Here are his words: ' Doctiſſimi illius Bartholomæi ' Pitiſci de triangulis acutum & compendioſum ' libellum lubens accepi: rogoque ut illi ex me ' gratias agas. Optarem, plures ejuſmodi concionatores reperiri, qui Geometrica gnaviter callerent: forte plus eſſet in iis circumſpecti & ſolidi judicii, rixarum inanium & logomachiarum minus. Si ' is mihi aliquando ſcripſerit; & de iis ſtudiis mecum ' contulerit, inveniet reſponſorem non invitum (2). - - - ' *I have with pleaſure received the ingenious and compendious book of the moſt learned Pitiſcus, concerning Trigonometry: and I beg you would return him my thanks.* ' *I wiſh there were many ſuch preachers that underſtood* ' *Geometry: perhaps there would be more circumſpection* ' *and ſolid judgment, and leſs ſtrife and contention amongſt* ' *them. If he will pleaſe to write, and conſult with me* ' *about thoſe ſtudies, he ſhall find me a very ready correſpondent.*' That wiſh of Tycho Brahe is grounded upon a very good reaſon, but it is liable to ſome inconveniencies. A pompous and florid eloquence is neceſſary to preachers: a dry and cloſe way of reaſoning, like that of Mathematicians, is not proper for them, and would not make ſuch an impreſſion upon their hearers, as the ſtate of man requires. Note, that Pitiſcus acquired by his own ſtudy all that he knew of the Mathematics. ' Illud verò mirandum, quod homo Theologus, in Mathematum ſtudiis, nullo niſi ſe magiſtro, ' eo uſque progreſſus eſt, ut editis ſcriptis, diſciplinæ ' illius gloriam magnis Matheſeos profeſſoribus præripuerit (3). - - - *It is indeed very ſurpriſing, that a Divine ſhould without any aſſiſtance make ſuch proficiency* ' *in the Mathematics, as by his writings to ſnatch the* ' *glory of that ſcience from the profeſſors of it.*'

[*B*] *That the Proteſtants ſhould leave off writing controverſial books againſt one another.*] In the year 1608, the Eccleſiaſtical Senate of the Elector Palatine deliberated about the means of putting a ſtop to the fatal diſputes of the Proteſtant Divines (4). Scultetus, preacher to his electoral highneſs, and ſome others, were of opinion, that it was for the advantage of the church, that for the time to come the Reformed ſhould compoſe neither Apologies, nor Antilogies, nor any ſuch like pieces of controverſy in religious matters; that it was not poſſible to ſay or write any thing but what had been ſaid or written a great while ago; that the confeſſions of faith, with their expoſitions, were ſufficient for any one who ſincerely enquired after truth; that there was no example of ſuch obſtinate and eager diſputes among the Prophets and Apoſtles; that ſuch books increaſed differences inſtead of terminating them, and that the ſatirical ſharpneſs of the authors of thoſe books afforded diverſion to profane men, and was a matter of triumph for the Papiſts, and inſpired a great many people with irreligion. This is expreſſed more at large, and with greater energy in the Latin words. ' Nec componi, ſed multiplicari controverſias iſtis contentionibus: paucos veritatis inquirendæ, gloriolæ ' vanæ aucupandæ gratiâ, multos in arenam diſputandi deſcendere: Diabolum hoc agere; ut totus Spiritus Theologicus, & quicquid ferè Dei providentia ' donorum huic ſeculo contulit, contentionibus impendatur: ut Fratres ſtylo Satyrico ſe mutuò exagitent ' & deforment, utque adeò per iſtiuſmodi ſcriptiones ' boni à vocationis ſuæ officiis avocentur, mali in capitali, quo ab antagoniſtis diffident, odio firmentur; ' denique mutuis iſtis convitiis, quibus libri inter ſe litigantium ſcatent, creari profanis riſum, Pontificiis ' jubilum & magnæ auditorum parti omnis religionis ' contemtum (5). - - - *That by ſuch contentions, controverſies were not terminated but multiplied: that few* ' *diſputed for the ſake of truth, but many for the ſake of* ' *vain glory: that it was the Devil's great deſign, that* ' *the whole ſpirit of Theology, and all the gifts God has* ' *beſtowed on this age, ſhould be laid out in debates: that* ' *the brethren ſhould exaſperate and diſgrace one another* ' *in ſatirical writings, and that thereby the good may be* ' *diverted from the proper functions of their calling, and* ' *the bad confirmed in their mortal hatred to their adverſaries: and laſtly, that thoſe mutual reproaches, which* ' *books of controverſy abounded with, occaſioned diverſion to the profane, joy to the Papiſts, and in many a* ' *contempt of all religion.*' It was reſolved in that aſſembly, that our Pitiſcus ſhould pathetically and gravely repreſent thoſe things in a public book. He performed it very well (6), and exhorted the Proteſtants to

(1) *See* Voſſius, de Scient. Math. *pag.* 306, & *alibi.*

(2) Tycho Brahe, Epiſt. ad Conradum Aſſachum, ap. Melch. Adamum, in Vit. Theolog. *pag.* 840.

(3) Melch Adam. ibid.

(4) Quænam triſtiſſimis Theologorum Evangelicorum certaminibus medicina reperiri queat. *Scultet. Narrat, Apologet. p.* 45.

(5) Ibid.

(6) His book was written in High-Dutch.

charged with that work. He publiſhed ſome other books [*C*].

to re-unite themſelves againſt the common enemy, and to lay aſide all diſputes *de Perſona Chriſti & de Cœna Domini*; - - - *Concerning the perſon of Chriſt, and the Lord's ſupper*; he ſhewed them that they might eaſily live in a perfect union, tho' they differed about the ſenſe of ſome paſſages of the Scripture (7). That book did more harm than good, for, as if it had been a new ſignal for war, the Divines of Saxony and Tubingen took up arms every where, and maintained with an extream eagerneſs, that the Lutherans could make no peace with thoſe that deny the Oral Manducation. 'Verax & hic fuit, quod proverbi locum obtinuit, ſapientis effatum: *Sæpè optimè cogitata peſſimè cadunt.* Vix enim lucem publicam aſpexerat pia exhortatio illa, cùm quaſi claſſicum ceciniſſent noſtri, ad arma undique concurritur in Saxoniâ & Sueviâ, magnoque ſtudio & labore orbi Chriſtiano demonſtratur, oralis munducationis in Euchariſtiâ patronos non poſſe pacem colere cum Reformatis (8). - - - *In this caſe was verified the ſaying of the wiſe man, which has paſſed into a proverb:* that the beſt deſigns have often the leaſt ſucceſs. *For that pious exhortation was hardly come out, when, as if it had been a ſignal to battle, the Divines of Saxony and Schwaben took up arms,* &c.' Scultetus was extreamly deſirous to ſee the Lutherans and Reformed re-united. He exhorted the Divines of Wirtemberg to it *viva voce*, and in writing; he repreſented to them the miſchiefs which ariſe from diſcord, the Atheiſm of Hearers, the contempt of the Miniſters, and the joy of the Papiſts (9). But it was to no purpoſe, for he was anſwered, that as for political friendſhip it was never refuſed to the Reformed, and would never be refuſed to them for the time to come, but that Theological friendſhip would never be granted them. *Fruſtra omnia: Reſponſum enim: ſe in amicitiam politicam nos ſemper recepiſſe, recepturoſque deinceps; in Theologicam, hoc eſt, fraternitatem Chriſtianam nunquam* (10).

[*C*] *He publiſhed ſome other books.*] Moſt of them in High-Dutch: but the book he wrote againſt a Jeſuit of Mentz, with this title *Anti-Roſarium*, is in Latin. See Mr Baillet's *Anti*'s (11).

(7) Schultet. ib. *pag.* 46.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Expoſitis malis, quæ ex mutuis Evangelicorum digladiationibus orirentur, atheiſmo auditorum, contemptu miniſtrorum verbi, jubilo Papiſtarum. *Ibid. pag.* 72, *ad ann.* 1616.

(10) Ibid.

(11) *Num.* 219.

PLACE (PETER DE LA) in Latin *Plateanus*, or *à Platea*, *was born in the country of Angoulmois* (*a*), *was in his* youth *ſo well educated in learning, that he alone, of all his brothers, reſolved to follow the ſtudy of the Law, in which he made ſuch proficiency that before he was twenty two years of age, he compoſed a Paraphraſe on actions* (*b*), *and about that time began to frequent and practiſe at the bar of the parliament of Paris, where he acquired the character of a ſenſible, well ſpoken, and conſcientious man* (*c*). For which reaſon, Francis I. choſe him *for his advocate in his court of Aids at Paris.* He executed that office with the greateſt integrity, and therefore Henry II *choſe him himſelf* (*d*), *out of many, to be his firſt preſident in the ſame court of Aids.* He inwardly embraced the faith of the reformed churches in the year 1554 [*A*], and profeſſed it openly after the death of Francis II: but the troubles that aroſe ſoon after obliged him to retire *for the ſecurity of his perſon to his own houſe in the country of Picardy.* The calm returning in the year 1562, *he went to the king to clear himſelf of ſeveral malicious aſperſions, which ſome enemies had thrown upon him, and after his majeſty was ſatisfied with his defence,* he *paid his reſpects* to the prince of Condé who *immediately committed to him the charge and* ſuperintendency *of all his houſehold affairs, which he undertook with ſuch zeal that in all things relating to the prince, he ſpared neither his ſubſtance, nor children, nor even his own perſon, ſo much was he devoted to his ſervice.* The diſturbances which broke out again five years after made *him retire once more from Paris to the caſtle of Vé in Valois* (*e*), *where he ſuffered great perſecution* [*B*].

The

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 408, *ſays he was born at Angouleſme.*

(*b*) See the laſt remark.

(*c*) See the Opuſcules of Loiſel, *pag.* 511, 525.

(*d*) In the year 1553. See the ſame Opuſcules, *pag.* 511.

(*e*) Belonging to his nephews on the account of Dame Ragonde Luillier, his wife. He was then their guardian. *P. de Farnace, Vie de P. de la Place, pag.* 15.

[*A*] *He inwardly embraced the faith of the reformed churches in the year* 1554.] We find in the account of his life, that *God called him to his knowledge* at that time *in a very extraordinary manner.* 'Being a ſcholar at Poictiers about twenty years before, he happened by the providence of God to ſee the late Mr John Calvin then paſſing through that place with archbiſhop du Tillet (1). He with pleaſure heard him talk glorioſly of the knowledge of God in general; but when he came to ſpeak of the pure ſervice of God, he ſtarted back as being very zealous for the religion in which he had been carefully brought up. However, from that time he entertained ſome ſcruple in his conſcience, that poſſibly he might have been deceived, which he often thought of, as he has ſince declared: this was a kind of preparative to nouriſh that ſmall ſeed, till it ſhould come to ſpring and ſhoot up in the ſeaſon appointed by God. One day as he ſtood before his houſe, a certain ſtranger, by a wonderful providence of God, without knowing any thing of him, but ſeeing him to be a perſon of diſtinction, and wanting to be relieved in his extreme poverty, humbly applied to him, and made a long diſcourſe in very good Latin concerning the cauſe of his miſery. This ſtranger ſeeming to be a man of parts, he made him come into his ſtudy, that he might be able to ſound him a little better at his leiſure. And then the poor man, as if he had been divinely ſent, began freely to diſplay all the abuſes of the Papal church, and to declare the true and only way of ſerving God. After he had heard all this very calmly, he beſtowed ſomething upon him; but however he deſired him very earneſtly, not to return again to ſee him; becauſe he was afraid of the fires, which were prepared againſt thoſe that were in the leaſt ſuſpected to be Proteſtants, as indeed that poor ſtranger was ſoon after tried in the furnace at Paris. But, from that time Peter de la Place never ceaſed to peruſe the Scriptures, and all the antient Doctors, and even the Scholaſtics, that he might be able to remove that ſcruple which tormented his mind day and night. By this means, in a little time, God touched his heart, and opened his eyes that he might behold the light of the Goſpel; ſo that Francis the ſecond happening to die, he publickly profeſſed the Reformed religion (2).' The brother of Papyrius Maſſo aſſures us (3) that Peter de la Place and Bertrand de la Place, brothers, and John du Tillet, followed John Calvin to Lyons, who had infected them with his Hereſies at Angouleme. This is not probable with reſpect to him, whoſe article I am now writing: for had he followed Calvin to Lyons, the author of his Life would have known it, and would not have ſaid a thing very different from it.

[*B*] *He ſuffered great perſecution.*] 'Neither the loſs of his office, nor the ſale of all his goods, nor the ſeizure of his real eſtate, gave him ſo much vexation and uneaſineſs, as the indignities he received from thoſe, of whom, humanly ſpeaking, he might have expected relief, as they were his near relations: . . . . A certain counſellor at court, ... having profeſſed the Proteſtant religion, even after the firſt troubles broke out, knowing that God was going ſharply to try his people, immediately revolted, and finding himſelf in ſome danger, becauſe of the threatnings that were given out againſt thoſe that had been Proteſtants, in order to remove all ſuſpicion of his being any wiſe concerned at his revolt, or having any deſire to return to the company of good men, he reſolved to commit a very ſignal act, which was to perſecute, by all ſorts of calumnies and injuries, Peter de la Place, who *was guardian to his nephews, the children of this counſellor's wiſe: and who was*

(1) This du Tillet never was a biſhop, or archbiſhop, but only canon and archdeacon of Angouleme. See what the brother of Papyrius Maſſo has added to the Life of Calvin, at the end of *Papirii Maſſonis Elogia varia.*

(2) P. de Farnace, Brief Recueil des principaux poincts de la Vie de Meſſire Pierre de la Place, *p.* 11, & *ſeq.*

(3) See the Elogies of Papyrius Maſſo, Life of Calvin.

The reformed church having enjoyed *ſome reſt*, he returned to his own houſe, *and notwithſtanding the oppoſition of a certain perſon, who during the war had been poſſeſſed of his place* [*C*], *he entered again upon his office of preſident, and exerciſed it without blemiſh, being reſpected by all honeſt men, and feared by the wicked, till the maſſacre of St Bartholomew*, at which he was killed in the manner as will be ſeen below (*f*) [*D*]. He wrote ſome

books,

(*f*) *Taken from* P. de Farnace, *in the* Brief Recueil des principaux poincts de la Vie de Meſſire Pierre de la Place, *before the* Traicté de l'Excellence de l'Homme Chreſtien, *p.* 18.

‘ *likewiſe retired to a caſtle belonging to his nephews. Upon which the counſellor, by a multitude of ſlanderous petitions, never ceaſed to forge and vent a thouſand malicious ſtories and calumnies at court: ſo that he not only got the ſaid de la Place to be ignominiouſly deprived of his guardianſhip, tho' abſent and ignorant of thoſe things, but alſo obtained a commiſſion both to ſeize on the ſaid caſtle and on the perſon of the ſaid de la Place. And it would have been actually executed in ſuch a miſerable and turbulent time, conſidering the diligence which he made Tanchou and his archers to uſe, as if the buſineſs had been to apprehend ſome highwayman, had not God raiſed up a friend, who came the night before and gave him notice of every thing. Whereupon, tho' he was ill of a violent fever, he was forced before day to make his eſcape to the foreſt of Rez, pretty near that caſtle, where afterwards he found a ſtranger that received him, whilſt this counſellor, on the contrary, violating not only all the rights of affinity, but alſo of humanity, ſeized on the caſtle, drove out the children of the ſaid de la Place, plundered the ſubſtance he had left there, and moreover ſent Tanchou with his archers in purſuit of him. He was therefore obliged to wander up and down the foreſt for ſeveral days, till at laſt Mr de Bouchavane was ſo kind as to take him very privately to a ſmall chamber of the caſtle of Couſſy* (4).’

[*C*] *The oppoſition of a certain perſon who . . . . had been poſſeſſed of his office.*] That certain perſon is no other than Stephen de Neuilly. We find in the dialogue of the advocates of the parliament of Paris, that *he was made firſt preſident of the court of Aids, when Mr de la Place was killed at the maſſacre of St Bartholomew* (5). Let us ſee the marginal note that was made on that paſſage of the dialogue. ‘ Miraumont tit. Court of Aids, ſays that the Sieur de Neuilly entered upon the office of firſt preſident the eleventh of January 1569, which he exerciſed afterwards during the abſence of Mr Peter de la Place: and yet Paſquier in the ſixteenth book of his letters writing to Mr Theodore Paſquier, his eldeſt ſon, pag. 245, ſays, he was made firſt preſident by the duke de Mayenne, that is, during the League.’ The difficulty propoſed in this marginal note is none at all: for Paſquier (6) ſpeaks only of the office of Preſident au Mortier conferred by the duke of Mayenne on Stephen de Neuilly, who was already firſt preſident of the court of Aids. See above the article NULLY.

[*D*] *The maſſacre of St Bartholomew, at which he was killed in the manner as will be ſeen below.*] Captain Michael, arquebuſier to Charles IX, went to the houſe of Peter de la Place at ſix a-clock in the morning. He was *armed with an arquebuſs on his ſhoulder, and a piſtol at his girdle, and as a ſignal that he was one of the maſſacreers wore a napkin about his left arm. The firſt words he ſpoke were, that the duke of Guiſe had killed by the king's order, the admiral and ſeveral other Huguenot lords: and as all the reſt of the Huguenots, what ever quality they were of, were deſtined to death, he was come to the houſe of the ſaid Mr de la Place to ſave him from that calamity. But that he deſired they would ſhew him the gold and ſilver that was in the houſe* (7). The anſwer of Mr de la Place made the captain blaſpheme, and obliged him to tell him that *he ordered him to come and ſpeak with the king*. La Place then doubting *there was ſome great ſedition in the city, ſlipt out at a back door of his houſe, deſigning to retire to a neighbour's houſe. In the mean while, moſt of the ſervants diſappeared, and the captain having got a thouſand crowns, as he was going away was intreated by Miſtreſs des Maretz, daughter to the ſaid la Place, to conduct her and her huſband Mr des Maretz to the houſe of ſome Catholic friend, which he agreed to, and actually did. After that, the ſaid Mr de la Place, having been refuſed acceſs at three different houſes, was forced to return to his own, where he found his wife in a very melancholy condition* (8). He exhorted her to patience, ‘ then ordered the ſervants that remained in the houſe to be called, who being come into his chamber, as he had uſed every Sunday to make a form of exhortation to his family, he went to prayer, then began to read a chapter of Job, with the expoſition or ſermon of Mr Calvin, and diſcourſed a little upon the juſtice and mercy of God, who, *ſaid he*, like a good father, exerciſes his elect with divers chaſtiſements, that their minds may not be fixed on the things of this life. . . Then he went to prayer again, preparing, both himſelf and all his family, to endure all ſorts of torments, and even death itſelf, rather than do any thing againſt the honour of God. Having ended his prayer, they came to tell him that Mr de Seneſcay, Prevoſt de l'hôtel, with ſeveral of his archers, were at the gate, demanding, by the king's order, that the gate may be opened, and ſaying that he came to preſerve the perſon of the ſaid de la Place, and to hinder the houſe from being plundered by the populace: whereupon the ſaid Mr de la Place commanded the gate to be opened for him, who being entered told him the great ſlaughter that was made of the Huguenots throughout the whole city, and by the order of the king, adding theſe words mingled with Latin, that there would not be left one ſingle man, *qui mingat ad parietem*, - - - *To piſs againſt the wall.* Nevertheleſs that the king had expreſsly commanded him to take care, that no injury be done him, but to bring him to the Louvre, becauſe his majeſty wanted to be informed by him, of ſeveral things relating to the affairs of the Proteſtants, which he had had the management of, and therefore that he ſhould prepare himſelf to go to the king. Mr de la Place anſwered, that he ſhould always think himſelf extremely happy to have the opportunity, before he left this world, of giving an account to his majeſty of all his actions and behaviour. But that it was impoſſible for him then to go to the Louvre, conſidering the horrible maſſacre that was committed in the city, without running the greateſt and moſt manifeſt hazard of his life, but that it was in his power to aſſure his majeſty of his perſon, by leaving in his houſe ſuch a number of his archers as he ſhould think fit, till the fury of the people was abated. Seneſcay conſented to it, and left with him one of his lieutenants, called Toutevoye, and four of his archers. A little while after Seneſcay was gone, the preſident Charon, then Prevoſt of the merchants of Paris, came to the houſe, where after he had talked ſome time in ſecret, he left at his departure four archers of the city, with thoſe of Seneſcay (9). . . . . Seneſcay returning the next day about two a-clock in the afternoon, declared to him, that he had a very poſitive and repeated order from the king to bring him, and that there muſt be no further delay (10).’ All the remonſtrances of La Place being to no purpoſe, he begged of him at laſt *to accompany him in perſon, to which Seneſcay replied, that having other affairs upon his hands he could not conduct him above fifty paces* (11). *The wife of the ſaid de la Place*, threw herſelf ‘ at the feet of the ſaid Seneſcay to beſeech him to go with her ſaid huſband. But upon that, the ſaid Mr de la Place, who never ſhewed the leaſt ſign of fear, lifted up his wife, reproving her and telling her it was not to the arm of fleſh, but to God only ſhe muſt have recourſe. Then turning about he perceived in the hat of his eldeſt ſon a paper croſs, which he had put there thro' infirmity, thinking to ſave himſelf by that means, for which he chid him ſeverely, commanding him to take off from his hat that mark of ſedition, and evincing to him, that the true croſs we muſt wear, was tribulation and affliction, which God ſent upon us as a ſure earneſt of the felicity and life eternal that he has prepared for his people. After that, finding, himſelf very much preſſed by the ſaid Seneſcay to ſet out in order to go to his majeſty, being entirely reſolved upon death which he ſaw was prepared for him, he took his cloak, embraced his wife, and earneſtly recommended to her above all things to have the honour and fear of God before her eyes, and ſo he went away very chearful. When he was come as far as Glaſs-houſe ſtreet, over againſt Cock-ſtreet, certain mur-

‘ derers,

(4) P. de Farnace, Vie du Préf. de la Place, *p.* 15, & *ſeq.*

(5) Opuſcules de Loiſel, *p.* 487.

(6) Paſquier, Lettres, *lib. xvi*, *Tom. ii*, *p.* 245.

(7) P. de Farnace, ibid. *p.* 19.

(8) Ib. *p.* 20.

(9) Ib. *p.* 21, & *ſeq.*

(10) Ib. *p.* 24.

(11) Ib. *p.* 25.

books, which were printed [*E*].

‘derers, who had waited for him with naked daggers about three hours, killed him, like an innocent lamb, in the midſt of ten or twelve archers of the ſaid Seneſcay who conducted him, and his houſe was pillaged for the ſpace of five or ſix days together. The body of the ſaid Sieur de la Place, whoſe ſoul was taken up into Heaven, was carried to a ſtable by the town houſe, where the face was all covered with dung, and the next morning was thrown into the river (12).

[*E*] *He wrote ſome books which have been printed.*] A little after the death of Francis II, he *publiſhed a treatiſe on Vocation* (13), which he dedicated to Charles IX, and then *another treatiſe on the right uſe of Moral Philoſophy with the Chriſtian doctrine.* During his firſt retreat, *he applied himſelf wholly to the ſtudy of Divinity . . . He likewiſe employed ſome hours in writing down the ſtate of religion and the commonwealth, ſome ſpecimens of which, tho' without his knowledge, were printed in the year* 1565 (14). Whilſt he reſided in the caſtle of Couſſy, he conſidered *the excellency of a Chriſtian*, and compoſed a ſmall treatiſe on that ſubject which he dedicated to the queen of Navarre (15). The Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Paris the twentieth of May 1572. The edition I make uſe of is of the year 1581, in 12mo. In La Croix we find what follows. ‘He wrote a very learned and excellent treatiſe on Vocation and the manner of life, to which every one is called, printed at Paris for Frederic Morel, in the year 1561 in 4to, and contains twenty one leaves. This book was printed afterwards at Paris by Robert le Mangnier, with a different title from what it had before; for the laſt title runs thus. *Diſcours politiques ſur la voye d'entrer deüement aux Eſtats, & la maniere de conſtamment s'y maintenir & gouverner, le tout reduit par chapitres.* It was divided into chapters, which was not done in the former edition. Some think the ſaid Sieur de la Place was the author of a book intituled *de l'Etat de la Religion de France*, printed the year 1557; but I can affirm nothing about it, ſince his name is not put to the aforeſaid book (16).’ I believe there is a fault in the words, *in the year* 1557, for the firſt edition of that work of Peter de la Place is of the year 1565: the title is *Commentaires de l'eſtat de la Religion & Republique ſoubs les Rois Henry & François ſeconds, & Charles neufieme.* Neither the name of the Author, or the Printer, or the place of the impreſſion are ſet down. The work is divided into ſeven books and reaches from 1556 till towards the end of the year 1561: it contains 282 leaves in 8vo: We muſt not forget theſe other words of La Croix du Maine. ‘He was a man very learned in the law (as he ſhewed by his Latin writings, printed long ago, and which we ſhall mention elſewhere) and beſides that, he was very eloquent (17).’ Du Verdier Vau-Privas quotes only one Latin book of that author: *Petri Plateani Angoliſmæi. . . . Paraphraſis in titulos Inſtitutionum imperialium de Actionibus, Exceptionibus, & Interdictis. Scholiis ſeorſum margini adpoſitis, Pariſiis* 4 *apud Galeotum à Prato* 1548 (18).

(12) Ib. *p.* 26, & *ſeq.*

(13) Ib. *p.* 13.

(14) Ib. *p.* 14.

(15) Ib. *p.* 18.

(16) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franç. *p.* 408.

(17) Ibid.

(18) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibl. Franç. *p.* 1038.

PLANTEVIT-LA-PAUSE (JOHN), in Latin *Plantavitius Pauſanus*, biſhop of Lodeve, was born in the caſtle of Marcaſſargues, a ſeat belonging to his mother, in the dioceſe of Nîmes. He was very learned in the Oriental languages, as it appears from the books he publiſhed [*A*]. He was not only born a Proteſtant, but he had been alſo miniſter of the church of Beziers (*a*). He turned Catholic in the year 1604, and was preſently ſent for to court, where Henry the Great careſſed him very much. He went to La Fleche, in order to paſs through a new courſe of Divinity under the Jeſuits. He left that place in 1609, to go to Rome (*b*). He was one of the biſhops of Languedoc, who engaged in the rebellion of the duke of Montmorency (*c*). Moreri has committed ſome faults [*B*].

(*a*) See the atteſtation he gave to *Fitz Simon*, inſerted in the *Britannomachia* of that Jeſuit, *pag.* 122, where he is miſnamed *John de Plantanil.*

(*b*) See the ſame atteſtation.

(*c*) *See the paſſage of* Rivetus, in Jeſuita vapulante, *quoted by* Colomeſius, Bibl. Orient. *p.* 182.

[*A*] *The books he publiſhed.*] Here are the titles of ſome of them. *Florilegium Biblicum, Heb. Lat.* at Lodeve, 1645. *Florilegium Rabbinicum, Heb. Lat. cum Biliotheca Rabbinica, ibid.* in the ſame year. *Theſaurus Synonymicus Hebræo-Chaldæo-Rabbinicus, ibid.* in the ſame year. An Hebrew Lexicon. Colomeſius ſpeaks of a book of Michael Beraud, Miniſter of Montauban, concerning Juſtification againſt that author (1).

[*B*] *Moreri has committed ſome faults.*] I. It does clearly appear from the atteſtation which I have quoted, that Plantavit-la-Pauſe made his abjuration at Beziers, and not at Bourges. Good Moreri miſtook, without doubt, the meaning of the Latin word *Biterrenſi*, and took it to be the ſame with *Bituricenſi*. II. I fancy that by the ſame miſtake he tells us, that that prelate *retired to the caſtle of Margon, in the dioceſe of Bourges, and died there the 28th of May*, 1651. III. It cannot be ſaid that a prelate *behaved himſelf with great prudence*, from the year 1625 to the year 1648, when it is certain that he declared for the rebels in the year 1632. That omiſſion is leſs excuſable than that of Plantevit's miniſtry, and of his ſtudies at la Fleche, and of ſome other facts of which there is not the leaſt hint in Moreri's Dictionary. IV. Thoſe words, *he made a particular ſtudy* of Divinity *in the college of Foix at Toloſe*, are captious and very improper; for they would make one believe, that the college of Foix is a houſe wherein ſciences are taught, which is not true (2).

(1) Colom. Bibl. Orient. *p.* 182.

(2) Compare this with the remark [*B*], of the article BOSQUET (FRANCIS).

PLATINA (BARTHOLOMEW) (*a*) author of an Hiſtory of the Popes, flouriſhed in the XVth century. He was born in the year 1421, in a village called *Piadena* [*A*], between Cremona and Mantua. His firſt profeſſion was that of a ſoldier (*b*); he followed it a conſiderable time, and then he applied himſelf to ſtudy, and made a conſiderable progreſs in it. He went to Rome (*c*) under the pontificate of Calixtus III (*d*), and having got cardinal Beſſarion's acquaintance, he obtained ſome ſmall benefices of Pius II, and then the place of Apoſtolic Abbreviator. Paul II, ſucceſſor of Pius II, turned all the abbreviators out of their places, without any regard to the money they had laid out to buy

(*a*) *Not* Baptiſt, *as he is called by* Jacobus Bergamenſis, Leander Albertus, Floridus Sabinus, &c. *See the proofs of it in* Voſſ. de Hiſt. Lat. *p.* 589. *See alſo the remark* [*H*], *at the end.*

(*b*) Volater. *lib. xxi, pag.* 777.

(*c*) Jovius, Elog. *cap. xix.*

(*d*) Not Calixtu II, as Moreri ſays.

[*A*] *He was born in the year* 1421, *in a village called Piadena.*] I do not find any author that mentions that year, but ſince Jacobus Bergamenſis and Maſſæus (1) place his death in the year 1481, and Raphaël Volaterranus (2), and Leander Albertus (3) affirm that he died being ſixty years old, it follows that he was born in the year 1421. Thoſe who ſay, as Moreri does, that he was born at Verona, are miſtaken (4): here is the proof of it. ‘Idem fecit Theodorus Hexarchus Ravennas cui quidem in magiſtratu mortuo non ita multo poſt Joannes Platina ſucceſſit. Hunc ego crediderim dediſſe nomen meo natali ſolo quod Platina appellatur in agro Cremonenſi poſitum. - - - - *Theodorus Hexarchus of Ravenna*

(1) *In Chronic.* They ſay that he died of the Plague.

---

(2) Commentar. Urban. *lib. xxi, pag.* 777.

(3) In Deſcript. Ital. *pag. m.* 626.

(4) Hofman, in voce Platina, *and* Cave, in Cartophyl. Eccleſiaſt. *Edit. Lipſ. pag.* 369, *are cenſured upon that account by* Daniel Will. Mollerus, Diſſert. de Platina, *pag.* 4. *Sir Thomas-Pope Blount*, Cenſura Author. *pag.* 339, *ſets down a long paſſage of* Boiſſardus, in Iconib. *where Platina is called* Veronenſis.

‘ *did*

buy that employment, or to the remonſtrances of Platina, who humbly beſought him to order, that their cauſe ſhould be judged by the auditors of the Rota (*e*). The Pope was offended at the liberty he took, and returned a very haughty anſwer [*B*]. The poor men being deprived of their places, did for ſome days whatever they could to obtain audience of the Pope, but they were denied with the greateſt contempt. Which moved Platina to write a letter to him [*C*], wherein he acquainted him, that they were ready to go into foreign countries, and to exhort the princes to call a council, in order to examine whether the abbreviators had been juſtly deprived of their places. His letter was looked upon as an act of felony. He was impriſoned and kept in irons, and left in that condition four months, being expoſed to a thouſand miſeries [*D*]. Afterwards he was ſet at liberty, at the requeſt of cardinal Francis de Gonzaga, and was ordered not to go out of Rome. He lived quietly in it for the ſpace of three years, and then he fell again into a new and more cruel perſecution. The Pope had been made to believe that Callimachus had conſpired againſt him, and that Platina was one of his accomplices. Several perſons were impriſoned, and put to the rack upon that account. Platina was as ſeverely uſed as the reſt. That conſpiracy proved a chimæra, yet not one priſoner was ſet at liberty; for they would have been aſhamed to acknowledge, that perſons of merit had been ſo cruelly treated upon an ill-grounded ſuſpicion [*E*]. When it appeared that the accuſation of treaſon was too ill-grounded to inſiſt upon it, they

‘ *did the ſame, who, dying during his magiſtracy, was* ‘ *ſucceeded ſoon after by John Platina. The latter, I* ‘ *believe, gave the name to the place of my birth, which* ‘ *is called Platina, and lies in the country of Cremona.*’ Theſe are the very words of Platina (5). The Italians do not call that village Platina, but Piadena: as appears from the Italian tranſlation of a Journey into Italy, written in Latin by Andreas Schottus (6). I believe that Platina was ſo called from the place of his birth: the name of this family was Sacchus, or Saccus.

[*B*] *Returned a very haughty anſwer.*] That Pope's anſwer does very much ſavour of Antichriſtianiſm: he plainly declared that all right, and all the laws depended upon his will. Theſe are the Latin words of Platina (7): ‘ Tentarunt tamen ii ad quos res ipſa ‘ pertinebat hominem è ſententia dimovere: atque ego ‘ certe qui horum de numero eram rogando etiam ut ‘ cauſa ipſa judicibus publicis (quos Rotæ auditores ‘ vocant) committeretur. Tum ille torvis oculis me ‘ aſpiciens, ita nos inquit ad judices revocas? ac ſi ‘ neſcires omnia jura in ſcrinio pectoris noſtri collocata ‘ eſſe? Sic ſtat ſententia, inquit: loco cedant omnes, ‘ eant quo volunt, nihil eos moror: pontifex ſum, ‘ mihique licet pro arbitrio animi aliorum acta & reſcindere & approbare. - - - - *Thoſe, whom the affair* ‘ *concerned, tried to make him alter his reſolution. I* ‘ *too, as being one of their number, beſought him that* ‘ *our cauſe might be heard before the public judges (ſtiled* ‘ *the auditors of the Rota). Upon this, looking at me* ‘ *with a ſtern countenance, do you then, ſaid he, appeal* ‘ *to the judges? As if you were ignorant, forſooth, that* ‘ *the law is wholly centered in my breaſt. Thus have I* ‘ *decreed: go they ſhall every one of them hence; they may* ‘ *chuſe where. I am Pope, and therefore have a right* ‘ *to approve or diſanul the acts of others, as I think beſt.*’

[*C*] *Which moved Platina to write a letter to him.*] You will ſee the contents of it in the following words: ‘ Ego vero, *ſays he* (8), tanta ignominia excitus quod ‘ mihi ac ſociis meis coram non licebat, id agere per ‘ literas inſtitui. Scripſi itaque epiſtolam his verbis. ‘ Si tibi licuit indicta cauſa ſpoliare nos emptione noſtra juſta ac legitima, debet & nobis licere conqueri ‘ illatam injuriam inuſtamque ignominiam. Rejecti à ‘ te ac tam inſigni contumelia affecti dilabemur paſſim ad reges, ad principes, eoſque adhortabimur ut ‘ tibi concilium indicant, in quo potiſſimum rationem ‘ reddere cogaris cur nos legitima poſſeſſione ſpoliaveris. - - - - - *But I, being provoked at ſo great an* ‘ *indignity, reſolved to do by a letter what my colleagues* ‘ *and I were not allowed to do in his preſence. I there*‘*fore wrote to him as follows. If you had a right to* ‘ *deprive us, without being heard, of our juſt and law*‘*ful purchaſe, we likewiſe ſhould have a right to com*‘*plain of the wrong which we ſuffer, and of the indignity* ‘ *that is put upon us. Since we are repulſed by you, and* ‘ *treated in ſuch a contumelious manner, we will go* ‘ *every where to the princes abroad, and exhort them to* ‘ *call a council, whoſe chief buſineſs it ſhall be to make* ‘ *you give an account of the reaſons which you had for* ‘ *depriving us of our right and property.*’ The character of Platina may be known from this letter: it appears by it that he was too impatient, and too much conceited, but at the ſame time, a ſincere man; for ſince he was pleaſed to acquaint the public with his conduct, tho' it was not agreeable to his duty, one may reaſonably ſuppoſe that he loved to write truth. It is certain, that a ſubject who is turned out of his place by his maſter, has no right to threaten him that he will complain of him to other princes, that he may have juſtice. The Pope is ſovereign in Rome, with reſpect to the ſuppreſſion or eſtabliſhment of certain employments, and cannot be ſubjected to a council in that reſpect. Beſides, the Pope could not but be extreamly offended at Platina's menaces about a council. It was treating him like a ſchool-boy, when he is told that his maſter ſhall know of it. Beſides, I ſhould be glad to know, whether the ſuppreſſion of a college of ſecretaries deſerves ſo great a buſtle, and is worth the calling of a council. But this is the character of ſuch men, to fancy there is nothing wherein the world is ſo much concerned, as what concerns them. Platina did not much trouble himſelf about other abuſes; he would have the council chiefly to mind the loſs which the apoſtolical abbreviators had lately ſuſtained.

REFLEXIONS on that letter, which ſhew the character of Platina.

[*D*] *He was left . . . expoſed to a thouſand miſeries.*] For he was in the middle of the winter, without a fire, in a tower which lay open to all ſorts of winds (9).

[*E*] *They would have been aſhamed to acknowledge, that perſons of merit had been ſo cruelly treated upon an ill-grounded ſuſpicion.*] Of all the defects of men, vanity is, perhaps, the cauſe of moſt crimes committed by them. How many men are there who begin an injuſtice, being fully perſuaded that they act juſtly? They ſoon perceive they were miſtaken, but their pride not permitting them to acknowledge their fault, they go on in their injuſtice, leſt any body ſhould come to know that they began it without reaſon. Every body had rather ſave his own reputation than that of his neighbour: from whence come the numberleſs ſhifts and cavils of informers, who know they are guilty of calumny, and are afraid of being convicted of it. Here is a Pope, who, for a falſe point of honour, perſiſted to perſecute thoſe who were found innocent, notwithſtanding his former ſuſpicions. ‘ Chriſtophorus Ve‘ronenſis Pauli Medicus ad me veniens, bono inquit ‘ animo te eſſe jubet Paulus: ac de ſe bene ſperare ‘ brevique liberum futurum: ſciſcitor quando id fore ‘ ſperaret. Reſpondet homo liber audientibus omni‘bus qui tum aderant: non ita cito fieri poſſe ne ‘ levitatis & ſævitiæ argueretur pontifex, quod illos ‘ quos tanto tumultu concitato cæpiſſet ac torſiſſet, ‘ ſtatim veluti innoxios dimitteret (10). - - - *Chriſtopher* ‘ *of Verona, Paul's Phyſician, came to me, and ſaid; the* ‘ *Pope bids you to be of good chear, and to expect good* ‘ *uſage from him, for that you ſhall ſhortly be ſet at li*‘*berty. I aſked him when he thought that would be. He* ‘ *anſwered, in his free way, before all that were pre*‘*ſent, that cannot be ſo very ſoon, leſt the Pope ſhould* ‘ *be accuſed of fickleneſs and cruelty, if he ſhould inſtantly* ‘ *releaſe, as innocent, thoſe whom he had cauſed, in ſuch* ‘ *a tumultuous*

(*e*) Platina, in Paulo II, *fol. m.* 350, *verſo.*

(5) In Vit. Cononis, *fol. m.* 104. That Pope reigned in the year 686.

(6) Da Cremona à Mantoua ſi va per una ſtrada piana e diritta ove ſi trova Piadena Patria di Bartolomeo Platina. *My edition of Vicenza* 1622, *ſays* Pianeda.

(7) In Paulo II, *fol. m.* 350, *verſo.*

(8) Ibid.

(9) Revinctus compedibus & quidem graviſſimis media hieme ſine foco, celſa in turri ac ventis omnibus expoſita coerceor menſibus quatuor. *Platina, ubi ſupra, fol.* 351.

(10) Ib. *fol.* 358.

they came to the accuſation of Hereſy [*F*], which at laſt vaniſhed away as the other. The priſoners were not ſet at liberty before the year's end [*G*]. The Pope entertained Platina with the hopes of a good ſettlement, and ſo kept him from going out of Rome. He expected in vain, for the ſpace of two years, the effect of thoſe promiſes, and then the Pope died of an Apoplexy (*f*). Sixtus IV, his ſucceſſor, made Platina library-keeper of the Vatican (*g*). Platina found himſelf, by that means, in his element. He lived very quietly till the year 1481, in which he died of the Plague (*h*). He left to Pomponius Lætus the houſe he had built upon mount Quirinal, with the grove of laurels, out of which the Poetical crowns were taken (*i*). I ſhall give a catalogue of his writings [*H*].

Mr

'*a tumultuous manner, to be taken up, and put to the rack.*' See the article EXPERIENS, remarks [*A*] and [*B*].

[*F*] *They came to the accuſation of Hereſy.*] So ſays Platina, *Neque hoc quidem contentus Paulus quos paulo ante conjurationis & majeſtatis accerſierat, eoſdem mutata ſententia ob divulgatam fabulam hæreſeos accuſat* (11). Pomponius Lætus was apprehended at Venice, and carried to Rome. He was accuſed of changing the names of young men, and giving them a Heatheniſh name inſtead of a Chriſtian. It is pretended that he did ſo, to inſpire them with a greater deſire of honour and virtue; but he was contented to anſwer, What is that to you, or to the Pope, if I have a mind to go by the name of Fennel, provided it be without any malice? *Rogatis cur nomina adoleſcentibus immutaret, ut homo liber erat, quid ad vos, inquit, & Paulum, ſi mihi fæniculi nomen indo, modo id ſine dolo ac fraude fiat. Amore namque vetuſtatis antiquorum præclara nomina repetebat quaſi quædam calcaria quæ noſtram juventutem æmulatione ad virtutem incitarent* (12). Beſides, thoſe priſoners were accuſed of having embraced the ſect of Plato, of diſputing in a doubtful manner, about the Immortality of the Soul, and the Exiſtence of GOD, and of valuing Paganiſm too much. *Multa nobis objicit* (Paulus) *ſed illud potiſſimum quod de immortalitate animorum diſputaremus, teneremuſque opinionem Platonis. . . . . in dubium, inquit Paulus, diſputando Deum vocabatis. . . . Præterea verò Paulus crimini nobis dabat, quod nimium gentilitatis amatores eſſemus* (13). To which they anſwered, 1. That if they loved Plato, they did but imitate the great St Auguſtin. 2. That all the Divines and Philoſophers of that time diſputed about the ſame truths, and called them in queſtion, in order to find the certainty of them; for it is one of the laws of diſpute, not to take for certain what is in queſtion, but to ſuppoſe for a time the uncertainty of it, in order to enquire, without any prejudices, into the reaſons and grounds of what is believed concerning it (14). 3. That, according to St Auguſtin, obſtinacy in maintaining errors makes a Heretic, but as for them, they had always ſubmitted to the diſcipline of the church. Platina, in particular, repreſented the innocency of his actions; that he had never forgot to confeſs, and communicate once a year, and that he never uttered a word againſt the Apoſtle's Creed, or that ſavoured of Hereſy. *Nullum mihi facinus impingi poteſt, non furtum, non latrocinium, non ſacrilegium, non depeculatus, non parricidium, non rapina, non ſimonia. Vixi ut Chriſtianum decebat: confeſſionem & communionem in anno ſemel præſertim intermiſi nunquam. Nil ex ore meo excidit quod contra ſymbolum eſſet, aut hæreſim ſaperet.* He obſerves, that no body appeared ſo fond of Pagan antiquities as the Pope, who gathered together all the antient ſtatues to adorn his palace (15), *&c.* Notwithſtanding that apology, the Pope ſet a mark of ignominy upon the name Academic, and declared Heretics all thoſe who, for the time to come, ſhould mention the word Academy, either in jeſt or earneſt. 'Veteres Academicos ſequebamur, novos contemnentes qui in rebus ipſis nil certi ponebant. Paulus tamen hæreticos eos pronunciavit qui nomen Academiæ vel ſerio vel joco deinceps commemorarent. Juncta eſt hæc ignominia Platoni, ipſe ſe tueatur (16). - - - - *We followed the old Academics, deſpiſing the new, who allowed of no certainty in the nature of things. Nevertheleſs Paul declared Heretics all thoſe who for the time to come,* &c. . . . . *This reflects upon Plato, let him defend himſelf.*' I have read in more than one place, but I cannot now tell where, that this Pope was ſo great an enemy to learning, that he forbad to pronounce the word College or Academy. Thoſe who ſaid ſo were groſsly miſtaken: Paul II did not condemn thoſe who ſhould mention the word Academy in the ſenſe of a college or a houſe wherein ſciences are taught. He only condemned the Sceptical and Pyrrhonian ſpirit of the wits of his time, who, under pretence of philoſophizing in the way of Plato, the founder of the antient academy, brought every thing in queſtion, and grew dangerous with reſpect to the foundations of the Goſpel.

[*G*] *The priſoners were not ſet at liberty before the year's end.*] Trithemius is hereby convicted of a falſehood, for ſaying that Platina was ſet at liberty only by Sixtus IV, after the death of Paul II. *Multas à Paulo Papa II calamitates ſuſtinuit, adeo ut bonis omnibus & dignitate ſpoliatus poſt equulei ſuſpenſionem in carcerem crudeliſſime detruſus, uſque ad mortem ipſius Pauli detentus ſit, qui à Sixto mox liberatus,* &c. (17). When an author writes the hiſtory of his own misfortunes, we ought to truſt him, and not believe that he wants our amplifications. Trithemius ſhould have followed that maxim, and conſulted the life of Paul II, written by the ſame perſon whoſe elogy he made: he might have known exactly how long he was a priſoner, and many people would not be deceived by him, as they are ſtill. 'A Paulo II in carcerem conjectus, menſeſque quatuor ipſos detentus eſt, donec à ſucceſſore Sixto IV liberatus - - - - (18). *He was thrown into priſon by Paul II, and kept there four months, till he was ſet at liberty by his ſucceſſor Sixtus IV.*'

[*H*] *I ſhall give a catalogue of his writings.*] The moſt conſiderable is, the Hiſtory of the Popes, from St Peter to Sixtus IV, to whom he dedicated it. It is variouſly ſpoken of: the Proteſtants like it well enough, and have placed that author in the catalogue of the witneſſes of truth (19). See the paſſage of Illyricus, which I ſhall quote by and by. Some Roman Catholics accuſe him of want of ſincerity and diligence. Nevertheleſs, Panvinius did not ſcruple to publiſh that Hiſtory, with notes of his own, and to add to it the Lives of the Popes from Sixtus IV to Pius IV. Cicarella went on, and added to it the Lives of the Popes from Pius V to Clement VIII. That book of Platina was printed firſt of all at Venice in the year 1479, in folio. Olearius (20) was therefore miſtaken, who believed that the Nuremberg edition, 1481, is the firſt. You will find this remark in Mollerus's diſſertation (21), with the liſt of ſeveral other editions. That which I make uſe of is not mentioned by him; it is a Lyons edition, 1512, in 8vo. Theſe words are to be found at the end of it: *Excellentiſſimi hiſtorici Platynæ in vitas ſummorum Pontificum uſque ad Julium II. Ponti. Maxi. præclarum opus fœliciter explicit. Ludun. impreſſum à Gilberto de Villiers Borbonnio: impenſis honeſtiſſimi viri domini Vincentii de Prothonariis & Conſtantini Fradin. Anno domini milleſimo quingenteſimo duodecimo. Die vero* XXII *menſis Februarii.* A reader might be deceived by the beginning of this paragraph: one would think that Platina lived to the time of Julius II, yet it appears by ſome Latin verſes printed the ſame year, and in the ſame Printing-houſe, that Platina died under Sixtus IV. Bartholomew Ariſtophilus, author of a Latin poem inſerted in the collection of the funeral verſes publiſhed to the honour of Platina, ſays, in his ſmall preamble, that having ſucceeded, by Sixtus's choice, to the place of library-keeper, which Platina enjoyed, and finding himſelf lodged in the ſame room where Platina lived, he felt, *&c.* Mr Mollerus has not forgot the liſt of ſome German, Italian, and French tranſlations of that book of Platina. He ſpeaks of a French tranſlation, printed at Paris in 1519, in folio, but ſays nothing of a later tranſlation, made by Mr Coulon, and publiſhed at Paris, in 4to, 1651. Here is the paſſage of Illyricus, which I have promiſed: 'Etſi *Platina* turpiter & impudenter *Papis* adulatis ſit: tamen nimia ipſorum turpitudine ac malitiâ coactus aliquando, etiam ſubindicat *Babyloniæ Meretricis* nefanda ſcelera. In *Marcellino* que-

'ritur

(*f*) *Taken from* Platina, in Vita Pauli II.

(*g*) The library of the Vatican was ſet up by that Pope. *Jovius, ibid.*

(*h*) See the remark [*A*], citation (1).

(*i*) Jovius, ibid.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Platin. ibid. *fol.* 358, *verſo.*

(13) Ib. *fol.* 359.

(14) In dubium, inquit Paulus diſputando Deum vocabatis. Quod quidem omnibus Philoſophis & Theologis noſtrorum temporum objici poteſt qui & animos & Deum & omnes intelligentias ſeparatas diſputandi ac veri inveniendi cauſa in dubium plerumque vocant. *Ibid. See the article* MALDONAT, *remark* [*L*].

(15) Cum nemo eo hujus rei ſtudioſior eſſet, quippe qui & ſtatuas veterum undique ex tota urbe conquiſitas in ſuas illas ædes quas ſub Capitolio extruebat congereret. *Ibid.*

(16) Ibid. *fol.* 359, *verſo, & fol.* 360.

(17) Trithem. de Script. Eccleſ. *pag.* 356. *Boiſſardus ſays the ſame thing,* ap. Pope Blount, Cenſ. Author. *pag.* 339.

(18) Boſius, de comparanda Prudentia civili, *p.* 377, *of the ſecond Tome of the treatiſe* de ratione ſtudiorum, *collected and commented by the learned Crenius, at Leyden* 1696.

(19) *See* Simon Goulart, in Catal. Teſtium Veritatis, *col.* 1904.

(20) In Abaco Patrolog. *p.* 68.

(21) *He might have ſaid that* Labbæus de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom.* i, *p.* 174. *has committed the ſame miſtake with Olearius.*

Mr Daniel William Mollerus, profeſſor in the univerſity of Altdorf, has publiſhed a curious piece (*k*), which was very uſeful to me for the compoſition of this article. He obſerves, that Andrew Corthymius (*l*) has made three Platina's of one; for he ſpeaks of Platina the Orator, Platina the Hiſtorian, and Platina a Father of the church. He obſerves alſo, that Barthius thinks he has found out a very criminal myſtery, in Platina's not having mentioned the Reſurrection of CHRIST, nor his Aſcenſion [*I*]. Varillas has committed

‘ ritur *Paparum* ſcelera eo excreviſſe, ut vix apud *Deum* miſericordiæ locum reliquerint: avaritiam, ſuperbiam, neglectum *Doctrinæ*, & Religionis ſimulationem, mores etiam in prophanis deteſtandos, propalam eſſe, ut inde laudem quærere videantur. In *Pontificibus* poſt milleſimum annum, ſubinde repetit, *Omnem pietatem & ſanctitatem à Papis ad Cæſares migraſſe* (22). - - - - - *Although Platina has flattered the Popes in a ſcandalous and impudent manner: neverthele ſs he is ſometimes conſtrained by their extreme wickedneſs and cruelty to diſcover the abominable ſins of* the Whore of Babylon. *In the life of Marcellinus, he complains that the iniquities of the Popes were come to ſuch a height, that there was ſcarce any room left for the mercy of GOD: that their covetouſneſs, pride, neglect* of learning, *hypocriſy, and vices, that even in profligates would be accounted execrable, were grown ſo public that they ſeemed to glory in them. In his lives of the Popes, after the year one thouſand, he often ſays,* that all piety and holineſs was fled from the Popes to the Cæſars.’ I ſhould willingly ſubſcribe to the judgment which Robert Creyghton made upon that work of Platina. ‘ Platinam, *ſays he* (23), auctorem ſiccum & ſtrigoſum ſæpe verba, ſæpe ſenſus, multoties rerum experientia, nonnunquam integritas deſtituunt. Et quod magis miremur nunquam lapſus eſt gravius quam in Eugenii vita, ſub cujus temporibus floruit. - - - - *Platina, a dry and barren writer, often wants words, often ſenſe, very often experience, and ſometimes integrity. And which is ſtill more to be wondered at, he has no where blundered more remarkably than in the life of Eugenius, in whoſe time he flouriſhed.*’ Theſe are the titles of the other books of Platina. *De naturis rerum: epiſtolæ ad diverſos: de honeſta voluptate & valetudine: de falſo & vero bono: contra amores: de vera nobilitate: de optimo cive: Panegyricus in laudem Beſſarionis: Oratio ad Paulum II de pace Italiæ componenda & bello Turcico indicendo: de floſculis linguæ Latinæ.* Gryphius, printed at Lyons in 1541, in 8vo, at the end of *Cælii Apicii de re culinaria libri decem*, this other book; ‘ P. (24) Platinæ Cremonenſis viri undecunque doctiſſimi de tuenda valetudine, natura rerum & popinæ ſcientia ad ampliſſium D. D. B. Roverellam S. Clementis Preſbyterum Cardinalem libri decem. *Ten books of Platina, on the Preſervation of Health; the Nature of Things; the Art of Cookery,* &c.’ That work was unworthy of that author, and I do not wonder that Sannazar ridiculed it by this epigram;

Ingenia & mores vitaſque obituſque notaſſe
 Pontificum, argutæ lex fuit hiſtoriæ.
Tu tamen hinc lautæ tractas pulmenta culinæ;
 Hoc Platina eſt ipſos paſcere pontifices (α).

Of Popes the lives and manners while you tell,
You act the part of an Hiſtorian well.
But when of kitchen-art you write a book,
You are not their Hiſtorian, but their Cook.

[§ (α) Sannazar was in the wrong to believe that Platina, after having writ the lives of the Popes, had debaſed himſelf ſo far as to write of Cookery. See the new *Menagiana* edition of Paris, 1715, p. 69, and 70. As for the reſt, the laſt editions of Palatina are not the moſt faithful. In the life of Pope Cletus, for example, in the thirteenth leaf of John Petit's edition, 1530, in 8vo, we find: *Uxorem habuit in Bithynia; - - - he had a wife in Bithynia:* and with this agrees an old Italian tranſlation that I have ſeen; whereas, the following editions, by a groſs corruption, have made it: *Uxorem non habens in Bithynia; - - - having no wife in Bithynia.* Rem. Crit.]

The edition of Lyons, 1541, came out after thoſe of Cologn, 1529, and 1537, in 8vo. The Italian book, which I have ſeen quoted with the title of *B. Scacchi Cuoco ſecreto di Papa Paolo II, Opera, dove ſi tratta di diverſe vivande, &c. con le figure in* 4to. *Venet.* 1570, is not a tranſlation of Platina's ten books, *de tuenda valetudine & popinæ ſcientia.* That Italian book is quoted otherwiſe by Lanzius: *Extat*, ſays he (25,) *memorabilis liber artis Apicianæ* de culina & architriclini officio di M. Bartholomeo Scappi cuoco ſecreto di Papa Pio V qui nunc præfectus eſt (*ait* * *ille*) noſtris intimis coquis, non ſine ejuſdem privilegio & approbatione inquiſitorum hæretice pravitatis, *Venetiis editus anno* M. D. LXXI, *ſed & ante hunc Bartholemæum extant Platinæ, Suetonii Pontificii de Popinæ ſcientia libri x. ad Cardinalem Rovarellam.* It appears that Lanzius was perſuaded that his *Bartholomew Scappi*, named by others *Bartholomew Scacchi*, is different from Platina. He is in the right, for the work of B. Scappi contains a relation of the funeral obſequies of Paul III, at which the author aſſiſted. Note, that it is a large quarto divided into ſix books, where all the ways of dreſſing fiſh and fleſh, *&c.* are treated of: they have not been ſparing of figures (26).

As to the Hiſtory of Mantua compoſed by Platina, Mr Morellus (27) affirms, that Lambecius publiſhed it in the year 1674. But he owns that he could never get a copy of it, whatever pains he took to find one, and that Martin Diſenbachius (28) maintains, that that work never came out in print. The original of that hiſtory of Mantua was left by the author himſelf to Gaudentius Merula, who ſent it to Oporinus, a Bookſeller of Baſil, to get it printed. Oporinus died before he could print it, and left it to the eldeſt ſon of his good friend Theodorus Zwingerus (29). It is certain that Lambecius publiſhed it with notes at Vienna in the year 1675, in 4to. The 10th, Giornale de Letterati, 1676, gives an abſtract of it, and tells us that this work is divided into ſix books, and not into ſeven, as Poſſevinus affirms (30), or into three, as Voſſius believed (31), and that Lambecius, who maintains againſt Trithemius, Angelus Rocca, Raphaël Volaterranus, Boiſſardus, and Voſſius, that Platina's name was Baptiſt, and not Bartholomew, is refuted by a Pope's Brief, to be found in the Vatican library. It is the Brief wherein Platina is appointed keeper of that library. He is named Bartholomew in it. That proof was unknown to Voſſius. Mr Wharton (32) obſerves that Richard Flemyngus, who knew Platina very well, and beſtowed great encomiums upon him (33), calls him Bartholomew (β).

[(β§) So does Benedictus Curtius, in his Commentary upon the Decrees of Love, *Les Arrêts d'Amour*, and Boiſſard in the title of an epigram which he made upon him, and which is to be ſeen in the firſt volume of the *Delitiæ Poetarum Galliæ.* Rem. Crit.]

[*I*] *Barthius thinks he has found out a very criminal myſtery, in Platina's not having mentioned the Reſurrection of* CHRIST, *nor his Aſcenſion.*] Theſe are Mollerus's words: ‘ Improbitatis *alicujus Platinam accuſaturi ad* Caſp. Barth. animadverſ. in Gui. Briton. lib. vi. Philipp. p. 459. *provocare ſolent, quippe ubi verba reperire liceat ſequentia Auguſti hoc dictum* (*nempe* melius eſt Herodis porcum eſſe quam filium, *de quo vid.* Macrob. in jocis Auguſti lib. ii. c. 4.) *illuſtravit renaſcentibus literis* B. Platina in primo ſuorum Pontificum nempe Domino & Deo noſtro Jeſu Chriſto. *Qui improbe tamen hoc & profane, quod vita ſervatoris obituque utcunque commemoratis, glorioſiſſimam reſurrectionem è mortuis & aſcenſionem in cælum, ne uno quidem verbo attigit. Cauſſa facile à ſagacibus hominibus odoranda* (34). - - - Thoſe who accuſe Platina of impiety generally have recourſe to Caſpar Barthius, where you find the following words immediately after this ſaying of Auguſtus, viz. *It is better to be Herod's hog than his ſon:* It was explained upon the revival of learning by *B. Platina, in the life of his firſt pontif, viz. our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Nevertheleſs he behaved like a profane and impious writer, in that having mentioned the life and death of our Saviour in a careleſs manner, he has not ſaid one word of his glorious

---

(*k*) *Intituled,* Diſputatio circularis de Platina. *Altdorf. d.* 17. *Feb.* 1694.

(*l*) In Florilegio Hiſtorico, *fol.* 204, *n.* 10, & *fol.* 206, *num.* 4.

(22) Illyricus, *lib. xix*, Catal. Teſtium Verit. ap. Pope Blount, ubi ſupra, *pag. m.* 339.

(23) Robert. Creyghton, Not. ad Sylveſtri Sguropuli Hiſt. Concilii Florentini, §. *v*, *cap. ii.*

(24) They have put a P. inſtead of a B. Mr Mollerus, *pag.* 7, obſerves, that in the catalogue of Thuanus's library, *pag.* 119, *Part i*, we read *Joh. Bap. Platinæ.* & *p.* 182, *Part ii*, *Petri Platinæ.* But it is not the fault of thoſe who made that catalogue, but of thoſe who printed Platina's works.

(25) Orat. cont. Italiam, *pag. m.* 845, 846.

* *M. Freber. Comm. ad Conſtant. Donat.*

(26) This particular I had from the Mazarin library.

(27) De Platina, *pag.* 26.

(28) De Henrico VII Imp. *p.* 47.

(29) Diſenbachius, ibid. apud Mollerum, *pag.* 27.

(30) In Apparatu Sacro.

(31) De Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 589.

(32) In Append. ad Cave Hiſt. Litt. Script. Eccleſ. *pag.* 153.

(33) In *lib. i*, Lucubrationum Tiburtinarum.

(34) Moller. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 29.

mitted ſome faults [*K*].

‘ ous reſurrection from the dead, nor of his aſcenſion into heaven. A wiſe man may eaſily gueſs the cauſe.’ Mollerus does not grant that Platina ſuppreſſed the reſurrection and aſcenſion of Jeſus Chriſt, ‘ *Sed tamen Platinam*, ſays he, mortis & reſurrectionis Chriſti *meminiſſe ex principio ſtatim vitæ S. Petri inſpecto apparebit ubi verba occurrunt iſta*: poſt Chriſti mortem & reſurrectionem completis jam diebus Pentecoſtes Spiritum S. accepere diſcipuli. - - - - Nevertheleſs it will appear, that Platina mentioned the death and reſurrection of Chriſt, by looking into the very beginning of his life of St Peter, where he has theſe words. *After Chriſt's death and reſurrection, when the days of Pentecoſt were fulfilled, the diſciples received the Holy Ghoſt.*’ You ſee how he proves that Platina mentioned thoſe two myſteries; notwithſtanding, he ſuſpects that this author had an ill deſign, under pretence, that the chapter which concerns the life of CHRIST, contains nothing touching the reſurrection and aſcenſion of the Meſſias. He mentions, without any refutation, the ſuſpicion which ſome have had, that Platina deſigned thereby to increaſe the glory of the Popes. *Certum autem eſt in vitæ Chriſti deſcriptione neque reſurrectionis è mortuis neque aſcenſionis in cœlum mentionem ullam eſſe injectam, non tam ob brevitatis cauſſam, ut aliqui ſuſpicati ſunt, quam ut nonnullorum ex opinione, inſignior inſequentes pontifices gloria maneret* (35). I confeſs, that all I can apprehend herein is, that ſeveral people make themſelves ridiculous, by their affecting too great a penetration. They look for political views in the moſt ſimple and moſt indifferent things. I ſhould be glad to know how it can be any advantage to the Popes, that Platina mentioned the reſurrection and aſcenſion of JESUS CHRIST, not in the chapter where he treats of JESUS CHRIST, but in the next chapter, which treats of St Peter? I believe Platina would be very much ſurpriſed, if he knew that ſuch ſubtleties are aſcribed to him, which are ſo unworthy of his country.

[*K*] *Varillas has committed ſome faults* (36).] I. He ſays, that Platina was born at Cremona. II. It is not true that Cardinal Beſſarion put Platina upon writing the lives of the Popes. III. Nor that this work was written before the time of Paul II. Thoſe two falſehoods are clearly refuted by the epiſtle dedicatory, where Platina ſays twice, that he wrote the hiſtory of the Popes by order of Sixtus IV. *Tu itaque Theologorum ac philoſophorum princeps Maxime Pontifex hac hominum utilitate motus ſimulque dignitati eccleſiaſticæ conſulens, non fruſtra* MANDASTI *ut res geſtas pontificum ſcriberem .... ſi quid emolumenti ex hac ſcriptione noſtra perceperint, tibi ſoli pontifex optime gratias agant, cujus ſanctiſſimo* IMPERIO *libentur* OBTEMPERAVI. IV. It is not true that Paul II *made him his ſecretary*: Pius II gave him that place, and Paul II took it away from him.

(35) Ibid.

(36) *In the A*necdotes de Florence, *pag.* 171.

PLOTINUS, a Platonic Philoſopher, flouriſhed in the IIId century. His genius was very much ſuperior to the common Philoſophers, and his ideas were very ſingular and extraordinary. He was aſhamed of being lodged in a body; and therefore took no pleaſure in ſaying what country (*a*), or what family he was of. His contempt for every thing material that was in him, was the reaſon why he would never ſuffer his picture to be drawn [*A*]; and had it not been for a man who drew it by memory, his diſciples had

(*a*) Nevertheleſs we know that he was born at Lycopolis, a city of Egypt. *Eunapius, in Plotin.*

[*A*] *He would never ſuffer his picture to be drawn.*] Amelius, his diſciple, deſired it of him, but it was in vain: Is it not enough, anſwered he, to drag every where with us that image in which we have been ſhut up by nature: do you think that we muſt, alſo, tranſmit to future ages an image of that image, as an object worthy of their attention? 1. How great is that thought! None but little ſouls will deny it. Οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ φέρειν ὃ ἡ φύσις εἴδωλον ἡμῖν περιτέθεικεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰδώλου εἴδωλον συγχωρεῖν αὐτὸν ἀξιοῦν πολυχρονιώτερον καταλιπεῖν, ὡς δή τι τῶν ἀξιοθεάτων ἔργων. *Quaſi vero non ſatis hanc imaginem fere ſit quam natura nobis ab initio circumdedit: etiam cenſes imaginis hujus imaginem diuturniorem inſuper poſteris ut opus ſpectaculo dignum relinquendum* (1). Madam des Houlieres has made ſome admirable verſes upon the vanity which induces men to have their pictures drawn (2). The elevation and depth of her morality is incomparable; a lady who thinks ſo nobly ſhould have lived in the age of Plotinus, our's was not worthy of her: the men of this age have too mean ſouls, they ſet too great a value upon the body, and the goods of fortune. There are no Plotinus's now a-days. Madam des Houlieres herſelf has yielded to the temptation of having her picture drawn (3). She was pleaſed to ſee herſelf grown young again by the pencil of Mrs Cheron, and to think that ſhe would not be unknown in that reſpect when ſhe ceaſed to be. She ſpeaks thus of Mrs Cheron, who drew her,

Elle me rend enfin mes premieres couleurs;
  Par ſon art la race future
Connoîtra les preſens que me fit la nature:
  Et je puis eſperer qu'avec un tel ſecours,
Tandis que j'errerai ſur les ſombres rivages,
    Je pourrai faire encor quelque honneur à nos jours.
    Oui je puis m'en flater: plaire & durer toûjours
      Eſt le deſtin de ſes Ouvrages.

At length my firſt complexion ſhe renews:
  And from her art poſterity ſhall know
What charms rich nature did on me beſtow:
  Perhaps my form preſerv'd by ſuch an aid,
When I am nothing but an empty ſhade,
  Will do ſome honour to the preſent age.
This may I promiſe to myſelf with eaſe;
  Since ev'ry piece that does her hand engage
Muſt laſt for ever, and for ever pleaſe.

Perhaps it will be ſaid, that to grow young again in a picture and in effigy is a very ſmall thing: and that to rejoice at this thought, that future ages will not be ignorant that one has been young and beautiful, is to content one's ſelf with a very chimerical honour. But who knows that better than the lady whom I ſpeak of? Is it not from thence that ſhe takes the niceſt part of her reflexion? I ſhall quote the laſt verſes of her poem.

Hé, comment pourrois-je pretendre
De guerir les mortels de cette vieille erreur,
  Qu'ils aiment juſqu'à la fureur,
Si moi qui la condamne ai peine à m'en deſendre?
Ce portrait dont Apelle auroit été jaloux,
Me remplit malgré moi de la flateuſe attente
Que je ne ſaurois voir dans autrui ſans couroux.
  Foible raiſon que l'homme vante!
Voilà quel eſt le fond qu'on peut faire ſur vous:
Toûjours vains, toûjours faux, toûjours pleins d'injuſtices,
  Nous crions dans tous nos diſcours
Contre leſs paſſions, les foibleſſes, les vices,
  Où nous ſuccombons tous les jours.

Alas! For how ſhould I remove
  This old and darling error of mankind,
Since, hardly free from what I diſapprove,
  In ſpight of my Philoſophy I find,
That this fair picture, which if he had known,
Apelles would have jealous grown,
  Preſents a pleaſing hope unto my view,
Which I with anger in another ſee;
  Weak reaſon, empty boaſt, adieu.
Such is the confidence repoſ'd in thee!

So

(1) Porphyr. in Vita Plotini, init.

(2) They are in the *Mercure Galant*, of Nov. 1693.

(3) She was ſtill alive when I wrote this. She died the 17th of Feb. 1694.

had been without that gratification. I believe that from the ſame principle, he refuſed to make uſe of ſeveral things which were looked upon as conducive to health [*B*]: but it was for another reaſon that he rejected the uſe of gliſters, which he was adviſed to take as a good remedy for the cholic; he thought that it was neither becoming nor ſuitable to the gravity of an old Philoſopher to make uſe of ſuch a remedy (*b*). He began very early to appear very ſingular in his taſte and manners; for being eight years of age, when he went already to ſchool, he would go to his nurſe, and uncover her breaſt to ſuck, which he did very greedily. He left it off, when he had been chid for it, as a troubleſome child. Being twenty-eight years of age, he appeared extremely deſirous to ſtudy Philoſophy: he was recommended to the moſt famous profeſſors of Alexandria; but he did not like them, and uſed to come from their lectures very much diſſatisfied. One of his friends knowing the reaſon of his diſtaſte, thought that the beſt remedy for it was to carry him to the lectures of Ammonius. He gueſſed right; for as ſoon as Plotinus heard that Philoſopher, he confeſſed to his friend that he was the man he wanted. He was a eleven years under that excellent maſter, and became a great Philoſopher. But the great learning he had acquired, inſpired him with an eager deſire of encreaſing it, and of knowing what the Perſian and Indian Philoſophers ſaid. He took hold of an occaſion which offered itſelf, when the emperor Gordian went to make war againſt the Perſians (*c*): he followed the Roman army, and repented of it without doubt; for he had much ado to ſave himſelf by flight, when the emperor was killed. He was then thirty-nine years of age. The next year he came to Rome, and read lectures of Philoſophy there. It is true, that he taught what he had heard of his maſter Ammonius; but he imitated not Erennius and Origen his ſchool-fellows, who having promiſed, as well as he, not to impart to the public the beſt things they had learned of Ammonius, kept not their promiſe. As for him, he was ten years at Rome without compoſing any book, and when he had compoſed twenty, he communicated them only to ſuch perſons, whoſe judgment was known to him. He was in the fiftieth year of his age, when Porphyrius became his diſciple. Such a diſciple was employment enough for him. Prophyrius did not reſt ſatisfied with ſuperficial anſwers; he would have all difficulties to be throughly explained to him: Plotinus was therefore obliged to write ſome books, that he might treat his ſubjects more exactly [*C*]. He compoſed twenty-four books during the ſpace of ſix years that Porphyrius was with him, and thoſe twenty-four together with twenty-one which he had compoſed before the arrival of Porphyrius, and together with the nine which he writ after his diſciple had left Rome, make up in all fifty-four books. They are divided into ſix Enneades, and run upon very abſtruſe matters [*D*]. One may obſerve in them three different ages of the mind of their

So vain, ſo falſe, and ſo unjuſt we are
That we the weakneſſes of others blame,
And nor their paſſions, nor their vices ſpare,
Though we are hourly guilty of the ſame.

This does very much ſet off the victory which Plotinus got over ſo general a weakneſs; and all true Philoſophers ought to rejoice that ſo noble a triumph was reſerved for one of their great heroes. It is true, that Plotinus's picture was drawn, but he knew nothing of it: Amelius brought an excellent Painter into the auditory. That painter looked upon Plotinus as long as he would, and drew him after the image he had drawn of him in his head: the picture was very like, Amelius took care that all the ſtrokes that wanted mending, ſhould be corrected (4). Here is another triumph of Plotinus. He would never tell the day nor the month wherein he was born (5). The reaſon of it was, that he did not deſire that the day of his birth ſhould be celebrated with feaſts and ſacrifices. He did not fail to celebrate in that manner the birth-day of Socrates, and that of Plato (6). Was not this deſpiſing immortal fame?

A SIGN of a cocquet.

Not knowing whether I ſhall find a better opportunity to make uſe of a remark which I have read in the Furetieriana, I ſhall ſet it down here. 'One 'may eaſily know women that are cocquets by their 'dreſs, the company they keep at home, their ſervants, and their way of ſpeaking; but they may be 'known alſo by the ſeveral copies of their pictures 'which they cauſe to be made. One of thoſe women, 'who had been drawn by Mrs le Hay, cauſed five 'copies of her picture to be made. Good Lord, ſaid 'a gentleman, why does that woman get ſo many 'pictures drawn? Mrs le Hay anſwered him pleaſantly, *Quoniam multiplicatæ ſunt iniquitates ejus* '(7), ... *becauſe her ſins are multiplied.*'

[*B*] *He refuſed to make uſe of ſeveral things which were looked upon as conducive to health.*] He never made uſe of any preſervative, nor of the bath, and did not ſo much as eat of the fleſh of tamed beaſts. Οὔτε τὰς θηριακὰς ἀντιδότους λαβεῖν ὑπέμεινε. μὴ δὲ τῶν ἡμέρων ζώων τὰς ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τροφὰς προσίεσθαι λέγων. λουτροῦ δὲ ἀπεχόμενος. *Neque theriaca antidota unquam accepit, cum nec ex animalium quoque manſuetorum corporibus capere eſcam ſe diceret. Abſtinebat & balneis* (8). He eat little, and abſtained very often from bread, which together with his ſtrong meditations kept him from ſleeping much (9).

[*C*] *Plotinus was obliged to write ſome books, that he might treat his ſubjects more exactly.*] It is almoſt impoſſible to determine any queſtion by meer conferences or verbal diſputes. Both ſides may eaſily go off from the queſtion, and the beginning may be forgotten before one comes to the end. Therefore I do not wonder, that Prophyrius reduced his maſter to the neceſſity of explaining himſelf in writing. Plotinus owned, that it was the beſt way to inſtruct a diſciple thoroughly; but he found it alſo very neceſſary to hear objections, and exerciſe himſelf by way of conference, before he took pen in hand. This is what he anſwered to a man, who complained of Pophyrius's frequent interrogations and replies. '*Niſi dubitationes interrogante* '*Porphyrio diſſolvamus, commentari oratione perpetua quicquam in librum non valebimus* (10). - - - - '*Without firſt reſolving the doubts which Porphyrius* '*ſtarts to me, I ſhould find it impoſſible to write a con-* '*tinued diſſertation in the form of a book.*' He diſputed three days together about the doubts which Porphyrius propoſed to him, concerning the manner how our ſouls are united to our bodies.

[*D*] *His works are divided into ſix Enneades, and run upon very abſtruſe matters.*] The order, diviſion, and titles, of Plotinus's works, are to be aſcribed to Porphyrius. They concern moſt of them the ſubtileſt notions of metaphyſics, and it ſeems that this Philoſopher differed not much from Spinoza in ſome things. There is ſcarce any age wherein the doctrine of Spinoza has not been taught. That impious man has only the unhappy advantage of being the firſt, who reduced it into a ſyſtem according to a Geometrical method. What did Plotinus mean, when he wrote two books,

---

(*b*) Κοιλιακῇ δὲ νόσῳ πολλάκις καταπονούμενος οὔτε κλυστῆρος ἐνέσχετο, οὐκ εἶναι πρὸς τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου λέγων ὑπομένειν τὰς τοιαύτας θεραπείας. Proinde cum ſæpe colico vexaretur morbo, ſemper clyſteres renuit, negans decere ſenem curationes ejuſmodi. *Porphyr. in Vita Plotini, pag.* 1, *inſtead of* colico, *the tranſlator ſhould have ſaid* cœliaco.

(*c*) In the year 243.

(4) Idem, Porphyr. ibid. *pag.* 2, *C.*

(5) See Porphyr. in the Life of Plotinus.

(6) See the ſame Life.

(7) Furetieriana, pag. 171, of the Dutch Edit.

(8) Porphyr. ibid. *pag.* 1.

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 6, *ſub fin.*

(10) Ibid.

their author [*E*]. His way of compoſing did very much ſavour of his great ſingularity [*F*], and therefore a faithful friend was very neceſſary to him to reviſe his writings. He choſe Porphyrius to do it, rather than Gentilianus Amelius, who had been his diſciple twenty-four years, and whom he very much eſteemed, as we have ſeen in another place (*d*). The eſteem which the Romans had for Plotinus is incredible. He had ſome diſciples in the very ſenate; and ſome ſenators, not contented to go regularly to his auditory, reſigned the magiſtracy to live a Philoſophical life. He inſpired ſome perſons of the fair ſex with a ſtrong inclination for the ſtudy of Philoſophy. A lady (*e*) would have him to lodge in her houſe, and ſhe, as well as her daughter, took great delight in hearing him. He had the reputation of being ſo learned and virtuous a man, that ſeveral perſons of both ſexes, intruſted him, before they died, with their eſtates and children, ſons and daughters, as if he had been a kind of guardian angel (*f*). He never refuſed that trouble. He had often the patience to be preſent when guardians gave up their accounts. He was the arbitrator of a thouſand law-ſuits, with ſo much equity and honeſty, that he did not get himſelf one enemy for the ſpace of twenty-ſix years that he lived in Rome. Thoſe of his profeſſion proved not all ſo juſt to him; for a Philoſopher of Alexandria (*g*), who affected the firſt rank, did his utmoſt to expoſe him to contempt, and even made uſe of magic to deſtroy him. I ſhall mention in the remarks by what means it was pretended that the magical operations of that man were rendered ineffectual [*G*], and occaſionally I ſhall ſay ſomething of Plotinus's familiar ſpirit, and

(*d*) In the article AMELIUS.

(*e*) She and her daughter were named Gemina.

(*f*) Πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες ἀποθνήσκειν μέλλοντες τῶν εὐγενεστάτων φέροντες τὰ ἑαυτῶν τέκνα ἄῤῥενάς τε ὁμοῦ καὶ θηλείας, ἐκείνῳ παρεδίδοσαν μετὰ τῆς ἄλλης οὐσίας, ὡς ἱερῷ τινι καὶ θείῳ φύλακι. Multi quinetiam viri multæ & mulieres generis nobilitate pollentes cum morti jam propinquarent, filios ſuos tum mares tum fœminas una cum omni eorum ſubſtantia Plotino tanquam ſacro cuidam divinoque cuſtodi tradebant atque commendabant. *Porphyr. ibid.*

(*g*) His name was Olympius.

books to prove, *Unum & idem ubique totum ſimul adeſſe* (11)? Did he not teach thereby, that the Being which is every where, is one and the ſame thing? Spinoza deſires no more. Plotinus examines in another book, whether there are ſeveral ſouls, or one only: *Utrum omnes animæ una ſint.* He applied himſelf very much to the ſtudy of ideas; he wrote a book to examine whether there are any ideas of ſingular things, and another, wherein he proved, that intellectual objects are not out of our underſtanding, ὅτι οὐκ ἔξω τοῦ νοῦ τὰ νοητὰ, *quod intelligibilia non ſint extra intellectum.*

(11) Τὸ ὂν πανταχοῦ ὅλον εἶναι ἓν καὶ ταυτό. Porphyr. *pag.* 4, C.

[*E*] *One may obſerve in them three different ages of the mind of their author.*] The firſt and laſt books he wrote are much inferior to the others. One may perceive in the firſt a ſtrength that is not come yet to it's full growth, and in the laſt, a ſtrength which began to decay; but one may ſee in the middle writings, a ſtrength that was come to its higheſt degree. Thus we have here three orders of books, twenty one in the firſt, twenty four in the ſecond, and nine in the laſt. Of thoſe nine, the five firſt were leſs weak than the other four; ſo true it is, generally ſpeaking, that the mind undergoes the ſame viciſſitudes with the body: the age of an author may be almoſt as eaſily known by the ſtrokes of his pen, as by the features of his face (12). Here are Prophyrius's words according to the Latin tranſlation. *Quemadmodum verò conſcripti ſunt alii quidem in ætate prima, alii verò in ipſo vigore vitæ, alii denique defeſſo jam corpore; ſic ferme libri vim ſimilem ipſi declarant. Primi namque unus atque viginti, ſi cum proximè ſequentibus conferantur, leviorem vim habere videntur, nondum ſatis conſtans robur habentem. Qui vero medio tempore compoſiti ſunt, virtutis florem præferunt ad ſummum uſque vigentem, Taleſque ſunt quatuor & viginti (exceptis quibuſdam paucis) perfectiſſimi. Ultimi denique novem remiſſiorem jam referunt facultatem; idque poſtremi quatuor magis quam antecedentes quinque declarant.* This tranſlation was made by Marſilius Ficinus. That learned man had no ſooner ended the tranſlation of Plato's works, but he was told by John Picus, Earl of Mirandula, that Coſmo de Medicis deſired to have Plotinus tranſlated. Marſilius knew nothing of it, becauſe Coſmo would not aſk him the verſion of thoſe two authors at one time, and thought it more reaſonable to let him know his deſire, when he had finiſhed the tranſlation of Plato. Marſilius undertook that new work, and made an end of it. He has not only tranſlated Plotinus, but he has alſo made ſummaries and analyſes upon each book (13). This is what goes by the name of Marſilius Ficinus's commentaries. That word is fallacious on this occaſion; for one would expect ſome critical notes upon the Greek text, and ſome explications of the difficult paſſages and intricate thoughts of the author: this is what is meant by a commentary. But the ſignification of that word is quite different here. I thought myſelf obliged not to leave my reader in the obſcurity of that equivocation, as Moreri has done.

(12) Mr Baillet, in the firſt Tome of the *Jugemens des Sçavans*, *pag.* 381, has many curious things about this.

(13) His Latin tranſlation, and his commentaries, were reprinted without the Greek, at Baſil 1559, *fol.*

[*F*] *His way of compoſing did very much ſavour of his great ſingularity.*] He never read over again what he had compoſed; he formed his letters very ill, and diſtinguiſhed not his ſyllables; his orthography was not at all exact; he was only attentive to things, and thoughts; and perſiſted as long as he lived in the ſame courſe. But here is a very admirable thing. His meditation was ſo ſtrong, that he placed in his head a whole work from the beginning to the end, and followed ſo exactly what he had meditated, that he made no manner of alteration in it in writing. One would have thought, that the inward original of his work was the rule of his pen, with the ſame punctuality as a written original is the rule of a copyiſt. He never loſt the ſight of his meditation, when he was interrupted for ſome buſineſs: he took cognizance of that affair, and examined and ended it without leaving off the ideas of his work; ſo that after the departure of thoſe who had interrupted him, he needed not read the laſt lines of his writing, to know where he was, and reſume the ſeries of his thoughts. His ideas had been all along preſent to his mind; therefore he uſed to write on without looking upon his paper for the place where he ſtopt, and made the connexions as well as if he had not ſtirred out of his place (14).

(14) *See* Porphyr. ubi ſupra.

[*G*] *I ſhall mention how the magical operations of that man were rendered ineffectual.*] He found by experience that his enchantments returned upon himſelf, which obliged him to confeſs to his friends, that Plotinus had a ſoul endowed with an extraordinary force, ſeeing it retorted upon it's enemies the darts which they ſhot at it. What is moſt admirable, is, that Plotinus perceived the magical devices contrived againſt him, and the effect which they produced upon the author of them. *At this very moment*, ſaid he to his friends, *the body of Olympius is folded as a purſe, and his members bruiſe one another.* Porphyrius, who relates this as a certain fact, endeavours to confirm it by this ſuppoſition: he ſays that Plotinus was under the protection of a genius ſuperior to that of other men, and that his genius was none of thoſe who are called *dæmons*, but of thoſe who are called *gods*. He tells us, that an Egyptian prieſt conjured up, in the temple of Iſis at Rome, the familiar ſpirit of Plotinus, in the very preſence of Plotinus and that he perceived that the ſpirit who preſented himſelf was a god, and not a meer dæmon; that immediately he congratulated Plotinus upon that excellent prerogative (15); that he prepared himſelf to aſk that ſpirit ſome queſtions, but he vaniſhed away preſently, becauſe a common friend of theirs, who was brought to the ſpectacle, ſtifled the birds that were given him to keep. Plotinus knowing that his familiar ſpirit was of ſo eminent an order, directed with greater application the ſight of his underſtanding towards him. He even compoſed a book concerning familiar ſpirits, in which he carefully enquired into the cauſes of their differences. I obſerve all theſe things for two reaſons: Firſt, that one may ſee here a ſmall pattern of the Platonic doctrine concerning Genius's. Secondly, that one may know that the doctrine of guardian-angels, ſo much ſpoken of in the church of Rome, and which is a practical doctrine, and attended with all the train of religious worſhip, is

OF Plotinus's familiar ſpirit.

(15) Μακάριος εἶ θεὸν ἔχων τὸν δαίμονα καὶ οὐ τοῦ ὑφειμένου γένους τὸν συνόντα. Beatus es, ô Plotine, qui habeas pro Dæmone Deum, neque ex inferiori genere ſis ducem ſortitus familiarem. *Porphyr. ibid.*

and of the ſurpriſing ſagacity which is aſcribed to him [*H*]. The emperor Gallienus and the empreſs Salonina had a very great reſpect for him; and had it not been for the oppoſition of ſome jealous and malicious courtiers, he would have obtained what he demanded, viz. that a town of Campania (*b*) ſhould be rebuilt, and yielded up to him with its whole territory. He deſigned to ſettle there a colony of Philoſophers, and to put into practice the ideal laws of Plato's republic. Some envious men accuſed him of having inriched himſelf with the thoughts of Numenius: but Amelius took pen in hand to refute that accuſation. Longinus, who ſuffered himſelf to be pre-poſſeſſed againſt that great Philoſopher, did afterwards value his writings very much, though he confeſſes that he found ſome very obſcure things in them [*I*]. He wrote againſt his treatiſe of ideas, and againſt Porphyrius's anſwer in defence of that treatiſe. Plotinus had ſeveral illneſſes in the laſt year of his life, an inflammation in his throat, which made him ſo hoarſe, that he could hardly ſpeak, ulcers in his hands and feet, and a great weakneſs of ſight. When he found himſelf in that condition, he left Rome, and went into Campania, to one of his friends heirs, who furniſhed him with all neceſſaries; and he had the comfort to find, that Caſtricius (*i*), whoſe eſtate was in the neighbourhood, did let him want nothing. He died as nobly as a Heathen Philoſopher could do; for theſe were his dying words, *I uſe my utmoſt endeavours to return that which is Divine in me, to that which is ſo in the univerſe* (*k*). He died in the ſixty-ſixth year of his age, the third of the emperor Claudius II, that is in the 270th year of the Chriſtian Æra. There was very good news of the ſtate of his ſoul [*K*]. Amelius, who had the curioſity to conſult the oracle of Apollo, received it, and imparted it to his friends (*l*).

(*b*) It was to be called *Platonopolis.*

(*i*) He was one of his diſciples.

(*k*) Φήσας πειρᾶσθαι τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν θεῖον ἀνάγειν πρὸς τὸ ἐν τῷ παντὶ θεῖον .... ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα. Equidem jam annitor, quod in nobis divinum eſt ad divinum ipſum quod viget in univerſo redigere, ſpiritumque his verbis emiſit. *Porphyr. in Vita Plot.*

(*l*) Taken from Plotinus's Life written by Porphyrius.

is much ancienter than the Chriſtian religion. There is no ſyſtem more proper to ſet up the doctrine of the Platoniſts duly rectified, than that of occaſional cauſes. I do not know what will happen; but I am apt to think that, ſome time or other, Philoſophers will be forced to lay aſide mechanical principles, unleſs the wills of ſome intelligent beings be aſſociated with them; and truly there is no hypotheſis more capable of giving an account of events, than that which admits of ſuch an aſſociation. I mean chiefly ſuch events as go by the names of caſuality, fortune, good luck, ill luck; things, the cauſes whereof are, without doubt, regulated and determined by ſome general laws unknown to us, but which probably are only occaſional cauſes, like thoſe which cauſe our ſouls to act upon our bodies. See Mr Dodwell's learned diſſertation upon the genius, or fortune, of the emperors (16). To return to Plotinus, I ſhall obſerve, that the ſuperiority of his tutelar genius filled him with an extreme confidence. Amelius deſiring him to aſſiſt at his devotions, I mean, at the ſacrifices he offered upon a a ſolemn day: Plotinus anſwered, *They ought to come to me, but I ought not to go them.* No body could apprehend, nor durſt aſk him the reaſon of ſo proud an an anſwer. Ἐκείνους δεῖ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἔρχεσθαι οὐκ ἐμὲ πρὸς ἐκείνους. τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ ποίας διανοίας οὕτως ἐμεγαληγόρησεν οὔτ' αὐτοὶ συνεῖναι δεδυνήμεθα, οὔτ' αὐτὸν ἐρέσθαι ἐτολμήσαμεν. *Illos decet ad me, non me ad illos accedere. Qua vero mente tam excelſa de ſe loqueretur neque intelligere ipſi potuimus, neque auſi ſumus interrogare* (17). Did ever any body hear of ſuch a bold Theology?

(16) Prælect. II, ad Spartiani Hadrianum, *pag.* 174, & *ſeq.*

(17) Porphyr. ibid.

[*H*] *I ſhall occaſionally ſay ſomething of the ſurprizing ſagacity which is aſcribed to Plotinus.*] A very honeſt widow (18), who lived in his houſe with her children, had loſt a necklace; Plotinus called for all the ſervants, and having well conſidered them, there is he that ſtole the necklace, ſaid he, pointing at one of them. The ſervant denied the fact, notwithſtanding the laſhes that were given him; but at laſt he confeſſed it, and reſtored what he had ſtolen. Plotinus foretold the fate of his ſcholars very well; he ſaid that Polemo would be a man of an amorous temper, and would not live long. Thoſe two things happened as he foretold them. Pophyrius had reſolved to kill himſelf; Plotinus gueſſed it, and went immediately to him, and diſſuaded him from it (19). As for the reſt, tho' Plotinus had very much ſtudied Aſtrology, he minded not it's predictions (20), but perceived the vanity of them, and refuted Aſtrologers very often.

(18) Her name was Chione.

(19) Porphyr. *pag.* 8.

(20) Ib. *p.* 10.

[*I*] *Longinus confeſſes that he found very obſcure things in them.*] He was very deſirous to have all the books of Plotinus; and to have them correct, he deſired Porphyrius to ſend him his copy; but at the ſame time he wrote to him theſe following words: 'Hoc equidem tibi tum præſenti, tum procul abſenti, tum habitanti Tyrum ſemper ſignificavi, me ſcilicet non multa admodum Plotini librorum argumenta capere: ipſam vero ſcribendi formam intelligentiarumque frequentiam & queſtionum diſpoſitionem admodum philoſophicam me amare ſupra modum atque venerari (21). - - - - *I have always told you, both when you were preſent, and when you were abſent, eſpecially while you lived at Tyre, that I underſtood but very few of the ſubjects which Plotinus treats of in his books: but that I greatly liked and admired his way of writing, the variety of his knowledge, and the order of his queſtions, which is entirely Philoſophical.*' This paſſage alone ſufficiently ſhews the exquiſite judgment and penetration of Longinus. It cannot be denied, that moſt of the things that Philoſopher examines, are incomprehenſible; nevertheleſs we ſee in his works a ſublime, fruitful, and vaſt genius, and a cloſe method of reaſoning. If Longinus had been a falſe Critic, and a man of no great parts, he would not have ſo eaſily diſcovered Plotinus's obſcurity. This is no paradox. There are none who complain leſs of the obſcurity of a book, than thoſe whoſe thoughts are confuſed, and whoſe penetration is ſhallow.

(21) Ibid.

[*K*] *There was very good news of the ſtate of his ſoul.*] Apollo was ſo warmed with a poetical rapture, when Amelius conſulted him concerning the ſtate of his dead maſter, that his anſwer contained fifty verſes. Porphyrius gives us this expoſition of it. Apollo declared that Plotinus had been peaceable, gracious, and vigilant; that he continually elevated his pure ſoul towards God; that he loved God with all his heart; that he diſengaged himſelf from this miſerable world, as much as poſſibly he could; and that lifting up his ſoul with all his might, by the ſeveral degrees mentioned by Plato, to the ſupreme Deity, who ſurpaſſes all underſtanding, he had been enlightened by him, and enjoyed the viſion of that ſupreme Being, not by the help of ideas, but as he is in himſelf, and according to that nature, which is beyond all comprehenſion. Ἐφάνη ἐκεῖνος ὁ μήτε μορφὴν μήτε τινα ἰδέαν ἔχων, ὑπερ δὲ νοῦν καὶ πᾶν τὸ νοητὸν ἱδρυμένος. *Ipſi protinus coruſcavit Deus ille nec formam nec ideam aliquam habens, ſed ſuper intellectum univerſumque intelligibile in ſe ipſo conſiſtens* (22). Porphyrius ſtops here to tell us, that in his ſixty-eighth year he was once honoured with that viſion; that the end to which Plotinus directed all his thoughts, was to unite himſelf with that great God, who fills the univerſe, and that he obtained that end four times, not in power only, but by an ineffable efficacy, during the ſpace of ſix years that he (Porphyrius) had kept company with him. Τέλος γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ σκοπὸς ἦν, τὸ ἑνωθῆναι καὶ πελάσαι τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ. ἔτυχε δὲ τετράκις που ὅτε συνήμεν αὐτῷ τοῦ σκοποῦ τούτου, ἐνεργείᾳ ἀῤῥήτῳ, καὶ οὐ δυνάμει. *Finis namque Plotino ſignumque erat quò aciem mentis intenderet propinquare conjungique ipſi Deo omnibus ubique præſenti; quater autem dum cum ipſo verſarer hunc finem eſt aſſecutus, non potentia duntaxat, inquam, ſed actu quodam ineffabili conſecutus* (23). Have we not here the unitive way ſo much ſpoken of by the Myſtics? May not one ſay, that they took it from the Platoniſts? Do not we ſee likewiſe in this place the ſeeds of Quietiſm? But to return to the Oracle: Plotinus had this advantage, that

(22) Ibid.

(23) Ibid.

that when he was in the wrong, the gods undeceived him and enlightened him, ſo that it might be ſaid, that he wrote his books by the rays of that celeſtial light which illuminated his mind. Thus much for what concerns this life. After his death, he went to the aſſembly of the bleſſed, where charity, joy, and the love of union with God reign; he was with the three judges of the other world, Minos, Rhadamanthus, Æacus, not only to give an account of his actions, but to converſe with them, and with the other gods who viſit them: in a word, he enjoyed the life of the bleſſed. I make no excuſe for the length of theſe remarks. I ſuppoſe no body will be diſpleaſed to find in this place, not only what concerns the perſon of Plotinus, but alſo what concerns his opinions, ſo far as a general notion requires it.

PLOTINA (Pompeia) the wife of the emperor Trajan, is mightily praiſed by ſome writers. She was not handſome, and it appears by her medals, that ſhe had more gravity than charms in her face *(a)*; but ſhe was very prudent and modeſt. Trajan married her before he was adopted by Nerva [*A*]. What ſhe ſaid, when ſhe firſt entered into the emperor's palace, is very remarkable: going up the ſtairs, ſhe turned to the people, and ſaid, *ſhe came in, juſt ſuch, as ſhe deſired to go out* (*b*) [*B*]. Her conduct was ſuch, during the time ſhe reigned, that no complaints were made of her (*c*). She refuſed the title of Auguſta, ſo long as her huſband refuſed that of *Pater Patriæ, father of his country* (*d*). The advices ſhe gave Trajan proved wonderfully advantageous to the provinces, ſince a great many exactions and diſorders were by that means redreſſed (*e*). The friendſhip between her and Marciana, Trajan's ſiſter, is no inconſiderable ſign of her wiſdom and good temper; for generally there is nothing but quarrels and factions between the wives and ſiſters of princes [*C*]. She was with Trajan when he died at Selinuntus inCilicia, the 117th year of Christ, and ſhe carried her huſband's aſhes to Rome, being accompanied by Tatian, and Matidia Trajan's niece (*f*). She did many good offices to Hadrian [*D*], and procured him the empire. The world was always ſo full of ſlanderers, that Plotina's modeſty, and ſo many other great and good qualities which eminently appeared in her [*E*], could not preſerve her from ſome ill

(*a*) Triſtan, Comment. Hiſt. *Tom. i, p.* 428.

(*b*) Xiphilin. in Trajan.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Plin. in Panegyr.

(*e*) Aurel. Victor. Epit. in Juliano.

(*f*) Spartian. in Adriano, *cap. v, pag. m.* 51.

[*A*] *Trajan married her before he was adopted by Nerva.*] This appears by theſe words of Pliny's panegyric. ‘Idem eſtis invicem, *ſays he to Trajan*, quod fuiſtis, probatis ex æquo, nihilque vobis felicitas addidit, niſi quod ſcire cœpiſtis quam bene uterque veſtrum felicitatem ferat. - - - - *You are the ſame to each other that you were, alike well-ſatisfied, and proſperity adds nothing to you, unleſs it be an opportunity of knowing how well you both bear proſperity.*’ And a little after, ſpeaking of Plotina and Marciana, he takes notice, that they lived in the emperor's palace with the ſame modeſty, as if they had been ſtill in a private condition. ‘Neque enim unquam periclitabuntur eſſe privatæ, quæ non deſierunt. - - - - *For they are in no danger of being reduced to the ſtate of private women, who have not ceaſed to behave as ſuch.*’

[*B*] *She came into the palace, juſt ſuch, as ſhe deſired to go out.*] Moreri has ſpoiled this thought of Plotina; he ſays, *that ſhe proteſted, when ſhe entered firſt into the palace, that ſhe was ready to go out of it whenever it ſhould be required.* This was not her meaning: ſhe deſired that the grandeur of her fortune might not change her manners, and that when ſhe ſhould be obliged to quit her poſt, ſhe might find in herſelf the ſame diſpoſition and moderation, which ſhe had when ſhe took poſſeſſion of the imperial palace. This wiſh is worthy of a great ſoul, and reſpects an happineſs which ſeldom happens, *Honores mutant mores.* - - - - *Honours change the manners.*

[*C*] *Generally there is nothing but quarrels and factions between the wives and ſiſters of princes.*] Let us hear what Trajan's panegyriſt ſays about it. ‘Nihil eſt tam pronum ad ſimultates quam æmulatio, in feminis preſertim: ea porro maxime naſcitur ex conjunctione, alitur æqualitate, exardeſcit invidia, cujus finis eſt odium. Quo quidem admirabilius exiſtimandum eſt quod mulieribus duabus in una domo, parique fortuna, nullum certamen, nulla contentio eſt: ſuſpiciunt invicem, invicem cedunt, quumque te utraque effuſiſſimè diligat, nihil ſua putat intereſſe utram tu magis ames; idemque utrique propoſitum, idem tenor vitæ, nihilque ex quo ſentias duas eſſe. - - - - - - *Nothing is ſo ready to beget feuds as emulation, eſpecially in women: Now this emulation which chiefly ariſes from their nearneſs to one another, is kept up by their equality, and gathers ſtrength from envy, which always terminates in hatred. For which reaſon it is the more admirable that there ſhould be no ſtrife nor animoſity between two women living together in the ſame houſe, and both of the ſame rank: they mutually eſteem and pleaſe one another, and while both love you to the higheſt degree, neither thinks herſelf concerned which of them has the greateſt ſhare of your affection. Their views and courſe of life are preciſely the ſame, and there is not any thing by which you can diſtinguiſh them to be two different women.*’ No better notion can be given of the merit of two princeſſes. Pliny knew admirably well how to deſcribe characters, and had reaſon to think that this concord was a happineſs, for which he ought to compliment Trajan; for princes are generally unhappy at home, however happy they may be abroad, if they have a mother, a wife, a ſiſter, a mother-in-law, a daughter, a daughter-in-law, &c. under the ſame roof: they will give them more trouble than the government of their ſtates, nay, half this number, or one third of it will do it. But when I conſider, that ſome panegyriſts, now a-days, repreſent princeſſes not as they were, but as they ſhould have been, according to the ſublime ideas of an Orator, I ſay, when I conſider this, I am apt to think that Pliny went beyond the truth.

[*D*] *She did many good offices to Hadrian.*] It was ſhe who got him married to Trajan's grand-niece (1), and procured him a government in the time of the expedition againſt the Parthians (2), afterwards the ſecond conſulſhip (3), and at laſt the empire (4).

[*E*] *The great and good qualities which eminently appeared in her.*] Pliny oppoſes, as often as he can, the perfections of Trajan to the imperfections of other princes. He doth not forget marriage, and ſays, that many illuſtrious men have diſhonoured themſelves upon that account; but as for Trajan, it was one of the moſt glorious paſſages of his life. ‘Multis illuſtribus dedecori fuit aut inconſultius uxor aſſumpta, aut retenta patientius, ita foris claros domeſtica deſtruebat infamia (5), & ne maximi cives haberentur hoc efficiebat quod mariti minores erant. Tibi uxor in decus & gloriam cedit. Quid enim illa ſanctius? Quid antiquius? Nonne ſi Pontifici Maximo deligenda ſit conjunx, aut hanc, aut ſimilem (ubi eſt autem ſimilis) elegerit? Quam illa nihil ſibi ex fortuna tua niſi gaudium vendicat? Quam conſtanter non potentiam tuam, ſed ipſum te reveretur? - - - - - Eadem quam modicè cultu, quàm parca comitatu, quàm civilis inceſſu! - - - - *Many illuſtrious men have got diſhonour to themſelves by marrying fooliſhly, or by living too patiently with a bad wife, and thus while they were high in reputation abroad, domeſtic ſhame ruined their characters at home, and their being weak huſbands hindered their being eſteemed very great citizens. To you, Sir, your wife is an honour and glory. For what can be more virtuous? What more nobly deſcended? Would not the High Prieſt, if he were to chuſe a conſort, pitch upon her, or one like her? (but where indeed could he find ſuch a one?) Is not the joy which ſhe takes in your good fortune all the portion that ſhe requires to herſelf? How ſteadily is ſhe attached to your perſon, without regarding your power? . . . . At the ſame time how modeſt* ‘ *is*

(1) Spartian. in Adriano, *cap. ii, pag.* 23.

(2) Ib. *cap. iv, pag.* 38.

(3) Ib. *p.* 40.

(4) Ib. *p.* 46.

(5) *Compare with this what Tacitus ſays, chap. xxiv, of the third book of his annals,* Ut valida divo Auguſto in Remp. fortuna, ita domi improſpera fuit ob impudicitiam filiæ ac neptis quas urbe depulit. *See in the article* LEWIS VII, *citation* (5), *and the article* HELOISA, *remark* [*G*].

ill ſuſpicions. It was thought that ſhe was in love with Hadrian [*F*], and all his great preferments were aſcribed to that paſſion. Some maintain that Trajan did not adopt him [*G*], but that Plotina concealed his death, and made ſome body imitate a languiſhing voice, that it might be thought that Hadrian was declared ſon and ſucceſſor to that prince. It does not appear that ſhe ever had any children. When ſhe died, Hadrian, who always appeared very thankful for her favours [*H*], expreſſed an extraordinary grief. He put on mourning for nine days, he made ſome hymns for her, built her a temple (*g*), and placed her amongſt the goddeſſes (*h*). He had already built her a palace at Nimes (*i*). We know nothing of Plotina's family or birth-place; and it is very ſtrange that the Hiſtorians of thoſe times ſhould be ſo negligent, as to take no notice of them. Neither, have they mentioned the time of her death. Mr de Tillemont (*k*) fancies he has found ſomething in Dion, from which one may conclude, that ſhe died in the year 129; but I would adviſe no body to believe it, till he ſhews for what reaſon he pretends to draw this concluſion. Moreri cannot prove what he ſays, that Plotina died in the year 122. What he adds of Hadrian's building her *a temple*, *a palace*, *and an amphitheatre* at Nimes, cannot be more eaſily proved. Spartian ſpeaks only of a Baſilica (*l*), without taking any notice whether Plotina was then alive or no.

(*g*) Xiphilin. in Adriano.

(*h*) There are ſome inſcriptions in Gruterus's *Theſaurus*, where mention is made of the prieſts of the goddeſs Plotina, *Sacerdos Divæ Plotinæ*. See *Triſtan's Comment. Tom. i, pag.* 430.

(*i*) Spartian. in Adrian. *cap. xii, pag. m.* 110.

(*k*) Hiſt. des Empereurs, *in the Life of Hadrian, pag. m.* 426.

(*l*) Per idem tempus in honorem Plotinæ Baſilicam apud Nemauſum opere mirabili extruxit. *Spart. ibid.*

'*is her dreſs, how ſmall her train, how courteous her deportment!*' In one of his letters (6), he calls her a moſt holy wife. 'Injungis mihi jucundiſſimum miniſterium, ut ad Plotinam ſanctiſſimam fœminam literæ tuæ perſerantur. - - - - *You put me upon a very agreeable office, when you charge me with the conveyance of your letter to Plotina, that moſt holy woman.*'

[*F*] *It was thought that ſhe was in love with Hadrian.*] Dion does plainly ſay ſo. Ἐξ ἐρωτικῆς φιλίας, *from the paſſion of love*, ſays he in one place, and in another, ἐρώσης αὐτοῦ διαφερόντως, *greatly in love with him.* See how malicious the world is: a woman cannot ſhew her affection to a man, and endeavour to load him with honours and riches, but they conclude ſhe loves him criminally. The difference of age is ſo far from ſilencing the ſatiriſts, that it rather provokes them. They pretend, that when a woman is in her decay, a grand-mother, if you will, her eagerneſs to raiſe a young man, is a more certain ſign of a criminal commerce, than if ſhe was but twenty. She would not expreſs ſo much affection in her old days, will a ſatiriſt ſay, if ſhe did not think herſelf obliged to pay for the nights, which her galant might have ſpent more agreeably elſewhere; ſhe would not be ſo forward to ſerve and recommend a man, and lay out money for him, if ſhe did not deſire that the ſport ſhould continue, In a word, he thinks of theſe verſes of Juvenal:

Cum te ſummoveant qui teſtamenta merentur
Noctibus, in cœlum quos evehit optima ſummi
Nunc via proceſſus, vetulæ veſica beatæ (7).

When night-performance holds the place of merit,
And brawn and back the next of kin diſherit;
For ſuch good parts are in preferments way,
The rich old madam never fails to pay
Her legacies. DRYDEN.

(6) The 28th of the 9th book.

(7) Juven. Sat. I, ver. 37.

[*G*] *Some maintain, that Trajan did not adopt him.*] Dion (8) ſays, that Apronian, his father, who was governor of Cilicia, told him, that the death of Trajan was concealed for ſome days, that the intrigue of the adoption might the better ſucceed; and that the thing was known by the letter of that prince to the ſenate, which was not ſigned by him, but by Plotina, a thing that had never happened before. See how Mr Dodwell refutes Dion in his learned lectures upon Spartian (9). As for the reſt, Dion is not the only author who ſaid this. 'Nec deſunt, *ſays another*, qui factione Plotinæ mortuo jam Trajano Adrianum in adoptionem adſcitum eſſe prodiderint, ſuppoſito qui pro Trajano feſſa voce loqueretur (10). - - - - *There are not wanting ſome who have given out, that Hadrian was adopted, after Trajan's death, by the intrigues of Plotina ,who ſuborned another perſon to ſpeak for Trajan, in a languiſhing voice.*' How difficult is it to confute a probable ſlander!

[*H*] *Hadrian always appeared very thankful for her favours.*] Triſtan (11) ſays, that *Hadrian left great legacies to Plotina by his will, if he ſhould die firſt, which I learn, ſays he, from the law,* Si Auguſtæ legaveris, ff. de legat. & fideicommiſſ. *lib.* 2. *which thus relates this matter.* 'Si Auguſtæ legaveris, & ea inter homines eſſe deſierit? deficit quod ei relictum eſt, ſicuti divus Hadrianus in Plotina,& proxime imperator Antoninus in Fauſtinæ Auguſtæ perſona conſtituit, cum ea ante inter homines eſſe deſiiſſet quàm teſtator decederet. - - - - *If you ſhall bequeath any legacy to Auguſta, and ſhe die, that part of the will is void, as Hadrian ordained, with reſpect to Plotina, and in late times the Emperor Antoninus, with reſpect to Fauſtina Auguſta, ſhe having died before the teſtator.*'

(8) In Adriano, init.

(9) Pag. 538.

(10) Spartian. *cap. iv, p.* 45

(11) Comment. Hiſt. *Tom. i, pag.* 430.

POINET (JOHN) biſhop of Rocheſter, and afterwards of Wincheſter, in the XVIth century [*A*], was zealouſly attached to the Reformation under the reign of Edward VI, and compoſed among other books a treatiſe on the marriage of prieſts, and an apology for that treatiſe (*a*). He was forced to leave his country in the reign of queen Mary, and retired to Straſbourg, where he died aged about forty years on the eleventh of April 1556 (*b*). He compoſed a book there, which was printed in the year 1557 with this title, *Diallacticon viri boni & literati de veritate, natura, atque ſubſtantia corporis & ſanguinis Chriſti in Euchariſtia* (*c*). He tried therein to reconcile the controverſies about the Euchariſt, and particularly thoſe of the Lutherans and Zuinglians. I ſhall ſpeak of this book in the remarks [*B*]. Poinet thoroughly underſtood the Greek tongue, and was tolerably

(*a*) Epit. Bibl. Geſneri, *pag. m.* 487, *ex Balæo.*

(*b*) Freher. in Theatro, *pag.* 169, ex Godwino de Præſ. Angl.

(*c*) It contains 83 leaves in 8vo.

[*A*] *He was biſhop of Rocheſter, and afterwards of Wincheſter, in the XVIth century.*] He was tranſlated to this laſt biſhopric on the twenty-ſixth of April 1551, and had a revenue of two thouſand marks *per annum* ſettled upon him for his ſubſiſtance (1). He ſucceeded Gardiner, who was depoſed for not ſupporting the rights of the crown (2); but he was obliged in his turn to make way for Gardiner, whom queen Mary reſtored to that biſhopric in the year 1553 (3).

[*B*] *I ſhall ſpeak of this book in the remarks.*] I have already mentioned the title of it, and the time when it was printed. I add, that they joined to it the famous treatiſe of Bertram *de corpore & ſanguine domini ad Carolum magnum* (4) *Imperatorem ante D. C. C. annos editus.* No mention is made where it was printed. The preface was not written by the author. He contented himſelf with giving a word of advice, wherein he gueſſes very right what would be the fate of his book,

(3) Ibid. at the year 1553, *pag.* 247.

(4) He ſhould have ſaid *Calvum.*

---

(1) Burnet, Hiſt. of the Reformat. of the Church of England, *Vol. ii, at the year* 1551, *pag.* 165. *See alſo* M. de Larrey, Hiſt. of England, *Vol. i, pag.* 690, *where the Printers have put* Pointe *inſtead of* Poinet.

(2) Burnet, ibid.

tolerably maſter of the German and Italian (*d*). He tranſlated from the Italian ſome books of Ochin (*e*). He had an excellent talent at preaching, for which he was in high eſteem with Edward VI (*f*). I ſhall relate what has been anſwered to the charge of his book, viz. that neither of the contending parties would approve of it, and that while he endeavoured to reconcile perſons who were at war with one another, he ſhould expoſe himſelf to the indignation of both ſides. He compares himſelf to a man who receives a wound with a ſword in ſtriving to part people that are fighting. *Author lectori. Pacem aliorum quærere pulchrum eſt, & habet certam promiſſionem Dei: beati pacifici. Sed vereor hoc dum cupidè ſector, ne quod iis qui pugnas dirunt evenire ſolet, idem mihi quoque accidat. Illi dum aliorum ſaluti conſulunt, ipſi reportant vulnera. Et ego dum id operam do ut diſſidentes redeant in gratiam, ab iiſdem fortaſſe nullam inibo gratiam. Id ſi fit, illius exemplo me levabo qui dixit, ſi hominibus placuiſſem, Chriſti ſervus non eſſem. Vale ac ſtude Chriſto placere.* We ſhould not perhaps have known the name of the perſon that wrote the preface if John Sturmius had not acknowledged it for his. *Quære quæ præfatus ſum ante annos viginti in Diallacticum P.* (5) *Poneti Epiſcopi Wintonienſis* (6). This book was inſerted in the firſt edition of the firſt volume of Theodore Beza's *Opuſcula* (7). He who tranſlated it into French, aſſures us, in the preface dedicated to the Vidame de Chartres, that he had communicated his deſign to ſome miniſters (8). They believed, perhaps, that ſuch a book would be proper at a time when they were endeavouring to find out a medium to re-unite the Roman Catholics and Proteſtants. Obſerve, that the tranſlator aſcribes this book to Antony Cooke, who had been Preceptor to king Edward VI (9). You will find the opinion of this biſhop explained in a book of Andrew Rivet (10). Read alſo theſe words of John Couſin, biſhop of Durham: ‘*Paulo ante hanc conſcriptam Apologiam* (Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ à Joh. Juello Epiſcopo Sariſberienſi) *prodierat* Dialacticon celeberrimi viri Johannis Poineti *Epiſcopi* Wintonienſis *de veritate, naturâ, atque ſubſtantiâ Corporis & Sanguinis Chriſti in Euchariſtiâ; quod non alio conſilio edidit, quàm ut fidem & doctrinam Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ illuſtraret. Et primò oſtendit* Euchariſtiam non ſolum figuram eſſe Corporis Domini, ſed etiam ipſam Veritatem Naturam, atque Subſtantiam in ſe comprehendere; idcirco nec has voces Naturæ & Subſtantiæ fugiendas eſſe; veteres enim de hoc ſacramento differentes ita loquutos fuiſſe. *Secundò quærit*, an voces illæ *Veritas, Natura, & Subſtantia*, communi more in hoc myſterio à Veteribus intelligebantur, an peculiari & Sacramentis magis accommoda ratione? Neque enim obſervandum eſſe ſolùm, quibus verbis olim Patres uſi ſint, ſed quid iſtis ſignificare ac docere voluerint. *Et licet diſcrimen ipſe cum Patribus agnoſcat, inter Corpus Chriſti formam humani corporis naturalem habens, & quod in Sacramento eſt Corpus myſticum, maluit tamen diſcrimen illud* ad modum præſentiæ & exhibitionis, *quàm* ad ipſam rem ſubjectam, hoc eſt Corpus Chriſti verum, *accommodari; quum certiſſimum ſit non aliud Corpus in Sacramento fidelibus dari, niſi quod à Chriſto pro fidelium ſalute in mortem traditum fuit. Tertiò denique*, Spiritualem hic intelligentiam, juxta communem & conſentientem veterum Patrum interpretationem, requiri *ſtatuit*, & carnalem omnem cogitationem excludi (11). - - - *A little before this vindication (of the church of England, written by John Jewell biſhop of Saliſbury) came out the* Dialacticon *of the famous John Poinet, biſhop of Wincheſter, concerning the Reality, Nature, and Subſtance of the Body, and Blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt; which he publiſhed with no other deſign but to ſet the faith and doctrine of the church of England in a clear light. And firſt, he ſhews that the Euchariſt is not barely the figure of our Lord's body, but that it likewiſe comprehends the reality, nature, and ſubſtance of it; for which reaſon theſe words,* Nature *and* Subſtance, *are not to be rejected, ſince the Fathers, in diſcourſing of this ſacrament, made uſe of them. Secondly, he enquires whether theſe words,* Reality, Nature, *and* Subſtance, *were underſtood by the Fathers in this myſtery, according to their general ſignification, or in a ſenſe that was peculiar and better adapted to the ſacraments? For that we ſhould not only obſerve what words the Fathers made uſe of, but likewiſe what meaning they put upon them. And that altho' he was ready, with the Fathers, to acknowledge a difference between the body of Chriſt, which had the natural form of a human body, and his myſtical body in the ſacrament; yet he inclined to think, that this difference ſhould be applied to the manner in which it is preſent and exhibited, rather than to the thing itſelf,* viz. *the true body of Chriſt;* it being moſt certain, that the body which believers receive in the ſacrament, is the ſame which Chriſt offered up by his death for their ſalvation. *Thirdly and laſtly, he maintains that it muſt be underſtood in a ſpiritual ſenſe, according to the general and unanimous expoſition of the antient Fathers, and that every carnal thought or imagination ſhould be excluded.*’ Poinet lays great ſtreſs upon the authority of the Fathers, who ſpeak in ſtrong terms of the preſence of our Lord's body in the ſymbols of the Euchariſt, and he entirely rejects the opinion that was aſcribed to the Zuinglians; nevertheleſs he condemns thoſe who admit of the oral manducation of the body of JESUS CHRIST. He is willing to allow of the word Tranſubſtantiation, provided it be underſtood in a certain ſenſe, and not to include Oral Manducation. *Vident ſubſtantiam quoque à nobis præſentem affirmari, & communionem noſtram cum Chriſto naturaliter, & ut ita dicam, ſubſtantialiter prædicari, ſed has voces, non ut Philoſophi, ſed ut Theologi loquuntur, intelligi opertere. Nec de Tranſubſtantiationis vocabulo, quanvis barbaro minimeque neceſſario litigaremus, ſi modò talem ſubſtantiarum tranſmutationem interpretentur, qualem veteres agnoſcebant, ſacramentalem videlicet, qualis etiam in homine fit per Baptiſmum regenerato, qui novus homo factus eſt, & nova creatura, qualis etiam fit quum nos in carnem Chriſti convertimur, quibus patres antiqui utebantur exemplis. Voces ipſas non tantopere fugimus, quamquam earum quoque ratio habenda eſt, ſed ſignificationem eam quam patres ipſi docent, atque adeò flagitant, nos quoque requirimus: & ſolam* σαρκοφαγίαν, *id eſt, carnis vorationem, quam nullo pacto probant, ſed ut ſtultam & impiam condemnant, rejicimus ut alienam à Scripturis, alienam à patrum interpretatione, denique cum vera fide ex diametro pugnantem, ac ſpiritualem ſenſum in hac carne edenda neceſſarium eſſe judicamus, ipſum Chriſtum authorem ſequuti, & conſenſum probatiſſimorum, qui habentur, interpretum* (12). He had no reaſon to think that the Roman Catholics would be ſatisfied with his allowing of a term which he modified in that manner. But as for thoſe who deſired to have a miracle granted in the Euchariſt, he might fancy his hypotheſis would ſatisfy them, provided that they only aſked a great miracle in general; for what he teaches on this head, is one of the moſt incomprehenſible things that can be thought of. He admits a real and ſubſtantial preſence of the body of JESUS CHRIST, but which is no more than ſacramental at the ſame time; and he affirms, that by virtue of this preſence, the bread in the Euchariſt may purify our ſouls, and unite us into one body with our Redeemer. *Quòd ſi nonnulli miraculum requirunt (nam patres aliquot Euchariſtiam ingens miraculum nominant) non minùs profectò mirandum eſt panem & vinum creaturas terrenas, & corpori tantum paſcendo natas, eam virtute benedictionis myſticæ vim inſitam, adeóque potentem efficacitatem poſſidere, ut & animos & corpora mundent, alant, ſanctificent, atque ad immortalitatem præparent, ut nos membra Chriſti & unum cum illo corpus conficiant. Imò plus ponderis habet hoc miraculum, plus dignitatis, majorem utilitatem, ac magis myſteriorum rationi congruentem, quàm ulla poteſt craſſa tranſubſtantiatio, aut animalis & humana complecti* σαρκοφαγια (13). The Catechiſm of the Reformed churches, compoſed by Calvin, does not differ much from the opinion of this biſhop of Wincheſter. Take particular notice of theſe words: *Thus I doubt not but that JESUS CHRIST, as he was ſignified, and promiſed, will make us partakers of his own ſubſtance, in order that we may be united to him in one life.* M. *But how can that be, ſince the body of JESUS CHRIST is in Heaven, and we are in this earthly pilgrimage?* S. *It is by the incomprehenſible power of his Spirit which unites things that are diſtant in place from one another* (14).

I have ſaid elſewhere (15) that this *Diallacticon* was reprinted with the book of a Phyſician, who endeavoured to reconcile the controverſies about the Eucha-

---

(*d*) Freher. ubi ſupra.

(*e*) Epit. Bibl. Geſneri, ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Freher. ubi ſupra.

(5) He ſhould have ſaid *Joannis.*

(6) Sturmius, in Parte III, Antipappi quarti, *pag.* 176.

(7) *See* Rivet, in Grotianæ Animadver. Diſcuſſ. *Tom. iii,* Oper. *pag.* 1132.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Id. ib. & in Annotat. in Conſultat. de Religione, *pag.* 948.

(10) Ibid.

(11) Joh. Coſinus, Epiſcopus Dunelmenſis, Hiſtoria Tranſubſtant. Papalis, *cap. ii, num.* 4, *pag.* 9, & *ſeq.*

(12) Diallecticon, *folio m.* 81.

(13) Idem, *folio* 82.

(14) Geneva-Catechiſm, §. 53.

(15) In the remark [*C*] of the article HARCHIUS, towards the end.

his having carried away another man's wife [*C*] notwithſtanding he had one of his own.

riſt, and whoſe notions are very particular concerning this important article.

[*C*] *I ſhall relate what has been anſwered to the charge of his having carried away another man's wife, notwithſtanding he had one of his own.*] Sanders, after having ſaid that one Poynet took poſſeſſion of the biſhopric of Wincheſter, when Stephen Gardiner was deprived, adds, ' This fine prelate accounting it a ſmall thing to marry one wife, now that he was a Biſhop, did likewiſe carry away the wife of a certain Butcher then living; but ſhe was taken from him by the parliament of that kingdom, as no ways belonging to him, and reſtored to her huſband. It was owing to this, that when ſome time after, a man of quality ſaid to biſhop Gardiner, partly by way of joke, and partly by way of ridicule: You expect, perhaps, that the time will come when your biſhopric ſhall be reſtored to you; the biſhop anſwered, and why ſhould not I expect to recover my biſhopric, as well as the Butcher has recovered his wife. For it was the ſame perſon who ſeized upon Stephen Gardiner's biſhopric, and who carried away the Butcher's wife (16).' This is the charge, to which Dr Burnet makes the following anſwer: ' The falſeneſs of this ſtory is clearly evinced by the anſwer that Dr Martin gave in the beginning of queen Mary's reign, to a book that Poinet had writ in the defence of the married clergy; Martin's anſwer is writ with ſo much ſpite, and ſo many indecent reflexions, that though it is not reaſonable to believe all he ſays, yet it is almoſt a certain argument that this ſtory concerning Poinet is a forgery, ſince, if it was a thing ſo public as our author makes it, Martin muſt have heard of it, eſpecially living in Gardiner's houſe, and it is not to be imagined that if he did know it, he would have concealed it: ſo this, and the jeſt that hangs upon it, muſt paſs as one of the flouriſhes of our author's pen (17).

(16) Sanders's book of the Engliſh Schiſm, *pag.* 216.

(17) Burnet, *ubi ſupra*, *pag.* 396.

POITIERS (**Diana de**) miſtreſs to Henry II, and daughter of the Count de St Vallier [*A*], made an ill uſe of her favour, either to heap up riches, or to bring into places, or exclude ſuch as ſhe thought fit. Her age made it to be believed that ſhe could not thus captivate a young prince, without the help of Magic [*B*]. But ſome judicious perſons

[*A*] *She was daughter of the count de St Vallier.*] His name was John (1) de Poitiers, and he was deſcended from a very antient family; for one Aymar de Poitiers, ' thus called, whether becauſe he was deſcended from the counts de Poitiers, or for ſome other reaſon, married about the year 1184, the heireſs of the houſe of Valentinois, in conſideration of the aſſiſtance he had given to her mother, who was a widow, againſt the biſhop of Valence, who was her great enemy..... The ſame Aymar had from Raymund, count of Toulouſe, his relation, the county of Diois, about the year 1190, ſo that theſe two counties remained united two hundred years in the houſe of Poitiers, and were poſſeſſed by ſeven ſucceſſive counts. Lewis II, the laſt of them, having no male-iſſue, nor much affection for Charles de St Vallier, his uncle by his father's ſide, who was to ſucceed him, and being very much in debt, by his ill management and debaucheries, made over, and conveyed theſe two counties to Charles, dauphin of France, and his ſucceſſors, for a hundred thouſand gold crowns, on condition, that they ſhould remain inſeparably united to Dauphiné. After his death, which was in the year 1419, Lewis, the ſon of Charles de St Vallier, would take on him the titles and poſſeſſions of them; but the dauphin, being then king, obliged him to yield up all his pretenſions to him for a yearly rent of ſeven thouſand florins to him and his heirs for ever (2).' As for St Vallier, Diana's father, he was arreſted, as being concerned in the rebellion of the conſtable Charles de Bourbon, and would have been beheaded at the Greve, if his daughter, as it is ſaid, in order to ſave his life, had not granted the laſt favour to Francis I. Mezerai ſpeaks of it thus in his large hiſtory (3). *St Vallier had his pardon on the ſcaffold at the Greve, by reaſon of the beauty of his only daughter Diana.* And, in another place (4), ſpeaking of the ſame Diana, he ſays, *The charms of her beauty were ſo powerful ſince the year* 1524, *that all the court interceded for her father, who was convicted of the rebellion of Charles de Bourbon, ſo that king Francis, on her account, ſent him his pardon on the ſcaffold.* It cannot be concluded from theſe two paſſages, that the chaſtity of the daughter was a ſacrifice offered to Francis I, to obtain her father's pardon. But here is a third place, where the Hiſtorian ſpeaks very plain of this propitiatory victim. ' St Vallier was tried, and condemned to loſe his head; but as he was at the Greve, on the ſcaffold, he received his pardon inſtead of the fatal ſtroke. It was ſaid that the king ſent it to him. After he had got from his daughter Diana, who was then about fourteen years of age, the moſt precious thing ſhe had. A ſweet exchange to thoſe who prefer life to virtue, or who place their honour in the glory of enjoying a favour, which is more envied than it is innocent (5).' The author of the Galantries of the kings of France does not ſpeak ſo roundly, but what he ſays is ſufficient to make every body underſtand what he means. I ſhall ſet down his words, becauſe they contain ſome particulars relating to the hiſtory of our Diana. ' She was, ſays he (6), the daughter of John de Poictiers, lord of St Vallier, who placed her very young near the counteſs of Angouleme. Afterwards ſhe went into the ſervice of queen Claudia, as a maid of honour. St Vallier, who hoped that the charms of his daughter would procure him ſome protection at court, was not deceived in it; for it may be ſaid, that ſhe ſaved his life by her private contrivances. He had a hand in the rebellion of the conſtable de Bourbon, and was ſo unfortunate as to be taken. He was tried, and condemned to be beheaded. Diana was ſo ſtruck with this news, that ſhe thought nothing was to be omitted in order to free her father from ſuch a preſſing danger. She threw herſelf at the king's feet, melting in tears, and begged of him to grant life to the perſon to whom ſhe owed her's. She appeared in this condition ſo beautiful, and ſo moving to that prince, that ſhe obtained her requeſt, and inſpired him with love under the maſk of pity. She preſerved that conqueſt till the fatal journey the king made into Italy; and that prince endeavoured to conceal his unfaithfulneſs from the counteſs de Chateau-Brian, for whom he always had a great regard.'

[*B*] *Without the help of Magic.*] Thuanus ſeems to believe it. ' Diana . . . . amiſſo viro, is fuit Ludovicus Brezæus magnus Normaniæ Seneſcallus, cum jam inclinata eſſet ætate, philtris & magicis, ut creditur, artibus adeo ſibi animum Henrici devinxit, ut is nunquam alienata voluntate ad exitum uſque vitæ in amore illo conſtanter perſeveraverit (7). - - - - *Diana . . . . having loſt her huſband (Lewis de Brezé, great ſeneſchal of Normandy) when her age was now upon the decline, is believed to have ſo fixed the affections of Henry, by philtres and magical enchantments, that he perſiſted in his love to her with an undeviating conſtancy to the end of his life.*' Mezerai gives an exact account of all the reaſons which gave occaſion to believe that this woman made uſe of enchantments, and yet does not ſeem to be perſuaded of it. ' As the fineſt features of her face vaniſhed away, the charms of her wit, and her addreſs, increaſed to ſuch a degree, that at thirty-five years of age, when ſhe ſhould have preferred virtue to beauty, ſhe abſolutely conquered the heart of king Henry; and becauſe people, in order to make favourites odious, and excuſe the baſeneſs of the princes, who become their ſlaves, are uſed to ſay that their affection has been extorted by magical charms, ſome gave out that ſhe had bewitched him with philtres. Indeed it was a ſad thing, to ſee a young prince fond of a woman,

(1) And not *Aymar*, as Mezerai calls him, *Hiſt. de Henry II*, at the beginning.

(2) Mezerai, Hiſt. de Charles VI, *pag.* 578, *of the 2d volume, in fol. ad ann.* 1418.

(3) *Tom. ii, pag.* 936, *ad ann.* 1523.

(4) Hiſt. de Henry II, *at the beginning, pag.* 1058, *of the 2d volume.*

(5) Mezerai, Abregé Chronol. *Tom. iv, pag. m.* 520, *ad ann.* 1523.

(6) *Tom. i, pag.* 195. *See in the remark* [*P*] *a fault that he has committed.*

(7) Thuan. *lib. iii, pag.* 58, *ad ann.* 1547.

perſons do not give that reaſon for it, and make very good reflexions upon the power of an old courtezan [C]. They obſerve among other things the amorous temper of Diana [D]. The greateſt ſcandal proceeded from the common report, that ſhe had yielded to the deſires of Francis I, to ſave her father's life (a) [E]; ſo that people could not

woman, who had a face diſcoloured, and full of wrinkles, a head that grew gray-haired, languiſhing, and ſometimes blood-ſhot and running eyes, in a word, who was ſaid to be the infamous leavings of ſeveral others; and one might very well wonder, that neither time, nor honour, nor wiſe counſels, nor any other object among ſo many great beauties he might have pitched upon, could bring him off from her. But it is neither a new thing, nor a wonderful one, to ſee a man thus bewitched without any enchantments: there are many inſtances of it (8), and it is no difficult thing to give ſome reaſons for it (9).' Thoſe reaſons will be ſeen in the following remark.

[C] *Good reflexions upon the power of an old courtezan.*] Here is the ſequel of the paſſage I have juſt now quoted out of Mezerai. 'Not to mention thoſe unknown qualities, like thoſe of the load-ſtone, which meeting in ſome perſons, do cloſely unite them by an equal and mutual conſent, or by ſubjecting the one to the other; it is obſerved, that phlegmatic people are conſtant in their love, tho' they are not ſo in their deſigns, and other paſſions.' Add to this, that the firſt engagements are almoſt always broke off. And therefore a cunning and crafty woman is no leſs dangerous to a young man, who begins to be acquainted with the world, than a rock to an ignorant pilot. Beſides, the ſuſpicions he entertained of his wife's honeſty, made him more fond of another woman. Laſtly, in point of love, as well as in point of war, the ſtratagems of old people are not leſs to be feared, than the ſtrength and vigour of the young, and therefore it is no wonder if he fell into the ſnares of ſo experienced a woman.' Ovid, who was ſo great a maſter in the art of love, might have afforded Mezerai another reaſon, and perhaps that Hiſtorian would not have omitted it in a Latin hiſtory.

Nec quotus annus eat, ne quo ſit nata require
  Conſule: quæ rigidus munera Cenſor habet.
Præcipuè, ſi flore caret, meliuſque peractum
  Tempus, & albentes jam legit illa comas.
Utilis, O juvenes, aut hæc, aut ſerior ætas;
  Iſte feret ſegetes; iſte ſerendus ager.
- - - - - - - -
Hoc quoque militiæ eſt: hoc quoque quærit opes.
Adde, quod eſt illis operum prudentia major:
  Solus & artifices qui facit, uſus adeſt.
Illæ munditiis annorum damna rependunt:
  Et faciunt curâ, ne videantur anus.
Utque velis, Venerem jungunt per mille figuras.
  Inveniat plures nulla tabella modos (10).

Nor aſk her age, conſult no regiſter,
Under whoſe reign ſhe's born, or what's the year.
If fading youth chequers her hair with white,
Experience makes her perfect in delight.
In her embrace ſublimer joys are found,
A fruitful ſoil, and cultivated ground.
- - - - - - - - -
Pleaſure and wealth reward thy pleaſing pains,
The labour's great, but greater far the gains.
Add their experience in affairs of love,
For years and practice do alike improve.
Their arts repair the injuries of time,
And ſtill preſerve them in their charming prime,
In vary'd ways they act the pleaſure o'er,
Nor pictur'd poſtures can inſtruct you more.

A woman, who is the *infamous leavings of many others*, has been in a good ſchool, ſhe can do her exerciſes much better, and knows how to play the game to the beſt advantage. However it be, this Hiſtorian rightly obſerves, that there are many inſtances of the great power of an old courtezan. See the marginal note (8).

[D] *They obſerve amongſt other things the amorous temper of Diana.*] 'The love of a young king for a woman of forty years of age, who had two or three children by her huſband, might well be called an enchantment without magic. . . . . The king loved her becauſe ſhe was very ſenſible of love, and her temper prompted her ſometimes to look elſewhere for the heighth of pleaſure, as ſhe found in him the heighth of riches and honours.' They are Mezerai's words (11), which give me occaſion to compare, in this point, Henry II with a man, who, in all other things, was infinitely ſhort of that prince's merit. We read in Suetonius, that Caligula, in the flower of his youth, fell deſperately in love with Cæſonia, who was not young, and had had three children by her huſband; but then ſhe was a woman of a moſt laſcivious temper (12). Ovid, one of the greateſt maſters in that art, intimates plainly enough, that ſuch a temper ſerves a voluptuous man inſtead of many other things, and that as the inſenſibility of a chaſt woman is a diſagreeable inconveniency, the eagerneſs of a leud miſtreſs gives a wonderful reliſh. It is the unhappy cauſe of the unfaithfulneſs of huſbands.

Odi quæ præbet, quia ſit præbere neceſſe,
  Siccaque de lana cogitat ipſa ſua (13).
Quæ datur officio, non eſt mihi grata voluptas;
  Officium faciat nulla puella mihi.
Me voces audire juvat ſua gaudia faſſas,
  Utque morer memet ſuſtineamque roget.
Aſpiciam Dominæ victos amentis ocellos,
  Langueat, & tangi ſe vetet illa diu (14).

Give me enjoyment, when the willing dame
Glows with deſires, and burns with equal flame.
I love to hear the ſoft tranſporting joys,
The frequent ſighs and tender murm'ring voice:
To ſee her eyes with vary'd pleaſure move,
And all the nymph confeſs the pow'r of love.

What has been ſaid, ſhews that Mezerai hit right: the leud temper of Henry's miſtreſs ſupplied her want of youth.

[E] *It was the common report that ſhe had yielded to the deſires of Francis I, to ſave her father's life.*] Beſides what has been ſaid upon this ſubject in the firſt remark of this article, I ſhall obſerve a circumſtance mentioned by Thuanus, concerning the fright of the Count de St Vallier. That unhappy man being brought to the place of execution, was ſtruck with ſuch a conſternation, that he fell dangerouſly ill. He was let blood ſeveral times, but this, and the good news of his pardon, could not recover his ſpirits and cure him. St Vallier's fever became afterwards a proverb. *Diana . . . . . . patrem habuit Joannem Pictavienſem Sanvalerium, qui Caroli Borbonii conjurationis particeps, cum apud Sacerdotem ſecretò rem confeſſus eſſet, à Sacerdote delatus, & ad mortem damnatus eſt: cum ad ſupplicium duceretur, ex pavore in tam acutam febrem incidit, ut venia in gratiam filiæ, quæ pulchritudine ſua multorum procerum benevolentiam demeruerat, à Franciſco impetrata, vix ad mentem & ſanitatem ſæpius miſſo ſanguine réduci potuerit, unde Sanvaleriana febris apud nos in proverbium abiit* (15). Some ſay (16), *That he ſaw death ſo near him, and was ſo frighted at it, that when he was brought back to his houſe* (17), *a continual fever ſeized him ſo violently, that he died of it.* Thuanus tells us, that St Vallier was accuſed by the prieſt, to whom he had confeſſed his conſpiracy. But moſt Hiſtorians ſay, that two gentlemen of Normandy, who were concerned in the ſame plot, diſcovered it to Francis I. Some will have it, that in this they followed the inclination, which is ſaid to be natural to their countrymen (18): others ſay, that their confeſſor made a ſtep, which obliged them to reveal

(a) See the remark [A].

(8) See the articles CALIGULA, remark [H], CYRUS, remark [F], and DELLIUS, remark [A]. See alſo the articles LAIS and LAMIA.

(9) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, *at the beginning of Henry II, pag.* 1028, *of the 2d volume, in folio.*

(10) Ovid. de Arte Amandi, *lib. ii, ver.* 663.

(11) Abrégé Chron. *Tom. iv, pag.* 643, *ad ann.* 1547.

(12) See the article CALIGULA, citat. (28).

(13) *Compare* Martial. Epigr. LXI, & CV, *lib. xi.*

(14) Ovid. ubi ſupra, ver. 692.

(15) Thuan. ubi ſupra.

(16) *Father* Anſelme, Palais de l'Honneur, *pag.* 555.

(17) See the remark [P].

(18) Franciſcus Lutetia profectus ad Fanum Petri Monaſterienſis . . . appulit . . . ibi duo Borbonii domeſtici natione Normani (quæ natio vulgo ut parum fida notari ſolet) Argugius ac Matigno Borbonium cum Cæſare conveniſſe atque adverſus Franciſcum multa moliri indicant. *Belcarius, lib. xvii, num.* 46, *pag.* 530.

not ſee, without indignation, that a woman, who had been a concubine to the father and the ſon ſucceſſively, ſhould have the chief authority in the kingdom. It is a chimerical fancy to pretend that Henry the ſecond's intimacy with that woman went no farther than pure friendſhip [*F*]. She was known at court for a long time, by the name of Grande Senechalle, and then by that of ducheſs of Valentinois. Se went by the firſt of thoſe two names, becauſe ſhe had been married to Lewis de Brezé, Great Seneſchal of Normandy, by whom ſhe had two daughters, whom ſhe married very advantageouſly [*G*].

As

reveal that ſecret. Varillas ſticks to this laſt opinion. 'Matignon and d'Argouges, ſays he (19), having 'confeſſed at Eaſter to a curate of their country, that 'they had a hand in a conſpiracy againſt the ſtate, 'he ordered them to diſcover it to the king; and he 'himſelf ſet out immediately to acquaint Brezé, great 'Seneſchal of Normandy, with it. Matignon and 'd'Argouges, who thought they were undone, took 'poſt, and overtook the king at Saint Pierre le Monſtier, where they threw themſelves at his feet, and 'obtained their pardon, by making an exact diſcovery of what they knew of the conſtable's negociation with the emperor.'

[*F*] *It is a chimerical fancy to pretend that Henry the ſecond's intimacy . . . . . . went no farther than pure friendſhip.*] I wonder how Mr le Laboureur could ever bring himſelf to believe ſuch a chimera. I ſhall ſet down his words, which contain a curious paſſage concerning the origin of that paſſion, and it will appear that he owns at leaſt that our Diana was one of Francis the firſt's miſtreſſes. 'He was further prompted 'to go thither, *ſays he* (20), *ſpeaking of a running at 'the ring, which Henry II took great delight in*, by his 'love to his miſtreſs Diana de Poitiers, ducheſs of 'Valentinois, who had been the firſt object of his inclinations, and had given him ſome briſkneſs. It is 'ſaid that king Francis, his father, who firſt loved 'that lady, having one day, after the death of his 'ſon the dauphin Francis, expreſſed ſome grief to her, 'for the little briſkneſs he perceived in prince Henry, ſhe told him, that he wanted to be in love, and 'that ſhe would make a galant of him. The king, 'whoſe affection was divided between her and the 'ducheſs d'Etampes, gave his conſent to it; but 'though the court was then very licentious, we ought 'to believe, that nothing paſſed between them that 'might occaſion any ſlanders, and that the imprecation and curſe uttered againſt Reuben (21), was 'thrown into Henry's chamber out of a calumny: 'nay (22), it is not certain that Diana de Poitiers ſuffered that this friendſhip ſhould go beyond a noble 'eſteem and a meer galantry. To prove this, it is to 'be obſerved, that ſhe had had ſome children by her 'huſband Lewis de Brezé, count de Maulevrier, Seneſchal of Normandy; and Henry II left behind him 'ſome legitimate and natural ones, but it does not 'appear that he had any by her.' The proof alledged by Mr le Laboureur is of ſmall force; nay, it is inſignificant, and even makes againſt him; for at this rate he ſhould not have ſaid, that the *affection of Francis I. was divided between Diana de Poitiers and the ducheſs d'Etampes*. We do not find that this prince, who was the father of ſeveral children, had ever any by Diana, who was not ſo old when he loved her, as when ſhe was Henry the ſecond's miſtreſs. I do not alledge againſt this proof, the great age of Diana, according to Varillas, when the dauphin began to be in love with her; I do not think ſhe was near ſo old as that Hiſtorian will have it. But I ſhall only ſay two things; Firſt, That Diana might have grown barren before ſhe was forty years of age by exceſſive leudneſs: Secondly, That barren marriages frequently happen between widowers and widows, who had, both of them, children by their former marriages.

If one had a mind to deny the inceſt, it were better to go about it as Varillas does; it were better to deny that Diana lay with the father, than to deny that ſhe did it with the ſon. However it be, let us ſee what Varillas ſays. 'I expect to be blamed for having ſaid nothing of the pretended inceſt of the ſame 'ducheſs of Valentinois, with the father and the ſon, 'that is, with king Francis I, and king Henry II. 'But to this I anſwer two things: Firſt, That of all 'the authors of thoſe times, whom I have ſeen in the 'king's library, in a collection divided into thirty-ſeven volumes, I have not found any Catholic writer 'who mentions that inceſt, and that the Catholics 'have been as careful to ſay nothing of it, as the 'Calviniſts have appeared eager and paſſionate in giving a particular account of it. Beſides, the ſame 'Calviniſts do not agree in their ſatires; for ſome 'will have it, that this ducheſs, who was then 'known only by the name of Diana de Poitiers, yield-'to the deſires of king Francis I, only to ſave by the 'loſs of her virginity, the life of St Vallier, her father, who was otherwiſe in a few days to loſe it upon a ſcaffold, for being an accomplice in the rebellion of the conſtable de Bourbon; and others affirm 'that ſhe proſtituted herſelf to the conſtable de Montmorency, chief miniſter and favourite of Francis I '(23).' If he goes upon no better grounds as to this, than in what he adds concerning the reaſon why the Calviniſts hated the ducheſs de Valentinois, he has loſt his cauſe; for it is an abſurd thing to alledge the laſt-will of the ducheſs (24), as the true reaſon of their hatred, and not the cruel perſecution which they ſuffered under a reign, in which every thing was managed according to the caprices of that woman. This is certainly the ſophiſm *à non cauſa pro cauſa*.

[*G*] *She had two daughters, whom ſhe married very advantageouſly.*] Frances de Brezé, the eldeſt, was married in 1538, to Robert de la Marck, fourth of that name, duke of Bouillon, ſovereign prince of Sedan, who was made marſhal of France in the year 1547 (25). Louiſa de Brezé, the other daughter of the great Seneſchal, was married to Claudius de Lorrain, duke d'Aumale (26), brother to the duke of Guiſe, who was killed by Poltrot. Varillas is very much out here (27). He ſuppoſes, that in the beginning of Henry the ſecond's reign, the ducheſs de Valentinois and the cardinal de Lorrain, mutually endeavoured to unite their intereſts, in order to keep up and increaſe their credit, and that the cardinal, upon ſuch a proſpect, propoſed to marry the prince of Joinville his eldeſt brother, with the eldeſt daughter of the ducheſs: which not ſucceeding, the ducheſs was obliged to be contented to marry her eldeſt daughter to the duke d'Aumale, the cardinal's younger brother; after which ſhe married her ſecond daughter to the ſon of the marſhal de Fleuranges, prince of Sedan (28). Varillas confounds times and things; for the eldeſt daughter of Diana married Robert de la Marck, prince of Sedan, in the year 1538 (29). Would Henry Robert de la Marck, their ſon, have married in 1558 the daughter of the duke of Montpenſier (30), if his mother had married in the reign of Henry II? I ſay nothing of Antoinette de la Marck, ſiſter of Henry Robert, who was married to Damville, ſecond ſon to the conſtable de Montmorency, in the year 1558, according to Varillas (31); but as he obſerves that ſhe *was almoſt marriageable*, he might evade the force of my objection, and I do not know what age that lady was of at that time. Having deſired a friend (32) to conſult Mr d' Hozier, who has a vaſt knowledge of Hiſtory and Genealogies, I have been informed that Frances de Brezé, eldeſt daughter of Diana de Poitiers, was married in the year 1538 to Robert de la Marck, and that Louiſa de Brezé, her ſecond daughter, was married to Claudius de Lorrain, duke d'Aumale, in 1546 (33); for *William de Poitiers, her uncle, mentions her, as being that prince's wife in the laſt-will he made the* 12*th of March* 1546. Preſident de la Place obſerves, that the duke d'Aumale married in the reign of Francis I, by ſuch a token that the [illegible]ng would not ſuffer the bride *to be dreſſed like a princeſs on her wedding-day* (34). Which ſhew the miſtakes of the modern author of the life of admiral de Coligny. He ſuppoſes, that the conſtable de Montmorency having attained again to the top of favour after the death of Francis I, had a mind to marry Coligny to the heireſs of Laval. Coligny did not like the match, and put in his brother d'Andelot for it. The conſtable thinking that Coligny had refuſed it, becauſe he was in love with the lady de Brezé,

desired

(19) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I, *lib. iv, pag.* 269.

(20) Addit. aux Mémoires de Caſtelnau, *Tom. i, pag.* 276.

(21) See the 49th chapter of Geneſis, ver. 4.

(22) This *nay* is needleſs here, ſince the author is going to ſay nothing ſtronger than what goes before.

(23) Varillas, Preface to the Hiſtory of Henry II.

(24) By which ſhe diſinherited the duke of Bouillon, her ſon-in-law, in caſe he ſhould embrace the new religion.

(25) Anſelme, Hiſt. des Officiers de la Couronne, *pag.* 179.

(26) Idem, Palais de l'Honneur, *pag.* 448.

(27) Hiſt. de Henry II, *lib.* ., *pag.* 44, 49, *ad ann.* 1547.

(28) Ib. *p.* 49.

(29) Anſelme, Hiſt. des Off. ib.

(30) Ibid.

(31) Hiſt. de Henry II, *lib. vii, pag.* 361.

(32) Mr Janniçon, Advocate to the king's council.

(33) It is perhaps by reckoning the beginning of the year from Eaſter.

(34) Commentaires de l'état de la Religion & Republique, *fol.* 59 *verſo*, *Edit.* 1565.

As for the other name, ſhe took it, becauſe Henry II gave her the duchy of Valentinois. I do not think that when ſhe ſet up as head of a party in oppoſition to the ducheſs d'Etampes, in the reign of Francis I, ſhe was ſo old as Varillas will have it [*H*]. We are

deſired that young lord *to forbear viſiting that lady ſo frequently, or to do it at leaſt with a deſign only to try whether ſhe would be of her mother's humour* (35). Nevertheleſs, the viſits continued to be as frequent as before. That author having related ſeveral intrigues, tells us, that Diana having two daughters to marry, looked out for huſbands, who might help her to keep up her credit (36), and ſhe caſt her eyes upon the prince of Joinville, and ſpoke to the cardinal de Lorrain about it. He adds (37), that Coligny repreſented to that prince, that it was a diſhonourable match for him, and put him out of conceit with it, and that afterwards, Diana married her daughter to the duke d'Aumale, younger brother to that prince. See the remark [*Q*]. I admire the many particulars mentioned by this author, and his vaſt commentaries upon a few words of Brantome. He is a faithful imitator of Varillas, an Hiſtorian who will ſpoil a great many authors, if it be not prevented. But omitting his hiſtorical miſtakes, I ſhall only obſerve that Diana had no daughters to marry, when Henry II, her lover, came to the crown on the 31ſt of March 1547; for, as I have already ſaid, the eldeſt of her two daughters was married in the year 1538, and the youngeſt in the year 1546.

[*H*] *I do not think . . . . that ſhe was ſo old as Varillas will have it.*] I ſhall ſet down his own words, but let us rememember that they concern the year 1544. 'Diana de Poitiers was the dauphin's miſtreſs, 'as the ducheſs (38) was loved by the king; but this 'was the only thing wherein they were alike, both 'in reſpect of their body and mind. The ducheſs 'had never been ſo beautiful as ſhe was then: ſhe had 'loſt nothing of the luſtre, which procured her the 'reputation of being the greateſt beauty in Europe, 'in the opinion of the niceſt judges, and even of the 'emperor himſelf: but Diana had ſcarce any of thoſe 'charms, which ſaved her father's life one and twenty 'years before. The ducheſs was but one and thirty 'years of age, and it was ſuſpected that Diana was 'near ſixty years old; for the care that was taken to 'know her age, by enquiring where ſhe was chriſtened, proved ineffectual. . . . . The ducheſs . . . . . 'ſpoke freely of Diana, whereas Diana concealed under feigned demonſtrations of reſpect and complaiſance, her vexation for the ſlight that was put upon 'her. The ducheſs's freedom made her ſay upon a 'certain occaſion, that ſhe was born the ſame day 'that Diana was married. Theſe words were the 'more offenſive, becauſe they might be true, and reflected upon Diana as if ſhe had been equally incapable of inſpiring or entertaining the paſſion of 'love, ſince it was known that ſhe had been a long 'time without finding a huſband (39). Nevertheleſs, 'ſhe concealed her reſentment as long as the king enjoy'd perfect health; but as ſoon as ſhe perceived that 'his majeſty began to decline, ſhe made the ducheſs 'ſenſible, that the time was coming on when ſhe 'would be revenged on her (40). I cannot tell from whence this author had theſe ſtories, but I very much queſtion the truth of them. I heard one day a certain perſon argue againſt it in the following manner. In the firſt place, ſaid he, if Diana de Poitiers had been forty years of age when her father was tried, it is not likely that the Hiſtorians would have repreſented her as a tid-bit for Francis I. A married woman or a widow will be more eaſily accounted handſome at forty years of age, than a maid of the ſame years. The latter will be ſooner called an old maid, than the former will be called old women, and through an ill effect of prejudices, ſhe is not looked upon as ſo good a chance. II. Mezerai ſays, that Diana was but fourteen years of age, when ſhe ſaved her father's life (41); which is much more likely than to ſay that ſhe was forty. The exchange of a criminal's life for an old maidenhead, is not ſo eaſily apprehended by the readers, as when they are told (as they are by Mezerai) that this exchange was made by one that was but fourteen years of age; and the fault of king Francis may be better excuſed by it. III. If Diana had been near ſixty years old in 1544, ſhe muſt have been ſeventy-five years old when Henry II died; that is, on the day of the famous tournament, wherein that prince received a wound, of which he died, he took white and black for his livery, *on account of the handſome widow he ſerved* (42): Would an old woman of ſeventy-five years have been ſerved as a handſome widow? Would the Proteſtants, to whom ſhe was ſo violent an enemy, and who revenged themſelves upon her by their ſatirical books, have forgot her great age? A young king deſperately in love with an old woman of ſeventy years, lies ſo open to be ridiculed, that Henry II would have been bantered and railed at in the moſt inſulting manner, on acount of his old miſtreſs, if the ducheſs of Valentinois had been of ſuch an age. The ſilence of the ſatirical writers, who only ſay, that Diana was in her autumn, that is, between forty and fifty years of age, ſeems to me a very ſtrong reaſon againſt Varillas. But this is not the main part of the objection: what Brantome gives an account of in his *Memoires des Dames Galantes* was more inſiſted upon. He ſays (43), that two years after the death of that prince, the enemies of the ducheſs of Valentinois courted her friendſhip. She muſt therefore have lived at leaſt ſeventy-ſeven years: how comes it then that, according to Brantome, ſhe died being ſeventy years and a half old (44)? IV. One can hardly believe that the ducheſs d'Etampes was but thirty-one years of age in 1544: if this was true, ſhe muſt have been but thirteen when Francis I. made a miſtreſs of her. But not to inſiſt upon this, I further obſerve, that ſhe was maid of honour to the queen-regent, before the king fell in love with her; and I queſtion whether at that time, when the education of children was not ſo forward as it is in our age, a maid of twelve years would have been qualified to be a maid of honour to the regent. V. I own that jealouſy prompts the court ladies, as well as others, to uſe paſſionate expreſſions, and to tell ſtrange lyes; but when a woman knows that her enemies have an eye upon her, ſhe will take care not to ſay any thing that is palpably abſurd, and ſhe will forbear telling groſs and notorious lies. The ducheſs d'Etampes took quite another courſe, if ſhe ſaid that ſhe was born on the day that Diana de Poitiers was married. Every body knew at court, at what time, the ducheſs had loſt her honour: the return of king Francis from Spain was too remarkable a thing to be eaſily forgotten. Now this was the very time when Mademoiſelle de Heilli began to ſet up for a gallant woman. The court did not leſs remember the pardon that was ſent to St Vallier on the ſcaffold; and conſequently they knew when Diana loſt her honour, and they were not ignorant that thoſe two ladies began to play the ſame game not long one after another. Wherefore, ſince it was known to the whole court, that St Vallier's daughter had not been married to the great ſeneſchal of Normandy, till Francis I. had lain with her (45), the ducheſs d'Etampes would have been a mad woman, if ſhe had ſaid what we read in Varillas, *I was born on the ſame day that Diana was married*; for it had been an eaſy thing to prove it an impoſture and a ſilly jeſt. We ſhall ſee below (46) that all theſe reflexions are not well grounded.

The author of the *Galantries of the kings of France* has adopted all theſe miſtakes of Varillas, and even made them worſe, by referring to the year 1547 (47) what the other had referred to the year 1544; which occaſions many new falſities. Mademoiſelle de Heilli was but ten years old, when the king lay with her. St Vallier obtained his pardon in 1526. Epernai and Chateau-Thierry were taken, and the treatiſe of Creſpy was made after the year 1546. Here follows another fault of that author. He ſays (48), that the love which king Francis conceived for Mademoiſelle de Heilli, at his return from Spain, made him *inſenſible with reſpect to all the other perſons of the court, and that Diana, who had been married a long time to Lewis de Brezé, ſeneſchal of Normandy, endeavoured to eaſe her grief for the inconſtancy of that prince, by conſidering that the Dauphin gave her ſeveral marks of love.* You muſt know that Henry II was but eight years of age when his father returned from Spain in 1526. You muſt further know, that he was not Dauphin till the year 1536, and that Diana was a widow when the Dauphin fell in love with are told very ſingular things about the great reſolution ſhe ſhewed after the death of Henry II [*I*], and about the continuance of her beauty [*K*]. She was a deadly enemy to the Proteſtants [*L*]; and doubtleſs, the religious zeal of ſuch a woman, was one of the moſt remarkable parts of the great comedy that is acted upon the ſtage of the world. If there is any thing in Brantome's memoirs, that is not only inſipid, but alſo execrable, it is the baſeneſs he is guilty of in praiſing this ducheſs, and applauding the exceſſive complaiſance of Henry II [*M*]. Thuanus is far from being guilty of ſuch a baſe flattery:

---

(35) Vie de Gaſpard de Coligny, *book ii*, *pag.* 87, *Edit.* 1686.

(36) Ibid. *pag.* 102.

(37) Ibid. *pag.* 106.

(38) That is, the ducheſs d'Etampes.

(39) This is not true. See the remark [*P*].

(40) Varillas, Hiſt. de François I, *book xi*, *pag.* 97, *Dutch Edit.*

(41) Abrégé Chronol. *Tom.* iv, *pag.* 520. *This agrees with what he ſays in the 2d volume of his large hiſtory, pag.* 1058, *that Diana got the dauphin's love at* 35 *years of age. La Planche, in his Hiſt. of Francis II, ſays much the ſame.* In her younger years, *ſays he*, *pag.* 14, ſhe redeemed her father's life with her maidenhead, and afterwards, to the misfortune of France, ſhe became king Henry's miſtreſs, being far advanced in years.

(42) Brantome, Eloge de Henri II, *pag.* 39, *of the 2d Tome.*

(43) *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 328.

(44) Ibid. *pag.* 228.

(45) This is not true. See the remark [*P*].

(46) In the remark [*P*].

(47) *Tom. i*, *pag.* 204, *edition of* 1695.

(48) *Pag.* 187.

her. From this you may judge, whether the author of the Galantries is an exact writer.

[*I*] *The great reſolution ſhe ſhewed after the death of Henry II.*] Brantome gives this account of it. ‘When Henry II was dying, the ducheſs of Valentinois was ordered to retire to her houſe at Paris, and to come no more into the king's chamber, leſt ſhe ſhould diſturb his godly thoughts, and becauſe ſome bore her an ill will. She retired, and then a meſſenger was ſent to her to demand of her ſome rings and jewels that belonged to the crown. She immediately aſked him, is the king dead? No, Madam, replied he, but he cannot live long. Well, ſaid ſhe I will have my enemies to know, that I am not afraid of them, and will not obey them as long as he is alive. I have ſtill an undaunted courage; but when he dies, I will not live after him, and tho' my life be never ſo bitter, I ſhall think it ſweet in compariſon of my loſs, and therefore, whether my king be dead or alive, I am not afraid of my enemies. That lady ſhewed herſelf very generous: but ſome will ſay that ſhe did not die, tho' ſhe ſaid ſhe would. It is true: however, ſhe came very near death; and I think it was well done of her not to die, in order to let her enemies know that ſhe did not fear them, and that if ſhe had formerly ſeen them tremble and humble themſelves in her preſence, ſhe would not do the ſame. And indeed, ſhe appeared ſo ſtout and reſolute that they could never vex her: nay, two years after, they courted her more than ever, and were friends again; as it is uſual with great people, whoſe friendſhip and enmity are of no long continuance, who quickly make up their differences, like thieves at a fair, and love and hate one another with the ſame eaſe. It is not ſo with us inconſiderable people; for we muſt either fight and die, or put an end to our quarrels by a very nice agreement, and after all we are never the better friends (49).’

What Brantome ſays, that great people are eaſily reconciled, and that the little ones are very eager in their quarrels, puts me in mind of what was ſaid to a Pariſian, during the wars between the houſes of Orleans and Burgundy. ‘While this war laſted, things were carried on with ſuch a heat, that after ſeveral ſieges, and the deſtruction of many towns, the peace was projected, concluded, and agreed upon at Auxerre. For, as the duke of Burgundy told a Pariſian, who went to meet him, WE THAT ARE DESCENDED FROM THE ROYAL BLOOD, GROW ANGRY ONE WITH ANOTHER, WHENEVER WE HAVE A MIND TO IT, AND IN LIKE MANNER, WE MAKE A PEACE WHENEVER WE HAVE A MIND TO IT. Monſtrelet further ſays, that a Burgundian was of opinion, THAT IT WAS A GREAT FOLLY TO KILL ONE ANOTHER FOR THE SAKE OF PRINCES, WHO ARE RECONCILED WHENEVER THEY PLEASE (50).’

[*K*] *And about the continuance of her beauty.*] ‘I ſaw, ſays Brantome, the ducheſs of Valentinois as beautiful, at threeſcore and ten years of age, and as freſh and lovely as when ſhe was but thirty; and therefore it is no wonder if ſhe was beloved by one of the greateſt and moſt valiant kings in the world. This I may freely ſay, without doing any prejudice to the beauty of that lady; for whenever a lady gains the love of a great king, it is a ſign that ſhe is a moſt accompliſhed perſon: beſides, beauty, which is a preſent of Heaven, ought to be enjoyed by the demi-gods. I ſaw that lady half a year before ſhe died: ſhe was ſtill ſo beautiful, that none but a hard-hearted man would have been inſenſible to her charms, tho' ſome time before ſhe had broke one of her legs in the ſtreets of Orleans. She rid then as dexterouſly as ever ſhe did; but her horſe fell. One would have thought, that the great pains ſhe felt, would have made ſome alteration in her face; but, on the contrary, her beauty, and her charming and majeſtical air were the ſame as before: She had a very white ſkin without any paint; only it is ſaid that ſhe drank every morning ſome broth, with potable gold and other drugs in it, which I do not underſtand, as the good Phyſicians and the learned Apothecaries do. I think, if that lady had lived an hundred years longer, ſhe had never been an old woman; her face was ſo well formed, and her body of ſuch a good temper and conſtitution. It is pity ſuch a fine body ſhould lie under ground (51).’

[*L*] *She was a mortal enemy to the Proteſtants.*] Beza aſcribes the cruel perſecution which the Proteſtants ſuffered under the reign of Henry II, to the counſels of three perſons, viz. the Cardinal de Lorrain, the Ducheſs of Valentinois, and the Marſhal de St André. The cardinal, ſays he (52), *had the king's conſcience at his diſpoſal.* The ducheſs *was in poſſeſſion of his body, not without ſuſpicion of witchcraft, ſince ſhe had lived in a very bad reputation, and had nothing in her that might reaſonably (if there is any reaſon in ſuch paſſions) win or preſerve the heart of ſuch a prince. Thoſe three perſons, who continually endeavoured to make him believe theſe two things, that the Proteſtants were enemies to the kingly power, and great lovers of confuſion, and that the right way of making amends for all the vices, in which they themſelves indulged him, was to exterminate the enemies of the Romiſh religion, did ſo work upon him, that from the very beginning of his reign he made it his buſineſs to perſecute and deſtroy the churches, as his late father had done before him.* Here is a paſſage out of Brantome. *But above all, ſhe was a very good Catholic, and hated the Proteſtants very much. Which is the reaſon why they hated and ſlandered her* (53). But Varillas's words are very remarkable (54): ‘She declared in the principal articles of her will, which ſhe made when ſhe was moſt in favour, and which ſhe did not revoke when ſhe died ten or twelve years after, that ſhe was ſo zealous for the Catholic faith, that if the ducheſſes d'Aumale and de Bouillon, her daughters, ſhould forſake it upon any pretence whatſoever, and embrace any of the new ſects, ſhe deprived them of her eſtate, and gave it to the hoſpitals of the places where the ſeveral parts of it lay. If one of her daughters only renounced the Catholic faith, ſhe gave her ſhare to her ſiſter (55); and if her relations were not careful to execute her laſt will, ſhe applied herſelf to the parliament, and intreated them, by the good offices ſhe had formerly done them with Henry II, to ſupply the fault of her relations.’ This Hiſtorian obſerves, that this article of her will was not executed; the ducheſs of Bouillon made an open profeſſion of the Reformed religion, and yet had an equal ſhare of her mother's eſtate with the ducheſs d'Aumale. Varillas takes occaſion from hence to commend the generoſity of the Guiſes. *So true it is,* ſays he, *that the houſe of Guiſe has ſometimes performed generous actions, which are not to be found in the princes of other houſes.* He quickly overthrows the foundation on which he builds this encomium (56). But we have no buſineſs with that here. I ſhall ſet down another paſſage, which clearly ſhews how much the ducheſs hated the Proteſtants. ‘She durſt not explain her thoughts to d'Andelot; for tho' ſhe made no ſcruple, for the ſpace of twenty years, to live an unchaſt life with her king, contrary to the laws of the goſpel, yet ſhe had ſuch a nice conſcience, that ſhe would not ſo much as ſpeak to thoſe who were ſuſpected of Hereſy (57).’ What extravagance! I deſire the readers to make their reflexions upon this odd zeal, which is ſo common.

[*M*] *Brantome . . . . was guilty of the baſeneſs of applauding the . . . . . complaiſance of Henry II.*] If Brantome had ſaid only that the ducheſs of Valentinois had a great deal of courage, that ſhe was ſtill handſome at ſeventy years of age, and that ſhe was a good horſe-woman, no body would find fault with him for it.

---

(49) Brantome, Dames Galantes, *Tom. ii, pag. m.* 327.

(50) Roulliard, Hiſt. de Melun, *pag.* 515.

(51) Brantome, Dames Galantes, *Tom. ii, pag.* 228.

(52) Hiſtoire Eccleſiaſtique, *lib. ii, pag.* 68.

(53) Brantome, Eloge de Henri II, *in the 2d Tome of his Memoirs, pag.* 9.

(54) Hiſtoire de Henri II, *book i, pag.* 36, 37.

(55) The author expreſſes himſelf ſo ill that one muſt gueſs at his meaning.

(56) *He ſays, pag.* 49, *that* the Cardinal de Lorrain who neglected nothing, took care to get ſome clauſes inſerted in the contract of the Count d'Aumale, which were ſo advantageous to that Count, that he inherited afterwards the beſt part of the ſucceſſion of his mother-in-law.

(57) Varillas, ibid. *book vii, pag.* 301, *ad ann.* 1558.

tery.: he does not ſpare the conſtable de Montmorency [*N*], who, notwithſtanding all his haughtineſs, cringed to that leud woman. Mezerai did not act the part of a flatterer [*O*]. She has been praiſed for not revenging herſelf on the ducheſs d'Etampes as much as ſhe might have done after the death of Francis I (*b*). The great riches ſhe got proved very uſeful to her after the death of Henry II. She made uſe of them to pacify the queen-mother, and retired to her fine ſeat at Anet; not without receiving as it is ſaid, a ſevere reprimand from Catherine de Medicis (*c*). That queen was terrified, when Tavannes offered to cut off the noſe of the ducheſs of Valentinois: *ſhe told him, that he would undo himſelf by it*; and he anſwered, that he would willingly die *to put an end to vice, and to the misfortune of the king and his kingdom* (*d*). To conclude, I ſhall examine what ſome ſay, that her virginity ſaved her father's life, and produce dates, which will compoſe the differences of ſome Hiſtorians [*P*]. It is a ſhameful thing that they ſhould diſagree in matters of fact, ſo modern as theſe are.

What

it. But it is an intolerable thing that he ſhould ſay, ‘That ſhe never adviſed the king to any thing but what was great, noble, and generous. . . . . (58). That ſhe was very mild, charitable to the poor, devout and pious, for which reaſon ſhe had a tomb for her device. . . . . as living only in God, and that the French ought to wiſh, that their kings may never have a worſe favourite than ſhe was (59). The great and vaſt preſent, which the king made to the ſaid ducheſs of Valentinois at his coming to the crown, upon the confirmation of all the officers of France, as it is uſually practiſed in the beginning of a new reign, was thought a very ſtrange thing. The money, that was raiſed by it, amounted to a prodigious ſum, becauſe king Francis had reigned a long time. Such a king might very well make ſuch a preſent to ſuch a lady; for it was a caſual branch, which made no part of his revenues, demeſnes, ſubſidies, or taxes, and our former kings were very free of ſuch things, as I have it from good hands, and were blamed when they made any account of them, ſince it was out of this fund that they generally diſtributed rewards to their ſervants. They uſed to do it; but our late kings keep them for themſelves, and farm them out to ſupply their neceſſities. Beſides, this lady did not make an ill uſe of that money, for ſhe built that fine houſe at Anet, that will be for ever an ornament to France (60).’ One cannot read this without indignation: the praiſes beſtowed upon her by Francis de Billon, on account of her being a woman of her word and beneficent, are leſs offenſive (61).

[*N*] *Thuanus . . . does not ſpare the conſtable de Montmorency.*] I ſhall ſet down his own words, which are more energical than a tranſlation would be. *Hæc violenta & acerba regni initia, ſub miti & moderato principe & qui alieno potius quam ſuo ingenio uteretur, facile Miniſtris tributa ſunt, ſed præcipue Dianæ Pictavienſi ſuperbi & impotentis animi feminæ, apud quam plurimum gratia valebant Lotharingi fratres & Santandreanus. . . . . Hujus feminæ arbitrio omnia regebantur, & Momorantius ipſe ut auctoritatem & potentiam quam apud regem obtinebat incolumem tueretur morem gerere & prudentiam ad turpe obſequium flectere ſatagebat, peſſimo exemplo ſummi imperii ad impotentis feminæ libidinem proſtituti, quæ poſtremo ut jam in homines ſic & in ærarium quod hominibus imperat poteſtatem arripuit, expulſo Joanne Vallo ſanctioris ærarii quæſtore, & in ejus locum ſuffecto Blondo Rupicuriano homine ſuo* (62). He mentions afterwards many other extortions which that blood-ſucker made uſe of to ſatisfy her avarice (63). Mezerai obſerves, that the king *changed immediately the whole face of the court to pleaſe that crafty woman* (64).

[*O*] *Mezerai did not act the part of a flatterer.*] Speaking of the poſture of affairs after the death of Henry II, he expreſſes himſelf thus. ‘The ducheſs of Valentinois made no long ſtay at court after Bertrandi, *keeper of the ſeals*: ſhe was turned out when Oliver came in, whom ſhe had expelled, and ſhe was ſhamefully obliged to reſtore the keys of the king's cloſet, and the jewels of the royal family, which were given to the queen-regent. However, this was not done to pleaſe Oliver, but to ſatisfy the juſt reſentment of Catherine, who could no longer ſuffer, without diſgracing herſelf, a woman who had for ſo many years robbed her of the king's affection. We may gueſs that this princeſs did not let her go without reproachful and injurious words. The duke d'Aumale, her ſon-in-law, obtained that ſhe ſhould not receive a worſe uſage, and that ſhe ſhould keep the vaſt wealth ſhe had got by the forfeited eſtates of criminals, the ſale of benefices, and by other unlawful means, becauſe ſhe promiſed to make him her only heir. But ſhe was forced to give the queen-mother her fine ſeat of Chenonceaux upon the Cher (65).’ This is a mollified extract out of La Planche (66).

[*P*] *I ſhall examine what ſome ſay, that her virginity ſaved her father's life, and produce dates which will compoſe the differences of ſome Hiſtorians.*] I have been informed by Mr d'Hozier, that ſhe married the great ſeneſchal of Normandy on the twenty-ninth of March 1514. And therefore Mezerai advances a great falſity, when he ſays, that the king ſent St Vallier's pardon, *after he had got from his daughter Diana, who was then fourteen years of age, the moſt precious thing ſhe had* (67). Doubtleſs he means, that ſhe granted her virginity to Francis I, he is therefore miſtaken in two things: he did not know that ſhe was at leaſt twenty years of age in 1523, and that ſhe had been married eight or nine years. It is plain, his words are only a paraphraſe upon thoſe of La Planche, which I have quoted (68). He gives the following judgment about that Hiſtorian. *Regnier de la Planche*, ſays he (69), *was the ſon of the lieutenant-general of Poitiers, a cunning man, and of a quick wit, but malicious, and imbued with Calvin's opinions, and beſides, a confident of the Marſhal de Montmorency, and conſequently an enemy to the Guiſes.* It is no wonder if a man ſo qualified, did not enquire whether our Diana had been married a long time, when ſhe ſaved her father's life. Thoſe, who find a myſtery in the leaſt things, fancy that it was not without reaſon that Francis I. expreſſed himſelf thus in the pardon he granted to St Vallier. *Whereas our dear and truſty couſin, counſellor and chamberlain, the count de Maulevrier, great Seneſchal of Normandy, and the friends and relations of John de Poitiers, Sieur de St Vallier, have moſt humbly ſupplicated and intreated us to take pity on the ſaid de Poitiers, Sieur de St Vallier*, &c. Care was taken, ſay thoſe ſpeculative men, not to mention the affinity that was between the great Seneſchal and the criminal, and not to ſay, that he interceded for his wife's father; leſt it ſhould occaſion ſome ſuſpicions and ſlanders, conſidering the youth and beauty of the lady, who begged her father's life. But laying aſide theſe vain ſubtilties, I ſhall conſider Varillas's remark. He has not *found*, he ſays (70), *any Catholic who mentions that inceſt: the Catholics have been as careful to ſay nothing of it, as the Calviniſts have been paſſionate in their accounts of it.* He only mentions the writers of that time, *whoſe works make up thirty-ſeven volumes.* I wiſh I had the time to examine whether there were any books great or ſmall written by the Catholics in the reign of Francis I, or in that of Henry II, which mentioned this reaſon for the pardon granted to St Vallier; and I deſire all thoſe to inquire into the matter, who are able to do it, and may be any ways concerned in it. However, Varillas cannot deny, that in the XVIIth century the Catholic writers tell us, that Francis I. was in love with Diana de Poitiers. Mr le Laboureur does not deny it (71). Mezerai ſpeaks of it more clearly than la Planche; and I have quoted a modern author, who never was a Proteſtant, and who confirms what is to be found in the books they call the Huguenot's libels. I have ſet down his words (72), but I have not obſerved that he falſely ſays, that young *Diana was admitted into the ſervice of queen Claudia*, as a

maid

(*b*) Varillas, Hiſtoire de Henry II, *livr. i, pag. m.* 33, 34.

(*c*) See the remark [*O*].

(*d*) Memoires de Tavannes, apud le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 573.

(58) Brantome, Eloge de Henry II, *pag.* 9, *in the 2d volume of his Memoirs.*

(59) Ibid. *pag.* 11.

(60) Ibid. *pag.* 10.

(61) *See the book, intituled,* Le fort inexpugnable de l'Honneur du ſexe feminin conſtruit par François de Billon Secretaire, *printed in the year* 1555, *fol.* 170.

(62) Thuan. Hiſtor. *lib. iii, pag.* 58.

(63) See Lewis de Reinier Sieur de la Planche, in his Hiſt. of Francis II, *pag.* 14.

(64) Hiſtoire de France, *Tom. ii, pag.* 1058, *ad ann.* 1547.

(65) Ibid. *Tom. iii, pag.* 6.

(66) *Pag.* 15, 16, *of the book, intituled,* Hiſtoire de l'eſtat de France, tant de la Republique que de la Religion, ſous le regne de François II.

(67) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. *Tom. iv, pag.* 520, *ad ann.* 1523.

(68) In the remark [*H*], citation (41).

(69) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, *Tom. iii, pag.* 26.

(70) Above, remark [*F*], citation (23).

(71) See the remark [*F*].

(72) Above, citation (6).

What has been ſaid in a book printed at Baſil in the year 1698, that the duke of Guiſe intended to marry Diana de Poitiers, is not true [Q]. It is one of thoſe miſtakes ſo common in converſation: thoſe who have the beſt memory, do ſometimes miſtake one time for another, the father for the ſon, and the daughter for the mother &c.

maid of honour. That queen was the daughter of Lewis XII, ſhe married Francis I. on the 14th of May 1514, and was not a queen till the month of January following. But Diana married Lewis de Brezé on the 29th of March 1514, and therefore ſhe was not maid of honour to queen Claudia. A friend of mine (73) has been pleaſed to acquaint me, that ſhe loſt her huſband in 1531, and that ſhe erected to him a ſtately monument in the Church of Noſtre-Dame at Rouen; that ſhe died in 1566, at the age of ſixty-ſix years and twenty-ſeven days, and that ſhe lies buried at Anet. Beſides, Hilarion de Coſte (74) obſerves, that ſhe died on the 26th of April 1566. The reſult of all which is, that ſhe was born on the 31ſt of March 1500, and that the ducheſs d'Etampes was ridiculous in making herſelf ſo young, in compariſon of her rival. This will give me occaſion to rectify the want of exactneſs in the paſſages above-mentioned, concerning the age of the ducheſs of Valentinois.

The Minime I have quoted, does plainly enough intimate the inceſt. I ſhall ſet down his words ſomewhat at large, which contain ſome particulars belonging to this article. ‘After the death of Lewis de Brezé, her huſband, king Henry II, who was very much in love with her, gave her the title of ducheſs of Valentinois, which ſhe enjoyed till the day on which ſhe died, which was the 26th of April 1566, and ſhe was buried in the fine chapel that ſhe had built in her caſtle of Anet, (which the Poets of her time called Dianet) after ſhe had divided her eſtate between her ſecond daughter Louiſa, ducheſs d'Aumale, and the children of the eldeſt. She ordered by her laſt-will, that if ſhe died at Paris, her corps ſhould be carried firſt to the church of the Filles Penitentes, and from thence to Anet, and ſhe ſhewed her great averſion for the pretended reformed religion. The devices of Diana, ducheſs of Valentinois, were more proper for Diana, dutcheſs of Angouleſme. The firſt was a dart or an arrow, (the ſymbol of the arms of chaſt Diana, goddeſs of hunting) with this motto upon a ribbon that went round the dart, CONSEQUITUR QUODCUMQUE PETIT, -- *She obtains whatever ſhe aſks.* She deſigned to expreſs by this device, how much ſhe was in favour with Henry II, and the great aſcendant ſhe had over that prince, who could not deny her any thing, and likewiſe over all the great men of this kingdom, and Francis I, having obtained from him a pardon for her father the lord de St Vallier, who, by that king's order, had been taken up, and condemned to be beheaded, for favouring the retreat of Charles, duke of Bourbon, out of the kingdom. The ſentence was not executed upon him; his majeſty having ſent him his pardon at the requeſt of that lady (75) . . . . . Diana de Poitiers had alſo another device, *viz.* a tomb, out of which ſprung an arrow, ſurrounded with ſome boughs and ſhoots of a green tree, with this motto, SOLA VIVIT IN ILLO, - - - *She alone lives in it*, meaning, that the only hope of a reſurrection makes us live in the loweſt part of our graves. This fine device, and the third, which was a Diana triumphing over Cupid, whom ſhe had thrown down, and put under her feet, with this Latin inſcription, * OMNIUM VICTOREM VICI, - - - - *I have vanquiſhed the vanquiſher of all*, were not actually practiſed by Diana ducheſs of Valentinois, but by Diana, ducheſs of Angouleſme (76).’ Note, That all the authors I have quoted, miſrepreſent the favour obtained for St Vallier: it was not ſo great as it is thought; the puniſhment of death was only changed into that of a perpetual and very ſevere impriſonment. The pardon was expreſſed in theſe words (77): *We make it known that for theſe cauſes, and conſidering the ſaid ſervices, and particularly that which the ſaid great Seneſchal has done us* (78); *as it has been ſaid we have with our certain knowledge, full power and royal authority, changed, and do change, the puniſhment of death into that hereafter mentioned. That is to ſay, the ſaid de Poitiers ſhall be ſhut up for life between four ſtone walls, built above and underneath, having but one little window to give him meat and drink. In all other things the contents of the ſentence pronounced againſt him ſhall remain in their full force, and be entirely executed.* If one ſhould infer from thence, that what is ſaid of Diana's favours beſtowed upon Francis I, is falſe, he might be told that the king cauſed a ſuperſedeas to be immediately drawn up, wherein he ordered the parliament *to keep the ſaid St Vallier where he was* (79), till he ſhould give further orders about it. Beſides, Paſquier may be quoted, who was perſuaded that *if death had not prevented it, St Vallier would have been reſtored in time to all his honours* (80). If it be further ſaid, that the crime of that priſoner was one of thoſe, that leaſt deſerve a pardon, one may anſwer, that the laſt favour granted by his daughter, was paid for to it's full value; for her father was involved in a plot, wherein the king was perſonally concerned. It is what the king declares in his pardon (81).

[Q] *What has been ſaid . . . . that the duke of Guiſe deſigned to marry Diana de Poitiers is not true.*] I find in the ſecond volume (82) of the *Melange Critique de Literature, That the ducheſs of Valentinois occaſioned the difference between admiral de Coligny and the duke of Guiſe, which produced afterwards ſuch prodigious and diſmal effects. Thoſe two lords playing one day at tennis, the admiral told the duke of Guiſe, that he* wondered a wiſe man, and one of his quality ſhould be willing to marry a whore, *meaning that ducheſs: the duke of Guiſe, who loved her, was offended at his diſcourſe, hated him, and declared himſelf his enemy, and endeavoured to undo him. So that* the whore, *as the admiral called her, or the quarrel that happened upon her account, did, perhaps, contribute more to the Paris-maſſacre than religion, which in all likelihood was only a pretence for it. Perhaps, this Herodias aſked the admiral's head* . . . . (83). *I believe this quarrel did very much contribute to the maſſacre. What confirms me in this opinion is, that ſince the maſſacre, the duke of Guiſe, as ſeveral Hiſtorians agree, was often heard to ſay, that they had done more than he deſired, and that he deſigned a miſchief to no body but the admiral.* The author of theſe words ſuppoſes, that the ſame duke of Guiſe, who had a mind to marry Diana de Poitiers, had frequently declared, that the Paris-maſſacre had been carried farther than he intended. Which is to confound the father and the ſon; for the duke of Guiſe, who is here ſaid to have been in love with Diana, had been dead above nine years at the time of the maſſacre. But the greateſt miſtake lies in ſaying, that the duke of Guiſe, who had been the admiral's intimate friend, fell in love with the ducheſs of Valentinois, *&c.* than which nothing can be more falſe. Here is what has occaſioned that miſtake. The admiral adviſed againſt marrying the ducheſs's daughter; which was taken as if he deſigned to prevent the elevation of the Guiſes, and it was one of the reaſons why thoſe two friends became enemies. Here follows a paſſage out of an author of that time. ‘The firſt cauſe of the late duke of Guiſe's enmity was this. The late duke of Guiſe, your father (84), was deſirous that the duke d'Aumale ſhould marry the ſecond daughter of the ducheſs of Valentinois, to bring your houſe into credit. The duke of Guiſe, your brother, was againſt that marriage, but durſt not openly oppoſe it, for fear of diſpleaſing king Henry. Whereupon he applied himſelf to the admiral, as being his particular friend, deſiring him to adviſe him what anſwer he ſhould make when they ſhould ſpeak to him about it, adding, not without ſhedding many tears, that he would never conſent to it upon any terms whatſoever. The admiral being willing to eaſe his grief, did his beſt towards it, and after ſome diſcourſe on both ſides, his concluſion was, that it were better to have an inch of authority with honour, than a fathom without honour, and then they parted. But the duke of Guiſe was ſo far from approving that advice, which at firſt he was obſtinately reſolved to follow, that in order to exaſperate king Henry againſt the admiral, he told the marſhal de Vieille-ville, who was their common friend, that he could never have believed that the admiral deſigned to prevent his advancement, by adviſing him againſt ſuch a marriage (85).’

(73) Mr Janniçon, Advocate to the king's council at Paris.

(74) Eloges des Dames illuſtres, *Tom. i, p.* 519.

(75) Hilarion de Coſte, ibid.

* In the cabinet of medals of the library of the Minimes in the *Place Royale.*

(76) Hilarion de Coſte, ib. *p.* 520.

(77) *See the* Recueil de divers Mémoires, *printed at Paris in* 1623, *pag.* 58.

(78) A prieſt having told him that two gentlemen of Normandy had confeſſed to him, that they were guilty of a ſtate-crime, he gave notice of it to the court, and took the depoſitions of the two gentlemen.

(79) That is, in the priſon of the parliament at Paris.

(80) Paſquier, Recherches de la France, *book viii, cap. xxxix, pag. m.* 741.

(81) The ſaid great ſeneſchal . . has diſcovered to us the plots formed againſt our perſon, our children, and our kingdom. *Recueil de Mémoires, pag.* 58.

(82) Pag. 113.

(83) Ib. *p.* 114.

(84) Theſe words are ſpoken to Cardinal de Lorraine.

(85) Reſponſe à l'Epiſtre de Charles de Vaudemont Cardinal de Lorraine . . . maintenant ſimple Gentilhomme de Hainault, *printed in* 1565. *See alſo* Brantome's *Memoirs, pag. m.* 146, *of the* 3*d volume in the diſcourſe on admiral de Chaſtillon.*

It was the more neceſſary to rectify this, becauſe ſome learned perſons might have been deceived by it, and looked upon it as a curious and ſecret piece of Hiſtory, concerning the cauſes of the Paris-maſſacre. The learned Journaliſts of Leipſic (86), who have given an extract of the *Mélange Critique de Literature*, took what has been ſaid above concerning admiral de Coligny, and the duke of Guiſe, who was in love with our Diana, *&c.* as a very remarkable particular. One can never be too careful in preventing ſome readers from being impoſed upon.

(86) *See the* Acta Eruditorum, *for June* 1698, *pag. m.* 293, 294.

POLYDAMUS (VALENTINUS) an Italian Phyſician, in the XVIth century, publiſhed not only ſome books of Phyſic (*a*), but alſo an Hiſtory, of which Bembus ſpeaks with contempt (*b*).

(*a*) *See* Lindenius renovatus, *pag.* 1033.

(*b*) Petrus Bembus, Epiſt. LVI, *lib. vi, dated the firſt of March* 1535.

POLYÆNUS, a Greek author of a Collection of Stratagems [*A*], was born in Macedonia. He dedicated that work to the emperors Antoninus and Verus, when they were engaged in a war with the Parthians. He was then a very old man, and he told them, that if it had not been for his great age, he would willingly have ſerved upon ſuch an occaſion, but that inſtead of his ſervice he would preſent them with ſomething warlike, viz. the ſtratagems made uſe of by the ancients. I do not know whether Caſaubon had a better authority than this, to maintain that Polyænus was a ſoldier as well as a gown-man (*a*); but if he had none but this, I think he does not go upon very good grounds. What he ſays that Polyænus was an Orator and an Advocate is more certain, for Suidas calls him a Rhetorician. Suidas may be likewiſe produced, to ſhew that Polyænus was a military man; for he aſcribes to him not only a book concerning the taking of Thebes, but alſo three books of Tactics, or of the art of drawing up an army in Battalia. Yet this is no abſolute proof that a man was a ſoldier. Is it not an uſual thing for ſeveral people to write upon a ſubject, though they have only the theory of it? Suidas mentions one POLYÆNUS a ſophiſt, a native of Sardis, who lived in the time of Julius Cæſar [*B*], and who publiſhed ſome pleadings, and three books of the Parthian Triumph, &c. There is a third POLYÆNUS, an Athenian, quoted in Euſebius's chronicle (*b*). I cannot tell who he was. Scaliger himſelf knew nothing of him (*c*). Cicero (*d*) ſpeaks of one POLYÆNUS, who was accounted a great Mathematician, but having afterwards embraced the opinions of Epicurus, he maintained that all Geometry was falſe.

(*a*) Polyænus ſcriptor antiquus, elegans, acutus, eruditus & quod ad rem facit haud quaquam ἀπερισάλπιγκτος, ſed qui utramque militiam (ſagatam inquam & togatam) ſecutus eſt. *Caſaub. Epiſt. Dedicat. Polyæn.*

(*b*) Euſeb. Chron. *lib. i*, apud Voſſium, de Hiſtor. Græcis, *pag.* 404.

(*c*) Notis in eum locum Euſebii apud Voſſium, ibid.

(*d*) Academ. Quæſt. *lib. ii.*

[*A*] *Author of a Collection of Stratagems.*] It is divided into eight books. Caſaubon is the firſt who publiſhed it in Greek. He publiſhed it in the year 1589 with notes, and the Latin tranſlation of Juſtus Vulteïus, which had been printed in 1550. There is a better and more correct edition of it ſince the year 1690, publiſhed by Pancratius Maaſvicius, principal of a college at Delft.

[*B*] *One Polyænus a Sophiſt . . . who lived in the time of Julius Cæſar.*] Voſſius (1) makes Suidas ſay, that this Sophiſt lived under Caligula. Moreri and Konig place him under the ſame emperor; but it is certain that Suidas places him under Julius Cæſar, ἐπὶ τȣ̃ πρώτȣ Καίσαρος Γαΐȣ. According to Charles Stephens, he lived in Cæſar's and Mark Antony's time, and this author will have it, that the triumph mentioned by Suidas was that which Mark Antony obtained over the Parthians: but he ſhould have ſaid, that it was Ventidius's triumph (2).

(1) De Hiſtor. Græc. *pag.* 227. *See alſo pag.* 480.

(2) Plut. in Antonio, & Valerius Maximus, *lib. vi, cap. x, mention Ventidius's triumph.*

POLITIAN (ANGELO), in Latin *Politianus*, was born at Monte Pulciano (*a*) in Tuſcany, the fourteenth of July 1454. He was one of the moſt learned and polite writers of his age [*A*]. He learned the Greek tongue under Andronicus of Theſſalonica, and made a great progreſs in it (*b*). It is ſaid that he was bred up a ſcholar with Marſilius Ficinus, at the charges of Coſmo de Medicis [*B*]. The firſt work that procured him reputation, was a Poem upon the tournament of Julian de Medicis [*C*]. Every body owned

(*a*) *In Latin* Mons Politianus.

(*b*) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Latin. *pag.* 628.

[*A*] *He was one of the moſt learned and polite writers of his age.*] The learned are a little divided in their opinions about Politian's merit, and perhaps, no author was ever more unanimouſly praiſed. The two Scaligers have beſtowed great encomiums upon him, which is no ſmall glory to him. This, and ſeveral other paſſages in his praiſe, may be ſeen in Sir Thomas-Pope Blount (1). You may alſo conſult Mr Baillet (2), and Barthius (3), and Mr Crenius in the preface which he has prefixed to the new edition of the *Helleniſmus* of Caninius, printed at Leyden in the year 1700.

[*B*] *It is ſaid that he was bred up a ſcholar . . . . at the charges of Coſmo de Medicis.*] I ſhall quote Boiſſard for it. *Is ſumptu*, ſays he (4), *& promotione Coſmi Florentinorum principis, cum Marſilio Ficino bonis literis inſtitutus eſt.* I do not know from whence Varillas had the following circumſtances. 'He was a 'native of Florence, and his parents were ſo poor, 'that he was obliged to wait upon Julian and Laurence de Medicis, when they went to ſchool, and 'to carry their books, that he might make uſe of 'them (5).' It is not true that Politian was a native of Florence, as Varillas and Bullart (6) affirm: he was born at Monte Pulciano (7). Obſerve, 1. That Coſmo de Medicis died in the year 1464, and therefore Politian could not have enjoyed the favours of ſuch a patron but till he was ten years of age. 2. That Marſilius Ficinus was a grown man when Coſmo died; and therefore Boiſſard expreſſes himſelf very ill. Politian ſays, in one of his books, that being very young (8) he ſtudied the Platonic Philoſophy under Marſilius Ficinus, and that of Ariſtotle under Argyropylus.

[*C*] *The firſt work that procured him reputation, was a poem upon the tournament of Julian de Medicis.*] Let us quote Paul Jovius: 'Politianus à prima ſtatim juventa 'admirabilis ingenii nomen adeptus eſt; quum novo, 'illuſtrique poëmate Juliani Medicis equeſtres ludos 'celebraſſet, Luca Pulcio, nobili poëta omnium con'feſſione ſuperato, qui Laurentii fratris ludicrum 'equeſtris pugnæ ſpectaculum, iiſdem modis, & nu'meris decantarat (9). - - - - *Politian had the reputa'tion of an admirable genius from his very youth, having 'writ a new and celebrated poem upon the tournament of 'Julian de Medicis, wherein he is confeſſed by all to 'have out-done the famous Poet Luke Pulci, who had 'compoſed a poem of the like nature on the tournament of 'Laurence de Medicis, Julian's brother.*' Theſe words intimate, that Pulci's poem was compoſed before that of Politian; and what confirms it is, that Julian de Medicis was Laurence's younger brother. Baillet and

(1) *Sir Thomas-Pope Blount*, Cenſura Author. *pag.* 357.

(2) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Critiq. Gramm. *num.* 315. Jugemens ſur les Traduct. Lat. *num.* 817; *and in the* Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1227.

(3) Barthius, Adverſ. *lib. xlvii, cap. v.*

(4) Boiſſard. in Iconib. apud Blount, ubi ſupra.

(5) Varillas, Anecdot. de Florence, *pag.* 193.

(6) Bullart. Academ. des Scienc. *Tom. i, p.* 277.

(7) Leand. Albert. Deſcript. Italiæ, *p. m.* 89.

(8) Tenera adhuc ætate. *Polit. in fine Miſcellan.*

(9) Jovius, Elog. *cap. xxxviii, pag.* 88.

owned that he had better ſucceſs than Luke Pulci, an illuſtrious Poet, who likewiſe wrote a poem on the tournament of Laurence de Medicis, Julian's brother. The Hiſtory of the conſpiracy of the Pazzi, which he wrote ſome time after, was wonderfully cried up (*c*); and being made profeſſor of the Greek and Latin tongues at Florence, he acquired ſo much glory by it, that the ſcholars left Demetrius Chalcondylas, who was a native of Greece [*D*], and a very learned man; but his lectures, if compared with thoſe of Politian, were dry and barren. Politian's reputation increaſed more and more, when he publiſhed his Latin verſion of Herodian, his *Miſcellanea*, and his Latin poems. Had he lived longer, he would have enriched the commonwealth of learning with ſeveral excellent compoſures (*d*); but he died at forty years of age in 1494 [*E*].

If

Varillas underſtood thoſe words in the ſame ſenſe. ‘Julian de Medicis won the prize at the tournament, and was deſirous to get a paranymph not inferior to Luke Pulci, who had ſignalized himſelf upon ſuch an occaſion, in the praiſe of Laurence de Medicis. Politian undertook it, and as he perceived that Pulci's poem was not all of the ſame force . . . . he ſtole the fineſt thoughts of the ancient panegyrics . . . and made ſo fine a piece, that after he had read it, Pulci had a mind to ſuppreſs his out of ſhame and vexation (10).' Baillet relates the ſame thing in different terms (11). But if we may believe the ſame Jovius in a book wherein he ſpeaks more largely of thoſe two tournaments, that of Laurence was celebrated after that of Julian, and Pulci made his poem after he had ſeen that of Politian (12). ‘Ejus glorioſi laboris præmium fuit triumphus Politiani divini poëtæ carminibus celebratus. Nec MULTO POST Laurentius ut fraternis laudibus æquaretur, novum ſpectaculum periculoſiſſimæ pugnæ edidit. . . . . Hujus quoque ſpecioſiſſimi certaminis memoriam Pulcius (13) ipſe Politiani æmulus perjucundo edito poëmate ſempiternam fecit. - - - - *This glorious triumph was celebrated by the divine Poet Politian. Not long after Laurence, that he might not fall ſhort of his brother's praiſe, ſet forth a new ſpectacle of a dangerous fight. . . . . The memory of this ſpecious tournament was likewiſe made immortal by a very pretty poem of Pulci, the rival of Politian.*' I do not know that this author ever ſaid that Pulci was ſo aſhamed and vexed, that he had a mind to ſuppreſs his poem. It might very well be an invention of Varillas, as well as the pretended method that Politian pitched upon to out-do a work that was not yet in being.

[*D*] *The ſcholars left Demetrius Chalcondylas, who was a native of Greece.*] I find this particular in Jovius: *Tantos de ſe excitavit clamores favente juventute ut Demetrius Chalcondyles vir Græcus præſtantique doctrina, uti aridus atque jejunus à Diſcipulis deſereretur* (14). Here is an inſtance of the exorbitant liberty that Varillas took in his paraphraſes. ‘When Argyropylus, *ſays he* (15), left his Greek Profeſſorſhip at Florence, Politian took poſſeſſion of it. Being a man of wonderful parts, and leaving nothing unattempted to ſucceed in his deſigns, he ſo pleaſed his hearers that he excluded all the Greeks who contended for that place. Chalcondylas, notwithſtanding his great humility, and the little care he took of his own glory, could not brook the affront that was put upon his countrymen. He uſed his intereſt with Laurence de Medicis, who deſigned that he ſhould teach his children the Greek tongue, and obtained leave to read lectures in competition, and at the ſame time with Politian, to ſhew which of the two ſhould have more hearers. But Chalcondylas's harſh accent, which he could never leave off, and his difficulty to pronounce ſome Latin words, made him contemptible in compariſon of Politian, whoſe agreeable tone, and handſome expreſſions, charmed every body. Laurence de Medicis, who deſired by all means that Chalcondylas ſhould ſtay at Florence, was obliged to procure him ſome ſcholars, and endeavoured to perſuade Politian to be more civil to him. He undertook ſeveral times to reconcile them, but he found by his own experience, that it was more eaſy to reſtore peace to Italy, than ſettle it between two learned men. However, he prevented an open rupture between them during his life.' This narrative is grounded upon the following words of Jovius: ‘Demetrius Chalcondyles . . . . . ſcholam Florentiæ inſtauravit, deſertam ab Argyropylo, & à Politiano deficientibus Græcis occupatam; ſed ambitioſo, peracrique æmulo, multis bonis, maliſque artibus ſuggeſtus locum, & nomen defendenti Demetrius ceſſit; Latina præſertim facundia inferior, & ob id rareſcente auditorio à juventute deſtitutus, quandoquidem vel apprimè doctus, facilè jejunus, & hebes, laſcivis & delicatis auribus videri poterat: quibus Politiani decantantis, & varios ſpargentis flores, jucunda argutaque vox, & ſalſa comitas mira dulcedine placuiſſet. Sed manſit Demetrio honeſtus gratiæ locus apud Laurentium, vel infeſto, & obliquè ſemper inceſſente Politiano, qui quum neminem è Latinis ſibi parem pateretur, Græcis ipſis eruditior exiſtimari volebat. Diviſit idcirco munera Laurentius, ut æmulationis lites dirimeret, & filii præceptorum contentione ad diſcendum accenderentur (16). - - - - *Demetrius Chalcondylas . . . at Florence, adorned the ſchools which Argyropylus had left, and which Politian, the Greek profeſſors failing, had got poſſeſſion of; but he was forced to yield to his active and ambitious rival, who ſupported his place and reputation by many good as well as by many evil arts, eſpecially ſince Demetrius was far ſhort of the other in his knowledge of the Latin-tongue, for which reaſon chiefly he was deſerted by his ſcholars, becauſe notwithſtanding his great learning he ſeemed barren and inſipid to wanton and delicate ears; whereas Politian pleaſed them beyond meaſure by the variety of his rhetorical flowers, by his ſweet and ſonorous voice, and by his polite and engaging behaviour. Nevertheleſs, Demetrius ſtill preſerved the favour of Laurence de Medicis, in ſpite of the malicious and underhand attacks of Politian, who, as he could bear no rival among the Latins, ſo he wanted to be thought more learned than the Greeks themſelves. Laurence therefore divided their offices, that he might put an end to their quarrels ariſing from emulation, and that the earneſt pains of two contending maſters might prove a ſpur to the application of his children.*' The reader will not find in this paſſage, that Politian excluded all the Greeks who undertook to diſpute the chair, nor that Chalcondylas looked upon it as an intolerable affront, nor that Laurence de Medicis procured him ſome hearers. The laſt period of Jovius ſeems to be obſcure; the meaning of it is, that Laurence divided that employment to compoſe the differences ariſing from emulation, and to excite in his children a greater deſire of ſtudying, by the diſputes of their maſters. Methinks thoſe two motives are hardly conſiſtent. Mr Bullart ſays, that *Chalcondylas was forced to reſign* his place *to Politian, who diſpoſſeſſed him of it by his intrigues and artifices*, and that Laurence de Medicis *gave them different employments to . . . . remove the cauſe of ſuch a troubleſome emulation* (17).

[*E*] *He died at forty years of age, in* 1494.] It was at Florence on the 24th of September (18). Volaterran is more exact in his computation than Jovius: the latter will have it that he had entered into his forty-fourth year (19); the other ſays, he was only forty years of age (20). Several authors are miſtaken, as to the time of his death, which they place in 1509. Eber (21) and Reuſnerus (22) do ſo, as Voſſius obſerves. Nathan Chytræus mentions this epitaph of Politian, as having been tranſcribed in St Mark's church at Florence:

Politianus in hoc tumulo jacet Angelus, unum
Qui caput & linguas, res nova, tres habuit.
Obiit an. 1509, Septemb. 24.

Here lies Politian, who, things ſtrange indeed,
Had, when alive, three tongues, and but one head.
He died the 24th of September, 1509.

(c) Taken from Paul Jovius, *Elog. cap. xxxviii.*

(d) See the preface of his works written by Aldus Manutius. You will find ſome paſſages out of it in Geſner's *Bibliotheque, fol.* 45.

(10) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, *pag.* 194.

(11) Baillet, Enfans celebres, *ch. xxvii.*

(12) Jovius, in Vita Leonis X, *lib. i, pag. m.* 15.

(13) Some lines before he calls him *Aloyſius Pulcius.* In his *Elogia* he calls him *Luke.* There were at that time three brothers at Florence, who were good Poets, Luke, Lewis, and Bernard Pulci.

(14) Paul. Jovius, in Elog. *cap. xxxviii, pag. m.* 88.

(15) Varillas, Anecdotes de Florence, *pag.* 179, 180.

(16) Paul. Jovius, Elog. *cap. xxix, pag. m.* 69.

(17) Bullart. Academ. des Scienc. *Tom. i, pag.* 281.

(18) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Lat. *pag.* 629.

(19) Vix quadrageſimum quartum ætatis annum attigerat. *Jovius, Elog. cap. xxxviii, pag.* 89.

(20) Deceſſit quadragenarius. *Volater. lib. xxi, p.* 777. *See a paſſage of* Marſilius Ficinus, in Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

(21) In Faſtis apud Voſſium, ubi ſupra.

(22) In Diario Hiſtorico, apud eumd. ibid.

If what is reported to have occaſioned his death was true [*F*], one might ſay, that his morals were more anſwerable to the uglineſs of his face, than to the beauty of his wit [*G*]. Some of his poems were ſo much admired, that ſeveral learned men made it their buſineſs to comment upon them [*H*]. I muſt not forget that he was a prieſt and canon of Florence (*e*), and preceptor to the children of Laurence de Medicis

This we find in the 110th page of the *Variorum in Europa itinerum deliciæ*, collected by Nathan Chytræus, in the ſecond edition of the year 1599, *apud Chriſtophorum Corvinum in 8vo*; but Father Mabillon affirms, that there is no epitaph on Politian's tomb (23). What he further ſays does not differ from Chytræus, and he places that tomb in St Mark's church at Florence, and Politian's death in the year 1509, as does alſo St Romauld (24). Voſſius has ſolidly confuted this date; he alledges a proof grounded upon this, viz. that John Picus Mirandula, Hermolaus Barbarus, and Politian died in the ſame year. Palmerius's Continuator affirms it; and we have a letter of Marſilius Ficinus, wherein Politian's death is lamented, as having quickly followed that of John Picus. Now every body owns that John Picus died in 1494. Theſe are Voſſius's proofs; to which I add, that Peter Crinitus, a diſciple of Politian, ſays, that the three learned men abovementioned died the ſame year that Charles VIII made an irruption into Italy (25), which plainly denotes the year 1494.

[*F*] *If what was ſaid to have occaſioned his death was true.*] I will make uſe of Varillas's words (26): 'Death ſurprized him at forty-two (27) years of age. Not being able to ſatisfy the unchaſte love he had conceived for one of his ſcholars, who was a youth of quality, he fell into a fever, and in the violence of the fit he made a ſong for the beloved object, got out of his bed, took his lute, and fell a ſinging ſuch a moving and doleful tune, that he expired as he was ending the ſecond couplet, the ſame day (28) that Charles VIII croſſed the Alps in order to conquer Naples.' Thus Varillas has been pleaſed to tranſlate this paſſage of Jovius: *Ferunt eum ingenui adoleſcentis inſano amore percitum, facilè in letalem morbum incidiſſe. Correpta enim cithara, quum eo incendio, & rapida febre torreretur, ſupremi furoris carmina decantavit; ita, ut mox delirantem, vox ipſa, & digitorum nervi, & vitalis denique ſpiritus, inverecunda urgente morte deſererent* (29). Some ſay, not being able to reſiſt the violence of his love, he daſhed his head againſt a wall (30). Another author gives a different account of the death of this learned man. 'His death, *ſays he*, was not very edifying. Mr Balzac ſpeaks of it in the following manner: We are now certainly informed of the circumſtances of Politian's death, which have been diſguiſed by cardinal Bembo in his epitaph upon him. As he was ſinging upon a lute, at the top of a ſtaircaſe, a ſong which he had formerly made for a young woman, with whom he was in love, when he came to ſome verſes that were very moving, his lute fell from his hands, and he himſelf fell down ſtairs and broke his neck. That cardinal ſaid in his epitaph, that he died as he was ſinging ſome mournful verſes upon the death of Alexander duke of Florence, who had been wickedly killed by his couſin (31).' There is a groſs falſity in theſe words; for this Alexander duke of Florence, was killed forty-three years after Politian's death. The epitaph (32) upon the latter, made by Peter Bembo, imports, that he died as he was ſinging ſome doleful verſes on the death of Laurence de Medicis. Bullart advances a falſity, when he makes cardinal Bembo ſay, that *Politian fell down ſtairs as he was ſinging upon his lute an elegy he had made on the death of Laurence de Medicis* (33). The verſes of that cardinal, mentioned by him, ſay nothing of that fall. What does an author dream of, when he alledges a paſſage that is plainly againſt him? It is to be obſerved that ſome ſay, that the ſtory mentioned by Jovius is a meer calumny. Read theſe fine words of Pierius Valerianus: 'Angelus Politianus, nullius ignarus eruditionis, & diſciplinæ, cùm in adverſa Medicorum procerum tempora incidiſſet, inclinantibus jam Petri, quem ipſe literis inſtituerat, rebus, in eam incidit ægritudinem, ut in multis, & variis moleſtiis, cogitationibuſque conſolationem nullam admittere voluerit, atque ita demum dolore, mœſtitiaque confectus expirarit. Quodque illi longè fuit infelicius conficta in eum turpitudinis fabula maledicentiſſimis obtrectationibus proſciſſus, calumniatuſque eſt, utque ea gens promptiſſima eſt ad inſimulandum in invidiam Petri ipſius ignominioſam aliam mortis voluntariæ cauſam univerſo terrarum orbi magna cum ejus infamia propalarunt (34). - - - *Politian, a man of univerſal erudition, was ſo concerned at the troubles of the houſe of Medicis, eſpecially when the affairs of Peter, whoſe preceptor he had been, began to be in a declining ſtate, that he contracted a very deep melancholy, which preyed upon him to ſuch a degree, that he would admit of no comfort in his many afflictions and uneaſy thoughts, and ſo died at length of pure grief and vexation. And which was a geater misfortune to him ſtill, his memory was aſperſed by a cruel and malicious ſtory which they coined upon him; and as that ſet of men bore no good will to Peter, they gave out, that there was another infamous cauſe of Politian's voluntary death, which redounded very much to his pupil's diſhonour.*' According to this account, Politian died only of the grief he conceived for the decay of the houſe of Medicis. Philoſophers may cenſure this as a Phyſical, but not as a Moral defect.

[*G*] *One might ſay that his morals were more anſwerable to the uglineſs of his face, than to the beauty of his wit.*] It is likely that his great zeal for the houſe of Medicis expoſed him to horrid calumnies, whilſt the Florentines, fond of a Republican liberty, inſulted that family in their exile, and vented all ſorts of paſquinades. I will not therefore affirm, that Jovius's ſtory is well grounded; but I may boldly ſay, that Politian contracted a pride and envy, which learning is but too commonly attended with. We have ſeen (35), that in order to maintain himſelf againſt his rival, he indifferently made uſe of lawful and unlawful means. The following paſſage will diſcover to us his envy and preſumption. 'Erat diſtortis ſæpe moribus, uti facie nequaquam ingenua, & liberali, ab enormi præſertim naſo, ſubluſcoque oculo perabſurda, ingenio autem aſtuto, aculeato, occulteque livido, quum aliena ſemper irrideret, nec ſua, vel non iniquo judicio expungi pateretur (36). - - - - *His manners were awkward, his face, ungenteel, ugly, and remarkably deformed by a huge noſe and a ſquinting eye. His mind was crafty, ſatirical, and full of inward malice; for his cuſtom was to laugh at the productions of other men, and not to allow of any criticiſm, however juſt it was, upon his own.*' If you had rather have Varillas's paraphraſe upon theſe words, read what follows: 'He had a very ugly face, and a very large and long noſe; he ſquinted with his left eye, and was a pliant and nicely ambitious man. He uſed a great deal of art to diſguiſe himſelf, eſpecially with reſpect to thoſe whom he was moſt converſant with; he could not bear that any body ſhould be praiſed, and equally envied his friends and his enemies. He never liked the compoſures of other men, and hated to be adviſed, tho' he was very troubleſome in adviſing others. It appeared ſometimes that he was ſenſible of his faults, and that he oppoſed truth meerly out of malice; and yet he never owned that he had been in a fault (37).'

[*H*] *Several learned men made it their buſineſs to comment upon his poems.*] Nicolas Beraldus wrote a commentary (38) upon Politian's Sylva, intituled, *Ruſticus*; and John Murmelius did the ſame. Francis Sanchez, profeſſor at Salamanca, a Grammarian, ſo much praiſed by Scioppius, publiſhed his notes in the year 1544, upon the four Sylvas of Politian. John Alexander Braſſicanus publiſhed a commentary at Nuremberg in 1538, upon that which is intituled *Nutricia*. Jodocus Badius added ſome notes of his own to Politian's works, which he publiſhed at Paris, in the year 1519, in folio. He likewiſe added to them the notes of Francis Sylvius upon Politian's epiſtles. Thoſe epiſtles were reprinted in quarto, for the ſame Badius, in the year 1526, with the ſame obſervations. Braſſicanus makes great complaints againſt a Plagiary. 'Meminit, *ſays he* (39), & Politianus in *Nutritiis*, ubi quidam nugator arrogantiſſimus noſtra ante nos dixit: Expungendus jam & plane radendus è Philologiæ faſtis quoniam, ut Cicero dixit, maluit improbè tollere quàm

'humaniter

(*e*) See the remark [*I*].

(23) Mabill. in Muſeo Ital. *Tom. i, p.* 178.

(24) Peter de St Romuald, Abrégé Chronol. *Tom. iii, p. m.* 262, *ad ann.* 1509.

(25) Crinitus de honeſta Diſcipl. *lib. xv, cap. ix.*

(26) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 196.

(27) It ſhould be forty.

(28) This is not true. Charles VIII went over the Alps, before the 24th of September 1494.

(29) Jovius, Elog. *cap. xxxviii, p.* 89.

(30) Vulgo fertur obiiſſe Politianum fœdi amoris impatientia capite in parietem illiſo. *Voſſius, ubi ſupra, p.* 629.

(31) Peter de St Romuald, ubi ſupra, *p.* 262.

(32) *It is in* Jovius, ubi ſupra, *p.* 90, 91.

(33) Bullart, Academ. *Tom. i, p.* 278.

(34) Pierius Valerianus, de Litterator. Infelic. *lib. ii, p.* 70, 71.

(35) Above, citation (16).

(36) Jovius, ubi ſupra, *p.* 89.

(37) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 193.

(38) *Printed at Baſil in the year* 1518. *See Crenius*, Animadv. Philol. *Part iii, p.* 55, *but inſtead of* Beroaldus, *read there* Beraldus.

(39) Jo. Alexander Braſſicanus, Schol. in Petronium.

Medicis (*f*). He is ſaid to have ſpoken of the Bible with great contempt [*I*], whereupon ſome make it a queſtion, whether he ought not to be reckoned an Atheiſt [*K*]; but others juſtify him, by denying the fact (*g*). I could eaſily believe what we are told of the judgment he made on David's Pſalms, and the Odes of Pindar [*L*].

He

‘ humaniter ſumere & agnoſcere. - - - - *Politian makes mention, in his* Nutritia, *of a certain inſolent ſcribbler who publiſhed the ſentiments of others before they had done ſo themſelves. Such a fellow's name ought to be blotted out of the catalogue of learned men, becauſe, as Cicero ſaid, he rather choſe to take impudently than to borrow with a good grace, and acknowledge it.*’ This complaint ſeems to concern a man who ſtole manuſcripts.

[*I*] *He is ſaid to have ſpoken of the Bible with great contempt.*] Ludovicus Vives is, perhaps, the firſt who taxed him with it: *Angelus Politianus*, ſays he (40), *totam ſacram lectionem aſpernabatur.* - - - - *treated the whole Scripture with contempt.* Melanchthon expreſſes the thing with greater energy; for he ſays, that Politian having read the Bible but once, complained, that he had never ſpent his time ſo ill. *Melanchthon ait ſemel ſolum ſacras literas legiſſe, dixiſſeque nullum ſe tempus pejus collocaſſe* (41). Which has been repeated by a thouſand writers (42). Voſſius denies it as a thing little credible (43), and alledges two reaſons for it: 1. That Politian was a prieſt and a canon of Florence. 2. That he preached a whole Lent, as appears from theſe words: ‘ Cum per hos quadrageſimæ proximos dies enarrandis populo ſacris literis eſſem occupatus, perlegi tamen libros carminum tuorum quos mihi pro ſingulari humanitate tua mutuoque inter nos amore dedicaveras (44) - - - - *Though I was taken up in this Lent in preaching, nevertheleſs I found time to read over your books of poetry, which you were ſo good as to dedicate to me, on account of our mutual friendſhip.*’ Some (45) think that the ſecond reaſon alledged by Voſſius, is a ſolid confutation of Melanchthon's paſſage; but others value neither of them. ‘ Hæc ratio nimis tenuis videbitur iis qui norunt quantopere Atheiſmus ſeu Epicureiſmus ſive libertiniſmus graſſetur inter Sacerdotes non tantum Canonicos & Monachos papales, ſed etiam inter Prælatos, Cardinales, Pontifices (46). - - - - *This argument appears weak to thoſe who know how much Atheiſm, Epicureiſm, and Libertiniſm, prevail among prieſts, not only monks, and canons, but likewiſe biſhops, cardinals, and Popes.*’ This is what Voëtius ſays againſt the firſt reaſon; and what he ſays againſt the ſecond is contained in the following words: ‘ Quaſi vero poſtilliſtæ coram populo iſtic concionantes ut plurimum abſque lectione ſcripturæ, ex inſpectis legendis, poſtillis, homiliariis, dormi ſecurè, theſauris pauperum concionatorum & ſimilibus myrotheciis prædicare non ſoleant. Prædicavit etiam aliquando coram populo Cæſar Atheorum Vaninus, quod tamen illum è numero profanorum non eximit (47). - - - *As if theſe lecturers, holding forth to the people, generally without reading the Bible, were not uſed to take their diſcourſes out of the legends, poſtils, homilies, the* dormi ſecurè, *the* theſauri pauperum concionatorum, *and the like collections. Vaninus himſelf, the prince of Atheiſts, preached ſometimes before the people, which nevertheleſs did not hinder his being among the number of the profane.*’ This author obſerves, that we muſt not think that Melanchthon and Mornai cried down Politian, being acted by a factious ſpirit; for, adds he, Gabriel Putherbeus, a paſſionate author againſt the Proteſtants, taxed Politian with the ſame thing (48). But it is fit the reader ſhould know this Putherbeus did but tranſcribe Ludovicus Vives word for word, and that du Pleſſis Mornai alledged the teſtimony of the ſame Vives (49), and therefore theſe ſeveral evidences amount only to one.

Mr Crenius has lately imparted to the public the obſervations which his great reading afforded him concerning this particular. He does not think the reaſons alledged by Voſſius to be ſolid, and quotes ſome authorities, whereby it appears, that the preachers did not much mind the Bible at that time (50). What he quotes out of *Ariſtarchus Philoſophicus* (51), a book little known in this country (52), is very curious. I have read in Manlius's Common-Places, taken moſt of them from Melanchthon's lectures, that it was not the Bible but the Breviary, of which Politian ſpoke with ſo much contempt. *Politianus Canonicus Florentinus interrogatus an legiſſet horas Canonicas? Dixit ſemel perlegi iſtum librum & nunquam pejus collocavi tempus* (53).

[*K*] *Some make it a queſtion whether he ought not to be reckoned an Atheiſt.*] Voëtius aſks whether Politian ought not to be ſuſpected of indifference in point of religion, as Lucian was, or of Epicureiſm (54); and he anſwers that, according to Mornai, Politian complained, that he had never ſpent his time ſo ill, as when he read the Scripture (55). He adds, That he does not know how that Critic, and ſome others died; but that if one may gueſs at it from their ſtudies, they were like the Philoſopher Averrhoes, who, ſlighting the Chriſtian religion, wiſhed his ſoul might be among the Philoſophers. Note, That Mornai does not ſay what Voëtius aſcribes to him. Authors are full of ſuch falſities; which proceeds from their truſting to the quotations of others, without taking the pains to verify them. I muſt not forget theſe words of Peter de St Romuald: *Some writers ſay, that Politian profeſſed Atheiſm privately with Marſilius Ficinus, and Domitius Calderinus a prieſt* (56).

[*L*] *I could eaſily believe what we are told of the judgment he made of David's Pſalms, and the Odes of Pindar.*] He did not deny that there are many good and fine things in the Pſalms; but he pretended that the ſame things appear in Pindar with more brightneſs and ſweetneſs. One of his ſcholars is ſaid to have related this. Here are Melanchthon's own words. ‘ Dionyſius Capnio, qui adoleſcens audivit Angelum Politianum, narrabat eum interrogatum aliquando, quid de Pſalmis Davidis ſentiret, & ad quid prodeſſe eorum lectionem judicaret, reſpondiſſe, ſibi vero placere illa antiqua carmina, & continere ea partim honeſta præcepta, partim graviſſimas conciones de providentia & de ſceleratorum pœnis: partim querelas de infirmitate hominum utiles ad frenandos immoderatos impetus: partim hiſtorias ejus gentis. Sed addidit Politianus hanc collationem, res eaſdem dulcius & ſplendidius narrari in odis Pindaricis, ibi pingi Ixionem in rota clamantem,

Diſcite juſtitiam moniti, & non ſpernere divos.

‘ Ibi deſcribi Bellerophontem propter priores victorias factum inſolentiorem, & vehi Pegaſo intra cœlum volantem, id eſt, res non neceſſarias ambitioſe moventem, excuti à Pegaſo & dejici in Ciliciam. Ibi celebrari Pelei caſtitatem, qui expetitus ab Acaſti conjuge, & ab ea falſo accuſatus, & objectus Centauris, ſervatur accepto gladio divinitus. Denique multas imagines pulcherrimas, multas hiſtorias & graviſſima præcepta tradi. Hæc Politiani oratio & ſi ſpecioſa eſt, tamen eſt hominis ignorantis diſcrimen inter genera doctrinarum, inter legem & Evangelium (57). - - - *Dionyſius Capnio, who in his youth was Politian's ſcholar, uſed to tell of him, that being one day aſked what he thought of David's Pſalms, and what advantage one could have by reading them, he anſwered, that he was truly very much pleaſed with theſe old Poems, for that they contained partly moral precepts, partly ſolid diſcourſes upon providence, and the puniſhments of the wicked: partly complaints upon the weakneſs of human nature, ſuch as were fit to bridle our immoderate deſires; and partly hiſtorical accounts of that nation. But Politian added, by way of compariſon, that the ſame things were ſet forth in Pindar's Odes with more ſweetneſs and luſtre; for that there was repreſented Ixion upon a wheel, crying out,*

- - - Learn to be juſt, take warning here
And ceaſe at the immortal gods to ſneer.

‘ *That there Bellerophon is deſcribed as puffed up with his former victories, and flying within the circumference of Heaven, mounted upon Pegaſus, that is, ambitiouſly fond of unneceſſary enterprizes. Next he is repreſented as thrown by Pegaſus, and fallen into Cilicia. That there the chaſtity of Peleus is celebrated, who being*

‘ *tempted*

(*f*) Volater. *lib. xxi, pag.* 777.

(*g*) See the remark [*I*].

(40) Ludov. Vives, de Veritate Fid. Chriſt. *lib. ii, p.* 264, *Edit. Baſil.* 1544.

(41) Voſſius, de Poët. Lat. *p.* 80. *He quotes Tom. iii, declamationum, p.* 545.

(42) Mr Teiſſier, among others, in his Additions to the Elogies, *Tom. i, p.* 11, but inſtead of quoting Melanchthon, he quotes Vives, who does not ſay what he mentions.

(43) Voſſius, ubi ſupra.

(44) Angelus Politianus, Epiſt. X, *lib. iv*, ad Joannem Gottium Raguſinum, *fol. m.* 106.

(45) Boxhor. in Monument. illuſtr. Viror. apud Pope Blount, Cenſ. Auth. *p.* 359. Borremanſ. Var. Lect. *p.* 126.

(46) Voët. Diſp. Theol. *Tom. ii, p.* 1273.

(47) Ibid. *pag.* 1274.

(48) Putherbeus, de tollendis & expurgandis malis Libris. *lib. i, p.* 81.

(49) Mornai, Verité de la Religion, *ch. xxvi, fol. m.* 336.

(50) Thomas Crenius, Animadv. Philolog. & Hiſt. *Part iii, p.* 22, & *ſeq. Leyden* 1698.

(51) Written by Henry Ernſtius, counſellor to the king of Denmark, and printed at Hamburg in 1678, in 8vo.

(52) Admodum raro & inde hic paucis noto. *Crenius, ibid. p.* 25.

(53) Joannes Manlius, in Locor. Commun. Collectan. Titulo de Satisfact. *p. m.* 99.

(54) Voët. Diſp. Theol. *Tom. i, p.* 206.

(55) De Politiano refert *Pleſſeus in libro de veritate religionis Chriſtianæ*, quod diceret nunquam ſe bonas horas ſuas pejus collocaſſe quam in lectione ſcripturæ. *Ibid.*

(56) Peter de St Romuald, ubi ſupra.

(57) Melanchth. in Epiſtola ad Adamum Cratonem, præfixa Exegeſi Nicolai Aſclepii Barbati de antiqno & profundo conſilio Dei.

He is alſo charged with being a plagiary [*M*]. George Meruſa was one of his adverſaries

‘ *tempted by the wife of Acaſtus, and afterwards falſely accuſed by her, and expoſed to the Centaurs, was preſerved by having a ſword miraculouſly put into his hands. In ſhort, that they contained ſeveral beautiful images, many valuable paſſages of Hiſtory, and many ſolid precepts of Morality. Theſe words of Politian, although they have a ſpecious appearance do nevertheleſs ſhew him unacquainted with the different kinds of doctrine: between the Law and the Goſpel.*’ Manlius, in the book above quoted, does not aſcribe this opinion to Politian, but to Lazarus Bonamicus. *Lazarus Bonamicus vir doctus cum eſſet interrogatus quomodo ei placeret Pſalterium reſpondit placere ſibi, recitari enim ibi egregias ſententias de providentia: ſed tamen nihilo melius eſſe quam Pindari poëma* (58). It does not appear from theſe Latin words, that Bonamicus preferred Pindar to David, but only that he made them equal: And yet the commentator upon Gaffarel affirms, on the credit of a German Divine, that Bonamicus ſet a greater value upon Pindar, than upon David's pſalms: *Ejuſdem blaſphemiæ veneno correptus fuit* Lazarus Bon-Amicus *Italus, qui vociferabat* ſe Odas Pindaricas præferre hymnis Davidicis. *Vid. beatus Dn.* Selneccerus *Explicat. in* 1 *Cor.* viii. *p.* 496 (59). He had been ſaying that Politian uttered the ſame blaſphemy. This ſhews that Melanchthon, or his tranſcribers, are not uniform in their accounts, which is an uſual thing when people go only upon a hear-ſay. Peucerus has inſerted in a letter (60) what I have quoted above out of Melanchthon..

[*M*] *He was alſo accuſed of being a Plagiary.*] Every body knows it has been ſaid, that he appropriated to himſelf the Latin tranſlation of Herodian made by Tiphernas, and that he did no more than alter ſome parts of it. Leo X ſaid, that this calumny had been vented by thoſe who envied Politian's glory. ‘ Quamquam æmuli eam tranſlationem, uti nos à Leone Pontifice accepimus, Gregorii Tiphernatis fuiſſe dicerent, quod paſſim inducto fuco, & falſis nævorum coloribus interlita alieni ſtyli habitum mentiretur (61). - - - *Though his rivals, as I have been told by Pope Leo, aſcribed that tranſlation to Gregory Tiphernas, and pretended that Politian had given it a new turn of ſtile by introducing a multitude of flouriſhes and falſe colourings.*’ This is all that Jovius ſays of it: I ſhould be glad to know in what author Varillas found the Particulars contained in the following narrative. ‘ He publiſhed a tranſlation of Herodian, which did not procure him all the ſatisfaction he expected from it; for though it was generally admired, a report went about, that Politian had found it among the papers of the famous *Gregorio de Citta di Caſtello*, which he had bought; and this report was grounded upon ſome conjectures, that were but weakly confuted. Pope Leo, who was then Politian's ſcholar, and heard whatever was ſaid *pro* and *con* at his father's table, being deſired twenty years after, by the academiſts of Rome, to tell them what he thought of it, left the thing doubtful, and owned that the ſtile of that tranſlation was not at all like the other works of Politian, and ſavoured much more of the art and flouriſhes that were to be ſeen in the compoſures of *Gregorio de Citta di Caſtello*. However, he added (as if he had been afraid of having ſaid too much) that this Gregorio had done nothing that came up to the tranſlation of Herodian (62).’ I am apt to believe that the author of this narrative went only upon Jovius's words, which he inlarged upon and paraphraſed at pleaſure, as if he had been writing a Romance. However, he did not underſtand them, for the art and flouriſhes that were obſerved in that verſion, were not aſcribed to Tiphernas, but to Politian. If Leo X had ſpoken of it, as Varillas will have it, Jovius would not have rejected that accuſation as a thing that deſerved no credit (63). Note, that the beſt Critics reject it; they find the ſame ſpirit and the ſame character in every part of that tranſlation. Tiphernas was not able to produce ſuch a maſter-piece (64). It had been an eaſier thing for Politian to tranſlate the whole work, than to give ſuch a form to the tranſlation of another.

It is more difficult to clear him of ſome other thefts with which he is charged; for what can one anſwer for him to theſe words of Budæus? ‘ Plutarchus in eo libro, quem de Homero compoſuit; qui liber nondum Latinus ex profeſſo factus eſt, licet Politianus, vir ille quidem excellentis doctrinæ, ſed animi non ſatis ingenui, ex eo libro rerum ſummas ad verbum tranſcribens, quaſique flores præcerpens; non erubuit id opus pro ſuo edere, in quo nullam præterquam tranſcribendi ac vertendi operam navaverat (65). - - - *Plutarch in his book upon Homer, of which none has hitherto undertaken to give a Latin tranſlation, though Politian, a man of greater learning than candor, tranſcribing the ſubſtance word for word, and, as it were, gathering the flowers of it, has not been aſhamed to publiſh that work as his own, which coſt him no other trouble beſides that of tranſlating and copying.*’ Budæus told a ſtory, which has been printed, and we find in it a notable trick of Politian. The thing is this. That Profeſſor ſet forth with an emphaſis in his auditory, many things as his own, which he had from Herodotus. John Laſcaris, who was one of his hearers, took him aſide and reproved him for his boldneſs. I could never have believed, anſwered Politian, that ſuch a Grecian as you are, ſhould have been ignorant of the artifice that is made uſe of in order to get the eſteem of the public. You are three or four, at moſt, among my hearers, who have read Herodotus. What is that in compariſon of that crowd of ſcholars, who applaud and extol me to the ſky? I am apt to believe that you will not be ſo malicious as to undertake to prejudice them againſt me; and I think it would be to little purpoſe if you went about it. I ſhall ſet down the original words. *Non poſſum mihi temperare, quin tibi nunc referam, quod Budæus noſter de Angelo Politiano quondam nobis domi ſuæ narrare ſolebat, idque ſe ex Jano Laſcare, qui Politiani fuerat æqualis, crebrò audiviſſe confirmabat. Cùm enim Politianus Florentiæ Interpretationem Homericæ Iliados in magna celebritate aggrederetur; non ſine ingenti oſtentatione quæ de Homeri Poëmate perſcripta ſunt ab Herodoto, auditoribus ſuis è ſuggeſto recitabat, quo tempore Herodoti liber Græcè ſcriptus, à nullo adhuc converſus in linguam Latinam, nec Typographorum formis excuſus erat. Itaque Laſcaris, qui tùm honoris causâ auditorum numerum augebat, cum paucis quibuſdam aliis Græcè doctis hominibus, qui non ignorarent unde omnia, quæ pro ſuis recitaverat, hauſiſſet. Is igitur paulo poſt ad hominem converſus, eumque ſeducens, Dic mihi quæſo, inquit, Politiane, quo ore Herodoti Opus inſigne, quod ante tot ſæcula conſcriptum eſt, in tanto cœtu ut tuum recitaſti? Cui mox ſubridens Politianus, Nunquam, inquit, putaſſem, Jane, hominem Græcum adeò ejus artificii rudem & ignarum eſſe, quo apud multitudinem exiſtimatio & fama comparari ſolet. Quaſi vero, inquit, non ſatis intelligam tres aut ad ſummum quatuor fortaſſis vos hîc adeſſe, quibus Herodoti libros aliquando inſpicere contigerit. Sed quænam hic ſit turba nobis applaudentium & in cœlum laudibus ferentium vides, apud quos ſi exiſtimationem noſtram (quod minimè ſpero) vel tantillum lædere volueritis; Oratio profecto veſtra non multum fidei ponderiſque habitura eſt* (66). I muſt not forget what concerns his *Miſcellanea*. He ſhewed them to his friends in manuſcript, which was the reaſon why this work was very much talked of before it was printed; but a ſtory went about, that Politian had ſtolen many things from a compilation, intituled, *Copiæ Cornu*, and made by Nicolas Perotus: It was ſaid that the duke of Urbino had lent him the original, thinking it would be a thing acceptable to Laurence de Medicis. When Politian heard this news, he put off the publication of his work. In the mean time, the book of Nicolas Perotus came out, and put an end to the ſlander; for thoſe who compared it with Politian's *Miſcellanea*, did not find that the latter had ſtolen any thing from the other. Politian gives a large account of this towards the end of the book. I ſhall only ſet down ſome of his words. ‘ Fit concurſus. Eſt in manibus (*Copiæ Cornu*). Effunditur. Excutitur. Quid multa? calumnia me liberat. Vidiſſes continuò nonnullorum vultus lugubre quiddam tacentes . . . . . . & erubeſcentes. . . . . . Tantum conſtiterit in præſentiarum, non idem ſpectâre me, quod ejus voluminis autorem, nec par utrique deſtinatum præſtitumque faſtigium. Quod ſi locos eoſdem pro re natâ forte uterque tractavimus, (id autem incidere alicubi fuit neceſſe), craſſior tamen inter nos, quàm inter Pyramum Thyſbenque paries (67). - - - *Several of the learned met. They had the book* (Copiæ Cornu) *in their hands. It was opened, and examined. What occaſion is there for many words. It cleared me from* adverſaries [*N*]. Some ſay that he was very much abuſed by the Poet Marullus [*O*]. He has been juſtly placed in the catalogue of illuſtrious children; but Varillas, who

---

(58) Manlius, ubi ſupra, Titulo de Veteri & Novo Teſtamento, *p.* 81.

(59) Gregorius Michael, Præpoſitus Regius Flenſburgenſis, Notis in Jacobi Gaffarelli Curioſitates, *p.* 110.

(60) Peucer, Epiſt. ad Chriſt. Carlowitz. *See* Saldenus de Libris, *p.* 434.

(61) Paul. Jovius, ubi ſupra, *p.* 88.

(62) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 195.

(63) Paul. Jovius, Elog. *cap.* *cxvii*, *p.* 259.

(64) Henry Stephens did very much criticize it. Conſult Mr Crenius, *ubi ſupra*, *p.* 22, & *ſeq.*

(65) Budæus, Annot. in Pandectas, *fol. m.* 151 *verſo.*

(66) Franciſcus Duarenus, Operum, *p.* 1478, *Edit.* 1584, apud Colomeſium, in Opuſcul. *cap.* *xxxi*, *p. m.* 66.

(67) Politian. in fine Miſcellan. apud Thomaſium, de Plagio Literario, *pag.* 235.

‘ *the aſperſion. You might have ſuddenly perceived the countenances of ſome mournfully ſilent . . . . and bluſhing. . . . . . Let this ſuffice at preſent, that the author of that book and I had not the ſame point in view, and did not arrive to the ſame pitch. If peradventure we have both occaſionally treated of the ſame matters, (which could not ſometimes be avoided) yet there is a thicker wall between us than that which divided Pyramus from Thiſbe.*’ Notwithſtanding this, Hereſbachius called him a great thief (68). Note, that Politian complained that ſome Plagiaries had ſtolen from him (69), and he threatned to purſue them in order to recover his own.

[*N*] *George Merula was one of his adverſaries.*] He was Profeſſor in the college of Milan: ‘ He did not ſpare Politian, though the latter had acquired a ſufficient reputation to ſtand upon his own bottom. He ſhewed him, that though nature had beſtowed upon him all the neceſſary qualifications to become a learned man, yet ſhe had not made him ſuch. He obſerved to him above thirty conſiderable faults, which had eſcaped him, and told him in a charitable way (as he ſaid) that whoever pretends to keep the firſt rank in the commonwealth of learning, muſt have read and ſtudied more than all the reſt together (70). . . . . Politian was the greateſt gainer by his death. He had publiſhed the firſt century of his *Miſcellanea* (§ α), and Merula being offended at the boldneſs of the word *Century*, threatened to alledge a world of paſſages and authorities, to juſtify the contrary to what was contained in it; but he had only time to draw a rough draught of his project (71).’ The laſt part of this narrative is grounded upon Jovius's words (72); but I do not know what authority may be alledged for the foundation of the firſt. Obſerve, that Politian wrote very ſharp letters to Merula (73), and ſeemed to deſire that Ludovicus Sforza would permit his adverſary to publiſh his critical remarks.

[(§ α) In a letter of Peter Crinitus to Alexander Sartius, inſerted in Vol. 1. page 384 of Politian's works, publiſhed by Gryphius in the year 1550, are mentioned ſome paſſages of the ſecond part of Politian's Miſcellanies, compoſed, as Crinitus ſays, and finiſhed at the intreaty of Sartius, and out of regard to him, but pilfered from the author by ſome body, who had thereby occaſioned the public's being deprived to that time of ſuch a valuable piece. This ſecond part contained among others twenty chapters, the titles of which are mentioned in the ſame letter. Accordingly the Baſil edition of 1522 has in the title *Centuria una*, - - - *one Century*, and not as the others *Centuria I.* which is equivocal, and ſeems to import that there is a ſecond century of his Miſcellanies extant. In the following letter the ſame Peter Crinitus mentions the titles of other eight chapters of the ſame ſecond century ſeen, as he ſays, in manuſcript by ſeveral of the author's friends. As for the reſt, this ſecond letter of Crinitus ends with an epigram, wherein the author makes Politian ſpeak in terms which plainly aſſign the year 1494 for the year of his death. I ſhall quote the laſt verſes of this epigram.

Is ille ego Angelus Politianus ſum.
Fovit benigno me ſinu Flora, & illic
In fata ceſſi, Parthenopeos reges
Cum Gallica arma irruerent minabunda.
Tu vale, & hoc ſis meriti memor noſtri.

- - - That ſame Politian am I.
Me Florence cheriſh'd with a mother's care,
Until at laſt my days I ended there;
Juſt in the year when, like a rapid flame,
Gaul's monarch on the king of Naples came.
Reader, by this admoniſh'd, view
What merit I had once. Adieu.

REM. CRIT.]

[*O*] *He was . . . . abuſed by the Poet Marullus.*] This we read in St Romuald. *Marullus*, ſays he (74), *uſed him very ill under the name of Mabilius*: which may ſignify two things; either that Marullus took the name of Mabilius in the verſes he made againſt him, or that he gave this name to Politian. I have lately re-peruſed his poems, and found nothing in them under that name: Nor is there any thing in Politian's Poem, to make one believe that this Monk is in the right. I find among his Poems ſome cutting epigrams *in Mabilium Novatum Inſubrem*, in which there is nothing whereby it may appear that they are levelled at Marullus. And indeed, how can the epithet *Inſuber* agree with him, ſince he was a native of Conſtantinople? Though I have not read the Poems of this Mabilius, I believe Politian was very much abuſed in ſome of them; for I find that Politian reviles him at a ſtrange rate, as it will appear from the following verſes:

Si jam carmina noſtra te Mabili
Urgent ad laqueum miſer crucemque,
Ne quæſo propera mori, tuum ne
Fraudes carnificem ſuo lucello:
Namque eſt percupidus tui, ac libenter
Is tantum tibi dempſerit laboris.
Quid? noſtin hominem? negas: at idem eſt
Aurem qui ſecuit tibi ſiniſtram (75).

Gall'd with my verſe if you deſire relief,
And headlong run to hang yourſelf for grief;
Let me beſeech you, ſtop a while, leſt you
Should thus deprive the hangman of his due.
He loves you ſo, that, if you were to aſk,
I'm certain he would eaſe you of the taſk.
'S life, know you not the man? it does appear
That he's the ſame who cropped your left ear.

Mabilius jeſted upon Politian, becauſe his neck was not ſtrait. The latter replied in the following manner:

Sed quid te cruciat reflexa colla
Si interdum gero? num parum videtur
Si pronos ſtatuis tuos cinœdos,
Si pronum ſtatuent miſer Mabili
Mox te carnificis manus, velut nunc
Pronum te ſtatuunt Mutoniati.

Hard words are ſtill thicker in the following verſes:

Hæres relictus à parente ſordido
Ille impudicus, temulentus aleo,
Spurcus, lutoſus, pedecoſus, hiſpidus,
Pannoſus, unctus, horridus, caprimulgus,
Edax, ineptus, inſolens Mabilius
Uno expatravit patrimonium die,
Gula helluante, cunnilingis oſculis,
Vorace culo, & exſutata mentula.

Politian imitated the horrid licentiouſneſs of Catullus and Martial, a ſort of men, who made an ill uſe of a maxim of the Stoics, concerning the uſe of words, and

- - - - Apud quos
Nomen adeſt rebus, nominibuſque pudor (76).

- - - - - With whom
Things have their names, and names have modeſty.

Politian carried this imitation too far in ſome other Poems, particularly in his invective againſt an old woman, who had loſt all the ſigns of youth, excepting lewdneſs (77). This invective contains moſt of the thoughts that are to be found in two Odes of Horace (78), and thoſe thoughts are there expreſſed more at large. The laſt verſes are full of obſcenities, the more offenſive, becauſe immediately after there are two very devout hymns to the Holy Virgin. The wrong placing of thoſe hymns ought not to be imputed to the Poet; it is the fault of thoſe who publiſhed his works. But to return to Mabilius, I ſhall obſerve, that his epitaph is to be found among Politian's verſes:

(68) Hereſbachius in Præfat. librorum ſuorum de re ruſtica furaciſſimum vocat Politianum, atque in Panepiſtemone aliorum non intellecta congeſſiſſe. *Thomaſius, ibid. p.* 235, 236.

(69) Id. Polit. ib. ap. eumd. *p.* 234.

(70) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 192.

(71) Ibid. *pag.* 193.

(72) Politiano obiter vehementi metu liberato, cum in miſcellaneam ejus centuriam cohortes & alas quæ impetu obruerent emiſſurns eſſe diceretur. *Jovius, Elog. cap. xxxvii, p.* 87.

(73) See the 11th book of Politian's letters.

(74) St Romuald, ubi ſupra.

(75) Politianus, in Libro Epigrammatum.

(76) Ὁ σοφὸς εὐθυῤῥήμων ἔϛω. Sapiens ſine circuitu omnia efferrat.

(77) *It begins thus*, Huc huc ïambi arripite mi jam mordicus Anum hanc furenti Percitam libidine Tentiginoſam, catulientem ſpurcidam.

(78) *The eighth Epode* in anum libidinoſam, *and the 12th of the ſame book* ad mulierem fœdam & anum.

who is the occaſion of it, is wrong in his Chronology [*P*]. I ſhall have ſomething to ſay againſt Moreri [*Q*]. For the reſt, thoſe who ſay, that *Baſſo*, or *Baſſus*, was the name of Politian's family, are miſtaken. Menage (*b*), alledges a letter of Mr Magliabechi to prove that *his name was* Cino, *and not* Baſſo. He is called *Meſſer Agnolo de Montepulciano* in Machiavel's Hiſtory of Florence (*i*); and we read in an oration of Majoragius, that he changed his name *Angelus de Monte Pulciano* into that of *Angelus Politianus*. Note that Sannazarius in two ſatirical Epigrams (*k*) he made againſt him, calls him *Pulicianus* alluding to the word *Pulex*, a flea.

(*b*) *See his* Origines Italiennes, *at the word* Poliziano; *and the 14th chapter of the* Anti-Baillet.

(*i*) Towards the end of the 8th book, *p. m.* 349.

(*k*) The 66th and 67th of the firſt book.

Flecte viator iter, fetet nam putre Mabili
  Hac fovea corpus conditur atque animus.

Turn traveller aſide, and come not hither.
  The ſoul and body of Mabilius lie
Within this grave, and ſilent rot together,
  Whence all around the noxious vapours fly.

If this be not a good proof againſt Peter de St Romuald, it ſeems at leaſt to be a ſign that he is miſtaken; for Marullus ſurvived Politian ſome years. But I will not inſiſt upon this reaſon; for an epitaph affords an opportunity of uſing ſo many injurious words, that ſeveral Poets have falſely ſuppoſed that their adverſaries were dead, in order to make uſe of ſuch a common topic. I will not diſſemble, that a very learned man, who made ſome notes upon Sannazarius's Poems (79), is of opinion that Marullus and Mabilius mentioned by Politian, are one and the ſame perſon.

[*P*] *Varillas . . . . is wrong in his Chronology.*] ' Politian was a man of ſo wonderful a genius, that ' the like had not been ſeen ever ſince Ovid. When ' he was but twelve years of age, he made ſuch fine ' verſes, that one would have thought they had been ' compoſed in Alexander's or Auguſtus's time. And ' when he had a mind to ſurpriſe the learned, and to ' give out his productions for ſome fragments of Anacreon or Catullus, which he had lately found out in ' ſome old manuſcripts of the library of the houſe of ' Medicis, the beſt judges were impoſed upon by ' him (80).' Mr Baillet relates the ſame thing more at large in his *Hiſtory of Illuſtrious Children* (81), in which he places our Politian with great reaſon; for though what Varillas ſays of him were not true, we know that Politian was very young when he made his Greek verſes, which, in the judgment of the Critics, are better than the Latin Poems he compoſed long after (82). But here is a Chronological fault. ' A marriage was propoſed to Virginia de Urſini, between her daughter, who was but twelve years of ' age, and Laurence de Medicis, the eldeſt ſon of Peter, ' who was not yet fifteen. . . . . . The wedding was ' not celebrated with great pomp, becauſe the circumſtances of the time did not allow of it. However, ' there were many Epithalamiums, among which, that ' of Politian, whoſe verſes were worthy of Auguſtus's ' age, though he was not older than the bridegroom, ' was beſt approved. Some few days after, young ' Laurence, hearing of Coliogne's approach, was obliged to leave his dear ſpouſe, and to get on horſeback, in order to learn the art of war under the diſcipline of his father-in-law (83).' Laurence was born in the year 1448; and therefore Politian was four years older than he. Machiavel, who is a more credible author than Varillas, ſays, that the wedding of Laurence de Medicis, and Clarice de Urſini, was celebrated with very magnificent pomp after the peace (84), that is, when the war, which Coliogne made with the Florentines, was fully ended. He does not ſet down the year of that marriage, which is a great fault in an Hiſtorian; but it may be inferred from his narrative, that it was in the year 1471. Laurence was therefore twenty-three years of age. Thus you ſee how little Varillas minded Chronology. He places all the chief exploits of Coliogne's war after the death of Peter de Medicis, the father of Laurence (85). He might have ſeen in Paul Jovius that the peace was made before the death of Peter de Medicis (86).

[*Q*] *I ſhall have ſomething to ſay againſt Moreri.*] I. Theſe words are not exact, *Laurence de Medicis kept at Florence Angelo Politian, who was already a prieſt*; for they give us to underſtand, that it was the firſt favour Politian received from the houſe of Medicis, which is not true: we have ſeen above (87) that he ſtudied at the charges of Coſmo, grandfather of Laurence. II. Moreri ſhould not have ſaid *that Laurence made him tutor to the children of Coſmo de Medicis*; for he put his own children under his tuition (88). If a man ſhould give a tutor to his grandfather's children, it would be a very rare thing. III. *John de Medicis, who was afterwards Pope Leo X*, was the ſon of this Laurence, and not of Coſmo. IV. In order to ſay that Politian *wrote thoſe fine Greek and Latin Epiſtles, which are ſo much commended by the learned*, the public ſhould have ſeen ſeveral Greek letters of that author; but if I am not very much miſtaken, there is but one in the collection of his letters. The following words of Volaterranus, which Moreri read in Voſſius (89), were probably the occaſion of his miſtake: ' Mihi ſolebat Epiſtolas cum Græcas tum Latinas ſcribere ſed ſermone vernaculo plures quod frequenter faciebat occupatus, ne naſus aliquis ſtilo offenſus impræmeditato, ' præjudicatæ jam de eo opinioni officeret (90). - - - - ' *He uſed to write letters in Greek and Latin to me,* ' *but oftner in Italian, which he generally did when he* ' *was buſy, leſt ſome nice critic, offended at his extempore ſtyle, ſhould make him loſe the good opinion that* ' *had been conceived of him.*' Whereupon, without any farther conſideration, he fancied that we have ſome Greek letters of Politian in print. Obſerve by the by, the great caution of Politian. He knew that he was famous for the politeneſs of his ſtyle, and that in order to keep up his reputation, nothing ſhould come from him but what was elaborate. But becauſe his occupations did not permit him to beſtow a great deal of time upon the compoſition of a letter, he reſolved to write often in Italian; for it is likely he dealt with his other friends as he did with Volaterranus. Such is the ſlavery of thoſe, who have the reputation of writing fine letters; they dare not write familiarly and careleſsly to their friends. They know their letters will be ſeen, and deſpiſed, unleſs they be written in a polite ſtyle. Balzac did often groan under that heavy yoak; and I have read that an ingenious man envied the happineſs of his attorney, who might without any fear begin his letters thus, *I have received your's: This is to let you know* (91). The Manutius's, and the Latin writers of the ſame rank, found themſelves reduced to the ſad neceſſity of beſtowing ſeveral months upon a letter (92). I am not therefore ſurprized at what we have juſt now ſeen in the words of Volaterranus. It is to be obſerved, that this ſlavery reaches ſometimes as far as converſation (93). But to return to Moreri. V. It cannot be ſaid that Politian *had a ſhare* in the calamity of the houſe of Medicis, *in which all the men of letters that were at Florence, found themſelves involved*; for he died whilſt Peter de Medicis was ſtill maſter in his country. It is true, ſome think he was vexed, when he foreſaw that this lord would not be able to maintain himſelf, conſidering what courſe things were ready to take: however Paul Jovius is of opinion, that he was a happy man becauſe he died before the fall of that family (94). VI. We are not told that he fell into deſpair, *becauſe he could not win the love of a lady*. He is ſaid to have had a more vicious paſſion, as we have ſeen above (95). Do not mind the paſſage of Peter de St Romuald. VII. It cannot be ſaid that Paul Jovius believes thoſe ſtories; he only mentions them, without affirming them, and makes uſe of the word *ferunt*. He is only to blame for not adding, that it was an uncertain report; for he knew, without doubt, that people were divided in their opinions about it; which is a ſufficient reaſon for an Hiſtorian, when he ſays, *ſuch a ſlandering report went about*, to add, *but ſome looked upon it as a calumny*. VIII. Ludovicus Vives does not ſay what Moreri fathers upon him (96).

---

(79) See the Notes upon Sannazarius, *pag.* 229, *Amſterd. Edit.* 1689.

(80) Varillas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 194.

(81) Baillet, Enfans celebres, *p.* 89, 90.

(82) Græcis vero quæ puerum ſe conſcripſiſſe dicit, ætatem minus prudenter appoſuit ſuam. Tam enim bona ſunt ut ne virum quidem Latina æque bene ſcripſiſſe putem. *Jul. Cæſ. Scaliger, Poët. lib. vi, p. m.* 740.

(83) Varillas, ibid. *p.* 40.

(84) Machiav. Hiſt. Florentine, *lib. vii, p. m.* 289.

(85) *See his 2d book of the* Anecdotes de Florence.

(86) Jov. in Vita Leonis X, *lib. i, p.* 14.

(87) In the remark [*B*].

(88) See the 2d Letter of the 4th book of Politian's Letters, *fol. m.* 94.

(89) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 628.

(90) Volaterr. *lib. xxi, p.* 777.

(91) Preface to the works of Sarraſin, *p.* 46.

(92) *See* Scioppius, de Stilo Hiſtorico, *p. m.* 61, 62.

(93) *You will find the following words in the* Menagiana, *p.* 164, *of the firſt Dutch edition, upon occaſion of a converſation of ſome learned men.* Every body ſtrove . . . to ſpeak well, for, contrary to what is now practiſed, people took care to ſpeak correctly, and to avoid faults, when they met to diſcourſe together. At laſt every body being gone, Balzac and I happened to be alone. Then he took me by the hand, and told me, now that we are alone. let us ſpeak freely, and without fearing to be guilty of a ſolеciſm.

(94 Eo præpropero vitæ exitu profecto felix fuit quod imminentem, convulſæ Medicæ domus ruinam effugerit. *Jovius, p.* 89.

(95) In the remark [*F*].

(96) It is the ſame thing that Voëtius aſcribes to Mornai in the remark [*K*].

POLITIAN (Giovanni Angelo), a native of the ſame town with the foregoing, taught Logic at Poitiers, about the beginning of the XVIIth century. Mr Daillé was one of his ſcholars (*a*). He wrote two controverſial books againſt cardinal Bellarmin, his countryman [*A*]; which makes me think that he renounced Popery, and turned Proteſtant.

(*a*) See Mr Daillé's Life, *p.* 4.

[*A*] *He wrote two controverſial books againſt cardinal Bellarmin his countryman.*] One of them is intituled *Philoſophia Euchariſtica de potentia & voluntate Dei ex tertio libro Bellarmini de Euchariſtia, expoſita & refutata*, Amberg 1604, in 4to. And the other, *Philoſophiæ ſeu potius Sophiſticæ Euchariſticæ Bellarmini pars altera refutata*, Amberg 1606, in 4to.

POLITIAN (Antony Laurentin) was profeſſor of Logic in the univerſity of Piſa (*a*). He was at Padua in the year 1604, as it appears from the epiſtle dedicatory of the ſecond edition of his dialogue *de Riſu* (*b*), to which he annexed his treatiſe *de Cœlis eorumque motibus*, and his book *de natura Logicæ*. His mother was deſcended from the family of St Agnes (*c*), a ſaint to whom the inhabitants of Monte Pulciano pay a great veneration (*d*).

(*a*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his dialogue *de Riſu*.

(*b*) The firſt came out at Francfort. I make uſe of that of Marpurg 1606, in 8vo.

(*c*) Ant. Laurent. Politianus, de Riſu, *pag. m.* 134.

(*d*) Leand. Albert. Deſcript. Italiæ, *p.* 89.

POLONUS (Martin) a Dominican Friar and Penitentiary to Pope Nicholas III, flouriſhed in the XIIIth century. Some ſay that he was archbiſhop of Coſenza, others that he was archbiſhop of Benevento; but they cannot alledge good proofs for either. It is certain that he was promoted to the archbiſhopric of Gneſna on the twenty-ſecond of June 1278 (*a*), by Pope Nicholas III, and that he was going to take poſſeſſion of it when he died at Boulogne in the ſame or the following year. He was buried in that city in the convent of his own order (*b*). He writ a chronicle of the Popes and Emperors from Jeſus Chriſt and Auguſtus Cæſar to Pope John XXI, who died in the year 1277 [*A*]. It contains the Hiſtory of the She-Pope; although ſome learned men do not believe that part of it to be his [*B*]. Some others imagine that he was the firſt

(*a*) *Decimo Kalend. Julii ſay* Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *p.* 486, & F. Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. *vol. ii, p.* 62; *but* Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1278, *n.* 18, *uſes the phraſe* Decimo Kalendas Junii.

(*b*) *See Father* Labbe, ibid. & Starovolſ. in Elogiis centum Polonorum, *pag.* 30.

[*A*] *He writ a chronicle . . . that reaches from Jeſus Chriſt . . . . to Pope John XXI, who died in the year 1277.*] Thoſe who believed that it reached as far as the year 1320, did not know that he died in the Pontificate of Nicholas III, in the year 1278 or 1279. Volaterranus was as little acquainted with it, ſince he has repreſented him as flouriſhing under Pope John XXII (1). He was no doubt deceived by a copy which had an appendix continued to the year 1320. That appendix which was in the manuſcript of the abbey of Fuld, was printed with the Chronicle of Martin Polonus, in the edition of Baſil 1559. Suffridus Petri, in the edition of Antwerp 1574, has falſely aſcribed it to our Martin; and it is undoubtedly by a miſtake of the like nature that Coccius affirms this author to have been alive in the year 1320 (2). There are manuſcripts of this chronicle which reach no farther than Clement IV, whoſe Pontificate begun in the year 1265, and ended in the year 1271. It is from one of theſe manuſcripts that the edition of Cologn was printed (3). We are not to imagine however that the continuation to the year 1277 belongs to another, and not to Martin Polonus; for he ſays himſelf in the preface that he has carried his Chronicle as far as Pope John XXI incluſively. *Ego Frater Martinus Polonus Papæ Pænitentiarius & Capellanus ex diverſis Chronicis & geſtis ſummorum Pontificum & Imperatorum præſens opuſculum uſque ad Joannem XXI Papam deduxi incluſivè.* Let us ſay rather that he gave more than one edition, that the firſt reached no farther than Clement IV, and that he continued it afterwards to the Popedom of John XXI, and that the manuſcripts which end at Clement IV, were copyed from the firſt edition. There is a manuſcript in the library of Vienna where we find theſe words, ‘ Uſque ad Gregorium ‘ Papam X deduxi incluſivè : - - - *I have carried it as* ‘ *far as Pope Gregory X incluſively.*’ Upon which Lambecius makes the following remark, ‘ Quod autem ‘ Chronicum Martinianum hic dicitur pertingere ad ‘ Papam Gregorium X incluſivè, non eſt intelligendum ‘ de anno obitus ejus, qui fuit annus Chriſti 1276, ‘ ſed de initio Pontificatus, ſive anno Chriſti 1271, ‘ quo is poſt Papam Clementem IV electus eſt. Hoc ‘ enim manifeſtè apparet ex ipſo illo codice, utpote ‘ ubi de Gregorio X nihil aliud antiqua manu ſcriptum cernitur, quàm hoc : *Gregorius natus Lombardus* ‘ *de civitate Placentia ſedit.* . . . . Quæ autem deinceps ‘ ſequuntur, multò recentiori manu adjecta ſunt (4). ‘ . . . . *As to what is ſaid here, that the Martinian* ‘ *Chronicle reaches down as far as Pope Gregory X in-* ‘ *cluſively it is not to be underſtood of the year of his death,* ‘ *which was the year of Chriſt* 1276, *but of the begin-* ‘ *ning of his pontificate, or the year of Chriſt* 1271, ‘ *when he ſucceeded Pope Clement IV. This appears plainly* ‘ *from the manuſcript itſelf, where we find nothing writ-* ‘ *ten by the old hand concerning Gregory X except this :* ‘ Gregory, born in Placentia a city of Lombardy, ‘ took his ſeat . . . *What follows after is added by a* ‘ *much later hand.*’

From hence we learn, 1, that the edition which I call the firſt, reached to the beginning of Clement the fourth's pontificate, and not to the end of it in the year 1271 (5), as Voſſius would have it; 2, that there was a ſecond edition which reached to the beginning of Gregory the tenth's pontificate, and another which reached as far as Pope John XXI. But here is a difficulty : a manuſcript of the library of Vienna contains theſe words, *Uſque ad Quartum Honorium Papam deduxi incluſivè, - - - I have carried it as far as Pope Honorius IV incluſively* (6). Honorius IV was choſen in the year 1285, and died in the year 1287. How ſhall we reconcile this to what thoſe ſay, who place the death of Martin Polonus in the year 1278 or 1279; might not Blondel have found there an argument to defend himſelf againſt the man (7) who cenſured him for making this ſame Martin live till about the year 1290 (8)? The learned Conringius thinks it evident that Martin Polonus carried his book as far down as the year 1285 (9).

Abbot Ughelli (10), does not indeed deny that Martin Polonus, archbiſhop of Gneſna, was a Dominican, but on the other had he takes his Chronicle from him and gives it to one Martin a monk of the Order of Citeaux, archbiſhop of Coſenza, and Penitentiary to Innocent IV; but this pretenſion cannot be ſupported, ſeeing there are ſeveral manuſcripts of this Chronicle, which expreſsly contain theſe words, *Ego Frater Martinus Ordinis Prædicatorum, - - - I Brother Martin of the Order of Preachers.* They are likewiſe to be found in the prologue to the alphabetical table of the decree and the decretals, which table is generally called *Martiniani*, and of which Martin Polonus is ſuppoſed to be the author (11).

[*B*] . . . . *It contains the hiſtory of the She-Pope, altho' ſome learned men do not believe that part of it to be his.*] This is a diſpute which is ever and anon revived when any one writes for or againſt the Hiſtory of the She-Pope : but there will always remain difficulties ſo long as the original itſelf of Polonus cannot be produced. The copies which mention the She-Pope, and thoſe

(1) See his words in the remark [*E*].

(2) Coccius in Catalogo Scriptorum quem ſuo Theſauro præmiſit. *Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. p. m.* 485.

(3) Cura Joannis Fabricii Cæſaris, Canonici Gladbachenſis. *Ibid.*

(4) Lambecius, *lib. ii*, Bibl. Vindobon. apud Sandium, Notis in Voſſium, de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 175, 176.

(5) There is in *Voſſius* 1251; either by an error of the author, or by a fault in the printing. Father Labbe, and Sandius, have not obſerved this miſtake.

(6) Lambecius, ubi ſupra.

(7) *Father* Labbe, in Addendis ad *Tom. ii*, de Script. Eccleſ. *p.* 759.

(8) Blondel in his Latin treatiſe upon the She-Pope, *p. m.* 6. Obſerve that in the French treatiſe, *p.* 17, he ſays that Martin Polonus died about the year 1270.

(9) Conringius, Animadv. in Bullam Innocentii X, *p. m.* 329.

(10) In Italia Sacra in Catalogo Archiepiſcoporum Conſentinor. *See* Sandius, in Voſſ. de Hiſtor. Latin. *p.* 174.

(11) *See* Sandius, *ibid.*

firſt who wrote any thing concerning this fabulous ſtory (*c*). He has been cenſured as a credulous

thoſe which mention her not, can never decide the queſtion clearly and demonſtratively; for if one anſwers that the She-Pope has been taken out of the manuſcripts where ſhe is not, the other replies that ſhe has been added to the manuſcripts where ſhe is. Both theſe anſwers have a ſhew of probability and reaſon. The prejudices of the heart are more capable to determine a man in his opinion than the light of the underſtanding. We muſt nevertheleſs acknowledge, that there are Roman Catholics who aſcribe this paſſage to our Martin, and that there are Proteſtants who do not think it his. Dr Cave, an Engliſh Divine, maintains that the ſtory of Pope Joan has been thruſt into the Chronicle of Polonus by another hand. I ſhall quote his words; we ſhall ſee that he treats what concerns the She-Pope as a mere fable, and that ſome manuſcripts of a right ſtamp do not make the leaſt mention of her. ‘ Nihil illud (*Chronicon Martini Poloni*) magis famoſum reddidit, quàm decantatiſſima illa de Joanna Papiſſa, ſeu fabula, ſeu narratiuncula. Sanè fabulam eſſe, & Martini Chronico intruſam nullus dubito, præſertim cùm in pleriſque vetuſtis Codicibus MSS. deſideretur. In IV Codicibus MSS. Bibliothecæ Cæſareæ deſiderari, in totidem etiam reperiri ingenuè fatetur Cl. Lambecius *. Deerat etiam in antiquiſſimo codice, quem Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ donavit Urbanus VIII cujus meminit Leo Allatius *Confut. fab. de Joan. Pap. num.* 7. ut alios taceam; certe Martini Chronicon non unam interpolationem paſſum eſſe eruditi dudum obſervarunt. Editum eſt hoc *Chronicon Baſil.* 1559. deinde cum notis Petri Suffridi, *Antverp.* 1574. in 8vo. Denique è vetuſtiſſimo MS. & ipſi Scriptori, uti ferunt, penè coætaneo, ſumma fide & diligentia expreſſum, in lucem emiſit Joannes Fabricius Cæſar, Monachus Præmonſtratenſis, *Colon.* 1616, fol. in qua editione Hiſtoria de Joanna Papiſſa non comparet (12). - - - - *Nothing helped more to make that Chronicle famous than the much talked of fable, or the ſhort narrative, which you pleaſe to call it, of Pope Joan. For my own part I am thoroughly convinced that it is a mere fable, and that it has been thruſt into Martin's Chronicle, eſpecially ſince it is wanting in moſt of the old manuſcripts. Lambecius frankly acknowledges, that four manuſcripts of the emperor's library have it not, and four have it. It was likewiſe wanting in that very old manuſcript which Urban VIII gave to the Vatican library, and of which Leo Allatius, not to mention others, takes notice in his confutation of this ſtory. Certain it is the learned have long ago obſerved that Martin's Chronicle has been interpolated in more than one place. Laſt of all John Fabricius Cæſar, a Monk of Præmonſtré copied it with great diligence and integrity, from a very old manuſcript that was almoſt cotemporary with the author himſelf, and publiſhed at Cologn* 1616 *in fol. in which edition there is no account given of Pope Joan.*’ Mr du Pin is one of thoſe who believe that this ſtory of Pope Joan has been added to the Chronicle of Polonus (13).

One thing is very certain, *viz.* that the Proteſtants did not inſert this addition: it is to be found in manuſcripts that were copyed before Luther was talked of; for Antoninus archbiſhop of Florence, and Platina, who lived in the XVth century, have mentioned, in quoting Martin, the ſtory of the She-Pope; and there are authors of the XIVth century, who have quoted the ſame Martin upon this ſubject (13*). It was therefore a notable piece of temerity and groſs ignorance, in Florimond de Remond to accuſe Heroldus of having added this ſtory to the edition of Polonus (14). He means the Baſil edition, publiſhed by John Heroldus in the year 1559, which comprehends the Chronicle of Marianus and that of our Martin. Theſe two Chronicles had never been printed before. Mr Maimbourg muſt have committed the ſame blunder, if Mr Jurieu is to be credited. ‘ It is fit to obſerve that Mr Maimbourg expoſes himſelf very much to be laughed at when he accuſes us of having invented this monſtrous fable, *and of having inſerted it in the Chronicles of the Monks Marianus Scotus, Sigebert, and Martin Polonus* ‡. Nothing was ever ſaid more raſhly and inconſiderately. There are copies now to be ſeen of theſe authors, printed twenty years before Luther was heard of, where this is to be found. All the old manuſcripts agree: and granting it ſhould be true what Maimbourg ſays, viz. that there are one or two copies which have it not, it would be more likely that thoſe few manuſcripts, where this ſtory is not to be found, had been corrected by ſuch perſons as were diſpleaſed at the adventure and thought it had an odious appearance (15).’ To make a right judgment of this cenſure, we muſt know in what terms Maimbourg expreſſed himſelf. *The fable of Pope Joan*, ſays he (16), had never any other foundation *but in the perſon of this Pope John* (17). *For on account of his weak conduct, and becauſe he had ſuffered himſelf to be ſhamefully impoſed upon by a half-man* (18) *that was more cunning than he, they called him a woman and Pope Joan, in a bitter kind of raillery, not unlike thoſe paſquils which the inſolent liberty of detraction puts out ſo frequently at Rome, againſt the Popes upon more trifling occaſions. But at laſt, ſome time after, in an age of groſs ignorance this raillery was taken for truth, and ſimple people imagined that a woman, diſguiſed in the ſhape of a man, had by ſurpriſe been advanced to the throne of St Peter. Nevertheleſs neither the time nor the circumſtances of ſuch a ſtrange and improbable adventure were ſet down, till in the latter ages ſome writers bolder than the reſt, and afterwards the Heretics, that they might have an opportunity of inſulting the church of Rome, when they had often varied upon this head, ſome fixing it to one time, ſome to another, did at length moſt of them agree to place it between Leo V, and Bennit III. Nay, it is highly probable, that they themſelves did invent this monſtrous fable, and inſert it in the chronicles of the Monks Marianus Scotus, Sigebert, and Martin Polonus. For there is nothing to be ſeen of it in the oldeſt manuſcripts and copies of theſe three authors, unleſs it be perhaps in the firſt.*

If we compare the words of this author with thoſe of Mr Jurieu, we ſhall find that the latter has not at all valued himſelf upon the two eſſential qualities of a good critic, fairneſs and accuracy; which require that no conſtruction ſhould be put upon the words that one has a mind to cenſure, beſides what neceſſarily agrees to them. Now the words of Mr Maimbourg do not neceſſarily ſignify that the Heretics invented the ſtory of the She-Pope, and inſerted it in the Chronicles of Marianus, Sigebert, and Martin Polonus. This author had been juſt ſpeaking of two ſorts of writers, the one Catholic and the other Heretics: he may therefore have poſſibly meant that the former invented and inſerted this little ſtory; why then has he been cenſured as if he had only meant the latter? But this not the only fault of Mr Jurieu: he pretends that there are copies of Marianus Scotus, Sigebert, and Martin Polonus, *printed twenty years before Luther was heard of, which contain this ſtory*; it is a miſtake, Marianus Scotus, and Martin Polonus were not put in the preſs till the year 1559, and there is no edition, as far as we know, of Sigebert older than that of Paris 1513. Neither is it true that *all the old manuſcripts* agree (19), nor that Maimbourg ſays there are *one or two copies* which have it not. For we have ſeen that without limiting any number he ſays in general *the oldeſt manuſcripts*.

If Mr Jurieu had been leſs ſuperficially acquainted with the books written *pro* and *con* upon this diſpute, he would not have ventured to affirm this pretended conformity of all the old manuſcripts, than which nothing can be more falſe. Read only, with reſpect to Marianus and Sigebert, the remarks [*B*] and [*C*] of the article POPE (JOAN), and with reſpect to Polonus, what I have quoted from Dr Cave (20), and what I am now going to add: ‘ Joſias Simbler (21), miniſter of Zuric, who augmented the library of Conrad Geſner, owns that he has read four copies of this Martin, which are ſtill to be ſeen in the library of Dreſſerus (22), all different from one another, and ſome more full than the reſt. I myſelf have ſeen an old one which does not agree with that which was publiſhed in the year 1573 by Suffridus Petrus Leovadienſis (23) Friſius, who confeſſes that he had made a curious ſearch after the old copies, and picked them up here and there, in order to purge out the errors and groſs blunders which had crept into that author through the ignorance or malice of ſome perſons. I cannot enough wonder, ſays he, how ſo many things, which are not to be found in the manuſcripts, can have ſlid into the firſt edition of Polonus, without there being the leaſt appearance

---

(*c*) See the remark [C].

* Comment. Biblioth. Vindob. *lib. ii, cap. viii, pag.* 889.

(12) Cave, de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. i, p.* 739, 740, *Edit.* London, 1688.

(13) Du Pin, Bibl. *Tom. x, p. m.* 82.

(13*) *See Mr* Spanheim, de Papa fœmina, *p.* 165; *and Mr* Des Marets, in Examine de Papa fœmina, *p.* 22.

(14) Florimond de Remond, the Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. ii, num.* 5, *fol. m.* 367. *See alſo Father* Oudin, in Supplem. de Script. Eccleſ. *p.* 550.

‡ Hiſtoire du Schiſme des Grecs, an. 881.

(15) Jurieu, Apologie pour la Reformation, *Tom. ii, p.* 38, 39, *Edit. in* 4to.

(16) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Schiſme des Grecs, *book ii, p.* 198, *of the firſt Vol. Dutch edition.*

(17) That is to ſay, John VIII.

(18) That is to ſay, Photius, patriarch of Conſtantinople, who was an eunuch.

(19) See the remark [*B*], of the article POPE (JOAN).

(20) Above, citation (12).

(21) He ſhould have ſaid *Simler*.

(22) *The words of Simler are;* Ejuſdem (*Martini Poloni*) exemplaria quatuor copioſiora multo quam expreſſum extant in Bibliothec. Dreſſeri. - - - *There are yet to be ſeen in the library of Dreſſerus four copies of the ſame author, abundantly more copious than the printed one.* Florimond does not tranſlate them faithfully.

(23) *He ſhould have ſaid* Suffridus Petri Leovardienſis.

‘ of his having ever thought of ſuch things, ſo far was ‘ he from having deſigned to leave them in writing. ‘ But if theſe had truly been of his production, he ‘ would have every where diſcovered his ſimplicity and ‘ ignorance (24).’ We find in an Engliſh writer, that was a great advocate for the hiſtory of the She-Pope, the following words: *Dr Briſtow* † . . . . *relates that ſome years ago a certain Proteſtant (reputed to be a great Hiſtorian) ſhewed this book of Martin, writ in a very fine character, and deſired that they would point out to him that fable. And behold it was not in the text but only in the margin, and by a different hand. Upon which he ſaid:* I ſee now that you want this author likewiſe (25). The Engliſh writer will not allow this teſtimony to be good, and defies any one to ſhew *a book of* Polonus, *either in print or manuſcript*, which does not contain the hiſtory of the She-Pope (26). Nevertheleſs, Dr Burnet (27) ſpeaks of it in this manner. *I do not believe* the hiſtory of Pope Joan, *having ſeen in England with my own eyes a manuſcript of Martin Polonus, who is one of the oldeſt authors that are generally quoted upon this ſubject, and which ſeems to have been written ſoon after the author's death, where this ſtory is only in the margin and not in the text, and beſides it is written by another hand than that which writ the text* (28). Who can doubt but this is the ſame manuſcript wich Dr Briſtow mentions. Mr Spanheim (29) quotes John Chiflet who alledges an old manuſcript where Martin Polonus makes no mention of the She-Pope. The manuſcripts of this author in the library of Leyden are very different from that (30): we find in them the ſame things concerning the She-Pope, that are in the printed copies (31) they were likewiſe to be found in a manuſcipt which a Monk, that turned Proteſtant ſhewed to a profeſſor of Groningen. *Nec diu eſt quod meis oculis uſurpavi vetuſtiſſimum Martini codicem in charta pergamena ſcriptum, quam ſecum Colonia detulit R. V. D. Michaël Ruckertius olim Philoſophiæ Lector inter Recollectos Colonienſes, nunc Dei gratia Verbi Divini fidelis diſpenſator in Ooſtfriſia, in quo extabat hæc eadem narratio* (32). It is then certain that the old manuſcripts do not agree.

CONSIDERATION on the cauſes of the difference of manuſcripts.

Let us make a few reflexions upon this diverſity, and inquire into the cauſe of it. I begin with theſe two propoſitions: I. It is no proof that Martin Polonus mentioned Pope Joan, becauſe an account of her may be ſeen in ſome very old manuſcripts of his Chronicle. II. Neither is it a proof that he has ſaid nothing at all of her, becauſe one may produce very antient manaſcripts where this ſtory is not to be found. The truth of theſe two Propoſitions is grounded upon this, that very poſſibly ſome paſſages may have been taken from or added to the works of an author ſoon after his death. Additions and ſubſtractions are two means alike frequently made uſe of to corrupt the original ſtate of a manuſcript. One might prove this by a hundred examples. Conſequently ſo long as we ſhall not have the original of Polonus it will be impoſſible to diſcover certainly whether it is by the way of addition or ſubſtraction, that ſo great a diverſity has been introduced between the copies of his Chronicle.

The Proteſtants will anſwer, that it is not probable this ſtory of the She-Pope ſhould have been tacked to the manuſcript of Polonus, but that it is very probable it was taken from it, becauſe it is ſcandalous, and ſuch a thing as redounds to the reproach and ignominy of the Papal chair. As therefore thoſe who copyed the manuſcripts, were jealous of the honour of the Popes they muſt have reckoned themſelves obliged to ſuppreſs this narrative, and by no means to introduce it. This diſcourſe has an air of probability; but it proves too much, and makes it difficult to ſolve this queſtion, whence comes it that the ſtory of the She-Pope remained in a very great number of manuſcripts? Where was the zeal of the tranſcribers? What could the reaſon of this inconſiſtency be? There is another difficulty ſtill. You pretend that Anaſtaſius Bibliothecarius, Marianus Scotus, Sigebert, Martin Polonus, &c. publiſhed this ſcandalous ſtory. They were neverthelefs very good Papiſts, they were Prieſts or Monks devoted to the intereſt of the church of Rome. Why ſhould it be ſuppoſed that they had leſs zeal than their tranſcribers? Or how came it about that their tranſcribers were more ſcrupulous? Were not moſt of the writers who have related the adventure of the She-Pope ſtrongly attached to the Romiſh religion? Who could be more attached to it than St Antoninus, who has inſerted it in his book? Here is a further difficulty. This tradition had been ſo well eſtabliſhed that no body contradicted it. Aventinus, cotemporary with Luther, is the firſt who rejected it as a fable. The council of Conſtance did not cenſure John Huſs for having alledged this fact (33), an evident ſign that the Fathers of that council did not doubt but there had been a She-Pope. It follows from thence that the Roman Catholics had got a habit of looking upon that accident as a thing which did no ſort of prejudice to their religion. Whence therefore could thoſe ſcruples ariſe which ſhould have moved ſome tranſcribers to expunge that paſſage from the manuſcripts of Martin Polonus? If the church of Rome had been loaded with inſults and objections upon that ſcore, as it has ſince the Reformation, one could more eaſily conceive that the zealots of Popery would have laboured to ſuppreſs the writings which mentioned the She-Pope, and even in that caſe they muſt have begun by ſaying, that the fact was not true, or at leaſt that it was very doubtful. But we do not find that the ſectaries inſiſted upon this article. Ockam in the the XIVth century (34), and the Huſſites in the XVth (35) made uſe of that fact as a proof that the church can err. Æneas Sylvius anſwered that the fact of the She-Pope was not certain, and that granting it to be true, it would include no error of right. This objection made little noiſe at that time, inſomuch that no body thought it worth their while to chuſe the negative, and go back to the fountainhead in order to diſprove the hiſtory of the She-Pope. What therefore could occaſion a conſpiracy in the tranſcribers againſt the pages wherein the Chroniclers had written this hiſtory? In fine, and this is my laſt difficulty, by what ſtrange whim ſhould they have paſſed over ſo many other narratives, where the ignominy and ſcandal is greater, and diſcharged their whole zeal upon this? Have they not ſpared in theſe ſame manuſcripts and in a great many others, the memory of Popes that were accounted Intruders, Schiſmatics, Simoniſts, Adulterers, Magicians, &c. I do not give theſe for demonſtrative reaſons, neither would I poſitively affirm that no body has curtailed the manuſcripts, in order to hide the ſhameful ſtory of the She-Pope; I content myſelf with oppoſing probabilities to probabilities, and thereby giving a caution to the readers that one ought not to be too peremptory about the reaſon (36) alledged by ſo many people why the ſtory of the She-Pope is not to be found in ſeveral old manuſcripts of the Chroniclers.

But it will be ſaid, if Marianus, Sigebert, Martin Polonus, *&c.* had not mentioned the She-Pope, how comes it that her ſtory ſhould be found in ſeveral old manuſcripts of their Chronicles? Is it at all likely that the Monks, who in thoſe times were the chief depoſitaries of the manuſcripts, and tranſcribed the greateſt number of copies, ſhould have propagated ſuch a ſtory, by adding it to books where it was not? Had the Sectaries, the Huſſites, for example, any occaſion for inſerting it? Did they not find that tradition, ſo well eſtabliſhed that no body denied or contradicted it, and the firſt of their antagoniſts (37), who examined their objection founded upon it, durſt not poſitively ſay that the fact was not true? Wherefore if this addition could neither come from the Papiſts, nor Heretics, we muſt conclude, that the manuſcripts which mention the She-Pope do therein exactly agree with the original, and that thoſe which ſay nothing of her have been curtailed of that paſſage. This objection has a ſeducing appearance, but it contains nothing in it ſufficient to convince thoſe who require ſolid proofs. It falſly ſuppoſes, that this ſtory of the She-Pope could not have been inſerted in the manuſcripts of Sigebert, Polonus, *&c.* with any other view than to prejudice the church of Rome. There are ſeveral other motives which might have induced the tranſcribers to foiſt this addition into a copy.

The humour which reigns now of preferring editions that are enlarged to ſuch as are not, has prevailed at all times. We have therefore good reaſon to believe, that there have always been ſuch perſons as liked a Sigebert improved with the ſtory of the She-Pope, better than a Sigebert that wanted it: therefore the tranſcribers might very well aſſure themſelves that they could ſell to better advantage a copy where this ſtory had been inſerted, than a copy where it had not, and which, on account of that omiſſion, would have been looked upon as caſtrated. And as before the art of Printing was found out, a great deal of time was neceſſary to prepare the copies, and books were

---

(24) Florimond de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. ii, num.* 6, *fol.* 367 *verſo.*

† In his Reply to Dr Fulke, *ch. x, Queſtion LIV, p.* 373.

(25) Cooke, on the She-Pope, *p.* 61, 62.

(26) Ib. p. 61.

(27) Biſhop of Salisbury.

(28) Burnet's Travels, *p. m.* 300.

(29) Spanh. de Papa fœmina, *p.* 60, 61.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 66, 67.

(31) Ibid.

(32) Sam. Mareſius, in Exam. *p.* 22, *Edit. Gron.* 1658.

(33) See Launoi, Epiſt. VIII, *Part iv, p. m.* 355.

(34) See Mareſius, in Examine, *p.* 22.

(35) *See* Launoi, Epiſt. VIII, *book iv, p.* 355.

(36) That reaſon is, that this ſtory has been retrenched out of a zeal for Popery.

(37) *Æneas Silvius.* See the remark [*E*] of the article POPE (JOAN).

extreamly dear, all poſſible care was taken to huſband the tranſcriber's time, and the buyer's purſe, and it was ſo managed for the benefit of ſeveral perſons, that one Chronicle ſupplied the place of two or three, and for that end, inſtead of copying ſeveral, they added to one every thing that was particular and moſt remarkable in the reſt, from whence it might happen that the prodigious adventure of a pretended Pope, brought to bed in the middle of a proceſſion, was added to Anaſtaſius, Marianus Scotus, and Sigebert. We may ſuppoſe beſide, that a curious man, who had bought a Sigebert, or a Martin Polonus, and did not find the ſtory of the She-Pope there, would have added it on the margin, tranſcribing it from ſome other chronicle; and that copy might ſerve as an original ſome years after to a writer, who inſerted in the text what he found upon the margin (38). Who can doubt that there were perſons at that time who might be more deſirous of having a book, than able to purchaſe it? What did they upon ſuch occaſions? They borrowed a chronicle, and copyed it themſelves; and if they did not find there certain facts mentioned by other Hiſtorians, they added them each in it's proper place, and by that contrivance they reaped the ſame advantages from one ſingle manuſcript, as they would have done from ſeveral. Such a manuſcript may have paſſed from the cloſet of a private man into the great libraries of univerſities or monaſteries, or, perhaps, it may have ſerved as an original to the tranſcribers before Printing was invented.

Theſe are probable ſuppoſitions, from which we learn, that although Sigebert and Polonus had not touched upon the ſtory of Pope Joan, it might nevertheleſs be found in ſome old manuſcripts of their chronicles, without our having the leaſt ground to ſuſpect that the authors of the addition had any ill deſign againſt the holy ſee. This is a moſt natural account of the diverſity that is ſaid to be in the old copies. Some have been faithfully tranſcribed from the original, either immediately or mediately. Thoſe want the ſtory of the She-Pope; the reſt have been taken from a copy that had been adorned with this fable.

What we have mentioned (39) concerning the manuſcripts of Anaſtaſius, together with the teſtimony of Onuphrius (40), and Dr Burnet (41), leaves us no room to doubt that divers things, which the author never ſaid, have been written upon the margin of the copies.

A particular obſervation may be made on the diverſity of the manuſcripts of Martin Polonus. We have ſeen, above, that he put forth ſeveral editions of his Chronicle, and without doubt he was not ſatiſfied with ſubjoining a continuation to each of them, but he likewiſe reviſed and improved his firſt performance, and made in it alterations and additions. Some manuſcripts of theſe different editions, which have been preſerved (42), muſt of neceſſity be more full and ample than the reſt, and ſome of them muſt have things here and there which the others have not. Let the tranſcribers have been never ſo faithful and exact, this difference would have neceſſarily happened in the manuſcripts. We are not therefore in general to pretend, that thoſe where we do not find every thing that is contained in the reſt have been unfaithfully copied; for beſides the reaſon I have alledged, there is a conjecture which is very probable. All thoſe who tranſcribed the Chronicle of Polonus did not do it with a deſign to ſell the copies. They might tranſcribe it for their own private uſe. For example, a man that was not rich, was rather willing to take that trouble than to lay out his money in the purchaſe of the book. There is no abſurdity in ſaying, that ſuch a man may have ſtuck cloſer to the things than to the expreſſions, and that in order to have ſooner done, he may have left out what he thought ſuperfluous, abridged ſome particular phraſes, and ſubſtituted his own words for thoſe of the original. A man writes much quicker when he furniſhes the expreſſion himſelf, than when he copies thoſe of another, for the trouble of turning every moment to look at the manuſcript occaſions a great loſs of time, and one is a conſiderable gainer by it if he does no more than copy his own thoughts. A tranſcriber who takes the ſenſe of a whole period, and expreſſes it in his own way, will finiſh in one day what would require two, if he followed the manuſcript word for word. Suppoſe ſuch a copy of Martin Polonus has ſerved for an original, we may eaſily apprehend that the copies of the Chronicle will differ from one another, though there has been no ill deſign nor fraud to cauſe that diverſity. Thoſe who make a good number of collections, and inſert whole pages of a book together, will readily grant what I ſuppoſe; they will remember how that, in order to have ſooner done, they did not copy word for word, but retrenched, and altered many words. The authors themſelves, who quote long paſſages, often take this liberty, to ſhorten the tedious trouble of tranſcribing (43). There is ſometimes a little fraud in it, but not always. What ſhall I ſay of the many involuntary omiſſions of the tranſcribers, and eſpecially when two periods bordering upon one another begin with the ſame word? They read it over, it is true, with ſome ſort of attention, but they too often ſpare themſelves the trouble of comparing their copy with the original line by line; and except the omiſſions evidently and groſly marr the ſeries of a thought, they imagine that all is very well. Now it is certain that there are periods, or half-periods, which may be taken out of a book, and ſtill leave a tolerable ſenſe behind.

Let us conclude, that want of ſincerity does not always occaſion the difference of manuſcripts: ſeveral innocent cauſes may contribute towards it; but I confeſs that fraud is too often concerned in the affair. I ſhall quote the obſervation which Spanheim makes upon the manuſcripts of Sigebert. *Collato eo codice* (Bibliothecæ Leydenſis) *cum aliis, ac præcipue cum iis quibus uſus eſt Aubertus Miræus, Gemblacenſi, Lipſiano,* &c. *patet non pauca addita, mutata, detracta, quædam etiam paſſim in noſtro deſiderari ex eo genere quæ Romæ inviſa, & quæ Baronius exagitat in Sigeberto* (44). You ſee that among the things wherein he ſays copies differ, he places additions and omiſſions, and that ſome of theſe omiſſions concern facts, not agreeable to the court of Rome, and which ſavour of a writer too partial to the emperors that have at any time quarrelled with the Popes. There is room for thinking that theſe particular facts have been fraudulently left out by partial tranſcribers; but as for ſuch omiſſions, additions, or alterations, as no ways relate to diſputes or ſchiſms, they are not liable to the ſame ſuſpicion. We ſhould judge of them almoſt in the ſame manner as we do of the manuſcripts of Pagan authors, which have been maimed or corrupted. There may be a manuſcript of Cicero, of Titus Livius, &c. which contains certain paſſages that are not to be found in another. No paſſion, private intereſt, nor prejudice, could be the reaſon why the tranſcriber ſuppreſſed theſe. His only fault was lazineſs, ignorance, &c.

To diſtinguiſh well, whether a tranſcriber has retrenched, or added any thing from a party-view, we ſhould know what the factions of ſtate or religion were that could prepoſſeſs him, and of what conſequence theſe paſſages ſuppreſſed, or added, might be to thoſe factions. If they can neither ſerve, nor hurt any party, we are to ſuppoſe that there was not any treacherous deſign in the addition or omiſſion; but we may ſuppoſe the contrary, when they have a particular relation to ſome violent diſpute. For which reaſon the copies of Martin Polonus would be juſtly ſuſpected of being either fraudulently maimed or enlarged, if they had been formed after the Proteſtants and Roman-Catholics began to write upon the ſubject of Pope Joan with ſo much heat and animoſity; but ſince they preceded that difference, and were written at a time when the hiſtory of that woman was contradicted by none, I ſee no reaſon why falſe zeal, partiality, a ſpirit of impoſture, &c. could move the tranſcribers to ſuppreſs it. Indeed ſome one may poſſibly have left it out, becauſe he looked upon it as a ridiculous ſtory. See the margin (45).

The ſpirit of party is a ſtrange fury: ſome readers are ſo warm that they tear to pieces, or take out all the pages where they find certain ignominious things charged upon their ſect. You may judge from thence what they would do if ſuch or ſuch manuſcripts paſſed through their hands. It is impoſſible to deſcribe the ravages which this paſſion has committed in the antient libraries (46). And how ſhould they not have dared to falſify manuſcripts, ſince they dare now a-days falſify ſecond editions even in the author's life-time (47). I am informed that the third volume of the Revolutions of England (48), reprinted in Holland, has been corruped in ſeveral places, ſometimes by additions, and ſometimes by ſuppreſſions.

I muſt not forget that there are ſome who believe, that the ſtory of Pope Joan has been added to the book

of

---

(38) Compare with this what I have ſaid in the remark [*B*] of the article POPE (JOAN).

(39) In the remark [*A*] of the ſaid article.

(40) Ibid.

(41) Above, citation (28).

(42) Since at this day ſeveral authors quote the firſt editions, without knowing that there are others corrected and enlarged, they might with more reaſon be ignorant in thoſe times that there were editions of Polonus fuller than the firſt, and conſeqnently the copies of that were multiplied.

(43) See in the remark [*B*] of the article VOLKELIUS, the obſervation that is made upon a citation from the book of Mr Stoupp.

(44) Spanhem. de Papa fœmina, *p.* 54, 55.

(45) Unuſquiſque quæ ipſe digna memoria judicabat addidit: eraſitque quæ ſibi indigna lectu videbantur. *Allat. Symm. p.* 417, *in ſpeaking of the chronicle of Martin Polonus,* apud Spanhem. de Pap. fœmina, *p.* 68.

(46) *See the preface of* Laurence Bouchel, in Decreta Eccleſ. Gallic. *Rivet quotes him in his* Remarks upon the Anſwer to the Myſtery of Iniquity, *p.* 602, *of Vol. I.*

(47) See the remark [*F*] of the article PELLISSON; and the remark [*D*] of the article ANCILLON.

(48) By Father d'Orleans, a Jeſuit.

a credulous Author, and a man of a very weak judgment [C]. There is no doubt but that

of Platina. It is the opinion of Bernartius; for, says he *, *I have heard Antony Hetweld, a man of good reputation, and a magiſtrate of Louvain, ſay, that one Engelbertus Boonius, a grave perſon, and dean of a conſiderable church in Germany, often told him that he had ſeen ſeveral antient manuſcripts of* Platina, *in the Vatican at Rome, that he had examined them carefully, but that he had never found in them a ſingle word concerning the She-Pope* (49). Alexander Cooke makes ſtrong objections to this. *How came theſe old manuſcripts*, ſays he (50), *to be ſo numerous and antient in the Vatican, ſeeing that Printing was then in uſe, and that* Platina *died in the year* 1481? *Whence comes it that neither* Onuphrius, *nor* Bellarmin, *nor* Baronius, *who had as free acceſs as others to the library of the Vatican, could find theſe manuſcripts? What can be the reaſon, that no body ſince* Bernartius *has dreamt of this exception againſt* Platina? *The acknowledgment which* Onuphrius, Bellarmin, *and* Baronius *make, that this ſtory is in* Platina, *inclines me to believe that* Bernartius *ſcandalized the magiſtrate, or the magiſtrate the dean, or elſe that the dean made a bubble of the magiſtrate. For, without doubt, if there had been ſuch manuſcripts, ſome of thoſe gentlemen would have produced them before now.* Mr Spanheim (51) does not diſpute the fact with Bernartius, on the contrary, he makes uſe of it as an example to ſhew that the curtailing of manuſcripts was a thing which had been long practiſed. For my own part I will not deny that there may have been in the Vatican ſome faithful copy of Platina's book, which wanted the ſtory of Pope Joan. I think it very poſſible that this author may have ſhewn his manuſcript, and ſuffered copies thereof to be taken ſome years before he publiſhed it. It is probable that after he had ſuffered it to be copied, he reviſed, corrected, and enlarged it, and that the ſtory of the She-Pope was one of the additions. Conſequently it may very well be, that there were ſome manuſcripts of Platina without that ſtory. But becauſe Onuphrius, Bellarmin, and Baronius, did not queſtion the faithfulneſs of that edition, where it was contained, they would not quote ſuch manuſcripts. That could not have been of any ſervice to them. It muſt even be allowed that the teſtimony of Platina is not very prejudicial to the cauſe which theſe three authors defend, for it will ſooner convince one that there has been no She-Pope, than that there has. Coëffeteau did not forget this obſervation. ‘One Martin Polonus is accuſed of having been the firſt who expoſed it to the eyes of Chriſtendom; and Platina, from whom du Pleſſis borrows the account of it, confeſſes that he had taken it from him, adding theſe words, which inſtead of confirming du Pleſſis, ſhould have made him waver in his opinion, and doubt, or rather condemn his whole narrative. *What I ſay of this affair* † *is a common report, the authors of which are obſcure and uncertain. Nevertheleſs I reſolved to ſet it down briefly and fairly, leſt I ſhould ſeem to have wilfully omitted what is in a manner affirmed by all*, (he means later authors) *for even wiſe men have their follies: let us alſo err with the people, tho' it evidently appears that the preſent ſtory is one of thoſe things which we can believe poſſible.* Is not this a glorious foundation for a monſtrous ſtory? And would not one, after ſeeing this, give it up as incredible, granting even that he had believed it to be true before (52).’

If there was any example of a writer that had brought himſelf into trouble, and got ill will, by relating the ſtory of Pope Joan, one might imagine that Platina ſuppreſſed it in the copies which he ſhewed to the Pope and cardinals; but in thoſe days authors ſuffered no inconveniency upon that ſcore, every one was free to ſpeak of it as he had a mind. Whence therefore could ariſe ſuch a precaution in Platina, as his having two ſorts of copies, the one for the court, and the other for his intimate friends? It is eaſy to be accounted for why Varillas did not publiſh all that he had written, and what a hundred perſons had ſeen in the copies of his Hiſtory (53). He was afraid of being ill uſed. When it ſhall be proved that Platina, who had courage enough to mention other things, that were much more diſagreeable in his days than the preſent ſtory, did not dare to publiſh this, it will then be time to own that his book was only printed from the copy which he had deſigned for his intimate friends.

[C] *He has been cenſured as a credulous author, and a man of a very weak judgment.*] I ſhall quote another paſſage of Coëffeteau (54). ‘The oldeſt author, who ſullied his writings with this infamous narrative, was one Martin Polonus (55), a Ciſtertian monk, who ends his Chronicle at Nicholas III, about the year 1278. Platina has borrowed it from him; and both the one and the other proceed upon a vulgar report, without having any other knowledge of the matter. Du Pleſſis, that he might add weight to his authority, told us, above *, *That as he had been penitentiary to Pope Nicholas III, and afterwards archbiſhop of Coſenze* ‡, *he deſerved more reſpect and credit from us than we ſeemed willing to allow*: but as we honour his dignities, ſo we know very well that they do not always make one a compleat annaliſt, or a very good writer of chronicles. We have a clear proof of it in the writings of this author, ſince one eaſily diſcovers, by reading them, that he was a ſimple well-meaning man, who picked up vulgar ſtories, as if they had been oracles, and inſerted them in his works without any judgment. And beſides, as touching this fact, he himſelf makes it doubtful, by ſpeaking of it in ſuch a cold manner. *This perſon*, ſays he, ſpeaking of that monſter, *as we are told*, ut aſſeritur, *was a woman*, &c.’ Naudé treats him ſtill worſe. *Without giving ourſelves the trouble*, ſays he (56), *to conſider the difference of the copies, and the additions made to this Martin Polonus, we ſhall do better to conclude at once, that his authority cannot any ways hurt Sylveſter, both on account of the foregoing reaſon, and becauſe he has given us ſuch a vaſt number of fabulous things in his accounts, that one muſt be alike credulous and weak to believe what he ſays of Sylveſter. I call to witneſs the ſtories that he has borrowed from the book* de Infantia Salvatoris, *and thoſe which he tells of Pilate, of the Greeks who intended to ſteal the bodies of St Peter and St Paul, of the Dragon of Sylveſter, which killed ſix-thouſand perſons every day: of another ſo big that eight yoke of oxen could not draw him to the place where he was to be burnt; of the Britiſh Arthur, of the Prophet Merlin, of Pope Joan, of the Letters of Gold which weighed a hundred pounds each, given by Charlemaign to twenty-three monaſteries erected by him, and a great many others, which are only fit to lull children to ſleep in their cradles.* Alexander Cooke puts the following objection in another perſon's mouth; ‘Know (that as *Bellarmin* ** and N. D. † obſerve) he was a very ſimple man; and that, in the opinion of Dr *Harding* ‡, his writings are trifling and impertinent, and have not the leaſt appearance of truth. Know, beſides, *that he was good for nothing but to make ſtories*, for this is the cenſure which ⸸ Bernartius paſſes upon him (57).’ In anſwer to which it is ſaid that *he was* ⸸⸸ *well verſed in the Holy Scritures, and not ignorant of worldly learning*, and that *he was a perſon on whom* Platina *laid a great deal of ſtreſs in point of Hiſtory* ‡‡, *and held him worthy to be eſteemed* a man of great knowledge, and of a ſingular life and converſation (58). After that Cooke examines five inſtances which are alledged to prove the ignorance of Martin Polonus, and maintains that they do him wrong. He ſays that Bernartius and Florimond de Remond impute thoſe five blunders to him. I have not Bernartius's book (59), but I know that Florimond de Remond is falſly accuſed, ſince he has not aſcribed them to Martin Polonus, but to another Martin. This will evidently appear upon reading the following quotation. ‘Having made as ſtrict an enquiry as the place, where I am, could allow me, into every thing that can be ſaid upon this ſubject, I lighted on an old book in manuſcript, containing the lives of the Popes and Emperors, where I found an account of this mitred Joan. The author's name is Martinus. I do not know whether the likeneſs of names has given occaſion for aſcribing to Martin Polonus what this other Martin writ, who was never printed, as far as I know, and of whom I have been able to diſcover nothing excepting that he was a German. This is probable, conſidering the difference of the copies which Simbler quotes. There is likewiſe to be ſeen another Chronicle of one

---

THE reaſons why ſome manuſcripts of Platina do not contain the ſtory of the She-Pope.

* Impudens aliquis nebulo interpolavit ſcripta Platinæ. Audivit ex Antonio Heetueldio, ampliſſimo laudatiſſimoque viro, conſulari Lovanienſi, dixiſſe ſibi ſæpius Engelbertus Boonius . . . vidiſſe ſe Romæ in Bibliotheca Vaticana, antiquiſſima Platinæ exemplaria manuſcripta, ſedulo examinaſſe, & de Joanne fœmina ne literam quidem reperiſſe. *Bernartius, de utilitate legendæ hiſt. lib. ii, pag.* 111.

(49) Cooke, on the She-Pope, *p.* 46, 47.

(50) Ib. *p.* 47, 48.

(51) Spanhem. ubi ſupra, *p.* 64.

† *Here are Platina's words in Joanne VIII, folio m.* 140. Hæc quæ dixi vulgo feruntur: incertis tamen & obſcuris auctoribus: quæ ideo ponere breviter, & nude inſtitui: ne obſtinate nimium & pertinaciter omiſiſſe videar: quod fere omnes affirmant: erremus etiam nos hac in re cum vulgo: quamquam appareat ea quæ dixi ex his eſſe: quæ fieri poſſe creduntur.

(52) Coëffeteau, Réſponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 504, 505.

(53) The paſſages ſuppreſſed in his Hiſtory of Francis I, and of Charles IX, are to be found in the Dutch editions.

(54) Coëffeteau, ubi ſupra, *p.* 507.

(55) *Father* Mabillon, Muſei Ital. *Tom. i, p.* 27, *ſays alſo* Martinum Polonum primum eſſe hujus fabulæ ſi non auctorem, ſaltem narratorem. *Scrarius is of the ſame opinion in book i, chap. xlii, of the* Hiſtory of Maience; *but ſee the remark* [*K*] *of the article* POPE (JOAN).

* Pag. 165, near the end.

‡ That cannot be; for Nicholas III made him archbiſhop of Gneſna, and not of Coſenza.

(56) Naudé, Apolog. des Grands Hommes, *p. m.* 559, 560.

** Lib. iii, de Rom. Pont. cap. xxiv.

† 3. Conv. Part ii, cap. v, num. 29, pag. 399.

‡ Anſwer to the Challenge of biſhop Jewell.

⸸ Martinus Polonus fabulis tantum celebris, cætera obſcurus homo, *lib. ii, de utilitate legend. Hiſt. pag.* 113.

(57) Cooke, on the She-Pope, *p.* 63.

⸸⸸ Trithem. de Script. Eccleſ. verbo, Martin.

‡‡ Vir magnæ doctrinæ ſingulariſque vitæ. *Platina, in Vita Victor.* 3.

(58) Cooke, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 64.

(59) De Utilitate legendæ Hiſtoriæ.

that he had the ſirname of *Polonus* from his being a Polander, or at leaſt from his being reckoned ſo [*D*]. Voſſius ſhould have affirmed poſitively that the Martinus Carſulanus, of whom Volaterranus ſpeaks in the beginning of the twenty-ſecond book, is the ſame with this man [*E*]. You will obſerve that his chronicle is ſirnamed Martinian, and that it was printed in French at Paris with the additions of Verneron canon of Liege, and with thoſe *of the chronicle-writer Caſtel*, in folio by Antony Verard (*d*).

(*d*) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 897.

'one Martinus, full of impertinent ſtories (60).' Remond gives as an inſtance of it, the five blunders, from which Cooke has vindicated our Polonus. You will likewiſe pleaſe to obſerve, that du Pleſſis mentions another Martin, *of the order of Friars Minors*, and author of a *Chronicle, intituled*, Flores Temporum, where he ſpeaks of the She-Pope (61). Blondel places him towards the end of the XVth century (62).

[*D*] *He had the ſirname of Polonus from his being a Polander, or at leaſt from his being reckoned ſo.*] He was of the noble family Streperi, *Streporum*, if Starovolſcius is to be credited, who adds, that he was both the firſt and only Polander of that time who got himſelf any reputation by his writings, and that this was the reaſon of his being ſirnamed Polonus. *Quod primus tum ex Polonis, idque ſolus, ſcriptis inter extraneos inclaruerit, unde & Polonus, à gente cognominatus eſt, ac ſi Scylurus ille Scytha, quod alium è Scythia parem ſibi ingenio non habuerit* (63). There is in the library of Vienna a manuſcript of this Martin, where he ſays that he was born in Oppaw a city of Bohemia. *Ipſe Martinus in præfat. Codicis MSi cujuſdam Bibl. Viennenſis, ſeipſum ait de regno* Bohemiæ *oriundum, patria* Opimenſem; *vel, ut in alio MSo, ut & Codice monaſterii Gamingenſis rectius legitur*, Oppavienſem, *obſervante Lambecio lib.* 2. *Bibl. Vindob.* (64). At that time Poland was better known in Italy than Bohemia was, and people gave themſelves very little trouble about Geographical niceties. Thus a man born in any country which bordered upon the kingdom of Poland eaſily paſſed for a Polander. Thoſe who ſay that Martin was a Polander, of the city Carſula or Corſula (65), examine things in a very ſuperficial manner; for if he were of that city, he would be an Italian (66). They tack together what Volaterranus relates of his being a native of Carſula, and what others affirm of his being a Polander; but Volaterranus is miſtaken.

[*E*] *The Martinus Carſulanus, of whom Volaterranus ſpeaks in the beginning of the twenty-ſecond book, is the ſame with this.*] Volaterranus expreſſes himſelf in this manner: 'Pontificum Romanorum ſeu temporum eorum hiſtoriam ſcripſere. . . . . Vincentius & Martinus Carſulanus ordinis ambo Prædicatorum Jo. XXII tempore (67). - - - *The Hiſtory of the Popes of Rome, or of thoſe times was written by . . . . Vincentius and Martinus Carſulanus, both of the order of preachers, in the Pontificate of John XXII.*' He had ſaid elſewhere (68), in giving a catalogue of the famous Dominicans, 'Martinus Pœnitentiarius urbis, patria Carſulanus quam Caſcinam vocant, chronicam ſcripſit quam Martinianam vocant, Jo. XXII tempore. - - - *Martin Penitentiary of Rome, and born at Carſula, which they call Caſcina, writ the chronicle ſirnamed Martinian, in the time of John XXII.*' It is evident that he means the ſame Martin in theſe two paſſages; notwithſtanding which Voſſius doubts of it (69). He commits a greater blunder ſtill, ſince he imagines that Volaterranus ſpeaks of one Vincentius Carſulanus in the beginning of the twenty-ſecond book. He confeſſes that he does not know that author (70). But how ſhould he, ſeeing it is all a chimera? Volaterranus is only ſpeaking of the ſame Vincentius Bellovacenſis whom he had mentioned in book XXI (71).

(60) Florimond de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. ii, num.* 6, *fol.* 367 *verſo.*

(61) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 162.

(62) Blondel, in Examine Quæſt. de Papa fœmina, *p. m.* 8.

(63) Simon Starovolſcius, in Centum Polonor. Elog. *p.* 29.

(64) Sand. Animadv. in Voſſium, de Hiſt. Latin. *p.* 173.

(65) *Among thoſe are Father* Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. ii, p.* 62; *and Dr* Cave, de Script. Eccleſ. *p.* 739.

(66) Volaterranus ſays, *lib. xxi, p. m.* 759, that Carſula is at this day named Caſcina; and *lib. vi, p.* 199, that this town is in Umbria.

(67) Volaterran. *lib. xxii, init. p.* 783.

(68) Ib. *lib. xxi, p.* 759.

(69) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *lib. ii, cap. lx, p.* 485, *& cap. lxiv, p.* 507.

(70) De eo nihil ultra occurrit. *Ibid. p.* 507.

(71) Pag. 759.

POMPONATIUS (PETER) was born at Mantua, the ſixteenth of Sptember 1462 (*a*). He was a man of ſo ſmall a ſtature, that he wanted but little of being a dwarf (*b*); but he was endowed with excellent parts, and accounted one of the greateſt Philoſophers of his age. He taught Philoſophy at Padua with a wonderful reputation, having the famous Achillini for his antagoniſt, whoſe puzzling objections would have often confounded him, had it not been for his ſkill in ſhifting them off with a witty jeſt [*A*]. During the dreadful war in which the Venetians were engaged againſt the league of Cambray, he removed to Bologna, where he taught Philoſophy. Though he was married thrice, he never had but one daughter (*c*), to whom he gave twelve thouſand ducats for her portion (*d*). I know that he did not die in the year 1512 (*e*), as Moreri will have it; but the time of his death is unknown to me: I only know that ſome ſay he attained to a very great age (*f*), and others, that he died of a retention of urine in the ſixty-third year of his life (*g*). His dead body was removed to Mantua, where cardinal Hercules de Gonzagua cauſed it to be decently buried (*h*). That great Philoſopher

(*a*) Laucas Gauricus, in Schemat. *Tract. IV, fol.* 57, *verſo.*

(*b*) Erat puſillus corpore homuncio quodammodo nanus. *Ibid.*

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) See the remark [*B*] towards the end.

(*f*) Obiit ſenio confectus. *Ibid.*

(*g*) Sexageſimo tertio ætatis anno ſtranguria oborta Bononiæ fato functus eſt. *Jovius, in Elog. cap. lxxi, p. m.* 165.

(*h*) Ibid.

[*A*] *His ſkill in ſhifting them off with a witty jeſt.*] This I find in Jovius. 'In coronis, *ſays he* (1), confeſſuque doctorum, quum exercitatione perutili ad prætoriam porticum diſputaretur, ita mirus evadebat, ut ſæpe ancipiti, & cornuto Achillini enthymemate circumventus, ſuperfuſo facetiarum ſale, adverſarii impetum, ex illis gyris, & mæandris explicatus eluderet. - - - *In large companies, and in an aſſembly of the learned, while they were diſputing upon ſerious and uſeful points, he had ſuch a wonderful art of evading, that oftentimes being hard preſſed by a ſharp and piercing argument of Achillini, he had recourſe to a witty jeſt, and thus eluding his adverſary's attack, extricated himſelf out of the labyrinth he was in.*' Nothing can be more convenient in a diſpute than this talent of Pomponatius: If you are not able to anſwer an argument, if you find it puzzling and inſoluble, you may get off with a witty jeſt; all the laughing men will be of your ſide, and your adverſary will be confounded.

Solventur riſu tabulæ, tu miſſus abibis (2).

He laugh'd and jeer'd at, you diſcharg'd the court.

It is upon ſuch an occaſion that this maxim proves true,

- - - - Ridiculum acri
Fortius & melius magnas plerunque ſecat res (3).

- - - - *A waggiſh ſneer*
Doth hit the great ones more than a ſevere.
CREECH.

I knew a Profeſſor of Philoſophy, who made himſelf dreaded only upon this account. He was a man of no depth, and would have been eaſily confounded in a public diſputation, had it not been for his jeſts and ſometimes even for his low puns, which ſet the aſſembly a laughing. The ſtrongeſt objections came to nothing by that means, and he was ſo fully perſuaded that it was the beſt way of anſwering a puzzling argument, that he made uſe of it, even when he might have made a ſerious and ſolid anſwer. But after all, men of ſenſe do not reſt ſatisfied with ſuch a method; they laugh as well as others, but they adjudge the victory to thoſe who deſerve the honour of it. Paul Jovius

(1) Paul. Jovius, in Elog. *cap. lxxi, p. m.* 164.

(2) Horat. Sat. I, lib. ii, ver. ult.

(3) Idem, Sat. X, lib. i, ver. 14.

loſopher was brought into trouble by the Monks, on account of his book concerning the immortality of the ſoul [*B*], and was ſuſpected of impiety. The clamours raiſed againſt him, and the books publiſhed againſt his tract, did not make him alter his opinion:

obſerves, that Achillini prevailed in a diſputation by the inſuperable ſtrength of his doctrine; though Pomponatius, his antagoniſt, made the aſſembly merry with his jeſts, and uſed many ſly tricks. *Æmulum in corona veteratoriè diſputantem, & riſum ſalſa dicacitate ſæpius excitantem, ipſo invicto doctrinæ robore ſuperabat* (4). I muſt obſerve, by the by, that Pomponatius made uſe of his talent like a cunning man, to get the ſcholars of Achillini, who was a plain man, and unfit for intrigues (5).

[*B*] *He was brought into trouble by the Monks, on account of his book concerning the immortality of the ſoul.*] Theſe are Jovius's words: *Exorto bello Veneto, poſt Achillini mortem Bononiæ profeſſus eſt; ubi cucullatos ſacerdotes contra ſe in caput, & nominis famam vehementiſſimè concitavit; edito ſcilicet volumine, quo animas poſt corporis mortem interituras, ex ſententia Ariſtotelis probare nitebatur; ſecutus Aphrodiſæi placita, cujus dogmate ad corrumpendam juventutem, diſſolvendamque Chriſtianæ vitæ diſciplinam, nihil peſtilentius induci potuit* (6). Jovius acts here the part of an Hiſtorian, and of a judge: he ſays not only that Pomponatius endeavouring to prove, that the ſoul of man is not immortal, according to Ariſtotle's opinion, expoſed himſelf to the perſecutions of the Monks, but alſo, that it is the moſt pernicious doctrine that ever was, and the moſt proper to corrupt youth and Chriſtian morality. He is certainly much more in the right, when he keeps within the bounds of an Hiſtorian, than when he ſets up for a judge; for it is not at all material, whether Ariſtotle believed the mortality of the ſoul, or whether, according to the principles laid down by him, one cannot well prove that it is not mortal. And therefore if Pomponatius maintained only, that any one who ſticks to Ariſtotle's principles, muſt needs own that it dies with the body, his opinion is not pernicious, provided he acknowledges the immortality of the ſoul: but he expreſsly and formally acknowledges it. He examines Ariſtotle's hypotheſis; he declares what may be ſaid for or againſt that hypotheſis; he brings in the Philoſophical reaſons that were alledged at that time, to prove that the ſoul is mortal or immortal; he obſerves wherein the ſtrength or the weakneſs of the arguments lies on both ſides, and then he concludes, that there being no demonſtrative reaſon for the mortality or immortality of the ſoul, that queſtion ought to be looked upon as a problematical one. Now, ſays he, ſince it belongs to GOD to decide the problematical queſtions about which men diſpute, let us enquire whether he teaches us that our ſouls are immortal, and let us keep to his deciſion, as a definitive and infallible ſentence. Afterwards, he proves by the Old and New Teſtament, that there is a future life, and declares that his faith is grounded upon that. Theſe are his words: (7) *His itaque ſic ſe habentibus, mihi (ſalva ſaniori ſententia) in hac materia dicendum videtur, quòd quæſtio de immortalitate animæ eſt neutrum problema, ſicut etiam de mundi æternitate: mihi namque videtur quòd nullæ rationes naturales adduci poſſunt cogentes animam eſſe immortalem, minuſque probantes animam eſſe mortalem, ſicut quamplures Doctores tenentes eam immortalem declarant . . . . . quapropter dicemus ſicut Plato I de Legibus certificare de aliquo cum multi ambigunt ſolius eſt Dei; cum itaque tam illuſtres viri inter ſe ambigant, non niſi per Deum hoc certificari poſſe exiſtimo.* . . . . (8) *Quapropter dico quòd ante donum vel adventum gratiæ, multifariam per Prophetas, & bona ſupernaturalia hanc quæſtionem Deus terminavit, ut manifeſtè per vetus Teſtamentum eſt videre; noviſſimè autem per Filium, quem conſtituit hæredem univerſorum, per quem fecit & ſæcula eam quæſtionem dilucidavit, ſicut ſcribit Apoſtolus Epiſt. ad Hebræos.* . . . . (9) *Quantò lux diſtat à lucido, & veritas à vero, & quantò cauſa infinita eſt potior effectu finito, tantò efficacius hoc demonſtrat immortalitatem animæ; quare ſi quæ rationes probare videntur mortalitatem animæ, ſunt falſæ & apparentes, cum prima lux, & prima veritas oſtendant oppoſitum, ſi quæ verò videntur probare ejus immortalitatem, veræ quidem ſunt & lucidæ, ſed non lux & veritas: quare hæc ſola via inconcuſſa & ſtabilis eſt, cæteræ vero ſunt fluctuantes.* . . . . . (10) QUARE INDUBIE (11) *ipſam immortalem eſſe aſſerendum eſt: verùm ea non via incedendum eſt quâ hujus ſeculi ſapientes inceſſerunt, qui cum ſapientes ſe dixerunt ſtulti facti ſunt, quiſquis enim hac via procedet ut exiſtimo ſemper incertus & vagus fluctuabit.* How can ſuch a man be accuſed of impiety? How can he be taxed with denying the immortality of the ſoul? At this rate one might affirm, that all Divines bring into queſtion the Trinity, the Incarnation, Tranſubſtantiation, the Reſurrection, and, in general, all the doctrines which they ground only on revelation, without pretending that they are diſcovered to us by the light of reaſon. Will not the holy Scriptures, being once acknowledged to be the word of GOD, as effectually produce the belief of the immortality of the ſoul, as a Geometrical demonſtration (12). Jovius gives a very wrong judgment of that work of Pomponatius. Had he ſaid in general, that the denying of the immortality of the ſoul deſtroys morality, he would have ſaid a thing which is looked upon as a common notion, though ſome are of opinion it is not ſo certain as it ſeems to be; for, ſay they, if we conſider what ſort of life the Chriſtians live, their leudneſs, ſlanders, cheats, and whatever they do to get money and preferments, or to ſupplant their competitors, we ſhall find that they could not be worſe, though they did not believe a future ſtate. It will be found, generally ſpeaking, that they only forbear doing ſuch things as are attended with infamy, or a capital puniſhment: two curbs, which would put a ſtop to the corruption of an impious man, *cæteris paribus*, as well as to theirs. But this is a ſubject that would require a particular treatiſe.

FACTS concerning the treatiſe of Pomponatius concerning the Immortality of the Soul.

When I conſider that Pomponatius did publickly acknowledge, that we cannot be ſure of the immortality of the ſoul by the light of reaſon; I do not know what to think of the diſtinction which he is ſaid to have made before his judges. The thing is related by la Mothe le Vayer in the following manner, ‘ Such a ‘ dexterity proved very ſucceſsful not long ago to ‘ Pomponatius. That Philoſopher having declared ‘ with a peripatetical liberty and warmth, that he ‘ did not believe the immortality of the ſoul, was pro‘ ſecuted by the Inquiſition; but he got off by virtue ‘ of this explanation, that he did not believe it, pro‘ perly ſpeaking, ſince he knew it demonſtratively, as ‘ he explained himſelf in a long diſcourſe to ſome ‘ judges, who had been formerly his ſcholars, and ‘ whoſe favour he ſtood pretty much in need of at ‘ this time (13).’ I ſhould rather think that he diſtinguiſhed between faith and ſcience, than between ſcience and opinion, that is, he confeſſed to them that he had no demonſtration of the immortality of the ſoul; but that he believed it as an article of faith revealed in the Scripture, and decided by the councils (14). However it be, it is ſaid, he was not ſorry that his book ſhould be confuted, and that he wiſhed, the pernicious poiſon that was in it might be deſtroyed by the antidote of Javellus's anſwer. This the Jeſuit Antony Sirmond obſerves againſt a man, who had publiſhed in France Pomponatius's tract without that anſwer. *Quem repugnante autore neſcio quis curioſus, aut impius, novis typis juſſerat in lucem exire ſolitarium & ſine reſponſione Javelli, quam ipſe Pomponatius ſcripta ad eum epiſtola ita olim comprobarat, ut palam rogaret edici, ſe quoque ſuffragante, perſperſum libro ſuo venenum hoc antidoto niſi diluatur, peſtiferum eſſe, ac toti humano generi extimeſcendum* (15). I think this Philoſopher bethought himſelf too late of this charitable office; for he maintained his firſt book twice againſt Niphus, and once againſt Ambroſe, archbiſhop of Naples. This you will find in the ſame Sirmond (16); but he ſays nothing of the book publiſhed by Contarinus, in the year 1516, againſt that of Pomponatius, which appeared very ſolid to that Philoſopher. ‘ Edidit juvenis ‘ adhuc (trigeſimum enim tertium ætatis annum tunc ‘ agebat) librum contra judicium Petri Mantuani docto‘ ris ſui . . . . argumenta autem illa firma ad proban‘ dum & gravia fuiſſe, opuſque totum valde elabora‘ tum perſpicitur, quia acutiſſimus ille phyſicus in li‘ bro quo defendit opinionem illam ſuam acriter op‘ pugnatam ab eo quem inſtruxerat, tradit eum librum ‘ & doctiſſimum omnium & uberrimum eſſe qui omni ‘ tempore materiam illam perſecuti ſunt: additque vi‘ deri prorſus eum divina opera & manu fabricatum

‘ fuiſſe

---

(4) Jovius, ubi ſupra, *cap. lvii, p.* 134.

(5) Ipſo Pomponatio acri æmulo inſidioſa ambitione ſcholam ejus depopulante. Erat enim à ſumma ingenii ſimplicitate ambiendi, adulandique prorſus imperitus. *Ibid.*

(6) Jovius, ubi ſupra, *cap. lxxi, p.* 164.

(7) Petrus Pomponatius, de Immortalitate Animæ, *cap. xv, & ult. pag. m.* 124.

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 125.

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 126.

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 128.

(11) *Note, that his laſt chapter is intituled,* In quo ponitur ultima concluſio in hac materia, quæ ſententia mea videtur indubie ſuſtinenda.

(12) See, above, the article PERROT (NICOLAS), citations (46) and (47).

(13) La Mothe le Vayer, Dialogue de la Diverſité des Religions, *pag. m.* 294, 295. *It is the laſt of the five dialogues of* Oraſius Tubero.

(14) Animam eſſe immortalem eſt articulus fidei, ut patet per Symbolum Apoſtolorum & Athanaſii. *Pomponatius, ubi ſupra, p.* 126.

(15) Antoninus Sirmondus, de Immortalitate Animæ, *pag.* 1, 2. *His book was printed at Paris in the year* 1635, *in* 8*vo.*

(16) Ibid. in Appendice, *p.* 19, 20.

opinion: he made ſeveral replies, and inſtead of giving ground, went on ſteadily, keeping to his firſt corrective [*C*], viz. that the divine authority of the ſcripture was to him an unſhaken foundation, on which he grounded his belief of the immortality of the

‘ fuiſſe (17). - - - - *He publiſhed while he was ſtill a young man (for he was then in the thirty-third year of his age) a book againſt the doctrine of his maſter Pomponatius .... It plainly appears that his arguments were ſtrong and weighty, and that the piece in general was extremely well finiſhed, ſince that ingenious Natural Philoſopher, in a book where he defends his opinion that was ſo ſmartly attacked by his own ſcholar, declared that his performance was abundantly more learned and copious, than any thing which had been ever writ upon that ſubject, and that he truly looked upon it as a compoſition altogether divine.*’ Why then did he not wiſh that this anſwer of Contarinus ſhould be printed, for the time to come, with his treatiſe, as we are told that he wiſhed ſuch a thing as to Javellus's anſwer? Niphus wrote againſt Pomponatius by Leo the tenth's order. On the contrary, others ſay, that Pomponatius compoſed his tract, only to pleaſe that Pope; which is confuted by la Mothe le Vayer. I ſhall ſet down ſomewhat at large what he ſays upon this ſubject; there are ſome things in it whereby the text of this remark will be illuſtrated. ‘ I need not enlarge upon theſe conſiderations (18), ſince every body may ſee what thoſe two great adverſaries, Pomponatius and Niphus, wrote upon this ſubject above a hundred years ago. Whereupon I muſt adviſe my reader to place among the idle fancies of Poſtel, a man who is known to have had very dangerous intervals, what he aſſerts, that Pomponatius engaged in that diſpute only to pleaſe the ſupreme * pontif, of whom he ſpeaks very diſreſpectfully. For, on the contrary, it is certain that Niphus was pitched upon by Pope Leo X, to whom he dedicated his book, as one of the moſt learned men of his time, and beſt qualified to defend a cauſe as far as it can be defended. And indeed it muſt be confeſſed, that he did all that could be done for a cauſe which lay open to great diſadvantages, being confined, by a mutual agreement, within the bounds of Peripatetiſm; and therefore Pomponatius jeſts upon him, ſaying, that he imitated a Phyſician of Milan, who ordered all ſorts of graſs that grew in a meadow, to be put into a bath, in hopes that ſome of them would prove beneficial to his patient: that in like manner Niphus had made uſe of all ſorts of arguments, tho' never ſo weak and ſophiſtical, to try whether ſome of them would be ſatisfactory. The beſt of all is, that the queſtion was only about Ariſtotle's opinion, which after all, cannot be more prejudicial to truth, than what he ſays of the eternity of the world, or the quinteſſence of the Heavens, two opinions that are laughed at in the ſchools (19).’ Spondanus having ſaid, that all Philoſophers were forbidden by Leo X to teach, that the ſoul of man is mortal, and but one in all men (20), obſerves, that it is thought Pomponatius occaſioned that bull. ‘ Occaſionem autem prædictæ de philoſophis ſanctioni dediſſe dicitur *Petrus Pomponatius* Mantuanus, Jovii in philoſophiâ præceptor: qui enarrans Ariſtotelem & Averroëm Bononiæ, animas poſt corporis mortem interituras ex ſententiâ Ariſtotelis probare conatus, juventutem valdè corruperat; ſe eo tuens quòd philoſophicè loqueretur, ſed aliter, cùm Chriſtianus eſſet, ſentiret (21). - - - *Petrus Pomponatius of Mantua, Jovius's maſter in Philoſophy, is ſaid to have given occaſion to the above-mentioned bull concerning Philoſophers; becauſe while he explained Ariſtotle and Averroës at Bologna, he had very much corrupted the youth, by endeavouring to prove that according to Ariſtotle's opinion the ſoul dies with the body; making this excuſe for himſelf that he ſpoke as a Philoſopher, but that as a Chriſtian, he thought otherwiſe.*’ Theſe words are not exact; for Spondanus ſuppoſes that Pomponatius taught, as Averroës did, that all men have but one ſoul in ſome reſpects, than which nothing can be more falſe. If you read his book, you will find, that having laid down the opinion of Averroës in the third chapter, he declares in the very beginning of the fourth, that it is abſurd and monſtrous, and that he does not think it neceſſary to confute it, becauſe Thomas Aquinas has ſo fully ſhewn the extravagancy of that opinion that the Averroiſts are not able to make any further reply: he has ſo entirely overcome them, ſays he, that the only thing they can do is to to give him hard words. *Tam luculenter tam ſubtiliter adverſus hanc opinionem invehitur, ut ſententia mea nihil intactum, nullamque reſponſionem quam quis pro Averroë adducere poteſt impugnatam relinquat; totùm enim impugnat, diſſipat, & annihilat, nullumque Averroiſtis refugium relictum eſt, niſi convitia & maledicta in Divinum & Sanctiſſimum virum* (22). And therefore, referring his readers to Thomas Aquinas, he only ſhews, that Averroës could not find that chimerical notion in Ariſtotle. ‘ Quamvis hæc opinio tempeſtate noſtra ſit multùm celebrata, & fere ab omnibus pro conſtanti habeatur eam eſſe Ariſtotelis, mihi tamen videtur quod nedum in ſe ſit falſiſſima, verum inintelligibilis, & monſtroſa, & ab Ariſtotele prorſus aliena; imò exiſtimo quòd tanta fatuitas nunquam fuerit nedum credita, verùm excogitata: Et primò quidem de ejus falſitate nihil novi intendo adducere, ſed tantùm lectorem remittere ad ea quæ latinorum decus Divus Thomas Aquinas .... ſed quoad ſecundum hæc paucula quæ mihi plenam fidem faciunt adducere ſtatui, videlicet hoc alienum eſſe ab Ariſtotele, verùm hoc eſſe figmentum, & monſtrum ab Averroë confictum (23). - - - *Though this opinion be very current in our days, and almoſt univerſally allowed to be Ariſtotle's, yet to me it ſeems not only extremely falſe in itſelf, but likewiſe unintelligible, monſtrous, and entirely contrary to Ariſtotle's ſentiments; nay I am truly perſuaded, that ſuch a fooliſh conceit, far from being believed, was never thought of: and firſt as to the falſeneſs of it I ſhall ſay nothing new, but only refer the reader to what Thomas Aquinas, that honour to Latin authors .... but in the ſecond place I ſhall mention a few things which have fully convinced me, that this opinion was entirely foreign to Ariſtotle, and is indeed the monſtrous production of Averroës.*’ Nevertheleſs, it may ſaid that he was one of thoſe who occaſioned the bull of Leo X, of which he made no great account. It was read and approved by the Fathers of the council of Lateran, in the eighth ſeſſion, in the month of December 1513, and he wrote his book concerning the immortality of ſoul in the year 1516 (24). From whence we may infer, by the by, that Moreri, Konig, and ſeveral others are miſtaken, who place his death in the year 1512. According to the calculation of his nativity, mentioned by Gauricus, he was born in the year 1462. But according to Jovius, he died in the ſixty-third year of his life, and therefore he muſt have died in 1525. Freherus (25) ſays, that he flouriſhed in 1530, which is a miſtake.

[*C*] *He made ſeveral replies, and inſtead of giving ground, went on ſteadily, keeping to his firſt corrective.*] Having no other book of Pomponatius but his treatiſe *de immortalitate animæ*, I am not able to give a Chronological Hiſtory of the diſpute that was occaſioned by it. All that I can do is to make uſe of what I find in Mr le Noble. I do not take the account he gives of it to be altogether exact, and I perceive ſeveral omiſſions in it; but I am apt to believe that the things contained in it are true, and I muſt be contented with what he ſays, ſince I can have no better information (26). ‘ That tract (27) made a great noiſe, and when it came out at Venice, Pomponatius adds, that the Monks, whom he denotes by the word *Cucullati*, raiſed great clamours againſt his doctrine. .... (28) Thoſe *Cucullati* inveighed in their ſermons againſt Pomponatius, as againſt a downright Heretic, cauſed the reading of that treatiſe to be forbidden by the Patriarch, whom that Philoſopher calls a man of a moſt holy life, but very ignorant in Philoſophy and Divinity; and afterwards, by a decree of the ſenate, the Bookſellers were forbidden to ſell it .... A man of letters .... wrote againſt that treatiſe with great moderation .... (29) Pomponatius compoſed an apology in anſwer to that author: in the two firſt books of that apology, he anſwered, paragraph by paragraph, all the arguments alledged againſt his doctrine, and proved again, that Ariſtotle did not believe the immortality of the ſoul, and that it could not be proved by natural reaſons. In the third book he very much blames the violent anger of Brother

‘ Ambroſe

(17) Johan. Caſa, in Vita Gaſparis Contareni, *p. m.* 184.

(18) That is, whether Ariſtotle teaches the Immortality of the Soul.

* Lib. i, de orb. concord.

(19) La Mothe le Vayer, de l'Immortalitate de l'Ame, *pag.* 136, 137, *of the 4th volume of his works in 12mo.*

(20) You will ſee the words of that bull towards the end of the remark [*L*] of the article SPINOZA.

(21) Spondanus, Annal. Eccleſ. *ad ann.* 1513, *num.* 20, *p. m.* 308.

(22) Pomponat. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 8, 9.

(23) Ibid.

(24) Finis impoſitus eſt huic tractatui per me Petrum filium Joannis Nicolai Pomponatii de Mantua die 24 menſis Septembris anno Chriſti 1516 Bononiæ. *Ibid.*

(25) In Theatro, *p.* 1441.

(26) Le Noble, Tableaux des Philoſophes, *Tom. ii, p.* 80.

(27) That is, the tract concerning the Immortality of the Soul.

(28) Ib. *p.* 81.

(29) Ib. *p.* 82.

the ſoul. His tract *de Incantationibus* was alſo accounted a very dangerous book [*D*]. He did not want apologiſts (*i*); but the only thing that ſome alledge in his juſtification is, that he renounced his Atheiſm [*E*]. If the charge of impiety laid upon him was

only

Ambroſe of Naples, of the order of the hermits of St Auguſtin, who had been made biſhop ſome few days before. He complains, that preaching his lent ſermons in the cathedral church of Mantua, he had ſpoke very injuriouſly of him from the pulpit, calling him publickly an heretical and impious man, and falſely charging him with not believing the reſurrection and the immortality of the ſoul. He therefore declares, that he believes that ſouls are immortal, and that he is ready to die in defence of that truth; but that he is fully perſuaded of it, becauſe God hath revealed it to men, and not becauſe the light of reaſon teaches it, and that if Brother Ambroſe will give him good reaſons for the contrary, he is ready to hear him and change his opinion.' Afterwards he ſays, that the patriarch of Venice wrote to Peter Bembo, who was at Rome, *to deſire him to get that tract concerning the immortality of the ſoul, condemned by the Pope*. Bembo read it, *and tho' he found nothing in it contrary to truth, yet, according to the duty of his place, he communicated it to the maſter of the apoſtolical palace, who having read it, was of Bembo's opinion, that it contained nothing but what was agreeable to the doctrine of the moſt celebrated doctors of the Chriſtian religion* (30).

‘ (31) Afterwards, as it is uſual to grow hot by much diſputing, and to carry things too far, he (32) maintains and endeavours to prove, that the immortality of the ſoul is repugnant to natural reaſon, and that nothing can be more injurious to faith, than to pretend to prove it by natural arguments. . . . (33). When Pomponatius had made this apology, a new book, written by Auguſtin Niphus, a Philoſopher, came out againſt his firſt treatiſe concerning the immortality of the ſoul. Pomponatius anſwered it by another tract, intituled *Defenſorium*, wherein he ſhews Niphus's ignorance, further proves what he had advanced, and at laſt concludes that work with theſe words: if Chriſt is raiſed from the dead, we ſhall likewiſe riſe, and if we riſe, the ſoul is immortal. But it is certain that Chriſt is raiſed; therefore it is true that the ſoul is immortal. This is, ſays he, the only ſolid argument whereby the immortality of the ſoul can be proved: whoever is not contented with it, does not deſerve the name of Chriſtian, and does not know the excellency of faith, which ought to have the firſt place in all our reaſonings, and is alone ſufficient to lay down in a ſolid manner what cannot be maintained any other way.'

We ſhall ſee below, that Mr le Noble cenſures ſome of theſe thoughts of Pomponatius.

[*D*] *His tract* de incantationibus *was accounted a very dangerous book.*] It appears from it, that he believed nothing of what is ſaid about Magic and Witchcraft, and he lays great ſtreſs on I know not what virtues that ſome men have had, whereby they produced miraculous effects. He alledges many inſtances of it; but his adverſaries do not allow that they are true, or free from Magic, and wonder that Zacutus ſhould think himſelf obliged in conſcience to believe them. Here is a paſſage of Theophilus Raynaud (34). ‘ Exempla quæ ad ſpecialem aliquorum hominum proprietatem individualem ad miros effectus præſtandos, præſertim ſanationum, à Pomponatio addenſantur; vel fabuloſa ſunt, vel Magica, ut Andreas Laurentius capite (35) illo 4. contendit. Ridiculè autem Zacutus (36) dicta q. 53. inter *magnos autores quibus fidem abrogaſſe piaculum propè eſſe dicit*, numerat Pomponatium in Opere de Incantationibus, exempla illa recenſentem. - - - *The many examples which Pomponatius brings to prove, that there is a ſpecial and individual virtue in ſome men to perform wonderful things, particularly in the cure of diſeaſes, are either falſe, or owing to Magic, as Andreas Laurentius affirms. But Zacutus ridiculouſly places Pomponatius, with reſpect to thoſe examples in his book* de Incantationibus, *among the great authors whom he reckons it a ſort of impiety not to believe.*' He refers us to his *Theologia Naturalis*, wherein the following words againſt that book of Pomponatius are to be found (37). ‘ Nec minor Pomponatii culpa, qui (38) idem conatus in opere de incantationibus ad extremum tamen ſubjicit opus ſuum correctioni Eccleſiæ, à qua ut rectè ſuprà divinavit (39) Carpentarius aliud expectare non potuit, quàm unam lineam à principio ad finem uſque ductam. Ita enim factum eſt, collocato ante aliquot annos, inter reprobata, illo opere, in quo Buccafferr. l. de divinat. per ſomnium lect. 29. ait aſſeri à Pomponatio, *multa falſa, & multas ac magnas nugas*. - - - *Nor was Pomponatius leſs to blame, who having attempted the ſame thing in his book* de Incantationibus, *did however at laſt ſubmit it to the cenſure of the church, from which, as Carpentarius rightly gueſſed above, he could expect no other thing but to have one line drawn quite acroſs from the beginning to the end. For ſo it happened a few years ago, when that book was condemned, in which, according to Buccaffer. l. de divinat. &c. Pomponatius aſſerts many things that are falſe, and many that are exceedingly trifling.*' A Fellow-Jeſuit of Theophilus Raynaud, expreſſed himſelf with greater force. ‘ Pomponatii de Incantationibus opuſculum certè miratus fui tam diu tolerari ab Eccleſiâ; nunc recens & meritò in Romano Indice damnatur; veriſſimum enim quod ab Antonio Mirandulano ** ſcriptum, hoc opere Pomponatium, ſe nec philoſophum bonum, nec quod fœdiùs Chriſtianum bonum exhibuiſſe, cum effectus omnes mirificos cœlorum influctionibus adſcribit; adeò ut velit & religiones & leges earumque latores ab iis dependere. Quod prorſus impium (40). - - - *I was certainly ſurprized, that this treatiſe of Pomponatius* de Incantationibus *was ſo long ſuffered by the Church. It has lately with very good reaſon been put in the catalogue of condemned books; for it is moſt true what Antony of Mirandula ſays, that Pomponatius, by this performance, has neither ſhewed himſelf to be a good Philoſopher, nor, which is ſtill worſe, a good Chriſtian, ſince he aſcribes all wonderful effects to the influence of heavenly bodies, and would have religion, laws, and law-givers, to depend upon them: which is a monſtrous impiety.*' Pomponatius ſpeaking of the cures that are aſcribed to the virtue of relics, ſaid a thing which at firſt ſeems to be offenſive, but one might give it a very good turn according to the common hypotheſis. He affirms, that the bones of a dog would as effectually produce a cure, if the ſick perſon, who relies on the virtue of relics, formed the ſame imagination concerning thoſe bones, as concerning the bones and aſhes of martyrs. *Pomponatius dicere non veretur in ſanatione acquiſita ex veneratione Oſſium Divis aſcriptorum, ſi eſſent oſſa canis & tanta & talis de eis haberetur imaginatio non minus ſubſequeretur ſanitas* (41). The controverſial writers of the Church of Rome being not able to deny, that ſome ſuppoſititious relics have wrought miracles, as it is pretended, ſay, that the good intention of thoſe who have recourſe to them, procured them ſuch a reward from God.

[*E*] *The only thing that ſome alledge in his juſtification is, that he renounced his Atheiſm.*] Helidæus, a famous Phyſician of Forli, ſaid, that his maſter Pomponatius was an Atheiſt. John Wierus hopes that this Philoſopher did not die in that condition. *Pomponatium ante redditum ſpiritus extremi halitum reſipuiſſe ex ſingulari Dei miſeratione, nec permanſiſſe* ἄθεον, *ſperare volo. Talem etenim fuiſſe, à clariſſim. medicinæ ornamento D. Helidæo Forolivienſi, ejus olim diſcipulo non ſemel auditum eſt* (42). Voëtius tells us that Gratarolus made an apology for Pomponatius, and is ſo equitable as not to follow the ſtream. He owns, that moſt of the Catholic writers, and ſome Proteſtant authors, call that Philoſopher an Atheiſt (43), and lays ſome ſtreſs upon the remark of the apologiſt, that the opinion of Pomponatius about the mortality of the ſoul, concerned only Ariſtotle's hypotheſis. He ſhould have ſaid, that this is a plain proof of that author's innocency, unleſs he deſigned to hide his pernicious doctrine under that cover. Voëtius alledges that reſtriction. ‘ *Gul. Gratarolus Medicus Italus* (quem propria ſcripta uno volumine in 8vo Baſileæ edita, & teſtimonium *Bezæ in epiſtolis*, ut & *in dedicatione libelli* cujuſdam, aliorumque præterea doctorum virorum ſuffragia, quorum familiaritate Baſileæ & alibi uſus eſt, à Pietatis zelo commendant) eum contra calumniatores tuetur, & piè pro eo tempore vitam cum morte commutaſſe

‘ mutaſſe

(*i*) See the remark [*E*].

(30) Ib. *p.* 83.

(31) Ib. *p.* 84.

(32) That is, Pomponatius in his apology.

(33) Le Noble, ubi ſupra, *p.* 85, 86.

(34) Theoph. Raynaudus, de Stigmatiſmo ſacro & profano, §. *ii*, *cap. iv*, *p. m.* 321, 322.

(35) *That is, of the firſt book* de Strumis.

(36) *That is, of the firſt book* Medicorum principum Hiſtoriæ.

(37) Id. in Theologia Naturali, *Diſtinct. III*, *Quæſt. II*, *Art. V*, *num.* 139, *p. m.* 200, 201.

(38) That is, to reject what is ſaid of the devil's operations.

(39) *That is*, Digr. IV, in Alcino.

** Lib. vi, de ſingulari certamine.

(40) Mart. Delrio, Diſquiſit. Magicar. *lib. i*, *cap. iii*, *pag. m.* 22.

(41) Jo. Wierus, de Præſtigiis Dæmonum, *lib. v*, *cap. xvii*, *p. m.* 402. *He quotes the 2d book of* Pomponatius, de Incantamentis, *cap. xii.*

(42) Wierus, ib. *lib. vi*, in Epilogo Operis, *p. m.* 569.

(43) Voëtius, Diſput. Theol. *Tom. i*, *p.* 197.

only grounded on his book concerning the immortality of the ſoul, no accuſation was ever more impertinent [*F*], and a more ſignal inſtance of the unjuſt prepoſſeſſion of thoſe

mutaſſe ſcribit: in *epiſtol. dedicator.* Operibus Pomponatii anno 1567. Baſil. editis præfixâ. . . . . Illud penitus conſiderandum, quod reſpondet: Eum ex mente Ariſtotelis negaſſe animæ immortalitatem: quod, ut illi cum aliis philoſophis ac Theologis ita judicantibus commune fuit (*Plutarcho, Galeno, Aphrodiſæo, Juſtino Martyre, Theodoreto, Origene, Nyſſeno, Nazianzeno, Cajetano in* 3. *de Anima*) ſic non debet hic fraudi eſſe: niſi probari poſſet illum ſub hoc ſchemate ſubdolè & tutò voluiſſe hunc Atheiſmum ſpargere in animos auditorum. Niſi itaque alia ex dictis, ſcriptis, factis ejus certior demonſtratio ſuppetat, utique in benigniorem partem, immo in optimam accipienda ſunt illa, quæ ille pro modulo & conditione ſua de Fato, Providentia Dei, & prædeſtinatione conſcripſit: in quibus ſi non rei dignitati, & ſolidis Theologis per omnia ſatisfaciat, ſaltem hoc præſtat, ne nigra Atheiſmi nota illi tam peremtoriè inuratur. Hæc ego in re dubia, poſtquam omnia ejus opuſcula præſertim modo nominata videre contigit: qui ante multos annos ex lectione ſolius tract. *de Incantationibus* (ubi placitis Avicennæ & Averrois nimis adhæreſcens, in ſupernaturalibus quibuſdam ſatis miſerè fluctuat) & ex communi aliorum judicio ſiniſtram magis de illo opinionem conceperam (44). - - - *William Gratarolus, an Italian Phyſician, (in high repute for his religious zeal, as it appears from his own writings printed at Baſil in one volume in* 8*vo, and from the teſtimony of Beza in his epiſtles, and in the dedication of a certain book, and likewiſe from the joint ſuffrages of other learned men, with whom he converſed familiarly at Baſil and elſewhere) defends him againſt his falſe accuſers, and in the epiſtle dedicatory, prefixed to the works of Pomponatius printed at Baſil in* 1567, *ſays, that he died a pious death for thoſe times. . . . . That part of his anſwer ſhould be thoroughly conſidered, where he ſays that Pomponatius denied the immortality of the ſoul according to the opinion of Ariſtotle: which, ſeeing it was common to him with other Philoſophers and Divines of that opinion* (Plutarch, Galen, &c.) *ought not to redound to his diſadvantage in particular, unleſs it could be proved that he made uſe of that ſcheme in order to inſtil Atheiſm with the greater cunning and ſafety into the minds of his hearers. Wherefore, unleſs ſome more ſolid proof can be alledged from his ſayings, writings, or actions, a more favourable, or rather indeed a more reaſonable, conſtruction ought to be put upon what things he has written, after his way and manner concerning Fate, Providence, and Predeſtination: where if he does not come up in every part to the dignity of his ſubject, and ſatisfy judicious Divines, he at leaſt deſerves not to have the brand of Atheiſm ſo peremptorily fixed upon him. This came to be my opinion in a doubtful matter, when I had peruſed all his works, particularly thoſe above-mentioned; whereas ſome years before, from reading only his treatiſe* de Incantationibus *(where by ſticking too cloſely to the ſentiments of Avicenna and Averroës he is abundantly at a loſs about ſome ſupernatural things) and from the common talk of others, I had imbibed a much worſe opinion of him.*’ I muſt not omit the epitaph which ſomebody made on this Philoſopher: ‘Hic ſepultus jaceo. Quare? neſcio: nec ſi ſcis aut neſcis curo. Si vales, bene eſt: vivens valui. Fortaſſe nunc valeo. Si aut non, dicere nequeo (45). - - - - *Here I lie buried. Why? I do not know: neither do I care whether you know or not. If you are in good health it is well. I was well when I was alive. Perhaps I am ſo now. But if I am, or am not, I cannot tell.*’

[*F*] *If the charge of impiety laid upon him was only grounded on his book concerning the immortality of the ſoul, no accuſation was ever more impertinent.*] In the firſt place, to aſſert, that the principles of Ariſtotle lead us to believe that the ſoul is mortal, is at moſt, but a perſonal reflexion. Whoever ſays ſo, is, at moſt, guilty of doing injuſtice to a man, who was preceptor to the conqueror of Aſia, and the founder of a moſt flouriſhing ſect. But can this be called an impiety? In the ſecond place, ſince Ariſtotle is dead, and conſequently cannot give an account of his faith, and clear the equivocations that are in his books, any one may be allowed to declare againſt him, if he finds in his writings, as many or more plauſible reaſons, to ſhew that he taught the mortality of the ſoul, than to ſhew that he taught it's immortality; and therefore nothing can be more harmleſs, than to convert the opinion of Ariſtotle on this great point into a problem, and to maintain the affirmative or negative, according as the reaſons alledged by him for or againſt the immortality of the ſoul, make a greater impreſſion. If any one does not take his ſenſe right, he does him injuſtice; but after all, it is only a material injury, which Ariſtotle would be obliged to forgive, by imputing it to his own want of exactneſs, and to his own variations and contradictions. *The moſt famous of all his interpreters* (46), *and many others after him, as the two Gregory's, Leſcot, Cajetan, and Simon Portius, have acknowledged, that* the Mortality of the Soul *was a thing altogether neceſſary, according to the doctrine of that Philoſopher* (47). And therefore he muſt needs have advanced ſome maxims, which afford a fair pretence to aſcribe to him ſuch an impious doctrine. It is therefore a moſt ridiculous thing to aſſert, that none but an impious man can have ſuch thoughts of Ariſtotle's doctrine; and conſequently, the pretended impiety of Pomponatius would be grounded on a groſs illuſion. Nay, he could not be ſuſpected, with any ſhew of reaſon, of any deſign prejudicial to the memory of that great founder of the Peripatetics. In the third place I obſerve, that one may aſſert, not only that it appears from his works, that he did not believe the immortality of the ſoul, but alſo that his ſyſtem, ſuch as the ſchoolmen have been pleaſed to explain it, and ſuch as it is explained to this day in the univerſities, cannot afford any proofs of the immortality of the ſoul, and can furniſh us with many arguments for the contrary. For, in ſhort, the principal part of that ſyſtem is, 1. That natural bodies are made up of two ſubſtances, one whereof is called matter, and the other form. 2. That the form of all natural bodies, man only excepted, is a corruptible Being, which never fails to be deſtroyed when the compound periſhes, that is, whenever a ſtone, a tree, a dog, &c. are converted into natural bodies of another kind. From whence it neceſſarily reſults, that thoſe who follow this ſyſtem, can give no proofs of the immortality of the ſoul; for in order to it, they ſhould make it appear, that it is immaterial: but how can they ſhew it, ſince they own, that the ſoul of brutes, though endowed with the faculty of feeling, diſcerning, and deſiring, is material? It is to be obſerved that in Pomponatius's time, they knew of no philoſophical ſyſtem but that of Ariſtotle, ſo that to aſſert, that the immortality of the ſoul could not be proved by the principles of that Philoſopher, and to aſſert that it could not be proved by philoſophical reaſons, was one and the ſame thing. This goes a great way towards excuſing, and even juſtifying the book of Pomponatius; the rather, becauſe the Platonic, or any other ſect, did not afford better proofs. Des Cartes is the only Philoſopher who laid down very ſolid principles concerning this ſubject. He ſays, that all thinking ſubſtances are diſtinct from matter; from whence it neceſſarily follows, that the ſoul of man is a ſpirit, or a ſimple indiviſible Being, and conſequently immortal. No Carteſian will ſcruple to ſay, that the principles of the old Philoſophy cannot afford one good proof of the immortality of the ſoul. Were it not an extravagant thing to maintain, that a Carteſian who ſays ſo is an impious and atheiſtical man? Why then was Pomponatius ſo ill uſed? It will be ſaid, that a Carteſian acknowledges that his ſyſtem affords a demonſtrative proof of the immortality of the ſoul, whereas Pomponatius acknowledged no ſyſtem that afforded ſuch an argument. Such a difference cannot be admitted, but by ſuppoſing that this Philoſopher rejected the Carteſian ſyſtem, though he knew it; but he knew nothing of it, and therefore his fault lies only in not inventing a ſyſtem, according to which whatever thinks is incorporeal and ſpiritual. This is the fault of a great many orthodox men, and conſequently a chimerical one. I further add, that though he had rejected the ſuppoſition whereby whatever thinks is diſtinct from matter, he had done nothing but what is done at this day by men of great parts, who relying intirely on the authority of the Holy Scripture, as Pomponatius did, cannot be juſtly charged with irreligion

(44) Ibid. *pag.* 198.

(45) Konig, Biblioth. *p.* 654.

(46) Alexander Aphrodiſæus.

(47) La Mothe le Vayer, de l'Immortalité de l'Ame, *pag.* 139.

thoſe who perſecute the Philoſophers. For he did not queſtion the immortality of the ſoul; on the contrary, he maintained that it was a moſt certain doctrine, and that he was fully perſwaded of it. He only aſſerted, that the natural reaſons alledged for it, are not ſolid and ſatisfactory. Now, though a good uſe may be made of the opinion he

ligion (48). Laſtly, I obſerve, that nothing can be more unworthy of a Divine, than to cry down a Philoſopher as an impious man, becauſe he declares, that in order to free our minds from the uncertainty of human reaſon, we ought to rely on the word of God, as containing the true foundation and moſt certain proofs of the immortality of our ſouls (49). This is what Pomponatius did, for which he was cruelly perſecuted by the monkiſh tribe. What a ſhameful and horrid thing was this!

I go farther, and ſay, that the Carteſians themſelves, who are convinced of the immortality of the ſoul, becauſe the principles of their Philoſophy appear evident to them, act the part of wiſe men, when they adviſe their readers to have recourſe to faith, as *an anchor of the ſoul, both ſure and ſtedfaſt, and which entereth into that within the veil* (50); that is to ground their belief of this doctrine on the authority of God, which is the true remedy of our uncertainties, and ſupplies the obſcurity of our reaſon. For if they have right notions of things, they ought to believe, that what appears evident to them, does not appear ſo to many other Philoſophers, who oppugn it. I have read in a book of Mr Arnauld, that Gaſſendus's reply to Des Cartes made many diſbelieve at Naples, the immortality of the ſoul (51), becauſe Gaſſendus uſed all his ſkill to enervate the arguments of Des Cartes, concerning that doctrine; which ſhews, that the Carteſian principle is not evident to every body. Nay, it is certain that if ignorant people made uſe of common ſenſe, they could never be ſure of the immortality of their ſouls, whilſt they ſee that the greateſt Philoſophers do not agree about it. Were an ignorant man to blame if he argued in this manner? If Des Cartes's arguments were evident, Gaſſendus could not oppugn them, ſo as to ſatisfy many people; for if Gaſſendus had writ a book wherein he had uſed all his wit and ſkill to prove, that the whole is not greater than it's parts, and that if things equal be taken from things equal, the remainder will not be equal, no body would have been perſuaded of the truth of thoſe aſſertions: and therefore ſince Gaſſendus, and many other great Philoſophers, do not want followers, when they oppoſe Des Cartes's doctrine, they muſt needs oppugn a doctrine that is not evidently true; there is therefore ſome obſcurity in it, it appears true to ſome, and falſe to others: how can I then reſolve the matter, being no ſcholar, and having no ſkill in diſputes? Some of thoſe great men muſt needs be miſtaken, and therefore whatever party I ſide with, I run the hazard of being in an error. People ſhould argue thus, when they ſee that learned men are divided in their opinions. But if they ſhould do ſo, how would they get out of their uncertainties? There is an effectual way for it, as to the immortality of the ſoul, which is to have recourſe to the light of revelation. And therefore if a Carteſian ſhould imitate Pomponatius, he ought to be accounted a wiſe man, and charitable to his neighbour. It is well done of him ſteadily to maintain the truth of his principle, and to anſwer, to the utmoſt of his power, thoſe who may object, that ſubſtances diſtinct from matter are, perhaps, of ſuch a nature as to be able to preſerve their exiſtence without having any thought; and that therefore ſpirituality is not a neceſſary proof of immortality: for if the life of the ſoul conſiſts in thought, it is certain, that a total ceſſation of thought would be a true death of the ſoul; and therefore the ſoul might die without ceaſing to be a ſpiritual ſubſtance, as dogs die without ceaſing to be a corporeal ſubſtance: but after all, if he adviſes his neighbour to rely on the word of God, he is to be commended for it. Note, that Scaliger the Father, one of the greateſt wits of his time, and who was never accounted a libertine, acknowledged, as Pomponatius did, that it is a matter of faith to know whether there is a future life. It has been always ſuſpected or believed, ſays he, but it is ſtill a matter of diſpute to this very day (52).

I ſhall conclude with ſome paſſages of a diſpute that laſted ſome years between a Miniſter of Rotterdam and a Miniſter of Utrecht. The firſt (53) owns, *That tho' he believes that matter is not capable of any ſenſation or knowledge, yet he has no* diſtinct *idea, and no* clear *perception of that truth, and cannot prove it to thoſe who deny it. What I perceive in it,* ſays he, *is confuſed and undiſtinct....* (54). *Can M. Saurin, and his rational colleagues ſay in conſcience, that they have a clear perception and a diſtinct idea of the Immortality of the Soul? Are not theſe propoſitions clear in appearance, that* whatever has a beginning ought to have an end; *that a being, whoſe duration is divided by moments, days, and years, cannot be eternal, becauſe it would be infinite, and that infinite duration would contain an infinite number of moments, and yet there would be but an infinite number of days and years; and therefore there would be as many months and years as moments, which is a palpable abſurdity. An impious man ſays, theſe are clear perceptions, and they appear to him to be ſo.* The deſign of this Miniſter is ſomewhat like that of Pomponatius: he will have us to miſtruſt our reaſon, and to depend on the authority of God (55). Here follows his adverſary's anſwer (56). *I anſwer, that I have a clear perception and a diſtinct idea of the* Immortality of the Soul. *I know that the ſoul is a ſpiritual and indiviſible ſubſtance, which can only be deſtroyed by annihilation: I know that there is a providence, a ſupreme juſtice, a ſupreme felicity, a natural morality, in ſhort, a great many truths, which have a neceſſary connexion with the Immortality of the Soul, and conſequently they would be chimerical notions, if the ſoul was mortal: muſt a Chriſtian Philoſopher be leſs orthodox than Plato? Muſt he give the preference to Epicurus, when he draws up a parallel of the antient Philoſophers?...* (57) *Mr Jurieu confutes himſelf, when he ſays that* thoſe perceptions are clear in appearance: *for if they are only clear in appearance, nothing can be concluded from them in favour of thoſe that are really clear.*

I ſhall make ſome ſhort obſervations upon theſe words of Mr Saurin. I. Mr Jurieu does plainly ſuppoſe, that in order to have a *diſtinct idea*, and a *clear perception* of the ſpirituality of the ſoul, we muſt clearly apprehend, *that matter is not capable of any ſenſation or knowledge.* How comes it then, that Mr Saurin leaves this unanſwered? Should he not have ſaid, that he has a diſtinct idea, and a clear perception, whereby he knows, that an extended ſubſtance cannot have any ſenſation. II. It is not ſufficient to know, that the ſoul *cannot be deſtroyed but by annihilation*; for the ſame may be ſaid of extenſion, and yet trees and beaſts are mortal. Mr Saurin ſhould therefore have expreſſed himſelf thus; *I know that the ſoul cannot ſubſiſt without thought; the diſtinct idea I have of a ſpiritual and indiviſible ſubſtance teaches me, that if it were deprived of thought, it would ceaſe to exiſt.* III. Plato and Epicurus are improperly alledged; for this allegation ſuppoſes that Mr Jurieu is not ſo orthodox as Plato, and that he prefers the doctrine of Epicurus to that of the other antient Philoſophers; which is falſe. He acknowledges the Immortality of the Soul, but he has not a clear idea, and a diſtinct perception of it: he means, that his idea of it is not ſo evident, as that whereby we know the properties of numbers, and the connexion of a local preſence with the extenſion of matter. Do you think that Plato's idea of the Immortality of the Soul was as clear as that? When a man declares, that he does as the generality of mankind do, that is, that his perſuaſion goes farther than his evidence, the charge of unbelief laid upon him is a falſe accuſation. He cannot be accuſed of heterodoxy, ſince he believes what ought to be believed; all that can be ſaid againſt him, is, that he does not act like a Philoſopher. IV. The diſtinction between ideas apparently and really clear, is inſignificant; for the clearneſs of ideas does neceſſarily imply a relation to our minds, and is never ſeparated from appearance; they are always ſtiled or denominated clear from appearance. This is not the caſe with truth. An object may be true, tho' it appears falſe; but an idea, which appears obſcure, is neither really nor apparently clear; and therefore, if the clear ideas of the Immortality of the Soul are inconſiſtent with ideas that are apparently clear, Mr Jurieu's objection is good, he oppoſed, and though the Philoſophers, who make it their buſineſs to enforce the human reaſons, alledged for the immortality of the ſoul [G], ought to be commended and

---

(48) See, above, the end of the remark [*M*], of the article of the firſt DICÆARCHUS; and the remark [*L*], of the article PERROT (NICOLAS).

(49) Hæc ſola via inconcuſſa & ſtabilis eſt, cæteræ verò ſunt fluctuantes *Pomponat. de Immort. Animæ, cap. ult. p. m.* 126. See, above, what Ablancourt ſaid, towards the beginning of the remark [*L*] of his article PERROT (NICOLAS) Sieur d'Ablancourt.

(50) Hebr. vi, 19.

(51) See the remark [*G*].

(52) *Thus I render ſomewhat freely theſe words,* Cæterum eſſe alterum eſſe ab hoc eſſe adeo neſcimus ut quotidianis vel ſuſpicionibus vel perſuaſionibus res etiamnum ſit controverſa, ſola fide res agatur. *Scaliger adverſus Cardanum, Exercit. CCCVII, cap. xxxiii, p. m.* 990. *See the article* PERROT (NICOLAS), ubi ſupra, *citat.* (48), (49), *and* (50).

(53) Jurieu, Religion du Latitudinaire, *p.* 393.

(54) Ib. *p.* 394.

(55) Note, that he does not require we ſhould know, by a clear and diſtinct idea, that authority; that is, that we ſhould evidently know that God has revealed ſuch and ſuch things to us.

(56) Saurin, Juſtification of his Doctrine, *pag.* 467.

(57) Ib. *p.* 468.

good, ſo far is he from confuting himſelf, as his antagoniſt would have it. V. Laſtly, Mr Saurin is very much to blame for not anſwering the objection: he might have confounded Mr Jurieu in that reſpect, who falſly ſuppoſes that thoſe who ſay, that *whatever has a beginning muſt have an end*, go upon this, that an infinite duration would contain as many months and years as moments. He ſuppoſes that they look upon this as a great abſurdity. But he ſhould have known that the Atheiſts aſſert, that the duration of matter had no beginning, and will never end: and therefore they do not look upon the neceſſity of admitting an infinite number of moments, and an infinite number of months, and years, and ages, &c. as a good reaſon to reject a doctrine.

[G] *Though a good uſe may be made of the opinion which Pomponatius oppoſed, and though the Philoſophers who made it their buſineſs to enforce the human proofs of the Immortality of the Soul, ought to be commended.*] What I have to ſay upon this, cannot be better, nor more clearly and nobly expreſſed than in the words of a Divine, who was a follower of Des Cartes, and therefore I ſhall make uſe of no other commentary upon the text of this remark (58). 'It is ſaid that the reading of Gaſſendus's works, led ſome perſons at Naples, into the error of Epicurus, concerning the Mortality of the Soul. It muſt be confeſſed, that the inſtances of that Philoſopher, againſt the Metaphyſical Mediations of Des Cartes, may lead young people, not well confirmed in the Chriſtian faith, into that pernicious error, becauſe he has uſed all his ſkill to ſhew, that reaſon affords no ſolid arguments to prevent our believing, that there is no other diſtinction between the ſoul and the body, than between a thin and ſubtile body and a groſs one. On the contrary, I know that ſome pious perſons are of opinion, that what Des Cartes wrote upon that ſubject, ought to be looked upon as an effect of GOD's providence, who was willing to put a ſtop to the propenſity, which many people of theſe later times ſeem to have for irreligion, and a libertine way of thinking, by a method ſuited to their diſpoſition. They are a ſort of men, who will admit nothing but what may be known by the light of reaſon; they are altogether unwilling to begin with faith; they look upon moſt of thoſe, who profeſs themſelves pious men, as weak-minded people; and it is impoſſible for them to have any ſenſe of religion, becauſe they are poſſeſſed with this notion (which in moſt of them is an effect of their corrupt morals) that whatever is ſaid of another life, is only a fiction, and that the ſoul dies with the body. It ſeems therefore, that the moſt effectual means to remove the greateſt obſtacle to the ſalvation of thoſe men, and prevent the ſpreading of that contagion, was to diſturb their falſe tranquillity, and make them ſenſible of their miſtake, in thinking that it is a piece of weakneſs to believe the Immortality of the Soul. Now have we not reaſon to believe that GOD, who diſpoſes of his creatures as he thinks fit, and makes human means ſubſervient to his providence, deſigned to reclaim thoſe unbelievers, by forcing them to miſtruſt the certainty of their notions, when he raiſed a man ſo well qualified to work upon them, a man who had an extraordinary penetration to dive into the moſt abſtracted ſciences, who wholly applied himſelf to Philoſophy, who openly profeſſed himſelf free from all vulgar prejudices, a quality which they are ſo very fond of, and by that very thing found out a way to convince the moſt incredulous, (if they will but open their eyes to ſee the light) that nothing can be more contrary to reaſon, than to aſſert that the ſoul periſhes with the body. But how did he make it appear? By laying down from clear principles, and ſuch as are only grounded on natural notions, which men of ſenſe cannot but acknowledge, that the ſoul and the body, that is, what thinks, and what is extended, are two ſubſtances wholly diſtinct, ſo that it is impoſſible that extenſion ſhould be a mode of a thinking ſubſtance, and thought a mode of an extended one. This being well proved, (as it is in Des Cartes's Meditations) no libertine, if he has any juſtneſs of thought, can remain convinced, that the ſoul dies with the body. For, &c (59).'

This long paſſage of Mr Arnauld ſhews what advantage may accrue to religion from the hypotheſis oppoſed by Pomponatius: it may be made uſe of againſt ſome libertines, who will ſee before they believe, and who deſpiſe the obſcure arguments alledged by Divines. Nothing can more effectually reclaim thoſe men, than to convince them of the Immortality of the Soul; it is an inlet to the right way, and this firſt ſtep may be attended with happy conſequences. Pomponatius could not work upon them in that manner, he would rather have confirmed them in their error, and conſequently his hypotheſis is more prejudicial than advantageous, in order to convert that ſort of men; and indeed he would be more praiſe-worthy, if, inſtead of giving himſelf ſo much trouble to examine the arguments of the Peripatetics, he had endeavoured to find out better proofs of the Immortality of the Soul, than thoſe which ſeemed weak to him. It is to be obſerved, that Mr Arnauld alledges this particular fact concerning Des Cartes and Gaſſendus, to ſhew the wrong judgment of the Inquiſitors of Rome. *The Cenſors of Rome*, ſays he (60), *little minded the advantage of religion, when they put into their* Index *that book of Des Cartes, wherein he proves the Immortality of the Soul by Philoſophical arguments, more ſolidly than was ever done; and when they put into it none of Gaſſendus's works, not even that wherein he endeavoured, with all his might, to confute thoſe arguments: which is to deprive thoſe, who have no faith, of all human means to free themſelves from their pernicious prejudices againſt that important truth. Is not this to permit the ſwallowing of the poiſon, and hinder the taking of the antidote? This they have done again, by putting into the* Index *another place of Des Cartes concerning the ſame ſubject. For one of his followers, who forſook him as to his Metaphyſical notions, having maintained, in a placart, that, were it not for revelation, one might believe, that thinking is only a modification of matter; Des Cartes thought himſelf obliged to confute ſuch a dangerous doctrine, and ſhew the abſurdity of it; and yet this book is prohibited in the* Index *under this title,* Notæ in programma quodam ſub finem Anni 1654, in Belgio editum; *without condemning the placart at the ſame time. Once more, this is to permit the poiſoning of one's ſelf, and at the ſame time to forbid the uſe of a counter-poiſon.*

I have quoted in the remark [C] an author, whoſe cenſure upon Pomponatius wants ſome reſtriction. Theſe are his words. 'Whereby (61) Pomponatius carried things too far, and did not a little favour the opinions and inclinations of the libertines. Nay, one can hardly forbear calling him an inſolent man, for ſaying, that whoever goes about to prove the Immortality of the Soul by Philoſophical arguments, does not deſerve the name of a Chriſtian; for, on the contrary, there is nothing more proper to diſpoſe the Pagans to hearken to the Goſpel, than to prove before-hand, that reaſon teaches us the Immortality of the Soul, and that therefore men muſt endeavour to make themſelves happy after this life: whereas, nothing would more effectually prevent the converſion of idolaters and libertines, than their believing that the ſoul is mortal, according to the light of reaſon (62). . . . (63). Theſe are the words (64) that have been cenſured; for it is ſo far from being true, that whoever undertakes to prove the Immortality of the Soul by natural reaſons, does a thing unworthy of a Chriſtian; that, on the contrary, nothing is more proper to confirm him in the truth of his religion, than the agreement of reaſon and revelation, tho' the doctrines revealed ought to keep the firſt rank. I was therefore in the right to ſay, that Pomponatius was guilty of great inſolence, in aſſerting that a man, who alledges any arguments beſides thoſe taken from revelation, to prove the immortality of the Soul, does a thing unworthy of a Chriſtian.'

EXAMINATION of the cenſure on Pomponatius, by Mr le Noble.

I will examine this cenſure. The words of Pomponatius, as they are in Mr le Noble's book, may be taken in this ſenſe, that a Chriſtian, who endeavours to ſhew that both reaſon and revelation teach the Immortality

(58) Difficultez propoſées à Mr. Steyaërt, *Part ix, pag.* 81, & *ſeq.*

(59) Mr Arnauld adds here a ſhort and good explication of what he intended to prove.

(60) Difficultez à Mr Steyaërt, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 85.

(61) *That is by what Pomponatius ſays,* that nothing can be more injurious to faith, than to attempt to prove it by natural arguments.

(62) Le Noble, Tableaux des Philoſophes, *Tom. ii, p.* 84, 85.

(63) Ib. *p.* 86.

(64) That is, thoſe that are to be ſeen above in the remark [*C*] at the end of the quotation from Mr le Noble.

and encouraged; yet ſince they are only Philoſophical arguments, every body ought to be allowed to diſpute about them, and to ſay what he thinks of them. The anſwer he made to this objection, that the doctrine of the mortality of the ſoul would induce men to all manner of crimes [*H*], is remarkable. I do not know whether we ought to believe what ſome authors ſay, that this work was condemned to be burnt by the Venetians, and diſowned by the author himſelf [*I*]. One cannot excuſe the audaciouſneſs

mortality of the Soul, does a thing prejudicial to faith, and makes himſelf unworthy of the name he bears. But I think that thoſe words, in Pomponatius's book, ſignify, that a Chriſtian, who has recourſe to any arguments beſides God's authority, becauſe faith, without the help of the light of nature, is not ſufficient to remove his uncertainty, does an injury to revelation, and acts contrary to the principles of a true Chriſtian. Such is my conjecture about the true ſenſe of Pomponatius's words: having not his apologies by me, I cannot be poſitive about it, and muſt be contented with probability. What was the ſtate of the queſtion between him and his adverſaries? It was, whether he deſerved to be accounted an heretical and impious man, becauſe he ſaid, that the Philoſophical reaſons alledged for the Immortality of the Soul, are not ſolid proofs, and that this doctrine cannot be well proved but by revelation. The queſtion was not therefore to know, what judgment ought to be made of thoſe, who undertake to reclaim the libertines fond of Lucretius, and full of contempt for the word of GOD. The queſtion was not to know, whether thoſe who alledge Philoſophical arguments againſt theſe pretended free-thinkers, and endeavour to reclaim them by that method, the only one that can work upon them, do an injury to faith, and make themſelves unworthy of the name of a Chriſtian. The queſtion was about thoſe Chriſtians, who have recourſe to the light of nature for their own uſe, and to ſupply their perſonal wants, a ſort of wavering men, who know not whether they ought to prefer revelation to reaſon, or at leaſt do not rely on God's authority, unleſs it be confirmed by Philoſophical arguments. Whoever ſays, that ſuch men are injurious to faith, and do not act like Chriſtians, does not make a wrong judgment of them, and does not deſerve the cenſure I examine in this place; for, properly ſpeaking, thoſe men are not yet Chriſtians, they are determined to nothing, they offer to believe the doctrine of future rewards and puniſhments, provided he give them better proofs than thoſe of the the Goſpel. God's authority is not ſufficient to them, they will have the promiſes of the Scripture to be confirmed by the light of reaſon, otherwiſe they give no credit to them, if the thing be as I fancy it is, all my readers will own that Pomponatius was cenſured without reaſon: but the cenſure paſſed upon him would be well grounded in the firſt ſenſe abovementioned.

I do not deny that he might have been told, that he was not a fit man to convert thoſe who believe the Mortality of the Soul, and look upon the Goſpel as a meer human book, and that therefore his Philoſophy was not ſo uſeful as that of his adverſaries. Had he been ſincere, he would have owned this, and acknowledged, that unleſs he imitated thoſe Phyſicians, who, to perſuade their patients to take a medicine, make them believe that there is more virtue than they know to be in it; he could not have maintained againſt impious men, that the mortality of the Soul is certainly contrary to the light of reaſon. Perhaps he would not have diſapproved the charitable method of the Philoſophers, who ſhould imitate thoſe Phyſicians; he would have been contented to ſay, that he was rather for a perfect ſincerity; but after all, he might have told his adverſaries, that as to the reſurrection, and ſome other doctrines, they were obliged to deal with impious men, as he would have done as to the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul.

[*H*] *The doctrine of the Mortality of the Soul would induce men to all manner of crimes.*] This is the laſt thing that Pomponatius objected to himſelf. His anſwer is (65), that ſince man does naturally deſire to be happy, and hates miſery, it is enough, in order to make an honeſt man of him, to ſhew him that the happineſs of our lives conſiſts in the practice of virtue, and miſery in the practice of vice. He adds, that thoſe who teach the Mortality of the Soul make way for the moſt perfect virtue, which is practiſed without hopes of reward, or fear of puniſhment. *Quare perfectius aſſerentes animam mortalem melius videntur ſalvare rationem virtutis quàm aſſerentes ipſam immortalem, ſpes namque præmii, & pœnæ timor, videntur ſervilitatem quandam importare, quæ rationi virtutis contrariatur* (66). He ſays alſo, that brutiſh people ought to be told that their Souls are immortal, and that it is likely ſome authors taught it without believing it, in order to curb the licentiouſneſs of that ſort of men. *Exiſtimandum eſt multos viros ſenſiſſe animam mortalem qui tamen ſcripſerunt ipſam eſſe immortalem: ſed hoc feciſſe ex pronitate virorum ad malum, qui parùm, aut nihil habent de intellectu, bonaque animi noc cogneſcentes, nec amantes, tantùm corporalibus incumbunt: Quare hujuſmodi ingeniis neceſſe eſt eos ſanare, ſicut & medicus ad ægrum, & nutrix ad puerum ratione carentem ſe habent* (67). Theſe obſervations do not remove the difficulty, and are but weak ſolutions. What follows is more reaſonable, being grounded upon experience. He ſays, that many wicked and profligate men believe the Immortality of the Soul, and that many good men did not believe it (68). ‘Neque univerſaliter viri impuri ponunt mortalitatem, neque univerſaliter temperati immortalitatem: Nam manifeſtè videmus multos pravos homines credere, verùm ex paſſionibus ſeduci, multos etiam viros ſanctos & juſtos ſcimus mortalitatem animarum poſuiſſe. Plato namque 1, de repub. dicit Simonidem Poëtam virum divinum & optimum fuiſſe, qui tamen eam mortalem aſſeverat: Homerus quoque ut Ariſtoteles 2, de anima refert, exiſtimavit ſenſum ab intellectu non differre: quæ autem fuerit Homeri dignitas quis ignorat? Hippoc. quoque & Galen. viri doctiſſimi & optimi hujus perhibentur opinionis; Alexander Aphrodiſæus, magnus Alfarabius, Abubacher, Avempace, ex noſtratibus quoque Plinius Secundus, Seneca, innumerique alii hoc ſenſere; Seneca namque lib. 7. epiſtolarum ad Lucilium epiſt. 54, quæ incipit, Longum mihi comitatum dederat mala valetudo, maniſeſtiuſque in de conſolatione ad Martiam affirmat, ipſam eſſe mortalem: multoſque alios ſtudioſos & viros doctiſſimos (69) connumerat ejuſdem opinionis fuiſſe. - - - *Neither are all the vitious perſuaded of the Mortality of the Soul, nor all the virtuous of it's Immortality. For we plainly ſee many ill men who believe in this, but are ſeduced by their paſſions, and we know that many good and juſt men have taken the Mortality of the Soul for granted. Plato, in the firſt book of his Republic ſays, that the Poet Simonides was a divine and excellent man, who nevertheleſs affirmed the ſoul to be mortal. Homer like-wiſe, as Ariſtotle relates in his ſecond book on the Soul, was of opinion, that Senſation and Underſtanding were the ſame thing, and who can be ignorant how great a man Homer was? It is alſo ſaid that Hippocrates and Galen, two very learned and good men, were of this opinion. Alexander Aphrodiſæus, the great Alſarabius, Abubacher, Avempace, and among our countrymen Pliny the ſecond, Seneca, and innumerable others, had the ſame way of thinking; for Seneca in the ſeventh book of his epiſtles, epiſt.* 54, *to Lucilius, which begins thus,* Longum mihi comitatum dederat mala valetudo, *and more clearly in his Conſolation to Martia, affirms that the ſoul is mortal, and reckons up many other learned and ſtudious men who believed the ſame thing.*’

[*I*] *I do not know whether . . . this book was condemned to be burnt by the Venetians, and diſowned by the author himſelf.*] Theophilus Raynaud ſays ſo. ‘Venetos illud opus addixiſſe ignibus, nec *de immortalitate* ſed *de mortalitate animæ* fuiſſe inſcribendum tradit Sylveſter, *lib.* 5, *de Strigimagis, cap.* 5. expoſtulans quod à ſe approbatum eum librum dixiſſet Pomponatius, quod negat ſe unquam cogitaſſe (70). - - - - *Sylveſter, in his book* de Strigimagis, *relates, that the Venetians condemned that book to the flames, and that it ſhould have been intituled,* of the Mortality, *and not* of the Immortality of the Soul, *and complains of Pomponatius*

(65) Pomponat. ubi ſupra, *cap. xiv, p.* 120.

(66) Ib. *p.* 121.

(67) Ib. *p.* 120.

(68) Ib. *p.* 119.

(69) It is certain that Seneca plainly lays down the Mortality of the Soul in thoſe two places; but I have not obſerved that he gives a liſt of thoſe who were of that opinion.

(70) Theoph. Raynaudus, de malis & bonis Libris, *num.* 43, *pag. m.* 26.

audaciouſneſs and prepoſſeſſion of a Lutheran civilian [*K*], who maintains, that this Philoſopher read public lectures againſt the immortality of the ſoul, and that he was an infamous Magician, who vented ſome impious things about the occult virtue of ſorcery and imagination. For the reſt, he was ſo bent upon reſolving difficulties, that he minded neither ſleep, nor eating, nor drinking, nor ſpitting; it made him almoſt mad, and ridiculous to every body. He himſelf informs us of theſe particulars [*L*].

Since the firſt edition of this article I have ſeen in the book quoted by Father Theophilus Raynaud (*k*), that Sylveſter Prierias affirms that Pomponatius's book was burnt at Venice (*l*). He adds that if it had been in his power, that pernicious book ſhould have met with the ſame treatment every where elſe. He had confuted the opinion of Pomponatius before it was printed, but as what he writ upon that ſubject had not then appeared, he inſerted it in the book quoted by Theophilus Raynaud, and publiſhed it in the year 1521. He obſerves that two Monks had written very ſolid anſwers to that treatiſe of Pomponatius. The name of the one is Bartholomew of Piſa, and of the other, Jerom Fornarius Bachalarius. This by way of ſupplement (*m*).

(*k*) See the beginning of the remark [*I*].

(*l*) Sylveſt. Prierias de Strigimagarum Dæmonumque mirandis, *lib. i,* (*and not lib. v, as quoted by Theophilus Raynaud; the work is only divided into three books*), *cap. v, pag.* 19, *Edit. Rom.* 1575, *in* 4*to.*

(*m*) To the remarks [*B*] and [*C*].

‘*Pomponatius for ſaying that he had given his approbation to it, which he ſays he never thought of.*’ He had been ſaying, that it was pretended that Pomponatius himſelf condemned his own book, but that the reaſons which moved him to it are variouſly reported, ſome aſcribing it to a deſire of ſecuring his reputation, others pretending that he did it to pleaſe his friends, and others, out of a principle of conſcience. *Pomponatius, mutata mente, opus ſuum de eo argumento improbaſſe dicitur, variantibus ſententiis, an id amicorum precibus dederit, an famæ ſuæ ac nomini caverit, an ex animo audierit Eccleſiam, & palinodiam cecinerit, ut conſcientiæ faceret ſatis* (71). He had been ſaying alſo, that all the books, wherein it is affirmed that the Immortality of the Soul cannot be proved by Philoſophical arguments, ought to be proſcribed (72), for he pretends they make way for an abſolute negation of that Immortality. This aſſertion of his is not ſo equitable, as his acknowledgment juſt before, that the Philoſophers, who were condemned by a biſhop of Paris in the year 1227, and by Leo X, in the council of Lateteran, were not ſo abſurd as to maintain, that the ſoul is immortal and mortal abſolutely ſpeaking; immortal according to Divinity, and mortal according to Philoſophy. He explains the true ſenſe of their doctrine: they abſolutely acknowledged the Immortality of the Soul on account of revelation, without which they had believed it to be mortal. *Animam ergo abſolutè videntur agnoviſſe immortalem, quòd ita aperte ferant fidei ſcita; quamvis niſi de animæ rationalis perpetuatione doceremur, ſolaque naturali ratione conſulta, negaturi fuiſſent immortalitatem.* This he acknowledges particularly in favour of Pomponatius, and quotes a book wherein this reſtriction was proved, *viz.* the book which cardinal Contarini, a diſciple of that Philoſopher, wrote againſt his maſter. *Non abſolutè ac ſimpliciter, mortalem animam cenſuiſſe videtur* (Pomponatius) *ſed duntaxat ſi ratio nuda conſuleretur, ut liquet ex opere Contareni Cardinalis,* de immortalitate, *conſcripto adverſùs Pomponatium, ipſius quondam Contareni in Philoſophicis Magiſtrum. Nec aliud cenſuerim voluiſſe illos ejuſdem ævi Philoſophaſtros, damnatos à Lateranenſi Concilio ſub Leone X, & alios longè antè à Stephano Pariſienſi Epiſcopo, anno* 1277, *vel potiùs* 1227, *in reſcripto quod extat* tomo 5, Bibl. Margarini pag. 1319. *æquè damnatos, quod aſſererent, animam rationalem, ſecundùm fidem eſſe immortalem; at ſecundùm Philoſophiam, eſſe mortalem* (73). Boccalini, according to his uſual cuſtom, jeſts upon this diſtinction of Pomponatius. He ſuppoſes, 1. That this impious man being condemned to be burnt by Apollo, proteſted, that he believed the Mortality of the Soul only as a Philoſopher. 2. That Apollo, having regard to that proteſtation, ordered the executioner to burn him only as a Philoſopher (74).

We have ſeen above (75) how this book was uſed, and that it was not burnt.

[*K*] *The audaciouſneſs . . . . . of a Lutheran Civilian.*] His name is Godelman: Theſe are his words. ‘Petrus Pomponatius Mantuanus philoſophus & Epicureiſmi defenſor maguſque nefarius in Academiis Italiæ publicè contra animæ immortalitatem diſputavit: ſcripſit de fato & de incantatione libros, in quibus de verborum magicorum, imaginum, characterum, & imaginationis occulta poteſtate impiè ſatis diſputavit (76). - - - *Petrus Pomponatius, a Mantuan Philoſopher, an advocate for the doctrine of Epicurus, and a wicked Magician, diſputed publickly againſt the Immortality of the Soul in the univerſities of Italy: he compoſed books upon Fate and Enchantments, in which he reaſons with a good deal of impiety about the occult virtue of magical words, images, characters, and imagination.*’ In the firſt place, it is not true that Pomponatius did publickly diſpute againſt the Immortality of the Soul in the univerſities of Italy. Such a thing cannot be charged upon him but by virtue of the Sophiſm, *à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter,* that is, *by underſtanding in a general ſenſe what is only meant in a particular one.*’ He maintained, that Ariſtotle's hypotheſis afforded no proof for the Immortality of the Soul, and he anſwered all the arguments of thoſe, who pretended to prove by the doctrine of that Philoſopher, that our ſouls are immortal; but he did not abſolutely and peremptorily maintain the Mortality of the Soul. It is plain therefore, that this Lutheran is neither exact nor equitable. 2. A good author will not ſay that Pomponatius, who was a notorious Magician, denied the Immortality of the Soul. Men are ſo fully perſuaded, that if there are Devils, the ſoul of man is immortal, and commonly ſuppoſe ſuch a connexion between thoſe two doctrines, that who ever is not willing to be accounted extravagant, will never charge any body with Epicureiſm and Magic, without making ſome reflexions upon ſuch a paradox. He muſt expect, that the readers will be ſurprized at it, and that ſuch a combination will puzzle and confound them. An author, who does not foreſee ſuch a thing, muſt needs be very ſtupid; and if he foreſees it without giving himſelf the trouble to clear that difficulty, he knows but little what he does. We may therefore conclude, that Godelman is very much to blame. In the third place, he confutes himſelf; for he complains of a tract of Pomponatius, wherein all the effects commonly aſcribed to Magic, or to a pact with the Devil, are aſcribed to other cauſes; and therefore in the ſame period he accuſes him of Magic, and of having writ a book againſt the exiſtence of Magic. An author, who writes in ſuch a manner, is inexcuſable, when he does not make ſuch an obſervation as this: Pomponatius was a cheat; he believed and practiſed Magic, but he wrote againſt it, for fear of being known to be a Magician.

[*L*] *He himſelf informs us of theſe particulars.*] Being not able to reconcile ſome maxims of Ariſtotle with free-will, he cries out, This is what vexes me, this is what keeps me from ſleeping, and makes me mad. *Iſta ſunt quæ me premunt, quæ me anguſtiant, quæ me inſomnem & inſanum reddunt* (77). He ſays, that like another Prometheus faſtened to mount Caucaſus, he is continually tormented with grief. *Perpetuis curis & cogitationibus rodi, non ſitire, non fameſcere, non dormire, non comedere, non expuere, ab omnibus irrideri* (78). He would be more excuſable, if the cauſe of his anguiſh was not ſo unreaſonable; but for a man to vex and torment himſelf, in order to reconcile another man with reaſon, is a thing that cannot be excuſed. If a Divine endeavours, though he ſhould loſe his health, and even his life by it, to reconcile the Scripture to truth, when they ſeem to diſagree, it is a commendable and heroical action; there being ſuch an agreement, one may reaſonably hope to find it out. But how can any body flatter himſelf with ſuch hopes, with reſpect to the opinions of a private man ſubject to error, and who drinks it as fiſhes drink water?

---

(71) Ibid.

(72) Jure libri eo doctrinæ reprobæ fermento vitiati, ſuffixione digni ſunt habiti. *Ibid.*

(73) Ibid. *num.* 42, *p.* 25, 26.

(74) Boccalini, Ragguagli di Parnaſo, *cent.* I, *cap. xc, pag. m.* 306.

(75) In the remark [*C*], citation (23).

(76) Godelmanus, *lib. i, cap. viii,* de Magis apud Joh. Chriſtian. Frommannum de Faſcinatione, *lib. i, Part. ii,* §. *iii, cap. ii, pag. m.* 327.

(77) Pomponat. de Fato, *lib. iii, cap. vii.*

(78) Ibid.

PONCET (MAURICE) Doctor of Divinity in the univerſity of Paris (a), *Profeſſed* Benedictin *in the abbey of St Pere* at Melun, where he was born, *and curate of* St ASPAIS in the ſame town, and then of *St Peter des Arſis at Paris* (b), was one of the famous preachers of the XVIth century. He preached with the greateſt boldneſs againſt the diſorders of the court of Henry III. We have ſeen above (c) that he was carried to Melun for ſome invectives he made from the pulpit the twenty-ſixth of March 1583, againſt a new fraternity of Penitents inſtituted by that king. The Paſſage I have quoted out of Peter Matthieu, is to be found in the ſame terms in the journal of Henry III, with the anſwer mentioned in this article, which Poncet it ſaid to have made to the duke of Epernon [*A*]. Others ſay, he made it to the duke of Joyeuſe at another time (d) [*B*]; which ſeems to me more likely [*C*]. Poncet was afraid of being carried to the caſtle of Loches, as he had been threatened ſome time before (e); and therefore he was well pleaſed when he was only confined to St Pere's abbey at Melun. He did not continue long under ſuch a diſgrace; for he had leave to return to Paris, *and to be there curate of St Peter des Arſis: but he preached ſtill with his uſual boldneſs, and perſiſted in that reſolution till his laſt breath (f).* He died the twenty-third of November 1586 (g). He publiſhed ſomething [*D*], and it is very likely his way of preaching was ſomewhat comical [*E*], and like that which little Father Andrew was ſo fond of in the next century.

I add that Peter de Saint Romuald, a Bernardine Fryer, commends him very much for a thing which deſerves no praiſe, viz. for having diſapproved the tranſlating of the Bible into

[*A*] *The anſwer . . . . which Poncet is ſaid to have made to the duke of Epernon.*] Poncet having been arreſted, that duke went to ſee him, and told him ſmileing, 'Maſter, they ſay you make people to laugh at 'your ſermons; which is very wrong; for a preacher 'ought to edify his hearers, and not make them 'laugh. Poncet without any concern replied, Sir, I 'would have you know that I preach nothing but the 'word of GOD, and that no body comes to my ſermons to laugh, unleſs they be wicked or atheiſtical 'people: and truly, I never made ſo many to laugh 'as you have made to cry. A bold anſwer for a 'Monk to a lord of that quality, and it was found 'very much to the purpoſe (1).'

[*B*] *Others ſay that he made it to the duke of Joyeuſe at another time*] Here follows a paſſage, wherein le Laboureur mentions the ſame thing, and adds a reflexion to it as good as the repartee of our Benedictin. 'At that time (2) there were ſome bold 'Preachers, who did not except from the number of 'ſins the cruel or looſe maxims of the cabinet. Dr 'Poncet, among others, an eloquent and very zealous 'man, boldly comprehended kings and great men 'within the extent of his miſſion; and Brantome ſays, 'that one day he grew ſo hot about this political 'axiom, *He who knows not how to diſſemble, knows not 'how to reign*, that he made no ſcruple to aſſert, '*They were the words of a downright Atheiſt, and opened a direct way for kings and princes to go all to the 'Devil, and turn true tyrants. He was*, adds Brantome, *one of the boldeſt Preachers that ever got into a 'pulpit. One day the duke of Joyeuſe, when his wedding was celebrated with an extraordinary pomp and 'great charges, meeting him in the ſtreet, told him, 'Mr Poncet, I never knew you before, and am glad to 'meet you now; for I have often heard of you, and that 'you make people to laugh at your ſermons. Poncet anſwered him as coldly as the other ſpoke to him angrily. 'Sir*, ſaid he, *it is not improper for me to make them to 'laugh, ſince you make them to cry ſo much, by reaſon 'of the great charges of your noble wedding, which the 'people have been at. The duke was forced to go away, 'though he had a great mind to ſtrike him; but if he 'had touched him never ſo little, the people, who are 'fond of ſuch bold preachers, and were then gathering, 'would have done ſome ſcandalous thing to him and his 'retinue; for that Monk was very well beloved at Paris.* This was a deadly hit, whereby the duke of 'Joyeuſe learned, that an honeſt prieſt, who prefers 'the public intereſt to his own, is like an unruly 'horſe, whom the brightneſs of grandeur makes more 'furious, and who ought to be cautiouſly approached, 'for fear he ſhould kick. Every body laughed at 'this, and the duke's beſt friends, who pitied him, 'blamed him at the ſame time for having thus engaged a Monk in the ſtreets, he who had ſo many 'dignitaries at his diſpoſal, who would have taken it 'as an honour to be jeſted upon by him, and promiſed themſelves ſome advantage by it (3).'

[*C*] *This ſeems to me more likely.*] For it is agreed, that being taken up he was afraid of being ſent to Loches, as he had been threatened. Would a man, who was under ſuch an apprehenſion, as he himſelf confeſſed (4), have made ſuch a blunt and diſobliging anſwer to the favourite of his prince? It is a great deal more probable that he made it, when he enjoyed full liberty, and in the middle of a ſtreet, where he knew the inhabitants of Paris would have boldly repelled any inſult offered to him. We ought therefore to keep to Brantome's account, and at the ſame time obſerve, how carleſsly the memory of ſuch events is preſerved by Hiſtorians, and conſequently how they differ in their accounts of them.

[*D*] *He publiſhed ſomething.*] Three books concerning eccleſiaſtical Oration by way of contemplation, Paris 1568 in 8vo. A remonſtrance to the French nobility, concerning the happineſs which the king procures to his people, and how he ought to be inſtructed to govern them well, Paris 1572 in 8vo. A funeral Oration pronounced the 31ſt of Auguſt 1574, in the church of Brecy le Buiſſon, at the funeral of Meſſire Euſtace de Conſtans, viſcount d'Aulchy, Paris 1574 in 8vo. A diſcourſe concerning the advice given to Meſſire Peter de Gondy, biſhop of Paris, about the propoſal made by him to the Divines, concerning the tranſlation of the Bible into the vulgar tongue, Paris 1578 in 8vo. *Meditations familieres ſur l'Hiſtoire de l'Incarnation, Rheims* 1574 *in 8vo* (5).

[*E*] *It is very likely that his way of preaching was ſomewhat comical.*] I have three reaſons to think ſo: for firſt, The words he is ſaid to have ſpoke in his ſermon, that was the occaſion of his confinement (6), are far from being grave. That *petit tendron*, [young laſs] that was kept ready for the nocturnal collation of the penitents, is very comical. 2. It is agreed on all hands, that the favourite, who received ſuch a ſharp anſwer from Poncet, cenſured him for making his hearers laugh. Laſtly, James Roulliard, his countryman and panegyriſt, wards off the blow in ſuch a manner, as makes me think, that he deſigned to anſwer thoſe who found fault with Poncet for acting the part of a jeſter or buffoon in the pulpit. *Beſides his learning and piety, known to every body*, they are Roulliard's words (7), *he had this particular talent, that he freely preached againſt the vices of his age, preferring the truth of the word of GOD before the threatenings of great men, and the daily danger of his life. It is ſaid he had ſuch an agreeable delivery, that what the injudicious laughed at, was looked upon by the wiſeſt as a great piece of art, that the ſharpneſs of his cenſures might go down the better, and that he might the longer keep up his miniſtry, which was ſo uſeful to the church: whereas, had it not been for that, the furious courtiers, or ſome ſilly people would have endeavoured to undo him.* You ſee this author dares not deny, that Poncet's ſermons made people laugh. How then can one doubt that his ſermons were ſomewhat comical? Had he boldly, but gravely, cenſured the diſorders of the court, the pleaſure he would have afforded his hearers, though never ſo great, had never made any body laugh.

[*F*] *Peter*

(a) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Bibl. Franç. *pag.* 862.

(b) Roulliard, Antiquitez de Melun, *p.* 627.

(c) In the remark [*O*] of the article HENRY III.

(d) When the duke of Joyeuſe's wedding was celebrated in the year 1581.

(e) Roulliard, ubi ſupra.

(f) Ibid. *pag.* 628.

(g) Ibid.

(1) Journal de Henry III, *ad ann.* 1583, *pag. m.* 67. *See alſo* Peter Matthieu, Hiſt. des derniers Troubles, *p.* 15.

(2) That is, under the reign of Henry III.

(3) Le Laboureur, Addit. aux Mémoires de Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 58, 59.

(4) *See the* Antiquitez de Melun, *p.* 627.

(5) *Taken from* Du Verdier Vau-Privas, Biblioth. Franç. *p.* 862.

(6) See, above, citation (68) of the article HENRY III.

(7) *Pag.* 627, *of the* Antiquitez de Melun.

into the vulgar tongue [*F*]. The book which he writ upon that ſubject is extremely trifling, if we follow the judgment of Mr Arnauld [*G*].

[*F*] *Peter de S. Romuald commends him . . . . for having diſapproved the tranſlating of the Bible into the vulgar tongue.*] This Bernardine, who extolls him for it, chiefly admires his reaſon grounded on the abuſe that is poſſible to be made of the Scripture, of which he alledges two very ſurprizing inſtances. ‘ Maurice Poncet, *ſays he* (8), was admired in his days for his profound learning, extraordinary piety, and ſingular zeal in reproving vice, not only by his fervent way of preaching, but likewiſe by his writings againſt Libertines and Heretics, as may be particularly ſeen in the advice which he gave to the moſt illuſtrious Peter de Gondy biſhop of Paris, touching the tranſlation of the Holy Bible into the vulgar tongue. He maintains that ſuch a thing ought not to be allowed for ſeveral reaſons, one of which is, that the Bible would be in danger of becoming a ſubject of wrangling and contempt, on account of the ambiguity, obſcurity, and variety of phraſes in every language, from which ignorant and ſenſual men might take occaſion to ruin themſelves, as it happened in the laſt age to a Painter in Pruſſia, who having bought a German Bible tranſlated by Luther, and read what Lot did to his daughters, behaved in the ſame manner to his own. It was likewiſe the caſe with a woman in Munſter, at the time when it was beſieged by the biſhop, who is ſovereign lord of that city. She having read the Hiſtory of Judith tranſlated into her tongue, took it into her head to go and kill the biſhop, in order that ſhe might deliver thoſe of her own ſect who had got poſſeſſion of the town, from the danger of being put to death. But ſhe was apprehended, and learned, at the expence of her life, that the letter of the Holy Scripture killeth, and the ſpirit maketh alive.’

(8) Pierre de S. Romuald, Journal Chronolog. *Novemb.* 23, *p.* 575, 576.

[*G*] *The book which he writ upon that ſubject is extremely trifling, if we follow the judgment of Mr Arnauld.*] We have ſeen elſewhere (9) what judgment he paſſes upon a book of the like nature compoſed by Peter Lizet. He has no better opinion of our Maurice's piece; for in ſpeaking of a collection which had this title, *Collectio quorumdam gravium Authorum, qui ex profeſſo, vel ex occaſione ſacræ Scripturæ, aut divinorum officiorum in vulgarem linguam tranſlationes damnarunt* (10), he ſays that, ‘ It is a trifling collection of the moſt impertinent authors that have writ upon the ſubject, mixed with ſome good ones. . . . . It is a book of Preſident Lizet. . . . . It is a piece compoſed by a Dominican Inquiſitor of Toulouſe (11). . . . . It is the remonſtrance of Fryer Maurice Poncet . . . . the bare title whereof gives us ſufficiently to know what we are to expect from it (12). A DISCOURSE UPON THE ADVICE *given to the reverend Father in GOD Peter de Gondy biſhop of Paris. By Fryar Maurice Poncet, Doctor of Divinity.* One of the chief reaſons, as we have already ſaid, for his not allowing the Bible to be tranſlated into French, is becauſe the French is a barbarous language which cannot be reduced to any grammatical rules (13). . . . . Is it then poſſible that the archbiſhop of Paris who has done the French Academy the honour to be a member of it can juſtify the publiſhing at this time ſuch a ridiculous cenſure paſſed upon one of the fineſt languages in Europe (14).’

(9) In the remark [*B*] of the article LIZET.

(10) It was printed at the expence of the clergy in the year 1660.

(11) Arnauld, Défenſe des Verſions, *pag.* 160, 161.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 162.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Ibid.

PONTIUS (CONSTANTINE),

burnt in effigy at Seville in 1559, was called Conſtantin de la Fuente, in Latin *Conſtantinus Fontius.* Some body took one letter for another, a P inſtead of an F, which is the reaſon why this doctor is much more known by the name of Conſtantine Pontius [*A*], which does not belong to him, than by his true name. However it be, he was a man of great merit, Doctor of Divinity, canon of Seville, and preacher to Charles V (*a*). He followed Philip II, into England; and doubtleſs it was in that country, that he reliſhed the doctrine of the Proteſtants, for which he was apprehended by the Inquiſition, and was deſtined to be burnt. He did not live till the *Auto de fé*, at which he was to be expoſed to the public view. The Spaniſh Hiſtorians do commonly ſay that he killed himſelf; others will have it, that he died of ſickneſs; but it is agreed on all hands, that the Inquiſition produced an effigy, which repreſented him, and was burnt on the day of the *Auto de fé* (*b*). Several authors ſay, that he was confeſſor to Charles V, and that he attended him on his death-bed to the laſt breath; but I have ſhewed in another place (*c*), that he was only his preacher, and that he was impriſoned before the death of that emperor. He wrote ſome books [*B*], which the Spaniſh Inquiſition put into their Index without any exception (*d*): he is mentioned in the Martyrology of the Proteſtants [*C*].

Beza,

(*a*) Nicol. Antonio, Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. *Tom. i, p.* 196.

(*b*) *See* Nicol. Antonio, ibid.

(*c*) Remark [*C*] of the article CARRANZA; and remark [*S*], citation (1), of the article CHARLES V.

(*d*) Conſtantino de la Fuente Autor condenado: todas ſus obras en qualquier lengua, y eſpecialmente *la Confeſſion del Pecador.* Ind. libr. prohib. *p. m.* 229.

[*A*] *By the name of Conſtantine Pontius.*] Thuanus calls him ſo, and ſo does Father Paul (1), who was not reproved for it by Pallavicino, though he took notice of ſome of his miſtakes concerning that Spaniard. See above the Remark [*C*] of the article CARRANZA, and the remark [*S*] of the article CHARLES V, citat. 1.)

[*B*] *He wrote ſome books.*] A ſummary of the Chriſtian Doctrine, printed in Spaniſh at Antwerp. Six ſermons on the firſt Pſalm of David, printed in the ſame language, and at the ſame place in 1556 (2). A large Catechiſm. The Confeſſion of a Sinner. Some Commentaries on the Proverbs, Eccleſiaſtes, the Song of Songs, and Job. Don Nicolas Antonio (3) ſeems to believe, that the ſermons were not made on the firſt Pſalm, but on the fiftieth, and that they are the ſame with the confeſſion of a ſinner; but he is miſtaken: that confeſſion is a prayer ſomewhat ſhorter than a ſermon: it is in the Proteſtant Martyrology (4).

[*C*] *He is mentioned in the Martyrology of the Proteſtants.*] We find there that Egidius, Conſtantine Fontius, and Varquias, *were the firſt who diſcovered the darkneſs of Spain almoſt at the ſame time* (5). They are called the *three pillars of truth:* they preached at Seville with great zeal and ſucceſs. Egidius was nominated by Charles V to the biſhopric of Tortona (6), but the inquiſitors were ſo vexed at it, that, to prevent his being made a biſhop, they ſeverely perſecuted him for a long time. During that perſecution, Fontius was in the Low-countries preacher and confeſſor (7) to Charles V. ‘ Being returned to Seville, after the death of Egidius, he re-aſſumed his office with great courage; and the affection the people had for him was ſtill the ſame. Notwithſtanding the weakneſs of his body, he continued to diſcharge the duties of his office, keeping up himſelf with the uſual remedies GOD gives us to recover the health and ſtrength of the body. He had ſeveral encounters with the Prieſts and Monks, and with Waldes archbiſhop of Seville, and preſident of the conclave of the Inquiſition. And though his enemies were furiouſly exaſperated againſt him, yet he ſo dexterouſly warded off all their blows, that they could not bring him to make an open confeſſion of his faith, that they might have a better hold of him. But at length GOD prevailed upon him in the following manner, to make a full declaration of his truth, putting a ſtop to all his ſubtilties and ſhifts, which he had made uſe of againſt his conſcience (8).’ The diſcovery was made by his books coming into the hands of the Inquiſitors, notwithſtanding the great care he had taken to conceal them. ‘ They found among other books, a large one written with his own hand, wherein he treated of the following doctrines,

(1) Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, *lib. v, p. m.* 426, *Edit.* 1629, *in 4to.*

(2) Epit. Bibl. Geſner.

(3) Bibl. Script. Hiſp. *Tom. i, pag.* 196.

(4) In the eighth book, *fol.* 507, *verſo, & ſeq.*

(5) Hiſtoire des Martyrs, *book viii, fol.* 505, *verſo, Edit.* 1582, *in fol.*

(6) It ſhould be *Tortoſa.* See the article CHARLES V, remark [*S*], citation (2).

(7) The Spaniſh Hiſtorians deny that he was his confeſſor. See the remark [*S*], citation (1), of the article CHARLES V.

(8) Hiſt. des Martyrs, *fol.* 506, *verſo.*

Beza, who calls him Conſtantine Pontius, and who ſays that he was for a long time confeſſor to Charles V, and that he was burnt at Seville (*e*), did not well remember the circumſtances he had read in that Martyrology. I have read a Latin diſcourſe concerning the life and death of that Spaniard (*f*), wherein he is called *Conſtantinus Fontius*. The publiſher of that diſcourſe ſays, that it was written by *Reginaldus Gonſalvius Montanus Hiſpanus*. I find in it that Fontius had been a looſe man in his youth [*D*]; but that he mended his life, and took a right courſe, though he was ſtill faulty in one thing, that was a kind of a blot; for being a man of a very lively wit, he gave himſelf too much liberty in his jeſts. Many of his witty ſayings went about. His ſharpeſt railleries were commonly levelled at the hypocrites and ſorry preachers of that time. He perfectly learned, without any maſter, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and whatever is neceſſary to make a good preacher. He was maſter of all the beauties of his mother-tongue, and preached ſo eloquently, that an incredible number of hearers flocked to his ſermons. People had much ado to find any convenient place three or four hours before he came into the pulpit (*g*). He was free from avarice and ambition, and refuſed a rich canonſhip that was offered him at Toledo: his refuſal was attended with a jeſt [*E*]. After the death of Dr Giles (*h*), being appointed to preach in the cathedral, he did it

(*e*) Beza, in Iconib. *fol.* 90.

(*f*) *It is in the book intituled,* Hiſpanicæ inquiſitionis & carnificinæ ſecretiora, *and publiſhed at Amberg in the year* 1611, per Joachimum Urſinum, Anti-Jeſuitam.

(*g*) Concionabatur ut plurimum octavâ horâ, tantus erat populi concurſus, ut quartâ, ſæpe etiam tertiâ noctis horâ vix in templo inveniretur commodus ad audiendum locus. *Hiſpanicæ Inquiſit. Secret. pag.* 254.

(*h*) The ſame who is called *Egidius* in the remark [*C*].

‘ doctrines, as the Inquiſitors declared by their ſentence, which was publickly pronounced, *viz.* of the ſtate of the church; of the true church, and the church of the Pope, whom he called Antichriſt; of the ſacrament of the Euchariſt, and the invention of the Maſs, wherewith he ſaid the world was bewitched, by reaſon of their ignorance of the Holy Scripture; of man's juſtification; of purgatory, which he called a wolf's head, and a monkiſh invention to feed the belly; of the Pope's bulls and indulgences; of the merit of good works; of confeſſion, and ſeveral other points. That book being produced, the inquiſitors aſked him whether it was his own handwriting: he anſwered them without any tergiverſation, that the whole book was written with his own hand, and maintained the truth of what was contained in it, ſaying, you need not take further pains to look for evidence againſt me, you have an ample declaration of my faith: deal with me as you ſhall think fit. He continued afterwards two years in priſon, where he fell ſick by reaſon of his bad diet, (though he was little concerned for it) and of the grief he conceived for the diſperſion of the church, and alſo becauſe the ſun made his priſon as hot as a furnace; ſo that at laſt, a looſeneſs, attended with the gripes, occaſioned his death and removal to a happier ſtate. . . . . His enemies ſpread a report that he had made away with himſelf, by cutting one of his veins with a piece of broken glaſs, to avoid the ignominious puniſhment he was to undergo. The children ſung ſongs about, which had been made by the tools of the Inquiſition. On the day appointed for the triumph, his dead body was taken up, covered with ſtraw, like a phantom, and cloathed, and then it was ſet on a chair, holding up one hand, and laying the other upon the chair, as artificially as ſuch a thing could be contrived (9).’

The Latin author quoted by me in the following remarks, does alſo acknowledge that Fontius eluded the proceedings of the Inquiſition, by his ſubtile anſwers; but that he at laſt gave over all his ſubterfuges, when they ſhewed him his manuſcript. ‘ Raptus ad Inquiſitoriam arcem, etſi ex controverſiis præcedentibus omnium adverſariorum animos habebat vehementer exulceratos, tamen acutiſſimis ſuis reſponſis omnes eorum cavillos facilè, more ſuo, eludens, ad apertam fidei confeſſionem, ex qua periculum, ut ipſi exoptabant, crearetur, trahi non poterat: atque evaſiſſet tandem, ut ſæpè anteà, ipſorum manus, ni mirabili quodam Providentiæ ſuæ artificio rotundam confeſſionem veritatis ſuæ, Deus ab invito & modis omnibus tergiverſante extorſiſſet (10). . . . . Viſo hoc libro Conſtantinus interrogatus ab Inquiſitoribus, an propriam manum agnoſceret, quum per multos dies, conquiſitis undique ſubterfugiis, conatus illorum eluſiſſet, agnoſcens porro Dei voluntatem, quæ omnem tergiverſandi amplius occaſionem ſibi præcidiſſet, agnoſco (inquit) manum meam, ac proinde fateor, me iſta omnia ſcripſiſſe, quæ & vera eſſe ingenuè profiteor (11). - - - *Being carried to the Inquiſition, although his former diſputes had exaſperated the ſpirits of his enemies to the higheſt degree, nevertheleſs by his ſharp anſwers he eluded their cavils with eaſe, and could not be prevailed upon to make a free and open confeſſion of his faith, which might have afforded them their long-wiſhed for opportunity of deſtroying him. Nay he would have got ſafe out of their hands at laſt, as he had done oftentimes before, if GOD by a wonderful device of providence had not, in ſpight of all his ſhifts and ſubterfuges, extorted from him a full confeſſion of the truth. . . . . At ſight of this book, Conſtantine being aſked by the Inquiſitors whether he knew his own hand-writing, after he had baffled their attempts for many days by his numberleſs evaſions, and now perceiving that the will of GOD had cut him off from all opportunity of equivocating any longer, I acknowledge my hand, ſays he, and thereby confeſs that I did actually write all theſe things, which I ſincerely believe to be true.*’

[*D*] *He had been a looſe man in his youth.*] Here are the words of the Latin author: ‘ Juventutem quidem tranſegit pro ſtudioſorum juvenum libera educatione non admodum laudatam, ſed quæ, quo minùs, quod ætatis ſubſequutum eſt, quàm laudatiſſimum extiterit, haud impedimento fuerit. Probatos enim ſatis mores, ut erat ingenio mirè feſtivo, & in jocis peracuto, una ſubinde jocandi licentia vel in provectiore ætate corrumpebat (12). - - - *He paſſed his youth, conſidering the liberal education of ſtudents, not in a very commendable way: nevertheleſs this did not hinder the following part of his life from being extremely praiſe-worthy. Only, as he was naturally of a very chearful temper, and had an admirable turn for raillery, he ſometimes hurt his character, even in his more advanced age, by his unſeaſonable jokes.*’ Perhaps, the faults of his youth had never been objected to him, had he not had extraordinary gifts, which expoſed him to envy; but having got a great reputation by his eloquence and learning, he could not avoid thoſe reproaches. His friends perſuaded him to diſpute for a canonſhip (13) in the metropolitan church of Seville; and his competitor bethought himſelf of raiſing perſonal objections againſt him, and carefully collected all the ſchool-boy's tricks that might make him aſhamed, and in general, whatever he had done amiſs in his youth, certain marriages, the irregularity of his ordination, *&c.* *Competitor & eruditione & authoritate, & ipſâ demum gratia Capituli Conſtantino nullo modo comparandus, ad exceptiones perſonales conatus omnes convertens ſuſcitavit ei ineptias omnes juventutis ſuæ, contracta videlicet, antequam ſacris initiaretur, matrimonia, neque ritè ſacris initiatum, neque rectè atque ordine Magiſterii & doctoratus inſignia accepiſſe* (14). It were to be wiſhed, that young men, who hope to make themſelves eminent, would remember ſuch examples. It would be a reſtraint upon them; they would be afraid of being upbraided with the follies of their youth, in the midſt of their glory. Thoſe, who excuſe ſuch faults, will nevertheleſs ſay, that it were better to want no ſuch indulgence. It is always a ſubject of mortification, which an enemy improves to his advantage.

[*E*] *His refuſal was attended with a jeſt.*] The chapter of Toledo ſent ſome deputies to him, to deſire him to fill up the place of preacher in the metropolitan church. Conſtantine anſwered, that he was very thankful for that honour, and would endeavour to ſhew his acknowledgment; but that he would do nothing that might diſturb the repoſe of his anceſtors. *Cæterùm parentum avorumque ſuorum oſſa ante multos annos*

(9) Ibid. *fol.* 507.

(10) Hiſpaniæ Inquiſitionis ſecretiora, *pag. m.* 262.

(11) Ib. *p.* 264.

(12) Ib. *p.* 253.

(13) Canonicatus Concionalis ſeu (ut vocant) Magiſtralis. *Ibid. pag.* 259.

(14) Ib. *p.* 261.

it before he had recovered his health; but he happened to be ſo weak in the middle of his ſermon, that he was obliged to do a thing which had never been ſeen before [*F*]. The director of the Houſe of Doctrine having founded there a lecture of Divinity; our Conſtantine was charged with it, and performed it very well (*i*) [*G*]. You will ſee in the remark [*C*] the cataſtrophe of his life, and in the laſt remark, a ſtory he told Cardan, which concerns apparitions [*H*].

annos ſepulta conquieſcere, ſe vero nolle quicquam admittere, occaſione cujus à ſancta illa quiete interturbarentur (15). To underſtand this jeſt, the reader muſt know, that the chapter of Toledo had then a great quarrel with the archbiſhop Siliceus, a man of mean extraction, who had been raiſed to that great poſt by favour. ‘ Qui ex aratro & glebis, neque virtute, neque eruditione, ſed (ſi ita dici licet) fortunæ potius temeritate ad ſummam totius Hiſpaniæ, ſecundum regem ipſum, dignitatem convolarat (16). - - - *He had riſen in a manner from the plough to the higheſt dignity in Spain, next to the king himſelf, neither by his virtue nor his learning, but (if one may ſay ſo) by the pure raſhneſs of fortune.*’ That prelate perſecuted the chief canons, and diſgraced them publickly, under pretence that they were deſcended from Jewiſh families (17). He cauſed inquiries to be made, that were ignominious to the memory of ſeveral perſons, who had been buried a hundred years before, and by that means he diſturbed the repoſe of the dead. Fontius's jeſt turned upon this. *Ea occaſione neque à centum annis ſepultis parcebatur, inquirente malo archiepiſcopo, & quidem ſub pretextu religionis, in parentes, avos, atavos canonicorum, eoſque ad originum rationes peſſimè è ſuis ſepulchris revocante. Eas non minus impias quàm ſtultas contentiones, ex ſua ipſius vocatione occaſione arrepta, Conſtantinus tempeſtivè admodum illo conciſo Laconiſmo perſtringebat* (18). The reader will not be diſpleaſed to know by the by this paſſage of the Hiſtory of Siliceus.

[*F*] *He was obliged to do a thing which had never been ſeen before.*] He had ſome wine and water brought to him once or twice, and drank in the pulpit to recover his ſpirits. The great eſteem he was in, and the authority he had got, made every body excuſe the novelty of this ſight. *Delatus in templum viribuſque adeo exhauſtus, ut in medio concionis filo uno atque altero limphati vini hauſtu vires ad pergendum in concione reficeret, novam neque unquam anteà viſam licentiam ſummâ viri tum gratia, tum authoritate, qua pollebat, excuſante* (19).

[*G*] *He had the charge of making lectures of Divinity, ... and performed it very well.*] The lectures he made upon ſome books of the ſcripture were admirable, if one may believe my Latin author, I ſhall ſet down his words, that the reader may be more fully acquainted with the circumſtances of the writings of that reformed Spaniard. ‘ Accepit primo Salomonis libros, Proverbia, Eccleſiaſten, & Cantica canticorum, atque his mirabili eruditione explicatis, librum Jobi eſt aggreſſus, quem ultra medium interpretando perduxit. Extant ipſius in hos libros prælectiones omnes manu ſcriptæ opera Bab. diligentiſſimi cujuſdam ex auditoribus exceptæ, quas cum vulgaverimus, deprehenſo quanto intervallo poſt ſe relinquat eos omnes, qui hactenus in eos libros quippiam ediderunt, de ſumma viri eruditione certius judicari poterit (20). - - - *He firſt took in hand the books of Solomon, the Proverbs, Eccleſiaſtes, and the Song of Songs, and having explained theſe with wonderful erudition, he next ſet about the book of Job, more than the one half of which he went through. His lectures upon thoſe books are ſtill extant, all written and picked up from among his hearers by a diligent hand. As ſoon as theſe ſhall be publiſhed, it will appear how far he has excelled every body that has writ any thing upon the ſame ſubjects before, and from thence we ſhall be more able to form a right judgment of his extraordinary learning.*’ You ſee there was a deſign to publiſh that work, and it was actually printed. See the remark [*B*].

[*H*] *A ſtory he told Cardan which concerns apparitions.*] If what Cardan ſays be true, our Conſtantine ſpoke of apparitions, not upon a hear-ſay, but as an eye-witneſs. ‘ Vigebat olim in Hiſpania hæc ars, (*Necromantia*) publicéque docebatur in Salamantica Academia, nunc verò publicis legibus ſublata eſt. Unde ibi aliqua adhuc artis experimenta ſuperſunt. Narrabat mihi Don Conſtantinus Fontanus Hiſpanus theologus, & ab exomologeſi Principis Philippi Hiſpaniarum, dum in Vagliadolit civitate Hiſpaniæ, in domo Typographi, quæ malè ob ſtrepitus audiebat nocturnos, diverſaretur, prima nocte incubum ſenſiſſe: ſed cùm olivas nigras in cœna comediſſet, naturale exiſtimaſſe, cùm incubus inter morbos numeretur. Sequenti nocte ſuper lecto videt auditque feles concertantes, quod quanquam durum videretur, quia tamen eſſe poterat, & hoc naturale eſſe duxit. Tertia autem nocte cùm nondum dormitum iſſet, de hiſque diſſereret, tubæ vocem quaſi in aure audivit. Exiſtimans ſibili ſpeciem eſſe, pueros videbat, qui ibi aſtabant ridentes: tum vox illa cubiculum circumire cœpit, perfectoque circuitu ſub lecto ſe abdidit, ibi diu ſtrepens, cùm nihil videretur (21). - - - *This art* (Necromancy) *prevailed long ago in Spain, and was publickly taught in the univerſity of Salamanca. Now indeed ſuch a thing is forbid by the law; yet ſtill there are ſome examples of it remaining in that country. Don Conſtantine Fontanus, a Spaniſh Divine, and confeſſor to Philip king of Spain, told me that while he lodged in the city of Valladolid at a Printer's houſe, which had the name of being haunted, he felt the night-mare the firſt time he lay in it: but as he had eaten black olives for ſupper, he fancied it to be a natural effect of that; eſpecially ſince the night-mare is looked upon as a diſeaſe. The following night he ſaw cats fighting upon the bed, which however diſagreeable it was, yet becauſe ſuch a thing might very well be, he thought there was nothing ſupernatural in it. But on the third night, before he went to ſleep, and as he was ruminating on theſe things, he heard the ſound of a trumpet, as it were, in his ear. While he imagined that this was only a kind of whiſtling noiſe, of a ſudden he ſaw boys who ſtood laughing: then a voice went round the chamber, and having made an end of it's circuit, got under the bed at laſt, and continued there muttering a long time, when nothing was to be ſeen.*’ What Cardan ſays of the Magic ſchools, which had been in Spain, was affirmed by a Magician mentioned by Thuanus. See the remark [*K*] of the article TIRESIAS.

(*i*) *Taken from* Hiſpan. Inquiſ. Secretiora, *pag.* 251, *& ſeq.*

(15) Ibid. *pag.* 255.

(16) Ibid. *pag.* 256.

(17) Ibid.

(18) Ibid. *pag.* 256.

(19) Ibid. *pag.* 258.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Card. de Subtilitate, *lib.* *xix*, *pag.* 691, *Edit. Lugdun.* 1580, *in* 8*vo.*

POPE (JOAN) poſſeſſed the papal chair, as it is ſaid, between Leo IV, who died the ſeventeenth of July 855, and Benedictus III, who died the eighth of April 858. It does not appear that Anaſtaſius, the Library-keeper, who lived in that age, has made mention of this She-Pope [*A*]. Many think that Marianus Scotus, who lived two

[*A*] *It does not appear that Anaſtaſius, the Library-keeper . . . . has made mention of this She-Pope.*] There are ſome manuſcripts however of this Anaſtaſius, which contain the whole ſtory, but this alone proves nothing; for it cannot be denied but that tranſcribers have added many foreign things to the works of an author. Panvinius aſſures us, that in the *old books of the lives of the Popes, written by Damaſus, by the Library-keeper, and by Pandulphus of Piſa, there is not the leaſt mention of this woman, only in the margin between Leo IV, and Benedictus III, this fable is inſerted by a later author, in various characters, and altogether different from the reſt* (1). Blondel, who ſaw in the library of the king of France, a manuſcript of Anaſtaſius, in which is found the ſtory of the She-Pope, plainly perceived that to be an additional piece. *Having read it over and over*, ſays he (2), *I obſerved that the elogy of the pretended She-Pope was framed in the very words of Martinus Polonus* (3), *penitentiary of Innocent IV, and archbiſhop of Coſenza, an author later than Anaſtaſius by four hundred years, and moreover, one that was very apt to ſpread all ſorts of fables. For that none may imagine he has tranſcribed,* two hundred years after, is the firſt that ſpoke of her. Some others maintain he ſaid nothing *either from Anaſtaſius, or any other that lived ſince the year* 900, *what he has inſerted in his chronicle, the diſcourſe which we find now prepoſterouſly inſerted in that of Anaſtaſius, ſhews it, both by it's conformity to the idiom of Martinus Polonus, and by the things it ſuppoſes, without apprehending, that they ſerve to prove the impoſture.* He gives ſome examples of theſe things, and afterwards brings a very ſolid reaſon; which is, that the ſtory of the She-Pope can by no means agree with the account of Anaſtaſius, touching the election of Benedictus III. ‘In the elogies of Leo IV, and Benedictus III, as they are in the manuſcript of the king's library ſwelled with the romance of the She-Pope, are found the ſame words as in the edition of Mayence: whence it neceſſarily follows, that (according to the intention of Anaſtaſius, violated by the temerity of thoſe who have intermixed their own dreams) it is abſolutely impoſſible any could have poſſeſſed the Popedom between Leo IV, and Benedictus III; for he ſays, *that after biſhop Leo was taken out of this world,* (mox) *preſently all the Clergy*, the chief men and people of Rome, *determined to chuſe Benedictus: that immediately* (illico) *they went to him, intreating him under the title of S. Calliſtus*, and that after having *placed him upon the pontifical throne*, and ſigned the decree of his election, they *ſent it to the moſt invincible emperors Lotharius and Lewis*, whereof the former (by the confeſſion of all the authors of that time) died the twenty-ninth of Sept. 855, ſeventy four days after Pope Leo (4).’ Certainly, if we found in a manuſcript, that the emperor Ferdinand II died in the year 1637, and that Ferdinand III immediately ſucceeded him, and that Charles VI ſucceeded Ferdinand II, and held the empire for the ſpace of two years, after which Ferdinand III was elected emperor, we ſhould ſay that the ſame author could never have writ all theſe things, and that the tranſcribers muſt neceſſarily have jumbled together without judgment what had been ſaid by different perſons. Muſt not a man be mad, or drunk, or delirious, if he ſhould relate that Innocent X being dead, was immediately ſucceeded by Alexander VII, that Innocent XI was preſently made Pope after Innocent X, and poſſeſſed the chair above two years, and that Alexander VII ſucceeded him? Anaſtaſius the Library-keeper would be guilty of the like extravagance, were he the author of all we find in the manuſcripts of his work, which mention the She-Pope. Therefore I ſay, what relates to this woman is ſpurious, and comes from another hand.

---

(1) Onuphr. in Addit. ad Plat. *quoted by* Coëffeteau, Reſponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *p.* 506.

(2) Blondel, Eclairciſſement de la Queſtion, Si une Femme a eſté aſſiſe au Siege Papal de Rome, &c. *pag.* 6, 7.

(3) We ſhall examine this in the remark [*K*].

Sarravius, a zealous Proteſtant, and an able man, made the ſame judgment, after he had very carefully examined the manuſcript of the king's library. He concluded from the narrative he found there, touching the election of Benedictus III, which happened preſently upon the death of Leo IV, that the ſtory of the She-Pope had been tacked to it by one that miſuſed his time (5). He ſpoke after this manner in the letters he wrote to Salmaſius, and ſupported his opinion with ſeveral other reaſons. ‘Venio ad Papiſſam. Quicquid de Papiſſâ confidentius dicas, intricatiſſimum eſt omne id negotium. Sederit illa, nec ne, longior eſt diſquiſitio, nec unius Epiſtolæ. Jam autem quæro tantum, num Anaſtaſii Bibliothecarii legitimus ſit fœtus Vita illa, quam apud te nuper tranſmiſi. Ut eum cenſeam ὑποϐολιμαιον, præter allatas jam rationes, hæ ſuadent (6). - - - - *I come to the She-Pope. Whatever you may confidently affirm about the She-Pope, it is all a very intricate affair. The queſtion, whether ſhe poſſeſſed the chair or not, would take up too much time, and cannot be diſcuſſed in one letter. At preſent I ſhall only inquire whether that life I lately tranſmitted to you, be the genuine offſpring of Anaſtaſius the Library-keeper. Beſides the reaſons already alledged, the following convince me that it is ſpurious.*’ One of theſe other reaſons ſeems to me demonſtrative. The account of the She-Pope does not appear in the manuſcript of Anaſtaſius as a fact, which the author warrants to be true; he uſes the expreſſion, *it is affirmed, that*, &c. *it is ſaid, that*, &c. Now, is it poſſible that a cotemporary author, living at Rome, ſhould ſpeak in that manner of the adventures of a Pope ſo extraordinary as theſe are? ‘Si Anaſtaſius hanc Hiſtoriam conſcripſit, rem ſua ætate, ſe vivo & Romæ degente, geſtam literis mandavit. Atqui de re tamquam parum comperta, & ſibi tantùm ex famâ cognitâ loquitur hic Auctor cum ait, *ut aſſeritur, ut dicitur*. Qui ità loquitur, non curat ſuo teſtimonio fidem haberi, quaſi diceret, *credat qui voluerit, fides ſit penes Auctores*. An autem credibile eſt virum doctum & ſagacem de adeo ſingulari ſui temporis eventu, non inquiſiviſſe diligenter, ut ad poſteros res notabilis, utque maximè in dubiâ fide cum ſuis omnibus circumſtanciis, dimanaret (7)? - - - *If Anaſtaſius was the author of this ſtory, he has left upon record a matter that was tranſacted in his own age, in his own life-time, whilſt he reſided at Rome. But this author ſpeaks of a fact as doubtful, and known to him only by report, when he ſays*, as it is affirmed, as it is given out. *He that ſpeaks ſo does not care that his own word ſhould be taken for it, as if he ſhould ſay*, believe it who will, I leave it to the authors. *But is it credible that a learned and ingenious man would not diligently inquire into ſo ſingular an event of his own time, but ſhould hand down to poſterity a memorable tranſaction, extremely doubtful in all it's circumſtances?*’ I do not believe that any author now-a-days, not even in the extreme parts of the north, is capable of uſing a *they ſay, they affirm*, in relating that Alexander VII ſucceeded Innocent X, and that Clement IX ſucceeded Alexander VII. Theſe are facts that cannot be rendered obſcure but through a long ſeries of years; but with regard to a cotemporary author, they have always a compleat certainty, and therefore he is never ſo ſilly as to report them upon a hear-ſay.

Theſe are reaſons ſo proper to convince us, that Anaſtaſius has ſaid nothing of the She-Pope, that in order to invalidate them, it is not ſufficient to alledge there are ſeveral manuſcripts like that of the French king's library (8): it would be abſolutely neceſſary to ſhew the ſtory in the original of Anaſtaſius; for then one would chuſe rather to believe upon the teſtimony of one's own eyes, that this author has made himſelf ridiculous in relating contradictory things, and in uſing fooliſhly a hear-ſay, than to reaſon, or diſpute. The difficulty is not removed, by objecting that this author is not exact, and that we meet with ſeveral variations and contrarieties in his accounts of things (9): certainly, no conſequence can be drawn from thence as to thoſe matters that paſſed under his own eyes. Thoſe who ſpeak of paſt ages conſult ſeveral books, and take from one, one thing, and from another, another. And therefore if they have not judgment, they put together facts that are inconſiſtent; but this does not happen with reſpect to events that are freſh and new, and ſo notorious as the inauguration of Popes. As to thoſe who pretend the particles *mox* and *illico*, preſently and immediately, have been foiſted by another hand into the text of Anaſtaſius (10), it may be anſwered, that with the like evaſion we may get rid of every evidence that makes againſt us, and all hiſtory would be reduced to a frightful Scepticiſm. One particular, and very ſtrong reaſon, why we cannot here admit the conjecture of thoſe men, is becauſe we have proofs founded on paſſages of ſome other cotemporary authors, by which it appears, that Benedictus III was the immediate ſucceſſor of Leo IV, and that the diſtance of time between the death of the one, and the inauguration of the other, was but ſmall (11). And therefore, in reaſon, we ought to ſuppoſe, that Anaſtaſius made uſe of the particles in queſtion.

An examination of what Salmaſius ſaid touching the edition of Anaſtaſius by the Jeſuits of Mayence.

Let us examine one thing which has made a great noiſe, and which I think is only founded upon the familiar diſcourſes of Salmaſius. ‘Marc Velſerus, one of the chief magiſtrates of Augſburg, having ſent in the year 1601 to the Jeſuits of Mayence, the manuſcript of Anaſtaſius, to get it printed: they deſired Marquard Freher, counſellor to his electoral highneſs at Heidelberg, to aſſiſt them in this affair; upon their promiſe that they would honeſtly publiſh what ſhould be communicated to them, he ſent them two manuſcripts of Anaſtaſius, in which the life of the pretended She-Pope was. But theſe gentlemen being contented with having two copies of this ſort printed, they ſuppreſſed in the reſt of the edition, what had been imparted to them; ſo that it did not appear, and Freherus was forced, by a kind of *Manifeſto* printed, to complain of the trick

they

---

(4) Blondel, Eclairciſſement, &c, *pag.* 9, 10.

(5) Inde patet quod de ea (*Joanna*) ibi dictum eſt, aſſumentum eſſe hominis otio abuſi. *Sarravii Epiſt.* CXXXVIII, *pag.* 144, *Edit. Ultraj.* 1697.

(6) Idem, Epiſt. CXL, *p.* 145.

(7) Idem, *pag.* 146. *See alſo* Epiſt. CXLVI, *pag.* 151.

(8) *See* Colomies, *in his* Mêlanges Hiſtoriques, *pag.* 56.

(9) Mareſius, in Examine Quæſt. de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 31, 32, 155; *and Cooke, in the treatiſe of the She-Pope, pag.* 106, *& ſeq.*

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 156, 157.

(11) *See* Blondel, Eclairciſſement, &c. *pag.* 39, *& ſeq. and Father* Labbe, in Cenotaphio everſo, *pag.* 842, *& ſeq. Tom.* 1, de Script. Eccleſ.

nothing about her [*B*], or however but very little: for he is contented to obſerve under the

‘ they had ſerved him (12).’ This is what Blondel had heard Salmaſius ſay in the year 1640 (13). *I was extremely concerned*, continues he (14), *becauſe no body being able to ſhew either the writing of Freherus againſt the Jeſuits, nor the copies they had cauſed to be printed for him, nor, in fine, thoſe he had ſupplied them with from the library of Heidelberg, which undoubtedly have been buried in the ruins of the Palatinate, or tranſported by the Bavarians where they thought fit, we were left deprived of the means of learning what they contained.* Rivetus (15), Sarravius (16), Mareſius (17), Spanhemius (18), and Boëclerus (19), had heard Salmaſius ſay the ſame thing; and they have not failed upon his teſtimony to charge publickly the Jeſuits of Mayence with having played there a knaviſh trick. It may paſs for indiſputable that Salmaſius ſaid ſo: but it is a queſtion whether his memory, as good as it was, did not deceive him. It would be much more civil and much more charitable to impute this defect to him, than to accuſe him of calumny as Father Labbe does (20). However it be, if the ſtory of Salmaſius were true, we ſhould have here one of the ſtrangeſt prodigies that ever happened among mankind. The Jeſuits would have committed a notorious fraud, in a point controverted between the Catholics and Proteſtants. Marquard Freherus, villainouſly made a dupe in this affair, would have complained of it to the public, and have had the moſt ready and the moſt inconteſtable means that a man can wiſh for, to load with ſhame an impoſtor that he abhors. He would have been able to ſhew to all the world the conformity of the manuſcripts to the two copies they had preſented him with, and the difference that would be found between theſe two copies and the reſt: and yet there would not have been one author that had made mention of this egregious and public fraud of the Jeſuits. Du Pleſſis Mornai, who held intelligence with all the Proteſtant world, and a particular correſpondence with the Palatinate, would have known nothing of this printed letter of Marquard Freherus, for he has ſaid nothing of it in the chapter of Pope Joan (21). Rivetus, the moſt curious man in the world in all ſorts of books of controverſy, would not have been better inſtructed than Du Pleſſis in refuting Coëffeteau, who had denied the ſtory of this She-Pope. Conrad Deckher, publiſhing a book in the Palatinate to maintain this ſtory, would have been unacquainted with the adventure of the edition of Anaſtaſius. One Urſinus, who ſtiled himſelf Anti-Jeſuit, and publiſhed in the ſame country ſeveral books very ſatirical againſt the Jeſuits, would have ſaid nothing of that adventure. David Pareus, profeſſor at Heidelberg, who was perpetually quarrelling with the Jeſuits; and particularly with ſome Fathers of the college of Mayence, would have ſpared them on that point, though the war between them was as fierce as if between Turks and Moors. Never were the diſputes between Proteſtants and Jeſuits ſo violent, and eſpecially in Germany, as during the firſt thirty years of the XVIIth century, and yet amongſt an infinite number of books of controverſy, and libels that appeared againſt the Jeſuits in that ſpace of time, there would not be found one that reproached them with the cheat of the edition of Anaſtaſius. Whence could ſo univerſal a gentleneſs proceed? Was there a law made at Heidelberg after the edition of Anaſtaſius in 1602, to the ruin of the library in 1622, not to ſhew any perſon the two copies that had been preſented by the Jeſuits, and to hinder the confronting of them? Did every body agree to throw into the fire the public complaint of Marquard Freherus, and even to loſe the memory of it? Whence comes it that Salmaſius, the only one that has not had the gift of oblivion, never ſpoke of this fraud in the works he publiſhed, being contented only to entertain his friends with it in converſation? The queſtions that might be made on this ſubject are numberleſs. Father Labbe has puſhed ſome of them in an unmerciful manner, and with thundering expreſſions againſt Mareſius (22). Theſe are queſtions which are very obvious, and yet it does not appear that any of thoſe learned men, who have publiſhed what Salmaſius had told them by word of mouth about the conſequences of this edition of Mayence, ever thought to propoſe to him any of theſe doubts. Spanhemius, who was not ignorant of Father Labbe's queſtions, has made no anſwer at all. I am ſurprized, and yet I am not ſurprized at it in different reſpects; but though I am a dwarf in compariſon of theſe giants, I think, if I had had the honour to hear Salmaſius ſay what he told them, I ſhould have intreated him to give me ſome reaſons for this prodigious ſilence of all the authors who have writ againſt the Jeſuits ſince the year 1602. See the margin (23).

If a gentleman aſſured me that in 1664 he heard Mr Arnauld ſay what I am going to relate, I would plainly anſwer him in this manner. I believe Mr Arnauld has told you this ſtory, ſince you atteſt it as an ear-witneſs; but I do not believe what he ſaid; it is one of thoſe indeterminate diſcourſes of converſation, in which things are miſerably confounded. We have a thouſand inſtances of this kind in the *Scaligerana*, and in the *Menagiana*. This is the narrative which I ſuppoſe on purpoſe to furniſh out a parallel.

Meſſieurs Du Puy ſent in the year 1644 (24) to the Jeſuits of Rome the manuſcript of a council, in which there was a deciſive paſſage for the efficacy of Grace. The Jeſuits had engaged their honour that they would not curtail the manuſcript, they cauſed two copies of it to be printed faithfully, and retrenched the deciſive paſſage in all the reſt. They ſent back the manuſcript to Meſſieurs Du Puy, and made them a preſent of the two copies that were not altered. Meſſieurs Du Puy finding out the trick complained of it by a printed letter. This is what I ſuppoſe Mr Arnauld told very ſeriouſly in the year 1664.

There is not a reaſonable man but ſhould have aſked him, how comes it that no body ever boaſted of having ſeen the letter of Meſſieurs Du Puy? How comes it they did not challenge the Jeſuits to ſend ſomebody to aſſiſt at an aſſembly, in which they might compare the manuſcript both with the two copies received in a preſent, and with the reſt of the edition? Why did they not draw up an act before a Public Notary, that they might have a moſt invincible proof of the fraud? Why did you, who have writ ſo much againſt the Jeſuits, never charge them with having falſified the manuſcript of a council? Why is there not found one author, ſince the diſputes about Janſeniſm, which have produced an infinite number of pieces againſt the ſociety, that complains of the retrenching of this paſſage? What head of Meduſa has ſo petrified the hand and memory of a world of Anti-Moliniſts, that none of them ſhould print any thing about it? Would they have agreed among themſelves to ſpare the Jeſuits the ſhame they deſerved? But why ſpare them upon that point, when nothing was forgot that could give an advantage againſt them? And, in fine, is it likely that people, who have at leaſt a great deſire not to be taken in the fact, ſhould ſo groſly impoſe upon Meſſieurs Du Puy, that their cheat muſt inevitably be diſcovered to the utter confuſion of the whole body?

Theſe difficulties cannot be removed, and they ſtrike us ſo forcibly, that unleſs we ſuffer ourſelves to be blinded with ſtrange prejudice in favour of Mr Arnauld's ſincerity, and the faithfulneſs of his memory, we muſt always think his ſtory is nothing but a fable.

But ſuppoſe all that Salmaſius relates were true, it would not affect the main point of the queſtion; for what has been already obſerved with regard to the manuſcript of the king's library would have no leſs force againſt that of the Elector Palatine. It might be ſaid upon the ſame foundation, that the ſtory of the She-Pope has been tacked to the one and the other, and therefore it might be concluded that Anaſtaſius is not the author of it.

We ſhall ſee below (25), of what force the argument is, drawn from the ſilence of cotemporary authors.

[*B*] *Many think that Marianus Scotus . . . is the firſt that ſpoke of her. Others maintain he ſaid nothing about her.*] Let us quote Coëffeteau. ‘ Several learned men, who reckon Marianus Scotus a pretty ‘ good Hiſtorian, ſuſpect that the Lutherans have ‘ corrupted the copy which they made uſe of in printing it: for it is certain this ſtory is not to be found ‘ in old copies. And Mireus, canon of Antwerp, a ‘ learned man, particularly well verſed in hiſtory, ‘ who not long ſince cauſed Sigebert to be printed, ‘ aſſures us, that he has an old manuſcript of Marianus, the year 853, that *Joan, a woman*, ſucceeded Pope Leo IV, *during the ſpace of two years five months and four days* (a). Sigebert, who died in the year 1113, was a little more particular in the affair; but ſome affirm the paſſage aſcribed to him is forged [*C*], and ground their aſſertion upon manuſcripts, in which it is not to be found. Martin Polonus, who

---

(12) Blondel, Eclairciſſement, &c. *pag.* 3, 4.

(13) It is Salmaſius that Blondel meant; as *Colomies, Mélanges Hiſtoriques, pag.* 55, 56, has obſerved.

(14) Blondel, ubi ſupra, *p.* 5.

(15) Rivet. Crit. Sacri, *lib. iii, ch. xiv. See alſo* Spanh. de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 292.

(16) Ibid.

(17) Mareſius, in Examine Quæſtionis, *pag.* 178.

(18) Spanh. de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 292.

(19) Boëcler. in Commentar. de Rebus Seculi noni, apud Spanh. ibid.

(20) Philippus Labbe, in Cenotaphio everſo, *pag.* 929, & *ſeq.*

(21) *In his* Myſtere d'Iniquité, *printed in the year* 1611.

(22) Labbe, in Cenotaphio everſo, *pag.* 929, & *ſeq.*

(23) Daniel Francus, *p.* 145, de Indicibus Librorum expurgandorum, *relates all the objections of Father Labbe, and the only anſwer he makes is to intreat thoſe that have the letter of Freherus to produce it.*

(24) This time, and afterwards the year 1664, is ſuppoſed as the æra of the narrative of Mr Arnauld, that the parallel may agree the better, there having been twenty years between the edition of Anaſtaſius, and the ruin of the Palatine library.

(25) See the remark [*G*].

‘ nus, written on parchment, which the reverend abbot of Gembloux, called *Ludovicus Sombechus*, ſent him, in which this fable of the pretended She-Pope is not inſerted, either in the text or in the margin. The ſame is alſo atteſted by the perſon that publiſhed at Cologn, Krantzius (26). Even Serrarius ſays he ſaw at Francfort a manuſcript in the hands of Latomus who ſhewed it him, where this ſtory is related not abſolutely, as in that of Baſil, which the Calviniſt Heroldus printed, but according to common report, *ut aſſeritur* (27).’ Obſerve, if you pleaſe, that the edition of Marianus procured by Herold was printed from this manuſcript of Latomus (28). Now by the confeſſion of the Jeſuit Serarius this manuſcript does not differ from the edition but with regard to the terms *ut aſſeritur*. It contains therefore all the reſt, and conſequently there are ſome manuſcripts of Marianus that mention the She-Pope, which the Lutherans cannot be ſaid to have added to them; ſince it is certain that the manuſcript of Latomus had never been falſified by the Lutherans. It was a prieſt that furniſhed it, and took it from the library of a church (29). But it will be objected, whence proceed theſe variations of the manuſcripts of Marianus? Why do we find Pope Joan in ſome of them and not in others? I anſwer, this diverſity may ariſe as well from addition as ſubſtraction, and to know certainly whether Marianus be the author of the clauſe touching the She-Pope, it would be neceſſary to ſee the original of his book; if it were found there, he muſt have put it, if it were not found there, it would be a forged piece in the manuſcripts that have it. But as we cannot ſee the original, it is impoſſible to determine any thing that way. Another queſtion may be aſked, is it more likely that tranſcribers have caſtrated than that they have added what relates to Pope Joan? It is difficult to anſwer any thing poſitively: for there are reaſons on both ſides. It is pretended, that probably ſome tranſcribers, finding the period of the She-Pope to be ſcandalous, would not inſert it: and that probably other tranſcribers, being ſtruck with the ſingularity of the fact, would not have it omitted in their Marianus, but put it in. Some readers write, in the margin of a hiſtory or calendar, a great many ſupplements. If a Bookſeller were to reprint this hiſtory by a copy of this kind, he would inſert in his new edition all theſe marginal notes, each in it's own place, and would not always be at the pains to diſtinguiſh them from the old text. There was ſtill more room for ſuch a practice before Printing was invented: books were dearer, and therefore people choſe rather to put in the margin the ſupplements that another book could furniſh them with, than to buy two books. Now theſe marginal additions ordinarily paſſed into the text, when a new copy was writ. I ſhall add here a remark of Florimond de Remond. ‘ Books . . . compoſed on diſtinct ſubjects without connexion, as chronologies are, are very liable to the gloſſes of thoſe into whoſe hands they fall. We commonly ſee in them a world of gaps, which are filled up by the firſt comer, and with ſuch materials as he can light on: and very frequently trimmed up with ſome falſe piece. Every one, according to the years, readily adds what in his opinion was left out by the author, who could not take notice of all that is ſcattered amongſt a great multitude of books that we have, and amidſt the confuſion of things that happened in paſt ages. Who is he amongſt us, that does not comment, and recomment upon the Chronology of the learned Pontac, and that of Genebrard, a great maſter of languages, becauſe they have both omitted, perhaps thro' inadvertency, ſome particulars, or elſe deſignedly paſſed them over. If afterwards theſe books, with marginal notes, fall into the hands of any Printer, he is ſure to make all paſs under the name of their firſt maſter, however innocent of the faults which the author of theſe gloſſes may have committed (30).’

By this we may perceive, how it comes to paſs that the ſtory of the She-Pope is found at length in the manuſcripts of Anaſtaſius. I own that by the ſame reaſon it ought to be found as fully in the manuſcripts of Marianus, and not in two or three words only; but it is to be obſerved, that the practice I ſpeak of muſt have been more frequent with reſpect to manuſcripts deſigned for the libraries of academies and churches. Communities had not the ſame reaſon as a private perſon to be ſaving. Now, the manuſcripts of Marianus, deſigned for the uſe of a private perſon, might poſſibly be loſt, and thoſe of Anaſtaſius might paſs from the poſſeſſion of a private perſon to that of public libraries. I do not alledge this as a convincing proof, nor even as a conjecture that cannot be refuted; but what can one do better in matters ſo uncertain, and where one gropes in the dark? See the margin (31).

What I am going to ſay has not much of the problem in it. If Marianus did not ſpeak of a She-Pope, that which we find of it in the manuſcripts of this author, cannot be attributed to the Lutherans: for theſe manuſcripts are undoubtedly prior to Luther. This Reformer appeared at a time when Printing was common, and people no longer employed themſelves in copying manuſcripts, and after all, the connoiſſeurs can very well diſtinguiſh whether a copy was writ in the XVIth century, or a long time before. I ſay then, that if the chronicle of Marianus has been lengthened out a few lines, to inſert the She-Pope in it, this has been done by the Roman Catholics.

This, you will ſay, is againſt all probability: they ought to have been incomparably more inclined to cancel the adventure of this woman, wherever they found it, than to inſert it where they found it not. They ſaw very well, it was ſcandalous to their church. I anſwer, that this objection, which ſeems ſomewhat plauſible, is nothing at bottom but a meer ſhadow; for if the ſtory of the She-Pope be a fable, it was forged in the breaſt of Popery, and they were Prieſts and Monks that firſt publiſhed it. It has been believed, and adopted by ſome authors extreamly devoted to the Papacy, ſuch as Antoninus, archbiſhop of Florence, one of the ſaints of the Romiſh communion. A vaſt number of writers have related it ſincerely and honeſtly, and without ſuſpecting it did any prejudice to the holy ſee; and even after the ſectaries of Bohemia had drawn from thence an argument (32), they continued to own it, and did not begin to combat it in good earneſt till the Proteſtants thought fit to make great advantage of it. There are many other things, which the zealots of Popery were concerned to ſuppreſs, and which they have not ſuppreſſed (33), tho' infinitely more ſcandalous and diſhonourable than that.

[*C*] *Some maintain it is a piece forged by Sigebert*]. What I have juſt ſaid, about the manuſcripts of Marianus, may be applied to the manuſcripts of Sigebert, monk of Gemblours, who died in the year 1113. Here follows what we read in the chronicle of this Sigebert, printed at Paris in the year 1513. *Pope John, an Engliſhman. The report is, that this John was a woman, and that only one of her familiar friends knew it, who uſed to lie with her, and that at laſt, even whilſt ſhe was Pope, ſhe became with child, and was delivered. This is the reaſon why ſome do not rank her among the Popes, and that therefore ſhe does not increaſe the number of the Popes of this* name (34). *There are ſome manuſcripts of Sigebert, which have nothing of this paſſage. Mireus aſſures us*, that in four different copies, among which was the *copy of the Abbey of Gembloux, whereof Sigebert was Monk, which is the original, or at leaſt was taken from the very manuſcript that Sigebert made uſe of to publiſh it, there is no mention made of Pope Joan, not even in the margin, tho' there is abundance of things added not long ſince: however*, ſays he, *it is certain this fable is falſly attributed to our Sigebert* (35). Add to that theſe words of Florimond de Remond: ‘ The forgery which we ſay has been committed in Sigebert, is obvious to the eye by the comparing of an old author, called William of Nangiac, who has writ a chronicle to the year 1302, in which that of Sigebert is tranſcribed from one end to the other, without any thing miſſing. And yet the only ſtory of this

---

(a) *See* Blondel, *pag.* 17, *of* Eclairciſſement de la Queſtion, Si une Femme a eſté aſſiſe au Siege Papal de Rome.

(26) *He calls himſelf* Gervinus Calenius, *and takes the title of* Legum Licentiatus. *He publiſhed the* Saxonia & Metropolis *of* Albert Krantz, *at Cologn in* 1574.

(27) Coëffeteau, Reſponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 506.

(28) It is certain that John Herold publiſhed Marianus at Baſil, in the year 1550, from the original that was ſent him from Francfort by Joannes Latomus, dean of St Bartholomew's church in the ſame town. *Florim. de Remond, l'Anti-papeſſe, ch. ii, num.* 4, *fol.* 366.

(29) See the foregoing quotation.

(30) Remond, L'Anti-Papeſſe, *chap. v, num.* 3, *fol.* 375, *verſo.*

(31) I enlarge more on all theſe conjectures in the remark [*B*] of the article POLONUS.

(32) See in the remark [*E*] what Æneas Sylvius ſays in anſwer to the biſhop of the Taborites.

(33) See the remark [*G*].

(34) Sigebert. Gemblacenſis, in Chronico, *ad ann.* 854. *His words are*, Johannes Anglicus, fama eſt hunc Johannem fœminam fuiſſe & uni ſoli familiari cognitam qui eam complexus eſt, & gravis facta peperit Papa exiſtens. Quare eam inter Pontifices non numerant quidam, ideo nomini numerum non facit.

(35) Coëffeteau, Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 507: *he quotes* Myreus, in Edit. Sigeb. *ad ann.* 854.

who died *about the year* 1207, *that is* 184 *years after the death of Marianus* (b), enlarges much more upon the ſtory. He aſſures us, 'that the Joan of Marianus was called *the Engliſhman*, that ſhe was *of the nation of Mayence*, that having been got with child, ſhe was delivered in the midſt of a proceſſion, *between the Coloſſus and the church of S. Clement*, and that in abhorrence of her crime, the proceſſion (taking another way) hath ceaſed to paſs along that ſtreet. Thierry de Niem who wrote . . . . . . about 328 years after the death of Marianus . . . . . ., adds, out of his own head, *that a ſtatue* was erected in memory of this accident. William Breuin who wrote * of the VII principal churches of Rome, and Baptiſt Platina who died in the year 1481, 395 years after the death of Marianus, ... (to ſwell the doſe) have mentioned *the cloſe-ſtool*, upon which (as they ſay) the Pope muſt ſit in order to be ſearched. And above a hundred years after, others thought fit to contribute their quota, affirming that the pretended Joan was *a witch*, that ſhe *crowned the emperour Lewis the ſecond* &c: ſo that ſcarce 460 years have been ſufficient to give a compleat form to this bear, which the poor Marianus (I know not how) brought forth.' Thus ſpeaks David Blondel, who though he was a miniſter, yet treats this ſtory of the She-Pope as a fable, and

'this female Pope is not there. Why ſhould he have omitted it, ſince the original, from whence he ſays he had taken it, could contradict him? This manuſcript is ſtill to be ſeen in the Abbey of Gemblours near Louvain, if it has eſcaped the fury of the men of this age. It was there where our Sigebert was monk. His book is kept there very curiouſly by the monks, to ſhew it as a rarity, when men of learning viſit their convent. It is writ with Sigebert's own hand, in which nothing is ſaid of this new Pontif. The learned Franciſcan-Father Protaſius ſwore to me he had ſeen it, and aſſured me there was not one word of this fable in it: Onuphrius, Genebrard, and others, likewiſe atteſt the ſame. It is a thing eaſy to be verified, if any incredulous perſon will take the trouble. The ſame Onuphrius writes, that in antient copies, which are found of Sigebert in Italy, taken from the original of Gemblours, and which are ſeen among the old libraries, there is nothing ſaid of it neither (36).' Alexander Cook (37), has writ ſome notes aginſt this paſſage of Florimond de Remond; but they do not ſerve to prove that the manuſcript of Gemblours is not antient, *&c.* This juſtice ought reciprocally to be done by one author to another, that if the one affirms there is ſuch a manuſcript in a public library, the other do not deny it, unleſs he knows it to be falſe (38); for we are not to ſuppoſe that an author would be ſo imprudent as to tell a lie, when he is well aſſured that his lie will be fully and eaſily diſcovered (39). Might not ſome traveller be commiſſioned to deſire to have the manuſcript of Sigebert ſhewn him? Is that denied one? Do they not take pleaſure to ſatisfy all the curious about it? I do not ſee then why Cook ſhould have depiſed what Florimond de Remond alledges of Father Protaſius. I think too he trifles, when he obſerves (39*) that Bellarmin, in aſſuring us that Molanus ſaw the manuſcript of Gemblours *does not tell us to whom* Molanus *ſaid ſo, nor in what book it is writ. So that*, concludes he, *to this day no juſt proof has been brought that there is one ſingle copy in which it is not found, much leſs that it has been added to copies, where this ſtory is found.* Why did he not conſult the dialogues of one of his own country? There he might have read, that Molanus, as an eye-witneſs, had aſſured Alanus Copus that the manuſcript of Gemblours contained nothing about the She-Pope, and that if it was not the original of Sigebert, it was at leaſt a copy made from the original. This would have cauſed ſeveral of Cook's remarks to fall to the ground. Note, that it is affirmed, that ſeveral impertinencies of a fabulous writer have been foiſted into the chronicle of Sigebert. Read the following words of Alanus Copus: 'Antiquiora Sigeberti exemplaria nullam hujuſmodi narrationem complectuntur: & ſatis præterea conſtat, illius hiſtoriæ multa aſcititia & plane vana ex, neſcio, cujus Galfridi Monumetenſis libro aſperſa (40). - - - - *The antient copies of Sigebert contain no ſtory of this kind: and beſides, it is evident enough, that many very impertinent things are taken from the book of one Jeffry of Monmouth, and interſperſed in his Hiſtory.*' We muſt not forget that Mr Spanheim owns that the words of Sigebert, related above, according to the edition of Paris, 1513, are a parentheſis, which may be taken away without injuring the recitals and chronological calculations of the author: for he gives to Benedictus III, immediately after Leo, the ſame year, which the parentheſis aſſigns to Joan (41). Mr Spanheim likewiſe very ingenuouſly acknowledges that the parentheſis is not in the manuſcript of the Leyden library (42). It is a very old manuſcript, and of the year 1154, if we believe the title.

Blondel has taken no ſide in the diſpute about the manuſcripts of Sigebert; but he intimates very clearly that he thinks it probable this author ſaid nothing of the She-Pope. One of his reaſons is this (43): 'Vincent de Beauvais, and William de Nangis (44) (who have from year to year inſerted his words in their collections, and particularly with regard to what he wrote upon the year 854, touching Benedictus III, and Anaſtaſius his Anti-Pope; and upon the year 857, touching Nicolas the Firſt), do not tranſcribe the clauſe concerning the She-Pope.' This reaſon is very ſtrong, to prove, at leaſt, that the tranſcribers made uſe of a copy, that ſaid nothing of Joan. I know it is anſwered, that they ſkip this place of the original, becauſe Sigebert himſelf tells us, that ſome *do not rank her among the Popes, and therefore ſhe does not augment the number of the Popes of this name* (45). This remark is likewiſe made uſe of to refute the argument Blondel draws, from the ſilence of many famous Hiſtorians concerning the She-Pope. It is ſhewn that certain Popes have been eraſed out of the catalogue of the biſhops of Rome (46); and Bede is quoted, who informs us, that two Anglo-Saxon kings became ſo odious, that it was thought proper to let their memory periſh, and to unite immediately in hiſtory the reign which preceded, and the reign which followed theſe two apoſtate princes (47). Ita referente Beda in Hiſt. Anglo-Saxonum *, adeo fuit exoſa memoria Regum paris, Oſrichi & Earfridi, *propter apoſtaſiam*, ut *cunctis placuerit*, *Regum tempora computantibus*, *ut ablata de medio Regum perfidorum memoria*, *idem annus ſequentis Regis regno aſſignaretur*: but theſe anſwers can never ſatisfy an unbyaſſed judgment for even the obſervation of Sigebert ought to have been a reaſon, why the authors that adopted his narratives ſhould have ſpoke of the She-Pope. They ought, after his example, to have related the adventures of this pretended Pontif, and afterwards added, that ſhe was not numbred amongſt the Popes, *&c.* But as they have not ſpoke in this manner, it is a ſign they did not find in Sigebert the paſſage in queſtion. I ſhall obſerve further, that had there been a decree, ordering that the name of the She-Pope ſhould be razed out of all public records, and that her ſtatues ſhould be deſtroyed, this would have been one of thoſe remarkable circumſtances, which Hiſtorians principally relate. There was ſuch a decree againſt the memory of Domitian, who notwithſtanding that has had a place in all the Hiſtories amongſt the emperors of Rome. This very order of the ſenate is one of the things, which Hiſtorians have moſt carefully obſerved. Mr Spanheim, who cites Procopius (48), might have cited Suetonius (49). What he quotes from the Hiſtorian Bede confirms this. And when all is done, it is certain that Annaliſts, in order to reach the true ſpirit of ſuch a decree, and to anſwer the real intent of the ſenate, who deſigned that the memory of a tyrant ſhould periſh, ought to mention this ſtigmatizing ſentence. It is by no means to be thought, that thoſe, who inflict ſuch a puniſhment upon and has writ books to refute it (c). This whole ſtory, ſays he (d), *is an inlaid piece of work, embelliſhed with time.* We ſhall give it afterwards according to the account of thoſe who have been at moſt pains to collect the circumſtances [D]. Undoubtedly, new

---

(b) Blondel. Eclairciſſement, &c. *pag.* 17, 18.

* About the year 470.

(36) Flor. de Remond, L'Anti-Papeſſe, *chap. v*, *num.* 5, *fol.* 376.

(37) Cook, in treatiſe of the She-Pope, *pag.* 82, *& ſeq.*

(38) Compare what Mr Arnauld ſays in the third volume of the *Morale Pratique*, *pag.* 471, *& ſeq.*

(39) It is not pretended but that ſome authors are imprudent enough ſome times in that reſpect: but we muſt not eſtabliſh a rule upon that.

(39*) Cook, Treatiſe of the She-Pope, *pag.* 82.

(40) Alanus Copus, Dialogo I, *cap. viii*, *pag.* 37, *Edit. Ant.* 1573, *in* 4*to.*

(41) Spanh. de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 53.

(42) Ibid. *pag.* 52.

(43) Blondel, Eclairciſſement, &c. *pag.* 69. *He joins to theſe two in his Latin work, pag. m.* 42, *Alberic Monk of Trois fontaines*, Sigeberti exſcriptor, qui de Joanna ſilet.

(44) *Here is what Genebrard ſays on the year* 858, *pag. m.* 539. Chronica Guliel. Nangiaci, in quibus cum totus Liber alioqui Sigeberti exſcriptus ſit, hoc unum deſideretur.

(45) Qui dicuntur Docto Anacritæ exſcripſiſſe Sigebertum, nec tamen Joannæ meminiſſe, ut Albericus, Vincentius Bellovacenſis, Guillelmus Nangiacus, non ideo illam omiſerunt, quod de ea tacuiſſet Sigebertus, ſed quod ipſo Sigeberto judice, verbis modò relatis, *nomini numerum non faceret.*

(46) *See Mr* Spanheim, de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 38, *& ſeq.*

(47) Ibid. *pag.* 40.

* Beda Hiſt. Anglo-Saxonum, *lib. iii*, *ch. i.*

(48) Spanh. de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 40: *he cites* Procopius, *cap. viii*, Hiſtor. arcanæ.

(49) Sueton. in Domitiano, *cap. ult.*

an uſurper, deſire that none ſhould ſpeak of him either good or ill; this would be to favour him, and to have him ſheltered from ignominy. Now, this they could not have in view, without falling into a contradiction; and therefore they deſire that what they deſerve againſt his memory ſhould ſerve to make him deteſted in all future ages. Conſequently they wiſh that their ſentence be expreſsly mentioned in the annals of the country.

Let it be added, that there is a very wide difference between razing one out of the number of Popes, and the making no mention of him. The Anti-Popes are not in the number: thoſe, who took the name of Clement, are not reckoned among the Clements: and yet Annaliſts do not ſuppreſs the actions, the intruſion, and the diſorders of theſe falſe Popes. Mareſius puts this queſtion, Was there not in France a Charles X, whom the league ſet up againſt Henry IV? and yet no Hiſtorian has put him in the number of the kings of France (50). Grand illuſion! For tho' Hiſtorians do not put him in the number of the kings, they, however, inform us what the league did for him. The queſtion here is not, whether the She-Pope ſat in the chair rightfully: the queſtion is only about the fact; did ſhe uſurp the papal chair after the death of Leo IV? Did ſhe poſſeſs it for the ſpace of two years? Did ſhe loſe it by her death, when ſhe was delivered in the ſtreets? An Hiſtorian, who conſiders her as a falſe Pope, may very well exclude her from the number of Popes that have had the name of John, and reckon Leo IV for the 102d (51), and Benedictus III for the 103d, but he muſt neceſſarily ſpeak of the interregnum of this female uſurper. The French Hiſtorians begin the reign of Charles VII at the death of Charles VI, and do not reckon as king of France Henry VI king of England; but they do not diſſemble, that after the death of Charles VI, this Henry VI was proclaimed king of France. However ſhameful ſuch facts may be, they are too public to be entirely ſuppreſſed in Hiſtory.

I conclude, it is arguing ſophiſtically *à non cauſa pro cauſa*, to ſuppoſe that the remark of Sigebert hindered his tranſcribers from copying his account of the She-Pope. Therefore, other anſwers than that of Samuel Mareſius muſt be ſought for.

We ſhall ſee elſewhere (52), that the ſame difficulties are raiſed on Martin Polonus as on Marianus and Sigebert.

[D] *We ſhall give* this ſtory *according to the account of thoſe who have been at moſt pains to collect the circumſtances of it.*] There are but few wanting in the relation I am going to give, and which I take from a work of John Creſpin. ‘JOHN the eighth of this name, took the name of Engliſhman, on the account of a certain Engliſh Monk of the abbey of Fulda, whom he ſigularly loved: as to his office, he was Pope, but as to his ſex, a woman. This maid, by nation a German, born at Mayence, and firſt named Gilberta, pretending to be of the male-ſex, and having taken the habit of a man, went to Athens with the monk her galant. At which place, after having exceedingly improved in all ſorts of ſciences, ſhe returned after his death to Rome: but ſtill diſſembling that ſhe was a woman. Now, ſince ſhe was extreamly witty, and had a graceful and ready way of talking at diſputations and public leſſons, ſo that many were vaſtly ſurprized at her learning; every one became ſo well affected to her, and ſhe gained the friendſhip of all in ſuch a manner, that after the death of Leo, ſhe was choſen Pope. Into which office after ſhe was introduced, ſhe conferred holy orders (as they call them) after the manner of other Popes: ſhe made prieſts and deacons, ordained biſhops and abbots, ſung maſſes, conſecrated churches and altars, adminiſtred the ſacraments, preſented her feet to be kiſſed, and did all the other things that Popes uſe to do: and her acts were not at that time reckoned invalid.

‘During the time this woman was Pope, the ~~empe~~ emperor Lotharius, now grown old, went into a monaſtery; and Lewis the ſecond of that name coming to Rome, took the ſcepter and crown of the empire at her hands, with the benediction of St Peter. . . . Now, whilſt ſhe was in this office of Pope, ſhe was got with child by one of her own chaplains, a cardinal, who knew very well what ſex ſhe was of. And as ſhe was going in ſome ſolemn proceſſion to the church of Latran, ſhe was delivered of this child, thus conceived in fornication, between the Coloſſus and the church of St Clement, in the midſt of the city of Rome, in the great ſquare, even in a public ſtreet, in the preſence of all the people of Rome: and died upon the ſpot in bringing forth her child, in the year of our Lord 857. Upon the account of this crime, and becauſe ſhe was delivered in public, ſhe was deprived of all the honour that had been uſually done to Popes, and was buried without any Papal pomp. . . . . Now, that the Popes and anointed Fathers may ſeem to have ſuch a treſpaſs in abhorrence, they turn aſide from that place, as if they looked upon it to be ominous. . . . . But that the good Fathers might not again fall into the like miſfortune, they ordered that a Deacon ſhould feel the privy-parts of the perſon who ſhould be choſen Pope, through a cloſe-ſtool, in order to know whether he be a male or not. But now-a-days, whilſt they are Cardinals, and before they are choſen Popes, they get ſo many baſtards, that no body can doubt of their being males, and there is no further occaſion for ſo holy a ceremony (53).’

Theſe laſt words allude to thoſe Latin verſes of Johannes Pannonius, which Mr du Pleſſis has related in his Hiſtory of the Papacy (54):

Non poterat quiſquam reſerantes æthera claves
  Non exploratis ſumere teſticulis.
Cur igitur noſtro mos hic nunc tempore ceſſat?
  Ante probat quod ſe quilibet eſſe marem.

That is,

The keys of Heav'n no man cou'd take,
Unleſs his ſecret parts were felt.
Why is this cuſtom now left off?
Each proves himſelf a male before.

Florimond de Remond, makes uſe of this paſſage to convict thoſe of a lie, who ſaid this cuſtom ſtill continued. *Our adverſaries,* ſays he (55), ... *tell us, that to prevent the Papacy from falling hereafter to females, they ſtill feel, to this day, the privy-parts of the Popes, who are elected, crying out, when they touch them, with great joy,* He is worthy to be made Pope. *The centuriators, relating theſe ſhameful things, ſay, that with great rejoycing, they cry,* He has them, he has them. *To this purpoſe Pannonius made theſe verſes, which, tho' they ought to be ſuppreſſed, I was willing to put here, tranſlated into our own tongue, ſince they make an advantage of them: that one may ſee by theſe ſame authors their contradictions and calumnies.* . . . . The verſes of Pannonius ſhew, *that this method was not practiſed in his time. The authors of the Centuries and Bale dare not ſay the contrary, and immediately add a fine reaſon worthy of this profeſſion.* This cuſtom, ſay they, of ſearching them, is annihilated and aboliſhed, becauſe it is no longer neceſſary, ſince their concubines and whores give ſufficient teſtimony of their exiſtence (56).

He obſerves that John Creſpin has copied *word for word* the expreſſions of *John Bale* (57). But however we do not find in the account of Creſpin, as in that of the other, this particular, *it is ſaid, that this learned and ſubtile woman wrote a book of Magic* (58). Florimond has likewiſe the following paſſage from the Chronicle of James Curio. *Benedictus the third, being choſen after this whore, ſucceeded to this wicked chair, after his ſecret parts had been felt: that people might not be deceived in him, as they had been in Joan a little before* (59). He gives alſo the account of Boccace, and does not forget to take notice that it does not agree with that of other authors. ‘Boccace . . . . in the book of illuſtrious women, has this monſter repreſented as bringing forth a child at a general proceſſion in the arms of her cardinals, with theſe verſes engraven new pieces would have been interwoven from time to time, if the Roman Catholics had not at laſt thought proper to combat it. This put an end to embelliſhing. A vaſt number of writers, who were otherwiſe attached to the Papacy, have believed this ſtory. Æneas Silvius, who was Pope under the name of Pius II, in the XVth century, was the firſt that called it in queſtion: he even paſſed over it very ſlightly and as it were with fear; but Aventinus reſolutely denied it [*E*]. Since that time, Onufrius Panvinius (*e*), Bellarmin (*f*), Serarius (*g*), George Scherer (*h*), Robert Parſons (*i*), Florimond

---

(c) See the remark [*I*] of the article BLONDEL (DAVID).

(d) Blondel, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 17.

(50) Sam. Mareſius, in Examine Quæſtionis, *pag.* 45, 46.

(51) There are many variations about the number of this Pope. See *Blondel, in Examine, pag.* 17.

(52) In the remark [*B*] of the article POLONUS (MARTIN).

(53) Creſpin, l'Etat de l'Egliſe, *pag. m.* 242, & *ſeq.*

(54) *Pag. m.* 164.

(55) Florimond de Remond, l'Antipapeſſe, *ch. xviii, num.* 1, *fol.* 410, *verſo.*

(56) Ibid. *fol.* 411.

(57) Ibid. *chap.* iii, *num.* 5, *fol.* 370, *verſo. Edit.* 1599, *in* 4to.

(58) Ibid. *n.* 3.

(59) Ibid. *n.* 6.

‘ engraven in the front of her picture, which tranſlated ‘ from the Latin, run thus;

Joan was in tricks, and holy Scriptures verſ'd,
And by great craft, was made in name a Pope:
But bringing forth a child amongſt her Prieſts,
She ſhew'd ſhe was a woman ſly in fact.

But he ſhould have ſaid quite the reverſe.

She ſhew'd ſhe wan't a woman ſly in fact.

‘ drawing out this fine ſtory at full length, he ſays, ‘ *She was a German, having ſtudied in England with* ‘ *a young ſcholar, her favourite, after whoſe death, not* ‘ *deſigning to give herſelf up to another, ſhe went to* ‘ *Rome, where ſhe became famous, both for her learning* ‘ *and her good life, ſo that after the death of Leo V, ſhe* ‘ *was made Pope.* But GOD, ſays he, *taking pity on* ‘ *his people, would not ſuffer them to be thus ſhamefully* ‘ *impoſed upon by a woman. So that the evil ſpirit, which* ‘ *had given her the boldneſs to attempt ſuch a wickedneſs,* ‘ *incited her, whilſt ſhe was in this high rank, to commit whoredom. She ſoon found an opportunity, inſomuch, that afterwards ſhe proved with child. O monſtrous iniquity! O wonderful patience and goodneſs of* ‘ *GOD! But ſhe, who had bewitched the eyes of all* ‘ *the world, loſt her ſenſes, and could not conceal her* ‘ *delivery. For not having time to call a midwife, ſhe* ‘ *brought forth whilſt ſhe was celebrating divine ſervice.* ‘ *And becauſe ſhe had thus deceived the world, the miſerable wretch, diſſolved in tears, was ſent to a dungeon* ‘ *by order of the Fathers,* This Florentine, you ſee, ‘ does not agree with the reſt, either in her education, ſucceſſion, or death (60).’ Remond has not forgot the new circumſtance, with which a Monk has embelliſhed the ſtory. *Being ſhut up in a cloiſter he has repreſented in his poems, the She-Pope, with more ſhame and infamy, than was ever done by any body: it is Baptiſt Mantuan* (61) *who thus writes:*

Upon a gibbet I ſaw this ſly jade hang,
Who, dreſs'd like man, and feigning holy zeal,
Was to the papal chair by cunning rais'd:
Now, on the head of this audacious whore
The triple crown was plac'd, and by her ſide
Hung her galant, who did her crime deteſt.

He adds, for the embelliſhment of the ſtory, the hanging the Pope's maſter of horſe (62), *which none beſides himſelf had ever ſpoke of* (63). Here is a paſſage of Mr du Pleſſis Mornai (64): ‘ Another Martin (65) of the ‘ order of Friar Minors, in his chronicle intituled, ‘ *Flores Temporum*, adds that this Joan conjuring a ‘ demoniac, and aſking the Devil when he would de‘ part out of him, he anſwered her in verſe:

Papa pater patrum, Papiſſæ pandito partum
Et tibi nunc eadem de corpore quando recedam *.

Tell, when a female Pope ſhall have a child,
And I will tell thee when I ſhall depart.

‘ It was about the year 1370.’ Coëffeteau aſſures us, that a miniſter named Angelocrator, ſaid *it was at a proceſſion ſhe brought forth a child, and that the Devil pronounced theſe fine verſes in the air* (66). Let us obſerve that in 1615, Rivetus owned he had not as yet heard of Angelocrator (67): nevertheleſs he was one that had publiſhed in 1601 a piece on Chronology with great pomp, and in 1618 was deputed to the ſynod of Dort (68).

Here is a new circumſtance, which ſeems to have been invented for an anſwer to thoſe who object, that a woman ſo cunning as ſhe was would have found out ſome means to conceal her fault, ‘ GOD deſigning ‘ that ſo abominable a wickedneſs ſhould not remain ‘ unpuniſhed, ſent an angel to this Pontif, who ‘ told her, her ſin ſhould be forgiven her, provided ‘ ſhe was delivered in the open ſtreet, without help, ‘ and without calling any woman to aid or aſſiſt her ‘ in ſuch a neceſſity. That this ſhould ſerve inſtead ‘ of penance; and this *amende honorable* for a puniſhment. Which ſhe did in obedience to the commandment of GOD. This author had learned the ‘ ſtory of ſome good old woman of Rome: for thoſe, ‘ who have been at the pains to inform themſelves ‘ about it, aſſured me it was ſtill the talk of many, ‘ that this angel gave her the choice either to bring ‘ forth privately and without ſhame, and to go to ‘ hell: or publickly, and to go to paradiſe (69).’ Florimond de Remond tells this as a ſtory which a German, whom he does not name, ſpread abroad; and then adds, *very conſcientious truly by his account, to be delivered at a proceſſion without having however confeſſed her ſin, or declared her impoſition upon the church. It is not ſo, ſays Scheremberg, ſhe was delivered in the hall, upon her chair. . . . . I do not know how Serres* (70) *came to imagine, that a houſe was then built in which this ſtrange accident happened, and which, ſays he, ſome time after was deſtroyed, but that nevertheleſs the chair is ſtill in being. . . . . There are others who have inriched the ſtory, to render this delivery ſo much the more remarkable. They aſſert that the laſt act of this unfortunate woman was not only repreſented in the public ſtreet, at a proceſſion, but at the ſolemn proceſſion, which we make at the feaſt of the holy ſacrament, called Corpus Chriſti day. Gio. Sazon, a German, has taken a great deal of liberty upon that head. In many places of Germany, and in the eccleſiaſtical books and hiſtories of Geneva, we ſee pictures, wherein this woman is repreſented under a canopy, carrying the holy ſacrament, with a new born infant coming out from between her legs. . . . Imprudent as they are, they have not conſidered, that in the time of the female Pope, which they deſcribe to us, the feaſt of the holy ſacrament was not inſtituted, nor a long time after* (71).

[*E*] *Æneas Silvius . . . . . was the firſt that called it in queſtion . . . . . Aventinus reſolutely denied it.*] This Silvius ‘ obſerved the 20th of Auguſt 1451 † to Juan ‘ de Carvajal cardinal of S. Angelo, as a concluſion ‘ of his reply to Nicolas biſhop of the Taborites, ‘ that in placing thus this woman *there had been nei*‘ *ther error of faith nor of right, but ignorance of fact:* ‘ *and beſides, the ſtory was not* ‡ *certain* (72).’ Mareſius obſerves that this author expreſſes himſelf very faintly, and that in other works he ſeemed to think the affair of this She-Pope was true. ‘ Eo quidem re‘ currit, ut dicat hiſtoriam non eſſe *certam*, ſed tam ‘ timidè, ut ſatis appareat eum non loqui ex animi ‘ ſententia. Ut ſi quid hîc putarit incerti, magis ‘ forte ad circumſtantias & nomen proprium hujus ‘ mulieris ſpectet, quam ad rei ipſius ſubſtantiam (73). ‘ . . . . Quin ipſe Doctiſſ. Anacrita (74) *pag.* 10. Pi‘ um II, id eſt, hunc Æneam Sylvium, accenſet iis ‘ Pontificibus qui Joannæ Pontificatum videntur ag‘ noviſſe, eo quod *Joannæ nomen cæteris Pontificum no*‘ *minibus permixtum in Dominico Senenſi, ſcriptæ ad Jo*‘ *annem Carvajal epiſtolæ immemor vel pœnitens proſtare* ‘ *paſſus eſt.* Et quod amplius eſt ipſe Æneas Sylvius ‘ Pontifex tandem factus hanc Hiſtoriam exſcripſit in ‘ 6. mundi ætate, pag. 170. operis Hiſtorici impreſſi ‘ Norimbergæ anno 1493. per Kobergerum, inquit ‘ Johannes Gerhardi Auguſtanæ Confeſſionis Theolo‘ gorum Doctiſſimus, *Loco de Eccl. edit. in 4to. p.* 1004 ‘ (75). - - - *Indeed he goes ſo far as to ſay the ſtory is* ‘ *not certain, but ſo timerouſly, that it is evident enough* ‘ *he does not ſpeak his real ſentiments. And therefore* ‘ *if he thought there was any uncertainty in this matter,* ‘ *it rather regarded perhaps the circumſtances and the* ‘ *proper name of this woman, than the thing itſelf. . . .* ‘ *But even the learned examiner himſelf reckons Pius II,* ‘ *that is, this Æneas Sylvius among thoſe Popes, who* ‘ *ſeem*

(*e*) In Notis ad Platinam.

(*f*) De Romano Pontif. *lib. iii, cap. xxiv.*

(*g*) Rerum Mogunt. *lib. i.*

(*h*) In a treatiſe purpoſely written on that ſubject.

(*i*) In Libro de tribus Converſionib. Angliæ, *Part ii, cap. v.*

(60) Florimond de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. iii, num.* 1, *fol.* 368, *verſo.*

(61) *Lib. iii.*

(62) Alexander Cook, *refuting this book of* Florimond de Remond, *recites pag. m.* 31, *theſe three verſes of Mantuan*; Hic pendebat adhuc Sexum mentita virilem Fœmina, cui triplici Phrygiam diademate mitram Extollebat apex, & Pontificalis adulter. *Tom. iii, lib. iii, Alphonſi. fol.* 44, *Edit. Francof.* 1573. *He adds, pag.* 32, *that Mantuan* ſays nothing of a groom of the ſtables, but of one in general, who had committed whoredom with her, nor even of any hanging unleſs in Hell, which is probable enough.

(63) Florimond de Remond, Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. xxii, num.* 4, *fol.* 426, *verſo.*

(64) Du Pleſſis, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 162.

(65) He had juſt ſpoke of Martin Polonus.

* Chronic. Martini Minoritæ ultimæ Impreſ. An. 1486.

(66) Coëffeteau, Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 508: *he cites the eighth book of the Chronicle of Angelocrator*, in Joan. VIII. Papiſſ.

(67) Rivet, Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *Part i, p.* 594.

(68) *See* Voſſius, de Scient. Math. *pag.* 402.

(69) Florimond de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. xxiii, num.* 3, *fol.* 429.

(70) *He is the author of the* Inventaire de l'Hiſtoire de France.

(71) Florimond de Remond, ubi ſupra.

† Epiſt. cxxx.

‡ Neque certa hiſtoria eſt.

(72) Blondel, Eclairciſſement ſur la Papeſſe, *pag.* 11.

(73) Samuel Mareſius. Examen Quæſt. de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 8.

(74) That is to ſay, David Blondel.

(75) Mareſius, Exam. Quæſt. *pag.* 3.

mond de Remond, Allatius, Launoius, Father Labbe, and ſeveral others (*k*) have fully confuted this old tradition. Cardinal Baronius expreſſed a great eſteem for the work of Florimond de Remond; but he was in the wrong to affirm that the Heretics were ſo confounded by it that they were aſhamed of having ſpoke of this fable [*F*]. This is ſo falſe that even now a days, Proteſtants write books to maintain the ſtory of the She-Pope. I believe that ſome traditions, which are advantageous to the Popes, and ſupported by as ſtrong reaſons as thoſe are which ſupport this ſtory, would ſeem worthy the utmoſt contempt to thoſe who diſpute moſt ardently for it. So certain is it, that the ſame

‘ *ſeem to have acknowledged Joan as a Pope, becauſe* ‘ being either unmindful or ſorry that he had writ a ‘ letter to John Carvajal, he ſuffered the name of Joan ‘ amongſt the other names of Popes. *And which is* ‘ *ſtill more, Æneas Sylvius himſelf after he was made* ‘ *Pope, wrote this ſtory in the ſixth age of the world,* ‘ *page* 170 *of his hiſtorical work printed at Nuremberg* ‘ *in the year* 1493 *by Kobergerus, as John Gerhardi, a* ‘ *moſt learned divine of the Auſburg confeſſion, ſays.*

As to what relates to Aventinus, I muſt intreat all my readers to beware of the falſe reaſoning of the Engliſh doctor, who has refuted the book of Florimond de Remond. Theſe are his words: *I own John Aventinus* (76) *rejects in general* this ſtory of the She Pope *as a fable; but gives no reaſon why he rejects it. Beſides, Bellarmin rejects him as an author of little credit* ‡: *and Baronius, ſets a mark upon him, not only as a ſcabby ſheep, but likewiſe as a beaſt infected with the mange of hereſy, intirely void of piety and learning* *; *and ſeveral of your Popes have prohibited* ** *his hiſtory as unworthy to be read: therefore I do not ſee why his rejecting that ſtory without reaſon can be any prejudice to it* (77). You find that in order to diſcredit the teſtimony of Aventinus, he takes advantage of the detraction, wherewith two cardinals have loaded him; but on the contrary, by reaſon of this detraction Aventinus ought to be conſidered as a good evidence (78); for Bellarmin, and Baronius and ſeveral others cry him down, only becauſe he has taken a pleaſure in ill treating the court of Rome: and we have ſeen above (79) that he was in his heart a good Lutheran. We muſt ſay then, that had he found the leaſt probability in the ſtory of the She-Pope, he would have affirmed it, and taken occaſion from thence to divert himſelf at the expence of the Popes. Such are the Paralogiſms into which one falls, when in handling a controverſy, one will cavil at every thing and give up nothing.

[*F*] *Baronius . . . . . was in the wrong to affirm that the heretics were ſo confounded* at the work of Florimond de Remond, *that they were aſhamed of having ſpoke of this fable.*] ‘ He thinks it is the beſt diſcourſe that ‘ was ever made on this ſubject ††: and declares he ‘ would have inſerted it in his annals, if the book ‘ had not been a little too large. For by this, as the ‘ cardinal alſo obſerves, he has ſo confounded the ‘ whole herd of heretics, who before reproached the ‘ Catholics with this fable, that now they are aſhamed ‘ of what they have ſaid about it ⸸⸸. . . . . Poſſevinus ‘ is of the ſame opinion. For he ſays, he has ‘ killed the heretics ſtone-dead. And that ſince the ‘ publiſhing of this book the heretics are ſo quiet, ‘ they have not a word to ſay ‡‡, they dare not ſpeak ‘ any longer of a Pope *Joan* (80).’ Baronius and Poſſevinus did not well know the ſituation of the affair: the book of Florimond de Remond was deſpiſed by the Proteſtants, and did not make them alter their opinions. A miniſter of Bearn wrote againſt it. See what Florimond ſays in anſwer to him in his ſecond edition (81). He ſpeaks of *a certain perſon . . . . . to whom he will not be obliged to reply, no more than againſt this other, adds he, who under the borrowed name of Jeſſeen, count of Malta, uſed but a poor ſhift. The latter in his codicil promiſes abundance of great matters, and among others to ſhew the impertinencies and ſilly reaſons of him, who wrote the book concerniug the vulgar error about Pope Joan* (82). Mr du Pleſſis Mornai was not ignorant of what Remond had writ, and yet he declared himſelf ſtrongly for thoſe, who hold the ſtory of the She-Pope to be true, and made uſe of all their reaſons. This was done in a book he publiſhed in the year 1611 (83). Coëffeteau refuted him in the beſt manner he was able (84): but he was refuted in his turn by Andrew Rivetus (85), who affirms that in the ſtory of the She-Pope, there is nothing *that oppoſes our reaſon or conſcience, if we hold for truth, as we ſtill do, though the Monk* (86) *ſhould run mad at it, what has been left on record to poſterity* (87). The book, where he ſpeaks after this manner, was printed in the year 1615: only three years after Conrad Decker had publiſhed a book at Oppenheim *de Papa Romano & Papiſſa Romana quod Joannes octavus fuerit mulier & puerpera:* and but five years after Vignier miniſter of Blois had maintained the ſame thing (88). James Cappel, miniſter and profeſſor of Theology at Sedan, aſſerted (88*) in 1619 the ſtory of the She-Pope in anſwer to the objections of Father Coton. Alexander Cook wrote a piece on purpoſe to refute that of Remond, and to ſupport in general the ſtory of the She-Pope, and to defend it againſt all the objections of the Roman Catholics. His book tranſlated from Engliſh into French was printed at Sedan in 1633. Another Engliſh Profeſſor at Weſel publiſhed a work of the ſame nature about the ſame time (89). Every body knows that David Blondel's book was refuted in the year 1655 by an advocate of Roüen, and in the year 1658 by a miniſter of Groningen, and that the great Salmaſius had promiſed to anſwer it (90). It is known likewiſe that Mr Hottenger publiſhed a treatiſe to maintain the tradition of the She-Pope, and that Mr Zuinger, Profeſſor of Divinity at Baſil, has aſſerted the ſame pretenſion in his book *de Feſto corporis Chriſti*, printed in the year 1685. Mr Megerlin, Profeſſor of Mathematics at Baſil, had defended a little before the ſame thing in his *Diſquiſitio Chronologica de Johanna Papiſſa*. Mr Spanheim, Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, publiſhed a pretty large book according to the ſame prejudice in the year 1691 (91). I could name ſeveral other Proteſtants (92), who, ſince the book of Florimond de Remond, have ſupported what he endeavoured to deſtroy. And therefore there is nothing more frivolous or falſe, than the commendation which Baronius and Poſſevin have given him, for having ſilenced the Proteſtants and brought them to ſhame.

The ſame extravagance we find in the following words of Father Maimbourg (93): ‘ The moſt learned ‘ miniſters of the pretended reformed religion are ‘ aſhamed that thoſe of their party ſhould fall into ſo ‘ groſs an error, and which diſgraces all ſuch as ſtill ‘ continue in it either through ignorance, paſſion, or ‘ prejudice. Mr Blondel, one of the moſt ingenious ‘ amongſt them, has even endeavoured to undeceive ‘ them in a learned diſſertation he has made on this ‘ ſubject. Some of the ſame ſect, as Samuel Mareſius, ‘ are offended at it, and have thought fit to combat ‘ him, and to maintain a falſhood ſo viſible, and at ‘ preſent ſo much decried: but the late Father Labbe, ‘ a learned Jeſuit, to whom we owe among many o‘ther learned works the greateſt part of the laſt col‘lection of councils of the Paris edition, has ſo entire‘ly diſarmed him, and afterwards ſo ſeverely puniſh‘ed his ignorance and boldneſs, in the refutation ‘ (94) of this fable, which we find in the eighth tome ‘ of his councils, that I do not believe any of the ‘ brethren of this miniſter of Groningen dares again ‘ enter the liſts, to defend ſo bad a cauſe, and ſo aban‘doned by all reaſonable people, even amongſt the ‘ Proteſtants themſelves. For at laſt they acknow‘ledge ingenuouſly, that there is no other Pope Joan ‘ than this John VIII, to whom this ridiculous name ‘ was given, becauſe he had ſhewn ſo little courage in ‘ maintaining the decrees of a general council, and of ‘ his predeceſſors againſt Photius.’ All this is full of hyperboles and lies properly ſo called; for ſince the publication of this treatiſe of Father Labbé, the Proteſtants continue to write as before for the exiſtence of the She-Pope. I do not alledge that in 1662 there was reprinted at Helmſtad, ‘ Hiſtoria Johannis VIII ‘ Romani Pontificis, virum primum ſimulantis, poſtea ‘ ſexum ſuum partu in publica via edito prodentis, à ‘ Jeſuitarum in primis technis vindicata; - - - *The* ‘ *Hiſtory*

---

k See the liſt that Father Labbe gives in the firſt Tome, *de Script. Eccleſ. pag.* 837, & *ſe.*

(76) In the 4th book of the Annals of Bavaria.

‡ Joh. Aventin. author parum probatæ fidei: *ſays* Bellarmin. Append. ad li. de Sum. Pont. cap. x.

* Infectam hæreſis ſcabie beſtiam pietate & doctrina omnino deſertam. *Baro. An. To.* 10. *ad ann.* 996. *n.* 54.

** In Indicib. lib. prohibitorum.

(77) Cook, on the She-Pope, *pag.* 10.

(78) *See Father* Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. ii, pag.* 920.

(79) In the remark [*H*] of the article AVENTINUS.

†† Præ cæteris commendandus fama nobilis Florimondus. *Baronius, Annal. Tom. x, ad ann.* 853, *num.* 62.

⸸⸸ Sic confecit monſtrum iſtud, ut novatores pudeat quæ ſcripſerunt vel ſomniaſſe. *Ibid.*

‡‡ Prorſus confodit hæreticos qui commentum illud ſparſerunt in vulgus, ut amplius ea de fabula hiſcere non audeant. In *Apparat. Sac.* verbo *Florimondus.*

(80) Cook, on the She-Pope, *pag.* 2, 3.

(81) Florimond de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. vii, num.* 5, *fol.* 380, *verſo: he deſcribes him by theſe two letters* R. T. *and anſwers him in the end of his work.*

(82) Ibid. *ch. ii, num.* 3, *fol.* 365, *verſo, & fol.* 366.

(83) *Intituled,* Le Myſtere d'Iniquité, *ſee there pag.* 161, & *ſeq.*

(84) *In his* Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 504, & *ſeq.*

(85) *In his* Remarques ſur la Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *Part* i, *p.* 590.

(86) That is, Coëffeteau.

(87) Rivet, Remarq. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 590. *He had the ſame opinion, when he anſwered the Jeſuit* Petra Sancta *in* 1635. *See the third Tome of his works, p.* 587.

(88) See the remark [*L*].

(88*) *See his* InſtructionChreſtienne reſponſive au I Tome de l'Inſtitution du P. Coton, *pag.* 514, & *ſeq.*

(89) See the remark [*B*] of the article FRANC.

(90) See the remark [*I*] of the article BLONDEL (DAVID).

(91) *Intituled,* de Papa fœmina inter Leonem IV & Benedictum III Diſquiſitio Hiſtorica.

(92) *See the names of ſome in the* Introductio in Hiſtor. Eccleſ. *of* Gaſpar Sagittarius, *pag.* 686, *and in the mark of the article* RADULPHUS, *towards the end.*

(93) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Schiſme des Grecs, *livr. ii, at the year* 881, *pag.* 202, 203, *of the firſt Tome.*

(94) *It is the diſſertation which he has put under the title of* Cenotaphium Joannæ Papiſſæ . . . eversum, *at the end of the firſt Tome* de Script. Eccleſ. *printed at Paris in the year* 1660.

ſame things appear to us true or falſe, according as they favour our own, or the oppoſite party [*G*]. The ſame force of prejudice is the cauſe, that the controverſy about the She-Pope has been thought an affair of the utmoſt conſequence againſt the church of Rome (*l*); but when all is done it would be but a trifle (*m*), for the objections, that may

(*l*) Cook, on Pope Joan, *pag.* 273.

(*m*) Blondel, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 96.

' *Hiſtory of John VIII Pope of Rome, who at firſt pre-* ' *tended to be a man, but afterwards diſcovered his ſex* ' *by bringing forth a child in the open ſtreet, vindicated* ' *chiefly from the artifices of the Jeſuits*;' with ſome collections of Berneggerus upon the ſame ſubject (95); but I will add to the authors I have already mentioned John Lehman, who publiſhed at Wittemberg in 1669, *Infelix puerperium Johannis Pontificis*, - - - *The unhappy delivery of Pope John*, and John Daniel Artopæus author of a treatiſe *de Johanne VIII Papiſſa* printed at Leipſic in 1673 (96), and Mr Mayer (97) who in his treatiſe *de Pontificis Romani electione* (98), printed at Hamburgh in 1690, embraces and maintains the opinion of the reality of the She-Pope, though he owns that the reaſon of Allatius and Blondel had raiſed in him ſome doubts before. I muſt not forget Mr Miſſon (99) who diſputes ſtrenuouſly and at ſeveral times for the common tradition, and who even treats with great contempt the arguments of Blondel, and informs us (100) that *an Engliſh Doctor has not long ſince writ a book upon the queſtion of the She-Pope, which is not yet printed, and in which he makes admirable uſe of the force of* a teſtimony drawn *from the Chronicles of the ancient monaſtery of Canterbury.* He cites (101) Mr le Sueur, a French miniſter, as one of the partiſans of the Hiſtory of the She-Pope, and as one of thoſe who have alledged the ſtory of the two copies of Anaſtaſius ſent to Marquard Freher. The book, in which Mr le Sueur does ſo, is an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory whereof the ſeventh part, which treats of the IXth century, was printed at Geneva in 1686.

(95) *See* Sagittarius, Introd. in Hiſt. Eccleſ. *pag.* 686.

(96) *See* Sagittar. ibid.

(97) John Frideric, profeſſor of Theology at Kiel, and at Hamburgh.

(98) *Pag.* 244, *& ſeq.*

(99) *In the 2d Tome of his* Voiage d'Italie, *p.* 178, *& ſeq. p.* 202, *& ſeq*; *and pag.* 306, *Edit. of* 1696.

(100) Preface of the third Tome.

(101) Pag. 203, of the ſecond Tome.

PROTESTANTS who have not believed the ſtory of the She-Pope.

It is true there have been ſome miniſters, who did not believe what is ſaid of the She-Pope (102). Peucer, if we may credit Remond, did not believe it neither. *He has ſhewn himſelf more conſcientious than the reſt*, theſe are the words of Remond; *and though an enemy to the Catholic religion and the holy Fathers, believed what was ſaid of Pope Joan to be a fable, and did did not think fit to give it a place in his Chronicle. Which he would not have omitted, had he thought it in the leaſt probable. Perhaps, he followed the memoirs of Melancthon, who was the moſt modeſt of all thoſe, who have ſtrayed from the church* (103). The Jeſuit Gretſer (104) has quoted ſome paſſages of a little piece which had been compoſed by a Proteſtant, and printed in the year 1588 under the title of, ' Simplex Narratio indi- ' cans & exponens meretriculam quandam Anglam ' nunquam Papam fuiſſe, neque unquam in rerum na- ' tura extitiſſe, & unde figmentum illud originem ' duxiſſe credatur. - - - *A plain narrative declaring and* ' *ſhewing that a certain Engliſh harlot had never been* ' *Pope, nor ever was in being, and whence that fiction* ' *may be thought to have taken it's riſe.*' I muſt not omit that Courcelles, an Arminian Profeſſor at Amſterdam, declared for the opinion of Blondel, whoſe Latin book he cauſed to be printed, which overthrows the ſtory of the She-Pope. He obſerved moreover in the Preface that he put to it (105), 1. That Boxhornius, (106) Profeſſor at Leyden, had plainly enough given his approbation to the opinion of Blondel; 2. That he had heard that George Calixtus (107), and Herman Conringius, famous Profeſſors at Helmſtad, likewiſe approved it. He related (108) a paſſage of Nicholas Vignier, which evidently ſhews that this learned Proteſtant Hiſtorian did not think the ſtory of the She-Pope true. I add that Geſſelius, Phyſician at Utrecht, approved the book of David Blondel (109), and that Dr Cave and Dr Burnet (110) believe the tradition of the She-Pope to be fabulous. I add likewiſe, that Schoockius, a Profeſſor in the univerſity of Groningen, had been one of thoſe who vigorouſly and publickly maintained the ſtory of the She-Pope; but at laſt owned it to be a forgery (111). He had inſerted in one of his books his change of opinion; and yet to avoid the ſcandal he retrenched this place and cancelled the leaves by the advice of his colleagues; but when the work of Blondel appeared, he no more regarded them; he printed in a ſecond edition what he had ſuppreſſed, and owned, that by comparing, one by one, the arguments of this miniſter, with the anſwers that had been made to them, he had found no anſwer that was good for any thing, or which did not ſerve rather to confirm than weaken the contrary opinion (112). *Legi & expendi poſtea quam diligenter, quæ* τῷ πάνυ *Blondello ab exceſſu objecta fuerunt: Sed ingenue profiteri debeo, hæc omnia mihi videri* κωφὰ βέλη. *Reſponſiones minus ſolidæ, adverſariæ ſententiæ firmandæ magis quam evertendæ ſerviunt* (113). We ſhall ſee afterwards (114), what has been reported of Caſaubon.

(102) See the remark [*I*] of the article BLONDEL (DAVID), towards the end.

(103) Florimond de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. vi, num.* 5, *fol.* 378.

(104) Gretſ. in Examine Myſterii Pleſſæani, *pag.* 301.

(105) *Pag.* 322.

(106) In his Univerſal Hiſtory.

(107) Father *Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. Tom. i, pag.* 932, puts him in the number of the partiſans of the She-Pope: and juſtly: for in the book of this *Calixtus, de Conjugio Clericorum*, there is a long digreſſion for the affirmative, on the ſtory of the She-Pope.

(108) *Pag. m.* 319.

(109) Timannus Geſſelius, Hiſtoria Sacra & Eccleſiaſt. *Tom. ii, pag.* 79, *Edit. Ultraj.* 1661, *in* 4to. *See Father* Labbe, in Cenotaphio everſo, *at the end of Tom. i,* de Script. Eccleſ. *pag.* 986.

(112) Idem, in Præfatione.

(113) Schoockii Fabula Hamel. *Part ii, ch. xii, pag.* 124.

(114) In the remark [*L*].

When all is done, it is reaſonable to allow that the work of Florimond de Remond is not bad in it's kind, and I do not think any body had as yet ſo well refuted the ſtory of the She-Pope. However, he was guilty of many blunders (115), and uſed too many digreſſions and declamations. I ſhall give here the extract of a letter, which informs us that his proofs ſeemed very convincing to Juſtus Lipſius. ' De quæ- ' ſtiuncula quod petis, ſuper pontifice Joanna fœmina, ' ut nugantur; vides, quid ſentiam cum appello nu- ' gas. Revera fabella eſt haud longè ab audacia & ' ineptiis Poëtarum. Vis clarè tu & conſortes illi rem ' videre, Adito Librum gallicè nuper ſcriptum & edi- ' tum Burdigalis, *Auctore Florimundo Remundo*, Con- ' ſiliario Regio, qui totus eſt in hoc argumento, auctor ' ipſe ad me miſit & ita planè omnia exſecutus eſt, ut ' nobis nihil reliqui ſit, præter credere & aſſentiri ' (116). - - - *As to my opinion, which you are pleaſed to* ' *aſk, about the affair of Pope Joan, as men imperti-* ' *nently talk*; *you ſee what it is, by my calling it im-* ' *pertinence. In truth it is a fable not much differing* ' *from the boldneſs and ſilly ſtories of the Poets. If you* ' *have a mind to ſee that matter ſet in a clear light,* ' *conſult a book lately writ in French and publiſhed at* ' *Bourdeaux, by Florimond de Remond, one of the king's* ' *counſellors, who is wholly employed in this argu-* ' *ment. The author himſelf ſent it to me, and he has ſo* ' *thoroughly diſcuſſed every point, that nothing remains* ' *for us to do, but to believe and aſſent.*' As for the reſt, many aſſure us that the Jeſuit Richeome is the true author of this work (117). There is however a prodigious difference as to the manner of writing, between the compoſitions of Richeome and that; and it is not likely that thoſe blunders, which are found in the book that appeared under the name of Florimond de Remond, could ſlip from one, whom the Jeſuits at that time looked upon as their beſt French writer.

(115) We ſee a liſt of them in the books of Blondel on this queſtion.

(116) Lipſius, Epiſt. ad Aub. Miræum, *inſerta in* Not. Miræi ad Sigebertum, apud Gretſ. in Myſta Salmurienſi, *p.* 300.

(117) See the remark [*C*] of the article REMOND.

[*G*] *The ſame things appear to us true, or falſe, according as they favour our own, or the oppoſite party.*] This maxim cannot be called in queſtion but by thoſe, who let the affairs of human life paſs away without ſeriouſly reflecting. The malady of prejudice would not be ſo bad, were we contented to determine thro' affection, when the reaſons *pro* and *con* appear clearly to be equal: but we go much further, the party we love carries it, though the reaſons which favour it are nothing near equal to thoſe which oppoſe it. Undoubtedly this is the reaſon, why it is ſo difficult to diſcharge one's duty in the office of a Judge. Montaigne had a ſolid thought upon that head. ' What- ' ever good deſign a Judge may have, if he be not ' much upon his guard, which few people mind, the ' byaſs to friendſhip, kindred, beauty, and revenge, ' and not only things ſo weighty as theſe, but that ' fortuitous inſtinct, which makes us favour one thing ' more than another, and which, without the leave ' of reaſon, determines our choice in two equal caſes, ' or any umbrage of the like vanity, may inſenſibly ' convey into his judgment, the recommendation or ' diſfavour of a cauſe, and give a turn to the balance ' (118). . . . . . I have heard of a Judge, that meeting ' with a ſharp conteſt between Bartolus and Baldus, ' and ſome point perplexed with many difficulties, put ' in the margin of his book, a queſtion for a friend, ' that is, the truth was ſo imbroiled and intricate, ' that in ſuch a caſe, he might favour what party he ' thought fit. It was owing only to want of wit and ' ability, that he did not put every where, queſtion ' for a friend. The Lawyers and Judges of our time ' find in all cauſes, byaſs enough to turn them as they ' pleaſe,

(118) Montaigne, Eſſais, *livr. ii, ch. xii, pag. m.* 426, 427.

---

(110) I ſhall relate their words in the remark [*B*] of the article POLONUS.

(111) Mart. Schoock, Fab. Hamel. *in Præfat. & in cap. xii, Part ii, Edit. Gron.* 1662.

may be drawn from thence, are not more embarraſſing than thoſe that are founded on facts,

‘ pleaſe. In a ſcience ſo infinite, depending on the authority of ſo many opinions, and a ſubject ſo arbitrary, it is impoſſible but that a vaſt confuſion of judgments muſt ariſe. And indeed there is hardly any cauſe ſo clear, but men vary in their opinions about it; one court decides contrary to what another has done, and this other the quite contrary at another time. Therefore, by this licence which caſts a great blemiſh on the ceremonious authority and luſtre of our law, we frequently ſee that people do not ſtop when judgment is given, but run from one Judge to another, to determine the ſame cauſe (119).’

Very few men are ſo much maſters of their own hearts, as not to turn the ſcale by the weight of friendſhip, unleſs the arguments of the other ſide form a perfect even balance. Friendſhip commonly carries it, even when the arguments of the party we love are not ſo weighty. Hatred is ſtill more active. Iſidorus of Peluſium ſaid very well, *that if favour has a little ſight, hatred and reſentment have none at all* (120). Blondel remarks that ſome have taken a pride in verifying this maxim in the diſputes about the She-Pope (121). Is it not well known, that Bellarmin, Baronius, and ſo many others, who have writ againſt the ſtory of this woman, maintain with might and main ſeveral traditions as ill, or even worſe grounded than that? The authority of the negative argument, the ſilence of many ages, the variations, credulity, and a hundred other defects of evidences do not hinder Baronius from taking the affirmative, and from being angry with thoſe who are of another opinion; and thus in pleading his own cauſe he looks on thoſe objections as bad, which in attacking his adverſaries he takes for good proofs. Is not this judging of things according to his paſſion, and turning them ſometimes in one ſenſe and ſometimes in another, agreeably to the intereſt of his prejudices.

May it not be ſaid, that thoſe, who maintain with ſo much heat that the ſtory of the She-Pope is true, conſider more the intereſt of their cauſe, than the ſtate and condition of the proofs? For were they void of all paſſion, would they not remember that the ſilence of cotemporary authors has often appeared to them an invincible reaſon againſt a thouſand traditions, which the court of Rome alledges? Could they ſay with a clear conſcience, that if a tradition, which reflects ignominy upon the Albigenſes, were ſupported preciſely by the ſame proofs, and oppoſed by the ſame objections as that of the She-Pope, they would judge both of the proofs and of the objections as they do in the controverſy of the She-Pope? Is it not certain, they would laugh at the proofs and take the objections for demonſtrative arguments? Would they not affirm, that theſe arguments could not be eluded but by extravagant quirks, and that to be at the pains to invent exceptions would in truth be the trick of a Lawyer, that wants to perpetuate a law-ſuit?

CONSIDERATION on the force of the negative argument of this ſubject.

A man free from all prejudice would think the negative argument ſufficient to reject the romance of the She-Pope. By this I do not pretend to ſay, that with regard to all kinds of facts, the ſilence of cotemporary authors is a good reaſon to deny them. This ought not to be ſuppoſed but with reſpect to remarkable events, as the retreat of Charles the Vth into a monaſtery, and with regard to the eſſential and principal circumſtances of an action, which every body muſt know, and of which it would be abſurd to hope that future ages would be intirely ignorant. I rank in this claſs the kind of death which Henry II, Henry III, and Henry IV, died, the firſt killed at a tournament, the ſecond aſſaſſinated by a Monk during the ſiege of Paris, and the third murdered in his coach in the ſtreets of the ſame city. It is not to be imagined that all the Hiſtorians, who lived in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries, could be obſtinately reſolved or conſpire not to ſay a word of the abdication of Charles the Vth, nor of what was tragical in the death of theſe three Henries. You muſt obſerve, I do not conſider here in general the ſilence of cotemporary authors: I know it is very poſſible that in books of devotion, or morality, written in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries, one may relate incidently ſeveral actions of theſe four princes, without ſaying where or how they died. I mean only thoſe, who have writ either the particular Hiſtory of theſe monarchs, or the Hiſtory of Spain and France, or the general Hiſtory of Europe. It would be a prodigy, and a monſter more ſtrange than all thoſe Titus Livius mentions, not only if all theſe Hiſtorians were ſilent as to the things I have taken notice of: but even if ſeven or eight of the chief had ſuppreſſed them. Let us ſuppoſe that in the XXIVth century, there are but ſeven or eight of the beſt Hiſtorians extant, who lived in the time of Charles V, and Henry IV, or a little after: and that thoſe, who ſhall live then, find no trace of the abdication of Charles V, and of the aſſaſſination of Henry III and Henry IV, but in ſome wretched Annaliſt of the XIXth century: I do maintain they will be the moſt raſh and credulous of all men, if they give credit to this Annaliſt, and a hundred others who may have copied him. This may be eaſily applied to the diſpute about the She-Pope. I have obviated the objection of thoſe, who might pretend we have not all the Annaliſts that lived at that time. It ſuffices that there remain ſome of the chief of them. But in order to ſee more clearly, that it was impoſſible the Hiſtorians of the IXth century could have ſuppreſſed a fact ſo extraordinary as the papacy of the pretended Joan, I will make uſe of a ſhort fiction. I will ſuppoſe an author of the XIth century has related the following ſtory.

Charlemagne ſo eagerly wiſhed to be the father of his ſucceſſor, that he was extremely grieved becauſe his wife was barren. At laſt ſhe proved with child: he was exceedingly pleaſed at it: but as ſhe was delivered of a girl, he found his uneaſineſs return, and not caring to truſt to futurity, he contrived to make his daughter paſs for a ſon, and gave her the name of Pepin. Six years after, the queen proved with child again, and lay-in of a boy: but that the public might not know they had uſed any fraud, the father and mother continued to conceal the ſex of their firſt child: ſo that after the death of Charlemagne, his daughter, who paſſed for a boy, was crowned without any difficulty. In the third year of her reign the impoſture was diſcovered, and in this manner. She had called her parliament together, and repaired to them with all the ſplendor imaginable; but whilſt ſhe was making her ſpeech, ſhe fell in labour, was delivered in the preſence of this auguſt aſſembly, and died immediately. This appeared ſo horrible, that the parliament deteſted the place, and would no more aſſemble there. Meaſures were alſo taken to prevent the like accidents, and it was ordered that for the future, before they proceeded to the coronation, one of the twelve peers of the kingdom ſhould put his hand, where it ſhould be neceſſary, to diſtinguiſh whether the perſon to be crowned was a male or not. Here is a ſtory which reſembles that of the She-Pope, as one drop of water is like another.

Let us not rigorouſly preſs the parallel, let us allay it, we need not improve all our advantages. Let us ſuppoſe that the Annaliſt has unfolded the matter another way, and ſaid that after the ſecond year of the reign of this Pepin, prince Lewis, really the eldeſt ſon of Charlemagne, claimed the crown, under pretence that Pepin was a female, and that by the Salique law ſhe could not reign. A violent civil war was raiſed upon this account. Pepin refuſed to let himſelf be ſearched; but the city of Paris riſing up in arms, they forced him in his palace, ſtripped him ſtark naked, diſcovered his ſex, dethroned him, confined him in a convent, and ſet Lewis the Good upon the throne.

This adventure is ſo ſurprizing, whether it be related the firſt way, or the ſecond, that for this very reaſon, becauſe it does not appear in any Hiſtorian of the IXth century, nor even of the Xth, it ought to be rejected as a tale altogether like that of John of Paris, Peter of Provence, and the fair Maguelonne, or of Lancelot du Lac, *&c.* for it is morally and even naturally impoſſible, that all the Hiſtorians of that time ſhould be ſilent upon the adventures of this Pepin, and all take notice of an immediate ſucceſſion between Charlemagne and Lewis the Good, and that no tranſaction of the reign of this diſguiſed female is to be found. Not one letter writ, or received, not one ambaſſador diſpatched, no peace concluded, no declaration of war publiſhed. See the margin (122). One might as well tell me that in 1694, the Engliſh took Marſeilles and Toulon, and put all to the fire and ſword even

---

(119) Ibid. *pag.* 460, 461.

(120) Iſid. Peluſiota, *lib. i*, Epiſt. cccx, *quoted by* Blondel, Eclairciſſement, &c. *pag.* 79.

(121) Blondel, ibid.

(122) I make this obſervation, becauſe it does not appear that the She-Pope, during the ſpace of two years and ſome months which they aſſign her, had writ, or received any letter, or done the leaſt thing in the world, tho' ſhe was a woman of great wit and learning. Father *Labbe*, *in Cenotaphio everſo*, *pag.* 925, 926, puſhes this argument ſtrongly, and is merry upon it.

facts, or on principles acknowleged by the Roman Catholics. Theodore Beza made mention

even to the gates of Arles, and afterwards re-imbarked, loaded with booty: that all this is very true, tho' neither the Gazettes of that year, nor any pamphlet upon the affairs of that time make the leaſt mention of it.

REFUTATION of the reaſons oppoſed to the negative argument.

The force of the negative arguments will be more manifeſt, when we have refuted thoſe who enquire into the reaſons of this great ſilence of cotemporary authors. They ſay, that the Papacy of this woman was looked on as ſo ſcandalous to the church of Rome, that people were forbid to ſpeak of it, and therefore authors were ſilent, ſome thro' zeal, and others thro' fear. But the anſwer that may be made utterly deſtroys this reaſoning.

I. In the firſt place it may be ſaid, it is not true that this adventure has been conſidered as a diſgrace to the Catholic religion, or as a thing that ſtrikes at the rites of the Romiſh communion; for they do not depend, according to their principles, on the perſonal qualities of Popes. The crime of Joan conſiſted in her not having lived chaſtly, but not in being delivered in the open ſtreets. Such a delivery might have been the effect of chance, or imprudence, and would not have aggravated the immorality ſhe had committed. She was culpable then, only becauſe ſhe had not preſerved her virginity. How can you ſuppoſe, that on this occaſion Rome would acknowledge herſelf covered with an ignominy which muſt be entirely forgotten, when ſhe does not conceal the wicked lives of ſeveral Popes, who, before, and after their advancement to the Papal chair, were plunged into irregularities much more heinous. The election of Joan was to the honour of the Romans: for ſhe was a perſon famous for her learning and behaviour (123). To have been ignorant of her ſex was an error of fact, and an ignorance which excuſes one, and no body is anſwerable for the ſecret amours of a diſguiſed woman. It is ſo certain that the ſtory of the She-Pope cannot diſgrace the church of Rome, that even Mr Jurieu himſelf, as much Mr Jurieu as he is, has confeſſed it. *I do not think*, ſays he (124), *we are much concerned to prove the truth of this ſtory of Pope Joan. Tho' the Papal chair had ſuffered this ſurprize, that a woman ſhould be eſtabliſhed in it under the notion of being a man, and that this woman ſhould afterwards be delivered at a ſolemn proceſſion, as it is ſaid, this, in my opinion, would form no great prejudice. And the advantage we might draw from thence is not worth the trouble of holding a long diſpute about it. I even think, by the manner this ſtory is told, it does more honour to the ſee of Rome than it deſerves. They ſay, this She-Pope had ſtudied much, that ſhe was learned, ingenious, and eloquent, that her excellent qualities made her to be admired at Rome, and that ſhe was elected by univerſal conſent, tho' ſhe appeared as a young ſtranger, unknown, without friends, or any other recommendation than her own merit. I ſay, this is doing too much honour to the ſee of Rome, to ſuppoſe that a young man unknown ſhould be advanced to it, meerly upon the account of his merit; for it is well known, this dignity was never obtained but by intrigues.* You ſee there, a Miniſter confirms the following remark of Florimond de Remond. 'But tho' this misfortune had happened to the church, that a woman ſhould hold the Roman ſee, ſince ſhe came to it by cunning and deceit, and ſince the appearance and ſhew ſhe made of her virtue and holy life had dazzled the eyes of every body, the fault ought to be laid upon her, and not upon the electors, who keeping in the plain beaten road, and walking honeſtly, without intrigues or ſecret practices, could not be accuſed of having a ſhare in the impoſture (125)'. The author adds that, *this accident could not be ſo monſtrous, if it were true, as what thoſe, who call themſelves Reformed, Evangelics, and Puritans, have not only tolerated, but eſtabliſhed, nay forced ſome queens and princeſſes, to call, and declare themſelves head of the church in their ſtates and dominions, diſpoſing of pious and holy things, and eccleſiaſtical offices, according to their will and pleaſure.* He had undoubtedly read this thought in Alanus Copus (126), or in Genebrard (127).

II. Secondly, it may be anſwered, it is not at all likely that Rome would forbid to make mention of an event ſo public and extraordinary as that was. Such an order would have been fruitleſs: people do not ſo expoſe their authority, by prohibitions which are not of a nature to be obſerved, and which are ſo far from ſhutting the mouth, that they rather excite an itching deſire to ſpeak (128).

III. Add in the third place, that if zeal or fear had ſtopped the pen of Hiſtorians, we ſhould not find that the firſt, who publiſhed the Papacy of Joan, were perſons devoted to the Catholic religion, and more within reach of puniſhment than others; for they were Monks. It is certain that almoſt all thoſe, who ſpread this ſtory, were good Papiſts, and nothing was farther from their thoughts than ſlander.

IV. In the fourth place, the irregularities of the court of Rome, infinitely more infamous than the Papacy of this woman would be, have been deſcribed very ingenuouſly by many authors, who were zealous for the court of Rome (129).

V. Laſtly, I ſay, that a prohibition to ſpeak of the She-Pope cannot be ſuppoſed without a contradiction; for this order to be ſilent would entirely deſtroy the principal circumſtances of the narrative. Blondel has not forgot this obſervation. Theſe are his words: 'Many . . . . have thought they could juſtify the ſtory of Marianus, againſt the objection taken from a ſilence of more than 200 years, by maintaining that the authors, who lived from the year 855, to the year 1050, forbore to ſpeak of it, becauſe they were aſhamed of it, and choſe rather to alter the order of the ſucceſſion of Popes by an affected ſilence, than to contribute by expreſſing an odious truth to the preſervation of the execrable memory of this harlot, who had (as is pretended) diſgraced their ſeries, by intruding into it. For ſetting aſide that, the cotemporary authors expreſs (as has been ſhewn before) ſome truths directly contrary to this ſuppoſition, ſtarted ſince their death: thoſe who reſided at Rome, as Nicolas I, and Anaſtaſius, and William, the library-keeper, would have been ſtark-mad to think, they could (by means of their ſilence and ſhame) bury a filth, which is ſuppoſed to have filled Rome in ſuch a manner with aſtoniſhment, indignation, and ſhame, that ſhe ſhould not be ſatisfied but by perpetuating the effect of her juſt diſdain, and ſetting forth continual marks of it to poſterity, by erecting a ſtatue repreſenting the cauſe of her reſentment, by the turning aſide of her proceſſions, and the introduction of cuſtoms unheard of before, and not very decent (130)' Florimond de Remond, a long time before, had made uſe of the ſame proof (131). Nevertheleſs Mr du Pleſſis Mornai had no regard to it. *Onuphrius ſays that Anaſtaſius, who lived then, ſays nothing of it; nor Regino, nor many others ſince that time. But to that it might be anſwered in one word, to argue from authority negatively concludes nothing. Ranulphus alſo, in his Polychronicon, might anſwer him*, that it was omitted by reaſon of the turpitude of the fact (132). The reply of Coëffeteau upon theſe words of Ranulphus is remarkable. 'It would be very well, *ſays he* (133), if theſe authors had not filled the chair with a true Pope in that time, and that they had left at leaſt ſpace enough for this whore to bring forth a child. Beſides, where is here the conſcience of the Reformed? They will have it, that, in deteſtation of this infamy, and for an eternal monument of this ſcandal, a chapel was built at Rome in the place where ſhe was delivered; that a ſtatue of marble was erected to repreſent the fact: and that indecent chairs were ſet up, to prevent the like accidents for the future: and yet they affirm, that Hiſtorians durſt not ſpeak of it, out of reſpect to the Popes. What ray, nay what ſhadow, of truth is there in things ſo inconſiſtent.' Rivetus, who refuted Coëffeteau, and who followed him almoſt ſtep by ſtep, replied nothing to this paſſage. I have not as yet obſerved any ſolution upon that point, in the writings of thoſe who defend the ſtory of the She-Pope. They have imitated Homer, who abandoned ſuch things as he deſpaired to handle well (134).

REFUTATION of an author, who has endeavoured to ſolve the contradiction objected.

This is not to be underſtood as if I abſolutely maintained, that I know no body who has undertaken to remove the contradiction. I know Alexander Cook has examined it, and thinks *he has unravelled it pretty well* (135); but I know likewiſe, it had been better for his cauſe, if he had kept ſilence. He ſuppoſes there were various opinions; ſome thought the adventure mention of the She-Pope in his ſpeech at the conference of Poiſſi. Somebody ſaid in a book, that *the Papal crew hung down their heads for ſhame at the bare recital of this ſtory*

---

(123) Cum in urbe & Vita & ſcientia magnæ opinionis eſſet. *Martin. Polonus.*

(124) Jurieu, Apologie pour la Réformation, *Tom. ii, p.* 38, *Edit. in 4to.*

(125) Florimond de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. xi, num.* 5, *folio* 391.

(126) He pretends that the Engliſh, who made Elizabeth head of the church, are more criminal than the electors of the She-Pope would be. See the 8th chapter of his firſt dialogue, *pag.* 39.

(127) Genebr. Chron. *lib. iv, ad ann.* 858, *pag. m.* 540.

(128) *See* Florimond de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *chap. xxviii, fol.* 442.

(129) See, ibid. *ch. xv, num.* 2, *fol.* 402, *verſo.*

(130) Blondel, Eclairciſſement, &c. *pag.* 78, 79.

(131) Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. xxii, num.* 1, & *ch. xxiv, num.* 6.

(132) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 161.

(133) Coëffet. Réponſe au Myſtère d'Iniquité, *pag.* 505, 506.

(134) Et quæ Deſperat tractata niteſcere poſſe, relinquit. *Horat. de Arte Poët. ver.* 149.

(135) Cook, on the She-Pope, *pag.* 148.

ture of the She-Pope ſhould be ſuffered to drop into oblivion, and others, that monuments ſhould be erected in memory of it. He gives two examples of the like diverſity of opinions; one is, that there were *ſome Papiſts in France, who denied that* John Chaſtel *had been inſtructed by the Jeſuits to aſſaſſinate* Henry IV, *king of France, becauſe they would not have the Jeſuits rendered odious:* and yet there were *others who aſſiſted in raiſing a pyramid near the palace of Paris, by which the whole affair was made known* (136). The other is, ſome people *were of opinion that* the writing given to Paul III, touching the reformation of abuſes, *deſerved to be regiſtred; others judged it more fit to be burnt: this appears evidently from hence, that the ſaid memorial is found in the edition of the Council, printed by* Crab, *in the year* 1551, *and yet is put in the Index of books prohibited by Paul IV. . . . and was caſtrated in the edition of Councils of* Dominicus Nicolinus *at Venice*, auſpiciis Sixti Quinti, *in the year* 1585, *and alſo in the edition of* Severinus Binnius *at Cologne*, 1606 (137).

To overthrow this whole diſcourſe, I obſerve; firſt, that the ſuppoſition of Cook changes the ſtate of the queſtion. The point was to know whether the authors, who kept ſilence for two hundred years, were determined to it out of reſpect to or fear of the holy ſee. It is ſuppoſed, that the immediate ſucceſſors of the She-Pope enjoined, or recommended, ſilence on this ſcandalous accident, and that Anaſtaſius, and the other Hiſtorians, down to Marianus Scotus, came into this notion, either out of zeal for the honour of the church, or fear of bringing themſelves into trouble (138). This ſuppoſition is evidently and directly contrary to thoſe public monuments, which are pretended to have been raiſed, and that new ceremonial which was introduced at Rome, as they ſay, with reſpect to anniverſary proceſſions, and the election of Popes. I remark, ſecondly, that even by changing wholly the ſtate of the queſtion, the abſurdity is not avoided; for if Anaſtaſius, for example, had been one of thoſe, who thought that for the honour of the church, it was neceſſary to conceal the accident of the She-Pope, he would not have forborn to ſpeak of it, after the contrary opinion had ſo far prevailed, that the city and church of Rome ſhould have authorized it by public monuments, and by perpetual and anniverſary reglations. What end could the ſilence of an Hiſtorian in that caſe have anſwered? How whimſical, or rather how fooliſh, would it be, to think to ſuppreſs, out of regard to the holy ſee, a matter, which the whole church of Rome, openly, and publickly eternized the memory of? I ſay, in the third place, the examples Mr Cook brings ſignify nothing at all: for thoſe, who would not have had a pyramid raiſed, or the Jeſuits defamed, upon the account of John Chaſtel, were perſonally concerned in it, either through affection to that ſociety, or becauſe they believed they were not guilty. But Anaſtaſius, and the other Hiſtorians, were not perſonally concerned in the affair of the She-Pope, they did not matter her honour or her reputation, and entertained, no doubt, about the truth of the fact. Beſides, after the opinion of the neceſſity of raiſing a pyramid had prevailed, the Hiſtorians, who were moſt devoted to the Jeſuits, took notice of it, and could not have ſuppreſſed the fact, without making themſelves ridiculous. If the memorial preſented to Paul III, preſently appeared, and then diſappeared, it was becauſe the court of Rome made the opinion of thoſe quickly prevail, who were for having it ſuppreſſed. This cannot be ſaid of the monuments of the She-Pope; for it is alledged, they ſubſiſted ſeveral ages. The compariſon would be tolerable, if ſome private perſons had ſtifled the memorial, and that the court of Rome had cauſed it to be printed in the Vatican, with the moſt authentic atteſtations that can accompany what ſhe would make public *in æternam rei memoriam*.

Samuel Mareſius, who calls a little ſubtilty (139) the contradiction Blundel had objected, does not get off from it better than Cook. He ſays, that among thoſe, who have kept ſilence, with regard to the She-Popes, ſome did it becauſe they did not think it neceſſary to inſert her in the catalogue of Popes, and the reſt, becauſe having a veneration for the holy ſee, they were aſhamed of this ſcandalous accident, but did not pretend that their omiſſion could aboliſh the memory of a thing, which the public monuments atteſted and perpetuated. We have ſeen above (140), that tho' our Joan was thought unworthy to have a place in the catalogue of Popes, and to enlarge their number, yet Hiſtorians could not diſpenſe with making mention of her falſe Popedom, the thing being too public and extraordinary. And as to this veneration for the holy ſee, and this ſhame which might have induced ſome Annaliſts to ſay nothing of a fact, whereof the whole city of Rome publickly kept up the remembrance, they are ſuch fantaſtical and fooliſh paſſions, that we cannot believe the writers, who have taken no notice of the Papacy of Engliſh Joan, capable of them. A ſenſible Hiſtorian does not ſtifle a truth for the ſake of thoſe that would have it made public, nor when he knows his ſilence can produce no good effect, and may expoſe him to ridicule, as a perſon poſſeſſed with a fooliſh ſhame. Whoever then will buſy himſelf here in the office of reconciler, loſes his pains (141). The contradiction objected by David Blondel is a knot that cannot be untied: 'Qui 'vetuſtiorum (de fœdo ejuſdem exitu, excitatis ad per'petuam memoriam monumentis publice, ſi deo placet, 'conteſtato) diſſimulationem pudori imputandum autu'mant, ἀσύγκλαστα κλώθειν merito cenſeantur. Quis 'enim Nicolaum primum, Hincmarum, Adonem, Ana'ſtaſium, Luitprandum, alioſque, quibus cum Romanis 'optimè conveniebat, id ſe conſecuturos ſperaſſe fin'gat; ut (quod famoſa ſtatuarum propalam proſtantium 'erectio, ſcrupuloſa in proceſſionum ſolennibus ſceleris 'conſciæ viæ declinatio, ſtercorariæ ſedis ad explo'randum Paparum ſexum decreta in poſterum inſeſſio, 'urbi & orbi indeſinenter ebuccinabant) illatum per 'ſummum nefas Eccleſiæ Romanæ dedecus tacendo 'eluerent (142)? - - - *They, who affirm that the diſſi'mulation of the ancient Hiſtorians (concerning her end, 'publickly atteſted, forſooth, by raiſing monuments to the 'perpetual memory of it) is to be imputed to their modeſty, 'may juſtly be thought to talk inconſiſtently. For who '. . . . can imagine that Nicholas the firſt, Hincmarus, 'Ado, Anaſtaſius, Luitprandus, and others, who agreed 'perfectly well with the Romans, could ever hope, by their 'ſilence, to wipe off the diſgrace, moſt impiouſly brought 'upon the church of Rome; ſince it was daily proclaimed 'to the city and the whole world, by the famous erecting 'of ſtatues which were publickly ſold, by the ſcrupulous 'turning aſide of ſolemn proceſſions from the place which 'was privy to the crime, and by the placing of the Popes 'upon a cloſe-ſtool, which was decreed for the future 'in order to examine their ſex.*'

The paſſage of Mr du Pleſſis contains one thing, which leads us back to the reflexion on the influence of prejudices. *To argue from authority negatively concludes nothing*, ſays he. *Impertinent Logic in Hiſtory*, anſwers Coëffeteau (143). *It is rather to argue affirmatively, for all thoſe authors, as Anaſtaſius, Ado of Vienna, Rhegino, William the library-keeper, and the reſt, even the author of Vignier, if it be he that was afterwards printed under the name of Luitprand, were obliged, as faithful Hiſtorians, to write down a fact ſo memorable, which happened in their time, ſince it concerned the hiſtory they treated of: and therefore not to have writ it, is to affirm it never happened: and beſides, what ſome of them relate entirely deſtroys the fable.* Pray conſider well, what Andrew Rivetus replied. 'If this Logic is im'pertinent in matter of Hiſtory, why is this inference 'reckoned bad, *viz.* that Peter was never at Rome, 'becauſe the hiſtory of the Acts, and the Epiſtles, 'both his own and thoſe of St Paul, ſay nothing of 'it? *I anſwer*, (ſays Bellarmin, and it is a point 'about Hiſtory) *that one concludes nothing ab authori'tate negativè*, from authority negatively. *For this 'does not follow, Luke, Paul, Seneca, do not ſay 'that Peter was at Rome, therefore he was not 'there: for theſe three were not obliged to tell every 'thing; and more credit is given to three evidences who 'affirm a thing, than to a thouſand that ſay nothing of 'it, provided the latter do not deny what the former af'firm.* Now it is true, Anaſtaſius, and the reſt, do 'not deny this accident, but they are ſilent about 'it (144).' What example of the illuſion, into which the intereſt of party throws us! The ſame way of reaſoning ſeems good to us when we uſe it ourſelves,

and

(136) Ibid.

(137) Ibid. *pag.* 149, 150.

(138) It is true that Anaſtaſius and the other Hiſtorians do not deny this accident, but they are ſilent about it. They ought to have told it, ſays Coëffeteau; and that is the queſtion. We ſay on the contrary they were obliged to conceal it, both by the authority of the Popes at that time, and by the cuſtom, and the conſideration of the times in which they wrote. The Popes would not let their writers diſcloſe this turpitude, to the eyes of thoſe who called their ſee in queſtion, and concealed it as much as they could, that they might not expoſe themſelves to the ridicule of the Greeks. *Rivet, Remarques ſur la Reſponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, Part i, pag.* 595.

(139) Valeret utcunque hæc doctiſſimi Viri argutiola. *Mareſ. Examen Quæſtionis, &c. pag.* 51.

(140) In the remark [C].

(141) Pergit pugnantia ſecum Frontibus adverſis componere. *Horat. Sat. I, lib. i, ver.* 102.

(142) Blondel, in Examine Queſt. de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 32.

(143) Coëffet. Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 505.

(144) Rivet, *ubi ſupra, Tom. i, pag.* 595.

ſtory (*n*). Florimond de Remond ſays it is falſe (*o*), and wiſhes the prelates had *humbled the boldneſs* of Theodore Beza, *and ſhewn his impoſture*; but they had ſo many other things of greater importance to diſcuſs, that they would have been to blame to loſe time about a queſtion of fact of ſo little conſequence. And beſides, it is not true that Theodore Beza embelliſhed *his harangue with this ſtory* (*p*). He took no notice at all of it. Mr Moreri is miſtaken when he affirms as ſomething *remarkable*, *that among ſo great a number of people*, *who have* aſſerted the ſtory of the She-Pope, *not one Frenchman is to be found* (*q*) [*H*]. As for the reſt, this multitude of teſtimonies cannot paſs for a proof, ſince

(*n*) *See* Florimond de Remond, *in the treatiſe* l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. vi*, *num.* 6, *fol. m.* 378, *verſo*.

(*o*) Ibid.

(*p*) Ibid.

(*q*) Moreri, under John VII, Pope.

and bad when it is uſed againſt us. The Roman Catholics will not admit the negative argument in the queſtion, whether St Peter was at Rome, and pretend it is convincing in the queſtion, whether there was a She-Pope. The Proteſtants, who think it demonſtrative in the firſt queſtion, reject it in the ſecond, and to invalidate it, even alledge what Bellarmin and other Jeſuits ſay againſt it (145). The anonymous author (146) of *Judicium* (147) *de Samuelis Mareſii Joanna Papiſſa reſtituta*, drew a parallel between the diſpute of Sibrand Lubbert with Bellarmin, and that of Samuel Mareſius with Blondel, and ſhewed that the reaſons of Samuel Mareſius are like thoſe of Bellarmin. In the firſt of theſe two diſputes, the queſtion is, whether St Peter was at Rome or not; and in the ſecond, whether there was a She-Pope or not. From whence ariſes this conſequence, if Bellarmin be a caviller, Mareſius is not leſs ſo.

What is the reaſon that another miniſter, who would not affirm there was a She-Pope (148), has thought *the ſtrongeſt arguments* that are produced againſt this tradition *very weak?* Does it not proceed from prejudice and the intereſt of party? For, the like arguments would ſeem to him ſo ſolid in refuting a ſilly ſtory given out againſt the Waldenſes, that he would load the Monks with reproaches that ſhould not acquieſce in them. It muſt be owned that it is chiefly in the matter of controverſy that the underſtanding is the dupe of the paſſions.

This, amongſt other bad effects, produces the diſadvantageous opinion each entertains of the contrary party. They look upon one another as obſtinate perſons, that will not ſwerve a jot from pre-conceived notions, and chuſe rather to ſeek out evaſions, than yield to reaſon. Has ſuch a ſpirit as this been ſeen to reign in the works deſigned to maintain the ſtory of the She-Pope; one imagines the authors are animated by the ſame principle, when they diſpute either againſt the Pope's ſupremacy, or the real preſence, and that if the proofs of theſe two tenets were as clear as the ſun, they would however oppoſe them, and think they had ſufficiently refuted them, provided they had furniſhed cavils like thoſe of the ſticklers for the She-Pope. Whereupon ſome believe, that nothing is to be got by gentle methods, and that ſuch an obſtinacy requires the remedy of penal laws. On the other hand, when one ſees the Roman Catholics continue to write books to ſupport the moſt ill grounded traditions, as the arrival of Lazarus into Provence, the apoſtleſhip of Dionyſius the Areopagite, *&c.* one thinks the ſame ſpirit leads them to reject the moſt convincing reaſons that can be alledged againſt Tranſubſtantiation. Can there be any thing more clear than the facts, by which the changes of belief that have happened in the church are proved (149), and yet the controverſiſts of Rome deny them with the greateſt aſſurance, and even treat them as impoſſible (150). How then can the Proteſtants forbear to call this obſtinacy?

A very learned Calviniſt, who has embraced the opinion of Blondel, would without difficulty aſſent to what I have juſt ſaid; for he obſerves that by maintaining ſo zealouſly that there was a She-Pope, occaſion is given to the Roman controverſiſts to confirm their followers in their falſe notions, and to make them hate the Proteſtant communion, as if it alledged nothing ſtronger againſt the other doctrines of Popery, than for the defence of the ſtory we ſpeak of. *Si dicere liceat, quod res eſt, Papani Doctores dum vident quoſdam ex Noſtris, pro Johannæ Papiſſæ Hiſtoria, ut vera, velut pro aris atque focis digladiari, argumentum inveniunt ad confirmandos cæcos ſuos ſectatores, eoſque ab Orthodoxa doctrina alieniores reddendos. Cum enim non difficulter, imo ſufficienter, (licet non deberent ipſi) commentum hoc deſtruere queant, facile ſimplicioribus perſuadent, ejuſdem notæ eſſe reliqua, quæ illi, quos per calumniam hæreticos vocant, adverſus dogmata ſuæ Eccleſiæ, quam ſolam contendunt eſſe Catholicam, adducere conſueverint* (151). We ſhall ſee afterwards (152) theſe are not things ſpoken at random: for I ſhall quote a Capuchin, who, to convict the Proteſtants of obſtinacy, alledges the diſpute about the She-Pope as an inſtance of it. Let us conclude with a ſhort digreſſion. I do not think there is reaſon to accuſe David Blondel of temerity, under pretence that the arguments which combate the exiſtence of the She-Pope have determined him to the negative. But if, becauſe other arguments may be oppoſed to theſe, one thinks he ought to be condemned, the condemnation muſt be founded on his not remaining neuter. This is the courſe ſome people take: they leave the queſtion of the She-Pope undecided, they neither affirm nor deny what Martin Polonus has ſaid about it. This conduct ſeems to them prudent: but do they keep to it in every thing elſe? Do they ſuſpend their judgment until proofs are brought, againſt which they can invent nothing to ſay? Not at all: they content themſelves with the pooreſt reaſonings upon a hundred other occaſions which humour their prejudices.

The ſame fault is every day obſerved in Newsmongers. Does there go a report, favourable to the enemy, and backed with all kinds of probability, they diſpute as much as they are able, and will not give credit till the thing is evidently certain. I have ſometimes told them their oppoſition could not be ſufficiently applauded, if it were accompanied with two conditions, one is, that they would be pleaſed to ſuſpend their judgment without paſſing to the negative, and the other that they would be as difficult to be perſuaded, when a piece of news is ſpread, diſadvantageous to the enemy. But then they are credulity itſelf, the ſtrongeſt appearances of falſhood make no impreſſion upon them: they combate them as much as they can, without remembering that every day they uſe weaker proofs againſt ſuch reports as are diſagreeable to them, and which for that reaſon ſeem to them unworthy of credit. They ſuffer themſelves to be taken on the firſt onſet by the Gazettes of their own nation, and ſuſtain four or five aſſaults from thoſe of the enemy's. Extreme credulity in ſome reſpects, and extreme incredulity in others, agree ſo well together in the ſame man, that they beget each other.

[*H*] *Mr Moreri . . . . affirms . . . . that among ſo great a number of people, who have aſſerted the ſtory of the She-Pope, not one Frenchman is to be found.*] In theſe words of Moreri there is a truth and a falſhood. It is certain that a world of people have related this ſtory (153): but it is falſe that we do not ſee one Frenchman among them. Mr Moreri would have avoided this miſtake, had he conſulted the Anti-She-Pope of Florimond de Remond: for there he would have found theſe words: 'Our French Hiſtorians and 'Annaliſts, going in the old road, have touched up'on ſomewhat of it. For in order to embelliſh their 'work, they have thought fit to add this fine piece 'to it. One ſays, ſhe was a very pretty woman and 'of a great genius, born in England, and fell in love 'with a young ſtudent. Then going on with the 'reſt of the ſtory, ſays it was her Valet de Chambre, 'that ſporting with her, got her with child, and 'that going one day on horſeback through the city, 'ſhe was delivered, and died ſuddenly upon the place 'after having held the ſee two years, five months, and 'four days. And that after her death Nicolas the 'firſt was choſen. This happened in 858. In which 'he belies all thoſe, who went before him. One of 'her cardinals, as this author ſays, ſporting with the 'life of his maſter, or rather miſtreſs, immortalized 'her memory in this fine verſe,

Papa pater patrum papiſſa peperit partum (154).

(145) See Cook, in the treatiſe of the She-Pope, *pag.* 141, *&* *ſeq*; *and* Samuel Mareſius, in Examine Quæſt. de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 44, *&* *pag.* 20.

(146) *It is* Daniel Zwickerus. *See* Biblioth. Antitrinitariorum, *pag.* 152.

(147) *It is a piece of* 22 *pages, at the end of the* Quaternio Diſſertationum Theologicarum *of* Curcellæus, *printed at Amſterdam* 1659, *in* 8*vo*.

(148) Jurieu, Apologie pour la Reformation, *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 40.

(149) See among other works written by the miniſters, *l'Hiſtoire de l'Egliſe*, which Mr Baſnage publiſhed in the year 1699, in two volumes in folio.

(150) Meſſieurs de Port-Royal have writ ſeveral books upon that with regard to the Euchariſt, and a doctor of the Sorbonne, named Langevin, has maintained it with regard to all the articles of faith. *Le Journal des Sçavans*, of the ſixth of February 1702, gives an extract of his book.

(151) Mart. Schoockius, Præf. Fabulæ Hamelenſis, *folio ult*.

(152) In the remark [*I*].

(153) See the remark [*B*], of the article FRANK.

(154) Florimond de Remond, l'Anti-Papeſſe, *ch. iv*, *n.* 4, *folio* 372, *verſo*.

ſince the moſt antient is poſterior by two hundred years to the fact in queſtion, and inconſiſtent with thoſe indiſputable facts related by cotemporary authors [*I*]. Colomiés cenſures Blondel for believing that the ſtory of the She-Pope, which we meet with in a manuſcript of Anaſtaſius, *was framed in the very words of Martinus Polonus.* He ſhews that an Hiſtorian, who lived before Martinus, has related the ſame thing that we ſee in this Manuſcript; but in the main, this rather favours than hurts the opinion of Blondel [*K*]. Thoſe, who have writ to ſhew the falſity of this ſtory, have inquired into the

The Holy Father became a mother.

If the author of the Annals of Aquitain, whom he cites, be John Bouchet, as it is very likely, he muſt have uſed an edition either prior or poſterior to what I uſe (155); for I find in mine only this: *After this Leo, who ſat in the chair of St Peter eight years, an Engliſhwoman, who was thought to be a man, and was named John, was inſtalled Pope. She was born at Mayence: and when ſhe was twelve years of age, ſhe diſguiſed herſelf in the habit of a man, and went to ſtudy at Athens, where ſhe made great proficiency: afterwards ſhe went to Rome in the ſame dreſs, where ſhe was ſo much eſteemed, that the cardinals, thinking ſhe was a man, made her Pope: and ſhe held the ſee thirteen months or thereabouts. And in the thirteenth month being got with child by her Valet de Chambre, as ſhe was going to the church of St John de Lateran, between the Coloſſus and St Clement, ſhe fell in labour, and died in bringing forth. It is ſaid that upon this account, a cardinal uſed afterwards, whenever a Pope was made, to feel whether he had genitals or not* (156). Florimond perhaps miſquoted, and inſtead of the Annals of Aquitain ſhould have ſet down the Annals of France by Nicolas Gilles (157). He complains moreover of another writer whom he does not name, and afterwards of the Sieur du Haillan, *who would not publiſh his hiſtory in France without putting the ſtory of Joan in it, of which neither* Gaguin nor Paulus Æmilius *makes any mention.* He acknowledges that du Haillan confeſſed *that ſome deny what is ſaid of her.* He thinks Stephen Paſquier is more to be blamed, who ought *in his excellent Reſearches to have ſought after truth, that he might not pollute with ſuch filth the beauty of his writings* (158)*: for after ſo many authorities and ſtrong reaſons as I had already publiſhed, the name of Pope Joan could not ſubſiſt in the world.* He afterwards cenſures the Hiſtorian de Serres, who *alledging the ſole authority of Platina has interpolated that paſſage, and has retrenched the* it is ſaid *and* theſe words, *that this ſtory has been left by authors unknown and of little credit.* One may juſtly tell him, *he ought to alledge authors fairly, and not to cite by halves.*

As de Serres was a miniſter, I grant he cannot ſerve as a teſtimony againſt Moreri, who without doubt meant only to ſpeak of French Catholics; but the other writers, whom Remond quotes, have all that is neceſſary to furniſh me with a good proof. I can cite beſides thoſe, the author of *l'Arbre des Batailles* (159), and Martin Franc (160), and Nicolas Gilles (161), and Raviſius Textor (162), and the preſident Fauchet (163), *&c.* I do not know whether I ought to add du Verdier Vau-Privas, who relates at great length (164) the ſtory, without affirming or denying it; but however he ſhews he thinks it very doubtful.

[*I*] *This multitude of teſtimonies cannot paſs for a proof, ſince the moſt antient is poſterior by two hundred years, ... and is inconſiſtent with . . . . the cotemporary authors.*] Thoſe, who refute the ſtory of the She-Pope, make it evident that ſhe cannot be placed between Leo IV, and Benedictus III. They give chronological demonſtrations of it, which they ſupport by clear paſſages from the authors of the IXth century. Whence it follows, that the firſt, who ſpoke of the She-Pope two ages after, deſerves no credit at all, and that thoſe, who after that ſpread the ſame thing, copied one another without running back to the true ſource, and without making any examination, and conſequently we ought not to rely on their great number. Blondel ſays the ſame thing in other words. ‘So, ſays he (165), Marianus is the firſt and only fountain whence all the ſtreams of later writers flow, and I do not think (after having laid open their inexcuſable fault) there is any neceſſity to go further in the examination of thoſe who have only copied one from another, without knowing whether the firſt had been well grounded. Tho' the witneſſes ſhould riſe by hundreds, nay by thouſands, to give depoſitions digeſted in this manner, there is not an honeſt man that would have any regard, either to their number, which ought never to counter-balance truth and reaſon, or to their diſcourſe, which in effect would be only the eccho of the firſt reveries, that might have been very eaſily convicted of impertinence and falſhood, if thoſe who undertook it had had more inclination to ſtudy the Hiſtory of the IXth century, than to exerciſe that abuſive eloquence, which St Jerom in his time had called *caninam facundiam*, ſnarling eloquence.’ Some pages after he relates ſeveral examples of falſe traditions, and particularly that *of the ſiege of Paris, under the reign of Lewis ſirnamed the debonaire, by the giant Iſaurus whoſe burying-place is ſhewn in the monaſtery of St Germains* (166); and afterwards he concludes thus: ‘Let it ſuffice us, that all theſe ſtories are ſtories and no more; that though all the world ſhould hold them for oracles, it would not be in their power to change their nature; and, on the other hand, though truth (oppreſſed by the tyranny of prejudices, and braved by the vanity of romances, and betrayed by the forgetfulneſs or cowardice of men) ſhould be for ſome time forſaken and deſpiſed, neither it's ſolitude could turn to it's ſhame, nor the efforts of it's enemies make it loſe it's dignity, nor the fair appearance of fables eclipſe it's divine light (167). . . . . Since then it is found ſo clear on the ſide of authors, who wrote between the years of our Lord 850 and 1050, ſince all their depoſitions agreeing together compoſe a well adjuſted body, and ſet forth the events, which are the matter in controverſy, with as great a brightneſs as if they had been drawn with a beam of the ſun, and ſince the later writers are full of contradictions and inconſiſtencies, both with thoſe that went before and with themſelves; methinks their opinion (whatever length of time it may boaſt of) deſerves no better treatment than to be (by the common voice of all who will hearken to reaſon) condemned as falſe coin (168).’

The particular nature of the ſtory of the She-Pope diminiſhes much the weight of the great number of writers that have ſpoken of it. It is a caſe that is very uncommon, ſtrange, and ſingular in all it's circumſtances. It is of uſe to thoſe who give liſts of women that are either learned, or leud, or have diſguiſed their ſex. It is of ſervice to ſuch, as collect examples of the judgments of GOD, and ſuch as employ themſelves in writing diverting ſtories. All ſorts of authors might make ſome advantage of it. We are not to wonder then that ſo many people have thruſt it into their writings, and pretended at the ſame time it was true. One does not much examine the traditions that may ſerve for an ornament to the ſubject one treats of.

We have ſeen above (169) ſome circumſtances, which in this affair give great force to the negative argument.

[*K*] *Colomiés cenſures Blondel . . . . He ſhews that an Hiſtorian who lived before Martinus Polonus has related . . . . but in the main this rather favours than hurts the opinion of Blondel.*] ‘Mr Blondel is much miſtaken in thinking that the life of this woman, as it is in the Anaſtaſius of the king's library, was framed in the very words of Martinus Polonus. For how can that be? Since Gervaſius Tilberienſis, an author more ancient by a hundred years than Martinus Polonus, in a piece, intituled, *Otia Imperialia*, written for the diverſion of the emperor Otho IV, which I have read in MS. at Mr Voſſius's, relates the life of the She-Pope in the ſame terms as the Anaſtaſius of the king's library; adding only that this She-Pope was found in few Chronicles, *Et in paucis Chronicis*, ſays he, *invenitur*. If Mr Blondel had ſeen this author, perhaps he would have ſtopped his pen; but he was not known to him

(155) That of Poitiers, by Enguilbert de Marnef, 1557, in folio.

(156) Bouchet, Annales d'Aquitaine, *Part ii*, *folio m.* 60.

(157) There you find the words and things related by Remond: ſee leaf 66, of the edition of Paris 1538, by Nicolas Couteau, in folio.

(158) Paſquier ſpeaks of it in his *Recherches*, *livr. iii, ch. iv, p. m.* 165, *& ch. vii, p.* 178, *& livr. vi, ch. v, pag.* 465; but making good uſe of this cenſure of Remond, he wrote a long letter (in the 12th book, *pag. m.* 829, *& ſeq.*) in which he turned to the negative.

(159) See the remark [*B*], of the article FRANK.

(160) See the remark [*A*] of his article.

(161) *In the* Annales de France.

(162) In Officina.

(163) In the *Antiquitez Françoiſes*, in the Life of Charles the Bald, *folio* 53, *Edit. of Paris* 1602, *in* 8*vo*.

(164) In the 3d Tome of his *Proſopographie*, *pag.* 1667, *& ſeq.*

(165) Blondel, Eclairciſſement, &c. *pag.* 70, 71.

(166) Ibid. *pag.* 93, 94.

(167) Ibid. *pag.* 94.

(168) Ibid. *pag.* 95.

(169) In the remark [*G*].

the origin of it, and have alledged ſeveral conjectures. Some ſay, Pope John VIII diſcovered ſo much cowardice in the cauſe of Photius, that people thought he *ſhould rather be called* a woman *than a man* (r). This is the opinion of Baronius. But Aventinus imagines the fable aroſe on occaſion that John IX was created Pope by the intereſt of Theodora *a noble and imperious whore* (s), whoſe minion he was. Onufrius Panvinius thinks that Pope John XII, *carrying with him a herd of ſtrumpets, among others cheriſhed Joan Rainiere*; and becauſe ſhe governed him abſolutely, ſhe was *afterwards in rallery called the She-Pope* (t). Bellarmin will have it that the fable had its riſe from a current report, that a woman had been Patriarch of Conſtantinople (u). Allatius maintains that one Thiota, who ſet up for a propheteſs in Germany in the IXth century, was the occaſion of the ſtory. Blondel, having refuted theſe conjectures, declares that one ought not *to exerciſe one's wit in fruitleſs inquiries about a ſubject that is not worth the while* (x). *What would become of us*, adds he (y), *were it neceſſary for us to gueſs, what the authors of ſo many romances, which to this day find credit among the vulgar, are grounded upon?* He gives ſeveral inſtances of it. I do not think he had reaſon to reject all that is conjectured about the original of the romance of the She-Pope. I will be bold to ſay, that the Proteſtants who have ſo much exclaimed againſt him, and conſidered him as a falſe brother, have neither been equitable, or have well underſtood the intereſts of their own party. It is of little moment to them, whether this woman ever exiſted or not: a miniſter, who is none of the moſt tractable, owns it (z). But it concerns them much not to give occaſion to be looked upon, as an obſtinate ſet of people, that will never ſwerve in the leaſt from the opinions they have pre-conceived. They might juſtly have objected the ſtory of the She-Pope before it was refuted. They were not the inventers of it: they found it in ſeveral books written by good Papiſts: but after it was refuted with the ſtrongeſt arguments, they ought to have abandoned it, and not to have uſed all their induſtry to keep up the diſpute; for this was to point out to their adverſaries the method of conteſting all facts, and to countenance them in the tradition, which ſays there was one Cyriacus a Pope that abdicated the Popedom, in order to go to ſeek for martyrdom at the head of eleven thouſand virgins (aa). If they had imitated Blondel, they would have been able to have ſhewn by a notable example, that they ſubmit to reaſon, and that they are wrongfully accuſed of obſtinacy [L]. They would have been able to boaſt, that they do not maintain the other diſputes through a ſpirit of contradiction; but becauſe pertinent anſwers are not made to the difficulties they propoſe (bb). Launoi, and ſome other writers who oppoſe ill grounded traditions, diſpleaſe many, and

(r) Blondel, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 85.

(s) Ibid. *pag.* 87.

(t) Ibid. *pag.* 88.

(u) *Pope* Leo IX *atteſts it*, Epiſt. I, chap. xxiii. *See* Blondel, ibid. *pag.* 89. *Compare with this what Father* Mabillon *relates in his* Muſæum Italicum, *Tom. i, pag.* 27, *and conſult* Spanheim. de Papa fœmina, *pag.* 12, *& ſeq.*

(x) Blondel, Eclairciſſement, &c. *pag.* 92.

(y) Ibid. *pag.* 93.

(z) Mr Jurieu: his words will be ſeen in the remark [G].

(aa) See Launoi, *Epiſt. viii, Part iv, p. m.* 356, where he compares this tradition with that of the She-Pope.

(bb) See upon all this the remark [G].

‘ him no more than Amalricus Augerii, who lived in the year 1362, and who wrote a Chronicle of the Popes, dedicated to Urban V, wherein he ſpeaks of the She-Pope in theſe words: ‘ Joannes dictus Anglicus, natione magnanimus (*I believe it ſhould be* Maguntinus) poſt dominum Leonem papam in Romanum Pontificatum fuit aſſumptus; & poſt B. Petrum apoſtolum ponitur papa centeſimus decimus. - - - *John, ſirnamed the Engliſh, a native of Mayence, was made Pope after Leo; and is reckoned the hundred and tenth Pope from St Peter the apoſtle.*’ The learned Scriverius had this author in manuſcript (170). I ſhall obſerve two things upon this paſſage. Firſt, that Gervaſe of Tilburi was not prior to Martin Polonus by a hundred years; for he dedicated his book to Otho IV (171), who was choſen emperor in the year 1198, and died in the year 1218. Blondel ſays that Martin Polonus died about the year 1270. It was in the year 1278 as Voſſius has proved it (172). My ſecond remark is, that if Blondel had known that Gervaſe of Tilburi ſpoke of the She-Pope in the words of the manuſcript of Anaſtaſius, that, as Mr Colomiés ſuppoſes, would not have hindered him from refuting the ſtory of this woman; for on the contrary he would have had ſomething to confirm him in his opinion. He would have ſaid that Martin Polonus drew from a bad fountain, to wit, a Chronicle deſigned to divert and entertain the emperor, and filled for that purpoſe with a thouſand ridiculous ſtories. Thus Gabriel Naudé diſcredits all that the ſame Martin Polonus has reported of the Magic of Pope Sylveſter II; *for it is certain he has tranſlated all he ſaid of it in his Chronological Computations from this Galfridus who lived about the year* 1150, *and from one Gervaſius who was Orator of the city of Arles, and Chancellor to the emperor Otho III* (173), *but as for the reſt, the greateſt forger of fables and the moſt notorious liar that ever put pen to paper, as there would be no reaſon to doubt it after the bare reading of the book which he wrote* de Ociis Imperatoris, *where every thing he ſays is ſo extravagant, and ſo remote from reaſon and poſſibility, ordinary and extraordinary, that the Fables of Æſop and the Tales of Amadis are a hundred times more credible* (174). Let us remember the fables he has related of the pretended Magic of Virgil, and how Naudé cenſured him for it (175). Martin Polonus owns that Gervaſe, that is Gervaſe of Tilburi (176), is one of thoſe from whom he took the materials of his Chronicle.

[L] *That they are wrongfully accuſed of obſtinacy.*] We have ſeen in remark [G] ſome reflexions, which tend to ſhew, that the diſputes about the She-Pope adminiſter to the Roman Catholics an occaſion to affirm, that the Proteſtants are obſtinate. Perhaps ſome readers might pretend I ſpoke ſo only by conjecture. This induces me to give here ſome practical proofs of what they would have paſs for meer ſpeculations. A Capuchin preacher, who put out a book of controverſy, in the year 1611, averred (177), that *one cannot better repreſent the humour and way of our miniſters who meddle with writing*, than by applying what *St Athanaſius, tired with confounding, without converting, the Heretics of his time, ſaid of them* †, tho' they be confuted, they will never yield. Tho' they have nothing new to ſay, yet are they not aſhamed; but bold, as leud women, they become impudent in their impieties in ſpite of all (178). ‘ A clear anſwer is made to the Miniſters, continues the Capuchin, and without leaving room for a juſt reply to their doubts or impoſtures. They are made to ſee with their eyes, to hear with their ears, to feel with their hands, that their objections are falſe: that their hiſtories are fables: that their prepoſſeſſions are unreaſonble. No matter, they ſtill repeat their fancies as quite new, without ſhame, without reaſon, without conſcience. Provided they fill their books with ſuch old paltry ſtuff, and impoſe upon ſome fool, they are ſatisfied. They make it appear that the wiſe man had reaſon to ſay ‡: *Though thou ſhouldeſt bray a fool in a mortar among wheat with a peſtil, yet will not his fooliſhneſs depart from him* (179).’

Now ſee by what example he endeavours to prove this unjuſt accuſation. ‘ It is impoſſible for theſe to reply to the ſolid diſcourſes, the clear reaſons, and unexceptionable evidences, that the Catholics have a thouſand times produced, to ſhew that what their fathers thought fit to ſay of Pope Joan is a meer ſtory, and a vile calumny. Mr Caſaubon, the moſt learned of all the pretended Reformers, who by his good

(170) Colomiés, Mélanges Hiſtor. *pag.* 57, 58. *See the words of Blondel in the remark* [A], *citation* (2).

(171) Theodor. à Niem. *lib. ii*, de Schiſm, *cap. xix, pag. m.* 97.

(172) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 486.

(173) He ſhould have Otho IV.

(174) Naudé, Apolog. des grands Hommes, *ch. xix, pag. m.* 558, 559.

(175) See the remark [I], of the article VIRGIL.

(176) *See* Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *pag.* 486.

(177) Silveſtre de Laval Prédicateur Capucin, les juſtes Grandeurs de l'Egliſe Romaine, *livr. iii, chap. v, p.* 68, 69.

† *Athanaſ. Orat. iv, contr. Arian.* Οὔτε γὰρ ἐλεγχόμενοι παύονται, οὔτε ἀποροῦντες ἐντρέπονται, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ὄψις πόρνις, ἀπηναισχύντισαν πρὸς πάντας ἐν ταῖς ἀσεβείαις.

(178) Silv. de Laval, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 68.

‡ Prov. xxvii, 22.

(179) Ibid. *pag.* 69.

and do credit to their church; for after that, it cannot be accuſed of oppreſſing people about ſuch kind of ſubjects. On the contrary, thoſe, who are ſtiff in defending theſe traditions, do but diſgrace it.

‘ good literature has acquired moderation, and the friendſhip of ſeveral perſons of honour and learning, particularly of Thuanus, laughs at the fable. I have heard them both agree together in ſaying, that after reading the Annotation of Onuphrius, upon the life of John the eighth in Platina ‡, it is impoſſible to believe that this imaginary Joan could ever have exiſted, as the ignorant ſay. Since that, Onuphrius, Bellarmin, Genebrard, Florimond de Remond, and fifty other Catholics have writ upon the ſame ſubject, and made the thing ſo clear, that men ought never to be believed, if that can be called in queſtion. After which, however, the little Vignier (180) has repeated this nonſenſe, in order to ſwell his ſeditious book. His Theatre, which was to be a large heap of the ſlanders of his whole cauſe, would not have been compleat without this falſehood. What ſhall we do to him? What ſhall we ſay both to him and thoſe who give credit to him, except what they ſing in their aſſemblies:’

O cruel ſons of men, how long
Will ye love vanities?
How long my glory turn to ſhame,
And follow after lies (181)?

After that, he ſpends ſixteen pages in refuting this old tradition, and concludes with theſe words: ‘It is then for want of modeſty and ſenſe, and of true or probable objections, that the Miniſters, after ſo much certainty and clearneſs, dare repeat to us this piece of folly. I think, without doing them injuſtice, it may be ſaid of them, and thoſe who believe them, that they fullfil what the Apoſtle foretold was to come to paſs *. *The time will come when they will not endure ſound doctrine; but after their own luſts ſhall they heap to themſelves teachers, having itching ears. And they ſhall turn away their ears from the truth, and ſhall be turned unto fables.* But as to this point, whoever has the ſpirit and fear of God, will remember what the ſame St Paul wrote to Timothy at another time **, *Refute profane and old wives fables, and exerciſe thyſelf rather unto godlineſs:* for in conſcience, one cannot call the Miniſters Hiſtory of Joan any other, than a *profane fable, and an old woman's ſtory* (182).’

Theſe two quotations of Scripture are ſufficient to ſhew that he did not abound in judgment; for they may be applied againſt his own church, which for ſome ages did not queſtion this fable. A Proteſtant, whom I have cited before, alledges this credulity as a proof the Antichriſtianiſm of the Popiſh communion. ‘Nec quando hanc foveo ſententiam (*non extitiſſe Papiſſam*) patrocinor Papiſmo at Babyloni adulor. Abſit. quicquid alii ſentiant, meam opinionem ei confundendæ, præ altera ſervire credo. Quod enim à pluribus ſeculis Papani conſtanter crediderint, Johannam Papiſſam Eccleſiæ præfuiſſe, completum eſt vaticinum Apoſtoli, 2 Theſſ. 11. *minantis iis efficaciam erroris, immittendam à Deo, ad hoc ut crederent mendacio* (183). ---- *Nor by maintaining this opinion (that there was no She-Pope) do I plead for Popery, or careſs Babylon. God forbid. Whatever others think, I believe my opinion tends more to confound her than the other. For ſince the Papiſts, for ſeveral ages, have conſtantly believed, that Pope Joan governed the church, the prophecy of the Apoſtle was accompliſhed, 2 Theſſ. ii. ver.* 11. threatening, that God would ſend them ſtrong deluſion, that they ſhould believe a lie.’

I cannot help ſaying, that the words of Athanaſius, quoted by the Capuchin, are a common-place, which all parties provide themſelves with, to decry the obſtinacy of their adverſaries. They might be retorted upon this Capuchin; for how many things did he advance, which had been a thouſand times refuted? A certain ſpirit of contradiction reigns every where more or leſs, that will not ſuffer people to renounce their former arguments. They ſeem to conſider them, as if they had received them under the ſame condition, that ſome women of Lacedæmon preſcribed when they gave their ſons the buckler, *rather die than loſe it* (184). Let us uſe another compariſon. They ſeem to look upon them as an inviolable truſt, or as a talent that one is charged to improve under the penalty of a curſe, or, in fine, as an intailed eſtate from father to ſon, and of ſuch a kind, that one muſt be as delicate as Naboth was concerning alienation (185). However it be, there are a thouſand diſputes, wherein the weakeſt reaſonings always recur; refute them never ſo much, they are like nature, which the ſtrokes of a fork cannot expel (186), *or thoſe troubleſome inſects, which are the more eager to purſue us, the more we try to drive them away* (187). Wiſe diſputants do not act after this manner: their prejudice is not ſo great as to hinder them from diſcerning what is ſtrong, and what is weak, and they imitate good warriors, who abandon ſuch poſts as it would be of no ſervice to defend.

POQUELIN (*a*) (**JOHN BAPTIST**) a famous Comedian, known by the name of **MOLIERE**, the ſon of a Valet de Chambre, Tapeſtry-maker to the king, was born at Paris about the year 1620. He went through his ſchool-learning under the Jeſuits in Clermont-college. He was deſigned for the bar, but *after he had made an end of his ſtudy of the Civil-Law he pitched upon the profeſſion of a Comedian, having a very ſtrong inclination for Comedy* (*b*), *and being entirely bent upon the ſtage.* His firſt play was *l'Etourdi*, which he expoſed to the public view at Lyons in the year 1653. *Being ſome time after in Languedoc, he offered his ſervices to the prince of* Conti, *who received him very kindly, gave an allowance to his company, and took him into his ſervice, as well for himſelf, as for the ſtates of Languedoc.* Having ſpent the Carnaval at Grenoble in the year 1658, *he went and ſettled at Rouen, where he ſtaid all the ſummer; and having made ſome journeys to Paris privately, he had the good luck to pleaſe the king's brother, who granting him his protection, and making his company his own, introduced him in that quality to the king and the queen-mother.* That company *began to appear before their majeſties and the whole court* the twenty-fourth of October 1658, upon a ſtage ſet up on purpoſe *in the hall of the guards of the old Louvre*, and were well approved, ſo that *his majeſty gave orders for their ſettlement at Paris. The hall of the Petit Bourbon was granted them, to act by turns with the Italian Players.* In October 1660 the hall of the royal palace was granted them (*c*). Moliere obtained a penſion of a thouſand livres in 1663. His company was altogether in his majeſty's ſervice in the year 1665, and he continued all the remaining part of his life to give new plays, which were very much applauded. His laſt comedy was *Le Malade Imaginaire.* It was acted for the fourth time on the ſeventeenth of February 1673, and he died the ſame day [*A*]. This is what I have taken from his life, prefixed to his

[*A*] *And he died the ſame day.*] The chief perſon repreſented in Moliere's laſt play, is a ſick man who pretends to be dead. Moliere repreſented that perſon, and conſequently was obliged in one of his ſcenes to act the his works. Perhaps I have done a needleſs thing, for that book is more known and read than this Dictionary will ever be, and therefore what I tranſcribe out of that life will be no new thing to any body. I have been told of a thing by ſeveral people, which is not to be found in it, viz. that he turned Comedian only to be near an actreſs, with whom he was very much in love. Let the reader gueſs whether this particular was omitted becauſe it was not true, or for fear of doing him ſome prejudice. Many are of opinion, that his plays exceed or equal the nobleſt performances of that kind in ancient Greece and Rome [*B*]. It is no wonder that he did ſo well ſucceed in deſcribing the jars of married people, and the uneaſineſs of huſbands that are jealous, and have

---

‡ Onufr. apud Platin. Annot. ad John VIII.

(180) In chap. xxvii, of the 2d part of his *Theatre de l'Antichriſt*, printed in the year 1610, in folio, and reprinted in 8vo, in the year 1613.

(181) Silveſtre de Laval, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 69, 70.

* 2 Tim. iv, 3, 4.

** 1 Tim. iv, 7.

(182) Silv. de Laval, *livr. iii, pag.* 86, 87.

(183) Martin. Schoockius, in Præfat. Fabulæ Hamelenſis, *folio ult.*

(184) Ἢ τᾶν ἢ ἐπὶ τᾶς, aut hanc aut ſuper hac: ταύταν σῶζε, ἢ μὴ ἔσω, aut hanc ſerva aut peri. *Plut. in Inſtitutis Laconicis, pag.* 241, F.

(185) The Lord forbid it me (*anſwered Naboth to king Ahab who wanted to buy his vineyard*) that I ſhould give the inheritance of my fathers unto thee. 1 *Kings xxi*, 3.

(186) Naturam expellas furca licet uſque recurret. *Horat. Epiſt. X, ver.* 24, *lib. i.*

(187) *Father le Tellier ſays this of the adverſaries of the Jeſuits in the* Défenſe des nouveaux Chrétiens, *pag.* 28. *Add to that the verſe of Horace, Sat. V, lib. II, ver.* 83. Ut canis à corio nunquam abſterrebitur uncto. *Like dogs once blooded ſhe will never leave.*

(*a*) And not *Poclain*, as in Moreri.

(*b*) See the remark [*G*].

(*c*) See the remark [*H*].

the part of a dead man. It has been ſaid by a great many people, that he expired in that part of his play, and that when he was to make an end of it, in order to ſhew that it was only a feint, he could neither ſpeak, nor get up, being actually dead. This ſingularity was looked upon as very wonderful, and afforded the Poets plentiful matter for witty conceits and ingenious alluſions; which, in all probability was the reaſon why that ſtory was ſo much credited. Nay, ſome gave a ſerious turn to their thoughts, and made many moral reflexions upon that incident. But the truth is, Moliere did not die in ſuch a manner: he had time enough, tho' very ſick, to make an end of his part, as it appears from this paſſage of his life. ‘The 17th of February 1673 (1), on which *le Malade Imaginaire* was acted a fourth time, he was ſo much troubled with his defluxion, that he had much ado to act his part; he made an end of it in great pain, and the ſpectators were ſenſible that he was very far from being what he acted: for indeed when the comedy was over, he went home, and was ſcarce got to bed, when his continual cough increaſed ſo violently, that one of the veins of his lungs broke. He no ſooner found himſelf in that condition, but he bent all his thoughts upon heavenly things; and immediately he loſt his ſpeech, and in half an hour's time was ſtifled by the great quantity of blood that ran out at his mouth (2).’ But I muſt inform the reader that if ſome other writers are to be credited, Moliere was not able to hold out till the play was over. ‘Moliere . . . died in a very ſurprizing manner. He had been indiſpoſed for a long time; which was aſcribed to the trouble his wife gave him, but more ſtill to his great application. One day being to act *le Malade Imaginaire*, a new piece at that time, and the laſt he had made, he was taken very ill before he began it, and was like to put it off on account of his illneſs. Nevertheleſs, conſidering the great number of ſpectators, and being unwilling to ſend them away, he ſtrained himſelf, and acted his part almoſt to the end, without perceiving that his illneſs increaſed upon him. But when he came to that part of the play, wherein he counterfeited a dead man, he happened to be ſo weak, that it was thought he was really dead, and they had much ado to make him ſtand up. They adviſed him to go to bed, but he choſe rather to make an end; and the play being far advanced, he thought he could go through it without much prejudice to himſelf. But his zeal for the public was attended with a ſad conſequence to him; for as he was ſpeaking of Rheubarb and Sena, in the ceremony of the Phyſicians, ſome blood came out at his mouth, at which the ſpectators, and his friends being very much frighted, he was immediately carried home, and his wife followed him into his chamber, pretending to be very much afflicted. But every thing they did to relieve him proved ineffectual, and he died in a few hours, having loſt all his blood, which came out at his mouth in great plenty (3).’ The Poets, as I have already ſaid, took hold of that occaſion to ſhew their wit: they handed about a great many ſmall pieces: ‘but of all thoſe that were made upon Moliere's death, none was better approved than theſe four Latin verſes; which they have thought fit to preſerve.

Roſcius hic ſitus eſt triſti Molierus in urnâ,
  Cui genus humanum ludere, ludus erat.
Dum ludit mortem, Mors indignata jocantem
  Corripit, & mimum fingere ſæva negat (4).

Here Moliere lies, the Roſcius of his age,
Whoſe pleaſure, while he liv'd, was to engage
With human nature in a comic ſtrife,
And perſonate her actions to the life.
But ſurly death, offended at his play,
Would not be jok'd with in ſo free a way.
He, when he mimick'd him, his voice reſtrain'd,
And made him act in earneſt what he feign'd.

I add a French epitaph (5) to thoſe Latin verſes:

Cy git qui parut ſur la Scene
Le ſinge de la vie humaine,
Qui n'aura jamais ſon égal,
Qui voulant de la Mort, ainſi que de la Vie,
Eſtre l'imitateur dans une Comedie,
Pour trop bien reüſſir, y reüſſit fort mal;
Car la Mort en eſtant ravie,
Trouva ſi belle la copie,
Qu'elle en fit un original.

Within this melancholy tomb confin'd,
Here lies the matchleſs ape of human kind;
Who, while he labour'd with ambitious ſtrife
To mimick death as he had mimick'd life,
So well or rather ill perform'd his part,
That death, delighted with his wondrous art,
Snatch'd up the copy, to the grief of France,
And made it an original at once.

[*B*] *Many are of opinion that his plays exceed or equal the nobleſt performances of that kind in ancient Greece and Rome.*] Mr Perrault diſpleaſed many people by contradicting thoſe who ſay, that no modern author can be compared with Homer and Virgil, Demoſthenes and Cicero, Ariſtophanes and Terence, Sophocles and Euripides. This diſpute has occaſioned on both ſides ſeveral books, which contain very good things. But we have not ſeen hitherto the anſwer to Mr Perrault's Parallel, nor do we know when it will come out. I think I may ſay that among the productions of the pen, there are few things, wherein ſo many people have acknowledged the ſuperiority of our age, as in the comical pieces. Perhaps the reaſon of it is, that the beauties and niceties of Ariſtophanes are not known to all thoſe who are ſenſible of Moliere's wit and charms; for it ought to be granted, that in order to paſs a right judgment upon the comic Poets of Greece, it were neceſſary to be throughly acquainted with the faults of the Athenians. There is a ridicule common to all times and people, and a ridicule peculiar to certain ages and nations. Some ſcenes of Ariſtophanes, which appear dull to us, did, perhaps, wonderfully pleaſe the Athenians, becauſe they knew the fault he ridiculed. Perhaps, it was a fault altogether unknown to us, a ridicule conſiſting in ſome particular facts, and in a tranſient and common taſte of that time, of which we can have no notion, though we are able to read the originals. Theſe obſtacles do not permit us to admire that Poet according to his merit, neither in Greek nor in Latin, nor in the French verſions, though never ſo faithful and polite. Moliere is not liable to this inconveniency, we know what he aims at, and eaſily diſcover whether he deſcribes well the ridicule of the age we live in; when he ſucceeds in any thing, it cannot eſcape us. Nay, he ſeems to be more copious than Ariſtophanes and Terence, as to thoſe thoughts and nice railleries, of which all ages and polite nations are ſenſible. This is a very conſiderable prerogative; for it cannot be ſaid, that our age has not a true reliſh of the fine paſſages of the Latin Poets. If you ſhew ſome thoughts of have reaſon to be ſo: for it is ſaid, he knew it by experience as well as any man in the world [C]. This is what I find in a printed book, out of which I ſhall give ſome paſſages *(d)*. What is moſt ſtrange is, that there has been a report that his wife was his own daughter *(e)*. He made verſes with a wonderful facility *(f)*; but he took too much

---

(1) Correct in Moreri 1672. I take occaſion to obſerve that in the ſame article it ought to be *Polixene*, and not *Polixeme*.

(2) Life of Moliere prefixed to his works. I make uſe of the Bruſſels edition 1694.

(3) *See the book, intituled*, La fameuſe Comedienne, ou Hiſtoire de la Guerin, aupavant femme & veuve de Moliere, *pag.* 38, 39.

(4) Vie de Moliere, *fol.* * 3.

(5) It is in the firſt Tome of the *Mercure Galant*, for the year 1673. There are in it ſeveral other ſuch pieces, with a funeral oration in proſe, which is ſomewhat waggiſh.

of Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, *&c.* to ingenious ladies in old French, if you tranſlate them faithfully, though never ſo coarſely, they will tell you that thoſe thoughts are fine, delicate, and nice. There are ſome beauties of wit in faſhion at all times: one would think that Moliere is more copious in that reſpect than the ancient comic Poets. He has ſome beauties that would vaniſh away in a tranſlation, or in a country of a different taſte from that of France; but he has many others that would be preſerved in all ſorts of tranſlations, and approved whatever the taſte of the readers might be, provided they underſtood the eſſence of a good thought. See the article AMPHITRYO (6).

[C] *It is ſaid that he knew by experience* the uneaſineſs of huſbands that are jealous, or have reaſon to be ſo.] I have read in a ſmall book printed in the year 1688, That (7) *Moliere was leſs praiſed than his wife was courted*; that ſhe was *the daughter of the deceaſed Mrs Bejard, a country actreſs, who made many young ſparks of Languedoc happy when her daughter was born. And therefore,* adds the author, *it were a very difficult thing to know who was her father among ſo many galants: all that we know of it is, that her mother affirmed, ſhe never admitted any but perſons of quality, except Moliere, and that therefore her daughter was of a very noble blood. And indeed the only thing ſhe recommended to her all along, was to proſtitute herſelf to none but the beſt ſort of people. Moliere was thought to be her father, though he married her afterwards; however the truth of it is not well known. . . . .* (8) *Moliere married young Mrs Bejard ſome time after he had* ſettled his company at Paris: *He made ſome pieces for the ſtage*, and among others *La Princeſſe d'Elide*, wherein his wife, who acted the part of the princeſs, (9) *ſhone ſo brightly, that he had all the reaſon in the world to repent his having expoſed her in the middle of all the ſprightly youth of the court. For ſhe was hardly got to the chamber, where the king gave that entertainment, but ſhe fell deſperately in love with the count de Guiche, and the count de Lauzun fell deſperately in love with her. . . . . Moliere was made ſenſible* (10), *that the great care he took to pleaſe the public, kept him from obſerving how his wife behaved herſelf; and that whilſt he made it his buſineſs to divert every body, every body made it their buſineſs to divert his wife. Jealouſy awakened his tenderneſs, which had lain aſleep by reaſon of his application to ſtudy: he immediately went and made great complaints to his wife, telling her in a reproachful manner, how carefully he had brought her up, how he had ſtifled his paſſion, how he had behaved himſelf towards her, more like a lover than a huſband, and that to reward him for ſo many kindneſſes, ſhe made him ridiculous to the whole court. His wife fell a weeping, and confeſſed to him, that ſhe had had an inclination for the count de Guiche; but ſhe ſwore, that the only fault ſhe was guilty of conſiſted in the intention: ſhe added, that he ſhould forgive the firſt fault of a young woman who for want of experience will be apt to make ſuch ſteps; but that the kindneſs ſhe was ſenſible he had for her, would prevent, for the time to come, her being guilty of ſuch a weakneſs. Moliere being perſuaded of her virtue by her tears, begged her pardon a thouſand times for the anger he had expreſſed, and gently repreſented to her, that a good conſcience was not ſufficient to preſerve one's reputation, but that one ſhould take care to do nothing that may occaſion ill reports, eſpecially in an age wherein people are ſo apt to think ill, and ſo little diſpoſed to judge favourably of things* (11). She quickly began again *her old trade more openly than ever . . . .* (12). ‘Moliere being informed of his wife's behaviour by ſome people, who were willing to make him uneaſy, renewed his complaints with more violence than he had done before, and even threatened to get her confined. That woman being provoked to the higheſt degree with his reproaches, wept and fell into a ſwoon. Her huſband, who was extremely fond of her, repented of having put her into that condition, and did his beſt to recover her ſpirits, intreating her to conſider, that nothing but love was the occaſion of his paſſion, and that ſhe might be ſenſible of the great power ſhe had over him, ſince, notwithſtanding all the reaſons he had to complain of her, he was ready to forgive her, provided ſhe would be more cautious for the time to come. One would think that ſuch an extraordinary huſband ſhould have made her ſenſible of her fault, and brought her off from her ill courſe; but his kindneſs produced a quite contrary effect. She thought ſhe had a fair opportunity of parting with him, and therefore ſhe ſpoke in a high ſtrain, and told him, that ſhe knew well enough from whom he had thoſe falſe ſtories; that ſhe was weary of being every day accuſed of a thing ſhe was not guilty of; that he might think of a ſeparation, and that ſhe could no longer endure a man, who was always intimate with Mrs de Brie (13), who lived in their houſe, and had never left it ſince they were married. The care that was taken to pacify Moliere's wife, proved ineffectual: From that very moment ſhe conceived an extreme averſion for him; and when he had a mind to make uſe of the privileges of a huſband, ſhe treated him with the utmoſt contempt. At laſt ſhe carried things to ſuch an extremity, that Moliere, who began to perceive her wicked inclinations, conſented to the ſeparation ſhe continually deſired ſince their quarrel; ſo that without a decree of parliament, they agreed to have no commerce with one another. But Moliere could not reſolve upon it without doing himſelf a great violence; and if his reaſon made him look upon his wife as a woman unworthy of the careſſes of an honeſt man, by reaſon of her ill conduct, his tenderneſs made him ſenſible, that he would hardly be able to ſee her without enjoying the privileges of a huſband. One day as he was thinking upon it in his garden at Auteuil, one of his friends, called Chapelle, who came to walk there by chance, accoſted him, and finding him more uneaſy than he uſed to be, aſked him ſeveral times the reaſon of it. Moliere being ſomewhat aſhamed of ſhewing ſo little conſtancy under a misfortune, that was ſo much in faſhion, held out as much as he could; but having then his heart full, a thing well known to thoſe that have been in love, he yielded to the deſire of eaſing himſelf, and ingenuouſly confeſſed to his friend, that the grief wherewith he was overwhelmed, proceeded from his being obliged to uſe his wife as he did. Chapelle, who thought he was above things of that nature, jeered him, and told him he wondered that a man, who knew ſo well how to repreſent the weak ſide of other men, ſhould be guilty of a weakneſs he blamed every day, and ſhewed him, that the moſt ridiculous of all was to love a woman, when her love is not reciprocal. For my part, added he, I muſt needs tell you that if I was ſo unhappy as to find myſelf in ſuch a condition, and if I was fully perſuaded that the woman I love grants ſome favours to others, I ſhould have ſuch a contempt for her, that it would infallibly cure my paſſion. You have a ſatisfaction you could not have if ſhe was your miſtreſs; and revenge, which commonly ſucceeds love in an injured lover, may make amends for all the uneaſineſs your wife gives you, ſince you need only get her ſhut up: and this will be a ſure way to quiet your mind. Moliere, who heard his friend quietly enough, interrupted him, and aſked whether he had ever been in love. Yes, replied Chapelle, I have been in love, as a man of ſenſe ought to be; but I ſhould not have been ſo much troubled for a thing which my happineſs ſhould have required from me, and I am aſhamed to ſee you ſo uncertain. I perceive, replied Moliere, that you have never been a true lover, and that you took the figure of love for love itſelf. I will not alledge many examples, whereby you might know the power of that paſſion, but ſhall only give you a faithful account of the perplexity I am in, to make you ſenſible how little a man is maſter of himſelf, when love has got it's uſual aſcendant over him. Wherefore, in anſwer to what you ſay, that I have a perfect knowledge of mens hearts, as it appears by the public deſcriptions I daily make of them, I confeſs that I have made it my chief ſtudy ‘to

---

(d) See the remark [C].

(e) See the remark [C].

(f) See the 2d Satire of Deſpreaux.

(6) Remark [*B*].

(7) Hiſtoire de la Guerin, auparavant femme & veuve de Moliere, *pag.* 6.

(8) Ib. *p.* 12.

(9) Ib. *p.* 13.

(10) Ib. *p.* 16.

(11) Ib. *p.* 18.

(12) Ib. *p.* 19.

(13) She was an actreſs belonging to the company, which Moliere found ſettled at Lyons the firſt time he acted there. He fell in love with that woman, and was reciprocally loved by her, and got her into his company. *Hiſtoire de la Guerin, pag.* 8.

much liberty in inventing new words and new expreſſions [*D*]: nay, he was very often guilty of barbariſms [*E*]. You will find in Mr Baillet (g) what judgment ought to be made of his talent.

Some

‘ to know their weak ſide; but if I have learned that ‘ the danger may be ſhunned, experience has but too ‘ well taught me that it is impoſſible to avoid it: I ‘ judge of it every day by myſelf.’ Afterwards he gives an account of his marriage, and after ſome reflexions, he adds (14): *I am therefore reſolved to live with her as if ſhe was not my wife. But if you knew the anguiſh I am in, you would pity me: my paſſion is come to ſuch a pitch, that I cannot forbear being concerned for her; and when I conſider that it is impoſſible for me to overcome my affection for her, I am apt to fancy, that, perhaps, ſhe finds it no leſs difficult to conquer her inclinations to be a coquet, and I am more diſpoſed to pity her than to blame her. You will ſay that none but a Poet can love in ſuch a manner; but it is my opinion, that there is but one ſort of love, and that thoſe who have never been ſo nice, are perfect ſtrangers to true love.* . . . . (15) *Do not you wonder that my reaſon ſhould ſerve only to make me ſenſible of my weakneſs, without being able to conquer it? I muſt needs tell you, replied his friend, that you are more to be pitied than I thought: but I hope time will cure you; and I beſeech you to uſe your endeavours towards it.*

Such was the fate of that wit. In the midſt of the acclamations of the whole court, ſhining with glory, and admired in France and in foreign countries, he was tormented with a thouſand domeſtic griefs. His marriage deprived him of his honour and quiet: nay, he could not have the ſatisfaction of hating his croſs, I mean the perſon who was the cauſe of ſo much vexation. He might have been told, *Phyſician, cure thy ſelf*: Moliere, you who give ſo much diverſion to the public, cannot you divert yourſelf? You laugh at every body, you give very good advice to the poor cuckolds, why do not you make uſe of it yourſelf firſt? Perhaps he ſaid a thouſand times, as Horace did (16), I had rather be accounted the meaneſt of all authors, than have ſo much wit, and live ſuch an uneaſy life.

[*D*] *He took too much liberty in inventing new words and new expreſſions.*] Take notice, that I only blame the exceſs of his liberty; for I do not deny but that he was often very happy in the uſe of it, and that it proved uſeful to our language. He introduced ſome phraſes and ſome words, that are very pleaſant; and if any Grammarian ſhould think otherwiſe of it, he would deſerve no better treatment than that ancient Grammarian, who cenſured the Poet Furius for inventing ſome words which ſhortened the diſcourſe, and had no harſhneſs in them that might offend nice ears. Read this paſſage of Aulus Gellius. ‘ Non ‘ hercle idem ſentio cum Cæſellio Vindice grammatico, ut mea opinio eſt, haud quaquam inerudito. ‘ Verum hoc tamen petulanter inſcitéque; quod Furium veterem poetam dedecoraſſe linguam Latinam ‘ ſcripſit hujuſcemodi vocum fictionibus, quæ mihi ‘ quidem neque abhorrere à poetica facultate viſæ ſunt, ‘ neque dictu proſatuque ipſo tætræ aut inſuaves eſſe; ‘ ſicuti ſunt quædam alia ab illuſtribus poetis ficta durè ‘ & rancidè. Quæ reprehendit autem Cæſellius Furiana, hæc ſunt; quod terram in lutum verſam *luteſcere* dixerit, & tenebras in noctis modum factas *noćteſcere*, &c (17). - - - *I am not of the ſame opinion ‘ with Cæſellius Vindex, the Grammarian, whom otherwiſe I do not think unlearned. But there is a great ‘ deal of preſumption and ignorance in his ſaying that the ‘ old Poet Furius has diſfigured the Latin tongue by his ‘ new-invented words of this kind, which in my opinion ‘ are neither inconſiſtent with Poetry, nor harſh and unpleaſant in the pronunciation, as ſome other words are, ‘ which have been rudely coined by famous Poets. Thoſe ‘ which Cæſellius finds fault with in Furius, are as ‘ follows*; luteſcere *applied to earth, growing into clay, ‘ and* nocteſcere *applied to darkneſs, putting on the reſemblance of night*, &c.’ I muſt obſerve, that there is no better forge for new words than the ſtage; for when it produces any novelty in the language, that is well approved, a world of people will immediately take it up, and ſpread it far and near by their frequent repetitions. It cannot reaſonably be denied that good authors have a right to forge new words, for otherwiſe languages would always remain poor, barren, and weak. See Voſſius (18) and ſeveral other writers (19) upon this head. It ought therefore to be granted, generally ſpeaking, that Moliere had a right to enrich his dramatic pieces with new terms, conſidering the great reputation he had acquired in that way of writing: all that can be ſaid againſt him is, that he miſuſed his right; for it ought to be remembered, that the writers of ſuch pieces are not ſenſible of the poverty of a language, as thoſe who write upon dogmatical ſubjects. *It ought to be confeſſed*, ſays Mr Arnauld (20), *that we are more ſenſible our language wants words, when we treat of ſciences, than when we ſpeak or write about common things*. This he ſays in a preface, wherein he juſtifies the liberty he took to invent the words *Philoſophiſme*, *Philoſophiſtes*, and *Advertance*. It is certain, that a comic Poet is not ſo excuſable for inventing new words as a Philoſopher. The latter is forced to it by an indiſpenſable neceſſity. Read this complaint of Lucretius:

Nec me animi fallit, Graïorum obſcura reperta
Difficile inluſtrare Latinis verſibus eſſe,
(Multa novis verbis præſertim cum ſit agendum,)
Propter egeſtatem linguæ, & rerum novitatem (21);
. . . .
Nunc & Anaxagoræ ſcrutemur Homœomeriam,
Quam Græci memorant, nec noſtra dicere lingua
Concedit nobis patrii ſermonis egeſtas (22).

I'm ſenſible the Latin is too poor
To equal the vaſt riches of the Grecian ſtore:
New matter various nature ſtill affords,
And new conceptions do require new words.
. . . .
Now let's examine with a curious eye
Anaxagoras his Philoſophy,
By copious Greece term'd Homœomery:
For which our Latin language, poor in words,
Not one expreſſive ſingle voice affords.

CREECH.

It was not by reaſon of the rules of quantity that he wanted words; for thoſe who wrote Philoſophical books in proſe did likewiſe complain of it. ‘ Quanta verborum nobis paupertas, imo egeſtas ſit, nunquam magis quam hodierno die intellexi. Mille res ‘ inciderunt, cum forte de Platone loqueremur, quæ ‘ nomina deſiderarent, nec haberent: quædam vero ‘ cum habuiſſent, faſtidio noſtro perdidiſſent. Quis ‘ autem ferat in egeſtate faſtidium (23). - - - *I was ‘ never more ſenſible than I am to day of the great poverty or rather want of words in our language. While ‘ we were diſcourſing of Plato a thouſand things offered ‘ themſelves which had no names; and ſome had loſt ‘ what names they had formerly, by means of our diſtaſte. ‘ Now what can be more ridiculous than diſtaſte in the ‘ middle of want?*’ Obſerve, by the by, the two cauſes of the poverty of languages mentioned by Seneca: one is, that ſome words have not yet been found out; the other is, that ſeveral grow out of uſe. It is alſo to be obſerved, that the Romans even when they wrote nothing but epigrams, complained that they wanted words (24); from whence we may conclude, that Moliere was ſenſible of the ſame want, and therefore he might well have recourſe to invention. Laſtly, I obſerve, that the birth of one word is commonly the death of another (25). Which holds true, particularly in France; and therefore it cannot be expected that our language ſhould ever ceaſe to be poor.

[*E*] *He was very often guilty of barbariſms.*] I might give a hundred inſtances of it, but I ſhall confine myſelf to two, which I take out of a piece prefixed to his works in ſome editions, wherein he thanks the king. He gives a wonderful turn to it, and perhaps it is the beſt ſmall piece that ever

he

(g) Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, *Tom. v, n.* 1520.

(14) Ib. *p.* 28.

(15) Ib. *p.* 30.

(16) Prætulerim ſcriptor delirus inerſque videri, Dum mea delectent mala me vel denique fallant, Quam ſapere & ringi. *Horat. lib. ii, Epiſt. II, ver* 125.

(17) Aulus Gellius, *lib. xviii, cap. xi, pag. m.* 494, 495.

(18) Voſſius, Inſtitut. Orator. *lib. iv, cap. i, pag. m.* 442.

(19) Theophilus Raynaud, de malis ac bonis Libris, *n.* 427, *pag. m.* 248, *quotes many of them.*

(20) Arnauld, *Preface to the* V Dénonciation du Péché Philoſophique.

(21) Lucretius, lib. I, ver. 137.

(22) Ibid. ver. 830.

(23) Seneca, Epiſt. LVIII, init. *pag. m.* 266.

(24) See Pliny the younger, *Epiſt. XVIII, lib. iv.*

(25) *Juſt as in the productions of nature*, generatio unius eſt corruptio alterius.

Some pretend, that the glory of invention does not belong to Moliere, and that he made a good uſe of the comedies acted by the Italians at Paris [*F*]. Thoſe are in the wrong who ſay that Mr Boileau changed his note after the death of that great Comedian: if we may believe ſome ignorant Critics, he praiſed him in his life-time, and blamed him when he was in his grave. The truth is, that he continued to commend him after his deceaſe, only he found fault with him for humouring too much thoſe that ſat in the pit; which is a reaſonable* cenſure in ſome reſpects, but unjuſt in the main [*G*]. Father Bouhours's verſes in Moliere's praiſe (*h*), are the beſt that ever he made, if we relie upon Menage's judgment (*i*). I do not know whether the Italians like

(*h*) You will find them in the 2d volume of Menage's obſervations upon the French language, *pag.* 15.

(*i*) Ibid. *pag.* 12.

he wrote. Mind theſe four verſes: he ſpeaks to his Muſe:

Vous pourriez aiſément l'étendre (26),
Et parler dès tranſports qu'en vous font éclater
Les ſuprenans bienfaits, que ſans les meriter
Sa liberale main ſur vous daigne repandre.

(26) C'eſt-à-dire, votre compliment.

The author's meaning is, that his Muſe received great favours, though ſhe did not deſerve them; but according to the grammatical ſenſe, thoſe verſes ſignify, that though the king did not deſerve thoſe favours, yet he beſtowed them upon Moliere's Muſe. And therefore this is a barbarous expreſſion. Here is another inſtance:

Les Muſes ſont de grandes prometeuſes,
Et comme vos ſœurs les cauſeuſes
Vous ne manqueriez pas ſans doute per le bec.

The author means, that his Muſe would be like her ſiſters, who are full of talk; but according to the literal ſenſe the plain and only meaning of thoſe words is, that ſhe would prove a very prattling Muſe, tho' her ſiſters are of a quite contrary humour. Obſerve, that by a *barbariſm*, I do not mean an expreſſion, or a word, taken from another language, and unknown to the French, but a diſpoſition of words againſt the rules, which is looked upon as barbarous by our beſt grammarians.

There is in the ſame poem *Marquis repouſſable*; which is a barbariſm. There is alſo *prevenant amas*; another barbariſm: for the word *prevenant* is only uſed in the figurative ſenſe, and does not denote a man, who goes before others.

[*F*] *Some pretend . . . . . that he made a good uſe of the comedies acted by the Italians at Paris.*] I ſhall not ſcruple to quote an anonymous book for this: it is printed, and therefore ſufficient to juſtify what I advance; for I am only to prove that ſome will have it, that the Italian comedies acted at Paris were Moliere's original. Read the following paſſage: Arlequin is brought in ſpeaking thus: 'If the Italian players had never appeared in France, perhaps Moliere had never been what he was. I know he was perfectly acquainted with the old comic Poets; but after all, he had his firſt notions from our ſtage. You know that his *Cocu Imaginaire* is *il Ritratto* of the Italians: Scaramouche interrupted in his love, produced his *Facheux:* his *Contre-temps* are only Arlequin, *Valet étourdi*, and ſo with moſt of his pieces: and in theſe latter times, is not his *Tartuffe* our *Bernagaſſe.* It is true, he excelled in his characters, and his comedies are ſo full of ſenſe, that they ſhould be read to young people as ſo many inſtructions, to give them a true notion of the world. And yet thoſe excellent Italian originals produce nothing now (27).'

[*G*] *Mr Boileau . . . . found fault with him for humouring too much thoſe that ſat in the pit; which is a reaſonable cenſure in ſome reſpects, but unjuſt in the main.*] Moliere was dead when Mr Boileau praiſed him in one of his Epiſtles (28), as much, or more, than in the ſatire he had inſcribed to him (29). It is therefore a great piece of injuſtice to ſay, that he praiſed him out of policy, and for fear of being bantered by him upon the ſtage, if he ſhould ſay nothing to his advantage, or if he ſhould venture to criticize him. But, will ſome ſay, he criticized him when he had nothing to fear, and therefore the ſuſpicion entertained of him ſeems to be well grounded. I am not of that opinion; I believe that if he had made his *Art Poëtique* in Moliere's life-time, he would have inſerted in it the cenſure contained in the following verſes. It was, in a manner, eſſential to his ſubject; there is in it a very judicious obſervation, which ſhould be an inviolable rule, if comedies were only made to be printed; but becauſe they are chiefly deſigned to appear on the ſtage in the preſence of all ſorts of people, it is not juſt to require they ſhould be adapted to Mr Boileau's taſte. Theſe are his words.

(27) *Livre ſans nom*, divided into five dialogues, printed at Paris and in Holland in the year 1695, pag. 6, of the Dutch edition.

(28) The VIIth.

(29) The IId.

Etudiez la Cour, & connoiſſez la ville,
L'une & l'autre eſt toûjours en modeles fertile.
C'eſt par là que Moliere illuſtrant ſes écrits
Peut-être de ſon Art eût remporté le prix;
Si moins ami du peuple en ſes doctes peintures,
Il n'eût point fait ſouvent grimacer ſes figures,
Quitté pour le bouffon, l'agreable & le fin.
Et ſans honte à Terence allié Tabarin.
Dans ce ſac ridicule où Scapin * s'envelope,
Je ne reconnois plus l'Auteur du Miſanthrope (30).

* One of Moliere's plays.

Study the court, and know the city well:
So ſhall your various characters excel.
It was by this that Moliere in his plays
Perhaps, as victor, might have claim'd the bays;
If he, to pleaſe the rabble of the town,
Had not ſometimes affected the buffoon;
Preferr'd low farce and drollery to wit,
And more like Tabarin than Terence writ.
In that ſame bag which Scapin doth encloſe,
The author of the Miſanthrope I loſe.

(30) Deſpereaux, Art Poëtique, *Canto III, ver.* 391, *& ſeq.*

He blames Moliere for endeavouring to pleaſe, not only men of a nice judgment, but alſo the common people. Moliere had ſome reaſons for it, and might have ſaid what Arlequin anſwered in a like caſe. 'Thoſe jeſts, ſaid I to him, (to Arlequin) are pleaſant enough in your plays; it is pity they are not equally good. I own it, replied he, but they pleaſe ſeveral young people, who come to our play-houſe only to laugh, and who laugh at any thing, and very often without knowing why. Our plays are frequently acted before ſuch people, and if our jeſts were not ſuited to their capacity, our houſe would be very often empty. I am ſorry, ſaid I to him, that you have almoſt left your old pieces off; they were well approved by men of ſenſe, they contained many things of good uſe in morality, and I dare ſay, that your ſtage was a place where vice was ſo effectually ridiculed, that every body found himſelf inclined to love virtue meerly out of reaſon. Should we act none but our old pieces, replied he, our play-houſe would be little reſorted to, and I will tell you what Cinthio formerly told St Evremond, that good actors would be ſtarved notwithſtanding their excellent plays (31).' It ought to be obſerved, that players are at great charges, and that plays are no leſs deſigned for the diverſion of the people, than for the diverſion of the ſenate (32); and therefore they muſt be adapted to the taſte of the public, in order to bring a numerous audience; for without that although they were a perfect compound of ingenious, nice, and exquiſite, thoughts, the actors would be ruined by them, and they would be of no uſe to the people.

(31) Livre ſans nom, *pag.* 4, 5.

(32) *Mind theſe words of Terence in his prologue to his Andria.*
Poeta quum primum animum ad ſcribendum appulit,
Id ſibi negotii credidit ſolum dari
Populo ut placerent quas feciſſet fabulas.

A GENERAL obſervation againſt thoſe who cenſure this Dictionary.

This is what may be ſaid, not only againſt thoſe who cenſure Moliere, but alſo againſt thoſe who find fault with many other books, becauſe they do not conſider the ſeveral uſes they are deſigned for, and becauſe there are many things in them which they could wiſh the author had left out. What do I care for that, ſays one? What is it to me, ſays another, that ſuch a one had a bad wife? To what purpoſe ſo many quotations, ſo many merry thoughts, ſo many Philoſophical reflexions, &c? Such are the complaints of thoſe like Moliere's plays, tranſlated into their language, by one of their countrymen ſettled in Germany (*k*). It is more difficult in a work of this nature than in others, to preſerve all the beauties of an original in a tranſlation. For the reſt, what I have ſaid of Moliere's inclination for the ſtage, is to be found with new circumſtances in a book of Mr Perrault [*H*]. The readers will not be diſpleaſed to know what became of the company of Comedians headed by Moliere, when that excellent actor came to die [*I*]: it may ſerve to make his merit known.

(*k*) His name is *Nicolas di Caſtelli*, and he ſtiles himſelf *Secretary to the Elector of Brandenburg*: he publiſhed that verſion at his own charges in the year 1698, at Leipſic, in four volumes in 12mo.

thoſe who cenſure this Dictionary: but they will give me leave to tell them, that they want the moſt neceſſary notion to paſs a right judgment upon this work. They do not conſider that it ought to be of ſome uſe to all ſorts of readers, and that if it had been intirely framed according to the taſte of the greateſt puriſts (33); it would go out of it's natural ſphere. I would have them to conſider, that if I had kept to their notions of perfection, my book would indeed have been acceptable to them, but then many others had been diſpleaſed with it, and it had remained in the duſt of the Bookſeller's warehouſes. What a poor thing would two or three large folio's be for him, if there was nothing in them but what may pleaſe thoſe who pretend to gravity, and to an exquiſite taſte, and who would have the moſt copious ſubjects explained in the ſhorteſt way? They may, if they pleaſe, make ſuch a reflexion as Socrates made at the ſight of a fair (34); but the fair will nevertheleſs be as it ought to be.

[*H*] *His inclination for the ſtage is to be found with new circumſtances in a book of Mr Perrault.*] Moliere is one of the illuſtrious men, whoſe pictures Mr Begon (35) cauſed to be engraved, and has alſo procured to the public their hiſtorical encomiums. Mr Perrault, who wrote thoſe encomiums, ſays, *that Moliere was born with ſuch an inclination for the ſtage, that it was impoſſible to prevent his turning comedian. He had ſcarce made an end of his ſtudies, wherein he did very well ſucceed, but he joined with ſeveral young men of his age and inclination, and reſolved to form a company of comedians, to act in the provinces of the kingdom. His father . . . made uſe of all his friends to diſſuade him from it*, and not being able to prevail upon him by their remonſtrances, and the promiſes they made him in his name, *he ſent to him the maſter in whoſe houſe he boarded during the firſt years of his ſtudies . . - but the maſter was ſo far from perſuading him to leave the profeſſion of a comedian, that young Moliere prevailed upon him to embrace the ſame profeſſion . . . Having formed his company, he went and acted at Roüen, and from thence he removed to Lyons, where having pleaſed the prince of Conti, &c* (36). The remaining part of the elogy is very curious.

(33) Give me leave to call by that name thoſe very ſtrict obſervers of the laws of perfection, who ſet up as a ſtandard in all things the taſte of the few, or the choice wits.

(34) Quam multis rebus ego non egeo? *How many things here are*, ſaid he, *which I do not want?* Vide Eraſmum, in Apoph. *pag. m.* 168.

(35) Intendant of Juſtice and Marine.

(36) Perrault, of Illuſtrious Men, *pag.* 79.

[*I*] *The readers will not be diſpleaſed to know what became of the company of players headed by Moliere, when that excellent actor came to die.*] What I find upon this ſubject in a book of Mr Chappuzeau is as follows. Before that company was ſettled in the royal palace, they diſcovered their merit at Paris in the Foſſez de Neſle, and in St Paul's ward, at Lyons, and in Languedoc. They were juſtly accounted the beſt country-players. The two Brothers Bejar, and du Parc, were ſome of the chief actors. Du Croiſy, who headed a company of country-players, and la Grange, a very good player, joined with them. They acted for ſome time in the hall of the *petit Bourbon*, by an agreement with the Italian players, who had been already ſettled there. After the theatre of the Royal Palace was opened to them, where they acted till the beginning of Lent 1673. Moliere happening to die at that time, four players of his company joined with that of the Hôtel de Bourgogne, and becauſe thoſe that remained were not in a capacity to go on, the king was pleaſed to make but one body of the company of the Marais (37), and of that of the Royal Palace. Mr Colbert was ordered to pitch upon the beſt actors of thoſe two companies, and to form out of them a fine company, that ſhould be called the king's company. It was ſettled in the Hôtel du Roy, in the ſtreet called Rue Mazarine (38), and they began to appear in public upon a Sunday, the ninth of July 1673. The players were forbidden to act upon the theatre of the Royal Palace, and upon that of the Marais. Note, that Moliere, who was the firſt orator of the company of the Royal Palace, reſigned that place to la Grange ſix years before he died (39).

(37) It was ſettled in 1620, and called the king's company.

(38) Otherwiſe called the Foſſez de Neſle.

(39) Taken from a book, intituled, *Le Theatre François*. Mr Chappuzeau is the author of it.

PORCIA, the daughter of Cato Uticenſis, had ſuch a noble ſoul, that ſhe was not corrupted by the ill examples of her mother and of her aunts [*A*], but only imitated the virtues of her father. She applied herſelf very much to the ſtudy of Philoſophy, and gave convincing proofs of her great courage; for conjecturing that Brutus, her huſband, was preparing for a great enterprize, ſhe wounded herſelf with a knife, to ſhew by

[*A*] *She was not corrupted by the ill examples of her mother, and of her aunts.*] Cato Uticenſis was unfortunate with relation to the fair ſex; his ſtar proved in that reſpect very unlucky and malignant. He had two uterine ſiſters, called Servilia: one of them was Brutus's mother, and ſuffered herſelf to be debauched by Julius Cæſar (1), and it was the talk of the whole town (2). The other was married to Lucullus, and proved ſo leud, that her huſband put her away. She retired to her brother's, who was ſo kind as to take her into his houſe, and carry her along with him in his travels. It was no glorious thing for him to have ſuch an infamous woman in his houſe, nor eaſy to take care that ſhe ſhould not go on in her ill courſe. *She was not by a great deal ſo ill ſpoken of as ſhe had been before, when it appeared, that ſhe willingly ſubmitted to Cato's cuſtody, and ſtrict way of living, following him in his flight: nevertheleſs, Cæſar did further reproach him with this ſiſter of his* (3). Attilia, Cato's wife, was ſo leud, that her huſband was obliged to part with her, having had two children by her (4). He married a ſecond wife, whom he afterwards yielded to Hortenſius by way of loan; and he married her again when ſhe was a widow, and Hortenſius's heireſs (5): which afforded Cæſar a fair opportunity of cenſuring Cato's life (6). Beſides, Cato being of age to marry, courted a maid who had been contracted to Metellus Scipio. Her name was Lepida. The contract was broke, ſo that being at liberty to marry, ſhe anſwered Cato's deſires, and was betrothed to him. But at laſt, Metellus Scipio being ſorry that he had broke his engagement, left nothing unattempted to recover Lepida, and ſucceeded in his deſign (7). 'At which Cato was very much incenſed, and reſolved to go to law about it; but his friends perſuaded him to the contrary. However, he was ſo moved by his heat of youth and paſſion, that he writ Iambics againſt Scipio, which had all the wit and ſatire of Archilochus, without his impudence and ſcurrility. After this he married Attilia, the daughter of Soranus, which was the firſt, but not the only woman he ever knew; in this much leſs happy than Lælius, the friend of Scipio, who, in the whole courſe of ſo long a life, never knew but one woman (8).' The laſt part of this paſſage is needleſs, with reſpect to the text of this remark; but it contains

(1) She did alſo proſtitute her daughter to him. See, above, citation (1), of the article CASSIUS LONGINUS (CAIUS).

(2) Οὕτω μὲν ἦν ὁ πρὸς Καίσαρα Σερβιλίας ἔρως περιβόητως. Uſque adeo Serviliæ fuit in Cæſarem pervagatus amor. *Plut. in Bruto, pag.* 986.

(3) Idem, in Catone minore, *pag.* 785.

(4) A ſon and our Porcia.

(5) See, above, the remark [*O*], of the article of the firſt HORTENSIUS (QUINTUS).

(6) *Taken from* Plut. in Catone minore, *pag.* 770, 784.

(7) Plut. ibid. *pag.* 762.

(8) Ibid.

by her patiently bearing the pain, that ſhe could hold her tongue, and conſequently that ſhe deſerved to be intruſted with her huſband's ſecret [*B*]. He imparted it to her, whereby ſhe came to know that there was a deſign to kill Cæſar. But if ſhe raiſed herſelf then much above her ſex, ſhe appeared like other women on the day of the execution; for ſhe was tranſported with ſuch a violent uneaſineſs, that ſhe fell into ſeveral ſwoons, and was thought to be dead [*C*]. We do not know what ſhe did, nor what ſhe ſaid when ſhe heard of the ſucceſs of that enterprize, and during the war in which her huſband found himſelf engaged againſt Cæſar's friends; but we know that having accompained him to the ſea-ſide, and expreſſed a great conſtancy, ſhe could not forbear ſhedding tears at the ſight of a certain picture [*D*], and that ſhe put an end to her life with great courage, when ſhe heared that Brutus had killed himſelf [*E*]. Note, that when

tains a matter of fact ſo curious, that I thought the reader would be glad to know it. Is there any man at this day, of Lælius's quality, and intimately acquainted with the general of an army, who, like him, during the courſe of a long life, never knew any woman but his wife? Nay, is there any young man of Cato's quality, who keeps himſelf chaſte till he gets into the nuptial bed? Theſe particulars are therefore very extraordinary, and deſerved that I ſhould lengthen the quotation.

[*B*] *She wounded herſelf with a knife, to ſhew .... ſhe could hold her tongue, and ..... deſerved to be entruſted with her huſband's ſecret.*] If the reader will have a full view of her noble behaviour on this occaſion, he muſt read the whole following paſſage of Plutarch: ‘ Porcia being addicted to Philoſophy, a great lover of her huſband, and full of courage and prudence, reſolved not into enquire to Brutus's ſecrets before ſhe had made this trial of herſelf: ſhe turned all her attendants out of her chamber, and taking a little knife, ſuch as they uſe to cut nails with, ſhe gave herſelf a deep gaſh in the thigh, upon which followed a great flux of blood, and ſoon after violent pains, and a dangerous fever, occaſioned by the anguiſh of the wound. Now, when Brutus was mightily afflicted for her, ſhe, in the heighth of all her pain, ſpoke thus to him: Brutus, I being the daughter of Cato, was given to you in marriage, not like a concubine, to partake only in the common civilities of bed and board, but to bear a part in all your good, and all your evil fortune: and for my part, when I I look upon you, I find no reaſon to repent the match; but from me, what evidence of my love, what ſatisfaction can you receive, if I may not ſhare with you in bearing your moſt hidden griefs, nor be admitted to any of your counſels that require ſecrecy and truſt? I know very well that women ſeem to be of too weak a nature to be truſted with ſecrets; but certainly, Brutus, a virtuous birth and education, and a converſation with the good and honourable, are of ſome force to the forming our manners, and ſtrengthening our natural weakneſs. And I can boaſt that I am the daughter of Cato, and the wife of Brutus; in which two great titles, tho' before I put too little confidence, yet now I have tried myſelf, and find, that even againſt grief and pain itſelf I am invincible. Which words having ſpoke, ſhe ſhewed him her wound, and related to him the whole trial that ſhe had made of her own conſtancy: at which he being aſtoniſhed, lifted up his hands to Heaven, and begged the aſſiſtance of the gods in his enterprize, that he might live to be a huſband worthy of ſuch a wife as Porcia. So having comforted his wife, he left her (9).’ Valerius Maximus (10) is ſhorter in his account, and ſuppoſes other circumſtances, for he affirms, that ſhe knew her huſband's deſign before ſhe wounded herſelf. He adds, that ſhe wounded herſelf the very ſame day that Cæſar was aſſaſſinated, and ſhe did it to try whether ſhe could be ſo courageous as to put an end to her life, if Brutus's attempt ſhould be attended with an ill ſucceſs. Obſerve how Hiſtorians vary about the moſt memorable adventures.

[*C*] *She was tranſported with ſuch a violent uneaſineſs, that ſhe fell into ſeveral ſwoons, and was thought to be dead.*] The only deſign of Plutarch, in the particular account he gives of that accident, is to ſhew Brutus's intrepidity. Theſe are his words: ‘ In the mean while there came one in all haſte from Brutus's houſe, and brought him news that his wife was a-dying: for Porcia being extreamly diſturbed with expectation of the event, and not being able to bear the greatneſs of her cares, could ſcarce keep herſelf within doors, and at every little noiſe or voice ſhe heard, leaping forth, and ſtarting ſuddenly, like one of the mad Prieſteſſes of Bacchus, aſked every one that came from the Forum, what Brutus was doing? and continually ſent one meſſenger after another to enquire. At laſt, after long expectation, the ſtrength of her body could hold out no longer, but overcome with her doubts and fears, ſhe fainted away. She had not time to betake herſelf to her chamber, for as ſhe was ſitting amongſt her women, a ſudden want of ſpirits, and a great ſtupidneſs ſeized her, and her colour changed, and her ſpeech was quite loſt. At this ſight her women made a great and lamentable outcry, and many of the neighbours running to Brutus's houſe, to know what was the matter, the report was ſoon ſpread abroad that Porcia was dead; tho' ſhe recovered in a little while, and came to herſelf again. When Brutus received this news, he was extreamly troubled, not without reaſon, yet was not ſo carried away by his private grief, as to neglect the public concern.’ (11) Cæſar was killed ſoon after.

[*D*] *Having accompanied her huſband to the ſea-ſide .... ſhe could not forbear ſhedding tears at the ſight of a certain picture.*] Plutarch's narrative contains ſome things that are to Porcia's honour, and therefore it will not be improperly inſerted in this place. ‘ Brutus began to deſpair of any good event of ſuch proceedings; and reſolving to leave Italy, paſſed by land through Lucania, and came to Elea by the ſea-ſide. From hence it was thought convenient, that Porcia ſhould return to Rome: ſhe was overcome with grief to part with Brutus, but ſtrove as much as poſſible to conceal it; but in ſpight of all her conſtancy and reſolution, a picture which ſhe found there accidentally betrayed it. The ſtory of it was, the parting of Hector from Andromache, when he went to engage the Greeks, giving his young ſon Aſtyanax into her arms, and ſhe fixing her eyes upon him, with an earneſt and affectionate look. As ſoon as ſhe ſpied this piece, the reſemblance it bore to her own concern made her burſt out into tears, and ſeveral times a day ſhe walked where that picture hung, to gaze at it, and weep before it. Upon this occaſion, when Acilius, one of Brutus's friends, repeated out of Homer theſe verſes, wherein Adromache ſpeaks to Hector.

Be careful Hector, for with thee my all,

My father, mother, brother, huſband fall.

Brutus ſmiling, replied, but I muſt not anſwer Porcia, as Hector did Andromache,

Mind you your wheel, and to your maids give law.

‘ For tho' the natural weakneſs of her body hinders her from acting what the ſtrength of men can perform, yet ſhe has a mind as valiant and as active for the good of her country, as the beſt of us. This relation is in the Memoirs of Brutus, written by Bibulus, Porcia's ſon (12).’ That Bibulus, who proceeded from Porcia's firſt marriage, wrote *a ſmall book concerining the exploits of Brutus* (13). There was at leaſt another child by that marriage (14).

[*E*] *She put an end to her life with great courage, when ſhe heard that Brutus had killed himſef.*] Thoſe who do not underſtand Latin, will find hereafter in a paſſage of Plutarch, the ſenſe of this apoſtrophe of Valerius Maximus: *Tuos quoque caſtiſſimos ignes Porcia,* when ſhe married him, ſhe was the widow of Bibulus, by whom ſhe had children (*a*). If Preſident du Vair had known it, he would not have aſcribed to her an anſwer [*F*], which probably belongs to another PORCIA, ſiſter to Cato Uticenſis, and wife of one Domitius Ænobarbus (*b*), and was doubtleſs endowed with noble qualities, ſince Cicero (*c*), Lollius, and Varro, wrote an encomium upon her. She died before Cæſar was killed.

---

(9) Plut. in Bruto, *pag.* 989.

(10) Valerius Maximus, *lib. iii, cap. ii, num.* 15, *pag. m.* 254.

(11) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 990.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 994.

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 989.

(14) Idem, in Vita Catonis minoris, *pag.* 771, *A.*

Porcia, M. Catonis filia, cunctа ſæcula debita admiratione proſequuntur: Quæ cum apud Philippos victum & interemptum virum tuum Brutum cognoſceres, quia ferrum non dabatur, ardentes ore carbones haurire non dubitaſti, muliebri ſpiritu virilem patris exitum imitata. Sed neſcio an hoc fortius, quod ille uſitato, tu novo genere mortis abſumpta es (15). Plutarch relates the ſame thing, and quotes Valerius Maximus, and another author; but he further ſays, that there was a letter in Brutus's name, whereby it appeared, that Porcia reſolved to die, becauſe ſhe was not aſſiſted in her ſickneſs. ‘As for Porcia .... Nicolaus the Philoſopher, and Valerius Maximus write, that being deſirous to die, but being hindered by her friends, who continually watched her from killing herſelf, ſhe ſnatched ſome burning coals out of the fire, and ſhutting them cloſe in her mouth, ſtifled herſelf, and died. Tho' there is yet extant a Letter of Brutus to his friends, in which he laments the death of Porcia, and accuſes them for neglecting her ſo, that ſhe deſired to to die, rather than languiſh with her diſeaſe. So that it ſeems Nicolaus was miſtaken in the time. For this Epiſtle (if it is indeed authentic, and truly Brutus's) gives us to underſtand the diſeaſe, and the love of this lady, and the manner of her death (16).'

[*F*] *Preſident du Vair .... would not have aſcribed to her the anſwer he does.*] One of the decrees pronounced by that preſident concerns a ſuit in Law in the parliament of Provence, between a woman, who had married again nine months after her being a widow, and the relations of her firſt huſband. She was deprived, by virtue of that decree, *of the things left her by her huſband's laſt will, and of her nuptial advantages, for having married again before the year of her mourning was out* (17). Mr du Vair alledges a great many ſentences out of the Pagan authors, and the ancient Fathers againſt ſecond marriages (18), and ſays, that our Porcia declared, that a virtuous woman never marries but once. *Dido being intreated to marry again, wiſhes that ſhe may rather die..... Nevertheleſs, being afterwards perſuaded to it, and deploring her misfortune, ſhe ſays,*

Extinctus pudor, &, quâ ſolâ ſidera adibam,

For you alone I ſuffer in my fame,

Bereft of honour, and expos'd to ſhame.

DRYDEN.

as believing, with great reaſon, that thoſe who married twice, were neither honeſt nor happy. And therefore, as we read in Tertullian, Fortunæ muliebri coronam non imponebat niſi univira, --- *No woman is compleatly fortunate, unleſs ſhe has been true to one huſband; which agrees with the ſaying of the celebrated Porcia, Brutus's wife,* Fœlix & pudica matrona non nubit niſi ſemel (19), ---- *A virtuous and happy woman never marries but once.* That Porcia could not have ſaid this, without condemning herſelf, ſince Brutus was her ſecond huſband. I am apt to think, that Mr du Vair was led into this error for want of a due attention in reading St Jerome's words. They are not exact, and beſides they contain a falſity, and therefore they may very well occaſion a miſtake: but after all, the anſwer in queſtion is not aſcribed to Porcia, Brutus's wife, in the words of that Father. St Jerome having mentioned Marcia, Cato's younger daughter (20), who would never marry again, adds, that Brutus married Porcia, who was a maid (21), and that Cato married Marcia, who was not a maid (22), and that accordingly Marcia did not ſcruple to leave Cato, in order to marry Hortenſius, whereas Porcia would not live without Brutus. Afterwards St Jerome mentions Porcia the younger, who made the anſwer we have ſeen in Mr du Vair's paſſage. ‘Martia Catonis filia minor cum quæreretur ab ea, cur poſt amiſſum maritum denuo non nuberet, reſpondit, non ſe invenire virum, qui ſe magis vellet, quâm ſua. Quo dicto oſtendit divitias magis in uxoribus elegi ſolere, quam pudicitiam, & multos non oculis, ſed digitis uxores ducere. Optima ſanè res, quàm avaritia conciliat. Eadem cum lugeret virum, & matronæ ab ea quærerent, quem diem haberet luctus ultimum: ait, quem & vitæ. Arbitror, quæ ita virum quærebat abſentem, de ſecundo matrimonio non cogitabat. Brutus Porciam virginem duxit uxorem, Martiam Cato non virginem: ſed Martia inter Hortenſium Catonemque diſcurrit, & ſine Catone vivere Martia potuit, Portia ſine Bruto non potuit. Magis enim ſe unicis viris applicant fœminæ, & nihil aliud noſſe, magnum arctioris indulgentiæ vinculum eſt, ... Portia minor, cum laudaretur apud eam quædam bene morata, que ſecundum habebat maritum, reſpondit: Felix & pudica matrona, nunquam præterquam ſemel nubit (23). ---- *Martia, Cato's younger daughter, being aſked why ſhe did not marry again after her huſband's death, anſwered, that ſhe found no man who preferred her perſon to her fortune: by which ſhe inſinuated, that riches in a wife are generally valued above chaſtity, and that many are determined in their choice not ſo much by their eyes as by their fingers. A noble effect of avarice! The ſame lady being aſked, while ſhe bewailed the loſs of her huſband, what bounds ſhe preſcribed to her mourning; anſwered, the ſame as to her life. I fancy that a woman who mourned in this faſhion for her deceaſed huſband, had no thoughts of a ſecond marriage. Brutus married Porcia, who was a maid ... Porcia the younger, when ſome body at her houſe cried up the virtue of a certain lady that had a ſecond huſband, anſwered: a virtuous and happy woman never marries but once.*' One cannot well apprehend what he means by Porcia the younger, *Porcia minor*, for the ancient hiſtory does not mention two daughters of Cato Uticenſis; and if it mentions two Porcia's, it is to inform us, that one of them was Cato's ſiſter, and the other his daughter. At this rate the latter ſhould have been Porcia the younger, *Porcia minor*; but ſhe could not have declared againſt ſecond marriages ſo ſeverely as St Jerome relates it. Some will have it that he means the other Porcia, Cato's ſiſter. *Meminit Hieronymus* (Porciæ Domitio nuptæ) *adverſus Jovinianum, qui tale ejus dictum celebrat* (24): Cum apud eam, *&c.* But why ſhould he call her *Porcia minor?* It is more likely that he meant one Porcia, younger ſiſter of Brutus's wife, and, perhaps, confounding his notions, he calls *Porcia minor* the ſame woman, whom he calls Marcia a little before. We muſt remember, that Marcia, wife of Cato Uticenſis, was with child when her huſband parted with her in favour of Hortenſius (25). Perhaps ſhe was delivered of a daughter, who is indifferently called *Porcia minor*, or Marcia (26), tho' it was not uſual for daughters to go by their mothers name. Perhaps St Jerome, for want of attention, changed the two names of one woman into two perſons. What is certain is, that the anſwer he aſcribes to Marcia is of the ſame nature with that which he aſcribes to Porcia the younger. It was of ſome uſe to him to diſtinguiſh them; for he was very willing to increaſe the number of ſuch examples. He alledges thoſe of Annia, and Marcella, and of Valeria. The firſt anſwered, that ſhe would not marry again; for, ſaid ſhe, if I ſhould get a good huſband, I ſhould be afraid of loſing him (27), and if I ſhould get a bad one, I ſhould find it a very hard caſe, having been ſo kindly uſed by my firſt ſpouſe. Marcella anſwered, I am ſo well ſatisfied with having been married once, that I do not want to be married again. Valeria was contented to anſwer, that her firſt huſband was ſtill alive as to her (28). *Anniam cum propinquus moneret, ut alteri viro nuberet; eſſe enim ei & ætatem integram, & faciem bonam: nequaquam, inquit, hoc faciam. Si enim virum bonum invenero, nolo timere, ne perdam: ſi malum, quid neceſſe eſt poſt bonum peſſimum ſuſtinere? .... Marcella major rogata à matre ſua gauderet-ne ſe nupſiſſe, reſpondit; ita valde, ut amplius nolim. Valeria Meſſalarum ſoror, amiſſo Servio viro, nulli volebat nubere.*

(*a*) See the end of the remark [*D*].

(*b*) Plut. in Catone Utic. *pag.* 778, *F.*

(*c*) *See* Cicero, Ep. ad Atticum, xxxvii, & xlviii, *lib. xiii*,

(15) Valer. Maximus, *lib. iv, cap. vi, pag. m.* 394, 395.

(16) Plut. in Bruto, in fine, *pag.* 1009.

(17) Oeuvres du Sieur du Vair, *pag.* 859, *Edit. of Geneva* 1017, *in* 8*vo*.

(18) Compare what has been ſaid in the remark [*E*], of the article GONZAGA (LUCRETIA OF).

(19) Oeuvres du Sieur du Vair, *pag.* 820.

(20) Such a daughter of Cato is not mentioned by the Pagan authors.

(21) This is falſe: ſhe was Bibulus's widow.

(22) Plutarch ſays no ſuch thing.

(23) Hieronym. *lib. i*, adverſ. Jovinianum, *pag. m.* 36.

(24) Glandorp. Onomaſt. *pag.* 716.

(25) Plut. in Catone minore, *pag.* 771.

(26) The author of the Scholia upon St Jerome, *ad locum ſupra relatum*, is of opinion, that this Marcia was ſo called becauſe of her mother.

(27) See, above, the remark [*A*], of the article GONZAGA (JULIA OF).

(28) Hieronym. ubi ſupra.

nubere. Quæ interrogata cur hoc faceret, ait ſibi ſemper maritum Servium vivere (29).

It is to be obſerved, that if theſe maxims afforded a copious ſubject to the advocates, who pleaded againſt the widow concerned in Mr du Vair's decree, ſhe afforded them more matter ſtill by her haſtily marrying again, in the ninth month of her widowhood, and without waiting for the end of Lent. *She not only tranſgreſſes*, ſaid the advocates (30), *her private mourning, and deſpiſes the memory of her late huſband and benefactor, but ſhe does alſo defile the time appointed for a public penitence, ſhe breaks the laws of the church, and ſcandalizes every body. But why ſo haſtily? If you could not ſtay till the end of a year already ſo far advanced, why did not you ſtay at leaſt till the end of Lent, which was already half gone. Perhaps, the heat of youth tranſported you, and as Tertullian ſays,* deſpumare iſtis nuptiis ſanguinis fervorem oportuit : - - - *that marriage was neceſſary to bring down the violent heat of the blood. Such an excuſe could hardly be admitted from a young maid, in the flower of her age. Tho'*, as St Jerome ſays, libido majorem in virginibus patiatur famem, dum dulcius putat omne quod neſcit : - - - *the luſt of a virgin is more fierce and ravenous, while ſhe fancies there is a remarkable ſweetneſs in every thing ſhe has not tried. And will an old woman alledge it, after ſhe has been twenty-five years married to man, who was ſeventy years old when he died? How came you then to contain yourſelf during your huſband's life, when the title of wife, and the cover of marriage, gave you more liberty, and the ſight of an old man raiſed in you a greater luſt?* Many civil laws were thundred out againſt her; but ſhe alledged againſt them the Canon-Law, and the indulgence of the Pope's decrees (31). It is a ſcandalous thing, that ſome injunctions of the Civil Law ſhould have been enervated by the Canon-Law, to countenance the abuſes of marriage (32).

(29) *Accordingly an antient author ſays, that* viduæ luctus pro marito erat. - - - *a widow's mourning was to her inſtead of a huſband.* Which Lucan did ſince transfer to the praiſe of Pompey's wife, ſaying,

Perfruitur lachrymis & habet pro conjuge luctum.

Now all her comfort in her tears doth lie,
And mourning doth her huſband's place ſupply.

Du Vair, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 820.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 818.

(31) Ibid. *pag.* 826, 854.

(32) See, above, citation (42), of the article PIENNE.

PORCIUS (Marcus) one of the greateſt men among the ancients, commonly known by the title of CATO THE CENSOR, was born at Tuſculum (*a*), in the year of Rome 519 [*A*]. He began to bear arms at ſeventeen years of age, and ſhewed not only much courage, but alſo a great contempt of pleaſures, and even of the conveniencies of life [*B*]. He was a man of an extraordinary ſobriety, and no bodily exerciſe ſeemed to him unworthy of him; for at his return from his campaigns, he betook himſelf to plow his ground, but did not neglect to cultivate his mind, eſpecially in order to ſpeak well, a talent neceſſary to him, ſince he pleaded many cauſes in the neighbouring towns; which he did ſo generouſly, that he would never receive any reward for it. The diſcourſes of a Pythagorean Philoſopher (*b*), which he heard at Tarentum, when that town was re-taken by Fabius Maximus, in whoſe army he ſerved, did very much ſtrengthen his inclination for temperance. Valerius Flaccus, who had a country-ſeat near that of Cato, was deſirous to ſee that young man of whom he was told ſo many remarkable things; and finding that it was a good plant which wanted only to be cultivated and tranſplanted into better ground, he perſuaded him to come to Rome. Cato made himſelf ſoon eſteemed in that city, and having ſuch an officious patron as Valerius Flaccus, quickly raiſed himſelf. He was firſt of all elected Military Tribune, afterwards they made him Queſtor, and then by degrees he came to be Conſul (*c*) and Cenſor (*d*). No man was ever better qualified than he for the office of Cenſor, nor did better diſcharge the duties of it. He made uſe of his ſeverity, eloquence, and exemplary life, to put a ſtop to the luxury and other vices of the Romans (*e*): which was the reaſon

(*a*) Cornel. Nepos, in Fragmento Vitæ Catonis. Plut. in Catone Majore, *init. pag.* 336.

(*b*) His name was *Nearchus.*

(*c*) In the year of Rome 558.

(*d*) In the year of Rome 569.

(*e*) *Taken from* Plut. in Vita Catonis Majoris.

[*A*] *He was born . . . . in the year of Rome* 519.] Here is the proof of it, ‘ Anno poſt conſul primum ‘ fuerat (*Q. Maximus*) quam ego natus ſum (1). - - - - ‘ *The year after I was born, Fabius Maximus was* ‘ *choſen conſul for the firſt time.*' They are Cato's words in a book of Cicero. But the *Faſti Conſulares* place the firſt conſulſhip of Fabius Maximus in the year of Rome 520. All the dates ſpecified in the ſame book ſhew, that the Latin words I have quoted ought to be read thus. See Grævius's edition, where you will find a note of Vincent Contarinus, and another of Charles Langius, which clear the matter, I infer from the poſition of that year, that Livy and Plutarch are miſtaken, when they ſay, that Cato pleaded his cauſe at eighty-ſix years of age, and accuſed Sergius Galba four years after (2). He died at eighty-five years of age, for it was in the year of Rome 604, under the conſulſhip of Lucius Marcius, and Manius Manilius, which was eighty-ſix years before Cicero's conſulſhip, as Cicero obſerves (3). Corradus is a little miſtaken upon this paſſage. He ſays (4), that Cato was born ſeven years after the conſulſhip of Claudius Cento, and Sempronius Tuditanus, which falls in with the year of Rome 513; and that he was in his thirtieth year under the conſulſhip of Cornelius Cethegus, and Sempronius Tuditanus, that is in the year of Rome 549. This computation is wrong, any body may ſee that there are only twenty-nine years from the year of Rome 520, to the year 549. Corradus obſerves a little farther (5), that Cato was born in the year 521, and that being dead in the year 604, he lived at leaſt eighty-five years; which is a wrong calculation. Some pages after (6) he ſays, that Cato died in the year 605, at eighty-five years of age, being born in the year 521, which does not rectify the computations. However, we may ſay that he lived to that age, for Cicero affirms it in expreſs words. ‘ Annos quinque & LXXX natus exceſſit è vita cum quidem eo ipſo anno contra Ser. ‘ Galbam ad populum ſumma contentione dixiſſet, ‘ quam etiam orationem ſcriptam reliquit (7). - - - - - ‘ *He died in the eighty-fifth year of his age. That very* ‘ *year he had pronounced a vehement ſpeech againſt Ser-* ‘ *vius Galba, which he likewiſe left in writing.*' Cato did not only write that pleading againſt Galba, but alſo inſerted it in his *Origines* (8). Pliny denotes the time of Cato's deceaſe too indeterminately : ‘ Cir- ‘ ca captas, *ſays he* (9), Carthaginem & Corinthum ‘ . . . . ſupremum is diem obiit. - - - - *He died about* ‘ *the time that Carthage and Corinth were taken.*' Thoſe two towns were conquered in the year 608. I do not find that he ſays in his nineteenth book, as Glandorpius will have it (10), that Cato died at eighty-five years of age: I only find there, that he died a year after he had perſuaded the Romans to begin the third Punic war (11). The twenty-ninth book ſhould have been quoted, where theſe words are to be found, ‘ Hic Cato DCV. anno urbis noſtræ o- ‘ biit, LXXXV. ſuo (12). - - - - *This Cato died in the* ‘ *eighty-fifth year of his age, and in the year of Rome* ‘ 605.' Paterculus agrees with this as to the year of Rome, for he ſays, that Cato died three years before the deſtruction of Carthage (13). I will not cenſure Moreri for placing Cato's deceaſe in the year of Rome 606, but I think it ſomewhat ſtrange, that the fault he has committed in ſaying, that it was *during the ſecond Punic war*, has not been mended hitherto (14).

[*B*] *He ſhewed . . . . a great contempt of pleaſures, and even of the conveniencies of life.*] I ſhould be too prolix, ſhould I mention whatever is to be found in books upon this ſubject; and therefore I ſhall only ſet down a paſſage of Seneca, whereby it appears, that Cato was contented with one horſe for himſelf and baggage, and looked after him himſelf. ‘ M. Cato ‘ Cenſorius (quem tam reip. hercule profuit naſci quam Scipionem :

(1) Cicero, de Senect. *cap. iv, pag. m.* 392.

(2) Titus Livius, *lib. xxxix, pag. m.* 762. Plut. in Catone Majore, *pag.* 344, 345.

(3) Cicero, in Bruto, *pag. m.* 109.

(4) Corradus, in Brutum Cicer. *pag.* 109.

(5) Ib. *p.* 110.

(6) Ib. *p.* 150.

(7) Cicero, ibid. *pag.* 149.

(8) Quam orationem in O igines ſuas retulit paucis ante quam mortuus eſt an diebus an menſibus. *Ibid. pag.* 165.

(9) Plin. *lib. xiv, cap. iv, pag. m.* 124.

(10) Glandorp. in Onomaſt. *pag.* 714.

(11) Plin. *lib. xix, cap. xviii, pag.* 197.

(12) Idem, *lib. xxix, cap. i, pag.* 668.

(13) Patercul. *lib. i, cap. xiii.*

(14) I write this in March 1701.

reaſon why it has been ſaid, that he was not leſs ſerviceable to the republic of Rome by making war againſt immorality, than Scipio by his victories over the enemies (*f*). It was well known that he would exerciſe the cenſorſhip with the utmoſt rigour; which was one of the reaſons why the Patricians oppoſed him when he ſtood for that office; but that ſame reaſon induced the people to prefer him to all his competitors. This circumſtance is admirably repreſented by the beſt Latin Hiſtorian, together with his elogy [*C*]. The inſcription of the ſtatue erected to him, was a glorious teſtimony of his

'Scipionem: alter enim cum hoſtibus noſtris bellum, alter cum moribus geſſit) canterio vehebatur, & hipperis quidem impoſitis, ut ſecum utilia portaret. . . . . . O quantum erat ſæculi decus, imperatorem triumphalem, cenſorium (& quod ſuper omnia hæc eſt) Catonem, uno caballo eſſe contentum, & ne toto quidem! Partem enim ſarcinæ, ab utroque latere dependentes, occupabant. Ita non omnibus obeſis mannis, & aſturconibus, & tollutariis præferres unicum illum equum, ab ipſo Catone defrictum (15)? - - - - *Cato the Cenſor (a man of as great conſequence to the republic as Scipio: for the one fought againſt our enemies, and the other againſt our vices) uſed to ride upon a gelding, which carried at the ſame time his cloak-bag and his neceſſaries . . . What an honour was it to that age to ſee a man who had triumphed as a general, and enjoyed the dignity of Cenſor, and (which is more than both theſe) to ſee Cato put up with one horſe, and even not require a whole one to himſelf! For his baggage hanging down on each ſide took up part of him. Who would not prefer that honeſt gelding, rubbed down by Cato himſelf, to all the ſleek nags, fine genets, and ſmooth ambling horſes, in the world.*' He had ſlaves enough to do it for him, but he rather choſe to ſave them that trouble. It was his inclination: he plowed the ground, dreſſed like his ſlaves, and then ſat down at table with them, eating of the ſame bread, and drinking of the ſame wine (16). Seneca might have mentioned a thing more remarkable ſtill than what he relates. *When he entered upon the government of Sardinia, though his predeceſſors there uſed to require tents, bedding, and cloaths, upon the public account, and to charge them heavily by furniſhing proviſions and entertainments for a great train of ſervants and friends: he, on the contrary, by his frugality ſhewed an incredible difference, for in nothing wanted he the contribution of the public; nay, he would walk on foot to viſit the cities, and with one perſon only of the common town-officers, who carried his garment, and a cup to offer ſacrifice in* (17).

[*C*] *This circumſtance is admirably repreſented by the beſt Latin Hiſtorian, together with his elogy.*] This paſſage of Livy is ſo fine, that I can neither forbear to ſet it down at length, nor be ſo bold as to tranſlate it. 'In hoc viro (*M. Porcio*) tanta vis animi ingeniique fuit, ut quocunque loco natus eſſet, fortunam ſibi ipſe facturus fuiſſe videretur: Nulla ars neque privatæ, neque publicæ rei gerendæ ei defuit. Urbanas ruſticaſque res pariter callebat. Ad ſummos honores alios ſcientia juris, alios eloquentia, alios gloria militaris provexit. Huic verſatile ingenium ſic pariter ad omnia fuit, ut natum ad id unum diceres, quodcunque ageret. In bello manu fortiſſimus, multiſque inſignibus clarus pugnis: idem poſteaquam ad magnos honores pervenit, ſummus imperator: idem in pace, ſi jus conſuleres, peritiſſimus: ſi cauſa oranda eſſet, eloquentiſſimus: nec is tantùm, cujus lingua vivo eo viguerit; monumentum eloquentiæ nullum extet. Vivit imò, vigetque eloquentia ejus, ſacrata ſcriptis omnis generis. Orationes & pro ſe multæ, & pro aliis, & in alios. Nam non ſolùm accuſando, ſed etiam cauſam dicendo fatigavit inimicos; ſimultates nimio plures & exercuerunt eum, & ipſe exercuit eas. Nec facilè dixeris, utrum magis preſſerit eum nobilitas, an ille agitaverit nobilitatem. Aſperi proculdubio animi, & linguæ acerbæ, & immodicè liberæ fuit, ſed invicti cupiditatibus animi, & rigidæ innocentiæ, contemptor gratiæ, divitiarum: in parſimonia, in patientia laboris periculique ferrei propè corporis, animique, quem ne ſenectus quidem, quæ ſolvit omnia, fregerit: qui ſextum & octogeſimum annum agens cauſam dixerit, ipſe pro ſe oraverit, ſcripſeritque, nonageſimo anno Sergium Galbam ad populi adduxerit judicium. Hunc, ſicut omni vita, ita tum (*cenſuram*) petentem premebat nobilitas: conſenſerantque, præter L. Flaccum, qui collega in conſulatu fuerat, candidati omnes, ad dejiciendum honore eum, non ſolùm ut ipſi potius adipiſcerentur, nec quia indignabantur novum hominem cenſorem videre, ſed etiam quòd triſtem cenſuram, periculoſamque multorum famæ, & ab læſo à pleriſque, & lædendi cupido expectabant. Etenim tum quoque minitabundus petebat, refragari ſibi qui liberam & fortem cenſuram timerent, criminando. Et ſimul L. Valerio ſuffragabatur: illo uno collega caſtigare ſe nova flagitia, & priſcos mores revocare poſſe. His accenſi homines, adverſa nobilitate non M. Porcium modò cenſorem fecerunt, ſed etiam collegam ei L. Valerium Flaccum adjecerunt (18). - - - *This man carried with him ſo vigorous a ſpirit and pregnant wit, that howſoever he were born and deſcended, it ſeemed he was able to make way of himſelf to advancement and honour. He wanted no art and ſkill meet and requiſite for the managing either of private buſineſs of his own or public affairs of ſtate: cunning he was in country huſbandry, as well as in civil policy. Some are advanced to the higheſt dignities and moſt honourable places by their deep knowledge in the law; others attain to promotion by eloquence: and there be again who have riſen and become great through martial prowеſs and feats of arms. But this man was by nature ſo trainable and pliant to all alike, that whatſoever he addicted and gave himſelf unto, a man would have ſaid, he had been born and framed even from his mother's womb to it, and to nothing elſe. In war a moſt hardy and valiant ſoldier: and in many battles fought in fields highly renowned. Being mounted once to high places of honourable calling, a right excellent commander he proved and general of an army. In peace again for ſound counſel in the Civil Law, paſſing well learned: for pleading at the bar and making orations, moſt eloquent. Neither carried he himſelf ſo, that his tongue flouriſhed only while he lived, as leaving no monument behind him of his ſingular eloquence; but it liveth, nay it flouriſheth ſtill, immortalized, as it were, and recommended to poſterity in all kind of writing. Orations of his there be extant many, which he penned and pronounced as well in his own cauſe as for the defence of his friends, yea and invectives alſo againſt others: for able he was to put down and weary his adverſaries, not only by declaiming and accuſing them, but alſo by pleading his own cauſe. Factious quarrels and enmities there were exceeding many, that tormented him; and he plagued others with as many: and hard it is to ſay or ſet down, whether he were urged and preſſed upon by the nobility, or himſelf courſed and baited them more. Doubtleſs by nature he was auſtere and rigorous, his ſpeech was ſharp, biting, and beyond meaſure plain and free: but he carried a mind with him that ſtooped to no deſires and luſts whatſoever: his life, ſo ſevere and preciſe as it was, untouched and without all ſpot of blame: deſpiſing all fawning favours, and contemning earthly riches. In thrift and frugality, in ſobriety and patience, in ſufferance of travail and danger, his body was ſteel to the very back. And as for his mind and courage, it was ſuch as very age and time (which abateth and conſumeth all things elſe) was not able to break and daunt: when he was fourſcore years old and ſix, he pleaded at the bar for others: he made orations for his own defence, and wrote books: and in the ninetieth year of his age he convented Sergius Galba before the people, to receive his judgment by them. As all his life-time before the nobility was ſet againſt him, ſo when he ſtood now to be Cenſor, they preſſed hard upon him: inſomuch as all his competitors (excepting L. Flaccus, who had been his colleague in the conſulſhip) complotted together, how they might give him the repulſe, and put him beſide the cuſhion: not only for that their own teeth watered, and they were deſirous themſelves rather of that honour; nor becauſe they repined to ſee a new riſen gentleman, and one of the firſt head to be a Cenſor: but alſo becauſe they looked for no other but that his cenſorſhip would be rigorous aud prejudicial to the name and reputation of divers men; conſidering how he had been croſſed and hurt by very many, and was deſirous himſelf*

(*f*) See the paſſage of Seneca in the remark [*B*].

(15) Seneca, Epiſt. lxxxvii, *pag. m.* 353.

(16) Plut. in Marco Catone, *pag.* 337. *See alſo* Valerius Maximus, *lib.* iv, *cap.* iii, *num.* 12.

(17) Idem, Plutarch. *pag.* 339.

(18) Liv. *lib.* xxxix, *cap.* xl, xli.

nubere. Quæ interrogata cur hoc faceret, ait ſibi ſemper maritum Servium vivere (29).

It is to be obſerved, that if theſe maxims afforded a copious ſubject to the advocates, who pleaded againſt the widow concerned in Mr du Vair's decree, ſhe afforded them more matter ſtill by her haſtily marrying again, in the ninth month of her widowhood, and without waiting for the end of Lent. *She not only tranſgreſſes*, ſaid the advocates (30), *her private mourning, and deſpiſes the memory of her late huſband and benefactor, but ſhe does alſo defile the time appointed for a public penitence, ſhe breaks the laws of the church, and ſcandalizes every body. But why ſo haſtily? If you could not ſtay till the end of a year already ſo far advanced, why did not you ſtay at leaſt till the end of Lent, which was already half gone. Perhaps, the heat of youth tranſported you, and as Tertullian ſays,* deſpumare iſtis nuptiis ſanguinis fervorem oportuit : - - - *that marriage was neceſſary to bring down the violent heat of the blood. Such an excuſe could hardly be admitted from a young maid, in the flower of her age. Tho',* as St Jerome ſays, libido majorem in virginibus patiatur famem, dum dulcius putat omne quod neſcit : - - - *the luſt of a virgin is more fierce and ravenous, while ſhe fancies there is a remarkable ſweetneſs in every thing ſhe has not tried. And will an old woman alledge it, after ſhe has been twenty-five years married to man, who was ſeventy years old when he died? How came you then to contain yourſelf during your huſband's life, when the title of wife, and the cover of marriage, gave you more liberty, and the ſight of an old man raiſed in you a greater luſt?* Many civil laws were thundred out againſt her; but ſhe alledged againſt them the Canon-Law, and the indulgence of the Pope's decrees (31). It is a ſcandalous thing, that ſome injunctions of the Civil Law ſhould have been enervated by the Canon-Law, to countenance the abuſes of marriage (32).

(29) *Accordingly an antient author ſays, that* viduæ luctus pro marito erat. - - - *a widow's mourning was to her inſtead of a huſband.* Which Lucan did ſince transfer to the praiſe of Pompey's wife, ſaying,
Perfruitur lachrymis & habet pro conjuge luctum.
Now all her comfort in her tears doth lie,
And mourning doth her huſband's place ſupply.
Du Vair, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 820.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 818.

(31) Ibid. *pag.* 826, 854.

(32) See, above, citation (42), of the article PIENNE.

PORCIUS (Marcus) one of the greateſt men among the ancients, commonly known by the title of **CATO THE CENSOR**, was born at Tuſculum (*a*), in the year of Rome 519 [*A*]. He began to bear arms at ſeventeen years of age, and ſhewed not only much courage, but alſo a great contempt of pleaſures, and even of the conveniencies of life [*B*]. He was a man of an extraordinary ſobriety, and no bodily exerciſe ſeemed to him unworthy of him; for at his return from his campaigns, he betook himſelf to plow his ground, but did not neglect to cultivate his mind, eſpecially in order to ſpeak well, a talent neceſſary to him, ſince he pleaded many cauſes in the neighbouring towns; which he did ſo generouſly, that he would never receive any reward for it. The diſcourſes of a Pythagorean Philoſopher (*b*), which he heard at Tarentum, when that town was re-taken by Fabius Maximus, in whoſe army he ſerved, did very much ſtrengthen his inclination for temperance. Valerius Flaccus, who had a country-ſeat near that of Cato, was deſirous to ſee that young man of whom he was told ſo many remarkable things; and finding that it was a good plant which wanted only to be cultivated and tranſplanted into better ground, he perſuaded him to come to Rome. Cato made himſelf ſoon eſteemed in that city, and having ſuch an officious patron as Valerius Flaccus, quickly raiſed himſelf. He was firſt of all elected Military Tribune, afterwards they made him Queſtor, and then by degrees he came to be Conſul (*c*) and Cenſor (*d*). No man was ever better qualified than he for the office of Cenſor, nor did better diſcharge the duties of it. He made uſe of his ſeverity, eloquence, and exemplary life, to put a ſtop to the luxury and other vices of the Romans (*e*): which was the reaſon

(*a*) Cornel. Nepos, in Fragmento Vitæ Catonis. Plut. in Catone Majore, *init. pag.* 336.

(*b*) His name was *Nearchus.*

(*c*) In the year of Rome 558.

(*d*) In the year of Rome 569.

(*e*) *Taken from* Plut. in Vita Catonis Majoris.

[*A*] *He was born . . . . in the year of Rome* 519.] Here is the proof of it, ' Anno poſt conſul primum ' fuerat (*Q. Maximus*) quam ego natus ſum (1). - - - - ' *The year after I was born, Fabius Maximus was ' choſen conſul for the firſt time.*' They are Cato's words in a book of Cicero. But the *Faſti Conſulares* place the firſt conſulſhip of Fabius Maximus in the year of Rome 520. All the dates ſpecified in the ſame book ſhew, that the Latin words I have quoted ought to be read thus. See Grævius's edition, where you will find a note of Vincent Contarinus, and another of Charles Langius, which clear the matter, I infer from the poſition of that year, that Livy and Plutarch are miſtaken, when they ſay, that Cato pleaded his cauſe at eighty-ſix years of age, and accuſed Sergius Galba four years after (2). He died at eighty-five years of age, for it was in the year of Rome 604, under the conſulſhip of Lucius Marcius, and Manius Manilius, which was eighty-ſix years before Cicero's conſulſhip, as Cicero obſerves (3). Corradus is a little miſtaken upon this paſſage. He ſays (4), that Cato was born ſeven years after the conſulſhip of Claudius Cento, and Sempronius Tuditanus, which falls in with the year of Rome 513; and that he was in his thirtieth year under the conſulſhip of Cornelius Cethegus, and Sempronius Tuditanus, that is in the year of Rome 549. This computation is wrong, any body may ſee that there are only twenty-nine years from the year of Rome 520, to the year 549. Corradus obſerves a little farther (5), that Cato was born in the year 521, and that being dead in the year 604, he lived at leaſt eighty-five years; which is a wrong calculation. Some pages after (6) he ſays, that Cato died in the year 605, at eighty-five years of age, being born in the year 521, which does not rectify the computations. However, we may ſay that he lived to that age, for Cicero affirms it in expreſs words. ' Annos quinque & LXXX natus exceſſit è vita cum quidem eo ipſo anno contra Ser. ' Galbam ad populum ſumma contentione dixiſſet, ' quam etiam orationem ſcriptam reliquit (7). - - - - - ' *He died in the eighty-fifth year of his age. That very ' year he had pronounced a vehement ſpeech againſt Ser- ' vius Galba, which he likewiſe left in writing.*' Cato did not only write that pleading againſt Galba, but alſo inſerted it in his *Origines* (8). Pliny denotes the time of Cato's deceaſe too indeterminately : ' Cir- ' ca captas, *ſays he* (9), Carthaginem & Corinthum ' . . . . ſupremum is diem obiit. - - - - *He died about ' the time that Carthage and Corinth were taken.*' Thoſe two towns were conquered in the year 608. I do not find that he ſays in his nineteenth book, as Glandorpius will have it (10), that Cato died at eighty-five years of age: I only find there, that he died a year after he had perſuaded the Romans to begin the third Punic war (11). The twenty-ninth book ſhould have been quoted, where theſe words are to be found, ' Hic Cato DCV. anno urbis noſtræ o- ' biit, LXXXV. ſuo (12). - - - - *This Cato died in the ' eighty-fifth year of his age, and in the year of Rome* ' 605.' Paterculus agrees with this as to the year of Rome, for he ſays, that Cato died three years before the deſtruction of Carthage (13). I will not cenſure Moreri for placing Cato's deceaſe in the year of Rome 606, but I think it ſomewhat ſtrange, that the fault he has committed in ſaying, that it was *during the ſecond Punic war*, has not been mended hitherto (14).

[*B*] *He ſhewed . . . . a great contempt of pleaſures, and even of the conveniencies of life.*] I ſhould be too prolix, ſhould I mention whatever is to be found in books upon this ſubject; and therefore I ſhall only ſet down a paſſage of Seneca, whereby it appears, that Cato was contented with one horſe for himſelf and baggage, and looked after him himſelf. ' M. Cato ' Cenſorius (quem tam reip. hercule profuit naſci quam Scipionem:

(1) Cicero, de Senect. *cap. iv, pag. m.* 392.

(2) Titus Livius, *lib. xxxix, pag. m.* 762. Plut. in Catone Majore, *pag.* 344, 345.

(3) Cicero, in Bruto, *pag. m.* 109.

(4) Corradus, in Brutum Cicer. *pag.* 109.

(5) Ib. *p.* 110.

(6) Ib. *p.* 150.

(7) Cicero, ibid. *pag.* 149.

(8) Quam orationem in Origines ſuas retulit paucis ante quam mortuus eſt an diebus an menſibus. *Ibid. pag.* 165.

(9) Plin. *lib. xiv, cap. iv, pag. m.* 124.

(10) Glandorp. in Onomaſt. *pag.* 714.

(11) Plin. *lib. xix, cap. xviii, pag.* 197.

(12) Idem, *lib. xxix, cap. i, pag.* 668.

(13) Patercul. *lib. i, cap. xiii.*

(14) I write this in March 1701.

reaſon why it has been ſaid, that he was not leſs ſerviceable to the republic of Rome by making war againſt immorality, than Scipio by his victories over the enemies (*f*). It was well known that he would exerciſe the cenſorſhip with the utmoſt rigour; which was one of the reaſons why the Patricians oppoſed him when he ſtood for that office; but that ſame reaſon induced the people to prefer him to all his competitors. This circumſtance is admirably repreſented by the beſt Latin Hiſtorian, together with his elogy [*C*]. The inſcription of the ſtatue erected to him, was a glorious teſtimony of his

‘ Scipionem: alter enim cum hoſtibus noſtris bellum, alter cum moribus geſſit) canterio vehebatur, & hippoperis quidem impoſitis, ut ſecum utilia portaret. . . . . . O quantum erat ſæculi decus, imperatorem triumphalem, cenſorium (& quod ſuper omnia hæc eſt) Catonem, uno caballo eſſe contentum, & ne toto quidem! Partem enim ſarcinæ, ab utroque latere dependentes, occupabant. Ita non omnibus obeſis mannis, & aſturconibus, & tollutariis præferres unicum illum equum, ab ipſo Catone defrictum (15)? - - - - *Cato the Cenſor (a man of as great conſequence to the republic as Scipio: for the one fought againſt our enemies, and the other againſt our vices) uſed to ride upon a gelding, which carried at the ſame time his cloak-bag and his neceſſaries . . . What an honour was it to that age to ſee a man who had triumphed as a general, and enjoyed the dignity of Cenſor, and (which is more than both theſe) to ſee Cato put up with one horſe, and even not require a whole one to himſelf! For his baggage hanging down on each ſide took up part of him. Who would not prefer that honeſt gelding, rubbed down by Cato himſelf, to all the ſleek nags, fine genets, and ſmooth ambling horſes, in the world.*’ He had ſlaves enough to do it for him, but he rather choſe to ſave them that trouble. It was his inclination: he plowed the ground, dreſſed like his ſlaves, and then ſat down at table with them, eating of the ſame bread, and drinking of the ſame wine (16). Seneca might have mentioned a thing more remarkable ſtill than what he relates. *When he entered upon the government of Sardinia, though his predeceſſors there uſed to require tents, bedding, and cloaths, upon the public account, and to charge them heavily by furniſhing proviſions and entertainments for a great train of ſervants and friends: he, on the contrary, by his frugality ſhewed an incredible difference, for in nothing wanted he the contribution of the public; nay, he would walk on foot to viſit the cities, and with one perſon only of the common town-officers, who carried his garment, and a cup to offer ſacrifice in* (17).

[C] *This circumſtance is admirably repreſented by the beſt Latin Hiſtorian, together with his elogy.*] This paſſage of Livy is ſo fine, that I can neither forbear to ſet it down at length, nor be ſo bold as to tranſlate it. ‘ In hoc viro (*M. Porcio*) tanta vis animi ingeniique fuit, ut quocunque loco natus eſſet, fortunam ſibi ipſe facturus fuiſſe videretur: Nulla ars neque privatæ, neque publicæ rei gerendæ ei defuit. Urbanas ruſticaſque res pariter callebat. Ad ſummos honores alios ſcientia juris, alios eloquentia, alios gloria militaris provexit. Huic verſatile ingenium ſic pariter ad omnia fuit, ut natum ad id unum diceres, quodcunque ageret. In bello manu fortiſſimus, multiſque inſignibus clarus pugnis: idem poſteaquam ad magnos honores pervenit, ſummus imperator: idem in pace, ſi jus conſuleres, peritiſſimus: ſi cauſa oranda eſſet, eloquentiſſimus: nec is tantùm, cujus lingua vivo eo viguerit; monumentum eloquentiæ nullum extet. Vivit imò, vigetque eloquentia ejus, ſacrata ſcriptis omnis generis. Orationes & pro ſe multæ, & pro aliis, & in alios. Nam non ſolùm accuſando, ſed etiam cauſam dicendo fatigavit inimicos; ſimultates nimio plures & exercuerunt eum, & ipſe exercuit eas. Nec facilè dixeris, utrum magis preſſerit eum nobilitas, an ille agitaverit nobilitatem. Aſperi proculdubio animi, & linguæ acerbæ, & immodicè liberæ fuit, ſed invicti cupiditatibus animi, & rigidæ innocentiæ, contemptor gratiæ, divitiarum: in parſimonia, in patientia laboris periculique ferrei propè corporis, animique, quem ne ſenectus quidem, quæ ſolvit omnia, fregerit: qui ſextum & octogeſimum annum agens cauſam dixerit, ipſe pro ſe oraverit, ſcripſeritque, nonageſimo anno Sergium Galbam ad populi adduxerit judicium. Hunc, ſicut omni vita, ita tum (*cenſuram*) petentem premebat nobilitas: conſenſerantque, præter L. Flaccum, qui collega in conſulatu fuerat, candidati omnes, ad dejiciendum honore eum, non ſolùm ut ipſi potius adipiſcerentur, nec quia indignabantur novum hominem cenſorem videre, ſed etiam quòd triſtem cenſuram, periculoſamque multorum famæ, & ab læſo à pleriſque, & lædendi cupido expectabant. Etenim tum quoque minitabundus petebat, refragari ſibi qui liberam & fortem cenſuram timerent, criminando. Et ſimul L. Valerio ſuffragabatur: illo uno collega caſtigare ſe nova flagitia, & priſcos mores revocare poſſe. His accenſi homines, adverſa nobilitate non M. Porcium modò cenſorem fecerunt, ſed etiam collegam ei L. Valerium Flaccum adjecerunt (18). - - - *This man carried with him ſo vigorous a ſpirit and pregnant wit, that howſoever he were born and deſcended, it ſeemed he was able to make way of himſelf to advancement and honour. He wanted no art and ſkill meet and requiſite for the managing either of private buſineſs of his own or public affairs of ſtate: cunning he was in country huſbandry, as well as in civil policy. Some are advanced to the higheſt dignities and moſt honourable places by their deep knowledge in the law; others attain to promotion by eloquence: and there be again who have riſen and become great through martial prowеſs and feats of arms. But this man was by nature ſo trainable and pliant to all alike, that whatſoever he addicted and gave himſelf unto, a man would have ſaid, he had been born and framed even from his mother's womb to it, and to nothing elſe. In war a moſt hardy and valiant ſoldier: and in many battles fought in fields highly renowned. Being mounted once to high places of honourable calling, a right excellent commander he proved and general of an army. In peace again for ſound counſel in the Civil Law, paſſing well learned: for pleading at the bar and making orations, moſt eloquent. Neither carried he himſelf ſo, that his tongue flouriſhed only while he lived, as leaving no monument behind him of his ſingular eloquence; but it liveth, nay it flouriſheth ſtill, immortalized, as it were, and recommended to poſterity in all kind of writing. Orations of his there be extant many, which he penned and pronounced as well in his own cauſe as for the defence of his friends, yea and invectives alſo againſt others: for able he was to put down and weary his adverſaries, not only by declaiming and accuſing them, but alſo by pleading his own cauſe. Factious quarrels and enmities there were exceeding many, that tormented him; and he plagued others with as many: and hard it is to ſay or ſet down, whether he were urged and preſſed upon by the nobility, or himſelf courſed and baited them more. Doubtleſs by nature he was auſtere and rigorous, his ſpeech was ſharp, biting, and beyond meaſure plain and free: but he carried a mind with him that ſtooped to no deſires and luſts whatſoever: his life, ſo ſevere and preciſe as it was, untouched and without all ſpot of blame: deſpiſing all fawning favours, and contemning earthly riches. In thrift and frugality, in ſobriety and patience, in ſufferance of travail and danger, his body was ſteel to the very back. And as for his mind and courage, it was ſuch as very age and time (which abateth and conſumeth all things elſe) was not able to break and daunt: when he was fourſcore years old and ſix, he pleaded at the bar for others: he made orations for his own defence, and wrote books: and in the ninetieth year of his age he convented Sergius Galba before the people, to receive his judgment by them. As all his life-time before the nobility was ſet againſt him, ſo when he ſtood now to be Cenſor, they preſſed hard upon him: inſomuch as all his competitors (excepting L. Flaccus, who had been his colleague in the conſulſhip) complotted together, how they might give him the repulſe, and put him beſide the cuſhion: not only for that their own teeth watered, and they were deſirous themſelves rather of that honour; nor becauſe they repined to ſee a new riſen gentleman, and one of the firſt head to be a Cenſor: but alſo becauſe they looked for no other but that his cenſorſhip would be rigorous aud prejudicial to the name and reputation of divers men; conſidering how he had been croſſed and hurt by very many, and was deſirous*

(*f*) See the paſſage of Seneca in the remark [*B*].

(15) Seneca, Epiſt. lxxxvii, *pag. m.* 353.

(16) Plut. in Marco Catone, *pag.* 337. *See alſo* Valerius Maximus, *lib. iv, cap. iii, num.* 12.

(17) Idem, Plutarch. *pag.* 339.

(18) Liv. *lib.* xxxix, *cap.* xl, xli.

his reforming inclination [*D*]. He expreſſed a great indifferency for the erection of ſtatues [*E*], and, in general, for praiſes (*g*); nevertheleſs, he highly commended himſelf (*h*), and was willing that people ſhould ſee in his books the great encomiums he beſtowed on himſelf. He harangued very often, and inſerted ſome of his orations in his Roman Hiſtory [*F*]. That Hiſtory, and the book he wrote concerning the art of war, are not extant (*i*). He compoſed ſome books of agriculture (*k*), and was very particular in the deſcription of that art (*l*). He wrote alſo ſomething concerning Rhetoric, and it is likely he was the firſt Roman who writ upon that ſubject (*m*). He was accuſed ſeveral times, and always defended himſelf very well: he was ſo ſure of his innocence, that an action being brought againſt him, he offered to ſubmit to the judgment of

‘ *himſelf to wait them a ſhrewd turn, and meet with* ‘ *them again. For even then, while he laboured and* ‘ *ſued for the place, he uſed minatory ſpeeches, and gave* ‘ *out that they only were oppoſed againſt him, who feared* ‘ *they ſhould have a cenſorſhip ſharply exerciſed without* ‘ *partiality and reſpect of perſons. And herewith he* ‘ *maintained the ſuit of L. Valerius with him, ſaying* ‘ *that if he had but him of all others to be his colleague,* ‘ *he ſhould be able to repreſs the wicked enormities newly* ‘ *come up and riſe in the city, and to bring in requeſt* ‘ *again the ancient manners and faſhions of the old world.* ‘ *Men were much moved in theſe reſpects and conſiderations; and ſo maugre the heads of the nobility, they* ‘ *not only created him Cenſor, but alſo adjoined unto him* ‘ *L. Valerius Flaccus for his companion in that govern*‘*ment* *.’

[*D*] *The inſcription of the ſtatue erected to him was a . . . . teſtimony of his reforming inclination.*] ‘ The ‘ people did like his cenſorſhip wondrous well; for ‘ ſetting up a ſtatue for him in the temple of the god‘deſs of health, they put an inſcription under it, not ‘ of his warlike feats and triumphs, but ſuch a one as ‘ ſignified, That this was Cato the Cenſor, who by his ‘ good diſcipline and ordinances reclaimed the Roman ‘ commonwealth, when it was declining and ſupinely ‘ tumbling into vice (19).’ Cornelius Nepos obſerves, that Cato's ſeverity put a ſtop to the luxury which had already crept into the commonwealth. *Cato Cenſor cum eodem Flacco factus, ſeverè præfuit ei poteſtati. Nam & in complures nobiles animadvertit, & multas res novas in edictum addidit, quare luxuriâ reprimeretur, quæ jam tum incipiebat pullulare* (20).

[*E*] *He expreſſed a great indifferency for the erection of ſtatues.*] The following words of Plutarch are to be found next to thoſe I have quoted in the remark [*D*]. ‘ Now before this ſtatue honour was done to himſelf, ‘ he uſed to laugh at thoſe who loved ſuch kind of ‘ things, ſaying, They were not ſenſible that they ‘ gloried chiefly in the workmanſhip of Engravers ‘ and Painters, but that the citizens bore about his ‘ faireſt image in their breaſts. When any ſeemed to ‘ wonder at him, that he ſhould have never a ſtatue, ‘ when many ordinary perſons had one; I would, ‘ ſaid he, much rather be aſked why I have not one, ‘ than why I have one.’ Ammianus Marcellinus mentions this noble anſwer. *Cenſorius Cato . . . . interrogatus quamobrem inter multos nobiles ſtatuam non haberet, malo, inquit, ambigere bonos quamobrem id non meruerim, quam, quod eſt gravius, cur impetraverim muſſitare* (21). Note, that Plutarch in another place of his works (22), ſhould not have ſaid abſolutely, that Cato would not ſuffer that a ſtatue ſhould be erected to him.

[*F*] *He inſerted ſome of his orations in his Roman Hiſtory.*] He wrote that Hiſtory in his old age, and divided it into ſeven books. The firſt contained the actions of the kings of Rome; the ſecond and the third contained the origin of all the towns of Italy; for which reaſon it is thought he intituled the whole work *Origines*. In the fourth he deſcribed the firſt Punic war; and in the fifth he deſcribed the ſecond, which he did ſummarily, and by way of ſections. He deſcribed in the ſame manner the following wars, to the pretorſhip of Sergius Galba, who conquered the Luſitani. He mentioned things without naming thoſe who had done them. He took notice of the rarities that were to be found in Spain and Italy, and ſhewed a great deal of learning and exactneſs (23). Obſerve theſe words of Cornelius Nepos, ‘ Ab adoleſcentia ‘ confecit orationes: Senex hiſtorias ſcribere inſtituit ‘ (24); - - - *He made orations from the time that he* ‘ *was a young man, and in his old age he ſet about* ‘ *writing a Hiſtory.*’ And at the ſame time remember that Cicero ſays, that Cato went about that work the very ſame year that he died (25). Which affords a very good reaſon to cenſure Livy, who ſuppoſes that Lucius Valerius, tribune of the people, making a ſpeech againſt Cato in the year 558, quoted his *Origines* (26). Cato was then but thirty-nine years of age, from whence it ought to be inferred, that he had not writ that book yet, and that Livy, who is doubtleſs the author of the ſpeeches related by him, forgot to reconcile his ſuppoſitions with Chronology. He affords an argument againſt himſelf, for he obſerves in another place (27), that Cato's ſpeech for the Rhodians, made in the year 587, had been inſerted in the fifth book of the *Origines*: which ſhews, that thoſe *Origines* had not been publiſhed when the tribune Valerius made a ſpeech againſt Cato. It were in vain to ſuppoſe ſeveral editions of that work, ſome larger than others, ſince no ancient author intimates any ſuch thing, and beſides, the firſt was only made when the author was far advanced in years (28). Father Noris (29) found fault with Livy upon this account: Voſſius (30) had ſaid before that cardinal, that he believed Livy was miſtaken, in ſuppoſing that the tribune of the people (31) made an objection to Cato which he took out of his *Origines*. Obſerve, that we read in the epitome of the forty-ninth book of Livy, that Cato's ſpeech againſt Galba was to be found in the *Origines*. But he made it the laſt year of his life: See above, what I have quoted out of Cicero (32). He publiſhed above one hundred and fifty Orations, very much commended by Cicero, though he obſerves, that no body read them (33). Doubtleſs, they were uſed a hundred years after Cato's death, as we uſe now a-days the ſpeeches that were made in the ſtates of the kingdom of France, or at the opening of the audiences in the XVIth century. A freed man of Cicero criticized with great ſubtilty, upon Cato's ſpeech for the Rhodians; but ſee in Aulus Gellius the anſwer that was made to his criticiſms (34).

Let us conſider theſe words of Cornelius Nepos, ‘ Atque horum bellorum duces non nominavit, ſed ‘ ſine nominibus res notavit. - - - *He did not name the* ‘ *generals who commanded in thoſe wars, but ſet down* ‘ *their actions without their names.*’ The commentators upon Pliny, without excepting Father Hardoüin, knew nothing of this paſſage. I prove it thus, Pliny obſerves, that Cato, who had ſuppreſſed the names of the generals in his Annals, mentioned the name of an elephant. ‘ Certe Cato, cum Imperatorum nomina ‘ Annalibus detraxerit, eum (*elephantum*) qui fortiſſime ‘ præliatus eſſet in Punica acie, Surum tradidit voca‘tum (35). - - - *It is certain that Cato, while he omit*‘*ted the names of the generals in his Annals, did not* ‘ *forget to take notice that the elephant which fought moſt* ‘ *ſtoutly in the Carthaginian army, was called Surus.*’ Read this note of Father Hardoüin (36). ‘Auctoris men‘tem aſſequi cum minime poſſent Plinii editores, hanc ‘ poſtremam vocem corruptam rati ſcripſere, *cum Impe*‘*ratorum nomina annalibus deſcriberet*, contra fidem codi‘cum Reg. 1, 2. ceterorumque melioris notæ, à ſcrip‘toris mente longiſſime aberrantes, cujus hæc ſententia ‘ eſt: Cato, inquit, Imperatorum Punicorum nomina ‘ annalibus ſuis apponere neglexit: idem tamen, quod ‘ nomen elephanti eſſet, qui tunc fortiſſime præliatus, ‘ referre operæ pretium duxit. - - - *The editors of Pliny,* ‘ *not underſtanding his meaning, fancied that a word* ‘ *was corrupted, and put in* while he deſcribed (*inſtead* ‘ *of while he omitted*) the names of the generals in his ‘ Annals. *But in this they contradict the beſt manu*‘*ſcripts, particularly the 1ſt and 2d in the king's library,* ‘ *groſſly miſtaking the ſenſe of the author which is this:* ‘ *Cato, ſays he, left out the names of the Carthaginian* ‘ *generals in his Annals; at the ſame time he thought it* ‘ *worth his while to mention the name of the ſtouteſt* ‘ *elephant.*’ He thought that Cato had only omitted the

---

(*g*) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 347.

(*h*) Ibid. & *pag.* 344, *B.*

(*i*) Plin. in Præf. Vegetius, *lib. i, cap. viii.*

(*k*) They are ſtill extant.

(*l*) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 351.

(*m*) *See* Quintilian. Inſt. Orat. *lib. iii, cap. i.*

* Taken from Philemon Holland's Engliſh tranſlation of Pliny.

(19) Plut. ubi ſupra. *pag.* 347.

(20) Cornel. Nepos, in Fragmento Vitæ Catonis, *pag. m.* 384.

(21) Amm. Marcell. *lib. xiv, cap. vi, pag. m.* 21.

(22) Plut. in Præcept. Reip. Ger. *pag.* 820, *B.*

(23) *Taken from* Cornel. Nepos, ubi ſupra.

(24) Ibid.

(25) See the remark [*A*], citation (7).

(26) Liv. *lib. xxxiv, pag. m.* 623.

(27) Ibid. *lib. xlv, pag.* 880.

(28) Cornel. Nepos, ubi ſupra.

(29) Noris Cenotaph. Piſan. *pag.* 4.

(30) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Lat. *lib. i, cap. v, pag.* 21.

(31) His name was not Oppius, as Voſſius affirms.

(32) In the remark [*A*], citation (7).

(33) Cicero, in Bruto, *pag. m.* 114.

(34) Aulus Gellius, *lib. vii, cap. iii.*

(35) Plin. *lib. viii, cap. v, pag. m.* 142.

(36) Harduin. in Plin. *Tom. ii, pag.* 253.

of one of his enemies [*G*]. He was no friend to the Phyſicians, and did not approve the ſtudies that were moſt in vogue among the Grecians [*H*]: nevertheleſs, he ſtudied the

the names of the Carthaginian generals; he would not have thought ſo, if he had remembered the words of Cornelius Nepos.

Note, that the fragments of Cato's Origines publiſhed by Annius Viterbienſis, are accounted a ſuppoſititious piece; but thoſe which have been collected by Riccobonus, and printed at the end of his treatiſe of Hiſtory, are genuine. They have been enlarged by Auſonius Popma, and added by him with notes to the other writings of Cato (37).

[*G*] *He was accuſed ſeveral times, and defended himſelf . . . . . . and offered to ſubmit to the judgment of one of his enemies.*] 'But neither did he himſelf eſcape ſcot-free in his managery of affairs; for if he gave his enemies but the leaſt hold, he was ſtill in danger, and ready to be brought to juſtice: for he is reported to have eſcaped at leaſt fifty indictments, and one above the reſt, which was the laſt, when he was fourſcore and ſix years old, about which time he had this remarkable ſaying, *That it was hard for him who had lived cotemporary with others a great while ago, to plead now before a new race of men.* Neither did he make this the laſt of his law-ſuits; for four years after, when he was fourſcore and ten, he accuſed Servilius Galba; ſo that he arrived (we ſee, as Neſtor did) to three uſual ages of man, and that in continual action (38).' Theſe words of Plutarch want to be corrected in ſome places, for it is not true that Cato lived ſo long, and it had been better to uſe the preciſe number forty-four, as it is in Pliny. 'Cato primus Porciæ gentis, *ſays he* (39), tres ſummas in homine res præſtitiſſe exiſtimatus, ut eſſet optimus Orator, optimus Imperator, optimus Senator: quæ mihi omnia, etiamſi non prius, attamen clarius fulſiſſe in Scipione Æmiliano videntur, dempto præterea plurimorum odio, quo Cato laboravit. Itaque ſit proprium Catonis, quater & quadragies cauſam dixiſſe, nec quenquam ſæpius poſtulatum, & ſemper abſolutum. - - - *It is ſaid of Cato, the firſt of the Porcian family, that he had three of the greateſt qualifications that a man can be ſuppoſed to have; for he was eſteemed an excellent Orator, an excellent General, and an excellent Senator. But in my opinion Scipio Æmilianus was poſſeſſed of the ſame, if not before Cato, at leaſt in a more eminent degree, with this advantage that he had not, like Cato, a great number of enemies. This may be peculiarly ſaid of Cato that he pleaded his cauſe forty-four times, and that no man was ever ſo often accuſed and always acquitted.*' Aurelius Victor made uſe of the ſame number forty-four (40), wherein he is more exact than in what he ſays, that Cato being eighty years of age, became Galba's accuſer. He ſhould have ſaid, *being eighty-five years of age:* See the remark [*A*]. Moreri is ſtrangely miſtaken, when he ſays, that Cato's enemies *proſecuted him above four hundred times.* I muſt not forget theſe words of an ancient author. 'Cato ſextum & octogeſimum annum agens, dum in rep. tuenda juvenili animo perſtat, ab inimicis capitali crimine accuſatus, ſuam cauſam egit. Neque aut memoriam ejus quiſquam tardiorem, aut firmitatem lateris ulla ex parte quaſſatam, aut os hæſitatione impeditum animadvertit. Quia omnia iſta in ſtatu ſuo æquali ac perpetua induſtria continebat. Quin etiam in ipſo diutiſſimè actæ vitæ fine diſertiſſimi oratoris Galbæ accuſationi defenſionem ſuam pro Hiſpania oppoſuit (41). - - - *While Cato was in the eighty-ſixth year of his age, and perſiſted in ſerving the republic with a youthful activity, he was accuſed of a capital crime by his enemies, and forced to plead his cauſe. Neither could any one perceive the leaſt decay in his memory, nor weakneſs in his lungs, nor faltering in his ſpeech. For he had preſerved all theſe in their wonted vigour by an even and uninterrupted exerciſe. Nay it was remarkable, that in the height of his old age, he made his defence for Spain, in oppoſition to the charge of that eloquent Orator Galba.*' There are two faults in this paſſage, for Cato was not eighty-ſix years old, when he pleaded the firſt of the two cauſes mentioned by Valerius Maximus; and he was Galba's accuſer in the ſecond, and not obliged to clear himſelf of Galba's accuſations: the latter wanted but little of being condemned, and would have undergone that puniſhment, had he not raiſed the compaſſion of the people (42).

To make an end of my Commentary upon the text of this remark, I need only quote Valerius Maximus, whoſe words run thus: 'Cato ſuperior ſæpenumero ab inimicis ad cauſæ dictionem vocatus, nec ullo unquam crimine convictus: ad ultimum tantum fiduciæ in ſua innocentia repoſuit, ut ab his in quæſtionem publicam deductus, Ti. Gracchum, à quo in adminiſtratione reip. ad multum odium diſſidebat, judicem depoſceret. Qua quidem animi præſtantia pertinaciam eorum inſectandi ſe inhibuit (43). - - - - *The elder Cato, being often accuſed by his enemies, but never convicted of any crime, did at laſt put ſo much truſt in his own innocence, that when he was brought to a public trial, he offered to ſubmit to the judgment of Ti. Gracchus, a man, whoſe meaſures he had violently oppoſed, and who therefore was looked upon as his profeſſed enemy.*'

[*H*] *He was no friend to the Phyſicians, and did not approve the ſtudies that were moſt in vogue among the Grecians.*] I ſhall quote Plutarch, who having ſaid, that Cato was diſpleaſed to ſee the three Philoſophers, deputed by the Athenians, ſo well approved at Rome, and that he adviſed the ſenate to ſend them home immediately (44), goes on thus. 'Yet this he did not out of any anger (as ſome think) to Carneades; but becauſe he wholly deſpiſed Philoſophy, and out of a kind of pride, ſcoffed at the Greek Muſes and Literature: for indeed he would uſe to ſay, that Socrates was a prating ſeditious fellow. . . . . And to fright his ſon from any thing that was Greek, he uſed a much harſher tone than was uſual with one of his age, pronouncing, as it were, with the voice of an Oracle, That the Romans would certainly be deſtroyed, when they were once to be infected with Greek, tho' time ſhewed the vanity of this his *way-ward ſaying*; for in truth, the city of Rome grew never greater than when they entertained the Greek learning; nor had he an averſion only to the Grecian Philoſophers, but the Phyſicians alſo; for having, it ſeems, heard how Hippocrates ſhould ſay, when the king of Perſia ſent for him, and would have fee'd him even with ſeveral talents, That he would never aſſiſt Barbarians, who were enemies to the Grecians; he affirmed, that this was now become a common oath to be taken by all Phyſicians, and ſo enjoined his ſon to have a care and avoid them; for that he himſelf had written a little treatiſe, whereby he gave preſcriptions, and cured thoſe who were ſick in his family (45).' If you deſire to ſee the very words of Cato, read this paſſage of Pliny: 'Mox à ſævitia ſecandi urendique, tranſiſſe nomen in carnificem, & in tædium artem omneſque Medicos, quod clariſſime intelligi poteſt ex M. Catone, cujus auctoritati triumphus atque Cenſura minimum conferunt: tanto plus in ipſo eſt. Quamobrem verba ejus ipſa ponemus. Dicam de iſtis Græcis ſuo loco, Marce fili: quid Athenis exquiſitum habeam, & quod bonum ſit illorum litteras inſpicere, non perdiſcere, vincam. Nequiſſimum & indocile genus illorum: & hoc puta vatem dixiſſe: Quandocunque iſta gens ſuas litteras dabit, omnia corrumpet. Tum etiam magis, ſi Medicos ſuos huc mittet. Jurarunt inter ſe barbaros necare omnes Medicina. Et hoc ipſum mercede faciunt, ut fides iis ſit, & facile diſperdant. Nos quoque dictitant barbaros: & ſpurcius nos, quam alios opicos, appellatione fœdant. Interdixi tibi de medicis (46). - - - *Soon after, from their cutting and burning, they got the name of hangman, and all Phyſic and Phyſicians came to be diſliked; as evidently appears from M. Cato, whoſe triumph and cenſorſhip add no weight to his authority; ſo much greater was his perſonal worth. For which reaſon I ſhall ſet down his own words. Son Marcus,* ſays he, *I ſhall take a proper opportunity of ſpeaking my mind concerning theſe Greeks, and of telling you what diſcoveries I have made at Athens. I ſhall prove that it is a good thing to know a little of their learning, but not to be thoroughly acquainted with it. Believe it as if an oracle had ſaid ſo, that they are a moſt villainous and intractable ſet of people. Whenever that nation ſhall introduce their learning here, it will corrupt every thing; eſpecially if*

'they

(37) At Leyden 1590, in 8vo.

(38) Plut. in ejus Vita, *pag.* 345.

(39) Plin. *lib.* *vii, cap. xxvii, pag.* 47.

(40) Galbam octogenarius accuſavit, ipſe quadragies quater accuſatus, glorioſe abſolutus. *Aurel. Victor. de Vir. Illuſtr.*

(41) Val. Maximus, *lib. viii, cap. vii, num.* 1, *pag. m.* 677, 678.

(42) Cicero, in Bruto, *pag. m.* 165.

(43) Valer. Maximus, *lib. iii, cap. vii, num.* 7, *pag.* 309.

(44) See, above, the article CARNEADES, remark [*F*].

(45) Plut. in Catone majore, *pag.* 350.

(46) Plin. *lib. xxix, cap. i, pag.* 667, 668.

the Greek tongue; but it is ſaid that it was not till his old age [*I*]. He lived a long life (*n*); and preſerved a great ſtrength of body and mind to the laſt. Being a man of a ſtrong conſtitution, he wanted women in his old age, and becauſe he could not conceal, as much as he deſired, his keeping a concubine, he married again [*K*]. His ſecond wife was not of the ſame quality with him. We ſhall ſee (*o*) what anſwer he made to his ſon, who complained of it. It is ſaid that this under-match did not prove ſo advantageous

‘ *they ſend us their Phyſicians at the ſame time. They* ‘ *are ſworn among themſelves to deſtroy all Barbarians* ‘ *with their Phyſic. This they do for a fee, that they may* ‘ *be the more truſted, and have the better opportunity of* ‘ *doing the work effectually. They will call us Barba*‘ *rians likewiſe, and give us more opprobrious names than* ‘ *they give to the reſt. I have charged you to have no*‘ *thing to do with the Phyſicians.*’ This may ſerve to confute thoſe who ſay, that Carneades's ſpeech againſt Juſtice, was the chief reaſon that moved Cato to adviſe the ſenate to ſend away immediately thoſe Athenian prattlers. I know a man of great parts, who thought that Cato gave that advice, becauſe Carneades had undermined the foundations of the Roman Policy, and diſcovered a myſtery, which was the baſis of the power and glory of that ambitious Republic. Thoſe who governed it, made people believe, that reaſon and uprightneſs were the rule of their actions; but Carnenades ſpeaking againſt Juſtice, alledged this proof amongſt others, That the Romans would be obliged to return into huts, if they would be juſt, that is, reſtore what they had invaded (47). I believe Cato was diſpleaſed with this argument, and clearly ſaw the conſequences of it; but I am perſuaded that more powerful reaſons incenſed him againſt thoſe Athenian deputies, *&c.*

Here I muſt take notice of a falſity that is to be found in Agrippa and Montagne, and which has been learnedly confuted by Dr Drelincourt, profeſſor of Phyſic. ‘ Romani quondam ſub Catone Cenſorio medi‘ cos omnes & urbe tota, & tota Italia pepulerunt, eorum ‘ funeſta mendacia, crudelitatemque averſati. - - - *The* ‘ *Romans, formerly in the time of Cato, the Cenſor, drove* ‘ *all the Phyſicians out of Rome and Italy, deteſting their* ‘ *pernicious lies and cruelty.*’ They are Agrippa's words (48): Montagne expreſſes himſelf thus (49). *The Romans had been ſix hundred years without any* Phyſicians, *and having tried them, expelled them from Rome by the help of Cato the Cenſor.* Many modern writers might be quoted who ſay the ſame. John Langius, a German Phyſician, affirms, that Cato the Cenſor, cauſed the Greek Phyſicians to be forbidden to come to Rome (50). Gaſpar à Reies, a Spaniſh Phyſician, ſays, that Cato's opinion, that all the Greeks and Egyptians ſhould be turned out of Rome, was approved without any contradiction, and that all the Phyſicians of Rome being natives of Greece or Egypt, were involved in the decree pronounced by the ſenate, purſuant to the deſires of that ſevere Cenſor (51). He adds (52), that this proſcription was made in the year of Rome 590, and laſted till the reign of the firſt emperors. But this is all groundleſs; for it cannot be proved that Cato uſed his intereſt with the ſenate or the people to obtain that decree, or that there was ſuch a decree in his time. On the contrary, we read in Pliny, who of all ancient authors may be moſt eaſily quoted to the diſadvantage of the Phyſicians, that the ſenate baniſhed them a long time after Cato's deceaſe. *Et cum Græcos* (antiqui) *Italia pellerent*, ſays he, DIU POST CATONEM, *excepiſſe Medicos* (53). The meaning of this paſſage ſeems to be, that all the Greeks, except the Phyſicians, were expelled from Italy. It is the ſenſe the learned Dr Drelincourt puts upon it (54); but it is certain, thoſe words are to be underſtood otherwiſe; they ſignify, that the Phyſicians were particularly comprehended in the expulſion; for had they been excepted, Pliny would have had no occaſion to alledge the reaſons ſo exactly mentioned by him to juſtify both the prejudices of Cato, and the ſeverity of the Roman ſenate. ‘ Non ‘ deſeram Catonem, *they are his words in the following* ‘ *page*, tam ambitioſæ artis invidiæ à me objectum, ‘ aut Senatum illum qui ita ſenſebat. - - - - *I will* ‘ *not leave Cato, nor the ſenate, which paſſed that* ‘ *cenſure, expoſed to the envy of ſuch an ambitious pro*‘ *feſſion.*’ It appears from the Law-Dictionaries (55), that the word *excipere* very often ſignifies not *to except* or *to exclude*, but *namely and expreſly to include.* Note, that Pliny ſhould not have ſaid, that the city of Rome was without Phyſicians for the ſpace of ſix hundred years. Dr Drelincourt ſhewed the contrary in a ſpeech he delivered (56) in July 1671. It is a very good apology for the Phyſicians, and it has been reprinted twice. See alſo Gaſpar à Reies (57).

[*I*] *It is ſaid he ſtudied the Greek tongue in his old age.*] I make uſe of theſe words; *it is ſaid*, becauſe there are ſome authorities *pro* and *con.* Cato, one of the interlocutors in Cicero's dialogues *de Senectute*, declares, that he began to learn the Greek tongue in his old age. ‘ Quid, quod etiam addiſcunt *(Senes)* ali‘ quid? ut Solonem verſibus gloriantem videmus, qui ‘ ſe quotidie aliquid addiſcentem ſenem fieri dicit. ‘ ut ego feci, qui Græcas litteras ſenex didici. Quas ‘ quidem ſic avide arripui, quaſi diuturnam ſitim ex‘ plere cupiens (58). - - - *What ſhall we ſay as to this,* ‘ *that old men are ſtill learning? As we find Solon boaſt*‘ *ing in his poems, that he learned ſomething new* ‘ *every day, as he grew old: and as I did, who ſtudied* ‘ *the Greek-tongue in my old age; and took to it as gree*‘ *dily as if I had been drinking after a long thirſt.*’ Let us conſider this paſſage of Plutarch: ‘ He is ſaid ‘ to have learned Greek late, and when he was ‘ pretty old; and that as to his Rhetoric, he profited ‘ a little by Thucydides, but much more by De‘ moſthenes, and indeed his writings are handſomely ‘ mixed both with Greek ſayings and hiſtories; ‘ nay, many of them tranſlated word for word, are ‘ interwoven with his own apophthegms and ſentences, ‘ (59).’ This paſſage does not favour Cicero, and one might infer from it, that Cato was not ſo old when he learned the Greek tongue. What I am going to ſay is ſtill more proper, to ſhew that he learned it much ſooner than it is thought. Plutarch confutes thoſe who ſaid, that there was ſtill a ſpeech of Cato delivered in Greek before the Athenians. *It is not true*, ſays Plutarch (60), *for he ſpoke to the Athenians by an interpreter, tho' he might have made his harangue in Greek, if he had pleaſed.* Cato was not then forty-five years of age. Some Hiſtorians ſay, that being Prætor in Sardinia, he was taught the Greek tongue by Ennius. ‘ In prætura Sardiniam ‘ ſubegit ubi ab Ennio Græcis literis inſtitutus (61). ‘ *He ſubdued Sardinia in his prætorſhip, and was there* ‘ *taught the Greek tongue by Ennius.*’ This *ſubegit* of Aurelius Victor is an untruth, which Moreri did not perceive. Sardinia was already conquered when Cato was ſent thither in the quality of Prætor. Moreri ſays, he conquered it in the year 556. Mrs le Fevre (62) places that Prætorſhip in the year 555, and therefore Cato was then but thirty-ſix years of age, and conſequently it cannot be ſaid that he learned the Greek tongue in his old age, or the teſtimony of Aurelius Victor ought to be rejected. I ſhall quote hereafter (63) ſome words of Cicero, whereby it appears that our Cato had no Greek learning.

[*K*] *He could not conceal . . . his keeping a concubine, he married again.*] The following paſſage out of Plutarch is a good piece of hiſtory (64). ‘ Cato having loſt his ‘ own wife, he married his ſon to the daughter of Paulus ‘ Æmilius, who was ſiſter to the ſecond Scipio Afri‘ canus; ſo that being now a widower himſelf, he ‘ made uſe of a young ſervant maid, who came pri‘ vately to him; but the houſe being very little, and ‘ a daughter-in-law alſo in it, the intrigue was quick‘ ly diſcovered; for the young wench ſeeming one day ‘ to paſs by a little too boldly to Cato's bed-chamber, ‘ the youth, his ſon, though he ſaid nothing, ſeemed ‘ to look a little grim upon her; the old man per‘ ceiving it a little offenſive, without finding any fault, ‘ or ſaying a word, away he goes, as his cuſtom was, ‘ with his uſual company to the market: among the ‘ reſt, was one Salonius, a clerk of his, to whom he ‘ called aloud, and aſked him, whether he had married ‘ his daughter?’ The concluſion was, that Cato deſired to have that maid, and the match was *quickly ſtruck up.* . . . *Now whilſt this marriage was in hand, Cato's ſon, taking ſome of his friends along with him, went and aſked* *his*

(*n*) See the remark [*A*].

(*o*) In the remark [*K*].

(47) Omnibus populis qui florerent imperio & Romanis quoque ipſis qui totius orbis potirentur, ſi juſti velint eſſe, hoc eſt ſi aliena reſtituant ad caſas eſſe redeundum, & in neceſſitate ac miſeriis jacendum. *Carneades, apud Lactant. lib. v, cap. xvi, pag.* 341.

(48) Agrippa, de Vanit. Scientiar. *cap. lxxxiii, p. m.* 196.

(49) Montagne, Eſſais, *book ii, cap. xxxvii, p. m.* 788.

(50) Langius, Epiſt. Medic. II, *lib. ii, pag.* 482.

(51) Gaſpar à Reies, in Elyſio jucund. Quæſt. Campo, *Quæſt. I, num.* 13, *p. m.* 11.

(52) Ibid. *pag.* 12, 13.

(53) Plin. *lib. xxix, cap. i, pag.* 668, 669.

(54) Drelincurtius, Apol. Medica, *pag.* 47, *Edit.* 1693.

(55) See Father Hardouin upon this paſſage of Pliny.

(56) In the univerſity of Leyden.

(57) Reies, ubi ſupra, *Quæſt. I, num.* 17.

(58) Cicero, de Senectute, *cap. viii, pag. m.* 406. *See alſo cap. i, pag.* 386, & Valerius Maximus, *lib. viii, cap. vii, n.* 1.

(59) Plut. in Catone Majore, *pag.* 337.

(60) Ibid. *pag.* 343.

(61) Aurel. Victor, de Viris illuſt. *p. m.* 70.

(62) Anna Tanaquilli Fabri filia in Aurel. Victor. ibid.

(63) In the remark [*U*], citation (113).

(64) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 350.

advantageous to him as he expected [*L*]. He was a good huſband, and a good father (*p*), and no leſs exact in keeping his family in good order, than in reforming the diſorders of the town. Some great ſtateſmen are not able to put their domeſtic concerns upon a good foot, and have a better ſucceſs and leſs trouble in the adminiſtration of public affairs, than in the management of their families. Cato was not like them, he underſtood Oeconomics as well as Politics, and found the way to confine his ſervants tongues, ſo that they ſhould not divulge what paſſed in his houſe [*M*]. One would

his father, for what offence he brought in a mother-in-law upon him ; but Cato preſently cried out, Soft, and fair, good ſon, what thou doſt is agreeable enough to me, nor do I find any fault with it ; only I deſire to have ſeveral children, and to leave the common-wealth more ſuch citizens as thou art. . . . . Cato had a ſon by this ſame venter, to whom, from his mother, he gave the ſirname of Salonius.' This Cato Salonius was the father of Marcus Cato, the father of Cato Uticenſis, who therefore was not the grand-nephew of the Cenſor, as Moreri affirms (65) but his great-grand-ſon.

[*L*] *This undermatch did not prove ſo advantageous to him as he expected.*] St Jerome deſigning to prove, that thoſe who marry a poor wife to be quiet at home, do not obtain their end, alledges the example of Cato. The ſeverity of that Cenſor could not free him from the ill effect of his wife's pride, tho' ſhe was a woman of a mean extraction. ' M. Cato Cenſorius habuit ' uxorem Actoriam Paulam, humili loco natam, vino-' lentam, impotentem, & (quod nemo poſſet credere) ' Catoni ſuperbam. Hoc ideo dico ; ne quis putet ſi ' pauperem duxerit, ſatis ſe concordiæ providiſſe (66). ' - - - *Cato the Cenſor married Actoria Paula, a woman ' of a mean birth, given to drinking, outragious, and ' (which is a thing that one could ſcarce believe) inſolent ' to Cato. I mention this, leaſt any one ſhould think that ' he has ſufficiently provided for his peace at home by mar-' rying a poor wife.*' I do not find that Cato had above two wives. But this paſſage of St Jerome cannot be underſtood of the firſt, and therefore ought to be underſtood of the ſecond, tho' Plutarch does not call her Actoria Paula, and ſays ſhe was the daughter of one Salonius. He gives us the following account of Cato's firſt marriage. ' He married a wife more noble ' than rich ; being of opinion nevertheleſs, that both ' of them ſo qualified, are uſually haughty and proud : ' But yet that thoſe of noble blood, would be more ' aſhamed of baſe things, and conſequently more obe-' dient to their huſbands in all that was fit and hand-' ſome for them (67).' From whence we may infer, that he was reſolved to bear the pride of his wife, whether ſhe was noble or rich ; but that he hoped a wife of a good family would make him leſs uneaſy than a rich one : he took other meaſures in his ſecond marriage ; he pitched upon a wife of no birth, and no fortune, and yet ſhe proved proud and paſſionate : ſo eaſy it is to be deceived, and to make a wrong gueſs about ſuch a thing. See the remark [*G*] in the article of AVENTINUS. A famous author quotes that paſſage of St Jerome, in one of his books, wherein he diſapproves the cuſtom of requiring from the ſtudents in Divinity, or the miniſters, that they ſhall marry the widows or daughters of the paſtors whom they are to ſucceed. He ſays, that ſuch a condition is ſomewhat tyrannical, and that it were better to leave them at liberty to chuſe a wife with a pretty good portion. ' Optandum Patroni non injicerent compedes iis, quos ' ad miniſterium promovere laborant, obtrudendo illis, ' aut demortuorum Paſtorum viduas, aut filias. Quod ' tamen, proh dolor ! nimis quam freqenter in hoc ipſo ' Fœderato Belgio contingit (68). - - - *It were to be ' wiſhed, that patrons would not lay this heavy bur-' then upon ſuch as they endeavour to put in as mini-' ſters,* viz. *that they ſhould be obliged to marry the wi-' dows or daughters of their deceaſed predeceſſors ; which ' nevertheleſs, to our ſhame be it ſpoken, is too often the ' caſe in theſe United Provinces.*' ' Ut non probo, *ſays ' he* (69), illius patris inſtitutum, (videatur Plutarch. ' in Demetr.) qui ut perſuadere poſſet filio, vetulam lo-' cupletem uxorem ducere, ex Euripidis Phæniſſis occi-' nebat (70). *Ubi lucrum ſuadet, reluctetur licet natura ' uxorem ducatis :* ita neque conſultum paſtori, ut re-' ſpectu unius miſericordiæ, pauperem uxorem domum ' ducat. Nam licet poëta Græcus exiſtimet, *ſponſam ' ſine dote non habere loquendi libertatem :* talis tamen ' ſæpe deprehenditur procaciſſima eſſe, atque marito ' ſuo quam immorigera ; imo nec abſimilis Actoriæ ' Paulæ, quam (teſtis eſt Hieronym. lib. 1. in Jovin.) ' cum Cenſorius Cato, *&c.* - - - *As I do not approve of ' that father's conduct,* (See Plutarch in the life of De-' metrius) *who, in order to perſuade his ſon to marry a ' rich old woman, was conſtantly buzzing into his ear ' this expreſſion of Euripides,* When money is to be had, ' never ſcruple to marry any woman, how much ' ſoever you may diſlike her ; *ſo neither do I think it ' adviſable for a paſtor to marry a poor wife for the ſake ' of doing an act of charity : ſince notwithſtanding what ' the Greek Poet ſays,* That a wife without a dowry has ' not the privilege of ſpeaking, *yet ſome ſuch are to ' be found who are extreamly ſaucy and diſobedient to ' their huſbands, and not unlike Actoria Paula, whom, ' according to St Jerome, when Cato the Cenſor,* &c.' There may be ſome reaſon in what he ſays.

[*M*] *He found the way to confine his ſervants tongues, ſo that they ſhould not divulge what paſſed at home.*] The following paſſage ſhews how he behaved himſelf towards his ſlaves. ' He purchaſed a great many ' ſlaves out of the captives taken in war, but chiefly ' he bought up the young ones, who were capable to ' be (as it were) broken and taught like little whelps ' and colts ; but none of theſe ever went into another ' man's houſe, except ſent either by Cato himſelf, or ' his wife. If any one of them were aſked what Cato ' did, they anſwered, *They did not know.* When a ' ſervant was at home, he was obliged either to do ' ſome work, or ſleep ; for indeed Cato loved thoſe ' moſt, who uſed to lie down often to take a nap, ' accounting them more docile than thoſe who ſate up ' much, and more fit for any thing, when they were ' refreſhed with a little ſlumber. Being alſo of an ' opinion, That ſervants would take the greateſt pains ' imaginable to ſatisfy their venery, he ſet a certain ' price to be paid by thoſe who conſorted with his ' bondwomen, but would ſuffer none to be concerned ' with any others abroad. At firſt, when he was but ' a poor ſoldier, he would not be difficult in any thing ' which related to his diet, but looked upon it as a ' pitiful mean thing, to quarrel with a ſervant for ' the ſake of his own belly ; but afterwards, when he ' grew richer, and made any feaſts for his friends and ' companions, preſently when ſupper was done, would ' he with a leathern thong ſcourge thoſe who had ' waited and dreſſed the meat careleſsly. He always ' contrived that his ſervants ſhould have ſome diffe-' rence one among another, always ſuſpecting and ' fearing a good underſtanding between them. Now ' thoſe who had committed any thing worthy of ' death, he accordingly puniſhed, if in the opinion of ' their fellow-ſervants they were found guilty (71).' This paſſage contains ſeveral particulars, whereby it appears, that Cato was a man of great ſenſe and great ability. His finding out a way to prevent his ſervants divulging what paſſed in his houſe, is a greater exploit than one can think. Such a thing is near as difficult as to find out the Philoſophers ſtone : beſides it is of great advantage ; for can there be a greater ſlavery, than to be afraid of the prattling of one's ſervants ? It is to be a ſlave in one's own houſe. This is admirably well expreſſed by Juvenal.

- - - Taceant illi, ſed prodere malunt
Arcanum, quam ſubrepti potare Falerni,
Pro populo faciens quantum Laufella bibebat.
Vivendum recte cum propter plurima, tunc his
Præcipue cauſſis, ut linguas mancipiorum
Contemnas : nam lingua mali pars peſſima ſervi.
Deterior tamen hic, qui liber non erit, illis
Quorum animas & farre ſuo cuſtodit, & ære (72).

- - - *There's a luſt in man no charm can tame,*
Of loudly publiſhing our neighbour's ſhame ;

On

(*p*) See the remark [*N*], towards the end.

(65) This error is corrected in the edition of Paris 1699.

(66) Hieronym. adv. Jovinianum, *lib. i, pag. m.* 37.

(67) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 347.

(68) Schoockius, ubi infra.

(69) Martinus Schoockius, Exercitat. *pag.* 259, *Edit. in* 4*to*.

(70) See, above, citation (4), of the article PHILLA.

(71) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 348.

(72) Juven. Sat. IX, ver. 115.

would think that he was to blame for ſuffering them to lie with his maids for a certain ſum of money which they were to pay him (*q*); but he had ſome reaſons for it. He was more liable to cenſure upon another account, I mean for his eagerneſs to improve his eſtate, and increaſe his revenues; for he was guilty of the worſt ſort of uſury [*N*]. I have mentioned, in another place (*r*), the ſpeech he made for the preſervation of the law, whereby women were forbidden to wear ornaments: I have alſo pointed, in the ſame place, at a ſpeech which ſhews, that he knew how to enliven the majeſty and gravity of his diſcourſes. We ſhould have a wrong notion of him, ſhould we think that auſterity was the only ingredient in his ſpeeches and converſations; for he knew how to intermix them with railleries and agreeable ſtrokes: he had many witty ſayings [*O*]; even young people might have been pleaſed with his converſation; he talked freely

On eagles wings immortal ſcandals fly,
While virtuous actions are but born and dye.
Let us live well, were it alone for this,
The baneful tongues of ſervants to deſpiſe.
Slander (the worſt of poiſons) ever finds
An eaſy entrance, to ignoble minds:
And they whoſe vicious lives ſuch abject foes muſt fear
More mean and wretched far than their own ſlaves appear.

STEPH. HARVEY.

Cato had not ſo much reaſon as many other Romans to be afraid of the indiſcretion of his ſlaves; but he looked upon their ſilence as a thing that was requiſite in a well-ordered houſe. He is not to blame for hating their ſprightlineſs; for commonly the more lively and ingenious footmen are, the greater knaves they prove. When the miniſters of a prince do not love one another, ſome keep a watchful eye over the conduct of others, they dread one another, and their maſter is thereby better ſerved, and leſs betrayed. The ſame may be ſaid, in proportion, concerning private families, where there are a great many ſervants; and it may be inferred from thence, that Cato acted according to his uſual prudence, when he cunningly fomented diſcord among his domeſtics. He cannot be ſo well excuſed for permitting them to lie with his maids for a certain price. It was a natural conſequence of his forbidding them to ſport out of his houſe; but at preſent ſuch a regulation would not be approved; there is no houſe of honour where ſuch a ſport is allowed; and maids are turned out whether they play their leud tricks at home or abroad. As for the men, it is required they ſhould keep themſelves chaſte, at leaſt within doors.

[*N*] *His eagerneſs to improve his eſtate .... he was guilty of the worſt ſort of uſury.*] ‘ But being, after ‘ all, much given to an extravagant deſire of gain, he ‘ looked upon agriculture rather as a pleaſure than ‘ profit; reſolving therefore to lay out his money in ‘ laſting and ſolid things, he purchaſed ponds, hot-baths, grounds full of Fullers-earth, paſtures and ‘ wood, whereby a great revenue flowed in unto him, ‘ and ſuch a one (he uſed to ſay) as Jupiter himſelf ‘ could not hurt. He was alſo given to a moſt blameable uſury in his traffic by ſea; and that was thus: ‘ He would that thoſe whom he put out his money ‘ to, ſhould have many partners: Now when the ‘ number of them and their ſhips came to be fifty, he ‘ himſelf would put in but one ſhare; for which ‘ Quintion, whom he had made a freeman, and who ‘ traded and ſailed along with the ſaid adventurers, ‘ was to be his factor; ſo that thus there was no danger of loſing his whole ſtock, but only a little part, ‘ and that with a proſpect of great profit. He likewiſe lent money to thoſe of his ſlaves who would ‘ borrow any, with which they bought alſo other ‘ young ones, whom, when they had taught and bred ‘ up at his charges, they would ſell again at the year's ‘ end; but ſome of them Cato would keep for himſelf, giving juſt as much for them as another had offered. To incline his ſon to be of this kind of ‘ temper, he would uſe to ſay, *That it was not like a* ‘ *ſolid man to leſſen an eſtate, but rather like a weak* ‘ *widow.* But a farther argument of Cato's avaricious ‘ humour, was, when he took the boldneſs to affirm, ‘ *That he was a moſt wonderful, nay, a godlike man, who* ‘ *left more behind him than he received* (73).’ Theſe are wrong maxims: His advice and example, in this reſpect, were very pernicious to his ſon, and did not anſwer the care he had taken in other reſpects to bring him up, like a good father. He himſelf taught him learning, though he had a ſlave who taught many others: *But he thought not fit, as he himſelf ſaid, to have his ſon reprimanded by a ſervant; or lugged, it may be, by the ears, when found tardy in his leſſon: Nor would he have him owe to a ſervant the obligation of ſo great a thing as his learning; wherefore he himſelf (as we were ſaying) taught him his Grammar, Law, and Fencing: Nor did he only ſhew him too how to throw a dart, to fight with other arms, and to ride; but even to play at fiſty-cuffs, to endure both heat and cold, and to ſwim over the moſt rapid and rough rivers. He ſays likewiſe, That he wrote Hiſtories in great characters, with his own hand, that ſo his ſon, without ſtirring out of the houſe, might learn the experience and virtuous exploits of his forefathers: Nor did he leſs abſtain from ſpeaking any thing obſcene before his ſon, than if it had been in the preſence of thoſe ſacred virgins which we call* Veſtals (74). Cato practiſed a very fine maxim, which Juvenal deſcribes thus,

Nil dictu fœdum viſuque hæc limina tangat,
Intra quæ puer eſt. Procul hinc, procul inde puellæ
Lenonum, & cantus pernoctantis paraſiti.
Maxima debetur puero reverentia: ſi quid
Turpe paras, nec tu pueri contempſeris annos,
Sed peccaturo obſiſtat tibi filius infans (75).

Suffer no leudneſs, or undecent ſpeech,
Th' apartment of the tender youth to reach;
Far be from thence the glutton paraſite,
Singing his drunken catches all the night:
But farther ſtill be woman; woman firſt
Was evil's cauſe, herſelf of ills the worſt.
Boys ev'n from parents may this rev'rence claim;
For when thou doſt at ſome vile action aim,
Say, ſhould the harmleſs child with-hold thy hand,
Would it not put thy fury to a ſtand?

J. DRYDEN, *jun.*

[*O*] *He had many witty ſayings.*] Plutarch has collected many of them (76): I ſhall only mention one, uſing Balzac's paraphraſe and prologue. ‘ The very ‘ Cenſors, Madam, though ſadneſs ſeemed to be one of ‘ the functions of their office, did not altogether lay ‘ aſide all manner of raillery. They were not always ‘ bent upon ſeverity; and the firſt Cato, that troubleſome and intolerable honeſt man, ceaſed ſometimes ‘ to be troubleſome and intolerable. He had ſome ‘ glimpſes of mirth, and ſome intervals of good humour. He dropped now and then ſome words that ‘ were not unpleaſant; and you may, Madam, judge ‘ of the reſt by this. He had married a very handſome wife, and Hiſtory tells us, That ſhe was extremely afraid of the thunder, and loved her huſband very well. Thoſe two paſſions prompting her ‘ to the ſame thing, ſhe always pitched upon her ‘ huſband as a ſanctuary againſt thunder, and threw ‘ herſelf into his arms, at the firſt noiſe ſhe fancied ‘ ſhe heard in the ſky. Cato, who was well pleaſed ‘ with the ſtorm, and very willing to be careſſed ‘ more than uſually, could not conceal his joy: He ‘ revealed that domeſtic ſecret to his friends, and ‘ told them one day, ſpeaking of his wife, that ſhe ‘ had found out a way to make him love bad weather, ‘ and that he never was ſo happy as when Jupiter ‘ was

(*q*) See the remark [*M*].

(*r*) In the remark [*B*], of the article PRETEXTATUS.

(73) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 349.

(74) Ibid. *pag.* 348.

(75) Juven. Sat. XIV, ver. 44. *See alſo Plato in the fifth book* de Legibus.

(76) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 340, & in Apophth. *pag.* 198.

freely at table with his friends, and had always ſome merry thoughts. He was then very well pleaſed to hear them diſcourſe of the merit of illuſtrious men, but would not ſuffer that the wicked ſhould be well or ill ſpoken of. I muſt not forget the judgment he made of kings, whom he took to be inferior in merit to the great man who had flouriſhed in a republican ſtate [*P*]. I muſt alſo take notice of the opinion he entertained of women guilty of adultery: he believed they were all poiſoners [*Q*]. This was very ſevere, but not ſo much as the puniſhment he inflicted upon a Roman Senator for kiſſing his wife in the preſence of his daughter (*s*), for he ſtruck him out of the liſt of the ſenators merely upon that account. It is ſaid that he would not have grown young again; a thought very worthy of his great ſenſe [*R*]. What he told a nobleman, whom he ſaw coming out of a bawdy-houſe, ſavours of a looſe morality; but he might have excuſed himſelf by alledging this axiom, that out of two evils the worſt ought to be avoided [*S*]. It is a miſtake to ſay, that he introduced among the Romans the cuſtom

of

‘ was angry. The man who diverted himſelf in this ‘ faſhion was upon other occaſions all ſeverity. He ‘ was all rigor, all juſtice (77).’

It will not be improper to obſerve at what time he ſaid this; it was during his cenſorſhip, when he degraded the ſenator Manlius, who, it is likely, would have been made conſul the year following, and was only degraded for giving a kiſs to his wife in the day-time, and in the preſence of his daughter (78). Some are of opinion, That at Rome, and in ſome other countries, it is neither becoming nor prudent, for a huſband to careſs his wife in the ſight of his children; nevertheleſs, they believe that Cato was too rigid, and that he made the education of children too difficult: They take it to be a piece of injuſtice, that the ſenator Manlius ſhould have paid ſo dear for ſuch a kiſs. Plutarch taxes Cato with too great a ſeverity, but at the ſame time he blames Manlius. Theſe are his words, *Cato deprived a Roman ſenator of the ſenatorial dignity, becauſe he kiſſed his wife in his daughter's preſence, wherein he was a little too rigid. But if it be a ſhameful thing, as certainly it is, to kiſs and embrace one another in the preſence of others* (79); *it is more ſhameful ſtill to abuſe and chide one another, to ſport with a wife in private, and then to reprove and give her hard words before every body* (80).

[*P*] *The judgment he made of kings, whom he took to be inferior in merit to the great men . . . . . of a republican ſtate.*] ‘ King Eumenes being come to Rome, ‘ the ſenate gave him a very good reception, and the ‘ greateſt men of the town ſtrove to careſs and honour ‘ him. But Cato appeared unwilling to do the ſame, ‘ and did not care to ſee him. Whereupon a friend ‘ of his told him, I wonder you ſhun king Eumenes, ‘ who is a very good prince, and a great friend to the ‘ Romans. To which he anſwered, I have nothing ‘ to ſay againſt it: however, this I muſt needs ſay, ‘ that a king is by his nature a ravenous beaſt; and ‘ there never was a king, though never ſo commendable, ‘ that deſerved to be compared with Epaminondas, ‘ Pericles, Themiſtocles, Manius Curius, or Amilcar, ‘ ſirnamed Barca (81).’ Which puts me in mind of what I have heard ſome Engliſh gentlemen ſay, that royalty is a very chargeable thing, and that many ſoldiers and ſhips would be maintained with what is neceſſary for the maintenance of a king. It is certain that a king's expences, merely for the civil liſt, are prodigious. How many guards and officers muſt be kept in pay? One volume would not be ſufficient to explain all the offices belonging to the court of the emperor of Conſtantinople; and any one who reads the *State of France* (82), and finds ſo many uſeleſs mouths in it, the twentieth part whereof would be ſufficient to maintain and ſerve the king, ſo that the reſt are only a troubleſome and ſtately ſuperfluity, muſt needs own, that this very thing would be a burthen upon the people. The ſame ſuperfluities are to be ſeen, in proportion, in all monarchical governments; and if it had been ſaid, that they may be of uſe to imprint a reſpect in the inferiors, and to give foreigners a great notion of the power of a prince, Cato would have anſwered, That that very thing ſhewed that kings are neceſſarily ſuch as he deſcribed them.

[*Q*] *The opinion he entertained of women guilty of adultery . . . . that they were all poiſoners.*] Quintilian ſays, This judgment was an authority that might be alledged by an advocate pleading againſt an adultereſs, who is accuſed of being a poiſoner. *Si cauſſam veneficii dicat adultera, non Marci Catonis judicio damnata videatur, qui nullam adulteram non eandem eſſe veneficam dixit* (83)? Quintilian is in the right to think that this ſentence of Cato was of ſome weight in the cauſes ſpecified by him; but, generally ſpeaking, it is not to be admitted. If it be true, that a huſband has been poiſoned, and that his wife had committed adultery, thoſe who think ſhe is guilty of her huſband's death, go upon ſtrong preſumptions, and may lay great ſtreſs upon her adultery; but it would be wrong to infer, without any exception, that ſince a wife is not faithful to her huſband ſhe will poiſon him. Many ſuch women are kind to their huſbands, and take care of them when they are ſick. In a word, they would by no means poiſon them, though they were of a croſs humour: and therefore Cato's maxim is overſtrained.

[*R*] *It is ſaid that he would not have grown young again*] The words aſcribed to him by Cicero, upon this ſubject are admirable. ‘ (84) Quo quidem me ‘ proficiſcentem (85) haud ſane quis facile retraxerit, ‘ neque tamquam Peliam recoxerit (86); & ſi quis ‘ Deus mihi largiatur, ut ex hac ætate repueriſcam, & ‘ in cunis vagiam, valde recuſem: nec vero velim, ‘ quaſi decurſo ſpatio, ad carceres à calce revocari: ‘ quid enim habet vita commodi? quid non potius laboris? ‘ ſed habeat ſane; habet certe tamen aut ſatietatem, ‘ aut modum; non lubet enim mihi deplorare ‘ vitam, quod multi & ii docti ſæpe fecerunt, neque ‘ me vixiſſe pœnitet: quoniam ita vixi, ut non fruſtra ‘ me natum exiſtimem: & ex vita ita diſcedo, tamquam ‘ ex hoſpitio, non tamquam ex domo: commorandi ‘ enim natura diverſorium nobis, non habitandi ‘ dedit. - - - *While I am going thither, no man ſhould ‘ eaſily prevail upon me to return back, or to have my ‘ fleſh renewed like Pelias. If any god put it in my ‘ choice to grow young again at this age, and to ſquawl ‘ out in a cradle, I ſhould certainly beg to be excuſed; ‘ neither would I incline to begin my race anew, after ‘ having almoſt reached the goal. For what is there in ‘ life ſo much to be deſired? Or rather what things are ‘ in it not diſagreeable? But let us ſuppoſe it to be a ſtate ‘ of pleaſure, there ought to be a fulneſs of that pleaſure, ‘ at leaſt ſome bounds ſet to it. I am not ſorry for having ‘ lived, as many learned men have pretended to be, ‘ neither do I repent of it; becauſe I have lived in ſuch ‘ a manner as to think that I was not born in vain. I ‘ leave the world not as an houſe, but as an inn upon ‘ the road: for nature has provided us with a lodging ‘ for a ſhort ſtay, not for a conſtant habitation.*’ Obſerve the coherence of the maxims of that great man. He was not ſorry that he had lived, he believed he had acted a glorious part upon the ſtage of the world, and yet he would not go through it again, if a god ſhould offer it him (87); and he does not inſiſt upon a reaſon, which he took to be a true one, *viz.* That this life is liable to a thouſand inconveniencies, and has very few conveniencies.

[*S*] *What he told a nobleman whom he ſaw coming out of a bawdy-houſe, ſavours of a looſe morality; but he might have excuſed himſelf by alledging this axiom, that out of two evils the worſt ought to be avoided.*] I think Horace is the only perſon who mentions this particular,

Nil medium eſt. Sunt, qui nolint tetigiſſe, niſi illas,
Quarum ſubſutâ talos tegat inſtita veſte:
Contrà, alius nullam, niſi olenti in fornice ſtantem.
Quidam notus homo cùm exiret fornice, Macte

Virtute

(*s*) See the remark [*O*], towards the end.

(77) Balzac, Diſcours à Madame la Marquiſe de Rambouillet, *pag. m.* 49, 50, *of his* Oeuvres diverſes.

(78) Plut. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 346.

(79) Εἰ δὲ αἰσχρὸν ἐςιν (ὥσπερ ἐςὶν) ἑτέρων παρόντων ασπάζεσθαι καὶ φιλεῖν καὶ περιβάλλειν ἀλλήλȣς. Sed tamen ſi eſt (ut profecto eſt) turpe conjuges in præſentia aliorum blandiri, oſculari, & amplecti ſeſe invicem. *Ibid.* *See, below, citation* (109), (110).

(80) Id. in Præceptis Conjugalibus, *pag.* 139, *D, E.*

(81) Plut. in Caton. Majore, *pag.* 340.

(82) It is a book reprinted very often. Codinus (they are *Vigneul Marville*'s words, *pag.* 70, of the third volume of his *Mêlanges*) in his account of the ceremonies obſerved at the table of the emperors of Conſtantinople, makes me ſweat at the ſight of ſo many myſteries.

(83) Quintil. Inſt. Orat. *lib. v, cap. xi, pag. m.* 244.

(84) Cicero, de Seneƈt. *cap. ult. pag. m.* 452.

(85) That is, to the place whither the ſouls repair when they leave their bodies.

(86) See the remark [*C*], in the article PELIAS, concerning the miſtake that is here.

(87) See the end of the remark [*R*], in the article TULLIA.

of kiſſing their kinſwomen, to know whether they had drunk wine [T]. As for the reſt,

Virtute eſto, inquit ſententia dia Catonis.
Nam ſimul ac venas inflavit tetra libido,
Huc juvenes æquum eſt deſcendere, non alienas
Permolere uxores (88).

That is, as Mr Dacier renders it, ‘ People do not ‘ know how to keep a medium. Some do not care ‘ to meddle with any women, but ſuch ladies as wear ‘ long robes trimmed with purple. Others are only for ‘ common women. Whereupon it is ſaid, that the ‘ Divine Cato ſeeing a man of quality coming out of ‘ a houſe of ill repute, told him: Well done, dear ‘ Sir, go on; thither you ought to go, when you are ‘ inflamed with love, inſtead of debauching your neighbour's wife.’ Here follows Mr Dacier's note upon *Macte virtute eſto* (89): ‘ They are the words of Cato ‘ the Cenſor, who ſeeing a man of quality coming out ‘ of a houſe of ill repute, praiſed him, and exhorted ‘ him to do always ſo; but obſerving afterwards that ‘ he kept there continually, he told him, *Friend, I* ‘ *praiſed you for going thither ſometimes, but not for* ‘ *making your conſtant abode in that place. Adoleſcens,* ‘ *ego te laudavi quòd interdùm huc venires; non quòd hic* ‘ *habitares.*’

[T] *It is a miſtake to ſay that he introduced among the Romans the cuſtom of kiſſing their kinſwomen, to know whether they had drunk wine.*] There is no doubt that the Romans forbad women the uſe of wine, and that to prevent their drinking of it in private, they introduced the cuſtom for men to kiſs their kinſwomen (90); but it is not true that Cato eſtabliſhed that law or that cuſtom. We read in Pliny (91) that one Egnatius Mecenius, who killed his wife, becauſe ſhe had drank wine, was acquitted by Romulus. We read the ſame thing in Servius, upon the 737th verſe of the firſt book of the *Æneid*. The abſolution of that huſband ought not to be looked upon as a ſtrange thing, ſince by the law of Romulus the puniſhment of a wife for her crimes was left to the diſcretion of the huſband and relations; and the two greateſt crimes ſhe could be guilty of, were to be unfaithful to her huſband, and to drink wine. Romulus, when he eſtabliſhed that law, was perſuaded that a woman guilty of adultery would attempt any thing; and that the drinking of wine was the beginning of adultery. This you may ſee in Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (92). It is highly probable, that the firſt king of Rome followed therein the old laws of Italy, among which none was more ancient than that whereby women were forbidden to drink wine; for we find that king Faunus whipped his wife to death, becauſe ſhe drank ſome, contrary to cuſtom. *Sex. Clodius in eo libro quem Græcè ſcripſit, refert Fauni hanc uxorem fuiſſe: quæ quia* CONTRA MOREM, *decuſque regium clam vini ollam ebiberat, & ebria facta erat, virgis myrteis à viro uſque ad mortem cæſa* (93). Plutarch mentions this, as you will ſee hereafter, in a place where I correct a fault, which, as far as I can remember, the critics have taken no notice of.

From what has been ſaid, it ought to be inferred, That Cato the Cenſor was not the author of that law I have been ſpeaking of; and therefore there is a great miſtake in theſe words of Lomeierus: ‘ Apud ‘ Romanos mulieres paſſim oſculo ſalutabantur à pro- ‘ pinquis, quo explorarent, an contra legem temetum ‘ olerent. Inſtitutum hoc erat Catonis teſte Plinio, ‘ lib. xiv. cap. 13 (94). - - - *The Romans ſaluted their* ‘ *kinſwomen wherever they met them, in order to find* ‘ *out whether they had been drinking wine contrary to the* ‘ *law. According to Pliny, this was inſtituted by Cato.*’ This he ſays in his diſſertation concerning kiſſes. He has quoted Pliny, without giving himſelf the trouble to conſult him; for if he had conſulted him, he would have found that Pliny cites Cato, not as having introduced thoſe cuſtoms, but only as a writer, who mentioned them. ‘ Cato *(ſcripſit)* ideo propinquos fe- ‘ minis oſculum dare, ut ſcirent an temetum olerent. ‘ Hoc tum nomen vino erat, unde & temulentia ap- ‘ pellatur (95). - - - *Cato writes, that men kiſſed their* ‘ *kinſwomen for this reaſon, that they might know whe-* ‘ *ther they ſmelt of* temetum, *which at that time was* ‘ *the name for wine; from thence comes the word* temu- ‘ lentia *(ſignifying drunkenneſs).*’ I think Lomeierus took what he ſays from Kempius, whoſe words he read with little attention. He has vented a falſity for want of underſtanding the words of that writer; and another, though he underſtood them. Kempius affirms, That women were forbidden the uſe of wine by Cato's authority; and that afterwards the men began to kiſs their kinſwomen, to know whether they acted contrary to the law. ‘ Poſtmodum Succeſſu temporis ‘ (96) cum ex auctoritate M. Catonis vinum mulieri- ‘ bus interdictum eſſet, primùm viri cognatarum os ‘ cæperunt oſculari, ut odor indicium faceret, ſi bi- ‘ biſſent. *Affinibus & propinquis oſculari eas jus eſt, ut* ‘ *ſobrias comprobent*, inquit *Arnobius Lib. II. adverſus* ‘ *gentes*. Vinum enim mulierem bibiſſe perindè erat, ‘ ac ſi in adulterio ac gravi crimine deprehenſa, capi- ‘ tali ſupplicio plectenda eſſet, ceu *Plinius* habet *Li-* ‘ *bro* XIV. Hiſtor. Nat. cap. 13 (97). - - - *Afterwards* ‘ *in proceſs of time, when women were forbidden the uſe* ‘ *of wine by Cato's authority, men firſt began to kiſs their* ‘ *kinſwomen, that they might diſcover by the ſmell whe-* ‘ *ther they had been drinking*. Arnobius ſays, that ‘ their kinſmen and relations kiſſed them to make ‘ proof of their ſobriety. *For the ſame puniſhment* ‘ *was inflicted upon a woman for drinking, as if ſhe* ‘ *had been convicted of adultery, or ſome other capital* ‘ *crime; according to Pliny Book XIV of his Natural* ‘ *Hiſtory.*’ It is plain that the quotation out of Pliny, at the end of this paſſage, does not concern the beginning of it; and yet Lomeierus made uſe of it to prove what he tranſcribed from Kempius, at the beginning of the Latin words which I have juſt now quoted.

Here is the fault, which, as I have ſaid, has not been obſerved in Plutarch's text. That Hiſtorian having aſked why the Roman ladies carried no myrtle into the chappel of the good goddeſs, though they uſed all other ſorts of leaved branches, anſwers, that the reaſon of it was, becauſe that goddeſs had been married to a man, who whipped her with a rod of myrtle, when he came to know that ſhe had drunk wine. Πότερον (ὡς οἱ μυθολογοῦντες ἱστοροῦσι) Φαυλίου μὲν ἦν γυνὴ τοῦ μάντεως, οἴνῳ δὲ χρησαμένη κρύφα, καὶ μὴ λαθοῦσα, ῥάβδοις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐκολάσθη μυρσίνης (98). That is, as Xylander renders it, *An credendum eſt fabulæ, quæ perhibet Faulii cujuſdam aruſpicis uxorem cùm clàm poto vino non fefelliſſet, à marito virgis myrteis fuiſſe caſtigatam.* The Greek word Φαυλίου ought to be changed into Φαύνου; for not only the author quoted by Lactantius affirms, that the good goddeſs had been married to Faunus, &c (99); but Plutarch obſerves it alſo in the life of Cæſar. Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ νύμφην δρυάδα Φαύνῳ συνοικήσασαν. *Romanam nympham Dryada Fauno nuptam* (100). The Latin tranſlator might have boldly corrected that paſſage, but inſtead of rectifying it, he ſpoils it, and tranſlates it wrong. He ſuppoſes that Plutarch anſwered, that myrtle was not carried into the chapel of the goddeſs, becauſe the wife of one Phaulius had been whipped, &c. This is not the ſenſe of the original; Plutarch does not denote a man who may be called ſlightingly, *quidam, a certain man*; he ſays, That the woman whipped by her huſband was the ſame that was worſhipped at Rome by the name of the *good goddeſs*. Amyot avoided this laſt miſtake, which is the moſt conſiderable. He tranſlates the paſſage in this manner: *Is it becauſe ſome fabulouſly report that ſhe was married to one Flavius a ſoothſayer, and that her huſband having ſurprized her while ſhe was drinking wine privately, whipped her with rods of myrtle.* Boxhornius (101) made no obſervation upon Xylander's tranſlation of thoſe words.

What I have ſaid concerning the cuſtom of the Romans, who kiſſed their kinſwomen, wants a further explanation. Plutarch explains it very well, and it appears from the account he gives of it, that the women went and kiſſed their kinſmen, when they met them. This is a remarkable circumſtance, which the other writers have wholly omitted. *Why*, ſays he (102), *do women kiſs the mouth of their kinſmen? Is it becauſe, as moſt think, women being forbidden to drink wine, a cuſtom was introduced, that they ſhould kiſs the mouth of their kinſmen, when they met them, that thoſe who had drunk ſome might be convicted of it? or for the reaſon alledged by Ariſtotle the Philoſopher* (103) . . . . *or rather, that privilege was granted to the ladies, as a thing that redounded to their honour, when it appeared that they were related to many honeſt men: or becauſe men* reſt, he was both a great Orator and a profound Civilian [*U*]; two qualities which ſeldom meet together, no more than thoſe of eloquent Preacher and learned Divine (*t*). You will ſee in one of the remarks (*u*), in what degree Cato Uticenſis deſcended from him. I have obſerved ſeveral faults in the Hiſtorical Dictionaries and in ſome other writers, which I ſhall ſet down in my ſupplement, where I ſhall give the article of the other illuſtrious Cato's.

---

(88) Horat. Sat. II, lib. i, ver. 28.

(89) Dacier upon this paſſage of Horace, *Tom. vi, pag.* 130, 131, Dutch edition.

(90) See the paſſage of Valerius Maximus, quoted above, in citation (49), of the article EREMITA; and Aulus Gellius, *lib. x, cap. xxiii*; and Tertullian, *in Apologet. cap. vi.*

(91) Plin. *lib. xiv, cap. xiii.*

(92) In the ſecond book of the Roman Antiquities, *cap. xxvi, pag. m.* 93.

(93) Lact. *lib. i, cap. xxii. See alſo* Arnobius, *lib. v, p.* 165, & Plutarch. ubi infra.

(94) Lomeier, Genial. Dierum, *Part i, pag.* 357.

(95) Ibid.

(96) The author had quoted the Canon-Law, and mentioned ſeveral things that happened after Cato: judge therefore whether his *Poſtmodum*, &c. is rightly placed.

(97) Martinus Kempius, Diſſert. XVI, de Oſculis, *pag. m,* 637.

(98) Plut. in Quæſt. Romanis, *pag.* 268, *D.*

(99) See, above, citation (93).

(100) Plut. in Cæſare, *pag.* 711.

(101) He publiſhed, with notes, Plutarch's tract *de Quæſtionibus Romanis*, in Greek and Latin, in the year 1637, in 4to.

(102) Plut. ibid. *pag.* 265.

(103) Viz. that the Trojan ladies having burnt Æneas's fleet, pacified the men by their embraces and kiſſes.

men were not allowed to marry their kinſwomen, the latter were permitted to make much of them, ſo far as to kiſs them, which was the only ſign of kindred amongſt them; for heretofore they did not marry women related to them, as now it is not lawful for them to marry their aunts and ſiſters, and it was a long time before they were allowed to marry their couſins. I need not examine whether the reaſons alledged by Plutarch are very ſolid; I ſhall only conſider the facts mentioned by him, which are worth knowing. It plainly appears from his words, that the women kiſſed the men publickly, as they met them either in the ſtreets, or elſewhere. Civility required that the men ſhould not begin firſt, for it would have looked as if they had ſome ſuſpicion that their kinſwomen had drunk wine. The women were to preſent their mouths, and that very thing was a ſign they were not guilty. Their innocence had been doubtful, had they not boldly and readily offered to kiſs the men. Such a cuſtom at this day would occaſion many new thoughts, and a world of witty conceits and ſorry jeſts, for men are ſometimes very ſweet upon their couſins. A wiſe mother would not be very willing that the couſins of her daughters ſhould have the privilege of knowing whether they ſmell of wine. It is to be obſerved, that Propertius told his unfaithful miſtreſs (104), in a reproachful manner, that ſhe pretended to have more kinſmen than ſhe had, that ſhe might not want kiſſes,

Quin etiam falſos fingis tibi ſæpe propinquos
  Oſcula ne deſint (105) qui tibi jure ferant (106).

Often falſe kinſmen you invent for this,
That you may have a fair pretence to kiſs.

I ſhall conclude this remark, as I have begun it, that is, with cenſuring a fault concerning Cato. Kempius ſays, that he publiſhed a law whereby married people were forbidden to kiſs one another in the preſence of their daughters, and he quotes Plutarch for it. But Plutarch ſays no ſuch thing: we have ſeen above (107) what he ſays upon that ſubject. ‘Nihilominus tamen parcè inter veteres maritale oſculum, & non niſi admodum circumſpectè, ac remotis arbitris, ne liberi ſcilicet inde furtivis amorum illecebris ſtimularentur, M. Catonem Cenſorinum (108) Stoicæ diſciplinæ addictum, edicto prohibuiſſe, ne Maritus conjugem deoſcularetur in præſentiâ filiæ, Manliumque, quem omnium opinio Conſulem deſignabat, Senatu ejeciſſe, quod uxorem coram filia nubili exoſculatus eſſet, Auctor eſt *Plutarchus in Catonis vitâ pag.* 346 (109). - - - *Neverthele ſs among the ancients conjugal kiſſes were given in a very frugal and circumſpect manner, and that too when no body was by; for fear that the children ſhould be inflamed thereat with the hidden temptations of love. Plutarch relates that Cato the Cenſor made a law which forbid the huſband to kiſs the wife before the daughter, and that he degraded the Senator Manlius, who, as every body expected, was to have been conſul for the year following, becauſe he had kiſſed his wife in preſence of their daughter that was grown up.*’ It is not true, that Cato enacted any law, or cauſed it to be enacted on that account. He puniſhed Manlius by the ſole authority of his office, which could not ſerve for a precedent: the Cenſors who ſucceeded him were not obliged to imitate him. I find no other example of ſuch a puniſhment, and it is very likely a great many people uſed the ſame liberty that Manlius took. The laws can hardly extend to ſuch prohibitions; all that can be done, is to give good advice, and make people afraid of being cenſured. I think Clemens Alexandrinus did not blame Cato's ſeverity. See how he adviſes married people to forbear kiſſing one another in the preſence of their ſervants (110).

[*U*] *He was both a great Orator and a profound Civilian.*] See Valerius Maximus (111), and Quintilian (112), or rather, this fine paſſage of Cicero, whereby it appears, that Cato excelled in many things. ‘Quid Marco Catoni præter hanc politiſſimam doctrinam tranſmarinam, atque adventitiam defuit? num quia jus civile didicerat, cauſas non dicebat? aut quia poterat dicere, juris ſcientiam negligebat? at utroque in genere & laboravit, & præſtitit: num propter hanc ex privatorum negociis collectam gratiam tardior in republica capeſſenda fuit? nemo apud populum fortior, nemo melior ſenator, idem facile optimus imperator: denique nihil in hac civitate temporibus illis ſciri, diſcive potuit, quod ille non tum inveſtigarit, & ſcierit, tum etiam conſcripſerit (113). - - - *What elſe was wanting in Marcus Cato, beſides that polite and foreign learning which was newly brought to Rome? Did he forbear to plead cauſes, for having ſtudied the Civil Law? or did he neglect that ſtudy, becauſe he had the art of pleading well? No, he applied himſelf to both with great induſtry and ſucceſs. Was he at all the more remiſs in ſerving the republic, becauſe he had thus acquired a good deal of favour by managing the affairs of private men? None had a greater influence with the people, none was accounted a better Senator, and every body allowed him to be an excellent general. In ſhort there was nothing at Rome in thoſe days that could be either underſtood or learned, which he did not thoroughly enquire into, know, and even write of.*’ Thoſe who have been endowed with the nobleſt talents of rhetoric, and the moſt profound knowledge of the laws have been ſo few, that ſuch a conjunction may well be looked upon as one of the moſt eminent and extraordinary qualities of our Cato. I am not ignorant that Cicero (114) endeavours to prove, that none can be a great Orator without having an univerſal knowledge. ‘Illud eſt, *ſays he* (115), hujus inſtitutæ ſcriptionis, ac temporis, neminem eloquentia, non modo ſine dicendi doctrina, ſed ne ſine omni quidem ſapientia florere unquam, & præſtare potuiſſe. Etenim cæteræ ferè artes ſe ipſæ per ſe tuentur ſingulæ: bene dicere autem, quod eſt ſcienter, & perite, & ornate dicere, non habet definitam aliquam regionem, cujus terminis ſepta teneatur. Omnia quæcunque in hominum diſceptationem cadere poſſunt, bene ſunt ei dicenda, qui hoc ſe poſſe profitetur, aut eloquentiæ nomen relinquendum eſt. - - - *It will be proper to obſerve in this treatiſe that no man was ever famous for his eloquence, who had not acquired, beſides the art of ſpeaking, a kind of univerſal knowledge. For every other art ſtands in a manner ſingly by itſelf: but to ſpeak well, that is, to ſpeak properly, judiciouſly, and ornately, has no particular province to which it is bounded. A man who profeſſes to do this, muſt expreſs himſelf handſomely upon every ſubject that can fall under debate, otherwiſe he muſt give over his pretenſions to eloquence.*’ I know likewiſe that he maintains, that Lucius Craſſus and Marc Antony the Orator, two of the moſt eloquent perſons of their time, were not ignorant men, as ſome believed; and, on the contrary, that they had a great deal of learning (116): but he himſelf owns that experience is againſt him; and if he had not confeſſed it, he might have been eaſily convicted of his error by ſome examples. ‘Et in noſtra civitate, & in ipſa Græcia quæ ſemper hæc ſumma duxit, multos & ingeniis, & magna laude dicendi ſine ſumma rerum omnium ſcientia fuiſſe fateor (117). - - - *I confeſs that both in our city, and in Greece, which always held theſe things in the greateſt eſteem, there have been many endowed with extraordinary parts, and famous for ſpeaking well, though they wanted this univerſal learning.*’ Durſt he have ſaid, that Demoſthenes might be accounted a learned man, if compared with Ariſtotle? Durſt he have ſaid, that Ariſtotle might have compoſed as good orations as thoſe of Demoſthenes? To ſpeak the truth, the talents of eloquence, and a vaſt erudition, do ſeldom meet together. This may be obſerved now, as it was in former times. The moſt famous preachers, generally ſpeaking, have no great ſkill in the Oriental languages and critical learning, and are not very profound Divines. See upon this the New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm (118), where you will find what ſome perſons

---

(*t*) See the remark [*U*].

(*u*) At the end of the remark [*K*].

(104) Cynthia, and not Phryne, as Kempius, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 636, falſly ſuppoſes.

(105) There is in the printed copies *nec deſunt*: I follow Gebhardus's correction.

(106) Propert. Eleg. VI, lib. II.

(107) In the remark [*O*].

(108) It ſhould be *Cenſorium.* It is not true that this Cato was addicted to the ſect of the Stoics. Kempius miſtakes him for Cato Uticenſis, his great-grandſon.

(109) Kempius, ubi ſupra, Diſſert. XV, *pag.* 615.

(110) Clemens Alexandr. Pædagog. *lib. iii, cap. xii, pag. m.* 258.

(111) Val. Maximus, *lib. viii, cap. vii, num.* 1.

(112) Quintil. Orat. Inſtit. *lib. xii, cap. iii, pag. m.* 565.

(113) Cicero, de Oratore, *lib. iii, fol. m.* 95, *B. He had been ſaying in the firſt book, fol.* 66, *A.* Quid vero ille M. Cato? nonne & eloquentia tanta fuit, quantam illa tempora, atque illa ætas in hac civitate ferre maximam potuit, & juris civilis omnium peritiſſimus?

(114) In Libris de Oratore.

(115) Cicero, de Oratore, *lib. ii, init. fol. m.* 71, *B.*

(116) Ibid.

(117) Ibid. *C.*

(118) *Pag.* 624, *& ſeq.*

ſons, well qualified to judge of this matter, have ſaid about it. To which I add the teſtimony of the abbot of Saint Cyran: *You have ſhewed me by experience*, ſays he to a Jeſuit (119), *what I have heard ſay ſeveral times, that it is a very difficult thing to be both a good preacher and a very learned man.* Dr Huarte maintains, that learning and eloquence do not belong to the ſame faculty of the ſoul; that the former belongs to the underſtanding, and the latter to the imagination. See the ninth and tenth chapters of his *Trial of Wits*. Imperialis confutes him as well as he can (120), and does not prove his aſſertion. It is certain, that the Divine Providence diſtributes its gifts in ſuch a manner, that they are commonly ſeparated, ſome fall to one man's ſhare and ſome to another's. Thoſe who have received the gift of obtaining victories do not know how to improve them; and thoſe who might improve a victory, are not qualified to obtain it (121). Thoſe who excel in the knowledge of languages, and matters of fact, are not maſters of reaſoning. It cannot be denied, that, if Bochart did very much exceed M. Claude in learning, he was much inferior to him in urging difficulties, reſolving controverſial objections, and diving to the bottom of a Theological or Philoſophical diſpute. Balzac was a little ſurprized, when he ſaw a ſolid diſcourſe publiſhed by Father Faure, a great preacher (122).

(119) *St Cyran in his* Cenſure de la Somme Theologique du Pere Garaſſe, *pag.* 8, *of the* Avis au Pere Garaſſe.

(120) Joh. Imperialis, in Muſæo Phyſico, *lib. ii, cap. vii.*

(121) See, above, citation (12), of the article CÆSAR.

(122) See the Diſſertation printed at the end of the *Socrate Chrétién*, *pag. m.* 11, *& ſeq.*

PORSENA (CHRISTOPHER) See **PERSONA**.

PORTUGAL (ALFONSO SIXTH OF THAT NAME, KING OF) was born the twenty-eighth of Auguſt 1643. He was hardly ſeven years of age when he diſcovered ſome grains of folly. The diſorder of his mind did not leſſen his ambition it only diſcovered it the more plainly; for prince Dom Theodoſio, eldeſt brother of Alfonſo, dying the fiftheenth of May 1653, Alfonſo did not diſſemble his joy. He made it appear that he ſpoke in earneſt, when, the very firſt day of his brother's illneſs, he ſaid, he ſhould not be ſorry if it proved mortal, ſince he ſhould get a crown by it. He took poſſeſſion of that crown, under his mother's regency the fifteenth day of November, 1656 (*a*). He diſcovered more and more his bad qualities: he paid no regard to his governour's advice: he drew his ſword againſt the firſt perſons he met, and, if he did not kill them, it was not his fault: he ran about the ſtreets in the night with a parcel of rakes: he committed a thouſand violences, and played a thouſand mad tricks, in bawdy-houſes [*A*], and boaſted of it the next day, as of a glorious action. All the means, that were uſed to bring him off from theſe ill courſes proving ineffectual, it was reſolved to remove from him the perſons, who ſpoiled him, and they were carried away by main force out of his apartment. He was very angry at it, and left Liſbon to go to Alcantara. To prevent the ill conſequences of this retreat, the queen-regent, his mother, was obliged to put the government of the ſtate into his hands; which was done at Liſbon with the requiſite ceremonies, the twenty-third of June 1662. From that time three or four great lords, who had engroſſed that young prince, uſed their utmoſt endeavours to bring the queen into diſgrace [*B*], and ſucceeded ſo well in it, that ſhe was forced to execute, in March

---

(*a*) Her name was Loniſa Frances de Guſman. Her huſband, who, being duke of Braganza, became king of Portugal in 1640, died the ſixth of November 1656. See concerning this Revolution an anonymous book, printed at Paris in 1689, with this title, *Hiſtoire de la Conjuration de Portugal.* It was written by the Abbot Vertot, and is not leſs eſteemed than the *Hiſtory of the Revolutions of Sweden*, publiſhed by him in 1695.

[*A*] *He committed a thouſand violences, and played a thouſand mad tricks in bawdy-houſes.*] The relation (1) which affords me this article, informs me, (2) that he ran about the ſtreets with thoſe rakes; that they got into ſcandalous places, where they offered a thouſand violences to women; that he never went out with them in the night, but the next day one might hear many tragical ſtories; that he was dreaded every where as a wild beaſt; that, though he viſited proſtitutes in their own houſes, ſome were brought to his palace; and that he boaſted of ſuch mighty feats with them, as exceeded all belief. After the queen-mother's retreat, he formed two companies, one of foot, and the other of horſe, which he called, *The little and great patrol, conſiſting of the moſt profligate men in the kingdom* (3). He went out every night with them, and attacked every body he met in his way. *His attendants had generally their ſwords drawn, to be more ready to obey his orders; and, the better to ſurpriſe people, they blackened them, leſt the brightneſs of the ſteel ſhould diſcover their deſign. Thoſe who came back with bloody ſwords, were highly commended by the king.* ‘ His debauchery was as exorbitant as ‘ his fury; either he went to leud women, or they ‘ were brought to him at a country-ſeat near Alcan‘tara; and his favourites indulged him in it, to re‘move the report that he was impotent. (4) ’

(1) The title of it may be ſeen in the margin of the text of this article, citation (*b*).

(2) *Pag.* 19.

(3) Ibid. *pag.* 91, 92.

(4) Ib. *p.* 9[illegible].

[*B*] *Three or four great lords uſed their utmoſt endeavours to bring the queen into diſgrace.*] They were not in the wrong to believe, that the queen deſigned to ſet the crown on the head of her ſecond ſon; for, in the reaſons alledged to ſhew the nullity of the marriage, which are printed at the end of the relation, it is ſaid, *That, conſidering the incapacity and impotency of king Alfonſo, the queen, his mother, who was fully perſwaded of it by a private conſultation of her Phyſicians about it . . . . reſolved, during her regency, to put the ſceptre into the hands of the Infant her ſecond ſon.* Alfonſo revenged himſelf: *He was well pleaſed to hear all the queen's actions reflected upon in his preſence.* Some people met at night under the queen's window, *at a time when ſhe uſed to ſhut herſelf up, in order to ſay her prayers, and broke her windows, and gave her ſuch injurious words, as are not fit to be put in writing* (5). Upon a day of the Conception of the Holy Virgin, the king, in the preſence of the whole court, *went by the queen, who ſat in her gallery, without paying her the uſual civility* (6). On the day ſhe left the court, the king ſeemed to be very well pleaſed, and having accompanied her to the country-ſeat ſhe had pitched upon, he left her at the door of the firſt room, without ſhewing her any civility. *He returned to Liſbon in the night on horſeback, being very chearful, and coming up to the coaches of the ladies he met, he ſaid many indecent things to them* (7). Not long before ſhe died, ſhe acquainted her two ſons with the condition ſhe was in: the Infant wept; *but the king was ſo far from being moved with it, that he bantered his brother for his tenderneſs, and oppoſed his deſign of ſetting out immediately* (8). It is certain that queen had a great many vexations on account of her ſon Alphonſo. It is the fate of moſt ſovereigns, and it is not the leaſt miſery that attends them. Of all men, ſovereigns ſtand moſt in need of children, and no men are more diſquieted by them than they are. When they have no children, they ſee either many intrigues carried on, to give them a ſucceſſor, or exceſſive honours paid to another family. When they have children, they are tormented with jealouſy, to ſee the riſing-ſun adored. They are very happy, if they are ſuffered

(5) Ib. *p.* 85.

(6) Ib. *p.* 86.

(7) Ib. *p.* 90.

(8) Ib. *p.* 110.

March 1663, a deſign, which perhaps was not ſo deeply rooted in her heart, as ſhe pretended; I mean, her deſign of leaving the world, to mind only her ſalvation. After ſhe had retired to a country-ſeat, the king indulged his vicious inclinations more than ever, ſo far as to make no account of the outſide of religion [*C*]; which ſhews, that his very favourites could not govern him [*D*]. They were, for ſome time, three or four; but at laſt the count de Caſtelmelhor ſupplanted the reſt, and ſecured his intereſt, by pretending he had diſcovered a horrid conſpiracy [*E*]. The infant Dom Pedro (*b*) was ſuſpected of a deſign to make himſelf king, and met with ſo many occaſions of diſcontent, that he left the court after the king had made his public entry at Liſbon, with his new ſpouſe, the twenty-ninth of Auguſt 1666. The queen-mother died the twenty-eighth of February in the ſame year. The new queen was a French princeſs, but of the houſe of Savoy (*c*). She prevailed with the Infant, by her intreaties, to return to Liſbon, where he had a great deal of vexation. The king gave her alſo a great deal of trouble, upon many occaſions; and from that time there was nothing but complaints and broils. The removal of the count de Caſtelmelhor, upon the repeated ſollicitations of the Infant, did not advance the affairs of that prince. The recalling of Antonio de Souſa de Macedo, ſecretary of ſtate, proved ſuch a terrible blow to the queen, that ſhe reſolved to ſee no body but the king, *who ſaid nothing to her but what was offenſive and indecent.* That ſecretary of ſtate had very much offended the queen, and had been deprived of his office at her ſollicitation; but he was reſtored in an inſulting manner. The Infant reſolved to turn him out at any rate, and went to the palace (*d*) with ſuch a ſtrong guard, that the ſecretary, relying no longer upon the king's protection, left the court. Afterwards the king was prevailed upon to order, that the ſtates ſhould meet the firſt of January 1668; but, before the day came, the queen made uſe of a terrible expedient: ſhe retired into a convent the twenty-firſt of November 1667, and acquainted the king, that ſhe deſigned to return into France; and declared to the ladies, who accompanied her, that her marriage had never been conſummated: ſhe mentioned it in her letter to her pretended huſband. Thus an action for impotency was brought againſt Dom Alfonſo [*F*]; a prince, who made ſuch boaſts of his amorous exploits (*e*). As ſoon as he had read the queen's letter, he went to the convent, and would have cauſed the gates

(*b*) He was the king's only brother.

(*c*) Her name was Mary-Frances-Elizabeth, and ſhe was born the 21ſt of June 1646, from the marriage of Charles Amadeus of Savoy, duke of Nemours, with Iſabella de Vendôme, daughter to the duke of that name, natural ſon of Henry IV.

(*d*) In October 1667.

(*e*) See the remark [*A*].

ſuffered to reign, till they die a natural death: the ſaying of Ovid may be particularly applied to them:

Filius ante diem patrios inquirit in annos (9),

[*C*] *So far as to make no account of the outſide of religion.*] Theſe are the words of the author who is my voucher. 'He had ſo little reſpect for religion, that, without any reaſon, he heard maſs in his own chamber, upon the week-days, whilſt he was in bed, and at an unſeaſonable hour. Upon holy-days, he never went to his chapel till he had dined; which was the reaſon that maſs was never ended in his chapel, but when they were ſinging veſpers in the other churches: And, becauſe he could not be excuſed from hearing ſermons, he ordered the preachers to cut them ſhort. Some, refuſing to obey, were baniſhed, and others would not preach. However, ſome had the courage to exclaim againſt ſuch diſorders; but it was to no purpoſe, becauſe others made their zeal inſignificant by the baſe flatteries which they mixed with their ſermons (10).'

[*D*] *His very favourites could not govern him.*] Doubtleſs, they had ſenſe enough to know, on the one ſide, that nothing could more endanger his crown, than his contempt of holy ceremonies: and, on the other, that an appearance of devotion was the beſt way to cover his irregularities, it was therefore their intereſt to inſpire him with ſuch a policy; ſince therefore, they did not make him a conſtant attendant upon the public exerciſes of devotion, and did not teach him to put on a devout countenance at ſuch hours, which, much more than charity, *covers a multitude of ſins*, we may very well believe, that they could not do it. They had been certainly very ſtupid, had they permitted a young prince, ready to comply with their will, to draw upon himſelf the hatred of the preachers, by ſuch an unpleaſing and mortifying order, as that of making ſhort ſermons. Was it not to wound them in the moſt ſenſible part? Some choſe rather to be baniſhed, or not to preach at all, than to obey that order (11). There was another thing, wherein this prince had no regard for the Preachers. He laughed at comets in the moſt extravagant manner. Here is a paſſage out of the above-mentioned relation. 'At that time there appeared a comet: the king being told that it foreboded the death of kings, or a change in their ſtates, gave it a thouſand hard words from his terras, called it a thouſand names, and fired a piſtol at it.' It was an eaſy thing to draw his true nativity, conſidering what ſort of men he exaſperated, and the great follies he committed.

[*E*] *The count de Caſtelmelhor . . . . ſecured his own intereſt, by pretending he had diſcovered a horrid conſpiracy.*] The pretended diſcovery of a great plot, is a piece of craft frequently neceſſary to prevent conſpiracies, or to get rid of ſuſpected perſons. It is no matter, tho' no body be convicted: an alarm has been raiſed, and due meaſures have been taken to keep people in awe. The count de Caſtelmelhor *made the king believe, that there was a deſign to take away his crown, and at the ſame time ſpread a report, that he had diſcovered that conſpiracy by a divine revelation.* He accuſed the queen, the duke of Cadaval, and ſeveral other perſons, who were out of favour. *It was therefore reſolved, that enquiry ſhould be made into the pretended conſpiracy. . . . . That enquiry laſted a long time, either to ſhew, that they proceeded impartially in the matter, or to ſtrike a greater terror into the accuſed perſons, by exaggerating the pretended diſcoveries that were made every day. . . . Tho' the information laid no charge upon the accuſed, ſome pretended that they were not innocent; but the Judges ſhewed an unſhaken integrity, and moſt of them acquitted the innocent. The accuſed deſired to know what they were accuſed of; but a copy of their accuſation was denied them. And tho' that information ought to have been declared null, as containing no proofs againſt thoſe who were accuſed, yet it was preſerved, by the intereſt of the favourites, as a hand ready to ſtrike a blow, upon another occaſion on the heads of the perſons accuſed* (12). This was a refined piece of policy.

[*F*] *An action for impotency was brought againſt Dom Alfonſo.*] The queen's confeſſor had begun to carry on an intrigue, ſome months before, with count de Schomberg, and confeſſed to him the perplexity that princeſs was in. The king's impotency was one of the firſt things that were revealed to him. 'The queen, being no longer able to live under the conſtraint, which the king's brutality, and the favourite's cruelty, reduced her to, diſcovered to Father de Ville, her confeſſor, that ſhe was extreamly deſirous to acquaint the count de Schomberg with all her misfortunes, and the apprehenſion ſhe was in of ſomething worſe; that the duke of Beaufort, and 'the

(9) Ovid. Metam. lib. i.

(10) Relation, *pag.* 97.

(11) See the foregoing remark.

(12) Relation, *pag.* 100.

gates to be broken open, if the Infant had not prevented it. The next day he told his brother, *in a great paſſion, and in very indecent words, that he was more a man than people thought.* The queen declared, before ſeveral counſellors of ſtate and officers of the crown, the reaſon of her retreat, and that ſhe deſigned to get her marriage declared null. She writ to the chapter of the cathedral church of Liſbon (*f*), and deſired them to take congnizance of that affair. It was immediately propoſed to marry her to the Infant. The brief for a diſpenſation was not long a coming. In a word, they made ſuch diſpatch, in all reſpects, that, on the twenty-third of November 1667, Dom Pedro took poſſeſſion of the royal palace, and, the ſecond of April following, married Mademoiſelle d'Aumale; for ſo ſhe was to be ſtill called. The chapter had declared the marriage null the twenty-eighth of March foregoing [*G*]. I forgot to ſay, that, when Dom Pedro took poſſeſſion of the palace, he ſecured the king's perſon, who, on the ſame day, ſigned a writing, whereby he acknowledged, that he reſigned the kingdom to his brother, of his own motion. The ſtates of the kingdom declared Dom Pedro regent. He might have been proclaimed king, and have added to the royal authority, wherewith he was inveſted, a title which is of great uſe, even when another man is poſſeſſed of the whole monarchical power. Spain made a prudent uſe of this revolution, to conclude a treaty of peace (*g*), which the League, that was concluded, in 1667, between France and Portugal, might have prevented, had not a peace been neceſſary to a kingdom, which had lately got another maſter by ſuch proceedings. This is what I have taken from a book (*h*) printed at Amſterdam. I do not pretend to warrant the truth of it [*H*]; and, if I had ſome authentic and private

‘ the biſhop of Laon, had recommended to her to repoſe an entire confidence in him; ſo that ſhe was perſuaded, he was the only man that could allay her grief, and afford her the means of getting gloriouſly out of the ſad condition ſhe was in. That Jeſuit, who was very faithful to his miſtreſs, and behaved himſelf with great diſcretion and prudence in the midſt of ſo many dangers, approved the queen's deſign, and imparted it to the count de Schomberg; and, becauſe they had a mutual eſteem for each other, he gave him a particular account of the queen's trouble, according to the order he had received, and his own inclination. He alſo told him, that the report about the king's impotency was but too true; and that it was to be feared, the conſequences of it would prove diſmal; that a private door had been lately contrived in the queen's chamber; and that the bed had been placed in ſuch a manner, that one might get into it through that door, without being ſeen by thoſe, who were in the chamber; and that it was to be feared ſomebody would come in that way, to ſupply the king's weakneſs (13).’ This is what I find in the Memoirs of Mr Fremont d'Ablancourt (14); who was very well acquainted with the affairs of the court of Portugal. The queen's confeſſor, and the confeſſor (15) of the infant Dom Pedro, did very much contribute to the revolutions of that country (16).

It muſt be confeſſed, that few perſons have been in a more deplorable condition than that queen, before the revolution: for (17) *the next day after ſhe married king Alfonſo . . . . it appeared, that things did not paſs ſo agreeably between two perſons of their age as might have been expected. At firſt this was only perceived by thoſe, who had the neareſt acceſs to them; but by degrees the thing went farther, and began to lay the foundation of a third cabal in that court, of which the two weakeſt, as it commonly happens, ſided againſt the ſtrongeſt, and at laſt triumphed over it . . .* (18). *The king was not of a more courteous diſpoſition than he had been before his marriage: he went on in his old way, and gave every day new vexations to the queen, ſo far as to declare he was in love with the firſt lady of her chamber . . . The count de Caſtel Melior, his favourite, having* (19) *gained one of the queen's women, whom ſhe truſted moſt, had only an outward reſpect for that princeſs; ſo that the king and his favourite, abating ſome civilities they ſhewed her in public, made it appear that they cared little for her in private. Such an odd conduct gave the queen occaſion to miſtruſt them, and to ſuſpect that they were contriving pernicious deſigns againſt her; but the more ſhe had reaſon to complain, the more ſhe was cautious in expreſſing her reſentment, not knowing whom to truſt. . . . France, from whence ſhe was lately come, was ſtill in her mind; and the deſire ſhe had of doing what was expected from her took up all her thoughts; and therefore ſhe was more willing to diſſemble her grief, than to ſeek a remedy for it. But, though her unhappineſs was very great, ſhe was uneaſy upon another account; for ſhe could not bear the injuſtice that was done to the Infant, and, upon all occaſions, ſhe endeavoured to reſtore him to the king's favour.* How unhappy was this queen! ſhe was at the ſame time both a wife and a maid; ſhe had an impotent and a brutiſh huſband; ſhe was afraid of his ill deſigns; ſhe miſtruſted every body; ſhe ſaw a prince, whom ſhe eſteemed, and who loved her (20), cruelly perſecuted. The king of Portugal had particular reaſons for being civil and complaiſant to his ſpouſe: he ought to have acted like an inſolvent debtor, who endeavours to pacify his creditors by his humility, and great civility, *qui nummos non geſtat in burſa, mel ſaltem habeat in bucca.* He ſhould at leaſt have given good words; but, on the contrary, he abuſed his wife, not conſidering that he could not make amends for his abuſive language. Moſt huſbands, in a like caſe, are humble and complaiſant: they endeavour to ſhew the falſity of the proverb, *That one misfortune is always attended with another.* This is alſo the uſual practice of diſloyal wives; they do whatever they can, by their flatteries and ſubmiſſion, to make their huſbands eaſy with their horns.

[*G*] *The chapter had declared the marriage null, the twenty-eighth of March foregoing.*] Their ſentence imports, that the two parties had done their beſt to conſummate the marriage, without being able to ſucceed in it, and that the whole fault was to be aſcribed to the huſband. I ſhall ſet down their own words ſomewhat at length. ‘It appears, that, during that time (21), having endeavoured both of them to conſummate the marriage, they could not effect it, though they uſed their endeavours towards it, by reaſon of the prince's impotency, which proceeds from an infirmity, which he has had from his childhood, and which is now altogether incurable. Which may be ſufficiently made out by means approved of in law; ſo that the impotency is at leaſt morally certain: and therefore there is no need of an inſpection, or a better proof, ſuch as that of three years, or any other arbitrary time. This whole matter having been examined, with ſome others acts, in conformity to the laws, we judge the marriage, between the ſaid moſt ſerene prince and princeſs, to be contracted *de facto*, and not *de jure*, and we declare it to be void, and that the ſaid prince and princeſs may diſpoſe of themſelves as they ſhall think fit, and divide their eſtates according to the tenor of their contracts (22).’

[*H*] *I do not pretend to warrant the truth of it.*] Who hears but one ſide, hears nothing: I ſhould be very glad to ſee an anſwer of the Count de Caſtelmelhor to the author of the Relation. There is one thing, which I do not underſtand: if the follies of Dom Alfonſo had been ſuch as they are repreſented by that author, they could not have been unknown to the ambaſſadors or envoys of the Moſt Chriſtian King; and, if they knew them, they could not be ignorant, that this

---

(*f*) The archbiſhopric was then vacant.

(*g*) It was concluded the 13th of Febr. 1668. See Wicquefort, *de l'Ambaſſad. Tom. i, pag.* 367.

(*h*) *Intituled,* Relation des Troubles arrivez dans la Cour de Portugal, en l'année 1667 & 1668.

(13) Mémoires de Mr Fremont d'Ablancourt, *pag.* 319, 320.

(14) They were printed in 1701.

(15) He was alſo a Jeſuit.

(16) See the ſame Memoirs, *pag.* 322, *& ſeq.*

(17) Fremont d'Ablancourt, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 294.

(18) Ib. *p.* 295.

(19) Ib. *p.* 296, 297.

(20) The Infant conſidered, that, if *the project of the queen-mother had been executed*, he would have been now in poſſeſſion of what he valued more than the crown, and that he ſhould not have the vexation to ſee ſo beautiful a princeſs (*the queen married to Dom Alfonſo*) ſo unworthily treated. *Ibid. pag.* 294.

(21) That is, the ſpace of ſixteen months.

(22) Relation, *pag.* 218.

private memoirs of the contrary party, I would produce them without any partiality, for or againſt Dom Alfonſo, that the readers might be the better able to judge of the whole matter. That prince was ſo far from appealing from the ſentence, whereby he was declared impotent, that he acquieſced in it *viva voce*, and by writing. The new married couple, having lived together for ſome time, demanded the Pope's diſpenſation, for the greater precaution, to confirm that, which the cardinal de Vendoſme, legate *à latere* in France, ſent them before they married. The Pope granted their requeſt. It is certain that the queen alledged great motives of conſcience, to get her marriage diſſolved (*i*) [*I*]; and that it would be unreaſonable to put a malicious

(*i*) Taken from the ſame Relation.

this prince was in a condition, wherein private men are not allowed to diſpoſe of their eſtates. Thoſe who are guilty of ſuch follies, uſe to be ſhut up, or at leaſt are put under the guardianſhip of their relations. How comes it then, that the miniſters of France did not acquaint the king their maſter, when the marriage of Dom Alfonſo was on foot, that he was a madman, and, beſides, ſuſpected of impotency? It has been ſaid, that princeſſes are victims ſacrificed to the intereſt of the ſtate; which was never truer than with reſpect to Mademoiſelle d'Aumale. The favourites of Dom Alfonſo ſuborned a woman to declare, that the king had got her with child (23): but ſhe ſwore afterwards that it was falſe. The author of the relation (24) lays a great ſtreſs upon that woman's oath; but he had no reaſon for it: what ſhe ſaid ought not to be regarded; for, ſince ſhe could tell a lie at the ſollicitation of a favourite, ſhe might as well tell a lie againſt a prince, who was a priſoner, and near being depoſed. Such retractations ſhould not be admitted as an evidence: whoever will be ſuborned to ſay a thing, may as well be ſuborned to deny it (25).

(23) Relation, *pag.* 96.

(24) *Pag.* 248.

(25) *Confer quæ ſupra*, in the article CALVIN, remark [*T*].

[*I*] *The queen alledged great motives of conſcience, to get her marriage diſſolved.*] This wants to be explained; otherwiſe one would be apt to think, that the queen, miſtruſting her temper, and not being able to oppoſe the inclinations of nature, had a mind to make uſe of the lawful remedy, which ſhe did not find in the perſon of Dom Alfonſo. In a word, one would be apt to think, that ſhe had not the gift of continence; and that ſhe wanted a huſband, for fear of tranſgreſſing the laws of chaſtity. But this would be a wrong interpretation of the motives of conſcience alledged by her. It is therefore neceſſary to explain the matter, in order to prevent the falſe judgments of the readers.

I. Dom Alfonſo, notwithſtanding his impotency, was a very unchaſte and leud man; and therefore he was guilty of ſin in that reſpect, and brought the ſame guilt upon the queen; for the looſeſt Caſuiſts are agreed, that, without certain conditions, which were wanting in Alfonſo, it is a piece of leudneſs in a huſband to come near his wife, and in a wife to permit it. This cannot be more particularly explained in our language. It is not likely that a perſon of her rank, whoſe ſteps are expoſed to the public view, would have engaged, without an extreme neceſſity, in a ſuit, wherein an hundred things, contrary to modeſty, were to be diſcuſſed.

II. The queen knew, that the king and his favorite would never conſent to Dom Pedro's marriage; and therefore, ſince the king was not in a capacity to get children, ſhe could no longer diſſemble, without expoſing the kingdom of Portugal to diſmal revolutions, which ſhe thought herſelf obliged to prevent, not only out of love for that kingdom, but alſo out of conſcience.

III. Whenever the king had a mind to ſport with a young woman, he made uſe of a fore-runner: one of his favourites broke the ice, and then the prince did his beſt to get in through the breach He deſigned to uſe the queen in the ſame manner; and therefore the queen was obliged in honour and conſcience to get herſelf diſengaged from ſuch an huſband.

Thoſe three things want to be proved; and therefore I ſhall ſet down what I find in the *Reaſons alledged for the invalidity of that marriage*(26).

(26) Relation, *pag.* 251.

What follows concerns the firſt point. ‘Conſcience continually dictated to her majeſty, that, after a tedious experience of ſixteen months, ſhe was obliged to part with the king, without deſiring to make a longer trial, eſpecially conſidering, that, being fully ſenſible of his incurable impotency, and having frequently conſulted her confeſſor about it, to manage that important affair with greater ſecrecy, the ſame confeſſor, having maturely conſidered the thing, and what he was to ſay about it, declared before God, that he believed her majeſty was no longer obliged to do violence to her conſcience, by cohabiting with the king.’ As to the ſecond head, I refer the reader to the two hundred and fifty ſecond page of the relation.

What concerns the third head is contained in the following words. The queen ſaw her honour, *which was always dearer to her than the crown, and her own life* (27), ‘expoſed to great dangers, and had very good reaſons to think ſo. Though it be never ſo neceſſary to mention them, yet virtue and modeſty will not allow me to ſay more of the matter, than what is abſolutely neceſſary to give a right notion of it. One of thoſe reaſons was, that, though the king knew he ſhould never be able to get children, yet he expreſſed a very great deſire of getting ſome; to be reſtored (28) to the throne by that mean, and to put an end to the common report of his impotency, which made him more uneaſy than his own weakneſs. And therefore, the more he was ſenſible of his impotency, the more he endeavoured to ſhew the contrary, by proſtituting himſelf to all ſorts of women, hoping to keep his crown by that means, and to vex his brother to death, whom he mortally hated, becauſe he ſaid, and knew for certain, that his majeſty would never get any children, by reaſon of his impotency. The other reaſon is, That the queen was not ignorant of what was then kept ſecret, and which the judges afterwards came to know, by the declaration of the perſons concerned, viz. that, when the king had a mind to lie with a maid, not being able to do it himſelf, by reaſon of his impotency, he cauſed her to lie, in his chamber, and in his own preſence, with one of his favourites, to make the thing more eaſy to him; though, after all, he did not ſhew himſelf more a man than before; as it appears from the depoſitions of thoſe concerned in it, who have ſworn it upon the holy goſpel. And what made the queen moſt apprehenſive, that the king, without any regard to his honour and conſcience, had ſuch a deſign upon her, was her being continually ſollicited, in the king's name, towards the latter end of April, 1667, by his moſt intimate favourites Enrigo Enriguez de Miranda, and the Count de Caſtelmeglior, with the marchioneſs his mother, lady of honour to her majeſty, to remove in the night from her apartment, (where the king had made hitherto no difficulty to come to her) into that of his majeſty, to lie with him (29), contrary to the ancient form, and the uſual cuſtoms of the palace, and without any apparent neceſſity. And, becauſe the queen declined it ſeveral times, with all poſſible gentleneſs, alledging for her reaſon, not that which made her moſt apprehenſive (30), (for, notwithſtanding this new uneaſineſs, ſhe would have complied with the king's will, having always been very ſubmiſſive to him) but modeſty, which will not allow a woman of honour, much leſs a princeſs and queen, to make, without any neceſſity, ſuch an extraordinary alteration; which doubtleſs would have occaſioned ſeveral reflexions upon her's and the king's reputation; the king fell into ſuch a paſſion, that, in the night of the ſame day, he had a mind to drag her out of her bed into his apartment. But, after many threatnings and hard words, holding a dagger in his hand, he told her, that ſhe muſt reſolve upon it in twenty-four hours; and then, if ſhe refuſed to comply with his deſires, he ſwore he would drag her, or get her dragged by four footmen. The queen was ſenſibly afflicted at it; and therefore the next day ſhe ordered her confeſſor to complain of it to the count, and to deſire him to prevent it, proteſting, that ſhe had rather die than do what the

(27) Ibid. *pag.* 253.

(28) This is a very improper word: for king Alfonſo had not been dethroned yet.

(29) Compare with this the remark [*F*], towards the end, where mention is made of another device, which made the Queen uneaſy.

(30) I put here a NOTA BENE, becauſe the author expreſſes himſelf in ſo intricate a manner, that it requires great attention to underſtand his meaning.

malicious conſtruction upon the deep melancholy which appeared in her face [*K*], as ſoon as ſhe was ſenſible of her huſband's weakneſs. Dom Alfonſo was ſent into the iſle of Tercera, where he continued ſeveral years: but there being ſome reaſon to fear, that the enemies of the ſtate would reſcue him from that place, in order to raiſe troubles in the kingdom, he was removed to a ſafer place, viz. the caſtle of Cintra, ſeven leagues from Liſbon, where he died of an apoplexy, the twelfth of September 1683 (*k*).

The queen of Portugal, formerly his wife, followed him ſoon after; for ſhe died at Palhavam, the twenty-ſeventh of December 1683 (*l*), being in the thirty-eighth year of her age. Her only daughter, the Infanta of Portugal, was born the ſixth of June 1669, and contracted to the duke of Savoy in 1679. That marriage was made public in the council of ſtate of Portugal, on the fifth of September: the ſtates of the kingdom were aſſembled to ratify it, and to derogate from a law, whereby the princeſſes of the royal family, who marry foreign princes, are excluded from the crown (*m*) [*L*]. Notwithſtanding which, this marriage was broke, before the duke of Savoy ſaw the Infanta: ſhe died, without having been married, the twenty-firſt of October 1690. The queen her mother took great care of her education: *ſhe wrote with her own hand ſome inſtructions* for the Infanta, *which were found after her death* (*n*), and are very fine. They may be ſeen at length in the Mercure Galant for the month of May 1684 (*o*). King Dom Pedro married, in 1687, a daughter of the Elector Palatine, who died in the year 1699, aged thirty-three years (*p*). Several particulars are to be found in the Memoirs of Mr Fremont d'Ablancourt, printed in 1701, concerning Dom Alfonſo's reign, the diſſolution of his marriage, his depoſition, &c.

Since I have mentioned the mariage of the duke of Savoy with the Infanta of Portugal, it may not be improper to add here, that it was thought the court of France had greatly influenced this affair. The reaſoners have not failed to argue hereupon, and to alledge ſeveral motives, with as much confidence, as if they had been let into the ſecrets of the cabinet. I will not examine what they relate: I will only point out a book, in which one of their lies has been refuted (*q*).

(*k*) *Taken from the* Mercure Galant, *for October* 1683.

(*l*) Mercure Galant, *for February* 1684, *pag.* 123.

(*m*) Taken from the Paris Gazette.

(*n*) Mercure Galant, *for May* 1684, *pag.* 23, 24.

(*o*) *Pag.* 25, & *ſeq.*

(*p*) *See* l'Eſprit des Cours de l'Europe, *for September* 1699, *pag.* 480.

(*q*) *The fifth volume of the* Reply to the Queſtions of a Provincial, *ch. vi.*

‘ king deſired, or any thing unworthy of her. This, together with the fear that was imprinted in the queen's mind, is the reaſon why from that time ſhe never thought herſelf ſafe, whilſt ſhe remained expoſed to a danger, which ſhe could not ſo well avoid at another time, as ſhe did then; eſpecially conſidering, that the woman, whom her majeſty ought to have placed the moſt confidence in upon ſuch an occaſion, viz. her lady of honour, was the perſon whom ſhe had moſt reaſon to miſtruſt, by reaſon of the advice ſhe had given her, becauſe ſhe was the mother of the king's favourite, and openly expreſſed a great deſire that the queen ſhould have children by any means whatever, in order to make her's and her ſon's fortune; having ſaid, in expreſs words, to the confeſſor, in a conference they had together upon that ſubject, in order to perſuade him to prevail with the queen to change her bed and apartment, that it would be only for five or ſix nights, and then ſhe aſſured him, that the king would go to the queen as he did before.’

[*K*] *The deep melancholy, which appeared in her face.*] If any one aſks, how I come to know, that the queen was melancholy, he need only read the following paſſage, which is to be found among the reaſons alledged for the invalidity of that marriage. ‘ The firſt time the king lay with the queen. which was three or four days after ſhe arrived in Portugal, that princeſs was ſo ſenſible of his impotency, tho' ſhe was ignorant of things of that nature, that her confeſſor, who perceived ſhe was very melancholy, and ſuſpected the truth of what was ſaid, having taken the liberty to aſk her, out of confeſſion, with all due modeſty and civility, whether there was any ground for what was reported, or whether ſhe might quickly expect to ſee the fruits of her marriage; ſhe anſwered him (as may be ſeen in the proceedings) in ſuch a manner, as made him ſenſible of what ſhe thought already of the ſtate of her marriage, and of the king's inability to get children (31).’ I ſhould be glad to ſee a book lately publiſhed (32).

[*L*] *And to derogate from a law, whereby princeſſes, who marry foreign princes, are excluded from the crown.*] It is called, The law of Lamego. It was made by Dom Alfonſo Henriquez, the firſt king of Portugal, in the ſtates general aſſembled at Lamego, after the victory he obtained over five Mooriſh kings at the battle of Urica, in the year 1139. It is enacted by that law, that the princeſſes of the royal blood, who marry foreigners, cannot ſucceed to the crown. It is by virtue of that law, that the dukes of Parma were excluded from the crown of Portugal, tho' they are deſcended from the princeſs Mary, eldeſt ſiſter of Catherine, grandmother to king Dom Pedro (33).

(31) Relation, *pag.* 250.

(32) I have been told juſt now, that the hiſtory of this Princeſs, written by Father Orleans, a Jeſuit, has been publiſhed at Paris in May 1696. This I ſaid in the firſt edition; and now I hear that this hiſtory has been reprinted at Amſterdam, and yet I have not been able to ſee it.

(33) I have taken this from a Paris Gazette of the year 1679.

POZZUOLO, in Latin *Puteoli*, a town in the kingdom of Naples, has now but ſome few inconſiderable remains of its ancient luſtre. It was built by the Samians, in the fourth year of the LXIVth Olympiad, which was the 232d year of Rome (*a*). It was called *Dicæarchia* (*b*). It did belong, for ſome time, to the inhabitants of Cumæ, who made it their harbour (*c*). The Romans conquered it, during the ſecond Punic war, in the year of Rome 538, and put a ſtrong garriſon in it (*d*). They made it a colony twenty years after, and changed its name into that of *Puteoli* (*e*) [*A*]. It was one of the beſt ports they had upon that ſea [*B*]. It became very conſiderable for the beauty of the public ſtructures that were

(*a*) Euſeb. in Chron.

(*b*) By contraction Dicharchia. The Latin Poets made uſe of that word, even when it was called Puteoli.

(*c*) Strabo, *lib. v.*

(*d*) Livius, *lib. xxiv.*

(*e*) Livius, *lib. xxxii*, & *xxxiv. See alſo the inſcription given by Andreas Schottus,* in Itinerario Italiæ, *Part iii.*

[*A*] *Into that of Puteoli.*] Either becauſe of the great number of wells, or by reaſon of the ill ſmell of the hot waters (1).

[*B*] *It was one of the beſt ports the Romans had on that ſea.*] The merchantmen of Alexandria had their ſtore-houſe there, as it appears from theſe words of Seneca. ‘ Subito hodie nobis Alexandrinæ naves apparuerunt, quæ præmitti ſolent & nunciare ſecuturæ claſſis

(1) Strabo, *lib. v.*

were raiſed in it (*f*), I mean its Temples, Circus's, Theatres, and Amphitheatres. The country-houſes, which the moſt wealthty citizens of Rome, and Cicero, among the reſt, built near that town, contributed ſtill more to make it famous (*g*). Some ſay its purple was more valued than that of Tyre [*C*]. I ſhall ſay nothing of its baths; every body knows they were very famous [*D*]; and they are ſo to this day. Auguſtus (*h*) and Nero (*i*) ſent new colonies thither. It was burnt down by Alaric, in the 410th year of the Chriſtian Æra, and by Genſeric in the year 455 (*k*). Totila took it ninety years after, or thereabouts; and it was then diſmantled, and plundered with ſuch fury, that it remained uninhabited for the ſpace of ſixteen years. The Greeks having rebuilt it, it recovered itſelf by degrees, ſo that it was a good place, when Romuald II, duke of Benevento, made himſelf maſter of it in the year 715, and deſtroyed it with fire and ſword. It was plundered by the Hungri in the Xth century. After ſeveral revolutions, it fell at laſt into the power of Alfonſo of Arragon, king of Naples, in the XVth century. Earthquakes have made ſtrange devaſtations in this town, at ſeveral times, eſpecially in the year 1538 (*l*). The place, wherein Gaſſendus mentions them, will give me occaſion to obſerve a miſtake of his abbreviator [*E*]. I ſhall alſo take notice of a blunder of Benjamin Tudelenſis [*F*].

(*f*) See the Antiquities of Pozzuolo, written by Scipio Mazzella.

(*g*) Ibid.

(*h*) Frontin. de Colon.

(*i*) Tacitus, Annal. *lib. xiv.*

(*k*) Scip. Mazzella, ubi ſupra.

(*l*) Taken from the ſame Scipio Mazzella.

' claſſis adventum; tabellarias vocant. Gratus illorum ' Campaniæ adſpectus eſt: omnis in pilis Puteolorum ' turba conſiſtit - - - In hoc omnium diſcurſu prope' rantium ad litus, magnam ex pigritia mea ſenſi vo' luptatem (2). - - - - *This day, on a ſudden, we had* ' *a ſight of the Alexandrian ſhips, which are uſually* ' *diſpatched before, to give notice that the fleet will ſoon* ' *arrive, they call them* tabellariæ. *The ſight is pleaſing to* ' *the people of Campania, who ſtand in crowds on the* ' *ſhore of Puteoli . . . Whilſt every one elſe ran in haſte* ' *to the ſtrand, I found great pleaſure in my own lazi*' *neſs.*'

[*C*] *Some ſay its purple was more valued than that of Tyre.*] Scipio Mazzella ſays ſo, and quotes Pliny for it: however it is certain, that Pliny does not ſpeak of the purple, but of a kind of vermillion with ſome purple in it. Theſe are Mazzella's words: ' *Fù da gli antichi* ' *tenuta in gran ſtima la purpura, che ſi faceva in* ' *Pozzuolo, che per la bontà & eccellenza ſua avanzava* ' *quelle di Tirio, de Getulico, e del Laconico, ch'erano* ' *purpure pretioſiſſime. Di che Plin. nel.* 35. *lib. al* 6. ' *capo della purpura parlando così ſcrive.* Quare Puteo' lanum potius laudatur, quàm Tyrium aut Getuli' cum, unde precioſiſſimæ purpuræ (3). - - - *The purple* ' *of Puteoli was held in great eſteem by the ancients, as* ' *exceeding in goodneſs thoſe of Tyre, Gætulia, and La*' *cedæmon, which were the moſt valuable purples, ac*' *cording to Pliny, lib. xxxv. cap.* 6.' He ſhould have conſidered, that the word *Puteolanum* is to be referred to *purpuriſſum è creta argentaria*, which Pliny had been ſpeaking of: women uſed it for a paint (4).

[*D*] *Its baths . . . were very famous.*] See the treatiſe of John Eliſius, a Phyſician, *de Balneis Puteolanis*, corrected and enlarged by Scipio Mazzella: it is printed at the end of the Antiquities of Pozzuolo. There are in it ſome Latin verſes, written by Alcadinus in praiſe of thoſe baths. Alcadinus was born at Syracuſe, and his father ſent him to Salerno, to ſtudy there, where he made ſo great a progreſs in Philoſophy and Phyſic, that he was quickly made profeſſor of thoſe two ſciences. He acquired ſo great a reputation in Phyſic, that ſeveral princes deſired to have him. He cured the emperor Henry VI, who fell dangerouſly ſick in the kingdom of Naples, and ever after he was a favourite of that emperor, who beſtowed many preſents upon him. After Henry's deceaſe, he was Phyſician to the emperor Frederic II, and made, at his requeſt, the verſes I ſpeak of. He flouriſhed in the year 1191, and lived fifty-two years (5). Thomas Bartholinus does not mention him in his catalogue of Phyſicians, who have been Poets.

[*E*] *A miſtake of his abbreviator.*] Gaſſendus ſays, that earthquakes do ſometimes produce mountains in the continents, and iſlands in the ſea. As to the mountains, he alledged what happened near Pozzuolo, in the year 1538. ' Mirabilius videri poteſt, *ſays he* ' (6), enaſci ex oppoſito non modo in continentibus ' montes, ſed etiam in medio mari inſulas. Nam de ' montibus quidem facit fidem Puteolanus ille, quem ' Simon Portius * ita deſcribit, ut fuerit una nocte ad ' pluſquam M. paſſuum altitudinem, ex pumicibus, ci' neribuſque congeſtus; id nempe ſub finem Septem' bris, anni M. D. XXXVIII. - - - - *It may ſeem* ' *more ſtrange, that not only mountains, ſhould ariſe on* ' *the continent, but iſlands likewiſe in the ſea. As to* ' *mountains, it is confirmed by what Simon Portius re*' *lates of one that was thrown up near Puteoli, conſiſt*' *ing of pumice-ſtones and aſhes, about the end of Sep*' *tember* 1538.' Though Berneir was a man of learning, he miſtook a word in this paſſage, the ſenſe of which is very plain. He did not conſider, that Puteolanus ought to be referred to *terræ motus*; but he made an author of it. *What is no leſs ſurpriſing*, ſays he (7), *is, to ſee mountains of pumice-ſtones and aſhes ariſe in one night, in the middle of a continent, as Puteolanus relates.* Which puts me in mind of the *Hexameron Ruſtique*, wherein la Mothe le Vayer obſerves, that *du Pinet* —— *made two Roman gentlemen of two kinds of marble* (8), and that Coëffeteau (9) ſpeaks of Captain Corſinius, inſtead of the town of Corfinium.

[*F*] *The blunder of Benjamin Tudelenſis.*] He ſays, not only that the town Puteoli was called Surrentum in former times, but alſo that it was built by Tſintſan Hadar-Ezer, who betook himſelf to flight for fear of king David. *Ulterius profectus fui Puteolos quondam Surentum dictum, urbem magnam, quam olim condidit Tſintſan Hadar Ezer, quum metu Davidis regis (in pace quieſcentis) aufugiſſent* (10). Thoſe two falſities have been taken notice of by Mazzella (11), and Conſtantin l'Empereur (12), and afterwards by Pinedo (13), who obſerves, that this Tſinſan Hadar is mentioned in the ſecond book of Samuel, chap. viii. v. 3. and that the ſuppoſititious Joſeph Ben-Gorion, tells the ſame fabulous ſtory in the third chapter of his firſt book. This ſhews the ſpirit of the Jewiſh nation, and even of all others. Every people fancies, that their great men have performed many things in the remoteſt countries. David, whoſe name was unknown in Italy, till the Romans read Joſephus, and who lived about three hundred years before the foundation of Rome, did ſo fright Romulus, if Benjamin may be credited, that this founder of Rome dug out a way of fifteen miles under the mountains near Puteoli to hide himſelf. *Hinc per milliaria quindecim ſub montibus iter conficitur. Operis author eſt Romulus, qui Romam condidit, atque hæc omnia fecit cum ſibi à Davide Iſraelitarum rege & Joabo exercitus duce metueret. Alia etiam cum ſupra, tum infra montes urbis Neapolis exſtruxit* (14). Here follows the note of Conſtantin l'Empereur: it contains an exclamation, which is not too vehement, conſidering the impertinence of that rabbin. ' Quis ' ad tantum ſtuporem non obſtupeſcat? coætaneos fa' cit Davidem & Romulum, quum trecentis circiter ' annis poſt Davidem regnare cœperit. Quod in du' bium vocari non poteſt; ſed ex diverſis hiſtoricis ' conſtat, & paſſim à Chronologis obſervatum, quo' rum verba repetere neceſſe non eſt in tanta luce. ' Huic parallelum eſt, quum Romulum talparum ' more in terram ac longiſſimas ſpecus ſe recepiſſe fin' git, ſive eas metu Davidis, qui ante aliquot ſecula ' mortem obierat, excavaſſa ſcribit. Quis ad hujuſ' modi non ſtomachetur? ſi nos ita aberraremus, quàm ' ſuperbe nobis Judæi inſultarent (15). - - - *Who is* ' *not aſtoniſhed at ſuch ſtupidity? he makes David and* ' *Romulus cotemporaries, when the latter began his reign* ' *about three hundred years after David: which cannot* ' *be doubted, but is evident from ſeveral Hiſtorians, and* ' *conſtantly obſerved by the Chronologers; whoſe words I* ' *need not repeat in ſo clear a point. Parallel to this is,*

---

(2) Seneca, Epiſt. LXXVII, init. *Compare what* Suetonius *ſays, in* Auguſt. *cap. xcviii.*

(3) Scipione Mazzella, Antichita di Pozzuolo, *pag.* 6, & 7, *Edit. Napol.* 1606, *in* 8*vo.*

(4) Quiaque iſtas buccas tam belle purpuriſſatas habes. *Plautus, in Trucul. Act. II, Sc. II, ver.* 35. *See alſo the ſame* Plautus, in Moſtell. *Act. I, Sc. III, ver.* 101.

(5) *Taken from* Scipio Mazzella, de Balneis Puteolanis, *pag.* 260.

(6) Gaſſendus, Phyſicæ, §. *iii, membro I, lib. i, cap. vi, pag.* 50, *Oper. Tom. ii.*

* Epiſt. de Conſl. agri Put.

(7) Bernier, Abrégé de la Philoſophie de Gaſſendi, *Tom. v, pag.* 127, *Lyons* 1684.

(8) See the article PINET, citation (26).

(9) In the 18th chapter of the 3d book of his tranſlation of Florus.

(10) Benj. Itiner. *pag.* 14, *Edit. Lugd. Bat.* 1633.

(11) Mazzella, Antichita di Pozzuolo, *pag.* 4, & 5.

(12) L'Empereur, Notis in Benj. Itiner. *pag.* 159.

(13) Pinedo, in Stephanum Byzantinum, voce Δικαιάρχεια, *pag.* 236.

(14) Benjam. ibid. *pag.* 15.

(15) L'Empereur, ubi ſupra.

‘*his making Romulus hide himſelf under ground like a mole, for fear of David, who had been dead ſome centuries before. Who can ſwallow ſuch abſurdities? If we were guilty of the like, how haughtily would the Jews inſult us?*’

PRADILLHON (JOHN BAPTIST) born in the Limouſin, ‘retired when very young to the ſolitude of the Feuillants, the abbey and chief of the order in the dioceſe of Rieux. The cloyſter preſently acknowledged his merit; from the age of twenty-five years he ſhared in the government, and at the age of forty he became its judge and head. This election was repeated four times, and, if the laws of their condition had not oppoſed it, the eſteem and inclination of his Monks would have continued him always in this poſt (*a*). . . . . . He died at Paris in his monaſtery of the ſtreet of St Honoré, the twenty-fifth of September, 1701 (*b*)’. I will take ſome notice of the books he publiſhed [*A*].

(*a*) Mercure Galant, *month of October* 1701, *pag.* 253.

(*b*) Ib. *p.* 263.

[*A*] *I will take ſome notice of the books he publiſhed.*] ‘The intimate acquaintance and familiarity, which there was at Rome between him and the learned Fagnanus, where he was procurator-general at that court, has procured us a practical treatiſe of the Canon-Law, which not only the monks, but the eccleſiaſtics alſo, conſult in matters of diſcipline. It is not eaſy to collect together in a large volume ſo great a number of important matters, with ſo much order and perſpicuity, as is contained in this ſmall volume. The Feuillant nuns of Toulouſe owe to it the diſcovery of the ſecret and almoſt incredible auſterities of their firſt mothers. The public has reliſhed his accounts (1).’ He is the author of a book, intituled, *The conduct of Don John de la Barriere, firſt abbot of the Feuillants, during the troubles of the League, and his attachment to the ſervice of king Henry III.* This work was printed in 1699: the *Journal des Savans* of the thirteenth of September, 1700, has given an abſtract of it. Pradilhon had taken ſeveral journeys, *for the good of his congregation,* which gave him acceſs *to the moſt celebrated archives of the provinces of the kingdom. As he had a great deal of diſcernment with reſpect to ancient writings, and an honeſty proof againſt all intereſt, the learned referred themſelves to his extracts alone: the teſtimony of the famous Mr Baluze, in his Popes of Avignon, is to him inſtead of an entire elogium. The nobility willingly truſted him with the examination into their titles; but he had ſtudied that matter by way of amuſement; but his modeſty would never ſuffer him to publiſh what he had written on that ſubject* (2).

(1) Mercure Galant, *month of October* 1701, *pag.* 255, 256.

(2) Mercure Galant, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 259, &c.

PRÆPOSITUS (NICOLAS) was a Phyſician at Tours, and compoſed a Diſpenſatory, which is full of thefts, if we believe the author I am going to cite [*A*]. The Sieur Konig (*a*) calls him a Phyſician of Salernum. It is a miſtake.

(*a*) In Biblioth. vet. & nova. *pag.* 661.

[*A*] *He compoſed a Diſpenſatory, which is full of thefts, if we believe the author I am goiug to cite.*] This author's name is John de Renou: I have given his article. He informs us (1), that there have been four Phyſicians, named Nicolas each of which has written a Diſpenſatory, and that, among theſe, he, who is ſirnamed Præpoſitus, formerly a Phyſician at Tours, ‘has made no ſcruple to ſeize to himſelf the honour and labour of the other three, by tranſcribing word for word, and attributing to himſelf, the antidotary of a certain Pharmacographer, named James des Parties (2), which had been before compiled and tranſcribed by Nicolas Myrepſus, and other Antidotariographers; and, beſides this, has maliciouſly concealed the ſirname of the ſaid Nicolas's, the better to hide the manifeſt theft he has been guilty of from their writings, and has been contented to put at the head of the compoſitions, which he ſtole from them, the ſaid name of Nicolas alone, without ſpecifying the ſirname of Nicolas of Alexandria, Nicolas of Florence, or Nicolas of Salernum; from whom he has taken (and they from the above ſaid James des Parties) what he falſly aſcribes to himſelf.’ He has deceived many perſons; for *the common Apothecaries look upon him as the true and rightful author of all the barbarous and groſs compoſitions, which are in a certain vulgar and trivial Diſpenſatory, in the frontiſpiece of which he has put his name and ſirname. But he has been ſo malicious, that he has put his name alone at the head of each compoſition, to make it be believed, that he is the author of it, tho' the contrary is very well known.* This may be of uſe to thoſe writers, who would continue the liſt of plagiaries begun by Thomaſius.

The author of *Lindenius renovatus* (3), citing the Chronology of the Phyſicians, compoſed by Wolfgang Juſtus, affirms, that Nicolas Præpoſitus ſeems to be the ſame as Nicholas Myrepſus, ſirnamed the Alexandrian, and that it is ſaid, he was a Phyſician at Lyons about the year 1524. Now this Wolfgang Juſtus had ſaid (4), that *Nicolaus Myrepſus Alexandrinus, Præpoſitus alias dictus,* lived among the modern Greeks about the year 1198, and (5) that Nicolaus Alexandrinus lived before Ægineta, i. e. before the year 420 (6). Judge a little, I pray, whether he conſidered the matter nearly. We find in *Lindenius renovatus* (7), that the *Diſpenſatorium Nicolai Præpoſiti ad Aromatarios, ſive Introductiones in Artem Apothecariatus,* was printed at Lyons, in 1505 and 1536, in 4to; and at Paris, in 1582, in 4to.

(1) John de Renou, in the 6th book of the *Antidotary, ch. vi, pag.* 751, *Edit. of Lyons* 1637. See alſo his *Introduction to Pharmacy, ch. xvii, pag.* 489; and in the preface, and the 3d chapter of the 5th book of the *Antidotary, & alibi paſſim.*

(3) *Pag.* 842.

(4) Ib. *p.* 840.

(5) Ib. *p.* 829.

(6) Ib. *p.* 865.

(7) *Pag.* 842.

---

(2) The author of *Lindenius renovatus* ſays, *pag.* 490, that *Jacobus de Partibus*, born at Tournay, was Phyſician of Charles VII, King of France, and Philip duke of Burgundy, and that he died canon of Tournay, about the year 1465. See the article PARTS.

PRAT (ANTONY DU) chancellor of France, and afterwards cardinal, in the reign of Francis I, was born at Iſſoire in Auvergne. It is agreed, that he was a man of great abilities, but not that he was a good man. He is blamed, among other things, for the Concordate, that was made between Leo X and Francis I, in the year 1516. It is ſaid, that by that means he introduced into the kingdom a pernicious uſage [*A*], whereby the choice of biſhops was transferred to the court; which

[*A*] *It is pretended, that he introduced,* by the Concordate, *a pernicious uſage.*] I deſign to quote ſome authors upon this ſubject, and I begin with the words of a Janſeniſt (1): ‘Chancellor Antony du Prat, cardinal, archbiſhop of Sens, biſhop of Alby, Valence, Die, and Gap, and abbot of Fleury, aſſembled (2) in the convent of the great Auguſtins at Paris, the biſhops of his province, who attended the court, and cauſed ſome ordinances to be read, which he had made for the explanation of the Chriſtian doctrine, and for the diſcipline of the church, againſt the errors of Luther, which made a great noiſe in Europe at that time . . . . (3)

‘That

(2) In the year 1528.

(3) Ib. *p.* 38.

---

(1) Dialogue entre deux Parroiſſiens de St Hilaire du Mont, ſur les Ordonnances contre la Traduction de Mons, *pag.* 37, *of the firſt volume of the pieces, concerning that tranſlation.*

which was the ready way to beſtow mitres upon men more worldly and vain, than learned and virtuous. But it may be anſwered, that the church was not better ſerved

That prelate never reſided in any of his dioceſes, and never performed any epiſcopal function, except that ordinance againſt Martin Luther, Philip Melanchthon, Oecolampadius, and Zuinglius; for Calvin and Beza were not yet talked of. This good prelate is ſaid to have aboliſhed the Pragmatic Sanction, that is, the pure obſervation of the ancient canons in the church of France, and to have been the author of the *Concordate* between king Francis I and Leo X, whereby the apoſtolical diſcipline has been deſtroyed in France, canonical elections have been aboliſhed, and the Gallican church brought under a deplorable ſlavery.' The archbiſhop of Ambrun took that chancellor's part, and endeavoured to make the Janſeniſts odious to the court; as if by diſapproving the Concordate they envied the advantages that accrue to his majeſty from it: *They endeavour*, ſays he (4), *to deprive his crown of a great advantage: they exclaim, in the tenth page of the firſt libel, againſt the Concordate, that was made between Francis I and Pope Leo X.* That good prelate, *ſay they, ſpeaking of chancellor du Prat, cardinal and archbiſhop of Sens*, is ſaid to have aboliſhed the Pragmatic Sanction, that is, the pure obſervation of the ancient canons, &c. . . . . *They bear an ill will to that great man, becauſe, in a council he held in his province of Sens, in the year* 1528, *he forbad the tranſlations of the Bible into the vulgar language.* Theſe words were criticized by a perſon, who wondered (5) he ſpoke of *the Concordate in a manner ſo unbecoming his character*. 'He ſhould have learned from the moſt famous Hiſtorians, and the verbal proceſſes of the clergy of France, what opinion the biſhops, the parliaments, and good men, have always had of that treaty. He ſhould not have been ignorant, that for a long time public prayers were put up in ſeveral churches, to beg of GOD that it might be aboliſhed, by the reſtoration of canonical elections (6), as it appears from ſeveral Rituals, ſuch as that of Vannes, printed at Lyons, and another of Clermont, printed in 1608, by order of the late cardinal de la Rochefoucaut. Laſtly, ſince he ſets a great value upon the authority of the archbiſhop of Paris, he ſhould at leaſt have ſpoken of it as that prelate does in the life of Henry IV, wherein he ſays, *pag.* 229, that the General Aſſembly of the Clergy, held at Paris in 1599, *made a long remonſtrance to the king, whereby the prelates intreated him not to take upon him to nominate to the biſhoprics, abbies, and other benefices, with cure of ſouls.* And he ſhould not have appeared leſs knowing than a prince like Henry IV bred up in hereſy, and in the war, who notwithſtanding anſwered the clergy, as the archbiſhop of Paris tells us, *that he acknowledged the truth of what they had told him concerning the nomination to benefices, but that he was not the author of that abuſe.*' I ſhall add another paſſage (7). *It is not true*, that the writers of Port-Royal *have reaſon to bear an ill-will* to chancellor du Prat, *becauſe* he forbad the tranſlations of the Bible into the vulgar language in the council of Sens, of the year 1528; 'for he never iſſued ſuch a prohibition, being contented to forbid only the printing of the ſacred books, without the authority of the ordinary: which does not concern the verſion of Mons, which was approved by the ordinary of the place where it was printed. Neither is it true, that it is a fault not to ſpeak of cardinal du Prat as of a *great man*, and that the author of the Dialogue is to blame for ſpeaking of him as he does, ſince no one, who is ever ſo little acquainted with our Hiſtory, can deny, that no man was more cried down than he was by the writers of his time. Belcarius, biſhop of Metz, calls him *Bipedum nequiſſimus*, - - - *the worſt of men*, and accuſes him of having bribed the judges to condemn to death the Sieur de Semblance. Probably it is upon him that Budæus beſtows the ſtrange encomium which is at the beginning of the 260th page * of his book intituled *Forenſia*.'

It is certain, that the Concordate was attended with terrible abuſes in the collation of benefices: hence it is, that, upon the complaints of the three eſtates of the kingdom, aſſembled at Orleans, in the year 1560, a regulation was made, which might have put things in a very good way, if it had been obſerved. It runs thus, 'All archbiſhops and biſhops ſhall be, for the time to come, upon a vacancy, elected and nominated, *viz.* the archbiſhops, by the biſhops of the province, and the chapter of the archiepiſcopal church: the biſhops, by the archbiſhop and biſhops of the province, and the canons of the epiſcopal church, together with twelve notable gentlemen elected by the gentry of the dioceſe, and twelve notable citizens, who ſhall be likewiſe elected in the town-houſe of the archiepiſcopal or epiſcopal city. All which being convened upon a certain day, by the chapter of the vacant ſee, and aſſembled in the aforeſaid manner, ſhall agree in the choice of three perſons, duly qualified according to the holy canons and councils, and of thirty years of age at leaſt, whom they ſhall preſent to us, that we may elect one of the three for the vacant archbiſhopric or biſhopric.' I ſhall ſet down the words of a commentator (8), to give the reader a notion of the evils, which it was thought that ordinance would remedy. 'If the divine and human laws had been obſerved by thoſe who profeſs them, or whoſe buſineſs it is to put them in execution, this article would certainly have been needleſs; for the things mentioned in it were regulated by the ancient laws and holy ordinances, as they are here. But the calamities of the time, the boldneſs, avarice, and the credit of great men, had corrupted and altered every thing; and the miſchief would have daily increaſed, had not our judicious prince, or thoſe who aſſiſt him, prevented it. Ignorant and fooliſh men were poſſeſſed of the beſt benefices and the nobleſt dignities and biſhoprics, by favour, friendſhip, and money; and becauſe, for want of capacity and experience, they were not able to diſcern good from evil, and knew not how to diſtinguiſh virtue from vice, they acted exactly according to their mean knowledge. Nay, ſometimes they were appointed biſhops before they were intirely formed in their mothers womb; the ill effects of which have been felt in all Chriſtendom. The poor afflicted people could not forbear murmuring, being governed by ſuch men, or their lieutenants and vicars, of the ſame ſtamp with their maſters, who laid intolerable burdens upon them, though they themſelves did not care to touch them with one of their fingers; until the LORD opened the eyes, the heart, and the mouths of the people, to ſee and complain, and of princes to hear, and of the king to judge with equity and uprightneſs. I think we have reaſon to hope from Charles IX, our king, what the Augurs or Soothſayers ſaid of Auguſtus, in whoſe reign the whole monarchy was ſo well governed, and enjoyed all manner of proſperity and happineſs. It appears by this article, that good and honeſt men, well ſkilled in learning, ſhall receive a reward for their labours; the ignorant ſhall be rejected and laid aſide; and young people will be encouraged to appear on the noble ſtage of virtue. Sucking children will be no longer raiſed to eccleſiaſtical dignities, a burden too heavy for their weak ſhoulders, eſpecially in what concerns religion, which requires, that none ſhould be appointed to teach it but ſuch as are honeſt, chaſte, and holy, and whoſe fleſhly luſts are extinguiſhed through age, or the love of GOD. For, to appoint for the government of the church ignorant men and children, who are not able to govern themſelves, is a ſtrange and extravagant thing, and no leſs contrary to all divine and human laws, than if one ſhould appoint a pupil to be guardian of another pupil, and a blind-man to lead another blind-man. . . . . The good king Lewis XII, perceiving ſuch a fault among his clergy, ſaid, that aſſes had a better time than horſes; for horſes, added he, gallop to Rome in queſt of benefices, but many aſſes are provided with them. Which is the reaſon why they have been expoſed by ſeveral paſquinades and famous libels; and the following verſes have been made upon the loſs of the elections, againſt thoſe, who have uſurped them, and thoſe who are unworthily poſſeſſed of church-preferments.

(4) Requête preſentée au Roi par l'Archevêque d'Ambrun, *pag.* 270, *of the aforeſaid volume.*

(5) Remarques ſur la Requête de l'Archevêque d'Ambrun, *pag.* 271, *of the ſame Tome.*

(6) Quintin, in his ſpeech to the clergy, in the general aſſembly of the ſtates of the kingdom in 1561, ſpoke with great vigour for the reſtoration of the elections. See *Preſident de la Place, Hiſt. de l'état de la Religion & Republique, fol. m.* 143, *verſo, & ſeq.*

(7) Remarques, &c.

* *Lib. iii.*

(8) *Joachim du Chalard, advocate in the great council,* Sommaire Expoſition des Ordonnances du Roi Charles IX, *fol.* 7, *verſo, Paris* 1568.

ſerved in the time of the elections, than it was under the Concordate [*B*]. I can hardly believe what is ſaid by ſome Hiſtorians, that cardinal du Prat diſcovered a deſire of being made Pope [*C*]. Some authors ſay, that he pretended a retention of urine,

Au temps paſſé l'Eſprit Saint eſliſoit
  Ceux, dont ſouloit l'Egliſe eſtre ſervie.
  En ce temps-là, vertu fruit produiſoit :
  Car les eleuz eſtoyent de ſainte vie.

Mais maintenant les mondains par envie
  Ont uſurpé la ſainte eſlection,
  Dont s'en enſuy humaine affection :
  Et par ainſi tous vices procedez

Sont des Paſteurs : qui nous ſont concedez
  Par les chevaux, par la poſte, & par dons.
  Trop mieux vauldroit les eſlire à trois dez :
  Car à l'hazard ils pourroyent eſtre bons.

In times of yore, the Holy Spirit choſe
  Such as moſt uſeful to the church cou'd be:
Virtue then had its crown; ſince only thoſe
  Elected were, of noted ſanctity.

But now the worldlings have uſurp'd the choice,
  Low grov'ling minds, by baſeſt motives ſway'd:
Hence favour and affection rule each voice,
  And hence the vileſt men are paſtors made.

Who fitteſt are in churches to preſide,
  By bribery alone determin'd is:
Better with box and dice the choice decide,
  And truſt to chance for good ones, hit or miſs.

If I write the article of Genebrard, as I hope I ſhall, I will not forget to mention the book he publiſhed, to ſhew the neceſſity of reſtoring canonical elections (9). He called the Concordate a myſtery of iniquity.

[*B*] *The church was not better ſerved in the time of the elections, than it was under the Concordate.*] It appears from the jeſt of Lewis XII, mentioned in the foregoing remarks, that there were many abuſes under the Pragmatic Sanction, and before the Concordate. The archbiſhop of Ambrun maintains (10), *that the Concordate has removed the abuſes, the Simony, and the cabals which formerly prevailed in the elections.* An Abbot Commendatory does very much enlarge upon thoſe diſorders. ‘ A great lady was ſaying one day, in my hearing, that ſhe heard king Francis ſay, that the chief reaſon, which moved him to make the Concordate with Pope Leo, in order to aboliſh the elections of biſhops and abbots, and of ſome priors, was becauſe thoſe elections were attended with great abuſes among the Monks; for, without any regard to a man's abilities and learning, which were then very rare in monaſteries . . . . they elected, moſt times, the merrieſt fellows, the greateſt whoremongers and tipplers, the greateſt lovers of dogs and hawks, in a word, the greateſt debauchees, that they might have the liberty to live a looſe and diſorderly life, under ſuch abbots and priors, who were bound by an oath to indulge them in their debaucheries. The worſt of all was, that, when they could not agree in their elections, they frequently fought and wounded one another; nay, ſometimes their quarrels were attended with murder: in ſhort, they made a greater noiſe, and formed more cabals and factions, than there are at the creation of the rector of the univerſity of Paris, which I have ſeen formerly; I do not know whether it be ſo ſtill. Beſides, ſome elected a ſilly Monk, who wanted courage and reſolution to keep them to their duty, and threatened him, when he pretended to ſeverity. Others elected a poor wretch, who ſtole their money and ſtarved his Monks, which occaſioned great complaints, and the impoveriſhing of the abbey. . . . In a word, there were many other abuſes in thoſe elections, which I paſs over in ſilence. Beſides, that great king, conſidering the many ſervices of his nobility, and not being able to reward them with the revenues of his demeſns, and the money ariſing from taxes, (for the whole was neceſſary to carry on his long wars) he thought it more proper to beſtow upon them ſome abbies, and other church-preferments, than to leave them in the hands of the Monks, a ſort of men, ſaid he, good for nothing but eating and drinking, gaming, making bowſtrings and ferret-bags, catching rabbets, whiſtling to linets, and living an idle and diſorderly life; and therefore it was then a common ſaying, *As idle as a Prieſt or a Monk*; and likewiſe, *as covetous and as great a whoremonger as a Prieſt or a Monk*; as the Italians ſay, *Preti, fratri Monachi & pulli, mai non ſon ſatulli* (11). . . . . It is to be obſerved, that, if the elections have been attended with abuſes among Monks, thoſe of biſhops have not been more regular; for, when a man had a mind to be made a biſhop, he bribed the canons and other dignified men with money or great promiſes: ſo that it was rather a downright Simony, than a lawful and holy election; in imitation of many Popes of thoſe times, who bribed the cardinals in order to get their votes. There were alſo great tumults and factions in the chapters, ſo far as to beat and kill one another; as it was formerly practiſed in Germany; for the canons were fighting men, as they are ſtill, and made uſe of ſwords, as well as of the Breviary. The biſhops lived a very diſorderly life in thoſe times: they reſided in their dioceſes more than they do now, for they never left them; but then they minded nothing but dogs, hawks, feaſts, and whores, of whom they had a Seraglio; as I have been told of one, who picked up young and handſome girls of ten years of age, and had them bred up and down in ſeveral villages (as gentlemen do their dogs) in order to make uſe of them when grown up. They were allowed to live ſuch a ſcandalous life; for they were ſo much dreaded, that none would have had the courage to cenſure them for it. I might ſay a great deal more upon this ſubject, but I will not raiſe a ſcandal. Our preſent biſhops (ſaid a great man to me) are more diſcreet, or at leaſt more cunning hypocrites, and know better how to conceal their vices. God forbid that what I have ſaid of the ancient and modern biſhops, ſhould be underſtood of all; for in former times many of them were good and holy men, as there are ſtill, and there will be many, with God's bleſſing, who loves and never forſakes his people (12).’

[*C*] *It is pretended, that cardinal du Prat diſcovered a deſire of being made Pope.*] The gentlemen of Port-Royal took care to repreſent to the archbiſhop of Ambrun what Laurence Capelloni relates concerning the death of Antony du Prat. ‘ Clement VII, *ſays that author*, being dead, cardinal du Prat had ſuch an extravagant deſire of being made Pope, that he took the liberty to tell the king, that it was in his power to raiſe him to the Holy See. The King, being willing to ſee how far his ambition would carry him, gave him leave to go on. The cardinal added, That, if His Majeſty would be pleaſed to uſe his intereſt with the college of cardinals, in order to make him Pope, he would be contented with the name, and the king ſhould have the power. The king, perceiving the exceſſive ambition of this man, and conſidering the great difficulties of ſuch an enterprize, which could not be executed without vaſt ſums of money, anſwered him, Faith, Mr Chancellor, the cardinals are ſo greedy, that I have no mind to ſatisfy their greedineſs. The cardinal replied, That, if the king approved of the deſign, he would find four hundred thouſand crowns to put it in execution. The king told him, For what I know, Sir, you have the ſum you mention; but I have no mind to concern myſelf with ſuch a project. This anſwer made the cardinal ſenſible, that he was to blame, not ſo much for having expreſſed his ambition, as for having diſcovered his great riches. He grew ſo melancholy upon it, that he fell ſick, and his illneſs, which was inconſiderable at firſt, increaſed very much, when he was told, that the king, knowing that he kept his bed, had ordered his goods and money to be ſeized, telling thoſe, who complained of it in the cardinal's name, that he dealt with him as he had adviſed him to deal with others: So that, urine, in order to get out of a danger [*D*]. It is not likely, that his ignorance of the Latin tongue was ſo great, as Jonſton will have it [*E*]. It has been obſerved, that

---

(9) It was burnt by the hangman. See the XIth Diſſertation of Natalis Alexander, *in Selecta Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ capita, Seculi XV, & XVI.*

(10) In his petition to the king againſt the verſion of Mons, pag. 272, 273, of the firſt volume of the pieces relating to that verſion.

(11) Brantome's Memoirs, *Tom. i*, in his diſcourſe upon Francis I, *pag.* 251, *& ſeq.*

(12) Brantome, ibid. *pag.* 255.

‘ ſays that Hiſtorian, the cardinal died, God knows how, (*Dio ſa come*) very uneaſy about it (13).’ It will not be improper to add, that thoſe gentlemen intimated to that prelate, that he could not doubt of the truth of that ſtory, ſince he had approved the book wherein it is to be found. *Such was*, ſay they (14), *the death of that great man, of whom one cannot give an ill character, without offending the archbiſhop of Ambrun. And yet it is obſervable, that this ſtory is mentioned in the lives of the cardinals, written by Aubery, and printed for Soly, in* 1645, *with an authentic approbation of* Messire George d'Aubusson, *wherein he declares, that* the truth of Hiſtory is exactly repreſented in that book ; *and therefore it is ſomewhat ſtrange, that his great employments ſhould ſo quickly make him forget his firſt ſtudies.*

Mr Varillas (15) gives us Capelloni's narrative, without citing him, and obſerves, that *du Prat grew ſo big, that his table was cut hollow, to make room for his belly.* He adds (16), that this cardinal, ‘ after he had been in a languiſhing condition for half a year, died the 9th of July 1535 (17) ; and to make a kind of ſatisfaction to his cathedral church of Sens, into which he never entered, tho' he had been a long time archbiſhop of that place, he deſired to be buried in it.’ We are told another ſtory, which is more diſadvantageous to Francis I, than that of Capelloni. I ſhall ſet it down, to ſhew how little ſuch narratives ought to be minded ; for there is hardly any greater ſign of falſity, than when a thing is differently related, and applied to different times and perſons. ‘ It was a peccadillo of the court, like that of king Francis I, to trick cardinal Marcellus (§ *a*) out of his money, for the king wanted money. Melanchthon, who ſays he was very well acquainted with that cardinal, relates the thing in the following manner : *The king, having received ſome letters from Rome, ſpread a report, that Pope Paul was dead. He ſent for that cardinal, whom he knew to be an ambitious man, and very deſirous to be made Pope, and told him that piece of falſe news. The cardinal repreſented to the king how much it concerned him and his kingdom, that the next Pope ſhould be a good friend to him. It is certainly ſo, replied the king ; what if we ſhould make you Pope? The cardinal approved the motion. This cannot be done without money, ſaid the king, and I have not the neceſſary ſums to carry on ſuch a project. The cardinal offered him two tuns of gold. That is enough, ſaid the king ; I will add to it ſomething of my own.* The next letters, that came from Rome, brought advice that the Pope was ſtill living, and had not been ſick. The cardinal told the king of it, and demanded his money. The king's anſwer was, *I will chide my ambaſſador for writing to me falſe news :* as for the money, he ſaid, *If the Pope be not dead, he will die* (18).’ The author, who relates this ſtory, quotes a book of Melanchthon, which I have not (19), and therefore I cannot tell whether he is exact ; but I find in another work of Melanchthon, a fact which ſeems to keep a medium between this ſtory, and that of Capelloni. Here it is related at length. ‘ Rex Galliæ, pater Franciſci, indigebat ſubitò pecunia. Itaque per alium quendam ad ſuum Cancellarium ex Roma, & per poſtam mittit ei literas, ſignificans Papam eſſe mortuum. Lectis literis, mox properat Cancellarius ad Regem, ei nunciaturus tanquam aliquid novi. Rex legit literas, ſimulans ſe neſcire, & interrogat quid ſibi ſit faciendum? Reſpondit Cancellarius, conſultiſſimum eſſe mittere Romam Legatum, & aliquem conſtituere Papam, qui ſit à partibus regis Galliæ. At Rex : ad eam rem opus eſt pecunia, ſicut dicitur : Nulla pecunia eſt ſatis magna, aſpiranti ad Pontificatum. Cancellarius dicit, ſe adhuc habere duas thonnas auri ; utrum ſufficerent? Reſpondit Rex : Bene eſt, & ego aliquid pecuniæ addam. Cura igitur unam thonnam auri perferri ad me. Poſtquam eam Rex acceperat, ſubornat alium nuntium aſſerentem ei literas, Papam adhuc vivere, & non eſſe mortuum. Egregium ſanè inventum, quo quaſi cornicum oculos confixit, & avarum per ſuam avaritiam decepit (20). - - - *The king of France, the father of Francis, on a ſudden wanted money. Wherefore he cauſed a letter to be ſent by another hand, and by the poſt, from Rome, to his chancellor, informing him, that the Pope was dead. The chancellor having read the letter, haſtened to the king, to acquaint him with the news. The king read the letter, pretending ignorance, and aſked what was to be done? The chancellor replied, that it is moſt adviſable to ſend an ambaſſador to Rome, and ſet up one for Pope, who was a friend to the king of France. The king anſwered, that money was neceſſary for that purpoſe, and that no ſum was large enough to one who aſpired to the pontificate. The chancellor ſaid, he had two tuns of gold, if that would do. The king replied, it is well, I will add ſome money to it ; therefore ſend one of the tuns to me. After the king had received it, he ſuborned another meſſenger to bring him a letter, acquainting him that the Pope was not dead. An ingenious device this, to deceive an avaritious man by the means of his own avarice !*’ According to this paſſage, it was not Francis I, who tricked his chancellor out of his money, but another king of France, father to Francis. But becauſe the father of Francis I was not a king, it ſhould be ſaid, that Melanchthon means Henry II, father to Francis II ; but can Francis II be rightly denoted by the bare name of Francis? Manlius did no honour to his maſter, by publiſhing a narrative, wherein the perſons are ſo ill deſcribed. I leave it to the reader to obſerve how differently the three ſtories mentioned by me have been related.

[(§ *a*) The margin (19) cites *Dom. p.* 3. *fol.* 171, an author or book which Mr Bayle ſays he had not. The ſame ſtory is found in the *Joco-ſeria* of Melander, n. 34 of the firſt tome of the Francfort edition, 1615 : it is there quoted from D. Pezelius, *Poſtill. Mel. part III, pag.* 170. Probably the cardinal Marcellus here is no other than du Prat himſelf, of whom the ſame ſtory is related, and whoſe Latin name *Pratellus*, in Melanchthon, may, perhaps, have been changed into *Marcellus* by the German Bookſellers. Rem. Crit.]

[*D*] *Some authors ſay, that he pretended a retention of urine to get out of a danger.*] ‘ How many perſons could I name, whoſe ſickneſs had ſaved their lives, as formerly Auguſtus's? How many have avoided death, only becauſe their great infirmity made every body believe that they were near their grave? * *Multorum mortem diſtulit morbus, & ſaluti illis fuit videri perire.* Cardinal du Prat was releaſed out of priſon in the reign of Francis I, for fear he ſhould die of a retention of urine, having impoſed upon his Phyſicians by drinking privately the water he made. And we have ſeen a favourite of Henry III, who ſucceeded ſo well in pretending to be a dying man, in order to divert ſome impending danger, in the reign of Henry IV, that he lived thirty years under the late king in perfect health (21).’ I fancy la Mothe le Vayer took one man for another. If I am not miſtaken, no author ſays, that our du Prat was impriſoned ; but it is reported that *cardinal Balue bethought himſelf of drinking his urine, that he might be ſet at liberty, by Lewis XI, on pretence of retention of urine* (22). They are la Mothe le Vayer's words : he quotes the life of Lewis XI, written by Peter Matthieu ; his quotation is right (23). And tho' it is not impoſſible that two miniſters of ſtate ſhould make uſe of the ſame device in different times, I do not think, the two ſtories related by that author are true : it was ſtill an eaſier thing for him to confound the time and the perſons he ſpeaks of. Many others have done it, and will do it for the time to come.

[*E*] *It is not likely that his ignorance of the Latin tongue was ſo great as Jonſton will have it.*] That author wrote a little book, intituled, *Naturæ Conſtantia*, wherein he pretends to prove, that the world does not grow worſe and worſe. Among other inſtances of the ignorance of former ages, he alledges our du Prat, who thought that *moloſſus* ſignified a mule, and that the Latin word for a mule was *muletus*. *Placet hic adjicere*, ſays he (24), *& exemplum* du Prat *Epiſcopi & Cancellarii Galliæ ; qui cum in literis ab Henrico VIII, Angliæ Rege ad Franciſcum I, Galliarum Regem ſcriptis, iſta verba,* Mitto tibi duodecim moloſſos, *offendiſſet, mulos per moloſſos intellegi exiſtimavit : & poſt* that he was a great lover of young aſſes fleſh [*F*], and that others loved it in imitation of him.

---

(13) Remarques, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 272.

(14) Ibid.

(15) Hiſt. de François Prémier, *livr. vii, pag.* 241, *of the* 2d *Dutch edition.*

(16) Ibid. *pag.* 242, 243.

(17) The author of the *News from the Republic of Letters*, Aug. 1684, Art. VIII, pag. 629, mentions the year 1534, on the authority of the firſt Dutch edition of Varillas's Francis I. It appears from the epitaph of this Chancellor, mentioned by Frizon, pag. 574, 575, of the *Gallia purpurata*, that he died the 9th of July 1535, aged 72 years.

(18) Jeremiah de Pours, Divine Melodie du Saint Pſalmiſte, *livr. v, pag.* 1090.

(19) He quotes Dom. *pag.* 3, *fol.* 171.

(20) Joannes Manlius, in Locorum communium Collectaneis ex Lectionibus Philippi Melanchthonis excerptis, *pag.* 375, *Edit. Francof.* 1568. *This book might be intituled,* Melanchthoniana.

* Seneca, Epiſt. LXXIX.

(21) La Mothe le Vayer, Diſcours de la Santé & de la Maladie, *in the* 8*th volume of his Works, pag.* 185, 186.

(22) La Mothe le Vayer, Letter xlii, in the 10th volume of his Works, *pag.* 339.

(23) *Theſe are Peter Matthieu's words, lib. x, num.* 3, *pag. m.* 524. He drank his urine ſo privately, that it was thought he would die of a retention of urine. The king ordered him to be viſited ; the Phyſicians gave him over, &c.

(24) Jo. Jonſtonus, de Naturæ conſtantia, *pag.* 73, *Edit. Amſtel.* 1632.

He was a great perſecutor of the Proteſtants: ſome of them ſay, that, as a puniſhment from God, he died in deſpair [*G*]. A famous Hiſtoriographer ſuppoſes, that he was cruelly tormented by the ſtings of his conſcience, remembring that he had introduced ſeveral innovations, whereby the people were oppreſſed *(a)*. I ſhall ſet down the epitaph which Beza made on him *(b)*.

(*a*) Mezerai, Abr. Chronol. *Tom. iv, pag. m.* 584, *ad ann.* 1535.

(*b*) Antonio Pratenſi, Cancellario Galliarum, inter obeſos obeſiſſimo. Ampliſſimus vir hic jacet, *Beza, Poëmat. pag.* 94, *Edit. Tertiæ.*

& poſt animadverſo errore, moloſſos ſe pro muletis *accepiſſe, duplicata inſcitia ſubjunxit.* It is to be obſerved, that Jonſton cites no body for this, tho' in other places he very carefully quotes his authors for the moſt trifling things. Some aſcribe this ſlander to Beza, as it appears by the following words. ‘ Perhaps it will be with cardinal de Birague's ignorance, as it was with that of cardinal du Prat, who, according to Beza, when king Francis I had received twelve Engliſh maſtives from Henry VIII, the letter ſaying *duodecim moloſſos*, aſked of the king one of the mules ſent to him from England; and being told by the king that they were maſtives, he excuſed himſelf, ſaying, he thought there was in the letter *duodecim muletos* But, after all, Mr Aubery, who has written a very faithful hiſtory of the cardinals**, ſhews that this ignorance, which Beza aſcribes to cardinal du Prat, is a meer calumny; and he proves it by the teſtimony of Feron, who calls him a very learned and famous Civilian, of Sadolet, who pitched upon him to cenſure his Latin works, and of Auton, who praiſes him for his eloquent ſpeech, which he made in Latin before the emperor Maximilian (25).’

I know not whether Beza has this ſtory in any of his works; but I know that it is to be found in a book of Henry Stephens (26).

[*F*] *It has been obſerved, that he was a great lover of young aſſes fleſh.*] He was like Mæcenas, in this reſpect, who was the firſt that brought aſſes-fleſh into vogue. *Pullos earum* (aſinarum) *epulari primus Mæcenas inſtituit, multum eo tempore prælatos onagris: poſt eum interiit auctoritas ſaporis* (27). After the death of that favourite, people grew weary of that food. Meibomius obſerves, that the ſame thing was ſeen in the time of Antony du Prat (28). *Simile quid de* Antonio Pratenſe, *Galliæ Cancellario, refert Johannes Bruyerinus lib. xxiii. de re cibaria cap. xx.* Ætate noſtra, *inquit*, Antonius Pratenſis, Galliæ Cancellarius, imitator exſtitit Mæcenatis in eo genere eſcæ *(carnis nempe aſininæ)* quàm avidiſſimus; verum & cum ipſo gratia quoque illius carnis ſepulta eſt (29). That book of Meibomius being ſomewhat ſcarce, I hope the reader will not be diſpleaſed to find here ſeveral particular facts mentioned by that author, whereby it will appear, that men bring their taſte into ſlavery, out of flattery; and that a favourite can bring into faſhion, not only ſuch cloaths as he likes, but alſo ſuch meats as ſuit with his palate (30). ‘ Potuit vero *(Mæcenas)* & gulæ tantum aut peculiaris ſibi appetitus gratia cibo iſto veſci cœpiſſe familiarius: quem deinde ob ipſius auctoritatem alii, quaſi aſſentatione quadam, cariorem & in pretio habuere, donec ab obitu Mæcenatis rurſum vileſceret, quod uſu venire in ejuſmodi rebus fere ſolet. Sic *acipenſerem* Plinius refert lib. IX. cap. XVII. nullo in honore fuiſſe ſuo, id eſt, Trajani tempore: quem tamen Serenus Sammonicus apud Macrobium Saturn. lib. III. cap. XVI. docet, tum apud antiquos fuiſſe in pretio, tum poſt Plinium ſuo ævo gratiam ejus ad epulas quaſi poſtliminio rediiſſe. Sic Horatius *rhombum & ciconiam* nullo in cibis uſu fuiſſe ſcribit, antequam id docuiſſet vir prætorius, ſive is fuerit, dubitantibus Acrone & Porphyrione, Aſellius, ſive Rufus, aut Sempronius. Et addit, *mergos*, vile alias cibi genus, ſi quis aſſos dixerit futuros ſuaves, juventutem Romanam pravi docilem id facile credituram. Verſus ſunt Serm. lib. II. Sat. II.

Tutus erat rhombus, tutoque ciconia nido,
Donec vos auctor docuit prætorius. Ergo
Si quis nunc mergos ſuaveis edixerit aſſos,
Parebit pravi docilis Romana juventus.

Nec diſſimile quid contigit ſuperiori ſeculo Romæ. De *Hadriano VI*, enim Pontif. Max. narrat Paulus Jovius (31), *&c.* - - - - *Mæcenas might accuſtom himſelf to that diſh, becauſe he had a particular taſte that way: whilſt others pretended to eſteem it, out of flattery to him: till after the death of Mæcenas, it fell again into diſeſteem, as generally happens in things of this nature. So Pliny relates,* (lib. IX. cap. XVII) *that, in his time, that is, in the reign of Trajan, the ſturgeon was in no eſteem; which yet Serenus Sammonicus* (*in Macrobius*, lib. III. cap. XVI) *tells us was in eſteem among the Ancients, and even in his time, which was after Pliny's, had, by ſtealth, as it were, gained a place in entertainments. So Horace writes, that the turbot and ſtork were not ſerved up at tables, till a perſon of quality ſhewed the way: whether he was Aſinius, or Rufus, or Sempronius, is uncertain; for Acron and Porphyry are in doubt about it. He adds, that if any one ſhould ſay, the cormorant, otherwiſe a mean diſh, would be very good eating ſtewed, the youth of Rome would eaſily come into the belief of it. His verſes are,*

Safe ſwam the turbot, ſafe the ſtork cou'd reſt,
Unclaim'd by nicer palates, in her neſt,
Till a rich glutton ſerv'd them at his feaſt.
Nay, were it ſaid, a cormorant, when ſtew'd,
Becomes, by dreſſing, moſt delicious food,
The youth of Rome their taſte wou'd thence refine,
And each young lord upon a cormorant dine.

Something, not unlike this, happened at Rome in the laſt age. For Paul Jovius relates of Pope Hadrian VI, &c.’

[*G*] *Some ſay, that, as a puniſhment from GOD, he died in deſpair.*] Henry Stephens, having mentioned a lieutenant-criminal, (who died *diſtracted, after he had uttered ſeveral blaſphemies againſt GOD*) adds (32), ‘ Chancellor du Prat died alſo a miſerable death, notwithſtanding his *Hoſtel-Dieu* [Hoſpital], (of which king Francis I ſaid, that it was not large enough to contain all thoſe whom he had reduced to beggary); for he died at Nantoillet, his country-ſeat, his ſtomach being eaten up by worms, and uttering blaſphemies againſt GOD, with great impatience, occaſioned by the violent pain he felt, and (as ſome ſay) by the vexation he was under to ſee his trunks ſealed up, ſo that he ſaid, ſee what it is to ſerve a king with body and ſoul. This du Prat was the firſt, who thought fit that the parliament ſhould take cognizance of hereſies, becauſe he ſaid, they are attended with blaſphemy. It was he likewiſe who gave the firſt commiſſions to put to death thoſe who oppoſed the church of Rome, being weary of the long proceedings in Berquin's trial.

** *Tom. iii, pag.* 355.

(25) Naudé, Dialogue de Maſcurat. *pag.* 426. *See alſo Father* Garaſſe, *pag.* 641, *of his* Doctrine Curieuſe.

(26) In the 29th chapter of his Apology for Herodotus, *pag. m.* 334.

(27) Plin. *lib. viii, cap. xliii.*

(28) Joh. Henricus Meibomius, in Vita Mæcenatis, *cap. xxvi, pag.* 165.

(29) I have verified this quotation out of Bruyerinus: it is right, except that inſtead of *lib. xxiii*, it ſhould be *lib. xiii.*

(30) Meibom. ibid. *pag.* 165, 166.

(31) Meibomius mentions here what I have quoted in the remark [*R*], of the article HADRIAN VI.

(32) Henry Stephens's Apology for Herodotus, *ch. xxvi, pag. m.* 310.

PRÆTEXTATUS (PAPYRIUS) made himſelf famous at Rome from his youth, by keeping a thing ſecret which his mother had a mind to know. This ſtory is mentioned in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary; but all the wit of it has been left out; and therefore I ſhall give a more faithful account of the thing [*A*]. I ſhall

[*A*] *I ſhall give a more faithful account of the thing.*] The ſenate not being able to put an end to a matter of great moment, that was under debate, put it off till the next day, and ordered that the thing ſhould be kept ſecret, till they had made a decree about it. Young Papyrius, who had followed his father into the ſenate, according to the cuſtom of that time, being aſked by his mother what had been done

in

I ſhall alſo direct the reader to the firſt author of the ſtory, better than has been done by the writer of that Supplement: the thing is of ſome importance on this occaſion [*B*].

in the aſſembly, anſwered, that every body was ordered to be ſilent about it, and that therefore he was not allowed to ſay any thing of it. This anſwer increaſed the lady's curioſity. The youth, being more importuned than before, was obliged to tell a lie, in order to make himſelf eaſy, without diſobeying the ſenate. He told his mother, that this queſtion had been debated, whether it would be more advantageous to the Republic, to allow a huſband to have two wives, or a wife to have two huſbands. The lady, ſurprized at this diſcourſe, went out haſtily to acquaint the other women with it; ſo that the next day a whole crowd of them appeared at the gate of the ſenate-houſe, entreating the aſſembly, with tears in their eyes, that they would rather ordain, that a woman ſhould have two huſbands, than that a man ſhould have two wives. The ſenators were ſurprized to ſee theſe women making ſuch an uproar; but young Papyrius explained the thing to them, telling them what device he had made uſe of to ſatisfy his mother's curioſity. The ſenate admired him for it, and ordered, that, for the time to come, he ſhould be the only boy allowed to be preſent in the aſſembly. This is the origin of the ſirname *Prætextatus* (1). We find this ſtory in Aulus Gellius: I ſhall ſet down the words of that author. *Secretum rei & ſilentium deberi puer affirmans animum ejus ad inquirendum everberat. Quærit igitur compreſſus violentiuſque. Tum puer, matre urgente, lepidi atque feſtivi mendacii conſilium capit. Actum in ſenatu dixit, utrum videretur utilius magiſque è Republica eſſe, unuſne ut duas uxores haberet, an ut una apud duos nupta eſſet. Hoc illa ut audivit, animo compaveſcit: domo trepidans egreditur: ad ceteras matronas defert quod audierat. Perveniunt ad ſenatum poſtera die matrumfamilias caterva, lacrymantes atque obſecrantes orant una potius ut duobus nupta fieret, quàm ut uni duæ. Senatores ingredientes in curiam, quæ illa mulierum intemperies & quid ſibi poſtulatio iſthæc vellet, mirabantur. Puer Papyrius in medium curiæ progreſſus quid mater audire inſtitiſſet, quid ipſe matri dixiſſet, rem, ſicuti fuerat, denarrat. Senatus fidem atque ingenium pueri deoſculatus conſultum facit, ut poſthac pueri cum patribus in curiam ne introëant, niſi ille unus Papirius* (2). Macrobius tranſcribed this almoſt word for word; but he added to it a circumſtance, that is not to be found in Aulus Gellius: he ſays, that the ſenators looked upon the boldneſs of thoſe women as an ill-boding prodigy, at which they were amazed (3).

The author of the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary has committed two faults. I. He ſuppoſes (4) that Papyrius told his mother, that the ſenate had ordered, that a man ſhould have two wives. That author ſhould have ſaid, that he made her believe, it had been debated, whether this would be more advantageous to the republic, than to order that a woman ſhould have two huſbands. II. He ſuppoſes, that thoſe women begged *of the ſenate, that women might have the ſame advantage that was granted to men the day before, and that each of them might be allowed to have two huſbands.* This account makes the ſtory inſipid, and deprives it of it's pleaſantneſs: nay, it repreſents thoſe ladies as altogether ignorant of their true intereſt; for what could they get by aſking ſuch a thing? Is it not manifeſt, that, all things duly conſidered, they had been rather in a worſe than in a better condition, if each man might have had two wives, and each woman two huſbands? The beſt thing they could hope for, was, to be upon the ſame terms; for if each of them might have ſaid, *I have two huſbands*, ſhe might alſo have ſaid, *I ſhare them with another.* Are two halves more than a whole? I know, one may think of ſeveral caſes, wherein it would be an advantage to them; but, upon other accounts, and in ſeveral other caſes, which one may eaſily ſuppoſe, the diſadvantage would counterbalance, and, perhaps, exceed the advantage.

[*B*] *It is of ſome importance on this occaſion to direct the readers to the firſt author.*] Notwithſtanding the authority of Aulus Gellius, I ſhould be apt to think that it is an idle ſtory: But I cannot believe it to be ſo, when I conſider, that the grave Cato the Cenſor mentioned it in a ſpeech. And therefore, the better to enable the readers to paſs a right judgment upon this matter of fact, it is not ſufficient to acquaint them that Macrobius mentions it (5); for ſuch a compiler of witty ſayings and ſtories, as he is, does not deſerve to be much credited. Witty ſayings and ſtories are frequently forged in one's cloſet. Thoſe who invent them, being unwilling to loſe their labour, publiſh them, and aſcribe them to certain perſons, who lived at ſuch a time, omitting no circumſtances that may make them credible. When theſe inventions are diverting, and afford matter for ſlander, they take root in the memory, and paſs from mouth to mouth. They are collected, and often printed; but good judges will only commend the wit that is in them, without taking them for real matter of fact. This is the judgment that ought to be made of ſeveral ſtories and witty conceits, mentioned by Macrobius; and therefore his authority is very inconſiderable, as to this commotion of the Roman ladies. Aulus Gellius, whom he tranſcribes, is a more credible writer; for he lived nearer the time when the thing is ſaid to have happened; and yet all thoſe, who quote no other author but him upon this occaſion, want diſcernment. Cato ſhould be quoted for this ſtory, ſince Aulus Gellius had it from him: He does not quote the very words of that Cenſor, becauſe he had not then the original, but he gives the ſenſe of them. 'Hiſtoria, '*ſays he* (6), de Papirio Prætextato dicta ſcriptaque 'eſt à M. Catone in oratione, qua uſus eſt ad milites 'contra Galbam, cum multa quidem venuſtate atque 'luce atque munditia verborum. Ea Catonis verba 'huic prorſus commentario indidiſſem, ſi libri copia 'fuiſſet id temporis, quum hæc dictavi. Quod ſi non 'virtutes dignitateſque verborum, ſed rem ipſam ſcire 'quæris, ferme ad hunc modum eſt. *M. Cato relates this ſtory of Papirius Prætextatus in an elegant 'oration to the army againſt Galba. I ſhould have inſerted the words of Cato in this commentary, if I had 'been maſter of the original, when I wrote it. But, if 'you deſire to know the fact itſelf, ſtripped of the beauty of 'language, it is thus.*' There is ſome probability, that this ſtory is true, ſince the grave Cato mentioned it in a ſpeech that was publiſhed, I am not ignorant that this Cenſor jeſted now and then (7); but it was neither a proper time, nor a fit place, for a man of his character to jeſt in. Perhaps it will be objected to me that Livy, who mentions another commotion of the Roman ladies, ſays nothing of this; but it may be anſwered, that perhaps he gave an account of it in the books of his hiſtory that are loſt. I ſhall obſerve, by the by; that the other commotion was occaſioned by the law, whereby women were forbidden to wear any ornaments. There was a deſign to ſuppreſs it. Some tribunes deſired it might be kept up; others were againſt it. Our Cato, who was conſul that year (8), made a vigorous ſpeech (9) for the preſervation of that law, and againſt the liberty women took of running in crowds, and making a great uproar in the ſtreets. Neverthéleſs the law was repealed: the tribunes, who oppoſed it were obliged to conſent to it, when they ſaw their houſes beſet by thoſe mutinous women (10). 'Capitolium turba hominum faventium adverſantiumque legi complebatur. 'Matronæ, nulla nec auctoritate, nec verecundia, nec 'imperio virorum, contineri limine poterant: omnes 'vias urbis, adituſque in forum obſidebant: viros deſcendentes ad forum orantes, ut florente republica, 'creſcente indies privata omnium fortuna, matronis 'quoque priſtinum ornatum reddi paterentur. Augebatur hæc frequentia mulierum indies; nam etiam 'ex oppidis conciliabuliſque convenerant. Jam & 'conſules prætoreſque, & alios magiſtratus adire & 'rogare audebant. Cæterum minime exorabilem alterum utique conſulem M. Porcium Catonem habebant; qui pro lege, quæ abrogabatur, ita diſſeruit '. . . (11). Hæc quum contra legem proque lege 'dicta eſſent, aliquanto major frequentia mulierum 'poſtero die ſeſe in publicum effudit, unoque agmine omnes tribunorum (12) januas obſederunt, qui 'collegarum rogationi intercedebant: nec ante abſtiterunt quam remiſſa interceſſio ab tribunis eſſet. 'Nulla deinde dubitatio fuit, quin omnes tribus legem abrogarent, anno vigeſimo poſt abrogata eſt, 'quam lata. - - - *The capitol was filled with a crowd 'of thoſe, who favoured and oppoſed the law. The 'matrons could not be kept at home either by authority,*

---

(1) Ei puero poſtea cognomentum honoris gratia inditum prætextatus, ob loquendi tacendique in ætate prætextata prudentiam. *Aulus Gellius, lib. i, cap. xxiii.*

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ut non parvæ rei prodigium illam verecundi ſexus impudicam inſaniam paveſcebant. *Macrob. Saturn. lib. i, cap. vi, pag. m.* 211.

(4) *At the word* Papyrius.

(5) Macrobius is the only author quoted in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary.

(6) Aulus Gellius, ubi ſupra.

(7) *See* Balzac, Oeuvres diverſes, *in his* Diſcours de la converſation des Romains, *pag. m.* 49. *I have quoted his words in citation* (77) *of the article* PORCIUS.

(8) It was the year of Rome 558.

(9) See his oration in the 34th book of Livy, at the beginning.

(10) Tit. Liv. *lib. xxxiv, init. pag. m.* 621.

(11) Ibid.

(12) That is, of Marcus and Publius Brutus, tribunes of the people, who oppoſed their colleagues, who deſigned to propoſe that the *Lex Oppia* ſhould be abrogated.

‘ *by modeſty, or by the command of their huſbands: they thronged all the ſtreets that led to the Forum; petitioning the ſenators, as they paſſed, that, in the preſent flouriſhing ſtate of the common-wealth, they would conſent that the matrons ſhould be allowed to adorn themſelves as formerly. This concourſe of women increaſed daily by the means of aſſemblies and cabals. They even had the boldneſs to petition the conſuls, prætors, and the other magiſtrates. But they found one of the conſuls, M. Porcius Cato, inflexible, who thus harangued in favour of the law, which was repealed . . . . The reaſons for and againſt the law being thus urged, there was the next day a greater concourſe of women, who beſieged the doors of thoſe tribunes, who oppoſed the motion of their colleagues, nor left them, till they had promiſed to drop their oppoſition. After this, the law was unanimouſly repealed, it being twenty years ſince it was enacted.*’

An obſervation upon the manner of citing authors.

I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that the way of quoting authors is ſo faulty, that it were to be wiſhed ſome rules were laid down for it. The moſt inconſiderable things may be brought into a method; and if there was a method for the manner of quoting authors, it would prevent ſeveral abuſes. If any one undertook to lay down ſuch rules, he ſhould tell us how far writers may be allowed to add ſomething of their own to the matters of fact related by them. We have ſeen that Macrobius amplified the ſtory we read in Aulus Gellius. A Spaniſh Jeſuit has added more to it; for he affirms, that on that day the ſenators came later than uſually from the aſſembly, and that it was the reaſon why Papyrius's mother aſked him what buſineſs took them up ſo long. *Como el negocio era peſado, y los votos no ſe concertavan, ſalieron aquel dia los Senadores algo mas tarde de ſu conſejo de lo que ſolian: lo qual fue occaſion para que la madre del Papyrio le preguntaſſe, porque cauſa ſe havian detenido tanto en el Senado* (13). He ſuppoſes the boy anſwered, that the thing under debate was to be kept ſecret till it ſhould be determined another day. Theſe circumſtances are not to be found in Aulus Gellius, nor in Macrobius: however, I think that, if there is any fault in advancing them, it is but a ſmall one; and the Spaniſh author ſeems to me more inexcuſable for quoting not only thoſe two ancient writers, but alſo Alexander ab Alexandro, Volaterranus, and Charles Stephens.

(13) Juan de Torres, primera parte de la Philoſophia Moral de Principes, *lib. i, pag.* 59, *Edit. of Barcelona* 1598.

PRICE (John) flouriſhed in the XVIIth century *He was a native of England, and a very learned and judicious man. After he had travelled a long time, he retired to Florence, where he turned Catholic* (*a*). . . . . . . *He died at Rome in the year* 1676 (*b*). He publiſhed ſeveral learned books [*A*], and *left behind him a Commentary upon the Epiſtles of Pliny the younger, which will ſhortly be printed* (*c*). He has been praiſed by very learned men [*B*]. He ſtaid a conſiderable time at Paris, and publiſhed ſome books in that city; but he left it in 1646, and returned into England (*d*). Sarravius ſays, he had reaſon to be angry with France (*e*), and that he was a man who deſerved to be admired on account of his learning and great conſtancy in adverſity (*f*).

(*a*) Colomiés, Bibl. Choiſie, *p.* 142, *Amſterdam* 1699.

(*b*) Ib. p. 143.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Sarrav. Epiſt. CLXIX, *pag.* 173.

(*f*) Idem, Ep. CLVII, *pag.* 162.

(*e*) Ille in Angliam heri repatriavit erga Galliam noſtram peſſime, nec immerito, animatus. *Ibid.*

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral learned books.*] He put out at Paris, in 1635, Apuleius's Apology, with notes in 4to; and in 1646, *Annotationes in Evangelium Matthæi*, in 4to, and *Annotationes ad Epiſtolam Jacobi*, in 8vo; and in 1647, *Acta Apoſtolorum ex ſcriptura, Patribus, Græciſque ac Latinis ſcriptoribus illuſtrata*, in 8vo. His notes *in Pſalmos & in pleroſque alios libros Novi Teſtamenti*, were printed at London, in 1660, in folio. His commentary upon Apuleius's metamorphoſis was printed at Tergow in the year 1650 in 8vo. ‘He intended to reprint Apuleius's Apology, with ſeveral new notes of his own, and to publiſh Aulus Gellius, upon whom he had written many obſervations, Avienus *de oris maritimis*, and ſeveral corrections upon Heſychius, whoſe index he inſerted at the end of Apuleius's metamorphoſis; I mean the index of the authors alledged by Heſychius. But his ſight being grown very weak, he ſays, in one of his notes, that he thinks he ſhall not be able to perform his deſigns (1).’ The notes of this writer upon Apuleius's metamorphoſis are ſo long, that, whereas the text contains only two hundred and ſixty-two pages, they take up ſeven hundred and thirty-four pages, and are printed in a ſmaller letter than that of the text. The author declares his deſign was to fill his notes with new and good things, which was no eaſy taſk, ſince he wrote after ſo many other commentators (2). He adds, that he obſerves what Apuleius took from Tacitus, Suetonius, and Salluſt, and particularly from Virgil, and ſome other writers, and what Ammianus Marcellinus, Sidonius, St Jerom, and St Auguſtin took from him; that, above all things, he has endeavoured to print the text as like the original as he could, and that he has corrected about three hundred places, only by way of conjecture, having but one manuſcript in his hands. It was the ſame manuſcript which he gave to the archbiſhop of Canterbury, who preſented it to the Bodleian library. He had Colvius's edition, with Caſaubon's notes, written with his own hand, and the edition of Vicenza, of the year 1488. He takes it to be the moſt ancient, next to that of Rome in 1472, and follows it in many places preferably to the later editions. Theſe two editions of Apuleius have been omitted by Mr Fabricius (3); the moſt ancient edition mentioned by him is that of Venice, 1493.

[*B*] *He has been praiſed by very learned men.* ‘Price is praiſed by Sarravius, in his letters; by archbiſhop Uſher, upon St Ignatius's epiſtles; by Heinſius in an epiſtle to Charles Dati; by Mr Selden more than once, in the ſecond book *de Synedriis Ebræorum*; by Voſſius in his *Harmonia Evangelica*; by Mr Morus, in his notes upon the New Teſtament; by Redi, in his tracts of the generation of inſects; but particularly by Axenius upon Phædrus (4).’ Sarravius obſerves, that Price complained, that Salmaſius had treated him with contempt. In order to pacify him, Sarravius preſented him with a book of Salmaſius. *Unicum quod ſupererat* (exemplar) *donavi doctiſſimo viro tuique ſtudioſiſſimo Jo. Priceo, ut eum placarem aliquo modo conquerentem, quod in Miſcellis Defenſionibus contemptim à te eſſet habitus* (5).

(1) Colomiés, Bibl. Choiſie, *pag.* 142, *Amſt.* 1699.

(2) Dedimus operam ut & appoſita & nova afferremus: rem poſt tot alios haud adeo in proclivi ſitam. *Jo. Pricæus, in Præfat.*

(3) Joh. Albertus Fabricius, in Bibl. Latina, *pag.* 137.

(4) Colomiés, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 143, 144.

(5) Sarravius, Epiſt. CXLIV, *pag.* 150.

PRIDEAUX (John) biſhop of Wincheſter, and a very eminent Divine, was born in 1578, at Stafford in Devonſhire. He was admitted into Exeter-college at Oxford, in the year 1596, where he made a great progreſs in a very little time. His ſtrong conſtitution enabled him to apply himſelf very much to ſtudy; and, having an excellent memory, he quickly reaped the fruits of his labours. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his ſubtilty in diſputing, and was made fellow of Exeter-college in 1602. He ſucceeded Dr Holland in the rectorſhip of that college, and was admitted Doctor of Divinity. He was made Regius profeſſor of Divinity, when Dr Abbot was promoted to the biſhopric of Saliſbury. He diſcharged the duties of his rectorſhip with ſo much prudence and politeneſs, that many ſtudents reſorted to Exeter-college, where they made ſo great a progreſs by his wiſe remonſtrances, and the good choice of their tutors, that many of them proved an ornament to the church and ſtate. He continued in that employment thirty-two years, or thereabouts. He was no leſs careful in diſcharging the duties of his profeſſorſhip; which he did with great learning, expreſſing an inviolable fidelity to the king and the church of England. He exerciſed that profeſſorſhip ſomewhat above twenty-ſeven years. He was five times vice-chancellor of the univerſity of Oxford, and was made biſhop of Wincheſter in the year 1641. He died the twenty-ninth of July 1650, being ſeventy-two years of age (*a*). He publiſhed ſeveral books [*A*]. I need not ſay, that he ought not to be confounded with another PRIDEAUX [*B*], who put out a ſecond edition of the *Marmora Arundelliana.*

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] He wrote an apology for Caſaubon *contra Andream Eudæmon-Johannem*, printed at Oxford in 8vo, in the year 1614. His *Hypomnemata Logica, Rhetorica, Phyſica, Tyrocinium ad ſyllogiſmum legitimum contexendum, &c. Heptades Logicæ, &c.* came out in the ſame town; as alſo *Lectiones decem in totidem Religionis capita: Lectiones* 22, *Orationes* 13, *Conciones* 6, *& Oratio ad Jacobum Regem: Orationes* 9 *inaugurales in promotione Doctorum: Faſciculus controverſiarum Theologicarum: Theologiæ Scholaſticæ Syntagma, & Conciliorum Synopſis: Manuductio ad Theologiam Polemicam: Iſagoge ad omnigenæ Hiſtoriæ lectionem*, and ſeveral others. I omit the books he wrote in his mother-tongue.

[*B*] *Another* PRIDEAUX, *who put out a ſecond edition of the* Marmora Arundelliana.] His Chriſtian name is Humphry, and he is a ſtudent of Chriſt-Church in Oxford. He ſhews a great deal of learning in the book he publiſhed in that town, in the year 1676, in folio, with this title, *Marmora Oxonienſia ex Arundellianis, Seldenianis, aliiſque conflata.*. It is a book in folio. He inſerted in that work what Mr Selden had publiſhed at London in 1628, with this title, *Marmora Arundelliana*. This book of Mr Selden contained an explication of part of the marbles, which the earl of Arundel cauſed to be brought from the Levant. Prideaux inſerted alſo in his work Lydiat's notes upon ſome of thoſe marbles: but what he wrote of his own is the moſt conſiderable part of that book: for he reviſed and commented upon, *recenſuit & perpetuo commentario explicavit*, not only the inſcriptions of the marbles of the earl of Arundel, but alſo thoſe of ſeveral other monuments of the ſame nature beſtowed upon the univerſity of Oxford. It is to be obſerved, that Mr Selden explained only the inſcriptions of twenty-nine Greek and ten Latin marbles. He pitched upon thoſe, which ſeemed to him moſt conſiderable among many others; for the Arundelian marbles amounted to about two hundred and fifty. They were brought to London in 1627, and placed in the garden of Arundel-houſe. Thomas Howard, earl of Arundel had been at great pains and expence to procure them, and ſent William Petty, a very learned man into the Levant for that end. ‘Ea *(marmora)* illuſtriſſimus Comes, dum in Italia degerat, (quæ ei altera patria erat) ex antiquarum Aſiæ, Græciæ, & Italiæ urbium ruinis, operâ doctiſſimi viri Gulielmi Pettæi in hac re uſus, ſummis impenſis conquiſivit. Græcorum pleraque è Smyrna habuit; ea ibi * Gaſſendus (ſi fides ipſi hac in re habenda ſit) narrat operâ Peireſkii ſui primo detecta erutaque fuiſſe, perſolutis quinquaginta Aureis per Sampſonem quendam illius negotia Smyrnæ procurantem; ſed cum inde convehenda eſſent, Turcarum fraude Sampſone in carcerem conjecto, ibi detenta erant, donec ea illuſtriſſimus Arundelliæ Comes majori pretio per Pettæum redempta cum aliis, quæ per eundem procuratorem collegerat, Londinum in hortos Palatii Arundelliani, anno Dom. noſtri 1627 curavit transferenda (1). - - - - *The illuſtrious earl, whilſt he reſided in Italy, collected theſe marbles, at a great expence, out of the ruins of the ancient cities of Aſia, Greece, and Italy; in which he was aſſiſted by a very learned man, Mr William Petty. He had moſt of the Greek from Smyrna: Gaſſendus (if he is to be believed) ſays, they were firſt diſcovered there, and dug up, by the care of Peireſk, who paid for them fifty piſtoles by the hands of one Sampſon, who tranſacted his affairs in that city: but, when they were to be conveyed from thence, Sampſon being thrown into priſon by the treachery of the Turks, they were detained there, till the earl of Arundel, having paid a greater price for them by the hands of Petty, ſent them, together with others, which he had procured by the ſame hand, to the garden of Arundel-houſe in London, in the year* 1627.’ Henry Howard, earl of Arundel, his grandſon, preſented them to the univerſity of Oxford; and thoſe, who had the like monuments, did the ſame in imitation of him. ‘Quæcunque Vir immortalitate digniſſimus Thomas Arundeliæ Comes, legatione quaſi ſolemni eam ob rem inſtitutâ, infinitis impenſis, & repetito ſæpius capitis periculo eruditiſſimi viri Gulielmi Pettæi, cui procuratio ea demandabatur, Europâ, Aſiâque excuſſis, in Britannias noſtras deduxerat, Nepos ejuſdem, tanto Avo non inficiandus, æternitati & muſis hic loci demum conſecrabat: reliquiſque quotquot fuere eruditæ antiquitates Patronis autor extitit, ut ad tanti Auſpicis morem quæcunque apud ſe laterent ex temporum naufragio Tabulæ ibidem appenderent (2). - - - *The nephew of the immortal Thomas earl of Arundel, a gentleman worthy of ſuch an uncle, beſtowed on this univerſity whatever the earl had collected of this ſort, at a great expence, by the means of Mr William Petty, who often hazarded his life in procuring them from all parts of Europe and Aſia: which example was followed by all the patrons of ancient learning, who depoſited in the ſame place whatever lay by them, ſaved out of the ſhipwreck of time.*’ The firſt word of this paſſage ſignifies, that the grandſon beſtowed upon the univerſity of Oxford, all the marbles that his grandfather had procured; but it is not true: he only gave one half of them, and ſome few more, the reſt being loſt when the earls of Arundel left their houſe in the time of the civil wars. Dr Prideaux ſays ſo in his preface; and therefore his wrong account may be rectified by himſelf (3). ‘Arundelliana *(marmora)* plura quam centum & triginta numerantur; hæc tamen vix ultra dimidiam partem eorum conficiunt, quæ inſigniſſimus Arundelliæ Comes collegerat; cetera, cùm tempore nuperrimi belli civilis incendii in hortis Arundellianis Londini, pulſis inde dominis, diu neglecta jacuerunt, aut furtim ſurrepta, aut ſervorum negligentiâ corrupta, aut à Lapicidis (4) ad reficiendas ædes adhibita in magnum rei literariæ damnum amittuntur. - - - *There are more than one hundred and thirty Arundelian marbles, yet theſe are ſcarce more than half of what the earl of Arundel collected: the reſt, having lain a long time neglected, in the gardens of Arundel-houſe at London, in the time of the civil war, when the owners were driven from thence, and either ſtoln, or ſpoiled by the negligence of ſervants, or made uſe of by maſons in the repairing of houſes, are loſt to the great detriment of learning.*’ This ſhews, that Mr Vigneul Marville does not go upon a falſe report, when, having mentioned thoſe marbles, he adds: ‘It is a deplorable thing, that during the civil wars of England, moſt of thoſe marbles were made uſe of for the repairing of doors and chimneys. This will not encourage the curious to be at ſuch great expences (5).’ I would enlarge upon the importance of thoſe marbles, were it not that they make an article in the Supplement to Moreri's dictionary, and in the Journal des Savans of the twenty-fifth of April 1678. Note, that Humphry Prideaux tranſlated into Latin a tract of *Maimonides de jure pauperis & peregrini apud Judæos*, printed with his notes at Oxford, in the year 1679, in 4to. He is alſo author of the life of Mahomet, which I have ſo often quoted in the article MECCA. I am told he is dean of Norwich.

(*a*) *Taken from Freherus's* Theatrum, *pag.* 550. *He quotes Antony Wood's* Hiſtoria & Antiquitates Univerſitatis Oxonienſis.

* In Vita Peireſkii, *lib. iv, ad ann.* 1629.

(1) Humphridus Prideaux, Præf. ad Marmora Oxonienſia.

(2) Idem, Epiſt. Dedicator. init.

(3) Idem, in Præfat.

(4) The author ſays, two pages after, that he has read all the inſcriptions but one, *viz.* that of a marble, one half of which was made uſe of by a Maſon, and the letters of the other half are defaced. *Alterâ à Lapicida quodam ad reficiendum focum in Palatio Arundelliano adhibitâ.*

(5) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges, *Tom. ii, pag.* 301, 302, *Dutch Edit.*

PRIERIAS.

PRIERIAS or DE PRIERIO (SILVESTER) a monk of the order of St Dominic, was ſo called becauſe he was of the village of Prierio in Italy (a). He flouriſhed at the begining of the XVIth century. He paſſed for a learned Divine, and an eloquent preacher, and he publiſhed ſeveral books. He was maſter of the ſacred palace under Pope Leo X, and ſome ſay that he paſſed from this employ to that of general of the Dominicans: but they do not mark the time of his promotion to this firſt dignity of the order. What makes me believe that they are miſtaken [*A*] is, that an author, who has extremely commended him, remarks that he was made vicar-general of the order of the Dominicans, and that he would have riſen to a higher degree, if death had not prevented it (b). He had been honoured by the ſenate of Venice with the office of profeſſor in the univerſity of Padua (c) from whence he had been called to Rome to diſcharge the like office, with a public ſtipend, after which he became maſter of the ſacred palace (d). He ſucceeded very ill in writing againſt Luther [*B*]. It is ſaid that he was the firſt who wrote books againſt him: it is the opinion of Onuphrius Panvinius (e): and of ſeveral other writers. Nevertheleſs ſome pretend that the Divines of Louvain and ſome others diſputed this priority with him (f). I have read in Antonius Senenſis that the firſt work which he wrote againſt Luther was printed at Rome in the year 1520, under the litle of *Errata & Argumenta Martini Lutheri recitata, detecta & repulſa &c* (g). This is not true [*C*]. We may ſee in the Anſwer to the Queſtions of a Provincial (h) a miſtake of Moreri copied by Mr du Pin. Our Prierias boaſts in his reply to Luther that he had refuſed a biſhopric (i). He carried the relaxation of morals very far; for he pretended that it *is not even neceſſary, in order to be juſtified in the ſacrament of Penance, to have attrition, and that it is ſufficient to be ſorry for not having it, or even to deſire to be ſory for it* (k). His doctrine concerning Equivocations is not much better [*D*].

[*A*] *What makes me believe that they are miſtaken.*] Beſides the reaſon that I alledge in the text, I will ſay here that Auguſtin *ab Eccleſia*, who has written the Hiſtory of the biſhops of Piedmont, has added to it a long catalogue of all the eccleſiaſtics of the dominions of the duke of Savoy, on both ſides of the Alps, who have been generals of the order; but he does not mention Silveſter Prierias (1). Nevertheleſs he was well acquainted with him; for he obſerves in his *Corona Regia Salaudica*, that Prierias was born at Prierio a village of the weſtern Liguria under the marquiſate of Ceve (2).

[*B*] *He ſucceeded very ill in writing againſt Luther.*] The indulgences were the firſt thing which was attacked by that Reformer. He oppoſed them by reaſons; but Eckius and Prierias, who anſwered him, *not finding themſelves ſufficiently ſtrong, had recourſe to common-places, and laid down for a foundation . . . . . the authority of the Pope and the conſent of the ſchool-men; concluding, that we ought to receive indulgences as an article of faith, ſince they proceeded from the Pope, who was infallible in matters of faith, and who had approved the doctrine of the ſchool-men* (3). Here is the judgment of Father Maimbourg on this method of reply. 'Silveſter Prieraſk, inſtead of ſolidly refuting, as he 'might have done, what Luther had anſwered him in 'his book, publiſhed another filled with exceſſive ex'aggerations of the power and authority of the Pope, 'which he raiſes infinitely above all the councils, of 'which he ſpeaks in terms which even Rome would 'not approve of: This gave Luther a handle to ren'der this authority odious to the Germans, and to 'make a diverſion, by applying himſelf warmly to 'ſo nice a point which was not the thing in contro'verſy. So neceſſary it is, in oppoſing heretics to 'keep preciſely to what the faith teaches, without 'meddling unſeaſonably with litigious queſtions thro' 'an over-haſtineſs of temper, in which we give our 'adverſary the advantage of being able to maintain 'his opinion, with as much right as we have to op'poſe it (4).' Nothing can make us better underſtand the bad ſucceſs of the writings of Prierias, than to know that he was commanded by the Pope to write no more on matters of controverſy. *Reſpondit Silveſter Prierias tam feliciter ut ipſe Pontifex indixerit illi ſilentium* (5).

[*C*] *It is not true that the firſt book . . . . was printed in the year* 1520.] In the year 1518, Luther publiſhed a book which was an anſwer to a dialogue that Prierias had written againſt him (6). Prierias anſwered him by a work intituled, *De juridica & irrefragabili veritate Romanæ Eccleſiæ Romanique Pontificis, Liber tertius, index quidem longiſſimus, ſed breviſſimum Epitoma* (7). Luther refuted this reply in the ſame year 1518. I do not pretend to maintain that Prierias's firſt book againſt Luther was not printed at Rome in 1520, as Antonius Senenſis and Mr Du Pin affirm (8). I only maintain that it had been printed before that year. For the reſt, I believe that John Eckius, a German Divine, wrote his Obeliſks againſt Luther's theſis on indulgences before Prierias took pen in hand; but he did not intend to publiſh this piece, and I am of opinion that Luther publiſhed it together with his own refutation. He had recovered a manuſcript copy of this little work of John Eckius (9). Note that John Tezelius, a Dominican, and Inquiſitor in Germany, and the firſt of the commiſſaries for the publication of indulgences, is the perſon who firſt wrote againſt Luther; for, in a public diſpute at Francfort on the Oder, he laid down a theſis, in which he oppoſed that of Luther, and he had already publiſhed a piece in German againſt a ſermon which Luther had preached on indulgences (10).

[*D*] *His doctrine concerning equivocations is not much better*] Let us quote it as it is to be found in the Anti-Coton. 'The ſame Andreas Eudemonojohannes 'Cydonius, in page 40, builds on the authority of 'Silveſter, in the fifth accuſation, queſtion 13, where 'he ſays, *When the judge does not proceed judicially, be'cauſe the accuſed is not ſimply ſubject to him, or for 'ſome other reaſon, then though a lie be unlawful, it is 'not a mortal ſin; becauſe it is neither contrary to what 'juſtice requires, nor in a true judgment, but that 'which is uſurped: A lie will not even be a venial ſin, 'if in anſwering fraudulently, and, as they ſay, ſophi'ſtically, he ſays ſomething which is falſe, according to 'the ſenſe of the judge, but which is true according to 'his own; becauſe in this caſe, not being his ſubject, he 'is not obliged to ſpeak the truth* *. We muſt under'ſtand that by this judgment, which is not a true 'judgment, but uſurped over thoſe who are not his 'ſubjects, he means the authority of civil magiſtrates 'over the Clergy, and principally over the Jeſuits, who 'are not even ſubject to the biſhops (11).' The Jeſuit Eudæmon Johannes had quoted theſe words of Prierias in his apology for Garnet, now here is what he anſwered to the author of the Anti-Coton. 'Sylveſtri verba profers non infideliter . . . . ſed Gallicè 'pervertis potius quam vertis: quero enim ex te ubi 'illa legeris in verbis Sylveſtri, *Voire le menſonge ne 'ſera pas meſme peché veniel?* Imo inquit ille, non 'erit etiam veniale ſi reſpondendo, &c. Tu ut men'daciis totus ſcates, de tuo verbis ejus mendacium ad'didiſti, cum ita verteris mendacium non erit pecca'tum veniale. Nunquam ſomniavit vir ille menda'cium ullum eſſe poſſe, quod peccatum minimum ve'niale non ſit: ſed negavit peccatum eſſe veniale cum 'injuſto judice æquivocationibus agere, quod ipſum 'S. Gregorius docuit (12). - - - *You quote the words 'of Sylveſter not unfaithfully . . . . but you rather per'vert, than tranſlate it into French: for I aſk you 'where you read in the words of Sylveſter,* Voire le 'menſonge

---

(a) In the Montferrat according to ſome, or in the Aſtezan according to others: but to give a clear notion of the ſituation of this place, I muſt ſay that it is in the Montferrat of Savoy, between the Marquiſate of Ceve, and that of Final, and very near the town of Ceve.

(b) Ghilini, Teatro, *Tom. i, pag.* 209.

(c) Mr Du Pin, *Tom. xiv, pag.* 115, pretends that he was a long time profeſſor of Divinity at Boulogne.

(d) Ghilini, ubi ſupra.

(e) Onuphrius, in Chron. Eccleſ. *ad ann.* 1521, apud Anton. Senenſem, in Biblioth. Prædicat. *pag. m.* 223.

(f) Labbe, Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. ii, pag.* 374.

(g) Anton. Senenſis, in Bibl. Prædicat. *pag.* 223.

(h) *At pag.* 619, *of Tom. i.*

(i) Seckend. Hiſtor. Luther. *lib. i, pag.* 39, *col.* 1.

(k) Journal de Trevoux, *Sept.* 1703, *p.* 1623, *French Edit.*

(1) This remark was communicated to me by Mr Minutoli.

(2) *See* Oldoini, in Athenæo Liguſtico.

(3) Father Paul, Hiſtory of the Council of Trent, *book i.* See alſo Pallavicini, Hiſt. of the ſame Council, *book i, ch. vi, num.* 3.

(4) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Luther. *livr. i, pag.* 30, 31, *Dutch Edit.*

(5) Eraſm. Epiſt. LXXI, *lib. xix, pag. m.* 887.

(6) *See* Seckend. Hiſt. Luther. *lib. i, pag.* 31, *col.* 1.

(7) Ibid. *p.* 39, *col.* 1.

(8) Du Pin, Bibl. *Tom. xiv, pag.* 115, *Dutch Edit.*

(9) *See* Seckend. ubi ſupra, *p.* 30, *ad ann.* 1518.

(10) Seckend. ibid. *pag.* 25, 26. See alſo Mr du Pin, *Tom. xiii, p.* 33.

* Quando juridice non procedit, vel quia accuſatus ei non eſt ſubjectus ſimpliciter, vel in hoc caſu, aut quacunque alia de cauſa, tunc licet mendacium ſit illicitum, non tamen eſt mortale, quia nec contra debitum juſtitiæ, nec eſt in judicio vero, ſed in uſurpato. Immò non erit etiam veniale ſi reſpondendo cautelosè & ut aiunt ſophiſticè dicat aliquid falſum apud ſenſum judicis & apud ſuum verum.

(11) Anti-Coton, *pag.* 24.

(12) Eudæmon Johannes, Anti-Coton, Confutat. *cap. iii, p.* 113.

‘menſonge ne ſera pas meſme peché veniel? *What he ſays is,* It will not even be a venial ſin, if in anſwering, *&c. You, as you are wholly given to lying, have added to his words a lie of your own, by tranſlating it thus,* A lie will not be a venial ſin. *That author never dreamt that there could be any lie, which is not a venial ſin: but he denied that it is a venial ſin to uſe equivocations before an incompetent judge, which very thing St Gregory taught.*’ It is very probable that by theſe words, *he underſtands the judgment of magiſtrates,* the author of the Anti-Coton means our Sylveſter, and not Eudæmon Johannes. In this caſe he commits a miſtake; for the book, out of which the paſſage cited in the apology for Garnet is taken, was written a long time before there was any Jeſuit in the world. It was dedicated to Leo X, who died in the year 1521. Eudæmon Johannes (13) did not forget to critize thereupon the author of the Anti-Coton. He likewiſe cenſures him (14) for not having underſtood that *V. Accuſat.* ſignified, not the fifth Accuſation, but *Voce Accuſatio,* under the word *Accuſation.*

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 114.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 112.

PRIEZAC (Daniel de) *counſellor of ſtate in ordinary, born in the caſtle of Priezac in Limoſin* (*a*), was choſen, in the year 1639, *to fill up the only place that was left among the forty members* of the French academy (*b*). He wrote ſeveral books [*A*], and died in the year 1662.

(*a*) Pelliſſon, Hiſt. de l'Academie Françoiſe, *pag.* 229.

(*b*) Ibid.

[*A*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] I ſhall uſe here the words of Mr Pelliſſon (1): ‘His printed works are, *Obſervations againſt the book of Melroſe, intituled,* Philip the Prudent. *Vindiciæ Gallicæ. Three volumes concerning the privileges of the Holy Virgin. Diſceptatio legitima, in controverſia mota inter Apoſtolicæ Cameræ cognitorem, Actorem; & Eminentiſſimos Cardinales Barberinos, excellentiſſimumque urbis Romæ Præfectum; Defenſores.* One volume in quarto of Political Diſcourſes. He is now (2) writing a ſecond volume.’ Note, That the *Vindiciæ Gallicæ* is an anſwer to the *Mars Gallicus* of Janſenius.

(1) Pelliſſon, Hiſt. de l'Academie Françoiſe, *pag.* 354.

(2) Mr Pelliſſon wrote this in the year 1652.

PRYNN (William) an Engliſh Lawyer, made himſelf very much talked of during the civil wars of Charles I, and the parliament. He had a great deal of inconſtancy and impetuoſity in his temper. He declared ſo violently againſt the Epiſcopal clergy, that he expoſed himſelf to an ignominious puniſhment; for he was condemned to have his ears cut off [*A*]: which was executed, and proved advantageous to him, when the war broke out between the king and the parliament. He was looked upon as a glorious confeſſor of the Good Cauſe, and as one who had ſuffered for the purity of the goſpel. He was a member of the houſe of commons, and expreſſed a great animoſity againſt the royaliſts; nevertheleſs, either thro' inconſtancy, or private diſcontent, he grew milder afterwards, and was impriſoned. He wrote a ſmall piece in his confinement [*B*], wherein he repreſented to the parliament, that they ought not to bring the king to his trial; and that the army, which oppreſſed the liberty of the parliament, was directed by the counſels of the Jeſuits. He had before publiſhed a book, wherein he exhorted the parliament to exterminate by penal laws

[*A*] *He was condemned to have his ears cut off.*] A miniſter of Baſil ſeems to ſay, that he was alſo condemned to be tranſported into America; but it is more likely he meant, that he was condemned to ſpend the remaining part of his life in a dungeon. Theſe are his words: ‘Author noſter *Prynnus, Baſtwicus & Burtonus,* trium Facultatum Doctores, quod contra iſtam tyrannidem hiſcere auſi fuiſſent auribus mutilati, extra anni ſoliſque viam expulſi ſunt quo longa tabe perimerentur (1). - - - *Our author* Prynn, Baſtwick, *and* Burton, *Doctors of three Faculties, had their ears cut off, and were baniſhed beyond the ſun's annual courſe, for daring to open their mouths againſt this tyranny.*’ Here follows a paſſage of Mr Baillet, wherein we find at what time, and in what place, William Prynn had his ears cut off. It contains alſo ſome other particulars, and thereſore I ſhall ſet it down at length. ‘(2) There is indeed an Anti-Arminianism of William Prynn; but the title does not ſo much concern the Arminians themſelves, as the nature of their doctrines. The deſign of his work is only to ſhew, that the doctrine of abſolute Predeſtination, ſuch as the Calviniſts teach it, has been conſtantly believed by the Chriſtian Church. This Prynn ſeems to be the ſame with that famous enemy of the biſhops of England, and particularly of the unfortunate William Laud, archbiſhop of Canterbury (3). He had his ears cut off by the common executioner, in the Palace-yard of Weſtminſter, the 30th of June 1637, for his tragedy concerning the breaking of the Sabbath, and the ſtate of the biſhops; and being fined five thouſand pounds, with a Phyſician named Baſtwick, and a London miniſter named Burton, was clapped up in a priſon, where he was to remain the reſt of his days. But he was ſet at liberty, when Charles I was put to death, and even choſen a member of Parliament (4). He wrote afterwards a prodigious number of books, moſt of them in his mother-tongue; and was made keeper of the records in the tower of London. He died about eighteen or nineteen years ago.’

(1) Wolfgangus Meyerus, S. Th. D. & Verbi divini in Eccleſia Baſil. Miniſt. Senior, Epiſtola Dedicator. Fulcimenti Gladii.

(2) Baillet, in the firſt Tome of the Anti, *num.* 88.

(4) He had been releaſed before, and was a member of the Houſe of Commons.

[*B*] *He wrote a ſmall piece in his confinement.*] It is to be found in a collection of ſeveral pieces, publiſhed by a royaliſt in the year 1649, with this title, *Sylloge variorum Tractatuum, Anglico quidem idiomate & ab Auctoribus Anglis conſcriptorum, ſed in linguam Latinam tranſlatorum; quibus Caroli Magnæ Britan. Franciæ, & Hiberniæ Regis innocentia illuſtratur, & parricidium injuſtiſſimè & immaniſſimè in illum perpetratum, à Pſeudo-Parlamentò & perduelli exercitu luce clarius declaratur. Acceſſit Reſponſum perneceſſarium ad declamationem ſeu provocationem M. Joannis Cooke. Auctore I. V. A. R.* That piece of William Prynn is intituled, *Breve Memento ad præſens Non-Parlamentarium conventiculum, tangens ipſorum præſentes intentiones & proceſſus ad deponendum & ſupplicio afficiendum Carolum Stewardum legitimum ſuum Regem: per Guilielmum Prynnium, Armigerum, membrum Domus Communium, & captivum ſub exercitus Tyrannide: qui, ut apparet, arma fert contra Domos Parlamenti, ſuos quondam Dominos: quarum membra nunc violenter capit & detinet captiva, durante ipſorum illegali licentià.* He who tranſlated it into Latin obſerves, that it is the work of a man not well-affected towards the king. ‘Quam injuſtè, perfidè, perjurè, crudeliter hæc geſta ſint in Unctum Domini, auctor hujus ſcripti quamquam omnium minime Regi obnoxius liberrimè & fideliſſimè exponit. - - - *This author, though no friend to the king, expoſes, with great freedom and truth, the injuſtice, treachery, perjury, and cruelty, with which they treated the LORD's anointed.*’

(3) *Here is a paſſage of Dr Smith,* in Vita Cambdeni, *pag.* 56. Illo (*Archiepiſcopo Laudo*) in carcerem detruſo, Gulielmus Prinnus, ob ſeditioſos libellos ſtigmate inuſtus, in D. Archiepiſcopi ſcrinia, tum ut ſi quicquam, quod fictis criminibus objectis aliqualem induceret colorem, occurriſſet, inde excerperet, tum ut quantum erat documentorum quod Viro innocentiſſimo iiſdem diluendis, cum pro Tribunali ſiſtendus eſſet, de capite dicturus, uſui eſſe potuerit, quoque auferret, animo malevolo involavit. - - - *Archbiſhop Laud being thrown into priſon, William Prynn, who had been branded for writing ſeditious libels, ſearched the archbiſhop's papers, with a malicious deſign of taking from thence whatever might give a plauſible colour to the accuſations brought againſt him, as alſo whatever might be of uſe to that moſt innocent prelate in juſtifying himſelf at his trial.* See the article CAMBDEN, remark [*M*].

laws all the Independants [*C*]. If it be true, that he ſaid what is aſcribed to him, concerning the perſon, who ſet London on fire [*D*], he was a very great viſionary. He wrote a vaſt number of books, which ſhew his great reading [*E*]. He died the twenty-fourth of October 1669, aged ſixty-nine years (*a*).

(*a*) Witte, in Diario Biographico.

[*C*] *To exterminate by penal laws all the Independants.*] He dedicated that book to the Houſe of Commons. I have it tranſlated into Latin, and printed in 1649. The author of that tranſlation was a Swiſs miniſter, named Wolfgang Meyer. The title runs thus: *Guilielmi Prynn Angli Armigeri Aulæ Lincolnienſis, Fulcimentum Gladii Chriſtianorum Regum, Principum & Magiſtratuum: Quo ipſorum Hæreticos, Idololatras, Schiſmaticos, Sectarum Authores, & Blaſphemos, pro criminis gravitate puniendi authoritas, jus ac poteſtas teſtimoniis Veteris ac Novi Teſtamenti, edictis & praxi Chriſtianorum Imperatorum. Regum, Statuum & Magiſtratuum, ſanctionibus item & ſtatutis Regni Angliæ: conſenſu denique optimorum tàm veteris, quàm recentioris Eccleſiæ Doctorum, & Politicorum, contra hodiernos Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ turbatores, veterum Donatiſtarum, & Monaſterienſium Anabaptiſtarum æmulos, ſolidiſſimè vindicatur.* Prynn alledges in that book all that can be ſaid for the power of the ſword againſt errors; he brings in arguments, authorities, cuſtom, the deciſions of Doctors, the Confeſſions of Faith, &c. Father *de Sainte Marthe*, a French Benedictin, made no ſmall uſe of this book, to ſhew, that the edict of Nantes was lawfully repealed. See his anſwer to the complaints of the Proteſtants, or the extract which Mr Couſin has given of it (5). In the year 1643, Prynn began to oppoſe the Independants, who thought that the ſuppreſſion of Epiſcopacy would prove inſignificant, and even prejudicial, if people were to ſubmit to the ſynodal government of the Puritans. Voſſius wrote the following words to Grotius in September 1643. ‘Unum eſt in quo non ſatis conveniat illis, qui ſe Epiſcopis opponunt. Multi omnem regendæ Eccleſiæ poteſtatem penes preſbyterale collegium eſſe volunt. Alii vero ajunt hoc jugum gravius Epiſcopali. Quare contendunt, ſingulis id committendum Eccleſiaſtis, ut ſecundum Dei verbum, populum doceant, & gubernent. Atque ſic ab Epiſcopalibus & Preſbyteralibus (ſicuti vocant) diſtincti, independentes nuncupantur. Prynnius, cujus magna adeo in Parlamento eſt authoritas, prioris eſſe ſententiæ dicitur; ſed multi hac parte ei adverſantur, qui cætera convenire videntur. Eſtque plurimorum id judicium, utcunque infracta omni Regis poteſtate, & abolito Epiſcopatu, geminum agerent triumphum, eos inter ſeſe mox commiſſum iri; quia multi non à Preſbyterii poteſtate minus, quam Epiſcoporum abhorreant (6). - - - *There is one thing in which the oppoſers of Epiſcopacy do not agree. Many would have the whole power of governing the church lodged in the college of Preſbyters. Others ſay, this yoke is heavier than that of Epiſcopacy. Wherefore they contend, that it ſhould be left to every particular Eccleſiaſtic, to teach and govern his flock, according to the word of GOD. And, thus, being diſtinct both from Epiſcoparians and Preſbyterians (as they are called) they have gained the name of Independants. Prynn, whoſe authority is ſo great in parliament, is ſaid to be of the former opinion: but many, who agree with him in other things, oppoſe him in this. And it is the opinion of many, that, after having triumphed over both the regal and epiſcopal power, they will ſoon quarrel among themſelves, there being many who abhor the power of the Preſbytery no leſs than that of the biſhops.*’ Here is an inſtance of mens inclination to run into extreams. Part of thoſe who hated Epiſcopacy were againſt the Preſbyterian ſynods, and pretended that it was a more intolerable yoke than that of the Hierarchy. Prynn ſtrenuouſly oppoſed them, and was for inflicting a corporal puniſhment upon them. See his *Fulcimentum gladii.*

[*D*] *Concerning the perſon, who ſet London on fire.*] If the following words had not been printed, I would not inſert them in this place. ‘This thought . . . . puts me in mind of William Prynn's extravagance. . . That madman maintained to a gentleman of my acquaintance, from whom I have it, that Pope Alexander VII had ſet London on fire in the year 1666, and that he came into England in the diſguiſe of a Coal-man (7).’

[*E*] *He wrote a vaſt number of books, which ſhew his great reading.*] I find the following paſſage in Witte's *Diarium* (8). GUIL. PRYNNE, Anglus, Swainſwica-Somerſetenſis, Collegii Orielenſis Oxoniæ Commenſalis, Artium Baccalaureus. . . . . Libri quos varii admodum, Theologici nimirum. Hiſtorici, Politici & Polemici argumenti conſcripſit ad 170; adverſaria potius quam opera nuncupari merentur, adeoque (9) ipſum pene Toſtatum æquaſſe videtur. . . . . Libros à ſe conſcriptos moriens Hoſpitio Lincolnienſi quod Londini eſt, legavit, qui voluminibus XXXVII. in fol. & 4. continentur. - - - - *William Prynn, a Somerſetſhire gentleman, bachelor of arts of Oriel college in Oxford. . . . He wrote 170 pieces on different ſubjects, namely, Divinity, Hiſtory, Politics, and Controverſy; which deſerve rather the title of* Adverſaria, *than* Works; *inſomuch that he ſeems to have equalled Toſtatus. . . . . . . At his death, he left the books he had wrote to Lincolns-Inn in London, conſiſting of thirty-ſeven volumes in folio and 4to.*’ I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Schoockius, whereby it appears, that Prynn was praiſed for his great reading, and that he was a rigid Puritan, who could not ſo much as endure the drinking of healths (10). ‘Is eſt qui auguſto elogio ab eodem (*D. Voëtio*) condecoratur in diſput. *de ebrietate*, & quidem ſecundum hanc formulam: *Diffuſæ eruditionis Juriſconſultus Gul Prynne* (11), *cum generis nobilitate tum rara pietate conſpicuus, in Tract. Anglico, adverſus* Salutes *conſcripto.* Liber hic Prynnii (de quo viro ante aliquot annos tam amplus rumor per Britanniam & Belgium fuit) ſi reſpondeat ejuſdem Tractatui de Spectaculis, (nam hunc ſolum vidi) dixerim, diffuſam eruditionem Authoris (licet hic ipſe à D. Voëtio oſtentetur ut *nobilis*) reſpondere ſcopis diſſolutis, atque ſervire confirmando dicto vulgato, quod eam ſolam vim fortem eſſe agnoſcit, quæ fuerit *unita*. Fueritne vero Prynnius pius ſolus Deus novit, quum *D. Voëtius* quando favet, nimis quam liberalis ſit in titulo illo concedendo. Certe hoc non poſſum cognoſcere ex ejuſdem libro de Spectaculis, niſi pariter Phariſæi pii fuerint agnoſcendi, eo, quod *cuminum & anethum decimarent*. - - - - *He is the Perſon, whom Voëtius honours with a grand elogy, in his Diſputation on Drunkenneſs. It is as follows:* William Prynn, a Civilian of extenſive learning, famous both for the nobility of his family, and his piety, in the Engliſh tract which he wrote againſt drinking healths. If this book of Prynn's (who was ſo much talked of for ſeveral years in England and Holland) be like his treatiſe againſt plays, (for I have ſeen no other) I will venture to ſay, that the extenſive learning of the author (tho' he himſelf be extolled by Voëtius for the nobility of his birth) is like a rope of ſand, and ſerves to confirm the common ſaying, which allows that force only to be ſtrong, which is united. But whether Prynn was a man of piety, God only knows, when Voëtius is too liberal in beſtowing that title on him. I am ſure I cannot diſcover this from his book on Public Shows, unleſs at the ſame time the Phariſees be allowed to have been pious, becauſe they *tithed cummin and anniſeed.*’

(5) *In the* Journal des Sçavans, *of the 26th of April* 1688. *See alſo the* Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *for March* 1688, *pag.* 384.

(6) Voſſius, Epiſt. cccclxii, *p. m.* 409, *col.* 1.

(7) Le Grand, Hiſt. du Divorce de Henri VIII, Roi d'Angleterre, *pag.* 82, *of the continuation of the 2d part.*

(8) *Ad* 24. *Oct.* 1669.

(9) This *adeo* does not make a right concluſion; for Toſtatus's works are not like *Adverſaria.*

(10) Martin. Schoockius, Exercitat. Variarum, *pag.* 302, *Edit.* 1663, *in* 4*to.*

(11) The edition of this diſputation, *de ebrietate*, which I make uſe of, (it is that of 1667, in the fourth volume, *Diſput. Selectar. pag.* 503) has only, *Diffuſæ lectionis Juriſconſult. Gul. Prynn. in tractatu, &c.*

PRIOLO (**BENJAMIN**) in Latin *Priolus*, author of an Hiſtory of France, from the death of Lewis XIII, to the year 1664, was born at Saint Jean d'Angeli, the firſt of January 1602. He deſcended from the *Priuli* or *Prioli*, an illuſtrious family, which has afforded ſome Doges to the republic of Venice [*A*]. He was but fifteen

[*A*] *He deſcended from the* Priuli, *or* Prioli, *an illuſtrious family, which has afforded ſome Doges to the Republic of Venice.*] ANTONY PRIOLI, nephew to LAURENCE, and JEROM PRIOLI, brothers and doges of Venice one after another, came very young into France, in the reign of fifteen years of age, when he loſt his father and mother, which doubtleſs increaſed the obſtacle he met with in the courſe of his ſtudies: but thoſe obſtacles did not abate, in the leaſt, his eager deſire of being a learned man. His inclination for learning was ſo great, that he ſpent whole days and nights in reading without any interruption (*a*). He ſtudied firſt at Orthez, and then at Montauban, and afterwards at Leyden. He improved himſelf by the lectures of Heinſius and Voſſius in this laſt town, and beſtowed three years in reading all the Greek and Latin Poets and Hiſtorians. Being deſirous to ſee and conſult Grotius, he took a journey to Paris, and then went to Padua, by reaſon of the great reputation of Cremoninus and Licetus, of whom he throughly learned the opinions of Ariſtotle, and of the other ancient Philoſophers. He returned into France, from whence he went again into Italy, to get himſelf acknowledged by the Prioli as one of their relations [*B*]. He attached himſelf to the duke

of Henry II, with an ambaſſador of the family Lauredano, his uncle by the mother's ſide. He fell in love with a daughter of a gentleman of Saintonge, who was at Paris about a conſiderable law-ſuit. He married her, and having carried her to Venice, they were both ſo unkindly received by the Republic, and their relations, that the diſſolution of their marriage was a thing reſolved upon. It would have been declared void according to the laws, had not the ambaſſador, who repreſented in France the body of the Republic, ſigned the contract; for which he was cenſured by a decree of the year 1554; and it was voted, that Antony, and his poſterity, ſhould be excluded from all offices in the ſenate. This ill ſucceſs moved him to leave Venice, and, having ſecured his effects, he returned to France, and ſettled in his wiſe's country, at St Jean d'Angeli. He had many children: MARK, the eldeſt, was the father of JULIAN, and Julian was the father of BENJAMIN, who makes the ſubject of this article. Julian ruined himſelf by his four marriages, and the expences he was at in the war, being the firſt officer of the regiment de la Force. Benjamin was his ſon by his fourth wife. He put his father's name under the cut engraved by the famous Pitau, and prefixed to his Hiſtory of France: that cut may be had ſtill at the Print-ſellers. The inſcription runs thus: *Benjaminus Priolus Santo. Juliani F. Eques Venetus, Rerum Gallicarum Scriptor florentiſſimus.* Which ſhews Sorbiere's miſtakes concerning the father of Benjamin Priolo.

That family increaſed very much, and was naturalized in the reign of Charles IX. They entirely embraced the Reformed Religion under Henry IV, and there has been ſeveral eminent miniſters of that family (1). They were ſollicited by a letter (2) from the doge, Leonard Donato, to return to Venice, but did not care to do it, being well ſettled in France. They troubled themſelves no more about Venice; but it may be proved, by a paſſage out of the book, intituled, *Recherches de la Nobleſſe*, printed at Montaubon in 1616, that they always pretended to be originally from Venice. The author of that book, who was a gentleman of Bearn, called la Roque, ſays, that the Prioleau's (ſo he writes their name) (3) of Saintoigne and Aunix, were not originally of Venice, as ſeveral of them pretended, in ſeveral records, under the reign of Henry III, but that they are antient gentlemen, who had a mind to derive their pedigree from the Venetians, becauſe their name was like that of the noble Prioli of Venice. Tho' this paſſage contains a falſity, it irrefragably confutes the Sorberiana. The falſity I ſpeak of, manifeſtly appears by the good ſucceſs of Benjamin Priolo, in making out his extraction from the Prioli of Venice. The genealogical memoir, preſented by him, having been examined, the Republic ordered, that a patent ſhould be drawn up, which he received from Mr Grimani, ambaſſador in France in the year 1660, with a gold chain and medal worth three hundred piſtoles. By that patent the ſenate acknowledged him to be a noble Venetian knight. The arms of the Prioli are blazoned and added to the ſeal, and round about, *Non data, non conceſſa, ſed adnata, ſenatus decreto.* The title is alſo in Latin, and the reſt in Italian. Mr Prioli received at the ſame time a congratulatory letter from Laurence Prioli, proveditor of the ſea, who was then the head of the family.

It ought to be obſerved, that the Republic of Venice takes no notice of the baſtards of noblemen. Their very fathers will not own them, and even abandon them; for it is not the cuſtom of the noble Venetians to have private miſtreſſes: they apply themſelves to courtezans, and club for the keeping of one; by which means they avoid being jealous one of another: but if the courtezan has a child, none of them owns it (4).

[*B*] *He went again into Italy, to get himſelf acknowledged by the Prioli, as one of their relations.*] So I paraphraſe the Latin words of John Rhodius, *In Italiam reverſus eſt, quærendis apud Venetos originis ſuæ primordiis* (5). The author adds, That the ſenate of Venice gave Benjamin Priolo a very kind reception, and made him a knight, but without admitting him to the prerogatives of his family, the laws of the Republic not permitting it, becauſe he deſcended from one Antoni Prioli, who had married a foreigner out of Venice. *Blandè acceptus à Senatu, factus eques, ſed excluſus generis ſui prærogativa, quoniam Antonius Priolus ejus avus paternus, qui Princeps fuit Reip. Venetorum, non potuit legitimum matrimonium extra urbem & cum extera contraxiſſe ſalvis patriæ legibus* (6). That author is in the wrong to ſay, that Antony Prioli was a doge; and he ſhould not have ſaid, that he was Benjamin's grand-father, but his great-grand-father. He is alſo miſtaken as to the time: the patent whereby the ſenate owned Benjamin to be related to the Prioli of Venice, was not granted before the year 1660. What he ſays in the concluſion of his elogy, that Mr Priolo took orders after the death of his wife (7), is a great falſity.

The two following paſſages will confirm what I have ſaid in the foregoing remark. Mr Priolo, ſpeaking of the town of St Jean d'Angeli, makes this ſmall digreſſion: 'Ibi mea infantia vagiit, hic aërem primum hauſi. Hæc terra, mihi atavis Venetis, iiſque illuſtribus, neſcio quo caſu, primum tacta. Si decora meæ gentis à me intermiſſa ſunt, forſan nepotibus inſtaurabuntur; & Sant-Angelium olim me alumno gaudebit (8). - - - *There I firſt drew my breath; being deſcended of a noble Venetian family. If the honours of my race are loſt to me, perhaps they will be reſtored to my poſterity; and St Angeli will one day boaſt of having educated me.*' You ſee that he publickly boaſts of his Venetian extraction, as he does alſo in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his work to the Republic of Venice: 'O Patria! *ſays he,* O vaſti pelagi dominatrix! agnoſce tuum civem, vel ſolo nomine Prioli tibi dilectum. - - - *O my country, O miſtreſs of the wide ocean! acknowledge thy citizen, dear to thee by the name alone of Prioli.*'

ADVERTISEMENT to the reader once for all.

As for the reſt, I beſeech the readers to mind what I am going to ſay. There is a very remarkable difference between other Hiſtorical Dictionaries and mine. I am not contented, according to the cuſtom of thoſe Dictionaries, to give a general account of a man's life; but I collect, as much as the few books I have will permit me, the moſt curious and remarkable paſſages, the judgments that have been made of thoſe I ſpeak of, and the faults that have been committed concerning them. I examine, I prove, I confute, as there is occaſion. But when I have no proofs to confute a falſity, I am forced to leave it without a confutation; and my ſilence, in that reſpect, is not a ſign, that I warrant the truth of the facts mentioned by me. The authors, whom I quote, ought to be anſwerable for what they advance. It is enough for me to confute the falſities that are known to me, and to be always diſpoſed to confute thoſe I ſhall diſcover by the help of others, and by my own enquiries. No one can do me a greater pleaſure than to impart to me the proofs and explanations that are neceſſary to rectify the miſtakes (9) inſerted in this work, upon the credit of authors. I ſhall always be ready to do whatever juſtice and truth require. I can be poſitive about it: I know

(*a*) Tanta fuit in illo diſcendi intemperies, ut noctes diebus continuaret evolvendo quidquid voluminum edidit Romana aut Graia vetuſtas. *Joannes Rhodius, de Vita Benjamini Prioli, pag.* 3.

(1) A nephew of Benjamin, was miniſter of the church of Niort.

(2) Dated the 15th of April 1608.

(3) I have it from very good hands, that ſome miniſters in thoſe parts writ their name *Prioleau*. But it ought to be obſerved, that the pronunciation being the ſame in the greateſt part of France, whether that name be written *Priolo*, or *Prioleau*; and the French not being very nice and exact, it is no wonder that the name of that family ſhould have been differently ſpelt.

(4) Taken from a manuſcript Memoir.

(5) Johannes Rhodius, de Vita Benj. Prioli, *pag.* 4.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ipſe pater ſe ſacris addixit, rerum humanarum & ſæculi pertæſus, pervicacis, ingrati. *Ibid. pag.* 7.

(8) Priolus, de Rebus Gallicis, *lib. vi, n.* 38, *pag. m.* 283.

(9) This muſt be likewiſe underſtood of my own miſtakes.

duke of Rohan [C], who was then in the ſervice of the Venetians, and ſo inſinuated himſelf into his favour, that he became one of his moſt intimate confidents. The duke ſent him twice into Spain upon important negotiations, and left to his diſcretion the management of all particular affairs, whilſt he commanded the troops of France in the Valteline, and in the country of the Griſons. Mr Priolo was in all the battles, and ſhewed his courage both on foot and on horſeback (*b*). Being uncertain of his fate, after the death of that duke, he retired to Geneva, being lately married to Elizabeth Michaeli of a very noble family (*c*). He bought a country-ſeat at Saconnent near Geneva, where he reſted after the toils and fatigues of his foregoing life. The duke of Longueville being named plenipotentiary of France for the treaty of Munſter, and being deſirous to carry him thither, as a man, whoſe parts and counſels would be of great uſe to him, Mr Priolo reſolved to leave Geneva and to ſettle at Paris [D]. He ſtaid half a year at Lyons, where he had ſeveral conferences with cardinal Barberini about controverted doctrines; the reſult of which was, that he, his wife, children, and domeſtics, abjured the Proteſtant religion, and immediately received the communion from the cardinal's hands. He did not enjoy a long repoſe at Paris; for the civil war quickly broke out, and he engaged in the faction of the malecontents, which occaſioned the ruin of his fortune (*d*). This is what I find in a Latin piece, written by John Rhodius, and printed at Padua in 1662. The following particulars come from another hand. Being dazzled with the prince's glory, with whom he had ſided, he neither regarded the many favours, which the queen-mother beſtowed upon him, nor the great promiſes of Cardinal Mazarin; which was the cauſe of his misfortune: he was forced to retire into Flanders, his eſtate was confiſcated, and his family baniſhed. Having regained the king's favour, he reſolved to live a retired life, and to follow his ſtudy, ſupporting himſelf on the wreck of the tempeſt he had ſuffered. It was then, and to divert his melancholy, that he wrote [E] with great impartiality

(*b*) In Rhætia & Tellina valle, cùm Gallicis armis præeſſet Rohanius, Priolus omnia pro nutu verſavit. Præliis variis illic cum Germanis & Iberis certatum: ubique interfuit: pugnavit eques, & pedes. *Ibid. pag.* 4.

(*c*) Cùm ante trimeſtre uxorem duxiſſet Elizabetham Micheliam, illuſtri genere, ſcilicet atavis editam principibus Lucenſis Reip. & Micheliis patriciis Venetis, unde Principes non pauci. *Ibid.*

(*d*) *Taken from* Rhodius, ubi ſupra.

know my own thoughts, and I have given ſome inſtances of it. For example, it is a great pleaſure to me to be put in a capacity of ſhewing the impoſture, or illuſion, of the author of the *Sorberiana*, in what he ſays concerning the father of Benjamin Priolo, *&c.* I muſt make another obſervation: a falſity diſadvantageous to an honourable family, would be ſlighted, if it were only to be found in a ſmall inconſiderable piece, which is ſoon forgot; but if it be inſerted in a large volume, eſpecially in a folio book, called a Dictionary, it makes one more uneaſy. For the alphabetical order of this ſort of books does ſo ſhorten the enquiries of the curious, that every body will have them in ſmall libraries, as well as in great ones, even tho' they are not good; and therefore it is to be feared, that what is contained in them will be believed every where, and laſt for ever. But it ought to be conſidered, at leaſt as to this work, that my bare relating what has been ſaid by another, does not multiply the number of authorities. Should I relate a thing, without quoting any body for it, I ſhould ſet up for a new evidence: but ſince I quote the very words of the authors, whoſe names I put in the margin, what I ſay is only grounded upon their authority. A tranſient piece, a ſmall book, whoſe title ends with *ana*, a heap of ſeveral indigeſted collections, found in Sorbiere's cloſet, and containing looſe diſcourſes of converſation, do not become more weighty and conſiderable, becauſe they are quoted in a large volume. They are ſtill what they were before, and nothing elſe. It is to be obſerved, that of all things, that make the ſubject of common converſation, there is none that is leſs to be depended upon, than what is ſaid about the origin of families. For when a man raiſes himſelf, envy on the one hand, or flattery on the other, do quickly forge obliging or diſobliging falſities, which ſpread far and near; but with this difference, that ſatirical falſities ſpread more, and are ſooner credited than flattering lies.

[C] *He attached himſelf to the duke of Rohan.*] John Rhodius's expreſſion, *Incidit illic in infelicem Rohanii Ducem* (10), ought to be rectified. It ſeems to ſignify, that Mr Priolo was beholden to chance for his firſt acquaintance with the duke. The truth is, that his family had been in the duke of Rhoan's intereſt, and the duke of Soubiſe, brother to the duke of Rohan, was his godfather. Take notice, that he was not admitted into the duke's family, as his Phyſician, and that he was not aftewards his ſecretary (11), as we are told in the Sorberiana. I have been informed, that, all the time he was in that poſt, he was only very intimate with the duke, and never had any ſkill in Phyſic, but ſuch as one may get by a general ſtudy of Philoſophy.

[D] *Mr Priolo reſolved to leave Geneva, and to ſettle at Paris.*] The attentive reader will eaſily perceive the incoherency of this narrative: it is a fault of Rhodius, which I will correct. That author has ſhewed here, that it is an eaſier thing to write the hiſtory of an illuſtrious man in good Latin, than to prevent great gaps and omiſſions in relating a fact. Is it not a very incoherent narrative to ſay, that a man went and ſettled at Paris, becauſe the duke of Longueville had a mind to carry him to Munſter, without informing his reader whether, or no, he accepted his propoſal? 'Longavillanus Dux ad conventum Monaſterienſem 'cum ſumma poteſtate de pace Legatus iturus, eo 'Priolum invitavit, ejus operâ & conſilio uſurus in 'tam arduo negotio. Hinc illi decretum Geneva re'licta irrevocabilem pedem Lutetiæ figere, quo to'tam familiam . . . deduxit. Lugduni ſex menſes re'manſit. . . . Non diu tranquillè Lutetiæ egit, cùm 'derepentè ſtudia partium exarſere, & bella civilia 'cœpta (12). - - - *The duke of Longueville was ſent to* '*the congreſs of Munſter, with full power to treat of* '*peace; whither he invited Priolo, in order to make* '*uſe of his advice and aſſiſtance in ſo difficult an un*'*dertaking. Hence he reſolved, having left Geneva, to* '*ſettle at Paris, whither he had brought his whole fami*'*ly. He ſtaid ſix months at Lyons. . . . He was not long* '*quiet at Paris, the rage of party ſoon after burſting out,* '*and the civil war being kindled.*' To fill up this gap, I muſt obſerve, that Mr Priolo ſet out from Geneva to go to Munſter, according to the duke's deſire. He was there about a year, and then he returned to Geneva, from whence he went into France, in order to ſettle at Paris. Being at Munſter, he contracted a ſtrict friendſhip with the nuncio Chigi, who was afterwards Pope Alexander VII. He wrote to him a congratulatory letter in Latin, when he heard that he was made Pope, and received from him a very devout anſwer, with ſome medals, *&c.* The duke of Longueville was ſo well ſatisfied with his ſervices, that he aſſigned him a penſion of 1200 livres upon the principality of Neufchatel (13), and, not long before he died, he preſented him with 1200 crowns, as the laſt token of his affection (14).

[E] *It was . . . to divert his melancholy that he wrote . . . the hiſtory of France.*] He repreſents himſelf as a man perſecuted by fortune, and declares, that he ſet about that hiſtory to drive away his melancholy. 'Inter maximas ærumnas natus eſt hic fœtus, quem lin'cturus eram, ſi licuiſſet. Paſſim notabuntur veſtigia 'minus alacris animi. Quid reſpondeam, non habeo. 'Humanæ imbecillitatis ingens patrocinium neceſſitas. 'Non fama, ſed requies mihi quæſita, fallendis innu'meris tædiis, ipſe me damnavi in hanc arenam (15). '- - - *This offspring was produced amidſt the greateſt miſ*'*fortunes; which, if it had been in my power, I would* '*have ſhaped into form. There appeared up and down* '*in*

(10) Joh. Rhodius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 4.

(11) Patin ſays he was. See, below, citation (17).

(12) Rhodius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 4, & 5.

(13) It was paid him till that prince died.

(14) Taken from the abovementioned Memoir.

(15) Benj. Priolus, Lectori ad calcem Hiſtoriæ.

impartiality, a Hiſtory [*F*], which has been reprinted ſeveral times: the beſt edition is that of Leipſic 1686 [*G*]. He was put again upon negotiations; for, in the year 1667, he was ordered to go to Venice upon a ſecret affair as it appears from a credential letter, that was found among his papers, drawn up by Mr de Lionne. He could not make an end of that journey; for he died of an apoplexy at Lyons, in the archbiſhop's palace. I advanced, upon a hear-ſay, in the firſt edition, that he died in the hoſpital of Lyons; but I correct that fault in this ſecond edition; and I do ſincerely proteſt, that I ſaid ſo only according to the ſentiments of thoſe, from whom I had it at Geneva. I had no reaſon to believe, that they were not rightly informed; and, as they expreſſed their eſteem for this author, they alledged that particular only as an inſtance of the misfortune of men of letters. It was out of pity to him, and to ſhew the injuſtice of the time, that they alledged it upon occaſion of Pierius Valerianus's book *de Infelicitate Litteratorum*, which ſome body in the company had mentioned. I omit alſo the paſſage I had quoted out of the Sorberiana: I have been fully informed, that Sorbiere was groſsly miſtaken, as it will appear from the remarks I point at (*e*). I would have confuted him in the firſt edition (*f*), had I then had the neceſſary information. Mr Priolo left behind him ſeven children, who loſt, by his death, the penſions he enjoyed; but his name ſupported them, and they ſupported it in their turn,

‘ *in it the traces of a mind ill at eaſe. I know not what to anſwer. Neceſſity is the grand excuſe for human weakneſs. I ſought not fame, but eaſe; and I undertook this work, to take off my mind from reflecting on the innumerable misfortunes of my life.*’ If his life written by himſelf were to be printed, we ſhould find in it a very particular account of his great troubles. It is one of the books he promiſed to publiſh, as we ſhall ſee hereafter (16).

[*F*] *He wrote with great impartiality, a Hiſtory.*] What I have quoted of it, in the article of the marſhal de Guebriant's widow, is ſufficient to ſhew, that the author took the liberty to publiſh things that might offend great perſons. Any one, who reads what he ſays of the ducheſs of Longueville, will be convinced of his boldneſs. Patin went upon a fallacious probability, when he wrote theſe words: *Mr Prioleau, who was formerly ſecretary to the duke of Rohan, has written the Hiſtory of France in Latin, from the death of the late king*, in gratiam Mazarini. *His book is intituled*, Conatus Hiſtorici: *it will be full of flattery; but that is eſſential to the age we live in* (17).

Sorel did not paſs the ſame judgment upon that hiſtory, but rather had a contrary opinion of it (18). The author was ſo far from being a flatterer, that, having obtained the king's licence, he thought it neceſſary, before he made uſe of it for the impreſſion of the whole work, to ſee how the chief perſons of the court would like the liberty he took: and therefore he publiſhed firſt (19) the ſubſtance of his hiſtory in one book, keeping the freedom of his pen under ſome reſtraint; and yet ſome miniſters thought he was too free, and declared that they would oppoſe the impreſſion of his work, unleſs it was caſtrated by ſuch examiners as they ſhould appoint. Mr Priolo made his remonſtrances to the king, who gave him leave to have his hiſtory printed at Charleville (20): which was performed in the year 1665, and the book was publickly ſold in France (21); that edition is a quarto book, and is not intituled *Conatus Hiſtorici*, but *Benjamini Prioli ab exceſſu Ludovici XIII, de Rebus Gallicis Hiſtoriarum libri XII.* It was reprinted once at Utrecht (22), and twice at Leipſic.

I muſt obſerve, that this hiſtory is quoted in the Life of Cardinal Mazarin, written by Aubery; in the Life of the Prince of Conde, and in ſome other pieces. I am ſure, that, if it had been written in French with the ſame ſprightlineſs and ſtrength, which appears in the Latin, it would have been printed above ten times. It would very much pleaſe thoſe, who are fond of the modern taſte; for it is full of thoſe characters and deſcriptions, which are now ſo much in vogue: The phraſes of Tacitus are very frequent in it, and ſeem to come in of themſelves. I ſhall ſay nothing of ſeveral private intrigues, mentioned by the author, who had them from the firſt hand. It appears by the works of count Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato, and by the memoirs of the regency, that he was employed in ſome negotiations.

[*G*] *The beſt edition is that of Leipſic* 1686 (23).] For there are ſome letters in it, which the author ſuppreſſed in the edition of Charleville; and very good alphabetical tables, and beſides, very curious and inſtructive notes (24). There is alſo in that edition a Latin tranſlation of what was ſaid of that work in the Journal des Savans (25). Mr. Gallois took ſuch an ingenious turn to expreſs his thoughts about it, that, though the author had ſome reaſon to be diſſatisfied, he had no good pretence to complain: ſo true it is, that ſome railleries are offenſive, and yet one dares not appear to be offended at them (26). The Latin tranſlator has not preſerved the niceneſs of the raillery in every part of his verſion; and I will venture to ſay, he has not only enervated, but alſo falſified the laſt period. Let the reader judge of it. The words of the journaliſt run thus. *Had I not purpoſed to forbear giving my opinion about the books mentioned in this journal, perhaps the ſtyle of this hiſtory would be the thing I ſhould leaſt find fault with* (27). Compare this with the Latin: *Ita ut niſi omnino propoſitum eſſet abſtinere à librorum judicio, de quibus in his Ephemeridibus nonnullæ* (28) *ſolent proferri, diceretur fortaſſe, ſtylumhujus hiſtoriæ ejus eſſe generis, in quo vix quicquam occurrat quod correctionem mereatur.* According to this tranſlator, Mr Gallois ſays, that Priolo's ſtyle is of ſuch a nature, that there is hardly any thing in it that deſerves to be mended. But he is far from ſaying ſo: his meaning is, that the hiſtory he ſpeaks of does not ſo much deſerve to be cenſured on account of the ſtyle, as upon other accounts: And therefore his words ſhould have been rendered thus; *In ſtylo hujus hiſtoriæ pauciora quam in cæteris omnibus fortaſſe reprehenderem.* The author was not ſurpriſed, that ſome ſevere and even devout perſons were diſpleaſed with the ſpecimen of his work; he took it to be a ſign of the merit of his performance: ‘Procul tetrici & moroſi, *ſays he*, (29); immo devoti. Tales me carpſerunt lecto primo meo libro. Eorum flagello patientiam indulſi, Boni argumentum talibus diſplicere. - - - *Away from me, ye ſour and ſevere, and even ye devout. Such perſons cenſured me in my laſt book. I patiently endured their laſh, ſince to diſpleaſe ſuch perſons is an argument of merit.*’ He owns that he never was at ſchool, or at an univerſity (30). Why then, will ſome ſay, does he acknowledge in his epiſtle dedicatory to the doge and ſenate of Venice, that he is beholden to the univerſity of Padua for his beſt inſtructions? ‘Illa veſtra Antenorea altrix mei, dulcis Artium parens . . . . me ſuis præceptis imbuit . . . . hæc me docuit à celſa mentis arce deſpicere errantes, & ex veris cauſis ſcire, ſub quantis tenebris jaceret mortalium dies. - - - *Your univerſity of Padua, the pleaſing mother of arts and ſciences, gave me the firſt inſtructions of my youth. . . . . She taught me to look down from the lofty ſummit of the mind on wandring mortals below, and to diſcover the true reaſons of the darkneſs, with which they are benighted.*’ I anſwer, that he does not contradict himſelf; his meaning is, that he learned all his Latin of himſelf, without the help of any ſchool-maſter; but he does not ſay ſo as to the ſciences; he acknowledges, that the profeſſors of Padua had been his maſters.

There ſeems to be a more real contradiction between him and Rhodius; and yet they may be reconciled, by ſuppoſing (31) that Priolo was ſent to Orthez, and to Montauban, to go through his claſſical learning; but

---

(*e*) Viz. the remarks [*A*] and [*B*] of this article.

(*f*) See the remark [*B*], towards the end.

(16) In the remark [*I*].

(17) Patin, Letter CC, pag. 190, of the 2d volume. It is dated the 14th of September 1660.

(18) *See* Sorel's Bibliotheque Françoiſe, *pag.* 366, 367, *Paris* 1667.

(19) At Paris for Cramoiſi 1662.

(20) A town belonging to the duke of Mantua, ſituate upon the Maeſe, between Sedan and Charlemont.

(21) Taken from the Memoir abovementioned.

(22) In the year 1669, in 12mo.

(23) It is in 8vo, and the ſecond edition of that town.

(24) See the remark [*I*], of the article GUEBRIANT.

(25) Of the 22d of February 1666.

(26) Heu quam miſerum eſt ab eo lædi, de quo non poſſis quæri? *Pub. Syr.*

(27) Journal des Sçavans, *of the 22d of February* 1666, *pag. m.* 159, 160.

(28) One does not know what that adjective refers to, and whatever ſenſe be put upon it, it cannot be that of the original.

(29) In his advertiſement to the reader, at the end of the book.

(30) Etſi nullas ſcholas nec Academias unquam viderim, & nullo niſi me præceptore uſus ſim, nemo tamen me temere debet arbitrari niſi Latini ſermonis bene peritus. *Ibid.*

(31) I have been aſſured that it was ſo.

turn, and have been well ſettled for a long time [*H*]. I cannot ſay whether the books he deſigned to publiſh will ever be printed [*I*]. It is pity they have not been publiſhed. I will ſet down ſome of his maxims [*K*], and the judgment he made upon Cicero, and Livy, and the moſt celebrated writers of ancient Rome [*L*].

that he payed no regard to the rules of his maſters, and learned Latin by another method.

[*H*] *He left behind him ſeven children, who loſt . . . . the penſions he enjoyed . . . . and have been well ſettled.*] Cardinal Mazarin left him, by his laſt-will (32), a penſion of 1500 livres, aſſigned upon the whole legacy of the duke of Mazarin; and when the king granted him a licence to print his hiſtory in 1661, he gave him a penſion of 2000 livres. This appears from the State of France, publiſhed at that time, in the liſt of men of letters. Though his family loſt this noble income, they found ſome other helps. The court took care of them. The eldeſt ſon was placed in the finances by Mr Colbert, and raiſed himſelf very much. The younger brother was made a life-guard-man, not being twenty years of age. He is now an exempt in the firſt troop (33). Of the five daughters, three are nuns, and the two others hold the firſt rank among the gentlewomen belonging to two of the moſt conſiderable ducheſſes of the court. The eldeſt nun was a prioreſs in the royal monaſtery of Chaillot, and was named by the king, in 1692, to eſtabliſh the rule, that is now obſerved by the ladies of the royal-houſe of St Cir near Verſailles. She is the ſpiritual founder of it (34).

[*I*] *I cannot ſay whether the books he deſigned to publiſh will be in printed.*] The following words are in the laſt page of his hiſtory: *Opera Benjamini Prioli brevi edenda. Vitanda in vita, ſeu de ſtultitia humanæ gentis, Lib. IV. Quæſtionum naturalium, ſeu de re plantaria veterum & recentiorum, Lib. III. Opus Emunctum, triginta annorum Meditatio, quod jam celebratur ſub apertiori titulo, & falsò nonnulli ſibi aſſcripſerunt. De Vita & Geſtis Henrici Rohannii Ducis. De Vita & Moribus Cæſaris Cremonini. Vita Benjamini Prioli. Judicium de Scriptoribus Græcis & Latinis. Epiſtolarum Senilium ad Maximos Europæ Proceres centuria ſingularis.*

It is very probable the life of this author will be prefixed to a book (35) taken from the maxims, which have been found among his papers: and which form a natural image of the heart of man, according to the various events of human life.

[*K*] *I ſhall ſet down ſome of his maxims.*] Man, ſaid he, is only poſſeſſed of three things, the ſoul, the body, and wealth; which are continually expoſed to three ſorts of ſnares: the ſoul is expoſed to the ſnares of Divines, the body to the ſnares of Phyſicians, and wealth to thoſe of Lawyers. Rhodius expreſſes it thus: *Cùm tribus tantùm homo conſtet, anima, corpore, & bonis: tres inſidiatores illis perpetuò imminere: adulterinos Theologos animæ per laqueos conſcientiæ injectos, nihil ad bonos mores, & ſolidam pietatem: medicos corpori, per pharmaca noxia, cùm ruſticatio, diæta, & mens hilaris, ſola morbis opitulentur: bonis rabulas forenſes, per litium articulos & formulas, cùm per arbitros idoneos amputandæ ſint radices, creſcentibus ſine fine familiarum malis* (36). A wiſe man ought not to be too forward, if he has a mind to ſucceed at court: A good judgment and ſubmiſſion are the only means of obtaining one's deſires. A man ought not to make himſelf too familiar with any body; that is, he ought to reveal nothing but what he would have made public: for can any thing be more abſurd, than to expect that others will be more faithful to you than you have been to yourſelf (37). A man, who frequents the court, ought particularly to avoid falling into the ſnares of the fair ſex. *Cavendum præſertim in aulâ à fallacibus feminarum vinclis: omnes nugaces eſſe, infidas, & judicii modicas, nunquam eodem tenore mentis & animi* (38) Leudneſs is the fulneſs of all evils: it hurts the ſoul, the body, the reputation; and, what is moſt ſenſible to debauched men, it affects their purſe. It is a piece of folly to marry, unleſs a man be bound in a ſpecial manner to prevent the extinction of his family. We have much ado to govern ourſelves; why then ſhould we undertake to govern what is moſt ungovernable. Rhodius expreſſes thoſe maxims better than I do. *Scortationem ultimum malorum, indecoram, noxiam, probroſam; animum, corpus, famam, & quod magis diſſolutum hominem afficit, crumenam lædentem. Quæcunque uni venditat ſui corporis jura, cuilibet ſine diſcrimine ſui copiam facit. Uxorem ducere, inſanum; ſi eos excipias, qui propagando ſanguinis hoc debent ſuis penatibus; vix potens humana vis ſe regere, adſciſcit difficillimum quod regat, ut qui remigiis vix lembum ſubigit, remulcum adjungit* (39). He abhorred lying to ſuch a degree, that he could not hear of it without falling into a great paſſion; and he exhorted his children, above all things, to avoid that fault, and to live a pious life. Every Chriſtian, ſaid he, ought to hate lying; and a gentleman ought to be free from it, tho' he be not a Chriſtian. He mortally hated thoſe, who laughed at the ſcripture. *Mendacium ita averſabatur, ut ad ſolam mentionem excandeſceret, nihil prius veritate & pietate in Deum, liberis commendans. Omnem Chriſtianum à mendacio alienum eſſe debere; nobilem autem, etiamſi Chriſtianus non ſit. In deriſores Scripturæ Sacræ, horum hoc ſeculum feraciſſimum, inexpiabili odio flagrabat* (40). He was a great obſerver of juſtice, but little regarded the outſide of religion (41). This puts me in mind of Montagne, who, though no very devout man, proteſts, that he had naturally an averſion for a lie (42).

[*L*] *I ſhall ſet down the judgment he made of Cicero and Livy, and the moſt celebrated writers of ancient Rome.*] He was no great admirer of Cicero: he admired Livy, and found him ſo inimitable, that deſpairing to copy his excellencies, he reſolved to imitate Tacitus. He was extremely fond of Seneca, and preferred Lucan to Virgil, and the tenderneſs of Catullus to the majeſty of Horace. Rhodius, his good friend, and his panegyriſt, wonders at the oddneſs of his taſte. *Senecam deperibat: neſcio quo malo genio M. Tullium ingentem virum, Romanæ eloquentiæ patrem, non admiratus eſt: cæteros ad unguem tenebat. Tit. Livium inimitabilem prædicabat, ideoque deſperans, nobis poſteriſque Tacitum repræſentavit. Lucanum præferebat Virgilio: quis hoc credat? Et teneras Catulli amationes Horatianæ majeſtati* (43). It is certain, that this judgment is wrong; for a man, who prefers Livy to Tacitus, ſhould place Cicero above Seneca, and Virgil above Lucan. The eloquence and character of Cicero, Livy, and Virgil, are much of the ſame kind (44). Thoſe authors do not affect to be bright; they caſt, without any affectation, a light, which adorns the whole work: but does not dazzle the reader; as thoſe of ſome other writers, who, inſtead of letting every ray paſs through its proper medium, have recourſe to a kind of dioptric, in order to collect together an infinite number of rays, to caſt the greater light. It is their chief ſtudy: It was the method of Seneca, the two Pliny's and Tacitus. Lucan, in like manner, toils and labours hard to expreſs himſelf in an uncommon manner, and to appear great and lofty. It muſt be confeſſed, that they were men of very great parts, and perhaps they would have taken a more natural courſe, if they had lived in the time of Cicero, Livy, and Virgil; but they began to ſtudy when the true taſte began to be depraved. It was with the Romans, as it is with thoſe, who are uſed to drink excellent wines; their taſte grows dull, nothing will ſerve their turn but Brandy, or the ſtrongeſt liquors. A majeſtic, natural, and uniform eloquence became inſipid, when people were uſed to it: they were for witty ſtrokes and flights; the day-light was not ſufficient for them, they wanted flaſhes of lightning. The French begin to be ſick of the ſame diſtemper. Seneca and Tacitus complied with the common taſte; they were afraid of being ſlighted, if they ſhould write like the authors of the golden age. However it be, their ſtyle is quite different from that of Livy. How comes it then, that Priolo did ſo much admire that hiſtorian and Seneca at the ſame time? How could he prefer Lucan to Virgil, and Seneca to Cicero? There is no uniformity in ſuch a judgment: but one muſt not diſpute about taſtes. We muſt be contented with the matter of fact. I ſhall ſet down Mr Priolo's words relating to Livy (45). ‘ De me equidem dixero, ſi quis ævi priſci inflexit ſenſus, fuit ille Livius, quem unicum ſcriptorem Romanum imperium tulit majeſtate ſuâ dignum. Ita ſpiritus & quaſi voces repræſentabat, ut & agere eadem & loqui credas di-

---

(32) It has been printed.

(33) I write this in April 1701.

(34) Taken from the abovementioned Memoir.

(35) By his ſon.

(36) Jo. Rhodius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 6. *See the* Cortegiano, *of Caſtiglione, lib. ii, pag. m.* 295.

(37) Nulli ſe facere nimis ſodalem oportere, id eſt, nihil revelare, niſi quod publici juris eſſe velis. Nam quid ineptius quàm putare aliquem tibi magis fidum, quàm tibi ipſe fuiſti. *Ibid.*

(38) Ibid.

(39) Ibid.

(40) Ibid. *pag.* 7.

(41) Juſti & æqui ſervantiſſimus, religionis parum, quæ quidem in externis actibus verſatur. *Ibid. pag.* 5.

(42) See the 17th chapter of the 2d book of his Eſſays, *pag. m.* 579, 580.

(43) Joh. Rhodius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 7.

(44) Setting aſide the difference which depends, 1. On the characters of the ſubjects treated by them; 2. On proſe and verſe.

(45) Priolus, ad Lectorem, in limine Hiſtoriæ, *fol. m. cap.* iii, *verſo.*

‘cendi genere non anxio, ſed limpido, & quod me torquet, non imitabili . . . . . . Ego deſperatione Livianæ imitationis (46) nulli me addicere decrevi. - - - *As to my own opinion, I take Livy to have been the nobleſt author, that the Roman empire ever produced. He repreſented the very ſpirit and words of perſons in ſo lively a manner, that you would think he is acting and ſpeaking the ſame things; and this he does, not in a forced and laboured, but an eaſy and clear, and (what gives me pain) an inimitable ſtyle.*’ What follows concerns his admiration of Seneca. ‘Ego M. Tullium magni ſemper feci; ſed ſi hodie viveret, ſtylum immutaret. Seneca, qui eum ingenio & judicio longiſſime ſuperavit, uſus eſt dicendi genere auribus ſui temporis accommodato, nec de imitatione Tulliana unquam cogitavit, jactatæ puritati arenam ſuam ſine calce præferens. Certè mirari ſatis non poſſum eorum ingenia, qui quicquid altum ſpirat, inflatum & tumidum appellant. Tales Lucanum, tales Statium ſuæ cenſuræ ſubjiciunt (47). - - - *I always greatly eſteemed Cicero; but, if he were now alive, he would alter his ſtyle. Seneca, who far ſurpaſſed him in ability and judgment, employed a ſtyle adapted to the ears of his cotemporaries, nor did he ever think of imitating that of Cicero, preferring his own ſand without chalk to the boaſted purity of that writer. Indeed I cannot enough wonder at the diſpoſition of thoſe, who call every thing, that is lofty, ſwelling and bombaſt. Such perſons find fault with Lucan and Statius.*’ I ſhall likewiſe ſet down what he ſays concerning his imitation of Tacitus. ‘Profiteor me furem eſſe notæ rapacitatis, habeo piceatas manus, omnia rapio. Taciti & aliorum audax prædo, crudas ejus paginas in opus meum propello. Poteram adſcito fuco diſſimulare, non curavi. Niſi centonibus ſtylum animes in deſita lingua, quid niſi languidum & emortuum expectandum (48). - - - *I profeſs myſelf to be a thief of ſingular rapaciouſneſs; I have pitched hands, and lay hold on every thing. A bold plunderer of Tacitus and others; I transfer his indigeſted pages into my own work. Unleſs you animate a dead language with paſſages of the ancients, what is to be expected but a languid and lifeleſs performance?*’ His ſtyle was criticiſed by the Jeſuit Coſſard; and, if I am not miſtaken, it was at him this ſharp reply was levelled (49). ‘Meum ſtylum abruptum, inæqualem, immo, (ut verbis ejuſdem ſcioli utar) nullum: ſcatere paginam centonibus & furtis. Scias, ô blenne, quiſquis es, familiares mihi à puero antiquos ſcriptores, in aula & in caſtris aliquando lectos, nunc ſeſe offerre non vocatos, & abhinc quadraginta annis nequidem eos libaſſe, & dictaſſe totam hanc Hiſtoriam inter ambulandum, ne litura quidem imperata: tantum abeſt, ut bis aliquid unquam ſcripſerim. - - - *My ſtyle, forſooth, is broken, unequal, and (to uſe the words of the ſame pretender to criticiſm) no ſtyle at all. Know, thou coxcomb, whoever thou art, that I have had an intimate knowledge of the ancients from my childhood; that I read them at court, and in the camp; that they now preſent themſelves to me uncalled; that I have not dipped into them for theſe forty years paſt; and that I dictated this hiſtory walking up and down, without blotting out any thing of it; ſo far am I from writing any thing twice over.*’ We learn from the laſt words of this paſſage, how that Hiſtory of France was compoſed. The author dictated it, as he walked, and made no raſures in it: which is a very extraordinary thing.

PRISCILLIAN, a Spaniſh Hereſiarch, lived in the IVth century. He was endowed with very fine qualities [*A*]; he had a quick wit, and a great deal of eloquence and learning, he was laborious, ſober, and free from avarice. An eager thirſt after knowledge, which induced him in his youth to ſtudy Magic (*a*), made him liſten to the Rhetorician Helpidius, and to a lady, who had embraced ſome errors of the Gnoſtics (*b*). He was infected with them, and employed his utmoſt ſkill to ſpread them. He gained over many people, eſpecially women, who flocked to him [*B*]: nay, ſome biſhops followed his ſect. This poiſon having ſpread itſelf in ſeveral towns, great endeavours were uſed to put a ſtop to it. A ſynod met at Saragoſſa (*c*), at which the biſhops of Aquitain aſſiſted (*d*). Priſcillian, and all his adherents, were condemned for refuſing to appear at it, and the ſecular arm was employed to expel them from all the towns. Theſe Heretics were ſo little concerned at this condemnation, that they made Priſcillian a biſhop. He left Spain with Inſtantius and Salvianus, two prelates of his party, in order to go to Rome, and juſtify himſelf to the Pope. As they paſſed through Aquitain, they gained many diſciples. Euchrocia,

[*A*] *He was endowed with very fine qualities.*] Sulpicius Severus expreſſes it thus: ‘Ab his (*Agape quadam non ignobili muliere, & rhetore Helpidio*) Priſcillianus eſt inſtitutus, familia nobilis, prædives opibus, acer, inquietus, facundus, multa lectione eruditus, diſſerendi ac diſputandi promptiſſimus: felix profecto, ſi non pravo ſtudio corrupiſſet optimum ingenium, prorſus multa in eo animi & corporis bona cerneres. Vigilare multum, famem, ſitim ferre poterat, habendi minime cupidus, utendi parciſſimus (1). - - - *Priſcillian was inſtructed by one Agape, a woman of ſome note, and a Rhetorician called Helpidius. He was of a noble family, wealthy, of an impetuous and reſtleſs temper, eloquent, very learned, and moſt ready at diſputation: Happy had it been for him, if he had not corrupted the beſt genius by a wrong application; for he had many excellent qualities both of mind and body. He could watch long, and endure hunger and thirſt; was not eager to get, and very temperate in the uſe of riches.*’

[*B*] *He employed all his ſkill to ſpread them. Women flocked to him . . . . biſhops . . . . came over to his ſect.*] I ſhall quote again Sulpicius Severus for it. *Is ubi doctrinam exitiabilem aggreſſus eſt, multos nobilium, pluresque populares authoritate perſuadendi & arte blandiendi allicuit in ſocietatem. Ad hoc mulieres novarum rerum cupidæ, fluxa fide, & ad omnia curioſo ingenio, catervatim ad eum confluebant. Quippe humilitatis ſpeciem ore & habitu prætendens, honorem ſui & reverentiam cunctis injecerat. Jamque paulatim perfidiæ iſtius tabes, pleraque Hiſpaniæ pervaſerat: quin & nonnulli epiſcoporum depravati, inter quos Inſtantius & Salvianus, Priſcillianum non ſolum conſenſione, ſed ſub quadam etiam conjuratione ſuſceperant* (2). I ſhall likewiſe ſet down Maimbourg's paraphraſe upon theſe Latin words. ‘That Hereſiarch, being ſenſible on the one hand, and knowing by his own experience, that men are naturally very much inclined to voluptuouſneſs, which occaſioned a general corruption of mankind before the Flood; and knowing, on the other hand, the weak ſide of people, eſpecially of women, who are eaſily impoſed upon by a ſhew of piety; pretended to ſo much holineſs, that there never was a greater hypocrite than that impoſtor. And indeed no man did ever appear leſs fond of the world, for which he affected to expreſs a great contempt in all things, by the meanneſs of his dreſs, his behaviour, and his converſation; by his modeſt and humble look, the auſterity of his life, and his great charity to the poor; talking of nothing but penitence, faſting, watchings, prayers, and the contempt of all worldly things, in order to be perfectly united to God. So that he was quickly accounted, all over Spain, a great ſervant of God, and a man of a wonderful holineſs, and admired upon that account. Women, who are more eaſily deluded by ſuch deceitful appearances, and whoſe natural curioſity makes them fond of novelty, and extraordinary things, eſpecially in point of religion, flocked to him, to be directed by him, tho' he was as yet but a lay-man. Being, moreover, learned, and having the talent of perſuading, and inſinuating himſelf into mens minds, by his nice and ingenious flatteries, he quickly found himſelf the head of

‘a great

---

(46) *He ſays, that Buchanan endeavoured in vain to imitate Livy.* Buchananus Titum Livium præſtare nobis conatus eſt; certè vigeſies à capite ad calcem antequam ad ſuum opus ſe accingeret, eum lectitaſſe perhibetur . . . . Buchananus, illius quidem ſimia eſt, tantum ab eo diſtans, quantum ſimia ab homine. *Ibid.*

(47) Ibid. *fol. cap. iv.*

(48) Ibid. *fol. cap. v.*

(49) Ibid. in fine, libri C c 4 verſo.

(*a*) Idem vaniſſimus & plus juſto inflatior profanarum rerum ſcientia, quin & Magicas artes ab adoleſcentia eum exercuiſſe creditum eſt. *Sulpicius Severus, Sacræ Hiſt. lib. ii, pag. m.* 163.

(*b*) That Rhetorician and that lady were inſtructed by one Marc, an Egyptian. It is falſly ſaid in Moreri's Dictionary, that this Marc inſtructed Priſcillian.

(*c*) In the year 381.

(*d*) Among others, Delphinius biſhop of Bourdeaux. *Vide Alteſerram, Rerum Aquitanicarum, lib. v, cap. v, pag.* 323.

(1) Sulpicius Severus, Sacr. Hiſtor. *lib. ii, pag.* 162, 163.

(2) Ibid. *pag.* 163.

Euchrocia, the wife of the Rhetorician Delphidius (*e*), received them at her country-houſe, and was ſo charmed with Priſcillian, that ſhe followed him every where. Several other women were ſeduced by theſe Heretics, and left all, to accompany them in their journey [*C*]. The Pope refuſed to hear them, and ſo did St Ambroſe; but the Imperial court was more indulgent, and granted them a reſcript, importing, that their churches ſhould be reſtored to them. They returned into Spain, where they had ſo great an intereſt, that Ithacius, their accuſer, being ſummoned to give an account of his conduct, as a diſturber of the peace of the church, fled into Gaul. He ſo exaſperated the tyrant Maximus againſt theſe ſectaries, that they were ordered to repair to the council of Bourdeaux. Inſtantius was condemned in it. Priſcillian, ſeeing the condemnation of his companion, deſired to be referred to Maximus; which was granted him. His enemies followed him to the court, and proſecuted him ſo warmly, that he was condemned (*f*) to death (*g*). I ſhall give the character of Ithacius, the chief promoter of Priſcillian's death [*D*], and the conſequences

‘ a great party in moſt provinces of Spain, not only among women, and the common people, but alſo among perſons of quality and eccleſiaſtics, ſome of whom were biſhops, who, like others, adhered to him as a ſaint (3).’

[*C*] *Euchrocia, the wife of the Rhetorician Delphidius .... and ſeveral other women .... left all to accompany them in their journey.*] If we believe what ſome ſay, they began in the ſpirit, and ended in the fleſh. Euchrocia was at firſt charmed with the outward devotion and pious diſcourſes of this heretic; but by degrees he charmed her with ſomething elſe; he lay with her, and got her with child. If it be ſaid that the Latin words, which I ſhall quote preſently, ſignify, that he lay with Procula, Euchrocia's daughter, I will not obſtinately deny it: perhaps it is the beſt ſenſe that can be put upon thoſe words. The outward devotion, which Priſcillian had affected for a long time, did not make him forget, that young Procula was preferable to her mother. ‘ Iter eis præter interiorem Aquitaniam fuit: ubi tum ab imperitis magnifice ſuſcepti, ſparſere perfidiæ ſemina, maximeque Eluſanam plebem, ſane tum bonam & religioni ſtudentem, pravis prædicationibus pervertere: à Burdigala per Delphinum repulſi, tamen in agro Euchrociæ aliquantiſper morati, infecere nonnullos ſuis erroribus. Inde iter cœptum ingreſſi, turpi ſane pudibundoque comitatu, cum uxoribus atque alienis etiam fœminis, in quis erat Euchrocia, ac filia ejus Procula: de qua fuit in ſermone hominum, Priſcilliani ſtupro gravidam, partum ſibi graminibus abegiſſe (4). - - - *They took their journey thro' Aquitain, where, being ſplendidly received by the ignorant, they ſcattered the ſeeds of perfidiouſneſs, and by wicked diſcourſes perverted the minds of the good and pious people of Gaſcony. Being driven from Bourdeaux by the Dauphin, they ſtopped a little at the eſtate of Euchrocia, where they infected ſome perſons with their errors. Thence they proceeded on their intended journey, with a ſhameful and ſcandalous retinue, with other mens wives and daughters, among whom was Euchrocia, and her daughter Procula; concerning whom it was reported, that, being with child by Priſcillian, ſhe was delivered in the graſs.*’ It was well for Delphidius that he died young; for he had not the misfortune to ſee the debauchery of his daughter, and the execution of his wife (5). Every body knows, that Euchrocia and Priſcillian were put to death at the ſame time (6). A panegyriſt of Theodoſius inveighed againſt that cruelty in an eloquent manner: he did not ſpare Maximus, who had condemned to death the wife of an illuſtrious Poet, becauſe ſhe was accuſed of being too devout. ‘ De virorum mortibus loquor, cum deſcenſum recorder ad ſanguinem feminarum, & in ſexum cui bella parcunt non parce ſævitum? Sed nimirum graves ſuberant, invidioſæque cauſæ ut unco ad pœnam clari vatis matrona raperetur. Objiciebatur enim, atque etiam exprobrabatur mulieri viduæ nimia religio, & diligentius culta divinitas (7). - - - *Do I mention the death of men, when I remember, that he deſcended to ſpill the blood of women, and treated that ſex with cruelty, which even war ſpares? But no doubt there were weighty reaſons for puniſhing the wife of an illuſtrious Poet: for it was objected againſt her, that ſhe was too religious, and too diligent a worſhipper of God.*’ Some wonder how Priſcillian could draw in ſo many devout women, ſince his pretended devotion was attended with ſuch offenſive leudneſs. He confeſſed at his trial, that he had had leud meetings with women in the night-time, and that he was ſtark naked, when he prayed (8). But others ſay, that he drew in the fair-ſex by that very thing: it is Maimbourg's opinion. I ſhall again ſet down his paraphraſe upon the words of Sulpicius Severus. ‘ When people are preposſeſſed with an opinion of a man's holineſs, they will blindly ſubmit to all his orders, and look upon all his deciſions as ſo many oracles, eſpecially when they indulge the inclinations of corrupt nature: and therefore that profligate wretch found it no difficult thing to perſuade his followers, that, when the ſpirit, which comes from God, was perfectly united to them by a certain form of prayer, which he taught them, they might lawfully give a full ſcope to the luſts of the fleſh; and that God is not offended at it, ſince the fleſh does not proceed from him, but from the wicked principle, as well as marriage. By virtue of that abominable doctrine, the women, who did not love their huſbands, left them againſt their will *, and huſbands likewiſe left their wives, of whom they were weary; and all of them, and in general all his followers, prayed together as he did, as if they had been in the ſtate of innocency, and then defiled themſeves with all ſorts of pollutions. Such is commonly the end of the new doctrines, enthuſiaſms, and new ways of praying more fanatical than myſterious, of ſome men, who pretend to be extraordinarily enlightened, and who, beginning with the ſpirit to deceive the world, ſeldom fail to end with the fleſh (9).

[*D*] *I ſhall give the character of Ithacius, the chief promoter of Priſcillian's death.*] That Spaniſh biſhop was a debauched and impudent man, and ſacrificed every thing to his paſſions. He plainly ſhewed, that he was not actuated by the love of truth, and that his violent perſecution of thoſe heretics proceeded only from a principle of vanity. The firſt ſteps he made engaged him to go through with it: he was fond of obtaining a compleat victory, and of ſhewing his great intereſt and authority; the loſs of his cauſe would have been intolerable to him: he left nothing unattempted with the tyrant Maximus, in order to triumph by the favour of the ſecular arm. And, becauſe he was afraid of being thwarted in his deſign by wiſe and judicious men, he was ſo impudent and malicious as to accuſe of Priſcillianiſm all thoſe whom he did not like. Whoever faſted, or applied himſelf to the reading of pious books, was cried down by this violent perſecutor as an accomplice of that ſect. He was ſo bold as to accuſe St Martin of favouring theſe heretics, becauſe he exhorted him to leave off his proſecutions, and entreated Maximus not to ſhed the blood of thoſe ſectaries. Such are the abominable devices of moſt of thoſe, who charge others with hereſy: they are renewed in every age, and yet the world is impoſed upon by them to this very day, as if they had never been been practiſed before. Sulpicius Severus deſerves to be highly commended for ſaying, that the Priſcillianiſts were not more unacceptable to him than their accuſers. *Secuti etiam accuſatores Idacius & Ithacius Epiſcopi: quorum ſtudium in expugnandis hæreticis non reprehenderem, ſi non ſtudio vincendi plus quam oportuit certaſſent. Ac mea quidem ſententia eſt, mihi tam reos quam accuſatores diſplicere. Certe Ithacium nihil penſi, nihil ſancti habuiſſe definio. Fuit enim audax, loquax, impudens, ſumptuoſus, ventri & gulæ plu*-

rimum

(*e*) De quo vide Alteſerram, ibid. *cap. iii, pag.* 316, 317; & Auſonium, in Profeſſor. *n.* 5.

(*f*) In the year 385.

(*g*) *Taken from* Sulpicius Severus, *Hiſtor. Sacr. lib. ii.*

(3) Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Pontificat de St Leon, *livr. i, pag.* 44, 45, *Dutch Edit.* He quotes the words of Sulpicius Severus, in the margin.

(4) Sculp. Severus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 165.

(5) Minus malorum munere expertus Dei, Medio quod ævi raptus es. Errore quod non deviantis filiæ, Pœnaque læſus conjugis. *Auſonius, in Profeſſor. n.* 5, *p. m.* 160.

(6) Sulpic. Severus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 170.

(7) Latinus Pacatus, in Panegyrico Theodoſio dicto, *cap. xxix, pag. m.* 509.

(8) Nec diffitentem obſcœnis ſe ſtuduiſſe doctrinis, nocturnos etiam turpium fœminarum egiſſe conventus, nudumque orare ſolitum, nocentem pronunciavit. *Sulpic. Severus, ibid. p.* 170.

* *Sever. lib. ii.*

(9) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 45, 46.

PRISCILLIAN.

conſequences of that ſeverity [*E*]. St Martin, biſhop of Tours, refuſed to communicate with the biſhops, who put Maximus upon ſuch violent proceedings; and, having ſuffered, at laſt, an act of communion with them even to be extorted from him, he was very ſory for it the remaining part of his life; and even believed it was the reaſon, why the gift of miracles, flagged in his perſon. Some other biſhops imitated him [*F*], in not admitting Ithacius and his adherents to their communion. Ithacius was not uneaſy at it during the life of Maximus his protector, and the idol of his flattery; but, when he loſt that ſupport, he was puniſhed for his fault. Pope Leo was not ſo nice as St Martin; for

rimum impertiens. Hic ſtultitiæ eo uſque proceſſerat, ut omnes etiam ſanctos viros, quibus aut ſtudium inerat lectionis, aut propoſitum erat certare jejuniis, tanquam Priſcilliani ſocios aut diſcipulos, in crimen arceſſeret. Auſus etiam miſer eſt, ea tempeſtate Martino epiſcopo, viro plane Apoſtolis conferendo, palam objectare hæreſis infamiam. Namque tum Martinus apud Treveros conſtitutus, non deſinebat increpare Ithacium, ut ab accuſatione deſiſteret: Maximum orare, ut ſanguine infelicium abſtineret: ſatis ſuperque ſufficere, ut epiſcopali ſententia hæretici judicati eccleſiis pellerentur (10). St Martin's interceſſion proved ſo powerful, that, whilſt he was at Triers, theſe heretics were not brought to their trial; but, as ſoon as he went away, ſome biſhops gained Maximus, and prevailed with him to break his word to him (11). Priſcillian was condemned to death, and then Ithacius, being fully ſatisfied, deſiſted from his accuſation, that is, he did not appear againſt him before the Judges, when the ſentence came to be confirmed. A groſs artifice, which Sulpicius Severus juſtly laughs at. *Ceterum Ithacius videns quam invidioſum ſibi apud epiſcopos foret, ſi accuſato etiam poſtremis rerum capitalium judiciis aſtitiſſet (etenim iterari judicium neceſſe erat) ſubtrahit ſe cognitioni fruſtra calido jam ſcelere perfecto* (12). Latinus Pacatus uſes theſe ſanguinary biſhops as they deſerved, and ſhews the ſcandal they occaſioned by laying their unclean and bloody hands upon ſacred things. He exclaims againſt the iniquity of the tyrant Maximus, who cheriſhed and ſupported ſuch prelates (13). 'Quid hoc majus poterat 'intendere accuſator ſacerdos? fuit enim, fuit & hoc 'delatorum genus, qui nominibus antiſtites, revera 'autem ſatellites, atque adeo carnifices, non contenti 'miſeros avitis evolviſſe patrimoniis, calumniabantur 'in ſanguinem, & vitas premebant reorum jam pauperum. Quinetiam cùm judiciis capitalibus aſtitiſſent 'cum gemitus & tormenta miſerorum auribus ac luminibus hauſiſſent, cùm lictorum arma, cùm damnatorum frena tractaſſent, pollutas pœnali manus 'contactu ad ſacra referebant, & cæremonias quas inceſtaverant mentibus, etiam corporibus impiabant. 'Hos ille (14) Phalaris in amicis habebat, hi in oculis ejus, atque etiam in oculis erant: nec injuria, à 'quibus tot ſimul votiva veniebant, avaro divitum 'bona; cruento innocentium pœna; impio religionis 'injuria. - - - - *What more could a prieſtly accuſer 'have done? For there was this kind of informers, who, 'being biſhops in name, but in reality ſoldiers, and 'conſequently executioners, not content to have deprived 'wretches of their paternal eſtates, purſued them to 'death, and took away the lives of thoſe, whom they 'had before impoveriſhed. Moreover, after ſitting in 'judgment in capital matters, and hearing and ſeeing the 'groans and torments of miſerable men, after handling 'the Lictors rods, and the chains of the condemned, they 'performed the ſacred rites of religion with polluted hands, 'and defiled its ceremonies. Theſe were the tyrant's 'friends, who ſatisfied his avarice with the eſtates of 'the rich, his cruelty with the puniſhment of the innocent, and his impiety with the prophanation of religion.*'

There is another thing to be obſerved in Ithacius, in which the moſt violent accuſers reſemble him. No biſhop would have found it a more difficult thing, than he, to give an account of his own conduct, and yet he was the warmeſt in defaming and proſecuting others. This unaccountable behaviour has been obſerved by the heathens, who ſay that innocence is the moſt neceſſary qualification of an accuſer. 'Çognoſce quam multa eſſe oporteat in eo qui alterum 'accuſet . . . . Primum integritatem atque innocentiam ſingularem. Nihil eſt enim quod minus ferendum ſit, quam rationem ab altero vitæ repoſcere 'eum, qui non poſſit ſuæ reddere (15). - - - *Conſider 'how many things are requiſite in him, who accuſes 'another . . . . Firſt, integrity and ſingular innocence. 'For nothing is more intolerable, than for him to call 'another to an account for his actions, who cannot give 'an account of his own.*' But thoſe, who ſet up for accuſers, are generally the leaſt concerned about it. There are perſons whoſe books are full of abſurdities, contradictions, prophanations, innovations, and dangerous paradoxes and hereſies, and yet they fail not to charge many people with hereſy; and had they a Maximus at their diſpoſal, we ſhould hear of nothing but of men depoſed, proſcribed, anathematized, to ſay no worſe. It is probable theſe irregular and unjuſt proceedings will laſt as long as the world.

[*E*] *The conſequences of that ſeverity.*] The words of Mr Flechier, one of the beſt writers of his time, are ſo fine, that, in copying them here, I am ſure to pleaſe all my readers, 'That execution occaſioned ſeveral diſorders; for the capital puniſhment of that 'Hereſiarch gave a new ſtrength to his hereſy. He 'was magnificently buried by his followers, and honoured as a martyr; and thoſe, who had procured 'his condemnation, making an ill uſe of their intereſt 'at court, perſecuted good men with impunity. 'Whoever † faſted, and loved a retired life, was 'immediately ſuſpected by them; whoever was more 'ſober and regular than they, was a guilty perſon. 'Thoſe, who did not pleaſe them, were immediately accounted Priſcillianiſts, eſpecially when their 'death was like to be acceptable to the prince, or to 'fill his coffers with their ‡ ſpoils; for they deprived 'men of their lives and eſtates, as they thought fit, 'and preſerved the tyrant's friendſhip by calumnies, 'and cruelties, and other actions like his (16).'

[*F*] *Some other biſhops imitated St Martin.*] Going on to ſhew the ill conſequences of the puniſhment of Priſcillian, I make uſe of the words of Mr Maimbourg, which are better than any tranſlation I can make of them. 'What was moſt deplorable, was, a kind of a 'dangerous ſchiſm occaſioned in Gaul by this action 'of Ithacius. For, on the one hand, a biſhop of 'great authority, called Theognoſtus, having highly 'condemned it, and afterwards ſeparated from his 'communion, was followed therein by moſt biſhops, 'who thought, as well as he, that they could not communicate with a man, who had diſhonoured his character and the church, by defiling himſelf with the 'blood of thoſe, whoſe death he had procured: But, 'on the other hand, many biſhops, bribed by Ithacius, whoſe accomplices they were, or who approved 'what he had done, ſided with him, and finding 'themſelves powerfully ſupported by the prince, who 'favoured Ithacius, met at Triers in a kind of council, 'or rather in a conventicle, where he was abſolved, 'and declared innocent, by a formal ſentence (17).' We are told afterwards how St Martin refuſed to communicate with them, till he was made ſenſible, that by complying he ſhould obtain from Maximus a revocation of the *order, whereby all the Priſcillianiſts, that ſhould be found, were to be put to the ſword* (18). *St Martin did not approve, that Heretics ſhould be put to death, and was afraid that many of the beſt Catholics would be involved in that ſlaughter, becauſe thoſe, who, by reaſon of their modeſt and mortified look, ſeemed to be more regular than others, were accounted Priſcillianiſts, without making any diſtinction between hypocrites and truly devout men* (19). And therefore being of opinion, that of two evils he was to chuſe the leaſt (20), he yielded for a ſhort time to the violence offered to him, and aſſiſted with thoſe biſhops *at the ordination of Felix biſhop of Triers. . . . The very next day he went away very melancholy, and very ſorry, that ſuch an ordination had been made; and perceiving that the gift of miracles, which † G O D had beſtowed upon him, did not exert itſelf ſo often as it did before, he endeavoured to make up that loſs by his penitence. As for the ſchiſm, occaſioned by Ithacius, it did not laſt long, becauſe Maximus, his protector, having been defeated ſome time after by the ‡ great Theodoſius, and killed by the ſoldiers at Aquileia, he was forſaken by all the biſhops of his party, and puniſhed with baniſhment, in which he died.*

---

(10) Sulpicius Severus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 168, 169.

(11) Quoad uſque Martinus Treveris fuit, dilata cognitio eſt: & mox diſceſſurus egregia authoritate à Maximo elicuit ſponſionem, nihil cruentum in reos conſtituendum. Sed poſtea Imperator per Magnum & Rufum epiſcopos depravatus, & à mitioribus conſiliis deflexus, cauſſam præfecto Evodio permiſit, viro acri & ſevero. *Ibid. pag.* 169.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 170.

(13) Latinus Pacatus, ubi ſupra.

(14) That is, the tyrant Maximus, vanquiſhed by Theodoſius.

(15) Cicero, in Verrem, *lib. i, fol.* 22, *B.*

† Sulpic. Sever, de Vita S. Mart.

‡ Pacat. in Panegyr.

(16) Flechier, Hiſtoire de Theodoſe, *livr. iii, pag. m.* 303, *ad ann.* 385, *Paris, in* 12*mo*, 1680.

(17) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 57, 58.

(18) Ibid. *pag.* 59.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Ibid. *pag.* 60, *where he quotes theſe words of Sulpicius Severus, Dial. III,* Satius æſtimans ad horam cedere, quam his non conſulere quorum cervicibus gladius imminebat.

† Sever. ibid.

‡ Iſid. de Vir. illuſt. cap. ii.

for he approved Priſcillian's execution [*G*]. Maimbourg makes uſe of a diſtinction, which is not very far from being ridiculous (*b*). I do not examine whether theſe Heretics believed and practiſed whatever is imputed to them (*i*); I ſhall only ſay, that it ſeems, one of their opinions has been condemned, which yet has been approved in St Auguſtin [*H*].

(*b*) See the remark [*G*].

(*i*) See Moreri's Dictionary, the Dutch edition, in the addition to the article PRISCILLIAN.

[*G*] *Pope Leo . . . . approved Priſcillian's execution.*] Maimbourg (21) acknowledges, that Heretics had not been puniſhed with death till then; but he maintains, *that they may be juſtly treated with that ſeverity, as it has been frequently practiſed ſince.* And, not to mention, ſays he, 'thoſe who have proved in their 'books, that it is not only lawful, but very proper to 'treat them ſo; we need only read what St Leo wrote 'upon this ſubject, when, giving the neceſſary orders 'to proceed in Spain againſt Priſcillian's hereſy, he 'praiſes Maximus for that action, and ſays; ‡ *That 'the rigour and ſeverity of his juſtce againſt that Hereſiarch and his followers, whom that prince put to death, 'has been very ſerviceable to the clemency of the church. 'For, tho' ſhe is contented with the mild judgment pro'nounced by the biſhops againſt obſtinate Heretics, ac'cording to the canons, and tho' ſhe is not for bloody exe'cutions* (§ *α*), *yet ſhe is very much aſſiſted and ſup'ported by the ſevere conſtitutions of the emperors, ſince 'the fear of ſo rigorous a puniſhment ſometimes moves 'Heretics to have recourſe to the ſpiritual remedy, in or'der to cure the mortal diſtemper of their hereſy by a true 'converſion.*' The ſame Maimbourg ſays (22), that the greateſt fault of Ithacius was, *his applying himſelf to a ſecular court in a cauſe meerly eccleſiaſtical,* and procuring the death of thoſe Heretics to the utmoſt of his power, *which is contrary to the laws of the church; and therefore,* ſays he, *when the clergy implore the aſſiſtance of princes and magiſtrates againſt them, they always proteſt they do ſo earneſtly wiſh for their amendment, that they do not deſire they ſhould be puniſhed with death, but rather that they ſhould find mercy, leaving it however to the Judges to act according to the laws, for the good of the church and ſtate.* This is meer grimace; it is at leaſt a conduct ſo oppoſite to the ſolemnity of a ſerious tribunal, that no one can think it ſtrange, that the Inquiſition ſhould be ridiculed upon that account. You require of princes, that they ſhould make laws againſt Heretics; you highly commend them when they appoint a capital puniſhment for them; you deliver up to them thoſe, whom you declare to be Heretics: you therefore, properly ſpeaking, are the cauſe of their death. When you tell the magiſtrates, that you are not for their being put to death, you act a meer farce (23). Why do you not aſk the ſame favour for aſſaſſins? For you ſay, that a Heretic is worſe than a poiſoner and a murderer. Ariſtotle's maxim, *Poſito uno abſurdo multa ſequuntur,* was never truer than in the preſent caſe. The abſurdity of maintaining that men ought to be puniſhed with the ſword for their opinions, is attended with a thouſand abſurdities; and thoſe, who advance it, fall into a thouſand contradictions. It is to be obſerved, that the inquiſitors condemn people to death, and are not contented to declare that a man is a Heretic (24).

[(§ *α*) In countries, where the Inquiſition prevails, Heretics are puniſhed with burning. Now, as in ſuch puniſhment, there are neither bones broken, nor *blood ſpilt,* the queſtion is to know, whether the maxim *Eccleſia non novit ſanguinem,* expreſſed here in equivalent terms by St Leo, is in this reſpect obſerved, or only eluded. REM. CRIT.]

[*H*] *It ſeems, one of the opinions of the Priſcillianiſts has been condemned, which yet has been approved in St Auguſtin.*] Theſe three things are certain; 1. St Auguſtin believes, that man is invincibly determined to evil by his natural corruption, or to good by the Holy Spirit. 2. This doctrine deprives man of free-will, taking this word for the liberty of indifference. 3. St Auguſtin's doctrine has been ſolemnly approved by the church. Now we ſhall ſee, that the Priſcillianiſts were condemned, becauſe they deſtroyed free-will, *by ſubmitting man's will to a fatal neceſſity, which it cannot oppoſe* (25). That is to ſay, they were condemned, becauſe they deſtroyed free-will, taking that word not for the faculty of acting voluntarily (26), and with a very agreeable propenſity, but for the power of chuſing between two contraries; and therefore they were condemned for a doctrine, which was approved in St Auguſtin. Let us conſider how Pope Leo confutes them. '* If it be lawful to believe and 'teach that doctrine, virtue ought no longer to be 'rewarded, nor ought vice to be puniſhed; and all 'human and divine laws may be violated with impu'nity; becauſe it will never be poſſible to give judg'ment in favour of good actions, or againſt ill 'actions, if the will is overcome by a fatal neceſ'ty.' (27) *Now can any body doubt,* (I ſtill uſe Maimbourg's words (28), without adopting all that he ſays) *whether St Leo believed, what we are obliged to believe,* viz. *that grace does ſo influence our minds, as to lay no neceſſity upon us, and that it does not in the leaſt deprive us of our free-will or liberty of indifference, by virtue of which we may chuſe one of two things that are contrary, and do good by grace, or evil of our ſelves.* I eaſily believe, that they differ from St Auguſtin in explaining the cauſes, which determine the will; but they muſt needs have agreed with him in this point, that the principle, which moves it, does not allow it to ſtop, or go back, or turn aſide. But the reaſons alledged by Pope Leo, to confute theſe Heretics, are grounded upon that very thing; it is therefore certain, that, when he condemned their doctrine, he refuted St Auguſtin, and that he could not approve the doctrine of that Father, without adopting what he had rejected in the Priſcillianiſts. I do not examine whether he argues right; I only ſay, that all the proofs he builds upon rewards and puniſhments, laws and judgments, would be wrong againſt this ſect, if they were not good againſt St Auguſtin's ſyſtem. Take notice, that St Leo argues from the conſequences of the doctrine of a fatal neceſſity; and that he does not ſay, that theſe Heretics acknowledged theſe conſequences: which ſhews, that he argued againſt the doctrine itſelf, independently of the principle on which they grounded it, and of the conſequences they actually drew from it. I make this obſervation, becauſe it confirms the text of this remark.

(21) Maimbourg, ibid. *pag.* 56.

‡ Profuit diu iſta diſtrictio Eccleſiaſticæ lenitati, quæ etſi ſacerdotali contenta judicio cruentas refugit ultiones, ſeveris tamen Chriſtianorum Principum Conſtitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad ſpirituale nonnunquam recurrunt remedium qui timent corporale ſupplicium. *S. Leo, Epiſt. XCV, ad Turib.*

(22) Maimbourg, ibid. *pag.* 57.

(23) *See* Jurieu, Apologie pour la Réformation, *Tom. ii, pag.* 241, 257, *Edit. in 4to.*

(24) See Jurieu, ibid.

(25) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 65.

(26) It cannot be ſuppoſed, that any Heretic did ever deprive men of that faculty.

* Quod ſi id credi liceat, & doceri, nec vitutibus præmium, nec vitiis pœna debitur. Omniaque non ſolùm humanarum Legum, ſed etiam divinarum Conſtitutionum decreta ſolventur. Quia neque de bonis, neque de malis actibus ullum poterit eſſe judicium, ſi in utramque partem fatalis neceſſitas motum mentis impellit. *S. Leo, Epiſt. XCIII.*

(27) Maimbourg, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 66.

(28) I made uſe of his tranſlation of the words of St Leo, ibid. *pag.* 65, 66.

PRODICUS, a native of Julis (*a*) in the iſle of Cea [*A*], one of the Cyclades, cotemporary with Democritus, and Gorgias Leontinus, and diſciple of Protagoras, was one of the moſt celebrated Sophiſts of Greece. He flouriſhed in the LXXXVIth Olympiad (*b*), and had, among other ſcholars, Euripides, Socrates (*c*), Theramenes (*d*), and Iſocrates (*e*). He did not ſcruple to teach in private at Athens, though he was ſent thither with the character of an ambaſſador by his countrymen, who had before conferred ſeveral other public employments upon him (*f*), and though one would have thought, that the glory he had gained by haranguing the Athenians,

(*a*) Suidas.

(*b*) Euſeb. in Chron.

(*c*) Plato, in Menone, *pag.* 425.

(*d*) Suidas.

(*e*) Plutarch, and Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, in the Life of Iſocrates.

(*f*) Plato, in Hippia Maj. *pag.* 1246.

[*A*] *In the iſle of Cea.*] Suidas ſays in expreſs words, that Prodicus was born in that iſland, ἀπὸ Κέω τῆς νήσȣ, and calls him Κεῖον, as he had been called by Plato (1), Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (2), Plutarch (3), Diogenes Laërtius (4), *&c.* From Κέως comes Κέϊος, and by contraction Κεῖος, which the Latins have expreſſed *Ceus, Ceius,* or *Cius* (5). Menage (6) cenſures Marſilius Ficinus with great reaſon, for rendring Πρόδικος Κεῖος in Plato, *Prodicus Chius.* Amyot has done the ſame in his tranſlation of the life of *Iſocrates.* The Latin tranſlator of Philoſtratus has committed the ſame fault; for he calls *Prodicum Chium* the ſame perſon whom Philoſtratus calls Πρόδικον Κῖον (7). The French tranſlator was doubtleſs more careful

(1) In Protagora, & paſſim alibi. *He ſays in Hippia Majore, p. m.* 1246, *that Prodicus came* ἐκ Κέω ex Cea Inſula.

(2) In Vita Iſocr.

(3) Ibid.

(4) In Protagora.

(5) *See* Wolfius, in Iſocrat. Vitam, & Menag. in Diog. Laërt. *pag.* 419.

(6) Ibid.

(7) In Vita Sophiſt. *pag.* 449.

Athenians, on the day of his public audience, ſhould have made him reſerve his talent for the like occaſions. Plato, who frequently mentions, and even praiſes him, though not without irony (*g*), the darling figure of Socrates, his great interlocutor, intimates, that the deſire of getting money moved Prodicus to keep ſchool; and it is certain he got a great deal by that trade. Philoſtratus (*h*) ſeems to be of Plato's opinion; for he ſays, that Prodicus loved money, and ſpent it for his diverſion. He went from town to town, diſplaying his eloquence; and, though he did it in a mercenary manner [*B*], he received great honours at Thebes, and greater ſtill at Lacedæmon. His declamation at fifty drachms [*C*], πεντηκοντάδραχμος, was very much talked of: ſome learned men ſay it was ſo called, becauſe each hearer was obliged to give him fifty drachms (*i*), which make above four French crowns. Prodicus muſt needs have had a very eloquent ſtile [*D*], ſince he was ſo much followed, though he had a diſagreeable

careful to conſult the Latin tranſlation of Philoſtratus, than to examine the Greek text; for he renders it, *Prodicus, a native of Chio.* Caſeneuve, who blames him for it, and cenſures him for ſome other miſtakes (8), takes no notice of two, which deſerve to be cenſured. The Greek words run thus: Προδίκου δὲ τοῦ Κίου ὄνομα τοσοῦτον ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ ἐγένετο ὡς καὶ τὸν Γρύλλον Ξενοφῶντα ἐν Βοιωτοῖς δεθέντα ἀκροᾶσθαι διαλεγομένου, καθιστάντα ἐγγυητὴν τοῦ σώματος. The French tranſlator renders theſe words in the following manner. *Prodicus, a native of Chio, and ſon of Grillus, was ſo much eſteemed, that being a priſoner in Bæotia, Xenophon was bail for him, that he might hear him.* 1. Xenophon, and not Prodicus, ſhould have been called the the ſon of Gryllus. Caſeneuve ſays ſo himſelf, pag. 43; and yet, when he cenſures the verſion, pag. 42, he ſays the tranſlator *ſhould have ſaid*, Prodicus, a native of Cio, and ſon of Gryllus, *&c.* 2. It was Xenophon, and not Prodicus who was a priſoner; and yet any one, who reads this tranſlation, will think that Xenophon was bail for the priſoner Prodicus. Tho' Caſeneuve was not ignorant, that this ſophiſt was not a native of the iſle of Cio, he knew not what countryman he was; for he ſays he was born in the iſle of Cio, *now called* Standia. This is not true; for he was born in the iſle of Cea, or Ceos, now called Zea. Moreri, who makes him a native of the iſle of Cos (9), was led into that miſtake by ſome writers, who had more learning than he. Eraſmus calls him *Coum*, page 394 of his Adages. Charles Stephens does the ſame in his Dictionary, which has not been corrected by Lloyd or Hofman, neither have they amended what he falſly aſcribes to Suidas, *viz*, that he made Prodicus a native of the iſle of Cio. Menage (10) thinks an error has crept into the firſt chapter of the third book of Quintilian, where Prodicus is called Chius. I have not found that error in the editions I have conſulted. Maucroix, in his tranſlation of the great Hippias, printed at Paris in 1685, ſays, that Prodicus was born in the iſle of Cos. Father Goulu committed the ſame fault in the French tranſlation of Socrates's Apology. (11)

[*B*] *In a mercenary manner.*] See Philoſtratus (12) and Plato. The latter ſays, that young men of the richeſt and nobleſt families being enticed by Prodicus, Gorgias, Polus, and Hippias, who went from town to town, gave them a great deal of money, and beſides promiſed them to remember it gratefully, whilſt they neglected to be inſtructed by their fellow-citizens, who would have taught them for nothing (13).

[*C*] *The declamation at fifty drachms.*] I make uſe of the word *declamation*, without depriving myſelf of the liberty of uſing another term, if there is occaſion for it. The word ἐπίδειξις in Plato and Suidas ſeems to ſignify an harangue, wherein the author diſplays all his Rhetoric, intending to ſignalize himſelf both on account of the importance of the ſubject, and the great concourſe of hearers. Thoſe who render ἐπίδειξιν ποιεῖν, *ſpecimen edere*, have not a wrong notion of the thing; for they give us to underſtand, that an Orator exerts all his ſtrength, as if he were to produce a maſter-piece. I think this is the reaſon why the brighteſt orations, *viz.* thoſe that contain a panegyric or an invective, have been aſcribed by the Rhetoricians to the demonſtrative kind, ἐπιδεικτικόν. However it be, there is ſome difficulty about the ἐπίδειξις πεντηκοντάδραχμος of Prodicus. Suidas ſays, that Prodicus is the firſt, who made it, and does not tell us what it was: nevertheleſs Voſſius makes him ſay, that all thoſe, who had a mind to hear that Orator, gave him fifty drachms, that is, four French crowns, and two Spaniſh rials. *Quanti orationes ejus fieri ſoleant, illud arguit, quod qui audire eum vellet, is, Suida teſte, quinquaginta drachmas perſolveret, hoc eſt quatuor coronatos Gallicos, ac duos inſuper regales Hiſpanicos* (14). It is very likely, that Voſſius depended upon Creſollius (15), and went no farther. He makes uſe of the ſame valuation of money as that Jeſuit does; but whereas, in the book of the Jeſuit, the ſum of four crowns and two rials, paid to Prodicus by each hearer, is only an explication of Suidas's words, or a conſequence drawn from them, it is in Voſſius a formal teſtimony of Suidas. Judge how cautious one ought to be in reading ordinary authors, ſince ſuch a man as Voſſius takes ſuch a liberty. Let us ſee what he had ſaid in another book (16). He had related, as a matter of fact taken from Ariſtotle, that when Prodicus perceived, that his hearers did not mind what he ſaid, he uſed to propoſe to them ſomething relating to his art, which he would not teach for leſs than fifty drachms. The paſſage of Ariſtotle ſeems capable of two ſenſes; one is, that Prodicus had an oration full of ſuch lively ſtrokes, that ſome of them were ſufficient to expel the drowſineſs of the hearers; the other is, that he had a treatiſe of Rhetoric, which contained ſeveral ſecrets proper to excite the attention of the hearers, though they were never ſo weary. Τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν, ὥσπερ ἔφη Πρόδικος, ὅτε νυστάζοιεν οἱ ἀκροαταὶ παρεμβάλλειν τῆς πεντακονταδράχμου αὐτοῖς. *Hoc autem eſt, ut dixit Prodicus, cum dormitant auditores, inferre aliquid demonſtrationis quinquaginta drachmarum ipſis* (17). According to the firſt ſenſe, he had made an oration, which he kept for the beſt days that is for ſuch hearers as gave him fifty drachms; and, according to the ſecond ſenſe, he had a collection of good remedies to keep his hearers from ſleeping, which he imparted to none but thoſe who gave him that price. Which puts me in mind of a famous profeſſor of Philoſophy (18) among the Proteſtants of France, who would not teach certain ſophiſms, unleſs he was paid according to the price he ſet on them. Voſſius keeps to the firſt ſenſe in one of his books, and to the ſecond in another. It were no eaſy thing to determine which of the two is the trueſt, conſidering that Ariſtotle and Suidas have affected to be very ſhort upon this ſubject: but Plato acquaints us, that Prodicus's ἐπίδειξις πεντηκοντάδραχμος was rather a lecture, than an oration. Socrates complains, in a bantering way, that he is not able to diſcourſe well of the nature of names, becauſe he had not heard the ἐπίδειξις of fifty drachms, which, according to Prodicus, diſcovered the whole myſtery; he had only heard that of one drachm, τὴν δραχμιαίαν (19). Creſollius did not underſtand this laſt word: He took it to be the ſame thing, in Plato, with what was called before πεντηκοντάδραχμος. *Plato qui rem eamdem memorat, ea cauſa* δραχμιαίαν ἐπίδειξιν *nominavit* (20). Madam Dacier, in her notes upon Ariſtophanes's comedy; intituled, *The Clouds*, page 235, had a better notion of the thing. *Prodicus*, ſays ſhe, *was an extraordinary vain man, and had ſo good an opinion of his own learning, that he never taught any thing* gratis. *He had diſcourſes ready made of all prices, from an obolus to fifty drachms.*

[*D*] *A very eloquent ſtile.*] This may be proved by the teſtimony of ſeveral grave authors. Maximus Tyrius (21) ſays, that the beauty of expreſſion, καλλιλογίαν, was Prodicus's true character. According to Marcellinus (22), he made an exact choice of his words. Themiſtius ſays, that his orations were full of ornaments and charms, πολυτελεῖς τε καὶ γέμοντας ἡδονῆς. I think Naudæus (23) had no good reaſon to place him among the Sophiſts, who made ſpeeches

---

(*g*) Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus, in his letter to Pompey, blames Plato for ſpeaking ill of Prodicus, and of ſeveral others.

(*h*) In Vita Sophiſt. *lib. i, p.* 500.

(*i*) Hofman, in the article PRODICUS, ſays only five drachms.

(8) Caſeneuve, Commentaire ſur les Epiſtres de Philoſtrate, *pag.* 42.

(9) In the Dutch edition they have put it *Col*: it is an error of the preſs.

(10) Menag. in Laërt. *p.* 419.

(11) It is in the 2d part of Phyllarchus's Letters. See pag. 581.

(12) In Vit. Sophiſt. *pag.* 488.

(13) Plato, in Apolog. Socr. *pag.* 15, 16, *&* in Theagen, *p.* 93.

(14) Voſſius, de Rhetor. natura, *pag.* 69.

(15) Creſol. Theatr. Rhetorum, *lib. iii, cap. v, pag.* 178.

(16) Voſſius, Inſtitut. Orator. *lib. iii, cap. ii.*

(17) Ariſtot. Rhetor. *lib. iii, cap. xiv.*

(18) David Derodon.

(19) Νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἀκήκοα, ἀλλὰ τὴν δραχμιαίαν. Plato, in Cratylo, *pag.* 265.

(20) Creſollius, ubi ſupra.

(21) Differt. VII. *init.*

(22) In the Life of Thucydides, who ſays, that he imitated τὴν τοῦ Προδίκου ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀκριβολογίαν.

(23) Synt. de Studio Liber. *p.* 87, *in the collection of diſſertations* de Studiis inſtituendis, *printed in* 1645, *where there is* Prodichum Chium. *The laſt fault is, without doubt,* Naudæus's.

diſagreeable voice (k). It is ſaid, that Xenophon being a priſoner in Bœotia [E], and deſiring to hear him (l), ſatisfied his curioſity, having found a perſon, who was bail for him. Few harangues have been ſo much quoted, or have occaſioned ſo many applications, as that, wherein our ſophiſt feigned that virtue [F], and pleaſure, diſguiſed like women, came to Hercules and ſtrove which ſhould gain him. The Athenians put him to death as a corrupter of youth (m). Had it been no other corruption than that, mentioned by Ariſtophanes, in one of his Comedies (n), when he ſaid, *this man has been ſpoiled by reading of books, or by Prodicus, or by the converſation of great talkers*, the puniſhment would have been a little too ſevere; but it is not improbable he was accuſed of teaching his ſcholars Atheiſm [G]. I do not know, whether any author beſides Plutarch ſays, that he was a man of a weak and ſickly conſtitution [H].

ſpeeches without any preparation upon any ſubject propoſed to them. The quite contrary may be inferred from what we read in the lives of the Sophiſts, written by Philoſtratus, page 487, that Gorgias was the firſt, who went through that trial, and that he did it, to eclipſe the glory Prodicus had acquired by going from town to town, and reciting elaborate ſpeeches. Being willing to go beyond that Orator, whom he laughed at on account of his frequently repeating the ſame pieces (24), he reſolved to try what he could do without preparation. We need not doubt, that the beautiful ſtile of Prodicus's ſpeeches was attended with ſubtil thoughts, and that he contributed, at leaſt as much as any body elſe, to the Athenians forbidding the Sophiſts to plead cauſes. They could no longer bear, that the ſubtilties of thoſe men ſhould make that appear juſt, which was unjuſt (25). See the Proverb, Προδίκȣ σοφώτερος, *more knowing than Prodicus*. Eraſmus was miſtaken in believing, that this proverb was not meant of Prodicus the Sophiſt but of another. See how he is cenſured for it in Caſeneuve's Notes upon Philoſtratus's Letters, page 42, 43. See alſo *The Clouds* of Ariſtophanes. Notwithſtanding the railleries of that Poet, it may be inferred from what he ſays, that our Sophiſt was accounted a man of a great deal of wit and learning.

[E] *Xenophon being a priſoner in Bœotia.*] Charles Stephens did not underſtand that paſſage of Philoſtratus. He explains it as if that author had ſaid, that Prodicus was ſo conſiderable a man, that Xenophon, being apprehended in Bœotia, obtained leave to go home, becauſe Prodicus was bail for him. Lloyd and Hofman have retained that miſtake of Charles Stephens word for word.

[F] *The harangue, wherein Prodicus feigned that virtue.*] I make uſe of the word *harangue*, not only becauſe Philoſtratus gives me that notion of it, but alſo becauſe Prodicus's profeſſion leads one to it. It is not unlikely ſuch a fiction might be the ſubject of a declamation. However, it is true that Xenophon (26), who gives us the ſubſtance of it, ſpeaks of it as of a piece written concerning Hercules, ἐν τῷ συγγράμματι τῷ περὶ τȣ̃ Ἡρακλέȣς. What Mr Charpentier ſays of it is more particular; *In the book*, ſays he, *which* the learned Prodicus *wrote concerning the life of Hercules*. Suidas tells us, that it was a book intituled ὧραι, *the hours*: neverthele ſs, that work of Prodicus may be called an harangue. I have ſaid, that this fiction has been frequently quoted, and has occaſioned many explications: and I have good reaſons to ſay ſo, Cicero (27), Quintilian (28), and Maximus Tyrius (29) ſpeak of it; but Silius Italicus, quoted by Moreri, ſays nothing of it. He feigns ſomething like it in honour of Scipio Africanus. Lucian alſo has imitated that fiction (30). Among the moderns, I ſhall only quote Henry Stephens, who mentions it in his exhortation, prefixed to the Greek tranſlation of the Catechiſm of Geneva (31).

[G] *He was accuſed of teaching his ſcholars Atheiſm.*] Sextus Empiricus ranks him among Atheiſts (32). Cicero does the ſame, though not ſo directly; for he ſays that Prodicus affirmed, that human gratitude had occaſioned the belief of the exiſtence of the gods. This is no leſs contrary to ſound Theology, than if one ſhould ſay, as ſome have done, *Primus in orbe Deos fecit timor*, fear has brought religion into the world: or, as others would have it, religion was invented by wiſe Politicians to keep people in awe. Cicero ſhews, that Prodicus's opinion is deſtructive of religion. ‘ Quid? ii qui dixerunt totam de Diis immortalibus ‘ opinionem fictam eſſe ab hominibus ſapientibus Reipub. cauſâ, ut quos ratio non poſſet, eos ad officium ‘ religio duceret, nonne omnem religionem funditùs ‘ ſuſtulerunt? Quid Prodicus Chius? qui ea quæ prodeſſent hominum vitæ Deorum in numero habita eſſe ‘ dixit, quam tandem religionem reliquit (33)? - - - - ‘ *Do not thoſe, who pretend, that the belief of a GOD ‘ is the meer fiction of politic men, for the good of the ‘ public, utterly deſtroy all religion? What religion did ‘ Prodicus the Chian leave, when he ſaid, that thoſe ‘ things, which are profitable to the life of man, are ‘ reckoned in the number of the gods?*

[H] *He was of a weak and ſickly conſtitution.*] Plutarch obſerves, that when a public employment is to be conferred, the vigour of a man ſhould be conſidered, and not his age; and that, therefore a robuſt old man ought not to be excuſed from it, as it was reaſonable to diſpenſe with Prodicus in his youth. It is upon this occaſion that he acquaints us with that Sophiſt's infirmity. He couples him with a man ſo lean and ſo weak (34), that the paſſage deſerves to be ſet down. (35) *And therefore, as he who would adviſe the Sophiſt Prodicus, or the Poet Philetas, who were both young, but thin, lean, and ſickly* (36), *and kept their bed the greateſt part of the time, to concern themſelves with public affairs, would be ſenſeleſs; ſo would thoſe be, who ſhould forbid ſuch old men as Phocion, Maſſiniſſa the African, and Cato the Roman to exerciſe public offices.*

(k) Δυσήκοον καὶ βαρὺ Φθεγγόμενος, diſſonè & injucundè loquens. *Philoſtr. pag.* 500. *See alſo* Plato, in Protag. *pag.* 220.

(l) Philoſtr. *pag.* 499.

(m) Ἐν ἀθήναις κώνειον πιὼν ἀπέθανεν ὡς διαφθείρων τοὺς νέȣς. Athenis hauſta cicuta mortuus eſt quaſi juvenes corrumperet. *Suidas.*

(n) Id. Suid.

(24) Ἐπικόπτων τὸν Πρόδικον ὡς ἕωλά τε καὶ πολλάκις εἰρημένα ἀγορεύοντα ἐπαφῆκεν ἑαυτὸν τῷ καιρῷ. Philoſtr. *pag.* 488.

(25) Ibid.

(26) *Lib. ii*, de memor. Socratis.

(27) Cicero, Officior. *lib. i*, *cap. xxxii*, Epiſtol. XII, ad Famil. *lib. v.*

(28) Quintil. *lib. ix*, *cap. ii.*

(29) Maxim. Tyr. Orat. IV, *init.*

(30) Lucian. in Somnio.

(31) Berchet, in his *Scholia* upon that paſſage of Henry Stephens, makes Prodicus a native of the iſle of Cos, or of the iſle of Chios, and ſince he ſays that he was a man *ſummæ auctoritatis*, he ſhews, that he ran into the miſtake of Charles Stephens's Dictionary.

(32) Sext. Empir. adv. Math.

(33) Cicero, de Natura Deorum, *lib. i*, *circa fin. pag. m.* 170.

(34) See the article PHILETAS.

(35) Plut. an ſeni ſit gerenda Reſpublica, *pag.* 791, *E.*

(36) Νέȣς μὲν, ἰσχνοὺς δὲ καὶ νοσώδεις καὶ τὰ πολλὰ κλινοπετεῖς δ᾽ ἀῤῥωστίαν ὄντας. Integra quidem ætate verum graciles & ob infirmitatem valetudinis crebro decumbentes. *Ibid.*

PRODICUS, an Heretic of the IId century (a), founder of the ſect of the Adamites, followed the abominable opinions of Carpocrates, to which he added the impudence of public copulation of both ſexes [A]; for he ordered, that women ſhould be in common: ſo that, at a public feaſt, every man took the firſt woman he lighted upon, after the candles were removed; and leudneſs was accounted the myſtical ceremony of the initiation (b). Thoſe who are endued with the leaſt ſpark of piety, are ſtruck with horror, when they ſee, that, ſo ſoon after the death of the Apoſtles, the doctrine of the myſtical union, which ought to be among the faithful, was underſtood of the carnal copulation of men and women, and that thoſe Heretics durſt affirm, that the true participation of myſteries conſiſted in that. What could be expected from ſuch a man as Prodicus, who believed, that human ſouls were ſent into bodies, not in order to

[A] *To which he added the impudence of public copulation of both ſexes.*] Here are Theodoret's words. Οὗτος περιφανῶς λαγνεύειν τοῖς Καρποκράτȣς προσέθηκε δόγμασι. *Hic ad decreta Carpocratis adjecit palam & publicè ſcortari* (1). The only proof Theodoret alledges for it is, that Prodicus ordered a community of women; that is to ſay, that, in the meals which the ancient Chriſtians called Ἀγάπαι, every man ſhould enjoy a woman, as chance ſhould bring them together in the darkneſs of the room. This they

(a) See the remark [A], in the article ADAMITES.

(b) Theodor. Hæret. Fab. *lib. i*, *cap. vi*, & *lib. v*, *c. xxvii.*

(1) Theod. Hæret. Fabul. *lib. i*, *cap. vi.*

to be puniſhed, but to pay homage to the angels, who had created the world, by all manner of ſenſuality (*c*)? The followers of Prodicus boaſted, that they had the ſecret books of Zoroaſter (*d*), and maintained, that God was not to be prayed to (*e*), and that no man ought to expoſe himſelf to martyrdom by confeſſing the truth (*f*).

they called communicating, and being initiated into the myſtery. I do not find, that Theodoret had any reaſon to aſcribe this additional doctrine to Prodicus, ſince Clemens Alexandrinus, on whoſe credit he ſpeaks, imputes (2) the whole matter to Carpocrates; for, having mentioned upon a meer hear-ſay, and not as a thing to be found in their writings, the infamous cuſtom of removing the candles, and lying one with another, he ſays, that Carpocrates ſhould have eſtabliſhed thoſe laws for dogs, hogs, and goats: and therefore Clemens Alexandrinus did not believe, that Carpocrates had left them to the care of ſome of his ſucceſſors; for inſtance, to Prodicus. Thus Theodoret alledges an author, who is againſt him. That author obſerves, that the men, before they went to thoſe feaſts, acquainted the women, whom they had a mind to lie with, that they made choice of them. Μελετήσαντας δὲ ἐν τοιαύτῃ ἀγάπῃ τὴν κοινωνίαν, μεθ' ἡμέραν ἤδη παρ' ὧν ἂν ἐθελήσωσι γυναικῶν ἀπαιτεῖν τὴν τοῦ Καρποκρατείου (οὐ γὰρ θέμις εἰπεῖν θείου) νόμου ὑπακοήν. *Meditatos autem in ejuſmodi agape communionem, interdiu jam, à quibus velint mulieribus exigere Carpocrateæ (divinæ enim nefas eſt dicere) legis obedientiam* (3). Which is likely enough: The paſſions are too ingenious to be inactive on ſuch occaſions, and to refer the whole matter to chance. The Carpocratians knew therefore, pretty near, who ſhould fall to their ſhare, and were not wholly in the caſe, mentioned by a Roman Poet.

Mox juniores quærit adulteros
Inter mariti vina: neque eligit
Cui donet impermiſſa raptim
Gaudia luminibus remotis:
Sed juſſa coram non ſine conſcio
Surgit marito: ſeu vocat inſtitor,
Seu navis Hiſpanæ magiſter,
Dedecorum pretioſus emtor (4).

Marry'd, their leſſons ſhe improves
By practice of adulterous loves,
And ſcorns the common mean deſign,
To take advantage of her huſband's wine;
Or ſnatch in ſome dark place
A haſty illegitimate embrace.
No! the bribed huſband knows of all,
And bids her riſe, when lovers call:
Hither a merchant from the Streights,
Grown wealthy by forbidden freights,
Or city Cannibal repairs,
Who feeds upon the fleſh of heirs.
Convenient brutes! whoſe tributary flame
Pays the full price of luſt, and gilds the ſlighted ſhame.
Lord ROSCOMMON.

I muſt add, that Theodoret is not ſo exact, as he ſhould have been, in quoting Clemens Alexandrinus about another circumſtance. He makes him ſay of Prodicus, what is properly and directly ſaid of ſome others, and cannot be applied to Prodicus, but in general, and with ſeveral indirect arguments.

PRUDENTIUS, in Latin *Aurelius Prudentius Clemens*, a Chriſtian Poet, was born in the year 348 [*A*] in Spain; but it is diſputed whether it was at Calahorra, or Saragoſſa, or in another town of that country [*B*]. Thoſe who ſay that he was

[*A*] *He was born in the year* 348.] This appears from theſe words:

Hæc dum vita volans agit
Inrepſit ſubito canities ſeni,
Oblitum veteris me Saliæ Conſulis arguens
Sub quo prima dies mihi (1).

Whilſt thus my fleeting being haſtes away,
Old age creeps ſudden on, and marks me gray:
Old Salia's conſulſhip's forgotten quite,
The year, in which I firſt beheld the light.

The meaning of which is, that he was born under Salia's conſulſhip; but we find, that the conſuls of the year 348 were Flavius Philippus, and Flavius Sallia, or Sallea (2). Obſerve that, thoſe who make him flouriſh in the year 380 (3), are as much miſtaken, as thoſe, who make him flouriſh in the year 430 (4).

[*B*] *It is diſputed whether it was at Calahorra, or at Saragoſſa, or in another town of that country.*] Aldus Manutius, Sixtus Senenſis, Poſſevin, and ſome others, make him a native of Saragoſſa; but Mariana maintains, that he was born at Calahorra (5). They alledge for the firſt opinion the hymn *in honorem ſanctorum decem & octo Martyrum Cæſarauguſtanorum* (6), which begins thus:

Bis novem NOSTER populus ſub uno
Martyrum ſervat cineres ſepulchro:
Cæſarauguſtam vocitamus urbem
Res cui tanta eſt.

MY *country-men, with pious zeal, give room*
To twice nine martyrs aſhes in one tomb.
Cæſar Auguſta is the city's name,
Which only can ſo great an honour claim.

We read the following paſſage in the ſame hymn:

NOSTER eſt quamvis procul hinc in urbe
Paſſus ignota dederit ſepulchri
Gloriam victor, prope litus altæ
Forte Sagunti.
NOSTER, & NOSTRA puer in palæſtra,
Arte virtutis, fideique olivo
Unctus, horrendum didicit domare
Viribus hoſtem (7).

Tho' martyr'd in a foreign land he dye,
The conqueror, perhaps, will not deny
On fam'd Saguntum's ſhore his corpſe interr'd to lye.
OUR *country-man, 'midſt us he did a hero grow,*
And learn'd, with th' oil of faith, to triumph o'er the foe.

Prudentius ſpeaks of St Vincent, who was born at Saragoſſa. A like proof is alledged for the ſecond opinion; for theſe two verſes are to be found in the hymn, *in honorem ſanctorum Martyrum Hemiterii & Chelidonii Calagurritanorum* (8):

Hoc bonum ſalvator ipſe, quo fruamur, præſtitit
Martyrum cum membra NOSTRO conſecravit oppido (9).

This good our Saviour's bounty did beſtow,
From him alone our happineſs does flow,
Who kindly to OUR *city doth decree*
The blood of martyrs ſlain ſhou'd ſacred be.

And in the very hymn for the martyrs of Saragoſſa we read this:

(*c*) Idem, *lib. v, cap. x, & xx.*

(*d*) Clem. Alexand. Strom. *lib. i, pag.* 304. I ſhall obſerve in the remark [*H*] of the article ZOROASTER, that the words of Clemens Alexandrinus are equivocal.

(*e*) Ibid. *lib. vii, pag.* 722.

(*f*) Tertull. in Scorpiac. cap. ult.

(2) Stromat. *lib. iii, p.* 430.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Horace, Od. VI, lib. III.

(1) Prudent. in Prolog. Oper.

(2) Onuphrius, on the 3d book of the *Faſti*, ſhews by an inſcription, that his name was *Sallea.*

(3) Sixtus Senenſis is cenſured for it by Father Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſ. Tom. ii, pag.* 794.

(4) Biblioth. Hiſp. p. 205.

(5) Mariana, Hiſt. Hiſp. *lib. iv, cap. xvii.*

(6) It is the 4th of the book περὶ Στεφάνων.

(7) Prudent. ib. Hymn. IV, *ver.* 97.

(8) It is the firſt of the book Περὶ Στεφάνων.

(9) Id. Hymn. I, ver. 115.

was made conſul, are groſly miſtaken [*C*]. They ſhould only have ſaid, that he had a very conſiderable office (*a*). He was fifty-ſeven years of age when he betook himſelf to write Poems upon matters of religion. He had been an advocate, and then a judge, afterwards a ſoldier, and at laſt he had a noble employment at court [*D*]. He does not deny that he was a looſe man in his youth (*b*). There is more zeal for religion, than poetical ornaments, in his works (*c*). He did not always obſerve the rules

NOSTRA geſtabit Calagurris ambos
Quos veneramur (10).

OUR *Calahorra both ſhall bear,*
Whom we revere.

Mariana made uſe of thoſe two paſſages; but the author (11), who wrote againſt him, ſhews, that, if they afforded a good proof, they would be inſignificant for that very reaſon, becauſe they cannot be ſolid, without the paſſages brought for the contrary opinion be ſo too. In a word, Thoſe reaſons prove too much, and conſequently prove nothing. He confutes Mariana and Aldus Manutius's arguments reciprocally one by the other, and ſays, that, though Prudentius was not born at Saragoſſa, nor at Calahorra, he might call them *noſtra*, becauſe they were ſituated in Hiſpania Tarraconenſis, his native country. He confirms his opinion by two remarks (12): One is taken from theſe words concerning Tarragona:

O triplex honor, o triforme culmen
Quo NOSTRÆ caput excitatur urbis
Cunctis urbibus eminens Hiberis (13).

O triple honour, triple height of fame,
Which thus, above all elſe, exalts OUR *city's name!*

The other is grounded upon this, that Prudentius, who ſays many things of Merida, where St Eulalia was born, does not call it *noſtra*; becauſe, ſays he, it was not in Hiſpania Tarraconenſis, but in Hiſpania Luſitanica. Obſerve that he is miſtaken concerning thoſe words, *noſtra puer in palæſtra:* he (14) underſtood them of Valencia (15), where St Vincent ſuffered martyrdom; but it is plain they are meant of Saragoſſa, where he was born and bred up.

This Critic is better at pulling down than at building up; for, when he goes about to prove, that Salia, in the Aſturias, is Prudentius's birth-place, he alledges no good reaſon for it, though he ſhews a great deal of ingenious learning. His chief argument is built upon theſe words; *oblitum veteris me Saliæ Conſulis* (16). He pretends (17), that if *veteris* refers to *Conſulis*, there would have been two conſuls called Salia, one before the other, and Prudentius muſt have been born under the conſulſhip of the firſt. But it is not true, that there was a *Salia major* and a *Salia minor*, as there was a *Scipio Africanus major*, and a *Scipio Africanus minor*. This objection would have ſome force, if Prudentius was very exact in the choice of his words. But, after all, if we refer *veteris* to a town, as Pedro Mantuano will have it, what will become of the word *Conſulis?* His ſaying (18) that it ſignifies a year, will never be a ſatisfactory explication.

[*C*] *Thoſe, who ſay, that he was made conſul, are groſly miſtaken.*] Aldus Manutius (19) calls him *Vir Conſularis*, and *Maſſaliæ Conſul.* His miſtake proceeds from not rightly underſtanding the letters *V. C.* added to the names of Prudentius, and from reading in his manuſcript *oblitum veteris Meſſaliæ conſulis arguens*, whereas it ſhould be *me Saliæ*. The two letters *V. C.* ſignify *Vir Clariſſimus*, as Alciatus obſerves (20), and not *Vir Conſularis*, a title that was grown out of uſe at that time (21). Here follows a paſſage of Mr du Pin. '(22) Moſt authors have not underſtood this paſſage (23), and ſome, as Aldus Manutius, Sixtus Senenſis, Poſſevin, and even Father Labbe, thought he had been conſul of a town called Meſſalia, which Father Labbe (24) fancies to be Marſeilles. It is a blunder. They took the name of the conſul Salia, who was conſul with Philippus in 348, for the name of a town, and aſcribed to Prudentius the title of conſul, which belongs to Salia, under whoſe conſulſhip Prudentius came into the world.' The author, who criticizes Mariana (25), confutes Antonius Nebriſſenſis, who thinks, that Prudentius was born under Meſſalia's conſulſhip: he ſhews, there was no conſul of that name, from the beginning of Diocleſian's reign to the time of Anaſtaſius. He confutes Aldus, who believed that Prudentius had been conſul of Meſſalia (26): he ſhews, there is no ſuch conſul in the *Faſti Conſulares*, and that the ancient authors never mentioned a town called Meſſalia. There was indeed a town called Maſſilia, and now Marſeilles. But, ſays he, ever ſince the diviſion of the empire under Conſtantine, it was an uſual thing to elect a conſul at Rome, and another at Conſtantinople, or both at Rome, and then both at Conſtantinople; and ſometimes two at Rome, and two at Conſtantinople at the ſame time; but it does not appear, that any of the weſtern conſuls did ever reſide at Marſeilles. It is ſufficient to ſay, that, if Prudentius had been conſul, he would have ſaid ſo in the paſſage which may be ſeen at the beginning of the following remark.

[*D*] *He was fifty-ſeven years of age when he betook himſelf . . . . . He had been an advocate, and at laſt he had a noble employment at court.*] He himſelf gives us a ſhort account of his life, without forgetting the leudneſs of his youth.

Per quinquennia jam decem,
Ni fallor fuimus; ſeptimus inſuper
Annum cardo rotat, dum fruimur ſole volubili.
Inſtat terminus, & diem
Vicinum ſenio jam Deus adplicat.
Quid nos utile tanti ſpatio temporis egimus?
Ætas prima crepantibus
Flevit ſub ferulis: mox docuit toga
Infectum vitiis falſa loqui, non ſine crimine:
Tum laſciva protervitas,
Et luxus petulans (heu pudet ac piget!)
Fœdavit juvenem nequitiæ ſordibus ac luto.
Exin jurgia turbidos
Armarunt animos, & male pertinax
Vincendi ſtudium ſubjacuit caſibus aſperis.
Bis legum moderamine
Frenos nobilium reximus urbium:
Jus civile bonis reddidimus, terruimus reos.
Tandem militiæ gradu
Evectum pietas Principis extulit,
Adſumptum propius ſtare jubens ordine proximo (27.)

Ten Luſtra, *with ſeven added years,*
Are paſt, and roll'd away,
Since firſt my eyes beheld the ſun,
And open'd on the day.

Life's limit almoſt I approach;
Old age is ſtealing on;
In all this ſpace of fleeting time,
What good thing have I done?

The tyrant's laſh my boyiſh age
For manhood did prepare;
Inſtructed them in all the quirks
Of the evaſive bar.

Then wantonneſs and luxury
(Of which I now repent)
Into my ſoul of every vice
The ſtrong infection ſent.

Next broils, and fierce contention's rage,
Arm'd every angry thought;
And many hazards, many ills,
Deſire of conqueſt brought.

(*a*) See the remark [*D*].

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Melior omnino Chriſtianus, quam Poëta, meo judicio. *Lilius Gregor. Gyraldus, Dialogiſmo xxv, pag.* 906, *Tom. ii*, Oper. *See alſo the ſame* Gyraldus, in Poët. Hiſtoria, *pag.* 290.

(10) Id. Hymn. IV, ver. 31.

(11) Pedro Mantuano, Advertencias à la Hiſtoria de Juan de Mariana, *pag.* 82, *& ſeq.*

(12) Ib. *p.* 85.

(13) Prudent. Hymn. VI, ver. 142.

(14) Pedro Mantuano, ubi ſupra, *p.* 84, 85.

(15) *A town in* Hiſpania Tarraconenſis.

(16) See the remark [*A*].

(17) Ib. *p.* 87.

(18) Ib. *p.* 90.

(19) Aldus, in Vita Prudentii.

(20) See Father Chamillard upon Prudentius, *p.* 1.

(21) Ibid.

(22) Du Pin, Bibl. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt. *Tom. iii, p.* 6, *of the Dutch Edit.*

(23) *That is*, oblitum veteris me Saliæ, &c.

(24) *See his Diſſertation* de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. ii, p.* 793.

(25) Pedro Mantuano, ubi ſupra, *p.* 86, 87.

(26) It ſhould be Maſſalia.

(27) Prudent. in Prologo Operum.

rules of quantity; beſides, he does not appear to be orthodox in all his opinions [*E*]: the liberty he took in ſaying, that few people are damned, would not be born with at preſent.

Twice with the righteous rein of law
Two cities I controll'd;
Encourag'd good and modeſt men,
But ſhock'd the bad and bold.

At length, to military rank
Rais'd by my prince's hand,
He kindly bad me nearer to
His royal perſon ſtand.

He bethought himſelf ſomewhat late, though not too late (28), of renouncing the vanities of the world, and making pious verſes. It may be a queſtion, whether his publiſhing the debaucheries of his youth will be of advantage to all his readers. A young debauchee, who may reply to thoſe who reprove him, *Prudentius, that pious and devout Poet, did as I do when he was young, I will do as he did when I come to be fifty-ſeven years of age,* makes a very bad anſwer; and yet it appears to him ſolid, and lulls him aſleep in his ſins.

[*E*] *He does not appear orthodox in all his opinions.*] He ſays expreſsly, that the damned have a day of reſt every year, and that it is the day, on which our Saviour came out of hell. How came he to know this?

Sunt & ſpiritibus ſæpe nocentibus
Pœnarum celebres ſub Styge feriæ,
Illa nocte, ſacer qua rediit Deus
Stagnis ad ſuperos ex Acheronticis (29):

The damn'd have reſt from pain, their tortures ſtay,
And hell's inhabitants keep holiday;
On that bleſt night, in which the Son of God
From out thoſe gloomy realms in triumph rode.

Marcent ſuppliciis Tartara mitibus,
Exſultatque ſui carceris otio
Umbrarum populus liber ab ignibus:
Nec fervent ſolito flumina ſulphure (30).

The puniſhments of Tartarus abate,
And, free from penal fires, their diſmal fate,
The airy people a ſhort reſpite know,
Nor the dire ſtreams with uſual ſulphur flow.

He affirms in another place, that GOD damns but few people.

Quæſitor ille ſolus
Animæque corporiſque,
Enſiſque bis timendus
Prima ac ſecunda mors eſt.
Idem tamen benignus
Ultor retundit iram,
Paucoſque non piorum
Patitur perire in ævum (31.)

He only ſearches out the heart,
The lord of life and death,
The ſword that twice is to be fear'd,
The firſt and ſecond death.

Yet he, in mercy to mankind,
Puts th' edge of juſtice by,
And of th' ungodly ſuffers few
Eternally to die.

He is very much blamed for deſiring, not the glory of heaven, but the ſtate of a man, whoſe ſufferings are not exceſſive. He ſays, he will be contented, provided his ſoul be not caſt into the deepeſt dungeon of hell; and deſires no better fate after the reſurrection (32).

Multa in theſauris Patris eſt habitatio, Chriſte,
Diſparibus diſcreta locis, non poſco beatâ
In regione domum: ſint illic caſta virorum
Agmina, pulvereum quæ dedignantia cenſum
Divitias petiere tuas: ſit flore perenni
Candida virginitas, animum caſtrata reciſum.
At mihi Tartarei ſatis eſt ſi nulla miniſtri
Occurrat facies, avidæ nec flamma Gehennæ
Devoret hanc animam, merſam fornacibus imis.
Eſto: cavernoſo, quia ſic pro labe neceſſe eſt
Corporeâ, triſtis me ſorbeat ignis Averno:
Saltem mirificos incendia lenta vapores
Exhalent, æſtuque calor languente tepeſcat.
Lux immenſa alios, & tempora vincta coronis
Glorificent: me pœna levis clementer adurat (33).

In heav'n, thy father's dwelling-place, O Chriſt,
Are many manſions. In that happy region
I aſk not to be plac'd: be there the ſouls
Of thoſe, who, bravely ſcorning worldly gain,
Have ſought thy riches: there be plac'd the chaſt,
Eunuchs in mind. For me, if heaven conſent,
That no dark miniſter of hell approach me,
Nor its devouring flames enwrap my ſoul,
I'm ſatisfied. But ſince the ſtains of guilt
Require purgation in annealing fires,
O! Let ſome milder flame, with languid heat,
Gently exhale, and purge away my crimes,
Let others at a crown of glory aim:
I aſk but lighter puniſhment at beſt.

Dr Perkins, a Proteſtant Divine, ſays this is an impious prayer, and that it ought not to be aſcribed to Prudentius (34). He is not the only one who thinks that it is a piece added to his Hamartigenia. However it be, Victor Giſelinus, a Catholic writer, highly condemns this prayer, in a work (35) that is very much commended by Poſſevin (36). Obſerve that it is to be found as a genuine piece in the moſt exact editions (37); whereas ſome verſes, that are accounted ſuppoſititious, have been left out. You will not find in Heinſius's edition, as in that of Sichardus, the third Strophe of the hymn falſly intituled, *Ad incenſum cerei Paſchalis* (38). That title, and that Strophe, not being in the beſt manuſcripts, have been left out as ſuppoſititious pieces. The prayer, that is at the end of the Hamartigenia, would likewiſe have been expunged, if there had been any reaſons to believe that it was not genuine. But here is a hereſy, of which he cannot be cleared by denying the thing: he believed the materiality of the ſoul.

Reſciſſa ſed iſta (39) ſeorſum
Solvunt hominem perimuntque:
Humus excipit arida corpus,
Animæ rapit aura LIQUOREM (40).

When ſoul and body by the hand
Of death divided are,
The body to the duſt returns,
The liquid ſoul to AIR.

The following verſes make it plain, that he means a material ſubſtance by *Animæ liquorem*.

Non occidet, inquit,
Interior qui ſpirat homo: luet ille perenne
Supplicium, quod ſubjectos male rexerit artus.
Nec mihi difficile eſt LIQUIDAM circumdare flammis
Naturam, quamvis PERFLABILIS illa feratur
Inſtar Noti: capiam tamen, & tormenta adhibebo (41).

Th' interior man, he ſays, will never die,
But bear eternal puniſhment in hell.
I can conceive a liquid nature, tho'
Impaſſive as the wind, by flames encompaſs'd,
Suffer eternal burnings.

---

(28) Nam ſera numquam eſt ad bonos mores via, Quem pœnitet peccaſſe pene eſt innocens. - - - - *For it is never too late to reform: he who repents of having ſinned, is almoſt innocent.* Seneca, in Agamemn. Act. II, ver. 342, pag. m. 262.

(29) Prudent. Hymn. V. Cathemer. ver. 125, *p. m.* 21.

(30) Ib. ver. 133.

(31) Ib. Hymn. VI, ver. 89, *p.* 24.

(32) *See the* Bibl. Univerſ. *Tom. xii, pag.* 186, 187.

(33) Prudent. in Hamartigenia, *ſub fin. p.* 227.

(34) Dictum impium & non tribuendum Prudentio ait noſter Perkinſius. *Rivet, Crit. Sacri, lib. iii, cap. xxvi, p.* 1123, *Tom. ii,* Oper.

(35) In his Notes upon Prudentius.

(36) *See* Rivet, ubi ſupra.

(37) For inſtance, that of Nicolas Heinſius.

(38) It is the 5th of the *Cathemerinon.*

(39) That is, the body and the ſoul.

(40) Prudent. Hymn. X. Cathemerin. ver. 9.

(41) Id. contra Symmach. *lib. ii, ver.* 184.

preſent. It might be of ſome uſe to him, in anſwering the objections of the Marcionites againſt whom he wrote a poem; but, at the bottom, he could not clear up by it the difficulties concerning the origin of evil [*F*]. There are ſeveral editions of his works

Mr le Clerc obſerves (42), that theſe words of Prudentius, *Animæ rapit aura liquorem*, do naturally ſignify the mortality of the ſoul, and that *an Epicurean would not expreſs himſelf better*. It is certain, that this verſe, and the foregoing, explain a doctrine which is to be found in the books of ſeveral Pagan authors concerning the characters of death (43). It is, ſaid they, the reſolution of a compound into its principles, each of which returns to the place from which it came, the body into the earth, the ſoul into the air or the æther. If we conſider how Lucretius expreſſes himſelf on this head, it will appear, that Prudentius might be looked upon as his abridger.

Denique cœleſti ſumus omnes ſemine oriundi,
Omnibus ille idem Pater eſt, unde alma liquenteis
Humorum guttas Mater cum Terra recepit
Fœta parit nitidas fruges, arbuſtaque læta,
Et genus humanum (44)

. . . .
. . . .

Cedit item retro de Terra quod fuit ante,
In terras: & quod miſſum 'ſt ex Ætheris oris,
Id rurſum Cœli rellatum templa receptant:
Nec ſic interimit mors res, ut Materiaï
Corpora conficiat, ſed cœtum diſſupat ollis (45).

Laſtly, we all from ſeed cœleſtial riſe,
Which heav'n, our common parent, ſtill ſupplies.
From him the earth receives enlivening rain,
And ſtrait ſhe bears bird, tree, and beaſt, and man.

. . . .

And ſo each part returns, when bodies die,
What came from earth to earth, what from the ſky
Dropt down, aſcends again, and mounts on high.
For death does not deſtroy, but diſunite
The ſeeds, and change their order and their ſite.

CREECH.

But, though theſe two Poets agree in their expreſſions, their notions are quite different. The return of the ſoul to its principle was a true death, according to Lucretius (46), but not according to all other Heathens, and leſs ſtill according to Prudentius, who ſoon after (47) explains himſelf ſo poſitively, that one cannot doubt of his believing the immortality of the ſoul.

I deſire I may be allowed to ſay, that Dr Perkins's judgment ſeems too ſevere to thoſe, who have a regard to equity and charity. They think, that this Poet was willing to be deprived of happineſs in heaven, and to ſuffer a moderate puniſhment after this life, becauſe he looked upon himſelf as a man unworthy of the ſupream beatitude, and too worthy of puniſhment. Is ſuch an humility impious? May not one call it a ſacrifice of himſelf to the divine juſtice?

[*F*] *He could not clear up by it the difficulties concerning the origin of evil.*] I have propoſed them in ſeveral places of this Dictionary (48); but, in order to ſhew, that the Philoſophers are not the only men, who mention thoſe objections, I ſhall ſet down a long paſſage of a learned Divine. '(49) The Manichees and the Marcionites raiſed an objection againſt, the orthodox, mentioned by Prudentius (50), in its full ſtrength, *viz.* That, if the God, who governs the world, was not pleaſed with vice, he would prevent it, ſince he is not ignorant of the corruption of men, and is able to prevent it. They pretended, that it is one and the ſame thing, to do evil, or to ſuffer it, if one can hinder it. Prudentius anſwers, in the firſt place, that God is not pleaſed with vice, ſince he has appointed a remedy for it, and ſaves thoſe, who abſtain from it. But, replied thoſe Heretics, a man cannot ſin againſt God's will, ſince he is the maſter of our hearts, and inclines them as he thinks fit. Our Poet, in order to reſolve this difficulty, has only recourſe to free-will, without which there can be neither vice nor virtue. He very much enlarges upon it, and proves his aſſertion by the example of our firſt parents, of Lot, and his wife, of Naomi's daughters-in-law, and of brothers, one of whom, as we daily ſee, loves virtue, and the other gives himſelf up to vice. To which he adds this general maxim:

' *Omnibus una ſubeſt natura; ſed exitus omnes*
' *Non unus peragit, placitorum ſegrege formâ.*

'All men are of the ſame nature, but all of them have not the ſame fate, becauſe all of them have not the ſame will. It appears from what has been ſaid above, that Prudentius believed, that men are born corrupt; but what he ſays here ſhews, he did not believe, that ſuch a corruption did neceſſarily determine them to evil. He adds, that God has appointed rewards and puniſhments, becauſe men may be good or bad as they pleaſe. If the Manichees had farther objected to him, that it had been better if there had been no free-will, and no happineſs beſtowed as a reward; and if men had been neceſſarily happy, by being neceſſarily determined to the love of virtue, than to make them ſo fatal a preſent as liberty, whereby moſt of them become unhappy for ever: I ſay, if the Manichees had objected ſuch a thing to him, perhaps he would have made uſe of the principle abovementioned, *viz.* that few people are damned. How do we know but Prudentius came to have ſuch a thought by reaſon of this objection, which might eaſily come into his mind.'

Theſe laſt words of Mr Le Clerc contain nothing but what is very probable: I believe with him, that if our Poet had found himſelf hard preſſed, he would have anſwered, that the number of the damned is very ſmall: and therefore that we ought not to cry out ſo much againſt the rigours of divine juſtice, which expoſe mankind to miſery. But this anſwer would not have ſatisfied the Manichees, and would not have paſſed even for a palliative remedy; for here is what they might have replied. You acknowledge that our objection would be good if two thirds, or if half the human race were eternally damned. You confeſs then, that the good principle cannot make choice of a plan, in which the damnation of the greateſt part of mankind is included. You confeſs then, that infinite goodneſs is inconſiſtent with the eternal unhappineſs of ſo many perſons. By this confeſſion you deſtroy your whole ſyſtem; for you cannot admit this inconſiſtency without acknowledging, that the eternal unhappineſs of a very great number of creatures would be a mark of cruelty in him who ſhould puniſh them. You know very well that infinite goodneſs cannot be mixed with cruelty, and if you could comprehend that, without any mixture of this vice, the Lord of all things, might condemn to the flames two thirds or half of the human race, you would no longer think the infinite goodneſs inconſiſtent with this condemnation. Here then is the foundation of your anſwer; the good principle would be cruel, if a great number of perſons were damned; but becauſe few are damned, he is not cruel, and preſerves all the characters of infinite goodneſs. Conſider well to what you expoſe yourſelf. You ought to grant us, that the damnation of all men would be the effect of extream cruelty, *Actus ſævitiei ut octo*, as the ſchool-men would ſay, who meaſure the whole extent of a quality by eight degrees. Conſequently the damnation of the half of mankind would be the effect of four degrees of cruelty. From whence it follows, that the damnation of a fourth part of mankind would be a ſign of two degrees of cruelty in GOD. Make the number of the damned as ſmall as you pleaſe, it will always prove a degree of cruelty in GOD, which however ſmall it be is inconſiſtent with infinite goodneſs, ſince this goodneſs neceſſarily excludes all mixture of the contrary quality (51). In one word, if there is cruelty in damning a thouſand millions of ſouls, there is in damning nine hundred millions, and this proves that there is in damning eight hundred millions, and ſo on; for the difference would be only of more to leſs, and this kind of abatement will never lead you from cruelty to infinite goodneſs, but at moſt to a goodneſs leſs mixed with the contrary vice, a goodneſs inconſiſtent with a principle works [*G*]. His books againſt Symmachus were written before the victory obtained over Radagaiſus in the year 405, and after that which Stilico obtained over Alaric, near Pollentia, in the year 402. He mentions the latter (*d*), and ſays nothing of the other, though his ſubject required it.

---

(42) Le Clerc, Biblioth. Univerſelle, *Tom. xii, pag.* 166.

(43) See, in the article AMPHIARAUS, citat. (35), what I have quoted out of Epicharmus.

(44) You will find it in citat. (58), of the article JUPITER.

(45) Lucret. lib. II, ver. 990.

(46) See the remark [*R*], of the article LUCRETIUS.

(47) And alſo in ſome other books. See Mr *le Clerc, ubi ſupra.*

(48) In the articles MARCION, MANICHEES, PAULICIANS.

(49) Biblioth. Univerſelle, *Tom. xii, pag.* 182, *& ſeq.*

(50) *Theſe are his words:* Si non vult Deus eſſe malum, cur non vetat? inquit. Nil refert auctor fuerit factorque malorum. Anne opera in vitium ſceleris pulcherrima verti, Cùm poſſit prohibere, ſinat? quòd ſi velit omnes Innocuos agere Omnipotens, nec ſancta voluntas Degeneret, facto nec ſe manus inquinet ullo. Condidit ergo malum Dominus, quod ſpectat ab alto, Et patitur, fierique probat, tamquam ipſe crearit. Ipſe creavit enim, quod, cùm diſcludere poſſit, Non abolet, longoque finit graſſarier uſu. ***Prudent. in Hamartig. ver.* 640, *pag. m.* 217.**

(51) Compare with this §. vii, of the 3d treatiſe of *Janua Cœlorum reſerata*.

(*d*) Prudent. in Symmach. *lib. ii, ver.* 695, *& ſeq.*

a principle eternal and eſſentially good (52). On the other ſide, if there is no cruelty in damning an hundred thouſand perſons, why would there be any in damning two hundred thouſand perſons ? And if infinite goodneſs is not impeached by the damnation of two hundred thouſand men, neither would it be by the damnation of three hundred thouſand, and you can aſſign no number which can leſſen it's fulneſs, ſince three hundred thouſand does not hinder it's continuing ſuch ; acknowledge then that your ſyſtem falls to the ground, if you pretend to anſwer our difficulty by leſſening the number of the damned. We may apply here a thought of Horace (53), with all the ſubtilties of the Sorites (54). The true anſwer is, to maintain that the damnation of all men would be but an act of juſtice without any mixture of cruelty, ſmall or great. The method therefore of our Poet would be defective.

I ſay nothing of another defect in his anſwer ; the objection of his adverſaries is grounded upon this, that a being, which can prevent evil, and does not prevent it, wills it. This notion is plain. What ſignifies it to ſay, as our Poet does, that GOD has given to man a full power of doing good, and that man is the ſole cauſe of ſin by the abuſe of free-will ? This does not weaken the objection : it is to give his theſis for a reply, it is *ignoratio elenchi*, and *petitio principii*, ſince the Manichees directly attack the hypotheſis of a free creature whom a good principle will ſuffer to fall into ſin.

[*G*] *There are ſeveral editions of his works.*] That of Aldus at Venice, 1502, in 4to, is not the firſt, as he pretended. That of Deventer went before it (55). Some ſay he put out two editions ; but there is ſome reaſon to believe, that they ſay ſo without any foundation (56). Mr du Pin (57) mentions the Antwerp edition, 1540, *in 8vo, which contains the notes of Antonius Nebriſſenſis, and Sichardus.* I have an edition of Antwerp in 8vo, with the notes of thoſe two authors ; but it is of the year 1546. The Epiſtle Dedicatory, written by Sichardus, is dated from Baſil, in March 1537. Geſner, in his Bibliotheque (58) mentions an edition of Baſil, by Cratander, 1527, with Sichardus's Scholia, and another edition of Baſil by Henricus Petri of the ſame town. Father Labbe (59), followed the Antwerp edition of Plantin, 1564, with Theodorus Pulmannus's notes (60) and corrections, and Victor Giſelinus's commentary. The two books againſt Symmachus were printed at Paris in 1614, with Grangæus's notes : Mr du Pin calls him by miſtake Gangræus. He ſays, the laſt edition of Prudentius is that of Amſterdam 1667, *with Heinſius's notes and corrections.* He ſhould have ſaid Nicolas Heinſius, leſt the works of the ſon ſhould be aſcribed to the father. I think he might have mentioned the edition *in uſum Delphini*, by Father Chamillard at Paris, 1687. Moreri ſays, there is an Amſterdam edition of Prudentius, 1670, with the notes of Nicolas Heinſius, and the author's life : I have not been able yet to know whether this be true. I have only the edition of the year 1667, in 12mo, printed by Daniel Elziver, without the life of Prudentius : it (61) is in Sichardus's edition. As for the edition *Variorum*, publiſhed by Weitzius, it was printed at Francfort, or Hanaw, 1613, and not at Hanover, as Mr du Pin ſays.

The reader will not be dipleaſed to find here Father Chamillard's judgment concerning thoſe who have written upon this author. ‘ Giſelinus ſectatus eſt tantum ea ‘ quæ omnium erant facillima & minime ſcitu neceſſaria, lapſus in multis etiam & hallucinatus. Nebriſſenſis hæret in Prudentio magis, ſed eſt brevior & ‘ ſingula delibare ſatis habet, quæ ad fabulam, hiſtoriam & penitiorem ſcriptoris cognitionem requiruntur, omittit. Quid quod Apotheoſim, Hamartigeniam, duos contra Symmachum libros qui ſunt ‘ præ cæteris tamen digniſſimi qui legantur non attigit . . . Heinſii *variæ lectiones in Prudentium* adſperſis interdum lectiſſimis notulis perquam eruditæ ‘ ſunt & accuratæ ut ab Heinſio profectas facile noris. ‘ . . . Weitzius qui cum editas hactenus in Prudentium notas collegiſſet, addidit etiam ſuas, eaſque ‘ minime contemnendas, hoc uno cæteris ſuperior ‘ quod veterum autorum locos indicet, ac eos præcipue ‘ ſacræ ſcripturæ quos Prudentius operi ſuo intexuit. ‘ Mitto Jacobum Spiegelium qui commentariolum edidit in oden Prudentii inſcriptam *omnis hora*, ejus ‘ enim in illam notæ non ſolum ſunt propter nimiam ‘ prolixitatem moleſtæ, verum etiam minutis quibuſdam ‘ ac pene puerilibus nugis ab ipſa grammatica repetitis refertæ. Mitto etiam Adamum Siberum, Georgium Remum, Adamum Theodorum Siberum, Andream Wilkium : quorum alii verba ſex interdum ‘ aut ſeptem protulerunt, in hymnos tres aut quatuor ‘ totos, alii in unum duntaxat, ut merito ab interpretum Prudentii numero ſint expungendi. Aliter ſentiendum de Scholiis Iſonis quæ quamvis admodum ‘ brevia ſint quidquid eſt tamen gravioris modi ſolvunt (62).’ He very much commends Fabricius's notes upon five hymns of Prudentius, and thoſe of Eraſmus upon the two laſt hymns of the CATHEMERINON.

(52) See the article ORIGEN, remark [*E*], citat. (4).

(53) Eſt vetus atque probus centum qui perficit annos, &c. *Horat. Epiſt. I, lib. ii, ver.* 39. See the whole paſſage in citat. (91), of the article CHRYSIPPUS.

(54) See the remark [*O*], of the article CHRYSIPPUS.

(55) Nicolaus Heinſius, in Præfat. Prudentii.

(56) Ibid.

(57) Du Pin, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 5.

(58) *Fol.* 125.

(59) Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. ii, pag.* 262.

(61) Written by Aldus Manutius.

(62) Stephanus Chamillard è *Societate, Jeſu, Præfat. ad* Prudent. in uſum Delphini.

---

(60) He calls him *Pulmaninus Cranenburgius.* Mr du Pin calls him *Pulman Graffembourg.* He has committed two faults ; for, beſides that he ſhould have ſaid *Cranenbourg*, (it is a ſmall town in the duchy of Cleves, where *Theodorus Pulmannus* was born) he ſhould not have expreſſed himſelf ſo as to make one think, that it was the author's ſirname.

PSAMMITICHUS, king of Egypt, 640 years before the birth of CHRIST, was the ſon of Necus, whom Sabacus, king of Æthiopia, cauſed to be put to death, when he invaded Egypt. The ſon would have had the ſame fate, had he not made his eſcape into Syria. He was recalled, when Sabacus retired into his country, and was one of the twelve great lords, who governed Egypt (*a*). Each of them had his portion ; but they acted, in concert, or rather like partners, or colleagues, than like neighbouring princes (*b*) Pſammitichus drew upon himſelf the envy of the eleven other princes, either becauſe the wealth he got, by the duties laid upon merchandiſes (*c*), enabled him to make alliances with foreigners, or becauſe they were afraid he would be king of the whole country, as it had been foretold by an Oracle [*A*]. Wherefore they confined him to marſhy places, where perhaps he had remained all his life-time, had he not been informed, that ſome foreigners, who had made a deſcent into Egypt, deſtroyed

(*a*) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. clii.*

(*b*) Ibid. *cap. cxlvii.*

(*c*) Diodor. Sicul. *lib. i, cap. lxvi.*

[*A*] *As it had been foretold by an Oracle.*] The Oracle had told them, that he, who ſhould make his libations in a braſs cup, ſhould have the whole kingdom to himſelf. It happened, on the laſt day of a ſolemn feſtival, the twelve kings being in the temple of Vulcan, ready to make their libations, that the Prieſt, who was to give them the golden cup, which they uſed for that ceremony, miſtook the number, and brought only eleven cups. Pſammitichus, being the laſt of all, and having no cup, pulled off his helmet, and uſed it for the libations. The other kings, remembering the Oracle, would have killed him, to prevent the effect of it, had they not certainly known that he had no hand in the Prieſt's miſtake (1). I know not how to excuſe Athenæus ; he makes Herodotus ſay, that the Egyptian Prieſts drank out of braſs cups, and that it does not appear, that the kings themſelves, when they ſacrificed in public, made uſe of a ſilver cup ; ſo that Pſammitichus, who was the youngeſt king, made his libations with a braſs cup, whilſt

(1) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. cli.*

deſtroyed all the flat country. They were Ionians and Carians. Being told that they were men of braſs [*B*], he conceived great hopes, by reaſon of an Oracle delivered to him. He went to ſee what it was, and, having engaged thoſe foreigners to ſtay with him, he made himſelf maſter of all Egypt by their means. He ſhewed himſelf very thankful, and gave them ſome lands near the Nile, below the town of Bubaſtus (*d*). From that time he always had foreigners in his pay, and even gave them the precedency above the ſoldiers of his own nation, in the war he made againſt Syria (*e*); at which the Egyptians were ſo incenſed, that two hundred thouſand men left him. They went and ſettled in Æthiopia [*C*], and made a blunt anſwer to the reaſons he alledged, to perſuade them to return into their country [*D*]. He left nothing unattempted to make up that loſs, and particularly applied himſelf to make trade flouriſh: he was kind to foreigners, and granted them all manner of protection, putting a ſtop to the barbarity exerciſed upon them in the foregoing reigns. He made an alliance with the Athenians, and ſome other Greek nations, and would have his children inſtructed by them (*f*). He cauſed alſo many children to be inſtructed by the Carians and Ionians, whom he had placed on the banks of the Nile; and it was the firſt time, that men, ſpeaking a different language from that of Egypt, ſettled in that country (*g*). By this means, as Herodotus obſerves (*h*), the curious, who, in proceſs of time, travelled in Egypt, found there ſeveral people who underſtood them, and were their interpreters. I have examined, in another place (*i*), whether the town of Naucratis was built under the reign of Pſammitichus by ſome inhabitants of Miletus. This Prince reigned fifty four years [*E*], and died in the third Year of the XLth Olympiad (*k*), leaving his kingdom to his ſon Necus (*l*). He was buried at Sais, where he was born, the chief town of the lower Egypt, in the temple of Minerva (*m*), where the Saites buried all their kings (*n*). He was the firſt king of Egypt who drank wine (*o*): he ordered, that the ſprings of the Nile (*p*) ſhould be looked for: and, in order to know who were the moſt antient people in the world, he cauſed two children to be brought up, ſo as to hear no body ſpeak; and, becauſe, when they came to be two years old, they ſpoke a Word, which ſignifies bread, in the Phrygian Language, the Egyptians were obliged to give up their pretenſion to the greateſt antiquity, and to yield, in that reſpect, to the Phrygians (*q*). No ſiege did ever laſt a longer time than that which Pſammitichus laid to the town of Azotas (*r*); for it held out twenty nine years. The taking of that town, was not ſo glorious to him, as the dexterity wherewith he ſtopped a torrent, that had like to have overflowed his kingdom. The Scythians, having defeated the Medes, ruled in Aſia, and were marching towards Egypt. Pſammitichus met them in Paleſtine, and, by his preſents and entreaties, perſuaded them to go back; and it was then that ſome of them plundered the temple of Venus Urania at Aſcalon (*s*). Moreri, and the continuators of his Dictionary, made but little account of this king, ſince, inſtead of inſerting in his Article ſuch things as belong to him, which, as we have ſeen, are neither few nor common, they have only filled it with things that concern his Succeſſors.

(*d*) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. cliv.*

(*e*) Diodor. Sicul. *lib. i, cap. lxvii.*

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. cliv.*

(*h*) Ibid.

(*i*) In the article NAUCRATIS.

(*k*) Calviſius, Helvicus, &c.

(*l*) Herod. *lib. ii, cap. clviii.*

(*m*) Strabo, *lib. xvii, pag.* 551.

(*n*) Herod. *lib. ii, cap. clxix.*

(*o*) Plutarch. de Iſide, *pag.* 353.

(*p*) Athen. *lib. viii, pag.* 345.

(*q*) Herod. *lib. ii, cap. ii.*

(*r*) Ibid. *cap. clvii.*

(*s*) Ibid. *lib. i, cap. cv.*

whilſt the others made them with ſilver cups (2). If you read the 151ſt chapter of the ſecond book of Herodotus, you will ſee, that Athenæus relates the matter very unfaithfully. His tranſlator is no leſs unfaithful: here is the Greek, Ψαμμήτιχον δοῦν νεώτερον ὄντα τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων χαλκῆ φιάλῃ σπεῖσαι, τῶν ἄλλων ἀργυρέαις σπενδόντων. The tranſlator renders it thus, *Itaque Pſammetichum aliis regibus poſteriorem libaſſe argentea phiala, ſuperiores autem ænea.*

[*B*] *That they were men of braſs.*] Pſammitichus, being reduced to a low condition by the envy of the other kings, conſulted an Oracle of Latona in the town of Butis, which was accounted the beſt in all Egypt. He was anſwered, that revenge would come to him by ſea, when men of braſs ſhould be ſeen. The Pirates, who had landed in Egypt, were armed from head to foot: ſuch armed men had never been ſeen in that country: and therefore it was thought they were men of braſs, and Pſammitichus was informed of it. He began then to have a good opinion of the Oracle, to which he had till then given no credit (3). It is pity Herodotus, whoſe relations are ſo charming, did not live in another age, or was not ſenſible of the difference between Hiſtory and a piece of Poetry. In the latter, things muſt not be unfolded without a miracle; the reader muſt be ſtruck with admiration at any rate: but Hiſtorical events ought to be attended with ſimplicity; and if a judicious reader does not find it in an Hiſtorian, he may very well believe that the author has inſerted wonderful fictions in the room of it. I wonder Herodotus left any gleanings after him. He knew nothing of the Oracle mentioned by Polyænus (4). The god Hammon adviſed king Tementhes to beware of cocks. A Carian informed Pſammitichus, that no nation before the Carians had ſet creſts upon their helmets. This was ſufficient to make Pſammitichus raiſe a great many Carians.

[*C*] *They went, and ſettled in Ethiopia.*] Strabo (5) ſays, they were under the dominion of a queen, to whom the iſland of Meroë did belong, and that they inhabited the province of Teneſis near that iſland, and an iſland above that of Meroë. Pliny (6), quoting Ariſtocreon, mentions the ſame fugitives, and a town called Eſar, which they inhabited for the ſpace of three hundred years. What he ſays of it's ſituation does not agree with Ptolemy, nor with Strabo's account.

[*D*] *And made a blunt anſwer to the reaſons he alledged, to perſuade them to return.*] At firſt Pſammitichus ſent to them their captains, to perſuade them to return into their country; and then he himſelf went to them: he exhorted them to conſider, that they forſook their country, their wives, and children. They unanimouſly anſwered him, ſtriking their ſhields with their lances, *We ſhall never want a country as long as we are able to handle theſe arms, and we ſhall never want wives and children, as long as we can make uſe of theſe other things.* When they ſpoke the laſt words, they were ſo impudent as to ſhew their nakedneſs. *Precibus ad ſententiæ mutationem eos ſolicitans, templa, patriam, uxores, liberos, recordari jubet. Tum univerſi haſtas clypeoſque pulſantes, contentâ voce reſpondent, quoad arma in poteſtate habeant facilè ſibi patriam reperturos; reductis quoque tunicis genitalia oſtentant, nunquam ſibi uxores aut liberos defore, quàmdiu his ſint inſtructi, dictitantes* (7).

[*E*] *He reigned fifty-four years.*] Herodotus (8) ſays ſo: Euſebius makes him reign only forty-four years, and Moreri fifty-eight years.

(2) Athen. *lib. vi, pag.* 231.

(3) Herod. *lib. ii, cap. clii.*

(4) Polyænus, Stratag. *lib. vii, num.* 3.

(5) *Lib. xvi, pag.* 530, *lib. xvii, pag.* 541.

(6) *Lib. vi, cap. xxx.*

(7) Diodor. Sicul. *lib. i, cap. lxvii, pag. m.* 59.

(8) Herod. *lib. ii, cap. clviii.*

PTOLOMY, king of Egypt, the eleventh of that name, was ſirnamed Auletes, by reaſon of his great inclination to play on the flute. He ſucceeded his father (*a*) towards the beginning of the CLXXVth Olympiad, and in the year of Rome 673 (*b*). He laid heavy taxes upon Egypt, in order to pay the vaſt ſums neceſſary, to gain and preſerve the friendſhip of the Roman people. This made him odious; and beſides being deſpiſed by his ſubjects, by reaſon of his ſuffering the iſland of Cyprus to be ſubdued by the Romans, he was expelled from the kingdom. He went to Rome, and demanded, for a long time, that the republic would protect him, and enable him to recover his dominions. He met with many oppoſitions in his negotiation, and, at laſt, having no hopes he left Rome, and went to Epheſus, where he obtained letters, by which Gabinius was ordered to reſtore him to his kingdom, wherein he happily ſucceeded (*c*). I have ſaid, in another place (*d*) what became of Berenice, the eldeſt daughter of this king; and here I ſhall obſerve, that Arſinoë, his younger daughter, reigned for ſome time [*A*]: but, properly ſpeaking, it was the famous Cleopatra, his other daughter, who ſucceeded him.

If any one deſires a more particular account of the life, manners, and fortune of this king, he may read his Hiſtory, publiſhed at Paris in 1698, by Mr Baudelot de Dairval.

(*a*) His name was Ptolomy Lathurus.

(*b*) *See* Calviſius, ad hunc annum.

(*c*) See the article BERENICE, Ptolomy's daughter.

(*d*) Ibid.

[*A*] *Arſinoë, his younger daughter, reigned for ſome time.*] Here I perform the promiſe, I made (1), to ſupply Moreri's brevity. I ſay then, that ARSINOE ſtole away from the palace, whilſt the neceſſary preparations were making to attack Julius Cæſar, who had the young king in his power (2). She went to the Egyptian army, and commanded jointly with Achillas; and a quarrel quickly ariſing between her and Achillas, each of them being willing to have the whole command, ſhe cauſed him to be killed by the eunuch Ganymede (3). But, Cæſar having ſet the young prince at liberty, Arſinoë was obliged to yield to her brother. After the victory of Cæſar, and the death of young Ptolomy, Cæſar, for the ſecurity of Cleopatra, ordered that Arſinoë ſhould leave Egypt (4). Appian informs us, that Megabyzus, a Prieſt of Diana, at Epheſus, received her into his houſe as a queen (5); and he had like to have been puniſhed with death upon that account, when Marc Antony, out of complaiſance to Cleopatra, cauſed Arſinoë to be killed at Miletus. He ſeized on Megabyzus, for the good reception he had given that princeſs. Cleopatra releaſed him at the requeſt of the Epheſians.

(1) In the article ARSINOE.

(2) Cæſar, de Bello Civ. *lib.* iii, *ſub fin.* Lucanus, *lib.* x, *ſub fin.*

(3) Hirtius, de Bello Alexandr. *circa init. pag.* m. 378.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* m. 396.

(5) Appian. de Bell. Civil. *lib.* v.

PUCCIUS (Francis), born at Florence, of an illuſtrious family, forſook the church of Rome, when he came to examine the diſputes about religion, which aroſe in France in Calvin's time: he was then at Lyons. He came into England and ſtudied Divinity at Oxford, and then at London: afterwards he removed into Swiſſerland, where he had a diſpute with Socinus about the ſtate of the firſt man. One would infer from thence, that he was accounted an Orthodox man by the Proteſtants; but it was not ſo: the magiſtrates of Baſil expelled him for his opinions. He returned to London, where he was impriſoned on account of his doctrine. Being ſet at liberty, he removed into the Netherlands, and challenged Socinus to a verbal diſpute. They diſputed ſeveral times in Poland, in the preſence of the church of Cracow, but could not agree. Whereupon Puccius, breaking with the ſectaries of that country, followed ſome perſons, who ſtudied Magic [*A*], and went with them to Prague, where he returned to the Roman

[*A*] *Who ſtudied Magic.*] The author I have quoted uſes theſe words: *In comitatum ſe dedit aliquorum magiæ ſtudioſorum, quibuſcum Pragam pervenit* (1). It is beſt to conſult Socinus, who ſpeaks of it more at large (2). He ſays, that Puccius, being condemned by the arbitrators of the diſpute he had with him at Cracow, would not confeſs, that he had been worſted; but no body would hear him any longer: the ſynod of the Unitarians did not vouchſafe to read his new piece. Socinus adds, that he received from him an Italian book concerning the ſeal ſet to the ſcripture (3). Puccius ſaid, that every thing was incomprehenſible in that divine book, and that the only way was to wait for the coming of the two men, mentioned in the eleventh chapter of St John's Revelation; that they would explain all the myſteries of the Bible, and that no diſputation was to be made uſe of before their coming to compoſe the differences about matters of religion. He believed, thoſe two men would quickly appear, becauſe he reckoned the 1260 days of the reign of the beaſt for ſo many years, and becauſe, according to his computation, that reign began with the council of Nice. He expected a conſiderable employment under the miniſtry, or miſſion, of thoſe two men (4); and, whilſt he flattered himſelf with theſe hopes, he grew acquainted with two Engliſhmen in the retinue of the Palatin Laſki, who was returning from an embaſſy into England. One of them was a Phyſician, the other had been a Magician, and they were both Catholics; but they promiſed a ſpeedy and general reformation, which God would make in Chriſtendom by their means. They boaſted of a familiar converſe with the angels. The Phyſician neither ſaw nor heard any thing, but wrote down punctually what his companion ſaid that he ſaw and heard. Socinus, and ſeveral others, adviſed Puccius not to follow thoſe two perſons; but they could not diſſuade him. He went to Prague with them, and reunited himſelf to the Romiſh church; on which occaſion he wrote a long letter to Socinus, wherein he aſſured him, that one of the angels which uſed to appear to one of thoſe gentlemen, applied himſelf directly to him, and induced him to abjure his errors. *Statim autem fere ut Pragam pervenit, factus eſt Papiſta, & miniſtros pontificios adiens, ſuæ ab Eccleſia Romana olim defectionis veniam, conveniente ſatisfactione exhibita, impetravit. Ac mox huc ad amicos & præſertim ad me, ad quem hac de re bene longas literas dedit, de ſuo, ut ipſe loquitur, ad Catholicæ Sanctæque Dei Eccleſiæ gremium reditu diligenter ſcripſit, aſſerens, ſe verbis unius ex illis Dei Angelis, qui ſociis illis ſuis reſponſa dare ſolent, ad ſe nominatim loquentis, monitum atque impulſum id feciſſe, diuturnumque errorem ſuum tandem agnoviſſe* (5). Socinus's letter, in which theſe words are found, was written in the beginning of the year 1586, not long after Puccius was returned to Popery. For the reſt, he was a Merchant at Lyons, when he began firſt to reliſh the Proteſtant doctrines: his noble birth permitted him to be of that profeſſion without any diſgrace, according to the principles of the Italians. I ſay, his nobility, for it is affirmed that he was of the family of the Pucci, which has afforded three Cardinals. *Scias eum ante plures annos, cum Lugduni, quamvis ex nobili admodum familia, quæ etiam tres Cardinales habuit, natus, ut patriæ ipſius adeoque totius noſtræ Etruriæ mos fert, mercaturam exerceret, exorientibus illis de religione in Gallia diſſidiis, quæ*

(1) Hoornbeek, Apparat. ad Controverſ. Socinianas, *pag.* 52.

(2) In his third Letter to Matthew Radecius.

(3) Librum … cui titulum fecit de Bibliis occluſis, deque Elia qui ea aperturus eſt. *Socin. Epiſt. III, pag.* 380, *Vol.* 1. *Biblioth. Fratrum Polonorum.*

(4) Dum Puccius in hac venturi Eliæ expectatione totus eſt, dumque ſeipſum participem hujus divinæ legationis fore ſperat, quemadmodum ejus ipſe libellus non obſcure indicat. *Socin. ibid.*

(5) Socin. ibid.

Roman communion (*a*). Notwithſtanding this it is ſaid that he was burnt at Rome [*B*]. He had no learning, and gave himſelf up to Fanaticiſm [*C*]. But the principal doctrine that he was fond of, was, that honeſt men ſhould be ſaved, even though they were Pagans [*D*]. Mr Baillet ſpeaks of him [*E*].

quæ necdum ſopita ſunt, ſtatuit, mercatura relicta, ſe totum ſtudio Sacrarum Literarum tradere, ut quid ſentiendum in noſtra religione eſſet, dilucide cognoſcere poſſet (6).

[*B*] *Notwithſtanding it is ſaid, that he was burnt at Rome.*] It is ſaid (7), the archbiſhop of Saltzburg cauſed him to be ſeized and ſent to Rome. This man deſerved to have been ſupported by the Inquiſitors, becauſe he furniſhed them with a ſpecious pretence to declaim againſt the principles of the Proteſtants. Puccius returning into the boſom of the Catholic church, may the controverſiſts ſay, after he had endeavoured to fix among thoſe who were ſeparated from it, in France, Switzerland, England, and Poland, is a convincing proof, that when any one has abandoned the principle of authority, and put himſelf on that of examination, he can find no ground to rely on any where; he rambles from one party to another, and not being able to find any ſure footing, he is obliged, like Noah's dove, to return to the ark again. A fine commonplace which two modern authors (8) have lately inſiſted upon (9), when they returned into the Romiſh communion; but it is only a meer blaze, for the way of authority neceſſarily leads every particular man to be a Mahometan in Turkey, a Heathen in China, and always of the national religion.

[*C*] *He had no learning, and gave himſelf up to Fanaticiſm.*] This is the character that Voëtius gives of him. ‘ Fr. Puccius natione Italus Filidinus (10) inſtar cothurni omnium aut nullius religionis, nullius eruditionis literariæ, philoſophicæ, ſcripturariæ, molitus eſt libellum Goudæ in Hollandia anno 1592, editum & Clementi VIII, dedicatum, quo aſſerit univerſalem reſtitutionem, & fidem naturalem in Deum, per quam omnes ſalvari poſſint. Fanatico illi errori (jactat enim revelationes *rat.* 120, *pag.* 94.) mox publica ſcripta oppoſuerunt, ex Reformatis *Franciſcus Junius* ex Lutheranis *Lucas Oſiander*, ex Pontificiis *Nicolaus Serrarius.* De hominis iſtius univerſali ἀπαιδευσία ex ſcriptis, de ingenio & moribus ex *epiſtolis Socini* judicare poteris *Epiſt.* 3. *quæ eſt ad Matth. Radecum* Secret. Gedanenſ. Puccius *prior* Socinum ſatis ſarcaſticè perſtrinxerat in collatione de Mortalitate, quæ poſtea typis edita fuit in 4to (11). - - - *Franciſcus Puccius, an Italian, a man of all religions, or none, of no manner of learning either in Philoſophy or the Scriptures, wrote a book, which was publiſhed at Gouda in Holland, in the year* 1592, *and dedicated to Clement VIII, in which he aſſerts the reſtoration of all things, and the natural faith in GOD, by which all men may be ſaved. This fanatical error (for he boaſts of revelations) was preſently oppoſed in print by Francis Junius, a Calviniſt, Luke Oſiander, a Lutheran, and Nicolas Serrarius, a Papiſt. Of this man's utter ignorance one may judge by his writings, of his wit and morals by the epiſtles of Socinus. Puccius had before ſarcaſtically attacked Socinus in a conference concerning Mortality, which was afterward printed in 4to.*’

[*D*] *That honeſt men ſhould be ſaved, even though they were Pagans.*] Tobias Pfannerus attributes this opinion to him, on the credit of two perſons whom he quotes. ‘ Franciſcus Puccius Fedelinus, Romæ quidem poſtea neſcio quâ de causâ combuſtus, ignorationem & incredulitatem Evangelii, vel defectum Baptiſmi ad ſalutem nulli obeſſe (*ſtatuit*) modò ſtudeat vitæ inculpatæ, quoad externos mores, nec præfractè quicquam neget: ineſſe omnibus naturaliter hanc facultatem, ut poſſint & velint ſalvi fieri, etiam abſque ſcrutinio quæſtionum Theologicarum; ut Oſiander †, & poſt hunc Joh. Ludovicus Hartmannus ‡ teſtantur (12). - - - - *Franciſcus Puccius Fedelinus, who afterward, for what reaſon I know not, was burnt at Rome, held, that the ignorance and diſbelief of the Goſpel, or the want of Baptiſm, would hinder no man's ſalvation, ſo he lead a blameleſs life as to his morals, and did not deny any thing out of obſtinacy: and that there is a natural ability as well as deſire in all men to be ſaved, without the examination of Theological queſtions, as Oſiander, and, after him, John Ludovicus Hartmannus teſtify.*’

[*E*] *Mr Baillet ſpeaks of him* (13).] He tells us, that Luke Oſiander publiſhed a book in the year 1593, againſt one Francis Puccius, and that it may be the ſame book which is intituled, *Anti-Puccius.* He adds theſe words: ‘ Francis Puccius ſeems to me to be the author of Puccianiſm; that is to ſay, of a new ſect which laſted but a little while, and remains buried under the ſtones which were caſt at it by the Calviniſts, Lutherans, and Catholics. Going a little farther back, I find that this Puccius may be the ſame with Franceſco Pucci of Florence, who retired to Baſil, and had ſome diſpute with the archheretic Socinus, in the year 1577, concerning the ſtate of the firſt man before his fall, and who maintained the immortality of all creatures, and conſequently of man by the creation. But I will not ſay that this Florentine is the ſame (14) with Francis Puccius Filidinus, of whom mention is made in the firſt claſs of the Index of authors, and books, condemned by the Council of Trent; wherein it is remarked, that this man falſly took on him the name of Pucci.’ Note, that there is an *Anti-Puccius* quoted, as written by Fauſtus Socinus; but that is not the title of the book, it is only quoted ſo for brevity's ſake. That work conſiſts of four parts. It contains, 1. A diſcourſe of Puccius, concerning the immortality of all creatures before ſin. There are ten theſes in it, each of which contains one of the ten arguments, on which he grounded his paradox. 2. Socinus's Anſwer to thoſe ten theſes. 3. The Rejoinder of Puccius to the Anſwer. 4. The Reply of Socinus (15), it is very long and elaborate. All this is under the general title *De ſtatu primi hominis ante lapſum diſputatio*, in the ſecond volume of the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.*

(*a*) *Taken from* Hoornbeek, Apparat. ad Controverſias Socinianas, *pag.* 52.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 379.

(7) Ab Archiepiſcopo Saliſburgenſi captus tandem, & Romam miſſus, in rogo periit. *Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. pag. m.* 860.

(8) Mr Papin and Mr de Verſé.

(9) I write this in 1696.

(10) See, below, citat. (12).

(11) Giſb. Voëtius, Diſputat. Theolog. *Tom.* ii, *pag.* 234, 235.

† *Oſiand. Cent. XVI, lib. iv, cap. xlvi, cit. ibid.*

‡ *I. L. Hartman. hiſt.* Concil. *Tom. iv, Period.* 6. *Peric.* 16. *Exerc.* 67. (*pag.* 701.)

(12) Tob. Pfannerus, Syſt. Theolog. Gentilis, *p.* 493.

(13) In the *Anti*, num. 33. See alſo num. 69.

(14) It is certain that he is the ſame.

(15) *Intituled,* Ad Defenſionem Fr. Puccii Reſponſio.

PUTEANUS (Erycius) author of a vaſt number of books [*A*], was born a Venlo in Guelderland the fourth of November, 1574. He ſtudied firſt at Dort, from whence he went to Cologn to learn Rhetoric, and to go through a courſe of Philoſophy in the college of the Jeſuits: after which he was a ſtudent of the Law at Louvain. He there took his bachelor's degree in the month of June 1597, and profited much by the lectures of Juſtus Lipſius, who conceived a great eſteem and particular friendſhip for him. He went into Italy in the year 1597, and ſtaid ſome time

[*A*] *Author of a vaſt number of books.*] See the catalogue of them in Valerius Andreas's Bibliotheque, and in the Theatre of Ghilini; but it is more compleat in Mr Witte (1). They are moſt of them ſmall tracts, and never any man ſeemed more perſuaded of the truth of the maxim of a Greek Poet, *That a great book is a great evil* (2). It is eaſy for a man to multiply the number of his books, if he will publiſh all that he writes. Our Puteanus was guilty of this fault, he printed even the collection of the teſtimonies, which he gave to his ſcholars (3). Mr Colomiés has publiſhed a thing which cannot be better placed than here. ‘ Mr Voſſius told me, that Moret, a famous Printer at Antwerp, reproaching Erycius Puteanus, the ſucceſſor of Lipſius, that he writ only ſmall books; the latter anſwered him, that Plutarch, and ſeveral others among the Antients, did ſo as well as he. Moret immediately replied, Do you believe that your books, which I cannot ſell, are as

(1) Witte, Memoriæ Philoſophorum, *pag.* 567, *& ſeq.*

(3) *See the little book called* Erycii Puteani Martyremata Academica ſive doctrinæ & probitatis teſtimonia. *It was printed at Leyden* 1618.

---

(2) See Mr le Fevre, in the Lives of the Greek Poets, *pag.* 141, 142. He attributes this thought to the Poet Callimachus. Here are the words of Callimachus, as they are related by Athenæus, in the beginning of the third book, Τὸ μέγα βιβλίον ἴσον ἔλεγεν εἶναι τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ. *Magnum librum parem eſſe dicebat magno malo.*

time with Juan Fernando de Velaſcos, governor of the Milaneſe; after that he went to Padua, and lodged with the famous Pinelli (*a*). They took him from thence in 1601, to make him profeſſor of eloquence at Milan. He gained a great deal of reputation in that employment, inſomuch that he was honoured with the office of Hiſtoriographer to his Catholic Majeſty; and in 1603 the city of Rome admitted him and his poſterity into the number of their freemen and patricians. He took his degree of Doctor of Law at Milan, *more rituque majorum* (*b*). He took a wife (*c*) alſo there in the year 1604, and had a great many children by her. He praiſed her, and them, very much in his letters [*B*]. He removed to Louvain in 1606, to ſucceed to the chair of the profeſſorſhip, which Juſtus Lipſius had filled with ſo much glory. He was very much conſidered in the Low-Countries, and had the titles of Hiſtoriographer to the king of Spain, and counſellor to the arch-duke Albert. He was alſo governor of the caſtle of Louvain (*d*). He died in 1646 [*C*], and was buried in a chapel where none had been buried before him: it was that of St Charles Borromeo, in the church of St Peter at Louvain (*e*). He was a man of merit and learning, and kept a great correſpondence by letters [*D*]. He affected to ſcatter in his works what we call flaſhes of wit; this ſucceeded ſometimes, but on many occaſions his witticiſms were not natural, but a meer forced playing upon words. He publiſhed a book intituled *Statera Belli & Pacis*, which made a great noiſe, and which had like to have ruined him [*E*]. Nevertheleſs, it is a work which ſhews that he underſtood the true intereſts

‘ as good as Plutarch's? This made Puteanus angry, ‘ and he immediately went out of Moret's ſhop (4).’ See Mr Baillet in the firſt tome of the *Judgments of the Learned*, chap. x. ſect. *concerning the ſmallneſs of his books*. Read alſo theſe words of the ſecond tome (5): *It is true that this Puteanus paſſed for a tatler, and a great writer of little books, but he was otherwiſe a very learned man.*

[*B*] *He praiſed his wife and children very much.*] There is nothing more agreeable than a good wife, ſays he in a letter, to a friend, I ſpeak by experience, mine always appears to me young and fair; for altho' ſhe has had ſeveral children, ſhe keeps the charms of her face. ‘ Illa mihi ſemper juvencula, ‘ ſemper pulchra; quia & ætatis florem, & formæ ‘ decus, toties jam puerpera ſervat. Imò illa mihi ‘ bona eſt, & qualem ex Apiculâ naſci Simonides vo‘luit. Opportunè hic igitur illud Theognidis uſur‘pem:

Οὐδὲν Κύρν' ἀγαθῆς γλυκερώτερόν ἐστι γυναικός.
Μάρτυς ἐγώ, σὺ δέ μου γίγνου ἀληθοσύνης.

‘ Vin' & Latine dicam?

Nil uxore bona, Cyrne, eſt jucundius: hujus
Cum tibi ſim teſtis, tu mihi teſtis eris (6).

‘ *She ſeems to me always young, always fair; be‘cauſe notwithſtanding ſhe has had ſo many children, ‘ ſhe ſtill preſerves the flower of her age, and the beauty ‘ of her face. She is always good to me, and ſuch ‘ a one as Simonides deſired to have born of Apicula. ‘ Therefore I may here fitly quote theſe verſes of Theognis:*

Of all good things, ſure, a good wife's the beſt:
Thou, Cyrnus, ſhalt the truth of this atteſt.

This is what he wrote in 1626. This would not have have ſatisfied the deſire of a Roman Poet. Puteanus's wife appeared ſtill young and handſome to her huſband, becauſe ſhe was ſo ſtill: the buſineſs is to appear ſo, when one is no more ſo. The Poet's wiſh was thus:

Candida perpetuo reſide, Concordia, lecto,
Tamque pari ſemper ſit Venus æqua jugo.
Diligat illa ſenem quondam: ſed & ipſa marito.
Tunc quoque cum fuerit, non videatur anus (7).

Fair Concord ever on their bed attend,
And, Cytherea, the bleſs'd pair befriend.
When youth is paſt, and wrinkled age appears,
May neither to each other ſeem in years.

Puteanus writes in another letter (8), in 1617, that ſhe had brought him four ſons and four daughters, and that he had loſt three boys. He ſeems to be well pleaſed with his having daughters, and gives a reaſon for it (9). He had male children after that. His ſon Fauſtus bore arms (10); but that did not laſt long, for he became a bare-footed Carmelite at the end of two years, that he might, in ſome meaſure, imitate his brother John-Stephen, who had taken the habit of the Jeſuits (11). Puteanus ſpeaks alſo of two other ſons, of which one called Juſtus, was ſecretary to the archbiſhop of Compſa, Apoſtolical Nuncio; the other, named Maximilian, ſtudied at home (12).

[*C*] *He died in the year* 1646.] Mr Bullart doth not ſuppoſe this, for he ſays that Puteanus, born on the fourth of November, 1574, died, aged ſeventy years, after he had been profeſſor of Hiſtory at Louvain near forty years (13). This is to ſay downright, that he died in 1644, Lorenzo Craſſo (14) is much in the wrong in placing his death in 1624; he miſtook for want of giving ſufficient attention to theſe words of Ghilini, *L'anno* M. DC. XXIV. *fù il Puteani, da malattia oppreſſo, percio ſcriſſe queſto Epitaffio da metterſi ſop a la ſua ſepoltura* (15). It is plain that this only ſignifies, that he was very ſick that year. The Sieur Witte (16) places Puteanus's death in the year 1646, and the ſeventy-firſt of his life; he ſhould have ſaid the ſeventy-ſecond. He places it in the ſame year, 1646, in the abridgment which he gives us of this profeſſor's life (17). Valerius Andreas is the author of that abridgment, and therefore we may depend upon it.

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I have conſulted the life of Puteanus prefixed to his poſthumous letters, publiſhed by his ſon-in-law, and I find there that he died the ſeventeenth of September, 1646, in the caſtle of Louvain.

[*D*] *And kept a great corrreſpondence by letters.*] This appears by the letters which he has publiſhed, and much more by this paſſage of Mr Bullart. *To conclude, it was this learning that made him conſiderable in the chief courts of Europe, and which obliged almoſt all princes, all learned men, ambaſſadors of kings, and generals of armies, to give him tokens of their friendſhip and eſteem by their letters, of which there were found above ſixteen thouſand in his ſtudy, put in order* (18).

The diviſion of his works into five tomes (19) ſhews that the ſecond tome comprehends his letters, that is to ſay, *Epiſtolarum Atticarum apparatus, nimirum promulſis.* This comprehends three hundred letters. *Miſſus ſecundi*, three hundred alſo. *Bellaria*, as many. *Deliciæ adoptivæ*, one hundred. *Epiſtolarum Atticarum Centuria ſingularis & nova. Epiſtolarum Atticarum apparatus novus*, this contains four hundred letters. *Apparatus Poſthumus in quatuor Centurias diſtributus.* A collection of letters which he writ to Mr de Zuylichem, and Daniel Heinſius, publiſhed at Leyden by Boxhornius in the year 1647. Add to them the fifth, ſixth, and ſeventh centuries of poſthumous letters, printed at Louvain, 1662, by the care of Xiſtus Antonius Milſer (20) his ſon-in-law, who had alſo printed, in the ſame place and year, the four preceding centuries. See Mr de Vigneul Marville (21).

[*E*] *He publiſhed a book called*, Statera Belli & Pacis, *which . . . had like to have ruined him.*] This book

(*a*) Moreri falſely ſuppoſes that Pinelli lived at Milan.

(*b*) That is to ſay, according to the antient ceremonies.

(*c*) Who was called Mary Magdalen Catherine de la Tour, *Turriana*.

(*d*) *Taken from* Valerius Andreas, Biblioth. Belgic. *pag.* 206, 207.

(*e*) Vita Erycii Puteani, *in limine*, Epiſt. Poſthum.

(4) Colomiés, Opuſcula, *pag.* 124, 125, *Utrecht Edit.* 1669.

(5) *Article* ccxxix, *of the* Critiques Hiſtoriques.

(6) Eryc. Puteanus, Epiſtolar. ſelectarum Apparatu, *Epiſt. X, Centuriæ IV, pag. m.* 10.

(7) Martial. Epigr. XIII, lib. iv.

(8) It is the 65th of the firſt century, *pag.* 26.

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 27, 28.

(10) See the 28th letter of the 4th century. It was writ in the year 1626.

(11) See the 55th letter of the ſame century, It was writ in 1628.

(12) See the ſame letter.

(13) Bullart, Academie des Sciences, *Tom. ii, pag.* 220.

(14) Lor. Craſſo, Iſtoria de' Poëti Greci, *pag.* 193.

(15) Ghilini, Teatro d'Huomini Letterati, *Vol. ii, pag.* 73.

(16) In Diario Biographico.

(17) In Memoriis Philoſoph. *pag.* 565. *Konig quotes this book, and yet places it in* 1644.

(18) Bullart, ubi ſupra.

(19) Prefixed to his poſthumous Letters, printed at Louvain 1662.

(20) He was knight of the order of Chriſt, and governour of the caſtle of Louvain.

(21) In the 2d Tome of his Miſcellanies, pag. 368, Rotterdam edition.

of his Catholic Majeſty better than thoſe who meddled only with affairs of ſtate. A ſatire

was publiſhed during the negotiation of a treaty between his Catholic Majeſty and the United Provinces in 1633. The author adviſed to peace, and ſhewed that the continuation of the war would be very prejudicial to the Spaniſh Netherlands. He ſpoke very clearly of the advantages which the enemies had already gained, and of the victories which they might expect. Voſſius, his good friend, and the moſt pacific man in the world; I mean, the fartheſt from certain authors, who to animate the people to continue a war, ſet before them a thouſand artificial deſcriptions of their forces, and of the enemies weakneſs, was concerned that Puteanus ſhould bring himſelf into trouble by publiſhing a work of a quite contrary nature (22). ‘His diebus haut lætus accepi, optimum, & diſertiſſimum virum Erycium Puteanum, in periculum, aut certè moleſtias aliquas incidiſſe. Scripſit ſtateram Belli, & Pacis, quo nonnullis de partium ſuarum impotentia prolatis, complures offendit. Noſti faſtum Hiſpanorum, & principum aures, quorum nec hæ, neque illi veritatem accipere ſuſtinent. Itaque niſi noſſem multos ei in aula Bruxellenſi, quo vocatus eſt, amicos eſſe; niſi quoque ingenium, & eruditionem illius æſtimari ſcirem, ſiniſtri aliquid vererer. Nunc optima non omnino deſpero. Utinam non aliud audire cogatur, quam quod olim in ſimili ferè negotio, à Phalaride ajunt fuiſſe dictum Simonidi (23), Μέλοιεν σοὶ Μȣσῶν ἐυκλεεις ϖόνοι. - - - - *I lately received the melancholy news, that the beſt and moſt learned man, Erycius Puteanus, was fallen into danger, or, at leaſt, ſome trouble: he wrote the* Statera Belli & Pacis *(Balance of War and Peace), where he mentioned ſomething of the weakneſs of his party, which offended many. You know the pride of the Spaniards, and the ear of princes, neither of which, can bear the truth. Therefore did I not know that he had many friends in the court of Bruſſels, whither he is called, and that his ingenuity, and learning are very much eſteemed, I ſhould fear ſome miſchief. Now I hope for the beſt. I wiſh he may be forced to hear no worſe than what was formerly ſaid to Simonides by Phalaris on a like occaſion,* Mind your Muſe, it is moſt honourable for you.’ He communicated his uneaſineſs to a Phyſician of Dort, who anſwered him, that Puteanus had acted imprudently, and that ſuch a fault would not be pardoned in Holland (24). ‘De Cl. Puteano quod ſcribis, valdè me percuſſit, quamvis tale quid metuerem, cum legiſſem ſtateram, doctè magis, quam prudenter ſcriptam. Accepi ab eo literas, ſtatera jam edita, quam tamen præter morem ſuum non miſit. Eam Catzius Haga (ubi impreſſam (25) quoque noſti, nec hoc noſtro melius) ex conventu ordinum, ubi cum plauſu excepta, attulit, & mihi legendam tradidit. Deus bone! quam bonus ille Belga, tam malus Politicus. Non hic ferremus, qui talia de nobis, quæ ille de Rege, de importuna Archid. legatione, & ſimilia. Ac niſi amici omnia pro illo, eſt quod metuamus vicem optimi, & elegantiſſimi ingenii. - - - - *I was very much troubled at what you wrote me concerning Puteanus, altho' I was afraid of ſome ſuch thing, when I had read his* Statera, *a tratiſe rather learned than prudent. I received letters from him when his* Statera *was publiſhed, which nevertheleſs he ſent not to me contrary to his cuſtom. Catzius brought it from the Hague, (where you know it was printed not better than this edition of ours) from the aſſembly of the States, where it was received with applauſe, and lent to me to read. Good God! how good a Dutchman, how ill a politician! Here we ſhould not ſuffer ſuch things to be ſaid of us, as he ſays of the king, and of the unſeaſonable embaſſy of the arch-duke, and the like. And unleſs his friends do their utmoſt for him, there is reaſon to fear the fate of the beſt and fineſt genius.*’ He adds, that he was ſummoned to Bruſſels, and that he was to be farther examined; that the preſident Roſe was his enemy, but that ſome other conſiderable people protected him, and that it was hoped that their protection would ſave him. Without doubt every body will be glad to ſee the names of thoſe protectors. It is a part of the hiſtory of Puteanus. ‘Ob amicos quos plurimos habet, nihil illi periculi fore putabat. Sibi addictiſſimum habet, Varambonum Archiepiſcopum Ceſarienſem Infanti à ſacris, Chiffletium Medicum, qui plurimùm apud Ser. Inf. poſſunt, & alios, ſed infeſtum Roſam Præſidem Hiſpanis obnoxium, & paci ut dicitur, adverſum, qui etiam cauſa eſſe putatur, cur decem jam menſibus, nullæ ex Hiſp. literæ ad εἰρηνοποιȣ̀ς. Infans quoque Cardinalis, qui jam in Burgundia, non minùs quàm Eugenia, illi benè volunt. Deum rogo, & benè faciant, neque ob ϖαῤῥησίαν hanc gravius animadvertant in virum candoris melle penitus imbutum. - - - - *He did not imagine that he was in any danger, by reaſon of the many friends he had. Verambonus, archbiſhop of Ceſarea, chaplain to the Infant, is his great friend, and Chiffletius the Phyſician, who have great intereſt with the moſt ſerene Infant, and others: but the preſident Roſe, his enemy, a creature of Spain, and averſe, as it is ſaid, to peace, who alſo is thought to be the occaſion why no letters are come from Spain theſe ten months to the plenipotentiaries. The Infant Cardinal, who is now in Burgundy, as well as Eugenia, wiſh him well. I beſeech God they may be favourable to him, and not too ſevere on this freedom, in a man of ſo much candour and eloquence.*’ The buſineſs terminated according to the deſires of this Phyſician. I muſt not forget to tell you that an anonymous author writ againſt this work of Puteanus: that anſwer was intituled, *Anti-Puteanus, ſive Politico-Catholicus ſtateram Puteani inducias expendentis alia ſtatera expendens* (26). I have a little book (27) which contains Puteanus's *Statera*, and the anonymous anſwer, with two letters, in which is the judgment of a Hollander on that anſwer. The author of theſe letters ſuſpects that the anonymous writer was a church-man (28), and even a monk (29), and redicules him for ſaying, that courage and prudence were only to be found in the Catholic church (30), that the revenues of Holland were drained; that it's people groaned under the heavy taxes; that it's troops were cowardly; that it's victories were rather prejudicial than advantageous; that the king of Spain could well enough ſpare thoſe towns he had loſt; that the Dutch got their victories by treachery, and that they had given much more for them than they were worth. To morrow, ſays his critic, he will tell us that it is advantageous for Spain, to have our troops encamp in the heart of Brabant, for the fields will become more fruitful by the dung our horſes will leave behind. ‘Nec minus ridiculus eſt, cum tributis & exactionibus ſupra quam fas eſt Batavos premi queritur, qui iſtos cenſus ſe Dominis ſuis debere, & felicitatis ſuæ ac fortunarum non niſi ſpicilegium eſſe credunt. . . . Verum enimvero, quam lepide fatuus eſt hic ſcriptor, cum milites Federatorum *timidos lepores* vocat, cum Batavos *pugnam ſemper declinare* ſcribit: *victorias nobis magis nocuiſſe, quam profuiſſe.* Illane ſcribere non veretur poſt cladem Turnhoutanam & Flandricam? An & tunc Henrici Bergii culpa terga vertit Hiſpanus? Et quando quæſo Regi Hiſpaniarum ac ſuis perſuadebit, Sylvam Ducis, Veſaliam, Venloam, Ruræmundam, Trajectum ad Moſam, expugnata ad Scaldim & alibi caſtella, victam Bercam nobis nocere? Regem vero ſuo commodo iis carere? quia non ſine magnis impenſis ea vicimus. Dicet propediem, utile eſſe Brabantis, exercitus noſtros in ipſo pene Brabantiæ meditullio ſtare & in hoſtico ali, ut ab equorum multitudine ſtercorati agri uberiorem ſegetem ferant (31). *Nor is it leſs ridiculous to complain, that the Dutch are oppreſſed with aſſeſſments and taxes beyond meaſure, who believe that they owe thoſe tributes to their governors, and that they are only the gleanings of their happineſs and good fortune. . . . But, indeed, how ſimple a writer is this, when he ſays that the ſoldiers of the allies are fearful hares, that the Dutch always declined fighting: that our victories were always more hurtful than profitable to us. Was he not afraid to write ſuch things, after the battles of Turnhout and Flanders? What then, did Spain turn it's back thro' the fault of the count de Berg? And when I beſeech you, will he perſuade the king of Spain, and his country-*

‘ *men,*

---

(22) Voſſius, Epiſt. CXCIX, *pag. m.* 218. This letter is dated in July 1633.

(23) It ſhould be Steſichoro.

(24) Joh. Beverwyck. Epiſt. ad Voſſium. *It is the 172d, pag. m.* 111, 112, *dated the 8th of July* 1633.

(25) This was not the firſt edition; for it was printed firſt in the Spaniſh Netherlands, in 4to.

(26) See the *Anti* of Mr Baillet, *num.* 158.

(27) *Printed* Coſmopoli, apud Batavum patriæ libertatis & pacis amantiſſimum, *in 12mo.*

(28) Impenſe cavet, ne alius eſſe videatur quam ex ſacrorum ordine. *Barlæus, Epiſt. CCXIV, pag.* 458, *Tom. I.*

(29) Videtur cucullus galeam induiſſe, aut galea cucullum, ita amice conjurant, & ex eodem ore jam Theologo jam milite digna audis. *Idem, Epiſt. CCXIII, pag.* 451.

(30) In Principe Auriaco nec fortitudinem, nec prudentiam agnoſcit, hac fretus ratione, quia Catholicus non eſt. Audi verba: Ad. num. 90. *In ſola Eccleſia Catholica vera eſt fortitudo & prudentia.* Ibid. pag. 453.

(31) Ibid. *pag.* 454.

ſatire againſt king James was falſely attributed to him [F]. It is affirmed that he did very great ſervice to the king of Poland (f). Thoſe who would ſee the praiſes which ſeveral learned men have given him, and the honours which ſome princes did him, need only read the Cenſura of Sir Thomas-Pope Blount [G], and the Academy of

men, that Boſleduc, Weſel, Venlo, Ruremond, Maeſtricht, and the forts gained upon the Scheld, and elſewhere, and the conqueſt of Berg op Zoom were hurtful to us? Did the king loſe them to his real advantage, becauſe we conquered them, not without great expence? In a little time he will ſay, it is to the advantage of the Brabanters, that our armies ſhould encamp in the very heart of Brabant, and be there maintained by free quarter, becauſe the fields will produce greater plenty of corn, when dunged by ſuch a multitude of horſes.' The author of that anſwer (32) has been known a long time to be Barleus. I have alſo another little book (33), which, beſides the *Statera Belli & Pacis*, and the *Anti-Puteanus*, contains a political Diſſertation of *Puteanus de induciis Belgicis*, and a letter of Lipſius, with notes on that letter (34), and ſome other little treatiſes. Lipſius's letter was written from Louvain the third of January, 1595, to a great lord, who aſked him, *Bellumne an potius induciæ expediant Regi Hiſpaniarum cum Gallo, Anglo, Batavo? - - - Whether it is better for the king of Spain to have peace or war with France, England, and Holland?* It is full of malice againſt Holland, and of maxims of refined politics (35). The author of the Notes refutes them ſolidly, and calls himſelf *Juſtinus Bonæfidius Mont.* He treats Lipſius very roughly. See (36) the complaints the Jeſuit Petra Sancta made of it.

The event ſhewed that Puteanus was in the right; for if Spain had concluded either a peace, or a truce, with the United Provinces, in 1633, it would have avoided a great many vexations and loſſes, and would have been, perhaps, in a more flouriſhing condition at this time. I do not pretend to excuſe this profeſſor, he had better have kept within his own ſphere; it is imprudent to publiſh all ſorts of truths; but we muſt not imagine that his book brought any thing new to Holland, they knew well enough the ill condition of the Spaniſh Low-Countries. It is the firſt thing that the politicians inform themſelves of, in relation to their enemies; and the people generally believe more than is true.

However that be, this profeſſor did not ſufficiently conſider the words of Salluſt, which he put at the beginning of his book, and which ſhewed him ſo plainly the reaſons why it is dangerous to adviſe princes. They have other people enough to conſult; futurity is unknown to the wiſeſt heads; and bad advice is very often followed with good ſucceſs; ſo true is it, that fortune diſpoſes of all things according to her fancy. It is Salluſt who ſpeaks thus: *Scio ego*, ſays he (37), *quam difficile atque aſperum factu ſit, conſilium dare regi, aut imperatori; poſtremo cuiquam mortali, cujus opes in excelſo ſunt: quippe cum & illis conſultorum copiæ adſint; neque de futuro quiſquam ſatis callidus, ſatiſque prudens ſit. Quinetiam ſæpe prava magis, quam bona conſilia proſperè eveniunt: quia pleraſque res fortuna ex lubidine ſua agitat.* Princes repent a thouſand times of having followed the advice of good heads; becauſe things often fall out, which make them judge, that if they had taken another courſe, they would have done ſome very notable thing. Thoſe they have to do with commit faults that one would not think them capable of. A good counſellor does not rely upon thoſe faults, and therefore he diſſuades from thoſe enterprizes, which a fool, or a raſh fellow propoſe; but it falls out that thoſe unforeſeen faults, or ſome unexpected accidents, would have rendered the enterprize infallibly ſucceſsful, if they had engaged in it. The ſureſt way, is not to be forward in giving advice about the public affairs, of which Salluſt knew the reaſons very well.

[F] *A ſatire againſt king James was falſely attributed to Puteanus.*] The title is, *Iſaaci Caſauboni Corona Regia, id eſt, Panegyrici cujuſdam verè aurei, quem Jacobo I, Magnæ Britanniæ, &c. Regi, fidei defenſori delinearat, fragmenta ab Euphormione inter ſchedas* τȣ̃ μακαρίτȣ *inventa, collecta, & in lucem edita* 1615, *pro officina regia Jo. Bill Londini.* Mr Almeloveen lent me the book (38) in 1693. It was then very ſcarce, but Mr Thomaſius has printed it ſince in his *Hiſtoria Sapientiæ & ſtultitiæ Humanæ.* Nothing can be more ſatirical; the worſt of princes was never worſe treated by an ill-natured writer, than the good king James was by the fierce Scioppius; for we muſt not doubt that Scioppius was the author of that bloody piece. I ſhall quote one who tells us that Puteanus publickly denied that he was the author of it. 'Non potuit ſatyricorum manus effugere Jacobus Britanniæ Rex, utut doctiſſimus & laudatiſſimus Princeps: cui ſub ſpecie Panegyrici Poſthumi à Caſaubono ſcripti, cujus quaſi fragmenta inter ſchedas ejus reperta, per inſignem nequitiam, continuo myćteriſmo horrenda flagitia objiciuntur. Lepide alioquin ſcriptus liber eſt; cui titulus, *Caſauboni Corona Regia, &c.* . . . Refertur in Georgii Richteri vitâ Epiſtolis ejus præfixâ pag. 21. è Colloquio cum Erycio Puteano accepiſſe Richterum, quod Puteanus ejus libelli autor habitus fuerit: cujus rei verò famam ille innixè declinans velut Apologiæ loco ſcriptum quoddam exhibuerit, cui nomen, Perjurium RUFFI & GIBBOSI, præfatus, quo delatorum ſuorum virulentiæ ac ſiniſteritati ſatis fuiſſe obviatum exiſtimaverit (39). *That James, king of Great-Britain, tho' the moſt learned and praiſe-worthy prince, could not eſcape the pen of the ſatiriſts, who, under the notion of a Poſthumous Panegyric, written by Caſaubon, fragments whereof were found among his papers, have moſt villanouſly abuſed him. The book is otherwiſe wittily written, and intituled,* Caſauboni Corona Regia, *&c.* . . . . *It is ſaid, in the life of George Richter, prefixed to his letters, that Richter was told by Erycius Puteanus, that this libel was attributed to Puteanus; to clear himſelf from which imputation, he wrote a book by way of apology, called, the Perjury of Ruffus and Gibboſus, and he tells us in his Preface, that he thinks he had ſufficiently obviated the virulency and barbarity of his accuſers.*' Theſe words of Mr Morhoff were not rightly underſtood in the extract that was given of his book. 'We may put into this claſs alſo, the ſatires which attack the honour of the moſt virtuous perſons, as that which is called *Caſauboni Corona Regia, &c.* which was attributed, without any reaſon, to Mr du Puy, and which lays enormous crimes to the charge of James I, king of England, from which Mr du Puy has ſufficiently cleared him in his *Perjurium Ruffi & Gibboſi* (40).' Here are two faults: I. Without doubt the author of this extract thought that Erycius Puteanus was the famous Peter de Puy, whoſe life was written by Mr Rigault. When one ſays Mr du Puy without any addition, ſpeaking of books and learned men, he ought to mean him who was the king of France's library-keeper, that wonderful man, who, together with his brother, afforded ſuch aſſiſtance to men of letters, and who held ſuch learned conferences. II. It is not true that the author, of whom Morhoff ſpeaks, juſtifies king James from thoſe egregious crimes which are imputed to him in that ſatire; he only juſtified himſelf from having writ that wicked libel, and ſhewed the malice of thoſe that ſlandered him. We will quote a curious paſſage. *They attribute to John Barclay a very biting ſatire writ againſt James, king of Great Britain, called* Corona Regia; *in which, under the ſpecious title of Panegyric, he very ſharply attacks the reign of Henry VIII, the birth and celibacy of queen Elizabeth, but eſpecially the birth and actions of James, whom he ſlanders by a diſcourſe as ingenious as it is injurious. Curioſity has carried that book over all Europe, and that prince finding himſelf painted in ſuch black colours, got all his allies to make a ſtrict enquiry after the author, in order to puniſh him. And there being ſome ſuſpicion of Erycius Puteanus, profeſſor of eloquence in the univerſity of Louvain, the archduke Albert cauſed an information to be brought againſt him, but he was found innocent* (41).

[G]. *The Cenſura of Sir Thomas-Pope Blunt.*] But blot out theſe words, *Inter præcipua Galliæ ornamenta dum viveret*

(f) See the remark [H].

(32) Theſe two letters are the 213th, and the 214th, of Barlæus.

(33) Printed at Leyden, *in officina Elzeviriorum* 1633, in 12mo.

(34) Notæ ſeu Stricturæ Politicæ ad Juſti Lipſii Epiſtolam.

(35) This letter of Lipſius had been anſwered before in the year 1618, by John Gael, advocate at the Hague.

(36) In the article LIPSIUS, remark [C].

(37) Salluſt. Orat. II, ad Cæſarem de Republica ordinanda, *init. p. m.* 527.

(38) It is a book in 12mo, of 127 pages.

(39) Morhofius, Polyhiſt. *lib. i, cap. viii, pag.* 78.

(40) Bibliotheque Univerſelle, *Tom. xiii, pag.* 23.

(41) Bullart, Academy of Sciences, *Tom. i, pag.* 198.

of Bullart (g) [*H*]. One of the principal friends he had at Milan was ſecretary of the council, whoſe name was John Baptiſt Saccus. I ſhall ſpeak ſomething of the manner after which Puteanus educated a young gentlewoman [*I*], for whom he intereſted himſelf.

viveret, merito ſuo ſemper habitus eſt Erycius Puteanus (42). They are quoted from Caſaubon's Preface to the *Hiſtoria Auguſta*; but 1. our Puteanus was not a Frenchman. 2. He was not very much known when Caſaubon publiſhed that book (43). He lived more than forty years after that book of Caſaubon's was publiſhed.

[*H*] *And the Academy of Bullart.*] You will find this there. ' (44) It was this great learning which ' having gained the heart of Urban VIII, induced ' this great Pontiff to ſend him his picture, in a ' medal of gold of great weight, and ſome copies of ' his works. It was the ſame learning that obliged ' the cardinal Frederic Borromeo to receive him ' into his palace when he returned to Milan, and ' to give him part of the relics of his uncle St Charles ' Borromeo, which that learned man gave to the ' collegiate church of St Peter in Louvain. It was ' alſo this learning that made him be tenderly be' loved by the count de Fuentes, governor of Milan, ' and after that by the arch-duke Albert, who when ' he had placed him in the chair of Juſtus Lipſius, ' received him alſo with honour into the number of his ' counſellors. To conclude, it was his learning that ' made him conſiderable in ſeveral courts of Europe ' (45). . . . . He had the honour to ſave the king of ' Poland's life, by the explaining of an enigmatical ' writing formed in unknown characters, which no ' body could either read or underſtand, and which ' contained a deteſtable and horrid conſpiracy againſt ' that prince.'

We find the following words relating to this laſt head, at the beginning of his poſthumous letters. ' Ejus ' ingenio ac ſolertia conjurationem Polonicam dete' ctam & ſic impeditam fuiſſe tanti momenti fuit ut ' omne præmium ſuperarit. Verba Patris HERMANNI ' HUGONIS qui Marchioni SPINOLÆ à ſacris confeſ' ſionibus erat, eſtimanda hic ſunt: *mea cautio erit, ut* ' REX POLONIÆ *ſciat, cui ſalutem debeat ſuam, ut* ' PHARAONIS *liberalitatem imitetur in* JOSEPHUM, *aut* ' ASSUERI *gratitudinem in* MARDOCHÆUM. POLO' NIA quidem recepit hoc ab illo beneficium, ſed in ' univerſum orbem Chriſtianum extenſum eſt, quod ' quale quantumque ſit BOHEMIA & turbæ inde natæ ' ſatis declararunt (46). - - - *By his ingenuity and dili' gence the Poliſh conſpiracy was detected and prevented, ' a thing of ſuch moment as exceeds all reward. The ' words of Father Herman Hugo, confeſſor to the marquis ' of Spinola, are very remarkable :* I will take care that ' the king of Poland ſhall know to whom he owes his ' ſafety, that he may imitate the liberality of Pharaoh ' to Joſeph, or of Ahaſuerus to Mordecai. *Poland, ' indeed, immediately received this benefit from him, but ' it extended to the whole Chriſtian world, and of what ' ſort, and how great it is, Bohemia, and the diſturbances ' raiſed there, ſufficiently declare.*

[*I*] *The manner after which Puteanus educated a young gentlewoman.*] He writ to his friend, that he would not ſuffer her to let herſelf be kiſſed; that, ſays he, is dangerous for Italian girls. Our Flemiſh ones may do it without any hazard or detriment; they do not underſtand that there are any love-leſſons in ogling and kiſſes; but thoſe of your country know very well the conſequences of it, and for this reaſon I have taught her our language, and all our cuſtoms, except that of kiſſing. If I did not quote the author's own words, perhaps the reader might think that I magnify this. I therefore do it, and you will find that I have fallen ſhort of his meaning. *De puella veſtra quid ſcribam? Valet, viget, jam matura viro, jam plenis nubilis annis. Mores & linguam quoque noſtram diſcit, tamen oſcula non libat. Sic eam habeo, uti educata eſt. Scis tu, ut confringi vas cito Samium ſolet. Pudica quidem Belgarum oſcula, ſed tamen oſcula : & inſinuentur multo honeſtius, quam figantur. Abhorrere illa ab hoc ritu debet, & ſi pudicitiæ alumna eſſe velit, illæſum uſque quoque verecundiæ florem ſervare. Neſciunt noſtræ virgines ullum libidinis rudimentum oculis aut oſculis ineſſe, ideoque fruuntur. Veſtræ ſciunt. Si noſtra eſſe hæc quoque incipiet, particeps candoris noſtri erit, & caſtæ immunitatis capax* (47). Kempius quotes this paſſage in his learned and curious compilation *de Oſculis*, and refers us to a profeſſor of Philſophy at Leyden. This Profeſſor, treating of temperance, one of the four cardinal virtues, propoſes this among other queſtions: *Is the cuſtom which is allowed to ſtrangers in the Low-Countries, and elſewhere, to kiſs other people's wives, widows, and maidens, when they pay them a formal viſit, conformable to the laws of chaſtity* (48)? He anſwers, that this cuſtom is very ancient; but the ſeveral wiſe men of antiquity looked on it as a little unchaſte. He quotes Socrates, who would have people abſolutely abſtain from it, there being nothing which ſtirs up the fire of love ſo much as kiſſes. He quotes Seneca, as ſaying that a maiden was accuſed of impudence, becauſe ſhe received a kiſs (49). He ſays, that the antients were perſuaded, that kiſſing made a ſtrong attack on chaſtity (50), and proves it by theſe words of Ovid:

> Oſcula qui ſumpſit, ſi non & cætera ſumpſit,
> Hæc quoque quæ data ſunt perdere dignus erat.
>
> *He that took kiſſes, and took nothing more,*
> *Deſerves to loſe what he obtain'd before.*

His concluſion is, that ceremonial kiſſes are not contrary to chaſtity, provided they are given without any further deſire, and that we muſt not think that every body is ſo eaſily moved, that kiſſes of civility may not be altogether honeſt. *Neque exiſtimandum eſt, omnium eſſe tam pronam & irritabilem ad libidines naturam, quin citra violationem caſtitatis, ac citra libidinem ullam, id genus mediorum, officii teſtandi cauſa, adhiberi poſſit* (51). This determination, and the reaſon on which it is grounded, are ſolid and good; but what can be more fooliſh than the quotation out of Ovid, for the verſes of that Poet concern only the kiſſes of lovers? This profeſſor is to be blamed for quoting them on ſuch a ſubject. He ſhould have laid aſide the learning that is in his theſis, and kept to the difference of climates, like Puteanus. Thoſe familiarities which are dangerous in Italy, are very little, or not at all ſo in the northern countries. This is certainly the meaning of the Louvain profeſſor; for he had no thoughts of a farewel kiſs, or of a kiſs upon the return from a long journey. There is no probability that on ſuch occaſions he would have excepted his young Italian maid from that cuſtom. There were other occaſions enough, in which he might preſcribe her a particular rule, and in which ſhe might, according to the knowledge of her nation (52), experience what Horace ſays (53).

The Leyden profeſſor hath not ſtrained what he ſays of Socrates, *Socrates apud Xenophontem abſtinendum eſſe in totum ab iſta oſculandi conſuetudine cenſet : quia nihil, inquit, ad amorem incendendum acrius eſt oſculo* (54), for that ancient Philoſopher has expreſſed himſelf on this in the livelieſt manner imaginable. *Critobulus,* ſaid he (55), *is more raſh than if he had thrown himhimſelf upon the point of naked ſwords, or leaped into fire,* for *he had the boldneſs to kiſs* a fine face. Is this ſo great a raſhneſs? ſays Xenophon to him. ' Truly ' I fancy I could very eaſily expoſe myſelf to the ' ſame danger. Ah, unfortunate, *ſays Socrates,* do ' you know what follows after kiſſing a fine face? ' Do not you loſe your liberty? Do not you become ' a ſlave? Do not you engage in exceſſive expences ' to obtain a deſtructive pleaſure? Do not you find ' yourſelf unable to do good, and conſtrained to fol' low thoſe things which you would deſpiſe if your ' reaſon was not corrupted? O God! *ſaid Xenophon,* ' this is to attribute a ſtrange power to a kiſs. ' Are you aſtoniſhed at it, *ſays Socrates?* Do not ' you ſee little ſpiders whoſe bite is ſo venomous, ' that it cauſes ſtrange pains, and makes people loſe ' their ſenſes? I know it very well, *ſaid Xenophon;* ' but thoſe creatures ſpit out their poiſon when they ' bite. Do you think, *added Socrates,* that love' kiſſes are not venomous, becauſe you do not ſee ' the poiſon? Know, that a fair woman is an ani' mal more dangerous than ſcorpions, becauſe they

cannot

(g) *See alſo Mr* Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Critiq. Gramm. *num.* 503.

(42) Pope Blount, Cenſura Authorum, *pag.* 689, *Edit. Lond.* 1690.

(43) It was printed at Paris 1603.

(44) Bullart, ibid. *Tom. ii, pag.* 220.

(45) What I ſuppreſs here is found in the remark [*D*].

(46) Vita Erycii Puteani, *in limine,* Epiſt. poſthum.

(47) Erycius Puteanus, Epiſt. ad Joh. Baptiſtam Saccum, apud Martinum Kempium, Diſſertat. XVI, de Oſculis, *num.* 6, *pag.* 626.

(48) *Quæritur tertio,* An cum legibus caſtitatis, quæ temperantiæ eſt ſpecies, bene conveniat recepta illa apud noſtrates Belgas, aliaſque nationes, conſuetudo, qua peregrini oſcula figunt alienis uxoribus, viduis, ac virginibus, quando eas humanitatis cauſa ſalutant? *Adrianus Heereboord, Exercitat. Ethic. XLIV, pag. m.* 173.

(49) Apud ſapientiſſimum Senecam, Virginis Sacerdotem (*he ſhould have ſaid* Sacerdotium) petentis, inde arguitur impudentia (*it ſhould be* impudicitia) quod oſculo ſalutata fuiſſet. *Ibid. That is not the queſtion. See* Seneca's Controverſ. II, lib. i.

(50) Oſculo pudicitiam virginis delibari cenſebant veteres, unde illud Ovidii. *Ib.*

(51) Ibid.

(52) Neſciunt noſtræ virgines . . . veſtræ ſciunt. *See, above, citation* (47).

(53) Oſcula quæ Venus quinta parte ſui Nectaris imbuit. - - - *Kiſs, Which Venus doth in Nectar ſteep.* Horat. lib. I, Ode XIII.

(54) Heereboord, ubi ſupra.

(55) Xenophon, de Memorab. Socratis, *lib. i.*

himſelf. As ſhe was an Italian, he did not permit her to follow the Flemiſh cuſtoms,

‘ cannot hurt unleſs they touch us; but beauty wounds us without coming near us. What way ſoever we perceive it, it ſhoots out it's venom, and perverts our underſtandings. Perhaps it is for this reaſon that the Cupids are repreſented with bows and arrows, becauſe a fair face wounds us from afar. I adviſe you then, Xenophon, when you ſee any beauty to fly without looking behind you; and as for you, Critobulus, I think it would be proper for you to be abſent a whole year, for that will be time little enough to heal your wound.’ Can any morality be more worthy of a great Philoſopher than this? Our good Caſuiſts would not judge it too ſevere, nor find any hyperbole in the compariſons of Socrates (56). The maxims of an antient Roman had no leſs rigour. He had a freed-man whom he loved very much, and a daughter who began to grow marriageable. He knew that this freed-man had kiſſed her, and puniſhed him ſeverely, tho' there was ſomething which might be urged as an excuſe in the circumſtances of that fault; but he had no regard to that, nor to the friendſhip which he had for the criminal, he conſidered only the conſequences of the puniſhment. It is not ſaid whether he was ſatiſfied with the ordinary puniſhment of a kiſs, which was whipping; there is a probability that he was not: however it be, we know that his chief motive was to let the damſel underſtand, that even in reſpect of kiſſing, ſhe ſhould keep herſelf a virgin for her huſband, and preſerve the firſt flower for him. ‘ Si alienæ fœminæ oſculum infixum rationis ſit verbere vindicare; nonne qui illud puncto temporis fecerit, incomparabili horarum ſpatio verberatur, & ſuavitas voluptatis exiguæ diuturno dolore punitur (57). - - - *If the laws inflict the puniſhment of whipping upon a man for giving a kiſs to another woman than his own wife; is not he, who did that in a moment of time, ſcourged for ſome hours, and the ſweetneſs of a ſhort pleaſure puniſhed with a long continued pain.*’ Valerius maximus expreſſes himſelf finely on this ſubject. ‘ Quid P. Mænius? quam ſeverum pudicitiæ cuſtodem egit! In libertum namque gratum admodum ſibi animadvertit, quia eum nubilis jam ætatis filiæ ſuæ oſculum dediſſe cognoverat, cùm præſertim non libidine, ſed errore lapſus videri poſſet. Ceterùm amaritudine pœnæ, teneris adhuc puellæ ſenſibus, caſtitatis diſciplinam ingenerari magni æſtimavit. Eique tam triſti exemplo præcepit, ut non ſolum virginitatem illibatam, ſed etiam oſcula ad virum ſincera perferret (58). - - - *What of P. Mænius? how ſevere a guardian of chaſtity was he, in that he puniſhed his freed-man, who was a great favourite with him, becauſe he underſtood he had given a kiſs to his daughter when ſhe was marriageable; eſpecially when he might ſeem to have committed that fault not through luſt but miſtake. But he thought it of great conſequence to imprint a ſingular regard for chaſtity in that young maid, by the bitterneſs of the puniſhment. And he taught her, by this ſevere example, that ſhe ſhould preſerve not only her virginity untouched, but even her kiſſes for her huſband.*’ Penelope would not have thought this morality too ſevere. See the remark [*L*] of her article. We have ſpoken (59) of a Florentine lady who managed herſelf after this rule, and of a law which was grounded on the ſame maxim (60). This law ſubſiſts no longer in France, but it is not abrogated at Naples. Half the donations of the man who is contracted, and dies before the conſummation, belongs to the woman, if ſhe gave him a kiſs, but otherwiſe ſhe has nothing. Does not this ſhew that ſhe has no longer any firſt-fruits to beſtow (61), and that therefore ſhe ought to be indemnified? Theſe are maxims unknown to a great many nations, that judge of things quite otherwiſe, and do not ſet them at ſo high a rate. We will quote the author of the Saint-Evremoniana. *A kiſs, which in Turkey, Italy, and Spain, is the beginning of adultery, at Paris is only a meer civility; and if that Perſian, who made ſo many myſterious voyages to get three kiſſes of the fair Cyrus, had been at Paris, he would not have valued that pleaſure ſo much as he did. There are no viſits now in which there are not kiſſes, but they are like money, which we value juſt as we pleaſe; and as kiſſes are a merchandiſe which coſts nothing, and does not wear out, and is always plentiful, no body is ſparing of them, and few are greedy of them* (62). What I am going to quote out of Montagne is not of the ſame ſort, for that author conſidered only kiſſes of civility; but as what he ſays is an evidence of the cuſtom of his time, I may join it to the words of the Saint-Evremoniana. The reader will diſtinguiſh where there is occaſion. ‘ Scarcity gives a reliſh to meat. Thus the manner of ſalutations, which is particular to our nation, takes off, by it's frequency, the pleaſure of kiſſes, which Socrates ſays is ſo dangerous and powerful to ſteal our hearts. It is an unpleaſant cuſtom, and injurious to the ladies, to hold out their lips to every one who has three footmen in his retinue, how diſagreeable ſoever he be.

*Cujus * livida naribus caninis*
Dependet glacies, rigetque barba:
Centum occurrere malo culilingis.

‘ And we ourſelves do not get much by it; for as the world is at preſent, we muſt kiſs fifty ugly ones for three that are handſome; and for a tender ſtomach, as ſuch of my age have, one bad kiſs is too much for a good one (63).’ We have ſeen before (64), in a paſſage of Eraſmus, what concerns the cuſtom of England. We will ſee here what Kornmannus ſays concerning ſome towns in Germany (65): ‘ Apud Germanos in multis locis uſitatum vidi Coloniæ Agrippinæ, Tubingæ (66), &c. Ubi nefas grande creditur ſi juvenis ad puellam veniens ipſam non oſculetur, & amplexetur: aſt in aliis locis contrarium obtinet: ſi enim quis apud nos in chorea puellam oſculetur indignata prorumperet. Quam me? &c. aſt in occulto & ubi nemo videt benè patiuntur, imo per totam noctem non ſemel ferre, recuſant: nam poſt factum oſculum nihil reliqui manet, quod cernatur: tantum de abſterſione agitur. *Among the Germans I have obſerved in many places, as at Cologn, Tubingen,* &c. *where it is accounted very uncivil, if a young man, approaching a young woman, does not kiſs and embrace her; but in other places, the contrary cuſtom prevails: for if any one among us ſhould kiſs a girl in a dance, ſhe would immediately fly into a paſſion, and ſay, What do you take me to be?* &c. *In private, and when no body ſees them, they will take it well enough; nay, they will not refuſe it all the night long; for a kiſs leaves no marks behind it; only wipe the mouth.*’

The remark of the author of Saint-Evremoniana; That in ſome countries a kiſs paſſes for the beginning of adultery, would make ſome commentators quote a hundred paſſages. They would not forget the words of Achilles Tatius, where kiſſes are called fine preludes; nor thoſe wherein they are conſidered as ſuch a powerful bait, that people are more aſtoniſhed that they are not followed by the whole game, than that the other advances were in vain. Μέχρι τίνος ἐπὶ τῶν φιλημάτων ἱστάμεθα, φιλτάτη; καλὰ τὰ προοίμια. προσθῶμεν ἤδη τὶ καὶ ἐρωτικόν. Quouſque tandem chariſſima Leucippe, baſiis inſiſtemus? ſpecioſa quidem certe initia hæc ſunt, verum aliquid etiam ex iis quæ ab amantibus expetuntur, addamus (67). - - - *How long, my dear Leucippe, ſhall we ſtick at kiſſes? Theſe are certainly very fair beginnings; but let us add a little more of what lovers deſire.* Οὐδέν σε ἠρέθισεν εἰς ἀφροδίτην κἂν μίαν, οὐ δέησις, οὐ χρόνος, οὐχ ἡ τῶν σωμάτων συμπλοκή. ἀλλά, τὸ πάντων ὑβριστικώτατον, προσαπτόμενος, καταφιλῶν, οὕτως ἀνέστης ὡς ἄλλη γυνή. Quid, quod animum tuum non modo non pellexerunt preces meæ, ut ſemel ſaltem mihi morem gereres: ſed ne ullum quidem idonei temporis opportunitas, aut mutuus complexus, aut aliud quidpiam apud te pondus habuerunt. Quinimo, quod omnium contumelioſiſſimum eſt, è complexu meo, EX IPSIS DISSUAVIATIONIBUS æque diſcedis atque alia mulier (68). - - - - *What ſhall I ſay, not only intreaties have been inſufficient to prevail on you ſo* cuſtoms, which he would not have thought to be dangerous if ſhe had been born at Louvain.

---

(56) *Confer quæ* Achilles Tatius, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 79.

(57) Auguſt. de Civit. Dei, *lib. xxi, cap. xi.*

(58) Valer. Maximus, *lib. vi, cap. i, num.* 4, *pag. m.* 513.

(59) In citation (1), of the article GUALDRADA.

(60) Citation (1), of the article MAMMILARIANS.

(61) Quia ex oſculo vir capit gaudium, & ſponſa verecundiam, & quod Sponſus oſculando videtur quaſi cœpiſſe caſtrum. Alii eam aſſignant rationem, quia oſculum eſt actus carnis, & pro medietate eſt quaſi corrupta caro. *Kempius, Diſſert. XV, de Oſculis, pag.* 607.

(62) Saint Evremoniana, pag. 271, Dutch edition 1701.

* Mart. Epigr. VII.

(63) Montagne's Eſſays, *book iii, ch. v, pag. m.* 171.

(64) Citation (57), of the article ERASMUS.

(65) Kornmannus, de Linea Amoris, *pag. m.* 189, 190.

(66) Thomas Lanſius, apud Kempium, Diſſert. XVI, pag. 624, *has given the lie to* Kornmannus *about* Tubingen.

(67) Achilles Tatius, *lib. ii, pag.* 107.

(68) Ibid. *lib. v, pag.* 347.

ſo much as once to grant me the favour, but even no opportunity of time, or mutual embraces, or any thing elſe have any weight with you. Nay what is moſt provoking of all, from my embraces, and even kiſſes, you go away as a woman would do. Theſe are the complaints of a woman. But I may very well be allowed to comment on theſe words of the Saint-Evremoniana, That *a kiſs is a merchandiſe which does not wear out.* A man who had not run through a courſe of Philoſophy, and yet was uſed to inform himſelf of the reaſons of every thing, aſked a Phyſician one day, why certain ſtatues of braſs bear the marks of the kiſſes which are given them (69), and that no ſuch thing was ever perceived on the face of the moſt famous courteſans? The Phyſician told him, that the ſtatues were expoſed for many ages to the devotion of a prodigious number of people, but that the duration of beauty is very ſhort. He was not ſatisfied with this, but ſaid, that the difference between the hardneſs of the braſs and the ſoftneſs of the fleſh ought to make a compenſation, and ſo much the more, becauſe the kiſſes of reſpect which are given to the idols are very ſuperficial, and do not come near the forcible impreſſion of the others. The Phyſician was ſenſible of theſe two diſparities, and gave another reaſon; which was, that whatever the rubbing takes off from the ſtatue, is loſt for ever, whereas what is loſt in living bodies is reſtored by their nouriſhment: that man was very well ſatisfied with this ſecond anſwer. The rigid readers may ſay theſe are trifles, but muſt there be no trifles in ſuch volumes as theſe? Muſt not the reader find from time to time a place, where he may reſt, I mean, ſome things that are not ſerious.

To conclude, I muſt needs ſay, that Puteanus was much in the right, not to breed an Italian girl as they did the Flemiſh ones. All muſt act in ſuch an affair, according to the law of cuſtom; neither the law of nations, nor the law of nature include this part of education? the diverſity of climates and opinions is the beſt rule here. We ſhall ſee, in another place (70), what a profeſſor of Groningen has obſerved in a work, in which he has drawn the parallel of ſome cuſtoms, which the Rigoriſts (71) condemned, and of ſome others which they allowed of.

* * *

QUELLENEC

---

(69) See, above, citation (17), of the article GERGENTI, to which we may add this paſſage of Lucretius, *lib. I, ver.* 317.
Tum portas propter ahena
Signa manus dextras oſtendunt attenuari
Sæpe ſalutantum tactu, præterque meantum.
The brazen ſtatues that our gates adorn,
Shew their right hands diminiſhed and worn
By th' touch of theſe that viſit or paſs by.
CREECH.

(70) In the remark [*M*], of the article SAINT-ALDEGONDE.

(71) Note, that this name is not that which is given them by the Proteſtants of Holland: for they call them *Preciſiſts*.

Q.

QUELLENEC (Charles de) Baron of Pont in Bretagne, made a great figure, under the name of Soubiſe, among the Proteſtants, in the reign of Charles IX. He took the name of Soubiſe in 1568, when he married Catherine de Parthenai, the only daughter of John de Parthenai, lord of Soubiſe. We ſhew in another place (a) ſome of the conjunctures in which he evidenced a great deal of courage, and how he defended himſelf againſt thoſe who committed the Paris Maſſacre on St Bartholomews day (b), under whom he was forced to fall at laſt. The curioſity of ſome of the court ladies, with reſpect to his naked body, which was laid, with the others, before the Louvre, has already been taken notice of (c). The proceſs of impotency which was entered againſt him [*A*], and which will give me occaſion

[*A*] *The proceſs of impotency entered againſt him.*] Thuanus ſays expreſsly, that it was his mother-in-law, and not his wife, who entered the proceſs. Mr Varillas ſays the ſame thing in his two editions of Charles IX. Mezerai, not conſidering the conſequences, has ſaid of the wife what Thuanus ſaid of the mother-in-law. I have cenſured him for it (1), for the honour and glory of Catherine de Parthenai; for altho' a woman may enter ſuch a proceſs without blemiſhing her honour, yet it is better not to do it, eſpecially conſidering the youth of the heireſs of Soubiſe. There are certain actions (2) which are no ſin, and do not imprint any note of infamy, neither *de facto*, nor *de jure*; however, becauſe it is better to let them alone than to do them, they have ſomething which tarniſhes the reputation; ſo that an Hiſtorian ought to take great care not to impute them to thoſe who did them not. He is not allowed to be unexact, and to confound the mother with the daughter, or one ſiſter with another. The more celebrated a Hiſtorian is, the more cautious he ought to be, for when he is very famous, he becomes a public ſource; he alone ſerves as an original record to a great many writers all the world over. How many able men are there that will not think themſelves deceived if they follow Mezerai (3)?

I have ſaid ſomething in another place (4) which may ſerve as an excnſe to the lady Soubiſe; and certainly what ſhe did againſt her ſon-in-law needs an apology. A time of perſecution, ſuch as ſhe lived in, was not proper for ſuch proceedings. A church under trouble and arms at the ſame time, and which is in that condition, in order to maintain the reformation of doctrine and manners, ought not, under pretence of impotency, to draw a young huſband before judges of a contrary religion. It is certain, that in all times and places, proceſſes of this nature bring very little honour to thoſe that enter them; and whether they obtain a new huſband, or not, they are always an object of raillery and contempt as long as they live, and not without reaſon; for the ſteps they take are ſo contrary to modeſty, a virtue which is the crown and ornament of that ſex, and without which they cannot ſhare in human glory, that no body can have any reſpect for a woman who takes ſuch a courſe.

Without going out of the bounds of indulgence, we may ſay here of thoſe women, what was ſaid, tho' a little too rigorouſly, againſt the widows which marry. I ſhall uſe Mr du Vair's own terms (5). *St Jerom to Marcellus, ſays, that* ſecundas nuptias non appetimus, ſed concedimus, *by a certain indulgence, which is not altogether exempt from blemiſh: as if he ſhould ſay with the law,* indulgentia quos liberat notat . . . (6). *In what terms ſoever the ſaying of the Apoſtle be expreſſed,* juniores viduæ nubant, *we muſt conceive that it was ſaid by way of indulgence to the incontinence of ſome women,* ut maritum potius accipiant quam diabolum, & ſciant ſibi non tam maritos datos quam adulteros imputatos, *as St Jerome ſays,* ad Salvinam. *Now as St Cyprian ſays,* aliud eſt ad veniam ſtare, aliud eſt ad gloriam pervenire. *There is a great deal of difference between ſaying, that their incontinence ſhall not be imputed to them for a ſin, and to ſay that it ſhall be imputed to them for grace.* This is the moſt favourable judgment that can be made of theſe pleaders in matters of impotency, conſidering the manner of proceeding which they muſt follow.

I. It is a great ſtep to confeſs publickly, that one cannot contain one's ſelf. Now every woman who enters ſuch a proceſs, declares before all the world, that ſhe has this defect: ſhe delivers an act (7) which remains with the Public Notaries, and which affords a ſubject of raillery to thoſe who are inclined to be merry, and even an occaſion of fear to a new huſband. For if he be obliged to take long voyages, or has a long ſickneſs, how ſhall he rely on the virtue of a wife who has confeſſed her incontinence to the whole world?

II. The interrogatories they muſt anſwer before the judges, are ſo nice and troubleſome for a woman of honour, that none can have a good opinion of a maid who can paſs thoſe bounds, and anſwer to ſuch queſtions. I ſay a maid, becauſe thoſe who accuſe their huſbands generally pretend to be ſuch; and they muſt needs do it when it is their firſt marriage, as it is generally. An advocate ſtrangly puzzled ſuch a complainant once: he aſked her, in the preſence of ſeveral people, whether her huſband had careſſed, kiſſed, and embraced her. She anſwered yes. Who told you, quoth he, that this is not enough? Where did you learn the reſt? If you have your maidenhead, as you pretend, you ought not to know that your huſband is impotent; and if you know it, it is a ſign that you have tried what another man can do? He preſſed her ſo hard, that ſhe bluſhed, and ſaid ſhe could not anſwer to ſuch puzzling queſtions. I will give the whole ſtory in Latin. *Erumpit interdum inverecunda intemperies mulierum. . . . Erumpit inquam impudens, & in facie erubeſcentium populorum, genialis tori revelat & denudat arcana, & de mariti frigiditate conqueritur, allegans hanc ſufficientem & evidentem repudii vel divortii cauſam, quod ſemivir eſt, & inutilis matrimonio, qui non eſt promptus ad coitum. Eleganter quidem Gaufridus de Heroum villa, familiaris meus, unius talium in cauſa hujuſmodi confudit audaciam. Cum enim ei patronus datus eſſet à judice celebraturo, ut putabatur divortium, & mulier generoſa audientibus amicis & ſuffragatoribus, advocato ut ſit diligentius merita cauſæ ſuæ exponeret, ſcrutatus eſt ab ea vir prudens, an alium maritum quandoque habuerit. Quod cum illa negaſſet, quæſivit iterum an adhuc virgo eſſet, dicens: hoc ſibi inquiſitu, & ſcitu perneceſſarium, ne à diſcreto judice caperetur occaſione aliqua in ſermone. Illa vero hoc (verecunde tamen, eo quod ſibi non bene credebatur) aſſeruit. Et ille, an ſimul de noctu dormire conſueverint* occaſion to quote ſome paſſages of a book publiſhed in the year 1612, was the true cauſe

---

(a) In the article SOUBISE (John de Parthenai).

(b) See citation (8), of the article PARTHENAI (Catherine de).

(c) Ibid.

(1) In the remark [*C*], of the article PARTHENAI (Catherine de).

(2) Certain qualities are named in the ſchools, *perfectio ſimpliciter ſimplex.* Every quality *melior ipſa quam non ipſa*, is of that ſpecies.

(3) *Franeiſcus* Quelletrius *Dux è Britannia, cui ab uxore* Catharina Parthenia Subizia *impotentiæ accuſato divortium intentabatur.* Ulr. Huber. Hiſt. Civil. *Tom. ii, pag.* 353.

(4) See the remark [*C*], of the article PARTHENAI (Catherine de).

(5) Du Vair, pag. 820, of his Works, Geneva Edit. 1617.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 824, 825.

(7) Note, that I do not mean that they make ſuch a confeſſion in direct terms; we know that they generally ſpeak only of the commendable deſire they have of getting children; but the public is not ſatisfied with that, they generally put another conſtruction upon it.

conſueverint, & ſe invicem oſculari & amplexari maritus & ipſa, inquiſivit. Quæ omnia cum illa fateretur : unde ergo, inquit patronus, noſti virgo pudiciſſima, prudentiſſima, pudoratiſſima, quod efficacem tecum virum non impleverit, & totius matrimonii jura non perſolvit ? Quis te docuit, quid ſit coitus, ut eum tecum coiiſſe neges, inter tot oſcula, tot amplexus, qui te pro libitu quoties voluit pertractavit licentia maritali ? Nam & quædam animantia certum eſt ſe invicem oſculando miſceri. Alia ſe tenuiter tangendo concipiunt. Et ſunt qui ſuo gravidante calore, ab aëre temperato impregnantur, & pariunt. Hic illa tandem erubuit, hoc ſolum dicens, ſe quid ad hujuſmodi captiones hiſceret, non habere (8).

III. They muſt reſolve to ſuffer an inſpection of the ſecret parts. Other proofs are too weak, for this reaſon the judges have recourſe to this, and order an inſpection ; they cauſe the woman to be inſpected, to ſee whether ſhe be defloured. Where is the modeſty of thoſe who dare begin a proceſs which has ſuch conſequences ? With what impudence muſt they be armed ? There was an advocate of the parliament of Paris, in the beginning of the reign of Lewis XIII, who wrote ſtrenuouſly againſt the inſpection, and uſed two arguments ; one is, that it is immodeſt ; the other, that is uncertain. *This is*, ſays he (9), *the firſt thing that is now ordered in ſuch caſes, when the marriage has been contracted with a maid, who being inſpected, and reported to be an undefiled virgin, all the proof of the huſband's impotency, and his condemnation are grounded upon it* . . . . (10). *Such an inſpection is very indecent, and not becoming the modeſty which a woman ought to have, and therefore it is odious, and ſhe ought to avoid it, there being nothing more commendable in a woman than modeſty.* Gratia verecundiæ mulieris ſuper aurum, *Ecclеſ. vii. eſpecially in her who calls herſelf a virgin,* quæ ſeipſam debet erubeſcere, & nudam videre non poſſe, *ſays* St Jerom. Epiſtola citata ad Lætam. De Inſtitutione filiæ ; *and St Ambroſe in his 64th epiſtle,* Nihil ſanctius in virgine quam verecundia ; *and in the firſt book of offices,* Eſt pudicitiæ comes verecundia ; *and again, in the firſt chapter of the book of the inſtitution of a virgin* ; In virgine eſt dos quædam verecundia quæ taciturnitate cognoſcitur, *ſo that ſhe who complains of her huſband's impotency, and, in order to a ſeparation, ſuffers men to ſee, pry into, and handle thoſe parts which nature would have to be hid, ought to be looked on as impudent, and without ſhame* . . . (11). *A woman,* (ſays Herodotus, at the beginning of his hiſtory) *puts off ſhame with her ſhift. And St Cyprian,* De habitu virginum, tract. 2. Simul cum amictu corporis, pudor ponitur. *Pliny, in the ſeventeenth chapter of the ſeventh book of his Natural Hiſtory, ſays, that the bodies of drowned men always float on their backs, with their faces upwards ; but women with their bellies and faces downwards, as if nature, careful of their honour, would hide that which could not modeſtly be ſeen.* Quaſi pudori deffunctarum parcente Naturâ. *Nay, this putting off of cloaths, and denudation, was formerly a puniſhment, as Nicephorus ſays, in the eighth chapter of the ſeventh book of his Hiſtory ; and* Tacitus, libro de Moribus Germanorum, *ſpeaking of the puniſhment of adulterous women. For this only reaſon ſeveral have looked on theſe inſpections as evil, and reproved them. St Ambroſe, in the ſame epiſtle,* 64, *reproving Syagrius, biſhop of Verona, for ordering that a nun, who was accuſed of leudneſs, ſhould be ſearched, uſes theſe words :* Quid ſibi velit, & quò ſpectet quod Obſtetricem adhibendam credideris non poſſum advertere ; itane ergo liberum erit accuſare omnibus, & cùm probatione deſtiterint, petere genitalium ſecretorum inſpectionem ? & addicentur ſemper ſacræ virgines ad hujuſmodi ludibria, quæ & viſu & auditu horrori & pudori ſunt ? Quæque in alienis auribus ſine damno pudoris reſonari non queunt, ea poſſunt ſine ejus tentari verecundia (12) ?' *By which it appears, that this great man abhorred to hear theſe things ſo much as ſpoken of ; ſo far was he from approving them, adding, that he had never read that maids uſed to be inſpected. We do not find that the Romans, who were ignorant of nothing that belonged to good manners, uſed this means to convict their veſtals who were accuſed of inceſt, tho' they were very ſevere in their enquiries after, and in the puniſhment of that crime* . . . (13). *From whence we may conclude, that the Romans did not, in thoſe doubtful caſes, inſpect the women to be ſatisfied, and thence draw proofs of their virginity or corruption, as is done nowadays ; whether they judged that kind of proof uncertain, and not to be depended on, or whether they rejected it as indecent, and contrary to a woman's modeſty ; which was ſo much in eſteem with them, that the ſame Valerius, in the firſt chapter of the ſecond book, ſpeaking of Spurius Carvilius, who put away his wife becauſe ſhe was barren,* ſays, *that they would not let her be ſearched.* Quò matronale decus, munimento verecundiæ tutius eſſet, in jus vocanti corpus ejus attingere non permiſerunt, ut inviolata manus alienæ tactu relinqueretur. *In which they were not like thoſe, who immediately, upon a proceſs of ſeparation, order that the woman ſhall be inſpected, tho' they might begin in a more decent manner with the inſpection of the huſband, and the wife might be ſearched, if there was occaſion for it, without going ſo faſt, or cauſing them to be ſearched at the ſame time without any interval, that they may the ſooner be ſeparated ; as if it was a thing that required great haſte, and that it could not be deferred without the public being very much concerned at it.*

IV. The congreſs muſt be reſolved upon, for almoſt all other means of diſcovering impotency are inſufficient. Now it is impoſſible to conceive, that a woman, who hath not loſt all ſhame, can think, without horror, on the circumſtances of a congreſs ; for after the parties have taken an oath (14), *that they will endeavour ſincerely, and without diſſimulation, to conſummate the marriage, without any let or hindrance on either ſide*, and after *the viewers* have ſworn, *that they will make a faithful relation of what ſhall paſs at the congreſs*, they *retire into a chamber, where the man and the woman are ſearched again ; the man to know whether he hath no ailment . . . . . the woman, to conſider the condition of her privy parts, and by that means to know the difference of the dilatation before and after the congreſs, and whether there hath been any intromiſſion. . . . . In* * *ſome proceſſes (as that of de Bray)* (15), *the parties are viewed naked, even from the crowns of their heads to the ſoles of their feet,* etiam in podice, *to know whether they have any thing about them that may advance or hinder copulation. The privy parts of the man are waſhed with warm water, (to what purpoſe?) and the woman put for ſome time into an half bath* (16). *This done, the man and the woman go into one bed in the day-time, the men-viewers being preſent, who remain in the chamber, or retire (if both or one of the parties require it) into ſome wardrobe or adjacent gallery, the door being half open. As for the matrons, they keep about the bed ; and the curtains being drawn, it is the man's buſineſs to do his duty, and prove his power by carnally knowing his wife,* &c (17). . . . . *To conclude, the parties having been ſome time in bed, as an hour or two, the viewers being called, or coming of their own accord, and opening the curtains, inform themſelves of what has paſſed between them, and ſearch the woman again, to know whether ſhe is wider than when ſhe went to bed, and whether the intromiſſion has been made ; and alſo* an facta ſit emiſſio, ubi, quid, & quale emiſſum. *This is not done without a candle, and ſpectacles for thoſe who uſe them, nor without very naſty and odious enquiries ; and then they make their verbal proceſs of what was done at the congreſs, or rather of what they would have, which they deliver to the Judge, who is in the hall, or ſome other room of the houſe, with the Proctors and practitioners of the Eccleſiaſtical Court, waiting the end of this action.* This is not all, the huſband is permitted to call the ſearchers, if he ſucceeds. Antony Hotman obſerves that Dr Hoſtienſis adviſed the midwives *to uſe warm water, to waſh the bodies of the women they inſpect, in order to take off any reſtringents that may have been uſed ; which is repeated by Panormus,* in cap. Fraternitatis de frigid. & malef. (18). The Protectors of the Congreſs pretended that this method was ſure; but Antony Hotman maintained, that it was deceitful. *When they are told,* ſays he (19), *of the artifices uſed by ſome women to ſtraiten themſelves, they pay no regard to it, inſiſting, that by the waſhing uſed at the viſitation, all that is removed, and the truth appears. Yet we have ſeen, in our time, a woman of no great quality, who having a proceſs againſt her huſband for impotency, and afterwards dropped it, becauſe ſhe proved with child, had, by art, ſo ſtraitened herſelf for carrying on the proceſs, that ſhe had need of a Surgeon at her labour.* Et Prepoſitus in cap. conſultationis de frigidis & malef. *And after him the author of the book intituled,*

Sylva

(8) Joan. Sareſberienſis, in Policratico, ſive de nugis curialium, & veſtigiis Philoſophorum, *lib. viii, cap. xi, pag. m.* 504, 505.

(9) Vincent Tagereau, Diſcourſe of the Impotency of Men and Women, *chap. iv, pag.* 57, *Edit. of Paris* 1612.

(10) Ibid. *pag.* 58.

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 60.

(12) You will find in Mr Du Pin's *Biblioth. Tom. ii, pag.* 278, Dutch edition, an exact and true abridgment of this letter of St Ambroſe to Syagrius.

(13) Tagereau, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 63.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 123.

* This appears by the report of the laſt congreſs, dated April 21, 1578.

(15) He was a treaſurer. See Brantome, in the firſt volume of the Gallant Ladies, *pag. m.* 97, 98.

(16) See the reaſon below, citation (18).

(17) See the reſt below, citation (31).

(18) Antoine Hotman, *pag.* 47, *of the firſt Treatiſe* de la Diſſolution du Mariage.

(19) Idem, in the 2d Treatiſe, pag. 34. See alſo pag. 47, of the firſt Treatiſe.

cauſe why they were ſo curious. Thuanus doth not tell us that the queen-mother would

Sylva Nuptialis, lib. 2. ampliatione 5. *relate that a woman in Italy ſtraitened herſelf ſo very much to pleaſe her huſband, that afterwards neither he, nor any other man could have to do with her.* Here is another paſſage of this Pariſian Advocate (20). *De Bray, who is ſo much talked of, and whoſe caſe has been printed,* ſiniſtrum tantum habebat teſticulum ex defectu naturali, *and at the firſt congreſs (having gone thither twice in ſeveral days)* arrexerat ſufficienter ad coeundum, ac ſubſtantiam ſeroſam & aquoſam extra vas emiſerat, quæ non poterat dici verum ſemen, ſed non intromiſerat, *according to the report of* † *three Phyſicians, three Surgeons, and three Matrons, who were preſent. The Judges, without minding the natural defect, ordered that* ⸸ *De Bray ſhould come to the congreſs again, before they came to a definitive ſentence, if he thought fit to do it; (which was as much as to ſay, that the intromiſſion had been wanting) and having declared that he would not go, and that his wife had hindered him twice when he was there, he was ſeparated only becauſe there had been no intromiſſion in the congreſs, tho' there was no proof in the proceſs of the virginity of his wife. And it is remarkable, that when he* ‡ *went to the congreſs the ſecond time, the Judges adviſed him, that if there was an intromiſſion he ſhould call the ſearchers, that they might ſee and teſtify it. By which it is plain, that they do not conſider, in theſe proceſſes, the quality of the ſeed, nor whether the man* arrigit etiam ſufficienter ad coeundum: *but they require a viſible intromiſſion. (a moſt indecent thing!)* Had not this Lawyer reaſon to maintain (21), that the congreſs is not only *more proper to ſuppreſs the truth, than to bring it to light,* but alſo that *it is immodeſt and brutiſh?* Has he not reaſon to oppoſe to the impudence of thoſe who demand it, the remainder of ſhame which is ſeen in public ſtews? *Even common women,* ſays he (22), *ſhut up and hide themſelves.* Eſt aliqua etiam proſtitutis modeſtia *(ſays the ſame Seneca)* & illa corpora publico objecta ludibrio aliquid, quo infœlix patientia lateat, obtendunt, adeo quodammodo lupanar verecundum eſt: *and Ovid*;

Ignoto Meretrix corpus junctura Quiriti,
Oppoſita populum ſubmovet ante ſera.

He quotes (23) alſo theſe fine words of St Auguſtin; ‘Opus ipſum quod libidine peragitur, non ſolùm in quibuſque ſtupris ubi latebræ ad ſubterfugienda hominum judicia requiruntur, verùm etiam in uſu ſcortorum (quam terrena Civitas licitam turpitudinem fecit) quamvis id agatur quod ejus Civitatis nulla lex vindicat, devitat tamen publicum etiam permiſſa & impunita libido conſpectum: & verecundia naturali, habent proviſum Lupanaria ipſa ſecretum, faciliuſque potuit impudicitia non habere vincula prohibitionis, quam impudentia removere latibula illius fœditatis. Quid concubitus conjugalis qui ſecundum matrimonialium præſcripta tabularum procreandorum fit cauſa liberorum? nonnè & ipſe, quamvis ſit licitus & honeſtus, remotum ab arbitris cubile conquirit? nonnè omnes famulos, atque ipſos etiam Paranymphos, & quoſcumque ingredi quælibet neceſſitudo permiſerat, antè mittit foras quam vel blandiri conjux conjugi poſſit? Nec ipſi filii, ſi qui jam inde nati ſunt, teſtes fieri permittuntur. - - - *The act itſelf, not only in all caſes where concealment is ſought to avoid public juſtice, but alſo in the uſe of common women (a vice tolerated by the ſtate) tho' the action be ſuch as no law takes cognizance of; yet even in theſe caſes, where it is done with impunity, ſhuns the public view; and by a natural modeſty, the very ſtews are provided with their ſecret places. And it has been found eaſier to take from immodeſty the reſtraint of a prohibition, than for impudence to remove the concealments of that filthineſs. What ſhall we ſay of conjugal embraces in lawful matrimony for procreation of children? Does not even that, tho' lawful and honeſt, ſeek a place retired from all obſervers? Are not all the ſervants, and the bride-maids, and all relations who were before admitted, obliged to retire before the huſband can ſo mch as careſs his wife, nor are the children themſelves, if any be of that marriage, permitted to be preſent.*’

Theſe are the proceedings which the heireſs of Soubiſe was to ſubmit to, when ſhe was at law with the Baron du Pont. They would injure the memory of the illuſtrious mother of the duke de Rohan, that heroine, who ſignalized herſelf at the ſiege of Rochelle; if it were true, that in the prime of youth, modeſty did not prevent her entering ſuch an action againſt her huſband, as obliged her to act ſuch a part. It is for this reaſon I have taken great pains to excuſe her, by laying all this contrivance upon her mother. I have endeavoured alſo to excuſe her mother. When I ſaid, that in thoſe times they were to ſubmit to ſuch proceedings, I had regard to the Decree of the parliament of Paris, which *forbad, on the eighteenth of February,* 1677, *the Judges, Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, to order, for the time to come, any proof of congreſs in matrimonial cauſes* (24). It is ſtrange that ſo many wiſe heads ſhould be ſo long before they thought of aboliſhing this law. ‘There have been more diſſolutions of marriages within theſe hundred years, ſince the introducing of the congreſs into France, than were ever ſeen before. It is for this reaſon that the parliament of Paris, at laſt judging that the congreſs was any enemy to chaſtity, and that it was not a true proof of a man's virility, abrogated it the eighteenth of February, 1677, by a ſolemn decree, *&c* (25).’ Theſe are the words of an able Phyſician, who had ſaid before (26), ‘That the congreſs, which had been formerly aboliſhed by the emperor Juſtinian, as contrary to Chriſtian purity, was re-eſtabliſhed by ſome curious people of our age: for it is the infamy of both ſexes, and the diſhonour of our times: I do not believe that we can find in Hiſtory any examples of it but what are ridiculous. It is a law which offends modeſty; it is too hard and ſevere on the man. It expoſes to public view thoſe parts which nature has hid with ſo great care; and a man muſt have witneſſes, which he avoids when he follows the law of nature; for what a ſhame is it to ſhew that at mid-day, which we are careful to hide even in the night? It is only a pretence for a divorce, and an effect of the laſciviouſneſs and audaciouſneſs of women. It is they have produced in the minds of the Judges the thought of a trial as uncertain as it is immodeſt: perhaps there is not one man of a thouſand, who can come off victorious from this public congreſs.’ There has been a complaint of this abuſe a long time. The Advocate I have quoted, and who lived at the beginning of the XVIIth century, ſets forth very pathetically the injuſtice of this cuſtom; and ſeeing the diſorder increaſe, he endeavoured to oppoſe it. *And foraſmuch,* ſays he (27), *as the ſeparations for impotency are more frequent now than they ever have been, altho' there are not more men impotent now than formerly, which have been always rare (thoſe at leaſt in whom one may perceive any token by the ſearch, whether the defect be natural or accidental) and of ten ſeparations we ſhall hardly find one, where they have been able to diſcern any defect in the man by inſpection; which makes many people wonder and complain of it: I have enquired, with the greateſt diligence, from whence this can proceed.* He obſerves that many people favoured theſe diſſolutions of marriages. *Not being able to believe that there can be ſo much impudence, and ſo little conſcience in him, or her who complains, that they ſhould demand a ſeparation without any reaſon; as ſoon as ſuch proceſſes are entered, they haſten to the condemnation of the party who is accuſed of impotency. And if it is the man, and he refuſes out of ſhame, or for ſome other reaſon, to accept of the congreſs, or has no intromiſſion, they declare him impotent, tho' there appears no other defect in him; ſaying, that if they were in the ſame caſe, they would ſhew their ſtrength and vigour. But, perhaps, they would find it difficult, if they ſhould happen to be in the ſame trouble, by reaſon of the ſhame, fear, vexation, hatred, and other difficulties which neceſſarily attend ſuch an act, and hinder the execution of it* (28). He gives us a great many particulars on this head, which are very curious and rational, and which I ſhall ſet down, without fearing that wiſe men will take it amiſs; for can any one be offended to find here what a grave author publiſhed by authority at Paris above eighty years ago (29), and the only deſign of which is to inſpire horror for theſe unlawful and immodeſt cuſtoms (30). ‘It is a ſtrange and almoſt incredible thing, that ſuch an act that was blamed by the Pagans for it's filthineſs, and for being againſt nature, (that is to ſay, againſt modeſty, which, ac-would ſee, by the naked body of this Baron, whether the proceſs was well or ill grounded. Neither do our other famous Hiſtorians ſay ſo. However, it might be true

---

(20) Tagereau, ibid. *pag.* 30, 31, 32.

† This report was made the 11th of April 1578.

⸸ It is the ordinance of the 14th of May following.

‡ This appears by the report and verbal proceſs of the laſt congreſs.

(21) See the 7th chapter of his treatiſe.

(22) *Ibid. pag.* 153. *He quotes pag.* 157, *theſe verſes of Martial, Epigr. XXXV, (and not XCI, as he takes it).* Et meretrix abigit teſtem veloque ſeraque, Raraque Summenii fornice rima patet.

(23) Idem, pag. 154, 155, quoting the 18th chapter of the 14th book *de Civitate Dei.*

(24) Venette, Tableau de l'Amour Conjugal, *pag.* 579. *See the* Journal des Scavans, *of the fifth of July* 1677, *pag.* 208, *Dutch Edit.*

(25) Nicolas Venette, doctor of Phyſic, royal profeſſor of Anatomy and Surgery, and dean of the college of Phyſicians at Rochelle, *pag.* 578, 579, of his *Tableau de l'Amour Conjugal,* 7th Edit. 1696. This edition is larger and more correct than the preceeding ones. The author has added a preface to it, which deſerves to be read. I have quoted him in the article JOUBERTUS, remark [*C*].

(26) Ibid. *pag.* 577.

(27) Tagereau, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 7, 8.

(28) Ibid. *pag.* 9, 10.

(29) The ſecond edition of Tagereau's book, which I uſe, is of the year 1612, the firſt is of the year 1611.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 159, *& ſeq.*

‘ cording to St Auguſtin, is naturally in all men) ſhould be received amongſt Chriſtians, and by churchmen, who ſhould have more modeſty than other people. It is true, it is not long ſince they began to uſe this method, being firſt introduced, as may be ſuppoſed, by ſome impudent man, who being proſecuted for a ſeparation, demanded a congreſs, boaſting that he would there ſhew his vigour, which was permitted, there being more appearance than reaſon for it. It perhaps alſo was allowed, to prevent women from undertaking ſuch proceſſes, leſt they ſhould be obliged to perform ſuch an unſeemly act. But this method has neither ſerved to diſcover the truth and ability of men, nor to deter women from theſe proſecutions. On the contrary, they are become bolder, knowing very well that the intromiſſion required at the congreſs, to prevent a ſeparation, depends on them, no man whatſoever being able to do it without their conſent, either voluntary or forced (31), and that it is a ſure and infallible way of gaining their cauſe, and being ſeparated: and, which is worſe, they have introduced the cuſtom of ordering a congreſs, when a man is ſued for impotency, omitting, or neglecting, the ancient forms, inſomuch that men are compelled, by impriſonment, to ſubmit to a congreſs, if they refuſe to do it freely, or do not conſent to a ſeparation; a thing ſo abſurd, that one would hardly believe it, if one did not ſee it. Now this cuſtom being introduced without any good reaſon, ought neither to be followed nor continued. *Quod enim non ratione introductum eſt, ſed errore primum, deinde conſuetudine obtentum eſt, in aliis ſimilibus obtinere non debet. l. Quod non ratione. De legibus & ſenatus-conſultis.* Beſides the ſhame which accompanies the congreſs, ſufficient to hinder the execution, it's circumſtances render it impoſſible, *viz.* The fear which a man has of ſo many people that ſee, ſearch, and handle him, on whoſe report his reputation depends, nay, his ruin or preſervation; as alſo of failing in that which he has undertaken, and which is of ſo great importance to him. The vexation of being proſecuted upon ſuch a ſhameful account, which renders him the town-talk, and laughing-ſtock of every body. The hatred alſo which he has for his wife, for bringing him to that, inſtead of procuring his honour and advantage. Add to this the conſtraint put upon him, by confining him in a priſon if he will not go to the congreſs, or conſent to the ſeparation. All theſe things are true remedies of love, and directly contrary to it's principal work and action, which requires ſecrecy, aſſurance, friendſhip, and a mind not ruffled by ſhame, fear, hatred, and vexation, which infallibly render the effect and execution of the congreſs very difficult, and even impoſſible; as Ambroſe Paré obſerves in his works, book twenty-eight, of the ſixth edition, where he treats of the *report of the impotency of men and women*: it is not in the firſt editions. And a man muſt be without ſhame and apprehenſion of any thing, and worſe than a beaſt, who can perform the congreſs, notwithſtanding all theſe hindrances; conſidering alſo (as St Auguſtin ſays, in the fourteenth book *De Civitate Dei*, the twenty-third chapter) that copulation doth not depend only on our will, *&c.*’

Mr Venette is too much a gentleman to take it ill, if I believe that he is miſtaken in what he ſays of Juſtinian. I have heard very learned Civilians ſay, that there are no footſteps of the congreſs in the old Civil-Law, and that is an abomination invented in theſe laſt ages. We will quote Vincent Tagereau again (32). ‘ Now although marriage, in it's firſt inſtitution, and by the Evangelical-law, be inſeparable, unleſs one of the parties dies, or at leaſt ſo as that the parties ſeparated may marry again; and it is not found that the Jews, Greeks, or Romans, with whom divorces were uſual, had any laws concerning the marriages of the impotent; except the Athenians, who had one made by Solon, by which a woman who was maried to an impotent huſband, was allowed to cohabit with any one of her huſband's relations; and the Romans another, made by the emperor Juſtinian, near 1300 years after the foundation of Rome, (there being none before) by which he firſt of all allowed the women, rather by favour, than reaſon, and contrary to the Divine-law, to be divorced from their impotent huſbands, and to put them away: as he made many other laws in favour of the women, by the perſuaſion of the empreſs Theodora, who ruled him, and made him do what ſhe pleaſed, as the ſame Bodin ſays in that place of his Republic, which has been quoted (33), and in the ſecond chapter of the fifth book. However the Canoniſts, in imitation of Juſtinian, have allowed the ſame liberty to the women, if their huſbands ſhould prove impotent; ſo that they be married to another after their ſeparation, permitting the ſame alſo to thoſe huſbands whoſe wives are too ſtrait, which Juſtinian had not done, there being hardly any ſuch women to be found.’

The advocates, who pleaded for . . . . . . in 1677, maintained *that the congreſs has no foundation neither in the authority of the laws, nor in the opinions of the doctors; that there is no mention made either in the Civil or in the Canon Law, of the inſpection or congreſs; that it is only practiſed in France, and not above ſixſcore years ago; that the ancient books afford us only two ridiculous precedents for it* (34).

It is likely Mr Venette's error proceeds from a tranſpoſition of ideas, which has confounded the knowledge of Juſtinian's law. He would no longer permit that the ripeneſs of males ſhould be decided by an inſpection of their privy parts. He fixed it to the age of fourteen years, whether they were vigorous or not, and looked on what had been practiſed until that time as a very immodeſt thing. He thought himſelf obliged to exceed the modeſty of the Romans, who forbad the regulation of the ripeneſs of the girls by inſpection (35); but they made no ſuch prohibition with reſpect to the boys.

Theodoret did very much inveigh againſt the laws of Plato, which ordained not only that girls and women advanced in years ſhould practiſe naked all the exerciſes proper for men, but alſo that ſome inſpectors, in order to judge whether the perſons of either ſex were marriageable, ſhould make them ſtrip themſelves (36). Τὴν δὲ τοῦ τῶν γάμων χρόνου ξυμμετρίαν δικαστὴς σκοπῶν κεινήτω, γυμνοὺς μὲν τοὺς ἄῤῥενας, γυμνὰς δὲ ὀμφαλοῦ μέχει θεώμενος τὰς γυναῖκας. *Judex vero inſpiciens judicet quænam ætas celebrandis nuptiis conveniat: eamque ob rem nudos mares, nudaſque umbilico tenus feminas inſpiciat* (37). Equity required from Theodoret that he ſhould not paſs over in ſilence the caution of the legiſlator, with reſpect to the girls, who were only to be naked to the navel (38). Theodoret, I ſay, ſhould have oppoſed Plato's law, as it was thus limited; whereas he oppoſes it, as if there had been no limitation at all. He alledges the ſaying of king Candaules's wife, That a woman puts off modeſty at the ſame time ſhe puts off her ſhift; from whence he concludes that this philoſophical legiſlator taught the women who were betrothed to put off all ſhame. Τοιγαροῦν ὁ φιλόσοφος τὰς νυμφευομένας γυμνοῖ τῆς αἰδοῦς, καὶ ἀναίδειαν ἐκδιδάσκει. *Quare Philoſophus pudore ſponſas exuit, & impudentiam docet* (39). Theodoret's way of reaſoning on this occaſion has not all the exactneſs or preciſeneſs of a ſtrict Logician; but what he ſays againſt Plato's inſtitution concerning dances and ſhews, at which both ſexes might aſſiſt naked, is juſt: he pretends that it was the ruin of modeſty, and a ſchool of laſciviouſneſs. ʼΟυ γὰρ ποῦ μόνον εἰς ἀναίδειαν ἐπαιδοτριβοῦντο γυμνούμεναι καὶ γυμνουμένους ἄνδρας θεώμεναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὰς ἀλλήλους ἀφορμὰς προὐξένουν ἀκολασίας, τῶν γὰρ δὴ γυμνῶν σωμάτων ἡ θεωρία, καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας, καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας εἰς ἔρωτας ἐκτόπους ἠρέθιζεν. *Non modo enim ad impudentiam erudiebantur nudatæ, nudoſque viros ſpectantes, ſed multas invicem incontinentiæ occaſiones præbebant; Nudorum enim corporum aſpectus ad nefarios amores & viros & feminas provocabat* (40). This confirms the remarks I made in another place (41) againſt the cuſtom of the Lacedemonians. But we muſt ſay that Plato's laws were not put into execution like thoſe of Lycurgus; they were mere ſpeculative laws, which, as Theodoret obſerves (42), were not ſo much

(31) *He ſays, pag. 125, concerning the congreſs* ſouvent adviennent des altercations honteuſes & ridicules, l'homme ſe plaignant que la partie ne le veut laiſſer faire, & empeſche l'intromiſſion: elle le niant, & diſant qu'il y veut mettre le doigt & la dilater, & ouvrir par ce moyen . . . . encore ne ſçauroit il quelque erection qu'il faſſe, ſi ſa partie veut l'empeſcher, ſi on ne lui tenoit les mains & les genoux, ce qui ne ſe fait pas.

(32) Tagereau, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 4, 5.

(33) That is in the third chapter of the firſt book.

(34) Journal des Sçavans, ubi ſupra.

(35) Pubertatem autem veteres quidem non ſolum ex annis, ſed etiam ex habitu Corporis in maſculis æſtimari volebant. Noſtra autem Majeſtas dignum eſſe caſtitate noſtrorum temporum exiſtimans, bene putavit: quod in feminis etiam antiquis impudicum eſſe viſum eſt, id eſt, inſpectionem habitudinis corporis, hoc etiam in maſculos extendere. Et ideo noſtra ſancta Conſtitutione promulgata, pubertatem in maſculis poſt decimum quartum annum completum illico initium accipere diſpoſuimus: antiquitatis normam in feminis bene poſitam, in ſuo ordine relinquentes, ut poſt duodecim annos completos viripotentes eſſe credantur. *Inſtitut. lib. i, Tit. xxii.*

(36) Theodor. de Græc. affect. *lib. ix, pag. m.* 615.

(37) Ibid. *pag.* 616.

(38) It is to be obſerved that they begun at the head.

(39) Ibid.

(40) Ibid.

(41) In the article LYCURGUS.

(42) Theodor. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 615.

true that ſhe caſt her eyes, on thoſe naked bodies with the ſame intent; and there are ſome books wherein ſhe is accuſed of it [*B*], and even of having ordered the body of the Baron du Pont to be looked for among all the reſt [*C*]. I ſhall ſay, in one of the remarks, why I give that gentleman the name of *Quellenec* [*D*].

The paſſages which I have inſerted in the firſt remark of this article, have diſpleaſed ſeveral people, and made them aſſert with great heat that they containe dintolerable obſcenities, though I was always perſuaded that they took the thing wrong, yet I was almoſt reſolved to leave out thoſe paſſages in this ſecond edition; and it was the advice of ſome perſons, for whom I have a very great eſteem: but ſome other perſons, of no leſs judgment than they, diſſuaded me from it, and told me that the reaſons I have given of my conduct are a good excuſe, and that it ſufficed to inſert here the apology already publiſhed in a ſingle ſheet. I follow their advice, and recite thoſe reaſons [*E*]; to

as received in the country of that Philoſopher: and therefore it cannot be ſaid that Juſtinian was obliged to ſuppreſs the abuſes which this Father of the church condemned.

We will end this digreſſion with a paſſage of the Menagiana, which informs us that this abuſe of the congreſs was not then ſo frequent. Thoſe who are pleaſed with the ſuppreſſion of ſcandals, will read this with edification. ‘ An official, in the time of Mr de ‘ Gondy, whoſe name I do not well remember, told ‘ me, that during forty years that he had been in ‘ that poſt, he had only ordered the congreſs once; ‘ it was to a Miller, and as he performed his duty ‘ very well, his wife ſaid to him, Jacob, why did ‘ not you do the ſame at home, and then we ſhould ‘ not have had the trouble to come here (43)?

[*B*] *There are ſome books wherein ſhe is accuſed of it.*] John Lætus Profeſſor at Franeker (44) ſays, that the queen gave orders that they ſhould look out for the body of Soubize, a gentleman who was thought to be impotent, and that when it was found, ſhe looked upon his privy-parts and laughed very heartily in the preſence of many ladies. ‘ *Subiſii* nobilis qui frigidæ & ‘ minimè ad procreandam ſobolem aptæ naturæ eſſe ‘ dicebatur *cadaver* juſſit inveſtigari *Regina*, inventum ‘ (45) *pudenda illius, cum ſuarum pediſſequarum nume-* ‘ *roſo comitatu, non ſine magno & effuſo riſu inſpexit.*’ Could a thing of this nature be unknown to d'Aubigné? and if he had known it, would he have omitted it in his Hiſtory? His ſilence will certainly decide the buſineſs ſo much the more, becauſe he obſerves that *the ladies viewed Soubiſe, to ſee whether he was incapable of marriage, becauſe there was a proceſs againſt him upon that account* (46). Mr Varillas would not have concealed this action of the queen-mother, for he doth not ſpare her in things of leſſer or greater importance. Speaking of the ſiege of Rouën, he ſays (47), That *the queen-regent was blamed for carrying the king her ſon into the forts as ſoon as they were taken, as if ſhe had a deſign to uſe the eyes of that prince to ſlaughter; and that people found fault with her for having too curiouſly viewed the naked body of a young woman who had dreſſed her ſelf in man's cloaths, to increaſe the number of the defenders: which ſhews that people will forgive nothing to the great ones.* Another Profeſſor of Franeker maintains, that the queen ſearched Soubiſe's impotency very curiouſly (48).

[*C*] *And even of having ordered the body of the baron du Pont to be looked for among all the reſt.*] This is an aggravating circumſtance which I will not warrant; let him who advances it anſwer for it: It is a Proteſtant writer. ‘ Rex, Regina, fratres & Regius comi- ‘ tatus frequens ſub veſperam Lupara egrediuntur, ſtra- ‘ gis illius per urbem effuſæ conſpiciendæ cauſa. Su- ‘ bizius vir nobilis, frigidæ & minimè ad procreandam ‘ ſobolem aptæ naturæ eſſe dicebatur: illius cadaver ‘ juſſit inveſtigari Regina, & pudenda illius, cum ſua- ‘ rum pediſſequarum numeroſo comitatu, inſpicit, non ‘ ſine magno & effuſo riſu (49). --- *The king, the queen,* ‘ *the king's brothers, and a number of attendance, went* ‘ *out in the evening from the Louvre, to ſee the ſlaughter* ‘ *that had been made in the city. Soubiſe, a nobleman,* ‘ *had been accuſed of frigidity, and incapacity of propa-* ‘ *gation; the queen cauſed his body to be ſought for, and* ‘ *viewed his privy-parts, together with ſeveral of her* ‘ *ladies, with a great deal of laughter.*’

[*D*] *The name of Quellenec.*] So Mr Varillas calls him in the ſecond edition of his Hiſtory of Charles IX. Now as that edition was rectified, according to the remarks of Mr d'Hoſier, one of the greateſt Genealogiſts in France (50), there is no doubt but that the baron du Pont, who married the heireſs of Soubiſe, muſt be called ſo. This name is very much mangled in moſt Hiſtorians, which probably has been occaſioned by an error of the preſs. The Printers of Thuanus's Hiſtory, put *Quellevetum Pontium* inſtead of *Quellenecum Pontium* (§ α); hence it is, that Mezerai calls this baron *Quelleve-Pontivy*: which is making two faults; for Pontivy was a lord of the houſe of Rohan. This laſt fault is not to be found in Mezerai's Chronological Abridgment, but only in his large Hiſtory. I muſt obſerve by the by, that he whom he called Charles in his large Hiſtory, is called Francis in the abridgment. Thuanus and the ſecond edition of Varillas, give the name of Charles to the baron du Pont, and therefore it ſeems to me to be his right name. Varillas in the firſt edition uſed the word *Kuellevé*. It was ſtill the fault of the Printers of Thuanus: If Varillas made ſome alteration in the orthography of the word, it is likely he did it becauſe he remembred that ſeveral noble families of Bretagne put a *K* to their names. A famous author, has not long ſince called him *Franciſcus Quelletrius, dux è Britannia* (51).

[(§ α) This is corrected in Mr Buckley's edition of Thuanus. See Tom. III. pag. 131. REM. CRIT.]

[*E*] *I will recite thoſe reaſons.*] I do not know whether any body remembers ſtill the two ſmall pieces that came out in 1697: one was intituled *The Judgment of the public . . . . upon the Critical Dictionary*, and the other *reflexions upon . . . . the judgment of the public*, &c. In the laſt of theſe two pieces is the apology, which I was adviſed to inſert here, and which has been thought ſufficient to remove my readers ſcruples, I heartily wiſh it may have that good effect. Here follows what I anſwered to my Critic. ‘ (52) We may add to the ‘ three inſtances which he alledges, what he has ſaid ‘ againſt the article, wherein I have ſet down ſome paſ- ‘ ſages out of a book of Tagereau. He could not ‘ chuſe a worſe ſubject of complaint; for I will ſhew, ‘ in a proper time, that I had very good grounds to ‘ inſert in my work what I have ſaid of the congreſs. ‘ I might ſay as an Hiſtorian, that Quellenec was ac- ‘ cuſed of impotency, and that it was his mother-in- ‘ law, and not his wife, who entered the action againſt ‘ him. Truth obliged me to make that remark in ‘ favour of an heroine of our party. As a faithful Hi- ‘ ſtorian, it was my duty to criticize thoſe who caſt a ‘ blot upon that lady, ſuppoſing that ſhe ſued her huſ- ‘ band upon ſuch an account in the flower of her age. ‘ This is to declare that I do not think it a com- ‘ mendable thing for a woman to engage in ſuch pro- ‘ ceedings. Every author has the privilege of ſhewing ‘ the reaſons of his opinion; and therefore as a com- ‘ mentator on my own text, I might, nay I ought to ‘ ſet forth the proofs of the opinion which I did ad- ‘ vance, and conſequently relate what Tagereau had ‘ publiſhed againſt the practice of thoſe times: We ‘ would appear wiſer than our fathers, but we are not ‘ ſo wiſe. That advocate, in the parliament of Paris, ‘ eaſily obtained a licence to publiſh a book, in which ‘ he laid open all the filthineſs of the congreſs: But ‘ great clamours are raiſed in Holland againſt an au- ‘ thor who only tranſcribes ſome paſſages out of that ‘ book. Is not this a reſpect of perſons, which be- ‘ trays an ill turn of mind, or a corrupt heart? But ‘ will ſome ſay, this advocate ſet forth thoſe things ‘ only to oblige the judges to ſuppreſs ſuch a practice, ‘ which was contrary to modeſty and liable to injuſtice. ‘ But do not I declare with the utmoſt indignation that ‘ this practice was infamous, becauſe it weakened the ‘ principle of ſhame, the precious ſource of chaſtity? ‘ Can any one take the right ſide with more zeal than I have

(43) Menagiana, *pag.* 291, 292, of the firſt Dutch edition.

(44) *Compend. Hiſt. univerſ. pag. m.* 424. He quotes *de Statu Religionis in Gallia.* We ſhall ſee in the following remark the words of the author whom he quotes.

(45) This word placed there makes a ſoleciſm.

(46) D'Aubigné, Hiſt. *Tom. ii, pag.* 545.

(47) Varillas's Hiſt. of Charles IX, *lib. iv, ad ann.* 1562.

(48) Cujus cadaver cum reliquis ante Regiam projectum à Regina ejuſque puellis diligenter, ſi nota impotentiæ appareret, inſpectabatur. *Huber. Hiſt. Civil. Tom. ii, pag.* 353.

(49) Commentar. de Statu Religionis & Reipubl. in Regno Galliæ, *Part iv, fol. m.* 39, *verſo.*

(50) See the letter publiſhed by Mr Larroque in his Animadverſions upon Varillas.

(51) Huber. Hiſt. Civil. *Tom. ii, pag.* 353, *printed at Franeker in* 1692.

(52) Réflexions ſur un Imprimé qui a pour Titre *Jugement du Public, &c. p.* 3, 4.

to which I ſhall add one inſtance, taken from the approbation which Juſtus Lipſius gave to the book of an advocate, who, in a cauſe concerning the diſſolution of a marriage [*F*], found himſelf obliged to relate ſeveral obſcene things, and even was merrier than the neceſſity of the ſubject required. If any one is not ſatisfied with what

‘ I have done in this article? Beſides, as an Hiſtorian, have not I the right to relate a cuſtom which was a long time practiſed in the diſtrict of the parliament of Paris, and which is not aboliſhed in other places? Certainly the manner of proceeding in civil and criminal cauſes belongs to hiſtorical facts; and if there be any thing ſingular in it, many travellers and writers of relations are very careful to be informed of it. What a pleaſure had it not been for Pietro della Valle to find a book in Perſia which might have informed him of a very odd cuſtom, as well as Tagereau could inform him of the ceremonial of the congreſs? I aſk whether the verbal proceſſes of the jury and matrons in certain cauſes, are things to be rejected when one goes about to make an exact collection of all the uſages and cuſtoms of a nation? Furetiere, who did not write an Hiſtorical Dictionary with comments, but a Grammatical one, made uſe of thoſe proceſſes. Did any body find fault with him upon that account? Dr Menjot . . . . . who was a man of great probity, has put a great many laſcivious things in his diſcourſe concerning the *Furor uterinus*, and barrenneſs. It would be a ridiculous thing to cenſure him for it, ſince, as a Phyſician, he had a privilege to do it; his ſubject required or allowed it. Now, I ſay, that a compiler, who relates and comments, has all the privileges of a Phyſician and of an advocate, *&c.* according as there is occaſion; he may uſe their verbal proceſſes, and the terms of their profeſſion. If he relates the divorce of Lotharius and Tetberga, he may give an abſtract of Hincmar, archbiſhop of Rheims, who writ down all the impurities which were proved whilſt the proceedings laſted. One ought never to judge of a commenting Hiſtorian before one be well acquainted with the laws of Hiſtory, and the privileges of a commentator. If thoſe gentlemen had read the commentary which Andrew Tiraquellus writ on the laws of marriage, they would have ſeen there a great many more obſcenities. Yet he was a counſellor in the parliament of Paris, and one of the moſt illuſtrious men of the laſt century, as well for his learning as for his virtue.’

[*F*] *The approbation which Juſtus Lipſius gave to the book of an advocate, who in a cauſe concerning the diſſolution of a marriage.*] Sebaſtian Roulliard, one of the moſt learned advocates of the parliament of Paris, pleaded in the year 1600 for a gentleman, who had been accuſed of impotency by his wife. She had gained her cauſe before the official of Sens, and afterwards before the delegates of the primacy of Lyons. The huſband appealed from their ſentence, and obtained commiſſaries from the Apoſtolical See to give a final determination in the matter. Roulliard, his advocate, publiſhed *A Capitulary, ſhewing, That a man born without any viſible teſticles, but having all the other marks of virility, is capable of matrimonial duties.* The gentleman was born ſo, and it was on this imperfection that his wife grounded her ſuit for impotency. He maintained that he had conſummated the marriage, *not by the ridiculous means which ſhe ſuppoſed, but by the natural effort of his ſex* (53). He demanded that ſhe might be inſpected, *and for a convincing proof, and the moſt frequent that can be practiſed on ſuch occaſions, he offered to accept the congreſs, to ſhew, that he was capable of erection, intromiſſion, and ejaculation, which were objected to him* (54). The judges had neither ordered a congreſs nor an inſpection, the woman having declared that thoſe two things offended her modeſty (55). From theſe offers of the huſband Roulliard drew what conſequences he thought moſt proper, and diſcourſed at large of the uſe of the teſticles, according to the doctrine of the Philoſophers, and the obſervations of the Anatomiſts. He did not trouble himſelf with paraphraſes and covered ſpeeches, but he uſed the terms of art with the greateſt liberty; and ſometimes mixed with his diſcourſe ſome Latin verſes which were very obſcene; but the application he made of them was very ingenious. He ſeems to be all along upon a ſerious tone, and yet the whole book is full of drolleries and merry thoughts. He ſent a copy of it to Juſtus Lipſius, who anſwered him thus. ‘ Ita, ita, venit ad nos libellus tuus, Deum immortalem, venuſtus, lepidus, & pro ipsâ re libellus (56). . . . . Sed ô te (auſim dicere?) nequam! Novios, Pomponios, Titinnios, Petronios, quidquid hoc genus Atellanas, Mimos, Satyras ſcripſit, vincis aut æquas. Imo uno vincis, quòd Salvo pudore & probitate jocaris. Quid jocaris? ſeriò loqueris, & de illo quod Græci *Neceſſarium* vocant, neceſſariò, atque id apud judices, agis. Meum & meorum riſum! quâ fronte, quàm ſubſtrictâ aure, Caſſii & Catones veſtri hæc audiunt? . . . . . Extra jocum, argutus tuus libellus & in re ſeriâ, nec ſeriâ, ſeriò doctus (57). - - - *Yes, yes, I have got your little book, but good God! how elegant and diverting, how much to the purpoſe . . . . but oh! you knave ſhall I call you, you excel, or at leaſt equal the Noviuſes, Pomponiuſes, Titinniuſes, Petroniuſes, and all the reſt who have written farces, mimes, or ſatires; nay in this you excel them all, that you jeſt without treſpaſſing on modeſty or probity. How jeſt? you ſpeak ſeriouſly and treat neceſſarily of what the Greeks call neceſſary, and that before the Judges. It is good ſport to me and my friends to think with what countenance and attention your Caſſiuſes and Catos hear thoſe things . . . . without jeſt, your witty book about a matter ſerious and not ſerious at the ſame time, is in good earneſt a learned one.*’ In another letter he proteſts that he has praiſed Roulliard's Capitulary without any irony, that he had not the leaſt thought of reflecting on the author's morals, and that he knew well enough that they were unblameable, and of the greateſt purity. *Ego te, cum Varrone hoc dicam, modo ſcænatili tetigerim?* ȣ̓δ' ὡς ὄναρ. *Joci fuerunt innoxii, puri, & niveos dicam, quia & frigus, credo, habuerunt. De moribus tuis ne mihi verbum, ſcio ſanctos eſſe: aut ſcripta tua mihi mentiuntur, character ille interioris mentis* (58). Note that Lipſius had already begun to ſet up for a bigot, and yet he judged very well and charitably of Roulliard's Capitulary. I do not know whether the wife's advocate publiſhed his proceſs; but had he been never ſo grave, he could not have avoided a thouſand groſs obſcenities: his caſe, or his anſwer to Roulliard, would inform us of ſeveral circumſtances of that proceſs. I know very little of it. See the margin (59).

I muſt take notice, that Roulliard and Tagereau were not of the ſame principles. The intereſt of the cauſe which Roulliard had in hand, induced him to maintain, that the practice of the congreſs and inſpection of the parts was lawful; ſo that, ſays he (60), ‘ All thoſe concurring circumſtances were a ſufficient motive for the Judges to order the congreſs, which the ſaid appellant offered to ſubmit to, ſince he affirmed to have had carnally to do with his ſaid wife, and in ſuch a caſe, *ſtandum eſt verbo viri, qui dicit ſe uxorem cognoviſſe cap. continebatur de deſponſat. impub.* conſidering that the man is the head of the woman, and ought to have that prerogative over her; beſides, he has a legal preſumption for him that he has known his wife, *gloſſ. cap. inſpicimus de regul. in* 6. *cap. literas ë de preſumpt.* . . . . At leaſt to make that preſumption void, the midwives muſt depoſe the contrary; and that by the inſpection of the ſecret parts of the wife, they have found her a virgin, *cap. propoſuit ë de probat.* Now this is ſo far from being mentioned in the proceſs, that on the contrary, after ſeveral evaſions, ſhe has acknowledged ſhe has been defloured by her huſband; and, becauſe ſhe pretended it had not been done by a manly effort, which an inſpection would have decided, ſhe would never conſent to it, nor the Judges order it, notwithſtanding the preſſing inſtances of the appellant. . . . . . . (61) As for the congreſs, which the ſaid lady pretends to reject on account of modeſty.

Ah ſi cubitum locus exigit, omnibus illum
Deliciis imple, & ſit procul inde pudor.

If opportunity preſent the bliſs,
Snatch it, nor loſe, thro' modeſty, a kiſs.

(53) Roulliard, Capitulaire, *pag.* 8.

(54) Ib. *p.* 9.

(55) Ib. *p.* 40.

(56) Lipſius, Epiſt. LXVI, Centuriæ ad Germanos & Gallos, *pag. m.* 697.

(57) Ib. *p.* 698.

(58) *Idem*, Epiſt. LXXV, ejuſd. Centur. *pag.* 707.

(59) It appears from thoſe two Letters of Lipſius, that Roulliard pleaded for a Baron, and gained his cauſe. I gueſs it was on that occaſion that Julian Peleus, advocate in the parliament of Paris, publiſhed his treatiſe *De ſolutione matrimonii ob defectum teſtium non apparentium.* See the laſt paragraph of this remark [*F*].

(60) Roulliard, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 39.

(61) Ib. *p.* 41.

what I ſay for my juſtification, he is deſired to conſider that it would have been very needleſs to have omitted theſe paſſages of Tagereau in my ſecond edition; for his book is

‘ For duelling is, indeed, forbidden to prevent revenge by offenſive weapons; but not between a huſband and his wife, whoſe half-ſweet and half-ſowre trial tends only to renew peace and love. However, in the preſent caſe *bellum juſtum*, as Livy ſays, *quia neceſſarium*, and neceſſity renders that lawful, which would be unlawful in itſelf . . . . (62). The congreſs is the uſual and moſt certain proof that can be uſed in a caſe of impotency, witneſs Lucian in his eunuch. *Nec inimicum videri debet probationis genus quod ſolum eſt*, ſays Quintilian in his ſeventh declamation; at leaſt the biſhops courts in France have admitted it, and the court has authorized it by ſeveral decrees, particularly that of the 20th of January, 1597, made againſt one, who being accuſed of wanting teſticles, would not ſubmit to it. . . . . (63) Certainly the beſt precaution that can be uſed is to come to an actual trial: *Nec enim de veritate dubitari poteſt, quoties cum incertis experimenta conveniunt, æquumque eſt non ſemper auribus ſed & oculis credere:* eſpecially when we are induced to it by a deſire of peace, which will better excuſe a lawful copulation, though done openly, than all clandeſtine doings can juſtify an unlawful divorce. Otherwiſe it would be an abſurd thing to admit, for the proof of adultery, the evidence of one who ſhould ſay that he has ſeen, ἄρθρα ἐν ἄρθροις, and likewiſe that in order to avoid the ſuppoſition of a child, the Civil Law ſhould permit the inſpection of a woman; and yet, that to juſtify the validity of a marriage (which is a thing much more important) one ſhould be unwilling to ſee, *impactum Thyrſum horto in cupidinis*.’

Theſe reaſons, and ſeveral others which he produces, are far from being ſo good as Tagereau's arguments. I fancy, that if Roulliard had been ſome months after to plead for a woman, who had refuſed to ſubmit to the inſpection and congreſs upon a motive of modeſty, he would have uſed the ſame arguments and maxims as Tagereau, and refuted himſelf very well. It is the fate of advocates, they muſt reaſon ſometimes after one manner, and ſometimes after another, according to the variety of the cauſes which they are to defend (64); and note, that they quote the ſame authorities upon quite contrary ſubjects. You have ſeen (65) how Tagereau oppoſes St Cyprian's authority, and that of St Ambroſe, againſt the practice of inſpection, and you will ſee that Roulliard cites the ſame authors to maintain it. ‘ (66) It is to no purpoſe to ſay, that his wife, pretending to modeſty when it is too late, and upon an occaſion when it is not neceſſary, objects that ſhe would be aſhamed to have her ſecret parts inſpected, and to go to the congreſs, for ſhe muſt be forced to it, ſince ſhe has brought things to ſuch a paſs.

Quàm bene diſpoſitum terris ut dignus iniqui
Fructus conſilii, primis authoribus inſtet.

‘ I add, that in ſuch caſes the inſpection is uſual, ſo that it cannot be ſaid that there is any injuſtice in requiring that which is practiſed by the common law: for we learn from St Cyprian in his epiſtles, and from St Auguſtin and St Ambroſe, that in caſes relating to the defloration of virgins, inſpection has been always practiſed; nay we are told by Clemens Alexandrinus 7. *Strom.* and by Suidas *in verbo* JESUS, that the Virgin Mary ſubmitted to it, the Sanhedrim of the high-prieſt having ordered that ſhe ſhould be inſpected, to diſcover whether ſhe remained a virgin, and whether our Lord, whom they had a mind to adopt into their own order, ſhould be matriculated in their regiſters as the ſon of Joſeph, or as the ſon of the living GOD, and of a Virgin-mother. Chaſſanæus (67) recites the ſtory at length in the fourth part of his *Catalogus gloriæ mundi, diſtinct.* 6.’ Roulliard uſed a trick of his profeſſion. The Fathers he quotes condemn the practice of the inſpection, and therefore are proofs that it was practiſed: he quotes them to prove that cuſtom, and ſuppreſſes the reſt; that is not fair: the authority of an evidence ought not to be cut into two; ſo that here we may apply the maxim of the Civilian Celſus, ‘ Incivile eſt niſi tota lege perſpecta, una aliqua particula ejus propoſita judicare vel reſpondere (68). - - - *It is irregular without conſidering the whole law, to give judgment or anſwer one part of it.*’

There is one thing in which theſe two lawyers agree, that is, to deplore the multitude of proceſſes which were entered againſt huſbands on account of impotency. ‘ (69) Her relations . . . . . have unjuſtly . . . . . prompted her to ſue for a diſſolution of her marriage, by reaſon of his pretended impotency, and other falſe ſtories which it had been better for her to conceal,

- - - - Quam protinus urbi
Pandere res alta ſylvâ & caligine merſas.

- - - - *The ſecrets to reveal,*
Which darkneſs and the ſhady woods conceal.

‘ It was the misfortune of the appellant, that the corruption of the age has given a free courſe to theſe proceedings, *dedit hanc contagio labem, & dabit in plures*; whereas for the ſpace of twelve hundred years, in which modeſty appeared in the faces, and was rooted in the ſouls of the women of France, there were ſcarce ſo many ſuits on that account as there are now almoſt daily. . . . . (70) The appellant, deploring the misfortune of this age, in which the women on very ſlight pretences get themſelves divorced and ſeparated from their huſbands, repreſents to you this complaint of Tertullian, - - - Ubi eſt illa felicitas matrimoniorum qua per ſexcentos ferme annos nulla repudium domus ſcripſit? at nunc in fœminis præ auro nullum eſt leve membrum, præ vino nullum eſt liberum oſculum, repudium vero quaſi votum eſt, & matrimonii fructus. - - - - *Where is that happineſs of marriages, when for near ſix hundred years there was no divorce in any family? but now among our women every member is loaded with gold, all their kiſſes are ſpoiled by wine, and divorce is, as it were, a vow, and the fruits of matrimony.* A thing of very pernicious conſequence, as well to the public as to private perſons.’ This is what Roulliard ſays; compare it with Tagereau's words which you have ſeen above (71).

If any body aſks me to what purpoſe are all theſe paſſages of Roulliard? I anſwer, 1. That they prove that the moſt venerable tribunals have permitted the advocates to expreſs themſelves plainly on obſcene matters. 2. That they ſhew how far the approbation of a great Critic (72) which I have alledged as an example, extended. 3. That they confirm ſome of Tagereau's obſervations, or ſerve to give ſome light to the matter, by the conflict of the arguments *pro* and *con.* If any one replies, that I have not the ſame liberty as the advocates; I reply in my turn, that I, as well as the regiſter of a court, ought to be allowed to mention the reaſons which an advocate has alledged. The nature of my work, which is made up of Hiſtory, and of a critical commentary, requires it. If any one would now-a-days give us a collection of cauſes, and go back ſo far as thoſe which were pleaded in the beginning of the XVIIth century, he might very well publiſh the ſubſtance of Roulliard's *Capitullary*, and in the very terms of the author. He might perhaps think it more proper to ſubſtitute the modern language in the room of the old French; but no body can juſtly blame thoſe who alledge for a proof the very words of an original, rather than a verſion. This is the method I have preſcribed to myſelf.

Since the impreſſion of this, a gentleman of worth (73) hath informed me, 1. That the baron d'Argenton, who married Magdalen de la Chaſtre, was the perſon for whom Roulliard publiſhed his *Capitulary* (74). One may know by that, the meaning of theſe words of Lipſius's letter to that advocate. ‘ Quid autem ille baro? te patrono vir erit, aut fiet? . . . . Unum tamen etiam quæro, vel te augure Cominæos (75) nobis radicula hæc propagabit? Cui tamen favere me fateor, ob ſacrum illud nobis nomen. Illius autem miſereor, quæ tua opera fortaſſe Tantali aliquo fato contabeſcet. - - - *But what ſhall I ſay of the baron? will your patronage make a man of him?* . . .

---

(62) Ib. *p.* 43.

(63) Ib. *p.* 44.

(64) Compare this with the remarks [*B*] and [*C*], of the article ANTONY (MARC) the Orator.

(65) Above, in the remark [*A*], citation (3).

(66) Roulliard, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 40.

(67) It is certain that Chaſſanæus, *pag. m.* 824, tells a long ſtory on that head, but obſerve that Clemens Alexandrinus, *book vii, Strom. pag. m.* 756, does not ſpeak of the Sandhedrin, he only ſays μετὰ τὸ τεκεῖν αὐτὴν μαιωθεῖσαν, φασί τινες παρθένον εὑρεθῆναι. Quidam dicunt eam poſtquam peperiſſet, inſpectam ab obſtetrice, inventam fuiſſe virginem. - - - *Some ſay that after ſhe was delivered, ſhe was inſpected by the Midwife, and found to be a maid.*

(68) Leg. incivile 24. D de Legibus.

(69) Roulliard, ibid. *pag.* 5, 6.

(70) Ib. *p.* 46.

(71) Citation (27).

(72) Juſtus Lipſius.

(73) Mr Marais, advocate in the parliament of Paris.

(74) Lipſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 698.

(75) Every one knows Philip de Comines was baron d'Argenton.

is not ſcarce, and is to be found entire in an alphabetical collection, and conſequently in a work which is extremely like my Dictionary. Laurence Bochel, advocate in the parliament of Paris, has inſerted it at length in the third tome of his Bibliotheque of the French law, at the letter S, under the word *Separation* (*d*). No body found fault with him for having adopted the whole book of Tagereau; why then ſhould I be blamed for quoting only ſome paſſages out of it? If it be ſaid that people are more nice now than they were then, I ſhall refute this objection in a diſſertation at the end of this work, and in the mean time I ſhall obſerve, that I have acquainted my readers, that the book I have quoted was printed in the year 1612. Ought any one to be ſurprized or offended becauſe the ſtyle of ſuch a work is not faſhionable? I add, that obſcenities are allowed even now in cauſes of this nature in a full court [*G*]; and that the judges, though they are divines, do not reform that uſage: they cannot do it nor can they make any uſe of the obſervation of an author I have cited (*e*). See the margin (*f*). For the reſt, as the epoch of cuſtoms that have ſomething particular and extravagant in them, is a thing that the curious are glad to know, I thought it not improper to ſet down here what authors have told us concerning the epoch of the congreſs [*H*].

‘ *I aſk likewiſe will this little root produce more Co-*
‘ *mineſes? I confeſs I incline to favour him on account of*
‘ *his name, which we eſteem ſacred. But I pity him,*
‘ *who perhaps will pine away like another Tantalus.*’
2. That there is an edition of Roulliard's *Capitulary* larger than that which I made uſe of. Mine is an 8vo, and only contains forty-ſeven pages; the other is a large book in 12mo, and contains one hundred and thirty-nine pages. *There is in page 139 a ſonnet by the author, and in another page, without any number, this epigram,*

Ad Lectorem,

Hæc ſi ſcripta putes parum ſeverè
Fruſtra te mihi præbeas ſeverum.
Nam quis ſchemate ni Thalaſſionis
Inumbrare queat Thalaſſionem?
Ergo quamlibet obſtrepente Momo
Fas ſit porrigier manu pudica
Quod ſolum datur auribus pudicis.

[*G*] *Obſcenities are allowed in cauſes of this nature in a full court.*] Here is a paſſage of a letter written by Mr Bourſault to the biſhop of Langres. ‘ I have ‘ often wondered, that my lords the biſhops ſhould ‘ ſuffer the judges of their courts to be prieſts, or that ‘ the doors are not ſhut up when a cauſe is pleaded, ‘ by reaſon of the plain things that are ſpoken there, ‘ which generally dwindle into obſcenities. I never ‘ had the curioſity to go thither, but I have heard it ‘ ſpoken of by ſo many different perſons, and all that ‘ they have told me ſeemed ſo free, that probably ‘ modeſty is baniſhed from thoſe tribunals. I deſire ‘ no other evidence for it than the ſubject which gave ‘ occaſion to theſe verſes:

Dans une Officialité
Ces jours paſſez une Soubrette,
Paſſablement belle & bien faite,
Et d'une robuſte Santé;
Avec la Bienſéance ayant fait plein Divorce,
Dit qu'un vieux Médecin l'avoit priſe par force.
Qu'il falloit ou le pendre, ou qu'il fût ſon Mary:
Et comment, dit le Juge, a-t-il pû vous y prendre?
Vous êtes vigoureuſe, il falloit vous deffendre;
L'avoir égratigné, déviſagé, meurtry:
J'ay, Monſieur, luy répondit-elle,
De la force quand je querelle;
Mais je n'en ay point quand je ry.

Within theſe few days an Abigail
To th' biſhop's court was brought.
Handſome enough, and pretty tall;
And ſtrong, as all there thought:
Having with modeſty made a full divorce,
She ſaid an old doctor had ta'en her by force;
And I will have him hang'd, ſaid ſhe,
Unleſs my huſband he will be.
How could he take you? ſays the judge; my friend,
You're ſtrong enough, and could your ſelf defend.
You ſhould have ſcratch'd and claw'd him too;
Yes, Sir, quoth ſhe, that I can do
In quarrels well enough;
But truly, Sir, not when I laugh.

‘ Was not this girl finely forced, when ſhe laughed ‘ all the while (76)?’ All that can be done is only to prevent the exceſs: but as long as there are any law ſuits about adultery, impotency, keeping of baſtards, or the reparation of womens honour, the judges muſt neceſſarily hear ſome obſcenities. An advocate of Paris (77) did very much exclaim againſt the cuſtom of pleading, at the time of the Carnaval, the *ſmutty Cauſe*, as they call it. But if that abuſe was taken away, there would ſtill remain many cauſes, which only differ from it more or leſs.

[*H*] *What authors have told us concerning the epoch of the congreſs.*] We have ſeen (78) that of its abolition in the diſtrict of the parliament of Paris. It may be certainly fixed to the 18th of February 1677; but that of its original is uncertain. There are ſome authors who ſay that it did not begin until the middle of the XVIth century, and that the ancients did not make uſe of it. I have refuted the Phyſician who thought that Juſtinian aboliſhed it. That emperor ‘ (79) in the Code * *de repudiis*, ſays, that if a huſ‘ band and his wife have lived two years together, ‘ without conſummating the marriage (80), it ought ‘ to be diſſolved. In the twenty-ſecond novel (81) ‘ he prolongs the time of two years to three, rec‘ koning from the day of the celebration of the ‘ marriage. That novel adds a remarkable reaſon; ‘ from which we may learn, that we ought not to ‘ force nature, by a trial that is not only ſhameful but ‘ ſometimes too haſty: *edocti namque ſumus ex iis quæ* ‘ *ante hoc provenerunt, quoſdam amplius quam biennium* ‘ *temporis non valentes, poſtea potentes oſtenſos miniſtrare* ‘ *filiorum procreationi.* This is all that we find in the ‘ Civil Law concerning the accuſation of impotency; ‘ neither the inſpection nor the congreſs appear in it. ‘ The Canon Law agrees with the Civil, and all its ‘ deciſions in that matter are contained in two diffe‘ rent kinds..... (82) Nevertheleſs it has introduced ‘ another ſort of proof, which is the inſpection; it has ‘ been received by ſeveral Conſtitutions, and particu‘ larly by the chapter, *litteras de frigidis*; but two ‘ conſiderable reflexions ought to be made on it. The ‘ firſt .... the ſecond .... that after the inſpection, ‘ if it be favourable to the ſtate of marriage, there is ‘ no occaſion to confirm it by any other proof. This ‘ is the determination of the gloſs on the chapter ‘ *propoſuiſti de probationibus*; and as for the inſpection ‘ they proceed in it in this manner: The huſband is ‘ inſpected firſt; if he appears to be potent they go ‘ no farther, and the woman is obliged to be ſilent, ‘ and they ſpare her modeſty againſt her will, which ‘ her raſhneſs has already too much blemiſhed. But ‘ when, after the inſpection of the huſband, there is ‘ ſome doubt about his ability, the woman is inſpect‘ ed, provided ſhe has not been married before. The ‘ Canon ** *requiſiſti* goes further, and ſays, that after ‘ an inſpection favourable to the huſband, he cannot ‘ be unmarried though he ſhould confeſs his impoten‘ cy.... Theſe are all the proofs that we find in ‘ the Civil and Canon Laws concerning the accuſations ‘ of impotency. In the Civil Law the *triennium*; in the

(*d*) I have been informed of this by Mr Marais, advocate in the parliament of Paris.

(*e*) In the remark *G*].

(*f*) The *Bibliotheque du Droit François*, written by Bochel, was reprinted at Paris in 1667. See the *Journal des Sçavans*, of the 16th of May 1667, *pag. m.* 196.

(76) Bourſault, Lettres nouvelles, *pag.* 173, 174, *Dutch edition.*

(77) *Called* Martin Huſſon. *See his book* de Advocato, *printed at Paris in* 1666; *the* Journal des Sçavans, *of the 25th of April* 1666, *ſpeaks of it, pag.* 178, *Dutch Edit.*

(78) Above, citation (24).

(79) Journal du Palais, *Part v*, *pag.* 23.

* *Lib. x.*

(80) *The words of the law are,* ſi maritus coire minime propter naturalem imbecillitatem valeat.

(81) *The Novel calls it* agere quæ à natura viris data ſunt, *and in Greek* πράττειν τὰ παρὰ τῆς φύσεως ἀνδράσι διδομενα. *I have this remark from Mr Marais.*

(82) Journal du Palais, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 24.

** *Quæſt.* 35.

‘ the Canon Law the affirmation of the parties, with that of ſeven of their relations; and at the utmoſt extremity the inſpection of the parties; the laws require no more; they do not in the leaſt mention the congreſs. . . . (83) The congreſs . . . without doubt, owes its original to ſome raſh young fellow, who demanding it, the judges being ſurprized at the novelty of his demand, thought at firſt that he ought not to be refuſed; ſo that as one precedent gives occaſion for another, the error of the congreſs was inſenſibly eſtabliſhed. Thus all the authors who have treated of this matter ſpeak of it ‡, and among the reſt Antony Hotman a famous advocate of the parliament of Paris, towards the end of the laſt century. He ſays that this practice was only eſtabliſhed forty years before he wrote. . . . . The books of the ancients furniſh us but with two inſtances to ſupport it, and they are both equally ridiculous; one is in Lucian, who tells us that one Bagoas deſiring to be admitted into an aſſembly of Philoſophers, as ſome doubted whether he was a man, ſome body ſaid that he ſhould make ſuch a trial: a propoſal becoming the impudence with which that author ſo often reproaches the falſe Philoſophers. The other example is in Peter Ancharanus, on the chapter *Litteræ* †, where he ſays, that a certain official of Venice, to try an impotent man, ſhut him up with a debauched woman, on whoſe report he divorced him. Ancharanus does not ſay that this is an example to be imitated; neither was it followed in his country, nor in any other parts of Italy no more than in Spain or the Netherlands. All nations allow only of inſpection in a cauſe concerning impotency; and we do not find by the writings of their lawyers that the congreſs is in uſe among them.’

(83) Ib. *p.* 25.

‡ Vincent Tagereau. Antony Hotman. Peleus. Anne Robert.

† *In the decretals* de Frigidis.

The chronological calculation which we have juſt ſeen, as taken from a book of Antony Hotman, is more indeterminate than it is repreſented. Theſe are the words of that author (84). *The argument taken from the practice of times paſt, to authorize the congreſs, cannot be traced up farther than thirty or thirty-five years. And there is a great deal of probability that it was introduced not ſo much by order of the judges, as by conſent of the parties offering to do it*; *in which caſe it is ſaid*, nullas eſſe judicis partes. I. Si convenerit. De jud. *And this practice (with ſubmiſſion to better judgments) ought not to be drawn into cuſtom, and authorized*; *on the contrary, if it has been tolerated in former times, it is better to amend it, as has been done in ſeveral like caſes.* ‘ As for the congreſs, *ſays he in another place* (85), introduced about thirty-five or forty years ago, altho’ it ſeems at firſt ſight that it may ſerve for the clearing up the truth, in a cauſe of a man’s impotency, and (as we may ſay) rectify the fault which might have been made in the inſpection, without which, perhaps, it would not have been ordered; nevertheleſs, the action being duly conſidered, is not only immodeſt and brutiſh, but alſo uſeleſs, by reaſon of it’s circumſtances, which render the effect and execution of it impoſſible.’ The author who ſpeaks thus died in 1596; but I do not know the true date of his book (86), I have only the Paris edition, 1610, and therefore I cannot fix the epoch which I look for. All that I can ſay, is, that admitting the evidence of this advocate, we cannot carry it up higher than the year 1540. You ſee that he maintains the ſame thing as Tagereau did, he declares plainly againſt the congreſs, and alledges a great many things which are to be found in Tagereau’s treatiſe. He ſurpaſſes him alſo with reſpect to obſcenities; ſo that we have here a new and illuſtrious example of the liberty of expreſſing one’s ſelf obſcenely when the ſubject requires it, and when one endeavours to ſuppreſs an abuſe that is very contrary to public modeſty. It is ſaid that Hotman writ that book, *to ſerve a kinſman who had appealed from the congreſs* (87), and who loſt his cauſe. Roulliard reproaches him with it in the edition of 12mo of his Capitulary. The loſs of that cauſe ſhould have been imputed to the Judges, and not to the Advocate, who brought ſo many arguments againſt that new cuſtom that he deſerved the Judges ſhould give it for him. He did not forget to ſay that the proceedings at the congreſs afford matter for a thouſand fooliſh diſcourſes in all ſorts of company. ‘ The wiſeſt men have always been for the mildeſt and leaſt ſhameful remedies; whereas they ſeem now a days to have forgot all honour and modeſty, in order to favour a brutiſh impudence; and what is more ſhameful ſtill, the men have, in ſome trials, inſpected the women, and the women have been admitted to inſpect the men, which has been the ſubject of ſo much deriſion and mockery, that ſuch proceedings ſerve, in moſt places, for pleaſant ſtories and jocular diſcourſes; whereas what belongs to juſtice ought to be treated ſeriouſly, and with fear and reverence (88).’ Among ſeveral other reaſons he alledges this (89), that the inſpectors *have never reported*, mulierem fuiſſe carnaliter à viro cognitam, *at a congreſs*; *but it is ſaid, that once or twice the woman cried out as if her huſband did hurt her*; *which the aſſiſtants hearing, adviſed the parties to agree and go home together*; *which they did, and the woman never complained afterwards: which is as much as to ſay, that the parties being agreed after the proceſs was begun, and the inſpection made, they were told of this expedient, by means of which it appeared that the woman did not complain without cauſe, being yet a virgin, and reported as ſuch, and that the huſband was not in the wrong for maintaining alſo that he was not impotent*; *and the report of the integrity of the woman was looked upon as truth, and ſo both were ſatisfied.* He condemns the inſpection as much as the congreſs, without making any mention of the many alterations that were made afterwards in the edict of the Pretor *de ventre inſpiciendo* (90).

(84) Antony Hotman’s firſt treatiſe on the diſſolution of marriage for the impotency and frigidity of the man or the woman, *pag.* 59.

(85) *Idem*, in the ſecond treatiſe, *pag.* 58.

(86) See the remark [*B*], of the article ROBERT.

(87) Journal du Palais, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 20.

(88) Antony Hotman’s firſt treatiſe, *p.* 63.

(89) *Idem*, in the ſecond treatiſe, *pag.* 63.

(90) Journal du Palais, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 20.

QUETIF (JAMES)

QUETIF (JAMES) a Pariſian, and a Monk of the order of St Dominic, was accounted a learned man. He publiſhed ſome books [*A*], and had ſpent a great deal of time in compoſing the Bibliotheque of the writers of his order, when he died at Paris in the convent of the Reforme, in St Honoré ſtreet, the ſecond of March 1698, at the age of eighty years (*a*).

(*a*) Taken from a letter of Mr *Pinſſon des Riolles*.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] Theſe are the titles of them; *Concilii Tridentini Canones, editio aucta, cui acceſſit index accuratus Legatorum, Patrum, & Oratorum. Item Index Librorum prohibitorum*, at Paris 1666, in 12mo. *Hieronymi Savonarolæ Epiſtolæ ſpirituales & aſceticæ ex Italico in Latinum verſæ. Item vita Savonarolæ à Joanne Franciſco Pico cum notis. Compendium revelationum Savonarolæ & additiones quibus varia ad hanc vitam acta, epiſtolæ, diplomata, inſtrumenta publica, ſcriptorumque monumenta, Apologiæ*, &c. *referuntur* (1), at Paris, 1674, in three volumes in 12mo. *Petri Morini Pariſienſis Opuſcula & Epiſtolæ primum editæ*, at Paris 1675, in three volumes in 12mo. Concerning this Peter Morin, and this edition of his Opuſcula, ſee the Select Letters of Mr Simon (2).

(1) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, *January* 20, 1676, *pag.* 23, *Dutch Edit.*

(2) *At pag.* 241, *& ſeq.*

QUILLET (CLAUDIUS)

QUILLET (CLAUDIUS) a native of Chinon in Touraine, was one of the good Latin Poets of the XVIIth century. I have mentioned in another place (*a*) the occaſion which obliged him to retire into Italy. I now add that ‘ being at Rome, and frequenting the houſe of the French ambaſſador, who was the mareſchal d’Eſtrées, he was made ſecretary of the embaſſy (*b*) [*A*] ’. I do not know for what

(*a*) In the article of GRANDIER, remark [*E*].

(*b*) Sorberiana, *p.* 173, *Dutch Edit.*

[*A*] *He was made ſecretary of the embaſſy.*] ‘ This place was contended for by Mr de Lionne; but Quillet carried it, and de Lionne put himſelf into the ſervice of cardinal Mazarin, for want of a better employment, and Quillet’s refuſal, who choſe the worſe, as the event has verified: for one died ‘ without what reaſon he was angry with cardinal Mazarin; but it is certain that he ſpoke very ill of his Eminence [*B*] in a poem which he publiſhed in the year 1655. The cardinal received the inſult with a great deal of mildneſs, and was ſo eaſily ſatisfied with the excuſes of the author, that he promiſed him an abbey [*C*]. The poem I ſpeak of contains ſome things which Mr Baillet condemns very much [*D*]. The Abbot Quillet wrote ſome other books, which have not been publiſhed [*E*].

'without raiſing himſelf higher, and the other has been promoted to the chiefeſt places in the government (1).' Theſe particularities are curious, but I do not know whether they are true.

[*B*] *It is certain that he ſpoke very ill of his Eminence.*] You will find in the continuation of the *Menagiana* (2) what he ſaid againſt the cardinal.

[*C*] *Cardinal Mazarin was ſo eaſily ſatisfied with the excuſes of the author, that he promiſed him an abbey.*] This deſerves to be inſerted at length, out of the Continuation of the *Menagiana* (3). 'The *Callipedia* of Mr Quillet, diſguiſed under the name of *Calvidius Lætus*, is a very fine Latin poem. Being ſomewhat diſcontented, he inſerted in it ſome verſes againſt cardinal Mazarin, and his family, he cauſed that book to be printed in Holland. The cardinal being informed of it, ſent to Mr Quillet to come and ſpeak to him, and inſtead of ſhewing him any reſentment, he only complained very mildly of the little regard he had ſhown for him in that poem. You know, *added he*, that I have had an eſteem for you a long time, and if I have done nothing for you, it is becauſe importunate people get all my favours; but I promiſe you that the firſt abbey that ſhall be vacant ſhall be for you. Mr Quillet affected with the cardinal's goodneſs, threw himſelf at his feet, aſked his pardon, and promiſed to correct his poem in ſuch a manner as would pleaſe him; praying at the ſame time, that he might dedicate it to him, which the cardinal granted. Accordingly he printed the ſecond edition corrected, in 8vo, at Paris, 1656, and dedicated it to the cardinal, who a little while before had given him a conſiderable abbey; but death prevented his enjoying it long. The firſt edition, which is the moſt ſcarce, was printed at Leyden in 4to, 1655: that of Paris is larger.'

[*D*] *His poem contains ſome things which Mr Baillet condemns very much.*] See what he ſays (4). 'This abbot, intending to teach men how to get fine children, has endeavoured to reduce all the precepts of his new art into four books in Latin verſe, intituled, *Callipædia*. Tho' he does not tell the public from from whence he had ſo many rarities, yet it appears, that for an abbot (5), he knew more of the matter than the moſt experienced laymen, and that he was able to teach nature itſelf. . . . . . (6). It is ſaid, that there are ſome things in it finely touched; but that it contains ſome deſcriptions concerning generation, which are very infamous, and unbecoming a man who has any ſenſe of modeſty, and that he ſeems thro' the whole work to make oſtentation of his reading of Petronius, and therefore the praiſes which Coſtar beſtowed on the *Callipædia*, in a letter to the author *, muſt be looked upon as meer compliments.'

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I have read the *Callipædia*, printed at Paris in the year 1656 (7). This is the title of it: *Cl. Quilleti Callipædia ſeu de pulchræ prolis habendæ ratione poema didacticon. Cum uno & altero* (8) *& ejuſdem Authoris carmine.* The preface mentions the things that were added to the Paris edition, which are more in number than thoſe that are left out. It is a very fine piece as to the Poetry; the reading of Lucretius appears much more in it than that of Petronius. Thoſe who told Mr Baillet that the author ſpeaks very freely of what concerns generation, were not miſtaken; but it is not true, that this is unbecoming a man who has any ſenſe of modeſty; for the abbot Quillet ſays nothing but what is to be found in ſeveral books of Phyſic written by grave authors. I do not know whether he had any other maſters; but I am ſure that the reading of the moſt ſerious writers is ſufficient to teach one all the precepts that he gives. He is called *Abbas Dudavillæus* at the end of the licence, and *Abbas D. S.* in the epiſtle dedicatory.

[*E*] *He wrote ſome other books which have not been publiſhed.*] The abbot de Marolles having mentioned (9) the *Callipædia*, and ſome other French and Latin verſes which Quillet had preſented to him, goes on thus. *He had compoſed another large poem in twelve books in Latin, intituled* Henricias, *in honour of king Henry IV, but I do not know whether that work, and his tranſlation of all the ſatires of Juvenal into French verſe, will ever appear in print; ſince editions of the beſt poems, written by the moſt excellent Poets, muſt be paid for now a days; and thoſe that have been printed, which are very many even in Latin, are ſcarce read now. I ſhall forbear making an enumeration of them; the reader would be ſurprized at it.* I believe the following paſſage of Coſtar is to be underſtood of the *Henricias*. 'I am ſorry you have taken from me the words *convoiter* [to covet] and *convoitiſe* [deſire], for I would make uſe of them very much to the purpoſe, in order to expreſs the great deſire I have to ſee the continuation of your divine Latin poem, the beginning of which you have been pleaſed to ſend me. If the remaining part is like the beginning, that poem is as much beyond the fine *Callipædia*, as the fine *Callipædia* is beyond all the works of that nature which our age has produced. What a pleaſure will it be for me, Sir, if you keep your word, and bring me four thouſand verſes as fine as thoſe which I have juſt now read (10).'

(1) Sorberiana, *at the word* Quillet, *pag. m.* 173.

(2) *Pag.* 131, 132, *Dutch edition.*

(3) *Pag.* 130, 131. *See* Coſtar's Letters, *Tom. i, p.* 176.

(4) Judgment on the Poets, *Article* 1511.

(5) According to the *Menagiana* above, citat. (3), he was not an Abbot when he wrote that poem.

(6) Baillet, ubi ſupra.

* It is the 250th letter of Coſtar's ſecond Tome, *p.* 598, 599.

(7) Mr Bourdelot has been pleaſed to ſend it me.

(8) Thoſe two poems are an Epiſtle *ad Eudoxum* in hexameter verſes, and an Elegy *in obitum Petri Gaſſendi.*

(9) In the enumeration of thoſe who preſented him with books.

(10) Coſtar, Lettre à l'Abbé Quillet: *it is the* 250*th of the ſecond Tome, pag.* 598.

QUINTUS CURTIUS RUFUS, compoſed an Hiſtory of Alexander. It is ſo fine, and ſo well written, that they are in the wrong who take it to be the work of an author of the middle age [*A*]; but there is ſome reaſon to wonder that

[*A*] *That it is the work of an author of the middle age.*] Here is a paſſage of Guy Patin. 'Are you ſure that Quintus Curtius lived under the empire of Tiberius? Some ſay it was under that of Auguſtus, by reaſon of his fine Latin ſtyle, and others place him in the reign of Veſpaſian, with ſome appearance of reaſon. I had formerly a maſter, who had a very particular opinion concerning Quintus Curtius. He ſaid, that his hiſtory was but a romance; that his ſtyle indeed was beautiful, but that there were groſs geographical miſtakes in it. . . . . The ſame maſter told us, that the author of that book was a learned Italian, who wrote it about three hundred years ago. That Quintus Curtius was never quoted by any antient author, and that it was a fictitious name. That the river Indus, the river Ganges, and ſome other parts of the Indies, are mentioned in that hiſtory, tho' they were unknown to the antients who lived before Ptolomy, who is the firſt and the oldeſt author that ſpoke of China under the name of Sinæ. . . . . This is a controverſy . . . . which I hope will be determined in the fine book of the late Mr Voſſius concerning the Latin Hiſtorians, which is now printing in Holland (1).' I ſhall make ſome animadverſions on theſe words. I, It is not true, that the Indus, the Ganges, and ſome other parts of the Indies were unknown before Ptolomy. Strabo and Pliny, who lived the one under Auguſtus, and the other, under Veſpaſian, ſpeak of thoſe two rivers; now Ptolomy lived in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. II. What ſort of argument is this? Quintus Curtius mentions ſome rivers *unknown to the Antients, who lived before Ptolomy*; therefore his Hiſtory was forged about the middle of the XIVth century. Can it be denied, that

(1) Patin, Letter XLIV, *pag.* 186, 187, of the firſt Tome.

that no body ſhould have mentioned it before the XVth century (*a*). One ought to be leſs ſurprized to find ſome incredible things in it, than not to find more of them. Nay, the author was ſo cautious as to prevent the reproach of credulity, which he had reaſon to be afraid of [*B*]. It had been better ſtill, if he had related fewer prodigies, and

that in the very age of Ptolomy one might have ſpoke of the rivers and provinces mentioned by him? III. Since Quintus Curtius did not uſe the word *Sinæ* to denote *China*, there was no reaſon to obſerve that no body had made uſe of that word before Ptolomy. Take notice that Patin's letter is dated the 15th of September, 1650; and that in a letter of the 14th of June in the ſame year, he ſpeaks like a man who had read Voſſius's book. How comes it then that he ſpeaks of it here as of a book that is in the preſs? For the reſt, Guy Patin's maſter was not miſtaken, when he ſaid that Quintus Curtius *had not been quoted by any of the Antients*. Such a ſilence cannot be ſufficiently wondered at; it is a very ſingular misfortune. That Hiſtorian has this common with ſeveral others, that we know not where he was born, nor when he lived, and that his book has been maimed and corrupted; but perhaps he is the only author of merit, who has not been quoted by any body during ſo many ages (2). Acidalius was ſomewhat angry at it. 'Illa autem, *ſays he* (3), vix omnino quemquam 'calamitas extra Curtium afflixit, ut reliquorum ſcrip'torum nemo mentionem ejus uſquam, vel uno verbo, 'certam dico mentionem, & indubitatam faciat, ad 'unum omnibus tacentibus, quaſi de compacto ut con'ſpiraſſe videantur ad ſupprimendum hominis nomen, 'ad famam prorſus opprimendam. In hoc quis non 'indoleat? quis non miretur & indignetur? - - - - - '*Scarce any author but Curtius has ever been at'tended with the misfortune of not being mentioned, 'ſo much as in a ſingle word, by other authors: I 'ſpeak of a certain and undoubted mention; all of 'them being ſilent, as if they had conſpired to ſuppreſs 'his name and quite obſcure his reputation. Who is not 'affected with grief, wonder, and indignation at this?*' Father le Tellier wonders at that ſilence, and takes it to be the reaſon why ſome have been of opinion, that this hiſtory is the work of a modern author. 'Hic 'mirari cum Acidalio licet ſingulare Curtii fatum 'quod ſcriptor Nobiliſſimus, & nihilo primis inferior, 'non ſolum communi illa temporum injuria duobus 'truncatus libris, aliis quoque locis mutilus, plurimis 'depravatus ad nos pervenerit: verum etiam, quod 'nulli forte præterea contigit, tam multis ætatibus ig'notus latuerit, ſicut ante ſeculum à Chriſto nato de'cimum nemo omnium repertus ſit qui vel per tran'ſennam Curtii hiſtorici, ſcriptæve ab illo hiſtoriæ 'mentionem injecerit. Quæ res, opinor, nonnullos 'adduxit ut ſuſpicarentur non genuinum Curtii ac 'vetuſtum, ſed ſuppoſititium recentioris cujuſquam 'ſcriptoris fœtum eſſe, qui poſt renatas litteras, felici 'veterum imitatione eximiam ſcribendi facultatem 'adeptus, opus hoc ſuum Romano ſub nomine prodire 'voluerit (4). - - - *Here let me wonder, with Acidalius, 'at the common fate of Curtius, that this moſt noble 'writer, and not inferior to the beſt, is not only come 'down to us with two books, loſt thro' the injury of 'time, maimed in other places, and in many corrupted; 'but alſo, which perhaps never happened to any other 'author, was unknown for ſo many ages, inſomuch 'that before the Xth century, from the birth of Chriſt, 'no one is found who makes the leaſt mention of the Hiſto'rian Curtius or the hiſtory written by him. This, I 'ſuppoſe, has induced ſome perſons to ſuſpect, that we 'have not the ancient and genuine work of Curtius, but 'the ſuppoſititious production of ſome modern writer, who, 'ſince the revival of learning, having acquired an excel'lent faculty of writing, by an happy imitation of the 'antients, publiſhed this work of his under the name of 'a Roman author.*' It might be inferred from theſe words, that they begun to quote that Hiſtorian in the Xth century; and yet that commentator *in uſum Delphini* names no author that mentions him before the XVth century; for Antony Panormita is the moſt ancient author that he alledges in the catalogue of the *Teſtimonia*, that concern Quintus Curtius. That catalogue is much larger in Freinſhemius; yet it contains no author that lived before Panormita (5). I do not know why the abbot de la Roque, in his Journal *des Savans* of the 18th of April, 1678, makes Father le Tellier ſay, *that Quintus Curtius has not been placed among the Hiſtorians by any author before the XVth century* (6). It is certain, that this Jeſuit does not mention the XVth century, but the Xth. I have cited his words (7). The argument he makes uſe of againſt thoſe, who pretend that this hiſtory of Alexander was forged ſince the reſtoration of learning, is not a convincing one. He ſays that Gaultier wrote a poem, intituled, *Alexandreis*, which in many places is only made up of Quintus Curtius's words put into verſe, and that this Poet lived in the XIIth century. *Quorum conjecturam vel una refellit Gualteri Belgæ Alexandreis, jam inde uſque à duodecimo æræ Chriſtianæ ſeculo condita, ux unius ſæpe Curtii vocibus in verſum redactis* (8). But it might be anſwered, that a modern author, deſigning to write a hiſtory of Alexander, and to publiſh it as the work of Quintus Curtius, made uſe of Gaultier's poem, and put into proſe all the paſſages that he liked. As for me, who cannot believe that any learned man of the XVth century has been able to write in ſo good a ſtyle, and ſo like the ancient way of writing, as that of Quintus Curtius, I need no other reaſon to convince me, that the author of that hiſtory lived before Suetonius; and therefore I approve of thoſe, who blame Angelus Decembrius for ſaying, that Quintus Curtius took many things from Arrianus (9). I know that Iſaac Pontanus, a learned man, did very much approve Decembrius's opinion; but he was not infallible. 'Nos quoque, *ſays he* (10), poſt Decembrium aliquot 'ad varios datis epiſtolis .... idem adſtruximus ac 'demonſtravimus poſt ævum Trajani & Adriani cla'ruiſſe, & Taciti inſuper maximi Authoris imitatorem 'eſſe, ejuſque non ſemel verba ac dictionem expreſ'ſiſſe, & uſum ſubinde iis vocibus quæ non niſi ab au'thoribus ejus ævi uſurpantur. - - - - *I alſo, after De'cembrius, have confirmed and demonſtrated the ſame 'thing in ſome letters to different perſons; namely, that 'he flouriſhed after the time of Trajan and Adrian, 'and that he imitated that great author Tacitus, and 'often made uſe of his very words and phraſes, as alſo 'ſuch words as were uſed only by the authors who lived 'at that time.*' This is ſaying poſitively, that Quintus Curtius flouriſhed after the emperor Hadrian: How comes it then that in two other letters (11), he endeavours to ſhew that the paſſages of that author, which ſome apply to Auguſtus, and others to Claudius and Veſpaſian, ought be underſtood of Trajan?

I ſhall conclude this remark with a paſſage of Vigneul-Marville. 'Some Critics, *ſays he* (12), are of 'opinion, that the name Quintus Curtius was forged 'by an Italian wit, who compoſed that Hiſtory, or 'Romance, about three hundred years ago. I do not 'know what proof they have for it; the truth is, 'that none of the ancients mention him: But grant'ing this to be true, is it not a wonderful thing, that 'a man, who was a good Latin writer, and who had 'writ a book, that was able to immortalize his 'name, if he had made himſelf known, ſhould have 'been willing to ſacrifice his glory to that of an ima'ginary Quintus Curtius, who could not enjoy it? A 'learned man would formerly make me believe, that 'the name of that author, who was an Italian, is to 'be found latinized in that of Quintus Curtius. It 'may be ſo, but who will explain that emblem? It is 'too late now to do it.'

[*B*] *He was ſo cautious as to prevent the reproach of credulity, which he had reaſon to be afraid of.*] I take this from la Mothe le Vayer in his Judgment concerning the principal Hiſtorians, page 204 of the third tome of his works in 12mo. He ſays that *Arrianus is one of the moſt cautious Hiſtorians in relating prodigies*; but that Quintus Curtius 'is more cautious ſtill. 'We need no other proof for it, than what they ſay 'of one or two miraculous fountains, which ſprung 'up as ſoon as Alexander had encamped near the 'river Oxus. Arrianus tells us, that one was a foun'tain of oil, and the other of clear water, without 'raiſing any ſcruple about the truth of ſuch a ſtory 'in the minds of his readers. Quintus Curtius †, 'who ſays nothing of the ſpring of oil, relates, that 'as they were digging ſome wells, they found a

---

(*a*) See in the remark [*A*], Father le Tellier's words, and the reflexion I made upon them.

(2) This is more than what I have ſaid of PATERCULUS (ſee, above, the remark [*B*], of the article PHÆDRUS), and of QUINTUS CALABER, in his article, citation (7).

(3) Valens Acidalius, Animadv. ad lib. iv, Curtii.

(4) Michael le Tellier, in Præfat. ad Q. Curtium, in uſum Delphini.

(5) By a letter of Mr de la Croſe from Berlin I learn, that *Johannes Sariſburienſis*, in the XIIth century; and *Michael Scot, in Menſa Philoſophica*, in the XIIIth century, have cited *Quintus Curtius.*

(6) The Abbot de la Roque, having ſaid what I have quoted, and ſome other things, goes on thus, *After this remark, Father le Tellier examines, &c.* Which ſhews that he imputes to him all that he had been ſaying.

(7) Obſerve, that the *Journal de Trevoux*, May 1705, p. 811, ſays, that there is an error of the preſs in this paſſage of Father Tellier, and that it ought to be read *ante Seculum à Chriſto nato quintum decimum.*

(8) Michael le Tellier, ubi ſupra.

(9) Græcorum & Arriani conſtat Hiſtoria, ex quorum fontibus hic ſcriptor . . . opus ſuum excudit. *Ang. Decembrius, de Politia Literaria.*

(10) Joh. Iſacius Pontanus, Epiſt. ad Wicquefortium. *It is the LXXVth of thoſe that Mr Matthæus publiſhed at Leyden in the year* 1695.

(11) Written to Voſſius, viz. the LXXXVIIth and XCVIIth of the ſame collection of Mr Matthæus.

(12) Vigneul Marville, Mêlang. *Tom. ii, pag.* 302, *Dutch Edit.*

† *Lib. vii.*

and if he had oftener intimated that he did not believe all the ſtories which he relates. I have ſaid in another place (*b*) that the reading of his book recovered a king of Naples, from his illneſs. We have an excellent French tranſlation of his work (*c*). The learned Freinſhemius wrote a fine commentary upon that Hiſtorian, and a ſupplement to the two firſt books, and to ſome other places that are loſt. Father Michael le Tellier, a Jeſuit, ſhews in his preface (*d*) that it is more likely he lived in the reign of the emperor Claudius than in that of Veſpaſian. In taking notice of Moreri's miſtakes, I ſhall have occaſion to mention ſome other things [*C*]. Cardinal du Perron was too great an admirer of Quintus Curtius [*D*].

Nothing can more effectually bring a man off from the exceſſive admiration he might have for him, than the remarks publiſhed by Mr le Clerc, intituled, *Judicium de Quinto Curtio.* They are at the end of his book *de Arte Critica*, and they do manifeſtly ſhew ſeveral great faults of that famous Hiſtorian, his ignorance of Aſtronomy and Geography, his contradictions, his wrong deſcriptions, his ill taſte in the choice of matter, his careleſſneſs in dating the events, &c. The greateſt part of thoſe faults might be found in moſt ancient Hiſtorians, if one would take the pains, or was ſufficiently qualified to criticize them ſeverely. I do not know but it might be ſaid, that his ignorance of certain things, is a proof that he did not live in theſe later times; for if a man of the XIVth or XVth century had been able to write that Hiſtory of Alexander, he muſt have had more talents than were neceſſary to compoſe

‘ ſpring in the king's tent, which having not been obſerved before late, occaſioned a report that it was a new one: Alexander himſelf being glad that people ſhould believe it was a divine favour, and a gift from Heaven (13). That I may clearly ſhew with what circumſpection that Hiſtorian uſed to relate things, the truth of which might be queſtioned, I ſhall ſet down the words which follow the account he gives of a dog in the kingdom of Sophita, that ſuffered all his limbs to be cut to pieces, rather than to let go his hold of a lion. ‘ Equidem, *ſays he* ‡, plura tranſcribo, quàm credo. Nam nec affirmare ſuſtineo de quibus dubito, nec ſubducere quæ accepi. - - - *In truth I tranſcribe more than I believe. For I neither can affirm what I doubt of, nor ſuppreſs what I have received from others.* Theſe words muſt be applied to that paſſage of the ſame book, wherein it is ſaid, that during Ptolomy's ſickneſs, a ſerpent ſhewed Alexander in his ſoundeſt ſleep the herb that would cure him. For when an Hiſtorian makes it appear that he does not deſign to impoſe upon the credulity of his readers, he may write any thing, as I have already ſaid, ſpeaking of Livy.’

[*C*] *In taking notice of Moreri's miſtakes, I ſhall have occaſion to mention ſome other things.*] I. He had no good reaſon to repreſent Quintus Curtius as a Roman knight. That title is not given to Quintus Curtius mentioned by Cicero, nor to Curtius Rufus mentioned by Tacitus, nor to Quintus Curtius Rufus ſpoken of by Suetonius, who are three perſons, one of whom was our Hiſtorian, as ſome learned men will have it. II. The excellency of his ſtyle is not a good reaſon to doubt *whether he is not more ancient than Titus Livius*; on the contrary, it may move one to think that he did not live before Livy, but at the ſame time. It is an eaſier thing to find a harſh ſtyle beyond Livy's time, than in the age wherein he lived. Is it not the golden age of the Latin ſtyle? III. It is not true, that Quintus Curtius, in the tenth book, or elſewhere, makes *a digreſſion about the facility of his age.* Moreri ſhould have ſaid *about the felicity.* I take notice of this only to ſhew his careleſſneſs: he tranſcribed without any judgment even the errors of the preſs. This had crept into a paſſage of la Mothe le Vayer (14), and he faithfully tranſcribed it, though it was an eaſy thing to perceive how it was to be mended. IV. Suetonius does not ſay that Quintus Curtius Rufus, *a great Rhetor*, lived in Tiberius's time. What he ſaid concerning that Rhetor is not extant, and it is only by a liſt which was found in a manuſcript that we came to know that he ſpoke of him. Perhaps Voſſius is not miſtaken in conjecturing, from the age of thoſe who precede and follow that Rhetor in that liſt, that he lived in Tiberius's time (15); but this does not prove that Suetonius placed him in the reign of that emperor. V. Moreri ſhould not have aſſerted that Quintus Curtius Rufus, mentioned by Suetonius, is the ſame Curtius Rufus ſpoken of by Tacitus (16). The latter was the ſon of a gladiator, and attained to the conſulſhip, without having taught Rhetoric (17). VI. Moreri is very much in the wrong *to wonder that Quintilian, who mentions all the conſiderable Hiſtorians in the tenth book of his Inſtitutions, written under the empire of Domitian, ſhould ſay nothing of Quintus Curtius's Hiſtory.* What Moreri aſcribes to Quintilian is falſe; he ſpeaks but of four Hiſtorians at moſt, and therefore his ſilence is of no uſe to thoſe who alledge it as a proof, that Quintus Curtius had not then publiſhed his book. ‘ Quod argumentum . . . . validius ſemper mihi viſum eſt, quam quod à Quintiliani ſilentio petunt adverſarii. Quaſi vero hiſtoricorum catalogum Fabius texuerit, qui quatuor admodum ex iis appellavit: ſuperſtites autem, in quibus eſſe potuit Curtius conſulto prætermiſerit (18). - - - - - *Which argument . . . . always appeared to me of more force than that which our adverſaries borrow from the ſilence of Quintilian. As though Quintilian had drawn up a catalogue of Hiſtorians, who has named but four of them at moſt: he deſignedly paſſed over thoſe that were ſtill extant, among which Curtius might be.*’ VII. We may therefore reckon as a new fault what is ſaid in theſe words, *which* (19) *cannot be excuſed but by ſuppoſing that this work had not yet been publiſhed in his time.* All theſe faults are to be found in la Mothe le Vayer (20). VIII. Raderus did not write a ſupplement to Quintus Curtius, but a commentary. I ſhall ſay nothing of Moreri's wrong quotations (21). I muſt obſerve, by the by, that the ſupplements of Chriſtopher Bruno came out in the year 1545. That author taught Philological learning at Munich, and dedicated his Quintus Curtius to the duke of Bavaria. Poſſevin (22), and James Gourdon (23) affirm, that Quintianus Stoa had ſupplied what is wanting in Quintus Curtius; but Freinſhemius never ſaw that ſupplement (24). Others maintain, that Quintianus Stoa made none (25). I add what Colomiés obſerves about the edition of Quintus Curtius, *Lugduni apud Paulum Frellon*, 1615, in 12mo. ‘ That edition, ſays he, (26) Which is little known, has this peculiar to it; that beſides the common ſupplements aſcribed to Chriſtopher Bruno, a monk of Bavaria, it contains ſome others tranſcribed from a manuſcript of the library of St Victor, by John Maſſon, archdeacon of Bayeux, brother to Papyrius Maſſon, who is well known to the learned. Thoſe ſupplements, the author whereof could not be found out by the two Maſſons, were written by Francis Petrarch, if we believe Scaliger in the ſecond *Scaligerana*: *In Bibliotheca S. Victoris*, ſays he, *primus liber Q. Curtii erat, ſed deprehendi eſſe compoſitum à Petrarcha.*’ I further add, that Vaſſan writ one day to Goldaſtus, that the firſt book of Quintus Curtius would quickly be publiſhed. *Eſt in manibus, Pap. Maſſonii liber ille* 1. *Quinti Curtii hactenus deſideratus, quem ubi primum publicaverit tibi exhibebo* (27).

[*D*] *Cardinal du Perron was too great an admirer of Quintus Curtius.*] ‘ One page of Quintus Curtius is worth thirty of Tacitus. . . . . Quintus Curtius is the beſt Latin author; he is ſo polite, and ſo neat; and what is admirable, is, that notwithſtanding his ſubtilties he is clear, eaſy, and intelligible. I place

‘ Florus

(*b*) Citation (11), of the article NAPLES (ALPHONSUS I, king of).

(*c*) Made by Vaugelas.

(*d*) Ad Q. Curtium, in uſum Delphini.

(13) *Compare this with the article PHASELIS, remark* [*B*]. *The words of* Quintus Curtius, *lib. vii, cap. x, n.* 14, *are remarkable.* In ipſo tabernaculo regis conſpectus eſt fons quem quia tarde notaverant ſubito extitiſſe finxerunt, rexque ipſe credi voluit donum Dei id fuiſſe.

‡ *Lib. ix.*

(14) It is in my edition in 12mo, of la Mothe le Vayer's works, Paris 1681, pag. 197, of the 3d Tome.

(15) Voſſius, de Hiſt. Latin. *pag.* 152.

(16) Tacitus, Annal. *lib. xi.*

(17) Before he was promoted to any dignity he was in the ſervice of the governor of Africa. *Tenuis adhuc & obſcurus obtinenti Africam comes hæſerat.* Plin. Epiſt. xxvii, lib. vii.

(18) Mich. le Tellier, ubi ſupra.

(19) That is, Quintilian's ſilence.

(20) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 197, 198.

(21) Moreri quotes Pliny, *Epiſt. VII*, it ſhould be *Epiſt. XXVII*, and Voſſius, *lib. ii*, it ſhould be *lib. i.*

(22) In Biblioth. Selecta.

(23) In Chronol. *cap. xx, num.* 31, apud Freinſhem. Proleg. *cap. iii.*

(24) Freinſhem. ibid.

(25) La Mothe le Vayer, ubi ſupra, *p.* 199.

(26) Colomiés, Biblioth. choiſie, *p.* 184, 185.

(27) See the 31ſt letter in the collection of the letters written to Goldaſtus, and publiſhed in 1688.

poſe it in the firſt century: he muſt have had eminent qualities, and have ſpent his life in ſtudy. Could ſuch a man be ignorant of what every body knew then, that the moon is not eclipſed both when it is new and full? But this is one inſtance of Quintus Curtius's ignorance (*e*).

(*e*) Lunam deficere cum aut terram ſubiret aut ſole premeretur. *Q. Curtius, lib. iv, cap. x.*

'Florus next to him, he is ſo florid, and ſo elegant. 'Mr Des Portes, who was an excellent judge of ſtyle, 'gave the firſt rank to Quintus Curtius (28).' I had rather praiſe that Hiſtorian with ſome reſtriction, as Famianus Strada did. 'At Q. Curtio, *ſays he* (29), 'quamquam iis virtutibus exornato, quibus conſtat aut 'heroicis eum temporibus vixiſſe, aut dignum fuiſſe 'qui viveret, non defuêre, qui objicerent quæſiti in'terdum medicamenta candoris, & numerorum uſum 'paulo intemperantiorem. - - - *As for Quintus Curtius, 'though he was adorned with thoſe virtues, which make 'it appear either that he lived, or deſerved to have 'lived, in the heroical times, ſome objected to him the 'want of candor, and too free a uſe of numbers.*' Balzac (30) taxes a modern author with the ſame fault, and uſes the very ſame words of that Jeſuit. I mention this by the by, to diſcover a ſmall piece of Plagiariſm.

(28) Perroniana, *at the word* Stiles, *pag. m.* 307.

(29) Famian. Strada, Proluſion. Academ. *lib. ii*, Proluſ. III, *pag. m.* 266.

(30) In a Latin letter to Mr Silhon, *pag. m.* 194.

QUINTILIAN (MARCUS FABIUS) was born at Calagurris in Spain (*a*). It is ſaid, that he was brought to Rome by Galba (*b*), and it is certain that he taught Rhetoric in that city with great reputation. He was the firſt who taught it there publickly at the charge of the government (*c*). He was diſcharged from that laborious profeſſion, after he had exerciſed it for the ſpace of twenty years (*d*). He had ſeveral domeſtic afflictions, which had like to have overcome his conſtancy, and which made him complain of his cruel fate [*A*]. He lamented above all things the death of a ſon of ten years of age, who was an extraordinary promiſing child (*e*). He was not contented to give rules to ſpeak well; but he alſo ſhewed his eloquence at the bar: he pleaded for queen Berenice in her preſence (*f*), and was accounted ſo good an advocate, that ſome perſons writ down his pleadings to ſell them to the Bookſellers [*B*]. Some

(*a*) Adſerat uſque licet Fabium Calagurris alumnum. *Auſonius, in Profeſſoribus, pag. m.* 145. That town ſtands upon the Ebro, and is now called Calahorra.

(*b*) Chronic. Euſebii ſub Olymp. CCXI, *pag. m.* 162. See the remark [*E*].

(*c*) Ibid. ſub Olymp. CCXVI, *pag.* 164.

(*d*) Poſt impetratam ſtudiis meis quietem quæ per viginti annos erudiendis juvenibus impenderam. *Quintil. Præf. lib. i.*

(*e*) See the remark [*A*].

(*f*) Quintilian. *lib. iv, cap. i, pag. m.* 168.

[*A*] *He had ſeveral domeſtic afflictions, which . . . . made him complain of his cruel fate.*] The death of his wife, who was but nineteen years of age, made him inconſolable. He praiſes her very much. 'Omni 'virtute quæ in fœminas cadit functa, inſanabilem at'tulit marito dolorem . . . . illi dolori quem ex matre 'optima atque laudem omnem ſupergreſſa, paucos ante 'menſes ceperam gratulor (1). - - - *She being a wo'man adorned with every virtue proper to her ſex, her 'huſband was inconſolable for the loſs of her. . . . . I 'am pleaſed with that grief, which I felt ſome months 'before, for the beſt of mothers.*' She left him two ſons, whereof one died at five years of age, and the other at ten. The latter was the eldeſt, and had extraordinary gifts: beſides fortune begun already to put him in the way to dignities; a man who had been conſul had adopted him; and another, who was prætor, and his uncle by his mother's ſide, deſigned to make him his ſon-in-law. *Tene conſulari nuper adoptione ad omnium ſpes bonorum patris admotum, te avunculo prætori generum deſtinatum, te omnium ſpe Atticæ eloquentiæ candidatum ſuperſtes parens tantum ad pœnas amiſi?* Quintilian's affliction for ſo many loſſes was very great; he reſolved to leave off writing, and to throw into the fire what he had already compoſed; he was afraid of being taxed with little affection and tenderneſs, if he ſhould make uſe of his tongue to any other purpoſe, than to inveigh againſt Heaven. He did not forget to ſay, that there is a malicious and jealous Being, who will not ſuffer children that promiſe great things to live long. I muſt ſet down his own words, that the reader may ſee how far the wiſeſt Heathens let looſe their impatience. 'Tunc 'igitur optimum fuit, infauſtum opus, & quicquid 'hoc eſt in me infelicium literarum, ſuper immaturum 'funus conſumpturis viſcera mea flammis injicere, ne'que hanc impiam vivacitatem novis inſuper curis fa'tigare. Quis enim mihi bonus parens ignoſcat, ſi 'ſtudere amplius poſſum? ac non oderit hanc animi 'mei firmitatem, ſi quis in me eſt alius uſus vocis, 'quàm, ut incuſem deos, ſuperſtes omnium meorum? 'nullam terras deſpicere providentiam teſter? ſi non 'meo caſu, cui tamen nihil objici, niſi quod vivam, 'poteſt: at illorum certè, quos utique immeritos mors 'acerba damnavit (2). . . . . Juro per mala mea, per 'infelicem conſcientiam, per illos manes numina dolo'ris mei; has me in illo vidiſſe virtutes ingenii, non 'modò ad perſpiciendas diſciplinas, quo nihil præ'ſtantius cognovi, plurima expertus, ſtudiique jam 'tum non coacti, (ſciunt præceptores,) ſed probitatis, 'pietatis, humanitatis, liberalitatis; ut prorſus poſſit 'hinc eſſe tanti fulminis metus; quòd obſervatum ferè 'eſt, celerius occidere feſtinatam maturitatem; & eſſe 'neſcio quam, quæ ſpes tantas decerpat, invidiam; 'ne videlicet ultra quàm homini datum eſt, noſtra 'provehantur (3). - - - *Then it had been beſt to have 'thrown into the flames, which were about to conſume 'my own bowels, all the unhappy learning I am maſter 'of, and no longer to fatigue myſelf with new ſtudies. 'For what good parent can forgive me, if I go on with 'my ſtudies; and will not rather abhor my reſolution, 'if I make any other uſe of words, than to accuſe the 'gods for ſuffering me to ſurvive my whole family, and 'deny that there is any providence; if not upon my own 'account, to whom nothing can be objected, but that I 'am ſtill alive, yet certainly upon the account of thoſe, 'who, without deſerving it, have been ſnatched away by 'an untimely death. . . . . I ſwear by my misfortunes, by 'my unhappy reflexions, by thoſe ſhades the deities of my 'grief, that I diſcovered in him not only a readineſs to 'receive inſtruction, in which he excelled all I have 'ever met with, but alſo the virtues of probity, piety, 'humanity, and liberality; inſomuch that the fear of 'this terrible ſtroke might proceed from this, that what'ever is early ripe is ſooneſt blaſted, and that there is a 'kind of envy, which deſtroys ſo great hopes, leſt we 'ſhould exceed the limits preſcribed to man.*' Nevertheleſs he changed his mind as to his work; he went on with it, and finiſhed it.

(1) Quintil. Præfat. *lib. vi, p. m.* 267.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ib. *p.* 268.

[*B*] *Some perſons writ down his pleadings, to ſell them to the Bookſellers.*' There were at that time ſome men at Rome, who could write a whole ſpeech in Shorthand, though the Orator ſpoke never ſo faſt. That art is, at preſent, better known and practiſed in England than in any other country. Thoſe who took the pains to write in that manner what they heard at the bar, did not always do it out of curioſity, but ſometimes out of avarice. They were willing to get ſome good pieces to ſell them to the Bookſellers. The authors were ſometimes the worſe for it; for they ſaw, that the writer had forgot ſome good things, and the works, that were thus handed about under their names, were but imperfect pieces. This was our Quintilian's caſe, as he himſelf tells us, having mentioned a plea, which a youthful ambition prompted him to impart to the public. 'Id eſt in cauſa Nævii Apruniani ſo'lùm quæſitum, præcipitatane eſſet ab eo uxor; an ſe 'ipſa ſua ſponte jeciſſet. Quam actionem equidem 'ſolam in hoc tempus emiſeram, quod me ipſum fe'ciſſe ſeductum juvenili cupiditate gloriæ fateor. Nam 'cæteræ, quæ ſub nomine meo feruntur, negligentia 'excipientium in quæſtum notariorum corruptæ, mi'nimam partem mei habent (4). - - - *This was the on'ly queſtion in the cauſe of Nævius Aprunianus, whether 'he threw his wife down the precipice, or ſhe threw 'herſelf down. This is the only pleading I have hitherto 'made public, which I confeſs I did out of a youthful 'deſire of glory. For the reſt, which go under my name, 'being*

(4) Quintil. *lib. vii, cap. xi, p. m.* 321, 322.

Some are of opinion, that he was made conſul [*C*]: it is more certain, that he was preceptor to the grand-ſons of Domitian's ſiſter [*D*]. It is not certainly known whether

‘ *being corrupted through the negligence of thoſe who took* ‘ *them in writing, in order to get money by them, con*‘ *tain very little of mine.*’

[*C*] *Some are of opinion that he was made conſul.*] They ground their opinion upon theſe words of Auſonius. ‘ Quintilianus conſularia per Clementem orna‘ menta ſortitus, honeſtamenta nominis potius videtur ‘ quam inſignia poteſtatis habuiſſe (5). - - - *Quintilian,* ‘ *having obtained the conſular ornaments by the favour* ‘ *of Clement, ſeems rather to have had the honour of the* ‘ *name than the marks of the power.*’ Vinetus on theſe words ſays, that Marcus Arricinius Clemens, and Titus Flavius Clemens having been for ſome time very much in Domitian's favour, loſt it to ſuch a degree, that he cauſed them to be put to death. He does not know which of thoſe two Clements procured Quintilian the honour ſpoken of by Auſonius; but, ſays he, it was not the ordinary conſulſhip; for the *Faſti* make no mention of it, and therefore it was but a ſubrogated conſulſhip (6), Vinetus might have conjectured, that it was Flavius Clemens, as it will appear hereafter. The paſſage of Auſonius is confirmed by theſe verſes of Juvenal:

- - - - - - - - - - - Unde igitur tot
Quintilianus habet ſaltus? exempla novorum
Fatorum tranſi: felix, & pulcher, & acer,
Felix, & ſapiens, & nobilis, & generoſus
Appoſitam nigræ lunam ſubtexit alutæ:
Felix, orator quoque maximus & jaculator,
Et ſi perfrixit, cantat bene, diſtat enim, quæ
Sidera te excipiant modo primos incipientem
Edere vagitus, & adhuc à matre rubentem.
Si fortuna volet, fies de rhetore conſul,
Si volet hæc eadem, fies de conſule rhetor (7).

Amidſt this waſtful riot, there accrues
But poor ten ſhillings for Quintilian's dues:
For to breed up the ſon to common ſenſe,
Is ever more the parents leaſt expence.
From whence then comes Quintilian's vaſt eſtate?
Becauſe he was the darling ſon of fate;
And luck, in ſcorn of merit, made him great.
Urge not th' example of one ſingle man,
As rare as a white crow, or ſable ſwan.
Quintilian's fate was to be counted wiſe,
Rich, noble, fair, and in the ſtate to riſe:
Good fortune grac'd his action, and his tongue;
His colds became him, and when hoarſe he ſung.
O, there's ſtrange difference, what planets ſhed
Their influence on the new-born infant's head!
'Tis fate that flings the dice; and as ſhe flings
Of kings makes pedants and of pedants kings.

DRYDEN.

We learn at leaſt from this paſſage, that Quintilian got riches and honours; but Juvenal intimates, that fortune contributed to it as much, or more than his merit. If the thirty-ſecond letter of the ſixth book of Pliny was written to our Quintilian, there is no reaſon to think that Juvenal was in the right, when he repreſented that teacher of Rhetoric as an opulent man. Pliny ſays, that the perſon to whom he writes, had no great eſtate (8), he does not believe him able to equip his daughter as ſhe ſhould be, ſince ſhe was to be married to a man of note, and therefore preſents her with a conſiderable ſum (9), that ſhe may go to her huſband in a good equipage. ‘ Cum tamen ſit nup‘ tura honeſtiſſimo viro, Nonio Celeri, cui ratio civi‘ lium officiorum neceſſitatem quandam nitoris imponit, ‘ debet ſecundum conditiones mariti, veſte, comitatu ‘ augeri: quibus non quidem augetur dignitas, orna‘ natur tamen, & inſtitutum (10). - - - - *But being to be* ‘ *married to a man of diſtinction, Nonius Celer, whoſe* ‘ *civil employments lay him under a neceſſity of making* ‘ *ſome figure, ſhe ought to have cloaths and ſervants an*‘ *ſwerable to the dignity of her huſband: theſe things do* ‘ *not, indeed, add to a man's worth, but they ſet it off,* ‘ *and adorn it.*’ It might be ſaid, that the father of that maid is not our Quintilian; for, it ſeems, that Pliny would have mentioned the advantage of having been his diſciple, if he had writ to his profeſſor. Beſides, it might be ſaid, that Quintilian having loſt his wife, and two ſons, repreſents himſelf as a man whom the gods had deprived of all his family (11). Nay, he ſays that his wife died at nineteen years of age, and left him two ſons (12). Would he have expreſſed himſelf thus, if he had alſo a daughter by her? But theſe reaſons are not demonſtrative. Perhaps Quintilian married a ſecond wife, and had by her the daughter that Pliny ſpeaks of. Perhaps his eſtate decreaſed after the VIIth ſatire of Juvenal. Beſides, that Poet might look upon him as a rich man, if compared with the other Rhetors; and Pliny might think that he had but an indifferent eſtate with reſpect to the family, into which young Quintiliana was going to be married. Note, that it is certain he had been one of Quintilian's ſcholars (13), but he might very well write to him without mentioning ſuch a thing.

[*D*] *He was preceptor to the grand-ſons of Domitian's ſiſter.*] He ſays ſo himſelf; *Cum mihi Domitianus Auguſtus ſororis ſuæ nepotum delegaverit curam, non ſatis honorem judiciorum cæleſtium intelligam, niſi ex hoc quoque oneris magnitudinem metiar* (14). Moreri does not tranſlate theſe words right, when he ſays that Domitian *intruſted Quintilian with the education of his nephews.* Barthius would be guilty of the ſame fault, if by the word *nepotes* he did not underſtand *grand-ſons*, as it is very likely he does (15). Neverthele*ſ*s he is miſtaken. He, who wrote the contents of the chapters of Quintilian, ſays that this Rhetorician taught the ſons of Domitian's ſiſter; which is pretending to know more of the matter than Quintilian himſelf: but, will ſome ſay, where ſhall we find thoſe grand-ſons of Domitian's ſiſter? I anſwer, that it is very likely they were the two ſons of Flavius Clemens, couſin-german to that prince. He deſigned them publickly to be his ſucceſſors from their infancy, and gave one of them the name of Veſpaſian, and the other that of Domitian (16). It is therefore probable, that he gave them the beſt maſter that was then at Rome, I mean Quintilian. If it be objected to me, that Flavius Clemens marrried Domitian's ſiſter, and conſequently that his ſons were not the grand-ſons of that emperor's ſiſter: if Philoſtratus be alledged againſt me, who ſays that the wife of Flavius Clemens was Domitian's ſiſter (17): I anſwer, that Philoſtratus is leſs to be credited than Dion, who only ſays, that ſhe was related to that prince. Τὸν Φάβιον Κλήμεντα ὑπατεύοντα καίπερ ἀνεψιὸν ὄντα καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ αὐτὴν συγγενῆ ἑαυτοῦ Φλαβίαν Δομιτίλλαν ἔχοντα κατέσφαξεν ὁ Δομιτιανός. Fabium Clementem conſulem (etſi patruelis ejus erat & Flaviam Domitillam Domitiani conſanguineam uxorem habebat) morte affecit (18) . - - - *He put to death Fabius Clement the conſul, tho' he was related to him, and had married Flavia Domitilla, ſiſter of Domitian.* Moreover, I ſay that Domitilla, Domitian's ſiſter, was not alive when Flavius Clemens was put to death; and yet Philoſtratus tells us, that the wife of that Flavius was baniſhed after the death of her huſband. He is therefore miſtaken, when he ſays ſhe was Domitian's ſiſter. We read in Suetonius that Veſpaſian had but three children by his wife Flavia Domitilla, *viz.* Titus Domitian and Domitilla, and that he loſt his wife and daughter before he was emperor (19). I ſuppoſe that Domitilla, Veſpaſian's daughter, left a daughter who was married to Flavius Clemens. According to this ſuppoſition, the ſons of Flavius Clemens, who had Quintilian for their tutor, are the grand-ſons of Domitian's ſiſter, as Quintilian ſays in expreſs words. The time that paſſed between the death of Domitilla, and the empire of Domitian, was long enough to maintain, that the grand-ſons of Domitilla were of a ſufficient age to be taught by Quintilian under that reign; for I may very well be allowed to ſay, that Veſpaſian loſt his daughter a long time before he came to be an emperor, which happened when he was ſixty years of age. The inſcription, *Flavia Domitilla Imp. Cæſaris Neptis* (20) ought to be underſtood whether he was the ſon, or the grand-ſon of the Orator mentioned by Seneca the father [*E*]. Several Critics aſcribe to this Orator the declamations publiſhed by Ugolinus Parmenſis, and afterwards by Petrus Pithœus [*F*]; but the *Inſtitutiones Oratoriæ* are by every body looked upon as a work of our Quintilian. Poggius found out the manuſcript in a manner that is worth relating [*G*]. It would have been a great loſs to the commonwealth

---

(5) Auſonius, in Gratiar. Actione, *pag. m.* 712, 713.

(6) Vinet. in Auſon. *p.* 713.

(7) Juven. Sat. VII, ver. 188.

(8) Te porro animo beatiſſimum modicum facultatibus ſcio. *Plin. Epiſt. XXXII, lib. vi, pag. m.* 400.

(9) Tanquam parens alter puellæ noſtræ confero quinquaginta millia nummûm. *Ibid.*

(10) Ibid.

(11) Quintil. Præfat. *lib. vi,* Inſtitut. Orat.

(12) Nondum expleto ætatis undevicesimo anno duos enixa filios. *Ibid.*

(13) Plin. Epiſt. XIV, lib. ii, & Epiſt. VI, lib. vi.

(14) Quintilian. Præfat. *lib. iv,* Inſtitut. Orat.

(15) Sic Domitianum adulatur Quintilianus curæ Nepotum ejus admotus. *Barthius, in Statium, Tom. iii, pag.* 1592.

(16) Sueton. in Domit. *cap. xv.*

(17) Ἔτυχε μὲν γὰρ Κλήμεντα ἀπεκτονὼς . . . ᾧ τὴν ἀδελφὴν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐδεδώκει. Cum Clementem . . . cui ſororem ſuam nuptum dederat occidiſſet. *Philoſtr. in Vita Apollonii, lib. viii.*

(18) Xiphil. in Domitiano, *pag. m.* 236.

(19) Sueton. in Veſpaſ. *cap. iii.*

(20) It is in Gruterus, *pag.* 355.

ſtood, as Triſtan obſerves, not of a daughter of Veſpaſian, but of a daughter of Domitilla, Titus's ſiſter. Laſtly, I ſay that he, who beſtowed the conſulſhip upon Quintilian, was called Clemens: but he did it to reward Quintilian for his tutor-ſhip, which appears from Auſonius's deſign in mentioning this. Therefore either the father of Quintilian's pupils, or one of thoſe pupils, muſt needs have beſtowed that reward upon him ; from whence I conclude, that the pupils of that Rhetorician were the ſons of Flavius Clemens, and conſequently that this Flavius was married to a daughter of Domitian's ſiſter. I wonder that neither Caſaubon (21), nor Marcilius (22), who criticized him, took any notice of Philoſtratus's miſtake ; both of them approve what he ſays, that the wife of Flavius Clemens was Veſpaſian's daughter, and that ſhe was alive when that Flavius was killed. This is plainly contradicted by Suetonius (23).

[*E*] *It is not certainly known whether he was the ſon or the grand-ſon of the Orator mentioned by Seneca.*] That Orator muſt have lived under Auguſtus ; for Seneca, the father, ſpeaks of him as of a man, who was already dead, and whoſe reputation was extinct (24). But Quintilian was very young, when Domitius Afer, who died under Nero, was already an old man (25) : It is therefore an unreaſonable thing to make him the ſon of a man, who flouriſhed in the reign of Auguſtus. It were better to ſay, that he was his grand-ſon ; but perhaps it might be objected, that he has mentioned his father as an Orator (26), without ever ſpeaking one word of his grand-father. There are ſome good critics (27), who do not aſcribe the declamations publiſhed by Pithœus to the grand-father of Quintilian, nor to his father. Thoſe declamations, ſay they, do not ſavour of the age of Auguſtus ; and it is not at all likely, that the productions of Quintilian, mentioned by Seneca, ſhould be ſtill extant, when other works of the ſame time, and much more elaborate, have been loſt. They obſerve that, according to Seneca, the reputation of the Orator Quintilian died with him (28). If they infer from thence, that he publiſhed no books, they do not argue right ; for there are many authors, whoſe glory dies before them, or, at leaſt, with them. I muſt not forget to make this following obſervation : Quintilian's father pleaded ſome cauſes, and therefore he lived at Rome, ſay ſome ; why then is it ſaid in Euſebius's chronicle, that Galba brought him to Rome from Spain ? Was it an uſual thing for a man ſettled at Rome to leave his children in a province ? Mr de Tillemont (29) ſhews, that this is not a convincing objection ; but, nevertheleſs, he acknowledges the miſtake of Euſebius's chronicle. He ſhews,that it is not true, that Galba brought Quintilian to Rome in the year 69, and he alledges this reaſon for it, *viz.* that Quintilian heard Domitius Afer at Rome, who died in the year 59. Note, that Mr de Tillemont's argument is not very good ; for he quotes a paſſage, which imports, not that Quintilian heard Domitius Afer plead, but that a certain plea of that Orator was very much eſteemed (30). He ſhould have quoted another paſſage (31). He will not have Martial's omiſſion to be urged, and I confeſs it cannot be looked upon as a demonſtrative proof ; however, it affords a very ſtrong objection againſt thoſe, who ſay, that Quintilian was a Spaniard. Martial took great delight in mentioning the illuſtrious men of Spain, and in obſerving that they were born in Spain. Would he have forgot to make the ſame obſervation concerning ſo famous a man as Quintilian was ? Would he have expreſſed himſelf ſo as to make one believe that Quintilian was born at Rome, rather than that he was not ?

Quintiliane vagæ moderator ſumme juventæ,
Gloria Romanæ Quintiliane togæ (32).

Quintilian, youths ſupreme director grown,
Quintilian, glory of the Roman gown.

Let the readers judge of it : but I muſt obſerve, that this paſſage of Martial does not prove that Quintilian was a native of Rome ; and that thoſe, who inferred from a paſſage of Trebellius Pollio that he was a citizen of Rome (33), reaſoned wrong : ‘ Fuit autem, *viz. Poſthumius the younger*, (quod ſolum memoratu dignum eſt) ita in declamationibus diſertus, ut ejus controverſiæ Quintiliano dicantur inſertæ, quem declamatorem Romani generis acutiſſimum, vel unius capitis lectio prima ſtatim fronte demonſtrat. (34) - - *He was ſo eloquent an Orator (which alone deſerves to be remembered) that his controverſies are ſaid to have been inſerted by Quintilian, who was the moſt ſubtle declaimer of all the Romans, as the reading of one ſingle chapter preſently demonſtrates.*’ Theſe words of Trebellius Pollio ſignify only, that Quintilian was a Latin Rhetor. He is there mentioned not in oppoſition to the provincial writers, but to the Greeks. As in theſe words of Pliny : ‘ Rationem quidem defectus utriuſque (*Solis ac Lunæ*) primus Romani generis in vulgus extulit Sulpicius Gallus. . . . . Apud Græcos autem inveſtigavit primus omnium Thales (35). - - - *Sulpicius Gallus was the firſt among the Romans, who explained the reaſon of the eclipſes both of the Sun and Moon. . . . . Thales was the firſt among the Greeks, who diſcovered it.*’

[*F*] *The declamations publiſhed by Ugolinus Parmenſis, and afterwards by Petrus Pithœus.*] He only publiſhed one hundred thirty-ſix. Pithœus made a new edition of them in 1580, that was more correct, to which he added nine declamations, which had not been printed before. Voſſius obſerves this in one of his books (36) ; but in another he makes no diſtinction at all (37) ; *cujus declamationes CXLV à Tideo Ugolino primùm editas, ex veteri codici reſtituit P. Pythæus* (38). Moreri tranſcribes the wrong paſſage of Voſſius. For the reſt, I muſt not forget to ſay, that Voſſius is to blame for not taking notice of the time wherein Ugolinus Parmenſis lived (39), and for omitting that Peter Ayrault publiſhed (40) Quintilian's declamations, before they were publiſhed by Petrus Pithœus. He boaſts of it in his treatiſe concerning the Paternal Power. *Quintilian*, ſays he (41), *whom I have firſt publiſhed, and the learned Pithœus after me.*

[*G*] *Poggius found out the manuſcript in a manner that is worth relating.*] It was in the abbey of St Gall, during the council of Conſtance. The copy of Quintilian's works, which they had in Italy, was horribly mangled : *Ita lacerum, ita circumciſum, ut nulla forma, nullus habitus hominis in eo recognoſceretur.* You may judge, that the news of this diſcovery occaſioned a great joy. Poggius gave immediately notice of it : the letter that he writ on that occaſion was never printed ; it is at the end of a manuſcript of Quintilian, in the library of Milan, as we are informed by Father Mabillon, who has given us this curious fragment of that letter. ‘ Fortuna quædam fuit, cum ſua, tum maxime noſtra, ut cum eſſemus Conſtantiæ otioſi, cupido inceſſerit viſendi ejus loci, quo ille recluſus tenebatur. Eſt autem monaſterium ſancti Galli, prope urbem hanc millibus paſſuum viginti. Itaque nonnulli animi laxandi, & ſimul perquirendorum librorum, quorum numerus maximus ibi eſſe dicebatur, gratia eo perreximus. Ibi inter confertiſſimam librorum copiam, quos longum eſſet recenſere, Quintilianum reperimus adhuc ſalvum & incolumem, plenum tamen ſitu, & pulvere refertum. Erant enim in bibliotheca libri illi, non ut eorum dignitas poſtulabat, ſed in teterrimo quodam & obſcuro carcere, fundo ſcilicet unius turris, quo ne vita quidem damnati detruderentur. . . . . Reperimus præterea libros tres primos & dimidiatum quarti C. Valerii Flacci Argonauticῶn ; & expoſitiones, tamquam thema quoddam, ſuper octo Ciceronis orationibus Q. Aſconii Pediani eloquentiſſimi viri, de quibus ipſe meminit Quintilianus. Hæc mea manu tranſcripſi, & quidem velociter, ut ea mitterem ad Leonardum Aretinum & Nicolaum Florentinum ; qui cum à me hujus theſauri adinven-

(21) Caſaub. in Sueton. Domit. *cap. xv.*

(22) Theodorus Marcilius, in Sueton. ibid.

(23) In Veſpaſiano, *cap. iii.*

(24) Seneca, Controv. *lib. v, in Præf.*

(25) Domitio Afro quem adoleſcentulus ſenem colui. *Quintil. lib. v, cap. vii, pag.* 212.

(26) Ibid. *lib. ix, cap. iii, pag.* 432.

(27) *See* Faber's *Notes on* Seneca's Controverſies, ubi ſupra.

(28) Quorum fama cum ipſis extincta eſt. *Seneca, ubi ſupra.*

(29) Tillemont, Hiſt. des Emper. *Tom. ii, pag.* 873, 874, *Edit. of Bruſſels.*

(30) *He quotes the firſt chapter of the 10th book of Quintilian, where theſe words are to be found,* Nobis pueris inſignes pro Voluſeno Catulo Domitii Afri, Criſpi Paſſieni, Decimi Lælii orationes ferebantur.

(31) That which I have recited above, citation (25).

(32) Martial. Epigr. XC, lib. ii.

(33) Catanæus, in Plinium, Epiſt. XIV, lib. ii, *pag. m.* 120, 121, *is one of them.*

(34) Trebellius Pollio, in Poſth. juniore, *pag.* 260, *Tom. ii,* Hiſtor. Auguſt. Scriptor.

(35) Plin. *cap. xii, lib. ii.*

(36) Voſſius, in Inſtitut. Orat. *lib. i, cap. xi, pag. m.* 198, 199.

(37) *Idem,* de Rhetorices natura, *pag.* 105.

(38) It ſhould be *Pithœus.*

(39) He lived in the XVth century. Philelphus ſpeaks of him. See Reineſius, *Epiſt. LXIII, ad Daumium, pag.* 167.

(40) At Paris in the year 1563.

(41) Ayrault, *pag. m.* 271. *See alſo his* Diſſertation de la nature & mutation des Loix, *pag. m.* 189.

monwealth of learning, if Quintilian's works had been loſt, for he is an excellent author; and it were to be wiſhed, that all thoſe who write books, would firſt of all read him with great attention. I am ſorry I have been too late ſenſible of the uſefulneſs of ſuch a reading. Mr de la Fontaine, who was a very good judge, eſteemed that Rhetorician very much. See, in his poſthumous works (*g*), the verſes he ſent to the biſhop of Avranches, *when he preſented him with Quintilian's works tranſlated by Horatio Toſcanella.* Mr Nicolle the father, and the abbot de Pure, have given us a French tranſlation of that author. The moſt correct edition of Quintilian is that of Mr Obrecht [*H*]. The dialogue *de cauſis corruptæ Eloquentiæ* is to be found in it, as in all the other editions, though all the Critics do not believe that Quintilian is the author of it; many aſcribe it to Tacitus, and it is commonly printed with the works of that Hiſtorian. That which is certain is, that our author wrote a book *de cauſis corruptæ Eloquentiæ* (*h*). I think it is loſt, and I make no doubt that it was as excellent in its kind, as the other pieces of Quintilian that are extant. I have not given a full account of his merit. I muſt further add, that he appears by his works to have been a very honeſt man, and that there is a great deal of good morality in them. Some blame him for praiſing the emperor Domitian too much, and though he did it only by the by, and very nicely (*i*), they will not forgive him that fault, which ſeems, without doubt, to be very great to thoſe, who have read the Hiſtory of that wicked prince. Had I had Mr Dodwell's *Annales Quintilianei* (*k*), this article might have been better; but through a misfortune of which I ſo often complain, I mean that I am deprived of the moſt neceſſary books, I have not been able to peruſe that work.

(*g*) Pag. 52, of the Dutch edition.

(*h*) Quintilianus, Inſtitutiones, *lib. vi, init. & lib. viii, in fine.*

(*i*) Ibid. *lib. x, cap. i.*

(*k*) Printed at Oxford in the year 1698.

'tionem cognoviſſent, multis à me verbis Quintilianum per ſuas litteras quam primum ad eos mitti contenderunt (42). - - - - *It was his good fortune, but eſpecially ours, that being at Conſtance, and having nothing to do, we had a deſire to ſee the place, in which he was ſhut up. It is the monaſtery of St Gall, twenty miles from this city. Therefore ſome of us, to divert ourſelves, and at the ſame time to ſearch after books, of which there was a great number there, went thither. There we found Quintilian amidſt a heap of books, which it would be tedious to reckon up, ſtill ſafe and ſound, but covered with dirt and duſt. For the books in the library were not placed in a manner ſuitable to their merit, but lodged in a naſty and obſcure priſon, at the bottom of a tower, in which a condemned perſon would hardly be confined. . . . . We found alſo the three firſt books, and half the fourth, of Valerius Flaccus's Argonautics, and the Expoſitions on eight Orations of Cicero, by Quintus Aſconius Pedianus, a moſt eloquent man, which Quintilian himſelf mentions. Theſe I tranſcribed with my own hand, and as faſt as I could, that I might ſend them to Leonard Aretinus, and Nicolas Florentinus, who hearing that I had found this treaſure, earneſtly preſſed me that I would ſend Quintilian to them as ſoon as poſſible.*' For the reſt, to know the bad condition the Quintilian they had before that diſcovery, was in, we need only read one of Petrarch's letters (43). One Gaſparinus of Bergamo, who taught Philological learning at Milan, was very much to be pitied; for he took a great deal of pains about that wretched manuſcript, before a better could be found out (44). I muſt take notice of a miſtake in Varillas. 'Poggio, *ſays he* (45), had the good fortune to light upon the Inſtitutions, and the nineteen firſt declamations of Quintilian, as he was ſearching in a ſhop of a German Grocer, who was going to tear them to fold up his wares (46). They who know that it was the only copy extant, will be for ever indebted to Poggio for that diſcovery.' Mr de Larroque has made it appear, that it is not true that this was the only copy extant. Theſe are his words; 'How great ſoever that loſs might have been (47), it would not have been irrecoverable. A fine manuſcript of that Roman Rhetor, above five hundred years old, which is to be found in the noble library of Oxford, would have made up that loſs to the public, as well as ſeveral others of a conſiderable antiquity, that are at Cologne, and at Berne, as I have been lately informed by the learned Mr Grævius; and ſuppoſe thoſe had met likewiſe with an unmerciful Grocer, that loſs might have been ſupplied ſtill by thoſe that are to be found in the library of the moſt Chriſtian King; there are fourteen or fifteen of them, if the catalogue I have ſeen is true (48).'

[*H*] *The moſt correct edition . . . . is that of Mr Obrecht.*] It was publiſhed in two volumes in 4to, at Straſbourg, in the year 1698. He has mended the text in many places with the help of manuſcripts, or by his own conjectures (49). He has not done like other critics, who place in their notes, or at the end of the book, the various readings which they like beſt, and leave in the text thoſe which they believe to be falſe; but he gives the text as he thinks it ought to be read. Mr Salo, in the year 1665, adviſed thoſe who publiſh the ancient authors, to do the ſame. See his *Journal des Savans* of the ſixteenth of May, 1665 (50).

(42) Mabillon, in Muſeo Italico, *Tom. i, Part i, pag.* 211.

(43) That which he writes to Quintilian.

(44) Volaterran. *lib. xxi, pag. m.* 772, 773.

(45) Varillas, Anecdot. de Florence, *pag.* 163.

(46) Paul. Jovius, in Elog. *cap. x, pag. m.* 30, *ſays only* ita ut & ei quoque (*Pogio*) Quintilianum in ſalſamentarii taberna repertum debere fateamur. *Paul Jovius is miſtaken, and Mr Varillas more ſtill. Quintilian was found in the abbey of St Gall.*

(47) That of the manuſcript which the German Grocer was going to tear.

(48) Larroque's *Preface to the* Nouvelles Accuſations contre Mr Varillas, *folio* * 4 *verſo.*

(49) *See the* Acta Eruditorum, *Dec.* 1698, *pag.* 546, *& ſeq.*

(50) *Pag. m.* 222.

QUINTIN (JOHN) profeſſor of the Canon Law at Paris in the XVIth century, was a native of Autun. He neither wanted learning nor genius. At firſt he liked the new opinions, as they were called, and declared his mind, in an oration, ſo plainly about it, that he was forced to remove from Poitiers [*A*]; but his faith which was only temporary [*B*] was not proof againſt a long perſecution. He quickly accepted of a good benefice,

[*A*] *To remove from Poitiers.*] Preſident la Place informs us of it in this manner: 'Several having heard the harangue of the ſaid Quintin, were amazed at it, expecting no ſuch thing from him, becauſe he had been formerly ſuſpected, and even proſecuted on account of religion, and forced to retire from Poitiers, for having made a ſpeech in public quite different from that which he then made (1).' Beza ſays the ſame thing (2).

[*B*] *His faith was only temporary.*] Beza (3) ſpeaks of him thus: 'Some years before, another ſcholar, whoſe name was Quintin, a native of Autun, had likewiſe entred the liſts; but being forced to retire, he was ſo far from perſevering, that, on the contrary, he intirely fell off: and, at laſt, being a famous doctor of the Canon Law in the univerſity of Paris, and having got a ſubſtantial benefice from the order of the knights of Rhodes, he became a perſecutor as far as he was able.' That Hiſtorian mentions ſeveral other perſons whom he looked upon as men, who had received the ſeed *into ſtony ground* (4), and among the thorns: they had heard the word, and *anon with joy received it*; but they had no root in themſelves, they laſted but for a time, ſo that *tribulation or perſecution ariſing becauſe of the word, by and by they were offended; the care of this world, and the deceitfulneſs of riches,* choaked the word, and they became unfruitful.

[*C*] *To*

(1) La Place, de l'eſtat de la Religion & Republique, *livr. iv, fol.* 151, *verſo.*

(2) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *Tom. i, pag.* 436.

(3) Ib. *p.* 63.

(4) Matth. xiii, 20.

benefice, that was given him by the order of the knights of Malta (*a*); and when he returned from that iſland, where he had been a domeſtic to the Great Maſter, he was made profeſſor of the Canon Law at Paris in the year 1536. That which made him moſt ſpoken of, was the harangue he made in the name of the clergy during the aſſembly of the ſtates at Orleans in December 1560. He demanded that thoſe of the new religion ſhould be proceeded againſt with the utmoſt ſeverity; which would be more ſurprizing, if it had not been a thing practiſed for many ages: but though that bloody ſpirit had prevailed never ſo long, many could not forbear wondering that a clergyman ſhould have taken upon himſelf to ſollicit ſuch a thing [*C*]. Quintin did not foreſee, that the chief men of the Proteſtants would ſhew a great deal of vigour in that aſſembly; much leſs did he foreſee, that he would be extremely affected with the animadverſions that ſhould be made upon his harangue. Had he foreſeen thoſe things, he would without doubt have kept at Paris, and had rather choſen to explain ſome decretals to his ſcholars, than to give leſſons of cruelty to the king, his maſter, in the preſence of the three Eſtates of the kingdom. Admiral Chatillon complained ſo openly of Quintin's ſpeech [*D*], that the king, and the queen-mother, ſent for that Orator, to call him to an account for what he had ſaid. His anſwer was, that he had only followed the orders and memoirs of the body, whoſe ſpokeſman he had been. The Proteſtants were not ſatisfied with that anſwer (*b*); he was obliged to declare before the aſſembly of the Eſtates, that he did not deſign to reflect on admiral Chatillon: but he was much more vexed at the railleries and cenſures, that were diſperſed againſt his declamation [*E*]. He could not bear that mortification, and his affliction

(*a*) Doujat. Præn. Canonic. *lib. v, cap. viii, pag.* 620.

(*b*) Commentaires de l'état de la Relig. & Republ. *livr. iv, folio* 152. Thuanus, *lib. xxvii.*

[*C*] *To ſollicit ſuch a thing.*] Quintin having demanded that all the inhabitants of the kingdom ſhould be obliged to be Catholics; that the *Non-Chriſtians*, that is, the Heretics, ſhould not be *admitted into the converſation and company of the Chriſtian ſubjects* (5); and that *for the time to come, all Heretics ſhould be forbidden to deal in any commodity (whether it were books, or any other thing)* (6), added theſe dreadful words (7). 'And therefore our requeſt is juſt, 'reaſonable, holy, and catholic, and grounded upon 'the expreſs command of God, who injoins you, Sire, 'to grant it us, repeating the ſaid command in ſeveral 'places, and at ſeveral times. He ſpeaks of the idolaters and Gentiles, ſtrangers to the law: Heretics 'among Chriſtians are accounted to be ſuch. Theſe 'are the words of the ſaid law of God; be ſure not 'to contract any friendſhip, confederacy, or marriage, 'with them; do not ſuffer them to inhabit the country; take no pity on them, beat them, deſtroy them 'to a man. And then follows the reaſon of that 'command, leſt they ſhould make thee ſin againſt me, 'if thou believeſt their opinions; which will be an 'offence and a ſcandal, that will raiſe my fury againſt 'thee, and ſoon after I ſhall deſtroy thee. Sire, and 'you Madam, avoid thoſe horrible and dreadful threatnings, for the ſalvation of your ſouls, and the preſervation of your ſceptre. This is, Sire, what your 'clergy of France propoſe, and repreſent to your majeſty in all ſimplicity, obedience, humility, and ſubmiſſion, concerning the honour and ſervice of God 'in your kingdom, and for the extirpation and abolition of what is contrary to it, namely, of ſects and 'hereſies. The whole matter is more fully and particularly diſcuſſed and handled in their memorial, 'to which we expect an anſwer.' Quintin's ſpeech is to be found entire in the Hiſtory of preſident la Place. It is plain, that *the moſt humble and devout Orators of the clergy* (8) were for ſhedding blood, if it was neceſſary, ſince they re-minded the king of Moſes's order and threatnings; beſides, Quintin had already ſaid in expreſs words, that his *majeſty being ſtrong, and armed with the ſword*, ought to oppoſe the Heretics, that *in order to it, and for no other end, GOD had put the ſword into his hands, to protect the good, and puniſh the wicked; and that none can deny that a Heretic is capitally wicked, and conſequently ought to be puniſhed capitally, and be ſubject to the ſword of the magiſtrate* (9).

The French clergy acted more artfully one hundred and twenty-five years after; for in a ſpeech they made to the king ſome months before the revocation of the edict of Nantes, they declared that they did not deſire his majeſty ſhould make uſe of his power for the extirpation of the Heretics. This artifice, after all, is no very deep one, and I do not know whether the too ingenuous plainneſs of the year 1560, ought not to be preferred to the diſſimulation of the year 1685. Read theſe words of Mr Claude. '(10) Whilſt the thing 'was only preparing, the true authors of the perſecution did not conceal themſelves, but uſed their 'endeavours to make the king appear in it. . . . . . . '(11). When things came to the laſt extremity, and 'to open force, they concealed themſelves as much as 'they could, and made the king appear alone. There 'was nothing to be heard then, but this ſort of diſcourſes, *The king will have it ſo, the king is reſolved upon it, the king goes farther than the clergy deſire.* 'By theſe two means they have been ſo cunning, as 'to aſcribe to themſelves the leaſt violent part of that 'perſecution, and to charge the king with the moſt 'odious part.'

(5) La Place, ubi ſupra, *fol.* 139, *verſo.*

(6) Ib. *p.* 140.

(7) Ib. *p.* 141.

(8) They are Quintin's words, *ibid. fol.* 139.

(9) Ibid. *fol.* 134, *verſo.*

(10) Plaintes des Proteſtans, *pag.* 130.

(11) Ib. *p.* 131.

[*D*] *Admiral Chatillon complained openly of Quintin's harangue.*] He had been ſo plainly pointed at in ſome paſſages of that harangue, that every body caſt their eyes upon him: beſides, he had been deſcribed in a very offenſive manner; and it was plain enough, that there was a deſign to load him with infamy, and to undo him. Here is one of thoſe paſſages. '(12) In 'the firſt place, we beſeech you, Sire, that if any 'broacher of old hereſies now dead and buried, would 'impiouſly bring in and renew any ſect already condemned (as are *in univerſum* all thoſe of this deplorable and ſeditious time,) and in order to it petition for a church, and permiſſion of inhabiting this 'kingdom, (as ſome of your provinces have lately 'done, with great impudence, in their particular aſſemblies,) that ſuch a petitioner be accounted and 'declared a Heretic, as being a favourer of Heretics; 'and that he be proceeded againſt as ſuch, according 'to the rigour of the canonical and civil conſtitutions, '*ut auferatur malum de medio noſtri.*' Here is another paſſage, '(13) Gainas, captain-general of the emperor Arcadius's forces, both foot and horſe, in the year '410, or 412, plotting againſt the crown of his king, 'and deſigning to dethrone him, found no better way 'to conceal his ill will, and to hide his treaſon, than 'to demand of him a church in the city of Conſtantinople, to pray, as he ſaid, and to ſing with his brethren, who were all Heretics, as are now-a-days thoſe 'petitioners for churches.'

(12) La Place, ubi ſupra, *folio* 135, *verſo.*

(13) Ibid. *folio* 136, *verſo.*

[*E*] *Railleries and cenſures were diſperſed againſt his declamation.*] The author of the commentaries *De ſtatu Religionis & Reipublicæ in regno Galliæ*, does not poſitively ſay, that thoſe railleries, and the paſquinades that were poſted up in ſeveral places againſt Quintin, occaſioned his death; he makes an alternative between that and the uneaſineſs of his conſcience (14). Preſident la Place and Varillas uſe no alternative, and the former has not omitted the reaſons that were alledged in Quintin's vindication. Theſe are his words: 'Some ſaid, that thoſe who blamed him upon that account, did not conſider that his leſſon was written 'down for him, which he read all along, without any 'geſtures or motions uſual to thoſe who make orations; and that the chief prelates, ſome cardinals, 'and others, were witneſſes and comptrollers of what 'he read. However he died a few days after, being 'vexed to ſee ſeveral pieces publiſhed againſt him (15).

(14) Paſſim vero in eum dicteria jactari, libellos affigi: ille denique palam irrideri: tandemque ſeu contumeliarum illarum impatiens, ſeu malè geſtæ rei conſcientia in morbum delapſus, vitam cum morte commutavit. *Folio* 87.

(15) La Place, ubi ſupra, *folio* 151, *verſo.*

affliction was ſo great, that he fell ſick, and died of grief about the beginning of April, 1561. He was buried at Paris in the choir of the church of St John of Lateran [*F*]. I ſhall mention the books of his which we have [*G*]. Peter Ramus choſe him to be one of the judges of his diſputation againſt Govea in the year 1543. But Quintin, and the other judge (*c*) choſen by Ramus, would not concern themſelves in that affair, when they were to give the ſentence (*d*).

(*c*) A doctor of Phyſic, whoſe name was John de Beaumont.

(*d*) See John de Launoi, De varia Ariſtotelis fortuna, *cap. xiii, pag. m.* 52; and the remark [*D*], of the article RAMUS.

Now, let us hear Varillas. ‘ The zealous Calviniſts, ‘ ſays he (16), were not ſo moderate; for they publiſhed ſuch a bloody libel againſt Quintin, divided ‘ into three parts; the firſt of which contained the ‘ groſs ignorances, the ſecond the manifeſt calumnies, ‘ and the third the malicious omiſſions of that ſpeech; ‘ that the doctor being more touchy than he ſhould ‘ have been, took his bed after he had read that libel, and roſe no more.’ If Varillas had taken the trouble to read that libel, he would not have called it a *bloody* one: It is a piece, containing three pages, by way of remonſtrance to the queen, which was not preſented to her, and which *came but into few hands*. It is to be ſeen at length in Beza's Hiſtory of the reformed churches (17), and it does not at all look like a libel or a ſatire, but rather like a writing belonging to a proceſs, that is brought before the judges, according to the uſual ſtyle and formalities. There is ſcarce any thing in it beſides the heads of the complaints, and theſe words were added under the calumnies that were cited: *We deſire that theſe accuſations ſhould be proved againſt us, being ready to undergo puniſhment, upon condition that the accuſers, for want of proof, ſhall be puniſhed according to the heinouſneſs of the crimes falſly imputed to us.* It is very likely, that the mortal grief of that author proceeded from ſome other writings. Thuanus uſes the plural number, and obſerves that Quintin was otherwiſe a good man, and had formerly been zealous for the Reformation of the church (18). There was no meddling then with the Proteſtants; they had too many good writers on their ſide. Here is a man, who loſt his life for having prepoſterouſly declaimed againſt them. He may be added to thoſe whom I have mentioned in the article of HIPPONAX (19).

[*F*] *He was buried at Paris in the choir of the church of St John of Lateran.*] His epitaph is to be ſeen there in theſe words (20):

Quintinus Doctor, librorumque Helluo ſummus,
Dum nulla dapis alterius tentatur orexi,
Dumque fidem pro qua calamo pugnavit & ore
Fortiter, affligi videt, acrius & dolet, ex hoc
Orbe, invitis, non invitus, migrat amicis.
Obiit nona Aprilis 1561.

Quintin, whoſe eager appetite deſir'd
Cart loads of books, nor other food requir'd,
Seeing the faith, for which he ſpoke and writ,
Oppreſs'd, in grief reſolv'd the world to quit.
Willing he died; not ſo each weeping friend;
For all lament the learned Quintin's end.
He died the 9th of April 1561.

Obſerve, that whereas others aſcribe his death to the grief he conceived for the abuſive reflexions that were made upon him; the author of his epitaph aſcribes it to his being ſenſibly affected with the affliction of the church. This is a ſubterfuge which bigots for a long time have uſed on all occaſions.

[*G*] *The books we have of him.*] *Melitæ Inſulæ deſcriptio. Tractatus de ventis, & nautica buxula ventorum indice. Scholia in Tertulliani librum de præſcriptionibus hæreticorum* (21). *Repetitæ Prælectiones Capituli de multa providentia, de præbendis & dignitatibus, & Cap. novit. de judiciis.* The plurality of benefices, and the ariſtocracy of the Chriſtian religion, are the ſubject of this laſt book. *Octoginta quinque Regulæ ſeu Canones Apoſtolorum, cum vetuſtis Joannis Monachi Zonaræ ſcholiis Latine modo verſis. Speculum Sacerdotii. Synodus Gangrenſis explicata commentariolis ex Gratiani diſtinctione trigeſima. Hæreticorum Catalogus & Hiſtoria ex Gratiano.* He tranſlated into Latin the *Syntagma Canonum Græcorum*, written by Matthew Blaſtares, a Monk. That tranſlation was never printed, it is in the library of the king of France (22).

(16) Varillas, Charles IX, *Tom. i, pag.* 18, *Dutch Edit.*

(17) *Tom. i, p.* 437.

(18) Sane ob id mordacibus libellis ac dicteriis petitus tantum dolorem cepit, ut contracto inde morbo paulo poſt deceſſerit, homo alioqui minime malus, ſed Decretalis Juris quam rerum agendarum peritia clarior, & qui ſerio de emendanda Eccleſia aliquando cogitaverat. *Thuanus, lib. xxvii.*

(19) Remark [*F*].

(20) Vide Doujat. Præn. Canonic. *lib. v, cap. viii, pag.* 620.

(21) Epit. Bibl. Geſneri.

(22) Doujat. ubi ſupra.

QUINTUS (CALABER) a Greek Poet, lived in the Vth century, if we may rely on the conjectures of ſome learned men [*A*]. He compoſed a large ſupplement to the Iliad, which contains the Hiſtory of the Trojan war from Hector's death,

[*A*] *He lived in the Vth century, if we may rely upon the conjectures of ſome learned men.*] Rhodomannus (1) is in the right to ſay, that he did not live before the great conqueſts of the Roman people; for he brings in the ſooth-ſayer Calchas, foretelling that Æneas ſhould reign in Italy, and that his poſterity ſhould extend their empire from the eaſt to the weſt.

- - - - Ἐκ τοῦ δὲ γένος μετόπισθεν ἀνάξειν,
Ἄχρις ἐπ' ἀντολίην τε καὶ ἀκάματον δύσιν ἔλθῃ.

- - - - *Ejuſque exinde progenies regnet,*
Donec ad ortum & occaſum inſuperabilem imperii fines
extendat (2).

Beſides he mentions (3) the exerciſes of the Circus, as they were uſed under the Roman emperors. One may therefore conclude, that he did not live before the firſt Cæſars: But this being too general to ſatisfy an inquiſitive perſon, a more limited conjecture has been drawn from his ſtyle: Rhodomannus thinks, that the character of his muſe is ſo like that of Tryphiodorus, Coluthus, *&c.* that it is very likely they lived at the ſame time. ‘ (4) Character ipſe carminis γραμματικώτερον ‘ elaboratus oſtendit, eum Coluthi (qui ad ‘ quintum Chriſti nati ſeculum poëma lepidiſſimum de ‘ Helenes raptu conſcripſit) aliorumque illa ætate vi‘ gentium, æqualem aut vicinum fuiſſe. Enimvero ſi ‘ dictionem Cointi, Coluthi, Tryphiodori, Muſæi, ‘ (illum dico, qui Leandri Heruſque amores cecinit) ‘ & Nonni, ad examen Criticum vocâris, ſimillimam ‘ & ferè eandem ſermonis ideam ſtructuræque ratio‘ nem deprehendes: unde ætate quoque propinquos ‘ inter ſe fuiſſe ratiocineris. - - - *His elaborate verſes ‘ ſhew, that he was either cotemporary with or lived ‘ near the time of Coluthus (who in the Vth century ‘ after Chriſt wrote a moſt witty poem on the rape of ‘ Helen) and other writers of that age. For if you ‘ critically examine the ſtyle of Cointus, Coluthus, Try‘ phiodorus, Muſæus, (him I mean, who ſung the loves ‘ of Leander and Hero) and Nonnus, you will find an ‘ exact reſemblance between his and their manner of ‘ writing; from whence you may reaſonably ſuppoſe they ‘ lived about the ſame time.*’ What Rhodomannus adds, that the name Cointus, of a Latin original, ſhews, that this Poet was made a Roman citizen, is but a weak confirmation of what he had ſaid before; for, though this Greek Poet had lived before Cicero, he might have been honoured with the freedom of Rome. Reineſius (5) has good reaſon to laugh at thoſe, who pretend that he lived under one of the emperors of the family Julia. They ground their opinion on the oracle of Calchas, and they pretend that Nero being the laſt of the family of the firſt Cæſar, that Poet muſt have lived at fartheſt under the empire of Nero. This is a wrong way of drawing conſequences. At this very day our Poets might bring in Calchas, foretelling ſuch a thing, though the Roman empire has been diſmembred long ſince.

Cointus

(1) Laurent. Rhodomanus, *in Præfat. ad* Cointum Smyrnæum.

(2) Cointus Smyrnæus, *lib. xiii, ver.* 340, *pag. m.* 650.

(3) *Lib. vi.*

(4) Rhodomanus, ibid. *folio* †.† *verſo.*

(5) Thom. Reineſius, Epiſt. LXVII, ad Rupert. *pag.* 593.

death, 'till the deſtruction of Troy. Cardinal Beſſarion was the firſt who made that poem known [*B*]. He found it in the church of St Nicolas near Otranto in Calabria; and this is the reaſon why the author was called Quintus Calaber. Others being more exact, call him Quintus, or rather Cointus Smyrnæus; for they think he was of Smyrna. Thoſe, who ſay he taught youth there [*C*], ſeem to me to have no good grounds

Cointus needed not conſider the emperors, who pretended to be deſcended from Æneas: It was enough for him, that the city built by Romulus, who was deſcended from Æneas, did rule or had ruled from eaſt to weſt.

[*B*] *Cardinal Beſſarion is the firſt who made that Poem known.*] Here is a paſſage of Conſtantine Laſcaris. ‘ Poeſis autem Homericiſſimi Quinti jam multo tempore omnibus ignota fuit, & tanquam extincta: ſed propius Beſſarion Nicæas Cardinalis Tuſculani, ille ſane quam bonus & vere doctus, & ut Homericè dixerim, ſimilis Deo vir, aliaque plurima in nos, & hanc ex Apulia cum ſervaſſet, volentibus tradidit, quam & ipſe olim deſiderabam (6). - - - *The Poem of Quintus Calaber, a writer very like Homer, lay a long time buried in obſcurity: but Cardinal Beſſarion, that good, learned, and, to ſpeak like Homer, that godlike man having reſcued it from oblivion in Apulia, gave it to me who had long deſired to have it.*’ Very few authors had mentioned that Poem (7): And therefore we ought the leſs to be ſurprized that Quintus Curtius has not been mentioned for ſo many ages. The firſt edition of our Cointus is that of Aldus Manutius: It was full of faults (8).

[*C*] *That he taught youth at Smyrna.*] Here is Rhodomannus's argument. Since our Cointus ſays, that he fed the Muſes ſheep in the fine garden of Smyrna, it ought to be inferred from it, that he was maſter of a famous ſchool on that coaſt of Ionia. It was no mean ſchool; for he ſays that his ſcholars were illuſtrious: He was therefore one of thoſe Profeſſors of Philoſophy and Eloquence, who were called Sophiſts. This is the ſubſtance of Rhodomannus's argument. I ſhall give you his own words at length. ‘ Ex indicio iſto, quod de ſe ipſe facit, Muſarum oves in liberali Smyrnæ horto ſe paviſſe teſtatus, ſcholam in Ioniæ littore iſto nec infrequentem nec incelebrem habuiſſe Poëtam noſtrum, colligere eſt. Nec triviale magiſterium id fuiſſe apparet inde, quod oves ſuas, id eſt diſcipulos, nobiles ſeu fama illuſtres, (περίκλυτα) epitheto ſatis emphatico, appellat, unde ſi divinare licet, id tandem elicimus, Cointum fuiſſe ex profeſſione illorum, quos Sophiſtas, id eſt philoſophiæ & eloquentiæ magiſtros, Grammaticos, qui Poëtarum interpretes erant, & juventutis ſcholaſticæ doctores; florens adhuc Græcia indigitabat. Quid enim aliud per Muſarum hortum & oves, præter quam ſcholam, & diſcipulos in ea doctrinæ & eloquentiæ ſtudiis addictos, intelligi exiſtimemus (9)? - - - *From the diſcovery he makes concerning himſelf, by ſaying that he fed the Muſes ſheep in the fruitful garden of Smyrna, we may gather that our Poet kept a numerous and famous ſchool on the coaſt of Ionia. And that it was not a petty kind of a ſchool is evident from the emphatical title of noble or illuſtrious, which he gives his ſheep, that is, his ſcholars: and therefore, if I may be allowed to gueſs, I infer that Cointus was of the profeſſion of thoſe, who in the flouriſhing times of Greece were called Sophiſts, that is, the maſters of Philoſophy and Eloquence, or Grammarians, who did interpret the Poets and inſtruct the youth: For what elſe can we ſuppoſe to be meant by the garden and ſheep of the Muſes, but a ſchool and ſcholars trained up in the ſtudies of Philoſophy and Eloquence.*’ He had ſaid a little before: ‘ (10) Cum tota ejus vita ignorantiæ tenebris involuta ſit, patria tamen ſola vindiciis inde aſſerta eſt. Nam libro XIV & hanc & vitæ quodam modo genus exprimit; ubi ſe Muſarum ovibus paſcendis Smyrnæ operam dediſſe profitetur. - - - *Though his whole life be unknown to us, yet his native country has been preſerved from oblivion. For in the XIVth book he expreſly mentions it, and in ſome ſort the manner of life he led: he there declares that he imployed himſelf in feeding the Muſes ſheep at Smyrna.*’ Here follows a ſurprizing inſtance of a rambling imagination. I muſt firſt recite the Greek words of Cointus: They are not in the XIVth book, as Rhodomannus ſays, but in the XIIth; and they contain an invocation of the Muſes, occaſioned by the enumeration of thoſe, who were ſo courageous as to get into the wooden horſe.

Τοὺς μοι νῦν καθ᾽ ἕκαστον ἀνειρομένῳ σάφα Μοῦσαι
Ἔσπεθ᾽, ὅσοι κατέβησαν ἔσω πολυχανδέος ἵππου·
Ὑμεῖς γὰρ πᾶσαν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θῆκατ᾽ ἀοιδὴν,
Πρίν μοι ἀμφὶ παρειᾷ κατασκίδνασθαι ἴουλον,
Σμύρνης ἐν δαπέδοισι περικλυτὰ μῆλα νέμοντι.

Quos mihi nunc ſingulatim exquirenti, Muſæ perſpicuè
Recenſete, quotquot in multicapacem equum conſcenderunt.
Nam vos omnigenum animo meo carmen indidiſtis,
Antequam mihi circa genas lanugo ſpargeretur,
In campis Smyrnæ inclytas oves paſcenti (11).

Relate my muſe (to thee the truth's reveal'd)
How many Greeks the wooden horſe conceal'd.
Thou taught'ſt me verſe, e're the firſt down began
To cloath my youthful chin, and promiſe man,
When all my ſkill extended but to keep,
In Smyrna's fertile plains a flock of ſheep.

It is plain, the author tells the Muſes that they made him a Poet, when, being as yet beardleſs, he kept ſheep in the fields of Smyrna. How can this ſignify, that he taught the youth, that he had a famous ſchool, and illuſtrious ſcholars? How could a boy, who had as yet no beard, exerciſe ſuch a profeſſion? How could Rhodomannus be ſo heedleſs, though he ſpent many years upon that Poem, though he tranſlated it into Latin, and made an abridgment of it in Greek and Latin verſe? Where did he find that Cointus boaſts of having fed the Muſes ſheep (12)? Now let us ſee the lazineſs of another learned man. ‘ Nunc veriſimilius Smyrnæum nuncupant: quia ipſe lib. XIV. dicat, ſe περικλυτοῖς ſive illuſtribus Muſarum ovibus Smyrnæ paſcendis operam dediſſe: ex quo ſi de patria haud certo colligitur, ſaltem videmus ſcholam non infrequentem præſtantium diſcipulorum habuiſſe Smyrnæ (13). - - - *Now he is ſaid to be of Smyrna, which is more probable; becauſe in the XIVth book he himſelf ſays that he had been employed in feeding the noble or illuſtrious ſheep of the Muſes at Smyrna; from whence, if we cannot certainly determine which was his native country, at leaſt we ſee that he had a large ſchool of eminent ſcholars at Smyrna.*’ Voſſius, without taking the pains to conſult Cointus, tranſcribed what he found in Rhodomannus's preface: He took from it the falſe quotation of the XIVth book, and the falſe gloſs of the Muſes ſheep, with the whole conſequence which that tranſlator drew from it. He, and other learned men, have done the like a thouſand times. I wonder that Reineſius ſhould approve ſuch an explication of thoſe verſes of Cointus: He will have it alſo, that it appears from them that this Poet was a ſchool-maſter at Smyrna. ‘ Convenit autem, *ſays he* (14), ut quod maximè, Grammatico, qualis fuit Corintus, ludimagiſtri officio fungi & docere pueros, quod noſter de ſe profitetur l. II (15), verſibus dulciſſimis: neque falſi ſunt viri docti imprimis *Parrhaſius*, & diligentiſſimus ejus recenſitor ac interpres *Laur. Rhodomannus*, qui eos de inſtitutione ſcholaſtica apud Smyrnenſes interpretati ſunt. - - - *But it agrees very well with the character of a Grammarian, as Corintus was, to do the office of a ſchool-maſter, and to teach youth, which our Poet declares concerning himſelf l. II, in very fine verſes: and learned men, eſpecially* Parrhaſius, *and his moſt accurate reviſer and interpreter* Laur. Rhodomannus, *are not miſtaken in explaining them to relate to his teaching a ſchool at Smyrna.*’ What he ſays in the next words is better grounded: He rejects the opinion of thoſe, who pretend that Cointus deſigned only, by thoſe verſes, to boaſt of his following Homer. ‘ Dubitoque igitur quenquam ita ſimplicem eſſe, qui *Smyrnæ oves paſcere idem eſſe ac Homerum ſequi, quem bona pars Smyrnæum cenſuit*, credere velit, aut ita perſpicacem qui duo iſta eadem eſſe videre poſſit. Mihi quidem tam beato eſſe nondum contigit, &

---

(6) Conſtant. Laſcaris, in Grammatica, apud Lorenzo Craſſo, Iſtoria de' Poëti Greci, *pag.* 436.

(7) Hujus præter unum atque alterum è Græcis, & quidem recentioribus, nemo in ſcriptis ſuis mentionem facit. *Rhodomanus, in Præfat.*

(8) Geſner, in Bibl. *folio* 575.

(9) Rhodomanus, ubi ſupra, *folio* †† 2, *verſo*.

(10) Ib. *p.* 2.

(11) Cointus Smyrnæus, *lib. xii, ver.* 302, *pag.* 610.

(12) Se Muſarum ovibus paſcendis Smyrnæ operam dediſſe profiteretur. *Rhodom. ubi ſupra.*

(13) Voſſius, de Poëtis Græcis, *pag.* 81.

(14) Thom. Reineſius, ubi ſupra.

(15) It ſhould be *l. xii.*

grounds for it. The learned Reineſius pretends he ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from a Grammarian called Corintus [*D*], of whom there is a book concerning the dialects. The beſt edition of Quintus Calaber's Poem is that of Rhodomannus [*E*]. Some Critics admire Cointus; others ſpeak of him with great contempt. See the Paſſages quoted by Lorenzo Craſſo (*a*), and Mr Baillet's *Jugemens des Savans* (*b*). One Udenus Niſielus praiſes him for ſome things, and blames him for ſome others. See his *Progymnaſmata*; it is an Italian book.

(*a*) Lor. Craſſo, Iſtoria de' Poëti Greci, *p.* 436, *& ſeq.*

(*b*) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, *Tom. ii, num.* 1195.

' habeo pro violenta & à ſenſu Poëtæ alieniſſima eam ' expoſitionem (16). - - - *And therefore I queſtion whether any can be ſo ſimple as to believe*, that feeding ' ſheep at Smyrna is the ſame thing as following Homer, *or ſo quick ſighted as to be able to ſee thoſe ' two things to be the ſame. As for my part I have ' not been hitherto ſo fortunate, and I look upon that interpretation to be forced, and contrary to the meaning ' of the Poet.*' As for me, I believe the whole myſtery lies in an imitation of Heſiod. Read theſe words of Tanaquillus Faber. *Heſiod became a Poet, as he was feeding his ſheep: I hope you will believe him; for he ſays ſo himſelf: And thoſe, who ſaid it after him, ſaid it only upon the credit of that Poet, or upon the authority of the ſhepherds of Bœotia, to whom that adventure appeared ſo wonderful, that they made a ſong upon it, which is loſt* (17). Our Cointus, if I am not miſtaken, meant that the Muſes had done him the ſame favour, as they had done to Heſiod (18). For the reſt, I ſhall obſerve, that Volaterran, and ſome others, make him a Roman, without any ſhew of reaſon; and that Geſner (19) was in the wrong to fancy that Volaterran does not ſpeak of the ſame Poet, whoſe XIV books *derelictorum ab Homero* were publiſhed by Aldus. This fault has not been mended by thoſe, who abridged Geſner's *Bibliotheque*: Like him, they made two articles of *Quintus Poëta Romanus*, mentioned by Volaterran, and of *Quintus Calaber*, printed by Aldus.

[*D*] *Reineſius pretends he ought not to be diſtinguiſhed from a Grammarian called Corintus.*] Theſe are Reineſius's words: ' Fuit *Corintus* Grammaticus, cujus libellum *de dialectis* ad Studioſum quendam juvenem ſcriptum habemus editum cum appendice H. ' Stephani, eumque citat *Joh. Petrus Nunneſ. not. ad ' Phrynichum Sylburg. ſpicil. ad Herod. Betuleius not. ' ad Lact. l.* 1. *c.* 6. *Joh. Talenton. l.* 2. *rer. recondit. cap.* 19. è cujus vero nomine κόειντος amiſſa ' una literula vel prætervisâ à primo deſcriptore exiit ' Κόϊντος (20). - - - *Corintus was a Grammarian, ' whoſe book concerning the Dialects written to a certain ' ſtudious youth, we find publiſhed with an appendix of ' Henry Stephens, and is cited by Nunneſius Sylburgius. ' Betuleius and Talentonus, whoſe true name* Corintus ' *was changed into* Cointus, *through overſight or the ' omiſſion of one letter by the firſt tranſcriber.*' It muſt be confeſſed, that the word Κόειντος might eaſily have been changed into Κόϊντος; and that a Grammatical genius does very much appear in this author's Poem (21). Reineſius does fully prove it. He obſerves, that the Grammarian Corintus lived after John Philoponus, in the VIth or VIIth century; and that he cannot be later, ſince he is quoted by Tzetzes. I am amazed at this; for there is a vaſt ſpace of time between the VIIth century, and that wherein Tzetzes lived (22). ' Fuit autem poſt Johannem Gramm. ' Alexandrinum, d. Philoponum, teſte ipſo in *proœm. ' l. de dial.* inter mediæ ætatis Græcos ſeculo ſexto ' ſeptimove, quibus Græcia etſi à politia degeneraſſet ' plurimùm, viros tamen doctos & memorandos aliquos aluit. . . . Pauci ſunt, quos nominare poſſumus iſtorum temporum: *Johannes Stobæus, Georgius ' Piſides, Theophyl. Simocates, Thomas & Coprogenius ' magiſtri, Euphronius, Moſchopulus, Chœroboſcus, Demetrius Triclinius, Georg. Syncellus, Euſtathius,* & ' extremo octavi *Photius*, & qui ex ejus doctiſſimis ' epiſtolis noti ſunt: prioribus inter memoratos etiam ' adcenſeri debet *Corintus* iſte. Fuiſſe in æſtimio & ' non inferiorem tempore quàm determinavi inde apparet, quod laudantur à γραμματικωτάτῳ *Tzetze ' in Chiliad.* & *comm. ad Lycophr.* ubi de Machaone (23). ' - - - *But he lived after John Philoponus, a Grammarian of Alexandria, as he himſelf teſtifies in the preface to his book concerning the Dialects, in the VIth or ' VIIth century amongſt the Greeks of the middle age, at ' which time though Greece was very much degenerated ' in politeneſs, yet it produced ſeveral learned and famous men. . . . . A few whom we may reckon of thoſe ' times are,* Johannes Stobæus, Georgius Piſides, Theophyl. Simocates, Thomas and Coprogenius, Euphronius, Moſchopulus, Chœroboſcus, Demetrius Triclinius, Georgius Syncellus, Euſtathius, *and at the ' latter end of the VIIIth century* Photius, *and thoſe who ' are known by his learned epiſtles: amongſt the firſt,* ' Corintus *ought likewiſe to be numbered. That he was ' in eſteem and not later than the time I have mentioned, appears from his being commended by that learned ' Grammarian* Tzetzes in Chiliad. *and on* Lycophron, ' *where he ſpeaks of Machaon.*'

[*E*] *The beſt edition . . . . is that of Rhodomannus.*] I have not that of Hanaw 1604, mentioned in the catalogue of the Bodleian library; but I have that of 1614, *ex Officina Aubriana*. It contains the whole performance of Rhodomannus upon that author, and Claudius Dauſquejus's notes in *Quintum Calabrum, Tryphiodorum & Coluthum*. One Jodocus Valaræus made a tranſlation of Cointus in proſe, which was printed at Lyons in 1541 (§ *α*). Bernardin Baldus made another.

[(§ *α*) There is an edition before that in 12mo at Antwerp, *apud Johannem Steelſium* 1539. The title ſays, *editio prima*, and the epiſtle dedicatory is dated the XIth of the Kalends of Auguſt the ſame year. Rem. Crit.]

(16) Reineſius, ubi ſupra.

(17) Le Fevre, Vie des Poëtes Grecs, *p. m.* 10.

(18) *Confer quæ ſupra*, in the article ÆSCHYLUS, remark [*C*].

(19) In Biblioth. *fol.* 575, *where he recites Volaterran's words.*

(20) Reineſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 591.

(21) Non autem niſi Τρίβωνα quendam Grammaticum & conſummatæ peritiæ literatorem iſta Paraleipomena ſcripſiſſe patet inprimis ex accurata & curioſa valde locorum deſcriptione, quæ diligentius multo enarrat, quam aliquis de vulgo Poëta faceret, ut cum, &c. *Reineſius, ibid.*

(22) Tzetzes lived at the end of the XIIth century. See Nicolas Gerbelius's Preface upon Tzetzes.

(23) Reineſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 592.

QUIQUERAN (*a*) (Peter de) biſhop of Senez in the XVIth century, was the ſon of Antony de Quiqueran Lord and Baron of Beaujeu (*b*) in Provence. He ſtudied Rhetoric and Poetry at Paris under James Lewis Strebe, after which he went into Italy where he eagerly followed the ſtudy of Muſic. Being returned to Paris he applied himſelf to the Mathematics, and wrote a book in Latin on the praiſes of Provence his native country. He died at Paris whilſt it was in the preſs, the eighteenth of Auguſt 1550, at twenty-four years of age. His mother and ſiſter got the impreſſion of this work finiſhed (*c*). It is a ſmall volume in folio conſiſting of eighty-nine leaves, printed at Paris by Lambert Dodu in the year 1551. There are added to it an hundred Latin Hexameter verſes which Quiqueran had written on the arrival of Hannibal at Arles. There is a great deal of curious learning in the work of this writer who would certainly have become one of the moſt learned perſons of his age if he had enjoyed a long life. He deſerved the fine elogies beſtowed on him in the epitaphs which you will ſee below [*A*]. Any one who conſiders that he was not yet arrived at

(*a*) Almoſt all thoſe who quote him miſcal him *Quinqueran*, or *Quinqueranus*.

(*b*) This is the reaſon why he ſirnames himſelf *Bellojocanus*.

(*c*) Taken from the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the book *de Laudibus Provinciæ*, written by *Amandus Cabaſſius*.

[*A*] *The epitaphs which you will ſee below.*] I take them from the antiquities of Paris collected by Corrozet. *In another chapel of the church of the Auguſtins at Paris, in the nave, is the effigies of a biſhop on his knees, raiſed on high, and underneath two epitaphs, between which on the ſide, is the image of Fame, in demi-relief, ſitting on a globe, leaning on a lute: ſhe holds in one hand a trumpet, and under her feet lie* ſome at the age of performing the epiſcopal functions, will not be ſurpriſed that the particular account which he gives of ſome of his diverſions make him appear very far from practiſing the true duties of a biſhop [*B*]. The great abuſe of giving biſhoprics to children prevailed at that time.

ſome books, about her is a ſphere, a pair of compaſſes, and other inſtruments of the liberal arts. The firſt epitaph is written in letters of gold.

Epitaphium domini Petri Quiquerani Epiſcopi Senecenſis.

Dum Juvenilis honos, prima lanugine malas
Veſtit, & in calido pectore fervet amor,
Me rapuit, quæ cuncta rapit, mors invida doctis:
Hei mihi, cur vitæ tam brevis hora fuit?
Cur brevis hora fuit? rerum ſic volvitur ordo,
Alternatque ſuas tempus & hora vices.
Si fera longævæ tribuiſſent fata ſenectæ
Tempora, venturis poma dediſſet ager.
Flos periit, periere ſimul cum cortice fructus,
Aridaque ante ſuos poma fuere dies.
Nemo tamen lachrymis nec triſtia funera fletu
Fœdet, cur? volito docta per ora virum.

Why was I ſnatch'd ſo ſoon, and why my date
Of life ſo ſhort? Such are the laws of fate.
If to old age Heav'n had prolong'd my years,
A fruitful crop had bleſs'd my ſtudious cares.
But, ſince the flow'r is cropp'd before its time,
The fruit's decay'd and wither'd in its prime.
Let none lament with tears my death, or blame
My loſs: I live in an immortal name.

The other epitaph.

‘Hic jacet nobilis vir reverendus in Chriſto pater dominus Petrus Quiqueranus Epiſcopus Senecenſis filius domini Anthonii Quiquerani equitis & Baronis Bellojocani illuſtriſſimi in Provincia: cujus libri tres de Laudibus Provinciæ extant diſciplinarum ac rerum cognitione effloreſcentes, obiit anno domini 1550 Kalen. Septembris 15 annos natus 24 (1). - - - *Here lies the reverend Father in Chriſt Peter Quiqueran, biſhop of Senez, ſon of Antony Quiqueran, knight and baron of Beaujeu in Provence: who left behind him three books on the praiſes of Provence full of learning and knowledge: he died in the year* 1550 *the* 18*th of Auguſt in the twenty-fourth year of his age.*’ Peter de St Romuald (2) was very much in the wrong to quote the firſt of theſe epitaphs as a piece in which it is ſaid that *Quiqueran . . . . was a great Orator, a great Poet, and a great Divine.*' Every one ſees that the epitaph does not ſay this. This author obſerves that he died, *as it is thought, before he was conſecrated.*

[*B*] *The particular account he gives of ſome of his diverſions make him appear far from practiſing the true duties of a biſhop.*] The ornaments of his epitaph are infinitely better ſuited to a man paſſionately fond of the polite arts than to a biſhop; but if you read the book *de Laudibus Provinciæ*, you can no longer doubt that our biſhop of Senez employed himſelf in quite another thing than the government of his dioceſe. He did not ſtudy the diſeaſes of the ſoul and the methods of curing them. His curioſity led him to inquire into the properties of plants, minerals, and animals. He fed a great number of beaſts, he was a great hunter, he was extremely fond of cock-fighting. Camerarius often quotes him (3); but it is only in relation to ſuch things. He particularly quotes the paſſage in which the author confeſſes that his occupations were condemned. ‘Johannes Pierius Valerianus * relates that the boldeſt cocks are found in the iſland of Rhodes, and ſays he had ſeen a proof of it in ſome of them, brought from thence to Rome, which were of an extraordinary ſize and wonderfully fierce. Peter Quinqueran confirms this, ſaying †, I had a young cock preſented to me, brought from Rhodes, which I purchaſed at a very dear rate. Though it was not more than ſix months old, it was ſo courageous and ready to fight, that a dog could not come into my court-yard, without being briſkly pecked at: as to other common cocks that came near it, it killed them all. I often made it fight, to my great diverſion, with a large Turkey-cock that I had, as weighty as a fat ſheep. The Turkey-cocks are extremely choleric, and raiſe themſelves up fiercely, witneſs the ſwelling of their neck, and their cry: though otherwiſe their voice is whining and ridiculous. As to my game-cock of Rhodes, after a great number of battles, he fell ſick, and, notwithſtanding all the remedies applied to cure him, died: of which the Hiſtory of preceeding battles, as well as thoſe of others, gave me ſufficient warning. But reading the paſtime taken in ſuch exerciſes by the Delians, Athenians, Greeks, Aſiatics, even Roman emperors, and the inhabitants of Italy where they wagered all they were worth that ſuch or ſuch a cock would be victorious in the battle, I was deſirous to taſte ſomething of this pleaſure. Neither the judgment of the ancients nor my own inclination deceived me, and I have often contemplated ſuch battles without being diſpleaſed, from whence certain enemies, whom I had formerly diſguſted, not knowing on which ſide to attack me, took occaſion, as often as they could, to ſay that I ſpent my whole time in cock-fighting. They carried the matter ſo far, that one day, men, women, children, and old men, came in crouds to my epiſcopal houſe, and then gave out that I was too much addicted to ſuch paſtime. Do you aſk whether I deſpiſed, or laughed at their folly? Truly I cannot ſay. Perhaps I ſhould have acquieſced in their judgment, if I had not known that they are perſons who have no judgment (4).

Note that in the Latin of Quiqueran it is not ſaid that they came in crouds to his epiſcopal houſe: Theſe are his words, *Tandem viri, fœminæ, juveneſque, ſeneſque certatim exiliunt, proclamant, in libellis proſcribunt me ſtudioſiorem gallinaceæ pugnæ* (5). Camerarius has corrected ſome errors of the preſs which were in the original; but his Printers have committed others more conſiderable (6). Simon Goulart has not always well tranſlated it. You will eaſily judge of it if you compare with his tranſlation theſe words of Quiqueran: *mox paulo nequicquam tentatis omnifariis remediis perierit, ejus ſolatii ex Gallorum pugnis, hyſtoria me admonuerat. Quippe eas cùm legerem quàm frequenter celebraſſent Delii, quàm Athenienſes . . . . decrevi ego quoque ejus voluptatis particeps fieri.* Goulart ſuppoſes that the author intended to ſay, that the Hiſtory of the foregoing battles of cocks, and thoſe of others, had ſufficiently warned him that his Rhodian cock would fall ſick, and could not be cured by any remedy, but that neverthleſs the reading of the diverſions which the ancients took in theſe battles, had given him a deſire to take the ſame pleaſure. This ſenſe is wrong and abſurd. Quiqueran only ſays that Hiſtory had informed him of the pleaſure that might be taken in cock-fighting.

Cuſtom might in ſome meaſure excuſe our prelate for diverting himſelf in hunting, for it was an exerciſe which ſeveral biſhops gave themſelves at that time, not remembering that the Canons forbid it. See the extravagant *de Clerico venatore*. One of the Monks, who wrote againſt the biſhop of Bellei, inſinuates that the biſhop had been at a great expence in hawks and hounds (7). He wrote about the year 1644.

---

(1) Antiquitez de Paris, par Gilles Corrozet, *folio* 89, *Edit. of Paris* 1586, *in* 8*vo*.

(2) In his Chronological Journal, *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 183, under the 17th of Auguſt. He ſhould have placed the death of Quiqueran on the 18th, and not on the 17th.

(3) In the ſecond volume of his Hiſtorical Meditations. See there the pages marked in the Index of the authors cited under the word *Peter Quinqueran*, in Simon Goulart's French tranſlation.

* *In his* Hieroglyph.

† *In the ſecond book* de Laudibus Provinciæ.

(4) Camerarius, Hiſtorical Meditations, *Tom. ii*, *book v*, *ch. ix*, *pag. m.* 365.

(5) Quiqueranus, de Laudibus Provinciæ, *lib. ii*, *fol.* 39.

(6) In the edition of Francfort 1658.

(7) *See the* Anti-Baſilik of Mr Camus, biſhop of Bellei, *pag.* 550, 551.

QUIRINUS.

QUIRINUS (PUBLIUS SULPICIUS), conſul in the year of Rome 742 (a), was born at Lanuvium, and was not of the Patrician family *Sulpicia* (b). The ſervices he did Auguſtus with great zeal and application, eſpecially in the war, were the only cauſe of his advancement. After his conſulſhip he had the command of an army in Cilicia (c), in order to ſubdue a nation (d), which was accounted the moſt unconquerable of that country (e). He overcame them by famine (f), for which he had the honour of a triumph (g). Some place this in the time wherein our Saviour was born, and believe, that though there was then another governor in Syria, yet Auguſtus, in conſideration of the glory which Quirinus had acquired, gave him a ſpecial commiſſion for the taxation mentioned by St Luke (h), for no body doubts but, that he who is called Cyrenius in the Scripture (i), is the ſame with our Quirinus. The eſteem Auguſtus had for him, did eminently appear when he made him governor to Caius Cæſar, his grandſon, after the death of Lollius, who had been in that poſt. We have ſeen in another place (k) what difference Tiberius made between thoſe two governors of Caius Cæſar. Quirinus's marriage with Æmilia Lepida, is a very good proof of the conſideration he was in; for ſhe was at firſt deſigned for Lucius Cæſar, Auguſtus's grandſon (l). She was unfortunate in her marriage with Quirinus; he divorced her, and ſome years after he accuſed her of ſeveral crimes [*A*] for which ſhe was condemned to baniſhment. This proceeding of Quirinus appeared ſo ſtrange, that people begun to pity Lepida, though ſhe was infamous and guilty [*B*]. The victory he obtained over her was publickly abhorred, and they did not fail, on that occaſion, to compare his mean birth with the noble extraction of that lady. He had alſo rendered himſelf odious by his ſordid way of ſpending his old age in the midſt of a plentiful eſtate. He died in the year of Rome 774; and, at Tiberius's deſire, they made him a public funeral (m). If any one deſires to know whether he ought to be called Quirinus, or Quirinius (n), he needs

[*A*] *He divorced his wife, and ſome years after he accuſed her of ſeveral crimes.*] He accuſed her of having falſly pretended that ſhe had had a child by him. There might be ſtrong motives to ſuch a pretence; for he was very rich, and had no children. The other accuſations were about adultery, poiſoning, and conſulting the Diviners concerning the Imperial family. 'At Romæ Lepida, cui ſuper Æmiliorum decus L. Sulla ac Cn. Pompeius proavi erant, defertur *ſimulaviſſe partum ex P. Quirino divite, atque orbo.* adjiciebantur *adulteria, venena, quæſitumque per Chaldæos in domum Cæſaris*, defendente ream Manio Lepido fratre. Quirinus poſt dictum repudium adhuc infenſus, quamvis infami ac nocenti miſerationem addiderat (1). - - - - *But Lepida, who beſides the honour of being deſcended of the Æmilian family was great grand-daughter to L. Sulla and Cn. Pompeius, was accuſed at Rome of having falſely pretended to have a child by* P. Quirinus, who was rich and had no children. *She was moreover arraigned for* adultery, poiſoning, and conſulting Diviners concerning the family of Cæſar, *her brother Manius Lepidus being counſel for her. Quirinus, continuing ſtill to perſecute her after he had divorced her, excited the compaſſion of the people towards her, though ſhe was infamous and guilty,*' It appears from the beginning of this paſſage, that Æmilia Lepida was great-grand-daughter of Sylla and Pompey. She was not the better for it. I wonder that Suetonius, who wrote after Tacitus, ſhould reduce the accuſation to one ſingle head: He only ſays, that Lepida was accuſed of attempting to poiſon her huſband. 'Condemnatam & generoſiſſimam fœminam Lepidam, in gratiam Quirini conſularis prædivitis, & orbi, qui dimiſſam eam è matrimonio poſt vigeſimum annum veneni olim in ſe comparati arguebat (2). - - - *The moſt noble lady Lepida was alſo condemned upon the account of Quirinus, a man of conſular dignity, very rich and without children, who twenty years after he had divorced her, accuſed her of having formerly attempted to poiſon him.*' This omiſſion of Suetonius is attended with another fault; for he ſays, that ſhe was condemned twenty years after ſhe had been divorced. He is not exact in his Chronology. I prove it thus: That lady was condemned in the year 773. There had been a deſign to marry her to Lucius Cæſar, Auguſtus's grand-ſon, and therefore it muſt be ſaid, that ſhe did not marry Quirinus till after the death of that young prince. But he died in the year 755, according to the calculation of archbiſhop Uſher and Father Noris (3); or in the year 756, according to Petavius; or in the year 757, according to Valeſius (4). It is not likely that Quirinus ſhould have divorced her before he had lived a year with her; and therefore it is not true, that in 773 ſhe had been divorced twenty years. The commentators on Suetonius take no notice of this difficulty, though it deſerved to be cleared. Father Noris (5) had reaſon to find fault with archbiſhop Uſher for ſaying, on the one hand, that Lucius Cæſar died in the year 755; and on the other, that Lepida was married to Quirinus in the year 753. Theſe two things are inconſiſtent, ſince it is undeniable that Quirinus married after the death of Lucius Cæſar: Will any body ſay, that there was a deſign to marry a woman to the emperor's grand-ſon, who had been left, or put away by Quirinus? The learned Uſher fell into this miſtake, becauſe he truſted Suetonius, that is, becauſe he thought Suetonius had exactly computed the years between Lepida's divorce, and her trial. He ſhould not have had ſo good an opinion of him. I muſt not forget, that Tiberius, after the condemnation of that woman, declared at laſt that he was certainly informed by Quirinus's ſervants, that ſhe had endeavoured to poiſon her huſband. 'Dein tormentis ſervorum patefacta ſunt flagitia, itumque in ſententiam Rubellii Blandi, à quo aqua atque igni arcebatur: huic Druſus adſenſit, quamquam alii mitius cenſuiſſent, mox Scauro qui filiam ex ea genuerat, datum, ne bona publicarentur. Tum demum aperuit Tiberius, *compertum ſibi etiam ex P. Quirini ſervis, veneno eum à Lepida petitum* (6). - - - *Afterwards the ſervants being put to the torture diſcovered her crimes, and the opinion of Rubellius Blandus, by which ſhe was baniſhed, was agreed to: Druſus aſſented to it, though others had voted more favourably; and ſoon after Scaurus, who had had a daughter by her, obtained that her eſtate ſhould not be confiſcated. At laſt Tiberius* declared that he had been certainly informed by P. Quirinus's ſervants, that Lepida had endeavoured to poiſon him.' We ſhall preſently ſee, that in all likelihood Lepida was juſtly condemned.

[*B*] *People began to pity Lepida, though ſhe was infamous and guilty.*] If it cannot be ſaid, that Tacitus reflected too much upon Tiberius, much leſs can it be affirmed, that he was willing to ſpare him. Seeing therefore he acknowledges, that Lepida was guilty, and had loſt her reputation (7), we may very well believe that the thing was notorious. He does not deny, that Tiberius made ſome ſteps during that trial, whereby it appeared, that he was deſirous that Lepida ſhould be puniſhed; but he owns, that one might ſuſpect from ſome other ſteps, that he had a mind ſhe ſhould go unpuniſhed. 'Haud facile quis diſpexerit illa in cognitione mentem Principis, adeo vertit ac miſcuit iræ & clementiæ ſigna (8). - - - *It was not eaſy* needs only read Ryckius's Notes on Tacitus's Annals, *pag.* 37. Joſephus calls him Κυρήνιος, *Cyrenius*, and ſays, that he was a man, who had gone thro' all employments, and one of the moſt illuſtrious of thoſe times *(o)*.

(a) Dio, *lib. liv, p. m.* 619.

(b) Tacit. Ann. *lib. iii, cap. xlviii.*

(c) Ibid.

(d) *Called* Homonadenſes.

(e) Strabo, *lib. xii, pag.* 392.

(f) Ibid.

(g) Tacit. ubi ſupra.

(h) In the ſecond chapter.

(i) Ib. ver. 2.

(k) In the remark [*B*], of the article LOLLIUS.

(l) Tacit. Annal. *lib. iii, cap. xxiii.*

(m) Ex eod. Tacito, ibid. & *cap. xlviii.*

(n) He is ſo called in moſt editions of Tacitus.

(1) Tacit. Annal. *lib. iii, cap. xxii.*

(2) Sueton. in Tiberio, *cap. xlix.*

(3) *See Father Noris's* Cenotaphia Piſana, *p.* 258, & 260.

(4) In Notis ad Excerpta Dionis, *pag.* 90. *See* Noris, ibid. *p.* 259.

(5) Noris, ibid. *pag.* 258.

(6) Tacit. Ann. *lib. iii, cap. xxiii.*

(7) Quamvis infami ac nocenti. *Ib. cap. xxii.*

(8) Ibid.

(*o*) Joſeph. Antiquitat. Judaicar. *lib. xviii*, *cap. i*, *pag.* 616.

‘ *eaſy to find out the intention of the emperor in that tryal, he ſo mixed and blended the marks of his anger and clemency.*’ The worſt that can be ſaid is, That Tiberius promoted under hand the verification of the crimes of which Lepida was accuſed. This cannot be called an oppreſſion of innocence, an injuſtice, a tyranny, *&c.* Let us conclude, that the lady deſerved the puniſhment ſhe ſuffered. Nevertheleſs the people expreſſed their indignation againſt the authors of the trial, and openly complained, with horrid imprecations, that ſo illuſtrious a lady was ſacrificed to Quirinus. She had moved the people with the complaints ſhe made during the celebration of the public games; and beſides, Quirinus had rendered himſelf odious. This was the great point; for they who draw upon themſelves the hatred of the people, prompt them to favour and cheriſh the perſons whom they attack, though they have no merit, and even though they be very guilty. ‘ Quirinus quamvis infami ac nocenti miſerationem addiderat (9). . . . . Lepida ludorum diebus, qui cognitionem intervenerant, theatrum cum claris feminis ingreſſa, lamentatione flebili *majores ſuos ciens, ipſumque Pompeium*, cujus ea monumenta, & adſtantes imagines viſebantur, tantum miſericordiæ permovit, ut effuſi in lacrymas, *ſæva & deteſtanda Quirino* clamarent, *cujus ſenectæ atque orbitati, & obſcuriſſimæ domui, deſtinata quondam uxor L. Cæſari, ac divo Auguſto nurus, dederetur* (10). - - - *Quirinus had excited pity towards her, though ſhe was infamous and guilty. . . . At the celebration of the public games, which happened during the trial; ſhe entered the theatre with ſome ladies of quality, and with tears and lamentations invoking* her anceſtors, *and particularly* Pompey, *whoſe monuments and images were then preſent and ſeen by the people, ſhe ſo moved their compaſſion, that, ſhedding a flood of tears, they imprecated horrid curſes upon* Quirinus, to whom being old, childleſs, and of a very obſcure family, ſhe was ſacrificed, though ſhe had been formerly deſigned for the wife of L. Cæſar, and for the daughter-in-law of the divine Auguſtus.’ The puniſhment inflicted upon Lepida did but increaſe the hatred of the people againſt Quirinus (11). Compare this with what is ſaid above (12).

(9) Ibid.

(10) Ibid. *cap. xxiii.*

(11) Sed ceteris haud læta memoria Quirini erat, ob intenta, ut memoravi, Lepidæ pericula ſordidamque & præpotentem ſenectam. *Ibid. cap. xlviii.*

(12) The article MARILLAC (LEWIS DE). remark [*A*], citation (1).

R.

RACAN (HONORAT DE BEUIL, MARQUIS DE) the ſon of a knight of the orders of St Michael and the Holy Ghoſt; was born at la Roche Racan in Touraine (*a*) in the year 1589 (*b*). He was page to the king in the year 1605 (*c*), and as he began then to make verſes, he got acquainted with Malherbe, *of whom he learned whatever he knew of the French poetry. . . . . . This acquaintance and friendſhip with Malherbe laſted till he died, which happened in* 1628 (*d*). He was admitted into the French Academy, when it was founded, in which he cauſed a diſcourſe againſt the ſciences to be read the ninth of July 1635 (*e*). If he had been at Paris, he would have ſpoken it himſelf; but he was then in his province. He publiſhed that diſcourſe *with ſome of his poems* (*f*). He died in the year 1670, and was ſucceeded in the Academy by Mr de la Chambre, rector of St Bartholomew. He happened one day to make a Quatrain exactly like that of a Poet whom he thought he had never read [*A*]. I ſhall ſay in another place (*g*), that he was very fond of the favours of the ladies.

[*A*] *He made a Quatrain exactly like that of a Poet, whom he thought he had never read.*] Mr Menage tells us a great many particulars, which deſerve to be ſet down in this place. ‘(1) I have often heard Mr Chapelain ſay, that he and Mr d'Andilli had made that ſame verſe (2), without knowing that it was Malherbe's. And whilſt I am writing this remark, I underſtand by Mr Furetiere, that the ſame thing has happened to him. I have often heard likewiſe Mr Corneille ſay, that he had made, in his Polyeucte, thoſe two famous verſes concerning Fortune,

Et comme elle a l'éclat du verre,
Elle en a la fragilité;

That is,

Fortune, reſembling glaſs in ev'ry tittle,
Like glaſs is ſhining, and like glaſs is brittle.

without knowing that they were Mr Godeau's; for they were made firſt of all by Mr Godeau, biſhop of Vence, in his ode to cardinal Richelieu, fifteen years before Mr Corneille made them in his Polyeucte. It is no uncommon thing thus to hit on the thoughts and expreſſions of others. Porphyrius, in a fragment of his book concerning Philology, quoted by Euſebius in the third chapter of the tenth book of his *Præparatio Evangelica*, mentions one Aretades, who had written a whole treatiſe of ſuch fortuitous hits. . . . . . I ſay, it is a pretty common thing thus to hit upon the ſame thought and expreſſion of another man; eſpecially when one has formerly ſeen the ſame thought, and the ſame expreſſion, as Mr d'Andilli, Mr Chapelain, and Mr Furetiere, had certainly ſeen that verſe of Malherbe, and Mr Corneille, thoſe two verſes of Mr Godeau; for it often falls out, that a thing remains in our mind, when the author of it is forgotten. But what happened to Mr de Racan is very extraordinary. In the year 1608, being in garriſon at Calais, he made theſe four verſes at nineteen years of age:

Eſtime qui voudra la mort épouventable,
Et la face l'horreur de tous les animaux;
Quant à moye je la tiens pour le poinct deſirable
Où commencent nos biens, & finiſſent nos maux.

Let death be dreadful to both mean and great,
Let every creature fear the ſtroke of fate;
Not ſuch my thought; I count the moment bleſt
Which ends our trouble, and begins our reſt.

ſome time after being at Paris, and repeating thoſe verſes as his own to his friend Ivrante, his friend told him, that he muſt not think to impoſe upon him; that he knew very well thoſe verſes were the firſt Quatrain of Mathieu's book, intituled, *Les Tablettes de la vie & de la mort*. Mr de Racan, who had never ſeen that book, denied obſtinately, and for a conſiderable time, that Mathieu had made thoſe verſes, and would not yield till Ivrante brought Mathieu's book, and ſhewed him the verſes; at which Mr de Racan was not a little amazed. I do not queſtion the truth of this ſtory, being fully perſuaded that Mr de Racan, who told it me very often, and in the preſence of ſeveral people, is a very ſincere man. But I doubt very much of the truth of what Leonardo Salviati ſays, in the firſt book of his *Avertimenti della Lingua Italiana*, that a Poet of his time, who had never ſeen cardinal Bembo's ſonnets, had made ſome exactly like them.’ You ſee that Mr Menage makes a great difference between Racan's adventure, and thoſe of the other Poets, whom he named. He finds ſomething in the firſt that is more extraordinary. I ſhould judge otherwiſe of it, if I was to ſay what I think of it. Few people are ignorant, that well educated children are taught ſome moral and pious maxims; and that care is taken, even before they can read, to make them get by heart ſome ſententious ſtaves, of verſes. The Proteſtants pitched upon ſome paſſages of David's Pſalms; or, as the Catholics do, upon ſome Quatrains of Pibrac, or of another Poet of the ſame nature (3), which are never wanting in any country. Without doubt little Racan, when he was but five or ſix years of age, heard his governeſs, or his mother, repeat ſome of thoſe fine Quatrains, or ſome of Mathieu's, which are generally bound up with Pibrac. The traces that were imprinted on his brain, were ſtopped up, and remained ſo ſeveral years; afterwards they opened again, and ſeemed to him an object entirely new, without calling to remembrance the author, or the book, which had occaſioned them. He therefore thought himſelf to be the author of thoſe four verſes, though in truth they were only an imperfect remembrance. If a man would carefully examine himſelf, he would find, upon a thouſand occaſions, that what he takes to be his own invention, is a thing that he has heard or read; but he did not remember that circumſtance. Here follow ſome verſes of Moliere, which confirm what I have ſaid concerning the education of children:

(*a*) Pelliſſon, Hiſt. de l'Académie Franç. *pag. m.* 344.

(*b*) I ſhall ſay in the remark that he was nineteen years of age in the year 1608.

(*c*) Vie de Malherbe, *pag.* 5.

(*d*) Ib. *p.* 6.

(*e*) Pelliſſon, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 102, 103.

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) In the remark [*F*], of the article TIRESIAS.

(1) Menage, Obſervations ſur Malherbe, *pag.* 254, *& ſeq.* He has inſerted all this in the *Anti-Baillet, ch. cxxviii.*

(2) *That is,* d'arbitres de la paix, de foudres de la guerre, *which is in Malherbe's Paraphraſe upon the CXLVth Pſalm.*

(3) There is a book intituled, *Le miroir de vertu & le chemin de bien vivre.* It is a collection of Chriſtian and Moral Quatrains by Peter Habert, counſellor and ſecretary to the king.

dren: it is a cenſure of a coquet: a father ſpeaks to his daughter:

Voilà, voilà le fruit de ces empreſſemens,
Qu'on vous voit nuit & jour à lire vos Romans:
De colibets d'amour vôtre tête eſt remplie,
Et vous parlez de Dieu bien moins que de Clelie.
Jettez moi dans le feu tous ces méchans écrits,
Qui gâtent tous les jours tant de jeunes eſprits:
Liſez moi comme il faut, au lieu de ces ſornettes,
Les Quatrains de Pibrac, & les doctes Tablettes
Du Conſeiller Matthieu, ouvrage de valeur,
Et plein de beaux dictons à reciter par cœur:
La guide des pécheurs eſt encor un bon livre,
C'eſt là qu'en peu de tems on apprend à bien vivre,
Et ſi vous n'aviez leu que ces moralitez,
Vous ſçauriez un peu mieux ſuivre mes volontez (4).

That is,

See, ſee the conſequence of that delight
With which you read romances day and night:
Your head is fill'd with love's fantaſtic toys;
And Clelia more than G O D *your ſpeech employs.*
Then to the flames commit each impious page,
The bane of youth, and poiſon of the age:
And let to theſe deſtructive tales ſucceed,
The learn'd Matthieu, or virtuous Pibrac read,
In them you will the nobleſt maxims find:
They'll form the heart, and cultivate the mind.
Let theſe, and let the Sinner's Guide be thine;
There will you learn to lead a life divine,
And had not other books your youth betray'd,
A father's will, had now been more obey'd.

(4) Moliere, Sganarelle ou le Cocu imaginaire, *Scene I.*

RADULPHUS (*a*) archbiſhop of Bourges, was ſon of Radulphus, count and lord of Turenne, lay-abbot of Tulle, count of Quercy, and of Agana, his wife. His birth was very illuſtrious, being of the Blood-Royal of France, and of the ſame ſtock and branch as Wifridus count of Bourges (*b*), whom the acts of St James the Hermit, and thoſe of St Genulfus affirm to be ſprung from the kings of France (*c*).

Radulphus was from his youth deſigned for the church, and committed to the care of Bertrand abbot of Solignac, in Limoſin (*d*). He was afterwards abbot of Fleury (*e*), and then archbiſhop of Bourges in the year 839 (*f*). He was concerned in all the great affairs of his time (*g*). It was he that crowned king of Aquitain, at Limoges, in 855, the young Charles, ſon to Charles the Bald (*h*). He was with the ſame Charles the Bald at the council held at Savonieres near Toul, in the year 859. The manner in which the fathers of the council treated him, and the great ſubmiſſion and deference which they paid him (*i*) make it appear, that he was in the higheſt eſtimation, both with the court and with the clergy. He was one of the archbiſhops that were choſen by this council to judge of the complaints that Charles the Bald brought againſt Wenillon archbiſhop of Sens (*k*). He had before aſſiſted in the year 855, at the council of Meaux (*l*), as he did afterwards at that of Tuſei in 860 (*m*), and at the aſſemblies held at Piſtes in the preſence of Charles the Bald, in the years 862, and 864 (*n*). With his patrimony he built ſeveral abbies, to wit, that of Devra in Berry, ſince transferred to Vierzon (*o*); that of Beaulieu in Limoſin; the abbey of Vegennes in the ſame country; and the abbey of Saraſac in Quercy. Theſe two laſt are ruined (*p*).

He likewiſe re-built Chateau-Gourdon in Saiſſeau. This town was part of his patrimony: he brought thither the body of St Satirus, from whence they gave it the name of St Satur which it bears to this day (*q*). It is ſituated near Sancerre, which was the chief place of the other part of Saiſſeau, poſſeſſed by Wifridus count of Bourges, and which his daughter Agana brought in marriage to Robert, brother of Ingeltrude, wife of Pepin I, king of Aquitain (*r*). This Robert is the ſame as Robert the Strong.

An antient author (*s*) informs us, that St Radulphus governed the people that were under his care with ſo much prudence and greatneſs of ſoul, that he was by all the grandees of Aquitain juſtly ſtiled the father of his country (*t*). He took particular care of all his clergy, and it was for their inſtruction and edification that he compoſed fifteen canons, or ordinances, which Baluzius has printed. He compoſed ſome other canons alſo which the ſame Baluzius promiſes to publiſh. He was the firſt archbiſhop of Bourges which we know for certain to have been patriarch and primate of the provinces of Aquitain and Narbonne (*u*). It was on this ſubject that Pope Nicolas I. wrote to him a long letter, by which we learn that primates ought not to take immediate cognizance of the affairs of the clergy of other dioceſes ſubject to their primacy, but only in the way of appeal (*x*).

He died the twentieth day of June, in the year 866, and was canonized (*y*).

He, his brothers, and their poſterity, were all attached to Robert the Strong, and his deſcendants.

Two of his brothers, **GODFREY** and **ROBERT** left children behind them. The poſterity of Robert ended in **AIMAR**, viſcount of lower Limoſin, a lay-abbot and

(*a*) See the advertiſement concerning the 2d edition of this Dictionary.

(*b*) Mabillon, Act. SS. Benedict. Sæc. IV, *Tom. ii, pag.* 156. *Ibid. pag.* 151: Robertus ſiquidem Saxiaci vici, & circumjacentis Regionis Dominus, vir potens, & nobilis, ex Regum Francorum genere ortus erat, & quod optabilius eſt Chriſtianâ pietate inſignis: cui affectu & origine reſpondebat uxor ejus nomine Agana, ex patre Wicfrido Comite quondam Bituricenſi, Regali Proſapiâ exorto, & Matrona Oda nomine, filia, & hi omnes ex Regio Francorum Sanguine traxerant originem.

(*c*) *Ibid. pag.* 226. *Vitæ Sti. Genulphi*: Wifredus hic ex illâ Nobilium Scarrâ quam glorioſus Rex Pipinus præfati Auguſti Ludovici avus, in urbe Bituricâ ad Quaïfarii Ducis Aquitaniæ partes expugnandas reliquerat, originem trahens Regali quoque Proſapiâ oriundus.

(*d*) Ibid. *pag.* 157. (*e*) Ibid. (*f*) *Ibid.* & Gall. Chriſt. à Sammarthanis, *Tom. i, pag.* 151, & 152. Patriarch. Bituricen. *cap. xlvii*, in Biblioth. Labb. *Tom. ii, pag.* 66. (*g*) La Thaumaſſiere, Hiſt. du Berri, *pag.* 294. (*h*) Beſli, Hiſt. des Comtes de Poictou, & Annal. Bertini, *ad ann.* 855. (*i*) Sirm. Concil. Gall. *Tom. iii, cap. xi, pag.* 141. (*k*) Ibid. *pag.* 144. (*l*) Sæc. Benedict. IV, *Tom. ii, pag.* 165. (*m*) Sirm. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 160. (*n*) Ibid. (*o*) Cron. Vierzon. in Biblioth. Labb. *Tom. ii*, Act. SS. Benedict. Sæc. IV, *Tom. ii, pag.* 158, & *ſeq.* (*p*) Ibid. (*q*) Hiſt. de St Martial, *Part iii, pag.* 315. (*r*) Dominici, Anſberti Familia rediviva. Du Bouchet, Veritab. Orig. de la Maiſon de France. Labbe, Tableaux Généalogiques. (*s*) Fragmentum Vit. Sti. Jacobi Eremitæ, *relatum in* Patriarch. Bituricenſi, *cap. lxvii*, Labb. Biblioth. *Tom. i.* (*t*) Interea vir Domini Jacobus inter tot præclara bonorum operum exercitia illuſtratus gratiâ divinâ prædixit obitum præſtantiſſimi Pontificis Rodulphi, qui inſitâ ſibi prudentiâ, animi quoque nobilitate, ſuâ tempeſtate plebem ſibi creditam optimè regens, meritò Pater patriæ à cunctis Aquitaniæ Gentis Primoribus dici poterat. Idem refertur in *Vitâ Sti. Jacobi Eremitæ*, apud *Mabillonium, Sæc. Benedict. IV, Tom. ii, pag.* 256, *in Elog. Hiſtorico Sanct. Rodulp. Archi. Bituric.* (*u*) Gall. Chriſt. à Sammarth. *Tom. i, pag.* 151, & 152. (*x*) Nicolai I Papæ, Epiſt. xxxix. (*y*) Sæc. Bened. IV, *Tom. ii, pag.* 164.

and reſtorer of the abbey of Tulle. He reſtored to the Friars of this houſe the dignity of abbot, and the revenues of the abbey, which were in his family from the time of his great-great-grand-father, who had obtained a grant of them from our kings (z).

(z) Appendix ad Canones Rheginonis à Stephano Baluſio, *p.* 528. Juſtel, Preuves de l'Hiſt. de Turenne, *p.* 15.

Count Godfrey fought againſt the Normans, at the battle of Brieſerthe, with Robert the Strong who was ſlain there (*a a*). He left two ſons, count **GODFREY**, of whom St Eudes, abbot of Cluny, ſays, that he endeavoured to oblige St Gerald, count of Aurillac, to become his vaſſal (*b b*). **RANULPH**, younger brother of Godfrey, carried on the line; the eldeſt branch of his deſcendants ended in **SULPITIUS**, who by marriage brought Turenne into the houſe of Comborn (*c c*). The younger branch which took the name of Soüillac, when ſirnames became hereditary, is ſtill remaining, and continues the line of the princes, counts, and lords of Turenne, ſprung from the ſame ſtock as Wicfridus count of Bourges.

(*a a*) Annal. Bertin. *ad ann.* 866.

(*b b*) Bibl. Cluniac. *pag.* 84.

(*c c*) Juſtel, *ubi ſupra*, *pag.* 18.

RADULPHUS, or *Ralph*, a Benedictin Monk, ſirnamed *Flaviacenſis*, or *Flaicenſis*, becauſe he was of the convent of St Germer de Flaix, in the dioceſe of Beauvais, flouriſhed in the year 1157, as Albericus affirms (*a*) upon the teſtimony of Helinand (*b*). Several famous writers have erroneouſly placed him in the year 910 (*c*): ſome call him Ralph the Black (*d*). The commentary which he wrote on Leviticus is ſtill extant; it has been inſerted in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and printed ſeparately at Cologne in the year 1536. They (*e*) have reſtored to him a commentary on the Song of Songs, which formerly was aſcribed to St Gregory. The partizans of the hiſtory of Pope Joan have numbred him among their evidences, but this happened thro' a great miſtake [*A*].

(*a*) Albericus trium Fontium Monachus, in Chronic. *See Father* Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 274.

(*d*) Mr du Pin, Biblioth. *Tom. ix*, *pag.* 185, is one of them.

(*e*) Father Hommey, in the *Supplement. Patrum* in the year 1684.

(*b*) A Monk of Fromond in the dioceſe of Beauvais, about the end of the XIIth, and beginning of the XIIIth century. See Father Labbe, *ubi ſupra*, *pag.* 275.

(*c*) Labbe, ibid. *pag.* 273.

[*A*] *The partizans of the hiſtory of Pope Joan have numbred him among their evidences, but this happened through a great miſtake.*] This aroſe from confounding him with a Benedictin Monk, named Ralph Higden, an Engliſhman, who died in the year 1363; Father Labbe thinks that Conrad Decker was the firſt ſource of this blunder. ' Auctor primus illius apud Blondellum erroris atque in Mareſio malæ fidei fuit homo furioſus Conradus Deckerus in libro, cui titulum fecit de Papa Romano & Papiſſa Romana, quod Joannes Octavus fuerit mulier & puerpera, Oppenheimii ad Rhenum in 8 anno 1612; ſic enim loquitur pagina 430. Deſcripſit Radulphus hanc Hiſtoriam in ſuo Polychronico libri V, cap. 32, teſtis locupletiſſimus & omni exceptione major, utpote in quo veritatis Hiſtoricæ nulla deſiderantur κριτήεια: & vixit juxta Trithemium anno circiter 930. ita ut Papale hoc puerperium ab iis accipere potuerit, qui illud viderunt. Atque ex illo cœnoſo fonte promanavit in cæteros error (1.) - - - - *The firſt author of that error in Blondel, and diſingenuity in Mareſius was Conrad Decker, a violent man, in a book which he intituled*, de Papa Romano, & Papiſſa Romana *affirming, that John VIII was a woman, and had been brought to bed of a child (the book was printed at Oppenheim upon the Rhine, in* 1612, *in 8vo), for thus he writes in the* 430*th page. Radulphus related this ſtory in his Polychronicon. He is a moſt ſubſtantial witneſs, and above all exception, there being no mark of a true Hiſtorian which does not appear in him. Beſides, he lived, according to Trithemius, about the year* 930, *ſo that he might have received this account of the delivery of Pope Joan from thoſe who had ſeen it. From this polluted fountain the error ſpread itſelf among others.*' But it is certain Vignier had committed this error two years before Conrad Decker's work was printed. I ſhall quote what he publiſhed in the year 1610. ' What Baronius and Bellarmin ſay, that Marianus Scotus, was the firſt author of this ſtory is falſe, as may be ſeen by the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the deceaſed Nicolas Vignier, my father, in which he produces the teſtimony of Radulphus in his Polychronicon, who was a Monk of the order of St Benedict, and lived about the year 930, according to Trithemius (2).' A Capuchin who wrote againſt Vignier in the year 1611, did not know how to make uſe of the advantages he had, he did not ſufficiently underſtand books and authors. He knew not that the author of the *Polychronicon*, which his adverſary had quoted, did not live in the Xth century, but in the XIVth: let us ſee the anſwer which he made. *Read* your father *over again, you will find in the hiſtorical library on the ſame ſubject, firſt, that he is guilty of a falſhood, when he ſays,* That all thoſe who have written the hiſtory of Popes, except Anaſtaſius, agree, that your Pope Joan ſucceeded Leo IV, *as he might have learned from Onuphrius, whom he cites there. Secondly, That he ſpeaks doubtfully, and timerouſly of this affair, as well as others, who were miſtaken concerning it. Thirdly, It will appear from his text, well conſidered, that he alledges Marianus as the oldeſt author of this ſtory. Fourthly, That he does not in this place make the leaſt mention of your Arnulphus, but quotes Johannis Lucidus; but if you have a mind to make but one of theſe two, know further, that we give very little credit, not to ſay none at all, to the allegations of your ſaid father* (3). This was not home to the point, nor going to the bottom of the cauſe. Vignier furniſhed advantages againſt himſelf, in giving the title of Ranulphus's work. It is owing to this title, that Father Labbe (4) diſcovered by a paſſage of Decker, the ſource of this miſtake. The learned Blondel had taken no notice of this title: and from hence it came that he was prevailed upon to believe, that Radulphus Flaviacenſis had written concerning Pope Joan (5). It is true, that he has not followed the error of thoſe, who place him either in the year 910, or in the year 930. He hath placed his death in the year 1157; and he founds this on the teſtimony of Albericus; but he ought to have remembered that Albericus does not place the death of our Radulphus in this year, but the moſt proſperous time of his life: they were not very fortunate, when they repreſented to him that Radulphus Flaviacenſis was more ancient than he had made him, that he was an evidence of Pope Joan, prior to Marianus; and, in ſhort, that he was a man that might have ſeen Pope Joan with his own eyes (6). ' Hic (Radulphus Flaviacenſis) inter teſtes veritatis malè tertius ponitur à Mariano: Nec enim Radulphus Flaviacenſis mortuus eſt denuò anno 1157, niſi eum multò longæviorem faciamus Johanne de Temporibus; cùm floruerit ipſo nono Chriſti ſæculo, pluſquam 100. annis antequam Marianus naſceretur, adeo ut ipſam Joannam vidiſſe potuerit: Etenim Bellarminus *de Scriptor. Eccl.* Radulphum ait floruiſſe anno Chriſti 910 (7). - - - - *Radulphus Flaviacenſis is erroneouſly put in the third place after Marianus among the witneſſes of the truth, for Radulphus did not die in the* 1157, *unleſs we can ſuppoſe that he lived longer than* Johannes de Temporibus, *ſince he flouriſhed in the IXth century after Chriſt, above an hundred years before Marianus was born, ſo that he might have ſeen Joan herſelf; for Bellarmin, in his account of Eccleſiaſtical writers, ſays, that Radulphus flouriſhed in the year of Chriſt* 910.' He who talked thus made ſeveral miſtakes, which Father Labbe expoſed with dreadful ſeverity (8).

Had Mr Hartnac known this, when he publiſhed a new edition of Micrelius's *Syntagma Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ*, he would, no doubt, have informed his readers, that theſe words, ' Nobile indignari, Aventine, Onuphri, Raymunde (9), Bellarmine, Baroni, Bini, Florimunde, quod veſtram audaciam in negando muliebri hoc pontificatu nihil curans, veritatem rei profero

(1) Labbe, in Cenotaphio everſo, *ad calcem*, *Tom. i*, de Script. Eccleſ. *pag.* 986, 987.

(2) Nicolas Vignier, Theatre de l'Antechriſt, *Part ii*, *cap. xxvii*, *pag. m.* 1055.

(3) Silveſtre de l'Aval, Prédicateur Capucin, les juſtes Grandeurs de l'Egliſe Romaine, *livr. iii*, *pag.* 78.

(4) Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. i*, *p.* 987.

(5) Blondel, in Examine Quæſt. de Papa fœmina, *pag. m.* 5.

(6) They pretend ſhe came to be Pope after Leo IV, who died *an.* 855.

(7) Samuel Mareſius, in Johanna Papiſſa reſtituta, *p.* 5.

(8) *See the ſecond Tome of* Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ. *pag.* 274, 795, *& ſeq.*

(9) He ſhould not have been diſtinguiſhed from *Florimund*, who comes afterwards, for they have made two authors of one.

‘ profero ex *Rudolpho Flaviacenſi*, monacho Benedictino qui vixit circa annum ıↄcccxx. *ex* Mariano Scoto, *qui natus*, &c (10).’ - - - - *Now vent ‘ your noble rage, Aventinus, Onuphrius, Raymundus, ‘ Bellarmin, Baronius, Binius, Florimundus, becauſe ‘ without having the leaſt regard to your impudence in ‘ denying the ſtory of the female Pontiff, I demonſtrate ‘ the truth of it, from Rodulphus Flaviacenſis, a Bene‘ dictine Monk, who lived about the year* 820, *and out ‘ of Marianus Scotus, who was born*, &c.” are erroneous: and that the words *ex Rudolpho Flaviacenſi* muſt be ſtruck out. Here we ſee how much it concerns writers of controverſy, not to ſtop at the authors of their own party, but to carry their enquires through all the replies of the adverſe party. Should a man content himſelf to conſult only Mareſius, he would repeat his citations, but were he to conſult the author, who has confuted him (11), he would then be able to diſtinguiſh the good from the bad. Let us here occaſionally obſerve, that Mr Hartnac has put in the margin, the names of ſeveral Proteſtant authors, who have maintained the hiſtory of Pope Joan, and of whom the moſt part have written ſince Florimond de Remond (12). He cites, among others, the famous Gerhard, and Whitaker, and Andrew Willet.

(10) Micrælius, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. iii*, §. *i*, de Papis, *pag*. 508, *Edit*. 1699.

(11) That is to ſay, Father Labbe.

(12) Confer the remark [*F*], of the article POPE (Joan).

RADZIWIL (Nicolas), the fourth of that name [*A*], Palatin of Vilna, Great Marſhal and Chancellor of Lithuania in the XVIth century, was a very illuſtrious man. He travelled almoſt all over Europe in his youth, and was ſo expert in bodily exerciſes, that no gentleman of his age equalled him therein. He had a great ſhare in the love and eſteem of king Sigiſmund Auguſtus; he was made captain of his guards, and commanded his armies three times in Livonia, where he obtained a ſignal victory over the Germans, whereby they loſt that province, which was ſubjected to Poland. He brought the archbiſhop of Riga, and the Great Maſter of the knights of Livonia to the king, and delivered to him in a full ſenate the ſeal of that order, and the croſs which the Great Maſter wore about his neck. This noble expedition crowned him with glory. When he was ſent ambaſſador to the court of Charles V, and of Ferdinand king of the Romans, he ſtood godfather to the archduke Erneſtus. He died in the year 1567, and was carried to his grave upon the ſhoulders of his four ſons (*a*) [*B*]. I muſt not forget that he embraced the Proteſtant religion, and that he cauſed the Bible to be printed in the Poliſh language [*C*]. He made a very ſevere reply to Lippoman, the Apoſtolical

(*a*) *Taken from* Simon Starovolſcius, in Sarmatiæ Bellatoribus, *pag*. 172, 173.

[*A*] *Fourth of that name*.] Jagello being converted to Chriſtianity, and having united Lithuania, his own country, to the crown of Poland, which had been conferred upon him, created a lord, called Radziwil, palatin of Vilna, who, after his example, was become a Chriſtian. This palatin took the name of Nicolas at his baptiſm, and ordered that, for time to come, all the eldeſt ſons of his family ſhould be called Nicolas. He lived above a hundred years (1). Nicolas II, his only ſon, palatin of Vilna, ſerved the Republic with great glory under ſix kings ſucceſſively. He died being ninety-nine years old (2). Nicolas III, the eldeſt of his four ſons, palatin of Vilna, was made a prince of the empire, by the emperor Maximilian I, and died full of glory, being above ſeventy years of age (3). George Radziwil, his brother, palatin of Kiovia, marſhal of the court, caſtellan of Vilna, and great general of Lithuania, was the father of Barbara Radziwil, the ſecond wife of king Sigiſmund Auguſtus. He died in the year 1565 (4). John Radziwil, his brother, the youngeſt of the four ſons of Nicolas II, was made a ſenator of the kingdom by king Sigiſmund I. He was afterwards caſtellan of Troci, and at laſt great marſhal of Lithuania. He took a journey to Rome under the Pontificate of Julius II (5). He left an only ſon, who is Nicolas Radziwil, fourth of that name (6), who makes the ſubject of this article.

[*B*] *He was carried to his grave upon the ſhoulders of his four ſons* (7).] You will ſee their names and dignities in theſe Latin words: ‘ Quatuor filios, itidem ‘ bello inclytos, nec deteriores ingeniis (qui, ut inquit ‘ Valerius Maximus patriæ rem non ſuam augere pro‘ perabant) reliquit. Nicolaum Hieroſolymitana pere‘ grinatione clarum; Georgium, Vilnenſem primò, ‘ deinde Cracovienſem Epiſcopum, & S. R. E. Cardi‘ nalem; Albertum ſupremum M. D. L. Marſcalcum; ‘ & Staniſlaum Samogitiæ Toparcham: qui cum pluri‘ mis lachrymis, patre pro concione laudato funeratoque ‘ ampliſſime, propriis manibus Urnam Mauſoleo in‘ ferre non erubuerunt (8). - - *He left four ſons of great ‘ fame in the field, and of no leſs reputation in the cabi‘ net, who, as Valerius Maximus ſays, made it their ‘ buſineſs to increaſe their country's wealth, and not their ‘ own; Nicolas, famous for his travels to Jeruſalem; ‘ George, biſhop of Vilna, and afterwards of Cracow, ‘ and cardinal; Albertus, grand marſhal of the great ‘ duchy of Lithuania; and Staniſlaus, chief governor of ‘ Samogitia; who, with many tears, having heard a ‘ funeral ſermon preached over their father, and ſeen all ‘ the other ceremonies of a magnificent burial performed, ‘ were not aſhamed to carry his body to the grave with ‘ their own hands*.’ Thuanus (9) obſerves, that thoſe four ſons returned into the communion of the church of Rome, and that Albert married a daughter of the duke of Courland. He places the death of Nicolas Radziwil on the 28th of May, 1565. Bucholcerus does the ſame in his *Index Chronologicus*. Note, That David Chytræus (10) ſays the ſame things as Thuanus. The paſſage which I have quoted out of Simon Starovolſcius, informs us, that Nicolas Radziwil, the eldeſt ſon of our Nicolas Radziwil, made himſelf famous by his voyage to Jeruſalem: which obliges me to ſay, that the ſame author obſerves, in another book (11), that Thomas Treterus, a canon of Warmia, tranſlated into Latin the relation of Nicolas Christopher Radziwil's voyage to Jeruſalem (12). That voyage was made in the year 1584. This Nicolas Chriſtopher Radziwil gave a relation of it in four lettters in the Poliſh language. I have ſeen the Latin tranſlation, printed at Antwerp in the year 1614, in folio. The Epiſtle Dedicatory of Treterus the tranſlator is dated in the year 1601. He who made that journey, died in the month of February 1616, and was buried in a pilgrim's habit in the college of the Jeſuit at Nieſwiez (13). He was made a prince of the empire, and left four ſons (14), from one of which, if I am not miſtaken, prince Stanislaus Albert Radziwil deſcended, who was *duke of Olyka and Nieſwiez, chancellor of the great duchy of Lithuania* (15), and the author of a panegyric upon our Lady of Czeſtochovia. He flouriſhed at the time when Mr le Laboureur publiſhed a relation of a journey into Poland, that is, in the year 1647.

[*C*] *He cauſed the Bible to be printed in the Poliſh language*.] Nicolas Oleſnicki, as I have ſaid elſewhere (16), eſtabliſhed the Reformed religion in Pinczovia at the inſtigation of Stancarus. A ſchool was likewiſe ſet up in the ſame place. which proved a nurſery of learned men. John Laſcus, George Blandrata, Francis Liſmaninus, Martin Grovicius, Peter Statorius, George Schoman, Gregory Pauli, Brelius, Triceſſius, and ſome others, made it flouriſh to ſuch a degree, that Pinczovia was looked upon as the Athens of Poland (17). There it was that thoſe learned men tranſlated all the Bible into the vulgar tongue. Their tranſlation was printed at Breſt in Lithuania, at the charges of our Nicolas Radziwil. He was governor of that royal city, and ſet up a Printing-houſe in it. The Pſalms of David, a collection of Canticles, and ſome other works of the ſame kind, were printed in that town, and contributed very much to the converſion of the people. Here are the words of my author: ‘ Ibi *(Pinczoviæ)* à Viris illis piis & doctis ‘ univerſa Biblia Sacra in Linguam vernaculam tranſla‘ ta, ſumptibus Nicolai Radzivilii Palatini Vilnenſis

(1) Simon Starovolſcius, in Sarmatiæ Bellatoribus, *pag*. 163, 164.

(2) Ibid. *pag*. 165, 166.

(3) Ibid. *pag*. 167, *& ſeq*.

(4) Ibid. *pag*. 169, 170.

(5) Ibid. *pag*. 171, 172.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Filiorum humeris elatus fuit. *Ibid. pag*. 174.

(8) Ibid. *pag*. 173.

(9) Thuan. *lib. xxxviii, pag*. 769.

(10) David Chytræus, in Saxonia, *lib. xxi, ad ann*. 1565, *pag*. 558, *Edit. Lipſ*. 1602.

(11) Starovolſc. in centum Polonorum Elogiis, *pag*. 70, 71.

(12) This is the ſame with the eldeſt ſon of our Radziwil.

(13) Starovolſc. in Bellator. Sarmatiæ, *p*. 176.

(14) Ibid.

(15) Le Laboureur, Relation de Pologne, *Part iii, pag*. 25.

(16) In the article STANCARUS.

(17) Ita ut tunc Pinczovia velut Athenæ Sarmaticæ celebraretur. *Staniſl. Lubieniecius, Hiſt. Reform. Polon. lib. i, cap. v, pag*. 33.

Apoſtolical Nuncio, who had given him ſome very reproachful words [*D*]. The clergy of Vilna being not willing to permit the miniſters to preach in the churches, he made them preach in the court of his houſe, over againſt St John's church (*b*). The firſt ſynod of the Reformed was held under his protection at Vilna in December 1557 (*c*). He had a wife (*d*), who was no leſs zealous than he to ſettle the Reformation (*e*). There was at that time one CHRISTOPHER RADZIWIL, who embraced the Proteſtant religion; and it is ſaid, that the diſcovery of ſome monkiſh impoſtures occaſioned his change [*E*]. Others call him Nicolas (*f*), and ſay he was couſin-german to him,

(*b*) David Chytræus, in Saxonia, *lib. xv*, *pag. m.* 393.

(*c*) Regenſvolſc. Hiſt. Eccleſ. Sclavonicar. *pag.* 142.

(*d*) Called Elizabeth Sidlowieſki.

(*e*) David Chytræus, ubi ſupra.

(*f*) See the remark [*E*] at the end.

‘Principis Magnificentiſſimi & Fortiſſimi renaſcentis veritatis vindicis impreſſa ſunt Breſtiæ Lithuanorum. Huic enim urbi Regiæ Præfectus datus erat, in qua comparatam privato ære officinam typographicam condiderat, & illi Wojewodæ Cracoviâ evocato commiſerat. Ibidem exſcriptus fuit liber Pſalmorum & hymnorum aliique ejus notæ, quorum lectione populus à Romanis ſuperſtitionibus ad veram Dei colendi rationem revocabatur (18). - - - *There* (at Pinczovia) *the whole Bible was tranſlated by theſe pious and learned men, into the vulgar tongue; and at the charge of* Nicolas *Radziwil, Palatine of Vilna, a prince of great munificence, and a moſt valiant defender of the truth then reſtored; it was printed at Breſte: of which royal city being made a governor, he did, at his own expence, build there a Printing-houſe, and committed it to the care of Weiwood, who was ſent for from Cracow. There the book of Pſalms and Hymns, and many other ſuch like, were printed: by the reading of which, the people were turned from the Romiſh ſuperſtitions, to the knowledge of the true worſhip of God.*’ That author obſerves (19) that this impreſſion of the Bible was finiſhed in the year 1563, and that it was the firſt Poliſh tranſlation of the Scripture. He adds, that it was firſt followed by another tranſlation, in the year 1572, made by Simon Budnæus; and that a verſion of the New Teſtament by Martin Czechovicius was printed five years after. Note, that if we believe John Lætus (20), the tranſlators of the Bible, printed at Nicolas Radziwil's charges (21), were but five, *viz.* Orſacius, Zazius, Triceſius, James Lubelſcius, and Statorius.

[*D*] *He made a very ſevere reply to Lippoman, the Apoſtolical Nuncio, who had given him ſome very reproachful words.*] I am ſure my readers will be glad to find here part of that anſwer. ‘Apoſtaſia cum ei non ſine conviciis à *Lippomano Pontificis Legato* exprobraretur, eidem docta *Apologia* reſpondit, fidei ſuæ rationem dedit, inter alia vero: *Certum tibi eſſe volo, ſic me nunc doctiſſimorum virorum videndorum deſiderio teneri, ut ſi ſcirem me eos, aut alios etiam ex præcipuis illis qui ſunt in Germania, Melanchthones, Brentios, poſſe in mea poſtulata aliquomodo pertrahere, in eo vel præcipuè, non ſervitoris tantum mittendi laborem conferendum, ſed etiam omnes opes facultateſque meas eſſe mihi experiendas putarem quos quia per inſignem malitiam hæreticos appellas, omnium Hæreticorum, quos orbis terrarum habet, maxime Hæreticus es* (22). - - - When he was upbaided with apoſtacy in a ſcurrilous manner by Lippomanus, the Pope's Nuntio, he anſwered him by a very learned apology, in which he gave the reaſon of his faith, and among other things ſaid: *I would have you to be aſſured, that I have ſo ardent a deſire of converſing with the moſt learned men, that if I knew it was in my power to induce them, or others, ſo renowned in Germany, the Melanchthons and Brentiis, to comply with my propoſals; in that caſe, I ſhould think it my duty not only to ſend a ſervant, but even to beſtow all my wealth, and employ all my abilities with theſe men whom you, from the depth of malice, call heretics; but in ſo doing you prove your ſelf to be of all heretics, the greateſt heretic.*’ The letter he received from Lippoman, and his anſwer to it, were printed at Koningſberg, in the year 1556 (23).

[*E*] *It is ſaid, that the diſcovery of ſome monkiſh impoſtures occaſioned the change of Chriſtopher Radziwil.*] When the Reformation began to be eſtabliſhed in Lithuania, this Chriſtopher Radziwil being very ſorry *that a prince of his houſe had embraced it, went to Rome, and paid all imaginable honours to the Pope. The Pope being likewiſe willing to gratify him, preſented him with a box full of relics when he went away. Being returned home, and the news of thoſe relics being ſpread abroad, certain monks came to him, ſome months after, and told him that there was a man poſſeſſed with the Devil, that the wicked ſpirit had been exorciſed in vain, and that hitherto all the exorciſms had proved ineffectual. They begged of him that he would lend the precious relics he had brought from Rome, for the relief of that poor man. The prince readily granted their requeſt. The relics were carried into the church with a ſolemn pomp, and a proceſſion of all the monks. At laſt they were placed upon the altar, and on the day appointed an innumerable multitude of people crowded in to ſee the ſhow, and after the uſual exorciſms the relics were made uſe of. At that very moment the pretended devil went out of the body of the man, with the uſual geſtures and grimaces. Every body cried out, a* Miracle; *and the prince lifted up his hands and eyes to Heaven, to return thanks that he had brought a thing ſo holy, and which could do ſuch miracles. But ſome few days after, as he was full of admiration, and tranſported with joy, extolling the virtue of his relics, he perceived that a young gentleman of his houſe, who had the keeping of that rich treaſure, ſmiled, and made ſome geſtures, whereby it appeared that he derided his diſcourſe* (24). The prince grew angry, and would know the reaſon of his deriſion. The gentleman being aſſured that no harm ſhould come to him, told the prince in private, ‘That upon his return from Rome, he loſt the box of relics, which he had the keeping of, and that not daring to ſpeak of it, for fear of being puniſhed, he got one like it, and filled it with little bones of beaſts, and ſuch trifles as he could get that were like the relics which he had loſt. So that ſeeing ſo much honour paid to that vile heap of filth, and even that they aſcribed to it the virtue of driving away the Devil, he had good reaſon to wonder at it. The prince gave credit to what he ſaid, but being willing to be more particularly informed of the cheat, he ſent for the monks the next day, and deſired them to enquire, whether there was any other Demoniac, who wanted the aſſiſtance of his relics. Some few days after they brought him another man poſſeſſed with the Devil, who acted the ſame part with the firſt. The prince ordered him to be exorciſed in his preſence; but becauſe all the exorciſms, that are commonly made uſe of on ſuch an occaſion, proved ineffectual, he told the monks, that he would have the man to ſtay in his palace till the next day, and that they ſhould retire. After they were gone, he put the pretended Demoniac into the hands of his Tartarian grooms; who at firſt exhorted him to confeſs the cheat, as they were ordered to do: but becauſe he obſtinately perſiſted in it, with horrid and furious geſtures, ſix of them laid on him with whips and ſcourges, and put him into ſuch condition, that he was forced to implore the prince's mercy, who forgave him as ſoon as he had confeſſed the truth. When the night was over, the prince ſent for the monks, in whoſe preſence the poor fellow flung himſelf at his feet, and proteſted that he neither was, nor ever had been poſſeſſed with the Devil; but that thoſe monks had perſuaded him to counterfeit a Demoniac. Immediately the monks deſired the prince not to believe what he ſaid, and told him that it was a trick of the Devil, who ſpoke through that man's mouth. But the prince anſwered, that if his Tartars had been able to force the Devil to tell the truth, they would be able to extort it from the mouth of the monks. So that the monks finding themſelves preſſed ſo hard, confeſſed the impoſture, and ſaid that they had done it with a good intention, and to prevent the progreſs of hereſy. But the prince thanked God with all his heart, that he had been graciouſly pleaſed to diſcover ſuch an impoſture to him, and ſuſpecting a religion, that was ſupported with ſuch diabolical devices, tho' they went by the name of *pious frauds*, he declared, that he would no longer depend upon any body for his ſalvation, and betook himſelf to the reading of the Holy Scriptures with a wonderful aſſiduity; and having ſpent half a year in

(18) Ibid.

(19) Ibid. *lib. iii, cap. i, pag.* 170.

(20) Jo. Lætus, in Compend. Hiſtor. Univerſ. *pag. m.* 412. *He quotes* Laſicius, *lib. v*, Chytræus, in Sax. *ad ann.* 65.

(21) He ſpent ten thouſand florins upon it. *Jo. Lætus, ubi infra.*

(22) Ibid. *pag.* 390, 391.

(23) Regenſvolſcius, Hiſt. Eccleſ. Sclavonicar. *pag.* 142.

(24) Drelincourt, Réponſe au Prince Erneſt Landgrave de Heſſe, *pag.* 357.

him, who makes the ſubject of this article, and brother of Barbara Radziwil, who was married to Sigiſmund Auguſtus, king of Poland, and who died the twelfth of May 1551. They obſerve, that the church which he cauſed to be built for the Reformed in the city of Vilna, of which he was Palatin, was honoured with a fine privilege by king Stephen Battori in the year 1579, and that he died the twenty-ſeventh of April 1584, that Nicolas and Chriſtopher RADZIWIL, his two ſons, perſevered in the religion in which he had bred them up, and that their poſterity carefully preſerved that ſacred *depoſitum* (g) [*F*].

(g) *Ex eodem* Regenſvolſc. ubi ſupra, *p.* 144, 145.

'in reading and praying, he made a wonderful progreſs in piety, and in the knowledge of the myſteries of the Goſpel: and then he and all his family made an open profeſſion of our religion, in the 'year 1564 (25).' Theſe are the words of Mr Drelincourt, miniſter of the church of Paris, in the anſwer he publiſhed in the year 1663, to the letter which prince Erneſt, landgrave of Heſſe, had writ to the five miniſters of Paris. Mr Drelincourt adds (26), *Your Highneſs may believe it, if you pleaſe; but I proteſt, as if I was before the throne of God, that this ſtory was told me in this manner by the miniſter of prince Januſius Radziwil: nay, he gave me in writing part of what he told me, and explained to me* viva voce.

Regenvolſcius (27) calls him Nicolas Radziwil, whom the diſcovery of a monkiſh impoſture fully determined to forſake the Popiſh religion in the year 1564; but he ſays nothing either of the journey to Rome, or of the relics. He only ſays, that the monks of Czenſtochovia (28) had ſuborned a pretended Demoniac, whilſt Nicolas Radziwil was on his pilgrimage, which he had vowed after a great victory obtained over the Muſcovites.

[*F*] *Their poſterity carefully preſerved that ſacred* depoſitum.] NICOLAS RADZIWIL, palatin of Novogrod, was the father of GEORGE, who died caſtellan of Troki, in the year 1614, and left no children. CHRISTOPHER RADZIWIL, brother to this Nicolas, was palatin of Vilna, and died in the year 1604. He left two ſons, JANUSSIUS, and CHRISTOPHER. Januſſius, duke of Bierze, and caſtellan of Vilna, died in the year 1621, being forty-two years of age. He left by his wife, who was the Elector of Brandenburg's daughter, a ſon called BOGESLAUS. His brother Chriſtopher, palatin of Vilna, and great marſhal of Lithuania, died the nineteenth of September 1640, at fifty-five years of age, and left an only ſon, whoſe name was JANUSSIUS, and who was Great Chamberlain of Lithuania. This Bogeſlaus, and this Januſſius RADZIWIL, firſt-couſins, were both alive, and made profeſſion of the Proteſtant Religion, when the author, whom I quote (29), was writing this book, about the year 1650. The Gazettes, in the beginning of the year 1681, told us, that the princeſs LUDOVICA RADZIWIL, at fourteen years of age, married prince Lewis, ſecond ſon of the Elector of Brandenburg, at Koningſberg, the ſeventh of January, 1681; that ſhe was the only daughter of the late prince Bogeſlaus, and that ſhe was poſſeſſed of a duchy in Lithuania, which contains above forty leagues on the frontiers of Livonia, and two ſtrong caſtles. She was a Proteſtant, but after the death of prince Lewis of Brandenburg, ſhe married again in 1688, to a ſon of the Elector Palatine, and turned a Roman Catholic. There had been ſome diſcourſe of marrying her to prince James, ſon of John Sobieſki, king of Poland.

(25) Ibid. *pag.* 359, *& ſeq.*

(26) Ibid. *pag.* 362.

(27) Regenvolſc. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 145.

(28) See le Laboureur's Relation of Poland, *Part iii, pag.* 18, *& ſeq.* concerning the miraculous image of the holy Virgin, which is honoured in that place.

(29) Regenvolſc. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 145, 146.

RAIMARUS (NICOLAS) an Aſtronomer of the XVIth century. See URSUS.

RAYNAUD (THEOPHILUS), one of the moſt famous and learned Jeſuits of the XVIIth century, was born at Soſpello (*a*), in the county of Nice; but having lived in France the moſt part of his time, he paſſed for a Frenchman [*A*]. His life was very long, and attended with ſeveral diſgraces; yet he could never be perſuaded to leave his ſociety [*B*], and to aſſociate himſelf with another community, tho' he was offered great advantages elſewhere. He was extremely laborious, and loſt but little time, either in eating, or hearing devout women [*C*]. His great pleaſure was to write books, and carefully to perform the functions of his character. He compoſed a prodigious number of books: ſome of them were cenſured by the Inquiſition [*D*]; which ſenſibly afflicted him.

(*a*) From hence comes the title *Ceſpitellenſis*, that is given him to denote his native country.

[*A*] *He paſſed for a Frenchman.*] Alegambe ſays poſitively, that he was a Frenchman; *Natione Gallus, patria Ceſpitellenſis* (1). Theſe Latin words contain what is called in the ſchools *contradictio in adjecto*; for *Ceſpitellum* or *Soſpitellum* is undeniably in Italy. See Baudrand on thoſe two words. Father Oldoini cenſures Alegambe for this fault, and places our Theophilus among the writers born in Liguria. Soprani places him amongſt them likewiſe (2). They are more in the right than Southwell, who expreſſes himſelf doubtfully. *Natione Gallus*, ſays he (3), *an potius Italus? patria Ceſpitellenſis in Comitatu Niceenſi.*

[*B*] *His life .... was attended with ſeveral diſgraces; yet he could never be perſuaded to leave his ſociety.*] Here follow Southwell's words: 'Vocationis 'ſuæ religioſæ tenaciſſimus; quamvis & utilia & honorifica extra ſocietatem ei promitterentur à Primoribus, ſi hanc inter aſpera quæ ſubinde patiebatur, deſere vellet, nunquam eos auſcultare voluit (4). - - - '*He was moſt immovably attached to his religious vocation; altho' great advantages and honours were promiſed to him elſewhere by men of the firſt rank, provided he would quit the ſociety of the Jeſuits in the middle of thoſe hardſhips which he was every now and then obliged to ſuffer, he would never conſent to it.*' See below (5) the paſſage of Moncony's, and that of a Janſeniſt (6).

[*C*] *He loſt but little time either in eating, or hearing devout women.*] He was a very ſober man, and did not ſit at table above a quarter of an hour; and when, by reaſon of his great age, he might have converſed with women, without any danger and ſuſpicion, he would not ſpeak with them but in caſes of neceſſity, and told them in a few words what he had to ſay. I here only tranſlate Southwell's words. *In victu valde abſtinens*, ſays he (7), *paucis & communibus ſemper uſus cibis, vix amplius uno quadrante dabat menſæ. Puritatis amator ſummus, mulierum colloquia cum erant neceſſaria, etiam ſenex, paucis verbis definiebat.* He wiſhed that all other Eccleſiaſtics would imitate him in that, as he teſtifies in his book *De ſobria alterius ſexus frequentatione.* But, generally ſpeaking, the directors of conſciences do not like that morality; they are ſeldom weary of the company of devout women, if one may judge of it by their long and frequent converſations with them.

[*D*] *He publiſhed ſome books which were cenſured by the Inquiſition.*] He took ſo much pains to have the cenſure taken off, that he at laſt obtained leave to reprint them, provided that he corrected them (8). The Inquiſition cenſured three of his treatiſes, *viz. De Martyrio per peſtem; de Communione pro mortuis*; and *de Confixione Librorum* (9). As men have different notions of things, it is no wonder that this Jeſuit took ſuch a diſgrace to heart, tho' other writers are ſo little afraid of it, that ſometimes they are glad to hear that their works have been put into the Index, or that the Inquiſitors are diſpleaſed with them. It is very often a ſign

(1) Alegambe, Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jeſu, *p.* 431.

(2) Oldoinus and Soprani have publiſhed the catalogue of the writers of that part of Italy.

(3) Natan. Sotuel, Biblioth. Script. Societ. Jeſu, *pag.* 757.

(4) Ibid. *pag.* 758.

(5) In the remark [*L*].

(6) In the remark [*K*].

(7) Sotuel, ubi ſupra.

(8) Poſtea ab auctore emendata, ab eadem ſacra congregatione anno 1659 recudi permiſſa ſunt & libere diſtrahi. *Ibid. p.* 759.

(9) Ibid.

him. He diſcharged his anger upon the Dominicans, in a book (*b*) wherein he collected a vaſt number of paſſages out of their writings, which had not been cenſured, tho' they deſerved it. The quarrels he had with ſome Dominicans, and other people, produced many injurious and ſatirical pieces; for it cannot be denied that he had a very ſarcaſtical wit. The Jeſuits themſelves confeſs ſomething of it [*E*]. He died of an apoplexy (*c*) at Lyons, the laſt day of October 1663. The Bibliographers of the Jeſuits do not agree about his age [*F*]; and therefore I ſhall not determine whether he lived ſeventy-nine years, as Mr Gallois aſſerts, in a work that will afford me ſome paſſages concerning the genius and ſpirit of this Jeſuit [*G*]. He was very much eſteemed by Dr Patin [*H*], and ſome are of opinion that he praiſes him too much, and that, with

a ſign that a book is good. See what an ingenious man (10) hath lately ſaid upon occaſion of the cenſure paſſed upon the *Acta Sanctorum*.

[*E*] *The Jeſuits themſelves confeſs ſomething of it.*] They ſay he was impatient, and that he did not ſpare Father Bollandus, his Fellow-Jeſuit, and his good friend, who had done him great ſervices, and had diſpleaſed him only by maintaining a different opinion from his concerning a biſhop of Lyons. If all the angry and paſſionate expreſſions of our Theophilus had not been ſuppreſſed, Bollandus would have been very ill treated in the ſecond edition of the *Indiculus Sanctorum Lugdunenſium*. Father Papebroch has revealed this little myſtery. *Ita factus erat Theophilus*, ſays he (11), *ut neminem contradicentem ſibi patienter ferret, & niſi præſentes adfuiſſemus, cum prælo iterum pararetur Indiculus Sanctorum Lugdunenſium, noſque mature aliquis admonuiſſet, inveniretur ibi acriter perſtrictus P. Joannes Bollandus in S. Anemundo Lugdunenſi Epiſcopo, ſub regimine S. Bathildis occiſo, quia ad 26 Januarii eundem ſtatuerat cum S. Delfino contra Theophili ſententiam, cui alias Bollandus amiciſſimus erat, & in curanda operum ipſius impreſſione Antverpiæ meritus de illo optime.*

[*F*] *The Bibliographers of the Jeſuits do not agree about his age.*] Alegambe (12) ſays, that Father Theophilus was admitted into their order in the year 1602, at ſixteen years of age; but, according to Father Southwell (13), it was in 1592, and at the ſame age. And therefore, ſince he died in 1663, he lived ſeventy-ſeven years, according to Father Alegambe, and eighty-ſeven according to Father Southwell. But if he had lived eighty-ſeven years, this expreſſion of Father Southwell would be wrong, *Octogenario major . . . . migravit ad Dominum:* it is only proper for thoſe, whoſe life did not much exceed eighty years. Mr Gallois ſeems to be more credible than thoſe two Jeſuits, when he ſays (14), that Father Theophilus lived ſeventy-nine years. It is a ſtrange thing that the Jeſuits themſelves, who made it their buſineſs to write elogies upon the writers of their ſociety, ſhould not be able to tell us how long one of the moſt famous of them lived.

[*G*] *Concerning the genius of this Jeſuit.*] It was not poſſible to ſpeak more pertinently of the edition of all the works of that author, than the abbot Gallois has done in the Journal *des Savans*, of the fourteenth of March, 1667. That edition conſiſts of nineteen volumes in folio, and it came out at Lyons in the year 1665. That ingenious journaliſt having ſhewn, in a few words, the contents of each volume, gives his judgment on them in the following manner. ‘It appears by the works of this author, that he was bold and peremptory, and that he had a lively imagination, and a prodigious memory, Theſe natural endowments, together with an indefatigable application to ſtudy from his younger years, till he was ſeventy-nine years old, at which age he died, had made him one of the moſt learned men of his time. But he was too ſevere and ſatirical; for which reaſon many people hated him. His ſtile, tho' otherwiſe very neat, ſeems to be obſcure, becauſe he affects to uſe hard words and terms taken from the Greek. He has alſo ſometimes ſome odd thoughts, as when being to treat of the goodneſs of our Saviour in a chapter of the ſecond volume, he intitles it, *Chriſtus bonus, bona, bonum.* His great reading furniſhing him with an infinite variety of matter on all ſubjects, he often rambles from the ſubject in hand; as in his treatiſe *de Roſa benedicta*, a conſiderable part of which is taken up in examining after what manner Lent was kept in the primitive church. One may alſo obſerve that he did not give a free ſcope to his genius, being contented to mention what he had read in the antient authors, and often uſing their own words to expreſs what he might perhaps have ſaid better than they. Neverthelefs, his works are worthy of eſteem, and very uſeful to thoſe who apply themſelves to Divinity and Preaching (15).’ The following words of the ſame abbot particularly concern the fifteenth and ſixteenth volumes, intituled, *Heteroclita Spiritualia*. ‘This author treats there of ſeveral ſuſpected cuſtoms, which, thro' an exceſſive zeal, or thro' remiſſneſs, have been introduced into the worſhip of GOD, and of the ſaints, into the good works that are done to relieve the ſouls in purgatory, into the uſe of the ſacraments, and into all other pious exerciſes. He examines all thoſe doubtful acts of devotion with great ſeverity: he condemns ſome, and approves others; and what he ſays is ſupported by many learned obſervations taken from Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory and the Fathers. He did particularly excel in treating ſuch matters; for, being ſharp and ſatirical, he never had better ſucceſs than when he exerciſed his critical wit (16).’ Let us further ſee what he ſays concerning the pieces that have not been inſerted in the nineteen volumes. *They have left out, of that collection, for ſome particular reaſons, the Apologies againſt Hurtado, which he intituled* Depilationes, *becauſe that monk belongs to an order, called in Italy* Peloſi : *and the book, wherein he enquires whether a man may confeſs his ſins by letters; and that which is intituled* Hipparchus, *wherein he examines whether it be lawful for monks to trade. They have alſo left out the treatiſe* de Immunitate Cyriacorum à cenſuris, *againſt the Jacobins; and that which is intituled,* Religio Beſtiarum, *wherein the predetermination of the Thomiſts is confuted, and another written againſt Father Combefis. There are ſome other treatiſes of this author wanting in this collection, which may eaſily be known by the catalogue of his works, which he printed ſeveral times: he deſigned to make one volume of all thoſe pieces, and intitle it* Apopompæus, *a name which the Jews gave to the victim which they loaded with curſes, and ſent into the wilderneſs, but death prevented his deſign* (17). Father Southwell ſays, that the twentieth volume, intituled, *Apopompæus*, was actually printed after the author's death (18).

I muſt further add another paſſage of the abbot Gallois (19). *The moſt remarkable pieces of the ſeventh volume, intituled,* Marialia (20), *is the ſecond treatiſe, wherein the author vindicates the devotion of the Scapulary; and the fifth, which is ſufficient to ſhew his great learning, and the fruitfulneſs of his wit. For being to preach upon the ſeven ſolemn anthems, which the church ſings before Chriſtmas, and which begin with the letter O; he took only that letter for the ſubject of his ſermons; and that ſubject, tho' never ſo barren, afforded him a thouſand fine things, of which that treatiſe is made up.*

[*H*] *He was very much eſteemed by Dr Patin.*] ‘Martinus Schookius, who has writ many books . . . is as learned as thoſe ancient Sophiſts, who uſed to write and diſpute about every thing that can be known. He and Coringius in Germany are the moſt learned men in Europe in that ſort of learning and compoſure. Father Theophilus Raynaud exceeded them both; for he was a Jeſuit, and underſtood his Romiſh and Loyolitical Theology perfectly well: but had it not been for that, and the reſpect he had for his ſuperiors, he would have broke looſe, and might have done more than three others, upon any ſubject whatſoever: for beſides his great learning and wonderful memory, he gave to all his works ſuch a perfection, as none but a great maſter could give (21).’ Here is another paſſage. *If you ſee Father*

(*b*) *Intituled*, De immunitate Cyriacorum à cenſuris.

(*c*) Ictus apoplexia migravit ad Dominum. *Sotuel, Bibliotheca Script. Societ. Jeſu, pag.* 758. This does not ſeem to agree with the paſſage of Monconys, below, remark [*L*].

(10) The author of the *Lettres Hiſtoriques*, March 1696, *p.* 245.

(11) Papebroch. Elucidat. Hiſt. Actorum in Controv. Carmelitica, *cap. vii, in fine, p.* 110.

(12) Alegambe, ubi ſupra.

(13) Sotuel, ubi ſupra, *p.* 757.

(14) Gallois, Journal des Sçavans, *March* 14, 1667, *pag. m.* 127.

(15) Gallois, ibid.

(16) Ibid. *pag. m.* 122, 123.

(17) Ibid. *pag.* 124, 125.

(18) Tomum xx, quem *Apopompæum* vocant ediderunt alii poſt obitum Theophili, ſine approbatione ſuperiorum Societatis, unde hæc illum tanquam partum legitimum non agnoſcit. *Sotuel, ubi ſupra, p.* 759. *I have a copy of that Apopompæus, and there is in the title page,* Tomus vigeſimus & poſthumus per Anonimum digeſtus, nunc primum in lucem prodiit Cracoviæ ſumptibus Annibalis Sangoyſki bibliopolæ 1669.

(19) Gallois, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 118, 119.

(20) Becauſe all the treatiſes it contains, concern the perfections or the worſhip of the Virgin. *Ibid. pag.* 118.

(21) Guy Patin, Letter cccxxviii, pag. 663, of the ſecond Tome.

with regard to his ſtile, he cenſures him unjuſtly [*I*]; for it is not true that he imitated Juſtus

Father Theophilus, pray give my ſervices to him, and aſk him when we ſhall ſee his anſwer to a book printed againſt him at Amſterdam, in 8vo, and intituled, Antidotus duplex contra duplex venenum, *&c.* 8vo. Hiſpali, 1657. *The Printer has ſuppreſſed or diſguiſed the name of the town; for it has been printed in Holland, and not at Seville. I have ſent him a copy of it, for which he thanked me, and informed me that he would quickly anſwer it. I have ſeveral letters of that honeſt Father, and am one of his friends, and I am proud of it; for he is a very learned man, in* genere multiplici, *in ſeveral matters. I wiſh that he would publiſh many pieces that he has by him: there is a great deal of learning in all his books* (22). Theſe praiſes are the more conſiderable, becauſe they are beſtowed by a man, who was more inclined to cenſure than commend, and who ſpoke freely of the faults which he thought he had found in the writings of that Jeſuit. I muſt quote him again. *The author of the* Sanctus Georgius Cappadox *is an extraordinary and moſt learned man; only he ſets up for a Fiſhmonger on Eaſter-Eve, and affects to write in a manner that is out of uſe: nevertheleſs all his books are good,* eſt enim vir multijugæ eruditionis ac infinitæ lectionis; - - - *He is a man of great erudition, and infinite reading, as Grotius ſaid of the late Salmaſius. Father Raynaud's ſtile,* redolet Lipſianum, quo tamen eſt multo deterior, - - - *reſembles that of Lipſius, but is much worſe: there is no body now that writes ſo, except it be Dr Blondel, our Dean; who, tho' one of the moſt learned men in the world, affects that kind of barbariſm,* '& eadem ſcabie laborat cum Tertulliano, 'Lipſianus ſeu Lipſiomimus vel Lipſio minus, qualis 'aliquando fuit Erycius Puteanus, Petrus Gruterus, 'Theophylus Raynaudus, & pauci alii quos fama 'obſcura recondit (23). - - - *and has the ſame fault as 'Tertullian, for he imitates Lipſius too much, as did 'heretofore Erycius Puteanus, Peter Gruterus, Theophilus 'Raynaud, and ſome others, whoſe names are buried in 'oblivion.*' I confeſs I cannot apprehend upon what grounds Patin taxes that Jeſuit with affecting a broken and obſcure ſtile, and uſing many of thoſe obſolete expreſſions called *Archaïſms*. I have read ſeveral of his books, and I find that his ſtile is rather prolix than ſhort, and that it is free from the faults that are obſerved in Lipſius's ſtile, and in that of his imitators. It is true, that Father Raynaud does not write politely; but if his ſtile is rough and barbarous, it is not becauſe he affects old Latin phraſes, like thoſe of Plautus, or Greciſms (24), which are the delight of ſome learned men; it is rather becauſe he uſes a great many words borrowed from the ſchoolmen. Nay, I obſerve that he blamed one of his adverſaries for having uſed ſome Greek words: he was anſwered, that it was not for him to ſpeak of Greek, ſince he was ignorant of that language. 'Mira hominis Buccafœtidi audacia, 'cæcus cum ſit, vult de coloribus judicare, & cum 'prorſus idiota ſit Græci idiomatis, judicare de vocibus Græcis . . . . quid vis apparere *ferularius Mag.* 'in utraque lingua? etſi enim *Latinam* bene calleas, 'at *Græcam* prorſus ignoras (25). - - - - *It is a ſtrange 'piece of impudence for a blind man to pretend to judge 'of colours, and for one that is totally ignorant of the 'Greek tongue, to ſet up for a critic in Greek words; . . . 'What, would you ſet up for a Pedagogue in both languages? Tho' you underſtand Latin very well, you are 'quite ignorant of the Greek.*' His antagoniſt confeſſes that he underſtands the Latin tongue very well; but ſuch a confeſſion is of no great weight (26), ſince it was made by a man who was guilty of ſoleciſms in every page (27). *Barbararum lexeon, & ſolæciſmorum tanta ubertas eſt in Hurtadi opere, ut ſi tenui diligentia adhibita, notare grammaticas ejus ſtribiligines liberet, totum pene ejus volumen eſſet exſcribendum. Vix tres lineas exarat, quin ſolæciſmis adeo pinguibus contaminet, ut miſerationem moveat* (28). *Thomas Hurtado . . . . vix unquam emiſit periodum qui non ſordeat ſtribiligine aliqua grammatica, & indigna colaphizatione Priſciani.* Four examples of it are to be found in the ſame page. *Deus expaveſcit nos* (29): *opus bene executum: debet populus magis exhortari ad communionem: agendum eſſe de tactis* (30). There is at the end of the book (31) a liſt of his ſoleciſms and other faults againſt Grammar. Father Raynaud's adverſary made but a weak anſwer. I imitate the Fathers, ſaid he (32), *Nonne in multis patribus inveniuntur ſimiles non ita vigoroſæ in latinitate locutiones?* And he ſays (33), that John Buſæus drew up a liſt of above 250 barbariſms of Petrus Bleſenſis.

[*I*] *Some are of opinion that Dr Patin praiſes him too much, and that, with regard to his ſtile, he cenſures him unjuſtly.*] 'Theophilus Raynaud gave to all his 'works ſuch perfection, as none but great maſters can 'give. This judgment of Dr Patin is not altogether 'true. The character of perfection, which none but 'great maſters, ſuch as Petavius and Sirmondus, can 'give, was wanting in Theophilus Raynaud. His de'ſigns were odd, his learning without choice, and his 'ſtile, though good in it ſelf, was often ſpoiled with 'childiſh affectations. Beſides, the author was an unpo'lite man, and had no urbanity (34).'

I have already (35) refuted Dr Patin's opinion of Father Raynaud's ſtile; but I have ſomething elſe to ſay upon this ſubject. That Jeſuit obſerves that few people complained of the coarſeneſs of his ſtile. The only cenſurer he names is one Camerarius, who blamed him for uſing a harſh and bombaſtic ſtile, intermixed with barbarous words, and imitating Petronius and Apuleius rather than the Ciceronians. *Non defuit, qui mei ſtyli ſqualorem opponeret. Arguebat ſanè Gulielmus Camerarius præfatione ad ſuam (ut inſcripſit)* Antiquitatis de novitate victoriam, *quod ſtylus ſcriptionum mearum ſcaber eſſet ac tumens: quod voces paſſim barbaras, & à nitore & lenitate Tulli alienas adhiberem: Et quod Petronio potius ac Apulejo, tumidis & inflatis ſcriptoribus, quam probatæ latinitatis, ſtylique puri ac nativi Magiſtris, inter ſcribendum inhæſerim* (36). I ſhall not mention what he anſwered in his vindication, but only name the book which he wrote in his defence. *Diſſertatio hujus & aliarum Camerarii calumniarum depulſoria, edita eſt hoc titulo,* Non cauſa, ut cauſa, ſubjuncta vera cauſa; Elenchus ſophiſmatis Gulielmi Camerarii Scoti (37). *Ea lucubratione* a pag. 16. *quam ridicula ſit hæc criminatio, & quam abſurdum ſit voces è Nizolij Ciceroniana pinacotheca anxiè ſublegere, in Didacticis præſertim ſcriptionibus, (cujuſmodi ferè ſunt omnes noſtræ, eaque nominatim, adverſus quam Camerarii æſtus inferbuit,) plenè & accuratè demonſtratur.* I add, that he continues to refute his adverſary in the ſame place, out of which I have taken this paſſage. His main argument conſiſts in the quotations from ſeveral Fathers of the church, who did not much trouble themſelves about the elegancy of the ſtile. He ſays (38), that St Auguſtin was very careleſs of it, and he refers us to Bernard Vindincus's *Prolegomena ad Criticum Auguſtinianum caſtigatum*, where there is a chapter concerning St Auguſtin's ſoleciſms and barbariſms. After all he does not own that Camerarius's cenſure is well grounded, and leaves it to the judgment of unprejudiced readers. *Videor vaniſſimam & ineptiſſimam criminationem obtriviſſe multo pluribus quam neceſſitas poſtulabat. An verò Stylus Scriptionum mearum, adeò vel jaceat, vel horreat, quam ſibi fingit Camerarius cujus fuit hæc criminatio, pronuncient alii, affectu quo ille ducebatur liberi* (39). If any one ſhould ſay that I have unjuſtly cenſured Dr Patin, I appeal likewiſe to all the readers duly qualified, who will peruſe the works of this Jeſuit with an unprejudiced mind. If they look into them, and read ſome pages here and there, I am ſure they will not ſay that he imitated Lipſius, and that he may be compared with Peter Gruterus, and Erycius Puteanus, as Patin will have it. I believe they will ſay that his ſtile is neither exact, polite, nor agreeable; but they will deny that it is conciſe, full of dark ellipſes, and obſolete phraſes, and very much affected. Any reader well ſkilled in the critical art, will eaſily perceive that the author I ſpeak of wrote haſtily, that he was very careleſs of his ſtile, that he did not correct his works, and conſequently that his printed words and phraſes may be looked upon as a faithful copy of his minutes; and that the firſt effuſions of his pen were alſo the firſt effuſions of his mind: ſo that his bad Latin, whether it be too ancient or too new, ought not to be accounted an affectation, or an artifice, but a natural production. He was a man of a vaſt memory; he had read in his youth the claſſic authors, and afterwards, with greater application, the Eccleſiaſtical writers, the Philoſophers, and the modern Divines. His memory being full of the phraſes of all thoſe authors, readily ſupplied his pen; ſo that

(22) Ibid. Letter CCIX, pag. 230, of the ſame volume. See alſo Letter CCXLV, pag. 372, of the ſame volume.

(23) Ibid. Letter 173, pag. 65, of the ſame volume.

(24) Mr Gallois, above, citation (15), taxes him *with affecting to uſe words derived from the Greek.*

(25) Thomas Hurtado, in duplici Antidoto, *pag.* 453.

(26) *See* Hurtado, ibid. *pag.* 10.

(27) Leodeg. Quintinus, apud Hurtado, Antid. *pag.* 437.

(28) Idem, apud eundem, *pag.* 10.

(29) Makes us afraid.

(30) Of the touches.

(31) *See* Hurtado, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 437.

(32) Ibid. *pag.* 439.

(33 Ibid.

(34) Vigneul Marville, Mêlanges d'Hiſtoire, *Tom. ii, pag.* 303, *Rotterdam Edit.* 1700.

(35) In the foregoing remark.

(36) Theoph. Raynaud. Syntagm. de Libris propriis, *pag.* 6. Apopompæi, *col.* 2.

(37) Ibid.

(38) Ibid. *pag.* 8, *col.* 2.

(39) Ibid. *pag.* 10, *col.* 1.

Juſtus Lipſius, that he hunted after old words, and that he was fond of obſcure and antiquated phraſes, which has been the fault of ſome authors, for which they have been juſtly

that without much thinking, ſometimes a word of Plautus came out, or an expreſſion of Lucretius, Petronius, Aulus Gellius, Apuleius, or Macrobius; ſometimes an expreſſion of Tertullian, Arnobius, St Hilary, or Sidonius Apollinaris; ſometimes an expreſſion of St Bernard, or of the commentators upon Lombard, or of the Angelical Doctor, *&c.* But the common and moſt uſual words offered themſelves more frequently, and he took what came out firſt: and conſequently his ſtile is not affected; old words and barbarous expreſſions came into it naturally, but not in great numbers, and the author took no care to correct and poliſh his ſtile: he left it ſuch as he found it, when he read his writings over again. But if I was miſtaken in this, at leaſt the main part of my criticiſm would be unqueſtionable; for there were never two authors more unlike in point of ſtile, than Theophilus Raynaud and Juſtus Lipſius. The latter affected to end his periods at every line, and to leave out ſeveral words, which the reader was to ſupply and gueſs at. But the Jeſuit is rather diffuſe than conciſe, and not at all obſcure for want of words: his periods are long and full.

A CENSURE upon thoſe who affect to make uſe of old words.

It is ſtill a greater piece of injuſtice to compare him to Peter Gruterus; for this Gruterus was not an author who now and then dropped obſolete words; but he heaped them up upon one another with a ridiculous affectation, and took as much pains to gather thoſe old rags as Bembus and Manutius did to write politely. I cannot tell whether ſuch an affectation betrays more vanity or want of judgment; but it is certain, that thoſe who affect ſuch a ſtile, fancy that their readers will have a great opinion of their learning, and that being under a continual neceſſity to conſult a good Dictionary they will admire them the more for it. Men of ſenſe have always condemned this humour. The raillery which Phavorinus made uſe of againſt a young man, who was a great lover of old faſhioned words, is admirable. If you deſign not to be underſtood, ſaid he to him, why do not you hold your tongue? And if you love antiquity, pleaſe yourſelf by living a good life as our anceſtors did; but ſpeak as men do now. ‘Favorinus philoſophus adoleſcenti veterum verborum cupidiſſimo, & pleraſque voces nimis priſcas & ignotiſſimas in quotidianis communibuſque ſermonibus expromenti, Curius, inquit, & Fabricius, & Coruncanius antiquiſſimi viri noſtri, & his antiquiores Horatii illi trigemini, planè ac dulicidè cum ſuis fabulati ſunt: neque Auruncorum, aut Sicanorum, aut Pelaſgorum, qui primi incoluiſſe Italiam dicuntur, ſed ætatis ſuæ verbis locuti ſunt, tu autem, proinde quaſi cum matre Evandri nunc loquare, ſermone abhinc multis annis jam deſito uteris, quod ſcire atque intelligere neminem vis, quæ dicas. Nonne, homo inepte, ut quod vis abunde conſequaris, taceres? ſed antiquitatem tibi placere ais, quod honeſta & bona & ſobria & modeſta ſit, vive ergo moribus præteritis; loquere verbis præſentibus (40). *Favorinus the Philoſopher, obſerving a young man to be very fond of uſing obſolete and unknown words in common diſcourſe; Curius, ſaid he, Fabricius, and Coruncanius, theſe very old Romans, and the three Horaces who lived before them, diſcourſed to their cotemporaries in the moſt eaſy and plain language. They uſed not the words of the Aurunci, the Sicani, or the Pelaſgi, who are ſaid to have been the firſt inhabitants of Italy, but ſpoke the language then in uſe: but you, as if you were converſing with Evander's mother, make uſe of a language diſguiſed for many years, becauſe you would have no body underſtand what you ſay. Fool that you are, that you may gain your end more compleatly, would it not be better for you to hold your tongue altogether? But you ſay that the Antients pleaſe you, becauſe they were virtuous, diſcreet, and modeſt; live then as the Antients did, and ſpeak as the Moderns do.*’ He concludes with referring him to a precept of Julius Cæſar, that obſolete words ought to be ſhunned as a rock (41). The emperor Auguſtus was much of the ſame mind; he could not bear that Tiberius ſhould uſe any old words (42), and he called Marc Antony a mad man becauſe he affected to be rather admired than underſtood (43). We read in Aulus Gellius, that an advocate of his time was hiſſed at becauſe he uſed unintelligible words (44). There aroſe in the XVIth century a certain faction of Grammarian Antiquarians, whom the moſt learned men oppoſed with all their might, to prevent their growth, and the corruption of the Latin tongue. Paſſeratius made a ſpeech on purpoſe againſt that faction. ‘Exorti ſunt, *ſays he* (45), his annis viginti proximis, non diſſimili laborantes inſania, novi quidam Antonii, utinam minus multi, quorum cauſſa, ne quid diſſimulem, hanc præfatiunculam inſtitui. Si quidem me facturum operæ pretium putavi, ſi iſtum animi morbum vel arte aliqua perſanarem, quod in iis difficillimum eſt, qui ſic ægrotare malunt quàm valere, vel aliqua ex parte imminuerem: idque ſaltem aſſequerer ne hæc apud noſtros latius ſerpat contagio. - - - - *Within the laſt twenty years there have appeared ſome new Antonius's, with almoſt the ſame turn of madneſs, (I wiſh indeed their number had been leſs) for whoſe ſake, to tell the truth, I have written this ſhort preface. I ſhall think my pains well rewarded, if by any method I can either remedy the diſeaſe of the underſtanding, which I am ſure muſt be extreamly difficult to do, in perſons who are pleaſed with their diſtemper, and chuſe it; or in any degree diminiſh it: at leaſt, if I can be ſo happy as to prevent the infection from ſpreading any farther among us.*’ Afterwards he ſays, that nothing appeared too much antiquated to thoſe, whom he had a mind to reclaim; and they endeavoured to find out ſome words older than the verſes of the *Salii*. ‘Sordent nobis Tullius, Cæſar, Terentius: Valerii Antiatis, Cincii, Cælii, Piſonis, Fabii Pictoris, Quadrigarii, Siſennæ annales requirimus. Unde tam delicatum faſtidium? Cato, & Varro, vix ad ſtomachum faciunt: vix aviditatem noſtram explent primi Conſulum faſces, & faſtorum incunabula: Decemvirales tabulas, leges regias, Saliare carmen, icta cum Sabinis fœdera, Fecialium jura formulaſque tranſcendimus, ut penetremus in ſermonem Aboriginum, tanquam ſimus cum Egeria Numæ, aut cum Evandri Carmenta loquuturi (46). - - - *We deſpiſe Tully, and Ceſar, and Terence, and want the annals of Valerius Antias, Cincius, Cælius, Piſo, Fabius Pictor, Quadrigarius, Siſenna. Whence this delicate loathing? Cato and Varro can ſcarce go down with us: the times of the firſt conſuls, and the beginnings of the Roman calendars will hardly ſatisfy us; we go beyond the tables of the* Decem Viri, *the laws of the kings, the verſes of the Salii, the leagues made with the Sabines, and the rites and forms of the Heralds, that we may penetrate to the language of the Aborigines; as if we were to talk with Numa's* Egeria *or Evander's* Carmenta.’ Thoſe men had willingly blotted out a Ciceronian phraſe in their compoſures, to put in the room of it an expreſſion taken from Pacuvius's fragments, or found *in*

Verſibu' quas olim Faunus vateſque canebant,
Cum neque Muſarum ſcopulos quiſquam ſuperarat
Nec dicti ſtudioſus erat (47).

Such verſes, bards in antient ages ſung,
As Faunus wrote, when Poetry was young,
E're man the Muſes high abodes cou'd trace,
Or words were weigh'd to give the numbers grace.

They deſerved to be called *mortuaria gloſſaria* (48). Horace complained of ſuch a depravity; which I obſerve in order to ſhew, that the ſame depravations of taſte revive from time to time.

Sic fautor veterum, ut tabulas peccare vetantes,
Quas bis quinque viri ſanxerunt: fœdera regum
Vel Gabiis, vel cum rigidis æquata Sabinis:
Pontificum libros: annoſa volumina vatum,
Dictitet Albano Muſas in monte locutas (49).

Thus old-loves do admire the ancient laws,
The Sabines Leagues have their deſerv'd applauſe;
On muſty leaves at awful diſtance look,
Age makes it rev'rend, and exalts the book:

Give

---

(40) Aulus Gellius, *lib. i, cap. x.*

(41) Id quod à C. Cæſare excellentis ingenii ac prudentiæ viro, in primo de Analogia libro, ſcriptum eſt, habe ſemper in memoria atque in pectore, ut tamquam ſcopulum, ſic fugias inſolens verbum. *Ibid.*

(42) Sueton. in Auguſto, *cap. lxxxvi.*

(43) M. quidem Antonium ut inſanum increpat; quaſi ea ſcribentem quæ mirentur potius homines quam intelligant. *Ibid.*

(44) Aulus Gellius, *lib. xi, cap. vii.*

(45) Paſſerat. Præfat. in Cicer. Epiſt. ad Hirtium & Cæſarem, *pag. m.* 171.

(46) Ibid. *pag.* 175.

(47) Ennius, apud Ciceronem de Oratore, *fol.* 125, *D*; *& in* Bruto, *fol.* 103, *C.*

(48) Mera eſtis, ut M. Cato ait, mortuaria gloſſaria. Nam qui colligitis lexidia, res tætras & inanes & frivolas, tamquam mulierum voces præficarum. *Aul. Gell. lib. xviii, cap. vii.*

(49) Horat. Epiſt. I, lib. ii.

juſtly cenſured by men of judgment. I give ſome inſtances of it (d). He abuſed the Janſeniſts, and they did not ſpare him in their turn [K]. His enemies ſpread ſtrange reports

Give him the bards old ſongs, oh rare! divine!
I ſwear 'tis good, a Muſe ſang ev'ry line.
CREECH.

Paſſeratius was not the only man who exclaimed againſt thoſe falſe Antiquarians: I have metioned in another place in this Dictionary (50) a ſatirical piece, wherein they were ridiculed, and their condemnation may be found in Father Cauſſin's Rhetoric (51). I could name ſeveral other learned men (52), who could not bear that fondneſs for old words, and who revived the complaints made againſt Salluſt. If they did not ſpare that ancient Hiſtorian, they muſt needs have been more incenſed againſt the Moderns. ' Quid, quod è quibuſdam Salluſtianis verbis tanta ſollicitudine inter priſci ſermonis maceriem & ruinas conquiſitis, & in illa ipſa tam laudata compoſitione nonnulla prolatu & intellectu ſunt nova, quædam putidiuſcula & pumicata, quædam ita ſcrupea, ut in ea vox impingat ſe tanquam in ſaxea fragmina vetuſtatis (53). - - - *What ſhall we ſay of this, that even in that celebrated compoſition of Salluſt, among the words which he has picked up with ſo much care from amidſt the barrenneſs and ruins of the old language, ſome are new, both with reſpect to their pronunciation and ſenſe, ſome too affected, and ſmooth, and ſome ſo rugged that the voice daſhes upon them, as if it were upon the rocky fragments of antiquity.*' Theſe are the words of a very polite writer. He had before declared that words grown out of date ought to be avoided. (54) ' Pertimeſcunt *(verba humilis dicendi generis)* ſociari verbis rubiginoſis, ſpinoſis, nimium reconditis & abſtruſis, tum intermortuis & conclamatis;

Quæ priſcis memorata Catonibus, atque Cethegis
Nunc ſitus informis premit, & deſerta vetuſtas *.

' *Theſe* (he means words of a low ſtile) *will not bear to be joined with ruſty and harſh ſounding words, nor with ſuch as are abſtruſe and unintelligible, or in a manner dead and buried.*

Us'd by the Antients, tho' conſum'd by rage
Of eating time, and grown deform'd with age.
CREECH.

But take notice that this polite author is too rigid a cenſurer of the Hiſtorian Salluſt, and truſt rather to Paſſeratius, who has very well diſtinguiſhed the exceſſive affectation of the Moderns from the liberty that Salluſt took (55). I am not ignorant that Aſinius Pollio found fault with Salluſt for uſing too many old words (56), but perhaps, inſtead of being ſo ſevere a critic, he ſhould have thanked him for the pains he had been at to revive ſome words, and prevent their loſs in the Roman language. We have reaſon to wiſh that our great authors would do the ſame office to many French words which they ſuffer to be loſt. If they vouchſafed to make uſe of them, they would put a ſtop to preſcription, young writers would be encouraged to uſe them, and it would preſerve the copiouſneſs of the language. Virgil did ſo, and Horace adviſed to do the ſame.

Obſcurata diu populo bonus eruet atque
Proferet in lucem ſpecioſa vocabula rerum
Quæ priſcis memorata Catonibus (57).

Good words, now grown obſcure, bring gently forth,
Relieve them from the dark, and ſhow their worth,
Us'd by the Antients, - - - - - - -

That is, ' he will revive ſome words that have been dead long ago among the people, and will bring into light again thoſe expreſſive and energical terms that were in uſe in the time of Cethegus and Cato, and which lie at preſent buried under the ruins of antiquity.' See the margin (58).

I do not believe, that there are now many people in France like thoſe whom Paſſeratius had a mind to reclaim. However, I have read the following words in a book printed in the year 1685. ' There is a ſort of learned men, whom I ſhould ſuſpect, as thoſe who intervened in the petition of the late Dr Blondel. Thoſe men ſpend their lives upon Seneca and Plautus, to find out ſome Archaiſms, in order to make fine theſes, very moral and impenetrable, and proof againſt all vocabularies (59).' This Dr Blondel is one of the authors whom Dr Patin compared with Theophilus Raynaud, which is an unjuſt compariſon; for the books of that Jeſuit may be very well underſtood without being obliged every moment to conſult Nonius Marcellus, or Laurenbergius's Antiquarius, or even Calepinus. Neither is it true, that he ſtuffed his books with Greek words. It was an uſual thing among the moſt learned Philologers. Caſaubon is an inſtance of it in his letters. Balzac did not approve that cuſtom (60).

[K] *The Janſeniſts did not ſpare him in their turn.*] His eighteenth volume *contains the pieces which he wrote againſt Father Gibieuf, Mr Arnauld, Mr de Launoi, and ſome others. It cannot be denied that he often expreſſed too much bitterneſs againſt them. Wherefore it is ſaid, that he had reſolved to leave out many things in thoſe works, if death had not prevented it* (61). Theſe laſt words of the Journaliſt are only an officious lie; for it is not at all likely, that the laſt edition of Father Raynaud's works ſhould not be conformable to his intention. Read the following paſſage of a Janſeniſt, who obſerves that our Jeſuit died without giving any ſatisfaction to thoſe whom he had ſo much abuſed. ' Father Theophilus Raynaud was a Savoyard (62), who having been admitted into the ſociety of the Jeſuits at ſixteen years of age, died in their ſociety, being above eighty years old. He was once about to leave them, becauſe he had been very ill uſed by them; *inter aſpera quæ ſubinde patiebatur, &c.* ſay the Jeſuits themſelves in the catalogue of their writers. He could not expect it could be otherwiſe, ſince he had written ſeveral books againſt the bad morals of the ſociety, ſuch as that which is intituled, *Theophili Eugenii Protocataſtaſis ſeuprima Societatis Jeſu inſtitutio reſtauranda*, wherein he gives the plan of a reformation he wiſhes would be made to reſtore the order to it's firſt purity; and another intituled, *Hipparchus, of the Religious Merchant*, againſt the trafficking which prevailed every where in the ſociety. They diſown likewiſe a treatiſe, *de Exſolutione à votis*, which, ſay they, was not approved by his ſuperiors, and contains ſomething concerning St Ignatius, which is not true; as alſo what he wrote in his book againſt Julius Clemens Scotus, an Italian, who had left the order of the Jeſuits, that the declarations upon the conſtitutions of the Jeſuits were not made by St Ignatius, but by Father Lainez, the ſecond general. It was probably one of the two firſt books which occaſioned his being impriſoned by the Jeſuits for a conſiderable time. He was free and bold in his opinions, biting and ſatirical in his way of writing, and had a great conceit of himſelf; as it appears from what he ſaid, when he mentioned the commendation that an heretical writer had given him, *That it was the only truth that man had ever ſpoke.* What he did the year of his jubilee, in the ſociety, is alſo a ſingular thing. He celebrated a very pompous maſs, and a Jeſuit getting into the pulpit, made his panegyric in his preſence. This Father was certainly a man of prodigious reading. Twenty volumes in folio of his printed works ſhew with what eaſe he could write. It were to be wiſhed he had writ alſo with judgment, prudence, modeſty, and charity, and only out of love for truth. The world then had not ſeen ſo many books full of invectives and extravagant calumnies againſt many private perſons, ſuch as the infamous libel, intituled, *Arnauld of Breſſe, revived in Arnauld of Paris*, nor the book full of falſities and bitterneſs, which he publiſhed againſt the whole order of St Dominic, with this title, *De immunitate Autorum Cyriacorum à Cenſura: Diatribæ Petri à Valle claſa S. T. D.* This work was condemned at Rome, as well ports concerning the manner of his death; which are mentioned and refuted by Monconys [*L*]. I have ſomething to ſay againſt Moreri [*M*]. For the reſt, Father Theophilus Raynaud has often diſguiſed his name in the titles of his books [*N*].

(d) In the remark [I].

(50) Remark [F], of the article ACCURSIUS (MARIANGELUS.)

(51) Vide Cauſſinum de Eloquentia ſacra & humana, *lib. ii, cap. x, & xxii, pag. m.* 95, 121.

(52) *See* Philip Pareus, in Vita Davidis Parei, *pag. m.* 18.

(53) Carolus Paſchalius, de optimo genere Elocutionis, *pag.* 153.

(54) Ibid. *pag.* 129.

* Horat. lib. ii, Epiſt. II, ver. 117.

(55) Paſſerat. Præf. in Catilinam Salluſtii, *pag.* 181.

(56) Aſinius Pollio in libro quo Salluſtii ſcripta reprehendit, ut nimis priſcorum verborum affectatione oblita. *Sueton. de illuſtr. Gram. cap. x.*

(57) Horat. Epiſt. II, lib. ii, ver. 115. *See, above, citat.* *.

(58) Propriis (*verbis*) dignitatem dat antiquitas, namque & ſanctiorem & magis admirabilem faciunt orationem quibus non quilibet fuerat uſurus: eoque ornamento acerrimi judicii P. Virgilius unicè eſt uſus . . . ſed utendum modo in ex ultimis tenebris repetenda. *Quintil. lib. viii, cap. iii, pag. m.* 364, 365.

(59) Factum pour Maiſtre Nicolas Poſtel, ou Diſſertation ſur les Peripneumonies, *p.* 203. *See the* Nouvelles de la Rep. des Lettres, *Jan.* 1686, *pag.* 34.

(60) See his Latin Letters, *pag.* 170, *& ſeq.*

(61) Journal des Sçavans, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 124.

(62) This is not exact; he was born a ſubject of the duke of Savoy, but not in Savoy.

The

well as ſeveral others like theſe, *De Commuione pro Mortuis: De Matyrio per peſtem: De cenſura bonorum & malorum librorum*; and the twentieth volume, which his friends printed after his death. . . . This Father died at Lyons of an Apoplexy the laſt day of October, 1663, without ever giving any ſaisfaction for the ſlanders, injurious words, and calumnies that are ſo frequent in many of his books (63).’

[*L*] *His enemies ſpread abroad ſtrange reports . . . . . which are . . . . refuted by Monconys.*] The following paſſage is ſomewhat long; but it is no matter: there are ſome things in it which perhaps the relator did not believe. ‘When I told him (64) that I was a native of Lyons, he immediately aſked me ſome news about the death of Father Theophilus Raynaud. I told him that I happened to be at Lyons when he died, and that my brother, who was come from Paris, when he was cut for the ſtone, had often diſcourſed with me about him. He then ſhewed me a letter of Father Henſchenius, whoſe library I had ſeen at Antwerp, wherein he acquainted him, that the Jacobins had ſpread a report in Flanders, and at Rome, that Father Theophilus died mad; that the Jeſuits had deprived him of the ſacraments; that he run up and down their convent of Lyons, crying out like a damned man, *Philiſtini ſuper me*, - - - *The Philiſtines are upon me*; and that having been buried *Sepultura Aſini*, - - - *like an aſs*, he had been found unburied the next day, his body being livid all over, becauſe the devils had beat him all night. I told him that it was a groſs calumny, and a ridiculous report; for the good man had left off ſaying maſs for a fortnight out of weakneſs, and communicated every day. He had made three general confeſſions to Father du Lieu the week that he died. Nay, the very morning of the day that he departed this life, which happened laſt year on All-Saints eve, having had ſeveral warnings of it, he took his leave thrice of the brother who helped him to dreſs himſelf, aſſuring him that he ſhould give him no more trouble; and returning from the chapel where he had heard maſs, and communicated, he told a brother, whom he met, that he had begged of God that he might be in Heaven on All-Saints day; and preſently after, about half an hour after the communion, as he was going into his chamber, he expired in the arms of another good brother. Thus he fulfilled his prophecy, that he ſhould die in his caſſock, and in his chamber, both which he loved ſo well, that no perſecution could bring him off from the ſtate of life he had pitched upon in his younger years, having never left the ſolitude of his cell for the ſpace of ſixty years, but to do ſome acts of charity; as for inſtance, to confeſs the meaneſt peaſant at any time. I told him that the church of Lyons had performed a ſolemn ſervice for him in St Juſtus's chapel, where a council was held; that the Carmelites and Carthuſians had done the like at Lyons, and ſo had all the order, and that the congregation of the gentlemen of Lyons had ſaid the office in their chapel, and had aſſiſted at his obſequies in a body. I told him, that my brother himſelf, who did not eaſily believe revelations, had often told me, that when Father Theophilus was in great trouble at Avignon, on account of his book *de Negotiatore Religioſo*, a barefooted Carmelite having recommended him to the prayers of a Carmelite nun, who is accounted a holy woman at Avignon, without telling her his name; that nun anſwered him, that the perſon for whom he deſired her prayers, was one of the moſt learned men of the church, and very acceptable to God; but that in order to exerciſe his virtue, and increaſe his merit, our Lord had mortified him in that very thing, to which he was moſt attached, *viz.* in his books, whereof the whole glory and reward were reſerved for him after his death; and that then all the provinces of the world would eagerly ſeek for them. As I perceived that he heard me with a great deal of pleaſure, I added what the Prior Jugeact of Lyons had told me of Father Theophilus's modeſty, which his adverſaries ſhould imitate, *viz.* that he had refuſed the biſhopric of Geneva, after the death of the nephew of the bleſſed (Francis de Sales); that Don Felix of Savoy, and the whole ſenate of Chambery, having obtained the conſent of duke Charles Emanuel, Father Theophilus was the only man that oppoſed it, which he did ſo earneſtly, that they were forced to deſiſt. This the ſaid Prior told me he was certainly informed of; and that he himſelf was a witneſs of an act of yet a more heroic virtue; for having orders from the late archbiſhop of Bourdeaux, and ſome others, to offer ſome benefices, and a yearly penſion of two thouſand livres to Father Theophilus, during the time of his adverſity, with a city ſecurity at Lyons, if he would but write in favour of a certain doctrine; Father Theophilus kiſſing his caſſock, anſwered Mr Jugeact in theſe fine words, that he had rather die under perſecution in that habit, than live an eaſy life, and deficient in the fidelity he had vowed to God (65).’ If the monks do not ſcruple to ſpread ſuch reports againſt a Jeſuit, it is no wonder if they have publiſhed ſo many falſe ſtories concerning the death of Luther, Calvin, &c.

[*M*] *I have ſomething to ſay againſt Moreri.*] I. The beſt part of what he ſays being taken word for word from the Journal *des Savans* (66), he ſhould have acquainted the readers with it. It is an omiſſion for which he deſerves to be called a Plagiary, and theſe words of Pliny may be applied to him: ‘Obnoxii profecto animi & infelicis ingenii eſt deprehendi in furto malle, quam mutuum reddere (67). - - - - *It is a ſign of a bad mind, and of an unlucky genius, to chuſe rather to be caught ſtealing, than to return what one has borrowed.*’ II. It is not true that Father Theophilus *intended to intitle the collection of his books* Apopompæus, *which is the name the Jews gave to the victim, that they loaded with curſes, and ſent into the wilderneſs; but it was not thought proper to make uſe of ſuch a title.* The title *Apopompæus* was only intended for the collection of ſome pieces, which the author did not inſert in his nineteen volumes. We have ſeen, above, Mr Gallois's words, which are ſo plain that I cannot apprehend how Moreri could miſtake the ſenſe of them. Muſt not this Jeſuit have been out of his wits, if he had choſen to give this title to all his works? He kept that title for ſome forbidden pieces, as Father Southwell informs us; which ſhews that Moreri is guilty of another omiſſion. III. The works of Theophilus Raynaud were not printed in the year 1667, the edition of them was finiſhed in 1665. Moreri fell into this miſtake, becauſe that collection is mentioned in the *Journal des Sçavans* of the 14th of March 1667. This ſhould oblige the Journaliſts always to inſert the year of the impreſſion. They did not do it at firſt, eſpecially when they were afraid of diſcovering thereby that they ſpoke of a book which had loſt the grace of novelty. IV. It is not true, that our Jeſuit lived in the XVIth century. This fault is only to be found in the ſecond edition of Holland.

[*N*] *He often diſguiſed his name in the title of his books.*] This will afford matter to Mr Baillet in the fine collection we expect from him, concerning authors who have appeared in print under falſe names. He doubts (68) whether our Jeſuit took the name of Anſelmus Solerius in the book *de pileo, ceteriſque capitis tegminibus*; but ſince that book is to be found in the 13th volume of the works of this Father (69), we may be ſure that he is the author of it. Placcius (70) is in the wrong to believe that it came out at firſt without any name, in the Lyons edition, in the year 1655, in 4to, dedicated *ad Petrum de Macerat*; but that in the Amſterdam edition 1671, in 12mo, it was printed with the name of *Anſelmus Solerius Cimmelienſis*. It is certain that in the Lyons edition of the year 1655, the author called himſelf *Anſelmus Solerius Cemelienſis*, dedicating his book *ad Petrum de Maridat*. So that it appears that Placcius was ignorant of ſeveral things upon this head: he did not know the names that appeared in the firſt edition: Macerat is a meer chimera; Maridat is the true name of a counſellor in the

great

---

(63) Addition à la III Lettre du Prince de Conti au Pere de Champs, *pag.* 69, *Cologne* 1689.

(64) That is, a Jeſuit of Landſberg in Bavaria.

(65) Monconys, Voyages, *Part ii, pag.* 386, & *ſeq. Lyons* 1665, *ad ann.* 1664.

(66) The Journal of the 14th of March 1667, which I have quoted above, remark [*G*].

(67) Plin. in Præfat.

(68) In the liſt placed at the end of his book, intituled, *Auteurs deguiſez.*

(69) *See* Sotuel, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 758.

(70) Placcius, de Anonymis, *num.* 602, *pag.* 130.

The Carmelites praiſe him very much, and paid funeral honours to him, in all the convents of their order, in the year 1663 (e), on account of the book he had written concerning the Scapulary, which one of them publiſhed with many alterations [O]. He publiſhed a catalogue of his works, which was very acceptable to the curious. It is a very good piece in its kind: it was printed by itſelf; but it was ſince prefixed to the 20th volume of his works, which is intituled, *Apopompæus*. One may find in that catalogue the occaſion and ſubject of each book of that writer, and the names of thoſe who wrote againſt them, what was replied by the author, and ſuch like particulars, very pleaſing to thoſe who love the hiſtory of books and authors. It were to be wiſhed that a chronological order had been more careſully obſerved in it, which is a matter of no little importance. We find in that catalogue, that ſuch a book is the firſt that the author publiſhed; another the ſecond, the third, and ſo on; but neither the year, nor the place of the impreſſion, nor the number, nor the dates of the ſeveral editions, appear in it. Thoſe, who thought that the Bookſeller, who undertook to print all the works of that Jeſuit in twenty volumes in folio, would be ruined by it, were very much miſtaken [*P*].

great council: *Anſelmus Solerius Cemelienſis* (71) was a falſe name under which our Theophilus concealed himſelf. The ſame Placcius charges him, without any reaſon, with a kind of contradiction (this I obſerve by the by) about the Chronicle of Flavius Dexter. *Illud* (Chronicon) *ab ipſo* BIVARIO (72), vel VIVARIO *confictum credidere* Gabriel Pennottus & Matthæus Raderus, *contra quos ipſe tamen Apologiis ſeſe binis defendit quas approbant* Carolus Viſch *Bibl. Ciſtercienſis p.* 114. & Th. Raynaud. *de mal. & bon. lib. pag.* 139. *ſibi fere contrarius pag.* 164 (73). They are Placcius's words: he pretends that our Jeſuit having approved, pag. 139, the Apologies of the Spaniſh Monk, diſapproves them, pag 164. But there is no ſuch thing: he deſpiſes them plainly enough, pag. 164, and more clearly ſtill, pag. 139. ‘Flavii Dextri Chronicon nuper vulgatum, ſuppoſitum fuiſſe Dextro, latè contendit Gabriel Pennotus *in Canonicorum Regularium Hiſtoria*. Quamvis enim, ipſo S. Hieronymo teſte, ratum ſit, Flavium Dextrum ſcripſiſſe Chronicon quod eidem D. Hieronymo inſcripſerit; tamen hoc Chronicon nuper vulgatum, illud ipſum eſſe genuinum, cujus S. Hieronymus meminit, multa ſunt quæ diſſuadent. Nec quæ adversùs libri illius ſuppoſitionem proferunt Bivarius commentator ac defenſor, & Melchior Incofer *lib. pro epiſtola Deiparæ ad Meſſanenſes à cap.* 42. *ad* 46. explent revera legentis animum (74). - - - - *Gabriel Pennotus, in his hiſtory of the regular canons, ſtrongly contends, that the* Chronicon *of Flavius Dexter, newly publiſhed, was falſly aſcribed to Dexter. For although, on the teſtimony of St Jerom himſelf, it was evident that Flavius Dexter had written a Chronicle, which he had dedicated to this ſaint; yet there were many reaſons for believing that the Chronicle then newly publiſhed was not the genuine one which St Jerom mentions, nor do thoſe arguments that have been brought by Bivarius his commentator and defender, and by Melchior Inchofer, to prove this book genuine, throughly ſatisfy the mind of the reader.*’ This is what he ſays, pag. 139; and the following words are to be found, pag. 164. ‘Flavii Dextri Chronicon quod nuper prodiit, magna excitavit diſſidia. Aliquod Chronicon verè fuiſſe à Dextro conſcriptum, conſtat, cùm S. Hieronymus ejus ſibi à Dextro inſcripti meminerit; ſed an id quod nuper prodiit, ſit verum illud Dextri Chronicon, controverſia eſt. Multi hoc Chronicon eſſe ſuppoſitum ab aliquo, cui honor gentis ſuæ cordi eſſet, contendunt, & acriter Pennotus *in Canonicorum Regularium hiſtoria* (75). - - - - *The Chronicle of Flavius Dexter, lately publiſhed, has been the occaſion of great diſputes. It is plain, that there was a Chronicle written by Dexter, ſince St Jerom makes mention of it's being dedicated to him by Dexter himſelf; but whether that which was lately publiſhed, is the real Chronicle of Dexter, is ſtill a matter of controverſy. There are many who contend that this Chronicle has been the ſuppoſititious work of ſome perſon who had it at heart to advance the honour of his country, and Pennotus has ſtrenuouſly defended this opinion.*’ This Jeſuit took the name of *Stephanus Emonerius* when he wrote againſt Barnes in favour of equivocations (76); and that of *J. Heribertus Cemelienſis* in his Latin treatiſe concerning eunuchs (77); and that of *Leodegarius Quintinus Hæduus* writing againſt Hurtado, &c. This Hurtado was a Spaniſh monk, who got the book that is mentioned by Patin, printed at Amſterdam (78): there is ſome (79) raillery in it upon the titles that Father Raynaud gave to his books. But, by his favour, thoſe titles were ſometimes ingenious: Who would not read a work, intituled *Heteroclita Spiritualia, & Anomala pietatis?* which is the title of the 15th and 16th volumes of the works of that Jeſuit. Well! will ſome ſay, there are heteroclites in Religion as well as in Grammar? and anomalies in it as well as in the Moon?

Some have been of opinion that *Amadæus Guimenius*, whoſe works have made ſo great a noiſe on account of their looſe morality, was no other than Father Theophilus. Father Baron went upon that ſuppoſition in all the ſecond part of his *Manuductio ad moralem Theologiam* (80); *but having ſince found that the book of* Amadæus, which he refuted, *was written by a Spaniſh author, he retracted it in his preface. And certainly*, adds Mr Gallois, *Guimenius's book has but little affinity with the ſtile and manner of Father Raynaud.* Note, that by other means it came to be known that this piece was written by the Jeſuit Moya, confeſſor to the queen of Spain; the difference of ſtile, which is one way of deceiving, did not prevent Father Raynaud from being publickly charged with it, nor did it juſtify him.

[*O*] *A Carmelite publiſhed one of Raynaud's books, with many alterations.*] Poor poſthumous works! and you manuſcripts that come from remote countries: How can we be ſure that nothing has been added to or cut off from you, ſince a manuſcript of Father Raynaud was ſo much altered by a Carmelite during the author's life, and almoſt at his door? This Jeſuit had diſplayed all his learning to maintain the Scapulary of Simon Stock; but the chief of thoſe concerned, were not ſatisfied with his performance: for which reaſon they mangled ſome parts of his book moſt wretchedly, and made ſome additions to it. He expreſſed his indignation for it in the following words: ‘Hoc opuſculum (*Scapulare Stochianum illuſtratum & defenſum*) quale Pariſiis è meo M. S. prodiit anno 1654, apud Antonium Padelore, abjudico tamquam ſpurium & alienum; Irruit enim in illud Leo, à quo miſerè deformatum eſt, dicam diſcerptum & laceratum. Reciſa pleriſque locis, me inconſulto, multa; addita ex mente interpolatoris alia, quæ planè improbo. Titulus ipſe libri, (ut ab ipſo limine fieret perverſionis exordium) immutatus eſt; ita ut quod Hincmarus ſenior juniori exprobrabat, admiſſa in ipſo aditu ceſpitatione, non potuerit expectari progreſſio felicior. Hiat paſſim oratio, ob prætermiſſionem vel reciſionem unius aut alterius voculæ, menda ubique denſa. Sic rependitur gratia (81)? - - - - *This work, as it was printed from my manuſcript at Paris, in the year* 1654, *by Antony Padelore, I entirely reject and diſown as ſpurious and falſe; for the paw of the lion has been upon it, and has wretchedly defaced and mangled it, I may ſay, has quite torn it to pieces. Many paſſages have been eraſed, without conſulting me, and many others have been added from the interpolator's own fancy, which I abſolutely diſapprove of. And that they might begin their ruinous work at the very threſhold, the title it ſelf has been changed; ſo that I may reproach him as Hincmarus the elder reproached the younger, ſince they ſtumbled at the firſt ſetting out, it was not to be expected that their journey would be more proſperous. The ſenſe is frequently imperfect, by one or more words being left out, or cut off, and the faults are every way numerous. Is my kindneſs thus repaid?*’

[*P*] *Thoſe who believed that the Bookſeller . . . would be ruined by it, were very much miſtaken.*] This edition ſold very well, and when it is to be found compleat in the auctions of Holland and Germany, they commonly bid high for it. So that the Printer did not deſerve to be placed in a certain liſt mentioned by Mr Catherinot. As I was ending this article, ſays he (82), ‘ the reverend Father de Fourcroy, a Paris ‘ Jeſuit, but an inhabitant of Bourges, where he has ‘ been near fifty years teaching, and writing books, ‘ told me that one might make a pretty large volume ‘ of the catalogue of thoſe, who have entirely ruined ‘ their Bookſellers by their books. I ſhall ſpeak of ‘ this another time.’ Which puts me in mind of this paſſage of Stephen Paſquier (83). ‘ I cannot forbear complaining at this time of the calamity of ‘ this age which has produced ſuch a plenty of reputed ‘ or untimely authors. Any pitiful ſcribler will have ‘ his firſt thoughts to come to light; leſt, being too ‘ long ſhut up, they ſhould grow muſty. Good God! ‘ how appoſite are theſe verſes of Jodelle.

(e) Papebroch. Réponſ. ad Exhibit. Error. *p.* 117.

(71) Note, that this word ſignifies *a native of Cemelia*. It was an epiſcopal city, which has been ruined long ago. The epiſcopal ſee has been united to that of Nice. See *Theophilus Raynaud, de Libris propriis, pag. m.* 29.

(72) A Spaniſh monk of the order of Citeaux. He publiſhed this chronicle of Flavius Dexter with a commentary at Lyons, in 1627.

(73) Placcius, in Pſeudonymorum Catalogo, *num.* 294, *pag.* 185.

(74) Theoph. Raynaudus, de malis ac bonis Libris, *num.* 220, *pag. m.* 139.

(75) Ibid. *num.* 296, *pag.* 164.

(76) See the article BARNES, remark [*D*].

(77) Printed at Dijon in 4to, in the year 1655.

(78) Above, citation (22).

(79) See the preface of the *Duplex Antidotus, Article I.*

(80) Gallois, Journal des Sçavans, *April* 12, 1666, *pag. m.* 39.

(81) Theoph. Raynaudus, in Syntagm. de Libris propriis, *num.* 72, *pag. m.* 70, 71.

Et tant ceux d'aujourd'huy me faſchent,
Qui dés lors que leurs plumes laſchent
Quelque-trait ſoit mauvais ou bon,
En lumiere le vont produire,
Pour ſouvent avec leur renom,
Les pauvres Imprimeurs deſtruire.

That is,

This ſcribbling crew wou'd make one's vitals bleed,
They write ſuch traſh, no mortal e'er will read;
Yet they will publiſh, they muſt have a name:
So Printers ſtarve, to get their authors fame.

RAMUS (PETER), in French *de la Ramée*, was one of the moſt famous profeſſors of the XVIth century. He was born in a village of Vermandois in Picardy, in the year 1515 *(a)*. His grandfather retired into thoſe parts, having loſt all he had, when the place of his birth was burnt, in the territory of Liege [*A*], by the laſt duke of Burgundy. He was forced to make and ſell charcoal all the reſt of his life, in order to get a ſubſiſtence. He left a ſon, who got his living by being a huſbandman *(b)*, and who was the father of our Ramus: a man who proved the ſport of fortune; for his life was a perpetual alternative of riſing and falling. Being but eight years of age he went to Paris *(c)* from a deſire to learn, and being forced to leave that city by reaſon of his poverty, he went thither again as ſoon as he could; and finding no way to ſubſiſt, he left it a ſecond time: but his paſſion for ſtudy was ſo great, that, tho' he had been unfortunate in thoſe two journies, he went a third time to Paris with a deſign to look for a place. He was maintained there for ſome months by one of his uncles; after which he was forced to be a ſervant in the college of Navarre [*B*]. He ſerved his maſters

[*A*] *The place of his birth was burnt in the territory of Liege.*] This neither agrees with Moreri, nor with Mr Teiſſier. The firſt ſays, that *Ramus's grandfather had been forced to leave Burgundy during the wars, and that he retired into the Vermandois.* The latter ſays (1), *that Peter Ramus was deſcended from a noble family, originally of the city of Evreux; for his grandfather being expelled from his country, and deprived of his eſtate by the Burgundians, fled into the Vermandois.* Thus, according to Moreri, Ramus's grandfather was a Burgundian; but, according to Mr Teſſier, he was a Norman. I am ſure he was neither of them; he was of the country of Liege. Here is the proof of it: ‘ Parentes Rami agricolæ fuerunt pauperrimi. Avus ‘ certe, ut ipſe commemorat in Præfatione Regiæ ſuæ ‘ profeſſionis, in Eburonum gente familia in primis ‘ illuſtri fuit: ſed patria à Carolo Burgundionum duce ‘ capta, & incenſa, in Veromanduorum agrum profugus, ob paupertatem carbonariam artem exercuit (2). ‘ *The parents of Ramus followed Huſbandry, and were ‘ extreamly poor. His grandfather was undoubtedly of ‘ a moſt illuſtrious family in Liege, as he himſelf relates, ‘ but his own country being ſeized, and burnt, by Charles ‘ duke of Burgundy, he fled into the Vermandois, where ‘ he was reduced to the neceſſity of labouring as a Collier for his ſubſiſtence.*’ All good Geographers will tell you that the *Eburones*, and the inhabitants of the county of Liege are the ſame people.

[*B*] *He was forced to be a ſervant in the college of Navarre.* I follow the account of Banoſius, and not that of Joſeph Scaliger. The latter ſays, that Ramus was a ſervant when he went to Paris (3). ‘ Ramus ‘ ad annum uſque decimum nonum, ne quidem primas ‘ notas didicerat, inſerviebatque Dom. de la Broſſe (4). ‘ Lutetiam deductus tantum famulus profecit maximo ‘ diſcendi deſiderio percitus, ut quamvis repugnante ‘ ingenio tardo, rudi & ſtupido, repugnante, quod ‘ majus eſt, inſtitutione ſera, labore & diligentia in id ‘ litterarum decus pervenerit, quò perveniſſe vix credibile ſit, ita ut anno trigeſimo contra Ariſtotelem ‘ ſcripſerit meliori ſtylo quam poſterioribus annis. - - - ‘ *Ramus was nineteen years of age before he had learned ‘ even his letters, and was ſervant to Mr de la Broſſe. ‘ Altho' he came to Paris only in the quality of a ſervant, ‘ he was ſeized with ſuch a prodigious thirſt after learning, that notwithſtanding he was of a dull and heavy ‘ genius, and what is ſtill a greater obſtacle, notwithſtanding his late application to ſtudy, yet, by the dint ‘ of labour and induſtry, he arrived to ſuch perfection in ‘ literature as is ſcarcely to be believed, inſomuch that ‘ in his thirtieth year he wrote againſt Ariſtotle in a ‘ better ſtile, than in his advanced years.*’ I can ſcarce believe what the great Scaliger tells us here: It is not at all likely that Ramus was nineteen years of age (5) before he learned to read, nor that he had a dull and heavy wit. However it be, it is not true that he was thirty years old when he began to write againſt Ariſtotle; for his book was condemned, after many conteſts, the tenth of May, 1543. He was then but twenty-eight years of age; and therefore I am more inclined to believe Banoſius, who ſays that Ramus being eight years of age, took a journey to Paris of his own accord, &c. ‘ Anno ætatis ſuæ circit[illegible] octavo ſponte ‘ Lutetiam venit, & inde bis abductus violentia temporis, bis eodem tamen, quam libet reflantib. ventis ‘ reverſus, & ardenti diſcendi ſtudio incenſus, ab Honorato Carpenterio avunculo victum per aliquot menſes perexiguum accepit, ut artes addiſceret: deinceps neceſſitate coactus multos annos duram ſervitutem in collegio Navarræ ſervivit. Sed quum interdiu dominis ſuis fidelem operam præſtitiſſet, nocte, ‘ Cleanthis Philoſophi exemplo non diſſimili, oleo & ‘ lucerna diſciplinarum lumen brevi tempore tantum ‘ ſibi comparavit, ut artium liberalium laurea ſit donatus (6). - - - *In the eighth year of his age he came to ‘ Paris of his own accord, from whence he was twice ‘ driven by the violence of the times; yet he returned ‘ thither, tho' fortune ſeemed every way his enemy, and ‘ being inflamed with a moſt ardent deſire of learning, ‘ that he might attain the liberal arts, he contented himſelf with a very ſlender ſuſtenance for ſeveral months, ‘ which he received from Honoratus Charpentier his ‘ uncle: he was afterwards reduced by neceſſity to ‘ undergo a hard ſervice for many years in the college of Navarre. Neverthele ſs, as he diſcharged his ‘ duty faithfully to his maſters in the day-time, ſo in the ‘ night, after the example of the Philoſopher Cleanthes, ‘ by the help of his oil and his lamp, he, in a ſhort time, ‘ acquired ſuch knowledge and light in the Sciences, that he ‘ was graduated.*’ But here is a ſtrong proof againſt Banoſius, which I take from Ramus's own words, as they are related by John Freigius: ‘ Confiteor vitam mihi ‘ totam acerbiſſimis fluctibus jactatam eſſe. Puer vix ‘ è cunis egreſſus duplici peſte laboravi: juvenis invita ‘ modiſque omnibus repugnante fortuna Lutetiam ad ‘ capeſſendas artes ingenuas veni, inde bis abductus ‘ violentia temporis, bis eodem tamen quamlibet reflantibus ventis reverſus, atque eò ardentiore diſ-
‘ cendi

---

(82) Catherinot, l'Art d'Imprimer, *pag.* 11. It is a piece of twelve pages in 4to, dated from Bourges the tenth of March 1685.

(83) Paſquiere's Letters, *book x*, *Tom. i*, *pag. m.* 638.

(a) Theoph. Banoſius, in Vita Petri Rami, *pag.* 2.

(b) Ex eodem, ibid.

(c) Ibid. *pag.* 3.

(1) Teiſſier's Additions to Thuanus, *Tom. i*, *pag.* 371, *Edit.* 1696.

(2) Theoph. Banoſius, in Vita Petri Rami, *pag.* 2.

(3) Scaligerana prima, *pag.* 127.

(4) Mr Teiſſier, *ubi ſupra*, thinks that Scaliger ſpeaks of a lady: but *Dom.* is as well the beginning of *Domini*, as of *Dominæ*.

(5) Mr Teiſſier, ibid. quoting *Scaligerana* 1, ſays only nine years.

(6) Banoſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 3.

maſters in the day-time, and ſpent the greateſt part of the night in his ſtudy *(d)*; and the progreſs he made in it was ſo conſiderable, that when he took his degree of Maſter of Arts, he engaged to maintain a doctrine quite contrary to Ariſtotle, about any thing that ſhould be objected to him *(e)* [*C*]. But I muſt obſerve, that before this he had gone through a courſe of Philoſophy in the ſchools, which laſted three years and a half *(f)*. He very well anſwered the objections that were made againſt him for a whole day: which ſucceſs made him reſolve to examine Ariſtotle's doctrine more narrowly, and to oppoſe it more vigorouſly. But the perfecting of Logic was almoſt the only thing he applied himſelf to: he made his reading, and even his lectures of Eloquence, ſubſervient to it *(g)*. The two firſt books he publiſhed, *viz.* his *Inſtitutiones Dialecticæ*, and his *Ariſtotelicæ Animadverſiones*, occaſioned great troubles in the univerſity of Paris [*D*].

It

‘cendi ſtudio incenſus, quò vehementius prohibebar (7). - - - *I confeſs that my whole life has been the ſport of adverſe fortune. I was ſcarce out of my infancy when I was afflicted with a two-fold plague: when I was a young man, I came to Paris to acquire the Liberal Sciences, with fortune entirely my foe. I twice was driven from thence by the violence of the times, and twice I returned thither in ſpight of all difficulties, for the more vehemently I was oppoſed, the more ardent was I in my purſuit after learning.*’ If Ramus had been but eight years of age, when he went to Paris, would he have uſed the word *juvenis?* ought he not to have ſaid *puer!* And would he have failed in it?

[*C*] *He engaged to maintain a doctrine quite contrary to Ariſtotle, about any thing that ſhould be objected againſt him.*] Taſſoni looks upon it as an intolerable piece of boldneſs. *Ma più audace*, ſays he (8), *fù la prova di Pietro Ramo, autore per altro poco degno d'eſſere nominato. Queſto dovendo ſecondo l'uſo di Parigi ſoſtener concluſioni prima che foſſe creato Maeſtro, per bizzarria d'ingegno propoſe queſta ſola a qualunque voleſſe argumentare, dando libero campo à tutti.* Quæcunque ab Ariſtotele dicta ſint, falſa, & commentitia eſſe. *La quale havendo eccitati contra di lui tutti gl'ingegni, tutte le profeſſioni, tutte le ſcuole; egli nondimeno con tanta prontezza, e ſottigliezza di riſpoſte la difeſe, che ſe rimaner confuſa e ſtupita la Città di Parigi: e ben ne' ſuoi libri appariſcono ancora i ſegni della ſua audacia.* The beſt of all this is, that he owns that the reſpondent maintained his aſſertion with ſo great ſubtilty, that every body was amazed at it. Let us ſee how Freigius relates the matter. ‘Lutetiæ magiſterii titulum ſuſcepturus, pro more & conſuetudine ſcholarum liberam diſputandi copiam examinatoribus facere cogebatur. Problema igitur ſumpſit: Quæcunque ab Ariſtotele dicta eſſent, commenticia eſſe. Attoniti novitate & inſolentia problematis Magiſtri noſtri, cùm authoritatem Ariſtotelis (qua tanquam ſcuto, ſeſe ad omnes inſultus munire conſueverunt) ſibi ereptam viderent, irrito conatu per diem integrum, Magiſtrandum (ut barbari barbarè vocant) oppugnarunt. Ex hoc fortuito ſucceſſu anſam deinceps ſeriò & libere in Ariſtotelem animadvertendi & inquirendi arripuit (9). - - - *When he was about to take the the degree of maſter of arts at Paris, according to the cuſtom of the ſchools, he was obliged to give the examiners, or profeſſors, an opportunity to diſpute with him. He therefore advanced this problem, That* all that Ariſtotle had laid down was falſe. *The profeſſors being aſtoniſhed at the novelty and inſolence of ſuch a problem, that was to deprive them of the authority of Ariſtotle, with which, as with a ſhield, they had been uſed to defend themſelves againſt all attacks; they, for a whole day, oppoſed his being made a maſter, without ſucceſs. It was from this accidental victory that he was afterwards induced to engage in a more ſerious and full enquiry concerning the opinions of Ariſtotle.*’

[*D*] *His two firſt books . . . . occaſioned great troubles in the univerſity of Paris.*] The profeſſors of Paris, who admired Ariſtotle, ſhould have refuted Ramus's books in their writings and lectures; but inſtead of keeping within the bounds of an accademical war, they proſecuted that Anti-peripatetic before the civil magiſtrate, as a man who undermined the foundations of religion. They raiſed ſo many clamours, that the cauſe was brought before the parliament of Paris; but as ſoon as they perceived that it would be examined equitably, and according to the uſual forms, they got it removed from that tribunal by their intrigues, and brought it before the king's council. ‘Vix Ariſtotelicæ animadverſiones lectæ erant, cum Petrus Ramus repente non ad humanam aliquam, & literis uſitatam diſputationem ab Academia vocatur, ſed ad Prætorii tribunalis capitalem contentionem per certos homines falſo Academiæ nomine rapitur, novique & ante hunc diem inauditi criminis accuſatur, quòd Ariſtoteli repugnando Theologiam & artes enervaret. Hac enim oratione Ariſtotelea actio inſtituta eſt. Hinc Ariſtoteleorum clamoribus agitatus ad ſummum Pariſienſis Curiæ concilium traducitur: deinde cum legitimo judicii more res agi, atque apertiùs iniquiſſimæ fraudis invidia percipi videretur, novis artibus à Senatu Pariſienſi ad regiam cognitionem disjicitur (10). - - - *Scarce had his animadverſions upon Ariſtotle been read over, when Peter Ramus was ſent for, not by the univerſity, that the matter might be argued in a civil way, and ſuch as was uſual in affairs of learning, but by ſome men who falſly called themſelves the univerſity, he was ſuddenly dragged before the tribunal of the Judge, as if it had been for a capital crime. He was accuſed of a new, and, till that day, unheard of crime,* viz. *that, by oppoſing Ariſtotle, he undermined Theology and the Liberal Arts; for with this ſpeech did the Ariſtotelian plea begin. It was afterwards brought by the clamours of the partizans of Ariſtotle, before the parliament of Paris, but perceiving that it was likely to be determined there in a regular and legal manner, and that their envies and frauds were more and more diſcovered, by new ſtratagems, they got it removed from the parliament of Paris, to the king's own determination.*’ The king ordered *that Antony Govea, who had offered to impugn and refute the ſaid books, and the ſaid Ramus, who maintained and defended them, ſhould chuſe and nominate on both ſides, two worthy men well ſkilled in the Greek and Latin tongues, and in Philophy* (11). Purſuant to this ordinance, Govea and Ramus choſe each of them two perſons: Peter Danes and Francis Vicomercat were choſe by Govea; and John Quintin, Doctor of the Canon-Law, and John de Beaumont, Doctor of Phyſic, were choſen by Peter Ramus. The king choſe *a fifth*, viz. John de Salignac, *Doctor of Divinity.* Here follow the contents of the Letters-patents. ‘Before whom (12) the ſaid Govea and Ramus have been heard in their diſputes and debates, till the ſaid Ramus, in order to put a ſtop to the buſineſs, entered an appeal; which we being informed of, iſſued out our letters to our provoſt of Paris, or his lieutenant, to compel the ſaid Govea and Ramus to end their diſputes, that the ſaid information might be given us by the ſaid cenſors, notwithſtanding the ſaid appeal, or any other whatſoever. Purſuant to which letters the ſaid Govea and Ramus have appeared again before the ſaid cenſors, and the ſaid Ramus perceiving that he could not defend the ſaid books, declared he would diſpute no longer, and ſubmitted to the cenſure of the above mentioned Judges; but when they would have proceeded in it, the ſaid Quintin and Beaumont declared that they would be no longer concerned in the matter. Whereupon the ſaid Ramus was ſummoned and required to chuſe and name two others, which he refuſed to do, and wholly ſubmitted to the three others; who having examined and conſidered the whole matter, were of opinion that the ſaid Ramus was a raſh, arrogant, and impudent man, for rejecting and condemning the Logic received by all nations, which he himſelf was ignorant of, and that his ignorance plainly appeared from his cenſuring Ariſtotle in his animadverſions. Moreover they added, that he had an ill intention, ſince he blamed Ariſtotle for many things which that Philoſopher never thought of. In ſhort, the ſaid

‘animadverſions

(d) Ex eodem, ibid.

(e) Jo. Thomas Freigius, in Vita Petri Rami, *pag. m.* 10.

(f) Ibid.

(g) Ibid. *pag.* 10, 11.

(7) Johannes Thomas Freigius, in Vita Petri Rami, *p.* 7, ex Scheckiano epilogo Rami.

(8) Aleſſandro Taſſoni, Penſieri diverſi, *lib. x, cap. iii, pag.* 375.

(9) Freigius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 9, 10.

(10) Audomarus Talæus, in ſua ad Carolum Lotharingium Cardinalem Academia, apud Launoium, de Varia Ariſtotelis fortuna, *pag.* 57, 58, *Edit. Pariſ.* 1653.

(11) They are the words of the king's Letters Patents, dated the tenth of May 1543. See Launoi, *de Varia Ariſtotelis fortuna, pag. m.* 52. Thoſe Letters are to be found in the *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*, of du Verdier Vau-Privas, at the word *Pierre de la Ramée.*

(12) That is, before the five judges, *viz.* he whom the king nominated, and thoſe who were choſen by the parties.

It was neceſſary that Francis I. ſhould concern himſelf with it, bringing the cauſe before himſelf, which was depending in the parliament of Paris, between Ramus and Antony Govea. Some judges were aſſigned to the parties to pronounce ſentence in the difference between them, after they had heard them diſpute. Govea had all the advantage he could deſire: the books of Ramus were prohibited throughout the kingdom, and the author was forbidden any more to teach Philoſophy. His enemies expreſſed an extraordinary joy for it [*E*]. This happened in the year 1543. The year following the Plague raged at Paris, and occaſioned the diſperſion of the ſcholars of the college of Prele:

' animadverſions were full of lies and ſlanders; ſo that ' the good of learning required, that the ſaid book ' ſhould be wholly ſuppreſſed; and likewiſe the other ' above-mentioned book, intituled, *Dialecticæ Inſtitutiones*, as containing in like manner many falſities ' and things foreign to the matter.' Here follows the king's order upon it. ' We declare, that having ' ſeen the ſaid advice, and had other advices and deliberations about it with many learned and notable ' men, we have condemned, ſuppreſſed, and aboliſhed, ' and do condemn, ſuppreſs, and aboliſh, the aforeſaid two books; the one, intituled, *Inſtitutiones Dialecticæ*, the other *Ariſtotelicæ Animadverſiones*, and ' we have forbidden, and do forbid all Printers and ' Bookſellers of our kingdom, countries, territories, ' and lordſhips, and all our other ſubjects, whatever ' condition they may be of, to print the ſaid books, ' or cauſe them to be printed, to publiſh, ſell, or diſperſe them in our ſaid kingdom, countries, territories, and lordſhips, upon pain of forfeiting the ſaid ' books, and of corporal puniſhment, whether they ' be printed in our ſaid kingdom, countries, territories, and lordſhips, or in any other place not being ' under our dominion. We likewiſe forbid the ſaid ' Ramus to read the ſaid books, and to get them written or tranſcribed, publiſhed or diſperſed in any manner whatſoever, or to read any lectures Logic or Philoſophy without expreſs leave from us; as alſo not to ' uſe ſuch ſlanders and invectives againſt Ariſtotle, or ' any other antient author commonly received and approved, or againſt our ſaid daughter the univerſity, ' and the members thereof, upon the above-mentioned ' pains; and therefore we order and command, &c(13).'

He who hears but one ſide, hears nothing; and therefore it will not be improper to hear the account which a friend of Ramus publiſhed of the whole proceeding. Ramus, to obey the king's command, appeared before the five judges, tho' three of them were his great enemies. The diſpute laſted two days. He maintained that the Logic of Ariſtotle was imperfect, ſince it contained neither definition nor diviſion. The two judges he had choſen declared the firſt day in writing, that definition is neceſſary in every regular diſputation (14); the three others declared in writing, that Logic may be perfect without definition (15). The next day they acknowledged in writing, that diviſion is neceſſary in Logic; but when they ſaw that Ramus inferred from thence that he was in the right to condemn Ariſtotle's Logic, becauſe it was not divided, they put off the buſineſs till another time; and perceiving that they had ſo intangled themſelves, that they could not come off with honour, they declared that the diſputation ought to be renewed, and that what had been done there thoſe two days, ſhould be looked upon as nothing. *Ne non damnaretur Ramus, novum conſilium initur ut ab initio tota diſputatio retexatur, & adhuc injudicata induceretur, proque nihilo haberetur* (16). Ramus made great complaints of ſuch a proceeding, wherein the judges not only made it appear that they intended to condemn him, but alſo diſannulled their own judgment; he excepted againſt them, and entered an appeal, which was declared null by Francis I, who ordered the five judges ſhould give a definitive ſentence in that cauſe. The two judges choſen by Ramus retired, being unwilling to be preſent at the judgment, as meer witneſſes to the injuſtice intended againſt him (17). The three others gave ſentence as they were led by their paſſions, and care was taken ſo to prepoſſeſs the king with falſe reports, that he confirmed their judgment. ' Hæc omnia Regis, ' licet omnium Regum & humaniſſimi & literarum ' amantiſſimi, tamen per falſas & improbiſſimè confictas calumnias inducti, auctoritate confirmantur (18). ' *Notwithſtanding that no king was of a more humane* ' *diſpoſition, or a greater lover of learning than Francis I,* ' *yet all theſe judgments were confirmed by his authority,* ' *which they had obtained by moſt falſe and wickedly* ' *deviſed calumnies.*' Note, that the king declared in his letters-patents, that Ramus *did wholly ſubmit* to thoſe three judges, after the other two had deſiſted: which is falſe, if we may believe the author whom I quote; for having ſaid that the two judges gave over the proceedings, he adds that Ramus did the ſame, and that the three others condemned him without hearing him.. ' Idemque Ramus ipſe non ſine ſtomacho, cùm à tribus illis contumelioſe illuderetur, fecit & ſe tempora ſperare dixit, quibus tales ' judices de ſuo facto nequaquam parem eſſent voluptatem percepturi. Ita vi victa, vel certe hominum ' quorumcunque opinione ad tempus oppreſſa cauſa eſt. ' Condemnantur igitur triumvirali ſententia, non modò ' indicta, ſed incognita planè cauſa, animadverſiones ' Ariſtotelicæ (19). - - - *Ramus could not bear, without* ' *great reſentment, to ſee himſelf ſo ſhamefully abuſed by* ' *the three, who determined againſt him; and ſaid,* ' *that he hoped, he ſhould ſee the time, when ſuch judges* ' *would not reap the ſame pleaſure from what they had* ' *done. He was obliged to ſubmit to ſuperior force, or* ' *at leaſt to the opinion of ſome men, by which it was for* ' *a time trampled upon: the animadverſions upon Ariſtotle were condemned by the judgment of a triumvirate,* ' *not only without any cauſe being ſhown, but without* ' *any cauſe being known.*' Take notice that the thing is thus related, not in an anonymous book, but in a piece which Audomarus Talæus dedicated to the cardinal of Lorrain. If we give credit to it, we muſt look upon what is ſaid by Peter Gallandius as a meer fable. He tells us, that Francis I. being informed of the continual invectives of a certain ſophiſt againſt Ariſtotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, was reſolved to ſend him to the gallies, but that Caſtellanus adviſed him to uſe another ſort of puniſhment; which was to engage that ſophiſt in a diſpute, wherein the ſilence he would be reduced to, would plainly diſcover his folly. The king approved that expedient, and when he heard of the confuſion that man had been in, he was contented with that puniſhment. It is Ramus, whom Peter Gallandius means; but we muſt remember that he was his great enemy. *Cùm in hac ſchola ante annos octo Sophiſta famoſus Muſis iratis natus, gloriæ popularis ſiti inexplebili præceps, Ariſtotele, Cicerone & Quintiliano petulanter & ignoranter vexatis, nullum finem in quemvis auctorem claſſicum debacchandi facturus videretur, priuſquam præſentem literarum ſtatam labefactaſſet, & ad ſuam libidinem pervertiſſet, permulti doctrina & virtute conſpicui homines audaciam tam prodigioſam indigniſſime tulerunt. Cumque de eo apud regem ita conqueſti eſſent, ut ille, pro ſua perpetua in literas & literarum Profeſſores benevolentia, hunc indignabundus ad remum damnatum triremibus addicere ſtatueret, Regis animum faceti leporis ſuavitate emollitum, ad mitiorem ſententiam traduxit. Sophiſtam nugantem & inepte philoſophantem ab humaniſſimo Rege nullo capitali ſupplicio puniendum eſſe. Verum cum doctis hominibus coram gravibus diſceptatoribus in diſputationis certamen commiſſum, argumentis convincendum, & ratione aliqua leviore ad ſanitatem reducendum. Quorum ſententia cum illum Rex inſcitiæ, impudentiæ & temeritatis damnatum, ſilentiique pœna multatum vidiſſet, facile acquievit, neque acerbius quicquam in eum ſtatuit* (20).

[*E*] *His enemies expreſſed an extraordinary joy for it.*] They made a greater noiſe about it in proportion, than the moſt vain-glorious princes for the taking of a great town, or the obtaining a moſt important victory. The ſentence of the three judges was publiſhed in Latin and French in all the ſtreets of Paris, and in all the parts of Europe whither they could ſend it. Some plays were acted with great pomp, wherein Ramus was abuſed a thouſand ways among the acclamations and applauſes of the Ariſtotelians (21). *Triumphus de tam nobili victoria mirificus agitur, triſtis illa & horrenda*

---

(13) *See* Launoi, ubi ſupra.

(14) Omnem diſputationem quæ via & ratione procederet definitione proficiſci debere. *Audom. Talæus, ubi ſupra, apud Launoium, ibid. pag.* 58.

(15) Ad Dialecticæ artis perfectionem definitione nihil opus eſſe. *Ibid.*

(16) Ibid.

(17) Ex eo autem conſeſſu ſe diſcedere quia ſe non ſocios conſiliis, ſed injuriæ quæ Ramo fieret adhibitos teſtes intelligerent. *Ibid.*

(18) Ib. *p.* 59.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Petrus Gallandius, in Vita Petri Caſtellani, *num.* 45, *pag.* 75, 76.

(21) *Idem, Talæus, ibid.* See alſo Ramus's Life by John Thomas Freigius, *pag.* 17.

Prele: but Ramus being perſuaded by his friends to teach there, had quickly a great many hearers (b). The Sorbonne endeavoured to have him expelled from that college, but could not ſucceed in it: he was maintained in his place of Principal by a decree of the parliament (i). The cardinal of Lorrain proved ſo good a patron to him, that he obtained from Henry II the liberty of writing and ſpeaking in the year 1547, and the royal profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy and Eloquence in July 1551 (k). The parliament of Paris had before this maintained him in the liberty of adding philoſophical lectures to thoſe of Eloquence (l). That decree had put an end to many perſecutions, which Ramus and his ſcholars had been expoſed to. They had been vexed and proſecuted ſeveral ways [F], both before the academical and the civil judges (m), during the winter of the year 1551 (n). He was no ſooner made Regius Profeſſor, but he ſhewed a new deſire of perfecting the ſciences, and went about it with more eagerneſs, notwithſtanding the hatred of his reſtleſs enemies, who were ſo malicious as to pretend, that the manner after which he and his colleagues pronounced the letter Q, was an innovation for which he deſerved to be proſecuted [G]. They carried their attempts ſo far, that he was

renda Triumvirûm ſententia impreſſis & Latina & Gallica oratione libellis, non modò per hujus urbis compita, ſed per orbis terrarum loca omnia, quò expectari potuit (22), *promulgatur. Ludi magno apparatu celebrantur, ubi ſpectantibus & plaudentibus Ariſtoteleis, omni ludibrii & convitii genere Ramus afficitur.*

[F] *They had been vexed and proſecuted ſeveral ways.*] I do not give the particulars of thoſe perſecutions, which you may read in Freigius (23): I ſhall only ſay, that when Ramus's enemies came to perceive that the other complaints made no great impreſſion, they accuſed him of perverting the youth with the ſeeds of Hereſy and Scepticiſm. ‘Unius primum accuſationem graviſſimam audivit, Ramum Academicum nominantis, & inaudita calumnia deſcribentis, humanarum divinarumque rerum hoſtem & inimicum, qui de humanis diviniſque legibus addubitaret, deque iis dubitare diſcipulos ſuos doceret: qui lubricos Divi Auguſtini locos ſuis auditoribus ad effrænatam & impiam libertatem proponeret, qui (quò facilius incautis animis abuteretur) omnes Logicas diſputationes tolleret (24). - - - - *He firſt heard, what was the heavieſt charge of all, the accuſation of one perſon, who, venting unheard of calumnies, and calling Ramus a Sceptic, deſcribed him as a foe to all goodneſs, and the enemy of all knowledge, divine and human, who not only doubted himſelf of the laws of God and man, but alſo taught his diſciples to doubt thereof; who made uſe of ſome licentious paſſages of St Auguſtin to recommend to his hearers an unbridled and impious liberty, and who, that he might the more eaſily deceive unwary ſouls, was for taking away all Logical diſputations.*’

[G] *The manner after which he and his colleagues pronounced the letter Q.*] Amongſt other abuſes, the royal profeſſors mended that, which had crept into the pronunciation of the Latin. Some Eccleſiaſtics complied with that reformation, tho' the Sorboniſts were diſpleaſed with that innovation. But a beneficed man was very ill uſed by them upon that account; for they got him deprived of his revenues. He made his application to the parliament; and the royal profeſſors being afraid that he would ſink under the credit of the faculty of Divinity, for being ſo bold as to pronounce the Latin tongue according to their reformation, thought themſelves obliged to aſſiſt him: they went to the court, and repreſented in ſo lively a manner the ſhamefulneſs of ſuch a trial, that the accuſed perſon was acquitted. ‘Quas novas turbas innovata pronunciatio peperit? Sub annum milleſimum quingenteſimum quinquageſimum, cùm Profeſſores regii ſinceriorem Latinæ linguæ pronunciationem ſenſim introducere cœpiſſent, moleſtè ferebant cùm alii, tum præſertim Sorbonici, inveteratam loquendi conſuetudinem Gallorum improbari, ut quæ pueri didiciſſent, ſenes perdenda fateri cogerentur: in primis verò de ſono ipſius literæ Q. ambigebatur: regiis ſic, uti debet, cum ſequente u pronunciantibus, Quiſquis, Quanquam: Sorbonicis verò conſuetudine vernacula, Kiſkis, Kankam. Jam cum ſacris addictum hominem ob genuinam pronunciationem ampliſſimis proventibus Sorbonici ſpoliandum curaſſent, & lite coram Senatu Pariſienſi conteſtata, ne miſer illa ob grammaticam hæreſin (ut illi vocabant) theologicis fructibus jure excideret, periculum eſſet: profeſſores regii, & inter hos Petrus Ramus facto agmine in Curiam convolant, & judicii inſolentiam præfati, quod Jureconſulti de legibus regiis diſputare ſoliti, ad grammaticorum leges dijudicandas ſeſe dimiſiſſent, judices ita commoverunt, ut ſententiis ſuis non modo ſacerdotem abſolverent, ſed & impunitatem de Grammatica pronunciatione diſputandi tacito aſſenſu in perpetuum ſtabilirent. Ergo Kis & Kalis, & Kantus, & Miki, & ſimiles Gottiſmi & barbariſmi erant in Pariſienſi Academia ante regios profeſſores uſitati: quos barbariſmos ſi collega aliquis imitari nollet, acerbè & contumelioſè accipiebatur, quod collegii conſuetudinem violare diceretur. E ſchola regia tum primum Quis, Qualis, Quantus, Mihi, Latinè & Romanè ſonuerunt, & pudor fuit regiis Profeſſoribus tanquam regis ipſius voci palàm reclamare (25). - - - *What new diſturbances did an innovation in pronunciation produce? In the year* 1550, *the Royal Profeſſors having begun to introduce a purer pronunciation of the Latin tongue, there were other profeſſors, eſpecially thoſe of the Sorbonne, who took it highly amiſs, that the pronunciation, anciently made uſe of by the French, ſhould be diſapproved of, and could not bear to be obliged to unlearn when they were old men what they had learned when they were boys. The firſt diſpute of this kind was about the ſound of the letter Q. The Royal Profeſſors pronounced it as it ought to be, with the following vowel* u, Quiſquis, Quanquam: *but the Sorbonne adhered to the cuſtom then in uſe,* Kiſkis, Kankam. *The members of the Sorbonne had endeavoured to deprive a Clergyman of very ample revenues, for making uſe of the genuine pronunciation: the conteſt was brought before the parliament of Paris, and there was great danger that the unfortunate man would be deprived of the benefits of his Theological ſtudies, for a Grammatical Hereſy, as they called it. But the Royal Profeſſors, and amongſt them Peter Ramus, aſſembling themſelves together in a body, flew to the court, and having expoſed the ſtrangeneſs of their proceedings, that Lawyers, whoſe buſineſs it was to diſpute about the king's laws, ſhould debaſe themſelves into Critics on the laws of Grammar, they ſo prevailed upon the Judges, that they not only acquitted the Divine, but by a tacit aſſent eſtabliſhed for ever an impunity to all controverſies about Grammatical pronunciation.* Kis, *and* Kalis, *and* Kantus, *and* Miki, *and ſuch like Gothiſms and barbariſms were uſed in the academy of Paris in the preſence of the Royal Profeſſors: and if any of them refuſed to make uſe of theſe barbariſms, he was very ill treated, as one who took upon him to infringe the cuſtoms of the college.* Quis, Qualis, Quantus, *and* Mihi, *were then firſt reſtored to the genuine Roman pronunciation in the Royal ſchool, and people were aſhamed to contradict openly the Royal Profeſſors, who were in a manner conſidered as the voice of the king himſelf.*’ This is ſuch a ſtrange and incredible thing, that I did not think fit to omit any one word of the author who relates it. He maintains another immediately after, which I am more amazed at, and I would fain ſee the monuments of it in the archives; otherwiſe I would not adviſe any body to give an intire credit to it, any more than to the trial about *Kankan* and *Kiſkis*. The thing is this: The public authority was made uſe of to force many doctors of Paris to renounce this aſſertion, which they obſtinately maintained: *Ego amat* is as good a phraſe as *Ego amo*. I will quote Freigius for it. ‘Incredibile propè dictu eſt, ſed tamen verum & editis libris proditum, in Pariſienſi Academia Doctores extitiſſe, qui mordicus tuerentur ac defenderent, *Ego amat*, tam commodam was obliged to abſcond. He went to Fontainebleau, with the king's leave, where he concealed himſelf (*o*) [*H*], and continued his Geometrical and Aſtronomical ſtudies by the help of the books he found in the king's library. But when it came to be known that he was there, he did not think himſelf ſafe, and was forced to abſcond in ſeveral other places (*p*). In the mean time his library was plundered in the college of Prele. But the peace being concluded between Charles IX, and the Proteſtants, in the year 1563, he was reſtored to his place, wherein he maintained himſelf with great vigour, and endeavoured chiefly to make mathematical learning flouriſh; which he did till the ſecond civil war in the year 1567. He was then obliged to leave Paris, and to put himſelf under the protection of the Huguenots (*q*). He was in their army at the battle of St Denys. The peace was made ſome months after, and he was again eſtabliſhed in his profeſſorſhip; but foreſeeing that the war would ſoon break out again, and being unwilling to be expoſed to a new ſtorm, he aſked the king's leave to go and ſee the German univerſities, which was granted him. He made that journey in the year 1568, and received great honours wherever he came (*r*). He returned into France after the third war, in the year 1571 (*s*), and periſhed in the maſſacre at Paris on St Bartholomew's day, as may be ſeen in the paſſage which Moreri has tranſcribed from Thuanus. He was, without doubt, a great Orator [*I*], a man of univerſal learning, and endowed with excellent moral qualities; free from avarice, ſober, chaſt [*K*], fearing God, and zealous

---

(b) Theoph. Banoſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 7.

(i) Ibid.

(k) See the remark [L].

(l) Theoph. Banoſius, ubi ſupra, pag. 7, & 8.

(m) Jo. Thomas Freigius, ubi ſupra, pag. 18, & ſeq.

(n) Ramus, in Oratione habita anno 1551, pag. m. 9.

(22) *Thus we read in Mr* de Launoi, de Varia Ariſtotelis fortuna, *pag.* 60. *But* Freigius, in Vita Rami, *pag.* 17, *citing the ſame paſſage of Talæus, ſays,* quo exportari potuit.

(23) Freigius, in Vita Rami, *pag.* 18, & *ſeq.*

(24) Ibid. *pag.* 20. This is taken from Ramus's inaugural ſpeech made in the year 1551.

(25) Freigius, in Vita Rami, *pag.* 24.

(*o*) Freigius, ibid. *pag.* 26.

(*p*) Idem, *pag.* 28.

(*q*) Idem, *pag.* 30.

(*r*) Idem, & *pag. ſeq.*

(*s*) This is founded upon what is ſaid that he made a ſpeech at Baſil in the year 1571.

'orationem eſſe, quàm *Ego amo*; ad eamque pertinaciam comprimendam conſilio publico opus fuiſſe (26) (§ *a*). - - - - *It is almoſt incredible to tell, but nevertheleſs true, and alſo in print, that there were Doctors in the academy of Paris, who aſſerted and maintained moſt obſtinately, that* Ego amat *was as proper ſpeech, and as good Grammar as* Ego amo, *and they were forced to have the aſſiſtance of public authority before they could overcome their obſtinacy.*' Notwithſtanding my incredulity, I ſhall obſerve that there happened many things in the XVIth century in the faculty of Theology at Paris, at which they bluſh now when they think of them. They were laughed at for it to ſome purpoſe.

[(§ *a*) Taken from Agrippa *de Vanitate Scientiarum, Cap. III. de Grammatica*: ſee Mr Le Duchat's Notes upon Rabelais, note eighth of the nineteenth chapter of the firſt book. REM. CRIT.]

[*H*] *He went to Fontainebleau with the king's leave, where he concealed himſelf.*] I wiſh Freigius had not omitted the circumſtances of Ramus's retreat; I wiſh particularly he had mentioned the time: but perhaps if he had ventured to ſet down the year, he would not have been more ſucceſsful, than when he ſaid (27) that Ramus's *Animadverſiones* were condemned in the year 1545; and that the author was forbidden to meddle with Philoſophy; but that Ramus being re-inſtated by king Henry (28), at the ſollicitation of the Cardinal of Lorrain, made a ſpeech in the year 1546, *De ſtudiis Philoſophiæ & Eloquentiæ conjungendis. - - Concerning the uniting the ſtudies of Philoſophy and Eloquence.* However it be, he clearly intimates that the king not daring to protect Ramus openly, ſent him to Fountainebleau to ſecure him from the fury of his enemies. 'Paucis menſibus per reliqua Geometriæ myſteria pervaſiſſet, niſi curſus induſtriæ per fatalem quandam calamitatem abruptus fuiſſet. Acceptis igitur à rege literis, ad regiam Fontiſbellaquei bibliothecam profectus, mathematicas ſuperiorum temporum prælectiones ab initio plenius & uberius retractavit & conſideravit (29). . . . . . Hæc meditantem ſolitudo cervorum ac ſylva diutius occulere non potuit. In Italiam tum cogitavit, quò ipſum Bononia honorificè invitarat. In Germaniam noſtram ipſius illis mathematum amoribus chariſſimam ſæpe reſpexit, ſed viis omnibus terror mortis intentus ac pavor, rumor etiam Prælei ſui indignis modis direpti, tum bibliothecæ chariſſimis quibuſque rebus ſpoliatæ ac depopulatæ, ad regiam Vincennarum propius urbem revocarunt: quin alia vis etiam gravior accidit, ut è Vincennis per invia itinera profugiendum eſſet, & ſubinde variis in locis deliteſcendum: in fuga tamen & latebris otium lucemque reperit (30). - - - *He would have gone through the other myſteries of Geometry in a few months, if his career had not been ſtopped by a fatal calamity, having then obtained the king's letters, he retired to the royal library at Fontainebleau, where he more fully reviſed and examined, from the beginning, the Mathematical lectures which he had formerly read. . . . . Neither woods, nor the ſolitude of ſtags could no longer conceal him in the purſuit of theſe ſtudies. He then thought of going to Italy, whither Bologna had given him a moſt honourable invitation. He often turned his eyes towards Germany, that was moſt dear to him from the love that he bore to Mathematical ſtudies. But on every hand nothing ſurrounded him but terrors and the apprehenſions of death; the intelligence he received, that the college of Prele was cruelly ſacked, and that his library was plundered and ſtripped of every thing that was precious in it, brought him back to the caſtle of Vincennes, nearer the town: another accident happened ſtill more afflicting, and which obliged him to fly from thence by unknown ways, and to hide himſelf in divers places: nevertheleſs, in the midſt of his flight, and in his hiding-places, he found leiſure to improve his knowledge.*' Banoſius informs us that Ramus retired to Fontainebleau during the firſt religious war, that is, in the year 1562 (31).

(26) Ibid.

(27) Ibid. *pag.* 14.

(28) Henry II did not begin his reign till the year 1547. Ramus was deprived in 1543.

(29) Freigius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 26.

(30) Ibid. *pag.* 28.

A letter of Languet's (32), dated from Paris, February the firſt, 1562, informs us, that Ramus put himſelf at the head of ſome members of the univerſity (33), who let Catherine de Medicis know that they had no concern in the petition which the Rector had preſented to the parliament in the name of the whole univerſity, to prevent the publication of the edict of January; on the contrary, that they demanded the publication of it. It is certain that the Rector had never adviſed about it with thoſe that he knew to be favourers of the reformed religion (34).

[*I*] *He was a great Orator.*] I deſire no other proof for it than this teſtimony of Brantome, which contains a particular not be found any where elſe. Here are his words, wherein he mentions the learned men maintained by Henry II. 'Galandius Torticolis was a great Orator; but Ramus, his enemy, exceeded him. Ramus was a moſt eloquent Orator, and there have been few like him; for his eloquence was attended with an extraordinary graceful delivery. Having turned Huguenot ſome years after, and being in the Prince of Condé and the Admiral's retinue, in their journey to Lorrain, and the Reiſters, whom they had ſent for, refuſing to go into France, unleſs they had ſome money given them; the Huguenots made a gathering for them, and Ramus a ſpeech, which affected them ſo much, that they were prevailed upon to go into the heart of France, where they did great miſchief (35).'

[*K*] *He was . . . . free from avarice, ſober, chaſt.*] He refuſed ſome profeſſorſhips, which might have been very profitable to him, and choſe rather to be a teacher in the college of Prele, where he had no public ſalary (36). He would not accept the preſents that his pupils were willing to make him (37), and he maintained ſome ſcholars at his own charge. 'Solebat in patriam proficiſcens bonæ indolis juvenes pauperes ſuis ſumptibus fovere, eoſque in Academia Prælea bonis informabat diſciplinis: ex quorum numero plerique ſuperſunt viri doctiſſimi (38). - - - *Whenever he went into his own country, he uſed, at his own expence, to aſſiſt ſuch poor children as appeared to him of a promiſing genius. He afterwards placed them in the college of Prele, where he inſtructed them in all good diſcipline: moſt of them are ſtill alive, and are men of great learning.*' He refuſed to go into Poland, tho' he was promiſed to be well rewarded for the encomiums he ſhould beſtow upon the duke of Anjou. His anſwer

(31) Banoſius, in Vita Rami, *pag.* 20.

(32) *The 68th of the ſecond book, Edit. of Hall* 1699.

(33) Eorum qui Rectorem accuſant dux eſt Petrus Ramus. *Languet. Epiſt. LXVIII, lib. ii, pag.* 201.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Brantome, Mémoires des Hommes illuſtres, *Tom. ii, pag.* 55.

(36) Tho. Freigius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 35.

(37) Ibid.

(38) Banoſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 14.

zealous for the Reformed religion: but he was ſomewhat obſtinate, and given to contradiction; and ſome will have it that he robbed Vives of his inventions (*t*). He ſhewed a great firmneſs in his misfortunes [*L*]. He was not well beloved by the miniſters; for he made himſelf in ſome ſort the head of a party to alter the diſcipline of the Reformed churches. His deſign was fruſtrated, and even defeated in a national ſynod [*M*]. I could

anſwer was, that Eloquence ought not to be a mercenary thing, and that an Orator ought to be a man of probity. *Inter cætera referam quod cuidam reſpondit, qui in Poloniam legatus, Ramo, ut ſecum proficiſceretur ad Henrici, qui nunc eſt, Galliarum regis laudes decantandas, magno pretio perſuadere conatus eſt. At vero, ait, oportet Oratorem non tantum dicendi peritum, ſed virum bonum eſſe: nec viri boni lingua venalis eſſe debet* (39). We learn from theſe words a particular very remarkable, *viz.* that Monluc was deſirous to make uſe of Ramus's eloquence, in order to dazzle the Poliſh nobility, that they might be the more willing to elect the duke of Anjou for their king; for it is not to be queſtioned, that he who made the above-mentioned propoſal to Ramus, was the ſame Monluc, biſhop of Valence, who did ſo well ſucceed in his negotiations about the election of Henry III, and who, amongſt other means, made uſe of the eloquence of ſome perſons, who, in their verſes and harangues, extolled to the ſkies the qualities of the duke of Anjou. He took care to avoid the ſnare mentioned in a maxim of Horace (40).

Ramus was a man of an exemplary temperance; he was contented with boiled meat, and eat but little at dinner; he was twenty years without drinking wine, and began to drink it only by the preſcription of the Phyſicians; he lay upon ſtraw, and roſe very early (41); he ſtudied all day (42); he lived a ſingle life that was not ſo much as ſuſpected of the leaſt impurity, and took great care to avoid obſcene converſations. *Cœlebs vixit honeſtiſſime, ab ſcortationis non tantum crimine, ſed etiam ſuſpicione ſemper immunis: colloquia obſcœna, utpote quæ bonos mores corrumpunt, tanquam toxicum fugiebat* (43).

[*L*] *He ſhewed a great firmneſs in his misfortunes.*] Any body but he would have retired from Paris after the thundring decree of Francis I, which his adverſaries did ſo inſultingly boaſt of; but he kept ſtill in the college of Prele, and let them bawl as much as they would. He anſwered none of the pieces that were publiſhed againſt him. If it be ſaid that he durſt not do it, becauſe the king ordered him to be ſilent about matters relating to Philoſophy; I anſwer, that if he had not been maſter of his paſſions, he would have gone out of the kingdom, to enjoy the liberty of vindicating himſelf. Of all things in the world ſilence is perhaps the moſt difficult for an author who is attacked and ſlandered by every body; and yet this is a thing which Ramus was capable of. Here follow the words of an author who has very well expreſſed it. ‘Adverſus contumelias Doctorum quamlibet & eruditorum hominum, perpetuum ſilentium juraverat. ‘Nil Goveano, Gallandio, Perionio, Turnebo reſpondit: nil ingenii & doctrinæ per univerſam Germaniam principi Melanchthoni reſpondit: nil aliis ‘Germanis, nil Italis nonnullis reſpondit. Cumque ‘divulgatis per orbem terrarum Gallica & Latina lingua probris eſſet notatus, publicis ludis ignominioſiſſime traductus: conſtricta lingua, vinctis manibus ‘prohibitus quicquam de philoſophia vel publice, vel ‘privatim dicere, ſcribere, cogitare etiam (ſi menti ‘tantùm potuiſſet imperari) prohibitus eſſet: adverſus ‘tantas tot acerbitatum plagas, unicum patientiæ remedium adhibuit, in animoque ſemper illud habuit: *Grata ſuperveniet, quæ non ſperabitur hora* (44). ‘*He had ſworn to obſerve a perpetual ſilence with regard ‘to the ſlanders of his adverſaries, tho' they were men of ‘ever ſo much learning or knowledge. He made no anſwer ‘to Goveanus, Gallandius, Perionius, and Turnebus: nor ‘would he make any reply to Melanchthon himſelf, the ‘moſt famed for wit and learning throughout all Germany: there were other Germans, and ſome Italians, ‘to whom he gave no anſwer. And when in the Latin ‘and French tongue calumnies were every where publiſhed ‘againſt him, when he was in the moſt ignominious manner abuſed on the public ſtage, when his tongue was ‘tied and his hands too, and he was prohibited from ‘either publickly or privately ſpeaking, or writing, or ‘even thinking, about Philoſophy, if it had been poſſible ‘to have controlled the mind ſo far; yet amidſt this deluge of ills he made uſe of no other remedy than patience; and that he was always poſſeſſed of:* and ‘always hop'd for better times.’ That author has forgot a circumſtance, which would have very much ſet off Ramus's triumph, I mean the power he had over himſelf to be ſilent. This Profeſſor, four years after, recovered the liberty of writing and ſpeaking about Philoſophy. He ſays ſo himſelf in the firſt oration he made after he had been choſen Regius-Profeſſor: ‘Miſero Rex Henricus, Hercules videlicet ‘Gallicus, adfuit, meque quarto abhinc anno ad poſtulationem Caroli Lotharingi Cardinalis, & manibus & lingua ſolvit, ſolutoque Eloquentiæ & Philoſophiæ docendæ, exercendæ, illuſtrandæ poteſtatem ‘fecit (45): --- *King Henry, the Hercules of France, ‘relieved me from my diſtreſs, when four years ſince, at ‘the requeſt of Charles, Cardinal of Lorrain, he ſet ‘free both my tongue, and my hands, and reſtored to me ‘the power of teaching, practiſing, and explaining Eloquence and Philoſophy.*’ Here are ſome other proofs of his conſtancy. The firſt time he explained his Logic in the college of Cambray, the emiſſaries of his enemies left no ſtone unturned to vex him to the higheſt degree, and to force him to leave off reading his lecture: they hiſſed and hooted at him; they clapped their hands, and ſtamped with their feet. But all was in vain; he was not put out of countenance; he ſtopped now and then till the hooting was over, and made an end of his lecture in the interval of their outcries. They were aſtoniſhed at his unconcernedneſs, and proved afterwards leſs inſolent. *Anno* 1552, *cùm in Cameracenſi ſchola frequentiſſimo auditorio ſuam dialecticam auſpicaretur, ab æmulis clamores, ſtrepitus, ſibili ingentes per ſummam petulantiam excitari cœpêre. Hac inſolentia nihil ipſe permotus, eum ſe oratorem præſtitit. ut multum diuque licet obnitentibus adverſariis, per intervalla tamen clamorum, incredibili conſtantia, nec minori cum gloria perorarit. Qua ejus virtute conſternati inimici, in poſterum minus ei fuêre moleſti* (46). He was inſulted in the like manner at Heidelberg, and with no better ſucceſs, whilſt he read lectures there in the year 1568 (47). Which ſhews that he had made himſelf odious to ſeveral people in Germany as well as in France, for having been ſo bold as to write againſt Ariſtotle. It muſt be confeſſed that he had done it a little too haughtily, and that he had ſhewed too great an affectation of depriving that Philoſopher of all his glory: he took from him, as much as ever he could, the works that are aſcribed to him; and when he acknowledged him to be the author of ſome of them, he condemned the doctrine contained in them, and went ſo far as to inveigh againſt his perſon, by an odious deſcription of his vices and actions (48). See the two ſpeeches which Perionius publiſhed in the year 1544.

[*M*] *His deſign was .... defeated in a national ſynod.*] He deſigned to introduce a democratical government into the church: he pretended that the power of the keys, conferred by Jeſus Chriſt upon the people, ought only to be committed to the conſiſtories, that they ſhould firſt of all deliberate about the things in queſtion, and give their judgment about them; which ſhould afterwards be propoſed to the people, and ſhould not be enacted into a law, unleſs it were confirmed by the votes of the heads of the families. He ſaid that this was the only way to preſerve the church from Oligarchy and Tyranny. His opinion was examined in a national ſynod (49), who rejected it. Beza uſed his utmoſt endeavours to have that Eccleſiaſtical Democracy condemned, which in truth would occaſion a world of confuſion, and a meer Anarchy. He was afraid that if Peter Ramus ſhould refuſe to acquieſce in the judgment of the ſynod, it would cauſe many broils; for he looked upon him as a pragmatical fellow. Here follow his words: *Pſeudodialecticus ille, quem* ὄζον ἀςηθος· *jampridem docti multi cognominarunt, contentionem non parvam excitavit do tota Eccleſiaſtica* ευταξία. *quam inquit Democraticam eſſe oportere, non Ariſtocraticam, ſola* προβουλεύματα

(*t*) *See* Keckerman, in Præcognitis Logicis, *Tract. ii, cap. v.*

(39) Ibid. *pag.* 13.

(40) Multa fidem promiſſa levant, ubi plenius æquo Laudat venales qui vult extrudere merces. *Horat. Epiſt. II, lib. ii, ver.* 10.

(41) Banoſius, ibid. *pag.* 12.

(42) Ibid.

(43) Ibid.

(44) Freigius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 34.

(45) Ramus, in Oratione habita anno 1551, *pag. m.* 7.

(46) Freigius, ubi ſupra.

(47) Proinde minus debet mirum videri, ſi dum libera legatione regis permiſſu, tertiò civili bello ardente Gallia fungitur, in Heidelbergenſi Academia principali autoritate ad profitendum adductus, conſimiles æmulorum clamores invicto animo pertulit, tanta quidem conſtantia ut adverſarios ſuæ petulantiæ pudere meritò debuerit. *Ibid.*

(48) *See* Keckerman, in Præcognitis Logicis, *pag. m.* 95, 96.

(49) Held at Nimes in May, 1572.

could mention many other things relating to him; were it not that I avoid repeating what may be found in Moreri's Dictionary, and in the large collections of Mr Teiſſier: beſides, I have not been able to conſult a book (u) which I formerly was poſſeſſed of, and which contains a great many particulars of his life. I ſhall make ſome ſhort obſervations upon the narratives of thoſe two authors [*N*], wherein the reader will find ſome matters of fact cleared. He publiſhed many books; you may ſee the catalogue of them in

προβȣλεύματα preſbyterio relinquens. Synodus ob eam cauſam Nemauſi ineunte Majo coacta, cui etiam interfui, dogma iſtud plane, meo judicio, abſurdum & pernicioſum, refutatis contrariis omnibus argumentis damnavit, cui ſi cum ſuis pauculis ille obſequatur, bene erit: ſin minùs, certe turbas dabit homo ad turbanda optima quæque comparatus (50). Ramus was not ſo imprudent as to require that the diſcipline ſhould be aboliſhed; he only oppoſed the juriſdiction of the conſiſtories and ſynods; he pretended that the people had a right to judge of the doctrine, chuſe their miniſters, excommunicate, and abſolve (51). Some ſuſpect that he inſiſted upon this, to introduce into the church the power of the demagogues of Athens, or of the tribunes of Rome; for, being a very eloquent man, he might have excited in the aſſembly of the people ſuch paſſions as he would have had them poſſeſſed with. *Ille neſcio quem adeò Chriſtianum populum ſomnians ut ſemper à Spiritu ſancto regatur, ſolaque προβȣλεύματα preſbyterio relinquens, nihil vult ratum haberi, niſi quod præſens populus rogatis expreſſiſque ſuffragiis decreverit, quod ni fiat, clamitat Oligarchiam ac Tyrannidem invehi in Eccleſiam, nihil interea Ochlocratiam reformidans, in qua nimirum ipſe, & ejus ſimiles dominentur. Contendunt iidem quibuſvis etiam ἰδιώταις prophetandi partes in Eccleſia concedendas, huc detorto Pauli loco ex cap. prioris ad Cor.* xiv (52).

[*N*] *I ſhall make ſome ſhort obſervations upon the narratives of Moreri and Mr Teiſſier.*] I. I have already obſerved (53), their miſtake concerning the country of Ramus's grandfather. II. They take notice of a fault of Thuanus without mending it. That great man ſuppoſes (54) that Peter Ramus having taught Philological learning, Philoſophy, and the Mathematics in the college of Prele, and afterwards in the Royal College, forged at laſt a falſe Philoſophy in oppoſition to Ariſtotle (55). He is miſtaken; Ramus began firſt of all to attack Ariſtotle, as has been ſaid above (56). III. What they ſay of the foundation of a profeſſorſhip for the Mathematics is true; but their narrative would make one think, that Ramus paid five hundred livres every year during his life, to him who filled the mathematical chair. I do not believe it. It is likely his intention was, that after his death that ſum ſhould be taken from his revenue, to be paid to the Profeſſor, who ſhould be choſen according to the terms he had preſcribed. His laſt will was publiſhed by Banoſius (57): he made it the firſt (58) of Auguſt 1568, being ready to travel in order to viſit the foreign univerſities. He ordered by that will, that out of the yearly rent of ſeven hundred livres which he had in the town-houſe of Paris, five hundred ſhould be applied for the ſalary of a Profeſſor, who ſhould teach, for the ſpace of three years, Arithmetic, Muſic, Geometry, Optics, Mechanics, Aſtronomy, and Geography, in the Royal College; and he appointed Frederic Reiſnerus to be the firſt Profeſſor who ſhould have that ſalary. Paſquier, in his Recherches, has committed ſo childiſh a fault about this very thing, that I dare not but take notice of it. *That learned man*, ſays he, *after forty-five years labour, had got five hundred livres a year, by his good huſbandry, which he received from the town-houſe of Paris, out of which he left a hundred livres to his uncle by the mother's ſide, a hundred more to a nephew the ſon of his uterine ſiſter, and the five hundred livres that remained to him who ſhould be judged the fitteſt man for the mathematical chair* (59). Here is an inſtance of thoſe abſences of mind, which I have mentioned in another place (60): this is worſe than if one ſhould ſay, in caſting up an account, three times ſeven make twenty-two. Paſquier has before his eyes a ſum of five hundred livres; he takes from it one hundred on the one ſide, and one hundred on the other, and yet he finds ſtill five hundred livres: he reads this over and over again without perceiving his miſtake. If he did not commit this error, it muſt be imputed to the corrector of the Preſs. I muſt further obſerve, that Ramus was but fifty-three years of age, when he made his will; where then ſhall we find the forty-five years of his labour and good huſbandry? Father du Breul (61) ſays, that Ramus left only fifty livres by his will for the mathematical Profeſſor. IV. Moreri is in the right, when he ſays, that *we read in Beza's letters, that Ramus had a mind to retire to Geneva, where he deſired to be Profeſſor of Philoſophy.* The two letters Beza wrote to him are remarkable, and plainly ſhew that there was no great friendſhip between them. The firſt is dated the 30th of September 1569. Beza anſwers the complaints of Ramus, and at the ſame time declares to him, that he condemned his Logic, and his inveterate diſeaſe of cenſuring the greateſt men, and that his adverſaries were approved of. 'Illud ego multis ſæpe dixi, & ad teipſum ſcripſi non temere, ut tu putas, neque vel εἰρωνευόμενος, vel ullo, ita me bene Deus amet, maledicendi ſtudio, ſed quoniam tuum iſtud in ſummis omnibus & extra omnem judiciorum aleam poſitis ſcriptoribus reprehendendis cacoëthes probare nunquam potui, ac ne nunc quidem poſſum. . . . . Miror autem à me requiri quod tam multi doctiſſimi viri tam accurate & verbis & ſcriptis præſtiterunt, quibus ſummo conſenſu tuas in Ariſtotelem animadverſiones prorſus diſplicuiſſe non ignoras. Cum iſtis ſi ferre non potes ut à te diſſentiam, tuo ſane judicio fruere (62). *I have ſaid ſo very often to many, and have writ the ſame thing to you, not, as you ſuppoſe, in banter, or with any deſign to rail at you: but I did never approve of that cuſtom of your's in cenſuring the beſt and moſt judicious authors; neither do I now. . . . . I wonder that you ſhould expect from me what ſo many learned men have ſo accurately performed both in words and writing, to whom you know your remarks on Ariſtotle were altogether diſagreeable. If you cannot bear that I ſhould with them diſſent from you, follow your own judgment.*' Theſe are the ſweet things that Beza writ to him. He complains in the other letter that Ramus did not acquaint him with his deſign of being Profeſſor of Philoſophy in the Academy of Geneva, and he takes it for a ſign of diſtruſt (63). He gueſſed right; for certainly Ramus did not expect that Beza would favour him, and he had no reaſon to expect it. However, Beza made him ſome compliments, and writ to him in a civil manner; but after all, he told him that there was no profeſſorſhip for him at Geneva; all the places were filled; the funds appointed for the ſalaries of the Profeſſors could not be augmented, and the Academy was reſolved to admit no other ſyſtem but that of Ariſtotle. *Duo tantùm obſtant quo minus quod optas, & noſtrum collegium alioqui vehementer cuperet, commodè nunc confici poſſe videatur. Unum, quòd nullus nunc ſit in ſchola vacuus locus, noſtrorum verò tenues adeò ac pene nullæ ſint facultates, ut nec augere poſſint profeſſorum numerum, nec conſtitutis antea ſtipendiis, quæ ſanè perexigua ſunt, quicquam adjicere: alterum, quòd nobis certum ac conſtitutum ſit & in ipſis tradendis Logicis, & in cæteris explicandis diſciplinis, ab Ariſtotelis ſententia ne tantillum quidem deflectere. Hæc ad te ingenuè ſcribo ex vetere formula. Inter bonos bene agier oportet* (64). Here is a remarkable thing. When Ramus might have had an honourable employment out of the kingdom, he refuſed it ſeveral times; and when he was deſirous to have one at Geneva, he could not get it. V. Mr Teiſſier tells us this concerning the invitations this Philoſopher refuſed. *After the death of Romulus Amaſæus, the city of Bologna offered him a thouſand ducats, if he would ſucceed him in his place. The king of Poland endeavoured to have him at Cracow. John, king of Hungary, ſent him word that he would give him the management of the univerſity of Weiſemburg* (65). Thoſe words of Mr Teiſſier anſwer the Latin words of Banoſius. 'Nulla eſt Chriſtiani orbis natio quæ Rami ſapientiam non amaverit, & præmio laudando redimere ſtuduerit. Amiſſo enim Romulo Amaſæo, qui mille ducatorum ſtipendiis in celeberrima Bononienſi Academia docuerat, Angelus Papius totius Academiæ conſenſu illum in demortui locum evocavit. Ab Andrea Duditio Imperatoris legato Cracoviam eſt invitatus. Joannes Rex Pannoniæ Albæ Juliæ adminiſtrandæ magna propoſita mercede præficere voluit, & chirographo

---

(u) The Life of Peter Ramus, written by Nancelius. Mr Teiſſier ſays nothing of it in his *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum.*

(50) Theodor. Beza, Epiſt. LXVII. *It is dated July* 1, 1572.

(51) Contendebat non adverſus diſciplinam, ſed penes quos eſſet eccleſiaſtica gubernatio: volebat enim non penes paucos, ſed penes univerſam Eccleſiam eſſe judicium doctrinæ, electionem & abjectionem miniſtrorum, excommunicationem, & abſolutionem. *Simler. in Vita Bullinger. fol.* 45.

(52) Theodor. Beza, Epiſt. LXVIII, *of the ſame date as the other.*

(53) In the remark [*A*].

(54) Thuan. *lib. lii, pag.* 1078, *ad ann.* 1572. Spondanus has committed the ſame fault, *ad ann.* 1572, *num.* 15.

(55) Poſtremo erroneam in Philoſophicis doctrinam invexit, Ariſtotelem voce & ſcriptis importune oppugnans. *Idem, Thuanus, ibid.*

(56) In the remark [*D*].

(57) In Vita Rami, *pag.* 15, *& ſeq.*

(58) *And not the 8th, as Paſquier ſays,* Recherches de la France, *lib. ix, cap. xix, pag. m.* 835.

(59) Paſquier, ibid.

(60) In the article CATIUS, remark [*C*].

(61) Antiquitez de Paris, *pag.* 568, *Paris Edit.* 1639, *in* 4*to.*

(62) Beza, Epiſt. XXXIV.

(63) Mallem ex te ipſo tuum hoc de ornanda noſtra ſchola conſilium, quàm ex amicis intellexiſſe, minimè id quidem quòd abs te vel quoquam alio rogari velim, ut homines ambitioſi ſolent, ſed quòd inde conjiciam te nonnihil de meo in te animo dubitare cœpiſſe. *Id. Epiſt. XXXVI, It is dated December* 1, 1570.

(64) Beza, Epiſt. XXXVI.

(65) Teiſſier, Addit. to the Elogies, *Tom. i, pag.* 373, 374.

in Mr Teiſſier. His hand-writing was ſcarce legible, and gave a great deal of trouble to the Printers (*x*). His ſect flouriſhed for ſome time [*O*]. I ſhall make a remark againſt

‘ chirographo Regio obſignavit (66). - - - *There is no part of the Chriſtian world that does not admire the wiſdom of Ramus, and ſtudy to purchaſe it at the greateſt expence. For Romulus Amaſius being dead, whoſe ſalary for teaching in the famous univerſity of Bologna was a thouſand crowns, Angelus Papius, by the common conſent of that univerſity, invited him to fill the place of the deceaſed. He was called to Cracow by Andrew Duditius the emperor's ambaſſador. John, king of Hungary, offered him the management of the univerſity of Weiſemburg, promiſing him a very large ſalary, which promiſe he confirmed with his royal ſignet.*’ The following cenſure does not therefore concern Mr Teiſſier, but Banoſius. Romulus Amaſæus died in the year 1558, many years after Pope Paul III had removed him from his profeſſorſhip at Bologna. Ramus was not therefore invited to come and fill the place that was vacant by the death of Romulus; Banoſius ſhould have ſaid that this profeſſorſhip was offered him, when Amaſæus left it to go to Rome in order to teach the grand-ſon of Pope Paul III. But if it was not offered him till after the death of Amaſæus, it ſhould have been ſaid only, that he was offered a very honourable and profitable employment at Bologna, the very ſame that Amaſæus had formerly poſſeſſed. The reader is deceived, when he is told that Ramus refuſed the chair vacant by the death of Romulus Amaſæus; for he is induced to believe, that Romulus Amaſæus died a Profeſſor at Bologna, which is falſe. VI. Mr Moreri is miſtaken, when he ſays that *Ramus was baniſhed by virtue of the judgment* which the commiſſioners of Francis I. gave againſt him. He was only forbidden to concern himſelf with Philoſophy; and immediately he betook himſelf to teach claſſical learning in the college of Prele. I fancy theſe Latin words of Audomarus Talæus deceived Moreri, or the authors whom he copied. ‘ Auctori Animadverſionum & Inſtitutionum toto Philoſophiæ regno velut aqua & igni, gravi etiam pœna addita, interdicitur, ne unquam vel ſcribendo, vel docendo in ullam Philoſophiæ partem ingrederetur (67). - - - *The author of the Animadverſions and Inſtitutions was forbidden, under pain of baniſhment, and a great penalty, ever to meddle with any part of Philoſophy, either by writing or teaching.*’ Some body fancied, for want of attention, that Ramus was baniſhed from the whole kingdom of France, without minding that he was only baniſhed from the whole empire of Philoſophy, *toto Philoſophiæ regno*. VII. Moreri adds, that *he was accuſed of Hereſy, on account of a book intituled* de Religione Chriſtiana, *which was printed at Francfort ſome time after his death*. That book was not known during the author's life; the original was preſerved, when his library was plundered (68), and it was ſent into Germany, where Banoſius got it printed in 1576 (69). I think we may challenge all the friends of Moreri, to prove that Ramus did ever ſuffer any perſecution on account of that book. Ramus's enemies had other proofs enough of his being a Proteſtant: a public oration, an action of his which ſavoured of an Iconoclaſt (70), and the anſwer he made to one, who aſked him, why he went ſo ſeldom to maſs, were ſufficient to convict him. ‘ Hujus zelo inflammatus, publica concione Pariſienſis ſcholæ monachos graviter admonuit, ut puriorem Theologiam ex Evangelio, relictis Sophiſtarum lacunis, diſcerent. Idola gymnaſii Prælei amoveri & recondi juſſit ne conſpicerentur. Miſſæ autem raro intererat. Interrogatus vero hac de re à viro graviſſimo, ſtrenue reſpondit, E toto Vetere Novoque Teſtamento nihil quidquam magis à noviſſimis Chriſtianis depravatum & corruptum eſſe, quàm ſecundum mandatum Legis & Cœnæ Sacramentum, ut homo in utroque per ſpeciem religionis in exſecrabilem idololatriam laberetur (71). - - - *Fired with this zeal, he ſolemnly admoniſhed the Monks of the ſchool of Paris in a public Oration, that, laying aſide Sophiſtry, they ſhould learn a purer Divinity from the goſpel, he commanded the images of the college of Prele to be removed and hid, that they might not be ſeen. He was ſeldom at Maſs. Being aſked the reaſon of it by a grave perſon, he boldly anſwered, that nothing in all the Old and New Teſtament was more depraved and corrupted by the modern Chriſtians, than the ſecond commandment and the Euchariſt, whereby a perſon in both, under pretence of religion, fell into the moſt execrable idolatry.*’ He abſconded during the firſt Civil war; he followed the prince of Condé in the ſecond, and made an open profeſſion of Calvin's doctrine in Germany during the third. He received the communion at Heidelberg with the Reformed (72). He ſaid among other things in a public Oration at Baſil, that he had been ſo happy as to compoſe it in the ſame place where Calvin wrote his Inſtitution. ‘ Inter Academiæ Baſilienſis hoſpites Joannes Calvinus præcipue commemorandus eſt lumen Galliæ, lumen Chriſtianæ per orbem terrarum Eccleſiæ, lumen in hoc (in quo hæc meditor commentorque) hoſpitio præcipue perſpectum: hic enim tanti luminis faces (ut Catharina Petita lectiſſima matrona ſanctitate ſingularis ingenii mirifice capta tum Calvini, modò etiam Rami hoſpita ſæpe ac jucunde mihi narravit) primùm ſunt incenſæ: hic illuſtres illæ Chriſtianæ inſtitutionis cœleſteſque vigiliæ ſunt exaratæ & elaboratæ (73). - - - *Among all the ſtrangers at the univerſity of Baſil, the moſt remarkable was John Calvin, the light of France, the light of the whole Chriſtian Church, and a light that particularly diſcovered itſelf in theſe very lodgings (wherein I am now meditating and compoſing this Oration): here was that great light firſt kindled (as I have been often told in a pleaſant manner by Catherine Petit, a woman of great worth, who being prodigiouſly charmed with Calvin's extraordinary ſanctity and parts, was at that time his, as ſhe was ſoon after Ramus's, landlady): in this place were his famous Inſtitutions and his heavenly lucubrations compoſed and finiſhed.*’ Laſtly, Being returned into France after the firſt peace, he obtained from Charles IX a ſpecial permiſſion to profeſs the new religion, with a conſiderable ſalary. *Impetrat ergo à Rege ſtipendia perampla, ut non tantum privato ſtudio artes meditando ſcribendoque illuſtraret, ſed etiam ut, ſublatis impedimentis, reformatæ Religionis ſanctiſſimis exercitiis in poſtremum liberius frueretur* (74). VIII. Mr Teiſſier ſays that *Ramus learned Philoſophy of himſelf, and without a maſter* (75). But Ramus himſelf acquainted the public, that he had gone through a courſe of Philoſophy in the colleges, which laſted three years and a half according to cuſtom. ‘ Cùm tres annos ſexque menſes, inquit, in Philoſophia ſcholaſtica ex Academiæ noſtræ legibus poſuiſſem: Logicis Organi libris cognoſcendis, diſputandis, meditandis (ex omnibus enim Ariſtotelicis libris, Logici præcipue toto triennii tempore clamantur & reclamantur) cùm, inquam, tempus illud ita traduxiſſem, & jam ut abſolutus artium ſcilicet magiſter, philoſophica laurea donatus eſſem: ſubducta ætatis meæ ratione, &c (76). - - - *When I had ſpent three years and an half, ſays he, in the ſtudy of ſchool Philoſophy, according to the laws of our univerſity, in learning, diſputing, and meditating upon books of Logic, (for of all Ariſtotle's books his Logic is chiefly minded during the whole three years) when I had ſpent that time, I ſay, in this manner, and was now made a Maſter of Arts, being crowned with the philoſophical laurel; without conſidering my age, &c.*’ IX. See number IV of this remark, and then you may judge whether *it appears by two letters that Beza wrote to him in* 1570, that he intended to retire to Geneva, and that *Beza teſtified great regard for him* (77).

[*O*] *His ſect flouriſhed for ſome time.*] It was unknown in Spain and Italy, and it made but a ſmall progreſs in France; but it proſpered very much in England and Scotland, and ſtill more in Germany; which appears from the many books that ſeveral German peripatetic Philoſophers publiſhed againſt the Ramiſts. Nay, ſome of them thought themſelves obliged to mention the reaſons of the growth of that ſect, for they could not bear that its progreſs ſhould be alledged as a proof of its truth. *Et miramur adhuc quid rei ſit, cur . . . . ea* (contra quam ſcribimus) *philoſophandi ratio locum inveniat hoc ſeculo in pleriſque Germaniæ provinciis, etiam in iis, de quibus id nunquam quiſquam vel metuere vel ſperare potuiſſet? Non eſt ſane cauſa hujus* per

---

(*x*) Scriptitans tam miſere pingeret, ut in legendis ipſius ſcriptis typographus inſudaret. *Petrus à S. Romualdo, Fulienſis, in continuatione Chronici Ademari, pag.* 344.

(66) Banoſius, in Vita Petri Rami, *pag.* 9. *See alſo* Freigius, in Vita ejuſdem, *pag.* 36, & 41.

(67) Audomar. Talæus, in Academia, apud Launoium, de Varia Ariſtotelis fortuna, *pag.* 59.

(68) Banoſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 28.

(69) The edition I uſe is of Francfort 1594; but Ramus's Life prefixed to it, which ſerves for an Epiſtle Dedicatory, to Sir Philip Sidney, is dated the firſt of January 1576.

(70) He removed all the images from the college of Prele, and hid them. See the following quotation.

(71) Banoſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 19, 20.

(72) Cum Heidelbergæ una apud Immanuelem Tremellium anno ſeptuageſimo viveremus, Gallicis concionibus ſemper interfuit, & ſacræ Cœnæ, edita primum fidei ſuæ confeſſione, cum magno Dei timore & cultus divini reverentia non ſemel communicavit. *Ibid. pag.* 25.

(73) Ramus, in Baſilea, *pag. m.* 58.

(74) Banoſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 24.

(75) Teiſſier, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 372.

(76) Freigius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 10, *quoting Ramus*, in Epilogo libri quinti ſcholarum Dialecticarum.

(77) Teiſſier, ubi ſupra.

againſt Paſquier [*P*], in which you will ſee ſomething concerning Mercerus.

per Germaniam & Angliam etiam ac Scotiam incrementi (nam in Italia, Hiſpania & Gallia etiam ipſa planè obſcura eſt philoſophiæ Rameæ fama) ſed hæc cauſa eſt, quod cauſam optimam commodè non agimus (78). Thoſe words are taken from a chapter of Keckerman, wherein he judiciouſly cenſures the method of the Ramiſts (79). That author (80) very much commends a piece which David Pareus publiſhed againſt them in 1589. I have ſaid in another place (81) that this excellent Divine had no great eſteem for their founder. Keckerman complains very much of the Ramiſt Henningus Rennemannus, who furiouſly inveighed againſt Beza and Zacharias Urſinus on Ramus's account. He mentions likewiſe another Ramiſt, a haughty and paſſionate writer, whoſe name was Caſpar Pfaffradius. ‘(82) Scimus *Philoſophos Rameos* quodam eloquentiæ faſtu plerunque in alios (magiſtri ſui indole) deſpumare : exempla ſunt in luce : ex quibus unum illud proferam, quod & recens eſt, & præ reliquis inſigne, *M. Henningi Rennemanni Saxonis*, qui pro Ramea Philoſophia Diſſertationem ante annos circiter tres (83) ſcribere non potuit, quin maledicam linguam ſtringeret non tantum in Clariſſimum Philoſophum *Philippum Scherbium*, ſed & eos viros, qui Eccleſiam Chriſti adverſus Papatus furores, & Heterodoxorum ſophiſmata tot, tantis, tam tota Europa ſuſpiciendis ſcriptis juverunt. . . . . (84) Clariſſimum dico Theodorum Bezam, cujus ille Epiſtolas de *P. Ramo* ſcriptas, velut anathematicas lividè exagitat ; & item ſummum illum atque admirabilem æque Philoſophum ac Theologum *Dominum Zachariam Urſinum*, piæ memoriæ, cujus de *P. Rami* Dialectica & Rhetorica ſcriptum ad voluntatem Frideric III. Electoris Palatini Principis, merito certe, ſi quiſquam unquam Princeps, cognomentum *Pii* adepti, judicium, *furentem* vocat *Rami exercitationem*. - - - *It is very well known that the Philoſophers who follow Ramus do with a certain pomp of Eloquence (after the manner of their maſter) bitterly carp at others, of which there are ſeveral inſtances. I ſhall mention one, which is both a late one, and likewiſe remarkable above the reſt. I ſpeak of Henningus Renneman, the Saxon, who could not write a diſſertation for the Ramean Philoſophy about three years ago, without railing in a ſcurrilous manner, not only at the moſt famous Philoſopher Philip Scherbius, but alſo at thoſe men who defended the Church of Chriſt againſt the fury of the Papiſts and ſophiſtry of the Heterodox by books that have been univerſally eſteemed. . . . . I mean the moſt famous Theodore Beza, whoſe epiſtles concerning Peter Ramus he ſpitefully takes to pieces, as if they were anathematized, and likewiſe that great and admirable Philoſopher, as well as Divine, Mr Zacharias Urſinus, whoſe judgment on Ramus's Logic and Rhetoric, written at the deſire of Frederic III Elector Palatine (deſervedly ſirnamed the Pious, if ever any prince was ſo) he calls a furious invective againſt Ramus.*’ Paſquier ſays (85), *Ariſtotle's Philoſophy has been baniſhed from the univerſities that are in the dominions of the landgrave of Hain* (86), *and they have embraced that of Ramus, and thoſe who ſtudy Logic call themſelves Ramiſts.* Theſe words of Scaliger ſhall be my laſt proof, *Ramus was a learned man, but he is too much valued. . . . . Ramus magnus fuit vir, ſed magni nimis fit* (87). Ramiſm had been introduced into the univerſities of Holland, if Scaliger and ſome others had not prevented it. *Cujus* (Ramiſticæ Philoſophiæ) *introductioni in Academias Belgii cordatiores & intelligentiores fortiter obſtiterunt, quos inter Joſephus Scaliger ſui ſæculi Phœnix emicuit* (88). I find in a letter of Iſaac Pontanus, written in 1629 (89), that the Profeſſors of Harderwic adviſed the univerſity of Leyden to permit that Ramus's Logic, or that of du Moulin, ſhould be indifferently taught.

I have been informed (90) that Ramiſm flouriſhes in Swiſſerland to this day, and is countenanced by the magiſtrates of Bern ; ſo that the Profeſſors of Philoſophy at Bern, and at Lauſanne, are obliged to teach no other Logic but that of Ramus ; and if they dictate any thing taken from Claubergius, or from *the Art of Thinking*, they do it only under Ramus's auſpices, and, as it were, to explain his doctrine.

[*P*] *I ſhall make a remark againſt Paſquier.*] He obſerves (91) that la Fon complains (92), *that one Ramus and Mercerus*, who *had gone aſtray from the antient religion*, were at the head of the cabal, which obliged the parliament of Paris, in 1564, to refuſe the requeſts of the Jeſuits. His anſwer is, that *neither Ramus nor Mercerus were particularly concerned in it, and that they only joined with the other royal Profeſſors.* He adds (93), that *Mercerus was ſo far from being a caballing man, that he underſtood nothing but Hebrew books, upon which he pored continually ; being a great man in the knowledge of that language, in which he ſurpaſſed the Jews in the opinion of the moſt learned, but a perfect ſtranger to the affairs of the world.* Aftewards he goes on thus : The Jeſuits *cauſed Verſoris's plea to be printed in the year* 1595. *That man intending* * *to render the univerſity odious, gives out, not that Mercerus, but that Ramus and Gallandius had made themſelves ſollicitors of that cauſe ; but this appeared ſo unlikely, that it was looked upon as an incredible thing, by reaſon of the open enmity which had been between them all along, and which laſted till they died. An enmity, which Rabelais, the Lucian of our age, in the preface to his third book, and after him, that ingenious Poet Joachim du Bellay, in one of his moſt celebrated poems, jeſted upon in ſome places that are thought to be the fineſt pieces of their works. Beſides, Gallandius was all along a Roman Catholic.* Paſquier forgot the beſt way of refuting that plea, which is, that Gallandius, Ramus's adverſary, had been dead five years, when Verſoris pleaded the cauſe of the Jeſuits (94). Rabelais is not well quoted ; Paſquier ſhould have quoted the preface to the fourth book.

(78) Keckermann. in Præcogn. Logicis, *Tract. ii, cap. iv, pag. m.* 133.

(79) See alſo the preface to that book of Keckerman.

(80) Ibid. *cap. vi, pag.* 187.

(81) In the article PAREUS (DAVID), remark [*H*], at the end.

(82) Idem, Keckermann. ibid. *cap. v, ſub fin. pag.* 169.

(83) That book of Keckerman was printed in 1599.

(84) Ibid. *pag.* 170.

(85) Paſquier, ubi ſupra, *cap. xviii, pag.* 834.

(86) He ſhould have ſaid Heſſe.

(87) Scaligerana 2, *pag.* 201.

(88) Sam. Mareſius, *in Præfat.* Indiculi præcipuar. Controverſiar. Theologic. adverſus Wittich.

(89) Printed in Matthæus's collection in 1695. It is the 99th.

(90) By Mr Des Maizeaux, the ſame of whom Mr Bernard has publiſhed a Memoir in his *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Nov.* 1700, *Art. I.*

(91) Paſquier, Catechiſme des Jeſuites, *book i, ch. vi, pag. m.* 45.

(92) See René de la Fon's Anſwer for the Religious of the Society of Jeſus, to Simon Marion's plea, *pag.* 28.

(93) Paſquier, ibid. *pag.* 46.

* In the 24th and 32d leaves of Verſoris's plea.

(94) Du Breul, Antiquitez de Paris, *pag. m.* 565, ſays, that Peter Galland, Regius Profeſſor of the Greek tongue, died the 31ſt of Auguſt 1559.

RANGOUZE, a French author in the reign of Lewis XIV, whoſe good qualities are unknown to me: for ſuch a name cannot be given to the induſtry, wherewith an author knows how to make his Epiſtles Dedicatory, and his flatteries turn to a good account. Not but that ſuch an induſtry, though very bad, morally ſpeaking, may hold a conſiderable rank among thoſe qualities which are ſaid to be good, whether they be natural or acquired [*A*]. Rangouze was endowed with

[*A*] *Among thoſe qualities, which are ſaid to be good, whether they be natural or acquired.*] All languages may be ſaid to be more or leſs barren ; which does particularly appear with reſpect to ſuch things as are deprived of the perfection that belongs to them. If that perfection be a moral virtue, thoſe things are ſaid to be bad ; if it be a phyſical virtue, they are alſo accounted bad. On the other hand, thoſe things are indifferently called good, that have the moral virtue of their kind, and the phyſical virtue that belongs to them. An unjuſt judge is called a bad judge ; and an ignorant Painter is called a bad Painter ; a wiſe and equitable judge is ſaid to be a good judge ; and he who can make fine pictures is ſaid to be a good painter. Here we are ſenſible, that we want words (1), ſince we are obliged to make uſe of the words *good* and *bad*, to denote a thouſand things of a very different nature. It is therefore no wonder, that I ſhould place the induſtry of the Sieur Rangouze in the number of good things, tho' I do not allow it to be a moral virtue. It is a good thing in the ſame ſenſe, as we ſay a good memory, good ſight, good ears, a good noſe, &c. when thoſe faculties have the perfection which nature intended for them. Every ſcience, without excepting that of tricking and cheating, is a kind of perfection : a ſubtle wit is a natural advantage, as ſtupidity and fooliſhneſs are great imperfections. Morally ſpeaking, the ſcience of cheating is neither good nor bad ; but Phyſically ſpeaking it is a very good quality, an advantage, a perfection. The ſimplicity of a man, who can neither cheat others, nor avoid being cheated, is, Phyſically ſpeaking, an imperfection, and a bad quality. If the art of cheating be reduced into practice, it becomes, morally ſpeaking,

(1) Obſerve, that the lazineſs of men, and the caprice of uſe, are alſo one cauſe of it ; for we might find out, if we pleaſed, other words to denote a Painter, who underſtands, or does not underſtand his art.

with it in an eminent degree [*B*], as it will appear by my remarks.

ſpeaking, a very ill thing, and a crime fit to be puniſhed; but when ſome robbers are broke upon the wheel, whoſe induſtry, and other natural qualities, had attained to the higheſt degree of perfection in their kind, we admire for all that the Phyſical good that was in them; and we abhor only the ill uſe they made of it. We may therefore ſay in general, that the art of growing rich, either in the finances, or by trading, is a good thing, and a natural advantage, which deſerves to be eſteemed, when ſeparated from the ill uſe men may make of it. The ſame ought to be ſaid of a man's induſtry, who grows rich by the productions of his pen, and by the art of dealing in epiſtles dedicatory and books, which he ſends up and down. It cannot be denied that ſuch a man has a ſort of wit, and a kind of ſagacity and diſcerning, which is a natural perfection, that may be admired in ſome reſpects, though it ought to be deſpiſed and condemned, by reaſon of it's abuſes and it's ill conſequences. Equitable men do not equally cenſure that ſort of authors; they do not pour all the ſatirical ſtrokes, which Furetiere collected in his *Somme Dedicatiore* (2), upon thoſe, who having a great family, and no eſtate, or penſion from the public, cannot maintain themſelves any other way than with the help of their pen. This ſerves to excuſe the multitude of their dedications, and it is not ſo much a wonder that their works ſhould be divided into many tomes dedicated to ſo many different perſons, and that the ſecond editions ſhould be dedicated to new Mæcenas's, as it is that they ſhould be able to maintain honourably their wives and children with their pen, and that the ſubſiſtence of a large family ſhould depend altogether upon it. A very ingenious man has laid down a rule in vindication of thoſe, who apply themſelves to trifling things, which reaches the authors whom I am ſpeaking of. Theſe are his words: *Beſides, it is well known that we have ſometimes very ſolid reaſons to apply our ſelves to ſome works that do not appear to be ſolid, and that a private and unknown duty prevails often without any injuſtice upon a public and notorious one. That man whom you blame, has, perhaps, good reaſon to believe, that in order to recover his health, which is very much impaired, to ſecure himſelf from poverty, to maintain his family, whoſe only ſupport he is, it is better for him to compoſe ſongs than moral and political treatiſes. If it be ſo, I make bold to ſay that he is obliged to write ſongs out of a moral and political principle, and it is a great piece of injuſtice to blame the occupations of other men, without knowing their motives and circumſtances* (3).

[*B*] *Rangouze was endowed with it in an eminent degree.*] Coſtar ſupplies me with the proof of it. 'I 'am far from intending to make a compariſon with 'the Sieur de Rangouze, whoſe eloquence has procured him fifteen or ſixteen hundred piſtoles within 'theſe eight months, and who may be ſtiled the Cherilus of our age in proſe. *Cherilus incultis qui verſibus & male natis Retulit acceptos regale numiſma Philippos.* According to the Goſpel .... a tree is good 'that bears ſo good fruit. The tree of the garden of 'the Heſperides, ſo much talked of by the Poets, 'was not ſo valuable, ſince, according to a Greek 'ſcholiaſt of great authority, it bore golden apples 'only in it's ſeaſon, and not all the year (4).' Here is another witneſs, to wit, *Madam de Scuderi.* She ſpeaks of an author, *who had three dedicatory epiſtles ready made for the ſame book, for three perſons very different in quality and merit; being reſolved to uſe that which would turn to the beſt account, and employing a third perſon to manage the buſineſs: and accordingly he dedicated the book to him who paid moſt for it, tho' he was a man of leſs merit than the other two.* She ſays afterwards, that *an author, who is dead, having prepared an epiſtle, which might be looked upon as a great panegyric, ſuppreſſed it, when he heard that the perſon, to whom he intended to dedicate his book, was out of favour.* She adds, *that a man of Dauphiné having made a panegyric upon Cardinal Richelieu, and finding him dead at his arrival, turned it into a panegyric upon the queen-mother, Anne of Auſtria. I have alſo been informed, that an author, who had very much, and very juſtly praiſed a man that was alive, deprived him of all the praiſes he had beſtowed upon him, tho' that man had done nothing that deſerved it; only he died without being able to reward that author according to his expectation. All theſe inſtances are very ſingular. But I have been told a pleaſant ſtory of one Rangouze, who made a collection of letters, and cauſed them to be printed, without numbring the pages. So that the Bookbinder placed at the beginning of the book ſuch a letter as the author thought fit; and by that means, all thoſe whom he preſented with his book, finding their names at the beginning of it, thought themſelves the more obliged to him for it. This ſeems to be a very odd thing, and that man was as fond of dedicating books as an eminent Phyſician of Italy, who having writ upon the aphoriſms of Hippocrates, dedicated each book of his Commentaries to one of his friends, and the Index to another* (5). Now let us ſee what Sorel ſays: Rangouze's letters may very well be called *golden letters,* 'ſince he boaſted to write 'none for leſs than twenty or thirty piſtoles; for 'he ſeldom made any but for perſons of the higheſt 'quality, and who were able to pay well for them. 'They were all a kind of ſhort encomium upon 'thoſe to whom they were directed, containing an 'account of their beſt qualities and moſt remarkable 'actions, and ſeveral compliments for thoſe who afforded him but little matter to enlarge upon. We 'have ſeen ſome ingenious people wonder how that 'man, who was no ſcholar, had been able to write 'ſo many different letters upon praiſes that were almoſt 'alike. I do not ſcruple to take notice of him; becauſe 'his books may, however, ſerve to inform thoſe, 'who are ignorant of the characters and fortunes of 'the great men of the kingdom (6).'

(2) It is printed at the end of the *Roman Bourgeois.* You will find a kind of a Latin tranſlation of it in the preface to the third tome, *Obſervationum ſelectarum ad Rem Literariam ſpectantium,* printed at Hall in 1701.

(3) Pelliſſon, Diſcours ſur les Oeuvres de Mr Sarrazin, *pag. m.* 39, & 40.

(4) Coſtar, Letter L, Part ii, pag. 115.

(5) Madam de Scuderi, Converſations ſur divers Sujets, *Tom.* i, *in the dialogue that is at the beginning.*

(6) Sorel, Bibl. Franç. *pag. m.* 119.

RAPHELENGIUS (Francis), born (*a*) in Flanders the twenty-ſeventh of February 1539, made himſelf famous for his great knowledge of the Oriental tongues. After he had begun his ſtudies at Ghent (*b*), he loſt his father; and his mother obliged him to betake himſelf to trade: but his maſters having ſent him to Nuremberg, and thoſe in whoſe houſe he lived allowing him time enough to ſatisfy his inclination for learning, he applied again to ſtudy. Being returned into Flanders he found an opportunity to go to Paris, where he made a great progreſs in the Greek and Hebrew languages. The civil wars forced him to retire from Paris, and he went into England, and taught Greek for ſome time in the univerſity of Cambridge. He returned afterwards into the Low Countries, and was corrector of the preſs at Antwerp, in the houſe of the famous Chriſtopher Plantin; who was ſo well pleaſed with his learning and honeſty, that he made him his ſon-in-law in the year 1565 (*c*). Raphelengius did him great ſervices as to his Printing, eſpecially with reſpect to the edition of the famous Bible, called the Antwerp Bible [*A*]. Plantin being removed to Leyden, to be farther from

(*a*) At Lanoi, near Liſle.

(*b*) And not at Louvain, as Moreri ſays.

(*c*) And not in the year 1555, as Moreri ſays.

[*A*] *With reſpect to the edition of the famous Bible, called, the* Antwerp Bible.] I ſhall uſe the words of Meurſius, to ſhew how far Raphelengius contributed to it: 'In horum editione incredibile quantos labores Raphelengius ſuſtinuerit, dum accuratiſſime ſingula recognoſcit; Annotationibus, ubi opus 'erat, illuſtrat; verſionem interlinearem adornat; 'Grammaticam Hebræam, ex optimis quibuſque 'Grammaticis, cum judicio & cura collectam, addit; 'Epitomen Theſauri linguæ Hebrææ Santis Pagnini 'infinitis vocibus auget, & innumeris locis emendat; 'quod ſatis teſtimonio Benedicti Ariæ Montani, inter 'Prolegomena

from the troubles, left his Printing-preſſes under the direction of his ſon-in-law; but when he returned to Antwerp, in 1585, Raphelengius, on the contrary, went to Leyden with all his family. He took care of the Printing-houſe that his father-in-law had there; and made himſelf ſo agreeable to the curators of the univerſity that they conferred upon him the Hebrew profeſſorſhip. He diſcharged the duties of it to his honour, and ſpent part of his time in the ſtudy of the Arabic tongue, and even compoſed a Dictionary in that language (*d*). He had ſcarce made an end of it when he died, the 20th of July 1597. He had been wiſhing for death three years before; for he ſtruggled with two domeſtic enemies [*B*], that were very troubleſome to him; one was his grief for the loſs of his wife, and the other a Palſy (*e*).

(*d*) It was printed with Erpenius's notes in 1613.

(*e*) *Taken from* Meurſius, in Athenis Batavis, *pag.* 140, & *ſeq.*

‘ Prolegomena præmiſſo, patet. Multa iiſdem annis ad ornamenta librorum, quos ſocer excudebat, præcipue in linguis Orientalibus, corrigendo, illuſtrandoque, præſtitit; quamvis raro nomen ſuum adſcribi pateretur (1). - - - *It is incredible how much pains Raphelengius took in the edition of theſe books, while he examined every part of them with the greateſt accuracy, illuſtrated them with annotations whereſoever there was occaſion, improved the interlineary tranſlation, added a Hebrew Grammar, collected with care and judgment from all the beſt Grammarians, augmented* Pagninus*'s* Epitome Theſauri Linguæ Hebrææ, *with an infinite number of words, and corrected it in a vaſt many places; all which appears plain enough from the teſtimony of Benedictus Arias Montanus, inſerted among the* Prolegomena. *In the ſame years he was of great ſervice to his father-in-law, in correcting and illuſtrating the books which he was then printing, particularly thoſe written in the Oriental languages; tho' he would rarely ſuffer his name to be put to them.*’

(1) Meurſius, Athen. Bat. *p.* 140.

[*B*] *He ſtruggled with two domeſtic enemies.*] Moreri is here guilty of the ſophiſm called, *à non ſufficienti enumeratione partium*; which is the leaſt thing that he can be reproached with; for it might be ſaid, that he has neither wholly nor partly expreſſed the thought of the author quoted by him. Let us compare his words with thoſe of Meurſius. *He died*, ſays he, *of grief for the loſs of his wife.* Thus he renders theſe Latin words; *Mors quam toto triennio præ tædio amiſſæ uxoris & paralyſi afflictatus ſæpe optaverat, virum optimum humanis exemit* (2). It does not appear by this paſſage that the loſs of Raphelengius's wife created ſuch a grief in him as occaſioned his death; it appears only that the grief he conceived for her loſs, together with a Palſy, made him often wiſh for death for the ſpace of three years. If it be ſaid, in Moreri's vindication, that this grief might have occaſioned a Palſy, and that therefore he might very well reduce the two cauſes mentioned by Meurſius into one; I anſwer, that a Copiſt ought never to give his own thoughts and conjectures as matters of fact that are to be found in the authors to which he refers us. But not to dwell on theſe trifles, I proceed to a more important obſervation. Raphelengius regretted the loſs of his wife, and thought himſelf an unhappy man in ſurviving her; which ſhews that he loved her, and that his marriage had been very comfortable to him: It was therefore a very happy marriage. Now let us conſider the conſequences of this happy marrige, to wit, three years under a kind of deſpair. What muſt we think therefore of an unhappy marriage, ſince a happy one is attended with ſuch conſequences? But let us not argue in this manner according to the law of contraries. Let us rather ſay, that an unhappy marriage is attended with great advantages. The perſon that ſurvives the other is not afflicted in the leaſt; his widowhood is a ſtate of tranquillity and pleaſure. So that, inſtead of conſidering only the miſeries of this life, we muſt conſider the mixture of good and evil, which is allotted to man. We muſt remember the two caſks of Homer, of which I ſpeak in another place (3). It ought to be ſaid, that what comes down upon earth is a mixt liquor; but in ſuch a manner, that the good and bad drink ſucceed the one to the other. If you begin with the one, you will end with the other. If you have been happy when married, you are unhappy being a widower; but if you have been unhappy in your marriage, your widowhood will be a ſtate of happineſs to you. I do not deny, that in ſome reſpects the two liquors are mixed and confounded together as to their inſenſible parts, ſince there is ſcarce any pleaſure but what is immediately attended with ſome trouble; but it is certain, that in other reſpects the fate of man is in a glaſs, wherein the good and bad liquor are placed as it were in ſeveral ſtories. I have enquired in another place (4), whether the quantity of the bad liquor exceeds the quantity of the good. I ſhall ſay no more of it; but however I muſt obſerve, that that thoſe who alledge the marriage of Raphelengius, to ſhew that good exceeds evil, might be miſtaken in their calculation. He enjoyed the company of his wife twenty-nine years, and felt the miſery of widowhood only three. He had therefore, will you ſay, a greater ſhare of happineſs than of miſery. This conſequence will be denied. A man, who for the ſpace of three years is ſo tormented with pains and ſorrows, that he often wiſhes death would come to his deliverance, ſwallows a greater quantity of the bad liquor, than he had ſwallowed of the good for the ſpace of thirty years. For you muſt not fancy, that the marriage of this man was wine without any mixture during twenty-nine years. Not to mention the croſſes and ſorrows that proceeded from other cauſes, let us conſider only the ill ſide of his marriage. Thoſe who are extreamly afflicted for the death of their wives, did not always live with them without ſome miſunderſtanding. Beſides, the more they love them, the more they are afraid when they fall ſick. Do not tell me, that at this rate it were better for them to hate their wives; for I ſhall anſwer, that their unconcernedneſs at their wives being in danger of death, does not equal the dreadful evils of conjugal hatred. Nay, it might be ſaid, that if on the one ſide they are not afraid that they will die, they are afraid on the other ſide that they will not die. Now that fear is ſufficient to counter-balance that good. I wonder we do not find in the works of the Antients a dilemma expreſſed differently from that of Bias (5), for inſtance, in this manner: either you will love your wife, or you will not love her: if you love her, you will be always afraid of loſing her; if you do not love her, you will be always afraid that ſhe will not die. This dilemma is not better than that of Bias; for, without examining the other faults, it would be ſufficient to ſay, that, according to the uſual courſe of all ages, conjugal love and hatred are not carried ſo far. Some few inſtances ought not to make one afraid of having an uneaſy fondneſs, or a vexing antipathy. One may very well hope to enjoy the preſent time, as moſt huſbands do, without making one's ſelf uneaſy about the time to come.

(2) Meurſius, ibid.

A REFLEXION on the conſequences of marriage.

(3) In the article MANICHEES, remark [*C*], about the middle.

(4) In the article XENOPHANES, remark [*D*].

(5) See the article BION, remark [*G*].

RAPIN (**Nicolas**), was Provoſt-marſhal and a Poet, two things that are ſeldom to be found in one and the ſame perſon. He committed but few faults as a Poet; but he committed ſome in the adminiſtration of Juſtice, which were ſo enormous, that had it not been for the credit of his patrons, he would have been puniſhed with death [*A*]. He was a man of parts, and did not ſuffer himſelf to be corrupted by the Leaguers.

[*A*] ***Had it not been for the credit of his patrons, he would have been puniſhed with death.***] I have but one authority for it; the reader may think of it as he pleaſes. ‘ All the people of Fontenai are naught, Leaguers. He followed Henry III when that prince fled from Paris, and wrote ſeveral ſatirical verſes againſt the faction of the Sixteen (*a*). He had a great ſhare in the ingenious ſatire called the *Catholicon d'Eſpagne* [*B*]. After the death of his ſon, upon whom he had beſtowed all his employments (*b*), he retired to Fontenai-le-Comte, the place of his nativity, and died in the year 1609 [*C*]. I ſhall mention ſome circumſtances of his death, which ſeem to me to be very curious [*D*]. He was buried without any pomp; but, ſome ſay, it was not according to his laſt intention [*E*]. He had been a great

---

(*a*) Sequutus eſt Henricum III cum fœderati eum Lutetia pellerent, & Cæſaroduni Turonum multa egregia carmina in monſtrum Pariſienſe, quod ſedecim capitibus conſtabat, vulgavit. *Continuat. Thuani, lib. ii, ſub fin.*

(*b*) Ibid.

‘ and ſo is Mr Rapin, whoſe life I have ſaved, which he confeſſes: he is the ſon of a prieſt. He was mayor of Fontenai, and cauſed ſome Proteſtants to be maſſacred; ſo that at the time of the extraordinary ſeſſions, he was proſecuted by all the inhabitants of his town, both Catholics and Proteſtants, and by all the nobility of the lower Poitou, I was the only one who oppoſed it; he had corrupted me by his verſes, and he knew very well that I was a man of great intereſt. He is beholden to me for his life, next to Preſident du Harlay, ſo that he now loves the Proteſtants (1).’

[*B*] *He had a great ſhare . . . . in the* Catholicon d'Eſpagne.] We find in Mr du Puy's notes, which were publiſhed with that ſatire, in 1677, that the ſpeech of the archbiſhop of Lyons, that of Roze, and that which d'Engoulevent was to deliver, were made by Rapin. If it be ſo, *d'Aubigné ſhould not have gone about to undeceive thoſe, who aſcribed the whole ſatire Menippée to that fine wit; to tell us afterwards that he made only ſome verſes that are in it *: perhaps he ſaid ſo, becauſe in the works of Rapin, printed in 4to at Paris, in the year* 1610, *there are but three Latin epigrams that make part of the Catholicon* (2). This reflexion of the author of the Notes is a ſolid one.

Mr de Vigneul Marville, who has collected many curious things concerning the *Catholicon d'Eſpagne*, obſerves that Paſſerat and Rapin made the verſes of the ſecond part, which was intituled, *Abregé des Etats de la ligue convoquez à Paris au dixiéme Fevrier*; that the ſame Rapin made the ſpeech of the archbiſhop of Lyons, and that of Dr Roſe; and that he *made a collection of all* the other *ſpeeches, which he added to the* Catholicon d'Eſpagne (3), *under the title of* Satire Menipée; *and* that *it is upon this account that many have aſcribed the whole Catholicon to him* (4).

[*C*] *He died in the year* 1609.] Botereius (5), the French Mercury (6), and the Continuator of Thuanus (7), mention his death in that year. Father Garaſſe, whom I ſhall quote by and by, ſays, that in the month of December, 1608, he was preſent at Mr Rapin's death, who had been for ſome weeks in a languiſhing condition. Now becauſe Moreri ſays, that Rapin died the fifteenth of February, 1608, I fancy Garaſſe meant, that this brave man fell ſick in December 1608, and died ſome weeks after. If this be his meaning, what he ſays is a confutation of Moreri; not as to the day, but as to the year of Rapin's death. However it be, I am of their opinion who place his death in the year 1609. Nevertheleſs, I ſee that ſeveral exact writers follow Moreri (8).

[*D*] *Some circumſtances of his death . . . . very curious.*] Here is a long paſſage of Father Garaſſe. The reader may judge of it as he thinks fit ‘ In the month of December 1608, I happened to be preſent in Poitiers (9) at Mr Rapin's death, who having lived a pretty looſe life for the ſpace of ſeventy-four years, indulging his youthful paſſions, and following the humours of the times, whereby he got into dangerous acquaintance, died in the hands of four Fathers of our ſociety, after he had been for ſome weeks in a languiſhing condition; expreſſing a wonderful joy, becauſe he was ſo happy as to depart this life in the preſence of thoſe whom he had perſecuted all his life-time, without knowing them. After he had confeſſed, which he did with a very lively ſenſe of his ſins, before he received the holy ſacrament, the room wherein he died being full of the moſt eminent perſons of the town, he made the general confeſſion of his paſt life in three articles: 1. That he had never been a Huguenot, and had never wavered in his belief, tho' he had familiarly converſed with the Huguenots, and very much hated the Jeſuits. 2. That he had lived a very licentious life, and did not belive that God could have found him better diſpoſed at any other moment of his life. 3. That the only good thing he remembered to have done from his younger days, was, his preventing the teaching of Atheiſm at Paris, in a public manner; and then turning himſelf towards the Fathers, there preſent, he told them the ſtory in ſhort. He ſaid there was in his time a miſcreant at Paris, a ſtranger, of a ſubtile and factious ſpirit (§ *a*), who having got himſelf familiarly acquainted with thoſe ſeven fine wits, that made up the ſet, or Pleiad, of the Poets, of which Ronſard was the chief, began to ſpread ſome pernicious and abominable maxims againſt the Deity, which had already ſtaggered ſome of thoſe wits, foraſmuch as our ſouls are more ſuſceptible of evil, than of good impreſſions. When I perceived, ſaid Rapin, that ſome were charmed with the novelty of that doctrine, four of us ſtood up againſt that impious man, and ſettled the wavering minds of the other three, and of ſeveral others whom that wretched fellow had ſpoiled by his converſation. Ronſard was the firſt, ſaid he, who ſiding with me, exclaimed againſt him, and wrote that fine poem againſt the Atheiſts, which begins thus:

O ciel, ô terre, ô mer, ô Dieu Pere commun, &c.

Turnebus made a fine ſpeech againſt him, and Sammarthanus, an excellent poem in Iambic verſe, intuled, IN MEZENTIUM, without naming him, becauſe he was a profligate wretch, whoſe name would have profaned one's writings. We did not give over, ſaid Rapin, till we had got that infamous man condemned to death by a decree of parliament; and accordingly he was hanged and burnt at the Greve. Had it not been for us, ſaid he, perhaps France would have been a ſink of Atheiſm at this preſent time; eſpecially if he had been countenanced by us to introduce his maxims. Such were the laſt laſt words of Rapin (10).’

[(§ *a*) He probably means Geoffry Vallée of Orleans, who was hanged and burnt at the Greve for Atheiſm, February the ninth, 1573 *. Concerning the three Poets of the Pleïad, who, according to Garaſſe, had been ſeduced by that wretch, ſee the *Memoirs of the State of France*, &c. Tom. 1. fol. 278, *verſo* of edit. 1579 REM. CRIT.]

[*E*] *Some ſay it was not according to his laſt intention.*] I ſhall quote again Father Garaſſe. The late Scævola Sammarthanus, ſays he (11), ‘ made a glorious, and true encomium upon Mr Rapin, his good friend, in which he ſays, that Delatus eſt Fontenaïum, & modico funeris apparatu, quemadmodum Teſtamento præſcripſerat, ſepultus. - - - - *He was carried to Fontenai, and was buried there at a ſmall expence, as he deſired by his laſt will*; but it is neceſſary for Rapin's honour to know the ſtory exactly, as it happened, and I have been an eye-witneſs of it. It is therefore true, that the late Mr Nicolas Rapin, being upon his death-bed, in the extraordinary cold winter of the year 1608, had made his will, before he confeſſed to Father James de Moucy, wherein he ordered, that his body ſhould be carried from Poitiers to Fontenai, in the ſame manner as that of Budæus was carried from St Avoye-ſtreet, to the convent of the Celeſtins, *viz.* without torches, without any pomp, and without any company, upon a waggon covered with black cloth, only with a boy walking before it with a bell, and a lanthorn in his hand. But having been told that ſuch a burial might be ill conſtrued, and would confirm ſeveral people in the opinion they had entertained of his being a libertine in point of religion, he changed his mind, and made a codicil, wherein he revoked his firſt

(1) Scaliger, in Scaligerana, *voce* Rapin, *p. m.* 201.

* D'Aubigné, *Tom. iii, lib. iii, cap. xiii.*

(2) Notes on the Catholicon, *pag.* 385, *Edit.* 1696.

(3) It is the title of the firſt part of the work written by Mr le Roy, a canon of Rouën.

(4) Vigneul Marville, Mélanges d'Hiſtoire & de Litérature, *Tom. i, p.* 201, *Rouën* 1699.

(5) Rodolph. Botereius, de Rebus in Gallia Geſtis Commentar. *lib. xvi, p.* 567, 568.

(6) *Tom. i, p.* 408.

(7) *Lib. ii, in fine.*

(8) Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1376. The author of the Notes upon the Catholicon, *ubi ſupra.*

(9) Moreri is therefore miſtaken, when he ſays that Rapin died at Tours.

(10) Garaſſe, Doctrine Curieuſe, *book ii, pag.* 124, *& ſeq.*

* New Menagiana, *Tom. iv, pag.* 311.

(11) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, *book vii, pag.* 622, 623.

great enemy to the Proteſtants [*F*], and afterwards to the Jeſuits (*c*). *His friends beſtowed this elogy upon him, that he was the moſt learned ſoldier, and the moſt valiant counſellor, in the world* (*d*). You will find ſome other things concerning him in Moreri.

(*c*) See the remark [*D*].

(*d*) Garaſſe, Doctrine Curieuſe, *p.* 122.

‘ intention, and inſtead of his cook, whom he had appointed the executor of his will, he deſired Father Francis Solier, who was preſent, and who was to preach all the Lent at Fontenai, in the year 1609, to order matters ſo that he might have a decent burial, as it is practiſed among the Catholics, with the uſual prayers, in which he ſeemed to put great truſt. It is true, that by the fault of his heirs, his codicil was not exactly executed according to his deſires; but his death, his confeſſion, his tears, and the ſtory which I have related in the ſecond book, ſhewed that he died a very good Catholic.

[*F*] *He had been a great enemy to the Proteſtants.*] We have already ſeen what Joſeph Scaliger ſays of it: but the following words contain a more formal proof; for we find there that the Proteſtants having made themſelves maſters of Fontenai, in the year 1570, refuſed to comprehend the mayor Rapin in the capitulation: however they ſuffered him to make his eſcape. The beſieged ‘ being ſummoned to ſurrender, had no ſooner demanded that their lives ſhould be ſaved, and they ſhould come out with arms and baggage; but it was granted them by Soubize, who commanded in the abſence of la Nouë, till they ſhould know what was reſolved in the council of Rochelle; and the capitulation was faithfully obſerved by the Proteſtants, who permitted them to go to Niort, whither they brought the news of the ſurrender, which happened the 28th of June, without conſulting the mayor Rapin. He was ſo much hated by the Proteſtants, either becauſe he had formerly declared againſt them, or becauſe at his perſuaſion Landereau had ſided with the contrary party, that he was diligently ſought for that they might put him to death. When the town had ſurrendered, and his friends were going out of it, (and that the Proteſtants would not ſuffer him to be comprehended in the capitulation) he diſguiſed himſelf in the habit of a ſervant, and concealed himſelf in the houſe of a poor woman; from thence he ſent to Creſſonniere, and deſired of him that he might be ſet at liberty. Creſſonniere got him ſafely conducted out of town, and then he, with the other Catholics, retired to Niort (12).’

(12) La Vraie & entiere Hiſtoire des Troubles, *livr. xiii, fol.* 387, *Edit. of Rochelle*, 1573.

RAPIN (RENATUS) a famous Jeſuit, who profeſſed the fourth vow, was born at Tours in the year 1621, and was admitted into the ſociety in the year 1639. He taught the *Belles Lettres* for the ſpace of nine years (*a*). He had in a particular manner made it his ſtudy, and ſhewed by ſome Latin pieces [*A*], that he was able to treat the moſt curious ſubjects with a great deal of art and eloquence. He excelled in Latin poetry [*B*]; and having at laſt ventured to write in French, he ſucceeded in it to admiration. He compoſed in that language ſeveral treatiſes of Literature, and ſeveral pious books, which met with a good reception. The treatiſes of Literature having been publiſhed at ſeveral times, were collected together, and printed at Paris in 1684, in two volumes in 4to, and at Amſterdam in two volumes in 12mo, in the year 1686. There are very long extracts of them in the firſt tome of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, and in the *Acta Eruditorum* (*b*). The pious treatiſes were moſt of them printed together at Amſterdam in 1695 (*c*). Some are of opinion that he is too peremptory, for a man who ſeems to have more judgment and delicacy than learning (*d*). He died at Paris the twenty-ſeventh of October 1687. His elogy came out the month following (*e*): it is ſhort and well turned, and it was written by Father Bouhours. He is repreſented there as being endowed with all the beſt qualifications that an honeſt man and a good Chriſtian can have. We find there, among other things, that *his zeal for religion, and for the honour of his ſociety, prompted him above twenty years ago to undertake a great work, to which he applied himſelf conſtantly, though he could not expect to ſee it publiſhed, and that God enabled him to finiſh it before he died.* This great work is the Hiſtory of Janſeniſm. Father Rapin was one of the moſt dangerous adverſaries of that party: he attacked them on their weak ſide in a Latin book which he publiſhed in 1658 [*C*]. The Janſeniſts raiſed

(*a*) Ex Nathanaele Sotuello, Biblioth. Script. Societ. *pag.* 717.

(*b*) *Pag.* 192, ~~& 263,~~ *& ſeq. ann.* 1686.

(*c*) See the Journal of Leipſic 1695, *pag.* 387.

(*d*) See the paſſage of the *Menagiana*, in the remark [*F*].

(*e*) His article in the ſupplement to Moreri's Dictionary is taken from thence. See an extract of this elogy in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, November* 1687, *p.* 413. See alſo Rabutin's 31ſt and 32d Letters of the 2d part, and the 128th Letter of the 3d part.

[*A*] *By ſome Latin pieces.*] Theſe are the titles of ſome of them: *Sereniſſimæ Reipublicæ Venetæ trophæum ob debellatum Turcam & reſtitutam Societatem Jeſu*, Paris 1657, in fol. *Trophæum famæ Eminentiſſimo Cardinali Mazarino*, ibid. 1657, in fol. *Lacrymæ in alumni ſui Alphonſi Mancini tumulum nepotis ejuſdem Cardinalis* (1), ibid. 1658, in fol. *Pacis triumphalia ad Em. Cardinalem Mazarinum*, ibid. 1659, in fol. *Pax Themidis cum Muſis*, ibid. 1659, in fol. *Pacifer Delphinus*, ibid. in fol. To which may be added, his *Elogium Franciſci Foucquet defuncti*, ibid. 1669.

[*B*] *He excelled in Latin poetry.*] Beſides the pieces mentioned in the foregoing remark, ſee his *Eclogæ Sacræ cum diſſertatione de carmine paſtorali*. printed at Paris 1659, in 4to, and his *Chriſtus patiens carmine heroico*, printed in the ſame place, in 1674, in 12mo. But above all, ſee his *Hortorum libri IV, quibus addita eſt diſputatio de univerſa hortenſis culturæ diſciplina*. This work printed in 4to at Paris in 1665 (2), was reprinted there in 12mo, in 1666. It was very much commended in the *Journal des Savans* (3). Conſult Mr Baillet (4), who has collected a great many curious remarks relating to Father Rapin, conſidered as a Poet, moſt of which are to the honour of that Jeſuit. See alſo the ninth *Journal des Savans*, of the year 1682, which mentions the collections of all the poems of Father Rapin (5). There are ſome people, who ſay that he has been too much flattered in Mr Baillet's *Jugemens*, and that the Jeſuits pretend that his Latin Verſes do not come up to the delicacy and purity of thoſe of Father Commire, nor to the loftineſs and majeſty of thoſe of Father de la Rue, nor to the eaſineſs and neatneſs of thoſe of Father Coſſart, to ſay nothing of thoſe of Father Hoſchius and Father Vallius; and that his Gardens are the beſt of his Poems, after which he never advanced his reputation. They were reprinted at Naples, and tranſlated into Engliſh by J. Evelyn: which tranſlation was dedicated to Lord Arlington, and printed at London in 8vo, in the year 1673.

[*C*] *He attacked the Janſeniſts on their weak ſide* (6) *in a Latin book he publiſhed in the year* 1658.] His book (7) is intituled *Diſſertatio de nova doctrina, ſeu Evangelium Janſeniſtarum*. I confeſs I have not read it, and I think the moſt learned men in foreign countries may ſay the ſame; but a man of parts told me the turn which Father Rapin had given it. He ſuppoſes a Janſeniſt, who goes into the country of the Infidels to preach the goſpel to them, and who does ſincerely teach his ſyſtem concerning Grace, *viz.* that the greateſt part of mankind have been predeſtinated to everlaſting puniſhments from all eternity, and the reſt to the joys of Heaven; that God, the author of this abſolute Predeſtination, being not willing to want ſome

(1) Father Rapin had been director of the ſtudies to the nephew of cardinal Mazarin.

(2) And not in 1661, as Southwel affirms, in *Biblioth. Script. pag.* 717.

(3) See the Journal of the ninth of February 1665; and that of the tenth of May 1666.

(4) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1537.

(5) Printed at Paris in two volumes in 12mo, in the year 1682.

(6) Note, that I do not mean that the doctrine of Grace is the weak ſide of Janſeniſm: I mean, that the weak ſide of that doctrine is the occaſion it gives to declaim againſt it, by reaſon of the injuſtice of the puniſhments, &c.

(7) Printed at Paris in 8vo, 1658.

raiſed many clamours againſt an anonymous letter which he publiſhed [*D*] ſince the peace of the church, as they call it. It is pleaſant enough to find that Jeſuit placed among the Phyſicians in ſome Biographers [*E*]. In the *Menagiana* the circumſtances of his quarrel with his fellow Jeſuit, Francis Vavaſſeur, have not been well related [*F*]. His enemies endeavoured to expoſe him to the indignation of the late Prince of Condé, by the malicious turn they gave to his treatiſe on the Sublime (*f*).

ſome pretences to colour his decrees of damnation, declares to men that it is in their power to obtain ſalvation; that in order to it they need only obey his commands: he threatens them, he exhorts them; but at the ſame time he knows very well that it is impoſſible for them to do what he commands, that they cannot obey him for want of that efficacious grace, which he refuſes to all men, excepting his elect, and without which they cannot mend their lives, nor even have a good thought. Father Rapin ſuppoſes that the Infidels hearing ſuch a goſpel, are ſtrangely ſurprized at ſuch a deſcription of God, and aſk why he ſends Preachers to thoſe, whom he knows to be uncapable of being converted, unleſs he beſtows upon them a grace, which he is obliged to refuſe them, by reaſon of his eternal decrees. Father Rapin's Janſeniſt anſwers, that God uſes ſuch a method, to render men more inexcuſable, and more obnoxious to Hell torments. It is replied, that ſuch a motive is not worthy of the Being infinitely good, and that this is not a proper way to make men inexcuſable before the throne of God; that it may be pleaded, that none is bound to do an impoſſibility, and that never any lawgiver inflicts puniſhments, but upon ſuppoſition that the tranſgreſſors of the laws had it in their power to have obſerved them: For which reaſon Lunatics are never puniſhed. One may eaſily gueſs what a Moliniſt, who knows how to make the beſt of his argument, may ſay *pro* and *con*, having entered upon the diſcourſe as I have related it. But beſides many other good anſwers, he might be told, that if a Janſeniſt was to preach to the Infidels of Japan or China for the firſt time, he would not be ſuch a fool as to begin with the doctrine that denies man's free will, or with that of abſolute Predeſtination. He would preach as the Pelagians do, and as is recommended by one of our moſt rigid Predeſtinarians (8), and he would lay aſide his Janſeniſm, and conceal it until his young diſciples ſtand no longer in need of milk, and are capable of ſolid nouriſhment. They are myſteries which ought to be diſcovered to none but thoſe that are initiated.

[*D*] *The Janſeniſts have exclaimed very much againſt an anonymous letter which he publiſhed.*] It is written to Cardinal Cibo, and dated in July 1680 (9). A French tranſlation of it came out in Holland, in 1684 dated the 30th of Auguſt 1683. See what the author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* ſaid of it (10). As to the complaints of the Janſeniſts againſt that little book, ſee among other works the eighth volume of the *Morale pratique*. You will find there alſo (11) that Father Eſtrix, a Flemiſh Jeſuit, is the author of the book intituled, *De fraudibus Hæreticorum*, which came out under the falſe name of Francis Simonis; and that *Father Rapin is ſo well pleaſed with that book, that he has tranſlated it into French, and that, to give it more authority, he has dedicated it to the archbiſhops and biſhops of France, with a preface, wherein he acknowledges that the works of* Francis Simonis, *written in Latin, and printed at Cologne, had occaſioned his book, and furniſhed him with memoirs for the compoſing of it* (12). That work of Father Rapin is intituled, *Artifices des Heretiques*: it was printed at Paris in 1681, and reprinted the ſame year in the Low-Countries. See the *Critique generale* (13) *de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme* (14).

[*E*] *We ſee this Jeſuit placed among the Phyſicians by ſome Biographers.*] He is not numbered among Phyſicians in the new edition of Vander Linden's *de Scriptis Medicis* (15); but his *Hortorum libri*, are placed there, and then all his works in general, *Opera omnia, Lugduni Batavorum*, 1672, in 12mo. I ſhall ſay nothing of Bartholinus, who has inſerted that Jeſuit in his catalogue of ſuch Phyſicians as have been Poets (16); for he does not ſay that he was not a Jeſuit: but I cannot paſs over in ſilence what has been already obſerved by Mr Baillet. Theſe are his words: 'Mr Konigius .... divides Father Rapin into two, and ſays, 1. *Henricus Rapinus quatuor libros hortorum, anno* 1671 *edi curavit.* Afterwards he ſpeaks of Nicolas Rapin of Poitou, the great provoſt of the conſtable's juriſdiction, whom I have mentioned in another place; and then he adds, 2. *Renatus Rapinus Medicus anno* 1659 *claruit. Opera ejus Medica prodierunt anno* 1672. *Extant ejuſdem Eclogæ ſacræ, item, Hortus Epigrammatum.* See the 678th page. What he calls books of Phyſic, is nothing elſe but the four books about Gardens, whoſe title he had only ſeen in the Utrecht edition, that came out in the year he mentions. One may eaſily find out the cauſe of his other miſtakes. Some other foreign authors, as Mr Beughem in Holland, and Mr Lipenius in Germany, have alſo placed Father Rapin among the Phyſicians. But they cannot be taxed with any error, as long as they are not miſtaken about the name, the perſon, and the work of the author, and do not explain themſelves about his profeſſion. My intent was not to cenſure Mr Konigius for want of exactneſs; he has done nothing on this occaſion, but what is uſual with the writers of *Bibliotheques*, who ſpeak of foreign books which they have not ſeen. On the contrary, I deſigned to ſhew by this inſtance, that thoſe, who undertake ſuch works, are very excuſable, becauſe they cannot avoid falling into ſuch like miſtakes (17).'

[*F*] *In the Menagiana the circumſtances of his quarrel with .... Vavaſſeur, have not been well related.*] I ſhall ſet down the whole paſſage of the *Menagiana*, becauſe it confirms what I have already touched upon in the text of this article. 'Father Rapin was not ſufficiently qualified to draw a parallel between Virgil and Homer. Tanaquillus Faber, whom he intended to convert at that time, ſupplied him with the Greek paſſages quoted by him. After he had read his *parallel between Ariſtotle and Plato*, at the firſt preſident de la Moignon's, I told him I had found but one fault in it, to wit, that ſpeaking of the Colophonian woman, whom Plato loved, he had ſaid that ſhe was young; whereas it is ſaid in the Greek epigram, wherein mention is made of her, that the God of Love had placed himſelf in her wrinkles. Whereupon the abbot Tallemant ſaid, That the Father was very excuſable, becauſe he did not believe that ſo wiſe a man as Plato would have been in love with an old woman. Father Rapin made very good Latin verſes, but he had no great learning. He had a great quarrel with Father Vavaſſeur, and bought off the whole impreſſion of that Father's book *de Epigrammate*, by the authority of the firſt preſident, in order to ſuppreſs it, ſo that it is grown very ſcarce (18).' What is ſaid here of Vavaſſeur's book *de Epigrammate* is falſe, and has been rectified in the ſecond edition, thus: *He quarrelled with Father Vavaſſeur on account of his* Reflexions on Ariſtotle's Poetics, *which he cauſed to be printed by Muguet, without putting his name to that book. Father Vavaſſeur, who was not well pleaſed with him, publiſhed ſoon after ſome* Remarks upon thoſe Reflexions, *in which he treats very ill the author of the reflexions, pretending not to know him. Father Rapin made a great noiſe about it, and openly complained of the proceeding of his fellow Jeſuit; who anſwered that it was his own fault, and that if he had declared himſelf to be the author of the* Reflexions, *he had never writ againſt him. The expedient, found to reconcile thoſe Fathers, was to ſuppreſs the* Remarks *of Father Vavaſſeur, which was done by the authority of the firſt preſident de la Moignon; ſo that this book, which was printed by Billaine in* 1675, *and which contains but* 141 *pages, is grown very ſcarce* (19). See the *Critique generale* of Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm (20), where you will find ſomething about that conteſt, and about another quarrel of Father Rapin (21). I ſhall further obſerve two things. (22) *As Father Vavaſſeur had made two large books of Epigrams* (23), *he was not well pleaſed with theſe words of Father Rapin in his reflexions upon Ariſtotle's Poetics,* that it is ſo rare a thing to make very good epigrams, that it is enough to have made ſome few in one's lifetime (24); *and this is it which prompted him to write againſt that book of Father Rapin. I learned this particular from himſelf.* They are Mr Menage's words.

(*f*) You will find ſomething in his vindication in the *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lett. March* 1686, *p.* 356. This work had been mentioned in the *Nouvelles* of February 1686, *p.* 237.

(8) *See Mr Jurieu's book, intituled,* Jugemens ſur les Méthodes d'expliquer la Grace.

(9) *See the* Morale pratique des Jeſuites, *Tom. viii, pag.* 97.

(10) In January 1686, pag. 97, & ſeq.

(11) *Pag.* 50.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 51.

(13) Letter iii, pag. 302, of the third edition.

(14) That is, the Hiſtory of Calviniſm, by Mr Maimbourg.

(15) See *Lindenius renovatus, pag.* 938. It is ſaid there that the *Hortorum libri* have been printed in 4to, at Paris in 1661, and 1666, and at Leyden in 12mo, in 1666, and 1668, and at Utrecht in 12mo, in 1672.

(16) Thom. Bartholin. de Medicis Poëtis, *pag.* 136.

(17) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1537.

(18) Menagiana, *pag.* 60, 61, of the firſt Dutch Edit.

(19) Menagiana, *pag.* 83, of the 2d Dutch Edit.

(20) In the 4th letter.

(21) That which he had with Father Maimbourg.

(22) Menage, Anti-Baillet, *ch. lxxxiv.*

(23) You will find at the end of the book *de Epigrammate*, of the Paris Edit. 1672, three pretty ſmall books of Vavaſſeur's epigrams. He publiſhed, in 1675, an appendix to the third book, and the fourth book ſome time after.

(24) Theſe words are to be found in the *Anti-Baillet, ubi ſupra.*

The ſecond thing I am to obſerve is, that Father Rapin in the new edition of his *Reflexions*, did not correct all the faults cenſured by his ſellow Jeſuit: he was contented to correct ſome few, and retained ſome that are not to be maintained. He affirms in the firſt edition, that Homer never ſaid any impious thing (25); he affirms it ſtill in the other editions, tho' his cenſurer had proved to him that Homer has written ſeveral *profane falſities*, and ſeveral *infamous impoſtures againſt the reſpect and veneration he owed to his gods* (26): Nay, he had quoted Father Rapin himſelf, as witneſſing the ſame (27). I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that the Critic did not take notice of all the faults that are to be found in the reflexions on Ariſtotle's Poetics, and that if he had been willing to criticiſe the other works of that writer, he would have found many things in them that were liable to cenſure. See the remarks [*A*] and [*T*] of the article ARISTOTLE.

(25) Rapin, Réflex. ſur la Poëtique en général, *num.* 9, *pag.* 20.

(26) Vavaſſeur, Remarques ſur les nouvelles Réflex. *p.* 21, & *ſeq.*

(27) See Rapin, ibid. *num.* 25.

RASARIO (John Baptist) an Italian Phyſician, was born in the territory of Novara [*A*], in the year 1517 (*a*). He taught the *Belles Lettres* (*b*) at Venice twenty-two years, with great reputation (*c*); his eloquence was admired on many occaſions, and particularly in the oration which he made upon the victory at Lepanto, in the year 1571 [*B*]. He went afterwards to Rome, where Pope Pius IV offered him very handſome appointments; but it was not agreeable to him to ſtay in that city, and he choſe rather to accept of an employ which was offered him by the ſenate of Milan (*d*): it was to teach the *Belles Lettres* in the univerſity of Pavia; where he died in the year 1578 (*e*), and not in the year 1573, as it is ſaid in Lindenius Renovatus. His Latin verſion of ſome of the works of Galen was printed in the year 1545 (*f*). Neither Ghilini, Teiſſier, nor Moreri, make any mention of this verſion in the catalogue they have given of his works. What Moreri has ſaid of Raſario is taken from Mr Teiſſier. The reader will do well to have recourſe to the latter, and alſo to look into the original of Thuanus; but he will there find ſome miſtakes that want to be rectified [*C*].

(*a*) Lindenius renovatus, *p.* 537.

(*b*) According to Ghilini he was Greek profeſſor at Venice; and according to Thuanus he was profeſſor of Eloquence there.

(*c*) Thuan. *lib. lxv*, *ſub fin.*

(*d*) Ghilini, *Tom. ii*, *p.* 142.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Linden. renovatus, *p.* 537.

[*A*] *He was born in the territory of Novara.*] I ſpeak thus in general of the place of his birth, becauſe Thuanus and Ghilini are not agreed upon the name of it. The one calls it *Borgo di Seſia* (1): the other makes uſe of a phraſe that I do not underſtand, and which is very ungrammatical in my edition; *oppido quod à valle Uziæ in Novarienſi diocæſi ſito nomen retinet familia nobili natus* (2). Theſe words have been tranſlated by Mr Teiſſier in the following manner, *he was deſcended from a noble family of Valdugia in the Novareſe* (3). Moreri adds, that *Valdugia* is a town of the *Novareſe*. Paul Freherus (4), quoting the *Thuanus enucleatus* of Gerard de Stocken, has it *in vallo Uziæ*, and not *à valle Uziæ*. But this far from leſſening the difficulty, makes it ſtill the greater.

[*B*] *The Oration that he made upon the victory at Lepanto in the year* 1571.] After *Te Deum* had been ſung in the church of St Marc, Raſario received an order from the Doge to make an Oration to the people, on occaſion of this famous victory, which he accordingly performed three days after in the ſame church, and acquitted himſelf to the admiration of all that heard him, *Princeps Joanni Baptiſtæ Raſario viro doctiſſ. mandatum eodem die dedit, ut de hac victoria orationem ad populum haberet. Quam rem ille die tertio, cum eodem in templo expediret, Senatum, populum, peregrinos, adeoque infinitam prope auditorum multitudinem eloquentiæ ſuæ admiratione attonitam reddidit* (5). This Oration has paſſed ſeveral impreſſions.

[*C*] *We muſt rectify ſome miſtakes in Thuanus.*] What he ſays of the eſteem that Philip II had for Raſario was unknown to Ghilini, and I am very much ſurprized at it. This prince firſt became acquainted with the merit of Raſario, when he paſſed through Milan in his way to Germany in the year 1548 (6). Thuanus adds, that he offered him great advantages to draw him into Portugal, and to induce him to accept a Profeſſorſhip in the Academy of Coimbra, but Raſario excuſed himſelf on account of his age: he could not however deny his requeſt to go and teach Eloquence in Pavia, being obliged to him for his brother's liberty, and the reſtitution of his goods which had been confiſcated. Thuanus is miſtaken in what he ſays of the Profeſſorſhip at Coimbra; for Philip II did not make himſelf maſter of Portugal till the year 1580, and Raſario died in the year 1578, after having taught in the univerſity of Pavia four years (7). This great Hiſtorian attending chiefly to thoſe matters which were moſt eſſential to his work, did not examine with exactneſs into the lives of the learned, but thoſe who have collected together what he has ſaid of them, and publiſhed it ſeparately, ſhould have added thereto the neceſſary corrections.

(1) Ghilini, *Part ii*, *p.* 142.

(2) Thuan. *lib. lxv*, *ſub fin. p.* 233, *Edit. Francof.* 1625.

(3) Teiſſier, Elog. *Tom. i*, *p.* 486, *Edit.* 1696.

(4) In Theatro, *pag.* 1277.

(5) Jo. Petrus Contarenus, de Bello Venetis à Selimo II illato, *pag. ult.*

(6) Thuan. *lib. lxv*, *p.* 233.

(7) Thuan. ibid.

RATALLER (George), in Latin *Ratallerus* (*a*), deſcended from an antient and noble family of Frieſland, was born at Leeuwarden about the year 1518. He ſtudied firſt at Utrecht under George Macropedius (*b*), afterwards at Louvain, and in the univerſities of France and Italy (*c*). On his return to the Low-Countries he was made one of the council of the province of Artois, and afterwards of the great council at Mechlin, and Maſter of the Requeſts (*d*). The ducheſs of Parma ſent him to Denmark upon a negotiation; and having diſcharged that office well, he was made preſident of the council of Utrecht. He died ſuddenly in an aſſembly of that council on the firſt of October 1580, if we believe Sweertius (*e*), or on the ſixth of October 1581, if we credit Valerias Andreas (*f*). He was a man of merit, and was greatly eſteemed for his virtue, knowledge, and politeneſs (*g*). He was a good Latin Poet, as appears by his works, and particularly by his verſion of Sophocles [*A*]. John Lallemant, who likewiſe

(*a*) And not *Rotallerus*, as in the Abridgment of Geſner.

(*b*) Val. Andreas, Biblioth. Belg. *pag.* 266.

(*c*) Sweert. Athenæ Belgic. *p.* 275.

(*d*) Val. Andr. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 269.

(*e*) Sweert. ubi ſupra.

(*f*) Val. Andr. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 266.

(*g*) Ibid.

[*A*] *By his works, and particularly by his verſion of Sophocles.*] His tranſlation of Heſiod (1) into Hexameter and Pentameter verſe was printed at Francfort in the year 1546, in 8vo, together with one book of his epigrams (2). He had tranſlated in various kinds of Latin verſe pretty much reſembling the original the ſeven tragedies that we have left of Sophocles; but he could not be prevailed upon to conſent that this verſion ſhould be printed; his friends however who had got copies of it did not regard his ſcruples; they cauſed to be printed at Lyons by Gryphius in the year 1550 the Ajax (3), the Electra, and the Antigone. At laſt the author himſelf was prevailed upon; he put the finiſhing hand to theſe three tragedies and to the other four, and publiſhed them altogether at Antwerp *ex Officina Gulielmi Silvii, Typographi Regii*, in the year 1570, in 8vo. Valerias Andreas knew nothing of this work. To this ſin of omiſſion he has joined one of commiſſion: for he ſays that Ratallerus tranſlated into Latin verſe three tragedies of Sophocles, *viz.* the Phenician women, Hippolytus, and Andromache, with thoſe fragments of the ancient Poets that are to be met with in

(1) That is, the *Opera & Dies* of Heſiod.

(2) Val. Andr. Biblioth. Belgic. *pag.* 266.

(3) And not the *Alexandra*, as in the Abridgment of Geſner.

likewiſe made a verſion of Sophocles, borrowed ſeveral of his verſes from Rataller without acknowledging from whence he took them (*b*); ſo that he may juſtly be numbered among the Plagiaries.

(*b*) Præfat, Sophoclis à Rataller-ro metricè verſi.

in Stobeus. He did not know that theſe three were the tragedies of Euripides and not of Sophocles. They were printed together with thoſe fragments at Antwerp in the year 1581 in 16mo, as Sweertius informs us (4). He has been more exact in this particular than Valerius Andreas; but he was not exact when having told us that Rataller had tranſlated into Latin verſe all the tragedies of Sophocles, he adds, *ejuſdem* (Sophoclis) *Fabulas III carmine quoque Latino tranſtulit*, that is, *he hath alſo tranſlated into Latin verſe three fables of Sophocles*. It would betray great ignorance to ſuppoſe that *Tragœdiæ Sophoclis*, and *Fabulæ Sophoclis* are not the ſame.

(4) Sweert. Athen. Belgic. *pag.* 276.

A Phyſician (5) of Autun in Burgundy publiſhed a Latin verſion of the ſeven tragedies of Sophocles at Paris in the year 1557, and ſtole ſeveral paſſages from Rataller. *Hic multos verſus & paginas* . . . . in the print as far as the word *evicerit* (6) incluſively.

(5) *Called* Joannes Lalemantius, *or* Lalamantius.

(6) Adrian. Mylius, Præfat. Sophoclis Ratalleri.

The epiſtle dedicatory of Rataller's Sophocles is very well worth reading. He dedicates that work to Frederic Perenot, brother to the cardinal of Granvelle, and repreſents to him in a very noble manner the great advantages which men in the higheſt ſtation of life may reap from tragedy, when they are capable of profiting by the examples and maxims which the ſtage ſets before their eyes.

RAUBER (*a*) (ANDREW EBERHARD) of Talberg and Weineek [*A*], lord of the fortreſs of Petronel, a German knight, and one of the council of war to the emperor Maximilian II (*b*). He was very famous, not only for his great ſtrength and high ſtature, but alſo for his beard which was of an extraordinary length. He was deſcended from the very antient and noble houſe of Rauber, in the duchy of Carniola, which the emperor Maximilian I. promoted to the dignity of Barons [*B*]. Our Andrew Eberhard Rauber was in the ſervice of Maximilian II from his youth, he travelled with him into foreign countries, he was always in the favour of that emperor, who made him one of his council of war, and gave him for his firſt wife Helena Scharſeginn [*C*], his natural daughter, but he was firſt obliged to purchaſe her by a combat with his rival, which was pleaſant enough, and without loſs of blood. On this occaſion he gave moſt remarkable proofs of his ſtrength [*D*]. He had no children by her; but his ſecond wife [*E*] made him ample recompence for this defect; for ſhe brought eight twins into the world, one ſon whom he named Andrew Eberhard, and ſeven daughters, of which one died unmarried. The others were all married into illuſtrious families. Rauber's ſtrength was ſo great that he could break in pieces the ſtrongeſt horſe-ſhoe. He once took by the beard a Jew that had been baptized, and ſtriking upon it with his right hand, both the beard and the jaw-bone of the Jew came off into his hand [*F*]. His beard

(*a*) This article was communicated by Mr de Breſler.

(*b*) Valvaſor, la Gloire du Duché de Carniole, *livr. xi.*

[*A*] *Weineek.*] This Weineek is a caſtle in the country of Carniola, called in the language of that country Kraviek. It is ſituate upon an eminence in the innermoſt part of Carniola, four leagues from Laybach the capital of the country. From this caſtle came the family of the lords of Weineek, but their race is long ſince extinct, as is that of Hardegi de Pettau, governor of Carniola, who was in poſſeſſion of the ſame caſtle in the year 1530. At laſt, after count Herman de Cilly had ruined this caſtle, he gave it in the year 1433 to Frederic Rauber, and it has ever ſince been poſſeſſed by the family of Rauber (1).

(1) Valvaſor, la Gloire du Duché de Carniole, *pag.* 631, & 635.

[*B*] *Promoted to the dignity of Barons.*] This promotion was made on the 24th of December 1516, in the town of Hagenau, and that dignity was conferred on Leonard Rauber grand-marſhal to the court of the emperor, and on Nicolas Rauber, his brother, with the title of baron of Planckhenſtein and Carlſtetten. But this title was for ſome time dormant, and was revived by the preſent emperor on the 12th of April 1651 (2).

(2) Ibid. *pag.* 637, 638.

[*C*] *Helena Scharſeginn.*] The emperor Maximilian II, before he was married, fell in love with the daughter of the count of Eaſt-Frieſland, who was eſteemed the greateſt beauty of her time. The love and familiarity between them was ſo great, that he had by her a daughter named Helena Scharſeginn, not inferior to her mother in beauty, ſo that ſhe drew the affection of ſeveral perſons of diſtinction (3).

(3) Ibid. *pag.* 634.

[*D*] *Proofs of his ſtrength.*] We have here a very diverting method of gaining a lady, and ſo very uncommon, that I dare ſay it is not to be found in any romance. The writers of ſuch books do indeed tell us, that heroes uſed formerly to gain their miſtreſſes by tournaments, duels, combats with giants and dragons, and a thouſand other fancies of this ſort, but the method that Rauber uſed was never known to any of them. When he aſked the emperor's daughter in marriage, he found at court a Spaniſh gentleman of great quality, who alſo endeavoured to become the emperor's ſon-in-law. The reputation of the valour of the Spaniard, as well as the height of his ſtature which exceeded Rauber's, recommended him very much. The emperor, being unwilling to give either of them the mortification of a denial, agreed that they ſhould decide the affair by a trial of ſtrength. He then cauſed to be given to each of them a ſack, that was ſufficient to contain his antagoniſt, and promiſed that he who ſhould put the other perſon into the ſack ſhould have his daughter. The two lovers engaged in the preſence of the emperor, and in the ſtruggle exerted their utmoſt ſtrength, which, on this occaſion, was redoubled by love. Each of them, fired with an ardent deſire of marrying the emperor's daughter, with all his might ſtrove to put his rival into the ſack. Rauber at length carried the day, the ſtrength and valour of the German thruſt the bravery of the proud Spaniard into the ſack: by this means Rauber attained the poſſeſſion of his fair Helena, and the Spaniard after ſo terrible a diſgrace left the court (4).

(4) Ibid.

[*E*] *His ſecond wife.*] She was an Hungarian named Urſula de Tſchillack in Niemptſchitz.

She was loſt at the taking of Niemptſchitz going out of that place ſecretly, but was afterwards found by a German captain, who, commiſerating her caſe, kept her at his own houſe for ſome time. He afterwards preſented her to the emperor Maximilian II, who cauſed her to be lodged among his women in their apartment, and when ſhe was grown up he married her to Rauber (5).

(5) Ibid.

[*F*] *Came off in his hand.*] This happened at Gratz upon the requeſt of archduke Charles, at whoſe court was a Jew that had been baptized, who for ſtature and ſtrength might well be compared to a giant, the archduke Charles being deſirous to know whether the Jew was ſtronger than Rauber, in order to try their ſtrength, obliged each of them to receive from the other one blow with the fiſt, they were nevertheleſs allowed to decide by lot who ſhould ſtrike the firſt, which chanced to be the Jew. He gave Rauber ſo violent a blow, that he was obliged to keep his bed eight days, and his chamber many more. When he was recovered it was Rauber's turn to give the Jew a blow, which he did in the following manner. He took beard was a real prodigy, and of ſo extraordinary a length that it reached down to his feet, and then turned up quite to his girdle [*G*]. Beyond all doubt it ſurpaſſed in length all the beards of the Lombards [*H*]. Rauber died in the ſixty-eighth year of his age, at his caſtle of Petronel [*I*], in the year 1575 (*c*). There alſo he lies interred between his two wives.

(*c*) Ibid. *pag.* 635.

took hold of the long beard of the Jew, and twiſting it twice round his left hand, with his right he ſtruck upon it with ſuch prodigious force, that not only the beard, but the under jaw-bone came off into his hand, which ſoon after coſt the Jew his life (6).

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 34.

[*G*] *Quite to his girdle.*] It was yet longer, for beſides this he wound it about his ſtaff. He gloried ſo much in it, that he very ſeldom went to court either in a coach or horſeback, but almoſt always on foot, that his long beard might be ſeen, which he carried like a ſtreamer waving with the wind. When he died it was cut into two tufts.

[*H*] *It ſurpaſſed in length the beards of the Lombards.*] The name Lombard has been commonly derived from *Long-beard*, but it is a miſtake; this name rather taking its original from the old German word *Borde* or *Boerde*, which ſignifies a large ſpace or extent of country: and that extent of country which reaches along the Elbe, from Torgau in Miſnia, and through Magdeburg, quite to Lunenburg, was formerly called *Long-Boerde*, that is, the long extent of country, or the long ſpace, and the inhabitants were called *Long-bards*.

[*I*] *Petronel.*] The caſtle of Petronel is not far from Preſburg; it is at preſent poſſeſſed by count de Thum, and is built with great magnificence.

RECKHEIM, a county, a fief, and an immediate or ſoveraign ſtate of the empire, has the right of voting in the college of the princes both in the general and circular diets. It belongs to the circle of Weſtphalia, and contains a town and ſeveral villages. Its ſoil is very fruitful, and it is pleaſantly ſituated in a fine and well inhabited country upon the Maëſe, two leagues from Maeſtricht, between the territories of Juliers, Liege, and Fauquemont. It receives toll-money upon the Maëſe, and they coin gold, ſilver, and copper-money. The caſtle, which is the reſidence of the counts, is one of the fineſt, largeſt, and moſt magnificent in Germany. Thoſe, who are now in poſſeſſion of it, belong to the houſe of Aſpermont (*a*) Linden, a very illuſtrious and antient houſe, and are deſcended from the counts of Aſpermont in Lorrain, whoſe county conſiſted of almoſt three hundred villages. I ſhall give a ſhort account of their Genealogy, and of the preſent ſtate of the family of the counts of Reckheim [*A*].

(*a*) The French writers ſay *Aſpremont*, which is a corruption of the true orthography.

[*A*] *A ſhort account of their Genealogy, and of the preſent ſtate of the family of the counts of Reckheim.*] The name of the firſt count of Aſpermont was SIGISFRIDT; he lived in the year 660. He deſcended from the princes of Eſte in Italy, A younger brother of that family, deſcended from that Sigisfridt, and whoſe name was ARNOLD, ſettled in Holland in the year 1120, and poſſeſſed there the lordſhip of Linden, which his deſcendants enjoyed a long time. One of them, called HERMAN, purchaſed the county of Reckheim, about the year 1550. He was general of the troops of Erneſtus of Bavaria, elector of Cologne, and father of ERNESTUS, count of Aſpermont and Reckheim, who was born in the year 1583, and was chamberlain and colonel under the emperors Matthias and Ferdinand II. He married Anne Antoinette, daughter of Henry marquis de Gouffier-Bonnivet, by whom he had a ſon named FERDINAND. This Ferdinand was born in 1611, and married Elizabeth, daughter of Egon, count of Furſtemberg, and of Anne Mary, princeſs of Hohenzolleren, and had by her four ſons, and eight daughters, *viz.*

FRANCIS GOBERT count of Reckheim, biſhop of Cheur (1), and canon of the metropolitan churches of Cologne and Saltzburg, and of the cathedral of Straſburg (2).

FERDINAND, general of the armies of his Imperial majeſty, who by his firſt marriage with Charlotte, daughter of Lewis George, prince of Naſſau Dilembourg, and of Anne Auguſta princeſs of Brunſwic, had but one daughter named CHARLOTTE GOBERTINE canoneſs of Munſterbilſen, whoſe eight deſcents are Aſpermont-Reckheim, Gouffier, Furſtemberg, Hohenzolleren, Naſſau, Sayn, Brunſwic, and Denmark. He married a ſecond wife named Juliana, daughter of Francis Rakoczi, prince of Tranſylvania, and grand-daughter of George the younger, George the elder, and Sigiſmund, all princes of Tranſylvania. He has a ſon by her, whoſe name is JOSEPH GOBERT.

(1) Or *Choire*: the French write and pronounce it *Coire*. It is a biſhopric in the country of the Griſons, and ſuffragan to the archbiſhopric of Mayenne. The biſhop is allied to the Swiſſes. But nevertheleſs he has his vote and ſeat in the college of the princes of the empire. See the Hiſtory of the Empire, by Mr Heiſs, *Tom. ii*, *pag.* 265, *Hague Edit.* 1685.

(2) See the article TILLI.

CHARLES canon of the metropolitan church of Cologne, and of the cathedrals of Straſbourg and Liege.

FREDERIC, Great-Croſs of the order of Malta, and commander of Tobel, Steinfurt and Munſter.

ANNE MARY, the wife of count Wenceſlaus of Althann, counſellor to his Imperial majeſty, and chief judge of Moravia, governor of the province of Glatz, and ambaſſador extraordinary in Sweden and Poland.

ELEONORA, princeſs abbeſs of Munſterbilſen.

ANNE SALOME, the wife of Lewis count de Souches, major-general of the armies of his Imperial majeſty, and counſellor of ſtate.

ERNESTINA who was married firſt to John-George count of Collonitſch, chamberlain to his Imperial majeſty, and afterwards to Octavius count of Curiani, the emperor's chamberlain, and counſellor of ſtate.

ANNE ANTOINETTE, the wife of Claudius count de Tilly, lieutenant-general of the army of the United Provinces.

MARY FRANCES, the wife of Charles count of Aſpermont-Linden, counſellor of ſtate to the country of Liege, and governor of the marquiſate of Franchimont.

ALEXANDRINA and PETRONILLA, firſt canoneſſes at Remiremont, and afterwards Urſuline nuns at Metz.

The counts of Aſpermont-Reckheim bear quarterly, in the 1ſt and 4th Gules with a Croſs Or, which is Aſpermont-Linden; in the 2d and 3d Or, with a Lion Gules, which is Reckheim; and over all Azure with an Eagle Argent, which is the ancient Aſpermont or Eſte (3).

(3) Taken from a Memoir communicated to the author. Which muſt be likewiſe underſtood of the text of this article.

REFUGE (DU) a French gentleman, author of a book that has undergone ſeveral editions [*A*], intituled, *A Treatiſe on the Court*, or *Inſtructions for Courtiers*, was well verſed in ſtate-affairs, both in theory and practice; he had read a great deal, and had a large and long experience of courts, and of the affairs of kings, princes, ſtates, and republics, in which the kings of France had employed him with great advantage, and wherein he behaved with ſo much wiſdom, and had ſo good ſucceſs, that never any thing

[*A*] *Author of a book that has undergone ſeveral editions.*] The firſt edition is of Holland, and the ſecond of Paris. Theſe were followed by another which was publiſhed at Paris in the year 1618, in 8vo, after the death of the author, and from his laſt corrections. This third edition is enlarged, and divided into chapters, thing could be objected to his prudent conduct. He died in the reign of Lewis XIII, and there were found in his cloſet ſeveral ſtate-tracts that he had compoſed, and which his relations gave hopes ſhould be publiſhed. This is what we read in a ſhort preface to the third edition of his treatiſe on the Court. This edition was printed at Paris in the year 1618.

ters, with ſummaries and ſections, but they have left out the marginal notes and citations, with which the other editions had been *curiouſly enriched* (1). They have reſtored them ſince. I find them in the edition I make uſe of, which is that of Paris 1658, in 12mo, by Stephen Loyſon. The name of the author is in this edition, and it is alſo found in the Leyden edition 1649, in 12mo, but it was not in the edition of 1618; there was only at the end of the book the letters D. R. after ſome verſes of Seneca which are not in the edition of 1658. There are in this work abundance of excellent things; it was printed in Engliſh at London in the year 1622, in 8vo.

(1) Taken from the advertiſement to the reader before the Paris edition 1618.

REGIUS (URBAN) was a learned man of the XVIth century. He was born at Langenargen, upon the lake of Conſtance, and began his ſtudies at Lindaw; from whence he went to Friburg in Briſgaw, where he continued them the more ſucceſsfully, becauſe he lodged in the houſe of the famous Zazius, and was very much beloved by him [*A*]. He went afterwards to the univerſity of Baſil, and then to that of Ingolſtad, whither many ſcholars reſorted, by reaſon of the great reputation of John Eccius. He read private lectures there, and appeared ſo well qualified for the direction of the youth, that many gentlemen intruſted him with the whole conduct of their ſons, without excepting the care of what concerned their expence. It proved an impoſſible thing for him to regulate it: thoſe young men ran into debt in the taverns and ſhops (*a*), and becauſe he was ſecurity for them, and did not receive from their parents the money that he aſked for, he turned, in a manner, Bankrupt. Being preſſed by the creditors, and having not wherewithal to ſatisfy them, he thought of withdrawing clandeſtinely; but ſome officers being come to Ingolſtad at that time to raiſe men, he delivered up his books and all his things, and liſted himſelf. The new raiſed men were muſtered, and the profeſſor Eccius, who was preſent at the review, knew Regius among the ſoldiers: he went to him, and being informed of the reaſon which had moved him to liſt himſelf, he promiſed to ſerve him, and did it ſo effectually, that he reconciled him to the Muſes. He threatened thoſe indebted ſcholars with the prince's indignation, if they did not diſengage him. Regius went on in his ſtudies, and made ſo great a progreſs in the ſciences, that he received at Ingolſtad the oratorial and poetical crowns from the very hands of the emperor Maximilian. Some time after he was promoted to the profeſſorſhips of Rhetoric and Poetry in the ſame univerſity. While he was a profeſſor he wrote in the year 1516, ſome letters (*b*) by the duke of Bavaria's order, to invite Eraſmus to Ingolſtad; which did not ſucceed. Having applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Divinity, he was ſo charmed with it that he made it his only buſineſs. He thereby acquired ſome diſpoſitions for Lutheraniſm; but he found himſelf embarraſſed, when Eccius, his maſter and benefactor, came to have a quarrel with Luther. Upon this he reſolved to leave Ingolſtad, and to retire to Augſburg, where he proved an uſeful man againſt Popery. He founded a Reformed church there, and ſpread from thence into Suabia the new opinions, as they were called. He ſided with Zuinglius for ſome time; but afterwards he profeſſed himſelf a good Lutheran [*B*]. Eccius went to him at Augſburg, and conferred

(*a*) Modum in veſtitu & victu ubique excedere. *Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. p.* 22.

(*b*) See the 17th and 18th letters of the 2d book of Eraſmus's letters. Eraſmus thanked and praiſed him. See the 19th letter of the 2d book, and the 35th of the 18th book.

[*A*] *He lodged in the houſe of the famous Zazius, and was much beloved by him* (1).] He did chuſe in Zazius's library all the books which he thought proper for the improvement of his ſtudies, and tranſcribed all the marginal notes which that learned Profeſſor had written upon them. Thus that young ſcholar ſpent a great part of the night. Zazius, who ſlept but little, and got up ſometimes to walk, and thereby to allay the trouble of his want of ſleep, ſurprized him as he was tranſcribing thoſe notes, and told him in a loving manner, you are ſtealing the fruits of my ſtudies: *Lucubrantem invenit in deſcribendis illis ſcholiis, Urbanum: cujus auriculam Zaſius blandiuſculè vellicans*, arte & ſcientia ſua ſe ab ipſo defraudari jocatus eſt (2). Sometimes he found him aſleep, and then he would lay huge volumes on his ſhoulders until he waked. *Aut ſi quando ſomno ad candelam oppreſſum & inclinato in menſam capite dormitantem offendiſſet: juris volumen grande unum atque alterum humeris impoſitum reliquit, donec excitaretur* (3). I mention theſe little things, becauſe I know that ſeveral people are extreamly well pleaſed to ſee ſuch marks of the kindneſs of a profeſſor, or of the diligence of a ſcholar.

(1) Amavit eum Zazius ut filium. *Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. pag.* 71.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Ibid.

[*B*] *He ſided with Zuinglius . . . . but afterwards he profeſſed himſelf a good Lutheran.*] Here is what Zuinglius writ to him in the year 1526. ‘ In Euchariſtiæ ‘ re gratulor vobis, te noſtrum eſſe factum. Verum ‘ gratiam meretur novitas: brevi enim ſpero omnes ‘ qui adhuc obſtrepunt tropum, qui nullo negotio ‘ videri vobis debebat, viſuros eſſe ac ſententiæ noſtræ ‘ ſimplicitatem ac claritatem (4). - - - - *I congratulate* ‘ *you on your embracing our ſentiments touching the Eucha-* ‘ *riſt. But the newneſs of the thing deſerves our thanks:* ‘ *for I expect that all thoſe who ſtill exclaim againſt* ‘ *the figure, which you muſt have had no difficulty in com-* ‘ *prehending, will, in a ſhort time, come to ſee the ſim-* ‘ *plicity and clearneſs of our opinion.*’ They conferred together about Original Sin in the ſame year, and we have ſtill (5) the letter which Zuinglius wrote to Regius on that point. Luther knew that thoſe two men had the ſame opinions, and was very ſorry for it. ‘ Dolet mihi valde nobiliſſimum virum Oecolam- ‘ padium tam ludicris & nihili cogitationibus in hoc ‘ barathrum prolapſum; pulſat eum ſathanas: Do- ‘ minus eripiat eum. Urbanus regius in idem malum ‘ vel inclinat, vel jam cecidit: Dominus ſervet ſuos ‘ (6). - - - *I am vaſtly concerned that the great Oecolam-* ‘ *padius ſhould have ſtumbled into this pit from ſuch idle* ‘ *and ridiculous imaginations: he is puſhed on by ſatan;* ‘ *out of whoſe hands I pray God to deliver him. Regius* ‘ *Urban either inclines to the ſame evil way, or is al-* ‘ *ready fallen into it. May the Lord preſerve his own* ‘ *people.*’ Luther ſays, in another letter, that he had been informed, that Regius deſigned to write againſt him. ‘ Præterea Urbanus Regius minari dicitur in ‘ me ſcripta, ſcilicet Oecolampadium & Zuinglium ‘ tantos viros (ut ſentit) non vult offendere: ſic ‘ mutatus eſt ab illo (7). - - - *It is likewiſe ſaid, that* ‘ *Regius Urban threatens to write againſt me, forſooth,* ‘ *he is unwilling to offend ſuch great men as Oecolam-* ‘ *padius*

(4) Zuinglius, *Epiſt. lib. i, p.* 82, apud Melch. Adamum, ibid. *pag.* 73.

(5) Pag. 251, of Zuinglius's letters.

(6) Lutherus, *Tom. ii, Epiſt. pag.* 326, *anno* 1527, apud Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra.

(7) Idem, Lutherus, ibid. *pag.* 330, apud Melch. Adam. ibid.

ferred with him to bring him back to the church of Rome; but he did not ſucceed in it. Nay, there aroſe a paper-war betwixt them, which Regius maintained vigorouſly, though his antagoniſt might have reproached him with ingratitude. The new party did not always prevail in the city of Augſburg; there was a time when Regius was forced to leave it, and to abſcond in ſeveral places; but he was gloriouſly recalled, and married into a good family there. His diſpute with a woman that was an Anabaptiſt, had ſomething very remarkable in it [C]. He lived in that city till the year 1530, when a diet

‘*padius and Zuinglius are, in his opinion: ſo much is* ‘*he changed from what he was.*’ We learn from this paſſage, that Regius appeared at firſt what he appeared to be at laſt, that is, a good Lutheran. He forſook Zuinglianiſm in the year 1528. See the letter (8) wherein Luther expreſſes a great joy for it, and recommends him to the Margrave of Brandenburg. The converſation he had with Regius at Coburg in the year 1530, made a great impreſſion upon him. It filled Regius with admiration of Luther, which he thus expreſſed in a letter. ‘Cum Saxoniam peterem Coburgi integrum diem ſolus cum ‘Luthero, viro Dei, tranſegeram: quo die nullus ‘mihi in vita fuit jucundior. Talis enim ac tantus ‘Theologus Lutherus, ut nulla ſecula habuerint ſimilem. Hoc magis execror ſtultitiam & arrogantiam ‘Caroloſtadianorum, qui ſibi placent, quaſi Luthero ‘queant conferri, cujus umbram non aſſequuntur, ‘cum omni eruditione quam jactant. Semper mihi ‘magnus fuit Lutherus: at jam mihi maximus eſt. ‘Vidi enim præſens & audivi, quæ nullo calamo tradi ‘poſſunt abſentibus (9). - - - *In my way to Saxony I* ‘*I paſſed a whole day at Coburg, with that eminent* ‘*man of God, Luther. There was only he and I together; and, in my life, I never ſpent a day more agreeably. For ſuch, and ſo great a Divine is Luther,* ‘*that no age did ever produce his equal. I have therefore no patience with the folly and arrogance of the* ‘*Carloſtadian Divines, who flatter themſelves, as if* ‘*they were to be compared with Luther, of whom they* ‘*do not reach the very ſhadow, with all their boaſted* ‘*learning. Luther was always a great man, in my* ‘*opinion; but he is now much greater than ever. For* ‘*I have ſeen and heard, while I was with him, ſuch* ‘*things as no pen can communicate and deſcribe to* ‘*others.*’ Luther alſo, on his part, was very well pleaſed with that converſation, and Regius's learning, whoſe converſion ſeemed to him a piece of ſuch good news, that he ought to impart it to his friends. He writ the following words to Wenceſlaus Lincus: ‘Urbanum Regium quoque reſipuiſſe, credo te noſſe, ‘& contra hoſtes Sacramentarios ſtrenue nobiſcum ‘certare (10). - - - - *I ſuppoſe that you have already* ‘*heard of the converſion of Urban Regius, and of his* ‘*being ſtrenuouſly engaged on our ſide againſt our adver-* ‘*ſaries the Sacramentarians.*’

[C] *His diſpute with a woman that was an Anabaptiſt, had ſomething very remarkable in it.*] The magiſtrates of Augſburg put in execution the laws againſt the Anabaptiſts, which ſectaries are forbidden to meet in conventicles, and to perform the exerciſe of their religion; they were baniſhed, or impriſoned. There was a woman of a good family, who boaſted in priſon, that if ſhe had a conference with Regius, ſhe would prove to him, that the cauſe of the Anabaptiſts was very good; ſhe was therefore ſent for to diſpute with him in a full ſenate. She appeared there with the equipage of a priſoner, that is, with her hands fettered, and her feet in irons but Regius took his place among the ſenators: ſhe alledged abundance of paſſages out of the Holy Scripture, to maintain her opinions. Regius anſwered her, and clearly ſhewed the true ſenſe of thoſe paſſages. But he could not undeceive her; ſhe perſiſted in her errors, and ſpoke to the Miniſter thus: *Here is, without doubt, brother Urban, a very ſtrange way of diſputing. You ſit upon a ſoft cuſhion among the Burgomaſters, and you ſpeak like an Oracle, and as it were from Apollo's tripod. But as for me, I am proſtrated upon the ground, and forced to plead my cauſe in irons. Siſter,* replied Regius, *there is nothing in it but what you deſerve, ſince after you have been freed from the ſlavery of the Devil through* JESUS CHRIST, *you have been willing to undergo that infamous yoak again. An extravagant ſpirit makes you appear with ſuch acccoutrements, for an example to others.* This woman was at laſt baniſhed from the town (11). If any perſon doubts my tranſlation, here are the Latin words. *Ipſa tantum abeſt, ut monitis locum dederit: ut pervicaciter etiam Urbanum hiſce fuerit adorta:* Egregia enim verò, Urbane frater, hæc diſputandi ratio eſt inter me & te. Tu in molli culcitra ad latera Conſulum adſidens, quaſi ex Apollinis tripode proloqueris: ego miſera humi proſtrata, ex duris vinculis cauſam dicere cogor. *Ad hæc Urbanus:* Nec verò, *inquit,* injuria, ſoror: ut quæ ſemel è ſervitute diaboli per Chriſtum in libertatem adſerta, tua ſponte iterum cervicem turpi jugo ſubmiſiſti; & iſtis te ornamentis veſanus oſtentat genius, aliis in exemplum. *Senatus itaque, cum laterem ſe lavare videret; contagium illud exilio mulctavit, urbeque expulit* (12).

This woman did not want wit: ſhe made a very judicious reflexion, and ſeaſoned it with a great deal of ſalt; but ſhe had too great a confidence, or rather ſhe was too raſh. She believed, that if ſhe ſhould diſpute with a Miniſter of the prevailing religion, and before the Judges, who had already condemned Anabaptiſm, and impriſoned thoſe who taught it, ſhe might perſuade them of the juſtice of her cauſe. To expect ſuch a thing, it is not enough to be in the right, one muſt alſo hope for an extraordinary aſſiſtance of the divine ſpirit; for, according to the uſual courſe of things, it does not appear that a priſoner for religion can confound ſuch adverſaries as ſpeak to him with authority, and who have on their ſide an outward pomp, and all the company prepoſſeſſed for them. I know very well, that this woman had not a good cauſe to maintain, but I believe, that if ſhe had maintained as good, or even a better doctrine than that of Regius, ſhe would have been caſt in ſuch circumſtances as ſhe was in. The match was not even; the arms were too unequal. Regius ſat in an honourable place, and was ſurrounded with marks of favour: he ſpoke for a cauſe protected by the magiſtrate, and againſt a cauſe perſecuted by the magiſtrate. His antagoniſt was a woman loaded with chains, and in the poſture of a criminal already condemned. A very good reaſon alledged by that woman in ſuch circumſtances would not have balanced a very indifferent one alledged by Regius, with all the weight and emphaſis of a man ſitting on the bench of the Burgomaſters, and on a kind of tribunal. Shall I quote Euripides, who ſays, that the words of a man in favour have a greater force than if they were ſpoken by an unhappy and miſerable man?

Τὸ δ' ἀξίωμα κἂν κακῶς λέγῃ τὸ σὸν,
Πείσει· λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξούντων ἰὼν,
Κἀκ τῶν δοκούντων αὐτὸς, οὐ ταυτὸν σθένει (13).

That is, according to Ennius's tranſlation (14).

Hæc tu etſi perversè dices, facile Achivos flexeris.
Nam quum opulenti loquuntur pariter atque ignobiles,
Eadem dicta, eademque oratio æqua non æque valet.

Such is your privilege, that tho' you ſpeak
Amiſs; yet ſhall your arguments prevail:
For the ſame words with equal force expreſs'd,
By men that are in high repute, and ſuch
As are accounted infamous and vile,
Have not the ſame effect. - - -

Shall I quote theſe verſes of Plautus?

Centum doctum hominum conſilia ſola hæc devincit dea,
Fortuna, atque hoc verum'ſt proinde ut quiſque fortuna utitur,
Ita præcellet, atque exinde ſapere eum omnes dicimus (15).

Fortune has in herſelf alone more weight and power than the counſels of a hundred learned men; and this is moſt true, diet was held there. He then entered into the ſervice of the duke of Brunſwic, who made him ſuperintendant of the churches of the country of Lunenburg, and had a very great eſteem for him [*D*]. He exerciſed his talents for the good of the cauſe in ſeveral ſynods, and wrote ſeveral books [*E*]. He died at Zell in May 1541, in the ſame manner as he had often wiſhed [*F*], that is, almoſt ſuddenly (*c*). I muſt not forget that his wife underſtood the Hebrew tongue very well (*d*). He publiſhed a converſation which he had with her about the characters of the Meſſias applied to JESUS CHRIST. He had thirteen children by her (*e*). I ſhall make a remark upon the names of that miniſter [*G*].

---

(8) *It is in* Seckendorf, Hiſtor. Luther. *lib. ii, pag.* 122, *num.* 5.

(9) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 78.

(10) Lutherus, *Tom. ii, Epiſt. pag.* 311, apud Melch. Adam. ibid. *pag.* 78.

(11) Melch. Adam. ibid. *pag.* 73.

(12) Ibid.

(13) Hecuba ad Ulyſſem apud Euripidem, in Hecuba, *ver.* 293, *pag. m.* 20.

(14) Apud Aulum Gellium, *lib. xi, cap. iv, pag. m.* 286.

(15) Plautus, in Pſeudolo, *Act.* II, *Sc.* III, *ver.* 12.

We

(*c*) *Taken from* Melch. Adam. in Vitis Theol. *pag.* 70, & *ſeq.*

(*d*) Micrælius, in Syntagm. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. *pag. m.* 778.

(*e*) Melch. Adam. ibid. *pag.* 74.

---

true, that, according to the degree of favour in which every one ſtands with that goddeſs, ſo ſhall he be reckoned to excel, and by that do we all meaſure the dimenſions of his underſtanding.

Shall I quote theſe fine words of Pliny the younger? ‘ Quàm multum intereſt, quid à quoque fiat, eadem ‘ enim facta claritate vel obſcuritate facientium, aut ‘ tolluntur altiſſime, aut humillime deprimuntur (16). ‘ - - - *It is of great conſequence who the perſon is that* ‘ *does a thing, ſince the very ſame actions are exceedingly cried up, or run down, according to the fame* ‘ *or obſcurity of the doers.*’ Shall I quote an hundred other authorities of the ſame force? No; I omit all thoſe common topics, and ſhall only obſerve, that if Regius had diſputed againſt a Prieſt at Ingolſtad, in quite different circumſtances from the diſpute of Augſburg; if he had been in chains, &c. and if the Prieſt had ſat on a cuſhion among the Senators, &c. this affair would have ended with Regius's baniſhment, or ſomething worſe. He had been looked upon as a caviller, who wreſted the Holy Scriptures; and the Prieſt had been admired as a faithful interpreter of the word of God.

[*D*] *The duke of Brunſwic had a very great eſteem for him.*] Being aſked, whether he had bought at Augſburg any thing of great value, and of a new faſhion, as the other princes had done, he anſwered, *I have brought an incomparable treaſure, which will be of great uſe to my ſtates, and which I prefer to all delights* (17). He meant Regius. And when, in the year 1535, the city of Augſburg requeſted of him that he would reſtore them that Divine, he declared that he would as ſoon part with his eyes as with him (18). He gave him large penſions, and the ſuperintendency of all the churches in his territories (19).

[*E*] *He wrote ſeveral books.*] They have been collected into three volumes; the two firſt contain what he publiſhed in Latin, and the other what he wrote in High-Dutch (20). This laſt has been tranſlated into Latin, if I am not miſtaken, for I find in the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library, *Vita & Opera* (Urbani Regii) *Latine reddita per Erneſt. Regium.* Norib. 1562. Melchior Adam obſerves, that ERNESTUS REGIUS, the author's ſon, collected all thoſe works, and publiſhed them at Nuremberg, divided into ſeveral volumes. He mentions particularly the book, in which our Urban had collected the harſh phraſes, and thoſe that are polite. The firſt are only proper to ſow diſcord, and the latter to promote piety and concord. Prince Erneſt of Brunſwic put him upon making that collection, which was an inſtance of his prudence and piety; for blunt and ſharp expreſſions are like the teeth of Cadmus's dragon, a ſeed of war among brethren. This is Melchior Adam's reflexion. *Exſtat inter alia liber ejus in quo annotatæ ſunt* horridiores formæ loquendi: *& monſtrantur* propriæ ac concinnæ, *utiles pietati ac concordiæ. Has admonitiones ſcribi princeps Erneſtus Lunæburgicus voluit: qua in re ſapientiam & pietatem ejus agnoſcimus. Ut enim ex dentibus draconis, in Cadmæa hiſtoria, nata eſt ſoboles armatorum inter ſe dimicantium: ſic ex improprio ſermone diſſidia opinionum in docentibus & in populo naſcuntur* (21). This is little minded by the compoſers of Formularies, when they are more devout than judicious, or more paſſionate and vain than truly devout, they are perfect ſtrangers to prudence and moderation, they applaud themſelves for their ſeverity (22). Note, That John Freder, of Pomerania, publiſhed a work of Regius, after his death, intituled, *Loci Theologici ex Patribus & Scholaſticis neotericiſque collecti* (23).

[*F*] *He died . . . in the ſame manner as he had often wiſhed.*] He was not ſick above three hours, and he had all along wiſhed not to die of a long ſickneſs (24). *Nactus eſt genus mortis, quale ſæpè in votis habuit; citum & placidum; cum ſemper deprecaretur diuturnos languores & longas morborum periodos* (25). He is not the only man, who has wiſhed for ſuch a death, and to whom it has happened according to his wiſhes (26).

[*G*] *A remark upon the names of that Miniſter.*] The name of his family was *King*; but finding it too lofty, and knowing that it would occaſion ſeveral jeſts, he changed it into that of *Regius* (27). As for the name *Urban*, it was given him when he was chriſtened, becauſe the women, who carried him to church, could not tell the name his mother had a mind he ſhould have. She deſired he ſhould be chriſtened by the name of the ſaint that was marked in the calendar on the day he was born. The good women forgot it as they went: the curate finding they were uncertain about it, told them that St Urban's day was near: which was the reaſon why he was called *Urban*. I ſhall obſerve occaſionally, that among all nations there are many families, who bear the name of a dignity as king, prince, duke, marquis, count, baron, &c. They ſeldom think of changing it, tho' it affords continually matter for ſilly jeſts and childiſh alluſions. But I believe our Lutheran Doctor is not the only one, who diſguiſed his name, to avoid ſuch an inconveniency. There are ſome men every where, whoſe name is *Regis* or *Regius*; a diſguiſed name, if I am not miſtaken, for the reaſon I have mentioned. I have ſaid, in another place (28), that I wonder that thoſe families who have an odious or ridiculous name, did not leave it: and I add here, that there are ſome who have not now the obſcene name which they had formerly. Read theſe words of Menage (29): ‘ HAUTECLAIR. The name of a ‘ family. That name was given in Henry the ſecond's ‘ time to a Maſter of the Requeſts, named Couillard, ‘ upon a pleaſant occaſion. That Maſter of the Re‘queſts went often to the Louvre. One day, as he ‘ was knocking at the door of the king's or queen's ‘ cloſet, the uſhers aſked him his name, but he durſt ‘ not tell it plainly, becauſe of it's obſcenity. The ‘ uſhers not underſtanding him, or pretending not ‘ to underſtand him, bad him tell his name *haut &* ‘ *clair* (plainly and clearly) which occaſioned his be‘ing called afterwards *Hauteclair*. I have this ſtory ‘ from Mr du Puy, he had it from Thuanus, who, in ‘ the eighth book of his hiſtory, pag. 262, of the ‘ Geneva edition, mentions that change of name, ‘ only by the by. *Negotium datum P. Altoclaro, Li*‘*bellorum Supplicum Magiſtro, qui pudendo alio cognomine* ‘ *indigetabatur, ut negotium Regium*, &c.’ He ſaid, in his firſt edition of his *Origines*, that *the Beauharnois of Orleans have alſo changed their name of Beauvit, becauſe of it's obſcenity into that of Beauharnois*; but in the ſecond edition he ſays it is a meer ſtory.

EXAMINATION of an objection drawn from the prohibition of changing family names.

I foreſee, that thoſe, who ſhall remember a remark of Mr de Vigneul Marville, when they come to read what I have ſaid in the article of the friar Feuardentius, will object to me that I ſhould not have wondered that people do not leave their ridiculous or odious names. They will maintain that they have not the liberty to do it, and they will alledge theſe words of the *Mélange de Hiſtoire & de Literature* (30): *As for what Mr de la Roque ſays, that ſince the ordinance of Amboiſe of the twenty-ſixth of March,* 1555, *none is allowed to change his name, without the king's permiſſion; it ought to be obſerved, that a long time before that ordinance no body changed his name without being authorized for it.* Mr de Vigneul Marville proves by the example of the Barber of Lewis XI, and ſets down the words of that prince's patent, whereby he commands that Oliver le Mauvais (the wicked) who was his Barber, *and his poſterity be, for the time to come, ſir-*

---

(16) Plin. Epiſt. XXIV, *lib. vi.*

(17) Allatum eſſe à ſe theſaurum toti Ducatui incomparabilem quem omnibus anteponat deliciis. *Melch. Adam. ibid. p.* 78.

(18) Perinde ut oculos ita & Urbanum ſe amittere nolle. *Ibid.*

(19) Ibid. *pag.* 79.

(20) Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *pag. m.* 778.

(21) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 79, 80.

(22) But note, that general terms, and ſuch as are uſed out of condeſcenſion, are ſometimes uſeleſs. See, above, remark [*G*], of the article MUSCULUS.

(23) Melch. Adam. ubi ſupra, *pag.* 80.

(24) Ibid. *pag.* 79.

(25) Ibid.

(26) See the article VALLA (GEORGE).

(27) Majores ejus Regum cognomine inſignes fuerunt: ſed cum id ſublime & jocis aptum ex rege regius factus eſt ut ipſe dictitare ſolitus. *Melch. Adam. ibid. pag.* 70.

(28) In the article FEUARDENTIUS, remark [*A*].

(29) Menage, Origines de la Langue Françoiſe, *pag.* 395, *Edit.* 1694.

(30) Vigneul Marville, Mêlang. *Tom. i, pag.* 259, *of the firſt edition of Rouën.*

We cannot doubt, after having well examined ſeveral places (*f*) of his books, that he was of opinion we ſhould pray for the dead.

(*f*) *They may be ſeen in the* Calvino Turciſmus, *lib. iv, cap. viii, pag. m.* 840, *& ſeq.*

named le Dain . . . . and that it ſhall not be lawful for any body whatſoever to call them by the ſaid ſirname le Mauvais ; which name we have taken from them and aboliſhed, and do actually take away and aboliſh by theſe preſents. This patent is dated in October 1474, and was regiſtred in the parliament of Paris the 30th of January 1474 (31). If thoſe who make this objection againſt me, think it ſolid, they do not know how to judge well of things. I anſwer in the firſt place, that the expreſſion I made uſe of ought to be underſtood as this, *I wonder that looſe and debauched people are not afraid of the prejudice they do to their health and reputation.* Theſe words, tho' ſpoken in the preſent tenſe, do nevertheleſs take in paſt ages as well as that in which they are ſpoken ; and therefore my way of expreſſing myſelf to ſhew that I wonder that people did not part with odious or ridiculous names, concerns no leſs the time which preceded the ordinances mentioned by Mr de la Roque (32), than the time that followed it. Now it is certain that before that ordinance was made, ſome people parted with their names, or changed and diſguiſed them. Mr de la Roque (33), quotes Mr Menage, who ſays, *that William le Rat, being diſpleaſed, as it is thought, with his name, which is that of a noxious animal, ſirnamed himſelf Leſrat* ; and that *John Dorat, Regius Profeſſor of the Greek tongue, changed his name of Diſnemandy . . . which was the ancient name of his family, into that of Dorat or Daurat.* It were an abſurd thing to pretend that they had the king's permiſſion for it. Mr de Vigneul Marville does not ſay ſo. *I am apt to believe*, ſays he, (34), *that before the ordinance of Amboiſe, ſeveral perſons took upon themſelves to change their names, without having recourſe to the king, and perhaps the Phyſician named Sanſmalice* (without malice) *changed his name into that of Akakia, without a patent from Francis I; but then it was a mere tranſlation of a French word into a Greek one.* Thus the ſame author, whom they would alledge againſt me, acknowledges that people changed their names, notwithſtanding the patent of Lewis XI; and indeed we ought to believe that it was drawn up for his Barber, not that he might be permitted to change the name of his family, but that people ſhould not continue to call him by that name. He was very much hated in the kingdom, and conſequently people would have taken pleaſure in croſſing his deſign of parting with a name that he was aſhamed of. This was the motive of that patent : it did not therefore ſerve as a rule in many other caſes, in which the public was not concerned. Now if under pretence of a Greek tranſlation, one might, without any danger, ſubſtitute the name *Akakia* to that of *Sanſmalice* ; much more was it lawful to ſubſtitute one name in the room of another, when the difference between thoſe two names conſiſted only in the inſertion, tranſpoſition, or omiſſion, of ſome letters. 2. I ſay, that experience is on my ſide, ſince many famous authors have taken a new name, without being authorized by the prince to do it (35). 3. I add that it is likely the ordinance of the 26th of March before Eaſter 1555, tended only to prevent the uſurpations of the nobility, or ſome other fraud, and therefore when a man had no other deſign than that of Regius, he was not reſtrained by that ordinance. 4. I further ſay, that probably it was not better obſerved, than that of the ſtates of Blois, in the year 1579, whereby *all gentlemen were forbidden to ſign any act and contract with any other name but that of their family, upon the penalty of being made void. . . . That article has not proved ſo effectual as it was expected ; for many people, inſtead of obſerving it, have formally acted againſt it ; which I have obſerved in the authentic and public acts, ſays Mr de la Roque* (36). 5. And laſtly, I anſwer, that if the ordinance of Amboiſe was well obſerved, one might nevertheleſs wonder that people do not part with their odious or ridiculous names, becauſe they may obtain the king's permiſſion (37), if they will aſk for it ; and we find among other inſtances in Mr de la Roque's book, that James Miette [Crumb] a mean and comical name, and ſuch as may occaſion many ſilly jeſts, *had a patent from Henry IV, in March* 1603 . . . *which permitted him to change his name into that of Lauberie* (38). See the Bigarrures of *des Accords*, Lib. IV. cap. ii. and Baillet, *Auteurs deguiſez*, chap. V and VI ; we are told in the *Menagiana* that Father Commire's name was Commere [Goſſip].

(31) If Mr de Vigneul Marville had remembred that the year began then at Eaſter, he would not have ſaid, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 260, that the date is faulty, theſe letters of October 1474, not having been regiſtred till the year following.

(32) Gilles Andrew de la Roque, Sieur de la Lontiere, Traité de l'origine des Noms, *pag.* 182.

(33) Ibid. *pag.* 96.

(34) Vigneul Marville, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 260.

(35) See the ſpeech of Majoragius, cited above, in the remark [*E*] of his article. See alſo the remark [*A*], of the article PAREUS (David).

(36) La Roque's Diſcourſe on the origin of Names.

(37) La Roque, ibid. *pag.* 182.

(38) Ibid.

REIHING (James), profeſſor of Divinity at Tubingen, was born at Augſburg in the year 1579, of one of thoſe ancient families called *Patrician.* He performed his ſtudies at Ingolſtad, and his maſters were very much pleaſed with the progreſs he made in them (*a*). Having attained the age in which the ancient Romans had the *Toga Virilis* given them, he made a vow to take the habit of a Jeſuit, if he ſhould recover of a dangerous ſickneſs that he laboured under. He recovered, and performed his vow, though his mother oppoſed it (*b*). He made his noviciate at Landſberg (*c*), and became afterwards very famous in his order. He taught claſſical learning at Inſpruc, and Philoſophy and Divinity at Ingolſtad ; which he did with ſo good ſucceſs, that the General Aquaviva thought him worthy to be made Doctor of Divinity. He was promoted to this degree at Dillingen (*d*) ; and from that time he found himſelf poſſeſſed with a new zeal for the defence of the church of Rome : ſo that his ſuperiors appointed him Aulic preacher to Wolfgang-William duke of Newburg, who had then forſaken the Proteſtant religion [*A*], and they charged him to write againſt that religion. He ſtudied night and day

(*a*) He ſtudied in the college of the Jeſuits.

(*b*) *Taken from* Spizelius, in Templo Honoris, *pag.* 93, 94.

(*c*) Rauſcherus, in Laud. funebri Reihingi, apud Witte, Memor. Theol. *pag.* 897.

(*d*) Ibid. *pag.* 898.

[*A*] *The duke of Newburg who had then forſaken the Proteſtant religion.*] Martin Rauſcherus, who made Reihing's funeral oration, ſays nothing that may induce us to believe that this Jeſuit contributed to make the duke of Newburg change his religion. Theophilus Spizelius (1), and Father Alegambe (2), are alſo ſilent about it. Thoſe three authors only ſay, that ſoon after this prince had changed his religion, Father Reihing was made his preacher. Nevertheleſs ſome writers affirm, that this Jeſuit was the converter of the duke of Newburg, and prevailed with him by worldly intereſts. Here are the words of a Journaliſt in the extract of one of Mr Leti's books (3). ' The ' princes of the houſe of Newburg were formerly Pro' teſtants ; but a Jeſuit, whoſe name was James Rei' hing found the way to make one of them change ' his religion, by ſome weighty political reaſons, ' which may be ſeen in the author *. But what is ſur' prizing, the converter himſelf embraced afterwards ' the Proteſtant religion, to repair in ſome meaſure ' the breach he had made in it, by ſeparating the ' duke of Newburg from its body. The abbot Paci' chelli, and Baccati, ſecretary to the then Pope's ' nuncio at Cologne, who are quoted by our author, ' aſcribe this change to an *occulto giudicio di Dio* ; - - - ' *a ſecret judgment from God* ; but the Proteſtants may ' eaſily apprehend, that a man who ſtudies contro' verſy, may change his opinions, and believe that ' the Proteſtants are in the right ; as a prince from a ' Proteſtant turns Catholic out of intereſt. The one is ' not more miraculous than the other ; and there is ' no reaſon to ſay on this occaſion as one in the *Filli* ' *di Sciro :*

(1) In Elogio Reihingii, in Templo Honoris reſerato.

(2) In Biblioth. Script. Societ. *pag.* 209.

(3) Biblioth. Univerſ. *Tom. xiv, pag.* 24, *in the extract of the 2d part of the* Ritratti hiſtorici, overo hiſtoria dell' Imperio Romano in Germania, ſcritta da Gregorio Leti.

* *Pag.* 162.

day for arguments to overthrow the confeſſion of the Lutherans; but becauſe his adverſaries alledged continually the Scripture againſt him, he thought himſelf obliged to conſult that holy book, and to keep to it, in order to draw from thence, if poſſible, ſuch arms as he wanted to maintain that combat. This ſtudy made him ſenſible that he defended an ill cauſe, and therefore he quitted his employment, and retired to the court of Wirtemberg [*B*], where he embraced Lutheraniſm. He was made profeſſor of Divinity at Tubingen, preacher in ordinary, and director of a college. He diſcharged the duties of thoſe places with great capacity, and publiſhed ſome books that met with a good reception. The Jeſuits made uſe of promiſes and allurements of every ſort to bring him back again [*C*], but all was in vain; he deſpiſed their flatteries, as well as the ſlanders which

Le vie de gli Dei
Sono oſcure & ritorte:
Ch'il crederebbe? in ſomma
E il cielo un Laberinto, in cui ſi perde
Chiunque va per iſpiarne i fati.

The ways of God are dark and intricate:
Strange thing indeed! which ne'ertheleſs is true.
Heav'n is in ſhort a labyrinth where he,
Who ſeeks to ſcan the myſteries of fate,
Is puzzled and bewilder'd. - - - -

[*B*] *He retired to the court of Wirtemberg.*] Spizelius is guilty of a great omiſſion; for he does not mention the year of his retreat. This fault has not been committed in Reihing's funeral oration; but the Printers of the Sieur Witte have ſo much falſified that date, that it can be of no uſe to me. They ſay, that Reihing having made his eſcape from the duke of Newburg's court, came to that of Wirtemberg in the beginning of the year 1601 (4). They left out, without doubt, *vigeſimi*; for I find in another author (5) that he privately withdrew from the duke of Newburg the 5th of January 1620, and went to that prince's mother at Hochſtett, and from thence to Ulm, and then to Stutgard, and at laſt to Tubingen, where he abjured Popery, and preached about the motives of his converſion the ſecond of January 1621. I find here ſome confuſion, when I compare Paul Freherus's narrative with that of Rauſcherus; for according to the latter, the new comer was examined a whole week, and then was ſent to Tubingen, where his name was regiſtered in the book of the rector of the univerſity. If he arrived at Stutgard in the beginning of January, and if he underwent there an examination that laſted a week, before he ſet out for Tubingen, as Rauſcherus affirms, he did not preach at Tubingen on the motives of his converſion on the 2d of January, as Freherus affirms. I believe there are two errors of the Preſs in Freherus's account; and that in order to rectify them, it muſt be ſaid that Reihing left the court of the duke of Newburg the 5th of January 1621, and preached at Tubingen the 22d of January in the ſame year. Do not wonder at the long examination he was obliged to undergo. The Proteſtants miſtruſt a Jeſuit very much, and the condition they were in at that time in Germany, made ſuch a miſtruſt neceſſary. Beſides, it is a very rare thing to ſee a famous Jeſuit quit his order to turn Proteſtant; and therefore ſuch a rarity is looked upon as a kind of prodigy, and is thought to deſerve a careful examination, to diſcover whether it be a good preſage, or the forerunner of ſome evil. The duke of Wirtemberg being informed that Father Reihing was come to change his religion, convened his Divines, and ordered them to examine him well. They perſonated the Catholics, and for a whole week propoſed to that Father the difficulties that are objected againſt the Proteſtants. He anſwered them in ſuch a manner as ſhewed that he had very carefully compared the two religions. *Juro vobis Auditores: toto illo, quo res ſeriò utrinque acta eſt, octiduo, ea in omnibus, & quidem cardinalibus fidei noſtræ articulis deprompſit & exhibuit fundamenta, ut neminem non in admirationem ſui converteret: Sacræ etiam Scripturæ teſtimonia, quibus noſtrorum ſententia firmari ſolet, ita in numerato habebat, ita illi præcipui textus erant in mundo* (6), *ac ſi totam ætatem in ſcholis noſtris inſumpſiſſet. Quæ profectò non rudem & novitium, ſed aliquem in hac militia veteranum arguebant* (7). After he had undergone ſuch a trial, he was thought worthy of adoption, and they ſpoke to him the word of Priamus to Sinon (8). ‘Soluto conventu lætum ex aula carmen accipit.

Quiſquis es, amiſſos hinc jam obliviſcere Graios:
Noſter eris (9). - - -

‘*When the meeting was ended, the court ſaluted him with this joyful ſong;*

- - - - - - - *Diſmiſs thy fears,*
Forget the Greeks, be mine as thou wert theirs.

[*C*] *The Jeſuits made uſe of promiſes and allurements of every ſort to bring him back again.*] The more the Proteſtants gloried in the converſion of ſo famous a man, the more the Jeſuits were ſorry for the loſs of him. He had acquired the eſteem of the ſociety by his good life, eloquence, and learning (10); and therefore the whole order was afflicted at his change of religion, and they left no ſtone unturned to regain him. Father Keller promiſed him all ſorts of advantages, and a full liberty of returning to the Jeſuits, or of being a Canon, or of living a ſecular life. He gave him a *carte blanche*, and engaged his word that his ſuperiors would ratify whatever he ſhould promiſe him. *Quam lautas ille* (Kellerus) *fecit pollicitationes? quam pingues conditiones & propter quas vel vadimonium deſeri poſſet, Reihingo obtulit? videlicet optionem illi permiſerat, utrum in Lojolæ familia manere, an verò in Canonicum aut Laicum ſe componere eligeret: dummodo ad ſinum Romanæ Eccleſiæ rediret. Proferebat hanc in rem chartam puram, quam Itali biancam vocant, cui inſcriberet, quicquid animo collibitum eſſet ſuo: nec de approbatione Superiorum dubitaret* (11). Conrad Reihing, a Jeſuit, who was rector of a college at Augſburg, and brother to our Reihing, wrote to him continually, and exhorted him to return into the boſom of the church (12); ſeveral other Jeſuits did the ſame. Chriſtopher Grenzing, his provincial, was the firſt who endeavoured to bring him back; he promiſed him that the ſociety would be merciful to him. *Quid dicam de literis Chriſtophori Grenzing Provincialis, qui primus ex omnibus à fuga illum retrahere tentavit cum hoc monito: quod* Societas redeunti viſcera miſerationis & benignitatis recludat (13)? Even Mutius Vitelleſchi, general of the Jeſuits, took care to let him know, with a thouſand proteſtations of ſincerity, that he would be received with open arms, and that he would not be dealt with as Marc Antony de Dominis had been, but in a moſt cordial manner. Reihing did not truſt to thoſe promiſes, or rather he was ſo fully perſuaded that the church of Rome was not a good church, that he perſevered conſtantly in the Proteſtant religion. The Jeſuit, George Stengelius, confeſſed in ſome printed pieces, that the loſs of ſuch a man was very prejudicial to the ſociety. *Nec diſſimulavit hoc ipſum Georgius Stengelius, qui in ſcriptis ſuis hactenus publicatis, non uno loco conqueritur,* ingens diſceſſione Reihingi Societati ſuæ vulnus eſſe inflictum (14). There is ſcarce any religious order that has afforded fewer proſelytes to the Proteſtants, than that which Reihing quitted: This conſideration increaſed the ſorrow of the Jeſuits inſtead of leſſening it. The following words will ſhew you how much the Proteſtants triumphed on account of ſuch a ſingularity. ‘(15) Quod quidem factum, ‘quàm illuſtre, quàm admirabile, quàm inſperatum ‘rarumque nobis acciderit, ne commonere quidem vos ‘opus eſt. Clericum Regularem, & Societatis Ignatianæ Patrem ad caſtra tranſire Evangelicorum, contra quos hactenus omni impetu ſteterat: ſive ut latinè dicam, *Jeſuitam fieri Lutheranum*, res eſt imprimis memorabilis, & in tabulas æternitatis referenda which they ſpread againſt him [*D*]. He fell ſick of a Dropſy in the ſixth year of his converſion,

---

(4) Venerat ſub auſpicium ineuntis anni ſupra milleſimum ſexcenteſimum primi in aulam. *Martinus Rauſcherus, in Laudat. funebri Reihingi, apud Witte, Memor. Theolog. p.* 903.

(5) Paul. Freherus, in Theatr. Virorum illuſtr. *pag.* 431.

(6) A phraſe of Plautus, of the ſame import, with *in numerato*, or *in promptu*.

(7) Martinus Rauſcherus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 903.

(8) Virgil. Æneid. lib. ii, ver. 148.

(9) Rauſcherus, ibid. *pag.* 905.

(10) See the fragment of a letter of the Jeſuit John Agricola, chaplain to the count de Tilli in the army: I ſay, ſee that fragment in *Oratione funebri Reihingi, apud Witte, Memor. Theolog. pag.* 898, 899.

(11) Rauſcherus, ibid. apud Witte, *pag.* 912.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 913.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 899.

(15) Ibid. *pag.* 904.

‘ renda. Res, cujus prædicatio, multorum adhuc ſeculorum ingenia, ipſamque poſteritatis memoriam fatigabit. Res, quam nemo hodie (16) aut fando acceperit, aut oculorum fide fuerit arbitratus. - - - *I need not tell you how great and admirable, nor how ſingular and unexpected this event is. That a regular Prieſt, a Father of the Ignatian ſociety, ſhould retire to the camp of the* Evangelicans, *whom he had hitherto oppoſed with all his might: or, to ſpeak in plainer language,* that a Jeſuit ſhould turn Lutheran, *is a thing highly remarkable and worthy of eternal record: a thing, the praiſe of which ſhall fatigue the genius's of many ages to come, and even tire the remembrance of poſterity: a thing which never any man had either heard or ſeen before.*’ France has afforded very few ſuch examples: there was one in the year 1647, when Jarrige turned Proteſtant.

[*D*] *He deſpiſed . . . . the ſlanders that were ſpread againſt him.*] They publiſhed ſome verſes againſt him in the German language, wherein he was horribly defamed, and ſome letters were diſperſed in the towns and courts of Germany, to repreſent him as a profligate man. They called him a paraſite, who had preferred good chear and good wine to a pious and ſolitary life: they charged him with having been a great courtier to the ladies, and they pretended he had been ſo much in love with a maid, that he debauched and got her with child: they added, that the ſwelling of her belly having diſcovered her crime, he ran away to avoid infamy and puniſhment. *Circumvolitarunt vernacula lingua infames rythmi, & calumnioſæ literæ, aulas, urbes, oppida pernicioſiſſime pererrarunt. Narrarunt aulæ Palatinæ paraſitum: gynæcei aſſeclam: argenteos orbes, exquiſita fercula, & liquorem illius Dei, qui olim Indos expugnavit, præ lectione, præ oratione, præ ſolitudine amaſſe: vitæ cœlibis quietem deliciis prætuliſſe: Floræ & Veneris, non Societatis Sacerdotem fuiſſe: ſalacitatis libidine pruriiſſe: ſpecioſam puellam impudice deperiiſſe: inclinaſſe virginem, & infami compreſſu gravidaſſe: cumque illa uteri bulgam plus æquo intumeſcentem celare non poſſet, deſerto vadimonio, mali facinoris infamiam, & pœnas metuentem erupiſſe* (17). Reihing confuted thoſe ſlanders by a fine apology, which he ſent to the court of Wirtemberg (18). There happened a thing which proclaimed his innocence. The duke of Bavaria ſent three deputies to that court, to wit, Henry de Stein, the Civilian Faber, and Father Keller, a Jeſuit and Rector of the college of Munich. They had orders to demand that this deſerter ſhould be delivered up to them, and they enumerated all the crimes that were laid to his charge. The duke of Wirtemberg anſwered them, that if Reihing was guilty of thoſe crimes, they might juridically proceed againſt him, and that he would appoint ſome upright judges to try him without any partiality; but that if the proſelyte was innocent, juſtice and equity required that he ſhould be allowed to live quietly in the profeſſion of that religion, which ſeemed the beſt to him (19). If it ſhould happen, added the duke, that my two preachers ſhould quit their religion, I would not ſtir out of my chamber upon ſuch an account. ‘*Subjunxit hoc mantiſſæ loco generoſiſſimus Princeps.* Quod ſi fors hodie eveniret, utrumque Aulæ meæ Concionatorem à Religione ſua deficere: eorum cauſa, ne pedem quidem unicum extra limen promoverem (20).’ Father Keller had at that time a conference with Reihing, and reproached him with thoſe irregularities, which had occaſioned ſo many ſongs and ſatirical letters. Reihing vindicated himſelf upon all thoſe heads, and even took an oath for his juſtification in the preſence of the three deputies of the duke of Bavaria. ‘(21) Memores reſponſi iſtius, quod tibi comitibuſque tuis, in præſentia virorum honoratiſſimorum, manu pectori admota, & ſublatis in cœlum oculis catapultæ inſtar retorſit. *Ego*, inquiebat ille, *in conſpectu Cæleſtis illius Arbitri hic conſiſto, qui quæ nos gerimus, auditque & videt. Coram divina ejus Majeſtate agnoſco me peccatorum non infimum; ſed hunc teſtem invoco, vacare me culpa omnium, quæ imputantur, probrorum: fallentem vindicet, qui nunquam fallitur.* - - - *Bearing in mind that anſwer which like an engine he darted back upon you and your companions in the preſence of a very honourable company, laying his hand upon his breaſt, and lifting his eyes towards heaven.* I ſtand, *ſaid he*, in the ſight of that Heavenly Judge, who both hears and ſees what we do. Before him I acknowledge that I am none of the leaſt of ſinners: but I call the ſame God to witneſs that I am intirely innocent of all thoſe crimes which are laid to my charge; and may he, who never is deceived, puniſh me if I tell a lie.’ Keller having not been able to prevail with his old fellow Jeſuit, retired and told him, *Eve has been the occaſion of your fall.* His meaning was, that the deſire of marrying had induced Reihing to renounce his order and Popery. All the accuſations were at laſt reduced to this; the other vaniſhed away; but they obſtinately maintained that love was the only motive that had made him embrace the Proteſtant religion. They added, that after he had married, and got many children, he found himſelf ſo clogged, that he wanted courage to return into the boſom of the church, and departed this world to go into hell. This is what Alegambe reproaches him with. *Prolapſus in turpes amores, ordinem, fidemque transfuga deſeruit, factus errorum magiſter: ducta dein domum pellice pro uxore, ſuſceptis compluribus liberis, ita miſer implicatus eſt, ut ad veritatis confeſſionem redire non ſuſtineret. Sic in æternam mortem occubuit* (22). This is a common place ſo trivial and ſo much worn out, that I wonder people are not weary of making uſe of it. It has been turned a thouſand different ways, and ſome paſſionate men have choſen to alledge it againſt the Proteſtants in general, rather than againſt the Proſelytes. They ſay, that the firſt thing the Proteſtants do in favour of a Monk or Prieſt, who embraces their religion, is to procure him a wife; it is the cement wherewith they incorporate him into their ſect, and make him conſtantly adhere to it (23). They know that ſuch birds of prey cannot be better allured or tamed, than by ſuch a bit of fleſh. What a groſs fancy is this! I only mention it as an inſtance of the brutiſhneſs of ſome controverſiſts. *Quinetiam auſim dicere eos ſtudioſiùs multò laborare in quærenda quamprimùm, & fucati conjugii glutino alliganda unicuique transfugæ concubina, quàm in indaganda vitæ præteritæ ratione ac moribus. Illud quippe certò credunt non poſſe id genus accipitres vel efficaciùs accerſiri, vel meliùs cicurari, quàm ſi ejuſmodi carnis illicio ineſcentur* (24). Father Reihing had without doubt foreſeen that things would be brought to that paſs, and that he would be expoſed to ſuch railleries, if he ſhould marry; but he overcame that fear, and had a greater regard for the doctrine of the apoſtle of the Gentiles, who will have the biſhop to marry, and who reckons the prohibition of marriage among the doctrines of the Devil. He therefore married the next year, and choſe in his native country a wife whom he had never ſeen (25). She was a choice woman, and of a very good family, handſome, ſober, and adorned with all virtues. *Altero, poſtquam in hanc urbem venit, anno, cùm Tarſenſis Apoſtoli mandatum animo ſecum verſaret,* quo EPISCOPUM unius Uxoris Virum eſſe juſſit, *& quo nomine ipſe ille Gentium Doctor doctrinam matrimonio interdicentium appellaret, animum ad conjugium appulit, exemploque ſuo vetus illud Euripidis comprobavit:* Fatalem viro fœminæque torum eſſe (26).

Obſerve, that Reihing and the author of his funeral oration, explain the words of St Paul as a precept: they pretend that the Apoſtle commands the Miniſters of the Goſpel to marry, and to take but one wife. This would be certainly the meaning of St Paul's words, if they were underſtood literally, that is, according to the rules of Grammar; for the terms, which denote the marriage of the biſhop with one wife, are as much governed by the word *muſt* (27), as thoſe that denote the biſhop's blameleſs life, ſobriety, prudence, gravity, modeſty, equity, moderation, and unintereſtedneſs. As therefore it were abſurd to pretend that St Paul leaves it to the liberty of the Miniſters to be ſober, modeſt, blameleſs, &c. or not; ſo it is abſurd to pretend that he leaves it to their choice to marry a wife, or to marry none; I ſay, this is abſurd, if we ſtick to the literal ſenſe, and if we ſuppoſe that St Paul did actually obſerve Grammatical rules. I do not mean a rigorous exactneſs, such as is obſerved in the articles of a Treaty of Peace, wherein all the expreſſions are narrowly conſidered, to prevent the abuſes that might ariſe from an equivocation, or the omiſſion of

A REFLEXION on St Paul's words, wherein he ſeems to command the biſhops to marry.

---

(16) This author had, without doubt, forgot the converſion of Haſenmullerus: I have mentioned it in the article JARRIGE, remark [*E*].

(17) Rauſcherus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 905.

(18) Ib. *p.* 906.

(19) Si hæc crimina, quorum reum poſtularent, deferrentque, veritate niterentur: fas eſſe, & poteſtatem ipſis in Aula adverſus eum lege ac judicio experiri: habituros judicem neutri parti obnoxium, ſed ex æquo & bono jus dicentem. Sin autem, &c. *Ibid. p.* 908.

(20) Ibid.

(21) Ib. *p.* 906. This is an apoſtrophe of the Orator to Father Keller.

(22) Alegambe, *ubi ſupra.* Note, that Southwell has wholly ſuppreſſed the article of James Reihing.

(23) Compare with this the New Letters againſt Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, *p.* 497, 498.

(24) Jacobus Gualterius, Tabula Chronographica, *Sæc. XI, cap. vi, p. m.* 636.

(25) *Her name was Mary Velſer, and ſhe was the daughter of Felix Velſer.* Morum & virtutum & formæ ornamentis conſpicua lectiſſimaque Virgo. *Rauſcherus, ubi ſupra, p.* 909.

(26) Ibid.

(27) Δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι, μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα, νηφάλαιον, σώφρονα, &c. Oportet ergo Epiſcopum irreprehenſibilem eſſe, unius uxoris virum, ſobrium, prudentem, &c. *I. ad Timoth. cap. iii, ver.* 2.

converſion, and was ſuffocated by a catarrh ſome time after (*e*) [*E*]. New lies were ſpread concerning his death [*F*]. I ſhall give you the catalogue of his writings [*G*].

of a particle. Neither do I mean the rigid exactneſs of thoſe ſcrupulous pedantic Grammarians, who had rather ſpend three hours in mending a period, than let it paſs with ſome careleſsneſs. I mean a method of explaining ones ſelf clearly and diſtinctly, as a man of ſenſe would do in a letter to a tutor, containing ſome directions. If he ſhould write to him, *I will have my children to ſay their prayers twice a day, to go to church twice a week, to forbear ſwearing and quarrelling, to be dutiful to their mother, and to go every Monday to the play-houſe*, he would take all theſe ſeveral things as ſo many injunctions; he would not think that it is left to his diſcretion to carry his pupils every Monday to the play-houſe, or not: For in ſuch a caſe, he muſt ſuppoſe that there is no connexion between theſe words, *I will*, and *to go to the play-houſe*; and that the father of his pupils made uſe of another verb, as to this laſt thing, and ſaid for inſtance, *and I give you leave to carry them to the play-houſe every Monday*. It muſt be therefore granted, that if a Sophiſt ſhould obſtinately maintain, that whatever St Paul ſays concerning the qualifications of a biſhop is obligatory, it would be no eaſy thing to confute him; and that one would be obliged to beg of him not to take it ill, that one ſhould depart from the Grammatical ſtrictneſs (28): ſince it is not likely that the Apoſtle deſigned to exclude from epiſcopacy, thoſe who would live a ſingle life, though they were endowed with all the talents requiſite for the performance of epiſcopacy. Which ſhews, that too ſcrupulous an adherence to the literal ſenſe of the Scripture, would very often prove the cauſe of many illuſions, and that there are many caſes in which the interpreters ought to remember the axiom, *ſummum jus ſumma injuria*. This ſhews at the ſame time, that we ought to do, not what the Apoſtles command, according to the Grammatical ſenſe, but what common ſenſe teaches us they intended to command. St Paul, according to the Grammatical rules, commands the biſhops to marry; but reaſon ſhews us, that he intended only to forbid them Polygamy. We muſt therefore ſtick to this. Reihing and others are in the wrong to find in St Paul's words an injunction to marry; they contain only a permiſſion: but their miſtake is much more excuſable than the intolerable boldneſs of forbidding Clergymen to marry. The Chriſtian people will never be able to juſtify before God, the baſe compliance wherewith they have permitted that the laws of St Paul ſhould be abrogated, though never ſo plain, clear, and intelligible. They have been ſeverely puniſhed for it, by the overflowing leudneſs wherewith their families have been polluted, and they are not yet free from it. I muſt obſerve by the by, that the Holy Scripture has been handled by the Chriſtians much after the ſame manner as Juſtinian's Code. They are well pleaſed when the common-law agrees with the written-law; but if the common-law ſerves their turn better than the written-law, they can very well diſpenſe with the want of conformity. Chriſtianity has not been for many ages a country governed by the written-law.

[*E*] *He was ſuffocated by a catarrh ſome time after.*] Here is a new omiſſion of Spizelius: he neither ſets down the day nor the year of Reihing's death. To ſupply that omiſſion, I ſhall obſerve that he departed this life the fifth of May, 1628 (29). He uſed to bathe according to the Phyſician's preſcription, and having lain down to take ſome reſt, he fell aſleep, and never awaked again. His panegyriſt calls it a happy death (30), ſuch as Auguſtus wiſhed for himſelf and his friends. *Ultimum maximumque mortalium votorum nactus*, ευθανασιαν, *quam ille orbis Regnator Auguſtus olim ſibi ſuiſque exoptavit* (31).

[*F*] *New lies were ſpread about his death.*] His death was reported before it happened; his dropſy was ſaid to be an effect of the Divine vengeance; his dying without receiving the communion, occaſioned ſeveral malicious reflexions; they maintained, that at the approach of his laſt hour he was cruelly tormented by the remorſes of his conſcience (32): laſtly, they gave out, that upon the point of death he had made a recantation in the preſence of his neighbours. It is expedient to obſerve theſe things, becauſe they ſhew the blindneſs and fury of human paſſions, which are the fruits of credulity and falſe zeal, and the plague and deſtruction of reaſon. ‘Vidimus volantes ‘è vicinia chartas, immò ab Allobrogibus uſque in ‘manus noſtras pervenerunt literæ, quæ eum in ſuprema vitæ meta poſitum, Evangelium ejeraſſe, & ‘in præſentia Vicinorum, ipſiuſque D. PREGITZERI palinodiam ceciniſſe loquerentur. O linguæ! ‘ô calami! ô animorum effrons nequitia! Pudor & ‘verecundia quò receſſiſtis? Aliter tu loqueris Reverende Pregitzere (33). ------ *We have ſeen papers ‘diſperſed from the neighbourhood; nay letters from the ‘ſouth of France have reached to us; all of them affirming that in his laſt hours he had abjured the Lutheran religion, and made a formal recantation before ‘his neighbours, and in the preſence of PREGITZER himſelf. O tongues! O pens! O brazen ‘wickedneſs! Shame and modeſty whither are ye fled? ‘You, O reverend Pregitzer, will give a quite different ‘account of things.*’

[*G*] *The catalogue of his writings.*] His firſt book was printed at Cologne in the year 1615, it was intituled *Muri civitatis ſanctæ*, hoc eſt *Fundamenta* XII *Religionis Catholicæ quibus inſiſtens Sereniſſimus Princeps Neoburgicus, Lutheraniſmo abdicato in Eccleſiam pedem intulit*. He was then a violent Papiſt. Balthazar Meiſnerus, Frabricius Baſſecourt, and Matthias Hoë wrote againſt him. *Meiſnerus è theſibus ſcalam centum & quadraginta gradus altam fabricavit, qua MUROS BABYLONIS ROMANÆ, ET CONFICTA PAPISTICÆ RELIGIONIS FUNDAMENTA demoliebatur. Baſſecourtus TUBA DEI armatus, AD SUBVERTENDOS MUROS Eccleſiæ Romanæ progreſſus, eos velut illa Hierichuntis mœnia uno clangore diſſlare & ſolo æquare eſt aggreſſus. Ultimus Matthias Hoë* Enchiridion *oppoſuit, in quo Romanæ fidei nebulæ clariſſima Scripturarum luce diſcutiebantur* (34). He publiſhed a reply to the two firſt, printed at Newburg in 1617. Here is the title of it: *Excubiæ Angelicæ Civitatis Sanctæ pro defenſione* XII *Fundamentorum Catholicorum Balthaſari Meiſnero præconi Lutherano, & Fabricio Baſſecourt, Tibicini Calviniano oppoſitæ*. His reply to Matthias Hoë was only publiſhed in the German language: here is the title of it expreſſed in Latin, *Enchiridium Catholicum Manuali D. Hoë oppoſitum.* Let us ſee the titles of the books he publiſhed, after he had embraced the confeſſion of Augſburg. *Laquei Pontificii contriti; quibus, adjuvante DOMINO, liberatus, Liberatori ſuo Ter Opt. Max. libenter meritò publicas gratias in Academia Tubingenſi dicere voluit.* Tubingæ 1622 *in* 4to. Germanicè, ibidem *eodem anno* in 4to. *Diſſertatio de vera Chriſti in terris Eccleſia, adverſus larvatum Jeſuitam Dillinganum:* ibid. 1622 in 4to. *Araneorum operæ, quas contra laqueos Pontificios contritos, texturam improbam ſuſpenderunt Georgius Stengelius, Simon Schaitenreiſſer, & Laur. Forerus, Stilo Reihingi dejectæ:* ibid. 1623 in 4to. *Apologeticus pro Diſſertatione ſua, de Eccleſia Chriſti:* ibid. 1624 *in* 4to. He publiſhed in the German language (35) a retractation of the book he had written againſt Matthias Hoë.

(*e*) *Taken from* Spizelius, in Templo Honoris reſerato, *pag.* 95, *& ſeq.*

(28) *Here one muſt apply the following rule*, Grammaticæ leges plerumque Eccleſia ſpernit.

(29) Rauſcherus, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 916. Micrælius, Syntagm. Hiſtor. Eccleſ. *p. m.* 778, *places his death wrong in the year* 1624.

(30) Compare this with remark [*F*], of the article REGIUS.

(31) Rauſcherus, ubi ſupra.

(32) Horrentis conſcientiæ morſibus mortalitatis lineæ jam vicinus infeſtari cœpit. *Ibid. pag.* 917.

(33) Ibid.

(34) Ibid. *pag.* 900.

(35) At Tubingen, in the year 1623.

REINESIUS (Thomas) one of the moſt learned men of the XVIIth century, was born at Gotha (*a*), a town of Thuringia in Germany, the thirteenth of December 1587 [*A*]. He was a Phyſician by profeſſion, but he applied himſelf very much to the ſtudy of the *Belles Lettres*, wherein he excelled moſt. He had already practiſed Phyſic in ſome other places (*b*), when he ſettled at Altenburg, to be the Phyſician of that town. He lived there ſeveral years, and was made Burgomaſter. At laſt, having been honoured with the dignity of Counſellor of State to the elector of Saxony, he went to reſide at Leipſic, where he died the fourteenth of February (*c*) 1667 (*d*). He had often refuſed to be a profeſſor, becauſe he was afraid his colleagues would prove intolerable [*B*], and it is very likely that if he had accepted of any ſuch employment, he would have had many quarrels; for he could not avoid falling out with a profeſſor of Leipſic,

[*A*] *He was born .... the thirteenth of December, 1587.*] Tho' I had ſeen this date in large letters under Reineſius's cut prefixed to one of his books (1); yet I did a little ſuſpect it, conſidering that the Journaliſts of Leipſic ſay he died the fourteenth of February, 1667, being ſeventy years old (2). Thoſe gentlemen are very exact, and no body could be better informed of the true age of that learned man. Beſides, I ſaw that Andreas Carolus abbot of St George, in the duchy of Wirtemberg, obſerves, that he lived above ſeventy years, *obiit* Thomas Reineſius *ſeptuagenario major* (3). We do not ſpeak in this manner of a man, who dies in his eightieth year. But I was no longer uncertain about it, when I read the letter wherein Reineſius ſays, that his maſters had adviſed him, above ſeventy years ago, to make frequent uſe of Dictionaries (4). This he writ the tenth of Frebruary, 1665; which is a good confirmation of the date that is under his print.

[*B*] *He often refuſed to be made a profeſſor, becauſe he was afraid his colleagues would prove intolerable.*] I find this particular in his firſt letter (5) to Gaſpar Hoffman, Profeſſor of Phyſic at Altorf. That profeſſor had writ to him that he had been expoſed for the ſpace of thirty years, to the clamours and ſlanders of envious men, and obliged to maintain ſome violent aſſaults (6). Reineſius anſwered him, that he was likewiſe perſecuted by ſome croſs-grained jealous men, and that there was ſo little true friendſhip left in the world, and ſo little equity and order in the commonwealth of learning, that he had concealed himſelf the greateſt part of his life to avoid the ſtorm. *Me quoque circumſtrepunt & adſligunt turbæ æmulorum, invidorum ſuſurri, ſemidoctorum impudentia judicia. His enim heu! execrandis moribus hodiè vivitur, ut de Bonis judicent peſſimi, de artibus imperiti, in literis dominentur thraſones; omnia ſint fucata, & genuinarum amicitiarum nihil ferè reſtet; quas intemperies ſeriò deploravi ſemper, & ut declinarem iſta paſſiva,* βιώσας *maximam partem* λέληθα (7). He goes on, and ſays, I have often refuſed the profeſſorſhips that were offered me, becauſe I thought I could not bear the ill humour of ſome perſons with whom I muſt have lived, and I have rather choſen to ſtay here, though I do not live a very eaſy life. He was then Phyſician of the town of Altenburg. *Nominatus toties ab Academicis, vocatuſque a Principibus ad munus docendi publicum; repugnavi, ſocio uno alteroque è noſtratibus (non enim ſum* ϖολύφιλος*) conſilii, voluntatibus utrorumque, quòd mores incommodos nonnullorum, cum quibus vivendum eſſet, tolerare poſſe non confiderem, & manſi in ſtatione, nec ipſa ſatis commodâ* (8). Here is part of the inconveniencies which he does enumerate. My mentioning of them is not needleſs on this occaſion; for they are things that belong to the Hiſtory of his Life. '(9) Quid enim hoc decennio *Altenburgi (Curienſia* '& *Gerana* (10) tranſmittam, etſi & illic ſat fuerit 'nubilorum) non expertus ſum, in quo non tentatus? 'Poſt triſte ſpectaculum expilatæ domûs amiſi intra 'ſemeſtre tres jucundiſſ. filios, ſuaviſſimam conjugem, 'incomparabilem fœminam; ſolùm animus Deo 'nixus & invictus mihi ſupereſt, cum tantillo boni 'nominis, & quantum ſatis eſt frugali opum. Λιτῶς 'μὲν ἀλλ' ἐν ἐλευθερίᾳ. Trinâ vice, me Phyſico, 'τὸ λοιμῶδες ἐπιδήμιον hanc urbem adflavit ... 'Conjugium, quod ante triennium ſecundum inivi, 'eſt incommodius, quàm ſperaveram, & multis rei 'familiaris tricis, quas tamen deprecatus fui, me in'volvit, &, quod caput eſt, ſterile; quò malo triſtius 'nihil obvenire poterat antè liberis orbato, καὶ ὅλῳ 'ἀπεριστάτῳ. - - - - *What inconveniency is there that* '*I have not felt for thoſe ten years paſt at* Altenburg '*(I ſhall ſay nothing of my ſufferings during the time* '*that I practiſed at* Haff *and* Gera, *tho' there too I* '*had troubles enough) what trial is there that I have* '*not undergone? After the melancholy accident of ſeeing* '*my houſe robbed, I had the misfortune to loſe in leſs* '*than ſix months time, three charming boys, together* '*with a moſt ſweet and incomparable wife. I have* '*nothing left now but a mind, which, putting its truſt* '*in* GOD, *cannot be overcome, a little reputation, and* '*juſt as much wealth as is neceſſary for a frugal man.* 'Plainly but freely, *is my motto. Three times has* '*this town been afflicted with the plague, ſince I practiſed* '*here .... my ſecond marriage, which I contracted* '*about three years ago, has proved more inconvenient* '*than I thought it would; for it has involved me in* '*a great many little domeſtic cares to which I had a* '*ſtrong averſion. But above all it is barren; which* '*is the greateſt misfortune that can poſſibly happen to a* '*man that has been deprived of his former children, and* '*is in a manner wholly deſtitute.*' It ought to be obſerved that ſome ill affected perſons had ſent to Hoffman ſeveral ſheets of Reineſius's *Variæ lectiones*, whilſt they were printing, in hopes that Hoffman would write againſt that work: but the event proved contrary to their expectation; for Hoffman finding himſelf praiſed in that part of the book (11) that was ſent to him, laid aſide the reſentment he had conceived againſt Reineſius, by whom he had thought himſelf offended, and wrote a very obliging letter to him (12). I think I may ſay, that the ſharpeſt quarrel Reineſius ever had, was that which he had with Rivinus, profeſſor at Leipſic. Reineſius declares he had not been the aggreſſor, and had only anſwered the injurious words of that critic. Neverthileſs the latter made his complaints to the magiſtrates, and left no ſtone unturned to prevent the printing of Reineſius's anſwer. Can any thing be more unjuſt? 'Nun'quam odio habui hominem; ſed calumniatorem & 'projectiſſimæ proterviæ accuſatorem ferre non debui 'tamen. Etiamnum hodie crepant nutantque ſubſellia 'Judicum apud Nos, ad quos me, ſtulte querens de 'injuriis quas Ipſe prior intuliſſet, deferebat, neque 'ſuæ famæ ſatis cavens, dum meam maculare inten'deret μετὰ ϖολλῆς φαντασίας καὶ ὑψηληγορίας. '..... *Defenſionem* meam, quam à provocantis im'poſita mihi neceſſitas excuſat, in amicorum ſinu de'poſui (13) .... Dixit, quæ voluit; æquum eſt ut 'audiat quæ nolet. .... Ex eo vero, quod *apologiam* 'meam tot adhibitis machinis, mendaciis etiam ſup'primere anniſus fuit, malam cauſam fovere judica'tus eſt dudum, & deſignaſſe facinus, quod æternam 'nomini ejus inuſſit notam. Voluit nimirum ut ipſe 'de me cenſor ſedere poſſet, ſed ἀνυπεύθυνος; vo'luit ut liceret ſibi in me quidvis; mihi ne quidem 'hiſcere contra (14). - - - - *I never hated the man;* '*but I did not think myſelf obliged to bear with a calum*'*niator and a moſt inſolent accuſer. Even at this day* '*our courts of judicature, reſound with his fooliſh com*'*plaints againſt me, whom he ſummoned to anſwer for* '*thoſe very injuries which himſelf had offered firſt.* '*Thus he does not ſpare his own reputation, provided* '*he can but fix a blot upon mine, with his fantaſtical* '*inſinuations and high-flown words ..... I have de*'*poſited my defence; which the impudence of this aggreſ*'*ſor, made neceſſary and excuſable, in the hands of my* '*friends. ..... He ſaid what he pleaſed; it is there*'*fore fit he ſhould hear what will not pleaſe him* '*.... But from his ſcandalous endeavours to ſuppreſs my* '*apology by ſo many tricks, and even lies, it has been* '*long ago concluded that he maintained a bad cauſe, and* '*that his deſign was villanous, which has fixed an* '*everlaſting brand upon his name. He wanted forſooth* '*to*

(*a*) And not at Altenburg, as it is ſaid in Moreri's Dictionary.

(*b*) Witte, in Diario Biographico, *ad ann*, 1667. See the remark [*B*], citation (10).

(*c*) And not 1657, as in Konig's *Bibliotheque*, in Moreri, and elſewhere.

(*d*) Ex Witte, ubi ſupra.

(1) *His letters* ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum, *printed at Leipſic in the year* 1660.

(2) Acta Erudit. *Lipſ.* 1682, *p.* 92.

(3) Andreas Carolus, Memorab. Eccleſ. *lib. vii, ad ann.* 1667, *pag.* 409.

(4) Reineſ. Epiſt. XXIX, ad Joannem Vorſtium, *pag.* 61.

(5) It is dated from Altemburg the tenth of October 1638.

(6) *See Reineſius's Letters,* ad Hoffmannum & Rupertum, *p.* 2.

(7) Ibid. *pag.* 6.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Ibid. *pag.* 7.

(10) He means by *Curienſia*, his being Phyſician to the town of Hoff (in Latin *Curia*) in Voigtland; and by *Gerana* the like employment at Gera, a town in the ſame country, which belongs to the lords of Plaven, whoſe family name is Reuſſen, in Latin *Rutheni*.

(11) Reineſius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 5.

(12) Ibid. *pag.* 1.

(13) Reineſius, Epiſt. XLIV, ad Daumium, *pag.* 122.

(14) Ibid. *pag.* 123.

Leipſic, though they lived at a conſiderable diſtance from one another. It was at firſt a quarrel about ſome points of Literature, which turned afterwards into a law-ſuit (e). I cannot tell whether Reineſius left any children behind him; but I know that in 1638, he complained that he had loſt his firſt wife, and all the children he had by her; and that his ſecond wife, to whom he had been married three years, was barren (f). This was the greateſt, but not the only inconveniency of his ſecond marriage. He had a ſhare in the liberality of Lewis XIV, to the moſt famous learned men in Europe. The ſum that was ſent him, was attended with a very obliging letter of Mr Colbert, for which he expreſſed his acknowledgment, by dedicating to him his obſervations on the fragment of Petronius, in the year 1666. They who can judge of a point of Literature, have no ſooner read ſome pages of his writings, but they place him above thoſe Philologers, who have only a good memory, and reckon him among thoſe Critics, who go beyond their reading, and know more things than books have taught them. The penetration of their wit makes them draw conſequences, and affords them conjectures, which lead them to the diſcovery of hidden treaſures. By that means they clear the darkeſt parts of erudition, and extend the bounds of the knowledge of antiquity. Reineſius was one of thoſe Critics, and made it his chief buſineſs to find out what others had not ſaid. If his ſupplements to Voſſius's treatiſe *de Hiſtoricis Græcis* are ever printed, the reader will wonder how Voſſius, who made ſo fine and ſo large a collection, could omit ſo many things. It appears from Reineſius's printed letters, that he was conſulted like an Oracle; and that he anſwered very learnedly the queſtions that were propoſed to him, and that he was very well verſed in the knowledge of the antient families of Rome, and in the ſtudy of inſcriptions. There is a very fine elogy upon his merit, and his learned and political works in the Epiſtle Dedicatory (g) of the ſecond edition of Caſaubon's Letters. Some Divines have laid to his charge, that he had a particular religion made up of ſuch things as ſeemed to him beſt in other religions [C]. I ſhall ſet down the

(e) See the remark [B].

(f) See the ſame remark.

(g) Written by Mr Grævius, and dated from Amſterdam the 31ſt of Auguſt 1655. It is quoted in Moreri's Dictionary, and nothing elſe is quoted in it, though that Epiſtle does ſcarce mention any of the particulars related in this article.

‘ *to ſit as a privileged cenſor upon my actions, without* ‘ *being called to an account for it; he wanted to take all* ‘ *manner of liberties with me, at the ſame time that I* ‘ *ſhould not ſo much as dare to open my mouth againſt* ‘ *him.*' The apology of Reineſius was printed, notwithſtanding the aggreſſor's oppoſition. This I find in a letter written the ſeventh of Auguſt, 1653. See alſo the letter which Reineſius wrote to Boſius the eighteenth of January, in the ſame year (15).

(15) Epiſt. Thomæ Reineſii, & Joan. Andr. Boſii, *p.* 13.

A REFLEXION upon the faults of men of letters, and upon the difficulty of acquiring tranquillity of mind.

What I have ſaid of the misfortunes that Reineſius complained of, ſeems to be the common fate of learned men. The hiſtory of their lives and their letters do commonly ſhew that they have been engaged in troubleſome quarrels, attended with jealouſy, calumny, virulency, ſatire, factious ſpirit, fraud, and a thouſand other ſhameful paſſions. One would think, that of all men ſcholars are moſt apt to make themſelves and others uneaſy. Which muſt needs create a contempt and hatred for learning, or at leaſt make one loſe the good opinion one might entertain of it. Ignorant people fancy, that if they had ſpent all their time in reading, they would have learned to moderate their paſſions, and to cure themſelves of ſeveral faults, which incline them to behave themſelves unjuſtly toward their neighbour. But they would have other thoughts, if they knew that the moſt learned men abuſe and perſecute one another, and complain of their ſad deſtiny. From thence we may draw this concluſion, that there is nothing ſo difficult to be acquired as the tranquillity and uprightneſs of the mind. A continual ſtudy of good books ſeems to be a moſt proper means to acquire that treaſure; and yet it ſeldom procures it, but very often produces a quite contrary effect. Horace had a very wrong notion, when he ſpoke theſe words: *It is enough for me to beg of God that he would preſerve my life, and beſtow riches upon me; and then I ſhall know how to procure to myſelf tranquillity of mind.*

Quid ſentire putas? quid credis, amice, precari?
Sit mihi, quod nunc eſt, etiam minus: ut mihi vivam
Quod ſupereſt ævi, ſi quid ſupereſſe volunt Dî:
Sit bona librorum & proviſæ frugis in annum
Copia: ne fluitem dubiæ ſpe pendulus horæ.
Sed ſatis eſt orare Jovem, qui donat, & aufert,
Det vitam, det opes: æquum mî animum ipſe parabo (16).

(16) Horat. Epiſt. XVIII, lib. i, in fine.

For what do you imagine that I care?
What think, what make the ſubject of my pray'r?
Let me have what I have, or ſomewhat leſs,
'Twill ſtill be great enough for happineſs;
And that I may, if Heav'n more years will give,
Live to myſelf the time I have to live:
Eſtate in books, and food to ſerve a year,
Leſt I ſhould wav'ring hang 'twixt hope and fear.
And this is all for which mankind ſhould pray,
And beg of Jove who gives and takes away;
Let him but life and mod'rate plenty find,
And I'll provide myſelf an happy mind.

CREECH.

He was groſly miſtaken: the thing, for which he thought he ſtood in no need of God's aſſiſtance, was what he could leaſt expect from his own ability, and the firſt he ſhould have beſought Jupiter to beſtow upon him; for it is much more eaſy to get riches and honours by one's induſtry, than a quiet and contented mind. If it be ſaid, that riches and honours depend upon a thouſand things which we cannot diſpoſe of at pleaſure, and that therefore it is neceſſary to pray to God that he would turn them to our advantage; I anſwer, that the ſilence of the paſſions, and the tranquillity of the mind depend upon a thouſand things, which are not under our juriſdiction. The ſtomach, the ſpleen, the lymphatic veſſels, the fibres of the brain, and a hundred other organs, whoſe ſeat and figure are yet unknown to the Anatomiſts, produce in us many uneaſineſſes, jealouſies, and vexations. Can we alter thoſe organs? Are they in our power (17)?

(17) Theſe words of Horace, Epiſt. i, lib. i, ver. ult. *Præcipue ſanus* (he ſpeaks of the wiſe man of the Stoics) *niſi cum pituita moleſta eſt*, may be very well applied to the mind, ſuppoſing that *ſanu* ſignifies the tranquillity of the mind.

[C] *Some Divines have laid to his charge, that he had a particular religion made up of ſuch things as ſeemed to him beſt in other religions.*] A Divine of Wirtemberg, whom I have quoted above, affirms that Reineſius, who went to the Lutheran churches, and communicated with the Lutherans, ſpoke ſo ill of their Divines, and of their doctrine, and liturgies, that he was worſe than a profeſſed adverſary: from whence he concludes, either that he was of the religion of prudent men, or that he favoured it: for he openly declared that he followed a certain religion in certain points, and another religion in other points. *Tam ſiniſtrè ſenſit, tam ſcabioſè locutus eſt, de Doctoribus & Profeſſoribus harum* (Lutheranarum) *partium, imò de ipſa doctrina, de ſymbolicis libris, de dogmatibus in iiſdem contentis, ut vix quiſquam ex manifeſtis adverſariis taliter fecerit. Probari hæc poſſunt ex Epiſtolis, quas an.* 1654. *vel circiter, Coloniæ Brandenburgicæ publicavit, ubi contemptim* Formularios *vocat Theologas F. C. amplexos; D. Majorem Seniorem,* Grandionem, *qui applauſores nullos in N. habeat: alios nominat* Archiperecidas, *& ita conſeq. Religioni Prudentum procul ambiguo addictus erat Sycophanta, vel eidem certè favebat, apertè faſſus, hoc ſe in una* the titles of moſt of his books [*D*].

una Religione, aliud in alia ſequi (18). That Divine had explained, in another place, what he meant by the religion of prudent men. Here is the ſubſtance of his diſcourſe. A Dutchman ſaid one day, that the religion of Grotius was that of learned men. Being aſked what religion it was; he anſwered, to believe what they pleaſe (19). Hulſeman (20) aſked, whether Grotius meant, that one ought to follow the opinions of prudent men, and he believes this is the religion of prudent men, which is known but to few perſons, and very much boaſted of in France, and more particularly in Holland. Hereupon Mullerus, a Divine of Hamburgh (21), and Kromaier, a Divine of Leipſic (22), held it for a certain thing, that Grotius had followed the religion of prudent men, which is a mixture of ſeveral religions, and which takes ſometimes from one and ſometimes from another what it thinks fit, and ſuits to it's intereſt. It is called the religion of prudent men, becauſe the wiſe men of this world pitch upon it with great prudence, as they think, and keep it as long as they pleaſe; it is alſo called the Political and Philoſophical religion. It goes by the firſt of thoſe two names, becauſe the Politicians make choice of it; for they are men who will be free in that point, and who turn themſelves all manner of ways. It is ſtiled Philoſophical, becauſe it frees a man from the obligation of believing; and it is well known that a Philoſopher ſubmits to no human authority, and will not ſwear to the words of any maſter, *Liber homo Philoſophus nullius addictus jurare in verba Magiſtri*. The author mentions two other epithets; he ſays, that this religion of prudent men is called *Eclectic*, or *Eclogiſtic* (23). I wonder he ſaid nothing of the ſect of the Eclectic Philoſophers founded by Potamon of Alexandria, who lived in the time of Auguſtus. Thoſe men were neither Platoniſts, nor Stoics, nor Peripatetics, nor of any other particular ſect; but they took out of every one of them what they liked beſt, and left the reſt. Such is the notion of the religion aſcribed to Reineſius. It was a religion of choice, a Moſaic work, a work made up of in-laid pieces. There are more people than is commonly believed, who form ſuch a religion to themſelves, and do not boaſt of it. They might be called in Latin *Miſcelliones* (24).

(18) Andreas Carolus, Memorab. Eccleſ. *Sæc. XVII, lib. vi, cap. xxxii, pag.* 97.

(19) Ibid. *lib. v, cap. liii, p.* 1088. *He quotes* Burgold. Not. rer. Imp. *Part ii, xi.*

(20) In Diatr. Schol. de Auxil. Grat. *pag.* 479.

(21) Atheiſ. devict. *pag.* 459.

(22) Loc. Antiſyncret. *pag.* 271, *& ſeq.*

(23) Andreas Carolus, *lib. vi, cap. xxxii, pag.* 97.

(24) Miſcelliones appellantur qui non certæ ſunt ſententiæ, ſed variorum mixtorumque judiciorum. *Feſtus Pompeius.*

[*D*] *I ſhall inſert the titles of moſt of his books.*] Here are ſome concerning Phyſic. *De vaſis umbilicalibus eorumque ruptura obſervatio ſingularis*, at Leipſic, 1624, in 4to. *Chimiatria, hoc eſt Medicina nobili & neceſſaria ſui parte, Chimiâ, inſtructa & exornata*, at Gera in Voigtland, 1624, in 4to. The following books concern Literature: *De Deo Endovellico*, Altemburg, 1637. Ἱστορούμενα *linguæ Punicæ contra Vitum Wolfrum*, Altemburg, 1637. *Variarum lectionum libri tres*, ibid. 1640, 4to. *Defenſio variarum lectionum*, Roſtoch, 1653, in 4to. *Epiſtolæ ad Caſparum Hoffmannum, & Chriſt. Ad. Rupertum*, Leipſic, 1660, in 4to. They have printed, after his death, *Epiſtolæ ad Johannem Voſtium*, at Coln in Brandenburg, 1667, in 4to. *Epiſtolæ ad Neſteros patrem & filium, Leipſic*, 1670, in 4to. *Epiſtolæ ad Chriſtianum Daumium*, Iëna, 1670, in 4to. *Epiſtolæ ad Jo. Andream Boſium*, Iëna, 1700, in 12mo. *Syntagma inſcriptionum antiquarum cumprimis Romæ Veteris quarum omiſſa eſt recenſio in vaſto Jani Gruteri opere, cujus iſthoc dici poſſit ſupplementum, cum commentariis abſolutiſſimis* (25), Leipſic, 1682, in folio. *Diſſertatio Critica de Sibyllinis Oraculis* (26), Iëna, 1685, in 4to. I can ſay nothing certain about ſome other books which Mr Konig aſcribes to him. I am afraid he confounds thoſe that have been printed, with thoſe that have not been publiſhed. He aſcribes to him *Gloſſarium vocum barbaricarum: cenſuram nonnullorum in Salmaſii exercitationibus Plinianis. Commentarium in Inſcriptiones Gruteri. Variarum Lectionum libros ſex.* Ἱστορούμενα *Medicinæ, vel ſucceſſiones & vitas Medicorum*, and ſeveral other works. Moreri pretends, that *Reineſius made himſelf known by his ſix books of* Variæ Lectiones, *that he has alſo written a cenſure upon Salmaſius's* Exercitationes *on Pliny or Solinus, and ſome commentaries on Gruterus's Inſcriptions* (27). I cannot agree with him in this; for there are only three books of *Variæ Lectiones* printed; and I know nothing of Reineſius's book, intituled, *Cenſura exercitationum Plinarum Salmaſii.* I do not find it mentioned in the preface to his poſthumous works. I do not queſtion but that he was well qualified to write ſuch a book, and to cut out as much work for Salmaſius, as for Barthius (28); but I do not know whether he had ſuch a deſign; and if he had, I dare ſay the performance of it has not been made public. The inſcriptions commented upon by Reineſius are different from thoſe of Gruterus. Laſtly, Moreri ſays nothing of ſeveral books that have been publiſhed. If his article of Reineſius was corrected, there would remain but two or three words of his.

(25) *See the* Acta Eruditorum 1682, *pag.* 89, *& ſeq.*

(26) *See the* Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *July* 1685, *Art. V.*

(27) *Confer the* Jugemens des Sçavans, *num.* 525.

(28) See the remark [*R*], of the article BARTHIUS.

I muſt deſire the readers to take notice that the Bookſellers have prefixed Reineſius's name to a book, of which he did not write one line. Mr Witte mentions this, leſt Reineſius ſhould be looked upon as a Plagiary: *Exiit quoque Lipſiæ an.* 1679, *ſub ejus nomine*, Schola Jure-Conſultorum Medica, Relationum libris aliquot comprehenſa, quibus principia Medicinæ in jus tranſſumta ex profeſſo examinantur. *Verus autem Auctor & titulus iſte eſt: Fortunati Fidelis de Relationibus Medicorum libri IV. in quibus ea omnia, quæ in forenſibus ac publicis cauſis Medici referre ſolent, pleniſſimè traduntur, ſtudiô D. Pauli Ammanni, Lipſiæ* 1674. *Hoc indicare volui, ne Vir CL. præter meritum Plagiariis adſcribatur* (29). Mr Witte has forgot a material circumſtance, *viz.* that the book, intituled, *Fortunati Fidelis*, &c. was printed at Palermo in the year 1602, in 4to (30). That edition is quoted in *Lindenius Renovatus*, pag. 275, under the name of *Fortunatus Fidelis*; but the author did not know that the *Schola Juriſconſultorum, &c.* printed at Leipſic in the year 1679, is the ſame with that of Fortunatus Fidelis, for he aſcribes it to Reineſius, pag. 1023. I fancy the Leipſic edition, 1674, differs from that of 1679, as to the title; and that Reineſius's name was put to it, to make it ſell the better (31).

(29) Witte, in Diario Biographico, *ad ann.* 1667, *folio* Yyy 3.

(30) I have been informed of this by a letter of Mr Bourdelot, firſt Phyſician to the ducheſs of Burgundy.

(31) Compare this with citation (3), of the article PINEAU.

REMOND (*a*) (**FLORIMOND DE**) counſellor in the parliament of Bourdeaux, towards the end of the XVIth century, ſignalized himſelf by ſome violent books againſt the Proteſtants [*A*]. He had been a Huguenot in his younger days; but if we may believe him, he was reſcued *from the jaws of Hereſy* (*b*) by a miracle, of which he was an eye-witneſs in the year 1566. Moreri, who mentions it, knew not the place where that comedy was acted: he ſays, that a woman called Nicole Obri, a native of Vervins, was exorciſed at Loudun (*c*). He is miſtaken, it was at Laon: I have ſaid in another place (*d*), that Father Labbe has committed the ſame fault. There is ſome reaſon to believe that Florimond de Remond ſtudied under Peter Ramus, in the college of

Prele

(*a* He ſpelt his name *Ræmond*, but he calls himſelf *Ræmound* in ſome of his books.

(*b*) Florimond de Ræmond, Hiſt. de la naiſſance & progrès de l'Hereſie, *livr. ii, ch. xii, pag.* m 204.

(*c*) Moreri, *at the word* Florimond de Raymond.

(*d*) In the article LOUDUN, remark [*C*].

[*A*] *He ſignalized himſelf by ſome violent books againſt the Proteſtants.*] He publiſhed a book, intituled, *Erreur populaire de la Papeſſe Jeanne.* I have the Bourdeaux edition 1594; the author puts his name to it, which ſhews that it is not the firſt; for the firſt came out without his name. *As it was never my deſign*, they are Florimond de Remond's words (1), *to get reputation by thoſe inconſiderable productions of my brain, (it were to pretend to build a ſolid glory upon a ſandy foundation) ſo I have endeavoured to avoid ſhame. Which moved me to ſuppreſs my name, becauſe it could not keep a rank among ſo many learned men, wherewith France abounds. But ſince that author has put a quite contrary interpretation upon the laudable fear that reſtrained me, I have been willing to open the curtain, and appear in public; and yet I will, out of kindneſs to him, ſuppreſs his name, ſince he has ſo weakly anſwered my arguments.* This he ſays concerning a Miniſter of Bern (2), who had writ

ſomething

(1) *Pag.* 303, *of his* Erreur populaire, *Edit. of Bourdeaux* 1594.

(2) He denotes him only by theſe two letters *R. T.*

Prele at Paris: which I obſerve only to have an opportunity to mention what he ſays concerning the book *de Tribus Impoſtoribus* [*B*]. Botereius places his death in the year 1602 (*e*), and Moreri in the year 1600. Some will have it that he is not the author of the books that are aſcribed to him [*C*], whereof the moſt conſiderable is *The Hiſtory of the Birth, Progreſs, and Declenſion of the Hereſy of this Age.* He was the unfitteſt man in the world to ſucceed in ſuch an undertaking [*D*], conſidering the hatred he had conceived

ſomething againſt the anonymous book of the popular error concerning Pope Joan: which was the reaſon why the author publiſhed a ſecond edition of it well reviſed, and *undertook a longer and more ſerious work*; it was that concerning Anti-Chriſt. Vignier ſays that he made uſe of the ſecond edition of the Anti-Chriſt, and of the Anti-Pope Joan, *reviſed, corrected, and enlarged by the author, and printed at Paris, by Abel l'Angelier*, 1599 (3). He is miſtaken as to the Anti-Pope Joan; for the Paris edition 1599, was at leaſt the fourth; for there was one printed at Lyons by Bennet Rigaut, in 8vo, in the year 1595 (4). Cooke is ſtill more miſtaken, for he ſays that book was firſt written in French in the year 1602 (5). Saggittarius mentions only the French edition of Bourdeaux of the ſame year (6). The third book of Remond did not come out till after his death; it is intituled, *The Hiſtory of the Birth, Progreſs, and Decay of Hereſy in this age, divided into eight books.* The ſixth book was to contain an account of the ſchiſm of England; they found only the title of it among the papers of the author: he compoſed firſt *the ſeventh and the eighth, which were more neceſſary, becauſe they contained the hiſtory of what had happened in France* (7). Francis de Remond, his ſon, who took care of the impreſſion of that book, and dedicated it to Paul V, ſupplied the ſixth book (8). Sagittarius obſerves, that Florimond de Remond, or rather the Jeſuit Richeome, writ the Hiſtory of the Birth, Progreſs, and Decay of Hereſy, in three volumes; he quotes the French edition of Paris 1605, and that of 1624 (9). This account is not exact; for the edition of 1605, contains only one volume, and it is the only one that was written by Remond; the other two were compoſed by Claudius Mallingre, Hiſtoriographer of France, and printed at Paris in 1624. That work of Remond, and Mallingre's continuation, have been reprinted ſeveral times (10), ſometimes in French, and ſometimes in Latin. The two other works of Remond have been likewiſe tranſlated into Latin. Note, that he publiſhed at Bourdeaux in 1594, the French tranſlation he had made of Tertullian's treatiſe *de Corona Militis*, and of the ſame Father's diſcourſe *ad Martyres*. Note alſo, that Baronius, and ſome other writers of the ſame party, do very much commend his books of controverſy.

[*B*] *What he ſays concerning the book* de Tribus Impoſtoribus.] 'Have we not ſeen a deteſtable book forged in Germany, tho' printed in another country, at the very ſame time that hereſy acted it's part, which ſowed this doctrine with this horrid title, *Of the three Impoſtors*, &c. ridiculing the three prevailing religions, which alone acknowledge the true God, *viz.* the Jewiſh, the Chriſtian, and the Mahometan. That title alone ſhewed that it was a production of Hell; and what an age it muſt be which could bring forth ſo terrible a monſter. I would not have mentioned it, if Hoſius and Genebrard had not ſpoken of it before me. I remember, that when I was a little boy, I ſaw a copy of it in the college de Prele in Ramus's hands, who was an eminent man for his learning, and who confounded himſelf with his enquiries into the myſteries of religion, which he coupled with Philoſophy. That wicked book was handed about among the moſt learned, who were deſirous to ſee it (11).' Theſe are Remond's words. If he had known, that this wicked book was talked of under the empire of Frederic II (12), would he have been ſo bold as to aſcribe the production of ſuch a monſter to the XVIth century? Perhaps he would, for his only deſign was to render Lutheraniſm odious *per fas & nefas*. Moſt people father the pretended book *de tribus Impoſtoribus* upon Aretin (13), they put it therefore upon Italy, and not upon Germany.

[*C*] *Some will have it, that he is not the author of the books that are aſcribed to him.*] Let us go back a little. Mr Sagittarius ſupplies me with the two following paſſages in a book printed in 1694. *Florimundus Ræmundus, Vaſco, ſenator parliamenti Burdegalenſis, ſub cujus nomine Ludovicus Richeomus, Jeſuitici Sodalitii Theologus, Gallice ſcripſit* Errorem popularem de Johanna Pſeudo-pontifice, dicta Papiſſa, *Latine poſtea verſum* (14). This he ſays, pag. 683. Let us ſee what he ſays, pag. 820. *Florimundus Ræmundus*, ſive potius cujus ſtylo uſus eſt, *Ludovicus Richeomius* Soc. J. qui *de ortu, progreſſu & interitu hæreticorum hujus temporis* Tomis III. commentatus eſt. I proceed to a book printed in 1688. 'It is very much doubted, whether Florimond was really the author of thoſe books that paſs under his name. For many have ſaid, that Father Richeome, a Jeſuit, wrote them, and borrowed the name of a counſellor of the parliament of Bourdeaux, to give his work the more credit. Perhaps it was thought neceſſary to ſet a writer of ſome name in oppoſition to Thuanus, whoſe hiſtory was written with too much ſincerity to be acceptable to the Jeſuits. Peter Matthieu in his hiſtory ſays poſitively, that it was believed Father Richeome was the author of the books that went under the name of Florimond de Raymond. Vignier in his Theatre of Anti-Chriſt, and Rivetus in his Anſwer to the Jeſuit, ſay the ſame thing; and theſe were the men that wrote ſoon after Florimond's book appeared. Blondel was alſo of the ſame opinion (15).' Theſe are the words of a doctor, which is now an illuſtrious Prelate in England. It is certain, that theſe following words are to be found in a work of Vignier: *Matthieu the king's Hiſtoriographer ſays in his Hiſtory of the King, that he does not think that the book concerning Anti-Chriſt was written by the ſaid Remond, but by the Jeſuit Richeome* (16). It is no leſs certain, that Rivetus having mentioned what Florimond de Remond acknowledges to Calvin's honour in his Hiſtory of the birth of Hereſy, adds this (17): *I have been willing to inſert here the words of an enemy, and perhaps of the Jeſuit Richeome, to whom Peter Matthieu aſcribes Ræmond's Anti-Chriſt.* I have found the paſſage of Peter Matthieu; here it is: 'The aſſembly began with declaring that the biſhop of Rome was the Anti-Chriſt, foretold in the word of God. It is a long time ſince the miniſters have taught this doctrine in their writings, and in their ſermons, and the Catholics have taught the contrary. Florimond de Ræmond, or, as I think, Richeome a Jeſuit under that name, has more enlarged upon that ſubject than any body elſe, and collected by way of Antitheſis whatever belongs to the true Anti-Chriſt, and to the pretended one (18).' I leave it to the readers to judge whether this is a ſufficient ground to lay down as a certain matter of fact, that all the controverſial books that have been publiſhed under the name of Florimond de Remond, had been written by Richeome. But here is another teſtimony of one of the authors, who confuted Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm. *I cannot give any credit*, ſays he (19), *to Florimond de Remond, having been told by a counſellor of the parliament of Bourdeaux, called Lewis le Maſſip, (an honeſt man, with whom I have been intimately acquainted, having lodged at his houſe at Bourdeaux in* 1650, *where I attended the court, and having kept correſpondence with him for ſome years by letters) that it was a conſtant tradition in that country, that Remond, who was a member of their parliament, had three conſiderable advantages:* 1. To grow old without being gray-haired: 2. To build without money: 3. To write without learning; becauſe the Jeſuits ſupplied him with whatever is to be found in his Hiſtory of the beginning and declenſion of Hereſy.

QUALIFICATIONS requiſite for a good Hiſtorian.

[*D*] *He was the unfitteſt man in the world to ſucceed in ſuch an undertaking.*] Hiſtory, generally ſpeaking, is the moſt difficult compoſure that an author can undertake, or one of the moſt difficult. It requires a great judgment, a noble, clear and conciſe ſtile, a good conſcience, a perfect probity, many excellent materials, and the art of placing them in good order, and above all things the power of reſiſting the inſtinct of a religious zeal, which prompts one to cry down what he thinks to be falſe, and to adorn and embelliſh what he thinks to be true. From this ſhort and very juſt deſcription of the talents, that make up the character of a good Hiſtorian, one may eaſily perceive, that

---

(*e*) Rodolph. Botereius, Commentar. de Rebus in Gallia geſtis, *lib. ix, pag.* 91.

(3) Vignier, Théatre de l'Antechriſt, *in the table of the authors.*

(4) Blondel *made uſe of this in his* Examen Quæſt. de Papa fœmina, *where he takes notice of the errors of* Florimond de Remond.

(5) Cooke, upon Pope Joan, *pag. m.* 2.

(6) Sagittar. Introduct. in Hiſt. Eccleſ. *pag.* 683.

(7) *See the preface to the* Hiſtoire de la naiſſance, &c. de l'Hereſie.

(8) I was forced to work hard, and to write in haſte, that I might publiſh it as ſoon as ever I could. *Ibid.*

(9) Sagitt. ibid. *pag.* 820.

(10) I make uſe of the Roan edition 1648.

(11) Remond. Hiſt. de la naiſſance de l'Hereſie, *livr. ii, ch. xvi, pag. m.* 236.

(12) See the article ARETIN (PETER), remark [*G*].

(13) See the ſame remark.

(14) Sagittarius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 683.

(15) Burnet's Defence of the Reflexions on Varillas, *pag.* 26.

(16) Nicolas Vignier, *Théatre de l'Antechriſt*, in the table of the authors. I make uſe of the Geneva edition 1613, in 8vo, which was preceded by the edition in folio, 1610.

(17) Rivet, Sommaire des Controverſes (*it is* An Anſwer to the Controverſial Catechiſm, publiſhed by the Jeſuit William Baile), *pag.* 16, *of the 2d edition, which is that of Geneva* 1609, *in 8vo.*

(18) Matthieu, Hiſtoire de Henri IV, *lib. vi, Narration V, p. m.* 628, *ſpeaking of the National Synod of Gap.*

(19) John Baptiſte de Rocolles, Hiſtoire veritable du Calviniſme, *pag.* 285.

conceived againſt the party wherein he had been brought up, which a miracle, as he

Florimond de Remond could not ſucceed in his deſign of writing the Hiſtory of the beginning and progreſs of Lutheraniſm and Calviniſm. It was a great ſubject, one of the greateſt revolutions that have appeared in the Chriſtian world. Reaſons of ſtate had crept into it, and were combined with the intereſts of religion; which made up a mixture that increaſed the Hiſtorian's labour, and required great application, and a mind wholly free from prejudices. I do not examine whether our Remond had learning, judgment, and wit enough, and a good ſtile to treat well ſo important a ſubject, and I am willing to ſuppoſe, that in that reſpect he was far leſs contemptible than he is repreſented to be by his adverſaries; but had he had no other faults than thoſe, which his zeal for the Catholic religion, and his hatred againſt the Proteſtants produced in him, he ſhould have acknowledged that he undertook a work which was ſuperior to his ſtrength. He ſtumbled in his preliminaries; he did like thoſe who go about to build a houſe, before they caſt up the expence they muſt be at, to know whether they are able to ſpend ſo much (20). He neglected the precept which the moſt ſkillful maſters have ſo wiſely recommended, to wit, to pitch upon a ſubject adapted to one's capacity, and to make a long trial of one's ability:

> Sumite materiam veſtris, qui ſcribitis, æquam
> Viribus, & verſate diu, quid ferre recuſent,
> Quid valeant humeri (21).

> *You writers try the vigour of your muſe,*
> *And what her ſtrength will bear and what refuſe,*
> *And after that an equal ſubject chuſe.*
>
> CREECH.

The chief thing he ſhould have done, was to examine his conſcience, but in all probability it was what he neglected moſt: He did not think of ſounding his heart, and aſking himſelf very ſeriouſly, *Can I publiſh ſuch truths as would be diſadvantageous to the Catholics, and advantageous to the Huguenots? They hate me, and I hate them; they have abuſed me, and I have abuſed them. I have publiſhed ſome controverſial books, which they have refuted, and I have replied; can I be ſure that I ſhall not be overcome in the leaſt by my paſſion, my zeal, and my reſentment, and that I ſhall never tell a lie in favour of my cauſe* (22)? They, who have read his Hiſtory with ſome attention, may ſay without any raſhneſs, that he did not conſult himſelf about thoſe things, or that he did not follow the dictates of his conſcience. He repreſents the Proteſtants as guilty of all ſorts of injuſtice, and the Catholics as very wiſe and innocent men; and he ſeldom relates any thing without uſing injurious epithets, and outrageous words againſt Hereſy and the Heretics. His quotations ſignify but little; for he alledges either men of his party, and who, moſt of them, had ſome perſonal diſputes (23) with the miniſters, or ſome Proteſtants, as he found them quoted in the writings of thoſe men. Such an Hiſtorian muſt neceſſarily be a ſlave to pious frauds, or deluded by himſelf, and conſequently the unfitteſt man in the world to write the Hiſtory of the beginning and growth of the Proteſtant religion, and the fitteſt to tranſgreſs againſt the two great laws of his profeſſion (24); for there are ſome falſities he does not ſcruple to publiſh, and there are ſome truths he dare not publiſh. An Hiſtorian, who deſigns to write ſuch a Hiſtory, ſhould be told, as Phaëton was,

> Magna petis, Phaëton, & quæ non viribus iſtis
> Munera conveniunt, nec tam puerilibus annis (25).

> *Too vaſt and hazardous the taſk appears,*
> *Not ſuited to thy ſtrength, nor to thy years.*
>
> ADDISON.

I know ſome perſons, who could wiſh we had ſome Hiſtories of that important Revolution written neither by a Roman Catholic, nor by a Proteſtant. They fancy that party-intereſt, zeal for one's cauſe, and, much more, hatred of the contrary religion, engage a writer to exaggerate, or to ſuppreſs, or extenuate, or to diſguiſe things according as they may ſerve, or prejudice the honour of his party. They wiſh therefore, that a Thucydides, or a Livy, might have given us the Hiſtory of the events, which Florimond de Remond promiſes us in the title of his work. They wiſh thoſe illuſtrious authors might have done it, not ſo much on account of their eloquence and great judgment, as becauſe they were Heathens, and might have been neuters between the ſeveral ſects of Chriſtianity; ſo that they would have related without any prejudice or partiality, what was to be praiſed or blamed in the conduct of the Papiſts, Lutherans, and Calviniſts. But I do not know whether they might have kept an exact neutrality; for Popery being more agreeable to Paganiſm than the Proteſtant religion, they might have been prepoſſeſſed againſt Luther and Calvin. An Hiſtorian can never ſtand too much upon his guard; and it is almoſt impoſſible for him to be altogether free from prejudices. There are ſome forms of government, and ſome moral and political maxims, which he likes or diſlikes. This moves him to favour one party rather than another, even when he writes the Hiſtory of an ancient nation, or of a remote country. Suppoſe a man writes in our days the Hiſtory of an Indian king, who died two or three hundred years ago, after he had been dethroned, you will be apt to believe that no intereſt can hinder him from being a ſincere writer; and yet if he is an enemy to monarchy, and approves the rebellion of ſubjects, he will uſe a thouſand ſhifts and diſguiſes to render the memory of that monarch odious, and to juſtify the Civil wars which pulled him down from the throne. An Hiſtorian, who is an enemy to rebellion, would take a quite contrary courſe. Which is the reaſon why there are ſo few Hiſtories wherein the naked truth appears, and that are free from ſome marks of the Hiſtorian's anger or diſcontent, or from his ſatirical ſtrokes againſt ſome living perſons. He meets with them in his way, whilſt he writes the Hiſtory of the Indies. All readers cannot gueſs whom he means; but ſome gueſs at it, and he knows very well that ſome will. You may judge whether we can truſt the modern Hiſtorians, ſince Livy himſelf could not be altogether impartial between the Proteſtants and the Catholics, by reaſon of a certain general conformity. The beſt advice that could have been given to Florimond de Remond, had been to tell him that he ſhould continue to write controverſial books, wherein an author may be allowed to appear paſſionate; and not to ſet up for an Hiſtorian, it being an employment that does not agree with a zealous Catholic as he was, and which he ſhould have left to lukewarm and indifferent men. I am likewiſe of opinion, that a zealous Huguenot ſhould be adviſed not to write the Hiſtory of Calviniſm, or Lutheraniſm, or that of the edict of Nantes, or any ſuch like. They ſhould tell him, You are exaſperated, you have conceived a great hatred againſt the perſecutors, you are full of an ardent zeal for your cauſe, you would give us not a Hiſtory, but a piece like an advocate's plea; you would only blame the contrary party, and praiſe or juſtify your's; this you could not do without omitting ſeveral things, and publiſhing many falſities. Write therefore ſome other book, if you deſign to do ſomething that way for the public good.

But here is another reaſon why ſo few men can write a good Hiſtory. They who are able to overcome all prejudices, and reject all the tricks of art, could not appear altogether impartial without expoſing themſelves to the indignation of the people; (the word *people* has a large extent, and takes in a great many perſons of rank and title) they would be looked upon as falſe brethren, prevaricators, and perfidious men. Was not la Popeliniere like to be cruſhed to pieces, for having related ſome things in his Hiſtory of the Troubles under Charles IX, otherwiſe than he ſhould have done in the opinion of many? I ſhall ſpeak of it in his article in the Supplement to this Dictionary. Several people could wiſh that an Hiſtorian of their party would imitate thoſe that play at Piquet, who keep only good cards, and lay out the bad ones.

WHY I ſaid that probity ought to be an ingredient of the character of an Hiſtorian.

Perhaps ſome will wonder that I ſhould aſſert that an upright conſcience, and a perfect probity, are neceſſary to an Hiſtorian; and it will be ſaid that an ingenious he pretended, had obliged him to forſake. But that Hiſtory, though never ſo bad, has been quoted by a great many writers (*f*), and it is a ſurpriſing thing to find in many books ſeveral matters of fact very conſiderable, and of great conſequence, for which the reader is referred not to any authentic pieces, but to Florimond de Remond's teſtimony. Some ſay he did very ill diſcharge the duties of his office in the parliament of Bourdeaux [*E*]. The Proteſtants taxed him with a very great partiality againſt them (*g*). Varillas was a little mortified when he was obliged to confeſs he had tranſcribed that author [*F*].

---

(20) See St Luke's Goſpel, chap. xiv, ver. 28.

(21) Horat. de Arte Poët. ver. 38.

(22) See the remark [L], of the article TIMÆUS.

(23) That is, diſputes by word or writing.

(24) Quis neſcit primam eſſe hiſtoriæ legem, ne quid falſi dicere audeat, deinde ne quid veri non audeat, ne qua ſuſpicio gratiæ ſit in ſcribendo, ne qua ſimultatis? *Cicero, de Orat. lib. ii, fol. m.* 74, *A.*

(25) Ovid. Metam. lib. ii, ver. 54.

genious man may write a good Hiſtory as well as a good ſpeech, and a good tragedy, without thoſe qualifications; I ſhall therefore prove my aſſertion: in order to it, I obſerve that truth being the ſoul of Hiſtory, it is an eſſential thing for an hiſtorical compoſition to be free from lies; ſo that though it ſhould have all other perfections, it will not be a Hiſtory, but a meer fable and romance, if it wants truth. It is not ſo with a poetical or rhetorical piece. From whence I conclude, that none can be well qualified to write a good Hiſtory, unleſs he be ſuch an enemy to lying, that his conſcience does not permit him to tell lies even to the advantage of his religion, and deareſt friends, nor to the diſadvantage of an impious ſect, and of his moſt implacable perſecutors. I underſtand by lying, not only the invention of a falſe thing, but alſo the ſuppreſſion or addition of certain circumſtances, that may ſerve to juſtify others, or to lay ſomething to their charge. Thoſe, who have not ſuch an upright conſcience, and ſuch a perfect probity, will be guilty of a fraud in writing Hiſtories, ſometimes to pleaſe thoſe from whom they expect good offices, and ſometimes for fear of diſobliging ſome perſons, who might hinder them from obtaining penſions. What has been ſaid (26) of the Orator, is ſtill more neceſſary to an Hiſtorian: he ought to be defined, *Vir bonus narrandi peritus, an honeſt man, who knows how to relate things.* And yet you ſhall ſeldom hear any body enquire, whether the author of an Hiſtory is an honeſt man. The uſual queſtion is, Whether he be a man of wit and judgment? Whether he has a fine ſtyle? Whether he pleaſes the reader? And according as the anſwer is, people will either buy his book or not buy it. They ſhould at leaſt imitate thoſe, who in their enquiries about the character of witneſſes, begun with their riches, and ended with their honeſty (27).

Protinus ad cenſum, de moribus ultima fiet
Quæſtio: quot paſcit ſervos, quot poſſidet agri
Jugera, quam multa magnaque paropſide cœnat (28)?

The queſtion is not put how far extends
His piety, but what he yearly ſpends:
Quick, to the buſineſs; how he lives and eats;
How largely gives; how ſplendidly he treats:
How many thouſand acres feed his ſheep,
What are his rents, what ſervants does he keep.

Dryden.

It ought to be enquired whether the author is an honeſt man. Mr **** begins with ſuch a queſtion, when they ſhew him in a Bookſeller's ſhop the Relation of a Voyage, the Memoirs of ſuch a one, *&c.* Here is a book, ſay they to him, very well written, very curious, and that ſells well. But, ſays he, do you know the author of it? Is he a vain and ambitious man? Does he love pleaſure? Could he appear in a good dreſs, without getting three or four hundred crowns from the Bookſeller that he made uſe of? I ſhould be glad to know that before all things; for the writer of a relation, if he be a vain man, and deſigns to be well paid for his copy, will not ſcruple to foiſt into it all the lies that may pleaſe the reader, and ſet off the author.

[*E*] *Some ſay that he diſcharged very ill the duties of his office in the parliament of Bourdeaux.*] Conſult Dr Burnet in his *Defence of the Reflexions on Varillas*, where you will find theſe words: Florimond de Remond *was as little eſteemed in the quality of a Judge, as he deſerves to be for his writings; for the character that was given of him, was no leſs ſevere than pleaſant*: Judicat ſine conſcientia, libros ſcribit ſine ſcientia, & ædificat ſine pecunia: - - - *He judges without conſcience, he writes books without knowledge, and builds without money* (29).' If you read the laſt pages of the French edition, you will find an extract of a letter (§ *a*) with a preamble, that deſerve to be tranſcribed. Here they are: *So many complaints were made about his malignity and injuſtice towards the Proteſtants, in his life-time, that no credit can be given to his teſtimony againſt them. It is an eaſy thing for an unjuſt Judge to become a paſſionate Hiſtorian; nay, one muſt be more hard-hearted to commit an injuſtice as a Judge, than to write a falſhood as an Hiſtorian. But here is the extract I have mentioned* (30). '*There is a book intituled,* Plaintes des Egliſes Reformées au Roi, ſur pluſieurs injuſtices qui leur ſont faites. - - - *The complaint of the Reformed Churches to the king concerning ſeveral injuſtices they have ſuffered. It was printed in* 1597, *without the author's name. They complain, among others, of Florimond de Raymond, who, during the troubles of* 1572, *having been taken in a journey by a party of the Proteſtants, who made him pay a ranſom of one thouſand livres, never loſt any occaſion to get himſelf re-imburſed, and had that ſum paid him ten or twelve times, as he himſelf boaſted. Afterwards, being appointed to report the caſe of a Proteſtant widow, whoſe huſband had been killed in cold blood by a Roman Catholic, he helped the criminal off, ſo that the murder remained unpuniſhed. We find alſo at the end of the ſame book, that a Proteſtant maid having been buried in the churchyard of the Catholics at Bourdeaux, there came out a decree, at Remond's ſollicitation, by which it was ordered, that the body of that maid ſhould be taken up, and denied burial, together with all the bodies of the Proteſtants that had been buried there for the ſpace of ten years* (31).'

[(§ *a*) The letter was addreſſed to Mr Jurieu, and writ by the author of the Notes on the Confeſſion of Sanci from Paris in 1688. Some time after he ſent him the book itſelf, to rectify by it ſome inaccuracies that had ſlipped into his letter, for want of having the piece before him when he writ. See the remarks on the Confeſſion of Sanci, page 443, of the ſecond edition. Rem. Crit.]

[*F*] *Mr Varillas was a little mortified, when he was obliged to confeſs that he had tranſcribed that author.*] Dr Burnet criticized him (32) for having denied that the marriage of the prince of Wales (33) with the Infanta of Spain had been conſummated, and repreſented to him, that *he might have more eaſily impoſed on his readers, if he had ſet over againſt this, on the margin, ſome citations of a letter, or recital, which would have coſt him nothing, and have been full as true as his other citations are.* His anſwer contains this among other things, that *ſuppoſing he had poſitively affirmed that* this marriage *was not conſummated*, it would not be a fiction of his own, and that *he could alledge a good authority for it* (34), meaning Florimond de Remond. He declares, that conſidering how partially the Engliſh, German, Italian, and Spaniſh, writers had writ about the ſchiſm of Henry VIII, he had *been obliged to pitch upon a French author, and that he caſt his eyes upon Florimond de Raimond. He was counſellor in the parliament of Bourdeaux; he had a wife and children; he had no particular reaſon to diſguiſe the truth: The Calviniſts were in his time in the heighth of their power; he had no occaſion to be diſpleaſed with them; and he ſpent ſo much time upon his Hiſtory of the birth, progreſs, and declenſion of Hereſy, that he died before it was made public. His children took care to get it printed: it met with a very good reception; there have been ſeveral editions of it, and ſince not one Proteſtant has undertaken to confute it within theſe fourſcore years, no more than the books concerning Anti-Chriſt and Pope Joan, written by the ſame author; I had ſome reaſon to believe that if they did not approve of it, it was at leaſt indifferent to them* (35). Dr Burnet did eaſily run down the authority of ſuch a voucher: he ſhewed that *Florimond de Remond lived far from England, and from the knowledge of Engliſh affairs* (36); and that *a man ſees in every period of his Hiſtory, ſo much of a malignant ſpirit againſt the Reformation, that this gives a juſt prejudice againſt all that*

(*f*) See the remark [*Y*], of the article OCHINUS.

(*g*) See the remark [*E*].

(26) See, above, citation (203), of the article PERICLES.

(27) It is commonly ſaid, to denote a covetous age, that a father, who deſigns to marry his ſon, inquires firſt whether ſuch a maid is rich; ſecondly, whether ſhe is handſome; and laſtly, whether ſhe is honeſt.

(28) Juven. Sat. III, ver. 140.

(29) Burnet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 27, 28.

(30) Pag. 146, 147, of the French edition.

(31) See the Notes on the *Confeſſion de Sanci, pag.* 444, where you will find that the extract, tranſmitted to Dr Burnet, was not altogether exact.

(32) Burnet's Reflexions on the ninth book of Varillas, *pag.* 41.

(33) Arthur ſon of Henry VII.

(34) Varillas, Réponſe à la Critique de Dr Burnet, *pag. m.* 97.

(35) Ibid. *pag.* 98.

(36) Burnet's Defence of the Reflexions, *pag.* 24.

that he ſays . . . . . and beſides, that *this part of his Hiſtory, which relates to the affairs of England, is not ſo much as pretended to be writ by him* (37): For the contrary is expreſsly intimated in the preface, and *his ſon ſeems to claim the honour of that to himſelf. Nay, it is very much doubted whether he was at all the author of thoſe books that paſſed under his name*; for many have aſcribed them to Father Richeome. He adds (38), that *Florimond de Remond never paſſed in France among Hiſtorians for an author of any note, either for judgment or ſincerity*; and that he was accounted an unjuſt judge. The Doctor goes on, and ſays, *Mr Varillas, who, perhaps a year ago, would have reſented it, as the greateſt indignity that could have been done him, if it had been ſaid that he did nothing but copy ſo bad an author, and that he was only his eccho, is now glad to fly to ſo poor a ſhift; for which he is, as I hear, ſo much cenſured in Paris, that it is perhaps too great a cruelty in me to urge this matter any further.* He jeers him for having obſerved that Remond had a wife and children. *It is not eaſy*, ſays the Doctor (39), *to find out the force of this argument: but a man muſt riſe above the vulgar, as much as Mr Varillas, to comprehend his lofty ſtrains. If to have a wife and children makes a man a good writer, one may conclude without any further inquiry, that Mr Varillas has neither. Here is alſo a new argument for the marriage of the Clergy, that has never been yet thought on; yet an ordinary capacity ſuch as mine cannot comprehend why this ſhould have made Florimond de Remond a good writer, and why it had not the ſame effect on Thuanus.* At the end of the book this Critic tells him that the Proteſtants publiſhed their complaints againſt the furious animoſity which Remond expreſſed againſt them (40): this was ſufficient to prepoſſeſs him when he went about to write their Hiſtory; but beſides, he had not forgot that he had been their priſoner, and paid his ranſom to them. Is it not therefore a ſhameful thing for Varillas to maintain that he *had no occaſion to be diſpleaſed with them?* But if any Hiſtorian ſhould bluſh to alledge nothing elſe but the authority of ſuch a voucher as Remond, in giving an account of the ſchiſm of England; it is a moſt ſhameful thing for Varillas in particular to do ſo, ſince he ſet up for a writer, well furniſhed with rare, authentic, private, and unknown manuſcripts.

I muſt obſerve that there is a falſity in Varillas, that was not taken notice of. He pretends that the books concerning Anti-Chriſt and Pope Joan, written by Florimond de Remond, have not been refuted. If he had caſt his eyes upon the title page of the Theatre of Anti-Chriſt (41), and upon Alexander Cooke's Dialogue (42), he might have ſeen the contrary. I muſt alſo obſerve that the reaſon he alledges, grounded upon his Hiſtorian, being a married man, is not a contemptible one; for it is more natural to believe that a Layman was free from prejudices in writing the hiſtory of the enemies of his church, than it is natural to expect ſuch a thing from a Clergyman. And therefore Varillas might be perſuaded that Florimond de Remond was leſs to be ſuſpected than a Monk, or a Prieſt. I confeſs this reaſon is as good for Thuanus; but ſince he writ nothing about Henry the eighth's ſchiſm, how could Varillas make uſe of him? He might therefore have defended himſelf as to this particular.

(37) Ibid. *pag.* 25, 26.

(38) Ibid. *pag.* 28.

(39) Ibid. *pag.* 29.

(40) That paſſage of Dr Burnet is to be ſeen above, citation (31).

(41) Written by Nicolas Vignier, a miniſter, and printed in 1610. There came out alſo a book intituled, *l'Antechriſt Romain*, in anſwer to our Remond.

(42) It was tranſlated out of Engliſh into French by John de la Montagne.

RENOU (John de), in Latin *Renodæus*, Counſellor and Phyſician to the king at Paris, towards the beginning of the XVIIth century, was a Norman (*a*). He chiefly excelled in Pharmacy, as appears by the tracts which he compoſed in Latin [*A*], and which were tranſlated into French by Lewis de Serres. This tranſlator (*b*) affirmed in his praiſe, that in this part of Phyſic he as far ſurpaſſed Fernelius and Sylvius, and all others who had meddled with the ſame ſubject before, as Fernelius and Sylvius ſurpaſs Mirepſus and Præpoſitus. It is eaſy to obſerve that he was no great friend to Riverius, Phyſician to Henry IV. He even treats him as a Mountebank (*c*). I have taken notice that he rejects an infinite number of popular errors, touching the virtues of plants and minerals, &c. but he ſometimes ſpares traditions that are very childiſh [*B*]. He cenſured ſomewhat in Bauderon's Diſpenſatory (*d*), which gave occaſion to his being accuſed of Plagiariſm; for that author's ſon maintained that John de Renou had enriched his Antidotary with an infinite number of thefts taken from the Diſpenſatory of his deceaſed father, Bauderon (*e*). Renou anſwered, that the charge was equally falſe and ridiculous (*f*).

(*a*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the French tranſlation of his Works.

(*b*) See his preface.

(*c*) Renou, *book iii, of his* Materia Medica, *ch. xxxiv, pag. m.* 465.

(*d*) Idem, *book vi, of his* Antidotarium, *chap. iv, pag.* 739.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Ibid.

[*A*] *The tracts which he compoſed in Latin.*] The title of them runs thus; *Diſpenſatorium Galeno-Chymicum continens Inſtitutionum Pharmaceuticarum libros V*; *De Materia Medica libros III*; *& Antidotarium varium & abſolutiſſimum.* The *Lindenius renovatus* (1) mentions the editions of Paris in 1608, and 1623, in 4to; that of Frankfort, 1609, in 8vo; that of Hanau, 1631, in 4to; and that of Geneva, reviſed by Peter Uffenback, and enlarged with ſome new pieces, 1631, in 8vo. They have forgot the edition of Frankfort, 1615, from which Lewis de Serres had made his firſt tranſlation. He was afterwards informed that the author had enlarged this work by one third part in the Paris edition, 1623; and likewiſe tranſlated this ſupplement, and added it to the ſecond edition of his verſion. This ſecond edition is of Lyons, 1626, printed for Antony Chard. The copy which I have ſeen, ſhews in the title page that it is printed at Lyons, for Nicholas Gay, in the year 1637. The work is in folio, and contains fourteen books; five for the *Inſtitutiones Pharmaceuticæ*, three for the *Materia Medica*, and ſix for the *Antidotarium*: there are innumerable typographical errors in it. Lewis de Serres was of Dauphiné, and Fellow of the college of Phyſicians at Lyons. Mr Allard has not given him a place in his *Bibliotheque de Dauphiné*.

B] *Sometimes he ſpares traditions that are very childiſh.*] I ſhall give but one inſtance of it. *They ſay the virtue of the Emerald is ſo great, that it not only preſerves from the falling-ſickneſs all thoſe that wear it ſet in gold on their fingers, but alſo ſtrengthens the memory, and powerfully reſiſts the efforts of carnal concupiſcence. For they tell us, that the king of Hungary being hotly engaged with his wife, perceived that a fine emerald, which he wore upon his finger, broke into three pieces during their amorous conflict; ſuch a friend is that ſtone to chaſtity. This being ſo, I find that the interpreter of Meſue was in the right to ſubſtitute the emerald in the room of the turcoiſe*, &c (2).

(1) At page 666, of the edition of 1686.

(2) Renou, *book ii, of his* Materia Medica, *ch. i, pag.* 406.

RESENIUS (Peter), Counſellor and Profeſſor at Copenhagen, was born there the ſeventh of June 1625. His father, and his two grandfathers by his mother's and father's ſide, had been biſhops of Sealand. He was made Sub-principal of the college of Copenhagen in 1646; and having reſigned that employment the year following, he travelled into foreign countries. He ſtudied the *Belles Lettres*, and the Civil-Law, for the ſpace of four years, in the univerſity of Leyden, and then he went into France, Spain, and Italy. He was a whole year at Padua, where he applied himſelf chiefly to the ſtudy of the Civil-Law. He was elected Counſellor of the German nation there, and Vice-Syndic of the univerſity, and in that quality he made an harangue in the ſenate of Venice, and obtained a privilege for that univerſity. If he had pleaſed he might have been made a knight of St Mark. He left Padua after he had taken his degree of Doctor of Law the eleventh of September 1653. He returned into Denmark by the way of Germany, and married the eighth of July 1655. He was made Profeſſor of Moral Philoſophy, in the univerſity of Copenhagen, the twenty-fifth of November 1657, and then Conſul of the ſame city, and counſellor in the ſupreme council, and at laſt Preſident of Copenhagen, and counſellor of juſtice. He had a grant of nobility the eighth of January 1680, and was made counſellor of ſtate the ſixth of May 1684. He had a very fine library, which he beſtowed upon the univerſity of Copenhagen: the catalogue of it was printed (*a*) in 1685. He alſo publiſhed ſeveral books (*b*) [*A*].

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Here is the liſt of them; *Edda Snorronis Sturleſonii triplici linguâ Iſlandicâ & Latinâ: quaram Iſlandica primitiva eſt, reliquæ autem interpretationes. Præfixa etiam prolegomena de triplici ratione docendi Ethicam: Item de Eddæ Scriptoribus partibus & aliis ſimilibus. Impreſſum eſt hoc opus* in quarta *quam appellant forma, Anno MDCLXV. Eddæ Sæmundianæ pars dicta HAVAMAAL, complexa Ethicam Odini: eſtque & Iſlandicè & Latinè impreſſa, in quarto, ut vocant, anno MDCLXV. Eddæ Sæmundianæ VOLUSPA, continens Philoſophiam Danorum, Norvegorumque antiquiſſimam: eſtque impreſſa* in quarto, *anno MDCLXV. item anno MDCLXXIII. additis Gudmundi Andreæ Iſlandi annotationibus. Inſcriptiones Havnienſes, Amagrienſes & Uraniburgicæ, Latinæ, Danicæ & Germanicæ; una cum addita narratione de Tychone Braheo diverſiſque ipſius & ſororis ipſius Sophiæ Braheæ epiſtolis, editæ* in quarto, *anno MDCLXVIII. Jus aulicum vetus Regum Norvegorum, dictum HIRDSKRAA: Item jus aulicum vetus Regum Danorum dictum VITHERLAGSRET, linguâ triplici, originali Iſlandica, interpretibus Danica, atque Latina, additæ quoque annotationes, Impreſſio facta Havniæ anno MDCLXXIII. Havniæ delineatio topographica in ære expreſſa, unà cum brevi partium & locorum enarratione, Danicè & Germanicè impreſſa Havniæ, anno MDCLXXIV. Samoſæ deſcriptio & delineatio cum figuris.* in folio, *Havniæ anno MDCLXXV. Friderici II. Hiſt. Danicè* in folio *cum figuris, Haf. an. MDCLXXV. Lexicon Iſlandicum Gudmundi Andreæ Iſlandi, cum præfatione de ejuſdem vita: in forma quarta Havniæ, anno MDCLXXXIII. Leges Cimbricæ Valdemari ſecundi Regis Danici, Germanicè, interprete Erico Krabbio, equite Danico. In præfatione addita eſt narratio de ordine equeſtri Dannebrogico: item de novo corpore Juris Danici: nec non de genealogia ejuſdem Erici Krabbii. Havniæ* in quarto, *anno MDCLXXXIV. Leges civiles & eccleſiaſticæ Chriſtiani Secundi* in quarto, *Havniæ anno MDCLXXXIV. Havniæ & Riparum jus urbicum. In 12mo Havniæ, eod. an. MDCLXXXIV* (1).

(*a*) At Copenhagen, in 4to.

(*b*) Taken from the Journal of his Life, written by himſelf, and prefixed to the catalogue of his library.

(1) Vita Riſenii, *folio* D ij *verſo.*

REVEREND-DE-BOUGY (John), marquis de Bougy, and lieutenant-general in the French armies, under the reign of Lewis XIV, diſtinguiſhed himſelf upon many occaſions by his great courage and ability, and by a conſtant adherence to the ſervice of his king, when ſo many others joined with the rebels in the laſt civil war (*a*). He was a Proteſtant, and of an antient and noble family in the Lower Normandy [*A*], and the youngeſt of ſixteen brothers or ſiſters (*b*). He got into the regiment of guards as a cadet at twelve years of age, and afterwards he raiſed himſelf by degrees; for he was ſucceſſively a cornet, captain of the light-horſe, colonel of horſe, &c (*c*). He was cornet of the Gendarmes of marſhal de Gaſſion (*d*), who conceived ſo great an affection and eſteem for him [*B*], that this very thing is enough to convince us of his bravery, and other military accompliſhments. He proved very thankful; for he eſpouſed the intereſts of that marſhal ſo zealouſly, that cardinal Mazarin could never bring him off. His Eminence was very preſſing upon him on that account, when he went to court in order to mend what the marſhal's vivacity and boldneſs had ſpoiled (*e*). The cardinal was more ſucceſsful in his endeavours to gain Mr de Bougy after Gaſſion's death [*C*]. He performed great and important ſervices during the civil war,

(*a*) In 1649, and the following years.

(*b*) A Memoir imparted to the author.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Ibid.

[*A*] *He was . . . . of an antient and noble family in the Lower Normandy.*] He was the ſon of MICHAEL REVEREND-DE-BOUGY, and grandſon of OLIVER REVEREND-DE-BOUGY, and great-grandſon of MICHAEL REVEREND-DE-BOUGY. The two latter are mentioned in Mezerai's hiſtory, as we ſhall ſee by and by. The printed books ſay nothing of their predeceſſors; but the writings of the family go higher, tho' they are ſomewhat imperfect, the houſe having been plundered once, and burnt another time, during the civil wars of the XVIth century (1). Mezerai reckons one Bougy (2) among the lords that joined at Caën the duke of Montpenſier, whom Henry III had ſent into Normandy, to prevent the deſign of the Leaguers upon that province. This Bougy was the father of Oliver Reverend-de-Bougy, whom the ſame Hiſtorian mentions in theſe terms: ‘Caën had been loſt, if the reſolution and good conduct of Oliver Reverend-de-Bougy, a gentleman of that country, who happened to be there, had not put a ſtop to that irruption. He goes courageouſly into the ſtreet, ſends for his friends, ſtirs up the inhabitants, and in the mean time foreſeeing that the enemies intended to ſhut the gate of the bridge, he immediately orders one of his men to go and nail a piece of wood to it. So that whilſt the enemies endeavour to ſhut it, and the more haſte they make, the leſs they perceive the hindrance, he arrives thereupon with fifteen or twenty men animated by his example. They are ſurprized and troubled at his coming; and becauſe they cannot ſhut the gate cloſe, one of thoſe who attended him, called la Riviere-Renouf, thruſting himſelf with no leſs hardineſs than courage into the gap, ſhoots la Motte-Corbiniere in the head with a piſtol, and by his death cauſes his deſign to miſcarry. The town grew more ſenſible of the danger they were in, when it was over; and the king gave this character of Bougy, that his fidelity, of which he had already given many proofs, had ſaved, on this occaſion, all the Lower Normandy (3).’

[*B*] *The Marſhal de Gaſſion conceived ſo great an affection and eſteem for him.*] It is well known that he died of the wound he had received at the ſiege of Lens, as *he was ſhaking one of the ſtakes of a palliſado* (4). *He received a muſket-ſhot in the head, which ſtruck him down, but he was immediately taken up by his couſin Gaſſion, and by the marquis de Bougy, the only perſons who had followed him.* They carried him back into the trenches. He got himſelf carried to Arras. Mr de Bougy accompanied him thither (5). *The Marſhal gave him his ſword, as he was dying* (6), *telling him, that he thought he was the man in France beſt qualified to wear it after him.* The Marſhal's regiment was divided between his couſin Mr de Gaſſion, and the marquis de Bougy.

[*C*] *The Cardinal was more ſucceſsful in his endeavours to gain Mr de Bougy after Gaſſion's death.*] Having ſent for him to court, as ſoon as he heard of the Marſhal's death, he told him; *I offer you a friend in the room of him, whom you have loſt: I have been ſo well pleaſed with your conſtant fidelity to that marſhal, that I deſire you would ſhew the ſame to me, and I promiſe*

(1) Memoir imparted to me.

(2) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, *Tom. iii, pag.* 776, *Edit.* 1685.

(3) Idem, in the Life of Henry IV, *pag.* 1097, 1098.

(4) *The Abbot* de Pure, Vie du Maréchal de Gaſſion, *Tom. iv, pag.* 309, *ad ann.* 1647.

(5) The ſame Memoir.

(6) It is kept in the family to this day.

and his good conduct and fidelity were ſo well known, that he was *choſen to command in chief the troops that ſhould remain with* the king; *which he did ſo ſucceſsfully, that after he had beat* the rebels, *who undertook to prevent his paſſing the Loire at la Charitè, and being entered into Berri, he forced their commander to abandon the city of Bourges, where* the king *was received ſoon after* (*f*). He had before *commanded in chief* at the ſiege of Chateau-Portien; *which engaged* the king *after the taking of that place to make him governor of it. . . . He ſignalized himſelf by the taking of Mas d'Agenois . . . . and at the retreat of St Andras*, and on ſeveral other occaſions; *in one of which, being lieutenant-general, after he had fought with great valour to the laſt extremity, he was taken priſoner* (*g*) in the year 1653. He was permitted to go to court upon his parole (*h*), and having been exchanged he returned into Guienne, where he married in 1654 Mary de la Chauſade de Callonge, a very rich heireſs, by whom he left but one ſon [*D*]. The queen-mother and cardinal Mazarin, concerned themſelves very obligingly in that marriage [*E*], and did not forget to mention the good ſervices of the lady's father [*F*]. He ſerved in Catalonia the ſame year, under the Prince of Conti, and the years following till 1657, when he was obliged to aſk leave to go to Montpellier, that he might be cured of a defluxion upon his lungs. He got that illneſs by ſtaying a whole night upon the mountains, where he was covered with ſnow in his ſleep. He found no eaſe at Montpellier, and finding as little at Bourdeaux, he went to his country-ſeat at Callonge, where he died in the year 1658, being forty years of age. He was regretted by every body. The king, the queen, and cardinal Mazarin, did his widow the honour to write to her letters of conſolation. He would have made a greater fortune, if he had been a Roman Catholic: he received ſeveral letters from the queen, and from the cardinal, wherein they exhorted him to change his religion, and to remove by that means the obſtacle to his advancement: they offered him a marſhal's ſtaff, and a government that would be left to his choice, provided he would be a convert. His anſwer was, *that if he could reſolve to betray his GOD for a marſhal's ſtaff, he might betray his king for a leſſer advantage, and that he could do neither of them, being contented to ſee that his ſervices were acceptable, and that his religion was the only reaſon why he was not rewarded for them (i).* The king had erected the lordſhip of Bougy, ſituate in the Lower Normandy, into a marquiſate; but becauſe it is held of ſeveral lords, ſo many oppoſitions were formed againſt the regiſtring of the letters-patent, that they proved ineffectual: which was the reaſon why that erection was transferred to the barony of Callonge; which holds immediately of the king. The patent was drawn up in November 1667, and regiſtred in the Chamber of Accounts the ninth of September 1669. I have read it, and I found in it a large account of the ſervices which the marquis de Bougy did the king. They conſiſted not only in warlike actions, but alſo in negotiations (*k*). You will find, below, ſome of the moſt glorious paſſages of his life [*G*]. He received among other wounds five muſket-ſhots (*l*).

(*f*) The king's patent for the erection of the marquiſate of Bougy.

(*g*) Ibid.

(*h*) Imparted Memoir.

(*i*) Taken from the abovementioned Memoir.

(*k*) *Here are the words of the patent*, During all that time, having as great an opinion of his prudence, as of his valour, we employed him likewiſe in ſeveral important negotiations, particularly with the duke of Modena, when he declared for us, and joined his army with ours in 1648.

(*l*) The patent for the erection.

---

to be your friend. Mr de Bougy returned ſuch an anſwer as the Cardinal deſired, and proved ſo faithful to him, that when his Eminence went out of France, he accompanied him to the frontiers. I will come again, and will make your fortune, ſaid the Cardinal to him; but when he returned, he told him that his being a Proteſtant was an obſtacle to it (7).

[*D*] *By whom he left but one ſon.*] To wit, JOHN JAMES REVEREND-DE-BOUGY, who was born in 1655, and nine years commanded the regiment as colonel. He left the ſervice on account of his religion, and retired into Holland. He lives at the Hague, where he is very much reſpected; and indeed he deſerves it. He loſt his only ſon ſince he left France. He has only two daughters left by Elizabeth de Bar de Camparnau, whom he married in 1674. She is deſcended by the mother's ſide from that famous Reniers, whoſe quarrel with Veiſins was attended with very remarkable circumſtances. They are to be found in Thuanus (8) and Mezerai (9). This laſt Hiſtorian obſerves that he was Lieutenant of the Princes in Querci. The family of Bar de Camparnau is a very noble one. It is mentioned in ſeveral books, eſpecially in the Hiſtory of the Siege of Montaubon (10).

[*E*] *The Queen-mother and Cardinal Mazarin concerned themſelves very obligingly in that marriage.*] The Marquis de Bougy was the bearer of a letter which that queen writ to Mademoiſelle de Callonge, to deſire her to receive him as one that came from her. She added, *The ſervices of your deceaſed father engage me to ſee you ſettled: I do not think I can help you to a better match* (11).

[*F*] *The good ſervices of the lady's father.*] It was James de la Chauſade baron of Callonge. He had been governor of Montpellier during the wars of the duke of Rohan, to whom he was nearly related. It was he, who ſpoke in the name of the Reformed, when the peace was concluded before Montpellier. See du Pleix's Hiſtory, Girard in his Life of the duke of Epernon, Baſſompierre's Memoirs, the Life of the duke of Montmorenci, and ſeveral other authors. The king's patent for erecting the barony of Callonge into a marquiſate, imports, that this James de la Chauſade had been *colonel of a regiment of foot for the king's ſervice in Holland, that he had made himſelf conſiderable by his valour and experience in military affairs, and by many glorious actions, eſpecially at the time of the commotions in Guienne, under the duke of Epernon's government, during which he brought to* that duke *at two ſeveral times conſiderable ſuccours of gentlemen volunteers, which did not a little contribute to keep up* his majeſty's *authority, and to curb the factious, that at the battle of Avein he took the enemy's canon, after he had broke through and routed them with his regiment, conſiſting of twenty companies, and that, leſt his glory ſhould be confined within the frontiers of this kingdom, he followed the duke of Candale into Turkey, to fight the enemies of the Chriſtian name, where he blew up the gate of Agliman with a petard, and was one of the firſt who entered that place ſword in hand, after having ſignalized himſelf on ſeveral other occaſions* (12). Mrs de Callonge, his other daughter, died at the Hague ſome months ago (13), in a very advanced age. She had never been married. She was a perſon of an exemplary piety and virtue, and underſtood Hebrew very well (14): ſhe left France on account of her religion when the edict of Nantes was revoked. Mezerai mentions one Callonge among the Proteſtant lords of the province of Guienne, who took up arms in Charles the ninth's reign (15).

[*G*] *You will find . . . ſome of the moſt glorious paſſages of his life.*] At the battle of Rocroi he commanded the company of Gaſſion's Gendarmes, and tho' he had a foot bruiſed with a muſket-ſhot, he broke through a battalion of the enemies, where his horſe was killed under him

(7) Taken from the ſame Memoir.

(8) Thuan. *lib. lii, pag.* 1079, *ad ann.* 1572.

(9) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 259.

(10) The abovequoted Memoir.

(11) Ibid.

(12) Taken from the patent.

(13) I write this in April 1701.

(14) *See* Colomeſius, *pag.* 271, *of the* Gallia Orientalis.

(15) Mezerai, *Tom. iii, pag.* 93.

him with ſeveral puſhes of pikes and ſwords (16). They are the very words of the king's letters-patent abovementioned. In the year 1650. *He threw himſelf into the town of St Quintin with five hundred horſe,* and by that means diſappointed the Spaniards deſign *upon that place, which was in great danger.* Afterwards, when *they beſieged the town of Guiſe, the advice he gave to place 1200 muſketeers in the wood, to cut off the paſſage of the proviſions for the beſiegers and the great ability wherewith he himſelf executed that bold enterprize,* was one of the cauſes why that ſiege was raiſed (17). The court having reſolved to quit Paris in 1651, when the prince of Condé had diſcovered his ill deſigns, the queen ſent immediately for Mr de Bougy, who was in Flanders, and when ſhe ſaw him come into her chamber with his boots on, ſhe cryed out, *Here is Bougy, my fear is over;* and then ſhe told him, that ſhe had ſent for him to intruſt him with the king's perſon, and herſelf. Accordingly he carried them to Fontainebleau. Take notice he was then but a Marſhal de Camp, and that there were many officers at court in higher poſts (18), but the queen did not truſt every body, or rather ſhe miſtruſted almoſt every body. Mr de Bougy (19) at his ſetting out from Flanders had ordered a detachment of horſe to follow him, and then went poſt. As ſoon as he had conducted the court to Fontainebleau, he was informed, that the prince's troops were marching towards Gien, to poſſeſs themſelves of it. Whereupon he diſpatched a courier to the troops of Flanders, who had been ordered to follow him, and deſired them to make all the haſte they poſſibly could. The courier met them as they were taking their quarters. After they had ſeen the order, they only baited, and then they remounted and continued their march. They were no ſooner arrived, but Mr de Bougy put himſelf at the head of them, and being entered into Gien, he ordered the gate on the ſide of the prince's troops to be opened, and charged them ſo briſkly, that he routed them, and took three general officers priſoners. As he was purſuing the flying enemy, he perceived a boy who was frighted, and aſked him what was his name; and being told that he was the ſon of one of the chief magiſtrates of Bourges, *Will you,* ſaid he to him, *carry a letter to your father; the queen looks upon him as one of her moſt faithful ſervants.* The boy promiſed to deliver it, and immediately Mr de Bougy acquainted that magiſtrate that he had juſt now beat the prince's troops, and was marching to Bourges. In the mean while the prince of Conti had got into that town, and aſſembled the magiſtrates to oblige them to declare for him. The boy arrives, the prince of Conti laughs at the letter, and takes it for a ſtratagem, and ſteps into another room, to draw up the anſwer he would have them return to Mr de Bougy's letter. While he was writing it, ſome wounded ſoldiers arrive, who confirm the truth of that news; whereupon the magiſtrates declared to him that he muſt retire; and that they will remain faithful (20). The prince retired to Mouron, and from thence into Guienne (21). Mr de Bougy was *ordered to purſue him under the conduct of the count de Harcourt, who having permitted him to go with five hundred horſe over the river Né in Xaintonge, and over a very large and dangerous moraſs, behind which* the rebellious troops *lay to the number of four thouſand horſe, and five thouſand foot, he took two of their beſt quarters, and brought with him near five hundred troopers or officers priſoners.* At the ſiege of Capdequiers, in Catalonia, where he was lieutenant-general for the day the troops that gave the aſſault, having been repulſed from the breach, he took a halberd from a ſerjeant, mounted the breach firſt, and animated the ſoldiers by his example. He was wounded there with a muſket-ſhot, and notwithſtanding his wound he held out till the town was taken. He had the government of it given him, tho' ſuch a way of rewarding Huguenot officers was not in faſhion at that time (22).

(16) The patent.

(17) Ibid.

(18) In the abovementioned Memoir.

(19) Ibid.

(20) Taken from the ſaid Memoir.

(21) Letters Patents.

(22) From the ſaid Memoir.

REYNIER (PETER DE) knight of the order of St John of Jeruſalem, was of the illuſtrious family of the Reyniers of Toulouſe. He was killed in the year 1311, in the iſland of Rhodes, which Othman, king of the Turks, beſieged that year: this lord ſignalized himſelf in that ſiege by an uncommon bravery. This family has produced perſons of diſtinguiſhed merit, among others ELIAS DE REYNIER, counſellor of the parliament of Languedoc in the year 1523, who gained eſteem by his great attachment to his prince, and whoſe ſon, who was likewiſe a counſellor of the parliament, married Martha de Minut, daughter of Meſſire James de Minut, firſt preſident of the ſame parliament; FRANCIS DE REYNIER, ſeneſchal of Lauragois; JOHN DE REYNIER, camp-maſter. There remains at preſent of this family, CHARLES DE REYNIER, knight of the order of St Lewis, the king's lieutenant, and commandant of the town and government of Brouage (*a*), who has a brother a counſellor in the parliament of Toulouſe (*b*).

(*a*) He died in the month of December 1705. See the *Mercure Galant*, of the month of January 1706, *pag.* 223, 224.

(*b*) Etat de la France.

REZ (ANTONY DE) Eſq; advocate in the parliament of Paris, was the ſon of ANTONY DE REZ, Counſellor Secretary to the King, and born at Paris in the year 1650. His merit will beſt appear by two elogies that have been ſent to me (*a*). I make no doubt that all diſcerning men will own they are ſo well written, that they may ſerve as a model. The firſt is larger, and contains more particulars [*A*]. The ſecond

(*a*) By Mr Marais, advocate in the parliament of Paris.

[*A*] *The firſt elogy is larger, and contains more particulars.*] Here it is ſuch as it came to my hands; I thought I could neither alter nor curtail it without ſpoiling it. ‘Antony de Rez betook himſelf to the bar from his younger years, and pleaded his firſt cauſe at ſixteen years of age. After he had been ſome time in the inferior courts to learn their way of proceeding, he appeared in the parliament with great glory, being ſtill very young. He ſoon diſcovered all the noble talents, whereby he was ſo gloriouſly diſtinguiſhed afterwards; a ready, quick, and penetrating wit; a noble, plain and natural eloquence; a polite and charming delivery; a Ciceronian raillery; a certain way of inſinuating himſelf, which gained him the love of every body; a ſincerity which appeared in his look, and in all the features of his face before he ſpoke; a probity, that was proof againſt the moſt ſeducing temptations; an agreeable and ſolid erudition grounded upon reaſon, juſtice and humanity, more than upon books; in a word, all the fine qualities of an honeſt and great man. All ſorts of people reſorted to him; the men of quality were pleaſed with his good mien, affability and gentleman-like behaviour: thoſe of the meaner ſort were alſo deſirous to have him for their advocate, becauſe they knew he was a man of honour, obliging, and ready to hear every body. He diſcharged his duty moſt faithfully, and with the greateſt exactneſs, even in the leaſt things. The magiſtrates of all ranks, being perſuaded that nothing but truth could come out of his mouth, heard him with pleaſure, loved to ſee him, and honoured him with a particular affection. Tho' he was full of buſineſs, his great order enabled him to go through it. He was concerned in all the moſt conſiderable cauſes; he defended moſt eloquently that of the princes of Lorrain, relating to the donation of Madam de Guiſe, and afterwards he maintained the validity of her laſt will. All his combats were attended with ſo many victories; if a client wanted an advocate, the court nominated him by a ſuperior order, and intruſted him with ſuch cauſes as were given over. The great affairs ſecond is of great weight; for it is taken from a ſpeech ſpoken in the parliament of Paris by an advocate-general [B].

‘affairs increaſed, and became eaſy in his hands, the moſt knotty difficulties vaniſhed away as ſoon as he handled them, and the judges, being put in a ſafe way by him, gave their judgment without any fear of being miſtaken. We have ſeen what he was at the bar: he was yet more amiable in converſation. There was never a more affectionate, ſincere, and officious friend, a better father, and a better huſband. He lived an innocent and virtuous life, attended with briſkneſs and gayety: his wit ſupplied him immediately with a thouſand ingenious inventions to divert himſelf after his great labours: he was never weary of himſelf, and thoſe, who happened to be with him, were never weary of his company: he was that univerſal man, whom Mr Peliſſon deſcribes to us in his preface to Sarrazin, an excellent Orator at the bar, a judicious chamber-counſellor, a kind father, and a kind huſband in his family, a pleaſant and uſeful friend: in ſhort, he was adorned with all the natural and acquired knowledge, that can ſatisfy the mind of man. The only thing wanting to him was a longer life: but he died of a malignant fever, in the middle of a moſt glorious career, and the faireſt hopes, being forty-three years of age, the ſeventh of February, 1694, after a ſickneſs that laſted ſeven days. He left two children, a ſon and a daughter, by Magdalen du Four his wife.’

[B] *The ſecond elogy . . . . . is taken from a ſpeech ſpoken in the parliament of Paris by an advocate-general.*] Here is the continuation of the words you have read in the foregoing remark: ‘Mr de Harlay, who was then advocate-general, and ſpokeſman, at the opening of the parliament in the ſame year, did remember him ten months after his death, and propoſed him as a model to all his brethren in theſe words which are very glorious to his memory. * *To moderate the true liberty of your profeſſion we muſt tell you again, that it is not an eaſy undertaking, and a thing that requires no great labour: it is the fruit of a continual ſtudy, or rather of a continual attention upon ourſelves, and of an exact practice of many virtues. Thus one of your brethren, whom an untimely death has lately taken away from us, acquired the eſteem of the public, and the love of all thoſe who knew him, and attained in an age not far advanced to the reputation and practice of the moſt conſummate advocates. Adorned with thoſe outward advantages, which none but nature can give, he ſhewed in his countenance the character of probity and modeſty, which appeared in his whole conduct. You have ſeen him from his firſt beginning bear glorioſly the weight of the greateſt actions and defend the moſt difficult cauſes with no leſs politeneſs than ſobriety. Attentive to all his duties, zealous for his clients, civil to his brethren, reſpectful to the magiſtrates, he made it appear by ſignal proofs, that if ſometimes the neceſſity of your miniſtry, or the expreſs orders of your ſuperiors,* oblige you to ſpeak for impoſture and calumny, you may be the defenders of a crime without acting againſt your honour and your conſcience, and even uſe the hardeſt words, without tranſgreſſing the moſt exact rules of decorum and civility. *But it is not enough to pay inwardly this melancholy duty to his memory, nor to hear with pleaſure the praiſes he ſo juſtly deſerved; his example ought to excite you to imitate his virtues, and to lay upon us by your conduct a contiual obligation to ſpend theſe ſolemn days in publiſhing your praiſes, without being forced to cenſure the faults contrary to the duties of your profeſſion, and which are ſo rare among you to our great ſatisfaction.*’

* Diſcours prononcé à la St Martin 1694. ſur la Liberté.

RHODOMAN (LAURENCE), was born in the year 1546, in the village of Saſſowerf (a) belonging to the counts of Stolberg in the Upper Saxony. Thoſe counts perceiving in him a great diſpoſition for learning, maintained him in the college of Ilfeld (b). He was there ſix years, and made ſo great a progreſs under Michael Neander (c), that he appeared afterwards well qualified to be the chief teacher in the beſt colleges, and famous univerſities [A]. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf particularly by his great ſkill in the Greek tongue. The beſt judges admired his Greek verſes (d). Scaliger did not like his Latin poetry [B]. He ſucceeded very well in his Latin tranſlation of Diodorus Siculus. At laſt he was made profeſſor of Hiſtory in the univerſity of Wirtemberg, where he died the eighth of January 1606. You will find, below, the catalogue of his principal works [C]. He obtained the honour of Poet-Laureat. **NICOLAS RHODOMAN**, his ſon, has publiſhed ſomething (e).

(a) Rhodomanus, *Epiſt. Dedicat.* Quinti Smyrnæi, Quænſtedt, de Patriis Illuſtr. *pag.* 219.

(b) Their anceſtors had founded it in the monaſtery of that name by the advice of Luther and Melanchthon. See Rhodoman's Epiſtle Dedicatory, prefixed to Quintus Calaber.

(c) See the ſame Epiſtle Dedicatory, and the preface to his tranſlation of Diodorus Siculus.

(d) See the remark [B].

(e) Konig. Bibl. *pag.* 689.

[A] *He was qualified to be the chief teacher in the beſt colleges, and famous univerſities.*] Here is what he himſelf ſays: ‘(1) Eoſque in his, σὺν θεῷ καὶ μούσαις. progreſſus feci, ut nobilium inde puerorum, & illuſtriſſ. principum informationi neque immature neque infructuoſe applicarer; Scholarum etiam bene conſtitutarum adminiſtrationi dehinc præficerer. - - - - *I made ſuch progreſs in theſe ſtudies by the help of God and the Muſes, that from that time I was employed (neither unſeaſonably nor unſucceſsfully) in teaching young noblemen and illuſtrious princes. I came likewiſe to be truſted with the chief management of ſome well regulated ſchools.*’ The places, where he taught, are thus mentioned in his funeral Programma; *Docuit* Walcerodi, *docuit* Ienæ, *docuit* Stralesſundi, *docuit denique* Wittebergæ, *atque ita docuit ut eruditione, ſedulitate ac dexteritate ſecundus haberi nemini debeat* (2). He was profeſſor of the Greek tongue at Iena, for the ſpace of ſeven years, and profeſſor of Hiſtory at Wittemberg, for the ſpace of four years (3).

[B] *Scaliger did not like his Latin poetry.*] He ſpoke of them thus in converſation: *Rhodomanus doctiſſimus in Poëſi Græca, ſed in Latina imperitus & infelix. . . . Bonum Diodorum Siculum edidit; a pretty man, qui latuit, as Leopardus, who was a good Grecian. I have writ ſo many letters about Rhodomanus into Germany, that they have been ſhown to the duke of Saxony, who ſent for him from a trivial ſchool in Pomerania to Wittemberg: he is a very ugly and clowniſh man. . . . . He is a Poet and a good Grecian; he has publiſhed a Chronology, wherein he makes it his buſineſs to contradict all the world, and me too. There are very fooliſh things in his book. Chronologers have committed abundance of miſtakes; Rhodomanus dotes in his old days: he pronounces as Vulcanius does. Rhodomanus carmina Latina non bene ſcribit, ſed Græca bona; bonus eſt Græcus in Poetis* (4).

Note, That Scaliger has confounded our Laurence Rhodoman with one Laurence Codoman (5), who is the author of four books of Chronology, which he added to his Annals of the Holy Scripture, printed at Wittemberg in 1581. It is a very common thing for the moſt learned men to make ſuch miſtakes in converſation, and when the names of authors differ only in ſome letters, ſuch a miſtake may be eaſily committed. This is the caſe of Scaliger.

[C] *The catalogue of his principal works.*] He tranſlated into Latin the Greek Poem of Cointus Smyrnæus, or Quintus Calaber, concerning the taking of Troy, and added ſome corrections to it. As for the commentaries he made upon that author, I do not believe they have been printed; Moreri and others ſay, without any ground for it, *that they are very much eſteemed.* I make uſe of an edition of that work (6), in which there are two Greek and Latin Poems of Rhodoman: the one is intituled ΙΛΙΑΣ ΜΙΚΡΑ, and contains an abridgment of the Iliads, and of Quintus Calaber: the other, intituled ΤΡΟΙΚΑ, contains an epitome of the Trojan war, *ex variis auctoribus decerpta* - - - - *Taken from ſeveral authors.* There is alſo the oration, in which Dion Chryſoſtom maintains that Troy was not taken, with Rhodoman's Latin tranſlation, and ſome Scholia. Here are the titles of ſome other books (7). *Hiſtoria vitæ & doctrinæ Martini Lutheri*

(1) *In Epiſtola dedicatoria* Quinti Calabri.

(2) Daniel Sennertus, in Programmate, apud Henningum Witte, Memor. Philoſoph. *pag.* 24.

(3) Ib. *p.* 25.

(4) Scaligerana, *voce* Rhodomanus, *pag. m.* 204.

(5) See Mr Molerus, *pag.* 716, of his *Homonymoſcopia.*

(6) It is that of 1614.

(7) Witte, *ubi ſupra, pag.* 28.

theri carmine heroïco deſcripta. (8) *Deſcriptio Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiæ ſive populi Dei Politiæ ejuſdem & rerum præcipuarum, quæ in illo populo acciderunt, Græco carmine, cum verſione Latina è regione textus Græci,* Francof. 1581, in 8vo. *Poëſis Chriſtiana, id eſt, Paleſtinæ ſeu Hiſtoriæ ſacræ Græco-Latinæ libri IX,* Marpurgi 1589. Francof. 1590, 1630. in 4to. *Argonautica, Thebaica, Ilias parva:* Lipſ. 1588, *in 8vo. Tabulæ Etymologiæ Græcæ:* ibid. 1590, *in 8vo. Memnonis Hiſtoria de Republica Heracleenſium, & rebus Ponticis Ecloga: ſeu excerptæ & abbreviatæ narrationes in Sermonem Latinum tranſlatæ:* Helmſtadii 1591, *in 4to. Epithalamia ſacra:* Ienæ 1594, *in 4to. Ex Memnone, de Tyrannis Heracleæ Ponticæ Cteſia & Agatharchide excerptæ Hiſtoriæ Græcè & Latinè partim ex Laur. Rhodomani interpretatione:* Genevæ 1593, *in 8vo. Theologiæ Chriſtianæ tyrocinia, carmine Heroïco Græco-Latino in V libros digeſta:* Lipſiæ 1597, *in 8vo.* His *Germanis* was not printed when he died: it is very much commended in his funeral Programma. *Imprimis opus illud auro contra æſtimandum, quod de origine, moribus ac rebus geſtis veterum Germanorum Græcè ſcripſit, & Germanidem inſcripſit. Quod opus unicum tale eſt, ut animum atque ingenium hominis excellentem, charitateque patriæ inſigniter flagrantem, abundè oſtendat* (9). Witte (10) reckons it among the printed books of Rhodoman, but does not ſay in what year it was publiſhed at Wittemberg.

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 27.

(9) Sennertus, ubi ſupra, apud Witte, *pag.* 24.

(10) Ubi ſupra.

RHODOPE, a famous courtezan, cotemporary with Æſop, and his fellow-ſlave, was born in Thrace *(a)*. Xanthus, the Samian, carried her into Egypt, where Charaxus, a Merchant of Mitylene *(b)*, and brother to Sappho, became ſo much in love with her, that he bought her for a great ſum of money. By that means ſhe was made free; and becauſe ſhe was very beautiful, and the town of Naucratis, where ſhe ſettled, was full of rich and voluptuous men, ſhe got a great eſtate by being a courtezan *(c)*. However, we muſt not believe that ſhe got ſo much by it, as to be able to build one of thoſe pyramids [*A*], that have been reckoned among the ſeven wonders of the world. Herodotus calls it a fabulous ſtory. What is ſaid of her ſhoe is not better grounded [*B*]. Athenæus is of opinion, that the courtezan Dorica, miſtreſs to Sappho's brother, has been confounded with Rhodope by Herodotus *(d)*.

(a) Herodot. *lib. ii, cap. cxxxiv.*

(b) A town in the iſle of Leſbos.

(c) Taken from Herodotus, ibid. *cap. cxxxv.*

(d) Athen. *lib. xiii, pag.* 596.

[*A*] *To build one of thoſe pyramids.*] Pliny does not ſeem to doubt of it; but perhaps he believed nothing of it, and expreſſed himſelf as he did, only that he might have an occaſion to ſet forth ſome ſubtilties. He ſays, that the heighth and magnificent ſtructure of the pyramids is not that which ought to be moſt admired in that wonder of the world; the greateſt miracle (adds he) lies in this, that a courtezan ſhould have got ſo much wealth, as was ſufficient to raiſe that pyramid which is moſt eſteemed. *Hæc ſunt pyramidum miracula: ſupremumque illud, ne quis regum opus, miretur minimam ex his, ſed laudatiſſimam, à Rhodope meretricula factam. Æſopi fabularum Philoſophi conſerva quondam & contubernalis hæc fuit, majore miraculo tantas opes meretricio eſſe conquiſitas quæſtu* (1). That tradition was but a romantic ſtory of the Greeks. Herodotus, though a credulous author, rejects it. He maintains (2), that the pyramid, the building of which was aſcribed to Rhodope, was built many years before the reign of Amaſis, in which that courtezan lived. He adds (3), that though ſhe had got a great eſtate, ſhe would not have been able to ſuſtain the immenſe charges of that building. He proves it by a very good reaſon. We know, ſays he, what the riches of that woman amounted to; for the iron ſpits, which ſhe conſecrated in the temple of Apollo at Delphi, and for which ſhe ſpent the tenth part of her eſtate, are to be ſeen there ſtill. Thoſe ſpits were deſigned for the roaſting of oxen. The Heathen prieſts were not very nice; the ſmell of gain was very acceptable to them, though the cauſe of it was never ſo ſtinking: and Veſpaſian might have learned of them this maxim, *Lucri bonus eſt odor ex re qualibet* (4). They heartily received the offerings of courtezans, and conſecrated them among the moſt celebrated monuments of the devotion of people; whereby they immortalized the crimes of thoſe courtezans, according to their deſires. Rhodope gave away the tenth part of her booty for the making of ſpits, that ſhe might raiſe to herſelf an eternal monument in Greece. Ἐπεθύμησε γὰρ Ῥοδῶπις μνημήϊον αὐτῆς ἐν τῆ Ἑλλάδι καταλιπέσθαι, ποίημα ποιησαμένη τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ τυγχάνει ἄλλω ἐξευρημένον, καὶ ἀνακείμενον ἐν ἱρῶ, τοῦτο ἀναθεῖναι ἐς Δελφοὺς μνημόσυνον ἑωϋτῆς. τῆς ὦν δεκάτης τῶν χρημάτων ποιησαμένη ὀβελοὺς βουπόρους πολλοὺς σιδηρήους, ὅσον ἐνεχώρεε ἡ δεκάτη οἱ, ἀπέπεμπε ἐς Δελφούς. οἳ καὶ νῦν ἔτι συννενέαται, ὄπισθε μὲν τοῦ βωμοῦ τὸν Χῖοι ἀνέθεσαν, ἀντίον δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ νηοῦ. Quum enim optaret memoriam ſui in Græcia relinquere, fecit opus quod ab alio excogitatum non eſt neque donatum, idque donavit in templo Delphico monumentum ſui. E decima enim ſuarum opum tot è ferro verua ad boves torrendos fecit, ad quot facienda ſufficeret decima ipſa: quæ Delphos miſit: quæ nunc quoque poſita ſunt è regione templi, poſt aram quam Chii donaverunt (5). - - - *Rhodope, being deſirous that a monument of her ſhould be left in Greece, reſolved to make ſuch a preſent to the temple at Delphos as had never been thought of nor made before. For this reaſon ſhe provided as many iron ſpits to roaſt oxen as the tenth of her ſubſtance was ſufficient to buy, and ſent them to Delphos. Theſe are ſtill preſerved behind the altar which the Chians raiſed, and over-againſt the temple itſelf.* The law of the Jews did not allow of ſuch an impurity (6).

[*B*] *What is ſaid of her ſhoe.*] One day as ſhe was bathing, and her maids took care of her cloaths, an eagle came down, ſeized one of her ſhoes, and carried it away to Memphis, and let it fall upon Pſammitichus's lap. That prince was then ſitting upon his tribunal, to adminiſter juſtice. He admired the beauty of that ſhoe, and the conduct of that eagle, and ordered that the lady, who had been robbed of her ſhoe, ſhould be looked for all over Egypt. They found her, and brought her to him, and he married her (7). I do not believe it, though fortune is ſometimes pleaſed with ſuch ſports: ἡ τὰ παράδοξα καὶ τὰ ἀδόκητα φιλοῦσα ἐργάζεσθαι τύχη. *inopinatorum atque inexpectatorum amans fortuna* (8). Rhodope, Æſop's fellow-ſlave, would have been well contented to marry that monſtrous man. What a wonderful alteration! She would have been the wife of a great monarch, and one of thoſe,

Quales ex humili magna ad faſtigia rerum
Extollit, quoties voluit fortuna jocari (9).

Whom fortune does in merriment advance,
And places topmoſt on the wheel of chance.

Obſerve, by the by, that wit may prevent the ill effects of uglineſs, with reſpect to a fine woman. Æſop, though the ugliest of all men, moved Rhodope's heart (10).

(1) Plin. lib. xxxvi, cap. xii, pag. m. 302.

(2) Herodot. lib. ii, cap. cxxxiv.

(3) Ibid. cap. cxxxv.

(4) Juven. Sat. XIV, ver. 204. *See* Suetonius, in Veſpaſiano, *cap. xxiii.*

(5) Herodotus, ibid.

(6) Non inferes mercedem meretricis, aut pretium canis in domum Dei tui in quocunque voto, quia abominatio eſt utrunque apud Dominum Deum tuum. *Deuteron. cap. xxiii, ver.* 18.

(7) *Taken from* Ælian. Var. Hiſt. *lib. xiii, cap. xxxiii. See alſo* Strabo, *lib. xvii, pag.* 556.

(8) Ælian. ibid.

(9) Juven. Sat. III, ver. 39.

(10) Herodot. ubi ſupra, *cap. xxxiv.*

RICCI (MICHAEL ANGELO) made a cardinal by Pope Innocent XI, the firſt day of September 1681, was born at Rome in the year 1619. He was a lover of the Mathematics, and made a great progreſs in that ſcience, as appears by his treatiſe *De maximis & minimis*, which has been reprinted twice or thrice. He wrote two diſſertations, one of which is inſerted in the works of Cardinal Brancaccio, and the other in Carlo Dati's epiſtle *ad Philalethos*. He applied himſelf afterwards very earneſtly to the ſtudy of Divinity. He has been praiſed by ſome very famous authors, as Gaſſendus, Renatus Francis Sluſius, cardinal Pallavicini, Fabretti, &c. He had a very conſiderable library (a). He went through ſeveral employments, before he was made a Cardinal; and, amongſt others, through that of Secretary of the congregation of indulgences and relics, and that of Conſultor of the Holy Office. He was poſſeſſed of thoſe employments in 1678, when he approved the book of the biſhop of Condom, I mean his *Expoſition de la Doctrine Catholique*.

RICHER, or **RICHIER** (PETER), *a Carmelite, and a Doctor of Paris* (a), embraced the Proteſtant religion, and retired to Geneva, where he was admitted into the miniſtry in the year 1556, to be ſent to the Sieur Villegagnon, in America (b). He was then above fifty years of age (c). He embarked at Honfleur, the nineteenth of November, in the ſame year, with another miniſter, whoſe name was Chartier, and with ſome other perſons, whom the church of Geneva judged to be proper for Villegagnon's deſign (d): he arrived at the iſle of Coligni the tenth of March 1557 (e), and preached there the very ſame day before Villegagnon, who all the time *joined his hands, lifted up his eyes to Heaven, fetched great ſighs*, and the like (f), which filled the whole aſſembly with admiration. Some few days after they adminiſtred the Lord's-Supper, and John Cointa, formerly a Doctor of the Sorbonne, made an abjuration of Popery (g). Villegagnon made admirable prayers, *and received the bread and the wine from the miniſter's hand upon his knees* (h). The hopes grounded on thoſe expreſſions of zeal did ſoon vaniſh away, for he and Cointa began to diſpute ſoon after with Richer and Chartier about the Euchariſt (i). The latter was ſent back to Geneva, to acquaint Calvin with that diſpute, to whoſe judgment Villegagnon declared he would ſubmit (k). But he pulled off the maſk before the coming of Calvin's anſwer (l): he declared himſelf a Papiſt ſoon after the communion of Whitſunday (m); and, if he had been able, he would have dealt roughly with Peter Richer, and the other Genevois (n): but he was contented to command them to retire, which they did. I ſpeak of this more largely in another place (o). They embarked the fourth of January 1558 (p), and after having been reduced to very great ſtreights (q), they arrived at laſt in the harbour of Blavet in Bretagne, the twenty-ſixth of May following (r). Richer was afterwards made miniſter of the church of Rochelle [A], and publiſhed a piece againſt Villegagnon [B]. Nothing can be more ridiculous than to make him the head of the ſect of the Richerians, and to ſay that this pretended ſect was tainted with Neſtorianiſm: and yet a famous Jeſuit has been ſo bold as to affirm it [C]. He adds, that Richer infected the inhabitants of

[A] *Richer was made afterwards miniſter of the church of Rochelle.*] 'At that time Peter Richer being returned from America, where he had ſuffered very much under the tyranny of Villegagnon, a moſt wicked and wretched apoſtate, came to Rochelle, where he found about fifty perſons, who had been gathered together in the LORD by the miniſtry of la Fontaine and la Place, whom I have mentioned in the Hiſtory of the preceding year. He did ſo much encourage and ſtrengthen that ſmall flock in a little time, that a conſiſtory and the whole diſcipline were eſtabliſhed there; and GOD was pleaſed to favour that firſt beginning, ſo that in a little time a great part of the town joined themſelves to the Church of the LORD, forſaking the ſuperſtitions of the Church of Rome. From that time the LORD prepared that place to make it ſuſtain hereafter the moſt violent aſſaults of its adverſaries (1).' He was ſtill living when John de Leri printed his relation, that is, in the year 1577. For in the deſcription of the miſeries of their voyage, he ſpeaks thus: 'As to Mr Peter Richer, now a miniſter of the church of Rochelle, he will tell you that he lay all along in his cabbin, and was ſo weak that he could not lift up his head to pray to GOD; but he invoked him with great ardour in that condition (2).' Note, That Moreri is miſtaken, when he ſays that Richer was miniſter at Geneva after his return from America. Note alſo, That Mr Vincent (3), who ſets down Beza's words, and who adds, that they *gave Poupeliniere* * *occaſion to call Richer the Father of the church of Rochelle*, has obſerved that what Beza ſays *of the eſtabliſhment of a conſiſtory in that year* 1558, *may be juſtified by the regiſters of that church*; but he is ſo far from ſaying that Richer was made miniſter of that place, that he declares (4) that the miniſter appointed there, when the firſt conſiſtory was ſettled, was called Fayet. It is true, he ſays that in the year 1561, that church had two Paſtors, to wit, Fayet and de l'Iſle. The latter is our Richer (5).

[B] *He publiſhed a piece againſt Villegagnon.*] The book intituled, *A refutation of the lies and fooliſh ſtories of Nicolas Durand, called the Chevalier de Villegagnon*, and printed in 1562, in 8vo, was not written by James Spifame under Peter Richer's name, as du Verdier Vau-Privas affirms (6); it was written by the author, whoſe name is prefixed to it. We find this title in the epitome of Geſner's Bibliotheque. *Petri Richerii Apologetici libri duo, contra Nicolaum Durandum qui ſe Villagagnonem vocat, quibus illius in pios Americanos tyrannidem exponit, & negotium Sacramentarium tractat. Genevæ* 1561, *in 4to* (7). To which you may add theſe words of John de Leri. 'But becauſe, when Villegagnon returned into France, not only Peter Richer painted him in his true colours, but alſo ſome others *curried* and *bruſhed* ‡ him ſo well, I ſhall ſay no more of him, for fear of tiring the readers (8).' If you deſire to have a proof of Moreri's taking little care to examine what he advanced; you need only conſider that after he has given us a good character of Villegagnon, he refers us (9) to his life, written by Richer, a work wherein Villegagnon muſt needs be repreſented as a wicked man.

[C] *A famous Jeſuit has been ſo bold as to affirm it.*] Conſult the tables of Father Gaultier, where you will find that the 63d chapter of the XVIth century, is intituled DE RICHERIANIS, DUCE *Petro Richerio*. He ſays (10) that Peter Richer taught in America, before Villegagnon, that CHRIST, as a man, ought not to be worſhipped. This is one of the proofs alledged by that Jeſuit, when he maintains that the Calviniſts renew the impious doctrines of Neſtorius. 'Calvini veſtigiis, *ſays he* (11), inſiſtit Petrus Richerius in Americam ab eo miſſus anno 1557. quùm & præſente Domino Villagagnono prædicat, & coram Notario publico Franciſco Alberico mordicus tuetur *Jeſum Chriſtum in carne humana non eſſe adorandum*. Tuetur, inquam, dum reſpondet ad interpellationem ſibi per eum factam ejuſdem D. Villagagnoni nomine, utpote cauſam exigentis cur Jeſum Chriſtum adorare nolit. Horum nobis omnium fidem facit tum epiſtola ejuſdem Villagagnoni ad Eccleſiam Chriſtianam of Annonai in Vivarez with his errors [*D*]. I have mentioned in another place (*s*), a letter which that miniſter wrote from America.

(a) *Taken from* Proſp. Mandoſius, Bibl. Rom. *Cent. V, pvg.* 344, 345.

(a) Thevet, Coſmograph. Univerſelle, *livr. xxi, ch. ii, fol.* 909.

(b) John de Leri, Hiſt. d'un Voiage de l'Amérique, *ch. i, pag. m.* 6.

(c) Ibid.

(d) Ibid. *ch. ii, pag.* 8.

(e) Ibid. *ch. vi, pag.* 55.

(f) Ibid. *pag.* 56.

(g) Ibid. *pag.* 59.

(h) Ibid. *pag.* 66.

(i) Ibid. *pag.* 67.

(k) Ibid. *pag.* 68.

(l) Ibid. *pag.* 76.

(m) Ibid. *See alſo* Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. ii, pag.* 160.

(n) Leri, ibid. *pag.* 83.

(o) In the article VILLEGAGNON.

(p) Leri, *chap. xxi, pag.* 341.

(q) *Jean de Leri*, one of them, has deſcribed them. *Ibid. ch. xxi, xxii.*

(r) Ibid. *pag.* 373.

(1) Theod. Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. ii, pag.* 139, 140, *ad ann.* 1558.

(2) Leri, Hiſt. du Voiage de l'Amerique, *ch. xxii, peg. m.* 368.

(3) Vincent, Recherches ſur les commencemens & les prémiers progrès de la Réformation de la Ville de la Rochelle, *pag.* 27, 28.

* Poupel. *lib. v*, in the beginning.

(4) Vincent, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 44.

(5) Peter Richer, Sieur de l'Iſle. *Ibid. pag.* 27.

(6) Du Verdier, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 620.

(7) Epitome Biblioth. Geſn. *pag. m.* 682.

‡ The *Curry-Comb* and *Bruſh* are two ſmall books printed againſt Villegagnon.

(8) Leri, ubi ſupra, *ch. vi, pag.* 74.

(9) Moreri, *at the word* Villegagnon.

(10) Gaulterius, Tab. Chron. *p. m.* 802.

(11) Ibid. *pag.* 376, *col.* 2. *See alſo* Maimbourg, Hiſt. du Calviniſme, *livr. ii, p.* 103, *edition of Holland.*

(*s*) In the remark [*A*], of the article LERI.

‘ ſtianam data, tum ea quam octavo Julii anno 1560. ad Magiſtratum Genevenſem ſcripſit, tum annexa ejuſdem Notarii teſtificatio, quam diei decimæ quartæ Maii anni 1559. nota obſignavit; tum altera teſtificatio die octavo Junii 1558. data ſubſcriptaque à D. Petro à Falcilla, quem D. Villagagnonus ad Miniſtrum Richerium 27 Decembris 1557 miſerat, rationem ejuſmodi doctrinæ ſciſcitaturum: ubi aſſerit ſe, dum à Miniſtro Richerio quæreret, cur inter orandum non diceret, *Gloria Patri & Filio & Spiritui ſancto*, &c. reſponſum planè nullum accepiſſe: dum autem denuntiaret conqueri D. Villagagnonum, quòd nullam unquam ad Jeſum Chriſtum precationem dirigeret, hoc ſe à Miniſtro reſponſum habuiſſe, hæreticum illum arbitrandum eſſe, qui neceſſe duxerit orare Jeſum Chriſtum †. Nùm hac loquendi formula uti potuiſſet Miniſter Richerius, ſi credidiſſet in carne humana Jeſu Chriſti aliam non eſſe hypoſtaſim, ſubſiſtentiam aut perſonam, niſi Verbi Divini? - - - *Peter Richer follows the footſteps of Calvin, by whom he was ſent to America in the year* 1557; *ſince he preaches up in the preſence of Villegagnon, and ſtiffly maintains before Francis Albericus a Public Notary, that* Jeſus Chriſt as man is not to be worſhipped. *I ſay, he maintained this doctrine in his anſwer to the Notary, who interrupted him, and, in the name of Villegagnon, demanded to know the reaſon why he refuſed to worſhip Jeſus Chriſt. The truth of all this appears from Villegagnon's letter to the Church of Chriſt, and from his letter to the magiſtrates of Geneva, dated* 8 *July* 1560; *as likewiſe from the declaration of the ſaid Notary, which is annexed to it, and dated* 14 *May* 1559; *and from another declaration dated* 8 *June* 1558, *and ſigned by Peter à Falcilla, whom Villegagnon ſent to Richer on the* 27*th of December* 1557, *to aſk the reaſons of his doctrine. He there affirms that when he put the queſtion to Richer, why in his prayers he did not ſay,* Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghoſt, *&c. he received no anſwer; but when he told him that Villegagnon was offended at his not directing any prayer to Chriſt, his anſwer was, that whoever maintained the neceſſity of praying to Jeſus Chriſt, ought to be looked upon as an Heretic. Could Richer have uttered theſe words, if he had believed that in the human nature of Chriſt there was no other hypoſtaſis, ſubſiſtence, or perſon, but that of the Word only.*’ You may apply to the pretended ſect of the Richerians what I have ſaid in the article BEZANITES. Spondanus ſays, that ſome of the followers of Richer were ſo impious as to deny the reſurrection (12). But when I conſider that Mr Vincent, in the above quoted book, does ſcarce mention Peter Richer, I cannot forbear laughing at the boldneſs of thoſe, who repreſent as the head of a ſect a man, who made ſo little a figure. As for the reſt, many Divines among the Calviniſts are of opinion that the humanity of CHRIST *in abſtracto*, ought not to be worſhipped (13). If Peter Richer maintained nothing elſe, he needed not fear to be accounted a Heretic among thoſe of his ſect.

Note, That Varillas goes farther than Spondanus; for he affirms that Peter Richer taught, that eternal life is only promiſed to the ſouls of Chriſtians, and that they ſhall be happy only with reſpect to their ſouls, and that therefore the LORD's Supper having not been inſtituted to ſupply their wants, there was no need to uſe it frequently (14). I fancy he only taught, that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt being not appointed for the uſe of the body, it was not neceſſary that the fleſh of CHRIST ſhould be contained in it. This was his opinion, which his enemies altered and miſrepreſented.

[*D*] . . . . *He adds that Richer infected the inhabitants of Annonai in Vivarez with his errors.*] He does not mention the time: It was doubtleſs before the voyage into America. ‘ Probè novi hunc Petrum Richerium fuiſſe illum ipſum, qui urbi Annonæenſi in Vivarienſi provincia malorum plurimorum author fuit. Cum enim in eam, ſe Catholicum ſimulans, eſſet ingreſſus, imò & menſes aliquot in concionibus ea ſimulatione uſus, tandem ubi ſe in præcipuorum civium, qui illum ſæpe convivio exceperant, amicitiam inſinuatum vidit, cordis ſui peſtem aperuit; primùm quidem privatim, deinde verò è pulpito pleno ore in Sacramenta invectus, ac nominatim in Realitatem Euchariſticam. Quod ubi animadvertunt Magiſtratus, dum in eum inquirunt, ecce evaneſcit homo nequam, majorem tamen urbis partem erroribus illaqueatam relinquens (15). - - - *I know very well that this Peter Richer is the man who did ſo much miſchief to the town of Annonai in Vivarez. For having introduced himſelf there as a Roman Catholic, and preached ſome months under that diſguiſe, at laſt when he found that he was cloſely riveted in the favour of the principal inhabitants, who had often feaſted him in their houſes, he diſcloſed the venom of his heart; firſt indeed privately, but afterwards loudly in the pulpit, inveighing againſt the ſacraments, and particularly againſt the real preſence in the Euchariſt. The magiſtrates had no ſooner perceived this, and begun to inquire into the matter, but all of a ſudden the knave diſappeared. Nevertheleſs he left the greateſt part of the city infected with his errors.*’ I have mentioned that paſſage, as being part of Richer's life.

† Extant hæc omnia inter controverſias Villagagnoni.

(12) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1555, *num.* 15.

(13) *See Mr* Saurin, *in his* Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu, *p.* 738, *& ſeq.*

(14) Varillas, Hiſt. de l'Héréſie, *livr. xxi*, *pag.* 18, 19.

(15) Gaulterius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 802, *col.* 1.

RICIUS (PAUL) a converted Jew, was a German, and flouriſhed in the XVIth century. He was profeſſor of Philoſophy at Pavia, and acquired a great reputation by it, and the eſteem of ſeveral learned men, who recommended him ſo effectually to the emperor Maximilian, that he was ſent for into Germany by that prince, and made one of his Phyſicians. He publiſhed ſeveral books againſt the Jews, and concerning ſome other matters [*A*]. He is very much praiſed for his ſincerity, honeſty, moderation, and learning (*a*). See his elogy in a letter of Eraſmus [*B*], which I ſhall quote in the

(*a*) *Taken from* Melch. Adam. in Vitis Medicor. *pag.* 9, 10.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books againſt the Jews, and concerning ſome other matters.*] Here are the titles of ſome of them. *Philoſophica, prophetica ac thalmudiſtica pro Chriſtiana veritate tuenda, cum juniori Hebræorum Synagoga diſputatio. De ſexcentis & tredecim Moſaicæ ſanctionis ſeu pentateuchi edictis. Farrago ex Thalmudæorum codice excerpta, ad petitionem Maximiliani Cæſaris. Iſagoge in Cabaliſtarum ſeu allegorizantium eruditionem cum epiſtola contra Stephani Preſbyteri Cabalæ obtrectatoris epiſtolam: De modo orandi in nomine tetragrammato. Do novem doctrinarum ordinibus, & totius peripatetici dogmatis nexu compendium. Statera prudentum. Concluſiones quibus Ariſtotelem triplicem doctrinæ ordinem exercuiſſe, & totius ejus dogmatis nexum dijudicare poteris.* He did not forget the common ſubject for the declamations of that time; for he made an oration to excite the Germans to engage in a war againſt the Turks *in virulentam immaniſſimamque Turcarum rabiem, ad principes, magiſtratus, populoſque Germaniæ oratio* (1).

[*B*] *See his elogy in a letter of Eraſmus.*] It is the laſt of the firſt book, and is dated the tenth of March, 1516. In which are theſe words: ‘ Paulus Ricius ſic me proximo colloquio rapuit, ut mira quædam me ſitis habeat, cum homine ſæpius ac familiarius conferendi ſermonem. Præter Hebrææ linguæ peritiam, quantum ille tenet philoſophiæ, quantum Theologiæ: tum quæ animi puritas, qui diſcendi ardor, qui docendi candor, quæ diſputandi modeſtia? Mihi ſanè vir ille primo ſtatim guſtu placuit olim Papiæ; cum illic philoſophiam profiteretur: nunc propiùs intuito magis etiam placet. Is demùm verè mihi videtur Iſraelitam agere, ſuoque cognomini pulchrè reſpondere: cujus omnis voluptas, omnis cura, omne otium ac negotium, in divinis eſt literis.

(1) *Taken from* Geſner's Epitome, *pag.* 659.

the remarks. The famous John Eckius was one of his adverſaries: the ſubject of their diſpute was this queſtion, *viz.* Whether the Heavens are animated. Ricius maintained the affirmative, and advanced ſome opinions that were looked upon as paradoxical [*C*].

‘ris. Dignus nimirum animus cui otium contingat quàm maximè honorificum (2). - - - *Pauli Ricius ſo charmed in a late converſation which I had with him, that I am very deſirous of enjoying the ſame in a more frequent and familiar manner. Beſides his knowledge in the Hebrew tongue, how great is his ſtock of Philoſophy and Divinity, how remarkable his integrity, how keen his deſire to learn, and how great his candour in teaching, and his modeſty in diſputes! I was pleaſed with the man the firſt time I ſaw him, a great while ago, when he was profeſſor of Philoſophy at Pavia, but now that I have the opportunity of viewing him nearer, he pleaſes me ſtill more. In ſhort, I take him for an Iſraelite indeed, who anſwers his name well, ſince his whole pleaſure and ſtudy, his buſy and his idle hours are beſtowed upon the Holy Scripture. He ſhews a mind that is worthy of the moſt honourable eaſe.*’ Ricius ſent him his treatiſe concerning the Cabala, and the thanks he received for it are very glorious to him: for it appears by it that this proſelyte had defended the cauſe of one of his friends cruelly ſlandered, and had kept at the ſame time within the bounds of moderation, and abſtained from injurious words. ‘Arriſit animus iſte Gratiis & amicitiæ natus, qui tanto ſtudio tuetur hominis eruditiſſimi innocentiam, adverſus impudentiſſimos ſycophantas. Arriſit denique te, hoc eſt abſoluto veroque philoſopho, digna moderatio: quâ ſic fortiter patrocinaris amico, ut à convitiis in adverſarium temperes, magis reputans quid te, quàm quid illo dignum eſſet (3). - - - - *I was charmed with that generous and friendly ſpirit, which ſo zealouſly defends the innocence of a very learned man againſt his moſt audacious calumniators. Laſt of all I was charmed with your moderation, ſo worthy of your ſelf, that is, of a true and perfect Philoſopher: for while you ſtrongly maintain the cauſe of your friend, you forbear reviling his adverſary; and conſider more what is fit for you to ſay, than what he deſerves to hear.*’

[*C*] *Whether the Heavens are animated. Ricius maintained that they are, and advanced ſomething paradoxical.*] A Proteſtant Divine obſerves that the opinions of Ricius favoured the principles of Magic, and yet that his books *de Cæleſti Agricultura* had been approved and praiſed by the Divines of Bologna, Padua, Ferrara, and Pavia. *Paulus Ritius dum cælorum animationem & Cabaliſticam ſuam Arithmantiam per decem enumerationes tradit, magiæ principia non parum promovet in commentariis ſuis ad librum R. Joſeph Caſtilienſis qui* porta lucis *dicitur, & tamen libros illos de cæleſti agricultura magnifico elogio approbarunt Academiæ Theologicæ Bononienſis*, &c. (4) John Eckius did not follow the ſteps of thoſe Italian Divines; for he maintained that the doctrine, which teaches that the Heavens are animated, is ridiculous, execrable, and contrary to faith (5). Claudius Eſpencæus, of whom I learn this, knew not upon what reaſons that cenſure was grounded; for he had not ſeen John Eckius's book, and knew no more of it than what he had found in Ricius's confutation of it, of which he gives us a ſhort analyſis. He ſays (6) that author maintained three things. 1. That the doctrine, which teaches that the Heavens are animated, does not concern our faith; for it can neither be proved nor confuted by the principles of religion: hence it is that Divines are divided on that problem. 2. That this opinion agrees better with the words of the Prophets, than the contrary doctrine. 3. That reaſon leads us to believe that the Heavens are not inanimate beings (7). Eſpencæus examines Ricius's proofs, and criticiſes them, and at laſt declares that it is more ſafe to deny than to affirm that the Heavens have a ſoul. The reader will not be diſpleaſed to know upon what occaſion he publiſhed his book *de Cælorum Animatione* (8). They had a mind to print at Paris an edition of all the works of cardinal Contarinus; but the Divine, who was to give his approbation, ſcrupled to do it, becauſe he finds that the author affirms that the Heavens were animated (9). He conſulted Claudius Eſpencæus, who anſwered him, that he looked upon it as an inconſiderable difficulty, and ſoon after remembring that he had collected ſeveral things on that queſtion, he put them together and publiſhed them (10).

Obſerve that among the School-Divines and Philoſophers, the queſtion is only to know, whether the immediate mover of the celeſtial ſpheres is a ſoul properly ſo called, and *forma informans*. It is the opinion of ſome, and it is commonly rejected; but as for the opinion of thoſe, who admit of moving intelligences, as *aſſiſting forms*, it is almoſt generally received; and truly I do not ſee how one can be without them; and I fancy the Copernicans will fall into it ſooner or later in relation to their Planets. Father Daniel (11), and Mr le Clerc (12) have objected ſome difficulties againſt their ſyſtem, which puzzle them very much. Sir Iſaac Newton, and others, have ſo ſtrongly aſſaulted the hypotheſis of the Vortices, that the general laws of motion are not ſufficient to account for the phænomena. A particular direction of an intelligent Being would come in very ſeaſonably.

R Y E R (ANDREW DU), Sieur de Malezair, gentleman in ordinary of the king's chamber, and knight of the holy ſepulchre, lived in the XVIIth century. He made a conſiderable ſtay at Conſtantinople for the king's ſervice, and afterwards he was conſul of the French nation in Egypt. He got a great knowledge of the Turkiſh and Arabic languages, as it appears by his writings [*A*]. He was born at Marcigni (*a*), a little town on the Loire in the frontiers of Forez (*b*).

I ſhould not omit that his tranſlation of the Alcoran has appeared worthy of cenſure to ſome Critics [*B*].

[*A*] *He underſtood the Turkiſh and Arabic languages very well, as appears by his writings.*] He printed at Paris in 1630, a Turkiſh Grammar. Four years after he publiſhed in the ſame city his French tranſlation of the Guliſtan, or the Empire of the Roſes, written by Sadi the prince of the Turkiſh and Perſian Poets. But his chief tranſlation is that of the Alcoran, which has been tranſlated ſeveral times. He publiſhed it after he had been conſul for the French nation in Egypt; which appears by the honourable teſtimonial which the conſuls of Marſeilles gave him the 12th of February, 1633, and which may be ſeen at the end of that tranſlation.

[*B*] *His tranſlation of the Alcoran has appeared worthy of cenſure to ſome Critics.*] The learned Windet accuſes him of having tranſpoſed, added to, and retrenched, ſeveral things: *hunc locum male reddidit* Gallus *interpres* Sieur du Ryer; *& ſolet nimium licenter intervertere, addere, ac demere. Verſio autem* Anglica, ex Gallica *ejus facta, itidem male habet* (1).

---

(2) Eraſm. Epiſt. *ult. lib. i, pag.* 88.

(3) Idem, Epiſt. XXXIX, lib. xiii, *pag.* 642: it was written in the year 1520.

(4) Giſb. Voëtius, deſperata Cauſa Papatus, *lib. i, ſect. IV, pag.* 36. *He cites him* in compend. de anima cœli, & cœleſti agricultura, *lib. iv.*

(5) Joannes Eckius poſitionem hanc ludicram prorſus & exoticam, execrabilem, & à fide exorbitantem eſſe cenſuit in tractatu de prædeſtinatione. *Claudius Eſpenſæus, in Tractatu de cœlorum animatione, cap. v, pag. m.* 49.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid. *cap. viii, pag.* 70.

(8) It was printed at Paris in the year 1571.

(9) *In the firſt book of Contarinus,* de animæ immortalitate, *printed at Venice in* 1525.

(10) See the preface of that treatiſe of Claudius Eſpencæus.

(11) *In his* Voiage du Monde Des Cartes.

(12) In his Phyſics.

(*a*) Marciniacenſis. *See* Colomiés, Gallia Orient. *p.* 163.

(*b*) *See* Baudrand, *voce* Marciniacum.

(1) Ja. Windet, de vita functorum ſtatu, *Sect. IX. pag.* 223, *Edit. Lond.* 1677.

RYER (PETER) a Pariſian, was admitted into the French Academy in Faret's room, the twenty-firſt of November 1646 (*a*). He is the author of ſeveral French tranſlations, and ſome dramatic pieces (*b*). Moſt of the authors tranſlated by him are Greek or Latin: as for the Greek, he only put the old tranſlations into new French (*c*), or at moſt followed the Latin tranſlations: and as for the antient Latin authors, he often miſtook their ſenſe. This he did alſo ſometimes in his tranſlation of the modern authors [*A*], I mean of Thuanus and Strada. It is thought his tranſlations would be better, if he had been better paid by the Bookſellers [*B*]; but becauſe they gave him but a ſmall matter for every ſheet, he was forced to make all the haſte he could, that he might be able to maintain his family. He died in the year 1656 (*d*). There is ſomething about him in the *Menagiana* [*C*]: you will find it in the remarks.

(*a*) Pelliſſon, Hiſt. de l'Academie Françoiſe, *pag. m.* 229.

(*b*) See the liſt of them in the Hiſtory of the French Academy, *pag.* 356, 357, and in Mr Baillet's *Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, num.* 1486.

(*c*) *See* Baillet's Jugemens des Sçavans, *Tom. iv, num.* 949, *who refers unto the* Parnaſ. Reform. *pag. m.* 20, *& ſeq.*

(*d*) And not in 1658, as Moreri ſays. St Romuald places his death, not on the ſixth of November 1658 (as Moreri does), but on the twenty-firſt. *Journal Chronologique, Tom. ii, pag.* 570.

[*A*] *He often miſtook the ſenſe of the antient authors. This he did alſo ſometimes in his tranſlations of the Moderns.*] (1) The leaſt faulty of his tranſlations, *in the judgment of ſeveral perſons, is that of Cicero's works, tho' he omitted many paſſages which he did not underſtand, eſpecially in the orations, though in order to come off, and to fill up the chaſms, he put in the room of them ſeveral inſignificant and nonſenſical things, that are only fit to dazzle and perplex young readers* (2). Theſe words in the *Hexameron ruſtique* are levelled at him, if I am not miſtaken: 'He, who tranſlated Cicero's fine treatiſe *de Amicitia* into French, has not been more lucky in his tranſlation of theſe words, *Agrigentinum doctum quendam virum*, which he renders thus, *a learned man called Agrigentinus*, without minding that Cicero ſpeaks of Empedocles Agrigentinus, whom he denotes by the name of *Agrigentum*, or *Agragas*, a town of Sicily, where he was born. Beſides there never was a man of letters, whoſe proper name was Agrigentinus. The ſame writer in his tranſlation of Valerius Maximus, chap. 1, example 4, pag. 6, renders *vitio tabernaculum captum*, thus, *the tabernacle had been touched by chance*, inſtead of ſaying, *they had been wanting in the ceremonies that are to be obſerved, when they take the place of the Augurs, called the Tabernacle*. For want of underſtanding theſe words, *Tabernaculum captum*, as they ought to be underſtood in that place, and for want of knowing the practice of the Augurs, he thought this ought to be expounded according to the cuſtom of the Jews, amongſt whom none but the Levites were allowed to come near the tabernacle (3).' To this I ſhall add a paſſage out of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (4): 'Mr Teiſſier takes notice of ſome faults in Mr du Rier's tranſlation: here is one amongſt others. Thuanus ſpeaking of John Rivius, who died in the year 1553, ſaid *annos cum ſeculo numerabat*; which ſignifies that Rivius died at fifty-three years of age. Mr du Rier ſays on the contrary, *that he died a hundred years old*. If he committed ſuch faults in his tranſlating a modern author, whoſe meaning may be more eaſily underſtood, than that of the Antients; one may very well believe, that he is ſometimes miſtaken in his tranſlation of Cicero: and indeed Father l'Eſcalopier in his commentary on the books *de Natura Deorum*, continually cenſures poor Mr du Rier's tranſlation (5).' I have obſerved another fault which Mr Teiſſier takes notice of. Thuanus ſays, *Hulrico Huteno equiti Franco . . . . quadam tenus comparandas.* (6) Du Ryer renders theſe words thus; *He may be compared in ſome manner with Ulric Huten a French knight*; and Mr Teiſſier ſays upon it, *Hutten was a German born in Franconia, and not a Frenchman, as Mr du Ryer ſays, who did not underſtand the true ſignification of the Latin word* Francus. (7) Mr Teiſſier has overlooked ſuch a like miſtake in the article of Duaren. *Eaque* (Duareni Opera) *Cujacius ipſe plurimi ſemper fecit, cùm ex quatuor Franciſcis qui eadem ætate eandem ſcientiam profitebantur, unum Duarenum ſibi placere, ceteros jus tantum deligurire diceret* (8). Thoſe words of Thuanus have been rendered by du Ryer in this manner. *Nay, Cujas himſelf very much valued Duaren's works, and ſaid, that of the four French Profeſſors, who taught the ſame ſcience at the ſame time, he liked none but Duaren.* What a miſtake to fancy that Franciſcus is the name of a nation, and not a proper name. Thuanus's meaning is this: there were at the ſame time four Profeſſors of the Civil Law, whoſe proper names were Francis, and Duaren was the only one of the four whom Cujas eſteemed. The three others were Francis Baudouin, Francis Hotman, and Francis Roaldes. I have found many other faults in his verſion of Thuanus. Here follows an overſight which Colomeſius obſerved. Theſe are his words (9): 'Mr du Ryer . . . has very much obliged pious ſouls, by tranſlating thoſe Pſalms (10) into our language with ſo much politeneſs. Only there is one place, wherein I wiſh he had minded the Latin a little better. It is in page 17, *& ſeq.* of the ſecond edition, where Mr du Ryer's tranſlation runs thus; *and as if I was ſtill a child at a hundred years of age, though never ſo old and broken, I do ſtill the actions of a child*. He ſhould have rendered the Latin words thus; *and as if I was a hundred years old, I do at the age I am all the actions of a child*. If thoſe Pſalms were compoſed by Antony, king of Portugal, Mr du Ryer's miſtake cannot be excuſed; for it is certain, that poor prince was not ſixty-four years old when he died.'

(1) Baillet, Jugemens des Sçavans, *num.* 949.

(2) *The author adds*, that Father l'Eſcalopier does often complain of the faults he committed throughout his whole tranſlation of Cicero.

(3) Héxameron ruſtique, *pag.* 27, 28.

(4) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *October* 1684, *Art. ii, pag.* 774, *in the extract of the* Elogies taken from Thuanus, publiſhed and commented by Mr Teiſſier.

(5) Note, that l'Eſcalopier criticizes only the tranſlation of the books *de Natura Deorum.*

(6) Thuan. *lib. xiii, pag.* 271, *ad ann.* 1554.

(7) Teiſſier, Addit. to the Elogies, *Tom. i, pag.* 91.

(8) Thuan. *lib. xxiii, pag.* 471, *ad ann.* 1559.

(9) Colomiés, Biblioth. Choiſie, *pag.* 145.

(10) *That is,* Pſalmi confeſſionales inventi in ſcrinio Antonii Portugalliæ Regis, *Lutetiæ* 1595, 16.

[*B*] *It is thought his tranſlations would have been better, if he had been better paid by the Bookſellers.*] You will find the following words next to thoſe I have ſet down out of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (11): 'Which ſhould teach ſeveral mean authors, who know no more Latin than what they learned at School, not to venture upon tranſlations. It requires more capacity than one would think, and men that do it not to get a livelihood. This, I ſay, without alluding to this paſſage of Richelet's Dictionary, page 110 of the ſecond part (12). *The late du Rier wrote to get bread*, that is, *only to maintain himſelf*.' Here are two paſſages of Mr Baillet. *And therefore it is believed that his learning and ſkill in languages were but inconſiderable; and that the Bookſellers, who maintained him, did not allow him time enough to perfect any thing* (13). This is the firſt paſſage: the ſecond is ſtill more diverting. '(14) Such writers who are reſolved never to go back, or who by their choice, or by reaſon of the ill circumſtances they are in, find themſelves neceſſitated to go forward, whatever obſtacle they meet with, would think themſelves maimed if they ſhould cut off any thing from their writings. And particularly thoſe whoſe ſubſiſtence depends upon the weight and meaſure of their writings, would be afraid of loſing a penny, if they ſhould ſtrike a needleſs or ill-placed word out of their works. This was the reaſon why William Xylander, Lewis Dolce, John Baudoin, Peter du Ryer, and many other mercenary writers, and ſuch as receive a ſalary from Bookſellers, thought themſelves obliged to lengthen and enlarge their writings as much as ever they could; ſo that to preſerve their lives they were willing to ſpoil their reputation, ſome by tranſlating for half a crown, or a crown, a ſheet, and others by making verſes at four livres a hundred when they were long, and forty pence when they were ſhort, as Mr Furetiere ſays *.' See what I have ſaid of Cardan (15).

(11) Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 775.

(12) According to the Geneva edition 1680; but in favour of thoſe, who have not that edition, I muſt ſay, that this is to be found under the word *Pain* [*Bread*].

(13) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Traducteurs, *num.* 949.

(14) Baillet, Prejugez de la groſſeur & petiteſſe des Livres, *ch. x, Part ii, pag.* 445, 446.

* *Nouvell. Allegor. pag.* 161, *des Troubles du R. d'Eloq.*

(15) In his article, remark [*Y*].

[*C*] *There is ſomething about him in the Menagiana.*] 'I think Mr du Ryer was a native of Paris. He was like Xylander, *qui fami magis quam famæ inſerviebat . . . a man that ſtudied more to fill his belly, than gain reputation*. He tranſlated to get money, and died before he had made an end of the tranſlation of Thuanus's hiſtory. To avoid expences, he lived out of Paris farther than the Piquepuces, where he lodged with his wife and children. I went once to ſee him with ſome friends. He treated us with cherries gathered in a little garden he had. He made a tragedy, intituled, *Alcyonée*, which is an admirable piece, and may be compared with the beſt pieces of Corneille. There are ſome wonderful verſes in it, and it is very

‘ well modelled. Mondory acted his part very well ‘ in it (16).’

Mr de Vigneul Marville, page 196, of the firſt volume of his *Mélanges*, mentions a viſit that he and ſome others paid to du Ryer, and ſays, that the collation they had, which conſiſted of milk, cherries, freſh water and brown bread, made them lament the fate of that excellent man.

(16) Menagiana, pag. 366, of the firſt Dutch Edit.

RIGORISTS. So they call in the Spaniſh Netherlands the Janſeniſts, the Fathers of the Oratory, and, in general, thoſe whoſe maxims are moſt oppoſite to looſe morality (*a*). A man of Prateolus's character might make a ſect of thoſe Caſuiſts, to inſult the church of Rome about her diviſions. They are falſly accuſed *of commanding their penitents to eat hay, and young maids to put on wet ſhifts* [*A*], *which, as it is ſaid, occaſions the death of ſome of them* (*b*).

[*A*] *They have been accuſed of commanding . . . . maids to put on wet ſhifts.*] I do not think that any Caſuiſt, who is a man of ſenſe, tho' never ſo ſevere, preſcribes ſuch a penance to a young woman, tho' it were neceſſary to ſuppreſs a violent temptation to leudneſs; but there are ſome men whoſe rigid morals ſpoil their judgment to ſuch a degree, that it is not unlikely ſome young woman, who revealed too many frailties at a confeſſion, has had ſuch a remedy preſcribed her; and ſince Francis of Aſſiſi thought it expedient for him to get a wife of ſnow (1), he might have very well preſcribed a wet ſhirt to others.

I have read a memorial printed at Delft in 1696, and containing *a ſhort anſwer to the three accuſations of* Janſeniſm, Rigoriſm, *and* Innovation. The author having laid down in it the maxims of JESUS CHRIST goes on thus: ‘ (2) If thoſe that are called Rigoriſts, ‘ have more rigorous maxims, a conduct harder to ‘ fleſh and blood, and a ſeverity which exceeds that ‘ wholeſome ſeverity, they deſerve to be puniſhed. ‘ But if it be true, on the contrary, as it is certain ‘ and evident, that the ſoftneſs of moſt Chriſtians ‘ forces them to be contented with much leſs, and to ‘ comply with humane frailty in the application of ‘ thoſe holy rules; it is a great injuſtice and a ‘ puniſhable calumny to cry them down as men, ‘ whoſe maxims are cruel and exceſſively ſevere; ‘ and it is more certain ſtill, that they who oppoſe ‘ what they call Rigoriſm, oppoſe the Goſpel . . . . ‘ It is therefore true, that Rigoriſm is a meer phantom, wherewith they ſcare people to undo good ‘ men, and the true ſervants of JESUS CHRIST. ‘ Mr Steyaert acknowledges it himſelf in his theſes ‘ on the rituals publiſhed within theſe few years. ‘ His teſtimony cannot be ſuſpected; he ſays there, ‘ that *thoſe who endeavour to obſerve the Rules of the* ‘ *church in the direction of ſouls, are thoſe who are* ‘ *called Rigoriſts, and that he knows no other* . . . . . (3) ‘ It is certain, on the contrary, that the looſeneſs ‘ oppoſite to that Rigoriſm, is but too real. (4) ‘ Mr Steyaert acknowledges it in his theſis of ‘ *Moral Divinity amended*. For after having proved ‘ it by the words of Pope Alexander VII, which ‘ I have recited he adds; what would certain men ‘ do, or rather what would they not do, if they ‘ could alledge any ſuch thing againſt Rigoriſm; ‘ whereas, in order to prove it, they have nothing ‘ to produce but ſome idle ſtories as hay, and ‘ wet ſhifts, preſcribed for a penance?’

(*a*) The way of thoſe gentlemen is called *Rigoriſm*.

(*b*) See the Difficulties propoſed to Mr Steyaërt, *Part i, pag.* 31.

(1) See, above, remark [*B*], of the article FRANCIS of Aſſiſi.

(2) Memorial printed at Delft 1696, in 4to, *pag.* 11.

(3) Ib. *p.* 14.

(4) Ibid.

RIMINI (GREGORY OF), in Latin *Gregorius Ariminenſis*, is known by that name, becauſe he was born at Rimini, (Ariminum) a town of Italy. He taught in the univerſity of Paris with great applauſe (*a*). He was one of the moſt ſubtile ſchool-men of the XIVth century, and the ſubtilty of his wit prompted him to addict himſelf much more to the party of the Nominaliſts than to that of the Realiſts (*b*). He was an Auguſtin Monk, and was made general of his order at Montpellier in the month of May 1357. He had been the chief profeſſor of the Auguſtins in the convent of Rimini, in the year 1351. He died at Vienna in Auſtria in 1358. His chief works are ſome commentaries on the Maſter of the Sentences, and on St Paul's epiſtles. He was no leſs recommendable for the holineſs of his life, than for his learning and great parts, and he is reckoned among thoſe that have been canonized (*c*): I muſt ſay ſomething of his opinions. He vigorouſly oppoſed the Divines, who aſſert that by the almighty power of GOD two contrary propoſitions concerning one and the ſame thing may be true at the ſame time (*d*). I do not apprehend how he durſt queſtion ſuch a doctrine as this, which is an unavoidable conſequence of the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation. He came much nearer the orthodox doctrine of St Auguſtin as to Free-will, than moſt Divines of his time (*e*); nay, he maintained that an invincible ignorance does not juſtify a man [*A*]. But he taught a thing, which was objected to Des Cartes, and which would be

[*A*] *He maintained that an invincible ignorance does not juſtify a man.*] Mr Arnauld makes this obſervation in the ninth part of the Difficulties propoſed to Mr Steyaert. It is upon occaſion of a decree of Pope Alexander VIII, which condemns thirty-one propoſitions; the ſecond whereof is this: *Tametſi detur ignorantia invincibilis juris naturæ: hæc in ſtatu naturæ lapſæ operantem ex ipſa non excuſat à peccato formali:* that is to ſay, ‘ though there is an ignorance of the law of nature, that is invincible, yet ‘ in the ſtate of corrupt nature that ignorance does ‘ not excuſe from a formal ſin thoſe who do what ‘ is forbidden by the Law of nature.’ (1) Mr Arnauld afterwards mentions three opinions. The firſt is *that a humane action is not a formal ſin, if he who does it, does not know that he commits a ſin* (2). He aſcribes this opinion to the Jeſuits, and affirms that they *pretend to ſay nothing but what is reaſonable; becauſe it is agreed on all hands, as they ſuppoſe, that an invincible ignorance juſtifies a man, and that he is reputed to be invincibly ignorant of the ſinfulneſs of what he does, when he has no ſuch thought in the doing it.* (3) The ſecond opinion is, that of ‘ ſeveral Divines, who, ‘ leſt thoſe falſe ſubtleties ſhould overthrow this ‘ important maxim, that the ignorance of the law of ‘ nature does not juſtify a man, which has been ‘ acknowledged by the Heathens themſelves, and is ‘ laid down in the Canon-law in theſe words, *Ignorantia juris omnibus adultis damnabilis eſt:* - - - - - ‘ *Ignorance of the law in all adult perſons is damnable:* ‘ maintain that it ought not to be looked upon as ‘ invincible, abſolutely ſpeaking, becauſe that law is ‘ ſuch, that man was made capable to know it, and ‘ would have known it, if he had continued in the ‘ ſtate wherein God had placed him; that in the ‘ ſtate he is in, it is one of the conſequences of original ſin that he knows only the firſt principles of it, ‘ and is ignorant of the reſt, which he may however know with the aſſiſtance of grace: which, ‘ according to St Thomas, is ſufficient to oblige men ‘ to do what they cannot do without grace; though ‘ that grace, without which they cannot do it, be ‘ given to ſome out of mercy, and be denied to ‘ others out of juſtice, as a puniſhment of a preceding ‘ ſin,

(*a*) Elſſius, in Encomiaſtico Auguſtiniano, *pag.* 247.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) Ex eodem, ibid.

(*d*) See Fonſeca, on Ariſtotle's Metaphyſics, *lib. iv, cap. iii, p. m.* 651.

(*e*) *See the* Scholaſticus Orthodoxus *of Paul Ferri, p.* 304, 447.

(1) Difficultez propoſées à Mr Steyaërt, *Part ix, pag.* 234.

(2) Ib. *p.* 235.

(3) Ib. *p.* 236.

be very ſcandalous, if a favourable interpretation was not put upon it; for he taught that God can lie or deceive us [*B*]. They made a great noiſe in Holland againſt a miniſter,

‘ ſin, if it were but original ſin. Nothing can be more expreſs than what this Angelical Doctor teaches upon that ſubject, 2. 2. qu. 2. art. 5 (4).’ According to this ſecond opinion, *which has been entertained by moſt of the ancient Divines*, the ignorance of the law of nature *did never juſtify any body, becauſe it could not be looked upon as invincible* (5). ‘The third opinion is that of Gregorius Ariminenſis, of Eſtius, and other Divines, who taking the word *invincible* in another ſenſe, do not ſcruple to aſſert that the ignorance of the law of nature does not juſtify a man, even when it might be looked upon as *invincible*. For, ſay they, it may be called *invincible* with reſpect to human means, ſuch as inſtruction, of which many people have been deprived, eſpecially among the infidels (6). . . . . . Thoſe, who, taking the word *invincible* in this ſenſe, have acknowledged that a vaſt number of Heathens have been invincibly ignorant of many duties of the law of nature, ſhould neceſſarily have ſaid, that the ignorance of the law of nature does not clear men from ſin, even when it may be called invincible, with reſpect to the want of human, and even divine means, when God does not afford thoſe, that would be immediately neceſſary to overcome that ignorance. We have ſtill ſome theſes publickly aſſerted in our days at Rome in the ſchool of the Auguſtins, wherein this propoſition is to be found: *Ignorantia invincibilis juris naturalis non excuſat à peccato. Ex Gregorio in 2. Sent. diſp. 29. qu. 1. art. 2. in reſp. ad arg. ubi ait. Ad probationem: Secundùm omnes Doctores non imputantur homini quæ ex ignorantia ſimpliciter invincibili committuntur: dico quod illud eſt intelligendum de ignorantia quæ non eſt peccatum nec pœna peccati, cujus ille ſit vel fuerit reus. Quod probat ex S Aug. in Ep. ad Sixtum. Ignorantia enim invincibilis eſt pœna peccati Originalis, cujus omnis homo naſcitur reus.* So that it is not very long ſince they publickly aſſerted at Rome, that an invincible ignorance does not clear men from ſin, and no body was offended at it; nor was it believed that they who aſcribed that opinion to St Auguſtin, and to Gregorius Ariminenſis, one of his moſt faithful diſciples among the ſchool-men, impoſed upon that Father. Eſtius did alſo teach the ſame doctrine in expreſs words (7).’ Mr Arnauld adds (8) that the difference between the two laſt opinions *is but a diſpute about words*, and that *at the bottom each of them does perfectly agree with the general maxim of the Canon-law, and the doctrine of St Auguſtin againſt the Pelagians, and that of St Bernard againſt Abelard; that whatever is done againſt the law of nature is a ſin, in whatever manner one may be ignorant of it, becauſe it is always a puniſhment of ſome ſin, as St Auguſtin ſays in his letter to Sixtus. But the firſt opinion, which is that of the Jeſuits, does totally overthrow the maxim of the Canon-law, and the doctrine of holy men, by generally aſſerting on one hand that an invincible ignorance does always juſtify men; and on the other by ſtretching ſo far the word invincible whenever they pleaſe that if they would ſpeak ſincerely, they ſhould ſay that the ſins of ignorance are never formal ſins, but only material.*

I thought fit to mention all theſe things, not only becauſe they afford us a ſhort and uſeful inſtruction about a very difficult and important ſubject; but alſo becauſe they diſcover to us that our Gregorius Ariminenſis did not uſe any evaſion and ſubterfuge. He dived into the bottom of a doctrine, he perceived the moſt natural conſequences of a principle, and owned them boldly, without ſeeking any equivocal or mitigated expreſſions. I do not ſay this, to condemn thoſe who endeavour to ſoften what they think might offend the readers. They may have a good deſign, and ſome matters are ſo difficult and intricate, that we may very well excuſe thoſe, who uſe ſometimes a different method to explain them. The queſtion about ſins of ignorance is one of that kind: it is ſurrounded with precipices on all ſides. It is therefore no wonder, if thoſe, who walk in ſuch a way, do ſometimes turn aſide, or go back. They grant one thing, and then they oppoſe it: they give with one hand, what they take away with the other. They will grant, *that an invincible ignorance excuſes men both in fact and right* (9), and then they will alledge a great many examples taken from the holy Scripture, to ſhew that the ſins of ignorance do not excuſe men; and the neceſſary reſult of thoſe quotations muſt be, either that the ignorance of moral duties was never invincible, or that though it be invincible, it does not excuſe a ſinner. If you conſider narrowly all their arguments, you will find that after they have ſuppoſed that ignorance of right or of fact is never a ſin, but when it is not invincible (10); they leave, properly ſpeaking, no caſe, wherein that ignorance is invincible (11); for, they ſay, it may be overcome with reſpect to the paſſion of JESUS CHRIST (12), even when it has never been heard of. They pretend, that if a ſavage of America is ignorant of the matters of fact contained in the New Teſtament, it is his fault, becauſe he has not put himſelf in a diſpoſition that may move God to reveal to him the myſteries of ſalvation, and has made himſelf unworthy of that heavenly favour. Aſk them this queſtion; Could he have that good diſpoſition that you ſpeak of? Could he make a good uſe of the light of nature? They will anſwer you, That he could if he would. If you aſk them whether he could have ſuch a will? I think they will anſwer you that he could not, but that it was only *a moral impotency, which is nothing elſe but the ill diſpoſition of his will* (13), and a conſequence of the corruption wherewith the children of Adam are born. This is at the bottom the ſame doctrine with that of our Gregory, and I think it were better to ſay plainly, as he does, that an invincible ignorance can be no excuſe, when it proceeds from original ſin, and is a puniſhment for it. It is true, that this doctrine is liable to ſome inconveniences; for it ſeems to lead one by degrees to this aſſertion, *frenzy and madneſs can be no excuſe, ſince they ought not to be excluded from the number of evils which have been introduced by ſin, and which ſerve as a puniſhment for ſin*. But is not the firſt opinion, mentioned by Mr Arnauld, alſo liable to many inconveniencies (14)? The queſtion is not to chuſe between an opinion free from all intricacies, and one that is very intricate. But the queſtion is to chuſe between two extreams, whereof one is contrary to Philoſophical notions, and the other to the Theological ſyſtems.

[*B*] *He taught that God can lie or deceive us.*] Des Cartes laid down, as the only foundation of human knowledge, the perſuaſion we ought to have that God can neither be deceived, nor deceive others. They objected againſt him (15), that, according to Gregory Ariminenſis, and ſome other ſchoolmen, God may ſay ſome things that are contrary to his thoughts and decrees, as when he commanded Jonas to preach in Nineveh, that it would be deſtroyed in forty days. If he hardened and blinded Pharaoh, if he ſent a lying ſpirit into ſome prophets, how do you know, ſaid they to Des Cartes, that he cannot ſeduce us? May he not deal with us as a Phyſician deals with ſick perſons, and as a father deals with children? They are often deceived wiſely, and for their good. Could we bear to look upon truth, if God preſented it to us naked? *Si Deus puram nobis oſtenderet veritatem quis eam oculus, quæ mentis acies ſuſtinere valeat* (16)? Des Cartes anſwered (17), that we muſt diſtinguiſh between God's way of ſpeaking, accommodated to man's capacity, and to the truths that have a relation to mankind, and the way of ſpeaking that relates to abſolute truths. The firſt way of ſpeaking is very frequent in the Scripture; but the laſt ought to be that of Philoſophers. Pharaoh's hardneſs of heart, and ſuch like things, do not denote a poſitive action of God; it was only a privation of grace. It is plain, ſays he, that I did not mean ſuch lies as conſiſt in words, but the inward and formal malice that is to be found in deceit. The decree againſt Nineveh was only comminatory, and depended upon a condition. However, I do not blame continued he (18), thoſe who ſay, that God may, by the miniſtry of his prophets, declare ſome lies free from all manner of malicious niſter, who had ſaid the ſame thing, but with ſome reſtrictions that corrected it [C].

---

(4) Ibid.

(5) Ib. *p.* 241.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ib. *p.* 242.

(8) Ib. *p.* 243, 244.

(9) See the preface of the Supplement to the Philoſophical Commentary upon theſe words, *Compel them to come in, folio* ** 4, *verſo*, *& ſeq.*

(10) *See Mr* Saurin's Reflexions ſur les Droits de la Conſcience, *pag.* 16.

(11) That is, as to the doctrines and facts that concern religion.

(12) Saurin, ibid. *p.* 15.

(13) Ib. *p.* 16.

(14) *See the* Difficultez propoſées à Mr Steyaërt, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 244, *& ſeq.*

(15) See the ſecond objections againſt Des Cartes's Meditations, *p. m.* 66.

(16) Object. ſecundæ contra Meditat. Carteſii, *p. m.* 66.

(17) See Des Cartes's Anſwer to the ſecond Objections, *p. m.* 75, 76.

(18) Nolim tamen reprehendere illos qui concedunt Deum per Prophetas verbale aliquod mendacium (qualia ſunt illa medicorum, quibus ægrotos decipiunt ut ipſos curent, hoc eſt in quo deſit omnis malitia deceptionis) proferre poſſe. Quinimo etiam, quod majus eſt, ab ipſo naturali inſtinctu, qui nobis à Deo tributus eſt, interdum nos realiter falli videmus, ut cum hydropicus ſitit, &c. *Carteſius, ibid. p.* 76. Note, that Mr Vogelſang, *Neceſſaria Reſponſio ad Præfat. Ludovici Wolzogii, cap.* ii, *p.* 59, *& ſeq.* does mightily exclaim againſt that paſſage of Des Cartes, as if it overthrew the Scripture, and even the whole Carteſian ſyſtem.

malicious deceit, and like thoſe of Phyſicians, who, to cure their patients, make them believe ſome things that are falſe. Moreover, I confeſs, that the natural inſtinct, which God has given us, does ſometimes deceive us really; for the nature, which God has given us for the preſervation of our body, actually moves the hydropics to do a thing that is prejudicial to them, that is, to drink: but I have ſhewn in my ſixth meditation how this can be reconciled with God's goodneſs and veracity.

I muſt obſerve, by the by, that the objection remains, notwithſtanding this anſwer; for when a man is forced to confeſs that a general maxim, which he had laid down as the foundation of a certain and demonſtrative doctrine, admits of many exceptions, he ſhakes it to that degree, that it can no longer fix our uncertainties, and there is no caſe wherein a Sceptic may not uſe Des Cartes's diſtinction. If I was deceived, will he ſay, by the ideas, which repreſent to me matter as an extended ſubſtance, it would be a deceit free from all manner of malice, and perhaps it would be uſeful to me in the ſtate I am in, which in ſome reſpects is a true ſtate of infancy or ſickneſs, whilſt my ſoul is united to my body. A verbal lie is not better than a ideal lie, and cannot be ſeparated from it; for men ſpeak only to excite ſome ideas in the minds of thoſe who hear them; and may I not ſuppoſe that all ſorts of ideas relate, not to abſolute truths, but to ſuch truths as have a relation to mankind?

I muſt alſo obſerve, by the by, that there are certain things and certain expreſſions in the Scripture, that will always confound the deepeſt Metaphyſicians. We have here an inſtance of it. See how Des Cartes was run down by the hypotheſis which Gregorius Ariminenſis pretended to ground on the Scripture. One may eaſily gueſs that he was ſtrangely ſurpriſed, when he ſaw that the thundering arguments that fell upon him, came from a place from which he expected it leaſt. He thought he had built upon a rock, for he had built upon the infallibility of God. He expected, without doubt, to have the approbation of Divines as to that fundamental part of his hypotheſis, and he was ſure at leaſt that no paſſages of the Scripture would be alledged againſt him: and yet the ſtorm fell upon him from that very quarter; and it was ſo violent that he was forced to yield. So vain are the thoughts and hopes of men! But, on the other ſide, we may very well wonder that Des Cartes made ſo weak a reſiſtance. His quick ſurrender is a ſign that he was not at all acquainted with books of Divinity. If he had been verſed in that reading, he might have known a great many explications and ſolutions of thoſe Scripture paſſages that Gregory Ariminenſis built upon, and they might have afforded him a method of diſputing, whereby he might have come off. It is likely ſome will ſay that I am miſtaken, and that he could not well make uſe of that method; for he was only for evident reaſons, and always preferred what is clearer to what is leſs clear. Now the paſſages that were objected againſt him out of the Holy Scripture, are infinitely clearer than the explanations and gloſſes of the commentators; which is the reaſon why he ſurrendred ſo ſoon. I can anſwer this objection, and I ſay before hand, that this great Philoſopher ſhould at leaſt have inſiſted more than he did on the nature of the expreſſions made uſe of by the holy writers, to accommodate themſelves to the capacity of the people. Vulgar minds being not able to raiſe themſelves to the moſt perfect being, it was neceſſary that the Prophets ſhould bring down God to man, and make him ſtammer with us, as a nurſe ſtammers with a child, whom ſhe ſuckles. Hence it is that there are ſo many expreſſions in the Scripture, importing that God repents, that he is angry, that he will inquire whether a thing has happened, that he will alter his mind if men obey, or do not obey him, and a thouſand ſuch things, that are inconſiſtent with infinite perfection. Des Cartes did not fail to ſhew what difference there is between thoſe expreſſions, and thoſe of a true Metaphyſician; but he touched too ſlightly upon it, and loſt all the advantage he might have drawn from it; for he yielded notwithſtanding, to the pretenſion of Gregory Ariminenſis. He ſhould not have done it, he ſhould have affirmed conſtantly, that the paſſages of the Scripture, wherein it is ſaid that God does ſometimes deceive, ought never to be literally underſtood, and ought to be expounded, as thoſe that ſay that he repents, and which aſcribe to him ſome other human frailty. He ſhould have ſhewn at large, that a Philoſopher ought not to have a regard to thoſe paſſages of the word of God, when the greatneſs of the Supreme Being is to be repreſented. Mr Regis was very ſenſible of this: I will lay down as a maxim, ſays he (19), ‘That whenever I deſign to ſpeak of God exactly, I muſt not conſult myſelf, nor ſpeak according to cuſtom, but raiſe my mind above all creatures, to conſult the vaſt and immenſe idea of the moſt perfect being: although I may be allowed to ſay in a moral treatiſe, that *God has repented*, that *he is angry*, *&c.* Yet thoſe and ſuch like expreſſions cannot be allowed me in a treatiſe purely Metaphyſical, in which one muſt ſpeak exactly.’

Let us remember, that if the Scripture does often repreſent God under popular, and conſequently very falſe, notions, to accommodate itſelf to the capacity of thoſe, for whom God deſigned the revelation; it affords us in other places the corrective that we want, I mean the deſcription of the Infinite Being in his immutable and moſt perfect majeſty.

[C] *They made a great noiſe in Holland againſt a miniſter, who had ſaid the ſame thing, but with ſome reſtrictions that corrected it.*] I mean Mr de Wolzogue. He was profeſſor and miniſter of the Walloon church at Utrecht, in the year 1666, when a book came out, intituled, *Philoſophia S. Scripturæ interpres, Exercitatio paradoxa.* It appeared a very pernicious piece to the orthodox Divines, and worſe than a Socinian book. Mr de Wolzogue was one of thoſe who confuted it; but he was ſo unlucky in his performance, that they made as much or more noiſe againſt his confutation (20), than againſt the book he had confuted. Here is one of the things that gave the greateſt offence. ‘(21) I am to prove in the third place, that God will not deceive any body: though I need not take much pains to prove it. When God ſays a thing, it is ſufficient to make us apprehend that he will not deceive men. I ſay, that he *will* not deceive, leſt one ſhould think that he cannot do it, if he would. For as any one, who goes about to deceive another, is reputed to be in ſome meaſure above him in that reſpect, and to ſurpaſs him either in addreſs, or ſtrength, or in ſome other faculty whatever it be; and becauſe God's wiſdom, and power, and all his other attributes are infinite; it is plain that creatures, even the moſt perfect of them, becauſe they are finite, as being creatures, may be led into error by the infinite Creator. But I deny that he *will* do it. For we can ſcarce think of an intention to deceive, without believing that there is ſome malice in it, whereby we endeavour to impoſe upon the perſon, whom we dare not aſſault without cunning and deceit; or that there is a weakneſs of mind, which makes one doubt of a good ſucceſs without it. Each of thoſe two things betrays a great imperfection: they muſt not be therefore aſcribed in the leaſt to him, whom we look upon as a moſt perfect Being (22). They, who wrote againſt Mr de Wolzogue (23), complained very much of this propoſition, *God might deceive, if he would.* It is certain that it ſounds ill, and tho' the explanation the author added to it, reduced it to the common opinion of the orthodox Divines, that it is impoſſible God ſhould deceive any body, yet it had been better for him to abſtain from thoſe offenſive words, which at the bottom were of no uſe to the queſtion in hand, and were a meer needleſs parentheſis. It ſeems to me that men in cold blood would not have carried their cenſure farther; only they might have added to it, that an author, who appears ſo much addicted to Des Cartes, ought not to uſe a great compaſs of words in order to ſay that God cannot deceive. He ought to ſay it in one word, and not in circumlocutions that require explanation. They who expreſs themſelves thus, *the reprobate might love God, if they would, but their corruption is ſo great, that they cannot be willing to love him,* ſay at the bottom the ſame thing with thoſe, who affirm roundly, that it is impoſſible the reprobate ſhould love God. This laſt propoſition being ſhorter, is preferable to the other. In like manner, ſince it is a ſhorter expreſſion to ſay, *God cannot deceive*, than to ſay, *He might deceive, if he would; but he is ſo holy, that he cannot have the will to deceive*; why did Mr de Wolzogue uſe ſo many windings and turnings in his diſcourſe? However it be, there is more reaſon to wonder that the cenſure was not wholly confined within thoſe bounds, than to ſee that the Sieur de Labadie, who, in the name of the Walloon church of Middleburg, proſecuted Mr de Wolzogue in the Walloon ſynod, durſt accuſe him of Heterodoxy for ſaying that God cannot have the will to deceive us. ‘Mr de Labadie objects againſt me, in his Latin book, as an error contrary to the Scripture; not what I ſaid that God might deceive if he would, but what I added to it, that God cannot have the will to deceive. He pretends, that I have not ſaid enough, and aſſerts that God *will* and *can* deceive. He objects the Scripture againſt me, and aſks, *What will Wolzogue ſay to the Hiſtory related in the 22d chapter of the 1ſt book of Kings, and eſpecially to the words of the 22d verſe?* And the Lord ſaid, Thou ſhalt perſwade *him*, and prevail alſo: go forth, and do ſo. Now therefore behold, the LORD hath put a lying ſpirit in the mouth of all theſe thy prophets, and the LORD hath ſpoken evil concerning thee. *When God willed and commanded that Ahab ſhould be ſeduced and put a lying ſpirit (for ſo Junius and Tremellius ſpeak) muſt he be charged with weakneſs of mind or malice* (24)*?*’ See the margin (25). I ſhall ſet down another paſſage, whereby it will appear that the adverſaries of Mr de Wolzogue were not offended at Labadie's temerity. It is a very long paſſage; but ſince it contains a doctrine, whereby the cenſured propoſition is cleared and explained in a ſolid manner, the reader will not think it ſtrange to find it in this place. Here are therefore Mr de Wolzogue's words in the preface to a collection of Judgments, which he publiſhed in 1669 (26).

---

(19) Regis, Syſteme de Philoſophie, *Tom. i, pag.* 168, *Edit. of Lyons* 1691, *in* 12*mo.*

(20) *It is intituled,* De ſcripturarum interprete adverſus Exercitatorem paradoxum libri duo, *and was printed in* 1667.

(21) It is pag. 24, of the 1ſt Edit. and pag. 11, of the 2d Edit. of *De Script. interpr. &c.*

(22) Wolzogue, Apologie pour le Synode de Naërden, *Part iv, pag.* 160.

(23) *See Mr Vander Waëyen, pag.* 19, *of his book* pro vera & genuina Reformatorum ſententia præſertim in negotio de interprete Scripturæ. *Mr Vogelſang, in the 2d chapter of the* neceſſaria reſponſio ad præfationem Ludovici Wolzogii. *John Brown, a Scotch miniſter, pag.* 61, *of his* Wolzogius cauſæ proditor, *and ſeveral others.*

‘(27) The principal objection, and which makes the greateſt noiſe, is what I have ſaid, that God can deceive, if he will. For it ſeems my meaning is, that God can deceive. But I think there is nothing more harmleſs than what I have ſaid, and that it will be found to be very Orthodox, if it be carefully examined. For if there be any thing to be ſaid againſt it, it muſt be in the ſenſe, or in the words. As for the ſenſe, I lay down that it is impoſſible God ſhould ever deceive any body, as it is impoſſible he ſhould lie or deny himſelf; this I have ſaid in expreſs words in ſeveral places of my book; I made it the foundation of my whole diſpute, and I think it is ſo important a truth, that I believe we can have no aſſurance of any thing in the world, nor of our ſalvation without it. Nevertheleſs, in order to explain the nature of deceit, I diſtinguiſh the will of deceiving from the qualifications neceſſary to perform that deceit. The will of deceiving is always ſinful, and contains properly the imperfection that is in deceit; but the qualifications that might ſerve to put that deceit in execution are good, and contain always ſome perfection (28). Let us conſider two men, one of which is ſtupid and malicious, and the other a virtuous and able man: it may be ſaid of the firſt, that he is deſirous to deceive ſome body, but that he has not wit enough for it; it is not for want of will, but for want of power. On the contrary, it will be ſaid of the ſecond, that he has all the wit that is requiſite to impoſe upon ſimple people, but that he is too honeſt to do it. Now if we apply this to God, it is moſt certain that he will not deceive, he cannot have ſuch a will, he is too perfect for it, being perfection it ſelf; but as for the qualities requiſite for the execution of a deceit, ſuch as wiſdom and power, without doubt God is endowed with them; not that he can at any time make uſe of his wiſdom and power to perform a deceit, for this ſtill ſuppoſes a will to deceive; but he has however the wiſdom and power requiſite for the execution of a deceit; and it is in this ſenſe, I ſay, that God can deceive if he will, but that he cannot will it; that is God cannot deceive, not for want of wiſdom or power; but by reaſon of the perfection of his will. So that theſe words, *God can deceive if he will*, ought to be paraphraſed thus, *God has all the qualifications neceſſary for the execution of deceit*; he is wiſe, powerful, and conſtant; he has whatever might ſerve for the performance of a deceitful deſign, if he was willing to deceive; but it is impoſſible for him to have ſuch a will; it is alſo impoſſible that he ſhould uſe his power for the execution of a deceit; from whence I conclude, that it is impoſſible he ſhould deceive. The meaning of which is, that God is moſt wiſe and powerful. Who will deny it? But perhaps it will be ſaid that there is ſome harſhneſs in the words. Suppoſe there was, is it ſuch a crime as deſerves all the noiſe that is made about it? If all harſh and offenſive words were ſtruck out of the books of our Divines, there would be many razures in them. Calvin himſelf would not be free from cenſure concerning the doctrine of Predeſtination. But as for the doctrine in queſtion, I maintain that the Scripture ſays more of it than I do. It ſays, 1 *Kings* xxii. that *the Lord has put a lying ſpirit in the mouth of the falſe prophets*. In the twentieth chapter of *Jeremiah*, *ver.* 7. *O Lord, thou haſt deceived me, and I was deceived.* For ſo it is tranſlated in the Engliſh Bible, and does not our verſion ſay in *Ezekiel* xiv. 9. *If the prophet be deceived when he hath ſpoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet.* Did I advance any thing that ſeems at firſt ſo ſtrange as this? I am not ignorant of the ſenſe that is put upon thoſe paſſages; but I wiſh they would likewiſe have admitted that which I put upon my aſſertion, without charging me with the appearance of harſhneſs that is to be found in the words. That which is ſurprizing, is, that Mr de Labadie maintains that God *can* and *will* deceive, and that he has deceived: he finds fault with me becauſe I ſaid only that God *can* deceive if he *will*, but that he cannot *will* it; and yet none of our zealots reprove him for it.’

Mr de Wolzogue's adverſaries were not ſatisfied with this explication. Mr Vogelſang confuted it with great contempt and indignation, and obſerved, among other things, that it is likely Des Cartes took from the ſchoolmen his diſtinction between the *power* and the *will* to deceive; as if that power was a kind of perfection, whereas the will to deceive is an imperfection. He will have it that Des Cartes hunted after the glory of invention, by digging up the ordures of the ſchoolmen (29); and he quotes a paſſage of the fifth chapter of the fourth book of Ariſtotle's Topics, where it is ſaid that the faculty of doing moral evil is in God, and in a good man. He alledges alſo theſe words of Thomas Aquinas, which explain that paſſage of Ariſtotle. ‘Deus peccare non poteſt, quia eſt omnipotens. Quamvis Philoſophus dicat in quarto Topicorum, quod poteſt Deus & ſtudioſus (*vir probus*) prava agere. Sed hoc intelligitur vel ſub conditione, cujus antecedens ſit impoſſibile, ut puta, ſi dicamus quod poteſt Deus prava agere ſi velit. Nihil enim prohibet conditionalem eſſe veram, cujus antecedens & conſequens eſt impoſſibile; ſicut ſi dicatur, ſi homo eſt aſinus, habet quatuor pedes. Vel, ut intelligatur, quod Deus poteſt aliqua agere, quæ nunc prava videntur, quæ tamen, ſi ageret, bona eſſent. Vel loquitur ſecundum communem opinionem gentilium, qui homines dicebant transferri in Deos, ut Jovem & Mercurium (30). - - - - *God cannot ſin, becauſe he is omnipotent: tho' Ariſtotle ſays in his fourth book of Topics, that the faculty of doing moral evil, is in God and in good men. But this is underſtood either under a condition, the antecedent of which is impoſſible, as if we ſhould ſay that God can do evil if he will. For nothing hinders a conditional propoſition from being true, tho' both the antecedent and conſequent part of it be impoſſible: for example we may ſay, if a man be an aſs, he has four feet. Or Ariſtotle means that God can do ſome things which now ſeem evil, but would nevertheleſs be good if he ſhould do them. Or laſtly he ſpeaks according to the common opinion of the Gentiles, who ſaid that men were changed into gods, as Jupiter and Mercury.*’ He maintains that Thomas Aquinas made himſelf ridiculous, by pretending to juſtify that opinion of Ariſtotle. He is very ſevere upon him: I ſhall only mention what he ſays upon the laſt point. ‘Quod ultimo loco hariolatur, Ariſtotelem forte ſic locutum fuiſſe *juxta communem opinionem Gentilium, qui homines dicebant transferri in Deos, ut Jovem & Mercurium*; quam hoc plane frivolum eſt? Etenim, juxta communem Gentilium opinionem, Dii non modo facultatem habebant mala vel turpiſſima perpetrandi, ſed & promptam ſane voluntatem. Quapropter eorum poëtæ furta Numinum & impoſturas, & rixas, & pugnas, & mu-

---

(24) Wolzogue, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 154, 155.

(25) *Note, that Mr de Wolzogue obſerves afterwards*, that he gave Mr de Labadie notice of that overſight in the ſynod of Naërden, and ſince that time, *adds he*, he has mended his opinion, having obſerved that it was an impiety to ſay that God will and does effectively deceive men.

(26) *That is*, Jugemens de pluſieurs Profeſſeurs & Docteurs en Theologie qui prononcent Orthodoxe le Livre de Louys de Wolzogue de l'Interprete de l'Ecriture.

(27) Wolzogue, *Avant propos des* Jugemens, &c.

(28) Compare with this what I have ſaid in the remark [*A*], of the article RANGOUZE.

(29) Solet Carteſius è putidiſſimis antiquorum philoſophorum atque Scholaſticorum liberalius ineptientium ſordibus excrementa præcipue fœdiora ſæpenumero deligere, uti de placitis obſoletis, & merita ſepultis oblivione, ſubtilitatis inſolitæ miſer gloriolam ſubripiat. *Reinerus Vogelſangius, Vianenſis V. D. M. & S. S. Theologiæ Profeſſor in Eccleſia & Gymnaſio Sylvaducenſi, ad Præfat. Lud. Wolzogii neceſſaria reſponſ. pag.* 49.

(30) Thomas Aquinas, *XXV Quæſt. Art. III, apud* Vogelſang. *ibid. p.* 51.

‘ tuorum odiorum rancores, & libidines & adulteria ‘ vulgo decantavere. Quod plane contra Philoſophi ‘ ſcopum & mentem eſt, qui mala perpetrandi vo‘ luntatem Deo penitus abrogat, etſi facultatem pra‘ va faciendi conceſſerit (31). - - - - *As to his laſt con‘ jecture, viz. that perhaps Ariſtotle ſpoke* according to ‘ the common opinion of the Gentiles who ſaid that ‘ men were changed into gods, &c. *how frivolous is ‘ it? For according to the common opinion of the Gentiles ‘ the Gods had not only the power, but alſo the will ‘ to commit the baſeſt actions. Hence it was that their ‘ Poets choſe for their ordinary themes, the thefts of the ‘ gods, their frauds and contentions, their battles and ‘ mutual animoſities, their luſts and adulteries. But this ‘ plainly contradicts the ſcope and meaning of the Philoſo‘ pher, who takes from God the will at the ſame time ‘ that he leaves him the power to do evil.’* He adds (32) ſome other paſſages of the Scripture to thoſe that were quoted by Mr de Wolzogue, and ſhews how they are to be underſtood. See the margin (33).

RINUCCINI (OTTAVIO), a gentleman of Florence (*a*), followed, into France, Mary de Medicis, with whom he was in love [*A*], and gained the eſteem of Henry IV, who made him gentleman of his bed-chamber (*b*). He was a man of wit, and a handſome perſon, polite, eloquent, and a very good Poet, and, with the advantage of theſe good qualities, he applied himſelf very much to make his court to the ladies (*c*). His inventions conſiderably enriched the Italian poetry; for he was the firſt who made verſes after the manner of Anacreon, and compoſed pieces which were ſet to Muſic, and acted on the ſtage (*d*) [*B*]. It is true, every one does not agree that he was

[*A*] *He followed into France Mary de Medicis with whom he was in love.*] Nicius Erythræus tells us this particular. *Mariam Medicæam*, ſays he (1), *Galliæ Reginam, non majori ambitione quam vanitate adamavit: quam etiam honoris gratia, proſecutus eſt euntem in Galliam. Sed poſtea reverſus in Italiam, omiſſis amatoriis nugis, ad quas erat mirè propenſus, tandem ad ſe rediit, quæque ratione non perſpexerat, ſatietate abjecit, experiendo contempſit, totumque ad pietatis amorem & ſtudium animum contulit: in quo demum Florentiæ diem obiit extremum.* Here is the paraphraſe made by Mr Baillet on theſe Latin words, ‘ Ottavio Rinuccini . . . . . ‘ was known in France under the moſt diſadvantage‘ ous character in the world, becauſe he had the folly ‘ and indiſcretion to diſcover the motives which had ‘ induced him to put himſelf in the retinue of queen ‘ Mary de Medicis (2). . . . . I muſt add for his repu‘ tation, that he changed his life and practice to‘ wards the end of his days, that the virtue and wiſ‘ dom of our queen, which had very much mortified ‘ his inclination, opened his eyes, and that returning ‘ into Italy with a ſincere repentance and ſalutary ‘ ſhame, he applied himſelf to exerciſes of piety ‘ which he never forſook till his death (3).’

[*B*] *He was the firſt who . . . . compoſed pieces which were ſet to Muſic and acted on the ſtage.*] Nicius Erythræus aſcribes to him four Operas, that of Daphne (4), that of Eurydice, that of Arethuſa, and that of Ariadne (5); but Mr Rilli makes no mention of Arethuſa, tho' he had made great enquiries after what related to this great Poet. He tells us (6) that the Daphne, repreſented before the Grand Ducheſs by James Corſi, was printed at Florence in the year 1600, in 4to. That the Eurydice, acted at the marriage of Mary de Medicis with Henry IV, was printed at the ſame place in the year 1600, in 4to. That the Ariadne, acted at the marriage of the prince of Mantua with the Infanta of Savoy, was printed at the ſame place in the year 1608, in 4to. That the *Maſcherata dell' Ingrate*, a ballet danced at the marriage of the ſame prince of Mantua, was printed at Mantua in the year 1608, in 4to. That the *Verſi Sacri cantati nella Cappella della Sereniſſima Archiducheſſa d' Auſtria Granducheſſa di Toſcana*, and the Ode *in lode de' Giuocatori di pallone*, were printed at Florence in the year 1622, in 4to, by the care of Peter Francis Rinuccini the author's ſon. That there were others printed in ſingle ſheets, beſides ſonnets, ſongs, &c. inſerted among the works of other authors, and that there are a great many pieces in manuſcript that deſerve to be publiſhed. He cites (7) a paſſage of Peter Francis Rinuccini (8), which tells us, that Ottavio Rinuccini deſerved great commendation for the *Verſi Sciolti* in his panegyric on the birth of Lewis XIII, and that he had deſigned to tranſlate the ſix books of St Catherine into that kind of verſe; but that he had only tranſlated the firſt, which they were reſolved to publiſh, tho' the author had not put the finiſhing hand to it. This is what Mr Rilli tells us concerning the works of our Ottavio. Could he be ignorant of what relates to the opera of Arethuſa which Erythræus mentions (9)?

But to come to the point, let us copy a long paſſage of the epiſtle dedicatory to the Eurydice (10). It will inform us, that Rinuccini thought that he was the firſt among the moderns that had attempted to introduce Muſic on the ſtage; but he was miſtaken, and knew not what I mention in another place (11). We ſhall alſo ſee there that James Peri (12) was the perſon that compoſed the Muſic for the paſtoral of Daphne, and afterward for the opera of Eurydice. ‘ E' ſtata ‘ openione di molti, Chriſtianiſſima Regina, che gli ‘ antichi Greci e Romani cantaſſero ſulle Scene le Tra‘ gedie intiere; ma sì nobile maniera di recitáre, non ‘ che rinnovata, ma nè pur che io ſappia fin qui è ‘ ſtata tentata da alcuno; & ciò mi credev' io per di‘ fetto della Muſica moderna, di gran lunga all' antica ‘ inferiore; ma penſiero sì fatto mi tolſe interamente ‘ dall' animo Meſ. Jacobo Peri, quando udito l'inten‘ zione del Sig. Jacopo Corſi, e mia, miſe con tanta ‘ grazia ſotto le note la Favola di Dafne, compoſta da ‘ me, ſolo per fare una ſemplice prova di quello, che ‘ poteſſe il Canto nell' età noſtra, che incredibilmente ‘ piacque a que' pochi che l'udirono; onde preſo ani‘ mo, e data miglior forma alla ſteſſa Favola, e di ‘ nuovo rappreſentandola in Caſa il Sig. Jacopo, fu ‘ ella non ſolo dalla Nobiltà di tutta queſta Patria fa‘ vorita, ma dalla Sereniſſ. Granducheſſa, e dagl' il‘ luſtriſſimi Cardinali dal Monte e Montalto, udita, e ‘ commendata; ma molto maggior favore, e fortuna ‘ ha ſortito l'Euridice meſſa in Muſica dal medeſimo ‘ Peri, con arte mirabile, e da altri non più uſata, ‘ havendo meritato dalla benignità e magnificenza del ‘ Sereniſſ. Granduca d'eſſere rappreſentata in nobiliſ‘ ſima Scena, alla preſenza di V. M. del Cardinal Le‘ gato, e di tanti Principi, e Signori d'Italia e di ‘ Francia; la onde cominciando io a conoſcere quanto ‘ ſimili Rappreſentazioni in Muſica ſiano gradite, ho ‘ voluto recare in luce queſte due, perchè altri di me ‘ piu intendenti s'ingegnino di accreſcere, e migliorare ‘ sì fatte Poeſie di maniera, che non abbiamo invidia ‘ a quelle antiche tanto celebrate da' Nobili Scrittori ‘ (13). - - - *It has been the opinion of many perſons, Moſt ‘ Chriſtian Queen, that the antient Greeks and Romans ‘ ſung their tragedies throughout on the ſtage; but ſo ‘ noble a manner of reciting has not been revived, nor ‘ that I know of ſo much as attempted by any one till ‘ now; and this I thought was owing to the defect of ‘ the modern Muſic, which is far inferior to the ancient. ‘ But Mr Jacob Peri made me intirely alter my opinion, ‘ when upon hearing the intention of Mr Jacob Corſi and ‘ my ſelf, he ſo beautifully ſet to Muſic the paſtoral of ‘ Daphne which I had compoſed, meerly to make a trial ‘ what ſong could do in our age. It pleaſed to an in‘ credible degree, thoſe few that heard it. From this I ‘ took courage. The ſame piece being put into better form, ‘ and repreſented anew in the houſe of Mr Peri, was not ‘ only favoured by all the nobility of the country, but ‘ heard and commended by the moſt ſerene Grand Ducheſs, ‘ and the moſt illuſtrious cardinals dal Monte and Mon‘ talto. But the Eurydice has met with more favour and ‘ ſucceſs, being ſet to Muſic by the ſame Peri with won‘ derful art, that is not uſed by any other, and having ‘ been thought worthy to be repreſented on the ſtage, by ‘ the bounty and magnificence of the moſt ſerene Grand Duke, ‘ in the preſence of your majeſty, the cardinal Legate, and ‘ ſo many princes and gentlemen of Italy and France; from ‘ whence beginning to know how well the like muſical ‘ repreſentations were reliſhed, I reſolved to publiſh theſe ‘ two,* was the inventer of theſe two things. Some ſay that Gabriel Chiabrera gave birth to the Anacreontic ſongs (*e*), and that Emilio Caveleri, a gentleman of Rome, wrote Operas before our Rinuccini (*f*). However that be, it cannot be denied that the dramatic pieces of the latter, in the pomp of machinery, the decorations of the ſcenes, and the ability of the Actors, excelled all that had been done before of that kind (*g*). I do not believe that he had reaſon to ſay that he firſt introduced ballets in France [*C*]. After his return to Florence, he grew weary of the follies of love to which he formerly had a very ſingular propenſity (*h*). What reaſon had not been able do, ſatiety and experience did, giving him a diſguſt to thoſe things, which had too much poſſeſſed his mind. He turned his thoughts inward upon himſelf, and applied himſelf wholly to piety, and ſo he died at Florence (*i*). Several of his Poems were printed there after his death, by the care of PETER FRANCIS RINUCCINI, his ſon, who dedicated them to Lewis XIII in the year 1624.

---

(31) Vogelſang. ibid. *pag.* 52.

(32) Ib. *p.* 69.

(33) Note, That the Walloon ſynod declared Wolzogue's book to be orthodox.

(*a*) Creſcimbeni, l'Iſtoria della volgar Poëſia, *pag.* 149.

(*b*) *Fu Gentiluomo della Camera del Re Chriſtianiſſimo.* Jacobo Rilli, Notizie Letterarie ed Iſtoriche intorno a gli Uomini illuſtri dell' Accad. Fiorent. *Part i, p.* 258.

(*c*) Nic. Erythræus, Pinac. I, *pag.* 61, 62.

(*d*) Creſcimbeni, ubi ſupra.

(1) Nic. Erythræus, Pinac. I, *pag.* 62.

(2) Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1375.

(3) Ibid.

(4) *It is* Daphium *inſtead of* Daphnem, *in the printed book of* Nicius Erythræus.

(5) Nic. Erythræus, Pinac. I, *pag.* 101.

(6) Jacobo Rilli, Notizie intorno a gli Uomini illuſtri dell' Accademia Fiorentina, *Part i, pag.* 258, 260.

(7) Ibid. *pag.* 259.

(8) Taken from a letter to the academy *de gli Alterati.*

(9) Note, that at pag. 145, of *Pinacotheca tertia*, he mentions the three others, but not *Arethuſa.*

(10) To Mary de Medicis, queen of France.

(11) In the remark, of the article SULPITIUS (JOHN).

(12) Nicius Erythræus, Pinac. I, *pag.* 61, *calls him* Jacobus Pera; *but at pag.* 144, *of the* Pinacotheca tertia, *he calls him* Jacobus Perius.

(13) Ottavio Rinuccini, *apud* Jacobum Rilli, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 258, 259.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) Nic. Erythræus, Pinac. I, *pag.* 62.

(*g*) Ibid.

(*h*) See the remark [*A*].

(*i*) Nic. Erythræus, ubi ſupra.

‘ *two, to the end that others of greater abilities than my ſelf may be induced to carry on and improve this kind of poetry in ſuch manner, that we may have no occaſion to envy thoſe antient pieces which are ſo much celebrated by noble writers.*’ Let us add to this a curious paſſage of Father Meneſtrier: ‘ Theſe dramatic pieces of Muſic were preſerved in carouſals and in ballets, the overtures of which were almoſt conſtantly made in dialogues and recitals of Muſicians, who ſung either in carts or other machines. At laſt Ottavio Rinuccini, a Florentine Poet, having a particular talent at expreſſing in his verſes all kind of paſſions, found means to adapt Muſic and ſinging to them ſo well, that they neither deſtroyed any part of the beauty of the verſes, nor marred the diſtinct underſtanding of the words, which are often in a manner loſt by the windings, turns, and quivers, of the voice. He conſulted in this Jacob Corſ, a gentleman of Florence, who underſtood Muſic, and delighted in fine things, and both calling in Giacomo Cleri (14), and Giulio Caccini, excellent maſters in Muſic, they together contrived a piece which was repreſented in the houſe of Mr Corſi in the preſence of the grand duke, and grand ducheſs of Tuſcany, and the cardinals Monti and Montalto, with ſo much ſucceſs, that this piece which was the Loves of Apollo and Daphne ſerved for a model to the Eurydice, which was repreſented a little after at the ſame place. Claudio de Monteverde, an excellent Muſician, compoſed the Ariane (15) on the model of theſe two; and being made maſter of the Muſic at St Mark's in Venice, he introduced theſe kind of repreſentations which are become ſo famous by the magnificence of the theatres and dreſs, by the delicacy of voices, harmony of concerts, and the learned compoſitions of this Monteverde, Soriano, Giovanelli, Teofilo, and ſeveral other great maſters (16).’

Theſe are citations which will be read with pleaſure by thoſe who love to know the origin and progreſs of every thing. Obſerve that Rinuccini was not a comedian (17).

[*C*] *I do not believe that they are in the right to ſay that he firſt introduced ballets into France.*] His ſon gives him this praiſe: ‘ Qual fu, *ſays he* (18), ne' ſuoi Verſi la facilità, quale la dolcezza veramente nata all' armonioſa melodia? Quindi nacque, che i Balli, quali egli ancora primiero conduſſe in Francia, accompagnati dalla Muſica piacquero mirabilmente. - - - *How eaſy was the ſtile of his verſes, and what a ſweetneſs truly calculated for a melodious harmony? Hence it was that the ballets, which he alſo firſt introduced into France, being accompanied with Muſic, were wonderfully liked.*’ He came into France with Mary de Medicis in the year 1600. Now we know that ballets were in uſe before that time: I will bring a proof of it which will be very agreeable to thoſe that are pleaſed with the Hiſtory of Inventions. ‘ Beaujoyeux was an Italian named Balthaſarini, one of the beſt violins in Europe: the marſhal de Briſſac when he governed Piedmont, ſent him to the queen (19) with all the band of violins under his direction. The queen made him her valet de chambre, and this Balthaſarini taking the name Beaujoyeux, became ſo famous at court for his inventions of ballets, concerts, entertainments, and repreſentations, that he was the only perſon talked of. It was he who made the ballet for the marriage of the duke de Joyeuſe with Madam de Vaudemont ſiſter to the queen. This ballet was publiſhed under the title of *Ballet comique de la Reine, fait aux Noces de Monſieur le Duc de Joyeuſe & Mademoiſelle de Vaudemont ſa Sœur, par Baltaſar de Beaujoyeux Valet de Chambre du Roi & de la Reine ſa Mere.* One of the court Poets wrote theſe verſes in his praiſe.

Beaujoyeux qui premier des cendres de la Grece
Fais retourner au jour le deſſein & l'addreſſe
Du Balet compaſſé en ſon tour meſuré
Qui d'un eſprit Divin toy-méme te devance,
Geometre inventif, unique en ta ſcience;
Si rien d'honneur s'acquiert le tien eſt aſſuré.

Great Beaujoyeux, who firſt from Greece's urn
Do'ſt teach the ſprightly ballet to return,
Contriv'd with judgment and proportion'd well;
Thou who divinely do'ſt thy ſelf excel,
Whoſe fancy geometrical and fine
Diſplays a ſcience that is wholly thine,
If endleſs honour can at all be got,
Then reſt aſſur'd that it ſhall be thy lot.

‘ Beaulieu and Salmon maſters of the king's Muſic aſſiſted him in the compoſition of the recitativos and airs in the ballet. La Cheſnaye the king's Almoner made part of the verſes, and James Patin the king's painter ſerved him in the decorations (20).’ This ballet was danced in the year 1582 (21). See in Father Meneſtrier (22) the deſcription of the machine with which it was introduced.

(14) I think *Cleri* is an error of the preſs for *Peri*.

(15) I do not know whether it ſhould not have been ſaid that Claudius de Monteverde compoſed not the Ariane, but the Muſic of the Ariadne of Rinuccini. However, this laſt piece deſerved to be mentioned as well as Daphne and Eurydice.

(16) Meneſtrier, Répréſentat. en Muſique, *pag.* 163, *& ſeq.*

(17) He was a Comedian in great repute at Florence. *Baillet, Jugem. ſur les Poëtes, num.* 1375.

(18) *In his letter to the academy* de gli Alterati, *apud* Rilli, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 259.

(19) Vit. Catherine de Medicis.

(20) Meneſtrier, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 272, 273.

(21) See the remark [*C*], of the article GOUDIMEL.

(22) *In his* Traitté des Ballets anciens & modernes, *pag.* 267, 268.

RITIUS (MICHAEL), in Italian *Riccio*, a Civilian of Naples, and author of ſeveral books [*A*], flouriſhed in the beginning of the XVIth century. He was baniſhed *by the faction that oppoſed France*, and retired to the court of Lewis XII, who *honoured him with the place of counſellor in the parliament of Paris* (*a*). La Croix du Maine calls him Michael de Ris, and affirms that he was *counſellor to the king in his great council, and in the parliament of Paris in* 1505, and that he was *commonly called the advocate of Naples* (*b*). When the Cardinal d'Amboiſe entered Milan, after Lewis Sforza had been made

(*a*) Baudier, Hiſt. du Cardinal d'Amboiſe, *pag.* 44.

(*b*) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franç. *p.* 331.

⁂

[*A*] *He is the author of ſeveral books.*] He compoſed at Blois in the year 1505, *A treatiſe of the duty of ſoldiers and their privileges*, which was printed at Paris the ſame year, and dedicated to Lewis XII (1). He wrote three books *de Regibus Francorum*, three *de Regibus Hiſpaniæ*, one *de Regibus Hieroſolymarum*, four *de Regibus Neapolis & Siciliæ*, two *de Regibus Hungariæ*, which were printed by John Frobenius at Baſil in the year 1517 in 4to. We find there a preface by the author written at Rome in the year 1505, and another preface by James Parrhaſius, who affirms that the ſtile of the work is pure, free, and natural, *purus*,

(1) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Franç. *p.* 331. *Note, that* du Verdier Vau-Privas *has not mentioned this book.*

made priſoner, he appointed Michael Ritius to anſwer the harangue made by the Milaneſe to obtain pardon for their diſobedience (*c*). Lewis XII ſent the ſame Ritius to Genoa, in the year 1506, to offer an amneſty to the revolted inhabitants (*d*). The remonſtrances of this Orator were of no effect.

purus, candidus, illaboratus (2). Ludovicus Vives ſays that there are abundance of faults in the proper names in theſe Hiſtories of Ritius. *Michael Ritius Reges aliquot Chriſtianos collegit, in quo opere multa ſunt locorum, hominum, & familiarum corrupta nomina, vitio credo deſcribentium* (3). His Hiſtory of the kings of France reaches from Pharamond to Lewis XII, and was printed at Rome in the year 1505, and dedicated to Guy de Rochefort chancellor of France (4). That of the kings of Spain begins with Gargoris, and ends with Philip I, father of Charles V (5).

(3) Lud. Vives, de tradendis Diſciplinis, *lib. v*, *pag.* 359, *Edit. Lugd.* 1551, *in 8vo.*

(5) Vaſæus, Chron. Hiſp. *cap. iv*, *pag.* 21, *Edit. Colon.* 1577, *in 8vo.*

RITTANGELIUS (JOHN STEPHEN), a converted Jew, was of Bamberg in Germany, and lived in the XVIIth century. He was profeſſor of the Oriental languages in the univerſity of Konigſberg, and publiſhed ſome books [*A*], which ſhew that he was zealous for the Chriſtian religion, and a learned man. He deſigned to publiſh ſome other books, and in order to it he made a voyage to Amſterdam; but his manuſcripts were torn to pieces by privateers, who took the ſhip in which he had embarked. He himſelf relates this adventure in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Jezirah. Some ſay he was born a Jew. The Journaliſts of Utrecht affirm it poſſitively (*a*), but others ſay, that *being a Roman Catholic he turned a Jew, and afterwards Proteſtant.* They are the words of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, in Auguſt 1699, pag. 212. But ſome are of opinion that he never profeſſed Judaiſm [*B*]. He was ſtill living the thirty-firſt

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſome books.*] He had ſaid in his notes upon the book Jezirah (1), that the Chaldaic paraphraſe on the Scripture affords very good arguments againſt the Jews and the Anti-Trinitarians. Whereupon a Socinian fell upon him in a book he publiſhed under the name of Irenopolita. Rittangelius anſwered it, and intituled his anſwer *Libra veritatis*, and dedicated it to John Caſimir, king of Poland. Mr Vander Wayen (2) cauſed it to be reprinted at Franeker in 1698, with another treatiſe of the ſame author concerning the ceremonies of the Paſſover. He reprinted alſo in the ſame place, in the year 1699, Rittangelius's book *de Veritate Religionis Chriſtianæ.* It contains a large collection of paſſages, which ſhew that the ancient Jewiſh church believed the myſtery of the Trinity, and the eternal Divinity of the Meſſias (3). Mr Wagenſeil (4) has publiſhed ſome letters, which Rittangelius wrote to a Jew, and which ſeem to him to be excellent. Mr du Voiſin, who refuted the book of the pretended Irenopolita, has not been ſo ſucceſsful in it as the Chriſtian proſelyte: it is the opinion of Mr Vander Wayen (5). I muſt add that ſome of thoſe, who do not like Rittangelius's principles, did no ſooner hear that there was a new edition of his *Libra veritatis*, but they publiſhed a manuſcript written long before, and intituled *Bilibra veritatis & rationis*, &c. To which they added the diſſertation *de Verbo Dei*, which had occaſioned Rittangelius's anſwer. Conſult the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (6).

Rittangelius publiſhed at Koningſberg in 1652, his German tranſlation of the prayers, which the Jews make in their ſynagogues on the firſt day of every year, and dedicated it to the Elector of Brandenburg. We read in the epiſtle dedicatory, dated the 31ſt of May 1652, that he had been ſick about a year, and that he had little hopes of recovering; that he had often deſired to have ſome choice diſciples committed to his care, that the talent he had received of GOD might not die with him, but be tranſmitted to others; that he could not obtain this favour, and therefore notwithſtanding his great illneſs, he had tranſlated ſome Jewiſh prayers into the German language. He takes notice in his preface of ſeveral faults committed by Kircher, Capel, Scaliger, Vechner, Vorſtius, Conſtantinus l'Empereur, Slevogtius, and Schickardus, in tranſlating ſome Hebrew paſſages (7). The Journal, which I have quoted, informs us of his infatuation. *In eo merito à cordatioribus Theol*[illegible] *reprehendendus, quod ubique fere jactat, ne apicem quidem ullum vel literam in Novo Teſtamento reperiri, quem non ex Hebræorum antiquitatibus deſumtum demonſtrare ipſe poſſit, & quidem, ut ipſe loquitur*, non opinionibus, (quia opinio verſatur circa illa, quæ ſe aliter habere poſſunt) ſed auctoritatibus omnium ſeculorum, tam Judaicæ, quam Chriſtianæ Eccleſiæ & Antiquitatis (8). He ſaid there is not a jot in the New Teſtament, but what is taken from the Jewiſh antiquities.

[*B*] *Some are of opinion that he never profeſſed Judaiſm.*] A manuſcript letter dated the 10th of September 1701, has been imparted to me, out of which I ſhall extract ſome paſſages that will doubtleſs pleaſe the curious.

The author of the letter was particularly acquainted with our Rittangelius. He obſerves, I. That Hornius, Wagenſeil, and ſeveral other writers affirm, that he had been a Jew, and was perhaps born of Jewiſh parents. II. That the anonymous author of the *Bilibra veritatis* affirms †, That Rittangelius having been bred up in the Church of Rome, embraced the religion of the Jews, who, as it is ſaid, circumciſed him at Hamburgh; and that afterwards he was baptized at Dantzic by Mr Nigrinus, and profeſſed himſelf a Chriſtian. III. That Chriſtopher Hartknoch, Profeſſor at Thorn, ſays ⸸, That Rittangelius being born a Chriſtian, as it is ſaid, and being initiated into the Chriſtian religion by Baptiſm, embraced Judaiſm, and was circumciſed at Hamburgh; that afterwards he turned Papiſt, and then Calviniſt, and at laſt Lutheran; that, contrary to cuſtom, he was made Profeſſor extraordinary of the Hebrew tongue, in the univerſity of Konigſberg, without any preliminary diſputation for it; that he was favoured therein by the Great Marſhal, and that a quarrel ariſing between Latterman and Miſlenta, he ſided with Latterman.

The author of the letter makes in the firſt place a remark upon the uncertainty that may be obſerved in thoſe writers, and upon their various accounts; from whence it follows, that if ſome of them are not miſtaken, the others muſt needs relate ſome falſities. Afterwards he gives an abſtract of a letter, which a ſenator of Dantzic writ to him the twenty-ſecond of April, 1700. That abſtract imports, that Mr Hartknoch, ſpeaking without doubt of the ſame Nigrinus, to whom he aſcribes the baptizing of Rittangelius, ſays ‡ that Nigrinus, being a Lutheran, turned Calviniſt, and was a preacher at Dantzic, and then turned Papiſt at the ſuggeſtion of the Capuchin Valerian Magni; and that before that time he had ſaid ſeveral things agreeable to the principles of the Socinians concerning the birth of JESUS CHRIST. That ſenator was deſired to inquire whether there was any monument of the pretended baptiſm conferred upon Rittangelius by Nigrinus at Dantzic; and he was told, that ſuch a ceremony would have been performed with great pomp, and in a particular manner regiſtred in the archives of the church, conſidering the merit and learning of that new Chriſtian. His anſwer was, that Nigrinus was invited, in 1630, to be paſtor of the Reformed in St Peter's church at Dantzic; and that the office of baptizing being appropriated

---

(*c*) See Gaguin in his 11th book of the Hiſtory of France, *fol. m.* 308 *verſo.*

(*d*) Guicciardin, *lib. vii*, *fol. m.* 192.

(2) *Taken from* Geſner, Biblioth. *fol.* 513.

(4) Voſſius, de Hiſtor. Latin. *pag.* 667.

(*a*) Biblioth. Librorum novorum, *Menſ. Sept. & Oct.* 1698, *pag.* 674.

(1) It is a book, which the Jews aſcribe to the patriarch *Abraham.* Others aſcribe it to Rabbi *Akiba. Rittangelius* made a tranſlation of it with ſome notes, which was printed at Amſterdam in 1642.

(2) Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker.

(3) See Mr Vander Wayen's preface to the *Libra veritatis.*

(4) In Lipmanni confutatione. *See the ſame preface.*

(5) See the ſame preface.

(6) Auguſt 1699, pag. 214.

(7) Taken from the Journal of Utrecht, *Sept. & Octob.* 1698, *pag.* 675, 677.

(8) Ibid. *pag.* 678.

† *Pag.* 69.

⸸ In his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of Pruſſia, *pag.* 641, *Edit.* 1686.

‡ Ib. *p.* 824.

thirty-firſt of May, 1652, for it is the date of the Epiſtle Dedicatory prefixed to one of his books (*b*).

(*b*) See the remark [*A*], towards the end.

appropriated to the deacons in that city, excluſively of the paſtors, Nigrinus could not have baptized Rittangelius. He had no time to inquire, whether he contributed to the converſion of that proſelyte. From all theſe things the author of the letter concludes, that Rittangelius was neither baptized nor re-baptized at Dantzic: which proves, ſays he, that thoſe are miſtaken, who ſay he was born a Jew, or became a proſelyte to Judaiſm. I wonder, continues he, that ſo many famous writers have neglected to inquire into the truth of the matter; which had been no difficult thing for them during Rittangelius's life, who, as he had many friends, had alſo many enemies. They have been contented to tranſcribe one another, and to publiſh a looſe report, without giving themſelves the trouble to examine whether it was well grounded, or not.

He ſays, that being in Pruſſia in the year 1649, and the two following years, and having lodged for ſome months in the houſe of Mr Ahaſuerus Brand, great marſhal, and one of the four counſellers of the regency, he had an opportunity to know Rittangelius, and to contract a very ſtrict friendſhip with him. The great marſhal was his patron, and uſed to invite him to dinner. He and ſeveral other perſons of honour and probity told the author of the letter, that Rittangelius was born a Roman Catholic in the fortreſs of Forcheim in Franconia, in the dioceſe of Bamberg; that having ſtudied claſſical learning, he went to Conſtantinople, where he converſed very much with the Rabbins for the ſpace of twelve years; that at his return, he embraced the reformed religion, and then removed to Konigſberg, where the Elector of Brandenburg made him profeſſor extraordinary of the Hebrew tongue, none but the Lutherans being at that time allowed to be profeſſors in ordinary in that univerſity; that no body believed he was born a Jew, but that ſome ſuſpected he had been one.

The ſame author of the letter ſays, that one day the baron of Eulenburg, ſon-in-law to the great marſhal, bantered Rittangelius about circumciſion, being at table at his father-in-law's, who was ſorry for it; that Rittangelius, being very much aſhamed, excuſed himſelf modeſtly, and complained that they had ſuch thoughts of him contrary to all truth. After dinner the author of the letter expreſſed to him his concern for the affront he had received. Rittangelius melting in tears, and fetching very deep ſighs, proteſted to him that it was not true that he had been circumciſed. The ſame author affirms, that a miniſter of Elbing, venerable for his probity and learning, gave him a good proof of it, that paſtor had taken all imaginable pains to reſtore peace and concord in the houſe of Rittangelius. This unfortunate man was married to a woman, who abuſed him (9), and was ſupported in her humours by her relations, who lived at Elbing. That miniſter uſed his utmoſt endeavours to make them friends, and was a witneſs of the violent paſſion of the wife, from which he drew a good argument againſt the common opinion of her huſband's being circumciſed; for he argued thus: that woman, during her paſſion, vented impudently whatever might contribute to the diſhonour of her huſband; but ſhe never reproached him with being circumciſed; therefore he is not circumciſed.

The author of the letter adds another reaſon. It does not appear, ſays he, that any of Rittangelius's adverſaries upbraided him with ſuch a thing in any of their books during his life. Yet they were many, and ſome of them ſhewed a great deal of ſpite. He did not ſpare them, and briſkly attacked ſeveral famous authors in his writings; and, among others, Miſlenta (10), the pillar of Lutheraniſm at Konigſberg, and the Buxtorfs, whom he charged with a groſs ignorance of the Hebrew tongue.

Laſtly, the author of the letter thinks, that ſeveral people entertained ſuch ſuſpicions of Rittangelius, becauſe he only converſed with the Jews during his ſtay at Conſtantinople, and becauſe he looked like a true Rabbi. But this does not prove that he embraced Judaiſm. Perhaps he made the Jews believe, he would do it, to make them the more willing to teach him their learning, and then he went away without keeping his word (11).

(9) The author of the letter told me, that the cauſe of that woman's ill humour, was, that Rittangelius, either by his conſtitution, or by reaſon of his age, had the gift of continency more than was agreeable to his wife.

(10) A Doctor of Divinity.

(11) *Taken from a letter* ſcripta à Medico Germano T L. K. ad Medicum Hollandicum P. B.

ROBERT (John) profeſſor of the Civil-Law in the univerſity of Orleans, the place of his birth, in the XVIth century, was eſteemed for his works [*A*]. **ANNE** (*a*) **ROBERT**, his ſon, advocate in the parliament of Paris, publiſhed ſome books relating to the Civil-Law, that are allowed to be good [*B*]. See the letter which Pa uier writ

(*a*) And not *Andrew*, as *Konig* ſays.

[*A*] *He was eſteemed for his works.*] He publiſhed *Sententiarum Juris libri IV*, Paris 1557. *Receptæ Juris civilis Lectiones libri II*, Orleans 1567. *Animadverſionum Juris civilis libri III*, Paris 1580. Cujas wrote againſt this laſt book, under the name of Mercator. Robert made a reply, intituled, *Notarum libri III, ad Jacobi Cujacii Mercatoris notarum libros III*, printed at Orleans in 1583. He writ alſo a book againſt a miniſter called Robert Maſſon. That work being tranſlated into French, was printed at Paris in 1569. See Du Verdier's *Bibliotheque Françoiſe* (1).

[*B*] *Anne Robert . . . . . . publiſhed ſome books relating to the Civil-law that are allowed to be good.*] His four books *Rerum judicatarum* are very much eſteemed. It is a collection of the decrees of the parliament of Paris, or of the great council, &c. in remarkable caſes. The reaſons of the advocates are mentioned at large, and learnedly. It is a continued ſeries of learned and choice quotations. I would ſay no more of it, were it not that I remember that among thoſe, who ſay, that the paſſages of Tagereau, which I have quoted in the article QUELLENEC, give ſome offence; ſome go upon this falſe ſuppoſition, that this writer was a man of no authority, and an unknown perſon; and that he is the only author, who has been ſo raſh as to write in ſuch a manner. I hope they will be no longer offended, if I ſhew them, that this ſcandal is grounded on a miſtake about a matter of fact; which was one of the reaſons that moved me to make it appear in the ſecond edition of the article QUELLENEC, 1. That Tagereau's diſcourſe is not an unknown piece (2). 2. That another advocate of the parliament of Paris (3) was as free in his expreſſions as he. I add here, with the ſame intent, that is, for the edification of thoſe offended perſons, that Anne Robert, one of the moſt famous advocates of that ſame parliament, went beyond thoſe two, and even in a book dedicated to the great Achilles de Harlai, firſt preſident of that auguſt ſenate The tenth chapter of his fourth book *Rerum judicatarum* is upon a proceſs concerning impotency brought to the parliament of Paris by way of appeal. That parliament confirmed by a decree (4) the ſentence of the Eccleſiaſtical judges, who had ordered a ſearch and a congreſs; which the huſband not liking, had appealed to the parliament. His advocate repreſented the abomination of ſuch proceedings. He did, in ſome meaſure, what happens in great revolutions of ſtate, when the laws are overturned for a little time, in order to make them laſt a very long time (5). He diſpenſed with the rules of modeſty, for the ſake of modeſty. He made an impudent deſcription of a ſearch, in order to make us abhor it, and endeavour the extirpation of a moſt impudent abuſe. Tagereau was animated with the ſame ſpirit; but Robert gave himſelf a freer ſcope, becauſe he wrote in Latin. *Vultis ad prepetuam rei deteſtationem, quam à foro & judiciis explodi convenit, viſitationem (ſpectaculum odio publico dignum) verbis repræſentari? Parcite pudicæ aures, ſi quid in re obſcæna*

(1) Pag. 753.

(2) It was inſerted in the *Bibliotheque du Droits François*; a book reprinted at Paris in the year 1667.

(3) Sebaſtian Roulliard.

(4) The 20th of January 1587.

(5) Leges ſemper ut eſſent, aliquando non fuerunt, *ſaid an ancient Roman.*

writ to him (b). **LEWIS ROBERT**, his ſon, advocate in the ſame parliament, died very young, and had already acquired a great reputation. See James Gutherius's *Choartius major, vel de orbitate toleranda.* This treatiſe is to be found at the end of the book *de Jure Manium:* the author addreſſed it to Anne Robert, and comforted him as well as he could. I have mentioned in another place (c) **PETER ROBERT**, one of the moſt illuſtrious advocates of the parliament of Paris, in the reign of Henry II, and I ſhall ſpeak of him again in the remark [*C*]. I do not know whether the profeſſor of Orleans and he were of the ſame family.

His ſon Anne had a daughter named Anne who was married to a brother of Andrew du Laurens the Phyſician (d); his family ſtill ſubſiſts at Paris and makes a very good figure. Mr **ROBERT**, the king's attorney at the Chatelet, is deſcended from it. *He has a ſon preſident in the chamber of accounts, and a brother grand vicar of the dioceſe of Niſmes*, and another brother who, quitting the intendency of Canada, was made intendant of the navy at Breſt, in the month of January 1703. The late Mr Robert, canon and grand penitentiary of Notre Dame at Paris, was their brother (e).

obſcœna labatur verecundi ſermonis modeſtia. Puella reſupina jacet cruribus hinc inde diſtentis. Proſtant pudendæ corporis partes, quas natura ad delicias generis humani velavit. Has & matronæ (quæ obſtetrices anus ſunt) & Medici inſpiciunt, pretractant, diducunt: Magiſtratus vultu compoſito riſum diſſimulat: Matronæ præſentes venerem dudum oblitam refricant: Medici pro ætatis diſcrimine, hic vires priſtinas reminiſcitur, ille animo æſtuante inanis ludicri ſpectaculo paſcitur: Chirurgus aut ferramento fabrefacto (id ſpeculum matricis vocari ſolet) aut cereo & fictitio Priapo aditus Venereos tentat, aperit, reſerat: Puella jacens titillatione veſana prurit: Ut etiam ſi virgo viſitaris cœperit, inde tamen non incorrupta recedat (6). Modeſty, continues he, does not allow me to ſay more of it (7). Afterwards he obſerves, that ſuch a practice might be tolerated, notwithſtanding its ſhamefulneſs, if it was a good way to find out the truth of the matter; but he maintains, that it is a deceitful way, and thereupon he heaps up many obſcene things. The whole chapter is full of ſuch thoughts and expreſſions; and nothing can be more laſcivious, than the paſſage wherein the wife's advocate exhorts the poor Huſband to a love-combat, and deſcribes to him the ſweets that one may enjoy in the field of battle. There had been ſuch a cauſe in the parliament of Paris ſome years before: which I obſerve only to acquaint the reader, that Antony Hotman, brother to the famous Francis Hotman, declared againſt the congreſs, and was extreamly free in his expreſſions (8). The book he publiſhed upon that ſubject in intituled, *Traité de la diſſolution du Mariage par froideur de l'homme ou de la femme - - - - - A treatiſe concerning the diſſolution of marriage, by reaſon of the huſband's or the wife's frigidity*; and was printed ſeveral times. I think the firſt edition came out in the year 1581 (9); and that it was in the ſame year that one of his kinſmen was proſecuted with a view to get the marriage diſſolved, under pretence of impotency. It is certain that Roulliard (10) ſays. that Antony Hotman compoſed that treatiſe only to favour one of his relations, who was impotent. Take notice, that this brother of Francis Hotman made a great figure among the advocates, and was preferred, by the Leaguers, to the office of advocate-general in the parliament of Paris. Let no body think therefore that Tagereau is the only author, whom I could have quoted; for I might have alledged the moſt celebrated advocates. I muſt not forget that the work of Anne Robert has been tranſlated and publiſhed in French by an advocate (11). I have not that tranſlation; but I think that the abovequoted Latin paſſage, and ſeveral others, are not expreſſed in it ſo nakedly, as in the original, and yet that they are very obſcene.

I have read, in Theodore Beza's Hiſtory of the reformed churches of France, that an advocate's wife, in whoſe houſe the Proteſtants had ſeveral meetings at Paris, made her ſelf a priſoner in the Chatelet, with her two daughters, to convince the world of the falſity of the report, that had been ſpread about the leudneſs of thoſe Aſſemblies (12). 'The court . . . . . . cauſed the two daughters to be ſearched by ſeveral ſurgeons and midwives, and at ſeveral times. But all the ſearchers, except an old matron, declared them to be virgins; nor did that matron poſitively affirm, that they had been corruped by the approach of a man; and, at laſt, ſhe begged their pardon, after they had been ſet at liberty, declaring how, and by whom, ſhe had been bribed (13).' Beza does not ſeem to condemn the trial which they ſubmitted to; and indeed, they found themſelves in ſuch circumſtances as might excuſe them for expoſing themſelves to a ſearch notwithſtanding modeſty, and the danger they ran, becauſe the ſearchers might well be ſuſpected of unfair dealing. I ſhall ſay nothing of the uncertainties of ſuch a proceeding; but after all, if thoſe gentlewomen had refuſed to be ſearched, they had confirmed thereby the depoſitions of the falſe witneſſes. The point was to confute the informations which the preſident Saint André had cauſed to be drawn up, wherein two witneſſes affirmed, that in an aſſembly, upon Thurſday in the Holy Week, compoſed of a *great number of men, women, and maids, about twelve a clock at night . . . . . after they had preached, and eat a pig inſtead of the paſchal lamb; and after they had put out the lamp that gave them light, every man coupled to his woman, and that among other women, they (the two witneſſes) ſaw the ſaid advocate's wife, and her two young and handſome daughters, one of which happening to meet one of them (one of the witneſſes) he knew her two or three times for his ſhare* (14). Thoſe informations made a great noiſe, and were ſhewn to the queen-mother (15).

[*C*] *And I ſhall ſpeak of him again.*] This Peter Robert was a Pariſian (16). Loiſel ſpeaks of him thus. 'He was more eſteemed than the others abovementioned, not that he was more learned than they, for I believe he was inferior to them in that reſpect; but he had a noble preſence, a good voice, and a fine delivery, and was more valued for his natural parts, than for his ſtudy. He made himſelf famous particularly by two pleadings: the firſt was that which he made for preſident d'Oppede, concerning the inhabitants of Cabrieres and Merindol; the thing is ſo well deſcribed by Thuanus, that I need not dwell upon it. The late Mr Clement du Puy had been firſt intruſted with that cauſe; but falling ſick of the ſickneſs of which he died, preſident d'Oppede applied himſelf to Robert, whom he daily informed of what he ſhould ſay. The other reaſon of Robert's advancement, was, that turning Proteſtant, he was employed by the prince of Condé, grandfather of this preſent prince, to declare his innocence: from that time he was always made uſe of by thoſe of that religion; which coſt him his life, for he was murdered on St Bartholomew's day (17).'

ROBERVAL, profeſſor of Mathematics at Paris, cotemporary with Des Cartes, and his great enemy. See the *Sorberiana*, and Mr Baillet (a).

(b) It is in the 19th book, pag. 522, &c. of the 2d tome.

(c) Citat. (10), of the article MARILLAC (CHARLES DE).

(d) See the remark [*E*], of the article LAURENS (ANDREW).

(e) Taken from the *Mercure Galant*, for the month of January 1703, *pag.* 271.

(6) Annæus Robertus, Rerum judicatarum, *lib. iv, cap. x, pag.* 786, *Edit. Genev.* 1620, *in* 8*vo.*

(7) Plura dicere vetat pudor. *Ibid.*

(8) See the remark [*H*], of the article QUELLENEC.

(9) *See* du Verdier, Biblioth. Françoiſe, *pag.* 891.

(10) In the capitulary quoted above, remark [*F*], of the article QUELLENEC, at the beginning.

(11) Called *Tournet.* I have this from Mr Marais, whom I mention above, citat. (88), of the article HENRY III, and elſewhere, with ſome other particulars.

(12) Beza, Hiſt. of the Reformed churches of France, *book iii, pag.* 238, *ad ann.* 1560.

(13) Ibid.

(14) *Taken from* Beza, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 235.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Loiſel, Dialogue des Avocats, *pag.* 517, 518.

(17) Ib. *p.* 519.

(a) Baillet, Vie de Des Cartes, *Tom. i, pag.* 304, where he ſays that there are two faults in the laſt volume of Moreri. See alſo his *Traité des Auteurs déguiſez, Part ii, cap. vi.*

ROCABERTI (John Thomas de) archbiſhop of Valencia in the XVIIth century was an ornament to the order of the Dominicans. He was profeſſor of Divinity at Valencia, provincial of the Dominicans in the province of Aragon, and afterwards general of the order, twice vice-roy of Valencia, and at laſt inquiſitor-general of Spain. He exerted himſelf with great zeal in maintaining the Pope's authority; and not content with writing ſeveral volumes on that ſubject againſt the deciſions of the clergy of France, he employed his time and money in collecting into one body the treatiſes that had been publiſhed by others on the ſame argument. This collection printed at Rome under the title of *Bibliotheca Maxima Pontificia* is in twenty volumes in folio. Rocaberti died on the thirteenth of January 1699, being ſeventy-four years of age.

ROCCO (Girolamo) was ſo great a maſter in the art of writing, that he deſerves to be mentioned. He was a Venetian, and lived in the beginning of the XVIIth century. The duke of Savoy expreſſed a great eſteem for him, as we ſhall ſee below [*A*].

[*A*] *The duke of Savoy expreſſed a great eſteem for him.*] The following paſſage is to be found in a book, intituled, *La ſage & delectable Folie*, written by J. Marcel. ‘ I ſhould be too tedious, ſhould I name all ‘ the princes who have been liberal and kind to the ‘ Virtuoſi; and therefore I ſhall only mention what ‘ concerns Rocco Girolami of Venice, a very good ‘ Arithmetician, and ſo excellent a writer, that I do ‘ not think any man in his time exceeded him. He ‘ dedicated a book, engraven upon copper-plates, to ‘ his highneſs of Savoy, in the year 1603, adorned ‘ with ſeveral ſorts of characters, cyphers, and ex‘cellent ſtriking. That great prince having ſeen it, ‘ rewarded the induſtry of the author, by putting, ‘ with his own hands, a gold chain worth 125 ‘ crowns, about his neck (1).’ The author mentions the ſame reward in another place of his book, *viz.* in the chapter, intituled, *La folie des eſcrivains* (2) Perhaps the reader will not be diſpleaſed to find here the names of ſome perſons, who, as he ſays, excelled in that art. ‘ We have ſeen, (ſays) he (3) many fine ‘ writers who have publiſhed books of ſeveral ſorts of ‘ characters, as in France, le Gagneur, Lucas, Joſſe‘rand, and others; in Italy, D. Auguſtin of Sienna, ‘ M. Martin of Romagna, Camillo Buonadio of Pia‘cenza, Creſei a Milaneſe, Curione a Roman, Pala‘tin, Veruue, and others, with M. Antonio a Ge‘noeſe, who, in the year 1606, wrote a book con‘taining ſeveral ſorts of letters and characters, de‘dicated to the prince of Mantua and Mont‘ferrat.’

See La Croix du Maine, pag. 424 and 425 of his *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*.

(1) *Marcel, ſage & delectable folie, livr. i, pag.* 106. It appears by the approbation of the doctors, and the king's licence, that this book was printed in 1628. I make uſe of the Lyons edition 1650, in 8vo.

(2) It is the 6th of the 2d book.

(3) Ibid. book ii, pag. 80.

ROCHEFOUCAUD (Alexander de la) abbot of St Martin (*a*) brother to the count de Randan, who was killed at the battel of Iſſoire, and to Francis biſhop of Clermont, who was ſince cardinal, engaged unluckily in the impoſture of Martha Broſſier, who pretended to be poſſeſſed by the Devil. I have ſaid, in the article of this Martha, that the parliament of Paris having ordered her to be carried to Romorantin by the provoſt, forbad her father to let her go out of that place without leave from the judge. Notwithſtanding that prohibition, the father and his daughter went with our abbot into Auvergne, and then to Avignon. Though the parliament of Paris ſummoned the abbot twice, and ordered at laſt that the revenues of his benefices ſhould be ſeized for contempt of the court (*b*), this crew proceeded in their journey, and went to Rome, *thinking that* the woman poſſeſſed by the Devil *would act her part much better on that great ſtage, and find more credulous people in that place, which is the fountain of belief* (*c*). The biſhop of Clermont was ſo much ſuſpected of having ſuggeſted this fooliſh deſign to his brother, that he was likewiſe deprived of his Eccleſiaſtical revenues (*d*). Henry IV being well informed of the wicked deſigns that were brooding, ordered Mr de Sillery, his ambaſſador, and cardinal d'Oſſat, to diſcover the plot, and to prepoſſeſs the Pope againſt that crew, before they ſhould act their part. They carefully executed his order; beſides, cardinal d'Oſſat prevailed with the Jeſuits to ſide with him [*A*]; ſo that the abbot of St Martin, at his arrival at Rome, found himſelf deprived of the chief aſſiſtance he relied upon. The Jeſuits forſook him, and the Pope, who had been forewarned, did nothing contrary to the ſentence given by the parliament of Paris againſt that pretended demoniac. The abbot was obliged to implore Henry the fourth's clemency for himſelf and his brother. *Not long after he fell ſick, and it was ſaid that he died of grief, for having undertaken ſo long a journey to make himſelf deſpiſed. Martha and her father, being forſaken by every body, took ſanctuary in the hoſpitals* (*e*).

(*a*) Mezerai, Abrégé Chronol. *ad ann.* 1599, *pag. m.* 205, 206.

(*b*) Thuanus, *lib. cxxiii, circa init.*

(*c*) Mezerai, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 206.

(*d* Thuanus, ubi ſupra.

(*e*) *Mezerai, ubi ſupra. Thuanus ſpeaks of it thus;* Ita fabula de Martha à Spiritu obſeſſa omnino evanuit, ipſo Sammartino qui ſpe ſua falſus in aula illa deſpectus eſſe cœperat, ex mœrore mox mortuo, & Martha patreque ejus ex xenodochiorum ſtipe miſeram vitam vix tolerantibus.

[*A*] *Cardinal d'Oſſat prevailed with the Jeſuits to ſide with him.*] He ſpoke particularly to Father Sirmond, ſecretary to their general (1); and having ſhewed him the king's orders, he repreſented to him, that it was to be feared the attempt of the abbot would prove an obſtacle to the recalling of the Jeſuits, becauſe he and the biſhop of Clermont had ſtudied amongſt them. Afterwards he repreſented to him the raſhneſs of ſuch an undertaking, and how prejudicial it would be to the church, if the ſupreme courts of the kingdom ſhould quarrel again with the Pope. Thoſe reaſons had a very good effect.

(1) His name was *Aquaviva*.

RODON (David de) or rather **DERODON** (David) profeſſor of Philoſophy, firſt at Die, and then at Orange, and at laſt at Nimes, was a native of Dauphiné. He was one of the moſt ſubtile Logicians in France, and few Spaniſh or Iriſh ſchoolmen exceeded him in what concerns the Univerſals, *Entia Rationis*, and the airy and abſtracted ſpeculations of the categories, and the dependencies of the ſyllogiſtical form. But if he equalled in this the moſt refined Logicians of the ſchools, he far exceeded them in his Phyſics; for he embraced the opinion of the Moderns and the hypotheſis of atoms, to explain, as Gaſſendus did, ſeveral natural effects by mechanical principles. His body of Philoſophy ſold very well, and the Printer got a great deal by it, eſpecially by the abridgment of it; for the long ſcholaſtic diſputes contained in his large work, diſcouraged the readers. Derodon wrote a book *de Suppoſito*, wherein he openly declared for Neſtorius, againſt St Cyril; not by admitting two perſons, but by maintaining that Neſtorius did not admit of them, and that St Cyril confounded the two natures of JESUS CHRIST. Herein he only followed the footſteps of a gentleman of Provence [*A*], whom doubtleſs he had been accquainted with, and who forſook the church of Rome to turn Proteſtant. This opinion of Derodon is an incident, or epiſode, of the famous diſpute between two miniſters of Holland [*B*], and which is not ended yet (*a*). I ſhall

[*A*] *Herein he only followed the footſteps of a gentleman of Provence.*] His name was Giles Gaillard. He turned Proteſtant about the year 1630, and retired to Orange, where he made a panegyric upon prince Frederic-Henry. He took care to publiſh the motives of his converſion. See the book he intituled *Le Proſelyte Evangelique*. The following paſſage, concerning his book *de Suppoſito*, is to be found in a letter of Sorbiere to Voſſius, written in the year 1646, when he ſent him the copy he had been preſented with by the author. ‘Illi (*Ægidio Gaillardo nobili Gallo*) nuper venit in mentem neſcio quid circa Neſtorium, quaſi perperam in Epheſiana Synodo fuerit livore Cyrilli hæreſeos inſimulatus damnatuſque; eaque de re edidit librum, cui titulus eſt *De Suppoſito* (1). - - - - *This Giles Gaillard, a French gentleman, had a ſtrange fancy concerning Neſtorius, as if he had been wrongfully accuſed and declared guilty of hereſy in the Council of Epheſus. He writ a book on that ſubject with this title,* De Suppoſito.’ The poſtſcript to this letter is remarkable; for it informs us, that one of the moſt learned miniſters was of the ſame opinion (2).

[*B*] *His opinion . . . is an incident, or epiſode, of a famous diſpute between two miniſters of Holland.*] This will appear by a long paſſage of Mr Saurin, one of thoſe two diſputants. ‘Mr Jurieu is a wonderful man! An error will be purified by going through his channel, and what is hereſy in another man, is an orthodox doctrine in him, by virtue of his violent, and perſecuting zeal. In his firſt apology which he publiſhed after the ſynod of Leyden, he gives the hiſtory of the riſe and growth of that pernicious cabal of Heretics, Socinians, or men inclined to Socinianiſm, to whom all religions are indifferent, and who are half atheiſts, in which he involves all thoſe whom he has a mind to ſacrifice to the hatred of the public. He relates ſeveral particulars concerning that cabal, to have a fair pretence of enumerating his virtues and noble exploits. Among the characters of Hereſy, which he has diſcovered in ſome Divines, he reckons their approbation of Derodon's book, intituled, *De Suppoſito*, which he ſtiles, twice in half a page, *the wretched book De Suppoſito*. He informs us that this wretched book was burnt at Toulouſe: a great ſign of reprobation in a book! I confeſs that author had been ſuſpected of ſome errors: perhaps he gave occaſion to thoſe ſuſpicions, by departing from the opinions commonly received, and and carrying his Philoſophical liberty a little too far. He was ſometimes brought into trouble for his doctrine; but he came off with honour. I ſaw him at Geneva in the year 1664, where he was a refugee, after he had been baniſhed from France, for having writ a book, intituled, *Le Tombeau de la Meſſe*. I have often diſcourſed with him about ſeveral matters, and always found him very orthodox. He died at Geneva in the ſame year 1664, if I am not miſtaken, not long after I ſet out from thence for Holland. I was informed that his death had been very edifying, and that he had made a confeſſion of faith that was approved. But whatever the private opinions of that Philoſopher might be, or whatever he might have ſaid in converſation, or writ in other books, his treatiſe *De Suppoſito* is not anſwerable for them, but only for the errors contained in it. When a man is ſuſpected, he ought to be narrowly obſerved, and all his words ought to be ſcanned, *ne lateat anguis in herba*; but his orthodox opinions muſt not be changed into errors, nor all his errors into hereſies. The deſign of this reflexion is not fully to juſtify the treatiſe *De Suppoſito*; but to excuſe it from being condemned by a man who himſelf ſtands in need of excuſe and pardon. One can hardly gueſs what Mr Jurieu finds fault with in that book, unleſs it be the ſame liberty of condemning the title of *Mother of GOD*, beſtowed upon the Holy Virgin, which he himſelf takes in one of his Paſtoral Letters. That Philoſopher explains the word *Suppoſitum* in a very orthodox manner, both with reſpect to divine and human perſons. In his explication of the perſon of Chriſt after his Incarnation, he pitches upon the opinion that is the moſt commonly received, and leaſt liable to ill conſequences, and the cavils of Heretics. It is true, that he ſides with Neſtorius, againſt Cyril and the Fathers of the council of Epheſus, from whom he thinks Eutyches had his hereſy. But if this be an error, it is only in a matter of fact; and a book cannot be accounted pernicious upon ſuch an account. What poiſon is there then in that unfortunate book? It lies only in the author's averſion for the title of Θεοτόκος, *Mother of GOD*, and his reflecting upon Cyril, and the Divines of his party, whom he looks upon as the Patriarchs of idolatry (3). The cenſurer of this Philoſopher is not ſo ſevere in his judgment of them, but his opinion is the ſame as to the doctrine. He ſpares thoſe, who have introduced the word in queſtion into the church; but he uſes that word without any mercy. In his opinion Cyril was no idolater, and his fault lies only in a wrong zeal; but this fatal word Θεοτόκος has occaſioned idolatry, and even the Neſtorian Hereſy. I muſt ſet down once more the very words of our Divine ſo zealous for Orthodoxy, and particularly for the Anti-Neſtorian Orthodoxy (4).’

The author inſerts in this place a large extract of the Paſtoral Letters of his adverſary, wherein the title of the *Mother of God* is condemned as the ſource of idolatry, and then he goes on thus. ‘(5) The author of the book, intituled *De Suppoſito*, ſays nothing at the bottom that goes beyond this. For if Mr Jurieu pretends that this Philoſopher abſolutely refuſed to call the Holy Virgin *Mother of God*, it will be ſaid that he did it in the ſame ſenſe that Mr Jurieu himſelf does it. The contrary cannot be proved by his book. And ſince that author acknowledges one only perſon as well as two natures in Chriſt, and according to the principles of his Philoſophy, *actiones & paſſiones ſunt Suppoſitorum*, a maxim which he often repeats; there is reaſon to believe that he did not deny that the Holy Virgin was the mother of him, who is God, and a divine perſon. Accordingly he calls her the Mother of Chriſt, having acknowledged that Chriſt is but one perſon, both God and man, and even a divine perſon, whoſe perſonality does properly reſide in the word. What great difference is there then between the niceneſs of this Philoſopher, and that of our Divine? Why is the former an Heretic, and the later Orthodox, when they think and ſpeak the ſame thing about the ſame matter? . . . As for me, I have openly declared againſt the niceneſs of the Philoſopher, and of the Divine. I perſiſt in this declaration; I do not approve their boldneſs and the ſingularity of their opinions; I condemn their errors; I blame them both, but I anathematize neither of them. . . . . I have ſometimes admired Derodon's zeal, a Proteſtant, Anti-Papiſt, and Anti-idolatrous zeal. He calls all the reformed miniſters angels of Laodicea, and lukewarm Paſtors, becauſe we are not willing to excommunicate Cyril, and the Fathers of the council of Epheſus. This is a very extraordinary zeal for a Philoſopher; but Mr Jurieu is too indulgent, for he excuſes Cyril and the Fathers of the council of Epheſus, who introduced idolatry.

Derodon's

(*a*) I ſaid this in the year 1696, when I was about the firſt edition of this work; but I muſt ſay now, that this controverſy was ended ſoon after.

(1) See the 432d letter, among thoſe that were written to Voſſius, *pag.* 285.

(2) Audio Joh. Croium in eadem eſſe ſententia in qua Gaillardus noſter.

(3) See in the remark [*M*], of the article NESTORIUS, whether it be true, that the words *Mother of God*, have occaſioned the worſhip paid to the holy Virgin.

(4) Saurin, Examen de la Theologie de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 867, & *ſeq.*

(5) Ib. *p.* 870.

I ſhall ſay ſomething of it in the remarks; and I will not omit the ſpecious accuſation of great ignorance, in matters relating to Eccleſiaſtical antiquity [*C*], brought in againſt

‘ Derodon's ſyſtem is more conſiſtent than that of Mr Jurieu. Derodon places Cyril, and the Fathers of the council of Epheſus, among the idolaters, whoſe fathers they are. Mr Jurieu diſtinguiſhed the fathers from the children, tho' he charges the former with being the cauſe of the crime of the latter. All the difference between Derodon and Mr Jurieu conſiſts in this: according to Derodon, Cyril, and the Fathers of the council of Epheſus acted and argued conſequentially, they were idolaters, and eſtabliſhed idolatry; whereas, according to Mr Jurieu, thoſe Fathers who compoſed an œcumenical council, introduced the greateſt of all idolatries, without being idolaters.’

Mr Jurieu's reply is very long, and made up of many pieces. I ſhall only ſet down ſome paſſages out of it, that concern Derodon. ‘ (6) Derodon's book *De Suppoſito* is ſcarce, and I had not ſeen it, when I publiſhed a looſe ſheet with this title, *Idée des Sentimens de Mr Saurin*; and therefore what I have ſaid of it in that ſmall piece ought not to be minded. Derodon's book has been ſince imparted to me by an illuſtrious friend: having peruſed it, I have not found any formal Hereſy in it, but a prodigious raſhneſs, and a violent deſire of making Cyril odious, and defaming the council of Epheſus. Beſides, his quotations are unfaithful, his explications unfair, and his proofs ſophiſtical: and therefore I believe that book deſerved to be burnt, as it was by a decree of the parliament of Toulouſe; for to cry down as Heretics thoſe who maintained the holy myſteries, is an infallible way of bringing thoſe myſteries into contempt. The author was one of thoſe Latitudinarians, who appeared above forty years ago in the ſouthern provinces; and it ſeems, that Petit, profeſſor of Divinity at Nimes, favoured them. At leaſt, one may infer it from the extracts produced out of him by Mr d'Huiſſeau, a great Latitudinarian, in vindication of his book, intituled, *De la Reunion du Chriſtianiſme*. Derodon, in order to promote the common intereſt of his ſect, makes it his buſineſs to render the Antients odious and contemptible. . . . . (7) Derodon, the greateſt, and perhaps the firſt enemy of Cyril among the Moderns (8), was a ſilly Sophiſt, ignorant of Antiquity: he was profeſſor of Philoſophy, and took a great pride in his ſubtilty. But learned and wiſe men know what a man is who is ſubtile in the peripatetic way: ſuch a one is a Sophiſt; which was alſo Dorodon's character. He had a mind to diſtinguiſh and immortalize himſelf by ſetting up againſt Cyril, and the council of Epheſus. He writ his book deſignedly, to ſhew that he was an Eutychian, that is, that he confounded the two natures, and out of the two made but one; and to prove, on the contrary, that Neſtorius was a very orthodox man. This work is mightily cried up by our Latitudinarians. The firſt time I ſaw it, was in Mr Pajon's hands, who praiſed it as an excellent book. Mr Saurin has often beſtowed the ſame encomium upon it in my preſence; which ſhews, that thoſe two men are thoroughly unacquainted with Antiquity. Derodon was a man of the ſame character, and undertook to write upon a ſubject that he was ignorant of. He took, or ſtole, what he ſays againſt Cyril, from a friend whom he often mentions, and who had writ a compleat hiſtory of the diſputes of Cyril and Neſtorius, which was to be publiſhed: this he does not ſcruple to confeſs. . . . . Beſides his ignorance, he was guilty of malignity; for nothing can be more malicious and unfair than that man's diſpute againſt Cyril (9).’

I ſhall make no reflexions upon this; for it is likely Mr Saurin's reply will come out before I make an end of this work; and the readers will find in that reply (10) the raſh judgments and other faults of Mr Jurieu fully laid open. I ſhall only ſay, that it is not at all likely that Derodon intended to favour the pretended faction of the Latitudinarians; for he maintains Neſtorius's cauſe, not by looking upon him as the defender of the moral union of the Word with the human nature (11), but by conſidering him as an orthodox man, with reſpect to the hypoſtatical union; and he impugns Cyril, only becauſe he looks upon him as the author of the Eutychian confuſion of the two natures. Without doubt he only deſigned to vex the Papiſts, and make them aſhamed of their oppreſſing the memory of innocent men, while they extol to the ſky a Heretic, who had the ſecular power, the emperor's favour, and the prevailing cabal of a council on his ſide. Nay, if one had a mind to carry charity ſomething farther, one might affirm, that his only deſign was to protect innocence, by making it appear that Neſtorius is wrongfully accounted an Heretic. A man who impugns St Cyril, cannot be ſaid to be a malicious man; no ſuch thing can be neceſſarily inferred from it. Perhaps no party-leader did ever leſs deſerve to be tenderly uſed: he behaved himſelf with ſo much violence and fury, that he deſerves no thanks for having maintained the truth, ſuppoſing he maintained it; if he found it, it was only by chance and accidentally. An unruly horſe, running away with the bit in his teeth, that eſcapes breaking his head againſt the walls of a ſtable, only becauſe his fury runs him againſt a door, which by good luck is half open, is a faithful picture of ſome Divines who light upon Orthodoxy, notwithſtanding a thouſand violent paſſions which tranſport them, and make them violate all rules of equity and juſtice. All the common places alledged by Mr Jurieu to juſtify St Cyril, and to condemn Neſtorius, may ſerve to juſtify the latter, and condemn the former. I could eaſily give a ſpecimen of it.

[*C*] *The ſpecious accuſation . . . . . of ignorance in matters relating to Eccleſiaſtical antiquity.*] ‘ It is highly probable, that he had not ſeen the acts of the council of Epheſus; the bare title of his book is ſufficient to make one ſenſible of it. *Diſputatio de ſuppoſito: in quâ plurima hactenus inaudita de Neſtorio tanquam Orthodoxo, & de Cyrillo Alexandrino, aliiſque Epiſcopis in Synodum Epheſi coactis tanquam hæreticis:* and in the 71ſt page of his book he ſays, *Rem novam & hactenus inauditam jam demonſtrandam ſuſcipimus, &c. Scilicet Cyrillum Alexandrinum & alios Epiſcopos qui tertio Concilio Oecumenico interfuerunt fuiſſe hæreticos, & Authores hæreſis Eutychianæ.* What a prodigious ignorance and boldneſs is this! if this man had but caſt his eyes upon the authors of the Vth century, eſpecially upon the acts of the council of Epheſus, would he have ſaid, that the accuſation brought againſt Cyril, of being the author of the Eutychian Hereſy, which confounds the two natures, is a thing unheard of? He was reproached with it by all the Neſtorians, and many others who were not Neſtorians; by John biſhop of Antioch, who excommunicated Cyril as confounding the two natures, and aſcribing to the divine nature all the infirmities that belong only to the human nature of Chriſt (12).’ The author alledges ſeveral other ſuch proofs, whereby it appears that St Cyril was accuſed of that Hereſy, and concludes with theſe words, *And therefore his telling us that his accuſation againſt Cyril is a new diſcovery, and a thing unheard of, betrays a great ignorance, and an intolerable vanity. We might give ſeveral other proofs of Derodon's ignorance in this matter* (13).

If I had Derodon's book, I would give my opinion upon this particular; but ſince I have it not, I ſhall only ſay, that the words quoted out of it by his cenſurer do not prove what he brings them for. They ſhew that Derodon undertook to prove, as a thing unheard of, not that St Cyril was accuſed of being the author of Eutyches's errors; but that St Cyril, and the other Fathers of the third Oecumenical council, were Heretics, and brought in Eutychianiſm. This weakens the arguments alledged for the ignorance of that Philoſopher (14), and ſhews that his cenſurer perverts, or does not underſtand, the ſtate of the queſtion. If it be a miſtake, it ought to be excuſed, conſidering the perplexity he muſt needs have been in, when he was to act the part of an apologiſt for thoſe very men, whom he had ſeverely cenſured. Conſider, that this man being to anſwer the biſhop of Meaux, gave a hideous deſcription of the primitive Fathers, and being to anſwer Mr Saurin, was obliged to commend thoſe ſame Fathers. How can ſuch a man know what he is about, or be maſter of his thoughts? Can an author, beaten at his own weapon, and who cannot de-againſt that Philoſopher. He ſet up for a controverſiſt, and ſo exaſperated his adverſaries, that they obtained a decree from the king, whereby he was baniſhed the kingdom in the year 1663 (*b*). He retired to Geneva, where he died two years after, or thereabouts. Thoſe of his party were not always pleaſed with his doctrine, and he was brought into trouble upon that account, but he came off with honour (*c*). I do not know whether the ſynods or conſiſtories were offended at his denying, that the conſervation of the creatures is a continual creation [*D*].

---

(6) Jurieu, Religion du Latitudinaire, *p.* 270.

(7) Ib. *p.* 278.

(8) If Mr Jurieu had known what concerns Giles Gaillard (ſee the remark [*A*],) he would not have ſaid this.

(9) Jurieu, ibid. *pag.* 281, 282.

(10) *It came out in* 1697, *with this title,* Juſtification de la doctrine du Sieur Saurin . . . contre deux libelles de Mr Jurieu l'un intitulé *Idée des ſentimens, &c.* & l'autre *La religion du Latitudinaire. See chap. xiii, pag.* 342, *& ſeq.*

(11) Note, That Mr Jurieu declares, *pag.* 277, that the hatred of the Latitudinarians againſt St Cyril, proceeds from his cauſing to be condemned the moral union of the Word which they are ſo fond of.

(12) Jurieu, ubi ſupra, *p.* 279.

(13) Ibid. *pag.* 281.

(14) There is a very great difference between maintaining that a whole council is heretical; and maintaining, that a private man was formerly accuſed of Hereſy. The firſt aſſertion may be advanced as a thing unheard-of, without pretending that the charge laid upon that private man is a matter of fact not known before.

He had been a Roman Catholic ; which is the reaſon why Theophilus Raynaud calls him a deſerter of the faith, for it is he that is meant in the paſſage I quote out of his Hoplotheca [*E*].

(*b*) It was for having publiſhed a book intituled, *Tombeau de la Meſſe*. See the hiſtory of the edict of Nantes, *Tom. iii, p.* 563. He publiſhed ſomething on the Euchariſt at Geneva, in the year 1655, in 8vo.

(*c*) See the remark [*B*].

fend himſelf but by confuting and contradicting himſelf in a moſt wretched manner ; I ſay, can ſuch an author be anſwerable for an overſight ? Neceſſity has no law ; this is what he may plead for himſelf : but ſuch an apology will not ſatisfy the juſt complaints of the public ; all the readers may very well tell him, *Whom do you take us for ? Muſt we be ſo ſhamefully impoſed upon ? When you cannot anſwer an adverſary but by ſuppoſing that the Fathers were heretical, you charge them with Hereſy ; and becauſe at a year's end it is neceſſary for you that they ſhould be* Orthodox, *in order to get rid of another adverſary, you make them ſound in their doctrine : is it not a very unfair and ſhameful thing* (15).

Here follows Mr Saurin's anſwer, to clear Derodon of the ignorance charged upon him. ‘ Mr Jurieu ‘ makes it appear, that he has not ſeen Derodon's ‘ treatiſe *de Suppoſito*, or that he hopes no body will ‘ ſee it ; for the author has collected many teſtimonies ‘ and hiſtorical facts, to confirm his accuſation againſt ‘ Cyril and the council of Epheſus. He quotes Ibas ‘ biſhop of Edeſſa, Gennadius patriarch of Conſtantinople, Theodoret biſhop of Cyrus, John archbiſhop of Antioch, and above forty eaſtern biſhops, ‘ who charged Cyril with the Hereſy of Apollinaris, ‘ and objected to him that he made the divine nature ‘ of Chriſt paſſible, by confounding it with his human ‘ nature. The author therefore was not ignorant of ‘ this, and when he ſpeaks of Cyril's Hereſy, and Neſtorius's Orthodoxy, as of a thing unheard of, it is ‘ with reſpect to the latter ages, and not with reſpect ‘ to the age that Cyril and Neſtorius lived in : Nay, ‘ he mentioned as a thing unheard of, not the queſtion, which of thoſe two patriarchs was a Heretic, ‘ or an orthodox man, but the anſwer he makes to ‘ it, by juſtifying Neſtorius, and condemning Cyril (16).’

[*D*] *He denied that the conſervation of the creatures, is a continual creation.*] This was denying a doctrine, which tho' very common among the Spaniſh and Iriſh ſchoolmen, is very evident. We muſt reject the cleareſt notions, or acknowledge that a Being made out of nothing by the infinite power of the Creator, cannot have any cauſe of its exiſtence in itſelf ; and therefore it cannot continue to exiſt but by the ſame power that produced it at firſt : it is therefore created in each moment of its duration, that is, it exiſts in each moment, only becauſe GOD continues to have the ſame will that he had, when that Being began to exiſt.

This act of the divine will cannot ceaſe to create whilſt it ſubſiſts, ſince it did create in the firſt moment that creatures began to exiſt. Derodon's objections may be eaſily confuted ; they are much the ſame with thoſe propoſed by Bernier (17). A Profeſſor of Philoſophy in the Academy of Puylaurens (18) wrote a treatiſe againſt Derodon upon that ſubject, and ſolidly confuted him. That Profeſſor had ſeveral quarrels with him at Nimes, and I have heard ſay, that he had a hand in a book intituled, *L'impieté decouverte*, which was publiſhed againſt Derodon. I have alſo been told, that Mr Claude, who was then miniſter of Nimes, lent a helping hand to the enemies of that Philoſopher, by writing, or at leaſt correcting, that work. It is an abſurd thing to ſay, with Gaſſendus and Derodon, that GOD contributes to the preſervation of creatures by preventing their deſtruction. Could any thing deſtroy them, ſince there are but two ſorts of Beings in the univerſe, *viz.* GOD and the creatures ? Such a care would be as needleſs as the watchfulneſs of a ſhepherd againſt wolves in a country where there are no wolves, and even where there could be none. It were in vain to ſay that a body deſtroys another body, that fire deſtroys wood, that a man kills another man, *&c.* for this is not a deſtruction of creatures, but only a change of modifications : modes or accidents are not accounted the ſubject of creation, but the ſubſtances in which they reſide.

[*E*] *It is he that is meant by Theophilus Raynaud in the paſſage I quote out of his Hoplotheca.*] Having ſaid that the ſubtile Scotus is falſely accuſed of admitting a kind of real diſtinction between the Divine Eſſence and its attributes ; he adds, that he had lately diſcourſed at Orange with an apoſtate, who alledged the authority of Scotus to maintain a new blaſphemy. *Placuit hanc crambem obiter hic recoquere, quia his ipſis diebus Arauſicæ, murcus* FIDEI DESERTOR *blaſphemiam novam Scoti autoritate tegere eſt auſus* (19). That blaſphemy was, that the three perſonalities of the Trinity are modes of the Divine Eſſence properly ſo called. He obſerves, that this innovator, who quoted Scotus in his preſence, had not made uſe of his authority in his diſputation *de Suppoſito*. It is a ſign he meant Derodon. Here is another proof of it : ‘ Perperam tam craſſus ‘ error, ſimplicitatem divinam & puriſſimam actualitatem exſcindens tanti viri (*Scoti*) ſuffragio calumnioſè captato munitus eſt ab eo, quem retuli ſpurco ‘ fidei deſertore male Rotundo (20). - - - *It is without* ‘ *reaſon that ſuch a groſs error as this, which deſtroys* ‘ *the ſimplicity of the divine nature, and the purity of his* ‘ *eſſence, is ſaid to be warranted by the authority of ſo* ‘ *great a man as* Scotus. *This, I ſay, is falſely ſuggeſted by that dirty apoſtate whom I mentioned before as* ‘ *a man who only in an evil ſenſe is round.*’ This laſt word is a manifeſt alluſion to Derodon's name. Three years after he made uſe of the ſame quibble in another book, wherein he refuted Derodon, who maintained that the work intituled *Theſaurus*, and aſcribed to St Cyril, was not that Father's. ‘ Eidem ‘ S. Cyrillo ſuppoſitum eſſe opus quod inſcribitur *Theſaurus* contendit ſpurcus hæreticus, autor diſputationis ‘ de ſuppoſito, quam nuperrime ementito nomine loci ‘ ſuoque ſuppreſſo, homo male teres atque ROTUNDUS ‘ edidit Arauſicæ. In ea diſputatione, quæ eſt una ‘ jugis hæreſeon & atrociſſimarum calumniarum lepra, ‘ nebulo qui in S. Cyrillum maxime rabit, abjudicat ‘ ei opus Theſauri (21). - - - - - *That dirty Heretic* ‘ *the author of the diſputation* de Suppoſito, *which* ‘ *he lately publiſhed at Orange, giving the falſe name* ‘ *of a place, and ſuppreſſing his own, maintains that the* ‘ *work intituled* Theſaurus *is without reaſon aſcribed to* ‘ *St Cyril. In that diſputation, which is one continued* ‘ *ſcab of Hereſies and enormous ſlanders, the knave, who* ‘ *rails at St Cyril in the moſt furious manner, will not* ‘ *allow him to have writ the* Theſaurus.’

(15) Compare this with the remark [*B*], of the article PETAVIUS.

(16) Saurin, Juſtification de ſa doctrine contre deux libelles de Mr Jurieu, *pag.* 346.

(17) See Bernier's book, printed at Amſterdam in 1685, and intituled, *Traité du libre & du volontaire.*

(18) He was a Phyſician, called *John Bon* ; his Body of Philoſophy has been printed.

(19) Theoph. Raynaud, Hoploth. *Sect. ii, Serie i, cap. vi, pag.* 89. That book was printed at Lyons in the year 1650.

(20) Ib. *p.* 90.

(21) *Idem*, Erotemat. de malis ac bonis Libris, *num.* 209, *pag. m.* 134. *See Father* Labbe, de Script. Eccleſ. *Tom. i, p.* 243.

ROHAN (RENATA DE) daughter of Lewis de Rohan the fourth of that name, lord de Guemené (*a*), was the accidental cauſe of a murder, which had like to have occaſioned many diſorders at the court of France, ſoon after the death of Francis II [*A*]. She

(*a*) *Father* Anſelme, Hiſt. des grands Officiers, *pag.* 536.

[*A*] *Soon after the death of Francis II.*] Varillas ſays (1), that it was three days after the death of that prince ; but he is miſtaken, having not carefully conſidered Thuanus's words. *Triduo poſt de Vicedomini Carnutum morte allatum eſt . . . . . in idem tempus incidit Buellii . . . . . cædes* (2). If he had minded what goes before, he might have ſeen that this *triduo* refers to the 21ſt of December (3), on which day a reſolution was formed, the ſubſtance whereof was given juſt before by that Hiſtorian. According to this account,

(1) In the two editions of the Life of Charles IX.

(2) Thuanus, *lib. xxv, pag.* 525.

(3) XII Kalend. Januar.

She was the widow of Francis de Rohan, lord de Gié, and courted by the count de Laval (*b*). The baſtard de Buell, ſon to the count de Sancerré, and *one of the moſt renowned bravoes of the duke of Guiſe*, deſigning to oppoſe that courtſhip, *was not contented to become the count's rival*, but alſo *inſolently gave out that this widow, after a promiſe of marriage, written and ſigned with her own hand, had granted him the laſt favours. Perhaps he only intended to give Laval and his other rivals, a diſguſt to that lady; but Laval was of opinion, that is was an affront which required ſhedding of blood* [*B*]; *and becauſe his eſteem for the baſtard was not great enough to do him the honour to fight him, he took an opportunity to kill him at Orleans* (*c*). The conſtable Montmorency approved that murther, and ſollicited a pardon for Laval (*d*): on the contrary, the houſe of Guiſe urged that the murderer ſhould be puniſhed; and their credit did ſo prevail in the council, that the king of Navarre, *in whoſe palace Laval had taken ſanctuary*, was obliged *to procure his eſcape in the night*. Afterwards his eſtate was confiſcated (*e*). Thoſe, who ſay that the Conſtable protected the murtherer, becauſe he was of his family, are not miſtaken [*C*]. Our Renata was married to Renatus de Laval (*f*); and John de Laval, marquis de Neſle, was her third huſband.

(*b*) Renatus de Laval, lord de Loüé.

(*c*) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, *Tom. i, pag.* 8.

(*d*) Ibid.

(*e*) Ibid.

(*f*) *Father* Anſelme, *ubi ſupra.*

count, the news of the Vidame's death came to Orleans the 24th of December. But Francis II died the fifth of the ſame month, and therefore there had been more than three days between the king's death, and the baſtard's murder. Tho' I take notice of this fault, I am not ignorant that it is very inconſiderable; but it is fit the readers ſhould know what leads a writer into an error. I do not pretend that the Vidame of Chartres died fifteen or ſixteen days after the king; I only mean, that if we keep to Thuanus's account, we muſt judge of it in that manner: but I would adviſe no body to give credit to that Hiſtorian in this particular. My reaſon is, that Thuanus follows preſident de la Place, whoſe Chronology is not at all exact upon this head. For the account he gives runs thus: Francis II dies the 5th of December 1560; the king of Navarre reſigns the regency to the Queen-mother; a regulation is agreed upon the 21ſt of December; three days after the death of the Vidame of Chartres is heard of; the greateſt difficulties being removed by that regulation, the holding of the ſtates is reſolved upon, notwithſtanding the proteſtations of part of the deputies; cardinal de Lorrain endeavours to get a commiſſion to harangue the three eſtates of the kingdom; he does not obtain it; in the mean while the baſtard of Sancerre is killed; laſtly, the eſtates meet on the 13th of December. This is the model that Thuanus goes by, which is of no uſe to fix the day on which the Vidame died, nor that on which the baſtard was killed.

[*B*] *That it was an affront which required ſhedding of blood.*] According to the unhappy maxims of the point of honour, men cannot judge otherwiſe, conſidering how indulgent the judges are to thoſe who ſtain a woman's reputation by their ſlanders. If you proſecute a downright calumniator, or an indiſcreet bragging fool upon ſuch an account, they will come off with a denial or a retractation, which does not put an end to the ſuſpicions and reflexions. This is what induces a dueliſt to right himſelf. The baſtard of Sancerre expected it, and without doubt truſted to his courage and ſkill, more than to the juſtice of his cauſe (4); for can any one ſay with any juſtice, even without telling a lie, that he has obtained ſuch favours? But he was attacked in ſuch a manner, that he could not defend himſelf.

[*C*] *Thoſe, who ſay . . . . are not miſtaken.*] Preſident de la Place is one of them (5); Loüé, ſays he, was ſupported by the Conſtable, *becauſe the ſaid Lady was grand-niece to the ſaid Conſtable, and the ſaid Loüé was deſcended in a direct male line from the Conſtable Matthew Montmorency, as well as the ſaid Conſtable.* Thuanus makes the ſame obſervation concerning Renatus de Laval: 'Unde magna rurſus irarum ſeges inter Guiſianos & Momorantios orta eſt, cum illi Sancerræ Comiti adeſſent, hi Lavallum uti ex Matthæi Momorantii Equitum Magiſtri ſtirpe profectum tutarentur (6). - - - *This produced another great quarrel between the houſes of Guiſe and Montmorency; while the firſt ſtood up for the count de Sancerre, and the other defended Laval as being deſcended from the Conſtable Matthew Montmorency.*' I cannot apprehend why Varillas, who had ſaid in the firſt edition of his life of Charles IX (7), *That the count de Laval was of the houſe of Montmorency*, ſtruck it out in the ſecond. I eaſily apprehend why he left out, that this count *was brother-in-law to the Chatillons*; for it is a plain falſity: but the other fact agrees with the Genealogy of the houſe of Montmorency, publiſhed by du Cheſne (8).

(4) Buellius, qui earum (*nuptiarum*) ſpe ſe dejectum dolebat, ut impedimentum afferret à Renata ſibi datam fidem diceret, & ut erat pugnacitatis fama arrogans, parum honeſtè de illuſtri fœmina loqueretur. *Thuanus, ubi ſupra.*

(5) De l'Etat de la Relig. & Repub. *livr. iii, towards the end.*

(6) Thuanus, ubi ſupra.

(7) Tom. i, pag. 8, Dutch Edit.

(8) Anſelme, Hiſt. des grands Officiers de la Couronne, *pag.* 19.

ROHAN (ANNE DE) the daughter of Renatus de Rohan and Catherine de Parthenai, heireſs of the houſe of Soubiſe, was no leſs illuſtrious for her piety and wit, than for her noble extraction. She was ſiſter to the duke of Rohan, the ſupport of the Proteſtants during the civil wars, in the reign of Lewis XIII. I have ſaid in another place (*a*), that ſhe bore the hardſhips of the ſiege of Rochelle with an heroical conſtancy; and that, for the ſpace of three months, ſhe lived upon horſe-fleſh and four ounces of bread every day. The Hiſtorian (*b*) who informs us of this particular, adds, that ſhe and her mother refuſed to be comprehended in the capitulation, and remained priſoners of war. He beſtows this encomium upon her, that *ſhe was celebrated for her exemplary piety among thoſe of her religion, and for her learning which was uncommon in one of her ſex.* She made very good verſes: the excellent Poem ſhe wrote upon the death of Henry IV [*A*] is a proof of it. What is ſaid of her ſkill in the Hebrew tongue is very

(*a*) In the article of Catherine de PARTHENAI.

(*b*) Hiſt. du Duc de Rohan, *Paris* 1666.

[*A*] *The excellent Poem ſhe wrote upon the death of Henry IV.*] D'Aubigné, who was ſparing of his praiſes, inſerted part of it at the end of his Hiſtory, and prefixed theſe words to it: *Anne de Rohan, princeſs of Leon, and of all thoſe who write well at this time, will ſpeak better than I. She expreſſes herſelf thus:*

Quoi? faut-il que Henri, ce redouté Monarque,
Ce dompteur des humains, ſoit dompté par la Parque?

Ha! muſt dread Henry too reſign his breath,
And, conqueror of men, ſubmit to death?

I would not have mentioned theſe two verſes, were it not that they afford matter for a criticiſm. Mr Pelliſſon having ſaid. (1) *That it was one of Malherbe's maxims, that the adjectives ending with an e maſculine, ought never to be placed before, but after a ſubſtantive; whereas thoſe that have a feminine termination, may be placed before or after, as one thinks fit; that one may ſay for inſtance* ce redoutable Monarque; *or,* ce monarque redoutable; *and, on the contrary, that one may ſay* ce monarque redoute, *but not* ce redouté monarque; I ſay, Mr Pelliſſon having ſaid this, goes on thus: *I have not pitched upon this example without reaſon, and at random;*

(1) Hiſt. de l'Acad. Françoiſe, *pag. m.* 178.

very remarkable [*B*]. She died a maid at Paris the twentieth of September, 1646, in the ſixty-ſecond year of her age. Mrs Schurman wrote ſome letters to her, which may be ſeen in the collection of her works.

random; for I have often heard Mr de Gombauld ſay, that before this obſervation had been made, Malherbe and he walking one day together, and diſcourſing of ſome verſes of Anne de Rohan, one of which was,

Quoy faut-il que Henri, ce redouté Monarque,

Malherbe told him ſeveral times, that he did not like the end of that verſe, without being able to give any reaſon for it; which made him conſider it very attentively, and having immediately found out the reaſon of it, he imparted it to Malherbe, who was as much pleaſed as if he had found a treaſure, and afterwards made a general rule of it. Now here is an obſervation of Menage not very well grounded. Mr de Gombauld, *ſays he* (2), *did alſo frequently diſcourſe with me of that converſation he had with Malherbe, but not altogether in the ſame manner as Mr Pelliſſon relates it; for he always told me, that it was he who perceived, that* redouté Monarque *was wrong. However, that rule, whether it be Malherbe's or Gombauld's . . . . . . is altogether falſe:* He proves (3) it by ſeveral examples, and ſhews that Malherbe himſelf did not keep to it, ſince he ſaid in two places *aſſeuré Secours*. But this is not the thing I would be at. I maintain, that Menage underſtood Mr Pelliſſon's words, as if they ſignified that it was Malherbe, and not Gombauld, who found out the reaſon why the verſe in queſtion was faulty; for had he not underſtood them in that ſenſe, he would not have ſaid *this rule, whether it be Malherbe's or Gombauld's*. The plain meaning of which is, that this rule was found out by Malherbe, according to Mr Pelliſſon's account, and by Gombauld, if we rely on what Menage was told by Gombauld himſelf. But it is more plain ſtill, that Mr Pelliſſon aſcribes the diſcovery to the latter, and not at all to Malherbe: will any body wonder, that ſometimes a Latin author ſhould not be underſtood for want of application; ſince Mr Menage did not underſtand a French author, though he expreſſed himſelf very intelligibly?

[*B*] *What is ſaid of her ſkill in the Hebrew tongue, is very remarkable.*] She read the Old Teſtament in that language; and inſtead of ſinging Pſalms at church in French verſe as others did, ſhe meditated upon them in Hebrew. ‘Hanc illuſtriſſimam & ſapientiſſimam ‘Principem Hebraicis Literis haud leviter fuiſſe tinctam ‘teſtis fuit αὐτόπτης Rev. Parens, dum Pariſiis degeret; quotieſcunque enim ipſam adiret, Vet. Teſtamenti caput aliquod Hebraicè legentem inveniebat, ‘&, quod mirere, ne in Eccleſia quidem hocce ſtudium deſeruit, cùm etiam illic, dùm Hymni Davidici decantarentur, ipſa interim Hebraico idiomate ‘mente pſalleret (4). - - - - *My father, while he lived ‘at Paris, was himſelf an eye-witneſs of the great ſkill, ‘which that moſt illuſtrious and wiſe princeſs had in the ‘Hebrew tongue; for as often as he waited upon her, ‘he found her reading ſome chapter in the Hebrew Bible; ‘but what will raiſe your wonder is, that even at ‘church, ſhe did not quit this ſtudy, for while other people ‘were ſinging the Pſalms of David there, ſhe, in the ‘mean time, ſung them over in Hebrew to herſelf.*’ Mr Colomiés, who mentions this, alledges an authority for it, which is worth tranſcribing. ‘Hujus in ‘Hebraicis peritiam firmat Phil. Aquinas Epiſtola ‘Præfat. in capitula Patrum, à ſe ex Hebræo in Gallicum ſermonem verſa (5). - - *Philip d'Aquin witneſſes ‘her great knowledge in the Hebrew tongue, in the Prefatory Epiſtle to* Pirke Avoth (capitula Patrum), *which ‘he tranſlated from the Hebrew into French.*’

(2) Obſervations ſur les Poëſies de Malherbe, *pag.* 302.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Colomeſius, in Gallia Orientali, *pag.* 165.

(5) Ibid.

ROY (James le) Baron of the holy empire, and Lord of St Lambert, deſcended from an ancient and noble family originally of France [*A*], got a great reputation by the works he publiſhed. He was born at Antwerp the twenty-eighth of October, 1633. As ſoon as his age permitted him to travel, Baron LE ROY (*a*), his father, ſent him to the moſt famous univerſities of Europe, and at his return reſigned to him the places he was poſſeſſed of at the court of Bruſſels. Our Baron did ſo punctually diſcharge the duties of thoſe places, that the marquis de Caracene, governor of the Low-Countries, ſent him into Spain to inform his Catholic majeſty, Philip IV, of the ſtate of his government. Having worthily performed his commiſſion, he returned into the Netherlands, and could not agree with the marquis de Caſtel Rodrigo, governor of that country; wherefore he reſolved to lay down his employments, and retired to his ſeat near Antwerp. Had it not been for this, he would have raiſed himſelf to the moſt conſiderable civil offices; but the commonwealth of learning would have loſt by it; for he had not been at leiſure to write ſeveral books that have been publiſhed [*B*]. See the remark [*B*].

There

(*a*) PHILIP LE ROI, Seigneur de Ravels Broughem, & de St Lambert en Brabant. *See the remark* [*A*].

[*A*] *He was deſcended of an antient and noble family, originally of France.*] The anceſtors of baron le Roy left France, to follow Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy, and ſettled in the Low-Countries.

Philip le Roy, knight-banneret, lord of Brouchem, *&c.* the father of him who is the ſubject of this article, bought of the lady Margaret Baudewyns the lordſhip of Chapelle St Lambert, the fifteenth of December, 1654 (1). He was made free baron of the holy empire by a patent of the emperor Leopold, dated from Luxemburg the thirtieth of May, 1671 (2). He was then counſellor to his Catholic Majeſty in the ſupreme council of the finances of the Low-Countries and Burgundy.

[*B*] *He wrote ſome books that have been publiſhed.*] The firſt book he undertook to write in his retirement, was the *Notitia Marchionatus Sacri Romani Imperii* (3), which was printed at Amſterdam in folio, in the year 1678. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (4). He publiſhed afterwards in the ſame city, in the year 1683, a piece intituled, *Achates Tiberianus, ſive gemma Cæſarea, antiquitate, argumento, arte, hiſtoria prorſus incomparabilis, D. Auguſti apotheoſin, Imp. Cæſ. Tiberii, Auguſtæque Juliæ Domus ſeriem & iconas, genteſque bello captas repræſentans, notis hiſtoricis illuſtrata*, in folio. See the *Acta Eruditorum* (5), and the *Journal des Savans* (6). He printed, in 1693, at Amſterdam, a book in folio with this title, *Topographia Hiſtorica Gallo-Brabantiæ, qua Romanduæ oppida, municipia & dominia illuſtrantur, atque Monaſteria, Nobiliumque Prætoria, Caſtellaque in æs inciſa exhibentur.* This book contains a very particular account of that part of the Low-Countries called the Walloon Brabant; and if we had ſuch a deſcription of all Europe, it would be extremely uſeful and inſtructive. I add, that he has commented upon the chronicle of Balduinus de Avennis, and that he is now (7) commenting upon that of the Monk Albericus, *Trium-fontium*, which has never been printed, and the publication whereof has been wiſhed for a long time. He has lately publiſhed (8) a ſmall book of thirteen pages, intituled, *Prædictio Anthoniæ Bourignon de vaſtatione urbis Bruxellarum per ignem*, wherein, after a ſhort deſcription of the miſery that town ſuffered on the thirteenth of Auguſt, 1695, when the French bombarded it, he mentions what has been ſaid concerning *Antoinette Bourignon*, in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary, and theſe words of one of her letters. *I do not ſee how I can ſtay at Bruſſels, tho' I had full liberty to do it; nor could I ſtay long in it,* Singe

(1) Topograph. Gallo-Brabantiæ, *pag.* 185.

(2) You find an abſtract of it in the 70th page of the book of which I have given the title below, citation (10).

(3) Antwerp is the capital of that marquiſate, which is one of the 17 provinces of the Low-Countries.

(4) For September 1685, *Art. V, p. m.* 1004.

(5) Acta Erudit. Lipſienſ. 1684, *p.* 255.

(6) Journal des Sçavans, *March* 19, 1685.

(7) In the year 1696.

(8) At Amſterdam 1696.

There is ſomething in that remark which concerns Mrs Bourignon, and at which her friends have been offended. I ſhall examine what one of them ſays in anſwer to my remark [*C*].

Bruſſels is to be destroyed by fire, *if I have had a right viſion, as I told you at Maſuriel's houſe* (9). The ſpirit which revealed this burning to Mrs Bourignon, did not well fix the time; for ſhe fancied, in the year 1666, that Bruſſels would be ſhortly burnt down, and yet it was not bombarded till twenty-nine years after.

Since the firſt impreſſion of this article, baron le Roy has publiſhed, *Caſtella & Prætoria Nobilium Brabantiæ, Cœnobiaque celebriora ad vivum delineata æ rique inciſa . . . . . cum brevi eorundem deſcriptione.* At Antwerp, 1696, in folio. And *L'Erection de toutes les Terres*, &c. *The erection of all the ſeats, lordſhips, and families, of Brabant, proved by extracts of original patents* (10). Such a book ſhould be printed for each province of Europe, whereby one might know thoſe, who boldly aſſume the title of marquis, or count.

[*C*] *I ſhall examine what one of Mrs Bourignon's friends ſays in anſwer to my remark.*] His anſwer is to be found in a *letter concerning myſtical authors*, printed a year ago (11) with the book intituled *Theologie réelle vulgairement dite la Theologie Germanique.* The anonymous author, who has publiſhed this, quotes my words, and then adds (12). 'No, by your leave, 'laying aſide all manner of equivocation, there was 'no time neither well nor ill fixed in the prediction, 'as you intimate: beſides, it was not a verbal revelation, as you would make us underſtand, in order 'to make it ſuſceptible of a falſity as to the time; 'but it was viſual, and conſequently of ſuch a nature, as to fix no time in expreſs words. Nor did 'Mrs Bourignon fancy, that Bruſſels would be burnt 'down in a ſet time, ſooner or later; but nothing 'being determined upon that point, no time being 'fixed or excluded, this indetermination was the true 'reaſon why ſhe did not think herſelf ſecure from that 'danger at any time, and had a provident care at all 'times.' He adds, *That, in the ſame manner, the Lord and his Apoſtles having foretold in general his ſecond coming, exhorted the Chriſtians to be watchful at all times, leſt they ſhould be ſurprized; whereupon a profane man might have had a better pretence than our author, to ſay as he does, 'The ſpirit, which revealed that 'ſecond coming to them, did not well fix the time; for 'they fancied, ſeventeen hundred years ago, that it ſhould 'happen in their life-time, and yet no ſuch thing has 'been ſeen hitherto.' St Peter tells us, that the profane men of his time argued then in that manner.* Thus the anonymous author criticizes my remark: I will make it appear that he lies under a great illuſion.

I obſerved, that the ſpirit *did not fix the time well*; and this author owns that it fixed no time. What can I deſire more? Is it not manifeſt, that whoever does not fix a time, does neither fix it right nor wrong; and that therefore one may ſay he did not fix it well? My aſſertion is therefore true; and it is certain, at leaſt that Mrs Bourignon drew a falſe conſequence from what had been revealed to her *viſually*. She concluded from it, that Bruſſels would be ſhortly deſtroyed by fire; for ſhe believed that the permiſſion ſhe had to ſtay in that town, would ſerve her but for a little time; I ſay, ſhe came to think ſo, by reaſon of the *viſual Revelation* we are told of. As ſhe reſolved to leave a town, which ſhe thought was ready to be burnt, ſhe would doubtleſs have adviſed all thoſe, who had been willing to be directed by her, to do the ſame; ſhe would therefore have given that advice to all the inhabitants of Bruſſels, if they had been her diſciples. Now, how ſtrangely had they been deluded, if they had followed her direction! A great many people, who could not live above ten, twelve, fifteen, or twenty years, had left their birth-place for fear of being deſtroyed by a fire that was to happen twenty-nine years after. They had been impoſed upon by falſe prophecies; for a revelation, though true in it ſelf, becauſe it exhibits only ſome images, becomes fallacious and deceitful when applied to times or places that do not belong to it. If the revealing ſpirit does not deceive, the perſon who receives the revelation will nevertheleſs deceive by his falſe applications; and therefore Mrs Bourignon's apologiſt, without being aware of it, enables us to conclude, that ſhe has been a falſe propheteſs in this point. It were better to have no revelations at all, than to receive prophecies that are not underſtood, and the wrong explication of which moves one to make uſeleſs ſteps, and ill grounded precautions. If Mrs Bourignon had been quiet in the places which ſhe thought would be entirely burnt down, ſhe would have lived there the remaining part of her life, without ſeeing that prediction fulfilled; for ſhe died fifteen years before Bruſſels was bombarded. She was therefore afraid without any reaſon, and ſhe removed out of a panic fear. I would not have you to think, that I grant to her apologiſt, that the viſual revelation he ſpeaks of *was evidently verified by the event* (13). The bombarding of Bruſſels has no greater connexion with the viſion of that woman, than with the dreams of other people. I think it will be granted me, that moſt people do ſometimes ſee a town on fire in their dreams. When we dream that a houſe is ſet on fire, it is commonly that which belongs to us: if we dream that a town ſinks in the water, or is devoured by flames, it is commonly a town that is beſt known to us, that wherein we were born, or where we make our abode. I therefore venture to ſay, and I think thoſe who mind their dreams will not charge me with raſhneſs for it, that ſeveral citizens of Bruſſels have ſeen that town on fire in a dream; and even that ſome of them dreamed that it was bombarded (14). Muſt ſuch dreams be accounted prophetical? Viſions of this kind in the head of devout people, are more ſuſpicious than in the head of worldly people; for a devout perſon fancies, when he is awake, that the corruption he ſees in a great town will draw fire from Heaven upon it. Now people do commonly ſee, when they are aſleep, what they have thought of being awake (15). I omit that, according to Mrs Bourignon's prophecy, Bruſſels was to be deſtroyed by fire: it is plain, this denotes a total deſtruction, and therefore it is not the bombarding of the year 1695. That town was not deſtroyed by it; only ſeveral houſes were ruined or damaged. It grew finer and more magnificent a few years after; and the inhabitants were ſo little concerned for the damage, occaſioned by the bombs, that when they heard that the treaty of Riſwick was carried on ſucceſsfully, they freely owned they had rather be bombarded three or four times, than ſee the end of a war, which brought in money amongſt them ſo plentifully.

The beſt thing alledged by the anonymous writer, is the prediction of the Apoſtles concerning the laſt coming of the Son of God. They preached it as being ready at hand (16), and yet ſeventeen hundred years have paſſed and that prophecy is not fulfilled. The ſolution of this difficulty may be ſeen in the commentaries upon the Scripture. I ſhall only ſay, that this was never looked upon as a ſufficient reaſon to juſtify thoſe, who, in the following ages, foretold things that did not come to paſs. They have always been accounted falſe Prophets, or falſe interpreters of the Apocalypſe. Why ſhould I be the only man not allowed to make uſe of the ſame argument againſt thoſe who pretended to foretel things to come? It is well known, that thoſe who are engaged to vindicate the new Prophets, anſwer the objections, as this anonymous writer does, at the coſt of the true Prophets mentioned in the Scripture. We have not forgot yet the Paſtoral Letters of the author he ſpeaks of ſome pages before, *Who*, ſays he (17), *will have many chimerical prophets of all ages to be truly inſpired, and expects ſtill that his party will be reſtored in France by way of inſpiration.* It was in vain for him to alledge the Prophets of the Old Teſtament, in order to juſtifie the pretended Prophets of Dauphiné: wiſe and pious people following the dictates of reaſon, declared againſt them; and when the time fixed by him for the deliverance was expired, they maintained that his prophetical inſpirations were falſe. They were not afraid that the prediction of the ſecond coming of Christ, alledged by the anonymous writer, would be objected againſt them. I proceed in this

(9) Theſe words are taken from a letter written from Ghent to Mr de Cort, the 15th of January 1666. It is the 12th of the 3d part of a book, intituled, *Tombeau de la fauſſe Theologie.*

(10) This book was printed at Leyden, for Peter vander Aa, in the year 1699, in folio.

(11) At Amſterdam, for Henry Wetſtein 1701, in 12mo. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Nov.* 1700, *pag.* 555, *& ſeq.*

(12) Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques, *pag.* 114.

(13) Ibid.

(14) Eſpecially ſince the Gazettes did ſo frequently mention the bombarding of towns.

(15) See what is ſaid above, in the remark [*G*], of the article of 2 LOTICHIUS (Peter).

(16) For they exhorted thoſe, to whom they ſpoke, to keep themſelves ready for it.

(17) Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques, *pag.* 108.

matter as thoſe gentlemen did, and as it has been the conſtant practice of the moſt grave Divines, whenever any fanatics aroſe, whoſe prophecies were confuted by the event.

I muſt anſwer another complaint of Mrs Bourignon's apologiſt. He ſays, that I ſeem to *take a great delight in reflecting upon her*, and very much enlarges upon it. He adds, that I frequently refer my readers to a libel of Mr de Seckendorf; whereupon he quotes a long paſſage of Mr Thomaſius, profeſſor at Hall, whereby it appears that Mr de Seckendorf was blinded by his paſſion when he writ againſt that gentlewoman. I anſwer in few words, 1. That none will ſay I had a mind to *reflect upon her*, but ſuch as are prepoſſeſſed with an infatuating admiration: being charmed with the perfections they think they diſcover in a certain perſon, they can find no fault in him, all his actions appear holy to them, and they grow very angry with thoſe who are more diſcerning, and undertake to ſhew the weak ſide of ſuch a perſon. I have not in the leaſt reflected upon Mrs Bourignon's zeal and chaſtity; I only made a plain and hiſtorical abridgment of her life, referring my readers to a memoir imparted to me by Mr Poiret, which our anonymous author takes to be advantageous to that gentlewoman. If I ſaid ſomething of her ſcolding humour, and of her great vigilance in the oeconomy of her eſtate, it is what truth required from me as an Hiſtorian. I have advanced nothing without a proof for it; but let the impartial readers judge of it. I anſwer in the ſecond place, that among ſeveral quotations out of Antoinette's life and works, there are hardly above five or ſix out of Mr de Seckendorf. Why then does this anonymous writer intimate that I entirely depend upon the authority of that author? Laſtly, I ſay, that I knew not then what Mr Thomaſius obſerves concerning the proceedings of that illuſtrious German. Mr Thomaſius is a man of merit, and I have had a long time a great eſteem for him: I need not object any thing againſt his remarks, for he charges Mr de Seckendorf with curtailing ſome paſſages only in what concerns the opinions of Mrs Bourignon; but I have only quoted him for a matter of fact, and I have moſt times confirmed what I take from him by ſome other paſſages. I have no reaſon to think that he was blinded by paſſion in that reſpect. After all, if he was ſo guilty as this author will have it, would no body have taken notice of it? Would not Mr Poiret, whom he has confuted, have writ againſt him a ſecond time to ſhew his unfairneſs?

I ſhall make no anſwer to ſeveral other obſervations of the anonymous author. His complaints are very general, and plainly ſhew that he is too touchy, and wants ſtill to mortify his internal ſenſes. The mortification of the external ſenſes is not ſufficient; one muſt chiefly overcome the iraſcible appetite. I beſeech him to think ſeriouſly of it, and I refer him to the anſwers I have already made (18), or to this general obſervation, *viz.* That it would be a needleſs and inſignificant thing to anſwer complaints grounded upon no manner of proof. If any one raiſes any particular objection againſt me, and examines ſome arguments advanced in this Dictionary fairly cited, I ſhall not deny him an anſwer; but as to general complaints, I ſhall only appeal to the equitable readers.

RONSARD (PETER DE) a famous French Poet, of a noble family [*A*], was born in Vendomois the ſame year that Francis the firſt was made priſoner before Pavia. This circumſtance of time occaſioned ſome injudicious reflexions [*B*]. He was in

[*A*] *Of a noble family.*] Lewis de Ronſard, his father, was knight of the order of St Michael, and High-ſteward to Francis I, who pitched upon him to attend Francis, Dauphin de Viennois, and Henry, duke of Orleans, his ſons, into Spain, while they were there as hoſtages for the king their father (1). He married Joan de Chandrier, whoſe family was related to that of la Trimouille, &c. and conſequently to that of Craon; *from whence the kings of England are deſcended, by the match of the empreſs Maud* (2): *ſo that he* (3) *made it appear that Ronſard was related in the ſixteenth or ſeventeenth degree to Elizabeth queen of England.* It is ſaid, that Lewis de Ronſard was deſcended from one Baudouin, a younger brother of a great family (4), upon the borders of Hungary and Bulgaria, who brought a company of gentlemen to king Philip de Valois (5). Nay, it is ſaid that *there is a lordſhip called the marquiſate of Ronſard* (6), in the place where the Danube is neareſt to Thrace (7); but I think this may be looked upon as one of the romantic ſtories which moſt noble houſes tell of their firſt founders (8). They are very fond of deriving their original from the remoteſt countries, and from ſome younger brother of a noble extraction, a brave adventurer, whoſe fine exploits were very well rewarded by the prince in whoſe ſervice he engaged. If ſuch ſtories were only told by three or four families, one would not be ſo apt to laugh at them. As for the reſt, the author quoted by me has only turned into proſe what Ronſard ſaid of his extraction in one of his elegies (9). Du Perron (10) told the ſame ſtory, but inſtead of Bulgaria he ſaid Moravia. The collection of the fineſt pieces of the French Poets, printed in 1692, contains (11) a life of Ronſard, wherein it is ſaid he *originally came from Hungary and Bulgaria.* If it be not an abſurdity, it is at leaſt a falſification; for the tradition of that family aſſigns but one native country to their anceſtors, *upon the borders of Hungary and Bulgaria.* They are the words of Claudius Binet: thus you ſee how writers run into miſtakes, when they change the terms of the originals, whether it be in order to be ſhorter, or becauſe thoſe words are thought to be too old. The word *borders* ſhould not have been left out here.

[*B*] *Some injudicious reflexions.*] ‘Peter de Ronſard, ſon of Lewis de Ronſard, and Joan de Chandrier, was born in the caſtle de la Poiſſonnerie . . . . . upon a Saturday the eleventh of September, 1524; on which day king Francis was made priſoner before Pavia. It is a queſtion whether France was more unfortunate by the king's impriſonment, or happy by ſuch a birth, which was made remarkable, like that of many other great men, by ſuch a memorable event. Thus the birth of the great Alexander was ſignalized, and as it were lighted by the flames which conſumed the temple of Diana at Epheſus (12).’ What a fine compenſation is this! Was not France well indemnified for the impriſonment of her king, a misfortune which had like to have occaſioned the ruin of the kingdom, and which actually occaſioned a long ſeries of ſhameful and diſmal loſſes to the nation; I ſay, was not France well indemnified, ſince a wit was born on that very day, who adorned her with thouſands of verſes by way of ſonnets, madrigals, ſtanzas, hymns, odes, &c. this thought of Claudius Binet could not be tolerable but in a Poem of a panegyriſt; and even there men of ſenſe would cenſure it as an inſipid hyperbole. Doubtleſs this was the reaſon why du Perron did not make uſe of it in his funeral oration on Peter Ronſard (13). What ſhall we ſay then, when we ſee it in proſe in a piece of Hiſtory, I mean, in the life of Ronſard? But what ſhall we ſay of Thuanus, that grave, that venerable magiſtrate, who very ſeriouſly ſet forth the ſame thought in a general Hiſtory, which is a maſter-piece? ‘Natus erat, (*Petrus Ronſardus*) *ſays he* (14), eodem quo infeliciter à noſtris ad Ticinum pugnatum eſt, anno, ut ipſe in Elegia ad Remigium Bellaqueum ſcribit, quaſi Deus jacturam nominis Gallici eo prælio factam & ſecutum ex illo veluti noſtrarum rerum interitum tanti viri ortu compenſare voluerit. - - - - - *He was born, as he himſelf takes notice in an an elegy to Remi Belleau, in the ſame year that our countrymen were beaten before Pavia; as if God had been willing to compenſate the loſs of honour which the French ſuſtained in that battle, and the great diſorder of our affairs that enſued, by the birth of ſo great a man.*’ Take notice that Thuanus does not ſay that Ronſard was born on the ſame day that the battle in danger of periſhing on his birth-day; and the hazard he run was attended with an incident, which occaſioned ſome witty conceits, that are not more ſolid than thoſe reflexions [*C*]. He put himſelf at the head of ſome ſoldiers in Vendomois, in the year 1562, and made as great a ſlaughter of the Proteſtants as ever he could [*D*]; which was the reaſon

---

(1) Binet, *Vie de Ronſard*, in the 9th Tome of Ronſard's works, in 12mo, *pag.* 113. Note, That du Perron, in the funeral oration of Ronſard, in the ſame volume, *p.* 189, does not ſay, that Lewis de Ronſard was High-ſteward to Francis I, but to Henry II.

(2) Binet, ibid. *pag.* 112.

(3) That is, the Sieur du Fauz of Angers, in his Memoirs. There is, in my edition, le Sieur du Faur; but I find in la Croix du Maine that this author's name was *Paſcal Robin du Fauz.*

(4) Binet, ibid.

(5) Ib. *p.* 113.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ib. *p.* 112.

(8) See, above, remark [*C*], of the article PINET.

(9) The 20th. It is inſcribed to Belleau.

(10) Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard, *pag.* 188.

(11) In the firſt Tome, p. 239.

(12) Binet, ibid. *pag.* 113.

(13) See, below, citation (18).

(14) Thuanus, *lib. lxxxii, ſub fin. pag. m.* 43, *ad ann.* 1585.

(18) *In my* Reflexions ſur le Jugemens du public, *which he quotes in his letter*, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 312, 313.

battle of Pavia was fought: he only ſays, that Poet was born in the ſame year. But Claudius Binet, not finding that wonderful enough, affirms, that thoſe two things happened the ſame day. He betrays himſelf, he diſcovers his lie; for he marks the eleventh day of September, 1524, as the birth day of his Poet; and every body knows that Francis I, was beaten before Pavia the twenty-fourth of February, 1525. However, Ronſard was born in the ſame year, according to the way of reckoning at that time; for the year did not then begin in France, the firſt day of January, but at Eaſter, and ſo the battle of Pavia was in the year 1524. It cannot be ſaid that there is an error of the preſs in Binet's book; for when he tells us that Ronſard died the twenty-ſeventh of December, 1585, he ſays, that Poet was ſixty-one years, three months, and ſixteen days old (15), and therefore he believed that he was born the eleventh of September, 1524. Which gives me occaſion to take notice of a miſtake of Sammarthanus (16); but, I confeſs, there is ſome uncertainty in the matter, whereby he might be excuſed. It is only from a paſſage of Ronſard that we know he was born the ſame year that Francis I was taken; at leaſt it is certain that du Perron alledged no other proof againſt thoſe who were not of that opinion. As to the time of his birth, ſays he (17), 'There are ſeveral opinions about it. Some think he was born in the year 1522, and that conſequently he died in his climacterical year, as it has been obſerved of many great men. Others ſtick to what he writes, that he was born the ſame year that the great king Francis was made a priſoner; as the birth of illuſtrious men is frequently remarkable by ſuch notable events. We may further obſerve, that the taking of that king, before Pavia, by which Ronſard denotes the year of his birth, falls exactly upon the ſame day on which we celebrate the memory of his death, which is St Matthias's day (18).' This only proof of du Perron will appear weak, if we conſider that Ronſard in one of his Poems mentions his age, which does not ſuit with a man born in 1524, or 1525. Theſe are his words: they are rough and not very ſuitable to the ſubject, but he was anſwering ſatirical and railing adverſaries, who accuſed him, among other things, of a voluptuous life.

Tu dis que je ſuis vieil, encore n'ay-je atteint
Trente & ſept ans paſſez, & mon corps ne ſe plaint
D'ans ny de maladie, & en toutes les ſortes
Mes nerfs ſont bien tendus, & mes veines bien fortes;
Et ſi j'ay le teint palle & le cheveu griſon,
Mes membres toutesfois ne ſont hors de ſaiſon (19).

You ſay I'm old; though yet, as I declare,
My years not fully ſev'n and thirty are:
Robuſt and firm my body ſtill remains,
And nor of ſickneſs, nor of age complains.
My ſinews and my veins are ſtrong and hail:
Then if my locks be gray, or viſage pale,
It matters not, ſince I in ev'ry limb
Am ſound and vigorous . . . . . .

The Poem, wherein he ſpeaks thus, was compoſed ſome weeks after the death of the duke of Guiſe (20) and conſequently in the ſpring of the year, 1563. A man, who was then but thirty-ſeven years old, muſt have been born in 1526, and at this rate Scævola Sammarthanus would not be to blame. It is ſomewhat ſtrange, that our Poet did not well know when he was born.

[C] *Which occaſioned ſome witty conceits, that are not more ſolid than thoſe reflexions.*] 'His birth-day had like to have been the day of his burial; for as they were going from the caſtle de la Poiſſonnerie to the parochial church, to get him chriſtened, the woman who carried him, going over a meadow, let him fall through inadvertency; but he fell gently upon the graſs and the flowers of the meadow. Beſides, a gentlewoman, who carried a veſſel full of roſe-water and alſo ſeveral ſorts of herbs and flowers, as it is uſual, going to take up the child, ſpilt upon his head part of that ſweet-ſmelling water, which was a preſage of the good ſmell which the flowers of his learned writings would ſpread all over the kingdom (21).' This is what the Italians call *Concetti.* When Mr le Païs wrote the Hiſtory of Ronſard's Muſe, he omitted not to make ſome verſes upon that thought. *He was born*, ſays he, *of a knight of the order, on the ſame day that Francis the firſt was taken at the battle of Pavia; and it has been ſaid to his glory, that France would have been inconſolable on account of ſuch an unfortunate day, if that ſame day had not produced ſo great a man. His birth-day had like to have been that of his death. A gentlewoman, who carried him* (22) *from the caſtle de la Poiſſonnerie, where he was born, to the church of the pariſh, where he was to be chriſtened, let him fall unawares; but by good luck he fell in a meadow, and upon flowers, and got no hurt by it, only he was wet all over with the roſe-water, which they carried, as it is uſual for the chriſtning.*

Ce ne fut point ſans doute un effet du hazard,
    Je croi qu'on peut ſans badinage,
    Dire que ce fut un preſage
    De la fortune de Ronſard;
Un preſage certain qui fit alors comprendre,
Combien de bonne odeur Ronſard devoit répandre,
Un preſage certain que les neuf doctes Sœurs,
    Dont il devoit chanter la gloire,
    Pour éterniſer ſa memoire
Luy feroient quelque jour des couronnes de fleurs (23).

[*D*] *He put himſelf at the head of ſome ſoldiers . . . . againſt the Proteſtants.*] I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Beza. 'The worſt of all was, that the mob broke not only the images, but alſo ſome monuments of the houſe of Vendome, that is now the head of the houſe of Bourbon, which was taken very heinouſly, and not without reaſon. When the Romaniſts ſaw this, and that part of the nobility of the country were gone to the prince at Orleans, and others had thrown themſelves into the town of Mans, they began to keep the Reformed under great conſtraint. Among others, Peter Ronſard, a gentleman, the moſt excellent French Poet of our time, who let his tongue to hire, not only to defile his Muſe with all ſorts of filthineſs, but alſo to ſlander our religion, and thoſe who profeſſed it, having turned Prieſt, reſolved to have a hand in thoſe quarrels with his companions. In order to it, having got together ſome ſoldiers in a village called Evaille, which was his pariſh, made ſeveral excurſions attended with plunder and murders (24).' Spondanus will have it, that the nobility of Vendomois pitched upon the prieſt Ronſard to be their head; but I had rather keep to Beza's narrative. However, I ſhall ſet down the words of that Annaliſt. They contain ſome other things that want to be rectified. *Arma quoque ſumens nobilitas, ducem ſibi elegit Ronſardum, qui inſolentiam profanorum non ferens, multos ex iis male mulctavit: quamquam curionatum Evalliæ tenebat, loci amœnitate aut commoditate captus. Neque enim is erat, qui libertatem ſuam, atque adeò licentiam poëticam ſacerdotalis muneris neceſſitate tamquam compede ad gravitatem eâ functione dignam vellet adſtringere: ſed homo generoſus, & à teneris annis inter nobiles pueros Caroli Ducis Aureliani Franciſci I. filii in aulâ, & poſteà militaribus ſtudiis in Angliâ & Scotiâ innutritus, antequàm literis ſub Io. Aurato operam daret, & divinum ingenium ad poëticam appelleret, inter pacatæ vitæ oblectamenta etiam armorum curam & amorem retinuerat* (25). Theſe words give us to underſtand, that Ronſard had a living only for his pleaſure, and that he diſcharged the duties of the Prieſthood perfunctorily. If Spondanus had known that this pretended curate

(15) Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 156.

(16) Neque ſexageſimum ætatis annum exceſſit (*Ronſardus*) articulari morbo ſæviſſime vexatus. *Sammarthan. Elog. lib. i, pag. m.* 80.

(17) Du Perron, Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard, *pag. m.* 190.

(18) I have ſet down the whole paſſage, to ſhew what I have ſaid above, citation (13), that du Perron did not make uſe of the thought, concerning the compenſation for the impriſonment of Francis I.

(19) Ronſard, Reſponſe à quelque Miniſtre, *p.* 86, *of the* 9*th Tome of his works, in* 12*mo.*

(20) See the Epiſtle prefixed to that poem.

(21) Claudius Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 114.

(22) Binet does not ſay that the gentlewoman carried him; he diſtinguiſhes her from the woman who carried him.

(23) Le Païs, Titres de nobleſſe de la Muſe Amourette, *pag.* 182, 183, *of the* 2d *part of the new Works, Dutch Edit.* 1687.

(24) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſ. *livr. vii, pag.* 537, 538.

(25) Spondanus, Annal. Eccleſ. *ad ann.* 1562, *num.* 16, *pag. m.* 621, 622.

reaſon why ſome ſatirical pieces were publiſhed at Orleans againſt him, wherein it was ſuppoſed that he was a prieſt. He defended himſelf in verſe, and denied that he was inveſted with ſuch a character [*E*]. What is certain, is, that he had ſome benefices *in Commendam*,

curate had been in the ſame poſt at the court of Scotland, that he had in the houſe of the duke of Orleans, would he have made uſe of this diſtinction, *viz.* that Ronſard was bred up a page to that duke, and learned the art of war under the king of Scotland? Let us rectify this, and obſerve that this young man was made page to the Dauphin in the year 1536, three days before that prince died (26). *Afterwards he entered into the ſervice of Charles duke of Orleans, the king's ſecond ſon, aud continued there for ſome time, being very acceptable to his maſter* . . . who, *to give him an occaſion of ſeeing the world, made him page to James Stuart, king of Scotland, who was come to marry* (27) *the lady Magdalen, daughter to Francis I.* The king of Scotland *carried him into his kingdom, where he continued two years* (28), *and half a year in England*; and then he returned into France, and *went to the duke of Orleans, his maſter, who made him page of his ſtables, and ſent him upon buſineſs into Flanders and Zealand, with orders to go as far as Scotland, which he did. . . . . At his return from that journey, being only about fifteen or ſixteen years of age, after he had ſerved the duke of Orleans five years, till that prince died, and afterwards Henry, who was ſince king, in the year* 1540, *he went in the retinue of Lazarus de Baïf . . . . . who was ſent the king's ambaſſador to the Diet of Spire* (29). It appears from this narrative, 1. That Ronſard did not learn the art of war in Scotland, otherwiſe than he had done in the ſervice of the duke of Orleans, and otherwiſe than the pages of princes learn it. 2. That Spondanus expreſſed himſelf ill, and knew not that our Poet was only thirteen or fourteen years of age when he was in Scotland, and that at his return into France he was made page to the Dauphin's brother. Perhaps it will be objected to me, that Binet's narrative being full of faults, ought not to be alledged againſt that Annaliſt; but notwithſtanding this objection, I believe Binet is not miſtaken as to the time that Ronſard was made page to the king of Scotland. However, he is groſſly miſtaken in his computation; for if Ronſard had been a domeſtic to the duke of Orleans *five years, till that prince died*, he would have ſerved him till the year 1545; and if he had been ſince in the ſervice of the Dauphin Henry, how could he have been ſince in Lazarus de Baïf's retinue, in the year 1540? But it is true, that Lazarus de Baïf being ſent, by the king, ambaſſador into Germany in the year 1540, took along with him our Ronſard, who had made an end of his ſervice as a page (30). However it be, Varillas has been deceived by Spondanus. 'New puiſhments 'were invented againſt the Calviniſts of Vendome, 'becauſe the moſt violent amongſt them had ſearched 'the ſepulchres of the anceſtors of the king of Navarre: and the famous Poet Ronſard, a gentleman 'of that country, who being weary of the court, and 'deſiring to be in better circumſtances than he was 'at home, had accepted the living of Evailles, took up 'arms again which he had born in Scotland and England. Afterwards he excuſed himſelf for it, ſaying, 'in a pleaſant manner, that not being able to defend 'his pariſhioners with St Peter's key, for which the 'Calviniſts had no reſpect, he took St Paul's ſword, 'and putting himſelf at the head of the neighbouring 'gentry, kept his church and his pariſh from being 'plundered (31). You ſee he falſly ſuppoſes that 'Ronſard bore arms in Scotland and England.'

[*E*] *He defended himſelf in verſe, and denied that he was a Prieſt.*] The Miniſter Chandieu, and Florent Chretien, were the authors of the pieces publiſhed againſt him at Orleans. The firſt appeared under the diſguiſe of A. Zamariel B. de Mont-Dieu, and the ſecond under that of Francis de la Baronnie (32). Father Garaſſe ſpeaks of them in the following manner. 'Thoſe two men gave him a ſevere reprimand, which 'is intituled, *la Metamorphoſe de Ronſard en Preſtre, ou le Temple de Ronſard*. They accuſed him, among 'other things, of having taught atheiſm.

Je t'ay veu diſcourir tout ainſi qu'Epicure
Qui attacheois au ciel un Dieu qui n'a la cure
De ce qu'on fait en bas, & en parlant ainſi
Tu monſtrois que de luy tu n'avois grand ſoucy, *&c.*

Like Epicurus, I have heard you try
To fix in Heav'n an idle deity,
Who takes no thought of what is done below:
By ſuch diſcourſe as this you plainly ſhow
How little you regard him, &c. - - -

'But Ronſard made a ſolid anſwer to their ſcurrilous 'and impertinent language, in a poem ntituled, *Des 'Miſeres du Temps*, in which he proteſts, *&c* (33).' Garaſſe is miſtaken: the poem intituled, *Des Miſeres du Temps*, is not an anſwer to Zamariel and la Baronnie. The piece publiſhed againſt them by Ronſard in his vindication, came out with this title, *Reponſe aux Injures & Calomnies de je ne ſçai quels predicantereaux & Miniſtreaux de Geneve*. The reaſon which induced the Proteſtants to make verſes againſt that Poet, is imperfectly related by Binet and Varillas. One of them ſays, that they abuſed him, to revenge themſelves for the poems he had writ againſt them; the other affirms, that they cenſured him by reaſon of his warlike exploits. Thoſe two reaſons ſhould have been put together; for it is certain they fell upon him, becauſe he had made uſe of his pen and ſword againſt them with great fury. Here follow Binet's words. This 'gave Ronſard occaſion to oppoſe that new opinion, and to arm the Muſes in the defence of France, 'publiſhing his remonſtrances, which were thought 'ſo proper to confute the enemies of the Catholic 'religion, that the king, and the queen, his mother, 'gratified him for it; as did alſo Pope Pius V, who 'wrote to him a letter of thanks: which was the 'reaſon why thoſe of the new religion fell upon 'him, and publiſhed a very ſatirical and biting poem 'againſt him, which they called *le Temple de Ronſard*, wherein they painted his life as it were in 'tapeſtry. They alſo made ſome anſwers to his 'remonſtrances, with this title, *La Metamorphoſe de 'Ronſard*, the authors of which were one A. Zamariel 'and B. de Mont-Dieu, both miniſters. He ſufficiently points at the latter in theſe verſes of his 'anſwer to him, comparing him to Siſyphus,

Qui remonte & repouſſe aux enfers un rocher,
Dont tu as pris ton nom (34).

- - - - *Whoſe work in hell*
Is ſtill a-doing, but is never done,
While he rolls back a huge unwieldy ſtone,
From which your name is borrowed - - -

Binet divides one author into two; A. Zamariel B. de Mont-Dieu is but one man. I proceed to Varillas's words. *This* (35) *occaſioned the terrible ſatire which Florent Chretien, at that time a violent Calviniſt, and preceptor to the prince of Navarre, wrote under the name of the Miniſter de la Baronnie againſt the ſame Ronſard; and the anſwer of the latter, wherein he ſhewed that indignation would enable him to make finer verſes than nature, tho' he had a wonderful genius to Poetry* (36). He is in the wrong to ſay, that *Florent Chretien wrote under the name of a Miniſter*, and to believe that none but he publiſhed ſatires againſt Ronſard. We have ſeen that he ſays after Beza and Spondanus, that this Poet was a curate; but their miſtake will appear by the following verſes.

Or ſus mon frere en Chriſt, tu dis que je ſuis Preſtre:
J'atteſte l'eternal que je le voudrois eſtre,
Et avoir tout le chef & le dos empeſché
Deſſous la peſanteur d'une bonne Eveſché:
Lors j'auroy la couronne à bon droit ſur la teſte,
Qu'un raſoir blanchiroit le jour d'une grand' feſte,
Ouverte, large, longue, allant juſques au front,
En forme d'un Croiſſant qui tout ſe courbe en
rond (37).

You tell me that I am a prieſt. By heav'n
I only wiſh the name were juſtly giv'n,

And

---

(26) Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 115.

(27) He married her at Paris, the firſt of January 1537.

(28) Du Perron, Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard, *pag.* 193, *ſays, that he was two years and a half in Scotland.*

(29) *Taken from* Claudius Binet, *pag.* 115, *& ſeq.*

(30) See the verſes of Antony de Baïf, in Mr Menage's *Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, *pag.* 196.

(31) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, *Tom. i, p.* 171, *Dutch Edit. ad ann.* 1562.

(32) *See* Garaſſe's Doctrine Curieuſe, *p.* 126, & 1022, & la Croix du Maine, *pag.* 88.

(33) Garaſſe, ibid. *pag.* 126, 127.

(34) Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 138, 139. See alſo the funeral oration by du Perron, *pag.* 197, where no other reaſon is to be found but that alledged by Binet.

(35) That is, Ronſard's taking up arms againſt the Proteſtants.

(36) Varillas, Hiſt. de Charles IX, *livr. iii*, *pag.* 171, 172.

(37) Ronſard, Reſponſe à quelque Miniſtre, *p. m.* 80.

Commendam, and among others the priory of St Coſmus near Tours. He died there the twenty-ſeventh of December, 1585 and had but an indifferent burial; but twenty four years after a noble monument was erected there to his honour [*F*]. He was cruelly tormented with the Gout, and, it is ſaid, he brought this misfortune upon him by his debaucheries [*G*]. His works are full of love-verſes, wherein we find that he had three chief miſtreſſes

And that my ſhoulders were condemn'd to bear
The load of a fat biſhopric. I'd wear
With pleaſure then the crown upon my head,
Which ſhou'd on all great holidays be made
Smooth with the razor's edge. Long, open, wide
It ſhou'd be, and my forehead reach beſide,
In figure like a creſcent bending round. - - -

Does not Ronſard plainly deny, in theſe verſes, that he was a Prieſt? And if he had been one, would he have been ſo bold as to deny it? Something may be ſaid, in order to excuſe the Miniſters, who gave him that title. He had been ordained, and performed Eccleſiaſtical functions in the choir in ſacerdotal habits: he himſelf informs us of it.

Mais quand je ſuis aux lieux où il faut faire voir
D'un cœur devotieux l'office & le devoir,
Lors je ſuis de l'Egliſe une colonne ferme
D'un ſurpelis ondé les eſpaules je m'arme,
D'une haumuſſe le bras, d'une chape le dos:
Et non comme tu dis faite de croix & d'os:
C'eſt pour un Capelan, la mienne eſt honorée
De grandes boucles d'or & de frange dorée (38):
- - - - - - - - - -
Je ne perds un moment des prieres divines:
Dés la poincte du jour je m'en vais à matines,
J'ay mon breviaire au poing, je chante quelquefois,
Mais c'eſt bien rarement, car j'ay mauvaiſe vois,
Le devoir du ſervice en rien je n'abandonne,
Je ſuis à prime, à Sexte, & à Tierce, & à Nonne,
J'oy dire la grand'Meſſe, & avecques l'encent
(Qui par l'Egliſe eſpars comme parfum ſe ſent,)
J'honore mon Prelat des autres l'outrepaſſe,
Qui a pris d'Agenor ſon ſurnom & ſa race.
Apres le tour finy je viens pour me r'aſſoir (39).

But when I am in places which demand
Duties of ſtrict devotion at my hand,
Then like a pillar of the church I wear
A wavy ſurplice, and an ameſſe bear
Upon my arm: my back a cope has on,
But not, as you ſay, made of croſs and bone:
'Tis for a Chaplain, if you muſt be told,
That mine has buckles and a fringe of gold.
- - - - - - - - -
At ſervice-hours I never fail to pray,
But trudge to mattins by the break of day.
Sometimes I ſing in chorus; but, egad,
That's very ſeldom, for my voice is bad.
In ſhort, when any thing is to be done,
I'am always there, at Prime, Terce, Sexte *and* None.
High maſs I hear, and with frankincenſe ſweet,
Perfuming all the temple round, I greet
My noble Prelate far above the reſt.
He from Agenor, as it is confeſs'd,
His race and ſirname takes. That rite perform'd,
I ſit me down again - - - -

This was the reaſon why the Proteſtants believed that he was a curate. Note, That Menage fancies that a miniſter, whoſe name was de Mont-Dieu, wrote againſt Ronſard (40); but he is miſtaken; it is only a diſguiſe under which the miniſter Chandieu appeared when he publiſhed that piece. Mr Baillet (41) thinks that Florent Chretien aſſumed that falſe name. Colomiés has no reaſon to ſay that la Croix du Maine knew not *in his Bibliotheque*, page 88. that *Florent Chretien wrote againſt Ronſard, under the name of Francis de la Baronnie* (42). I have mentioned in another place (43), the anſwer made by Ronſard, when he was charged with an act of Paganiſm.

[*F*] *A noble monument was erected there to his honour.*] Joachim de la Chetardie, counſellor clerk in the parliament of Paris, being Prior-commendatory of St Coſmus, twenty years after Ronſard's death, could not endure that the tomb of that illuſtrious Poet ſhould remain without diſtinction or inſcription (44). Wherefore, when he got the monaſtery repaired, he cauſed a marble tomb to be erected, and adorned it with an epitaph (45), and a ſtatue of Ronſard made by an excellent ſculptor. *Cum magni Ronſardi cineres populari loculo, muto & illiterato jacere videret, melior æquiorque illis qui ejus opimis exuviis ditati ſunt, tandiu manes eſſe neglectos non tulit, ac Ronſardum illum. . . . . Chetardius marmoris alta ſtrue, ſtatua ad viventis ſimilitudinem veriſſime expreſſa à Phidia Lutetiano donavit, brevi nota & elogio* (46). Theſe Latin words reflect upon Ronſard's relations, as if they had taken no care to preſerve his memory; but it is certain that Gallandius cauſed a pompous funeral to be made for him in Boncourt-college, of which he was principal. *Teſtamento condito quo hæredem ſcripſit Johannem Gallandium juventutis Pariſienſis optimum moderatorem, cujus hoſpitio cum Lutetiæ eſſet, familiariſſime utebatur, qui dignam tanti viri memoriæ gratiam rependens ei exequiis perhonorificis poſtea in ſchola Becodiana ſua parentavit* (47). Here follows a deſcription of that funeral. 'Mr Galland, whoſe affection for him was not buried in the 'ſame grave, doing what France was bound to do, 'cauſed great preparations to be made in Boncourt-'chapel, where his funeral was celebrated in a ſo-'lemn manner upon Monday, the 24th of February '1586. The ſervice, ſet to Muſic, and attended with 'all ſorts of inſtruments, was ſung by the choiceſt 'ſingers, the king's Muſicians being ordered to be 'there; for the king lamented the loſs of ſo great a 'man, who was an ornament to his kingdom. I 'ſhould be too long, ſhould I make a particular de-'ſcription of the funeral orations, encomiums and 'verſes, that were made upon that occaſion, and con-'ſecrated to his memory, and of the lords, who, to-'gether with that generous prince Charles de Valois, 'attended by the duke of Joyeuſe, and the moſt re-'verend cardinal his brother, to whom Ronſard was 'related, honoured that funeral pomp with their pre-'ſence; at which the moſt conſiderable members of 'the parliament of Paris, followed by the greateſt 'wits of France, were pleaſed to aſſiſt. In the after-'noon Mr du Perron pronounced his funeral oration 'with great eloquence; and there was ſuch a vaſt 'concourſe of hearers, that cardinal de Bourbon, and 'ſeveral other princes and lords, were obliged to go 'away, being not able to get in (48).'

[*G*] *It is ſaid he brought this misfortune upon himſelf by his debaucheries.*] He was a handſome perſon, ſtrong and vigorous; and beſides, having a great deal of wit, and a great inclination for pleaſures, one may eaſily judge he improved the opportunities of ſporting with the fair ſex, and that thoſe opportunities ſeldom failed him. He ruined his ſtrong conſtitution by his looſe life, as Thuanus obſerves: *Verum homo ut ingenio ſic forma & corporis robore inſignis cum vita ſoluta licentioſe nimis genio indulgeret, valetudinem firmiſſimam debilitavit, acerbiſſimis arthritidis doloribus extrema ætate conflictatus* (49). He was very deaf; and the author of his life owns, that this infirmity came upon him, among other reaſons, becauſe, *being in Germany, he was forced to drink ſuch wines as are to be found there, moſt of which are ſophiſticated* (50). This is a miſtake; for there are excellent wines in Germany; and if Ronſard had drank them moderately, they had done him no harm. The authors of the pieces publiſhed againſt him at Orleans, repreſent him as a great debauchee.

Tu m'accuſes, Cafard, d'avoir eu la verolle;
Un chaſte Predicant de fait & de parole
Ne devroit jamais dire un propos ſi vilain:
Mais que ſort-il du ſac? cela dont il eſt plein (51).
. . . .

(38) Ibid. *pag.* 94.

(39) Ibid. *pag.* 95.

(40) Menage, Anti-Baillet, *ch. cxlv.*

(41) Baillet, in his liſt of diſguiſed authors.

(42) Colomiés, Biblioth. choiſie, *pag. m.* 202.

(43) In the article JODELLE, remark [*D*].

(44) See how Paſquier expreſſed his indignation, *Recherch. livr. vii, ch. xi, p.* 648, when he ſaw ſuch a mean tomb.

(45) *You will find it in* Botereius, ubi infra, *pag.* 567.

(46) Rodolphus Botereius, Commentar. de Rebus in Gallia geſtis, *lib. xvi, pag.* 566, *ad ann.* 1609.

(47) Thuanus, Hiſtor. *lib. lxxxiii, ſub fin. pag. m.* 43, *col.* 1.

(48) Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 159, 160.

(49) Thuanus, ubi ſupra.

(50) Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 118.

(51) Ronſard, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 86.

miſtreſſes (a). The laſt was only an amuſement to him, and a poetical ſubject [H]. Beſides, it is to be obſerved that he often made love-verſes at the requeſt of ſome lords of the court; ſo that they contained a deſcription of their paſſion, and not of his own. The remembrance of it made him uneaſy; for he remembered at the ſame time that he got nothing by thoſe verſes [I], and that the reward due to him had been beſtowed upon others. He was not ſo unfortunate as to the Poems he inſcribed to Charles IX; for he was well paid for them [K]. He proſecuted Joachim du Bellay, to recover ſome odes which

. . . .

Tu te plaints d'autre part que ma vie eſt laſcive,
En delices, en jeux, en vices exceſſive:
Tu mens meſchantement, ſi tu m'avois ſuivy
Deux mois, tu ſçaurois bien en quel eſtat je vy (52).

You ſay, Cafard, that I was pox'd. For ſhame!
A modeſt preacher ſhould not dare to name
So vile a thing: it does not ſuit his part.
But from the great abundance of the heart
The mouth per *force will ſpeak - - - -*
. . . .
You likewiſe in another place pretend
That I my life in wanton pleaſures ſpend,
In games, and vices of the blackeſt hue:
Which is an arrant falſity. Had you
But follow'd me two months, you would have ſeen
How different from this my life has been.

[H] *The laſt miſtreſs was only . . . . . a poetical ſubject* (53).] Let us ſee firſt of all what we are told of his two firſt miſtreſſes. '(54) Ronſard falling in love with a handſome woman of Blois, whoſe name was Caſſandra, on the 21ſt of April, in a journey he made to Blois, where the court was, being then twenty years of age (55), reſolved to ſing his beloved object, as well on account of her beauty, as by reaſon of her name. He was ſmitten as ſoon as he ſaw her, as if it had been by an inſtinct divinely inſpired, which he ſeems to intimate by this motto, ΩΣ ΙΔΟΝ ΩΣ ΕΜΑΝΗΝ (56).' The verſes he made upon that miſtreſs were thought too obſcure; wherefore *he reſolved to deſcribe in a more eaſy ſtile his paſſion for Mary, who was a handſome maid of Anjou. He often denotes her by the name of Pin de Bourgeuil, becauſe it was the place where ſhe lived, and where he ſaw her firſt, happening to be there with his friend Baif. He loved her very much after he had courted Caſſandra ten years, whom he left out of jealouſy* (57). Here follows the Hiſtory of his third love. 'He ended his works with his ſonnets upon Helena, whoſe virtues, beauty, and great accompliſhments, were the laſt and moſt worthy ſubject of his Muſe: the laſt, becauſe he never had the happineſs to ſee her until he was an old man; and the moſt worthy, becauſe this lady was, by her quality, virtue, and reputation, above thoſe whom he loved in his younger years. He was more familiar with them, than with the laſt, whom he honoured and praiſed, rather than courted. Witneſs the title he gave to his praiſes, imitating Petrarch in that reſpect, who being one day praiſed in the Queen-mother's preſence, on account of his chaſte and modeſt Poetry, her majeſty adviſed him (Ronſard) to write in the ſame ſtile, as being more ſuitable to his age, and the gravity of his learning. Thus Ronſard having, as he thought, an opportunity of conſecrating his Muſe to a perſon of great merit, took the queen's advice for a permiſſion, or rather a command, to addreſs himſelf to one of her maids of honour, of a very antient and noble family of Saintonge; and he continued to praiſe her almoſt to the end of his life: and becauſe her wit did frequently afford him matter to exerciſe his Muſe, he conſecrated a fountain to her in Vendomois, which goes by her name to this very day (58).'

The collection of the fineſt pieces of the French Poets, both ancient and modern, printed at Paris in the year 1692, contains the life of Ronſard, wherein I have found a fault, which wants to be rectified. *He ſung the praiſes of Helena de Sugeres, a maid of honour to the queen, and deſired Cardinal du Perron to write a preface, in order to prefix it to theſe gallant Poems; in which he intreated him to tell the world, that he loved that maid in an honeſt way. The cardinal anſwered him, that inſtead of a preface, he ſhould put the picture * of Helena de Sugeres to his book* (59). Du Perron being but a young man when Ronſard died, it is not likely that this great Poet would have deſired him to write a preface for him. The truth is, that he deſired no ſuch thing of any body: it was the lady, who made ſuch a requeſt to cardinal du Perron. If you read the Perroniana at the word Gournay, you will find theſe words in it (60). *This is what I told Mrs de Surgeres one day, who deſired me, at Monſieur de Rets's, to put an epiſtle to Ronſard's works, whereby it might appear, that he had not an unchaſte love for her. I told her, inſtead of ſuch an epiſtle, it is but putting your picture to it.*

[I] *He was uneaſy when he remembred that he had got nothing by thoſe verſes.*] I ſhall ſet down a paſſage of Binet to prove this. '(61) He often told me, that he had made amorous verſes and maſquerades by order of ſome great men, meaning, that he had often ſtrained his Muſe without any ſatisfaction; others having got the reward he deſerved: which was the reaſon why he prefixed theſe verſes of Virgil to theſe pieces, *ſic vos non vobis*, &c. It is well known for whom he wrote the amours of Callirea, a very handſome lady of the court, of the noble family of Atry (62), ſirnamed Aquaviva, as he ſufficiently intimates by the ſonnet, which begins thus, *La belle eau vive.* It is alſo known for whom he made the verſes concerning Aſtrea (63), who was likewiſe a very handſome lady of the court, whoſe name is very much embelliſhed by the meer alteration of a vowel.' It appears from theſe words, that Ronſard was not ſo diſintereſted as an honeſt man ought to be. It had been a glorious thing for him, if he had ſhewed himſelf leſs mercenary: it is a fault that prevails among Poets, and I wonder that Binet ſhould have been ſo ingenuous as to acquaint the public with the complaints that Ronſard made to him in private, for not being rewarded. However it be, this ſhews that a man may write very paſſionate verſes, without being in love with the perſon who is the ſubject of thoſe verſes. I think this may be more eaſily done by a man who has a miſtreſs (64).

[K] *He was well paid for the Poems he inſcribed to Charles IX.*] That prince, 'beſides his yearly penſion, made him ſome preſents. It is true, he ſaid ſometimes in jeſt, that he was afraid of loſing his Ronſard, and that too much wealth would make him idle, adding, that a good Poet ought not to be fattened no more than a good horſe, but only kept in good caſe. Neverthelеſs he was always very liberal to him, and would have continued ſo, if he had lived; for he was not ignorant that Poets have a kind of ſympathy with the grandeur of kings, and are apt to take fire, being ſenſibly affected when their labours and merit are not ſufficiently rewarded, as he complains of it in ſeveral places (65).' The latter part of this paſſage confirms what has been ſaid above (66), concerning Ronſard's mercenary humour, and therefore I have not left it out, as I would have done, had it not been for that reaſon. Note, That Brantome mentions (§ α) this policy of Charles IX, as may be ſeen in the article of DAURAT (67). It is the moſt effectual way of keeping the Poets buſy: if they were too rich, they would be apt to deſpiſe their trade. Charles IX was therefore in the right to deal with the Poets, as if they had made Agur's prayer to him, *Give us neither poverty nor riches, feed us with food convenient for us* (68). The temper he obſerved, is perhaps the greateſt bleſſing that can be wiſhed for the commonwealth of learning; for ſome authors would not have publiſhed ſeveral good books, if they had lived in plenty: others would have been more accurate in their compoſures, had they not been ſo poor. The great poverty of ſome authors has occaſioned a multitude of bad books, which the public are

(a) See the remark [H].

(52) Ibid. *pag.* 93.

(53) See what has been ſaid of Malherbe, in the remark [B], of his article.

(54) Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 129.

(55) It was therefore in the year 1544: nevertheleſs Binet had juſt before ſaid, that Ronſard had publiſhed the *Epithalamium on the marriage of Mr de Vendome, and Madam Joan d'Albert, queen of Navarre,* and afterwards writ other poems before he fell in love with Caſſandra: this marriage was in the year 1548. In the Life of Ronſard, in the *Recueil des plus belles pieces des Poëtes Françoiſe,* printed in the year 1692, it is aſſerted that he fell in love with Caſſandra at Blois, when he was there with the duke of Anjou. There was no duke of Anjou at that time.

(56) They are Theocritus's words, which Virgil renders thus in his 8th eclogue, *ut vidi ut perii.*

(57) Binet, ibid. *pag.* 133.

(58) Ibid. *pag.* 142, 143.

* Becauſe ſhe was ugly.

(59) Recueil des plus belles pieces, *Tom. i. pag.* 241, 242, *Dutch Edit.*

(60) See the remark [B], in the article GOURNAY.

(61) Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 141, 142.

(62) I have ſpoken of that lady above, at the end of the text of the article JACCETIUS.

(63) She was a lady of the houſe d'Eſtrée.

(64) It is but fancying that the lady for whom he makes verſes, is his beloved object.

(65) Binet, Vie de Ronſard, *pag.* 143.

(66) In the preceding remark.

(67) Citation (21).

(68) Prov. xxx, 8.

which had been cunningly ſtolen from him [L]; but afterwards they agreed, and were friends again. He would have had better ſucceſs in his amorous verſes, had he not ſo carefully imitated the ancient Poets: the too frequent uſe of their fables made him harſh and obſcure [M]. Nay, he ſometimes took the liberty, as they did, to uſe ſome obſcene expreſſions [N], and in general was guilty of ſeveral profanations, and inſerted too many Pagan notions in his Poems, which nevertheleſs were paid with ſacred things

are peſtered with. A moderate income would have enabled them to poliſh their works; but the preſſing neceſſity of a man, incumbered with a great family, and perſecuted by a creditor, whom he puts off until he be paid for his copy, and gratified for his epiſtle dedicatory, obliges him to write ſo haſtily, that he has no time to lick his young cubs into the beſt ſhape before he ſhews them to the world. It is to be obſerved, that there are ſome ſuch works which it is better to have, than to be wholly deprived of them. For inſtance, it was better to have du Ryer's tranſlations of the authors tranſlated by him than none at all: and therefore, if we ſuppoſe that du Ryer would have lived an idle life, if he had been rich, it was better for the public, that he had no more than was neceſſary to maintain him. See what Eraſmus ſaid concerning Sigiſmund GELENIUS (69). When a writer deſigns to raiſe his fortune, he endeavours to write well; but he has no ſooner obtained his end, than he grows remiſs. This is what may be obſerved in preachers: they are thought to preach better before they are biſhops, than after they have attained to that dignity (70). Which puts me in mind of an ingenious repartee. A great prince of our time, deſigning to beſiege a town, was told, that it would be defended by a mareſchal of France, and did not alter his reſolution upon that account, ſaying, that *a governor, who is not yet mareſchal of France, is more to be feared, than one who is ſo already.*

[(§ α) What Brantome ſays there, is taken from theſe words of Papirius Maſſo, in his life of Charles IX, reprinted at the end of the additions to the Memoirs of Caſtelnau. ' Poetas generoſis equis ſimiles ' eſſe dicens, quos nutrire non ſaginari oporteat. - - - ' *Saying that Poets are like generous horſes whom it is* ' *proper to feed, but not to pamper.* REM. CRIT.]

[L] *He proſecuted . . . . . to recover ſome odes which had been cunningly ſtolen from him.*] This is a remarkable ſuit, and I do not doubt, that Ronſard proſecuted it as warmly, as others would do to recover an eſtate left them by their fathers. The Hiſtorian ſpeaks of it with great caution, being tender of the plaintiff's and defendant's reputation. The latter acted the moſt odious part before the Judges, and the other was laughed at by them. I ſhall ſet down the whole narrative of Binet. ' When the amours of ' Caſſandra, and the four books of odes, which Ron' ſard promiſed in imitation of Pindar and Horace, ' were much talked of; it being a common thing ' for wits to be jealous one of another, du Bellai, ' who had alſo ſung his Oliva in an amorous ſtrain, ' went about to compoſe ſome odes like thoſe of Ron' ſard, which he got into his hands without his know' ledge. He made ſome, which, together with ſe' veral ſonnets, he publiſhed, to prevent Ronſard, un' der the title of a collection of Poems. The latter ' conceived a reaſonable jealouſy againſt du Bellay, ' ſo far as to ſue him in order to recover his papers. ' They were adjudged to him; and then the quarrel ' was over. Ronſard deſired du Bellay to go on with ' his odes, by which means they became greater friends ' than ever, being of opinion that ſuch an ambition ' ſhews a generous ſoul; and that if men, jealous of ' glory, grow quickly angry, they are alſo eaſily re' conciled (71).'

[M] *The too frequent uſe of their fables made him harſh and obſcure.*] The obſcurity of his works was complained of at that very time, which was the reaſon why ſome of his friends commented upon them. The amours of Caſſandra were commented upon by Muretus: The firſt book of his love for Mary was commented upon by Remi Belleau, and the ſecond by Nicolas Richelet: his ſonnets upon Helena, the five books of his odes, and his hymns, were commented upon by the ſame Richelet; as were all the pieces of the ninth part of his works, by Claudius Garnier. *Beſides ſeveral pieces of the firſt part, Peter de Marcaſſus commented upon the Franciade, which makes the third, the Bocage Royal which makes the fourth, the Eclogues, Maſquerades, and Cartels, which make the fifth, the Elegies which make the ſixth, and the Poems which make the eighth* (72). John Beſly, the king's advocate at Fontenai le Comte, commented upon the hymns (73). Poor Ronſard is put to a non-plus in the *Parnaſſe Reformé*, on account of the impenetrable obſcurity of his works, without the help of a good commentary. His *Je ne ſuis point ma guerriere Caſſandre*, &c. is particularly alledged againſt him. *Do you really believe*, ſay they, (74) *that your Caſſandra, for whom you made that ſonnet, had ſuch a good opinion of it? Can it be imagined that ſhe knew the brother that you have found for her? Do you think that the Dolope Soudart, the Myrmidon, the Corebe inſenſé, and the Gregeois Penelée, were names very intelligible to her; and was it a ſmall matter for a woman to be put to the trouble of unfolding all the fables relating to the ſiege of Troy?*

Ronſard's obſcurity and harſhneſs would be more excuſable, had he been the firſt who improved the French Poetry; but he ſaw it full of charms, and near its perfection in Marot's writings, which might have been a great help to him. I ſhall ſet down Mr de la Bruyere's opinion. ' One would think from MA' ROT's turn and ſtile, that he writ after RON' SARD: there is hardly any difference between him ' and us, but in ſome words. RONSARD, and the ' authors cotemporary with him, did the French ſtile ' more harm than good; they kept it from arriving to ' perfection, and were like to hinder it from ever at' taining to it. It is ſurprizing that MAROT's ' works, which are ſo eaſy and natural, did not make ' Ronſard, who was full of a poetical ſpirit, a greater ' Poet than Ronſard and Marot (75).' But how could they produce ſuch an effect in a man whoſe taſte was ſo depraved, that he looked upon them as a heap of dirt with ſome grains of gold in it? He had *conſtantly in his hands*, as we are told by the author of his life (76), *ſome French Poet . . . . . eſpecially . . . . . John le Maire de Belges, the Romance of the Roſe, and Marot's works, which he called, as Virgil did thoſe of Ennius, a dunghil, out of which, as it were, by an induſtrious waſhing, he gathered grains of gold.* That waſhing would not have appeared very induſtrious to Mr de la Bruyere; he would have ſaid that Ronſard took the earth, and threw off the gold.

[N] *Some obſcene expreſſions.*] I ſhall only give one inſtance of it alledged by Mr Menage in a place, wherein he finds fault with him for making uſe of obſcure fables. *No fables*, ſays he (77), *ought to be made uſe of, but ſuch as are known to every body. Ronſard, who made uſe of ſome that are only known to the learned, and only to be found in the ſcholiaſts, ſuch as that which he mentions in theſe words of the twenty-firſt ode of the ſecond book out of the ſcholiaſt upon Nicander,*

Ny les fleurons que diffama
Venus, alors que ſa main blanche
Au milieu du Lis renferma
D'un grand Aſne le roide manche,

was accounted a pedant, inſtead of a learned man. Here follows a note of Nicolas Richelet upon thoſe four verſes of Ronſard. ' This we find in Nicander's Alexi' pharmaca. One can hardly apprehend how it can ' be underſtood of the lilly, which the ſame Nicander ' calls in another place Venus's delight. And indeed ' our author ſeems to doubt of it, ſpeaking a ſecond ' time of the lilly in that ſame ode; for it were need' leſs to ſpeak twice of the ſame flower. Nicander ' ſays that this flower, whatever it be, undertook one ' day to contend for beauty with Venus, who out of ' ſpite, and to revenge herſelf, ſhut up the yard of ' an aſs in its leaves.

- - - - Τότ' ἀπέστυγεν, ἀφρῶ
Οὕνεκ' ἐειδμαίνεσκε χροῆς ὕπερ, ἐν δὲ νυθρίοις
'Αργα-

(69) Above, citation (10), in his article.

(70) See the remark [C], in the article ZEUXIS.

(71) Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 129, 130.

(72) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1335.

(73) Colomeſ. Obſervat. ſacræ, *pag.* 54.

(74) Parnaſſe, Reformé, *pag.* 91, 92, *Dutch* *Edit.*

(75) La Bruyere, Caractères, *in the chapter intituled*, des Ouvrages de l'Eſprit, *pag. m.* 82.

(76) Binet, Vie de Ronſard, *pag. m.* 121.

(77) Menage, Obſervat. ſur Malherbe, *pag.* 531.

things [O]. People are very much divided in their opinions about his works, as may be ſeen in Mr Baillet (*b*). See alſo Sorel's remarks upon the *Berger Extravagant* (*c*), wherein you will find many curious and ſolid Criticiſms upon that Poet. I muſt not forget what has been obſerved, that he did not well ſucceed in correcting his own works [*P*]; he

᾿Αϱγαλέην μεσάτοισιν ὀνειδίην ἐπέλασσε
Δεινὴν βρωμήεντος ἐναλδήσασα κορύνην (78).

That commentator does not complain of the obſcenity of the text.

[*O*] *Which nevertheleſs were paid with ſacred things.*] Conſult Sorel, who ſays that Ronſard's odes, ‘ written to any one's praiſe, are an imitation of Pindar, and that the reſt, which are indifferent, are moſt of them taken out of Anacreon; ſo that there is ſcarce any thing to be found in them, but that perhaps to-morrow we ſhall be nothing but duſt, that we ought to enjoy our ſelves whilſt we may do it, and drink and indulge the love of women; which ſeem to be the maxims of a man, who does not believe the immortality of the ſoul. His hymns contain very few precepts of virtue: ſome are only a meer repetition of what is to be ſeen in Homer and other Poets, as his hymns upon Calais and Zethes, and Caſtor and Pollux; which is very improper, for what ſignifies it to ſing the praiſes of thoſe chimerical heroes? His hymn concerning Hercules compared with CHRIST, both as to his birth and labours, cannot excite any devotion; for thoſe remote and far-fetched applications are fitter to make one laugh, than to produce in us a repentance of our ſins (79).' He gives the ſubſtance of that hymn, and then he adds, ‘ I had rather lay aſide entirely the fables of the Heathens, than pretend to mend them by applying them in ſuch a manner to holy myſteries. It is a dangerous thing to ſuffer ſuch ſubjects to be handled by the Poets. If you examine the matter narrowly, you will find that the myſteries of our religion are profaned by ſuch a method; for the relations are only ſuperficial. What a ſhameful thing is it to refer Jupiter's adultery to the incarnation of the Eternal Word? At this rate it muſt be ſaid, that the Holy Virgin is repreſented by Alcmena, and then the angel Gabriel, who declared the conception, and the Holy Ghoſt that wrought it, muſt be repreſented by Mercury. Wretched Poet! if you deſign to explain in ſuch a manner what we are told of Hercules, mind what you do; for there are ſuch abominable thoughts concealed under it, that my pen drops from my hands when I think of them. Perhaps you will ſay, that you have not meddled with them: but will not every reader, if he has never ſo little ſubtilty in him, be deſirous to know all the relations contained in your fable? Beſides, is not the compariſon between Hercules and CHRIST execrable in every part of it (80).' I muſt not forget that he ſays ſomething to excuſe that Poet. ‘ I have alſo ſeen ſome moral reflexions upon the Romance of the Roſe, wherein the moſt leud things contained in that Romance were explained, with relation to our creation and redemption, and eternal life. There are ſome execrable fancies in that book; however I believe the author was a well-meaning man, and acted therein according to the ſimplicity of the time he lived in. And I make no doubt that Ronſard had a very good intention in his *Chriſtian Hercules*, but his performance did not anſwer his hopes. As for his other hymns, for inſtance, concerning eternity, juſtice, the devils, and others of the like nature, he brings in ſeveral deities, which he ſhould have left to the Greeks (81).' When he criticiſes the hymns about the four ſeaſons of the year, which are the maſter-piece of that Poet, if we may depend upon his funeral oration (82), and Paſquier (83), he obſerves a thouſand faults in them, and even a groſs contradiction. *Tho' fictions wholly depend upon a writer's fancy, the ſame Poet ought not to have two different opinions in one and the ſame work; and yet in a following hymn, which muſt needs have a dependance upon the firſt, ſince the four hymns are coupled together, Ronſard ſays, that nature perceiving that, tho' ſhe did ſtroke the belly of Time, her huſband, and put a leg over his, tickling his fleſh, he was no longer fit for amorous embraces, fell in love with the ſun, with whom ſhe lay, and got by him the four ſeaſons. Thus we have here another birth* (84). Had he not juſt reaſon to condemn him for ſuch groſs inventions? Nor does he forgive him for telling his dear Helena, *that ſhe muſt not forget upon Aſh-wedneſday to come and take ſome aſhes from his heart, which the fire of love has burnt* (85). Was he not very much in the right to condemn many other prophanations of our Poets, and the rewards beſtowed upon them. The worſt of all, ſays he (86), ‘ is, that ſome beneficed men of this age have writ in ſuch a ſtile more freely than others; as if they had been allowed to play with holy things, becauſe they had the adminiſtration of them. They were looked upon as men, who took more care of their bellies than of their flocks, and becauſe they ſpoke in a prophane manner, lay-people were ſo bold as to do the ſame, which did great prejudice to religion. I know but too many ſtill, who are not yet inveſted with Eccleſiaſtical offices, but deſire to be promoted to them, tho' their only talent conſiſts in writing impious and leud things. They are court-flies, buzzing in the palaces of princes, and continually importuning them, becauſe it is thought here that a benefice is the fitteſt reward that can be beſtowed upon a Poet. What an abominable cuſtom, to give Eccleſiaſtical preferments to men, who would not be rewarded, had they not been pimps to their maſters, as it appears from their amorous verſes, made in order to indulge the diſorderly paſſions of princes and kings. It is true that St Gelais was a biſhop, that Des Portes was an abbot, and that Ronſard had ſome benefices (87), and that he deſired the king to add a croſier to his lyre, as if a biſhopric had been a proper reward for his Poems, though it ought to be conferred on none but thoſe who are holy in their words and actions. However I will not blame all thoſe men upon that account; for I do piouſly believe, that they wrote thoſe looſe Poems in their youth, and that they have ſince repented of them, and made themſelves worthy of the poſts they held.'

Theſe laſt words agree, as to Ronſard, with what Mr Baillet ſays of him. ‘ I ſhall do a good office to Ronſard's memory, by informing the public, that in the laſt years of his life, he condemned the unchaſte and looſe Poems he had made. Nay, he began then to reform his Muſe, reſolving to write only Chriſtian Poems the remaining part of his days. Not contented to ſecure his conſcience for the time to come, he was deſirous to expiate his paſt ſins, by ſuppreſſing ſeveral pieces he had written in his youth, and leaving out all the paſſages he did not approve in thoſe that were not wholly bad. But it may be ſaid, that he did it more like a father, who cannot diveſt himſelf of his tenderneſs for his children, than like an uncorrupt judge (88).' Againſt this, Mr Menage (89) alledges theſe words of Binet: *Perſiſting in the reſolution* of loving and ſerving one of the maids of honour to the queen, *he praiſed her almoſt to the laſt moment of his life* (90). Thuanus obſerves, that Ronſard made ſome verſes even when he was a dying, and that they were pious and tolerable verſes (91). I have read in Brantome, that Chatellard, a French gentleman, who was beheaded in Scotland for loving the queen, and, which is more, making an attempt upon the honour of that princeſs, had no other *viaticum*, or preparation for death, than the reading of a Poem of Ronſard; which plainly ſhews, that he took it to be a very pious piece. *Being brought to the ſcaffold, he took Ronſard's hymns into his hands, and for his eternal comfort, read out the hymn concerning death, which is a very fine one, and fit to make one leſs afraid of dying, having no other godly book, nor any miniſter or confeſſor* (92).

[*P*] *He did not well ſucceed in correcting his works.*] In order to make a very inſtructive commentary upon theſe words, I ſhall ſet down a long note of Mr Menage (93). ‘ It often falls out that the ſecond thoughts of the Poets are not ſo good as the firſt, as Binet very judiciouſly obſerves, ſpeaking of Ronſard's verſes (94). *Some*, ſays he, *are of opinion, that ſeveral paſſages which he has mended in his works, are not ſo agreeable as they were at firſt; for it happens ſometimes, eſpecially in Poetry, that the firſt fury is more*

(*b*) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1335.

(*c*) Upon the 13th book, *pag.* 647, & *ſeq.*

(78) Richelet, upon the ſecond book of Ronſard's odes, *pag. m.* 306.

(79) Sorel, Remarks on the 13th book of the *Berger extravagant*, *pag.* 648.

(80) Ib. *p.* 650.

(81) Ib. *p.* 652.

(82) Thoſe who have ſeen his hymns about the four ſeaſons, (and I think there are few in this aſſembly but have had that curioſity) will doubtleſs confirm my opinion of them, and acknowledge that it is almoſt impoſſible to peruſe them, without being charmed with them, and confeſſing that there is a ſoul and a genius in them, which affects and tranſports both the readers and hearers. *Du Perron, Oraiſon funebre de Ronſard, pag.* 198, 199.

(83) Paſquier, Recherches, *book vii, ch. xi, p. m.* 646.

(84) Sorel, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 653, 654. He had been mentioning another fiction of Ronſard, about the birth of the four ſeaſons.

(85) *Idem*, Remarks upon the 14th book, *pag.* 733.

(86) Ibid. *pag.* 738, 739, 740.

(87) He was prior of Croixval, and St Coſmus.

(88) Baillet, Jugemens ſur les Poëtes, *num.* 1335.

(89) Anti-Baillet, *ch. cxlv.*

(90) Claudius Binet, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 143.

(91) Etiam dum animam ageret aliquot piis verſibus non pœnitendis factis, qui poſtea cum ceteris ejus operibus editi ſunt. *Thuanus, lib. lxxxiii, ſub fin.*

(92) Brantome, Mémoires des Dames illuſtres, *pag. m.* 173.

(93) Menage, Obſervat. ſur Malherbe, *pag.* 385, 386.

(94) In Ronſard's Life, *pag. m.* 169.

he left out the beſt things. This is a great fault, and ſome other writers have not been free from it. I muſt alſo take notice, that the common-place of the jeſts upon Poets for being badly lodged, was uſed againſt Ronſard [Q].

‘ *more natural, and that the file too much uſed, inſtead of clearing and poliſhing, only wears out, and ſpoils the temper.* Paſquier, in his Recherches (95), has made the ſame obſervation. *A great Poet*, ſays he, ſpeaking of Ronſard, *but a very bad judge of his own books; for about two or three years before his death, being weakned with old age, afflicted with the Gout, and troubled with melancholy, and continual ſickneſs, that poetical vein, which before kept him good company, having almoſt forſaken him, he cauſed all his Poems to be printed in one great volume, whereof he changed the general order, cut out of his book many beautiful inventions, and changed ſome verſes entirely, and in ſome he put in other words, which were not ſo ſmart as the firſt; having, by this means, totally deſtroyed, in many places, the beauty of his Poems, not conſidering that tho' he was the father, and by conſequence, looked on himſelf to have an abſolute authority over his own compoſitions; yet he ſhould have reflected, that old and melancholy age was an unfit judge of the flights of a vigorous youth.* But nothing proves this truth ſo well, as the example of Taſſo, who changed from better to worſe, his Poem of Hieruſalem.’ It is a long time ſince Taſſo was reproached with this. I have by me a book called, *Il Duello dell' ignoranza, e della ſcienza*, which was printed at Milan in 1607; and I find there, That this great Poet was blamed for leaving out ſeveral beautiful paſſages *nella Gieruſalemme conquiſtata*, and putting in their place things ridiculous. The author obſerves ſome of theſe paſſages, after which he ſpeaks thus, ‘ a' quali tutti gratiſſimi, e giocondiſſimi auvenimenti ſuſtituiſce il Taſſo coſe tali, che ſe con ſemplice intelligenza debbono prenderſi, ſono ſi frivole, che niente più, e ſe ci è dentro qualche miſtero, egli ci è involto con tante ambagi, ch' à ſottrarnelo non baſterebbe l'iſteſſo Edippo (96). - - - *To all which moſt agreeable and pleaſant paſſages, Taſſo has ſubſtituted ſuch things, as if literally underſtood, are ſo trifling, as not any thing can be more; but if they contain any myſtery, it is ſo perplexed and wrapped up in obſcurity, that Oedipus himſelf would be at a loſs to gueſs the meaning.*’ The author who furniſhes me with this paſſage, is called *Don Conſtantino de' Notari Nolano della Congregatione Caſſinenſe.* I have made ſeveral obſervations in another place (97) upon the faults one may fall into by corrections.

[Q] *The common place of the jeſts upon Poets for being badly lodged, was uſed againſt Ronſard.*] His condition in this reſpect, was worſe than to lodge in a garret, ſince it is ſaid, that he was poſted like a lanthorn on a high tower, or like centinels who watch all night, leſt any houſe ſhould be on fire. It is added, that there is ſtill a monument of that ſad lodging, ſince the tower in which he was lodged is ſtill called by his name. This is certainly what he did not expect; none deſires to become immortal by ſuch means, and any one would be very unwilling to have this thought of Horace applyed to him.

Exegi monimentum ære perennius,
Regalique ſitu Pyramidum altius (98).

- - - - *I have raiſed a monument*
More ſtrong than braſs, and of a vaſt extent;
Higher than Egypt's ſtatelieſt pyramid,
That coſtly monument of kingly pride.

CREECH.

The witneſs whom I am to produce, ſpeaks in the following manner. ‘ Ronſard, they ſay, not daring to attack Rabelais, whilſt alive, in writing, though they often quarrelled at Meudon in the houſe of the princes of the houſe of Lorrain, writ only an epitaph againſt him, in which he abuſed him very much, becauſe Rabelais looked on him only as a poor miſerable Poet, inſomuch that he thought himſelf very happy to lodge in a watch-tower, which is at this time called Ronſard's tower, at Meudon; from whence he went to the caſtle to make his court where he often met Mr Francis Rabelais, who did not ſpare him; for after all, though he was not ſo good a Poet as he; yet he was born a Poet as well as a Phyſician *; incomparably more knowing than that prince of the Poets of his time, and underſtood railing much better (99).’ The book from which theſe words are taken, was printed at Paris, in 1697. The author has not put his name to it: but in an Epiſtle Dedicatory he has made it plain enough who he was (100). He had practiſed Phyſic fifty years, and yet was poor; his ill fortune had made him ſatirical, and he employed his time only in criticiſing. This appears by his Supplement to the Hiſtory of Phyſic, in his Anti-Menagiana, and in the little book he publiſhed under the falſe name of Pepinacourt, with the title of *Reflexions, Penſées, & Bons-mots anecdotes.* He died at Paris the eighteenth of May, 1698.

(95) *Lib. vii, ch. vii, pag. m.* 623.

(96) Duello dell' ignoranza & della ſcienza, *lib. iv, cap. iii, p.* 183.

(97) See, above, remark [*F*], of the article LINACER.

(98) Horace, Ode XXX, lib. iii.

* Ex utroque Apollo.

(99) A judgment; and new obſervations on Rabelais's works, *pag.* 52, 53.

(100) He was called John Bernier, and was a native of Blois.

ROQUETAILLADE (§ *a*) (JOHN DE LA) in Latin *de Rupeſciſſa*, a Franciſcan friar, in the convent of Aurillac (*a*), of the dioceſe of St Flour, made himſelf famous in the XIVth century; as well for the liberty he took of exclaiming againſt the vices of the clergy, and the oppreſſion of the people, and diſperſing menacing predictions [*A*], as for his long impriſonment, which was the puniſhment of his boldneſs

(*a*) See the remark [*A*], at the end; and citation (26).

[(§ *a*) Rabelais, l. 1. ch. 6. mentions one *Roquetaillade*, who, I know not by what tradition was brought into the world from the heel of his mother. What does he mean by that? REM. CRIT.]

[*A*] *Of exclaiming againſt the vices of the clergy . . . and diſperſing menacing predictions.*] I am of opinion, that to comment upon theſe words, I can do nothing more to the purpoſe than to ſet down a long paſſage out of Froiſſard. ‘ There was in the city of Avignon a friar minor of great learning, and great judgment, who was called fryar John de Roquetaillade, whom the Pope cauſed to be kept priſoner in the caſtle of Baignoux, for predicting wonderful things that were to happen; and eſpecially to fall upon the prelates and preſidents of the holy church, for their great luxury and pride; and alſo upon the kingdom of France, and all the great men of Chriſtendom, for their great oppreſſions of the common people. And the ſaid fryar John would prove what he ſaid out of the Apocalypſe, and the ancient books of the holy prophets, which were diſcovered and opened to him, by the grace of the Holy Ghoſt; ſo that he ſaid many things which it was difficult to believe. Some of them came to paſs at the time fore-told by him, which he did not predict as a Prophet, but out of the Scriptures, and by the grace of the Holy Ghoſt, who had given him underſtanding to declare and explain all the ancient prophecies, to proclaim to all Chriſtians the year and the time they were to come to paſs. And he wrote on this ſubject ſeveral books, ſupported by great knowledge and learning, one of which was written in 1346, which contained many wonderful and incredible things; ſome of which have already happened (1). . . . . . In my youth, Pope Innocent then reigning at Avignon, kept this fryar in priſon. This fryar, (as he ſaid,) and as I have often heard ſay, (in ſeveral places not public but private) had put forth, and continued to put forth, many predictions of great and remarkable events that were to happen in due time, and are ſince come to paſs in the kingdom of France; as the taking of king John priſoner; and he often ſaid, and ſhewed by ſtrong reaſons, that the church was to ſuffer much, becauſe of the luxury of thoſe who had the government of it. And then when I ſaw him in priſon, I was told in the Pope's palace at Avig-

(1) Froiſſard, *vol. i. ch. ccxi, cited by* Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtery of Iniquity, *pag.* 449.

neſs [*B*]. Some people ſay that the event juſtified his predictions; but others aſſure us,

‘ non, of an example he had given to the cardinal of Oſtia, *alias* of Arras, and to the cardinal of Auxerre, who had been to ſee him, and reaſon with him about his words (2).’ This example is the Apologue, or fable, which you may ſee here below (3). ‘ Why do not you read, *continued he* (4), the Life of St Sylveſter, *&c.* how the Emperor Conſtantine gave him the tythes of the church, and upon what Conditions. He did not ride about with two or three hundred horſes, but kept himſelf cloſe in Rome, and lived ſoberly with thoſe of the church, *&c.*’ This fryar declared to them, that the change which he predicted and denoted by the Apologue, would quickly come to paſs: *Inſomuch*, adds the Hiſtorian, *that very often the cardinals were aſtoniſhed at it, and would willingly have put him to death, if they could have found, as they could not, any juſt cauſe to have coloured the action: ſo they let him live as long as he could, but durſt not let him out of priſon: for fear he ſhould lead the people into an error, by his profound predictions, drawn from his own interpretations of the Scripture. Nevertheleſs, many things, (as ſome ſay, who have better obſerved his predictions than I have) which he foretold and wrote in priſon, and which he proved by the Apocalypſe, came to paſs: the true proofs with which he armed himſelf, ſaved him often from being burnt; and beſides, there were ſome cardinals who had pity on him, and were not ſo hard upon him as they might have been.*

We will make two obſervations upon the diſtinction mentioned by Froiſſard. He ſays, that this fryar did not predict what was to come as a Prophet, but only as a perſon who had received from the Holy Ghoſt the underſtanding of the prophecies. This is only a diſpute about words: however it ſeems to me, that the privilege of this fryar equalled, or even ſurpaſſed that of the Prophets; for the Prophets did not always know what God couched under the ſignificative images of what was to come to paſs, and by conſequence, a perſon to whom God reveals the true ſenſe of thoſe prophetical ſigns, receives a more particular favour. And therefore neither ſuch a man, nor his favourers, ought, under pretence of modeſty, to make any difficulty to call this favour the gift of prophecy. If a man ſhould pretend to expound the Revelation of St John, only by the aſſiſtance of what may be gathered from a ſerious examination of the Scriptures, it were another matter; but when he perſuades himſelf that he underſtands the Apocalypſe only by the help of the Holy Ghoſt; when I ſay, he ſpeaks thus to his readers; *I can ſay, that God in the way opened my eyes in ſuch a manner, that it has given me more conſolation than I can expreſs; for after having conſulted the eternal truth a hundred and a hundred times with a profound humility, and a great attention, at laſt it was anſwered me* (5); And declares himſelf in reality, to be a perſon raiſed by God to diſcover future events: is not this to call ones ſelf effectually a Prophet, or more than a Prophet? This is my firſt obſervation: the next is this; that all authors do not agree, that John de la Roquetaillade did not pretend to the ſpirit of prophecy. Read the following words of an author who has writ the life of Innocent VI. ‘ Circa idem tempus (*that is in* 1356) inſurrexit quidam frater ordinis Minorum de conventu Aureliaci dioceſis ſancti Flori, dicens ſe habere SPIRITUM PROPHETIÆ, qui de futuris dicebat & in ſcriptis redigebat multa, vocatus Frater Johannes de Rupeſciſſa, qui quia potius vaticinator quam PROPHETA merito erat cenſendus, ad dictum Innocentium fuit adductus, &c (6). - - - - *About the ſame time there aroſe a certain friar of the order of St Francis, and convent of Aurillac in the dioceſe of St Flour, pretending to the* SPIRIT *of* PROPHECY, *who ſpoke of things to come, and committed many things to writing, called Fryar John de Roquetaillade, who, becauſe he was rather to be deemed a foreteller than a true* PROPHET, *was brought before the foreſaid Innocent*, &c.’ It is certain that this friar declared very freely in his writings, that he did not ſpeak as a Prophet. See what I ſhall quote below (7), out of a Journaliſt.

[*B*] *His long impriſonment, which was the puniſhment of his boldneſs.*] Froiſſard tells us, that the Pope kept this friar in priſon in the caſtle of Bagnols. Another writer aſſures us, that about 1356, this pretended Prophet was ſent to Pope Innocent VI, who impriſoned him, and never after gave him his liberty. ‘ Ad dictum Innocentium Papam fuit adductus per quem fuit carceribus mancipatus, in quibus permanſit per totum tempus ipſius (8). - - - - *He was brought to the ſaid Pope Innocent, by whom he was impriſoned, and ſo remained during the reſt of his life.*’ But this was not his firſt impriſonment; for in 1345, he was impriſoned in the convent of Figeac by order of Friar William Farmena, miniſter of the Franciſcans of the province of Aquitain. This is to be ſeen in the beginning of the Revelations of this Prophet. Where it is alſo to be ſeen that he reduced them into writing, at the requeſt of cardinal William Curti. It will be worth while to give you his very words. ‘ Ego frater Johannes de Rupeſciſſa ordinis fratrum Minorum Provinciæ Aquitaniæ, provinciæ Ruthenenſis, & conventus Aurelhiaci, ad mandatum veſtrum deſcripſi ſeriem notabilium eventuum futurorum mihi in carceribus apertum, prout meliùs & veriùs potero recordari. Modus revelandi, fuit iſte. Cum anno Domini milleſimo trecenteſimo quadrageſimo quinto multis diebus flerem vinctus ferro in carcere luti in conventu Figiaci ſtupens & mirans quare cum tanta crudelitate miſſus eſſem per fratrem Guillermum Farmena tunc miniſtrum Aquitaniæ in carcerem, &c (9). - - - *I Friar John de Roquetaillade, a friar minor of the province of Aquitain, in the province of Rouergue, and convent of Aurillac, by your order, have put in writing a ſeries of remarkable future events, according to the moſt exact, and beſt of my memory. The manner of Revelation was thus. When in the year* 1345, *I had for many days bewailed my fate, being bound in irons in the priſon of the convent of Figeac, aſtoniſhed, and wondring why I ſhould with ſuch cruelty be ſent thither by Friar William Farmena then miniſter in Aquitain*, &c.’ It ſeems that we may conclude from theſe words, that he was not honoured with the gift of Revelation till he was a priſoner; which may excite our curioſity to know for what reaſon he was put in irons. Some ſay, it was becauſe of his Hereſies; but the writers that were nearer his time, ſay, he was only impriſoned becauſe he foretold the near approach of Antichriſt, and advanced ſeveral things that diſpleaſed the Popes and Princes; for he maintained, that their ambition, pride, and avarice, were the cauſe of the evils he foretold. ‘ Quod autem ſunt nonnulli recentiores qui ob hæreſim in vincula conjectum dixerunt, non ita antiquiores qui nonniſi ob prophetias de Anti-chriſto proxime venturo captum volunt (10). - - - *But that there are ſome Moderns who have aſſerted, that he was caſt in priſon for Hereſy; yet more antient writers, will have it that he was apprehended for his prophecies of the near approach of Antichriſt.*’ Alciatus places him among thoſe who have ſuffered for uſing a certain method of maintaining religion. They give out prophecies, and it is the principal means by which they endeavour to fright thoſe perſons, whom by other means they cannot induce to ſerve God: ‘ Sunt & qui vaticinia ſe ſcire profiteantur, hocque potiſſimum modo, quos verbis ad cultum & pietatem inducere neſciunt, terrere conantur, quod merito Hercule in malam rem Johanni de Rupeſciſſa Symmiſtæ veſtro vertit. Cum enim ſe à Deo admonitum univerſalis Judicii affirmaret, cumque mundi finem adeſſe conclamaret, quia dictis ejus res non reſponderunt, Avinione ab Urbano quinto captus in cuſtodia manſit (11). - - - - - *Some there are who pretend to the gift of prophecy, and by this means chiefly endeavour to fright into religion and piety, thoſe whom they cannot otherwiſe perſuade; which did, deſervedly indeed, prove cauſe of great affliction to John de Roquetaillade, your colleague in the miniſtry. For affirming that he was warned by God of the approach of the general judgment, and that the end of the world was at hand, and the event not happening accordingly, he was apprehended, and detained in priſon by Pope Urban V at Avignon.*’ This friar having propheſied that the end of the world was at hand, was impriſoned by Urban V; becauſe the event did not anſwer that formidable prediction. Alciatus has committed a miſtake in Chronology: It was Innocent V, the predeceſſor of Urban V, who impriſoned Roquetaillade.

(2) Froiſſard, *vol. iii, chap. xxiv, cited by the ſame, pag.* 450.

(3) In the remark [*D*].

(4) Froiſſard, ubi ſupra.

(5) Jurieu, *Preface to the* Accompliſſement des Prophéties, *fol.* ***.

(6) Autor primæ vitæ Innocentii VI, vulgatæ à Baluzio, *p.* 332, *Tom. i*, Vitarum Paparum Avenionenſium.

(7) In the remark [*F*].

(8) Ibid.

(9) Joh. de Rupeſciſſa, init. Revelationum apud Baluzium, Not. ad Vitas Paparum Avenion. *pag.* 942.

(10) Spondanus, *ad ann.* 1356, *num.* 20, *pag. m.* 540.

(11) Andreas Alciatus, Epiſt. contra vitam Monaſticam, *p.* 65, 66.

us, that the quite contrary to what he foretold, came to paſs [*C*]. He did not properly give himſelf out for a prophet, but for one who had obtained of GOD the knowledge of the ſecrets of the Apocalypſe, and other prophecies of the Scripture. See in the remark [*A*], the paſſage out of Froiſſard. Great notice was taken of the Apologue, which he made uſe of to ſhew, that the ſame princes, who had enriched the church of Rome, would bring her back again to her ancient poverty [*D*]. He compoſed ſeveral books [*E*], of which only a part hath been printed; you will find two of them in the appendix of the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum* [*F*]. We are told (*b*) that he was a great Divine, and a good Philoſopher. I know not whether he died in priſon

[*C*] *Some ſay that the event juſtified his predictions; but others aſſure us, that the quite contrary came to paſs.*] We have obſerved already, that Froiſſard does teſtify that ſeveral things foretold by this friar, came to paſs. The author of the life of Innocent VI does not deny it; but he adds, that in ſeveral other things the predictions of this Friar proved falſe, from whence he reaſonably infers, that he was not a Prophet. ‘ Licet in dictis & ‘ ſcriptis ſuis reperta fuerint multa quæ proceſſu temporis contigerunt, propter quæ plures ſibi fidem dabant, tamen etiam multa defuerunt; & ſic apparebat quia non erat verè Propheta, quia in illis, ſi talis fuiſſet, nullus fuiſſet defectus (12). - - - - *Though many things which he ſpoke and wrote, in proceſs of time came accordingly to paſs, which cauſed many to give credit to him: yet many others did not: ſo that it was manifeſt he was not a true Prophet; otherwiſe there had been nothing deficient.*’ I do not much wonder that it was believed he had foretold ſome truths; for, firſt, thoſe who exclaim againſt public diſorders, and affirm that God will ſpeedily revenge the oppreſſed people, and chaſtiſe the pride, avarice, and luxury of the great ones, are favourably heard by the multitude, who interpret every thing to the honour of the Prophet, it ſuiting well with their genius; nay, they force themſelves to believe what is foretold, and gloſs on it according to what they earneſtly deſire. In the ſecond place, the world has been always ſo ſubject to great calamities, to wars civil and foreign, to peſtilence, famine, &c. that at any time, whoever ſhall foretel fatal events, and dreadful chaſtiſements of the Divine wrath, may be ſure to hit upon truth. But to ſilence at once all the favourers of this friar, we need only make one obſervation, which is, that the principal points of his prophecy proved falſe. He foretold the total deſolation of the clergy; the coming of an Angel, who in quality of the vicar of Jeſus Chriſt, would reform all things, and convert all the Infidels; a peace that ſhould continue upon earth about a thouſand years (13). He ſaid that all thoſe things would quickly come to paſs, which has proved doubly falſe; for nothing like it came to paſs either in the age in which he lived, nor in the ſucceeding ages to this hour (14). I ſhall ſet down what we find in a pretty good chronicle. ‘ Johannes de Rupeſciſſa Minorum ordinis inſignis Theologus tempeſtate hac præter ea, quæ in ‘ ſententiarum libros accurate docteque ſcripſerat, in ‘ carcerem truſus multa de futuris tanquam Propheta ‘ ſcribere præſumpſit, videlicet de duobus Antichriſtis, ‘ & de eccleſiæ conciliatione & de converſione omnium gentium ad fidem Chriſti; & alia multa, quæ ‘ in januis adeſſe affirmabat. Et hæc à domino Jeſu ‘ Chriſto ſibi revelata fuiſſe conteſtabatur, quæ non ‘ modo non evenere, ſed oppoſitum in omnibus fuiſſe ‘ conſtat. Hujuſmodi autem pronoſticatores multi ab ‘ initio decepti fuere. Quibus ſatius fuiſſet ſilere, ‘ quam talia temere loqui (15). - - - - *John de Roquetaillade a friar minor, and notable Divine at this ‘ time, beſides what he wrote on the book of the Sentences ‘ with great accuracy and learning, being caſt in priſon, ‘ preſumed to write as a Prophet many things that were ‘ to come; namely of two Antichriſts, of the union of the ‘ church, and the converſion of all nations to the faith ‘ of Chriſt; and many other things which he ſaid were ‘ ready to happen. And theſe things he ſaid had been revealed to him by Jeſus Chriſt, which not only failed in ‘ the event, but the direct contrary in every point happened: many ſuch foretellers have been deceived from ‘ the beginning. For whom it had been better to be ſilent, than raſhly to utter ſuch things.*’

[*D*] *The Apologue which he made uſe of to ſhew that the ſame princes, who had enriched the church of Rome, would bring her back again to her antient poverty.*] He ſpoke it when the Cardinal of Arras, and Cardinal d'Auxerre went to ſee him in priſon, to cenſure him. Mr du Pleſſis Mornai draws from hence a proof of the oppoſitions that were made to Antichriſt: let us ſee how he abridges the long recital of Froiſſard: ‘ The ſum is, that the church was to be like a beautiful bird, which ſhould be hatched without feathers, ‘ and not being able to fly, ſhould be in danger of ‘ ſtarving; that other birds had pity on her, and covered her with their feathers; kings and princes ‘ enriched her with lands, and honoured her above ‘ meaſure: upon this ſhe grew proud, and ſeeing ‘ herſelf grown up, ſhe thought that ſhe had no more ‘ need of them, but began to pick at them with her ‘ beak, and ſcratched them with her claws, and to quarrel with emperors and princes: that the birds thereupon, reſolved to retake their feathers, and ſo ‘ princes would reaſſume their gifts and demeſnes, and ‘ compel her to cry mercy: the emperor, and other ‘ Chriſtian princes would ſtrip her of all, if ſhe grew ‘ proud again (16).’ Mr du Pleſſis adds, That *this Apologue of the bird has manifeſtly it's foundation in the Apocalypſe*, cap. xvii, where it is ſaid *; That kings ſhall give their power and authority to the beaſt, or whore; *but afterwards they* ſhall hate her, and ſhall make her deſolate, and ſhall eat her fleſh, and burn her with fire. Wolfius has inſerted in his firſt tome all theſe paſſages of Froiſſard, and has added a figure of the bird of the Apologue (17). It is to be obſerved, that Roquetaillade declared that this impoveriſhment of the church was near at hand; but he was deceived. See Coëffeteau in his anſwer to the book of Mr du Pleſſis (18). The ſame thing is ſtill propheſied about the end of the XVIIth century.

[*E*] *He compoſed ſeveral books.*] Beſides his prophecies, there is a book of his *de Conſideratione quintæ eſſentiæ*; another, *de familiatu Philoſophiæ*; another called *Vade Mecum in Tribulatione*; and a commentary, *ſuper prophetiam Cyrilli eremitæ Preſbyteri*. Baluzius (19) ſpeaks of this laſt book, as if it were a manuſcript in the king's library; and ſays the others are to be found in manuſcript in Mr Colbert's library (20). Obſerve that the book *de Conſideratione quintæ eſſentiæ rerum omnium*, was printed at Baſil in 1561 (21). It is ſaid ſo in the abridgment of Geſner (22), and it is affirmed there by a miſtake of an hundred years, that this author lived about the year 1240. I have quoted, in another place (23) Naudæus, who has made mention of this book of *Joannes de Rupeſciſſa*. There goes about, under the name of this apocalyptical friar, a book *de Confectione veri lapidis Philoſophorum*, printed at Baſil in 1561.

[*F*] *You will find two of them in the appendix of the* Faſciculus rerum expetendarum & fugiendarum.] This is a book that was printed at London in 1690. The author of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* ſpoke much of it in his nineteenth volume (24). Here is what he ſays of our Roquetaillade: ‘ (25) They have inſerted here two works of this friar; one of which ‘ is called, *A Copy of the prophecy of brother John de ‘ la Roquetaillade, of the order of the Friars Minors, of ‘ the province of Guienne, Warden of Rhodes, and Advocate of Orleans* (26), *priſoner at Avignon, the eighth ‘ year of the Pontificate of Clement VI, in the priſon called ‘ Soldan, in the month of November, in the year of our ‘ Lord* MCCCXLIX..... (27) The other work of ‘ this friar is his *Vade Mecum in tribulatione*. In this ‘ book which he calls *Librunculus*, he declares, that ‘ he is not a Prophet, as thoſe who have received ‘ revelations immediately from God, and who ſay, ‘ when they denounce them, *Thus ſaith the Lord*; ‘ but that God had given him the talent of ſeeing by ‘ the Scripture things to come (28). He points at ſome

(*b*) Trithemius, de Script. Eccleſ.

(12) Autor primæ vitæ Innocentii VI, ubi ſupra.

(13) Spondanus, ubi ſupra.

(14) I write this April 1701.

(15) Jacobus Philippus Bergomas, *ad ann.* 1375.

(16) Du Pleſſis Mornai, Myſtery of Iniquity, *pag.* 450.

* Rev. xvii. 13, 16.

(17) Joh. Wolfius, Lectionum Memorabilium & Reconditarum, *Centenar. XIV, p. m.* 623, *& ſeq. Tom. i.*

(18) Coëffeteau, Reſponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité, *pag.* 1076.

(19) Baluzius, Not. ad Vitas Paparum Avenion. *p.* 1434.

(20) Ibid. *pag.* 942.

(21) The Oxford catalogue takes notice of the Baſil edition 1597.

(22) Epit. Bibl. Geſneri, *pag. m.* 492.

(23) In the remark [*E*], of the article ALBERTUS MAGNUS.

(24) From pag. 331, to pag. 363.

(25) Bibl. Univerſ. *Tom. xix, pag.* 348.

(26) The Latin, *pag.* 492, *Append. Faſcic.* has it *Cuſtodis Ruthenenſis ac Cauſidici Aureliaci.* This laſt word ſignifies of Aurillac, and not of Orleans. Cauſidicus ſignifies ſome employ equivalent to the Don Procurator among the Benedictins, or Carthuſians; but I do not know how the Mendicant Friars call him. I think it is not advocate.

(27) Bibl. Univerſ. *Tom. xix, pag.* 349.

(28) *The ſecond continuator of William de Nangis*, apud Dacher. Spicil. *Tom. xi, pag.* 822, *ſays that this Friar being aſked about future things by the Archbiſhop of Toulouſe, ann.* 1356, *anſwered*, Ego ſicut unus vilis & abhominabilis peccator ea quæ dico, non dico de capite meo, nec ſum propheta, ſed tantum per intelligentias Prophetarum. - - - - *I, as a vile and abominable ſinner, ſpeak not of my own head what I ſay, nor am I a Prophet, but only by underſtanding the Prophets.* He anſwered ſeveral things, whereof moſt did not come to paſs. See Mr Brown's prologue in the appendix of the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum.*

priſon or not; but I believe that thoſe who ſay he was burnt, are miſtaken [*G*]. James Fodera ſays he was buried at Villefranche, in the dioceſe of Lyons, in a convent of his own order (*c*). Raynaldus, who endeavoured to take advantage of a prophecy of this friar, has been ſolidly refuted by Baluzius [*H*].

(*c*) Jacob Fodera, in Hiſt. Provinciæ Sancti Bonaventuræ, *pag.* 318, 322, apud Baluzium, Not. ad Vitas Paparum Avenionenſium, *pag.* 943.

'ſome of his books, wherein he ſays, he had exactly determined ſome events, and it appears that he compoſed this in MCCCLVI. Afterwards he propoſes twenty explications of the Apocalyſe, which he calls *Intentiones*. In the firſt, he foretels that the Pope ſhall one day ſubdue all the world, which ſhall look upon him as their paſtor: a prediction which is very contrary to that of our Proteſtant interpreters of the Apocalypſe, who are not more happy in their predictions than Friar John de la Roquetaillade; and ſome of them, perhaps, are more blameable, in that they would engage princes to make war without end, that their conjectures may take effect. Our friar, at leaſt, *non erat intentionis faciendi guerras*, - - - - *had no intention to make war*, and would uſe only ſpiritual arms; whereas ſome of our Roquetaillades of theſe days would oblige by force *erroneous conſciences* to make profeſſion of their opinions, without believing them.'

[*G*] *I believe thoſe that ſay he was burnt are miſtaken.*] 'Some ſay that at laſt he was burnt (29).' Theſe are the words of Mr du Pleſſis, who puts in the margin, 'Pretus Premonſtratenſis in Chronico quod inſcribitur Biblia pauperum. - - - - *Petrus Premonſtratenſis, in his Chronicle, which is called the Bible of the Poor.*' Baluzius rejects this, and ſays (30), he knows not from whence Cæſar Noſtradamus (31) had it, That this friar was burnt publickly at Avignon, in 1362, by the Pope's order. What Froiſſard has writ is a ſolid refutation of this lie, tho' we had not the teſtimony of thoſe who ſay (32) that Rupeſciſſa was buried at Villefranche in a convent, where he had made his profeſſion of the rule of St Francis.

(29) Du Pleſſis, ubi ſupra.

(30) Baluzius, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 942.

(31) Cæſar Noſtradamus, in Hiſtoria Provinciæ, *pag.* 411.

(32) Jacobus Fodera, apud Baluzium, ibid.

[*H*] *Raynaldus, who endeavoured to take advantage of a prophecy of this friar, has been ſolidly refuted by Baluſius.*] He applied it to the election of Urban VI. 'Odoricus Raynaldus, an. 1379, n. 12, refert inſigne, ut ille vocat, vaticinium viri religioſi Joannis è Rupeſciſſa inventum inter monumenta Avenionenſia, ex quo multum adjuvari putat cauſam Urbani (33). *Odoricus Raynaldus*, an. 1379, n. 12, *mentions a remarkable prophecy, as he calls it, of the Friar John de Rupeſciſſa, found, amongſt other writings, at Avignon, whereby he thinks the cauſe of Urban was much promoted.*' The prophecy is (34), that the ſee of Rome ſhall be vacant eighteen months, and that in the time of the conclave there ſhall be ſo great a battle between the people, and the tyrants of Italy, and ſo great an effuſion of blood, that it will be thought the end of the world is come. Now by the juſt judgment of God, an Anti-Pope ſhall be choſen, according to the ſuggeſtions of an impoſtor, who ſhall have two tongues, *ad ſuggeſtionem unius bilinguis falſarii*. This impoſtor, according to Raynaldus, was no other than the cardinal of Amiens. But Mr Baluzius ſhews us two things (35); the firſt, that the prophecy does not relate to the time when Urban VI was choſen Pope; the ſecond is, that if it concerned that time, it would be more contrary to Urban VI than to the pretended Anti-Pope Clement VII. He ſhews by the commentary of Roquetaillade upon the prophecy of Cyril, that the vacancy of the Papal chair, during a year and a half, has relation to the time that Anti-Chriſt ſhall appear. Now here is the character of that time. The king of France, and the king of England, ſhall then fight againſt the infidels in the eaſt. This does in no manner agree with the time of the ſchiſm of Urban VI and Clement VII. Obſerve that this friar acknowledges that the Anti-Pope ſhall be elected to the diſhonour of JESUS CHRIST, and of the true Pontif (36), and that Anti-Chriſt ſhall ſupport the cauſe of the Anti-Pope. *Illud ſcandalum erit majus quia Antichriſtus partem Antipapæ ſuſtinebit* (37). From this it is manifeſt, that he did not hold the Pope to be Anti-Chriſt.

(33) Baluz. ibid. p. 1160, 1161.

(34) *See* Baluz; ibid.

(35) Ibid. *pag.* 1459.

(36) In contumeliam Chriſti & veri Pontificis. *Joh. de Rupeſciſſa, apud Baluz. pag.* 1161.

(37) Idem, apud eundem, *pag.* 1459.

RORARIUS (HIERÔME),

Nuncio of Clement VII at the court of Ferdinand king of Hungary (*a*), has compoſed a book which is worth the reading. He undertakes to ſhow, not only that brute beaſts have reaſon, but that they make better uſe of it than man. The occaſion which moved him to write that book is curious, and very ſingular. He happened to be in a company, where a learned man affirmed that Charles V did not equal the Otho's, nor Frederic Barbaroſſa. There needed no more to make Rorarius conclude that beaſts are more reaſonable than men, and he ſet himſelf immediately about the compoſing a treatiſe upon this ſubject [*A*]. It was at the time that

(*a*) Rorarius, quod animalia bruta ratione utantur melius homine, *lib. i, pag.* 57, *Edit. Anſtelod.* 1654.

[*A*] *He ſet himſelf immediately about the compoſing a treatiſe of this ſubject.*] There are two Epiſtles Dedicatory in the beginning of this book; one to the biſhop of Arras, dated March 1, 1547; the other to Cardinal Chriſtopher Madrucio, biſhop of Trent. This piece remained almoſt a hundred years in the dark receſſes of libraries. At laſt Naudæus had it printed in France, and dedicated it to Meſſieurs du Puy. His Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Paris, April 9, 1645. That book was reprinted in Holland more than once (1). I do not know for what reaſon it is placed among the books of Phyſic, in *Lindenius Renovatus*. I am ſure I ſhall be accuſed of producing ſometimes proofs without neceſſity; but the readers would be in the wrong to ſay ſo, as to what I have advanced, touching the motive of Rorarius's writing that book. If I did not quote his own words, I ſhould give occaſion to think, that I had framed the idea of a chimerical writer to divert my reader: for what can be imagined more comical and extravagant. than a man who takes pen in hand to place mankind below beaſts, for no other reaſon, but becauſe a learned man takes it ill that Charles V ſhould aſpire to the univerſal monarchy, without having the qualities of Otho the Great, or of Frederic Barbaroſſa? It is therefore very neceſſary that I ſhould prove what I have ſaid above. 'Eram, illuſtriſſime Princeps, *(they are Rorarius's words)* paucis ante diebus, ubi de Cæſare ſermo habebatur; & fuit doctiſſimus alioqui vir, qui diceret, neſcire quo odore olens Chriſtianum orbem ditionis ſuæ facere niteretur. Haberet in ſe ſaltem quo cum Othonibus, aut Federico Ænobarbo conferri poſſet. Movit (fateor) mihi ſtomachum, dignum immortalitate Principem illis poſtponi: qui licet inſignes fuerint, ſi tamen in unum omnes congerantur, hujus magnitudini non ſufficiant. Itaque in mentem mihi venit animalia bruta ſæpe ratione uti meliùs homine, idque duobus libellis oſtendi (2). - - - *I was, moſt illuſtrious prince, a few days ago, in a company, where they were talking of the emperor; amongſt whom there was a perſon, otherwiſe of great learning, who ſaid, he knew not upon what ground he ſhould attempt to bring the Chriſtian world under his own dominion. That he ought to have in himſelf at leaſt what might qualify him to be compared to the Otho's, or to Federic Ænobarbus. I muſt confeſs it moved my indignation, that a prince, worthy of immortal fame, ſhould be poſtponed to them, who, tho' perſons of eminence, if both their qualities were united in one, would come ſhort of his greatneſs. Wherefore it came into my mind, that the brutes did often uſe their reaſon better than man.*' He did not content himſelf with one ſingle declaration: He had already obſerved this in another Epiſtle Dedicatory.

(1) I make uſe of the Amſterdam edition of 1654, in 12mo.

(2) Rorarius, Epiſt. Dedicat. ad Madrutium Cardinalem.

that Charles V made war againſt the league of Smalcalde. This book is not ill wrote, and it contains a great many ſingular facts concerning the ingenuity of beaſts, and the malice of man. Thoſe which concern the capacity of beaſts, put under great difficulties both the followers of Mr Des Cartes and thoſe of Ariſtotle [*B*]. The firſt deny that beaſts have any ſoul; the latter maintain that they are endowed with ſenſe, with memory, and with paſſions, but not at all with reaſon. It is pity that the opinion of Des Cartes ſhould be ſo hard to maintain, and ſo improbable; for it is otherwiſe very advantageous to religion [*C*], and this is the only reaſon which hinders ſome people from quitting

‘Scripſeram libellos duos, in quibus oſtenderam animalia bruta ſæpè ratione uti meliùs homine; idque feceram, ut quorundam impudentiam, anne potiùs dementiam retunderem; qui maximi omnium Imperatorum Caroli Quinti ſplendorem intueri non valent (3). - - - *I had written two ſmall pieces, in which I had ſhewn that beaſts oftentimes reaſon better than man; which I did to repreſs the impudence, or rather madneſs of ſome, who were not able to fix their eyes upon the glory of Charles V, the greateſt of all emperors.*’ Read the reſt of this epiſtle, you will find there a man very partial to Charles V, and a great flatterer. There were, and ſtill are, many more like him in the world.

[*B*] *Thoſe facts which concern the capacity of beaſts, put under great difficulties both the followers of Des Cartes, and . . . . of Ariſtotle.*] This needs no proof, with reſpect to the Carteſians; there is no body but knows that it is difficult to explain, how mere machines can do what animals do. Let us only prove, that the Peripatetics will find it very hard to give good reaſon for what they aſſert. Every Peripatetic, when he hears it affirmed, that beaſts are only *automata*, or machines, preſently objects, that a dog that hath been beaten for falling foul upon a diſh of meat, touches it no more when he ſees his maſter threatning him with a ſtick. But to ſhew that this phænomenon cannot be explained by him that propoſes it; it is enough to ſay, that if the action of this dog is attended with knowledge, the dog muſt neceſſarily reaſon: he muſt compare the time preſent with that which is paſt, and from thence draw a concluſion: he muſt needs remember both the blows that were given him, and why he has received them: he muſt needs know, that if he ſhould fall foul upon the diſh of meat, which affects his ſenſes, he ſhould do the ſame action for which he was beaten; and conclude, that to avoid a new beating, he muſt abſtain from that meat. Is not this true reaſoning? Can you explain this act by the ſimple ſuppoſition of a ſoul that has ſenſe, without reflecting upon it's acts; without remembrance; without comparing two ideas; without drawing any concluſion? Examine well the examples which are collected (4), and which are objected to the Carteſians; you will find they prove too much, for they prove that beaſts compare the end with the means, and that on ſome occaſions they prefer what is honeſt before what is profitable: in ſhort, that they are guided by the rules of equity and gratitude. Rorarius ſays there have been horſes that have refuſed to leap their mothers; or if having done it unwittingly, being deceived by the artifice of their groom, after knowing what they had done, have thrown themſelves down a precipice. ‘Teſtantur literarum monumenta, fuiſſe gregis cuſtodem, qui equum ut matrem iniret, nunquam inducere potuerit; & quoniam ambo eximia ſpecie erant, fraude tamen illuſiſſe, velatis oculis, ne matrem videret: detracto poſtmodum operimento, & agnito cum matre concubitu, petiiſſe præærupta, & ſe patratri ſceleris reum peſſundediſſe. Maris hæc virtus; alibi fœminæ; ſiquidem in Reatino agro equa lacerato priùs auriga, qui flagitii auctor fuerat, eundem exitum habuit (5). - - - - *We find it upon record, that there was an herdſman, who could never make one of his horſes to cover his dam; and as both were very beautiful in their kind, yet he was obliged to veil his eyes, that he might not ſee her, whereby he deceived him; and having after removed the cover, whereby the horſe perceived what he had done, he went in ſearch of a precipice, and conſcious of the crime he had committed, threw himſelf headlong. This was the virtue of a male, the like has been ſeen of a female; for in the territory of Reaty, a mare, after ſhe had torn to pieces the charioteer, who was the cauſe of the crime, ſhe made the like exit.*’ What he ſays, and what other authors relate; how eagerly ſome dogs have laboured to aſſiſt their maſter, and to revenge his death, &c. are things abſolutely inexplicable according to the hypotheſis of the Ariſtotelians; ſo that all their diſpute againſt the diſciples of Des Cartes, is labour in vain. There is no need of any thing, but of the dextrous management which Pereira made uſe of. You grant, ſaid he, to his adverſaries (6), that animals do many things which much reſembles what the rational ſoul does, and yet that their ſoul is not rational. Why then did you forbid me to maintain that they do ſeveral things, which much reſemble what a ſenſitive ſoul does, tho' their ſoul be not ſenſitive? I do not wonder in the leaſt, that neither Des Cartes, nor any of his diſciples ever made uſe of a paſſage in the Code of Juſtinian, where it is ſaid that beaſts are incapable of doing any injury, becauſe they want ſenſe (7); it is clear that the word *ſenſus* in that law is taken for deſign and underſtanding.

[*C*] *The opinion of Mr Des Cartes . . . . is very advantageous to the true religion.*] What induces the Carteſians to ſay that beaſts are *automata*, is, that according to them, all matter is incapable of thinking. They do not content themſelves to ſay, that only ſpiritual ſubſtances are capable of reaſonings, and to join a long train of conſequences, but they maintain that every thought, whether you call it reflexion, meditation, inferring from principles, or whether it be called ſenſation, imagination, inſtinct, is of ſuch a nature, that the moſt ſubtile and perfect matter is incapable of it, and that it is only to be found in incorporeal ſubſtances. By this principle there is no man but may be convinced of the immortality of his own ſoul: every one knows that he thinks, and conſequently, if he reaſons after the Carteſian manner, he muſt own that what in him is the ſubject of his thoughts is diſtinct from his body: from whence it follows, that in this reſpect he is immortal; for the mortality of creatures conſiſts only in this, that they are compoſed of ſeveral parts of matter, which are ſeparated one from another. This is a great advantage to religion; but it will be almoſt impoſſible to preſerve it by Philoſophical reaſons, if it be granted that beaſts have a material ſoul which periſhes with the body; a ſoul, I ſay, whoſe ſenſations and deſires are the cauſe of the actions which we ſee them do. See the remark [*F*]. The Theological advantages of Des Cartes's opinion concerning beaſts being mere *automata*, do not ſtop there. They diffuſe themſelves over many important principles, which cannot be ſufficiently maintained, if beaſts are allowed to have a ſenſitive ſoul. If St Auguſtin maintained theſe principles, tho' he granted this ſort of ſoul in beaſts; and if he did not find himſelf much perplexed about the connexion of theſe two things; he was more fortunate than wiſe. *From the principles which he has carefully examined, and ſolidly eſtabliſhed, it manifeſtly follows*, that beaſts have no ſoul, *as Ambroſius Victor* (8) *ſhews in his ſixth volume of Chriſtian Philoſophy* (9). The author, who furniſhes me with theſe words, ſuppoſeth, *That this holy doctor knowing too well how to diſtinguiſh the ſoul from the body, to think that there were corporeal ſouls*, admitted a ſpiritual ſoul in beaſts (10). Now here is a ſpecimen he gives us of the principles of St Auguſtin, which are incompatible with this ſoul of beaſts: *Some of thoſe principles of St Auguſtin are, that a creature which hath not ſinned, can never ſuffer any evil; now, according to him, pain is the greateſt of evils, and beaſts ſuffer pain. That the more noble thing cannot have for it's end the leſs noble; but, according to him, the ſoul of beaſts is ſpiritual, and more noble than the body, and yet they have no other end than the body. That what is ſpiritual is immortal, and the ſoul of beaſts, tho' ſpiritual, is ſubject to death. There are many other ſuch like principles in the works of St Auguſtin, from whence it may be concluded that beaſts have* no

---

(3) Idem, Epiſt. Dedicat. ad Epiſcopum Atrebatenſem.

(4) See in Lipſius, *Epiſt. L, Centur. I, Miſcellan.* ſeveral ſurprizing actions of elephants. This letter is a commentary by way of examples, upon the words of Pliny, which I will quote in the remark [*D*]. See concerning horſes, the ſame Lipſius, *Cent. III, ad Belgas, Epiſt. LVI*, and concerning dogs, *Cent. I, ad Belg. Epiſt. XLIV*.

(5) Rorarius, *lib. ii, pag.* 72.

(6) See the article PEREIRA, citation (55).

(7) Nec enim poteſt animal injuria feciſſe quod ſenſu caret. - - - *Nor can a ſoul that hath no ſenſe be capable of any crime.* See Grotius, Flor. Sparſ. ad Jus Juſtinianeum, *pag.* 124, *Edit. Amſtel.* 1643, *in* 12*mo*.

(8) This is a falſe name aſſumed by a Father of the Oratory.

(9) Mallebranche, Eclairciſſemens ſur le vi livre de la Recherche de la Verité, *p. m.* 380, 381.

(10) *It is certain, that St Auguſtin, whatever F. Mallebranche may ſay, believed the ſouls of beaſts to be ſenſitive and corporeal.* Vita brutorum, *ſays he, cap. iv, of the knowledge of true life*, eſt ſpiritus vitalis conſtans de aëre & ſanguine animalis, ſed ſenſibilis, memoriam habens, intellectu carens, cum carne, moriens, in aëre evaneſcens. - - - *The ſoul of beaſts is a vital ſpirit, conſiſting of air and the blood of the animal, but ſenſible, having memory, without underſtanding, dying with the body, vaniſhing into air.* See alſo chap. xxiii, *de Spiritu & Anima*.

quitting it. It is not liable to the moſt dangerous conſequences of the common opinion. It is a long time ſince it has been maintained that the ſouls of beaſts are rational [D]. The

no ſuch ſpiritual ſoul as he admits in them (11). I am not fully perſuaded that St Auguſtin believed that the ſoul of beaſts is an incoporeal ſubſtance, but be that as it will, the ſecond principle which is given us here for an example, is incompatible with the opinion of this great doctor; for that which knows, is more noble than that which does not know: but St Auguſtin allowed ſenſe at leaſt to the ſoul of beaſts; therefore he believed it more noble than the body; therefore he maintained on the one ſide, that the more noble thing cannot have for it's end the leſs noble; and on the other ſide, that the ſoul of beaſts, being more noble than their body, had no other end than their body. This, you will ſay, is of ſmall importance to religion. But you are miſtaken, ſome will anſwer; for all the proofs of original ſin, drawn from ſickneſſes and death, which children are ſubject to, fall to the ground, if you ſuppoſe that beaſts have ſenſation, they are ſubject to pain and death, and yet they never ſinned. And therefore you argue wrong, when you ſay, *little children ſuffer, and die, therefore they are guilty*; for you ſuppoſe a falſe principle, which is contradicted by the condition of beaſts, *viz. That a creature, which never ſinned, can never ſuffer*. This is nevertheleſs a moſt evident principle, which flows neceſſarily from the ideas we have of the juſtice and goodneſs of GOD. It is agreeable to immutable order, that order from which we clearly apprehend that GOD never departs. The ſouls of beaſts confound this order, and overthrow thoſe diſtinct ideas: it muſt therefore be granted, that the *automata* of Des Cartes very much favour the principles by which we judge of the infinite Being, and by which we maintain Orthodoxy. Read what follows.

'Religion was drawn into the cauſe (12), the Anti-Carteſians hoping thereby to ruin the machines of Des Cartes; but it is impoſſible to expreſs the advantage, which accrued from thence to his diſciples. For they believe that they have demonſtrated, That by allowing beaſts to have a ſoul capable of knowledge, all the natural proofs of the immortality of the ſoul are deſtroyed. They have ſhewed, That their opinion had not more obſtinate enemies than the impious, and the Epicureans; and that a greater ſpite cannot be done to thoſe bad Philoſophers, than by depriving them of all the falſe reaſons, which they borrow from the ſouls of beaſts, to draw this concluſion, that there is only more or leſs difference between them and us. It is certain, That there are none who affect more than thoſe people, to make beaſts come near men in perfection. Thus the ſectators of Des Cartes, have by this means intereſſed religion in their cauſe: but they are not contented with this reaſon. They went as far as the nature of GOD, to find out invincible arguments againſt the knowledge of beaſts; and it may be ſaid, they have found very good ones. The author of the *Recherche de la Verité* [*Search after Truth*] has given us the plan of it in ſome places of his works. Father Poiſſon of the Oratory has profoundly treated the argument, which is grounded upon this principle of St Auguſtin, *That GOD being juſt, miſery is a neceſſary proof of ſin*; from whence it follows, That beaſts not having ſinned are not ſubject to miſery: but they would be ſubjected to it, if they were endowed with ſenſe; therefore they have none (13).' You will find after theſe words the extract of a book (14), which ſhews, That if beaſts have a knowing ſoul, *it follows*, 1. *That GOD does not love himſelf*; 2. *That he is not conſtant*; 3. *That he is cruel and unjuſt* (15). He would not love himſelf; for he would have created *ſouls capable of knowledge and love, without obliging them to know and love him*. He would have created them to be in a ſtate of ſin, and by conſequence he would have diſcharged them from the law of order, which is the ſupreme and indiſpenſible law. The ſtate of ſin is to fix upon creatures, as the ultimate end: this is what the ſouls of beaſts do, according to the common opinion. According to the ſame opinion theſe ſouls are annihilated, when beaſts die: where is then the conſtancy of GOD? He creates ſouls, and ſoon annihilates them. He does not deal ſo with matter: he never deſtroys it. He therefore preſerves the leſs perfect ſubſtances, and deſtroys the more perfect. Is this the part of a wiſe agent? The ſouls of beaſts never ſinned, and yet they are ſubject to pain and miſery, and rendred obnoxious to all the irregular deſires of creatures, which have ſinned. How do we treat beaſts? We make them tear one another in pieces for our diverſion; we kill them for our nouriſhment, and ranſack their bowels during their lives, to ſatisfy our curioſity; and all this we do by virtue of the dominion that GOD has given us over them. What a diſorder is it, that an innocent creature ſhould be ſubject to the caprices of a criminal one? There is no Caſuiſt that believes that there is any ſin in baiting of bulls, *&c.* or in making uſe of innumerable deceits and violences, by hunting or fiſhing, to deſtroy animals, or in killing of flies, as Domitian did. Is it not cruelty and injuſtice to ſubject an innocent ſoul to ſo many miſeries? The opinion of Des Cartes frees us from all theſe difficulties. I will give a liſt of ſome pieces, which have been publiſhed in favour of this opinion.

A preface of Mr Schuyl: it is at the beginning of the Latin tranſlation of Des Cartes's treatiſe *de Homine*. A treatiſe of Antony le Grand (16), *De carentia ſenſus & cognitionis in brutis*. A letter of Mr de Cordemoi, *to a learned Jeſuit*, printed in 1668 (17). A treatiſe of the ſouls of beaſts, printed in the year 1676, at Lyons, writ by Dilly, a Prieſt of Ambrun. Philoſophical Dialogues by Mr Rohault. The Notes of Father Poiſſon, upon the method of Des Cartes. The *Brutum Carteſianum* of Arnoldus Geulinex. This is a poſthumous work, which was publiſhed in 1688, by Mr Langenhert, a good Carteſian, but not in what concerns the ſouls of beaſts (18); tho' he has put in a Geometrical form the reaſons which prove that beaſts have no ſenſe. Several diſciples of Des Cartes do the ſame, deſerting him as to his doctrine of *Automata*. Mr Craanen, Profeſſor of Philoſophy, and afterwards of Phyſic at Leyden, has been a great ſtickler for this Philoſopher, even to ſuffer for him; and, what perhaps is more wonderful, he would not forſake his doctrine about the *Glandula Pinealis*: but he laughed at thoſe, who hold that beaſts have no ſenſe. Mr Regis, one of the moſt famous Carteſians in theſe times, went not ſo far: he was contented to ſay, That *whatever inclination he might have to give to beaſts a ſoul diſtinct from the body, he had rather ſuſpend his judgment in that reſpect* (19). The book of Father Pardies, concerning the knowledge of beaſts, may be reckoned among thoſe that have been publiſhed to maintain Des Cartes's opinion; for the reaſons of the Carteſians are propoſed in it, with their utmoſt ſtrength, and very weakly refuted. I believe nevertheleſs that he was not negligent in the ſecond part of his work, and that he did all that was poſſible to maintain the antient opinion: but having alſo done all that he could do to repreſent faithfully, and in their beſt colours, the reaſons of the new; he has made ſome ſuſpect, that he had no real deſign to confute Des Cartes. Here is the judgment of one of his order: *There is nothing more apt to deceive than the expoſitions made by Father Pardies, in his book called,* De la connoiſſance des beſtes, - - - - *(of the knowledge of brutes) wherein giving the Carteſian arguments all the force they can have on that point, he goes almoſt ſo far as to convince his readers, not only that there is no need of a ſoul to walk, drink, eat, complain, but alſo to ſpeak, and to ſpeak as long as a preacher in a ſermon of an hour, or a lawyer in a long plea. This book has made the author, to paſs among the Peripatetics, for a prevaricator, who at the bottom was a Carteſian, notwithſtanding the pains he has taken in the ſecond part of his book, to refute Carteſianiſm, and to defend the antient Philoſophy, as to the ſouls of beaſts* (20).

[D] *It is a long time ſince it has been maintained, that the ſouls of beaſts are rational.*] All that I had to ſay upon this, might have been put in the remarks of the article PEREIRA; but I had a mind to avoid prolixity in that place. We may reckon Strato and Æneſidemus among thoſe, who have maintained that the ſouls of beaſts are rational; for they taught that ſenſe could not ſubſiſt without underſtanding. '(21) Idem eſſe αἴσθησιν, καὶ διανοίαν *, ſenſum & cogitationem, opinio fuit tum Stratonis Phyſici, qui Theophraſti auditor † fuit; tum Æneſidemi, qui ‡

---

(11) Mallebranche, ibid. *in the margin*.

(12) Viz. the diſpute againſt Des Cartes, concerning the ſouls of beaſts.

(13) Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres, *March* 1684, *pag.* 26, 27.

(14) *Intituled*, La Bête transformée en machine. *The author's name is* Darmanſon.

(15) Nouv. de la Rep. des Lettres, *March* 1684, *pag.* 28.

(16) See concerning this author the book *de Scriptis Adeſpotis*, of Deckherrus, *p.* 321, 387, *Edit.* 1686. In one of the letters of Mr Arnauld to Father Mallebranche, we find that le Grand is a Franciſcan Friar.

(17) This letter was anonymous; but *Baillet*, *Vie de Des Cartes*, *Tom. ii*, *p.* 544, ſays that Mr Cordemoi is the author of it.

(18) See the Journal of Leipſic, *Nov.* 1688, *pag.* 624.

(19) Pierre Sylvain Regis, Syſtême de Philoſophie, *liv. vii*, *Part ii*, *Tom. v*, *pag.* 126, *edition of Lyons* 1691, *in 12mo.*

(20) Suite du Voiage du Monde de Des Cartes, *pag.* 9, 10, *Edit. of Amſter.* 1696.

(21) Voſſius, de origine & progreſſu Idololatriæ, *lib. iii*, *cap. xli*, *init. p. m.* 938, 939.

* Senſus & cogitatio mentis.

† Laërt. lib. v, ſive in Stratone.

‡ Laërt. in Pyrrho.

The Philoſophers of the ſchools are very much miſtaken, if, by rejecting that, they perſuade

in Pyrrhonia introductionem conſcripſit. De utroque teſtis nobis Sextus Empiricus adverſus Mathematicos ‡. - - - *That ſenſation and thinking are the ſame, was the opinion of Strato the Natural Philoſopher, who was a diſciple of Theophraſtus; and alſo of Æneſidemus, who wrote an introduction to the Phyrrhonia. Which Sextus Empiricus teſtifieth of them both in his book againſt the Mathematicians.*’ Voſſius without doubt would have here cited Plutarch, if he had called to mind this paſſage. Καίτοι Στράτωνός γε τοῦ Φυσικοῦ λόγος ἐστὶν, ἀποδεικνύων ὡς οὐδ' αἰσθάνεσθαι τοπαράπαν ἄνευ τοῦ νοεῖν ὑπάρχει. *Stratonis etiam Phyſici exſtat oratio, qua ſine intelligentia ſentiri omnino nihil poſſe demonſtrat* (22). It is ſaid that Parmenides, Empedocles, Democritus, and Anaxagoras, taught that all beaſts are endowed with underſtanding. ‘ Ab hac opinione qua beſtiæ ſenſus creduntur expertes, ad alteram venio: ſecundum quam, ut Sextus Empiricus †† ait, οὐδὲν ἐστιν ζῶον ἄλογον, ἄλλα καὶ νοῦ, καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικά ἐστι πάντα: nullum eſt animal rationis expers; ſed omnia ſunt intelligentiæ, & ſcientiæ capacia. Hanc ſententiam Parmenidi, Empedocli, & Democrito, tribuit Stobæus in Eclogis Phyſicis ⸸⸸. Anaxagoras quoque interdum in hanc opinionem inclinavit; teſte Ariſtotele lib. 1. de anima cap. 11 ‡‡: ubi agnoſcit quidem, non uno loco dicere, mentem eſſe ejus cauſſam, quod rectè, & pulchrè ſe habet: ſed addit, alibi tradere, τὸν νοῦν εἶναι τὸν αὐτὸν τῇ ψυχῇ· ἐν ἄπασι γὰρ ὑπάρχειν αὐτὸν τοῖς ζώοις καὶ μεγάλοις καὶ μικροῖς, καί τιμίοις, καὶ ἀτιμωτέροις. *Idem eſſe mentem, & animam: mentem enim omnibus ineſſe animalibus, tam parvis, quam magnis; tam vilioribus, quam honeſtioribus* (23). - - - *From this opinion, that beaſts are void of ſenſe, I come to the other; according to which, as Sextus Empiricus affirms*; there is no animal without reaſon, but all are capable both of underſtanding and ſcience. *This opinion is, by Stobæus in his phyſical eclogues attributed to Parmenides, Empedocles, and Democritus. Anaxagoras alſo ſome time was inclined to this opinion; witneſs Ariſtotle* de Anima *cap.* 11. *where he owns in more places than one, that the mind is the cauſe of what is right and beautiful; but adds, that he elſewhere teacheth, that* the mind and ſoul are the ſame: for that there is in all animals a mind, whether they be ſmall or great, deſpicable or more noble.’ I paſs by that opinion which was ſo common amongſt the Antients, *viz.* that living bodies contain a ſoul, which is part of the ſoul of the world. I grant that the natural conſequence of this opinion is, That the ſouls of beaſts are of the ſame nature as the ſouls of men; but this does not prove that beaſts are actually rational: for it might be maintained that the portions of the ſoul of the world, that are united to certain bodies, loſe the faculty of reaſoning. And ſince the ſticklers for the doctrine of the ſoul of the world, never taught that the ſouls of plants were rational; they muſt needs have believed that their doctrine did not engage them to maintain, That beaſts were endowed with reaſon. Let us therefore paſs by this opinion, tho' Virgil alledged it as the fitteſt means to explain all that he had ſaid of the qualities of bees.

His quidam ſignis, atque hæc exempla ſecuti,
Eſſe apibus partem divinæ mentis, & hauſtus
Æthereos dixêre: Deum namque ire per omnes
Terraſque, tractuſque maris, cœlumque profundum:
Hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne ferarum,
Quemque ſibi tenues naſcentem arceſſere vitas.
Scilicet huc reddi deinde, ac reſoluta referri
Omnia: nec morti eſſe locum; ſed viva volare
Sideris in numerum, atque alto ſuccedere cœlo (24).

Induc'd by ſuch examples, ſome have taught
That bees have portions of Etherial thought:
Endu'd with particles of heavenly fires:
For GOD *the whole created maſs inſpires;*
Thro' heav'n and earth, and ocean's depth he throws
His influence round, and kindles as he goes.
Hence flocks, and herds, and men, and beaſts, and fowls,
With breath are quicken'd and attract their ſouls,
Hence take the forms his preſcience did ordain,
And into him at length reſolve again.
No room is left for death they mount the ſky,
And to their own congenial Planets fly.

Dryden.

It is better to ſpeak of Philo, who wrote a book, wherein he maintained that beaſts are rational: Περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχειν τά ἄλογα ζῶα, *de eo quod bruta animalia ratione ſint prædita* (25). I have elſewhere (26) ſpoken of the opinion of Galen; but ſee here a more formal proof of it. ‘ An animantia quæ dicuntur bruta, prorſus expertia ſint rationis, nondum ſatis liquet. Fortaſſis enim, tametſi non habeant eam Rationem, quæ juxta vocem intelligitur, nobiſcum communem, quam vocant enuntiativam; certe eam, quæ ſecundum Animam accipitur, quam Rationem appellant affectuum capacem, habent nobiſcum communem, licet alia magis, alia minus (27). - - - *Whether the animals, called brutes, are altogether void of reaſon, does not yet ſufficiently appear. For though they have not perhaps in common with us that reaſon which is called diſcurſive; yet ſurely they have in common with us that reaſon which is underſtood to belong to a ſoul, and is capable of paſſions, though ſome in a greater, ſome in a leſſer degree.*’ Tho' Lactantius declares in ſome places, That God has not granted beaſts a rational faculty (28); yet he maintains in his treatiſe *de ira Dei*, that excepting religion beaſts imitate men in every thing, and participate of the privileges of the human ſpecies. The difference is only in more or leſs. ‘ Solus *(homo)* ſapientia inſtructus eſt ut religionem ſolus intelligat, & hæc eſt hominis atque mutorum vel præcipua, vel ſola diſtantia; nam cætera quæ videntur hominis eſſe propria, etſi non ſint talia in mutis, tamen ſimilia videri poſſunt..... Quid tam proprium homini quam ratio, & providentia futuri? Atqui ſunt animalia, quæ latibulis ſuis diverſos, & plures exitus pandant; ut ſi quod periculum inciderit, fuga pateat obſeſſis; quod non facerent, niſi ineſſet illis intelligentia, & cogitatio. Alia provident in futurum (29). - - - *Man only is endowed with wiſdom ſo as to underſtand religion, and this is the principal if not the only difference betwixt him and dumb animals; for other things that ſeem peculiar to him, though they are not the ſame in them, yet they appear to be alike...... What is there more peculiar to man than reaſon, and foreſight? Yet there are animals which make ſeveral different ways of retiring from their dens; that when in danger they may eſcape; which without underſtanding and forethought they could not do. Others make proviſion for the future.*’ We are not for all this to believe that he maintained that the ſouls of beaſts are ſpiritual and immortal; for at that time the connexion between thought and ſpirituality, was not clearly ſeen. Doth not Arnobius manifeſtly affirm, That human ſouls, of their own nature are mortal, and that they ſhall totally periſh in Hell by the activity of the torments, and could not continue always in Heaven, were it not by the grace of God? Does not he aſſert that a ſimple and immortal nature is incapable of pain? He felt ſome; therefore he did not believe that his ſoul was a ſpiritual, immaterial, and immortal Being. ‘ Homo prudentiæ non pravæ, *ſays he* (30), *ſpeaking of Plato*, & examinis judiciique perpenſi, rem inenodabilem ſuſcipit, ut cum animas dicat immortales, perpetuas, & corporali ſoliditate privatas, puniri eas dicat tamen, & doloris afficiat ſenſu. Quis autem hominum non videt, quod ſit immortale, quod ſimplex, nullum poſſe dolorem admittere? quod autem ſentiat dolorem immortalitatem habere non poſſe: Nec tamen ejus auctoritas plurimum à veritate declinat..... Non eſt abſonè ſuſpicatus jaci eas in flumina torrentia flammarum globis, & cœnoſis voraginibus tetra. Jaciuntur enim, & ad nihilum redactæ, interitionis perpetuæ fruſtratione vaneſcunt. Sunt enim mediæ qualitatis, ſicut Chriſto auctore compertum eſt, & interire quæ poſſint Deum ſi ignoraverint vitæ, & ab exitio liberari, ſi ad ejus ſe minas atque indulgentias applicarint. - - - *A man of no deſpicable wiſdom, and a penetrating judgment, undertakes what is not to be explained, when he aſſerts that ſouls are immortal, perpetual, and incorporeal, and*

‘ *yet*

‡ Cap. de homine, five, pag. 201, Edit. Aurelian.

(22) Plutarch. de ſolertia Animalium, *p.* 961, *A.*

†† Pyrrhoniarum Hypotypoſ. lib. ii, cap. v.

⸸⸸ Pag. 93, Edit. Plantin.

‡‡ Cont. 24.

(23) Voſſius, ubi ſupra, *pag. m.* 940.

(24) Virgil. Georg. lib. iv, ver. 219.

(25) Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. *lib. ii, cap. xviii, pag. m.* 59.

(26) In the article PEREIRA, citation (38).

(27) Galenus, in Exhortat. ad Art. lib. ſtud. *init. apud* Ant. le Grand de carentia ſenſus, *p.* 10.

(28) Cæteris animantibus quoniam rationalem iſtam vitam non attribuit. *Lactant. de opificio Dei, cap. ii, p. m.* 574.

(29) Idem, de ira Dei, *cap. vii, pag.* 529.

(30) Arnobius, adverſus Gentes, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 52.

perſuade themſelves, that they ſhall avoid the ill conſequences of the opinion that gives beaſts

‘yet may be puniſhed and ſuffer pain. Who knows not that an immortal uncompounded Being is not capable of pain? And that what is ſubject to pain cannot be immortal? Nor does what he ſays much differ from truth. .... He has imagined, not unreaſonably, that they are caſt into torrents of fire, with horrible devouring gulphs, and there are annihilated by a perpetual deſtruction. For they are of ſuch a nature, as Chriſt has manifeſted, that they may periſh, if ignorant of GOD, and be delivered from deſtruction, by a right uſe of his threats and promiſes.’ He confutes the Platonics, who ſaid, That the ſoul of man has a celeſtial origin, that it is immortal, and incorporeal; he refutes them, I ſay, by this argument amongſt others, That there is but little or no difference between our ſouls and thoſe of beaſts. ‘Nihil eſt quod nos fallat, nihil quod nobis polliceatur ſpes caſſas, id quod nobis à quibuſdam dicitur viris, immoderata ſui opinione ſublatis, animas immortales eſſe, Deo, rerum ac principi gradu proximas dignitatis, genitore illo ac patre prolatas, divinas, ſapientes, doctas, neque ulla corporis attrectatione contiguas (31). - - - *There is no reaſon we ſhould deceive, or flatter ourſelves with vain hopes, becauſe of what is told us by ſome men, puffed up with an immoderate opinion of themſelves; that our ſouls are immortal, next in dignity to GOD, and the higheſt order of Beings, proceeding from, and begotten of him, divine, wiſe, learned, not partaking of corporeal imperfection.’* ‘Vultis tumore depoſito cogitationibus tacitis pervidere animantia nos eſſe, aut conſimilia cæteris, aut non plurima differitate diſtantia? Quid eſt enim, quod nos ab eorum indicet ſimilitudine diſcrepare? vel quæ in nobis eminentia tanta eſt, ut animantium numero dedignemur adſcribi (32). - - - *Will ye, laying aſide your pride, conſider that we are animals, either altogether alike, or not much differing? For what is there to demonſtrate the difference? or what ſuch excellency is in us, that we ſhould diſdain to be accounted of their number?’* He examines the pre-eminence of man above brutes, and he pretends to ſhew that it is inconſiderable: he particularly affirms that men do not ſurpaſs brutes in reaſon. ‘Sed rationales nos ſumus, & intelligentia vincimus genus omne mutorum. Crederem iſtud veriſſimè dici, ſi cum ratione & conſilio cuncti homines viverent, ſervarent officiorum tenorem, abſtinerent ab illicitis ſeſe, negotia turpia non adirent, neque quiſquam pravitate conſilii, atque ignorantiæ cæcitate contraria ſibimet atque inimica depoſceret. Vellem tamen ſcire quænam ſit hæc ratio, per quam ſumus potiores animalium generibus cunctis: quia nobis domicilia fecimus, quibus poſſimus hyemalia frigora, & æſtatis flagrantias evitare? Quid? animantia cætera hujus rei providentiam non habent (33)? - - - *But we are rational creatures, and ſurpaſs in underſtanding the whole kind of mute animals. I would believe this to be true, if all men lived according to reaſon and conſideration, performed all duties, abſtained from unlawful and ſhameful things, and by wicked and blind ignorance did not purſue what tends to their deſtruction. I would gladly know what this ſame reaſon is, whereby we excel all the other kinds of animals: is it in building houſes to ſhelter us from the ſummer's heat and winter's cold? Why? do not the other animals act in like manner?’* We may therefore reckon Arnobius among thoſe, who hold that the ſouls of beaſts are rational. It is from him, without doubt, That Lactantius learned to put no other difference between them and man, but religion. There have been Philoſophers who denied this to be a privilege of man; for they ſaid that beaſts have a religion. Xenocrates the Carthaginian did not deny their having the knowledge of GOD. Democritus muſt needs have been of his opinion, if he reaſoned conſequentially: this is at leaſt the pretenſion of Clemens Alexandrinus. Καθόλου γ' οὖν τὴν περὶ τοῦ Θείου ἔννοιαν Ξενοκράτης ὁ Καρχηδόνιος οὐκ ἀπελπίζει, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις· Δημόκριτος δὲ, κᾂν μὴ θέλῃ, ὁμολογήσει διὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν δογμάτων· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πεποίηκεν εἴδωλα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις προσπίπτοντα, καὶ τοῖς ἀλόγοις ζώοις ἀπὸ τῆς θείας οὐσίας. Ut ſummatim quidem dicam, Xenocrates Carthaginienſis non ſpem omnium abjicit, quinetiam in rationis expertibus animantibus ſit Dei notitia. Democritus autem, etſi nolit, confitebitur per dogmatum conſequentiam: fecit enim eaſdem imagines in homines incurrentes, & in animantes rationis expertes, ex divina eſſentia (34). - - - *To ſpeak in few words, Xenocrates the Carthaginian is not without hope that animals deſtitute of reaſon have alſo knowledge of GOD. But Democritus, though he will not, muſt grant it, in conſequence of his doctrine: for he holds that the ſame images that are in men, and alſo in irrational animals, are produced by the divine eſſence.* Pliny places religion among the moral virtues of elephants. ‘Maximum eſt Elephas, *ſays he* (35), proximumque humanis ſenſibus: quippe intellectus illis ſermonis patrii, & imperiorum obedientia, officiorumque, quæ didicere, memoria: amoris, & gloriæ voluptas: imo vero, (quæ etiam in homine rara) probitas, prudentia, æquitas, religio quoque ſiderum, Soliſque ac Lunæ veneratio. Auctores ſunt, in Mauritaniæ ſaltibus ad quendam amnem, cui nomen eſt Amilo, miteſcente Luna nova, greges eorum deſcendere: ibique ſe purificantes ſolenniter aqua circumſpergi, atque ita ſalutato ſidere in ſilvas reverti, vitulorum fatigatos præ ſe ferentes. Alienæ quoque religionis intellectu, creduntur maria tranſituri non ante naves conſcendere, quam invitati rectoris jurejurando de reditu. Viſique ſunt feſſi ægritudine, (quando & illas moles infeſtant morbi) herbas ſupini in cœlum jacientes, veluti tellure precibus allegata. - - - *The elephants are the greateſt of animals, and come neareſt to human ſenſe: for they underſtand the language of their country, obey commands, remember the offices done them, have the pleaſure of love and glory; yea alſo (which are rare even in men) probity, prudence, equity, religious regard of the ſtars, the worſhip of the ſun and moon. It is reported, that in the foreſts of Mauritania they go down in troops to a certain river called Amilo, in the decreaſe of the moon, where they are purified by ſprinkling water in a ſolemn manner, and after adoration of the luminary, return unto the woods carrying their tired young ones. And being to croſs the ſeas, they will not go aboard, as is ſaid, till they have the maſter's oath to bring them back. And they have been ſeen, when worn out with ſickneſs, (which theſe bulky animals are alſo ſubject to) lying on their backs, and throwing herbs into the air, as if thereby to atone the heavens.’* Dion relates part of theſe things (36). Could one believe that the diſciples of Plato, who looked upon brutes to be probably immortal, with reſpect to the ſoul, as Paganinus Gaudentius obſerves, ſhould take reaſon from them? ‘Quod ſi dicas apud Platonicos ſolas animas rationales eſſe immortales, reſpondebit Alcinous non eſſe id prorſus exploratum. Nam poſtquam dixit animas rationales ſecundum Platonem eſſe immortales, mox ſubjungit *: *Utrum verò & irrationales, ambiguum eſſe videtur:* & quamvis ipſe ſentiat eſſe probabile eas eſſe mortales, indicat tamen id inter Platonicos non fuiſſe certum (37). - - - *But if you ſay that only rational ſouls are by the Platoniſts thought to be immortal, Alcinous will anſwer, that neither is that altogether certain. For after he hath ſaid, that according to Plato rational ſouls are immortal, he adds immediately:* but whether alſo the irrational are ſo, is doubtful. *And though he thinks it himſelf probable that they are mortal, yet he ſays that this was not thought certain among the Platoniſts.’* I ſay nothing of Solomon, who ſeems to ſay expreſsly (38), That the ſouls of beaſts and thoſe of men, are of the ſame nature; for we ought not to take his words literally, we ought to give them a better ſenſe (39): but we may be allowed to believe that ſeveral Rabbins did hold that beaſts have a rational ſoul.

THOUGHTS of ſome Rabbins upon the ſouls of beaſts.

The famous Maimonides believed without doubt, that they reaſon; for he gives them a kind of free-will. Mr Arnauld had reaſon to object againſt him, that from thence it would follow, that they might be rewarded or puniſhed after death. If I relate ſomewhat at length what precedes this reflexion of Mr Arnauld, it is becauſe of certain facts which ſhew us the opinion of ſome Jews about animals. This great Rabbi *explains five opinions touching providence, which are all, as he believes, as antient as the Prophets* (40). The fourth of theſe opinions extended the providence of God to every thing, and did not deny the free-will of men (41). Maimonides objects ſeveral inconveniences

---

(31) Ib. *p.* 53.

(32) Ib. *p.* 54.

(33) Ib. *p.* 55.

(34) Clemens Alexand. Strom. *lib. v, p.* 590, C.

(35) Plin. *lib. viii, cap. i, init.*

(36) Dio, *lib. xxxix, pag. m.* 120.

* *Cap. xxv.*

(37) Paganinus Gaudentius, de tranſmigratione Pythag. *p.* 76.

(38) Eccleſ. chap. iii.

(39) *See chap. ix, x, of a book intituled,* Traité de Religion contre les Athées, les Deïſtes, & les nouveaux Pyrrhoniens, *printed at Paris* 1677.

(40) Arnauld's Reflexions upon the Syſtem of Mallebranche, *livr. i, ch. xiii, pag.* 241. *He cites cap. xvii, of the ſecond part of* More Nevochim, Doctor perplexorum, *of* Maimonides.

(41) Ib. *p.* 245.

beaſts a ſenſitive ſoul [*E*]. Theſe gentlemen want neither diſtinctions, nor exceptions, nor

againſt the followers of this opinion. *They ſaid that it was a work of the wiſdom of God, that there were men who, tho' they had never ſinned, were born with many defects, and that it was better to be ſo than not be at all. We do not underſtand*, ſays this Jewiſh Doctor, *what goodneſs there could be in that, - - - ſed nos iſtam bonitatem non intelligimus* (42). 'When they were aſked what juſtice there was in the death of beaſts, what ſin they had committed, and why GOD would, ſince his providence extended to all, have an innocent rat pulled in pieces by a cat? They anſwered, GOD had ordered it ſo; but that he would recompenſe that rat in another world. It was very ridiculous to think that there ſhould be a heaven for beaſts. But this Rabbi himſelf gives ſome occaſion to this idle fancy, when he aſcribed a will to irrational animals as well as to men: *Omnia pariter animantia irrationalia moventur voluntate ſua*; for if they have a will it would be hard to give a reaſon why they ſhould not be capable of good or evil, rewards and puniſhments (43).'

The Socinians do not go ſo far as Maimonides; they do not aſcribe to beaſts a will properly ſo called, nor a free-will; they do not allow them to be capable of virtue and vice, or of puiſhments and rewards, properly ſpeaking. They ſay, nevertheleſs, that reaſon, liberty, and virtue, are found in them imperfectly and analogically; and that in ſome manner they are worthy of reward or puniſhment. If you will not believe me, read the following paſſage: 'Quia homo inter animantia ſolus ratione propriè dicta præditus eſt, in illum etiam ſolum tum voluntas, tum virtus & vitium, tum denique præmium & pœna cadit. In bruta tamen animalia cadit aliquid ſingulis iſtorum analogum, in ea præſertim, quæ ſunt perfectiora, & diſciplinæ alicujus capaciora. Eſt enim in illis primum aliqua facultas rationi reſpondens, quam nonnulli rationem inferiorem vocant, qua non de rebus modo jucundis, ac utilibus quodammodo ratiocinantur, & de ratione illorum adipiſcendorum diſpiciunt; ſed etiam viam ſibi à Deo præſcriptam, ſeu rectam quandam vivendi rationem naturæ ſuæ conſentaneam, quæ honeſtati analoga eſt, agnoſcunt. Inde ſequitur facultas altera, voluntati quodam modo reſpondens, in qua nonnihil eſt libertatis. Hinc aliquid etiam virtuti & vitio ſimile, ſeu rectè & pravè factum: quorum illud eſt, cum bruta naturæ ſuæ ductum ſequuntur, hoc cum à naturali via exorbitant. Unde tandem etiam aliquid præmio aut pœnæ, & huic quidem maxime ſimile. Unde beſtias etiam à Deo punitas (44), aut pœnas certas lege illis conſtitutas, cernimus: qua de re legatur Socinus in Anti-Puccio. Quemadmodum ergo rationem humanam κατ' ἐξοχὴν, & propriè hoc nomine appellamus, & brutis eam adimimus (dicimus enim irrationalia ſeu ratione carentia) ita & cætera omnia. Rurſus quemadmodum impropriè & per analogiam rationem brutis tribuimus, ita & cætera omnia (45). - - - - - *Of all animals man only is endowed with reaſon, properly ſo called, ſo he only hath a will, and is capable of virtue and vice, rewards and puniſhments. Yet ſomething bearing a reſemblance to each of theſe, may alſo be found in brutes, eſpecially ſuch as are more perfect, and more capable of diſcipline. For there is in them a certain faculty that anſwers to reaſon, called by ſome an inferior degree of reaſon, whereby they not only conſider in a manner what is pleaſant and profitable, and ſearch for the means of attaining them; but they likewiſe acknowledge a certain manner of living ſuitable to their nature preſcribed to them by* GOD, *which has ſome affinity to virtue. This muſt ſuppoſe another faculty, ſomething like the will, in which there is ſome liberty. Hence alſo there is ſomething in them reſembling virtue and vice, or doing good or evil, when they act according to their nature, or otherwiſe. And hence they become capable of rewards and puniſhment, but eſpecially of this laſt. Hence we ſee that beaſts alſo are puniſhed by* GOD, *and have certain penalties preſcribed by law; concerning which, conſult Socinus in his* Anti-Puccius. *Wherefore as we give the appellation of reaſon, by way of eminence and property, to that which is in man, and deny it to beaſts, (which we call irrational, or void of reaſon) ſo we do with reſpect to all other things.*' I know not whether Gulielmus Pariſienſis, one of the greateſt genius's of his age, could avoid going a little farther than this opinion; for it is ſaid, he taught that the ſouls of beaſts are ſpiritual; and it is not certain that ever he retracted this opinion (46). See the citation (48) of this page.

To come to the Moderns, I ſhall obſerve that Valla (47) and Antony Cittadinus (48) acknowledged reaſon in beaſts. Stephen Paſquier has writ a fine letter upon this opinion. This letter is the firſt of the tenth book. Montagne declared for this opinion, and has taken ſuch care to defend it, that he ſeems to have deſigned that apology for Raimundus Sebunus ſhould partly ſerve for the brutes. Charron has followed him in this, as well as in ſeveral other things. A Phyſician of Rochelle (49) having writ againſt Charron, was confuted in his turn by one of the beſt pens that has writ in French on Philoſophical matters; I mean Mr de la Chambre, Phyſician to Mr Seguier, Chancellor of France. The Phyſician of Rochelle replied (50); his antagoniſt did the ſame, and intituled his book, *Traité de la Connoiſſance des Animaux, où tout ce qui a été dit pour & contre le raiſonnement des bêtes eſt examiné. - - - - A treatiſe on the knowledge of brutes, wherein all that has been ſaid for and againſt the reaſoning of beaſts is conſidered.* I obſerve, by the by, that Iſaac Voſſius is of opinion, that, in reſpect of language, the condition of beaſts is much better than ours, becauſe they communicate more readily, and probably more happily, their thoughts than we (51). A German cenſures him for that (52). We ſhall ſee the opinion of Sennertus in the remarks [*D*] and [*E*] of his article: I will there name ſome modern authors, who have believed that the ſoul of beaſts is ſpiritual.

[*E*] *The ill conſequences of the opinion that gives beaſts a ſenſitive ſoul.*] There is nothing more diverting, than to ſee with what authority the ſchoolmen take upon them to ſet bounds to the knowledge of beaſts. They will have it, that they know only particular and material objects, and that they only love what is profitable and agreeable; that they cannot reflect upon their ſenſations and their deſires, nor infer one thing from another. One would think that they have ſearched more exactly into the faculties and acts of the ſouls of beaſts, than the moſt expert Anatomiſts into the entrails of dogs. Their temerity is ſo great, that tho' they had found out the truth by chance, they would yet have rendered themſelves unworthy of praiſe, and even of excuſe. But let us give them quarter; let us grant them all that they ſuppoſe: What do they hope for from it? Do they fancy, that by this means they ſhall obtain from any body that can reaſon, that it ought to be granted, that the ſoul of man is not of the ſame ſpecies with that of beaſts? This is a chimerical pretenſion. It is evident to any one that can judge of things, that every being that has ſenſe, knows that it has it: and it would not be more abſurd to maintain, that the ſoul of man knows actually an object without knowing that it knows it; than it is abſurd to ſay, that the ſoul of a dog ſees a bird, without perceiving that ſhe ſees it. This ſhews that all the acts of the ſenſitive faculty are, of their own nature, and by their own eſſence, reflexive upon themſelves. Father Maignan, who, notwithſtanding all his knowledge, has remained in the errors and rubbiſh of the ſchools, as to the ſouls of beaſts, owns nevertheleſs that in order to perceive any thing, one ought to know the perception one has of it. 'Id quod vocamus ſentire, *ſays he*, non eſt ſine cognitione ejus rei quæ dicitur ſenſibilis: cum autem nihil externum ſit per ſe ſenſibile; ſed tantum per ſuam actionem; adeoque actio ejus ſit primario ſenſibilis: & cum inſuper nos non dicamur alicujus agentis actionem ſentire, ſi ea dum in nobis ſit, omnino lateat nos; conſequenter id quod vocamus ſentire, non eſt ſine cognitione actionis, quæ fit in nobis ſentientibus; imo quia ſentire nihil aliud ex parte ſentientis dicit, præter eam cognitionem; conſequens eſt ipſum ſentire, quatenus ſe tenet ex parte ſentientis, conſiſtere in eo quod eſt agnoſcere ſe pati; quod coincidit cum eo quod eſt agnoſcere actionem in ſe receptam, ſeu paſſionem ſuam (53). - - - - *That which we call ſenſation*, ſays he, *is not without the knowledge of that thing which is called ſenſible; but as nothing external is ſenſible but only by it's action, which therefore is chiefly ſenſible, and ſince* nor aſſurance to decide, that the acts of this ſoul do not exceed certain bounds, which they preſcribe to them: but all this idle and unintelligible diſcourſe ſignifies nothing towards

---

(42) Arnauld, ibid. *pag.* 246.

(43) Ibid.

(44) See, below, citation (60), what I quote from Franzius. You will find there, where God orders that beaſts ſhould be puniſhed.

(45) Joan. Crellius, Ethicæ Chriſtianæ, *lib.* ii, *cap.* i, *pag. m.* 65, 66.

(46) *In the little diſſertations in the beginning of Tom.* ii, *of his works, in the edition of* 1676, it is inquired whether he ever recanted the opinion, which he was accuſed to have maintained concerning the ſpirituality of the ſoul of brutes, where it is compared with the opinion of Des Cartes, and other Philoſophers, who have particularly treated on this queſtion. *Journal des Sçavans, January* 18, 1677, *pag. m.* 28.

(47) Valla, Dial. *cap. ix*, apud Voſſium, de orig. & progr. Idol. *lib. iii, cap. xli, pag.* 940.

(48) In lib. i, Poſt. Analyt. cap. iii, apud eundem ibid.

(49) Chanet, in his Reflexions upon Charron.

(50) *His reply is intituled*, De l'inſtinct & de la connoiſſance des Animaux, *Rochelle* 1646, *in* 8*vo*.

(51) Iſaacus Voſſius, de Poëmatum cantu & viribus rythmi, *pag.* 65.

(52) Joh. Cyprianus, in Hiſtoriæ Animalium Continnatione, *pag.* 20.

(53) Emanuel Maignan, Philoſophia naturæ, *cap. xxiv, num.* 2, *pag. m.* 527. *See alſo Caſimirius of Toulouſe*, Atomi Peripateticæ, *Tom. iv, pag.* 70, *where he ſets down in few words, the definition of Father Maignan, and this of Caſſerius*, Senſus eſt objecti in organo formaliter ſuſcepti dignotio. - - - *Senſe is the knowledge of an object formally received into the organ*; and approves them.

'*moreover we cannot be ſaid to feel the action of any agent, if, while it is performed in us, it is altogether unknown to us; by conſequence what we call ſenſation, is not without the knowledge of the action done in us when we feel: yea, becauſe ſenſation, with reſpect to that which hath it, beſides that knowledge, implies nothing more; it follows, that ſenſation itſelf, conſidered as in the ſentient being, conſiſts in it's perceiving what it feels, which is the ſame as to know that an action is received in itſelf, or it's own paſſion.*' It muſt then be ſaid, that the memory of beaſts, is an act that makes them remember what is paſt, and which tells them that they remember it. How then can it be ſaid, that they have not the power of reflecting upon their thoughts, nor of drawing conſequences? But once more let us not diſpute upon that; let us give theſe Philoſophers leave to build their ſuppoſitions very ill; let us only make uſe of what they teach. They ſay, that the ſoul of beaſts perceives all the objects of the five external ſenſes; that among thoſe objects it judges that ſome are ſuitable to it, and others hurtful; and that, in conſequence of this judgment, it deſires thoſe that are ſuitable, and abhors the others; and that in order to enjoy the object it deſires, it tranſports it's organs to the place where that object is, and that in order to fly from the object which it hates, it withdraws it's organs from the place where the object is. I conclude from all this, that if it doth not produce acts ſo noble as thoſe of our ſoul, it is not it's fault, or becauſe it is of a nature leſs perfect than the ſoul of man; it is only becauſe the organs it animates do not reſemble our's. I aſk of theſe gentlemen, if they would allow that one ſhould ſay, that the ſoul of a man is of another ſpecies at the age of thirty-five years, than at the age of one month; or, that the ſoul of a mad-man, of an ideot, or of an old man, become childiſh through age, is not ſubſtantially as perfect as the ſoul of a man of excellent parts. They would, without doubt reject this opinion as a groſs error, and with good reaſon; for it is certain, that the ſame ſoul which in children is only ſenſitive, meditates and reaſons ſolidly in a grown man, and that the ſame ſoul which makes it's reaſon and wit to be admired in a perfect man, would only dote in an old man, talk idly in a natural, and exert ſenſation in a child. We ſhould be guilty of a groſs error, did we believe, that the ſoul of man is only capable of thoughts which are known to us. There are infinite ſenſations, paſſions, and ideas, of which this ſoul is very capable, tho' it be never affected with them during this life. If it were united to organs different from our's, it would think otherwiſe than it does at preſent, and it's modifications might be far more noble than thoſe we now experience. If there were ſubſtances, which in organized bodies had a train of ſenſations, and other thoughts far more ſublime than our's, could it be ſaid that they are of a more perfect nature than our ſoul? No, without doubt; for if our ſoul was removed into thoſe bodies, it would have the ſame train of ſenſations, and other thoughts far more ſublime than ours. This may be eaſily applied to the ſoul of beaſts. It will be granted us that it has a ſenſation of bodies; that it diſcerns them; that it deſires ſome, and abhors others. This is enough: it is therefore a ſubſtance that thinks; it is therefore capable of thought in general; it can therefore entertain all ſorts of thoughts; it can therefore reaſon; it can therefore know what is honeſt; the univerſals; the axioms of Metaphyſics; the rules of morality, *&c.* For as wax can receive the impreſſion of one ſeal, it manifeſtly follows, that it may receive the figure of any ſeal; it muſt likewiſe be granted, that ſince a ſoul is capable of one thought, it is capable of any thought. It would be abſurd to reaſon thus; *This piece of wax has only received the impreſſion of three or four ſeals; therefore it cannot receive the impreſſion of a thouſand. This piece of pewter has never been a plate; therefore it can never be made one, and it is of another nature than the pewter plate I ſee there.* They reaſon no better, who ſay, *The ſoul of a dog has never had any thing but ſenſations,* &c. *therefore it is not capable of the ideas of morality, or Metaphyſical notions.* From whence comes it that a piece of wax bears the impreſſion of a prince, and that another does not? It is becauſe the ſeal has been applied to the one and not to the other. This piece of pewter that never was a plate, will be one, if you caſt it into the mould of a plate. Caſt in like manner the ſoul of this beaſt into the mould of univerſal ideas, and of the notions of arts and ſciences, I mean, unite it to a well choſen human body; it will become the ſoul of a man of parts, and be no more that of a beaſt.

You may ſee therefore that is impoſſible for the School-Philoſophers to prove, that the ſouls of men, and thoſe of beaſts, are of a different nature, let them ſay, and repeat it a thouſand and a thouſand times, *That man's ſoul does reaſon, and know univerſals and virtue, and that of beaſts knows nothing of all this.* We anſwer them, *Theſe differences are only accidental, and are no marks of a ſpecific difference. Ariſtotle and Cicero, at the age of one year, never had more ſublime thoughts than thoſe of a dog; and if they had lived in the ſtate of infancy thirty or forty years, the thoughts of their ſouls had never been any thing but ſenſations and little paſſions for play and eating: it is therefore by accident, that they have ſurpaſſed beaſts; it is becauſe their organs on which their thoughts depended have acquired ſuch and ſuch modifications, to which the organs of beaſts arrive not. The ſoul of a dog in the organs of Ariſtotle or Cicero, would not have failed to acquire all the knowledge of thoſe two great men.*

This conſequence is very falſe; *viz.* ſuch a ſoul does not reaſon, does not know univerſals, therefore it is of a different nature from that of a great Philoſopher: for if this conſequence were good, it would follow that the ſoul of little children is different from that of men. What then do you dream of, you Peripatetic Philoſophers, when you pretend that if the ſouls of beaſts do not reaſon, they are eſſentially leſs perfect than ſouls that reaſon? You ought firſt to have proved that the want of reaſoning in beaſts, proceeds from a real and intrinſic imperfection of the ſoul, and not from the organic diſpoſitions on which it depends; but this is what you can never be able to prove: for it is clear, that a ſubject which is capable of the thoughts which you allow in the ſoul of beaſts, is capable of reaſoning, and of any other thought; from whence it reſults, that if it doth not actually reaſon, it is becauſe of certain accidental and external obſtacles, I mean, becauſe the Creator of all things has fixed every ſoul to a certain train of thoughts, by making it depend on the motions of certain bodies. This is the reaſon why ſucking-children, naturals, and mad-men do not reaſon.

One cannot, without horror, think of the conſequences of this doctrine, *The ſoul of men and the ſoul of beaſts do not differ ſubſtantially, they are of the ſame ſpecies, the one acquires more knowledge than the other, but theſe are only accidental advantages, and depending on an arbitrary inſtitution.* This doctrine neceſſarily and inevitably flows from what the ſchools teach about the knowledge of beaſts. It follows from thence, that if their ſouls are material and mortal, the ſouls of men are ſo likewiſe; and that if the ſoul of man is a ſubſtance ſpiritual and immortal, the ſoul of beaſts is ſo too. Horrible conſequences! turn which way you will. For if to avoid the immortality of the ſoul of beaſts, you ſuppoſe that the ſoul of man dies with the body, you overthrow the doctrine of another life, and ſap the foundations of religion. If to preſerve to our ſouls the privilege of immortality, we extend it to thoſe of beaſts, into what an abyſs do we fall? What ſhall we do with ſo many immortal ſouls? Will there be for them alſo an Heaven and a Hell? Will they go from one body to another? Will they be annihilated as the beaſts die? Will God create continually an infinite number of ſpirits, to plunge them again ſo ſoon into nothing? How many inſects are there which only live a few days? Let us not imagine that it is ſufficient to create ſouls for the beaſts which we do know; thoſe that we do not know are far the greater number. The microſcopes diſcover them to us by thouſands in a ſingle drop of liquor. Many more would be diſcovered if we had more perfect microſcopes. And let no man ſay that inſects are only machines; for one might better explain by this hypotheſis the actions of dogs, than the actions of piſmires and bees. There is, perhaps, more wit and reaſon in the inviſible creatures, wards the eſtabliſhing a ſpecific difference between the ſouls of men and thoſe of beaſts [*F*]; and it is not likely, that they can ever invent a better explication, than that

tures, than in the large (54). We are now going to take a view of the vain efforts of the ſchools, to eſtabliſh a ſpecific difference between the ſouls of men and beaſts.

[*F*] *A ſpecific difference between the ſouls of men and thoſe of beaſts.*] They ſay, that the ſoul of beaſts is a material form, but that the ſoul of man is a ſpirit which God creates immediately. But how do they prove that? I ſuppoſe they only argue upon the principles of natural reaſon, without having recourſe to ſcripture or the doctrines of religion; and I aſk of them one good proof to ſhew that the ſouls of beaſts are corporeal, and that ours is not? They will alledge the beauty and extent of human knowledge; and the ſmallneſs, groſſneſs, and obſcurity of the knowledge of beaſts; and they will conclude, that a corporeal principle is capable of producing the knowledge of beaſts, but not the reflexions, the reaſonings, the univerſal ideas, the ideas of honour and honeſty, which are found in the ſoul of man; and that by conſequence this ſoul ought to be of an order ſuperior to matter, and ought to be a ſpirit. I will not ſay now that they aſſert raſhly, that the ſoul of beaſts does not argue, and that it has no idea of what is honeſt. Let us lay aſide this objection, and only ſay, that it is a thouſand times more difficult to ſee a tree, than to know the act by which we ſee it; ſo that if a material principle is capable of knowing an infinite number of outward things, it will be far more capable of knowing it's own thoughts, and of comparing them together, and multiplying them; therefore the reflexions, and concluſions, and abſtractions of man, require not a principle nobler than matter. A very learned Peripatetic is of our ſide; let us hear him ſpeak; his confeſſion will be more perſuaſive than my objections. ‘ If you once admit, *ſays he*, that all ‘ that is moſt wonderful in the actions of beaſts, ‘ may be done by means of a material ſoul; will you ‘ not ſoon grant what follows, and ſay, that all that ‘ paſſes in man may be alſo done by a material ſoul? ‘ . . . If you once grant that beaſts, without any ſpiritual ſoul, are capable of thinking, of acting for an end, ‘ of foreſeeing things to come, of remembring what ‘ is paſt, of acquiring experience by the particular reflexion they make upon it; why will you not grant ‘ that men are capable of exerciſing their functions ‘ without any ſpiritual ſoul? After all, the operations ‘ of men are no other than thoſe which you aſcribe ‘ to beaſts: if there be any difference, it is only as to ‘ more or leſs; and ſo all that you can ſay will only ‘ be, that the ſouls of men are more perfect than ‘ thoſe of beaſts, becauſe men remember better than ‘ they, think with more reflexion, and foreſee things ‘ with more certainty; but in fine you cannot ſay, but ‘ that their ſouls are ſtill material. You will ſay ‘ perhaps, That in men there are ſome operations ‘ that cannot ſuit with beaſts, nor proceed from any ‘ other principle than a ſpiritual ſoul: and thoſe operations are univerſal knowledge; that ratiocination, ‘ whereby we infer one thing from another; and the ‘ ideas we have of infinity, and of things ſpiritual ‘ which do not fall under the ſenſes: but thoſe who ‘ deny that there is any knowledge in beaſts, do not ‘ deny for all that, that thoſe thoughts and reaſonings are in us, ſince we ourſelves are conſcious of ‘ them: ſo that they have always the ſame right ‘ which you have to prove the exiſtence of the rational ſoul. But beſides, they add, that all thoſe ‘ operations which you look upon to be ſo extraordinary, differ only in degrees from the operations ‘ which you attribute to beaſts. And certainly, it ‘ ſeems that to act with a deſign, to improve by experience, to foreſee things to come, (which you grant ‘ to beaſts) ought to proceed no leſs from a ſpiritual ‘ principle than what is found in man. For after all, ‘ what is an univerſal knowledge, but a knowledge ‘ which ſuits with many things that are like, as the ‘ picture of a man would ſuit with all the faces that ‘ ſhould reſemble it? What is reaſoning, but a ‘ knowledge produced by another knowledge, as we ‘ ſee that a motion is produced by another motion? ‘ Certainly, if it be once granted, That thought, intention, and reflexion, may proceed from a body animated with a material form; it will be very difficult to prove, That the reaſonings and ideas of man ‘ cannot proceed from a body animated likewiſe with ‘ a material form (55).’

I deſire all my readers to take notice of the unlucky condition the ſchool-men are in, as to the doctrine of the ſenſitive ſoul. They alledge againſt Des Cartes the moſt ſurpriſing actions of beaſts; they chuſe them on purpoſe, the better to confound him; but afterwards they find that they are gone too far, and have ſupplied their adverſary with weapons to deſtroy the ſpecific difference which they endeavour to prove between our ſouls and thoſe of beaſts. They could wiſh that one ſhould forget all the examples of cunning, precaution, docility, and knowledge of things to come, which they have ſet forth with ſo much pomp, in order to ſhew that beaſts are not meer machines; they could wiſh that one ſhould mind only the groſs actions of an ox whoſe ſole buſineſs is feeding: but it is too late to require ſuch a thing; thoſe very examples are made uſe of to confound them, and to prove againſt them, That if a material ſoul is capable of all thoſe things, it will be able to do whatever is performed by the ſoul of man. Only a greater degree of refinement will be wanting to the ſouls of beaſts. Muſt we not ſuppoſe, That the ſoul of a dog or of an ape is not of ſo coarſe a nature as that of an ox? In one word, if nothing but a ſpiritual ſoul can produce the actions of a dull witted clown; I will maintain againſt you, That nothing but a ſpiritual ſoul can produce the actions of an ape; and if you ſay that a corporeal principle is able to produce whatever is performed by apes; I will maintain againſt you, that a material principle may be the cauſe of whatever is performed by ſtupid men, and that provided matter be ſubtilized, and diſintangled from all groſs particles, phlegms, *&c.* it may be the cauſe of whatever the moſt underſtanding man can do.

A QUESTION concerning the liberty of the ſouls of beaſts.

Some authors inſinuate, That ſince the ſoul of man is endowed with free-will, and that of beaſts is deprived of it, there muſt needs be a ſpecific difference between them, and one muſt be ſpiritual and the other material. The Jeſuit Theophilus Raynaud, publiſhed in 1630, a little book intituled *Calviniſmus Beſtiarum Reilgio* (56). His chief deſign was to prove that the doctrine of the Dominicans reduces men to the condition of beaſts, by depriving them of free-will (57). ‘ Præcipuè ex eo capite pronunciavit Catholicus, cenſendum eſſe, Calviniſmum eſſe religionem beſtiarum, ‘ quòd juxta placita Calviniana, homo redigatur in ordinem beſtiarum, & hominis gradu ac dignitate excidat. Ad quod ſolidè probandum, duæ propoſitiones viſæ illi ſunt ſtabiliendæ. Una eſt, hominem in ‘ ratione hominis, conſtitui per libertatem. Altera ‘ eſt, libertatem everti per Calviniſmum (58). - - - ‘ *That Calviniſm was to be accounted the religion of* ‘ *beaſts, hath been affirmed by the Jeſuit, becauſe, according to their principles, man was degraded into the* ‘ *rank of beaſts, and deprived of the degree and dignity* ‘ *of man. In order to the proof of which, two propoſitions were by him to be eſtabliſhed. One is, that to* ‘ *man, conſidered as ſuch, liberty of acting is eſſential.* ‘ *The other, that by Calviniſm, liberty is deſtroyed.*’ He ſuppoſes that the liberty of indifference is the character, whereby men are diſtinguiſhed from beaſts; for as to the liberty, which conſiſts only in being free from conſtraint, or in ſpontaneity, no ſchool-men can ſay that beaſts are deprived of it. I will make it appear that it is moſt falſe, that a ſoul endowed with free-will is of another kind than a ſoul that is not endowed with it. The ſouls of children and mad-men are deſtitute of free-will, and yet they are of the ſame ſpecies with the ſouls that are moſt free. To which may be added, that thoſe who maintain the liberty of indifference, ſay, that it will ceaſe after this life, and yet they acknowledge that a human ſoul is the ſame ſubſtance upon earth as in heaven or in hell. It is therefore manifeſt, That the liberty of indifference is not an eſſential attribute of creatures, but a gift, or an accidental favour beſtowed upon them by the Creator: and conſequently the ſouls that are not gratified with it, are not of a different ſpecies from thoſe that receive it. This argument is therefore very wrong: the that which they have already given. The author, who has beſt confuted the opinion of Des Cartes concerning the ſouls of beaſts, would have done us a ſingular favour, if he could have cleared the common opinion from the great difficulties that attend it [*G*]. Mr Leibniz

---

(54) See the words of Pliny, cited in the article MENAGE, citation (1).

(55) Pardies, of the knowledge of beaſts, *num.* 49, *pag.* 100, *& ſeq.*

(56) See Baillet, Vie de Des Cartes, *Tom. i, pag.* 224.

(57) He diſputes, it is true, againſt Calvin, but it is in order to conclude againſt the Dominicans, (whom he pretends to be like Calvin as to that doctrine,) what he concludes againſt Calvin.

(58) Calviniſmus, Beſtiarum Religio, *Diatriba ii, pag. m.* 25.

the ſouls of beaſts are deprived of free-will, but the ſouls of men are not deprived of it; therefore the ſouls of beaſts are material, and the ſouls of men are ſpiritual. I will go farther, and ſay that thoſe, who admit of a ſenſitive ſoul, have no good reaſon to aſſert, That beaſts are not free creatures. Do not they ſay, that they do a thouſand things with great pleaſure, being directed by the judgment they make of the uſefulneſs of objects, whereby they are prompted to unite themſelves to thoſe objects? If liberty conſiſts only in being free from conſtraint, and in a ſpontaneity preceded by the diſcerning of the objects, is it not an abſurd thing to deny the liberty of beaſts? Has not a hungry dog the power of abſtaining from a piece of meat, when he is afraid of being beaten if he does not abſtain from it? Is not this to have the power of acting or not acting? Doubtleſs his abſtinence proceeds from his comparing his hunger with the blows of a ſtick, which he judges to be more intolerable than hunger. If you obſerve all the human actions that are aſcribed to a liberty of indifference, you will find that a man does never ſuſpend them, or never chuſes one of the two contraries, but becauſe having compared the reaſons *pro* and *con*, he ſees more inducements to ſuſpend his action than to act, or has more motives for one action than for another. Let us further hear the Jeſuit, who wrote againſt the Carteſians. ‘It is no eaſy thing thus to ſeparate reaſoning from thought; and I think it may be eaſily proved, that when a ſubſtance is capable of thinking, it is alſo capable of reaſoning; that it is endowed with will and liberty; and, in a word, that it can act like men. The ancient Philoſophers, and even the Fathers of the Church, have proved that we have a free-will by this general argument; that whatever is capable of knowledge, can know good and evil, that is, what is good or bad for it; and conſequently, that, by conſidering thoſe two objects, it can compare them together, can deliberate, and determine to chuſe the one and reject the other, in which the uſe of our liberty conſiſts. And this is ſo true, that the definition of liberty taken in general, which we uſe ſtill to this day, is this, *Facultas agendi cum ratione*, the faculty of acting with knowledge, which is the ſignification of theſe words, *cum ratione* (59).’

One of the ſtrongeſt arguments alledged for the liberty of man, is taken from the puniſhment of malefactors. All ſocieties are agreed to puniſh them exemplarily, and even to extend, in ſome caſes, the puniſhment to their dead bodies: they are deprived of burial, and expoſed to the public view upon wheels and gibbets. If man did not act freely, if he was determined by a fatal and unavoidable neceſſity to have a certain train of thoughts, robberies and murders ſhould not be puniſhed, and no advantage could be expected from the puniſhment of criminals; for thoſe who ſhould ſee the dead body of a malefactor upon a wheel, would not be leſs ſubject than before to that prevailing power, which makes them act and does not allow them the uſe of their liberty. This argument for a free-will is not ſo ſtrong, as it ſeems to be; for though men are perſuaded that machines have no feeling, they will nevertheleſs give them a hundred blows with a hammer, when they are out of order, if they think that they may be ſet right by flatting a wheel, or another piece of iron. They would therefore cauſe a pick-pocket to be whipped, though they knew that he has no free-will, if experience had taught them that the whipping of people keeps them from committing certain actions. However, if this argument for a free-will has any force, it will manifeſtly ſhew, that beaſts are not deprived of liberty (60). Men puniſh them every day, and mend their faults by that means. Ochinus, in the beginning of his labyrinths, examines all the reaſons, which make us believe that we act freely; and ſays among other things againſt that which is taken from the puniſhments inflicted upon malefactors, that if the judges were ſure that the hanging of a horſe, which had killed a man, and the leaving him a long time upon the gallows in the high-way, would hinder other horſes from doing miſchief, they would uſe that puniſhment, whenever a horſe maims or kills any body by kicking or biting (61). It is likely he did not know that in ſome countries they make uſe of ſuch ſights, to keep beaſts in awe. Rorarius was an eye-witneſs of it; he ſaw two wolves hanging upon a gibbet in the duchy of Juliers, and he obſerves, that it made a greater impreſſion upon the other wolves, than the mark of a red hot iron, the loſs of one's ears, *&c.* does upon thieves. He ſays alſo that it is uſual in Africa to nail lions to a croſs, in order to terrify others, and that the people find ſome benefit by it. ‘Solent in Africa crucifigere leones, ſi qui deprehendantur urbes obſidere, quod in ſenectâ faciunt: quoniam ad perſequendas feras vires non ſuppetunt; cujus pœnæ metu, licet urgeat fames, deſinunt: & nos ab Agrippina Colonia Duram verſus equitantes, in illa vaſta ſylva, vidimus duos caligatos lupos, non ſecus quam duos latrones furcæ ſuſpenſos: quo ſimilis pœnæ formidine à maleficio reliqui deterreantur. At inter homines quotidie reperiuntur, quibus ob admiſſa furta tergus virgis cæſum, abſciſſæ auriculæ, ſignatæ genæ, truncata altera manus, erutus oculus, nec adhuc à furtis ſe continere poſſunt, donec laqueus vitæ finis extiterit (62). - - - *It is uſual in Africa to crucify lions, when they come into towns, as they do when grown old; becauſe they are not able to hunt down the beaſts: for fear of which puniſhment, tho' pinched with hunger, they keep away: and when we were journeying from Cologn to Duren, through that great foreſt, we ſaw two wolves truſſed like two robbers hanging on a gibbet, that others might be deterred by fear of the like puniſhment. But amongſt men are daily to be ſeen ſuch as for their crimes have been whipped, had their ears cut off, been burnt in the cheek, had a hand cut off, an eye pulled out, and yet could not abſtain from wickedneſs, till an end was put to their life on a gibbet.*’

[*G*] *If he could have cleared the common opinion,* &c.] The book intituled, *Le Voyage du Monde de Des Cartes* (63), has been very much eſteemed, and not without good reaſon. It contains very great difficulties objected to the Carteſians in an agreeable and lively manner, and very well urged. Thoſe which concern the machinal ſouls of beaſts, are, I think, the beſt that can be propoſed. The author ingenuouſly confeſſes, that the Peripatetics ſhewed at firſt but very little ſkill in attacking that great paradox of Des Cartes, and that the Carteſians took an advantage of it. He makes uſe with great dexterity, of the ill conſequences that may be drawn from that paradox; for he ſhews that the arguments of the Carteſians tend to make us believe, that other men are meer machines. This is perhaps the weakeſt ſide of that Carteſian opinion, and it confirms a very judicious thought that one may have about the nature of human knowledge. It ſeems that GOD, who beſtows it, acts like the common father of all ſects, that is to ſay, that he is not willing that any of them ſhould entirely triumph over the others, and ſink them without recovery. A ſect, tho' defeated, and put to the rout, will always recover, if it ceaſes to ſtand upon the defenſive, in order to act offenſively by way of diverſion and retortion. The combat of ſects is always like that of the Trojans and Greeks the night that Troy was taken (64): they overcame one another by turns, as they happened to change their way of fighting. A Carteſian has no ſooner overturned, ruined, and deſtroyed, the opinion of the ſchoolmen about the ſouls of beaſts, but he finds that he may be beaten with his own weapons, and that his adverſary may ſhew him that he proves too much, and that if he will argue conſequentially, he muſt give over ſome opinions; which he cannot do without making himſelf ridiculous, and admitting manifeſt abſurdities: for is there any man that dares affirm that he is the only perſon that thinks, and that all other men are meer machines? Would not he be looked upon as more extravagant than Bedlamites, or thoſe that are removed from all human ſociety? This conſequence of that Carteſian doctrine is a ſad mortification: it is like the peacock's feet, whoſe uglineſs gives a check to the vanity which the beauty of his feathers had inſpired him with. However, it muſt be confeſſed that the whole advantage of Father Daniel

---

(59) Pardies, ubi ſupra, *num.* 52, *pag.* 104, 105. *Note, that at pag.* 113, *he alledges for an inſtance a dog, who had learned* to ſing his part with his maſter. *He adds,* Vide Horarium oratione peculiari de ratione brutor. *He ſhould have ſaid,* Rorarius, quod animalia bruta utantur ratione melius homine. - - - *That the brute animals uſe reaſon better than man.* Lib. i, pag. 2.

(60) *Obſerve this queſtion which* Franzius *propoſed to himſelf,* Hiſt. Animal. Sacra, *Part i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 16. Quæri autem poſſet *an non ponenda ſit rationalis anima in brutis . . .* cum *Geneſ. ix, ver.* 5. Deus ipſe vindicare velit ſanguinem hominis in brutis ſi quando effuderunt ſanguinem humanum. - - - *But it might be aſked,* is there not a rational ſoul in beaſts . . . *Since God himſelf will revenge the blood of a man upon beaſts that ſhed the blood of man.* He alſo quotes Exodus xii. 28; and Leviticus xx. 15, 16. where God orders that brutes ſhould be puniſhed.

(61) I have not now by me that book of Ochinus; I quote what I remember he ſays; and perhaps I do not exactly tranſlate his words; but I am ſure that I ſet down his meaning.

(62) Rorarius, ubi ſupra, *lib. ii, pag.* 109.

(63) Father Daniel, a Jeſuit, is accounted the author of that work.

(64) Nec ſoli pœnas dant ſanguine Teucri: Quondam etiam victis redit in præcordia virtus, Victoreſque cadunt Danai. *Virgil. Æneid. lib. ii, ver.* 366.

Mr Leibniz, one of the greateſt wits of Europe, being ſenſible of theſe difficulties, has given us ſome inſights, which deſerve to be improved [*H*]. I ſhall mention part of what

againſt Des Cartes's opinion conſiſts in the objections that he raiſed, and not at all in the anſwers that he made to the objections of the Carteſians. He does not deny that their queſtions are very puzzling; but he maintains that, in their turn, they are not leſs perplexed by the queſtions that are put to them, and that *good repriſals* may be made upon them (65). You muſt not expect to find in his book the ſolution of the Phyſical, Moral, and Theological difficulties, that are propoſed to the Peripatetics about the ſouls of beaſts; he is contented to anſwer, that if there are ſome things in their opinion that cannot be comprehended, there are others likewiſe in Des Cartes's hypotheſis. The definition of the ſoul of a beaſt, *a ſubſtance capable of ſenſation*, that is, of ſeeing, hearing, *&c.* is as clear as the Carteſian definition of a ſpirit, *a thinking and reaſoning ſubſtance* (66). They are Father Daniel's words, which he proves afterwards as well as can be. A little before he had ſaid (67) that the ſoul of a beaſt is neither matter nor a ſpirit, but *a middle being between both*, which is not *capable of reaſoning or thought, but only of perception and ſenſation*. If he ſays nothing that is more ſatisfactory, it is not for want of ability, but the nature of the ſubject does not permit it.

He muſt give me leave to ſay, that his hypotheſis cannot be maintained, and that no difficulty can be reſolved by it. Theſe two words, *matter*, *ſpirit*, ſeem at firſt ſight to admit of a *medium*; but if the thing be narrowly looked into, it appears that they may be reduced to a contradictory oppoſition. It is but aſking whether a ſubſtance, that is neither a body nor a ſpirit, is extended or not. If it be extended, it will be difficult to diſtinguiſh it from matter; and if it be not extended, I deſire to know why it ſhould be diſtinguiſhed from a ſpirit: for the notion of a ſubſtance, that has no extenſion, ſuits with the notion of a ſpirit, and we cannot apprehend that this notion can be divided into two different kinds, ſince the ſpecific attribute aſſigned to the one, will never appear inconſiſtent with the other. If God can add thought (68) to one unextended Being, he may likewiſe add it to another Being that is unextended, there being nothing but extenſion that ſeems to us to make matter uncapable of thinking; at leaſt we clearly conceive, that an unextended ſubſtance which hath ſenſation, is alſo capable of reaſoning; and conſequently, if the ſoul of a beaſt is an unextended ſubſtance capable of ſenſation, it is alſo capable of reaſoning; it is therefore of the ſame ſpecies with the ſoul of man, and conſequently is not a middle ſubſtance between matter and ſpirit. Here is a queſtion put by Father Daniel. *Will the Carteſians deny the poſſibility of this ſort of Beings, capable only of ſenſation? What is become of the reſpect which their maſter endeavoured to inſpire into them for the almighty power of GOD, who, he ſays, can order it ſo, that a triangle ſhall not have three angles, and that two and two ſhall not make four; and yet cannot produce a Being, that has only ſenſations* (69)? This queſtion might puzzle a man, who ſhould have made a vow never to depart from any of Des Cartes's opinions; but it does not appear that any Carteſian will be ſuch a ſlave to him, and it is certain that Des Cartes would never have ſeriouſly affirmed, that God can make two feet of wax ſuſceptible of three or four figures, and uncapable of all others. Whatever opinion Des Cartes may have had about this, his followers will never think they are wanting in the reſpect they owe to God, if they ſay, that *a Being only capable of ſenſation*, is not more poſſible than a piece (70) of wax only ſuſceptible of a ſquare figure. As for what concerns a *being, that ſhould have only ſenſation*, they will think it very poſſible; as it is poſſible that a certain piece of matter ſhould be always round, if God would for ever hinder the tranſpoſition of its particles. Father Daniel will give me leave to obſerve, that he did not perceive that it is not the ſame thing to ſay, firſt, *a Being only capable of ſenſation*, and then, *a Being that has only ſenſations*. The poſſibility of the firſt is unconceivable; and the poſſibility of the ſecond is manifeſt. But as a piece of wax, in which God ſhould always hinder the tranſpoſition of the particles, would be of the ſame ſpecies with a piece of wax, the change of whoſe extremities would continually produce a new figure; it may likewiſe be ſaid that a ſubſtance, which God ſhould always confine within the bounds of ſenſations, would be of the ſame ſpecies with a ſubſtance that ſhould arrive to reaſoning.

It remains for me to ſhew the inſufficiency of Father Daniel's hypotheſis. I. We want a ſyſtem, which maintains that the ſouls of beaſts are mortal: but this cannot be proved by ſuppoſing a middle being between a body and a ſpirit: for ſuch a being is not extended: it is therefore indiviſible; nothing but annihilation can deſtroy it: diſeaſes, fire, and ſword, cannot hurt it; and therefore it is in that reſpect of the ſame nature and condition with ſpirits, and human ſouls. II. We want a ſyſtem whereby it may appear that there is a ſpecific difference between the ſouls of men and thoſe of beaſts: but this middle Being does not afford it; for if the ſoul of a beaſt, being neither a body nor a ſpirit, has nevertheleſs ſenſations, the ſoul of man will be able to reaſon, tho' it be neither body nor ſpirit, but a middle being between both. It is a more difficult thing for a being deſtitute of ſenſe to arrrive to the perception of a tree, than for a ſenſitive being to acquire the faculty of reaſoning. III. We want a ſyſtem, that gives an account of the ſurpriſing ſkill of bees, dogs, apes, elephants; and you talk of ſuch ſouls in beaſts, as have only ſenſations, without thinking (71) and reaſoning. If you conſider it well, you will be ſenſible that ſuch a ſoul is not ſufficient to explain the phænomena. Father Daniel confeſſes it in another place of his book, where he ſeems to allow the Peripatetics no other advantage but that of poſſeſſion: for having mentioned the difficulties that are to be found in the opinion of the Carteſians concerning the beaſts, he adds (72): *It cannot be denied that the Peripatetics have alſo ſeveral difficulties to reſolve; but tho' they were much more conſiderable than they really are, as long as the Carteſians have nothing to ſay that is more ſatisfactory, or more intelligible, we ought to keep to this, and argue upon this head, as a great miniſter of ſtate did twenty-five years ago, upon the whole body of Philoſophy. He was adviſed not to let his ſon learn the antient Philoſophy, becauſe, they told him, there was nothing in it but trifling and fooleries. I have been told alſo ſaid he, that there are many fooliſh and chimerical things in the new, and therefore, continued he, ſince I am to chuſe the antient or the new fooleries, I think the antient ought to be preferred before the new.* Perhaps Nihuſius argued in the ſame manner (73).

[*H*] *Mr Leibniz - - - has given us ſome inſights which deſerve to be improved.*] He approves (74) the opinion of ſome Moderns, who think that animals are organized in the ſeed; and beſides he believes (75) that matter alone cannot conſtitute a true unity, and that therefore every animal is united to a form, which is a ſimple, indiviſible, and only one being. Moreover he ſuppoſes (76) that this form never leaves it's ſubject; from whence it reſults, that, properly ſpeaking, there is neither death nor generation in nature. He excepts (77) the ſoul of man from all this; he lays it aſide, *&c.* This hypotheſis (78) frees us from part of the difficulties. There is no longer any need to anſwer the perplexing objections raiſed againſt the ſchoolmen. The ſoul of beaſts, ſay their adverſaries, is a ſubſtance diſtinct from the body; it muſt therefore be produced by creation, and deſtroyed by annihilation: heat muſt therefore have the power to create ſouls (79), and to annihilate them (80), than which nothing can be more abſurd. The anſwers of the Ariſtotelians to this objection do not deſerve to be mentioned, or to be brought out from the obſcurity of the ſchools where they are taught to young ſcholars: and are proper only to ſhew us, that the objection is by them unanſwerable. They do not come off better, when they are urged to ſhew the reaſonableneſs of a continual production of almoſt an infinite number of ſubſtances, which are totally deſtroyed a few days after, tho' they are far more noble, and more excellent than matter, which never loſes it's exiſtence. Mr Leibniz's hypotheſis removes all thoſe difficulties, for it induces us to belive, 1. That God in the beginning of the world created the forms of all bodies, and

(65) Suite du Voiage du Monde de Des Cartes, *pag.* 75.

(66) Ib. *p.* 84.

(67) Ibid. *pag.* 82, 83.

(68) I take this word in the ſenſe of the Carteſians, that is, for a generic modification, which includes ſenſations, reflexions, reaſonings, &c. as ſo many different ſpecies.

(69) Suite du Voiage du Monde, *pag.* 84.

(70) By a piece here, is meant a collection of different particles. This I obſerve to prevent the difficulty of an Atomiſt, who believes, that the figure of an atome is eſſentially immutable.

(71) I uſe here the word *thinking* for a kind of perception, and not in the general notion of Des Cartes.

(72) Suite du Voiage du Monde de Des Cartes, *pag.* 105, 106.

(73) See the remark [*H*], of his article.

(74) See Mr Leibniz's Memoir, inſerted in the *Journal des Sçavans*, of the 27th of June 1695, pag. 449, Dutch Edit.

(75) Journal des Sçavans, *June* 27, 1695, *pag.* 446.

(76) Ibid. *pag.* 447.

(77) Ibid. *pag.* 448, 450.

(78) Bernier, in his relation of the Pagans of Indoſtan, *pag. m.* 200, ſpeaks of an opinion of the Philoſophers of that country much like this.

(79) They hatch chickens by putting the eggs in an oven heated by degrees. Such a thing is practiſed in Egypt.

(80) Many ſorts of animals may be deſtroyed; if they are put in an oven a little too hot.

what he ſays upon this ſubject, were it only to propoſe my doubts. But to return to Rorarius,

and conſequently all the ſouls of beaſts. 2. That thoſe ſouls have ſubſiſted ever ſince, being inſeparably united to the firſt organized bodies in which God placed them. This exempts us from the neceſſity of recurring to the metempſychoſis or tranſmigration of ſouls, which otherwiſe we muſt have done. I ſhall down part of Mr Leibniz's diſcourſe, that my readers may ſee whether I have taken his ſenſe right. ‘(81) Here the *tranſformations* of Swammardam, Malpighius, and Leeuwenhoeck, ſome of the moſt excellent obſervators of our time, came to my aſſiſtance, and made me more eaſily believe, that animals, or any other organized beings, do not begin to exiſt when we think they do, and that their ſeeming generation is only an unfolding, and a kind of augmentation. I have alſo obſerved that the author of the *Recherche de la verité*, - - - *Search after truth*, Mr Regis, Mr Hartſoeker, and ſome other able men have not been far from this opinion. But the greateſt queſtion remains ſtill, *viz.* what becomes of thoſe ſouls, or forms, after the death of the animal, or the deſtruction of the organized ſubſtance. This is the moſt perplexing thing ; becauſe it does not ſeem reaſonable that ſouls ſhould remain uſeleſs in a chaos of confuſed matter. This made me think at laſt that the only reaſonable opinion I could embrace, was that of the preſervation not only of the ſoul, but alſo the animal itſelf, and it's organized machine, tho' the deſtruction of the groſs particles had reduced it to a ſmallneſs, which is no leſs imperceptible to our ſenſes than it had before it was born. And indeed no body can exactly fix the true time of death, which may paſs a long time for a meer ſuſpenſion of viſible actions, and at the bottom is never any thing elſe in meer animals : as it appears from the *reſuſcitations* of flies drowned, and then buried under pulverized chalk, and ſeveral ſuch like inſtances, which ſhew that there would be many other *reſuſcitations*, and traced up higher, if men were able to put the machine again in order. . . . . . It is therefore natural that the animal having been always alive, and organized, (as ſome perſons of great penetration begin to acknowledge) ſhould always continue ſo. And ſince there is no firſt birth, nor generation of the animal altogether new, it follows that there will be no final extinction, nor total death taken in a ſtrict metaphyſical ſenſe ; and that conſequently inſtead of the tranſmigration of ſouls, there is only a transformation of the ſame animal, according as it's organs are differently folded, and more or leſs diſplayed.’

I ſhall obſerve occaſionally that ſome are of opinion that the primitive ſubject, to which our ſoul is united, goes out of our body together with it, when we come to die. Mr Poiret is not far from that opinion, and believes that Moſes, upon the day of tranſfiguration, appeared with the true body that attended his ſoul at his departure from this life ; that is, as he explains it, when that bleſſed ſoul left the caſe or cover, which wrapped up the ſubtile body to which it was united. He gives the carcaſe the appellation of caſe or ruſt, with reſpect to the true ſubject, that is united to the ſoul. Theſe are his words : ‘ Cùm Deus ſit conſtans in ſuis operibus, maxime in præcipuis, & quoad fundamentaliora, condideritque mentes quaſdam, humanas nempe, corporibus annexas ; probabile non eſt, id opus vel per aliquod tempus ex toto interrumpi atque deſtrui : & ex hiſtoriis ſacris habemus, Moſen, cujus cadaver omnino cecidit, cum Elia apparuiſſe Apoſtolis Chriſtum in transfiguratione radiantem ſpectantibus : id quod ſine corpore, cui mens fuerit juncta, fieri non poterat. Nonnulli ad corpus ex aëre aſſumptum recurrunt : at quidni id ex ipſo Moſis corpore (& ſic de cæteris) eſſet, portio nempe materiæ illius internæ ſpiritualioris, ſubtilioris & purioris, quæ depoſito cadavere, ſeu tegmine vel cortice aut ſcabie vel rubigine quadam, exhalaret, & menti adhuc unita, ejus regimine, ſecundum Dei placitum, dirigeretur (82) - - - - *Seeing God is conſtant in all his works, eſpecially the principal, and hath created certain minds, namely that of men, joined to bodies ; it is not probable that work is altogether interrupted or deſtroyed, tho' but for a time : and we learn from ſacred writ, that Moſes, whoſe body died, with Elias, appeared unto the Apoſtles, beholding the glorious transfiguration of Chriſt : which could not have been without a body to which the mind was joined. Some have recourſe to an aſſumed aërial vehicle : but why might it not be from the body of Moſes itſelf, (and ſo of others) namely, a portion of that internal, more ſpiritual, ſubtile, and purer matter, which, the groſs carcaſe being put off as a cover, bark, cruſt, or certain ruſt, exhaled, and being yet united to the mind, was thereby directed according to the divine pleaſure.*’ He has publiſhed ſome objections, that were ſent him from Sedan. It was objected to him, among other things (83), that the example of Moſes proves nothing ; becauſe that great Prophet could not have been ſeen by the Apoſtles, unleſs a great deal of matter had been added to that, which went out of his dead body with his ſoul. Now if it had been neceſſary to give him above one half of a new body, one may very well ſay that the matter, with which he appeared on that day, was all new. Mr Poiret anſwered (84) that the ſubtile matter, which goes out of the body with the ſoul, is indeed too fine to ſtrike upon our groſſer ſenſes ; but that we may ſee it, when God aſſiſts us in an extraordinary manner. He was told that ſome ſchoolmen admit of a quinteſſence, which ties a human ſoul to the organs formed out of the four elements, and ſerves it as a vehicle, when it leaves the body. They ſay alſo that this vehicle is the ſubject of the torments, which the reprobate endure after the reſurrection. ‘ Obſervo opinionem viri docti non multum diſcrepare à quorundam Scholaſticorum placitis, qui præter quatuor elementa neſcio quam quintam eſſentiam venire in compoſitionem humani corporis opinantur, quæ ſit veluti medium quoddam vinculum, quo incorporeus & immortalis animus cum terreno ac mortali corpore copuletur : aliter enim ſi res eſſet, nulla videretur eſſe proportio & convenientia inter corpus & animam rationalem : & illam quidem quintam eſſentiam naturæ cœleſtis eſſe volunt, eamque ferre animum quando per mortem è corpore migrare cogitur, & in ea pœnas apud inferos luere ſceleribus ſuis promeritas (85). - - - *I obſerve that the opinion of the learned man does not much differ from the principles of ſome ſchoolmen, who think that beſides the four elements, there is a fifth ſubſtance (quinteſſence) in the compoſition of the human body, which is a ſort of medium whereby the incorporeal and immortal mind is united to the earthly and mortal body : for were it otherwiſe, there would appear to be no proportion and agreement betwixt the body and rational ſoul : and they will have that fifth ſubſtance to be of a celeſtial nature, and that it accompanies the mind when it is obliged to part from the body, and therein ſuffers the puniſhment deſerved for it's crimes.*’ Mr Poiret anſwered (86), that he had nothing to do with the ſchoolmens notions. See the margin (87).

There are ſome things in Mr Leibniz's hypotheſis, that are liable to ſome difficulties tho' they ſhew the great extent of his genius. He will have it, for inſtance, that the ſoul of a dog acts independently upon outward bodies ; *that it ſtands upon it's own bottom, by a perfect* ſpontaneity *with reſpect to itſelf, and yet with a perfect* conformity *to outward things. . . . . That it's internal perceptions ariſe from it's original conſtitution, that is to ſay, repreſentative (capable of expreſſing beings out of itſelf, with reſpect to it's organs) which was beſtowed upon it from the time of it's creation, and makes it's individual character* (88). From whence it reſults, that it would feel hunger and thirſt, at ſuch and ſuch an hour, tho' there were not any one body in the univerſe, and tho' *nothing ſhould exiſt but God and that ſoul.* He has explained (89) his thought by the example of two pendulums that ſhould perfectly agree : that is, he ſuppoſes, that according to the particular laws, which put the ſoul upon action, it muſt feel hunger at ſuch an hour ; and that according to the particular laws, which direct the motion of matter, the body which is united to that ſoul muſt be modified at that ſame hour, as it is modified when the ſoul is hungry. I will forbear preferring this ſyſtem to that of occaſional cauſes, till the learned author has perfected it. I cannot apprehend the connexion of internal and ſpontaneous

(81) Journal des Sçavans, *June* 27, *pag.* 449.

(82) Poiret, Cogitat. rational. de Deo, anima, & malo, *in Appendice, num.* 1, *pag.* 611, *Edit. Amſtelod.* 1685.

(83) *Idem*, Reſponſ. ad primas Object. *p.* 696.

(84) Ibid. *pag.* 697.

(85) Ibid. *pag.* 696.

(86) Ibid. *pag.* 697.

(87) *The anonymous Platoniſt, who writ* Philoſophia vulgaris refutata, *printed in* 1690, *ſays, that* Ockam, Maironi, Antonius Mirandulanus, Garbius, *and* Licetus, *will have the ſoul of man to be made up of two ſubſtances,* alia immateriali quæ à Deo creatur, alia materiali quæ ex traduce progignatur, &c. - - - *One immaterial, which is created by God, another material, which is propagated by generation, &c.*

(88) Journal des Sçavans, *July* 4, 1695, *pag.* 457.

(89) *In the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *February* 1696, *pag.* 274, 275.

Rorarius, I do not believe I am miſtaken when I think he was born at Pordenone in Italy [*I*]. I wiſh I had read the plea, which he compoſed for Rats (*b*). It was printed in the country of the Griſons in the year 1548. There is ſomething like it in the works of Preſident Chaſſaneus (*c*). I ſhall here give the remainder (*d*) of the collection, whereof you have ſeen the principal part in the article of Pereira.

I am informed from ſeveral hands that many perſons, who love an hiſtorical account of opinions, have approved the collections, which I publiſhed in the remarks of this article. And I have alſo heard that it would be acceptable if I publiſhed ſome others, if any new ones ſhould come into my hands. This makes me take the liberty to add here ſome ſupplements [*K*], though I am not ignorant that many readers will not much care

neous actions, which would have this effect, that the ſoul of a dog would feel pain immediately after having felt joy, tho' it were alone in the univerſe. I underſtand why a dog paſſes immediately from pleaſure to pain, when being very hungry, and eating a piece of bread, he is ſuddenly ſtruck with a cudgel; but I cannot apprehend that his ſoul ſhould be ſo framed, that at the very moment he is beaten, he ſhould feel pain, tho' he were not beaten, and tho' he ſhould continue to eat bread without any trouble or hindrance. Nor do I ſee how the ſpontaneity of that ſoul ſhould be conſiſtent with the ſenſe of pain, and in general with all unpleaſing perceptions. Beſides, the reaſon why this learned man does not like the Carteſian ſyſtem, ſeems to me to be a falſe ſuppoſition; for it cannot be ſaid that the ſyſtem of occaſional cauſes brings in God acting by a miracle (90), *Deum ex machina*, in the mutual dependency of the body and ſoul: for ſince God does only intervene according to general laws, he cannot be ſaid to act in an extraordinary manner. Does the internal and active virtue communicated to the forms of bodies, according to Mr Leibniz, know the train of actions which it is to produce? By no means; for we know by experience that we are ignorant whether we ſhall have ſuch and ſuch perceptions in an hour's time. It were therefore neceſſary that the forms ſhould be directed by ſome external principle in the production of their acts. But this would be *Deus ex machina*, as well as in the ſyſtem of occaſional cauſes (91). In fine, as he ſuppoſes with great reaſon, that all ſouls are ſimple and indiviſible, it cannot be apprehended how they can be compared with a pendulum, that is, how by their original conſtitution they can diverſify their operations, by uſing the ſpontaneous activity, beſtowed upon them by their Creator. It may clearly be conceived that a ſimple being will always act in an uniform manner, if no external cauſe hinders it. If it was compoſed of ſeveral pieces as a machine, it would act different ways, becauſe the peculiar activity of each piece might change every moment the progreſs of others: but how will you find in a ſimple ſubſtance the cauſe of a change of operation?

[*I*] *I think he was born at Pordenone in Italy.*] Here is the reaſon I have for it. He ſays that Sacillum is near the place of his birth. ‘Proximum eſt patriæ meæ Sacillum oppidum (in quo doctiſſimus Franciſcus Amaltheus publico ſtipendio humaniores litteras profitetur, cujus ſub ductu pueritiæ meæ rudimentum depoſui) amœnum flumine. - - - - *Near unto my country is the town of Sacillum, (in which the moſt learned Francis Amaltheus was public profeſſor of the* Belles Lettres, *under whom I firſt ſtudied) beautified by an adjoining river.*’ This parentheſis is not needleſs here; for we learn from it where our Rorarius began his ſtudies, and that the three brothers, who made the name of Amaltheus ſo famous (92), were not the only perſons of that name, that were learned. It is certain that Sacillum is not far (93) from *Portus Naonis*, or Pordenone, as the Italians call it, or Portenau, as the Germans name it (94). The Epiſtle Dedicatory of Rorarius's book to the biſhop of Arras, is dated from *Portus Naonis*; and there was a Phyſician of the ſame town, whoſe name was NICOLAS RORARIUS. He is the author of a book printed at Venice, in 1566, and 1572, intituled, *Contradictiones, dubia & paradoxa in libros Hippocratis, Celſi, Galeni, Aëtii, Æginetæ, Avicennæ cum eorundem conciliationibus.* We find the following words concerning this writer in Lindenius Renovatus. *Nicolaus Rorarius Utinenſis Medicus, vixit circa A. C.* 1563. *Renatus Moreau de V. S. in Pleurit.* The meaning of which is not that he was a native of Udine, but only that he practiſed Phyſic there. And therefore Konig has committed a fault, when he ſays, *Rorarius* (Nicol.) *de Portunnone, Utinenſis, collegit conciliationes contradictionum in ſcriptis Medicorum anno* 1566. The omiſſion of the word *Medicus* after *Utinenſis* deceives us, for it makes us believe that this Phyſician was born at Udine, and that *de Portunnone* was the firname of his family. Doni dedicated one of the chapters of his *Ramo della Zucca* (95) al S. Gregorio Rorario de Pordonone.

AUTHORS who believed that the ſoul of beaſts is endowed with reaſon.

[*K*] *Makes me take the liberty to add here ſome ſupplements.*] I ſhall begin with naming the authors, who believe that beaſts have rational ſouls. I do not think that any body has carried this thing farther than the Philoſopher Celſus for deſigning to confute the Chriſtians, who ſay that all things were made for the uſe of man, he endeavours to ſhew that beaſts are not leſs excellent than man, and that they even ſurpaſs them. He aſcribes (96) to them a form of government, the obſervation of juſtice, and alſo of charity (97). He pretends that ants converſe one with another. *When they meet one another*, ſays he, *they converſe together; hence it is that they never loſe their way. They are therefore endowed with reaſon in all its degrees; they have naturally the notions of ſome univerſal truths; they have the uſe of ſpeech; they have the knowledge of accidental things, and know how to expreſs them* (98). He affirms that there are ſome beaſts ‘(99) which know the ſecrets of Magic (100); ſo that men cannot boaſt of it as of a privilege peculiar to them. He ſpeaks of it in this manner. *If a man is proud of his knowledge of the ſecrets of Magic, ſerpents and eagles know more of it than he. For they have ſeveral antidotes againſt poiſons and diſeaſes, and they know the virtue of certain ſtones, for the cure of their young ones; which men value ſo much, that when they find any of them, they think they have found a treaſure.* . . . . . (101) Afterwards deſigning to ſhew at large, that men, under pretence of knowing the Deity, ought not to pretend upon that account that they are above all mortal beings, ſince there are ſome irrational animals, that have a clear and diſtinct idea of it; whilſt the moſt ſubtile men, whether they be Grecians or Barbarians, have every where ſo many diſputes about it; he adds: *if any one pretends to raiſe man above other animals, becauſe he is capable of knowing the Deity, and receiving the idea and impreſſion of it; let him know, that there are ſeveral among them, that may boaſt of the ſame advantage: and not without good grounds. For can any thing be more divine than to foreſee and to foretel things to come? Now other animals, eſpecially birds, are in that reſpect the teachers of men; and the art of our diviners conſiſts only in underſtanding what thoſe animals teach them. Birds therefore, and other animals qualified for divination, to whom* GOD *diſcovers things to come, give us the knowledge of them by ſigns and ſymbols: which ſhews that they have naturally a greater and more intimate intercourſe with the Deity than we have; that they exceed us in knowledge, and that they are dearer to* GOD *than we. The moſt knowing men ſay alſo, that thoſe animals converſe together in a more holy and noble manner than we do, and that as for themſelves, they underſtand their language; which they make to appear from this, that after they have told us that the birds ſay they will go to ſuch a place, and do there ſuch a thing; they ſhew us thoſe birds going thither, and actually doing what they ſaid they would do. As for the elephants, there is no creature that ſhews a more religious reſpect for oaths* (102), *or a more inviolable fidelity to* GOD: *which doubtleſs proceeds from no other cauſe than their knowledge of him.*’ I do not here recite what Origen anſwers to all theſe things: it is ſufficient if I give notice that he refutes them in the work he compoſed againſt Celſus.

Salmaſius

(*b*) Oratio pro Muribus adverſus Nicolai Boſtii edictum, Auguſtæ Rheticæ, apud Phil. Ulhard. *Draudius, Biblioth. pag.* 1093.

(*c*) *See* Thuanus, *lib. vi, pag.* 126.

(*d*) See the remark [*D*].

(90) Ibid.

(91) See the objections made againſt Mr Leibniz, by Mr S. F. (*it is Mr Foucher*) in the *Journal des Sçavans*, of the 12th of September 1695. *pag*, 639, *& ſeq.*

(92) Hieronymus, Joannes Baptiſta, & Cornelius Amalthei. *Their Latin poems have been printed at Amſterdam in* 1689, *with a preface of Mr Grævius.*

(93) *See* Leander Albertus, in Deſcriptione Italiæ, *pag. m.* 750.

(94) *See* Baudrand, *at the word* Portus Naonis.

(95) *It is the* Chiachiera ultima, *fol. m.* 64, *verſo.*

(96) To bees and ants.

(97) *See* Origen *againſt* Celſus, *lib. iv, pag. m.* 180.

(98) Ibid. *pag.* 181, 182.

(99) Ibid. *pag.* 182.

(100) He means natural Magic.

(101) Ibid. *pag.* 183, 184.

(102) See, above, citation (35).

care for them, and will look upon them as meer excreſcencies. They ſhall not have any occaſion

Salmaſius muſt be reckoned among the Moderns, who believed that brutes are endowed with reaſon. He ſays that the examples, which may be alledged for it, are ſo many that one might fill up a book with them (103). Oſiander diſapproves this opinion. See his notes upon Grotius's book *de Jure Belli & Pacis*, in the chapter wherein he rejects the definition of the law of nature, adopted by Juſtinian in the firſt book of the Inſtitute (104). This definition lays down that men and beaſts have the knowledge of the law of nature. Moſt of thoſe, who approve it, go upon this hypotheſis, that beaſts are not deprived of the uſe of reaſon; but moſt of thoſe, who reject that notion of the law of nature, go upon the contrary hypotheſis. Oſiander is one of them (105), and he commends Grotius for not approving Juſtinian's definition, wherein, ſays he, he was guided by Laurentius Valla, Franciſcus Conanus, Dominicus Sotus, and many others. We ſhall ſee below (106) an opinion of Grotius, which Oſiander has condemned, concerning the principle of certain actions of beaſts, that ſeem to proceed from reaſon.. John Antony Cappella, a Neapolitan Phyſician, publiſhed in 1641 *Opuſculum paradoxicum quod ratio participetur à brutis* (107), I have not read the book; and therefore I cannot ſay which way the author goes about to prove it. I am better acquainted with Dr Willis's opinion. He pretends that the ſoul of brutes is compoſed of organs, and that it has the ſame figure and extent with the body it informs; only it is not ſo thick, and its parts are ſo fine that they cannot be ſeen, and would eaſily be diſſipated, if the body of the animal did not keep them together. 'Iſta particularum ſubtilium congeries, ſive anima, quæ ſeſe latiùs explicans, & particulas ſuas aliis craſſioribus inſinuans, & intertexens corpus fabricat, juxta figuram & dimenſionem iſtius corporis exactè conformatur, ipſi coextenditur, & tanquam capſulæ, aut vaginæ ad amuſſim adaptatur, totum ac ſingulas partes ejus actuat, vivificat, ac inſpirat; porro invicem, ipſamet anima, ex ſe ſtatim diſſolvi, tenueſque in auras evaneſcere apta, à corpore continenti, in ſubſiſtentia ſua & actu conſervatur. Ità quidem Anima, tenuiſſima licet, corporea, corporis quaſi ſpectrum, ſive larva umbratilis videtur: Porrò hæc ſimul cum corpore ex materia ritè diſpoſita emergens, hypoſtaſin, ſive ſubſiſtentiam ſuam, non minùs quàm corpus, juxta Ideam, ſive Typum ipſimet ex naturæ lege præſtitutum accipit; quamvis autem corpori intimè uniatur, ejuſque velut ſubtegmen exiſtat, attamen texturâ ſubtiliſſimâ, & quaſi filo admodum prætenui conſtans, ſenſibus noſtris percipi nequit, at ſolummodo ab effectis & operationibus ſuis dignoſcitur (108). - - - - - *That collection of ſubtile particles, or the ſoul, which, expanding itſelf, and inſinuating and intermixing its particles with others more groſs, frames the body, is exactly conformed to the figure and dimenſions of that body, is co-extended with it, and exactly fitted to it as a caſe or ſheath, giving activity, life, and ſpirit, to the whole and every part of it; moreover the ſoul it ſelf, being apt in a little time to be diſſolved and to vaniſh into the air, is by the body containing it, kept in its ſubſiſtence and office. And ſo indeed the ſoul, tho' moſt ſubtile, yet ſeems to be corporeal, and, as it were, the apparition of the body, or a ſhadowy ghoſt: moreover the ſoul ariſing from matter duly diſpoſed receives its hypoſtaſis, or ſubſiſtence, no leſs that the body according to the idea or type allotted it by nature; but though it be intimately united to the body, being thereto as it were what the woof is to cloth, yet being of a texture ſo ſubtile, and of a moſt fine thread, it cannot be preceived by our ſenſes, but is only known by its effects and operations.*' He aſcribes to this ſoul a kind of reaſon which he does even give an analyſis of (109). He ſays that there is ſuch a ſoul in man, and alſo a ſpiritual one, and pretends to explain by thoſe two ſouls the conflict which we are conſcious of within our ſelves, and which other Philoſophers explain by the ſuperior and inferior faculties of one ſimple and ſingle ſpiritual ſubſtance, which they call the rational ſoul (110). But, by his leave, this way of explaining the conflict between reaſon and the ſenſitive ſoul is not ſatisfactory; for every body is conſcious to himſelf, that the principle which deſires ſenſual pleaſures, is numerically the ſame with the principle that oppoſes ſuch deſires, and which overcomes it ſometimes, but is moſt times overcome by it. If we had two kinds of ſouls really diſtinct one from another, we ſhould not obſerve this unity of principle. If he ſhould anſwer that one of them produces its ſentiments and paſſions in the other; I then would reply, that it follows from thence, that there are two ſubſtances in each man, which have the ſame deſires. But no man did ever perceive two ſuch diſtinct principles. Beſides, if a material ſoul could communicate a ſenſual deſire to the ſpiritual ſoul of man, the body would do it likewiſe; and conſequently beings are multiplied without neceſſity, by aſcribing to each man a body, and two ſouls, one of which is ſenſitive, and the other rational. But to proceed, Dr Willis obſerves that Sir Kenelme Digby was of the opinion of Pereira and Des Cartes, concerning the ſouls of brutes 'Pereira . . . . . beſtias omni cognitione, ſeu perceptione carere affirmavit; quem in nupero hoc ſeculo κατὰ πόδα ſequuti ſunt Viri Clariſſimi, *Carteſius, Digbeius*, cum aliis, qui *brutorum animas*, quantum fieri poſſit, ab humana diſcriminare præ ſe ferentes, eas non modò corporeas, & diviſibiles, ſed etiam mere *paſſivas* aſſeruerunt (111). - - - - - *Pereira . . . . . affirmed that beaſts, were without, any ſenſe or perception; who in this latter age hath been followed by the moſt famous men Des Cartes, Digby, and others, that endeavouring as much as poſſible to diſtinguiſh the ſouls of beaſts from that of man, have aſſerted that they are not only corporeal, and diviſible, but alſo merely paſſive.*' Afterwards he ſhews what difference there is between Des Cartes's opinion, and that of Sir Kenelme Digby, and he ſays that the latter does not deprive beaſts of either ſenſe or memory. It is not true therefore that his opinion was the ſame with that of Pereira, and Des Cartes: why then did the doctor ſay it was? 'Digbeius . . . . . inſuper adjecit, effluvia quædam tenuiſſima è corpore ſenſibili delibata, non modò ſenſoria exteriora afficere, verùm & interiores receſſus ſubingredientia, ſeſe ſpiritibus immiſcere, eoſque in varias fluctuationes agendo, & *ſenſus* & *motus locales* diverſimodos producere; porrò ex his atomis extrinſecis ita partes nervoſas, ac cerebrum ipſum ſubeuntibus, haud tantùm actiones extemporaneas procedere; verùm ex iiſdem in corpore ſentiente relictis, ac intra cerebri loculos reconditis, prioreſque configurationes retinentibus, rerum anteactarum ideas in *memoriâ* reſiduas conſtitui (112) - - - - *Digby . . . . added, that certain moſt ſubtile effluvia from the bodies perceived by ſenſe, did not only affect the outward organs, but entring more inwardly, mixing with the animal ſpirits, and exciting various motions in them, produce both* ſenſation, *and* local motion; *moreover from theſe outward atoms ſo entring into the nervous parts, and into the brain it ſelf, not only proceed the ſudden actions; but from the ſame remaining in the receſſes of the brain, and retaining their former figures, the ideas of things paſt reſiding in the* memory, *are framed.*' Let us conclude, that Sir Kenelme Digby is none of thoſe who maintain that beaſts are meer machines. Mr Locke has declared himſelf to be againſt thoſe who will not allow reaſon to brutes. The following words will ſhew you wherein he places the difference between men and beaſts. 'This I think I may be poſitive in, that the power of abſtracting is not at all in them, and that the having of general ideas is that which puts a perfect diſtinction betwixt man and brutes; and is an excellency, which the faculties of brutes do by no means attain to. For it is evident, we obſerve no footſteps in them of making uſe of general ſigns, for univerſal ideas: from which we have reaſon to imagine, that they have not the faculty of abſtracting, or making general ideas, ſince they have no uſe of words or any other general ſigns (113). And therefore I think we may ſuppoſe, that it is in this that the ſpecies of brutes are diſcriminated from men: and it is that proper difference wherein they are wholly ſeparated, and which at laſt widens to ſo vaſt a diſtance. For if they have any ideas at all, and are not bare machines, (as ſome would have them) we cannot deny them to have ſome reaſon. It ſeems as evident to me that they do, ſome of them, in certain inſtances, reaſon, as that they have ſenſe;

---

(103) *See* Oſiander, Annot. in Libr. Grotii de Jure Belli & Pacis, *pag.* 213.

(104) Jus naturale eſt quod natura omnia animalia docuit. Nam jus iſtud non humani generis proprium eſt, ſed omnium animalium, quæ in cœlo, quæ in terra, quæ, in mari naſcuntur . . . Videmus enim cætera quoque animalia illius juris peritia cenſeri. *Inſtitut. lib. i, tit. II.*

(105) Oſiander, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 206, *& ſeq.*

(106) Citation (119).

(107) Nicolo Toppi, Biblioth. Napolet. *p.* 124.

(108) Thomas Willis, de Anima Brutorum, *Part i, cap. ii, pag. m.* 14, 15.

(109) Ibid. *cap. vi, pag.* 91, 92.

(110) Ibid. *cap. vii,*

(111) Ibid. *cap. i, pag.* 5, 6.

(112) Ib. *p.* 7.

(113) Locke, An Eſſay concerning Human Underſtanding, *book ii, chap. xi, §. x, xi.* It is an excellent work, which deſerved to be tranſlated into French, as well as it has been done by Mr Coſte.

occaſion to ſay ſo of the obſervations I deſign to make upon Mr Leibniz's reflexions

but it is only on particular ideas, juſt as they receive them from their ſenſes, they are the beſt of them tied up within thoſe narrow bounds, and have not, as I think, the faculty to enlarge them by any kind of abſtraction (114).'

AUTHORS who have aſcribed the actions of brutes to an external principle.

There is in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (115), an abſtract of a book intituled, *Eſſais nouveaux de Morale*, which was printed at Paris in 1686. The author, who denies, on the one ſide, that beaſts are endowed with the faculty of reaſoning, confeſſes, on the other ſide, that their actions are directed by an *external reaſon*, and that *the reaſon and wiſdom, which governs them, is a reaſon and wiſdom more excellent and ſure than that of men* (116) . . . . *The reaſon*, ſays he (117), *which operates in beaſts, is not in them* . . . . . *it is, as St Thomas ſays after all the antient Fathers, the ſovereign and eternal reaſon of the ſupreme architect, who preſerves his works, and directs them to the ends for which he created them, with the ſecret ſprings he has put in them, which are variouſly determined according to occurrences, to produce a thouſand ſorts of different motions, according to their ſeveral wants.* Add to this the following words of Mr Bernard: 'The Philoſophers, who are moſt inclined to believe that beaſts are meer machines, muſt ingenuouſly confeſs that they perform ſeveral actions, the mechaniſm of which it is impoſſible to explain. It would be much better to ſay in general, that GOD, who was willing that their machines ſhould ſubſiſt for ſome time, has, through his infinite wiſdom, diſpoſed their parts agreeably to ſuch an intention. I think I have read ſomewhere this poſition, *Deus eſt anima brutorum:* this expreſſion is ſomewhat harſh; but it is ſuſceptible of a reaſonable ſenſe (118).' Grotius ſays that ſome actions of beaſts, wherein they give over their private intereſt in favour of others, proceed from an external intelligence. 'Cæterarum animantium quædam utilitatum ſuarum ſtudium, partim fœtuum ſuorum partim aliorum ſibi congenerum reſpectu, aliquatenus temperant: quod in illis quidem procedere credimus ex principio aliquo intelligente extrinſeco, quia circa actus alios, iſtis neutiquam difficiliores, par intelligentia in illis non apparet (119) - - - - - *Some of the other animals, do in ſome meaſure abſtain from what is profitable to themſelves, in regard partly of their own young, and partly of thoſe of others of the ſame ſpecies: which we believe to proceed from ſome outward intelligent principle, becauſe about other actions not more difficult, the like underſtanding does not appear.*' Gaſpar Zieglerus, in his note upon this paſſage, complains of Grotius for not explaining more clearly his thoughts about the nature of that external principle: if it be the divine providence, ſays he, Grotius lies open to the ſevere ſtrokes of Dr Juan Huarte (120), who ſhews that a Philoſopher ought not to explain phænomena by the immediate operation of GOD. He quotes two writers, who have aſcribed all the ſkill of brutes to a natural inſtinct, and he approves their opinion (121). Oſiander did very much enlarge in confuting Grotius, and he ſays among other things, that this external principle muſt be either GOD himſelf, or an angel, or the univerſal form of Averroës, and that none of thoſe three ſuppoſitions can be admitted (122). My mentioning Averroës, puts me in mind that he admitted an external principle of human knowledge common to all particular underſtandings, and which influences alſo beaſts and ſtones; but ſince he acknowledged that this influence is fruitleſs with reſpect to beaſts and inſenſible creatures; becauſe it falls upon a matter ill diſpoſed, it cannot be inferred that he aſcribed more perfection to beaſts than the ſchoolmen do. 'Averroës lib. 3. de anima cap. 5. unum facit omnium hominum intellectum, re ab animæ ſubſtantia ſeparatum, ſed ſingulis conjunctum per inſidentes phantaſiæ imagines; etiam equo, & aſino, lapidi, & metallo, aſſiſtentem, ſed citra fructum, quia materies ſit inepta (123) - - - - - *Averroës in his third book concerning the ſoul, ſays, that the underſtanding of all men is the ſame, really diſtinguiſhed from the ſubſtance of the ſoul, but united to every particular man by the images reſiding in the phantaſy: it is alſo aſſiſtant to horſes, aſſes, ſtones, and metals, but without effect, becauſe of the incapacity of the ſubjects.*'

Mr de Vigneul Marville tells us (124), that there was a certain Philoſopher who in order to explain in Mr Rohault's conferences, how beaſts, being meer machines, *acted nevertheleſs, as if they had a ſoul*, made uſe of the hypotheſis of the Comte de Gabalis, and by way of accommodation, made it ſerve his purpoſe; that is, he ſuppoſed that certain elementary ſpirits make it their buſineſs *to put in motion all the machines of beaſts, according to the rules of mechanics.* He gave ſo ingenious a turn to his diſcourſe, that Mr Pequet told him, that *if his agreeable ſyſtem was not true, it was however* bene trovato (*well contrived*) (125). I make no doubt that ſome people will be pleaſed with it: but if I was to diſpute about it, I could eaſily ſhew that it is inſufficient to explain the phænomena, and that in ſome reſpects it is more intricate than that of Des Cartes. The difficulty, which makes the Carteſians moſt uneaſy, does not conſiſt in ſaying that beaſts do readily move a thouſand different ways, but in ſaying that they expreſs love, hatred, joy, jealouſy, fear, grief, &c. The ſyſtem of thoſe elementary ſpirits is of no uſe to explain this, ſince it is pretended that they put in motion the ſprings of beaſts, only to procure to themſelves an agreeable amuſement. They would not be therefore ſuch fools as to undergo hunger, cold, or pain. It were therefore neceſſary to ſuppoſe, that none of thoſe paſſions is to be found in beaſts, and then all the difficulties return again; or elſe it muſt be ſaid, that thoſe ſpirits are condemned to direct the machines of brutes, in order to expiate their ſins, by ſuffering all the paſſions which the Peripatetics aſcribe to beaſts: which is againſt the ſuppoſition of the Gabaliſt Philoſopher. I omit ſeveral other difficulties as great as theſe which may be raiſed againſt that ſyſtem falſly ſaid to be *bene trovato.*

AUTHORS who have maintained that beaſts are mere machines, or confuted that opinion.

You will find in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (126), that Mr Vallade, author of a Philoſophical diſcourſe concerning the creation and ordering of the world, has explained the moſt ſurpriſing actions of brutes by mechanical laws. The ſame *Nouvelles* (127) inform us, that Mr de la Bruyere was cenſured for aſſerting *that beaſts are nothing but matter.* There is in the fine book of Don Francis Lami (128), about the knowledge of ones ſelf, an explanation (129) wherein the author ſhews that *there is no ſolid reaſon to aſcribe either knowledge or immortality to the ſouls of beaſts; whereas it cannot be reaſonably denied that human ſouls have both the one and the other.* That explanation is worth reading, eſpecially, becauſe it contains a ſolution of the moſt perplexing difficulty of the Carteſian ſyſtem; for Don Lami ſhews that any body may be convinced by very ſtrong arguments, that other men are not meer machines: and yet the Anti-Carteſians draw ſuch an inference, from this poſition, viz. that brutes are made up of organs ſo well contrived, that they may do without knowledge whatever they do. If GOD, ſay they, was able to form ſuch a machine, he might alſo make others that would perform all the actions of man, and conſequently we could not be ſure that any other man thinks beſides us. Father Giſbert, Regius profeſſor in the univerſity of Toulouſe, is one of thoſe who have publiſhed ſome books againſt the opinion of the Carteſians about the ſouls of beaſts (130). Note, that this opinion has been aſſerted in a courſe of Philoſophy taught (131) at Paris, in the college *of the four Nations*, and afterwards printed in the ſame city in the year 1695 with this title, *Inſtitutio Philoſophica ad faciliorem veterum ac recentiorum Philoſophorum lectionem comparata.* It contains four volumes in 12mo. What concerns the ſenſitive ſoul is to be ſeen in the third volume from page 271, to page 292. I do not queſtion that Dr Bayle, a Phyſician and profeſſor of the Liberal Arts at Toulouſe, has embraced Des Cartes's opinion upon this head in his Phyſicks, which he has lately publiſhed in three volumes in quarto (132).

I could make a long ſupplement to what I have ſaid (133), concerning Mr Poiret's opinion; but I had rather ſuppreſs it, and only point out a writer (134), who made a very learned collection relating to the doctrine of the Platoniſts, about the ætherial matter, which attends ſouls at their entrance into bodies, and at their going out of them.

(114) Ibid. *pag.* 171.

(115) For the month of October 1686, *pag.* 1196, *& ſeq.*

(116) Nouveaux Eſſais de Morale, *pag.* 30.

(117) Ibid. *pag.* 32.

(118) Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, *October* 1700, *pag.* 419, 420.

(119) Grot. de Jure Belli & Pacis, *Proleg. num.* 7.

(120) *In the 7th chapter of his* Examen de Ingenios para las Sciencias [*Trial of Wits*].

(121) Nos omnem brutorum induſtriam ad inſtinctum referimus naturæ, cum Sperlingio noſtro, *lib. i, Inſtit. Phyſ. cap. vi, qu. iii,* & eum ſecuto Joh. Frid. Hornio, *de ſubject. jur. nat. cap. vi.* Ziegler, in Prolegomena Grotii, *pag.* 5.

(122) Oſiander, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 48, *& ſeq.*

(123) Voſſius, de origine & progreſſu Idol. *lib. iii, cap. xlii, pag. m.* 952.

(124) Mélanges d'Hiſtoire & de Litterature, *Tom. i, pag.* 100, *& ſeq. Rouën* 1700.

(125) Ibid. *pag* 106.

(126) For the month of October 1700, *pag.* 419.

(127) April 1701, *p.* 433, *& ſeq.*

(128) A Benedictin of the congregation of St Maur.

(129) *Tom. v, pag.* 526, *& ſeq. Paris* 1698.

(130) *See the* Journal des Sçavans, *January* 16, 1690, *pag.* 49, *Dutch Edit.*

(131) By Mr Pourchot.

(132) See the abſtract of the firſt in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, February 1701, *pag.* 209, *& ſeq.* Which gives a great character of that work.

(133) *Above, remark* [*H*].

(134) Renatus Vallinus, ad Librum III Boëtii de Conſolatione Philoſophiæ, *p.* 62, *& ſeq.*

flexions [L], which have been publiſhed in the journal of Mr Baſnage; for thoſe obſervations are

[L] *Of the obſervations which I deſign to make upon Mr Leibniz's reflexions.*] I declare firſt of all, that I am very glad I have propoſed ſome ſmall difficulties againſt the ſyſtem of that great Philoſopher, ſince they have occaſioned ſome anſwers, whereby that ſubject has been made clearer to me, and which have given me a more diſtinct notion of what is moſt to be admired in it. I look now upon that new ſyſtem as an important conqueſt, which enlarges the bounds of Philoſophy. We had only two hypotheſes, that of the ſchools, and that of the Carteſians: the one was a *way of influence* of the body upon the ſoul, and of the ſoul upon the body; the other was a *way of aſſiſtance*, or occaſional cauſality. But here is a new acquiſition, a new hypotheſis, which may be called, as Father Lami ſtiles it, *a way of pre-eſtabliſhed harmony* (135). We are beholden for it to Mr Leibniz, and it is impoſſible to conceive any thing, that gives us a nobler idea of the power and wiſdom of the author of all things. This, together with the advantage of ſetting aſide all notions of a miraculous conduct, would engage me to prefer this new ſyſtem to that of the Carteſians, if I could conceive ſome poſſibility in the way of *pre-eſtabliſhed harmony*. I deſire the reader to take notice, that though I confeſs that this way removes all notions of a miraculous conduct, yet I do not retract what I have ſaid formerly, that the ſyſtem of occaſional cauſes does not bring in God acting miraculouſly (136). I am as much perſuaded as ever I was, that an action cannot be ſaid to be miraculous, unleſs God produces it as an exception to the general laws; and that every thing, of which he is immediately the author, according to thoſe laws, is diſtinct from a miracle properly ſo called. But being willing to cut off from this diſpute as many things as I can poſſibly, I conſent it ſhould be ſaid that the ſureſt way of removing all the notions that include a miracle, is to ſuppoſe that created ſubſtances are actively the immediate cauſes of the effects of nature. I will therefore lay aſide what I might reply to that part of Mr Leibniz's anſwer. I will alſo omit all the objections which are not more contrary to his opinion, than to that of ſome other Philoſophers. I will not therefore propoſe the difficulties that may be raiſed againſt this ſuppoſition, that a creature can receive from God the power of moving itſelf. They are ſtrong, and almoſt unanſwerable (137); but Mr Leibniz's ſyſtem does not lie more open to them than that of the Ariſtotelians: nay, I do not know whether the Carteſians would preſume to ſay, that God cannot communicate to our ſouls a power of acting. If they ſay ſo, how can they own that Adam ſinned? And if they dare not ſay ſo, they weaken the arguments, whereby they endeavour to prove, that matter is not capable of any ſort of activity. Nor do I believe that it is more difficult for Mr Leibniz than for the Carteſians, or other Philoſophers, to free himſelf from the objection of a fatal mechaniſm, which deſtroys human liberty. Wherefore waving this, I ſhall only ſpeak of what is peculiar to the ſyſtem of the *pre-eſtabliſhed harmony*.

I. My firſt obſervation ſhall be, that it raiſes the power and wiſdom of the Divine art above whatever can be conceived. Fancy to your ſelf a ſhip, which, without having any ſenſe, or knowledge, and without being directed by any created or uncreated being, has the power of moving itſelf ſo ſeaſonably as to have always the wind favourable, to avoid currents, and rocks, to caſt anchor where it ought to be done, and to retire into a harbour preciſely when it is neceſſary: ſuppoſe ſuch a ſhip ſails in that manner for ſeveral years ſucceſſively, being always turned and ſituated as it ought to be, according to the ſeveral changes of the air, and the different ſituation of ſeas and lands; you will acknowledge that God, notwithſtanding his infinite power, cannot communicate ſuch a faculty to a ſhip; nay, you will ſay that the nature of a ſhip is not capable of receiving it from God. And yet what Mr Leibniz ſuppoſes about the machine of a human body is more admirable and more ſurprizing than all this. Let us apply his ſyſtem concerning the union of the ſoul with the body to the perſon of Julius Cæſar.

II. We muſt ſay according to this ſyſtem that the body of Julius Cæſar did ſo exerciſe its moving faculty, that from its birth to its death, it went through continual changes, which did moſt exactly anſwer the perpetual changes of a certain ſoul which it did not know, and which made no impreſſion upon it. We muſt ſay that the rule, according to which that faculty of Cæſar's body performed ſuch actions, was ſuch that he would have gone to the ſenate upon ſuch a day, and at ſuch an hour; that he would have ſpoke there ſuch and ſuch words, *&c.* tho' God had been willing to annihilate his ſoul the next day after it was created. We muſt ſay, that this moving faculty did change and modify itſelf exactly according to the volubility of the thoughts of that ambitious man; and that it was affected preciſely in a certain manner, rather than in another, becauſe the ſoul of Cæſar paſſed from a certain thought to another. Can a blind power modify itſelf ſo exactly by virtue of an impreſſion, communicated thirty or forty years before, and which was never renewed ſince, and which is left to itſelf, without ever knowing what it is to do? Is not this much more incomprehenſible than the navigation I ſpoke of in the foregoing paragraph?

III. The difficulty will be greater ſtill, if it be conſidered that the human machine contains an almoſt infinite number of organs, and that it is continually expoſed to the ſhock of the bodies that ſurround it (138), and which by an innumerable variety of ſhakings, produce in it a thouſand ſorts of modifications. How is it poſſible to conceive that this *pre-eſtabliſhed harmony* ſhould never be diſordered, but go on ſtill during the longeſt life of a man, notwithſtanding the infinite varieties of the reciprocal action of ſo many organs upon one another, which are ſurrounded on all ſides with infinite corpuſcles, ſometimes hot and ſometimes cold, ſometimes dry and ſometimes moiſt, and always acting and pricking the nerves a thouſand different ways. Suppoſe that the multiplicity of organs, and of external agents, be a neceſſary inſtrument of the almoſt infinite variety of changes in a human body; will that variety have the exactneſs here required? Will it never diſturb the correſpondence of thoſe changes with the changes of the ſoul? This ſeems to be altogether impoſſible.

IV. It is in vain to have recourſe to the power of God, in order to maintain that brutes are meer machines; it is in vain to ſay that God was able to make machines ſo artfully contrived that the voice of a man, the reflected light of an object, *&c.* will ſtrike them exactly where it is neceſſary, that they may move in a certain manner. This ſuppoſition is rejected by every body, except ſome Carteſians; and no Carteſian would admit of it, if it were to be extended to man, that is, if any one ſhould aſſert, that God was able to form ſuch bodies as would machinally do whatever we ſee other men do. By denying this, we do not pretend to limit the power and knowledge of God; we only mean that the nature of things does not permit, that the faculties, imparted to a creature ſhould not be neceſſarily confined within certain bounds. The actions of creatures muſt be neceſſarily proportioned to their eſſential ſtate, and performed according to the character that belongs to each machine; for according to the axiom of the Philoſophers (139), whatever is received, is proportioned to the capacity of the ſubject that receives it. We may therefore reject Mr Leibniz's hypotheſis as being impoſſible, ſince it is liable to greater difficulties than that of the Carteſians which makes beaſts to be meer machines. It puts a perpetual harmony between two beings, which do not act one upon another; but if ſervants were meer machines, and ſhould punctually obey their maſters command, it could not be ſaid, that they do it without a real action of their maſters upon them: for their maſters would ſpeak ſome words, and make ſome ſigns, that would really ſhake and move the organs of the ſervants.

V. Now let us conſider the ſoul of Julius Cæſar, and we ſhall find the thing more impoſſible ſtill. That ſoul was in the world without being expoſed to the influence of any ſpirit. The power it received from God, was the only principle of the actions it produced at every moment: And if thoſe actions were different one from another, it was not becauſe ſome of them were produced by the united influence of ſome ſprings, which did not contribute to the production of others, for

(135) *Dom* Francis Lami, *Traitté II, de la* Connoiſſance de ſoi-même, *p.* 226, *Edit.* 1699.

(136) See the Memoir which Mr Leibniz has cauſed to be inſerted in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans*, *July* 1698, *p.* 334.

(137) See Mr Sturmius, in the firſt tome of his *Phyſica electiva ſive hypothetica* (whereof an extract is to be found in the Journal of Leipſic 1697, *pag.* 474, *&* *ſeq.*) and in the Memoir which he hath inſerted in the Journal of Leipſic 1699, *pag.* 208, *&* *ſeq.* to anſwer a Memoir of Mr Leibniz, inſerted in the ſame Journal 1698, *pag.* 427, *&* *ſeq.*

(138) Obſerve, that according to Mr Leibniz, what is active in every ſubſtance, ought to be reduced to a true unity. Since therefore the body of every man is compoſed of ſeveral ſubſtances, each of them ought to have a principle of action really diſtinct from the principle of each of the others. He will have the action of every principle to be ſpontaneous. Now this muſt needs vary their effects, *in infinitum*, and confound them. For the impreſſion of the neighbouring bodies muſt needs put ſome conſtraint upon the natural ſpontaneity of every one of them.

(139) Quidquid recipitur, ad modum recipientis recipitur.

are a natural and neceſſary conſequence of a paſſage in the firſt edition of this article. I hope

for the ſoul of man is ſimple, indiviſible, and immaterial. Mr Leibniz owns it: and if he did not acknowledge it, but if, on the contrary, he ſhould ſuppoſe with moſt Philoſophers, and ſome of the moſt excellent Metaphyſicians of our age (140), that a compound of ſeveral material parts placed and diſpoſed in a certain manner, is capable of thinking; his hypotheſis would appear to me, for that very thing, abſolutely impoſſible, and I could refute it ſeveral other ways, which I need not mention, ſince he acknowledges the immateriality of our ſoul, and builds upon it. Let us return to the ſoul of Julius Cæſar, and call it an immaterial Automaton (141), and compare it with an atom of Epicurus; I mean an atom ſurrounded with a vacuum on all ſides, and which would never meet any other atom. This is a very juſt compariſon; for this atom on the one hand, has a natural power of moving itſelf, and exerts it without any aſſiſtance, and without being retarded or hindred by any thing; and on the other hand, the ſoul of Cæſar is a ſpirit, which has received the faculty of producing thoughts, and exerts it without the influence of any other ſpirit, or of any body. It is neither aſſiſted nor thwarted by any thing whatſoever. If you conſult the common notions, and the ideas of order, you will find that this atom can never ſtop, and that having been in motion in the foregoing moment, it will continue in it at this very moment, and in all the moments that ſhall follow, and that it will always move in the ſame manner. This is the conſequence of an axiom approved by Mr Leibniz: Since *a thing does always remain in the ſame ſtate wherein it happens to be, unleſs it receives ſome alteration from ſome other thing* (142); .... *We conclude*, says he (143), *not only that a body which is at reſt, will always be at reſt; but alſo that a body in motion, will always keep that motion or change, that is, the ſame ſwiftneſs, and the ſame direction, if nothing happens that hinders it.* Every one clearly ſees that this atom, whether it moves by an innate power, as Democritus and Epicurus would have it, or by a power received from the Creator, will always move in the ſame line equally, and after an uniform manner, without ever turning, or going back. Epicurus was laughed at, when he invented the motion of declination (144); it was a needleſs ſuppoſition which he wanted to get out of the labyrinth of a fatal neceſſity, and he could give no reaſon for this new part of his ſyſtem. It was inconſiſtent with the cleareſt notions of our minds; for it is evident that an atom, which deſcribes a strait line for the ſpace of two days, cannot turn away at the beginning of the third, unleſs it meets with ſome obſtacle, or has a mind, all of a ſudden, to go out of its road, or contains ſome ſpring which begins to play at that very moment. The firſt of theſe reaſons cannot be admitted in a vacuum. The ſecond is impoſſible, ſince an atom has not the faculty of thinking. And the third is likewiſe impoſſible in a corpuſcle that is a perfect unity. I muſt make ſome uſe of all this.

VI. Cæſar's ſoul is a being to which unity belongs in a ſtrict ſenſe. The faculty of producing thoughts is a property of it's nature (145), which it has received from God, both as to poſſeſſion and exerciſe. If the firſt thought it produces is a ſenſe of pleaſure, there is no reaſon why the ſecond ſhould not be likewiſe a ſenſe of pleaſure; for when the total cauſe of an effect remains the ſame, the effect cannot be altered. Now this ſoul at the ſecond moment of it's exiſtence, does not receive a new faculty of thinking; it only preſerves the faculty it had at the firſt moment, and it is as independent from the concourſe of any other cauſe at the ſecond moment as it was at the firſt; it muſt therefore produce again at the ſecond moment the ſame thought it had produced juſt before. If it be objected that it ought to be in a ſtate of change, and that it would not be in ſuch a ſtate, in the caſe that I have ſuppoſed; I anſwer that it's change will be like the change of the atom: for an atom, which continually moves in the ſame line, acquires a new ſituation at every moment; but it is like the preceding ſituation. A ſoul may therefore continue in its ſtate of change, if it does but produce a new thought like the preceeding. But ſuppoſe it be not confined within ſuch narrow bounds; it muſt be granted at leaſt, that its going from one thought to another implies ſome reaſon of affinity. If I ſuppoſe that in a certain inſtant the ſoul of Cæſar ſees a tree with leaves and bloſſoms, I can conceive (146) that it does immediately deſire to ſee one that has only leaves, and then one that has only bloſſoms, and that it will thus ſucceſſively produce ſeveral images ariſing from one another; but one cannot apprehend the poſſibility of the odd changes of thoughts, that have no affinity with, and are even contrary to, one another, and which are ſo common in mens ſouls. One cannot apprehend how God could place in the ſoul of Julius Cæſar the principle of what I am going to ſay. He was without doubt pricked with a pin more than once, when he was ſucking; and therefore, according to Mr Leibniz's hypotheſis, which I am here conſidering, his ſoul muſt have produced in itſelf, a ſenſe of pain immediately after the pleaſant ſenſations of the ſweetneſs of the milk, which it had enjoyed for the ſpace of two or three minutes. By what ſprings was it determined to interrupt its pleaſures, and to give itſelf all of a ſudden a ſenſe of pain, without receiving any intimation of preparing itſelf to change, and without any new alteration in its ſubſtance? If you run over the life of that Roman emperor, every page will afford you matter for a ſtronger objection than this is.

VII. The thing would be leſs incomprehenſible, if it were ſuppoſed that the ſoul of man is not one ſpirit, but rather a multitude of ſpirits, each of which has its functions, that begin and end preciſely as the changes made in a human body require. By virtue of this ſuppoſition it ſhould be ſaid, that ſomething analogous to a great number of wheels and ſprings, or of matters that ferment, diſpoſed according to the changes of our machine, awakens or lulls aſleep for a certain time, the action of each of thoſe ſpirits; but then the ſoul of man would be no longer a ſingle ſubſtance, but an *Ens per aggregationem*, a collection and heap of ſubſtances juſt like all material beings. We are here in queſt of a ſingle being, which produces in itſelf ſometimes joy, ſometimes pain, *&c.* and not of many beings, one of which produces hope, another deſpair, *&c.*

In theſe obſervations I have only cleared and unfolded thoſe, which Mr Leibniz has done me the honour to examine; and now I ſhall make ſome reflexions upon his anſwers.

VIII. He ſays (147), that *the law of the change which happens in the ſubſtance of the animal, tranſports him from pleaſure to pain, at the very moment that a ſolution of continuity is made in his body; becauſe the law of the indiviſible ſubſtance of that animal, is to repreſent what is done in his body, as we experience it, and even to repreſent in ſome manner, and with reſpect to that body, whatever is done in the world.* Theſe words are a very good explication of the grounds of this ſyſtem: they are, as it were, the unfolding and key of it; but at the ſame time they are the very things at which all the objections of thoſe, who take this ſyſtem to be impoſſible, are levelled. The law Mr Leibniz ſpeaks of, ſuppoſes a decree of God, and ſhews wherein this ſyſtem agrees with that of occaſional cauſes. Thoſe two ſyſtems agree in this point, that there are ſome laws, according to which the ſoul of man is *to repreſent what is done in the body of man, as we experience it.* But they diſagree as to the manner of executing thoſe laws: the Carteſians ſay, that God executes them: Mr Leibniz will have it, that the ſoul itſelf does it; which appears to me impoſſible, becauſe the ſoul has not the neceſſary inſtruments for ſuch an execution. Now however infinite the power and knowledge of God be, he cannot perform with a machine deprived of a certain piece, what requires the concourſe of ſuch a piece. He muſt ſupply that defect; but then this effect would be produced by him and not by the machine. I ſhall ſhew that the ſoul has not the inſtruments requiſite for the execution of the Divine law we ſpeak of, and in order to it I ſhall make uſe of a compariſon.

Fancy to your ſelf an animal created by God, and deſigned to ſing continually. He will always ſing, that is moſt certain, but if God deſigns him a certain tablature, he muſt neceſſarily either put it before his eyes, or imprint it upon his memory, or diſpoſe his muſcles in ſuch a manner, that according to the laws of mechaniſm, one certain note will always come after another,

(140) Mr Locke for inſtance.

(141) Mr Leibniz uſes this expreſſion, *ubi ſupra*, *pag.* 338. The ſoul, *ſays he*, is a moſt exact immaterial *automaton*.

(142) *Memoir inſerted in the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *July* 1698, *pag.* 331.

(143) Mr Leibniz, *ibid.* declares that he acknowledges the truth of this axiom: *nay*, ſays he, *I maintain that it is favourable to me, and indeed it is one of the things I build upon.*

(144) See, above, the article EPICURUS, remark [*U*].

(145) This I ſay, according to Mr Leibniz's ſyſtem.

(146) I ſpeak thus by way of conceſſion; that is to ſay, I will not take an advantage of the reaſons which hinder us from conceiving that a created ſpirit can of himſelf frame any ideas.

(147) Leibniz, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 332.

hope they will prove an occaſion of clearing up a ſubject, which is not leſs difficult than important.

another, agreeable to the order of the tablature. Without this one cannot apprehend that this animal can ever follow the whole ſet of the notes appointed by GOD. Let us apply this to man's ſoul. Mr Leibniz will have it, that it has received not only the power of producing thoughts continually, but alſo the faculty of following always a certain ſet of thoughts, which anſwers the continual changes that happen in the machine of the body. This ſet of thoughts is like the tablature preſcribed to the ſinging animal abovementioned. Can the ſoul change its perceptions or modifications at every moment, according to ſuch a ſet of thoughts, without knowing the ſeries of the notes, and actually thinking upon them? But experience teaches us, that it knows nothing of it. Were it not at leaſt neceſſary, that, in default of ſuch a knowledge, there ſhould be in the ſoul a ſet of particular inſtruments, each of which would be a neceſſary cauſe of ſuch or ſuch a thought? Muſt they not be ſo placed and diſpoſed as to operate preciſely one after another, according to the correſpondence *pre-eſtabliſhed* betwixt the changes of the body and the thoughts of the ſoul? but it is moſt certain, that an immaterial, ſimple, and indiviſible ſubſtance, cannot be made up of ſuch an innumerable multitude of particular inſtruments placed one before another, according to the order of the tablature in queſtion. It is not therefore poſſible that a human ſoul ſhould execute that law.

Mr Leibniz (148) ſuppoſes that the ſoul does not diſtinctly know its future perceptions, *but that it perceives them confuſedly*, and that *there are in each ſubſtance tracts of whatever hath happened, and ſhall happen to it* (149)*: but that an infinite multitude of perceptions hinders us from diſtinguiſhing them. . . . . . The preſent ſtate of each* ſubſtance, is a natural conſequence of its preceding ſtate. . . . . . (150) *The ſoul, though never ſo ſimple, has always a ſentiment compoſed of ſeveral perceptions at one time; which anſwers our end as well as if it was compoſed of pieces, like a machine. For each foregoing perception has an influence upon thoſe that follow, agreeably to a law of order, which is in perceptions as well as in motions. . . . . .* (151) *The perceptions that are together in one and the ſame ſoul at the ſame time, including an infinite multitude of little undiſtinguiſhable ſentiments that are to be unfolded, we need not wonder at the infinite variety of what is to reſult from it in time. This is only a conſequence of the repreſentative nature of the ſoul, which is to expreſs what happens, and what will happen in its body, and in ſome manner in all other bodies, by the connexion and correſpondence of all the parts of the world.* I have but little to ſay in anſwer to this: I ſhall only obſerve, that this ſuppoſition when ſufficiently cleared, is the right way of ſolving all the difficulties. Mr Leibniz, through the penetration of his great genius, has very well conceived the whole extent and ſtrength of the objection, and what remedy ought to be applied to the main inconveniency. I do not queſtion but that he will ſmooth the rough part of his ſyſtem, and teach us ſome excellent things about the nature of ſpirits. No body can travel more uſefully and more ſafely than he in the intellectual world. I hope that his curious explanations will remove all the impoſſibilities, which I have found hitherto in his ſyſtem, and that he will ſolidly reſolve my difficulties, and even thoſe of Father Lami (152); and theſe hopes made me ſay before, without deſigning to paſs a compliment upon that learned man, that his ſyſtem ought to be looked upon as an important conqueſt (153).

He will not be much embaraſſed by this, *viz.* that whereas according to the ſuppoſition of the Carteſians, there is but one general law for the union of all ſpirits with bodies, he will have it, That GOD gives a particular law to each ſpirit; from whence it ſeems to reſult, that the primitive conſtitution of each ſpirit is ſpecifically different from all others (154). Do not the Thomiſts ſay, That there are as many ſpecies as *individuums* in the angelical nature?

(148) Ubi ſupra, *pag.* 337.

(149) This is what cannot be conceived in an indiviſible, ſimple, and immaterial ſubſtance.

(150) Ibid. *pag.* 339, 340.

(151) Ibid. *pag.* 340.

(152) They are in the 2d diſcourſe of Self-Knowledge, *from pag.* 225, *to pag.* 243, *Paris Edit.* 1699.

(153) Above, remark [*L*], at the beginning.

(154) There never were two men, who had the ſame thoughts, I will not ſay for one month together, but even for two minutes. The principle of thought, muſt therefore have a particular rule and nature in every man.

RORENCO (MARCO AURELIO) one of the joint lords of the valley of Lucerne and Grand Prior of St Roc at Turin, was a great perſecutor of the Vaudois in the XVIIth century [*A*]. He alſo wrote books againſt them [*B*], *Narratione dell' introduttione delle Hereſie nelle Valli de Piemonte*, printed at Turin in the year 1632, and *Memorie Hiſtoriche dell' introduttione delle Hereſie*, printed at the ſame place in the year 1649,

[*A*] *Was a great perſecuter of the Vaudois in the XVIIth century.*] Peter Gilles in his Hiſtory of the Reformed Churches of Piedmont; having ſpoken of the famine in the year 1628, adds; *The adverſaries of the Reformed Churches in the Valleys, who were ever waiting for an occaſion to perſecute them, choſe that of the famine, hoping it would ſerve for a net to fiſh and draw unto them the poor famiſhed people, and herein thoſe who above others zealouſly exerted themſelves were the abovementioned Monk Bonaventure, and the Sieur Marcus Aurelius Rorenco, prior of Luſerne, ſon to one of the gentlemen of the valley, who having ſtudied the laws became a Prieſt, and going to Rome, was made Prior of Luſerne, and had the revenues of that Priory given him: but this (as was given out even by thoſe of his own party) was for having promiſed at Rome and elſewhere to uſe the utmoſt of his power and knowledge for promoting the Romiſh religion in the Vallies, and to aboliſh, or at leaſt reſtrain the Reformed, and he was not even yet returned from his Roman journey, when ſome Reformed of the Vallies were credibly informed that the Prior for the foreſaid purpoſe, determined to get new monaſteries built in the valley of Luſerne, in ſome other places, and in others to fix the abode of ſome Monks, and to do other matters of that kind, which not long after he endeavoured with all his power to perform. And firſt he cauſed Count John Baptiſt Rorenco, his father, reſiding at la Tour, to ſell his houſe and the adjoining buildings, in order to make a monaſtery for Monks called Franciſcans, Reformed Minimes. And on the 23d of June of the foreſaid year,* 1628, *he conducted them thither, together with Friar Bonaventure, with ſeveral other Monks, and Prieſts, and immediately after they ſent thither proviſions of whatever the Monks had occaſion for themſelves, and to bribe the conſciences of poor famiſhed people, and they began to give largely to the few Papiſts that had remained with them at la Tour, even to ſome who had no need, that the neighbouring Reformed might be enticed to preſent themſelves before them, and ſay, What will you give me and I will do as you deſire: but ſeeing none to come, they invited them to deal with them by their Papiſts; wherein appeared more diligent than any other, the lady Catherine, mother to the foreſaid Friar, who went from houſe to houſe, exhorting the poorer and weaker ſort to go and accept the great charity which the neighbouring Fathers had prepared* (1).

Another writer of the Hiſtory of the Churches in the Vallies ſays, that *the Grand-prior Rorenco is their great perſecutor, and a member of the council* de extirpandis hæreticis, - - - *for extirpating Heretics* (2), . . . *was looked upon at Rome as the moſt diligent, the moſt cunning, and moſt effectual inſtrument that could be employed in this age to haraſs theſe poor people of the Vallies, and the perſon moſt ſkillful to contrive deſigns and other methods of their ruin, as having grown old in that ſtudy (for he is now decrepit)* (3).

[*B*] *He alſo wrote books againſt them.*] Peter Gilles having ſaid (4) that in the year 1610 came out a book, intituled, *Vittoria triomphale*, compoſed by the Franciſcan Friar Samuel de Caſſini, which calumniated the Vaudois, adds, ' There is to be ſeen almoſt the ſame in a book intituled *Breve narratione*, of the preſent Prior of Luſerne, printed in the year 1632, and expreſsly compoſed to defame the religion and the manners of the Reformed of the Vallies, full of falſehoods and impudent calumnies thus prefaced, *You do, you ſay, and there are ſtill ſome perſons alive, who remember that your fathers did ſuch and ſuch things.*

(1) Peter Gilles, Hiſt. Eccleſ. des Egliſes Vaudoiſes, *pag.* 473, 474.

(2) John Leger, Hiſtory of the Churches of the Vaudois, *Part i, p.* 155: he ſays Rorenco is yet alive, and he dates the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his book, May 1, 1669.

(3) Ib. *p.* 173.

(4) Hiſtory of the Churches of the Vaudois, *p.* 13.

1649, and dedicated to the duke of Savoy (*a*). He was born in the valley of Lucerne, and was the ſon of Count John Baptiſt Rorenco (*b*), and was ſtill living in the year 1668 (*c*).

(*a*) *See* John Leger, Hiſt. des Egliſes Vaudoiſes, *Part i, pag.* 144, 173, where he ſays, that the Memoirs were printed in the year 1645. (*b*) See the remark [*A*]. (*c*) See the ſame remark.

‘ *things.* But finding afterwards that violent complaints were made of his ſlanders, and that he was in good earneſt challenged to prove what he had written, and eſpecially to produce the pretended living witneſſes of ſome former wickedneſſes; and not knowing where to have them: he publiſhed another book in the year 1634, intituled, *An apologetic letter*, wherein he declares, *That it never was his intention to defame the Proteſtants of the Vallies, and that what he had written in his book, was only an account that ſome authors had given of certain vices, which in former times reigned in diverſe places.* But that he might not again be cenſured, he carefully kept himſelf from naming the pretended authors, and the places, and times.’ The churches of the Vallies ordered the Sieur Valerius Gros, Paſtor of the church of Villar to anſwer the firſt book of the Prior (5): this anſwer was never publiſhed; but as to that which was made to the ſecond book it was printed, and there may be found a general idea of it in the Hiſtorian which I cited (6). See the article GILLES (PETER).

(5) Hiſt. des Egliſes Voudoiſes, *pag.* 539.

(6) Ibid. *pag.* 540, *& ſeq.*

ROSE (WILLIAM) preacher to Henry III, and biſhop of Senlis, the moſt enraged Leaguer that was in France. See the Notes upon the *Catholicon d'Eſpagne* (*a*); but add to them this circumſtance, that having refuſed to pull off his Epiſcopal habits, when the parliament of Paris condemned him to make an *Amende Honorable*; he made it in his Pontificalibus the fifth of September 1598 (*b*). Mr de Launoi is very much to blame (§ α) for having beſtowed ſo many encomiums upon that prelate (*c*), without cenſuring him in the leaſt. It is a ſcandalous thing.

(*a*) *Notes upon the* Catholicon d'Eſpagne, *pag.* 196, *& ſeq. Edit.* 1696. See alſo *pag.* 91.
(*b*) Thuanus, *lib. cxx, pag.* 827. (*c*) Launoius, in Hiſtoria Collegii Navarr. *pag.* 1019, *& ſeq.*

[(§ α) He is no leſs to be blamed with reſpect to Dr Francis le Picart, likewiſe one of his heroes, if it is true what is reported of that man, that one day, which was the 25th of November 1553, after having in his ſermon ſufficiently, according to his uſual cuſtom, vented his rage againſt the Lutherans, he proceeded at laſt to ſay, *that the king ought for ſome time to counterfeit the Lutheran with them, to the end that, taking thence the occaſion publickly to hold their aſſemblies, they might all be put to the ſword, and the kingdom once for all cleared of them.* See the Anatomy of the Maſs, *&c.* tranſlated from Italian, by Antony d'Adam, pag. 538, of the edition of John Martin, 1562. As for the reſt, who knows but ſome of thoſe who nineteen years after adviſed king Charles IX to the *Paris Maſſacre*, was preſent at that ſermon? REM. CRIT.]

ROSE (TOUSSAINT) Marquis de Coye, ſecretary to the king's cabinet, preſident in the Chamber of Accounts, and one of the forty members of the French Academy, had been ſecretary to Cardinal Mazarin. He died the ſixth of January 1701 in the eighty-ſixth of year of his age (*a*). His poſterity ſtill remains [*A*]. His place in the academy, which he left vacant by his deceaſe, and wherein he ſucceeded to Mr Conrart in the year 1675, was given to Mr de Saci the ſeventeenth of March 1701. We find in the *Menagiana* that he was deſcended of *a good family of Provence*, that he had been *ſecretary to the cardinal de Rets*, and that he had *in his name* written *letters admirably fine* (*b*).

(*a*) Mercure Galant, *January* 1701, *pag.* 104.

(*b*) Menagiana, *p.* 297, *of the firſt Holland Edition.*

[*A*] *His poſterity ſtill remains.*] LEWIS ROSE, his ſon, Lord of Coye, counſellor in the parliament of Mets, and ſecretary to the king's cabinet, died in the year 1688, and left behind one ſon and one daughter of his marriage with Magdalen de Bailleul (1). The daughter was married on the 28th of April 1699 to Antony Portail advocate-general in the parliament of Paris (2).

(1) The daughter of Mr de Bailleul, preſident à Mortier. She was a ſecond time married to the Marquis de Vatan.

(2) Taken from the *Mercure Galant* of Jan. 1701, *pag.* 105.

ROSEN (*a*) (REINHOLD) a gentleman of Livonia [*A*], ſerved under the Duke of Weimar, and afterward in the armies of France, and acquired the reputation of a good warrior [*B*]. He married in Alſatia, *and there made a conſiderable ſettlement* (*b*). He went to ſalute the king at the ſiege of Dole in year 1668. He was mounted on a horſe thirty-eight years old, which, ‘ he told the king, had ſaved his life at the ‘ battle

(*a*) The Latin Hiſtorians call him *Roſa*, and the French *Roſe.*

(*b*) Mercure Galant, *for the month of February* 1703, *pag.* 332.

[*A*] *A gentleman of Livonia.*] He was of a family, *of which there have been knights of the order of Swordbearers* (1), and it is well known that Mr Roſen the marſhal of France *had records brought from Livonia which proved that the nobility of his houſe was very antient. He had the honour to be related to the royal family of Sweden, and there has been a marſhal of Sweden of his houſe* (2).

[*B*] *He acquired the reputation of a good warrior.*] His courage and conduct ſufficiently appeared by his being choſen by the duke of Weimar to the command of his cavalry (3), and named him by his will one of the directors of the army (4). It would be endleſs to deſcribe all the battles wherein he was, and wherein he gave proofs of his courage. I think it better to refer my readers to the hiſtories of thoſe times. He is there very often mentioned by the bare title of *Colonel Roſe.* Yet I muſt not omit to ſay that he was not always victorious: he was made priſoner at Mariendal in 1645 (5), where the army under Marſhal de Turenne was defeated. He would have had the ſame fate at the loſs of the battle of Dutlingen (6), had he not fled very ſpeedily (7). Marſhal Turenne was not pleaſed with him in the fight of Mariendal (8); but he was much more diſpleaſed two years after when he believed him to be the chief promoter of the revolt the Swedes were contriving in his army, inſomuch that he put him under guard (9). He afterwards had an order from court to ſet him at liberty (10).

(1) Mercure Galant, *February* 1703, *pag.* 331.

(2) Ibid. *p.* 335.

(3) Cum ſub Bernardi Saxonis auſpiciis magiſtrum equitum egiſſet. *Franckenſteinius, in Indice Hiſtoriæ Benjam. Prioli.*

(4) Puffendorf, Rerum Suecic. *lib. xi, pag.* 374.

(5) Franckenſt. in Indice Hiſt. Prioli.

(6) The 14th of November, 1643.

(7) Appendix Hiſtor. Univerſ. Joh. Cluveri, *pag. m.* 759.

(8) See the Life of Marſhal Turenne, by the pretended du Buiſſon, *lib. iii, pag.* 195, *Hague Edit.* 1688.

(9) Ib. *p.* 221, 222.

(10) Franck. in Indice Hiſt. Prioli.

‘ battle of Rocroy (c).’ He died not long after *and left a penſion to his horſe, with a meadow, and his liberty* (d) [C]. Having no male iſſue, *he reſolved to promote* one of his kinſmen, *whom he had engaged to quit Livonia, he provided him a wife, and left him all his eſtate.* This kinſman of his was created a marſhal of France in the month of January 1703. *He hath large poſſeſſions in Alſatia which are ſettled upon him in fee* (e). He has a ſon who is a major-general, and a daughter who is married to the Marquis de Rottembourg (*f*).

Priolo obſerves that a brother of our Roſen was killed at the battle of Rhetel in the month of December 1650 (11). The French Mercury (12) mentions one colonel JOHN ROSE, couſin of colonel Reynold Roſe. The *Theatre de l'Europe*, at pag. 899 of the fifth volume, mentions one VOLMAR ROSA, who was killed for having given a box on the ear (13).

[C] *He left a penſion to his horſe, with a meadow, and his liberty.*] One who would lay hold upon all occaſions to communicate his collections would here have a large field; for though he ſpoke not of all the beaſts to which teſtimonies have been given of affection, and gratitude (14), but only of ſuch as concern the horſes, he might quote a very great number of examples. I know ſome ſuch myſelf, beſides what I have obſerved in the remark [*M*] of the article CALIGULA, and in the remark [*O*] of the Emperor ADRIAN; however I ſhall be ſhort upon this matter, it is an eaſy matter to conſult Philip Camerarius, who hath made very good collections on this ſubject in the firſt tome of his hiſtorical Meditations in the firſt chapter of book II. Some quotations relating to this may alſo be ſeen in the *Peintures Morales* of Father le Moine. He has not omitted Caligula, and has repreſented the folly in ſuch affected terms that I cannot forbear reciting them. *An emperor*, ſays he (15), *cauſed a palace of marble to be built for a horſe: he appointed him the furniture and retinue of a prince, and not contented with this, he named him conſul, he gave him a place in the ſenate, and made him to be regiſtred in the Faſti among the Cato's and Pompeys. Had he ſurvived him, he would undoubtedly have made a god of him by an apotheoſis of a new form, and have conſtrained the twelve deities of the capital to receive him into their number.* In Pliny (16) alſo may be ſeen ſome inſtances of honours done to horſes.

All military gentlemen have not had the like ſentiments of gratitude for their horſes as our Roſen. A certain Neapolitan gentleman abandoned his horſe, and was enjoined to maintain him. Father Pardies concerning this quotes Spondanus, and ſays that *a great prince* (17) *of former times of great renown for his virtue, and for the zeal he had to do juſtice to every one, thought he gave a judgment worthy his grandeur, when he decreed in favour of an old horſe, which, having been forſaken by his maſter, in his old age, to whom he had done very conſiderable ſervices in the war, went, I know not by what inſtinct, or by what accident, and ſounded a bell, which had been hung on purpoſe at the gate of the palace, that all thoſe who thought themſelves injured, might ring it in order to make their complaints, and demand juſtice* (18). Sabba Caſtiglione, a gentleman of Milan, who died knight of Malta and commander of Faenza in the month of March 1554 (19), hath given a very long account of this in the CXXII chapter of his *Ricordi neceſſarii dal principio della vita civile, ſino a fine di quella*, &c. See Camerarius in the chapter quoted above.

I believe the judges, by whoſe award (20) the cat of *Madam de Puis a famous player on the harp* (21), loſt a law-ſuit, would not have in ſuch manner treated the horſe of the Neapolitan gentleman. The laſt will and teſtament of this lady made a *great noiſe*: a proceſs was raiſed *to ſet it aſide: Meſſieurs Maurice, Vautier, and de Ferriere, famous advocates,* diſplayed *their eloquence, the firſt in defending it, the two laſt in pleading againſt it. The penſion which the deceaſed* had left *to her cat, and the viſits ſhe* had appointed to be made to her *every week*, were *the things which* were moſt exclaimed *againſt* (22).

ROSEO, or ROSEUS (Mambrin) an Italian author, lived in the XVIth century. He publiſhed in 1549 the Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Prince, wherein he neither followed thoſe who deſcribe government as it is commonly managed, nor thoſe who give an idea of it according to the moſt perfect ſpeculation. He choſe a middle way between theſe extremes [*A*], which was to ſhew what the rules of common policy might allow. He continued the Hiſtory of the world which John Tarcagnota had from Adam brought down to the year 1513: he continued it, I ſay, to the year 1558, and thence to the year 1571 (*a*). That work is written in Italian, and was by Don Barthelemi Denys de Fano carried down to the year 1582. Roſeo was not alive when the edition which I uſe was publiſhed, which is that of Venice *appreſſo i Giunti* 1585 *in* 4. At the ſame time was reprinted the work of Tarcagnota, the ſecond edition of which was in the year 1562 (*b*). It hath been ſaid elſewhere (*c*) that Roſeus tranſlated into Italian a treatiſe of the military art which went for a work of William de Bellai. He alſo wrote an Hiſtory of the kingdom of Naples. He ſhews himſelf extremely paſſionate in his continuation of Tarcagnota whenever he ſpeaks of the Proteſtants, and it appears that he took the method of Hiſtorians who never examine the teſtimonies of each party, but only thoſe of the party they favour. As to proper names, he is beſides guilty of innumerable miſtakes.

[*A*] *He choſe a middle way between theſe extremes.*] This obſervation I have taken from Naudæus. ‘ Niphus, *ſays he* (1), & Machiavellus Principes ſuos effinxêre, quales ut plurimùm eſſe deprehenduntur: Eraſmus, Oſorius, Foxius, Natta, Omphalius Wimphelingus, ut ſe moraliter gerere deberent: Mambrinus Roſeus, Frachetta, & Lælius Marettus Senenſis, cujus liber publici juris nondum factus eſt, ut illis Politicæ communis legibus agere conceditur. Bellarminus denique, Ribadeneira, & Scribanius, ut ſe ad Chriſtianæ Religionis Præcepta componere deberent. - - - *Niphus and Machiavel have repreſented their princes ſuch as we commonly find them to be: Eraſmus, Oſorius, Fox, Natta, Omphalius Wimſelingus, ſuch as they ought morally to be: Mambrinus Roſeus, Frachetta, and Lælius Marettus of Sienna whoſe book is not yet publiſhed, ſuch as the maxims of common policy will permit. Finally, Bellarmin, Ribadeneira, and Scribanius, ſuch as they ought to be, by conforming to the precepts of Chriſtianity.*’ From this may be learnt the various models which different writers have choſen for their inſtruction of ſovereign princes. Obſerve that ever ſince the year 1549, the work of Mambrin Roſeo hath been extant in French, bearing the title of *Le Paragon de vertu pour l'Inſtitution de tous Princes, Potentats, & Seigneurs Chreſtiens, contenant en Sommaire les Hiſtoires Hebraïques, Greques, Latines, & Modernes faiſans à propos. Pris de l'Italien de Membrin de la Roſe, à Paris par Eſtienne Groulleau* 1549 in 8vo (2). A Latin tranſlation of the ſame work was publiſhed at Straſbourg in 1608. Upon which Mr Konig fancied that Mambrin Roſeo had compoſed that book in the year 1608 (3). But therein he was very much miſtaken, he is very often guilty of ſuch faults.

(c) Ibid. *p.* 333.

(d) Ibid. *p.* 334.

(e) Ibid. *p.* 336.

(*f*) Ibid. *pag.* 334, 335.

(11) Priolus, de Rebus Gall. *lib. v, num. xxxvi, pag. m.* 225.

(12) *In Tom. xxiii, pag.* 696, 699, *in the year* 1640.

(13) Franckenſteinius, *ibid.*

(14) As to the honours done to Camels, ſee the remark [*DD*], of the article MAHOMET. You may alſo ſee in the *Mercure Galant* of July 1678, ſome honours done to beaſts.

(15) Father le Moine, in his *Peintures Morales.* See Suetonius, *in Caligula, cap. lv.*

(16) Plin. *lib. viii, cap. xlii.* See alſo *lib. x, cap. xliii*, concerning the funeral of a raven.

(17) It was Charles duke of Calabria, ſon to Robert king of Naples. See *Annal. Spond. ad ann.* 1328, *num.* 18, he quotes *Summonte, lib. iii.*

(18) Pardies, Epiſtle Dedicatory of a treatiſe concerning the knowledge of beaſts.

(19) Ghilini, *Tom. ii, p.* 224.

(20) Mercure Galant, *July* 1678, *pag.* 136, *Dutch edition.*

(21) Ibid. *p.* 132.

(22) Ibid.

(*a*) That continuation was printed at Venice in the year 1573, in 4to.

(*b*) That which makes me ſpeak in this manner, is, becauſe the Epiſtle Dedicatory addreſſed to Coſmo di Medici duke of Florence, is dated at Naples the 1ſt of January 1562.

(*c*) In the Remark [*G*] of the article BELLAI (WILLIAM DU).

(1) Naudæus Bibliograph. Polit. *pag. m.* 47.

(2) Du Verdier Vau Privas, Biblioth. Franç. *pag.* 839.

(3) Konig, Biblioth. *pag.* 701.

ROSES, a town of Catalonia. It was only an abbey, when Charles V built there a town and a fortreſs, thirty-five fathoms from the ſea, in an open country *(a)*. This town has the Mediterranean ſea on the ſouth, the plain of Lampurdan and a pond on the weſt, and the Pyrenees on the eaſt and north. It is fortified with five baſtions lined with free-ſtone. It remained faithful to the king of Spain, when all Catalonia revolted to France in the year 1640. Du Pleſſis-Pralin laid ſiege to it in 1645, and took it fifty-ſeven days after the opening of the trenches; for which he was made a marſhal of France. The Spaniards having almoſt recovered all Catalonia during the civil war of France, could not for all that re-take Roſes. They kept it blocked up nine months, and reduced the garriſon to an extreme famine; but they retired upon the approach of the French ſuccours. This happened in 1653. Roſes was reſtored to them by the Pyrenean treaty, in 1659. They loſt it in the year 1693 [*A*], and had it reſtored by the peace of Reſwick in the year 1697. The bay of Roſes is above four leagues in compaſs, and begins at the end of the Pyrenean mountains, at the caſtle of the Trinity, and ends near the little town of Empurias. It has no harbour, being only a ſhallow road which neither ſhips nor gallies can come to for want of water. But between the caſtle of the Trinity and the town, there is a ſmall hollow, where great ſhips may lie for ſome time upon a neceſſity. A league and a half beyond the caſtle, towards Rouſſillon and out of the bay, there is a borough called Capdequiers (*b*), which depends upon the government of Roſes, and has a pretty good harbour (*c*).

(*a*) Baudrand in Rhoda.

(*b*) It was formerly a ſtrong place. See concerning this the end of the remark [*G*] of the article REVEREND-DE-BOUGY.

(*c*) Taken from a relation of the ſiege of Roſes publiſhed in 1693.

[*A*] *They loſt it in the year* 1693.] The Marſhal duke of Noailles beſieged it about the latter end of May, and obliged the governor, Don Pedro Robi, to capitulate the 9th of June. The caſtle of the Trinity, at the entrance of the bay of Roſes, and within cannon ſhot of the place, was taken four days after.

ROSIER *(a)* (HUGH SUREAU DU) in Latin, *Hugo Surœus Roſarius* (*b*), was a famous miniſter of the church of Orleans, under the reign of Charles IX. He was born at Roſoy in Tierache, in the province of Picardy *(c)*. He was impriſoned at Orleans, in the year 1566 (§ *a*), being ſuſpected of being the author of a book full of ſeditious maxims [*A*]. But becauſe they could not convict him of it he was ſet at liberty.

(*a*) *Some call him* des Roſiers.

(*b*) Thuanus *ſays* Sorellus Roſerius, *lib. xxxiv, pag.* 687, *and* Sorellus Roſarius, *lib. lii, pag.* 1088.

(*c*) La Croix du Maine, *pag.* 173.

[(§ *a*) It might therefore probably have been at Orleans, and for the particular uſe of the Reformed Church there, that Hugh Sureau cauſed to be printed in 1565, for Abel Clemence, the Pſalms of Clement Marot and Beza, in four parts, compoſed by Goudimel, but to a more plain and eaſy Muſic, with a particular diſtinction in every Pſalm of what is to be ſung in the ſervice. There is alſo of his a *Treatiſe concerning the marks of the true Church of GOD*, in 8vo, printed at Heidelberg in 1574 *, and a Latin tranſlation of the Memoirs of M. du Bellai, printed in 8vo, with a fine letter on good paper, by John Marſhal, in the year 1575. I know not whether it is the ſame which the preceding year was publiſhed by Andrew Wechelius without the name of the tranſlator †. As for the reſt, the Memoirs of the ſtate of France, under the reign of Charles IX, tome 1, at fol. 277, ſay, that it was the reſtleſs ſpirit of the miniſter Hugh Sureau, which made him firſt be ſent from Orleans to . . . . and afterward to the little church he ſerved at the time he was taken up during the maſſacres of the year 1572. In fine, I fancy that his ſirname *du Roſier* might be nothing elſe but a nickname given him from the place of his nativity at Roſoi in Tierache. REM. CRIT.]

* Thuani Biblioth. *Tom. i, pag.* 175.

† Draud. Biblioth. *Tom. i, p.* 1105.

[*A*] *He was ſuſpected to be the author of a book full of ſeditious maxims.*] Beza gives the following account of that libel. ‘At that time (1), *ſays he*, there came out a book printed privately at Lyons, without the name of the author or Printer, and intituled, *La Defenſe Civile & Militaire des Innocens, & de l'Egliſe de Chriſt*, written without doubt by a wicked and ſeditious perſon. The ſaid book falling into the hands of ſome good men, all means were uſed to know from whence it came, but it was in vain. Only there was a ſtrong ſuſpicion, that Charles de Moulin, a famous Civilian, an advocate of the parliament of Paris, who was then at Lyons, and had ſided with the Proteſtants from the time of king Henry, was the author of it; having always before, and after, appeared a very fantaſtical man. But however he denied it even with great oaths, right or wrong (2).’ Lyons was then in the hands of the Proteſtants: Soubiſe who commanded in it, deſired the miniſters to examine that book, and they gave their judgment about it in the following words. ‘We, miniſters of the word of GOD, in the Reformed Church of Lyons, after having invoked the name of GOD, and ſeen a certain book lately printed, and intituled, *La Defenſe Civile & Militaire des Hommes & de l'Egliſe de Chriſt*, do certify and declare, That it is full of falſe and wicked doctrine, being in ſome points the ſame with that of the Anabaptiſts, inducing men to ſedition and rebellion, and to diſobey kings and princes againſt the expreſs command and ordinance of GOD: and ſo much the more, becauſe the author of it makes an ill uſe of many paſſages and examples of the Holy Scripture, which he wrongfully applies to his purpoſe, againſt their true ſenſe and meaning, as we are ready to make appear and demonſtrate by the word of GOD: for which reaſon we deſire and requeſt that the ſaid book be wholly ſuppreſſed, that men may not be infected with ſuch a ſeditious and peſtilential doctrine (3).’ Purſuant to this cenſure, Soubiſe ordered, That all thoſe who had this book, ſhould bring it to him within twenty-four hours, and that all thoſe who ſhould ſell it, or hand it about, ſhould be hanged, *without any formal trial* (4); and he had it burnt by the common hangman in the four principal places of the town, the 12th of June 1563 (5). *Thus things went as to this book*, ſays Beza (6): ‘And ſeveral years after, du Roſier, a miniſter of Orleans, who was not then at Lyons but at Orleans, and knew no more what was done at Lyons than what paſſed in the Indies, was accuſed of being the author of it. And accordingly he was arreſted, and ſent priſoner to Paris with great noiſe, as if the Proteſtants approved that doctrine. But GOD would have it that the truth ſhould quickly come out, though du Roſier had powerful enemies, particularly Birague, who ſome years after was undeſervedly made governor of Lyons.’

(1) That is in the year 1563.

(2) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *book xi. pag.* 244.

(3) Ibid.

(4) Ibid. *p.* 245.

(5) Id. ib. *p.* 246.

(6) Id. ibid.

liberty. He and another miniſter diſputed in the ſame year with two Doctors of Divinity, of the Faculty of Paris [*B*], in the houſe of the Duke of Nevers, at the requeſt

'Lyons.' Thuanus mentions in a few words, the proceedings againſt this book; but he obſerves that it was falſely aſcribed to the Civilian Charles du Moulin (7). Deckherrus has miſrepreſented the title of that book. 'Eodem, (*ſuperiori ſeculo*) *ſays he* (8), non expreſſo Authoris nomine vulgatus libellus *de poteſtate principis* Lugduni combuſtus, &c. --- *At the ſame time a libel was publiſhed* concerning the power of the prince, *without the author's name, which was burnt at Lyons, &c.*' One of thoſe who publiſhed ſome animadverſions upon Deckherrus, expreſſed himſelf in a doubtful manner upon occaſion of thoſe words; which he ſhould not have done: he was uncertain whether that book was different from that which was printed at Paris in the year 1589, with this title, *Traité de la puiſſance des Rois contre le Roy de Navarre.* Had he known that du Moulin had been dead (9) long before the right of the king of Navarre came to be ſpoken of, he would have ſaid expreſly, that thoſe two books were very different one from another: here is a *non liquet*, which is not much to his honour. *An vero iſte tractatus idem ſit de quo Cl. Deckherrus, pag.* 338. *loquitur tanquam Lugduni combuſto, & falſo adſcripto Carolo Molinæo J. C. ſed quem alii tribuunt* Hugoni Sorello Roſerio, *non mihi liquet* (10).

I muſt take notice of ſome faults of Davila. He ſays, that in the year 1566, a miniſter, born at Orleans, preached a ſeditious ſermon, after he had publiſhed a book wherein he maintained, that the French ought to obey the king no longer, and that they might lawfully kill him, ſince he was an idolatrous prince. 'Nè erano meno ardite le penne de gli Ugonotti di quello, che ſi foſſero l'armi, perche in queſto medeſimo tempo un Miniſtro, nativo di Orliens, andava ſeditioſamente predicando contro alla podeſtà del Rè, & havea anco ſtampato un libro, nel quale ſoſteneva, che il popolo Franceſe non era più in obligo d'obbedire al Rè, per eſſer egli diventato idolatra, & per queſta ragione contendeva ancora, che ſi poteſſe lecitamente ammazzare; dalla quale empia, e diabolica ſemente è poi ſucceſſivamente derivata in altri tempi, & in altre perſone, quella peſtifera dottrina, che con horribile perverſione d'ogni legge divina, & humana ha inſegnato a gli huomini ad inſanguinarſi le mani ſotto preteſto di pietà, e di religione, nelle viſcere de i Rè legitimi, conſtituiti ſopra gli huomini per rappreſentanti di Dio (11). --- *The Huguenots were no leſs bold with their pens than their ſwords; for at the ſame time a miniſter, who was born at Orleans, preached ſeditiouſly againſt the king's authority; and had alſo printed a book in which he maintained, that the people of France were no longer obliged to be obedient to the king, becauſe he was turned idolater; and for this reaſon affirmed, that it was lawful to kill him; from which impious and diabolical ſeed afterwards ſprang up in other times, and in other perſons, that pernicious doctrine, which, with ſuch horrible perverſion of all laws human and divine, inſtructed men, under the pretence of piety and religion, to imbrue their hands in the blood of their lawful kings, by God's ordinance appointed over them as his deputies.*' It is plain he means the miniſter du Roſier, who was impriſoned that year, under pretence of a ſeditious libel. But, 1. That miniſter was not a native of Orleans. 2. He did not preach againſt the king's power; for if his ſermons had been ſeditious, it had been no difficult thing to convict him of rebellion. Birague, his enemy, who cauſed him to be impriſoned, as being the author of a libel, would not have been caſt for want of proofs: had he had none, as to the book, the ſermons would have afforded him ſome, which had been ſufficient to convict him. And therefore ſince that miniſter was ſet at liberty, it is manifeſt his ſermons were not ſuch as Davila repreſents them to be. 3. I cannot believe that the book, which was burnt at Lyons, taught that the killing of kings was a lawful thing: had it contained ſuch an execrable doctrine, the miniſters who cenſured it, would have thundered more terribly againſt it than they did. I confeſs that la Croix du Maine, a Proteſtant author, ſays, That *du Roſier wrote ſome French books*, amongſt others that, *wherein he endeavours to ſhew that it is lawful to kill a king or a queen, who will not embrace the pretended reformed religion, and ſide with the Proteſtant party* (12). But I am perſuaded he ſaid this without having read the libel, that was burnt by Soubiſe's order; and if I am not miſtaken, he goes only upon the credit of the authors quoted by him. *See*, ſays he, *the French hiſtory of our time of the laſt edition enlarged by John le Frere de Laval, and alſo Belleforeſt, in the ſecond volume of his great Annals of France, fol.* 1689. 1653, &c (13). Varillas, who certainly would not have extenuated the heinouſneſs of that libel, ſpeaks of it as of a book levelled at the monarchical authority. But there is a vaſt difference between this and teaching, that kings may be lawfully murdered. It is neceſſary I ſhould ſet down the whole paſſage of that Hiſtorian. 'Soubiſe, before his departure (14), cauſed a ſeditious book, lately come out, to be burnt by the hang-man. The Calviniſts aſcribed it to the famous Civilian Charles du Moulin; which they did probably out of ſpite againſt him, becauſe he was the only Frenchman, who adhered to the Lutheran ſect, and refuſed to join with with them. For du Moulin's ſtyle and character did not appear in that book. It was, properly ſpeaking, a ſatire againſt all Chriſtian monarchies, which he pretended to overthrow by ſeveral paſſages of the Holy Scripture curtailed or wreſted to another ſenſe. The Catholic writers ſay that it was written by a Calviniſt miniſter; that it was not their firſt attempt of that kind againſt the authority of kings; and that three years before, in 1560, they held a ſynod at Chalons upon the Saone, wherein they declared, that the equality of conditions was the moſt certain privilege of the Goſpel-liberty purchaſed by the blood of JESUS CHRIST. But that ſynod is not to be found in the collection * of the twenty-ſix firſt ſynods held in France by the pretended Reformed. There is nothing to be ſeen about it any where, except in the writings of their adverſaries; beſides, it is not likely that their miniſters ſhould have at firſt taken upon themſelves, without conſulting Calvin, to lay down, as the foundation of their religion, a paradox ſo well confuted in Ariſtotle's Ethics, and ſo dangerous, that it tended to the deſtruction not only of Calviniſm, which they endeavoured to eſtabliſh, but alſo of all civil ſocieties, of what nature ſoever they might be (15).' This paſſage does not contain many things that the Proteſtants can complain of; on the contrary they may praiſe the equity of that author, who juſtifies them very well. But his marginal note has been a ſnare to ſome learned men. Their fault, tho' very excuſable, is of great moment. I call it an excuſable fault; becauſe a French reader will be apt to take that note in the ſame ſenſe that was put upon it in the *Acta Eruditorum*, unleſs he uſes great attention. Any one that reads that marginal note of Varillas, will preſently think that he ſaw among the manuſcripts of Lomenie the acts of the ſynod, which the Proteſtants have not inſerted in the collection of their twenty-ſix firſt ſynods. The learned authors of the *Acta Eruditorum* underſtood it ſo. This ſenſe does a great deal of wrong to the Reformed: for were it true, that there is in the collection of their ſynods, among the manuſcripts of Lomenie, a ſynod held in 1560, which declared for equality of conditions; one would be apt to believe that they made a deciſion about it in the year 1560, which afterwards they thought fit to ſuppreſs with all the acts of that aſſembly. It is therefore expedient that every body ſhould know that the word *it* in the marginal note refers to the word *collection*, and not to the word *ſynod*. Varillas means, that he has ſeen among the collections of Lomenie, the collection of the twenty-ſix firſt ſynods held by the French Proteſtants, and that he has not found in it the ſynod of the year 1560, which determined, as it is pretetended, that all conditions were equal. The authors of the *Acta Eruditorum* make him ſay the quite contrary. *Ex* Manuſcriptis Lomenianis *decretum Synodi à Reformatis* Catalauni (16) *habitæ allegat, quo contra regiam poteſtatem ſtatuerint,* æqualitatem conditionis humanæ inter potiſſima privilegia libertatis Evangelicæ eſſe, quam Chriſtus ſuo ſanguine veris Chriſtianis promeruerit (17).

[*B*] *He and another miniſter diſputed . . . . with two Doctors of Divinity of the Faculty of Paris.*] The duke

---

(7) Quem nonnulli, ſed falſo, Carolo Molinæo J. C. alii Hugoni Sorello Roſerio tribuebant. *Thuan. lib. xxxiv, pag.* 687. *ad an.* 1563.

(8) Deckher. de ſcriptis adeſpotis, *pag.* 338.

(9) He died in the year 1566.

(10) Petrus Bælius, epiſtola ad Almeloveenium de ſcriptis adeſpotis ad calcem tractatus Deckherri, *pag.* 371. *Edit.* 1686.

(11) Davila, delle Guerre Civili di Francia, *lib. iv, pag. m.* 160. *ad ann.* 1566.

(12) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth Françoiſe, *pag.* 173.

(13) *He might have quoted* Miles Piguerre, Hiſtory of France, *p.* 457. *edition of* 1582.

(14) That is from Lyons.

* I have ſeen it among thoſe of Lomenie.

(15) Varillas, Hiſtoire de l'Hereſie, *book xxvi, pag.* 10, 11, *ad ann.* 1563, *Dutch Edit.*

(16) It ſhould be *Cabilloni*: for *Catalaunum* is Chalons upon Marne; but according to Varillas the ſynod in queſtion was held at Chalons upon Saone, a town called in Latin *Cabillonum.*

(17) Acta Erudit. Lipſ. 1691, *pag.* 31.

requeſt of the Duke of Montpenſier, who was in hopes that this diſpute would bring back the Ducheſs of Bouillon, his daughter, to the Romiſh church; but he was diſappointed in his expectation. Du Roſier redeemed his life, in the time of the maſſacre on St Bartholomew's day, by abjuring his religion; and being immediately made uſe of to exhort the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, &c. to embrace the Romiſh communion, and having had all the ſucceſs that the court of France could wiſh for, he was thought a very fit perſon to be a converter (*d*). He was therefore employed as ſuch in ſeveral places of Paris, and the court was ſo well pleaſed with the progreſs he made, that he was ſent with the Jeſuit Maldonat to Metz, where there was a plentiful harveſt. He harangued, and exclaimed againſt the ſchiſm; but he was not perſuaded of the truth of what he ſaid [*C*]: for ſome miniſters having found an opportunity to ſpeak to him in private, and to make him ſenſible of the heinouſneſs of his fault, he ſeemed to be well diſpoſed to amend it; and accordingly he left Maldonat, and retired to Heidelberg, where he profeſſed himſelf a Proteſtant again. He could never recover the eſteem he had been in among the Reformed; and he would have been not only very much deſpiſed, but alſo reduced to great neceſſity, had he not found a place of corrector

(*d*) This may be ſeen at large in Thuanus, *lib. lii, pag.* 1088.

of Montpenſier believed that the ducheſs of Bouillon would renounce Calviniſm, provided ſhe would hear Dr Vigor. Nay, he conſented that the miniſter Spina ſhould be preſent when ſhe heard the doctor ſpeak. In order to pleaſe him, the duke of Bouillon and admiral Coligni agreed upon a conference, which was to be held in his houſe the firſt of July, 1566. Spina, and Barbaſte, miniſter of the queen of Navarre, came thither on the appointed day. They were aſked, whether they intended *to pray according to the cuſtom of the reformed churches, before they ſhould begin* the conference: they anſwered that they were reſolved upon it, and becauſe they perſiſted in their reſolution to begin with a prayer pronounced aloud, the whole project was broke; and they went away, having rejected all the expedients that were propoſed, to prevail upon them not to make any prayer. Dr Ruzé told them, that if they intended to pray, he *would go out of the room and make water during the prayer.* He propoſed to them to make only a mental prayer, or to go and pray in a neighbouring houſe. All theſe propoſals were rejected, and ſo there was no conference (18). People did not fail to ſay that *they had declined the diſpute:* the admiral maintained the contrary before the king and queen, and that they would be ready at all times to meet the doctors, and to defend the confeſſion of the churches by the Scripture. Whereupon the duke of Nevers begged of their majeſties that the conference might be renewed. The conditions were agreed upon: Dr Vigor, and Dr de Sainctes on the one ſide, and the miniſters Spina and Sureau on the other, began the diſpute in his houſe the ninth of July, 1566, and continued it for ſeveral days. Some Hiſtorians affirm that Hugh Sorel (19) was then taken out of priſon: Mezerai (20) and Varillas ſay ſo: theſe are the words of the latter. ‘The ‘duke of Montpenſier was of opinion, that the beſt ‘way to bring back again the ducheſs of Bouillon his ‘daughter to the communion of the Catholic church, ‘was a public conference of two doctors with two ‘miniſters; and it began at Paris in Nevers houſe. ‘The doctors were Simon Vigor, afterwards archbiſhop of Narbonne, and Claudius de Sainctes, afterwards biſhop of Evreux. The two miniſters appointed for that diſpute were John de l'Eſpine, ‘whom I have already mentioned, and Charles Barbaſte, who had been a Carmelite: but Barbaſte being not in a condition to come to the conference, ‘the Calviniſts took from thence occaſion to deſire ‘that Hugh Sorel des Roſiers ſhould be put in his ‘place. Des Roſiers was a miniſter, who had been ‘impriſoned for writing a libel concerning the authority of magiſtrates, wherein he pretended that it ‘was a lawful thing, to deſtroy, in any manner, a ‘prince of a contrary religion. He deſerved at leaſt ‘to be condemned to a perpetual impriſonment for ‘ſuch a crime; but he obtained his pardon by the ſollicitations of thoſe of his party, and by the credit ‘of the duke of Montpenſier. It was thought expedient that the ducheſs of Bouillon ſhould have no ‘occaſion to complain, under pretence that ſhe could ‘not have the two miniſters, whom ſhe took to be ‘the beſt diſputants *; and the diſputation was managed without any heat, out of reſpect to the illuſtrious perſons that were preſent at it. But notwithſtanding this moderation, the Catholics and the Calviniſts both gave out that they had the advantage. ‘Nor did the event clear the truth of the matter; ‘for if on the one ſide, *&c* (21).’ It ſeems from the printed account of the Miniſters, that du Roſier had been ſet at liberty, before there was talk of making him one of the diſputants. For when they heard that Vigor was ſick, and that Sainctes was gone from Paris, they were afraid that the conferences being interrupted would remain ſo too long; and therefore they deſired to go home, and repreſented that they happened to be at Paris *only accidentally; that Spina was come thither in order to go farther and take a turn into Anjou; and that the other, who was miniſter of the church of Orleans, was but lately come out of priſon, to which he was committed in the preceding June, upon a falſe accuſation of the enemies of the church of* GOD, *who charged him with being the author of a pernicious and wicked book, written againſt the obedience that is due to kings and princes; and that therefore it was a great inconveniency for him to make a long ſtay in a town to which he was come againſt his will* (22). Claudius de Sainctes got that diſpute printed (23).

[*C*] *He harangued and exclaimed againſt the ſchiſm, but he was not perſuaded of the truth of what he ſaid.*] Beza, in his hiſtory of the Reformed churches of France, gives an account of it in the following words. The Marſhal de Rets, governor of the country called Meſſin, ‘tried another way, and ſent for du Roſier, ‘a miniſter who had changed his religion, and who ‘was attended by a Spaniſh Jeſuit, whoſe name ‘was Maldonat: this Jeſuit was accounted the moſt ‘learned and moſt ſubtile man of his order. As for ‘du Roſier, he had done at Paris all that he could ‘do to pervert others, ſo far as to print his abjuration, and other books full of falſities, and which ‘ſhewed an ill conſcience; whereas before, he had ‘the reputation of a learned man, as he really was, ‘and had been choſen to diſpute at Paris with ‘Dr Vigor and Dr des Saintes. This man's changing his religion, proved a great ſcandal to many ‘people: he endeavoured afterwards to mend the ‘buſineſs as well as he could; but ſince that time he ‘never had a ſound judgment, nor an upright conſcience, and at laſt he died of the plague at Francfort, ‘with his wife and all his children. But to return ‘to our Hiſtory, thoſe two men being come to ‘Metz, and moſt of the Proteſtants being compelled to repair to the biſhop's palace upon a Sunday, du Roſier made a long ſpeech to them about ‘the ſucceſſion of biſhops, which he ſaid was the mark ‘of the true church (24).’ Beza adds (25), that *du Roſier being partly convinced of his fault in his own conſcience, and alſo adviſed by good people to take pity on himſelf, deſired ſome help to get out of the mire; which was granted him, and that poor wretch was conducted to the church of Heidelberg, where he, in ſome manner, acknowledged his faults, and publiſhed a ſmall treatiſe contrary to thoſe he printed at Paris.* Now, let us ſee what a ſlandering miniſter, who changed his religion, ſays of it. ‘They (26) were very much afraid that du ‘Roſier would too much inſiſt upon that point (27): ‘and therefore ſome perſons of Sedan went to him at ‘a place called Chemery, and made him believe (for ‘he was a timorous, inconſtant, and credulous man) rector in Andrew Wechel's Printing-houſe at Francfort (*e*). He died of the plague in that town with his whole family [*D*]. When he took his journey to Metz he was deſired to go to Sedan, to convert the ſame Ducheſs of Bouillon, who had occaſioned his conference with two Catholic doctors; but he could not prevail upon that lady (*f*). I ſhall ſpeak of his books [*E*].

---

(18) *Taken from the preface of the* Actes de la Conférence tenue à Paris és mois de Juillet & Août 1566 entre deux Docteurs de Sorbonne & deux Miniſtres. *I make uſe of the Antwerp edition* 1566, *in 8vo.*

(19) It ſhould be *Sureau*. Thuanus's *Sorellus*, has deceived the Hiſtorians.

(20) Mezerai, Hiſt. de France, *in folio, Tom. iii, pag.* 145.

* An account of it hath been printed.

(21) Varillas, Hiſtory of Hereſy, *book xxvii, pag.* 88.

(22) Actes de la conference, *pag.* 323.

(23) In the year 1568, according to all the Bibliographers that I have conſulted. There is no likelihood that it is the firſt edition: the relation of the miniſters had appeared two years before.

(24) Beza, Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt. *book xvi, pag.* 475.

(25) Id. ibid.

(26) That is the miniſters of Sedan.

(27) That which concerned the vocation of the miniſters.

He is ſaid to have been a man of a wrangling humour, and fond of particular opinions, and to have ſowed ſeeds of diſcord in the church of Orleans [*F*], by keeping correſpondence with ſome fanatics; that it was to be feared that the French churches would have been ſadly divided, if the peace had been of any continuance, and if the maſſacre had not prevented a ſchiſm.

'that if he returned to Paris with Maldonat, he would 'certainly, after they had conquered him, be put to 'death, and that the duke of Bouillon had been 'informed of it; which was falſe. Moreover, they 'told him that Maldonat had given him a hint 'of it, ſaying that he had ſtill ſomething of a Heretic; and they prevailed ſo far upon him at Metz, 'that he left that Jeſuit without taking his leave of 'him, and retired into Germany. In order to which 'they ſupplied him with money for his journey, and 'afterwards they made ſeveral gatherings to be ſent 'to him, which amounted to above 250 livres (28).' I remember, ſays he, elſewhere (29), 'that it was the 'firſt crime they charged du Roſier with, when he 'ſeemed to have a mind to ſeparate from them, and 'to return into the pale of the Chriſtian and Catholic church. But when they ſaw that this and ſome 'other common faults, as his being a mumper, 'a liar, and a man of no reſolution, were not ſufficient to run him down; ſome of them went about 'to caſt a blemiſh upon his wife's chaſtity, giving 'out that ſhe had proſtituted herſelf to ſome canons of Orleans: a thing not to be credited for the 'reaſons, which I had rather leave to the conſideration of thoſe, who have ſeen and known her, than 'publiſh them in print.'

[*D*] *He died of the plague.*] We have already ſeen it in a paſſage of Beza, and Philip Lonicerus ſays it likewiſe. 'Ex improviſo ſiquidem anno ſuperiori, in 'ipſa Vindemia, peſte Rempublicam noſtram tunc 'infeſtante, ex hac vita, non ſine magno doctorum 'virorum, quibus ille notus erat, tuoque cum primis 'dolore, ex hac miſera vita, unà cum uxore ſua, 'in cœleſtem illam avocatus eſt (30). - - - *The year before, he (together with his wife) in vintage-time, 'when the plague raged in our country, was ſuddenly 'removed, to the grief of learned men, and your's eſpecially, from this life, into a better in Heaven.*' Thus he ſpeaks to John Fichard, ſyndic of the city of Francfort, in an Epiſtle Dedicatory prefixed to a poſthumous piece of our Sureau, *viz.* the Latin tranſlation of a book of John Corras (31). If Lonicerus had dated that epiſtle, we might know in what year du Roſier died. The year of my edition, which is 1588, is of no uſe to me. It is certain that this miniſter did not die the year before: he was already dead when Beza publiſhed his hiſtory of the Reformed churches of France in 1580. Here follows another paſſage of Lonicerus, wherein du Roſier is very much praiſed. 'Quæ ſit humanarum rerum fragilitas, Ficharde clariſſime, ſuperiore anno præmatura ſua morte, etiam noſter ille Hugo Suræus, non ſine doctiſſimorum virorum ſuſpiriis, teſtatus eſt. Qui cum 'laudatiſſimæ Andreæ Wecheli, viri optimi & humaniſſimi, Typographiæ ſtrenuam navaret operam, 'talem ſuæ induſtriæ, quam exacta, non ſolum Latinæ '& Græcæ, verùm etiam Hebraicæ atque Chaldaicæ 'linguæ notitia ornabat, laudem conſequutus eſt, ut 'omnibus bonis & doctis viris eſſet gratiſſimus (32). '*The uncertainty of human affairs, illuſtrious Fichard, 'appeared alſo laſt year in the too early death of our 'Hugh Sureau, ſo much lamented by learned men. Who, 'when he was employed in the Printing-houſe of Andrew 'Wechel, a moſt excellent and obliging perſon, gave ſuch 'proofs of his learning and ability, as acquired him the 'eſteem of all good and learned men.*'

I find in the epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheque* (33), that this Latin tranſlation of Corras's book was printed at Francfort in 1579, *apud Andream Wechelum.* If it be the firſt edition, it muſt be ſaid that du Roſier died in the autumn of the year 1578. The author of the notes upon the *Confeſſion de Sanci* (34), places his death in year 1575 (§β).

[(§β) The Memoirs of the State of France under the reign of Charles IX, tom. 2. fol. 74. *verſo*, of the ſecond edition, ſay at the year 1572. Hugh Sureau, who had eſcaped from the city of Metz the 19th of December, died *about three years after*, at Frankfort, where he had reſumed the employment of a Corrector to a Printing-houſe. REM. CRIT.]

[*E*] *I ſhall ſpeak of his books*] He publiſhed ſeveral of them in French, if we may believe la Croix du Maine (35), who mentions but two of them, *viz.* that which concerns the killing of kings, and *a treatiſe concerning his confeſſion of faith, with an abjuration of his Huguenotiſm*, &c. printed at Paris in 1573. We have ſeen above, that he wrote one concerning his return to the Reformed church. He had publiſhed ſome controverſial books at Orleans, before the Paris maſſacre, as it appears from the anſwers of Gentianus Hervetus mentioned by la Croix du Maine (36). I have elſewhere ſaid (37), that he tranſlated into Latin the memoirs of Mrs Bellai. If Konig had ſaid that *Hugo Suræus* tranſlated into Latin an arrêt of the parliament of Toulouſe, he would not be liable to cenſure; but he made uſe of this expreſſion, *Edidit arreſtum Parlamenti Tholoſani in caſu admirabili matrimoniali An.* 1588 (38). Which contains two faults. 1. It does not appear from it whether Sureau is the tranſlator or the author, or meerly the publiſher of that arrêt. 2. Sureau could not put out ſuch a piece in the year 1588, for he was not then living. There is a vaſt number of ſuch faults in the Bibliographers.

[*F*] *Who had ſowed ſeeds of diſcord in the church of Orleans.*] The author of the memoirs intituled, *de Statu Religionis & Reipublicæ in regno Galliæ*, which are aſcribed to John de Serres, gives the following account of this miniſter. 'Vir non ineruditus, '*(Rozarius)* ſed fœdiſſimo lapſu oſtendens quid 'ſit infirmitas humana, & quàm periculoſum etiam 'ſit, pacato tempore, dum nullo hoſte urgemur, 'indulgere inſanientis noſtræ rationis commentis, ut 'certam exploratamque veritatem ſempiternis principiorum firmamentis cœlo & terra firmiorem, 'in dubium pro arbitratu noſtro revocemus: quo 'curioſæ licentiæ morbo Rozarius laborabat, corrupto quodam more & ambitioſiore de Eccleſiæ ſucceſſione, diſciplina, & de aliis etiam religionis capitibus ſuperciliosè diſputans, ſéque ſuis collegis hac in 're excellentiorem importuno quodam ſtudio exiſtimans. Non obſcurarum enim turbarum ſemina in 'Eccleſia Aureliana inſeminarat, dum ſeſe cum novorum commentorum architectis, phanaticis ingeniis 'familiarius conjungeret: unde, niſi periculoſæ tranquillitatis incommoda, novo hoc remedii genere 'Deus præcidiſſet, magnæ & periculoſæ turbæ in Eccleſiis Gallicis erant haud dubiè exundaturæ (39). '- - - - *A man not unlearned,* (du Roſier) *but by his diſgraceful fall ſhewing the prevalence of human infirmity, and how dangerous it is, even in peaceable times, 'to follow the fictions of our wild imagination, and to 'call in doubt at pleaſure the certain and eſtabliſhed 'truth, which too curious and unreſtrained licence, was 'the diſeaſe du Roſier laboured under, after a corrupt 'and ambitious manner ſupercilliouſly challenging the 'ſucceſſion and diſcipline of the church, and other points of 'religion, and on account of this his unſeaſonable diligence, preferring himſelf to the reſt of his colleagues. 'For he ſowed the ſeeds of ſchiſms and diviſions in the 'churches of Orange, aſſociating himſelf with projectors 'of innovations, and fanatical perſons: from whence 'grat and pernicious confuſions had undoubtedly enſued in 'the churches of France, unleſs by this new kind of remedy, 'God had prevented the conſequences of a dangerous tranquillity.*' Another writer of that time has theſe words: 'One du Roſier, a miniſter, a man of a 'ready wit, but reſtleſs and inconſtant, being made a 'priſoner about a day's journey from Paris, as he was 'running away, began to waver, and ſoon after 'changed his religion (40).'

(*e*) See the remark [*D*].

(*f*) *See* Thuanus, ubi ſupra.

(28) Matthieu de Launoy, Declaration & Refutation des fauſſes ſuppoſitions, *fol.* 139.

(29) Defenſe de Matthieu de Launoy contre les fauſſes accuſations, *fol.* 37.

(30) Phil. Lonicerus, *Epiſt. Dedicat.*

(31) The Arrêt of the parliament of Toulouſe, againſt the pretended Martin Guerre; which arrêt, Corras, who reported the cauſe, adorned with a large commentary.

(32) This is the beginning of the Epiſtle Dedicatory.

(33) *Pag. m.* 425.

(34) *Pag.* 470, 471. *Edit.* 1699.

(35) La Croix du Maine, Biblioth. Françoiſe, *pag.* 173.

(36) Reſponſe à Hugues Sureau dit des Roſiers. Maiſtre d'Eſcole à Orleans. L'Anti-Hugues, ou reſponſe à Hugues Surreau dit des Roziers, imprimé par Cheſneau, l'an 1566. *Id. ibid. Here is an* Anti *not mentioned by Mr Baillet.*

(37) In the article BELLAI (WILLIAM DU) remark [D].

(38) Konig, Biblioth. *pag.* 786.

(39) De Statu Relig. & Reipubl. *Part iv, ad ann.* 1572, *fol. m.* 4.

(40) Hiſtoire des choſes memorables avenues en France, *à l'an* 1572, *pag. m.* 444.

ROTAN (JOHN BAPTIST) miniſter of Rochelle, was very much eſteemed for his parts and learning; but he was ſuſpected of having betrayed his party [*A*], by countenancing Henry IV underhand in his deſign of turning Papiſt. It is ſaid that he promiſed to ſuffer himſelf to be worſted in a diſpute with du Perron, in the preſence of that prince, in the year 1593, but the remorſe of his conſcience, or his vanity, obliged him to pretend to be ſick, that he might avoid entring the liſts [*B*]. It is further ſaid, that he continued to be a prevaricator all the reſt of his life, and that he and de Serres deſigned to go about a deceitful project [*C*] in a national ſynod; but they died before that ſynod was held. Rotan had taught Divinity at Rochelle (*a*), and publiſhed a contro-

[*A*] *He was ſuſpected of having betrayed his party.*] D'Aubigné ſays (1), that *the miniſter Rotan, a Piedmonteſe* (2), *a profound Divine and a ſubtile Philoſopher*, had a mind to be a courtier, and thought that the third party, which was formed ſome time after the death of Henry III, would open a breach, through which he might come into buſineſs. He joined with Morlas, who had the ſame deſign, and then both of them concerted with du Perron how they might engage the king to turn Catholic. They were kindly treated by the directors of the Finances, which occaſioned the coming of others into their faction. Rotan and Morlas *diſputed about ſeveral points againſt du Perron in the king's preſence, and deſignedly yielded to him, who was a man of prodigious learning; ſo that ever ſince the ſiege of Rouen he inſinuated himſelf into the king's favour by his eaſy and charming eloquence. . . . . Whereupon, each of them giving an opportunity to his friend, they began to propoſe the change of religion.* Note, that Rotan began to reliſh a court-life, when he was there to ſollicit *the payment of ſome money, which he had lent, or rather cauſed to be lent by others, at Geneva, for the troops raiſed by Sanci* (3). This ſhews that he did not confine himſelf to the functions of his profeſſion, but meddled with political affairs: and therefore it is leſs to be wondered at, that as ſoon as he was acquainted with the court, he reſolved to raiſe himſelf, by preferring his worldly intereſts to thoſe of his religion. He was deputed to Mante, with ſeveral others, to repreſent to the king the grievances of the Proteſtants; but he got himſelf choſen to diſpute againſt du Perron (4). *He had promiſed to act the part of a cunning prevaricator, and being ready to do it, it happened that vanity or fear made him ſo waver, that he choſe rather to pretend to be ſick; and Beraud, a miniſter of Montauban, took his place. The diſpute was very ſharp on both ſides about the ſufficiency or inſufficiency of the Scripture, and the words of St Paul in his Epiſtle to Timothy; and the conference was broken by the prohibition of the Clergy.*

[*B*] *He pretended to be ſick, that he might avoid entring the liſts.*] We have juſt now ſeen that d'Aubigné ſays ſo: to which I ſhall add a paſſage of the Hiſtory of the edict of Nantes, from which it appears that Rotan's conduct was approved in a national ſynod. 'Rotan, a famous miniſter, was ſuſpected of having 'conſented to thoſe artifices, whether he was really 'prevailed upon in hopes of ſome favours, or only 'pretended to approve them, in order to get himſelf 'deputed; becauſe it was an honourable commiſſion. 'So that the conference began, and du Perron appeared 'in it as a man ſure of obtaining a compleat victory 'by his adverſary's colluſion. The diſpute ran upon 'the ſufficiency of the Scripture, and the explication 'of the ſixteenth verſe of the third chapter of the 'ſecond Epiſtle of St Paul to Timothy. But Rotan, 'either out of honour or conſcience, not daring to be 'ſo baſe as it was ſaid he had promiſed to be, pretended to be ſick, and ſo got out of the lurch. 'Beraud, a miniſter of Montauban, took his place; 'but the conference did not laſt long, when they 'ſaw that they had nothing more to expect from 'their colluſion with Rotan. The clergy found out 'a way to break it, without ſeeming to decline it; 'and the miniſters on their part offered to renew it, 'whenever they ſhould be deſired to do it. But 'becauſe notwithſtanding thoſe offers, the clergy 'boaſted of having worſted the miniſters; Beraud and 'Rotan got their procedings approved by the national 'ſynod, that was held at Montauban the year 'following. Rotan was ſheltered under Beraud's 'protection, and this approbation put an end to the 'ſuſpicion that was entertained of him, as if he had 'been a prevaricator (5).' It doth not clearly appear from this account, nor from that of d'Aubigné, whether Rotan pretended to be ſick after ſome conferences, or before any conference; and therefore I ſhall ſet down the words of another Hiſtorian, that the readers may have a more diſtinct knowledge of the matter. 'Among thoſe deputies,' ſays he (6), 'there 'were ſeveral miniſters, and among others one Rotan 'a Griſon by nation, who being ſtill at Rochelle, 'boaſted that he would overcome all the Catholic 'doctors in a diſputation, and he believed it; and to 'ſhew that he was in earneſt, he had a great many 'books carried from Rochelle to Mante: wherein he 'was very much aſſiſted by the Sieur du Pleſſis governor of Saumur . . . . . . On the appointed day, 'the ſaid Sieur du Perron, and the miniſter Rotan, 'after ſome preambles, wherein they proteſted that 'they acted only out of zeal for truth, began the 'diſputes of the ſufficiency of the word of GOD (7). That Hiſtorian gives the ſubſtance of the objections and anſwers, like a partial man againſt the Proteſtants, and then concludes thus, *Rotan was then a little confounded, and began to praiſe the ſaid Sieur du Perron, and then the aſſembly was diſmiſſed for that day. Rotan appeared no more at the conference: Berault a miniſter of Montauban took his place, who the ſix following days was carried by the ſaid Sieur du Perron,* per omnes locos Dialecticæ, *about the word* σοφίσαι, to make wiſe. *Hiſtory, Poetry, Mathematics, Philoſophy, Phyſics, Morals, Metaphyſics, Scholia's, and Commentaries, were brought in right or wrong by Berault: but he could never make it out that that Greek word ſignifies or includes* ſufficiency. *And indeed after he had praiſed the ſaid Sieur du Perron, he intimated that he was not come prepared for diſputing. Thus ended this conference, and the miniſters of the pretended Reformed religion returned into their reſpective provinces* (8).

[*C*] *He and de Serres deſigned to go about a deceitful project.*] I have only read this in d'Aubigné: he ſhews how the court made uſe of addreſs to pervert the miniſters, and then he ſays: *the effect of it appeared particularly in the miniſters Rotan, Serres, Cahiers, Morlas, and de Vaux. The whole myſtery of thoſe practices, and particulary of thoſe of Mante, was laid open by the latter, who confeſſed his prevarication to ſeveral eminent perſons with horrid cries* (9). D'Aubigné was one of theſe perſons. *After he had*, ſays he (10), *depoſited his confeſſion in my boſom, with great ſighs, he put into my hands three bonds; one of* 2500 *crowns, and the other two ſomething leſſer, which I reſtored to his heirs.* In the *Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci* he brings in Cahier relating all theſe things and affirming what he (d'Aubigné) durſt not affirm (11), concerning the circumſtances of de Vaux's death. 'Being in this 'perplexity,' they are Sanci's words (12) 'I perceived M. Cahier walking in the court. I went to 'him and aſked him what was become of the miniſter de Vaux. Sir, ſaid he, that wretch having 'promiſed many fine things to the biſhop of Evreux, 'and received ſome money from him in order to 'perform his promiſes, wanted courage to do it, and 'went from hence into his country, crying and 'bawling out that GOD's cauſe had been betrayed 'by him and five of his friends, whom he pointed 'at without naming them. He added, that GOD 'would be merciful to him, and that he was going 'home to give up his ſoul into his hands, as ſoon 'as he ſhould come to Millaud. However, he 'offered to write letters to the biſhop of Evreux, by 'a truſty friend, whereby the biſhop would diſcover 'to him the prevarication of the conference of Mantes, 'and the other preparations of Rohan (13) and de 'Serres, who, you know, did early promiſe their 'perfidious aſſiſtance. The Huguenots were ſuch 'fools as to refuſe his offer, ſaying that Chriſt's 'kingdom ought not to be eſtabliſhed by craft (14). 'I aſked Cahier what cover Rohan (15) and Serres 'could now make uſe of to juſtify themſelves? Theſe 'two

3

(*a*) Cum Rupellam rediiſſet (*Andreas Rivetus*) publice profitentem audivit Joannem Baptiſtam Rotanum Italum, doctiſſ. & eloquentiſſimum Doctorem, qui ſcholam Theologicam aperuerat. *Meurſius Athen. Batav. p.* 316.

(1) D'Aubigné, Hiſt. Univerſelle, *Tom. iii, book iii, chap. xxiv, p. m.* 405, *ad ann.* 1593.

(2) Others ſay he was a Griſon. See below the paſſage quoted out of Cayet, citation (6).

(3) D'Aubigné, ubi ſupra.

(4) Ib. ibid. *book iv, chap. xi, pag.* 505.

(5) Hiſtoire de l'Edit. de Nantes, *Tom. i, book iii, pag.* 112, *ad ann.* 1593.

(6) Peter Victor Cayet, Chronologie Novenaire, *Part ii, fol.* 269, *verſo.*

(7) Id. ibid. *fol.* 270, *verſo.*

(8) Idem, *fo.* 271, *verſo.*

(9) D'Aubigné, *Tom. iii, book v, chap. i, pag.* 625.

(10) Id. ib. *pag.* 626.

(11) See it in the original, I do not recite it.

(12) Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci, *in the laſt chapter of book ii, pag.* 547, *Edit.* 1699.

(13) It ſhould be *Rotan.*

(14) Confeſſion, ibid. *pag.* 548.

(15) Read *Rotan.*

controverſial book concerning the Euchariſt [*D*], and another (*b*) to conſute the reaſons, which Cayet had alledged for his converſion. There is ſome reaſon to believe that he had been miniſter of the church of Geneva [*E*]. He had been admitted Doctor of Divinity at Heidelberg, in the year 1573. Zanchius, who performed the ceremony, ſays that Rotan had left his country fifteen years before for his religion, and that he bore joyfully the loſs of a conſiderable eſtate (*c*). Maimbourg deſerves to be criticized [*F*].

(*b*) Printed at Rochelle in 1596, it contains 215 pages, in 8vo.

(*c*) Exilium, quod propter Domini Jeſu Chriſti cauſam, annos jam totos quindecim, cum non parva ſuorum bonorum eorumque non tenuium jactura conjunctum, æquiſſimo ſemper animo tulit, imo magnæ gloriæ loco habuit. *Zanchius Epiſt. lib. ii. pag.* 603.

‘ two, anſwered he, need no cover; for they are covered with earth. I will tell you how. As ſoon as they heard of de Vaux's confeſſion, they encouraged one another by letters, and got themſelves elected for the national ſynod of Montpellier, being reſolved to venture all, and to try whether they could get ſomething by the confederates before they ſhould make their retreat. But it fell out unluckily that they died at the opening of the ſynod.’ The author of the notes upon the *Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci*, obſerves, (16) that this is the national ſynod which was held at Montpellier, in May 1598. Againſt which Reboul wrote in 1600 the ſatire intituled, *Actes du Synode Univerſel de la Sainte Reformation* - - - - *Acts of the general ſynod of the holy reformation.*

[*D*] *He had ..... publiſhed a controverſial, book concerning the Euchariſt.*] It was printed at Rochelle, and intitled *Traité Orthodoxe de l'Euchariſte* (§ α). Dr Julius Cæſar Bulenger refuted it in a book printed at Paris, for Frederic Morel, in 1598, in 8vo. He refers the reader to it in the preface of his Catholic Anſwer to du Pleſſis Mornai's book upon the Euchariſt.

[(§ α) That treatiſe, to which, by the by, Rotan had not put his name, came out at the lateſt in the year 1596. Since we have in the ſame year printed by Gilles Robinot, an anſwer to it by Cayet, intituled, *Le vray Orthodoxe de la foi Catholique du Sainct Sacrement de l'Autel, Pour reſponſe au Traité prétendu Orthodoxe anonyme.* REM. CRIT.

[*E*] *There is ſome reaſon to believe that he had been miniſter of the church of Geneva* (§ β).] For we find in Melchior Adam that he was one of the three miniſters (17), who went from Geneva to Bern in the year 1588, to aſſiſt at a ſynod, which was convened on account of the diſputes raiſed by Samuel Huberus and Claudius Auberi (18). I have ſpoke in another place (19) of this Samuel Huberus, and now I ſhall ſay, that this Claudius Auberi was profeſſor of Philoſophy at Lauſanne, and that going out of his ſphere, and taking upon him to dogmatize in Theology, he taught, *viva voce*, and in writing, that the righteouſneſs of man before the tribunal of GOD, is an inherent quality. The ſynod condemned that opinion, and obliged Auberi and his adherents to acknowledge that they embraced the doctrine contained in the confeſſion of faith of the churches of Swiſſerland and the churches of France, viz. that we are juſtified before the throne of GOD by faith as by an inſtrument, wherewith we take hold of JESUS CHRIST our righteouſneſs. *Claudius Alberius Triuncurianus cum ſuis, receptæ doctrinæ & in confeſſione tam Gallicana quam Helvetica comprehenſæ, de noſtra ad tribunal Dei juſtificatione per fidem tamquam inſtrumentum, quo Chriſtus, juſtitia noſtra apprehendatur, profeſſus ſit ſe penitus aſſentiri* (20). I ſhall occaſionally obſerve, that he only ſubmitted in words to the deciſions of that ſynod. I have a book, publiſhed in the year 1591, by one Antony Leſcaille, wherein I find that Dr Gryneus ſpoke thus in an aſſembly held at Baſil in the month of December 1590, upon the ſubject of the differences of this Antony with Conſtant and Couët, miniſters of the French church: ‘ That there was one Aubery, who had heretofore writ a book, which had been afterwards condemned at Bern, who had ſubſcribed to ſome poſitions, which afterwards he did not keep to. That going through Baſil, and returning to it as he came from Francfort, he had taught his errors at Baſil in ſeveral houſes and to divers perſons, but none was ſo bold as to maintain them, except Leſcaille, to whom the ſaid Aubery had left a piece of his own writing. And therefore he ſhall give notice of it to the magiſtrates of Bern, that the ſaid Aubery may be puniſhed (21).’ This Leſcaille was an illiterate layman, who took upon him to dogmatize, and put into the hands of his miniſters a piece concerning good works (22). Beza ſpoke to him thus in the month of Auguſt, 1591: ‘ Mind what I ſay, you have not written that piece: Aubery is the author of it, though he hath denied it at Bern againſt his conſcience. Leſcaille anſwered, it is a piece of my own compoſing, and Mr Aubery never ſaw it ſuch as it is: I do not deny that I have learned of him, and of others, ſome things that are in it. Beza ſaid, it is an ill piece. Leſcaille anſwered, I do not pretend that it is all good: if any one ſhews me by the word of GOD that there is any thing wrong in it, I will believe it. Beza went on and ſaid, Aubery has written an ill book, and you praiſe it. Leſcaille anſwered, I like very well what I underſtand in Mr Aubery's book; but I will neither approve nor condemned what I do not underſtand (23)’.

[(§ β) The *Citadin* of Geneva pag. 42, makes mention of the name of *John Baptiſt Rotan an Italian*, as being written in letters of gold, amongſt the miniſters that were moſt renowned for their underſtanding in *Divinity*, in the regiſter of the academy of Geneva. REM CRIT.]

[*F*] *Maimbourg deſerves to be criticized.*] Theſe are his words. ‘ What have they not ſaid to diſhononr the memory of Sponde (Spondanus) lieutenant-general at Rochelle, Salette counſellor to the king of Navarre, Morlas counſellor of ſtate, and ſuper-intendant of the magazines of France, du Fay, Clairville, Rohan, and a hundred others of their moſt famous miniſters, who having been very honeſt men, whilſt they lived amongſt them, and the moſt conſiderable perſons of their conſiſtory, are become all of a ſudden by a very ſtrange change profligate wretches, and the worſt of men, for having abjured Calviniſm (24).’ He ſuppoſes in this paſſage, 1. That du Fay was a miniſter. 2. That there was a miniſter called Rohan (25). 3. That thoſe two pretended miniſters made an abjuration of the reformed religion. Which is all falſe. They were looked upon as falſe brethren; but it does not appear that Rotan and du Fay died real and profeſſed Papiſts. See the notes upon the *Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci*, pag. 357. and 358. of the edition of 1699.

(16) *Notes on the* Confeſſion de Sanci, *pag.* 560.

(17) The two others were *Beza* and *la Faye*.

(18) *Melch. Adam.* in *vita Stuckii*, pag. 771, *Vitar. Theol. German.* Obſerve that he places this in the year 1578; but in Beza's Life, *pag.* 229, where he relates the ſame thing, he puts 1588. See concerning this, the text of the article BEZA.

(19) In the remark [*E*] of the article HUNNIUS.

(20) Melch. Adam. *in* vitis Theolog. Germ. *pag.* 771.

(21) La doctrine ancienne du premier, deuxieme, troiſiéme & dernier Jugement, ... par A L P D D G G H. *pag.* 50, 51.

(22) Ib. *p.* 27.

(23) Ibid. *pag.* 92, 93.

(24) Maimbourg, *preface of* the Hiſtory of the League.

(25) He was deceived by an error of the preſs, which crept into the *Confeſſion Catholique de Sanci*.

ROTTERDAM, is one of the moſt conſiderable cities in Holland. It ſtands upon the Maeſe, very convenient for trade. There is no doubt that it took its name from its ſituation at the mouth of the Rotte (*a*). It is not known at what time it began to be built, but it is well known that about the year 1270. It was erected into a city; for it was ſurrounded with ramparts, and endowed with privileges (*b*). Nothing has made it more famous than its being the place, where the Great Eraſmus was born [*A*]: a glory, to which it has not been inſenſible; for the inhabitants of their city took

(*a*) It is the name of a River.

(*b*) Boxhornius, Theatr. Holland. *pag. m.* 281.

[*A*] *Nothing has made it more famous than its being the place where the Great Eraſmus was born.*] If Homer had been as much eſteemed in his life time, as he was after his death, many cities would have aſpired in vain to the glory of having produced him; for the city, which had really that advantage, would have given undeniable proofs of it, before the length of time could have afforded any other town matter to took care to honour the memory of that great man [*B*], from whom it received ſo great a luſtre

to contend about it. This is the reaſon why there are no diſputes about the place where Eraſmus was born: the great reputation he acquired during his life has prevented ſuch diſputes. The city of Rotterdam was early ſenſible of the glory, that accrued to it from being the birth place of Eraſmus. Whilſt things were freſh in mens memory, they took care to prevent their being deprived of it, and to make the thing unqueſtionable. There was a neceſſity for them to think early of it, for ſuch a birth as that of Eraſmus might in time have been covered with a thick darkneſs, ſince his mother, a woman of a mean extraction, went to Rotterdam with a deſign to conceal the birth of her child. As for his conception, the city of Tergow lays a juſt claim to it, and looks upon it as no ſmall advantage. What would it be if that conception was not ſtained by a double original ſin, or rather by an actual ſin beſides the original? A Burgo-maſter (1) of this town undertook to prove that Eraſmus was born in it, and only bred at Rotterdam. But it is to no purpoſe for him to maintain ſuch a thing; the contrary appears from the regiſters of the convent of Stein, and every body believes that Eraſmus was born at Rotterdam and not at Tergow. We find theſe words in a letter of the Burgo-maſters and counſellors of Tergow, inſerted in Guicciardin's deſcription of the Low-Countries tranſlated from the Italian (2). 'Oriundus etiam hac urbe magnus ille Deſiderius Eraſmus, Goudæ enim conceptus & utero geſtatus, ROTERODAMI (quo cum ad pariendum vicina eſſet mater ſe certa de cauſa contulerat) IN LUCEM EDITUS EST. - - - - - - *The great Eraſmus was originally of this town, for his mother having conceived and gone with child of him at Tergow,* HE WAS BORN AT ROTTERDAM, *to which place his mother had, for certain reaſons, gone when ſhe was near the time of her delivery.*' They ſhew in the library of Tergow a head of Eraſmus, which may be looked upon as a public monument of their not believing that he was born there; for the inſcription, that is about that head, imports that he was conceived at Tergow and born at Rotterdam. Mr Almeloveen has renewed the diſpute of thoſe two towns by a curious incident (3): he pretends that Eraſmus is rather a citizen of Tergow than of Rotterdam, becauſe according to the laws, a place where a child happens to be born by chance, is not accounted his country. If a woman being upon a journey is brought to bed in a town, if ſhe does not deſign to ſettle there, and makes her abode in another place, her child is not accounted a citizen of that town, and the place where his parents are ſettled is looked upon as his country. At this rate Eraſmus ſhould rather be called *Goudanus* than *Roterodamus*; for his father and mother lived at Tergow: and if his mother did not lie-in at Tergow but at Rotterdam, it was a meer accidental thing. She abſconded to ſave her honour, and went to a neighbouring town only for ſome days to lie-in privately (4).

A DISPUTE between Germany and France, about Eraſmus.

I ſhall obſerve, by the by, that ſome French authors, grounded upon an antiquated right, I mean the ancient Geography, and the old diviſion of Gaul mentioned in Julius Cæſar's Commentaries, would aſcribe the honour of Eraſmus's birth to their nation. Robert Cenalis (5) biſhop of Avranches ſaid poſitively that France is Eraſmus's native country, and that it is very much obliged to him, *utpote homini in Gallia nato*. Eraſmus favoured this pretenſion; for he ſaid ſometimes that Gaul was his native country (6), and looked upon the learning of Budæus, a French man, as a thing very glorious to his own country. Some Germans were jealous of this conceſſion, and humbly begged of Eraſmus not to ſuffer that the French ſhould engroſs him to themſelves. *Ne patiar ut Gallia ſibi me aſſerat, ſed ingenue fatear Bataviam eſſe Germaniæ partem, videlicet ne tanta gloria fraudetur* (7). His anſwer, which is full of affection to the ſciences, and very modeſt, is to this effect, that he was born upon the borders of Gaul and Germany, but ſomewhat nearer the former than the latter. *An Batavus ſim non mihi ſatis conſtat. Hollandum eſſe me negare non poſſum, ea in parte natum ut ſi Coſmographorum picturis credimus magis vergat ad Galliam quàm ad Germaniam, quamquam extra controverſiam eſt totam eam regionem in confinio Galliæ Germaniæque eſſe.* Hence it is, that in another letter (8), he neither ſays that he is a French-man, nor denies it; looking upon it as a problematical thing. *Gallum eſſe me nec aſſevero, nec inficior, ſic natus ut Gallus ne an Germanus ſim anceps haberi poſſit.*

[*B*] . . . . *The inhabitants of that city took care to honour the memory of that great man.*] The city of Rotterdam ordered, 1. That the houſe wherein Eraſmus was born, ſhould be adorned with an inſcription, whereby all the inhabitants, and all foreigners, might be informed of ſuch a glorious prerogative. 2. That the college, wherein Latin, Greek, and Rhetoric are taught, ſhould be called Eraſmus's college, and conſecrated to him by an inſcription upon the frontiſpiece. 3. That a wooden ſtatue ſhould be erected to him in the year 1549. Another ſtatue of ſtone was put in its place in the year 1557. The Spaniards having overthrown it in 1572, the inhabitans ſet it up again (9), as ſoon as they were freed from their tyranny; and at laſt a braſen one (10), was erected in the 1622, which is admired by good judges. It ſtands in the great place of the city, near a canal, upon a pedeſtal, adorned with inſcriptions, and ſurrounded with iron rails. Thus thoſe ſeveral ſtatues were made by degrees of a more valuable matter; wherein Eraſmus was dealt with as the deities of Ancient Rome: for not only the offerings of private perſons were at firſt none of the moſt conſiderable,

> Nunc te marmoreum pro tempore fecimus: at tu
> Si fœtura gregem ſuppleverit aureus eſto (11);
>
> *But if the falling lambs increaſe my fold,*
> *Thy marble ſtatue ſhall be turn'd to gold;*

but alſo thoſe of whole towns and nations were made in the beginning with mean and common things,

> Fictilibus crevere diis hæc aurea templa (12).
>
> *To earthen gods they golden temples rais'd.*

Travellers commonly ſpeak of the ſtatue of Eraſmus, when they publiſh an account of what they have ſeen in the United Provinces. Mr Joli, a canon of Paris, having mentioned that ſtatue, and the houſe wherein Eraſmus was born (13), adds, that *the great reputation of that man makes thoſe two things, which are little of themſelves, the moſt conſiderable of the town; tho' they cannot be ſaid to be little and inconſiderable, ſince Sebaſtian Munſter tell us in his Coſmography* (14), *that Philip, king of Spain, ſon to the emperor Charles V, being come to Rotterdam, in the month of Semptember, of the year* 1545 (15), *that ſtatue was erected upon the account of his arrival, and that ſome verſes made in his honour, were put into the hands of Eraſmus, to be preſented to him* (16); *which being done, the king, Mary queen of Hungary, and all the princes, who accompanied them, out of love for the* memory of ſo great a man, went, and viſited with reſpect, the houſe and the chamber where he was born. Mr Monconis (17) ſays not ſo much of it, being contented to obſerve the poſture of the ſtatue, and to ſet down the inſcriptions of the little houſe; he ſays, *That Eraſmus invented the uſe of turf* (18), *and ſails to ſerve for all winds, as thoſe of barks and yachts:* which does not ſeem to me to be more true, than what he had ſaid before, that *the Schelde and the Rhine being united, paſs by the city of Rotterdam, and encompaſſing part of it, run alſo into the city by two large canals.* But Mr Bullart (19) confirms the paſſage, which I have quoted out of Mr Joli; for he ſays, that *Philip II made a ſolemn entry into the town of Rotterdam, as being the ſovereign prince of the Low-Countries, the Senate cauſed the ſtatue of Eraſmus to be placed, as their greateſt ornament, over-againſt the houſe where he was born, dreſſed in his Eccleſiaſtical habit, holding a pen in his right hand, and preſenting to the prince with the left a paper, with theſe words in it.*

---

(1) He was a Phyſician called *Reynerus Snoyus*, (See the *Journal des Sçavans* 1690, pag. 540.) He put out ſeveral books, and had very good employments. He had been Eraſmus's friend. *Val. Andreas Deſſelius Bibliotheque Belgica*, pag. 175. ſays, that he has read in the record of the monaſtery of Stein, where Eraſmus lived ſeveral years, what *Snoyus* ſaid.

(2) *Pag. m.* 294, *edid. Arnhem.* 1616.

(3) *In his* Amœnitates Theologico-Philologicæ, *pag.* 40, & *ſeq. Edit. Amſtel.* 1694.

(4) See the letter of a Civilian called Mr Coſterus, written to Mr Almeloveen, upon this ſubject, and inſerted in the *Amœnitates Theologico-Philologicæ.*

(5) Hiſtor. Galliæ, *lib. i, fol.* 30, 39, 40.

(6) Et priſtinam illam laudem noſtræ afferas Galliæ. Nihil enim vetat eumdem ditione Germanum eſſe, & veterum Coſmographorum deſcriptione Gallum. *Eraſmus, Ep. VII. lib. xi.*

(7) Idem. Epiſt. XLIII, *lib. xiii.*

(8) Epiſt. XVIII, *lib. vi.*

(9) Verheiden ſays in his Elogies, that the Spaniſh ſoldiers, who were in garriſon at Rotterdam, did not commit theſe outrages, till after they were exaſperated by the invectives which a Friar of their nation preached againſt Eraſmus; and that the magiſtrates did not erect the ſame ſtatue again, but had another made.

(10) Quenſtedt, de Patr. illuſtrium. viror. *pag.* 121, *is miſtaken, when he ſays it is of marble.*

(11) Virgil. Eclog. VII, ver. 35.

(12) Propert. *lib. iv*, Eleg. I, *ver.* 5.

(13) Voiage de Munſter, *p.* 145.

(14) *Lib. ii, cap. liv.*

(15) It is a fault; it ſhould be 1549.

(16) Fuit, *ſays Munſter*, imago Eraſmi ad vivum expreſſa, advenienti (*Philippo*) oppoſita, quæ exerto brachio gratulatorium carmen Principi offerebat.

(17) *Voyage*, Part ii, pag. 129, 130. All thoſe faults of *Monconis* are found in a book printed in 1692, intituled *Theatro Belgico*. See the place that relates to Rotterdam.

(18) Æneas Silvius *mentions the turf in a book which he publiſhed in* 1458. *See* Martinus Schoockius de Turffis, *pag.* 3.

(19) Acad. des Sciences, *vol. ii*, *pag.* 162.

a luſtre [*C*]. Rotterdam is the ſeat of the admiralty of the Maeſe.

Sereniſſimo Hiſpaniarum Principi D. Philippo
à Bugundia Deſiderius Eraſmus
Rotterodamus.

Rotterodamus ego non inficiabor Eraſmus
Ne videar cives deſeruiſſe meos.
Ipſorum inſtinctu, Princeps clariſſime, ſalvum
Ingreſſum precor ad limina noſtra tuum,
Atque hunc quo poſſum ſtudio, commendo popellum
Maxime præſidiis Cæſare nate tuis.
Te Dominum agnoſcunt omnes, te Principe gaudent,
Nec quiquam toto charius orbe tenent.

To the moſt ſerene prince D. Philip
of Burgundy, Deſiderius Eraſmus
of Rotterdam.

Eraſmus I, of Rotterdam, am call'd:
My country's welfare ſtill employs my care.
Great ſon of Cæſar, in the people's name
I bid thee welcome to the Belgic land,
Which flies to thee for ſhelter and defence.
Thee all acknowledge as their lawful prince,
And pay a joyful homage to thy pow'r.

Obſerve that Mr Joli might have quoted, upon this occaſion, a more authentic author than Sebaſtian Munſter ; for he might have quoted the Spaniſh relation of the journey of Don Philip prince of Spain, written by Juan Chriſtoval Caluete de Eſtrella. You may alſo obſerve, that, in the year 1672, the mob having made an inſurrection in moſt towns of the province of Holland, Rotterdam was, for ſome days, at the diſcretion of the rabble, and during that anarchy, the ſtatue of Eraſmus was removed from it's place, as a thing that ſavoured of Popery. The mob carried it into a public houſe, and took into conſideration whether it ſhould not be melted down. The magiſtrates of Baſil did no ſooner hear of it, but they ordered ſome Merchants of their town to deſire their correſpondent in Rotterdam, to buy that ſtatue at a certain price. The correſpondent went upon a bargain, and might have had it, had it not been for a ſmall difference in the price. He gave an account of his commiſſion, and received a new order to give the magiſtrates of Rotterdam the full of what they demanded ; but in that interval of time, they had changed their mind, and reſolved neither to ſell nor to melt down that ſtatue, but to ſet it up again in the ſame place ; which they did ſome time after. The Merchant, who had a commiſſion to buy it for the magiſtrates of Baſil, gave me this account within theſe two days (20).

[*C*] . . . *From whom it received ſo great a luſtre.*] Moſt of thoſe who write concerning Eraſmus's life, take notice of the glory he has procured to his native country. Du Verdier Vau-Privas (21), and Bullart (22), begin with an encomium upon that youth of Rotterdam. The words of Rhenanus upon this occaſion, are too fine not to be inſerted in this place. ‘ Natus eſt, *ſays he, ſpeaking to the emperor Charles V* (23), ab avi tui Friderici III. Aug. primis Imperii annis ad quintum Calend. Novembris, Roterodami in Hollandia tua inferioris Germaniæ Provincia, quam olim Batavi poſſederunt, nunc magis notam ſtudioſis omnibus ob unius indigenæ Eraſmi incunabula, quàm veterum incolarum memoria quamlibet bellico robore præſtantium. Hoc alumno Roterodamum oppidum ſe ſemper jactabit, & doctis erit commendatum. - - - *He was born about the beginning of the reign of your glorious anceſtor Frederic III, upon the 26th of October, at Rotterdam in Holland, your province of Lower Germany, which was of old poſſeſſed by the Batavi ; but is now better known to the learned world, for being the birth-place of Eraſmus, who drew there his firſt breath, than by the renown for warlike proweſs of it's antient inhabitants. Upon which account the city of Rotterdam will ever glory, and be eſteemed by the learned.*’ I might quote many authors, who, in order to heighten the glory of Rotterdam, join theſe two things together ; the one, that Eraſmus was born in it, and the other, that they have erected a ſtatue to him.

ROVENIUS (PHILIP) a titular archbiſhop of Philippe, and apoſtolical vicar in the United Provinces, was born at Deventer *(a)*. He publiſhed ſeveral books, and one amongſt others, *de Republica Chriſtiana*, printed in the year 1648. I ſhall quote a paſſage out of it, to ſhew the ſtrange jargon of ſome devout women, which he does ſeverely condemn [*A*].

[*A*] *The ſtrange jargon of ſome devout women, which he does ſeverely condemn.*] You may ſee in the following paſſage, what he ſays of ſome nuns, who affected ſome particular exerciſes of devotion and ſpirituality (1). ‘ Non raro etiam ſuperbiam aliquam conjunctam habent, ut ambulent in magnis, & mirabilibus ſuper ſe, ut vileſcant illis ordinaria pietatis exercitia approbata ab Eccleſia, vel à Patribus commendata : nihil crepent niſi uniones cum Deo, cum uniantur proprio (ſi non pejori) ſpiritui : jactent tranſubſtantiationes myſticas, cordis concentrationes : potentiarum, imo omnis ſui eſſe, annihilationem, connubium eſſentiæ creatæ & Divinitatis : ſpirituale Sacramentum inſeparabilitatis, ſomnium omnium affectionum, abſorptionem & liquefactionem in amplexu ſponſi, triplicem animæ hierarchiam, orationem in quiete paſſiva, ebrietatem ſpiritualem, cordis ſilentium, meditationes negativas, uniones ſupereſſentiales, puteum & gurgitem annihilationis, amorem Deificum, transformantem, unientem, ſtringentem, amplexantem, ſuavitatem cor auferentem, ſugentem ſponſi ubera, ruminantem collum, abſorbentem enthuſiaſmum, inſenſibilitatem & oblivionem omnium inducentem abyſſalem cum Deo identificationem, confricationem Deificam, incendentem & conſumentem cor : elevationem ad ſuavitatem cœleſtem, ex infernali languore, introverſionem ſuper cœleſtem, caliginem & umbram Dei, allocutiones internas, elevationes incognitas, extentiones & applicationes amoroſas, animæ ſuſpenſiones, deliquium, ſuſpiria, mortem ſenſuum & omnium affectuum, ecſtaſim continuam, juſtitium ratiocinii, cordis contactum & patefactionem, liquefactionem, influxum, inflammationem, aſſultus qui ferri nequeant, penetrationes ad intima, vulnerationes, conſtrictiones, alligationes inſeparabiles, aſpectus penetrantes & oblectantes, voces tremulas, murmura columbina, guſtus ſuaviſſimos, odores gratiſſimos, auditus melodiæ cœleſtis, hypermyſticas Dei & animæ perichoreſes, impudentiam ſpiritualem, aſpirationes Myſanthropicas, ignem ſine carbone, flammam ſine corpore, holocauſtum meridianum in viſcerali & medullari penetrabilitate, contactum mirabilem & ſuaviſſimum, obſcuræ noctis gaudia & caliginem. Hæc & ſimilia ſeſquipedalia verba in nova pietatis ſchola inter ſponte electos Magiſtros, & diſcipulas curioſas, adeo frequenter tenero proferuntur palato, ut intimis in viſceribus ſentiantur (2). - - - - *They often alſo take a ſort of pride, in pretending to the performance of things great and wonderful, beyond their ability, ſo as to deſpiſe the uſual exerciſes of piety approved by the church, or recommended by the Fathers : they talk of nothing leſs than their union with God, which is only with their own ſpirit, if not with a worſe. They boaſt of myſtical tranſubſtantiations, concentrations of heart, annihilation of powers, yea, of all their being, marriage of the created eſſence with the Deity, the ſpiritual ſacrament of inſeparability, the dream of all the affections, abſorption, and diſſolution in the embrace of the ſpouſe, a triple hierarchy of the ſoul, prayer in paſſive quietude, ſpiritual intoxications, ſilence of heart, the negative meditations, ſupereſſential unions, the pit and gulph of annihilation, deifying love, transforming, uniting, preſſing, embracing, a ſweetneſs raviſhing the ſoul, ſucking the breaſts of the ſpouſe, a ruminating neck, an abſorbent enthuſiaſm, inſenſibility and oblivion of all things inducing an abyſſal identi-*

---

(20) I write this the 28th of July, 1699.

(21) Proſopogr. *Tom. iii, pag.* 2389.

(22) Acad. des Sciences, *Tom. ii, pag.* 159.

(23) *Epiſt. præfixa* Operibus Eraſmi. *See alſo* Quenſtedt *p.* 121, *of his Dialogue* de patriis illuſtrium doctrina & ſcriptis virorum.

(*a*) Valerius Andreas, Biblioth. Belg. *pag.* 778.

(1) Philip. Rovenius, de Republ. Chriſtiana, *lib. i, cap. xliii. pag.* 278.

(2) Dr Stillingfleet hath gathered out of the myſtical authors ſome ſuch phraſes. See his *Tract of the Fanaticiſm of the Romiſh church.* pag. m. 240, 307, & ſeq. See alſo the like jargon in remark [*K*] of the article BRACHMANS.

fication with God, deific confrication, inflaming and conſuming the heart ; an elevation to a celeſtial ſweetneſs from an infernal languiſhing, ſuperceleſtial introverſion, darkneſs and ſhade of God, inward allocutions, unknown elevations, amorous extenſions and applications, ſuſpenſions of the ſoul, ſwooning, groans, death of all the ſenſes and affections, perpetual extaſy, ceſſation of reaſoning, contact and opening of heart, liquefaction, influx, inflammation, inſupportable aſſaults, thorough penetrations, woundings, up-bindings, inſeparable alligations, penetrating and delighting looks, warbling ſounds, dove-like murmurs, ſweeteſt taſtes, moſt pleaſant odours, heavenly melodious ſounds, ſupermyſtical walks of God and the ſoul, ſpiritual impudence, myſanthropical aſpirations, fire without coal, flame without a body, meridian holocauſt in a viſceral, and medullar penetrability ; admirable and moſt delightful contact, joys and darkneſs of obſcure night. Theſe and the like enormous words, and this unintelligible jargon, is frequently repeated in the new ſchool of piety by their own choſen maſters and inquiſitive ſhe-diſciples with faint and trembling voice.’

RUA (PETER), a learned Spaniard, who taught Philology at Soria, the place of his birth [*A*], lived in the XVIth century. He publiſhed three very learned and curious letters (*a*) againſt Antony de Guevara, wherein he confuted a vaſt number of falſities publiſhed by that author, and the ridiculous ſhift that he made uſe of. This you may ſee in a paſſage of Andreas Schottus which I quote [*B*]. Moreri has committed a very great blunder [*C*].

(*a*) Intituled, *Cartas del Bachiller Rua.* Nicol. Anton. Biblioth. Hiſpan. *Tom. ii, p.* 187.

[*A*] *At Soria, the place of his birth.*] One would think, at firſt ſight, that Andreas Schottus, and Don Nicolas Antonio do not agree. The one ſays, ‘Petrus Rhua Numantinus primum Abulæ, poſt Numantiæ in patria annos plurimos ad extremam uſque ætatem bonas litteras docuit (1). - - - - *Peter Rua of Numantia taught the* Belles Lettres *firſt at Abula, and after at Numantia, in his country, many years, to an extream old age.*’ And the other, ‘Petrus Rua, Sorienſis, Abulæ primum, mox in patria urbe juventutem humanioribus imbuit literis ad extremam uſque ætatem (2). - - - *Peter Rua, of Soria, firſt at Abula, and ſoon after in the town where he was born, inſtructed the youth in human learning to an extream old age.* But at the bottom they ſay the ſame thing. Soria, which was built near the ruins of Numantia, is called Numantia by ſome, and, amongſt others, by Andreas Schottus.

(1) Andr. Schottus, Biblioth. Hiſpan. *p.* 567.

(2) Nicol. Anton. Biblioth. Scriptor. Hiſpan. *Tom. ii, pag.* 187.

[*B*] *This may be ſeen in a paſſage of Andreas Schottus.*] Here it is. ‘In quo egregie verſatum fuiſſe teſtantur *epiſt.* 3. Hiſpanicè ſcriptæ eruditionis plenæ, & Humanitatis ſatis copioſæ : quibus Ant. Guevarræ (qui tum ſolus doctrinæ, & eloquentiæ arcem tenere videbatur) errores, mendaciaque in hiſtoriis antiquorum, veteribuſque monumentis lapidum, & nummorum explicandis, egregie refellit. Valde ut mirer Gallos, Guevarræ epiſtolas converſas *Aureo* titulo decoraſſe, manibuſque ita tenere ſolitos, ut pro oraculis circumferant, quæ tot mendaciis, quot verſibus ſcatere dicantur. R U A itaque de tot millibus multa indicavit, facemque prætulit, ne quis poſthac credulus in errorem induceretur. Epiſt. 1. numiſmatum inſcriptiones, & confinxiſſe, & ridicule explicaſſe, in Chronologia & magiſtratuum dignitate turpiter hallucinatum. Epiſt. 2. erraſſe in hiſtoria Rom. temporum ratione, locorumque nominibus, ſolenne illud ſuum ſervando, audacter ut omnia pronunciet, quaſi poſteris imponere volens, aut credens omnes ei temere aſſenſuros audito illo Pythagoreorum ἀυτὸς ἔφα, cornicum oculos confixit, citans indentidem, & prodigioſa nomina propria hiſtoricorum, cudenſque arbitratu ſuo, ad hanc diem inaudita. De numiſmatis inepta & ridicula leges ; ut & de legibus Rom. & legum auctorib. de lege Julia Poppæa, Cornelia, Falcidia, aliiſque : de medicina & empirica. Tertia epiſtola ut mole ſua ita rerum pondere ceteris major eſt. Cum enim Guevarra omnem antiquitati fidem derogare niteretur, epiſtola quadam, quo ficta mendacia tegeret, velaret, vel tueretur ; cum à ſacris litteris diſceſſeris, omnia incerta fabuliſque plena affirmat. Refellit virum diſerte R U A ex Athenagoræ apologia pro Chriſtianis, & hoc eſſe omnem artium tractationem, fidemque ut ſocietatis humanæ, ita & ſcientiarum vinculum è medio tollere (3). - - - *That he was very ſkillful therein appears from three* letters *he wrote in Spaniſh, full of learning : wherein he excellently confutes the errors and falſhoods of Antonius Guevara, (who then ſeemed to be the only maſter of learning and eloquence) with reſpect to antient hiſtories, and inſcriptions of ſtones and coins. And I cannot but think it ſtrange, that the French ſhould have adorned the tranſlation of Guevara's epiſtles, with a* golden *title, and carry them about as oracles, in which there are as many errors as lines. Wherefore RUA of ſo many thouſands has mentioned ſeveral, that henceforth none may by their credulity be led into error. He has ſhewed, that in his firſt epiſtle he hath both feigned, and ridiculouſly explained inſcriptions of coins, and is ſhamefully miſtaken in the chronology and promotion of magiſtrates. In his ſecond epiſtle he hath erred in Roman hiſtory, with reſpect to times, and names of places, obſerving his uſual cuſtom, of boldly aſſerting, as if deſirous to impoſe on poſterity, or thinking all would believe him upon his word, often quoting, and feigning at pleaſure, ſtrange names of Hiſtorians unheard of to this day. You ſhall find things fooliſh and ridiculous concerning coins, as alſo concerning Roman laws, and their authors, of the Julian, Poppæan, Cornelian, Falcidian, and others. His third epiſtle is greater both in bulk and the importance of it's ſubject : For Guevara, endeavouring to aboliſh the credit and authority of antiquity, in a certain epiſtle, in order to cover, conceal, or maintain, his forged lies, affirms, that, except the Scriptures, all is uncertain, and full of fables. RUA does fully confute him out of Athenagoras's apology for the Chriſtians, ſhewing that this would deſtroy all belief of the foundation of human ſociety and ſcience.*’ This is a curious ſupplement to the article Guevara.

(3) Andr. Schottus, ubi ſupra.

[*C*] *Moreri has committed a very great blunder.*] He ſays, Peter Rua wrote a treatiſe *De Lege Julia, Poppæa, Cornelia, Falcidia,* &c. *de Medicina & Empyrica* ; and he quotes Father Schottus's book for it. What a horrid blunder is this ! Does not that Father clearly ſay, not that Rua wrote a treatiſe upon thoſe ſubjects, but that the deſign of his ſecond letter was to ſhew the falſities of Guevara upon ſeveral other matters, and particularly upon theſe ? Beſides, the *Lex Julia,* and the *Lex Poppæa,* are not two laws, but one and the ſame law. Father Schottus ſhews that plainly enough ; he puts no comma between *Julia* and *Poppæa.*

RUARUS (MARTIN) a Socinian miniſter, was born at Krempen (*a*) in Germany. He was infected with the Socinian Hereſies by Erneſtus Sonerus, profeſſor at Altdorf, who taught them privately. He grew ſo fond of them, that he choſe rather to loſe his patrimonial eſtate than to renounce that ſect. He was eſteemed both at home and abroad for his judgment, learning, and good life (*b*). He was made rector of the college of Racovia, and then miniſter of the Socinians at Dantzic, both in the town, and in the borough of Straſſin, and he died in that office, in the year 1657 (*c*), being ſeventy years old (*d*). He was already poſſeſſed of it in the year 1635, as it appears from the

---

(*a*) A town in the country of Holſtein.

(*b*) Ob eruditionis, judiciique præſtantiam, morumque integritatem, in magno & apud iſtos & alios eruditos fuit pretio. *Mollerus Iſagoge ad Hiſt. Cherſoneſi Cimbricæ,* Part. iii, pag. 106.

(*c*) Id. ibid.

(*d*) Sandius *in* Biblioth. Antitrinit. *pag.* 114.

the travels of James (§ *a*) Ogier [*A*]. He wrote ſome pieces, which have been printed [*B*]. The famous Calixtus left no ſtone unturned to convert him, during the conference of Thorn in the year 1646, but he could not prevail with him (*e*).

(*e*) Nulli ut popularem hunc ſuum in viam revocaret, pepercit operæ, ſed pertinaciam ejus ſuperare non potuit. *Mollerus, ubi ſupra, pag.* 107.

[(§ *a*) It ſhould be *Charles Ogier*, as Mr Bayle here calls him in the marginal citation (1), and the remark [*Q*] of the article ULEFELD. Here is the whole title of thoſe travels: *Caroli Ogerii Ephemerides, ſive Iter Danicum, Suecicum, Polonicum, cum eſſet in comitatu Illuſtriſſ. Claudii Memmii, Comitis Avauxii, ad Septentrionis Reges extraordinarii Legati. Lutetiæ Pariſiorum, apud Petrum Le Petit* 1636, *in 8vo.* He hath been called *Ogier the Dane*, becauſe of his voyage to Denmark. His brother, the Prior Ogier, was called Francis. Rem Crit.]

[*A*] *From the travels of James Ogier.*] That author was at Dantzic in 1635, in the retinue of count d'Avaux, ambaſſador of his moſt Chriſtian majeſty. He ſays, that being in a Bookſeller's ſhop, one Ruardus, (he ſhould have ſaid Ruarus) came to him, with whom he diſcourſed in Latin for two hours, and then in French. 'Aggreſſus me eſt quidam N. Ruardus, 'quocum per duas horas collocutus ſum Latinè, ac deinde Gallice, qui me ad ædes ſuas adeundas invitabit. Didici poſtea ab aliquo, eum eſſe Arianorum 'Paſtorem: ſunt quippe Gedani hujuſmodi homines, 'qui clam congregantur, inſcio vel diſſimulante Senatu (1). - - - - *I was accoſted by one N. Ruardus, 'with whom I diſcourſed in Latin about two hours, and 'then in French, who gave me an invitation to his 'houſe. I underſtood afterwards from a certain perſon, 'that he was the miniſter of the Arians; for at Dantzic there are ſuch perſons, who meet privately, either 'without the knowledge, or by the connivance, of the 'ſenate.*'

(1) Carol. Ogerius, in itinere Polonico, *p.* 418, 419.

[*B*] *He writ ſome pieces.*] He writ ſome notes upon the Catechiſm of the Socinian churches of Poland, which were printed in the edition of that Catechiſm publiſhed in 1665. They are alſo to be found in the edition of 1680. He made ſome other notes upon the ſame work; which have not been publiſhed (2). There are two centuries of his letters: the firſt was printed at Amſterdam for DAVID RUARUS, the author's ſon, in 1677, with a preface of JOACHIM RUARUS, David's brother. The ſecond was publiſhed in 1681, for the ſame David, who added a preface to it. Thoſe letters are very curious (3). Some took him to be the author of the German tranſlation of the New Teſtament, made at Racovia, and publiſhed in the year 1630 (4); but it is a miſtake. 'Quos 'falli mihi conſtat, tum ex Sandio * illam Johann. 'Crellio & Joach. Stegmanno Seniori vindicante, tum 'ex indicio Filii, quem noſter reliquit, cognominis, 'Amſtelodami viventis, à quo, adornatam eam credi 'à Chriſtoph. Oſtorodo ac συνέργοις aliquot, reviſam 'autem eſſe à tota Societate, & in hac parente ſuo, 'ac præfationem tandem à Crellio adjectam, A. 1684 'ſum edoctus (5). - - - *Whom I know to be miſtaken, 'both from Sandius's aſcribing it to John Crellius, and 'Joach. Stegmannus, ſenior, as alſo by the declaration of 'his ſon of the ſame name living at Amſterdam, of 'whom I underſtood that it was believed to have been 'prepared by Chriſtopher Oſtorodus, and others aſſiſting 'him, but reviſed by all the ſociety, and amongſt them 'his father, and that at laſt a preface was added by 'Crellius, in the year* 1684.'

(2) *Taken from* Sandius in Biblioth. Antitrinit. *pag.* 114.

(3) *Eruditæ & lectu digniſſimæ.* Mollerus, Iſagoge ad Hiſt. Cherſon. Cimbricæ, *Part. iii, p.* 107. *See* Morhof, Polyhiſt. *cap. xxiv, pag.* 300.

(4) *See* Matth. Zimmermanni Diſſert. inaug. de acceptilatione, *pag.* 27, 31, apud Mollerum, ibid.

* In Biblioth. Antitrin. *pag.* 94, 116, 133.

(5) Mollerus, ibid.

RUBENUS (Leonard) a native of Eſſen (*a*) in Germany, entred into the order of St Benedict at Cologn the eleventh of July 1596 (*b*). He had for ſeveral years reſided in Livonia, Lithuania, and Tranſylvania, for promoting the intereſts of the Romiſh religion. He was in Tranſylvania in the year 1588, and he there publiſhed theſes concerning idolatry, and dedicated them to prince Sigiſmund Battori. He propoſed them at a public diſputation, but no one would undertake to impugn them. He was deſired in ſeveral places to print a ſecond edition, and that was the cauſe he took that ſubject again into conſideration, and treated on it more at large (*c*), from whence proceeded a book of 327 pages which he printed at Cologn in the year 1597. He relates a thing which ſhews that Livonia was ſtill infected with Heatheniſh idolatry [*A*]. Mr Konig knew nothing of this author, ſave that he undertook to write a book *de falſis Prophetis* in the year 1600 (*d*).

(*a*) A ſmall town three miles from the Rhine and from Duiſburg.

(*b*) See the Epiſtle Dedicrtory of his treatiſe *de Idololatria*.

(*c*) See his Advertiſement to the reader.

(*d*) You may ſee in the Catalogue of Oxford, a book of Leonardus Rubenus, *de falſis Prophetis & Lupis rapacibus*, printed at Paderborn in 8vo, in the year 1606.

[*A*] *He relates a thing which ſhews that Livonia was ſtill infected with heatheniſh idolatry.*] Having received an order from his ſuperiors to go to Dorpat, which is almoſt the outmoſt town of Livonia, in his way he paſſed through the ſacred woods of the Eſthonians. He ſaw there a pine-tree of an extraordinary height and bigneſs, the branches whereof were full of divers pieces of old cloth, and its roots covered with many bundles of ſtraw and hay. He aſked a man of the neighbourhood what was the meaning of it, he anſwered that the inhabitants adored that tree, and that the women after a ſafe delivery brought thither theſe bundles of hay; that they had alſo a cuſtom to offer at a certain time a tun of beer, and to throw a tun of it into the lake of Mariemburg, when it thundred, and that they thought the thunder was the Son of God, and that he was appeaſed by the effuſion of that liquor. He deſired they would bring him a good hatchet, for that which he had in his chariot was not ſharp; and when they aſked him what he deſigned to do with it, I will ſhew you, ſaid he, the weakneſs of what you worſhip. The Eſthonians replied, that they could not do what he deſired without the utmoſt danger, and cried to him to take care of going under the tree, and if he did, both he and his chariot would be taken up into the air. However he made his horſes go under it; and taking his hatchet, in a devout manner, he cut the figure of a croſs on the pine, and leſt that figure made by a man, whom they honoured with the appellation of the great temple of God, ſhould increaſe their ſuperſtition, he cut a gibbet on the ſame tree, and, in deriſion, ſaid, behold your God (1).

(1) Taken from Rubenus, *lib. i*, de Idololatria, *cap. xviii, p.* 66.

RUCELLAI (John), a noble Florentine and good Poet, lived in the XVIth century. I have elſewhere ſaid (*a*) that he compoſed in the year 1524 at Rome a Poem intituled *le Api*, to which I now add that he was at that time governor of the caſtle St Angelo, and that PALLA RUCELLAI, his brother, cauſed that Poem to be printed at Florence in the year 1539 in 8vo, and dedicated it to Giovani Giorgio Triſſino, author of the *Italia liberata da Goti*, which was printed at Rome in the year 1547. John Ruccellai compoſed alſo a tragedy intituled *Oreſte.* Leo Allazzi makes mention of it in page 605 of his *Drammaturgia* (*b*).

(*a*) In the remark [*E*] of the article ORICELLARIUS, at the end.

(*b*) *Taken from the* Biblioteca Aproſiana, *pag.* 458, 459.

RUFFI (Antony de) counſellor in the ſeneſchal's court of Marſeilles, where he was born, diſcharged the duties of his office with great integrity, and a ſingular tenderneſs of conſcience. Beſides, he applyed himſelf to Hiſtorical inquiries with a wonderful diligence and patience, as it appears from his Hiſtory of Marſeilles, printed in 1642, and re-printed with large additions in the year 1696, in two volumes, *in folio* (a). He was but thirty-five years of age, when it came out the firſt time. An office of counſellor of ſtate was beſtowed upon him in 1654, as *a teſtimony of the eſteem* they had *for his learning and merit.* I ſhall alledge an inſtance of the tenderneſs of his conſcience [*A*], which will give me occaſion to debate a queſtion concerning the ignorance, that excuſeth from ſin, and to examine the anſwers that may be made to the compariſons taken from Judges

(a) *See the* Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans, *June* 1697.

[*A*] *The tenderneſs of his conſcience.*] This appears 'from the reſtitution he made to a perſon, whoſe cauſe he had reported. He was afraid he had not beſtowed a ſufficient time upon the examination of that cauſe, and that he had contributed to the loſs of it by his careleſſneſs; and he was ſo far from ſeeking any excuſes or reaſons, which ſelf-love never fails to ſuggeſt in ſuch caſes, that he ſeverely condemned himſelf, and made uſe of a prieſt of the Oratory to reſtore the ſum which that perſon had loſt. Perhaps it may be ſaid that the niceneſs of the Judge proved more favourable to the perſon concerned, than a more ſevere and ſtrict examination of his right and defences would have been. Moreover this great probity was authentically acknowledged by the parliament of Provence, in an arrêt given in the year 1655, at the ſuit of the king's attorney-general.' This is what we find in the elogy of Mr de Ruffi (1) immediately after theſe words: *Whenever he ſat upon the bench, his mind was taken up with the deſcription of that court of juſtice mentioned by the royal prophet in one of his Pſalms: GOD is preſent in the aſſembly of the gods; being in the middle of them, he judges them*; ſtetit in ſynagoga Deorum, in medio autem Deos dijudicat: *being poſſeſſed with the ſentiments, that ſuch a thought can inſpire, he weighed every thing in the balance of the ſanctuary: the ſentiments inſpired by fleſh and blood, the dangerous ſeductions of friendſhip, and the power of intereſt never made him ſwerve from the path of juſtice; he omitted nothing to be informed of the truth: his firmneſs in protecting innocency, and puniſhing wickedneſs was as great as his penetration; and he never gave his opinion, nor pronounced a ſentence, without ſeriouſly conſidering whether he could maintain it before the tribunal of that impartial majeſty, who is at the laſt day to judge the righteouſneſs of men.*

Observations concerning ignorance that will excuſe.

It was not a needleſs thing for me to obſerve that theſe words are to be found immediately before thoſe, wherein it is ſaid, that he reſtored a certain ſum to a perſon who had loſt his cauſe. This will give me occaſion to make an important reflexion. The author of the elogy means without doubt, that Mr de Ruffi had examined the cauſe with his uſual exactneſs; but that his too great tenderneſs made him fear that he had been a little careleſs. This author, I ſay, does certainly give us to underſtand that the ſcruples of that Judge were grounded upon the informations he had received ſince the cauſe had been judged. In a word, the thing ought to be underſtood in this manner. The Judge who reported his cauſe uſed therein all his knowledge, all diligence and integrity; but after it had been decided, he found out, I do not know how, that the party who had been caſt, had a better right than he thought. He therefore came to think that if he had more carefully examined all the writings, he would have made a more favourable report, and thereupon he condemned himſelf, and believed himſelf obliged to make a reſtitution. This ſhews that he had a very tender and ſcrupulous conſcience; which could not be ſaid of him, ſhould we ſuppoſe that he was ſenſible of an affected careleſſneſs, and of ſome lazineſs and impatience. For in ſuch a caſe a man, who reports a cauſe, is certainly guilty; his ignorance cannot excuſe him: and though he feels ſome remorſe, it is not a proof of a tender conſcience; for a man may have a hard conſcience and yet be ſenſibly affected with ſuch inward remorſes. But I ſuppoſe by virtue of the expreſſions made uſe of by the elogiſt, that Mr de Ruffi could not blame himſelf for any ſuch thing. He ſincerely intended to make a very fair report; he neglected nothing that he thought neceſſary, and he knew that in many other cauſes the ſame application had been ſufficient. The only thing therefore that he blamed himſelf for, was his believing that he had done all that a good reporter ought to do, having found out at laſt that he might have reported the caſe better than he had done. Since he was uneaſy in his mind upon ſuch an account, he would have been uneaſy, though he had known that it was hardly poſſible, humanly ſpeaking, to do better, and that his ignorance was invincible. What I am going to ſay will ſhew you the reaſon, why I make theſe obſervations upon Mr de Ruffi's conduct.

Some pieces have been printed in Holland within theſe ten years (2) about the rights of an erroneous conſcience. The authors who have maintained that ignorance can be no excuſe, have inſtanced upon ſome holy men, who have been extremely afflicted for what they have done with a good intent, thinking to ſerve God, and who believed they ſtood in need of God's mercy, &c. Such examples, generally ſpeaking, prove nothing: for a man of a tender conſcience, and full of love for virtue, will grieve even for a fault that is purely material, I mean committed with an invincible ignorance. If a Phyſician ſhould come to know by Revelation, that the remedy he had preſcribed to a ſick perſon, had been the occaſion of his death, tho' according to all the rules of his art, he ought to have preſcribed it; he would heartily grieve for it, if he was a conſcientious and charitable man. He would make amends for it to the beſt of his power, by relieving the family of the deceaſed, reduced to great poverty by his death. And yet he would be very innocent before God; for I ſuppoſe that his ignorance was invincible, and ſuch as it ought to be, to excuſe a man according to the moſt rigid Divines (3). The ſame muſt be ſaid of a Judge who has occaſioned the loſs of a cauſe, when no human knowledge was able to diſcover the truth. He would certainly grieve, if he ſhould know that the party condemned was in the right; and would make up the damage if he was a man truly conſcientious and of a ſtrict virtue. The author of the encomium upon Mr de Ruffi, has given us an inſtance of it. Such a grief therefore and ſuch reparations ought not to be alledged, in order to prove, That an unaffected ignorance cannot excuſe a man. The more pious we are, the more we ſhall grieve for the material faults we have committed out of ignorance. The conſcience becomes then more ſevere than God himſelf, whether it be out of humility or precaution. A thouſand inſtances might be alledged to ſhew that an innocent man will grieve, make up a damage, reſtore, &c. If a good man hears that his horſe has lamed ſome body, is he not concerned for it? Does he not pay ſometimes the Surgeon, who takes care of the poor wretch? And if he be a man of a ſcrupulous conſcience, is he not afraid that God will call him to an account for his careleſſneſs, and for keeping ſuch a horſe? And yet all judicious Caſuiſts will acknowledge the innocency of that good man, if they know that his horſe has done ſuch a miſchief without any fault of his. If an Orator ſhould be at a ſtand, and by ſuch an involuntary misfortune ſhould prejudice his neighbour, would he not be exceedingly vexed at it? If he ſhould beg of God that he would forgive him, and if he went about to make up the damage, could we conclude from it that he has committed a ſin; and can we call that a moral fault, which is only a phyſical imperfection, as independent upon our reaſon and liberty, as the weakneſs of the eyes ſuddenly dazzled by too great a light? I ſuppoſe the Orator has neglected nothing that he thought neceſſary to make him remember his ſpeech. But let us keep to the ignorance of honeſt Judges. The

---

(1) It is prefixed to the ſecond edition of the Hiſtory of Marſeilles.

(2) I write this in September, 1697.

(3) We have ſeen above in the remark [*A*] of the article RIMINI, that they acknowledge, properly ſpeaking, no invincible ignorance in religious matters; but they are not ſo rigid in relation to matters of fact, and human diſciplines.

Judges, whoſe ſentences are unjuſt contrary to their intention [*B*], or from Phyſicians, whoſe

The firſt preſident of the parliament of Paris, made a ſpeech at the opening of that court in 1693, wherein he repreſented, *That though the Judges think they have done their beſt to have a full knowledge of a cauſe, yet ſometimes they commit an injuſtice, when they fancy they pronounce a very juſt ſentence, which has been ſeen in the late Mr de Langlade's caſe; for the Judges, notwithſtanding their great capacity, and the care they took to clear the matter, condemned an innocent man; for which they endeavoured to make amends by their arrêt* (4). From whence it appears, That thoſe Judges, tho' honeſt and careful of their duty, were concerned for their miſtake, and made amends for it. If they had died, before they came to know that they were miſtaken, being conſcious to themſelves of having done their beſt to find out the truth, could they have feared any thing from the divine juſtice? Can it be ſaid that they were obliged to overcome ſuch obſtacles as were invincible with reſpect to them? See the author of the *Commentaire Philoſophique* (5), who has ſo fully proved, that in ſome caſes an innocent man may be condemned, and a guilty one acquitted without any ſin, that the learned miniſter of Utrecht who writ againſt him (6), left this doctrine untouched.

[*B*] *I ſhall examine the anſwers . . . . . to the compariſons taken from Judges whoſe ſentences are unjuſt contrary to their intention.*] How can it be ſaid, will ſome object to me, that ignorant Judges deſerve to be excuſed, ſince they occaſion ſo many diſorders? Do not you know that they are puniſhed? For if application be made to the ſovereign, or to a ſuperior court, their judgments are reverſed, they are cenſured, and ſometimes alſo degraded. *It is the uſual courſe of human juſtice.* Now if princes puniſh in ſuch a manner thoſe that are ignorant of their laws, how can it be ſaid that God will not puniſh thoſe that are ignorant of his word? This compariſon is not therefore advantageous to thoſe who preach up Toleration. To this I muſt anſwer three things.

I. Should a Judge, through a groſs ignorance, take the wrong way in a cauſe, that may be eaſily determined, he would doubtleſs deſerve to be degraded, not as being an ill man, if he had followed the dictates of his conſcience (7) with an intent to be juſt to the parties concerned, but as being unqualified for ſuch an employment; and if thoſe, who degrade him, knew the uprightneſs of his heart, they would declare that he is a good, conſcientious, and juſt man, and in an authentic manner own that he only wanted learning. Juſt as if an ambaſſador ſhould diſmiſs his ſecretary, whoſe hand is not very legible, though he knows his faithfulneſs and capacity. This would be no blot upon his honeſty, no reflexion upon his wit; he is only diſmiſſed becauſe the ambaſſador wants a man, who writes a good hand. Let us compare two Judges one with another, the one is very learned, the other is a man of indifferent parts; and both are equally honeſt. If one of them be for the affirmative, and the other for the negative, according to the dictates of their conſcience, having uſed all the induſtry and application they are capable of in order to know the truth; and if the ſuffrage of the more learned is juſt, and the ſuffrage of the other unjuſt, I maintain that the one does not exceed the other in uprightneſs. I grant that he is a more knowing judge, and better qualified for his employment, becauſe the qualities of a good Judge take in knowledge and integrity; but he is not a man of greater probity, nor more zealous for juſtice.

II. As to that *uſual courſe* we are told of in puniſhing ignorant Judges; I do not know whether there are any inſtances of it. There is nothing more common than to ſee the judgment of an inferior court reverſed by a ſuperior court. But the inferior Judges are neither turned out nor cenſured, unleſs it does plainly appear that they have been guilty of bribery, partiality, or at leaſt of a very great ignorance. And if it be ſuppoſed that they have determined a cauſe according to their knowledge, though it be never ſo ſmall, their ſuperiors are contented to rectify their judgment. I ſhould be glad if any one would alledge an inſtance of a Judge, degraded for want of learning, though at the ſame time he was looked upon as a conſcientious and incorruptible man, very much intent upon ſtudy, and very careful to examine a cauſe. I am perſuaded that the puniſhment of Judges is always grounded upon this ſuppoſition, that they have been bribed, or have acted out of paſſion, or are guilty of a wilful ignorance. But here is a very pregnant inſtance to confirm the opinion laid down in the *Commentaire Philoſophique*. 'Though we pretend to be 'innocent, it does not follow that the Judges are unjuſt, for it is not a thing inconſiſtent with courts of 'judicature, made up of men, who may be deceived, 'and deceive others, that an innocent perſon ſhould be 'condemned, and a guilty one acquitted by a juſt 'Judge. It often falls out, that in civil and criminal cauſes, the Judges are divided in their opinions 'when the caſe is doubtful: and as all of them muſt 'be directed by the law, it may be that all of them 'are juſt, whether they acquit or condemn, notwithſtanding that contrariety of opinions, giving their 'judgment according to the dictates of their conſcience. * When king Henry II, your predeceſſor, 'was informed, that Peliſſon, preſident in the parliament of Chambery, which at that time did belong 'to France, had been deprived of his office by an 'arrêt of the parliament of Dijon, at the ſuit of Taboüet the king's attorney, and that the cauſe being 'afterwards brought to the parliament of Paris, by virtue of letters of reviſion, he had been acquitted, and 'the ſaid attorney condemned; he juſtified all the 'Judges, notwithſtanding their contrary opinions, 'ſaying, that ſome had given their judgment according to conſcience, and others according to the merit 'of the cauſe (8).'

III. We muſt not ſwerve from the true ſtate of the queſtion. The author of the *Commentaire Philoſophique*, compares together thoſe who are miſtaken in a lawſuit, and thoſe who are miſtaken in controverſies about religion; but he ſuppoſes that neither of them can be excuſed, unleſs they have heartily and ſincerely uſed their utmoſt endeavours to find out the truth. When he ſays that in ſome caſes the Judges condemn an innocent perſon, and acquit a criminal, without any guilt; he alſo goes upon this ſuppoſition, that they do whatever they can, and whatever the laws preſcribe to them in order to come to the true knowledge of the matter of fact, and that they have been led into an error meerly by the intricacy of the cauſe, acting all along according to the dictates of their conſcience, and the rules of judicial proceeding. If there are any inſtance where ſuch Judges have been degraded by their ſuperiors, though they were thought to be equally learned and honeſt, and if ſuch a degradation ſeems to be lawful to wiſe men, there is ſome reaſon to draw from thence ſome conſequences, in order to prove that God will puniſh ignorant men notwithſtanding their ſincerity. But if the thing is quite otherwiſe among men, what will become of thoſe conſequences? I think one may be allowed to draw quite contrary inferences from it, and this in particular; ſince kings do not puniſh thoſe who, notwithſtanding all their application and honeſty, cannot avoid being miſtaken in their judgment about a very intricate cauſe; much more will God, who is equity and goodneſs itſelf, bear with thoſe who are not able to unfold the true ſenſe of a paſſage of the ſcripture which is very obſcure.

I muſt further obſerve two things: one is, That a Judge of a very groſs ignorance, can hardly be accounted a good man; for this ſuppoſes that he has neglected to inſtruct himſelf, and that his lazineſs is inexcuſable (9), or that he has given up himſelf to pleaſures. A man who behaves himſelf thus in the exerciſe of ſuch an office, cannot have a right conſcience (10), and if ſuch a man is degraded, it cannot be ſaid that he has been puniſhed for his ſincere and involuntary ignorance. The ſecond thing I have to ſay is, That I advance all theſe obſervations only as doubts and probabilities, which may be examined, without pretending to eſpouſe the cauſe, or to aſſert the doctrine of the *Commentaire Philoſophique*. And to ſhew my readers that I am far from extenuating the faults of a Judge, which proceed only from ignorance, I ſhall ſet down a thundering judgment againſt them. 'The 'firſt preſident de Lamoignon would have thought 'himſelf deficient in the moſt eſſential part of his office, whoſe remedies prove mortal, notwithſtanding their honeſty and learning [*C*]. Our Ruffi lived eighty-two years. It does not appear from the elogy which I cite (*b*) in what year he was born, nor in what year he died: ſuch an omiſſion cannot be juſtified [*D*]. LEWIS ANTONY DE RUFFI, his ſon, had a hand in the additions to the ſecond edition of the Hiſtory of Marſeilles.

---

(4) *Mercure Galant*, for the month of November 1693, *pag*. 315.

(5) In the Supplement, *p.* 33, *& ſeq.* and *pag.* 62, *& ſeq.* to *pag* 81. See alſo Montagne's Eſſays, *lib. iii, cap. xiii, pag. m.* 518.

(6) See Mr Saurin's book, intituled *Reflexions ſur les droits de la Conſcience*, printed at Utrecht, 1697.

(7) Suppoſing ſuch a Judge can be ſaid to have a very upright conſcience. See below citation (10).

* Reſponſe du Roy Henry II, ſur deux jugemens contraires,

(8) Richeome, Plainte Apologetique au Roi Henri IV pour les Jeſuites, *pag. m.* 182.

(9) Obſerve that if he ſtudied hard, and yet found that he did not improve, it would denote ſtupidity. He would then deſerve to be blamed for pretending to be a Judge: he has not examined himſelf, and undertakes a thing that is beyond his reach, and perſiſts in it even after he has experienced the inſignificancy of his ſtudies.

(10) See, above, citation (7).

(*b*) See his Elogy prefixed to the Hiſtory of *Marſeilles*, in the edition of 1696. written by his nephew Peter

Antony de Paſcal, a Monk in the abbey of Toronet.

'fice, if he had not taken care to have as much 'knowledge as uprightneſs. And therefore he uſed 'to ſay, that there is no great difference between a 'wicked Judge and an ignorant one. The firſt knows 'at leaſt his duty, and is ſenſible of his injuſtice; but 'the other does neither know the good nor the miſ'chief he does: the one is conſcious of his faults, 'and is more inexcuſable; but the other ſins without 'any remorſe, and is more incorrigible. But they 'are equally guilty, with reſpect to thoſe whom they 'condemn through error or malice. A man does 'not leſs feel his wound, whether he be wounded by 'a madman or a blind one; and it matters little whe'ther one be undone by a man who deceives him, or 'by a man who is deceived (11).'

(11) Flechier, oraiſon funebre de Mr le premier Preſident de Lamoignon, *p.* 435. *of the volume of his funeral Orations, Dutch Edit.*

[*C*] ..... *or from Phyſicians, whoſe remedies prove mortal, notwithſtanding their honeſty and learning.*] I ſhall not dwell long upon this. Should a Phyſician, will ſome ſay, come to think that Arſenic is a good remedy, and give it to his patients, and ſo ſend them *apace into another world*, he would be juſtly puniſhed in this life, and in that which is to come, though he ſhould plead an involuntary ignorance. This is the image of an Hereſiarch. I anſwer that it is impoſſible, morally ſpeaking, that there ſhould be ſuch a Phyſician; and therefore ſuch an example ought not to be alledged. No man can believe that Arſenic is a good remedy, unleſs we ſuppoſe him like thoſe, who fancy that they are kings, or that they are made of butter, and therefore muſt not come near the fire. Such people are carefully watches, or ſhut up by their relations. No body conſults them in a fit of ſickneſs, or about a law-ſuit to follow their advices. If it be ſuppoſed that a Chymiſt may ſincerely believe, that he knows how to prepare Arſenic ſo as to make a good remedy of it; one may form a very good judgment concerning his ignorance. Either he has experienced the virtue of that remedy, or he has not experienced it. If he has made no ſuch experiment, we muſt ſay, either that he does not believe what he ſays, or that he is mad. If he has made the experiment, and yet perſiſts in the ſame opinion; one may certainly affirm that he is a wicked or a mad-man. An honeſt and ſincere ignorance ſuppoſes that a man has made it his buſineſs to examine a thing with an earneſt deſire of knowing the truth of it, and without being acted by avarice, pride, or any deſign of cheating. Hereſiarchs cannot be reaſonably compared with that imaginary Phyſician, who kills ſo many people, unleſs they have ſeen the eternal damnation of their firſt followers. If ſuch a ſight did not convert them, they muſt needs either be mad, or ſpeak againſt their conſcience; and in both caſes they ought to be delivered to the ſecular power; in the firſt caſe to be ſhut up in a mad-houſe, and in the ſecond, to ſuffer the puniſhment which thoſe deſerve, who blaſpheme againſt GOD whom they know. No body deſires that ſuch people ſhould be tolerated.

As to the puniſhment that a Phyſician ſhould deſerve before GOD, if he ſhould give Arſenic to his patients, the thing may eaſily be thus determined. If he was a mad-man, he would be judged as a mad-man: if he was not mad, he would be judged according as his ignorance has been voluntary or involuntary. Now by a voluntary ignorance we muſt underſtand ſuch an ignorance as proceeds from lazineſs, or from ſome other fault, which may be mended.

[*D*] *Such an omiſſion cannot be juſtified.*] Paul Jovius, Scœvola Sammarthanus, and ſeveral other elogiſts have often committed the ſame fault. Were they afraid that a date would ſpoil the harmony of a period? Or had they a mind to be ſhort? How vain would ſuch excuſes be! if they went upon ſuch ridiculous reaſons, why did not they put in the margin what they are cenſured for having omitted? I am ſure that upon ſome occaſions they have been ſilent, becauſe they did not know in what year their hero was born or died. The author of Mr Ruffi's encomium cannot be excuſed upon ſuch an ignorance. But will ſome ſay in his vindication, does he not ſay that the Hiſtory of Marſeilles was printed when the author was but thirty-five years of age? Does he not ſay that the author lived eighty-two years? Is it not an eaſy thing to infer from thence, that he was born in the year 1607, and that he died in 1689. I anſwer in the negative, becauſe he does not tell us that the Hiſtory of Marſeilles was printed in 1642, and that date is neither to be ſeen in the Epiſtle Dedicatory, nor in the Preface, nor in the king's Licence, nor in any other part of the Prolegomena; and therefore we want another book to know the year in which that author was born or died. It is therefore a fault; for a reader ſhould not be ſo much as obliged to turn to ſome other pages of the ſame book upon ſuch an occaſion. Much leſs ought an author to impoſe upon us the neceſſity of conſulting another book.

RUFINUS, a favourite of the emperor Theodoſius, 'was a Gaul, born in the 'province of Aquitain (*a*), of mean extraction, but of a lofty mind, he was a ſupple, 'inſinuating, and polite man, well qualified to divert a prince, and even to ſerve him. 'He came to the court of Conſtantinople, where he got friends and patrons: he made 'himſelf known to Theodoſius, and had the good fortune to pleaſe him. He ſo well 'improved the beginning of his fortune, that he was in ſhort time promoted to con'ſiderable employments. The emperor made him high ſteward of his palace †; admitted 'him into all his councils, honoured him with his friendſhip and confidence, and at laſt 'raiſed him to the conſulſhip with his own ſon Arcadius. This man maintained his poſt as 'he had acquired it, rather by his addreſs than by his virtue. His ambition increaſed with 'his fortune: he endeavoured to enrich himſelf with the ſpoils of thoſe, whom he oppreſſed 'by his calumnies ‡. Whoever had an extraordinary merit, and was in a condition 'to contend with him in his ſtation, could not fail to be his enemy. Neverthelesſ 'being afraid of loſing the prince's affection, unleſs he preſerved his eſteem, he appeared 'modeſt and diſintereſted. He covered his ill counſels with the pretence of juſtice, or of 'policy, and knew ſo well how to ſet off his good qualities, and conceal the ill ones, 'that the emperor, as knowing and jealous of his authority as he was, was often deceived 'and governed by him, without perceiving it. The principal lords of the court could not 'ſee the elevation of this favourite, without being offended at it (§). . . . . They 'conſpired againſt him, and reſolved to undo him (*b*)': but their enterpriſe ended only in their own ruin, and confirmed him in his power [*A*]. He was baptized with great

(*a*) Born at Eluſa, according to Claudian. It was then the metropolis of the country now called Armagnac in Gaſcony properly ſo called.

† Zozim. lib. iv. Ambr. Ep. 53.

‡ Claudian. lib. i, contra Ruff.

(§) Zoz.

(*b*) Flechier Hiſtoire de Theodoſe, *book iv, pag* 433, *Paris Edit.* 1680, *in* 12*mo.*

[*A*] *But their enterpriſe ended only in their own ruin, and confirmed him in his power.*] They, who conſpired againſt him, were (1) *Timaſus and Promotus, who had lately commanded the army, and done important ſervices.*

(1) Flechier, Hiſt. de Theodoſe, *livr. iv, p.* 434, *ad ann.* 391.

great pomp in the year 394 [*B*]. The ſpite he conceived to ſee Stilico above him after the death of Theodoſius, put him upon treacherous deſigns, whereby he undid himſelf. *He took advantage of his maſter's weakneſs; he embroiled the empire and emperors, by his ſecret practices with the Huns, the Goths, and the Alans, and endeavoured to make himſelf ſovereign, or at leaſt independent upon his maſters, and his enemies* (*c*). He was killed in the year 395 (*d*). See Moreri. His death put an end to Claudian's doubts about providence; they vaniſhed away as ſoon as he heard of the fall of that inſolent and unjuſt favourite. I ſhall make ſome reflexions upon his words [*C*]; which will give me occaſion

(*c*) Flechier, ibid. *pag.* 500.

(*d*) But according to Mr Flechier, ibid *pag.* 437. this ſhould be in the year 397.

vices. . . . . Tatian, who had governed all the Eaſt in the abſence of Theodoſius . . . . and Proculus, Tatian's ſon, governor of Conſtantinople, a young, bold, and daring man. Rufinus being informed of all their deſigns, prepoſſeſſed the emperor in his own behalf, and repreſented to him, (2) That the favours he daily received from his majeſty, made him odious to the whole court; that though he was never ſo careful to prevent the murmurs of thoſe, who envied him, new factions and cabals were daily formed againſt him; that he muſt infallibly ſink, unleſs he were ſupported by the ſame hand, that raiſed him; that he was ſenſible of his want of merit, and gloried only in the kindneſs his majeſty had for him, and in expreſſing his acknowledgment for it all the days of his life. *Having thus engaged the emperor to protect him, he made it his buſineſs not only to avoid being ſurpriſed, but alſo to deſtroy his enemies. . . . . Being in the council with Promotus, he had ſeveral conteſts with him.* † *The emperor went out, and then their diſpute began again: both of them maintained their opinions, and inſenſibly grew hot upon it. Rufinus ſpoke ſome offenſive words; whereupon Promotus fell into a paſſion, and gave him a box on the ear. . . . . The emperor, to whom Rufinus immediately complained, was extremely angry at it. He openly declared,* that he was weary of ſuffering ſuch diviſions and intrigues, and the authors of them; that he would teach them to live peaceably, and to conſider thoſe whom he had an affection for; and that if they continued to be jealous of Rufinus, he would raiſe him ſo far above them, that they ſhould be forced to reſpect, and perhaps to obey, him. *That prince, who knew how to ſpeak with authority, and to make himſelf feared, when there was a neceſſity for it, ſpoke thoſe words ſo warmly, that from that time no body durſt murmur. He turned Promotus out of the court, and almoſt at the ſame time he made Rufinus Præfect of the* Prætorium. *The new dignity of this favourite, and the emperor's protection, on which he entirely relied, enabled him to revenge himſelf more eaſily of his enemies. Promotus did not live long after his diſgrace, for having received orders to go and join the army, and to march towards the Baſtarnæ, who were plundering Thrace, he was killed in an ambuſh, by a party of thoſe Barbarians: ſeveral people accuſed Rufinus of that treachery. Proculus's death* ǂ *was not leſs diſmal. That miniſter had him accuſed of ſeveral crimes, bribed the commiſſioners appointed to try him, obliged them under-hand to condemn him to death, and contrived the matter ſo that the pardon, which the emperor ſent him, came after the execution. He croſſed Tatian* ‡ *in ſome domeſtic concerns, and Timaſus would not have been more fortunate than the reſt, had he not endeavoured to gain the affection of that favourite, and made himſelf an accomplice of his crimes.*

(2) Id. ibid. *pag.* 435, ad ann. 392.

† Zoz. *lib. iv.*

ǂ Zoz. *lib. iv.*

‡ Ambr. *ep.* 53.

[*B*] *He was baptized with great pomp in the year* 394.] Mr Flechier has given us a noble deſcription of it, after a preamble, which is a maſter-piece, and therefore I ſhall ſet down his words ſomewhat at large. 'Rufinus, who governed the empire with an abſolute power in the abſence of Theodoſius . . . . had for a long time concealed his vanity and ambition under the appearance of an affected modeſty: and whether he had a mind that the emperor who loved him, ſhould have a good opinion of him, or whether he was willing to give leſs umbrage to the courtiers, who envied his fortune, he grew every day more powerful, without ſeeming to be more proud. He was deſirous to get wealth by private means; and though he loved pomp and ſtatelineſs, his avarice gave a check to his pride. But when he ſaw that he could rely upon his maſter's affection, being loaded with the wealth he had received from him, or had himſelf unjuſtly acquired, he gave a full ſcope to his inclinations, and grew inſolent, as ſoon as he believed he might be ſo with impunity. He procured himſelf a great many creatures, appeared abroad with a more magnificent equipage than became a private man, and built more ſtately houſes than the very palaces of the emperors. He had taken a particular care to build near the ſuburb of Chalcedon, called the ſuburb of the Oak *, a houſe of pleaſure ſo vaſt, that one would have taken it for a town, and ſo full of ornaments and precious goods, that one could hardly believe that a private man had been able to bear ſuch exceſſive charges. On the one ſide was erected a large church in honour of the apoſtles St Peter and St Paul; and on the other, at a ſmall diſtance, a monaſtery was to be ſeen in perſpective upon a riſing ground, which was to ſupply the want of clergymen in that church. When thoſe buildings were finiſhed, Rufinus reſolved to be baptized, and at the ſame time to celebrate the dedication of that new church with all imaginable pomp (3). . . . . Adding a great deal of oſtentation and vain-glory to a little religion, he ** called together the biſhops of the ſeveral parts of the eaſtern empire, eſpecially thoſe, who were poſſeſſed of the firſt ſees. Nay, he intreated by repeated letters, the moſt famous anchorets of Egypt to leave their ſolitude, in order to aſſiſt at this pompous ceremony. The great ſtation he was in, in the empire, whereof he had the chief direction under the prince Arcadius, engaged a great many biſhops to ſet out upon the firſt invitation, and to bring along with them the moſt holy men of their provinces. The aſſembly was very numerous. There were in it three patriarchs, Nectarius of Conſtantinople, Theophilus of Alexandria, and Flavian of Antioch, Gregory biſhop of Nyſſa, Amphilocus of Iconium, Paul of Heraclea, Dioſcorus of Helenopolis, and ſeveral other famous Prelates arrived there before the reſt. The chief perſons of the nobility and clergy, and an innumerable multitude of people reſorted thither, ſome to honour the feaſt, others to make their court to that favourite, and many to ſatisfy their curioſity. This ceremony was performed in the month of September. The church was hung with rich tapeſtry; the altar glittered with gold and precious ſtones. The conſecration was made with all the order and magnificence poſſible. The ſervice being over, they proceeded to Rufinus's baptiſm with the ſame pomp. The Patriarch Nectarius adminiſtred it to him, and the famous Evagrius of Pontus, who had been ſent for from Egypt with the anchoret Ammonius, received at the coming out of the font †† that regenerated man, who did not long preſerve his innocency. Thus ended that ſolemnity, which would have been one of the moſt holy and moſt magnificent of the eaſtern church, had it not been attended with a prophane luxury, and had not that miniſter endeavoured to get again [illegible] the people by his injuſtice, the immenſe ſums which he ſeemed to have ſpent for GOD upon that occaſion (4).'

* Sozom. *lib. viii, cap. xvii.*

(3) Flechier, ibid. *pag.* 488.

** Theodoret. *lib. i, cap. xxxi,* Socrat. *lib. ii, cap. v.* Pallad. in Lauſiac. *cap. iv.*

†† Pallad. in Lauſiac.

(4) Flechier, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 488.

[*C*] *I ſhall make ſome reflexions upon Claudian's doubts* (5).] He ſays that the beautiful order, which appears in the world, moved him to believe that it is directed by the moſt wiſe laws of an infinite GOD; but that the diſorder, which prevails among men, the proſperity of the wicked, and the miſery of good men, induced him to believe, as Epicurus did, that all things had been made by chance, and that the gods did not concern themſelves with the government of the world. At laſt, ſays he, the puniſhment of Rufinus has removed my doubts; I acquit the gods; I do no more complain that the wicked have got ſo much power; they are only raiſed to fall from a higher place. This will be better repreſented in his own words.

(5) Concerning Divine Providence.

Sæpe

occaſion to inquire whether all thoſe, who have maintained the Orthodox opinion concerning providence, have well obſerved the rules of diſputation.

Gabriel

Sæpe mihi dubiam traxit ſententia mentem,
Curarent Superi terras, an nullus ineſſet
Rector, & incerto fluerent mortalia caſu.
Nam cum diſpoſiti quæſiſſem fœdera mundi,
Præſcriptoſque maris fines, annique meatus,
Et lucis, noctiſque vices: tunc omnia rebar
Conſilio firmata Dei, qui lege moveri
Sidera, qui fruges diverſo tempore naſci,
Qui variam Phœben alieno juſſerit igne
Compleri, Solemque ſuo: porrexerit undis
Littora; tellurem medio libraverit axe.
Sed cum res hominum tanta caligine volvi
Adſpicerem, lætoſque diu florere nocentes,
Vexarique pios: rurſus labefacta cadebat
Relligio, cauſſæque viam non ſponte ſequebar
Alterius, vacuo quæ currere ſemina motu
Affirmat, magnumque novas per inane figuras
Fortuna, non arte, regi: quæ Numina ſenſu
Ambiguo vel nulla putat, vel neſcia noſtri.
Abſtulit hunc tandem Rufini pœna tumultum,
Abſolvitque Deos. Jam non ad culmina rerum
Injuſtos creviſſe queror, tolluntur in altum,
Ut lapſu graviore ruant (6).

Oft has my mind with anxious doubts been toſt,
Whether the care of Heav'n extends to earth,
Or mortal things depend on chance alone.
For, when the fair creation I ſurvey'd
In beauteous order rang'd; the ſea confin'd
Within its bounds, and its proud waves reſtrain'd;
The year revolving in its conſtant courſe:
And the viciſſitude of day and night;
I clearly ſaw the hand of Providence,
And own'd the mighty ruler of the world;
That GOD, whoſe all-informing hand directs
The rapid motion of the whirling ſpheres;
Who rules the ſeaſons of the varied year;
Who fills the moon's bright orb with borrow'd light;
And bids the ſun with native luſtre ſhine:
Who on the ocean's brink extends the ſhores,
And on its axis ballances the earth.
But, when the gloomy ſcene of man I view'd,
The bad triumphant, and the good oppreſs'd;
Religion in a moment loſt its hold;
My heart inclin'd to that Philoſophy,
Which tells us, that diſcordant ſeeds of things,
Hurl'd thro' the vaſt abyſs of emptineſs,
Produced, by chance, not art, this fair variety;
Which wou'd perſuade, there are no gods in heav'n,
Or gods regardleſs of the human race.
At length, Rufinus puniſhment has clear'd
My anxious doubtings, and abſolv'd the gods.
No longer I complain, that proſp'rous vice
Is rais'd on high: the wicked are exalted,
Only to fall with greater ruin down.

I have promiſed in the article of Marſhal d'Ancre (7), to mention in this place Balzac's reflexions upon a thought of Malherbe like that of Claudian: I do now perform my promiſe. ‘ (8) It is true they ſpoke thus, before they had been better inſtructed by the Chriſtian Religion. The gods were charged with all the crimes of men. The divine providence was every day indicted by ſome body, who complained that the things of this world did not go, as he could have wiſhed. THAT FORTUNATE TYRANT BEARS WITNESS AGAINST GOD. This is an old ſaying alledged by your Cicero; and there is nothing ſo obvious in the Heathen Poets, as the crimes of their gods, and of fate, *Crimen Deorum*, *Fatorum crimen*, &c. Cynthia is ſick, and if ſhe dies of her ſickneſs, ſays a Poet who was in love with her, *the death of ſuch a beautiful woman will be the crime of the god of Phyſic.*

Tam formoſa tuum Mortua crimen erit.

‘ Nay ſince the empire of Conſtantine, and under the children of Theodoſius, there are ſome inſtances of thoſe poetical blaſphemies, and of that prophane liberty. If Rufinus had not been puniſhed for his crimes, the gods would have been indicted, as Rufinus's abettors and accomplices:

Abſtulit hunc tandem Rufini pœna timorem (9),
Abſolvitque Deos.

‘ One of our Poets ſaid ſomething like it, but in a very excellent manner, and his copy exceeds all his originals. I take it to be a maſter-piece: it is in that Ode, which may be ſet above the fineſt and moſt elaborate Odes of the Ancients. The god of the Seine ſpeaks to a favourite, who was going over the Pont-neuf.' I ſhall not tranſcribe the verſes of Malherbe which Balzac quotes; you will find the concluſion of them in the article of CONCINI remark [*F*]. I add the following words of Menage (10) to thoſe of Balzac: *For the reſt, this thought,* Et le ciel accuſé de ſupporter tes crimes, eſt reſolu de ſe juſtifier, *(and Heaven being accuſed of favouring thy crimes, is reſolved to vindicate itſelf) is not originally Claudian's: ſeveral other authors, who lived long before him have ſaid the ſame thing. Cicero in the third book de Natura Deorum:* Diogenes quidem Cynicus dicere ſolebat, Harpalum, qui temporibus illis prædo felix habebatur, contra Deos teſtimonium dicere, quòd in illa fortuna tam diu viveret. *And in another place of the ſame book:* Improborum igitur proſperitates, ſecundæque res redarguunt, ut Diogenes dicebat, vim omnem Deorum ac poteſtatem. *Martial:*

Nullos eſſe Deos, inane cœlum
Affirmat Selius; probatque, quòd ſe
Factum, dum negat hæc, videt beatum.

There are no gods, Rufin aſſerts,
But empty Heavens, and this he proves
From his own happineſs who ſays it.

Seneca ſays in that ſenſe, Deorum crimen, Sylla tam felix; *and an ancient comic Poet,*

Θεοῦ δ' ὄνειδος, τοὺς κακοὺς εὐδαιμονεῖν.

The wicked's happineſs is GOD's reproach.

Barthius (11) has collected a great many ſuch ſayings, and has not omitted thoſe that are to be found in the Scripture (12). One may bring under this head all the paſſages of the antients, wherein fortune is reviled, as a blind, inconſtant, rambling, unjuſt Being, that favours unworthy perſons (13). I ſhall only ſet down one of thoſe paſſages out of Pliny (14): ‘ Invenit inter has utraſque ſententias medium ſibi ipſa mortalitas numen, quo minus etiam plana de Deo conjectatio eſſet. Toto quippe mundo, & locis omnibus, omnibuſque horis omnium vocibus Fortuna ſola invocatur: una nominatur, una accuſatur, una agitur rea, una cogitatur, ſola laudatur, ſola arguitur, & cum convitiis colitur (15): volubilis, à pleriſque vero & cæca etiam exiſtimata, vaga, inconſtans, incerta, varia, indignorumque fautrix. Huic omnia expenſa, huic omnia feruntur accepta: & in tota ratione mortalium, ſola utramque paginam facit. Adeoque obnoxiæ ſumus ſortis, ut Sors ipſa pro Deo ſit, qua Deus probatur incertus. - - - - *Betwixt both theſe opinions concerning a Divinity, mortals have invented a medium, that the exiſtence of GOD might ſtill become more uncertain. For all the world over, and in all places, and times, fortune only is invocated: only talked of, only accuſed, only condemned, only thought on, only praiſed, only blamed, and with reproaches worſhipped: inconſtant, and by moſt part even thought to be blind, wavering, wandering, un-*

---

(6) Claudian. in Rufin. *lib. i, init.*

(7) See the article CONCINI, remark [*F*].

(8) Balzac Socrate Chrétien, *pag. m.* 237.

(9) *It ſhould be* tumultum. *Mr Menage,* Obſervat. ſur Malherbe, *pag.* 431, *took no notice of this* Quid pro quo *of Balzac, whoſe very words he alledges.*

(10) Menage, Obſervations ſur Malherbe, *pag.* 432.

(11) Barthius, ad Claudian, in Rufin. *lib. i, init. pag. m.* 1078, *& ſeq.*

(12) Apud Regem Prophetam Pſal. lxxiii, & xciii. Hiobum cap. xxiii. Habacuc cap. i. Maleachum cap. iii. *Barthius, ibid. pag.* 1082.

(13) See the article PAYS, remark [*H*].

(14) Plin. *lib. ii, cap. vii, pag. m.* 145.

(15) See concerning this an obſervation againſt Coſtar, citation (51) of the article HERCULES.

Gabriel Naudæus affirms a thing which is moſt falſe, namely, that Rufinus has been praiſed

‘*certain, various, and favouring the unworthy. To her is attributed whatever is given and received: and in all the thoughts of mortals ſhe alone is all in all. And ſo obnoxious we are to the power of chance, that fortune herſelf is in place of a god, whereby the exiſtence of GOD is proved uncertain.*’ It may be ſaid that in all ages and among all nations, without excepting the age we live in, and Chriſtianity, the proſperity of wicked men has occaſioned many murmurs againſt God, and raiſed many doubts about Providence. On the other ſide, that objection has been anſwered at all times and in all countries: ſeeing then it hath been perpetually renewed, notwithſtanding all anſwers to it, we muſt conclude that it has ſomething very ſpecious, and I do not know what proportion to our mind, which eaſily admits it, and cannot throw it off (16). So that what is ſaid of the palm-tree may be applied to it, *curvata reſurgo.* Anſwers may bend me a little, but I am ſoon reſtored. We need not examine its ſolidity; for we ought to be perſuaded that it is a falſe and inſignificant objection; but perhaps it will not be improper to examine whether Claudian made a good anſwer to it.

Some conſiderations upon the method of anſwering the difficulties about providence. Laws of diſputation.

Some may tell him; you have not taken the right way; the only anſwer you ſhould have made to your difficulty, was to conſider the vaſt and immenſe idea of the moſt perfect Being, and to draw this conſequence from it: he is the author and governor of all things; and therefore nothing comes to paſs but what is directed in a moſt wiſe, juſt, and admirable manner. This is certainly the true way of removing all doubts: ſilence reaſon; let it acquieſce to authority (17): God ſaid ſo, αὐτὸς ἔφα, God has done it, God has permitted it; it is therefore true, juſt, wiſely done, and wiſely permitted. If you enter into the diſcuſſion of each particular argument, you will never ſee an end of the matter, and after a thouſand diſputes, you will be obliged to have recourſe to authority, and to the immenſe idea of the moſt perfect Being. But ſince we muſt come to that at laſt, let us keep immoveably and ſtedfaſtly to it, laying our finger on our mouth and ſilencing our imperfect knowledge. Being fully perſuaded that the beſt uſe of reaſon as to thoſe things is not to reaſon at all. Let us inforce more ſtrongly the motives of this method. When a man engages in a diſputation, we expect he will ſhew his adverſary that he is in the wrong; but he muſt not pretend that his adverſary will acquieſce in his firſt and ſecond anſwers. The rules of diſputation require that each party may be allowed to reply, as often as he can anſwer an argument by another argument, and till the matter be brought to the firſt principles. If I can ſhew a man that his aſſertion is contrary to the common notions, and that mine is a natural and neceſſary conſequence of thoſe notions; I am not obliged to hear him any longer, but to ſilence him with this axiom, *adverſus negantem principia non eſt diſputandum.* But if I give only a probable ſolution of his objections, and he is able to bring in new difficulties as probable, or near as probable, as my ſolution, I cannot require of him that he ſhould acquieſce in my anſwers: I muſt look out for a new ſolution of his new difficulties; and if I can find none that is evident, or that will not admit of a ſpecious anſwer, I ought to give over the diſpute without pretending to have got the victory; otherwiſe I ſhould imitate the converters in France. About the year 1680, theſe gentlemen offered to enter upon a conference on religion with their erring brethren: they promiſed to hear their doubts, and to clear them, and to inſtruct them in a very cordial manner: but after they had anſwered two or three times, they could no longer bear to be contradicted, they would have their explanations ſubmitted to, otherwiſe they declared that their adverſaries were obſtinate. It had been better to ſay ſo at firſt: it is a ridiculous thing to enter into a diſcuſſion, if we will not ſuffer an adverſary to make a hundred and a hundred replies, if he can do it; and if he is able to alledge againſt the tenth reply, an argument as probable as the objection which he propoſed againſt the main aſſertion. Such is the true ſtate of diſputations. Your adverſary attacks your aſſertion, you anſwer him; but it often falls out that your anſwer lies more open to difficulties than the aſſertion itſelf. You ought therefore to refute his reply: your new anſwer contains I know not what, that raiſes new difficulties more plauſible than the firſt; therefore they muſt be examined, and ſo *in infinitum,* unleſs you bring on your ſide common notions (18), to nonplus your antagoniſt. Such are the laws of the combate; if you have no mind to obſerve them, it is better for you not to enter the liſts, being contented to ſay, this ought to be believed without reaſoning: God ſaid ſo; that is enough.

This would be an unjuſt proceeding, if the ſtate of the queſtion was this, *Has God ſpoke?* But it cannot be ſaid to be unjuſt, when we diſpute with men, who acknowledge the exiſtence of a moſt perfect Being, and raiſe doubts in their minds becauſe good men are unhappy, and wicked men live in proſperity. The only anſwer, that ought to be made to thoſe doubting men, is this. You are perſuaded of the exiſtence of a moſt perfect Being; you ought therefore to believe that it governs all things in a moſt perfect manner: for if you do not draw this conſequence from the principle which you admit, you are ignorant of the firſt rules of common ſenſe, and you might as well argue thus; the ſun cannot produce darkneſs, therefore it has produced it. That it may the better appear that we ought to keep to that ſhort anſwer, and to that general principle of the exiſtence of God, I will ſhew the inconveniencies, which ariſe from a particular diſcuſſion of each argument. In the firſt place, it is certain that in ſuch a caſe you are obliged to anſwer all the replies of an adverſary, till you can bring an argument againſt him, to which no reaſonable reply can be made: ſuch are the laws of diſputation, as I have already obſerved. In the ſecond place, it is certain that your particular arguments will be anſwered *in infinitum,* and that the anſwers will be at leaſt no leſs plauſible, as it will appear from this ſpecimen. Suppoſe our Poet had acquainted another man with the reaſon, that removed all his doubts: he would have told him, ſince Rufinus has been puniſhed, there is a providence, whereby all things are wiſely and juſtly governed. The proſperity of that wicked man did not prove that providence was aſleep, but, on the contrary, that it was preparing by degrees a ſevere puniſhment for him; he was raiſed that he might be the better cruſhed to pieces by falling from a high place: ‘tolluntur in altum, ut lapſu graviore ruant. - - - *they are lifted up on high, that their fall may be the greater.*’ Claudian might have been anſwered, if you have nothing elſe to ſay, the difficulty remains ſtill; though your ſolution be never ſo ancient (19), it is not the better for it; whilſt you reſolve a great difficulty, you lie open to one that is ſtill greater: your particle *UT* ſtrikes one with horror. It cannot be heard without trembling. You aſcribe to the moſt perfect Being, who is conſequently infinitely good, a motive and a final cauſe, which are ſo far from having any goodneſs in them, that they are the moſt malicious and tyrannical character that can be conceived. It is juſt as if one of our emperors deſigning to inflict a capital puniſhment upon ſome of his domeſtics, ſhould make them governors of provinces, and ſuffer them to exerciſe all ſorts of extortions, and to ſuck the ſubſtance of the people; it is, I ſay, as if he permitted thoſe things in order to puniſh them more ſeverely. If you had been ſo bold as to ſay of Theodoſius what you ſay of God, that he raiſed Rufinus to the higheſt dignities to cruſh him the better, and to ſhew his ſubjects his ſovereign power of raiſing and depreſſing men, he would have had you hanged, as a ſatirical and inſolent Poet. Claudian would doubtleſs be ſenſible of the heinouſneſs of his *UT* and of his final cauſe, and would deſire that this word ſhould not be taken in a ſtrict and criminal ſenſe. He would ſay that providence had not loaded wicked Rufinus with good things, in order to do him more miſchief, but in hopes that that favourite would make a good uſe of them. He would add, that, according to the laws of nature, the fall of bodies is ſo much the greater, as they fall from a higher place, and that therefore Rufinus's elevation could not but aggravate his puniſhment, when the ill uſe he continually made of heavenly favours called for it. But Claudian would be anſwered that this does not remove the difficulty: hopes are not to be found in the divine nature; God moſt certainly knows whatever ſhall come to paſs; he knew moſt certainly that Rufinus would make an ill uſe of his favours; and therefore it had been better to

prevent

(16) *It is like nature,*
Naturam expellas furca, tamen uſque recurret.
Horatius, Epiſt. X, lib. i, ver. 24.

(17) I was ſilent and opened not my mouth becauſe thou didſt it. *Pſal. xxxix,* 9.

(18) By common notions I underſtand in general all the principles, which the two contending parties are agreed upon.

(19) Juvenal, Stat. X, ver, 104, *ſaid before, ſpeaking of Sejanus.*
Nam qui nimios optabat honores,
Et nimias poſcebat opes, numeroſa parabat
Excelſæ turris tabulata, unde altior eſſet
Caſus, & impulſæ præceps immane ruinæ.

praiſed by three or four celebrated Hiſtorians [*D*].

prevent him (20), than to bear his crimes for many years, in order to inflict upon him a puniſhment, which cannot atone up the miſchief he has done, the oppreſſion of ſo many innocent perſons, the death of ſo many people, and the ruin of ſo many families. It is but a poor ſatisfaction for a province deſolated by a governor, only to have him puniſhed; it continues in the miſerable condition it was in before, and ſometimes the guilty man is the better for it (21). I do not carry farther the replies, which our Poet could make; doubtleſs he could make a great many, but thoſe of his adverſary would be no leſs numerous, and would always be like thoſe we have juſt now ſeen, that is, they would be more proportioned to the notions of our mind, and to the ideas by which we judge of the perfection of a government than thoſe of Claudian. I ſuppoſe that after a long diſputation his adverſary would tell him: I believe as well as you, that whatever has happened in the caſe of Rufinus is juſt, wiſe, and perfect in reſpect to GOD; but I do not believe it by virtue of your arguments, they are apter to raiſe doubts, than to enlighten the mind. You may uſe them however to thoſe whom they may ſatisfy, but do not mention them to thoſe who carry arguments as far as they can go. The idea of the moſt perfect Being ought to be ſufficient to them, and it is ſufficient when they make good uſe of their reaſon. I know ſome men, who have read ſeveral times Boëtius, *de Conſolatione Philoſophiæ*, and find a great difference between the objections and the anſwers of that author. Boëtius was both a great Philoſopher, and a very good man. Groaning under the weight of his misfortune, and overwhelmed with grief, he ſuppoſes that Philoſophy comes to comfort him. He raiſes ſeveral objections about providence: Philoſophy anſwers them as well as ſhe can, but whereas the difficulties of Boëtius are fitted to the meaneſt capacity, the ſolutions can hardly be underſtood without the greateſt attention, and the quickeſt apprehenſion. Philoſophy miſtruſts herſelf, and requires moſt times that ſhe may be allowed to wind about, and to trace up things higher; and though what ſhe ſays be never ſo ſolid, it happens ſometimes that we do not underſtand it; and if ſhe convinces us, ſhe does it moſt times without enlightening the mind. Such is the opinion of ſome perſons who have read Boëtius. They have acquainted me that a moſt ſubtile Profeſſor of the XVIIth century, has more dextrouſly defended the honour of Philoſophy than he; for after introducing a Heathen who propoſes innumerable doubts about providence, he gives him no other expedient, but the aſſiſtance of the divine grace (22).

Before I make an end of this remark, I muſt take notice of the injuſtice of ſome perſons, who fancy that thoſe who reject the reaſons alledged for a doctrine, reject the doctrine itſelf. There is a very great difference between thoſe two things; and they are eaſily diſtinguiſhed by equitable and underſtanding men, who ſuffer patiently and without any ill ſuſpicion, thoſe, who cannot abide that weak and wrong arguments ſhould be made uſe of to maintain a truth. This however may be liable to ſome abuſes; for, (to give an inſtance of it) the Sceptics under pretence of confuting only the arguments of the Dogmatiſts for the exiſtence of GOD, did actually undermine the doctrine itſelf. At firſt, they declared (23), that they followed the common opinion, without addicting themſelves to any particular ſect; that they acknowledged the exiſtence of the gods, honoured them, and aſcribed a providence to them; but that they could not abide that the Dogmatiſts ſhould be ſo raſh as to reaſon about it: afterwards they propoſed their objections, which, by overthrowing providence, tended to overthrow the exiſtence of GOD. See Sextus Empiricus (24), who inſtead of grounding his doubts, as Claudian did, upon the proſperity of wicked men, grounds them upon adverſity, and the many evils that prevail in the world. He alledges an argument, which has been better expreſſed than confuted by Lactantius. See, above, the article PAULICIANS, remark [*E*], citation 16, and the following words of a Jeſuit who has obſerved that Arnobius confeſſes this argument is unanſwerable. *Poſſet denique cum Sexto Empirico* Lib. 1. (it ſhould be 3.) *Pyrrhonicarum hypothypoſeon cap.* 1. *fieri tale argumentum, quòd ſi Deus ſit, cùm ſit bonus infinitè, & perfectiſſimus, nulla in mundo eſſet malitia aut imperfectio: nam contrarium unum infinitum, deſtruit totaliter aliud. Cui argumento reſponſurus Arnobius lib.* 2. *num.* 49. *poſt multam exaggerationem difficultatis, inſolubilem exiſtimare videtur. Alexander autem quem refert & latè rejicit Simplic.* 2. *cœli,* in fine, *concedit Deum non poſſe mala excludere, alioqui ea omnino fuiſſe prohibiturum. Et verò hoc ipſum argumentum multos Philoſophos vexaſſe, teſtatur Lactantius libro de ira Dei cap.* 13. *Sed rectè reſpondet* Scot. &c (25).

[*D*] *Naudæus affirms . . . that Rufinus has been praiſed by three or four celebrated Hiſtorians.*] ‘Claudian ‘does very much inveigh againſt Rufinus . . . . and ‘yet Zozimus, Zonaras, Eutropius, and Paulus Oroſius praiſe him exceedingly (26).’ They are Naudé's words; let us examine theſe four authors aſcending, we ſhall ſoon ſee that he is miſtaken. Oroſius (27) ſpeaks ill of Rufinus, and Eutropius ſays nothing neither good nor evil of him: for his Hiſtory ends with the death of Jovian, who lived before the empire of Theodoſius. I find nothing in Zonaras that relates to our Rufinus. The Rufinus mentioned by that Annaliſt (28), was conſul of Rome, when Pyrrhus made war againſt the Romans: as for Zozimus, he is ſo far from praiſing Rufinus exceſſively, that he repreſents him as a wicked man. I could cite ſeveral paſſages of his Hiſtory which prove it clearly, but this will be ſufficient. Ρουφῖνος μὲν οὖν, ἰδίᾳ τε πολλοῖς κακῶν ἀποφορήτων γενόμενος αἴτιος, καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ λυμηνάμενος ἀπάσῃ, δίκην ἐξέτισε τῶν πεπονηρευμένων ἀξίαν. *At Rufinus quidem, qui compluribus intolerabilium malorum auctor privatim exſtiterat, & univerſæ reipublicæ detrimentum adtulerat, dignas admiſſis facinoribus diris pœnas luit* (29). One can hardly conceive how ſuch a man as Gabriel Naudæus, who had a vaſt reading, and a great memory, could commit ſo many miſtakes in ſo few lines.

RUGGERI (*a*) (COSMO), a Florentine, introduced himſelf into the court of France as a great Aſtrologer, when Catherine de Medicis favoured that ſort of people. He was a man of parts, and had the reputation of being learned: beſides he was very bold even to impudence, he thruſt himſelf among perſons of quality, and was a great intriguer (*b*). Catherine de Medicis beſtowed upon him the abbey of St Mahé, in the Lower Bretagne. He calculated the nativities of all the lords of the court, and did it in ſuch a manner as he thought moſt proper to get money from them (*c*). At laſt, he was accounted a Diviner and a Magician, and in the year 1574, he found himſelf involved in the affair of la Mole and Coconas [*A*], who, among other crimes, were charged with practiſing ſorcery againſt the life of Charles IX. He is called Coſmo the Italian in that trial (*d*), and he was condemned to the gallies; but the queen-mother ſet him at liberty ſome time after (*e*). He perſuaded la Mole and ſome others, that he could make wax-images, ſome of which would procure the love of women, and others make any one they pleaſed die in a lingring condition (*f*). He began in 1604, to ſet up for

[*A*] *He found himſelf involved in the affair of la Mole and Coconas.*] They were two favourites of the Duke of Alençon, brother to Charles IX, who had put their maſter upon wicked deſigns, or had been inſtrumental in the execution of them. I am apt to believe that they were falſly accuſed of ſome crimes; but

---

(20) Cur omnium crudeliſſimus tamdiu Cinna regnavit? At dedit pœnas. Prohiberi melius fuit, impedireque ne tot ſummos viros interficeret, quam aliquando pœnas dare. *Cicero de Natura Deorum, lib. iii, cap. xxxii.*

(21) Exul ab octava Marius bibit & fruitur Diis Jratis: at tu victrix provincia ploras. *Juvenal. Sat. I, ver.* 49.

(22) Unde Philoſophus noſter ethnicus tot difficultatibus oppreſſus, niſi afflatu divino animetur ad cognitionem Dei unius ac diſtincti ab univerſo nunquam aſſurget. *Claudius Berigardus in priores Libros Phyſ. Ariſtot. Circulo xx, in fine.*

(23) Sext. Empiricus, Pyrrhon. Hypotyp. *lib. iii. cap. i.*

(24) Sext. Empiric. *ibid.*

(25) Theoph. Raynaudus, Theolog. Naturali, *Diſtinct. V, num.* 166. *p. m.* 532, 533.

(26) Naudé Dialogue de Maſcurat, *pag.* 630.

(27) See chap. xxxvii of book vii.

(28) Zonaras, Ann. *lib. viii, pag.* 377, 379. *Paris Edit.* 1686.

(29) Zozimus, *lib. v, pag.* 297. *Edit.Oxon.* 1679.

(*a*) Balzac. Socrate Chrétien, *p. m.* 253. *calls him* Coſmus Roger.

(*b*) Garaſſe, Doctrine curieuſe, *p.* 155.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) Mercure François, *Tom. iv, pag.* 46. ad ann. 1615.

(*e*) See the remark [*A*].

(*f*) Mercure François, *Tom. iv, pag.* 47.

for a writer of Almanacks, and continued to do ſo every year: they were intermixed with ſentences taken from Latin authors (*g*). He lived a long life, and ſurvived all the Italian courtiers of Catherine de Medicis (*h*). He died at Paris in the year 1615, and becauſe he had openly and inſolently declared that he died an Atheiſt [*B*], his body was thrown upon a lay-ſtall. He had been accuſed in the year 1598, of having made uſe of witchcraft againſt the life of Henry IV [*C*]: he was thereupon examined by
Thuanus

but they deſerved to ſuffer death for the things that were truly laid to their charge. I will quote Mezerai firſt; and then le Laboureur. *They found in la Mole's houſe an image of wax, which one Coſmo Rugier, a Florentine, and a great cheat, had made for him, to enchant a gentlewoman with whom he was in love. The queen-mother was willing that people ſhould believe it had been made againſt the king; which he denied all along: nevertheleſs he was beheaded with Coconas. It is ſaid that two princeſſes, who were in love with them, ſtole away their heads, and embalmed them in order to keep them: one of their accomplices was broke upon the wheel, and Rugier was ſent to the gallies. The queen-mother, who gave much credit to diviners and ſorcerers, had him ſet at liberty ſome time after to make uſe of him* (1). Le Laboureur tells us, that the queen would have had Coſmo hanged, and he does not ſay that it was ſhe who ſet that galley-ſlave at liberty: I call him ſo, though I know he never rowed. 'Tourtai was condemned to be hanged, and 'to be put firſt of all to the rack . . . . . Being 'aſked whether one Coſmo, an Italian, knew any 'thing of the matter, he anſwered, *that there is an 'Italian, a black man, with an ugly face, who plays 'upon the inſtruments, wears ſometimes round, and ſome'times taffety, breeches, and always black cloaths, and is 'a very luſty man, and very much converſant with la 'Nocle; but he does not know whether he knows any 'thing of that enterprize* (2).' Theſe words are explained by le Laboureur in the following manner (3). 'That 'Italian is Coſmo Rogieri, of whom I have already 'ſpoken (4), and whom the queen herſelf had placed 'with the duke, her ſon, under pretence of teaching 'him the Italian tongue, but in truth to be a ſpy 'upon him; being informed, or afraid, that a party 'was forming to ſet him upon the throne after the 'death of Charles IX, preferably to the king of 'Poland, his brother, whoſe return into France, 'they deſigned to prevent. He confeſſed afterwards to 'ſome body, that after he had given ſome advice to 'the queen, he found out that the faction would be 'ſo ſtrong, by reaſon of the hatred which the Paris-'Maſſacre had occaſioned, and becauſe that prince 'was ſuſpected of cruelty, beſides, that thereby the 'queen and the houſe of Guiſe would have again the 'government in their hands, that he reſolved to 'follow his maſter's fortune, not doubting that this 'faction would ſucceed in their attempt, being ſup'ported by great men, and by the ſecretaries of ſtate, 'and ſeveral members of the parliament, He was 'ſtill more confirmed in that opinion, when having 'diſcovered to the duke the ſecret converſations he 'had with the queen, the duke truſted him with all 'his deſigns, and made uſe of him to amuſe his 'mother with ſome inconſiderable things that he 'reported to her, whereby he had an occaſion to 'diſcourſe with her, and dive into her thoughts. 'Thus he was deeply engaged in that deſign; but 'the queen having diſcovered the whole matter, 'cauſed him to be impriſoned, as well as the reſt, 'and brought to his tryal; but to little purpoſe, for 'he endured the torture with great reſolution upon 'more than fourſcore heads, and even upon many 'which he himſelf had diſcovered, without confeſſing 'any thing relating either to the conſpiracy or to the 'enchanted medals, for he was accuſed of having 'made a medal of king Charles, to bring him to 'his death, and two more for the Duke of Alençon 'and la Molle his favourite, who had them tied to 'their hats in order to keep up an inviolable friend'ſhip betwixt them. But they proved very fatal to 'la Molle, who, upon this vain aſſurance, ſet up for 'a mighty man; and he was ſo far from being ſup'ported by any friends in his misfortune that his 'own maſter, and good friend, gave evidence againſt 'him. He did not think that our flowers-de-luce, 'which are ſaid to have been ſent from Heaven, 'have a ſupernatural virtue againſt charms. If it be 'true that Coſmo gave away many charms, he kept 'a good one for himſelf againſt hanging. Catherine 'de Medicis would have had him hanged; but he 'would not: ſhe had only the ſatisfaction to ſee him 'chained, and his journey to Marſeilles was the only 'toil and fatigue that he went through. He got 'ſome friends there, who prevailed with the captain 'of his galley to take him into his houſe; which 'was never ſo much frequented upon his account, 'as it was then by reaſon of that illuſtrious galley-'ſlave. He turned it into a ſchool of Mathematics 'and Judicial Aſtrology, having a keeper, who looked 'rather like a man given him out of honour, than 'in order to obſerve him and prevent his eſcape.' Thuanus ſays, that la Mole had an image of wax pricked in the heart, and that Ruggeri being proſecuted as a Magician, was ſet at liberty by the queen-mother. I ſhall ſet down Thuanus's words and la Mole's anſwers in the remark [*E*].

[*B*] *He had openly and inſolently declared that he died an Atheiſt.*] Theſe are the words of the *Mercure François. Old age, the Gout and the Stone, having reduced him to a dying condition, his friends adviſed him to think of GOD, and ſent for the curate of the pariſh; but he would not ſee him: they brought him ſome Capuchins; but he laughed at them. When he was told that he ſhould duly prepare himſelf to obtain GOD's mercy, and be afraid of the laſt judgment, he anſwered: O ye fools! there are no Devils but the enemies that torment us in this world, nor any God beſides kings and princes who can raiſe us and do us good* (5). If you prefer the paraphraſe of a Jeſuit to the plainneſs of this account, read the following words (6). 'The 'Gout and the Gravel . . . . . . like two officers of 'death, having ſeized on him, waſted and conſumed 'him; but they left him a ſound and a clear judg'ment to repent of his ſins if he would have 'taken warning. Four days before he died, the 'curate of St Medard viſited him, being in bed, and 'endeavoured to make him ſenſible of his duty; 'but he would not hear him. Some honeſt Capuchins 'were ſent for to try whether they could work upon 'him: they came to ſee him at the requeſt of ſome 'of his friends, and laid before him the ſeverity of 'GOD's judgments, and the power and malice of 'Satan in this laſt ſtage of a man's life, telling him 'that he ſhould think of his ſalvation. But he 'anſwered them with the tone of a mad and deſ'perate man, you fools, get out of my chamber; 'I would have you know that there are no other 'Devils but our enemies, who do us miſchief in this 'world, nor any God beſides kings and princes who 'do us good: I have lived in this belief and I will 'die in it. They omitted neither fair words, nor 'threatnings to bring him into the right way; but it 'was to no purpoſe: From that time he went on 'uttering moſt horrid blaſphemies, as Lucilio (Vanini) 'had done upon the wood-pile; till at laſt he 'ended his wretched life as Judas did, *Infelicem 'ſpiritum non emiſit, ſed amiſit*. The noiſe of his 'deſpair was immediately ſpread all over Paris; he 'was curſed by the people, and his body was thrown 'upon a lay-ſtall, as being unworthy of Chriſtian 'burial (7).'

[*C*] *He had been accuſed of having made uſe of witchraft againſt the life of Henry IV.*] That prince being at Nantes in the year 1598, was told that Coſmo Ruggeri was guilty of that crime. There was a report that this man, being then an eccleſiaſtic, had a private cloſet in the caſtle of Nantes, wherein he ſhut up himſelf every day, under pretence of painting, but in truth to prick with a needle a wax image like the king. He gave ſome hopes that by this means the king would pine away with a lingring diſeaſe. *Coſmus Rugerius tunc ſacris addictus ad regem delatus fuerat, quaſi ipſius vitæ deteſtandis magiæ artibus perniciem molitus eſſet. Nam in arce Namnetenſi ſpecie pingendi cellam peculiarem habuiſſe, in qua ceream imaginem, quæ*
regis

(*g*) Ibid.

(*h*) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra.

(1) Mezerai, Abregé Choronol. *Tom. v, p.* 180, *ad ann.* 1574.

(2) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 408.

(3) Id. ibid.

(4) *Viz. in page* 401, *where are theſe words:* There are ſcarcely any ſuch criminals who will not endure all kinds of torture, if their life depend on their confeſſion. Which will appear by Coſmo Rogieri, of whom we ſhall ſpeak afterwards; who was known to be one of the principal in the ſecret, and had violated his fidelity to the queen, who had placed him with the duke her ſon for a ſpy.

(5) Mercure François, *Tom. iv. pag.* 46.

(6) Garaſſe, Doctrine Curieuſe, *pag.* 156, 157.

(7) Spizelius in Scrutinio Atheiſmi, *pag.* 130. *is in the wrong to place him among the Atheiſts, that were burnt alive.*

Thuanus, and diſmiſſed without puniſhment. The account I ſhall give *(i)* of this attempt will ſhew us the impudence of that wicked man, and the favour he was in with the ladies. Many reflexions might be made upon his addicting himſelf to Aſtrology and Magic, though he believed neither a GOD nor a Devil [*D*]; for it is a general opinion among Chriſtians,

regis ſpeciem referebat, diris epodis excantatam cottidie acu figebat, eaque re fore ſpem fecerat, ut rex mox mortifero languore ſenſim abſumeretur (8). The king ordered Thuanus, and another Judge to enquire into that affair. Coſmo being juridically interrogated, anſwered firſt of all the objection that was made to him, grounded upon his having been put to the torture for ſuch a thing in the year 1574. He maintained that he had been then falſly accuſed, and that his innocence had been acknowledged by his Judges; that his being ſuſpected of Magic, was only grounded upon his ſkill in Aſtrology; becauſe people thought that he could not foretel ſo many things without the aſſiſtance of the Devil, though he had only foretold them by an exact knowledge of nativities (9). He added that the great affection he had conceived for the king long ago was ſufficient to clear him from the crime charged upon him. He ſaid that after the Paris-maſſacre, the court of France took into conſideration what they ſhould do with the king of Navarre, and the prince of Condé, and that Catherine de Medicis aſked him whether he had calculated their nativities; and that he anſwered her he had done it, and knew by that means they would occaſion no diſturbances in the kingdom. He added that his anſwer prevented the ill deſigns that were formed againſt them; that he had acquainted la Noue with it, and deſired him to give them notice of it, that for the time to come they might behave themſelves ſo as to confirm what he had told Catherine meerly out of affection for them; ſince ſuch things could not be certainly diſcovered by Aſtrology (10). He concluded with ſaying that he hoped his majeſty, remembring ſo good a ſervice, would have more regard to it than to the malicious and falſe accuſations of his informers. Thuanus gave an account of all theſe things to the king: that prince, after walking a while, acknowledged that la Noue had told him ſo at that time, and he ordered that Ruggeri ſhould be ſet at liberty, and that all informations againſt him ſhould be ſuperſeded. The ladies had already obtained the pardon of that wretched man, who quickly appeared at court very familiar with them. *Intermiſſa ulterior in Coſmum inquiſitio & ipſe libertati reſtitutus fuit, & in arctam familiaritatem cum gynæceo venit, cujus favore à Rege, cum hæc diceret, jam gratia in arcano facta fuerat* (11). Thuanus, mentions a thing, which ought not to be omitted. Ruggeri, was ſo impudent as to ſay that it was not he, but a Gardener of the ſame name, who had been accuſed and puniſhed in la Mole's time, and he impoſed upon them in ſuch a manner that he had a penſion of Hiſtoriographer beſtowed upon him. *Homo impudentiſſimus ac perditiſſimus poſtea auſus eſt palam dicere quæ ad annum LXXIII. de Coſmo Rugerio commemorantur, ad ſe minime pertinere, ſed Thuanum olitoris cujuſdam cognominis tunc poſtulati errore allucinatum eſſe; eoque væſaniæ venit, ut emendicato ſtipendio in aula obtinuerit, ut ſcribendæ hiſtoriæ munus ſibi demandaretur* (12). Admire that man's impudence. The anſwers he made to the two commiſſioners appointed to examine him at Nantes, ſigned with his own hand, were ſtill extant, wherein he acknowledged that he was the ſame Coſmo Ruggeri, who had been falſly accuſed, when la Mole was tried; but he maintained that he had been honourably acquitted by the Judges; by this his impudence plainly appears, for the records of his proceſs teſtify that he was condemned to the gallies. *Iis* (confeſſionibus) *eundem ſe eſſe minime diffitetur, ſed per calumniam accuſatum, & poſtea honorifice, ſicuti jam dixi, dimiſſum; in quo rurſus inſigniter mentitus eſt, nam ex archivis Curiæ itidem conſtat, eum poſt quæſtionem ad triremeis damnatum eſſe, ſed aulicorum in hoc hominum genus prono favore pœnam remiſſam fuiſſe, & cum duceretur, vinculis exemptum in aula ſtatim comparuiſſe* (13). I muſt further add, that the commiſſioners having told him at Nantes, that Judicial Aſtrology being a thing impious and unworthy of a Chriſtian, he was very much to blame for applying himſelf to it, eſpecially conſidering that he was a prieſt; he excuſed himſelf as well as he could, and even ſpoke of that ſcience in a contemptible manner, and ſwore that he had never calculated any nativity ſince he was a prieſt (14).

[*D*] *His addicting himſelf to Aſtrology and Magic, though he believed neither a GOD nor a Devil.*] Mark well the confeſſion he made, when he was dying. *There are no other Devils,* ſaid he (15), *but the enemies who torment us in this world, nor any God beſides kings and princes, who can raiſe us and do us good.* He added, according to Garaſſe (16), *I have lived in this belief, and in this belief I will die.* If this addition was made by that Jeſuit, I think it may be juſtified by the laws of paraphraſe; for it is almoſt an indubitable thing, that an old man, who dies an Atheiſt has been an Atheiſt a long time. People do not grow irreligious upon their death-bead, nor even in their old-age; on the contrary the greateſt part of the wits, libertines, and unbelievers, &c. renounce their impiety in their ſickneſſes (17), and die making orthodox declarations (18). It is therefore very likely that our Ruggeri had been for a long time ſuch as he died. To what purpoſe then did he caſt nativities, and make wax images, which he diſtributed as ſo many cauſes of love and ſickneſs? Such things can ſcarcely be reconciled: all thoſe, who mention his death, make the following reflexion upon it. *He had formerly made people believe . . . . . . that he knew how to make images, &c. and* YET *that Atheiſt did not believe that there was any Devil* (19). *The wiſeſt men were then* (20) *of opinion, that he had no knowledge* of Necromancy, *and* INDEED THE ISSUE *of his life made it plainly appear* (21). It is certain that ſince he did not believe the exiſtence of any ſpirit diſtinct from human ſouls, he muſt needs have looked upon what is ſaid on Magic as fabulous; and conſequently his pretending to make images, which had the power to kill, or to inſpire love, proceeded only from a greedy deſire of getting money. He knew himſelf, the vanity of his promiſes, and that the pricking of images with a needle was ineffectual. It is not ſo certain that he knew the vanity of Aſtrology: A man of ſenſe and learning does clearly perceive that a piece of wax in the ſhape of a man or of a woman which is pricked in the heart, cannot produce in any diſtant perſon the deſire of marrying a certain man, or any other kind of paſſion. He evidently knows that a piece of wax, which repreſents Henry IV, whether it be put near the fire at Nantes, or pricked in ſeveral places in the ſame town, cannot bring an hectic and mortal fever upon that king at Paris. And therefore any man of judgment, ſenſe, or learning, who is perſuaded that thoſe wax images have ſuch a power, muſt needs know that thoſe effects are produced by an inviſible ſpirit, which works immediately and phyſically upon certain perſons, whilſt thoſe images are in ſuch circumſtances. Ruggeri did not believe that there was any ſuch ſpirit, and therefore he knew that thoſe images had no ſuch virtue. But it does not ſo evidently appear, that the celeſtial bodies are not capable of producing many effects upon earth. It is well known that ſome perſons, who were accounted Atheiſts, ſeemed to be perſuaded of the influence of the ſtars, even with reſpect to the free actions of men, and what we call fortune, or contingent events. And therefore it is not certain that Ruggeri was ſenſible of the vanity of Judicial Aſtrology. However I believe it may ſafely be ſaid, conſidering the turn of his mind (22), that he gave nativities about as impoſtors uſe to do, without giving any credit to them, and to trick people out of their money.

Perhaps it will be objected to me, that it is as difficult to believe that a certain planet, ſituated in a certain manner in the figure of one's nativity, is the phyſical cauſe of the kind reception a prince gives to a man of fifty years of age, who waits upon him at a certain hour, as to believe that a wax image pricked in the heart can produce an act of love in a man a hundred leagues off. To which I anſwer, that this effect of the planet appears to many people as chimerical as the effect of the image, and I am one of them; but I repeat it again,

---

(i) In the remark [*D*].

(8) Thuan. de vita ſua, *lib. vi, ad ann.* 1598. *pag.* 1234, *col. i. C.*

(9) Ob id autem pleriſque ſuſpectum fuiſſe, quod aſtrologiæ peritus certiorem ac ſibi cum paucis cognitam natalium horarum conficiendarum ſcientiam calleret, cujus ope ac ductu cum multa multis prædixiſſet, in eam veniſſe opinionem, quaſi occulta cum malis ſpiritibus familiaritate hæc didiciſſet. *Id. ibid.*

(10) Id autem non tam ex arte, quam adfectu erga ipſos bene animato feciſſe, quippe cum res ejuſmodi eſſet, ut per aſtrologicæ artis rationem præſtari non poſſet. *Id. ibid. col. ii, A.*

(11) Id. ibid. B.

(12) Id. ibid.

(13) Id. ibid. C.

(14) Ipſe ſe quibus potuit verbis etiam elevata ea, excuſavit, & inter alia adjecit ac religioſe affirmavit, ſe poſtquam ſacris addictus eſſet, quod diu poſtea fuit, nunquam nataleis cujuſquam horas confeciſſe. *Id. ib. D & E.*

(15) Mercure François, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 46.

(16) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 157.

(17) See the article BION the Boryſthenite, remark [*E*].

(18) That is orthodox with reſpect to the providence of God, Heaven, and Hell.

(19) Mercure François, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 47. *See alſo the Continuator of Thuanus, lib. viii, pag.* 537.

(20) That is, when la Mole was beheaded.

(21) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, *p.* 155.

(22) We have ſeen above, citation (10), that he aſſured that the king of Navarre's and the prince of Condé's nativity promiſed that they would cauſe no diſturbance, and yet that he did not learn this from Aſtrology.

Chriſtians, that if there are Devils, there is a God, and that thoſe who do not believe the

it is an eaſier thing to be deceived with reſpect to the power of the planets, than that of thoſe wax figures. Not one learned man can be alledged, who believed that thoſe figures inſpire love, and occaſion death a hundred leagues off by their own power, and without the interpoſition of any ſpirit; but ſome men of learning may be alledged, who believed that without the help of good or bad angels, the planets of man's nativity are the cauſe of his moſt accidental adventures. It is eaſily conceived that a piece of wax pricked at Nantes, heated and modified at one's pleaſure, cannot be the phyſical cauſe of any thing at Rome; but it is known by experience that the virtue of the ſun produces a thouſand things upon earth phyſically and as a true cauſe: which is the reaſon why people are led into an error, thinking that the operations of the planets do likewiſe reach the earth; which being once admitted will carry a man a great way by degrees, and at laſt they are looked upon as the cauſe of every thing.

THAT if judicial Aſtrology diſcovered futurity, it would be a kind of black Magic.

I muſt obſerve, by the by, that this illuſion ſhould be more ſeverely checked than it is; for were it true, for inſtance, that by means of nativities one may know beforehand the happineſs or misfortunes of others, the circumſtances of their marriages and death, *&c.* were it true, for inſtance, that Gauricus diſcovered, by an Aſtrological operation, that king Henry II would be killed in a duel, Aſtrology ſhould be accounted one of the magical arts, and of thoſe ways of knowing things to come, that are grounded on a covenant with the Devil. The pains Aſtrologers are at in calculating a nativity, and conſulting the rules they have laid down upon the diſtinction of the ſigns, the properties of the houſes, the different aſpects of the planets, *&c.* I ſay, their pains in that reſpect would be like that of Magicians, who draw circles, make many poſtures in them, utter certain words, *&c* (23). On both ſides what a man does would be only a ſign by inſtitution, upon making whereof a bad angel would act in a certain manner. Any one, who conſiders the thing impartially, will plainly ſee that magical ceremonies, a circle, a bow, a wand ſucceſſively pointed to the four cardinal points of the horizon, certain words uttered, and others written upon a piece of paper, *&c.* can no more cure a man dangerouſly ſick, than a figure of the nativity can diſcover whether a man will meet with a happy match, whether he will get the love of ſome princes, whether he will be baniſhed, whether he will be a rich man in land or money, and whether he will die at ſea, or at the ſiege of a town. Which ſhews that an Aſtrologer ſhould be liable to a greater puniſhment, according as he tells more certainly the truth of things to come; for the certainty of his predictions would be a ſign that he carefully performs the ceremonies, upon performing of which the Devils are engaged by their firſt covenant to reveal things to come. This further proves that Judicial Aſtrology cannot be a way of foretelling future events different from a ſieve, a looking-glaſs, ſmoak, and an hundred other abominations (24). From whence I conclude that the indulgence of the Eccleſiaſtical and Secular courts to Aſtrologers is very criminal. There are very good Civil and Canonical laws againſt that ſort of men. They have been carefully collected by a profeſſor of Padua, in a book publiſhed at Venice, in the year 1662 (25); but they are not put in execution. Did not John Baptiſt Morinus, Regius profeſſor at Paris, quietly enjoy his penſions and offices till he died, tho' every body knew he calculated nativities, and boaſted publickly that he had a wonderful ſkill in it (26)? Had he ventured to maintain, that relics ſhould not be worſhipped, he would have been degraded the very next day; he would have been ſhamefully expelled; and if any conſiderable perſon durſt have protected him, all the clergy would have been in an uproar, and nothing could have pacified them but the depoſing of ſuch an impious man. What Partiality to errors! he was ſuffered to practiſe all his lifetime, without being puniſhed for it, an art which muſt needs be magical, if things to come may be known by it. Obſerve, I pray, that it is a difficult thing to apprehend how they can be known by the help of the Devil; for tho' the knowledge of angels be ſuppoſed never ſo great, it does not ſeem to include the concatenation of all the objects that muſt be known to foretel certainly that ſuch and ſuch things will come to paſs; and it would be an abſurd thing to ſay that God reveals them to the evil ſpirits, whenever they have a mind to execute the covenant which they have contracted with man. The abbot Furetiere does very clearly propoſe this objection (27); but he forgets the main difficulty: he does not ſay that man's free-will would be a mere chimera, if angels could foretel a man's thoughts ten years hence; if they could, I ſay, foretel them by the knowledge of the connection that is between natural cauſes and their effects.

WHETHER it can well be concluded from the exiſtence of Devils that there is a God.

Nothing could be more abſurd than to aſk, Whether it be poſſible that Ruggeri, who denied the exiſtence of God, and of good and bad angels, ſhould have believed that his wax images had ſome virtue in them; but it were no abſurd thing to put this queſtion to all Atheiſts. It is commonly believed that all thoſe, who deny the exiſtence of God, do likewiſe deny, by a neceſſary conſequence, the exiſtence of all ſpirits, and the immortality of the ſoul. I do not wonder that this ſhould be a common opinion, for I think there is no example of the ſeparation of thoſe two blaſphemies (28), I mean that there never was any Atheiſt, who believed the exiſtence of Devils and the immortality of the ſoul; or that there never was a man perſuaded of the truth of Magic, but believed the exiſtence of God. Some Chriſtians, who are orthodox in all other points, cannot believe that bad angels concern themſelves with any thing, and reject, without any exception, what is commonly ſaid of Magic and Sorcery. If they were contented to ſay that the exiſtence and operation of bad angels can only be proved from the Scripture, I ſhould not ſo much wonder at their opinion; for it is certain that reaſon affords great arguments againſt the empire of the Devil, which are grounded on our notions of God's wiſdom and goodneſs: but it is a great piece of temerity, to ſay no worſe, in thoſe who deny that the Devil has any power, to pretend to reconcile their opinion with the Scripture. However it be, the following conſequence is falſe and unjuſt, *You do not believe that there are any devils, and therefore you do not believe that there is a GOD.* As for this other conſequence, *You do not believe that there is a GOD, and therefore you do not believe that there are any good or bad angels,* it ſeems to be very certain; for, as I have already ſaid, no example can be alledged to diſprove it. Here is another conſequence, which ſeems to be certain, *there are Devils, therefore there is a God.* People are ſo fully perſuaded of the neceſſity of ſuch a conſequence, that they peremptorily affirm that thoſe, who deny the exiſtence of Devils, deprive the orthodox of an undeniable proof of God's exiſtence. I confeſs that hitherto I have not ſeen any body but ſeemed to me fully perſuaded, that the exiſtence of the Devil, is a neceſſary and irrefragable proof of the exiſtence of God; and you will ſee no man, who doubts ever ſo little of this laſt truth, (29), but abſolutely denies that there are angels. However, I confeſs I have not a ſufficient penetration to ſee that ſtrict connection, which every body perceives between theſe two aſſertions, *There are devils; therefore there is a GOD.* Laying aſide the Scripture, to go upon Metaphyſical principles, may one not ſay that God has created no other ſpirits but the ſoul of man? If it be aſked why ſo powerful a Being has not produced other beings, it may be anſwered, that he was not pleaſed to do it; he has produced all things with a perfect liberty; more of one kind, and fewer of another: his will, always directed by an infinite wiſdom, was the only rule that he went by. What can one ſay againſt ſuch a reaſon? Go to an Atheiſt, and aſk him, why he denies the exiſtence of Devils; he will give you a pitiful anſwer, and if you preſs him hard, he will be quickly ſilent. Will he ſay that the univerſe being infinite and eternal, the moſt perfect Being, which neceſſarily exiſts, contains nothing that exceeds man in underſtanding and knowledge? What! becauſe man has two eyes, a noſe, a mouth, a brain, nerves and veins, muſt all the knowledge and induſtry of nature fall to his ſhare? Muſt there be no will, no underſtanding, no paſſions, no art of applying bodies one to another any where elſe? If you could make it out that a free agent was pleaſed the exiſtence of God, do not believe that there are Devils. I ſhall ſay ſomething on that opinion. I muſt take notice of Father Garaſſe's miſtakes [*E*].

---

(23) See in the 12th letter of *Cyrano de Bergerac* a long deſcription of magical ceremonies.

(24) *See an alphabetical catalogue of them in be 35th chapter of a book printed at at Paris, and afterwards in Holland in* 1692, *intiutled*, Remarques ou reflexions critiques, morales, & hiſtoriques, ſur les plus belles & les plus agreables penſées des Anciens & des Modernes. *I believe the author took all this out of Martin Delrio's book.*

(25) *Don* Joſeph Maria Maraviglia *Clerk Regular, in his* Pſeudomantia veterum & recentiorum exploſa, ſive de fide divinationibus adhibenda.

(26) See the article of this MORINUS.

(27) *See* Furetieriana, *pag* 199, *& ſeq. Edit. of Bruſſels.*

(28) See hereafter what reſtriction is put to this in ſpeaking of the Eaſtern nations.

(29) That is, the exiſtence of God.

pleaſed to beſtow knowledge upon no other beings but ſuch as have a brain, you would put me to a ſtand ; but you acknowledge no ſuch cauſe. According to your principles every thing exiſts and acts neceſſarily ; and therefore you cannot tell me why an impalpable matter ſhould be leſs ingenious than that which we call fleſh and blood, a man, a beaſt, &c. and if you argue right, you ought to believe that ſince the infinite Being thinks in a man, it thinks every where elſe ; and that if there are many living bodies upon earth, which love and hate one another, and ſome of which are oppreſſed by others ; there are alſo in the air, or elſewhere, ſome compounded beings, that love man, and ſome that hate him, and are more knowing and powerful than man. Thoſe will be good angels, and theſe bad angels. In a word, ſince an Atheiſt cannot deny that there are wicked, envious, and revengeful beings (30), which are pleaſed with the miſfortunes of others, and by the application of bodies produce ſtrange changes in nature according to their paſſions, he will make himſelf ridiculous if he dares to deny that beſides thoſe wicked beings, which are the objects of his eyes, there are many others which he does not ſee, and which are ſtill more malicious and knowing than man. And therefore it may be ſaid, that if the univerſe was not the work of God, it would neceſſarily contain bad angels, as it contains wolves and men ; but ſince it is the work of God, it is not at all neceſſary it ſhould contain ſuch and ſuch things, and conſequently the exiſtence of Devils is not ſo good a proof of the exiſtence of God, as it is commonly believed. It is more proper to corroborate Manicheiſm (31) than to maintain the orthodox faith. I propoſe this only as a problem to be examined.

A CONSIDERATION upon the religion of the Eaſtern nations.

Thus it were poſſible, tho' ſuch a thing, in all appearance, never happened, that ſome men no leſs atheiſtical in ſome reſpects than Ruggeri was, ſhould nevertheleſs believe that ſome wax images, with the help of ſome ceremonies, might inſpire love, or occaſion, death a hundred leagues off. They would look upon thoſe ceremonies only as a ſign of agreement, whereby a Devil would be determined to produce ſome effects by the application of bodies, whoſe force would be known to him.

I deſire you to take notice that hitherto I have only conſidered the knowledge we have of the opinions of the antient Pagans and modern Europeans ; for I confeſs, that what is ſaid of the religion of the Eaſtern nations, does not permit me to uſe the general expreſſion I made uſe of. We are told (32) that the Siameſe acknowledge no Deity, and yet they (33) believe the return and apparition of ſpirits ; that they are afraid of the dead, and practiſe ſome ceremonies to pacify them. (34) *Beſides they offer up prayers to the good* genii *almoſt upon all occaſions, and make imprecations againſt the bad ones.* Such men are well qualified to be Magicians, without believing any Deity. The author of the relation I have quoted, adds, *That* (35) *the Indians believe now as the antient Chineſe did, that there are good and bad ſouls every where, on which they have as it were beſtowed the almighty power of God.* The meaning of which is, that they acknowledge no ſupreme Deity, but an infinite number of *genii*, ſome good, and others bad ; and therefore they may be both Atheiſts and Magicians. The notions of the learned in that country, are more like thoſe of the Europeans ; for if, on the one ſide, they are Atheiſts, they deny on the other the exiſtence of ſpirits, and the immortality of the ſoul. *Several relations of China tell us, that the men of letters, who are the moſt conſiderable men in that country, look upon funeral ceremonies only as civil duties, without mixing any prayers with them ; that they have at this day no ſenſe of religion, and do not believe either the exiſtence of* GOD, *or the immortality of the ſoul ; and that tho' they pay an outward worſhip to Confucius in the temples conſecrated to him, they do not beg of him the learning which the lettered men of Tonquin deſire him to beſtow upon them* (36). Their outward worſhip of Confucius is therefore a mere mummery with reſpect to them ; they conform to it out of policy. Read the following paſſage, there you ſhall ſee that they deny not only a Supreme Intelligence, but alſo inferior beings endowed with intelligence. *By little and little, the* Litterati, *that is theſe who have taken ſome degree in literature, and are the only perſons that have a hand in the government, becoming wholly impious, and yet having made no alteration in the ſtile of their predeceſſors, have changed the ſoul of Heaven, and all other ſouls, into I know not what ætherial ſubſtances, deprived of knowledge, and for a ſovereign judge of our actions, have only ſet up a blind fate, which, in their opinion, does whatever a moſt powerful, wiſe and juſt Being might do* (37).

[*E*] *I muſt take notice of Father Garaſſe's miſtakes.*] I. He ſays (38) that *about fifteen days before Coſmo Ruggeri died*, in the year 1615, a ſmall book came out at Paris with this title, *Hiſtoire épouvantable de deux Magiciens eſtranglez par le Diable la ſemaine ſaincte* (39). (A dreadful hiſtory of two Magicians ſtrangled by the Devil in the holy week). But we are told in the *Mercure François* (40), that Ruggeri's death occaſioned that ſmall book. There is no doubt that the author of that *Mercure* is more exact and credible than the author of the *Doctrine Curieuſe* ; and therefore all the moral reflexions of the latter, grounded upon forerunning reports, fall to the ground. I muſt not forget theſe words of the *Mercure* (41) : *The firſt of thoſe two Magicians was Cæſar, that famous cheat, who tricked all the curious of his time of their money, to ſhew them Devils, or to put them in the way of finding treaſures, and then laughed at them. It was reported that he had been ſtrangled by his Devil, and yet he is ſtill alive, being a priſoner in the Baſtile. The ſecond was this abbot of St Mahé.* II. Garaſſe goes on thus (42) : *It happened in the year MDLXXIV, that la Mole and Caconas* (43) *being condemned by a decree of parliament, as perſons convicted of witchcraft and enchantment, upon occaſion of Charles IXth's death, Coſmo Ruggeri was involved in their accuſations, as having lent them a helping hand by his necromancy.* La Mole and Coconas were executed during the life of Charles IX ; and therefore it is not true that they were put to death *upon occaſion* of his death. It does not appear that their witchcraft was levelled at that prince's life, and it cannot be ſaid that they were convicted of it. Here follows an abſtract of la Mole's anſwers when he was put to the rack. *Being told that he had ſome waxen images in his houſe with two holes in their head, he has anſwered no. Being aſked about the waxen image, which is ſaid to have been found in his houſe, he ſays, ah ! my God, I deſire I may die, if I have made any waxen image for the king. Being aſked about the golden figures in his hat, he ſays he knows nothing of them. Being again faſtened to the buckles and rings, he ſays that he knows no more than what he has ſaid. The little treſtle has been brought in again, and being exhorted to ſpeak the truth, he ſays, Gentlemen, I know nothing elſe upon the damnation of my ſoul ; before the living God I know nothing elſe. True eternal God, my God, I do not know whether the waxen image was made for the king or for the queen. Being aſked where the ſaid image is, and if Coſmo had brought it to him, he ſays, that the ſaid image was made for his miſtreſs, his countrywoman, whom he had a mind to marry, and that it will appear it is the figure of a woman, and that the ſaid Coſmo has the ſaid image, and that the ſaid figure has two thruſts in the heart, and that he will ſhew it to be ſo. Being interrogated about the king's ſickneſs, he ſays, put me to death if poor la Molle had ever any ſuch thoughts, and deſires that Coſmo ſhould be ſent for ; who will ſay there is nothing elſe in it. Being aſked where the ſaid waxen image is, he ſays Coſmo has it, and that it was made for a woman, and he did not deſire Coſmo to do any thing elſe, and that the ſaid Coſmo pricked it in the heart. Being aſked why he pricked it in the heart, he ſays he does not know. Water has been brought to him, he deſires it ſhould be removed, and ſays he will ſpeak the truth. He has been brought to the fire, and exhorted to ſpeak the truth about that waxen image ; he ſays, I deny my God, and may I be damned for ever, if it be for any thing elſe than what I have ſaid* (44). Here follows likewiſe an extract of the confeſſions extorted from Coconas by the torture. *Being aſked about the waxen image, he ſays he knows nothing of it, and that Coſmo, and la Molle are moſt intimate friends. Being aſked whether he knows of any pictures or characters made againſt the king, he ſays no ; and that he was diſcourſing about it with a captain of this town, who told him they had broke all the rings of la Molle ; and that he aſked the ſaid captain whether they had broke a ring as big as one's finger, and that if there*

(30) By thoſe Beings I mean mankind.

(31) Mr Becker inſiſts very much in charging Divines with introducing Manicheiſm, by the power which they aſcribe to the Devils. He is in the wrong to accuſe them of this, ſince they build upon Scripture. I here conſider things as a Philoſopher.

(32) La Loubere, Relation de Siam, *Tom. i, cap. xxii, num.* 6, *pag. m.* 501.

(33) Id. ibid. *ch. xx, num.* 20, *pag.* 481.

(34) Id. ibid.

(35) Id. ib. *chap. xxiii, num.* 8, *pag.* 508.

(36) Id. ibid. *chap. xx, num.* 4, *p.* 467, 470.

(37) Id. ibid. *ch. xxiii, num.* 14. *pag.* 514. Compare what is above citation (55) of the article MALHERBE.

(38) Garaſſe, Doctrine curieuſe, *book ii*, §. *viii, p.* 155.

(39) Id. ibid. *pag.* 154. *See alſo* Thuanus's Continuator, *lib. viii, pag.* 537.

(40) Tom. iv, pag. 47.

(41) Ibid.

(42) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra.

(43) It ſhould be Coconas.

(44) Le Laboureur, Addit. to Caſtelnau, *Tom. ii, pag.* 411.

there was any thing, it would be found there. He further ſays, he never heard any thing ſpoken of an attempt upon the king's life. Being aſked whether he knew any thing about the waxen figure, he ſays no, and if any body knows any thing of it, it is Coſmo (45). Thuanus ſays, that la Molle proteſted, that this waxen image was only deſigned to inſpire a woman with love. *Tortus Mola & interrogatus de imaguncula cerea, quam magicis præſtigiis ab ipſo confictam, & acu in corde tactam conſtabat, quem in rei uſum id faceret, & cujus opera ad id uteretur: reſpondit, ut puellam quandam in Provincia, quam efflictim deperiebat, hac arte ad mutuo ſe radamandum accenderet, id feciſſe; eaque in re uſum opera Coſmi Rugerii Florentini, qui mox comprehenſus & tanquam maleficus omnino raſus, Reginæ favore, quæ illius & hujuſmodi hominum opera perfamiliariter utebatur, periculo exemptus eſt* (46). III. Garaſſe is not exact in the following words. ‘ This man having been delivered from that danger by his miſtreſs's favour, he ſuffered himſelf to be ſeduced with an unhappy fancy of being accounted a great Aſtrologer, and one who had a wonderful ſkill in that art, ſo that he promiſed waxen images to all the curious debauchees, to inſpire love or hatred; and as thoſe two paſſions are equally fooliſh, he had a greater practice in Paris than if he had promiſed pardons, and plenary indulgences (47).’ This author, in order to prove that Coſmo was willing to be accounted a man of great ſkill in Judicial Aſtrology, ſays that he *promiſed waxen images*. Theſe images have been at all times looked upon as effects or fooleries of Magic, and do not belong to Judicial Aſtrology: they are not reckoned among Taliſmans; and the manner how they are uſed plainly ſhews that their virtues, whether true or falſe, do not depend upon the conſtellations. We are told that they muſt be pricked with needles; they muſt be heated with a ſlow fire, &c. and great alterations will happen by that means in thoſe who are the objects of ſuch practices. This cannot be natural; the influences of the ſtars cannot produce ſuch effects; it is black Magic; it is the Devil's work. The Pagans aſcribed that practice to none but witches.

Devovet abſentes, ſimulacraque cerea fingit,
Et miſerum tenues in jecur urget acus (48).

In molten wax, tho' abſent, kills by art,
And with her needle goars the tortur'd heart.

I obſerve that the *Mercure François* does not ſay, as Garaſſe does, that Coſmo promiſed waxen images, *to inſpire love or hatred* (49). He promiſed waxen images, *ſome to make women love thoſe that courted them, and others to make ſuch perſons die in a lingering condition as one deſired, by uttering their names and invoking certain Devils* (50). We are told a pleaſant ſtory about Tamerlane's daughters: it is ſaid that their father would have them learn Magic, and that with the help of ſome images they facilitated the conqueſt of the provinces he deſigned to ſubdue. *Audivi ab aliquibus qui dictum Tamerlanum diu noverunt, quod habuit tres filias quas in arte magica fecit inſtrui, in qua mirabiliter profecerunt, quæ incantationes, & exorcizationes, &* IMAGINES *contra provincias quas ſibi ſubjicere voluit facere conſueverunt, quæ plerumque effectum ſortitæ fuerant* (51). IV. The following words contain a wrong argument: *That wretched man .... went on with that infamous trade, till the year* 1604, *though he was an abbot, aſſiſting the diſorderly paſſions of all the looſe courtiers: from that year* 1604 *he began to take another courſe. For he betook himſelf to write Almanacks, ſome under the name of Quelberus, others under the name of Vannerus, or the Weeping Pilgrim of Savoy* (52). Garaſſe had juſt joined the making of waxen images and the ſtudy of Aſtrology, as two things one whereof is the proof of the other; and then all of a ſudden he tells us, that as ſoon as Coſmo began to write Almanacks, he left off diſtributing thoſe images to the looſe courtiers: in which there is a contradiction and a wrong argument. Though a man writes Almanacks, he may be ſtill a cheat with reſpect to thoſe images. The *Mercure François* does not at all agree with Garaſſe about all the fictitious names prefixed to Ruggeri's Almanacks. Compare the words of the Jeſuit with theſe (53): *From the year* 1604 *he wrote Almanacks every year, ſome under the name of Querberus, others under the name of Vannerus and the Weeping Pilgrim of Savoy, which he adorned with verſes or ſentences out of the beſt Latin Poets and Orators.*

RUSSILIANUS (TIBERIUS) a moſt ſubtile and bold Philoſopher, lived in the XVIth century. He was born in Calabria, and was one of the moſt celebrated diſciples of Auguſtinus Niphus. He was ſo haſty and ſo paſſionate, that when he diſputed with other ſtudents he would ſometimes come to Blows, which made Niphus in a jeſt, which at that time might paſs for wit, call him *Turberius (a)* inſtead of *Tiberius (b)*. He had the ambition to imitate Joannes Picus, and perhaps even to ſurpaſs him; for he propoſed, to be publickly diſputed in ſeveral colleges of Italy, four hundred propoſitions taken from almoſt all ſciences (*c*). The Inquiſitors were enraged at it, as they had been on account of the like proceeding of Joannes Picus, and they thought it very ſtrange that Ruſſilianus who was ſo very young ſhould have the impudence to maintain ſeveral doctrines which to them appeared to be impious [*A*].

They

[*A*] *The Inquiſitors .... thought it very ſtrange .... that he had the impudence to maintain ſeveral opinions which to them appeared to be impious.*] He maintained that JESUS CHRIST, with reſpect to the temperament of the body, and in the courſe of his life, was ſubject to the influences of the ſtars; that time and the Heavens never had any beginning; that the deluge of Noah was not the only one which had happened. He revived many of the doctrines of Joannes Picus which had been condemned. This is aſſerted by Gabriel Naudæus. ‘ Tam ardenter Pici Mirandulani veſtigiis inſtitiſſe certum eſt, ut non ſecus ac ille, propoſitiones ſupra quadringentas, ex omni ferme ſcientiarum genere ſelectas, publicis in Italiæ Gymnaſiis, diſputandas propoſuerit; ſed invitis tamen ac frementibus, quemadmodum etiam Pico contigerat, ſacris fidei quæſitoribus, qui patienter ferre non poterant, ab hoc tam præcocis ut ſapientiæ, ſic ætatis Philoſopho, Chriſtum quoad ſui corporis temperiem, & vitæ mortiſque hiſtoriam legibus Aſtrorum ſubjici: Tempus, & Cœlum, durationis æternæ conſtitui; Inundationem illam univerſalem, quam nos Chriſtiani ſemel dumtaxat accidiſſe contendimus, ſannis, & dicacibus verbis excipi, quaſi certis temporum inclinationibus reverti ſolitam: Cætera denique Placita quæ dudum à Pico in medium propoſita, temeritatis, & hæreticæ labis damnata fuerant, rurſum in ſcenam, Academicarum concertationum palæſtram, revocari (1). - - - *It is certain he ſo zealouſly followed the example of Picus Mirandula, that, in like manner as he had done, he propoſed above four hundred Propoſitions, taken from all ſciences, to be debated in all the public ſchools of Italy, to the great diſpleaſure and vexation of the holy Fathers of the Inquiſition, who could not bear that, by a Philoſopher of ſo early an underſtanding and age, Chriſt, as to the temperament of his body, and hiſtory of his life and death, ſhould be made ſubject to the dominion of the ſtars: that time, and the Heavens, ſhould be ſaid to be of eternal duration; that an univerſal Deluge, which, we Chriſtians hold to have been but once, ſhould be ſcoffed at, as a thing which had often happened: and finally that the other doctrines of Picus, long ſince condemned of temerity and heretical pravity ſhould be again brought on the ſtage, for ſubjects of academical diſputation.*’ Mr Heidegger accuſes him of having maintained the opinion of one Henricus Mechlinius, diſciple of Albertus Magnus, that the Deluge was cauſed by the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the ſign Cancer towards the end, overagainſt the ſign Argo Navis. ‘ Et Mechlinius quidem

‘ in

---

(45) Le Laboureur, *ibid. pag.* 412, 413.

(46) Thuan. Hiſtor. *lib. lvii, pag. lxiv. col. i, A.* See d'Aubigné, who has only abridged Thuanus in this place as well as in many others, *Hiſtoire Univerſelle, Tom. ii, lib. ii. chap. vi, pag. m.* 688.

(47) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra. *p.* 156.

(48) Ovid, *ſpeaking of Medea in* Epiſt. Hypſip. ad Jaſon. *See* Frommannus de Faſcinatione, *lib. iii, Part. v, cap. vi, pag. m.* 718. *He cites alſo* Horace, Sat. VIII, lib. i. & *Cujas* in Paratit. cod. de Malefic & Mathemat.

(49) *However it is true that thoſe images are ſometimes deſigned to inſpire hatred. See* Servius on theſe words of Virgil, Eclog. VIII, *ver.* 80. Limus ut hic dureſcit, & hæc ut cera liqueſcit Uno eodemque igni.

(50) Mercure François, *Tom. iv, pag.* 47. *See alſo the* Continuation of Thuanus, *book viii, pag.* 537.

(51) Theodoricus à Niem, de Schiſmate, *lib. ii, pag. m.* 114.

(52) Garaſſe, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 156.

(53) Merc. François, *Tom. iv, pag.* 46.

(*a*) That is a turbulent perſon.

(*b*) Auguſt. Niphus de Viro aulico, *cap. lix, pag.* 316.

(*c*) *See* Naudæus in Judicio de Aug. Nipho, *pag.* 40.

(1) Naudæus, in Judicio de Nipho, *pag.* 40.

They ſtirred up perſecutions againſt him which did not at all fright him, and he had the courage to publiſh againſt the Monks a very ſharp apology [*B*]. I have elſewhere (*d*) quoted an oration wherein he introduces Philoſophy repreſenting her grievances to Pope Leo X.

‘ in Commentariis, quos edidit in magnas Albumaſaris conjunctiones, refert, ſe inveniſſe ex aſtronomicis ſupputationibus, quod Noëticum Diluvium præceſſerit conjunctio quædam Aſtrorum, generalem Aquarum Illuvionem inducens, nimirum Jovis & Saturni in fine Cancri, è regione Argolicæ Navis per quam etiam Arca Noë ſignificatur. Verùm hanc Sententiam ſuperiori ſeculo à Tiberio Calabro defenſam refutavit Hieronymus Armellinus Dominicanus, edito peculiari adverſus eum volumine, in quo eam tamquam hæreticam æſtuante ſtomacho damnavit (2). - - - *Mechlinius in the Commentaries he publiſhed upon the great conjunctions of Albumaſar, ſays, that he had found by Aſtronomical calculations, that the flood of Noah was preceded by a certain conjunction of the ſtars which brought on an univerſal inundation of waters, namely the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the extremity of Cancer, oppoſite to the conſtellation of the ſhip Argo, whereby alſo was ſignified the ark of Noah. But this opinion maintained in the laſt age by Tiberius of Calabria, was confuted by the Dominican Jerom Armellinus, in a particular treatiſe he publiſhed againſt him, wherein he in great paſſion condemns it as heretical.*’

[*B*] *He had the courage to publiſh a very ſharp apology againſt the Monks.*] We will go on with the words of Gabriel Naudæus. ‘ Quamobrem ſeveriùs in illum, & diligentiùs inquirere cœperunt, ſed eo tamen veluti dubiæ pugnæ exitu, ut Tyberius edito adverſus cucullatos Apologetico, talem enim libello ſuo titulum eſſe voluit, & opiniones ſuas liberiùs quàm anteà feciſſet propugnaſſe, & acriùs ejuſmodi cenſores ſuos, quàm rationi conſentaneum eſſet, pupugiſſe videretur (3). - - - *Wherefore they began more ſeverely, and more carefully to inform againſt him, when on the other ſide he publiſhed an apology againſt the cowled Friars, for this was the title he gave his book, and more freely defended his own opinions than before he had done, and attacked his cenſurers with more poignancy than was conſiſtent with diſcretion.*’

RUTILIA, a Roman lady, ſiſter of that Publius Rutilius, who ſuffered with ſo great conſtancy the injuſtice of his baniſhment, and wife of Marcus Aurelius Cotta, had a ſon who was a man of great merit, whom ſhe loved tenderly, and whoſe death ſhe bore with great courage (*a*). Seneca has propoſed her for an example [*A*]. Cicero had a mind to do the ſame; but not being ſufficiently informed of the matter of fact, he had recourſe to Pomponius Atticus, who could not very well ſatisfy him [*B*]. The book wherein he deſigned to ſpeak of our Rutilia (*b*), being not extant, we know not whether he had all the information he wanted, and whether he did really ſpeak of her; but it is very likely he did. But what is moſt obſervable in this matter is, that we are told he deſired to be informed of ſome circumſtances he had already mentioned in his works (*c*). This would ſhew that the greateſt authors forget thoſe very things they have publiſhed.

[*A*] *Seneca has propoſed her for an example.*] It is in the book he writ during his exile to comfort his good mother. He exhorts her to imitate our Rutilia among other ladies of reſolution. ‘ Rutilia, *ſays he* (1), Cottam filium ſecuta eſt in exilium, & uſque eo fuit indulgentia conſtricta, ut mallet exilium pati, quàm deſiderium: nec ante in patriam, quàm cum filio rediit. Eumdem jam reducem, & in Rep. florentem tam fortiter amiſit, quam ſecuta eſt: nec quiſquam lacrimas ejus poſt elatum filium notavit. In expulſo virtutem oſtendit, in amiſſo prudentiam, nam & nihil illam à pietate deterruit, & nihil in triſtitia ſupervacua ſtultaque detinuit. Cum his te numerari feminis volo, quarum vitam ſemper imitata es, &c. - - - *Rutilia followed her ſon into baniſhment, and ſo great was her fondneſs that ſhe rather choſe to ſuffer exile than the want of him; nor did ſhe return to her country till ſuch time as her ſon came with her. She bore his death after his return and proſperity with the ſame courage that ſhe had ſhewed in following him; neither was ſhe obſerved to ſhed a tear at his burial. Thus ſhe gave proof of her courage in his baniſhment, and of her prudence at his death; for as in the one caſe ſhe could not be deterred from ſhewing her piety, ſo in the other nothing could make her indulge a fooliſh and unprofitable grief. With theſe women I would have you numbered, whoſe life you have always imitated, &c.*’ The reader will give me leave to ſet down a paſſage out of Father Senault's treatiſe *de l'Uſage des Paſſions*, - - - *of the uſe of the paſſions*, in that part of it wherein he explains the nature of deſire. ‘ Baniſhment is doubtleſs one of the moſt cruel puniſhments Judges have found for the chaſtiſement of guilty perſons: we are thereby ſeparated from whatever we love, and it ſeems to be a long death, attended with a little life to make us more miſerable: and yet there was a mother, who rather choſe to ſuffer the cruelty of that puniſhment than the violence of deſire, and was willing to follow her ſon in his baniſhment, that ſhe might not be obliged to lament his abſence, and wiſh for his return.’ But how came Father Senault to know, that becauſe ſhe followed her ſon, ſhe was free from the trouble of wiſhing he might return to Rome? As for the reſt, Rutilia's ſon was called Caius Aurelius Cotta. He was a good Orator (2): he was baniſhed during the quarrels of Marius and Sylla, and returned to Rome when the party of the latter was uppermoſt. He was made Conſul in the year of Rome 678. It is probable he died two years after of a wound that opened again; which deprived him of the glory of the triumph that was decreed for him (3). He is not that Cotta, who is one of the interlocutors in Cicero's books *de Natura Deorum*, as Glandorpius will have it (4).

[*B*] *He had recourſe to Pomponius Atticus, who could not very well ſatisfy him.*] He deſired to know whether Rutilia died before or after her ſon. ‘ Rutilia vivo ne C. Cotta filio ſuo mortua ſit, an mortuo? Pertinent ad eum librum quem de luctu minuendo ſcripſimus (5). - - - *Whether Rutilia died before or after C. Cotta her ſon? Theſe things have a relation to the book I have writ on the motives for abating our grief.*’ In another letter he has theſe words: ‘ De Rutilia, quoniam videris dubitare ſcribes ad me cum ſcies, ſed quam primum (6). - - - *Becauſe you ſeem to be in a doubt with reſpect to Rutilia, write to me when you are fully ſatisfied; but let it be as ſoon as poſſible.*’ Corradus's note is too curious not to be inſerted here: ‘ Mortuo mortua eſt . . . . quod mirum Ciceronem quæſiſſe quum in libris oratoriis jampridem ſcripſiſſet Cottam ipſum ſibi ſermonem illum retuliſſe: quin Atticus etiam dubitabat, quum tamen uterque & Cottam & Rutiliam vidiſſet (7). - - - *She died after him . . . . and it is ſtrange that Cicero ſhould have aſked ſuch a queſtion, ſince long before that in his books of Rhetoric he had ſaid, that Cotta himſelf related that diſcourſe to him: but it ſeems that Atticus was likewiſe in a doubt about it, notwithſtanding that he, as well as Cicero, had ſeen both Cotta and Rutilia.*’

(*d*) In the remark [*B*] of the firſt NIPHUS.

(2) Heidegger Hiſt. Patriarch. *Exercitat. xviii, pag.* 538, *Tom. i, he ſays the ſame in his Diſſertation* de Signis cœleſtibus, *pag.* 679.

(3) Naudæus, in Judicio de Nipho, *pag.* 41.

(*a*) See remark [*A*] towards the end.

(*b*) In his book *de Conſolatione*.

(*c*) See the remark [*B*].

(1) Seneca de Conſolatione ad Helviam, *cap. xvi, p. m.* 787.

(2) Cicero, de Oratore, *lib. i, cap. viii*, & in Bruto *cap. xxx. See* Corradus in Brutum Ciceronis, *pag.* 310. & *ſeq.*

(3) *Conſult* Sigonius in faſtis Conſul, *ad ann.* 678, 680.

(4) Glandorp. Onomaſt. *pag.* 144.

(5) Cicero, Epiſt. XX, *lib. xii*, ad Atticum.

(6) Idem. Epiſt. XXII, ejuſd. libri.

(7) Corradus in Epiſt. XX, *lib. xii*, ad Atticum, *pag.* 328, *edit. Græviana.*

RUYSBROECK (JOHN DE) in Latin *Ruſbrochius*, was ſo called from the village of Ruyſbroeck in Brabant between Bruſſels and Hall, where he was born. He was firſt curate and then rector of the church of St Gudula at Bruſſels, and afterwards founder and firſt prior of a convent of Canons regular of the order of St Auguſtin at Groendal, in the foreſt of Soignies, two leagues from Bruſſels; and laſtly reformer of the order in all the Low-Countries (*a*). He was a man of no learning, but very devout [*A*] and contemplative, and altogether internal; and went ſo far into the depths of myſtical Divinity that he paſſed for one of the greateſt maſters in that ſcience. He was called a ſecond Dionyſius Areopagita (*b*). He wrote ſeveral books in Dutch, the manuſcripts of which are kept in the monaſtery of Groendal, with the Latin verſion of ſome of them tranſlated by William Jordan, his contemporary, and of the ſame fraternity with the author (*c*). By reaſon of his ignorance it was thought that he was to be accounted one of thoſe who have written by inſpiration (*d*). There is a Latin tranſlation of all his works done by Laurence Surius, and thrice printed at Cologn, viz. in the year 1552, in the year 1609, and in the year 1692. His treatiſe of the ſpiritual marriage had already been printed in Latin at Paris in 1512. John de Schoonhove hath writ an apology for that treatiſe in anſwer to the critical diſſertation of John Gerſon. He is not the only perſon who has anſwered that diſſertation. Denis the Carthuſian likewiſe anſwered it (*e*). It is obſervable that our Ruyſbroeck wrote without any other aſſiſtance ſave that of a profound meditation. He retired into a remote corner of the foreſt, and there expected the inſpirations from above (*f*), and as he received them, he wrote them in his pocket-book. Theſe were the only materials of his works which he digeſted when he was returned to his monaſtery. There are ſome who have them in great eſteem; and even ſome Proteſtants commend them [*B*]. The character of this myſtical Divine, may be learnt from what hath been ſaid elſewhere, and from what will be ſeen below [*C*]. The ſubmiſſion of Ruyſbroeck to the Divine Will extended even to the torments of

Hell

[*A*] *He was a man of no learning, but very devout.*] This is what we are told by the abbot Trithemius, ‘ Vir, ut ferunt, devotus, ſed parùm literatus (1). - - - ‘ *A devout man, as they ſay, but of ſmall learning.*’ Dionyſius the Carthuſian obſerves that Ruyſbroeck though unlearned had notwithſtanding thoughts ſo ſublime, that they raviſhed to admiration, and even almoſt to an extaſy, the moſt excellent Profeſſors of Theology, who owned that they were above their underſtanding. This he aſcribes to the inſpirations of the Holy Spirit: *Nonnè ritè mirabile cenſemus, quod Ruſbrochius, cum idiota eſſet, nihilominus meritò ſanctitatis & ſimplicitatis ſuæ, tam ſupernaturales divinitùs theorias ſortitus eſt, & in ſuo quoque vulgari idiomate tam ſubtiliſſimas veritates conſcripſit, ut excellentiſſimi Sacræ theologiæ profeſſores Spiritum præ admiratione vix habeant, ſeque ſententias ejus non poſſe intelligere ediſſerunt* (2). Many other authors have had recourſe to the ſame cauſe; and have maintained that Ruyſbroeck had all his knowledge immediately from the Holy Spirit, and they obſerve that he himſelf thought ſo. ‘ Fundamentum & originem horum ejus ſcriptorum, ‘ Lector, qui illuminatis mentis oculis, ſanoque Spi‘rituali guſtu, ad diſcernendum bonum à malo gau‘det, facile purum & divinum cognoſcet. Quâ cauſâ ‘ & Editores promiſcuè ferè Inſcriptionibus Librorum ‘ ejus ejuſmodi teſtimonia propoſuerunt. *Hos nempè* ‘ *libros divinitate & illuminatione plenos, ac à DEO* ‘ *inſpiratos eſſe.* Et in vitæ ejus Hiſtoria narratur. ‘ Cap. iix. p. 4. quod à Gerardo Magno interroga‘tus, ſic reſponderit: *Certum ac firmum habeto, nul*‘*lum me unquam verbum ſcriptis meis inſeruiſſe, niſi ex* ‘ *inſtinctu Spiritus S. & in ſingulari quadam & dulciſ*‘*ſima præſentia superſanctiſſimæ Trinitatis.* Et ſequente ‘ Capite ix. commemoratur; quod plerumque ſolus in ‘ ſylvæ abdita ſe recipere conſueverit, atque ibi ſum‘mo ſilentio, quæ ex Dei Spiritu hauſiſſet, in ſcripta ‘ redegerit, hocque pacto omnia ſua opera conſcrip‘ſerit, atque ita minimè ex aliis congeſſerit. Quippe ‘ nulla literarum cultura ornatus, artem hanc neſci‘vit (3). - - - *Whoſoever, reader, hath the eyes of* ‘ *his mind illuminated, and is of a ſound ſpiritual* ‘ *taſte, to diſcern good from evil, will plainly per*‘*ceive, that the foundation and origin of theſe writings,* ‘ *is holy and divine. Upon which account it is that the* ‘ *publiſhers of all his works in general have given them* ‘ *ſuch teſtimonies as this,* viz. *that* theſe books are full ‘ of divine illumination, and inſpired by GOD. *And* ‘ *it is reported in chap. viii. p. 4. that being aſked by* ‘ *Gerardus Magnus, he thus anſwered:* Believe it moſt ‘ certain, that I have never put any word in my writ‘ings, but by the inſpiration of the Holy Spirit, and ‘ in a certain particular and moſt raviſhing preſence of ‘ the moſt Holy Trinity. *And in the following ninth* ‘ *chapter it is ſaid; that he commonly uſed to retire alone* ‘ *into the moſt ſolitary places of the foreſt, and there, in* ‘ *profound ſilence, put in writing what he received from* ‘ *the Divine Spirit, and in this manner he compoſed all* ‘ *his works, and ſo did not collect them from others. For* ‘ *not being endowed with learning, he was a ſtranger to* ‘ *that art.*’ What I am going to cite from Valerius Andreas will explain and confirm all this. *Vir divinæ contemplationi addictiſſimus, & ſanctitatis majoris quàm doctrinæ; cùm ea, quæ ſcripſit, divino ſpiritu edoctus videatur. Narrat enim Henricus à Pomerio, ejuſdem inſtituti ac loci Religioſus, Vitæque Scriptor, quòd antequam libros ſuos dictaret, habuerit pro conſuetudine,* ut, dum divinæ illuſtrationis radio immadeſceret, ſolus ſecederet in abdita ſilvæ, ibique dictante Spiritu ſancto ea, quæ ſibi occurrebant, in tabula cerea ſcripto commendans, ſecum ſolebat, ad monaſterium rediens, apportare: *ſicque interpolatis vicibus edidiſſe ſuos libros* (4). Can any one after this be ſurprized that many have complained that the writings of Ruyſbroeck are very obſcure (5)? How can they be otherwiſe being compoſed by an unlearned man, and on the ſubject of myſtical Divinity, where almoſt nothing is underſtood, even when the moſt ſubtile and learned pens have treated it.

[*B*] *There are ſome who have them in great eſteem, and even ſome Proteſtants themſelves commend them.*] Mr Arnold (6) points out ſeveral paſſages from Catholic authors who have admired Ruyſbroeck. He does not forget the Lutherans who praiſe him, and ſpeaks alſo of the Calviniſts who have judged favourably of him; but he ſhould not have put (7) Franciſcus Swertius in that number who is a ſtanch Popiſh author. In all likelihood the occaſion of his miſtake was his calling to mind that there was a book intituled *Athenæ Batavæ*, the author of which was a Calviniſt, and his not taking notice of the difference between that book and the *Athenæ Belgicæ* of Swertius. It is impoſſible for a man not to fall ſometimes into ſuch a miſtake, how careful ſoever he may be.

[*C*] *The character of this myſtical Divine may be learned from what hath been ſaid elſewhere* (8), *and what will be ſeen below.*] It is aſſerted in the work from whence we took the character of Taulerus, that Ruyſbroeck, *his cotemporary, and in ſome manner his maſter, was almoſt of the ſame character, and ſometimes ſoars higher and is more methodical than he* (9). Two pages after it is ſaid that Henry Harphius comes very near the character of Taulerus, ‘ and that before ‘ him, no perſon ever did, nor perhaps after him ever ‘ will penetrate ſo deep into the inward ſtates of a ‘ ſoul altogether reſigned to GOD; whereby we may ‘ ſee that Ruyſbroeck has been no ſmall aſſiſtance to ‘ him. His character is, to propoſe the gradual re-

‘ ſurrection

(*a*) Val. Andreas, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 555.

(*b*) Dionyſ. Carthuſianus, Tract. ii, de Donis Spiritus Sancti, *Artic. xiii.*

(*c*) Val. Andreas, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 556, 557.

(*d*) See the remark [*A*].

(*e*) *See* Gothofr. Arnoldus, Hiſtoria Theolog. Myſticæ, *p.* 308.

(*f*) See the remark [*A*].

(1) Trithem. *apud* Geſner. Biblioth. *folio* 452, *verſo.*

(2) Dionyſ. Carthuſianus, Serm. I. de Confeſſ. non Pontif. *apud* Gothofredum Arnoldum, *in* Hiſtoria Theolog. Myſticæ, *pag.* 307, *where he alſo ſays,* & hinc *Dionyſium* illum nuncupavit *alterum, ob excellentem ejus ſapientiam, cujus ſolum Spiritum S. habuit Doctorem.* Tract. II de Donis Spirit. S. Art. 13.

(3) Gothofr. Arnoldus, *ibid. pag.* 310.

(4) Val. Andreas, Biblioth. Belgic. *pag.* 555, 556.

(5) Arnol. Hiſt. Theol. Myſticæ, *pag.* 311.

(6) Idem. ibid, *pag.* 307, *& ſeq.*

(7) Ibid. *p.* 309.

(8) In the remark [*E*] in the article TAULERUS.

(9) Lettre touchant les Auteurs Myſtiques, *printed with the* Theologie Germanique, *pag.* 13, *Amſterd. Edition.* 1700.

Hell [*D*]. He died the ſecond day of December 1381, at the age of eighty-eight years. It is ſaid that he wrought maricles, and an attempt was made to canonize him [*E*]. I ſhall take notice of the miſtakes of Moreri, and of the author of the Eſſays of Literature [*F*]. I do not explain the ſubject of the diſpute in which Gerſon engaged

‘ ſurrection of the ſtates of ſpiritual life in a purified and experienced ſoul. He ſhews how after various mortifications, purifications, and experiences of the ſoul, there are raiſed in it from one degree to another new ſtates of divine life, firſt active, then paſſive, in the inferior powers of the ſoul, after that in the ſuperior (the memory, the underſtanding, and the will): afterward in its eſſential ground, and finally over its being and the operations of its powers, by being poſſeſſed by the Holy Trinity, which therein manifeſt their adorable operations. This is the moſt curious, moſt ſubſtantial, and moſt advanced ſyſtem of the depth of myſtical Divinity that hath ever yet appeared (10).’ Mr Arnold (11) quotes ſome authors who obſerve that Henry Harphius hath borrowed of Ruyſbroeck almoſt all the matter of the contemplation in his ſecond and third books. Thus we may form an idea of the ſpirit of Ruyſbroeck by conſidering the character of Harphius.

[*D*] *The reſignation of Ruyſbroeck to the will of GOD extended even to the torments of Hell.*] That is he found nothing was better than to be willing to ſuffer whatever GOD ſhould be pleaſed to ſend, death, or life, and even the pains of Hell. In this manner he explained himſelf one day when ſome body attempted to inſpire him with fear of infernal pains. *In Hiſtoria illius cap. viii. legitur* “ Quod Gerhardus cùm quandoque inſolitam in Ruſbrochio erga Deum fiduciam, non ex temeritate, timorem foras mittente, conceptam perſpexiſſet, quandoque divini judicii & inferni metum ei incutere multis Scripturæ commemorandis ſententiis attentaverit.” Sed quanto plus ei quandam injicere formidinem connitebatur, tanto vir plus majori in Deum amore ferveſcebat; & tandem reſpondit: *Magiſter Gerharde fixum & certum habe, me ex animo paratum eſſe ad perferenda omnia, quæ Dominus mihi accidere volet, ſive mors ſit, ſive vita, ſive etiam ipſi intolerabiles cruciatus inferorum. Neque enim quicquam mihi vel jucundius, vel melius, vel ſalubriùs judico, nec quicquam aliud vel peto, vel deſidero, quam ut amantiſſimus Dominus Deus meus promtum me ſemper atque paratum inveniat, ad ſuæ arbitrium voluntatis.* Hoc breviter totum viri hujus Principium detegit (12). “ - - - *When Gerhard perceiving Ruyſbroeck profeſſed faith, love, and truſt in GOD, would ſometimes try to excite in him the fear of the divine judgment and of Hell, by quoting ſeveral paſſages of ſcripture to that effect; the man was ſo far from being moved thereby, that his love to GOD ſeemed to be more inflamed; and at laſt he would anſwer:*” ‘Mr Gerhard aſſure your ſelf, that from my heart I am willing to ſuffer whatever the Lord ſhall be pleaſed to lay on me, whether it be death, or life, or even the intolerable pains of Hell. For I judge nothing more pleaſant, or better, or more to my advantage, nor do I ſeek, or deſire any thing elſe, than that my moſt beloved Lord GOD, may always find me willing and prepared to comply with the good pleaſure of his will. *This briefly diſcovers the principles of this man.*’ Mr Arnold, from whom I have taken what I have related, ſays that Ruyſbroeck was not ſo much as other Myſtics, occupied in ſquaring his actions according to the law from a principle of the ſervile fear of puniſhment, but all his endeavour and ſtudy was the exerciſe of a free evangelical virtue, manifeſting itſelf by the filial ſpirit that operates in every true believer. *Character Myſtici hujus Doctoris* (Ruſbrochii) *in multis ad Tauleri ſupra excerptum accedere videtur. Attamen judico, Ruſbrochii propoſitionem longè puriorem & vivæ ac fiduciali* fidei in nomen Jeſu in nobis *conformiorem eſſe. Dum minus ac omnes ferè alii antiquorum Myſticorum theologorum, timorem ſervilem & inde orientem propriam activitatem ac legales, anxiaſque exercitationes intendat, & è contrario ad liberam Evangelii virtutem & efficaciam Novi Fœderis tantummodo ducat, eo modo, quo hæc ſe per unctionem filialis Spiritus unicuique vere credenti revelat* (13).

We may obſerve, by the by, that there is no doctrine for which the Myſtics are ſo much exclaimed againſt, as for that of conſenting to their own eternal damnation. Mr Jurieu has not forgot it (14): but he is accuſed of having unfaithfully related the words of Francis de Sales. Conſult Mr Arnold (15) who taxes him pretty briſkly, for this and other faults, and eſpecially for contradicting himſelf (16); but he hath not rightly underſtood that place of the 158th page: *Theſe words of Francis de Sales ſhew the weakneſs of the archbiſhop of Cambray's Theology.* He thus tranſlates them; *hæc verba monſtrant nobis amentiam Archiepiſcopi Cameracenſis*: he ſhould have rendred them, *hæc verba monſtrant nobis locum debilem Theologiæ Archiepiſcopi Cameracenſis.* There is a great difference between the folly of a man, and the weakneſs of his doctrines.

[*E*] *It was ſaid that he wrought miracles; and endeavours were uſed to have had him canonized.*] This is what you will find in theſe Latin words: ‘Plura de Vita & Miraculis ſancti hujus viri, poſt *Henr. à Pomerio, Marcus Maſtelinus*, ejuſdem loci Religioſus, in ſuo Necrologio Viridis Vallis lib. II. cap. i. & ſeqq. Deſcripſit & acta Vitæ ejuſdem *Thomas de Jeſu*, Carmelita Excalceatus, Gregorio XV. pro obtinenda illius beatificatione præſentata (17). - - - *More of the life and miracles of this holy man we have from* Marcus Maſtellinus *in his* Necrologium Viridis Vallis, *a Monk of the ſame monaſtery.* Thomas de Jeſu, *a Carmelite, barefooted Friar, wrote alſo the acts of his life, which he preſented to Pope Gregory XV, in order to obtain his canonization.*’

[*F*] *I ſhall take notice of the miſtakes of Moreri, and of the author of the Eſſays on Literature.*] I. He ſhould not have ſaid that the village *Ruiſbroeck* is *upon the Sambre in Brabant*. It would be difficult to find upon the banks of the Sambre any village belonging to Brabant; but however that would not agree to the country of Ruyſbroeck. It is ſituated upon the river of Senne between Bruſſels and Hall. Valerius Andreas and Father Labbe who were Mr Moreri's authors in this article obſerve this in expreſs terms. How then could he think that a place ſituated between theſe two cities ſtood upon the Sambre? II. When he ſays that Ruyſbroeck, was firſt prieſt and curate of the church of St Gudula, he has not ſufficiently conſidered theſe words of the original which he intended to tranſlate. *Fuit primo Eccleſiæ D. Gudilæ Vicarius & Preſbyter* (18). I am of opinion they ſignify that he was ſucceſively curate and rector of the church of St Gudula; for methinks it had been to no purpoſe to obſerve that he was Prieſt while he was curate of a parochial church. However it be, Mr Moreri has prepoſterouſly tranſpoſed the two titles of Ruyſbroeck, he has put that of Prieſt before that of curate in ſpite of Valerius Andreas who was his author. III. No ſuch thing is known as the monaſtery of *Val-vert* in the neighbourhood of Bruſſels: that of which Ruyſbroeck was Prior is called *Groendal.* Valerias Andreas calls it in Latin *Viridis-Vallis,* but Mr Moreri ought not to have tranſlated it into French: he ſhould have given it the common name of that convent. IV. Mr du Pin had no reaſon to ſay that Ruyſbroeck had been a Prior *of the monaſtery of the canons regular of Wavre in the foreſt of Soignies* (19); for Wavre is not in that foreſt, and it is a Priory of Benedictins: and after all Ruyſbroeck was Prior of Groendal, not of Wavre. The French name of that foreſt is *la Foret de Soigne*, or *de Soignies*, and not *de Sognien*, as Moreri calls it. V. Dionyſius the Carthuſian is not one of thoſe who turned into Latin the works of Ruyſbroeck. VI. Ruyſbroeck died in the eighty-eight year of his age, and not in the *forty-eight* (20). VII. Inſtead of quoting Mark Maſtelin *in Necro Viridis Vallis*, he ought to have cited *in Necrologio Viridis Vallis.* VIII. He ſhould have quoted book II, article xiii of Dionyſius the Carthuſian *de Donis Spiritus Sancti*, and not book I, article iii.

The anonymous author, who began in the month of July 1702 to publiſh at Paris *Eſſays of Literature for the knowledge of books*, has given us the article of Ruyſbroeck in the eſſays for November of that year (21). It is almoſt nothing elſe but a paraphraſe of Moreri; he is fallen into the firſt ſix faults which I have juſt now obſerved, and to theſe he has added other very groſs engaged againſt the book of ſpiritual marriage: Mr du Pin may be conſulted, who acquaints us in few words with what is ſufficient to be known in that affair (g).

---

(10) Idem. *p.* 15.

(11) Arnold. Hiſt. Theol. Myſtic. *p.* 308.

(12) Idem. ibid. *pag.* 313.

(13) Idem. ibid. *pag.* 312.

(14) In his Hiſtorical Treatiſe, concerning Myſtical Divinity, printed at Rotterdam in the year 1699.

(15) Arnold, ubi ſupra, *pag.* 543, *& ſeq.*

(16) Idem. ibid. *pag.* 537, *& ſeq.*

(17) Valer. Andreas, Biblioth. Belg. *pag.* 557.

(18) Idem, ibid. *pag.* 555.

(19) Du Pin, Biblioth. *Tom. xi, pag. m.* 84.

(20) This miſtake is in the Paris edition of 1699; but not in the former editions.

(21) Pag. 132, & ſeq.

groſs ones. I. He ſays that the works of Ruyſbroeck printed at Cologn in the years 1552, and 1609, are in 4to. This is only true of the edition of 1609: the other is in folio. II. He is ignorant of the edition at Cologn 1692. III. He ſays that *it is obſerved that* Gerſon *was ſo prejudiced againſt that author, that he could not bear even to hear his name mentioned.* Mr du Pin on the contrary affirms, that Gerſon *afterwards acknowledged that* Ruyſbroeck *might be excuſed* (22). IV. This anonymous author will have it that there was one John Ruſbach, who hath been confounded with John Ruyſbroeck. He aſcribes to this John Ruſbach the following books, *Tractatus de præcipuis virtutibus. Liber de fide & judicio. De quatuor tentationibus. De ſeptem cuſtodiis. De ſeptem gradibus amoris. De perfectione filiorum Dei. Regnum amantium Deum. De vera contemplatione. Epiſtolæ & cantiones.* He ſays that *Ruſbroch flouriſhed in the year* 1390, *as Trithemius hath obſerved, who hath alſo confounded him with John Ruſbach:* notwithſtanding that he had but juſt before ſaid that *Ruſbrochius died young*, which *was in the year* 1381, *aged forty-eight years, contrary to the opinion of Trithemius, who places his death no earlier than* 1390 (23). He pretends that ſeveral authors have obſerved that a diſtinction was to be made between John Ruſbach, and John Ruyſbroeck. He adds, that he has beſides for his author *Conrad Geſner, whoſe Hiſtorical Library is in great eſteem, and who for certain knew better the authors of his own country than any other Annaliſt.* This is to make many miſtakes in a few words; for in the firſt place Geſner's *Bibliotheque* ſays nothing at all about John Ruſbach, and in the ſecond place Geſner was a Swiſs, and not John Ruyſbroeck's countryman, and our author ſays nothing of the country of his pretended John Ruſbach. Will he have him to be a Swiſs, and that this conſequence may be inferred from what he hath ſaid of Geſner? But in this caſe it muſt likewiſe be concluded that Ruyſbroeck was a Swiſs. In the third place, he confounds with Geſner thoſe who have abridged his *Bibliotheque*, and who have thereto added new articles: theſe are they which ſpeak not only of *Johannes Ruſbachius*, but alſo of *Johannes Ruſberus*, as of two authors different from *Joannes Ruyſbroekius.* They are groſsly miſtaken: they make three authors of one, as Father Labbe has very well conjectured (24). The books which they aſcribe to this John Ruſbachius, and which they ſay were printed at Cologn in 1552, *apud hæredes Quenteli*, are found in the edition of the works of John Ruyſbroeck, publiſhed at Cologn in the year 1552, by the ſame Printers. And as to the book which they attribute to John Ruſberus *de ornatu ſpiritualium nuptiarum, libri III*, it is undoubtedly the work of our Ruyſbroeck (25): even the author of the Eſſays is of this opinion (26).

(g) Du Pin, Bibl. *Tom. xi, pag.* 84, *Holland Edition.*

(22) Du Pin, Bibliotheq. *Tom. xi, pag.* 84.

(23) It is in this year Trithemius ſays that Ruyſbroeck flouriſhed, not that he died in it.

(24) Labbe, de Scriptor. Eccleſ. *Tom. I, p.* 604.

(25) *See* Valerius Andreas, Bibl. Belg. *pag.* 556.

(26) Eſſais de Literat, *Nov.* 1702, *pag.* 136.

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

The End of the Fourth VOLUME.